



000000

تم رفع هذه الرسالة بواسطة / سنوي محمود عقل

بقسم التوثيق الإلكتروني بمركز الشبكات وتكنولوجيا المعلومات دون أدنى

مسئولية عن محتوى هذه الرسالة.

**ملاحظات:**





# **Visibility of Urinary Stones in Plain Kidney, Ureter and Bladder Radiographs and Computed Tomography Scout View With Correlation with CT Hounsfield Unit**

Thesis

*Submitted For Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree  
In Radio diagnosis*

By

***Eman Musbah Jummah***

*M.B.B.Ch.,*

Under supervision of

**Prof. Dr. Khaled Aboufotouh Ahmad**

Professor of Radio diagnosis  
Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

**Assist. Prof. Remon Zaher Elia**

Assistant Professor of Radio diagnosis  
Faculty of Medicine – Ain Shams University

*Ain Shams University  
Faculty of Medicine  
2022*

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سببنا انك لا تعلم لنا  
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت  
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

# Acknowledgment

*First of all, thanks **GOD**, the merciful, the beneficent for helping me during this work.*

*I would like to express my indebtedness and deepest gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Khaled A. Ahmad**, Professor of Radio diagnosis, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for his valuable advice, guidance and constructive criticism, also for the invaluable assistance and efforts he devoted in the supervision of this study.*

*I'll never forget, how co-operative was **Assist. Prof. Dr. Remon Zaher Elia**, Assistant Professor of Radio diagnosis, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, also he was encouraging all the time. It is honorable to be supervised by him.*

*I would like to thank all the staff members of the Radio diagnosis department.*

*Finally, I would like to express my appreciation and gratitude to all my family, especially my caring and loving parents who enlighten my life.*

*Eman Musbah Jummah*

# *List of Contents*

Title	Page No.
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>List of Figures .....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations .....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Aim of the Work.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Review of Literature</b>	
☞ Anatomy of the Urinary System .....	5
☞ Pathology of Urinary Tract Stones .....	28
☞ Technique of Imaging in Urolithiasis .....	38
<b>Patients and Methods .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Results .....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Case Presentations .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Discussion.....</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>Conclusion .....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Recommendations.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Summary .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Arabic Summary.....</b>	<b>١</b>

## *List of Tables*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table 1:</b>	Frequency of types of urinary tract stones .....	30
<b>Table 2:</b>	Clinical factors associated with various types of stones .....	31
<b>Table 3:</b>	Differential diagnosis of renal colic .....	36
<b>Table 4:</b>	Imaging considerations of urolithiasis: implications for management .....	48
<b>Table 5:</b>	Common differential considerations for intrarenal and ureteral calculi .....	49
<b>Table 6:</b>	Common variants associated with stone formation .....	49
<b>Table 7:</b>	Demographic data of the studied patients.....	56
<b>Table 8:</b>	Results of scout and KUB among all 118 stones of the studied patients.....	57
<b>Table 9:</b>	Side and site of total 118 stones.....	58
<b>Table 10:</b>	Size and density of stones among the studied patients .....	60
<b>Table 11:</b>	Relation of Scout results with side and site of stones among the studied patients.....	60
<b>Table 12:</b>	Relation of Scout results with size and density of stones among the studied patients .....	61
<b>Table 13:</b>	Relation of KUB results with side and site of stones among the studied patients.....	63
<b>Table 14:</b>	Relation of KUB results with size and density of stones among the studied patients .....	64
<b>Table 15:</b>	Correlation of density with size, number of stone and age of the studied patients .....	68
<b>Table 16:</b>	Comparison between results of Scout and KUB .....	69
<b>Table 17:</b>	Diagnostic accuracy of KUB results taking Scout method as a gold standard .....	70

## *List of Figures*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure 1:</b>	The schematic of the male urinary system.....	5
<b>Figure 2:</b>	The posterior abdominal wall and topographical relationships of the kidneys, ureters and suprarenals .....	6
<b>Figure 3:</b>	Schematic cross-sectional diagram demonstrating renal (Gerota) fascia .....	8
<b>Figure 4:</b>	Internal structure of the right kidney .....	9
<b>Figure 5:</b>	Coronal sections through the left kidney showing pelvicalyceal system and renal sinus .....	10
<b>Figure 6:</b>	Posterior relationships of the kidneys .....	11
<b>Figure 7:</b>	Anterior relationships of the kidneys and ureters.....	13
<b>Figure 8:</b>	Vasculature of the Kidney.....	15
<b>Figure 9:</b>	Schematic representation of segmental arterial anatomy of right kidney .....	16
<b>Figure 10:</b>	The ureter demonstrating sites of normal functional or anatomic narrowing at the ureteropelvic junction (UPJ), the iliac vessels, and the ureterovesical junction (UVJ).....	18
<b>Figure 11:</b>	Relations of intrapelvic ureter; a - male, b – female .....	19
<b>Figure 12:</b>	Arterial supply of ureter.....	21
<b>Figure 13:</b>	Sagittal view of female pelvic cavity showing relations of urinary bladder and relationship of peritoneum to bladder .....	22
<b>Figure 14:</b>	Sagittal view of male pelvic cavity showing relations of urinary bladder and the various segments of the urethra .....	23

## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure 15:</b>	Coronal view of male pelvic cavity (viewed from behind) showing lateral and inferior relations of urinary bladder, and relationship of peritoneum to the bladder.....	23
<b>Figure 16:</b>	Longitudinal view of urinary bladder and urethra in the male.....	27
<b>Figure 17:</b>	Example of homogeneous and heterogeneous calcium oxalate monohydrate in bone window settings.....	32
<b>Figure 18:</b>	SSD measurement on CT .....	46
<b>Figure 19:</b>	Stone volumetry as a measure of stone burden.....	47
<b>Figure 20:</b>	MDCT in follow-up after urologic interventions .....	50
<b>Figure 21:</b>	Sex distribution among the studied patients.....	56
<b>Figure 22:</b>	Results of scout and KUB among all 118 stones of the studied patients.....	57
<b>Figure 23:</b>	Side of stones among the studied patients.....	58
<b>Figure 24:</b>	Site of stones among the studied patients.....	59
<b>Figure 25:</b>	Box plot showing median with inter-quartile range (IQR) of stone size in visible and not visible stones by Scout method .....	62
<b>Figure 26:</b>	Box plot showing median with inter-quartile range (IQR) of stone density in visible and not visible stones by Scout method .....	62
<b>Figure 27:</b>	Box plot showing median with inter-quartile range (IQR) of stone size in visible and not visible stones by KUB method .....	65
<b>Figure 28:</b>	Box plot showing median with inter-quartile range (IQR) of stone density in visible and not visible stones by KUB method .....	65



## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure 29:</b>	Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve for Density (HU) to differentiate between visible and non visible stones by Scout method.....	66
<b>Figure 30:</b>	Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve for Density (HU) to differentiate between visible and non visible stones by KUB method.....	67
<b>Figure 31:</b>	Correlation of density and size of stone .....	68
<b>Figure 32:</b>	Comparison between results of Scout and KUB.....	69
<b>Figure 33:</b>	Diagnostic accuracy of KUB results taking Scout method as a gold standard.....	70
<b>Figure 34:</b>	(A) KUB show two right kidney stones, (B) CT scout show two right kidney stones and left uretric stone at level of L2-L3 vertebral disc, (c) CTUT two right kidney stones measures 0.14 cm, 1038HU and 0.7 cm, 389 HU.....	71
<b>Figure 35:</b>	Left kidney stone visible on all three images—KUB, CT scou and CTUT 0.17x0.13 cm size, 1700 HU.....	72
<b>Figure 36:</b>	A: kidney, ureter, bladder x-ray show left upper pole kidney stone, B: CT scout show same stone visible in KUB, which also visible in CTUT (c) measure size 0.4cm, 500 HU, with another one left pelvic- ureteric stone seen only in CTUT measure 0.16 cm, 1103 HU.. .....	73
<b>Figure 37:</b>	(A) KUB- show stone visible (B) CT scout showing right renal stone (C) CT-UT right renal stone measure 6 mm, 1557HU. (D) CT-UT showing right ureter stone measure 0.2 cm 169 HU.. .....	74

## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure 38:</b>	(A) KUB revealed right kidney stone (B) CT scout same stone visible on the scout (C) CT-UT showed right renal stone 2 cm, 638 HU.....	75
<b>Figure 39:</b>	(A) KUB showing hyperechoic shadow in left kidney, (B) CT scout the same stone visible in (CT scout). (C) CT UT showing renal pelvis stone measure 2.8x2.7 cm size, density 1670 HU.....	76
<b>Figure 40:</b>	(A) KUB showing small right renal stone, (B) the same stone is no visible on CT scout, (C) CT-UT revealed right renal stone measure 0.6 cm with 199 HU density... ..	77
<b>Figure 41:</b>	(A) KUB showing right renal stent and right kidney stone, (B) CT scout visible right renal stone, (C) CT_UT right renal stone measure 2 cm, its density=780 HU.....	78

# *List of Abbreviations*

<b>Abb.</b>	<b>Full term</b>
<b>ACR</b>	<i>American College of Radiology</i>
<b>AIDS</b>	<i>Acquired immunodeficiency syndrome</i>
<b>BMI</b>	<i>Body mass index</i>
<b>CT</b>	<i>Computed Tomography</i>
<b>DECT</b>	<i>dual-energy CT</i>
<b>DEI</b>	<i>The dual energy index</i>
<b>DIR</b>	<i>Dose Index Registry</i>
<b>dsDECT</b>	<i>dual-source DECT</i>
<b>ESWL</b>	<i>extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy</i>
<b>HIV</b>	<i>Human immunodeficiency virus</i>
<b>HU</b>	<i>Hounsfield units</i>
<b>IVP</b>	<i>Intravenous Pyelogram</i>
<b>KUB</b>	<i>kidney, ureter and bladder</i>
<b>MDCT</b>	<i>The multidetector CT</i>
<b>MRI</b>	<i>magnetic resonance imaging</i>
<b>NCCT</b>	<i>noncontrast computed tomography</i>

<b><i>NCHCT</i></b>	<i>Non-contrast helical CT</i>
<b><i>PCNL</i></b>	<i>percutaneous nephrolithotomy</i>
<b><i>PRF</i></b>	<i>pulse repetition frequency</i>
<b><i>ROI</i></b>	<i>region of interest</i>
<b><i>RR</i></b>	<i>relative risk</i>
<b><i>SAFIRE</i></b>	<i>sinogram-affirmed iterative reconstruction</i>
<b><i>SSD</i></b>	<i>stone-to-skin distance</i>
<b><i>ssDECT</i></b>	<i>singlesource DECT</i>
<b><i>URS</i></b>	<i>Ureteroscopy</i>
<b><i>US</i></b>	<i>Ultrasound</i>

# INTRODUCTION

Urinary calculus remains to be a common presentation in the hospital (*Mahmoud et al., 2007*). It is the third most common urological problem after urinary tract infection and prostate disease with life time prevalence of urolithiasis at 10-15%. The prevalence has risen over a 20-year period from the mid 1970's to the mid 1990's (*Stamatelou et al., 2003*).

The diagnosis of urolithiasis is largely dependent on analyzing the clinical presentation and physical examination (*Mahmoud et al., 2007*).

Imaging has an important role in urolithiasis and aids not only in the initial diagnosis but also in planning treatment and follow-up of patients with renal and ureteric stones. Since the 1990s noncontrast computed tomography (NCCT) has become the gold standard imaging modality (*Waqas et al., 2018*).

Various imaging modalities are available to evaluate hydronephrosis and renal calculi (conventional X-ray of the abdomen; specific X-ray examination of the kidney, ureter and bladder (KUB), ultrasound (US),multidetector computed tomographay (MDCT); and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), although most recent protocols limit the choice of initial imaging modalities in an acute setting to MDCT and ultrasound (*Brisbane et al., 2016*), (*Coursey et al., 2012*).

Noncontrast CT of the abdomen and pelvis consistently provides the most accurate diagnosis but also exposes patients to ionizing radiation (*Brisbane et al., 2016*).

Traditionally US has a lower sensitivity and specificity than CT, but does not require use of radiation. However, when these imaging modalities were compared in a randomized controlled trial they were found to have equivalent diagnostic accuracy within the emergency department. Both modalities have advantages and disadvantages (*Brisbane et al., 2016*).

KUB plain film radiography is most helpful in evaluating for interval stone growth in patients with known stone disease, and is less useful in the setting of acute stones (*Brisbane et al., 2016*).

MRI provides the possibility of 3D imaging without exposure to radiation, but it is costly and currently stones are difficult to visualize (*Brisbane et al., 2016*).

(CT) is widely used to examine stones in the urinary system. In addition to the size and location of the stone and the overall health of the kidney, CT can also assess the density of the stone in Hounsfield units (HU). The HU, or Hounsfield density, measured by CT, is related to the density of the tissue or stone. A number of studies have assessed the use of HU in urology (*Güçük and Uyetürk, 2014*).

In recent years, the use of non-contrast MDCT in patients with urinary system stones has increased. Hounsfield units (HU), a parameter generated from standard CT, are related to the density of the stone (*Spettel et al., 2013*).

NCCT scan provides several advantages over the KUB radiograph such as detection of radiolucent calculi, sensitivity for small stones, identification of other causes of flank pain as well as avoidance of any preparation prior to the procedure (*Jellison et al., 2009*).

Non-contrast CT scan has long replaced the plain abdominal radiograph as the gold standard in the diagnosis of urolithiasis (*Krishnamurthy et al., 2005*). However, a KUB radiograph has remained part of the protocol for most clinicians even after a non-contrast CT scan is carried out because of its impact in clinical decision making prior to treatment (*Saw et al., 2000*).

KUB X-ray has been the preferred mode of follow up imaging provided the stone is visible on plain X-ray or radio-opaque. It has a much lower dose of radiation and is considerably cheaper, quicker and exposes patients to less radiation, CT scout film should be reported before proceeding to KUB. If the stone is visible on CT scout film, then the decision to use KUB for follow-up can be made. This minimizes radiation exposure and other costs (*Van Randen et al., 2011*).