US or CT for Diagnosis of Appendicitis in Children and Adults? A Meta-Analysis

To perform a meta-analysis to evaluate the diagnostic performance of ultrasonography (US) and computed tomography (CT) for the diagnosis of appendicitis in pediatric and adult populations.

Medical literature (from 1986 to 2004) was searched for articles on studies that used US, CT, or both as diagnostic tests for appendicitis in children (26 studies, 9336 patients) or adults (31 studies, 4341 patients). Prospective and retrospective studies were included if they separately reported the rate of true-positive, true-negative, false-positive, and false-negative diagnoses of appendicitis from US and CT findings compared with the positive and negative rates of appendicitis at surgery or follow-up. Clinical variables, technical factors, and test performance were extracted. Three readers assessed the quality of studies.

Pooled sensitivity and specificity for diagnosis of appendicitis in children were 88% (95% confidence interval [CI]: 86%, 90%) and 94% (95% CI: 92%, 95%), respectively, for US studies and 94% (95% CI: 92%, 95%) and 95% (95% CI: 94%, 97%), respectively, for CT studies. Pooled sensitivity and specificity for diagnosis in adults were 83% (95% CI: 78%, 87%) and 93% (95% CI: 90%, 96%), respectively, for US studies and 94% (95% CI: 92%, 95%) and 94% (95% CI: 94%, 96%), respectively, for CT studies.

From the diagnostic performance perspective, CT had a significantly higher sensitivity than did US in studies of children and adults; from the safety perspective, however, one should consider the radiation associated with CT, especially in children.
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Supplemental material: radiology.rsna.org/cgi/content/full/241/10/0913/DC1
Appendicitis is the most common acute condition of the abdomen requiring surgery in both adults (1,2) and children (3–5). The overall frequency of appendicitis for symptomatic patients younger than 20 years is 41%; the frequency for those older than 20 years is 59% (6,7). Imaging methods, such as ultrasonography (US) and computed tomography (CT), aimed at avoiding a misdiagnosis and facilitating earlier surgery, when necessary, have become increasingly important for decreasing the morbidity of the disease.

Advantages of US include low cost, the lack of ionizing radiation or need for patient preparation, and the ability to provide dynamic information through graded compression (8). Advantages of CT include less operator dependency than US; enhanced delineation of the extent of the disease in the case of perforated appendicitis (9,10); easier visualization of a retrocecal appendix; unchanged quality of imaging, regardless of the presence of bowel gas, obesity, or severe abdominal pain (11); and the possibility of multiplanar retrospective data reconstruction (12). Patients with abundant adipose tissue, who more frequently are adults rather than children, are prime candidates for CT; their bowels are more difficult to probe with a US transducer because of the thicker physical barrier and lesser compressibility of their abdomens.

The choice between US and CT for the diagnosis of appendicitis in different age groups should rest on the comparison of their diagnostic accuracy based on summary estimates of available experience. To our knowledge, no previous meta-analysis has been performed to evaluate the choice between CT and US for the diagnosis of appendicitis in both children and adults. The purpose of our study, therefore, was to perform a meta-analysis to evaluate the diagnostic performance of US and CT for the diagnosis of appendicitis in pediatric and adult populations.

Materials and Methods

Data Extraction

Two reviewers (A.S.D., C.J.K.) independently conducted a literature review to identify articles published between January 1986 and December 2004 on studies that used US, CT, or both as diagnostic tests for appendicitis in children and/or adults. Articles were obtained through a search of MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, the Cochrane Controlled Trials Register, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, and the American College of Physicians Journal Club databases and through a manual search of reference lists. Pertinent medical subject headings (“appendicitis,” “appendix,” “sonography,” “ultrasonography,” “computed tomography,” and “computed tomography scan”) were used. To check for eligibility criteria, we retrieved the study articles for more detailed investigation.

Study Selection

Criteria for retaining articles were as follows: (a) prospective or retrospective studies evaluating the performance of abdominal US and/or CT that used either surgical findings plus follow-up (longer than 1 week) or histologic evaluation plus follow-up as reference standards; (b) availability of data for the absolute number of true-positive, true-negative, false-positive, and false-negative findings either reported, derivable from the results, or communicated by the authors in response to our request; (c) segmentation of results according to age groups, with a maximum age of 20 years for children and young adults and a minimum age of 13 years for adults, and if this criterion was not fully met, the proportion of patients with outlying ages could not exceed 5% of the total sample size; (d) imaging criteria for positivity for appendicitis that included visualization of an inflamed appendix (diameter, >6 mm) (13–15), noncompressible appendix at US (16), or, in the case of nonvisualization of the appendix, presence of inflammatory signs of appendicitis, such as an appendicolith, cecal thickening, arrowhead sign, or cecal bar (as seen on CT images) (17–21); (e) in studies evaluating the performance of CT scanning, a description of the technique used—namely, the use of oral, rectal, and intravenous contrast material with a limited or complete scan; (f) inclusion of both female and male patients (ie, ratio of one sex to the other, <3:1); and (g) studies with a 15%–75% sample prevalence of appendicitis derivable from the reported results (ie, true-positive plus false-negative results, divided by the total of true-positive, true-negative, false-positive, and false-negative results), as arbitrarily determined and checked by means of sensitivity analysis. No language restriction was applied.

Exclusion criteria were as follows: (a) case reports, case series, reviews, pictorial essays, unpublished data, abstracts, and letters to editor; (b) data for pregnant women; (c) focus on topics other than diagnostic test assessment, such as management decision issues or cost-effectiveness analyses; and (d) performance of more than one US or CT examination per patient in subsequent...
days. We avoided duplication of data in the studies included in this meta-analysis. When more than one study used the same data or when the durations of studies overlapped, the study with the larger sample size was selected.

If the results of diagnostic test performance (sensitivity, specificity, accuracy, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value) did not match the reported values of true-positive, true-negative, false-positive, and false-negative results, we contacted the authors of the articles. If we received a reply, we reported the revised results; otherwise, we reported the results published in the original articles. We also contacted authors of articles that fulfilled the inclusion criteria for the meta-analysis except for the segmentation of the results by age group (written communication from David Mauger [22], Johan Styrud [23], Sang Hoon Cha [24], Miguel V. Ronco [25], and Blayne Standage [26]). The articles by those authors who provided the required information within our time frame were incorporated into our database. Only results from unenhanced gray-scale US were included in the meta-analysis.

Critical Appraisal of the Quality of Studies

The quality of methods was independently assessed by three radiologists by using a specific checklist (27–29) that yielded a total score for each study evaluated. Two radiologists (M.E., C.J.K.) were blinded to the journal names, author names, and year of publication; the third radiologist (A.S.D.) was unblinded. Detailed guidelines for interpretation of the items were discussed by the reviewers in an earlier meeting.

Statistical Analysis

Before defining the final inclusion criteria for our meta-analysis, we grouped positivity diagnostic criteria that resulted in a diagnosis of appendicitis according to three uncertainties for sensitivity analysis: (a) whether surgery alone or surgery plus clinical follow-up had been considered as the reference standards, (b) whether patients had undergone both US and CT or had undergone exclusively US or CT, and (c) whether the equivocal cases were handled as true-positive (best-case scenario) or as false-negative or false-positive (worst-case scenario).

Data from studies with these uncertainties were included in the pooled results of studies that used well-accepted criteria (ie, surgery and clinical follow-up as a reference standard, only one imaging modality per patient). If a significant difference was found between results obtained with and those obtained without inclusion of a particular factor of uncertainty in the pooled results, we considered that factor of uncertainty relevant and therefore incorporated it into our exclusion criteria; otherwise, it was not specified. The inclusion of data from studies that used true-positive, false-positive, or false-negative categorization to handle equivocal cases did not change our pooled results significantly; therefore, we decided to use the results as reported by the authors in our data analysis. Likewise, the exclusion of studies in which the prevalence of appendicitis was either less than 25% or greater than 75% did not change the results significantly, which allowed us to set a specific range of sample prevalence as an inclusion criterion.

We calculated the intraclass correlation coefficient (30) for scoring the quality of the studies of children and adults as a measure of the overall agreement among the three reviewers and between the two blinded raters. We also calculated the perforation rate in positive cases of appendicitis in studies of children and adults, weighted for the sample size. Information on the technique used for imaging acquisition was retrieved from the studies, if available.

Pooled point estimates and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were obtained for the sensitivity and specificity of US or CT for the diagnosis of appendicitis in studies of children and adults after natural logarithmic transformation. Data were derived from the numbers of true-positive, true-negative, false-positive, and false-negative findings given in the publications. Pooled results were weighted according to the quality score for the study with a fixed-effects model (31,32). As an initial step, we applied the random-effects model to our meta-analysis to estimate the variance of $\tau^2$, which is a statistical parameter that determines the study-to-study variation (33). If $\tau^2$ is a value close to zero, as shown in our study, the results of a random-effects model and those of a fixed-effects model are similar. Pooled results weighted according to the quality score for the study are presented in this article with a fixed-effects model (31,32).

We were able to calculate the pooled sensitivity and specificity statistics by using the Mantel-Haenszel fixed-effects model for US and CT studies of children and adults because no statistical evidence of heterogeneity was noted (Table E1, radiology.rsna.org/cgi/content/full/241/10/2411/DC1). Results were evaluated by including outliers and by excluding outliers. We a priori defined that if, by the time outliers were included in the analysis, the results of the Mantel-Haenszel test of homogeneity (34) became significant (indicating heterogeneity), the outliers would be excluded from the pooled results.

We performed a one-way sensitivity analysis of three studies that seemed to be outliers for US on the basis of their recorded sensitivity in studies of children (35) and adults (22,36). When two or more CT techniques were performed for the same patient on the same examination day (22), we selected the most conservative approach available, such as CT scanning of the entire abdomen and pelvis with administration of intravenous and oral contrast material (37,38), for the analysis.

Although pooled point estimates are simpler summaries of diagnostic accuracy for clinicians (39,40) in comparison with diagnostic odds ratios (DORs) and summary receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves, they are not recommended to summarize results when the diagnostic threshold varies between the studies, which is the case for appendicitis studies that used different thresholds to define positive and negative test results. Because of this limitation of the method, we also summarized the results of the studies by using best-fitting ROC curves. By doing so, we tried to ensure that apparent threshold effects, if present, were really
due to variations in diagnostic threshold rather than alternative sources of heterogeneity.

Meta-regression analyses were performed to examine the effect of three confounding factors (covariates) on the sensitivity and specificity of US and CT in studies of children and adults: study design (retrospective vs prospective), year of publication (before 1999 vs 1999 or later), and continent of study origin (North American vs non–North American country). The weights assigned to individual studies were in inverse proportion to their variance. The odds ratio (OR) is the ratio of the odds of disease in those with the risk factor (in our case, clinical suspicion of appendicitis) to the odds of disease in those without the risk factor (41). The OR derived from logistic-regression modeling was used to determine the effect of covariates as a source of heterogeneity for the sensitivity and specificity of the studies as they were, one by one, included in the model. Both the level of significance and the magnitude of the effect were assessed.

We conducted a visual examination of the funnel plots of sensitivity and specificity of studies to investigate the potential for publication bias and overall heterogeneity (42–44). We plotted the scoring of the quality of the US and CT studies of children and adults as a function of the reported sensitivity and specificity of the corresponding diagnostic tests.

Reported P values for all statistical tests were two-sided. We used P < .05 to indicate a significant difference. Analyses and graphic illustration were performed with a statistical software package (SAS version 8.2; SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

Results

Overview of Studies

Of the 229 articles screened, 57 met the inclusion criteria for the meta-analysis. Summary results and selected characteristics of the studies (22–26,35,36,38,45–92) included in the meta-analysis are outlined in Table E2 (radiology.rsnajnls.org/cgi/content/full/2411030913/DC1). Pediatric and adults studies were analyzed separately. In 26 studies of children (mean age range, 7–12 years) published between 1990 and 2004, only US, only CT, or combined US and CT results were reported for 6850, 598, and 1908 patients, respectively. Thirty-one studies of adults (mean age range, 20–49 years) published between 1988 and 2003 yielded results for only US, only CT, or combined US and CT in 903, 2394, and 1044 patients, respectively. The mean sample prevalence of appendicitis calculated on the basis of the data provided by the articles was 0.31 for both US and CT in pediatric studies and was 0.48 for US and 0.40 for CT in studies of adults. The weighted perforation rate in positive cases of appendicitis was 26.5% in studies of children (n = 10) and 18.5% in studies in adults (n = 3). The relative risk of a false-negative US finding in perforated appendicitis rather than nonperforated appendicitis was 0.34 in pediatric studies. Insufficient data were available for calculation of relative risk in studies of adults.

With the exception of one study of children (46) and one study of adults (36), all other studies used US linear probes with frequencies of 5 MHz or greater with US units from different companies. Except for one study of children (58) and one study of adults (23), all remaining articles reported the use of third-generation helical CT units. CT section collimation parameters ranged from 3.0 to 7.0 mm in studies of children and from 2.5 to 10.0 mm in studies of adults. The pitch level ranged from 1.0 to 1.5 in most studies. The rate of injection ranged from 2 to 3 mL/sec, and the amperage ranged from 200 to 320 mA in studies of adults. Information about the radiation dose was unavailable in most studies of children.

Critical Appraisal of Quality of Studies

Results of assessment of study quality can be found in the Table. The median score for the studies of children was 34.4% (maximum score, 32 points or 100%), and the median score for the studies of adults was 42.2%. The inter-rater agreement between the one unblinded reviewer and the two blinded reviewers (intraclass correlation coefficient, 0.78; 95% CI: 0.64, 0.87) and between the two blinded readers (intraclass correlation coefficient, 0.70; 95% CI: 0.46, 0.84) was good.

Pooling Sensitivities and Specificities

The pooled sensitivity of CT (94%; 95% CI: 92%, 97%) was 6% higher than that of US (88%; 95% CI: 86%, 90%) among studies of children with one outlier removed (P = .001) (Fig 1). The difference in pooled sensitivities between CT (94%; 95% CI: 92%, 95%) and US (83%; 95% CI: 78%, 87%) was 11% in studies of adults with two outliers removed (P = .001). Weighted pooled data for specificity (1 − false-positive rate) yielded similar values for US (for children, 94% [95% CI: 92%, 95%]; for adults, 93% [95% CI: 90%, 96%]) and for CT (for children, 95% [95% CI: 94%, 97%]; for adults, 94% [95% CI: 94%, 96%]), regardless of the age group being investigated (P = .26 for either age group of studies). The omission of two studies of adults (22,36) and of one study of children (34) from the pool of US studies yielded a considerable improvement in the weighted pooled sensitivity of studies of adults and children (from 78% to 83% for studies of adults and from 86% to 88% for studies of children). Therefore, we removed from the analysis the outliers for US in the series of adults and children.

Assuming the prevalence of appendicitis as 0.15, the minimum prevalence in a study of this meta-analysis, the number of cases of appendicitis missed by using US rather than CT would be 10 cases per 1000 children imaged and 18 cases per 1000 adults imaged. Conversely, if we had an observed prevalence of 0.75, the maximum prevalence in a study of this meta-analysis, the number of cases of appendicitis missed by using US would be greater (48 per 1000 children imaged and 83 per 1000 adults imaged).

Diagnostic Performance Comparison with ROC Plots and Linear Regression Analysis

Diagnostic tests in which the DOR is constant, regardless of the diagnostic threshold, have ROC curves or point estimates
that are symmetric around the line where sensitivity equals specificity. In our meta-analysis, most point estimates of the diagnostic tests of studies of children (Fig 2a) and adults (Fig 2b) tended to the symmetry around the “sensitivity = specificity” line, which enabled the use of standard meta-analysis methods to estimate the common DOR (93–95).

By computing a summary DOR for pooling ORs on the basis of the best-fitting ROC curve, we obtained estimates of 202 (95% CI: 159, 258), 239 (95% CI: 118, 487), and 46 (95% CI: 32, 67) for US only, CT only, and combined modalities, respectively, in studies of children; we obtained estimates of 15 (95% CI: 10, 21), 118 (95% CI: 85, 165), and 100 (95% CI: 57, 176) for US only, CT only, and combined modalities, respectively, in studies of adults.

In the regression models for sensitivity, CT had better diagnostic sensitivity than did US in studies of adults, as demonstrated by the significant OR for differences in sensitivity in these studies (OR = 3.1; 95% CI: 1.70, 5.69; P < .001). The OR for differences in sensitivity in studies of children was 2.47 (95% CI: 1.16, 5.26; P = .02). No differences in the diagnostic performance of these imaging modalities were noted with regard to specificity of studies of any of the age groups (studies of children, OR = 0.77 [95% CI: 0.55, 1.09]; studies of adults, OR = 1.18 [95% CI: 0.61, 2.28]).

Sources of Heterogeneity

Meta-regression analysis failed to show any evidence of heterogeneity related to the potential confounders on comparison of studies by means of dichotomization of the covariates into prospective versus retrospective (study design), before 1999 versus 1999 or later (year of publication), and North America versus non–North America (continent of study origin). The overall ORs were shown not to be different between the covariate arms, regardless of the imaging modality and age group being evaluated.

Comparative Meta-Analysis

We evaluated 18 US and three CT studies of children and 10 US and 16 CT studies of adults that compared the performance of these imaging modalities for diagnosis of appendicitis when only a single modality was assessed in the original studies (Table E3, radiology.rsna.org/cgi/content/full/2411050913/DC1). Except for specificity in US studies of adults, in which the variation of pooled estimates between overall studies and studies that evaluated individual imaging modalities...
was 5%, all other summary estimates for US and CT were similar between overall studies and studies of individual modalities (maximum range of variation, 2%).

Funnel Plots
The overall distribution of data points associated with the sensitivity and specificity of CT and the specificity of US seemed fairly funnel-shaped and symmetric, which indicates that the presence of publication bias was unlikely in the studies of either children or adults. The data point distribution for the sensitivity of US in the studies of children and adults was also symmetric, except for the presence of one outlier value in each funnel plot.

Discussion
For patients in whom the clinical diagnosis is uncertain and in whom further evaluation with imaging is required, our analysis shows that the differences in weighted pooled sensitivities between CT and US and in ORs between CT and US were significant for adults and children in spite of the lower sensitivity of US for the assessment of appendicitis in the adult group. US was moderately sensitive and highly specific for the diagnosis of appendicitis in children. No significant difference was noted in the specificity of the diagnostic performance between CT and US. This result
indicates that the major advantage of CT over US lies in the decrease in the false-negative rate for CT and the consequent improvement in sensitivity, as demonstrated elsewhere (95). The false-positive rate, however, was relatively unchanged with the use of either CT or US.

Although the sensitivity of US was higher for children than for adults, no significant differences were noted in the specificity of US. Prior meta-analyses that assessed the sensitivity of US for diagnosis of appendicitis in adults, which comprised studies from 1986 to 1994 (96) and studies from 1966 to 2003 (97), showed similar sensitivities (84.7% [96] and 86.0% [97]) in comparison with our results (83.0%). This minimal discrepancy in results may be explained by the different inclusion and exclusion criteria used for the retrieval of studies in the meta-analyses and by the different criteria used for weighted analysis. In addition, our results for CT were similar to those of a prior meta-analysis of appendicitis in adults (97), in which the pooled sensitivity and specificity of CT were 94% and 95%, respectively, compared with our results of 94% for both.

The greater radiosensitivity of the organs and tissues of children in compar-
parison with adults (98) suggests the need for a trade-off between the future risk of cancer with the use of CT and the risk of missing positive cases with US. According to estimates of the lifetime risk of mortality attributable to cancer and the relative doses of radiation from CT, calculated as a function of age by using Monte Carlo methods (99,100), and assuming a hypothetical sample prevalence of 0.31 for diagnosis of appendicitis in children, for every 10 000 children 11 years of age scanned with US rather than with CT, 280 would have a missed diagnosis of appendicitis and 13 could be prevented from developing cancer in the future. On the other hand, if we considered 10 000 adults 35 years of age scanned with US rather than with CT in a center with a sample prevalence of 0.40, the diagnosis of appendicitis would be missed in 480 patients, but only two patients could be prevented from developing cancer in the future. Because of radiation concerns, one way of restricting the use of CT in the population would be to aim its use toward higher prevalence settings. The higher the prevalence of appendicitis in the population, the larger the difference in false-negative rates between US and CT and the lower the number of cases that need to be imaged at CT to detect one additional case missed at US. Because sensitivity and specificity are not confounded by prevalence (101), potential differences in the prevalence of appendicitis among studies should not affect the pooled sensitivity and specificity results of the meta-analysis.

Although the articles in our meta-analysis have reported a worse clinical outcome for appendicitis in pediatric (24,25,35,45–67) than in adult (22–24, 26,36,38,68–92) populations, our results indicate that the risk of a child with perforated appendicitis having a false-negative result with US is 34% of the risk that he or she would be exposed to if he or she had nonperforated appendicitis. Thus, the sensitivity of US was not reduced with the diagnosis of perforated appendicitis, but conversely it seemed to be improved with this condition compared with the sensitivity observed in cases of nonperforated appendicitis in studies of children.

The higher incremental improvement in the sensitivity of CT in relation to US for studies of adults compared with that for studies of children suggests that the within-study heterogeneity might have been higher in studies of adults. Nevertheless, our funnel-plot analysis suggests that publication bias (102) for quality of scoring in studies of children or adults either does not exist or is minimal.

In spite of the recent technologic advances in both US and CT, the ORs obtained in more recent (1999 or later) or older (before 1999) studies were not significantly different in either of the age groups. This may be related to the high threshold used as a cutoff point for studies according to publication year, which was based on the median year of publication of the pool of selected studies. The origin of the study, however, did not seem to play a significant role in the incremental discriminatory ability of CT compared with US in studies of either children or adults.

The critical appraisal of studies revealed important methodologic limitations in the retrieved articles that were related to difficulties in diagnostic test evaluation. The most important of these was the potential for verification and selection bias (102–104). These types of
biases may lead to an overestimation of the sensitivity and to an underestimation of the specificity (105). Verification bias, present in other meta-analyses (96,97), remains a concern in this meta-analysis since most surgeons were aware of the results of the diagnostic imaging tests before making their case management decisions. However, no differential bias is expected to occur between US and CT studies since the diagnostic assessment of both imaging modalities was subject to verification bias. Therefore, the differential performance between US and CT in children and adults should not be significantly affected by this bias.

In this meta-analysis, two of the readers who reviewed the articles and extracted the data for the appraisal of study quality also rated the study quality. This would have the potential for bias; however, our results demonstrated a good interrater agreement between the third reader, who did not participate in these methodologic phases of the study, and the other two readers, which minimizes a potential concern for selection bias. With regard to the number of references screened, this is directly dependent on the search strategy applied and thesaurus descriptors used, which may vary between different meta-analyses on diagnostic tests for appendicitis.

The lack of true randomization of patients to US or CT groups in most studies and a potential geographic bias (preferential use of CT in studies conducted in North America and of US in studies in non–North American countries) could not be controlled for in this meta-analysis. In some studies, the results of a negative CT scan were considered definitive, whereas those of a negative or nondiagnostic US scan indicated a need for further testing or observation. None of the studies in our meta-analysis included information about patient weight or body mass index, which are factors that are particularly important in the case of obese patients, because the results of US are not as definitive as those of CT for these patients (106). Confounding variables for enhanced CT techniques, such as the gauge and site of intravenous access, the amount and rate of intravenous contrast agent, and the scan delay, have not been reported in many of the studies. The lack of information about the severity of the symptoms or the pretest clinical likelihood of appendicitis in most studies impaired the assessment of spectrum bias (106).

Typically, the evaluation of a diagnostic test will include examination of thresholds for test positivity using ROC curves. However, with imaging diagnosis the data are often simplified into binary data. Because we analyzed data on the basis of reported values of individual studies, the cutoff approaches were already set. There were insufficient data in these studies to permit any analysis of the effect of different thresholds for test positivity on the results. We did conduct a sensitivity analysis based on information available for the incidence of indeterminate or equivocal cases from a few studies, but this may not adequately represent the way different centers handled equivocal cases. Although some authors considered nonvisualization of the appendix to indicate a negative result, others considered it to indicate a positive or equivocal result since nonvisualization of the appendix could represent perforation. We included positive and negative results in the meta-analysis as reported by the authors.

In summary, this meta-analysis demonstrated that, in contrast with specificity, the difference in pooled sensitivities and ORs between US and CT is significant in both studies of children and studies of adults. On the basis of the results of this meta-analysis, and taking into account only the diagnostic performance of imaging modalities, CT has a significantly higher sensitivity than does US for the diagnosis of appendicitis in adults and children. We should note, however, that the sensitivity of US is reasonably high in children and that radiation issues are of special concern in this age group. Thus, after taking into account both diagnostic performance and safety, one should face the trade-off between the future risk of cancer with the use of CT, which is particularly worrisome in the pediatric group, and the risk of missing positive cases with US.
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