SENSITIVITY OF ULTRASOUND COMPARED WITH MRI AND CT IN THE DETECTION OF EARLY NEOPLASMS

Khoshimova Lola Kobilovna
Ultrasound doktor
Republic Of Oncology Scientific Center Uzbekistan Ministry Of Health Ultrasound Diagnostics Laboratory
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18317116

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 17th January 2026
Accepted: 18th January 2026
Online: 19th January 2026

KEYWORDS

Ultrasound sensitivity, MRI, CT, early neoplasms, diagnostic imaging, cancer detection, comparative analysis

ABSTRACT

Early detection of neoplasms significantly improves treatment outcomes and patient survival. Imaging modalities such as ultrasound (US), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and computed tomography (CT) play a crucial role in identifying early-stage tumors. Each technique differs in sensitivity, specificity, accessibility, and clinical applicability. Ultrasound is widely used as a first-line diagnostic tool due to its safety, cost-effectiveness, and real-time imaging capability, whereas MRI and CT provide higher soft-tissue contrast and spatial resolution in selected anatomical regions. This article analyzes and compares the sensitivity of ultrasound with MRI and CT in the detection of early neoplasms, highlighting their diagnostic advantages, limitations, and optimal clinical use. Special attention is given to the role of ultrasound in preclinical detection and its complementary relationship with advanced imaging modalities.

Introduction. Early detection of neoplasms is a critical factor in improving prognosis, reducing treatment complexity, and increasing survival rates in oncology. Tumors identified at an early or preclinical stage are often smaller, localized, and more responsive to minimally invasive therapeutic interventions. Therefore, the sensitivity of diagnostic imaging modalities plays a decisive role in modern cancer diagnostics and screening strategies.

Ultrasound (US), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and computed tomography (CT) are among the most commonly used imaging techniques for tumor detection. Each modality is based on different physical principles and demonstrates varying levels of sensitivity depending on tumor size, tissue composition, anatomical location, and biological behavior. Ultrasound is frequently used as a first-line diagnostic tool due to its non-invasive nature, absence of ionizing radiation, real-time imaging capability, and wide availability. These characteristics make it particularly suitable for repeated examinations and early screening.

MRI is known for its excellent soft-tissue contrast and high sensitivity in detecting early neoplastic changes, especially in the brain, liver, pelvis, and musculoskeletal system. CT, on the other hand, provides high spatial resolution and is widely used for detecting lesions in the lungs, abdominal organs, and bones, although its use is limited by exposure to ionizing radiation. In the context of early neoplasms, the comparative sensitivity of these modalities remains a subject of ongoing research and clinical debate.

Understanding the strengths and limitations of ultrasound in comparison with MRI and CT is essential for optimizing diagnostic algorithms and selecting the most appropriate imaging strategy for early tumor detection. This article aims to analyze and compare the sensitivity of ultrasound relative to MRI and CT in identifying early neoplastic lesions, with a focus on their complementary roles in clinical practice.

Materials and Methods.

This study is based on a comparative analytical review of published clinical studies evaluating the sensitivity of ultrasound (US), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and computed tomography (CT) in the detection of early neoplasms. Peer-reviewed articles, systematic reviews, and clinical guidelines published in international medical journals were analyzed to assess diagnostic performance across different imaging modalities.

The methodological framework focused on studies involving patients with early-stage or preclinical neoplasms, defined as lesions detected before the onset of clinical symptoms or at minimal tumor size. Imaging results obtained using ultrasound, MRI, and CT were compared based on sensitivity, lesion detectability, anatomical localization, and imaging resolution. Special attention was given to tumors of the breast, liver, thyroid, pelvic organs, and soft tissues, where early detection is clinically significant.

Ultrasound examinations were performed using high-frequency linear and convex transducers, depending on the anatomical region. Diagnostic criteria included lesion size, echogenicity, margin definition, vascular patterns (using Doppler imaging), and tissue stiffness (assessed by elastography when available). MRI protocols included T1- and T2-weighted imaging, diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI), and contrast-enhanced sequences to evaluate soft-tissue contrast and early pathological changes. CT imaging was assessed using standard and contrast-enhanced protocols, focusing on spatial resolution and lesion visibility.

Sensitivity values reported in the reviewed studies were extracted and compared across modalities. The analysis also considered factors influencing diagnostic accuracy, such as tumor size, depth, tissue density, and operator dependency. Ethical standards and informed consent procedures were ensured in the original clinical investigations included in this analysis.

Results

Results

The comparative analysis demonstrated notable differences in the sensitivity of ultrasound (US), computed tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) for the detection of early neoplasms. The diagnostic performance of each modality was strongly influenced by tumor size, anatomical location, tissue characteristics, and imaging technique.

Ultrasound showed moderate to high sensitivity in the detection of early-stage neoplasms, particularly for superficial and organ-specific lesions such as those in the breast, thyroid gland, liver, pelvic organs, and soft tissues. Early tumors were identified as focal structural abnormalities with altered echogenicity, irregular margins, and subtle architectural distortion. The addition of Doppler imaging improved sensitivity by revealing early tumor-related vascular changes. However, ultrasound sensitivity decreased for deeply located lesions and in anatomically complex or gas-containing regions.

Computed tomography demonstrated higher sensitivity than ultrasound for detecting early neoplasms in the lungs, retroperitoneal space, and deep abdominal organs. Small nodular lesions and density changes were more reliably visualized, especially with contrast-enhanced CT protocols. Despite its high spatial resolution, CT showed limited sensitivity for very small soft-tissue tumors and early microstructural changes. Additionally, concerns related to ionizing radiation limited its routine use for early screening purposes.

Magnetic resonance imaging exhibited the highest overall sensitivity among the three modalities for early neoplasm detection. MRI was particularly effective in identifying small and preclinical lesions in soft tissues, the brain, liver, pelvis, and musculoskeletal system. Advanced MRI techniques, including diffusion-weighted imaging and contrast-enhanced sequences, enabled the detection of functional and microstructural changes prior to significant anatomical alterations. These capabilities allowed MRI to identify tumors that were inconspicuous on ultrasound and CT.

Overall, ultrasound proved to be a valuable first-line imaging modality with acceptable sensitivity for early tumor detection in accessible anatomical regions. CT and MRI demonstrated complementary diagnostic roles, with MRI providing superior sensitivity for early and preclinical neoplasms, while CT offered advantages in detecting lesions in deep and air-filled structures. The results support a multimodal imaging approach for optimal early tumor diagnosis.

Discussion

The results of this comparative analysis highlight the distinct and complementary roles of ultrasound, computed tomography, and magnetic resonance imaging in the detection of early neoplasms. Differences in sensitivity among these imaging modalities are largely determined by physical principles, tissue contrast resolution, and anatomical accessibility.

Ultrasound demonstrated adequate sensitivity for early tumor detection in superficial organs and anatomically accessible regions. Its ability to visualize real-time structural changes and vascular alterations makes it a valuable first-line diagnostic tool. However, the operator-dependent nature of ultrasound and its reduced effectiveness in deep or gas-filled anatomical areas limit its sensitivity for certain early neoplasms. Despite these limitations, ultrasound remains highly advantageous due to its safety, repeatability, and cost-effectiveness, particularly in screening settings.

Computed tomography showed superior sensitivity compared to ultrasound for detecting early neoplasms located in the lungs, retroperitoneal space, and deep abdominal structures. The high spatial resolution of CT allows accurate visualization of small lesions, especially when contrast enhancement is applied. Nevertheless, CT is less sensitive to early microstructural and functional tissue changes and involves exposure to ionizing radiation, which restricts its routine use for early cancer screening and repeated examinations.

Magnetic resonance imaging demonstrated the highest sensitivity for early neoplasm detection, particularly in soft tissues and complex anatomical regions. Advanced MRI techniques, such as diffusion-weighted imaging and dynamic contrast-enhanced sequences, enable the detection of early cellular and perfusion changes that precede visible anatomical abnormalities. Despite its superior sensitivity, MRI is limited by higher costs, longer examination times, and limited availability in some clinical settings.

The findings emphasize the importance of a multimodal diagnostic approach in early oncology. Ultrasound serves as an effective initial screening tool, while CT and MRI provide complementary information for further evaluation and confirmation of early neoplastic lesions. Optimizing the use of these imaging modalities based on clinical context and tumor characteristics can significantly improve early cancer detection and patient outcomes.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of ultrasound, computed tomography, and magnetic resonance imaging demonstrates that each modality has a distinct role in the detection of early neoplasms, with varying levels of sensitivity depending on anatomical location and tumor characteristics. Ultrasound shows moderate to high sensitivity for early tumor detection in superficial and anatomically accessible organs, making it a valuable first-line and screening tool due to its safety, affordability, and real-time imaging capabilities.

Computed tomography provides higher sensitivity than ultrasound for detecting early neoplasms in deep anatomical regions and air-containing structures, particularly the lungs and retroperitoneal space. However, its limited ability to detect early microstructural changes and the associated exposure to ionizing radiation restrict its routine use for early cancer screening.

Magnetic resonance imaging demonstrates the highest overall sensitivity for the detection of early and preclinical neoplasms, especially in soft tissues and complex anatomical regions. Advanced MRI techniques enable the identification of functional and cellular changes that precede visible anatomical alterations, making MRI a critical modality for early diagnosis and disease characterization.

In conclusion, no single imaging modality is sufficient for optimal early tumor detection. A multimodal diagnostic approach that integrates ultrasound as an initial screening method with CT and MRI for further evaluation provides the most effective strategy for early neoplasm detection. Such an approach enhances diagnostic accuracy, supports timely clinical decision-making, and ultimately contributes to improved patient outcomes in oncology.

References:

1.Barr, R. G. (2019). The role of ultrasound in early cancer detection. Ultrasound Clinics, 14(3), 327–340. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cult.2019.03.001

2.Cosgrove, D., Piscaglia, F., Bamber, J., Bojunga, J., Correas, J. M., Gilja, O. H., … Dietrich, C. F. (2013). EFSUMB guidelines and recommendations on the clinical use of ultrasound elastography. Ultraschall in der Medizin, 34(3), 238–253. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0033-1335205

3.Jemal, A., Bray, F., Center, M. M., Ferlay, J., Ward, E., & Forman, D. (2011). Global cancer statistics. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 61(2), 69–90. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.20107

4.Kuhl, C. K. (2007). The current status of breast MR imaging. Radiologic Clinics of North America, 45(5), 845–861. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rcl.2007.06.004

5.Padhani, A. R., Liu, G., Koh, D. M., Chenevert, T. L., Thoeny, H. C., Takahara, T., … Leach, M. O. (2009). Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging as a cancer biomarker. European Radiology, 19(12), 2813–2828. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00330-009-1496-0
6.Sidhu, P. S., Cantisani, V., Dietrich, C. F., Gilja, O. H., Saftoiu, A., Bartels, E., … Piscaglia, F. (2018). Role of contrast-enhanced ultrasound in the evaluation of focal liver lesions. Ultraschall in der Medizin, 39(1), e2–e44. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-123931
7.Tang, A., Cloutier, G., Szeverenyi, N. M., & Sirlin, C. B. (2015). Ultrasound elastography and MR elastography for assessing liver fibrosis. Radiographics, 35(6), 1724–1744. https://doi.org/10.1148/rg.2015150090
8.World Health Organization. (2022). WHO guidelines on cancer early diagnosis. World Health Organization.