

## **Bibliography**

# **Benefits of 50° Wide Angle Breast Tomosynthesis**

Bibliography with key clinical and scientific findings

[siemens-healthineers.com/mammography](https://siemens-healthineers.com/mammography)



# Summary

Following its market introduction in 2009, several clinical studies on Digital Breast Tomosynthesis\* have proceeded to demonstrate the value of this technique for breast imaging. The following is a summation of key findings from studies conducted with 50° wide-angle tomosynthesis.

# Glossary

AUC	Area Under the (ROC) Curve	NAC	Neoadjuvant chemotherapy
BIRADS	Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System	NPV	Negative Predictive Value
CNR	Contrast-to-noise ratio	PMA	Premarket Approval
DBT	Digital Breast Tomosynthesis	PMMA	Polymethylmethacrylate (phantom)
EMPIRE	Enhanced Multiple Parameter Iterative Reconstruction	PPV	Positive Predictive Value
FBP	Filtered backprojection	ROC	Receiver Operating Characteristic
FFDM	Full Field Digital Mammography	TiCEM	Titanium Contrast Enhanced Mammography
FP	False Positives	US	Ultrasound
Insight 2D	Synthetic mammogram		
Insight 3D	Rotating synthetic mammogram		
Insight Breast Density	Volumetric Breast Density Assessment		
JAFROC	Jackknife Alternative Free-response Receiver Operating Characteristics		
MGD	Mean Glandular Dose		
MRI	Magnetic Resonance Imaging		
MRMC	Multi Reader Multi Center (study)		
MTF	Modulation transfer function		

\* Some studies contain technologies that are not commercially available.  
Due to regulatory reasons its future availability cannot be guaranteed.

Author and study title	Year	Key findings
Weigel et al. "Breast Density and Breast Cancer Screening with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: A TOSYMA Trial Subanalysis." <sup>1</sup>	2023	The TOSYMA trial revealed higher invasive cancer detection rates with digital breast tomosynthesis plus synthesized mammography than digital mammography in dense breasts, especially in women with extremely dense breasts.
Khanani et al. "Performance of Wide-Angle Tomosynthesis with Synthetic Mammography in Comparison to Full Field Digital Mammography." <sup>2</sup>	2023	Reader performance with wide-angle DBT plus Insight 2D is superior to that with FFDM, showing significantly higher breast-level accuracy and sensitivity and significantly lower recall rates.
Siminiak et al. "Are contrast enhanced mammography and digital breast tomosynthesis equally effective in diagnosing patients recalled from breast cancer screening?" <sup>3</sup>	2022	This prospective randomized study demonstrated a similar diagnostic accuracy for TiCEM and DBT in women recalled from breast cancer screening program.
Heindel et al. "Digital breast tomosynthesis plus synthesised mammography versus digital screening mammography for the detection of invasive breast cancer (TOSYMA): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled, superiority trial." <sup>4</sup>	2022	The results from this prospective randomized multi-center trial indicate that the detection rate for invasive breast cancer was significantly higher with digital breast tomosynthesis plus synthetic mammography (7.1 per 1000 women screened) than digital mammography alone (4.8 per 1000 women screened).
Clauser et al. "One view or two views for wide-angle tomosynthesis with synthetic mammography in the assessment setting?" <sup>5</sup>	2022	One-view and two-view wide-angle DBT plus Insight 2D can achieve a higher diagnostic performance compared to two-view FFDM. The detection rate and sensitivity were highest with two-view wide-angle DBT plus Insight 2D.
Murakami et al. "Diagnostic performance of digital breast tomosynthesis for predicting response to neoadjuvant systemic therapy in breast cancer patients: A comparison with magnetic resonance imaging, ultrasound, and full-field digital mammography." <sup>6</sup>	2021	DBT has good correlation with histopathology for measuring residual tumor size after neoadjuvant systemic therapy. DBT was comparable to MRI in assessing tumor response after completion of neoadjuvant systemic therapy.
Johnson et al. "Interval Breast Cancer Rates and Tumor Characteristics in the Prospective Population-based Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial" <sup>7</sup>	2021	The interval cancer rate in the prospective population-based Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial with one-view DBT and two-view FFDM was lower than that in a contemporary two-view FFDM screening control group (1.6 per 1000 screened women vs 2.8 per 1000 screened women).
Whelehan et al. "Digital breast tomosynthesis: sensitivity for cancer in younger symptomatic women" <sup>8</sup>	2021	FFDM and DBT in combination provided a small but statistically significant improvement in sensitivity for cancer in younger symptomatic patients. The greatest improvements in sensitivity, over FFDM alone, were seen with the combined modality in the densest breasts.

Author and study title	Year	Key findings
Georgian-Smith et al. "Can Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Replace Full-Field Digital Mammography? A Multireader, Multicase Study of Wide-Angle Tomosynthesis" <sup>9</sup>	2019	Wide-angle two-view DBT alone has greater diagnostic accuracy than FFDM for most radiologists, even for those inexperienced with DBT technology.
Clauser et al. "Synthetic 2-Dimensional Mammography Can Replace Digital Mammography as an Adjunct to Wide-Angle Digital Breast Tomosynthesis" <sup>10</sup>	2019	Wide-angle DBT, either combined with FFDM or synthetic mammograms, increases sensitivity and diagnostic accuracy without reducing specificity compared with FFDM alone. No differences were seen between synthetic mammograms or FFDM in DBT-combined readings, so synthetic mammograms should replace FFDM for combined readings with wide-angle DBT.
Heywang-Köbrunner et al. "Use of single-view digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) and ultrasound vs. additional views and ultrasound for the assessment of screen-detected abnormalities: German multi-reader study" <sup>11</sup>	2018	This study compared screening mammography, single-view DBT and ultrasound-information (combination 1) vs. screening mammography, additional views and ultrasound-information (combination 2) for assessment of screen-detected soft-tissue abnormalities. Combination 1 readings had slightly higher sensitivity than combination 2 readings (96.9% vs. 95.4%) but lower specificity (50% vs. 58.1%).
Zackrisson et al. "One-view breast tomosynthesis versus two-view mammography in the Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial (MBTST)" <sup>12</sup>	2018	In this prospective population-based screening trial, an increase in the cancer detection rate of 34% was achieved with one-view DBT only. At the same time, the breast compression force was lowered by 40% and the radiation dose reduced by 15%. It is the only prospective screening trial that has proven higher diagnostic accuracy with DBT at a lower radiation dose compared to the current screening standard.
Rodriguez-Ruiz et al. "One-view digital breast tomosynthesis as a stand-alone modality for breast cancer detection: do we need more?" <sup>13</sup>	2018	Detection performance with one-view DBT is not inferior to two-view FFDM or to two-view FFDM plus two-view DBT. Training may lead to one-view DBT being sufficient for screening.
Scaduto et al. "Impact of angular range of digital breast tomosynthesis on mass detection in dense breasts" <sup>14</sup>	2018	The simulation results show for DBT an increased in-plane detectability of masses with increasing angular range. This is confirmed by clinical results showing that masses are more conspicuous in wide-angle DBT than narrow-angle DBT. The detection of mass lesions in dense breasts can be improved by increasing the DBT angular range.

Author and study title	Year	Key findings
Neubauer et al. "Multiple Angulated Mammography Reconstructions in Digital Breast Tomosynthesis for the Diagnosis of Microcalcifications - Added Value to Standard Stack Reconstructions and Synthesized Mammography" <sup>15</sup>	2018	The depiction of microcalcifications is better in the slices with 50° wide-angle DBT compared to synthetic mammograms, but reading time is increased. Synthetic mammograms allow for faster reading times, with Insight 3D having a better depiction of calcification clusters compared to Insight 2D, at equal reading time, diagnostic accuracy and inter-reader agreement.
Heywang-Köbrunner et al "Value of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis versus Additional Views for the Assessment of Screen-Detected Abnormalities – a First Analysis" <sup>16</sup>	2017	DBT appeared to be at least equivalent to additional mammography views for assessing indeterminate screen-detected lesions and could replace the additional mammography views for most lesions.
Rodriguez-Ruiz et al. "New reconstruction algorithm for digital breast tomosynthesis: better image quality for humans and computers" <sup>17</sup>	2017	Image reconstruction with EMPIRE provides better contrast and image quality, fewer artifacts, and improved visibility of calcifications than standard reconstruction, as well as improved detection performance with deep-learning algorithms.
Galati et al. "Added value of one-view digital breast tomosynthesis combined with digital mammography according to readers concordance: changing in BIRADS rate and follow-up management" <sup>18</sup>	2017	The addition of 1-view DBT to 2-view FFDM reduced the inter-reader variability for BIRADS classification and recall rate. DBT+FFDM also increased the number of BIRADS 1-2 and BIRADS 4-5, while reducing the number of cases with BIRADS 0 and 3 (uncertain cases).
Amer et al. "Digital breast tomosynthesis versus full-field digital mammography – Which modality provides more accurate prediction of margin status in specimen radiography?" <sup>19</sup>	2017	DBT significantly improves the accuracy of specimen radiography regarding identification of the closest margin and sensitivity regarding margin status assessment compared to FFDM. This could reduce re-excision and re-operation rates.
Maldera et al. "Digital breast tomosynthesis: Dose and image quality assessment" <sup>20</sup>	2017	In-depth resolution improved with increasing scan angle but was also affected by the choice of reconstruction and post-processing algorithms. The highest z-resolution was provided by Siemens Healthineers.
Rodriguez-Ruiz et al. "Evaluation of the technical performance of three different commercial digital breast tomosynthesis systems in the clinical environment" <sup>21</sup>	2016	DBT systems with a wider angular range yield a higher depth resolution.
Korporaal et al. "White paper: Superior Diagnostic Accuracy with Additional and Stand-Alone Digital Breast Tomosynthesis" <sup>22</sup>	2016	DBT was used in addition to FFDM (adjunct scenario) and as a stand-alone modality (replacement scenario) and compared with FFDM. For the adjunct as well as the replacement scenario, superior diagnostic accuracy, a reduced non-cancer recall rate, improved reader performance, and lower interobserver variability were reported compared to FFDM alone.

Author and study title	Year	Key findings
Clauser et al. "Diagnostic performance of digital breast tomosynthesis with a wide scan angle compared to full-field digital mammography for the detection and characterization of microcalcifications" <sup>23</sup>	2016	50° wide-angle DBT enables similar detection and characterization performance for microcalcifications as with FFDM.
Whelehan et al. "Clinical performance of Siemens Healthineers digital breast tomosynthesis versus standard supplementary mammography for the assessment of screen-detected soft-tissue abnormalities: a multi-reader study" <sup>24</sup>	2016	50° wide-angle DBT demonstrates equivalent diagnostic accuracy according to ROC curve analysis when used in place of supplementary mammographic views in screen-detected soft-tissue mammographic abnormalities.
Lång et al. "False positives in breast cancer screening with one-view breast tomosynthesis: An analysis of findings leading to recall, work-up and biopsy rates in the Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial" <sup>25</sup>	2016	FPs increased with DBT screening mainly due to the recall of stellate distortions. The FP recall rate was still well within the European guidelines and showed evidence of a learning curve. The characterization of rounded lesions was improved with DBT.
Uchiyama et al. "Diagnostic Usefulness of Synthetic MG (SMMG) with DBT (Digital Breast Tomosynthesis) for Clinical Setting in Breast Cancer Screening" <sup>26</sup>	2016	Insight 2D plus DBT demonstrated higher AUC, sensitivity, specificity, and NPV compared to Insight 2D and FFDM alone ( $p < 0.05$ ). Insight 2D plus DBT had a 40% decrease in radiation dose as compared to FFDM plus DBT.
Elizalde et al. "Additional US or DBT after digital mammography: which one is the best combination?" <sup>27</sup>	2016	The combination of FFDM and additional US, DBT, or both, improved the diagnostic performance (AUC) as compared to FFDM alone.
Timberg et al. "Breast Density Assessment Using Breast Tomosynthesis Images" <sup>28</sup>	2016	Insight Breast Density is a promising approach using low dose central projection DBT images in order to obtain radiologist-like density ratings similar to results obtained from FFDM.
Scaduto et al. "Digital breast tomosynthesis with minimal breast compression" <sup>29</sup>	2015	Image acquisition is optimized for reduced compression in DBT without compromising image quality or increasing MGD. Measurements on phantoms and patients suggest comparable lesion conspicuity for DBT with no appreciable difference in patient motion due to minimal compression.
Lång et al. "Performance of one-view breast tomosynthesis as a stand-alone breast cancer screening modality: results from the Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial, a population-based study" <sup>30</sup>	2015	Interim results: The breast cancer detection rate improved by 43% and breast cancer screening with one-view DBT as a stand-alone modality seems feasible. Breast compression can be reduced by 50%. (The final results of the study have been published in 2018, see ref. Zackrisson et al.)

Author and study title	Year	Key findings
Mercier et al. "The role of tomosynthesis in breast cancer staging in 75 patients" <sup>31</sup>	2015	Tomosynthesis found more lesions than mammography in 10% of patients, resulting in an adaptation of the surgical planning.
Urano et al. "Digital mammography versus digital breast tomosynthesis for detection of breast cancer in the intraoperative specimen during breast-conserving surgery" <sup>32</sup>	2015	DBT can detect breast cancer more accurately than FFDM in latero-lateral views, indicating its potential to more precisely diagnose vertical invasion.
Baptista et al. "Dosimetric characterization and organ dose assessment in digital breast tomosynthesis: Measurements and Monte Carlo simulations using voxel phantoms" <sup>33</sup>	2015	Taking into account an average breast with a thickness of 4.5 cm, the MGDs for FFDM and DBT acquisitions were below the achievable value (2.0 mGy) defined by the European protocol.
Timberg et al. "Detection of calcification clusters in digital breast tomosynthesis slices at different dose levels utilizing a SRSAR reconstruction and JAFROC" <sup>34</sup>	2015	Compared to standard FBP, the detection performance for calcification clusters is increased with EMPIRE. Alternatively, for the same detection performance as standard FBP the dose level can be reduced by 50% with EMPIRE.
Abdurahman et al. "Optimizing High Resolution Reconstruction in Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Using Filtered Back Projection" <sup>35</sup>	2014	Image reconstruction with EMPIRE preserves microcalcifications at high spatial resolution while maintaining noise levels acceptable for clinical interpretations. Contrast and sharpness of microcalcifications have been increased and morphology of calcification clusters are preserved. Furthermore, the CNR of soft tissue regions was improved while the details of spiculated masses such as architectural distortions were preserved.
Uchiyama et al. "Clinical Efficacy of Novel Image Processing Techniques in the Framework of Filtered Back Projection (FBP) with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis (DBT)" <sup>36</sup>	2014	EMPIRE demonstrated a overall image quality compared to the standard FBP. In particular, the diagnostic certainty in the assessment of microcalcifications was improved.
Tani et al. "Assessing Radiologist Performance and Microcalcifications Visualization Using Combined 3D Rotating Mammogram (RM) and Digital Breast Tomosynthesis" <sup>37</sup>	2014	The visualization of microcalcifications was improved for all microcalcification-dominant cancer lesions with the adjunction of Insight 3D to DBT.
Dustler et al. "Image Quality of Thick Average Intensity Pixel Slabs Using Statistical Artifact Reduction in Breast Tomosynthesis" <sup>38</sup>	2014	It is possible to review DBT volumes with 2 mm slabs without compromising image quality, and the visibility of microcalcifications is improved.
Lång et al. "Breast cancer detection in digital breast tomosynthesis and digital mammography: a side-by-side review of discrepant cases" <sup>39</sup>	2014	Lesion visualization with DBT is improved compared to FFDM, particularly for spiculated tumors suggesting that DBT is better than FFDM in visualizing breast cancer.

Author and study title	Year	Key findings
Zackrisson S, Houssami N "Digital breast tomosynthesis: the future of mammography screening or much ado about nothing?" <sup>40</sup>	2013	Overview of tomosynthesis and its improvements compared to standard mammography.
Schulz-Wendtland et al. "Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) versus CMOS Technology, Specimen Radiography System (SRS) and Tomosynthesis (DBT) – Which System Can Optimise Surgical Therapy?" <sup>41</sup>	2013	The MAMMOMAT Inspiration with 50° wide-angle DBT had the highest sensitivity of the three systems tested. The rate of re-excisions was reduced compared to the results of FFDM.
Abdurahman et al. "Out-of-Plane Artifact Reduction in Tomosynthesis Based on Regression Modeling and Outlier Detection" <sup>42</sup>	2012	The authors propose a technique for reconstructing a set of super-resolution DBT slices and predicting the artifact-free voxel intensity based on statistical artefact reduction. The experiments show that the reconstructed images are de-blurred and streak-like artifacts are reduced. The visibility of clinical features, contrast and sharpness are improved and thick-slice reconstruction is possible without the loss of contrast and sharpness.
Marshall et al. "Measurements of system sharpness for two digital breast tomosynthesis systems" <sup>43</sup>	2012	Wide-angle tomosynthesis has a higher depth resolution (z-plane PSF) because of the wider tomographic angle used.
Uchiyama et al. "Diagnostic Impact of Adjunction of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis (DBT) to Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) and in Comparison with Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM)" <sup>44</sup>	2012	DBT+FFDM detect more cancers than FFDM alone. DBT as an adjunct to FFDM was able to detect early-stage breast cancer and it is not affected by breast density.
Dance et al. "Comparison of breast doses for digital tomosynthesis estimated from patient exposures and using PMMA breast phantoms" <sup>45</sup>	2012	The dose for tomosynthesis with the Siemens Healthineers MAMMOMAT Inspiration system is lower than the Hologic Selenia Dimensions system.
Uchiyama et al. "Usefulness of Adjunction of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis (DBT) to Full-Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) in Evaluation of Pathological Response after Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy (NAC) for Breast Cancer" <sup>46</sup>	2012	The adjunction of DBT to FFDM combined with other diagnostic modalities contributes to more accurate assessment of response to NAC. The adjunction of DBT to FFDM improves the assessment of the lesion and its margins without utilizing a contrast medium.
Svahn et al. "Breast tomosynthesis and digital mammography: a comparison of diagnostic accuracy" <sup>47</sup>	2012	The diagnostic accuracy of DBT was better than that of FFDM.
Uchiyama et al. "Evaluation of correlation between pathological size and diagnostic size" <sup>48</sup>	2012	For evaluating the extent of a lesion, FFDM plus DBT was more accurate compared to US or FFDM only. In addition, FFDM plus DBT showed a strong correlation with MRI.



Author and study title	Year	Key findings
Förnvik et al. "Breast tomosynthesis: Accuracy of tumor measurement compared with digital mammography and ultrasonography" <sup>49</sup>	2010	The study indicates that DBT is more accurate compared to FFDM in the assessment of breast tumor size and stage.
Förnvik et al. "The effect of reduced breast compression in breast tomosynthesis: human observer study using clinical cases" <sup>50</sup>	2010	No difference in the image quality was evident with reduced compression, indicating that DBT may be performed with less compression force compared with 2D mammography. A majority of the examined women felt that half compression was more comfortable than full compression.
Zhao et al. "Experimental validation of a three-dimensional linear system model for breast tomosynthesis" <sup>51</sup>	2009	The detection of masses with DBT can be improved by increasing the angular range, as it improves the MTF at low frequencies, resulting in better detection of large-area, low-contrast lesions.
Mertelmeier et al. "Optimization of Tomosynthesis Acquisition Parameters: Angular Range and Number of Projections" <sup>52</sup>	2008	For DBT, a larger angular range increases the depth resolution and also improves the visibility of low-frequency objects, i.e. the detection of masses.
Zhou et al. "A computer simulation platform for the optimization of a breast tomosynthesis system" <sup>53</sup>	2007	The in-depth resolution of DBT can be improved by increasing the angular range, whereas pixel binning (2x2) would cause more degradation to the in-plane MTF than the blur caused by the moving focal spot and the image reconstruction.

# References

All references to websites were accessed and validated on January 24, 2023.

- [1] Weigel S, Heindel W, Hense HW, Decker T, Gerß J, Kerschke L; TOSYMA Screening Trial Study Group. (2023) Breast Density and Breast Cancer Screening with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: A TOSYMA Trial Subanalysis. *Radiology*. 306(2):e221006 <https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/abs/10.1148/radiol.221006>
- [2] Khanani S, Hruska C, Lazar A, Hoernig M, Hebecker A, Obuchowski N. (2023) Performance of Wide-Angle Tomosynthesis with Synthetic Mammography in Comparison to Full Field Digital Mammography. *Acad Radiol*. 30(1):3-13 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S1076633222002033>
- [3] Siminiak N, Pasiuk-Czepczyńska A, Godlewska A, Wojtyś P, Olejnik M, Michalak J, Nowaczyk P, Gajdzis P, Godlewski D, Ruchała M and Czepczyński R. (2022) Are contrast enhanced mammography and digital breast tomosynthesis equally effective in diagnosing patients recalled from breast cancer screening? *Front. Oncol*. 12:941312 <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fonc.2022.941312/full>
- [4] Heindel W, Weigel S, Gerß J, Hense HW, Sommer A, Kirschke M, Kerschke L; TOSYMA Screening Trial Study Group. (2022) Digital breast tomosynthesis plus synthesised mammography versus digital screening mammography for the detection of invasive breast cancer (TOSYMA): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled, superiority trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 23(5):601-611. [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045\(22\)00194-2/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045(22)00194-2/fulltext)
- [5] Clauser P, Baltzer PAT, Kapetas P, Woitek R, Weber M, Leone F, Bernathova M, Helbich TH. (2022) One view or two views for wide-angle tomosynthesis with synthetic mammography in the assessment setting? *Eur Radiol*. 32(1):661-670 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00330-021-08079-2>
- [6] Murakami R, Tani H, Kumita S, Uchiyama N. (2021) Diagnostic performance of digital breast tomosynthesis for predicting response to neoadjuvant systemic therapy in breast cancer patients: A comparison with magnetic resonance imaging, ultrasound, and full-field digital mammography. *Acta Radiol Open*. 10(12):20584601211063746 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/20584601211063746>
- [7] Johnson K, Lång K, Ikeda DM, Åkesson A, Andersson I, Zackrisson S. (2021) Interval Breast Cancer Rates and Tumor Characteristics in the Prospective Population-based Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial. *Radiology*. 299(3):559-567. <https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.2021204106>
- [8] Whelehan P, Ali K, Vinnicombe S, Ball G, Cox J, Farry P et al. (2021) Digital breast tomosynthesis: sensitivity for cancer in younger symptomatic women. *Br J Radiol* 94(1119):20201105 <https://www.birpublications.org/doi/full/10.1259/bjr.20201105>
- [9] Georgian-Smith D, Obuchowski NA, Lo JY, Brem RF, Baker JA, Fisher PR et al. (2019) Can Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Replace Full-Field Digital Mammography? A Multireader, Multicase Study of Wide-Angle Tomosynthesis. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 212(6):1393-1399 <https://www.ajronline.org/doi/abs/10.2214/AJR.18.20294>
- [10] Clauser P, Baltzer PAT, Kapetas P, Woitek R, Weber M, Leone F et al. (2019) Synthetic 2-Dimensional Mammography Can Replace Digital Mammography as an Adjunct to Wide-Angle Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. *Investigative radiology* 54(2):83-8. [https://journals.lww.com/investigativeradiology/Abstract/2019/02000/Synthetic\\_2\\_Dimensional\\_Mammography\\_Can\\_Replace.4.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/investigativeradiology/Abstract/2019/02000/Synthetic_2_Dimensional_Mammography_Can_Replace.4.aspx)
- [11] Heywang-Köbrunner SH, Hacker A, Jänsch A, Kates R, Wulz-Horber S; German Reader Team. (2018) Use of single-view digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) and ultrasound vs. additional views and ultrasound for the assessment of screen-detected abnormalities: German multi-reader study. *Acta Radiol* 59(7):782-788. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0284185117732600>
- [12] Zackrisson S, Lång K, Rosso A, Johnson K, Dustler M, Föörnvik D et al. (2018) One-view breast tomosynthesis versus two-view mammography in the Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial (MBTST): A prospective, population-based, diagnostic accuracy study. *The Lancet Oncology* 19(11):1493-1503. [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045\(18\)30521-7/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanonc/article/PIIS1470-2045(18)30521-7/fulltext)
- [13] Rodríguez-Ruiz A, Gubern-Merida A, Imhof-Tas M, Lardenoije S, Wanders AJT, Andersson I et al. (2018) One-view digital breast tomosynthesis as a stand-alone modality for breast cancer detection: do we need more? *European radiology* 28(5):1938-48. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00330-017-5167-3>
- [14] Scaduto DA, Huang H, Liu C, Rinaldi K, Hebecker A, Mertelmeier T, Vogt S, Fisher P, Zhao W (2018) Impact of angular range of digital breast tomosynthesis on mass detection in dense breasts. *Proc. SPIE 10718*, 14<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Breast Imaging (IWBI 2018), 107181V (6 July 2018). <https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie/10718/12318243/Impact-of-angular-range-of-digital-breast-tomosynthesis-on-mass/10.1117/12.2318243.short>
- [15] Neubauer J, Neubauer C, Wicklein J, Mertelmeier T, Windfuhr-Blum M, Langer M (2018) Multiple Angulated Mammography Reconstructions in Digital Breast Tomosynthesis for the Diagnosis of Microcalcifications - Added Value to Standard Stack Reconstructions and Synthesized Mammography. *RoFo Fortschritte auf dem Gebiete der Röntgenstrahlen und der Nuklearmedizin* 190(5):433-40. <https://www.thieme-connect.com/products/ejournals/abstract/10.1055/s-0044-100726>
- [16] Heywang-Köbrunner S, Jaensch A, Hacker A, Wulz-Horber S, Mertelmeier T, Hölzel D. (2017) Value of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis versus Additional Views for the Assessment of Screen-Detected Abnormalities – a First Analysis. *Breast Care (Basel)* 12(2):92-97. <https://www.karger.com/Article/FullText/456649>
- [17] Rodríguez-Ruiz A, Teuwen J, Vreemann S, Bouwman RW, van Engen RE, Karssemeijer N et al. (2017) New reconstruction algorithm for digital breast tomosynthesis: better image quality for humans and computers. *Acta radiologica* 59(9):1051-1059. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0284185117748487>
- [18] Galati F, Marzocca F, Bassetti E, Luciani ML, Tan S, Catalano C, Pediconi F. (2017) Added Value of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Combined with Digital Mammography According to Reader Agreement: Changes in BI-RADS Rate and Follow-Up Management. *Breast Care (Basel)*. 12(4):218-222. <https://www.karger.com/Article/FullText/477537>
- [19] Amer HA, Schmitzberger F, Ingold-Heppner B, Kussmaul J, El Tohamy MF, Tantawy HI et al. (2017) Digital breast tomosynthesis versus full-field digital mammography-Which modality provides more accurate prediction of margin status in specimen radiography? *European journal of radiology* 93:258-64. [https://www.ejradiology.com/article/S0720-048X\(17\)30220-6/fulltext](https://www.ejradiology.com/article/S0720-048X(17)30220-6/fulltext)
- [20] Maldera A, Marco P de, Colombo PE, Origgi D, Torresin A (2017) Digital breast tomosynthesis: Dose and image quality assessment. *Physica medica* 33:56-67. [https://www.physicamedica.com/article/S1120-1797\(16\)31104-8/fulltext](https://www.physicamedica.com/article/S1120-1797(16)31104-8/fulltext)
- [21] Rodríguez-Ruiz A, Castillo M, Garayoa J, Chevalier M (2016) Evaluation of the technical performance of three different commercial digital breast tomosynthesis systems in the clinical environment. *Physica medica* 32(6):767-77. [https://www.physicamedica.com/article/S1120-1797\(16\)30039-4/fulltext](https://www.physicamedica.com/article/S1120-1797(16)30039-4/fulltext)
- [22] Korporaal JG, Nalleweg N, Mertelmeier T and Hebecker A. (2016) White paper: Superior Diagnostic Accuracy with Additional and Stand-Alone Digital Breast Tomosynthesis. [https://marketing.webassets.siemens-healthineers.com/1800000004140648/4b3114a78854/mammography-additional-breast-tomosynthesis-whitepaper\\_1800000004140648.pdf](https://marketing.webassets.siemens-healthineers.com/1800000004140648/4b3114a78854/mammography-additional-breast-tomosynthesis-whitepaper_1800000004140648.pdf)
- [23] Clauser P, Nagl G, Helbich TH, Pinker-Domenig K, Weber M, Kapetas P, Bernathova M, Baltzer PAT. (2016) Diagnostic performance of digital breast tomosynthesis with a wide scan angle compared to full-field digital mammography for the detection and characterization of microcalcifications. *Eur J Radiol*. 85(12):2161-2168 [https://www.ejradiology.com/article/S0720-048X\(16\)30302-3/abstract](https://www.ejradiology.com/article/S0720-048X(16)30302-3/abstract)
- [24] Whelehan P, Heywang-Köbrunner SH, Vinnicombe SJ, Hacker A, Jänsch A, Hapca A, Gray R, Jenkin M, Lowry K, Oepfen R, Reilly M, Stahnke M, Evans A. (2017) Clinical performance of Siemens digital breast tomosynthesis versus standard supplementary mammography for the assessment of screen-detected soft-tissue abnormalities: a multi-reader study. *Clin Radiol*. 72(1):95.e9-95.e15 [https://www.clinicalradiologyonline.net/article/S0009-9260\(16\)30345-2/fulltext](https://www.clinicalradiologyonline.net/article/S0009-9260(16)30345-2/fulltext)
- [25] Lång K, Nergården M, Andersson I, Rosso A, Zackrisson S. (2016) False positives in breast cancer screening with one-view breast tomosynthesis: An analysis of findings leading to recall, work-up and biopsy rates in the Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial. *Eur Radiol*. 26(11):3899-3907. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00330-016-4265-y>
- [26] Uchiyama N, Kikuchi M, Machida M, Arai Y, Murakami R, Otsuka K, et al. Diagnostic Usefulness of Synthetic MMG (SMMG) with DBT (Digital Breast Tomosynthesis) for Clinical Setting in Breast Cancer Screening. In: Tingberg A, Lång K, Timberg P, editors. *Breast Imaging. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2016. p. 59-67. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-41546-8\\_8](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-41546-8_8)
- [27] Elizalde A, Pina L, Etxano J, Slon P, Zalazar R, Caballeros M. (2016) Additional US or DBT after digital mammography: which one is the best combination? *Acta Radiol*. 57(1):13-8. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0284185114563641>
- [28] Timberg P, Fieselmann A, Dustler M, Petersson H, Sartor H, Lång K, et al. Breast Density Assessment Using Breast Tomosynthesis Images. In: Tingberg A, Lång K, Timberg P, editors. *Breast Imaging. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2016. p.197-202 . [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-41546-8\\_26](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-41546-8_26)

- [29] Scaduto DA, Yang M, Ripton-Snyder J, Fisher PR, Zhao W (2015) Digital breast tomosynthesis with minimal breast compression. *Proc. SPIE 9412, Medical Imaging 2015: Physics of Medical Imaging*, 94121Y (18 March 2015). <https://www.spiedigitallibrary.org/conference-proceedings-of-spie/9412/94121Y/Digital-breast-tomosynthesis-with-minimal-breast-compression/10.1117/12.2081543.short>
- [30] Lång K, Andersson I, Rosso A, Tingberg A, Timberg P, Zackrisson S. (2016) Performance of one-view breast tomosynthesis as a stand-alone breast cancer screening modality: results from the Malmö Breast Tomosynthesis Screening Trial, a population-based study. *Eur Radiol.* 26(1):184-90. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00330-015-3803-3>
- [31] Mercier J, Kwiatkowski F, Abrial C, Bousson V, Dieu-de Fraissinette V, Marraoui W, Petitcolin-Bidet V, Lemery S. (2015) The role of tomosynthesis in breast cancer staging in 75 patients. *Diagn Interv Imaging.* 96(1):27-35. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2211568414002010>
- [32] Urano M, Shiraki N, Kawai T, Goto T, Endo Y, Yoshimoto N, Toyama T, Shibamoto Y. (2016) Digital mammography versus digital breast tomosynthesis for detection of breast cancer in the intraoperative specimen during breast-conserving surgery. *Breast Cancer.* 23(5):706-11. <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs12282-015-0628-5>
- [33] Baptista M, Di Maria S, Barros S, Figueira C, Sarmiento M, Orvalho L, Vaz P. (2015) Dosimetric characterization and organ dose assessment in digital breast tomosynthesis: Measurements and Monte Carlo simulations using voxel phantoms. *Med Phys.* 42(7):3788-800. <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1118/1.4921362>
- [34] Timberg et al., Detection of calcification clusters in digital breast tomosynthesis slices at different dose levels utilizing a SRSAR reconstruction and JAFROC; *Proc. SPIE 9416, Medical Imaging 2015: Image Perception, Observer Performance, and Technology Assessment*, 941604 (March 17, 2015); <http://proceedings.spiedigitallibrary.org/proceeding.aspx?articleid=2209258>
- [35] Abdurahman S, Dennerlein F, Jerebko A, Fieselmann A, Mertelmeier T (2014) Optimizing High Resolution Reconstruction in Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Using Filtered Back Projection. In: Fujita H., Hara T., Muramatsu C. (eds) *Breast Imaging. IWD 2014*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 8539. Springer, Cham, pp 520–527. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8\\_73](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8_73)
- [36] Uchiyama et al., Clinical Efficacy of Novel Image Processing Techniques in the Framework of Filtered Back Projection (FBP) with Digital Breast Tomosynthesis (DBT); *Breast Imaging, 12th International, Workshop, IWD 2014, Gifu City, Japan, June 29 – July 2, 2014 Proceedings: LNCS 8539* pp. 320–326; [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8\\_45](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8_45)
- [37] Tani et al., Assessing Radiologist Performance and Microcalcifications Visualization Using Combined 3D Rotating Mammogram (RM) and Digital Breast Tomosynthesis; *Breast Imaging, 12th International, Workshop, IWD 2014, Gifu City, Japan, June 29 – July 2, 2014 Proceedings: LNCS 8539*, pp. 142–149; [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8\\_21](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8_21)
- [38] Dustler et al., Image Quality of Thick Average Intensity Pixel Slabs Using Statistical Artifact Reduction in Breast Tomosynthesis; *Breast Imaging, 12th International Workshop, IWD 2014, Gifu City, Japan, June 29 – July 2, 2014 Proceedings: LNCS 8539*, pp. 544–549; [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8\\_76](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-07887-8_76)
- [39] Lång K, Andersson I, Zackrisson S. (2014) Breast cancer detection in digital breast tomosynthesis and digital mammography-a side-by-side review of discrepant cases. *Br J Radiol.* 87(1040):20140080. <https://www.birpublications.org/doi/full/10.1259/bjr.20140080>
- [40] Houssami N, Zackrisson S. (2013) Digital breast tomosynthesis: the future of mammography screening or much ado about nothing? *Expert Rev Med Devices.* 10(5):583-5. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1586/17434440.2013.835555>
- [41] Schulz-Wendtland R, Dilbat G, Bani M, Fasching PA, Heusinger K, Lux MP, Loehberg CR, Brehm B, Hammon M, Saake M, Dankerl P, Jud SM, Rauh C, Bayer CM, Beckmann MW, Uder M, Meier-Meitingen M. (2013) Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) versus CMOS Technology, Specimen Radiography System (SRS) and Tomosynthesis (DBT) – Which System Can Optimise Surgical Therapy? *Geburtshilfe Frauenheilkd.* 73(5):422-427. <https://www.thieme-connect.com/products/ejournals/abstract/10.1055/s-0032-1328600>
- [42] Abdurahman S, Jerebko A, Mertelmeier T, Lasser T, Navab N (2012) Out-of-Plane Artifact Reduction in Tomosynthesis Based on Regression Modeling and Outlier Detection. In: Maidment A.D.A., Bakic P.R., Gavenonis S. (eds) *Breast Imaging. IWD 2012*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 7361. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 729–736. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7\\_94](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7_94)
- [43] Marshall NW, Bosmans H (2012) Measurements of system sharpness for two digital breast tomosynthesis systems. *Physics in medicine and biology* 57(22):7629–50. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/0031-9155/57/22/7629>
- [44] Uchiyama et al., Diagnostic Impact of Adjunction of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis (DBT) to Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) and in Comparison with Full Field Digital Mammography (FFDM); *Breast Imaging, 11th International Workshop, IWD 2012, Philadelphia, PA, USA, July 8 – 11, 2012 Proceedings: LNCS 7361*, pp 119-126; [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7\\_16](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7_16)
- [45] Dance et al., Comparison of breast doses for digital tomosynthesis estimated from patient exposures and using PMMA breast phantoms; *Breast Imaging, 11th International Workshop, IWD 2012, Philadelphia, PA, USA, July 8 - 11, 2012 Proceedings: LNCS 7361*, pp 316-321; [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7\\_41](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7_41)
- [46] Uchiyama et al., Usefulness of Adjunction of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis (DBT) to Full-Field Digital Mammography (FFDM) in Evaluation of Pathological Response after Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy (NAC) for Breast Cancer; *Breast Imaging, 11th International Workshop, IWD 2012, Philadelphia, PA, USA, July 8 - 11, 2012 Proceedings: LNCS 7361*, pp 354-361; [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7\\_46](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-31271-7_46)
- [47] Svahn TM, Chakraborty DP, Ikeda D, Zackrisson S, Do Y, Mattsson S, Andersson I. (2012) Breast tomosynthesis and digital mammography: a comparison of diagnostic accuracy. *Br J Radiol.* 85(1019):e1074-82. <https://www.birpublications.org/doi/full/10.1259/bjr/53282892>
- [48] Uchiyama et al., Evaluation of correlation between pathological size and diagnostic size; ISBN: 978-953-51-0285-4, Intech, DOI: 10.5772/39188; <http://www.intechopen.com/books/mammography-recent-advances/optimization-of-digital-breast-tomosynthesis-dbt-for-breast-cancer-diagnosis>
- [49] Förnvik D, Zackrisson S, Ljungberg O, Svahn T, Timberg P, Tingberg A, Andersson I. (2010) Breast tomosynthesis: Accuracy of tumor measurement compared with digital mammography and ultrasonography. *Acta Radiol.* 51(3):240-7 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.3109/02841850903524447>
- [50] Förnvik D, Andersson I, Svahn T, Timberg P, Zackrisson S, Tingberg A. (2010) The effect of reduced breast compression in breast tomosynthesis: human observer study using clinical cases. *Radiat Prot Dosimetry.* 139(1-3):118-23. <https://academic.oup.com/rpd/article-abstract/139/1-3/118/1603571>
- [51] Zhao B, Zhou J, Hu Y-H, Mertelmeier T, Ludwig J, Zhao W (2009) Experimental validation of a three-dimensional linear system model for breast tomosynthesis. *Medical physics* 36(1):240–51. <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1118/1.3040178>
- [52] Mertelmeier T, Ludwig J, Zhao B, Zhao W (2008) Optimization of Tomosynthesis Acquisition Parameters: Angular Range and Number of Projections. In: Krupinski E.A. (eds) *Digital Mammography. IWD 2008*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol 5116. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp 220–227. [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-70538-3\\_31](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-70538-3_31)
- [53] Zhou J, Zhao B, Zhao W (2007) A computer simulation platform for the optimization of a breast tomosynthesis system. *Medical physics* 34(3):1098–109. <https://aapm.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1118/1.2558160>

On account of certain regional limitations of sales rights and service availability, we cannot guarantee that all products / services / features included in this brochure are available through the Siemens Healthineers sales organization worldwide. Availability and packaging may vary by country and are subject to change without prior notice.

The information in this document contains general descriptions of the technical options available and may not always apply in individual cases.

Siemens Healthineers reserves the right to modify the design and specifications contained herein without prior notice. Please contact your local Siemens Healthineers sales representative for the most current information.

In the interest of complying with legal requirements concerning the environmental compatibility of our products (protection of natural resources and waste conservation), we may recycle certain components where legally permissible. For recycled components we use the same extensive quality assurance measures as for factory-new components.

Any technical data contained in this document may vary within defined tolerances. Original images always lose a certain amount of detail when reproduced.

The listed articles are Siemens Healthineers-external publications. Siemens Healthineers assumes no responsibility for the proper selection and/or the correctness of the content of the publication as well as for representing the complete scientific discourse through this publication and waives any respective liability.

The statements by Siemens' customers described herein are based on results that were achieved in the customer's unique setting. Since there is no "typical" hospital and many variables exist (e.g., hospital size, case mix, level of IT adoption) there can be no guarantee that other customers will achieve the same results

---

#### **Siemens Healthineers Headquarters**

Siemens Healthcare GmbH  
Henkestr. 127  
91052 Erlangen, Germany  
Phone: +49 9131 84-0  
[siemens-healthineers.com](http://siemens-healthineers.com)