

Breast Cancer Screening Using Tomosynthesis in Combination with Digital Mammography

Friedewald S M, Rafferty E A, Rose S L, Durand M A, Plecha D M, Greenberg J S, Hayes M K, Copit D S, Carlson K L, Cink T M, Barke L D, Greer L N, Miller D P, Conant E F

JAMA. 2014;311(24):2499-2507. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.6095

Objective

To study how 3D mammography (breast tomosynthesis) in combination with 2D mammography when used in breast cancer screening has impacted patient care at 13 academic and community based sites in the U.S.

Materials and Methods

A total of 454,850 examinations (n = 281,187 digital mammography; n = 173,663 digital mammography + tomosynthesis) for 13 centers interpreted by 139 radiologists over two time periods were retrospectively analyzed to determine if 2D mammography combined with 3D mammography improved performance of breast screening programs.

Period 1 included 1 full year of screening with 2D mammography alone, ending on the date of 3D mammography introduction at each institution. Period 2 included screening with 2D mammography + 3D mammography until December 31, 2012.

The primary measured outcomes were recall rate (proportion of patients requiring additional imaging based on a screening examination result), cancer detection rate, positive predictive value for recall (PPV1 - proportion of patients recalled after screening who were diagnosed as having breast cancer) and positive predictive value for biopsy (PPV3 - proportion of patients undergoing biopsies who were diagnosed as having breast cancer).

Results

This is the largest study reported to date on the effectiveness of 3D mammography. An analysis of the data (summarized below) indicated that 3D mammography outperformed conventional 2D mammography. Eleven (11) of the 13 sites showed simultaneous improvement for the key metrics of cancer detection and recall rates; the two sites that did not see these combined benefits had used 3D mammography for a short time or imaged very few women

	2D	2D+3D Mammography	Relative Change	P-Value
Number of screening examinations	281,187	173,663		
Recall Rate	10.7%	9.1%	-15%	P<.001
Cancer Detection Rate	4.2/1000	5.4/1000	+29%	P<.001
Invasive Cancer Detection Rate	2.9/1000	4.1/1000	+41%	P<.001
PPV1	4.3%	6.4%	+49%	P<.001
PPV3	24.2%	29.2%	+21%	P<.001

Conclusion

The authors conclude that the addition of 3D mammography to 2D mammography demonstrated an increase in cancer detection rate and a decrease in the recall rate.

For complete findings and full-text, please [click here](#)

hologic.com | info@hologic.com | +1.781.999.7300

Presented by **Hologic Medical Education**

MISC-02964 REV 001 © Hologic 2014. All rights reserved. Views and opinions expressed herein by third parties are theirs alone and do not necessarily reflect those of Hologic. This information is intended for medical professionals in the U.S. and other markets and is not intended as a product solicitation or promotion where such activities are prohibited. Because Hologic materials are distributed through websites, eBroadcasts and tradeshows, it is not always possible to control where such materials appear. For information on specific products available for sale in a particular country, please contact your local Hologic representative or write to womenshealth@hologic.com.