

ELSEVIER

Type here to search on Elsevier.com

Advanced search Follow us: [f](#) [in](#) [t](#) [+](#)

Help & Contact

Journals & books Online tools Authors, editors & reviewers About Elsevier Community Store



Applied Radiation and Isotopes

A journal of nuclear and radiation techniques and their applications in the physical, chemical, biological, medical, earth, planetary, environmental, security and engineering science.

Applied Radiation and Isotopes provides a high quality medium for the publication of substantial, original and scientific and technological papers on the development and applications of nuclear, radiation...

[View full aims and scope](#)

Editors-in-Chief: R.P. Hugtenburg, B.E. Zimmerman
[View full editorial board](#)

- Guide for Authors
- Submit Your Paper
- Track Your Paper
- Order Journal
- View Articles

Share this page:

[✉](#) [+](#) [e](#) [f](#) [t](#) [in](#) [+](#)

ADVERTISEMENT

CELEBRATING RESEARCH EXCELLENCE

Visit the new global awards website

Impact Factor: 1.179

5-Year Impact Factor: 1.248

Imprint: ELSEVIER

ISSN: 0969-8043

Publish your article
Open Access in Applied Radiation and Isotopes

Thank you Reviewers

Reviewers: 30 day free access to Scopus and ScienceDirect

[VIEW ALL](#)

Most Downloaded Articles [ScienceDirect](#)

Stay up-to-date

Register your interests and receive email alerts tailored to your needs

[Click here to sign up](#)

Recent Open Access [ScienceDirect](#) *i* Articles

Open Access
A MINIATURE TDCR SYSTEM DEDICATED TO IN-SITU ACTIVITY ASSAY
Lena Johansson | Eleanor Bakhshandear | ...

Open Access
Atmospheric input of ¹³⁷Cs and ^{239,240}Pu isotopes in Korea after the Fukushima nuclear power plant accident
Jung-Suk Oh | Sang-Han Lee | ...

Open Access
Variations of Gamma-Ray Background in the Belgrade Shallow Underground Low-Level Laboratory





Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Applied Radiation and Isotopes

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/apradiso

Exploratory survey of image quality on CR digital mammography imaging systems in Mexico



E. Gaona^a, T. Rivera^{b,*}, M. Arreola^c, J. Franco^a, N. Molina^a, B. Alvarez^d,
C.G. Azorín^b, G. Casian^d

^a Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana-Xochimilco, Calz. del Hueso 1100, 04960 México, D.F., Mexico

^b Centro de Investigación en Ciencia Aplicada y Tecnología Avanzada Unidad Legaria del IPN, Av. Legaria 694, 11500 México, D.F., Mexico

^c Department of Radiology, University of Florida, PO Box 100374, Gainesville, FL 32610-0374, USA

^d Hospital Juárez de México, Av. Instituto Politécnico Nacional No. 5160, 07760 México, D.F., Mexico

HIGHLIGHTS

- Radiation dose in CR digital mammography (CRDM) systems was determined.
- Image quality related with dose in CR digital mammography (CRDM) systems was analysed.
- Image processing artefacts were observed and correlated with dose.
- Measured entrance dose by TL phosphors could be good parameter for radiation protection optimization in patient.

ARTICLE INFO

Available online 12 July 2013

Keywords:

CR mammography
Quality image
Dose

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the current status of image quality and dose in computed radiographic digital mammography (CRDM) systems. Studies included CRDM systems of various models and manufacturers which dose and image quality comparisons were performed. Due to the recent rise in the use of digital radiographic systems in Mexico, CRDM systems are rapidly replacing conventional film-screen systems without any regard to quality control or image quality standards. Study was conducted in 65 mammography facilities which use CRDM systems in the Mexico City and surrounding States. The systems were tested as used clinically. This means that the dose and beam qualities were selected using the automatic beam selection and photo-timed features. All systems surveyed generate laser film hardcopies for the radiologist to read on a scope or mammographic high luminance light box. It was found that 51 of CRDM systems presented a variety of image artefacts and non-uniformities arising from inadequate acquisition and processing, as well as from the laser printer itself. Undisciplined alteration of image processing settings by the technologist was found to be a serious prevalent problem in 42 facilities. Only four of them showed an image QC program which is periodically monitored by a medical physicist. The Average Glandular Dose (AGD) in the surveyed systems was estimated to have a mean value of 2.4 mGy. To improve image quality in mammography and make more efficient screening mammographic in early detection of breast cancer is required new legislation.

© 2013 Published by Elsevier Ltd.

1. Introduction

The current morbidity and mortality of breast cancer in Mexico constitutes a public health problem as it has become the number one cause of death among Mexican women, only recently surpassing uterine cancer as such. In fact, data from the Mexican National Institute of Geography and Statistics (NIGS) show that in 2007 breast cancer became the leading cause of death for the female adult population with a 13.8% mortality rate (INEGI, 2007).

The screening mammography has proven to be a reliable radiological study for early detection of breast cancer in asymptomatic women. Mammography systems are designed with this purpose: the high efficacy of early diagnostic of breast cancer solely based in a radiographic image of all breast tissues. Therefore, such an image must perform well in terms of five fundamental image quality indicators: high tissue contrast, high spatial resolution, low image noise, adequate average optical density and low radiation dose per view (Gaona, 2002).

It is an accepted fact that sectors of adult female populations who do not have regular screening mammograms statistically show a lower survival rate when developing breast cancer than those who have periodic mammograms. A similarly serious problem

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +52 553 660 8403.
E-mail address: trivera@ipn.mx (T. Rivera).

arises when mammograms are performed improperly or inadequately and thus result in images of poor quality, as women whom met feel safer because they have regular mammograms may find out that a cancer was undetected because of the poor and inadequate quality of such studies. Due to the recent rise in the use of digital radiographic systems in Mexico, computed radiographic digital mammography (CRDM) systems are rapidly replacing conventional film-screen systems without any regard to quality control or image quality. The only reference to an image quality standard in digital mammography can be found in the Official Mexican Regulation NOM-041-SSA2-2011 Section 21D, which indicates that mammography facilities should “carry out tests for quality control compliance with frequencies and tolerances established by the manufacturer of the equipment” (SSA, 2011). As a consequence only a handful of CRDM facilities have an established image quality control program because manufacturers do not provide them with neither test procedures nor compliance standards; or simply because the tests do not exist given the age and vintage of the CRDM systems. There are no mandatory quality control programs or medical audit programs for digital mammographic modalities. In fact, it is likely that none of the CRDM systems underwent any optimization or fine-tuning process. Lack of knowledge and training on QC procedures among the technologists, or the lacks of a designated QC technologist also impact the performance of the systems. In general CRDM systems do not perform as well as state-of-the-art film-screen-based mammography systems in terms of acceptable detection and determination of the shape of small details in a mammographic image. Indeed, if the CR system is not optimized and setup, it may be possible for some very small micro-calcifications not to be detectable, thus significantly affecting the quality of the diagnosis.

The CRDM facilities surveyed print the processed images on laser film (hardcopy) for the radiologist to read on a scope or mammographic high luminance light box exactly in the same way that is done in the film-screen case, it is important to note that printing must be done on a printer dedicated to mammography. The purpose of this study was to assess the current status of image quality and dose in CR digital mammography (CRDM) systems. In the survey included CRDM systems of various models and manufactures for the purpose of performance comparison, dose and image quality.

2. Materials and methods

The survey was conducted in 65 mammography facilities which use CRDM systems in Mexico City and surrounding States (either private clinics or public part of the health system). No distinctions were made regarding manufacture and model of the systems. The studied was carried out in four different mammography systems which their ages range between one and five years old, using conventional CR technique. Image quality was assessed imaging the MQSA phantom and according to the American College of

Radiology (ACR) Mammography Quality Control Manual (Hendrick et al., 1999). Entrance exposures were measured using a Radcal Accu-Gold Dosimeter using standard technique factors as those for a right cranio-caudal (CC) mammographic view. These exposure values, along with the corresponding kV and half-value layers (HVL) values were used to determine the Average Glandular Dose (AGD) using the appropriate ACR tables (Hendrick et al., 1999). The Mexican regulations NOM-229-SSA1-2002 and NOM-041-SSA2-2011 establish that the AGD per view shall not exceed 3.0 mGy (SSA, 2006, 2011). All systems in the survey possess automatic exposure controls (AEC), with nominal focal spot sizes of 0.3 mm and nominal HVLs at 30 kV of 0.34–0.38 mm Al.

The systems were tested as used clinically. This means that the dose and beam qualities selected were chosen using the system automatic beam selection and photo-timed features. Three images were obtained on the same day for each CRDM system and these were evaluated by two radiologists and medical physicist on hardcopy using the local laser film printer. Image quality was assessed by the total score of resolved phantom objects detected, according to the ACR guidelines by viewing the film in a light box with a luminance above 3000 nits and each image classified into one of two groups, depending on whether it meets the minimum score or does not. The minimum number (score) of objects resolved must be 4 fibres, 3 speck groups and 3 masses, for a total of 10 resolved objects (Food and Drug Administration (FDA), 2002; Gaona, 2006; Hendrick et al., 1999).

3. Results and discussion

The study found that 51 (78.5%) of phantom images from the CRDM systems presented a variety of image artefacts and non-uniformities arising from poor acquisition and processing, as well as from defective printing (Table 1). These results point to a lack of QC procedures and programs at these facilities. This is quite a severe problem, as some of the artefacts can be mistaken as breast lesions or can disturb and affect the reading of the images. In order to avoid misinterpretation, recognizing artefacts and understanding their physical technical background is of great importance in digital breast imaging (Van Ongeval et al., 2008). Table 1 shows the overall results of the survey of 65 CRDM systems. A significant number of artefacts and non-uniformities were observed in the images of the 17 older CRDM systems surveyed. The photoluminescent plates and photomultiplier tube utilized with these systems had been in use for up to 2 years with significant variations in sensitivity across the plates. It appears that sensitivity had declined slowly with exposure and the mean glandular dose was increased > 3 mGy per view. In addition to this, some images present artefacts and non-uniformities due to prolonged use of the plates and photomultiplier tube, which are damaged and worn-off over time; such artefacts will affect image quality especially measurements using test objects (Ian et al., 2009; Van Ongeval et al., 2008). Manufacturers recommend regular replacement of

Table 1
General results of CRDM facilities surveyed.

Evaluated concepts	Number of CRDM systems
Images presenting artefacts and non-uniformities	51 (78.5%)
Facilities using laser printers dedicated to mammography	50 (76.9%)
Facilities using laser film dedicated to mammography	44 (67.7%)
Routine, undisciplined alteration of processing algorithms by technologist	42 (64.6%)
Quality image meets the minimum score of resolved objects (10) standards in the ACR phantom, not accounting for artefacts	27 (41.5%)
Meet standards of the Mexican regulations of the NOM-041-SSA2-2011	4 (6.2%)
Average glandular dose (AGD) ≤ 3 mGy per view	48 (73.8%)

the plates and photomultiplier tube and other parts of the reader system to minimize such problems. One issue that has not been fully addressed in CRDM systems is the importance of strict adherence to the image processing default settings as undisciplined changes in such will affect the quality of the displayed clinical images which may render such images as clinically unacceptable because reading is done on hardcopies, the original information is unrecoverable and the likelihood of misinterpretation and misdiagnosis severely increased. This is something that is not readily evaluated by the currently available physics tests. Image processing may improve the appearance of important features or degrade them. Only a careful clinical evaluation can actually assess this. Table 1 shows 42 (64.6%) of the facilities monitored there is evident and serious problems with undisciplined alteration of image processing settings by the technologist. This results from for lack of supervision by the radiologist and can lead to serious errors in medical diagnosis.

One of the problems of undisciplined alteration of processing algorithms by technologist is that the monitors where the images are displayed are very rarely calibrated or maintained and practically never set to the laser printers to make sure that the printed images will closely match the appearance and the quality of the originally displayed images. Failures in the displayed clinical images on the technologist monitor are by incorrect calibration of the CR reader system and its coupling with the displayed images. Table 2 shows how the quality of the printed images is affected by incorrect handling of the processing of image and printing.

The breast imaging algorithm utilized to process the CR images appeared to have little impact on the threshold contrast test results, though this may not be true for clinical images. Image processing may improve the appearance of important features or degrade them. Only a careful clinical evaluation could be expected to assess this (Ilan et al., 2009). It was found that 21 (32.1%) of facilities surveyed do not use dedicated mammographic film in their laser printers and that 15 (23.1%) facilities print their films on general purpose laser printers, rather than in high resolution mammography-dedicated printers. The use of general purpose films and printers in mammography constitutes the major image

quality problem found in the use of CRDM systems. Table 3 shows this particular set of results.

Table 1 illustrates that only four CRDM mammography facilities meet the minimum image quality standards in the ACR protocol and guidelines image quality. Image quality was assessed in the conventional manner by determining the total score of resolved phantom structures in the accreditation phantom (Gaona et al., 2007; Kalathaki et al., 2011). These four facilities surveyed have an image QC program in place which is periodically monitored by a diagnostic medical physicist. The rest of the facilities follow some verification of compliance of kV accuracy, HVL, tube output, air-kerma rate, compression, AGD, AEC performance among others, but do not monitor image quality at all.

The AGD in the systems surveyed had a mean value of 2.4 mGy, well under the 3.0 mGy limit, even though 17 of the systems surveyed had AGDs above such limit. None of facilities possessed report of calibration (coupling between the CRDM system and the mammography unit) and optimization (dose and image quality) performed by the manufacturer when the system was installed.

4. Conclusions

Modern CR mammography systems offer software and hardware aim at improving image quality, reducing artefacts and decreasing radiation dose. Such systems, however, have not been introduced in Mexico because they represent high costs. The results of the survey presented show an alarming misuse of CRDM in screening mammography, to the point of making the practice not only ineffective but risky in terms of misdiagnoses. The lack of QC programs and proper training of all personnel involved in the process (technologists, physicists and radiologists) must be resolved so that these facilities can fulfil their mission to provide proper early detection to women in the Greater Mexico city area. This situation can be firmly resolved with implementation and enactment of new legislation to regulate the practice of CRDM-based screening, as well as proper training and certification of professional. This is largely due to the fact that in Mexico there are a very small number of medical

Table 2

Effect on hardcopy image quality printed from improper handling of image processing by technologist. The association is statistically significant for a $p < 0.034$ using the exact statistic of Fisher.

		Undisciplined alteration of processing algorithms by technologist		Total
		No	Yes	
Quality image meets the minimum standards in the ACR protocol and guidelines	No	9	29	38
	Yes	14	13	27
Total		23	42	65

Table 3

Effect on hardcopy image quality from not using mammography dedicated devices. The association is statistically significant for a $p < 0.04$ using the exact statistic of Fisher.

		Quality image meets the minimum standards in the ACR protocol and guidelines		Total		
		No	Yes			
Use of printers dedicated to mammography	No	Use of dedicated film	No	13	1	14
			Yes	18	3	21
		Total		31	4	35
	Yes	Use of dedicated film	No	3	4	7
			Yes	4	19	23
		Total		7	23	30

physicists trained in mammography and the fact that there is no registry exam for mammographic technologists. The Mexican Council of radiology and Imaging (CMRI) has less than 200 radiologists certified in mammography for a current population 15 million women age of mammography (CMRI, 2012).

References

- CMRI, 2012. Base de Datos de Radiólogos Certificados, (<http://www.cmri.org.mx/>), Accessed September 3, 2012.
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA), 2002. In Mammography Quality Standards Acts Regulations. FDA, Rockville, MD, pp. 40–51.
- Gaona E., 2002. Elementos del Programa de Garantía de Calidad. In: *Los Rayos X en Mamografía*, first ed. Distribuidora y Editora Mexicana, S.A. de C.V. México, D. F. pp. 121–141.
- Gaona, E., 2006. first ed. *Radiología Digital y Mamografía*, en: *Física de la Radiología y Seguridad Radiológica*, 274–280. Distribuidora y Editora Mexicana, S.A. de C. V., México, D. F., pp. 238–241.
- Gaona, E., Nieto, J.A., Góngora, J.A.I.D., Arreola, M., Enríquez, J.G.F., 2007. TL dosimetry for quality control of CR mammography imaging systems. *Rad. Eff. Def. Sol.* 162, 759–763.
- Hendrick, R.E., Bassett, L., Botsco, M.A., et al., 1999. *ACR Mammography Quality Control Manual*, 149–63. American College of Radiology, Reston, pp. 117–121. (VA).
- Ian, D., Honey, I., Alistair, M., 2009. Artifacts found during quality assurance testing of computed radiography and digital radiography detectors. *J. Digit. Imaging* 2 (4), 383–392.
- INEGI, 2007. Estadísticas a Propósito del Día Mundial Contra el Cáncer: Datos Nacionales, (<http://www.inegi.org.mx/lib/buscaador/busqueda.aspx?s=inegi&textoBus=mortalidad cancer mama&seccionBus=docit>), accessed September 3, 2012.
- Kalathaki, M., Hourdakis, C.J., Economides, S., Tritakis, P., Kalyvas, N., Simantirakis, G., Manousaridis, G., Kaisas, I., Kamenopoulou, V., 2011. Comparison of full field digital (FFD) and computed radiography (CR) mammography systems in Greece. *Radiat. Prot. Dosim.*, 147; , pp. 202–205.
- SSA, 2006. Norma Oficial Mexicana NOM-229-SSA1-2002, Requisitos Técnicos para las Instalaciones, Responsabilidades Sanitarias, Especificaciones Técnicas para los Equipos y Protección Radiológica en Establecimientos de Diagnostico Medico con Rayos X. In: *Diario Oficial de la Federación de México de 15 de septiembre de 2006*, pp. 30–31.
- SSA, 2011. Norma Oficial Mexicana NOM-041-SSA2-2011, Para la prevención, diagnóstico, tratamiento, control y vigilancia epidemiológica del cáncer de mama. In: *Diario Oficial de la Federación de México de 9 de junio de 2011*, pp. 29–30.
- Van Ongeval, C., Jacobs, J., Bosmans, H., 2008. Artifacts in digital mammography. *J. Belge Radiol.-BTR* 1 (6), 262–263.