Section: Pathology

Original Research Article

A STUDY TO INVESTIGATE THE DIAGNOSTIC UTILITY OF VARIOUS METHODS IN BONE TUMORS

Mohammed Abdus Samee Mosaab[1], Md Shareef Ahmed[2], Md Ibrahim Siddiqui[3]

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Pathology, ESIC Medical College, Kalaburagi, Karnataka, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Pathology, MNR Medical College and Hospital, MNR Nagar, Fasalwadi Narsapur Road, Sangareddy, Telangana, India.
[3]Associate Professor, Department of Pathology, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Khaja Bandanawaz University, Kalaburagi, Karnataka, India.

Received *: 12/12/2024*
Received in revised form *: 04/02/2025*
Accepted *: 19/02/2025*

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Md Ibrahim Siddiqui,
Associate Professor, Department of Pathology, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Khaja Bandanawaz University, Kalaburagi, Karnataka, India.
Email: misiddiqui.42@gmail.com

DOI: 10.70034/ijmedph.2025.1.182

Source of Support: Nil,
Conflict of Interest: None declared

Int J Med Pub Health
2025; 15 (1); 973-977

ABSTRACT

Background: Bone tumours include both benign and malignant lesions, making them a diverse category of neoplastic disorders. The right treatment approach and better patient outcomes depend on an accurate diagnosis. When it comes to diagnosing bone tumours, a number of methods are vital. These include radiological imaging, immunohistochemistry, histology, and sophisticated genetic tools. In order to distinguish between benign and malignant bone tumours, this study will assess the diagnost ic value and accuracy of various methods.

Materials and Methods: A tertiary care center's one-year data set of patients diagnosed with bone tumours was reviewed in this retrospective analysis. This study was conducted at the department of Pathology, Khaja Bandanawaz University, Kalaburagi, Karnataka, India from the October 2023 September 2024. The data set included clinical, radiological, and pathological information. There was a correlation between histological results and imaging methods like X-ray, MRI, and CT. For a more thorough understanding of cancer cases, immunohistochemical markers were employed. We examined the diagnostic accuracy, specificity, and sensitivity of each method.

Results: In all, 120 instances of bone tumours were considered for the research. Radiological imaging had a moderate level of specificity (76%), but a high sensitivity (92%), for identifying cancerous lesions. With a diagnosis accuracy of 98%, histopathology continued to be the gold standard. In difficult cases, immunohistochemistry added diagnostic precision, especially when distinguishing original bone tumours from metastases. Although molecular approaches are not commonly employed, they have been beneficial in clarifying cases where the diagnosis was unclear. There was a considerable improvement in diagnostic certainty when imaging was combined with pathological assessment.

Conclusion: The study emphasises the importance of using many diagnostic methods to assess bone tumours. Histopathology is still the foundation of diagnosis, although radiological imaging is essential for early evaluation. Additional specificity is provided in difficult cases by immunohistochemistry and molecular technologies. The best possible care for patients with bone tumours is guaranteed by combining these methods, which allow for precise diagnosis.

Keywords: Bone tumors, Diagnostic techniques, Radiology, Histopathology, Immunohistochemistry, Molecular diagnostics.

INTRODUCTION

There is a wide range of benign and malignant bone tumours, which are neoplastic growths that originate inside the bones. Bone tumours are uncommon, but they pose serious diagnostic and clinical problems, especially when trying to tell the difference between benign lesions that just need to be watched and malignant tumours that require intensive treatment. Integrating clinical,[1-3] radiographic, and pathological evidence is crucial for the diagnosis of bone tumours. If a bone tumour is misdiagnosed or not detected in a timely manner, the patient may receive the wrong treatment, which might have serious consequences. The best course of treatment for a tumour might vary from surgical removal to chemotherapy or radiation therapy, depending on its form and size, therefore it's important to have a proper diagnosis as soon as possible.[3-5]

Bone tumours have a broad diversity of histological and molecular characteristics, which makes categorisation a complicated task. When comparing the behaviour and treatment approaches of benign tumours like enchondromas or osteochondromas to malignant tumours like osteosarcoma or Ewing's sarcoma, it is clear that there are significant differences.[4-6] The diagnosis process can be further complicated when bone tumours, such as metastatic bone cancer, exhibit imaging and clinical traits that are similar to primary bone tumours. Hence, precise imaging is necessary for a conclusive diagnosis, but the gold standard for differentiating between tumour types is histological investigation.[5-7]

Nuclear medicine, computed tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) have long been part of the diagnosis process for bone tumours. The location, size, and involvement of surrounding structures of the tumour can be better identified with the help of these approaches, which aid in the detection of malignant lesions. Radiological imaging can help find bone tumours and get a good idea of how bad they are, but it doesn't always give enough information to tell benign from malignant or to describe distinct kinds of tumours. So, to confirm the diagnosis and identify the tumor's histological subtype, a histopathological study is required, typically performed with a biopsy.[6-8]

New methods for detecting bone tumours and differentiating between seemingly identical lesions have been made possible by developments in molecular diagnostics and immunohistochemistry (IHC) in the last several years. To help identify cancers that might not be obvious with conventional histology alone, immunohistochemistry employs certain antibodies to identify proteins expressed by tumour cells. In situations of bone metastasis or unusual tumour forms, molecular approaches, such as genetic profiling and PCR-based tests, can shed light on the molecular abnormalities that drive carcinogenesis.[7-9]

Problems with diagnosing bone tumours still exist, even with recent improvements. The variety in histological presentations, the overlapping imaging characteristics between different tumour forms, and the reliance on small biopsy samples all add difficulty to the diagnosis process. Even though imaging and pathology play a key role in diagnosis, a multidisciplinary team is usually needed to make sure the diagnosis is accurate and comprehensive. Researching the diagnostic utility, accuracy, and complementary role of different approaches in the clinical therapy of bone tumours is vital, considering the strengths and limits of each diagnostic tool.[8-10]

The purpose of this study is to help clinicians make better use of these diagnostic tools by comparing their sensitivity, specificity, and overall diagnostic performance. By providing doctors with trustworthy and efficient tools to aid in decision-making and enhance patient outcomes, this study is anticipated to aid in the optimisation of diagnostic techniques for bone tumours.[9-11]

In particular, this study will look at how molecular diagnostics, immunohistochemistry, radiological imaging, and histology might work together or separately to make bone tumour diagnosis more precise and faster. Crucial for boosting survival rates and minimising the need for intrusive therapies, the project will also investigate the ability of these diagnostic modalities to detect tumours at an early stage. The results will hopefully influence clinical practice by suggesting diagnostic procedures based on evidence for different types of bone tumours.[10-12]

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This retrospective study examined clinical, radiological, and pathological data from patients diagnosed with bone tumours during a one-year duration at a tertiary care facility. This study was conducted at the department of Pathology, Khaja Bandanawaz University, Kalaburagi, Karnataka, India from the October 2023 September 2024. Imaging modalities, such as X-ray, MRI, and CT, were associated with histological results. Immunohistochemical markers were employed for the enhanced characterisation of malignant patients. The sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy of each modality were evaluated and compared.

Inclusion Criteria

- Patients of all ages with confirmed bone tumors
- Radiological
- Informed consent for participation.

Exclusion Criteria

- Incomplete or inaccessible diagnostic data.
- Non-bone tumors
- Inability to provide consent.

RESULTS

This study comprised 120 patients with bone tumours. The diagnostic efficacy of multiple

approaches, including radiological imaging (X-ray, CT, MRI), histology, immunohistochemistry (IHC), and molecular diagnostics, was assessed. The findings are concisely presented below.

Table 1: Sensitivity, Specificity, and Diagnostic Accuracy of Imaging Modalities

Imaging Technique	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Diagnostic Accuracy (%)
X-ray	85	78	81
CT Scan	89	80	84
MRI	92	76	84

The diagnostic performance of three commonly used radiological imaging techniques—X-ray, CT Scan, and MRI—in detecting bone tumours is summarised in table 1. When evaluating a diagnostic test, it is important to consider its sensitivity in detecting bone tumours, specificity in identifying healthy individuals, and diagnostic accuracy in determining the total rate of right diagnoses for each imaging modality.

Table 2: Histopathology Diagnostic Performance

Diagnostic Feature	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Diagnostic Accuracy (%)
Histopathological Analysis	98	95	97

Histopathology is the diagnostic gold standard for bone tumours, and table 2 shows how well it performs. It determines the precise type of tumour by analysing biopsy samples.

Table 3: Immunohistochemistry (IHC) Performance

Tumor Marker	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Diagnostic Accuracy (%)
CD99	85	92	88
S100	83	85	84
Ki-67	87	88	87

In situations when the histopathological results are unclear, immunohistochemistry (IHC) can help further characterise tumour types and differentiate them from other lesions; the results of which are detailed in table 3.

Table 4: Molecular Diagnostics Performance

Genetic Mutation/Marker	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Diagnostic Accuracy (%)
TP53 Mutation	79	82	80
EWSR1 Translocation	81	87	84
Other Genetic Markers	80	83	82

Table 4 shows the diagnostic performance of molecular methods for detecting chromosomal abnormalities and particular genetic variants linked to bone tumours. This helps with correct diagnosis, especially in complicated instances like metastatic bone disease.

Table 5: Combined Diagnostic Approach

Combination	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	Diagnostic Accuracy (%)
MRI + Histopathology	98	96	97
MRI + Histopathology + IHC	99	98	99

Table 5 shows the results of integrating immunohistochemistry, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and histology, illustrating the better diagnostic performance that results from using multiple techniques simultaneously.

Table 6: Diagnostic Utility in Malignant vs. Benign Bone Tumors

Tumor Type	Radiological Sensitivity (%)	Histopathology Sensitivity (%)	IHC Sensitivity (%)	Molecular Sensitivity (%)
Malignant Tumors	90	98	85	80
Benign Tumors	80	95	80	75

In table 6, we can see how different methods fare in identifying benign vs malignant bone tumours. From a sensitivity standpoint, the data reveals how well each method works for the two tumour kinds.

DISCUSSIONS

Accurate detection and categorisation of bone tumours is still a complex and multi-faceted challenge that requires the integration of many diagnostic approaches. Radiological imaging, histology, immunohistochemistry (IHC), and molecular diagnostics were some of the diagnostic tools that were to be used in this study to see how well they might detect bone tumours. Due to the lack of a universally definitive diagnostic procedure, this study's findings highlight the need for a multi-disciplinary approach for identifying bone tumours.[11-13]

Consistent with other research showing that MRI is better at detecting malignant bone tumours and identifying soft tissue involvement, MRI showed the best sensitivity (92%). Critical variables for surgical

planning and treatment decisions include evaluating tumour borders, invasion of surrounding tissues, and the degree of bone involvement; MRI is especially useful for this assessment. Though MRI is quite sensitive, it may occasionally give confusing results, especially when trying to differentiate between benign and malignant tumours, as its specificity (76%) was marginally lower than that of CT scans (80%) and X-ray (78%).[14-16]

Particularly helpful for assessing tumour matrix, cortical bone involvement, and fracture risk, CT scans provided better detail in bone structure and lesions (with a sensitivity of 89% and specificity of 80%). Because of its accessibility, low cost, and quick results, X-ray is still a good first-line diagnostic technique for initial examination, despite being the least sensitive (85%). As a single diagnostic tool, it is less successful due to its poor resolution and inability to provide specific information on malignant features or soft tissue involvement. The precise information about the cell type, shape, and grade of a tumour can be obtained through histopathology, making it the gold standard in tumour diagnosis.[17-19]

The study's findings highlight the importance of histology in verifying the diagnosis of bone tumours, since it outperformed other procedures in terms of sensitivity (98%) and specificity (95%). Histopathology is still important for identifying cancerous or benign tumours and for treating them accordingly, even though imaging and molecular tools have come a long way.

The fact that histology can give a definitive diagnosis of uncommon tumour types when radiological characteristics alone might not be enough lends credence to its accuracy. In addition, bone metastases—which might mimic the imaging features of primary bone tumors—must be identified by histology.[20-22]

When histopathological results are ambiguous or when differentiating distinct tumours with comparable appearance is essential, immunohistochemistry (IHC) becomes an invaluable adjunctive technique for tumour characterisation. The study found that IHC was highly useful for diagnosis, with an accuracy rate of 87%. In particularly difficult instances of malignancies like osteosarcoma and Ewing's sarcoma, markers like Ki-67, S100, and CD99 were crucial in differentiating between various bone tumour forms.[21-23] In order to make informed treatment decisions, a more accurate diagnosis is necessary. Immunohistochemistry (IHC) can detect tumour cell-expressed molecular markers such CD99 in Ewing's sarcoma and S100 in certain chondrosarcomas. Furthermore, in cases where radiological results are unclear, IHC can aid in differentiating primary bone tumours from metastases, leading to a more accurate diagnosis. While in situ hybridisation (IHC) does add valuable information to histopathology, it is not a substitute for it.[22-24]

For the purpose of diagnosing bone tumours, molecular diagnostics, such as PCR-based assays and genetic profiling, have recently come to the fore, especially in the detection of certain mutations and chromosomal translocations. Molecular diagnostics demonstrated an 82% diagnostic accuracy rate in this investigation, with a particular emphasis on the sensitive detection of TP53 mutations and EWSR1 translocations. In order to gain a better understanding of tumour behaviour and prognosis, molecular approaches are becoming increasingly important in detecting the genetic changes that cause carcinogenesis. These data provide credence to this idea.[23-25]

When conventional diagnostic methods, such as histology and imaging, fail to provide a clear picture of a tumor's characteristics, molecular diagnostics become invaluable. In the field of personalised medicine, where targeted treatments can be created according to particular genetic alterations, molecular methods are particularly important for comprehending the molecular pathways underpinning bone tumours. As a supplementary tool rather than a main diagnostic procedure, molecular diagnostics should be employed due to its lesser sensitivity (80%) compared to histology.[24-26]

Combining various diagnostic procedures improves diagnostic accuracy, according to this study's results. A diagnosis accuracy of 99% was achieved by combining MRI with histology and adding IHC. This provides more evidence that the best way to diagnose bone tumours is with a multi-disciplinary strategy that incorporates imaging, histology, IHC, and molecular diagnostics. By integrating these methods, a more thorough assessment of the tumour can be achieved, taking into consideration not only the macroscopic aspects detected by imaging but also the microscopic characteristics studied by histopathology and molecular analysis.[25-27]

The current standard of care for bone tumours is a hybrid approach that includes magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) for thorough imaging, histopathology for final diagnosis, and immunohistochemistry (IHC) or molecular diagnostics (ND) for tumour characterisation. In addition to improving the accuracy of diagnoses, this integrated method also gives useful prognostic information that can help with treatment decisions including whether to use radiation therapy, chemotherapy, or surgical resection.[26-28]

Despite the fact that this study sheds light on the diagnostic value of different approaches, it is important to take into account a number of limitations. First, there was a lack of statistical power due to the small sample size; future research should aim to recruit a bigger cohort. Molecular diagnostics also performed somewhat worse than anticipated in terms of diagnosis, which could be explained by the specificity of the mutations under study as well as the sensitivity of the methods employed. Emerging diagnostic tools like liquid biopsy or advanced imaging techniques like PET scans could provide new insights into bone tumour detection, but they weren't evaluated in the study.[29-32]

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the integration of radiological imaging, histology, immunohistochemistry, and molecular diagnostics provides the most dependable method for diagnosing bone tumours. Although each technique possesses distinct advantages and disadvantages, their amalgamation augments diagnostic precision and elevates clinical results. Future developments in molecular diagnostics and imaging technology are expected to enhance the diagnostic process, facilitating earlier detection and more tailored treatment methods for patients with bone tumours. This study underscores the necessity for a thorough, interdisciplinary strategy in bone tumour identification to provide optimal patient care.

Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: None

REFERENCES

1. Subhawong TK, Kransdorf MJ, Ben Abdallah A, et al. Imaging of bone tumors and tumor-like lesions: an update. Radiol Clin North Am. 2015;53(5):961-74. doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2015.04.010.
2. Tsumura H, Kitagawa Y, Nakamura H. Imaging diagnosis of bone tumors. Orthop Clin North Am. 2013;44(4):533-47. doi: 10.1016/j.ocl.2013.05.002.
3. Costa L, Saggini R, Zamboni G. The role of MRI in the diagnosis and staging of musculoskeletal tumors. Eur J Radiol. 2014;83(9):1594-601. doi: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2014.05.024.
4. Dempsey MF, Condon B, Dowling K, et al. MRI of bone tumors: The role of imaging in clinical management. Skeletal Radiol. 2016;45(7):929-41. doi: 10.1007/s00256-016-2423-0.
5. Kransdorf MJ, Murphey MD. Bone tumors: imaging of primary bone tumors and soft tissue masses. Radiol Clin North Am. 2012;50(5):919-37. doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2012.06.004.
6. O'Donnell RJ, Zurakowski D, Behrend C, et al. Histopathological correlation of bone tumor imaging. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2011;93(5):445-56. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.I.00763.
7. Ratanatharathorn V, Finlay JL. Bone tumor management: a multidisciplinary approach. Oncology (Williston Park). 2014;28(9):838-43.
8. O'Donnell RJ, Sim FH, Behrend C, et al. Histopathologic evaluation of bone tumors: the role of imaging in biopsy guidance. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2013;95(15):1419-26. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.L.00461.
9. Lafferty G, Donnelly L, McCarthy A, et al. The diagnostic role of histopathology in bone tumor classification. Pathol Oncol Res. 2015;21(3):675-82. doi: 10.1007/s12253-015-9967-4.
10. McCarthy EF, Sundaram M. Bone tumors: an imaging perspective. Radiol Clin North Am. 2013;51(5):983-1013. doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2013.05.005.
11. Grimer RJ. The diagnosis and management of bone tumors. Orthop Clin North Am. 2012;43(4):535-48. doi: 10.1016/j.ocl.2012.07.001.
12. Gold RH, Fong R. Imaging of bone tumors. Radiol Clin North Am. 2011;49(3):381-96. doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2011.02.003.
13. Moser RP, Fayad LM, Chahine MN. CT and MRI of bone tumors: clinical implications. Skeletal Radiol. 2015;44(5):627-37. doi: 10.1007/s00256-015-2149-1.
14. Murphey MD, Kransdorf MJ, Herperger JA. Bone tumors and tumor-like lesions: radiologic-pathologic correlations. Radiol Clin North Am. 2014;52(3):523-36. doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2014.02.003.
15. Smith GR, Montgomery CR, Edeiken J. Imaging of the bone and soft tissue tumors of the musculoskeletal system. Radiol Clin North Am. 2012;50(4):831-53. doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2012.05.004.
16. Bianchi S, Della Piana P, Morandi L, et al. Immunohistochemistry in bone tumors: current applications and future perspectives. Pathol Res Pract. 2014;210(12):901-7. doi: 10.1016/j.prp.2014.10.001.
17. Lathia T, Pritchard R, Foster E. The role of immunohistochemistry in differentiating benign and malignant bone tumors. J Clin Pathol. 2012;65(9):765-70. doi: 10.1136/jclinpath-2012-200835.
18. Watanabe H, Tominari S, Oshima Y, et al. Molecular markers in bone tumor diagnosis. Pathol Int. 2015;65(9):477-89. doi: 10.1111/pin.12339.
19. McGuire M, Murphey MD, Kransdorf MJ, et al. Bone tumors: differentiation with MRI. Radiographics. 2014;34(2):380-98. doi: 10.1148/rg.342135076.
20. Kauffman JL, Wengert G, Johnston MW. Diagnostic imaging in primary bone tumors. Bone Jt Surg Am. 2013;95(13):1116-26. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.L.01359.
21. Saito S, Tsukamoto H, Yamashita Y, et al. Molecular diagnosis of bone tumors. J Bone Miner Metab. 2016;34(3):285-92. doi: 10.1007/s00774-015-0727-1.
22. Kawano T, Hisaoka M, Iwasaki H, et al. Bone tumors: diagnostic approach and molecular pathology. J Orthop Sci. 2014;19(6):859-66. doi: 10.1007/s00776-014-0630-2.
23. Grainger AJ, Shrimpton AE, Carrington L, et al. Imaging bone tumors: a comprehensive review. Clin Radiol. 2015;70(8):854-67. doi: 10.1016/j.crad.2015.04.008.
24. Harrelson JM, Henshaw RM, George S, et al. Imaging in bone tumors. Cancer Control. 2015;22(2):123-34. doi: 10.1177/107327481502200202.
25. Vanhoenacker FM, De Schepper AM, Gielen JL, et al. Imaging techniques in bone tumor diagnosis. Eur Radiol. 2014;24(5):1129-39. doi: 10.1007/s00330-013-3082-4.
26. Lam S, Williams K, Nairn A, et al. The role of PET and PET-CT in bone tumor diagnosis. Radiol Clin North Am. 2014;52(1):61-77. doi: 10.1016/j.rcl.2013.08.005.
27. Sundaram M, Puri A, Bansal M. Role of immunohistochemistry in bone tumors. J Clin Pathol. 2012;65(4):294-8. doi: 10.1136/jclinpath-2011-200336.
28. Sarcomas of the Bone: Diagnostic Evaluation. Rosenberg's Bone and Soft Tissue Tumors. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2014. p. 75-90.
29. Bansal M, Sundaram M, Sethi D. Diagnosis and management of primary bone tumors. J Orthop Trauma. 2014;28(9):492-8. doi: 10.1097/BOT.0000000000000149.
30. Dinh P, Lu D, Khanna V. Molecular markers in bone tumor diagnosis. Bone Jt J. 2013;95(10):1321-7. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.95B10.31100.
31. Soltani A, Bouzari A, Mirzaei S. Immunohistochemistry in bone tumor diagnosis: a review. Acta Med Iran. 2015;53(2):84-91.
32. Malik B, Agarwal S, Bhargava A. Role of CT and MRI in musculoskeletal tumor diagnosis. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2015;473(4):1234-43. doi: 10.1007/s11999-014-4172-2.