

Table 6. Meta-analyses of randomized trials of screening mammography among women aged 40-49.

Study (reference), Year	Assessed Quality?	Included Trials	Methods	Years of Follow- up	Relative Risk (95% Confidence Interval)	Number Needed to Screen
Larsson et al (50), 1997; Nystrom et al (32), 1993	No	5 Swedish trials	Weighted relative risks	12.8	0.77 (0.59-1.01)	
Cox (51), 1997 Elwood (52), 1993	No	All 8 trials	Fixed effects	10	0.93 (0.77-1.11)	
Glasziou and Irwig (53, 54), 1997	Yes. All studies were "good." Rated Malmo and CNBSS highest and Two- County trial and Gothenburg lowest	All 8 trials	Variance- weighted	13.13	0.85 (0.71-1.01)	
Hendrick et al (55), 1997; Smart et al (56), 1995	No	All 8 trials*	Fixed effects	12.7	0.82 (0.71-0.95)	1,540
Kerlikowske (57,58), 1995,1997	No	All 8 trials	Fixed effects	Approxim ately 12	.84 (0.71-0.99)	2,500
Berry (30), 1998	No	All 8 trials	Random effects†	12 - 15	.82 (0.49-1.17)	
Olsen and Gotzsche (8), 2001	Yes. Excluded 6 trials rated "flawed" or "poor"	Canadian, Malmo	Fixed Effects	NR	1.04 (0.84-1.27)	
Current study, 2002	Yes. Rated Edinburgh "poor" and others fair or better	7 trials, excluding Edinburgh	Random effects	Approxim ately 14	0.83 (0.64-1.04)	1,698

* Included an additional 17 000 subjects from the Malmo II trial.

† Hierarchical Bayes model; estimates are for the "next trial" analysis.

Note: For multiple publications, data from the most recent update are recorded in the table.