



:  
 : 6 32,289 ( 25,541 )  
 (American  
 College of Radiology Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System; ACR BI - RADS)  
 ACR - BIRADS category  
 , category 0, 4, 5  
 , category 1  
 가 가  
 : 48.6 10 가 32,289  
 2,016 ( : 6.2%), cate-  
 gory 4, 5 256 51  
 2.0/1,000 (51/25,541), 1 (PPV1:  
 ) 2.5%, 2 (PPV2:  
 ) 20% . 가 23  
 (45%) 가 25 (49.0%) 37 (72.5%)  
 6 (27%) .  
 85.0% , 가 78.5% ,  
 99% .  
 : 2.0/1,000 ,  
 72.5% , 가 78.5% .  
 가 가  
 (performance) 가 .

가 가 (1).

<sup>1</sup> 1994 8 1999 12 6  
<sup>2</sup> 25,541 32,289  
 2003 4 21 2003 ( 7 11 )  
 ( 1.26 ).



**Table 2.** Comparison of Medical Audit Data of Screening Mammography with Previously Published Data in Korea and the Ideal Goal of ACR in America

Audit Data	Goal	This study	Kim et al	Choi et al
Total examinations		32,289	15,308	43,329
Total patients		25,541	13,889	36,802
PPV1*	5 - 10%	2.5%	0.8%	2.3%
PPV2*	25 - 40%	20%	18%	27.7%
Tumor found-stage 0 or I	> 50%	90.2%	47%	73.2%
Tumor found-minimal cancer	> 30%	72.5%	47%	48.8%
Node positivity	< 25%	27%	64%	22.0%
Cancers found/1,000cases	2 - 10	2.0	1.2	1.2
Recall rate	< 10%	6.2%	13%	5.1%
Sensitivity1*	> 85%	85.0%	89.5%	91.5%
Sensitivity2*	> 85%	78.5%	No data	No data
Specificity	> 90%	99%	> 99%	95.0%

Goal : Desirable goal of screening mammography in U.S.A.

\*PPV1; positive predictive value (PPV) based on abnormal findings

\*PPV2; PPV when biopsy or surgical consultation recommended

\*Sensitivity1; if an inquiry to Korean Central Cancer Registry are not made.

\*Sensitivity2; if an inquiry to Korean Central Cancer Registry are made.

**Table 3.** Age Distribution and Detection Rate of Breast Cancer

Age	< 40	40 - 49	50 - 59	60	Total
No. of MMG	6,338	12,123	9,570	4,258	32,289
No. of Cancer (%)	3 (6)	14 (27)	22 (43)	12 (24)	51 (100)
Cancer Detection Rate (/1,000cases)	0.5	1.2	2.3	2.8	1.6

\*No. ; Number

\*MMG ; Mammography

가 23 (45%) 19  
 7 (14%), 12 (24%)  
 9 (18%) (Table 4).  
 14  
 , 7 , 4  
 3

**Table 4.** Mammographic Findings of Breast Cancer on Screening Mammography

Findings	No. of Lesions	Percentile(%)
Microcalcification only	23	45
Mass or density	19	38
with calcification	7	14
without calcification	12	24
Architectual distortion	9	17
Total	51	100

No. ; Number

가  
 (7, 8). , 가 가  
 , , 40  
 , 1997 13.3% 2000 15.1% 가 가 (9 -  
 가 16.1% 1 가 가 10, 12). 40 30 , 35  
 , , 가 가 (3, 4).  
 , 30  
 , 가 30  
 , 40 가  
 , 22 (43%) 가 , 40 가 14 (27%), 60 가

:

12 (24%) .  
 60 2.8/1,000 가 , 30 60 가  
 가 가 가 40 (Stereotatic guided core needle  
 가 가 (9 - 10, 12) biopsy or mammotome biopsy)  
 (Table 3).

1994 Agency for Health Care Policy and 9  
 Research (AHCPR) Quality Determinants of 3 가 가  
 Mammography Guidelines 가  
 , 1, 2 (PPV1, PPV2)가 가  
 1 (PPV1)  
 , 가 (pseudolesion) 23), 가 (dense breast) 가  
 , 가 가 40 가 ,  
 (2 - 4, 13). , 6.2% 가 ,  
 10% , (5)  
 (breast imaging specialist) 78.5%  
 4.9%, 가  
 7.1%

2 가  
 가 가  
 가 가

(Stereotatic guided core needle biopsy or mam-  
 motome biopsy) 가 가 가  
 4 가 가 , ,  
 2.0/1,000 가  
 1.2/1,000 (3, 4)  
 0  
 14 , 2.0/1,000 , 72.5% 가  
 2.5/ 1,000 , 78.5%  
 , 1.0/1,000 0.8/1,000 ,  
 1.0/1,000 1 cm (performance) , 가  
 가  
 (14). , 가

ACR - BIRADS  
 category 5 category 4 가  
 (15 - 20). 51 가 23  
 (45%) 가 ,  
 가  
 51 25 (49%)

1. Dee KE, Sickles EA. Medical audit of diagnostic mammography examinations: comparison with screening outcomes obtained concurrently. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2001;176:729-733
2. American College of Radiology. Illustrated breast imaging reporting and data system (BI-RADSTM). Third edition. Reston(VA): American College of Radiology, 1998
3. , , , : 4  
 2000;42:1003-1008
4. , , , 5

- 859-864
5. Sickles EA, Wolverton DE, Dee KE. Performance parameters for screening and diagnostic mammography: specialist and general radiologists. *Radiology* 2002; 224:861-869
  6. Lewin JM, D'Orsi CJ, Hendrick RE, et al. Clinical comparison of full-field digital mammography and screen-film mammography for detection of breast cancer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2002; 179:671-677
  7. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, 1998. (1992-1995), 1998. 1997
  8. Kosany, CL, Ries LAG, Miller BA, Harras A, Edwards BK(eds), SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1973-1992: Tables and Graphs, National Cancer Institute, NIH pub. NO.95-2789. Bethesda, MD.1995
  9. *Journal of the American College of Radiology* (1997.1.-1997.12).
  10. *Journal of the American College of Radiology* (2000.1.-2000.12).
  11. 2001 *Journal of the American College of Radiology* (2001.1-2001.12).
  12. Ahn YO, Park BJ, Yoo KY, et al. Incidence estimation of female breast cancer among Koreans. *J Korean Med Sci* 1992;9:328-333
  13. Linver MN, Osuch JR, Brenner RJ, Smith RA. The mammography audit : a primer for the mammography quality standards act (MQSA). *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1995;165:19-25
  14. Schmid F, Hartwagner KA, Spork EB, Groell R. Medical audit after 26,711 breast imaging studies: improved rate of detection of small breast carcinomas (classified as Tis or t1a, b). *Cancer* 1998; 83:2516-2520
  15. Silverstein MJ, Gamagami P, Masetti R, Legmann MD, Craig PH, Gierson ED. Results from a multi-disciplinary breast center. *Surg Oncol Clin North Am* 1997;6:301-314
  16. Sickles EA. Mammographic features of 300 consecutive nonpalpable breast cancers. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1986;146:661-663
  17. Ciatto S, Cataliotti L, Distanti V. Nonpalpable lesions detected with mammography: review of 512 consecutive cases. *Radiology* 1987;165:99-102
  18. *Journal of the American College of Radiology* screening mammography 1999;31: 499-508
  19. Bassett LW, Liu TH, Giuliano AE, Gold RH. The prevalence of carcinoma in palpable vs impalpable. mammographically detected lesions. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 1991;157:21-24
  20. *Journal of the American College of Radiology* 1999;41:181-186
  21. Kolb TM, Lichy J, Newhouse JH. Comparison of the performance of screening mammography, physical examination, and breast US and evaluation of factors that influence them: an analysis of 27,825 patient evaluations. *Radiology* 2002;225:165-175
  22. Kaplan SS. Clinical utility of bilateral whole-breast US in the evaluation of women with dense breast tissue. *Radiology* 2001;221:641-649
  23. Berg WA. Rationale for a trial of screening breast ultrasound: American College of Radiology Imaging Network ACRIN 6666. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003;1225-1228

## Screening Mammogram in Health Center: Medical Audit for Six Years<sup>1</sup>

Ji-Young Kim, M.D.<sup>1,2</sup>, Boo-Kyung Han, M.D., Yeon Hyeon Choe, M.D., Jae Hyung Kim, M.D.<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Radiology, Samsung Medical Center,

<sup>2</sup>Department of Radiology, Inje University, Sanggye Paik Hospital (Current Address)

**Purpose:** To report the findings of a six-year medial oudit performed at our mammographic screening centre, comparing those findings with the follow-up data stored at our hospital and at the Korea Central Cancer Registry.

**Materials and Methods:** We analyzed the findings of 32,289 mammographic examinations of 25,541 women performed at our screening center between 1994 and 1999. For follow-up and outcome monitoring, the guideline of the American College of Radiology Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System (ACR BI-RADS) was used. All mammograms were categorized by means of BI-RADS, and cases in categories 0, 4, and 5 were followed up through a review of our hospital information system. To determine whether any cases were false negative, we compared breast cancer patients registered in our medical record department and in the Korean Central Cancer Registry during the study period, with women whose mammograms were interpreted as normal or benign at our screening center within a year prior to cancer diagnosis.

**Results:** The mean age of women enrolled in this study was 48.6 years, ten years less than reported in the West. The recall rate was 6.2%. Among 256 women whose final assessment category was 4 or 5, breast cancer was diagnosed in 51. The cancer detection rate was 2.0/1,000 women; positive predictive value 1 (PPV1: PPV, based on abnormal findings at screening examination) was 2.5% of cases and PPV2 (PPV when biopsy or surgical consultation was recommended) was 20%. The most common mammographic finding was microcalcifications only (45%). The rate of minimal breast cancer, including invasive cancer less than 1 cm in diameter and ductal carcinoma *in situ*, was 72.5%. Node positivity was 27%. Sensitivity was 85.0% based on the tumor registry of our institution's medical record department, and 78.5% based on the tumor registry of the Korea Central Cancer Registry. Specificity was 99.0%.

**Conclusion:** In our study, the cancer detection rate at screening mammography was 2.0/1,000 women. The rate of minimal breast cancer (72.5%) was very high but measurable sensitivity was 78.5%, somewhat lower than the ACR guideline of 85%. To improve the performance of screening mammography, appropriate interpretation of mammography and constant, follow-up and outcome monitoring are important.

**Index words :** Breast neoplasms, diagnosis  
Breast neoplasms, radiography  
Cancer screening

Address reprint requests to : Boo-Kyung Han, M.D., Department of Radiology, Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine, 50 Irwon-dong Kangnam-gu, Seoul 135-710, Korea.  
Tel. 82-2-3410-0517 Fax. 82-2-3410-0084 E-mail: bkhan@smc.samsung.co.kr