

1 Efficacy and Safety of Magnetic Seed Pre-Operative Non-Palpable Breast

2 Lesion Localization: a series of 37 consecutive cases.

3

4 M. Bouvier, Y Abrahami, I. Belaroussi, MR El Bejjani, S. Béranger, M. Cascarino, R. Afriat, N

5 Lotersztajn, S. Alran

6

7 Keywords : Magnetic localization, breast lesion, non-palpable, Magseed

8

9 **ABSTRACT :**

10

11 **Context:** 40% of breast surgery patients have a lesion that requires preoperative
12 localization, a process that demands close cooperation between radiological and surgical
13 team. Magnetic seed localization is a new tracking technique which does not require
14 programming the day before or on the day of the intervention. The aim of our study was to
15 evaluate the efficacy and safety of magnetic localization of non-palpable breast lesions.

16 **Methods and patients:** This is a study of 39 consecutive preoperative ultrasound-guided
17 implantations of a magnetic seed (MS) in 37 patients, for non-palpable breast lesions,
18 performed at the Breast Center at Saint-Joseph Hospital in Paris, France, between May 15th
19 and December 21st, 2018. One patient who was operated on for papillomatous lesions had a
20 double magnetic seed implanted. In the operating room, the MS was percutaneously
21 localized by a magnetic probe. The ex-vivo magnetism was noted and the removed tissue
22 was sent to radiology to look for the MS, after which it was sent for histopathological
23 examination. All localized lesions had previously been biopsied, and there were 29

24 infiltrative cancers, 7 atypical lesions, and 3 benign lesions. The sentinel node was identified
25 by super paramagnetic iron peroxide in 11 cases, and by isotopes in the 18 others.

26 **Results:** Our patients were on average 57 years old (33-86 years old). All magnetic
27 localization was realized using ultrasound. The mean ultrasound size of the lesions was 12.7
28 mm (5-34mm). The period of time from implantation to surgery varied from 0 to 21 days.
29 The localization method was characterized by a rapid pose, facilitated by the excellent
30 luminosity of the needle for the tracking. No compression pad was needed, optimizing the
31 implementation and quality of the control mammography. The mean time for the tissue
32 resection from incision to excision was 15 minutes for the first 10 cases. On the radiography
33 of removed tissue: the clip was present in 38 out of 39 cases. One failure was registered, in
34 relation to loss of the clip, found in the tumorectomy limits, in the patient with the double
35 localization procedure. However, the target was effectively removed and detected histo-
36 pathologically. In the 13 cases of super paramagnetic iron peroxide, the sentinel node was
37 identified each time. All biopsied lesions were removed, and in cancerous lesions, the
38 surgical margins were healthy in all cases.

39 **Conclusion:** The MS localization technique is reliable and safe. For the patient, the main
40 interest is a simplified procedure without long-term damage of the skin; for the radiologist,
41 the rapidity of the procedure; for the surgeon, a real time guide for localizing the target; and
42 for the hospital, an eased organization with regard to preoperative tracking during
43 ambulatory surgery, with implantations possible up to 1 month prior to surgery, for instance
44 at the time of the radiological review. The main limit to MS's development remains its cost.

45

46 INTRODUCTION

47 Thanks to widespread screening, the detection of non palpable lesions requiring surgery
48 represents more than half of all breast surgeries, and the challenge of their surgical
49 management lies in accurate preoperative location to allow complete removal, while limiting
50 the sacrifice of healthy glandular tissue for a satisfactory aesthetic result⁴.

51 The reference preoperative location technique for the detection of non-palpable lesions of
52 the breast is the radiologically placed hookwire. The effectiveness of this technique has long
53 been established. It is reliable and inexpensive, but it has evolved little since the 20th
54 century and has several drawbacks⁷. In particular, the insertion can be painful and a source
55 of stress for the patient. Some placements cause haematoma or even, in rare cases,
56 pneumothorax. The metal marker may migrate or be displaced before or during surgery. The
57 presence of hematoma can alter the surgical removal and the anatomopathological result. In
58 addition, the organization of its placement, the day before or the same day as the operation,
59 may be logistically burdensome for the different services involved⁴. If the insertion is carried
60 out the day before the operation, this implies that the patient goes home with the device
61 and spends a night at home with the presence of this externalized wire, all of which may
62 have an impact on the preoperative anxiety of the patients and her experience of the
63 operation, as well as that of their family. In addition, the risk of displacement of the tip of
64 the metallic marker may occur during the patient's sleep, thus losing the benefit of the
65 technique. Finally, the tip of the metallic marker which is in contact with the pectoral muscle
66 can generate significant pain. For all these reasons, new techniques of preoperative marking
67 have been developed. Magnetic seed (MS) appears to be a simple, non-radioactive and non-

68 aggressive technique. MR takes the form of a 1x5mm paramagnetic clip made of iron oxide
69 (Figure 1), visible on ultrasound and mammography and detected by a SentiMag¹⁰

70

71 Figure 1 Magnetic seed (Magseed)

72

73 In 2018, ambulatory surgery represented 36% of all surgeries in France (the rates for 2019
74 and 2020 have not been raised due to the health situation caused by Covid 19). The
75 objective of the HAS is to achieve a majority ambulatory practice of 70% in 2022²⁶. The place
76 of MR is particularly adapted in this new organization. The objective of this study is to
77 evaluate the effectiveness and safety of magnetic seed (MS), performed under ultrasound, in
78 the surgical management of non-palpable breast lesions in an essentially ambulatory surgical
79 setting.

80

81 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

82

83 This study is a consecutive cohort performed at the Breast Center of Saint Joseph Hospital in
84 Paris, France, between May 15 and December 21, 2018. Over this period, we studied the
85 consecutive placement of 39 magnetic seed (MS) in 37 patients preoperatively, under
86 ultrasound, within non-palpable breast lesions. Patients with benign, atypical or cancerous
87 non-palpable lesions requiring surgical removal were included.

88

89 The placement of the MS was done under ultrasound control by an experienced radiologist
90 (Figure 2). The tracer was inserted with a guide after local anesthesia. The magnetic tracer

91 used in this study was approved for use in the localization of breast lesions up to 30 days
92 before surgery¹¹.

93

94 When the tumor was an infiltrating ductal or lobular carcinoma, the tumor removal could be
95 accompanied by a lymph node procedure; the realization of an axillary lymph node
96 dissection or the dissection of the sentinel lymph node (SG). Two techniques were studied in
97 this study for the dissection of the sentinel lymph node: patients over 60 years of age
98 received an injection of iron peroxide (Sienna) and patients under 60 years of age or to be
99 followed by breast MR received an isotope injection. In the operating room, the MR was
100 located percutaneously with the magnetic detection probe. The ex-vivo magnetism was
101 noted, and the surgical specimen was sent for radiography to confirm the presence of the
102 MR and for traceability purposes (Figure 2).

103

104 Figure 2. X-ray of the lesion with Magseed present (on the right)

105

106 The primary endpoint was complete removal of the lesion, with healthy margins. Secondary
107 endpoints were the occurrence of complications, interference of MS with GS, and operative
108 time from incision to specimen resection.

109

110 The ethics committee of Hospital Paris Saint-Joseph (Paris, France) gave ethical approval for
111 this work.

112

113

114

115 **RESULTS**

116 During the analysis period, 37 patients benefited from the MS technique. The average age of
117 the patients was 57 years (33-86 years), the average size of the lesion on ultrasound was
118 12.7 mm (5-34 mm). All lesions were biopsied preoperatively. There were 29 infiltrating
119 cancers, 7 atypical lesions, and 3 benign lesions. The time from landmark to surgery ranged
120 from 0 to 21 days, with a mean of 5 days. Final lesion size averaged 12 mm, with lesions
121 ranging from 3 to 29 mm. The mean time from incision to excision was 15 min for the first 10
122 cases. One patient with extensive papillomatous lesions had double MS placement. One
123 patient had MS in each breast for bilateral invasive lobular carcinoma.

124 A lymph node procedure was required in 29 patients; the sentinel lymph node was identified
125 by iron peroxide injection (Sienna) in 11 cases (45%), isotopes in 18 cases (55%) and axillary
126 lymph node dissection was required in one patient. For the 11 cases in which the sentinel
127 lymph node search was performed with Sienna+, the rate of identification of the GS was
128 100%, no interference with the use of MS was found.

129 The characteristics of the patients are summarized in Table 1.

130

131

132

133

134

135 **Table 1 Characteristics of patients**

	(n = 37)
Age (year)	57 (33-86ans)
Size on ultrasound (mm)	12,8 (5-34mm)
Time to install magnetic tracking → surgery (days)	0 to 21
Incision - excision time (min)	15
Number of procedures associated with a sentinel node	11 (28%)
Sienna +	
Success	39 (100%)

136

137 The technical procedure for the location was characterized by a rapid placement, facilitated
138 by an excellent brilliance of the needle and the marker. No pressure dressing was required,
139 thus improving the performance and quality of the follow-up mammogram. All MS were
140 placed within the target area during the follow-up mammogram.

141 For all patients studied, the MS was present in 38 out of 39 cases on room radiography. The
142 only failure was due to the loss of the clip in the lumpectomy bed in a patient with a
143 papillomatous tumor who was double located in the same breast. However, the target was
144 well removed. All lesions were removed, with healthy margins in case of neoplastic lesion.

145 Of the 37 patients analyzed, we did not observe any postoperative complications.

146 **DISCUSSION**

147 The study of this case series confirmed the efficacy and feasibility of the magnetic tracking
148 technique. All lesions were removed with healthy margins. There were no postoperative
149 complications. The logistics of this technique appear to be easier in practice than the
150 metallic technique. We found a 100% efficiency on the use of 39 MS. In the light of our
151 exploratory series, MS appears to be an effective and safe solution for preoperative location
152 of non-palpable lesions of the breast and could thus be positioned as an alternative to
153 hookwire localization.

154 The strength of this study is that there is currently no published study in France on the use,
155 safety and efficacy of this modern method of detection in the surgical management of non-
156 palpable breast lesions.

157 This is a single-center study with a limited number of patients, which limits the
158 generalization of the results to other centers, but the implementation of innovative practices
159 requires this type of study to define optimal management before allowing the diffusion of
160 this technique. The evaluation of the efficiency (in terms of logistics, organizational ease) of
161 MS was limited by the retrospective nature of our study, which inevitably led to some loss of
162 data: the operating time was missing for the majority of patients, whereas some teams have
163 shown that the use of new methods of identification made it possible to reduce operating
164 time²⁵. A prospective analysis, with a control group on the gold standard (metallic
165 localization), would make it possible to evaluate the gain of time and the cost ratio of the MS
166 technique.

167 Studies published in the literature since 2017 report efficacy of more than 90% in localizing
168 subclinical breast lesions in cohorts ranging from 15 to 168 patients.

169 The safety of the technique had already been studied before its marketing in the United
170 States. Thus, magnetic tracking received clearance in 2016 by the FDA after a feasibility
171 study by Harvey & al⁸ who looked at 29 devices placed in 28 patients, 24 of which were
172 under ultrasound and 5 under radiographic guidance. In this series, one patient had bilateral
173 MR placement, 27 markers were placed directly on the target lesion and all implants were
174 retrieved. But unlike our study, this study sought to study the migration of the landmarks
175 and was performed on patients who were going to have a total mastectomy.

176 In 2019, in the team of Pohlodek et al. in Slovakia, 41 MS (Magseed) were placed in 38
177 patients. Twenty-seven patients with malignant tumors in this study had magnetic tracking
178 simultaneously for tumor and sentinel node detection. All 38 breast lesions were accurately
179 located using this method. No interference was observed on the magnetic probe between
180 the tumor signals and the sentinel node tracer signals. All tumors were removed with
181 healthy surgical margins²². The interaction between the two techniques could be evaluated
182 in a larger series with the required statistical power.

183 The study by Reitsamer et al. showed in their study including 80 patients that the magnetic
184 tracer is a reliable method for detecting post-chemotherapy target adenopathy.
185 Nevertheless, one of the weaknesses of MS is that it cannot be used to detect cancerous
186 lesions in the neoadjuvant setting because of signal artifacts on MRI, related to the presence
187 of magnetic material in the breast. Also, other methods are being developed, such as the
188 Savi Scout, an alternative tracking method that uses electromagnetic wave reflectors, but in
189 a recent study showed difficulty in skin detection, inactivation of the tracer by contact with

190 the electrocoagulation of the electric scalpel in the operating room, as well as migration of
191 several of their tracers without identified cause²³. Markers using radiofrequency are also
192 being developed, which would also give the major advantage of not giving artifact to MRI,
193 and would therefore allow the radiologist to place the marker at the same time as
194 performing the diagnostic biopsy regardless of the stage and severity of the initial disease.
195 New magnetic markers are being developed, including Sirius, which is distributed at a much
196 lower price than Magseed with the same advantages and good results; studies are
197 underway. On the other hand, although we have not noted any failure of the technique, we
198 know that the MS may not emit a signal if it is placed at a distance greater than 4 cm from
199 the target, which could pose a problem for large breasts. Finally, there is a technical
200 difficulty: surgical steel instruments cannot be used because they produce an artifact on the
201 Sentimag detection probe. For this reason, non-magnetic instruments are used, such as
202 plastic or titanium retractors, which can generate additional costs²⁴.

203 For the radiologist, MS has several advantages. First, because the placement can be done
204 remotely from the procedure, the organization in the radiology department is simplified.
205 Secondly, the time required for the dressing of the metal marker, often as long as the
206 insertion of the device itself, is subtracted. Thirdly, the patient does not have to fast on the
207 day of insertion (because she is at a distance from the surgical procedure) and anxiety is also
208 less important. In 2021, Micha et al. compared the effectiveness and satisfaction of patients
209 and physicians with metal and magnetic retrieval (a total of 296 patients). The results
210 showed that patients experienced less anxiety at the time of tracking and at surgery in the
211 magnetic tracking group, and physicians expressed greater ease of use of magnetic tracking.
212 This is the first large study of satisfaction for localization for impalpable breast lesions.

213 One of the main disadvantages of MS is its cost, which is an obstacle to its deployment.
214 While metal detection is a low-cost method (30 euros on average) and is fully covered by
215 social security. The cost of magnetic identification is 410 euros (including VAT) and is borne
216 by the establishment. On the other hand, the logistical simplification brought by this
217 magnetic tracer could lead to savings and increase the satisfaction of the patient, as well as
218 the medical team taking care of her. In addition, the price of MS is not fixed between
219 different countries. A Dutch study²⁰ studied the budgetary impact of MS according to its
220 price in the management of a non-palpable breast tumor, the price ranged from €100 to
221 €500, and the results show that if the price of MS does not exceed €175, it appears to be a
222 cost-effective method by reducing the costs of organization, implementation and
223 intervention. Manufacturers should take this aspect into account when determining and
224 harmonizing the price of MS. Medico-economic studies (budgetary impact analysis
225 comparing MR and metallic detection) and patient satisfaction studies (PROM's Patient
226 Reported Outcome measurements) are necessary to recommend the use of MR for
227 preoperative detection of non-palpable breast lesions on a routine basis, and even to obtain
228 its reimbursement.

229

230 **CONCLUSION**

231 The technique of magnetic detection of subclinical breast lesions is reliable and safe. The
232 major interest for the patient is an easy placement without any lasting invasion of the skin;
233 for the radiologist: rapidity of the procedure; for the surgeon: real time guidance to find the
234 target; and for the hospital: simplified organization of preoperative localization. With the
235 development of outpatient care and minimally invasive surgery, this surgical innovation has
236 its place by simplifying the organization, but its cost remains a barrier to its deployment

237 REFERENCES

- 238 1. Le cancer du sein - Les cancers les plus fréquents. [https://www.e-cancer.fr/Professionnels-](https://www.e-cancer.fr/Professionnels-de-sante/Les-chiffres-du-cancer-en-France/Epidemiologie-des-cancers/Les-cancers-les-plus-frequents/Cancer-du-sein)
239 [de-sante/Les-chiffres-du-cancer-en-France/Epidemiologie-des-cancers/Les-cancers-les-plus-](https://www.e-cancer.fr/Professionnels-de-sante/Les-chiffres-du-cancer-en-France/Epidemiologie-des-cancers/Les-cancers-les-plus-frequents/Cancer-du-sein)
240 [frequents/Cancer-du-sein](https://www.e-cancer.fr/Professionnels-de-sante/Les-chiffres-du-cancer-en-France/Epidemiologie-des-cancers/Les-cancers-les-plus-frequents/Cancer-du-sein).
- 241 2. Broeders, M. *et al.* The Impact of Mammographic Screening on Breast Cancer Mortality in
242 Europe: A Review of Observational Studies. *J Med Screen* **19**, 14–25 (2012).
- 243 3. Shapiro, S. Periodic Screening for Breast Cancer: The HIP Randomized Controlled Trial. *JNCI*
244 *Monographs* **1997**, 27–30 (1997).
- 245 4. Chagpar, A. B. *et al.* Does Localization Technique Matter for Non-palpable Breast Cancers?
246 *The American Surgeon* 00031348211011135 (2021) doi:10.1177/00031348211011135.
- 247 5. Hall, F. & Frank, H. Preoperative localization of nonpalpable breast lesions. *American Journal*
248 *of Roentgenology* **132**, 101–105 (1979).
- 249 6. Preoperative Localization of Nonpalpable Breast Lesions Demonstrated by Mammography |
250 NEJM. [https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJM197607292950506?url_ver=Z39.88-](https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJM197607292950506?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed)
251 [2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed](https://www.nejm.org/doi/10.1056/NEJM197607292950506?url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed).
- 252 7. Tardivon, A. & Malhaire, C. Cancer du sein (II). Procédures diagnostiques et thérapeutiques.
253 *EMC - Radiologie et imagerie médicale - Génito-urinaire - Gynéco-obstétricale - Mammaire* **4**, 1–22
254 (2009).
- 255 8. Norman, C., Lafaurie, G., Uhercik, M., Kasem, A. & Sinha, P. Novel wire-free techniques for
256 localization of impalpable breast lesions—A review of current options. *Breast J* **27**, 141–148 (2021).
- 257 9. Jeffries, D. O., Dossett, L. A. & Jorns, J. M. Localization for Breast Surgery: The Next
258 Generation. *Archives of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine* **141**, 1324–1329 (2017).
- 259 10. Pieszko, K., Wichtowski, M., Cieciorowski, M., Jamont, R. & Murawa, D. Evaluation of the
260 nonradioactive inducible magnetic seed system Magseed for preoperative localization of
261 nonpalpable breast lesions – initial clinical experience. *wo* **24**, 51–54 (2020).
- 262 11. Thekkinkattil, D. *et al.* A prospective, single-arm, multicentre clinical evaluation of a new

- 263 localisation technique using non-radioactive Magseeds for surgery of clinically occult breast lesions.
264 *Clinical Radiology* **74**, 974.e7-974.e11 (2019).
- 265 12. Hersi, A.-F. *et al.* A combined, totally magnetic technique with a magnetic marker for non-
266 palpable tumour localization and superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles for sentinel lymph
267 node detection in breast cancer surgery. *European Journal of Surgical Oncology* **45**, 544–549 (2019).
- 268 13. Greenwood, H. I., Dodelzon, K. & Katzen, J. T. Impact of Advancing Technology on Diagnosis
269 and Treatment of Breast Cancer. *Surgical Clinics of North America* **98**, 703–724 (2018).
- 270 14. Schermers, B. *et al.* Feasibility of magnetic marker localisation for non-palpable breast
271 cancer. *The Breast* **33**, 50–56 (2017).
- 272 15. Harvey, J. R. *et al.* Safety and feasibility of breast lesion localization using magnetic seeds
273 (Magseed): a multi-centre, open-label cohort study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* **169**, 531–536 (2018).
- 274 16. Singh, P. *et al.* Effectiveness and Safety of Magseed Localization for Excision of Breast
275 Lesions: A Prospective, Phase IV Trial. *Annals of Surgery Open* **1**, e008 (2020).
- 276 17. Žatecký, J. *et al.* Magnetic Seed (Magseed) Localisation in Breast Cancer Surgery: A
277 Multicentre Clinical Trial. *Breast Care* **16**, 383–388 (2021).
- 278 18. Fung, W. *et al.* Safety and efficacy of magnetic seed localisation of non-palpable breast
279 lesions: pilot study in a Chinese population. *Hong Kong Med J* (2020) doi:10.12809/hkmj208559.
- 280 19. Gera, R., Tayeh, S., Al-Reefy, S. & Mokbel, K. Evolving Role of Magseed in Wireless
281 Localization of Breast Lesions: Systematic Review and Pooled Analysis of 1,559 Procedures.
282 *Anticancer Res* **40**, 1809–1815 (2020).
- 283 20. Lindenberg, M., van Beek, A., Retèl, V., van Duijnhoven, F. & van Harten, W. Early budget
284 impact analysis on magnetic seed localization for non-palpable breast cancer surgery. *PLoS One* **15**,
285 e0232690 (2020).
- 286 21. Norman, C., Lafaurie, G., Uhercik, M., Kasem, A. & Sinha, P. Novel wire-free techniques for
287 localization of impalpable breast lesions—A review of current options. *Breast J* **27**, 141–148 (2021).
- 288 22. Pohlodek, K., Sečanský, P., Haluzová, I. & Mečiarová, I. Localization of impalpable breast

- 289 lesions and detection of sentinel lymph nodes through magnetic methods. *European Journal of*
290 *Radiology* **120**, 108699 (2019).
- 291 23. Mango, V. L. *et al.* Beyond Wires and Seeds: Reflector-guided Breast Lesion Localization and
292 Excision. *Radiology* **284**, 365–371 (2017).
- 293 24. Hayes, M. K. Update on Preoperative Breast Localization. *Radiologic Clinics of North America*
294 **55**, 591–603 (2017).
- 295 25. Woodfin, A. A. *et al.* Savi Scout vs Wire Localization: Is one more efficient for OR utilization?
- 296 26. [https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/c_2884938/fr/chirurgie-ambulatoire-indicateurs-de-](https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/c_2884938/fr/chirurgie-ambulatoire-indicateurs-de-processus-en-chirurgie-ambulatoire)
297 [processus-en-chirurgie-ambulatoire](https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/c_2884938/fr/chirurgie-ambulatoire-indicateurs-de-processus-en-chirurgie-ambulatoire)
- 298 27. 2021, Micha et al. (Patient and clinician satisfaction and clinical outcomes of Magseed
299 compared with wire-guided localization for impalpable breast lesions)
- 300



1

2