for the Diagnosis of Breast Lesions

Cosimo Di Maggio

CONTENTS

9.1	A Critical Analysis of the		
	Diagnostic Methods in Breast Diseases 9		
9.1.1	Breast Self-Examination 99		
9.1.2	Clinical Examination 100		
9.1.2.1	Signs and Medical Report 100		
9.1.2.2	Results 100		
9.1.2.3	Indications 102		
9.1.3	Mammography 103		
9.1.3.1	Signs and Medical Report 104		
9.1.3.2	Results 107		
9.1.3.3	Indications 107		
9.1.4	Ultrasound 107		
9.1.4.1	Signs and Medical Report 109		
9.1.4.2	Results 109		
9.1.4.3	Indications 112		
9.1.5	Pneumocystography 113		
9.1.6	Ductogalactography 113		
9.1.7	Magnetic Resonance Imaging 113		
9.1.7.1	Signs and Medical Report 114		
9.1.7.2	Results 115		
9.1.7.3	Indications 115		
9.1.8	Needle Sampling 116		
9.1.8.1	Fine-Needle Aspiration for		
	Cytological Analysis 116		
9.1.8.2	Needle Biopsy for Histological Analysis		
	(Percutaneous Biopsy) 117		
9.1.8.3	Indications for Needle Aspiration/Biopsy		
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	and Choice of Method 117		
9.2	Suggested Diagnostic Procedure for		
	Self-Referrals 119		
9.2.1	Women Who are Symptom-Free 119		
9.2.1.1	Under 40 Years of Age 119		
9.2.1.2	Over 40 Years of Age 119		
9.2.2	Women with Symptoms 119		
9.2.2.1	Under 35 Years of Age 119		
9.2.2.2	Over 35 Years of Age 120		
9.3	Operational Models (Organisation of		
	Diagnostic Procedures) 120		
9.3.1	Breast Diagnostic Units (BDUs) 120		
9.3.2	Mammographic Screening 121		
9.4	Concluding Considerations on Procedures		

for Timely Diagnosis of Breast Cancer 122

References 123

9.1

A Critical Analysis of the Diagnostic Methods in Breast Diseases

The risks of unjustified use of such techniques and the lack of rational clinical application have increased with the availability of many diagnostic techniques. Errors of this nature would affect the diagnostic accuracy and therefore reduce the possibilities for treatment. It is not uncommon for women and also for general practitioners to be misinformed about which is the most suitable technique, or rather what is the best combination of the various techniques; for this reason, inappropriate tests are often requested or tests which would in fact make a useful contribution to safeguarding the women's health.

This work has the following aims: to state precisely the real diagnostic contribution of each method, both radiological and otherwise, and suggest methods of application and indications consistent with the state of the art and to suggest the most effective and rational blends of the various techniques and organisation of diagnostic activities.

9.1.1 Breast Self-Examination

Women are still being advised to carry out periodic breast self-examination (BSE) although it has been well documented that this test does not provide early diagnosis (though it may anticipate the diagnosis) and that there is no evidence of a reduction in the mortality of women who practice BSE compared to those who do not (Hartmann 2005; Weiss 2003). In informing women how to carry out BSE, general practitioners and specialists should ensure that both its advantages and its limitations are explained (Table 9.1), so as to avoid both false reassurance and false alarms. Women should not be blamed for not 9

Table 9.1. Breast self examination (bse)

Limitations

does not provide early diagnosis

no proof of efficacy

creates anxiety if carried out or feeling of guilt if not

Advantages

awareness of own breasts

getting to know the problems of breast cancer

women performing self examination give a diagnostic contribution to clinicians

early diagnosis in the absence of other more sensitive and effective techniques

Conclusions

encourage women particularly those younger than 40 to carry out periodic self-examination

not blame women for not wishing to carry out BSE

wishing to carry out BSE. Since BSE may provide useful information in certain cases (when the lesion appeared, its volumetric development over time, etc.), the clinician would do well not to overlook findings reported by women who practice BSE.

From the methodological viewpoint, it is time to set aside commonplaces and teach women that BSE consists of two parts: an inspection to be carried out in front of the mirror and palpation to be carried out in the supine position and not in the shower, as often happens. Because of the length of time it takes for the tumour to grow, it would be better to explain to women that almost monthly self-palpation not only creates anxiety, but may actually delay the perception of nodes because the hand becomes accustomed to their slow growth. For this reason, it would be more logical to suggest that checks should be performed every 3 months during the fertile period, at the end of the menstrual stage.

9.1.2 Clinical Examination

The clinical examination should only be performed by trained medical personnel in a suitable environment (Lamarque et al. 1997) and should be preceded by careful examination of the patient's case history, including the assessment of possible risk factors (Cuzick 2003).

9.1.2.1 Signs and Medical Report

The most typical signs of cancer are the presence of a hard swelling with irregular or indistinct edges, skin involvement, fixation to the pectoral muscle or the chest wall, bloody discharge, axillary adenopathy (which is, however, non-specific if N2 cases are excluded) and the eczematous appearance of the nipple in Paget's disease. The relevant signs of the benign or malignant lesions (Figs. 9.1, 9.2) should be described in the concluding report. As regards nodular lesions, the report should always state the dimensions in centimetres, measured with callipers, and the site, with reference to the four quadrants and the areolar region. The conclusive diagnostic judgement (negative, benign or suspicious) should always be precisely indicated. In the case of suspicious signs, it is necessary to supply the data for the staging system or the TNM category directly.

9.1.2.2 Results

Sensitivity is relatively low for T1 forms (approximately 70%, but considerably lower for lesions of less than 1 cm) and therefore the clinical examination is of little use for the early diagnosis of tumours (Kolb et al. 2002). Its contribution is often limited to the perception of the existence of pathology, but it greatly facilitates the search for and recognition of lesions, preventing them from being overlooked. The specificity of this test is also somewhat limited; there would be a high bioptic cost if the decision on whether to perform a biopsy were to be based solely on the clinical examination.

It is obvious, therefore, that the clinical examination alone is not sufficient to exclude the presence of tumours and that any clinical signs, even if they are in the slightest way suspicious, should lead to the performance of other tests. Even today, a strong clinical suspicion of neoplasia constitutes good grounds for a biopsy, except in cases where mammography or other diagnostic techniques afford a sure diagnosis of benignity, as may occur in the presence of lipoma, calcific fibroadenoma, fat necrosis, etc.

It should be borne in mind that although the diagnostic contribution of the clinical examination is limited, its contribution in terms of giving accurate information to women, stimulating active involvement and renewing the relationship between



a, b Thin subcutaneous cords due to thrombophlebitis, c inverted nipples, d coloured discharges

а



to inflammatory carcinoma, **d** spontaneous skin retraction

doctor and patient, is irreplaceable (Berlin 2001). Under the pressure of economic problems, the human contribution which stems from the clinical examination is often overlooked. The effort to achieve lower mortality rates at an acceptable cost has made us forget that perhaps the greatest benefit of diagnostic activity lies not so much in the detection of disease as in the peace of mind that is derived from a negative diagnosis (Di Maggio 1993).

9.1.2.3 Indications

As well as offering an opportunity to talk to the patient about the problem of breast cancer, the clinical examination provides a guide to the performance of instrumental diagnostic investigations and helps in their interpretation. It is still a fundamental and irreplaceable examination when a symptom is present. In such cases, the clinical examination should always

precede instrumental investigations and should receive equal attention in the interpretative summary. For this reason, it is essential that the clinical examination is carried out by the physician who is to perform the instrumental investigation even if the patient has already been examined by other physicians.

9.1.3 Mammography

Mammography should be performed using the right equipment and methodology in order to acquire im-

ages which contain a wealth of information while delivering a limited radiation dose (ISTISAN 1995; EUREF 1999; Hendrick et al. 1999; Perry 2001; Cole et al. 2003; Gambaccini and Baldelli 2003; Gennaro et al. 2003; Gennaro and di Maggio 2006). In many diagnostic centres, digital technology is now widely used. The advantages of digital mammography include the possibility of obtaining high-quality images at lower doses than are required for analogue mammography, the capacity to compensate for errors in exposure (Fig. 9.3a,b) and the broader dynamic range. However, while digital mammography provides images of a medium to high standard and



Fig. 9.3. a Film-screen mammography: different parameters of exposure generate images with different optical density (underexposure leads to false radio density and subsequently the masking of possible small lesions), **b** screening/film versus digital mammography: in digital mammography the optical density of the images is always the same despite the different exposure values

facilitates perception of possible alterations above all in dense breasts (James 2004; Pisano 2000; Di Maggio et al. 2004; Pisano et al. 2005), the spatial resolution of digital images is currently lower than that of analogue ones; this sometimes makes it more difficult to categorise a lesion. The availability of numerous second-level diagnostic tests minimises this drawback, since the chief requirement for a firstlevel test is its ability to detect the presence of a possible lesion. Indeed, the task of basic mammography, whether performed in the course of a screening programme or in a clinical context, is mainly that of selection. Attempting a diagnosis almost always comes later, on the basis of supplementary radiographs or further investigations.

The advantage of the easier perception of the signal afforded by digital mammography is increased by:

- the use of a review workstation that, thanks to the elaboration of the images on the monitor, makes it possible to optimise the brightness and contrast of the interested area, rotate images, electronically magnify small areas, on the spot use of software capable of visualising the images with different algorithms and thus emphasize small differences in density (contrast enhancement);
- the possibility of using software (CAD: computer-aided detection) (Baker et al. 2003; Brem et al. 2003; Ciatto et al. 2003; Freer and Ulissey 2001; Lechener et al. 2002; Stines et al. 2002) capable of circumscribing with greater sensitivity small changes in density with morphological features suggestive of tumours. Such systems do not have a diagnostic task; their job is only to show items which might escape the radiologist's attention, but which the radiologist must later interpret without being influenced by the results obtained using CAD.

The most promising development in digital mammography is the "TOMOSYNTHESIS". This method is based on the successive automatic acquisition of multiple radiograms with different obliquities; the digital reconstruction of images seems to be able to highlight those lesions that are masked by overlapping structures (Fig. 9.4).

The carcinogenic risk from mammography is similar to that which can be hypothesised for all other radiological investigations and should always be assessed on a cost/benefit basis (Feig 1997; Gregg 1977). In the case of mammography, the danger of not recognising small carcinomas, in the



Fig. 9.4. Summary of how the tomosynthesis works

highest risk age group, is vastly greater than the hypothetical risk posed by exposure to small doses of radiation. At our current state of knowledge, we can state that, while every effort should be made to keep radiation doses as low as possible or to reduce them still further (Dendy and Brugmans 2003; Law and Faulkner 2002), the decision on whether or not to resort to mammography should be based above all on quantification of the expected benefit rather than on the possible hypothetical risk. A special case is that of women with deleterious mutation BRCA1 since their breasts may be subject to greater sensitivity to ionising radiation (Sharan et al. 1997). The decision to use mammography on these patients, especially if they are young, should be made with care, and numerous trials are taking place to clarify whether magnetic resonance imaging may be used as a routine technique instead of mammography.

9.1.3.1 Signs and Medical Report

The most common signs of neoplasia are nodular opacities (64%), microcalcifications (19%) and structural distortions (17%) (Tavassoli and Devilee 2003) (Fig. 9.5a,b). Other indirect signs of neoplasia, such as cutaneous inspissation and retraction, nipple retraction or an increase in vascularisation, are of little



Fig. 9.5a-d. Examples of breast carcinomas. a Mass with irregular edges, b nodular opacities, c structural distortions, d microcalcifications

diagnostic importance since they are often associated with voluminous and clinically evident neoplasia.

Special cases are lobular carcinomas and inflammatory carcinomas. Owing to the preservation of the glandular architecture and the limited stromal reaction, lobular carcinomas frequently do not show particular features on mammography (Amici et al. 2000). Inflammatory carcinomas almost always begin acutely with clinical signs, and it is often impossible to find even minor signs of them on previous radiographs. The mammography report should be drawn up according to the requirements for rationalisation and clarity of the informational content:

- Less significant findings (benign calcifications, microcysts, intramammary lymph nodes, etc.) may be omitted since they are often a source of needless anxiety. It is better to indicate the presence and extension of the anatomical radiopaque structures that can mask the mass (Fig. 9.6).
- Noteworthy findings should be clearly reported, with precise indication of the site of the lesion, its dimensions, the possible presence of several lesions and lesion location(s). No indelible marks



Fig. 9.6. Example of different distributions of radio-opaque structures (morphologic variant): radio density may mask some lesions

should be made on the original radiograph. In the presence of clinical signs, it should be specified whether or not there are corresponding changes on the mammogram.

• The radiologist must clearly indicate both the diagnostic orientation and, especially in the case of small subclinical lesions, whether the finding requires further investigation or a biopsy. In such situations it is always best to specify which type of guide (ultrasound or stereotactic) is preferable for taking the cyto-/histological specimen.

In order to avoid distorted interpretations as regards both the diagnostic hypothesis and the possible continuation with tests for diagnosis, the radiologist must sum up the conclusions in a five-category classification ranging from negative (class 1) or certainly benign (the diagnostic strategy stops) to an ever-increasing possibility of pathology (BI-RADS classes) (American College of Radiology 2003; ANAES 1998; Lattanzio and Simonetti 2002) (Table 9.2):

- In the presence of a lesion classified as benign (BI-RADS 2), no further tests are required and, if carried out, would only give rise to anxiety and false positives.
- In the presence of a probably benign picture (BI-RADS 3) (less than a 2% risk of malig-

Table 9.2. Assessment Of Breast Lesions Based On Acr-Birads Categories

Negative/ benign finding	(cat. 1-2)	Stop
Probably benign finding	(cat. 3)	Additional Tests/Initial short- term (6 months) follow-up
Suspicious abnormality	(cat. 4)	Percutaneous Needle Sampling
Suggestive of malignancy	(cat. 5)	Surgical Treatment

nancy), the radiologist should clearly indicate whether s/he feels it necessary to order other diagnostic tests or whether a short-interval follow-up is sufficient. In view of the consequences of a possible error of interpretation, the radiologist should keep track not only of the symptoms, but also of the dimensions of the alterations found. In these cases the radiologist, wherever s/he may be operating (clinical diagnostics or screening), must never forget that s/he is the only person responsible for the successive choices since they are based on the radiological semeiotics. These choices should be clearly communicated to and shared with the patient and other specialists.

- In the presence of a lesion classified as BI-RADS 4 (risk of malignancy between 2% and 70%), further diagnostic tests should be carried out (ultrasound, fine-needle aspiration cytology). If these tests prove negative, the radiologist should reexamine the radiographs and write a new report leading to an "integrated conclusive summary".
- In the presence of a lesion classified as BI-RADS 5, it is imperative to indicate surgical removal and therefore the histological diagnosis of the entire lesion. Other diagnostic tests may be useful only to assist in planning the surgical operation or to confirm the diagnosis in the case of non-surgical treatment.

In conclusion, in many cases the refined semeiotics of mammography permit diagnosis of the histological type, but the particular tasks of mammography are above all (1) the detection of possible lesions, (2) the search for "objective signs" of deviation from assumed normality (pathological semeiotics), and (3) the classification of the findings into one of the five categories mentioned above so that both the diagnostic hypothesis and the appropriate course of diagnostic and therapeutic action are clearly identified.

9.1.3.2 Results

Mammography has a sensitivity of more than 85%. However, the results are affected by the technical execution and the methodology used in the test. The accuracy is reduced if the adipose component is not well represented. In such cases it is very useful and sometimes indispensable to combine the test with a clinical examination or ultrasound (Burrel et al. 1996). Carrying out a clinical examination at the same time may also reveal the presence of possible neoplasia in peripheral sites which might not be included in the standard routine projections.

9.1.3.3 Indications

Mammography enables exploration of the entire breast and offers the greatest sensitivity, in particular for tumours in the initial stage of development. For this reason it is the only test which can be used as the basic technique in a screening programme.

If the clinical examination produces evident findings, it is always appropriate to carry out mammography in patients older than 35–40 years. It enhances the diagnostic accuracy of the clinical signs, better defines the extension of possible suspicious lesions and enables the discovery of non-palpable contiguous or contralateral lesions.

9.1.4 Ultrasound

Ultrasound involves the use of high-frequency probes (greater than or equal to 10 MHz), linear or annular, and surface focussed. The recent introduction of machines with a digital platform has greatly improved the definition and detail of the ultrasound image, thanks in particular to the use of new multifrequency broad-band transducers, the possibility of recording the harmonic tissue frequencies, and the use of a wide field of view and compound scanning (Giuseppetti 2002; Merritt 2001; Rizzatto 2001).

The examination should be performed carefully, exploring both breasts, in every quadrant, using different angles and exercising different pressure. Nowadays, the ultrasound scan may be enhanced by echo signal amplifiers, substances injected intravenously which increase the acoustic signal (Fig. 9.7a). Using special impulses, these substances generate harmonic frequencies which reveal both the macro-circulation and the micro-circulation and therefore give a more precise evaluation of vascularisation, if employed with the latest equipment with the appropriate software. The ability of this technique to detect the more homogeneous and regular vascularity of benign lesions as compared with carcinomas, where it is possible to reveal the presence of arteriovenous shunts, improves the accuracy of diagnostic differentiation between benign and malignant lesions on the basis of the signal/time intensity curve (Fig. 9.7b) (Jakobsen 2001; Martinez et al. 2003; Moon et al. 2000; Wittingam 1999). The use of echo signal amplifiers is, however, still at the stage of clinical validation. The current literature shows that the use of these substances improves sensitivity, but leads to a considerable reduction in specificity and an increase in costs.

The elastosonography is a recently introduced ultrasound technique. Dedicated instruments allow assessing variations in tissue elasticity during manual compression (Fig. 9.8a). By means of the chromatic scale utilised, the stiff tissue, typical of carcinomas, is highlighted in blue and the benign tissue in green. Instead, different to the other lesions, the colours of cysts appear in different layers (Figs. 9.8b, 9.9) (Itoh et al. 2006; Giuseppetti et al. 2005).



Fig. 9.7. a Ultrasound scan before and after echo-amplifiers (marked increase of the acoustic signal in the lesion). **b** Wash-in/wash-out curve in the benign lesion (slow initial increase in enhancement and slow wash-out) and in the malignant lesion (fast initial increase in enhancement and fast wash-out)





Fig. 9.9a-c. Paradigmatic findings of elastosonography: a cyst, b benign node, c carcinoma

9.1.4.1 Signs and Medical Report

Differential diagnosis is based on the morphology, structure, vascularisation and perilesional reaction. The American College of Radiology, in the fourth edition (2003) of BI-RADS, subdivided the ultrasound diagnostic hypotheses into five categories with an increasing probability of risk of carcinoma, similar to what already occurs for mammography. More specifically, the findings relevant to classification of nodules as suspicious or benign may be summarised as follows:

- Nodules of a very suspicious nature: irregular morphology, poorly defined edges, inhomogeneous echo structure, posterior acoustic attenuation, hyperechogenicity of the surrounding fat, anarchic and plentiful vascularisation with more than one pole (Fig. 9.10)
- Benign type nodules: regular or oval morphology, well-defined edges, internal echoes absent (cysts) or weak and uniform, underlying echoes enhanced (cysts) or normal, surrounding echo structure preserved, vascularisation absent or peripheral and limited with only one pole (Fig. 9.11).

Problems in the diagnosis derive, as usually happens, from ultrasound images that are difficult for the radiologist to classify as either malignant or definitely benign (Fig. 9.12a). The colour-power Doppler may prove to be useful, even if not decisive in these cases. In the presence of vascular peduncles needle aspiration is recommended (Fig. 9.12b), whereas, in the absence of vascular peduncles, a careful short-term follow-up would be more advisable especially if the lesion is less than 6–7 mm in diameter, has morphological ultrasound structure type cysts and the patient is on hormonal therapy (Fig. 9.12c).

The operator should describe the site of the lesions found, their nature (whether solid, liquid or mixed), their dimensions, their depth and possible involvement of the skin and the pectoral muscle. The description of the lesions as regards their physical acoustic features (anechoic, hyperechoic, hypoechoic, etc.) is optional and of no great utility, whereas it is essential to include diagnostic conclusions. The conclusions drawn from the ultrasound scan are essential since they are the result of direct evaluation of the images on the monitor by the operator and cannot be deduced from photographic reproductions.

Where there are also clinical or mammographic lesions, the report should also state whether they correspond to the lesion identified by ultrasound.

9.1.4.2 Results

When used together with mammography, ultrasound improves diagnostic accuracy, increasing both the sensitivity (to as high as 90%) (Fig. 9.13 a,b) and the specificity (to as high as 98%) (Fig. 9.13c,d) (Cilotti et al. 1997; Kaplan 2001; Kaplan 2001; Moy et al. 2002; Zonderland et al. 1999). Despite the continuing technological development, ultrasound remains a



Fig. 9.10. Conventional B-mode ultrasound: findings of lesions highly suggestive of malignancy



Fig. 9.11a-d. Conventional B-mode ultrasound: findings of benign lesions: a cyst, b lypoma, c fibroadenoma, d intramammary lymph node



Fig. 9.12. a Undetermined ultrasound benign-like lesions: unhomogeneously hypoechogeneity, microlobulated or quite well-defined edges, also with posterior enhancement. b Undetermined lesions at standard ultrasound, but with numerous vascular peduncles (histological diagnosis: carcinomas). c Undetermined lesions at standard ultrasound, but not vascularised (benign lesions at needle sampling)



Fig. 9.13. a,b Examples of mammographic dense breasts; the carcinoma is identifiable only with ultrasound. **c,d** Examples of suspect lesions at mammography. Ultrasound instead characterises the lesion as cysts and provides an accurate diagnosis. No need for the patient to undergo needle sampling.

complementary examination to mammography and cannot be used as a sole diagnostic test, except in certain specific situations (Feig 1992).

The most obvious limitations of ultrasound lie in the identification and characterisation of preclinical tumour lesions. On the other hand, it possesses extremely high specificity in the diagnosis of cysts and may be considered a first-line technique for non-oncological situations as well, such as inflammation and trauma. In screening programmes, there is no scientific justification for the use of ultrasound as the exclusive or preliminary diagnostic test (Balu-Maestro et al. 2003).

The use of colour power Doppler provides additional, but still debatable information, in the differential diagnosis between benign and malignant pathologies. It is, however, of use in the diagnostic differentiation between fibrosis and relapse.

The main contribution of the elastosonography consists in the characterisation of the small lesions almost certainly benign identified at ultrasound (e.g., small dense cysts, benign solid nodes) avoiding needle sampling (Fig. 9.14).

9.1.4.3 Indications

The indications for breast ultrasound suggested by the American College of Radiology in 1995, and updated in 1999 and 2001 (American College of Radiology (2000\2001) may be summed up as follows:

- Identification and characterisation of the lesions (whether palpable or not) and the further investigation of dubious clinical and/or mammographic findings.
- Guidance for interventional procedures (preoperative marking of lesions, cytological or histological sampling). One of the most recent indications is ultrasound-guided needle aspiration of axillary lymph nodes found to be suspicious on ultrasound, in order to prevent the excision of the sentinel lymph node if positive



Fig. 9.14. Small nodes presenting as benign at elastosonography (cytological confirmation)

- Evaluation of breast implants.
- First-level investigation for evaluation of lesions in young women (under circa 30 years of age) and women who are breastfeeding or pregnant.

The use of ultrasound as a method of screening should at present be regarded as the exclusive province of clinical research.

9.1.5 Pneumocystography

Pneumocystography consists in obtaining radiographs after the emptying of a cyst and injection of air into it; the walls of the cyst can thus be studied and possible vegetation revealed. At present, pneumocystography should be performed only to resolve doubts which persist after the ultrasound scan.

9.1.6 Ductogalactography

Ductogalactography consists in the injection of a radiopaque hydrosoluble contrast medium into the

secretion duct followed by radiography. It reveals defects in the filling of the duct due to vegetation within the duct (Fig. 9.15), but cannot provide certain differential diagnosis between benign and malignant lesions. This test is indicated in cases of bloody, mixed serous and bloody, or transparent secretions, especially if unilateral and from a single duct and when occurring in the presence of suspicious cytology. It is not indicated when there are other types of secretion since the probability of otherwise hidden neoplasia in such cases is negligible.

9.1.7 Magnetic Resonance Imaging

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) of the breast may only be performed with the appropriate equipment, including suitable hardware and software. The examination should be simple, fast and panoramic (a simultaneous bilateral study). It should guarantee high-quality images and provide a dynamic investigation with the possibility of subsequent processing of the images (subtraction, MIP, MPR, etc.) as well as measurement of the signal intensity-time (SI/T) curves.



Fig. 9.15. Galactography: presence of defects in the filling of the duct due to intraductal proliferation.

The diagnostic accuracy of MRI depends on the technical and acquisitional features, but also to a very great extent on the image processing. Processing should therefore be considered one of the main stages of the technique (Del Maschio et al. 2002; Morris 2002).

Reparative processes lead to focal or diffuse inflammatory reactions, with hypervascular areas and a consequent enhancement effect which is sometimes difficult to distinguish from that due to malignant lesions. MRI should therefore generally be performed at least 6 months after surgery and 12 months after radiotherapy. If necessary, however, the examination may be carried out in the few days immediately following the operation (since, during the first 30–70 h, none of the reparative processes have taken place), and it is useful when there is some doubt as to whether the lesion has been removed.

Hormone, physiological and pharmaceutical stimulation greatly affects the MR image. For this reason the examination should preferably be performed in the second or third week of the menstrual cycle, and, in menopausal patients, 1 or 2 months after possible replacement hormone treatment has been suspended. If this methodology is not observed, there is an increased risk of false positives. When MRI reveals lesions which did not appear on the conventional investigations, the matter can often be resolved by a second targeted ultrasound scan, guided by the MR images. When diagnostic doubt persists and cannot be resolved by secondlook ultrasound (or mammography), it is advisable to repeat MRI 1 or 2 months later, in the suitable period for fertile women, before undertaking surgery (Teifke et al. 2003).

It is also generally advisable for MRI to precede needle aspiration or needle biopsy since these manoeuvres may alter the behaviour of the precontrast signal and contrast enhancement. However, the methodological timing is still a matter of debate. It is believed to be best to take the specimen using the needle prior to MRI where there are unifocal lesions: if the specimen proves negative and the integrated negative diagnosis is deemed sufficiently accurate, normal follow-up with ordinary first-level tests may be considered sufficient. In contrast, where suspicious or clearly multifocal lesions exist, MRI should, if possible, precede needle aspiration.

9.1.7.1 Signs and Medical Report

Identification of lesions is based on visualisation of the areas of greatest vascularisation on images produced by subtraction. Once the possible lesions have been identified, the images are evaluated from the morphological viewpoint and the functional characteristics are assessed by means of SI/T curves.

Characterisation of breast lesions using MRI is based above all on contrast enhancement dynamics after the administration of paramagnetic contrast medium. The presence of enhancement is closely correlated with the dynamics of the contrast medium in the lesion, which appear to be determined by the volume and permeability of the vessels, as well as by the width of the interstitial space. Since these characteristics are intrinsic to the process of angiogenesis of malignant lesions, MRI of the breast may be assumed to be a suitable method for the discovery and quantification of the angiogenic process itself.

The parameters to consider are: morphology, edges, enhancement characteristics (homogeneous, inhomogeneous, centripetal, centrifugal), the intensity of the initial signal, and the course of the SI/T curve (Fig. 9.16). As regards morphology, the criteria for malignancy are the same as for conventional techniques: irregular lesions with ill-defined edges. The functional aspect of malignant lesions is characterised by the enhancement features: inhomogeneous, with a centripetal, rapid and intense, but brief course. A typical feature of malignant lesions is intense enhancement at the first measurement after injection of the contrast medium, with an increase in signal intensity of more than 70%-100% compared to the initial value; there is therefore an initially steep SI/T curve which decreases rapidly, giving an early wash-out, i.e. a fading out of the contrast medium. Benign lesions have a regular morphology and regular edges and show homogeneous enhancement with a slow and progressive course.

The report should state the presence of areas of enhancement, the lesion site, the lesion dimensions, the hypothesis as to its nature and the relation of the lesion to the surrounding tissue. Since MRI is often performed to resolve diagnostic doubts emerging from conventional methods, such tests should be referred to, a diagnostic conclusion should be expressed and specific suggestions should be made for further possible investigations.

It should be stressed that MRI cannot be proposed as the first diagnostic examination for breast pathologies and that the specific indications for this modality should be followed in order to prevent an excess of doubtful cases and false positives.

9.1.7.2 Results

MRI of the breast is characterised by very high sensitivity, of between 95% and 100% for infiltrating carcinomas and approximately 80% for in situ ductal carcinomas. The negative predictive value for infiltrating carcinomas approaches 100%. All authors agree on these values, but there is incomplete agreement on the specificity, which is approximately 80% using state of the art equipment.

9.1.7.3 Indications

Currently, breast MRI should be regarded as a technique to be used only in combination with mammography and ultrasound. There are a number of principal indications:



Fig. 9.16. Example of carcinoma highlighted at MRI in mammographic dense breast

- The study of women with a genetic or high family risk of breast carcinoma. Owing to the ability of MRI to detect characteristics associated with the process of angiogenesis, use of MRI in conjunction with conventional techniques allows the identification of some tumours which would not otherwise be recognised (the contribution in this respect is particularly valuable in women with radiologically dense breasts) (Kuhl et al. 2000; Podo et al. 2002; Tilanus-Linthorst et al. 2000).
- The search for unknown primitive carcinomas when conventional methods are negative (Schorn et al. 1999).
- Preoperative assessment or local staging in the case of breast carcinomas diagnosed using traditional techniques. MRI is the most accurate technique for correctly defining the relationship between surrounding tissue and the size and number of lesions, thus affording the identification of multifocality/multicentricity and contralateral lesions. The literature reports that multifocal/multicentric lesions not detected by conventional imaging techniques were identified using MRI in 16-37% of cases and that synchronous occult contralateral lesions were identified in 5-10% of the patients studied. In brief, MRI changed the therapeutic approach to the patient in between 11% and 51% of cases (Oellinger et al. 1993; Slanetz et al. 1998).
- Monitoring of breast lesions treated with neoadjuvant presurgical chemotherapy (MRI permits more precise definition of the dimensions of the residual tumour and its differentiation from necrotic and fibrotic components) (Panizza et al. 1997; Rieber et al. 1997; Wasser al. 2003).
- Follow-up after breast-conserving surgery and/ or radiotherapy, wherever conventional methods raise doubts regarding the differential diagnosis of fibrosis and relapses. The sensitivity of MRI in distinguishing between relapse and fibrosis ranges from 93% to 100%, and the specificity from 88% to 100% (Dao et al. 1993; Solomon et al. 1998).
- Evaluation of women with breast implants. MRI is the most effective technique for studying the state of the implant (integrity, fibrous capsule, dislocation, silicon migration); according to the literature, MRI has a 75% sensitivity and specificity in the recognition of ruptured implants. In addition, MRI allows assessment of the native breast and especially the regions hidden by the implant that are difficult to explore using mam-

mography or ultrasound (Ahn et al. 1993; Gorzica et al. 1994; Reynolds et al. 1994).

- Evaluation of breasts that are difficult to interpret using conventional techniques or for which different diagnostic approaches have yielded discrepant findings.
- As a guide for the taking of cyto-/histological specimens of lesions that can only be revealed by MRI. Combined use of new stereotactic equipment and surface bobbins and non-magnetic needles now makes it possible to perform cyto-logical and microhistological sampling pre-operative marking of lesions (Liiberman et al. 2003; Panizza et al. 2003; Wald et al. 1993).

Contra-indications to MRI include inflammation, which is indistinguishable from malignant alterations, and all the other usual contra-indications (pacemakers, metallic plates, etc.).

At our present state of knowledge, the most debated issue as regards the indications for MRI is whether or not it should be routinely used when a breast carcinoma has been diagnosed by conventional techniques and breast-conserving treatment proposed. The literature would appear to suggest that MRI should routinely be performed prior to conservative surgical interventions. However, it is clearly too early to impose such a protocol, both because it would be difficult to offer the test to every woman with a carcinoma in its initial phase and above all because we still do not have clear scientific evidence of the advantages in terms of survival. Until such evidence becomes available, each case should be carefully assessed and, before a decision is made on whether to use MRI, the patient should be made fully aware that if further foci are discovered, it will no longer be possible to avoid mastectomy, even though quadrantectomy and radiotherapy might offer the same results.

9.1.8 Needle Sampling

9.1.8.1

Fine-Needle Aspiration for Cytological Analysis

Cytology is performed on: secretions from the nipple, the contents of cysts, material obtained from scarification of erosive lesions of the nipple, and aspiration samples of palpable or non-palpable solid tumefaction when it is not definitely benign. The slide should bear the data essential for identifying the patient, placed there prior to the test.

Fine-needle aspiration cytology (FNAC) may involve the use of a needle alone or a needle attached to a syringe, with the syringe mounted on a handle. Complications are typically negligible (infection, haemorrhage) and more serious complications (pneumothorax) are extremely rare if the methodology is appropriate. In theory, it is possible that dissemination of neoplastic cells might occur as a result of FNAC, but no such cases have been described in the literature on breast carcinoma.

Signs and Medical Report

A descriptive diagnosis is optional and, in this case, the cytopathological report should be clear and succinct. By contrast, the diagnostic conclusion is obligatory and should be codified into five classes:

- C1: findings insufficient for a diagnostic judgement
- C2: findings negative for tumour cells
- C3: findings dubious; lesions probably benign, but presence of atypia
- C4: suspicious findings, peremptory indications for surgical biopsy
- C5: positive findings for malignant tumour cells (an area of tumour cells unequivocally malignant, already recognisable when only slightly enlarged) with almost absolute positive prediction (>99%).

Results

The sensitivity of FNAC for breast cancer (suspicious + positive cases, excluding insufficient findings from consideration) is 90-95%, and it has a positive predictive value of more than 99%. The rate of insufficient findings in cases of cancer is less than 10%. When FNAC yields a positive finding, intraoperative histological confirmation may be omitted. When a suspicious finding is obtained (in the literature the predictive value of suspicious findings ranges between 40% and 80%), surgical biopsy is required, regardless of the clinical evidence. Given the possibility of false-negative cytology, a negative cytological analysis is not sufficient to avoid a surgical biopsy if other diagnostic tests are either dubious or suspicious (Di Maggio et al. 2003; Helbich et al. 2003; Pisano et al. 2001; Sauer et al. 2003).

If the sensitivity, specificity and predictive values achieved at a treatment centre are not comparable with the foregoing rates, it is necessary to critically review sampling, smear staining and interpretation and possibly to compare one's own practice with that at a more experienced centre.

9.1.8.2 Needle Biopsy for Histological Analysis (Percutaneous Biopsy)

The specimen is taken using a wide-calibre needle and therefore special methodological precautions are required (informed consent, accurate anamnesis regarding coagulation disorders or allergy to anaesthetics, local anaesthesia and possible general sedation, cutaneous incision, subsequent manual compression for 10 15 min and radiography of specimens). In fact, not all of these precautions should always be carried out, but the methodology is undoubtedly more invasive than in FNAC. The average time for the procedure ranges from 15 to 60 min; a report is only available several days later.

Nowadays, various techniques are available for percutaneous biopsy, including multiple sampling with automatic or semi-automatic guillotine cutting needles with a 14- to 20-G calibre, the advanced breast biopsy instrumentation (ABBI) system, which allows removal of a core of breast tissue up to 2 cm in size, and the Mammotome breast biopsy system, allowing removal of samples with gentle suction.

Percutaneous biopsy allows histological analysis of the lesion, providing information on tumour invasiveness and certain parameters related to its aggressiveness; it yields a low number of insufficient findings. The expected results are influenced by the type of lesion (node or calcification), by the calibre of the needle and by the number of pieces taken. It should always be borne in mind, in the interests of correct programming of surgery and treatment, that in 10–30% of cases with a microhistological diagnosis of carcinoma in situ, subsequent surgical removal will reveal the presence of invasive carcinoma (Jackman et al. 2001).

9.1.8.3 Indications for Needle Aspiration/Biopsy and Choice of Method

Palpable lesions: Although FNAC almost always enables the diagnostic problem of palpable lesions to be resolved, it is preferable, except in certain specific cases, to use aspiration not as a sole clinical test, but after evaluation of the mammogram (or at least the ultrasound scan). This ensures that FNAC is carried out only when necessary, at the right time and in the right place.

Non-Palpable Lesions

Needle aspiration should be performed with an ultrasound or a radiostereotactic guide. In some centres, it is possible to use an MRI guide. In all cases where the lesion, though discovered through mammography, can be recognised with a targeted ultrasound scan and where there is certainty that the lesion on the ultrasound image corresponds to that on mammography, ultrasound-guided aspiration is to be preferred because it is simpler, faster, more agreeable for the patient and less expensive.

The increasingly frequent findings of non-palpable lesions and their small size require that diagnostic procedures should be very strictly applied, that the recommendation for aspiration must be justified, and that the choice of method (FNAC versus percutaneous biopsy) must be rational (Deurloo et al. 2003; Di Maggio et al. 2003; Nori 2003; Parker et al. 2001). In the presence of lesions of a dubious nature, therefore, the radiologist should use secondand third-level examinations (targeted radiography, mammographic enlargement, possible ultrasound scan studies with a contrast medium, digital processing, MRI, etc.) to try to characterise the lesions as well as possible.

The following considerations may justify aspiration and help in selection of the method:

• Needle sampling should be deemed necessary if the expected findings might change the subse-

quent diagnostic approach or treatment (followup control or excision, interval between checkups). In the presence of nodes with a diameter of less than 1 cm, classified 3 or 4A at mammography or ultrasound according to BI-RADS and classified negative or benign at needle aspiration, it is advisable to avoid surgical excision and perform only a short-term follow-up: this choice reduces anxiety in the majority of patients, reduces costs and avoids possible alterations in structural scarring that may cause diagnostic difficulties in future check-ups (Fig. 9.17). Similar considerations should be adopted in the case of hyperplasia without atypia (Jacobs 2002).

- Instead, in the case of atypical ductal hyperplasia, surgical excision is always recommended since the differential diagnosis between ADH and low-grade DCIS is difficult and in many cases foci of ADH can be found at DCIS margins. When ADH is diagnosed at needle aspiration subsequently a diagnosis of DCIS in a reasonable number of cases is made (from 19% to 44%) (Hartmann 2005).
- Needle sampling may also be recommended even when the mammogram is clearly suspicious or positive, in order to obtain a definitive preoperative diagnosis so that the patient can be better informed as to the type of surgical operation that will be performed or to avoid a two-stage operation (first, a diagnostic biopsy and then a radical intervention).
- 2. The choice among the various methods should be based both on the scientific evidence available



Fig. 9.17a,b. Images simulating a carcinoma, but caused by scar alterations after surgery

(evaluation of the contributions they offer for diagnosis, knowledge of the prognostic factors and knowledge of the invasiveness of the carcinoma) and on personal experience.

It is always worth bearing in mind that, if a choice can or has to be made, it is best to employ the less invasive method in cases in which the results will tend to coincide or in which the particular information that may be obtained using the more invasive technique (e.g., tumour invasiveness or aggressiveness, histological type) is not indispensable or can be obtained during the surgical intervention without prejudicing it and the prognosis.

To sum up, the following guidelines may be suggested: given the grounds for needle aspiration, the method of choice to obtain further diagnostic information will in most cases be FNAC (less invasive, less costly), with percutaneous biopsy reserved for cases without a definitive diagnostic evaluation (cases that are classified as C1/C3, or which are the subject of disagreement between the radiologist and the pathologist) and cases in which information is required that cytology cannot provide (invasiveness, aggressiveness).

It should be stressed that the choice of method lies with the operators (the radiologist, pathologist and surgeon), who may prefer FNAC or percutaneous biopsy, according to their own experience. In many cases, moreover, the choice should be discussed and agreed upon on a case-by-case basis in the multidisciplinary unit.

9.2 Suggested Diagnostic Procedure for Self-Referrals

9.2.1 Women Who are Symptom-Free

9.2.1.1 Under 40 Years of Age

There are no particular recommendations regarding the preventive control except to note that the women involved are at high risk (genetic/familial high risk) and are part of a specific programme of diagnostic surveillance. Rigorous check-up is also recommended in women submitted to previous treatment for Hodgkin's disease (Hill 2005; Travis 2003, 2005). Routine ultrasound scans are unjustified in the absence of objective signs.

9.2.1.2 Over 40 Years of Age

It is recommended that mammography should be performed at intervals of between 1 and 2 years. Mammography at 1-year intervals, in combination with routine breast and ultrasound examination, is justifiable for women with radiologically dense breasts owing to the greater difficulty in discovering a possible tumour and because the radiological density appears to be associated with a greater risk of tumour development (Boyd et al. 1995, 2002; Harvey and Bovbierg 2004; Mandelson et al. 2000).

As regards the clinical and instrumental surveillance of the group of women with a genetic risk of breast carcinoma, there are as yet no recommendations grounded in hard scientific evidence. It is advisable for such women to attend centres where there are working groups devoted to the problem.

Given that mammography has limitations, especially in younger women, the usefulness of routinely combining MRI with ultrasound and mammography is currently being assessed. At present it is widespread practice to advise that check-up visits should begin at 30 or at the same age as the youngest family member affected. Currently, diversified diagnostic procedures and intervals according to the level of risk (e.g., genetic risk for breast cancer) are being evaluated. Periodic tests may also be advisable in males over the age of 50 when there is a family history of breast cancer.

9.2.2 Women with Symptoms

9.2.2.1 Under 35 Years of Age

Due to the low incidence of breast carcinoma in patients aged less than 35 years, the clinical examination performed by the general practitioner may be sufficient to clear up any doubts and allay needless anxiety. In the presence of real focal pathology, which is not suspicious clinically, ultrasound and possible needle aspiration may be deemed sufficient. If the suspicion persists, the diagnostic evaluation should continue with mammography and other techniques if necessary.

9.2.2.2 Over 35 Years of Age

In patients aged over 35 years who have relevant symptoms, mammography in combination with clinical examination and, preferably, ultrasound will afford a correct diagnosis in most cases. The use of ultrasound has the advantage that it will avoid failure to diagnose carcinomas that cannot be revealed radiographically. Ultrasound is indispensable both when there is difficulty in exploring the breast radiographically (dense breasts) and when mammography or the clinical examination reveals nodules whose nature is unclear.

If the difficulty in classifying the images persists or if suspicious elements emerge, needle aspiration should be performed (percutaneous cytology or biopsy). It will be necessary to decide on a case-bycase basis whether or not needle aspiration should be preceded by MRI or breast scintigraphy.

9.3

Operational Models (Organisation of Diagnostic Procedures)

The organisation of the procedures used in diagnosing breast pathologies should take account of three objectives:

- To diagnose most small tumours at an early stage so as to ensure a reduction in the mortality and a better quality of life
- To achieve correct diagnosis of benign growths in order to avoid additional anxiety and unnecessary biopsies
- To reassure healthy women and give them peace of mind

From the methodological point of view, two ways of proceeding can be considered:

- Creation of breast diagnostic units (BDUs)
- Implementation of mammographic screening programmes

9.3.1 Breast Diagnostic Units (BDUs)

Only the centralisation of diagnostic activity in a single site (a BDU), catering for both women who

present spontaneously, with or without symptoms, and women selected through screening, enables administrators to optimise resources and to provide personalised procedures so that a definitive diagnosis can be obtained at low cost and with minimum inconvenience for the patient (Di Maggio 1991). It is convenient to arrange for two sets of procedures: one set for women with symptoms and another for those without (Di Maggio 1996, 2004).

Patients with evident clinical symptoms are inducted into a set of procedures that includes a preliminary clinical examination, then mammography and, in rapid succession, any other tests (ultrasound, needle sampling) needed to reach a conclusive diagnosis. Communicating rooms need to be available.

Naturally, the sequence of the diagnostic procedures may require modification in accordance with the presumed pathology and the patient's age. The result is given to the patient at the end of the tests, except in cases in which it is necessary to take a sample with a needle (the analysis of which should also be carried out in the same centre).

In the event of a positive result, it is the radiologist who provides the first explanations and prepares the patient for the subsequent therapeutic procedures (Figs. 9.18, 9.19). The referring doctor is, of course, informed immediately (with the patient's consent) and is directly involved.

Women without clinical symptoms who spontaneously present with a view to prevention undergo the same set of diagnostic procedures on the first occasion as patients with symptoms. In most cases, clinical examination and mammography are sufficient to conclude the diagnostic process in these women. The date of the next check-up and follow-up procedures are established when the results are given.

Women without symptoms who are found to be in a healthy state are offered one of two differing sets of subsequent procedures:

- Women with breasts that are more difficult to examine are invited to return for annual check-ups with mammography and ultrasound.
- Women with breasts that are mainly adipose can be monitored by mammography alone at 2yearly intervals. In this case, interpretation of the radiographs is deferred and double reading is essential.

The diagnostic activity must be carefully monitored. The patient should come away from the BDU with a definitive diagnosis and not with a request for further diagnostic testing.



Fig. 9.18. Practice guidelines in breast disease assessment



Fig. 9.19. Consultation with the patient at the end of the exam reduces anxiety that may occur from the moment of the diagnosis until the start of therapy

9.3.2 Mammographic Screening

The purpose of mammographic screening is not diagnosis as such, but the selection of women "probably affected by a tumour". The sole objective of the screening programme is to obtain a reduction in mortality at an acceptable cost; it is therefore to be undertaken only if its effectiveness has been demonstrated, if funds are available, if the cost is acceptable and if it is competitive in relation to other public health initiatives. For the same reasons, the programme is not directed at all women, but only at those in the age band at greatest risk.

As far as breast cancer is concerned, screening programmes have now been operative for very many years and their effectiveness is proven; the cost per life saved would also appear to be acceptable (Duffy 2002; Nystrom et al. 2002; Peto et al. 2000; Shapiro 1977; Vanara et al. 1995). Screening programmes can be credited with having demonstrated that prompt diagnosis results in a reduction in mortality and that good results can be obtained only if all steps of the programme are optimised and all results are periodically checked. Although the efficacy of mammographic screening has been proven over many years, it cannot be said that the population is adequately covered. However, it has to be borne in mind that is not possible, within a limited time, to fully implement a programme that requires broad participation among the population, growth of awareness, sufficient economic resources and an adequate number of well-trained professional figures (radiologists and radiographers) (EUREF 2001/2006; Sickles et al. 2002).

The negative aspects of a programme of mammographic screening are well known (di Maggio et al. 1994; Fletcher and Elmore 2003; Wald et al. 1993): prolonged awareness of illness when therapy is not able to yield the desired results, over-diagnosis and over-treatment, false reassurance in the event of false-negative results, anxiety inducement in the event of false-positive results and the possible risk associated with radiation, over-diagnosis and overtreatment (De Koning et al. 2006; Warren and Eleti 2006; Zackrisson et al. 2006).

Overdiagnosis is: the diagnosis of a tumour through screening that would never have been diagnosed if screening had not been carried out since progression is very slow. Overdiagnosis leads to: surgical interventions, useless drug therapy, intensive follow-up and negative psycho-physical consequences.

Overdiagnosis should not be confused with early diagnosis (excess of observed incidence with screening), which means anticipating the diagnosis of tumours that would have become clinically evident in the future.

The operating methodology for a screening programme is today rigorously codified (Advisory Committee on Cancer Prevention 2000; American Cancer Society 1999–2003; Piscioli and Cristofolini 1996; Bancej et al. 2003) exclusive mammography bi-annually, deferred reading, recall with further diagnostic testing of women with a doubtful diagnosis expressed even by only one of the two readers, and limitation to women aged between 50 and 69.

Some considerations with respect to current screening methodology include: Mammography is offered as the sole test, at 2-yearly intervals and with deferred reading. This allows a reasonable number of examinations per hour to be completed and reduces the number of working hours required of radiologists, but it leads to less thorough and sensitive diagnostics, as well as to the need for follow-up in uncertain cases. The limited sensitivity of mammographic screening used as the sole test on a bi-annual basis is clearly attested to by the rather high rate of so-called interval cancers (Maijd et al. 2003; Marra et al. 1999; Raja et al. 2001; Sylvester et al. 1977). It has been sufficiently documented that a good proportion of these cancers would be picked up if shorter intervals were used (Bauce et al. 1998; Feig 1997; Michaelson et al. 1999; Rosen et al. 2002; Zappa et al. 2002) if the screening were combined with other tests (Cilotti et al. 1997; Kaplan 2001; Kolb et al. 1998; Moy et al. 2002; Zonderland et al. 1999). It therefore seems reasonable to consider the possibility that, for women with breasts that are not amenable to X-ray scanning, the screening protocol should be modified to include routine ultrasound scans.

Very useful, but perhaps less feasible for reasons of cost and lack of personnel, would be the inclusion of the medical radiologist at the time of the first examination. The implementation of a concurrent clinical examination and ultrasound scan, when necessary, would lead to a 7–10% reduction in diagnostic errors (Bancej et al. 2003; D'Angelo et al. 1996) and thus also in the incidence of interval cancers (Kopans 2004; Guthrie 1999). Furthermore, it would obviate the need to recall patients for second-level tests, which causes anxiety, and would offer the woman receiving the information the kind of human contribution that can only be ensured by the presence of the doctor.

As stated above, women aged 50–69 are prioritised as subjects for screening, but in view of the longer life expectancy of women in good health and past the age of 70, it may be advisable to continue actively screening women who attended previous tests up to the age of 74.

The decision as to whether the age at which the first "invitation to screening" is offered should be lowered to 45 can be left to the health authorities, taking into account available resources and working in collaboration with the scientific society. There is a general consensus that women should be given the opportunity to undergo periodic tests at this age since the results of recent studies, although not conclusive, have indicated the possible effectiveness of early diagnosis in this age range as well. Naturally, the women concerned must be adequately informed of the possible benefits, but also of the possible negative effects (diagnostic overestimation of risk, anxiety) (Bjurstam et al. 1997; Smart et al. 1995).

9.4

Concluding Considerations on Procedures for Timely Diagnosis of Breast Cancer

Procedures for early diagnosis must be implemented in such a way that the entire geographic area in question is adequately covered, and women who undergo checkups, whether spontaneously or as directed by their own doctors, must be assured of good quality diagnosis. In order to obtain the greatest advantage from the diagnostic activities while containing the negative effects, every procedure aimed at achieving a timely diagnosis must take place within the context of a well-organised and supervised programme and must be supported by thorough training programmes for the operators. All the diagnostic programmes must therefore be backed up by adequate planning, and all the necessary resources, in terms of both professional support and institutional structures, must be guaranteed, including the health care functions subsequent to the diagnosis, namely therapy and follow-up to an appropriate standard.

Whenever the prerequisites for implementation of a high-quality screening programme within a limited period are lacking, it is essential that priority is given to measures aimed at reorganising and rationalising the diagnostic activities already available within that geographical area, reconstituting them into dedicated structures in the form of BDUs. It is necessary to create a network of BDUs evenly distributed across the territory since a network of this kind represents an indispensable preliminary phase in a programme that will extend to the population as a whole. The institution of a BDU network and the initiation of a screening programme may be perceived as a single project to be implemented at the regional level.

In view of the fact that the diagnosis of breast lesions is currently based on tests that rely largely or exclusively on the expertise of the radiologist, and given that the apparatus is costly and that its use must be supervised and carried out in an integrated fashion, it is appropriate for clinical and organisational responsibility for the diagnostic procedures to be entrusted to the radiologist, assisted by a physician or general practitioner and a pathologist. It is also necessary, when disease is found, for interdisciplinary expertise to be available so that the most suitable form of treatment can be identified more easily.

Possible non-standard modes of organisation should also be carefully evaluated (Dilhuydy et al. 2003; Di Maggio et al. 2001); this lies within the remit of the respective technical committees. Similarly, the diagnostic protocol to be used can be modified with a view to increasing the sensitivity of screening (Consiglio dell'Unione Europea 2003).

Finally, it would be desirable for each region to set up an *interdisciplinary body of reference for quality assurance*. The function of such a body would be to ensure that work on breast pathology reaches a high level of quality and that this level is maintained throughout the region in question. Naturally, in order to guarantee the desired quality, it is necessary to allocate adequate resources and to ensure the availability of suitably qualified personnel.

One of the most urgent problems is to guarantee the quality of the procedures employed in breast pathology diagnostics, both in the clinical context and in screening. Attention needs to be paid specifically to the need to extend quality control to diagnostic centres that do not operate under the auspices of a screening programme, since today most women still undergo tests autonomously outside the organised programmes. Some quality assurance activities can be undertaken as part of the activities of the health service, but others will require specific, targeted funding and will need to cover training activities, data collection and the compilation of proper annual reports to be presented at the regional level.

References

- Advisory Committee on Cancer Prevention (2000) Recommendations on cancer screening in the European Union. Eur J Cancer 36:1473–1478
- Ahn CY, Shaw WW, Narayanan K, et al (1993) Definitive diagnosis of breast implant rupture using magnetic resonance imaging. Plast Reconstr Surg 94: 681–691
- American Cancer Society 1999–2003. Guidelines for clinical cancer prevention
- American College of Radiology (2000\2001) ACR standard for performance of the breast ultrasound examination. In: Standards of the American College of Radiology. Reston, Va, 2000: 389–392
- American College of Radiology (2003) Illustrated breast imaging reporting and data system (BI-RADS), 4th edn. Reston, VA, ACR
- Amici F, Baldassarre S, Giuseppetti GM (2000) Imaging in senologia-Testo Atlante. Milano, Paletto
- ANAES (Agence National d Accreditation e d Evaluation de la Santè) (1998) Recommandations pour la pratique clinique. Synthèse des recommandations cancer du sein. Paris, ANAES
- Baker JA, Rosen EL, Lo JY, et al (2003) Computer-aided detection (CAD) in screening mammography. AJR 181:1083-1088
- Balu-Maestro C, Chapellier C, Bleuse A (2003) Place de l échographie dans le dépistage du cancer du sein. J Le Sein 13:127-134
- Bancej C, Decker K, Chiarelli A, et al (2003) Contribution of clinical breast examination to mammography screening in the early detection of breast cancer. J Med Screen 10: 16–21
- Bauce A, Benesso S, Galiano A (1998) Relazione tra densità mammografica, età delle pazienti e sensibilità. Radiol Med 5 (suppl 1): 271,1998
- Berlin L (2001) The missed breast cancer redux: time for educating the public about the limitation of mammography? AJR 176:1131–1134
- Bjurstam N, Bjorneld L, Duffy SW et al (1997) The Gothenburg Breast Screening Trial. Cancer 80: 2091–2099
- Boyd NF, Byng JW, Jong RA (1995) Quantitative classification of mammographic densities and breast cancer risk: results from the Canadian National Breast Screening Study. J Natl Cancer Inst 87: 670–675
- Boyd NF, Dite GS, Stone J, et al (2002) Heritability of mammographic density, a risk factor for breast cancer. N Engl J Med 347:886–894
- Brem RF, Baun J, Lechner M, et al (2003) Improvement in sensitivity of screening mammography with computer-aided detection: a multiinstitutional trial. AJR 181: 687–693
- Burrel HC, Pinder SE et al (1996) The positive predictive value of mammographic signs. Clin Radiol 51: 277-281

- Di Maggio C et al (2004) CHARTA SENOLOGICA. Radiol Med 108: 569–587
- Ciatto S, Rosselli del Turco M, Burke P, et al (2003) Comparison of standard and double reading and computeraided detection (CAD) of interval cancers at prior negative screening mammograms: blind review. Br J Cancer 89: 1645-9
- Cilotti A, Bagnolesi P et al (1997): Comparison of the diagnostic performance of high-frequency ultrasound in nonpalpable lesions of the breast. Eur Radiol 7:1240–1244
- Cole EB, Pisano ED, Kistner EO, et al (2003) Diagnostic accuracy of digital mammography in patients with dense breast. Radiology 226:153–160
- Consiglio dell'Unione Europea (2003) Raccomandazioni del 2–12–2003 sullo screening dei tumori. 2003/878/CE G.U. Unione Europea 16.12.2003 L 327/34–37
- ISTISAN (1995) Controllo di qualità in mammografia: aspetti tecnici e clinici. Istituto superiore di sanità. ISTI-SAN 95/12 (ISSN 1123-3117), Roma
- Cuzick J (2003) Epidemiology of breast cancer-selected highlights. Breast 12: 405-411
- D'Angelo I, Pindaro L, Glorioso V, et al (1996) Progetto primavera. Risultati del primo passaggio. In: Piscioli F,Cristofolini M (eds) Modelli operativi di prevenzione secondaria del carcinoma mammario. Trento, Temi, pp 209–221
- Dao TH, Rahmouni A, Campana F, et al (1993) Tumor recurrences versus fibrosis in the irradiated breast: differentiation with dynamic gadolinium enhancement MR imaging. Radiology 187: 751–755
- De Koning HJ, Draisma G, Fracheboud J, et al (2006) Overdiagnosis and overtreatment of breast cancer. Microsimulation modelling estimates based on observed screen and clinical data. Breast Cancer Res 8:202
- Del Maschio A, De Gaspari A, Panizza P (2002) Risonanza magnetica in senologia. Radiol Med 104:253-261
- Dendy PP, Brugmans MJP (2003). Low dose radiation risks. Br J Radiol; 76: 674–677.
- Deurloo E.E., Tanis P.J., Gilhuijs K.G. et Al (2003): Reduction in the number of sentinel lymph node procedures by preoperative ultrasonography of the axilla in breast cancer. European Journal of Cancer; 39:1068–1073Di Maggio C (1991) Il servizio di senologia diagnostica. Radiol Med 81: 585–591
- Di Maggio C (1996) La diagnosi del tumore della mammella: linee guida ed aspetti organizzativi (UFSD). In: Piscioli F,Cristofolini M (eds) Modelli operativi di prevenzione secondaria del carcinoma mammario. Trento, Temi, pp 361–379
- Di Maggio C (1993) Lo screening mammografico, questo sconosciuto. Atti LXIX Cong. Soc. It. di Ginecologia (SIGO) Padova La Garangola: 122-126
- Di Maggio C, Fioretti P, La Grassa M, et al (2001) Screening mammografico o diagnostica clinica? Proposta di un modello unificato. Radiol Med 101: 326–333
- Di Maggio C, Gennaro G, La Grassa M, et al (2004). Mammografia digitale. Radiol Med 107 (suppl 2): 15-20
- di Maggio C, Giuseppetti G, Gozzi G et al (1994) La mammografia nelle quarantenni: verso un chiarimento definitivo. Radiol Med 87:731–735
- Di Maggio C, La Grassa M, Pescarini L, et al (2003) Interventistica radio-stereoguidata tradizionale e digitale. In: Nori J, Mazzocchi M (eds) Senologia. Stato dell'arte in interventistica. Napoli, Idelson-Gnocchi, pp 9–18

- Di Maggio C, La Grassa M, Pescarini L, et al (2003) Indicazioni al prelievo con ago ed alla scelta metodologica. In: Nori J, Mazzocchi M (eds) Senologia. Stato dell'arte in interventistica. Napoli, Idelson-Gnocchi, pp 33–41
- Dilhuydy MH, Monnereau A, Barreau B (2003) Le dépistage «à la française». Action programmée ou aménagement du diagnostic précoce individuel? J Le Sein 2: 83–90
- Duffy SW, Tabar L, Chen HH, et al (2002) The impact of organized mammography service screening on breast carcinoma mortality in seven Swedish counties. Cancer 95:458–469
- EURWF (2001) European Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Mammography Screening. Terza Quarta edizione, 4th edn. EUREF, Gennaio
- Feig SA (1977) Can breast cancer be radiation induced? In: Logan WW (ed) Breast carcinoma. NewYork, Wiley Medical, pp 5–14
- Feig SA (1992) Breast masses: mammographic and sonographic evaluation. Radiol Clin North Am 30: 67–94
- Feig SA (1997) Increased benefit from shorter screening mammography intervals for women ages 40-49 years. Cancer 80: 2035-2039
- Fletcher SW, Elmore JG (2003) Mammographic screening for breast cancer. N Engl J Med 348: 1672–80
- Freer TW, Ulissey MJ (2001) Screening mammography with computer-aided detection: prospective study of 12,860 patients in a community breast center. Radiology 220: 781–786
- Gambaccini M, Baldelli P (2003) Mammografia digitale. Principi fisici e sviluppi futuri. Radiol Med 106: 454-466
- Gennaro G, Baldelli P, Taibi A, Di Maggio C, Gambaccini M (2003) Patient dose in full-field digital mammography: an Italian survey. Eur Radiol; published online 12 August 2003
- Gennaro G, di Maggio C (2006) Dose comparison between screen/film and full-field digital mammography. Eur Radiol DOI 10.1007/S00330-006-0314-2
- Giuseppetti GM (2002) L'ecografia senologica. Radiol Med 104: 1-12
- Giuseppetti GM, Martegani A, Di Cioccio B, Baldassarre S (2005) Elastosonografia nella caratterizzazione delle lesioni nodulari della mammella: esperienza preliminare. Radiol Med 1–2: 69–76
- Gorzica DC, De Bruhl ND, Mund DF, Basset LW (1994) Linguine sign at MR imaging: it represents collapsed silicone implant shell? Radiology 191: 576–577
- Gregg EC (1977) Radiation risks with diagnostic X-rays. Radiology 123: 447–453
- Guthrie TH (1999) Breast cancer litigation: an update with practice guidelines. Breast J 5: 335–339
- Hackshaw AK, Paul EA (2003) Breast self-examination and death from breast cancer: a meta-analysis. Br J Cancer 88: 1047–53
- Hartmann LC (2005) Benign breast disease and the risk of breast cancer. N Engl J Med 353:229 –237
- Harvey JA, Bovbierg VE (2004) Quantitative assessment of mammographic breast density: relationship with breast cancer risk. Radiology 230: 29-41
- Helbich TH, Matzek W, Fuchsjager MH (2003) Stereotactic and ultrasound-guided breast biopsy. Eur Radiol; published online 13 November 2003
- Hendrick RE, Basset L, Bosco MA, et al (1999) Mammography qualità control manual. Reston, Va, American College of Radiology

- Hill DA (2005) Breast cancer risk following radioterapy for Hodgkin's lymphoma. Blood 106: 3358–65
- Itoh A, Ueno Ei, Tohno E, et al (2006) Breast disease: clinical application of US elastography for diagnosis. Radiology 239: 341–350
- Jackman RJ, Burbank F, Parker SH, et al (2001) Stereotactic breast biopsy of nonpalpable lesions: determinants of ductal carcinoma in situ underestimation rates. Radiology 218:497-502
- Jacobs T (2002) Nonmalignant lesions in breast core needle biopsies. To excise or not to excise? Am J Surg Pathol 26: 1095–1110
- Jakobsen JA (2001) Ultrasound contrast agents: clinical application. Eur Radiol 11: 1329–1337
- James JJ (2004) The current status of digital mammography. Clin Radiol 59:1–10
- Kaplan SS (2001) Clinical utility of bilateral whole-breast US in the evaluation of women with dense breast tissue. Radiology 221: 641-649
- Kolb T, Lichy J, Newhouse JH (1998) Occult cancer in women with dense breast: normal mammographic and physical examination findings: detection with screening US. Radiology 207:191-199
- Kolb TM, Lichy J, Newhouse JH (2002) Comparison of the performance of screening mammography, physical examination, and breast US and evaluation of factor that influence them: an analysis of 27,825 patient evaluations. Radiology 225:165–175
- Kopans DB (2004) Mammography screening is saving thousands of lives, but will it survive medical malpractice? Radiology 230:20-24
- Kuhl CK, Schmutzer RK, Leutner C et al (2000) Breast MR imaging screening in 192 women proved or suspected to be carriers of a breast cancer susceptibility gene: preliminary results. Radiology 215: 267–279
- Lamarque JL, Cherifcheikh J, Laurent JC, et al (1997) La qualité en mastologie: criterès, contrôle. Montpelier, Manosmed, Tome I, Sauramps médical
- Lattanzio V, Simonetti G (2002) Mammografia: guida alla refertazione ed alla codifica dei risultati Re.Co.R.M. Napoli, Idelson-Gnocchi srl
- Law J, Faulkner K (2002) Concerning the relationship between benefit and radiation risk, and cancers detected and induced, in a breast screening programme. Br J Radiol 75: 678–684
- Lechener M, Nelson M, Elvecrog E (2002) Comparison of two commercially available computer-aided detection (CAD) systems. Appl Radiol 31: 31–35
- Liberman L, Morris EA, Dershaw DD, et al (2003) Fast MRIguided vacuum-assisted breast biopsy: initial experience. AJR 181: 1283–1293
- Maijd AS, Shaw de Paredes E, Doherty RD, et al (2003) Missed breast carcinoma: pitfalls and pearl. Radiographics 23:881-895
- Mandelson MT, Oestreicher N, Porter PL et al (2000) Breast density as a predictor of mammographic detection: comparison of interval- and screen-detected cancers J Natl Cancer Inst 92: 1081–1087
- Marra V, Frigerio A, Di Virgilio MR, Coll E (1999) Il carcinoma mammario diagnosticato nello screening mammografico nei passaggi di incidenza. Radiol Med 98: 342–346
- Martinez AM, Medina CJ, Bustos C, et al (2003) Assessment of breast lesions using Doppler with contrast agents. Eur J Gynaecol Oncol 24: 527–30

- Merritt CRB (2001) Technology update. Radiol Clin North Am 39: 385-397
- Michaelson JS, Halpern E, Kopans DB (1999) Breast cancer computer simulation method for estimation of optimal intervals for screening. Radiology 212: 551–560
- Moon WK, Im JG, Noh DY, Han MC (2000) Non-palpable breast lesion: evaluation with power Doppler US and microbubble contrast agent-initial experience. Radiology 217: 240-6
- Morris EA (2002) Breast cancer imaging with MR. Radiol Clin North Am 40: 349–355
- Moy L, Slanertz P, Moore MA, et al (2002) Specificity of mammography and ultrasound in the evaluation of a palpable abnormality: retrospective review. Radiology 225: 176-181
- Nori J, Mazzocchi M (2003) Senologia. Stato dell'arte in interventistica. Napoli, Idelson-Gnocchi
- Nystrom L, Andersson I, Bjurstam N et al (2002) Longterm effects of mammography screening: updated overview of the Swedish randomised trials. Lancet 359: 909-19
- Oellinger H, Heins S, Sander B et al (1993) Gd-DTPA-enhanced MRI of breast: the most sensitive method for detecting multicentric carcinomas in female breast? Eur Radiol 3: 223-226
- Panizza P, De Corbelli F, De Gaspari A, et al (2003) MRguided stereotactic breast biopsy: technical aspects and preliminary results. Radiol Med 106: 232-44
- Panizza P, De Gaspari A, Vanzulli A, et al (1997) Role of MR mammography (MRM) in planning preoperative chemotherapy treatment and analyzing results. Eur Radiol 7: 242
- Parker SH, Klaus AJ, Schilling KJ, et al (2001) Sonographically guided directional vacuum-assisted breast biopsy using a handled device. AJR 177: 405–408
- Perry NM (EUSOMA Working Party) (2001) Quality assurance in the diagnosis of breast disease. Eur J Cancer 37: 159–172
- Peto R et al (2000) UK and USA breast cancer deaths down 25% in year 2000 AD ages 20–69 years (letter). Lancet 20: 1822
- Pisano ED (2000) Current status of full field digital mammography. Radiology 214: 26-28
- Pisano ED, Fajardio LL, Caudry DJ, et al (2001) Fine-needle aspiration biopsy of nonpalpable lesion in a multicenter clinical trial. Radiology 219: 785–792
- Pisano ED, Gatsonis C, Hendrick E, et al (2005) For the Digital Mammographic Imaging Screening Trial (DMIST) Investigators Group. N Engl J Med 353: 1773–1783
- Piscioli F, Cristofolini M (1996) Modelli operativi di prevenzione secondaria del carcinoma della mammella. Trento, Tipolitografia Temi
- Podo F, Sardanelli F, Canese R, et al (2002) The Italian Multi-Centre Project on Evaluation of MRI and Other Imaging Modalities in Early Detection of Mammary Tumors in Subjects at High Genetic Risk. J Exp Clin Cancer Res 21/3: 115–124
- Raja MA, Hubbard A, et al (2001) Interval breast cancer: is it a different type of breast cancer? Breast 10: 100–108
- Reynolds HE, Buckwalter KA, Jackson VP, et al (1994) Comparison of mammography, sonography, and magnetic resonance imaging in the detection of silicone-gel breast implant rupture. Ann Plast Surg 33: 247–257

- Rieber A, Zeitler H, Rosenthal H, et al (1997) MRI of breast cancer: influence of chemotherapy on sensitivity. Br J Radiol 70: 452–458
- Rizzatto G (2001) Towards a more sophisticated use of breast ultrasound. Eur Radiol 11: 2425–2435
- Rosen EL, Baker JA, Soo MS (2002) Malignant lesions initially subjected to short-term mammographic follow-up. Radiology 223:221–228
- Rosselli del Turco M (1999) Programmi di screening per il carcinoma mammario. In: Veronesi U e Coll (eds) Senologia oncologica. Milano, Masson, pp 165-176
- Sauer T, Myrvold K, Lomo J, et al (2003) Fine-needle aspiration cytology in nonpalpable mammographic abnormalities in breast cancer screening. Breast 12: 314–319

Schorn C, Fischer U, Luftner-Nagel S, et al (1999) MRI of the breast in patients with metastatic disease of unknown primary. Eur Radiol 9: 470–3

- Shapiro S (1977) Evidence on screening for breast cancer from a randomized trial. Cancer 39: 2772–2782
- Sharan SK, Morimatsu M, Albrecht U, et al (1997) Embryonic lethality and radiation hypersensitivity mediated by Rad51 in mice lacking Brca2. Nature 386: 804–10
- Sickles EA, Wolverton DE, Dee KE (2002) Performance parameters for screening and diagnostic mammography: specialist and general radiologists. Radiology 224: 861– 869
- Slanetz PJ, Edmister WB, Weisskoff RM, et al (1998) Occult contralateral breast cancer detected by breast MR. Radiology 209: 416
- Smart CR, Hendrick RE, Rutledge JH, et al (1995) Benefit of mammography screening in women ages 40 to 49 years. Cancer 75/7: 1619-1626
- Solomon B, Orel SG, Reynolds C, et al (1998) Delayed development of enhancement in fat necrosis after breast conservation therapy: a potential pitfall of MR imaging of the breast. AJR 170: 966–968
- Stines J, Noel A, Levy L, et al (2002) Digital mammography and computer-assisted diagnosis. J Radiol 83: 581–90
- Sylvester PA, Vipond MN, Kutt E (1977) Rate and classification of interval cancers in the breast screening programme. Ann R Coll Surg Engl 79: 276–277
- Tavassoli FA, Devilee P (2003) Pathology and genetics of tumours of the breast and female genital organs. IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer)–WHO–OMS. Lyon, IARC Press

- Teifke A, Lehr HA, Vomweg TW, et al (2003) Outcome analysis and rational management of enhancing lesions incidentally detected on contrast-enhanced MRI of the breast. AJR 181: 655–662
- Tilanus-Linthorst MM, Obdeijn IM, Bartels KC et al (2000) First experience in screening women at high risk for breast cancer with MR imaging. Breast Cancer Res Treat 63: 53-60
- Travis LB (2005) Cumulative absolute breast cancer risk for young women treated for Hodgkin's lymphoma. J Natl Cancer Inst 97: 1428–27
- Travis LB (2003) Breast cancer following radiotherapy and chemotherapy among young women with Hodgkin's disease. JAMA 290: 465–531
- Vanara F, Ponti A, Frigerio A, et al (1995) Analisi dei costi di un programma di screening mammografico. Epidemiologia e prevenzione 19: 318–329
- Viehweg P, Heinig A, Amaya B, et al (2002) MR-guided interventional breast procedures considering vacuum biopsy in particular. Eur Radiol 42/1: 32–39
- Wald NJ, Chamberlain J, Hackshav A (1993) Report of the European Society for Mastology on Breast Cancer Screening, Breast 2: 209–216
- Warren R, Eleti A (2006) Overdiagnosis and overtreatment of breast cancer. Is overdiagnosis an issue for radiologists? Breast Cancer Research 8: 205
- Wasser K, Sinn HP, Fink C, et al (2003) Accuracy of tumor size measurement in breast cancer using MRI is influenced by histological regression induced by neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Eur Radiol 6: 1213–23
- Weiss NS (2003) Breast cancer mortality in relation to clinical breast examination and breast self-examination. Breast J 9:86-89
- Wittingam TA (1999) Tissue harmonic imaging. Eur Radiol 9: 323-326
- Zackrisson S, Andersson I, Janzon L, et al (2006) Rate of over-diagnosis of breast cancer 15 years after end of Malmo mammographic screening trial: follow-up study. BMJ 332: 689–692
- Zappa M, Falini P, Bonardi D, et al (2002) Monitoring interval cancers in mammographic screening: the Florence district programme experience. Breast 11: 301–305
- Zonderland HM, Coerkamp EG, Hermans J, et al (1999) Diagnosis of breast cancer: contribution of US as an adjunct to mammography. Radiology 213: 413–422