Original Article

The Impact of Socioeconomic Factors on Early Detection and Survival Rates in Breast Cancer Patients: A Comprehensive Analysis

Dr. MD. Meraj Alam[1], Dr Amita Hojai[2], Dr Sumitra Hagjer[3], Dr Prabir Pranjal Das[4]

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, Diphu Medical College and Hospital
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Anaesthesiology, Diphu Medical College and Hospital
[3]Professor Department of Surgery, Diphu Medical College and Hospital
[4]Professor (DACP), Department of Anaesthesiology, Diphu Medical College and Hospital

🔓 OPEN ACCESS

Corresponding Author:

Dr. MD. Meraj Alam
Associate Professor, Department of Surgery, Diphu Medical College and Hospital

A B S T R A C T

Background: Breast cancer remains the most commonly diagnosed cancer among women worldwide, with significant disparities in outcomes based on socioeconomic status (SES). This comprehensive review examines the complex relationships between socioeconomic factors and breast cancer detection, treatment, and survival outcomes.

Methods: We conducted a systematic analysis of current literature from multiple databases including PubMed, Scopus, and Embase, focusing on studies published between 2000-2025 that investigated socioeconomic determinants of breast cancer outcomes.

Results: Low SES is consistently associated with later stage at diagnosis, reduced access to guideline-concordant care, and worse survival outcomes. Women with lower SES have a 16-37% higher risk of breast cancer-specific mortality compared to those with higher SES. Disparities in mammography screening, Oncotype DX testing (with 41.4% overall testing rate but significantly lower rates in low-SES groups), and treatment adherence mediate these survival differences. Neighborhood-level socioeconomic factors independently influence outcomes beyond individual socioeconomic measures.

Conclusions: Socioeconomic factors significantly impact breast cancer detection and survival through complex, multifactorial pathways. Addressing these disparities requires coordinated interventions at health system, community, and policy levels to improve equitable access to screening, precision diagnostics, and timely treatment.

Keywords: breast cancer, socioeconomic status, health disparities, early detection, survival rates, access to care, healthcare disparities.

INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer constitutes a major global health challenge, with an estimated 2.3 million new cases diagnosed annually in women worldwide. In the United States alone, approximately 310,720 new female breast cancer cases were projected for 2024. While overall breast cancer mortality rates have declined significantly in high-income countries due to advancements in early detection and treatment, these improvements have not been equitably distributed across socioeconomic groups. The persistent disparities in breast cancer outcomes along socioeconomic lines represent a critical challenge in oncology and public health.

The cancer care continuum—from prevention and early detection to treatment and survivorship—is profoundly influenced by socioeconomic factors. Higher socioeconomic status has been paradoxically linked to both increased incidence of breast cancer but improved survival rates. This paradox reflects varying distributions of risk factors, differential access to screening services, and disparities in timely receipt of appropriate treatment. Understanding these complex relationships is essential for developing targeted interventions to reduce disparities and improve outcomes for all women, regardless of their socioeconomic background.

The purpose of this comprehensive review is to synthesize current evidence on the impact of socioeconomic factors on early detection and survival rates in breast cancer patients. We examine multiple dimensions of socioeconomic status, including income, education, occupation, and neighbourhood-level factors, and their influence on screening behaviours, stage at diagnosis, treatment patterns, and ultimate survival outcomes. Additionally, we explore mediating factors such as health insurance, geographic access to care, health literacy, and cultural barriers that contribute to socioeconomic disparities in breast cancer outcomes.

This review is particularly timely given the growing emphasis on health equity in cancer care and the increasing recognition that non-biological factors substantially influence cancer outcomes. By comprehensively examining the evidence linking socioeconomic factors to breast cancer detection and survival, we aim to inform clinical practice, health system interventions, and public policy initiatives designed to eliminate disparities and ensure equitable breast cancer care for all women.

METHODOLOGY
Literature Search Strategy
We conducted a systematic literature review following a predefined protocol designed to identify all relevant studies examining the relationship between socioeconomic factors and breast cancer detection and outcomes. Our comprehensive search encompassed multiple electronic databases including MEDLINE/PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Scopus from inception through December 2023. We employed a structured search strategy using controlled vocabulary terms (MeSH terms) and keywords related to "breast cancer," "socioeconomic factors," "early detection," "screening," "survival," and "disparities." The detailed search strategy was developed in consultation with a medical librarian specializing in health sciences research.

Study Selection and Eligibility Criteria
Studies were included if they: (1) examined female breast cancer patients; (2) investigated socioeconomic factors as independent variables; (3) measured outcomes related to early detection (e.g., stage at diagnosis, screening participation) or survival (e.g., overall survival, breast cancer-specific survival); (4) were observational studies (cohort, case-control, or cross-sectional designs); and (5) were published in English. We excluded case reports, editorials, and studies without explicit socioeconomic measures. The study selection process involved independent title/abstract screening and full-text review by two investigators, with disagreements resolved through consensus or third party adjudication.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment
We developed a standardized data extraction form to systematically collect information from included studies on: study characteristics (authors, publication year, location, design, sample size); participant demographics; socioeconomic measures used; outcome measures; statistical methods; and key findings. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale was utilized to assess the quality of included studies, evaluating selection, comparability, and outcome assessment. Two reviewers independently assessed study quality, with high-quality studies defined as those scoring ≥7 stars.

Analytical Framework
We employed a multilevel framework to examine socioeconomic influences on breast cancer outcomes, considering factors at the individual, community, and health system levels. The framework incorporates both traditional socioeconomic indicators (income, education, occupation) and contextual factors (neighbourhood SES, healthcare access). We examined mediators including health insurance status, geographic barriers, health literacy, and cultural factors. Due to heterogeneity in socioeconomic measures and outcome definitions across studies, we conducted a narrative synthesis rather than a meta-analysis, though we performed limited meta-analyses for specific homogeneous outcomes where feasible.

Socioeconomic Determinants of Breast Cancer Incidence
The relationship between socioeconomic status and breast cancer incidence is complex and exhibits notable variations across global contexts. In high-income countries, women with higher SES consistently demonstrate an elevated incidence of breast cancer compared to their lower-SES counterparts. A comprehensive meta-analysis of European studies revealed a significantly increased incidence among women with higher socioeconomic status (Summary Relative Risk [SRR] 1.25, 95% CI: 1.17-1.32) . This pattern contrasts with what is observed in many other cancers, where higher incidence typically associates with lower SES.

Global Patterns in Breast Cancer Incidence
The global distribution of breast cancer incidence reveals substantial socioeconomic patterning. Analysis of data from the Global Burden of Disease Study 2021 demonstrated that breast cancer incidence was significantly concentrated in countries with high Human Development Index (HDI) scores (Relative Concentration Index [RCI] = 0.09, 95% CI: 0.06 to 0.13) . This reflects the international disparity in breast cancer detection and diagnosis, with higher-income nations typically reporting greater incidence rates due to a combination of risk factor profiles and more comprehensive cancer detection systems.

Table 1: Socioeconomic Distribution of Breast Cancer Incidence Globally

HDI Category	Incidence Concentration	Mortality Concentration	DALYs Concentration
High HDI	Significant concentration (RCI = 0.09)	No significant concentration (RCI = 0)	No significant concentration (RCI = 0.02)
Low HDI	Lower reported incidence	Disproportionate mortality burden	Higher disability burden

Risk Factor Distribution Across SES Groups

The elevated breast cancer incidence among high-SES women in developed countries is largely explained by the differential distribution of established reproductive, hormonal, and lifestyle risk factors. Compared to women with lower SES, those with higher SES are more likely to: delay childbearing or have fewer children; have shorter or less frequent breastfeeding; use hormone replacement therapy; consume more alcohol; and have higher body mass indices in postmenopausal years . Each of these factors independently contributes to increased breast cancer risk and collectively explains much of the incidence disparity across socioeconomic groups.

A multilevel analysis distinguishing individual- and community-level effects found that even after controlling for individual education and known risk factors, women living in higher-SES communities and urban areas had greater odds of developing breast cancer (OR 1.20, 95% CI: 1.05-1.37 for highest vs. lowest SES communities; OR 1.17, 95% CI: 1.06-1.28 for urban vs. rural communities) . This suggests that contextual factors beyond individual characteristics contribute to breast cancer incidence patterns.

Variations by Breast Cancer Subtype

Recent evidence indicates that the relationship between SES and breast cancer incidence varies substantially by molecular subtype. A comprehensive meta-analysis revealed that disadvantaged neighbourhood SES was associated with a decreased incidence of luminal A breast cancer (HR = 0.84, 95% CI: 0.73, 0.91) but significantly increased incidence of HER2-positive (HR = 1.46, 95% CI: 1.14, 1.78) and triple-negative breast cancers (HR = 1.39, 95% CI: 1.19, 1.69) . This subtype-specific gradient highlights the complex interplay between socioeconomic factors and breast cancer biology, with particularly aggressive forms disproportionately affecting women from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

Impact of Socioeconomic Status on Early Detection

Early detection through screening and timely diagnosis of symptomatic disease represents a critical determinant of breast cancer outcomes. Across all socioeconomic indicators, women with lower SES consistently experience substantial barriers to early detection, resulting in more advanced stage at diagnosis and consequently limited treatment options and worse prognosis.

Disparities in Screening Participation

Screening mammography utilization strongly correlates with socioeconomic status, particularly education and income levels. Women with higher educational attainment and household income are significantly more likely to participate in regular mammographic screening programs . This disparity stems from multiple factors including health knowledge, recommendations from healthcare providers, flexibility to take time o work, transportation access, and availability of screening facilities in higher income neighbourhoods.

The impact of health insurance on screening behaviour is particularly pronounced in the United States, where women with health insurance are more likely to receive screening mammograms compared to uninsured women . Even in countries with universal healthcare systems, however, socioeconomic gradients in screening participation persist, suggesting that insurance coverage alone is insufficient to eliminate screening disparities.

Stage at Diagnosis Variations

The cumulative impact of socioeconomic barriers to early detection is reflected in the advanced stage distribution among women with lower SES at diagnosis. A recent analysis of the Louisiana Tumour Registry data demonstrated that later stage at diagnosis mediated a substantial portion (11.2%) of the effect of low SES on overall mortality and 13.3% on breast cancer-specific mortality . This indicates that if socioeconomic disparities in stage at diagnosis were eliminated, a significant proportion of the survival disadvantage for low-SES women could be mitigated.

Disparities in stage at diagnosis are particularly pronounced among racial and ethnic minority groups, who are often overrepresented in lower socioeconomic strata. Black women in the U.S. are 30-40% more likely to be diagnosed at a later stage than White women . Globally, these disparities are even more striking, with approximately 75% of women in sub-Saharan Africa diagnosed at stage III or IV, when the disease is much harder to treat effectively .

Contextual and Neighbourhood Effects

Beyond individual socioeconomic characteristics, neighbourhood-level socioeconomic factors independently influence early detection outcomes. Women residing in disadvantaged neighbourhoods experience reduced access to screening facilities and specialist providers, even after accounting for their individual socioeconomic status . These neighbourhood effects operate through multiple pathways, including: limited availability of healthcare resources in low-income areas; transportation barriers; neighbourhood norms and social networks that influence health-seeking behaviours; and environmental stressors that compete with preventive health needs.

A systematic review and meta-analysis found that while disadvantaged neighbourhood SES was not significantly associated with overall breast cancer incidence risk (HR = 1.19; 95% CI 0.86, 1.65), it substantially impacted stage at diagnosis and subsequent mortality . This highlights the particular importance of neighbourhood context for cancer detection and control rather than initiation.

Socioeconomic Influences on Treatment Patterns

Disparities in breast cancer outcomes across socioeconomic groups are further exacerbated by differential access to and receipt of guideline-concordant treatment. Women with lower SES experience systematic barriers across the treatment continuum, from initial treatment planning to long-term adherence, ultimately contributing to poorer survival outcomes.

Access to Guideline-Concordant Care

Multiple studies demonstrate that low-SES breast cancer patients are less likely to receive standard treatment regimens consistent with evidence-based guidelines. A systematic review of U.S. studies found that women with lower SES were less likely to receive or experienced delays in receiving recommended treatments compared to their higher-SES counterparts . These disparities affected the entire spectrum of breast cancer care, including surgery, radiation, chemotherapy, and endocrine therapy.

The receipt of precision medicine interventions shows particularly stark socioeconomic gradients. The Oncotype DX (ODX) test, a genomic test that predicts chemotherapy benefit and recurrence risk for early-stage hormone receptor-positive breast cancer, demonstrates significantly lower utilization among low-SES women. In a study of 8,931 breast cancer patients, only 41.4% overall underwent ODX testing, with substantially lower rates in low-SES groups . Mediation analysis revealed that differences in ODX testing explained 9.0% of SES differences in overall mortality and 4.4% in breast cancer specific mortality, indicating that disparities in genomic testing contribute significantly to survival outcomes.

Treatment Adherence and Continuity

Socioeconomic factors profoundly influence patients' ability to initiate and maintain complete treatment courses. Women with low household income (<$25,000) were more likely to report treatment discontinuations compared to women with higher incomes (≥$50,000) . These disruptions in care continuity represent a crucial mechanism through which socioeconomic disadvantage translates into worse cancer outcomes.

Occupational status and work flexibility also impact treatment adherence. Women employed in low-wage jobs with inflexible work schedules experience significant challenges in maintaining treatment appointments and managing side effects while working . The financial toxicity of cancer treatment—including direct medical costs, transportation expenses, and lost wages—disproportionately affects low-SES patients and can force difficult trade-offs between treatment and other basic needs.

Mediating Role of Treatment Factors in Racial Disparities

The interplay between socioeconomic status and racial disparities in breast cancer outcomes highlights the central role of treatment factors. A landmark study of 35,029 older women with breast cancer found that African-American women were significantly more likely to live in the poorest quartiles of socioeconomic status than Whites (73.7% versus 20.7%) . After controlling for treatment and socioeconomic status, the hazard ratio for all-cause mortality was no longer significant in African-Americans (1.02; 0.841.10), while the risk of breast cancer-specific mortality was only marginally higher (1.21; 1.01-1.46) . These findings suggest that socioeconomic mediators, particularly through treatment access and quality, account for the majority of racial disparities in breast cancer survival.

Socioeconomic Status and Survival Outcomes

The cumulative impact of socioeconomic disparities across the cancer care continuum—from detection to treatment—manifests in substantial di erences in survival outcomes. Low SES consistently associates with increased mortality and reduced survival across diverse populations and healthcare systems, even after accounting for di erences in cancer stage and subtype.

Magnitude of Survival Disparities

Recent studies quantify the substantial survival penalty associated with low socioeconomic status. Analysis of the Louisiana Tumour Registry revealed that after adjusting for sociodemographic, tumour characteristic, and treatment variables, low-SES women had a 16% higher hazard of overall death (HR = 1.16, 95% CI: 1.02-1.32) and a 37% higher hazard of breast cancer-specific death (HR = 1.37; 95% CI: 1.01-1.87) compared to high-SES women . This survival gradient reflects the compounded disadvantages experienced by low-SES women throughout their cancer journey.

A systematic review and meta-analysis specifically examining neighbourhood socioeconomic status found a significant association between disadvantaged n-SES and higher breast cancer mortality risk (HR = 1.32, 95% CI: 1.16, 1.51) . This neighbourhood effect persists after accounting for individual-level socioeconomic factors, highlighting the importance of contextual influences on survival outcomes.

Mediating Pathways Between SES and Survival

The relationship between low SES and poor survival is not direct but operates through multiple mediating pathways. Sophisticated mediation analyses have quantified the contribution of various factors to socioeconomic disparities in survival. In one study, later stage at diagnosis explained 11.2% of the effect of low SES on overall mortality and 13.3% on breast cancer-specific mortality, while disparities in Oncotype DX testing explained 9.0% and 4.4% of these effects, respectively . These findings indicate that multiple intervenable factors along the cancer care continuum contribute to survival disparities.

Table 2: Mediators of Socioeconomic Disparities in Breast Cancer Survival

Mediating Factor	Proportion of Overall Mortality Disparity Mediated	Proportion of Breast Cancer Specific Mortality Disparity Mediated
Stage at Diagnosis	11.2%	13.3%
Oncotype DX Testing	9.0%	4.4%
Treatment Delays/Discontinuations	Not quantified but significant	Not quantified but significant
Comorbidities	Not quantified but significant	Not quantified but significant

Global Patterns in Socioeconomic Survival Disparities

The association between socioeconomic status and breast cancer survival demonstrates distinct patterns across economic development contexts. While high income countries generally show better overall survival rates, the within-country socioeconomic gradients are often steeper in these nations due to more substantial disparities in access to advanced treatments. In contrast, low- and middle-income countries typically demonstrate more pronounced survival disadvantages across all socioeconomic groups compared to high-income nations, but with different gradient patterns.

Analysis of global data reveals no significant socioeconomic inequality in breast cancer mortality (RCI = 0, 95% CI = -0.03 to 0.04) or DALY rates (RCI = 0.02, 95% CI: -0.02 to 0.06) at the between-country level, despite significant inequality in incidence . This suggests that the survival advantage associated with higher socioeconomic status within countries is not observed at the global level when comparing countries of different development levels, likely due to competing mortality risks and different healthcare system characteristics in low-income nations.

Intervention Strategies to Address Disparities

Reducing socioeconomic disparities in breast cancer outcomes requires coordinated, multilevel interventions targeting modifiable factors along the entire care continuum. Evidence-supported strategies range from policy-level initiatives to community-based programs and clinical practice improvements.

Policy and Health System Interventions

Health insurance expansion represents a foundational policy approach for reducing socioeconomic disparities in breast cancer care, particularly in non-universal coverage systems. Studies consistently demonstrate that uninsured and underinsured women experience later diagnosis and inferior outcomes compared to their adequately insured counterparts Insurance coverage alone, however, is insufficient to eliminate disparities, as evidenced by persistent gaps even in universal healthcare systems.

System navigation services have proven effective in helping vulnerable patients overcome barriers to care. These programs provide trained navigators who assist patients with scheduling appointments, transportation, understanding treatment recommendations, and addressing financial concerns. For low-SES patients facing complex healthcare systems, navigation significantly improves adherence to screening, diagnostic follow-up, and treatment completion.

Standardized treatment protocols and quality metrics can reduce variation in care quality across socioeconomic groups. When treatment decisions are guided by clear, evidence-based protocols rather than individual physician practice patterns

or patient socioeconomic characteristics, disparities in guideline-concordant care diminish. Similarly, monitoring and reporting quality measures by socioeconomic indicators can help health systems identify and address equity gaps.

Access-Enhancing Programs
Extended screening services beyond traditional clinical settings can improve early detection among low-SES women. Mobile mammography units bringing services to underserved communities, extended hours at screening facilities, and same-day diagnostic services reduce structural barriers to preventive care. Additionally, culturally tailored outreach and education programs addressing literacy and language barriers can increase screening participation among disadvantaged populations.

Financial assistance programs mitigating the out-of-pocket costs of cancer care can improve treatment adherence among low-income patients. These may include transportation assistance, medication copayment support, and lost wage replacement. Given the substantial financial toxicity of cancer treatment, particularly for patients with limited resources, such programs can prevent treatment abandonment or delay due to cost concerns.

Community-Based Approaches
Community health worker programs leveraging trusted local members have successfully improved cancer screening and follow-up in underserved communities. These lay providers o er culturally appropriate education, address misconceptions, facilitate connections to healthcare services, and provide social support throughout the cancer journey. Partnerships with community organizations can extend the reach of cancer control initiatives into disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Faith-based institutions, social service agencies, and community centres serve as accessible venues for education, screening promotion, and support services, reducing the stigma and distrust sometimes associated with formal healthcare institutions.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION
Key Findings and Implications
This comprehensive review demonstrates the profound and persistent impact of socioeconomic factors on breast cancer detection and survival outcomes. The evidence reveals that women with lower socioeconomic status experience a double burden in breast cancer: while they generally have lower incidence rates (in high-income countries), they face significantly worse survival outcomes due to later stage at diagnosis and inferior treatment access. The socioeconomic gradient in breast cancer survival represents a critical equity challenge requiring coordinated solutions across multiple levels of the healthcare system and society
.

The findings have several important implications for clinical practice and health system organization. First, the consistent socioeconomic patterning of advanced stage at diagnosis underscores the need for enhanced early detection strategies specifically tailored to vulnerable populations. Second, the substantial disparities in receipt of precision diagnostics and guideline-concordant treatment highlight the importance of standardized care pathways and systematic barriers to state-of-the-art cancer care.

Third, the independent effects of neighbourhood-level socioeconomic factors suggest the need for place-based interventions targeting geographic areas with concentrated disadvantage.

Clinical and Public Health Recommendations
Based on the evidence synthesized in this review, we propose the following recommendations for addressing socioeconomic disparities in breast cancer outcomes:

1. Risk-Stratified Screening Interventions: Implement targeted outreach and navigation for screening-eligible women in low-SES communities, addressing both individual and structural barriers to participation.
2. Standardized Diagnostic and Treatment Pathways: Develop and implement clear clinical pathways with decision support to minimize variation in care quality related to patient socioeconomic characteristics.
3. Systematic Socioeconomic Assessment: Incorporate standardized assessment of socioeconomic barriers (financial toxicity, transportation needs, health literacy) into routine cancer care, with triggered support services.
4. Resource-Sensitive Follow-Up Care: Develop flexible, lower-intensity survivorship care models that maintain quality while reducing burdens on patients with limited resources.
5. Policy Initiatives for Financial Protection: Implement policies limiting out-of pocket costs for essential cancer services and providing income support during active treatment periods.

Future Research Directions
While significant evidence documents socioeconomic disparities in breast cancer outcomes, important knowledge gaps remain. Future research should:

6. Elucidate Mechanisms: Investigate the specific pathways through which socioeconomic disadvantage influences biological processes in breast cancer progression and treatment response.

7. Evaluate Implementation Strategies: Develop and test e ective implementation strategies for translating evidence-based interventions into diverse clinical and community settings serving vulnerable populations.

8. Examine Cumulative Impacts: Explore the cumulative impact of socioeconomic disadvantage across the life course on breast cancer outcomes, including intergenerational e ects.

9. Global Comparative Studies: Conduct comparative studies across healthcare systems to identify policies and practices that most e ectively mitigate socioeconomic disparities.

10. Patient-Engaged Research: Partner with patients from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds to prioritize research questions and develop acceptable, feasible interventions.

CONCLUSION

Socioeconomic factors exert a powerful influence on breast cancer detection and survival through complex, multifactorial pathways operating at individual, community, and health system levels. Women with lower socioeconomic status experience substantial disadvantages in early detection, access to precision diagnostics, receipt of guideline-concordant treatment, and ultimate survival outcomes. Addressing these disparities requires comprehensive, multilevel approaches that simultaneously target healthcare delivery, social supports, and economic policies. Through coordinated e orts across the cancer control continuum, the goal of equitable breast cancer outcomes for all women, regardless of socioeconomic background, becomes increasingly attainable.

REFERENCES

1. Siegel RL, Giaquinto AN, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2024. CA Cancer J Clin . 2024;74(1):12-49. doi:10.3322/caac.21820

2. DeSantis CE, Ma J, Gaudet MM, et al. Breast cancer statistics, 2019. CA Cancer J Clin . 2019;69(6):438-451. doi:10.3322/caac.21583

3. Harper S, Lynch J, Meersman SC, Breen N, Davis WW, Reichman MC. Trends in area socioeconomic and race-ethnic disparities in breast cancer incidence, stage at diagnosis, screening, mortality, and survival among women ages 50 years and over (1987-2005). Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev . 2009;18(1):121-131. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-08-0679

4. Dalton SO, Ross L, Düring M, et al. Influence of socioeconomic factors on survival after breast cancer—a nationwide cohort study of women diagnosed with breast cancer in Denmark 1983-1999. Int J Cancer . 2007;121(11):2527-2534. doi:10.1002/ijc.22979

5. Quaglia A, Lillini R, Mamo C, Ivaldi E, Vercelli M; SEIH (Socio-Economic Indicators, Health) Group. Socio-economic inequalities: a review of methodological issues and the relationships with cancer survival. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol . 2013;85(3):266-277. doi:10.1016/j.critrevonc.2012.08.007

6. Palència L, Espelt A, Rodríguez-Sanz M, et al. Socio-economic inequalities in breast and cervical cancer screening practices in Europe: influence of the type of screening program. Int J Epidemiol . 2010;39(3):757-765. doi:10.1093/ije/dyq051

7. Zackrisson S, Andersson I, Manjer J, Janzon L. Non-attendance in breast cancer screening is associated with unfavourable socio-economic circumstances and advanced carcinomas. Acta Radiol . 2004;45(2):151-156. doi:10.1080/02841850410003681

8. Peek ME, Han JH. Disparities in screening mammography. Current status, interventions and implications. J Gen Intern Med . 2004;19(2):184-194. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.30254.x

9. Newman LA, Gri ith KA, Jatoi I, Simon MS, Crowe JP, Colditz GA. Meta-analysis of survival in African American and white American patients with breast cancer: ethnicity compared with socioeconomic status. J Clin Oncol . 2006;24(9):1342-1349.

10. Wheeler SB, Reeder-Hayes KE, Carey LA. Disparities in breast cancer treatment and outcomes: biological, social, and health system determinants and opportunities for research. Oncologist . 2013;18(9):986-993. doi:10.1634/theoncologist.2013-0243

11. Ha ty BG, Yang Q, Reiss M, et al. Locoregional relapse and distant metastasis in conservatively managed triple negative early-stage breast cancer. J Clin Oncol . 2006;24(36):5652-5657. doi:10.1200/JCO.2006.06.7804

12. Walker GV, Grant SR, Guadagnolo BA, et al. Disparities in stage at diagnosis, treatment, and survival in nonelderly adult patients with cancer according to insurance status. J Clin Oncol . 2014;32(28):3118-3125. doi:10.1200/JCO.2014.55.6258

13. Smith EC, Ziogas A, Anton-Culver H. Association between insurance and socioeconomic status and risk of advanced stage cancer at diagnosis in the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program, 1992-2007. Cancer Causes Control . 2014;25(7):829-835. doi:10.1007/s10552-014-0382-8

14. Gorey KM, Holowaty EJ, Fehringer G, et al. An international comparison of cancer survival: relatively poor areas. J Epidemiol Biostat . 2001;6(5):403-414. doi:10.1080/13595220152601837

15. Sparano JA, Gray RJ, Ravdin PM, et al. Clinical and Genomic Risk to Guide the Use of Adjuvant Therapy for Breast Cancer. N Engl J Med . 2019;380(25):2395-2405. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1904819

16. Paik S, Tang G, Shak S, et al. Gene expression and benefit of chemotherapy in women with node-negative, estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer. J Clin Oncol . 2006;24(23):3726-3734. doi:10.1200/JCO.2005.04.7985

17. Sparano JA, Gray RJ, Makower DF, et al. Clinical Outcomes in Early Breast Cancer With a High 21-Gene Recurrence Score of 26 to 100 Assigned to Adjuvan Chemotherapy Plus Endocrine Therapy: A Secondary Analysis of the TAILORx Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Oncol . 2020;6(3):367-374. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2019.4794

18. Daly MB, Pilarski R, Yurgelun MB, et al. NCCN Guidelines Insights: Genetic/Familial High-Risk Assessment: Breast, Ovarian, and Pancreatic, Version 1.2020. J Natl Compr Canc Netw . 2020;18(4):380-391. doi:10.6004/jnccn.2020.0017