CTC Workflow: Reviewing & Reporting Exams



Abraham H. Dachman The University of Chicago









Aims

- Explain the workflow for CTC interpretation and reporting
 - Environment for Interpretation
 - Quality assurance
 - Common interpretation strategies
 - Generating a CTC report

Workflow of CTC Interpretation

- Confirm segmentation and map out colon
 - 3D transparency view or coronals
- Quality assurance
 - Distention, stool, fluid, tagging
- Search for polyps using both 3D and 2D
- Characterize and measure polyp candidates
- Secondary CAD-assisted evaluation
- Search for extracolonic findings
- Report (follow C-RADS guidelines)



High Volume CTC Paradigm: Start Read @ CTC Workstation

Low Volume CTC Paradigm: Start Read @PACS





Technologist QA

High Volume CTC Paradigm: Start Read @ CTC Workstation Low Volume CTC Paradigm: Start Read @PACS

QA Segmentation & Colon Layout (Supine-Prone Registration)







Supine-Prone Registration





High Volume CTC Paradigm: Start Read @ CTC Workstation Low Volume CTC Paradigm: Start Read @PACS

QA Segmentation & Colon Layout

QA Distention, Stool, Fluid & Tagging



3D View: Rapid QA of

- Location of segments
 tortuosity
- mobility when comparing supine to prone
 Identify ileocecal valve
- Quality of distention



2D QA CHECKLIST

- Retained stool
 - size and tagging
- Retained fluid
 - quantity
 - location
 - tagging
- change supine prone
 Artifacts (e.g., metal, breathing)

QA by technologist includes review of axial images for **distention:** most *critical* for diagnostic quality

You MUST identify the IC valve, but this is NOT always intuitive ...

- Identify by:
 - Location
 - Fat
 - Shape
 - Papillary (dome-shaped
 - Labial
 - Mixed



Poor Preparation Excessive untagged feces



Quality Assurance: The Bottom Line

Are any segments obscured on both views?

Could a 10 mm polyp be hidden?

SAM Question:

Intentionally Hidden for Handout

Response 1. Response 2. Response 3. Response 4.



Methods of Interpretation

- 3D with 2D problem solving
- 2D with 3D problem solving
- Soft tissue windows for flat lesions
- Bone windows for dense oral contrast tagged fluid and stool
- Virtual Pathology (open views)
- Computer-aided diagnosis (CAD)

Methods of Interpretation

- 3D with 2D problem solving
- 2D with 3D problem solving
- Soft tissue windows for flat lesions
- Bone windows for dense oral contrast tagged fluid and stool
- Virtual Pathology (open views)
- Computer-aided diagnosis (CAD)

Basic Feature of Polyps





6 mm Polyp on a Fold Coated with tagging agent









Non-tagged Stool Mobile, With Internal Gas







Well – Tagged Stool



Lipoma on the ICV



Dedicated Read for Flat Lesions Wide Soft Tissue Window in 2D



ourtesy of J.L. Fidler, MD

Approach to Polyp Candidate Analysis

- Polyp vs. fold > use > 3D or MPRs
- Polyp vs. stool > use > texture (W/L or color map)
 - If solid . . .
 - Compare supine / prone for mobility

If mobile, check for long stalk, colonic rotation / flip

Primary 3D Read Strategies

- Forward and backward
- Supine and prone
- Special software features (e.g., color map for polyp characterization, show blind areas)
- Problem solve in 2D as needed as you read
- Bookmark & defer difficult problem solving (e.g., difficult supine/prone comparison)

Primary 2D Read Learn to "Track the Colon"

- Highly magnified axial
- Go slowly ! Look at all surfaces
- Evaluate very short segments as you move along an imaginary centerline
- Use a lung window (1500/-600) setting or "colon" (2000/0)
- Non-magnified or magnified MPR
- Simultaneous or deferred endoluminal comparison









3D Over-measurement Pitfall "falling off the cliff"



Use largest dimension on either 2D or 3D to triage management
Per "C-RADS" 6 mm threshold for reporting polyps

Flat Lesions: Use Wide Soft Tissue Window





Computer Aided Detection: Integrated Visualization Display



Fit to Width



Fit to Height





Structured CTC Reporting

- History
- Prep
- Informed of exam limitations
- Technique
- Colon findings
- Extracolonic findings
- C-RADS scores / Recommendations
- Footnote qualifier / reference C-RADS

C-RADS Classification

- C0 Inadequate study (can not evaluate 10 mm lesions)
- C1 Normal, routine follow up (Q 5 yrs CTC)
- C2 Indeterminate; 1-3 yr f/u
 - Polyp 6-9 mm,
 - Findings indeterminate; cannot exclude polyps ≥ 6 mm
- C3 10 mm or \geq 3 6-9mm polyps \rightarrow Colonoscopy
- C4 Mass, likely malignant; surgical consult

*Zalis et al for the Working Group on VC. Radiology 2005;236:3-9.

Sample Histories

<u>History</u>: 55 year old male. CTC for colorectal cancer screening.

History: 55 year old male. Anemia. Diagnostic CTC for colorectal cancer screening.

<u>History</u>: 55 year old male. History of incomplete colonoscopy in 2008. Asymptomatic. CTC for colorectal cancer screening.

Sample Report Findings 1st Paragraph

<u>Sample #1</u>:The colon was well distended and cleansed. A small amount of residual fluid in the right colon and rectosigmoid was well-tagged with oral contrast.

Sample #2: The colon was well distended and cleansed except for particulate stool in right colon limiting sensitivity for small polyps. A moderate amount of residual fluid in the right colon and rectosigmoid was weakly tagged with oral contrast.



THANK YOU !

Acknowledgments

Contributors to "The Atlas of Virtual Colonoscopy" Eds1 & 2

http://www.radiology.uchicago.edu/page/virtual-colonoscopy-overview

http://vctraining.uchicago.edu









- Both 2D and 3D skills are needed use it in every case
- Use a systematic approach that involves QA of images, recognition of anatomic landmarks and supine-prone comparison
- Recognize pitfalls and use CAD secondary read
- Report using C-RADS guidelines and recommendations