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ABSTRACT

Background The MRI of the breast is of great importance in the diagnosis of disorders of the breast. This can be stated for the primary diagnosis as well as the follow up. Of special interest is diffusion weighted imaging (DWI), which has an increasingly important role. The present review provides results regarding the diagnostic and prognostic relevance of DWI for disorders of the breast.

Methods Under consideration of the recently published literature, the clinical value of DWI of the breast is discussed. Several diagnostic applications are shown, especially for the primary diagnosis of unclear tumors of the breast, the prediction of the axillary lymph node status and the possibility of a native screening. Moreover, correlations between DWI and histopathology features and treatment prediction with DWI are provided.

Results Many studies have shown the diagnostic value of DWI for the primary diagnosis of intramammary lesions. Benign lesions of the breast have significantly higher apparent diffusion coefficients (ADC values) compared to malignant tumors. This can be clinically used to reduce unnecessary biopsies in clinical routine. However, there are inconclusive results for the prediction of the histological subtype of the breast cancer. DWI can aid in the prediction of treatment to neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

Conclusion DWI is a very promising imaging modality, which should be included in the standard protocol of the MRI of the breast. DWI can provide clinically value in the diagnosis as well as for prognosis in breast cancer.

Key Points:
- DWI can aid in the discrimination between benign and malignant tumors of the breast and therefore avoiding unnecessary biopsies.
- The ADC value cannot discriminate between immunohistochemical subtypes of the breast cancer
- The ADC value of breast cancer increases under neoadjuvant chemotherapy and can by this aid in treatment prediction.
- There is definite need of standardisation for clinical translation
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Primary diagnosis of breast lesions via DWI

Most studies on DWI examine the diagnostic possibilities of DWI with regard to determining the status of lesions and tumors of the breast [16] (Fig. 1, 2). The level of evidence is highest for the use of DWI to determine the status of breast lesions. This application can be considered the most clinically relevant use for DWI [16–21].
Therefore, initial studies already showed that the combination of DWI and dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI (DCE-MRI) has a higher specificity than DCE-MRI alone [17, 18].

DWI is capable of differentiating malignant from benign breast lesions. A recently published meta-analysis examined the extent to which ADC values differ between benign and malignant lesions based on 123 studies including 13,847 breast lesions [19]. The mean ADC value was $1.03 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s for malignant tumors and $1.5 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s for benign lesions. A cutoff value of $1.0 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s was recommended since no benign lesions were identified below this value [19]. It is notable that the results in these studies were largely independent of Tesla strength (1.5 T compared to 3 T), the b-values that were used (600–650, 750–850, and 1000 s/mm$^2$), and the region of interest (ROI) measurement (single slice measurement compared to measurement of the entire tumor) [19].

However, mucinous breast carcinoma, which can have very high ADC values (up to approximately $1.5 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s) and can therefore be confused with benign lesions in DWI, must be mentioned as a limitation [10].

A recently published prospective multicenter study shows that an ADC cutoff value of $1.53 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s can lower the biopsy rate by 20.9% without reducing sensitivity [20]. 67 patients with 81 lesions were examined in this study. It is noteworthy that the diagnostic accuracy for non-mass lesions was slightly lower than for masses (0.72 compared to 0.79) [20]. Another multicenter study including 657 patients also showed that DWI is capable of further categorizing lesions characterized as BI-RADS 4 on contrast-enhanced MRI [21]. Using an ADC cutoff of $1.5 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s allowed the noninvasive downgrading of lesions thereby lowering the rate of unnecessary biopsies by 32.6%.

There is currently no consensus regarding ROI measurement criteria. Some approaches measure the entire tumor, while other approaches measure a mean ADC value on only one slice. A multicenter study showed that the mean ADC value measured on one slice could be sufficient and has a similar diagnostic quality to more complex measurement methods [22].

In summary, DWI and ADC value can help to better assess the status of lesions and even to decrease the need for biopsy. For the clinical routine, it is recommended to measure the ADC value on a representative slice and to include this information in the report.
Added clinical benefit of DWI

The relevant added clinical benefit of DWI compared to established imaging methods should be noted to highlight the necessity of the sequence in routine diagnostics. A very interesting multicenter study including 414 patients evaluated the use of ADC value alone, the Kaiser Score, the combination of the two [23]. The Kaiser Score yielded better diagnostic accuracy particularly in subcentimeter lesions. In the collective as a whole, the ADC value had comparable sensitivity to the Kaiser Score with respect to preventing unnecessary biopsies. Interestingly, the Kaiser Score alone was superior to the combination of Kaiser Score and ADC for preventing unnecessary biopsies.

In an earlier study, the quantitative ADC value with a cutoff of $1.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{mm}^2/\text{s}$ (suspicious for malignancy) or $1.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{mm}^2/\text{s}$ (intermediate) was used as an additional diagnostic method for contrast-enhanced BI-RADS evaluation [24]. A higher specificity could be achieved by including the ADC value [24].

Based on this data, it can be concluded that DWI with the ADC value can help to increase the specificity of BI-RADS reporting by including an additional parameter. However, if a lesion has already been classified based on the Kaiser Score, which combines different parametric findings of contrast-enhanced MRI, the ADC value is no longer beneficial and cannot further increase the specificity. Finally, the implementation of the Kaiser Score in the daily routine is simpler and more time-efficient than use of ADC values.
DWI as a prognostic marker

Various studies have evaluated the extent to which DWI and ADC value can predict disease course in breast cancer patients [16]. In most studies, ADC value was associated with already established prognostic parameters, like immunohistochemical markers [16].

The study by Kim et al., which directly correlated the ADC value with metastasis-free survival, should be mentioned as an important study [25]. A specially calculated ADC difference value based on 258 patients was used in this study [25]. Interestingly, this ADC value as an independent prognostic factor with a hazard ratio of 4.5 in the multivariate analysis was of even greater prognostic relevance than the presence of axillary lymph node metastases with a hazard ratio of 3.3. This study thus indicated that the ADC value could be more important than one of the most important clinically established prognostic factors.

However, it must be stated that the quality of these studies is low and large multicenter analyses are needed to show the prognostic relevance of the ADC value.

Correlation with the proliferation index Ki-67

Various studies have attempted to identify a correlation between the ADC value and the proliferation index Ki-67 [26]. For the Ki-67 index only the number of cells in mitosis per 100 cells are measured [27]. This is an established prognostic biomarker for breast cancer [27].

A first meta-analysis examining all oncological studies on the correlation of ADC values with the Ki-67 index yielded a mean correlation coefficient of $r = -0.44$, (95% CI $[-0.51; -0.37]$) [26]. However, for the breast cancer subgroup analysis, no statistical significance was found ($r = -0.22$ (95% CI $[-0.50; 0.06]$)) [26].

In multiple smaller studies, a significant moderate correlation between the ADC value and the Ki-67 index was identified [28, 29]. In contrast, in other studies, no reliable correlation between ADC value and Ki-67 was found [30, 31].

This was confirmed by a recently published multicenter study based on data from 870 patients from six centers. Only a weak correlation was identified ($r = -0.20$) [32]. This also resulted in low AUC values for the differentiation between low and high Ki-67 expression for multiple clinical Ki-67 cutoffs (Ki-67 value of 10% to 50%, AUC values of 0.64 to 0.58) [32].

Available studies tend to indicate that ADC value cannot be used to make a reliable conclusion about the Ki-67 index.

DWI for discriminating between immunohistochemical subtypes

Numerous studies have attempted to establish significant differences in ADC value between the various immunohistochemical subtypes of breast cancer [17]. Therefore, some significant differences in ADC value as a function of hormone receptor status were identified [16]. It was also shown that estrogen or progesterone receptor-positive tumors have slightly lower ADC values than hormone receptor-negative tumors [16]. Individual studies showed that the Her2-positive subtype has the highest ADC values while other studies showed that the triple-negative subtype has higher ADC values than other subtypes [30, 33]. However, the literature is inconclusive since a number of studies could not show any significant differences in ADC value between immunohistochemical subtypes [16].

A meta-analysis based on 28 studies including 2990 tumors examined this data and did not show any significant differences in ADC value between the different immunohistochemical subtypes [34].

It must therefore be noted that DWI is not capable of reflecting the immunohistochemical characterization of tumors.

DWI for predicting axillary lymph node status

Axillary lymph node status is one of the most important prognostic markers in breast cancer [35]. Multiple studies have examined whether the ADC value of an axillary lymph node could help to differentiate between benign and metastatic lymph nodes and whether the ADC value of the primary tumor differs significantly between node-positive and node-negative tumors [36–38].

Promising studies regarding both the ADC value of axillary lymph nodes and the ADC value of the primary tumor have been published [36–38]. Therefore, malignant axillary lymph nodes showed significantly lower ADC values than uninvolved lymph nodes.

In a meta-analysis based on 875 benign and 547 malignant lymph nodes, benign lymph nodes had a mean ADC value of $1.17 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s [95% CI 1.02–1.32], while malignant lymph nodes had a mean ADC value of $0.90 \times 10^{-3}$ mm$^2$/s [95% CI 0.83–1.01] [36].

It is of particular interest that the ADC value of axillary lymph nodes seems to be independent of lymph node size and thus can indicate a possible malignancy [36]. The ADC value of axillary lymph nodes can thus be used as a potential additional imaging parameter to existing morphological characteristics [36, 38].

With regard to the primary tumor, it was also shown that node-positive tumors have a slightly lower ADC value than node-negative tumors and the diagnosis of axillary lymph node status could also be improved with this additional parameter [36].

DWI for predicting treatment response in the neoadjuvant setting

The assessment or even early prediction of treatment response is an important objective of oncological imaging [39]. DWI which can reflect tumor microstructure should be able to visualize tumor changes during chemotherapy even before morphological changes. Cytotoxic chemotherapy causes necrosis and cytolyis which should result in an increase in the ADC value.

However, the pretherapeutic ADC value in breast cancer does not seem to be able to reliably predict response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy [40]. In this regard, the role of the ADC value in the assessment of response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy was evaluated in a recently published meta-analysis based on...
22 studies including 1827 patients. Significant overlapping of mean ADC values between patients responding to treatment ($0.98 \times 10^{-3} \text{mm}^2/\text{s}$ (95% CI = [0.94; 1.03])) and those not responding to treatment ($1.05 \times 10^{-3} \text{mm}^2/\text{s}$ (95% CI = [1.00; 1.10])) was seen. Therefore, the initial ADC value of the primary tumor cannot be used as a validated biomarker for treatment response [40].

One study based on 31 breast cancer patients showed similar results with no significant difference between the ADC values of the group with histopathologically complete treatment response compared to the group without treatment response [41]. However, in this study, parameters of morphological imaging were significant predictors of treatment response. Thus, patients with poor treatment response showed growth parallel to Cooper’s ligaments and a fast washout rate on dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI [41].

In contrast, an increase in ADC value during neoadjuvant chemotherapy was seen in multiple studies as a potential biomarker for the differentiation between responders and non-responders [42, 43]. It was shown in a large multicenter study that an increase in ADC value after 12 weeks of neoadjuvant chemotherapy is the most promising parameter for predicting treatment response [43]. In patients with pathological complete response, there was an increase in ADC value of 50% while an increase of only 36% ($p = 0.017$) was seen in patients without pathological complete response [43]. However, the initial ADC value in breast cancer patients prior to chemotherapy was not significantly different between the groups ($p = 0.48$). Thus, treatment-associated increase in ADC value could be used in the future for predicting pathological response.

Noteworthy results were achieved in a study that was able to predict treatment response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy as well as disease-specific survival with an AUC of 0.86 and 0.92 using artificial intelligence based on multiparametric MRI scans performed before the start of treatment and after two cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy [44]. This multiparametric, AI-based approach could therefore have the greatest benefit in the clinical routine with regard to determining treatment response.

However, it must be stated that there is not yet any data regarding changes to neoadjuvant therapy based on DWI. This would be a clinically relevant added benefit.

For clinical practice, an increase in ADC value indicates treatment response and should be included as such in the report. However, further study data is needed to determine a possible cutoff value.

**DWI for breast cancer screening without contrast**

Since DWI does not require the administration of contrast, the use of this MRI sequence for non-contrast breast cancer screening has been discussed [45].

In direct comparison to mammography, T2-weighted DWI showed superior diagnostic significance for detecting breast cancer (AUC 0.73 for DWI compared to 0.64 for mammography) and was able to detect a greater number of tumors (sensitivity of 69% vs. 40%) [46]. However, these data are based on 45 lesions in 42 women. A second study including 25 women also showed the superiority of DWI compared to mammography [47].

However, it must be noted that DWI is inferior to dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI in the screening setting (AUC of 0.93 and sensitivity of 86%) [46].

In a prospective study including 50 screening participants with mammography findings suspicious for malignancy, non-contrast MRI including DWI was performed with an examination time of only 7 minutes. A very good negative predictive value of 0.92 was able to be achieved. Consequently, DWI was able to prevent unnecessary biopsies [48].

In a further retrospective study including 378 patients, a very good sensitivity of 93% and specificity of 88% were achieved by DWI alone [49]. For lesions with a size of less than 10 mm, DWI still achieved a sensitivity of 71% so that even small lesions were able to be sufficiently detected in this study [49].

However, it must be noted that there is currently no recommendation for using DWI for screening. The variations in diagnostic accuracy between studies can be attributed to the highly heterogeneous image quality of DWI [50]. The EUSOBI is currently discussing the possibility of using DWI for supplementary screening in patients with a high/intermediate risk profile, but there is currently not yet a recommendation in this regard.

**Advanced DWI techniques**

Various DWI sequences have recently been studied to determine whether they can offer added benefit.

The diagnostic performance of the IVIM technique was evaluated in a recently published meta-analysis based on 16 studies including 1355 malignant and 362 benign lesions [14]. The key result of this analysis is that the IVIM parameters are diagnostically equal to the ADC.

A meta-analysis based on 13 studies including 867 malignant and 460 benign lesions was performed for the DKI method [15]. However, this study showed only an equivalent diagnostic performance of DKI parameters compared to the ADC value.

In a study including 85 patients, the ADC value was even able to outperform the DKI parameters in the discrimination between benign and malignant lesions [51].

Diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) was also evaluated with respect to breast diagnosis with similar results compared to conventional DWI [52].

Therefore, the clinical benefit of these novel sequences must first be evaluated in greater detail in studies. However, initial meta-analyses show that the benefits do not differ significantly from those of conventional DWI [53]. Due to the lack of standardization and undetermined additional clinical benefit, these cannot yet be recommended for the clinical routine.

**Summary**

The clinically relevant additional benefit of DWI is improved assessment of the status of lesions suspicious for malignancy. When the ADC value with a cutoff of $1.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{mm}^2/\text{s}$ is used in...
addition to contrast-enhanced MRI, up to 32.6% of unnecessary biopsies can be prevented. The ADC value can be used as a possible quantitative biomarker in addition to qualitative evaluation of the BI-RADS system for improved reporting. However, for structured reporting based on the BI-RADS system with the Kaiser Score, the ADC value does not seem to provide any additional benefit. There is no evidence regarding the prediction of histological and immunohistochemical properties of breast cancer based on the ADC value. An increase in the ADC value during neoadjuvant chemotherapy could indicate treatment response. The ADC value could help to determine axillary lymph node status since the ADC value of affected lymph nodes is lower than that of unaffected nodes. However, further studies are needed. Standardization of DWI in relation to image quality, image processing, and reporting is needed in order to be able to broaden the use of the ADC value in the clinical routine.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

[5] Surov A, Meyer Hj, Wienke A. Correlation between apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) and cellularity is different in several tumors: a meta-analysis. Oncotarget 2017; 8: 59492–59499


