



Prevalence of Benign Breast Lesions, Epithelial Proliferations with or without Atypia in Calabar-A Retrospective Review

**G. A. Ebughe^{1*}, T. I. Ugbem¹, D. E. Ushie¹, S. Effewongbe¹, J. E. Udosen²
and M. S. Umoh²**

¹Department of Pathology, University of Calabar, Nigeria.
²Department of Surgery, University of Calabar, Nigeria.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author GAE designed the study, performed the statistical analysis, wrote the protocol and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Authors TIU and DEU managed the analyses of the study. Author DEU managed the literature searches. Authors SE, JEU and MSU also contributed in the literature search. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJTDH/2019/v37i130157

Editor(s):

(1) Dr. Arthur V. M. Kwena, Professor, Department of Medical Biochemistry, Moi University, Kenya.

Reviewers:

(1) Eleonore Fröhlich, Medical University of Graz, Austria.

(2) Kemal Karakaya, Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Turkey.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/49961>

Original Research Article

Received 22 April 2019
Accepted 01 July 2019
Published 08 July 2019

ABSTRACT

Aims: The aim of this study is to find out the prevalence of benign breast lesions and proliferative lesions which are associated with increase risk of breast cancer. This is aimed at influencing the hospital policy on mammographic screening.

Study Design: Descriptive retrospective study involving a trend analysis of benign breast lesion, proliferative analysed in the surgical pathology unit of the University of Calabar Teaching Hospital between 1st of January 2012 to October 31st 2014.

Place and Duration of Study: Pathology Department of the University of Calabar Teaching Hospital. The study was carried out between March and April 2019.

Methodology: Descriptive retrospective study of trend analysis of benign and proliferative breast lesions over the period with literature review.

Results: Two hundred and seventeen 217 patients consisting of seven males and two hundred and ten females with a female: Male ratio of 1:0.04. Mean age was 26.4 ± 10.0 years, ranging from 10 to 70 years, with 21-30 (94, 43.5%), as the predominant age and less than 21 years (70, 32.4%) as the second common age group. Seventy four percent of (74%) of the breast lesions were benign non proliferative lesions while 26% were proliferative breast lesions. Of the proliferative lesions, five or 8.9% of the proliferative or 2.33% of the lesions were atypical ductal hyperplasia's which have a high risk of progression to cancer.

Conclusion: Proliferative breast lesions and the premalignant lesions of the breast are not commonly reported in Calabar. An upscale of population screening and mammographic services may improve their yield which will help prevent some invasive breast cancers.

Keywords: Proliferative; benign; breast; Calabar.

1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of a breast lump in Calabar-Nigeria as it is everywhere evokes such deep anxiety in the patients and relations, young and old alike [1]. Myths about breast cancer still abound among Nigerians, uneducated and educated, because according to Anyanwu et al missed opportunities for breast cancer education fuel them [2]. The generally young populations in sub-Saharan Africa are reflected in the low mean ages of breast cancer patients for instance, 44 years was reported by Anyanwu et al South east Nigeria, 49 years by Ikeri et al. in Lagos Nigeria [3] and 46 years by Anakwenze et al. in Botswana [4]. There is a high rate of surgical treatment for breast lesions. The low per capita presence of ancillary radiological diagnostic tools and pathology service means that many of these lumps are not properly investigated before surgery. So, lesions that should ordinarily be managed conservatively end up being removed surgically.

Previous studies of benign breast lesions in Nigeria reported a preponderance of fibroadenoma, followed by Fibrocystic disease and inflammations such as acute and chronic mastitis in females and in males gynaecomastia [5-14]. This compares favourably with other sub-Saharan African studies [15], and reports from other tropical settings [16]. In the western world fibroadenoma or fibrocystic disease followed by radial scar/complex sclerosing lesion as well as atypical ductal hyperplasia and usual ductal hyperplasia were the common lesions [17]. The risk stratification of benign lesions regarding association with breast cancer ranges from low, in non-proliferative types to intermediate in the case of benign epithelial proliferations [18-23]. In the case of fibroadenomas Ben Hassouna et al. reported four cases of breast cancer arising from fibroadenoma [24]. Although in two of these

cases, the fibroadenomas were complex, with cystic areas, adenosis, apocrine metaplasia, whereas the other case had fibrocystic dysplasia and lobular neoplasia in adjacent parenchyma [24]. Among the benign epithelial proliferations in which fibrocystic disease typifies, Cheng et al reported that a single breast lump may present with heterogenous histology, sometimes, the components may bear different risk profiles [25]. This kind of expression they term Heterogenous benign breast disease HBBD [25].

The current concept presupposes that ductal epithelial proliferations are a direct precursor to breast cancer [26], and the spectrum ranges from usual ductal hyperplasia, through atypical ductal hyperplasia to carcinoma in situ and invasive carcinoma [26]. While at the usual ductal hyperplasia stage the cell is still benign, it has however taken the committed step towards malignancy [27,28]. It will then progress through atypical ductal hyperplasia stage to cancer [27,28]. Although the Nurses commissioned study concluded that the extent of atypicality did not directly correlate with the transformation to cancer [29], as one would expect. The risk of association of atypical lesions of the breast were further demonstrated in a study by Anastasiadis et al. in Greece who found that in frozen section examination of breast specimens, fibro adenosis tended to occur with benign breast lesions while atypical ductal hyperplasia tended to occur with breast cancer [30].

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A trend analysis of benign breast lesions diagnosed at the department of Pathology University of Calabar Teaching Hospital between 1st of January 2012 to October 31st 2014 was carried out. Data extraction form comprised of Demographic, clinical and pathologic reports of

these patients. Extracts comprised of, age, sex, symptoms type and duration, laterality of the lesions and diagnostic procedure as well as histological diagnosis. Only formalin fixed paraffin embedded breast tissue obtained by incision biopsy, excision biopsy and core needle biopsy were included in the study. Special stains and hormone receptor assays were not included in the study. Two hundred and seventeen (217) benign breast lesions were diagnosed during this period. Two were subsequently treated as missing data because they had no specific diagnosis other than they are being called benign lesions. The data was fed into IBM SPSS statistical data package version 21.0. The data was entered according to the classes of benign breast diseases proposed by Page et al 1985 which recognised proliferative and non-proliferative benign lesions as the two broad groups [31].

3. RESULTS

Data was obtained from 217 subjects consisting of seven males and two hundred and ten females with a female: male ratio of 1:0.04. Mean age was 26.4 ± 10.0 years, ranging from 10 to 70 years, with 21-30 (94, 43.5%), as the predominant age and less than 21 years (70, 32.4%) as the second common age group (Table 1).

Table 1. Sociodemographic characteristics of subjects (N=217)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	7	3.2
Female	210	96.8
Total	217	100
Age groups		
<21	70	32.4
21-30	94	43.5
31-40	29	13.4
41-50	19	8.8
51-60	1	0.5
61-70	3	1.4
Total	216	100

Table 2 shows that most of these breast diseases (166, 89.3%) occurred on the right (87, 46.8%) or left (79, 42.5%) sides, with approximately one-tenth (20, 10.8%) occurring on both sides (Table 2). Painless lump (167, 85.6%) was the commonest presenting complain. Two subjects (1.0%) each, had bloody and non-

bloody nipple discharge. Mean duration of presenting complain was 21.2 ± 30.5 months, ranging from less than one to 240 months.

Table 2. Morphologic and clinical presentation of benign breast disease and, proliferative disease, with or without atypia (N=217)

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Side of breast		
Right	87	46.8
Left	79	42.5
Both	20	10.8
Total	186	100
Presenting complain		
Painless lump	167	85.6
Painful lump	23	11.8
Bloody nipple discharge	2	1
Non-bloody nipple discharge	2	1
Multiple symptoms	1	0.5
Total	195	100

Histologic findings consisted breast disease without proliferative activity (159,74.0%) (Table 3), the proliferative lesions comprised of of benign epithelial proliferations, proliferative without atypia and proliferative with atypia (56, 26.0%) (Table 3). Of the fibrocystic disease, unqualified fibrocystic change (38, 86.4%) was the commonest of the benign epithelial proliferative forms. Intraductal papilloma (5, 71.4%) was the commonest proliferative lesion without atypia, while atypical ductal hyperplasia (5, 100%) was the only form of proliferative lesion with atypia. Fibroadenoma (121, 76.1%) was the commonest form of benign breast disease without proliferation. All the cases of gynaecomastia (7, 4.4%) were found in males.

The mean age of patients with proliferative disease was 33.3 ±9 and this was statistically significant when compared to the mean age of the non-proliferative group, 24.0 ±9.1, Table 4.

4. DISCUSSION

Benign non proliferative lesions of the breast were the commonest lesions 159(74.0%) in females in our study. Of these lesions Fibroadenoma (76%),is the commonest benign non-proliferative lesion, mirroring other Nigerian

studies [14,32-36]. Other benign lesions in the female breast in our study were Periductal mastitis, lipomas, fat necrosis, tubular adenoma, Juvenile papillomatosis, granulomatous mastitis, granulation tissue, benign phyllodes, acute mastitis, lymphocytic mastitis, granular cell myoblastoma, lactating adenoma and myofibroblastoma all of which account for less than 30 percent. By comparison fibrocystic disease, followed by fibroadenoma and complex sclerosing lesions are commoner in reports from the developed world [17]. Although the rate of non proliferative lesions [37] (67%), in a fifteen year Mayo clinic cohort study in the United states, compares with our findings. Baum, M reviewed the impact of these lesions on the patients and concluded that the cost lies on the anxiety that they may be cancerous and the cosmetic deformity from multiple biopsies that

often accompany them [1]. Surgical treatment of these benign lesions tends to be common in our setting and diagnosis commonly relies on clinical assessment alone. Egwuonwu et al. in south east Nigeria studied the reliability of clinical diagnosis of fibroadenoma in women 25 years and below, and reported a high sensitivity of 93.3% but a low specificity of 58.8% [38]. In this age group non operative management of fibroadenoma may be an option if the other factors are favourable. And in adolescents well investigated, conservative management of small sized fibroadenoma is recommended [39,40]. Equally imaging in this age group differs from adults because of the rarity of cancer in this age [39]. A few fibroadenomas may show proliferative activities, however both non proliferative and proliferative types of fibroadenomas are associated with low risk of breast cancer [41,42].

Table 3. Histologic types of benign and proliferative breast diseases seen at UCTH (N=215)

Histology	Frequency	Percentage
Benign breast diseases (n=159)		
Fibroadenoma	121	76.1
Gynecomastia	7	4.4
Periductal mastitis	4	2.5
Lipoma	4	2.5
Fat necrosis	4	2.5
Tubular adenoma	3	1.9
Juvenile papillomatosis	3	1.9
Granulomatous mastitis	3	1.9
Granulation tissue	2	1.3
Benign phylloides	2	1.3
Mastitis	2	1.3
Lymphocytic mastitis	1	0.6
Granular cell myoblastoma	1	0.6
Lactating adenoma	1	0.6
Myofibroblastoma	1	0.6
Total	159	100
Benign epithelial proliferative diseases (n=44)		
Fibrocystic change (unqualified)	38	86.4
Duct ectasia	3	6.8
Blunt duct adenosis	2	4.5
Mild epithelial hyperplasia	1	2.3
Total	44	100
Proliferative Without Atypia (N=7)		
Intraductal papilloma / papillomatosis	5	71.4
Sclerosing adenosis	1	14.3
Moderate ductal hyperplasia	1	14.3
Total	7	100
Proliferative with atypia (n=5)		
Atypical ductal hyperplasia	5	100
Total	5	100

Table 4. Relationship between mean age and histomorphologic characteristics (N=215)

Variable	mean age ± SD	t-test	p-value
Proliferative disease	33.3 ± 9.2	6.52	0.00
Benign non proliferative disease	24.0 ± 9.1		

The proliferative lesions comprising of benign epithelial proliferations (BEP), proliferative breast diseases without atypia and proliferative breast diseases with atypia accounted for 26% of the cases. BEP comprised of Fibrocystic disease (unqualified) (17.7%), others are duct ectasia, blunt duct adenosis and mild epithelial hyperplasia. The frequency of fibrocystic disease in this study compares with some Nigerian series, for example 16.5% was reported by Adeniji et al. in South-West Nigeria [5], Anyikam 22.9% in South -East Nigeria [8]. Our results were lower than some Nigerian series, for instance Adesunkanmi reported 42.2% in South-West Nigeria [6]. This is equally lower than reports in western and Afro Caribbean literature [43], where it is often reported as the commonest BBD [44,45]. Lesions in this group do not just attract a passing interest, because there are documented low risk of association with breast cancers [37,46]. There is a tendency however to lump these lesions with all proliferative lesions in one basket with a heard risk of 1.5 to 3.0% when the generalizing term of fibrocystic disease is used [44].

In our review, proliferative lesions without atypia were 7(3.3%), with individual lesions being; ductal papilloma/ papillomatosis, sclerosing adenosis and moderate ductal hyperplasia. Radial scar or complex sclerosing lesion was a notably absent in our series. These lesions were comparatively fewer than 30% reported in the 15 years mayo clinic cohort study [37]. One hopes that benign epithelial proliferations (fibrocystic disease), were not included in the non-proliferative lesions reported in the Mayo clinic study. These lesions are reported to pose level two risk (1.5% to 1.7%) of breast cancer [41,47,48], which is inferior to the level three risk pose by atypical proliferative lesions. The only proliferative lesion with atypia in our series is Atypical ductal hyperplasia which were 5(2.3%). This number is slightly less than 4% reported in the Mayo clinic cohort study [37]. In terms of breast cancer risk these lesions are rated level 3

in the risk scale with cumulative risk of about 4-5% [48]. It is now thought that many breast cancers arise through a multistep process which takes them through ductal epithelial hyperplasia through atypical ductal hyperplasia, then carcinoma in situ before becoming invasive cancer [28]. It is our belief in conclusion that as more and more screening mammography and other radiological tools are employed, the harvest of the high risk proliferative lesions will increase thereby preventing many invasive cancers.

5. CONCLUSION

Benign breast lesions are diagnosed frequently as they should be in Calabar. But the high risk atypical lesions and the premalignant lesions are not frequently diagnosed. This is not unconnected to the lack of mammographic screening of the population. If this is routinely done it might help in reducing the incidence of invasive breast cancer.

CONSENT

It is not applicable.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Ethical approval was granted by the institutional ethical review board.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Baum M. Benign breast disease: The cost of the service and the cost to the patient. *World J Surg.* 1989;13(6):669-73.
2. Anyanwu LJ, Anyanwu OM, Yakubu AA. Missed opportunities for breast awareness information among women attending the maternal and child health services of an urban tertiary hospital in Northern Nigeria. *J Cancer Res Ther.* 2016;12(2):765-9.
3. Ikeri NZ, Oguntunde OA, Igbokwe U, Abdulkareem FB, Banjo AA. Breast cancer in a Lagos facility: Implications for the institution of a cancer screening programme. *Pathobiology.* 2018;85(4):254-60.
4. Anakwenze C, Bhatia R, Rate W, Bakwenabatsile L, Ngoni K, Rayne S, et al. Factors related to advanced stage of

- cancer presentation in Botswana. *J Glob Oncol.* 2018;4:1-9.
5. Adeniji KA, Adelusola KA, Odesanmi WO. Benign disease of the breast in Ile-Ife: A 10 year experience and literature review. *Cent Afr J Med.* 1997;43(5):140-3.
 6. Adesunkanmi AR, Agbakwuru EA. Benign breast disease at Wesley Guild Hospital, Ilesha, Nigeria. *West Afr J Med.* 2001;20(2):146-51.
 7. Ajao OG. Benign breast lesions. *J Natl Med Assoc.* 1979;71(9):867-8.
 8. Anyikam A, Nzegwu MA, Ozumba BC, Okoye I, Olusina DB. Benign breast lesions in Eastern Nigeria. *Saudi Med J.* 2008;29(2):241-4.
 9. Ibitoye BO, Adetiloye VA, Aremu AA. The appearances of benign breast diseases on ultrasound. *Niger J Med.* 2006;15(4):421-6.
 10. Ihekweba FN. Benign breast disease in Nigerian women: A study of 657 patients. *J R Coll Surg Edinb.* 1994;39(5):280-3.
 11. Kathcy KC, Datubo-Brown DD, Gogo-Abite M, Iweha UU. Benign breast lesions in Nigerian women in Rivers State. *East Afr Med J.* 1990;67(3):201-4.
 12. Olu-Eddo AN, Ugiagbe EE. Benign breast lesions in an African population: A 25-year histopathological review of 1864 cases. *Niger Med J.* 2011;52(4):211-6.
 13. Osime OC, Ohanaka EC. Analysis of five-year breast biopsies carried out in the University of Benin Teaching Hospital Benin City. *Niger Postgrad Med J.* 2008;15(3):160-3.
 14. Otu AA. Benign breast tumours in an African population. *J R Coll Surg Edinb.* 1990;35(6):373-5.
 15. Okoth C, Galukande M, Jombwe J, Wamala D. Benign proliferative breast diseases among female patients at a sub-Saharan Africa tertiary hospital: A cross sectional study. *BMC Surg.* 2013;13:9.
 16. Chaudhuri M, Sen S, Sengupta J. Breast lumps: A study of 10 years. *J Indian Med Assoc.* 1995;93(12):455-7.
 17. Burnett SJ, Ng YY, Perry NM, Gilmore OJ, Allum WH, Carpenter R, et al. Benign biopsies in the prevalent round of breast screening: A review of 137 cases. *Clin Radiol.* 1995;50(4):254-8.
 18. Amin TT, Al-Mulhim AR, Chopra R. Histopathological patterns of female breast lesions at secondary level care in Saudi Arabia. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* 2009;10(6):1121-6.
 19. Cote ML, Ruterbusch JJ, Alesh B, Bandyopadhyay S, Kim E, Albashiti B, et al. Benign breast disease and the risk of subsequent breast cancer in African American women. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila).* 2012;5(12):1375-80.
 20. Dorjgochoo T, Deming SL, Gao YT, Lu W, Zheng Y, Ruan Z, et al. History of benign breast disease and risk of breast cancer among women in China: A case-control study. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2008;19(8):819-28.
 21. Dupont WD, Parl FF, Hartmann WH, Brinton LA, Winfield AC, Worrell JA, et al. Breast cancer risk associated with proliferative breast disease and atypical hyperplasia. *Cancer.* 1993;71(4):1258-65.
 22. Dyrstad SW, Yan Y, Fowler AM, Colditz GA. Breast cancer risk associated with benign breast disease: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* 2015;149(3):569-75.
 23. Ferrara A. Benign breast disease. *Radiol Technol.* 2011;82(5):447M-62M.
 24. Ben Hassouna J, Damak T, Ben Slama A, Chargui R, Ben Dhiab T, Khomsi F, et al. Breast carcinoma arising within fibroadenomas. Report of four observations. *Tunis Med.* 2007;85(10):891-5.
 25. Cheng J, Qiu S, Raju U, Wolman SR, Worsham MJ. Benign breast disease heterogeneity: Association with histopathology, age, and ethnicity. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* 2008;111(2):289-96.
 26. Boecker W, Buerger H, Schmitz K, Ellis IA, van Diest PJ, Sinn HP, et al. Ductal epithelial proliferations of the breast: A biological continuum? Comparative genomic hybridization and high-molecular-weight cytokeratin expression patterns. *J Pathol.* 2001;195(4):415-21.
 27. Boecker W, Moll R, Dervan P, Buerger H, Poremba C, Diallo RI, et al. Usual ductal hyperplasia of the breast is a committed stem (progenitor) cell lesion distinct from atypical ductal hyperplasia and ductal carcinoma *in situ*. *J Pathol.* 2002;198(4):458-67.
 28. Chinoy RF. Proliferative lesions of the breast: Carcinoma *in situ*. *Indian J Pathol Microbiol.* 2003;46(2):153-64.
 29. Collins LC, Aroner SA, Connolly JL, Colditz GA, Schnitt SJ, Tamimi RM. Breast cancer risk by extent and type of atypical hyperplasia: An update from the Nurses'

- Health Studies. *Cancer*. 2016;122(4):515-20.
30. Anastasiadis P, Romanidis K, Polychronidis A, Koutlaki N, Tamiolakis D, Simopoulos K. Proliferative breast disease: Epidemiologic aspects, and cytologic diagnosis. *Eur J Gynaecol Oncol*. 2003;24(6):547-51.
31. Page D, William Dupoint, Lowell W. Rogers, Margaret S. Rados. <Page_et_al-1985-Cancer.pdf>. *Cancer*. 1985;55:2698-708.
32. Mayun AA, Pindiga UH, Babayo UD. Pattern of histopathological diagnosis of breast lesions in Gombe, Nigeria. *Niger J Med*. 2008;17(2):159-62.
33. Oluwole SF, Freeman HP. Analysis of benign breast lesions in blacks. *Am J Surg*. 1979;137(6):786-9.
34. Onukak EE, Cederquist RA. Benign breast disorders in nonwestern populations: Part III--Benign breast disorders in Northern Nigeria. *World J Surg*. 1989;13(6):750-2.
35. Uwaezuoke SC, Udoye EP. Benign breast lesions in Bayelsa State, Niger Delta Nigeria: A 5 year multicentre histopathological audit. *Pan Afr Med J*. 2014;19:394.
36. Ozumba BC, Nzegwu MA, Anyikam A, Okoye I, Okafor OC. Breast disease in children and adolescents in eastern Nigeria--a five-year study. *J Pediatr Adolesc Gynecol*. 2009;22(3):169-72.
37. Hartmann LC, Sellers TA, Frost MH, Lingle WL, Degnim AC, Ghosh K, et al. Benign breast disease and the risk of breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;353(3):229-37.
38. Egwuonwu OA, Anyanwu S, Chianakwana GU, Ihekwoaba EC. Fibroadenoma: Accuracy of clinical diagnosis in females aged 25 years or less. *Niger J Clin Pract*. 2016;19(3):336-8.
39. Elsheikh A, Keramopoulos A, Lazaris D, Ambela C, Louvrou N, Michalas S. Breast tumors during adolescence. *Eur J Gynaecol Oncol*. 2000;21(4):408-10.
40. Duflos C, Plu-Bureau G, Thibaud E, Kuttenn F. Breast diseases in adolescents. *Endocr Dev*. 2012;22:208-21.
41. Worsham MJ, Raju U, Lu M, Kapke A, Botttrel A, Cheng J, et al. Risk factors for breast cancer from benign breast disease in a diverse population. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2009;118(1):1-7.
42. Moskowitz M, Gartside P, Wirman JA, McLaughlin C. Proliferative disorders of the breast as risk factors for breast cancer in a self-selected screened population: pathologic markers. *Radiology*. 1980;134(2):289-91.
43. Pettinato G, Panico L, de Rosa N, D'Antonio A, Bifano D, Avallone M. Benign lesions of the breast. *Ann Ital Chir*. 1997;68(2):151-66.
44. Myhre E. Is fibrocystic breast disease a pre-malignant state? *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand Suppl*. 1984;123:189-91.
45. McFarlane ME. Benign breast diseases in an Afro-Caribbean population. *East Afr Med J*. 2001;78(7):358-9.
46. Schnitt SJ. Benign breast disease and breast cancer risk: Morphology and beyond. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2003;27(6):836-41.
47. Rubin E, Visscher DW, Alexander RW, Urist MM, Maddox WA. Proliferative disease and atypia in biopsies performed for nonpalpable lesions detected mammographically. *Cancer*. 1988;61(10):2077-82.
48. Salamat FM, Niakan BM, Keshtkar AP, Rafiei EM, Zendeheel MM. Subtypes of benign breast disease as a risk factor of breast cancer: A systematic review and meta analyses. *Iran J Med Sci*. 2018;43(4):355-64.

© 2019 Ebughe et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<http://www.sdiarticle3.com/review-history/49961>