Artificial Intelligence in Mammography: The Role of Microcalcifications in Early Breast Cancer Detection

Ahsen Qureshi
University of Waterloo
Electrical and Computer Engineering
a56qures@uwaterloo.ca

Abstract

Mammography remains the cornerstone of breast cancer screening, with clustered microcalcifications often the earliest radiographic sign of invasive cancer. Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) – particularly deep learning – show promise for improving the detection and classification of such findings. In mammography, convolutional neural networks (CNNs) and hybrid architectures (e.g. Mirai's CNN-transformer) can analyze full-field images for suspicious calcification. AI-assisted systems have achieved high accuracy (AUCs up to 0.93) and can reduce radiologist workload by highlighting critical findings. However, interpretability and generalizability remain challenges: black-box models risk overreliance, while factors like breast density, equipment differences, and sample bias can limit performance. We review mammographic calcification types and BI-RADS descriptors (Figure 1), current AI approaches (including CNN architectures for risk prediction, Figure 2), and interpretability techniques such as saliency heatmaps of bilateral asymmetry (Figure 3). Finally, we discuss technical and diagnostic challenges and outline future directions, including multimodal models and prospective validation.

1 Introduction

Breast cancer screening programs rely on mammography to detect early disease and it is found that calcifications could be present in up to 50% of breast cancers found on mammography. Fine linear or pleomorphic microcalcifications in clusters strongly suggest malignancy. AI and deep learning have emerged as transformative tools in medical imaging, achieving diagnostic accuracy comparable to radiologists. Recent meta-analyses report AI reaching AUCs up to 0.93 in mammography and significantly reducing radiologist reading times (by 17–91%). For example, Dang *et al.* found that using an AI support system significantly improved radiologist BI-RADS classification (AUC 0.74 vs 0.77, $p = 0.004$) without slowing interpretations. Moreover, a large prospective screening study showed AI-assisted double reading increased cancer detection by 18% without raising recall rates. These results highlight AI's potential to enhance early detection and workflow efficiency. In this article, we focus on the role of calcifications in early breast cancer detection and how AI techniques can aid mammographic analysis.

2 Background on Calcifications

Microcalcifications are tiny calcium deposits in breast tissue, visible as white spots on mammograms. They are often the earliest imaging sign of breast malignancy. In one study of non-palpable cancers, 58% of microcalcification-associated lesions were pure DCIS. The BI-RADS lexicon classifies calcifications by morphology and distribution.

Typically benign calcifications include coarse popcorn-like deposits, large rod-like (ductal) patterns, and lucent-centered or rim (eggshell) calcifications (often related to cysts or fat necrosis). In contrast, suspicious microcalcifications have specific shapes. As shown in Figure **??**, the high-risk types are:

- **Amorphous:** indistinct, powdery shapes
- **Coarse heterogeneous:** irregular shapes (0.5–1 mm)
- **Fine pleomorphic:** variable shards of glass < 0.5 mm
- **Fine linear/branching:** thin, linearly arranged or branching patterns

BI-RADS guidelines note that amorphous clusters are suspicious (BI-RADS 4), and fine linear/branching calcifications carry a high malignancy probability (BI-RADS 4C). Distribution also matters: clustered or segmental patterns raise concern, whereas diffuse (scattered) calcifications are usually benign.

Figure 1: Examples of calcification morphologies on mammography. (a) Amorphous; (b) Coarse heterogeneous; (c) Fine pleomorphic; (d) Fine linear/branching. Suspicious types (b–d) are associated with higher malignancy risk:contentReference[oaicite:23]index=23.

Identifying malignant calcifications usually prompts biopsy. High-risk calcification patterns often correspond to malignancy at pathology; for instance, fine pleomorphic or linear calcifications are frequently seen in invasive cancer. Microcalcifications may also coexist with associated findings (asymmetry, masses, or architectural distortion). Figure 1 shows the key morphologies to recognize. Early detection of DCIS via these calcification patterns significantly improves long-term outcomes.

3 AI in Mammography

Deep learning has shown impressive performance in mammographic image analysis. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) can learn hierarchical features from raw images, aiding detection and classification of lesions including calcifications. Several studies have developed CNN pipelines specifically for microcalcification detection: Pesapane *et al.* trained AlexNet and ResNet variants on a large annotated dataset (1986 mammograms) to localize and classify calcifications. Their best model achieved 98% AUC for detection and 94% AUC for classifying benign vs malignant microcalcifications. Similarly, Lin *et al.* demonstrated an automated deep-learning pipeline (using Faster R-CNN for detection) that not only classified breast exams as malignant vs benign but also annotated calcification regions, yielding accuracy $\sim$81% (AUC $\sim$0.73). These results suggest AI can reliably flag suspicious calcifications and support earlier diagnosis.

Beyond lesion detection, AI systems can predict long-term breast cancer risk from screening images. For example, the Mirai algorithm is a CNN-based risk model trained on 56,786 mammograms to predict 1–5 year cancer risk. Mirai's architecture feeds multiple views (e.g. CC and MLO of both breasts) through a shared CNN backbone and a transformer module that integrates features across views and images. An illustrative example of such an architecture is shown in Figure 2. Mirai achieved robust performance on external data, outperforming standard risk models, implying that CNN features capture latent imaging biomarkers of future cancer risk:.

Figure 2: Example CNN-based risk prediction architecture (adapted from Mirai). Four screening views (two views per breast) are processed by a shared CNN backbone; learned features are aggregated (e.g. via a transformer) to predict 1–5 year breast cancer risk:contentReference[oaicite:33]index=33.

AI systems have also been used to highlight image regions via saliency or activation maps. For instance, class activation mappings can visualize which pixels most influenced a malignant vs benign classification of calcifications. More recently, interpretable models explicitly leverage bilateral breast asymmetry as a risk feature. AsymMirai, a variant of Mirai, computes "localized bilateral dissimilarity" heatmaps of left-right differences (Figure 3). In a large cohort, AsymMirai's risk scores closely correlated with Mirai's (1-year AUC 0.79 vs 0.84), and cases where the model consistently highlighted the same tissue over time achieved very high 3-year AUC (0.92). These heatmaps (see Figure 3) effectively show which asymmetric calcification clusters or density differences are driving the AI's risk assessment.

Figure 3: Saliency (heatmap) outputs illustrating bilateral asymmetry in mammograms. Examples from an asymmetry-aware model (e.g. AsymMirai) highlight localized differences in tissue between left and right breasts that contribute to risk prediction:contentReference[oaicite:38]index=38.

Overall, AI shows promise in enhancing cancer detection on mammograms. In practice, combining AI with human readers can improve screening metrics. In the nationwide PRAIM study, AI-supported double reading raised the cancer detection rate to 6.7 per 1,000 (vs 5.7 per 1,000 without AI), with a higher positive predictive value of recall (17.9% vs 14.9%). These data support AI as a second-reader or triage tool to flag subtle calcifications that might be missed.

4 Technical and Diagnostic Challenges

Data variability is an important challenge. Mammography images differ by equipment manufacturer, acquisition parameters, and patient population. Algorithms trained on one dataset may underperform when faced with new imaging centers or technologies:contentReference[oaicite:44]index=44. For example, variations in image resolution or compression artifacts could affect calcification visibility. AI must also contend with class imbalance: true malignancies and suspicious calcifications are rare compared to normal findings, risking many false positives. Ensuring high specificity is critical to avoid unnecessary biopsies.

Bias and generalization are key concerns. A recent analysis stresses the need for prospective, multi-center validation to address biases and ensure reliability. Dang *et al.* note that AI algorithms "offer added value" by improving accuracy, but reaching their full potential requires prospective trials and attention to potential biases. Additionally, ethical and legal issues (e.g. data privacy, liability for AI errors) complicate clinical deployment.

5 Future Directions

Future advances will likely come from multimodal AI and deeper interpretability. Models that combine imaging with clinical risk factors (family history, genetics) or longitudinal data could improve predictions. For example, Mirai originally incorporated non-image features but AsymMirai found they did not improve performance, focusing instead on image-derived asymmetry. Ongoing work aims to build fully transparent risk tools: e.g., incorporating breast density measurements or radiomic texture features alongside calcification patterns.

Technically, federated learning and large multi-institutional datasets will help generalization. Integration with digital biopsy tools (e.g. AI-guided localization of calcifications for stereotactic biopsy) is another frontier. On the interpretability side, techniques like counterfactual analysis (showing how changes in calcification appearance would alter risk) and uncertainty quantification are active areas of research.

In summary, AI-enhanced mammography holds significant promise for improving early breast cancer detection via microcalcifications. By combining CNN-based detection with interpretable risk modeling, and by addressing challenges of bias and workflow integration, AI tools may enable radiologists to more accurately and efficiently identify subtle calcification patterns that herald early cancer. Ongoing research and validation efforts will be crucial to bring these technologies safely into routine screening practice.

Acknowledgments

This document has been adapted by ... Additional elements were taken from the formatting instructions of the *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* and the *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*.

References

References

[1] Dang L-A, Chazard E, Poncelet E, et al. Impact of artificial intelligence in breast cancer screening with mammography. *Breast Cancer (Tokyo)*. 2022; Online ahead of print. DOI:10.1007/s12282-022-01375-9.

[2] Ciurescu S, Ciupici-Cladovan M, Buciu VB, et al. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of AI-Assisted Mammography and the Systemic Immune-Inflammation Index in Breast Cancer. *Medicina*. 2025;61(7):1170. DOI:10.3390/medicina61071170.

[3] Eisemann N, Bunk S, Mukama T, et al. Nationwide real-world implementation of AI for cancer detection in population-based mammography screening. *Nat Med*. 2025;31:917–924. DOI:10.1038/s41591-024-03408-6.

[4] Pesapane F, Trentin C, Ferrari F, et al. Deep learning performance for detection and classification of microcalcifications on mammography. *Eur Radiol Exp*. 2023;7(1):69. DOI:10.1186/s41747-023-00384-3.

[5] Lin Q, Tan W-M, Ge J-Y, et al. Artificial intelligence-based diagnosis of breast cancer by mammography microcalcification. *Fundam Res*. 2023;5(2):880-889. DOI:10.1016/j.fmre.2023.04.018.

[6] Donnelly J, Moffett L, Barnett AJ, et al. AsymMirai: an interpretable mammography-based deep learning model for 1–5-year breast cancer risk prediction. *Radiology*. 2024;310(3):e232780. DOI:10.1148/radiol.232780.

[7] Rominger MB, Steinmetz C, Westerman R, et al. Microcalcification-associated breast cancer: presentation, successful first excision, long-term recurrence and survival rate. *Breast Care (Basel)*. 2015;10(6):380–385. DOI:10.1159/000440794.

A Example Appendix

This is an appendix.