

# SCREENING STUDIES

SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS (2011 - 2013) PAPER (P) / ABSTRACT (AB) / KEY STUDIES ★	RECALL RATE	CANCER DETECTION RATE	COST EFFECTIVENESS	DIAGNOSTIC VALUE	POSITIVE / NEGATIVE PREDICTIVE VALUE	INTERPRETATION TIME
(AB) Kalra V, Haas B, Forman H, Philpotts L. <b>Cost-Effectiveness of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, LL-BRS-WE5C Breast Imaging Afternoon CME Posters. ★	↓35% (↓~30%)*	Not Statistically Significant	↓Cost			↑70% - 100%
(P) Skaane P, Bandos A, Gullien R, Eben E, Ekseth U, Haakenaasen U, Izadi M, Jebsen I, Jahr G, Krager M, Niklason L, Hofvind S, Gur D. <b>Comparison of Digital Mammography Alone and Digital Mammography Plus Tomosynthesis in a Population-based Screening Program.</b> Radiology. 2013 Jan 7.	↓15%	↑27% All cancers ↑40% for Invasive Cancers			PPV=Comparable	↑100%
(AB) Rose S, Bujnoch L, O'Toole M, Nordmann A, Sexton R, Willison K, Tidwell A. <b>Breast Tomosynthesis and Digital Mammography for Breast Cancer Screening: Medical Outcomes Audit.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, VSB41-06 Breast Series: Emerging Technologies in Breast Imaging	↓39%	↑61%			PPV1=11.1% PPV3=43.9%	(↑50%)*
(P) Bernardi D, Ciatto S, Pellegrini M, Anesi V, Burlon S, Cauli E, Depaoli M, Larentis L, Malesani V, Targa L, Baldo P, Houssami N. <b>Application of breast tomosynthesis in screening: incremental effect on mammography acquisition and reading time.</b> Br J Rad. 2012 Dec;85(1020):e1174-8.	↓	↑				↑133%
(AB) Conant E, Gavenonis S, Weinstein S, Schnall M, Kontos D. <b>Early Implementation of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: Comparison of Call-back and Cancer Detection Rates in a Clinical Screening Practice.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, LL-BRS-MO8B Breast Imaging Lunch Hour CME Posters. ★	Not Statistically Significant 9% (↓22%)*	Not Statistically Significant (↑31%)*				
(AB) Haas B, Kalra V, Raghu M, Philpotts L. <b>Performance of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Compared to Conventional Digital Mammography for Breast Cancer Screening.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, SSE02-04 Breast Imaging (Digital Breast Tomosynthesis). ★	↓35% (↓28%)*	(↑~8% Not Statistically Significant)*				
(AB) Rose S, Ice M, Nordmann A, Sexton R, Song R. <b>A Comparison of Recall Rates between Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) and Full Field Digital Mammography Plus Tomosynthesis in a Community Setting.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, SSE02-01 Breast Imaging (Digital Breast Tomosynthesis). ★	↓35%				(PPV3=41.5%)*	

\*Information or data in parenthesis represent what was presented at RSNA 2012 meeting compared to the information or data provided in the RSNA 2012 meeting abstract. This is for informational purposes only and may or may not contain all the findings of the study.

SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS (2011 - 2013) (P) PAPER / (AB) ABSTRACT / KEY STUDIES ★	RECALL RATE	CANCER DETECTION RATE	COST EFFECTIVENESS	DIAGNOSTIC VALUE	POSITIVE / NEGATIVE PREDICTIVE VALUE	INTERPRETATION TIME
<b>(AB) Destounis S, Murphy P, Seifert P, Somerville P, Paulis L, Cavanaugh D, Arieno A, Morgan R. Experience with Combination 2D/3D Breast Tomosynthesis vs FFDM in the Screening Environment.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, LL-BRS-MO3C Breast Imaging Afternoon CME Posters. ★	↓63% (↓65%)*				PPV3=42.9%	
<b>(AB) Skaane P, Gullien R, Eben E, Ekseth U, Haakenaasen U, Jahr G, Jebesen I, Krager M. Reading Time of FFDM and Tomosynthesis in a Population-based Screening Program.</b> Presented at RSNA 2011, MSVB31-07 Breast Series: Emerging Technologies in Breast Imaging.		↑47%				↑88%
<b>(AB) Philpotts L.; Raghu M.; Durand M.; Hooley R.; Vashi R.; Horvath L.; Geisel J.; Butler R. Initial Experience With Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in Screening Mammography.</b> Presented at the ARRS 2012, Scientific Session 22 - Breast Imaging: Screening/Emerging Technologies.	↓58%					
<b>(AB) Gur D, Sumkin J, Zuley M, Anello M, Catullo V, Chough D, Cohen C, Ganott M, Hakim C, Hoffman W, Shah R, Shinde D. Recall Rate Reduction with Tomosynthesis during Baseline Examinations: Preliminary Assessment from a Prospective Screening Trial.</b> Presented at RSNA 2011, MSVB31-08 Breast Series: Emerging Technologies in Breast Imaging.	↓28%					
<b>(AB) Martinez P, Pina L, Minguillon C. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis (DBT) and Its Usefulness in the Management of Breast Distortions Detected in Conventional Mammography.</b> Presented at RSNA 2011, LL-BRS-SUZA Breast Imaging.	↓					
<b>(AB) Martinez P, Sainz M, Garcia-Lallana A, Minguillon C, Simon I, Viteri G, Pina L. The Role of Additional Digital Tomosynthesis Combined with Digital Mammography.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, SSE02-02 Breast Imaging (Digital Breast Tomosynthesis).		↑55%				
<b>(AB) Martínez P, Garcia Lallana A, Sainz Mendiguren R, Minguillon C, Pina L. The role of breast tomosynthesis combined with digital mammography.</b> Presented at ECR 2012, SS 602 Tomosynthesis and FFDM.		↑57%				
<b>(AB) Simon-Yarza I, Viteri G, Garcia-Lallana A, Ibanez I, Elizalde A, Pina L. The Role of Tomosynthesis after Normal Mammography According to ACR Density Patterns.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, LL-BRS-WE1D Breast Imaging Afternoon CME Posters.		↑23%				

\*Information or data in parenthesis represent what was presented at RSNA 2012 meeting compared to the information or data provided in the RSNA 2012 meeting abstract. This is for informational purposes only and may or may not contain all the findings of the study.

<p>(AB) Butler R, Hui A, Chen C, Durand M, Philpotts L. <b>Effect of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening on Diagnostic Work-up Patterns.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, VSB41-09 Breast Series: Emerging Technologies in Breast Imaging. ★</p>			<p>↓Cost</p>			
--	--	--	--------------	--	--	--

## DIAGNOSTIC STUDIES

<p style="text-align: center;">SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS (2011 - 2013) (P) PAPER / (AB) ABSTRACT / KEY STUDIES ★</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">RECALL RATE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CANCER DETECTION RATE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COST EFFECTIVENESS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">DIAGNOSTIC VALUE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">POSITIVE / NEGATIVE PREDICTIVE VALUE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">INTERPRETATION TIME</p>
<p>(P) Bernardi D, Ciatto S, Pellegrini M, Tuttobene P, Fanto' C, Valentini M, Michele SD, Peterlongo P, Houssami N. <b>Prospective study of breast Tomosynthesis as a triage to assessment in screening.</b> Breast Cancer Res Treat. 2012 Jan 22.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">↓74%</p>					
<p>(P) Skaane P, Gullien R, Bjørndal H, Eben EB, Ekseth U, Haakenaasen U, Jahr G, Jepsen IN, Krager M. <b>Digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT): initial experience in a clinical setting.</b> Acta Radiol. 2012 May 16.</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">↑8%</p>				
<p>(AB) Iqbal A, Michell M, Wasan R, Douiri A, Evans D, Peacock C, Morel C. <b>An Investigation into the Change of Mammographic Features of Lesions from Full-Field Digital Mammography to Digital Breast Tomosynthesis.</b> Presented at RSNA 2011, SSK01-09 Breast Imaging (Digital Mammography: Present and Advanced).</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Specificity 96.7% Sensitivity 88.8%</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NPV 93.7%</p>	
<p>(AB) Zuley M, Sumkin J, Ganott M, Bandos A, Kelly A, Lu A, Catullo V, Chough D, Gur D, Perrin R. <b>Digital Breast Tomosynthesis vs Supplemental Diagnostic Mammography Images for the Evaluation of Noncalcified Breast Lesions.</b> Presented at RSNA 2011, MSVB31-06 Breast Series: Emerging Technologies in Breast Imaging.</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Comparable Sensitivity and Specificity for DBT vs Additional Diagnostic FFDM</p>		
<p>(AB) ElMaadawy M, Seely J, Doherty G, Lad S. <b>Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in the Evaluation of Focal Mammographic Asymmetry, Do You Still Need Coned Compression Views?</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, SSE02-05 Breast Imaging (Digital Breast Tomosynthesis).</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">↑ Sensitivity 93% Compared to CCV 50%</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">(↑54% Compared to CCV)*</p>
<p>(P) Zuley ML, Bandos AI, Ganott MA, Sumkin JH, Kelly AE, Catullo VJ, Rathfon GY, Lu AH, Gur D. <b>Digital Breast Tomosynthesis versus Supplemental Diagnostic Mammographic Views for Evaluation of Noncalcified Breast Lesions.</b> Radiology. 2012 Nov 9. ★</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">&gt; FFDM for non- calcified breast lesions</p>		

\*Information or data in parenthesis represent what was presented at RSNA 2012 meeting compared to the information or data provided in the RSNA 2012 meeting abstract. This is for informational purposes only and may or may not contain all the findings of the study.

<p>(AB) Zuley M. <b>Diagnostic Accuracy of Tomosynthesis vs Mammographic Supplemental Views: Impact of Lesion Shape Perception.</b> Presented at RSNA 2012, SSE02-08 Breast Imaging (Digital Breast Tomosynthesis). ★</p>				<p>&gt; Than FFDM</p>		
<p>(AB) Morel J, Iqbal A, Peacock C, Evans D, Wasan R, Rahim R, Goligher J, Michell M. <b>A comparison of the accuracy of digital breast tomosynthesis with supplementary views in the diagnostic workup of mammographic lesions.</b> Breast Cancer Research 2011, 13(Suppl 1):O6.</p>				<p>Comparable for DBT vs Supplementary Views</p>		

## READER STUDIES

<p style="text-align: center;">SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATIONS (2011 - 2013) (P) PAPER / (AB) ABSTRACT / KEY STUDIES ★</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">RECALL RATE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CANCER DETECTION RATE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COST EFFECTIVENESS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">DIAGNOSTIC VALUE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">POSITIVE / NEGATIVE PREDICTIVE VALUE</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">INTERPRETATION TIME</p>
<p>(AB) Rafferty E, Niklason L. <b>FFDM vs FFDM with Tomosynthesis for Women with Radiographically Dense Breasts: An Enriched Retrospective Reader Study.</b> Presented at RSNA 2011, MSVB31-10 Breast Series: Emerging Technologies in Breast Imaging.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">↓31% Non-cancer Cases</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">↑</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">↑</p>		
<p>(AB) Henrichsen T, Bendel E, Craig D, Brandt K, Brandt S. <b>Can Tomosynthesis Replace Diagnostic Mammography in the Workup of Masses, Areas of Distortion, and Asymmetries Identified at Screening Mammography?</b> Presented at the ARRS 2012, Scientific Session 22</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Can Replace FFDM</p>		
<p>(AB) Michell M, Iqbal A, Wasan R, Douiri A, Evans D, Peacock C, Morel J. <b>Phase II Trial: A Multireader Multicase Study Comparing the Diagnostic Performance of Full-Field Digital Mammography with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis.</b> Presented at RSNA 2011, Session LLBRS-SU1B Breast Imaging.</p>				<p style="text-align: center;">Comparable Diagnostic Accuracy for 1 View DBT vs 1 View FFDM</p>		
<p>(P) Rafferty EA, Park JM, Philpotts LE, Poplack SP, Sumkin JH, Halpern EF, Niklason LT. <b>Assessing Radiologist Performance Using Combined Digital Mammography and Breast Tomosynthesis Compared with Digital Mammography Alone: Results of a Multicenter, Multireader Trial.</b> Radiology. 2012 Nov 20.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">↓ For Non-cancer Cases</p>			<p style="text-align: center;">↑ Diagnostic Accuracy</p>		

\*Information or data in parenthesis represent what was presented at RSNA 2012 meeting compared to the information or data provided in the RSNA 2012 meeting abstract. This is for informational purposes only and may or may not contain all the findings of the study.

United States /  
Latin America  
35 Crosby Drive  
Bedford, MA 01730-1401  
USA

Hologic UK Limited  
Unit 2, Link 10,  
Napier Way, Crawley,  
West Sussex, RH10 9RA  
United Kingdom

Hologic Asia Pacific  
7th Floor, Biotech Centre 2  
No.11 Science Park West Avenue  
Hong Kong Science Park  
Shatin, New Territories  
Hong Kong

Hologic Belgium  
Everest (Cross Point)  
Leuvensesteenweg 250A  
1800 Vilvoorde  
Belgium

Hologic Australia  
Hologic (Australia) Pty Ltd  
Suite 402, Level 4  
2 Lyon Park Road  
Macquarie Park NSW 2113  
Australia

Hologic China  
Hologic Healthcome  
Room 1606, Building A,  
Feng Lan Guo Ji Center  
32 Xi Zhi Men Bei Da Jie  
Haidian District, Beijing, (100082)  
China