## Shutter-Speed DCE-MRI Pharmacokinetic Analyses Facilitate the Discrimination of Malignant and Benign Breast Disease

## W. Huang<sup>1,2</sup>, X. Li<sup>3</sup>, E. A. Morris<sup>2</sup>, L. A. Tudorica<sup>4</sup>, E. S. Venkatraman<sup>5</sup>, Y. Wang<sup>1</sup>, J. Xu<sup>3</sup>, and C. S. Springer<sup>3,6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Medical Physics, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, United States, <sup>2</sup>Radiology, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, United States, <sup>3</sup>Advanced Imaging Research Center, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>4</sup>Radiology, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY, United States, <sup>5</sup>Epidemiology-Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, United States, <sup>6</sup>Cancer Institute, Oregon Health & Science University, Portl

**INTRODUCTION** There has been increasing interest in the Dynamic-Contrast-Enhanced (DCE) MRI method for the study of many different tumor types, using the approved monomolecular Gd(III) chelate contrast reagents (CRs) [1]. At the most sophisticated, DCE-MRI time-course data are analytically modeled to extract important pharmacokinetic parameters. These are usually variants of:  $K^{trans}$ , a rate constant for CR plasma/interstitium transfer, and  $v_e$ , the interstitial space volume fraction (the putative CR distribution volume). These can be obtained for ROI data or mapped on a pixel-by-pixel basis. Unfortunately so far, this quantitative DCE-MRI approach has been disappointing in its promised ability to increase cancer diagnostic selectivity [2].

The common Standard pharmacokinetic Model (SM) embeds the assumption that all tissue equilibrium intercompartmental water exchange MR systems remain in their fast-exchange-limit (FXL) conditions. The alternative Shutter-Speed Model (SSM) [3] does not assume this. For a limited cohort of (six) patients, it was recently shown that SSM K<sup>trans</sup> maps significantly improved malignant and benign breast lesion discrimination. The positive predictive value (PPV) results for a clinical MRI protocol, SM, and SSM DCE-MRI analyses were 50%, 75%, and 100%, respectively [4]. The SM K<sup>trans</sup> underestimation is greater the longer the transcytolemmal water exchange system departs the FXL during the CR passage. This occurs disproportionately in the *loci* of K<sup>trans</sup> hot spots, where there is greater vascularization and/or CR extravasation, and particularly in malignant tumors [4]. The current study determines the clinical MRI, SM, and SSM PPV results for a population of 22 patients.

**METHODS** All 22 patients had undergone a clinical MRI protocol prior to the research DCE-MRI study. All had contrast-enhanced lesions radiologically classified in the BIRADS (Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System) 4 (B-4, suspicious, n = 17) or 5 (B-5, highly suggestive of malignancy, n = 5) categories based on lesion morphology and qualitative assessment of enhancement kinetics (persistent, plateau, or washout). These results led to biopsy recommendations. The research DCE-MRI data acquisitions were performed under IRB-approved protocols. The data from six patients were collected as part of a combined MRI/MRS protocol prior to excisional or core biopsy. Those from the other 16 patients were acquired during the clinically scheduled MRI-guided preoperative needle localization or core biopsy procedures, just before needle insertions.

The study was conducted at 1.5T using a body transmitter RF coil and a four- or seven-channel phased-array bilateral breast receiver coil. A three dimensional (3D) SPGR pulse sequence was used to acquire 12-20 serial sagittal image volume sets continually, spatially covering the whole breast with the suspicious lesion to be biopsied. Other parameters included  $30^{\circ}$  flip angle, 3-4 ms TE, 6-9 ms TR, 3 mm section thickness, 20-24 cm field of view (FOV). Depending on the size of the breast, 16-32 image sections were acquired for each set, resulting in a temporal resolution range of 13-26 s. At the start of the second volume set acquisition, Gd CR was delivered intravenously [0.1 mmol/kg at 2 mL/s]. ROIs circumscribing the enhanced lesion and within an axillary artery produced the tumor signal intensity and arterial input function (AIF) time-courses, respectively. The latter was interpolated with a seven parameter empirical expression [3]. The time-course pairs were then subjected to both SM and SSM analyses [4]. Receiver-operating-characteristic (ROC) curves evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of the SM and SSM K<sup>trans</sup> and v<sub>e</sub> parameters.

**RESULTS** Upon pathology, 13 of the B-4 and two of the B-5 lesions were found benign (fibroadenoma, fibrocystic changes, lobular carcinoma *in situ*, stromal fibrosis, atypical ductal hyperplasia, and sclerosing adenosis). The other seven lesions were found malignant [five invasive ductal carcinomas (IDCs), one ductal carcinoma *in situ* (DCIS), and one IDC/DCIS mixture]. Though the sensitivity of the clinical MRI protocol is 100% (no false negative reading), its PPV is only 32%.

**Fig. 1a** shows the SM and SSM K<sup>trans</sup> and  $v_e$  scatter plots (each patient's values are connected). The SSM K<sup>trans</sup> value [0.85 (min)<sup>-1</sup>] of one IDC is off the top of the chart. Under the condition of retaining the clinical MRI 100% sensitivity, SSM achieves complete separation of malignant and benign lesions (100% PPV) with a threshold K<sup>trans</sup> value between 0.12 and 0.14 (min)<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 1a K<sup>trans</sup> plot black horizontal line). On the other hand, SM can achieve at best 58% PPV (five false positives and seven true positives) with a threshold K<sup>trans</sup> value that cannot be greater than 0.048 (min)<sup>-1</sup> and avoid false negatives. In the  $v_e$  dimension, there is no apparent SM and SSM difference in separating malignant and benign lesions. These results are quite consistent with those from a smaller population [4]: the SSM significantly increases parameter values except in the benign K<sup>trans</sup> cases. **Fig. 1b** shows the SM and SSM K<sup>trans</sup> ROC curves ( $v_e$  analogs not shown). The SM and SSM K<sup>trans</sup> ROC areas under the curve (AUCs) are 0.878 and 1.0, respectively. The permutation test to compare ROC curves from paired continuous markers gives a statistically significant p-value of 0.017. The SM and SSM  $v_e$  ROC curve AUCs are 0.52 and 0.55, respectively, suggesting that  $v_e$  is a poor diagnostic marker when used in this way.

**DISCUSSION** Even with ROI analysis, this preliminary study shows that the SSM DCE-MRI K<sup>trans</sup> diagnostic marker provides significantly better discrimination of malignant and benign breast lesions compared to SM. The pixel-by-pixel SSM K<sup>trans</sup> map, which reveals the nature of tumor heterogeneity [4], may perform the task even better. Incorporation of SSM DCE-MRI into clinical MRI protocols may help to reduce the number of possibly unnecessary (benign) biopsies. Recruitment of a larger population, including more pathology types, is warranted to refine the statistically significant K<sup>trans</sup> threshold. Unless extremely accurate, a "benign" K<sup>trans</sup> value is unlikely to counterindicate biopsy of a spiculated lesion. Thus, the population that may benefit the most from the SSM method might be that in the B-4 category, where the lesions have suspicious, but not compelling, features. In this study, 13 B-4 patients could have been spared biopsies had the SSM K<sup>trans</sup> been part of the clinical MRI interpretation. Though v<sub>e</sub> is a poor diagnostic marker, both v<sub>e</sub> (direct measure of cellularity) and K<sup>trans</sup> (directly related to perfusion and vessel permeability) may be important biomarkers for monitoring cancer therapies.

**REFERENCES 1.** M. Leach *et al. Brit. J. Cancer* 92: 1599-1610 (2005). **2.** R.E. Port *et al. JMRI* 10: 233-241 (1999). **3.** T.E. Yankeelov *et al. Magn. Reson. Med.* 50: 1151-1169 (2003). **4.** X. Li *et al. Magn. Reson. Med.* 53: 724-729 (2005).

