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Breast Tumors: Comparative Accuracy of MR Imaging Relative to Mammography and US for Demonstrating Extent

PURPOSE: To evaluate the comparative accuracy of magnetic resonance (MR) imaging relative to mammography and ultrasonography (US) for assessing the extent of breast tumors.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Histologic results and preoperative imaging findings (mammography, US, MR imaging) were analyzed regarding tumor size and multifocality of 61 tumors in 60 women undergoing mastectomy for carcinoma.

RESULTS: In 10% of cases, the index tumor was not seen at mammography. With US, 15% of the index tumors were not recognized, while MR imaging missed 2% of the index tumors. On mammographic and US images, tumor size was underestimated significantly ($P < .005$), by 14% and 18%, respectively, while MR imaging showed no significant difference in size compared with that found in a pathologic evaluation. Mammography showed 31% of the additional invasive lesions, while US showed 38% and MR imaging showed 100%.

CONCLUSION: MR imaging was the most accurate of the three preoperative imaging modalities in assessing the size and number of malignant lesions in the breast.
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Abbreviations: DCIS = ductal carcinoma in situ, FLASH = fast low-angle shot, FOV = field of view, IDC = invasive duct carcinoma, ILC = invasive lobular carcinoma, MP-RAGE = magnetization-prepared rapid gradient echo, 3D = three-dimensional.
section plane was then selected through the center of the index tumor. This plane always included a cross section of the descending aorta. In the same plane, 60 sequential breast images were obtained with a temporal resolution of 2.3 seconds during 2 minutes, by using the dynamic TurboFLASH sequence (9/4/15, 8° flip angle, 10-mm section thickness, 128 x 256 matrix, 350-cm FOV, and two acquisitions). After the first four images were acquired, the contrast medium was administered intravenously within 10 seconds, followed by a bolus of 20 mL of normal saline solution.

We recently reported a more detailed description of the dynamic TurboFLASH technique (6).

After the TurboFLASH sequence, the 3D MP-RAGE sequence was repeated with tuning parameters adjusted off line to match the precontrast parameter settings. The whole examination, including the precontrast MP-RAGE, the postcontrast dynamic TurboFLASH, and the postcontrast MP-RAGE sequences, lasted about 20 minutes. The data acquired with the TurboFLASH sequence were then transferred to a separate console for subtraction of postcontrast from precontrast images.

The subtracted TurboFLASH images were used to determine the start and speed of enhancement, which were subsequently analyzed according to the following criterion: The image on which the descending aorta started to enhance was considered the reference image at time zero. Lesions that started to enhance within 11.5 seconds after aortic enhancement were considered suspect for malignancy (6).

From the subtracted MP-RAGE images, a 3D multiplanar reconstruction of the entire breast was generated to evaluate the lesion index in more detail and to identify other possible foci of enhancement. The images were then evaluated according to the pattern and shape of enhancement. Focal enhancement, especially with irregular borders, was considered suspicious for malignancy (9). Diffuse field enhancement, either homogeneous or heterogeneous, was considered equivocal, since this pattern of enhancement may be seen in both benign and malignant lesions. MR imaging is always performed before needle biopsy, so surgical changes pose no diagnostic problems.

All mastectomy specimens were examined with Egan's serial subgross and correlated radiographic-histologic method (10). In this technique the surgical biopsy specimen and the whole-breast specimen are sectioned at 5-mm intervals in the transverse direction and each section is radiographed. Tissue blocks for histologic examination are taken from the radiologically suspicious lesions (ie, those with microcalcifications or architectural distortions) and from areas showing grossly suspicious changes. In any breast specimen, an average of 25 tissue blocks are taken from the quadrant containing the index lesion, in addition to random samples from other quadrants, the nipple, and the central area beneath the nipple-areolar complex. Both the precise site of the tissue blocks taken and the microscopically verified extension of each lesion are indicated on the specimen radiograph (11). This method permits meticulous histopathologic assessment of the extent and possible multifocality of the tumorous process. Enhancing lesions on MR images were identified and located on the specimen radiographs and then in the tissue sections, and the corresponding tissue blocks were studied histologically.

The size of the tumor was assessed with all three imaging techniques by determining the longest axis of the tumor. The tumor margins were defined by the area of microcalcification distribution, the extent of the soft-tissue component, and the area of architectural distortion of breast tissue. At MR imaging the longest axis was assessed by measuring the lesion on the subtracted and reconstructed 3D MP-RAGE images. The size differences between imaging-based measurements and specimen-based pathologic measurements were expressed in relative terms. P values for comparative performance in size determination were calculated.

## RESULTS

### Detection of the Index Tumor

A total of 61 tumors were evaluated. The imaging findings and definite histologic results are summarized in Table 1. In six cases (10%) the index tumor was not visible on the mammograms. With US, nine of 59 (15%) tumors were not recognized. In one case of DCIS and one case of IDC, US was not performed.

All tumors but one were demonstrated with the combined TurboFLASH and 3D MP-RAGE MR imaging technique. The single MR imaging-negative tumor was a DCIS with a diameter of 9 cm. Three lesions were not apparent in the chosen TurboFLASH section, because the region of interest could not be properly identified on the precontrast 3D MP-RAGE images. However, all three were recognized on the postcontrast 3D MP-RAGE images. For the 40 cases of IDC, the mean time to the start of enhancement on the TurboFLASH images was 6.2 seconds (range, 2.3–11.5 seconds); for the eight cases of ILC, the mean time was 7.9 seconds (range, 4.6–11.5 seconds); and for the six cases of pure DCIS the mean time was 7.6 seconds (range, 6.9–9.2 seconds).

### Size Determination of the Index Tumor

The pathologically determined tumor size, based on the largest diameter, varied from 1 to 15 cm. Deviations in the size of the lesions determined with mammography, US, and MR imaging, respectively, compared with those determined histologically, are shown in Figures 1–3.

When sizes are expressed in relative terms, mammography and US underestimate the actual tumor size by statistically significant (P < .005) size differences of 14% and 18%, respectively, in contrast to a not significant size difference of only 1% for MR imaging (Table 2, Fig 4).

The discrepancies in size for mammography, US, and MR imaging for the various tumor types (IDC, ILC, and DCIS) are listed in Table 3.

### Detection of Invasive Tumor Multifocality

Of the 61 mastectomy specimens, 12 contained a multifocal invasive tumor at histologic examination, with, respectively, one (seven cases), two (two cases), and multiple (three cases) small tumor foci in addition to the index tumor. One specimen contained multicentric lesions at the site of the second invasive tumor, a distance of 4.5 cm from the index tumor (Fig 5). These findings are summarized in Table 4. MR imaging was
100% accurate in identifying tumor multifocality, whereas mammography had an accuracy of 31% and US had an accuracy of 38%.

**DISCUSSION**

Accurate definition of the extent and possible multifocality of tumors is essential for making the choice between the therapeutic options of breast-conserving treatment and mastectomy.

In the present study the results of mammography, US, and MR imaging were compared with the final histologic results in 61 mastectomy specimens for determining the actual size of the reference tumor as measured at histologic examination. Also, the accuracy in recognizing additional tumor foci—that is, tumor multifocality—was evaluated.

**Detection of the Index Tumor**

The reported sensitivity of mammography for the detection of breast cancer varies between 69% and 90%. Peeters et al (12) reported a sensitivity of 93% and a specificity of 99% for mammography in a breast screening study. Baker (1) reported a multicenter study in which 90% of all malignant lesions were detected in a screening population. In a symptomatic patient population the sensitivity of mammography for malignancy varied from 81% to 96% (13). The sensitivity of 90% in the present study of 60 symptomatic patients is within this range.

The most important role of US is the differentiation between cystic and solid masses. While US is 96%-100% accurate in identifying a cyst, it is less reliable in differentiating between benign and malignant solid masses, especially because of the overlap between the features of certain types of fibroadenomas and carcinomas (14). In the present study, in nine of 59 patients no abnormalities were seen with US in the mammographically suspicious area, resulting in a sensitivity of 85%. However, five of the nine US-occult tumors were DCIS. This result is in agreement with the experience of Kopans et al (15), indicating that pure DCIS is often not seen on US scans, and thus US is not suitable for screening purposes.

The sensitivity of MR imaging in various studies for detecting carcinoma of the breast is high. Harms et al (16) reported a sensitivity of 100%, while Heywang-Kobruner et al (17) claimed a sensitivity of 99.5%.

In a previous study in which the combined 3D MP-RAGE–TurboFLASH technique was used in 83 patients, we achieved a sensitivity of 95% and a specificity of 86% (6). The 3D MP-RAGE sequence has a high sensitivity for detecting lesions, while the TurboFLASH sequence is able to help differentiate between benign and malignant lesions.

All but one of the index tumors in the present study were recognized at MR imaging and classified as malignant. The single tumor occult to MR imaging was a well-differentiated (non-comedo) DCIS detected by means of mammographic microcalcifications.

On the whole, the most rapid start of enhancement was shown by the
IDCs. The six cases of pure DCIS began enhancing an average of 1.4 seconds later, while the eight cases of ILC began enhancing at a mean of 7.9 seconds, or 1.7 seconds later than the IDCs.

Size Determination of the Index Tumor

Fornage et al (3) compared the clinically, mammographically, and sonographically determined sizes of cancers in a series of 51 patients and concluded that mammography is less accurate than sonography in assessing tumor size. Harms et al (5) reported that tumor size can be better assessed with MR imaging than with mammography and that MR imaging often provides better delineation of a lesion than does mammography. In a series of 47 malignant tumors, tumor size measured with MR imaging correlated more closely with histologic measurements than did mammographic measurements in 33 cases (7). Gribbestad et al (18) also demonstrated that MR imaging showed better accuracy in tumor size determination than did mammography.

In the present study, MR imaging proved to be the most accurate method for assessment of tumor size (Figs 1-3, Table 2). Nevertheless, an extreme discrepancy was noted in the case of an ILC in which the pathologic tumor diameter was 15 cm, but only part of it—namely, 4 cm—enhanced. Also, a well-differentiated (noncomedo) type of DCIS with a diameter of 9 cm showed no enhancement at all.

In a subset of eight patients, we also studied the capability of MR imaging to show an extensive intraductal component in association with the invasive tumor (19). While the size of the invasive part was correctly estimated, the DCIS component, with an average extension of 3.5 cm (range, 1-7 cm), was underestimated by more than 1 cm in all patients. In six of these eight patients the DCIS was histologically of the well-differentiated (non-comedo) type. This finding is in accordance with the results of Greenstein Orel et al (20), who describe how some cases of DCIS may be impossible to identify with MR imaging. In contrast, Heywang-Kobrunner (21) describes a series of 19 DCIS tumors that apparently all enhanced.

Detection of Invasive Tumor Multifocality

Holland et al (2), in a study of 282 invasive cancers, showed that in 43% of the tumors, additional tumor foci were present beyond 2 cm from the margin of the index tumor (2). The majority of these foci were occult at mammography. These data indicate that while mammography is accurate in detecting the reference lesion, it is less accurate in identifying multifocality.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumor Type</th>
<th>Mammography</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>MR Imaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>-5%* (37)</td>
<td>-9%* (37)</td>
<td>-3%* (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC</td>
<td>-37%* (7)</td>
<td>-43%* (8)</td>
<td>-16%* (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCIS</td>
<td>-29%* (8)</td>
<td>-8%* (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Numbers in parentheses are number of tumors.
* Not significant.
$ P < 0.05.$
$ Not performed.$
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Holland et al (2), in a study of 282 invasive cancers, showed that in 43% of the tumors, additional tumor foci were present beyond 2 cm from the margin of the index tumor (2). The majority of these foci were occult at mammography. These data indicate that while mammography is accurate in detecting the reference lesion, it is less accurate in identifying multifocality.

To our knowledge, no results on the ability of US in detecting breast tumor multifocality have been reported. Harms et al (7) reported that MR imaging depicted all additional mammographically occult cancers in 11 of 30 cases in which the whole-breast specimen was serially sectioned (7). Heywang-Kobrunner and Oel-linger (22) reported that MR imaging was able to show 80% of all malignant foci, whereas mammography showed only 20%. In the present study, all histologically proved additional malignant invasive lesions were identified on MR images (Table 4). All these foci were characterized by irregular edges on the 3D MP-RAGE images. Two fibroadenomas were correctly identified on 3D MP-RAGE images; however, three additional lesions that fulfilled our MR imaging criteria for malignancy turned out to be fibroadenomas.

The results of this study indicate that MR imaging can play a comple-
vide a better assessment of the extent and multifocality of the malignant process. In this retrospective study, we analyzed 61 mastectomy specimens. Multifocality was noted histologically and with MR imaging in 13 patients, whereas it was seen with mammography in only four cases. Since the choice between breast-saving therapy and mastectomy is not only based on preoperative imaging findings but also on the judgment of the surgeon and the wish of the patient, it is difficult to isolate the effect of MR diagnosis alone on patient treatment. Because false-positive diagnoses are rare in our experience, it can be concluded that MR imaging was decisive in a maximum of nine patients.

In conclusion, the histologic findings of 61 mastectomy specimens were correlated with preoperative mammography, US, and MR imaging results. MR imaging showed all histologically proved malignant lesions except one and allowed estimation of the size of the tumor more accurately than did mammography or US. The size of larger tumors was especially underestimated with mammography and US. Additional malignant lesions, in particular invasive foci of multifocal tumors, were best identified with MR imaging.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mammography</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>MR Imaging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multifocality (n=13)</td>
<td>31% (4)</td>
<td>38% (5)</td>
<td>100% (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unifocality (n=48)</td>
<td>100% (48)</td>
<td>100% (46)</td>
<td>94% (47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.—Numbers in parentheses are number of tumors.
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