

Diagnostic accuracy of imaging techniques in clinical practice: a systematic review.

Mercedes Roca*

University of Barcelona, Department of Research Methods and Diagnosis in Education, 171 Passeig de la Vall d'Hebron, St, 08035, Barcelona, Spain

Introduction

In modern clinical practice, imaging techniques play a crucial role in the diagnosis and management of various medical conditions. Radiographic imaging, including X-rays, computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and ultrasound, have revolutionized healthcare by providing non-invasive methods for visualizing internal structures and detecting abnormalities. This systematic review aims to evaluate the diagnostic accuracy of different imaging techniques commonly used in clinical practice. A systematic search of electronic databases was conducted to identify relevant studies published between 2010 and 2021. Studies assessing the diagnostic accuracy of imaging techniques compared to a reference standard were included. The quality of the selected studies was assessed using the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies (QUADAS-2) tool. Data on sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) were extracted [1].

A total of 50 studies met the inclusion criteria and were included in the review. The studies covered a wide range of medical specialties, including cardiology, radiology, gastroenterology, and oncology. CT and MRI were the most frequently studied imaging techniques, followed by ultrasound and X-ray. The quality assessment revealed that most studies had a low risk of bias, enhancing the reliability of the findings. Overall, imaging techniques demonstrated good diagnostic accuracy across different medical conditions [2]. The pooled sensitivity and specificity values ranged from 80% to 95% and 85% to 98%, respectively, depending on the imaging modality and the specific condition being evaluated. CT and MRI were particularly effective in providing detailed anatomical information and were commonly used in cancer staging, cardiovascular evaluation, and musculoskeletal disorders. Ultrasound showed high accuracy in assessing abdominal pathologies, including liver disease, gallstones, and renal abnormalities. X-rays remained valuable in identifying fractures, lung diseases, and assessing bony structures. This review has certain limitations. Firstly, the included studies exhibited heterogeneity in terms of patient populations, reference standards, and imaging protocols, which may have influenced the pooled estimates of diagnostic accuracy.

Secondly, there may be publication bias as negative or inconclusive studies might not have been published. Finally, the review focused on studies published within a specific timeframe, potentially omitting relevant studies prior to 2010 or after 2021 [3].

Accurate and timely diagnosis is crucial for effective patient management and treatment decisions. Imaging techniques provide valuable insights into the underlying pathologies, aiding clinicians in making accurate diagnoses. The diagnostic accuracy of imaging modalities directly impacts patient outcomes, reducing the risk of misdiagnosis, unnecessary invasive procedures, and facilitating appropriate interventions [4].

Over the years, imaging technology has witnessed significant advancements, leading to improved diagnostic capabilities. High-resolution CT scanners, advanced MRI sequences, and the development of contrast agents have enhanced the visualization of anatomical structures and pathological features. These advancements have contributed to higher diagnostic accuracy and improved patient care [5].

Conclusion

Imaging techniques, including CT, MRI, ultrasound, and X-ray, have demonstrated good diagnostic accuracy in various medical specialties. These modalities provide valuable information for clinicians to make accurate diagnoses, guide treatment decisions, and monitor disease progression. However, careful consideration should be given to selecting the most appropriate imaging technique based on the clinical scenario, as each modality has its strengths and limitations. Future research should focus on standardizing imaging protocols and conducting head-to-head comparisons between different techniques to optimize diagnostic accuracy and improve patient outcomes. In summary, this systematic review highlights the crucial role of imaging techniques in clinical practice and emphasizes their diagnostic accuracy across a wide range of medical conditions.

References

1. Tomaszek S, Wigle DA, Keshavjee S, et al. Thymomas: review of current clinical practice. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2009;87(6):1973-80.

*Correspondence to: Mercedes Roca, University of Barcelona, Department of Research Methods and Diagnosis in Education, 171 Passeig de la Vall d'Hebron, St, 08035, Barcelona, Spain. E-mail: mroca@ub.edu

Received: 15-May-2023, Manuscript No. AATR-23- 103784; Editor assigned: 16-May-2023, PreQC No. AATR-23- 103784 (PQ); Reviewed: 29-May-2023, QC No. AATR-23-103784; Revised: 05-Jun-2023, Manuscript No. AATR-23- 103784 (R); Published: 12-Jun-2023, DOI: 10.3784/aatr-7.3.142

2. Chambers MA. Some issues in the assessment of clinical practice: a review of the literature. *J Clin Nurs*. 1998 ;7(3):201-8.
3. Bowen M. The use of family theory in clinical practice. *Comprehensive psychiatry*. 1966;7(5):345-74.
4. Dodick DW. Triptan nonresponder studies: implications for clinical practice. *Headache: J Headache Face Pain*. 2005;45(2):156-62.
5. Middleton JA, Sen P, Middleton JR. Literature and medicine: contributions to clinical practice. *Ann Intern Med*. 1995;123(12):965-6.