'Going-to-have-cancerness': a study of living with increased risk of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations for six South Island women
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ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION: Mutations in the BRCA (breast cancer) 1 and 2 genes are thought to lead to 5–10% of breast cancers.

AIM: A qualitative study to explore six New Zealand women's experiences of living with increased risk for a genetic susceptibility to breast cancer.

METHODS: Six women were interviewed using semi-structured interviews, to explore their experiences of living at high risk for developing breast cancer due to familial and/or individual genetic susceptibilities. Results were analysed using thematic coding. After a three-year interval, interviewees were contacted again to discuss their experiences (although two were lost to follow-up).

FINDINGS: The women held fatalistic views on developing cancer and drew on family experience as much as biomedical research to assess their situation. They became increasingly immersed in biomedical screening and prophylaxis without accompanying improvement to their peace of mind and with unrealistic ideas of it 'preventing' cancer. The biomedical management options and advice they reported receiving was factually inconsistent and a discrepancy emerged between women's expectations of breast cancer health services (including genetic testing) and the delivered support and services.

CONCLUSION: This small sample group cannot be used to draw implications on the views of the wider group of higher risk patients, but for these six women, genetic testing, screening and prophylaxis have not provided peace of mind; rather the reverse has occurred. The findings are provocative as they challenge the biomedical idea of patients' experience of managing their genetic risk information as routinely positive.
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Introduction

This paper explores six patients' experiences of living with a familial and/or individual genetic susceptibility for breast cancer which is the most common cancer diagnosed in females in New Zealand. Only 5–10% of these breast cancers are thought to develop from a genetic susceptibility through mutations in the BRCA (breast cancer) 1 and 2 genes. The genetic mutation can be inherited either paternally, maternally or arise de novo and demonstrates variable penetrance. As genetic testing cannot determine who of those with BRCA mutations will develop breast cancer, the age of onset or the severity of the malignancy (if diagnosed), the clinical usefulness of BRCA test results is somewhat difficult to assess.

Furthermore, while previously a confirmed genetic susceptibility was thought to place the lifetime cumulative risk for developing breast cancer at 87% by the age of 70,9 there is now disagreement about the magnitude of the risk associated with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations and recent meta-analyses of BRCA penetrance provide differing estimates depending upon the sub-populations analysed. Some estimates suggest a 48% cancer risk by age 75 years for BRCA1 and 32% up to 75 years for BRCA2.10,11,12
developing breast cancer at 70 years of age have been estimated to be 55% for BRCA1 and 47% for BRCA2.\textsuperscript{12} However, the actual risk level is often unknown for breast (and other cancers)\textsuperscript{6} relative to the specific mutation present in the family.\textsuperscript{3,8}

Studies of primary health care provision to the affected patients suggest wide cultural variations in practice.\textsuperscript{13} Anglo-Saxon countries view the value of genetic testing as a means of preventing cancer in which patients carry high responsibilities for making appropriate lifestyle changes. French guidelines, on the other hand, favour the preservation of fertility and bodily integrity. Variations in referral for genetic testing exist within Anglo-Saxon countries as well\textsuperscript{14} with suggestions from the USA for more uniform approaches to both communicating and assessing risk. A recent USA survey demonstrated a trend for family physicians to refer inappropriate (i.e. low risk) patients for genetic testing when the patients themselves request the service.\textsuperscript{15} Internationally there have been several studies noting the need for better understanding of the principles of genetic risk assessment by primary and tertiary health care providers;\textsuperscript{16,17,18} the value of providing education programmes;\textsuperscript{19–22} and the need to focus on education in how to approach the topic of risk in concrete terms within clinical practice rather than in abstracted terms of bioethics or biological science.\textsuperscript{23,24} A United Kingdom (UK) study from 2002 exploring patients’ understandings of GP consultations over presumed high familial risk of breast cancer indicated that GPs had a major task of reassurance. Failure to reassure in these circumstances resulted from the GPs lacking awareness that patients frequently held very different understandings of the mechanisms of disease and heredity in relation to their specific medical risk.\textsuperscript{24}

This paper explores how six New Zealand women lived with the knowledge of the increased familial and/or personal risks of cancers associated with BRCA1 and 2 mutations against the broader backdrop of these studies. This project was conducted as research for a Masters Thesis in Health Sciences (Bioethics).

Methods

A semi-structured interview on the general topic of living with a high familial and/or individual risk of breast cancer, lasting one to two hours, was undertaken with six women who had considered genetic counselling for their perceived high risk for a BRCA mutation. The participants represented five distinct families with increased familial risk for the mutations in the South Island. The first round of interviews was conducted during 2003/2004, the second interviews in 2007, although two participants were lost to follow-up (via illness and relocation). The second interviews captured data regarding the continued experience of living with the knowledge of increased risk.

Table 1 contains a summary of the demographic characteristics of the participants. All six identified with New Zealand European ethnicity and four out of six participants had been tested prior to the first round of interviews. Since the first interviews, two of the participants each have had a sister diagnosed with breast cancer.

The initial interviews covered the topics of participants’ experiences of a family history of breast cancer, their understanding of the risk of a predisposition to inherited breast cancer, issues around screening recommendations and prophylactic interventions, influences on deciding whether to undergo genetic counselling and/or testing, the use of genetic testing, impacts on relationships once genetic test results are known, disclosure of any genetic information gained, and methods used to adjust to the information. The second interviews reviewed participants’ original comments to evaluate the relevance of the initial findings to their current views.

Data collection and analysis was qualitative, based on audiotaped interviews, transcribed verbatim and returned to each participant for checking. Selected interview passages were thematically coded\textsuperscript{25} and then collated into common themes of interest by the first author and checked by the second author.

These results cannot be used to predict wider trends in this subpopulation of high risk women because of the small number of participants; however they do reflect the views of members of five different families within the South Island. Morse suggests that six participants are adequate for distilling the ‘essence of experience’ and
WHAT GAP THIS FILLS

What we already know: The responsibilities of primary care providers to explain and refer individuals and families for genetic testing is interpreted differently in different cultural settings. Furthermore, patients may not share the same understanding of genetics and heredity as providers, with resulting difficulties in establishing a common base of knowledge.

What this study adds: This small South Island study explores six patients’ perspectives of the experiences of living longer-term with personal and familial risk for BRCA1 and 2 mutations. It demonstrates the difference in their understandings of their risk to that of conventional biomedical and primary care accounts of such risk, and the implications of this difference.

Findings

The eight themes identified (see Table 2) were common to all six interviewees at first interview. At second interview, themes 1, 5, 6, and 8 emerged as increasingly dominant for the remaining four women in the study.

Discussion

At first interview, all the informants spoke to all eight themes with equal emphasis (Table 2) indicating that the narrative of living with BRCA1 and 2 mutation risk was organised around these social experiences. Over the three-year interval, however, these women’s lived experiences of managing high familial and/or personal risks of cancer caused them to shift anxiously towards deeper medicalisation (theme 6) of lives that (for five out of six of them) were seemingly healthy. The women spoke of living with an increased cancer risk as a state of ‘hypochondria’, ‘paranoia’, ‘stress’, ‘anxiety’ and having it always ‘at the back of your mind’. Another less obvious effect was the implication from their GPs that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5*</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment method</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>Advert</td>
<td>Medical Specialist</td>
<td>Advert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at first interview</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at testing</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Untested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td>3 years high school</td>
<td>School cert.</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>Polytech cert.</td>
<td>Trade cert.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant cancer diagnosis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutation confirmed</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not tested</td>
<td>No useful result</td>
<td>Not tested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of relatives tested —mutation confirmed</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of relatives tested —no mutation detected</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3/6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of relatives diagnosed with breast cancer (at 1st interview)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of relatives diagnosed with other cancers (at 1st interview)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GS: Genetic Service

*Lost to follow-up (i.e. moved, presumed deceased) at time of 2nd interview
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Part of this negative experience was expressed in the women’s dismay at the lack of a BRCA register for high-risk women, as they considered themselves ‘abandoned’ by the medical professionals. During the time in which they had become alerted to their high risk status, as noted, the lifetime risk of developing cancer from BRCA1 and 2 mutations had been recalculated downwards; however the women were unaware of this trend, despite their information-seeking behaviours (theme 4). Women also expressed their awareness of an underlying imperative from their primary health care providers that, when making the decision about testing, the ‘right’ decision was to be tested. This belied women’s subsequent experiences of resulting difficulties ‘add together’ screening procedures for ‘increased protection’ (theme 5) indicating that participants were confused in their understandings of the advice offered about screening’s value. It could also indicate that they were offered inappropriate advice—an aspect of primary health care that has been criticised both nationally and internationally.27,39 All reported negatively the conflicting nature of the information that they received from this variety of sources and distrust and disillusionment emerged over the level of knowledge expressed by their local GPs. For example, most women reported being told that male family members could not transmit BRCA1 and 2 mutations to offspring and men were generally not invited for testing in high risk families. One deeply angry woman had been told the familial risk was on her ‘father’s side of the family’ and thus would not apply to her, and then developed breast cancer. The constant information searching (theme 4) was used to double-check the information from their local doctors. The implications are troubling for patient care. For instance, inappropriate use of screening could hold costing implications if these women’s experiences are shown in a wider study to reflect a common response.

Women also expressed their awareness of an underlying imperative from their primary health care providers that, when making the decision about testing, the ‘right’ decision was to be tested. This belied women’s subsequent experiences of resulting difficulties in living…and the impossibility of unlearning the knowledge gained from genetic testing.

The accepted risk management of high-risk women is through the use of screening and prophylactic measures (e.g. bilateral mastectomy, oophorectomy, and chemoprevention) recommended on the basis of ‘presumed efficacy’30 and ‘expert opinion’ rather than empirical evidence.8,10 In line with this, all of the women reported being encouraged to take up long-term screening by their local physicians. However, over time they spoke of the screening as coming to represent a talisman for cancer-free existence. They tended to

While appropriate management of at-risk individuals can also involve the consideration of surgical prophylaxis,4,8,11 in this study most participants tended to initially avoid breast surgery, opting instead for oophorectomy, while continuing a breast surveillance regime.10,37 However, breast surgery appeared to be more readily considered as time passed and concerns over personal risk continued. Chemoprevention (e.g. Tamoxifen) is another
route to prophylaxis, although the optimal dose and treatment duration is unknown, there are side effects,\textsuperscript{15,16} and concerns efficacy may be compromised by the tumour’s hormonal status.\textsuperscript{9} However, chemoprevention was not reported by the women to have been considered. The New Zealand Guidelines Group recommends all such options be discussed with very high risk women i.e. BRCA1 and 2 mutation carriers.\textsuperscript{8}

Even so, how adequately these prophylactic options might be conveyed to patients is a moot point given the incorrect understandings these women already exhibited regarding the purpose of screening. Similar problems of interpretation arose over the significance of test results and genetic counselling. Women with a confirmed mutation, for instance, indicated that it was difficult to comprehend the possibility of a gene mutation being present yet not expressed. Because prophylaxis only reduces risks for the individual, some women in this study were considering the possibility of either forgoing childbearing or using egg donors to remove the risk of the mutation being passed on to their children. These intentions highlight the concerns raised in themes 3, 6 and 7. Increasingly, in vitro fertilisation clinics offer preimplantation embryo testing for BRCA mutations and are discarding carrier embryos because of their associated predisposition for disease risk.\textsuperscript{14} Such contemporary clinical practices (in the context of the declining BRCA1 and 2 risk estimates) convey the same thread of genetic fatalism (theme 3) that the women reported of themselves. Uncoupling risk from personal destiny and a mutation from its full expression would appear then to be a conceptual task required on both sides of the consultation desk.

In conclusion, these results, while not representative of the whole population, are still interesting as they provide an alternative to the predominant medical view of the usefulness of genetic knowledge to individual patients. The fatalistic emotional and intuitive experience of genetic risk which these women described as ‘going-to-have-cancerness’ coupled with the sense of failure of expected support from the health care system created a negative experience of anxiety, futility and guilt. In light of the downward numerical movement of risk calculations, this creates a moral imperative for health care providers to provide frank discussions of this currently confusing state of risk assessment and also to discover a means of keeping in touch with clients to update them of changes in their risk status. Careful enquiry into how people make sense of their risk status as time progresses is also needed. While a role exists for GPs in ongoing education and support of these women, as previously noted, this support needs to be factually correct, to avoid genetic fatalism, and (given these women’s experiences) to be critically informed as to the benefits of not testing. Finally, the study suggests the value of a wider and systematic enquiry into the experiences of living with high personal or familial risk of BRCA1 and 2 mutations. In such a study, the views of medical practitioners on the management of such cases (e.g. referrals between primary, secondary and tertiary service providers) would also give a more complete understanding of the situation surrounding the long-term management of living with this genetic knowledge.
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