

# Reply on: »Thermography is Not a Feasible Method for Breast Cancer Screening« by Brkljačić et al.

Darko Kolarić<sup>1</sup> and Iskra Alexandra Nola<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>»Ruder Bošković« Institute, Centre for Informatics and Computing, Zagreb, Croatia

<sup>2</sup>University of Zagreb, School of Medicine, »Andrija Štampar« School of Public Health, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, Zagreb, Croatia

Dear Sirs,

We read the paper by Brkljačić et al.<sup>1</sup> with interest, especially in regard to the fact that the mentioned paper was published in the same issue of Journal as our paper. We very much regret the fact that we did not get the same chance to respond to the above mentioned paper – in the same issue. We believe that pretentious title by Brkljačić et al. paper could mislead your esteemed readers.

Namely, in June 2013 The Cochrane Library, prestigious medical data base, published systematic review<sup>2</sup> which comprises 600,000 women in the age range 39 to 74 years who were randomly assigned to receive screening mammograms or not. Screening with mammography uses X-ray imaging to find breast cancer before a lump can be felt. The goal is to treat cancer earlier, when a cure is more likely. In the summary report, the authors warn that systematic recording of women does not reduce mortality from breast cancer, but it increases the number of false positives and the number of unnecessary therapy<sup>2</sup>.

In our paper<sup>3</sup> we presented obtained results that were carefully analyzed and shown as a new insight in existing area: use of mammography and thermography simultaneously. We confirmed the high sensitivity of thermography<sup>4</sup> and based on other similar research we concluded that »it would be prudent« (no must or have to) »to use thermography as a primary screening method« (not the only one) »in detection of breast carcinoma«.

Brkljačić et al. did not confute our results, they only tried to negate the whole method, and we believe that the science must be opened for new approaches and challenges. Not as a reply and comment (not peer reviewed<sup>4</sup>) through 5 pages where title it self derogate our work which they could disprove only by their own scientific study. Therefore it would be advisable, according to common editorial practice, to publish *erratum* regarding Brkljačić et al. contribution changing the title in only appropriate: »Reply and comment on: Thermography – A Feasible Method for Screening Breast Cancer?«

## REFERENCES

1. BRKLJAČIĆ B, MILETIĆ D, SARDANELLI F, Coll Antropol, 37 (2013) 589. – 2. GOTZSCHE PC, JORGENSEN, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 6 (2013). DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001877.pub5. – 3. KOLARIĆ D, HERCEG Ž, NOLA AI, RAMLJAK V, KULIŠ T,

HOLJEVAC J, DETTSCH AJ, ANTONINI S, Coll Antropol, 37 (2013) 583. 4. Accessed: December 16, 2013, Available from: URL: [www.col-lantropol.hr/antropo/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope](http://www.col-lantropol.hr/antropo/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope).

D. Kolarić

»Ruder Bošković« Institute, Centre for Informatics and Computing, Bijenička cesta 54, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia

e-mail: [dkolaric@irb.hr](mailto:dkolaric@irb.hr)