Technique, protocols and adverse reactions for contrastenhanced spectral mammography (CESM): a systematic review

Moreno Zanardo, Andrea Cozzi, Rubina Manuela Trimboli, Olgerta Labaj, Caterina Beatrice Monti, Simone Schiaffino, Luca Alessandro Carbonaro and Francesco Sardanelli Zanardo et al. Insights into Imaging (2019) 10:76 https://doi.org/10.1186/s13244-019-0756-0

Abstract1

We reviewed technical parameters, acquisition protocols and adverse reactions (ARs) for contrast-enhanced spectral mammography (CESM). A systematic search in databases, including MEDLINE/EMBASE, was performed to extract publication year, country of origin, study design; patients; mammography unit/vendor, radiation dose, low-/highenergy tube voltage; contrast molecule, concentration and dose; injection modality, ARs and acquisition delay; order of views; examination time. Of 120 retrieved articles, 84 were included from 22 countries (September 2003-January 2019), totalling 14012 patients. Design was prospective in 44/84 studies (52%); in 70/84 articles (83%), a General Electric unit with factory-set kVp was used. Per-view average glandular dose, reported in 12/84 studies (14%), ranged 0.43–2.65 mGy. Contrast type/concentration was reported in 79/84 studies (94%), with Iohexol 350 mgl/mL mostly used (25/79, 32%), dose and flow rate in 72/84 (86%), with 1.5 mL/kg dose at 3 mL/s in 62/72 studies (86%). Injection was described in 69/84 articles (82%), automated in 59/69 (85%), manual in 10/69 (15%) and flush in 35/84 (42%), with 10-30 mL dose in 19/35 (54%). An examination time < 10 min was reported in 65/84 studies (77%), 120 s acquisition delay in 65/84 (77%) and order of views in 42/84 (50%) studies, beginning with the craniocaudal view of the non-suspected breast in 7/42 (17%). Thirty ARs were reported by 14/84 (17%) studies (26 mild, 3 moderate, 1 severe non-fatal) with a pooled rate of 0.82% (fixed-effect model). Only half of CESM studies were prospective; factory-set kVp, contrast 1.5 mL/kg at 3 mL/s and 120 s acquisition delay were mostly used; only 1 severe AR was reported. CESM protocol standardisation is advisable.

Conclusion regarding Power Injectors

Contrast mammography can be performed with either a power injector (highly recommended) or manual technique. Use of power injectors are known to be more effective in obtaining a stable contrast inflow and bolus shape. Moreover, the use of a power injector allows for the administration of a bolus chaser, a technical refinement that has shown good results in CT.² Combined, these suggest physicians and patients both will likely benefit from the use of a power injector, and thus have a better overall experience.

- 1 Technique, protocols and adverse reactions for contrast-enhanced spectral mammography (CESM): a systematic review
- 2 Technique, protocols and adverse reactions for contrast-enhanced spectral mammography (CESM): a systematic review

For more information regarding CEDM, visit www.hologiced.com

MED-00451 Rev.001 (09/20) © 2020 Hologic, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed in USA. Specifications are subject to change without prior notice. This information is intended for medical professionals in the U.S. and other markets and is not intended as a product solicitation or promotion where such activities are prohibited. Information is provided to clarify data presented publicly in scientific discussions and is not intended to promote products or specific intended uses. Because Hologic materials are distributed through websites, eBroadcasts and tradeshows, it is not always possible to control where such materials appear. For specific information on what products are available for sale in a particular country, please contact your local Hologic representative or write to womenshealth@hologic.com.