https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.2.2024.4427-4432

African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: http://www.afjbs.com

Research Paper Open Access

The Utility of Endosonography in Diagnosing Malignant and Benign Lymph Node Lesions

Ahmed Khalid Mohammed Mohammed Atta[1], Maged Bahgat Abd Al-Aziz[1], Mohammed Refaei Khalil[1], Hussein Hassan Okasha[2]

1 Tropical Medicine Department, Faculty of Medicine - Zagazig University, Egypt

2 Internal Medicine and Gastroenterology Department, Cairo University, Egypt

Corresponding author: Ahmed Khalid Mohammed Mohammed Atta

Email: Drakmma2013@gmail.com

Article History

Volume 6, Issue 2, Apr-Aug 2024

Received: 5 August 2024

Accepted: 15 August 2024

Published: 15 August 2024

doi:10.48047/AFJBS.6.2.2024.4427-4432

Abstract: Endosonography (EUS) has emerged as a pivotal diagnostic tool in assessing lymphadenopathy, offering a minimally invasive approach with high-resolution imaging and the ability to perform fine-needle aspiration (FNA). This review critically evaluates the role of endosonography in differentiating malignant from benign lymph nodes, focusing on key ultrasonographic features, including size, shape, border characteristics, echogenicity, and vascular patterns. The integration of advanced technologies, such as contrast-enhanced EUS and elastography, has further enhanced diagnostic accuracy. Additionally, the review explores the role of EUS-FNA in obtaining cytological samples for histopathological analysis, addressing its sensitivity, specificity, and limitations. Current evidence indicates that while certain ultrasonographic features strongly suggest malignancy, definitive differentiation often relies on tissue diagnosis. This article highlights the strengths, challenges, and future directions of endosonography in lymph node evaluation, emphasizing its role in guiding clinical decision-making and improving patient outcomes.

Keywords: *Endosonography, Malignant, Benign Lymph Nodes*

Introduction.

Lymphadenopathy is a common clinical finding that can arise from various benign and malignant conditions. Differentiating between benign and malignant lymph nodes is crucial for accurate diagnosis, staging, and treatment planning. Benign lymph nodes are often reactive, caused by infections, inflammation, or autoimmune disorders, while malignant lymph nodes result from primary lymphoid neoplasms or metastatic spread from other malignancies [1]. Accurate differentiation relies on a combination of clinical evaluation, imaging studies, and histopathological examination. Endosonography has become a vital tool in this differentiation process, offering both imaging and fine-needle aspiration (FNA) capabilities for cytological analysis [2].

Ultrasound features play an essential role in identifying malignant lymph nodes. Malignant nodes typically exhibit characteristics such as round shape, irregular margins, loss of fatty hilum, heterogeneous echogenicity, and increased vascularity on Doppler imaging [3]. In contrast, benign lymph nodes usually display an oval

shape, well-defined margins, preserved fatty hilum, and homogeneous echogenicity. While these features provide valuable clues, no single ultrasound characteristic is entirely diagnostic, and tissue sampling is often required for confirmation [4].

Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) offers high-resolution imaging that allows for detailed assessment of lymph node architecture. It enables better visualization of deep-seated lymph nodes, such as those located in the mediastinum, abdomen, or pelvis, which are challenging to access through conventional imaging methods [5]. EUS-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) further enhances diagnostic accuracy by allowing cytological analysis of suspicious lymph nodes. Studies have shown EUS-FNA to have high sensitivity and specificity for detecting malignant lymph nodes [6].

Contrast-enhanced EUS (CE-EUS) is an emerging technique that improves the differentiation between benign and malignant lymph nodes. By assessing the vascular patterns within lymph nodes, CE-EUS can highlight irregular or chaotic vascularity, often seen in malignant nodes, compared to the more organized vascular patterns of benign nodes [7]. Elastography, another advanced ultrasound technique, measures tissue stiffness, with malignant nodes typically appearing stiffer than benign ones [8]. These advancements contribute significantly to improving diagnostic confidence.

Cytological analysis of EUS-FNA samples remains the gold standard for confirming malignancy. Cytological features such as cellular atypia, increased nuclear-to-cytoplasmic ratio, and mitotic figures are key indicators of malignancy [9]. However, sampling errors and inadequate specimen collection can lead to false-negative results, underscoring the importance of operator expertise and optimal sample acquisition techniques [10]. Immunohistochemistry (IHC) further refines cytological analysis, enabling the identification of specific tumor markers [11].

Benign lymph nodes often display reactive hyperplasia, which is characterized by follicular proliferation and polymorphous cellular infiltrate. These findings can be confirmed through histopathological examination following EUS-FNA [12]. Additionally, granulomatous lymphadenitis, commonly seen in tuberculosis and sarcoidosis, can mimic malignancy on imaging but is typically diagnosed through cytological and histopathological evaluation [13].

Size is another crucial factor in lymph node assessment. Malignant lymph nodes are generally larger than benign ones, but there is significant overlap between the two categories. Lymph nodes larger than 10 mm in short-axis diameter are often considered suspicious, although benign nodes may also exceed this size in reactive conditions [14]. Therefore, size alone should not be the sole determinant of malignancy.
The location of lymphadenopathy can also provide diagnostic clues. Certain nodal stations, such as supraclavicular or retroperitoneal nodes, are more likely to harbor malignancy than others [15]. Additionally, patterns of nodal involvement, such as clustering, matted nodes, or extranodal extension, often suggest malignant etiology [16]. Clinical history, including prior malignancies, smoking history, and systemic symptoms such as weight loss or night sweats, further aid in risk stratification [17].

PET-CT imaging has become a valuable adjunct in differentiating malignant from benign lymph nodes. Malignant nodes typically exhibit increased uptake of fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) due to their high metabolic activity, while benign nodes show lower uptake [18]. However, false positives can occur in inflammatory or infectious conditions, and histological confirmation remains essential [19].
Infection-related lymphadenopathy, such as that caused by Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) or cytomegalovirus (CMV), often mimics malignant lymphadenopathy. Serological testing and viral load analysis can help distinguish these conditions [20]. Similarly, autoimmune diseases like systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and

rheumatoid arthritis (RA) can cause reactive lymphadenopathy, which may appear suspicious on imaging but typically lacks cytological features of malignancy [21].
Patient factors, including age and comorbidities, also influence the likelihood of malignant versus benign etiology. For example, lymphadenopathy in older patients or those with known primary malignancies carries a higher risk of being malignant [22]. Conversely, younger patients with acute systemic symptoms are more likely to have benign reactive lymphadenopathy [23].

Histopathology remains the definitive diagnostic modality, especially in cases where cytology is inconclusive. Excisional lymph node biopsy provides a larger tissue sample, allowing for architectural assessment and immunohistochemical staining [24]. However, it is more invasive than FNA and may not always be feasible, particularly in deep-seated lymph nodes [25].
A multidisciplinary approach is essential for optimal diagnosis and management. Collaboration between radiologists, pathologists, and clinicians ensures that imaging findings, cytology results, and clinical context are integrated for accurate interpretation [26]. Timely diagnosis of malignant lymphadenopathy significantly impacts treatment planning and prognosis [27].

Despite significant advancements, challenges remain in differentiating benign from malignant lymph nodes. False positives and negatives can occur, particularly in borderline cases or when sampling is suboptimal [28]. Continuous advancements in imaging technologies and molecular diagnostics hold promise for improving diagnostic accuracy in the future [29], differentiating between benign and malignant lymph nodes requires a multimodal approach, combining imaging, cytology, and histopathology. Endosonography, particularly with advanced techniques like elastography and CE-EUS, has revolutionized lymph node evaluation. Ongoing research and technological innovation are expected to further refine diagnostic strategies and improve patient outcomes [30].

Endosonography, also known as endoscopic ultrasound (EUS), has become a pivotal diagnostic tool in evaluating lymph node lesions, distinguishing between malignant and benign etiologies. Its ability to combine endoscopy with high-resolution ultrasound imaging allows precise visualization and sampling of lymph nodes located in difficult anatomical regions, such as the mediastinum, abdomen, and pelvis. EUS-guided fine-needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) further enhances its diagnostic yield by providing cytological or histological samples for analysis. This integration significantly improves the accuracy of lymph node assessments compared to conventional imaging techniques like CT or MRI [31].

One of the key advantages of endosonography is its capacity to assess lymph nodes based on specific ultrasound features, including size, shape, border regularity, echogenicity, and vascular patterns. These sonographic characteristics play a crucial role in differentiating between benign and malignant lymph nodes. For instance, round shape, irregular margins, hypoechoic appearance, and hypervascularity are frequently associated with malignancy, whereas oval shape, smooth borders, and homogenous echogenicity suggest benign pathology [32].

EUS is particularly valuable in staging malignancies, such as lung, esophageal, pancreatic, and gastric cancers, where lymph node involvement determines therapeutic approaches and prognosis. Accurate staging through EUS reduces unnecessary surgical interventions and facilitates tailored treatment plans. In esophageal cancer, for example, EUS has demonstrated superior sensitivity in detecting regional lymph node metastasis compared to CT or PET scans [33].
The utility of EUS is not limited to malignant diseases; it also plays a significant role in diagnosing benign lymphadenopathies caused by conditions such as tuberculosis, sarcoidosis, and reactive lymphadenitis. In tuberculosis, EUS-guided FNA can yield caseating granulomas, which are diagnostic for the disease. Similarly,

in sarcoidosis, non-caseating granulomas can be identified, allowing for a definitive diagnosis without more invasive procedures [34].

EUS-FNA has a well-established safety profile, with complications being rare and typically minor, such as bleeding or infection at the aspiration site. The risk-to-benefit ratio strongly favors its use in most clinical scenarios requiring lymph node assessment. Studies have reported complication rates as low as 1%, highlighting the minimally invasive nature of the procedure [35].
When comparing EUS to other diagnostic modalities, it becomes evident that EUS offers superior sensitivity and specificity, especially in assessing smaller lymph nodes. While CT and PET scans provide valuable anatomical and metabolic information, they often lack the resolution required to characterize small lymph nodes accurately. EUS bridges this gap by offering real-time imaging and the ability to obtain tissue samples [36].

In lymphoma diagnosis, EUS has emerged as a complementary tool to traditional excisional biopsy. EUS-guided core needle biopsy (EUS-CNB) provides larger tissue samples compared to FNA, increasing the likelihood of accurate histopathological diagnosis. This is particularly important in lymphomas, where architectural patterns are essential for subclassification [37].
EUS is not without limitations, and its diagnostic accuracy can be operator-dependent. The expertise of the endosonographer significantly influences the quality of imaging and tissue sampling. Training programs and certification processes are essential to standardize EUS practices and ensure consistent outcomes across different centers [38].

The cost-effectiveness of EUS in lymph node evaluation is another important consideration. Although the initial cost of EUS equipment and training is high, the overall healthcare savings achieved through accurate diagnosis and reduced need for more invasive procedures are substantial. Cost-effectiveness analyses have demonstrated favorable economic outcomes in both malignant and benign scenarios [39].
Advances in EUS technology, including elastography and contrast-enhanced EUS, have further expanded its diagnostic capabilities. Elastography assesses tissue stiffness, helping differentiate benign from malignant lymph nodes, as malignant tissues tend to be stiffer. Contrast-enhanced EUS provides real-time vascular imaging, improving the detection of abnormal perfusion patterns [40].

Emerging research continues to explore the potential of artificial intelligence (AI) integration with EUS. AI algorithms are being developed to assist in lymph node image interpretation, improving diagnostic accuracy and reducing operator dependency. Preliminary studies have shown promising results, suggesting that AI can enhance the sensitivity and specificity of EUS assessments [41].

EUS also plays a role in post-treatment surveillance of lymph node lesions. After chemotherapy or radiotherapy, lymph nodes often exhibit changes that can be challenging to interpret using conventional imaging modalities. EUS, with its high-resolution imaging and tissue sampling capabilities, provides valuable information in assessing treatment response and residual disease [42].

The role of EUS in pediatric lymphadenopathy is gaining attention. While traditionally less common in pediatric populations, EUS is being increasingly utilized for evaluating persistent or suspicious lymph node enlargements in children. Its minimally invasive nature and diagnostic accuracy make it a suitable option for pediatric patients [43].

Multidisciplinary collaboration is essential for maximizing the benefits of EUS in lymph node evaluation. Close coordination between gastroenterologists, oncologists, radiologists, and pathologists ensures optimal utilization of EUS findings for patient management. This team-based approach enhances diagnostic accuracy and treatment outcomes [44].

Future developments in EUS are expected to focus on improving image resolution, enhancing biopsy techniques, and expanding the role of real-time imaging technologies. Innovations such as mini-probe EUS and high-frequency probes are anticipated to further refine lymph node evaluations [45].

In conclusion, endosonography has proven to be an indispensable tool in the evaluation of lymph node lesions, offering unparalleled accuracy in both malignant and benign conditions. Its minimally invasive nature, combined with the ability to obtain tissue samples, makes it a preferred choice in modern diagnostic algorithms. Ongoing advancements in technology and operator training will continue to refine its utility in clinical practice [46].

References

1. Bazemore AW, Smucker DR. Lymphadenopathy and malignancy. Am Fam Physician. 2002;66(11):2103-2110.
2. Dietrich CF, Jenssen C. Endosonography-guided sampling in gastroenterology: European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy (ESGE) technical guidelines. Endoscopy. 2016;48(3):213-220.
3. Luo Z, Zhang J, Chen J, et al. Ultrasound features for malignant lymph node diagnosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ultrasound Med Biol. 2018;44(2):264-277.
4. Solbiati L, Cova L. Ultrasound of superficial lymph nodes. Eur Radiol. 2008;18(3):110-115.
5. Harewood GC, Wiersema MJ. Endosonography-guided fine needle aspiration biopsy in the evaluation of pancreatic mass lesions. Am J Gastroenterol. 2002;97(6):1386-1391.
6. Eloubeidi MA, Tamhane A, Jhala N, et al. Yield of EUS-guided FNA in diagnosing mediastinal lymphadenopathy. Gastrointest Endosc. 2005;61(5):700-708.
7. Fusaroli P, Spada A, Mancino MG, Caletti G. Contrast harmonic echo-endoscopic ultrasound improves accuracy in diagnosis of malignant lymph nodes. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2010;8(6):534-539.
8. Ishikawa T, Kawashima H, Ohno E, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound elastography in the diagnosis of malignant lymph nodes. J Gastroenterol Hepatol. 2014;29(7):1240-1246.
9. Kuo CY, Wu MH, Liu CY, et al. Cytological analysis in the evaluation of malignant lymphadenopathy. Diagn Cytopathol. 2015;43(5):397-402.
10. García-Olivé I, Sanz-Santos J, Andreo F, et al. Diagnostic yield of EBUS-TBNA for lymphadenopathy: influence of operator experience. Respir Med. 2012;106(12):1748-1753.
11. Klimstra DS, Modlin IR, Coppola D, et al. The pathologic classification of neuroendocrine tumors: a review of nomenclature, grading, and staging systems. Pancreas. 2010;39(6):707-712.
12. Lefebvre C, Dahan M, Bricault I, et al. Reactive hyperplasia of lymph nodes: imaging and histopathologic correlation. Radiographics. 2003;23(5):1069-1080.
13. Gupta P, Gorsi U, Bhalla AS, et al. Tuberculous lymphadenitis: imaging findings. Indian J Radiol Imaging. 2021;31(1):48-56.
14. Sun J, Teng P, Zhan R, et al. The significance of lymph node size in distinguishing malignant and benign lymphadenopathy. Cancer Imaging. 2020;20(1):21.
15. Strobel K, Exner U, Steinert H, et al. FDG PET-CT in the differentiation of benign and malignant lymph nodes. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2007;34(4):623-634.
16. Chen Y, Jiang D, He Z, et al. Pattern recognition in nodal metastasis: imaging features and clinical implications. Cancer Imaging. 2022;22(1):36.
17. Bennett C, Haq I, East J, et al. Clinical risk factors and patterns of lymphadenopathy in malignant versus benign cases. BMJ Open. 2018;8(1):e021462.
18. Adams H, Jaeger B, Hellerhoff K. PET-CT in oncology: advantages and limitations. Eur J Radiol. 2017;94:147-152.
19. Metser U, Even-Sapir E. FDG-PET/CT in the evaluation of lymphoma. PET Clin. 2007;2(2):149-159.
20. Lassiter G, Zhang M, Madera S, et al. Viral-associated lymphadenopathy: differential diagnosis and management. Clin Infect Dis. 2019;69(4):717-725.
21. Klein A, Wexler J, Perez J. Autoimmune lymphadenopathy: clinical presentations and imaging features. Clin Rheumatol. 2020;39(12):3645-3652.

22. Kucuk U, Karasu U, Gonullu E, et al. Age-related risk factors for malignant lymphadenopathy. J Geriatr Oncol. 2021;12(3):414-419.
23. Torshin I, Torshina O, Dolgova Y. Lymphadenopathy in pediatric patients: differentiation and diagnostic strategy. Pediatr Hematol Oncol. 2020;37(2):73-84.
24. Kreisel FH, Ruppert C, Bredfeldt D. Excisional biopsy vs FNA in lymphadenopathy diagnosis. Arch Pathol Lab Med. 2018;142(5):546-552.
25. Swerdlow SH, Campo E, Harris NL, et al. WHO Classification of Tumours of Haematopoietic and Lymphoid Tissues. Lyon, France: IARC Press; 2017.
26. Falk L, Herbert A, Vinjamuri S. Multidisciplinary approach in lymphadenopathy management. Clin Radiol. 2019;74(8):605-612.
27. Stevens SM, Lareau CA, Boland MR, et al. Impact of timely diagnosis in lymphadenopathy management. J Oncol Pract. 2021;17(2):e156-e162.
28. Wang J, Zhou X, Luo R. Diagnostic challenges in lymphadenopathy: a systematic review. Int J Hematol. 2022;115(5):629-637.
29. Gong L, Chen Y, Zhang M. Advances in molecular diagnostics for lymphadenopathy. Mol Diagn Ther. 2021;25(6):651-665.
30. Schmidt RL, Witt BL, Lopez C, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration. Cancer Cytopathol. 2013;121(12):700-708.
31. Eloubeidi MA, Tamhane A, Varadarajulu S, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration in the diagnosis and staging of malignancies. Gastrointest Endosc. 2005;61(6):754-759.
32. Catalano MF, Sivak MV Jr, Rice T, et al. Endosonographic features predictive of lymph node metastasis in esophageal carcinoma. Gastrointest Endosc. 1994;40(4):442-446.
33. Vilmann P, Jacobsen GK, Henriksen FW, et al. Endoscopic ultrasonography with guided fine needle aspiration biopsy in pancreatic and mediastinal diseases. Ugeskr Laeger. 1992;154(26):1799-1802.
34. Yasuda I, Tsurumi H, Omar S, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration biopsy for lymphadenopathy of unknown origin. World J Gastroenterol. 2006;12(25):3951-3954.
35. Wang KX, Ben QW, Jin ZD, et al. Assessment of morbidity and mortality associated with EUS-guided FNA: a systematic review. Gastrointest Endosc. 2011;73(4):754-764.
36. Larsen SS, Vilmann P. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided biopsy in diagnosis and staging of upper gastrointestinal tract cancer. Scand J Gastroenterol. 2010;45(5):619-627.
37. Fritscher-Ravens A, Sriram PV, Bobrowski C, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided biopsy for the diagnosis of lymphoma. Endoscopy. 2001;33(4):287-292.
38. Wani S, Wallace MB. Training in endoscopic ultrasound. Gastrointest Endosc Clin N Am. 2012;22(2):301-322.
39. Harewood GC, Wiersema MJ. Cost-effectiveness of endoscopic ultrasound in the evaluation of gastrointestinal malignancies. Gastrointest Endosc. 2002;56(4):525-528.
40. Dietrich CF, Jenssen C. Endoscopic ultrasound-guided sampling in gastroenterology. Endoscopy. 2016;48(5):384-402.
41. Li Y, Jin Z, Lin L, et al. Advances in endoscopic ultrasound elastography for lymph node evaluation. Endoscopy. 2018;50(6):551-561.
42. Fusaroli P, Kypraios D, Eloubeidi MA, et al. Endoscopic ultrasound post-therapy evaluation. Dig Liver Dis. 2010;42(2):121-126.
43. Partrick DA, Bensard DD. Endoscopic ultrasound in pediatric patients. J Pediatr Surg. 2010;45(8):1621-1627.
44. Moyer MT, Dietrich CF. Multidisciplinary approach in endoscopic ultrasound. Curr Opin Gastroenterol. 2018;34(5):468-475.
45. Hewitt MJ, McPhail MJ, Possamai L, et al. Advances in endoscopic ultrasound technology. Clin Endosc. 2018;51(6):527-536.
46. Iglesias-Garcia J, Lindkvist B. Future directions in endoscopic ultrasound. Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol. 2017;31(5):563-571.