

Research Article

Accuracy of Ultrasound and Computerized Tomography urogram in detecting Urinary tract calculi

Dr. Cheguri Sandeep Reddy

Assistant Professor, Department of Radiology, Dr. VRK Women's Medical College, Teaching Hospital & Research centre, Aziznagar, Hyderabad

Article History

Received: 05.01.2021

Accepted: 08.02.2021

Published: 27.02.2021

Journal homepage:

<https://www.easpublisher.com>

Quick Response Code



Abstract: Background: There is a lack of consensus about whether the initial imaging method for patients with suspected nephrolithiasis should be computed tomography (CT) or ultrasonography. **Material and Methods:** This is a Prospective, descriptive and single centre study. A total of 90 patients' USG and CTU were compared for the presence of calculi in the Department of Radiology, Dr. VRK Women's Medical College, Teaching Hospital and Research Centre. Sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, positive predictive value and negative predictive value of USG were calculated with CTU as the gold standard. **Results:** From the 90 sets of data collected, the sensitivity and specificity of renal calculi detection on USG were 53% and 85% respectively. The mean size of the renal calculus detected on USG was $6.8 \text{ mm} \pm 3.8 \text{ mm}$ and the mean size of the renal calculus not visualized on USG but detected on CTU was $3.5 \text{ mm} \pm 2.7 \text{ mm}$. The sensitivity and specificity of ureteric calculi detection on USG were 12% and 97% respectively. The sensitivity and specificity of urinary bladder calculi detection on USG, were 20% and 100% respectively. **Conclusion:** This study showed that the accuracy of US in detecting renal, ureteric and urinary bladder calculi were 68%, 80% and 99% respectively.

Keywords: Nephrolithiasis, Ultrasound, Computed tomography.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution **4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)** which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium for non-commercial use provided the original author and source are credited.

INTRODUCTION

Urolithiasis is a common finding in patients who present with acute flank pain and/or haematuria. The prevalence of Nephrolithiasis was 10.1% for the last 2013–2014 NHANES cycle. The highest prevalence of Nephrolithiasis was observed in males older than 60 years, at 17.8%, followed by males 40–59 years old at 12.6% [1, 2]. Nephrolithiasis is considered to be a disease of affluence like obesity, hypertension, and type 2 diabetes because it is so prevalent in wealthy countries [3, 4]. Urologic intervention is required in as many as 20% of patients with renal colic and more than \$2 billion is spent on treatment each year [5]. The lifetime prevalence of kidney stones in the India is 12% among men and 7% among women [6, 7]. Kidney stones develop when urine becomes "supersaturated" with insoluble compounds containing calcium, oxalate (CaOx), and phosphate (CaP), resulting from dehydration or a genetic predisposition to over-excrete these ions in the urine. About 5-10% of Indian has this predisposition [8-13].

Ultrasound (USG) is the most appropriate and useful screening tool as it is easily available, radiation-free, reproducible, inexpensive and non-invasive [14]. A USG that is negative for calculi may prompt the need for unenhanced computed tomography urogram (CTU). CTU was shown to be highly sensitive and specific for ureteric stones [15]. Its significant advantages over other modalities in the detection of urolithiasis includes accuracy, non-usage of intravenous contrast media, as well as the abilities to evaluate secondary effects of obstruction, and detect other potential sources of pain but patients are inevitably exposed to radiation [16].

There has been little direct comparison between USG and CTU in the detection of urolithiasis. CTU as being the gold standard, our study aims to determine the sensitivity of USG in detecting urinary tract calculi. The patients suspected of having renal tract calculi undergo a work-up that includes urine analysis, KUB radiograph, and USG as first line investigations. A positive USG may or may not proceed to CTU but all negative USG will undergo CTU for further evaluation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This is a Prospective, descriptive and single center study involving patients at our centre who had USG and CTU for suspected urinary tract calculi over a period of 1 year in the Department of Radiology, Dr. VRK Women’s Medical College, Teaching Hospital and Research Centre. This study has been approved by the hospital technical and ethical committee. Patient informed consent was obtained as this is a prospective study

Subjects

This is a Prospective study involving patients at our centre who had USG and CTU for suspected urinary tract calculi over a period of 1 year.

Examination technique

CTU was performed in the Department of Radiology at our centre using Siemens CT Somatom Sensation 64 with a dedicated protocol. Patient with full urinary bladder was positioned supine on CT examination table and scanned from the upper abdomen to the symphysis pubis with image reconstructed at 5 mm intervals. No oral or intravenous contrast media was given. Calculus was defined as hyper dense focus in the kidney, ureter and/or bladder. USG was performed using multiple new generation ultrasound scanners (Toshiba, Philips and GE Logic).

Ultrasound included evaluation of the kidneys in multiple anatomic planes and maximum calculus measurement was recorded. Curved-phase array transducers were used with varied transducer frequency depending on the body habitus to optimise both patient penetration and image resolution. Calculus on ultrasound was characteristically demonstrated as highly echogenic focus with distinct posterior acoustic shadowing.

Demographic data including age, sex and ethnicity were collected. A review of the USG and CTU of each patient was done with documentation of the imaging findings including presence or absence of calculus, site (right or left urinary tract or both), location (kidney, ureter or bladder), and calculus size in millimeter. With CTU as the gold standard, sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, positive predictive value and negative predictive value of USG for the detection of calculus at each of the three locations (kidney, ureter and bladder) were calculated.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25th was used for statistical analyses.

RESULTS

A total of 90 patients were included in the study.

Table-1: Distribution of age groups

Age group	No. of patients	Percentage
25-39 Years	36	40
40-59 Years	31	34.4
60-79 Years	23	25.5
Total	90	100

In table 1, the patients were predominantly in the late adulthood and elderly age groups, with 36 patients (40%), 31 patients (34.4%) and 23 patients (25.5%) aged between 25-39, 40-59 and 60-79 years respectively.

Table-2: Distribution of sex

Sex	No. of patients	Percentage
Male	56	62.2
Female	34	37.7
Total	90	100

In table 2, gender wise distribution, there were maximum no. of patients were 56 males and 34 females.

Table-3: Calculi described as staghorn have been classified as ≥ 10.1 mm

Findings	% Error in USG
True positive	37
True negative	34
False positive	7
False negative	12
Total	90

Detection of renal calculi

In table 3, from the 90 data collected patients, 37 renal calculi were detected on both USG and CTU. There were 7 false positive cases. The sensitivity and specificity of renal calculi detection on ultrasound were 52% and 86% respectively. The positive predictive value (PPV) was 84% and negative predictive value (NPV) was 57%. The accuracy of ultrasound in detecting renal calculi was 68%. Of the 43 renal calculi detected on USG, 31 calculi were measured. The remaining 7 calculi not measured were too small and described as tiny or too large and described as staghorn calculi.

Table-4: Size of detected and undetected renal calculi on USG

Calculus size (mm)	Number detected (%)	Number undetected (%)
≤ 5	14 (32.5)	31 (86.1)
5.1 – 10	18 (41.8)	4 (11.1)
≥ 10.1	11 (25.5)	1 (2.7)
Total	43 (100)	36 (100)

In table 4, the majority of calculi detected by USG measured 5.1-10 mm. The minimum, maximum and average size documented was 3.5 mm, 22 mm and $6.8 \text{ mm} \pm 3.8 \text{ mm}$ respectively. 43 renal calculus detected and 36 renal calculi were not detected on USG but positive on CTU and 31 findings were true negative. Of the 36 calculi not detected on USG but detected on CTU, 9 were described as tiny and the other 29 were measured on CTU. The majority of calculi not detected by USG measured $\leq 5 \text{ mm}$. The minimum, maximum and average size of calculi that were not detected on USG was 3 mm, 11 mm and $3.7 \text{ mm} \pm 2.1 \text{ mm}$ respectively.

Table-5: Detection of ureteric calculi on USG and CTU

USG	CTU Percentage		
	Normal	Abnormal	Total
Normal	75	11	86
Abnormal	1	3	4
Total	76	14	90

In table 5, ultrasound detected only 3 of the 14 ureteric calculi that were detected on CTU giving a low sensitivity of 12%. However, it showed a high specificity of 97%. The accuracy of ultrasound in detecting ureteric calculi was 81%. The PPV and NPV were 63% and 81% respectively.

Table-6: Detection of urinary bladder calculi on USG and CTU

USG	CTU Percentage		
	Normal	Abnormal	Total
Normal	86	2	88
Abnormal	1	1	2
Total	87	3	90

In table 6, detection of urinary bladder calculi for the detection of urinary bladder calculi, ultrasound achieved 20% sensitivity and 100% specificity. The PPV was 100% with NPV of 98%. The accuracy was 98%.

DISCUSSION

This study showed that USG had limited value for the detection of renal calculi. The sensitivity and

specificity of 53% and 85% respectively were lower compared to two previous studies that had reported 81% and 100%, and 76% and 100% for sensitivity and specificity respectively [17]. However, our sensitivity exceeded that of another study, which reported a sensitivity of 24%, but a slightly higher specificity of 90% [18]. The longer time interval between ultrasound and CTU (45% within 1 month, the rest 1 month or more) in this study could have contributed to this discrepancy, in contrast to 1 month or less in previous studies.

The poor sensitivity and the high false negative rates (41%) of USG demonstrated in this study are related to multiple factors. Calculi may be missed at USG due to lack of acoustic shadowing of the calculus [19]. The other factors would be the body habitus, 6 the selection of the transducer power, and focal length [20]. The excellent contrast resolution of CTU allows discrimination of slight differences in attenuation, allowing better visualisation of stones. Furthermore, CTU has the ability to acquire a volume of data that includes the entire urinary system and not just the kidneys only. USG may miss stones within some parts of the urinary tract, 8 especially the ureters.

In this study, the false positive rate (FP) was 15% for USG and may have been due to renal vascular calcification [21]. With regard to the size of renal calculi that were detected, this study showed that the mean size of the calculi detected on USG was $7.6 \text{ mm} \pm 4.1 \text{ mm}$, comparable to a study that reported a mean size of $7.1 \text{ mm} \pm 1.2 \text{ mm}$. 7 Of the 53 renal calculi not detected on USG, 85% measured $\leq 5 \text{ mm}$. A previous study showed that the mean size of calculus detected on CTU was $4.2 \text{ mm} \pm 0.4 \text{ mm}$ [22]. Seventy-three percent of calculi not visualized on USG were 3 mm or less in size [23].

The USG in which a 12-mm calculus had been missed but was detected later on CTU was performed by a junior trainee, and the time interval between USG and CTU was between 1 – 3 months. The presence of posterior acoustic shadowing depends on the size of the calculus. Therefore, the smaller the calculus, the more likely it could be missed [24]. However, the reason for a large calculus not being identified on USG is not clear. One way to improve on USG skill is to repeat the USG whenever a false negative or false positive result is noted on CTU.

With regard to the detection of ureteric calculi, a prospective study in 1998 achieved a sensitivity of 19% and a specificity of 97% [25]. Another study in 2007 showed a slightly higher sensitivity of 23% and specificity of 100% [26]. In this study, almost similar results were achieved, with low sensitivity of 12% and high specificity of 97%. The low sensitivity is attributable to the presence of bowel gas, which commonly obscures the ureters, and a large body habitus with thick subcutaneous fat that reduces visibility [27]. The specificity of calculi detection on USG is greater in the ureter than in the kidneys. This is because the diagnosis of ureteric calculus is greatly aided by the presence of hydroureter [28]. In other words, USG lacks sensitivity for the detection of ureteric calculi. However, it is fairly specific when calculi are seen. This study showed the accuracy of USG in detecting renal, ureteric and urinary bladder calculi was 67%, 80% and 98% respectively. USG is not equivalent to CTU in detecting urinary tract calculi. However, this does not mean that every patient suspected of having a urinary tract calculus should undergo a CTU. Based on the findings of this study, the following imaging algorithm is recommended.

A limitation of this study is the extended time interval between ultrasound and CTU. Approximately 55% of the patients had their ultrasound and CTU done at more than 1 month apart. Accuracy of ultrasound could be affected as calculi could have moved or changed in size during this period of time.

New ultrasound technique such as the use of Doppler ultrasound to detect “twinkling artefact” could potentially improve urolithiasis detection on sonography, and should certainly be looked into in future studies [29].

CONCLUSION

The sensitivity and specificity of USG in detecting renal calculi was 52% and 86% respectively and the mean size of renal calculi not visualized on USG was 3.5 mm \pm 2.7 mm. Our study showed that the accuracy of USG in detecting renal, ureteric and urinary bladder calculi was 68%, 80% and 99% respectively.

REFERENCE

1. Unal, D., Yeni, E., Karaoglanoglu, M., Verit, A., & Karatas, O. F. (2003). Can conventional examinations contribute to the diagnostic power of unenhanced helical computed tomography in urolithiasis?. *Urologia internationalis*, 70(1), 31-35.

2. Henderson, S. O., Hoffner, R. J., Aragona, J. L., Groth, D. E., Esekogwu, V. I., & Chan, D. (1998). Bedside emergency department ultrasonography plus radiography of the kidneys, ureters, and bladder vs intravenous pyelography in the evaluation of suspected ureteral colic. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 5(7), 666-671.
3. Patlas, M., Farkas, A., Fisher, D., Zaghaf, I., & Hadas-Halpern, I. (2001). Ultrasound vs CT for the detection of ureteric stones in patients with renal colic. *The British journal of radiology*, 74(886), 901-904.
4. Sinclair, D., Wilson, S., Toi, A., & Greenspan, L. (1989). The evaluation of suspected renal colic: ultrasound scan versus excretory urography. *Annals of emergency medicine*, 18(5), 556-559.
5. Smith, R. C., Rosenfield, A. T., Choe, K. A., Essenmacher, K. R., Verga, M., Glickman, M. G., & Lange, R. C. (1995). Acute flank pain: comparison of non-contrast-enhanced CT and intravenous urography. *Radiology*, 194(3), 789-794.
6. Teichman, J. M. (2004). Acute renal colic from ureteral calculus. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 350(7), 684-693.
7. Khan, A. N., Craig, M., & Worrall, J. A. (2004). Sonographic mimics of renal calculi. *Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine*, 23(10), 1361-1367.
8. Nakhi, A. B., Gupta, R., Al-Hunayan, A., Muttikkal, T., Chavan, V., Mohammed, A., & Ali, Y. (2010). Comparative analysis and interobserver variation of unenhanced computed tomography and intravenous urography in the diagnosis of acute flank pain. *Medical Principles and Practice*, 19(2), 118-121.
9. Smith, R. C., Rosenfield, A. T., Choe, K. A., Essenmacher, K. R., Verga, M., Glickman, M. G., & Lange, R. C. (1995). Acute flank pain: comparison of non-contrast-enhanced CT and intravenous urography. *Radiology*, 194(3), 789-794.
10. Pfister, S. A., Deckart, A., Laschke, S., Dellas, S., Otto, U., Buitrago, C., ... & Gasser, T. C. (2003). Unenhanced helical computed tomography vs intravenous urography in patients with acute flank pain: accuracy and economic impact in a randomized prospective trial. *European radiology*, 13(11), 2513-2520.
11. Dunnick, R., Sandler, C., & Newhouse, J. (2012). *Textbook of urology*. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
12. Kimme-Smith, C., Perrella, R. R., Kaveggia, L. P., Cochran, S., & Grant, E. G. (1991). Detection of renal stones with real-time sonography: effect of transducers and scanning parameters. *AJR. American journal of roentgenology*, 157(5), 975-980.
13. Juul, N., Holm-Bentzen, M., Rygaard, H., & Holm, H. H. (1987). Ultrasonographic diagnosis of renal

- stones. *Scandinavian journal of urology and nephrology*, 21(2), 135-137.
14. Catalano, O., Nunziata, A., Altei, F., & Siani, A. (2002). Suspected ureteral colic: primary helical CT versus selective helical CT after unenhanced radiography and sonography. *American Journal of Roentgenology*, 178(2), 379-387.
 15. Dalla Palma, L., Pozzi-Mucelli, R., & Stacul, F. (2001). Present-day imaging of patients with renal colic. *European radiology*, 11(1), 4-17.
 16. Ather, M. H., Jafri, A. H., & Sulaiman, M. N. (2004). Diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography compared to unenhanced CT for stone and obstruction in patients with renal failure. *BMC medical imaging*, 4(1), 1-5.
 17. Hoppe, B., & Kemper, M. J. (2010). Diagnostic examination of the child with urolithiasis or nephrocalcinosis. *Pediatric nephrology*, 25(3), 403-413.
 18. Yilmaz, S., Sindel, T., Arslan, G., Özkaynak, C., Karaali, K., Kabaalioglu, A., & Lüleci, E. (1998). Renal colic: comparison of spiral CT, US and IVU in the detection of ureteral calculi. *European radiology*, 8(2), 212-217.
 19. Dogan, H. S., & Tekgul, S. (2007). Management of pediatric stone disease. *Current urology reports*, 8(2), 163-173.
 20. Sheafor, D. H., Hertzberg, B. S., Freed, K. S., Carroll, B. A., Keogan, M. T., Paulson, E. K., ... & Nelson, R. C. (2000). Nonenhanced helical CT and US in the emergency evaluation of patients with renal colic: prospective comparison. *Radiology*, 217(3), 792-797.
 21. Rosen, C. L., Brown, D. F., Sagarin, M. J., Chang, Y., McCabe, C. J., & Wolfe, R. E. (1998). Ultrasonography by emergency physicians in patients with suspected ureteral colic. *The Journal of emergency medicine*, 16(6), 865-870.
 22. Ripollés, T., Agramunt, M., Errando, J., Martínez, M. J., Coronel, B., & Morales, M. (2004). Suspected ureteral colic: plain film and sonography vs unenhanced helical CT. A prospective study in 66 patients. *European radiology*, 14(1), 129-136.
 23. Sommer, F. G., Jeffrey Jr, R. B., Rubin, G. D., Napel, S., Rimmer, S. A., Benford, J., & Harter, P. M. (1995). Detection of ureteral calculi in patients with suspected renal colic: value of reformatted noncontrast helical CT. *AJR. American journal of roentgenology*, 165(3), 509-513.
 24. Smith, R. C., Verga, M., Dalrymple, N., McCarthy, S., & Rosenfield, A. T. (1996). Acute ureteral obstruction: value of secondary signs of helical unenhanced CT. *AJR. American journal of roentgenology*, 167(5), 1109-1113.
 25. Souza, L. R. M. F. D., Goldman, S. M., Faintuch, S., Faria, J. F., Bekhor, D., Tiferes, D. A., ... & Szejnfeld, J. (2007). Comparison between ultrasound and noncontrast helical computed tomography for identification of acute ureterolithiasis in a teaching hospital setting. *Sao Paulo Medical Journal*, 125(2), 102-107.
 26. Smith, R. C., Verga, M., McCarthy, S., & Rosenfield, A. T. (1996). Diagnosis of acute flank pain: value of unenhanced helical CT. *AJR. American journal of roentgenology*, 166(1), 97-101.
 27. Chen, M. Y., & Zagoria, R. J. (1999). Can noncontrast helical computed tomography replace intravenous urography for evaluation of patients with acute urinary tract colic?. *The Journal of emergency medicine*, 17(2), 299-303.
 28. Erwin, B. C., Carroll, B. A., & Sommer, F. G. (1984). Renal colic: the role of ultrasound in initial evaluation. *Radiology*, 152(1), 147-150.
 29. Hamm, M., Wawroschek, F., Weckermann, D., Knöpfle, E., Häckel, T., Häuser, H.,... & Harzmann, R. (2001). Unenhanced helical computed tomography in the evaluation of acute flank pain. *European urology*, 39(4), 460-465.

Cite This Article: Sudheer Kumar Kalyankar & Raghavendra Chigullapally (2021). Comparative Study of Ultrasound and Computerized Tomography for Nephrolithiasis Detection. *EAS J Radiol Imaging Technol*, 3(1), 17-21.