

University of Dundee

**Clinical performance of single-view Siemens digital breast tomosynthesis versus standard supplementary mammography for the assessment of screen-detected abnormalities - a multi-reader study**

Whelehan, Patricia; Heywang-Koebrunner, Sylvia; Vinnicombe, Sarah; Hacker, Astrid; Jaensch, Alexander; Hapca, Adrian

*Publication date:*  
2016

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Whelehan, P., Heywang-Koebrunner, S., Vinnicombe, S., Hacker, A., Jaensch, A., Hapca, A., Gray, R., Jenkin, M., Lowry, K., Oeppen, R., Reilly, M., Stahnke, M., & Evans, A. (2016). *Clinical performance of single-view Siemens digital breast tomosynthesis versus standard supplementary mammography for the assessment of screen-detected abnormalities - a multi-reader study*. Abstract from Symposium Mammographicum 2016, Liverpool.

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## **Clinical performance of single-view Siemens digital breast tomosynthesis versus standard supplementary mammography for the assessment of screen-detected abnormalities - a multi-reader study**

Ms Patsy Whelehan<sup>1</sup>, Professor Sylvia Heywang-Koebrunner<sup>2</sup>, Dr Sarah Vinnicombe<sup>1</sup>, Dr Astrid Hacker<sup>2</sup>, Dr Alexander Jaensch<sup>2</sup>, Dr Adrian Hapca<sup>8</sup>, Dr Rosie Gray<sup>5</sup>, Mrs Maggie Jenkin<sup>6</sup>, Dr Keith Lowry<sup>7</sup>, Dr Rachel Oeppen<sup>3</sup>, Dr Michael Reilly<sup>4</sup>, Dr Michaela Stahnke<sup>3</sup>, Professor Andy Evans<sup>8</sup>  
<sup>1</sup> University of Dundee & NHS Tayside, UK; <sup>2</sup> Referenzzentrum Mammographie Muenchen, Germany; <sup>3</sup> University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, UK; <sup>4</sup> Altnagelvin Hospital, UK; <sup>5</sup> Royal Cornwall Hospital, UK; <sup>6</sup> Derriford Hospital, UK; <sup>7</sup> Belfast City Hospital, UK; <sup>8</sup> University of Dundee, UK

**Background and purpose:** In the assessment of screen-detected abnormalities, digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) can offer equivalent or improved accuracy over standard supplementary mammography (SSM)<sup>1,2</sup>. However, it is difficult to generalise study results across equipment manufacturers because of wide design variations. We aimed to establish whether Siemens DBT is at least as accurate as SSM in the assessment of screen-detected soft-tissue mammographic abnormalities.

**Materials and methods:** Participants underwent single-view DBT (Siemens MAMMOMAT Inspiration) in addition to assessment with one or more supplementary mammographic views. All outcomes were proven by histology or >2 year follow-up. 230 cases were available for analysis. Eight accredited UK NHSBSP readers, blinded to assessment outcome, retrospectively read all cases with A: screening mammograms plus DBT, and B: screening mammograms plus SSM. Readings were 9 weeks apart to avoid recall bias. Reading condition order was reversed in half the readers. Statistical analysis included ROC curves, compared by Chi Squared test.

**Results:** Based on the area under the ROC curve, the two methods are not significantly different (auROC 0.87 for DBT vs 0.86 for SSM, p=0.49). DBT sensitivity was not significantly different from SSM sensitivity (90% vs 86%, p=0.10) whereas DBT specificity was significantly lower than SSM (59% vs 64%, p=0.0002).

**Conclusions:** Overall, Siemens DBT is as accurate as standard supplementary mammography for assessing screen-detected, soft-tissue, mammographic abnormalities. It is therefore suitable for optional implementation subject to practical evaluation. The accuracy of DBT in this study was driven by higher sensitivity compared with SSM, while specificity was lower.

### **References:**

1. Cornford EJ, Turnbull AE, James JJ, Tsang R, Akram T, Burrell HC, et al. Accuracy of GE digital breast tomosynthesis vs supplementary mammographic views for diagnosis of screen-detected soft-tissue breast lesions. *The British Journal of Radiology*. 2015 89(1058).
2. Morel JC, Iqbal A, Wasan RK, Peacock C, Evans DR, Rahim R, et al. The accuracy of digital breast tomosynthesis compared with coned compression magnification mammography in the assessment of abnormalities found on mammography. *Clinical radiology*. 2014 69(11): 1112-6.