White Paper

# Breast Mass Analyzer (BMA)



### Background

Breast cancer represents the most common oncological disease in women worldwide, and a multimodality imaging approach is becoming increasingly important to detect and monitor early-stage cancer and to initiate timely and appropriate treatment in order to reduce mortality. According to WHO data, in 2020, there were 2.3 million women diagnosed with breast cancer and 685,000 deaths globally<sup>[1]</sup>.

Technological developments over recent years have made breast ultrasound (US) an essential component for the breast cancer care, together with mammography/ tomosynthesis and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Mammography is the gold standard screening technique for breast cancer<sup>[2]</sup>. Ultrasound is not typically used at this stage but appears to be especially helpful in mass characterization where mammogram performance is limited and can be difficult to see abnormal features, as well as when a better look at a suspicious area, previously identified on mammography, is required<sup>[3]</sup>.

Other advantages of US include its wide availability, good tolerance by patients, lack of ionizing radiation and relative low cost<sup>[4]</sup>.

Moreover, US provides an optimal, cheap, and comfortable guidance for performing percutaneous needle biopsy, and, in particular, large-core needle biopsy (US-LCNB), the gold standard in diagnosis in case of suspect of breast cancer. This safe and cost-effective procedure has almost entirely replaced surgical biopsy, thus limiting costs, patients discomfort and possible complications<sup>[5]</sup>. However, it remains a semi-invasive procedure associated with an anticipatory emotional distress which could be avoided, where not necessary.

BI-RADS® (Breast Imaging-Reporting and Data System) provides a widely accepted reporting schema for imaging of the breast and characterization of findings. This system is designed to standardize breast imaging reporting and to reduce confusion in breast imaging interpretation, thus facilitating outcome monitoring and quality assessment. Results are sorted into categories numbered 0 through 6, by increasing the order of likelihood of findings <sup>[6,7]</sup>.

	Category	Management	Likelihood of cancer		
0	Need additional imaging or prior examinations	Recall for additional imaging and/or await prior examinations	N/A		
1	Negative	Routine screening	Essentially 0%		
2	Benign	Routine screening	Essentially 0%		
3	Probably Benign	Short interval-follow-up (6 months) or continued	>0% but ≤2%		
4	Suspicious	Tissue sampling	4a. low suspicion for malignancy (>2% to ≤10%); 4b. moderate suspicion for malignancy (>10% to ≤50%); 4c. high suspicion for malignancy (>50% to <95%)		
5	Highly suggestive of malignancy	Tissue sampling	≥95%		
6	Known biopsy-proven	Surgical excision when clinical appropriate	N/A		

Table 1: BI-RADS® final assessment category.

BI-RADS® category 3 represents a finding with a very low (>0% but ≤2%) probability of being cancer, that is not expected to change over time. A follow-up with repeat imaging in 3 to 6 months and regularly after that until the finding is known to be stable (usually at least 2 years) is usually prescribed. Studies aiming at reducing the USguided biopsy rate should take particular attention to this category.

US images contain a high number of quantitative features, known as radiomics, which can be associated with a higher or lower probability of malignancy and may thus help to better characterize breast lesions<sup>[8-10]</sup>. These features include not only shape, margins, and spatial orientation of lesions, but also their signal intensity and heterogeneity, the quantification of which is difficult for the human reader. Recent technological advances in the field of artificial intelligence applied to image analysis allow the development of machine learning models predicting different class of risks based on the wide spectrum of information found in a US image<sup>[11-12]</sup>.

TRACE4BUS is a machine learning model based on radiomics features belonging to different families, such as morphology, intensity-based statistics, intensity histogram, grey-level co-occurrence matrix, grey-level run length matrix, grey-level size zone matrix <sup>[13-14]</sup>, neighborhood grey tone difference matrix, grey-level distance zone matrix, and neighboring grey-level dependence matrix. Their definition, computation, and nomenclature are compliant with the International Biomarker Standardization Initiative (IBSI) guidelines<sup>[15]</sup>.

Rank	Feature Family	Feature Name		
1	Morphology	Perimeter-to-area ratio **		
2	Morphology	Maximum diameter **		
3	Morphology	Compactness **		
4	Morphology	Acircularity **		
5	Morphology	Perimeter **		
6	Morphology	Area **		
7	Morphology	Center of mass shift **		
8	Morphology	Circularity *		
9	Neighborhood grey tone difference matrix	Strength **		
10	Neighborhood grey tone difference matrix	Coarseness **		
11	Neighborhood grey tone difference matrix	Contrast		
12	Neighborhood grey tone difference matrix	Busyness *		
13	Grey-level size zone matrix	Zone size non-uniformity **		
14	Grey-level size zone matrix	Grey-level non-uniformity glszm **		
15	Neighboring grey-level dependence matrix	Dependence count non-uniformity **		
16	Neighboring grey-level dependence matrix	Low-dependence low-grey-level emphasis		
17	Grey-level run length matrix	Grey-level non-uniformity		
18	Grey-level run length matrix	Run length non-uniformity		
19	Intensity-based statistics	Minimum		
20	Intensity-based statistics	Energy		
21	Intensity-based statistics	Variance		
22	Intensity-based statistics	Quartile coefficient		
23	Intensity-based statistics 10th percentile			
24	Intensity histogram	10th percentile		
25	Grey-level co-occurrence matrix	First measure of information correlation		

\* Denotes statistical significance at 0.05 (adjusted with Bonferroni-Holm correction).

\*\* denotes a statistical significance at 0.005 (adjusted with Bonferroni-Holm correction).

Table 2: Top 25 most relevant predictors sorted in descending order of relevance.

#### TRACE4BUS: clinical validation

The development and the clinical validation of TRACE4BUS is described in detail in the paper by Interlenghi M. et al. "A Machine Learning Ensemble Based on Radiomics to Predict BI-RADS® Category and Reduce the Biopsy Rate of Ultrasound-Detected Suspicious Breast Masses"<sup>[12]</sup>.

Esaote systems were part of the pool of ultrasound devices that were used for the development and validation of the algorithm.



2

Article

check for updates

Citation: Interlenghi, M.; Salvatore C.; Magni, V.; Caldara, G.; Schiavon

E.; Cozzi, A.; Schiaffino, S.;

Carbonaro, L.A.; Castiglioni, I.; Sardanelli, F. A Machine Learning

Ensemble Based on Radiomics to Predict BI-RADS Category and

Reduce the Biopsy Rate of Ultrasound-Detected Suspiciou

187. https://doi.org/10.3390/ diagnostics1201018

Academic Editor: Dechang Chen

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral

Crypright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPJ, Essel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 400)

Received: 2 December 2021 Accepted: 10 January 2022 Published: 13 January 2022

auristner's Note: MDPI st with regard to jurisdiction: published maps and institu iations.

Breast Masses. Dirgnostics 2022, 12,

MDPI

A Machine Learning Ensemble Based on Radiomics to Predict BI-RADS Category and Reduce the Biopsy Rate of **Ultrasound-Detected Suspicious Breast Masses** 

Matteo Interlenghi <sup>1,1</sup><sup>(0)</sup>, Christian Salvatore <sup>1,2,†</sup><sup>(0)</sup>, Veronica Magni <sup>3</sup><sup>(0)</sup>, Gabriele Caldara <sup>2</sup>, Elia Schiavon <sup>10</sup>, Andrea Cozzi <sup>3</sup><sup>(0)</sup>, Simone Schiaffino <sup>4</sup><sup>(0)</sup>, Luca Alessandro Carbonaro <sup>5,6</sup><sup>(0)</sup>, Isabella Castiglioni <sup>7,8,4</sup><sup>(0)</sup> and Francesco Sardanelli <sup>3,4</sup><sup>(0)</sup>

- Deep Trace Technologies S.R.L., Via Conservatorio 17, 20122 Milano, Italy; interlenghi@deeptraoetech.com (E.S.) popartment of Science. Technology and Society, Scuola Universitaria IUSS, Istituto Universitario di Studi Superintoni of Science. Technology and Society, Scuola Universitaria IUSS, Istituto Universitario di Studi Superintoni of Science. Technology and Society, Scuola Universitaria IUSS, Istituto Universitario di Studi Superintoni of Science. Technology and Society, Scuola Universitaria IUSS, Istituto Universitario di Studi Superintoni of Sience Carbonica anggi@unimil.tl (VM); andreas.cozzi@unimil.tl (A.C.); franceso.sardanell@unimini (IQ). Unit of Radiology, IRCC: Policlinico San Donato, Via Rodolfo Morandi 30, 20097 San Donato Milanese, Italy; simone schaffingoirgupposardonito it Department of Radiology, ASST Grande Ospedale Metropolitano Niguarda, Piazza dell'Ospedale Maggiore 3, 20120 Allano, Italy: Loca.orhoonarollwinnial t Department of Chocology and Hemato-Oncology, Università degli Studi di Milano, Via Festa del Perdono 7, 20122 Milan, Italy Instituto ed Biomedical Imaging and Physiology, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Via Fratelil Cervi 93, 2009 Segatei, Italy

- Institute of promechan imaging and represented by the second seco

Abstract: We developed a machine learning model based on radiomics to predict the BI-RADS Abstract: We developed a machine learning model based on radiomics to predict the BF-KADs category of ultrasound-detected suspicious heast lesions and support medical decision-making towards short-interval follow-up versus tissue sampling. From a retrospective 2015-2019 series of ultrasound-guided core needle biopsies performed by four board-certified breast radiologists using six ultrasound-systems from three vendors, we collected 821 images of 834 suspicious breast masses from 819 patients, 404 malignant and 430 benign according to histopathology. A balanced masses from 619 patients, 404 maingnant and 400 beingn according to instopartiology. A balanced image set of biopsy-proven beingin (n = 299) and malignant (n = 299) lesions was used for training and cross-validation of ensembles of machine learning algorithms supervised during learning by histopathological diagnosis as a reference standard. Based on a majority vote (over 80% of the votes to have a valid prediction of beingin lesion), an ensemble of support vector machines showed an ability to reduce the biopsy rate of being lesion) by 15% to 18%, always keeping a sensitivity over 94%, when externally techan a 26 invector from two invectors of the 102 forms of 5 methods. returne the toppy that or being it reasons ( $y \ge m$  or  $D_{init}$  inverse being in reasoning over m/m, initial externally tested on 226 images from two image sets: (1) 123 lesions (51 malignant and 72 being) obtained from two ultrasound systems used for training and from a different one, resulting in a positive predictive value (PPV) of 45.9% (97% confidence interval 36.3-55.7%) versus a radiologists' PPV of 41.5% (p < 0.005), combined with a 98.0% sensitivity (89.6-99.9%); (2) 113 lesions (54 malignant and 59 benign) obtained from two ultrasound systems from vendors different from those used for training, resulting into a 50.5% PPV (40.4-60.6%) versus a radiologists' PPV of 47.8% (p < 0.005) training, testing and a 30.2 at 1-60.9 conversion versus a rationogene in Voi 4.28 of 2-50.0combined with 4.4% sensitivity (84.6-98.8%). Errors in BFARDS 3 category (i.e., assigned to the model as BFARDS 4) were 0.8% and 2.7% in the *Testing set* 1 and 11, respectively. The boar corrificit breast radiologist accepted the BFARDS classes assigned by the model in 114 mass (92.7%) and modified the BFARDS classes of 9 breast masses (7.3%). In six of nine cases, th signed b e board model performed better than the radiologist did, since it assigned a BI-RADS 3 classification to histopathology-confirmed benign masses that were classified as BI-RADS 4 by the radiologist.

Diagnostics 2022, 12, 187. https://doi.org/10.3390/diagnostics12010187

https://www.mdpi.com/journal/diagnostics

Fig. 1: Clinical study front page.

#### Augmented Insight<sup>™</sup>, an Esaote smart solution applied to breast ultrasound imaging

Augmented Insight<sup>™</sup> embeds all the solutions powered by Artificial Intelligence, developed by the Research & Development department at Esaote according to a multidisciplinary approach, across different modalities such as Ultrasound, MRI and Ebit. Based on data-driven machine learning, Augmented Insight<sup>™</sup> is designed to simplify the workflow in repetitive gestures, complex procedures, measurements, or lesions analysis.

Esaote, particularly active in the breast imaging field and in constant search of innovative solutions, has recently developed many Augmented Insight<sup>™</sup> solutions specifically for breast US imaging, including BreastNav™MRI, eDetect and Breast Mass Analyzer technologies.

#### Esaote Breast Mass Analyzer Technology

Esaote Breast Mass Analyzer (BMA) has embedded the TRACE4BUS software by Deep Trace Technologies.

BMA Augmented Insight™ technology is a radiomicsbased machine learning model to predict the BI-RADS® category of ultrasound-detected suspicious breast lesions and support medical decision-making towards BI-RADS® 3 versus BI-RADS® 4-5.

Therefore, this technology is indicated for all physicians with experience in breast ultrasound seeking support for reporting ultrasound-detected suspicious breast masses, assigning the diagnostic category to such masses according to BI-RADS® classification, and, consequently, making an informed decision whether or not to send such masses for ultrasound-guided needle biopsy.

During the ultrasound examination, as soon as the user identifies a suspected lesion, freezes the image and manually contours the mass using the trackball.

The software, supported by A.I., automatically processes the mass, and within a few seconds provides its characteristics (i.e. shape and orientation) and BI-RADS® category (BI-RADS® category calculated by BMA is on 3 levels: 3, 4 and 5).

The user can subsequently accept the proposed value, modify, or refine it on categories 4a, 4b and 4c, directly from the touchscreen. If approved, all the information are automatically included in the worksheet environment and in the report.





Fig. 2: BMA procedure: step 1 - mass processing; step 2 - BI-RADS® categorization.

The report, a dedicated template (that can be edited directly from the touchscreen) produced according to the BI-RADS® scoring and categorization, provides information on the localization of the lesion, with a dedicated body mark to visually locate the lesion in the correct quadrant, as well as details on the mass itself (shape, orientation, and echo pattern) and its margins (circumscribed, lobulated and spiculated).

To enhance the quality of lesion characterization, additional technologies such as microV, the Esaote tool for microvascularization visualization, and QElaXto 2D, the Esaote 2D shear wave technique for stiffness evaluation of the breast tissue, are available on the system.

		Bre	east				
R Mass				L Mass			
R Mass 1			L Mas	is 1			
Length	6.8	mm	Length 3.3		mm		
Height	8.6	mm	Heigh		6.7	mm	
Width	10.7	mm	Width		1.9	mm	
Volume	0.328	ml	Volume			ml	
Skin Depth	5.8	mm	Skin E		20.7	mm	
Nipple Dist 10.0		mm	Nipple Dist 23.0		23.0	mm	
O'clock			Locau	O'clock			
Region		Nipple		Region		Areolar	
Quadrants		Upper Inner		Quadrants		Upper Outer	
Profile		Posterior		Profile		Middle	
Probe Angle		60		Probe Angle		120	
Masses	Masses		Masse	5			
Shape		Oval		Shape		Oval	
Orientation		Parallel		Orientation		Parallel	
Echo Pattern		Anechoic		Echo Pattern		Hypoechoic	
Posterior Feature	s	No posterior features		Posterior Feature	s	No posterior features	
Margin			Margin				
Circumscribed		Yes		Circumscribed		Yes	
Not circumscribed - Indistinct No		No	Not circumscribed - Indistinct			No	
Not circumscribe	d - Angular	No		Not circumscribed	d - Angular	No	
Not circumscribe Microlobulated	-	No		Not circumscribed	-	No	
Not circumscribe Spiculated	d -	No		Not circumscribed Spiculated	± -	No	
Elasticity Assess		Elasticity Assess					
BI-RADS Category 3 - Probably Benig		3 - Probably Benign	BI-RADS Category		3 - Probably Benign		
•			(	Ð		•	

Fig. 3: BI-RADS® report.

#### Innovation and research

This innovative BMA tool further expands the scope of the company's breast ultrasound technologies dedicated to the breast. It has proved its viability as a second opinion on BI-RADS® classification as well as its potential clinical value in reducing the biopsy rate.

The underlying philosophy of research and development in Esaote is based on open innovation involving external expertise in a valuable co-operative network that includes research centers and highly experienced physicians and their patients.

## References

1. Mangone L, Bisceglia I, Michiara M, Musolino A, Mazzoleni G, Caldarella A, Minerba S, Cascone G, Bella F, Dinaro Y, Pau L, Pinto C. Breast Cancer in Italy: Stage and Region Distribution. Breast Cancer (Dove Med Press). 2022 Apr 29;14:125-131. doi: 10.2147/BCTT.S360244. PMID: 35515355; PMCID: PMC9064450;

2. Miller RG. Breast cancer screening: can we talk? J Gen Intern Med. 2001 Mar;16(3):206-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1497.2001.10119.x. PMID: 11318918; PMCID: PMC1495188;

 3. American College of Radiology. ACR BI-RADS ATLAS
Mammography. Reporting System, 2013. Accessed at https://www.acr.org/-/media/ACR/Files/RADS/ BI-RADS/Mammography-Reporting.pdf on September 30, 2021.

4. Jaime Geisel, Madhavi Raghu, Regina Hooley, The Role of Ultrasound in Breast Cancer Screening: The Case for and Against Ultrasound, Seminars in Ultrasound, CT and MRI, Volume 39, Issue 1, 2018, Pages 25-34, ISSN 0887-2171, https://doi.org/10.1053/j.sult.2017.09.006;

5. Bick, U.; Trimboli, R.M.; Athanasiou, A.; Balleyguier, C.; Baltzer, P.A.T.; Bernathova, M.; Borbély, K.; Brkljacic, B.; Carbonaro, L.A.; Clauser, P.; et al. Image-guided breast biopsy and localisation: Recommendations for information to women and referring physicians by the European Society of Breast Imaging. Insights Imaging 2020, 11, 12.

6. Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System? (BI-RADS?) Atlas.

7. Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System, Inter- and Intraobserver Variability in Feature Analysis and Final Assessment by Wendie A. Berg et al. Department of Radiology, University of Maryland School of Medicine, 22 S. Greene St., Baltimore, AJR 2000; 174:1769-1777.

8. Tagliafico, A.S.; Piana, M.; Schenone, D.; Lai, R.; Massone, A.M.; Houssami, N. Overview of radiomics in breast cancer diagnosis and prognostication. Breast 2020, 49, 74-80;

9. Stavros, A.T.; Thickman, D.; Rapp, C.L.; Dennis, M.A.; Parker, S.H.; Sisney, G.A. Solid breast nodules: Use of sonography to distinguish between benign and malignant lesions. Radiology 1995, 196, 123-134;

10. Bradley J. Erickson, Panagiotis Korfiatis, Zeynettin Akkus, Timothy L. Kline, RadioGraphics, Feb 17 2017 https://doi.org/10.1148/rg.2017160130;

11. Bitencourt, A.; Daimiel Naranjo, I.; Lo Gullo, R.; Rossi Saccarelli, C.; Pinker, K. Alenhanced breast imaging: Where are we and where are we heading? Eur. J. Radiol. 2021, 142, 109882. [Google Scholar] [CrossRef];

12. Hu, Q.; Giger, M.L. Clinical Artificial Intelligence Applications: Breast Imaging. Radiol. Clin. N. Am. 2021, 59, 1027-1043. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. breast.2019.10.018;

13. TRACE4. Available online: http://www.deeptracetech. com/temp/ TechnicalSheet\_\_TRACE4.pdf (accessed on 7 January 2022);

14. Interlenghi M, Salvatore C, Magni V, Caldara G, Schiavon E, Cozzi A, Schiaffino S, Carbonaro LA, Castiglioni I, Sardanelli F. A Machine Learning Ensemble Based on Radiomics to Predict BI-RADS® Category and Reduce the Biopsy Rate of Ultrasound-Detected Suspicious Breast Masses. Diagnostics (Basel). 2022 Jan 13;12(1):187. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics12010187. PMID: 35054354; PMCID: PMC8774734;

15. Zwanenburg, A.; Vallières, M.; Abdalah, M.A.; Aerts, H.J.W.L.; Andrearczyk, V.; Apte, A.; Ashrafinia, S.; Bakas, S.; Beukinga, R.J.; Boellaard, R.; et al. The Image Biomarker Standardization Initiative: Standardized Quantitative Radiomics for High Throughput Imagebased Phenotyping. Radiology 2020, 295, 328-338

Notes





#### Esaote S.p.A. - sole-shareholder company

Via Enrico Melen 77, 16152 Genova, ITALY, Tel. +39 010 6547 1, Fax +39 010 6547 275, info@esaote.com - www.esaote.com

BMA is powered by Deep Trace Technology. BI-RADS®incorporates the Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System ATLAS of the American College of Radiology, Copyright 1992, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2003, and 2013. The developer of this product is independently owned and operated, and is not an affiliate of the American College of Radiology. The American College of Radiology is not responsible for the contents or operation of this product or its associated software, and expressly disclaims any and all warranties and liabilities, expressed or implied, in connection therewith. Technology and features are system/configuration dependent. Specifications subject to change without notice. Information might refer to products or modalities not yet approved in all countries. Product images are for illustrative purposes only. For further details, please contact your Esaote sales representative.

Please visit us online for more information

60000514 ver 01



🗖 Italian design 📩