Role of Sonography and Digital Mammography in Diagnosis of Clinically Palpable Breast Lumps with Fnac Correlation

Dr.T.Srinivasan Ms¹, Dr.Vivek.C²

1. Associate Professor, Coimbatore Medical College Hospital/The TamilNadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University, India)

2. (Post graduate, Coimbatore Medical College Hospital/The TamilNadu Dr. M.G.R Medical University,

India)

DR .T SRINIVASAN.MS, CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: DR VIVEK C.

Abstract

Introduction: Screening and diagnostic efforts for breast cancer are critical because the disease has a high rate of successful outcomes with early identification and treatment. The mammography (MG) and Ultrasonography/ ultrasound (USG) are individually effective diagnostic modalities for detection of breast pathologies.

Materials and Methods: A prospective study on 100 patients carried out to evaluate breast lesions using digital Mammography and ultrasonography (USG) independently and in combination with fine -needle aspiration cytology (FNAC) correlation at Coimbatore medical college Hospital

Results: In case of benign lesions, mammography had a sensitivity of 56.75%, specificity of 100% and positive predictive value of 100%. USG showed sensitivity, specificity and positive predictive value of 97.30%,92.3% and 97.29% respectively. Sensitivity for combined approach was 97.30% and specificity was 100% and positive predictive value was 100%. 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. In case of malignant lesions sensitivity of mammography was 84.4% specificity was 94.59% and positive predictive value was 84.61%. Sensitivity of USG was 92.30% and specificity was 97.29% positive predictive value was 92.30%.

Conclusion: 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.

Keywords: mammography, FNAC, benign breast lesions, malignant breast lesions

Date of Submission: 13-01-2020

Date of Acceptance: 29-01-2020

I. Introduction

Breast cancer affects women both in the developed and the developing world. As per WHO, breast cancer accounts for 2.09 million cases and 627000 deaths globally¹. It is the most common cancer in women in India and accounts for 14% of all cancers in women². It can occur at any age but the incidence rates in India begin to rise in the early thirties and peak at ages 50-64 years.the incidence of breast cancer is increasing in all 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. Mammography is still the first line of the imaging investigation. MG is the most commonly used imaging method and is the only currently known means ofproven effectiveness. especially in patients withnonpalpable carcinoma^{3,4}. 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 malignancy⁵. 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^{6,7}. In response to these diagnostic deficiencies of mammography various modalities have been evaluated for the diagnosis of the breast cancer, including lightscanning, 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. Material and Methods

This cross-sectional, prospective, hospital-based study was carried out at Department of General surgery in Coimbatore medical college Hospital (Tamil Nadu) from January 2019 to January 2020.

A total 100 females of aged \geq 18, years were included this study

Study Design: Prospective open label observational study

Study Location: This was a tertiary care teaching hospital based study done in Department of General surgery in Coimbatore medical college Hospital (Tamil Nadu)

Sample size: 100 patients.

Subjects & selection method: The study population was drawn from patients presenting to General Surgery OPD with complaints of breast lump on clinical examination/self-examination

Inclusion criteria:

- Age >18
- Patients presenting with palpable breast lump

Exclusion criteria:

- Pregnant women
- Patients with bleeding diathesis
- Ulcerated and fungating breast
- Moribund patients
- Proven cases of malignancy
- Male patients

Procedure methodology

A total of 100 patients were studied. Study tools were MG machine and USG machine. MG was performed in a standing or sitting position in combination with mammographic X-ray tube assembly with compression paddle. Mediolateral oblique and craniocaudalimages were obtained and assessed carefully. USG was performed on a real-time scanner with a hand-held linear electronic array transducer. The transducer could be operated in the frequency range of 7.5 MHz. Parameters studied were

(a) On MG, the site of the lesion, margin of the lesion, surrounding halo, clustered microcalcification, surrounding parenchymal distortion, and thickening of the skin.

(b) On USG, the size, shape, margins, echo texture, homogeneity of internal echoes, lateral shadowing, posterior effect, calcification, infiltration across tissue space, and surrounding fat were studied. Data were collected and statistically analyzed, and suitable test of significance was applied

III. Result



	Benign	72
	Normal/ Inconclusive	0
Combined diagnosis	Malignant	30
	Benign	70
	Normal/ Inconclusive	0
FNAC correlation	Malignant	32
	Benign	68





IV. Discussion

A total of 100 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 FNAC reports. Breast is the organ most versatile in producing malignant as well as benignneoplasms with overlapping clinical and radiological manifestations. X-ray mammography is the gold standardimaging technique which can reliably detect clinically occult breast cancer before it grows large enough tobecome palpable. Microcalcifications which represent the most sensitive sign of early breast cancer can beeasily detected on mammography. One drawback is its limited role in dense breasts. It also cannot differentiatebetween cysts and solid masses. Ultrasonography is the most useful supplement to mammography for examiningpalpable breast masses and is used to differentiate cystic from solid masses. It also yields the most

accuratedetermination of breast cancer size and nodal status. It has the additional advantage of being simple, timesaving, safe, non-invasive, inexpensive & readily available

Age and Sex Distribution:

Hormonal factors play an important role in many benign pathologies with highest frequency of lumpsin the age group of 31- 40 years. Maximum number of benign cases was in age group of 31-40 years whilemalignant cases were maximum in above 60 years' age group.

Benign Lesions:

Total Number of Benign cases in our study were 68 (68%), according to FNAC correlation. Most common age group was 31-40 years.Fibroadenoma was most common accounting for 44patients (64%). Our Results are similar to study donebyHaagensen CD 1986⁹. On USG we wereable to detect all (100%) fibroadenomas, 12 cases more than mammography. Most of these are young patients. SoUSG is definitively better for diagnosis offibroadenomas, mainly in young patients with dense breast onmammography. Other benign lesions we encountered i.e. cysts, fibrocystic disease and galactocele do not havecharacteristic mammographic features. Out of these, fibrocystic disease formed 8% (8 cases), Phyllodes tumor 8% (8 cases), cyst 6% (6 cases) and galactocele 2% (2 case) of all cases. Cysts were characterised on mammography by round (66%) to oval(33%), smooth marginated (100%), anechoic (100%) lesions with posterior acoustic enhancement (100%).

Malignant Lesions

Most common mammographic presentation of infiltrating carcinoma was hyperdense (100%) masswithspiculated (46.15%) or irregular (46.15%) margins. Obscured margins seen in 7.69% cases. Microcalcification 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 withirregular 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 thanmammography. 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 firmon pressure as applied by probe indicating their malignant nature.

V. Conclusion

Breast ultrasonography has evolved tremendously and gained clinical acceptance over the decades. Contrary to the previously held belief that it is only capable of detecting palpable breast cancer, ultrasonography can now detect not only early tumors under 1 cm in diameter but also intraductal tumor components using high-resolution real-time systems^{10,11}. This claim, however, cannot be generalized as the accuracy of breast ultrasonography depends on the operator's experience and equipment used (rates range from 58% to 95.7%) We studied 100 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: -

- 1. Out of 44 cases of Fibroadenoma, mammography detected 68.18% cases while USG detected 100% cases and hence combined modality able to diagnose 100% cases.
- 2. 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
- 3. In case of benign lesions, mammography had a sensitivity of 56.75%, specificity of 100% and positive predictive value of 100%. USG showed sensitivity, specificity and positive predictive value of USG in our study was 97.30%,92.3% and 97.29% respectively.Sensitivity for combined approach was 97.30% and specificity was 100% and positive predictive value was 100%.
- 4. 84.37% of malignancy cases were detected by mammography while with USG we diagnosed 87.5% cases and combination of both modalities diagnosed up to 93.75 cases.
- 5. In case of malignant lesions sensitivity of mammography was 84.4% specificity was 94.59% and positive predictive value was 84.61%. 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. In this study, it can be seen that ultrasonography is equivalent to x-ray mammography in

diagnostic accuracy. In its ability to detect small tumor masses (less than 1 cm), ultrasonography was equal to xray mammography. The major limitation of ultrasonography was in the diagnosis of associated foci of ductal carcinoma in situ without a palpable mass, owing to its inability to visualize microcalcifications outside a mass. For this reason, ultrasonography has a limited role in breast screening. In conclusion we have demonstrated a high diagnostic accuracy of breast ultrasonography in the diagnosis of palpable breast cancer (sensitivity 97% and specificity 97%) as well as in the evaluation of benign breast conditions. Its role in the evaluation of a palpable breast mass is not only to define the size of a lesion and extent of disease with accuracy but also allow accurate guidance for biopsy.





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

CASE 2



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

CASE3



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

FNACDiagnosis: Fibroadenoma

CASE 4



Heterogeneous dense breast parenchyma with partially circumscribed mass in retroareolar region of left breast on mammogram.

FNAC -Fibrocystic disease of breast.

CASE 5





Two well defined hyperdense 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.

References

- [1]. American Cancer Society. Statistics for 2009. Available from: https://www.who.int/cancer/prevention/diagnosis-screening/breastcancer/en/
- [2]. National Cancer Registry Programme, Biennial Report 2012-2014. An Epidemiological Study, Indian Council of Medical Research, New Delhi; 2012-2014
- [3]. Ciatto S, Cataliotti L, Distante V. Nonpalpable lesions detected with mammography: Review of 512 consecutive cases. Radiology1987;165:99- 102.
- [4]. Kopans DB. The positive predictive value of mammography. AJR AmJRoentgenol 1992;158:521- 6
- [5]. European guidelines for quality assurance in mammographyscreening. Perry N, Broeders M, de Wolf C, Tornberg S (eds)European Commission, Europe Against Cancer. 3rd ed (pp. 162–165). Luxembourg, 2001
- [6]. Houssami N, Irwig L, Simpson JM, McKessar M, Blome S, NoakesJ: The Sydney Breast Imaging Accuracy Study: comparative sensitivity and specificity of mammography and sonography in young women with symptoms. AJR Am J Roentgenol 180: 935– 940, 2003
- Houssami N, Irwig L: Likelihood ratios for clinical examination, mammography, ultrasound and fine needle biopsy in women with breast problems. Breast 7: 85–89, 1998
- [8]. 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.
- [9]. Hermann, George: Janus, Cynthia L: Mendelson, David and Brady, James. W. Non palpable Tumor of thebreast radiological presentation. British Journal of Radiography 1982: 55: 623-628.
- [10]. Fomage BD, Sneige N, Faroux MJ, et al: Sonographic appearance and ultrasound guided fine-needle aspira- tion biopsy of breast carcinomas smaller than 1 cm. J Ultrasound Med 9:559, 1990
- [11]. Mad jar H, Ladner HA, Sauerbrei W, et al: A preoperative staging of breast cancer by palpation, mammography and high-resolution ultrasound. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol3:185, 1993

Dr.T.Srinivasan Ms. "Role of Sonography and Digital Mammography in Diagnosis of Clinically Palpable Breast Lumps with Fnac Correlation". *IOSR Journal of Dental and Medical Sciences (IOSR-JDMS)*, 19(1), 2020, pp. 34-41.