Impact of genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer disposition on psychosocial outcomes and risk perception: A population-based follow-up study

PhD thesis

Ellen M. Mikkelsen

Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital
Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital
The Centre for Innovation in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus

Faculty of Health Sciences
University of Aarhus
2006

Supervisors

Søren P. Johnsen, MD, PhD
Department of Clinical Epidemiology
Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark

Lone Sunde, MD, PhD
Department of Clinical Genetics,
Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark

Christoffer Johansen, MD, DMSc
Department of Psychosocial Cancer Research, Institute of Cancer Epidemiology,
The Danish Cancer Society, Denmark

Evaluation committee

Anders Bonde Jensen, MD, PhD
Department of Oncology
Aarhus University Hospital, Denmark

Karin Nordin, MSc, PhD
Department of Public Health and Caring Sciences
Uppsala University

Jørgen Lous, Professor, MD, DMSc
Institute of Public Health, Health Economics
University of Southern Denmark

Preface

This PhD thesis is based on studies carried out during my employment at the Centre for Innovation in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus, and at the Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital.

I am deeply indebted to a number of persons who have made this work possible. First of all to my supervisors: Lone Sunde, who introduced me to the field of genetic cancer counseling and supported me with great enthusiasm; Christoffer Johansen, for inspiring me to undertake the project and for his constructive and optimistic feedback; and Søren Paaske Johnsen, for his tremendous commitment to all aspects of this research project and for his unfailingly thoughtful and inspiring guidance.

I wish to thank Henrik Toft Sørensen for his belief in the project, and for allowing me to be a part of the inspiring and positive research environment at the Department of Clinical Epidemiology.

I also wish to thank the women and the physicians who participated in the study and the hospital staff for coordinating patient enrollment. Special thanks go to Marianne Askvold and Jette Sandgaard for help with myriad data collection problems.

I am grateful to Flemming Andersen and Tina Lauritzen at the Research Unit for Functional Disorders, Århus University Hospital, for their assistance in designing and handling the questionnaires. I am also grateful to biostatisticians Heidi Hundborg, Mette V. Skriver, and Henrik F. Thomen for their advice and assistance with the data analyses.

I wish to thank all my colleagues at the Department of Clinical Epidemiology for creating an inspiring and convivial daily atmosphere. Special thanks to Alma Pedersen, Vivian Langagergaard and Helle Terkildsen Maindal for rewarding discussions and for sharing the experiences of being PhD students.

Finally, my most sincere thanks go to my husband Flemming Bastholm and our children Sara and Simon for their encouragement and support at all times.

This research was funded by the Danish Cancer Society (Grant number PP 02 010), the Center for Innovation and Development in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus, the Danish Nurses´ Organization, the Aarhus University Research Foundation, the Western Danish Research Forum for Health Sciences, and Institute of Clinical Medicine Aarhus University Hospital.

This PhD thesis is based on the following papers:

I. Mikkelsen EM, Sunde L, Johansen C, Johnsen SP. Psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling: A population-based study. Submitted.

II. Mikkelsen EM, Sunde L, Johansen C, Johnsen SP. Risk perception among women receiving genetic counseling: A population-based follow-up study. Submitted.

III. Mikkelsen EM, Sunde L, Johansen C, Johnsen SP. Psychosocial consequences of genetic counseling: A population-based follow-up study. Submitted.

Abbreviations

RCT	Randomized controlled trial
HBOC	Hereditary breast ovarian cancer
HRQOL	Health related quality of life
IES	Impact of event scale
HADS	Hospital anxiety and depression scale
SF-36	The Medical Outcome Study Short Form 36 Health Survey

Introduction

Breast and ovarian cancer

Breast cancer is the most prevalent cancer in Danish women, accounting for 23% of all new cases. The standardized incidence rate of breast cancer has doubled over the past 50 years, and more than 4,000 new cases are currently identified each year. The lifetime risk of developing breast cancer for a Danish woman is approximately 10%. While ovarian cancer is less prevalent, 610 new cases were diagnosed in Denmark in 2001 (1). Important risk factors for breast cancer include sex, age, hormonal factors, family history of breast cancer, alcohol use, and obesity. It is estimated that having one first degree relative with breast cancer inflicts a relative risk of 2-4, while two first degree relatives increases the relative risk to over 4 (2). Knowledge about risk factors for ovarian cancer is sparser, but includes age, a family history of ovarian cancer, and/or early onset of breast cancer (3). Five-year relative survival among patients with breast and ovarian cancer, compared to the background population in Demark, has been estimated at 77% and 32%, respectively. Between 1986 and 1995, survival of breast cancer patients improved from 73% to 77%, while survival of ovarian cancer patients remained unchanged (4). These estimates indicate the diseases' severity and limitations of current treatment options.

Most cases of breast and ovarian cancer are non-hereditary. They develop when somatic mutations accumulate and transform normal cells into malignant cells (5-7).

Hereditary breast or ovarian cancer results from a germline mutation in a cancer susceptibility gene combined with a number of somatic mutations. Two highly penetrant cancer susceptibility genes, BRCA1 (8) and BRCA2 (9), have been identified at the long arms of chromosomes 17 and 13, respectively. Cancer susceptibility due to mutations in the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes

follows autosomal dominant transmission. It is estimated that mutations in these genes are responsible for approximately 7% of all breast cancers and 10% of all ovarian cancers (10). Carriers of mutations in the BRCA1 or BRCA2 genes have a substantially increased lifetime risk of developing both breast and ovarian cancer (HBOC). Their lifetime breast cancer risk has been estimated at 40%-85%, and their lifetime ovarian cancer risk at 15%-40%. Carriers of mutations in BRCA1 have a higher risk of both breast and ovarian cancer compared to carriers of mutations in BRCA2 (11-15). As a consequence of the autosomal dominant transmission, men and women are at equal risk of inheriting mutations in a cancer susceptibility gene. However, men rarely develop breast cancer.

Hereditary breast cancer is characterized by early onset (< 50 years), increased number of affected family members in two or more generations, increased risk of bilateral breast cancer, and a strong association with ovarian cancer (2;16). Hereditary ovarian cancer usually occurs in the context of hereditary breast cancer and does not differ markedly from non-hereditary ovarian cancer in respect to clinical and pathological features (3).

Genetic counseling

International and national clinical guidelines developed for genetic counseling address referral criteria, risk assessment, genetic testing, surveillance, and treatment (17-20).

The aims of genetic counseling have been described in the international literature as follows (6;20-22):

- to prevent disease and promote health
- to enhance the accuracy and usefulness of risk perceptions
- to promote informed decisions about surveillance, genetic testing, and treatment options

- to facilitate psychological well-being in risk adaptation.

Traditionally, physicians have provided genetic counseling in Denmark and the main focus of the counseling process has been information provision (17;23-25). The Danish Breast Cancer Cooperative Group (DBCG) (17) recently developed national genetic counseling guidelines for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. The literature describing Danish genetic counseling practices, including current guidelines, stresses that the counseling process should be non-directive, to promote autonomy and a sense of personal control (7;18;23;25).

Genetic counseling includes obtaining a pedigree followed by medical record confirmation of cancer diagnoses. During the counseling process, clients' risk perceptions and experiences with cancer in their families are explored. Furthermore, clients receive information on breast cancer incidence, genetics, inheritance patterns, treatment and prevention options, and a personal risk assessment (17;23;25).

Individual risk is assessed in one of two ways: when appropriate, it is calculated on the basis of a predisposing familial mutation or a pedigree indicating an autosomal dominantly inherited risk; otherwise, risk is assessed according to empirical data, *e.g.*, Claus *et al.* (26).

If indicated and feasible, clients are offered genetic testing. This consists of DNA analysis to detect hereditable disease-related mutations (27). Before testing, it is necessary to identify the mutation associated with the disease in a client's family. A primary mutation screening thus is offered to a cancer-affected individual in the family (22;28). When the mutation associated with

the disease has been identified in the family member, unaffected relatives then have the option of predictive testing.

Prevention guidelines

In Denmark, women found to be mutation carriers or who are estimated to be at considerably increased risk of breast cancer (> twice the risk of the background population) are referred to surveillance programs, which include mammograms, clinical breast examinations, and ultrasound scanning. In cases in which the risk of ovarian cancer is considerably increased, gynaecological examinations, serum CA125 levels, and vaginal ultrasound also are provided. Surveillance programs are designed individually, depending on age, level of risk, and personal preferences. Prophylactic mastectomy and oophorectomy are discussed as options for mutation carriers and other women at high risk (29).

Referral criteria

Genetic counseling is offered to men and women thought to be at risk of hereditary breast/ovarian cancer, independent of their own cancer status.

In Denmark, the tax-financed public health system offers counseling upon referral by a medical doctor. According to DBCG criteria, non-affected individuals can be referred if they are a first-degree relative of the following patients (or second degree relative via a male) (17):

- A patient diagnosed with breast cancer <40 years,
- A patient diagnosed with both breast and ovarian cancer,
- Two patients diagnosed with breast cancer or ovarian cancer <50 years,
- Three patients diagnosed with breast cancer across two generations, or

- A patient with a known mutation.

However, individuals who do not quite fulfill the criteria e.g. a woman who are diagnosed with breast cancer at early age or a person with another family history of cancer may still receive these services.

Genetic counseling for breast and ovarian cancer is offered at five departments of clinical genetics and one clinical oncology department in Denmark. A number of clinical departments provide surveillance programs and prophylactic surgery (17).

Outcomes of genetic counseling

Genetic counseling has been available for more than a decade in Denmark. The scarcity of primary prevention options for breast and ovarian cancers, together with positive expectations for genetic counseling, has increased the demand for this prevention strategy for hereditary cancer (23;30-32). While the number of individuals referred each year for genetic counseling for HBOC in Denmark is unknown, 215 new families with a hereditary disposition to HBOC were reported to the DBCG Registry in 2000, and this number increased to 685 in 2005 (33;34).

As well as other health care interventions genetic counseling has to be evaluated in terms of its outcomes. A simple way to summarize outcomes has been described as the five “Ds” – Death, Disease, Discomfort, Disability and Dissatisfaction (35). The "D´s" encompass a range of outcomes from death to emotional reactions. Genetic counseling is based on a multidimensional health concept incorporating physical, behavioural, social and psychological perspectives. The research related to the outcomes of genetic counseling should therefore reflect all these aspects.

Clinical outcomes

One of the aims of genetic counseling is to reduce cancer mortality and cancer incidence through genetic testing, clinical surveillance, and prophylactic surgery. However, because follow-up time for women who have received genetic counseling for HBOC is still limited, no studies to date have reported on these outcomes (18;19;28).

Instead, a number of studies have addressed intermediate clinical outcomes related to genetic counseling. In a randomized controlled trial (RCT), Schwartz *et al.* examined the rate of self-reported mammography following risk counseling and found no effect. (36). In a follow-up study, Meiser *et al.* detected no change in adherence to mammography surveillance after genetic counseling, but found a significant decrease in adherence to clinical breast examination 12 months later (37). Lerman *et al.* examined prophylactic surgery and surveillance behaviour during the year following BRCA1 or BRCA2 testing. They concluded that the vast majority of BRCA1 and BRCA2 carriers do not opt for prophylactic surgery and many do not adhere to surveillance recommendations (38).

Other studies have addressed the effect of specific surveillance and treatment procedures among women identified as mutation carriers or estimated to be at high risk. Breckelmans *et al*. found a lower sensitivity of mammography screening among BRCA1 and BRAC2 carriers and women under the age of 40 in a study of high-risk women (39). Oei *et al.* studied the effect of gynaecological screening of women at high risk of hereditary ovarian cancer. The procedure was found to be highly inefficient, in light of the high number of surveillance visits and the advanced stage of ovarian cancers detected.

Alcohol consumption and obesity are known risk factors for breast cancer (2). Together with other health behaviours, such as physical exercise and smoking, they may also influence the risk of hereditary breast cancer. To date, however, no studies have addressed the impact of genetic counseling on any of these health behaviours.

Psychological outcomes

The complexity of providing risk information (40;41), ethical dilemmas (42;43), and possible psychological distress (44;45) have spurred a large number of research projects on the cognitive and affective impacts of genetic counseling (18;19;46). Studies on cognitive outcomes mainly have focused on risk perception and knowledge of cancer genetics. The affective outcomes most frequently studied are generalized anxiety, generalized psychological distress, depression, and cancer-specific distress (47-49).

Review of the literature

I aimed to review the literature systematically to assess the effect of genetic counseling on risk perception and psychosocial outcomes.

Search strategy

The MEDLINE literature search used the following MESH terms: "genetic counseling" combined with "risk assessment", "breast neoplasm (major subheadings)", "ovarian neoplasm (major subheadings)", "anxiety", "depression", and "stress, psychosocial". Each search was limited to studies of female human adults aged 19+years, conducted during the period January 1, 1990 to May 21, 2006, and published in English with abstracts available. In addition, I searched MEDLINE for publications by key authors, and reviewed reference lists of the selected publications for other relevant articles.

I focused on studies that evaluated the impact of genetic counseling on risk perceptions in relation to breast cancer, and on the following psychosocial outcomes; anxiety, depression, cancer distress/worry, and health-related quality of life. A number of other outcomes related to genetic counseling were not considered, *e.g.*, knowledge (37;50;51), patient satisfaction (51;52), duration of counseling (53), compliance with breast cancer screening (37), intention to test (50), decisional conflict (50), decision to test (54), and general health (55).

I excluded all studies that were not designed as RCTs or as follow-up studies with at least one pre- and one post-counseling assessment (a minimum of 4 weeks after counseling) (56-58). In addition, I excluded studies that included only women affected with cancer (59) and studies in which data were not analyzed separately for affected and unaffected women (50;60-62).

In total 15 papers were reviewed in depth.

Studies on risk perception

The impact of genetic counseling on risk perception and risk accuracy at least four weeks after counseling has been assessed in 11 studies (13 papers) (Table 1).

Perceived risk

Perceived risk is defined as a client's perception of her personal risk of developing breast cancer during her lifetime. Three RCTs (30;51;63) and one follow-up study (64) examined the impact of genetic counseling on level of perceived risk, using four different assessment methods. A statistically significant reduction in perceived risk were observed for both the intervention and the control groups in the three RCTs, however, only one of the RCT found a statistically significant effect of genetic counseling (63) (estimates presented in Table1).

Risk accuracy

Risk accuracy has been described as the difference between a woman's perceived lifetime risk of developing breast cancer and her objective risk, as assessed by a medical professional. Most studies have classified women as "underestimators", "accurate estimators", or "overestimators". Altogether seven studies have examined the impact of genetic counseling on risk accuracy, using different models of object risk assessment (Gail, Claus, pedigree) and at least five different definitions of risk accuracy. One RCT (32) and four follow-up studies (65-68) found a statistically significant improvement in risk accuracy following counseling (estimates presented in Table1). Another RCT detected no difference between the intervention group and the control group (53). The remaining RCT (32) did not provide absolute estimates from the inter-group

analysis; however the published odds ratio (OR: 3.5, 95% CI, 1.3;9.5) indicates that the women who received genetic counseling were more likely to improve their risk perception, compared with women who received general health counseling . The proportion of women with accurate perceptions of their lifetime risk of developing breast cancer following counseling varied greatly across studies, ranging from 17% to 87%.

Table 1. Studies evaluating the impact of genetic counseling on perceived risk and accuracy of risk perception

Author Country, year	Design	Study-population	Outcome measure	Results
Brain *et al.* UK, 2000, 2002 (51;69)	RCT Multi-disciplinary genetic counseling (I) vs. surgical assessment (C)	Women with significant family history of breast cancer[1a] Referral: GP N=545 Complete follow-up: 55%	Perceived risk (range 2-10): Baseline 9 months	Mean score (sd) I: 7.3(1.2) C: 7.3(1.2) I: 6.7(1.3) C: 6.9(1.3) S reduction. NS differences between groups.
Cull *et al.* UK, 1998 (53)	RCT Video before genetic counseling (I) vs. video after genetic counseling (C)	Women with significant family history of breast cancer[1a] Referral: agent not reported N=95 Complete follow-up: 60%	Accuracy of risk: Accurate (2x obj. risk) Underestimate(>=0.5x obj. risk) Overestimate(>= 2x obj. risk) Obj. risk: not reported	PP: Baseline - 1 months I: 59% 81% C: 59% not reported I: 27% 18% C: 27% 38% I: 14% 2% C: 14% not reported S difference between groups for underestimate
Bish *et al.* UK, 2002 (64)	Follow-up study	Women with significant family history of breast cancer[1a] Referral: agent not reported N=143 Complete follow-up: not deducible	Perceived risk (range -4-+4): Baseline 6 months 12 months	Mean score women at moderate risk (sd) 1.2 (0.7) 1.0 (0.8) 1.1 (0.6) NS reduction
Fry *et al.* UK, 2003 (30)	RCT Community genetic counseling (I) vs. Standard regional genetic counseling (C)	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: GP N=247 Complete follow-up: 43%	Perceived risk (low, moderate, high): Baseline 4 weeks 6 months	PP: perceived risk (moderate + high) I: 96% C: 97% I: 92% C: 92% I: 91% C: 92% S reduction in both groups. NS differences between groups

Table 1. (continued)

Author Country, year	Design	Study-population	Outcome measure	Results
Watson *et al.* UK, 1999 (68)	Follow-up study	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: agent not reported N= 229-263 Complete follow-up: 76%-87%	Accuracy of risk recall: Accurate (= obj. risk) Underestimate (<obj. risk) Overestimate (>obj. risk) Obj. risk: Claus model	PP: Baseline - One year 9% 17% 18% 26% 52% 42% S increase in accuracy
Bowen *et al.* USA, 2004 (63)	RCT Psychosocial counseling (I) vs. genetic counseling (Ia) compared to a control group of no intervention (C)	Women with family history of cancer[1c] Referral: relative or calling a study line N=345 Complete follow-up: 62%	Perceived risk (lifetime risk 0-100%): Baseline 6 months Obj. risk: Gail and Claus model	Mean score (sd) I: 50.8(21.9) Ia: 48.5 (27.9) C: 53.0 (25) I: 24.2 (21.8) Ia: 23.4 (20.3) C: 49.0 (23) S decrease in perceived risk for I and Ia compared to control group(C)
Hopwood *et al.* UK, 1998, 2003 (66;70)	Follow-up study	Women with family history of cancer[1b] Referral: GP, clinicians N= 111 Complete follow-up: not deducible	Accuracy of risk: Accurate (= obj. risk) Underestimate(<obj. risk) Overestimate (>obj. risk) Obj. risk: Claus model	PP: Baseline - 3 months - 12 months 12% 67% 63% 49% 12% 9% 39% 21% 28% S increase in accuracy from baseline
Hopwood *et al.* Uk, 2001 (67)	Follow-up study	Women with moderate risk of breast cancer[1b] Referral: GP and clinicians N=330 Complete follow-up: not deducible	Accuracy of risk: Accurate (= obj. risk) Underestimate (<obj. risk) Overestimate (>obj. risk) Obj, risk: Claus model	PP: Baseline - 3 months 15% - 42% 37% - 29% 33% - 23% S increase in accuracy

Table 1. (continued)

Author Country, year	Design	Study-population	Outcome measure	Results
Evans *et al.* UK; 1994 (65)	Follow-up study	Women with family history of cancer[1c] Referral: GP and clinicians N=78 Complete follow-up: not deducible	Accuracy of risk: Accurate Inaccurate Accurate: within 50% of obj. risk Obj. risk: Claus model	PP: Baseline - 12 months 8% - 38% 92% - 62% S increase in accuracy
Meiser *et al.* Australia, 2001 (37)	Follow-up study	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: not reported N=218 Complete follow-up: 79 %	Accuracy of risk: Accurate Underestimate Overestimate Accurate: within or one response category below or above obj. risk Obj. risk: pedigree	PP: Baseline - 12 months 54% - 55% 12% - 14% 34% - 31% NS increase in accuracy
Lerman *et al.* USA, 1995 (32)	RCT Genetic counseling (I) vs. general health counseling(C)	Women with family history of cancer[1c] Referral: relative N=200 Complete follow-up: 46%	Accuracy of risk: Accurate (= obj. risk +/-10%) Obj. risk: Gail model	PP: Baseline 3 months I: 6.6% C: 11% I: 14.6% C: 9.4 S increase in accuracy in I group. OR= 3.5 (CI: 1.3;9.5) for improvement in I group vs. C group

[1a]Women at high risk of HBOC (classical characteristics), [1b]Women with moderate lifetime risk of breast or ovarian cancer
[1c]Women with any family history of cancer or minimum one first degree relative with breast or ovarian cancer
GP: General practitioner, N: Number of participants who completed both baseline and follow up assessment
Complete follow-up: Participation based on the number invited/eligible
NS: statistical non significant, S: Statistical significant, sd: standard deviation, CI: 95% confidence interval, PP: Prevalence proportion
Obj. risk: Objektive risk assessed by the professionals using pedigree or different risk prediction models

Studies of psychosocial outcomes

10 studies (10 papers) that evaluated psychosocial outcomes at least four weeks after genetic counseling were identified (Table 2).

Depression

One RCT (63) and two follow-up studies (37;64) assessed the impact of genetic counseling on depression, using the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale or Beck Depression Inventory. None found an effect.

Anxiety

Three RCTs (51;53;63) and three follow-up studies (37;64;68) evaluated changes in general anxiety following counseling, as measured by the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, the Spielberger State Anxiety Inventory, or the Brief Symptom Inventory. None found a substantial change in anxiety after counseling.

Cancer-specific distress

Four RCTs (30;51;63;71), one controlled trial (52), and four follow-up studies (37;64;67;68) investigated cancer-specific distress following genetic counseling. Three different scales were used to measure such distress: Impact of Event Scale, Cancer Worry Scale, and Cancer Anxiety and Helplessness Scale. Seven studies reported a statistically significant reduction in cancer-specific distress following counseling. However, only one of the four RCTs comparing an intervention group with a control group found that cancer-specific distress was significantly reduced by counseling (63) (estimates presented in Table 2).

Table 2. Studies evaluating the impact of genetic counseling on anxiety, depression and cancer-specific distress

Author Country, year	Design	Study-population	Outcome measure	Results
Brain *et al.* UK, 2000 (51)	RCT Multi-disciplinary genetic counseling (I) vs. surgical assessment (C)	Women with significant family history of breast cancer[1a] Referral: GP N=545 Complete follow-up: 55%	Anxiety (STAI)[2a] Baseline 9 months Cancer distress (Worry scale)[2b] Baseline 9 months	Mean scores (sd) I: 35.9 (11.1) C: 35.5 (10.9) I: 36.4 (12.3) C: 35.2 (11.8) No change. NS differences between groups I: 11.8 (3.4) C: 11.5 (3.0) I: 10.6 (3.2) C: 10.6 (2.9) S Reduction in both groups. NS differences between groups
Bish *et al.* UK, 2002 (64)	Follow-up study	Women with significant family history of breast cancer[1a] Referral: agent not reported N=144 (non-affected) Complete follow-up: not deducible	Anxiety (HADS)[2c] 2 weeks, 6 months, 12 months Depression (HADS)[2c] 2 weeks, 6 months, 12 months Cancer distress (Worry scale)[2b] Baseline 6 months 12 months	No changes - estimates not reported No changes - estimates not reported Mean score for women at moderate risk (sd) 12.4 (3.1) 10.3 (2.9) 10.6 (3.0) S Reduction in cancer stress
Cull *et al*. UK, 1998 (53)	RCT Video before genetic counseling (I) vs. video after genetic counseling (C)	Women with significant family history of breast cancer[1a] Referral: agent not reported N=95 Complete follow-up: 60%	Anxiety (STAI)[2a] Baseline 1 month	Mean scores (sd) I: 35 (11) C: 38 (14) I. 32 (9) C: 35 (13) No differences between groups

Table 2. (continued)

Author Country, year	Design	Study-population	Outcome measure	Results
Lerman *et al.* USA, 1996 (71)	RCT Risk counseling (I) vs. general health counseling (C)	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: relative N= 239 Complete follow-up: not deducible	Cancer distress (IES)[2d] Baseline 3 months	Mean scores (sd) I: 13.1 (12.0) C: 15.3 (12.8) I: 10.3 (12.7) C: 14.4 (14.4) Reduction in both groups. Between group analysis not reported.
Hopwood *et al.* UK, 2001 (67)	Follow-up study	Women with moderate risk of breast cancer[1b] Referral: GP and clinicians N=330 Complete follow-up: not deducible	Cancer distress (Worry scale)[2b] Baseline 9.4 months, mean (range 2-21 months)	Mean (sd) 11.93 (3.2) 11.83 (3.2) NS Reduction
Meiser *et al.* Australia, 2001 (37)	Follow-up study	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: not reported N=218 Complete follow-up: 79%	Anxiety (STAI)[2a] Baseline 12 months Depression (BDI)[2e] Baseline 12 months Cancer distress (IES)[2d] Baseline 12 months	Mean scores (sd) 35.8 (12.3) 37.3 (12.8) 6.2 (6.4) 7.4 (7.9) 15.1 (15.0) 13.8 (15.3) S Reduction
Watson *et al.* UK, 1998 (52)	Controlled follow-up study Standard counseling + tape (I) vs. standard counseling (C)	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: agent not reported N=91 Complete follow-up: 67%	Cancer distress (Worry scale)[2b] Baseline 1 month 6 months	Mean scores (sd) I: 11.1 (3.2) C: 11.4 (3.4) I: 10.5 (3.3) C: not reported I: 10.2 (2.9) C: not reported S Reduction in intervention group Between group analysis not reported.

Table 2. (continued)

Author Country, year	Design	Study-population	Outcome measure	Results
Watson *et al.* UK, 1999 (68)	Follow-up study	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: agent not reported N= 229-263 Complete follow-up: 76%-87%	Anxiety (STAI)[2a] 6 months 12 months Cancer anxiety (CAHS)[2f] 6 months 12 months Cancer distress (IES)[2d] 12 months	Mean difference in score from baseline (CI) 0.02 (-0.29;0.33) -0.17 (-0.49;0.14) 0.09 (-0.32;0.50) 0.38 (-0.04;0.79) -0.29 (-1.91;1.33)
Bowen *et al.* USA, 2004 (63)	RCT Psychosocial counseling (I) vs. genetic counseling (Ia) compared to a control group of no intervention (C)	Women with family history of cancer[1c] Referral: relative or calling a study line N=345 Complete follow-up: 62%	Anxiety (BSI)[2g] Baseline 6 months Depression Baseline 6 months Cancer distress (Worry scale)[2b] Baseline 6 months	Mean scores (sd) I: 0.45 (0.41) Ia: 0.44 (0.49) C: 0.49 (0.56) I: 0.32 (0.35) Ia: 0.40 (0.42) C: 0.50 (0.48) NS reduction I: 0.45 (0.47) Ia: 0.50 (0.54) C: 0.57 (0.58) I: 0.44 (0.39) Ia: 0.46 (0.43) C: 0.54 (0.52) NS reduction I: 6.1 (1.7) Ia: 6.0 (1.7) C: 6.2 (1.7) I: 5.2 (1.3) Ia: 5.3 (1.3) C: 6.2 (1.4) S reduction in both groups compared to control group
Fry *et al.* UK, 2003 (30)	RCT Community genetic counseling (I) vs. Standard regional genetic counseling (C)	Women with family history of breast cancer[1c] Referral: GP N=247 Complete follow-up: 43%	Cancer distress (Worry scale)[2b] Baseline 4 weeks 6 months	Mean scores (sd) I: 11.5(3.2) C: 11.3(3.0) I: 10.3(2.4) C: 10.2(2.7) I: 9.9(2.5) C: 9.7(2.7) S reduction in both groups. Between group analysis not reported

[1a]Women at high risk of HBOC (classical characteristics) ,[1b]Women with moderate lifetime risk of breast or ovarian cancer, [1c]Women with any family history of cancer or minimum one first degree relative with breast or ovarian cancer

[2a]Spielberger State Anxiety Inventory, [2b]Cancer worry scale, [2c]Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, [2d]Impact of Event Scale,[2e]Beck Depression Inventory, [2f]Cancer Anxiety and Helplessness Scale, [2g]Brief Symptom Inventory,

GP: General practitioner, N: Number of participants who completed both baseline and follow up assessment, Complete follow-up: Participation based on the number invited/eligible, NS: statistical non significant, S: Statistical significant, sd: standard deviation, CI: 95% confidence interval.

Methodological considerations

Study designs

While six RCTs explored the impact of genetic counseling, only one study compared the effect of genetic counseling to no counseling (63). The five other controlled trials compared the effects of different counseling methods, *e.g.*, counseling with and without a video (53), counseling with without an audio tape (52) and the effect of different health professionals as counseling providers (30;51). Furthermore, inter-group analyses were presented rarely despite the use of controls in the study design. None of the follow-up studies included control groups.

Study populations

The studies included in this review recruited participants through such means as public announcements (63), family referrals (32), and medical referrals (65). None was population-based, and study populations varied greatly. Inclusion criteria also differed, with participants in some studies required to be at risk of hereditary cancer (64), while in others participants qualified on the basis of any family history of breast cancer (63).

Based on the number of women eligible/invited to enroll, the completion rate for long-term follow-up varied from 43% to 79% across studies. For some studies it was not possible to deduce the completion rates (64-67;70;71). In addition, the size of the study population was rather small in a number of studies (52;53;64-66;70).

Most of the studies included in the review were conducted in United Kingdom. A few studies were done in the USA (32;63;71) and a single study came from Australia (37).

Study outcomes

In the studies reviewed, effect sizes are difficult to compare because of the many different methods used to assess perceived risk, risk accuracy, and cancer-specific distress. Most studies reported mean values for anxiety, depression, cancer-specific distress and perceived risk even though it appeared that the data were not normal distributed. In addition, tests of statistical significance were often stressed in the presentation of differences between baseline and follow-up scores or inter-group scores. Results such as P-values or a reduction in the mean value of a score, such as 1.3 points on the IES (37), are often difficult to interpret and have questionable clinical relevance. None of the studies reporting a statistically significant reduction in perceived risk or in cancer-specific distress commented on the clinical relevance of the effect size.

Conclusion

In this review I focused on the long-term (>= 4 weeks) impact of genetic counseling in terms of risk perception and psychosocial outcomes.

Overall, genetic counseling does not seem to have an adverse effect on general anxiety and depression. It does appear to improve the accuracy of risk perception and to decrease cancer-specific distress to levels that reach statistical significance; however the size and the clinical relevance of these improvements are unknown. A number of methodological concerns hamper interpretation of reported outcomes: use of heterogeneous measures for the same construct (perceived risk, anxiety, depression, cancer-specific distress), lack of suitable control groups (no counseling), lack of inter-group analysis, and highly selected study populations. The relevance of study findings to Denmark is unclear, as none were conducted in countries with a similar culture and health system.

Well-designed studies with comparison groups and unbiased study populations are needed to clarify the impact of genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. Standardized methods should be utilized to allow comparisons across studies.

Aims of the thesis

1. To compare the psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer risk with those of women awaiting mammography and those of a random sample of women from the general population. (Study I)

2. To examine possible clinical and socioeconomic differences between study respondents and non-respondents and between participants with complete follow-up and drop-outs. (Study I)

3. To assess the impact of genetic counseling over time on perceived personal lifetime risk of cancer, accuracy of risk perception, and to identify possible predictors of inaccurate risk perception among women who receive genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. (Study II)

4. To assess the psychosocial impact of genetic counseling over time on hereditary breast and ovarian cancer risk, in terms of anxiety, depression, cancer-specific distress, and health-related quality of life. (Study III)

Subjects and methods

This thesis is based on a follow-up study of women referred for genetic counseling compared to two reference groups.

Study population

The Genetic Counseling Group

We included all women (N=567) referred for genetic counseling, independent of their own cancer status, to the following clinics: Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital; Department of Clinical Genetics, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; Oncology Department, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; or the J. F. Kennedy Institute. The referral period was September 15, 2003 to September 15, 2004. Participants had to fulfill the following inclusion criteria:

- > 18 years of age
- referral because of a family history of breast or ovarian cancer or their own diagnosis of breast or ovarian cancer at an early age
- initial counseling session scheduled.

Reference Group I

To compare the impact of genetic counseling with the impact of an alternative approach to cancer prevention, we utilized women referred for mammography as a reference group (Reference Group I, N=689). This reference group was recruited at two hospitals. From Aalborg Hospital, we included all women aged 18-75 years who were referred for mammography for non-acute clinical indications during the period from March 15, 2004 to December 31, 2004.

From Rigshospitalet, we included all women aged 50-69 years who were enrolled in a breast cancer screening program during the period from November 25, 2003 to December 1, 2003.

Reference Group II

We chose a random sample of Danish women as an alternative reference group (Reference Group II) to represent women with an unknown risk of developing breast or ovarian cancer. This sample consisted of female Danish residents between 18 and 75 years of age (N = 2,000) randomly sampled from the Danish Central Personal Registry. This Registry is continuously updated with information regarding vital status and address changes for all permanent and temporary Danish residents.

Data collection

We obtained self-reported data from the women participating in the study (Fig. 1), registry data from six public medical registries, and data from the physicians providing genetic counseling.

We used self-administered, standardized, mailed questionnaires to obtain self-reported data from the entire study population. Data from the Genetic Counseling Group were collected one to four weeks before the first counseling session and two weeks, six months and 12 months afterwards. Data for Reference Group I were collected one to four weeks before mammography and 12 months afterwards. Data for Reference Group II were collected at the time of enrollment of the first woman in the Genetic Counseling Group and follow-up data were collected 12 months later. At each time point, participating women received a questionnaire and a prepaid return envelope. One reminder was mailed two weeks later if the first questionnaire was not returned.

For women who received genetic counseling, the physicians who provided the counseling completed a questionnaire ("physician questionnaire") immediately after the counseling session. The clinicians received one reminder if a questionnaire was not returned two weeks after the scheduled counseling date.

Questionnaires were designed using the computer program Teleform and entered optically with the Teleform Reader at the maximum confidence level (99%).

In order to link data from the different data sources, we used the civil registration number, a unique ten-digit personal identification number assigned to all permanent and temporary residents in Denmark since 1968.

Figure 1. Overview of study questionnaires



Self-reported and physician-reported data

Cancer-specific distress (Aims 1 and 4)

We used the Impact of Event Scale (IES) (72) to asses self-reported cancer-related distress. IES consists of 15 items; each item is scored 0, 1, 3, or 5, with a higher score reflecting a more stressful impact. A score below nine was used as the cut-off point for no cancer-specific distress (72).

Anxiety and Depression (Aims 1 and 4)

We used the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) (73) as a measure of self-reported generalized anxiety and depression. HADS consists of 14 items, seven on anxiety and seven on depression, forming two subscales. Each scale has a maximum score of 21, with a higher score reflecting more severe depression and anxiety symptoms. A score below eight was used as the cut off for "no anxiety" and "no depression", respectively.

Health- related quality of life (Aims 1 and 4)

Self-reported health-related quality of life (HRQOL) was assessed by the Medical Outcome Study Short Form 36 Health Survey (SF-36) (74). SF-36 consists of 36 items forming eight subscales, and two summary scores: Physical Component Summary (PCS) and Mental Component Summary (MCS). Scoring was executed according to Danish guidelines (75). We defined impaired health-related quality of life as a score below the 25th percentile for each subscale in the SF-36 data, as suggested by Rose *et al*. (76). We used the 25th percentile of unaffected women from the population sample (no personal history of breast or ovarian cancer) as the cut-off point for all three study groups.

Perceived risk (Aim 3)

In the questionnaires, respondents were asked to estimate and report their perceived lifetime risk of developing breast cancer as a percentage (0-100%).

Objective risk (Aim 3)

For each woman in the Genetic Counseling Group, the physicians reported the estimated lifetime risk of breast cancer as a percentage (0-100 %). The lifetime risk for women in the two reference groups was estimated to be 10% (77).

Risk accuracy (Aim 3)

Risk accuracy was calculated as the difference between a woman's perceived risk and her objective risk. Women were classified as perceiving their risk at three levels of accuracy (32;56):

Accurately: -10% < risk accuracy <10%

Underestimated: risk accuracy >= -10%

Overestimated: risk accuracy >= 10%.

Risk expression (Aim 3)

Physicians reported how estimated lifetime risk was communicated to their clients, *i.e.*, using numbers (percentage), using risk categories (low, moderate, high), using other words, or using a combination of these approaches.

Registry data (Aim 2**)**

We obtained registry data for the entire study population (respondents and non-respondents) from the six Danish public registries, all of which are nationwide, population-based, and continuously updated.

The Danish National Hospital Registry

We used the Danish National Hospital Registry (DHR) to identify non-cancer diagnoses related to the breast or uterus, in addition to all diagnoses included in the Charlson comorbidity index (78) for the period 1994 to 2003. The Charlson comorbidity index is a weighted index of the number and the seriousness of comorbid diseases. The DHR contains detailed information on date of hospital admission and discharge, and up to 20 discharge diagnoses and procedures for all patients admitted to a non-psychiatric hospital in Denmark since 1977 (including all outpatient and emergency contacts since 1995) (79).

The Danish Cancer Registry

All cancer diagnoses recorded for the 1988 - 2004 period were obtained from the Danish Cancer Registry. This registry contains records of all cancer cases diagnosed since 1943, including tumour characteristics and treatment procedures (80).

The Danish Psychiatric Central Registry

We identified all psychiatric diagnoses from 1994 to 2003 from the Danish Psychiatric Central Registry. This Registry contains data on admissions and discharges, diagnoses, and treatment codes for all patients admitted to a psychiatric hospital in Denmark since 1969, including all outpatient contacts since 1995 (81).

The National Prescription Database

Data regarding prescribed anxiolytic and anti-depressant drugs were obtained from the Danish Prescription Database for the 1996 - 2003 period. The Danish Prescription Database contains data on drug type and prescription date for all prescriptions filled in Denmark since 1996.

The Fertility Database, Statistics Denmark

Using the Fertility Database, we retrieved the number of biological daughters and sons born to each Danish woman from 1960 to 2003. The Fertility Database is updated every year with demographic and sociological data for both men and women of childbearing age, and with basic information related to their children (sex, birth weight, age, and cause of death, if relevant) (82).

The Integrated Database for Longitudinal Labour Market Research

Total household income in 2002, level of education, and marital status were retrieved from the Integrated Database for Longitudinal Labour Market Research, which includes comprehensive socio-economic data on the education, employment, and income for the entire Danish population.

Ethical considerations

The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Biomedical National Ethics Committee System. It was approved by the National Board of Health (J.nr. 0-604-04-20/E/EHG) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (CVR-nr.11-88-37-29).

Statistical analyses

Characteristics of the three study groups were described using medians, ranges and proportions. Prevalence-proportion ratios (PPR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to explore

differences in socio-demographic and clinical variables between study groups, between respondents and non-respondents, and between participants with complete follow-up and drop-outs (Aims 1 and 2). For the first comparison (respondents vs. non-respondents) we used registry-based data and for the other comparison (participants with complete follow-up vs. drop-outs) we used self-reported data.

Changes in perceived risk and HRQOL within groups and between groups were examined using Student's paired t test and Student's t test, respectively, after testing for the assumption of normality (Aim 4). We used the Wald test to compare differences between study groups in the proportion of women who changed from inaccurate to accurate risk perceptions (Aim 3) and from a cancer-specific stress score above a sub-clinical level to a score at a sub-clinical level (Aim 4). We used logistic regression analysis to estimate odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI), adjusted for age, to compare HRQOL baseline scores among groups (Aim 1). In addition, logistic regression analysis was used to identify possible predictors for inaccurate risk perception after 12 months of follow up (Aim 3). We included a number of possible predictors that had been suggested in the literature (age, education, cohabitation, cancer-specific distress at baseline, inaccurate risk perception at baseline) and others that had not been examined previously (number of daughters, number of affected first-degree relatives, known mutation in the family, smoking habits, risk expression).

We used multivariate linear regression analysis to compare changes (follow up scores minus baseline scores) in outcome variables (cancer-specific distress, anxiety and depression) among the study groups, adjusted for socio-demographic and clinical variables (Aim 4).

We computed Cronbach´s alpha to assess internal consistency of IES and HADS (83;84). To explore the number of factors in HADS we used an explorative factor analysis (83;84).

All analyses were performed using Stata Statistical Software version 9.0 (College Station, TX: Stata Corporation).

Results

The main study results are summarized below.

Participation

As shown in Figure 2, 431 (76%) of the 567 eligible women in the Genetic Counseling Group entered the study. Of these, 348 women (61%) completed two weeks of follow up, 312 (55%) completed 6 months of follow up, and 300 (53%) remained in the study for the final follow up at 12 months. Of the 689 eligible women in Reference Group I, 417 (61%) entered the study and 358 (52%) completed one year of follow up. Out of the 2000 women invited to participate in Reference Group II, 1,322 (66%) women agreed to take part, and 1,088 (54%) completed one year of follow up.

Baseline characteristics of the entire study population (including respondents and non-respondents) are shown in table 3. All data presented were obtained from nationwide population-based registries.

Figure 2. Flow of the study population



* Affected with breast or ovarian cancer, including women whose cancer status was not reported or inconsistently reported.

Comparison of respondents across the three study groups

Respondents in the Genetic Counseling Group had a lower median age and fewer biological children than respondents in Reference Group I. In addition, fewer women in the Genetic Counseling Group had filled one or more prescriptions for anxiolytics and antidepressants, compared to respondents in Reference Group I. The prevalence of breast cancer was substantially elevated for respondents in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to respondents in both Reference Group I and Reference Group II. We found no other major differences between respondents in the Genetic Counseling Group and those in Reference Group II (Table 3)

Table 3. Characteristics of respondents and non-respondents in the study population.

	Genetic Counseling Gr.[1]			*Reference Gr. I*[1]			*Reference Gr. II*[1]		
	Response (n=431)	*Non-response (n=136)*	*PPR(CI)*[2]	*Response (n=417)*	*Non-response (n=272)*	*PPR (CI)*[2]	*Response (n=1322)*	*Non-response (n=678)*	*PPR (CI)*[2]
Age, median	41	39		56	57		45	49	
Range	18-78	18-76		26-76	25-78		18-75	18-75	
Married / cohabiting, %	73	59	1.23 (1.06;1.44)	69	58	1.20 (1.07;1.36)	71	64	1.10 (1.03;1.18)
Biological offspring, %									
≥ one daughter	53	55	0.98 (0.82;1.17)	63	62	1.03 (0.91;1.16)	53	54	0.99 (0.91;1.08)
≥ one son	53	46	1.17 (0.95;1.43)	62	60	1.03 (0.91;1.17)	55	52	1.05 (0.96;1.15)
Further education, %									
None	34	36	1.03 (0.90;1.19)[7]	33	39	0.95 (0.87; 1.03)[7]	38	53	0.92 (0.88; 0.96)[7]
Short	34	30		40	38		39	31	
Medium	23	22		24	16		18	12	
Long	10	12		4	7		4	4	
Household income, %									
Low	10	20	0.47 (0.30;0.74)[8]	6	10	0.61 (0.36;1.01)[8]	10	18	0.57 (0.46;0.72)[8]
Medium	31	31		42	51		36	42	
High	60	49		52	39		54	40	
Breast cancer diagnoses[4], %	23	13	1.82 (1.13;2.93)	7	3	1.17 (1.05;4.51)	2	2	0.70 (0.36;1.35)
Other breast diagnoses[4], %	3	4	0.82 (0.30;2.26)	2	3	0.58 (0,23;1.48)	1	0	4.17 (0.96:18.07)
Genital cancer diagnoses[4], %	3	4	0.88 (0.32;2.41)	2	1	2.17 (0.60;7.83)	1	0	1.91 (0.54;6.82)
Uterus-related diagnoses[4], %	2	4	0.57 (0.19;1.67)	4	4	1.04 (0.48;2.27)	3	2	1.71 (0.87;3.33)
Co-morbidity[5], %									
Charlson low	92	91	1.01 (0.95;1.07)[7]	88	87	1.01 (0.95;1.07)[7]	94	90	1.04 (1.01;1.07)[7]
Charlson medium	7	9		11	11		6	9	
Charlson high	1	0		1	2		0	1	
Psychiatric diagnoses[4], %	5	7	0.81 (0.38;1.70)	4	11	0.36 (0.20;0.65)	4	8	0.49 (0.34;0.72)
Prescriptions filled[6], %									
Anxiolytics	15	18	0.87 (0.57;1.33)	29	40	0.72 (0.58; 0.88)	17	26	0.66 (0.55;0.79)
Antidepressants	14	15	0.95 (0.59;1.51)	20	27	0.75 (0.57;0.99)	13	18	0.74 (0.60;0.91)

[1]Registry data were not available for 4 women in the Genetic Group, 3 women in Reference Gr. I, and 6 women in Reference Gr. II
[2] Prevalence-proportion ratio, response vs. non-response, 95% confidence interval
[3] Pre-tax household income, year 2002; low ≤ $20,670, medium ≥ $20,671 & ≤ $64,134$, high > $64,134
[4]≥ one diagnosis , [5]Charlson co-morbidity index,[6]≥ one prescription,
[7]none + short vs. medium + long ,[8]low vs. medium + high.

Respondents vs. non-respondents (Aim 2)

Within the three study groups, respondents and non-respondents were similar in terms of age, number of biological children, educational level, and comorbidity. In addition, in the Genetic Counseling Group, history of psychiatric diagnoses, other non-cancer diagnoses, and filled prescriptions for anxiolytics and antidepressants appeared similar for respondents and non-respondents. In all three groups, respondents had a higher likelihood of living with a partner and a higher income compared to non-respondents. Within the two reference groups, a lower proportion of respondents had been diagnosed with psychiatric disease and/or had filled prescriptions, compared to non-respondents. Furthermore, we found a higher prevalence of breast cancer among respondents than among non-respondents in the Genetic Counseling Group and in Reference Group I.

Participants with complete follow-up vs. drop-outs (Aim 2)

We also explored possible differences between unaffected women who completed 12 months of follow up (full participants) and unaffected women who dropped out during the study period (drop-outs) in all three study groups, using self-reported baseline characteristics. We found no substantial differences between full participants and drop-outs in the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group I (Appendix, Paper II, Table 1). Full participants in Reference Group II, however, were characterized by a lower proportion of smokers (PPR 0.74, 95%CI: 0.61; 0.89), and a lower proportion with little or no education (PPR 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78; 0.98), compared to drop-outs.

Psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling (Aim 1)

We analyzed baseline data on anxiety, depression, and cancer-specific distress separately for affected and unaffected women, based on self-reported cancer status. The number of affected women differs in the self-reported data vs. registry data, due to delay in the availability of registry data.

Anxiety, Depression, and Cancer-specific distress

At baseline, approximately three-fourths of women in all three study groups experienced no anxiety and more than 90% experienced no symptoms of depression.

When we compared the Genetic Counseling Group to the reference groups, we did not find any substantial differences in overall anxiety and depression at baseline. In terms of cancer-specific distress, however, both affected and unaffected women in the Genetic Counseling Group appeared to have somewhat higher scores than the reference groups (Table 3). The largest difference was found between the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group II.

Table 4. Cancer-specific distress among women awaiting genetic counseling compared to the women in the Reference Groups

Cancer status[1]	*Cancer-specific distress (IES)*[2]	*Gen. C. Gr.*	*Ref. Gr. 1.*	*Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. I. PPR (CI)*[3]	*Ref. Gr. II*	*Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. II. PPR (CI)*[3]
Un-affected		n = 319	n = 381		n = 1264	
	Sub-clinical	46%	57%		68%	
	Mild	34%	26%	1.25 (1.07;1.40)	22%	1.67 (1.47;1.91)
	Moderate	16%	14%		9%	
	Severe	4%	3%		1%	
Affected		n = 110	n = 31		n = 38	
	Sub-clinical	36%	42%		53%	
	Mild	38%	32%	1.11 (0.80;1.55)	18%	1.36 (0.95;1.96)
	Moderate,	20%	19%		21%	
	Severe	6%	7%		8%	

[1] Self reported data. Women not reporting cancer status were excluded.
[2]Cancer-specific distress score 0-75; sub-clinical = 0-8, mild = 9-25, moderate = 26-43, severe = >44.
[3]Prevalence-proportion ratio, 95% confidence interval, mild + moderate + severe combined.

Internal consistency of the scales

We assessed the internal consistency of IES with Cronbach´s alpha, and found values between 0.90-0.92 in all three study groups. We found similar values for the HADS subscales (Anxiety, Depression), *i.e*. anxiety ranges between 0.84-0.88 and depression ranges between 0.80-0.83. An explorative factor analysis for HADS, with the number of factors defined by eigenvalues ≥1, revealed a two-factor structure in all three study groups, explaining from 50% to 54% of the total variance.

Risk perception among women receiving genetic counseling (Aim 3)

In the analyses of risk perception, we excluded all women who were affected with breast or ovarian cancer at baseline or who developed cancer during the follow-up period. We excluded them because they were at risk both of developing a second primary breast cancer and having a relapse of the first cancer. In addition, the small number of affected women did not allow us to conduct definitive separate analyses for this group.

Level and change in perceived risk

At baseline, women in the Genetic Counseling Group perceived their own risk to be 50% (median value) (Table 5). Two weeks after genetic counseling their perceived risk had decreased to 30% (median value) and remained at this level both after 6 and 12 months of follow up. Perceived risk at baseline was substantially higher among women in the reference groups (10% median value).

Based on paired analysis, perceived risk decreased 6.6 percentage points (95% CI: 3.0%; 10.2%) on average in the Genetic Counseling Group between baseline and 12 months of follow up. This contrasted with the reference groups, for which perceived risk remained relatively stable. The inter-group analysis of change in perceived risk therefore also showed a statistically significant difference between the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group I (-8.2 percentage points, 95% CI:-12.2%; -4.1%) and Reference Group II, (-7.7 percentage points, 95% CI:-11.4%; -4.0%).

Table 5. Perceived absolute lifetime risk (%) of breast cancer

Group	*Baseline*	*12 months Follow up*	*Intra-group changes*[2]	*Inter-group changes*[3]
	Median (25^{th}-75^{th})	Median (25^{th}-75^{th})	Mean (95% CI)	Mean (95% CI) *Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. I.*
Gen. C. Gr. (n=192)[1]	50 (20-50)	30 (18-50)	-6.6 (-3.0;-10.2)	-8.2 (-12.2;-4.1)
Ref. Gr. I. (n=278)[1]	10 (5-25)	10 (5-30)	1.6 (3.6;-0.5)	*Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. II.*
Ref. Gr. II.(n=972)[1]	10 (5-25)	10 (5-30)	1.1 (2.2;0.0)	-7.7 (-11.4;-4.0)

[1]Participants who reported perceived risk both at baseline and at 12-month follow up.
[2]Participants served as their own controls.
[3]Average change in the Genetic Counseling Group vs. average change in the reference groups.

Accuracy of perceived risk

At baseline, 53% of women referred for genetic counseling overestimated their personal risk of developing breast cancer, and 25% perceived their risk accurately (Table 6). Twelve months following counseling, the proportion of women in this group who perceived their risk accurately had increased to 41%. This clearly exceeded the changes observed in Reference Group I (p=0.03) and Reference Group II (p=0.01).

Table 6. Accuracy of perceived lifetime risk of breast cancer

	Time	*Gen. C. Gr. (n=138)*[1]	*Ref. Gr. I. (n=278)*[2]	*Ref. Gr. II. (n=972)*[2]
Underestimated, %	Baseline	22	-	-
	12 months follow-up	18	-	-
Overestimated, %	Baseline	53	29	32
	12 months follow-up	41	34	34
Accurate, %	Baseline	25	71	68
	12 months follow-up	41	66	66

[1]Participants in the Genetic Counseling Group, who reported their perceived risk both at baseline and follow up and for whom objective risks were available.
[2]Participants in Reference Group I and Reference Group II, who reported their perceived risk both at baseline and at 12-month follow up. Underestimates do not apply to the reference groups.

Predictors of inaccurate risk perception 12 months after genetic counseling

Table 7 presents the results of a logistic regression analysis of possible predictors of inaccurate risk perception following genetic counseling.

Factors which appeared associated with inaccurate risk perception included risk communicated only in words, inaccurate risk perception at baseline, presence of a familial mutation, and, to a lesser degree, having one or more daughters or a high level of cancer-specific distress at baseline.

Table 7. Predictors of inaccurate risk perception at 12-month follow up for unaffected women who received genetic counseling.

Predictor variable	*OR (95% CI)*
Age (ref.: >35years)	1.81 (0.72;4.55)
Education: None + short	Ref.
Medium	0.96 (0.38;2.45)
Long	0.93 (0.30;2.90)
≥One first degree relative with cancer (ref.: none)	2.10 (0.70;6.31)
Smoking (ref.: no smoking)	2.22 (0.91;5.39)
Daughters (ref.: no daughters)	2.68 (1.02;7.05)
Married / cohabiting (ref.: single)	1.44 (0.55;3.81)
Cancer-specific distress pre-counseling (ref.: no stress)	1.85 (0.80;4.28)
Inaccurate risk perception pre-counseling (ref.: accurate)	5.07 (2.07;15.79)
Risk expression, words only (ref.: words + numbers)	5.50 (1.88;16.10)
Mutation found in the family: No	Ref.
Yes	4.38 (1.32;14.48)
Don´t know	0.45 (0.14;1.45)

Psychosocial impact of genetic counseling (Aim 4)

Cancer-affected and cancer-unaffected women who are referred for genetic counseling cannot be considered a homogenous group. Affected women presumably opt for genetic counseling for other reasons than do unaffected women, who may seek counseling to avoid development of an initial breast or ovarian cancer. The small number of affected women kept us from examining this group separately. Consequently, we excluded all women who were affected with breast or ovarian cancer at baseline or who developed cancer during the follow-up period

Anxiety and Depression

In the group of women receiving genetic counseling, the prevalence of anxiety (borderline + case level, see Table 8) remained unchanged from baseline to one year of follow up, compared to increases of 4.1% (95% CI:-3.1; 11.3) and 5.9% (95% CI:2.1; 9.6) in Reference Groups I and II, respectively (Table 8).

In all three study groups, the prevalence of depression above non-case level increased equally (5-6 %) between baseline and one year of follow up. Similar results were found when we analyzed changes in anxiety and depression scores separately in a multivariate linear regression analysis, adjusting for age, educational level, number of biological children, number of first-degree relatives with breast or ovarian cancer, and perceived personal risk of breast cancer (data not shown).

Table 8. Anxiety and Depression among unaffected women in the Genetic Counseling Group and in the Reference Groups.

HADS	*Gen. C. Gr. Baseline (n=213)*	*Gen. C. Gr. 12 months (n=213)*	*Ref. Gr. I Baseline (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. I 12 months (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. II Baseline (n=1,070)*	*Ref. Gr. II 12 months (n=1,070)*
Anxiety[1]						
Non-case	73%	73%	70%	66%	76%	70%
Borderline	18%	10%	18%	15%	16%	13%
Case	9%	17%	12%	19%	8%	17%
Depression[1]						
Non-case	94%	89%	93%	87%	95%	90%
Borderline	5%	5%	5%	7%	3%	5%
Case	1%	6%	2%	6%	2%	5%

[1]Score 0-21, non-case = 0-7, borderline = 8-10, case = 11-21
Cancer-specific distress

At baseline, 52% of the women referred for genetic counseling experienced some degree of cancer-specific distress. This proportion decreased to 50% after two weeks of follow up, to 41% after 6 months of follow up, and remained at this level after 12 months of follow up. In Reference Groups I and II, 41% and 32%, respectively, experienced some degree of cancer-specific distress at baseline. These proportions were reduced by 6.3% (95% CI:-1.3; 13.8) and 1.6% (95% CI:-2.3; 5.5) at 12 months of follow-up, respectively (Table 9).

The 10.8% (95% CI:1.4; 20.8) decrease in cancer-specific distress observed in the Genetic Counseling Group between baseline and 12 months of follow up exceeded the decrease observed

in both reference groups, although only the comparison with Reference Group II reached statistical significance (p=0.006). A multivariate linear regression analysis of the change in cancer-specific distress score, adjusting for the same possible confounders as described above, confirmed these findings (data not shown).

Table 9. Cancer-specific distress among unaffected women in the Genetic Counseling Group and in the Reference Groups.

IES[1]	*Gen. C. Gr. Baseline (n=213)*	*Gen. C. Gr. 12 months (n=213)*	*Ref. Gr. I Baseline (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. I 12 months (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. II Baseline (n=1070)*	*Ref. Gr. II 12 months (n=1070)*
Sub-clinical	48%	59%	59%	65%	68%	70%
Mild	34%	26%	25%	25%	22%	20%
Moderate	14%	12%	13%	8%	9%	8%
Severe	4%	3%	3%	2%	1%	2%

[1]Cancer-specific distress score 0-75, sub-clinical = 0-8, mild = 9-25, moderate = 26-43, severe = 44-75.

Health related quality of life

We found a small increase in the summary score for physical quality of life (PCS) in the Genetic Counseling Group between baseline and 12 months of follow up, in contrast to the reference groups where the PCS decreased (Table 10). In the inter-group analysis of changes in PCS, these opposite patterns resulted in notable differences between the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group I (2.4 points, 95% CI: 1.2; 3.6) and between the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group II (1.2 points, 95% CI: 0.2; 2.2). Further, we observed an increase in the summary score for mental quality of life (MCS) in both the Genetic Counseling Group and in Reference Group I, whereas a decrease was seen in Reference Group II. The changes observed in MCS were small in all three groups and the inter-group analysis showed no statistically significant differences.

Table 10. Changes in quality of life for unaffected women in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to women in the Reference Groups.

Group	*PCS[1]*		*MCS[2]*	
	Inter-group change[3] Mean (CI)	*Intra- group change Mean (CI)*	*Inter-group change[3] Mean (CI)*	*Intra- group change Mean (CI)*
		Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. I.		*Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. I.*
Gen. C. Gr. (n=197)	0.9 (-0.1;1.8)	2.4 (1.2;3.6)	0.6 (-0.8;2.0)	-0.6 (-2.3;1.2)
Ref. Gr. I (n=287)	-1.5 (-2.3;-0.7)	*Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. II.*	1.2 (0.2;2.2)	*Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. II.*
Ref. Gr. II (n=996)	-0.3 (-0.7;0.1)	1.2 (0.2;2.2)	-0.6 (-1.1;-0.1)	1.2 (-0.3;2.7)

[1]Physical Component Summary
[2]Mental Component Summary
[3]Difference in scores between baseline and after 12 months of follow up

Methodological considerations

Interpretation of the findings presented in this thesis is dependent on a critical evaluation of the factors with impact on the validity of our risk estimates. The optimal design for examining the psychosocial impact of genetic counseling is doubtlessly a randomized controlled trial (RCT). Because this was not feasible for ethical and practical reasons, we undertook a follow-up study of women referred for genetic counseling and two reference groups of women.

Selection problems

In this study, the existence of possible selection biases related to sampling procedures, non-respondents, and drop outs during follow up must be considered. These issues may affect both the external and internal validity of the study findings.

Sampling

The decision whether to undergo genetic counseling is complex, usually requiring time and serious reflection. When a decision has finally been made, most women experience a waiting period before the first counseling session. By the time of the session, most women are likely to have reached a peak level of anxiety, depression, cancer-specific distress, and perceived risk. These concerns may spontaneously decrease after counseling, erroneously indicating a positive effect of genetic counseling. Thus, to estimate the true impact of genetic counseling, it is necessary to compare findings among women receiving counseling with those from appropriate reference groups.

We included women above the age of 18 years in both the Genetic Counseling Group and the reference groups. We were not able to use family history of breast and ovarian cancer as an inclusion criterion for the reference groups.

Reference Group I, composed of women undergoing mammography, was chosen in order to observe possible changes in psychosocial conditions among women receiving an alternative approach to breast cancer prevention. We expected women referred for mammography to be concerned about developing breast cancer, a situation similar to that experienced by the women in the Genetic Counseling Group. Reference group II was drawn from the general population to provide information about the natural variation in psychosocial conditions of women over a one-year period.

The Genetic Counseling Group was recruited from four clinical departments offering genetic counseling that serve a well-defined geographical region of Denmark (75% of the total Danish population). Denmark's tax-financed health care allows women to be referred free-of-charge for genetic counseling and mammography, independent of age, health, socioeconomic situation, or place of residence. Reference Group I consisted of women referred for mammography at two clinics serving two well-defined geographical regions of Denmark. Some women may receive mammograms outside these clinics, but this group is most likely very small, allowing us to consider Reference Group I to be a population-based sample. Reference Group II was a random sample of the Danish female population drawn from the Danish Central Population Registry. Thus our study may be characterized as a population-based multi-centre study in that sense, all women referred for genetic counseling or mammography in a given geographic area within a given time period were included (85). In this context we have to consider if the study sample was biased by non-respondents or drop-outs.

Non-respondents

Our response rates of 76% (Genetic Counseling Group), 61% (Reference Group I), and 66% (Reference Group II) have the potential to introduce selection bias. Denmark's nationwide public registries provided us with an exceptional opportunity to compare information regarding respondents and non-respondents within each study group. There appeared to be no major differences, except for the higher proportion of respondents living with a partner and higher household incomes among respondents. As well, in the Genetic Counseling Group and in Reference Group I, breast cancer was more prevalent among respondents than non-respondents. Only 13 women had missing registry data out of the 3,256 women invited to participate in the study. Thus our non-response analyses may be assumed to be very accurate, indicating that willingness to participate in our study did not introduce major bias.

Drop-outs

In the Genetic Counseling Group, 70% of women who entered the study remained active participants during the 12 months of follow up. In Reference Group I 86% and in Reference Group II 82% remained in the study for 12 months. Despite these rather high retention rates, drop-outs may still introduce selection bias. To address this issue, we compared self-reported baseline characteristics of full participants and those of drop-outs, and found no important differences. This led us to conclude that selection bias due to drop-outs was not a major problem in our study.

Despite limitations in the sampling procedure, non-response rates, and drop out rates, the study population was likely to be a representative sample.

Information problems

In this study, shortcomings in data collection instruments and data collection procedures may have produced information problems. In order to cause bias, however, information problems must be distributed differentially among the study groups. Because data were collected prospectively and systematically using standardized questionnaires and procedures for data collection were identical in the three study groups, possibilities for information bias were reduced.

Validity and reliability of measurement scales

It is not possible to observe and directly measure the psychosocial health outcomes that we undertook to assess. Instead, we used three different psychometric scales (IES, HADS, SF-36) as surrogate measures. It is important to consider the validity and the reliability of these scales when used in our study population. We did not test any of the scales against a gold standard which would be the optimal way of examining the validity. However, the three scales are well-established and have been found to work well in a number of other populations (86-88). We found no systematic patterns of non-response to single items or scales, and the internal consistency of IES and HADS, as assessed by Cronbach´s alpha, was high (>0,80) in all three study groups. An explorative factor analysis of HADS showed, as expected, a two-factor structure in all three study groups, explaining 50% or more of total variance. Based on these results, we have no reason to believe that our findings were weakened by low validity and reliability in the assessment of psychosocial outcomes. Furthermore, the scales seemed to work similarly in the three study groups. This suggests that any misclassification would have been non-differential, reducing the magnitude of differences found among the study groups.

Ceiling and floor effects

Ceiling and floor effects occur when a high proportion of respondents grade themselves as having the maximum or minimum score (83). When the impact of an intervention is assessed by comparing baseline scores with follow-up scores, ceiling and floor effects may introduce bias. Our baseline data for the eight SF-36 subscales showed some ceiling effects, equal to that of Danish norm data (75). To circumvent this problem, we used the two summary scores PCS (physical quality of life) and MCS (mental quality of life), which are not susceptible to ceiling effects. We were not able to eliminate a possible floor effect in the HADS and IES scales, and our findings should be interpreted with this in mind.

Cut-off points

We calculated total sum-scores for the IES and the two HADS subscales and then transformed these scores into categorical outcomes using cut-off points. While these cut-off points have been suggested in the literature (72;73;83;88-90), they have not been examined in depth. We performed the transformations for several reasons: first, single scores were not normally distributed; second, we wished to enhance the clinical relevance of our findings. Because the cut-off points may be questionable, we cannot entirely exclude the possibility of misclassification.

Pilot testing

Genetic assistants and a physician from one of the genetics departments participated in the development of the patient and the physician questionnaires. Patient questionnaires were pre-tested on women outside the target groups and physician questionnaires were pre-tested in three

clinical departments. Both questionnaires were revised before the start of a one-month period of pilot testing our study instruments and procedures.

All major scales and questions were adopted from previous studies carried out in Denmark and no translations were required. Extensive pilot-testing and use of well-established scales ensured the feasibility of the study and increased the validity of the instruments used.

Confounding

The study design, with two reference groups and no randomization, raises the question whether the observed effects of genetic counseling on perceived risk, risk accuracy and cancer-specific distress are influenced by confounding. In general, little is known about the causal pathway and the factors that might confound the relationship between genetic counseling and psychosocial outcomes.

We analyzed changes in the psychosocial outcome scores and perceived risk with paired analyses. This approach is preferred because each woman serves as her own control and variation between individuals is eliminated. Thus, our intra-group findings on changes over time could not be affected by confounding. However, inter-group comparisons do have this potential.

Primary concerns in regard to confounding were differences between the Genetic Counseling Group and the reference groups in terms of age and personal and family history of breast and ovarian cancer. In order to eliminate possible confounding due to personal cancer history, we performed separate analyses for affected and unaffected women in Aim 1. Similarly, to handle potential confounding, we excluded affected women in the analyses related to Aims 3 and 4.

To present clinically relevant information, we focused on absolute estimates instead of relative estimates derived from multivariate analyses. Nevertheless, we used multivariate linear regression analyses as a method of handling potential confounding in relation to Aim 4. Our findings regarding changes in anxiety, depression, and cancer-specific distress remained materially unchanged when a number of possible confounders were taken into account in our model, suggesting that confounding was not an important issue in our study. However, unaccounted confounding may have occurred, as we were able to adjust only for first-degree family members with breast or ovarian cancer and not for the full family history. In addition, we can not exclude the possibility that other unknown or unmeasured confounders, such as coping strategy or locus of control, influenced our findings.

Statistical precision

When possible, we used 95% confidence intervals to indicate the precision of our estimates. Despite the rather large size of our study compared to existing studies, it should be noted that some subgroups were small and the estimates were imprecise, as shown by the widths of the confidence intervals. Caution is needed particularly in interpreting findings for affected women (Aim 1) and findings on the accuracy of risk perception and predictors of accurate risk perception among unaffected women (Aim 3).

Conclusion

The follow-up design with appropriate reference groups was an efficient and feasible approach for evaluating the impact of genetic counseling on psychosocial outcomes and risk perceptions. Our study's internal validity was enhanced by use of valid, well-established psychometric scales and identical procedures for data collection in the three study groups. However, the use of less

established cut-off points and floor effects of HADS and IES are possible shortcomings. While confounding does not seem to be a major problem, unknown and unmeasured confounding may have affected our results. The study populations appear to be population-based samples, which improves the external validity of our findings - at least for the population of Danish women receiving genetic counseling.

Study findings in relation to the existing literature

The following discussion is organized by the four aims of this thesis.

Psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling (Aim 1)

We were not able to identify any studies that specifically focused on the psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling. However, a number of studies have touched on this topic, assessing psychological conditions of women in the waiting room or at an unspecified and variable point in time before the first counseling session. With few exceptions these studies report only mean values for psychosocial health scores (37;51-53;63;68;69;71).

Our study showed that 26% of unaffected women experienced some degree of anxiety and 7% experienced some degree of depression one to four weeks before their initial genetic counseling session. On the basis of mailed questionnaires, Bish *et al*. (64) found higher proportions of anxiety (41%) and depression (11%) prior to genetic counseling. However, the exact time frame was not provided, and the proportions were reported for a sample that included both affected and unaffected women.

We found that 54% of unaffected women and 64% of affected women awaiting genetic counseling experienced some degree of cancer-specific distress. Of these, only 4% and 6%, respectively, experienced a severe level of cancer-specific distress. In contrast, Carlsson *et al*. (91), assessing cancer-specific distress two to four weeks before genetic counseling, found that 20% experienced such distress at a severe level. Unlike our study, Carlsson's sample included affected and unaffected and referred and self-referred men and women at risk of breast or colorectal cancer. As well, a lower cut-off point was used to define a severe level of cancer-

specific distress. In another study of 302 women attending their first genetic counseling session, cancer-specific distress was measured in the waiting room (68). The results indicated high levels of distress, but only mean values were reported, making comparisons with our results difficult.

To our knowledge, HRQOL data for individuals awaiting genetic counseling for breast or ovarian cancer have been reported previously only by Carlsson *et al.* (91). Despite the difference in study populations, our findings accord with Carlsson's, indicating that unaffected women awaiting genetic counseling had the same HRQAL as women from the general population and better HRQAL scores than women awaiting mammography.

Respondents at baseline and participants with complete follow-up (Aim 2)

Our response rates of 76% (Genetic Counseling Group), 61% (Reference Group I), and 66% (Reference Group II) at baseline are comparable to those of a number of other studies (51;53;63;69;71). We examined differences between respondents and non-respondents for a large number of characteristics and found only a few differences (higher prevalence of breast cancer, greater likelihood of living with a partner, and higher household income among respondents). We have not been able identify any studies that have compared respondents and non-respondents to a similar degree.

Based on the number of women invited to participate in our study, proportions with complete follow-up were 61% in the Genetic Counseling Group, 55% in Reference Group I, and 53% in Reference Group II. While some studies reported similar completion rates (51-53;63;68;69), a number of others noted lower rates or failed to report them (30;32;64-67;70). Consistent with the

literature, we found no substantial differences between participants with complete follow-up and drop-outs (30;64;69).

Impact of genetic counseling on perceived risk and accuracy of risk perception (Aim 3)

Our findings indicate that genetic counseling can lead to a considerable decrease in perceived risk, maintained even a year after counseling. Our findings accord with those of a RCT (63) and a follow-up study (56), which reported even larger reductions in perceived risk after counseling. However, these two studies did not include paired analyses of the study participants, and the follow-up was restricted to one week. Our findings contrast with the results of a RCT conducted by Brain *et al*., (51) which did not find a decrease in perceived risk associated with genetic counseling compared to surgical counseling. As well, the initial decrease in perceived risk found in both the intervention and the control group diminished within the following 12 months.

A decrease in perceived risk is only of interest if it results in more accurate risk perception among women receiving counseling. Our findings indicate that genetic counseling is associated both with a decrease in perceived risk and with an improvement in accuracy of risk perception. Sixteen percent of women in the Genetic Counseling Group improved their accuracy following counseling. Still, after 12 months of follow up, 41% of women in this group continued to overestimate their perceived risk, compared to 34% of women in the reference groups. Our findings are consistent with those of the RCT conducted by Lerman *et al*., (32) in which the proportion of women who perceived their risk accurately increased by 8% after counseling, while two-thirds continued to overestimate their risk. We used the same method of measuring accuracy and the same definition of the level for overestimating perceived risk as Leman *et al*., strengthening the comparison. Other studies have found that 11-55% of women perceive their

risk accurately post-counseling, but methods of assessing accuracy and defining levels of accurate perception have varied widely (37;65;67;68). Unlike Lobb *et al*., (58) we found that women who received risk information only in words were more likely to perceive their risk inaccurately after counseling than women who received the information in a combination of words and numbers. As the women were not randomly assigned to one of the risk communication strategies, we cannot entirely exclude the possibility of confounding, *i.e*., if numerical information was provided mainly to women who were able to comprehend numbers. Consistent with the findings of Huiart *et al*., (57) we also found that inaccurate risk perception at baseline was strongly associated with inaccurate risk perception 12 months later.

Impact of genetic counseling on psychosocial outcomes (Aim 4)

The prevalence of anxiety in women receiving genetic counseling remained unchanged from baseline to 12 months of follow up. During this period the prevalence of anxiety increased only slightly in the reference groups. These findings indicate that genetic counseling does not reduce generalized anxiety in the long term, in accordance with findings from the RCT conducted by Brain *et al.* (51) and from three uncontrolled studies with 12 months of follow up (37;64;68).

The prevalence of depression increased equally among women in our three study groups. This suggests that the increase observed in the Genetic Counseling Group is unlikely to be caused by genetic counseling itself. Instead, the exercise of completing the questionnaires may have drawn the women's attention to their psychological well being. Our findings support those of a number of uncontrolled prospective studies (37;64;92), which indicated that genetic counseling for hereditary breast or ovarian cancer is not associated with an increase in depressive symptoms.

Women in both the Genetic Counseling Group and in Reference Group I received an intervention with the potential to reduce cancer-specific distress. As expected, the prevalence of cancer-specific distress decreased in both groups, although the decrease reached statistical significance only in the Genetic Counseling Group. The proportion of women in Reference Group II who experienced no cancer distress increased only slightly after 12 months of follow up, consistent with their lack of exposure to an intervention. The increase in the proportion of women who did not experience a clinically relevant level of cancer distress was substantially larger in the Genetic Counseling Group than in Reference Group II.

Previous studies on the long-term impact of genetic counseling on cancer-specific distress have shown conflicting results. A randomized trial of multidisciplinary genetic counseling compared to specialized surgical counseling (51) and two prospective studies (37;64) found a reduction in cancer-specific distress, though the reduction reported in the trial was small. In contrast, a meta-analysis based on three RCTs, including the RCT noted above, found no association between genetic counseling and cancer-specific distress (47). The reduction in cancer-specific distress we observed in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to the reference groups supports the hypothesis that genetic counseling reduces cancer-specific distress over the long term in a population-based sample of women.

To our knowledge, our study is the first to address the impact of genetic counseling on HRQOL as assessed by SF-36. Our findings suggest that counseling is not likely to have a major impact on HRQOL. While we found small changes in the two summary scores for HRQOL and a statistically significant improvement in the PCS for the Genetic Counseling Group compared to the reference groups, none of these changes are close to the five-point level considered clinically meaningful (75).

Main conclusions

The following are the main conclusions of this thesis, organized according to its aims.

1. Women who have decided to undergo genetic counseling, and who are awaiting their first counseling session, experience more cancer-specific distress, but do not suffer from more anxiety or depression, than women scheduled for mammography or women from the general population.

2. The findings showed no major differences among respondents and non-respondents. There also appeared to be no important differences between participants with complete follow-up and drop-outs. Despite limitations introduced by the sampling procedure, non-response rates, and drop-out rates, the study population was likely to be a population-based sample.

3. The findings indicated that genetic counseling leads to a decrease in perceived risk and to a considerable improvement in accuracy of risk perception, maintained even a year after counseling. In addition, women who received risk information only in words were more likely to perceive their risk inaccurately after counseling than women who received the information in a combination of words and numbers.

4. Genetic counseling leads to a substantial decrease in cancer-specific distress among women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer. Furthermore, genetic counseling does not appear to have an adverse impact on general anxiety, symptoms of depression, or health-related quality of life.

Perspectives

Overall the findings of this thesis are reassuring as regards psychosocial outcomes and risk perceptions following genetic counseling for HBOC. However, the findings also highlight some facets which need improvement in order to optimize the effect of genetic counseling.

We found that anticipation of genetic counseling for HBOC can be burdensome for both affected and unaffected women. Therefore it is important to address cancer-specific distress at referral and at the first counseling session. Although we found a substantial decease in cancer-specific distress 12 months after counseling, 41% of clients were still affected by it. There is a need for future studies to examine whether it is possible to further alleviate cancer-specific distress.

As 41% of the women still overestimated their perceived risk after counseling, counseling practices need to be strengthened, particularly regarding risk communication. Our findings suggest that professionals providing genetic counseling should use a multi-faceted communication strategy that expresses risk both in words and numbers. Extra attention should be given to women who indicate an inaccurate risk perception during their first genetic counseling session and to women from families where genetic testing already has been initiated.

In this thesis I have focused on anxiety, depression, cancer-specific distress, and risk perception as outcomes of genetic counseling. A number of other outcomes may also be relevant, such as compliance with recommended surveillance and the impact of genetic counseling on other health behaviors known to be risk factors for breast cancer. As well, I have addressed only women who received genetic counseling for HBOC. Genetic counseling is also offered in regard to other cancers, and in the future may become available for diseases such as diabetes, Alzheimer's, and

some heart conditions. Psychosocial consequences and risk perceptions may differ in these contexts, due to disease-specific genetic features, prognoses, and prevention options. As our findings cannot be applied directly to such diseases, new studies will be required. When RCTs are not feasible, our prospective study design using reference groups could be used as a model.

This thesis focuses only on the psychosocial impact of genetic counseling. Its clinical impact also needs to be addressed. The population-based registries, which we used only to examine selection issues, also provide an opportunity to follow our study population in the future. One strategy may be to examine the impact of genetic counseling for our study population beyond 12 months of follow-up, looking at clinical outcomes such as incidence of breast and ovarian cancer, mastectomy and compliance to recommended surveillance.

Summary

Much research has focused on the psychosocial impact of genetic counseling for HBOC risk, however results have been inconsistent. Moreover, the studies have been prone to limitations due to highly selected samples of women, a lack of control groups and none were population-based.

The aims of this thesis were: 1) to compare the psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling for HBOC with those of women awaiting mammography and those of a random sample of women from the general population; 2) to examine possible clinical and socioeconomic differences between study respondents and non-respondents and between participants with complete follow-up and drop-outs; 3) to assess the impact of genetic counseling over time on perceived personal lifetime risk of breast cancer and accuracy of risk perception and to identify possible predictors of inaccurate risk perception; 4) to assess the impact of genetic counseling over time on anxiety, depression, cancer-specific distress and HRQOL.

We conducted a population-based follow-up study of 431 women who received genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, 417 women who underwent mammography (Reference Group I), and a random sample of 1315 women from the general population (Reference Group II). We obtained self-reported data using self-administered, standardized, mailed questionnaires and registry data from six nationwide registries.

Women, awaiting their first counseling session, experienced more cancer-specific distress, but did not suffer from more anxiety or depression than women in the reference groups.

The study showed no substantial differences between respondents and non-respondents and between participants with complete follow-up and drop-outs.

Women who received genetic counseling decreased their perceived risk by an average of 6.6 percentage points (95% CI: 3.0%; 10.2%) between baseline and 12 months of follow-up. In contrast, perceived risk remained relatively stable in the reference groups. The proportion of women who accurately perceived their risk increased by 16% in the group receiving genetic counseling, compared to a reduction of 5% (p=0.03) and 2% (p=0.01) in Reference Groups I and II, respectively.

Furthermore, we found the following predictors for inaccurate risk perception: 1) Risk communicated only in words; 2) inaccurate risk perception at baseline and 3) presence of a familial mutation.

52% of the women referred for genetic counseling experienced cancer-specific distress at a clinical level at baseline and this proportion decreased to 41% after 12 months of follow up. This 10.8% (95% CI:1.4; 20.8) decrease observed in the Genetic Counseling Group exceeded the decrease observed in Reference Group I, 6.3% (95% CI:-1.3;13.8) and Reference Group II, 1.6% (95% CI:-2.3;5.5). In addition, genetic counseling did not lead to an increase in general anxiety and depression or a decrease in HRQOL among women in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to the women in the reference groups.

This population-based study indicates that genetic counseling can help Danish women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer to alleviate their cancer-specific distress and improve their risk perception.

Dansk resumé

Der har i forskningen været megen fokus på de psykosociale konsekvenser af genetisk rådgivning for arvelig bryst- og æggestokkræft (HBOC), men tidligere undersøgelser af dette felt har vist inkonsistente resultater. Der har ikke tidligere været foretaget danske undersøgelser af dette område, og de udenlandske undersøgelser bærer præg af en række metodiske svagheder som f.eks. manglende kontrolgrupper og højt selekterede studiepopulationer.

Formålet med denne PhD afhandling var at undersøge de psykosociale konsekvenser af genetisk rådgivning for HBOC, ved: 1) at sammenligne den psykosociale helbredstilstand for kvinder, der afventer genetisk rådgivning med kvinder, der afventer mammografi og med kvinder fra en tilfældigt udtrukket stikprøve fra baggrundspopulationen 2) at kortlægge eventuelle helbredsmæssige og sociodemografiske forskelle mellem deltagere og ikke deltagere i studiet samt mellem kvinder, der gennemfører hele studiet og kvinder, der udgår i løbet af studiet 3) at vurdere genetisk rådgivnings indflydelse over tid på oplevet risiko for brystkræft samt identificere prædiktorer for ukorrekt risiko opfattelse 4) at vurdere konsekvenserne over tid af genetisk rådgivning i forhold til angst, depression og cancerbekymring samt helbredsrelateret livskvalitet.

Undersøgelsen blev gennemført som et populationsbaseret follow-up studie af 431 kvinder, der var henvist til genetisk rådgivning for HBOC, 417 kvinder, der fik foretaget mammografi (reference gruppe I), samt 1315 kvinder udtrukket fra CPR- registeret (reference gruppe II). Data blev indsamlet ved brug af selvudfyldte standardiserede spørgeskemaer samt data fra 6 nationale registre.

Kvinder, der afventede deres første genetiske rådgivning, oplevede større grad af cancer bekymring, men ikke større grad af angst eller depression sammenlignet med kvinder i referencegrupperne.

Vi fandt ingen afgørende helbredsmæssige eller sociodemografiske forskelle mellem kvinder, der deltog i studiet, og kvinder, der ikke deltog i studiet. Ligeledes fandt vi ingen afgørende forskelle mellem kvinder, der gennemførte hele studiet, og kvinder, der faldt fra undervejs.

Kvinder, der gennemgik genetisk rådgivning, reducerede i gennemsnit deres opfattelse af risiko for brystkræft med 6,6 procent point (95% CI: 3,0%; 10,2%) mellem baseline og 12 måneders opfølgning. Kvinderne i de 2 reference grupper ændrede derimod stort set ikke deres opfattelse af risiko for brystkræft indenfor den samme periode. Blandt de kvinder, der modtog genetisk rådgivning, fik 16% flere en korrekt opfattelse af deres risiko i forhold til den objektivt vurderede risiko. Til sammenligning faldt den tilsvarende andel i henholdsvis i reference gruppe I med 5% (p=0,03) og i reference gruppe II med 2% (p=0,01). Vi fandt desuden følgende prædiktorer for ”ukorrekt” risikoopfattelse: 1) risiko formidlet i udelukkede i ord ved rådgivning, 2)”ukorrekt” risikoopfattelse før rådgivning samt 3)viden om en identificeret cancer-disponerende mutation i familien.

Før den første genetiske rådgivning var 52% af de henviste kvinderne påvirkede af cancerbekymring, hvilket 12 måneder efter rådgivningen var reduceret til 41%. Forekomsten af cancer specifik bekymring faldt også hos kvinder i referencegrupperne, men reduktionen (10,8%, 95% CI:1,4; 20,8) blandt kvinder, der gennemgik genetisk rådgivning, oversteg reduktionen

både i reference gruppe I (6,3%, 95% CI:-1,3;13,8) og i reference gruppe II (1.6%, 95% CI:-2,3;5,5).

Genetisk rådgivning medførte ingen stigning i generel angst og depression eller et fald i helbredsrelateret livskvalitet sammenlignet med reference grupperne.

Denne populationsbaserede undersøgelse viser, at genetisk rådgivning for HBOC kan mindske cancer specifik stress og forbedre kvindernes risikoopfattelse til at blive mere i overensstemmelse med den objektivt vurderede risiko.

References

1. Cancer incidens i Danmark. Sundhedsstyrelsen. København S: 2005.

2. Tchou J, Morrow M. Overview of Clinical Risk Assessment. In: Morrow M, Jordan VC, editors. Managing Breast Cancer Risk. London: BC Decker Inc, 2003: 3-25.

3. Chappuis PO, Foulkes WD. Overview of the clinical genetics of ovarian cancer. In: Morrison PJ, Hodgson S, Haites NE, editors. Familial Breast and Ovarian Cancer. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 2002: 43-72.

4. Storm HH, Engholm G. Relative survival of Danish cancer patients diagnosed 1981 to 1997 and followed to 2001. A status report. Ugeskr Laeger 2002; 164(22):2855-2864.

5. Isaacs C, Peshkin BN, Schwartz M. Managing Breast Cancer Risk. In: Morrow M, Jordan VC, editors. Managing Breast Cancer Risk. London: BC Decker Inc., 2003: 26-42.

6. Morrison PJ, Hodgson S, Haites NE. Familial Breast Ovarian Cancer. Genetics, Screening and Management. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

7. Brondum-Nielsen K, Sunde L, Gerdes AM. Cancergenetik. In: Nørby S, Nielsen PKA, editors. Medicinsk Genetik. Århus: FADL, 2006: 207-217.

8. Miki Y, Swensen J, Shattuck-Eidens D, Futreal PA, Harshman K, Tavtigian S et al. A strong candidate for the breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility gene BRCA1. Science 1994; 266(5182):66-71.

9. Wooster R, Stratton MR. Breast cancer susceptibility: a complex disease unravels. Trends Genet 1995; 11(1):3-5.

10. Claus EB, Schildkraut JM, Thompson WD, Risch NJ. The genetic attributable risk of breast and ovarian cancer. Cancer 1996; 77(11):2318-2324.

11. Risch HA, McLaughlin JR, Cole DE, Rosen B, Bradley L, Kwan E et al. Prevalence and penetrance of germline BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations in a population series of 649 women with ovarian cancer. Am J Hum Genet 2001; 68(3):700-710.

12. Antoniou A, Pharoah PD, Narod S, Risch HA, Eyfjord JE, Hopper JL et al. Average risks of breast and ovarian cancer associated with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations detected in case Series unselected for family history: a combined analysis of 22 studies. Am J Hum Genet 2003; 72(5):1117-1130.

13. Easton DF, Ford D, Bishop DT. Breast and ovarian cancer incidence in BRCA1-mutation carriers. Breast Cancer Linkage Consortium. Am J Hum Genet 1995; 56(1):265-271.

14. Ford D, Easton DF, Stratton M, Narod S, Goldgar D, Devilee P et al. Genetic heterogeneity and penetrance analysis of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes in breast cancer families. The Breast Cancer Linkage Consortium. Am J Hum Genet 1998; 62(3):676-689.

15. Struewing JP, Hartge P, Wacholder S, Baker SM, Berlin M, McAdams M et al. The risk of cancer associated with specific mutations of BRCA1 and BRCA2 among Ashkenazi Jews. N Engl J Med 1997; 336(20):1401-1408.

16. Claus EB, Risch NJ, Thompson WD. Age at onset as an indicator of familial risk of breast cancer. Am J Epidemiol 1990; 131(6):961-972.

17. Danish Breast Cancer Cooperative Group. Retningslinier for genetisk udredning og rådgivning ved arvelig disposition til bryst- og æggestokkræft. 2002.

18. Genetic risk assessment and BRCA mutation testing for breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility: recommendation statement. Ann Intern Med 2005; 143(5):355-361.

19. Nelson HD, Huffman LH, Fu R, Harris EL. Genetic risk assessment and BRCA mutation testing for breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility: systematic evidence review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Ann Intern Med 2005; 143(5):362-379.

20. Trepanier A, Ahrens M, McKinnon W, Peters J, Stopfer J, Grumet SC et al. Genetic cancer risk assessment and counseling: recommendations of the national society of genetic counselors. J Genet Couns 2004; 13(2):83-114.

21. Biesecker BB. Goals of genetic counseling. Clin Genet 2001; 60(5):323-330.

22. Schneider K. Counseling about cancer. Strategies for Genetic Counseling. 2 ed. New York: Wiley-Liss Inc., 2002.

23. Brondum-Nielsen K. Genetic counseling and genetic services. Ugeskr Laeger 2003; 165(8):777-779.

24. Gerdes AM, Rasmussen K, Graversen HP, Kronborg O, Qvist N, Holm NV et al. Clinics for counseling on cancer genetics. Experiences with genetic studies and counseling on familial breast cancer and colorectal cancer. Ugeskr Laeger 1998; 160(8):1145-1151.

25. Hertz JM, Jensen PKA. Genetisk Rådgivning. In: Nørby S, Nielsen PKA, editors. Medicinsk Genetik. Århus: FADL, 2006.

26. Claus EB, Risch N, Thompson WD. Autosomal dominant inheritance of early-onset breast cancer. Implications for risk prediction. Cancer 1994; 73(3):643-651.

27. Burke W. Genetic testing. N Engl J Med 2002; 347(23):1867-1875.

28. Gerdes AM. Cancer genetics. A review of oncological molecular biology seen in relation to the human genome. Ugeskr Laeger 2002; 164(22):2865-2871.

29. Sundhedsstyrelsen. Nye tal fra Sundhedsstyrelsen. 6 ed. København S: Sundhedsstyrelsen, 2002.

30. Fry A, Cull A, Appleton S, Rush R, Holloway S, Gorman D et al. A randomised controlled trial of breast cancer genetics services in South East Scotland: psychological impact. Br J Cancer 2003; 89(4):653-659.

31. Kinmonth AL, Reinhard J, Bobrow M, Pauker S. The new genetics. Implications for clinical services in Britain and the United States. BMJ 1998; 316(7133):767-770.

32. Lerman C, Lustbader E, Rimer B, Daly M, Miller S, Sands C et al. Effects of individualized breast cancer risk counseling: a randomized trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 1995; 87(4):286-292.

33. Møller S. Danish Breast Cancer Cooperative Group. 2006.
Personal Communication.

34. Nielsen JB, Pedersen FS. Risikoen for brystkræft ligger i generne. Berlingske 2006 Jul 6.

35. Fletcher RW, Fletcher SW. Clinical Epidemiology. The Essentials. 4 ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2005.

36. Schwartz MD, Rimer BK, Daly M, Sands C, Lerman C. A randomized trial of breast cancer risk counseling: the impact on self-reported mammography use. Am J Public Health 1999; 89(6):924-926.

37. Meiser B, Butow PN, Barratt AL, Schnieden V, Gattas M, Kirk J et al. Long-term outcomes of genetic counseling in women at increased risk of developing hereditary breast cancer. Patient Educ Couns 2001; 44(3):215-225.

38. Lerman C, Hughes C, Croyle RT, Main D, Durham C, Snyder C et al. Prophylactic surgery decisions and surveillance practices one year following BRCA1/2 testing. Prev Med 2000; 31(1):75-80.

39. Brekelmans CT, Seynaeve C, Bartels CC, Tilanus-Linthorst MM, Meijers-Heijboer EJ, Crepin CM et al. Effectiveness of breast cancer surveillance in BRCA1/2 gene mutation carriers and women with high familial risk. J Clin Oncol 2001; 19(4):924-930.

40. Hansen MB, Svendsen MN. Risikokommunikation i relation til sundhedsfremme og forebyggelse. København S: Viden og dokumentationsenheden, Sundhedsstyrelsen, 2005.

41. Hopwood P. Breast cancer risk perception: what do we know and understand? Breast Cancer Res 2000; 2(6):387-391.

42. Koch L. Etiske aspekter ved genetisk testning og rådgivning for arvelig cancer. Ugeskr Laeger 1998;1838.

43. Koch L. Styring af genetisk risikoviden. Distinktion 2001;(3):45-53.

44. Botkin JR, Croyle RT, Smith KR, Baty BJ, Lerman C, Goldgar DE et al. A model protocol for evaluating the behavioral and psychosocial effects of BRCA1 testing. J Natl Cancer Inst 1996; 88(13):872-882.

45. Hopwood P. Psychological issues in cancer genetics: current research and future priorities. Patient Educ Couns 1997; 32(1-2):19-31.

46. Marteau TM, Croyle RT. The new genetics. Psychological responses to genetic testing. BMJ 1998; 316(7132):693-696.

47. Braithwaite D, Emery J, Walter F, Prevost AT, Sutton S. Psychological impact of genetic counseling for familial cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Natl Cancer Inst 2004; 96(2):122-133.

48. Butow PN, Lobb EA, Meiser B, Barratt A, Tucker KM. Psychological outcomes and risk perception after genetic testing and counselling in breast cancer: a systematic review. Med J Aust 2003; 178(2):77-81.

49. Meiser B, Halliday JL. What is the impact of genetic counselling in women at increased risk of developing hereditary breast cancer? A meta-analytic review. Soc Sci Med 2002; 54(10):1463-1470.

50. Green MJ, Peterson SK, Baker MW, Harper GR, Friedman LC, Rubinstein WS et al. Effect of a computer-based decision aid on knowledge, perceptions, and intentions about genetic testing for breast cancer susceptibility: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2004; 292(4):442-452.

51. Brain K, Gray J, Norman P, France E, Anglim C, Barton G et al. Randomized trial of a specialist genetic assessment service for familial breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2000; 92(16):1345-1351.

52. Watson M, Duvivier V, Wade WM, Ashley S, Davidson J, Papaikonomou M et al. Family history of breast cancer: what do women understand and recall about their genetic risk? J Med Genet 1998; 35(9):731-738.

53. Cull A, Miller H, Porterfield T, Mackay J, Anderson ED, Steel CM et al. The use of videotaped information in cancer genetic counselling: a randomized evaluation study. Br J Cancer 1998; 77(5):830-837.

54. Lerman C, Hughes C, Benkendorf JL, Biesecker B, Kerner J, Willison J et al. Racial differences in testing motivation and psychological distress following pretest education for BRCA1 gene testing. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 1999; 8(4):361-367.

55. Cull A, Anderson ED, Campbell S, Mackay J, Smyth E, Steel M. The impact of genetic counselling about breast cancer risk on women's risk perceptions and levels of distress. Br J Cancer 1999; 79(3-4):501-508.

56. Gurmankin AD, Domchek S, Stopfer J, Fels C, Armstrong K. Patients' resistance to risk information in genetic counseling for BRCA1/2. Arch Intern Med 2005; 165(5):523-529.

57. Huiart L, Eisinger F, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, Lasset C, Nogues C, Vennin P et al. Effects of genetic consultation on perception of a family risk of breast/ovarian cancer and determinants of inaccurate perception after the consultation. J Clin Epidemiol 2002; 55(7):665-675.

58. Lobb EA, Butow PN, Meiser B, Barratt A, Gaff C, Young MA et al. Women's preferences and consultants' communication of risk in consultations about familial breast cancer: impact on patient outcomes. J Med Genet 2003; 40(5):56.

59. Randall J, Butow P, Kirk J, Tucker K. Psychological impact of genetic counselling and testing in women previously diagnosed with breast cancer. Intern Med J 2001; 31(7):397-405.

60. Calzone KA, Prindiville SA, Jourkiv O, Jenkins J, DeCarvalho M, Wallerstedt DB et al. Randomized comparison of group versus individual genetic education and counseling for familial breast and/or ovarian cancer. J Clin Oncol 2005; 23(15):3455-3464.

61. Hopwood P, Wonderling D, Watson M, Cull A, Douglas F, Cole T et al. A randomised comparison of UK genetic risk counselling services for familial cancer: psychosocial outcomes. Br J Cancer 2004; 91(5):884-892.

62. Lobb EA, Butow PN, Barratt A, Meiser B, Gaff C, Young MA et al. Communication and information-giving in high-risk breast cancer consultations: influence on patient outcomes. Br J Cancer 2004; 90(2):321-327.

63. Bowen DJ, Burke W, McTiernan A, Yasui Y, Andersen MR. Breast cancer risk counseling improves women's functioning. Patient Educ Couns 2004; 53(1):79-86.

64. Bish A, Sutton S, Jacobs C, Levene S, Ramirez A, Hodgson S. Changes in psychological distress after cancer genetic counselling: a comparison of affected and unaffected women. Br J Cancer 2002; 86(1):43-50.

65. Evans DG, Blair V, Greenhalgh R, Hopwood P, Howell A. The impact of genetic counselling on risk perception in women with a family history of breast cancer. Br J Cancer 1994; 70(5):934-938.

66. Hopwood P, Keeling F, Long A, Pool C, Evans G, Howell A. Psychological support needs for women at high genetic risk of breast cancer: some preliminary indicators. Psychooncology 1998; 7(5):402-412.

67. Hopwood P, Shenton A, Lalloo F, Evans DG, Howell A. Risk perception and cancer worry: an exploratory study of the impact of genetic risk counselling in women with a family history of breast cancer. J Med Genet 2001; 38(2):139.

68. Watson M, Lloyd S, Davidson J, Meyer L, Eeles R, Ebbs S et al. The impact of genetic counselling on risk perception and mental health in women with a family history of breast cancer. Br J Cancer 1999; 79(5-6):868-874.

69. Brain K, Norman P, Gray J, Rogers C, Mansel R, Harper P. A randomized trial of specialist genetic assessment: psychological impact on women at different levels of familial breast cancer risk. Br J Cancer 2002; 86(2):233-238.

70. Hopwood P, Howell A, Lalloo F, Evans G. Do women understand the odds? Risk perceptions and recall of risk information in women with a family history of breast cancer. Community Genet 2003; 6(4):214-223.

71. Lerman C, Schwartz MD, Miller SM, Daly M, Sands C, Rimer BK. A randomized trial of breast cancer risk counseling: interacting effects of counseling, educational level, and coping style. Health Psychol 1996; 15(2):75-83.

72. Horowitz M, Wilner N, Alvarez W. Impact of Event Scale: a measure of subjective stress. Psychosom Med 1979; 41(3):209-218.

73. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 1983; 67(6):361-370.

74. Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. Med Care 1992; 30(6):473-483.

75. Bjorner JB, Damsgaard MT, Watt T, Bech P, Rasmussen NK, Kristensen TS et al. Dansk manual til SF-36. Copenhagen: Lif, 1997.

76. Rose MS, Koshman ML, Spreng S, Sheldon R. Statistical issues encountered in the comparison of health-related quality of life in diseased patients to published general population norms: problems and solutions. J Clin Epidemiol 1999; 52(5):405-412.

77. Oksbjerg S, Mellemkjær L, Johansen C. Incidens og mortalitet af brystkræft hos kvinder i Danmark 1943-1992. Ugeskrift for Læger 1997; 159(48):7134-7140.

78. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. J Chronic Dis 1987; 40(5):373-383.

79. Andersen TF, Madsen M, Jorgensen J, Mellemkjoer L, Olsen JH. The Danish National Hospital Register. A valuable source of data for modern health sciences. Dan Med Bull 1999; 46(3):263-268.

80. Storm HH, Michelsen EV, Clemmensen IH, Pihl J. The Danish Cancer Registry-history, content, quality and use. Dan Med Bull 1997; 44(5):535-539.

81. Munk-Jorgensen P, Mortensen PB. The Danish Psychiatric Central Register. Dan Med Bull 1997; 44(1):82-84.

82. Knudsen LB. The Danish Fertility Database. Dan Med Bull 1998; 45(2):221-225.

83. Fayers PM, Machin D. Quality of Life. Assessment, Analysis and Interpretation. 1 ed. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2000.

84. Streiner DL, Norman GR. Health Measurement Scales. A practical guide to their development and use. 2 ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

85. Olsen J, Basso O, Sorensen HT. What is a population-based registry? Scand J Public Health 1999; 27(1):78.

86. Sundin EC, Horowitz MJ. Impact of Event Scale: psychometric properties. Br J Psychiatry 2002; 180:205-209.

87. Thewes B, Meiser B, Hickie IB. Psychometric properties of the Impact of Event Scale amongst women at increased risk for hereditary breast cancer. Psychooncology 2001; 10(6):459-468.

88. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, Neckelmann D. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. J Psychosom Res 2002; 52(2):69-77.

89. Devilly GJ, Hutchings E. Impact of Event Scale. http://www.swin.edu.au/victims/resources/assessment/ptsd/ies.html.2006.

90. Groenvold M, Fayers PM, Sprangers MA, Bjorner JB, Klee MC, Aaronson NK et al. Anxiety and depression in breast cancer patients at low risk of recurrence compared with the general population: a valid comparison? J Clin Epidemiol 1999; 52(6):523-530.

91. Carlsson AH, Bjorvatn C, Engebretsen LF, Berglund G, Natvig GK. Psychosocial factors associated with quality of life among individuals attending genetic counseling for hereditary cancer. J Genet Couns 2004; 13(5):425-445.

92. Ritvo P, Robinson G, Irvine J, Brown L, Matthew A, Murphy KJ et al. Psychological adjustment to familial genetic risk assessment: differences in two longitudinal samples. Patient Educ Couns 2000; 40(2):163-172.

Appendices – Papers (I-III) and Questionnaires (IV)

Title

Psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling: A population-based study

Short title

Awaiting genetic counseling

Ellen M. Mikkelsen RN., MPH[1,2], Lone Sunde, M.D., Ph.D. [3], Christoffer Johansen, D.M.Sc., Ph.D.[4], Søren P. Johnsen M.D., PhD.[1]

[1]Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Ole Worms Allé 150, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

[2]The Centre for Innovation in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus

[3]Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital, Bartholin Bygningen, 8000 Aarhus C

[4]Department of Psychosocial Cancer Research, Institute of Cancer Epidemiology, The Danish Cancer Society, Strandboulevarden 49, 2100 Copenhagen Ø

Correspondence

Ellen M. Mikkelsen, Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital, Ole Worms Allé 150, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark.

Phone +45 89 42 48 14, Fax +45 89 42 48 01, E-mail em@dce.au.dk

Original Article – Psychosocial study

Acknowledgements

We thank the patients for participating, the hospital staffs for coordinating patient enrollment and Henrik F. Thomsen, biostatistician at the Department of Clinical

Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, for assistance with statistical analyses of register-data.

Financial disclosures

The research was funded by the Danish Cancer Society Grant Number PP 02 010, the Center of Innovation and Development in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus, and Aarhus University Research Foundation. No conflicts of interests.

Informed consent

The study was conducted according to the guidelines of The Biomedical National Ethics Committee System, and approved by the National Board of Health (J. nr. 0-604-04-20/E/EHG) and The Danish Data Protection Agency (CVR-nr.11-88-37-29).

Keywords

Genetic counseling; psychological distress; hereditary breast and ovarian cancer

Pages Text : 19 pages. Tables : 5 tables (5 pages)

Abstract

Background

The decision whether to undergo genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer is complex. Knowledge about the psychosocial conditions of women who have decided on counseling and thus await counseling is sparse. We aimed to compare the psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling with those of women in two reference groups.

Methods

We included 567 women referred to genetic counseling for hereditary risk of breast or ovarian cancer, who was participating in an on-going population, based follow-up study. In addition, we included 689 women referred to mammography (Reference Group I) and a random sample of 2000 women from the general population (Reference Group II). One to four weeks before the first genetic counseling session or mammography, data were collected by questionnaires. We used data from six nationwide registries to compare respondents and non-respondents.

Results

We found no substantial differences in anxiety and depression when comparing the women referred to genetic counseling and reference groups. Sixty-four percent of the women affected with cancer and 54 % of the unaffected women awaiting genetic counseling experienced cancer-specific distress. Both affected and unaffected women in the Genetic Group had a higher prevalence of cancer specific distress than the reference groups. We found no striking differences in clinical and socioeconomic characteristics between respondents and non-respondents in the entire study-population.

Conclusion

Awaiting genetic counseling can be burdensome for both affected and unaffected women and cancer specific distress is a relevant topic to address at referral and at the first genetic counseling session.

Condensed Abstract

Sixty-four percent of the women affected with cancer and 54 % of the unaffected women awaiting genetic counseling experienced cancer-specific distress. Cancer specific distress is a relevant topic to address at referral and at the first genetic counseling session.

Introduction

The identification of the cancer susceptibility genes, BRCA1 (1) and BRCA2 (2) has extended preventive medicine with genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. Hereditary breast and ovarian cancers account for approximately 7 % of all breast cancers and approximately 10 % of all ovarian cancers, respectively, and are characterized by a younger age of occurrence than non-hereditary cancers (3). Carriers of mutations in the BRCA1 or BRCA2 genes have a substantially increased risk of breast and ovarian cancer (2;4;5). The scarcity of primary prevention options for breast and ovarian cancer and the positive expectations of genetic counseling for hereditary cancer has increased the demand for this prevention strategy (6-9).

The decision whether to undergo genetic counseling is not simple, and it usually requires time and serious reflection. When a decision has finally been made, most women experience a waiting period of four weeks or more before counseling can actually take place (10). In most studies, the first assessment of psychological reactions to genetic counseling is made in the waiting room, or at an unspecified and variable point in time before the first counseling session (11-14). These studies therefore provide little information on the possible stress experienced by women during the waiting period. Genetic counseling is relevant not only for the women seeking counseling but also for other family members, in particular the relatives of women affected with breast or ovarian cancer. However, very few studies have included women who are themselves affected by cancer (15;16) and none of these studies focus on a specific point of time before the first counseling session. The majority of studies on the impact of genetic counseling has been uncontrolled observational studies with highly selected study populations (17). The consequences of anticipating genetic counseling therefore remain unclear for the general

population at risk of hereditary cancer, including women who are already affected with cancer.

We are conducting a population-based prospective follow-up study of women attending genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. We have included two reference groups in order to overcome a number of the methodological problems in the existing observational studies. In this paper, we have analyzed baseline data with the aim of comparing the psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling with those of the women in the reference groups. Further, we have examined possible differences between respondents and non-respondents according to clinical and socioeconomic characteristics.

Materials and Methods

Genetic counseling is offered to all Danish women at risk of hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. The counseling is offered free of charge by the tax-financed public health system after referral from a medical doctor. The first counseling session includes genetic information, pedigree drawing, risk assessment, and if possible a genetic test. Women thought to be at an elevated risk are referred to a surveillance program (18).

Study population

In the Genetic Group, we included all women (N=567) who fulfilled the following criteria: aged 18 years or more, scheduled for a first counseling session in the period September 15, 2003 to September 15, 2004, and referred because of a family history of breast or ovarian cancer independent of their own cancer status to The Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital, The Department of Clinical Genetics, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, The Oncology Department, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen

University Hospital or The JF. Kennedy Institute. These four departments together serve the following counties: Copenhagen, Frederiksborg, Roskilde, West Zealand, Stor Stroem, Bornholm, Funen, Aarhus, Viborg, North Jutland and the capital of Copenhagen, with a population of approximately 4.1 million persons (75 % of the total Danish population). Eight women who were given an appointment for genetic counseling less than seven days in advance were excluded because we aimed to obtain data from the study population one to four weeks before the first counseling session.

To compare the impact of genetic counseling with the impact of an alternative approach to cancer prevention, we selected women who were referred to mammography as a reference group (Reference Group I). Reference group I (N=689) was recruited at two hospitals. From Aalborg Hospital, we included all women (age 18-75 years) who were referred to mammography for non-acute clinical indications during the period from March 15, 2004 to December 31, 2004. From Rigshospitalet, we included all women (age 50-69 years) who were enrolled in a breast cancer screening program during the period from November 25, 2003 to December 1, 2003.

In addition, we included a random sample of women (Reference Group II) from the general population. This sample consisted of women (N = 2000) randomly sampled from The Danish Central Person Registry. These women were between 18 and 75 years of age, and Danish citizens. Since April 1, 1968 each resident of Denmark has been assigned a unique ten-digit personal identification number (PIN) including information regarding date of birth and sex. The Central Personal Registry is continuously updated with information regarding vital status and change of address.

Self-reported data

We obtained self-reported data from the Genetic Group and from both reference groups using self-administered, standardized, mailed questionnaires. Data from the Genetic Group and Reference Group I were collected one to four weeks before the first genetic counseling session or mammography. Data collection in Reference Group II took place at the same time as the first woman was enrolled in the Genetic Group. Questionnaires were designed with the computer program Teleform (19). Data were entered with the Teleform Reader with a maximum confidence level (99%), which is comparable to double manual data entry according to error rates (19).

We used The Impact of Event Scale (IES) (20) to asses self-reported cancer related distress. IES consists of 15 items, and it performs well among women at risk of hereditary breast cancer (21). We assessed the internal consistency of IES with Cronbach´s alpha, and found high values in all three groups, i.e. values between 0.90-0.92.

We used The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) (22;23) as a measure of self-reported generalized anxiety and depression. HADS consists of 14 items, seven on anxiety and seven on depression, forming two subscales. We found high Cronbach´s alpha values for both subscales in all three study groups, i.e. anxiety ranges between 0.84-0.88 and depression ranges between 0.80-0.83. An explorative factor analysis for HADS with the number of factors defined by eigenvalues ≥ 1 revealed a two factor structure in all three study groups, explaining from 50 % to 54 % of the total variance.

Self-reported health related quality of life (HQAL) was assessed by The Medical Outcome Study Short Form 36 Health Survey (SF-36) (24). SF-36 consists of 36 items forming eight subscales. Scoring was executed according to the Danish guidelines (25). We defined impaired health related quality of life as suggested by Rose et al. (26), as a score below the 25^{th} percentile for each subscale in the SF-36 data. We used the 25^{th} percentile of

unaffected women from the population sample, as the cut off point for all three study-groups.

Register data

We obtained register data for the entire study population (respondents and non-respondents) from six nationwide, population-based, administrative and continuously updated registries; The Danish National Hospital Register (27), The Danish Psychiatric Central Register (28), The Danish Cancer Register (29), The National Prescription Database, The Integrated Database for Longitudinal Labour Market Research and The Fertility Database, Statistics Denmark (30). We linked data by use of the unique PIN described above.

We identified all non-cancer diagnoses of the breast or uterus in addition to all diagnoses included in the Charlson co-morbidity index (31) from the Danish National Hospital Register (DHR) for the period 1994 to 2003. The DHR contains detailed information including PIN, date of admission and discharge, and up to 20 discharge diagnoses and procedures for all patients, who have been admitted to a somatic hospital in Denmark since 1977, including all outpatient and emergency contacts since 1995 (27). All cancer diagnoses, from the period 1988 to 2004, were obtained from The Danish Cancer Register. The register contains records of all cancer cases diagnosed since 1943, including tumor characteristics and treatment procedures (29).

We identified all psychiatric diagnoses from 1994 to 2003 from The Danish Psychiatric Central Register. The Danish Psychiatric Central Register contains data on all psychiatric admissions and discharges, diagnoses, and treatment codes for all patients who have been admitted to a psychiatric hospital in Denmark since 1969, including all outpatient contacts since 1995 (28).

Data regarding prescribed anxiolytic and anti-depressant drugs were collected from The Danish Prescription Database for the period from 1995 to 2003. The Danish Prescription Database comprises data regarding type of drug and date of prescription on all prescriptions filled in Denmark since 1995.

From The Fertility Database we retrieved the number of biological daughters and sons born to each Danish woman from 1960 to 2003. The Fertility Database is updated every year, with demographic and social data related to both men and women in the fertile age, and basic information (sex, birth weight, age and cause of death, if relevant) related to their children (30).

Total household income in 2002, level of education and marital status were retrieved from The Integrated Database for Longitudinal Labour Market Research, which includes comprehensive socioeconomic data regarding the education, employment and income of the entire Danish population.

Statistical analysis

In all three study groups, we analyzed data separately for women who never have been treated for breast or ovarian cancer (unaffected) and women who have been treated (affected women). We computed the median, range, and proportions for each of the three study groups. Prevalence-proportion ratios (PPR) and 95 % confidence intervals (CI) were used to explore differences between the Genetic Group and the Reference Groups, as well as between respondents and non-respondents. We used Logistic Regression analysis to estimate odds ratios (OR) and 95 % CI, adjusted for age, to compare the health related quality of life scores between groups. All analyses were performed using the Stata Statistical Software: Release 8.0 Collage Station, TX: Stata Corporation.

Results

In the Genetic Group 431 women (76 %) returned the questionnaire, and in Reference Group I and II, 417 (61%) and 1315 (66%) responded, respectively. The socioeconomic and clinical characteristics of the respondents and non-respondents in all three study-groups are shown in Table 1.

Respondents versus non-respondents

Respondents in all three groups had a significantly higher prevalence of living with a partner, and a higher income compared to non-respondents. Further, breast cancer was more prevalent among respondents than non-respondents in the Genetic Group and in Reference Group I.

A difference in the history of psychiatric diagnoses and filled prescriptions for anxiolytics and antidepressants was found only in the reference groups, where the respondents had a lower proportion of psychiatric diagnoses and filled prescriptions.

Respondents in the Genetic Group versus respondents in the Reference Groups

The respondents in the Genetic Group had a significantly lower median age, number of biological children and household income than the respondents in Reference Group I. Further, the prevalence of breast cancer was substantially elevated for respondents in the Genetic Group than the respondents in Reference Group I, but the number of filled prescriptions for anxiolytics and antidepressants was smaller. We found no major differences between the respondents in the Genetic Group and the respondents in Reference Group II, with the exception of a significantly higher prevalence of breast cancer in the Genetic Group.

Anxiety, Depression and Cancer specific distress

We did not find any substantial differences in overall anxiety and depression when comparing the genetic groups to the corresponding reference groups (table 2). In terms of cancer-specific distress, however, both the affected and the unaffected women in the Genetic Group appeared to have a somewhat higher prevalence than the corresponding reference groups (table 3). The difference was greatest between the Genetic Group and Reference Group II.

Health related Quality of life (*HQAL)*

We found no systematic differences in impaired HQAL between the affected Genetic Group and the affected Reference Group I (table 4). In contrast, the affected women in the Genetic Group appeared to have a higher prevalence of impaired HQAL on all subscales than the affected women in Reference Group II, although not all differences reached statistical significance. The unaffected women in the Genetic Group had a lower prevalence of impaired HQAL on all subscales than the unaffected women in Reference Group I (table 5). We observed no systematic differences when comparing the unaffected Genetic Group with the corresponding Reference Group II.

Discussion

Our study has the advantage of being the first population based multi-centre study from a country with free tax-financed healthcare service, which means all women can be referred to genetic counseling, independent of their age, health, socioeconomic situation or place of residence. In contrast to the situation in most existing studies (17), the two reference groups included in our analysis constituted an additional strength that permitted formal comparisons. In addition, with the exception of age and prevalence of breast cancer, there

appeared to be no major differences among the six respondent and non-respondent groups in regard to socioeconomic and clinical characteristics, which strongly indicates that selection bias can not explain our results. The nationwide public registries provided us the exceptional opportunity to compare unbiased information regarding respondents and non-respondents. With this advantage and the fact that only 13 women had missing data out of the total 3,256 invited to participate in our study, our non-response analysis is very accurate.

It is not possible to draw conclusions about the impact of awaiting genetic counseling *per se* from our study as the differences between the women awaiting genetic counseling and the reference groups may both reflect concerns about the counseling in itself and an underlying concern about the possible hereditary cancer risk. To further assess any impact of genetic counseling would require a comparison of referred and non-referred women at risk of hereditary cancer; however, such a study is highly problematic for both ethical and practical reasons. Further, although the sample size in our study population was large compared to existing studies (13-16) it should be noted that some of the subgroups were rather small, and the estimates for the affected reference groups in particular were based on limited number of observations. However, these limitations did not seriously influence our interpretation of the overall results.

Anxiety, depression, HQAL and cancer-specific distress

Comparisons of existing studies on the psychological outcomes of genetic counseling are difficult, due to differences in methods of measuring and reporting data, and difference in the times at which the subjects were assessed (17). A number of studies have used the HADS and IES as measures of anxiety, depression and cancer specific distress. However, the results have typically been presented as mean scores, despite the fact that the data were

unlikely to follow a normal distribution. In our study we have therefore specified HADS, IES and HQAL scores as proportions.

We found that 26 % of the unaffected women awaiting genetic counseling experienced some degree of anxiety, and 7 % experienced some degree of depression one to four weeks before counseling. Compared to our results, Bish et al. (15) found higher proportions of anxiety (41 %) and depression (11 %) assessed prior to genetic counseling by mailed questionnaires. However, the exact time frame is not given, and the proportions are stated for a sample that included both affected and unaffected women. We found that 54 % of the unaffected women and 64 % of the affected women awaiting genetic counseling experienced some degree of cancer specific distress. However, Carlsson et al. (32) found a higher proportion of cancer specific distress two to four weeks before genetic counseling. Contrary to our study, Carlsson included affected and unaffected, referred and self-referred men and women at risk of breast or colorectal cancer. In a study of 302 women attending their first genetic counseling, cancer-specific distress was measured in the waiting room (14). The results are stated as high levels of distress, but only mean values are reported which makes comparison with our results difficult.

Our findings indicate that cancer affected women who are anticipating genetic counseling may be vulnerable to cancer-specific distress. This vulnerability may be due to both their own risk of having another cancer and concerns of having passed the mutation on to a daughter or son.

To our knowledge, HQAL data for individuals awaiting genetic counseling for breast or ovarian cancer have been previously reported only by Carlsson et al. (32). Despite the difference in the study populations, our findings are in accordance with those of Carlsson, who reported that unaffected women awaiting genetic counseling had the same HQAL as

women from the background population and better HQAL scores than women awaiting mammography.

This population-based study indicates that women who have decided to undergo genetic counseling, and who are awaiting their first counseling session, experience more cancer specific distress but do not suffer from more anxiety or depression than women scheduled for mammography or women from the background population. Further, affected women who are awaiting genetic counseling might experience less HQAL than affected women from the background population. These findings underline that anticipation of genetic counseling can be burdensome for both affected and unaffected women and that cancer specific distress is relevant to address at referral and at the first counseling session.

References

1. Miki Y, Swensen J, Shattuck-Eidens D, Futreal PA, Harshman K, Tavtigian S et al. A strong candidate for the breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility gene BRCA1. *Science* 1994;266:66-71.

2. Wooster R, Neuhausen SL, Mangion J, Quirk Y, Ford D, Collins N et al. Localization of a breast cancer susceptibility gene, BRCA2, to chromosome 13q12-13. *Science* 1994;265:2088-90.

3. Claus EB, Schildkraut JM, Thompson WD, Risch NJ. The genetic attributable risk of breast and ovarian cancer. *Cancer* 1996;77:2318-24.

4. Ford D, Easton DF, Stratton M, Narod S, Goldgar D, Devilee P et al. Genetic heterogeneity and penetrance analysis of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genes in breast cancer families. The Breast Cancer Linkage Consortium. *Am.J.Hum.Genet.* 1998;62:676-89.

5. Thorlacius S, Struewing JP, Hartge P, Olafsdottir GH, Sigvaldason H, Tryggvadottir L et al. Population-based study of risk of breast cancer in carriers of BRCA2 mutation. *Lancet* 1998;352:1337-9.

6. Lerman C, Daly M, Masny A, Balshem A. Attitudes about genetic testing for breast-ovarian cancer susceptibility. *J.Clin.Oncol.* 1994;12:843-50.

7. Lerman C, Seay J, Balshem A, Audrain J. Interest in genetic testing among first-degree relatives of breast cancer patients. *Am.J.Med.Genet.* 1995;57:385-92.

8. Kinmonth AL, Reinhard J, Bobrow M, Pauker S. The new genetics. Implications for clinical services in Britain and the United States. *BMJ* 1998;316:767-70.

9. Mogilner A, Otten M, Cunningham JD, Brower ST. Awareness and attitudes concerning BRCA gene testing. *Ann.Surg.Oncol.* 1998;5:607-12.

10. Wonderling D, Hopwood P, Cull A, Douglas F, Watson M, Burn J et al. A descriptive study of UK cancer genetics services: an emerging clinical response to the new genetics. *Br.J.Cancer* 2001;85:166-70.

11. Brain K, Gray J, Norman P, Parsons E, Clarke A, Rogers C et al. Why do women attend familial breast cancer clinics? *J.Med.Genet.* 2000;37:197-202.

12. Hopwood P, Wonderling D, Watson M, Cull A, Douglas F, Cole T et al. A randomised comparison of UK genetic risk counselling services for familial cancer: psychosocial outcomes. *Br.J.Cancer* 2004;91:884-92.

13. Lerman C, Schwartz MD, Miller SM, Daly M, Sands C, Rimer BK. A randomized trial of breast cancer risk counseling: interacting effects of counseling, educational level, and coping style. *Health Psychol.* 1996;15:75-83.

14. Watson M, Lloyd S, Davidson J, Meyer L, Eeles R, Ebbs S et al. The impact of genetic counselling on risk perception and mental health in women with a family history of breast cancer. *Br.J.Cancer* 1999;79:868-74.

15. Bish A, Sutton S, Jacobs C, Levene S, Ramirez A, Hodgson S. Changes in psychological distress after cancer genetic counselling: a comparison of affected and unaffected women. *Br.J.Cancer* 2002;86:43-50.

16. Randall J, Butow P, Kirk J, Tucker K. Psychological impact of genetic counselling and testing in women previously diagnosed with breast cancer. *Intern.Med.J.* 2001;31:397-405.

17. Braithwaite D, Emery J, Walter F, Prevost AT, Sutton S. Psychological impact of genetic counseling for familial cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J.Natl.Cancer Inst.* 2004;96:122-33.

18. Brondum-Nielsen K. [Genetic counseling and genetic services]. *Ugeskr.Laeger* 2003;165:777-9.

19. Jorgensen CK, Karlsmose B. Validation of automated forms processing. A comparison of Teleform with manual data entry. *Comput.Biol.Med.* 1998;28:659-67.

20. Horowitz M, Wilner N, Alvarez W. Impact of Event Scale: a measure of subjective stress. *Psychosom.Med.* 1979;41:209-18.

21. Sundin EC, Horowitz MJ. Impact of Event Scale: psychometric properties. *Br.J.Psychiatry* 2002;180:205-9.

22. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 1983;67:361-70.

23. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, Neckelmann D. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. *J.Psychosom.Res* 2002;52:69-77.

24. Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med.Care* 1992;30:473-83.

25. Bjorner JB, Damsgaard MT, Watt T, Bech P, Rasmussen NK, Kristensen TS et al. Dansk manual til SF-36. Copenhagen: Lif, 1997.

26. Rose MS, Koshman ML, Spreng S, Sheldon R. Statistical issues encountered in the comparison of health-related quality of life in diseased patients to published general population norms: problems and solutions. *J.Clin.Epidemiol.* 1999;52:405-12.

27. Andersen TF, Madsen M, Jorgensen J, Mellemkjoer L, Olsen JH. The Danish National Hospital Register. A valuable source of data for modern health sciences. *Dan.Med.Bull.* 1999;46:263-8.

28. Munk-Jorgensen P, Mortensen PB. The Danish Psychiatric Central Register. *Dan.Med.Bull.* 1997;44:82-4.

29. Storm HH, Michelsen EV, Clemmensen IH, Pihl J. The Danish Cancer Registry--history, content, quality and use. *Dan.Med.Bull.* 1997;44:535-9.

30. Knudsen LB. The Danish Fertility Database. *Dan.Med.Bull.* 1998;45:221-5.

31. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J.Chronic.Dis.* 1987;40:373-83.

32. Carlsson AH, Bjorvatn C, Engebretsen LF, Berglund G, Natvig GK. Psychosocial factors associated with quality of life among individuals attending genetic counseling for hereditary cancer. *J.Genet.Couns.* 2004;13:425-45.

Table 1. Characteristics of respondents and non-respondents in the study-population.

	Genetic Gr.[1]			*Reference Gr. I*[1]			*Reference Gr. II*[1]		
	Response (n=431)	*Non-response (n=136)*	*PPR(CI)*[2]	*Response (n=417)*	*Non-response (n=272)*	*PPR (CI)*[2]	*Response (n=1315)*	*Non-response (n=685)*	*PPR (CI)*[2]
Age, median	41	39		56	57		45	49	
range	18-78	18-76		26-76	25-78		18-75	18-75	
Married / cohabiting, %	73	59	1.23 (1.06;1.44)	69	58	1.20 (1.07;1.36)	71	64	1.10 (1.03;1.18)
Biological offspring, %									
≥ one daughter	53	55	0.98 (0.82;1.17)	63	62	1.03 (0.91;1.16)	53	54	0.99 (0.91;1.08)
≥ one son	53	46	1.17 (0.95;1.43)	62	60	1.03 (0.91;1.17)	55	52	1.05 (0.96;1.15)
Further education, %									
None	34	36	1.03 (0.90;1.19)[7]	33	39	0.95 (0.87; 1.03)[7]	38	53	0.92 (0.88; 0.96)[7]
Short	34	30		40	38		39	31	
Medium	23	22		24	16		18	12	
Long	10	12		4	7		4	4	
Household income, %									
Low	10	20	0.47 (0.30;0.74)[8]	6	10	0.61 (0.36;1.01)[8]	10	18	0.57 (0.46;0.72)[8]
Medium	31	31		42	51		36	42	
High	60	49		52	39		54	40	
Breast cancer diagnoses[4], %	23	13	1.82 (1.13;2.93)	7	3	1.17 (1.05;4.51)	2	2	0.70 (0.36;1.35)
Other breast diagnoses[4], %	3	4	0.82 (0.30;2.26)	2	3	0.58 (0,23;1.48)	1	0	4.17 (0.96:18.07)
Genital cancer diagnoses[4], %	3	4	0.88 (0.32;2.41)	2	1	2.17 (0.60;7.83)	1	0	1.91 (0.54;6.82)
Uterus related diagnoses[4], %	2	4	0.57 (0.19;1.67)	4	4	1.04 (0.48;2.27)	3	2	1.71 (0.87;3.33)
Co-morbidity[5], %									
Charlson low	92	91	1.01 (0.95;1.07)[7]	88	87	1.01 (0.95;1.07)[7]	94	90	1.04 (1.01;1.07)[7]
Charlson medium	7	9		11	11		6	9	
Charlson high	1	0		1	2		0	1	
Psychiatric diagnoses[4], %	5	7	0.81 (0.38;1.70)	4	11	0.36 (0.20;0.65)	4	8	0.49 (0.34;0.72)
Prescriptions filled[6], %									
Anxiolytics	15	18	0.87 (0.57;1.33)	29	40	0.72 (0.58; 0.88)	17	26	0.66 (0.55;0.79)
Antidepressants	14	15	0.95 (0.59;1.51)	20	27	0.75 (0.57;0.99)	13	18	0.74 (0.60;0.91)

[1]Register data were not available for 4 women in the Genetic Group, 3 women in Reference Gr. I, 6 women in Reference Gr. II
[2] Prevalence-proportion ratio, response vs. non-response, 95 % confidence interval
[3]Household income before tax, year 2002; low ≤ 20,670$, medium ≥ 20,671 & ≤ 64,134$, high > 64,134$
[4]≥ one diagnosis, [5]Charlson co-morbidity index, [6]≥ one prescription, [7]none + short vs. medium + long , [8]low vs. medium + high

Table 2. Anxiety and depression among women in the Genetic Group compared to women in the Reference Groups

Cancer status[1]	*Dimension (HADS)*	*Genetic Gr.*	*Ref. Gr. I*	*Genetic Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. I. PPR (CI)*[3]	*Reference Gr. II*	*Genetic Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. II. PPR (CI)*[3]
Unaffected	Anxiety[2]	n = 319	n = 381		n = 1264	
	Non-case, %	74	68		75	
	Borderline, %	15	19	0.82 (0.64;1.04)	16	1.02 (0.83;1.26)
	Case, %	11	13		9	
	Depression[2]					
	Non-case, %	93	90		94	
	Borderline, %	6	7	0.70 (0.42;1.17)	4	1.22 (0.76;1.96)
	Case, %	1	3		2	
Affected	Anxiety[2]	n = 110	n = 31		n = 38	
	Non-case, %	70	71		66	
	Borderline, %	13	16	1.03 (0.56;1.92)	24	0.88 (0.52;1.48)
	Case, %	17	13		10	
	Depression[2]					
	Non-case, %	91	87		92	
	Borderline, %	6	10	0.70 (0.24;2.09)	5	1.15 (0.33;3.96)
	Case, %	3	3		3	

[1]Self reported data. Women not reporting cancer status were excluded.
[2]Score 0-21, non-case = 0-7, borderline = 8-10, case = 11-21.
[3]Prevalence-proportion ratio, 95 % confidence interval, borderline + case combined

Table 3. Cancer specific distress among women in the Genetic Group compared to women in the Reference Groups

Cancer status[1]	*Cancer specific. Distress (IES)*[2]	*Genetic Gr.*	*Ref. Gr. I.*	*Genetic Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. I. PPR (CI)*[3]	*Ref. Gr. II*	*Genetic Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. II. PPR (CI)*[3]
Unaffected		n = 319	n = 381		n = 1264	
	Sub-clinical, %	46	57		68	
	Mild, %	34	26	1.25 (1.07;1.40)	22	1.67 (1.47;1.91)
	Moderate, %	16	14		9	
	Severe, %	4	3		1	
Affected		n = 110	n = 31		n = 38	
	Sub-clinical, %	36	42		53	
	Mild, %	38	32	1.11 (0.80;1.55)	18	1.36 (0.95;1.96)
	Moderate, %	20	19		21	
	Severe, %	6	7		8	

[1] Self reported data. Women not reporting cancer-status were excluded.
[2]Cancer specific distress score 0-75, sub-clinical = 0-8, mild = 9-25, moderate = 26-43, severe = >44.
[3]Prevalence-proportion ratio, 95 % confidence interval, mild + moderate + severe combined

Table 4. Impaired health related quality of life among affected women in the Genetic Group, compared to affected women in the reference groups.

Sf-36 sub-scales	*Genetic Gr.*	*Reference Gr. I*		*Reference Gr. II*	
	PP[1]	*PP*[1]	*adj. OR (CI)*[2]	*PP*[1]	*adj. OR (CI)*[3]
Physical Health:					
Physical functioning	63	65	1.29 (0.55-3.03)	51	2.41 (1.11-5.24)
Role-Physical	68	45	2.18 (0.91-5.28)	37	3.88 (1.74-8.62)
Bodily Pain	35	39	0.94 (0.39-2.25)	34	1.88 (0.89-3.96)
General Health	38	52	0.86 (0.37-2.03)	33	1.45 (0.67-3.13)
Mental Health:					
Vitality	49	47	1.07 (0.46-2.52)	35	1.96 (0.89-4.28)
Social Functioning	56	39	1.47 (0.62-3.49)	41	1.61 (0.74-3.50)
Role-Emotional	48	31	1.57 (0.61-4.01)	31	2.00 (0.89-4.53)
Mental Health	42	43	0.95 (0.40-2.25)	27	2.09 (0.91-4.79)

[1]PP: Prevalence proportion of women scoring less than the 25th percentile of Reference Gr. II unaffected.
[2]Odds ratio adjusted for age, Genetic Group vs. Reference Group I, 95% confidence interval.
[3]Odds ratio adjusted for age, Genetic Group vs. Reference Group II, 95% confidence interval.

Table 5. Impaired health related quality of life among unaffected women in the Genetic Group, compared to unaffected women in the reference groups. The Danish Genetic Counseling Cohort study

Sf-36 sub-scales	*Genetic Gr.*	*Reference Gr. I*		*Reference Gr. II*	
	PP[1]	*PP*[1]	*adj. OR (CI)*[2]	*PP*[1]	*adj. OR (CI)*[3]
Physical Health:					
Physical functioning	31	50	0.99 (0.67-1.46)	35	1.08 (0.82-1.43)
Role-Physical	23	34	0.72 (0.47-1.09)	27	0.94 (0.70-1.26)
Bodily Pain	26	33	0.85 (0.56-1.27)	30	0.80 (0.62-1.03)
General Health	32	40	0.80 (0.55-1.19)	29	1.26 (0.96-1.65)
Mental Health:					
Vitality	30	32	0.72 (0.48-1.09)	30	0.98 (0.75-1.29)
Social Functioning	34	41	0.51 (0.35-0.76)	35	0.89 (0.68-1.15)
Role-Emotional	29	32	0.74 (0.49-1.12)	28	1.01 (0.76-1.33)
Mental Health	33	33	0.79 (0.53-1.18)	28	1.22 (0.93-1.59)

[1]PP: Prevalence proportion of women scoring less than the 25th percentile of Reference Gr. II unaffected.
[2]Odds ratio adjusted for age, Genetic Group vs. Reference Group I, 95% confidence interval.
[3]Odds ratio adjusted for age, Genetic Group vs. Reference Group II, 95% confidence interval.

Risk perception among women receiving genetic counseling: A population-based follow-up study

Ellen M. Mikkelsen[1,2], Lone Sunde[3], Christoffer Johansen [4], Søren P. Johnsen[1]

[1]Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Ole Worms Allé 150, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

[2]The Centre for Innovation in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus

[3]Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital

[4]Department of Psychosocial Cancer Research, Institute of Cancer Epidemiology, The Danish Cancer Society

Original report

Acknowledgements

We thank the patients for participating and the hospital staff for coordinating patient enrolment. Mette V. Schriver, biostatistician at the Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, provided invaluable advice for our statistical analyses.

The research was funded by the Danish Cancer Society, Grant Number PP 02 010, the Center of Innovation and Development in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus, and Aarhus University Research Foundation.

Correspondence

Ellen M. Mikkelsen, Ole Worms Allé 150, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark. Phone +45 89 42 48 14, Fax +45 89 42 48 00, E-mail em@dce.au.dk

Running Head

The Danish Genetic Counseling Cohort study

Abstract

Purpose

We aimed to explore the impact of genetic counseling on perceived personal lifetime risk of breast cancer, the accuracy of risk perception, and possible predictors of inaccurate risk perception one year following counseling

Patients and Methods

We conducted a population-based prospective follow-up study of 213 women who received genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, 319 women who underwent mammography (Reference Group I), and a random sample of 1,070 women from the general population (Reference Group II).

Results

Women who received genetic counseling decreased their perceived risk by an average of 6.6 percentage points (95% CI: 3.0%; 10.2%) between baseline and 12 months of follow-up. In contrast, perceived risk remained relatively stable in the reference groups. The proportion of women who accurately perceived their risk increased by 16% in the group receiving genetic counseling, compared to a reduction of 5% (p=0.03) and 2% (p=0.01) in Reference Groups I and II, respectively. Risk communicated only in words, inaccurate risk perception at baseline, and presence of a familial mutation appeared to be predictors of inaccurate risk perception 12 months after counseling.

Conclusion

This population-based study of women with a family history of breast or ovarian cancer indicates that genetic counseling can help them both to reduce their perceived risk and to achieve a more realistic view of their risk of developing breast cancer.

Introduction

A key objective of genetic counseling for women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer is to provide individualized information about hereditary cancer risks.[1,2] It is hoped that this information will help them to achieve a realistic view of their personal risk of hereditary cancer without unnecessary emotional stress, and to allow informed choices about risk management options. Risk is difficult to communicate and understand, and in genetic counseling it is exceptionally complicated because several different risks are discussed: the risk of carrying the mutation oneself, the lifetime risk of developing cancer, the risk of passing the mutation onto children, and the risk reduction achievable through different risk management strategies.[3,4]

Difficulties communicating risk and concern that inaccurate risk perceptions may lead to suboptimal medical decisions have motivated several earlier studies of the effect of genetic counseling on the level and accuracy of perceived personal risk of developing hereditary cancer. Their findings have been inconsistent,[5,6] some showing a reduction in perceived risk after counseling[7,8] and some showing no effect.[9,10] Most studies found that while overall accuracy of perceived personal risk improved after this intervention,[11-13] a large proportion of women continued to over- or underestimate their personal risk.[11-15]

Little is known about predictors of inaccurate risk perception following genetic counseling.[7,13,16] Use of different models of risk assessment and varying definitions of risk accuracy make comparisons among existing studies difficult.[6] Furthermore, most studies lack comparison groups,[6,17] and, to our knowledge, none are population-based. When genetic counseling is a standard service offered throughout the population of women at risk of hereditary cancer it remains questionable whether this intervention changes the level of perceived personal risk and improves accuracy of perceived risk.

To clarify these issues, we conducted a population-based prospective follow-up study of perceived personal lifetime risk of cancer, accuracy of risk perception, and possible predictors of inaccurate risk perception among women who received genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancers. We included two comparison groups in order to address some of the methodological problems in the existing literature.

Patients and Methods

Genetic counseling is offered to all Danish women at risk of hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. After referral by a physician, counseling is available free of charge by the tax-financed public health system. Referral requires a family history indicating a possible predisposition to cancer.

The genetic counseling offered to our study population included information on incidence of sporadic breast cancer, genetics, inheritance patterns, and estimated personal lifetime risk of inherited cancer. The counseling routine included drawing a pedigree and, if indicated, an offer of genetic testing. Assessment of personal lifetime risk was assessed in one of two ways: when appropriate, the risk was calculated according to a pedigree indicating a dominant autosomal inherited risk or a predisposing familial mutation; otherwise the risk was assessed according to the empirical data published by Claus *et. al.*[18] The lifetime risk estimate was communicated to women receiving counseling as an exact percentage or in qualitative terms, such as "high risk", "moderate risk" etc., or in both ways, whichever the counselor found most appropriate for an individual woman. Women at elevated risk were referred to a surveillance program.

Study population

Data for this study were collected as part of a larger cohort study of all women referred for genetic counseling, independent of their own cancer status. The present study excludes all women who were affected with breast or ovarian cancer at baseline or who developed cancer during the follow-up period (Figure 1).

In our study the "Genetic Counseling Group" included all women who met the following criteria: aged 18 years or older and attendance at an initial genetic counseling session for breast or ovarian cancer in the period September 15, 2003 to September 15, 2004 at one of the four clinical departments in Denmark offering genetic cancer counseling (n=568). The region served by these four departments has a population of approximately 4.1 million persons (more than 75% of the Danish population). Of 568 eligible women, 431 agreed to participate at baseline and 300 stayed in the study throughout the follow-up period.

Two additional groups were included for comparison purposes (Figure1). Reference Group I was composed of women referred for mammography, permitting the impact of genetic counseling to be compared with that of an alternative approach to cancer prevention. This reference group was recruited at two hospitals. At Aalborg Hospital, all women aged 18-75 years who received a mammography for a non-acute clinical indication during the period from March 15, 2004 to December 31, 2004 were eligible. At Rigshospitalet, we recruited all women aged 50-69 years who underwent mammography as part of a breast cancer screening program during the period from November 25, 2003 to December 1, 2003. Of the 689 eligible women, 417 entered the study and 358 completed one year of follow up.

Reference group II consisted of a random sample of Danish women aged 18 to 75 years, representing women with an unknown risk of developing breast or ovarian cancer. This reference group II was randomly sampled from the Danish Central Personal Registry; since

April 1, 1968 this Registry has assigned each resident of Denmark a unique ten-digit personal identification number including information on date of birth and sex. The Central Personal Registry is continuously updated with information regarding vital status and address changes. 2,000 women were randomly selected from this Registry, of which 1,322 agreed to participate in the study, and 1,088 completed one year of follow up.

Data collection

We used self-administered, standardized mailed questionnaires to obtain data from the Genetic Counseling Group and the two reference groups. Data from the Genetic Counseling Group were collected one to four weeks before the first counseling session and two weeks, six months and 12 months afterwards. Data for Reference Group I were collected one to four weeks before mammography and 12 months afterwards. Data for Reference Group II were collected at the time of enrollment of the first woman in the Genetic Counseling Group and follow-up data were collected 12 months later. For women who received genetic counseling, the physicians who provided the counseling completed a questionnaire on risk assessment and risk communication immediately after the counseling session. Questionnaires were designed using the computer program Teleform. Data were entered with the Teleform Reader at the maximum confidence level (99%), comparable to double manual data entry in terms of error rates 19.

Data

Definitions of key risk terms used in the study are provided below.

Perceived risk: The lifetime risk of developing breast cancer, estimated and reported by a woman herself as a percentage (0-100%).

Objective risk: The lifetime risk of breast cancer for an individual woman, estimated by a medical doctor providing genetic counseling, as a percentage (0-100%). The lifetime risk for women in the two reference groups was estimated to be 10%.[20]

Change in perceived risk: The difference between perceived risk at baseline and perceived risk at follow up.

Risk accuracy: The difference between a woman's perceived risk and her objective risk. Women were classified as perceiving their risk at three levels of accuracy[8,13]: Accurately: -10% < risk accuracy <10%, Underestimated: risk accuracy >= -10%, Overestimated: risk accuracy >= 10%.

Risk expression: Risk communicated in qualitative terms (words) only vs. in a combination of words and numbers in a counseling session.

The following socio-demographic and medical data also were collected for the study participants: age, number of children, level of education, smoking habits, number of first degree relatives with breast or ovarian cancer, identification of a predisposing mutation in the family, and cancer-related distress as assessed by the Impact of Event Scale (IES)[21]. IES is a 15-item self-reported questionnaire, which has been found to perform well among women at risk of hereditary breast cancer.[22] A score below nine was used as the cut-off for "no cancer distress".[23]

Ethical considerations

The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Biomedical National Ethics Committee System. It was approved by the National Board of Health (J. nr. 0-604-04-20/E/EHG) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (CVR-nr.11-88-37-29).

Statistical analysis

Characteristics of the three study groups were described using proportions, medians, quartiles, and ranges. Prevalence-proportion ratios (PPR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to explore differences between participants and drop-outs in each study group, as well as differences between participants in the Genetic Counseling Group and the Reference Groups. The first comparison was made after twelve months of follow up, focusing on characteristics of participants vs. drop-outs, using baseline data for demographic, perceived risk, and health behavior variables.

Changes in perceived risk within groups and between groups were examined using Student's paired t test and Student's t test, respectively, after testing for the assumption of normality. We used the Wald test to compare differences between groups in the proportion of women who changed from inaccurate to accurate risk perceptions. Using logistic regression analysis, we estimated odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) to identify possible predictors for inaccurate risk perception after 12 months of follow up. The regression model included a number of factors suggested in the literature (age, education, cohabitation, cancer-specific distress at baseline, inaccurate risk perception at baseline).[13,15,24,25] In addition, we included a number of other possible predictors of inaccurate risk perception which had not previously been examined: number of daughters, number of affected first-degree relatives, known mutation in the family, smoking habits, and risk expression. All analyses were performed using the Stata Statistical Software, version 8.0 (College Station, TX: Stata Corporation).

Results

In the Genetic Counseling Group, 68% of unaffected women (n=213) remained in the study through 12 months of follow up. In Reference Groups I and II, 86% (n=319) and 85% (n=1,070) of unaffected women, respectively, completed 12 months of follow up (Table 1). We found no substantial differences in baseline characteristics between full participants and drop-outs in the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group I. Full participants in Reference Group II were characterized by a lower proportion of smokers (PPR 0.74, 95% CI: 0.61; 0.89), and a lower proportion of women with little or no education (PPR 0.87, 95% CI: 0.78; 0.98) compared to drop-outs.

Participants in the Genetic Counseling Group had a lower median age and fewer children compared to those in the reference groups. At the same time, the prevalence of high educational level, cancer in first degree relatives, and cancer-specific distress was substantially elevated in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to the reference groups.

Level and change in perceived risk

In all three study groups, we found no difference between participants and drop-outs in terms of perceived risk at baseline (Table 1). At baseline, women in the Genetic Counseling Group perceived their own risk to be 50 % (median value) (Table 2). Two weeks after genetic counseling their perceived risk had decreased to 30% (median value) and remained at this level both after 6 and 12 months of follow up.

Perceived risk at baseline was substantially higher among women in the Genetic Counseling Group (50% median value) compared to the perceived risk among women in the reference groups (10% median value) (Table 2).

As shown in Table 2, perceived risk on average decreased 6.6 percentage points (95% CI: 3.0%; 10.2%) in the Genetic Counseling Group between baseline and 12 months of follow

up. This contrasted with the reference groups for which perceived risk remained relatively stable. The between-group analysis of change in perceived risk showed a statistically significant difference between the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group I (-8.2 percentage points, 95% CI:-12.2%; -4.1%) and Reference Group II, (-7.7 percentage points, 95% CI:-11.4%; -4.0%), respectively.

Accuracy of perceived risk

At baseline 53% of the women referred for genetic counseling (Genetic Counseling Group) overestimated their personal risk of developing breast cancer, and 25% perceived their risk accurately (Table 3). Twelve months following counseling, the proportion of women in this group who perceived their risk accurately had increased to 41%. This exceeded the changes observed in Reference Group I (p=0.03) and Reference Group II (p=0.01).

Predictors of inaccurate risk perception 12 months after genetic counseling

Table 4 presents the results of a logistic regression analysis of possible predictors of inaccurate risk perception after genetic counseling. Factors which appeared associated with inaccurate risk perception included risk communicated only in words, inaccurate risk perception at baseline, presence of a familial mutation, and, to a lesser degree, having one or more daughters or a high level of cancer-specific distress.

Discussion

This population-based prospective cohort-study revealed that genetic counseling can help a broad variety of women to reduce their perceived risk, and achieve a more accurate risk perception sustained even a year after counseling.

Study strengths

Our study has the advantage of being a population-based multi-centre study conducted in a country with a free tax-financed healthcare service, which means all women can be referred for genetic counseling, independent of their age, health, socioeconomic situation, or place of residence. As well, the two reference groups included in our analysis permitted formal comparisons, unlike most existing studies.[6] Furthermore the two reference groups provide confidence that improvements in risk perception among women receiving genetic counseling were not caused by time factors or by public health information alone.

An earlier comparison of respondents and non-respondents at baseline using registry-based data detected no major non-response bias.[26] In the current study, we found no important differences in baseline characteristics between full participants and drop-outs, strongly indicating that selection biases have not affected our results.

Limitations

Although the sample size in our study population was quite large compared to existing studies,[6] it must be noted that the logistic regression analyses were based only on 138 women, mainly because of missing "objective risk" information from physicians. Furthermore, we cannot exclude the possibility that some differences in demographic and cancer-related characteristics found in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to the

reference groups may have affected the overall results, though we have no specific reason to believe so.

Risk perception

As expected, our study shows that women with a family history of cancer perceive their personal risk of developing breast cancer to be higher than that of both women referred for mammography and women from the general population. Furthermore, our findings indicate that genetic counseling can lead to a significant decrease in perceived risk maintained even a year after counseling. These findings contrast with the results of a randomized trial conducted by Brain *et al*.,[10] which did not find a decrease in perceived risk associated with genetic counseling; as well, the initial decrease in perceived risk found in both the intervention and the control group diminished within the following 12 months.
Our findings do accord with those of another randomized trial[7] and a follow-up study,[8] which detected even larger reductions in perceived risk after counseling. However, these two studies did not include paired analyses of the study participants, making it difficult to compare their findings to ours.

Risk accuracy

A decrease in perceived risk is only of interest if it results in more accurate risk perception among women receiving counseling. Our findings indicate that genetic counseling is associated both with a decrease in perceived risk and with an improvement in accuracy of risk perception. 16% of women in the Genetic Counseling Group improved their accuracy after counseling. However, after 12 months of follow up, 41% of women in this group continued to overestimate their perceived risk, compared to 34% of women in the reference groups. Our findings are consistent with those of the randomized trial conducted by

Lerman *et al*.,[13] in which the proportion of women who perceived their risk accurately increased by 8% after counseling, while two-thirds continued to overestimate their risk. We used the same method of measuring accuracy and the same definition of the level for overestimating perceived risk as Leman *et al*., strengthening the comparison. Other studies have found that 11-55% of women perceive their risk accurately post-counseling, but methods of assessing accuracy and defining levels of accurate perception have varied widely.[12,14-16]

Predictors

Unlike Lobb *et al*.,[27] we found that women who received risk information only in words were more likely to perceive their risk inaccurately after counseling than women who received the information in a combination of words and numbers. As the women were not randomly assigned to one of the risk communication strategies, we cannot entirely exclude the possibility of confounding, *i.e*., if numerical information was provided mainly to women who were able to comprehend numbers. Nevertheless, based on the strength of this association and the fact that women who attend counseling want to know about their exact personal risk and prefer the risk expressed in numbers,[28-31] we suggest a multi-faceted communication strategy including both words and a numerical risk estimate.

Consistent with the findings of Huiart *et al*.,[24] we also found that inaccurate risk perception at baseline was strongly associated with inaccurate risk perception 12 months later. This association suggests that it is important to explore perceived risk during the first counseling session and pay extra attention to risk communication with women who significantly over- or underestimate their personal risk.

Our findings further show that women at highest risk of inaccurate personal risk assessment following counseling come from a family with an identified predisposing mutation and/or have at least one daughter. This may stem from the complexity of understanding inheritance and heightened consciousness of the familial cancer risk. This population-based study indicates that genetic counseling can help women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer to achieve a more realistic view of their own risk of developing breast cancer. To avoid inaccurate risk perception, we suggest that professionals providing genetic counseling use a risk communication strategy which expresses risk both in words and numbers. Extra attention should be given to women who indicate an inaccurate risk perception during their first genetic counseling session, and women from families where genetic testing already has been initiated.

References

1. Brondum-Nielsen K: Genetic counseling and genetic services. Ugeskr Laeger 165:777-779, 2003

2. Trepanier A, Ahrens M, McKinnon W, et al: Genetic cancer risk assessment and counseling: recommendations of the national society of genetic counselors. J Genet Couns 13:83-114, 2004

3. Julian-Reynier C, Welkenhuysen M, Hagoel L, et al: Risk communication strategies: state of the art and effectiveness in the context of cancer genetic services. Eur J Hum Genet 11:725-736, 2003

4. Sachs L, Taube A, Tishelman C: Risk in numbers--difficulties in the transformation of genetic knowledge from research to people--the case of hereditary cancer. Acta Oncol 40:445-453, 2001

5. Genetic risk assessment and BRCA mutation testing for breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility: recommendation statement: Ann Intern Med 143:355-361, 2005

6. Braithwaite D, Emery J, Walter F, et al: Psychological impact of genetic counseling for familial cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Natl Cancer Inst 96:122-133, 2004

7. Bowen DJ, Burke W, McTiernan A, et al: Breast cancer risk counseling improves women's functioning. Patient Educ Couns 53:79-86, 2004

8. Gurmankin AD, Domchek S, Stopfer J, et al: Patients' resistance to risk information in genetic counseling for BRCA1/2. Arch Intern Med 165:523-529, 2005

9. Bish A, Sutton S, Jacobs C, et al: Changes in psychological distress after cancer genetic counselling: a comparison of affected and unaffected women. Br J Cancer 86:43-50, 2002

10. Brain K, Gray J, Norman P, et al: Randomized trial of a specialist genetic assessment service for familial breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 92:1345-1351, 2000

11. Cull A, Anderson ED, Campbell S, et al: The impact of genetic counselling about breast cancer risk on women's risk perceptions and levels of distress. Br J Cancer 79:501-508, 1999

12. Hopwood P, Shenton A, Lalloo F, et al: Risk perception and cancer worry: an exploratory study of the impact of genetic risk counselling in women with a family history of breast cancer. J Med Genet 38:139, 2001

13. Lerman C, Lustbader E, Rimer B, et al: Effects of individualized breast cancer risk counseling: a randomized trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 87:286-292, 1995

14. Evans DG, Blair V, Greenhalgh R, et al: The impact of genetic counselling on risk perception in women with a family history of breast cancer. Br J Cancer 70:934-938, 1994

15. Watson M, Lloyd S, Davidson J, et al: The impact of genetic counselling on risk perception and mental health in women with a family history of breast cancer. Br J Cancer 79:868-874, 1999

16. Meiser B, Butow PN, Barratt AL, et al: Long-term outcomes of genetic counseling in women at increased risk of developing hereditary breast cancer. Patient Educ Couns 44:215-225, 2001

17. Meiser B, Halliday JL: What is the impact of genetic counselling in women at increased risk of developing hereditary breast cancer? A meta-analytic review. Soc Sci Med 54:1463-1470, 2002

18. Claus EB, Risch N, Thompson WD: Autosomal dominant inheritance of early-onset breast cancer. Implications for risk prediction. Cancer 73:643-651, 1994

19. Jorgensen CK, Karlsmose B: Validation of automated forms processing. A comparison of Teleform with manual data entry. Comput Biol Med 28:659-667, 1998

20. Oksbjerg S, Mellemkjær L, Johansen C: Incidens og mortalitet af brystkræft hos kvinder i Danmark 1943-1992. Ugeskrift for Læger 159:7134-7140, 1997

21. Horowitz M, Wilner N, Alvarez W: Impact of Event Scale: a measure of subjective stress. Psychosom Med 41:209-218, 1979

22. Sundin EC, Horowitz MJ: Impact of Event Scale: psychometric properties. Br J Psychiatry 180:205-209, 2002

23. Joseph S: Psychometric evaluation of Horowitz's Impact of Event Scale: a review. J Trauma Stress 13:101-113, 2000

24. Huiart L, Eisinger F, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, et al: Effects of genetic consultation on perception of a family risk of breast/ovarian cancer and determinants of inaccurate perception after the consultation. J Clin Epidemiol 55:665-675, 2002

25. Lloyd S, Watson M, Waites B, et al: Familial breast cancer: a controlled study of risk perception, psychological morbidity and health beliefs in women attending for genetic counselling. Br J Cancer 74:482-487, 1996

26. Mikkelsen EM, Sunde L, Johansen C, Johnsen SP. Psychosocial conditions of women awaiting genetic counseling: A population-based study. (Submitted)

27. Lobb EA, Butow PN, Meiser B, et al: Women's preferences and consultants' communication of risk in consultations about familial breast cancer: impact on patient outcomes. J Med Genet 40:e56, 2003

28. Brain K, Gray J, Norman P, et al: Why do women attend familial breast cancer clinics? J Med Genet 37:197-202, 2000

29. Hallowell N, Murton F, Statham H, et al: Women's need for information before attending genetic counselling for familial breast or ovarian cancer: a questionnaire, interview, and observational study. BMJ 314:281-283, 1997

30. Hallowell N, Statham H, Murton F, et al: Talking About Chance: The Presentation of Risk Information During Genetic Counseling for Breast and Ovarian Cancer. Journal of Genetic Counseling 6:269-286, 1997

31. Hopwood P, Howell A, Lalloo F, et al: Do women understand the odds? Risk perceptions and recall of risk information in women with a family history of breast cancer. Community Genet 6:214-223, 2003

Figure 1. Flow chart of the study population in the Danish Genetic Counseling Cohort



* Affected with breast or ovarian cancer or cancer status not reported

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants who completed 12 months of follow-up vs. drop-outs.

	Gen. C. Gr.		*Reference Gr. I*		*Reference Gr. II*	
	Participants (n=213)	*Drop-outs (n=98)*	*Participants (n=319)*	*Drop-outs (n=53)*	*Participants (n=1070)*	*Drop-outs (n=183)*
Age, median	39	36	56	53	45	41
range	18-72	18-78	28-76	26-70	18-75	19-74
Married / cohabiting, %	72	81	71	77	76	66
Biological offspring, %						
≥ one daughter	49	48	61	72	54	52
≥ one son	51	52	61	64	56	57
Further education, %						
None	12	17	11	15	17	27
Short	27	32	42	42	40	39
Medium	44	36	38	37	34	22
Long	17	15	9	6	9	12
Family cancer 1st. degree[1],%	83	70	21	28	12	9
Perceived. risk, median	50	50	10	10	10	10
Smoking baseline, %	35	38	33	45	33	44
IES stress[2], %	52	54	41	55	33	32

[1]≥one relative

[2]Proportion with a cancer-specific distress score >8

Table 2 Perceived absolute lifetime risk (%) of breast cancer

Group	*Baseline*	*12 months Follow up*	*Within group changes²*	*Between group changes³*
	Median (25^{th}-75^{th})	Median (25^{th}-75^{th})	Mean (95% CI)	Mean (95% CI) *Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. I.*
Gen. C. Gr. (n=192)[1]	50 (20-50)	30 (18-50)	-6.6 (-3.0;-10.2)	-8.2 (-12.2;-4.1)
Ref. Gr. I. (n=278)[1]	10 (5-25)	10 (5-30)	1.6 (3.6;-0.5)	*Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. II.*
Ref. Gr. II.(n=972)[1]	10 (5-25)	10 (5-30)	1.1 (2.2;0.0)	-7.7 (-11.4;-4.0)

[1]Participants who reported their perceived risk both at baseline and at 12-month follow up.
[2]Participants served as their own controls
[3]Average change in the Genetic Counseling Group vs. average change in the reference groups

Table 3 Risk accuracy of perceived life-time risk of breast cancer

	Time	*Gen. C. Gr. (n=138)[1]*	*Ref. Gr. I. (n=278)[2]*	*Ref. Gr. II. (n=972)[2]*
Underestimate, %	Baseline	22	-	-
	12 months follow-up	18	-	-
Overestimate, %	Baseline	53	29	32
	12 months follow-up	41	34	34
Accurate, %	Baseline	25	71	68
	12 months follow-up	41	66	66

[1]Participants, in the Genetic Counseling Group, who reported their perceived risk both at baseline and follow up and for whom objective risks were available.
[2]Participants, in reference Group I and Reference Group II, who reported their perceived risk both at baseline and at 12-month follow up. Underestimates do not apply to the reference groups.

Table 4 Predictors of inaccurate risk perception at 12-month follow up for women who received genetic counseling.

Predictor variable	*OR (95% CI)*
Age (ref.: >35years)	1.81 (0.72;4.55)
Education: None + short	Ref.
Medium	0.96 (0.38;2.45)
Long	0.93 (0.30;2.90)
≥One first degree relative with cancer (ref.: none)	2.10 (0.70;6.31)
Smoking (ref.: no smoking)	2.22 (0.91;5.39)
Daughters (ref.: no daughters)	2.68 (1.02;7.05)
Married / cohabiting (ref.: single)	1.44 (0.55;3.81)
Cancer-specific distress pre-counseling (ref.: no stress)	1.85 (0.80;4.28)
Inaccurate risk perception pre-counseling (ref.: accurate)	5.07 (2.07;15.79)
Risk expression, words only (ref.: words + numbers)	5.50 (1.88;16.10)
Mutation found in the family: No	Ref.
Yes	4.38 (1.32;14.48)
Don´t know	0.45 (0.14;1.45)

Title

Psychosocial consequences of genetic counseling: A population-based follow-up study

Ellen M. Mikkelsen[1,2], Lone Sunde[3], Christoffer Johansen[4], Søren P. Johnsen[1]

[1]Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Ole Worms Allé 1150, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark

[2]The Centre for Innovation and Development in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus

[3]Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital, Bartholin Bygningen, 8000 Aarhus C

[4]Department of Psychosocial Cancer Research, Institute of Cancer Epidemiology, The Danish Cancer Society, Strandboulevarden 49, 2100 Copenhagen Ø

Correspondence

Ellen M. Mikkelsen, Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, Ole Worms Allé 1150, 8000 Aarhus C, Denmark.

Phone +45 89 42 48 14, Fax +45 89 42 48 01, E-mail em@dce.au.dk

Financial disclosures

The research was funded by the Danish Cancer Society (Grant number PP 02 010), the Center for Innovation and Development in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus, The Danish Nurses´ Organization, and Aarhus University Research Foundation.

Keywords

Genetic counseling; psychological distress; hereditary breast and ovarian cancer

Abstract

Purpose

We aimed to examine the psychosocial impact of genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer one year following genetic counseling.

Patients and Methods

We conducted a population-based prospective follow-up study of 213 women who received genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer, 319 women who underwent mammography (Reference Group I), and a random sample of 1,070 women from the general population (Reference Group II).

Results

The prevalence of anxiety above non-case level remained unchanged from baseline to one year of follow up in the Genetic Counseling Group. In contrast, it increased by 4.1% (95% CI:-3.1; 11.3) in Reference Group I and by 5.9% (95% CI:2.1; 9.6) in Reference Group II . The prevalence of depression above non-case level increased equally (5-6%) in the three study groups. 52% of the women referred for genetic counseling experienced cancer-specific distress above sub-clinical level at baseline and this proportion decreased to 41% after 12 months of follow up. This decrease of 10.8% (95% CI:1.4; 20.8) exceeded the decrease observed in both reference groups. However, it was statistically significant only in the case of Reference Group II (p=0.006).

Conclusion

This population-based study indicates that genetic counseling can help alleviate cancer-specific distress among women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer. Further, genetic counseling does not appear to have an adverse impact on general anxiety, symptoms of depression, or health-related quality of life.

Introduction

Genetic counseling and testing for genetic predisposition to hereditary breast and ovarian cancer has been available for more than a decade. The consequences of this prevention strategy, including its psychosocial impact, have been widely discussed (1-4). Psychological consequences have been assessed in terms of changes in level of general anxiety, depression, general distress, and cancer-specific distress (5-7).

A systematic review (8) and a meta-analysis (9) encompassing the majority of existing studies on the psychological impact of genetic counseling conclude that such counseling does not seem to have an adverse psychological effect. In its 2005 clinical guidelines, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) stated that the benefits of referring women at increased risk of hereditary cancer for genetic counseling outweigh the harms (1;4). However, existing studies have a number of limitations, and substantial uncertainty remains about the psychological and behavioral impact of genetic cancer risk counseling. Studies to date have been based on highly selected samples of women, have not included reference groups, and have focused primarily on short-term outcomes (1;4;8;9). The few controlled trials included in the reviews and addressed in the USPSTF clinical guidelines failed in almost all cases to compare the effect of genetic counseling to that of no counseling; instead they examined the effects of different counseling methods, *e.g.*, counseling with and without a video (10), counseling with and without an audio tape (11;12), and group vs. individual counseling (13).

We therefore conducted a population-based prospective follow-up study to clarify the psychosocial impact of genetic counseling for hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. In addition to a group of women referred for genetic counseling, we included two reference groups in an effort to overcome some of the methodological problems of studies published thus far.

Patients and Methods

Upon referral by a physician, genetic counseling is available to all Danish women at risk of hereditary breast and ovarian cancer. Referral requires a family history of cancer indicative of a possible cancer predisposition. Counseling services are provided free of charge by the tax-financed public health system.

The genetic counseling offered to our study population included information on incidence of sporadic breast cancer, genetics, inheritance patterns, and estimated personal lifetime risk of inherited cancer. The counseling regimen included drawing a pedigree and, if indicated and possible, an offer of genetic testing. Women at elevated risk were offered a surveillance program or preventive surgery (14).

Study population

The source of data for this study was a larger cohort study of all women referred for genetic counseling, independent of personal cancer status. In the present study we excluded women already diagnosed with breast or ovarian cancer at baseline or who developed cancer during the follow-up period (Figure 1). As well, women were excluded who did not respond to both the baseline and the 12-month follow up questionnaire, or whose genetic counselor did not return a questionnaire confirming that the genetic counseling had taken place.

The study's Genetic Counseling Group included all women who met two criteria: age 18 years or older and attendance at an initial genetic counseling session for familial breast or ovarian cancer during the September 15, 2003 - September 15, 2004 period at one of the following clinics: Department of Clinical Genetics, Aarhus University Hospital; Department of Clinical Genetics, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; Oncology Department, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; or J.F. Kennedy

Institute. These four departments serve a population of approximately 4.1 million persons (more than 75% of the Danish population). A total of 568 women were eligible for inclusion in the Genetic Counseling Group. Of these, 431 agreed to participate at baseline. 300 received genetic counseling and remained in the study throughout the follow-up period.

Two additional groups were included in the study for comparison purposes (Figure1). Reference Group I was composed of women referred for mammography, allowing us to compare the impact of genetic counseling with that of an alternative cancer prevention approach. This reference group was recruited at two hospitals. At Aalborg Hospital, all women aged 18-75 years who received a mammogram for a non-acute clinical indication during the period from March 15, 2004 to December 31, 2004 were eligible. At Rigshospitalet, we recruited all women aged 50-69 years who underwent mammography as part of a breast cancer screening program between November 25, 2003 and December 1, 2003. Of 689 women eligible for this reference group, 417 entered the study, and 358 completed one year of follow up.

Reference Group II consisted of a random sample of Danish women aged 18 to 75 years, representing women with an unknown risk of developing breast or ovarian cancer. This group was identified from the Danish Central Population Registry. Since April 1, 1968 this Registry has assigned each resident of Denmark a unique ten-digit civil registration number, including information on birth date and sex. The Registry is continuously updated with information regarding vital status and address changes. 2,000 women were randomly selected from this Registry and invited to participate in the study. Of these, 1,322 agreed to take part, and 1,088 completed one year of follow up.

Data collection

Self-administered, standardized, mailed questionnaires were used to obtain data from the Genetic Counseling Group and both reference groups. Data from the Genetic Counseling Group were collected one to four weeks before an initial counseling session, and then two weeks, six months and 12 months afterwards. Data from Reference Group I were collected one to four weeks before mammography and 12 months afterwards. Baseline data for Reference Group II were collected at the time when the first woman was enrolled in the Genetic Counseling Group and follow-up data were collected 12 months later. Questionnaires were designed using the computer program Teleform. Data were entered with the Teleform Reader at the maximum confidence level (99%), comparable to double manual data entry in terms of error rates (15).

The Impact of Event Scale (IES) (16) was chosen to assess self-reported cancer-related distress. IES consists of 15 items; each item is scored 0, 1, 3, or 5, with higher scores reflecting more stressful impact. A score below nine served as the cut-off point for "no cancer-specific distress" (16). The IES has been found to perform well among women at risk of hereditary breast cancer (17).

The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) (18) was used as a measure of self-reported generalized anxiety and depression. HADS consists of 14 items, seven measuring anxiety and seven measuring depression, forming two subscales. Each scale has a maximum score of 21, with a higher score reflecting a more severe level of depression and anxiety. A score below eight served as the cut off both for "no anxiety" and "no depression". Bjelland *et al.* found that HADS performs well both in general population samples, non-psychiatric patient samples, and primary care patient samples (19).

Self-reported health-related quality of life (HRQOL) was assessed by the Medical Outcome Study Short Form 36 Health Survey (SF-36) (20). SF-36 consists of 36 items

forming eight subscales. It provides two summary scores - Physical Component Summary (PCS) and Mental Component Summary (MCS) - with higher scores indicating better quality of life. Scoring was performed according to Danish guidelines (21).

The following socio-demographic and medical data were collected for all study participants at baseline: age, number of biological children, level of education, perceived personal absolute risk of breast cancer, and number of first-degree relatives with breast or ovarian cancer.

Ethical considerations

The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Biomedical National Ethics Committee System. It was approved by the National Board of Health (J.nr. 0-604-04-20/E/EHG) and the Danish Data Protection Agency (CVR-nr.11-88-37-29).

Statistical analysis

Characteristics of the three study groups were described using proportions, medians, and ranges. Prevalence-proportion ratios (PPR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) were used to compare the Genetic Counseling Group and the Reference Groups.

The Wald test was utilized to compare differences between groups in the proportion of women whose cancer-specific stress score moved from a clinical level to a subclinical level. In addition, we used multivariate linear regression analysis to compare change (follow-up score minus baseline score) in outcome variables (cancer-specific distress, anxiety, and depression) among study groups, adjusted for socio-demographic and clinical variables.

We used the PCS and MCS to assess changes in HRQOL between baseline and 12 months of follow up, in order to circumvent the “ceiling effect” in the SF-36 subscales. Changes in

HRQOL within groups and between groups were examined using Student's paired t test and Student's t test, respectively, after testing for the assumption of normality. All analyses were performed using Stata Statistical Software version 9.0 (College Station, TX: Stata Corporation).

Results

In the Genetic Counseling Group, 68% of unaffected women (n=213) received counseling and remained in the study throughout the 12 months of follow up (Figure 1). In Reference Group I, 85% (n=319) of unaffected women completed 12 months of follow-up (Figure 1), while for Reference Group II, the proportion was 85% (n=1,070)

As shown in Table 1, women in the Genetic Counseling Group had a lower median age and fewer children compared to those in the reference groups. Concurrently, the prevalence of a high educational level, cancer in first-degree relatives, and perceived personal risk of developing breast cancer was substantially elevated in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to the reference groups.

Anxiety and depression

Approximately three-fourths of women in each study group experienced no anxiety at baseline. In the Genetic Counseling Group, the prevalence of anxiety above non-case level remained unchanged from baseline to one year of follow up. In contrast, it increased by 4.1% (95% CI:-3.1; 11.3) in Reference Group I and by 5.9% (95% CI:2.1; 9.6) in Reference Group II .

At baseline, the prevalence of depression above non-case level appeared almost equally in the three study groups. The increase between baseline and one year of follow up was also consistent in the three groups (5-6 %). Similar results were obtained when changes in

anxiety and depression scores were analyzed separately in a multivariate linear regression model adjusting for age, educational level, number of biological children, number of first degree relatives with breast or ovarian cancer, and perceived personal risk of breast cancer (data not shown).

Cancer-specific distress

At baseline, 52% of women referred for genetic counseling experienced some degree of cancer-specific distress. This proportion decreased to 50% after two weeks of follow up and to 41% after 6 months of follow up, remaining at this level after 12 months of follow up. 41% of those in Reference Group I and 32% of those in Reference Group II experienced some degree of cancer-specific distress at baseline. These proportions fell by 6.3% (95% CI:-1.3; 13.8) and by 1.6% (95% CI:-2.3; 5.5), respectively, after 12 months of follow up (Table 3).

The 10.8% (95% CI:1.4; 20.8) decrease in cancer-specific distress observed in the Genetic Counseling Group between baseline and 12 months of follow up exceeded the decrease observed in both reference groups. However, this was statistically significant only in the case of Reference Group II (p=0.006). A multivariate linear regression analysis, adjusting for the same potential confounders as described above, confirmed these findings (data not shown).

Health-related Quality of life

In the Genetic Counseling Group there was a small increase in the summary score for physical quality of life (PCS) between baseline and 12 months of follow up. In contrast, the PCS decreased in both reference groups over this period (Table 4). In the between-group analysis of change in PCS, these opposite trends resulted in notable differences

between the Genetic Counseling Group and both Reference Group I (2.4 points, 95% CI: 1.2; 3.6) and Reference Group II (1.2 points, 95% CI: 0.2; 2.2). We also observed an increase in the summary score for mental quality of life (MCS) in both the Genetic Counseling Group and in Reference Group I, while a decrease was seen in Reference Group II. However, the changes observed in MCS were small in all three groups and the between-group analysis showed no statistically significant differences.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to examine the psychosocial impact of genetic counseling in a population-based sample of women with a family history of breast or ovarian cancer.

The prevalence of anxiety among women receiving genetic counseling remained unchanged from baseline to 12 months of follow up, while a slight increase in anxiety was observed in the reference groups. These findings indicate that genetic counseling does not reduce generalized anxiety in the long term, consistent with the results of Brain *et al.'s* randomized controlled trial (22), and with those of three uncontrolled studies, each with 12 months of follow up (5;23;24).

The prevalence of depression increased equally among women in the three study groups. This suggests that the increase observed in the Genetic Counseling Group is unlikely to be caused by genetic counseling itself. Instead the exercise of completing the questionnaires may have drawn the women's attention to their psychological well being. Our findings support those of a number of earlier uncontrolled prospective studies (5;23;25), which indicated that genetic counseling for hereditary breast or ovarian cancer is not associated with an increase in depressive symptoms.

Women in both the Genetic Counseling Group and Reference Group I received an intervention with the potential to reduce cancer-specific distress. As expected, the prevalence of cancer-specific distress did decrease in both groups, although the decrease reached statistical significance only in the Genetic Counseling Group. The proportion of women in Reference Group II who experienced no cancer distress increased only slightly after 12 months of follow up, consistent with their lack of exposure to an intervention. The increase in the proportion of women who did not report a clinically relevant level of cancer distress over time was substantially larger in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to Reference Group II.

Previous studies of the long term impact of genetic counseling on cancer-specific distress have produced conflicting results. A randomized trial of multidisciplinary genetic counseling compared to specialized surgical counseling (22) and two prospective studies (5;23) found a reduction in cancer-specific distress, though the reduction was small in the trial. In contrast, a meta-analysis based on three randomized trials found no association between genetic counseling and cancer-specific distress (9). The reduction in cancer-specific distress we observed in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to the reference groups supports the hypothesis that genetic counseling reduces cancer-specific distress over the long term in a population-based sample of women.

HRQOL provides a subjective assessment of physical, emotional, social, and cognitive functioning and it is often used as an outcome measure in evaluations of new clinical interventions (26). Our study, the first to address the impact of genetic counseling on HRQOL as assessed by SF-36, suggests that counseling is not likely to have a major impact on HRQOL. While we found small changes in the two summary scores for HRQOL and a statistically significant improvement in the PCS for the Genetic Counseling Group

compared to the reference groups, none of these changes are close to the five-point level considered clinically meaningful (21) .

Study strengths and limitations

Our population-based multi-centre study was conducted in a country with free tax-financed health care, which allows women to be referred for genetic counseling independent of age, health, socioeconomic situation, or place of residence. As well, the two reference groups included in our analysis permitted formal comparisons, unlike most previously published studies (8;9;27). Furthermore, the two reference groups provide confidence that the decrease in cancer-specific distress observed among women receiving genetic counseling was not caused by time alone. Our study also reports absolute changes in the emotional outcome scores, which are more useful for clinical practice than relative changes derived from multivariate analysis. An earlier comparison of respondents and non-respondents at baseline, using registry-based data, detected no major non-response bias (Article 1). A previous comparison of the baseline characteristics of full participants and drop-outs also detected no important differences, providing assurance that our results were not affected by selection biases (Article 2).

A potential study weakness is the difference in some baseline characteristics of the Genetic Counseling Group compared with the reference groups. However, our findings remained largely unchanged when these differences were taken into account using multivariate regression analysis. This suggests that this potential source of confounding was not an important issue.

Conclusion

This population-based study indicates that genetic counseling can help alleviate cancer-specific distress among women with a family history of breast and ovarian cancer. Further, genetic counseling does not appear to have an adverse impact on general anxiety, symptoms of depression, or health-related quality of life.

Acknowledgements

We thank the patients for participating and the hospital staff for coordinating patient enrollment. Mette V. Skriver, biostatistician at the Department of Clinical Epidemiology, Aarhus University Hospital, provided invaluable advice for our statistical analyses.
The research was funded by the Danish Cancer Society, Grant Number PP 02 010, the Center for Innovation and Development in Nursing Education in the County of Aarhus, Aarhus University Research Foundation, and the Danish Nurses' Organization.

References

(1) Genetic risk assessment and BRCA mutation testing for breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility: recommendation statement. Ann Intern Med 2005; 143(5):355-361.

(2) Botkin JR, Croyle RT, Smith KR, Baty BJ, Lerman C, Goldgar DE et al. A model protocol for evaluating the behavioral and psychosocial effects of BRCA1 testing. J Natl Cancer Inst 1996; 88(13):872-882.

(3) Marteau TM, Croyle RT. The new genetics. Psychological responses to genetic testing. BMJ 1998; 316(7132):693-696.

(4) Nelson HD, Huffman LH, Fu R, Harris EL. Genetic risk assessment and BRCA mutation testing for breast and ovarian cancer susceptibility: systematic evidence review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. Ann Intern Med 2005; 143(5):362-379.

(5) Bish A, Sutton S, Jacobs C, Levene S, Ramirez A, Hodgson S. Changes in psychological distress after cancer genetic counselling: a comparison of affected and unaffected women. Br J Cancer 2002; 86(1):43-50.

(6) Brain K, Norman P, Gray J, Rogers C, Mansel R, Harper P. A randomized trial of specialist genetic assessment: psychological impact on women at different levels of familial breast cancer risk. Br J Cancer 2002; 86(2):233-238.

(7) Lerman C, Schwartz MD, Miller SM, Daly M, Sands C, Rimer BK. A randomized trial of breast cancer risk counseling: interacting effects of counseling, educational level, and coping style. Health Psychol 1996; 15(2):75-83.

(8) Butow PN, Lobb EA, Meiser B, Barratt A, Tucker KM. Psychological outcomes and risk perception after genetic testing and counselling in breast cancer: a systematic review. Med J Aust 2003; 178(2):77-81.

(9) Braithwaite D, Emery J, Walter F, Prevost AT, Sutton S. Psychological impact of genetic counseling for familial cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Natl Cancer Inst 2004; 96(2):122-133.

(10) Cull A, Miller H, Porterfield T, Mackay J, Anderson ED, Steel CM et al. The use of videotaped information in cancer genetic counselling: a randomized evaluation study. Br J Cancer 1998; 77(5):830-837.

(11) Lobb EA, Butow PN, Meiser B, Barratt A, Gaff C, Young MA et al. Tailoring communication in consultations with women from high risk breast cancer families. Br J Cancer 2002; 87(5):502-508.

(12) Watson M, Duvivier V, Wade WM, Ashley S, Davidson J, Papaikonomou M et al. Family history of breast cancer: what do women understand and recall about their genetic risk? J Med Genet 1998; 35(9):731-738.

(13) Bowen DJ, Burke W, McTiernan A, Yasui Y, Andersen MR. Breast cancer risk counseling improves women's functioning. Patient Educ Couns 2004; 53(1):79-86.

(14) Brondum-Nielsen K. Genetic counseling and genetic services. Ugeskr Laeger 2003; 165(8):777-779.

(15) Jorgensen CK, Karlsmose B. Validation of automated forms processing. A comparison of Teleform with manual data entry. Comput Biol Med 1998; 28(6):659-667.

(16) Horowitz M, Wilner N, Alvarez W. Impact of Event Scale: a measure of subjective stress. Psychosom Med 1979; 41(3):209-218.

(17) Thewes B, Meiser B, Hickie IB. Psychometric properties of the Impact of Event Scale amongst women at increased risk for hereditary breast cancer. Psychooncology 2001; 10(6):459-468.

(18) Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica 1983; 67(6):361-370.

(19) Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, Neckelmann D. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. An updated literature review. J Psychosom Res 2002; 52(2):69-77.

(20) Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. Med Care 1992; 30(6):473-483.

(21) Bjorner JB, Damsgaard MT, Watt T, Bech P, Rasmussen NK, Kristensen TS et al. Dansk manual til SF-36. Copenhagen: Lif, 1997.

(22) Brain K, Gray J, Norman P, France E, Anglim C, Barton G et al. Randomized trial of a specialist genetic assessment service for familial breast cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2000; 92(16):1345-1351.

(23) Meiser B, Butow PN, Barratt AL, Schnieden V, Gattas M, Kirk J et al. Long-term outcomes of genetic counseling in women at increased risk of developing hereditary breast cancer. Patient Educ Couns 2001; 44(3):215-225.

(24) Watson M, Lloyd S, Davidson J, Meyer L, Eeles R, Ebbs S et al. The impact of genetic counselling on risk perception and mental health in women with a family history of breast cancer. Br J Cancer 1999; 79(5-6):868-874.

(25) Ritvo P, Robinson G, Irvine J, Brown L, Matthew A, Murphy KJ et al. Psychological adjustment to familial genetic risk assessment: differences in two longitudinal samples. Patient Educ Couns 2000; 40(2):163-172.

(26) Bottomley A, Vanvoorden V, Flechtner H, Therasse P. The challenges and achievements involved in implementing Quality of Life research in cancer clinical trials. Eur J Cancer 2003; 39(3):275-285.

(27) Meiser B, Halliday JL. What is the impact of genetic counselling in women at increased risk of developing hereditary breast cancer? A meta-analytic review. Soc Sci Med 2002; 54(10):1463-1470.

Figure 1. Flow chart of the study population in the Danish Genetic Counseling Cohort



* Affected with breast or ovarian cancer, cancer status not reported, or inconsistency in reported cancer status

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of participants who completed 12 months of follow-up

	Gen. C. Gr. (n=213)	*Ref. Gr. I (n=319)*	*PPR(CI)*[1]	*Ref. Gr. II (n=1,070)*	*PPR(CI)*[2]
Age[3]	39 (18-72)	56 (28-76)		45 (18-75)	
Married / cohabiting, %	72	71	1.00(0.91;1.13)	76	0.95(0.86;1.04)
Biological offspring, %					
≥ one daughter	49	61	0.80(0.68;0.94)	54	0.90(0.78;1.05)
≥ one son	52	61	0.85(0.73;0.99)	56	0.92(0.80;1.06)
Education, %					
None	12	11	0.74(0.60;0.90)[4]	17	0.68(0.57;0.81)[4]
Short (<3 years)	27	42		40	
Medium (3-4 years)	44	38		34	
Long (>4 years)	17	9		9	
Family cancer 1st degree,%	83	21	3.85(3.09;4.80)[5]	12	7.10(5.93;8.46)[5]
Smoking at baseline, %	35	33	1.00(0.77;1.30)	33	1.05(0.84;1.31)
Perceived. risk, median	50	10	-	10	-

[1]Prevalence-proportion ratio, Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. I, 95% confidence interval
[2]Prevalence-proportion ratio, Gen. C. Gr. vs. Ref. Gr. II, 95% confidence interval
[3]Median (range)
[4]none + short vs. medium + long
[5]≥one relative affected with cancer

Table 2. Anxiety and depression among women in the Genetic Counseling Group and in the Reference Groups

HADS	*Gen. C. Gr. Baseline (n=213)*	*Gen. C. Gr. 12 months (n=213)*	*Ref. Gr. I Baseline (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. I 12 months (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. II Baseline (n=1,070)*	*Ref. Gr. II 12 months (n=1,070)*
Anxiety[1]						
Non-case	73%	73%	70%	66%	76%	70%
Borderline	18%	10%	18%	15%	16%	13%
Case	9%	17%	12%	19%	8%	17%
Depression[1]						
Non-case	94%	89%	93%	87%	95%	90%
Borderline	5%	5%	5%	7%	3%	5%
Case	1%	6%	2%	6%	2%	5%

[1]Score 0-21, non-case = 0-7, borderline = 8-10, case = 11-21

Table 3. Cancer-specific distress among women in the Genetic Counseling Group and in the Reference Groups

IES[1]	*Gen. C. Gr. Baseline (n=213)*	*Gen. C. Gr. 12 months (n=213)*	*Ref. Gr. I Baseline (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. I 12 months (n=319)*	*Ref. Gr. II Baseline (n=1070)*	*Ref. Gr. II 12 months (n=1070)*
Sub-clinical	48%	59%	59%	65%	68%	70%
Mild	34%	26%	25%	25%	22%	20%
Moderate	14%	12%	13%	8%	9%	8%
Severe	4%	3%	3%	2%	1%	2%

[1]Cancer specific distress score 0-75, subclinical = 0-8, mild = 9-25, moderate = 26-43, severe = 44-75

Tabel 4. Changes in quality of life for women in the Genetic Counseling Group compared to women in the Reference Groups

Group	*PCS[1]*		*MCS[2]*	
	Within-group change[3] *Mean (CI)*	*Between-group change* *Mean (CI)*	*Within-group change[3]* *Mean (CI)*	*Between-group change* *Mean (CI)*
		Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. I.		*Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. I.*
Genetic Gr. (n=197)	0.9 (-0.1;1.8)	2.4 (1.2;3.6)	0.6 (-0.8;2.0)	-0.6 (-2.3;1.2)
Reference Gr. I (n=287)	-1.5 (-2.3;-0.7)	*Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. II.*	1.2 (0.2;2.2)	*Genetic vs. Ref. Gr. II.*
Reference Gr. II (n=996)	-0.3 (-0.7;0.1)	1.2 (0.2;2.2)	-0.6 (-1.1;-0.1)	1.2 (-0.3;2.7)

[1]Physical Component Summary, [2]Mental Component Summary
[3]Difference between scores at baseline and after12 months of follow up

Århus
Universitetshospital

John F. Kennedy
Instituttet

Genetisk vejledning

- en undersøgelse af livskvalitet og tanker om kræft hos kvinder der modtager genetisk vejledning

Rigshospitalet

Kræftens Bekæmpelse

Klinisk Epidemiologisk Afdeling, Århus Universitetshospital, Vennelyst Boulevard 6, Bygn.260, 8000 Århus C
Tlf.: 89 42 62 76 Email: em@soci.au.dk

Skema P1

Vejledning

Kære deltager

På de næste sider er der en række spørgsmål, der skal give et meget nuanceret billede af livskvalitet, tanker om kræft og betydningen af genetisk vejledning.

Du synes måske, at nogle af spørgsmålene slet ikke er relevante for dig, eller at der er flere spørgsmål, der ligner hinanden. Du bedes alligevel besvare alle spørgsmålene så godt som muligt, da spørgsmålene er nøje udvalgt for at give et dækkende billede af **mange forskellige** kvinders oplevelse af genetisk vejledning og livskvalitet.

Brug ikke for meget tid på hvert spørgsmål men svar, hvad der umiddelbart falder dig ind. Det tager ca. 25 min. at udfylde spørgeskemaet.

Spørgeskemaet aflæses maskinelt, derfor beder vi dig om at bruge en sort eller blå tusch eller kuglepen. Sæt et kryds i firkanten ud for det svar, som du synes passer bedst.

Hvis du laver en forkert afkrydsning, kan du blot strege det forkerte ud og sætte et nyt kryds.

Eksempel



Hvis du har spørgsmål til skemaet bedes du venligst kontakte Ellen Mikkelsen, tlf. 89 42 62 76 eller via e-mail: em@soci.au.dk

Tak for hjælpen

Med venlig hilsen
Ellen Mikkelsen

---

1. Dato for besvarelse af dette spørgeskema

				2	0	0	
Dag		Måned		År			

De første spørgsmål vedrører en række generelle oplysninger

1. Bor du sammen med en ægtefælle eller fast partner? Ja ☐ Nej ☐

2. Har du egne (biologiske) børn?

Ja ☐ ⟶ Antal døtre ☐ Antal sønner ☐

Nej ☐

---

3. Hvilken grunduddannelse har du?

- ☐ Går i skole
- ☐ 7 eller færre års skolegang
- ☐ 8-9 års skolegang
- ☐ 10-11 års skolegang
- ☐ Studenter-, HF-eksamen (inkl HHX, HTX)
- ☐ Andet (herunder udenlandsk skole)

---

4. Har du taget en erhvervsuddannelse?

- ☐ Nej, ingen uddannelse
- ☐ Ja,specialarbejderuddannelse
- ☐ Ja, Handelskolernes grunduddannelse(HG) eller basisår i EFG-uddannelse
- ☐ Ja, lærlinge, EFG- eller HG-uddannelse
- ☐ Ja, anden faglig uddannelse
- ☐ Ja, mellemlang videregående uddannelse 3-4 år
- ☐ Ja, kort videregående uddannelse, under 3 år
- ☐ Ja, lang videregående uddannelse over 4 år
- ☐ Ja, anden uddannelse

---

5. Har du erhvervsarbejde nu?

- ☐ Ja
- ☐ Ja, men på orlov
- ☐ Ja, men sygemeldt
- ☐ Ja, men delvis sygemeldt
- ☐ nej ⟶ Gå til spørgsmål 7

6. Hvilken type erhvervsarbejde har du?

- ☐ Selvstændig erhvervsdrivende (dvs har egen forretning/virksomhed)
- ☐ Medarbejdende ægtefælle
- ☐ Ufaglært arbejder
- ☐ Faglært arbejder
- ☐ Funktionær/tjenestemand
- ☐ Under uddannelse
- ☐ Anden type erhvervsarbejde

De næste spørgsmål vedrører en række generelle oplysninger om risiko for at få brystkræft eller æggestokkræft

7. Er du på nuværende tidspunkt i behandling for brystkræft eller æggestokkræft?

- ☐ Ja → Gå til spørgsmål **16**
- ☐ Nej
- ☐ Nej, men jeg har tidligere været i behandling → Gå til spørgsmål **16**
- ☐ Nej, men jeg skal i behandling → Gå til spørgsmål **16**

8. Hvor stor tror du, risikoen er for, at du får brystkræft i løbet af dit liv?

Skriv det procenttal du tror kommer nærmest: ☐☐☐ %

9. Hvis du sammenligner dig selv med andre kvinder på samme alder, hvor stor tror du så risikoen er for, at du får brystkræft i løbet af dit liv?

- ☐ Meget mindre risiko
- ☐ Lidt mindre risiko
- ☐ Samme risiko
- ☐ Lidt større risiko
- ☐ Meget større risiko

10. Tror du regelmæssige forebyggende mammografier (røntgen-undersøgelse af brysterne) vil være til gavn for dig ?

☐ Ja
☐ Nej
☐ Ved ikke

---

11. Hvis du bliver anbefalet at gå til regelmæssige forebyggende mammografier (røntgen-undersøgelse af brysterne), i hvilken grad tror du så, at du vil følge anbefalingerne?

☐ Helt
☐ Delvis
☐ Slet ikke
☐ Ved ikke

---

12. Har nogle af dine forældre, søskende eller egne børn haft brystkræft eller æggestokkræft?

☐ Ja ⟶ Hvis ja hvor mange, skriv antal? ☐☐
☐ Nej
☐ Ved ikke

---

13. Har andre personer (venner eller slægtninge), som du har været eller er nært knyttet til, haft brystkræft eller æggestokkræft?

☐ Ja
☐ Nej
☐ Ved ikke

---

14. Har du tidligere været til genetisk vejledning med henblik på risiko for brystkræft eller æggestokkræft?

☐ Ja
☐ Nej
☐ Nej, men andre i min familie har

---

15. Hvor stor tror du risikoen er for, at en almindelig dansk kvinde får brystkræft i løbet af hendes liv?

Skriv det procenttal du tror kommer nærmest: ☐☐☐ %

De følgende spørgsmål handler om din opfattelse af dit helbred. Oplysningerne vil give et overblik over, hvordan du har det, og hvor godt du er i stand til at udføre dine daglige gøremål.

16. Hvordan synes du, dit helbred er alt i alt?

- ☐ Fremragende
- ☐ Vældiggodt
- ☐ Godt
- ☐ Mindregodt
- ☐ Dårligt

17. Sammenlignet med <u>for et år siden</u>, hvordan er dit helbred alt i alt <u>nu?</u>

- ☐ Meget bedre nu end for et år siden
- ☐ Noget bedre nu end for et år siden
- ☐ Nogenlunde det samme
- ☐ Noget dårligere nu end for et år siden
- ☐ Meget dårligere nu end for et år siden

18. De følgende spørgsmål handler om aktiviteter i dagligdagen. Er du på grund af dit helbred begrænset i disse aktiviteter. Og i så fald hvor meget?

	Ja, meget begrænset	Ja, lidt begrænset	Nej, slet ikke begrænset
a. Krævende aktiviteter som fx. at løbe, løfte tunge ting, deltage i anstrengende sport	☐	☐	☐
b. Lettere aktiviteter så som at flytte bord, støvsuge eller cykle	☐	☐	☐
c. At løfte eller bære dagligvarer	☐	☐	☐
d. At gå flere etager op ad trapper	☐	☐	☐
e. At gå én etage op ad trapper	☐	☐	☐
f. At bøje sig ned eller gå ned i knæ	☐	☐	☐
g. Gå mere end én kilometer	☐	☐	☐
h. Gå nogle hundrede meter	☐	☐	☐
i. Gå 100 meter	☐	☐	☐
j. Gå i bad eller tage tøj på	☐	☐	☐

19. Har du inden for de sidste 4 uger haft nogen af følgende problemer med dit arbejde eller andre daglige aktiviteter på grund af dit fysiske helbred?

	Ja	Nej
a. Jeg har skåret ned på den **tid**, jeg bruger på arbejde eller andre aktiviteter	☐	☐
b. Jeg har **nået mindre**, end jeg gerne ville	☐	☐
c. Jeg har været begrænset i hvilken **slags** arbejde eller andre aktiviteter, jeg har kunnet udføre	☐	☐
d. Jeg har haft **besvær** med at udføre mit arbejde eller andre aktiviteter (fx krævede det en ekstra indsats)	☐	☐

20. Har du inden for de sidste 4 uger haft nogen af følgende problemer med dit arbejde eller andre daglige aktiviter på grund af følelsesmæssige problemer:

	Ja	Nej
a. Jeg har skåret ned på den **tid**, jeg bruger på arbejde eller andre aktiviteter	☐	☐
b. Jeg har **nået mindre**, end jeg gerne ville	☐	☐
c. Jeg har udført mit arbejde eller andre aktiviteter **mindre omhyggeligt**, end jeg plejer	☐	☐

21. Inden for de sidste 4 uger, hvor meget har dit fysiske helbred eller følelsesmæssige problemer vanskeliggjort din kontakt med familie, venner, naboer eller andre?

☐ Sletikke
☐ Lidt
☐ Noget
☐ En hel del
☐ Virkeligmeget

22. Hvor stærke fysiske smerter har du haft inden for de sidste 4 uger?

☐ Ingensmerter
☐ Meget lettesmerter
☐ Lettesmerter
☐ Middelstærkesmerter
☐ Stærkesmerter
☐ Meget stærkesmerter

23. Inden for de sidste 4 uger hvor meget har fysiske smerter vanskeliggjort dit daglige arbejde (både arbejde uden for hjemmet og husarbejde)?

☐ Sletikke
☐ Lidt
☐ Noget
☐ En hel del
☐ Virkeligmeget

24. Disse spørgsmål handler om, hvordan du har haft det i de sidste 4 uger. Hvor stor en del af tiden i de sidste fire uger?

	Hele tiden	Det meste af tiden	En hel del af tiden	Noget af tiden	Lidt af tiden	På intet tidspunkt
a. Har du følt dig veloplagt og fuld af liv	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Har du været meget nervøs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Har du været så langt nede, at intet har kunnet opmuntre dig	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Har du følt dig rolig og afslappet	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. Har du været fuld af energi	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Har du følt dig trist til mode	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Har du følt dig udslidt	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h. Har du været glad og tilfreds	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i. Har du følt dig træt	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

25. Inden for de sidste 4 uger, hvor stor en del af tiden har dit fysiske helbred eller følelsesmæssige problemer gjort det vanskeligt at se andre mennesker (fx besøge venner, slægtninge osv.)?

☐ Heletiden
☐ Det meste af tiden
☐ Noget af tiden
☐ Lidt af tiden
☐ På intet tidspunkt

26. Hvor rigtige eller forkerte er de følgende udsagn for dit vedkommende?

	Helt rigtigt	Overvejende rigtigt	Ved ikke	Overvejende forkert	Helt forkert
a. Jeg bliver nok lidt lettere syg end andre	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. Jeg er lige så rask som enhver anden, jeg kender	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Jeg forventer, at mit helbred bliver dårligere	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Mit helbred er fremragende	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

De næste spørgsmål drejer sig om dine sundhedsvaner

27. Ryger du?

- ☐ Ja, hver dag
- ☐ Ja, mindst én gang om ugen → Gå til spørgsmål **30**
- ☐ Ja, men sjældnere end én gang om ugen → Gå til spørgsmål **30**
- ☐ Nej, men jeg har tidligere røget → Gå til spørgsmål **29**
- ☐ Nej, jeg har aldrig røget → Gå til spørgsmål **30**

---

28. Hvor meget ryger du om dagen?

a. Antal cigaretter dagligt ☐☐ stk.

b. Antal cerutter dagligt ☐☐ stk.

c. Antal cigarer dagligt ☐☐ stk.

d. Antal pibestop dagligt ☐☐ stk.

---

29. Hvor længe siden er det, at du holdt op med at ryge?

- ☐ Mindre end 1 måned siden
- ☐ 1-3 måneder siden
- ☐ 4-6 måneder siden
- ☐ 7-12 måneder siden
- ☐ Mere end 12 måneder siden

---

30. Hvor ofte drikker du almindeligvis alkohol (øl, vin, hedvin eller spiritus)?

- ☐ Drikker ikke alkohol → Gå til spørgsmål **32**
- ☐ Mindre end 1 gang om måneden → Gå til spørgsmål **32**
- ☐ 1-3 gange om måneden → Gå til spørgsmål **32**
- ☐ 1 gang om ugen
- ☐ 2-4 gange om ugen
- ☐ 5-6 gange om ugen

31. Hvor mange genstande (øl, vin, hedvin eller spiritus) drikker du almindeligvis pr. uge?

- ☐ 1 genstand
- ☐ 2-4 genstande
- ☐ 5-7 genstande
- ☐ 8-10 genstande
- ☐ 11-14 genstande
- ☐ 15 genstande eller mere

---

32. Hvor mange gange om ugen dyrker du almindeligvis hård konkurrenceidræt?

- ☐ Aldrig
- ☐ 1 gang om ugen
- ☐ 2-3 gange om ugen
- ☐ 4-5 gange om ugen
- ☐ Mere end 5 gange om ugen

---

33. Hvor mange gange om ugen dyrker du almindeligvis motionsidræt (f.eks gymnastik, badminton, svømning, løb)?

- ☐ Aldrig
- ☐ 1 gang om ugen
- ☐ 2-3 gange om ugen
- ☐ 4-5 gange om ugen
- ☐ Mere end 5 gange om ugen

---

34. Hvor mange gange om ugen dyrker du almindeligvis lettere motion (f.eks gåture, lette cykelture, let havearbejde)?

- ☐ Aldrig
- ☐ 1 gang om ugen
- ☐ 2-3 gange om ugen
- ☐ 4-5 gange om ugen
- ☐ Mere end 5 gange om ugen

---

35. Synes du, at du spiser sundt?

- ☐ Ja, meget tit
- ☐ Ja, tit
- ☐ Ja, af og til
- ☐ Nej, aldrig

36. Passer nogle af nedenstående udsagn på dine kostvaner?
(Sæt ét kryds for hvert svar)

	Ja	Nej
a. Jeg spiser fedtfattigt	☐	☐
b. Jeg spiser fiberrigt	☐	☐
c. Jeg spiser varieret	☐	☐
d. Jeg spiser ofte økologisk	☐	☐
e. Jeg spiser jævnligt fisk	☐	☐
f. Jeg spiser magert kød	☐	☐
g. Jeg spiser mange grønsager	☐	☐
h. Jeg spiser meget frugt	☐	☐
i. Jeg undgår mad med tilsætningsstoffer	☐	☐

De næste spørgsmål handler om, hvordan du føler dig tilpas i denne tid

Du bedes besvare alle spørgsmål uden at tænke for meget over hver enkel besvarelse. Din første indskydelse vil som regel komme tættest på dine følelser. Husk at der er ingen rigtige eller forkerte svar.

37. Jeg føler mig anspændt

- ☐ Næsten hele tiden
- ☐ Meget af tiden
- ☐ En gang imellem
- ☐ Slet ikke

38. Jeg nyder stadig de ting, som jeg tidligere har nydt

- ☐ Helt som jeg plejer
- ☐ Ikke helt så meget
- ☐ Kun lidt
- ☐ Næsten ikke

39. Jeg er bange for, at der skal ske noget frygteligt

- ☐ Helt bestemt og meget voldsomt
- ☐ Ja, men det er ikke så slemt
- ☐ Lidt, men det bekymrer mig ikke
- ☐ Slet ikke

40. Jeg kan le og se det morsomme i en situation	☐ Lige så meget som jeg plejer ☐ Ikke helt så meget nu ☐ Helt klart ikke så meget nu ☐ Slet ikke
41. Jeg gør mig bekymringer	☐ En stor del af tiden ☐ Meget af tiden ☐ Engang imellem, men ikke så tit ☐ Kunlejlighedsvis
42. Jeg føler mig glad	☐ Slet ikke ☐ Ikke så tit ☐ Nogle gange ☐ Det meste af tiden
43. Jeg kan sidde roligt og føle mig afslappet	☐ Helt bestemt ☐ Som regel ☐ Ikke så tit ☐ Slet ikke
44. Jeg føler det som om, jeg fungerer langsommere	☐ Næsten hele tiden ☐ Meget ofte ☐ Nogle gange ☐ Slet ikke
45. Jeg føler mig bange, som om jeg har "sommerfugle i maven"	☐ Slet ikke ☐ Lejlighedsvis ☐ Temmelig tit ☐ Meget ofte

46. Jeg har mistet interessen for mit udseende

- ☐ Fuldstændig
- ☐ Jeg er ikke så omhyggelig, som jeg burde være
- ☐ Måske er jeg knap så omhyggelig som før
- ☐ Jeg er lige så omhyggelig, som jeg altid har været

47. Jeg føler mig rastløs, som om jeg hele tiden skal være i bevægelse

- ☐ Virkelig meget
- ☐ Temmelig meget
- ☐ Ikke særlig meget
- ☐ Slet ikke

48. Jeg glæder mig til ting, som skal ske

- ☐ Lige så meget som før
- ☐ Noget mindre end jeg plejer
- ☐ Helt klart mindre end jeg plejer
- ☐ Næsten ikke

49. Jeg får pludselig fornemmelse af panik

- ☐ Særdeles tit
- ☐ Temmelig ofte
- ☐ Ikke særlig ofte
- ☐ Slet ikke

50. Jeg kan nyde en god bog eller et radio/TV-program

- ☐ Ofte
- ☐ Nogle gange
- ☐ Ikke særlig tit
- ☐ Meget sjældent

De følgende spørgsmål drejer sig om bekymring for kræftsygdom

I det følgende er der beskrevet en række reaktioner, som man kan opleve, når man er bekymret for at få kræft eller har haft kræft. Du bedes angive i hvilken grad, disse reaktioner har været gældende for dig i løbet af **den sidste uge**. Hvis du ikke har oplevet sådanne reaktioner, skal du sætte kryds ved **slet ikke**.

	Ofte	Somme-tider	Sjældent	Slet ikke
51. Jeg tænkte på risiko for kræft, selvom jeg ikke ønskede det	☐	☐	☐	☐
52. Jeg undgik at lade mig blive følelsesmæssigt påvirket, når jeg tænkte på risiko for kræft eller blev mindet om risko for kræft	☐	☐	☐	☐
53. Jeg forsøgte at skubbe tanker om risiko for kræft ud af min bevidsthed	☐	☐	☐	☐
54. Jeg havde problemer med at falde i søvn, eller kunne ikke sove, fordi billeder eller tanker om risko for kræft dukkede op i min bevidsthed	☐	☐	☐	☐
55. Stærke følelser om risiko for kræft bølgede frem	☐	☐	☐	☐
56. Jeg drømte om risiko for kræft	☐	☐	☐	☐
57. Jeg har holdt mig væk fra ting eller situationer som kunne minde mig om risiko for kræft	☐	☐	☐	☐
58. Det føltes uvirkeligt, som om risiko for kræft slet ikke gælder for mig	☐	☐	☐	☐
59. Jeg bestræbte mig på ikke at tale om risko for kræft	☐	☐	☐	☐
60. Billeder af risiko for kræft dukkede op i min bevidsthed	☐	☐	☐	☐
61. Andre ting blev ved med at minde mig om risiko for kræft	☐	☐	☐	☐
62. Jeg var klar over, at jeg havde mange følelser om risiko for kræft, men jeg undlod at forholde mig til dem	☐	☐	☐	☐
63. Jeg forsøgte at lade være med at tænke på risiko for kræft	☐	☐	☐	☐
64. En hvilken som helst påmindelse bragte følelser om risiko for kræft tilbage	☐	☐	☐	☐
65. Jeg oplevede nærmest at være følelsesløs omkring risikoen for kræft	☐	☐	☐	☐

De sidste spørgsmål handler om din egen og sundhedsvæsenets indflydelse på dit helbred

Du bedes angive, hvor enig eller uenig du er i følgende udsagn på en skala fra 1 til 6, hvor 1 svarer til helt enig og 6 svarer til helt uenig.

	Helt enig 1	2	3	4	5	Helt uenig 6
66. Hvis jeg bliver syg, har jeg kræfterne til selv at blive rask igen	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
67. Jeg har selv ansvaret for at bevare mit helbred	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
68. Hvis noget går galt med mit helbred, er det min egen skyld	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
69. Mit helbred afhænger af, hvor godt jeg passer på mig selv	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
70. Når jeg føler mig syg, ved jeg, at det er fordi, jeg ikke har passet godt nok på mig selv	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
71. Ved at passe godt på mig selv kan jeg stort set holde mig rask	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
72. Hvis jeg går til læge med jævne mellemrum, har jeg mindre risiko for at få problemer med mit helbred	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
73. Den eneste måde, jeg kan bevare mit helbred på, er ved at gå til sundhedsvæsenet	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
74. Andre mennesker har stor betydning for, om jeg holder mig rask	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
75. Det er sundhedsvæsenet, der holder mig rask	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
76. Andre menneskers behandling og omsorg er afgørende, for hvor godt jeg kommer mig efter sygdom	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
77. For mig er den bedste måde at holde sig rask på at følge lægens råd til punkt og prikke	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
78. Tit føler jeg, at uanset hvad jeg gør, hvis jeg skal blive syg, bliver jeg syg	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
79. Det virker, som om mit helbred i høj grad afhænger af tilfældighedernes spil	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
80. Når jeg er syg, må jeg lade naturen råde	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
81. Når jeg er rask, skyldes det held	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
82. Selv hvis jeg passer på mig selv, bliver jeg let syg	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
83. Når jeg bliver syg, skyldes det skæbnen	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Hvis du har andre oplevelser eller tanker i forhold til, at du har ønsket at modtage genetisk vejledning, som du gerne vil fortælle om, er du velkommen til at skrive på denne side

Genetisk vejledning

- en undersøgelse af genetisk udredning og vejledning samt forløbet derefter

Århus Universitetshospital

John F. Kennedy Instituttet

SOLIDUM PETIT IN PROFUNDIS · UNIVERSITAS ARHUSIENSIS ·

HiS Rigshospitalet

Kræftens Bekæmpelse

Instruktion

1. Skemaet udfyldes **umiddelbart** efter den **første personlige** genetiske lægesamtale, hvor kvinden har fået oplysninger om sin **egen risiko** for mammae- og/eller ovariecancer.

2. Skemaet skal udfyldes uanset om kvinden er indexperson eller ej, uanset om kvinden har en cancerdiagnose eller ej, og uanset om der er foretaget mutationseftersøgning i familien eller ej, og uanset om andre af kvindens slægtninge er blevet prædiktiv testet.

3. Hvis kvinden informeres om sin personlige risiko pr. telefon eller brev, udfyldes skemaet umiddelbart efter telefonsamtalen, eller efter brevet er skrevet.

4. Når skemaet er udfyldt, returneres det **samme dag** til Ellen.

5. Hvis patienten udsætter rådgivningen og får en ny tid, gemmes skemaet blot.

6. Hvis patienten aflyser og slet ikke ønsker vejledning, eller patienten udsætter på ubestemt tid returneres skemaet med den oplysning til Ellen.

Klinisk Epidemiologisk Afdeling, Århus Universitetshospital, Vennelyst Boulevard 6, Bygn.260, 8000 Århus C
Tlf.: 89 42 62 76 Email: em@soci.au.dk

Lægeskema

Nedenstående spørgeskema bedes udfyldt af den læge, der har varetaget den genetiske rådgivning af følgende person, der har givet tilladelse til at deltage i projektet. Skemaet bedes udfyldt umiddelbart efter samtalen.

Navn:_____

Cpr. nr:_____

Spørgeskemaet aflæses maskinelt, derfor beder vi dig om at bruge en sort eller blå tusch eller kuglepen. Sæt ét kryds i svarfelterne ud for det svar, som du synes passer bedst.
Hvis du laver en forkert afkrydsning, kan du blot strege det forkerte ud og sætte et nyt kryds. Tal læses bedst, hvis de skrives inde i firkanten. Hvis du skriver et forkert tal, streger du blot det forkerte ud og skriver det rigtige udenfor feltet.

Eksempel



1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

1. Dato for besvarelse af dette spørgeskema

				2	0	0	

Dag Måned År

2. Har patienten tidligere været til genetisk rådgivning og fået oplysning om sin personlige risiko?

☐ Ja ⟶ Skemaet returneres uden yderligere besvarelse

☐ Nej ⟶ Resten af skemaet bedes besvaret

3. Har patienten nu eller tidligere fået diagnosticeret brystkræft eller æggestokkræft?

☐ Ja ⟶ Skemaet returneres uden yderligere besvarelse

☐ Nej ⟶ Resten af skemaet bedes besvaret

4. Antal kvindelige slægtninge til patienten der deltog i rådgivningssamtalen?

Skriv antal: | | |

5. Er patientens livstidsrisiko for <u>brystkræft</u> blevet vurderet?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, skriv vurderingen i procent: ☐☐☐ %

☐ Nej

6. Blev livstidsrisikoen for <u>brystkræft</u> formidlet til patienten ved procentangivelse?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, hvilken procentsats blev angivet? ☐☐☐ %

☐ Nej

7. Blev livstidsrisikoen for <u>brystkræft</u> formidlet til patienten ved risikogruppe?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, hvilken risikogruppe?

Høj risiko ☐

Moderat risiko ☐

Som baggrundsbefolkningen ☐

☐ Nej

8. Blev livstidsrisikoen for <u>brystkræft</u> formidlet til patienten på en anden måde?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, skriv hvordan

☐ Nej

9. Er patientens livstidsrisko for <u>æggestokkræft</u> blevet vurderet?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, skriv vurderingen i procent: ☐☐☐ %

☐ Nej

10. Blev livstidsrisikoen for <u>æggestokkræft</u> formidlet til patienten ved procentangivelse?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, hvilken procentsats blev angivet? ☐☐☐ %

☐ Nej

11. Blev livstidsrisikoen for <u>æggestokkræft</u> formidlet til patienten ved risikogruppe?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, hvilken risikogruppe?
- Høj risiko ☐
- Moderat risiko ☐
- Som baggrundsbefolkningen ☐

☐ Nej

---

12. Blev livstidsrisikoen for <u>æggestokkræft</u> formidlet til patienten på en anden måde?

☐ Ja → Hvis ja, skriv hvordan

☐ Nej

_____

_____

_____

13. Hvordan tror du, at patienten forstod informationen om risikoniveau? Marker det tal der passer bedst:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Helt forståelig — Helt uforståelig

---

14. Blev patienten henvist til et kontrolprogram for <u>brystkræft</u>?

☐ Ja

☐ Nej ikke endnu

☐ Nej → Hvis nej
- Patienten er allerede i kontrol ☐
- Patienten ønsker det ikke ☐
- Patienten vil overveje det ☐
- Ikke indiceret (f.eks. pga alder) ☐
- Patienten ønsker mastectomi ☐

---

15. Blev patienten henvist til et kontrolprogram for <u>æggestokkræft</u>?

☐ Ja

☐ Nej ikke endnu

☐ Nej → Hvis nej
- Patienten er allerede i kontrol ☐
- Patienten ønsker det ikke ☐
- Patienten vil overveje det ☐
- Ikke indiceret (f.eks. pga alder) ☐
- Patienten ønsker oophorektomi ☐