

## CONCLUSION

Semiautomatic segmentation of urinary stone size in CT is possible and may allow for reduction of manual measurement errors, allowing more precise estimation especially for smaller concrements.

Even semiautomated segmentation of stone size not always results in estimation of real stone size. Measurement errors always have to be taken into account in the image interpretation when using computer-assisted support in routine radiology.

## SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary Data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at [doi:10.1016/j.urology.2018.06.044](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2018.06.044).

## References

1. Pearle MS, Goldfarb DS, Assimos DG et al. Medical management of kidney stones: AUA guideline. *J Urol*. 2014;192:316–324.
2. Türk C, Petřík A, Sarica K, et al. EAU guidelines on diagnosis and conservative management of urolithiasis. *Eur Urol*. 2016;69:468–474.
3. Türk C, Petřík A, Sarica K, et al. EAU guidelines on interventional treatment for urolithiasis. *Eur Urol*. 2016;69:475–482.
4. Hollingsworth JM, Canales BK, Rogers MA, et al. Alpha blockers for treatment of ureteric stones: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2016;355:i6112.
5. Skolarikos A, Straub M, Knoll T, et al. Metabolic evaluation and recurrence prevention for urinary stone patients: EAU guidelines. *Eur Urol*. 2015;67:750–763.
6. Tepeler A, Akman T, Silay MS, et al. Comparison of intrarenal pelvic pressure during micro-percutaneous nephrolithotomy and conventional percutaneous nephrolithotomy. *Urolithiasis*. 2014;42:275–279.
7. Berkovitz N, Simanovsky N, Katz R, et al. Coronal reconstruction of unenhanced abdominal CT for correct ureteral stone size classification. *Eur Radiol*. 2010;20:1047–1051.
8. Nadler RB, Stern JA, Kimm S, et al. Coronal imaging to assess urinary tract stone size. *J Urol*. 2004;172:962–964.
9. Kadıhasanoğlu M, Marien T, Miller NL. Ureteral stone diameter on computerized tomography coronal reconstructions is clinically important and under-reported. *Urology*. 2017;102:54–60.
10. Patel SR, Stanton P, Zelinski N, et al. Automated renal stone volume measurement by noncontrast computerized tomography is more reproducible than manual linear size measurement. *J Urol*. 2011;186:2275–2279.
11. Drake T, Grivas N, Dabestani S, et al. What are the benefits and harms of ureteroscopy compared with shock-wave lithotripsy in the treatment of upper ureteral stones? A systematic review. *Eur Urol*. 2017;72:772–786.
12. Lidén M, Andersson T, Geijer H. Making renal stones change size—impact of CT image post-processing and reader variability. *Eur Radiol*. 2011;21:2218–2225.
13. Lidén M, Thunberg P, Broxvall M, et al. Two- and three-dimensional CT measurements of urinary calculi length and width: a comparative study. *Acta Radiol*. 2015, Apr;56:487–492.
14. Danuser H, Müller R, Descoedres B, et al. Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy of lower calyx calculi: how much is treatment outcome influenced by the anatomy of the collecting system? *Eur Urol*. 2007;52:539–546.
15. Sahinkanat T, Ekerbicer H, Onal B, et al. Evaluation of the effects of relationships between main spatial lower pole calyceal anatomic factors on the success of shock-wave lithotripsy in patients with lower pole kidney stones. *Urology*. 2008;71:801–805.

16. Srisubat A, Potisat S, Lojanapiwat B, et al. Extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy (ESWL) versus percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PCNL) or retrograde intrarenal surgery (RIRS) for kidney stones. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; CD007044.
17. Argyropoulos AN, Tolley DA. Evaluation of outcome following lithotripsy. *Curr Opin Urol*. 2010;20:154–158.
18. Zarse CA, Hameed TA, Jackson ME, et al. CT visible internal stone structure, but not hounsfield unit value, of calcium oxalate monohydrate (COM) calculi predicts lithotripsy fragility in vitro. *Urol Res*. 2007;35:201–206.
19. Patel T, Kozakowski K, Hruby G, et al. Skin to stone distance is an independent predictor of stone-free status following shockwave lithotripsy. *J Endourol*. 2009;23:1383–1385.
20. El-Nahas AR, El-Assmy AM, Mansour O, et al. A prospective multi-variate analysis of factors predicting stone disintegration by extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy: the value of high-resolution noncontrast computed tomography. *Eur Urol*. 2007;51:1688–1693. discussion 1693-4.
21. Kim SC, Burns EK, Lingeman JE, et al. Cystine calculi: correlation of CT-visible structure, CT number, and stone morphology with fragmentation by shock wave lithotripsy. *Urol Res*. 2007;35:319–324.
22. Takazawa R, Kitayama S, Tsujii T. Appropriate kidney stone size for ureteroscopic lithotripsy: when to switch to a percutaneous approach. *World J Nephrol*. 2015 6;4:111–117.
23. Ordon M, Andonian S, Blew B, et al. CUA guideline: management of ureteral calculi. *Can Urol Assoc J*. 2015;9:E837–E8351.
24. Pearle MS, Lingeman JE, Leveillee R, et al. Prospective, randomized trial comparing shock wave lithotripsy and ureteroscopy for lower pole caliceal calculi 1 cm or less. *J Urol*. 2005;173:2005–2009.
25. Trout AT, Zhang B, Towbin AJ. Measurement error in CT assessment of appendix diameter. *Pediatr Radiol*. 2016, Dec;46:1831–1836.
26. Huang AE, Montoya JC, Shiung M, et al. Consistency of renal stone volume measurements across CT scanner model and reconstruction algorithm configurations. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2017, Jul;209:116–121.
27. Niemann T, Van Straten M, Resinger C, et al. Detection of urolithiasis using low-dose CT—a noise simulation study. *Eur J Radiol*. 2011, Nov;80:213–218.
28. McNitt-Gray MF, Kim GH, Zhao B, et al. Determining the variability of lesion size measurements from CT patient data sets acquired under "no change" conditions. *Transl Oncol*. 2015;8:55–64.
29. Nazim SM, Ather MH, Khan N. Measurement of ureteric stone diameter in different planes on multidetector computed tomography—impact on the clinical decision making. *Urology*. 2014;83:288–292.
30. Kishore TA, Pedro RN, Hinck B, et al. Estimation of size of distal ureteral stones: noncontrast CT scan versus actual size. *Urology*. 2008, Oct;72:761–764.
31. Olcott EW, Sommer FG, Napel S. Accuracy of detection and measurement of renal calculi: In vitro comparison of three-dimensional spiral CT, radiography, and nephrotomography. *Radiology*. 1997;204:19–25.

## EDITORIAL COMMENT



Computed tomography (CT) is now considered the gold standard imaging modality for the diagnosis of renal and ureteral stones. With this technology, there are additional capabilities, such as the semiautomatic measurement of a variety of stone parameters such as size and volume, which cannot similarly be obtained by traditional plain radiography.

In this study, the authors performed a retrospective trial to assess if ex vivo semiautomatic size measurement of a stone on CT was non-inferior to manual size measurement using calipers on digital plain radiography. The measurement on

digital radiography was considered the gold standard. All measurements were reported as the maximal diameter in any plane. The threshold for non-inferiority was arbitrarily set at a difference of 7.5%. The mean size difference observed was 0.18 mm between the two techniques, which met the threshold, and thus semiautomatic measurement was non-inferior to manual measurement.

Although it is important to validate these semiautomatic measurements obtained via CT against a gold standard benchmark, a non-inferiority study comparing two different imaging modalities with two different measurement methods is likely not the ideal trial design to answer this question. Despite this significant limitation, the authors detected only <1 mm difference in size between the two imaging modalities, which is clinically insignificant. This suggests that semiautomatic size measurement via CT is accurate. More importantly, this study highlights that CT imaging has value beyond simply stone detection. Leveraging the captured image metadata to semi-automatically calculate clinically relevant stone parameters, such as size and volume will allow clinicians and researchers to better understand the natural history of stone disease and assess the efficacy of available treatment options.

**Justin B. Ziemba**, Division of Urology, Department of Surgery, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PAennsylvania, USA

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2018.06.046>  
UROLOGY 123: 74–75, 2019. © 2018 Elsevier Inc.

## AUTHOR REPLY



We thank you for your interesting and helpful remarks.

Computed tomography (CT) is indeed nowadays widely accepted as gold standard for diagnosis of urinary stones. Beyond computer assisted software tools for more precise and replicable size estimation, there has been enormous evolution in scan technology over the last years resulting in further substantial reduction in radiation dose.<sup>1</sup> Additionally new dual energy scan techniques allow for direct determination of stone composition.<sup>2</sup>

New photon counting detector based CT may further increase radiology performance in the future.<sup>3</sup>

The idea of our study originated due to the mistrust of urologists in the semiautomatic size estimations. Therefore we still consider our methodology of non-inferiority hypothesis as appropriate.

There will be further evolution of radiology imaging of urinary stones, especially ongonig research using dark field imaging seems to be promising for further imaging based stone characterisation.<sup>4</sup> In contrast to the well-known absorption-based imaging, dark-field contrast is generated by diffuse angular deflections of the X-ray wavefront when being scattered at inherent substructures. Since the dark-field signal has been shown to be highly dependent, not only on the chemical composition of imaged samples, but also on the samples morphological structure well below the resolution limit of commonly used imaging detectors it may allow for further discrimination of urinary stone subtypes.<sup>5</sup>

**T. Niemann, I. Jerjen, PhD, L Hefermehl, MD, Z Wang, PhD, M Stampanoni, Prof, K Lehmann, MD, RA Kubik-Huch, MD Prof**, Department of Radiology, Kantonsspital Baden, Baden, Switzerland; Department of Urology, Kantonsspital Baden, Baden, Switzerland; University and ETH Zürich and Paul Scherrer Institut, Zürich, Switzerland

## References

1. Rodger F, Roditi G, Aboumarzouk OM. Diagnostic accuracy of low and ultra-low dose CT for identification of urinary tract stones: a systematic review. *Urol Int.* 2018;100:375–385.
2. Acharya S, Goyal A, Bhalla AS, et al. In vivo characterization of urinary calculi on dual-energy CT: going a step ahead with sub-differentiation of calcium stones. *Acta Radiol.* 2015;56:881–889.
3. Leng S, Gutjahr R, Ferrero A, et al. Ultra-high spatial resolution, multi-energy CT using photon counting detector technology. *Proc SPIE Int Soc Opt Eng.* 2017;11:10132.
4. Scherer K, Braig E, Willer K, et al. Non-invasive differentiation of kidney stone types using x-ray dark-field radiography. *Sci Rep.* 2015;5:9527.
5. Weitkamp T, Diaz A, David C, et al. X-ray phase imaging with a grating interferometer. *Opt Express.* 2005;13:6296–6304.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2018.06.047>  
UROLOGY 123: 75, 2019. © 2018 Elsevier Inc.