The Breast 51 (2020) 102

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Breast

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/brst

Correspondence

Correspondence: Preoperative assessment of breast cancer: Multireader comparison of contrast-enhanced MRI versus the combination of unenhanced MRI and digital breast tomosynthesis

Dear Editor,

The results in this work have the potential to influence screening guidelines but all imaging combinations (contrast enhanced magnetic resonance imaging (CEMRI) + digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT), unenhanced magnetic resonance imaging (UMRI) only, or DBT only) should and could have been evaluated with the current data set. These combinations may help determine the reason for a lower false positive (FP) rate in the UMRI + DBT case.

The increased number of false negatives in the UMRI + DBT case is concerning [1]. While the conclusion states that UMRI + DBT may help reduce false positives (FP) when compared to CEMRI, the increase in false negatives (FN) should not be overlooked. Studies have shown that women are aware of FP and are willing to accept the inconveniences of extra screening if a possible cancer can be found earlier [2,3]. Improving specificity, by decreasing false positives, should not be at the cost of sacrificing sensitivity or increasing FN.

It is unlikely that extracting the UMRI images from a full CEMRI is a feasible or practical method of acquiring images. Sparse MRI methods may be a more efficient way of obtaining UMRI and future work may want to consider this imaging method if images are comparable [4,5].

References

[1] Girometti R, Marconi V, Linda A, et al. Preoperative assessment of breast cancer: multireader comparison of contrast-enhanced MRI versus the combination of unenhanced MRI and digital breast tomosynthesis. Breast 2020;49:174–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2019.11.013.

[2] Ganott MA, Sumkin JH, King JL, et al. Screening mammography: do women prefer a higher recall rate given the possibility of earlier detection of cancer? Radiology 2006;238(3):793–800. https://doi.org/10.1148/radiol.2383050852.

[3] Schwartz LM, Woloshin S, Sox HC, Fischhoff B, Welch HG. US women's attitudes to false-positive mammography results and detection of ductal carcinoma in situ. West J Med 2000;173(5):307–12.

[4] Lustig M, Donoho D, Pauly JM. Sparse MRI: the application of compressed sensing for rapid MR imaging. Magn Reson Med 2007;58(6):1182–95. https://doi.org/10.1002/mrm.21391.

[5] Comstock Christopher E, Gatsonis Constantine, Newstead Gillian M, et al. Comparison of Abbreviated Breast MRI vs Digital Breast Tomosynthesis for Breast Cancer Detection Among Women With Dense Breasts Undergoing Screening. JAMA 2020;323(8):746–56. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.0572.

Lambert T. Leong
Department of Molecular Bioscience and Bioengineering, University of Hawaii at Manoa, 2500 Campus Rd, Honolulu, HI, 96822, USA
E-mail address: lambert3@hawaii.edu.

5 March 2020
Available online 31 March 2020

DOI of original article: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2019.11.013.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2020.03.007
0960-9776/© 2020 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).