



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكرو فيلم

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم



MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكرو فيلم



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكرو فيلم



MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية
التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

جامعة عين شمس

التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم

قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها
علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار



MONA MAGHRABY

Lymph node status assessment in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma in patients with clinically non palpable lymph nodes.

Study Submitted for the partial fulfillment of Master Degree in Otorhinolaryngology

(Meta analysis)

Presented by

Heba Mohamed Mohamed Ahmed Abdelkader
M.B.B.Ch., Ain shams university.

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Hany Riad Mohamed Mousa

Professor of Otorhinolaryngology
Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Samer Ahmed Ibrahim

Professor of Otorhinolaryngology
Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University

Prof. Dr. Amr Gouda Shafik

Professor of Otorhinolaryngology
Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University

Dr. Ossama Mustafa Mady

Lecturer of Otorhinolaryngology
Faculty of Medicine- Ain Shams University

**Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2020**



Acknowledgement

*First thanks to **ALLAH** to whom I relate any success in achieving any work in my life.*

*I wish to express my deepest thanks, gratitude and appreciation to **Prof. Dr. Hany Riad**, Professor of Otolaryngology, Head & Neck Surgery for his meticulous supervision, kind guidance, valuable instructions and generous help.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Prof. Dr. Samer Ahmed Ibrahim**, Professor of Otolaryngology, Head & Neck surgery, for his great help, outstanding support, active participation and guidance.*

*My deepest gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr. Amr Gouda** for his generous help, support and valuable comments during preparation of this work*

*Special thanks to **Dr. Ossama Mustafa**, Lecturer of Otolaryngology, Head & Neck Surgery for his sincere efforts and fruitful encouragement.*

My thanks and appreciations to my family. I owe my utmost gratitude for all their support and understanding.



Heba Mohamed Mohamed

List of Contents

Topic		Page
•List of Tables		I
•List of Figures		II
•List of abbreviations		V
✓ Introduction		1
✓ Aim of work		2
✓ Review Of Literature		3
Chapter1	Surgical anatomy & Description	3
Chapter2	Management of the N0 Neck	6
Chapter3	Imaging methods for neck node evaluation	11
✓ Materials and Methods		25
✓ Results		34
✓ Discussion		65
✓ Conclusion		71
✓ Recommendation		72
✓ Summery		73
✓ References		75
✓ Arabic summery		--

List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
1	Description of the lymph node levels.	3
2	N (node) staging in the TNM system.	5
3	Included articles.	26
4	Excluded articles and reasons for exclusion.	29
5	The diagnostic accuracy of US.	34
6	The diagnostic accuracy of CT Scan with contrast.	39
7	Diagnostic accuracy of MRI with contrast.	44
8	Diagnostic accuracy of CT Scan –MRI.	49
9	Analysis of Diagnostic Threshold of CT Scan-MRI (Per patient).	51
10	Diagnostic accuracy of PET/CT Scan.	54
11	The diagnostic accuracy of USFNAC.	61
12	Sensitivity, specificity, LR+, LR-, DOR and AUC of each imaging modality.	64
13	Summary of sensitivity, specificity and AUC of each imaging.	64

List of Figures

Fig.	Title	Page
1	Lymph node levels of neck.	3
2	Radical neck dissection.	7
3	Supraomohyoid neck dissection.	7
4	Lateral neck dissection.	8
5	Modified radical neck dissection.	8
6	Transverse greyscale sonogram in Cancer Larynx withinhomogenous echogenicity metastatic node.	12
7	power Doppler sonogram of a metastatic lymph node with peripheral vascularity	13
8	Axial CT view demonstrating a metastatic node	15
9	Images represent a false-negative 18F-FDG PET/CT result of preoperative detection of a metastatic lymph node	17
10	The four different borders on the schematic drawing	18
11	Transverse turbo spinecho T2-weighted images of the neckExamples of the four differentscores on border regularity.	19
12	lymphadenitis	20
13	(MRI PET) showing metastatic node level II.	21
14	Metastatic lymph node measured 6 mm On hematoxylin-eosin staining	22
15	55-year-old man with posterior pharyngeal wall cancer (T2) and clinically negative neck.	23
16	Images show preoperative detection of metastatic lymph nodes in a 66-year-old woman	24
17	The N0 neck. A 69-year-old male with 2cm supraglottic SCC	28
18	Sensitivity of US (Per patient).	35
19	Specificity of US (Per patient).	35
20	Positive LR of US (Per patient).	35
21	Negative LR of US (Per patient).	36
22	Diagnostic OR of US (Per patient).	36
23	Symmetric SROC of US (Per patient).	36
24	Sensitivity of US (Per lesion/side).	37

Fig.	Title	Page
25	Specificity of US (Per lesion/side).	37
26	Positive LR of US (Per lesion/side).	38
27	Negative LR of US (Per lesion/side).	38
28	Diagnostic OR of US (Per lesion/side).	38
29	Symmetric SROC of US (Per lesion/side).	39
30	Sensitivity of CT Scan (Per patient).	40
31	Specificity of CT Scan (Per patient).	40
32	Positive LR of CT Scan (Per patient).	40
33	Negative LR of CT Scan (Per patient).	41
34	Diagnostic OR of CT Scan (Per patient).	41
35	Symmetric SROC of CT Scan (Per patient).	41
36	Sensitivity of CT Scan (Per Lesion / Side).	42
37	Specificity of CT Scan (Per Lesion / Side).	42
38	Positive LR of CT Scan (Per Lesion / Side).	43
39	Negative LR of CT Scan (Per Lesion / Side).	43
40	Diagnostic OR of CT Scan (Per Lesion / Side).	43
41	Symmetric SROC of CT Scan (Per Lesion / Side).	44
42	Sensitivity of MRI Scan (Per Patient).	45
43	Specificity of MRI Scan (Per Patient).	45
44	Positive LR of MRI Scan (Per Patient).	45
45	Negative LR of MRI Scan (Per Patient).	46
46	Diagnostic OR of MRI Scan (Per Patient).	46
47	Symmetric SROC of MRI Scan (Per Patient).	46
48	Sensitivity of MRI Scan (Per Side).	47
49	Specificity of MRI Scan (Per Side).	47
50	Positive LR of MRI Scan (Per Side).	48
51	Negative LR of MRI Scan (Per Side).	48
52	Diagnostic OR of MRI Scan (Per Side).	48
53	Symmetric SROC of MRI Scan (Per Side).	48
54	Sensitivity of CT Scan-MRI (Per patient).	49
55	Specificity of CT Scan-MRI (Per patient).	50
56	Positive LR of CT Scan-MRI (Per patient).	50
57	Negative LR of CT Scan-MRI (Per patient).	50
58	Diagnostic OR of CT Scan-MRI (Per patient).	50
59	Asymmetric SROC of CT Scan-MRI (Per patient).	51

Fig.	Title	Page
60	Sensitivity of CT Scan-MRI (Per Level).	52
61	Specificity of CT Scan-MRI (Per Level).	52
62	Positive LR of CT Scan-MRI (Per Level).	52
63	Negative LR of CT Scan-MRI (Per Level).	53
64	Diagnostic OR of CT Scan-MRI (Per Level).	53
65	Symmetric SROC of CT Scan-MRI (Per Level).	53
66	Sensitivity of PET/CT Scan (Per Patient).	54
67	Specificity of PET/CT Scan (Per Patient).	55
68	Positive LR of PET/CT Scan (Per Patient).	55
69	Negative LR of PET/CT Scan (Per Patient).	55
70	Diagnostic OR of PET/CT Scan ((Per Patient).	56
71	Symmetric SROC of PET/CT Scan (Per Patient).	56
72	Sensitivity of PET/CT Scan (Per Level).	57
73	Specificity of PET/CT Scan (Per Level).	57
74	Positive LR of PET/CT Scan (Per Level).	57
75	Negative LR of PET/CT Scan (Per Level).	58
76	Diagnostic OR of PET/CT Scan (Per Level).	58
77	Symmetric SROC of PET/CT Scan (Per Level).	58
78	Sensitivity of PET/CT Scan (Per side).	59
79	Specificity of PET/CT Scan (Per side).	59
80	Positive LR of PET/CT Scan (Per side).	60
81	Negative LR of PET/CT Scan (Per side).	60
82	Diagnostic OR of PET/CT Scan (Per side).	60
83	Symmetric SROC of PET/CT Scan (Per side).	61
84	Sensitivity of USFNAC (Per Lesion / Side).	62
85	Specificity of USFNAC (Per Lesion / Side).	62
86	Positive LR of USFNAC (Per Lesion / Side).	62
87	Negative LR of USFNAC (Per Lesion / Side).	63
88	Diagnostic OR of USFNAC (Per Lesion / Side).	63
89	Symmetric SROC of USFNAC (Per Lesion / Side).	63

Lists of abbreviations

ADC	Apparent diffusion coefficient
ASROC	Asymmetrical Receiver operating curve
AUC	Area under curve
CCA	Common carotid artery
CI	Confidence interval
CN0HNSCC	Clinically N0 Head and neckSquamous cell carcinoma
CT	Computerized topography
D	Dimension
DOR	Diagnostic odds ratio
FDG	F18 fluorodeoxyglucose
FN	False negative
FP	False positive
HNSCC	Head and neck squamous cell carcinoma
ICA	Internal carotid artery
LR+	Likelihood ratio positive
LR-	Likelihood ratio Negative
MRI	Magnetic resonance imaging
N	Node
PET	Positron emission tomography
PET/CT	Positron emission tomography Computerized topography
REM	Random-effects method
ROC	Receiver operating curve
SCC	Squamous cell carcinoma
SCM	Sternocleidomastoid muscle
SLN	Sentinel lymph node biopsy
SND	Selective neck dissection
SPECT	Single photon emission computed tomography
SROC	Symmetrical Receiver operating curve
TN	True negative
TP	True positive
US	Ultrasonography
USFNAC	US fine needle aspiration cytology
USgFNAC	US guided fine needle aspiration cytology

Abstract

Background: The most important prognostic factor in squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck (HNSCC) is the presence or absence of clinically involved neck nodes. The presence of metastases in a lymph node is said to reduce the 5-years survival rate by about 50%. The appropriate diagnosis of the presence of metastatic node is very important for the management of HNSCC

Aim: To compare different diagnostic modalities for assessment of the clinically non palpable lymph nodes in HNSCC including by meta-analysis: CT, MRI, US, USFNAC and PET/CT for the proper cervical lymph node staging.

Methods: Met-analysis study on patients with HNSCC of clinically non palpable lymph nodes (cN0).

Results: Analysis was divided in 6 groups .Each group contain analysis of one modality according to available studies per patient, per level and per lesion .US is fair test per patient and per lesion. CT is good test per patient and excellent test per lesion. MRI is poor test per patient and fair test per lesion.CT-MRI combined is fair per patient and excellent per level. PET/CT is good per patient, fair per lesion and excellent per level. USFNAC is excellent per lesion.

Conclusion: CT, CT-MRI combined, PET/CT and USFNAC proved to be excellent in detecting cN0. MRI was poor test in detecting cN0. US was a fair test in detecting cN0 if used alone.

Key words: lymph node metastases, Occult metastatic neck disease detection

Introduction

Squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) is the most common malignant neoplasm of the upper aerodigestive tract. One of the most important influences on the prognosis is the presence of cervical lymph node (LN) metastasis. **(Richard et al., 1987)**

The presence of cervical lymph node metastases is a major prognostic factor in SCC of the head and neck. The presence of a solitary ipsilateral metastatic lymph node reduces expected survival by almost 50%. **(Hillary et al., 2017)**

In patients with Clinically N0 Head and neck Squamous cell carcinoma (cN0HNSCC) patients, treatment options have been determined by considering the probability of cervical LN metastasis. The prevalence of occult cervical LN metastasis is known to range from 12% to 50% depending on the location and the size of the primary cancer. Also, the presences of occult metastasis increase the risk of recurrence and indicate poor prognosis. **(Kim et al., 2018)**

It is generally accepted that a watchful waiting should be considered when the risk of occult cervical LN metastases is estimated to be 20% or less. If the risk of occult cervical LN metastasis is thought to be greater than 15-20%, elective neck treatment such as selective neck dissection or irradiation should be considered as a standard treatment. **(Weiss et al., 1994)**

Neck dissection is too morbid to be used as a staging tool in patients with cN0HNSCC patients. Also, because of the high morbidity and the cost of the procedure, optimal diagnostic tools should be used to improve the preoperative assessment of the cervical LN involvement to avoid unnecessary operations and to detect patients who would have the greatest benefit from an elective neck dissection. Therefore, if preoperative imaging studies could predict the risk of cervical nodal metastasis with satisfactory sensitivity, patients without nodal metastasis could possibly avoid these procedures. **(Kim et al., 2018)**

Aim of the Work

This meta-analysis study aims to compare different diagnostic modalities for assessment of the clinically non palpable lymph nodes in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma including: Computerized topography (CT), Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), Ultrasonography (US), US guided fine needle aspiration cytology (USgFNAC) and Positron emission tomography Computerized topography (PET/CT) for the proper cervical lymph node staging.