

**American College of Radiology
ACR Appropriateness Criteria®
Palpable Breast Masses**

Variant: 1 Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Digital breast tomosynthesis diagnostic	Usually Appropriate	☼☼
Mammography diagnostic	Usually Appropriate	☼☼
US breast	May Be Appropriate	○
Digital breast tomosynthesis screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼
Mammography screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼

Variant: 2 Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US breast	Usually Appropriate	○
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼

Variant: 3 Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☼☼☼

Variant: 4 Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US breast	May Be Appropriate	○

Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant: 5 Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US breast	Usually Appropriate	O
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant: 6 Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US breast	Usually Appropriate	O
Digital breast tomosynthesis diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Digital breast tomosynthesis screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant: 7 Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Digital breast tomosynthesis diagnostic	Usually Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography diagnostic	Usually Appropriate	☢☢
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	Varies
Digital breast tomosynthesis screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	O

FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant: 8 Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Digital breast tomosynthesis diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Digital breast tomosynthesis screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant: 9 Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Digital breast tomosynthesis diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Digital breast tomosynthesis screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant: 10 Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
Digital breast tomosynthesis diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Digital breast tomosynthesis screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography diagnostic	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Mammography screening	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	☢☢☢

Variant: 11 Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

Procedure	Appropriateness Category	Relative Radiation Level
US breast	Usually Appropriate	○
Digital breast tomosynthesis diagnostic	Usually Appropriate	⦿ ⦿
Mammography diagnostic	Usually Appropriate	⦿ ⦿
Digital breast tomosynthesis screening	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿ ⦿
Mammography screening	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿ ⦿
Image-guided core biopsy breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
Image-guided fine needle aspiration breast	Usually Not Appropriate	Varies
MRI breast without and with IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
MRI breast without IV contrast	Usually Not Appropriate	○
FDG-PET breast dedicated	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿ ⦿ ⦿
Sestamibi MBI	Usually Not Appropriate	⦿ ⦿ ⦿

Panel Members

Katherine A. Klein, MD^a; Maddi Kocher, MD^b; Ana P. Lourenco, MD^c; Bethany L. Niell, MD, PhD^d; Debbie L. Bennett, MD^e; Alison Chetlen, DO^f; Phoebe Freer, MD^g; Lillian K. Ivansco, MD, MPH^h; Maxine S. Jochelson, MDⁱ; Mallory E. Kremer, MD^j; Sharp F. Malak, MD, MPH^k; Marion McCrary, MD^l; Tejas S. Mehta, MD, MPH^m; Colleen H. Neal, MDⁿ; Andrea Porpiglia, MD^o; Gary A. Ulaner, MD, PhD^p; Linda Moy, MD.^q

Summary of Literature Review**Introduction/Background**

Breast cancer remains the most common female malignancy (excluding skin) and the second leading cause of female cancer death in the United States, with a woman's lifetime risk of breast cancer at approximately 12.8%. Palpable breast masses are more commonly from benign causes; however, a palpable mass is the most common symptom associated with cancer, and palpable cancers tend to be more aggressive with poorer prognoses compared with screen-detected cancers [1-3]. Palpable breast masses may present in various circumstances: during routine breast self-examination or clinical breast examination; between regular mammographic screens; before baseline mammogram; or after prolonged abstention from mammography due to advanced age or personal choice [4]. Detection and characterization of a breast mass at physical examination may be difficult, but masses are generally asymmetrical in relation to the other breast, distinct from the surrounding tissues, and 3-D. Malignant masses cannot be reliably differentiated from benign by physical examination, even among experienced clinicians [5]. More suspicious features of a cancerous mass may include firmness and fixation due to attachments to the skin or deep fascia with dimpling or nipple retraction. In contrast, benign masses typically are mobile and have discrete, well-defined margins, as well as a soft or rubbery texture. Cysts cannot reliably be distinguished from solid breast masses by palpation. In one study, only 58% of 66 palpable cysts were correctly identified by physical examination [6].

Imaging evaluation is necessary to adequately characterize a palpable breast mass. After thorough clinical breast examination, usually by the referring clinician or by a specialist breast clinician, the

radiologist must be able to establish concordance between the clinically detected mass and the imaging features at that location [2]. The negative predictive value of mammography with ultrasound (US) in the context of a palpable mass ranges from 97.4% to 100% [7-10]. Nevertheless, negative imaging evaluation should not deter biopsy when a strongly suspicious finding is present on physical examination.

Initial Imaging Definition

Initial imaging is defined as imaging at the beginning of the care episode for the medical condition defined by the variant. More than one procedure can be considered usually appropriate in the initial imaging evaluation when:

- There are procedures that are equivalent alternatives (ie, only one procedure will be ordered to provide the clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care)

OR

- There are complementary procedures (ie, more than one procedure is ordered as a set or simultaneously where each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).

Discussion of Procedures by Variant

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

A. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Diagnostic

Diagnostic digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT) should be used for initial imaging evaluation. A small radio-opaque marker is placed on the skin over the palpable finding to identify its location. Several prior studies have shown the diagnostic accuracy of DBT is equivalent to or better than supplemental diagnostic mammographic views in the workup of women with clinical signs and symptoms and in women recalled from screening [11-14]. The added features of planar imaging and thin-section reconstructions allow further assessment of potential false-positive findings. In a recent study, DBT provided similarly accurate diagnostic results as compared with digital mammography (DM) in women with palpable breast masses for detecting breast cancer using either combination DM with DBT (DM/DBT) or DM alone [15]. Several small studies, which specifically included women presenting with clinical symptoms including palpable lumps, demonstrated increased accuracy on combination DM/DBT compared with DM alone [13,16,17]. Additionally, it was demonstrated that DBT may improve lesion detection and characterization with higher conspicuity scores as compared with conventional DM imaging, particularly for cancers presenting as spiculated masses and distortions [17].

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

B. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening DBT, with or without DM, is not useful as the initial imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

C. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of fluorine-18-2-fluoro-2-deoxy-D-glucose (FDG)-PET breast dedicated in the initial evaluation of a woman presenting with a palpable mass [2].

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

D. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided core biopsy in the initial evaluation of a woman presenting with a palpable mass. Because many breast masses may not exhibit distinctive physical findings, imaging evaluation is necessary in almost all patients ≥ 40 years of age to characterize the palpable lesion and screen the remainder of each breast for additional lesions. It is preferable for imaging to occur before biopsy because changes related to the biopsy may confuse, alter, obscure, and/or limit image interpretation. However, negative imaging evaluation should not deter biopsy when a strongly suspicious finding is present on physical examination. There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided core biopsy in the initial evaluation of women ≥ 40 years of age with palpable mass.

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

E. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided fine needle aspiration (FNA) in the initial evaluation of a woman presenting with a palpable mass. Because many breast masses may not exhibit distinctive physical findings, imaging evaluation is necessary in almost all cases to characterize the palpable lesion and screen the remainder of each breast for additional lesions. It is preferable for imaging to occur before biopsy because changes related to the biopsy may confuse, alter, obscure, and/or limit image interpretation. There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of image-guided FNA biopsy (FNAB) in the initial evaluation of women ≥ 40 years of age with palpable mass.

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

F. Mammography Diagnostic

Mammography should be using for initial imaging of a palpable breast mass in women ≥ 40 years of age. It is performed under the direct supervision of a radiologist and usually consists at a minimum of craniocaudal and mediolateral oblique views of each breast, enabling screening of the entire breast for additional lesions. The mammogram may only include the ipsilateral breast if the patient has had a recent bilateral mammogram (within the last 3 to 6 months). A small radio-opaque marker is placed on the skin over the palpable finding to identify its location. Spot compression views obtained with or without magnification or tangential views are often obtained to specifically evaluate the clinical finding. Supplemental mammographic views may also be needed to clarify the features or location of a mammographic lesion, including craniocaudal exaggerated, cleavage, step-oblique, and 90° lateral views.

In several series evaluating palpable breast abnormalities [18-20], the sensitivity of mammography alone was 86% to 91%. Mammography likely does not need to be repeated if it was performed within the past 6 months [21]. This modality may be particularly useful in women with almost entirely fatty breasts, in which mammography alone was shown to have a high sensitivity (96%) and specificity (93%) in the evaluation of palpable breast masses [22].

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

G. Mammography Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening mammography is not useful as the initial imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.
H. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI breast with or without intravenous (IV) contrast in the initial evaluation of a woman presenting with a palpable mass [2,23-25].

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.
I. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of Tc-99m sestamibi molecular breast imaging (MBI) in the initial evaluation of a woman presenting with a palpable mass.

Variant 1: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.
J. US Breast

US may be considered as an initial means of imaging if the patient has had a recent negative mammogram within the past 6 months. In a study of women presenting with a palpable breast mass with a negative mammogram within the previous 6 to 12 months, US detected a finding in 50.3% of 311 cases, whereas repeat mammography detected a change in 12.9% of cases [21]. US is more frequently used following DBT/mammography in this age group [2,26] (see Variants 2, 3, and 5). The negative predictive value of mammography with US in the context of a palpable mass ranges from 97.4% to 100% [7-9].

Variant 2: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

Variant 2: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

A. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a suspicious mammographic finding [2].

Variant 2: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

B. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

It is preferable for imaging to occur before biopsy because changes related to the biopsy may confuse, alter, obscure, and/or limit image interpretation. If a mammographically suspicious lesion is identified that correlates with the palpable mass, US is recommended as the next step in evaluation before image-guided core biopsy is pursued. However, the lack of sonographic correlate should not deter biopsy of a suspicious mammographic or DBT abnormality in this setting. Core biopsy is superior to FNAB in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and correct histological grading of palpable masses [27]. In addition, core biopsy allows for ready evaluation of tumor receptor status. When a mammographically or DBT-detected suspicious lesion is identified that correlates with a palpable mass, biopsy is warranted. If a lesion is only identified on mammography or DBT, mammographically or DBT-guided core biopsy may be pursued [28,29]. If the lesion can be

seen with US, US-guided biopsy may be pursued [30]. At image-guided biopsy, a marker clip is placed, and a postbiopsy diagnostic mammogram confirms that the US and mammographic findings correlate. Similarly, a postbiopsy DBT confirms that the US and DBT findings correlate. US-guided core biopsy is also usually more easily tolerated because of a lack of breast compression and may allow biopsy of lesions difficult to access stereotactically (eg, far posterior lesions or axillary lesions) [30].

Variant 2: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

C. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

It is preferable for imaging to occur before biopsy because changes related to the biopsy may confuse, alter, obscure, and/or limit image interpretation. If a mammographically suspicious lesion is identified that correlates with the palpable mass, US is recommended as the next step in evaluation before image-guided FNA is pursued. However, the lack of sonographic correlate should not deter biopsy of a suspicious mammographic or DBT abnormality in this setting. Core biopsy is superior to FNAB in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and correct histological grading of palpable masses [27]. In addition, core biopsy allows for ready evaluation of tumor receptor status. An additional consideration of FNAB over a core biopsy may be the faster turnover time for a pathology diagnosis without a difference in time to treatment [31]. At US-guided FNA, a marker clip is placed and a postprocedure mammogram confirms that the US and mammographic findings correlate. Similarly, a postprocedure DBT confirms that the US and DBT findings correlate.

Variant 2: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

D. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a suspicious mammographic finding [2,23-25]. If malignancy is subsequently established by biopsy, MRI may be useful in delineating extent of disease in certain circumstances [32].

Variant 2: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

E. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a suspicious mammographic finding.

Variant 2: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

F. US Breast

US may be helpful in characterizing a suspicious mammographic finding [33]. In a study of women presenting with palpable breast thickening, the sensitivity of diagnostic mammography for invasive cancer detection was 60%, whereas the sensitivity of US alone was 100% [34].

Breast US should be performed using a high-resolution, real-time linear array scanner with an adjustable focal zone and a transducer with a minimum center frequency of 12 MHz [35]. Some

mammographers also perform screening US of the remainder of the ipsilateral breast and the contralateral breast in the setting of a suspicious finding [33]. If there is no sonographic correlate for a suspicious mammographic finding, tissue sampling (stereotactic biopsy) should be guided by the suspicious mammographic finding. If there is no sonographic correlate for a suspicious DBT finding, tissue sampling (tomosynthesis-guided biopsy) should be guided by the suspicious DBT finding.

Variant 3: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

Variant 3: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

A. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a probably benign mammographic finding for women ≥ 40 years of age [2].

Variant 3: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

B. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

If a palpable mass has probably benign features as identified on mammogram and/or US, imaging follow-up may be appropriate. However, if a mass is new on imaging or increasing by $>20\%$ in volume or $>20\%$ in each diameter in a 6-month period, the mass is considered suspicious, and image-guided biopsy is recommended [36]. Core biopsy is superior to FNAB in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and correct histological grading of palpable masses [27]. In addition, there are certain cases in which biopsy may be performed even on probably benign lesions. For example, BI-RADS 3 lesions in high-risk patients, patients awaiting organ transplant, patients with known synchronous cancers, or patients trying to get pregnant may be appropriate for tissue sampling. In addition, situations in which biopsy may alleviate extreme patient anxiety may prompt tissue sampling [30,37]. If an image-guided biopsy is pursued, a marker clip is placed and a postbiopsy mammogram/DBT confirms that the clip placement and mammographic/DBT findings correlate.

Variant 3: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

C. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

If a palpable mass has probably benign features as identified on mammogram and/or US, imaging follow-up may be appropriate. However, if a mass is new on imaging or increasing by $>20\%$ in volume or $>20\%$ in each diameter in a 6-month period, image-guided biopsy is recommended [36]. In addition, there are certain cases in which biopsy may be performed even on probably benign lesions. For example, BI-RADS 3 lesions in high-risk patients, patients awaiting organ transplant, patients with known synchronous cancers, or patients trying to get pregnant may be appropriate for tissue sampling. In addition, situations in which biopsy may alleviate extreme patient anxiety may prompt tissue sampling [30,37]. Large series have demonstrated core biopsy is superior to FNAB in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and correct histological grading of palpable masses [27]. In addition, core biopsy allows for ready evaluation of tumor receptor status. FNAB; however, may allow a faster turnover time as compared with core biopsy for a pathology diagnosis without a difference in time to treatment [31]. At image-guided FNA, a marker clip is placed and a postprocedure mammogram/DBT confirms that the marker clip and mammographic/DBT findings correlate.

Variant 3: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

D. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a probably benign mammographic finding for women ≥ 40 years of age [2,23-25].

Variant 3: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

E. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a probably benign mammographic finding for women ≥ 40 years of age.

Variant 4: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

Variant 4: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

A. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a benign mammographic finding [2].

Variant 4: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

B. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided core biopsy breast as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a benign mammographic finding.

Variant 4: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

C. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided FNAB as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a benign mammographic finding. However, image-guided aspiration can be considered for symptomatic relief of a palpable simple cyst.

Variant 4: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

D. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast of the breast as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a benign mammographic finding.

Variant 4: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

E. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass in the context of a benign mammographic finding.

Variant 4: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography

findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass. Next imaging study.

F. US Breast

When the mammogram shows a definite benign mass (eg, lymph node, hamartoma, lipoma, calcified fibroadenoma, or oil cyst), US is not necessary as long as the benign mass identified on mammography is a definitive correlate of the clinical finding.

If correlation between the mammographic finding and the palpable lesion is uncertain, US is useful. US is preferably targeted specifically to the palpable finding [33]. When both mammography and US are negative or benign in the evaluation of a palpable breast mass, the negative predictive value exceeds 97% [8,9,38]. Together, these imaging modalities can be reassuring when the physical examination is not highly suspicious and clinical follow-up is planned. However, a suspicious physical examination should prompt biopsy regardless of benign imaging findings [38].

Variant 5: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

Variant 5: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

A. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated as the next step in the evaluation of a woman presenting with a negative mammogram and a palpable mass [2].

Variant 5: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

B. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided core biopsy as the next step in the evaluation of a woman presenting with a negative mammogram and a palpable mass. US should be performed, and if a suspicious correlate is identified, then US-guided core biopsy is recommended. However, a suspicious physical examination should prompt biopsy guided by palpation, regardless of negative imaging findings [38].

Variant 5: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

C. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided FNAB as the next step in the evaluation of a woman presenting with a negative mammogram and a palpable mass. US should be performed, and if a suspicious correlate is identified, then US-guided core biopsy is recommended. However, a suspicious physical examination should prompt biopsy guided by palpation, regardless of negative imaging findings [38].

Variant 5: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

D. MRI Breast

MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast for women with a palpable mass and negative mammography is not recommended as the next imaging study [2,23-25]. US should be performed next [8,9,19].

Variant 5: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography

findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

E. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI as the next step in the evaluation of a woman presenting with a negative mammogram and a palpable mass.

Variant 5: Adult female, 40 years of age or older. Palpable breast mass. Mammography findings are negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

F. US Breast

A major advantage of US is the ability to directly correlate the clinical and imaging findings. The use of multiple modalities in diagnosing palpable masses has been advocated as a measure to increase the true-positive rate. In 3 series evaluating palpable breast abnormalities [18-20], the sensitivity of mammography was 86% to 91%. The addition of US detects 93% to 100% of cancers [8,9,19]. The addition of US to mammography may also improve detection of a benign etiology for a palpable finding and may also identify lesions that are mammographically occult [26]. In a series, 40% of benign palpable masses were identified only on US [20]. In another study of 375 palpable masses in 320 women, 68.8% of the masses (n = 258) were only identified with US and were typically oval (n = 275, 73.3%) and hypoechoic (n = 336 in 372 US examinations, 90.3%) [39]. When both mammography and US are negative or benign in the evaluation of a palpable breast mass, the negative predictive value is very high, more than 97% [8,9,38,40]. Together, these imaging modalities can be reassuring when the physical examination is not highly suspicious and clinical follow-up is planned.

If almost entirely fatty tissue is identified in the palpable region of concern, US may not be necessary [2]. In a study that included 323 palpable masses in 271 women with almost entirely fatty tissue on diagnostic mammography, mammography alone yielded a negative predictive value of 99.6% [22]. Of the 294 (91%) of women with almost entirely fatty breasts who also underwent targeted US for the evaluation of palpable symptoms, US yielded 11 false-positives and 8 benign correlates at sites with no mammographic findings [22].

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

A. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Diagnostic

Because of the low incidence of breast cancer (<1%) in younger women, the recommended initial imaging differs from older patients [41-44]. Younger women tend to have relatively denser breast tissue [45], which is associated with decreased mammographic/DBT sensitivity [46]. DBT is not useful as the initial imaging modality in younger women.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

B. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening DBT, with or without DM, is not useful as the initial imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

C. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated as the initial imaging workup in women <30 years of age with a palpable mass [2].

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

D. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided core biopsy as the initial imaging workup in women <30 years of age with a palpable mass.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

E. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of image-guided FNAB as the initial imaging workup in women <30 years of age with a palpable mass.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

F. Mammography Diagnostic

Because of the low incidence of breast cancer (<1%) in younger women, the recommended initial imaging differs from older patients [41-44]. Younger women tend to have relatively denser breast tissue [45], which is associated with decreased mammographic/DBT sensitivity [46]. Most benign lesions in young women are not visualized on mammography [41,43]. Diagnostic mammography is not useful as the initial imaging modality in younger women.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

G. Mammography Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening mammography is not useful as the initial imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

H. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast as the initial imaging workup in women <30 years of age with a palpable mass [2,23-25].

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

I. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI as the initial imaging workup in women <30 years of age with a palpable mass.

Variant 6: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

J. US Breast

The probability of a woman developing breast cancer increases with age; a woman has a 1 in 53 chance of developing invasive breast cancer from birth to age 49 years compared with a 1 in 15 chance at ≥70 years of age [47]. Diagnostic mammography is useful as the initial examination in the evaluation of a palpable breast finding for women aged ≥40 years of age. However, because of the low incidence of breast cancer (<1%) in younger women, their imaging evaluation differs from that performed for older patients [41-44]. In addition, most benign lesions in young women are not visualized on mammography [41,43], and US is therefore used as the initial imaging modality in younger women. US is preferably targeted specifically to the palpable finding [33]. As with all age-related guidelines, pertinent clinical factors such as family history should be used to determine appropriate patient care.

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

A. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Diagnostic

DBT may be useful in a woman <30 years of age with a suspicious sonographic finding that correlates to a palpable mass. DBT may demonstrate findings not readily detected at US (calcifications or subtle architectural distortion); this may provide a more accurate assessment of the extent of disease in the ipsilateral breast and can identify contralateral lesions as well. In addition, DBT may have relatively high diagnostic accuracy in dense breast tissue, often encountered in younger patients [48,49].

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

B. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening DBT, with or without DM, is not useful as the next imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

C. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass with suspicious sonographic features in women <30 years of age [2].

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

D. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

If a suspicious mass has been identified on US, tissue sampling (US guided) is warranted. It may be appropriate to proceed directly to image-guided biopsy if a palpable lesion has suspicious features on US followed by placement of a biopsy clip. If US findings are particularly worrisome for malignancy, diagnostic mammography or DBT may be performed prior to tissue sampling to delineate disease extent (eg, calcifications extending beyond the margins of the US-identified solid mass) and identify any additional suspicious findings in the ipsilateral or contralateral breast. Core-needle biopsy has been shown in large series to be superior to FNA in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and correct histological grading [27]. Some practices have had good results using FNAB, but this may be facility specific, and a lower threshold for radiologic-pathologic discordance may need to be applied [50,51].

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

E. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

If a suspicious mass has been identified on US, tissue sampling (US guided) is warranted. It may be appropriate to proceed directly to image-guided biopsy if a palpable lesion has suspicious features on US. If US findings are particularly worrisome for malignancy, diagnostic mammography or DBT may be performed before tissue sampling to delineate disease extent (eg, calcifications extending beyond the margins of the US-identified solid mass) and identify any additional suspicious findings in the ipsilateral or contralateral breast. Core-needle biopsy has been shown in large series to be superior to FNA in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and correct histological grading [27]. Some practices have had good results using FNAB, but this may be facility specific, and a lower threshold

for radiologic-pathologic discordance may need to be applied [50,51]. US-guided FNAB may be preferred over core biopsy in rare situations but should be used judiciously.

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

F. Mammography Diagnostic

Mammography may be useful in a woman <30 years of age with a suspicious sonographic finding that correlates to a palpable mass. If US findings are particularly worrisome for malignancy, mammography diagnostic or diagnostic DBT would usually be performed before tissue sampling to identify any additional suspicious findings and/or delineate the extent of disease (eg, calcifications extending beyond the margins of the US-identified solid mass) in the ipsilateral breast. Mammography diagnostic is recommended as a prebiopsy assessment in cases in which cancer is strongly suspected clinically [41].

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

G. Mammography Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening mammography is not useful as the next imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

H. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass with suspicious sonographic features in women <30 years of age [2,23-25].

Variant 7: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). Next imaging study.

I. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI as the next step in evaluating a palpable mass with suspicious sonographic features in women <30 years of age.

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

A. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Diagnostic

If a correlate for a palpable mass has been identified on US and is probably benign, there is no indication for DBT to further evaluate the palpable mass in women <30 years of age.

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

B. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening DBT, with or without DM, is unnecessary for imaging surveillance. Screening mammography is provided

to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

C. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated in women <30 years of age with probably benign sonographic findings in the setting of a palpable mass [2].

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

D. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

If a palpable mass has probably benign features as identified on US, US follow-up is recommended. However, image-guided core biopsy may be performed after complete imaging assessment in some cases. For example, BI-RADS 3 lesions in high-risk patients, patients awaiting organ transplant, patients with known synchronous cancers, or patients trying to get pregnant may be appropriate for biopsy instead of imaging follow-up. In addition, situations in which biopsy may alleviate extreme patient anxiety may prompt tissue sampling and a biopsy marker clip should be placed [30].

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

E. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

If a palpable mass has probably benign features as identified on US, US follow-up is recommended. Image-guided FNAB may be performed after complete imaging assessment in some cases. For example, BI-RADS 3 lesions in high-risk patients, patients awaiting organ transplant, patients with known synchronous cancers, or patients trying to get pregnant may be appropriate for tissue sampling. In addition, situations in which biopsy may alleviate extreme patient anxiety may prompt tissue sampling, and a biopsy marker clip should be placed [30]. However, large series demonstrate that core biopsy is superior to FNAB in terms of sensitivity, specificity, and correct histological grading of palpable masses [27]. In addition, core biopsy allows for ready evaluation of tumor receptor status. US-guided FNAB may be preferred in rare situations (lesion abuts an implant).

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

F. Mammography Diagnostic

If a correlate for a palpable mass has been identified on US and is probably benign, there is no indication for diagnostic mammography to further evaluate the palpable mass in women <30 years of age.

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

G. Mammography Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening mammography is unnecessary for imaging surveillance. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

H. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast in women <30 years of age with probably benign sonographic findings in the setting of a palpable mass [2,23-25].

Variant 8: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings probably benign (BI-RADS 3). Next imaging study.

I. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI in women <30 years of age with probably benign sonographic findings in the setting of a palpable mass.

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

A. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Diagnostic

If a benign entity has been found on US and is the definitive correlate for a palpable mass, there is no role for further evaluation with diagnostic DBT in women <30 years of age.

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

B. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening DBT, with or without DM, is unnecessary for confirmation of benignity. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

C. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

If a benign entity has been found on US and is the definitive correlate for a palpable mass, there is no role for FDG-PET breast dedicated in women <30 years of age [2].

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

D. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

If a benign entity has been found on US and is the definitive correlate for a palpable mass, there is no role for tissue sampling. The likelihood of a palpable mass in a young woman that is benign on both clinical examination and US resulting in a cancer is extremely low; one study prospectively evaluating US-guided core biopsy in 248 young women <25 years of age with clinically benign masses and predominantly benign findings found no cancers in this group [52].

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

E. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

If a benign entity has been found on US and is the definitive correlate for a palpable mass, there is no role for image-guided FNAB in women <30 years of age.

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

F. Mammography Diagnostic

If a benign entity has been found on US and is the definitive correlate for a palpable mass, there is no role for further evaluation with diagnostic mammography in women <30 years of age.

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

G. Mammography Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening mammography is unnecessary for confirmation of benignity. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

H. MRI Breast

If a benign entity has been found on US and is the definitive correlate for a palpable mass, there is no role for MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast in women <30 years of age [2,23-25].

Variant 9: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings benign (BI-RADS 2). Next imaging study.

I. Sestamibi MBI

If a benign entity has been found on US and is the definitive correlate for a palpable mass, there is no evidence for Tc-99m sestamibi MBI in women <30 years of age.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

A. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Diagnostic

DBT is not useful unless the clinical findings are suspicious. DBT or mammography diagnostic is recommended as a prebiopsy assessment in cases in which cancer is strongly suspected clinically [41]. As with women ≥40 years of age, if physical examination is highly suspicious and DBT and US are negative, tissue sampling with core biopsy or surgical biopsy is warranted.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

B. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening DBT, with or without DM, is not useful as the next imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

C. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated in women <30 years of age with negative US findings [2].

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

D. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of image-guided core biopsy in women

<30 years of age with negative US findings.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

E. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of image-guided FNAB in women <30 years of age with negative US findings.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

F. Mammography Diagnostic

Mammography is not useful unless the clinical findings are suspicious. Mammography is recommended as a prebiopsy assessment in cases in which cancer is strongly suspected clinically [41]. If a mammographic correlate to a suspicious finding is identified, then stereotactic biopsy is recommended. As with women ≥ 40 years of age, if physical examination is highly suspicious and mammography and US are negative, tissue sampling with core biopsy or surgical biopsy is warranted.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

G. Mammography Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening mammography is not useful as the next imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

H. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast in women in women <30 years of age with negative US findings [2,23-25].

Variant 10: Adult female, younger than 30 years of age. Palpable breast mass. US findings negative (BI-RADS 1). Next imaging study.

I. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI in women <30 years of age with negative US findings.

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

A. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Diagnostic

Diagnostic mammography, DBT, or US can be useful as initial imaging for women 30 to 39 years of age with a palpable breast mass. DBT may demonstrate subtle architectural distortion or calcifications, findings not readily detected by US. DBT and diagnostic mammography can also provide more information regarding the extent of disease and the presence of additional findings in the ipsilateral breast [22]. In the absence of DBT data for women 30 to 39 years of age, the utility of DBT can be extrapolated from the diagnostic mammography data. Mammography has been shown to add clinical value for women ≥ 30 years of age with a palpable breast mass.

Mammographic sensitivity is dependent on the tumor size on palpation, ranging from 78% for a

palpable tumor size of ≤ 2 cm to 97% for a palpable tumor size between 2 and 5 cm [53]. DBT provided similarly accurate diagnostic results as compared to DM in women with palpable breast masses [15]. Several small studies that specifically included women presenting with clinical symptoms including palpable lumps demonstrated increased accuracy on combination DM/DBT compared with DM alone [13,16,17]. In one recent study, mammography contributed to the workup of palpable malignant masses in 16.7% of cases in women 30 to 39 years of age [54].

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

B. Digital Breast Tomosynthesis Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening DBT, with or without DM, is not useful as the initial imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

C. FDG-PET Breast Dedicated

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of FDG-PET breast dedicated in the initial evaluation of women 30 to 39 years of age with a palpable mass [2].

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

D. Image-Guided Core Biopsy Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of image-guided core biopsy in the initial evaluation of women 30 to 39 years of age with a palpable mass.

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

E. Image-Guided Fine Needle Aspiration Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of the use of image-guided FNAB in the initial evaluation of women 30 to 39 years of age with a palpable mass.

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

F. Mammography Diagnostic

Diagnostic mammography, DBT, or US can be useful as initial imaging for women 30 to 39 years of age with a palpable breast mass. Mammography has been shown to add clinical value for women ≥ 30 years of age with a palpable breast mass. Mammographic sensitivity is dependent on the tumor size on palpation, ranging from 78% for a palpable tumor size of ≤ 2 cm to 97% for a palpable tumor size between 2 and 5 cm [53]. In one recent study, it was demonstrated that in 16.7% of cases in women 30 to 39 years of age, mammography contributed in the workup of malignant palpable masses [54]. For example, mammography revealed calcifications that extended outside of the mass or associated satellite lesions. The overall contribution of diagnostic mammography for palpable breast masses is the characterization of benign disease, evaluating the overall extent of disease and assessing the remainder of the ipsilateral breast [22].

One study of 1,208 women 30 to 39 years of age presenting with focal breast symptoms found a higher sensitivity for US compared with mammography (95.7% versus 60.9%) but with a similar specificity (89.2% and 94.4%, respectively), negative predictive value (99.9% and 99.2%, respectively), and positive predictive value (13.2% and 18.4%, respectively) [40].

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.

G. Mammography Screening

In women presenting with signs or symptoms, including a palpable breast mass, screening

mammography is not useful as the initial imaging study. Screening mammography is provided to women without signs or symptoms of breast disease.

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.
H. MRI Breast

There is no relevant literature to support the use of MRI of the breast with or without IV contrast in the initial evaluation of women 30 to 39 years of age with palpable mass [2,23-25].

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.
I. Sestamibi MBI

There is no relevant literature to support the use of Tc-99m sestamibi MBI in the initial evaluation of women 30 to 39 years of age with palpable mass.

Variant 11: Adult female, 30 to 39 years of age. Palpable breast mass. Initial imaging.
J. US Breast

Diagnostic mammography, DBT, or US can be useful as initial imaging for women 30 to 39 years of age with a palpable breast mass. Most benign lesions in young women are not visualized on mammography [41,43], and US is therefore frequently used as the initial imaging modality in younger women. The criterion for "young" has historically been considered <30 years of age. However, the risk of breast cancer remains relatively low for women 30 to 39 years of age. The sensitivity of US may be higher than mammography for women <40 years of age [53]. One study of 1,208 women 30 to 39 years of age presenting with focal breast symptoms found higher sensitivity for US compared with mammography (95.7% versus 60.9%), with similar specificity (89.2% and 94.4%, respectively) [40]. US is a reasonable initial imaging study for women <40 years of age, with a low threshold for using mammography if the clinical examination or other risk factors are concerning. If the mass has probably benign US features, then short-term interval follow-up with US only may be appropriate. If a suspicious mass is identified on US in this group, bilateral mammography is useful.

Summary of Recommendations

- **Variant 1:** DBT diagnostic or mammography diagnostic are usually appropriate for the initial imaging of a female patient 40 years of age or older with a palpable breast mass. These procedures can be complementary (ie, more than one procedure is ordered as a set or simultaneously in which each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).
- **Variant 2:** US breast is usually appropriate as the next imaging study for a female patient 40 years of age or older with a palpable breast mass in which mammography findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5).
- **Variant 3:** Imaging is usually not appropriate as the next study for a female patient 40 years of age or older with a palpable breast mass in which the diagnostic mammography, DBT, and US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3).
- **Variant 4:** US breast maybe appropriate as the next imaging study for a female patient 40 years of age or older with a palpable breast mass in which mammography findings are benign (BI-RADS 2) at the site of palpable mass.
- **Variant 5:** US breast is usually appropriate as the next imaging study of a female patient 40 years of age or older with a palpable breast mass in which mammography findings are

negative (BI-RADS 1).

- **Variant 6:** US breast is usually appropriate as the initial imaging of a female patient younger than 30 years of age with a palpable breast mass.
- **Variant 7:** DBT diagnostic, mammography diagnostic, or image-guided core biopsy breast are usually appropriate as the next imaging study of a female patient younger than 30 years of age with a palpable breast mass in which US findings are suspicious or highly suggestive of malignancy (BI-RADS 4 or 5). These procedures can be complementary (ie, more than one procedure is ordered as a set or simultaneously in which each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care). The panel did not agree on recommending image-guided fine needle aspiration breast for this clinical scenario. There is insufficient medical literature to conclude whether or not these patients would benefit from this procedure. This procedure in this patient population is controversial but may be appropriate.
- **Variant 8:** Imaging is usually not appropriate as the next study in a female patient younger than 30 years of age with a palpable breast mass in which US findings are probably benign (BI-RADS 3).
- **Variant 9:** Imaging is usually not appropriate as the next study in a female patient younger than 30 years of age with a palpable breast mass in which US findings are benign (BI-RADS 2).
- **Variant 10:** Imaging is usually not appropriate as the next study in a female patient younger than 30 years of age with a palpable breast mass in which US findings are negative (BI-RADS 1).
- **Variant 11:** US breast, DBT diagnostic, or mammography diagnostic are usually appropriate as the initial imaging of a female patient 30 to 39 years of age with palpable breast mass. These procedures can be complementary (ie, more than one procedure is ordered as a set or simultaneously in which each procedure provides unique clinical information to effectively manage the patient's care).

Supporting Documents

The evidence table, literature search, and appendix for this topic are available at <https://acsearch.acr.org/list>. The appendix includes the strength of evidence assessment and the final rating round tabulations for each recommendation.

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents, please go to the ACR website at <https://www.acr.org/Clinical-Resources/Clinical-Tools-and-Reference/Appropriateness-Criteria>.

Appropriateness Category Names and Definitions

Appropriateness Category Name	Appropriateness Rating	Appropriateness Category Definition
Usually Appropriate	7, 8, or 9	The imaging procedure or treatment is indicated in the specified clinical scenarios at a favorable risk-benefit ratio for patients.
May Be Appropriate	4, 5, or 6	The imaging procedure or treatment may be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios as an

		alternative to imaging procedures or treatments with a more favorable risk-benefit ratio, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is equivocal.
May Be Appropriate (Disagreement)	5	The individual ratings are too dispersed from the panel median. The different label provides transparency regarding the panel's recommendation. "May be appropriate" is the rating category and a rating of 5 is assigned.
Usually Not Appropriate	1, 2, or 3	The imaging procedure or treatment is unlikely to be indicated in the specified clinical scenarios, or the risk-benefit ratio for patients is likely to be unfavorable.

Relative Radiation Level Information

Potential adverse health effects associated with radiation exposure are an important factor to consider when selecting the appropriate imaging procedure. Because there is a wide range of radiation exposures associated with different diagnostic procedures, a relative radiation level (RRL) indication has been included for each imaging examination. The RRLs are based on effective dose, which is a radiation dose quantity that is used to estimate population total radiation risk associated with an imaging procedure. Patients in the pediatric age group are at inherently higher risk from exposure, because of both organ sensitivity and longer life expectancy (relevant to the long latency that appears to accompany radiation exposure). For these reasons, the RRL dose estimate ranges for pediatric examinations are lower as compared with those specified for adults (see Table below). Additional information regarding radiation dose assessment for imaging examinations can be found in the ACR Appropriateness Criteria® [Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction](#) document [55].

Relative Radiation Level Designations		
Relative Radiation Level*	Adult Effective Dose Estimate Range	Pediatric Effective Dose Estimate Range
○	0 mSv	0 mSv
☢	<0.1 mSv	<0.03 mSv
☢ ☢	0.1-1 mSv	0.03-0.3 mSv
☢ ☢ ☢	1-10 mSv	0.3-3 mSv
☢ ☢ ☢ ☢	10-30 mSv	3-10 mSv
☢ ☢ ☢ ☢ ☢	30-100 mSv	10-30 mSv
*RRL assignments for some of the examinations cannot be made, because the actual patient doses in these procedures vary as a function of a number of factors (eg, region of the body exposed to ionizing radiation, the imaging guidance that is used). The RRLs for these examinations are designated as "Varies."		

References

1. Chiarelli AM, Edwards SA, Sheppard AJ, et al. Favourable prognostic factors of subsequent screen-detected breast cancers among women aged 50-69. *Eur J Cancer Prev*. 2012;21(6):499-506.
2. Lehman CD, Lee AY, Lee CI. Imaging management of palpable breast abnormalities. [Review]. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 203(5):1142-53, 2014 Nov.
3. Ma I, Dueck A, Gray R, et al. Clinical and self breast examination remain important in the era of modern screening. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 19(5):1484-90, 2012 May.
4. Salzman B, Collins E, Hersh L. Common Breast Problems. [Review]. *American Family Physician*. 99(8):505-514, 2019 04 15.
5. Boyd NF, Sutherland HJ, Fish EB, Hiraki GY, Lickley HL, Maurer VE. Prospective evaluation of physical examination of the breast. *Am J Surg*. 1981; 142(3):331-334.
6. Rosner D, Blair D. What ultrasonography can tell in breast masses that mammography and physical examination cannot. *J Surg Oncol*. 1985; 28(4):308-313.
7. Dennis MA, Parker SH, Klaus AJ, Stavros AT, Kaske TI, Clark SB. Breast biopsy avoidance: the value of normal mammograms and normal sonograms in the setting of a palpable lump. *Radiology* 2001; 219(1):186-191.
8. Moy L, Slanetz PJ, Moore R, et al. Specificity of mammography and US in the evaluation of a palpable abnormality: retrospective review. *Radiology*. 2002; 225(1):176-181.
9. Shetty MK, Shah YP. Prospective evaluation of the value of negative sonographic and mammographic findings in patients with palpable abnormalities of the breast. *J Ultrasound Med*. 2002; 21(11):1211-1216; quiz 1217-1219.
10. Chan CH, Coopey SB, Freer PE, Hughes KS. False-negative rate of combined mammography and ultrasound for women with palpable breast masses. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2015;153:699-702.
11. Brandt KR, Craig DA, Hoskins TL, et al. Can digital breast tomosynthesis replace conventional diagnostic mammography views for screening recalls without calcifications? A comparison study in a simulated clinical setting. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;200:291-8.
12. Noroozian M, Hadjiiski L, Rahnema-Moghadam S, et al. Digital breast tomosynthesis is comparable to mammographic spot views for mass characterization. *Radiology*. 2012;262(1):61-68.
13. Waldherr C, Cerny P, Altermatt HJ, et al. Value of one-view breast tomosynthesis versus two-view mammography in diagnostic workup of women with clinical signs and symptoms and in women recalled from screening. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013;200:226-31.
14. Zuley ML, Guo B, Catullo VJ, et al. Comparison of two-dimensional synthesized mammograms versus original digital mammograms alone and in combination with tomosynthesis images. *Radiology* 2014;271:664-71.
15. Hawley JR, Kang-Chapman JK, Bonnet SE, Kerger AL, Taylor CR, Erdal BS. Diagnostic Accuracy of Digital Breast Tomosynthesis in the Evaluation of Palpable Breast Abnormalities. *Acad Radiol*. 25(3):297-304, 2018 Mar.
16. Bansal GJ, Young P. Digital breast tomosynthesis within a symptomatic "one-stop breast clinic" for characterization of subtle findings. *British Journal of Radiology*. 88(1053):20140855, 2015 Sep.

- 17.** Skaane P, Gullien R, Bjorndal H, et al. Digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT): initial experience in a clinical setting. *Acta Radiol.* 53(5):524-9, 2012 Jun 01.
- 18.** Ciatto S, Houssami N. Breast imaging and needle biopsy in women with clinically evident breast cancer: does combined imaging change overall diagnostic sensitivity? *Breast.* 2007;16(4):382-386.
- 19.** Murphy IG, Dillon MF, Doherty AO, et al. Analysis of patients with false negative mammography and symptomatic breast carcinoma. *J Surg Oncol.* 2007; 96(6):457-463.
- 20.** Shetty MK, Shah YP, Sharman RS. Prospective evaluation of the value of combined mammographic and sonographic assessment in patients with palpable abnormalities of the breast. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2003; 22(3):263-268; quiz 269-270.
- 21.** Leung SE, Ben-Nachum I, Kornecki A. New Palpable Breast Lump With Recent Negative Mammogram: Is Repeat Mammography Necessary?. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 207(1):200-4, 2016 Jul.
- 22.** Linden OE, Hayward JH, Price ER, Kelil T, Joe BN, Lee AY. Utility of Diagnostic Mammography as the Primary Imaging Modality for Palpable Lumps in Women With Almost Entirely Fatty Breasts. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 214(4):938-944, 2020 04.
- 23.** Amitai Y, Menes TS, Weinstein I, Filyavich A, Yakobson I, Golan O. What is the yield of breast MRI in the assessment of palpable breast findings?. *Clin Radiol.* 72(11):930-935, 2017 Nov.
- 24.** Olsen ML, Morton MJ, Stan DL, Pruthi S. Is there a role for magnetic resonance imaging in diagnosing palpable breast masses when mammogram and ultrasound are negative? *J Womens Health (Larchmt)* 2012;21:1149-54.
- 25.** Yau EJ, Gutierrez RL, DeMartini WB, Eby PR, Peacock S, Lehman CD. The utility of breast MRI as a problem-solving tool. *Breast J.* 17(3):273-80, 2011 May-Jun.
- 26.** Durfee SM, Selland DL, Smith DN, Lester SC, Kaelin CM, Meyer JE. Sonographic Evaluation of Clinically Palpable Breast Cancers Invisible on Mammography. *Breast J.* 2000;6(4):247-251.
- 27.** Garg S, Mohan H, Bal A, Attri AK, Kochhar S. A comparative analysis of core needle biopsy and fine-needle aspiration cytology in the evaluation of palpable and mammographically detected suspicious breast lesions. *Diagn Cytopathol.* 35(11):681-9, 2007 Nov.
- 28.** Schrading S, Distelmaier M, Dirrichs T, et al. Digital breast tomosynthesis-guided vacuum-assisted breast biopsy: initial experiences and comparison with prone stereotactic vacuum-assisted biopsy. *Radiology.* 2015;274(3):654-662.
- 29.** Viala J, Gignier P, Perret B, et al. Stereotactic vacuum-assisted biopsies on a digital breast 3D-tomosynthesis system. *Breast J.* 2013;19(1):4-9.
- 30.** American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Ultrasound-Guided Percutaneous Breast Interventional Procedures. Available at: <https://gravitas.acr.org/PPTS/GetDocumentView?docId=125+&releasId=2>
- 31.** Ly A, Ono JC, Hughes KS, Pitman MB, Balassanian R. Fine-Needle Aspiration Biopsy of Palpable Breast Masses: Patterns of Clinical Use and Patient Experience. *J. Natl. Compr. Cancer Netw..* 14(5):527-36, 2016 05.
- 32.** American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for Performing and Interpreting Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). Available at: <https://gravitas.acr.org/PPTS/GetDocumentView?docId=146+&releasId=2>

33. Harvey JA. Sonography of palpable breast masses. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR*. 2006; 27(4):284-297.
34. Kaiser JS, Helvie MA, Blacklaw RL, Roubidoux MA. Palpable breast thickening: role of mammography and US in cancer detection. *Radiology*. 2002; 223(3):839-844.
35. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for the Performance of a Diagnostic Breast Ultrasound Examination. Available at: <https://gravitas.acr.org/PPTS/GetDocumentView?docId=124+&releaseId=2>
36. Barr RG, Zhang Z, Cormack JB, Mendelson EB, Berg WA. Probably benign lesions at screening breast US in a population with elevated risk: prevalence and rate of malignancy in the ACRIN 6666 trial. *Radiology*. 2013;269(3):701-712.
37. American College of Radiology. ACR Practice Parameter for the Performance of Stereotactic/Tomosynthesis-Guided Breast Interventional Procedures. Available at: <https://gravitas.acr.org/PPTS/GetDocumentView?docId=65+&releaseId=2>
38. Gumus H, Gumus M, Mills P, et al. Clinically palpable breast abnormalities with normal imaging: is clinically guided biopsy still required? *Clin Radiol*. 2012;67(5):437-440.
39. Harvey JA, Nicholson BT, Lorusso AP, Cohen MA, Bovbjerg VE. Short-term follow-up of palpable breast lesions with benign imaging features: evaluation of 375 lesions in 320 women. *AJR*. 2009; 193(6):1723-1730.
40. Lehman CD, Lee CI, Loving VA, Portillo MS, Peacock S, DeMartini WB. Accuracy and value of breast ultrasound for primary imaging evaluation of symptomatic women 30-39 years of age. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 199(5):1169-77, 2012 Nov.
41. Ciatto S, Bravetti P, Bonardi R, Rosselli del Turco M. The role of mammography in women under 30. *Radiol Med*. 1990; 80(5):676-678.
42. Feig SA. Breast masses. Mammographic and sonographic evaluation. *Radiol Clin North Am* 1992; 30(1):67-92.
43. Harris VJ, Jackson VP. Indications for breast imaging in women under age 35 years. *Radiology*. 1989; 172(2):445-448.
44. Williams SM, Kaplan PA, Petersen JC, Lieberman RP. Mammography in women under age 30: is there clinical benefit? *Radiology* 1986; 161(1):49-51.
45. Checka CM, Chun JE, Schnabel FR, Lee J, Toth H. The relationship of mammographic density and age: implications for breast cancer screening. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2012;198(3):W292-295.
46. Carney PA, Miglioretti DL, Yankaskas BC, et al. Individual and combined effects of age, breast density, and hormone replacement therapy use on the accuracy of screening mammography. *Ann Intern Med*. 2003;138(3):168-175.
47. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. *CA Cancer J Clin* 66:7-30, 2016 .
48. Lee WK, Chung J, Cha ES, Lee JE, Kim JH. Digital breast tomosynthesis and breast ultrasound: Additional roles in dense breasts with category 0 at conventional digital mammography. *Eur J Radiol*. 85(1):291-296, 2016 Jan.
49. Skaane P, Bandos AI, Eben EB, et al. Two-view digital breast tomosynthesis screening with synthetically reconstructed projection images: comparison with digital breast tomosynthesis

with full-field digital mammographic images. *Radiology*. 271(3):655-63, 2014 Jun.

50. Liew PL, Liu TJ, Hsieh MC, et al. Rapid staining and immediate interpretation of fine-needle aspiration cytology for palpable breast lesions: diagnostic accuracy, mammographic, ultrasonographic and histopathologic correlations. *Acta Cytol*. 2011; 55(1):30-37.
51. Rosa M, Mohammadi A, Masood S. The value of fine needle aspiration biopsy in the diagnosis and prognostic assessment of palpable breast lesions. *Diagn Cytopathol*. 2012; 40(1):26-34.
52. Yue D, Swinson C, Ravichandran D. Triple assessment is not necessary in most young women referred with breast symptoms. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*. 2015;97(6):466-468.
53. Osako T, Iwase T, Takahashi K, et al. Diagnostic mammography and ultrasonography for palpable and nonpalpable breast cancer in women aged 30 to 39 years. *Breast Cancer*. 2007; 14(3):255-259.
54. Brown AL, Phillips J, Slanetz PJ, et al. Clinical Value of Mammography in the Evaluation of Palpable Breast Lumps in Women 30 Years Old and Older. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 209(4):935-942, 2017 Oct.
55. American College of Radiology. ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Radiation Dose Assessment Introduction. Available at: <https://edge.sitecorecloud.io/americancoldf5f-acrorgf92a-productioncb02-3650/media/ACR/Files/Clinical/Appropriateness-Criteria/ACR-Appropriateness-Criteria-Radiation-Dose-Assessment-Introduction.pdf>.

Disclaimer

The ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

^aUniversity of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. ^bResearch Author, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina; American Society of Nuclear Cardiology. ^cPanel Chair, Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island. ^dPanel Vice-Chair, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute, Tampa, Florida. ^eWashington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, Missouri. ^fPenn State Health Hershey Medical Center, Hershey, Pennsylvania. ^gUniversity of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah. ^hKaiser Permanente, Atlanta, Georgia. ⁱMemorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, New York. ^jUniversity of Washington, Seattle, Washington; American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. ^kSt. Bernards Healthcare, Jonesboro, Arkansas. ^lDuke Signature

Care, Durham, North Carolina; American College of Physicians. ^mUMass Memorial Medical Center/UMass Chan Medical School, Worcester, Massachusetts. ⁿProMedica Breast Care, Toledo, Ohio. ^oFox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; American College of Surgeons. ^pHoag Family Cancer Institute, Irvine, California and University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California; Commission on Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging. ^qSpecialty Chair, NYU Clinical Cancer Center, New York, New York.