

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

- ACR. (2018). Digital mammography: Quality Control Manual. *American College of Radiology, May*, 1–395.
- Alawaji, Z., Taba, S. T., Cartwright, L., & Rae, W. (2024). Automated quality control analysis for American College of Radiology (ACR) digital mammography (DM) phantom images. *Journal of Applied Clinical Medical Physics*, 25(12), e14548.
- Alkhalifah, K., & Brindhavan, A. (2018). Investigation of Exposure Factors for Various Breast Composition and Thicknesses in Digital Screening Mammography Related to Breast Dose. *Medical Principles and Practice*, 27(3), 211–216. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000488198>
- Anugrah, M. A., Ilyas, S., & Tahir, D. (2021). Gelatin/Poly (vinyl alcohol)/Inorganic filler composites for phantom breasts. *Materials Chemistry and Physics*, 262(January), 124333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matchemphys.2021.124333>
- Anugrah, M. A., Suryani, S., Mutmainna, I., Fahri, A. N., & Tahir, D. (2020). Structural and bonding characteristic of composite gelatine-PVA-Zn for phantom breast cancer applications. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2219(May). <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0003008>
- Barufaldi, B., Lau, K. C., Schiabel, H., & Maidment, D. A. (2015). Computational assessment of mammography accreditation phantom images and correlation with human observer analysis. *Medical Imaging 2015: Image Perception, Observer Performance, and Technology Assessment*, 9416, 941606. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2082074>
- Boita, J., Bolejko, A., Zackrisson, S., Wallis, M. G., Ikeda, D. M., Van Ongeval, C., van Engen, R. E., Mackenzie, A., Tingberg, A., Bosmans, H., Pijnappel, R., Sechopoulos, I., & Broeders, M. (2021). Development and content validity evaluation of a candidate instrument to assess image quality in digital mammography: A mixed-method study. *European Journal of Radiology*, 134(November 2020), 109464. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2020.109464>
- Celina, F. M., Gani, M. R. A., & Endarko, E. (2023). Evaluation of in-house phantoms for mammography accreditation with various 3D printer filaments. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2498(1). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2498/1/012014>
- CIRSINC. (2013). *Tissue-Equivalent Phantoms for Mammography User Guide CIRS*. 1–16.
- da Silva, S. D., Joana, G. S., Oliveira, B. B., de Oliveira, M. A., Leyton, F., & Nogueira, M. do S. (2015). Dosimetry and image quality in digital mammography facilities in the State of Minas Gerais, Brazil. *Radiation Physics and Chemistry*, 116, 292–299. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radphyschem.2015.05.024>
- Dance, D. R., Skinner, C. L., Young, K. C., Beckett, J. R., & Kotre, C. J. (2000). Additional factors for the estimation of mean glandular breast dose using the UK mammography dosimetry protocol. *Physics in Medicine & Biology*, 45(11), 3225.
- Dougherty, G. (1998). Computerized evaluation of mammographic image quality using phantom images. *Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics*, 22(5), 365–373.
- Haus, A. G., Yaffe, M. J., Feig, S. A., Hendrick, R. E., Butler, P. A., Wilcox, P. A., & Bansal, S. (2001). Relationship between phantom failure rates and radiation dose in

- mammography accreditation. *Medical Physics*, 28(11), 2297–2301.
- Hejduk, P., Sexauer, R., Ruppert, C., Borkowski, K., Unkelbach, J., & Schmidt, N. (2023). Automatic and standardized quality assurance of digital mammography and tomosynthesis with deep convolutional neural networks. *Insights into Imaging*, 14(1), 90.
- Hill, M. L., Mackenzie, A., Warren, L. M., Khan, N., Wang, K., & Highnam, R. P. (2020). Mammographic image quality assessment by a contrast-to-noise ratio for clinical images. *15th International Workshop on Breast Imaging (IWBI2020)*, 11513, 132–140.
- Huda, W., Sajewicz, A. M., Ogden, K. M., Scalzetti, E. M., & Dance, D. R. (2002). How good is the ACR accreditation phantom for assessing image quality in digital mammography? *Academic Radiology*, 9(7), 764–772.
- Kartani, M. B. A., Sanjaya, I. D., & Timur, J. (2023). Penentuan mean glandular dose (MGD) pada pesawat mamografi dengan target / filter tungsten (W) dan rhodium (Rh). *Journal of Medical Physics and Biophysics*, 10(1), 1–7.
- Kato, Y., Fujita, N., & Kodera, Y. (2010). A consideration of the signal-to-noise ratio in phase contrast mammography. *Medical Imaging 2010: Physics of Medical Imaging*, 7622, 1338–1349.
- Ko, M.-S., Kim, H. H., Cha, J. H., Shin, H. J., Kim, J. H., & Kim, M. J. (2013). Dose reduction in automatic optimization parameter of full field digital mammography: Breast phantom study. *Journal of Breast Cancer*, 16(1), 90–96.
- Perez-Diaz, M., Orozco-Morales, R., Suarez-Aday, E., & Pirchio, R. (2019). Computer-Aided Detection Systems for Digital Mammography. *Latin American Conference on Biomedical Engineering*, 265–271.
- Sarno, A., Mettivier, G., Golosio, B., Oliva, P., Spandre, G., Di Lillo, F., Fedon, C., Longo, R., & Russo, P. (2016). Imaging performance of phase-contrast breast computed tomography with synchrotron radiation and a CdTe photon-counting detector. *Physica Medica*, 32(5), 681–690.
- Saunders Jr, R. S., Baker, J. A., Delong, D. M., Johnson, J. P., & Samei, E. (2007). Does image quality matter? Impact of resolution and noise on mammographic task performance. *Medical Physics*, 34(10), 3971–3981.
- Ślusarczyk-Kacprzyk, W., Skrzyński, W., & Fabiszewska, E. (2016). Evaluation of doses and image quality in mammography with screen-film, CR, and DR detectors – Application of the ACR phantom. *Polish Journal of Radiology*, 81, 386–391. <https://doi.org/10.12659/PJR.897304>
- Song, S. E., Seo, B. K., Yie, A., Ku, B. K., Kim, H. Y., Cho, K. R., Chung, H. H., Lee, S. H., & Hwang, K. W. (2012). Which phantom is better for assessing the image quality in full-field digital mammography?: American College of Radiology accreditation phantom versus digital mammography accreditation phantom. *Korean Journal of Radiology*, 13(6), 776–783. <https://doi.org/10.3348/kjr.2012.13.6.776>
- Sosu, E. K., Boadu, M., & Mensah, S. Y. (2018). Determination of dose delivery accuracy and image quality in full - Field digital mammography. *Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Sciences*, 11(3), 232–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrras.2018.02.002>
- Sundell, V.-M., Mäkelä, T., Meaney, A., Kaasalainen, T., & Savolainen, S. (2019).

Automated daily quality control analysis for mammography in a multi-unit imaging center. *Acta Radiologica*, 60(2), 140–148.

Thomas, M., Matsutani, Y., Conant, E., & Maidment, A. (2013). SU-C-116-06: Evaluation of Image Quality in Digital Mammography and Digital Breast Tomosynthesis: Phantom Observer Study From American College of Radiology Imaging Network PA 4006. *Medical Physics*, 40(6Part2), 98

Anonim, 2013, Mammographic Accreditation Phantom Model 015 User Guide, Computerized Imaging Reference Systems.