Differentiating Malignant from Benign Lymph Nodes Using Strain Histogram: A Comprehensive Review

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

E-mail: Drakmma2013@gmail.com

Conflict of interest: None declared.

Funding: No funding sources

Abstract

Infantile nystagmus syndrome (INS) is a congenital or early-onset ocular disorder characterized by involuntary, rhythmic eye movements that can significantly impact visual acuity, binocular vision, and overall quality of life. This review article explores the current management strategies for INS, emphasizing a multidisciplinary approach involving ophthalmologists, optometrists, neurologists, and geneticists. The paper discusses conservative management options, including optical interventions such as spectacles, contact lenses, and prisms, alongside pharmacological treatments aimed at modulating ocular motor behavior. Furthermore, the review underscores the importance of individualized treatment plans tailored to the patient's specific visual and functional needs. By synthesizing current evidence and clinical practice guidelines, this article aims to provide a comprehensive overview of the available management lines for infantile nystagmus and identify gaps requiring further research.

Keywords: Infantile Nystagmus

Regul Sci. ™ 2023; 9(1): 9149 - 9155

DOI: doi.org/10.18001 /TRS.9.1. 657

Introduction

Lymph node evaluation plays a critical role in diagnosing and managing various infectious and non-infectious diseases, particularly in tropical medicine where conditions like tuberculosis, leprosy, and filariasis are prevalent [1]. Swollen lymph nodes can indicate localized or systemic infections, malignancies, or autoimmune diseases, and their distribution, size, and consistency provide crucial diagnostic clues [2]. Physicians must employ a systematic approach, starting with a thorough history and physical examination, followed by imaging and biopsy when indicated [3]. The clinical presentation varies significantly, influenced by factors such as geographic

location, endemic pathogens, and patient immune status [4]. As a result, lymph node evaluation in tropical settings requires both clinical acumen and familiarity with regional disease patterns [5].

Infectious causes remain the most common reason for lymphadenopathy in tropical regions, with bacterial, viral, parasitic, and fungal pathogens contributing to lymph node enlargement [6]. Tuberculosis, caused by Mycobacterium tuberculosis, is a primary concern, often presenting with chronic cervical lymphadenopathy, known as scrofula [7]. Similarly, filariasis, caused by Wuchereria bancrofti, Brugia malayi, and Brugia timori, can cause lymphatic obstruction and significant lymph node swelling [8]. Accurate identification of the underlying etiology is essential for effective treatment and prevention of complications [9]. A combination of serological, molecular, and histopathological techniques is often required for definitive diagnosis in such cases [10].

In tropical medicine, leprosy remains a significant public health issue, with lymph node involvement often seen in multibacillary cases [11]. Mycobacterium leprae invades lymphatic tissues, leading to enlargement and granulomatous inflammation of regional nodes [12]. Histopathological examination reveals characteristic granulomas, which aid in differentiating leprosy from other granulomatous diseases [13]. Additionally, lymphadenopathy in leprosy may mimic other infections or malignancies, posing diagnostic challenges [14]. Proper clinical evaluation, supported by slit-skin smear and PCR techniques, remains essential for accurate diagnosis [15].

Viral infections are also common causes of lymphadenopathy in tropical regions, with Epstein-Barr virus (EBV), human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), and cytomegalovirus (CMV) being notable examples [16]. EBV, associated with infectious mononucleosis, often causes posterior cervical lymphadenopathy with systemic symptoms like fever and malaise [17]. HIV infection, on the other hand, can present with generalized lymphadenopathy during acute retroviral syndrome or persistent generalized lymphadenopathy in chronic stages [18]. Differentiating viral from bacterial causes often requires serological testing and viral load measurements [19]. Understanding the epidemiology and clinical patterns of viral infections is crucial in tropical lymph node evaluation [20].

Parasitic infections, including toxoplasmosis and leishmaniasis, also contribute significantly to lymphadenopathy in tropical settings [21]. Toxoplasmosis, caused by Toxoplasma gondii, typically results in cervical lymphadenopathy, while visceral leishmaniasis (kala-azar) often leads to generalized lymphadenopathy with hepatosplenomegaly [22]. Diagnosis of parasitic lymphadenopathy relies on serological tests, PCR, and microscopic examination of tissue samples [23]. Effective management requires timely identification and targeted treatment to prevent disease progression and complications [24]. Collaboration between clinicians, pathologists, and microbiologists is often necessary for accurate diagnosis [25].

Fungal infections, though less common, can cause lymphadenopathy in immunocompromised individuals in tropical regions [26]. Histoplasmosis, caused by Histoplasma capsulatum, often mimics tuberculosis, presenting with mediastinal or cervical lymphadenopathy [27]. Cryptococcosis, caused by Cryptococcus neoformans, is another fungal infection that can cause lymph node involvement, particularly in HIV-positive patients [28]. Diagnosis requires fungal

cultures, serological testing, and histopathological examination of lymph node biopsies [29]. Early detection and antifungal treatment are critical for preventing severe systemic disease [30].

Malignant lymphadenopathy remains an important differential diagnosis in tropical medicine, with lymphoma and metastatic cancers being common causes [31]. Lymphomas, including Hodgkin's and non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, often present with painless lymphadenopathy and systemic symptoms such as fever, night sweats, and weight loss [32]. Fine-needle aspiration cytology (FNAC) and excisional biopsy are essential for definitive diagnosis [33]. In addition, imaging studies, including CT and PET scans, help in staging and treatment planning [34]. Proper differentiation between infectious and malignant causes is crucial for effective management [35].

Autoimmune diseases, including systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and rheumatoid arthritis, can cause lymphadenopathy, often presenting diagnostic challenges in tropical medicine [36]. Lymph node enlargement in autoimmune diseases is usually symmetrical and generalized, accompanied by systemic symptoms [37]. Histological examination often reveals reactive hyperplasia or immune-mediated changes, which help distinguish autoimmune lymphadenopathy from infectious and malignant causes [38]. Serological markers such as ANA and rheumatoid factor play a key role in diagnosis [39]. Timely differentiation ensures appropriate immunosuppressive therapy [40].

Diagnostic techniques for lymph node evaluation include fine-needle aspiration cytology (FNAC), core needle biopsy, and excisional biopsy, each with specific advantages and limitations [41]. FNAC is minimally invasive and useful for preliminary assessment, while core needle and excisional biopsies provide larger tissue samples for histopathological analysis [42]. Ancillary studies, including immunohistochemistry and molecular diagnostics, further enhance diagnostic accuracy [41]. The choice of technique depends on the clinical context, lymph node location, and suspected pathology [41]. Proper sampling and tissue handling are critical for reliable results [41].

Imaging modalities such as ultrasound, computed tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) play a significant role in lymph node evaluation in tropical medicine [42]. Ultrasound is often the first-line modality due to its availability, cost-effectiveness, and real-time imaging capability [42]. CT and MRI are valuable for assessing deeper lymph nodes and detecting associated complications such as abscess formation or vascular compression [42]. Positron emission tomography (PET) is increasingly used in oncology for staging lymphomas and detecting metastasis [42]. Imaging findings must be interpreted in conjunction with clinical and laboratory data [43].

Lymph node evaluation is a critical component in oncology for staging and monitoring various cancers. Ultrasound elastography has emerged as a non-invasive imaging modality that provides valuable insights into the mechanical properties of lymph nodes, aiding in differentiating benign from malignant ones. Strain histogram analysis, in particular, quantifies tissue stiffness by displaying strain distribution within a region of interest (ROI) in the lymph node. Malignant lymph nodes typically exhibit a stiffer texture compared to benign nodes, which is reflected in their strain histogram patterns [1].

The strain histogram technique relies on measuring tissue deformation in response to applied external compression or intrinsic movement, such as arterial pulsations. This method generates a histogram that visually represents the proportion of softer versus stiffer regions within the lymph node. The data can then be analyzed statistically, with parameters such as mean strain, standard deviation, and histogram skewness being particularly informative in distinguishing pathology [2].

Previous studies have demonstrated that malignant lymph nodes tend to have lower mean strain values and a more negatively skewed strain histogram. This observation aligns with the increased stiffness associated with tumor infiltration and desmoplastic reactions within malignant tissues. On the other hand, benign lymph nodes often display higher mean strain values with more symmetric histogram patterns, reflecting their relatively elastic nature [3].

Strain histogram analysis is especially useful in cases where conventional ultrasound findings are indeterminate. For instance, lymph nodes with borderline size or ambiguous cortical thickening can pose diagnostic challenges. Incorporating strain histogram analysis provides an additional layer of diagnostic confidence, minimizing unnecessary invasive procedures like fine-needle aspiration cytology (FNAC) [4].

Technical factors play a crucial role in obtaining reliable strain histogram results. Adequate compression, proper probe positioning, and avoiding excessive movement artifacts are essential for accurate strain analysis. Furthermore, inter-operator variability can impact histogram outcomes, highlighting the importance of standardized imaging protocols and operator training [5].

Recent advancements in ultrasound elastography technology have improved the sensitivity and specificity of strain histogram analysis. Modern systems offer real-time histogram generation, enhanced resolution, and better software tools for data interpretation. These developments have contributed to more precise differentiation between benign and malignant lymph nodes [6].

The clinical applications of strain histogram analysis are diverse, extending beyond oncology into infectious and inflammatory diseases. For example, in tuberculosis lymphadenitis, lymph nodes may exhibit intermediate strain values, which can help distinguish them from malignant or reactive nodes. This versatility underscores the utility of strain histogram analysis in a broad spectrum of clinical scenarios [7].

One of the key advantages of strain histogram analysis is its non-invasive nature, reducing patient discomfort and procedural risks associated with biopsy-based techniques. Additionally, it can be performed repeatedly over time, enabling dynamic monitoring of lymph node changes in response to therapy [8].

Despite its advantages, strain histogram analysis is not without limitations. Factors such as calcification, necrosis, or cystic degeneration within lymph nodes can distort strain patterns and lead to misinterpretation. Awareness of these pitfalls is essential for clinicians to avoid diagnostic errors [9].

Several studies have compared strain histogram analysis with other elastography techniques, such as shear wave elastography (SWE). While SWE provides quantitative stiffness values, strain

histogram analysis offers qualitative and semi-quantitative data. Both techniques complement each other and can be used synergistically for improved diagnostic accuracy [10].

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning algorithms into strain histogram analysis holds significant promise for the future. AI-assisted analysis can reduce operator dependency, standardize interpretation, and enhance diagnostic precision. Preliminary results from AI-augmented strain histogram studies are highly encouraging [11].

Histopathological correlation remains the gold standard for confirming lymph node pathology. However, strain histogram findings often align well with histological results, lending credibility to its diagnostic utility. This concordance is particularly evident in studies comparing strain histogram patterns with biopsy outcomes [12].

Pediatric applications of strain histogram analysis have also shown promise. Differentiating benign reactive lymphadenopathy from malignant lymphomas in children is particularly challenging due to overlapping sonographic features. Strain histogram analysis offers an additional diagnostic tool in such scenarios [13].

In addition to differentiating lymph node pathology, strain histogram analysis can aid in treatment planning. For example, identifying malignant lymph nodes with strain histogram analysis can guide radiation therapy or surgical approaches, optimizing therapeutic outcomes [14].

Studies have explored the role of strain histogram analysis in post-treatment evaluation. Changes in histogram parameters, such as mean strain and skewness, can reflect treatment response or residual disease, providing valuable information for clinical decision-making [15].

The reproducibility of strain histogram analysis across different ultrasound systems and operators has been a subject of investigation. While variability exists, adherence to standardized protocols significantly improves reproducibility and diagnostic reliability [16].

Strain histogram analysis is also being evaluated for use in metastatic lymph node detection in patients with known primary malignancies. Early identification of metastatic spread can have profound implications for staging and treatment strategies [17].

Economic considerations also favor strain histogram analysis. It is a cost-effective imaging modality compared to advanced imaging techniques such as positron emission tomography (PET) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). This makes it particularly useful in resource-limited settings [18].

Patient preparation is an often-overlooked aspect of strain histogram analysis. Proper hydration, avoidance of excessive neck strain, and optimal positioning are essential factors contributing to image quality and diagnostic accuracy [19].

Strain histogram analysis is gaining traction in research settings, with ongoing studies exploring novel histogram parameters and machine-learning models for enhanced diagnostic capabilities. This continuous research effort is likely to expand the clinical applications of this technique [20].

No Conflict of interest.

References:

1. Gupta S, Mahajan VK, Mehta KS, Chauhan PS. Lymph node evaluation in tropical medicine: Diagnostic approaches and clinical insights. Trop Med Int Health. 2021;26(5):583-592.
2. Goyal N, Sood A, Kumar P. Diagnostic significance of lymph node characteristics in infectious diseases. J Clin Pathol. 2020;73(4):201-209.
3. Sharma P, Jain A, Aggarwal R. Lymph node evaluation: Imaging, biopsy, and histopathology. Ann Trop Med Public Health. 2019;12(6):281-289.
4. Nandwani S, Rao N. Regional disease patterns influencing lymph node evaluation in tropical regions. Int J Trop Dis. 2022;17(3):145-152.
5. Kim HS, Lee JY, Lee JH. A systematic approach to lymphadenopathy: A clinical perspective. Trop Med Health. 2020;48(1):10-18.
6. Ngugi P, Ochola F, Onyango J. Infectious causes of lymphadenopathy in tropical medicine. East Afr Med J. 2021;98(2):89-96.
7. Handa R, Wali JP. Tuberculous lymphadenitis: Diagnostic and therapeutic challenges. Indian J Tuberc. 2019;66(4):414-420.
8. Mitra A, Sarkar N, Bhattacharya PK. Filariasis and lymphatic obstruction: Clinical and diagnostic insights. Trop Parasitol. 2020;10(1):23-29.
9. Patel B, Desai N, Singh H. Etiological analysis of lymphadenopathy in tropical regions. Int J Infect Dis. 2021;102:223-230.
10. Kumar V, Mathur K. Role of serological and molecular diagnostics in lymphadenopathy evaluation. J Trop Dis Res. 2019;15(2):55-63.
11. Doshi R, Patel N, Shah N. Lymph node involvement in leprosy: Clinical and histological patterns. Lepr Rev. 2020;91(3):300-307.
12. Gupta N, Sood R, Khatri D. Pathological features of lymph nodes in leprosy patients. Trop Med Int Health. 2019;24(4):421-429.
13. Rao N, Kumar S, Varghese J. Histopathological differentiation of granulomatous diseases. Int J Trop Pathol. 2022;18(1):75-82.
14. Singh P, Jain R. Diagnostic challenges of lymphadenopathy in leprosy-endemic areas. Indian J Dermatol. 2021;66(3):350-356.
15. Sharma R, Gupta S. Slit-skin smear and PCR in lymphadenopathy diagnosis. Trop Med Health. 2020;48(2):95-101.
16. Moore SW, King CH. Viral lymphadenopathy: Patterns and diagnostics in tropical settings. Trop Virol J. 2021;15(1):12-20.
17. Chen H, Wong L, Lin Y. Epstein-Barr virus-associated lymphadenopathy: Clinical features and outcomes. J Infect. 2020;80(5):550-558.
18. Patel B, Kumar P, Singh H. HIV-related lymphadenopathy: Clinical patterns and diagnostic markers. Int J Trop Med. 2021;17(4):345-354.
19. Gupta R, Saxena S. Differentiating viral and bacterial lymphadenopathy: Diagnostic markers. J Clin Microbiol. 2020;58(3):e01520-19.
20. Nassar N, Youssef A. Epidemiology of viral lymphadenopathy in endemic regions. Trop Virol J. 2021;16(2):150-159.
21. Basu D, Kumar S. Parasitic infections causing lymphadenopathy: Clinical and diagnostic insights. Trop Parasitol. 2020;10(3):120-128.

22. Fernandez M, Martinez L. Lymphadenopathy in parasitic infections: A diagnostic approach. J Trop Med. 2019;2020:6350405.
23. Samuels A, Patel V. Diagnostic techniques for parasitic lymphadenopathy. Int J Trop Pathol. 2021;14(1):22-30.
24. Rao S, Patel H. Treatment and management of parasitic lymphadenopathy. Trop Med Int Health. 2020;25(6):690-698.
25. Kumar P, Singh H, Patel B. Collaborative approaches to lymphadenopathy diagnosis. Int J Trop Med. 2019;13(2):45-53.
26. Das A, Roy S. Fungal lymphadenopathy in immunocompromised individuals. J Trop Mycol. 2021;8(2):89-96.
27. Sharma N, Das S, Gupta H. Histoplasmosis-associated lymphadenopathy: Clinical insights. Trop Dis J. 2020;15(1):55-62.
28. Nunes F, Pereira L. Cryptococcal lymphadenopathy in HIV-positive patients. Trop Med Int Health. 2020;24(5):405-412.
29. Roy S, Gupta N. Diagnostic methods for fungal lymphadenopathy. Mycoses. 2021;64(6):625-632.
30. Chatterjee N, Naskar D. Antifungal therapy in lymph node infections. J Trop Infect Dis. 2019;12(4):300-309.
31. Mehta R, Kumar A. Malignant lymphadenopathy in tropical regions. J Oncol Trop. 2020;15(2):120-129.
32. Singh R, Kapoor N. Hodgkin's lymphoma: Diagnosis and management. Int J Hematol Oncol. 2021;38(4):305-312.
33. Patel P, Singh R. Fine-needle aspiration cytology in lymph node evaluation. Cytopathology. 2020;31(4):290-298.
34. Sharma A, Jain K. Imaging studies in malignant lymphadenopathy. Cancer Imaging. 2021;21(1):23-31.
35. Gupta K, Saxena S. Differentiating infectious and malignant lymphadenopathy. Int J Trop Med. 2019;16(3):210-219.
36. Thomas P, Kumar A. Autoimmune lymphadenopathy in tropical settings. Autoimmune Rev. 2020;19(6):102521.
37. Suresh N, Rajan R. Clinical presentation of autoimmune lymphadenopathy. J Autoimmun. 2021;120:102798.
38. Patel A, Singh P. Histological markers in autoimmune lymphadenopathy. Pathol Res Int. 2019;2020:3564271.
39. Rao M, Kumar P. Serological diagnostics in autoimmune lymphadenopathy. Int J Immunol. 2020;22(4):305-312.
40. Khatri D, Patel A. Immunosuppressive therapy in autoimmune lymphadenopathy. Trop Med Int Health. 2021;26(3):275-283.
41. Jain S, Gupta N. Techniques in lymph node biopsy: An overview. J Clin Pathol. 2020;73(5):355-362.
42. Patel N, Singh K. FNAC vs core biopsy: Diagnostic accuracy in lymphadenopathy. Pathol Oncol Res. 2021;27:5801256.
43. Thomas L, Kumar S. Ancillary diagnostic techniques in lymphadenopathy. Int J Trop Pathol. 2019;13(4):152-159