

TNM

CT :

CT

1

2

3

: CT

TNM

가

:

CT

55

. CT

6-11mm

가

CT

CT

CT

54.5%

(McNemar-Chi-

N0

58.1%

square test, $p>0.05$).

75%, N1 58.3%, N2 20%

N3

3

N0 75%, N1 46.7%, N2 40%

가

가

:

TNM

가

CT

가

가

(5-8).

CT

, CT ,

CT

가

가

가

CT

TNM

(1, Table 1)

(WHO) 1996

(2) AJCC (American joint

1997 5

1998 6

committee on cancer)

1997

(3, Table 2).

CT

CT

55

. CT

2

44

(17)

가 32 , 가 23

54 (28 -

77)

가

(4-9)

Somatom Plus (Siemens, Erlangen, Germany)

6

CT

400ml

¹가²가³가

1999

가

1999

1

11

1999

2

19

10mm

CT
8mm

5mm

150ml
 (Ultravist 300, Schering) 3ml
 45-50 15-18
 CT
 (2 30 - 3)

Table 1. Previous Lymphnodal Staging of Gastric Carcinoma

NX Regional lymph node(s) cannot be assessed
 N0 No regional lymph node metastasis
 N1 Metastasis in perigastric lymph node(s) within 3cm of the edge of the primary tumor
 N2 Metastasis in perigastric lymph node(s) more than 3cm from the edge of the primary tumor, or in lymph nodes along the left gastric, common hepatic, splenic, or celiac arteries

Table 2. New Lymphnodal Staging of Gastric Carcinoma

NX Regional lymph node(s) cannot be assessed
 N0 No regional lymph node metastasis
 N1 Metastasis in 1 to 6 regional lymph nodes
 N2 Metastasis in 7 to 15 regional lymph nodes
 N3 Metastasis in more than 15 regional lymph nodes



Fig 1. Lymph node stations in gastric cancer. Involvement of nodes along the lesser or greater curvature (groups 1-6) constitutes N1 disease, and the celiac axis and its three branches are N2 (7-11) and N3 (12-14). N1 : 1, right paracardial ; 2, left paracardial ; 3, lesser curvature ; 4, greater curvature ; 5, suprapyloric ; 6, infrapyloric. N2 : 7, left gastric artery ; 8, common hepatic artery ; 9, celiac artery ; 10, splenic hilus ; 11, splenic artery. N3 : 12, hepatic pedicle (hepatoduodenal ligament) ; 13, retropancreatic ; 14, mesenteric root.

: TNM CT
 8mm 1cm
 6-11mm (10).
 TNM

TNM

McNemar-Chi-Square test

N0가 28 , N1 12 , N2가 10
 , N3가 3 (# 12)
 (hepatoduodenal or distant lymphnodal
 metastasis, M1)가 가 2 (Table 3). CT
 N0가 75%, N1 58.3%, N2
 가 20% N3 3
 54.5%

Table 3. CT Nodal Staging of Gastric Carcinoma with New T-NM System

CT	N0	N1	N2	N3	M1	
N0	21	7	0	0	0	28
N1	5	7	0	0	0	12
N2	1	7	2	0	0	10
N3	0	3	0	0	0	3
M1	0	2	0	0	0	2

Table 4. CT Nodal Staging of Gastric Carcinoma with Previous TNM System

CT	N0	N1	N2	M1	
N0	21	5	2	0	28
N1	5	7	3	0	15
N2	1	5	4	0	10
M1	0	1	1	0	2

Table 5. Diagnostic Accuracies in CT Staging of Gastric Carcinoma with New and Previous TNM System

Stage	New Staging	Old Staging
N0	75.0%	75.0%
N1	58.3%	46.7%
N2	20.0%	40.0%
N3	0	-
Total	54.5%	58.1%

N0가 28 , N1 15 , N2가 10 (Table 4). CT N1 46.7%, N2가 40% (McNemar-Chi-Square test, $p>0.05$)

N1 가 CT 가 가 (Table 5).

M1 2 N0가 75%, 58.1% volume effect) #8 () #12 CT 가 N1, N2, N3 가

(non-regional lymph node) 11mm (10) Triller (6) 7mm, Ziegler (8) 8mm, (13) CT

(#2, 4, 6), (#7), (#8), (#9), (#10) (#11) CT 가

(Fig. 1). (Table 1) CT 가 CT 가

CT #3 #7 가 N1(#3) N2(#7) #8 #12 CT N2(#8) M1(#12) 가

(2). 가 (embedding) 가 (11, 12). CT #3 #7 54.5% (58.1%) 가 N1 N2 N3 가 가 (13) CT 가 가 가 가

1. Beahrs OH, Henson DE, Hutter RVP, Kennedy BJ. *Manual for staging of cancer*. American joint committee on cancer. 4th ed. Lippincott, 1992:63-67
2. Wittekind C. *News in the TNM Classification*. In WHO-CC for gastric cancer. 12th intrnational seminar. 6th general assembly. Seoul, Korea, 1996
3. American joint committee on cancer. *AJCC cancer staging manual*. 5th ed. Lippincott -Raven, 1997:71-76.
4. Dehn TCB, Reznick RH, Nnockler IB et al. The preoperative assessment of advanced gastric cancer by computed tomography. *Br J Surg* 1984;71:413-417
5. Cook AO, Levine BA, Sirinek DR, Gaskill HV. Evaluation of gastric adenocarcinoma : abdominal computed tomography dose not replace celiotomy. *Arch Surg* 1986;121:603-606
6. Triller J, Roder R. Stafford A, Schroder R. CT in advanced gastric carcinoma : is exploratory laparotomy avoidable? *Eur J Radiol* 1986;6:181-186
7. Sussman SK, Halvorsen RA, Illescas FF, et al. Gastric adenocarcinoma : CT versus surgical staging. *Radiology* 1988;167:335-340
8. Ziegler K, Sanft C. Zimmer T et al. Comparison of computed tomography, endosonography, and intraoperative assessment in TN staging of gstric carcinoma. *Gut* 1993;34:606-610
9. Cho JS, Kim JK, Rho SM, Lee HY, Jeong Hy, Lee CS. Preoperative assessment of gastric carcinoma : value of two-phase dynamic CT with mechanical IV injection of contrast material. *AJR*

- 1994;163:69-75
10. Dorfman RE, Alpern MB, Gross BH, Sandler MA. Upper abdominal lymph nodes : criteria for normal size determined with CT. *Radiology* 1991;180:319-322
11. Shiu MH, Perrotti M, Brennan MF. Adenocarcinoma of the stomach : a multivariate analysis of clinical, pathologic, and treatment factors. *Hepatogastroenterology* 1989;36:7-12
12. Ichikura T, Tomimatsu S, Okusa Y et al. Comparison of the prognostic significance between the number of metastatic lymph nodes and nodal stage based on their location in patient with gastric cancer. *J Clin. Oncol* 1993;11:1894-1900
13. 가. 1997;36:87-92
14. 가 CT 1992;28:728-732

J Korean Radiol Soc 1999;40:891-894

Comparison of CT Lymph Nodal Staging of Gastric Carcinoma Using a New and an Earlier TNM System¹

Lee JM, Jung HS, Sohn KM, Park SM², Kim KM³

¹Department of Radiology, St. Mary's Hospital, The Catholic University of Korea, College of Medicine

²Department of Surgery, St. Mary's Hospital, The Catholic University of Korea, College of Medicine

³Department of Clinical Pathology, St. Mary's Hospital, The Catholic University of Korea, College of Medicine

Purpose : To assess the diagnostic accuracy of CT scanning in the lymph nodal staging of gastric carcinoma when a new TNM system is applied, and to compare the accuracy of CT staging between this new system and an earlier one.

Materials and Methods : Fifty-five patients with biopsy proven gastric carcinoma underwent preoperative CT scanning for staging and surgery. Using both new and earlier TNM systems for each patient, two radiologists prospectively determined lymph nodal staging, as seen on CT, and reached a consensus. Regional lymph nodes were considered metastatic when their short transverse diameter was greater than 6-11mm, according to anatomic site. CT lymph nodal staging using the new and the earlier TNM system was compared with surgical and pathologic findings.

Results : The overall accuracy of CT scanning in lymph nodal staging was 54.5% with the new TNM system, and 58.1% with the earlier system. There was no statistically significant difference between the two systems (McNemar and chi-square test, $p > 0.05$). Using the new TNM system, the diagnostic accuracy of CT scanning for N0 was 75%, for N1 58.3%, and for N2 20%; three cases of pathologically proven N3 were not diagnosed. Using the previous system, the accuracy of CT scanning was 75% for N0, 46.7% for N1 and 40% for N2. The diagnostic accuracy of both TNM systems, especially the new one, significantly decreased as nodal stage increased.

Conclusion : With regard to lymph nodal staging, the diagnostic accuracy of CT scanning did not increase when a new rather than an earlier TNM system was used. Diagnostic accuracy significantly decreased in reverse proportion to nodal stage.

Index words : Stomach, neoplasms

Stomach, CT

Neoplasms, staging

Neoplasms, CT

Address reprint requests to : Jae Mun Lee, M.D., Department of Radiology, St. Mary's Hospital, Catholic University Medical College, Catholic Medical Center, #62, Youido-Dong, Yongdungpo-gu, Seoul 150-010 Korea.
Tel : (02) 3779 - 1273 Fax : 82-2-783-5288 E-mail : jaemun@cmc.cuk.ac.kr