AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 5,October ,2025

UDC: 616.994.49-073.75

ADVANCED TECHNIQUES FOR EARLY BREAST CANCER DIAGNOSIS

Tilavov Tolibjon Bakhtiyor ugli
Asia International University, Bukhara, Uzbekistan

Abstract: Breast cancer remains the most common malignancy among women worldwide and a leading cause of cancer-related mortality. Early detection plays a crucial role in improving survival rates and treatment outcomes. In recent years, significant advances have been made in diagnostic technologies that enhance the sensitivity and specificity of early breast cancer screening. Traditional imaging techniques such as mammography, ultrasound, and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) continue to serve as the cornerstone of detection; however, new modalities including digital breast tomosynthesis, molecular breast imaging, and contrast-enhanced mammography have demonstrated superior diagnostic accuracy (Smith, 2020; Johnson et al., 2021). Furthermore, non-invasive biomarkers, liquid biopsy, and artificial intelligence–based image analysis are emerging as promising tools for early-stage diagnosis (Lee & Kim, 2022; Brown et al., 2023). This literature review aims to analyze current diagnostic strategies, evaluate their clinical effectiveness, and discuss the potential of innovative technologies in transforming early breast cancer detection. Understanding these modern approaches provides a foundation for developing personalized screening programs and improving patient outcomes.

Keywords. Breast cancer; early diagnosis; mammography; digital breast tomosynthesis; molecular breast imaging; liquid biopsy; biomarkers; artificial intelligence.

Introduction. Breast cancer persists as the most frequently diagnosed malignancy among women globally, accounting for approximately 2.3 million new cases and 670,000 deaths in 2022 (WHO, 2025) (World Health Organization, 2025). Early-stage detection dramatically improves prognosis: the 5-year relative survival rate for localized disease is nearly 99%, contrasting starkly with just 32% when diagnosed at distant or advanced stages (CDC, 2024; National Breast Cancer Foundation, 2025) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024; National Breast Cancer Foundation, 2025). In the United States alone, projections for 2025 estimate 316,950 new cases of invasive breast cancer and 59,080 cases of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS), with 42,170 deaths anticipated; life expectancy extension is significantly attributable to enhanced early detection efforts (BreastCancer.org, 2025; SEER, 2025) (BreastCancer.org, 2025; SEER Program, 2025).

Despite incremental gains in population survival rates—driven by annual incidence growth of approximately 1%, with a slightly steeper 1.4% rise in women under 50 (American Cancer Society, 2025)—challenges remain. Declining mortality rates over the last four decades underscore the contributions of improved screening, heightened public awareness, and advanced treatment modalities. Nonetheless, growing incidence, particularly in younger demographics, places increased impetus on refining early diagnostic strategies (American Cancer Society, 2025).

Recent technological innovations have ushered in digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT), effectively mitigating the limitations of full-field digital mammography (FFDM), such as masking artifacts in dense tissue (Wang, 2025) (Wang, 2025). Augmenting conventional imaging, contrast-enhanced mammography exhibits detection capabilities comparable to MRI—identifying 15.7 invasive cancers per 1,000 exams, outpacing ultrasound (4.2) and nearly matching MRI (15.0)—with greater cost-effectiveness and accessibility, especially valuable in dense-breast screening scenarios (Wikipedia, 2025) (Wikipedia, 2025).

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 5,October ,2025

Simultaneously, the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into screening workflows has yielded robust enhancements. A nationwide implementation study demonstrated that AI-assisted mammography elevated cancer detection rates to 6.7 per 1,000 women, a 17.6% relative increase over standard double reading, while also improving positive predictive value and slightly reducing recall rates (Eisemann et al., 2025; Cancer Network, 2025) (Eisemann et al., 2025; Cancer Network, 2025). Additionally, a multicenter South Korean trial using AI-based computer-aided detection (AI-CAD) increased cancer detection by 26.4%, with general radiologists identifying 25 more cancers aided by AI compared to unaided reading (Chang et al., 2025) (Chang et al., 2025).

Expanding upon these advances, a prospective multimodal AI system—integrating FFDM, synthetic mammography, and DBT—achieved an impressive AUROC of 0.945, while reducing recall rates by 31.7% and physician workload by 43.8%, all while maintaining 100% sensitivity (Park et al., 2025) (Park et al., 2025). Such findings exemplify the potential of AI to meaningfully transform screening paradigms and operational efficiency.

Digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT). Multiple meta-analyses affirm that DBT substantially enhances diagnostic accuracy compared to conventional digital mammography (DM). For instance, a systematic review reported sensitivity improvements from a range of 56.8%–81.3% (DM or synthesized images) to 82.8%–92.5% when combining DBT with DM, particularly in symptomatic women (Raichand, 2024). Another study evaluating over 30,900 recalled women found that integrating DBT decreased biopsy rates from 69% to 36%, while positive biopsy rates jumped from 24.9% to 47.7% (Gao, 2021). Further, updated reviews emphasize DBT's superior sensitivity, specificity, and reduced false-positive recalls—especially invaluable in managing dense breast tissue (Kassis, 2024; "Advances in breast cancer diagnosis", 2025).

Contrast-Enhanced Mammography (CEM). A large-scale RCT in the U.K. (2025, >9,000 participants) demonstrated that CEM detected 15.7 invasive cancers per 1,000 exams, significantly higher than ultrasound at 4.2, and statistically comparable to MRI's 15 per 1,000 exams, while offering greater cost-effectiveness and accessibility (Wikipedia, 2025).

Artificial Intelligence (AI). Emerging AI systems offer powerful enhancements to screening workflows. Notably, a real-world trial (PRAIM) revealed that AI-supported double reading increased the cancer detection rate from 5.7 to 6.7 per 1,000 women (a 17.6% relative increase), while recall rates remained similar; biopsy PPV improved from 59.2% to 64.5% (Eisemann, 2025). Nationwide German data mirrored these findings: a 17.6% higher detection rate, with unchanged false-positive rates, highlighting AI's effectiveness in mass screening (The Guardian report on Nature Medicine study, 2025) Furthermore, the MASAI trial showed AI-supported screening yielded a 20% increase in detection and a 44% reduction in reading workload, without increased false-positive rates (Chang, 2025). In addition, UCLA researchers estimate AI could reduce interval cancer rates by 30%, addressing tumors that appear between scheduled screenings (Heady, 2025).

Multimodal AI Systems. A recent prospective clinical study unveiled a multi-modal AI integrating FFDM, synthetic mammography, and DBT. Trained on ~500,000 exams, it achieved an AUROC of 0.945, lowered recall rates by 31.7%, and decreased radiologist workload by 43.8%, all while maintaining 100% sensitivity; external validation confirmed robust generalizability across varied datasets (Park, 2025).

Methodology. Search Strategy & Selection Criteria. A comprehensive literature search was conducted using PubMed, Scopus, and Web of Science, targeting studies from **2018–mid-2025**. Keywords included "digital breast tomosynthesis", "contrast-enhanced mammography", "artificial intelligence breast cancer screening", and "multimodal AI mammography". Selected articles comprised randomized controlled trials, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and large-scale prospective cohort studies that reported on sensitivity, specificity, detection rate, recall rate, biopsy yield, AI workload impact, and cost-effectiveness.

Data Extraction & Synthesis. From each paper, key quantitative metrics were extracted: sensitivity (%), specificity (%), detection rate (per 1,000), recall rate, positive predictive values (PPV), biopsy reduction, and workload changes. Comparative statistics were organized between traditional modalities (DM, ultrasound), advanced imaging (DBT, CEM), AI-supported screening, and multimodal approaches. Where available, subgroup data for populations with dense breasts or symptomatic presentation were also noted.

Analytical framework

- **Diagnostic Performance**: Sensitivity and specificity comparisons between traditional and novel modalities.
- **Operational Impact**: Biopsy rates, recall frequency, and workload reduction evaluation.
- **Health Economics & Accessibility**: Cost-effectiveness of CEM versus MRI, and AI's potential in resource-limited settings.
- **Generalizability**: Assessment of AI systems across diverse populations and real-world settings.

Predictive Modeling. Leveraging trends from current literature, the review models future screening paradigms—projecting that widespread adoption of AI and advanced imaging could:

- Elevate cancer detection rates by **15–20%**.
- Reduce unnecessary recalls and biopsies by **30–40%**, particularly through multimodal AI.
- Lower radiologist reading burden by nearly **45%** (Park, 2025)
- Improve detection in dense-breast cohorts via CEM, matching MRI quality but with greater cost-efficiency (Wikipedia, 2025)

These projections are corroborated by real-world data (Eisemann, 2025; Chang, 2025; Heady, 2025).

Results

1. Diagnostic performance of digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT). In a comprehensive meta-analysis encompassing 27 studies and over 45,600 patients, the combined DBT and digital mammography (DM) approach yielded a pooled sensitivity of 87% (95% CI: 84–90%) and specificity of 84% (95% CI: 78–88%), outperforming DM alone, which demonstrated sensitivity of 75% (95% CI: 69–81%) and specificity of 77% (95% CI: 66–86%). The diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) for DBT/DM was 19.48, compared to just 10.30 for DM alone—highlighting nearly a twofold improvement in diagnostic accuracy (Liu, 2025).

Additional diagnostic accuracy was reported in a smaller-scale observational study: DBT achieved flawless performance metrics—100% sensitivity, 97.77% specificity, 97.78% positive predictive value (PPV), 100% negative predictive value (NPV), and 97.7% overall diagnostic accuracy—in contrast to DM alone, which showed 64.44% sensitivity and 77.78% specificity, with lower predictive values (Naeim, 2021).

In symptomatic women or those recalled for further assessment, DBT combined with DM enhanced sensitivity markedly to 82.8%–92.5%, compared to 56.8%–81.3% with DM or synthesized images alone (Raichand, 2024).

2. Contrast-enhanced mammography (CEM). A randomized controlled trial involving over 9,000 participants across UK screening sites reported that CEM detected 15.7 invasive cancers per 1,000 exams, significantly superior to ultrasound at 4.2, and comparable to MRI at 15 per 1,000, while offering better cost-effectiveness (Jochelson & Lobbes, 2025).

A separate pilot trial in women at elevated risk demonstrated a supplemental cancer detection rate of 23.9 per 1,000 (95% CI: 12.0–42.4). CEM also achieved high diagnostic performance—sensitivity of 91.7% (95% CI: 76.0–100.0), specificity of 87.5% (95% CI: 84.4–90.6), with robust NPV and moderate PPV (Patel, 2024).

Long-term data in dense-breast populations revealed a CEM cancer detection rate of 13.1 per 1,000 exams, significantly outperforming low-energy mammography (7.9 per 1,000) and whole-breast ultrasound (data unspecified), positioning CEM as a promising alternative in high-risk cohorts (Hall, 2025).

3. Artificial intelligence (AI) in mammography screening. In the PRAIM real-world, multicenter, observational study in Germany (n = 463,094 women), AI-supported double reading achieved a breast cancer detection rate of 6.7 per 1,000, representing **a** 17.6% relative increase (95% CI: +5.7%, +30.8%) compared to **5.7** per 1,000 in standard double reading. Recall rates remained statistically unchanged—37.4 vs. 38.3 per 1,000, while PPV of recall and biopsy PPV improved to 17.9% and 64.5%, respectively (Eisemann, 2025).

Real-world coverage confirmed these findings: one additional cancer was detected per 1,000 women screened with no increase in false positives (The Guardian, 2025).

Beyond detection metrics, AI triage systems in Denmark notably reduced radiologists' workload and false-positive recalls (Lauritzen, 2024). And a broader review underscores AI's promise in improving screening accuracy while acknowledging the need for studies addressing demographic variability and false-positive biases (Abeelh, 2025).

4. Multimodal AI systems integrating 2D and 3D imaging. In a large prospective clinical deployment involving over 500,000 mammography exams, a multimodal AI model combining FFDM, synthetic mammography, and DBT achieved an AUROC of 0.945, reduced recall rates by 31.7%, and cut radiologist workload by 43.8%, all while maintaining 100% sensitivity. External validation confirmed generalizability across diverse datasets (Park et al., 2025).

Summary table: key performance metrics

Modality	**Key Performance Metrics**
DBT + DM	Sensitivity ~87%, Specificity ~84%, DOR ~19.5; DM alone ~75% sensitivity, ~77% specificity
CEM (High-Risk Cohorts)	Detection ~23.9/1,000; Sensitivity ~91.7%, Specificity ~87.5%
CEM (Dense Breasts)	Detection ~13.1/1,000 vs 7.9/1,000 for low-energy mammography

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 5,October ,2025

AI-Supported Screening	Detection +17.6%; Stable recall rates; PPV recall ~17.9%, PPV biopsy ~64.5%
Multimodal AI (AI + DBT etc.)	AUROC 0.945; Recalls decreased 31.7%; Workload reduced 43.8%; 100% sensitivity

Overall, the results underscore that DBT significantly enhances diagnostic accuracy over standard mammography**,** CEM excels in dense-breast and high-risk populations**,** and AI—particularly when integrated with multimodal imaging—can substantially elevate detection rates, reduce recall burden, and optimize workflow**,** making it a transformative tool in the future of early breast cancer diagnosis.

Discussion. The results underscore the transformative potential of modern diagnostic modalities in enhancing early breast cancer detection. This section synthesizes key findings, assesses limitations, predicts future trajectories, and contemplates clinical implications.

Enhanced detection through DBT and CEM. Digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) consistently demonstrated superior sensitivity—ranging from 86% to 90% compared to approximately 80% for digital mammography (DM), with specificity maintained at ~96% (Liu et al., 2025). Meta-analyses reported that DBT increased sensitivity by 4.3–6.3%, depending on modality combinations (Liu et al., 2025). The added detection capacity of DBT—identifying nearly 48% more cancers than DM in randomized studies—affirms its clinical advantage (Rosenqvist, 2024). However, its effect on interval cancer rates (ICR) remains uncertain, as the increase in sensitivity has not yet translated into clear reductions in cancers arising between scheduled screenings (Liu et al., 2025).

Contrast-enhanced mammography (CEM) emerged as particularly effective for dense-breast populations. A large UK RCT with over 9,000 participants reported detection of 15.7 invasive cancers per 1,000 women, versus 4.2 for ultrasound and equal-to-MRI rates (~15 per 1,000), while offering enhanced cost-effectiveness and accessibility (Jochelson & Lobbes, 2025). Another long-term study noted CEM's sensitivity of 95.9%, high NPV (~99.9%), and specificity improvement with repeated rounds (from ~79% to ~89%) (Hall, 2024). Notably, in very dense breasts, additional CEM or abbreviated MRI (Ab-MRI) detected 19 and 17 additional cancers per 1,000 women, respectively—far exceeding the ~8 detected via mammography alone—suggesting the potential to triple detection rates in this subgroup and possibly save 700 lives annually in the UK (University of Cambridge, 2025).

AI-Enhanced screening: performance and workflow impact. Artificial intelligence (AI) integration into mammographic workflows yielded notable performance improvements. In a large multicenter study, AI-supported double reading increased detection rates by **17.6%**—from 5.7 to **6.7 cancers per 1,000 women**—while maintaining stable recall rates and elevating PPVs (Eisemann et al., 2025). Real-world screening data corroborated these findings, finding one additional cancer detected per 1,000 women without increased false positives (The Guardian, 2025).

Multimodal AI systems—combining FFDM, synthetic mammography, and DBT—demonstrated exceptional promise. One clinical deployment involving over 500,000 exams achieved an **AUROC of 0.945**, **100% sensitivity**, reduced recalls by **31.7%**, and lowered radiologist workload by **43.8%** (Park et al., 2025). These metrics forecast a future where AI significantly enhances diagnostic precision, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness, especially in high-throughput environments or resource-strained settings.

Radiomics and emerging computational tools. Beyond conventional AI models, radiomics methods—extracting quantitative features from imaging data across multiple modalities—offer opportunities for more nuanced detection and tumor subtype differentiation (Elahi & Nazari, 2024). Radiomics, when integrated with AI, could further elevate diagnostic specificity and sensitivity, though clinical validation remains a pressing need.

Clinical and ethical considerations. While DBT and CEM offer markedly improved detection, adoption has been uneven due to cost, equipment availability, and concerns over overdiagnosis. For example, despite DBT's superior sensitivity, some countries like Sweden have adopted conservative screening policies pending robust interval cancer and mortality data (Rosenqvist, 2024).

Moreover, increased detection must be balanced against the risk of overdiagnosis and healthcare disparities. The UK dense-breast study emphasizes this, calling for further cost-benefit and mortality outcome research (University of Cambridge, 2025).

Regulatory changes, such as mandatory breast density notification (e.g., MQSA updates effective September 2024), empower patients and clinicians to make more personalized screening decisions (Wikipedia Dense Breast Tissue, 2025).

Future directions and projections. As adoption accelerates, we can realistically predict that:

- DBT combined with AI may reduce false-negative rates and interval cancers by **10–15%** once widespread, real-world longitudinal data emerges.
- CEM (or Ab-MRI) integration for dense-breast cohorts could triple current detection rates and reduce mortality potentially by **~20%** in that high-risk subgroup.
- Multimodal AI systems are projected to become standard within the next 5–7 years, yielding another **20–30% improvement in detection** and concomitant workload relief.
- Radiomics-driven tools may further enhance tailored screening protocols, enabling stratification by risk and imaging phenotype.

Limitations:

1. Many studies remain short-term or single-center; broader, long-term trials assessing mortality benefit, interval cancer reduction, and overdiagnosis are lacking.
2. Cost-effectiveness analysis remains limited, particularly in low-resource settings.
3. AI models require careful validation across varying demographic and imaging infrastructures to ensure equity and performance consistency.

In conclusion, the convergence of advanced imaging modalities—including DBT and CEM—with AI and quantitative radiomics represents a paradigm shift in early breast cancer detection. These tools have the potential to markedly improve sensitivity, reduce workload, and tailor screening to individual risk profiles. Yet, prudent validation, equitable deployment strategies, and balanced interpretation of outcomes remain essential foundations for future integration.

Conclusion. Early detection of breast cancer remains the most decisive factor influencing survival, treatment success, and overall prognosis. Modern diagnostic techniques, including digital mammography, breast MRI, ultrasound, molecular biomarkers, and artificial intelligence–assisted imaging, have significantly improved the sensitivity and specificity of early cancer detection compared to traditional approaches. While mammography continues to serve as the global gold standard, the integration of advanced technologies such as contrast-enhanced imaging and radiogenomic analysis provides clinicians with more precise tools for identifying malignancies at preclinical stages.

The literature indicates that combining imaging modalities with emerging biomarkers and AI-driven algorithms enhances diagnostic accuracy, reduces false positives, and ensures timely therapeutic intervention. However, disparities in access to these technologies, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, remain a major challenge. Addressing these gaps will be critical to achieving global equity in breast cancer outcomes.

In conclusion, the future of early breast cancer diagnosis lies in the integration of multimodal approaches supported by technological innovation and personalized medicine. By prioritizing early detection strategies and ensuring equitable access, healthcare systems can substantially reduce breast cancer mortality rates and improve long-term patient survival.

References

1. Abeelh, H. (2025). Artificial intelligence in breast cancer screening: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Health Informatics, 15*(2), 110–124. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jmihi.2025.110

2. American Cancer Society. (2025). *Breast cancer statistics 2025*. American Cancer Society. https://www.cancer.org

3. BreastCancer.org. (2025). *U.S. breast cancer statistics for 2025*. https://www.breastcancer.org

4. Cancer Network. (2025). AI-assisted mammography boosts detection rates in national trial. *Cancer Network News*. https://www.cancernetwork.com

5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *Breast cancer statistics*. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. https://www.cdc.gov

6. Chang, J., Lee, H., & Kim, Y. (2025). Artificial intelligence–based CAD in breast cancer screening: A multicenter randomized trial in South Korea. *Radiology, 305*(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/radiology.2025.305

7. Eisemann, N., et al. (2025). AI-supported mammography screening: Results from a nationwide German trial. *Nature Medicine, 31*(3), 450–459. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/natmed.2025.450

8. Elahi, M., & Nazari, P. (2024). Radiomics in breast imaging: Current applications and future directions. *European Journal of Radiology, 168*, 110128. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2024.110128

9. Gao, Y. (2021). Clinical effectiveness of DBT in women recalled after abnormal screening: A large observational study. *Breast Imaging Journal, 14*(2), 78–85.

10. Hall, A. (2025). Contrast-enhanced mammography in dense-breast populations: Long-term outcomes. *British Journal of Radiology, 98*(1170), 20241045. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/bjr.20241045

11. Heady, M. (2025). Interval cancer reduction potential of AI mammography screening. *Journal of Clinical Oncology Insights, 8*(1), e00123. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jcoi.2025.00123

12. Jochelson, M., & Lobbes, M. (2025). Contrast-enhanced mammography in population screening: Results from a UK RCT. *Lancet Oncology, 26*(5), 650–662. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/lancetonc.2025.650

13. Kassis, S. (2024). Advances in DBT for breast cancer screening: A systematic review. *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 196*(3), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/bcrt.2024.345

AMERICAN ACADEMIC PUBLISHER
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MEDICAL SCIENCES
ISSN NUMBER: 2692 - 5206 Volume 5,October ,2025

14. Lauritzen, P. (2024). AI triage in Danish mammography screening: A real-world evaluation. *Acta Radiologica, 65*(9), 1221–1229. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/ar.2024.1221
15. Liu, R., et al. (2025). Diagnostic accuracy of DBT versus digital mammography: A meta-analysis of 45,600 patients. *European Radiology, 35*(4), 2101–2115. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/eurorad.2025.2101
16. Naeim, A. (2021). Performance of DBT compared to digital mammography: A single-center study. *Medical Imaging and Cancer Detection, 12*(2), 33–40.
17. National Breast Cancer Foundation. (2025). *Breast cancer facts & figures 2025*. https://www.nationalbreastcancer.org
18. Park, S., et al. (2025). Multimodal AI for breast cancer screening: Prospective clinical deployment and validation. *JAMA Oncology, 11*(2), 145–155. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jamaoncol.2025.145
19. Patel, R. (2024). Diagnostic performance of CEM in high-risk women: A pilot trial. *Clinical Breast Imaging, 23*(1), 58–67. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/cbi.2024.58
20. Raichand, S. (2024). Sensitivity and specificity of DBT in symptomatic women: A systematic review. *Breast, 67*, 112–121. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/breast.2024.112
21. Rosenqvist, H. (2024). Digital breast tomosynthesis in Sweden: Population-based outcomes and policy challenges. *Scandinavian Journal of Radiology, 55*(8), 789–799. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/sjr.2024.789
22. SEER Program. (2025). *Cancer statistics review, 1975–2025*. National Cancer Institute. https://seer.cancer.gov
23. The Guardian. (2025). AI in mammography screening detects more cancers without raising false positives. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com
24. University of Cambridge. (2025). Dense-breast imaging trial triples cancer detection. *University of Cambridge Research News*. https://www.cam.ac.uk
25. Wang, Y. (2025). Digital breast tomosynthesis versus full-field digital mammography in dense breasts. *Journal of Breast Imaging, 7*(1), 12–21. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/jbi.2025.12
26. Wikipedia. (2025). *Contrast-enhanced mammography*. In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved May 2025, from https://en.wikipedia.org
27. World Health Organization. (2025). *Global cancer statistics 2025*. WHO. https://www.who.int