Role of Digital Mammography , Sonography In Diagnosis Of Clinically Palpable Breast Lumps With Histopathological Correlation: Case Study

Vidisha Malpani[1], Rudraksh Gupta[2], Hemant Kumar Mishra[3], Ridhima Gupta Jain[4],Nipun Gumber[5]

[1]Resident, Department of Radiodiagnosis, MGMCH, Jaipur.
[2]Ex- Resident, Department of Radiodiagnosis, MGMCH, Jaipur.
[3]Head of Department, Department of Radiodiagnosis, MGMCH, Jaipur.
[4]Associate Professor, Department of Radiodiagnosis, SPMC, Bikaner.
[5]Resident , Department of Radiodiagnosis, MGMCH, Jaipur
*Corresponding author: Dr. Vidisha Malpani,

Abstract:*Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths in women today (After lung cancer) and is the most common cancer among women, excluding non-invasive non-melanoma skin cancers. Worldwide, breast cancer comprises 22.9% of invasive cancers in women and 16% of all female cancers.1 Mammography has been the basic screening tool in diagnosing breast lumps. It is still the first line of the imaging investigation. USG has emerged as the most important adjunct to mammography in patients with breast lumps and normal or inconclusive mammographic findings. This is a prospective study on 50 patients reporting with complaints of breast lump in surgical OPD at Mahatma Gandhi Hospital, Sitapura, Jaipur*

Date of Submission: 06-12-2017   Date of acceptance: 19-12-2017

I. Introdution

Worldwide, breast cancer comprises 22.9% of invasive cancers in women and 16% of all female cancers (WHO, 2008). According to an Indian health news report, one in 22 women's in India is likely to suffer from breast cancer during their life time. The figure is definitely more in America with one in eight being a victim of this deadly cancer.3 However the incidence of breast cancer is increasing inall countries of the world especially in developing countries such as India, especially in metropolitan cities because of change in lifestyle of women, alcoholism , delayed parity and intake of hormone replacement therapy. Mammography &sonomammography are widely used for the radiological evaluation of breast lumps. Both these procedures can be used individually or in adjunction to each other for the detection of nature (benign or malignant) of breast lump. Mammography has been the basic imaging method in breast diagnostics, and the only tool suitable for screening breast cancer (Tabár et al. 2000). Mammography is still the first line of the imaging investigation.The aim of interpreting mammograms is to find asymmetric densities, mostly circular or stellate lesions; parenchymal contour changes; architectural distortion and micro calcifications with or without associated tumor, which may indicate breast malignancy.4 The sensitivity and specificity of mammography in detecting breast cancers are highly dependent on the composition of the breast parenchyma. Detection of cancer is difficult in patients with dense breast parenchyma (young, pregnant or lactating patients and patients on HRT) and mammographically non calcified tumours. A definite differentiation between cyst and tumours is also not possible in most of the cases. In response to these diagnostic deficiencies of mammography various modalities have been evaluated for the diagnosis of the breast cancer, including light-scanning, thermography, ultrasonography (US), isotope scanning, digital subtraction angiography, computed tomography and MR imaging, USG and MR being the most reliable of these.The easy availability, cheapness, portability and low technical requirements have made USG the most important adjunct to mammography in patients with breast lumps with normal or inconclusive mammographic findings.

II. Aim of Study

1. To evaluate clinically palpable breast lumps with digital mammography, sonomammography and FNAC.
2. To assess the sensitivity, specificity and positive predictive values of digital mammography, sonomammography in detecting carcinoma of breast.
3. To diagnose malignant versus benign by various imaging modalities and confirmation on basis of histopathology.

2.1 Exlusion Criteria: Pregnant women
Patients with bleeding diathesis.

## III.	Observation

Mammographic diagnosis	Malignant	13	11	2	0
	Benign	21	0	21	0
	Normal/ Inconclusive	16	2	14	0
Sonographic diagnosis	Malignant	13	12	1	0
	Benign	37	1	36	0
	Normal/ Inconclusive	0	0	0	0
Combined diagnosis	Malignant	14	13	1	0
	Benign	36	0	36	0
	Normal/ Inconclusive	0	0	0	0

## IV.	Discussion

A total of 50 females with breast lumps were subjected to Mammography and Ultrasonography with the aim to detect characteristic benign or malignant pattern in breast lumps. The findings were then compared with histopathological reports. Breast is the organ most versatile in producing malignant as well as benign neoplasms with overlapping clinical and radiological manifestations. X-ray mammography is the gold standard imaging technique which can reliably detect clinically occult breast cancer before it grows large enough to become palpable. Microcalcifications which represent the most sensitive sign of early breast cancer can be easily detected on mammography. One drawback is its limited role in dense breasts. It also cannot differentiate between cysts and solid masses. Ultrasonography is the most useful supplement to mammography for examining palpable breast masses and is used to differentiate cystic from solid masses. It also yields the most accurate determination of breast cancer size and nodal status. It has the additional advantage of being simple, time saving, safe, non-invasive, inexpensive & readily available.

4.1 Age and Sex Distribution:

Hormonal factors play an important role in many benign pathologies with highest frequency of lumps in the age group of 31- 40 years. Maximum number of benign cases was in age group of 31-40 years while malignant cases were maximum in above 60 years age group. Similar results are seen in study done by Malik M.A.N. et al.5 (2010).

4.2 Site and side of Involvement:

23 cases were on the left side while 21 cases were on the right side. Similar results are seen in study done by Sandy L. Kwong, 2003.6 Quadrant involvement is a specific feature of breast disease. In our study upper-outer quadrant was predominantly involved in 40% followed by diffuse/ multi quadrant involvement in 18% cases. Similar quadrant involvement is seen in the study done by Sandy L. Kwong, 2003 and Hermann et al., 1982.7

4.3Benign Lesions:

Total Number of Benign cases in our study were 30 (60%). Most common age group was 31-40 years. Fibroadenoma was most common accounting for 44% of all breast lumps. Our Results are similar to study done by Haagensen CD 1986.8 Rarity of calcification has been documented by Witten DM 1964.9 On USG we were able to detect all (100%) fibroadenomas, 6 cases more than mammography. Most of these are young patients. So USG is definitively better for diagnosis of fibroadenomas, mainly in young patients with dense breast on mammography. Other benign lesions we encountered i.e. cysts, fibrocystic disease and galactocele do not have characteristic mammographic features. Out of these, fibrocystic disease formed 8% (4 cases), cyst 6% (3 cases) and galactocele 2% (1 case) of all cases. Cysts were characterised on mammography by round (66%) to oval (33%), smooth marginated (100%), hyperdense (100%) lesions. In USG, cysts were seen as round (66%) to oval (33%), smooth marginated (100%), anechoic (100%) lesions with posterior acoustic enhancement (100%).

4.4 Malignant Lesions

Most common mammographic presentation of infiltrating carcinoma was hyperdense (100%) mass with spiculated (46.15%) or irregular (46.15%) margins. Obscured margins seen in 7.69% cases. Micro calcification was seen in 53.84% of cases. Nipple retraction was seen in 53.84% and skin thickening in 30.76% of cases. On sonography all infiltrating carcinomas were seen as hypoechoic, heterogeneous masses with irregular margins. 61.54% cases have L/AP ratio less than 1. Majority of masses were irregular in shape (53.84%) followed by oval (23%), round (15.38%) and lobulated (7.69%). Posterior acoustic attenuation was

seen in 92.30% cases. Calcification was detected in sonography in 23% cases which is significantly lower than mammography. 84.61% cases showed axillary lymphadenopathyindicating disease was in advanced stage. Hilum of these lymph nodes was destroyed indicating these were metastatic nodes. These nodes were also firm on pressure as applied by probe indicating their malignant nature. Jokich et al 1992 described that breast carcinoma present as classically an ill-defined, hypoechoic mass with posterior acoustic shadowing.10

V. Conclusion

1. We studied 50 patients of breast lumps by mammography and USG and combination of both of them. Findings of these cases were correlated with FNAC findings statistically. Results were as follows:-
2. Out of 22 cases of Fibroadenoma, mammography detected 68.18% cases while USG detected 100% cases and hence combined modality able to diagnose 100% cases. So in case of young females with palpable mobile breast lump, USG is investigation of choice.
3. Out of 4 cases of fibrocystic disease mammography was inconclusive in 2 cases (50%) due to dense breast while one is reported normal (25%)while USG detected 100% cases. Hence by combined approach 100% cases are detected.
4. Mammography diagnosed only 33% cases of cystic disease but USG diagnosed all cases of cysts (100%). So we can say fluid filled pathology like cystic disease and fibrocystic disease USG is better than mammography.
5. Likewise 100% cases of abscesses were diagnosed on USG but not on mammography.
6. In case of benign lesions, mammography had a sensitivity of 56.75%, specificity of 100% and positive predictive value of 100%.
7. USG showed sensitivity, specificity and positive predictive value of USG in our study was 97.30%,92.3% and 97.29% respectively.
8. Sensitivity for combined approach was 97.30% and specificity was 100% and positive predictive value was 100%.
9. 84.61% of malignancy cases were detected by mammography while with USG we diagnosed 92.30% cases and combination of both modalities diagnosed up to 100% cases.
10. 8. In case of malignant lesions sensitivity of mammography was 84.61% specificity was 94.59% and positive predictive value was 84.61%.
11. Sensitivity of USG was 92.30% and specificity was 97.29% positive predictive value was 92.30%.

In case of malignancy although mammography was believed to be more sensitive screening method than USG but in context of palpable malignancies targeted USG is definitively better and combination gives further better results.

CASE1

Figure 1: Well circumscribed discrete oval mass, isodense to breast tissue in left breast seen in both Craniocaudal And Medio-Lateral Views.

Fnac Diagnosis :Fibroadenoma

CASE 2



Two well definedhyperdense rounded lesions in left breast on mammogram
Well-defined anechoic rounded lesion with posterior acoustic enhancement on USG.
On FNAC- Breast cyst/ Abscess.Pus like fluid was aspirated.

CASE 3

Lobulated mass in upper inner quadrant with microcalcifications on mammogramLobulated well defined mass with internal vascularity, satellite lesions and axillary lymph nodes on USG.
FNAC diagnosis : Ductal carcinoma

CASE 4

Lobulated hyperdense lesion with irregular margins in left breast on mammogram.
Ill-defined hypoechoic lesion with irregular margins in left breast at 7 'O' clock position on USG.
CASE 5

Heterogenous dense breast parenchyma with partially circumscribed mass in retroareolar region of left breast on mammogram.
FNAC –Fibrocystic disease of breast.

Bibliography

1. WHO (2008). The global burden of disease: 2004 update.
2. Tabár L, Vitak B, Chen H-H, Duffy SW, Yen M-F, Chiang C-F, Krusemo UB, Tot T & Smith RA (2000) The Swedish Two-County Trial twenty years later: updated mortality results and new insights from long-term follow-up. RadiolClin North Am 38:625–651.
3. American Cancer Society. Breast Cancer Facts and Figures 2011-2012.
4. Tabár L, Fagerberg CJ, Gad A, Baldetorp L, Holmberg LH, Gröntoft O, Ljungquist U, Lundström B, Månson JC, Eklund G, et al. Reduction in mortality from breast cancer after mass screening with mammography. Randomised trial from the Breast Cancer Screening Working Group of the Swedish National Board of Health and welfare.; 1(8433):829–832.
5. Malik MAN, Salahuddin O, Azhar M, Dilawar O, Irshad H, Sadia, Salahuddin A. Breast diseases; Spectrum in WahCantt; POF Hospital Experience. Professional Med J Sep 2010; 17 (3): 366-372.
6. Sandy L. Kwong, ed. Chapter 9. "Laterality, Detailed Site, and Histology of Female Breast Cancer, California, 1988–1999, Breast Cancer in California, 2003; 91-104.
7. Hermann, George: Janus, Cynthia L: Mendelson, David and Brady, James. W. Non palpable Tumor of the breast radiological presentation. British Journal of Radiography 1982: 55: 623-628.
8. Haagensen CD. Diseases of the breast 3rd ed. Philadelphia, Pa: Saunders, 1986; 808-814.
9. Witten DM, Thurber DL. Mammography as a Routine Screening Examination for Detecting Breast Cancer.Am J Roentgenol Radium TherNucl Med. 1964 Jul; 92: 14–20.
10. Jokich PM, Monticciolo DL, Adler YT. Breast ultrasonography. 1992 Sep; 30 (5):993-1009.