

Evaluation on Diagnosis Significance of Single High Frequency Ultrasonography and Mammography and Combination on Breast Cancer

Bo Wang^{1,*}, Lili Hu¹, Hongna Tan¹, Lulu Sun², Jianbo Gao¹

¹Department of Radiology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, 450000, China

²Department of Ultrasound, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, 450000, China

Keywords: Breast cancer, high-frequency ultrasonography, mammography.

Author's Contribution

All the authors contributed significantly to the research that resulted in the submitted manuscript.

Article info.

Received: May 12, 2016

Accepted: October 11, 2016

Funding Source: Nil

Conflict of Interest: Nil

Cite this article: Wang B, Hu L, Tan H, Sun L, Gao J. Evaluation on Diagnosis Significance of Single High Frequency Ultrasonography and Mammography and Combination on Breast Cancer. *J. Pharm. Pharm. Sci.* 2017;5(1):2-7.

***Address of Correspondence:**
wangbo20160512@sina.com

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate the diagnosis significance of single high-frequency ultrasonography and mammography and combination therapy of both on breast cancer.

Method: 352 cases of female breast cancer patients were selected in The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University from January 2012 to December 2014. Among the 352 patients, 124 patients had only performed high-frequency ultrasonography detection, 102 cases of patients only conducted mammography, and 126 patients had applied the combination detection of high-frequency ultrasonography and mammography.

Results: The coincidence rate of single mammography detection was 79.4%, the misdiagnosis rate was 10.8%, and the missed diagnosis rate was 9.8%; the coincidence rate of single high-frequency ultrasonography detection was 83.9%, the misdiagnosis rate was 11.5%, the missed diagnosis rate was 4.6%; the coincidence rate of combination of high-frequency ultrasonography detection was 89.7%, the misdiagnosis rate was 6.3%, the missed diagnosis rate was 4.0%. The detection rate and missed diagnosis rate of combination diagnosis had a statistical difference with single high-frequency ultrasonography and single mammography. There was no statistical difference on misdiagnosis rate.

Conclusion: Mammography and high-frequency ultrasonography had their own advantages. The combination application of both had better diagnosis complementary and could significantly improve the detection rate and accuracy rate on breast cancer and decrease the misdiagnosis rate and missed diagnosis rate.

INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer incidence rate and fatality rate increased year by year, and also had a younger age trend. While the primary prevention method was not satisfactory. The secondary prevention was the main way to improve the prognosis of breast cancer. In order to achieve early detection, early diagnosis and early treatment of breast cancer and improve the quality of life, this study retrospectively analyzed the clinical data of the breast cancer patients who were

pathological diagnosed and confirmed by surgery in The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhengzhou University. It aimed to investigate the difference and application significance of breast cancer diagnosis through high-frequency ultrasonography and mammography, which were the normal breast disease detection method and provided reliable imaging basis for clinical prevention and early diagnosis of breast cancer.

METHODOLOGY

General

There were 352 cases of breast cancer female patients who were selected in xxx hospital from January 2012 to December 2014. The age was from 25~66 years old, average age was (48.5±2.6) years old. 124 patients only performed high frequency ultrasonography detection, 102 patients only had mammography, and 126 cases received the combined therapy of both detections. The main clinical manifestations were breast lumps, nipple discharge, nipple hemorrhage, breast pain, skin thickening, nipple retraction, etc. which were physical examined and without symptom.

High-frequency ultrasonography detection

Ultrasonic diagnosis was the Philips HD 15000 color ultrasonic diagnostic instrument, with linear array probe, 5~12 MHz frequency, the center frequency of high-frequency probe was more than 7.5 MHz. Patients was in supine position with arm lifted, in order to fully expose bilateral breasts. Two-dimensional ultrasonography was applied to detect breasts each quadrant to confirm the location of the tumor. Meanwhile, many tumor features were observed, such as tumor size, edge shape, internal echo, the ratio of vertical and horizontal diameter and whether the sound had attenuated or not, etc. Color Doppler was used to investigating the blood morphology and distribution of tumor inner side and surrounding area. Adler semi-quantitative method was adopted to detect blood flow classification and blood flow resistance index (RI) value [1]. Normal detection were a bilateral axillary examination, the axillary lymph node size, quantity, morphology, border, internal echo and blood supply, etc.

Mammography

Planned Digital Nuance global digital mammary gland machine from Finland was adopted in this study. It could fully automatic expose the general detected bilateral breasts axial view and oblique position, the photograph needs to be compressed and enlarged when necessary. The detection time was within the 3rd day to the 10th day after the menstruation completely over. It needs to observe breast disease focal size, quantity, form, the presence of calcification, which included calcification size, shape, quantity and distribution, and whether the abnormal blood or axillary lymph nodes.

Diagnosis standard of breast cancer high frequency ultrasonography

Two-dimensional ultrasonography included rough edge, uneven internal echoes, rear echo attenuation, irregular tumor shape, the ratio of vertical and horizontal diameter which was more than 1; color Doppler detection included CDFI blood flow classification II and above, or arterial blood flow Vmax not less than 12cm/s. Breast cancer was diagnosed and confirmed for patients to have either 3 items of two-dimensional manifestations or 2 items of color Doppler manifestations [2].

Diagnosis standard of breast cancer mammography

The direct sign was a lump and nodular with shadows, tiny calcification focal, lobulation sign, spicule or horn change on edge, blur edge. The indirect sign was skin change, structural disorder, blood vessels change and catheter sign. Breast cancer was diagnosed and confirmed for patients to have 2 direct signs, or 1 direct sign and 2 indirect signs [3].

Combined diagnosis standard on breast cancer

Breast cancer was diagnosed and confirmed for patients to have either one malignant sign of high-frequency ultrasonography and mammography.

Statistical method

In this study, misdiagnosis was for the inconsistent of imaging results and pathological results. Missed diagnosis was for the non-detected patients. Both was the negative manifestation. Diagnosis coincidence was that the negative manifestation was coincident with pathology results. SPSS13.0 software was adopted for statistical analysis, and chi-square test of enumeration data, <0.05 was for the difference with statistical significance.

RESULTS

Invasion site

In the 352 cases of breast cancer patients, 184 cases of the patient had disease on the left breast (52.23%), and 168 cases had disease on the right breast (47.77%), all are unilateral breast cancer. 215 cases had disease on outer upper quadrant (61.08%), an inner upper quadrant for 49 cases (13.92%), inner lower quadrant 26 cases (7.39%), outer lower quadrant 48 cases (13.64%), rear areola

for 14 cases (3.98%). Tumor diameter 0.7~5.4cm, average (2.6±0.3) cm.

Pathological type

Apart from the 8 cases of intraductal carcinoma (2.27%), the rest 344 cases were invasive nonspecific carcinoma, accounting for 97.73%, which included 208 cases of invasive ductal carcinoma (59.09%), 74 cases of invasive lobular carcinoma (21.02%), 41 cases of papillary carcinoma (11.65%), 15 cases of carcinoma simplex (4.26%) and 6 cases of medullary carcinoma (1.70%).

Comparison of different inspection methods

The detection rate and missed diagnosis rate of the three methods for breast cancer had statistical significance, the missed diagnosis rate between the three did not have statistical significance; The statistical significance existed on detection rate and missed diagnosis rate of the single usage of high-frequency ultrasonography and mammography and combined diagnosis treatment, as seen in Table 1.

Comparison of the combined diagnosis of high frequency ultrasonography and mammography

Results on high-frequency ultrasonography and

mammography in combined diagnosis had statistical significance, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Comparison of high-frequency ultrasonography and X-ray mammography in diagnosing 126 cases.

Mammography	High frequency ultrasonography		Total
	+	-	
+	86	14	100
-	17	9	26
Total	103	23	126

Comparison of detection rate for different pathological characteristics

The detection rate of two detection methods had statistical significance on tumor pathological characteristics. The detection rate of high frequency ultrasonography on lump, abnormal blood flow and axillary lymph nodes was higher than the results of mammography. The detection rate of micro calcifications is lower than that of mammography, as seen in Table 3.

Table 1. Comparison of different examination methods for breast cancer detection (%).

Method	Cases	Diagnosis coincidence population	Misdiagnosis population	Missed diagnosis population
High frequency ultrasonography	124	104 (83.9)	12 (11.5)	8 (4.6)
Mammography	102	81 (79.4)	11 (10.8)	10 (9.8)
Combined diagnosis	126	113 (89.7)	8 (6.3)	5 (4.0)
χ^2 value		8.357	3.789	5.557
P value		0.019	0.006	0.007

Table 3. Comparison of detection rate of case characteristics between high-frequency ultrasonography and mammography.

Pathological features	High frequency ultrasonography (n=225)	Mamography (n=206)	χ^2 value	P value
Lump	202 (89.8%)	144 (69.9%)	27.856	<0.001
Microcalcification	72 (32.0%)	142 (68.9%)	51.318	<0.001
abnormal blood vessels and blood flow signal	142 (63.1%)	69 (33.5%)	36.837	<0.001
Enlarged axillary lymph node	88 (39.1%)	52 (25.2%)	6.845	0.002

DISCUSSION

Breast cancer had many detections, such as ultrasonography, mammography, magnetic resonance (NMR), of which the ultrasonography and mammography were commonly used in the clinical field. In this study, the coincidence rate of mammography and high-frequency ultrasonography were respectively 79.4% and 83.9%, between which there was no statistical significance, which was coincident to literature [4,5]. The Breast pathological type of cancer was complex which included noninvasive carcinoma, early stage invasive carcinoma, invasive specific carcinoma and invasive nonspecific cancer, there were few inflammatory breast cancer, nipple eczema-like breast cancer, etc. The invasive ductal carcinoma was the most common one, accounting for 65%~85%. The invasive ductal carcinoma in this group accounted for 59.09%. Although the complex pathological type of breast cancer could enable mammography and high-frequency ultrasonography have different image features, the same image feature may indicate different pathological types. Therefore, it was difficult to make the breast cancer diagnosis only based on imaging performance. It had a great difference on the false negative expression of the single application of mammography. The domestic literature reported that the false negative expression was 5%~15%, even up to 15%~25%. In this group, the misdiagnosis of single application of mammography was 11 cases, missed diagnosis was 10 cases, false negative expression was 20.59% (21/102), among which there were 3 cases with combination of severe mammary gland hyperplasia, the tumor size was less than 2cm, which was misdiagnosed as breast atypical hyperplasia; 6 cases of high-density mammary gland were misdiagnosed as dysplastic nodules; 2 cases of oval shaped medullary carcinoma with smooth boundary were misdiagnosed as fibroma. The missed diagnosis were 2 cases near chest wall tumor, which was because the size was less than 2cm, the density was low and the tumor was blurring; Therefore, only the imaging performance was difficult to make the breast cancer diagnosis. It had a big difference on the domestic and abroad literature on the false negative expression of a single application of mammography. In domestic literature, there were 5%~15% of false negative expression [6], even up to 15%~25% [7]; 2 cases of missed diagnosis were due to oppression; 1 case of missed diagnosed ductal

carcinoma was because the clear tumor and the calcification were not found; 3 cases of missed diagnosis were the dense breast. The abroad literature reported false negative expression was only 8%~10% [8]. In this experiment, there were 12 cases of misdiagnosis and 8 cases of missed diagnosis in the single application of high frequency ultrasonography, among which there were 2 cases of breast cancer with tumor size less than 1cm, 2 cases of medullary carcinoma and 2 cases of undifferentiated carcinoma with unsharp sphere, and smooth boundary, which were misdiagnosed as fibroma; 2 cases was misdiagnosed as atypical hyperplasia; 3 cases was miss-diagnosed as dysplastic nodules; 1 case was missed diagnosed, as the ultrasonography had formed the acoustic shadow at the rear of the nipple. The 2 cases of missed diagnosis located at the end of the mammary gland and the size were less than 1 cm; 5 cases were misdiagnosed, as the tumor was not clear; 2 cases of patients were obesity and with the big mammary gland. Therefore, the proper understanding of these two detection methods, it could avoid the bad effect and increase the diagnosis rate of breast cancer, especially the breast cancer early stage, which was the explored hot topic in domestic and abroad scholars [2,3,9].

The high-frequency method used the acoustic impedance in different tissues. The imaging principle of mammography was that different density tissues had different absorption attenuation on X-ray [10]. For the imaging principle, two methods had their own advantages, and also had diagnostic difficulties. In the tumor cases which did not happen in the clinical field, there were 11 cases without specific focal from the combined detection, high-frequency ultrasonography had misdiagnosed cases and missed diagnosed cases. In these cases, 7 cases were detected with malignant calcification through mammography, 4 cases were confirmed through mammography due to the local structural disorder and irregular dense shadow. In these 4 cases, 1 case was diagnosed to be fibroma combined with calcification through high-frequency diagnosis. In the 12 cases which the mammography did not found the tumor, the high-frequency ultrasonography had observed the tumor and found 8 cases was detectable and abnormal II~III stage blood flow, 1 case were confirmed in the axillary lymph nodes and 2 cases were found the chest wall got invaded. 2 cases of small scale focal was diagnosed to be

fibroma through mammography and ultrasonography. In the following re-examination, the tumor had fibroids changes on the surface and could reach at axillary lymph nodes. It was confirmed in the surgery. As both the begin and malignant tumor had calcification. The calcification was often smaller, around 10~500 μ m in diameter. Normally not more than 1000 μ m. The minimal calcification was 200 μ m through mammography detection [7]. As the current ultrasonography could detect the tiny calcified points in hypoechoic tumor with size of 100~500 μ m [11]. The calcification was the important index of benign and malignant tumor judgment for both detections. This research showed that mammography had higher detection rate on calcification than high-frequency ultrasonography. While, the microcalcification included sand-like microcalcification, tiny rod-like microcalcification, Y-shape calcification, pin like microcalcification, which were the key sign on breast cancer diagnosis, and usually seen in invasive ductal carcinoma. This study posed that the detection rate of high-frequency ultrasonography on the tumor, abnormal blood flow signal, and axillary lymph nodes was higher than that through mammography. The blood flow was sufficient in the malignant tumor. The blood vessels distribution and structure were the central type and penetration type. Related research had classified the mammary gland malignant degree into four types based on distribution and structure, including dead end blood vessels, different diameter blood vessels, twisted blood vessels and arteriovenous vessels. The blood vessels of fibroadenoma usually went through the coating and nodes [12]. There were a lot of adipose tissue in the axillary site, and the structure was complex. The enlarged lymph node for breast cancer patients might be the reactive hyperplasia and may transfer. Two detections could easily detect at the lymph node site. While, for the transfer diagnosis, the accuracy and sensitivity of both had big difference. In this study, the axillary lymph node coincidence rate of mammography and high-frequency ultrasonography were respectively 26.2% and 38.6%. Although both had a statistical difference, it was not high. The diagnosis standard of transferred lymph node which met the study reports included that diameter was more than 0.5cm, ratio of length and width was less than 1.7, lymph nodes gate disappeared, asymmetry of cortical thickening and increased peripheral blood flow. In small lymph node (<1cm), it had a significant difference for the cortical asymmetric thickening and

increased peripheral blood flow than normal lymph nodes [13].

Combined detection utilized the imaging advantages and emphasis of both to reflect the pathological characteristics of lesions from different aspects. It had a good diagnosis complementarity. Ultrasonography detection was suitable for any age, especially young women, pregnant women and lactating patients. Mammography had certain X-ray radiation, the frequent examination was not welcomed, and not suitable for pregnant women, lactation women and acute mastitis [14]. Mammary gland mammography was the whole detection, which included the entire breasts. It was not easy to misdiagnosed. The examinee's subjective factors were smaller than ultrasonography, and the ultrasonic integral feeling was poor, and could easily to be miss-diagnosed for the focal with little or no oblivious echo changes; this had higher requirement for surgeon technique and experience [15].

Mammography could express the calcification more highly than ultrasonography and expressed more lowly tumor than ultrasonography. High frequency ultrasonography was not affected by gland type, while was not sensitive on tumor in obesity patients and patients with big breasts. While, mammography was difficult to detect the high-density mammary glands. This might be one of the reasons why the false negative expression was high in China. Ultrasonography could scan in different angle and dimension and could make up the limitation of mammography technique which could not display the small breast cancer in inner quadrant and near the edge or chest wall. For young patients, it shall emphasized on the ultrasonography. The mammography expression of elderly patients' lard type was low density, most tumor was high density. The mutual dependence was good. The mammography detection shall be emphasized [16].

CONCLUSION

In a word, two detection methods were simple, no trauma and low-costed. As the single application had no statistical difference for the diagnosis coincidence rate, it could be applied according to their advantages and the specific conditions of patients. The combined application could obviously increase the detection rate and accuracy rate on breast cancer, increase misdiagnosis rate and missed

diagnosis rate. It had important significance on early stage breast cancer.

REFERENCES

1. Adler DD, Carson PL, Rubin M, Quinn-Reid D. Doppler ultrasound color flow imaging in the study of breast cancer preliminary findings. *J Ultrasound Med Biol.* 1990; (6):553-9.
2. Chunying S, Litao Z, Ying C. Study of mammography and color Doppler ultrasound in diagnosis of early breast cancer. *Journal of Harbin Medical University.* 2005; 39(6):531-3.
3. Yuan ST, Zhao ZH, Lu XL, Wang J, Ling GL. The clinical value on diagnosis of early breast cancer by mammography combined with high frequency ultrasound. *Shandong Medical Journal.* 2009; 49(12):21-3.
4. Qingchun M, Yunxia T, Lanfang G. Analysis on breast cancer mammography imaging signs. *Hebei Medical Journal.* 2012; 34(4):520-1.
5. Qiong Z, Sirun L, Jun H. Analysis of two-dimension and high-frequency color Doppler ultrasonography for breast cancer. *Journal of Jinan University (Medical Edition).* 2009; 30(4):441-4.
6. Ruibing L, Ruixue S, Zhenzhen G. Comparative analysis of BI-RADS^{III}~^{III} lesions imaging by X-ray mammography and ultrasound. *J BME Clin Med.* 2011; 15(1):37-40.
7. Junling W, Shicheng Q, Kefei C. Comparison of micro-pure imaging system of ultrasonography and mammography on microcalcification of breast tumor. *Chinese Journal of Medical Imaging Technology.* 2012; (2):297-300.
8. Jackson EF, Barboriak DP, Bidaut LM, Meyer CR. Magnetic resonance assessment of response to therapy: tumor change measure, truth data and error sources. *Transl Oncol.* 2009; 2(4):211-5.
9. Masroor I, Ahmed MN, Pasha S. To evaluate the role of sonography as an adjunct to mammography in women with dense breasts. *Pak Med Assoc.* 2009;59(5):298
10. Qunying L, Yin W. The value of ultrasonography and mammography combination diagnosis on breast tumor. *Modern Journal of Integrated Traditional Chinese and Western Medicine.* 2011; 20(1):85-6.
11. Yanfei L, Huagan L. Comparison of breast lumps diagnosis of color ultrasonography and mammography[J]. *Shanghai Medical Imaging.* 2010; (19) 20:141-2.
12. Shaoren G, Xingxia L, Rongxiu W. New development about comprehensive application of breast cancer ultrasonic diagnosis. *Hebei Medical Journal.* 2012; (4):582-4.
13. Zhenpeng L, Yang H. Application progress of ultrasonography on breast cancer lymph node detection. *Chin J Med Ultrasound (Electronic Edition).* 2010; 7(1):94-7.
14. Shuqiang W, Zhaohua Z, Pucha L, *et al.* Diagnostic significance of ultrasonography, mammography and combination of both on breast cancer. *Journal of Modern Oncology.* 2010; 18(7):1323-5.
15. Jun Z. Analysis on mammography and ultrasonography combined diagnosis on breast carcinoma in situ in 21 cases. *Chin J Misdiagn.* 2011;11(16):4002.
16. Shiqiang S. Mammography combined with high-frequency ultrasonography for the diagnosis of early breast cancer. *Journal of Qiqihar University of Medicine.* 2011; 32(11):1730-1.