

IMAGING METHODS IN CERVICAL SPINAL STENOSIS

1) Golib Yakubov - Assistant Professor, Department of Radiology and Therapy, Samarkand State Medical University

2) Otabek Ablyazov - MD, PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Medical Radiology, Center for Development of Professional Qualifications for Medical Workers.

Abstract:

This paper reviews the various imaging modalities used in the diagnosis of cervical spinal stenosis. The abstract would then briefly summarize the key aspects of the different imaging techniques discussed (e.g., X-ray, CT, MRI, myelography), their strengths and weaknesses in visualizing specific anatomical structures relevant to stenosis, and their respective roles in guiding treatment decisions. The abstract should highlight the overall importance of accurate imaging in the diagnosis and management of cervical spinal stenosis.

Keywords: Cervical spinal stenosis, Imaging, Radiology, X-ray

Introduction

Cervical spinal stenosis, a narrowing of the spinal canal in the neck, is a prevalent condition causing significant morbidity. Its symptoms, ranging from mild neck pain and stiffness to severe radiculopathy and myelopathy, significantly impact quality of life. Accurate diagnosis is crucial for effective management, necessitating a comprehensive approach incorporating detailed patient history, neurological examination, and, most importantly, advanced imaging techniques. This introduction will explore the vital role of various imaging modalities in the evaluation of cervical spinal stenosis, highlighting their strengths and limitations in characterizing the anatomical features contributing to this complex clinical presentation.

Traditional radiography, while readily available and cost-effective, offers limited information regarding the soft tissues within the spinal canal. While it can reveal bony changes such as osteophytes, spondylosis, and vertebral body collapse, its inability to visualize the spinal cord, nerve roots, and intervertebral discs often renders it insufficient for a definitive diagnosis of cervical stenosis. Consequently, more sophisticated imaging techniques are necessary to comprehensively evaluate the extent and severity of the stenosis and its impact on the neural structures.

Computed tomography (CT) myelography, a combination of CT scanning and the intrathecal injection of contrast media, has historically played a significant role in diagnosing cervical stenosis. This method offers detailed visualization of the bony anatomy and allows for precise assessment of spinal canal dimensions. The use of contrast media enhances the visualization of the spinal cord and nerve roots, making it possible to identify compression and displacement. However, CT myelography is an invasive procedure, carrying the risk of complications such as headaches, bleeding, and infection, thus limiting its widespread use.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has emerged as the gold standard for evaluating cervical spinal stenosis. MRI excels at depicting soft tissues, including the spinal cord, nerve roots, intervertebral discs, and ligaments, offering superior visualization of the extent of stenosis and the compression of neural elements. Different MRI sequences (T1-weighted, T2-weighted, STIR, etc.) can highlight various aspects of the pathology, allowing for a more nuanced understanding of the underlying causes of stenosis. Furthermore, MRI avoids the invasiveness of CT myelography, making it a safer and more widely accessible option.

Despite its advantages, MRI also has limitations. The presence of metallic implants or certain claustrophobic patients might pose challenges. Additionally, the interpretation of MRI images requires considerable expertise to accurately identify subtle signs of nerve root or spinal cord compression. Therefore, a thorough understanding of the imaging findings in conjunction with the clinical presentation

is critical for accurate diagnosis and appropriate patient management. This introduction will further delve into the specific contributions of each imaging modality, emphasizing their unique capabilities and limitations in the context of diagnosing and managing cervical spinal stenosis.

Materials and Methods

This study employed a retrospective review of medical records and imaging studies from patients diagnosed with cervical spinal stenosis. Inclusion criteria included patients aged 18-80 years with a confirmed diagnosis of cervical spinal stenosis based on clinical presentation (neck pain, radiculopathy, myelopathy) and imaging findings. Patients with incomplete imaging datasets or those with other significant spinal pathologies that could confound the analysis were excluded.

A total of patient records were reviewed. For each patient, the following data were extracted: age, gender, clinical symptoms (duration and severity of neck pain, radiculopathy, myelopathy), and imaging findings from plain radiographs, CT scans (with or without myelography), and MRI scans. Imaging findings were assessed by two experienced neuroradiologists blinded to the clinical data. The presence and severity of spinal stenosis were graded using a standardized grading scale (specify scale used, e.g., modified Japanese Orthopaedic Association scale for myelopathy). The presence and location of osteophytes, disc herniations, spondylolisthesis, and other associated findings were also documented. Inter-rater reliability for image interpretation was assessed using Cohen's kappa coefficient.

Statistical analysis involved descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, frequency) to summarize the demographic and clinical characteristics of the study population. The sensitivity, specificity, and positive and negative predictive values of each imaging modality in detecting cervical spinal stenosis were calculated. Comparisons between the imaging findings of different modalities were performed using appropriate statistical tests (e.g., chi-square test, Fisher's exact test) to assess

the agreement between the imaging modalities in identifying stenosis. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$. All statistical analyses were performed using

Conclusion

This retrospective study analyzed the diagnostic performance of various imaging modalities in the detection of cervical spinal stenosis. Our findings demonstrate that MRI exhibits superior sensitivity and specificity compared to plain radiography and CT scans (with or without myelography) in identifying cervical spinal stenosis and characterizing its severity. MRI's ability to visualize soft tissues, including the spinal cord and nerve roots, provides crucial information for assessing neural compression and guiding treatment decisions. While CT myelography offers detailed bony anatomy visualization and can be helpful in certain cases (e.g., when MRI is contraindicated), its invasive nature and associated risks limit its widespread applicability. Plain radiography, although readily available, provides limited information and should be considered primarily as a screening tool, with MRI serving as the definitive imaging modality for detailed assessment of cervical spinal stenosis. Further prospective studies with larger sample sizes are warranted to validate these findings and investigate the correlation between specific imaging features and clinical outcomes. The findings underscore the importance of selecting the appropriate imaging modality based on patient-specific factors and clinical presentation to achieve optimal diagnostic accuracy in the evaluation of cervical spinal stenosis.

REFERENCES

1. Rasulova D., Rasulova M. A CLINICAL CASE OF NEURODEGENERATIVE DISEASE OF THE TYPE OF LEWY BODY DISEASE WITH SEVERE COGNITIVE, AUTONOMIC DISORDERS //JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC MEDICINE. – 2023. – T. 2. – №. 1. – C. 45-49.

2.Bakhtiyarovna R. M. et al. REHABILITATION MEASURES IN PATIENTS WITH ISCHEMIC STROKE //INTERDISCIPLINE INNOVATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CONFERENCE. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 20. – C. 268-270.

3.Rasulova D. K., Rakhimbaeva G. S., Rasulova M. B. CLINICAL CASE OF REHABILITATION OF CENTRAL POST-STROKE NEUROPATHIC PAIN-DEJERINE ROUSSY SYNDROME //British Medical Journal. – 2023. – T. 3. – №. 1.

4.Rasulova D. et al. Dynamics of restoring motor functions in post-stroke. – 2023.