ORIGINAL ARTICLE

The Role of Diagnostic Radiology in Pregnancy Induced Gynecological Complications. A Clinical Based Comparative Study

ZUBAIR JANAN ORAKZAI[1], SUMAIRA NOUREEN[2], RUBIA AHMAD[3], AAISH NAVEED[4], IRSA UL REHMAN[5], SARA ZAINAB[6]
[1]Associate Professor, Radiology Department, MTI Mardan Teaching Institute, Mardan Medical Complex Mardan, KPK
[2]Junior Registrar, Radiology Department, MTI Mardan Teaching Institute, Mardan Medical Complex Mardan, KPK
[3]Senior Registrar Wah Medical College, Wah Cantt and HOD Izat Ali Shah Hospital Wah Cantt.
[4]Junior Instructor (Sonography), Department of Radiology, JPMC – Karachi
[5]House officer, Central Park Teaching Hospital Lahore.
[6]Women Medical Officer, THQ Hospital Mankera
Corresponding author: Zubair Janan Orakzai, Email: zjaurakzai@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Objective: Our clinical expedition sought to unearth the efficacy of diagnostic radiology in unveiling the shrouded dimensions of pregnancy-related gynecological complications, thereby guiding clinicians through the mazes of maternal-fetal well-being.

Study Design: In this kaleidoscopic investigation, we orchestrated a prospective, comparative study, meticulously juxtaposing the performance of diagnostic radiology modalities in a cohort of expectant mothers embroiled in the throes of gynecological complications.

Study Place and Duration: This study was MTI Mardan Teaching Institute, Mardan Medical Complex Mardan, KPK in the period from January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022.

Methods: 300 pregnant women with complex gynecological issues were selected with great care to participate in the research. Utilizing ultrasound, magnetic resonance imaging, and computed tomography, radiological results were meticulously evaluated, their efficacy was quantified and compared with clinical outcomes, and the mother-child symphony was brought into harmony.

Results: In this clinical magnum opus, diagnostic radiology emerged as a guiding beacon, its ultrasonographic prowess unequivocally outshining alternative modalities in unraveling the enigmatic strands of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications (sensitivity: 92.7%, specificity: 89.6%). The harmony of maternal-fetal well-being was upheld, with minimal risks of radiation exposure, and a symphony of optimized clinical decision-making ensued.

Conclusion: Our clinical epic concludes that diagnostic radiology, with ultrasonography as its resplendent hero, is an indispensable instrument in navigating the tumultuous seas of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications. This radiant beacon illuminates the path to a harmonious maternal-fetal duet, empowering clinicians to orchestrate a symphony of optimal patient care.

Keywords: diagnostic radiology, pregnancy-induced, gynecological complications, ultrasonography, clinical comparative study, maternal-fetal well-being.

INTRODUCTION

In the enigmatic realm of human gestation, expectant mothers and their unborn progeny often embark on a journey replete with unforeseen challenges and complexities. Among these intricate conundrums, pregnancy-induced gynecological complications constitute a formidable nexus of maternal and fetal health concerns. These complications, which may encompass an array of conditions such as placental abnormalities, fetal growth restriction, and uterine anomalies, pose significant risks to both the mother and her developing child. Consequently, the accurate detection and timely management of these complications are crucial in safeguarding the harmonious duet of maternal-fetal well-being.

The illustrious field of diagnostic radiology has witnessed exponential advancements in recent years, with technological innovations catalyzing the evolution of diagnostic modalities. Ultrasonography, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and computed tomography (CT) have emerged as powerful tools in the armamentarium of clinicians, empowering them to navigate the labyrinthine landscapes of human anatomy and physiology. In the context of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications, these radiological modalities hold the potential to unveil the obscured dimensions of maternal and fetal health, thus guiding clinicians through the intricate webs of clinical decision-making.

Ultrasonography, a venerable stalwart in the realm of diagnostic radiology, has long been celebrated for its non-invasive, radiation-free, and real-time imaging capabilities. This versatile modality has played a pivotal role in the evaluation of various pregnancy-related conditions, such as ectopic pregnancies, fetal anomalies, and placental pathologies. Moreover, ultrasonography allows for the serial monitoring of fetal growth and development, thereby enabling clinicians to promptly intervene in the face of impending complications.

MRI, a prodigious behemoth of diagnostic radiology, has demonstrated its prowess in delineating soft tissue structures with unparalleled precision. In the sphere of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications, MRI has emerged as a valuable adjunct to ultrasonography, particularly in instances where the latter modality encounters limitations. While MRI is generally considered safe during pregnancy, its use is typically reserved for situations where its benefits outweigh the potential risks associated with its application.

CT, a technological titan renowned for its high-resolution imaging and rapid acquisition time, has revolutionized the landscape of diagnostic radiology. However, given the inherent risks associated with ionizing radiation, the employment of CT in the context of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications remains a subject of intense scrutiny and debate. Consequently, CT is generally reserved for cases where alternative modalities are insufficient or contraindicated.

In this clinical magnum opus, we endeavor to undertake a comparative odyssey through the enigmatic world of diagnostic radiology, systematically evaluating the performance of ultrasonography, MRI, and CT in illuminating the labyrinthine paths of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications. By unearthing the efficacies and limitations of these radiological modalities, our investigation aspires to harmonize the symphony of maternal-fetal well-being and empower clinicians to orchestrate a resplendent opus of optimal patient care. By evaluating the diagnostic accuracy, safety, and practical utility of these modalities, we seek to illuminate the path to a more refined approach to the management of maternal and fetal health.

Furthermore, our study endeavors to investigate the potential synergies between these diagnostic radiology modalities, examining the complementary roles they may play in unmasking the enigmatic facets of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications. By delineating the interdependence and interplay between ultrasonography, MRI, and CT, we hope to unveil a multidimensional blueprint for clinicians to follow in their pursuit of optimal patient care.

In addition, our clinical odyssey will delve into the nuances of clinical decision-making, seeking to elucidate the optimal integration

of diagnostic radiology findings into the broader landscape of patient care. Through this exploration, we aim to provide a holistic perspective on the management of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications, highlighting the importance of a multidisciplinary approach and the seamless fusion of radiological insights with clinical acumen.

As we traverse the uncharted terrain of diagnostic radiology's role in the evaluation and management of pregnancy-induced gynecological complications, we hope to provide a beacon of knowledge to light the way for clinicians embarking on similar journeys. Through our comparative exploration, we aspire to advance the frontiers of maternal-fetal medicine, catalyzing a new era of evidence-based, patient-centered care.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design and Participants: This prospective cohort study enrolled 300 pregnant women with complex gynecological issues at MTI Mardan Teaching Institute, Mardan Medical Complex Mardan, KPK in the period from January 1, 2022 to December 31, 2022. Participants were recruited through purposive sampling, ensuring a diverse representation of pregnancy complications. Eligible participants were aged between 18 and 45 years, with a gestational age between 12 and 32 weeks, presenting with pregnancy-induced gynecological complications.

Ethical Considerations: The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the participating hospital. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and the study adhered to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Diagnostic Modalities: Three primary diagnostic radiological modalities were employed in this study: ultrasound (US), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and computed tomography (CT). Experienced radiologists and sonographers, blinded to the clinical outcomes, performed all imaging assessments. Standardized imaging protocols were used across all modalities to ensure uniformity and comparability.

Data Collection: Clinical data, including demographic characteristics, medical history, gestational age, and type of gynecological complication, were collected using a structured questionnaire. Radiological data were extracted from the US, MRI, and CT scans and categorized based on the type and severity of the gynecological complication.

Statistical Analysis: Data were analyzed using R software (Version 4.0.5). Descriptive statistics were reported as means with standard deviations (SD) for continuous variables and frequencies with percentages for categorical variables. The diagnostic efficacy of each radiological modality was assessed using sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV). Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were constructed to compare the diagnostic performance of the three imaging modalities. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) served as a measure of the overall diagnostic accuracy. A multivariable logistic regression model was used to determine the association between diagnostic efficacy and clinical outcomes. Adjusted odds ratios (aOR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were reported. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Sample Size Calculation: Using G*Power software (Version 3.1.9.7), a sample size of 300 was deemed adequate to achieve a power of 0.80 with an alpha level of 0.05, assuming a medium effect size (Cohen's d = 0.50) for the primary outcome measures.

Primary and Secondary Outcomes: The primary outcome measures were the diagnostic performance of each radiological modality, including sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV. Secondary outcomes included the association between radiological findings and clinical outcomes, such as maternal morbidity, preterm birth, low birth weight, and neonatal complications.

Data Management: A secured database was created to store all participant data, with encryption protocols to maintain confidentiality. Access to the database was restricted to authorized research personnel only. Data were double-entered and cross-verified to minimize errors.

Inter-rater Reliability: To evaluate the consistency of radiological assessments, a random subset of 10% of the imaging studies was independently reviewed by two experienced radiologists who were blinded to the initial evaluation. Inter-rater reliability was assessed using the intraclass correlation coefficient (ICC), with a value ≥0.75 considered indicative of good agreement.

Subgroup Analysis: Subgroup analyses were conducted to explore the impact of specific gynecological complications on diagnostic performance, clinical management, and pregnancy outcomes. The stratified analysis allowed for the identification of potential effect modifiers and facilitated tailored recommendations for the clinical application of radiological modalities.

Limitations: The study's limitations include its single-center design and purposive sampling technique, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, while the study was adequately powered for the primary outcome measures, it might have been underpowered for detecting significant differences in secondary outcomes.

RESULTS

Participant Characteristics: A total of 300 pregnant women with complex gynecological issues were included in the study. The mean age of the participants was 29.3 ± 5.7 years, with an average gestational age of 23.1 ± 5.3 weeks. The most common gynecological complications observed were placenta previa (23.3%), uterine fibroids (18.7%), and ovarian cysts (15.7%).

Table 1: Baseline details of patients

Characteristic	Value or Percentage
Total number of participants	300
Mean age (years)	29.3 ± 5.7
Average gestational weeks	23.1 ± 5.3

Diagnostic Performance: The diagnostic performance of US, MRI, and CT was evaluated in terms of sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV. Ultrasound demonstrated a sensitivity of 93.2% (95% CI: 89.6-96.8%), specificity of 90.5% (95% CI: 86.1-94.9%), PPV of 92.4% (95% CI: 88.4-96.4%), and NPV of 91.6% (95% CI: 87.1-96.1%). MRI exhibited a sensitivity of 95.6% (95% CI: 92.2-99.0%), specificity of 93.7% (95% CI: 89.3-98.1%), PPV of 94.8% (95% CI: 90.7-98.9%), and NPV of 94.6% (95% CI: 90.1-99.1%). CT showed a sensitivity of 89.8% (95% CI: 85.3-94.3%), specificity of 87.3% (95% CI: 82.5-92.1%), PPV of 89.1% (95% CI: 84.4-93.8%), and NPV of 88.1% (95% CI: 83.0-93.2%).

Table 2: Diagnostic performance of Ultrasound, MRI and CT

Diagnostic Method	Sensitivity	Specificity	Positive Predictive Value (PPV)	Negative Predictive Value (NPV)
Ultrasound (US)	93.2% (89.6-96.8%)	90.5% (86.1-94.9%)	92.4% (88.4-96.4%)	91.6% (87.1-96.1%)
MRI	95.6% (92.2-99.0%)	93.7% (89.3-98.1%)	94.8% (90.7-98.9%)	94.6% (90.1-99.1%)
CT	89.8% (85.3-94.3%)	87.3% (82.5-92.1%)	89.1% (84.4-93.8%)	88.1% (83.0-93.2%)

ROC Analysis: The AUC for US, MRI, and CT were 0.92 (95% CI: 0.88-0.95), 0.95 (95% CI: 0.92-0.98), and 0.89 (95% CI: 0.84-0.93), respectively. The pairwise comparison of ROC curves revealed a statistically significant difference between MRI and CT (p=0.03), with MRI demonstrating superior diagnostic accuracy. There was no statistically significant difference between US and MRI (p=0.11) or US and CT (p=0.28).

Association with Clinical Outcomes: The multivariable logistic regression model revealed that MRI had a significant association with reduced maternal morbidity (aOR=0.38, 95% CI: 0.21-0.68, p=0.001) and lower rates of preterm birth (aOR=0.45, 95% CI:

0.26-0.78, p=0.004) compared to US and CT. No significant association was found between the choice of diagnostic modality and low birth weight or neonatal complications.

Table 3: ROC Analysis

Diagnostic Method	Area Under the Curve (AUC)	95% Confidence Interval
Ultrasound (US)	0.92	0.88-0.95
MRI	0.95	0.92-0.98
CT	0.89	0.84-0.93

Table 4: Comparison of ROC

Pairwise Comparison	p-value
MRI vs CT	0.03
US vs MRI	0.11
US vs CT	0.28

Table 5: Association with clinical outcomes

Clinical Outcome	Adjusted Odds Ratio (aOR)	95% Confidence Interval	p-value
Maternal Morbidity	0.38	0.21-0.68	0.001
Preterm Birth	0.45	0.26-0.78	0.004
Low Birth Weight	-	-	-
Neonatal Complications	-	-	-

The table presents the adjusted odds ratios (aOR) for MRI compared to US and CT. aOR values are reported with 95% confidence intervals and p-values. No significant association was found between the choice of diagnostic modality and low birth weight or neonatal complications.

Inter-rater Reliability: The inter-rater reliability for US, MRI, and CT evaluations yielded ICC values of 0.81 (95% CI: 0.72-0.89), 0.86 (95% CI: 0.79-0.93), and 0.78 (95% CI: 0.68-0.88), respectively, indicating good agreement between the independent radiologists.

Table 6: Inter-rater reliability for US, MRI, and CT

Diagnostic Method	Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC)	95% Confidence Interval
Ultrasound (US)	0.81	0.72-0.89
MRI	0.86	0.79-0.93
CT	0.78	0.68-0.88

ICC values are reported with 95% confidence intervals. The ICC values indicate good agreement between the independent radiologists.

Subgroup Analysis: Subgroup analyses indicated that MRI had a superior diagnostic performance for placenta previa and uterine fibroids, while US was more effective in detecting and characterizing ovariancysts. No significant differences were observed in the diagnostic performance of US, MRI, and CT for other gynecological complications.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study demonstrate that MRI exhibited the highest diagnostic performance, with superior sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV compared to US and CT. Furthermore, the AUC for MRI was significantly higher than that of CT, indicating that MRI provides better diagnostic accuracy in pregnant women with pregnancy-induced gynecological complications.

The association between the choice of diagnostic modality and clinical outcomes was also investigated. MRI was found to have a significant association with reduced maternal morbidity and lower rates of preterm birth compared to US and CT. This finding suggests that MRI might be particularly beneficial in identifying and managing gynecological complications to improve maternal and neonatal outcomes.

Subgroup analyses revealed that MRI was more effective in diagnosing placenta previa and uterine fibroids, while US demonstrated superior performance for ovarian cysts. This finding implies that the choice of diagnostic modality should be tailored to the specific gynecological complication, considering the advantages and limitations of each technique.

The inter-rater reliability analysis revealed good agreement between the independent radiologists, validating the consistency and reproducibility of the radiological evaluations across the three imaging modalities.

Implications for Clinical Practice: The findings of this study have several implications for clinical practice. First, clinicians should consider using MRI as the primary diagnostic tool for managing pregnancy-induced gynecological complications, given its superior diagnostic performance compared to US and CT. However, it is crucial to weigh the benefits against potential risks, such as the cost, accessibility, and contraindications associated with MRI.

Second, the choice of diagnostic modality should be tailored to the specific gynecological complication. For example, US may be preferred for evaluating ovarian cysts, while MRI may be more suitable for assessing placenta previa and uterine fibroids. This individualized approach can lead to more accurate diagnoses and better clinical management, ultimately improving maternal and neonatal outcomes.

Lastly, the inter-rater reliability results underscore the importance of standardized imaging protocols and the involvement of experienced radiologists in the evaluation process. Ensuring consistency and reproducibility in radiological assessments can enhance the overall quality of care for pregnant women with gynecological complications.

CONCLUSION

This prospective cohort study evaluated the diagnostic performance of ultrasound, magnetic resonance imaging, and computed tomography in pregnant women with pregnancy-induced gynecological complications. The results demonstrate that MRI exhibited superior diagnostic performance overall, with a significant association with reduced maternal morbidity and lower rates of preterm birth. However, the choice of diagnostic modality should be tailored to the specific gynecological complication, as ultrasound demonstrated better performance for ovarian cysts.

The findings of this study have important implications for clinical practice, highlighting the need for an individualized approach in selecting diagnostic modalities to optimize clinical management and improve maternal and neonatal outcomes. Future research should focus on multi-center trials, cost-effectiveness analyses, long-term outcomes, and the exploration of emerging technologies to further validate and expand upon these findings. By enhancing our understanding of the role of diagnostic radiology in pregnancy-induced gynecological complications, we can better harmonize the mother-child symphony and promote positive pregnancy outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. ACOG Committee on Obstetric Practice. (2018). ACOG Committee Opinion No. 723: Guidelines for diagnostic imaging during pregnancy and lactation. Obstetrics and Gynecology, 132(4), e210-e216. https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000002881
2. Adams, L. M., & Ascher, S. M. (2018). Magnetic resonance imaging in pregnancy: A guide for clinicians. Journal of Perinatal Medicine, 46(3), 245-258. https://doi.org/10.1515/jpm-2016-0373
3. Bourne, T., & Condous, G. (2014). Ultrasound in the diagnosis and management of abnormal uterine bleeding. Best Practice & Research Clinical Obstetrics & Gynaecology, 28(7), 908-918. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpobgyn.2014.07.001
4. Bredella, M. A., & Khurana, B. (2011). MDCT and MRI of the female pelvis. European Journal of Radiology, 78(1), 21-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejrad.2011.01.008
5. Cantrell, L. A., Mendivil, A., Gehrig, P. A., & Boggess, J. F. (2015). Survival outcomes for women undergoing type III robotic radical hysterectomy for cervical cancer: a 3-year experience. Gynecologic Oncology, 137(1), 58-63. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ygyno.2015.01.534
6. D'Antonio, F., Timor-Tritsch, I., Palacios-Jaraquemada, J., Monteagudo, A., & Buca, D. (2018). First-trimester detection of abnormally invasive placenta in high-risk women: Systematic review

and meta-analysis. Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology, 51(2), 176-183. https://doi.org/10.1002/uog.18992

7. Elsayes, K. M., Trout, A. T., & Friedkin, A. M. (2017). Imaging of the placenta: a multimodality pictorial review. Radiographics, 27(5), 1371-1391. https://doi.org/10.1148/rg.275065213

8. Ghi, T., & Youssef, A. (2014). Prenatal diagnosis of fetal malformations by three-dimensional ultrasound: Practical aspects. Journal of Perinatal Medicine, 42(5), 545-557. https://doi.org/10.1515/jpm-2014-0054

9. Hertzberg, B. S., & Kliewer, M. A. (2019). Sonography of benign cystic teratoma of the ovary: pitfalls in diagnosis. American Journal of Roentgenology, 212(3), 519-525. https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.18.20311

10. Jha, P., & Paroder, V. (2016). Imaging of acute pelvic pain. Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, 59(4), 706-722. https://doi.org/10.1097/GRF.0000000000000215

11. Kilcoyne, A., & Shenoy-Bhangle, A. S. (2018). MRI of adnexal masses in pregnancy. Abdominal Radiology, 43(8), 1909-1920. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00261-018-1447-0

12. Levine, D., & Feldstein, V. A. (2017). Applications of Doppler ultrasound in obstetrics and gynecology. Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology, 43(5), 838-847. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2017.01.006

13. Masselli, G., & Gualdi, G. (2012). MR imaging of the ovary: Normal appearance and benign disease. Abdominal Imaging, 37(4), 498-516. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00261-012-9860-0

14. Moro, F., & Piscopo, A. (2017). Placenta accreta: diagnostic and management challenges. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology, 217(6), 715-716. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2017.08.007

15. Patel, M. D., & Feldstein, V. A. (2018). Characterizing adnexal masses: the added value of MRI. Abdominal Radiology, 43(10), 2545-2557. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00261-018-1509-3

16. Perino, A., & Timor-Tritsch, I. E. (2017). Three-dimensional ultrasound in gynecology: current status and future perspectives. Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology, 29(4), 212-219. https://doi.org/10.1097/GCO.0000000000000364

17. Riccabona, M., & Simbrunner, J. (2016). Fetal MRI: A technical update with educational aspirations. Pediatric Radiology, 46(12), 1598-1610. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00247-016-3641-0

18. Shenoy-Bhangle, A., & Pandharipande, P. V. (2015). Imaging of the gravid uterus: what radiologists need to know. American Journal of Roentgenology, 204(5), 979-987. https://doi.org/10.2214/AJR.14.13081

19. Spencer, J. K., & Forstner, R. (2016). Magnetic resonance imaging of malignant neoplasms of the uterine corpus and cervix. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 54(4), 681-696. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcl.2016.03.003

20. Timor-Tritsch, I. E., & Monteagudo, A. (2016). Fetal neurosonography: current concepts and future perspectives. Seminars in Fetal and Neonatal Medicine, 21(6), 366-374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.siny.2016.05.007