

Table E1. Sensitivity and specificity of SM/DBT versus DM/DBT screens.

	Sensitivity			Specificity		
	% (ratio) (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted* OR (95% CI)	% (ratio) (95% CI)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted* OR (95% CI)
Combined						
DM/DBT	87.7% (499/569) (85–90.4)	Ref	Ref	92.6% (78,442/84,685) (92.5–92.8)	Ref	Ref
SM/DBT	88.3% (368/417) (85.2–91.3)	1.05 (0.71–1.56)	1.27 (0.79–2.06)	93.5% (61,430/65,692) (93.3–93.7)	1.15 (1.10–1.19)	0.95 (0.90–0.99)
Center 1						
DM/DBT	91.5% (205/224) (87.9–95.2)	Ref	Ref	91.6% (31,047/33,882) (91.3–91.9)	Ref	Ref
SM/DBT	87.7% (192/219) (83.3–92)	0.66 (0.36–1.22)	1.10 (0.48–2.53)	93.6% (31,769/33,961) (93.3–93.8)	1.32 (1.25–1.40)	1.04 (0.96–1.11)
Center 2						
DM/DBT	85.2% (294/345) (81.5–89)	Ref	Ref	93.3% (47,395/50,803) (93.1–93.5)	Ref	Ref
SM/DBT	88.9% (176/198) (84.5–93.3)	1.39 (0.81–2.37)	1.61 (0.82–3.19)	93.5% (29,661/31,731) (93.2–93.7)	1.03 (0.97–1.09)	0.84 (0.79–0.90)

* Adjusted for age, race, BMI, breast density, first degree family history, baseline versus subsequent, DBT round, and practice ID.

There was no statistically significant interaction between institution (University of Pennsylvania/University of Vermont) and screen type in the adjusted models for sensitivity ($P = .08$), but there was a statistically significant interaction for specificity ($P < .01$). OR: odds ratio, CI: confidence interval, DM: Digital Mammography, SM: Synthesized Mammography, DBT: Digital Breast Tomosynthesis, Center 1: University of Pennsylvania, Center 2: University of Vermont.