The American Journal of Surgery (2014) 207, 698-701

The American Journal of Surgery®

North Pacific Surgical Association

Breast-specific gamma imaging is a cost effective and efficacious imaging modality when compared with MRI

Nathalie Johnson, M.D.*, Leslie Sorenson, B.S., Laura Bennetts, Karen Winter, R.N., Sally Bryn, R.N., William Johnson, M.D., Margie Glissmeyer, P.A.-C., Jennifer Garreau, M.D., Deb Blanchard, M.D.

Legacy Cancer Institute and Legacy Breast Health Center, Good Samaritan Breast Health Center, 1040 NW 22nd Avenue, Portland, OR 97210, USA

KEYWORDS:
Breast cancer;
BSGI;
MRI;
Imaging cost

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Both MRI and breast-specific gamma imaging are tools for surgical planning in newly diagnosed breast cancer. Breast-specific gamma imaging (BSGI) is used less frequently although it is of similar utility and lower cost. We compared the diagnostic and cost efficacy of BSGI with MRI.

METHODS: Retrospective review of 1,480 BSGIs was performed in a community breast health center, 539 had a new diagnosis of cancer, 75 patients having both MRI and BSGI performed within 2 months of each other. Institutional charges for BSGI ($850) and MRI ($3,381) were noted.

RESULTS: BSGI had a sensitivity of 92%, specificity of 73%, positive predictive value of 78%, and negative predictive value of 90%. This compared favorably with MRI that had sensitivity of 89%, specificity 54%, positive predictive value 67%, and negative predictive value 83%. The accuracy of BSGI was higher at 82% vs MRI at 72%. Total cost of MRI imaging was $253,575 vs BSGI at $63,750.

CONCLUSIONS: BSGI is a cost-effective and accurate imaging study for further evaluation of dense breast tissue and new diagnosis of cancer.

There are over 226,000 newly diagnosed cases of breast cancer in the United States annually. As treatment management in both surgery and radiation therapy has become more complex, many of these patients are evaluated with increasingly sophisticated imaging. This is occurring at the same time that there is scrutiny on the use of evidence-based medicine and a call to control the rising cost of medical care.

Recent studies have shown both MRI and breast-specific gamma imaging (BSGI) to be good imaging tools for surgical planning in newly diagnosed breast cancer and for the imaging of dense breasts. BSGI is used less frequently although it appears to be of similar utility and lower cost. There are several studies in the literature comparing the sensitivity and specificity of the 2 modalities but none to our knowledge comparing cost.

Our community comprehensive breast health center added a BSGI to the traditional MRI, ultrasound, and mammography units in 2006. We prospectively collected data on BSGI studies performed. There were occasions when patients had both

There were no industry sponsors at all for this project currently or in the past that would have influenced this work.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-503-413-5525; fax: 5 +1-03-413-5526.
E-mail address: nemtipi@aol.com

Manuscript received October 29, 2013; revised manuscript December 22, 2013

0002-9610/$ - see front matter © 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2013.12.015

studies performed in close proximity. This gave our center the opportunity to look retrospectively at clinical results and to compare the studies for outcome. We evaluated the diagnostic and cost efficacy of BSGI compared with MRI.

Methods

Retrospective data review of 1,480 BSGIs was performed in our community comprehensive breast health center. There were 539 studies performed specifically for a new diagnosis of breast cancer. We retrieved the data specifically on patients who had both an MRI and BSGI performed within 2 months of each other. All BSGI studies were performed using a gamma camera (Dilon 6800; Dilon Technologies, Newport News, VA). This camera uses a high-resolution and small field of view for optimal images. Imaging technique used injection of 20 to 30 mCi (925-110 MBq) of technetium-99m sestamibi into an arm vein using the contralateral side of the diseased breast whenever possible. When an arm vein was not accessible, a dorsalis pedis vein was used instead. Time from injection to the start of imaging procedure was approximately 10 minutes. Craniocaudal and mediolateral views were obtained of both breasts with a total time of 40 minutes (10 minutes per view). Dedicated breast radiologists in our community comprehensive breast health center interpreted films. Information on needle or surgical biopsies and results of final pathology were recorded. Additional imaging studies and their results were also documented, such as mammogram, ultrasound, and MRI, if performed.

MRIs studied may have been performed at institutions outside our breast health center. The institutional fee including professional fees of BSGI ($850) and MRI ($3,381) were calculated from those charged at our facility. Our institutional review board guidelines were observed for this review.

Results

There were 1,480 studies documented in our review and 539 had the study performed for a new diagnosis of breast cancer. Of these, 75 patients had both BSGI and MRI performed within a 2-month period (see Table 1). BSGI had a sensitivity of 92%, specificity of 73%, positive predictive value of 78%, and negative predictive value of 90%. This compared favorably with MRI that had sensitivity of 89%, specificity 54%, positive predictive value 67%, and negative predictive value 83%. The accuracy of BSGI was higher at 82% vs MRI at 72%.

Table 1 Number of cancers and false positives in breast patients with BSGI and MRI studies

	Patients	Cancers detected	False positives
+BSGI/−MRI	8	4	4
+MRI/−BSGI	14	3	11
+BSGI/+MRI	37	31	6
−BSGI/−MRI	16	0	0

Total charges for MRI vs BSGI were $253,575 versus $63,750. The charges for false positives for MRI vs BSGI were $30,429 vs $8,500 (not including cost of biopsy).

Comments

In today's world of fiscal challenges, we are called to provide quality care that is evidence based and to be conscious of the cost of care. As we navigate the new world of fiscal responsibility, the question of routine use of MRI preoperatively is an important one. It is also a fair question to ask if the evidence truly supports the wide spread use of preoperative MRI.

As breast cancer care becomes more complex and we are performing more breast-conserving surgery with radiation fields that are shrinking, some patients are benefited by more in-depth study of the breast tissue. Some argue that improved systemic therapies negate the need for routine use of imaging over and above mammography and ultrasound. This argument holds true for long-term control in patients undergoing breast-conserving therapy. However, practicing surgeons often order MRI in hopes of improving resection margins, ruling out multifocal disease, and evaluating regional nodal basins. In practice, a significant fraction of newly diagnosed breast cancer patients in the United States undergo MRI. Although many question the practice of additional imaging for newly diagnosed breast cancer, the move toward reduced therapy and partial breast radiation necessitates adequate evaluation of the breast tissue. Practitioners, both surgeons and radiation oncologists, should glean the information they need for treatment decisions with less fiscal and personal impact to the patient. The use of BSGI in our series would result in reducing unnecessary biopsies and out of pocket cost.

We initially became interested in MRI with the hope that it would allow us to better understand the extent of disease in the breast, and this would decrease the number of lumpectomies with positive margins and repeat surgery often required in this situation. We know that the extent of disease that we visualize on mammography may be an underestimate of the true extent of disease. This is particularly true when imaging for ductal carcinoma in situ. MRI is well studied in this realm. Rosen et al[1] performed an eloquent study of MRI in this setting showing that functional imaging with MRI can delineate the extent of disease far better than mammography alone. Unfortunately, this does not seem to translate into improvement in clear margins of resection on initial surgery. Several series have shown that MRI does not decrease the rates of positive margins and may in fact increase rates of mastectomies.[1] As born out in our review, this comes at considerable fiscal cost as well. Despite several recent reviews questioning the utility of MRI in the perioperative setting for breast cancer, the use of MRI does not appear to be declining.[2,3]