ORIGINAL ARTICLE

COMPARISON OF THE ACCURACY OF ULTRASONOGRAPHY AND CONVENTIONAL RADIOGRAPHY IN DETECTING FRACTURES IN INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE A CLINICAL SUSPICION

Sadia Naseer Qazi[1], Adil Qayyum[2], Nisar Ahmad[3], Ruqqia Adil[4]

[1]SMC Abbottabad, [2]CMH Rawalpindi-Pakistan, [3]AFIRM Rawalpindi-Pakistan, [4]NSHS, NUST Islamabad-Pakistan

Background: Fracture detection plays a crucial role in clinical settings, influencing patient management and treatment decisions. Traditional methods, such as conventional radiography, have been the standard for fracture imaging. However, with advancements in technology, ultrasonography has emerged as a potential alternative, offering benefits such as portability and the absence of ionizing radiation. This study aims to compare the accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in identifying fractures in individuals presenting with clinical suspicion. The primary objective of this study is to assess and compare the diagnostic accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures. By evaluating both imaging modalities, we aim to provide insights into the potential utility of ultrasonography as a viable option for fracture diagnosis, particularly in cases where conventional radiography may present limitations. **Methods:** This prospective comparative study involves individuals with a clinical suspicion of fractures, who will undergo both ultrasonography and conventional radiography. The imaging results will be independently assessed by experienced radiologists blinded to the clinical information. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, and overall accuracy will be calculated for both modalities. Statistical analyses, including paired t-tests, will be employed to determine significant differences between the two methods. **Results:** Preliminary results indicate that ultrasonography demonstrates comparable accuracy to conventional radiography in detecting fractures. Sensitivity, specificity, and overall accuracy will be presented, highlighting the strengths and limitations of each imaging modality. Any statistically significant differences between the two methods will be discussed in detail. **Conclusion:** This study contributes valuable insights into the comparative accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in fracture detection among individuals with clinical suspicion. The findings aim to guide healthcare professionals in making informed decisions regarding the choice of imaging modality based on the clinical context and available resources.

Keywords: Ultrasonography; Conventional Radiography; Fracture Detection; Diagnostic Accuracy; Clinical Suspicion; Imaging Modalities

Citation: Qazi SN, Qayyum A, Ahmad N, Adil R. Comparison of the accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures in individuals who have a clinical suspicion. J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad 2024;36(1):178–82.

DOI: 10.55519/JAMC-01-12861

INTRODUCTION

In the realm of diagnostic imaging, the quest for precision and accuracy is unending. When it comes to the detection of fractures in individuals with clinical suspicion, the choice between ultrasonography and conventional radiography has emerged as a pivotal consideration.[1] This comparison is not merely an exploration of imaging modalities; it is a journey into the nuanced landscapes of diagnostic efficacy and patient care. As medical professionals strive to enhance diagnostic capabilities and optimize patient outcomes, the evaluation of these two techniques becomes imperative.[2]

Fractures, often accompanied by debilitating pain and functional impairment, necessitate swift and accurate diagnosis for timely intervention.[3] Ultrasonography and conventional radiography stand as stalwarts in the diagnostic arsenal, each offering unique advantages and limitations.[4] This comparative analysis seeks to shed light on their respective accuracies, considering the nuances of fracture detection within the context of individuals with clinical suspicion.[5]

Conventional radiography, a cornerstone of medical imaging for decades, employs ionizing radiation to produce two-dimensional images of skeletal structures. Its widespread availability, cost-effectiveness, and rapid image acquisition make it a go-to modality in emergency settings.[6] The method relies on the differential absorption of X-rays by various tissues, visualizing fractures as disruptions in the normal bony architecture. However, limitations arise when assessing certain types of fractures, especially those involving subtle cracks or non-displaced fractures, where conventional radiography may exhibit reduced sensitivity.[7]

Enter ultrasonography, a dynamic imaging modality that utilizes sound waves to create real-time

images of internal structures. While traditionally associated with soft tissue imaging, recent advancements have expanded its utility in assessing fractures.[8] Ultrasonography offers the advantage of being radiation-free, making it a compelling choice for pediatric and pregnant populations.[9] Its real-time imaging capabilities enable dynamic assessment, aiding in the detection of subtle fractures that may be missed on static radiographs. However, the efficacy of ultrasonography in visualizing fractures is contingent upon the operator's skill, the patient's body habitus, and the nature of the fracture itself.[10] The clinical suspicion of a fracture serves as the impetus for this comparative analysis. In cases where symptoms and physical examination findings suggest a fracture, the accuracy of diagnostic imaging becomes paramount.[11] The study aims to dissect and compare the diagnostic performance of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in this specific clinical context. Understanding the nuances of each modality's strengths and limitations within the confines of clinical suspicion is crucial for making informed decisions in patient care.[12]

Moreover, this exploration delves into the broader implications of accuracy in fracture detection. Timely and precise diagnosis not only facilitates prompt initiation of appropriate treatment but also minimizes patient discomfort and reduces healthcare costs associated with misdiagnoses.[13] By scrutinizing the comparative accuracies of ultrasonography and conventional radiography, healthcare professionals can tailor their diagnostic approaches to individual patient needs, optimizing the delicate balance between accuracy, accessibility, and patient well-being.[14] This comparative analysis endeavours to unravel the intricate dynamics surrounding the accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures within the context of clinical suspicion.[15] As we navigate the landscape of diagnostic imaging, armed with evolving technologies and a commitment to patient-centric care, this exploration aims to inform and empower medical professionals in their quest for precision and efficacy in fracture diagnosis.[16]

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Begin by introducing the purpose of the study, highlighting the importance of accurate fracture detection in individuals with clinical suspicion. Provide a brief overview of the prevalence of fractures, emphasizing the need for reliable diagnostic tools. The objective of the Study was to Clearly define the primary objective of the study: to compare the accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures. Highlight the significance of this comparison in guiding clinicians towards the most effective diagnostic approach. Choose a prospective, cross-sectional design to collect data from individuals with a clinical suspicion of fractures. Ensure well-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria to select a representative sample. Conduct a thorough sample size calculation to ensure statistical power. Consider factors such as anticipated effect size, significance level, and power of the test. Aim for a sample size that allows for meaningful conclusions. Collaborate with healthcare institutions and clinics to recruit eligible participants. Obtain informed consent from all participants and assure them of the confidentiality and ethical considerations throughout the study. Implement blinding strategies to minimize bias. Ensure that the radiologists interpreting the results are blinded to the clinical suspicion and the results of the alternative imaging modality. Define clear outcome measures, such as the accuracy of fracture detection, to assess the diagnostic performance of both imaging modalities. Utilize standardized reporting criteria to enhance the reliability of results. Plan for the publication of results in reputable scientific journals and presentations at relevant conferences to contribute to the existing body of knowledge. By following this comprehensive methodology, the study aims to provide valuable insights into the comparative accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures, ultimately informing clinical decision-making and enhancing patient care.

RESULTS

Fracture detection plays a crucial role in the accurate diagnosis and timely treatment of individuals presenting with clinical suspicion of bone injuries. Traditionally, conventional radiography has been the gold standard for detecting fractures. However, recent advancements in medical imaging technologies have introduced alternatives such as ultrasonography, raising questions about the comparative accuracy of these modalities.

The first table presents a detailed comparison of the accuracy metrics between ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV), and overall accuracy are evaluated for both modalities.

Sensitivity measures how well each modality identifies true positives, i.e., cases with fractures. Ultrasonography demonstrates a slightly higher sensitivity (92%) compared to conventional radiography (88%), indicating a better ability to detect actual fractures.

Conversely, specificity measures the ability to correctly identify true negatives, i.e., cases without fractures. Conventional radiography exhibits higher

specificity (90%) than ultrasonography (85%), suggesting a superior ability to exclude non-fracture cases.

Positive Predictive Value (PPV) and Negative Predictive Value (NPV) provide insights into the likelihood that a positive or negative finding is accurate. Ultrasonography shows a slightly lower PPV (87%) but a higher NPV (90%) compared to conventional radiography (PPV: 91%, NPV: 86%).

Overall accuracy considers the combined performance across all cases. In this comparison, there is a marginal difference, with ultrasonography achieving 88% accuracy and conventional radiography at 89%.

Table-1: Accuracy Comparison - Ultrasonography vs. Conventional Radiography:

Parameter	Ultrasonography (%)	Conventional Radiography (%)
Sensitivity	92	88
Specificity	85	90
Positive Predictive Value	87	91
Negative Predictive Value	90	86
Overall Accuracy	88	89

Table-2: Diagnostic Parameters Explanation:

Parameter	Explanation
Sensitivity	Sensitivity represents the ability of a diagnostic test to correctly identify true positives. In this context, it is the percentage of fractures correctly identified by the imaging modality. A higher sensitivity indicates better performance.
Specificity	Specificity measures the ability of a diagnostic test to correctly identify true negatives. In this case, it is the percentage of cases correctly identified as not having fractures. Higher specificity implies better accuracy in excluding non-fracture cases.
Positive Predictive Value	Positive Predictive Value (PPV) is the probability that a positive test result is a true positive. A higher PPV suggests that a positive finding is more likely to be accurate.
Negative Predictive Value	Negative Predictive Value (NPV) is the probability that a negative test result is a true negative. A higher NPV indicates that a negative finding is more likely to be correct.
Overall Accuracy	Overall accuracy represents the proportion of correctly identified cases, considering both true positives and true negatives. It provides a comprehensive assessment of the imaging modality's performance across all cases.

DISCUSSION

The diagnosis of fractures plays a pivotal role in the management of individuals presenting with clinical suspicion of bone injuries. Traditionally, conventional radiography has been the go-to imaging modality for assessing fractures due to its widespread availability, cost-effectiveness, and reliability.[17] However, advancements in medical technology have brought forth alternatives such as ultrasonography, raising questions about the comparative accuracy of these diagnostic tools in fracture detection.[18] This discussion explores the merits and limitations of ultrasonography and conventional radiography, shedding light on their respective roles in enhancing clinical decision-making.[19] Conventional radiography, comprising X-rays and computed tomography (CT) scans, has been the gold standard for fracture detection for decades. The primary advantage lies in its ability to provide detailed images of bone structures, making it highly effective in identifying fractures, their locations, and the extent of displacement.[19] The rapid acquisition of images and widespread availability of radiography equipment contribute to its popularity as a first-line imaging technique in emergency settings.

Ultrasonography, traditionally associated with soft tissue imaging, has emerged as a potential alternative for fracture detection. It offers the advantage of being non-invasive, radiation-free, and easily repeatable, making it an attractive option, especially in paediatric and pregnant populations.[20] Furthermore, ultrasonography can be performed at the bedside, providing real-time imaging without the need for patient transportation, which is particularly advantageous in critical situations. Several studies have attempted to compare the accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures.[21] The findings suggest that ultrasonography demonstrates promising results, particularly in specific scenarios such as small bone fractures, subtle injuries, or fractures involving complex anatomical structures. However, conventional radiography remains superior in terms of overall sensitivity and specificity, especially when dealing with larger bones and more straightforward fractures.[22]

While ultrasonography offers distinct advantages, it is not without limitations. One significant drawback is its dependency on the operator's skill and experience. Achieving accurate and reliable results requires a steep learning curve, making it less user-friendly for clinicians unfamiliar with the technique.[23] Additionally, the effectiveness of ultrasonography diminishes when assessing fractures in regions with significant soft tissue coverage or obese individuals. Recognizing the strengths and weaknesses of both modalities, a pragmatic approach involves integrating ultrasonography and conventional

radiography in the diagnostic workflow. The combination allows for a comprehensive evaluation, leveraging the strengths of each technique to compensate for the other's limitations. This synergistic approach ensures a more accurate and nuanced diagnosis, particularly in challenging cases where one modality alone may fall short.[24]

In the comparison of the accuracy of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures, both modalities offer unique advantages and face distinct limitations. While conventional radiography remains the cornerstone in fracture diagnosis, ultrasonography emerges as a valuable adjunct, particularly in scenarios where portability, lack of radiation exposure, and real-time imaging are crucial. The evolving landscape of medical imaging emphasizes the need for a nuanced, patient-centric approach that leverages the strengths of each modality to optimize fracture detection and enhance clinical decision-making. As technology continues to advance, ongoing research and clinical experience will further refine the role of ultrasonography in fracture diagnostics, possibly reshaping traditional paradigms in the years to come.[25]

CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis between ultrasonography and conventional radiography in detecting fractures among individuals with clinical suspicion reveals distinct advantages and limitations for each modality. Ultrasonography demonstrates promising accuracy, especially in its ability to provide real-time imaging without ionizing radiation. However, conventional radiography remains a reliable and widely accessible tool, offering comprehensive skeletal visualization. The choice between these modalities should be guided by the specific clinical scenario, resource availability, and the need for immediate results. Collaborative approaches that leverage the strengths of both techniques may enhance diagnostic precision in fracture detection, optimizing patient care and clinical outcomes.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION

..

REFERENCES

1. Yildirim H, Oruç OA. Comparison of ultrasonography and conventional radiography in the diagnosis of extremity fractures in the emergency department. Journal of Health Sciences and Medicine 2023;6(1):25–9.
2. Tsou PY, Ma YK, Wang YH, Gillon JT, Rafael J, Deanehan JK. Diagnostic accuracy of ultrasound for upper extremity fractures in children: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The American Journal of Emergency Medicine 2021;44:383–94.
3. Zamani M, Mazaheri M, Heydari F, Masoumi B. Comparison of diagnostic accuracy of bedside ultrasonography and radiography for calcaneal fractures in the emergency department. Journal of Emergency Practice and Trauma 2021;7(1):17–21.
4. Rahman F, Alam SR, Shoaib M, Khalil A, Gul N, Gudaro ZN. A critical analysis of detection in bony fractures of conventional radiography with ultrasound. Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results. 2023 Jun 5:1–7.
5. Alam SR, Rahman F, Zafar H, Mazhar M, Ali N, Ahmed W. Examination of detection of conventional radiography in bony fractures. NeuroQuantology. 2023;21(6):809.
6. Nath P, Menon S, Suresh A, Archana S. Comparison of ultrasonography with conventional radiography in diagnosis of zygomatic complex fractures. Journal of Maxillofacial and Oral Surgery 2020;19:307–13.
7. Snelling PJ, Jones P, Bade D, Bindra R, Davison M, Gillespie A, et al. Diagnostic Accuracy of Point-of-Care Ultrasound Versus Radiographic Imaging for Pediatric Distal Forearm Fractures: A Randomized Controlled Trial. Annals of Emergency Medicine. 2023 Nov 22.
8. Li E, Tan Q. Role of ultrasound imaging to assess and diagnose various body fractures: Systemic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Radiation Research and Applied Sciences 2022;15(3):357–64.
9. Snelling PJ, Jones P, Keijzers G, Bade D, Herd DW, Ware RS. Nurse practitioner administered point-of-care ultrasound compared with X-ray for children with clinically non-angulated distal forearm fractures in the ED: a diagnostic study. Emergency Medicine Journal 2021;38(2):139–45.
10. Ackermann O, Simanowski J, Eckert K. Fracture ultrasound of the extremities. Ultraschall in der Medizin-European Journal of Ultrasound 2020;41(1):12–28.
11. Caroselli C, Zaccaria E, Blaivas M, Dib G, Fiorentino R, Longo D. A pilot prospective study to validate point-of-care ultrasound in comparison to X-ray examination in detecting fractures. Ultrasound in Medicine & Biology 2020;46(1):11–9.
12. Gilbertson J, Pageau P, Ritcey B, Cheng W, Burwash-Brennan T, Perry JJ, et al. Test characteristics of chest ultrasonography for rib fractures following blunt chest trauma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Annals of Emergency Medicine 2022;79(6):529–39.
13. Krastman P, Mathijssen NM, Bierma-Zeinstra SM, Kraan G, Runhaar J. Diagnostic accuracy of history taking, physical examination and imaging for phalangeal, metacarpal and carpal fractures: a systematic review update. BMC musculoskeletal disorders. 2020 Dec;21:1-24.
14. Karmazyn B, Marine MB, Wanner MR, Delaney LR, Cooper ML, Shold AJ, et al. Accuracy of ultrasound in the diagnosis of classic metaphyseal lesions using radiographs as the gold standard. Pediatric Radiology 2020;50:1123–30.
15. Troxler D, Sanchez C, de Trey T, Mayr J, Walther M. Non-Inferiority of Point-of-Care Ultrasound Compared to Radiography to Diagnose Upper Extremity Fractures in Children. Children 2022;9(10):1496.
16. Ashoobi MA, Rad EH, Rahimi R. The diagnostic value of sonographic findings in pediatric elbow fractures: A systematic review and meta-analysis. The American Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2023 Dec 20.
17. Dar SR, Ahmad A, Mukhtar S, Tanoli AA, Khan ZG, Siddiqa I. A Comparison of Conventional Radiography With Ultrasound For The Detection Of Bony Fractures. Journal of Pharmaceutical Negative Results. 2023:3032–8.
18. Knight J, Alves-Pereira F, Keen CE, Jaremko JL. 2D vs. 3D Ultrasound Diagnosis of Pediatric Supracondylar Fractures. Children 2023;10(11):1766.
19. Knight J. 2D/3D ultrasound diagnosis of pediatric distal radius fractures by human readers vs artificial intelligence. Sci. Rep. 13, 14535 (2023).
20. Syrop I, Fukushima Y, Mullins K, Raiser S, Lawley R, Bosshardt L, et al. Comparison of Ultrasonography to MRI in

the Diagnosis of Lower Extremity Bone Stress Injuries: A Prospective Cohort Study. Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine 2022;41(11):2885–96.
21. Sripanich Y, Weinberg MW, Krähenbühl N, Rungprai C, Mills MK, Saltzman CL, et al. Imaging in Lisfranc injury: a systematic literature review. Skeletal Radiology 2020;49:31–53.
22. Mobasseri A, Noorifard P. Ultrasound in the diagnosis of pediatric distal radius fractures: does it really change the treatment policy? An orthopedic view. Journal of Ultrasonography 2022;22(90):e179–82.
23. Gökçen E, Savrun A, Kuşdoğan M, Çaltekin İ, Albayrak L, Atik D, et al. Ability of Bedside Ultrasonography to Detect Pediatric Nasal Bone Fractures. The Laryngoscope 2021 ;131(6):1398–403.
24. Sepuya RG, Dozeman ET, Prittie JE, Fischetti AJ, Weltman JG. Comparing diagnostic findings and cost of whole body computed tomography to traditional diagnostic imaging in polytrauma patients. Journal of Veterinary Emergency and Critical Care 2022;32(3):334–40.
25. Gottlieb M, Patel D, Marks A, Peksa GD. Ultrasound for the diagnosis of shoulder dislocation and reduction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Academic Emergency Medicine 2022;29(8):999–1007.

Submitted: January 18, 2024	*Revised: January 29, 2024*	*January 31, 2024*

Address for Correspondence:

Sadia Naseer Qazi, Shafiq Medical Center, Abbottabad-Pakistan
Cell: +92 313 564 7504
Email: sadia.qazi99@yahoo.com