Walking the tightrope: communicating overdiagnosis in modern healthcare

Communication that empowers the public, patients, clinicians, and policy makers to think differently about overdiagnosis will help support a more sustainable healthcare future for all, argue Kirsten McCaffery and colleagues
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Overdiagnosis and overtreatment have serious implications for individuals, healthcare systems, and society,1 2 and effective strategies are urgently needed to help the public, clinicians, and policy makers address this problem. Communication about overdiagnosis has been highlighted as essential for moving forward but presents several challenges, such as the potential to confuse the public, undermine trust, and adversely affect people who already have a diagnosis. Various communication based strategies offer real promise; we describe what is known and what we need to know to communicate effectively and safely about overdiagnosis and overtreatment.

What are the key messages to be communicated?

Understanding of overdiagnosis among the general public and health professionals is limited, so it is essential to communicate what it means for individuals, the health system, and society (box 1). By definition, overdiagnosis will not improve prognosis and will probably harm individuals (for example, by unnecessary intervention) or society (opportunity costs). For individuals, it is important to communicate the nature (physical or psychological), likelihood, and duration of the harms. For societies with free public healthcare, the financial strain and opportunity cost are usually at system level—resources wasted on unnecessary tests and treatments are unavailable for people in greater need. But in private healthcare systems, overdiagnosis can be a huge personal financial burden, even for those with insurance.

Communication is further complicated because it is usually impossible to know whether an individual has been overdiagnosed or benefited from the diagnosis—overdiagnosis can only be observed at the aggregate level. Recent efforts to communicate the concept and likelihood of overdiagnosis in breast screening have had some success, albeit with much room for improvement. When given a patient decision aid including an infographic and icon array (figure⇓), 29% of women understood both the concept and quantitative outcomes of breast screening (including deaths avoided, false positive results, and overdiagnosis); 59% of women understood the conceptual information alone.1

Communication based strategies to mitigate overdiagnosis

Several communication based strategies have been applied in the areas of overtesting and overtreatment and directed at individual, community, or policy levels (box 2).

Strategies for individuals

Shared decision making is a consultation process where a clinician and patient jointly make a health decision. It changes
Box 1: Overdiagnosis and its consequences

Overdiagnosis occurs when a diagnosis is “correct” according to current professional standards but when the diagnosis or associated treatment has a low probability of benefiting the person diagnosed. It is caused by a range of factors such as:
- Use of increasingly sensitive tests that identify abnormalities that are indolent, non-progressive, or regressive (overdetection)
- Expanded definitions of disease—for example, attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder and dementia—and lowering of disease thresholds, such as osteoporosis (overdefinition)
- Creation of pseudodiseases (also called disease mongering), such as low testosterone and restless leg syndrome
- Clinicians’ fear of missing a diagnosis or litigation
- Public enthusiasm for screening or testing and desire for reassurance
- Financial incentives

Potential consequences of overdiagnosis
- Psychological and behavioural effects of disease labelling
- Physical harms and side effects of unnecessary tests or treatment
- Quality of life affected by unnecessary treatment
- Hassles of unnecessary tests and treatments
- Increased financial costs to individuals
- Wasted resources and opportunity costs to the health system
- Overmedicalisation of society

Strategies for communities

Mass media and direct to consumer campaigns can influence large numbers of people simultaneously and promote sustained beneficial changes in behaviour. For example, a mass media campaign about back pain, driven partly by concerns about unnecessary back imaging, changed both community and general practitioner beliefs about management, resulting in reduced imaging, work insurance claims, and healthcare usage. Scaled down versions of the programme have been replicated in several countries. Other important initiatives include the Choosing Wisely campaign, now operating in nine countries (www.choosingwisely.org), and the UK’s “do not do” list.

Policy directed strategies

Deliberative democratic methods (such as community juries) support policy decisions by gathering informed public responses about disputed issues, such as what services are available or reimbursed by health funds. Because overdiagnosis is scientifically and politically contested, this topic is ideal for deliberative democratic methods. Deliberative methods must meet exacting standards and are time consuming. Community juries have considered PSA testing in Australia and mammographic screening in New Zealand, where participants changed their recommendation at least partly because of potential harms from overdiagnosis. Disseminating findings from juries could enhance community health literacy, leading to better informed citizens and more transparent decision making.

Changing terminology: Behaviours can be influenced by medical terminology, and changing the names for medical conditions may help reduce the effect of overdiagnosis. In one study, describing ductal carcinoma in situ as “non-invasive cancer” resulted in 13-16% more women choosing surgical treatment (rather than medication or active surveillance) compared with calling it a “breast lesion” or “abnormal cells.” Similar findings were reported in Australia. Independent experts convened by the US National Cancer Institute and National Institute of Health have proposed dropping the word “cancer” entirely in this case, arguing for it to be reserved for lesions likely to progress if untreated. Similar arguments exist for thyroid and prostate cancer, but effects of disease labels extend beyond cancer. Parents were more likely to accept medication when “gastro-oesophageal reflux disease” (compared with no label) was used to describe excessive irritability in infants, even when told the drugs would not control the symptoms.

Potential challenges to effective communication

Low levels of awareness: Awareness of overdiagnosis is low, particularly for cancer screening with few people understanding overdiagnosis of cancer is even possible. In one study, 18% of Australian men and only 10% of women said they had been
told about overdiagnosis in screening for prostate and breast cancer respectively. Similar, a US survey reported only 9.5% of men and women (aged 50-69 years) said they had been informed about overdiagnosis when discussing cancer screening. Further US and UK studies reported that only about half of respondents had heard of ‘cancers that grow so slowly that they are unlikely to cause [you] problems in [your] lifetime.’ There are few publications reporting clinician awareness, but one recent survey among 126 university affiliated clinicians in the US found 28% listed overdiagnosis as a potential harm of PSA testing, and 56% listed unnecessary treatment.

Cognitive biases and counterintuitive messages: Longstanding, prominent public health messages have emphasised the benefits and ignored the harms of early diagnosis for many diseases. This makes the concept of overdiagnosis unfamiliar, counterintuitive, and difficult to understand. There is widespread faith in the importance of early detection, and people may choose cancer screening because it is the apparent default decision, even if their informed preferences would be different. Furthermore, when people are predisposed towards an intervention, they may perceive benefits to be high and risks low, even when explicitly told otherwise. Suggesting a reduction in tests that are popular with the public can provoke emotionally charged, even hostile responses, reflecting cognitive dissonance.

Uncertainty and trust: Intolerance of uncertainty and anxiety about missing rare cases underpin much medical excess. Communicating about overdiagnosis requires us to acknowledge the inherent uncertainty in the size and extent of the problem and its consequences. These issues are often hotly contested. Communicating uncertainty adds complexity and may lead to confusion and avoidance of decision making, and can undermine trust in the healthcare provider. However, distrust can also arise when patients discover that information about harms has been withheld. Clinicians often avoid discussing uncertainty with patients, but studies of breast and prostate screening show that people want to be told about overdiagnosis.

Vested interests and persuasive communication: Vested interests may influence how information is presented in the media and the scientific arena. Pharmaceutical and device manufacturers have direct interests in maximising product sales. Industry funded disease awareness campaigns often increase the numbers of people portrayed as patients. Narrowing the boundaries that define disease or raising diagnostic thresholds is a threat to turnover, profit, and professional interests. Similarly patient advocacy groups, often also industry funded, can have interests in portraying their condition as widespread, severe, and treatable to optimise media, professional, and policy attention and to attract resources. Politicians too have seen mileage in supporting screening programmes without offering more nuanced assessments of their benefits and harms, including risks of overdiagnosis.

Further research directions

We need studies about what the public, patients, and clinicians currently know, understand, and want to know about overdiagnosis and their attitudes, reactions, and choices when provided with such information. Then we can research effective communication—how to increase understanding among all parties and the effectiveness and acceptability of such strategies. Once effective interventions are identified, we need to understand how to implement them within healthcare systems that currently reward overdiagnosis. However, research must also consider potential harms of communicating overdiagnosis, and herein lies the tightrope. Possible harms include cognitively overburdening and confusing the public, adversely affecting patients already diagnosed and treated, and creating distrust in conventional medicine. A careful evidence based approach is essential.

Achieving widespread understanding about overdiagnosis will take time, but we have some tools to move forward. Given that high health anxiety is largely a consequence of the health system itself, the health community must be patient with and sympathetic towards those who do not share this concern about overdiagnosis. Successful communication that empowers the public, patients, clinicians, and policy makers to think differently about overdiagnosis will help support more sustainable healthcare for all.

We thank Teppo Jarvinen, Angie Fagerlin, and Elizabeth Dawson for reading and providing thoughtful comment on this manuscript and all
participants of the preventing overdiagnosis research workshop on communication, held in Oxford, September 2014. We thank Brooke Nickel for administrative support.

Contributors and sources: This article was produced following the 2014 preventing overdiagnosis conference research planning day. KJMCC and AE led writing of the manuscript. Each author contributed to sections of the paper and commented on drafts. KJMCC is guarantor. The authors have expertise in shared decision making, public communication about overdiagnosis, risk communication, and decision science.

Competing interests: We have read and understood BMJ policy on declaration of interests and declare KJMCC is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) career development fellowship (1029241), JJ is supported by an NHMRC early career fellowship (1037028), and JW is supported by a career development fellowship from Cancer Research UK (C7492/A17219).

Provenance and peer review: Commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Key messages

Overdiagnosis provides no benefits to patients and is a challenge to the sustainability of modern healthcare systems.

Communication-based strategies could help reduce overdiagnosis and its negative impact on individuals and health systems.

Mass media education, shared decision making, terminology changes for disease states, and deliberative methods (juries) all have potential as effective communication strategies.


**ANALYSIS**

**Figure**

**Infographic and icon array explaining overdiagnosis in breast screening in a patient decision aid developed by Hersch et al**

Over-detection: an example

Imagine a woman called Maria who develops a small, slow-growing breast cancer in her 50s or 60s. The picture below shows two possible scenarios that could happen to Maria. Scenario 1 (top) is with screening, and Scenario 2 (bottom) is without screening.

**Scenario One** Maria does have screening:
- Cancer diagnosis and treatment: Her cancer is found, she is diagnosed and has treatment.
- Maria lives to age 65, and then dies of breast disease.

**Scenario Two** Maria does not have screening:
- No cancer diagnosis, no treatment: Her cancer is never found and never affects her health.

**Putting it together**

For women in Australia who have breast screening over 20 years:
- 4 out of 1000 women avoid dying from breast cancer, and
- 19 out of 1000 women experience over-detection (a diagnosis and treatment she does not need).

2. Screening leads to finding some breast cancers that are not harmful (over-detection)^

The cancers found by screening are treated to try and prevent problems later. But some cancers found by screening would never cause problems anyway. Cancers like this may grow very slowly or just stay the same. Without screening, they would never be noticed or cause any trouble. Finding these cancers through screening is called ‘over-detection’ (or over-diagnosis).

Even after further checks and examination, doctors cannot be sure which cancers will be harmless. Therefore, treatment is recommended. So, across all the women who have screening, some end up having treatment they do not need.

Breast cancer treatments include surgery, radiotherapy, hormone therapy, and chemotherapy. There are important side effects to these treatments which are described on page 8.

**Over-detection** over 20 years of screening

Out of 1000 women who have breast screening for 20 years, 72 women are diagnosed with breast cancer.
Of these,
- 19 women experience over-detection: they are diagnosed and treated for a cancer that would not have caused any trouble and
- 54 women are diagnosed with breast cancer that is not over-detection.

As this information is new, there is an example of over-detection on the next page.