

## BÖLÜM 7

### KAS-İSKELET YUMUŞAK DOKU TÜMÖRLERİNİN GÖRÜNTÜLENMESİNDE TEMEL PRENSİPLER

Barış Can ARSLAN<sup>1</sup>

#### GİRİŞ

Kas-iskelet sisteminin yumuşak doku tümörleri birkaç geniş kategoriye ayrılabilir: vasküler, travmatik, inflamatuvar ve neoplastik. Yumuşak doku kitlelerinin çoğu benignidir. Benign tümörlerin malign tümörlere oranı kesin olarak bilinmemekle birlikte, bu oranın 100'e 1 kadar yüksek olduğu tahmin edilmektedir (1).

Dünya sağlık örgütünün yumuşak doku tümörleri sınıflamasına göre, yumuşak doku kitleleri matür hücre tipine göre histolojik olarak 9 ana kategoriye ayrılır: adipositik, fibroblastik/miyofibroblastik, fibroblastik, düz kas, perisitik (perivasküler), iskelet kası, vasküler, kondro-osseöz ve andiferansiye tümörler. Her histolojik kategori daha sonra benign, intermediate (lokal agresif ya da nadiren metastaz yapan) ve malign alt tipler olmak üzere alt kategorilere ayrılır. Malign yumuşak doku kitleleri, yumuşak doku sarkomları, prognostik bilgi sağlamak için mitotik indeks gibi çeşitli histolojik özelliklere göre farklı derecelere ayrılır. Yumuşak doku sarkomlarının yaklaşık %75'i yüksek derecelidir ve bu hastalar, özellikle kötü prognoza neden olan metastazla ortaya çıkabilir (2-4).

Görüntüleme teknolojisindeki süregelen gelişmelerle birlikte kas-iskelet yumuşak doku kitlelerinin radyolojik değerlendirmesi önemli ölçüde değişmiştir. Bilgisayar destekli görüntülemenin ortaya çıkmasından önce, klinik olarak şüpheli yumuşak doku kitlelerinin değerlendirilmesi genellikle radyografilerle sınırlıydı (5). Radyografiler genellikle bir kitlenin varlığının doğrulanmasına izin verse de ve yağ dokusu ile yumuşak doku mineralizasyonunun tanımlanmasında duyarlı olsa da, çok az başka tanı bilgisi sağlamaktadır. Ayrıca şüpheli lezyonların lokal evrelemesinde sınırlıdır (6).

<sup>1</sup> Uzm. Dr., Gaziantep Şehir Hastanesi, Radyoloji Kliniği, bariscanarslan@gmail.com,  
ORCID iD: 0000-0002-4530-3166

## KAYNAKLAR

1. Siegel MJ. Magnetic resonance imaging of musculoskeletal soft tissue masses. Radiologic clinics of north america. 2001;39(4):701-20.
2. Ahlawat S, Fritz J, Morris CD, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging biomarkers in musculoskeletal soft tissue tumors: review of conventional features and focus on nonmorphologic imaging. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging. 2019;50(1):11-27.
3. Gustafson P. Soft tissue sarcoma: epidemiology and prognosis in 508 patients. Acta Orthopaedica Scandinavica. 1994;65:2-31.
4. Fletcher CD, Unni K, Mertens F. World Health Organization classification of tumours. Pathology and genetics of tumours of soft tissue and bone: IARC Press; 2002.
5. Kransdorf MJ, Murphey MD. Radiologic evaluation of soft-tissue masses: a current perspective. American Journal of Roentgenology. 2000;175(3):575-87.
6. Kransdorf MJ, Murphey MD. Imaging of soft-tissue musculoskeletal masses: fundamental concepts. Radiographics. 2016;36(6):1931-48.
7. Fisher SM, Joodi R, Madhuranthakam AJ, et al. Current utilities of imaging in grading musculoskeletal soft tissue sarcomas. European journal of radiology. 2016;85(7):1336-44.
8. Sundaram M, McLeod R. MR imaging of tumor and tumorlike lesions of bone and soft tissue. AJR American journal of roentgenology. 1990;155(4):817-24.
9. Raghavan M. Conventional modalities and novel, emerging imaging techniques for musculoskeletal tumors. Cancer Control. 2017;24(2):161-71.
10. Noebauer-Huhmann I-M, Vanhoenacker FM, Vilanova JC, et al. Soft tissue tumor imaging in adults: European Society of Musculoskeletal Radiology-Guidelines 2023—overview, and primary local imaging: how and where? European radiology. 2024;34(7):4427-37.
11. Gartner L, Pearce CJ, Saifuddin A. The role of the plain radiograph in the characterisation of soft tissue tumours. Skeletal radiology. 2009;38(6):549-58.
12. Wu JS, Hochman MG. Soft-tissue tumors and tumorlike lesions: a systematic imaging approach. Radiology. 2009;253(2):297-316.
13. Kransdorf MJ, Murphey MD, Wessell DE, et al. ACR appropriateness criteria® soft-tissue masses. Journal of the American College of Radiology. 2018;15(5):189-97.
14. Manaster B. Soft-tissue masses: optimal imaging protocol and reporting. American Journal of Roentgenology. 2013;201(3):505-14.
15. Balach T, Stacy GS, Haydon RC. The clinical evaluation of soft tissue tumors. Radiologic Clinics. 2011;49(6):1185-96.
16. Ritchie D. Commentary on ultrasound for initial evaluation and triage of clinically suspicious soft-tissue masses. Clinical radiology. 2009;64(6):622-3.
17. Lakkaraju A, Sinha R, Garikipati R, et al. Ultrasound for initial evaluation and triage of clinically suspicious soft-tissue masses. Clinical radiology. 2009;64(6):615-21.
18. Carra BJ, Bui-Mansfield LT, O'Brien SD, et al. Sonography of musculoskeletal soft-tissue masses: techniques, pearls, and pitfalls. American Journal of Roentgenology. 2014;202:1281-90.
19. Panicek DM, Gatsonis C, Rosenthal DI, et al. CT and MR imaging in the local staging of primary malignant musculoskeletal neoplasms: Report of the Radiology Diagnostic Oncology Group. Radiology. 1997;202(1):237-46.
20. Costa FM, Canella C, Gasparetto E. Advanced magnetic resonance imaging techniques in the evaluation of musculoskeletal tumors. Radiologic Clinics. 2011;49(6):1325-58.
21. Teixeira PAG, Beaumont M, Gabriela H, et al. Advanced techniques in musculoskeletal oncology: perfusion, diffusion, and spectroscopy. Seminars in Musculoskeletal Radiology; 2015;19(5):463-74.
22. Bancroft LW, Pettis C, Wasyliv C. Imaging of benign soft tissue tumors. Seminars in musculoskeletal radiology; 2013;17(2):156-67.
23. Fujimoto H, Murakami K, Ichikawa T, et al. MRI of soft-tissue lesions: opposed-phase T2\*-weighted gradient-echo images. Journal of computer assisted tomography. 1993;17(3):418-24.

24. Shuman W, Baron R, Peters M, et al. Comparison of STIR and spin-echo MR imaging at 1.5 T in 90 lesions of the chest, liver, and pelvis. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 1989;152(4):853-9.
25. Rubin DA, Kneeland J. MR imaging of the musculoskeletal system: technical considerations for enhancing image quality and diagnostic yield. *AJR American journal of roentgenology*. 1994;163(5):1155-63.
26. Dwyer A, Frank J, Sank V, et al. Short-Ti inversion-recovery pulse sequence: analysis and initial experience in cancer imaging. *Radiology*. 1988;168(3):827-36.
27. Verstraete KL, De Deene Y, Roels H, et al. Benign and malignant musculoskeletal lesions: dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging--parametric" first-pass" images depict tissue vascularization and perfusion. *Radiology*. 1994;192(3):835-43.
28. Beltran J, Chandnani V, McGhee Jr R, et al. Gadopentetate dimeglumine-enhanced MR imaging of the musculoskeletal system. *AJR American journal of roentgenology*. 1991;156(3):457-66.
29. Mirowitz S, Totty W, Lee J. Characterization of musculoskeletal masses using dynamic Gd-DTPA enhanced spin-echo MRI. *Journal of computer assisted tomography*. 1992;16(1):120-5.
30. Fletcher BD, Hanna SL. Musculoskeletal neoplasms: dynamic Gd-DTPA-enhanced MR imaging. *Radiology*. 1990;177(1):287-8.
31. van Rijswijk CS, Geirnaerdt MJ, Hogendoorn PC, et al. Soft-tissue tumors: value of static and dynamic gadopentetate dimeglumine-enhanced MR imaging in prediction of malignancy. *Radiology*. 2004;233(2):493-502.
32. A Watson T, Olsen ØE. Fusion and subtraction post-processing in body MRI. *Pediatric radiology*. 2015;45:273-82.
33. Vanel D, Shapeero LG, Tardivon A, et al. Dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI with subtraction of aggressive soft tissue tumors after resection. *Skeletal radiology*. 1998;27:505-10.
34. Park MY, Jee W-H, Kim SK, et al. Preliminary experience using dynamic MRI at 3.0 Tesla for evaluation of soft tissue tumors. *Korean Journal of Radiology*. 2013;14(1):102-9.
35. Kransdorf MJ, Bridges MD. Current developments and recent advances in musculoskeletal tumor imaging. *Seminars in musculoskeletal radiology*. 2013;17(2):145-55.
36. Van Epps K, Regan F. MR cholangiopancreatography using HASTE sequences. *Clinical radiology*. 1999;54(9):588-94.
37. Rumboldt Z, Marotti M. Magnetization transfer, HASTE, and FLAIR imaging. *Magnetic Resonance Imaging Clinics*. 2003;11(3):471-92.
38. Outwater EK. Ultrafast MR imaging of the pelvis. *European journal of radiology*. 1999;29(3):233-44.
39. Ragab Y, Emad Y, Gheita T, et al. Differentiation of osteoporotic and neoplastic vertebral fractures by chemical shift {in-phase and out-of phase} MR imaging. *European journal of radiology*. 2009;72(1):125-33.
40. Kohl CA, Chivers FS, Lorans R, et al. Accuracy of chemical shift MR imaging in diagnosing indeterminate bone marrow lesions in the pelvis: review of a single institution's experience. *Skeletal radiology*. 2014;43:1079-84.
41. Disler D, McCauley T, Ratner L, et al. In-phase and out-of-phase MR imaging of bone marrow: prediction of neoplasia based on the detection of coexistent fat and water. *AJR American journal of roentgenology*. 1997;169(5):1439-47.
42. Bilbey JH, McLoughlin R, Kurkjian P, et al. MR imaging of adrenal masses: value of chemical-shift imaging for distinguishing adenomas from other tumors. *AJR American journal of roentgenology*. 1995;164(3):637-42.
43. Koh D-M, Collins DJ. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the body: applications and challenges in oncology. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2007;188(6):1622-35.
44. Brown R. XXVII. A brief account of microscopical observations made in the months of June, July and August 1827, on the particles contained in the pollen of plants; and on the general existence of active molecules in organic and inorganic bodies. *The philosophical magazine*.

- 1828;4(21):161-73.
45. El Kady RM, Choudhary AK, Tappouni R. Accuracy of apparent diffusion coefficient value measurement on PACS workstation: a comparative analysis. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2011;196(3):280-4.
  46. Pereira RS, Harris AD, Sevick RJ, et al. Effect of b value on contrast during diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging assessment of acute ischemic stroke. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging: An Official Journal of the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*. 2002;15(5):591-6.
  47. Jiang Z-X, Peng W-J, Li W-T, et al. Effect of b value on monitoring therapeutic response by diffusion-weighted imaging. *World Journal of Gastroenterology*. 2008;14(38):5893-4.
  48. Oka K, Yakushiji T, Sato H, et al. Usefulness of diffusion-weighted imaging for differentiating between desmoid tumors and malignant soft tissue tumors. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging*. 2011;33(1):189-93.
  49. Oka K, Yakushiji T, Sato H, et al. Ability of diffusion-weighted imaging for the differential diagnosis between chronic expanding hematomas and malignant soft tissue tumors. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging: An Official Journal of the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*. 2008;28(5):1195-200.
  50. Einarsdóttir H, Karlsson M, Wejde J, et al. Diffusion-weighted MRI of soft tissue tumours. *European radiology*. 2004;14:959-63.
  51. van Rijswijk CS, Kunz P, Hogendoorn PC, et al. Diffusion-weighted MRI in the characterization of soft-tissue tumors. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging: An Official Journal of The International Society For Magnetic Resonance In Medicine*. 2002;15(3):302-7.
  52. Genovese E, Cani A, Rizzo S, et al. Comparison between MRI with spin-echo echo-planar diffusion-weighted sequence (DWI) and histology in the diagnosis of soft-tissue tumours. *La radiologia medica*. 2011;116(4):644-56.
  53. Khoo MM, Tyler PA, Saifuddin A, et al. Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) in musculoskeletal MRI: a critical review. *Skeletal radiology*. 2011;40:665-81.
  54. Razek A, Nada N, Ghaniem M, et al. Assessment of soft tissue tumours of the extremities with diffusion echoplanar MR imaging. *La radiologia medica*. 2011;117(1):96-101.
  55. Surov A, Nagata S, Razek AAA, et al. Comparison of ADC values in different malignancies of the skeletal musculature: a multicentric analysis. *Skeletal Radiology*. 2015;44(7):995-1000.
  56. Maeda M, Matsumine A, Kato H, et al. Soft-tissue tumors evaluated by line-scan diffusion-weighted imaging: influence of myxoid matrix on the apparent diffusion coefficient. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging: An Official Journal of The International Society For Magnetic Resonance In Medicine*. 2007;25(6):1199-204.
  57. Subhawong TK, Jacobs MA, Fayad LM. Diffusion-weighted MR imaging for characterizing musculoskeletal lesions. *Radiographics*. 2014;34(5):1163-77.
  58. Subhawong TK, Wang X, Durand DJ, et al. Proton MR spectroscopy in metabolic assessment of musculoskeletal lesions. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2012;198(1):162-72.
  59. Shinkwin MA, Lenkinski RE, Daly JM, et al. Integrated magnetic resonance imaging and phosphorus spectroscopy of soft tissue tumors. *Cancer*. 1991;67(7):1849-58.
  60. Sostman HD, Prescott DM, Dewhirst MW, et al. MR imaging and spectroscopy for prognostic evaluation in soft-tissue sarcomas. *Radiology*. 1994;190(1):269-75.
  61. Hsieh T-J, Li C-W, Chuang H-Y, et al. Longitudinally monitoring chemotherapy effect of malignant musculoskeletal tumors with in vivo proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy: an initial experience. *Journal of computer assisted tomography*. 2008;32(6):987-94.
  62. Fayad LM, Wang X, Salibi N, et al. A feasibility study of quantitative molecular characterization of musculoskeletal lesions by proton MR spectroscopy at 3 T. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2010;195(1):69-75.
  63. Fayad LM, Salibi N, Wang X, et al. Quantification of muscle choline concentrations by proton MR spectroscopy at 3 T: technical feasibility. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2010;194(1):73-9.

64. Fayad LM, Barker PB, Jacobs MA, et al. Characterization of musculoskeletal lesions on 3-T proton MR spectroscopy. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2007;188(6):1513-20.
65. Fayad LM, Bluemke DA, McCarthy EF, et al. Musculoskeletal tumors: use of proton MR spectroscopic imaging for characterization. *Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging: An Official Journal of the International Society for Magnetic Resonance in Medicine*. 2006;23(1):23-8.
66. Glunde K, Jie C, Bhujwalla ZM. Molecular causes of the aberrant choline phospholipid metabolism in breast cancer. *Cancer research*. 2004;64(12):4270-6.
67. Wang C-K, Li C-W, Hsieh T-J, et al. Characterization of bone and soft-tissue tumors with in vivo <sup>1</sup>H MR spectroscopy: initial results. *Radiology*. 2004;232(2):599-605.
68. Subhawong TK, Fishman EK, Swart JE, et al. Soft-tissue masses and masslike conditions: what does CT add to diagnosis and management? *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2010;194(6):1559-67.
69. Kransdorf M, Meis J, Jelinek J. Myositis ossificans: MR appearance with radiologic-pathologic correlation. *AJR American journal of roentgenology*. 1991;157(6):1243-8.
70. Karcaaltincaba M, Aktas A. Dual-energy CT revisited with multidetector CT: review of principles and clinical applications. *Diagnostic and interventional radiology*. 2011;17(3):181-94.
71. Johnson TR, Weckbach S, Kellner H, et al. Clinical image: Dual-energy computed tomographic molecular imaging of gout. *Arthritis & Rheumatism*. 2007;56(8):2809.
72. Ning TC, Keenan RT. Unusual clinical presentations of gout. *Current opinion in rheumatology*. 2010;22(2):181-7.
73. Bamberg F, Dierks A, Nikolaou K, et al. Metal artifact reduction by dual energy computed tomography using monoenergetic extrapolation. *European radiology*. 2011;21(7):1424-9.
74. Zhou C, Zhao YE, Luo S, et al. Monoenergetic imaging of dual-energy CT reduces artifacts from implanted metal orthopedic devices in patients with fractures. *Academic radiology*. 2011;18(10):1252-7.
75. Mori T, Fujii M, Akisue T, et al. Three-dimensional images of contrast-enhanced MDCT for preoperative assessment of musculoskeletal masses: comparison with MRI and plain radiographs. *Radiation Medicine*. 2005;23(6):398-406.
76. Van der Woude H-J, Vanderschueren G. Ultrasound in musculoskeletal tumors with emphasis on its role in tumor follow-up. *Radiologic Clinics of North America*. 1999;37(4):753-66.
77. Morley N, Omar I. Imaging evaluation of musculoskeletal tumors. *Orthopaedic Oncology: Primary and Metastatic Tumors of the Skeletal System*. 2014;162:9-29.
78. Widmann G, Riedl A, Schoepf D, et al. State-of-the-art HR-US imaging findings of the most frequent musculoskeletal soft-tissue tumors. *Skeletal radiology*. 2009;38(7):637-49.
79. Inampudi P, Jacobson JA, Fessell DP, et al. Soft-tissue lipomas: accuracy of sonography in diagnosis with pathologic correlation. *Radiology*. 2004;233(3):763-7.
80. Lin J, Jacobson JA, Fessell DP, et al. An illustrated tutorial of musculoskeletal sonography: part 4, musculoskeletal masses, sonographically guided interventions, and miscellaneous topics. *American Journal of Roentgenology*. 2000;175(6):1711-9.
81. Lee MH, Kim NR, Ryu JA. Cyst-like solid tumors of the musculoskeletal system: an analysis of ultrasound findings. *Skeletal radiology*. 2010;39(10):981-6.
82. Bodner G, Schocke MF, Rachbauer F, et al. Differentiation of malignant and benign musculoskeletal tumors: combined color and power Doppler US and spectral wave analysis. *Radiology*. 2002;223(2):410-16.