

PET/MRI in Axillary Staging

Subjects: [Radiology](#), [Nuclear Medicine & Medical Imaging](#)

Contributor: Rosa Di Micco

Axillary surgery in breast cancer (BC) is no longer a therapeutic procedure but has become a purely staging procedure. The progressive improvement in imaging techniques has paved the way to the hypothesis that prognostic information on nodal status deriving from surgery could be obtained with an accurate diagnostic exam. Positron emission tomography/magnetic resonance imaging (PET/MRI) is a relatively new imaging tool and its role in breast cancer patients is still under investigation.

breast cancer

PET/MRI

sentinel node biopsy

1. Introduction

Modern diagnostic imaging tools provide an accurate local and systemic staging in order to plan the primary treatment and to tailor the best surgical procedure. Whilst mammography, ultrasound (US) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) represent an excellent option to stage the T, staging the axilla with imaging is still challenging. To date, several studies have demonstrated the limitations of axillary ultrasound (Ax-US); these include the fact that it is an operator-dependent technique, its sensitivity ranges from 23% to 80% and also, it is unable to estimate the true axillary tumor burden ^{[1][2]}. Similarly, other tools such as standard breast MRI ^[3], Positron Emission Mammography (PEM) ^[4], PET/CT ^[5] are not accurate enough to predict axillary stage. On the one hand, two large meta-analyses have shown that Ax-US and selective needle biopsy correctly identifies around 50–55% of node-positive patients ^{[2][6]}. On the other hand, when considering the tumor burden, having abnormal nodes on Ax-US, mammogram and MRI often equates to having only 1–2 positive sentinel nodes that do not always change surgical plans ^{[3][7][8]}. However, the accuracy is not excellent and even when Ax-US identifies fewer than two abnormal nodes, patients are still more likely to have more than three positive nodes ^[9].

At first, axillary surgery had a curative intent and axillary dissection (AD) was always indicated; thereafter, SNB replaced AD and axillary surgery was more intended as a way to derive information on axillary status and plan adjuvant treatments. In fact, historical trials demonstrated no survival advantage in performing AD, and showed that it could cause more complications, long-term morbidities and, indeed, a worse quality of life ^{[10][11][12][13]}. Over time, AD has been progressively abandoned: IBCSG 23-01, ACOSOG Z0011 and AMAROS trials showed no survival advantage in completing AD in cT1-2 tumors with a positive sentinel node ^{[12][13][14]}. In parallel, primary systemic therapy (PST) has started to downstage positive axillae where AD was initially indicated and de-escalate final axillary surgery ^[15].

Considering this gradual switch in the role of axillary surgery from a therapeutic to a staging procedure, the role of imaging has strongly increased. Ideally, in the future, imaging might even replace surgery in the axillary staging of BC patients [16][17], while still providing reliable information to guide medical treatments. Today, systemic therapy is increasingly based on tumor biology rather than on nodal status, and gene expression signatures can also help decide on adjuvant treatment [18]. In this context, achievement of the most accurate preoperative imaging assessment of the axilla, in order to decide the most appropriate treatment for each patient, is an unmet need.

2. The Role of PET/MRI in Breast Cancer

PET/MRI is a relatively new imaging tool, and its field of application is still being studied. It was introduced in 2011 in the USA and UE, offering the potential to combine the specificity obtained by the functional imaging of PET with the superior sensitivity of MRI, and provide relevant information of higher diagnostic accuracy [19]. In particular, the fully integrated PET/MRI system provides a simultaneous imaging acquisition [20].

As regards BC, the application of PET/MRI was studied in four different settings: for preoperative staging at diagnosis, for follow-up staging, to predict the prognosis and the response to therapy (Table 1).

Table 1. Previous studies on PET/MRI in breast cancer patients divided according to the main objective of the exam into four groups: staging, follow-up, prognosis and response to therapy. (Nr.BC/Tot pts.: Number of breast cancer patients/total patients; NA: not available; WB: whole-body PET/MRI; B: breast PET/MRI).

Category Group	Reference	Total Number of Patients Nr. BC/tot. pts. (%)	Study Design	Patient Position	Type of Acquisition	
STAGING	Catalano, O.A., 2013 [21]	35/134 (26.1%)	retrospective	supine	simultaneous	nodal guided and utility swinkel, S.; Schavemaker, M.; Nelemans, P.; de Vries, B.; Beets-Tan, R.G.H.; et al. Routine use of
	Huellner, M.W., 2014 [22]	5/106 (4.8%)	prospective	supine	sequential	
	Drzezga, A., 2012 [23]	3/32 (9.4%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
	Appenzeller, P., 2013 [24]	7/63 (11.1%)	prospective	supine	sequential	
	Wiesmuller, M., 2013 [25]	3/46 (6.5%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
	Kirchner, J., 2018 [26]	38/38 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
	Botsikas, D., 2019 [27]	80/80 (100%)	prospective	WB, prone	sequential	
	Pace, L., 2014 [28]	36/36 (100%)	prospective	B	simultaneous	
	Kong, E., 2014 [29]	42/42 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
	Melsaether, A.N., 2016 [30]	51/51 (100%)	prospective	WB, prone	simultaneous	
	Van Nijnatten, T.J., 2018 [31]	12/12 (100%)	prospective	B	simultaneous	
		36/36 (100%)	retrospective	supine	simultaneous	
		49/49 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
		58/58 (100%)	retrospective	WB, prone	sequential	
		51/51 (100%)	retrospective	B	simultaneous	
		40/40 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
		56/56 (100%)	prospective	prone	simultaneous	
		104/104 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
		154/154 (100%)	prospective	WB, prone	simultaneous	
				B		
				prone		

Category Group	Reference	Total Number of Patients Nr. BC/tot. pts. (%)	Study Design	Patient Position	Type of Acquisition	
	Taneja, S., 2014 [32]			supine		
	Grueneisen, J., 2015 [33]			WB, prone		
	Botsikas, D., 2016 [34]			B		
	Catalano, O.A., 2017 [35]			NA		
	Goorts B., 2017 [36]			prone		
	Kirchner, J., 2020 [37]			supine		
	Bruckmann, N.M., 2020 [38]			WB, prone		
	Bruckmann, N.M., 2021 [39]			B		
FOLLOW-UP	Grueneisen, J., 2017 [40]					
	Sawicki, L.M., 2016 [41]					
	Pujara, A.C., 2016 [42]	36/36 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
	Beiderwellen, K., 2013 [43]	21/21 (100%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous	
	Chandarana, H., 2013 [44]	35/35 (100%)	retrospective	prone	simultaneous	
	Rauscher, I., 2014 [45]	10/70 (14%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous	
	Catalano, O.A., 2015 [46]	10/32 (31.2%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous	
	Raad, R.A., 2016 [47]	4/40 (10%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous	
	Ishii S., 2016 [48]	109/109 (100%)	retrospective	NA	simultaneous	
	Kirchner, J., 2017 [49]	15/208 (7.2%)	retrospective	NA	simultaneous	
	Sonni, I., 2019 [50]	33/123 (26.8%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous	
			2/41 (5%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous
		23/74 (31%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous	
PROGNOSIS	Schiano, C., 2020 [51]	40/217 (18.4%)	retrospective	NA	simultaneous	
	Margolis, N.E., 2016 [52]	12/12 (100%)	prospective	prone	simultaneous	
	Catalano, O.A., 2017 [53]	21/21 (100%)	retrospective	supine	simultaneous	
	Jena, A., 2017 [54]	69/69 (100%)	prospective	WB, prone	simultaneous	
	Jena, A., 2017 [55]	98/98 (100%)	prospective	B	simultaneous	
	Kong, E., 2018 [56]	46/46 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
		50/50 (100%)	prospective	WB, prone	simultaneous	
		46/46 (100%)	prospective	B	simultaneous	
		77/155(49.7%)	prospective	prone	simultaneous	
		56/56 (100%)	prospective	prone	simultaneous	

axilla after a positive sentinel node in breast cancer (EORTC 10981-22023 AMAROS): A randomised, multicentre, open-label, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. Lancet Oncol. 2014, 15, 1303–1310.

1	Category Group	Reference	Total Number of Patients Nr. BC/tot. pts. (%)	Study Design	Patient Position	Type of Acquisition	la, on vs No er and IA 2017,
1		Incoronato, M., 2018 [57]	55/55 (100%)	retrospective	prone	simultaneous	
1		Inglese, M., 2019 [58]	32/32 (100%)	prospective	prone	simultaneous	
1		Incoronato, M., 2019 [59]			supine		C.;
1		Morawitz, J., 2021 [60]			WB, prone		h
1		Murakami, W., 2020 [61]			B		ncet
1		Carmona-Bozo, J.C., 2021 [62]			prone		de- ncol.
1	RESPONSE	Jena, A., 2017 [63]			supine		
1		Wang, J., 2017 [64]	50/50 (100%)	prospective	WB, prone		
1		Romeo, V., 2017 [65]	14/14 (100%)	prospective	B	simultaneous	A new
1		Cho, N., 2018 [66]	4/4 (100%)	prospective	prone	simultaneous	
1		Andreassen, M.M.S., 2020 [67]	26/26 (100%)	prospective	NA	simultaneous	
1			24/24 (100%)	prospective	supine	simultaneous	
1					WB, prone	simultaneous	st
1					B		
1					NA		

planned intergroup sentinel mamma trial. Breast Care 2014, 9, 87–95.

18. Gentilini, O.; Veronesi, U. Staging the Axilla in Early Breast Cancer: Will Imaging Replace Surgery? JAMA Oncol. 2015, 1, 1031–1032.

On the one hand, the advantages of this hybrid diagnostic tool are a lower radiation dose when compared to PET/CT, better inter-observer agreement, a one-stage exam and more accurate detection of brain, bone and liver metastases. On the other hand, PET/MRI is still an expensive and time-consuming imaging method, which is not available everywhere, despite the attractiveness of performing a single exam when both PET and MR imaging are indicated. PET/MRI also exhibits other limitations (i.e., long duration, MR truncation, PET/MRI misregistration, etc.) [68]

20. Ratib, O.; Beyer, T. Whole-body hybrid PET/MRI: Ready for clinical use? Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging 2011, 38, 992–995.

To conclude, the role of PET/MRI in the BC setting is not yet well defined, although it shows good accuracy in BC local and systemic staging and could be considered in both monitoring and predicting the response to PT.

21. Catalano, O.A.; Rosen, B.R.; Sahani, D.V.; Hahn, P.F.; Guimaraes, A.P.; Vangel, M.G.; Nicolai, E.; Soricelli, A.; Salvatore, M. Clinical impact of PET/MR imaging in patients with cancer undergoing same-day PET/CT: Initial experience in 134 patients—A hypothesis—generating exploratory study. Radiology 2013, 269, 857–869.

ongoing and future research on PET/MRI could help clarify its role and establish whether it may represent a useful diagnostic and prognostic tool, or if it needs to be replaced or integrated with other conventional diagnostic tools.

22. Huebner, M.W.; Appenzeller, P.; Kuhn, F.P.; Hushmann, E.; Pietsch, C.M.; Burger, J.A.; Porto, M.; Delso, G.; von Schulthess, G.K.; Veit-Haibach, P. Whole-body nonenhanced PET/MR versus PET/CT in axillary staging and predicting outcomes: Preliminary observations. Radiology 2014, 273, 859–869.

Several studies have investigated the power of PET/MRI in staging the axilla; the results are encouraging but preliminary, due to the small sample size and inhomogeneous study population and design (Table 2).

23. Przezga, A.; Souvatzoglou, M.; Eiber, M.; Beer, A.J.; Fürst, S.; Martinez-Möller, A.; Nekolla, S.G.; Ziegler, S.; Ganter, C.; Rummeny, E.J.; et al. First clinical experience with integrated whole-body

Table 2. PET/MR Comparison to PET/CT in patients with axillary staging diagnoses. (J Nucl Med 2012; 53: 845–855) PET/MRI, B = breast PET/MRI).

Authors	Total Number of Patients	Study Design	Patient Position	Type of Acquisition	Axillary Node Detection Sensitivity	Axillary Node Detection Specificity
Kirchner, J., 2018 [26]	38	prospective	supine WB, prone B	simultaneous	93%	95%
Botsikas, D., 2019 [27]	80	prospective	supine WB, prone B	sequential	0.85 (0.72–0.93)	0.89 (0.82–0.94)
Melsaether, A.N., 2016 [30]	51	prospective	supine	simultaneous	88–100% (CI 69, 97)	95% (CI 88, 98)
Taneja, S., 2014 [32]	36	retrospective	supine WB, prone B	simultaneous	60% on PET, 93.3% on MRI	91% on PET and MRI
Grueneisen, J., 2015 [33]	49	prospective	prone	simultaneous	78% (CI 52, 94)	90% (CI 74, 98)
Botsikas, D., 2016 [34]	58	retrospective	supine WB, prone B	sequential	79%	100%

Comparison of whole-body PET/CT and PET/MRI in breast cancer patients: Lesion detection and quantitation of 18F-deoxyglucose uptake in lesions and in normal organ tissues. Eur. J. Radiol. 2014, 83, 289–296.

4. Conclusions

29. Kong, L.J.; Chai, K.A.; Bom, H.S.; Lee, J.; Lee, S.J.; Cho, I.H. Initial experience of integrated PET/MR mammography in patients with invasive ductal carcinoma. Hell. J. Nucl. Med. 2014, 17, 171–176.

30. Melsaether, A.N.; Raad, R.A.; Pujara, A.C.; Ponzo, F.D.; Pysarenko, K.M.; Jhaveri, K.; Babb, J.S.; Sigmund, E.E.; Kim, S.G.; Moy, L.A. Comparison of Whole-Body (18)F FDG PET/MR Imaging and Whole-Body (18)F FDG PET/CT in Terms of Lesion Detection and MR Imaging in Breast Cancer Patients. J. Nucl. Med. 2016, 57, 193–202.

31. van Nijnatten, T.J.A.; Goorts, B.; Voo, S.; de Boer, M.; Kooreman, L.F.S.; Heuts, E.M.; Wildberger, J.E.; Mottaghy, F.M.; Lobbes, M.B.I.; Smidt, M.L. Added value of dedicated axillary hybrid 18F-FDG PET/MRI for improved axillary nodal staging in clinically node-positive breast cancer patients: A feasibility study. Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging 2018, 45, 179–186.

32. Taneja, S.; Jena, A.; Goel, R.; Sarin, R.; Kaul, S. Simultaneous whole-body 18F-FDG PET-MRI in primary staging of breast cancer: A pilot study. Eur. J. Radiol. 2014, 83, 2231–2239.

33. Grueneisen, J.; Nagarajah, J.; Buchbender, C.; Hoffmann, O.; Schaarschmidt, B.M.; Poeppel, T.; Forsting, M.; Quick, H.H.; Umutlu, L.; Kinner, S. Positron Emission Tomography/Magnetic Resonance Imaging for Local Tumor Staging in Patients With Primary Breast Cancer: A Comparison With Positron Emission Tomography/Computed Tomography and Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Invest. Radiol.* 2015, 50, 505–513.
34. Botsikas, D.; Kalovidouri, A.; Becker, M.; Copercini, M.; Djema, D.A.; Bodmer, A.; Monnier, S.; Becker, C.D.; Montet, X.; Delattre, B.M.; et al. Clinical utility of 18F-FDG-PET/MR for preoperative breast cancer staging. *Eur. Radiol.* 2016, 26, 2297–2307.
35. Catalano, O.A.; Daye, D.; Signore, A.; Iannace, C.; Vangel, M.; Luongo, A.; Catalano, M.; Filomena, M.; Mansi, L.; Soricelli, A.; et al. Staging performance of whole-body DWI, PET/CT and PET/MRI in invasive ductal carcinoma of the breast. *Int. J. Oncol.* 2017, 51, 281–288.
36. Goorts, B.; Vöö, S.; van Nijnatten, T.J.A.; Kooreman, L.F.S.; de Boer, M.; Keymeulen, K.B.M.I.; Aarnoutse, R.; Wildberger, J.E.; Mottaghy, F.M.; Lobbes, M.B.I.; et al. Hybrid. *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2017, 44, 1796–1805.
37. Kirchner, J.; Martin, O.; Umutlu, L.; Herrmann, K.; Bittner, A.K.; Hoffmann, O.; Mohrmann, S.; Gauler, T.; Theurer, S.; Antke, C.; et al. Impact of. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2020, 128, 108975.
38. Bruckmann, N.M.; Sawicki, L.M.; Kirchner, J.; Martin, O.; Umutlu, L.; Herrmann, K.; Fendler, W.; Bittner, A.K.; Hoffmann, O.; Mohrmann, S.; et al. Prospective evaluation of whole-body MRI and. *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2020, 47, 2816–2825.
39. Bruckmann, N.M.; Kirchner, J.; Umutlu, L.; Fendler, W.P.; Seifert, R.; Herrmann, K.; Bittner, A.K.; Hoffmann, O.; Mohrmann, S.; Antke, C.; et al. Prospective comparison of the diagnostic accuracy of 18F-FDG PET/MRI, MRI, CT, and bone scintigraphy for the detection of bone metastases in the initial staging of primary breast cancer patients. *Eur. Radiol.* 2021.
40. Grueneisen, J.; Sawicki, L.M.; Wetter, A.; Kirchner, J.; Kinner, S.; Aktas, B.; Forsting, M.; Ruhlmann, V.; Umutlu, L. Evaluation of PET and MR datasets in integrated 18F-FDG PET/MRI: A comparison of different MR sequences for whole-body restaging of breast cancer patients. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2017, 89, 14–19.
41. Sawicki, L.M.; Grueneisen, J.; Schaarschmidt, B.M.; Buchbender, C.; Nagarajah, J.; Umutlu, L.; Antoch, G.; Kinner, S. Evaluation of ¹⁸F-FDG PET/MRI, ¹⁸F-FDG PET/CT, MRI, and CT in whole-body staging of recurrent breast cancer. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2016, 85, 459–465.
42. Pujara, A.C.; Raad, R.A.; Ponzo, F.; Wassong, C.; Babb, J.S.; Moy, L.; Melsaether, A.N. Standardized Uptake Values from PET/MRI in Metastatic Breast Cancer: An Organ-based Comparison With PET/CT. *Breast J.* 2016, 22, 264–273.
43. Beiderwellen, K.; Gomez, B.; Buchbender, C.; Hartung, V.; Poeppel, T.D.; Nensa, F.; Kuehl, H.; Bockisch, A.; Lauenstein, T.C. Depiction and characterization of liver lesions in whole body [¹⁸F]-

- FDG PET/MRI. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2013, 82, e669–e675.
44. Chandarana, H.; Heacock, L.; Rakheja, R.; DeMello, L.R.; Bonavita, J.; Block, T.K.; Geppert, C.; Babb, J.S.; Friedman, K.P. Pulmonary nodules in patients with primary malignancy: Comparison of hybrid PET/MR and PET/CT imaging. *Radiology* 2013, 268, 874–881.
 45. Rauscher, I.; Eiber, M.; Fürst, S.; Souvatzoglou, M.; Nekolla, S.G.; Ziegler, S.I.; Rummeny, E.J.; Schwaiger, M.; Beer, A.J. PET/MR imaging in the detection and characterization of pulmonary lesions: Technical and diagnostic evaluation in comparison to PET/CT. *J. Nucl. Med.* 2014, 55, 724–729.
 46. Catalano, O.A.; Nicolai, E.; Rosen, B.R.; Luongo, A.; Catalano, M.; Iannace, C.; Guimaraes, A.; Vangel, M.G.; Mahmood, U.; Soricelli, A.; et al. Comparison of CE-FDG-PET/CT with CE-FDG-PET/MR in the evaluation of osseous metastases in breast cancer patients. *Br. J. Cancer* 2015, 112, 1452–1460.
 47. Raad, R.A.; Friedman, K.P.; Heacock, L.; Ponzo, F.; Melsaether, A.; Chandarana, H. Outcome of small lung nodules missed on hybrid PET/MRI in patients with primary malignancy. *J. Magn. Reson. Imaging* 2016, 43, 504–511.
 48. Ishii, S.; Shima, D.; Hara, T.; Miyajima, M.; Kikuchi, K.; Takawa, M.; Kumamoto, K.; Ito, H.; Shishido, F. Comparison of integrated whole-body PET/MR and PET/CT: Is PET/MR alternative to PET/CT in routine clinical oncology? *Ann. Nucl. Med.* 2016, 30, 225–233.
 49. Kirchner, J.; Sawicki, L.M.; Deuschl, C.; Grüneisen, J.; Beiderwellen, K.; Lauenstein, T.C.; Herrmann, K.; Forsting, M.; Heusch, P.; Umutlu, L. 18 F-FDG PET/MR imaging in patients with suspected liver lesions: Value of liver-specific contrast agent Gadobenate dimeglumine. *PLoS ONE* 2017, 12, e0180349.
 50. Sonni, I.; Minamimoto, R.; Baratto, L.; Gambhir, S.S.; Loening, A.M.; Vasanawala, S.S.; Igaru, A. Simultaneous PET/MRI in the Evaluation of Breast and Prostate Cancer Using Combined Na [18 F] F and [18 F] FDG: A Focus on Skeletal Lesions. *Mol. Imaging Biol.* 2019, 22, 397–406.
 51. Schiano, C.; Franzese, M.; Pane, K.; Garbino, N.; Soricelli, A.; Salvatore, M.; de Nigris, F.; Napoli, C. Hybrid. *Cancers* 2019, 11, 1444.
 52. Margolis, N.E.; Moy, L.; Sigmund, E.E.; Freed, M.; McKellop, J.; Melsaether, A.N.; Kim, S.G. Assessment of Aggressiveness of Breast Cancer Using Simultaneous 18F-FDG-PET and DCE-MRI: Preliminary Observation. *Clin. Nucl. Med.* 2016, 41, e355–e361.
 53. Catalano, O.A.; Horn, G.L.; Signore, A.; Iannace, C.; Lepore, M.; Vangel, M.; Luongo, A.; Catalano, M.; Lehman, C.; Salvatore, M.; et al. PET/MR in invasive ductal breast cancer: Correlation between imaging markers and histological phenotype. *Br. J. Cancer* 2017, 116, 893–902.

54. Jena, A.; Taneja, S.; Singh, A.; Negi, P.; Sarin, R.; Das, P.K.; Singhal, M. Reliability of 18 F-FDG PET Metabolic Parameters Derived Using Simultaneous PET/MRI and Correlation With Prognostic Factors of Invasive Ductal Carcinoma: A Feasibility Study. *AJR Am. J. Roentgenol.* 2017, 209, 662–670.
55. Jena, A.; Taneja, S.; Singh, A.; Negi, P.; Mehta, S.B.; Sarin, R. Role of pharmacokinetic parameters derived with high temporal resolution DCE MRI using simultaneous PET/MRI system in breast cancer: A feasibility study. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2017, 86, 261–266.
56. Kong, E.; Chun, K.A.; Bae, Y.K.; Cho, I.H. Integrated PET/MR mammography for quantitative analysis and correlation to prognostic factors of invasive ductal carcinoma. *Q. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2018, 62, 118–126.
57. Incoronato, M.; Grimaldi, A.M.; Cavaliere, C.; Inglese, M.; Mirabelli, P.; Monti, S.; Ferbo, U.; Nicolai, E.; Soricelli, A.; Catalano, O.A.; et al. Relationship between functional imaging and immunohistochemical markers and prediction of breast cancer subtype: A PET/MRI study. *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2018, 45, 1680–1693.
58. Inglese, M.; Cavaliere, C.; Monti, S.; Forte, E.; Incoronato, M.; Nicolai, E.; Salvatore, M.; Aiello, M. A multi-parametric PET/MRI study of breast cancer: Evaluation of DCE-MRI pharmacokinetic models and correlation with diffusion and functional parameters. *NMR Biomed.* 2019, 32, e4026.
59. Incoronato, M.; Grimaldi, A.M.; Mirabelli, P.; Cavaliere, C.; Parente, C.A.; Franzese, M.; Staibano, S.; Ilardi, G.; Russo, D.; Soricelli, A.; et al. Circulating miRNAs in Untreated Breast Cancer: An Exploratory Multimodality Morpho-Functional Study. *Cancers* 2019, 11, 876.
60. Morawitz, J.; Kirchner, J.; Martin, O.; Bruckmann, N.M.; Dietzel, F.; Li, Y.; Rischpler, C.; Herrmann, K.; Umutlu, L.; Bittner, A.K.; et al. Prospective Correlation of Prognostic Immunohistochemical Markers With SUV and ADC Derived From Dedicated Hybrid Breast 18F-FDG PET/MRI in Women With Newly Diagnosed Breast Cancer. *Clin. Nucl. Med.* 2021, 46, 201–205.
61. Murakami, W.; Tozaki, M.; Sasaki, M.; Hida, A.I.; Ohi, Y.; Kubota, K.; Sagara, Y. Correlation between. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2020, 123, 108773.
62. Carmona-Bozo, J.C.; Manavaki, R.; Woitek, R.; Torheim, T.; Baxter, G.C.; Caracò, C.; Provenzano, E.; Graves, M.J.; Fryer, T.D.; Patterson, A.J.; et al. Hypoxia and perfusion in breast cancer: Simultaneous assessment using PET/MR imaging. *Eur. Radiol.* 2021, 31, 333–344.
63. Jena, A.; Taneja, S.; Singh, A.; Negi, P.; Mehta, S.B.; Ahuja, A.; Singhal, M.; Sarin, R. Association of pharmacokinetic and metabolic parameters derived using simultaneous PET/MRI: Initial findings and impact on response evaluation in breast cancer. *Eur. J. Radiol.* 2017, 92, 30–36.
64. Wang, J.; Shih, T.T.; Yen, R.F. Multiparametric Evaluation of Treatment Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer Using Integrated PET/MR. *Clin. Nucl. Med.* 2017, 42, 506–513.

65. Romeo, V.; D'Aiuto, M.; Frasci, G.; Imbriaco, M.; Nicolai, E. Simultaneous PET/MRI assessment of response to cytotoxic and hormone neo-adjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer: A preliminary report. *Med. Oncol.* 2017, 34, 18.
66. Cho, N.; Im, S.A.; Cheon, G.J.; Park, I.A.; Lee, K.H.; Kim, T.Y.; Kim, Y.S.; Kwon, B.R.; Lee, J.M.; Suh, H.Y.; et al. Integrated. *Eur. J. Nucl. Med. Mol. Imaging* 2018, 45, 328–339.
67. Andreassen, M.M.S.; Goa, P.E.; Sjøbakk, T.E.; Hedayati, R.; Eikesdal, H.P.; Deng, C.; Østlie, A.; Lundgren, S.; Bathen, T.F.; Jerome, N.P. Semi-automatic segmentation from intrinsically-registered 18F-FDG-PET/MRI for treatment response assessment in a breast cancer cohort: Comparison to manual DCE-MRI. *MAGMA* 2020, 33, 317–328.
68. Martinez-Möller, A.; Eiber, M.; Nekolla, S.G.; Souvatzoglou, M.; Drzezga, A.; Ziegler, S.; Rummeny, E.J.; Schwaiger, M.; Beer, A.J. Workflow and scan protocol considerations for integrated whole-body PET/MRI in oncology. *J. Nucl. Med.* 2012, 53, 1415–1426.

Retrieved from <https://encyclopedia.pub/entry/history/show/32363>