



# CHARACTERIZING THE CLUSTERED MAMMOGRAPHIC MICROCALCIFICATIONS USING ARTIFICIAL NEURAL NETWORK

Karthika A<sup>1</sup>, Dr.S.Kavitha<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ME-Applied Electronics, <sup>2</sup>PROFESSOR & DEAN/ECE

Nandha Engineering College, Erode-52.

**Abstract— Goal:** The presence of microcalcification clusters is a primary sign of breast cancer; however, it is difficult and time consuming for radiologists to classify microcalcifications as malignant or benign. In this paper, a novel method for the classification of microcalcification clusters in mammograms is proposed. **Methods:** The topology/connectivity of individual microcalcifications is analyzed within a cluster using multiscale morphology. This is distinct from existing approaches that tend to concentrate on the morphology of individual microcalcifications and/or global (statistical) cluster features. A set of microcalcification graphs are generated to represent the topological structure of microcalcification clusters at different scales. Subsequently, graph theoretical features are extracted, which constitute the topological feature space for modeling and classifying microcalcification clusters. Artificial Neural Network based classifiers are employed for classifying microcalcification clusters. **Results:** The validity of the proposed method is evaluated using two well-known digitized datasets (MIAS and DDSM) and a full-field digital dataset. High classification accuracies (up to 96%) and good ROC results (area under the ROC curve up to 0.96) are achieved. A full comparison with related publications is provided, which includes a direct comparison. **Conclusion:** The results indicate that the proposed approach is able to outperform the current state-of-the-art methods. **Significance:** This study shows that topology modeling is an important tool for microcalcification analysis not only because of the improved classification accuracy but also because the topological measures can be linked to clinical understanding.

**Index Terms**—Classification, graphs, mammography, microcalcifications, topology.

## INTRODUCTION

BREAST cancer is currently the most common cancer affecting women worldwide [1]. In European women, it is the leading cause of cancer death, causing one in six of all deaths from cancers [2]. In the U.S., a woman has a 12.15% (about one in eight) risk of developing breast cancer during her lifetime [3].

Mammography is one of the most reliable and effective methods for detecting breast cancer at its early stages [4]. In developed countries, population-based mammography screening programs have been implemented [1]. Women are encouraged to participate in regular breast examinations through mammography. In the U.S., annual mammographic screening is recommended for women at normal risk, beginning at age 40 [5]. In the U.K., women aged between 50 and 70 years are invited for breast screening every three years [6].




Fig. 1. Example microcalcification clusters: malignant (top row) and benign (bottom row). First column: mammographic image patches; second column: manual annotations; third column: automatic detections [16]; fourth column: dilated microcalcifications using a disk-shaped structuring element (radius equal to 6 pixels)

Microcalcifications are small deposits of calcium salts within breast tissue that appear as small bright spots in mammograms [7]–[10]. The presence of microcalcification clusters is a primary sign of breast cancer. The radiological definition of a microcalcification cluster is an area of 1 cm<sup>2</sup> that contains, in general, no fewer than three microcalcifications [10], [11]. The spatial resolution of mammography is very high (normally in the range of 40–100  $\mu$ m per pixel), and therefore, mammography enables the detection of microcalcifications at an early stage. However, not all microcalcification clusters necessarily indicate the presence of cancer, only certain kinds of microcalcifications are associated with a high probability of malignancy [12], [13]. The first column

of Fig. 1 shows two mammographic image patches taken from the Mammographic Image Analysis Society (MIAS) database [14], containing a malignant microcalcification cluster and a benign microcalcification cluster, respectively. In clinical practice, it is difficult and time consuming for radiologists to distinguish malignant from benign microcalcifications. This results in a high rate of unnecessary biopsy examinations [9], [11]. In order to improve the diagnostic accuracy of radiologists interpreting microcalcifications in

mammograms, computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) systems have been applied to reduce the false positive rate (FPR) while maintaining sensitivity [9], [15].

Many methods for CAD of microcalcifications in mammograms have been proposed [9], [17]. A variety of features have been studied in the literature to characterize microcalcifications and classify these abnormalities into malignant and benign, such as shape, morphological, cluster, intensity-based, and texture features [9], [17]. Early research showed how the morphological characteristics of microcalcifications could be used to differentiate between malignant and benign cases [18]. The shape and morphological features are mainly extracted from individual microcalcifications and describe the morphological characteristics of individual microcalcifications, such as roughness, size, and shape [7], [10], [19]–[21]. Complementary to the shape and morphological features, cluster features concentrate on the global properties of microcalcification clusters [8], [15], [20], [22]–[25]. Some were used to describe the morphology of microcalcification clusters, such as cluster area, cluster perimeter, cluster diameter, cluster circularity, cluster eccentricity, and cluster elongation. Others were intended to capture the spatial distribution of individual microcalcifications within a cluster, such as average and standard deviation of distances

between microcalcifications. In addition, a novel model-based method was presented to reconstruct and analyze microcalcification clusters in 3-D from two mammographic views [26].

Although a broad variety of techniques for CAD of breast cancer have been developed in the past two decades, some of which have achieved a high sensitivity and specificity for specific abnormalities, the automatic and accurate classification of microcalcification abnormalities as malignant or benign remains a challenge due to their inherent nature; furthermore, most of the existing approaches have their own specific disadvantages. First, for the approaches based on the shape/morphology of individual microcalcifications [7], [10], informative features cannot be attained when microcalcifications are very small (occupying only a few pixels) so that it seems meaningless to analyze the shape/morphological properties of such small objects. Second, microcalcifications may have very low contrast with respect to the surrounding tissue especially when microcalcifications form within dense tissue which has high and homogeneous intensity. As such, the lack of useful texture information within the background region affects the capability of the approaches based on the intensity variations and texture features [8], [27]. In addition, for the approaches describing the spatial distribution of microcalcifications within a cluster, the global cluster

Features were computed based on a fixed resolution, and the distance-based features rely on the original spatial resolution of mammography. This results in a lack of robustness and adaptiveness to different spatial resolutions of mammograms in particular screen-film mammograms acquired by different digitizers

According to some studies on the evaluation of breast microcalcifications, malignant microcalcifications tend to be small, numerous ( $>5$  per focus within  $1 \text{ cm}^2$ ) and densely distributed because they lie within the milk ducts and associated structures in the breast and follow the ductal anatomy [12], [13], [28]. However, benign microcalcifications are generally larger, smaller in number ( $<4-5$  per  $1 \text{ cm}^2$ ) and more diffusely distributed as these microcalcifications arise within the breast stroma, benign cysts or benign masses [12], [13], [28]. These differences result in variations in the distribution and closeness of microcalcifications within the clusters and provide radiologists with information which enables decisions regarding the need for further assessment and possible breast biopsy. Hence, we

propose a novel method for modeling and classifying microcalcification clusters in mammograms based on their topological properties. The topology of microcalcification clusters is analyzed at multiple scales using a graph-based representation of their topological structure. This method is distinct from existing approaches that mainly concentrate on the morphology of individual microcalcifications and only compute the distance-based cluster features at a fixed scale. In this method, a set of topological features are extracted from microcalcification graphs at multiple scales, and a multiscale topological feature vector is subsequently generated to discriminate between malignant and benign cases.

A preliminary version of this study has been reported in [29], where the idea of analyzing microcalcification clusters using their topological structure is initially investigated based on a small number of cases. In this paper, the evaluation has been

extended by including additional data (from several databases). We have also investigated the effect of variation in microcalcification segmentation, the dataset size, the individual significance of eight graph metrics for malignancy diagnosis, and a direct comparison with state-of-the-art methods.

## II. DATA

The data used in the experiments consist of three datasets, which are composed of image patches of different cases (taken from different mammograms). The first dataset was taken from the MIAS database [14], containing 20 image patches with the same size of  $512 \times 512$  pixels. The mammograms were digitized to  $50 \mu\text{m}$  per pixel with a linear optical density in the range 0–3.2. The second dataset was extracted from the digital database for screening mammography (DDSM) database [30], containing 300 image patches with varied sizes (the average size of these image patches is  $482 \times 450$  pixels). The mammograms in the DDSM database were digitized by one of four different scanners: DBA M2100 ImageClear ( $42 \mu\text{m}$  per pixel, 16 bits), Howtek 960 ( $43.5 \mu\text{m}$  per pixel, 12 bits), Lumisys 200 Laser ( $50 \mu\text{m}$  per pixel, 12 bits), and Howtek MultiRad850 ( $43.5 \mu\text{m}$  per pixel, 12 bits). In contrast to the first two datasets, the third dataset contains 25 full-field digital image patches extracted from a nonpublic mammographic database. These mammograms were acquired using a HologicSelenia mammography unit, with a resolution of  $70 \mu\text{m}$  per pixel and a depth of 12 bits. The size of these image patches also varies and

the average size is  $352 \times 301$  pixels. In this study, all microcalcifications in each image patch are considered to be part of a single microcalcification cluster. The diagnostic gold standard (benign or malignant) of all microcalcification clusters in this study has been provided by biopsy: there are nine malignant and 11 benign clusters in the MIAS dataset, 141 malignant and 159 benign clusters in the DDSM dataset, and 14 malignant and 11 benign clusters in the Digital dataset, respectively.

The proposed method works on binary images where 0s stand for “normal” tissue and 1s represent microcalcifications that can be automatically detected by an automatic detection approach or manually annotated by experts. The approach developed by Oliver et al. [16] for automatic detection of microcalcifications is applied to the three datasets (the original work by Oliver et al. [16] showed better results for digital data when compared to digitized data). For the MIAS dataset, in addition to automatic detection, the exact location of individual microcalcifications was manually annotated by an expert (each microcalcification in every image patch was labeled and segmented from the surrounding tissue). The manual annotations and the automatic detection results of the example microcalcification clusters are shown in the second and third columns of Fig. 1, respectively. It appears that the automatic detection approach tends to

undersegment individual

microcalcifications, such that the pixels close to the boundaries of individual microcalcifications are lost.

### III. METHODOLOGY

We propose to investigate the potential correlation between the topology of microcalcification clusters and their pathological type. We construct a series of microcalcification graphs to describe the topological structure of microcalcification clusters at different scales. A set of graph theoretical features are extracted from these graphs for modeling and classifying microcalcification clusters. The proposed methodology consists of four main phases: estimating the connectivity between microcalcifications within a cluster using morphological dilation at multiple scales; generating a microcalcification graph at each scale based on the spatial connectivity relationship between

microcalcifications; extracting multiscale topological features from these microcalcification graphs; and using the extracted features to build classifier models of malignant and benign microcalcification clusters. The framework of our methodology is summarized in Fig. 2. All image analysis development work was done within MATLAB 7.8.0.

#### A. Connectivity Estimation Using Morphological Dilation

Morphological dilation [31] is performed on each




Fig. 2. Methodology framework for topology-based modeling and classifying malignant and benign microcalcification clusters in mammograms. The scales shown are  $s = 1, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64$  displayed left-to-right and top-to-bottom.

individual microcalcification using a disk-shaped structuring element at multiple scales. Here, the scale corresponds to the radius of the structuring element measured in pixels. The effect of multiscale morphological dilation on a microcalcification cluster is shown in Fig. 2. It can be seen that the multiscale morphological dilation continuously absorbs neighboring pixels into individual microcalcifications resulting in a change in the connectivity between microcalcifications within the cluster. To illustrate the connectivity of microcalcification clusters with respect to malignant and benign cases, the morphological dilation results of the two example microcalcification clusters are shown in the fourth column of Fig. 1, where the radius of the structuring element is equal to 6 pixels (i.e., scale = 6). The boundaries of dilated microcalcifications are displayed using different colors and each individual microcalcification is labeled with a sequential number which is ordered according to the spatial location of the corresponding microcalcification in the image patch. As indicated in Section I, the malignant cluster contains a larger number of microcalcifications that are located more closely together within the cluster, while the benign cluster contains fewer microcalcifications that are more

diffusely distributed within the cluster.

### B. Microcalcification Graph Generation

We propose to represent the topology of microcalcification clusters in graph form. A microcalcification graph is generated based on the spatial connectivity relationship between microcalcifications within a cluster. In a microcalcification graph, each node represents an individual microcalcification, and an edge between two nodes is created if the two corresponding microcalcifications are connected or overlap in the 2-D image plane. The resulting microcalcification graphs corresponding to the two example microcalcification clusters in Fig. 1 are shown in Fig. 3. The node locations in these two graphs are in accordance with the original spatial distribution of microcalcifications within the two clusters, and the node sequences are consistent with those in Fig. 1, which are sorted in a left-to-right and bottom-to-top direction (but alternative directions provide the same performance for the subsequent processing). As shown in Fig. 3, the connectivity of the microcalcification cluster increases from small to large scales and the corresponding microcalcification graph becomes denser and denser (more and more




Fig. 3. Microcalcification graphs of the example malignant cluster (top row) and benign cluster (bottom row) in Fig. 1 generated at three scales based on the connectivity of the dilated cluster at these scales. The node colors and sequences are consistent with the corresponding microcalcifications in Fig. 1.



edges are created in the graph).

### C. Multiscale Topological Feature Extraction

After generating microcalcification graphs over a range of scales, a set of graph theoretical features can be extracted to capture the topological properties of microcalcification clusters. These features will constitute the feature space for the classification of malignant and benign clusters. Before extracting the topological features of microcalcification clusters, we first provide the following definitions for general graphs. Further definitions for graphs can be found in [32]. Here, we use  $G(V, E)$  to represent a graph, where  $V$  is the vertex set and  $E$  is the edge set, and use  $|V|$  (the cardinality of  $V$ ) and  $|E|$  (the cardinality of  $E$ ) to denote the number of vertices and the number of edges in  $G$ , respectively.  $G_{\text{conn}}$  denotes the subgraph of  $G$  that corresponds to the largest connected component.

**Definition 1:** The adjacency matrix  $A(i, j)$  of a graph  $G(V, E)$  is a  $|V| \times |V|$  matrix, defined as

$$A(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } (i, j) \in E \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Where  $(i, j) \in E$  indicates  $(i, j)$  is an edge, i.e., there is an edge between vertex  $i$  and vertex  $j$  in  $G$ .

**Definition 2:** The degree matrix  $D(i, j)$  of a graph  $G(V, E)$  is a  $|V| \times |V|$  diagonal matrix containing the degree of vertex  $i$  at entry  $(i, i)$ , defined as

$$D(i, j) = \begin{cases} d(i), & \text{if } i = j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

**Definition 3:** The Laplacian matrix of a graph  $G(V, E)$ , denoted by  $L(i, j)$ , is defined as the difference between the degree matrix and the adjacency matrix, given by

$$L(i, j) = D - A = \begin{cases} d(i), & \text{if } i = j \\ -1, & \text{if } (i, j) \in E \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

**Definition 4:** The normalized Laplacian matrix of a graph  $G(V, E)$ , denoted by  $L(i, j)$ , is defined as the normalized version of the Laplacian matrix of  $G$ , given by

TABLE I

GRAPH METRICS INVESTIGATED FOR MALIGNANCY ANALYSIS OF MICROCALCIFICATION CLUSTERS ALONG WITH THEIR DEFINITIONS AND CLINICAL INTERPRETATIONS

| No. | Metric                          | Definition                                  | Clinical Interpretation  |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 1   | Number of Subgraphs             | $k$ (See Definition 4)                      | Malignant clusters tend to have a higher number of microcalcifications and therefore their corresponding graphs contain a higher number of subgraphs at smaller scales |
| 2   | Average Vertex Degree           | $\sum_{i \in V} d(i) /  V $                 | Malignant microcalcifications appear to be more densely distributed within a cluster and therefore malignant clusters generally have a larger average vertex degree    |
| 3   | Maximum Vertex Degree           | $\max_{i \in V} d(i)$                       | Malignant microcalcifications appear to be more connected in a cluster and therefore malignant clusters tend to have a larger maximum vertex degree                    |
| 4   | Average Vertex Eccentricity     | $\sum_{i \in V} e(i) /  V $                 | Malignant clusters tend to have a linear distribution and therefore have larger eccentricity values  |
| 5   | Diameter                        | $\max_{i \in V} e(i)$                       | Malignant clusters tend to have a linear topology and therefore have longer diameters  |
| 6   | Average Clustering Coefficient  | $\sum_{i \in V} c(i) /  V $                 | Malignant microcalcifications tend to be more connected in a cluster and therefore malignant clusters have a higher average clustering coefficient                     |
| 7   | Giant Connected Component Ratio | $\frac{ V \in G_{\text{conn}} }{ V \in G }$ | Malignant microcalcifications tend to be more closely grouped and therefore malignant clusters have a higher giant connected component ratio                           |
| 8   | Percentage of Isolated Points   | $ X  /  V $                                 | Malignant microcalcifications tend to be more densely distributed and therefore malignant clusters tend to have a smaller percentage of isolated points                |

$$\mathcal{L}(i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j \text{ and } d(i) \neq 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{d(i)d(j)}}, & \text{if } (i, j) \in E \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

According to the above definitions, the *normalized Laplacian matrix* of  $G$  can also be given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(i, j) &= D^{-1/2} L D^{-1/2} \\ &= D^{-1/2} (D - A) D^{-1/2} \\ &= I - D^{-1/2} A D^{-1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with the convention that  $D^{-1/2}(i, i) = 0$  if  $d(i) = 0$  (i.e.,  $D(i, i) = 0$ ), where  $I$  is the  $|V| \times |V|$  identity matrix. It should be noted that  $L$  is a symmetric positive semidefinite matrix and all eigenvalues of  $L$  are real and nonnegative. In addition, it can be seen from (5) that the eigenvalues of  $L$  are all between 0 and 2, which are closely related to many structural properties for general graphs and play an important role in spectral graph theory [33]. The multiplicity of the eigenvalue 0, denoted for ease of notation as  $k$ , corresponds to the number of connected components in the graph, and the multiplicity of the eigenvalue 2 coincides with the number of bipartite connected components in the graph.

**Definition 5:** The *distance* between two vertices  $i$  and  $j$  in a graph  $G(V, E)$ , denoted by  $\text{dist}(i, j)$ , is defined as the length of the shortest path between  $i$  and  $j$ , equal to the minimum number of edges between them.

Following these definitions, we explain a set of graph metrics in Table I that will be extracted from the generated microcalcification graphs and concatenated into the feature set for the subsequent classification process.

We construct a set of microcalcification graphs based on the spatial connectivity relationship between microcalcifications after performing morphological dilation at multiple scales, denoted by  $G = G_0, G_1, \dots, G_{S-1}$ , where  $S$  is the number of scales, and  $G_s (s = 0, 1, \dots, S-1)$  denotes the microcalcification graph generated at the  $s$ th scale (the 0th scale corresponds to the initial microcalcification cluster without morphological dilation). We extract the eight graph metrics from each graph in  $G$ , which produces eight graph feature sets covering  $S$  scales. We then concatenate the eight feature sets to create a feature vector, termed the multiscale topological feature vector in this paper, representing the topological characteristics of microcalcification clusters over multiple scales.

The resulting eight graph feature sets for the example malignant and benign microcalcification clusters in Fig. 1 are shown in Fig. 4, where the graph




Fig. 4. Resulting eight graph feature sets extracted from the example malignant and benign microcalcification clusters in Fig. 1. (a) Number of subgraphs. (b) Average vertex degree. (c) Maximum vertex degree. (d) Average vertex eccentricity. (e) Diameter. (f) Average clustering coefficient. (g) Giant connected component ratio. (h) Percentage of isolated points.

metrics are extracted from the microcalcification graphs generated at 65 scales, i.e.,  $G = G_0, G_1, \dots, G_{64}$  ( $S = 65$ ). It can be seen from Fig. 4(a) that the number of sub graphs corresponding to the malignant cluster is larger than the benign cluster at the first few scales, while it decreases more drastically as the scale increases due to the fact that malignant microcalcifications are more densely distributed. When the scale increases to a certain value, the number of subgraphs remains stable and further decreases to 1 when all microcalcifications in the cluster get connected after morphological dilation. As shown in Fig. 4(b), the average vertex degree goes up continuously as the scale increases. The maximum average vertex degree is achieved when a complete microcalcification graph is formed, in which case all microcalcifications within the cluster are connected with each other. Moreover, it is shown in Fig. 4(b) that the average vertex degree values of the malignant cluster are larger than those of the benign cluster over

the entire range of scales, which indicates that the malignant microcalcification cluster is more connected. Fig. 4(c) shows a set of values of the maximum vertex degree against scale which also have an increasing trend from small to large scales and tend

toward stability when reaching the maximum value. Similarly, as indicated by the average vertex degree, the maximum vertex degree values for the malignant cluster are also larger than those of the benign cluster. The resulting values of the average vertex eccentricity against scale are plotted in Fig. 4(d). At the first few scales, most microcalcifications are isolated from others in the cluster, which results in small average eccentricity values (the eccentricity of isolated vertices is set to 0). When the scale increases to a

specific value, the maximum average eccentricity is obtained, in which case the previously isolated microcalcifications are absorbed into a connected component with a relatively large diameter. After that, as the scale further increases, more and more microcalcifications get connected and the average vertex eccentricity starts to decrease. When all microcalcifications in the cluster are connected with each other, the average eccentricity is reduced to 1. Fig. 4(e) shows how the diameter (the maximum vertex eccentricity) of the malignant and benign clusters changes against scale, which is similar to that of the average vertex eccentricity in Fig. 4(d). In the beginning, the diameter value increases with the scale until it reaches the maximum value. After that, the

diameter value gradually goes down toward the minimum value of 1 when all microcalcifications are connected. Note that the maximum diameter of the malignant cluster is larger than that of the benign cluster. As indicated above, microcalcifications in the malignant cluster tend to present a linear topology and as such form a connected component having a longer diameter. For the resulting average clustering coefficients of the two clusters, as shown in Fig. 4(f), the malignant cluster obtains larger values at all scales than the benign cluster. Fig. 4(g) presents how the giant connected component ratio varies with scale. As the scale increases, more and more microcalcifications in the cluster are absorbed into the giant connected component until all of them are included. Thus, the resulting giant connected component ratio continuously increases until it goes up to the maximum value of 1. Note that the giant connected component ratio of the malignant cluster reaches its maximum at a much smaller scale than the benign cluster. The eighth feature set composed of the percentage of isolated points is provided in Fig. 4(h). In contrast to the giant connected component ratio, the percentage of isolated points decreases as the scale increases, which is reduced to 0 when all microcalcifications are linked together. The values for the malignant cluster are smaller than those of the benign cluster, and moreover, the malignant cluster achieves 0% at a much smaller scale than the benign cluster. These all indicate that the malignant cluster is more densely distributed and, therefore, generates a more connected microcalcification graph than the benign cluster at a specific scale.

#### D. Classification of Microcalcification Clusters

Four  $k$ -nearest neighbors ( $kNN$ )-based classifiers are used for classifying microcalcification clusters into malignant and benign. The classical  $kNN$  classifier [34] is a popular and conceptually intuitive instance-based learning approach. A number of alternatives are employed which attempt to address some inherent shortcomings of the classical  $kNN$ . Fuzzy nearest neighbors (FNN) [35] extends the classical  $kNN$  by fuzzifying the memberships for test and training objects. Fuzzy rough nearest neighbors (FRNN) [36], [37] models two different types of uncertainty: fuzziness and indiscernibility. Vaguely quantified nearest neighbors (VQNN) [38] incorporates the uncertainty modeling of FRNN and also employs vague quantifiers which limit the influence that noisy data might have on the classification outcomes. These approaches offer further flexibility, improved

generalization, and retain human interpretability when

compared to techniques such as ANN and SVM. In addition, it should be noted that the classical  $k$ NN is employed for the classification task such that the proposed method can be easily compared with existing work in the literature.

#### A. Experimental Setup

To evaluate the performance of the classifier models built using the multiscale topological feature vectors, a leave-one-out cross-validation (LOOCV) scheme was employed for all datasets, and an additional stratified ten runs tenfold cross-validation (10-FCV) scheme was employed for the DDSM dataset to investigate how significantly these two cross-validation schemes may affect the performance. Two evaluation metrics were used for this work. The first was overall classification accuracy (CA), which is defined as the percentage of microcalcification clusters correctly classified, providing a summary of the performance for balanced datasets (such as the datasets used here). ROC analysis was used as the second evaluation approach. An ROC curve is a plot of the true positive rate (TPR) against the FPR, which describes the whole range of possible operating characteristics for a binary classifier model. Here, TPR is defined as the number of correctly classified malignant cases divided by the total number of malignant cases, and FPR is defined as the number of benign cases incorrectly classified as malignant divided by the total number of benign cases. ROC analysis can be employed in order to assess the predictive ability of a classifier by using the area under the ROC curve denoted by  $A_z$ [39].  $A_z$  is a statistically consistent measure and is equivalent to the Wilcoxon signed-ranks test, which is a nonparametric alternative to the paired  $t$ -test [40], [41]. All of the classification and evaluation aspects were completed using the WEKA data mining suite [42]. Moreover, to provide a comparison between the classification results based on manually and automatically segmented microcalcifications (and also to investigate the robustness of the proposed method to microcalcification segmentation variations), it was tested using both manual annotations and automatic detection results for the MIAS dataset. In addition, to evaluate the stability of the proposed approach with respect to the size of the dataset, a number of subsets were randomly selected from each dataset for cross-validation. Specifically, for the MIAS dataset, two

groups of random subsets were selected, consisting of ten (five malignant and five benign) and 15 (seven malignant and eight benign) cases, respectively. For the Digital dataset, three groups of random subsets were selected, consisting of ten (five malignant and five benign), 15 (seven malignant and eight benign) and 20 (nine malignant and 11 benign) cases, respectively. For the DDSM dataset, six groups of random subsets were selected, consisting of ten (five malignant and five benign), 15 (seven malignant and eight benign), 20 (nine malignant and 11 benign), 40 (18 malignant and 22 benign), 80 (36 malignant and 44 benign), and 160 (72 malignant and 88 benign) cases, respectively. Each random selection was repeated 100 times, which produced 100 random subsets of each size for each dataset. The means, standard deviations, and maximum and minimum values of CA and  $A_z$  were statistically analyzed over each group of 100 random subsets, which are provided in the following section.

#### B. Experimental Results

We have used two digitized and one full-field digital datasets (see Section II for details) for evaluating the performance of the proposed approach in discriminating between malignant and benign microcalcification clusters. We have investigated a range of values for  $S$ , which determines the dimensionality of the feature space. As described in Section III-C, the multiscale topological feature vectors are extracted from a set of microcalcification graphs generated at scales  $s = 0, 1, \dots, S-1$ , which are composed of eight graph feature sets. Thus, the dimensionality of the multiscale topological feature space is equal to  $8 \times S$ . The largest scale used in the experiments was set to 65, and therefore, the dimensionality of the feature space was up to 520. In addition, we have used a range of values for  $k$ , which determines the number of the nearest neighbors used to build the classifier models. Fig. 5 shows the results for a range of scales ( $S$ ) defining the feature space for the DDSM dataset. As can be seen, the results are stable over a range of different scales.  $A_z$  results as a function of the  $k$  value show a similar stability over a range of  $k = [1 \dots 10]$  for the MIAS and Digital datasets, and  $k = [12 \dots 30]$  for the DDSM dataset. For brevity, detailed results of this are left out of the paper. Table II shows the best classification results achieved by the four classifiers over 65 scales, including CA [see Table II(a)] and  $A_z$  [see Table II(b)].

The CA is given at the scale maximum scoring Azvalue. For the MIAS dataset, when using the manual annotations, the best CA was 95% with one benign case misclassified and the largest Azwas 0.96, produced by all the four classifiers; when using the automatic detection results, the best CA was also 95%

with the same benign case misclassified, and the largest Azof 0.96 was also obtained by all the four classifiers. For the Digital dataset, the best CA of 96% with one malignant case misclassified and the best Azof 0.96 were achieved by kNN and FNN. For the DDSM dataset, when using LOOCV, kNN obtained the best CA of 86% and the largest Azof 0.90; for ten-fold cross validation, kNNalso indicated the best performance, and the CA and Azwere  $85.2 \pm 5.7\%$  and  $0.91 \pm 0.05$ , respectively [standard deviations were calculated across 100 classifier models (10 folds  $\times$  10 runs)].




Fig. 5.  $A_2$  values produced by the four classifiers for the DDSM dataset using leave-one-out (a) and ten-fold cross-validation (b). (a)  $A_2$  for DDSM (LOOCV). (b)  $A_2$  for DDSM (10-FCV).

As described in Section IV-A, to evaluate the stability of theproposed approach with respect to the size of the dataset, a set of subsets consisting of 10, 15, 20, 40, 80, 160 cases were randomly sampled from the MIAS, DDSM, and Digital datasets. Hundred random subsets were generated for each number of cases. The means, standard deviations, and maximum and minimum values of CA and Azcalculated over each group of 100 random subsets are provided in Table III, where the results were generated using kNN and LOOCV. As shown in Table III, with regard to each dataset, the random subsets containing a small number of cases produced slightly worse results with a larger standard deviation;however, the standard

TABLE II  
BEST CLASSIFICATION RESULTS OVER 65 SCALES

| Test Data        | (a) CA%                      |                              |                              |                              |
|------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                  | kNN                          | FNN                          | FRNN                         | VQNN                         |
| MIAS (manual)    | 95 ( $S = 10$ )              | 95 ( $S = 10$ )              | 95 ( $S = 14$ )              | 95 ( $S = 26$ )              |
| MIAS (automatic) | 95 ( $S = 5$ )               | 95 ( $S = 5$ )               | 95 ( $S = 8$ )               | 95 ( $S = 8$ )               |
| Digital          | 96 ( $S = 10$ )              | 96 ( $S = 10$ )              | 88 ( $S = 24$ )              | 88 ( $S = 15$ )              |
| DDSM (LOOCV)     | 86.0 ( $S = 40$ )            | 85.7 ( $S = 40$ )            | 78.0 ( $S = 12$ )            | 84.0 ( $S = 44$ )            |
| DDSM (10-FCV)    | $85.2 \pm 5.7$ ( $S = 41$ )  | $85.1 \pm 6.5$ ( $S = 41$ )  | $77.8 \pm 6.8$ ( $S = 12$ )  | $83.8 \pm 6.1$ ( $S = 50$ )  |
| Test Data        | (b) $A_2$                    |                              |                              |                              |
|                  | kNN                          | FNN                          | FRNN                         | VQNN                         |
| MIAS (manual)    | 0.96 ( $S = 10$ )            | 0.96 ( $S = 10$ )            | 0.96 ( $S = 14$ )            | 0.96 ( $S = 26$ )            |
| MIAS (automatic) | 0.96 ( $S = 5$ )             | 0.96 ( $S = 5$ )             | 0.96 ( $S = 8$ )             | 0.96 ( $S = 8$ )             |
| Digital          | 0.96 ( $S = 10$ )            | 0.96 ( $S = 10$ )            | 0.90 ( $S = 24$ )            | 0.92 ( $S = 15$ )            |
| DDSM (LOOCV)     | 0.90 ( $S = 40$ )            | 0.85 ( $S = 40$ )            | 0.84 ( $S = 12$ )            | 0.89 ( $S = 44$ )            |
| DDSM (10-FCV)    | $0.91 \pm 0.05$ ( $S = 41$ ) | $0.85 \pm 0.07$ ( $S = 41$ ) | $0.84 \pm 0.07$ ( $S = 12$ ) | $0.89 \pm 0.06$ ( $S = 50$ ) |

For 10-FCV, the results contain means and standard deviations resulting from 100 classifier models (10 folds  $\times$  10 runs)

deviations of CA and  $A_z$  were reduced as the number of cases in the subsets was increased. Note that the random subsets containing the largest number of cases selected from the three datasets (15, 20, and 160) achieved very similar results to those based on the whole datasets.

TABLE III  
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF CA AND  $A_z$  OVER 100 RANDOM SUBSETS OF DIFFERENT NUMBERS OF CASES SELECTED FROM THE MIAS, DIGITAL, AND DDSM DATASETS

| (a) CA% |      |      |         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|---------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|         | MIAS |      | Digital |      |      | DDSM |      |      |      |      |      |
|         | 10   | 15   | 10      | 15   | 20   | 10   | 15   | 20   | 40   | 80   | 160  |
| Mean    | 93.0 | 95.1 | 93.1    | 94.3 | 96.1 | 88.3 | 90.1 | 89.1 | 88.1 | 87.2 | 86.2 |
| Std.    | 6.5  | 4.1  | 7.2     | 4.6  | 3.7  | 9.2  | 7.9  | 7.0  | 4.6  | 3.4  | 2.8  |
| Max.    | 100  | 100  | 100     | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 97.5 | 95   | 91   |
| Min.    | 80.0 | 86.7 | 80.0    | 86.7 | 90.0 | 70.0 | 70.0 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 78.8 | 82   |

| (b) $A_z$ |      |      |         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|-----------|------|------|---------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
|           | MIAS |      | Digital |      |      | DDSM |      |      |      |      |      |
|           | 10   | 15   | 10      | 15   | 20   | 10   | 15   | 20   | 40   | 80   | 160  |
| Mean      | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.93    | 0.95 | 0.96 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.89 |
| Std.      | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.08    | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.11 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.03 | 0.03 |
| Max.      | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00    | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| Min.      | 0.74 | 0.88 | 0.76    | 0.87 | 0.90 | 0.62 | 0.67 | 0.70 | 0.73 | 0.80 | 0.80 |

In addition, we investigated redundancy among the defined topological feature set and explored the graph metrics which contributed most to malignancy analysis of microcalcification clusters. We performed feature selection by employing the Cfs Subset Eval attribute evaluator and the Greedy Stepwise search method in WEKA. The CfsSubsetEval attribute evaluator evaluates the importance of a subset of features by estimating the individual predictive ability of each feature as well as the extent of redundancy between them, and as such features that are highly correlated with the class while have low intercorrelation are more likely to be selected (see [43] for more information). The Greedy Stepwise search method performs a greedy forward or backward search through the feature space, which starts with no or all features and terminates when any addition or reduction of the currently selected feature subset results in a decrease in evaluation [44]. We used LOOCV for MIAS and Digital, while for DDSM, we used ten runs stratified ten-fold cross-validation. It should be noted that the feature selection is only performed on

the training data, and therefore, it cannot over fit since there is no bias. If we did not use cross-validation, then we could run into the risk of overtraining, but even with LOOCV, the test set remains uncorrelated with the




Fig. 6. Overview of the selection times of the eight graph metrics for the three datasets. The graph metrics from No. 1 to 8 correspond to (1) number of subgraphs, (2) average vertex degree, (3) maximum vertex degree, (4) average vertex eccentricity, (5) diameter, (6) average clustering coefficient, (7) giant connected component ratio, and (8) percentage of isolated points (see Table I). (a) MIAS (manual annotation)  $S = 10$ . (b) MIAS (automatic detection)  $S = 5$ . (c) Digital  $S = 10$ . (d) DDSM  $S = 40$ .

training data. The number of the resulting feature subsets was 20, 25, and 100 for MIAS, Digital, and DDSM, respectively. Fig. 6 illustrates how many times each of the eight graph metrics were taken after feature selection. As can be seen from Fig. 6, graph metrics No. 1 and 7, i.e., number of subgraphs and giant connected component ratio, seemed to be the two most important graph metrics among the eight, which were most frequently selected from the multiscale topological feature set. As indicated in Table I, these two graph metrics are mainly related to the number/distribution of microcalcifications within a cluster. Their precise clinical significance for the diagnosis of malignant and benign microcalcification clusters could be further investigated.

TABLE IV  
CLASSIFICATION RESULTS FOR THE THREE DATASETS AFTER  
FEATURE SELECTION

| Test Data        | Cross-Validation | CA               | $A_z$           |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| MIAS (manual)    | leave-one-out    | 90%              | 0.91            |
| MIAS (automatic) | leave-one-out    | 90%              | 0.93            |
| Digital          | leave-one-out    | 96%              | 0.94            |
| DDSM             | 10-fold          | $83.9 \pm 6.3\%$ | $0.90 \pm 0.05$ |

The classification results for the three datasets after feature selection are provided in Table IV. Here, the results were generated by the  $k$ NN classifier using the resulting feature subsets, which were slightly lower when compared to those results obtained before feature selection (see Table II).

## V. DISCUSSION

As described above, good classification results have been obtained for all the three datasets. The Digital dataset provided the best results, which might be due to the more accurate detection of microcalcifications using digital mammography. As stated in [16], the detection approach indicated the best performance when using the Digital dataset, and therefore, more realistic detection results of microcalcifications can be provided for the classification task. The MIAS dataset produced the second best classification results, and moreover, using manual annotations and automatic detections achieved the same performance. This indicates that the proposed method seems to be robust with respect to variations between manual and automatic segmentations of microcalcifications. For the DDSM dataset, very similar results were shown when using the leave-one-out and ten-fold cross-validation methods, showing a decreased performance in the results when compared to the other datasets. It might be partially explained by the fact that the detection approach performs worst for the DDSM database among the three datasets [16]. Moreover, the DDSM dataset used in our experiments contains 300 cases, which is expected to give a larger variability than the small datasets (especially as the DDSM dataset was generated using different digitizers). However, the obtained classification results are still comparable or even better than the related work reviewed by Cheng *et al.* [9] or Table V, where most publications used smaller databases than ours.

We compared the proposed method with related publications in the literature. Table V shows a

summary of the comparison. Note that the various approaches use different images taken from different databases, and therefore, this is a qualitative comparison. In [7], the 100% CA was obtained by classifying 143 individual microcalcifications from 18 biopsy proven cases based on a leave-one-microcalcification-out approach, which is different from the goal of our classification of microcalcification clusters. In [10], the classification of microcalcification clusters was based on the maximum feature value obtained by a selected single microcalcification rather than the whole cluster (and therefore some manual aspects were involved in the extraction process). In [46], the high classification performance was obtained by introducing an optimized decision making step, which was performed afterward through statistical analysis of the classifier outputs to achieve the minimum cost of error classification. As shown in Table V, the obtained classification results are comparable to the various approaches.

In addition, in order to enable a direct comparison, we extracted the features used in previously published works that showed the most promising performance [7], [10], [46], [47] and performed malignancy analysis of microcalcification clusters on our datasets. Table VI shows a summary of the best CA and  $A_z$  values achieved using our proposed topology-based feature set and the other three feature sets [7], [10], [46], [47], where the results were all produced using  $k$ NN and LOOCV. As shown in Table VI, our proposed approach performed best among the four approaches and achieved the best CA and  $A_z$  results for all the three datasets. In addition, our proposed approach provided a significant improvement over the existing methods, and when the results from Table VI were compared using an unpaired  $t$ -test, a  $p$  value of  $p < 0.01$  was obtained in all cases.

One inherent limitation of the developed method is that it cannot provide a reliable classification for the case where the cluster is structure less or few microcalcifications are segmented within the cluster. An extreme is when only a single microcalcification is detected from the cluster by the automatic detection approach, it will fail to discriminate malignant from benign based on the topology. Another concern of the proposed method is that its performance might depend on the performance of the microcalcification detection approach. False negatives or false positives may affect the global topology/connectivity of microcalcification

clusters. However, the experimental results demonstrate the robustness and effectiveness of the developed method when combined with automatic microcalcification detection.

In the experiments, the clusters with few microcalcifications being segmented by the automatic detection approach tend to be classified as benign since their graph metrics are more in line with those of a benign cluster. Thus, the underdetected malignant cases where the microcalcifications indicate a sparse distribution could be misclassified into benign. On the other hand, the benign cases with relatively a larger number of microcalcifications (including the false positives) being segmented from the clusters could indicate a malignant-like distribution and as such could be misclassified into malignant. Fig. 7 shows the CA as a function of the number of microcalcifications for the DDSM dataset using leave-one-out and ten-fold cross-validation. The results were obtained using the  $k$ NN classifier with  $S = 40$  for LOOCV and  $S = 41$  for ten-fold cross-validation since they correspond to the best performing scale for this classifier as displayed in Table II. For display purposes, the results shown in Fig. 7 were averaged such that each bar represents the mean CA over five sizes of microcalcification clusters.

not be big enough to show any relationship between the number of microcalcifications and the CA.

As discussed above, some highlights of this study should be noted. For the MIAS dataset, the same methodology was applied based on both manually annotated and automatically detected microcalcifications, and the same classification performance was obtained. This indicates the robustness of the proposed method to detection errors. For the DDSM dataset, we used a larger set of cases than related publications and achieved good results. In addition to these two well-known digitized databases,




Fig. 7. Graph showing the CA as a function of the number of microcalcifications. The results are reported for the DDSM dataset using (a) LOOCV and (b) ten-fold cross-validation with the  $k$ NN classifier and  $S = 40$  for LOOCV and  $S = 41$  for ten-fold cross-validation. (a) DDSM (LOOCV). (b) DDSM (10-FCV).

The results show that there is a slight dip in CA when the number of microcalcifications falls in the 11–15 range. This experiment was not replicated with the MIAS and Digital dataset due to their small sample size and good CA. Due to the fact that only a few samples are misclassified, the sample size would

TABLE V  
QUALITATIVE COMPARISON OF OUR RESULTS WITH THOSE ACHIEVED BY RELATED WORK

| Method                             | Database                        | Cases | Feature            | Classifier        | Result                                |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Shen <i>et al.</i> [7]             | unknown                         | 18    | shape              | kNN               | CA = 100%                             |
| Ma <i>et al.</i> [10]              | DDSM                            | 183   | shape              | thresholding      | $A_z = 0.96$                          |
| Chan <i>et al.</i> (1998) [21]     | unknown                         | 145   | morphology         | LDC               | $A_z = 0.79$                          |
| Dhawan <i>et al.</i> [8]           | unknown                         | 191   | texture&cluster    | ANN               | $A_z = 0.86$                          |
| Papadopoulos <i>et al.</i> [15]    | MIAS                            | 25    | cluster            | SVM               | $A_z = 0.81$                          |
| Chan <i>et al.</i> (1997) [27]     | unknown                         | 54    | texture            | ANN               | $A_z = 0.88$                          |
| Soltanian-Zadeh <i>et al.</i> [11] | Nijmegen                        | 103   | multiwavelet       | kNN               | $A_z = 0.89$                          |
| Betal <i>et al.</i> [20]           | Liverpool                       | 38    | shape/cluster      | kNN               | $A_z = 0.79, A_z = 0.84$              |
| Rana <i>et al.</i> [23]            | University of Chicago Hospitals | 49    | morphology         | ANN               | $A_z = 0.80$                          |
| Wei <i>et al.</i> [45]             | University of Chicago           | 104   | cluster&morphology | Ada-Cas-SVM       | $A_z = 0.81, A_z = 0.82$              |
| Shao <i>et al.</i> [25]            | Sun Yat-sen University          | 109   | pattern factor     | quantizing        | $A_z = 0.74$                          |
| Ren <i>et al.</i> (2011) [46]      | DDSM                            | 150   | varied features    | ANN               | $A_z = 0.98$                          |
| Ren (2012) [47]                    | DDSM                            | 150   | varied features    | ANN/SVM           | $A_z = 0.93, A_z = 0.94$              |
| Strange <i>et al.</i> [24]         | DDSM                            | 150   | cluster            | barcodes          | $A_z = 0.82$                          |
| Strange <i>et al.</i> [24]         | MIAS                            | 20    | cluster            | barcodes          | $A_z = 0.80$                          |
| Ours                               | MIAS I (manual annotation)      | 20    | topology           | kNN/FNN/FRNN/VQNN | CA = 95%, $A_z = 0.96$                |
| Ours                               | MIAS I (automatic detection)    | 20    | topology           | kNN/FNN/FRNN/VQNN | CA = 95%, $A_z = 0.96$                |
| Ours                               | Digital                         | 25    | topology           | kNN/FNN           | CA = 96%, $A_z = 0.96$                |
| Ours                               | DDSM (leave-one-out CV)         | 300   | topology           | kNN               | CA = 86.0%, $A_z = 0.90$              |
| Ours                               | DDSM (10-fold CV)               | 300   | topology           | kNN               | CA = 85.2 ± 5.7%, $A_z = 0.91 ± 0.05$ |

TABLE VI

DIRECT COMPARISON OF THE RESULTING CA AND  $A_z$  VALUES OF OUR APPROACH AND SHEN *et al.* [7], MA *et al.* [10], AND REN *et al.* [46], [47]

| Test Data                | Ours                   | Shen <i>et al.</i> [7] | Ma <i>et al.</i> [10]  | Ren <i>et al.</i> [46], [47] |
|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| MIAS (manual annotation) | CA = 95%, $A_z = 0.96$ | CA = 70%, $A_z = 0.68$ | CA = 80%, $A_z = 0.76$ | CA = 85%, $A_z = 0.91$       |
| Digital                  | CA = 96%, $A_z = 0.96$ | CA = 84%, $A_z = 0.71$ | CA = 72%, $A_z = 0.68$ | CA = 85%, $A_z = 0.91$       |
| DDSM                     | CA = 86%, $A_z = 0.90$ | CA = 73%, $A_z = 0.69$ | CA = 62%, $A_z = 0.56$ | CA = 82%, $A_z = 0.86$       |

we evaluated our method using a full-field digital database and obtained improved classification results. This demonstrates the capability of our method in dealing with two categories of mammograms, which allows it to be applied in both film and digital mammography. We also investigated the stability of the proposed method against the size of the evaluation dataset. For each dataset, no significant difference in the classification performance was shown among the subsets of varied numbers of cases. Furthermore, we investigated the most significant microcalcification graph metrics for malignancy analysis by performing feature selection. The most frequently selected graph metrics are worth further investigation from a clinical point of view. In addition to a qualitative comparison with related publications, we implemented a direct comparison

between the proposed approach and three state-of-the-art approaches, and our method demonstrated the best performance for all the three datasets used in this study. In addition, we used the CAD detection results directly instead of manual segmentation results for all the three datasets. High classification accuracies and good ROC analysis results were obtained when compared to the state-of-the-art approaches. This indicates its potential application in conjunction with automatic detection approaches in CAD systems.

As future work, other features such as shape and texture of individual microcalcifications and the whole cluster could be incorporated to build a complete framework for malignancy analysis of microcalcification clusters. A similarity measure between microcalcification graphs can be investigated in order to discriminate between



malignant and benign clusters using the graph-based representation directly without generating graph feature vectors. On the other hand, alternative classifiers (e.g., random forests, ANN, and SVM) could also be investigated. In addition, we will extend the evaluation using a larger collection of digital mammograms.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We have presented a method for classifying microcalcification clusters in mammograms based on morphological topology analysis. This is a novel approach to analyze microcalcifications in terms of the connectivity and topology for discriminating malignant from benign clusters. Unlike most features (e.g., shape/morphological features) in previous publications extracted at a single scale, a representation of microcalcification clusters covering the multiscale characteristics was developed in this paper. The topology/connectivity of microcalcification clusters was analyzed using multiscale morphology. A set of microcalcification graphs were constructed to describe the topological structure of microcalcification clusters at multiple scales. When analyzing the topology of microcalcification clusters, we extracted eight graph metrics from microcalcification graphs generated at multiple scales, which are number of sub graphs, average vertex degree, maximum vertex degree, average vertex eccentricity, diameter, average clustering coefficient, giant connected component ratio, and percentage of isolated points. The resulting eight graph feature sets were aggregated and constituted the multiscale topological feature vector, which has been used to classify microcalcification clusters into malignant and benign.

The proposed method has been evaluated using three datasets: MIAS, DDSM, and Digital. Four  $k$ -nearest-neighbors-based algorithms ( $k$ NN, FNN, FRNN, and VQNN) have been used for the classification task. Good classification results have been obtained for all the datasets. By investigating a set of  $S$  values for the number of scales and using a range of  $k$  values for the classifier, the obtained best CA was 95% for MIAS with manual annotations, 95% for MIAS with automatic detections, 96% for Digital, 86% for DDSM using LOOCV, and  $85.2 \pm 5.7\%$  for DDSM based on ten-fold cross-validation, and the largest area under the ROC curve was 0.96, 0.96, 0.96, 0.90, and  $0.91 \pm 0.05$ , respectively

## REFERENCES

- [1] American Cancer Society, *Global Cancer Facts & Figures*, 2nd ed. Atlanta, GA, USA: Amer. Cancer Soc., 2011, pp. 11–12.
- [2] Eurostat, *Health Statistics Atlas on Mortality in the European Union*. Office for Official Publications of the European Union, 2009, pp. 91–93.
- [3] American Cancer Society, *Breast Cancer Facts & Figures 2011–2012*. Atlanta, GA, USA: Amer. Cancer Soc., 2011, pp. 11–15.
- [4] L. Tab'aret *et al.*, "Mammography service screening and mortality in breast cancer patients: 20-year follow-up before and after introduction of screening," *The Lancet*, vol. 361, no. 9367, pp. 1405–1410, 2003.
- [5] National Comprehensive Cancer Network, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Breast Cancer Screening and Diagnosis *NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Breast Cancer Screening and Diagnosis*, 2012.
- [6] Cancer Research U.K. (2012, Aug.) "Who is screened for breast cancer?" [Online]. Available: <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancerhelp/type/breast-cancer/about/screening/who-is-screened-for-breastcancer>
- [7] L. Shen *et al.*, "Application of shape analysis to mammographic calcifications," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 263–274, Jun. 1994.
- [8] A. P. Dhawan *et al.*, "Analysis of mammographic microcalcifications using gray-level image structure features," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 246–259, Jun. 1996.
- [9] H. D. Cheng *et al.*, "Computer-aided detection and classification of microcalcifications in mammograms: A survey," *Pattern Recogn.*, vol. 36, no. 12, pp. 2967–2991, 2003.
- [10] Y. Ma *et al.*, "A novel shape feature to classify microcalcifications," in *Proc. 17th IEEE Int. Conf. Image Process.*, 2010, pp. 2265–2268.
- [11] H. Soltanian-Zadeh *et al.*, "Comparison of multiwavelet, wavelet, haralick, and shape features for microcalcification classification in mammograms," *Pattern Recogn.*, vol. 37, no. 10, pp. 1973–1986, 2004.
- [12] E. A. Sickles, "Breast calcifications: Mammographic evaluation," *Radiology*, vol. 160, no. 2, pp. 289–293, 1986.
- [13] W. D'ahnert, *Radiology Review Manual*, 7th ed. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Williams & Wilkins, 2011, pp. 557–558.
- [14] J. Suckling *et al.*, "The mammographic image analysis society digital mammogram database," in *Proc. Excerpta Med. Int. Congr. Ser.*, 1994, pp. 375–378.
- [15] A. Papadopoulos *et al.*, "Characterization of clustered microcalcifications in digitized mammograms using neural networks and support vector machines," *Artif. Intell. Med.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 141–150, 2005.
- [16] A. Oliver *et al.*, "Automatic microcalcification and cluster detection for digital and digitised mammograms," *Knowl.-Based Syst.*, vol. 28, pp. 68–75, 2012.
- [17] M. Elter and A. Horsch, "CADx of mammographic masses and clustered microcalcifications: A review," *Med. Phys.*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 2052–2068, 2009.
- [18] M. Lanyi, "Morphologic analysis of microcalcifications," in *Early Breast Cancer*, J. Zander and J. Baltzer, Eds. Berlin, Germany: Springer, 1985, pp. 113–135.
- [19] J. Dengler *et al.*, "Segmentation of microcalcifications in mammograms," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 634–642, Dec. 1993.
- [20] D. Betalet *et al.*, "Segmentation and numerical analysis of microcalcifications on mammograms using mathematical morphology," *Brit. J. Radiol.*, vol. 70, no. 837, pp. 903–917, 1997.



- [21] H. P. Chan *et al.*, "Computerized analysis of mammographic microcalcifications in morphological and texture feature spaces," *Med. Phys.*, vol. 25, no. 10, pp. 2007–2019, 1998.
- [22] Y. Jiang *et al.*, "Computerized classification of malignant and benign clustered microcalcifications in mammograms," in *Proc. 19th Annu. Int. Conf. IEEE Eng. Med. Biol. Soc.*, 1997, pp. 521–523.
- [23] R. S. Rana *et al.*, "Independent evaluation of computer classification of malignant and benign calcifications in full-field digital mammograms," *Acad. Radiol.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 363–370, 2007.
- [24] H. Strange *et al.*, "Modelling mammographic microcalcification clusters using persistent mereotopology," *Pattern Recog. Lett.*, vol. 47, pp. 157–163, 2014.
- [25] Y. Z. Shao *et al.*, "Characterizing the clustered microcalcifications on mammograms to predict the pathological classification and grading: A mathematical modeling approach," *J. Dig. Imag.*, vol. 24, pp. 764–771, 2011.
- [26] M. Yam *et al.*, "Three-dimensional reconstruction of microcalcification clusters from two mammographic views," *IEEE Trans. Med. Imag.*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 479–489, 2001.
- [27] H. P. Chan *et al.*, "Computerized classification of malignant and benign microcalcifications on mammograms: Texture analysis using an artificial neural network," *Phys. Med. Biol.*, vol. 42, pp. 549–567, 1997.
- [28] S. A. Feiget *et al.*, "Evaluation of breast microcalcifications by means of optically magnified tissue specimen radiographs," *Recent Results Cancer Res.*, vol. 105, pp. 111–123, 1987.
- [29] Z. Chen *et al.*, "Analysis of mammographic microcalcification clusters using topological features," in *Breast Imaging* (ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science), vol. 8539, H. Fujita, T. Hara, and C. Muramatsu, Eds. New York, NY, USA: Springer, 2014, pp. 620–627.

