

9. Literaturverzeichnis

1. Lacey, J.V., Jr., S.S. Devesa, and L.A. Brinton, *Recent trends in breast cancer incidence and mortality*. Environ Mol Mutagen, 2002. **39**(2-3): p. 82-8.
2. Ferno, M., *Prognostic factors in breast cancer: a brief review*. Anticancer Res, 1998. **18**(3C): p. 2167-71.
3. Gotzsche, P.C. and O. Olsen, *Is screening for breast cancer with mammography justifiable?* Lancet, 2000. **355**(9198): p. 129-34.
4. Dean, P.B., *Final comment. The articles by Gotzsche and Olsen are not official Cochrane reviews and lack scientific merit*. Lakartidningen, 2000. **97**(25): p. 3106.
5. Nystrom, L., et al., *Long-term effects of mammography screening: updated overview of the Swedish randomised trials*. Lancet, 2002. **359**(9310): p. 909-19.
6. Duffy, S.W., et al., *The Swedish Two-County Trial of mammographic screening: cluster randomisation and end point evaluation*. Ann Oncol, 2003. **14**(8): p. 1196-8.
7. Vlahou, A., et al., *A novel approach toward development of a rapid blood test for breast cancer*. Clin Breast Cancer, 2003. **4**(3): p. 203-9.
8. Ager, S. and C. Daniels, *Lasers bring new light to breast imaging*. Radiol Technol, 1998. **69**(5): p. 469-71.
9. Martin, G., et al., *Electrical impedance scanning in breast cancer imaging: correlation with mammographic and histologic diagnosis*. Eur Radiol, 2002. **12**(6): p. 1471-8.
10. Kavanagh, A.M., et al., *The sensitivity, specificity, and positive predictive value of screening mammography and symptomatic status*. J Med Screen, 2000. **7**(2): p. 105-10.
11. Carney, P.A., 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): p. 168-75.
12. Bick, U., *Digitale Vollfeldmammographie*. Rofo, 2000. **172**(12): p. 957-64.
13. Aus, R.J., et al., *Dependence of scatter on atomic number for x rays from tungsten and molybdenum anodes in the mammographic energy range*. Med Phys, 1999. **26**(7): p. 1306-11.
14. Dance, D.R., et al., *Influence of anode/filter material and tube potential on contrast, signal-to-noise ratio and average absorbed dose in mammography: a Monte Carlo study*. Br J Radiol, 2000. **73**(874): p. 1056-67.
15. Chan, H.P., et al., *Digital mammography: observer performance study of the effects of pixel size on the characterization of malignant and benign microcalcifications*. Acad Radiol, 2001. **8**(6): p. 454-66.
16. Grebe, S., et al., *Erste Erfahrungen mit digitaler Vollfeldmammographie*. Zentralbl Gynakol, 2000. **122**(11): p. 589-94.
17. Diekmann, F., et al., *Dosisreduktion durch rasterlose Technik in digitaler Vollfeldmammographie*. Rofo, 2003. **175**(6): p. 769-74.
18. Boone, J.M., *Glandular breast dose for monoenergetic and high-energy X-ray beams: Monte Carlo assessment*. Radiology, 1999. **213**(1): p. 23-37.

19. Chakraborty, D.P., *The effect of the antiscatter grid on full-field digital mammography phantom images*. J Digit Imaging, 1999. **12**(1): p. 12-22.
20. Pisano, E.D., et al., *Radiologists' preferences for digital mammographic display. The International Digital Mammography Development Group*. Radiology, 2000. **216**(3): p. 820-30.
21. Richter, K., et al., *Experimental study of X-ray mammography in a fluid bath: reduced radiation dose and improved detail resolution*. Invest Radiol, 1999. **34**(11): p. 678-84.
22. Diekmann, F., et al., *Vergleich von Mikroverkalkungen mit direkter Vergrößerung in digitaler Vollfeldmammographie vs. Film-Folien-Mammographie*. Rofo, 2002. **174**(3): p. 297-300.
23. Grebe SD, B.U., Diekmann F, Winzer KJ, Blohmer JU, Hamm B, *Needle localization of non-palpable breast lesions using full-field digital mammography*. Eur Radiol, 2000. **10** [Suppl. 1]: p. 764.
24. Baum, F., et al., *Computer-aided detection in direct digital full-field mammography: initial results*. Eur Radiol, 2002. **12**(12): p. 3015-7.
25. Birdwell, R.L., et al., *Mammographic characteristics of 115 missed cancers later detected with screening mammography and the potential utility of computer-aided detection*. Radiology, 2001. **219**(1): p. 192-202.
26. Freer, T.W. and M.J. Ulissey, *Screening mammography with computer-aided detection: prospective study of 12,860 patients in a community breast center*. Radiology, 2001. **220**(3): p. 781-6.
27. Diekmann, F., et al., *Evaluation of a wavelet-based computer-assisted detection system for identifying microcalcifications in digital full-field mammography*. Acta Radiol, 2004. **45**(2): p. 136-41.
28. Giger, M.L. *Computer-aided Diagnosis. RSNA Categorical Course in Breast Imaging Syllabus*. in RSNA. 1999. Chicago.
29. Huang, H.K.L., S.L. *Telemammography: A Technical Overview. RSNA Categorical Course in Breast Imaging Syllabus*. in RSNA. 1999. Chicago.
30. Skaane, P. and A. Skjennald, *Screen-film mammography versus full-field digital mammography with soft-copy reading: randomized trial in a population-based screening program--the Oslo II Study*. Radiology, 2004. **232**(1): p. 197-204.
31. Jennings, R.J., et al., *Optimal x-ray spectra for screen-film mammography*. Med Phys, 1981. **8**(5): p. 629-39.
32. Suortti, P. and W. Thomlinson, *Medical applications of synchrotron radiation*. Phys Med Biol, 2003. **48**(13): p. R1-35.
33. Baldelli, P., et al., *Quasi-monochromatic x-rays for diagnostic radiology*. Phys Med Biol, 2003. **48**(22): p. 3653-65.
34. Diekmann, F., et al., *Near monochromatic X-rays for digital slot-scan mammography: initial findings*. Eur Radiol, 2004. **14**(9): p. 1641-6.
35. Teifke, A., et al., *Computertomographie der Brust*. Rofo, 1994. **161**(6): p. 495-500.
36. Diekmann, F., et al., *Use of iodine-based contrast media in digital full-field mammography--initial experience*. Rofo, 2003. **175**(3): p. 342-5.
37. Lawaczeck, R., et al., *New contrast media designed for x-ray energy subtraction imaging in digital mammography*. Invest Radiol, 2003. **38**(9): p. 602-8.
38. Skarpathiotakis, M., et al., *Development of contrast digital mammography*. Med Phys, 2002. **29**(10): p. 2419-26.

39. Elmore, J.G., et al., *Screening for breast cancer*. *Jama*, 2005. **293**(10): p. 1245-56.
40. Kolb, T.M., J. Lichy, and J.H. Newhouse, *Comparison of the performance of screening mammography, physical examination, and breast US and evaluation of factors that influence them: an analysis of 27,825 patient evaluations*. *Radiology*, 2002. **225**(1): p. 165-75.
41. Schulz-Wendtland, R., et al., *Experimental investigations of image quality in X-ray mammography with conventional screen film system (SFS), digital phosphor storage plate in/without magnification technique (CR) and digital CCD-technique (CCD)*. *Rontgenpraxis*, 2001. **54**(4): p. 123-6.
42. Fischmann, A., et al., *Comparison of full-field digital mammography and film-screen mammography: image quality and lesion detection*. *Br J Radiol*, 2005. **78**(928): p. 312-5.
43. Rong, X.J., et al., *Microcalcification detectability for four mammographic detectors: flat-panel, CCD, CR, and screen/film*. *Med Phys*, 2002. **29**(9): p. 2052-61.
44. Obenauer, S., et al., *Full-field digital mammography: dose-dependent detectability of breast lesions and microcalcification*. *Rofo*, 2000. **172**(12): p. 1052-6.
45. Gaspard-Bakhach, S., et al., *ROC analysis comparing screen film mammography and digital mammography*. *J Radiol*, 2000. **81**(2): p. 133-9.
46. Cowen, A.R., et al., *Visibility of microcalcifications in computed and screen-film mammography*. *Phys Med Biol*, 1997. **42**(8): p. 1533-48.
47. Friedrich, M., *Digitale Mammographie*. www.brustkrebs-info.de, Stand 11.5.2005.
48. Obenauer, S., K.P. Hermann, and E. Grabbe, *Dose reduction in full-field digital mammography: an anthropomorphic breast phantom study*. *Br J Radiol*, 2003. **76**(907): p. 478-82.
49. Hermann, K.P., S. Obenauer, and E. Grabbe, *Radiation exposure in full-field digital mammography with a flat-panel x-ray detector based on amorphous silicon in comparison with conventional screen-film mammography*. *Rofo*, 2000. **172**(11): p. 940-5.
50. Undrill, P.E., A.D. O'Kane, and F.J. Gilbert, *A comparison of digital and screen-film mammography using quality control phantoms*. *Clin Radiol*, 2000. **55**(10): p. 782-90.
51. Obenauer, S., et al., *Full-field digital mammography: a phantom study for detection of microcalcification*. *Rofo*, 2000. **172**(7): p. 646-50.
52. Gennaro, G., et al., *Are phantoms useful for predicting the potential of dose reduction in full-field digital mammography?* *Phys Med Biol*, 2005. **50**(8): p. 1851-70.
53. Lewin, J.M., et al., *Clinical comparison of full-field digital mammography and screen-film mammography for detection of breast cancer*. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*, 2002. **179**(3): p. 671-7.
54. Skaane, P., K. Young, and A. Skjennald, *Population-based mammography screening: comparison of screen-film and full-field digital mammography with soft-copy reading--Oslo I study*. *Radiology*, 2003. **229**(3): p. 877-84.
55. Fischer, U., et al., *Comparative study in patients with microcalcifications: full-field digital mammography vs screen-film mammography*. *Eur Radiol*, 2002. **12**(11): p. 2679-83.

56. Fischer, U., et al., *Digital full field mammography: comparison between radiographic direct magnification and digital monitor zooming*. Radiologe, 2002. **42**(4): p. 261-4.
57. Shikhaliev, P.M., et al., *Scanning-slit photon counting x-ray imaging system using a microchannel plate detector*. Med Phys, 2004. **31**(5): p. 1061-71.
58. Feig, S.A. *Risk, Benefit and Controversies in Mammographic Screening*. RSNA Categorical Course in Breast Imaging Syllabus. in RSNA. 1999. Chicago.
59. Heywang-Köbrunner, S.H. and I. Schreer, *Bildgebende Mammadiagnostik*. Untersuchungstechnik, Befundmuster und Differenzialdiagnostik in Mammographie, Sonographie und Kernspintomographie, ed. U. Mödder. 2003: Thieme- Verlag.
60. Jung, H., *Assessment of usefulness and risk of mammography screening with exclusive attention to radiation risk*. Radiologe, 2001. **41**(4): p. 385-95.
61. Frankenberg, D., et al., *Enhanced neoplastic transformation by mammography X rays relative to 200 kVp X rays: indication for a strong dependence on photon energy of the RBE(M) for various end points*. Radiat Res, 2002. **157**(1): p. 99-105.
62. Willis, C.E. and T.L. Slovis, *The ALARA concept in pediatric CR and DR: dose reduction in pediatric radiographic exams--a white paper conference*. AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2005. **184**(2): p. 373-4.
63. Voisin, P., L. Roy, and M. Benderitter, *Why can't we find a better biological indicator of dose?* Radiat Prot Dosimetry, 2004. **112**(4): p. 465-9.
64. Willis, C.E. and T.L. Slovis, *The ALARA concept in radiographic dose reduction*. Radiol Technol, 2004. **76**(2): p. 150-2.
65. Seibert, J.A., *Tradeoffs between image quality and dose*. Pediatr Radiol, 2004. **34 Suppl 3**: p. S183-95; discussion S234-41.
66. Willis, C.E. and T.L. Slovis, *The ALARA concept in pediatric CR and DR: dose reduction in pediatric radiographic exams--a white paper conference executive summary*. Pediatr Radiol, 2004. **34 Suppl 3**: p. S162-4.
67. Riley, P., *Radiation risk in the context of liability for injury*. J Radiol Prot, 2003. **23**(3): p. 305-15.
68. Slovis, T.L., *Children, computed tomography radiation dose, and the As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA) concept*. Pediatrics, 2003. **112**(4): p. 971-2.
69. Boone, J.M., et al., *Development and Monte Carlo analysis of antiscatter grids for mammography*. Technol Cancer Res Treat, 2002. **1**(6): p. 441-7.
70. Nykanen, K. and S. Siltanen, *X-ray scattering in full-field digital mammography*. Med Phys, 2003. **30**(7): p. 1864-73.
71. Veldkamp, W.J., M.A. Thijssen, and N. Karssemeijer, *The value of scatter removal by a grid in full field digital mammography*. Med Phys, 2003. **30**(7): p. 1712-8.
72. Fahrig, R. and M.J. Yaffe, *Optimization of spectral shape in digital mammography: dependence on anode material, breast thickness, and lesion type*. Med Phys, 1994. **21**(9): p. 1473-81.
73. Lawaczeck, R., et al., *Monochromatic x-rays in digital mammography*. Invest Radiol, 2005. **40**(1): p. 33-9.
74. Gambaccini, M., et al., *Spatial resolution measurements in quasimonochromatic x rays with mosaic crystals for mammography application*. Med Phys, 2001. **28**(4): p. 412-8.

75. Burattini, E., et al., *Mammography with synchrotron radiation*. Radiology, 1995. **195**(1): p. 239-44.
76. Burattini, E., et al., [*Synchrotron radiation: a new source in x-ray mammography*]. Radiol Med (Torino), 1992. **84**(3): p. 181-8.
77. Pani, S., et al., *Breast tomography with synchrotron radiation: preliminary results*. Phys Med Biol, 2004. **49**(9): p. 1739-54.
78. Diekmann, F., et al., *Verbesserte Diagnosefindung durch Computeralgorithmen in der digitalen Vollfeldmammographie*. Zentralbl Gynakol, 2001. **123**(2): p. 117-22.
79. Nawano, S., et al., *Computer-aided diagnosis in full digital mammography*. Invest Radiol, 1999. **34**(4): p. 310-6.
80. Bornefalk, H. and A.B. Hermansson, *On the comparison of FROC curves in mammography CAD systems*. Med Phys, 2005. **32**(2): p. 412-7.
81. Brem, R.F., et al., *Impact of breast density on computer-aided detection for breast cancer*. AJR Am J Roentgenol, 2005. **184**(2): p. 439-44.
82. Suryanarayanan, S., et al., *A perceptual evaluation of JPEG 2000 image compression for digital mammography: contrast-detail characteristics*. J Digit Imaging, 2004. **17**(1): p. 64-70.
83. Przelaskowski, A., *Vector quality measure of lossy compressed medical images*. Comput Biol Med, 2004. **34**(3): p. 193-207.
84. Kocsis, O., et al., *Visually lossless threshold determination for microcalcification detection in wavelet compressed mammograms*. Eur Radiol, 2003. **13**(10): p. 2390-6.
85. Lo, S.C., H. Li, and M.T. Freedman, *Optimization of wavelet decomposition for image compression and feature preservation*. IEEE Trans Med Imaging, 2003. **22**(9): p. 1141-51.
86. Goldberg, M.A. and S.J. Dwyer, 3rd, *Telemammography: implementation issues*. Telemed J, 1995. **1**(3): p. 215-26.
87. Niklason, L.T., D.B. Kopans, and L.M. Hamberg, *Digital breast imaging: tomosynthesis and digital subtraction mammography*. Breast Dis, 1998. **10**(3-4): p. 151-64.
88. Reiser, I., et al., *Computerized detection of mass lesions in digital breast tomosynthesis images using two- and three dimensional radial gradient index segmentation*. Technol Cancer Res Treat, 2004. **3**(5): p. 437-41.
89. Dobbins, J.T., 3rd and D.J. Godfrey, *Digital x-ray tomosynthesis: current state of the art and clinical potential*. Phys Med Biol, 2003. **48**(19): p. R65-106.
90. Stevens, G.M., et al., *Circular tomosynthesis: potential in imaging of breast and upper cervical spine--preliminary phantom and in vitro study*. Radiology, 2003. **228**(2): p. 569-75.
91. Diekmann, F., et al., *Präoperative MRT der Brust beim Invasiv lobulären Karzinom im Vergleich zum invasiv duktalem Karzinom*. Rofo, 2004. **176**(4): p. 544-9.
92. Fischer, U., L. Kopka, and E. Grabbe, *Breast carcinoma: effect of preoperative contrast-enhanced MR imaging on the therapeutic approach*. Radiology, 1999. **213**(3): p. 881-8.
93. Cocquyt, V. and S. Van Belle, *Lobular carcinoma in situ and invasive lobular cancer of the breast*. Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol, 2005. **17**(1): p. 55-60.

94. Berg, W.A., et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of mammography, clinical examination, US, and MR imaging in preoperative assessment of breast cancer*. Radiology, 2004. **233**(3): p. 830-49.
95. Fischer, U., et al., *The influence of preoperative MRI of the breasts on recurrence rate in patients with breast cancer*. Eur Radiol, 2004. **14**(10): p. 1725-31.
96. Hollingsworth, A.B., *Perspectives on preoperative staging with breast MRI*. J Am Coll Surg, 2004. **199**(1): p. 173-4.
97. Winnekendonk, G., et al., *Diagnostic value of preoperative contrast-enhanced MR imaging of the breast*. Rofo, 2004. **176**(5): p. 688-93.
98. Richter, K., et al., *Combination of mammography with automated ultrasound (Sono-X) in routine diagnosis?*. Zentralbl Chir, 1998. **123 Suppl 5**: p. 37-41.
99. Richter, K., et al., *Automated mammary sonography and mammography: the differentiation of benign and malignant breast lesions*. Rofo, 1998. **169**(3): p. 245-52.
100. Richter, K., et al., *Detection of malignant and benign breast lesions with an automated US system: results in 120 cases*. Radiology, 1997. **205**(3): p. 823-30.
101. Richter, K., et al., *Description and first clinical use of a new system for combined mammography and automated clinical amplitude/velocity reconstructive imaging breast sonography*. Invest Radiol, 1997. **32**(1): p. 19-28.
102. Richter, K., et al., *Differentiation of breast lesions by measurements under craniocaudal and lateromedial compression using a new sonographic method*. Invest Radiol, 1996. **31**(7): p. 401-14.
103. Richter, K., *Detection of diffuse breast cancers with a new sonographic method*. J Clin Ultrasound, 1996. **24**(4): p. 157-68.
104. Richter, K. and S.H. Heywang-Kobrunner, *Sonographic differentiation of benign from malignant breast lesions: value of indirect measurement of ultrasound velocity*. AJR Am J Roentgenol, 1995. **165**(4): p. 825-31.
105. Richter, K., W. Rossdeutscher, and M. Hasenpusch, *A new ultrasound method for examination of the breasts*. Biomed Tech (Berl), 1995. **40**(9): p. 241-9.
106. Kapur, A., et al., *Combination of digital mammography with semi-automated 3D breast ultrasound*. Technol Cancer Res Treat, 2004. **3**(4): p. 325-34.
107. Kaiser, W., *MRI of the female breast. First clinical results*. Arch Int Physiol Biochim, 1985. **93**(5): p. 67-76.
108. Kuhl, C.K., et al., *Dynamic breast MR imaging: are signal intensity time course data useful for differential diagnosis of enhancing lesions?* Radiology, 1999. **211**(1): p. 101-10.
109. Lewin, J.M., et al., *Dual-energy contrast-enhanced digital subtraction mammography: feasibility*. Radiology, 2003. **229**(1): p. 261-8.
110. Jong, R.A., et al., *Contrast-enhanced digital mammography: initial clinical experience*. Radiology, 2003. **228**(3): p. 842-50.