



e-ISSN: 2319-8753 | p-ISSN: 2347-6710

IJIRSET

International Journal of Innovative Research in
SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

Volume 11, Issue 11, November 2022

ISSN INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA

Impact Factor: 8.118

9940 572 462

6381 907 438

ijirset@gmail.com

www.ijirset.com



Artificial Intelligence in Mammographic Phenotyping of Breast Cancer Risk

Sneha M. Patil, Dr.Parikshit N. Mahalle, Dr.Gitanjali R. Shinde

Asst. Professor, SKNCOE, Vadgaon Bk, Pune, India

H.O.D AI&DS, VIIT COE, Pune, India

Asso. Professor, VIIT COE, Pune, India

ABSTRACT: The large retrospective studies including racially diverse breast cancer screening populations, different mammographic imaging machines and various image acquisition settings are very important. The practical clinical considerations Adoption of AI (for example, IT infrastructure, healthcare workforce, technical integration into the clinic workflow and interaction of radiologists with AI), cost effectiveness, and various ethical and legal dilemmas AI must be addressed before it becomes commonplace in breast cancer risk assessment .Since it is based on retrospective scan data, often underrepresents certain minority groups, and may contain biases, AI potentially exaggerating existing inequalities for racial groups that already exist carries a high disease burden.

Keyword: mammographic, AI, breast cancer risk assessment, digital breast tomosynthesis

I. INTRODUCTION

Mammographic screening is associated with a reduction in breast cancer mortality and mortality. Additional efforts to improve the results of breast cancer screening focused on strengthening the test intervals and reading formats. Improvements to Breast cancer risk assessment algorithms with image-based data capture capabilities are helpful balance damages and profits with better reporting to test algorithms. A complex landscape of mammographic experiments offers several opportunities for integration development implantation of computational imaging phenotyping of breast tissue. The radiomic AI has shown great potential in improve breast cancer risk assessment and potential, patient outcomes. Recently, a list of computer tools developed to convert mammographic images into phenotypic features of computational Artificial Intelligence (AI). The public has been aware of the ongoing AI transformation by introducing in-depth study-based convolutional neural networks (CNNs). These DL-based CNNs not only increased image use in speculative models but also filled breast cancer testing as one of the most promising computer programs breast imaging tools.

II. RELATED WORK

The "spirit of change" of AI in medical imaging computers AI is an umbrella term that combines variety mechanization methods mimic human decision-making. Machine learning (ML) falls under a large AI class and encompasses all available methods allow computers to learn from the extruded features examples of training without those features become obvious programmed. Examples of ML approaches include: regression, support vector machines, random forest classifiers, k-nearest neighbour algorithms and artificial neural networks (ANN). In contrast, supervised machine learning the methods train algorithms to classify data or predict results using pre-labelled datasets.

In general, the development of DL models is a large volume of data for training, validation and testing with various imaging studies reporting logarithmic trends between model performance and data sample size. The development of crucial DL algorithms and training has made DL mainstream in the world. The medical image computing, including applications that evaluates mammographic imaging data for breast cancer risk evaluation. AI studies showing robust and reproducible breast density assessment for advanced risk estimation the most commonly used method to assess breast density in the clinical setting is visual and subjective.

Grading of breast density by a translator radiologist one of the 4 categories determined by the American College of Radiology (ACR) Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System (BI-RADS) .However, the inter-reader and inter-reader there is variability in the assignment of breast density with κ statistics, particularly among less experienced readers. The dense tissue area relative to the entire breast area (BI-RADS fourth edition, 2003), but recently (BI-RADS fifth edition, 2013), categories longer defined by percent density, but rather the potential to mask cancers with dense breast tissue.



Despite the great differences between readers. It is a common approach to use BI-RADS density assessments as the gold standard in AI density models, mainly due to the lack of large datasets with baseline accuracy density estimates. Moreover, study showed the difference between random sampling and equal sampling in each of the four BI-RADS categories, the format of the FFDM images in the training set is different from: that of the FFDM images in the evaluation set.

Recently, it could be an important step Toward BI-RADS breast density assessment with AI, research focused on exploiting domain customization Approaches to create DL models using 2D synthetics reconstructed mammographic (SM) images from DBT purchases where the adapted model is in good agreement with the BI-RADS density classification from the SM images of radiologists (four classes $F=0.72-0.79$).

Additional new directions in this field include: as well as cutting-edge DL architectures, federated learning shared by participating institutions model weights among themselves instead of actual weights. The purpose of the second approach is to educate and refine DL models with large multi-institution cohorts.

In addition, BI-RADS intensity evaluations of radiologists both the risk of developing breast cancer and masking risk in a single density assessment components are two different tasks.

Therefore, an important task to provide quantitative continuous measurements of breast density to predict breast cancer risk for AI and to predict the masking potential of cancers to areas of increased density.

FFDM images from a single vendor site that may limit their ability to generalize to various domains breast cancer screening populations.

Artificial intelligence advances in direct breast cancer risk assessment with mammographic images among the first to discover the potential of DL in the breast cancer risk assessment, Kallenberg et al. (Using a simple classifier, the authors showed Without further tweaking the mammogram images, features in the first fully connected layer can effectively distinguish the healthy ones of the model controls from both high-risk groups ($AUC=0.83$ and $AUC=0.82$ for BRCA1/2 gene mutation carriers and unilateral breast cancer patients, respectively).

Interpretability is also key to advancing AI applications in breast cancer risk assessment.

Interpretability approaches are growing rapidly, unique opportunities for AI applications in mammographic images.

III. CONCLUSION

Rise and prevalence of artificial intelligence in breast cancer screening poised to improve breastcancer risk assessmentand enable personalized browsing suggestions.

However, many technical challenges associated with the inherent features of mammographic imagingremain unresolvedespecially artificial intelligence developments,digital breast tomosynthesis. Also, to speed upValidation of AI breast cancer risk models and theirtransition to clinical practicesare very important thereproducibility, interpretability androbustness using large heterogeneous datasets. WithCreative AI solutions to improve accuracy, validate performance and improve confidence in decisionmaking, AIChange how breast cancer screening is done.

REFERENCES

- [1] Marmot MG, Altman DG, Cameron DA, et al. The benefits and harms of breast cancer screening: an independent review. *Br J Cancer* 2013; 108:2205–40.
- [2] Hanley JA, Hannigan A, O'Brien KM. Mortality reductions due to mammography screening: contemporary population-based data. *PLoS One* 2017; 12:e0188947.
- [3] Houssami N, Hunter K. The epidemiology, radiology and biological characteristics of interval breast cancers in population mammography screening. *NPJ Breast Cancer* 2017; 3:12.
- [4] Baré M, Torà N, Salas D, et al. Mammographic and clinical characteristics of different phenotypes of screen-detected and interval breast cancers in a nationwide screening program. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2015; 154:403–15.
- [5] Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Breast screen Australia monitoring report 2020. Canberra, 2020.
- [6] Rodriguez-Ruiz A, Lång K, Gubern-Merida A, et al. Stand-Alone artificial intelligence for breast cancer detection in mammography: comparison with 101 radiologists. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2019;111:djy222:916–22.
- [7] Harvey H, Karpati E, Khara G, et al. The role of deep learning in breast screening. *Curr Breast Cancer Rep* 2019;11:17–22.
- [8] Crouch B. Shortage of radiologists pushing out breast scan result times for patients. *The Advertiser*, 2018 October 24, 2018.
- [9] The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Radiologists. 2016 RANZCR clinical radiology workforce census report: Australia. Sydney, NSW, 2018.



- [10] Lotter W, Diab AR, Haslam B, et al. Robust breast cancer detection in mammography and digital breast tomosynthesis using an annotation-efficient deep learning approach. *Nat Med* 2021;27:244–9.
- [11] McKinney SM, Sieniek M, Godbole V, et al. International evaluation of an AI system for breast cancer screening. *Nature* 2020;577:89–94.
- [12] Salim M, Wählin E, Dembrower K, et al. External evaluation of 3 commercial artificial intelligence algorithms for independent assessment of screening mammograms. *JAMA Oncol* 2020;6:1581–8.
- [13] Houssami N, Kirkpatrick-Jones G, Noguchi N, et al. Artificial intelligence (AI) for the early detection of breast cancer: a scoping review to assess AI's potential in breast screening practice. *Expert Rev Med Devices* 2019;16:351–62.
- [14] Leeflang MMG, Rutjes AWS, Reitsma JB, et al. Variation of a test's sensitivity and specificity with disease prevalence. *CMAJ* 2013;185:E537–44.
- [15] Park SH. Diagnostic case-control versus diagnostic cohort studies for clinical validation of artificial intelligence algorithm performance. *Radiology* 2019;290:272–3.
- [16] Lee CI, Elmore JG. Artificial intelligence for breast cancer imaging: the new frontier? *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2019;111:djy223.
- [17] Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. *BreastScreen Australia data dictionary version 1.2*, 2019.
- [18] Rutter CM, Gatsonis CA. A hierarchical regression approach to meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy evaluations. *Stat Med* 2001;20:2865–84.
- [19] Oakden-Rayner L, Palmer L. Docs are ROCs: a simple off-the-shelf approach for estimating average human performance in diagnostic studies. *arXiv* 2020.
- [20] Macaskill P, Walter SD, Irwig L, et al. Assessing the gain in diagnostic performance when combining two diagnostic tests. *Stat Med* 2002;21:2527–46.



INNO SPACE
SJIF Scientific Journal Impact Factor
Impact Factor: 8.118



ISSN INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 **9940 572 462**  **6381 907 438**  **ijirset@gmail.com**



www.ijirset.com

Scan to save the contact details