Journal of Population Therapeutics & Clinical Pharmacology

RESEARCH ARTICLE
DOI: 10.53555/44q9gv60

"EFFICACY OF DIFFUSION WEIGHTED IMAGING AND MR SPECTROSCOPY IN DIFFERENTIATION AND GRADING OF BRAIN TUMORS"

Dr. Shashi Kant*

*Assistant Professor, Department of Radio- Diagnosis, United Institute of Medical Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India

***Corresponding Author:** Dr Shashi Kant
Assistant Professor, Department of Radio- Diagnosis, United Institute of Medical Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India, Email: shashikantsnmc2010@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective: To evaluate the efficacy of Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI) and MR Spectroscopy (MRS) in differentiating and grading brain tumors.

Methods: This prospective observational study included 100 patients with suspected brain tumors. All patients underwent conventional MRI, DWI, and MRS. Diagnostic performance was assessed for DWI and MRS individually and in combination, using histopathology as the gold standard. ADC values and metabolite ratios (Cho/NAA, Cho/Cr) were analyzed for different tumor types and grades. ROC analysis was performed to determine optimal diagnostic thresholds.

Results: The combined DWI and MRS approach showed the highest diagnostic accuracy (90%) in differentiating high-grade from low-grade tumors, compared to DWI (80%) or MRS (83%) alone. High-grade gliomas and metastases demonstrated lower ADC values (0.85 ± 0.18 and 0.76 ± 0.15 × 10^-3 mm^2/s, respectively) compared to low-grade gliomas (1.28 ± 0.22 × 10^-3 mm^2/s). Cho/NAA and Cho/Cr ratios were elevated in high-grade tumors. Meningiomas showed distinctively high Cho/Cr ratios (7.3 ± 1.2). ROC analysis revealed good discriminatory power for ADC values (AUC = 0.85) and metabolite ratios (AUC = 0.86-0.88) in tumor grading.

Conclusion: The combination of DWI and MRS significantly improves the accuracy of brain tumor differentiation and grading compared to either technique alone. These advanced MRI techniques provide valuable complementary information to conventional MRI, potentially enhancing diagnostic confidence and treatment planning in neuro-oncology.

Keywords: Brain tumors, Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI), MR Spectroscopy (MRS), Tumor grading, Multiparametric MRI

Introduction:

Brain tumors represent a diverse group of neoplasms that pose significant challenges in diagnosis, treatment, and management. The accurate differentiation and grading of brain tumors are crucial for determining appropriate treatment strategies and predicting patient outcomes. Conventional magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) has been the cornerstone of brain tumor diagnosis for decades,

providing excellent anatomical detail and soft-tissue contrast. However, conventional MRI techniques have limitations in distinguishing between different tumor types and grades, particularly in cases of infiltrative tumors or those with ambiguous imaging characteristics (Essig et al., 2012).

In recent years, advanced MRI techniques such as Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI) and Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (MRS) have emerged as powerful tools in the evaluation of brain tumors. These techniques offer complementary information to conventional MRI by providing insights into the physiological and metabolic characteristics of tumors, potentially improving diagnostic accuracy and treatment planning (Cha, 2006). Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI) is based on the principle of measuring the random motion of water molecules within tissues. In brain tumors, the diffusion of water molecules is often restricted due to increased cellularity, leading to characteristic signal changes on DWI. The quantitative measure derived from DWI, known as the Apparent Diffusion Coefficient (ADC), has shown promise in differentiating between low-grade and high-grade tumors, as well as in distinguishing tumor recurrence from treatment-related changes (Kono et al., 2001).

Several studies have demonstrated the utility of DWI in brain tumor evaluation. For instance, Yamasaki et al. (2005) found that ADC values were significantly lower in high-grade gliomas compared to low-grade gliomas, reflecting the increased cellularity and reduced extracellular space in more aggressive tumors. Similarly, Murakami et al. (2009) reported that DWI could effectively differentiate between primary central nervous system lymphomas and glioblastomas, two entities that can appear similar on conventional MRI. Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (MRS), on the other hand, provides information about the biochemical composition of tissues by measuring the concentrations of various metabolites. In brain tumors, MRS can detect alterations in metabolite levels that are characteristic of neoplastic processes. Common metabolites of interest include N-acetylaspartate (NAA), choline (Cho), creatine (Cr), and lactate. The ratios of these metabolites, particularly the Cho/NAA and Cho/Cr ratios, have been shown to be valuable in differentiating between tumor types and grades (Brandão & Castillo, 2016).

Numerous studies have explored the application of MRS in brain tumor diagnosis and grading. For example, Law et al. (2003) demonstrated that MRS could differentiate between high-grade and low-grade gliomas with high accuracy, based on the Cho/Cr and Cho/NAA ratios. Furthermore, Hourani et al. (2008) found that MRS was effective in distinguishing between recurrent tumors and radiation necrosis, a common diagnostic dilemma in post-treatment follow-up. The combination of DWI and MRS has shown even greater potential in improving the accuracy of brain tumor diagnosis and grading. These techniques provide complementary information, with DWI offering insights into tumor cellularity and MRS providing metabolic profiles. Several studies have explored the synergistic effects of combining these modalities. For instance, Zou et al. (2018) reported that the combination of DWI and MRS improved the diagnostic accuracy in differentiating between high-grade and low-grade gliomas compared to either technique alone.

Moreover, the integration of DWI and MRS with conventional MRI has led to the development of multiparametric imaging approaches. These approaches aim to leverage the strengths of each technique to provide a comprehensive assessment of brain tumors. Studies have shown that multiparametric imaging can improve the accuracy of tumor grading, guide biopsy planning, and assist in treatment response evaluation (Verma et al., 2013). Despite the promising results, challenges remain in the widespread implementation and standardization of DWI and MRS in clinical practice. Technical factors such as magnetic field strength, acquisition parameters, and post-processing methods can influence the results and reproducibility of these techniques. Additionally, the interpretation of DWI and MRS findings requires expertise and experience, as there can be overlap in the imaging characteristics of different tumor types and grades (Öz et al., 2014).

Furthermore, the heterogeneity of brain tumors presents a significant challenge in the application of DWI and MRS. Tumors, particularly high-grade gliomas, often exhibit varying degrees of cellularity, necrosis, and metabolic activity within the same lesion. This heterogeneity can lead to sampling errors and potentially affect the accuracy of diagnosis and grading based on these techniques (Pope et al., 2012). Ongoing research is focused on addressing these challenges and

further improving the diagnostic capabilities of DWI and MRS. Advanced diffusion techniques, such as diffusion tensor imaging (DTI) and diffusion kurtosis imaging (DKI), are being explored to provide more detailed information about tissue microstructure. In the realm of MRS, techniques such as 2D spectroscopy and high-resolution spectroscopic imaging are being developed to enhance spatial resolution and metabolite detection (Choi et al., 2012). The integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms with DWI and MRS data is another promising area of research. These approaches have the potential to automate image analysis, improve diagnostic accuracy, and provide prognostic information. For example, studies have shown that machine learning algorithms applied to MRS data can accurately classify brain tumor types and grades (Tate et al., 2006).

The aim of this study was to evaluate the efficacy of Diffusion Weighted Imaging and MR Spectroscopy in the differentiation and grading of brain tumors. The objective was to determine the diagnostic accuracy of DWI and MRS, both individually and in combination, compared to histopathological findings.

Methodology:

Study Design*:* This was a prospective, observational study conducted at a tertiary care hospital.

Study Site: The study was conducted at the Department of Radiology in collaboration with the Department of Neurosurgery at United Institute of Medical Sciences, Prayagraj, a tertiary care center specializing in neurological disorders.

Study Duration: The study was conducted over a period of 12 months.

Sampling and Sample Size*:* Consecutive sampling was employed to recruit patients with suspected brain tumors based on initial clinical and imaging findings. A sample size of 100 patients was determined using a power analysis, assuming a sensitivity of 85% for the combined DWI and MRS approach, with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 7%.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria*:* Patients aged 18 years or older with suspected intracranial tumors on initial imaging were included. Exclusion criteria encompassed patients with contraindications to MRI, prior brain surgery or radiation therapy, and those unwilling or unable to provide informed consent.

Statistical Analysis: Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 25.0. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient characteristics. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value were calculated for DWI and MRS individually and in combination. Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves were generated to assess the diagnostic performance. Kappa statistics were used to evaluate inter-observer agreement. A p-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Ethical Considerations*:* The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee (IEC) of UIMS, Prayagraj. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants or their legal representatives before enrollment. Patient confidentiality was maintained throughout the study, with all data de-identified before analysis. Participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any time without affecting their medical care. The study adhered to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki and Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

Result:

Table 1: Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of Study Participants (N=100)

Characteristic	**n (%)**
Age (years), mean ± SD	52.3 ± 14.7
Gender	
Male	58 (58%)
Female	42 (42%)
Tumor Location	
Supratentorial	75 (75%)
Infratentorial	25 (25%)
Histopathological Diagnosis	
Glioma	60 (60%)
Meningioma	20 (20%)
Metastasis	15 (15%)
Other	5 (5%)

The sample shows a balanced gender distribution with slight male predominance. Mean age is 52.3 years. Tumor locations are primarily supratentorial (75%). Gliomas are the most common tumor type (60%), followed by meningiomas (20%) and metastases (15%). This distribution reflects typical patterns seen in clinical practice and epidemiological studies.

Table 2: Diagnostic Performance of DWI, MRS, and Combined Approach in Differentiating High-Grade from Low-Grade Tumors

Modality	**Sensitivity**	**Specificity**	**PPV**	**NPV**	**Accuracy**
DWI	82%	78%	80%	80%	80%
MRS	85%	80%	82%	83%	83%
DWI + MRS Combined	91%	88%	89%	90%	90%
PPV: Positive Predictive Value; NPV: Negative Predictive Value					

DWI and MRS individually show good diagnostic performance in differentiating high-grade from low-grade tumors (80% and 83% accuracy respectively). However, the combined approach demonstrates superior performance with 90% accuracy, 91% sensitivity, and 88% specificity. This highlights the complementary nature of these techniques in improving diagnostic accuracy.

Table 3: Mean ADC Values (×10^-3 mm^2/s) for Different Tumor Types and Grades

Tumor Type and Grade	**Mean ADC ± SD**
Low-grade Glioma	1.28 ± 0.22
High-grade Glioma	0.85 ± 0.18
Meningioma	0.93 ± 0.13
Metastasis	0.76 ± 0.15

ADC values show clear differentiation between tumor types and grades. High-grade gliomas and metastases have lower ADC values (0.85 and 0.76 × 10^-3 mm^2/s respectively) compared to low-grade gliomas (1.28 × 10^-3 mm^2/s). This reflects increased cellularity in high-grade tumors, aligning with previous studies on diffusion characteristics of brain tumors.

Table 4: Mean Metabolite Ratios for Different Tumor Types and Grades

Tumor Type and Grade	Cho/NAA	Cho/Cr
Low-grade Glioma	1.8 ± 0.4	1.5 ± 0.3
High-grade Glioma	3.5 ± 0.7	2.8 ± 0.5
Meningioma	2.2 ± 0.5	7.3 ± 1.2
Metastasis	3.8 ± 0.8	3.2 ± 0.6

Metabolite ratios demonstrate distinct patterns across tumor types and grades. High-grade gliomas and metastases show elevated Cho/NAA and Cho/Cr ratios compared to low-grade gliomas. Meningiomas exhibit a uniquely high Cho/Cr ratio (7.3 ± 1.2). These findings support the utility of MRS in tumor characterization.

Table 5: ROC Analysis for Differentiating High-Grade from Low-Grade Tumors

Parameter	AUC	95% CI	p-value
ADC	0.85	0.77 - 0.93	<0.001
Cho/NAA ratio	0.88	0.81 - 0.95	<0.001
Cho/Cr ratio	0.86	0.79 - 0.93	<0.001
AUC: Area Under the Curve; CI: Confidence Interval			

ROC analysis reveals good discriminatory power for ADC values and metabolite ratios in differentiating high-grade from low-grade tumors. The Cho/NAA ratio shows the highest AUC (0.88), suggesting it may be the most reliable individual parameter for tumor grading. All parameters demonstrate statistically significant differentiation ability ($p<0.001$).

Discussion:

The present study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of Diffusion Weighted Imaging (DWI) and MR Spectroscopy (MRS) in the differentiation and grading of brain tumors. Our findings demonstrate the potential of these advanced MRI techniques, both individually and in combination, to improve the accuracy of brain tumor diagnosis and grading.

Table 1 presents the demographic and clinical characteristics of the study participants. The mean age of 52.3 ± 14.7 years and the slight male predominance (58%) are consistent with epidemiological data on brain tumor incidence. The distribution of tumor types in our sample, with gliomas being the most common (60%), followed by meningiomas (20%) and metastases (15%), reflects the typical pattern seen in clinical practice. This distribution is similar to that reported by Ostrom et al. (2018) in their comprehensive epidemiological study of primary brain and other central nervous system tumors.

Table 2 illustrates the diagnostic performance of DWI, MRS, and their combination in differentiating high-grade from low-grade tumors. Individually, both DWI and MRS demonstrated good diagnostic accuracy, with MRS showing slightly better performance (83% vs. 80%). However, the combined approach of DWI and MRS yielded the highest accuracy of 90%, with a sensitivity of 91% and specificity of 88%. These findings are in line with previous studies that have explored the complementary nature of DWI and MRS in brain tumor evaluation. For instance, Zou et al. (2011) reported that the combination of DWI and MRS improved the diagnostic accuracy in differentiating between high-grade and low-grade gliomas compared to either technique alone. They found that the combined approach achieved an accuracy of 93.3%, which is comparable to our results. Similarly, Server et al. (2010) investigated the combined use of DWI and MRS in grading gliomas and reported that the multiparametric approach significantly improved diagnostic performance compared to conventional MRI alone. They achieved a sensitivity of 93.3% and specificity of 96.7% for identifying high-grade gliomas, which is slightly higher than our findings. This difference could be attributed to variations in study populations and specific acquisition parameters.

Table 3 presents the mean ADC values for different tumor types and grades. Our results show that high-grade gliomas and metastases tend to have lower ADC values compared to low-grade gliomas and meningiomas. This pattern is consistent with the understanding that higher cellularity in malignant tumors restricts water diffusion, leading to lower ADC values. These findings align with several previous studies. For example, Kono et al. (2001) reported significantly lower ADC values in high-grade gliomas (0.82 ± 0.20 × 10^-3 mm^2/s) compared to low-grade gliomas (1.14 ± 0.18 × 10^-3 mm^2/s), which is very similar to our results. Similarly, Yamasaki et al. (2005) found that ADC values were effective in differentiating high-grade from low-grade gliomas, with a threshold ADC value of 1.09 × 10^-3 mm^2/s yielding high diagnostic accuracy. The relatively low ADC values observed in metastases in our study (0.76 ± 0.15 × 10^-3 mm^2/s) are also consistent with previous findings. Hayashida et al. (2006) reported that metastatic brain tumors showed significantly lower ADC values compared to high-grade gliomas, which could be helpful in differentiating these two entities that often present diagnostic challenges on conventional MRI.

Table 4 shows the mean metabolite ratios (Cho/NAA and Cho/Cr) for different tumor types and grades. Our results demonstrate elevated Cho/NAA and Cho/Cr ratios in high-grade tumors compared to low-grade tumors, with particularly high Cho/Cr ratios observed in meningiomas.

These findings are in agreement with numerous previous studies on MR spectroscopy in brain tumors. Law et al. (2003) reported that Cho/Cr and Cho/NAA ratios were significantly higher in high-grade gliomas compared to low-grade gliomas, with threshold values of 1.56 and 1.60 respectively for distinguishing between the two. Our results show even higher ratios for high-grade gliomas, which could be due to differences in acquisition parameters or tumor heterogeneity in our sample. The distinctively high Cho/Cr ratio observed in meningiomas in our study (7.3 ± 1.2) is a well-documented spectroscopic feature of these tumors. Majós et al. (2003) reported that a Cho/Cr ratio > 3.5 was highly specific for meningiomas, distinguishing them from other extra-axial tumors. Our findings support the utility of this metabolite ratio in the differential diagnosis of extra-axial brain tumors.

Table 5 presents the results of the ROC analysis for differentiating high-grade from low-grade tumors using ADC values and metabolite ratios. All parameters showed good discriminatory power, with AUC values ranging from 0.85 to 0.88. The Cho/NAA ratio demonstrated the highest AUC (0.88), suggesting it may be the most reliable individual parameter for tumor grading. These results are comparable to those reported in previous studies. For instance, Zonari et al. (2007) found that the Cho/Cr ratio had an AUC of 0.92 in differentiating high-grade from low-grade gliomas, which is slightly higher than our finding. Similarly, Server et al. (2010) reported an AUC of 0.87 for ADC values in glioma grading, which is very close to our result of 0.85.

The findings of this study underscore the value of integrating DWI and MRS into the diagnostic workup of brain tumors. The complementary information provided by these techniques can improve diagnostic accuracy and potentially influence treatment planning and prognostication. The high accuracy achieved by the combined approach (90%) suggests that this multiparametric strategy could be particularly useful in cases where conventional MRI findings are equivocal. However, it's important to note some limitations of our study. First, while our sample size of 100 patients is reasonable, larger studies would be beneficial to further validate these findings. Second, the heterogeneity of brain tumors, particularly high-grade gliomas, can lead to sampling errors in both imaging and histopathology. This heterogeneity remains a challenge in the application of quantitative imaging techniques. Furthermore, the overlap in ADC values and metabolite ratios between different tumor types and grades, as evident in our results, highlights the need for caution in interpreting these parameters in isolation. This underscores the importance of considering these advanced MRI techniques as complementary to, rather than replacements for, conventional MRI and histopathological evaluation.

Future Directions:

While our study demonstrates the utility of DWI and MRS in brain tumor evaluation, several avenues for future research emerge. Advanced diffusion techniques such as diffusion tensor imaging

(DTI) and diffusion kurtosis imaging (DKI) could provide more detailed information about tissue microstructure. In the realm of MRS, techniques such as 2D spectroscopy and high-resolution spectroscopic imaging hold promise for enhancing spatial resolution and metabolite detection. Moreover, the integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning algorithms with DWI and MRS data represents an exciting frontier in neuro-oncology imaging. These approaches have the potential to automate image analysis, improve diagnostic accuracy, and provide prognostic information. For example, Tate et al. (2006) demonstrated that machine learning algorithms applied to MRS data could accurately classify brain tumor types and grades.

Conclusion:

Our study adds to the growing body of evidence supporting the efficacy of DWI and MRS in the differentiation and grading of brain tumors. The combination of these techniques provides a powerful tool for non-invasive tumor assessment, potentially improving diagnostic accuracy and treatment planning. As technology continues to advance and our understanding of tumor biology deepens, the integration of these advanced MRI techniques into clinical practice is likely to play an increasingly important role in the management of patients with brain tumors.

References:

1. Brandão, L. A., & Castillo, M. (2016). Adult brain tumors: Clinical applications of magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Magnetic Resonance Imaging Clinics, 24(4), 781-809.
2. Cha, S. (2006). Update on brain tumor imaging: From anatomy to physiology. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 27(3), 475-487.
3. Choi, C., Ganji, S. K., DeBerardinis, R. J., Hatanpaa, K. J., Rakheja, D., Kovacs, Z., ... & Bachoo, R. M. (2012). 2-hydroxyglutarate detection by magnetic resonance spectroscopy in IDH-mutated patients with gliomas. Nature Medicine, 18(4), 624-629.
4. Essig, M., Nguyen, T. B., Shiroishi, M. S., Saake, M., Provenzale, J. M., Enterline, D. S., ... & Law, M. (2012). Perfusion MRI: The five most frequently asked clinical questions. American Journal of Roentgenology, 198(1), 24-34.
5. Hourani, R., Brant, L. J., Rizk, T., Weingart, J. D., Barker, P. B., & Horská, A. (2008). Can proton MR spectroscopic and perfusion imaging differentiate between neoplastic and nonneoplastic brain lesions in adults? American Journal of Neuroradiology, 29(2), 366-372.
6. Kono, K., Inoue, Y., Nakayama, K., Shakudo, M., Morino, M., Ohata, K., ... & Yoshikawa, K. (2001). The role of diffusion-weighted imaging in patients with brain tumors. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 22(6), 1081-1088.
7. Law, M., Yang, S., Wang, H., Babb, J. S., Johnson, G., Cha, S., ... & Zagzag, D. (2003). Glioma grading: sensitivity, specificity, and predictive values of perfusion MR imaging and proton MR spectroscopic imaging compared with conventional MR imaging. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 24(10), 1989-1998.
8. Murakami, R., Sugahara, T., Nakamura, H., Hirai, T., Kitajima, M., Hayashida, Y., ... & Yamashita, Y. (2007). Malignant supratentorial astrocytoma treated with postoperative radiation therapy: prognostic value of pretreatment quantitative diffusion-weighted MR imaging. Radiology, 243(2), 493-499.
9. Öz, G., Alger, J. R., Barker, P. B., Bartha, R., Bizzi, A., Boesch, C., ... & Kauppinen, R. A. (2014). Clinical proton MR spectroscopy in central nervous system disorders. Radiology, 270(3), 658-679.
10. Pope, W. B., Prins, R. M., Thomas, M. A., Nagarajan, R., Yen, K. E., Bittinger, M. A., ... & Cloughesy, T. F. (2012). Non-invasive detection of 2-hydroxyglutarate and other metabolites in IDH1 mutant glioma patients using magnetic resonance spectroscopy. Journal of Neuro-oncology, 107(1), 197-205.
11. Tate, A. R., Underwood, J., Acosta, D. M., Julià-Sapé, M., Majós, C., Moreno-Torres, À., ... & Arús, C. (2006). Development of a decision support system for diagnosis and grading of brain

tumours using in vivo magnetic resonance single voxel spectra. NMR in Biomedicine, 19(4), 411-434.
12. Verma, R., Zacharaki, E. I., Ou, Y., Cai, H., Chawla, S., Lee, S. K., ... & Davatzikos, C. (2008). Multiparametric tissue characterization of brain neoplasms and their recurrence using pattern classification of MR images. Academic Radiology, 15(8), 966-977.
13. Yamasaki, F., Kurisu, K., Satoh, K., Arita, K., Sugiyama, K., Ohtaki, M., ... & Saito, T. (2005). Apparent diffusion coefficient of human brain tumors at MR imaging. Radiology, 235(3), 985-991.
14. Zou, Q. G., Xu, H. B., Liu, F., Guo, W., Kong, X. C., & Wu, Y. (2011). In the assessment of supratentorial glioma grade: the combined role of multivoxel proton MR spectroscopy and diffusion tensor imaging. Clinical Radiology, 66(10), 953-960.
15. Hayashida, Y., Hirai, T., Morishita, S., Kitajima, M., Murakami, R., Korogi, Y., ... & Yamashita, Y. (2006). Diffusion-weighted imaging of metastatic brain tumors: comparison with histologic type and tumor cellularity. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 27(7), 1419-1425.
16. Kono, K., Inoue, Y., Nakayama, K., Shakudo, M., Morino, M., Ohata, K., ... & Yoshikawa, K. (2001). The role of diffusion-weighted imaging in patients with brain tumors. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 22(6), 1081-1088.
17. Law, M., Yang, S., Wang, H., Babb, J. S., Johnson, G., Cha, S., ... & Zagzag, D. (2003). Glioma grading: sensitivity, specificity, and predictive values of perfusion MR imaging and proton MR spectroscopic imaging compared with conventional MR imaging. American Journal of Neuroradiology, 24(10), 1989-1998.
18. Majós, C., Alonso, J., Aguilera, C., Serrallonga, M., Pérez-Martín, J., Acebes, J. J., ... & Gili, J. (2003). Proton magnetic resonance spectroscopy (1H MRS) of human brain tumours: assessment of differences between tumour types and its applicability in brain tumour categorization. European Radiology, 13(3), 582-591.
19. Ostrom, Q. T., Gittleman, H., Truitt, G., Boscia, A., Kruchko, C., & Barnholtz-Sloan, J. S. (2018). CBTRUS statistical report: primary brain and other central nervous system tumors diagnosed in the United States in 2011–2015. Neuro-oncology, 20(suppl_4), iv1-iv86.
20. Server, A., Kulle, B., Mæhlen, J., Josefsen, R., Schellhorn, T., Kumar, T., ... & Bjørnerud, A. (2010). Quantitative apparent diffusion coefficients in the characterization of brain tumors and associated peritumoral edema. Acta Radiologica, 51(9), 1069-1075.
21. Tate, A. R., Underwood, J., Acosta, D. M., Julià-Sapé, M., Majós, C., Moreno-Torres, À., ... & Arús, C. (2006). Development of a decision support system for diagnosis and grading of brain tumours using in vivo magnetic resonance single voxel spectra. NMR in Biomedicine, 19(4), 411-434.
22. Yamasaki, F., Kurisu, K., Satoh, K., Arita, K., Sugiyama, K., Ohtaki, M., ... & Saito, T. (2005). Apparent diffusion coefficient of human brain tumors at MR imaging. Radiology, 235(3), 985-991.
23. Zonari, P., Baraldi, P., & Crisi, G. (2007). Multimodal MRI in the characterization of glial neoplasms: the combined role of single-voxel MR spectroscopy, diffusion imaging and echo-planar perfusion imaging. Neuroradiology, 49(10), 795-803.
24. Zou, Q. G., Xu, H. B., Liu, F., Guo, W., Kong, X. C., & Wu, Y. (2011). In the assessment of supratentorial glioma grade: the combined role of multivoxel proton MR spectroscopy and diffusion tensor imaging. Clinical Radiology, 66(10), 953-960.