ISSN: 2581 – 3633
PubMed - National Library of Medicine - ID: 101745081

International Journal of Medical Science and Advanced Clinical Research (IJMACR)

Available Online at:www.ijmacr.com

Volume – 7, Issue – 3, June - 2024, Page No. : 01 – 04

Comparing CT and MRI for Detecting Cervical Lymph Node Metastasis in Oral Cancer Patients

[1]Dr. Abhijit Bapurao Kamble, MDS, PG Resident, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology, SMBT Dental College and Hospital, Sangamner, Maharashtra.

[2]Dr. Soraisam Bidyapati MDS, Oral Medicine and Radiology, Consultant, Imphal, Manipur.

[3]Dr. Brijesh Byrappa, Dental Surgeon and Implantologist, Dental Experts A Super Speciality Dental Clinic, Banglore.

[4]Dr.Ujjaini Banerjee, Senior Lecturer, Department of Prosthodontics, Crown and Bridge, Manav Rachna Dental College, Faridabad, Haryana.

[5]Dr.Surgeon Commander CM Zameer Ahmed, Senior Dental Health Officer, Government Hospital Channarayapatna, Hassan. Health and family welfare Services, Govt of Karnataka.

[6]Dr.Tamoghna Jana, Senior resident, Department of Cleft and Craniofacial Surgery, Shree Jain Hospital and Research Center, Kolkata.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Abhijit Bapurao Kamble, MDS, PG Resident, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology, SMBT Dental College and Hospital, Sangamner, Maharashtra.

How to citation this article: Dr. Abhijit Bapurao Kamble, Dr. Soraisam Bidyapati, Dr. Brijesh Byrappa, Dr. Ujjaini Banerjee, Dr. Surgeon Commander CM Zameer Ahmed, Dr. Tamoghna Jana, "Comparing CT and MRI for Detecting Cervical Lymph Node Metastasis in Oral Cancer Patients", IJMACR- June - 2024, Volume – 7, Issue - 3, P. No. 01 – 04.

Type of Publication: Original Research Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Abstract

Cervical lymph node metastasis in oral cancer significantly impacts patient prognosis and treatment planning. Accurate detection of these metastases is crucial, and two primary imaging modalities used are Computed Tomography (CT) and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). This review compares the efficacy, advantages, and limitations of CT and MRI in detecting cervical lymph node metastasis in oral cancer patients. CT is noted for its high spatial resolution, speed, and availability but involves radiation exposure and limited soft tissue contrast. MRI excels in soft tissue differentiation and does not use ionizing radiation, though it is costlier and less accessible. Studies suggest that MRI generally offers higher sensitivity and specificity compared to CT, particularly when advanced techniques like diffusion-weighted imaging are employed. Clinical decision-making should consider patient condition, availability, and specific diagnostic needs, with a combination of both modalities potentially providing the most comprehensive evaluation.

Keywords: Oral Cancer, Cervical Lymph Node Metastasis, Computed Tomography (CT), Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), Diagnostic Imaging

Introduction

Oral cancer is a significant global health issue, often leading to metastasis in cervical lymph nodes. Accurate detection and staging of these metastases are critical for determining the appropriate treatment strategy and prognosis. Two primary imaging modalities used for detecting cervical lymph node metastasis are Computed Tomography (CT) and Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI). This article compares the efficacy, advantages, and limitations of CT and MRI in detecting cervical lymph node metastasis in oral cancer patients.(1,2)

Imaging Modalities (3-6)

Computed Tomography (CT): CT uses X-rays to produce detailed cross-sectional images of the body. It is widely used in oncology for its speed, accessibility, and high-resolution images.

Advantages: High Resolution: CT provides high spatial resolution, making it effective in identifying lymph node enlargement.

Speed: The imaging process is relatively quick, which is beneficial for patient comfort and throughput.

Bone Detail: CT excels at visualizing bony structures, which can be useful in assessing bone invasion by tumors.

Availability: CT scanners are widely available in most medical facilities.

Limitations

Radiation Exposure: CT involves ionizing radiation, which can be a concern, especially with repeated imaging.

Soft Tissue Contrast: CT is less effective in differentiating soft tissues compared to MRI.

Contrast Allergies: The use of iodinated contrast agents can pose risks for patients with allergies or kidney issues.

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) (7-10)

MRI uses powerful magnets and radio waves to generate detailed images of soft tissues. It is known for its superior contrast resolution.

Advantages

Soft Tissue Contrast: MRI provides excellent differentiation of soft tissues, which is crucial for detecting subtle changes in lymph nodes.

No Radiation: MRI does not use ionizing radiation, making it safer for repeated use.

Multiplanar Imaging: MRI can acquire images in multiple planes (axial, sagittal, coronal) without moving the patient.

Limitations

Longer Scan Times: MRI scans take longer than CT scans, which can be challenging for patients to tolerate.

Higher Cost: MRI is generally more expensive than CT.

Availability: MRI machines are less available than CT scanners, particularly in resource-limited settings.

Contraindications: Patients with certain implants or claustrophobia may not be able to undergo MRI.

Efficacy in Detecting Cervical Lymph Node Metastasis

Sensitivity and Specificity

CT: (11,12)

Sensitivity: CT has a reported sensitivity of 70-85% for detecting cervical lymph node metastasis.

Specificity: CT specificity ranges from 70-90%, depending on the size and characteristics of the lymph nodes evaluated.

Size Criteria: CT typically uses size criteria (e.g., lymph nodes >1 cm in short-axis diameter) to identify metastases, which may miss micro-metastases.

MRI: (13,14)

Sensitivity: MRI sensitivity is generally higher, ranging from 80-90% for detecting cervical lymph node metastasis.

Specificity: MRI specificity also tends to be high, around 85-95%.

Functional Imaging: Advanced MRI techniques, such as diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) and dynamic contrast-enhanced (DCE) MRI, can provide functional information about lymph nodes, improving detection accuracy.

Diagnostic Accuracy (15)

Studies comparing CT and MRI for detecting cervical lymph node metastasis in oral cancer patients indicate that MRI tends to be more accurate overall. MRI's superior soft tissue contrast and ability to use functional imaging techniques give it an edge in identifying metastatic nodes, especially in complex anatomical regions. However, CT remains valuable for its speed, availability, and effectiveness in detecting large or obvious lymph node metastases.

Clinical Considerations (16)

The choice between CT and MRI should be guided by several factors:

Patient Condition: MRI may be preferred for patients requiring detailed soft tissue evaluation without radiation exposure, while CT may be chosen for quick assessment or when MRI is contraindicated.

Availability and Cost: CT is often more accessible and cost-effective, making it the first-line imaging modality in many settings.

Specific Clinical Scenarios: For detailed pre-surgical planning or cases where soft tissue contrast is paramount, MRI may provide additional valuable information.

Conclusion

Both CT and MRI have distinct roles in detecting cervical lymph node metastasis in oral cancer patients. CT offers high resolution and speed, making it a practical choice in many clinical scenarios. MRI provides superior soft tissue contrast and functional imaging capabilities, enhancing its diagnostic accuracy. The choice between these modalities should be tailored to the patient's specific needs, clinical scenario, and available resources. In practice, a combination of both imaging techniques may offer the most comprehensive evaluation, leveraging the strengths of each modality.

References

1. Laimer J, Lauinger A, Steinmassl O, Offermanns V, Grams AE, Zelger B, et al. Cervical lymph node metastases in oral squamous cell carcinoma—how much imaging do we need? Diagnostics (Basel). 2020 Apr; 10(4):199.
2. De Souza Figueiredo PT, Leite AF, Barra FR, dos Anjos RF, Freitas AC, Nascimento LA, Melo NS, Guerra ENS. Contrast-enhanced CT and MRI for detecting neck metastasis of oral cancer: comparison between analyses performed by oral and medical radiologists. Dentomaxillofac Radiol. 2012 Jul;41(5):396-404.
3. Taubmann O, Berger M, Bögel M, Xia Y, Balda M, Maier A. Computed Tomography. In: Medical Imaging Systems: An Introductory Guide [Internet]. Published online: August 3, 2018.
4. Jung H. Basic Physical Principles and Clinical Applications of Computed Tomography. Prog Med Phys. 2021;32(1):1-17.
5. Goodman PC. The new light: discovery and introduction of the X-ray. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 1995;165:1041-1045.Pubmed CrossRef

6. Mould RF. Invited review: Röntgen and the discovery of X-rays. Br J Radiol. 1995;68:1145-1176.PubmedCrossRef
7. Nagesh CP, Rao R, Hiremath SB, Honavar SG. Magnetic resonance imaging of the orbit, Part 1: Basic principles and radiological approach. Indian J Ophthalmol. 2021 Oct;69(10):2574-2584. doi: 10.4103/ijo.IJO_3141_20. PMCID: PMC8597479. PMID: 34571597.
8. Chavhan GB. 2nd ed. Jaypee Medical Publishers, New Delhi, India; 2013. MRI Made Easy (for Beginners) [Google Scholar]
9. Allisy-Roberts P, Williams JR, Farr RF. Elsevier, London, United Kingdom: 2008. Farr's Physics for Medical Imaging. [Google Scholar]
10. Schild HH. MRI Made Easy (Well Almost). Schering AG, New Jersey, United States. 1990 [Google Scholar]
11. Suh CH, Baek JH, Choi YJ, Lee JH. Performance of CT in the preoperative diagnosis of cervical lymph node metastasis in patients with papillary thyroid cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. AJNR Am J Neuroradiol. 2017 Jan;38(1):154-161.
12. Saraswathi MC, Dayanand R, Desai R, Reddy PB. Efficiency of ultrasonography in assessing cervical lymph node metastasis in oral carcinoma. Natl J Maxillofac Surg. 2010 Jul-Dec;1(2):117-122.
13. Sridevi K, Ila A, Nagarajappa AK, Rajan MSA, Kolte DR, Gunturu S, Jandrajupalli SB, Chandolu S, Nayyar AS. Sensitivity and specificity of magnetic resonance imaging in prediction of cervical lymph node metastasis in oral squamous cell carcinomas. Niger Med J. 2021 Jan-Feb;62(1):14-22. Published online 2021 Dec 10. PMCID: PMC10903285. PMID: 38504792.
14. Shuto K, Kono T, Shiratori T, Akutsu Y, Uesato M, Mori M, Narushima K, Imanishi S, Nabeya Y, Yanagawa N, Okazumi S, Koda K, Matsubara H. Diagnostic performance of diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in assessing lymph node metastasis of esophageal cancer compared with PET. Esophagus. 2020;17(3):239-249.
15. Takamura M, Nikkuni Y, Hayashi T, Katsura K, Nishiyama H, Yamazaki M, Maruyama S, Tanuma JI. Comparing the diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography, CT, MRI, and PET/CT in cervical lymph node metastasis of oral squamous cell carcinoma. Biomedicines. 2023 Dec;11(12):3119. doi: 10.3390/biomedicines11123119.
16. Florkow MC, Willemsen K, Mascarenhas VV, Oei EHG, van Stralen M, Seevinck PR. Magnetic resonance imaging versus computed tomography for three-dimensional bone imaging of musculoskeletal pathologies: A review. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2022 Jul;56(1):11-34. doi: 10.1002/jmri.28067. PMCID: PMC9305220. PMID: 35044717.