References

1. **“[Wire-free] localization technologies perform at least as good as WGL, with an average positive margin outcome of 11.2% (276/2460). Eleven comparative studies find no significant differences, a single study finds a significant benefit favoring wire-free localization. The positive margin rate combined for all technologies is 12.5% (472/3782). The reoperation rate (second surgical procedure required) com bined for all technologies is 14.8% (391/2636)”** Sirius Internal Literature Evaluation 000930v3.0 covering multiple wire-free devices.
2. **“Complications or adverse events related to marker-based localization technologies are mild, most are not device related (i.e. general post-operative complications) and in all cases when were compared to a control group, they were similar between groups.”** Sirius Internal Literature Evaluation 000930v3.0 covering multiple wire-free devices.
3. **Ottawa Hospital (Canada) found that their per-localization cost was $1,130 for wire, and $250 for wire-free. Overall, a cost reduction of 78% per patient for wire-free localization versus WGL.** Zhang, Y et al. (2017). Annals of Surgical Oncology, 125 https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-017-6084-z
4. **Significantly higher rated usability of previous generation Sirius Pintuition technology when compared to WGL. Surgeons significantly prefer Sirius Pintuition technology over WGL.** G.M. Struik and B. Scher mers et al., Breast J., vol. 27, no. 8, pp. 638–650, 2021, doi: 10.1111/tbj.14262.