



















































BREAST M R I	2 year post implantation Impact of the new consensus on waiting times for breast MRI			
INTRODUCTION		Sept 2013	Sept 2014	Sept 2015
PLAN DO	Total number of breast MRI requests awaiting examination	687	612	301
STUDY	Requests within recommended waiting times (< 90 days)	167	145	126
ACT IMPACT	Requests exceeding waiting times by < 6 months	132	58	66
CONCLUSION	Requests exceeding waiting times by 6-12 months	58	146*	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY	Requests exceeding waiting times by > 12 months	66	59*	8
	Delay before next non-urgent breast MRI availability	320 days	250 days	176 days
CHUM ⁰ 1@\$8x2015	* Because our delay for non-urgent MRI in 2013 was close to a year (320 days), the impact of the new guidelines was not fully evident until the 2-year post implementation cycle.			





CONCLUSION

- A multidisciplinary approach allowed for important changes to be made at our institution in terms of breast MRI use, with high compliance by all
- Evidence-based MRI utilization has improved the care of women requiring MRI evaluation
 - ✓ High-risk women get timely screening MRI
- Continuous adjustments to MRI use will be performed as evidence becomes available so that our institution constantly adheres to state-of-the-art utilization

	BREAST M R I	SELECTED BIB	LIOGRAPHY 3. NICE (National Institute of Health and Clinical Excellence) guidelines, 2013
	INTRODUCTION	2. Turnbull et al. Lancet 2010; 375:563	4. NCCN (National Comprehensive Consortium Network) guidelines, 2013
	INTRODUCTION	3. Houssami et al. J Clin Oncol 2014; 32:392	5. EUSOMA (European Society of Breast Specialists) guidelines, 2010
	PLAN	4. Hwang et al. Ann Surg Onc 2009; 16:3000	6. EUSOBI (European Society of Breast Imaging) guidelines, 2008
		5. Alliance A011104 / ACRIN 6694 Study	7. NHS (National Health Science) guidelines, 2013
	DO	6. Millar et al. J Clin Oncol 2009; 27:4701	8. Alberta Health Services, 2012
		7. Voduc et al. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28:1684	9. Saslow et al. CA Cancer J Clin 2007; 57:75
	STUDY	8. Houssami et al. Ann Surg 2013; 257:249	10. ACR (American College of Radiology) guidelines, 2013
		9. Woods et al. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28:15a	11. NBOCC- Austral World J Surg 2010; 34:979
	ACT	10. Mann et al. Eur J Surg Oncol 2008; 34:135	12. Robson et al. NEJM 2007; 357:154
		11. Mann et al. Br Ca Res Trt 2010; 119:415	13. Berg WA. AJR 2009; 192:390
	IMPACT	12. Bluemke et al. JAMA 2004; 292:2735	14. Zakhireh et al. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28:173
	CONCLUSION	13. Marinovich et al. J N Ca Inst 2013; 105:231	15. Pinel-Giroux et al. RadioGraphics 2013; 33:435
	CONCLUSION	14. Brennan et al. J Clin Oncol 2009; 27:5640	16. Vanderwalde et al. Am Surgeon 2011; 77:180
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	15. Lehman et al. NEJM 2007; 356:1295	17. Pijpe et al. BMJ 2013;345:e5660
		16. Am Society of Breast Surgeons, Position statement 2010	18. Griepsma et al. Ann Surg Oncol 2014; 21:1260
		17. BC Cancer agency, Clinical Indications for breast MRI, 2009	19. Houssami et al. JAMA 2011; 305:790
		18. NCCN (National Comprehensive Consortium Network) guidelines, 2013	20. Robertson et al. Eur Radiol 2011; 21:2484
		19. EUSOMA (European Society of Breast Specialists) guidelines, 2010	21. EBCTCG Trial. Lancet 2011; 378:1707
		20. CAR (Canadian Association of Radiologists) guidelines, 2013	22. EBCTCG Trial. Lancet 2005; 356:1687
		MRI FOR SCREENING HIGH AND MODERATE RISK WOMEN	23. Gorechlad et al. Ann Surg Oncol 2008; 15:1703
	ů	1. Cancer Care Ontario recommendations, 2013	24. Brennan et al. Am J Roentgenol 2010; 195:510
	CHUM	2. CAR (Canadian Association of Radiologists) guidelines, 2013	25. Friedlander et al. Radiology 2011; 261:421
	1 R S R 2015		26. Sung et al. Radiology 2011; 26:414



