

**Achtung: nur Seite 3 verwenden!  
Platzierung im Heft: auf Umschlagseite nach Mantelteil (Der bes. Fall).  
Tangiert Paginierung nicht.**

## Literatur

- 1 American College of Radiology. Breast imaging reporting and data system (BI-RADS). Reston, VA: American College of Radiology, 1993
- 2 American College of Radiology. Breast imaging reporting and data system (BI-RADS). Reston, VA: American College of Radiology, 2003
- 3 American College of Radiology. Breast imaging reporting and data system (BI-RADS). Reston, VA: American College of Radiology, 1998
- 4 Hong AS, Rosen EL, Soo MS, Baker JA. BI-RADS for sonography: positive and negative predictive values of sonographic features. *Am J Roentgenol* 2005; 184: 1260–1265
- 5 Rosen EL, Baker JA, Soo MS. Malignant lesions initially subjected to short-term mammographic follow-up. *Radiology* 2002; 223: 221–228
- 6 Rubin E. Six-month follow-up: an alternative view. *Radiology* 1999; 213: 15–18
- 7 Sickles EA. Probably benign breast lesions: when should follow-up be recommended and what is the optimal follow-up protocol? *Radiology* 1999; 213: 11–14
- 8 Samardar P, de Paredes ES, Grimes MM, Wilson JD. Focal asymmetric densities seen at mammography: US and pathologic correlation. *Radiographics* 2002; 22: 19–33
- 9 Fischer U. Mammographiebefundung nach BI-RADS. Stuttgart: Thieme, 2003
- 10 Berg WA, Campassi C, Langenberg P, Sexton MJ. Breast imaging reporting and data system: inter- and intraobserver variability in feature analysis and final assessment. *Am J Roentgenol* 2000; 174: 1769–1777
- 11 Berg WA, D'Orsi CJ, Jackson VP et al. Does training in the breast imaging reporting and data system (BI-RADS) improve biopsy recommendations or feature analysis agreement with experienced breast imagers at mammography? *Radiology* 2002; 224: 871–880
- 12 Liberman L, Abramson AF, Squires FB et al. The breast imaging reporting and data system: positive predictive value of mammographic features and final assessment categories. *Am J Roentgenol* 1998; 171: 35–40
- 13 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: 168–175
- 14 Vacek PM, Geller BM. A prospective study of breast cancer risk using routine mammographic breast density measurements. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2004; 13: 715–722
- 15 Geller BM, Barlow WE, Ballard-Barbash R et al. Use of the American college of radiology BI-RADS to report on the mammographic evaluation of women with signs and symptoms of breast disease. *Radiology* 2002; 222: 536–542
- 16 Aktuelle Information der AG Mammadiagnostik. *Fortschr Röntgenstr* 2005; 177: 1453
- 17 Berg WA. Rationale for a trial of screening breast ultrasound: American College of Radiology Imaging Network (ACRIN) 6666. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003; 180: 1225–1228
- 18 Berg WA. Supplemental screening sonography in dense breasts. *Radiol Clin N Am* 2004; 42: 845–851
- 19 Ikeda DM, Hylton NM, Kinkel K et al. Development, standardization, and testing of a lexicon for reporting contrast-enhanced breast magnetic resonance imaging studies. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2001; 13: 889–895
- 20 Liberman L, Morris EA, Dershaw DD et al. Ductal enhancement on MR imaging of the breast. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003; 181: 519–525
- 21 Liberman L, Morris EA, Lee MJY et al. Breast lesions detected on MR imaging: features and positive predictive value. *Am J Roentgenol* 2002; 179: 171–178
- 22 Kuhl CK, Mielcareck P, Klaschik S et al. Dynamic breast MR imaging: are signal intensity time course data useful for differential diagnosis of enhancing lesions? *Radiology* 1999; 211: 101–110
- 23 Wolfe JN. Breast patterns as an index of risk for developing breast cancer. *Am J Roentgenol* 1976; 126: 1130–1139
- 24 Mandelson MT, Oesterreicher N, Porter DW et al. Breast density as a predictor of mammographic detection: comparison of interval- and screen-detected cancers. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2000; 92: 1081–1087
- 25 Kopans DB. Sonography should not be used for breast cancer screening until its efficacy has been proven scientifically. *Am J Roentgenol* 2004; 182: 489–491
- 26 Buchberger W, Niehoff A, Obrist P et al. Clinically and mammographically occult breast lesions: detection and classification with high-resolution sonography. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR* 2000; 21: 325–336
- 27 Crystal P, Strano SD, Shcharynski S, Koretz MJ. Using sonography to screen women with mammographically dense breasts. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003; 181: 177–182
- 28 Gordon PB, Goldenberg SL. Malignant breast masses detected only by ultrasound. A retrospective review. *Cancer* 1995; 76: 626–630
- 29 Kaplan SS. Clinical utility of bilateral whole-breast US in the evaluation of women with dense breast tissue. *Radiology* 2001; 221: 641–649
- 30 Kolb TM, Lichy J, Newhouse JH. 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: 165–175
- 31 Leconte I, Feger C, Galant C et al. Mammography and subsequent whole-breast sonography of nonpalpable breast cancers: the importance of radiologic breast density. *Am J Roentgenol* 2003; 180: 1675–1679

- 32 Kerlikowske K, Shepherd J, Creasman J et al. Are breast density and bone mineral density independent risk factors for breast cancer? *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005; 97: 368–374
- 33 Zonderland HM, Pope TL, Nieborg AJ. The positive predictive value of the breast imaging reporting and data system (BI-RADS) as a method of quality assessment in breast imaging in a hospital population. *Eur Radiol* 2004; 14: 1743–1750
- 34 Kerlikowske K, Smith-Bindman R, Ljung BM, Grady D. Evaluation of abnormal mammography results and palpable breast abnormalities. *Ann Intern Med* 2003; 139: 274–284
- 35 Sickles EA. Periodic mammographic follow-up of probably benign lesions: results in 3184 consecutive cases. *Radiology* 1991; 179: 463–468
- 36 Varas X, Leborgne F, Leborgne JH. Nonpalpable, probably benign lesions: role of follow-up mammography. *Radiology* 1992; 184: 409–414
- 37 Lehman C, Holt S, Peacock S et al. Use of the American college of radiology BI-RADS guidelines by community radiologists: concordance of assessments and recommendations assigned to screening mammograms. *Am J Roentgenol* 2002; 179: 15–20
- 38 Yasmeen S, Romano PS, Pettinger M et al. Frequency and predictive value of mammographic recommendation for short-interval follow-up. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2003; 95: 429–436
- 39 Schulz KD, Albert US. Stufe-3-Leitlinie, Brustkrebs-Früherkennung in Deutschland. *Zuckerschwerdt*, 2004
- 40 Kerlikowske K, Smith-Bindman R, Abraham LA et al. Breast cancer yield for screening mammographic examinations with recommendation for short-interval follow-up. *Radiology* 2005; 234: 684–692
- 41 Caplan LS, Blackman D, Nadel M, Monticciolo DL. Coding mammograms using the classification „probably benign finding – short interval follow-up suggested. *Am J Roentgenol* 1999; 172: 339–342
- 42 Monticciolo DL, Caplan LS. The American College of Radiology's BI-RADS 3 classification in a nationwide screening program: current assessment and comparison with earlier use. *Breast J* 2004; 10: 106–110
- 43 Varas X, Leborgne JH, Leborgne F et al. Revisiting the mammographic follow-up of BI-RADS category 3 lesions. *Am J Roentgenol* 2002; 179: 691–695
- 44 Vizcaino I, Gadea L, Andreo L et al. Short-term follow-up results in 795 nonpalpable probably benign lesions detected at screening mammography. *Radiology* 2001; 219: 475–483
- 45 Stomper PC, Leibowich S, Meyer JE. The prevalence and distribution of well-circumscribed nodules on screening mammography: analysis of 1500 mammograms. *Breast Dis* 1991; 4: 197–203
- 46 Sickles EA. Nonpalpable, circumscribed, noncalcified solid breast masses: likelihood of malignancy based on lesion size and age of patient. *Radiology* 1994; 192: 439–442
- 47 Graf O, Helbich TH, Fuchsjaeger MH et al. Follow-up of palpable circumscribed noncalcified solid breast masses at mammography and US: can biopsy be averted? *Radiology* 2004; 233: 850–856
- 48 Baker JA, Kornguth PJ, Floyd CE. Breast imaging reporting and data system standardized mammography lexicon: observer variability in lesion description. *Am J Roentgenol* 1996; 166: 773–778
- 49 Kerlikowske K, Grady D, Barclay J et al. Variability and accuracy in mammographic interpretation using the American college of radiology breast imaging reporting and data system. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1998; 90: 1801–1809
- 50 Pijnappel RM, Peeters PHM, Hendriks JHCL, Mali WPTHM. Reproducibility of mammographic classifications for non-palpable suspect lesions with microcalcifications. *Br J Radiol* 2004; 77: 312–314
- 51 Poplack SP, Tosteson AN, Grove MR et al. Mammography in 53,803 women from the New Hampshire mammography network. *Radiology* 2000; 217: 832–840
- 52 Taplin SH, Ichikawa LE, Kerlikowske K et al. Concordance of breast imaging reporting and data system assessments and management recommendations in screening mammography. *Radiology* 2002; 222: 529–535
- 53 Chen SC, Cheung YC, Su CH et al. Analysis of sonographic features for the differentiation of benign and malignant breast tumors of different sizes. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 2004; 23: 188–193
- 54 Rahbar G, Sie AC, Hansen GC et al. Benign versus malignant solid breast masses: US differentiation. *Radiology* 1999; 213: 889–894
- 55 Stavros AT, Thickman D, Rapp CL et al. Solid breast nodules: use of sonography to distinguish between benign and malignant lesions. *Radiology* 1995; 196: 123–134
- 56 Baker JA, Kornguth PJ, Soo MS et al. Sonography of solid breast lesions: observer variability of lesion description and assessment. *Am J Roentgenol* 1999; 172: 1621–1625
- 57 Mainiero MB, Goldkamp A, Lazarus E et al. Characterization of breast masses with sonography. Can Biopsy of some solid masses be deferred. *J Ultrasound Med* 2005; 24: 161–167
- 58 Perry NM. Quality assurance in the diagnosis of breast disease. *Eur J Cancer* 2001; 37: 159–172

# Erratum

In der Arbeit A. Saleh, K. D. Kurz, U. Mödler: BI-RADS update: Mammographie, Brustultraschall und Kernspinnmammographie der Radiologie up2date, 5. Jahrgang, Dezember 2005, S. 285 – 316, wurden versehentlich die Tabelle 3 sowie die Literaturliste un-

vollständig abgedruckt. Wir bitten diese Fehler zu entschuldigen und drucken hier nochmals die korrekte Tabelle und die fehlenden Literaturverweise ab:

**Tab. 3 BI-RADS-Beurteilungskategorien (assessment categories).** Diese gelten für die Röntgenmammographie, Brustultraschall und Kernspinnmammographie

Beurteilungskategorie	Erklärung	Konsequenz	Abbildungen
0	Beurteilung unvollständig	weitere Bildgebung zur Gesamtbeurteilung erforderlich	
1	negatives Mammogramm	turnusgemäße Früherkennungsmammographie	
2	gutartiger Befund		Abb. 7, 8, 11, 16, 19
3	wahrscheinlich gutartiger Befund	Verlaufskontrolle in kurzem (6 Monate) Intervall	Abb. 9, 17
4a	geringgradig malignomsuspekter Befund	histologische Klärung	Abb. 1, 9
4b	mittelgradig malignomsuspekter Befund	histologische Klärung	Abb. 5, 14
4c	hochgradig malignomsuspekter Befund	histologische Klärung	Abb. 2, 6, 12, 18, 20
5	hochgradiger Verdacht auf Bösartigkeit		Abb. 3, 4, 10, 13, 21, 23, 24
6	histologisch gesichertes Malignom	angemessene Behandlung	

## Literatur

- 59 Baez E, Strathmann K, Vetter M et al. Likelihood of malignancy in breast lesions characterised by ultrasound with a combined diagnostic score. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2005; 31: 179–184
- 60 Orel SG, Kay N, Reynolds C, Sullivan DC. BI-RADS categorization as a predictor of malignancy. *Radiology* 1999; 211: 845–850
- 61 Lacquement MA, Mitchell D, Hollingsworth AB. Positive predictive value of the breast imaging reporting and data system. *J Am Coll Surg* 1999; 189: 34–40
- 62 Tan YY, Wee SB, Tan MPC, Chong BK. Positive predictive value of BI-RADS categorization in an Asian population. *Asian J Surg* 2004; 27: 186–191
- 63 Nunes LW, Schnall MD, Orel SG. Update of breast MR imaging architectural interpretation model. *Radiology* 2001; 219: 484–494
- 64 Daniel BL, Yen YF, Glover GH et al. Breast disease: dynamic spiral MR imaging. *Radiology* 1998; 209: 499–509
- 65 Kuhl CK, Schmutzler RK, Leutner CC et al. Breast MR imaging screening in 192 women proved or suspected to be carriers of a breast cancer susceptibility gene: preliminary results. *Radiology* 2000; 215: 267–279
- 66 Liberman L, Morris EA, Bentson CL et al. Probably benign lesions at breast magnetic resonance imaging. Preliminary experience in high-risk women. *Cancer* 2003; 98: 377–388
- 67 Sadowski EA, Kelcz F. Frequency of malignancy in lesions classified as probably benign after dynamic contrast-enhanced breast MRI examination. *J Magn Reson Imaging* 2005; 21: 556–564
- 68 Stoutjesdijk MJ, Boets C, Jager GJ et al. Magnetic resonance imaging and mammography in women with a hereditary risk of breast cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2001; 93: 1095–1102
- 69 Kriege M, Brekelmans CTM, Boets C et al. Efficacy of MRI and mammography for breast-cancer screening in women with a familial or genetic predisposition. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 351: 427–437