

1 A case-control study evaluating CT signs of xiphoid process associated with
2 xiphodynia

3

4

5

6

7 Ryosuke Ono ^{1,2*}, Ken Horibata ^{1,2}.

8

9 ¹Department of Community Medicine, Kameyama, Mie University School of
10 Medicine, Tsu, Mie, Japan

11 ²Department of Internal Medicine, Kameyama Municipal Medical Center,
12 Kameyama, Mie, Japan

13

14 * Corresponding author

15 E-mail: rikusan2005@yahoo.co.jp

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37 **Abstract**

38 Objectives: To investigate whether CT signs of the xiphoid process, such as
39 xiphisternal angle and evidence of soft tissue compression, are useful for
40 diagnosing xiphodynia.

41 Design: A case-control study within a cohort.

42 Setting/Participants: Participants included 1560 individuals who visited a small
43 urban hospital in Japan for chest or abdominal pain between January 2021 and
44 September 2023. Those who underwent CT examinations including the xiphoid
45 process were selected. Nine individuals diagnosed with xiphodynia were
46 assigned to the case group, while 321 individuals diagnosed with other causes
47 of pain were assigned to the control group.

48 Interventions: The xiphisternal angle, evidence of soft tissue compression
49 anterior to the xiphoid process, anatomical features at the tip of the xiphoid
50 process, and anatomical morphology of the xiphoid process were compared
51 between the two groups.

52 Results: There was no significant difference in the xiphisternal angle between
53 the two groups. No significant differences were observed in evidence of soft
54 tissue compression anterior to the xiphoid process or anatomical features at the
55 tip of the xiphoid process. New anatomical signs reveal that in approximately
56 70% of cases, the xiphoid process curves forward and then backward.

57 Conclusions: The xiphoid process sternal angle is not useful for diagnosing
58 xiphodynia. The curvature of the xiphoid process is frequently observed
59 regardless of the presence of xiphodynia.

60

61

62 **Introduction**

63 Xiphodynia is a relatively rare condition characterized by pain originating from
64 the xiphisternal joint or the xiphoid process. Although it does not typically
65 progress to a severe state, prolonged pain can lead to a decrease in quality of
66 life [1]. Symptoms of xiphodynia often manifest as chest pain or upper
67 abdominal pain, but may also include radiating pain to the back, neck, or upper
68 limbs. Due to these symptoms, it is commonly misdiagnosed as other conditions
69 such as cardiovascular or gallbladder diseases. Additionally, due to low
70 awareness of the condition, it frequently goes undiagnosed or treatment is

71 delayed [1]. While there is no established treatment, local injection of 40mg
72 depot methylprednisolone and 50mg lidocaine at the most tender area on the
73 xiphoid process has been reported to be effective [2]. In cases where there is
74 poor response to local injection or in refractory cases, xiphoid process excision
75 surgery is considered as an option [1].

76 While diagnostic criteria for xiphodynia have not been established, it is
77 diagnosed by the presence of reproducible tenderness upon palpation of the
78 xiphoid process [1,3]. As part of diagnostic treatment, injecting local anesthetic
79 agents directly onto the xiphoid process can help relieve pain [4]. Additionally,
80 organic diseases such as ischemic heart disease, gallbladder disorders, and
81 gastroesophageal reflux disease have been reported to present similar
82 symptoms, underscoring the importance of excluding these organic diseases
83 [3,5].

84 It has been suggested that anterior protrusion of the xiphoid process is a risk
85 factor for xiphodynia, and several reports suggest that using imaging tests to
86 look at the xiphoid process from the side can help diagnose xiphodynia when it
87 sticks out forward [6-9]. The largest study conducted to date was reported by
88 Maigne et al., who compared the xiphisternal angle between lateral CT images
89 of the xiphoid process in three patients diagnosed with xiphodynia and 60
90 healthy individuals without xiphodynia. The results showed that the xiphisternal
91 angles were 105°, 120°, and 135° in xiphodynia patients, while it was $172 \pm 14^\circ$ in
92 the healthy group. Therefore, they suggested that a decrease in the xiphisternal
93 angle could be useful for diagnosing xiphodynia, proposing the possibility of
94 inflammation around the xiphoid process due to anterior curvature being
95 involved in the pathophysiology of xiphodynia [6]. However, due to the small
96 sample size of three cases, the diagnostic accuracy was not clearly established,
97 and even in the healthy group, 14 out of 60 individuals exhibited a decrease to
98 140-159°. Furthermore, in our clinical experience, we often encounter patients
99 with significant decreases in the xiphisternal angle but without symptoms.

100 Additionally, we have reported cases of xiphodynia with a xiphisternal angle of
101 155°, which does not show a pronounced decrease [10]. Therefore, we question
102 the utility of the xiphisternal angle for diagnosing xiphodynia.

103 Additionally, we believe that signs of the xiphoid process compressing anterior
104 soft tissue or anatomical features at the tip of the xiphoid process may be useful
105 for diagnosing xiphodynia. The anterior surface of the xiphoid process is
106 attached to the rectus abdominis muscle, with subcutaneous tissue and skin

107 lying anteriorly [11]. Evidence of the xiphoid process tip compressing anterior
108 soft tissue, including the rectus abdominis muscle, can be observed in many of
109 the presented images in the literature on xiphodynia [6-8,10]. However, we
110 could not find any reports investigating these details.
111 In this study, we aim to evaluate whether CT signs such as xiphisternal angle and
112 evidence of soft tissue compression are useful for the imaging diagnosis of
113 xiphodynia.

114
115

116 **Methods**

117 **Study design**

118 A case-control study within a cohort.
119

120 **Population (Fig1)**

121 This study targeted patients who visited the internal medicine outpatient
122 department of Kameyama Municipal Medical Center between January 2021 and
123 September 2023 with complaints of chest pain or abdominal pain. Case group
124 were defined as patients diagnosed with xiphodynia who underwent CT scans
125 including the xiphoid process. Diagnosis of xiphodynia was defined as meeting
126 all of the following criteria: (1) presence of chest or upper abdominal pain, (2)
127 reproducible tenderness upon palpation of the xiphoid process, (3) absence of
128 other conditions more likely than xiphodynia as the cause of pain, and (4)
129 improvement of pain with local injection of anesthetic agents onto the xiphoid
130 process or xiphoid process excision surgery. Control groups were defined as
131 patients who underwent CT scans including the xiphoid process and were
132 diagnosed with other conditions than xiphodynia as the cause of pain. Patients
133 with unknown causes of pain were excluded from the control group.

134
135
136
137

Fig1.

Case and control groups inclusion flowchart.

138 **sample size**

139 It was calculated based on a case-control study by Maigne et al. regarding the
140 xiphoid process sternal angle [6]. Using a factor of the xiphoid process sternal
141 angle being less than 160° , the assumed proportion of cases with this factor was
142 0.8. Given that 14 out of 60 cases were less than 160° based on previous studies,
143 the proportion for the control group was set at 0.23. With an α error of 0.05,
144 power of 0.8, and a case-to-control ratio of 1:10, the calculation resulted in 7
145 cases and 70 controls.

146

147 **Data collection**

148 From October 1, 2023, to March 31, 2024, we accessed patients' medical records
149 and CT images to collect data. From medical records, we extracted age, gender,
150 site of pain, and underlying cause of pain. The signs of CT examinations were
151 measured by creating sagittal images including the xiphoid process from the
152 thinnest axial section.

153 The method for measuring the xiphisternal angle was not defined in previous
154 literature, resulting in two patterns: one measured between the xiphoid process
155 and the sternal body angle, and the other between the xiphoid process and the
156 base of the xiphoid process [6-9]. Additionally, since the xiphoid process may
157 bend midway or invert, the angle can vary significantly depending on whether it
158 is measured at the tip or before inversion. Therefore, we defined and measured
159 four angles: xiphoid-sternal body angle (XSBA), xiphoid to xiphoid base angle
160 (XXBA), xiphoid tip to sternal body angle (XTSBA), and tip to base angle of xiphoid
161 process (TBAXP), as shown in Fig2.

162

163 **Fig2.**

164 **The definition of the xiphisternal angle.**

165 A: A line connecting the midpoint of the cranial end and the midpoint of the
166 caudal end of the sternal body.

167 B: A tangent line to the midline of the base of the xiphoid process (excluding the
168 xiphisternal joint).

169 C: A tangent line to the midline at the maximum ventral curvature of the xiphoid
170 process.

171 D: A tangent line at the tip of the xiphoid process.

172 XSBA: The angle between line A and line C, with line A as the baseline.

173 XXBA: The angle between line B and line C, with line B as the baseline.

174 XTSBA: The angle between line A and line D, with line A as the baseline.

175 TBAXP: The angle between line B and line D, with line B as the baseline.

176

177 Regarding compression signs caused by the xiphoid process, we assumed and
178 measured the anterior shift of the rectus abdominis (ASRA), anterior shift of the
179 skin surface (ASSS), and thinness of the subcutaneous tissue (TST) as useful
180 indicators (Fig3). As for anatomical signs at the tip of the xiphoid process, we
181 measured the penetration of the xiphoid tip into the rectus abdominis (PXTRA),
182 calcification of the xiphoid tip (CXT), and hypertrophy of the rectus abdominis
183 (HRA) in contact with the tip of the xiphoid process (Fig3). The definitions for each
184 sign are as follows: (1) ASRA: At the most ventral projection of the xiphoid
185 process, the rectus abdominis shifts anteriorly. (2) ASSS: At the most ventral
186 projection of the xiphoid process, the skin surface line shifts anteriorly. (3) TST:
187 Subcutaneous tissue compressed by the xiphoid process is thinner than
188 surrounding tissue. (4) PXTRA: The tip of the xiphoid process contacts the rectus
189 abdominis, and the tip and rectus abdominis are not parallel. (5) CXT: In CT
190 abdominal conditions, there is calcification at the tip of the xiphoid process. (6)
191 HRA: At the point of contact with the xiphoid process, the rectus abdominis is
192 thicker than the surrounding rectus abdominis. For cases with multiple tips of the
193 xiphoid process, measurements for each sign were taken at the tip with a positive
194 PXTRA. In cases where this criterion was not applicable, measurements were taken
195 at the longest tip.

196

197 **Fig3.**

198 **Illustration of a CT sagittal image around the xiphoid process and**
199 **descriptions of soft tissue compression signs and anatomical features of the**
200 **xiphoid tip.**

201 The xiphoid process compresses the rectus abdominis and skin ventrally, leading
202 to positive signs for ASRA and ASSS (a). While the xiphoid tip protrudes into the
203 rectus abdominis, resulting in a positive PXTRA sign, there's no rectus abdominis
204 thickening, hence a negative HRA sign (b). Subcutaneous tissue thins due to
205 xiphoid pressure, resulting in a positive TST sign (c).

206

207 As additional items for CT signs, we recorded the imaging range of the CT, the
208 slice thickness of the original CT images, and anatomical features of the xiphoid
209 process (shape, number of tips, xiphoid foramen, fractures). Regarding the shape

210 of the xiphoid process, forward curvature was denoted as "F", backward curvature
211 as "B", and the curvature sequence from the base of the xiphoid process was
212 represented (e.g., if the sequence is F→B→F, it is labeled as "FBF type"), defining
213 it based on the number and direction of curvatures (Fig4). All observations were
214 assessed by the same evaluator.

215

216 **Fig4.**

217 **Examples of the xiphoid process shape, soft tissue compression signs, and**
218 **anatomical findings of the xiphoid tip (exclude CXT).**

219 The shape of the xiphoid process is defined by noting any bends from its base,
220 using 'F' for forward bends and 'B' for backward bends. If it is straight, we denote
221 it as 'S'.

222

223 **Statistical analyses**

224 Each variable will be compared between case and control groups. For binary
225 variables, odds ratios for case/control group will be calculated. For continuous
226 variables, a two-sample t-test will be conducted. Data aggregation will be
227 performed using Microsoft Excel®, and data analysis will be carried out using
228 EZR on R-commander (version 1.41 for Windows) [12].

229

230 **Ethics approval**

231 This study involves human participants and was approved by Kameyama
232 Municipal Medical Center Medical Research and Ethics Committee (code
233 No.2023092101). Informed consent was not obtained verbally; instead, it was
234 obtained through written opt-out notices posted on the outpatient bulletin
235 board at Kameyama Municipal Medical Center. Those who rejected were
236 excluded. An anonymization table was created separately from the database,
237 and all data was completely anonymized before analysis. No personally
238 identifiable information, such as names or addresses, was entered into the
239 database.

240

241

242 **Results**

243 **Baseline characteristics**

244 During the study period, 1560 patients presented with chest pain or abdominal
245 pain. Among them, 11 were diagnosed with xiphodynia, with 10 meeting all
246 criteria for xiphodynia. Nine of these, excluding one who did not undergo a CT
247 scan including the xiphoid process, were assigned to the case group. The
248 control group comprised 321 individuals who were diagnosed with other causes
249 of pain and underwent CT scans including the xiphoid process.

250 Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of patients in both the case
251 and control groups. There were no significant differences in age and gender
252 between the case and control groups. In the control group, the most common
253 causes of pain were gastrointestinal disorders such as intestinal obstruction (27
254 cases), ischemic colitis (19 cases), appendicitis (19 cases), diverticulitis (17 cases),
255 totaling 103 cases, followed by renal and urinary tract disorders such as ureteral
256 stones (54 cases), totaling 64 cases.

257

258 **Table1. Characteristics of case and control groups.**

	Case(n=9)	Control(n=321)	P value
Background			
Age(year), mean(SD)	71(15)	68(21)	0.63
Male, n(%)	4(44.4)	150(46.7)	1
Location of pain, n(%)			
Chest pain	3(33.3)	43(13.4)	
Abdominal pain	8(88.9)	286(89.1)	
Cause of pain, n(%)			
Lung disease	-	10(3.1)	
Heart disease	-	17(5.3)	
Gastroduodenal disease	-	20(6.2)	
Intestinal disease	-	103(44.6)	
Liver disease	-	5(1.6)	

Biliary tract disease	-	33(10.3)
Pancreas disease	-	3(0.9)
Uterine ovarian disease	-	15(4.7)
Renal urinary tract disease	-	64(19.9)
Cancer	-	25(7.8)
Musculoskeletal disease	-	15(4.7)
Other disease	-	11(3.4)
CT imaging range, n(%)		
Chest	7(77.8)	116(36.1)
Abdomen	4(44.4)	302(94.1)
CT slice thickness, n(%)		
1.25mm	9(100)	168(52.3)
2.5mm	0(0)	14(4.4)
5mm	0(0)	139(43.3)

259

260 Xiphisternal angle (Table 2)

261 There were no significant differences observed between the two groups in any
 262 of the four defined angles. In the control group, 21 cases had the xiphoid
 263 process base not captured in the imaging, thus preventing measurement of all
 264 four angles. Additionally, XSBA and XSTBA measurements were not possible in
 265 175 cases due to insufficient imaging of the sternum; these cases were excluded
 266 from the analysis for each respective angle. The range of xiphisternal angles in
 267 the case group was XSBA 104-174°, XXBA 91-163°, XTSBA 129-298°, and TBAXP
 268 135-295°. In the control group, the ranges were XSBA 10-230°, XXBA 7-197°,
 269 XTSBA 10-379°, and TBAXP 7-363°.

270

271 Table2. Comparison of CT signs between case and control groups.

	Case(n=9)	Control(n=321)	OR(95%CI)
--	-----------	----------------	-----------

Xiphisternal angle, mean(SD) *			
XSBA	142.1(22.3)	144.7(29.2)	
XXBA	144.3(17.5)	139.9(26.1)	
XTSBA	204.2(59.4)	194.6(58.2)	
TBAXP	206.4(58.3)	185.2(48.9)	
Soft tissue compression signs, n(%)			
ASRA	7(77.8)	211(65.7)	1.82(0.34 to 18.2)
ASSS	1(11.1)	113(35.2)	0.23(0.01 to 1.76)
TST	7(77.8)	200(62.3)	2.12(0.39 to 21.1)
Anatomical signs of xiphoid tip, n(%)			
PTXRA	2(22.2)	55(17.1)	1.38(0.14 to 7.51)
CXT	0(0)	77(24.0)	0(0 to 21.97)
HRA	0(0)	8(2.5)	0(0 to 23.95)
Anatomical characteristics **			
Shape of xiphoid process, n(%)			
S	0(0)	12(3.7)	
F	3(33.3)	72(22.4)	
FB	5(55.6)	213(66.4)	
FBF	1(11.1)	19(5.9)	
FBB	0(0)	2(0.6)	
FBFB	0(0)	2(0.6)	
Number of tips, n(%)			
1	7(77.8)	262(81.6)	
2	2(22.2)	57(17.8)	
3	0(0)	1(0.3)	

Xiphoid foramen, n(%)	2(22.2)	47(14.6)
Length, mean(SD)	60.6(11.1)	60.4(15.0)

272 * We excluded cases where all four angles couldn't be measured due to the
273 xiphoid process base not being within the imaging range in 21 controls.
274 Additionally, 175 controls were excluded from XSBA and XSTBA measurements
275 because the sternum wasn't adequately imaged.

276 ** We omitted one case of xiphoid process absence from the description but
277 included it in the denominator for probability calculations.

278

279 **Compression signs of soft tissues (Table 2)**

280 There were no significant differences observed between the two groups in any
281 of the ASRA, ASSS, or TST signs.

282

283 **Anatomical signs and morphology of the xiphoid process (Table** 284 **2)**

285 There were no significant differences observed between the two groups in any
286 of the PXTRA, CXT, or HRA signs. Regarding the morphology of the xiphoid
287 process, the FB type was the most common in both the case and control groups,
288 followed by the F type, together comprising approximately 90% of the total.
289 Within the control group, there was one case of complete absence of the
290 xiphoid process and one case of xiphoid process fracture with bone fragment
291 detachment. The tip of the xiphoid process was single in 269 cases, double in 59
292 cases, and triple in one case. Xiphoid foramen was observed in 49 cases. There
293 were no significant differences observed between the case and control groups
294 in the ratios of these morphologies. The length of the xiphoid process showed
295 no significant difference between the case group (60.6 ± 11.1) and the control
296 group (60.4 ± 15.0).

297

298 **Relationship between patient demographics and anatomical** 299 **features of the xiphoid process**

300 We investigated the association between age, gender, and xiphisternal angle
301 (XXBA), as well as between age, gender, and xiphoid process length. XXBA,
302 which is less affected by tip inversion and has a larger sample size, was utilized.
303 Outliers for each variable were excluded. We found a very weak correlation
304 between age and XXBA (correlation coefficient -0.16, 95% CI: -0.27 to -0.05, $p =$
305 0.005), but no significant correlation between age and xiphoid process length
306 (correlation coefficient -0.04, 95% CI -0.16 to 0.09, $p = 0.56$). The scatter plots
307 for each variable are shown in Fig5. Additionally, there was no significant
308 difference between gender and XXBA (males: $138.6 \pm 25.8^\circ$ vs. females: $141.4 \pm$
309 26.1° , $p = 0.34$), whereas a significant difference was observed between gender
310 and xiphoid process length (males: 61.5 ± 11.7 cm vs. females: 57.7 ± 10.6 cm, p
311 $= 0.005$).

312

313 **Fig5.**

314 **A scatter plot depicting the correlation between age and the length of the**
315 **xiphoid process, as well as the correlation between age and the xiphisternal**
316 **angle.**

317

318

319 **Discussion**

320 In our study, we investigated CT signs useful for diagnosing xiphodynia.
321 However, no significant differences were observed between the two groups in
322 terms of the xiphisternal angle, which has been considered useful in previous
323 studies. Additionally, among the compression signs of soft tissues anterior to
324 the xiphoid process and anatomical signs at the tip of the xiphoid process, no
325 signs were found to have odds ratios indicative of diagnostic utility.
326 One reason why we did not find a significant difference in the xiphisternal angle
327 might be that, unlike previous research, even the control group had smaller
328 angles. In Maigne et al.'s study, the control group's angle averaged $172 \pm 15^\circ$ [6],
329 while in our study, the XSBA and XXBA in the control group were around 140° .
330 This could be because of differences in the age distribution of the control
331 groups. In Maigne et al.'s study, the control group consisted of 60 individuals
332 without xiphodynia, with an average age of 55 ± 2 years [6]. On the other hand,
333 the control group in our study had an average age of 68 ± 21 years, indicating
334 older age and greater variability compared to the previous study. The weak but

335 positive correlation observed between XXBA and age in our study suggests that
336 the older age of our control group may have contributed to lower xiphisternal
337 angles. Secondly, it is well-established that skeletal differences exist among
338 races, and it's possible that racial differences within the control group influenced
339 the angles. Although we did not find prior studies discussing racial differences
340 in the xiphoid process, research has reported skeletal variations between
341 Western and Eastern populations in cranial and pelvic bones [13]. Since our
342 study was conducted in Japan and Maigne et al.'s study was conducted in
343 France, there is a possibility that differences in skeletal morphology due to race
344 could have influenced the angles. Thirdly, the lack of clear definition for the
345 xiphisternal angle in previous studies might have contributed to this outcome.
346 While such differences exist between our study and previous research, our study
347 suggests that a decrease in xiphisternal angle is common even in healthy
348 individuals. Perhaps, our focus on xiphisternal angles has been limited to
349 instances of xiphodynia, leading to a misconception that decreased xiphisternal
350 angles are specific findings for xiphodynia.
351 Furthermore, in our study, the xiphisternal angle in the case group was larger
352 than in previous studies. In prior research, many cases with decreased
353 xiphisternal angle on CT images have been reported. Maigne et al. reported
354 three cases with angles of 105°, 120°, and 135° [6], Patel et al. reported one case
355 with an angle of 100° [14], Ono et al. reported one case with an angle of 128°
356 [7], Ishizuka et al. reported one case with an angle of 133° [8], and Ismail et al.
357 reported one case with an angle of 138.4° [15]. Additionally, although not
358 explicitly stated the angles, there are numerous reports of cases with images
359 showing a prominently upwardly curved xiphoid process [9,16-18]. Conversely,
360 in case series literature, there are more reports of cases with larger xiphisternal
361 angles. Bakens et al. reported 19 cases who underwent xiphoidectomy for
362 xiphodynia, with 15 cases having xiphisternal angle measurements ranging from
363 103° to 177°, with an average of $149.1 \pm 19.5^\circ$ [19]. Dorn et al. reported 11 cases
364 who underwent xiphoidectomy for xiphodynia, with all cases having xiphisternal
365 angle measurements ranging from 120° to 208°, with an average of $156.1 \pm 23.8^\circ$
366 [20]. While there may be slight variations in angle definitions, the xiphisternal
367 angles in our case group were in the early 140s, which is similar to those
368 observed in the two case series. This similarity suggests that a significant
369 reduction in the xiphisternal angle is not a common feature in many cases of
370 xiphodynia. Therefore, the absence of a decrease in xiphisternal angle should

371 not lead to underestimating the possibility of xiphoidynia, and xiphisternal angle
372 may not be a useful diagnostic tool for xiphodynia.

373 Regarding compression signs of soft tissues, no signs indicating useful odds
374 ratios for diagnosis were identified in our study. Xiphodynia is a relatively rare
375 condition with low awareness among physicians, and studies conducted solely
376 in single institutions have limited case numbers. In the future, collaborative
377 multicenter studies with increased case numbers are desired.

378 One of the achievements of our study is the acquisition of new insights into the
379 anatomical features of the xiphoid process and the CT interpretation methods.
380 Initially, we hypothesized that inflammation-induced thickening of the xiphoid
381 process was caused by its tip penetrating the rectus abdominis muscle, and
382 thus, they incorporated hypertrophy of the rectus abdominis (HRA) into the
383 study. However, it was found that the cartilaginous portion of the xiphoid
384 process tip was in contact with the rectus abdominis muscle, and both
385 structures had similar CT values, leading to the appearance of rectus abdominis
386 hypertrophy. It was realized that a slice thickness of 5mm was insufficient for
387 distinguishing this example, necessitating imaging with a slice thickness of
388 1.25mm. Additionally, since calcification at the tip of the xiphoid process (CXT
389 positive) was observed in only 23% of cases, there is a possibility of
390 misinterpreting the calcified portion as the true tip of the xiphoid process. To
391 confirm the non-calcified portion, conditions in the abdominal sagittal plane
392 were found to be suitable. When assessing the anatomical features of the
393 xiphoid process tip on CT, imaging with abdominal conditions of 1.25mm slice
394 thickness or less and confirmation using sagittal reconstruction images are
395 necessary.

396 Additionally, it was found that the anatomical feature of the xiphoid process
397 known as the "FB type," where the xiphoid process curves forward and then
398 reverses backward, accounted for more than 60% of cases. In a study by Akin et
399 al., which assessed the shape of the xiphoid process using MDCT images of 500
400 individuals, a shape referred to as the "S-shape," where the xiphoid process
401 curved forwardly and then reversed backwardly, was identified in 4 cases (0.8%)
402 [21]. Although the study did not discuss events where the xiphoid process
403 reversed, multiple figures presented as cases of forwardly curved xiphoid
404 process in the same literature confirm reversing after contact between the
405 cartilage part of the xiphoid process tip and the rectus abdominis muscle.
406 Moreover, numerous studies on xiphodynia have presented images showing

407 reversal [14,19,22], indicating that reversal of the xiphoid process tip is a
408 common occurrence regardless of the presence of xiphodynia. In our study, no
409 cases exhibited a shape where the xiphoid process first curved backwardly
410 (toward the heart) from the base (B or BF type). There were also few cases with
411 shapes like FBF or FBFB where the xiphoid process reverses forwardly again, and
412 in such cases, the liver was positioned backwardly to the xiphoid process (Fig4).
413 From these observations, we believe that the xiphoid process bends forwardly
414 due to pressure from internal organs such as the heart or liver, and backwardly
415 reverses due to pressure from abdominal wall like the rectus abdominis. We
416 speculate that the positive correlation observed between age and xiphisternal
417 angle in our study may be attributed to worsening kyphosis with age, leading to
418 increased pressure from internal organs on the xiphoid process. It is noteworthy
419 that there was no difference in the shape of the xiphoid process between the
420 case and control groups, suggesting that the likelihood of curvature or reversal
421 of the xiphoid process being associated with xiphodynia is low. However,
422 considering the common occurrence of reversal of the xiphoid process tip, it is
423 inappropriate to use TBAXP or XTSBA, which use the xiphoid process tip as the
424 baseline for xiphisternal angle measurements. Instead, it is advisable to use
425 XXBA or XSBA, which use the baseline where the xiphoid process is most
426 forwardly curved or just before it contacts the rectus abdominis muscle.
427

428 **Limitation**

429 Firstly, since this study is a case-control study within a cohort, the control group
430 does not consist of individuals who are non-xiphodynia. Diagnosis of xiphodynia
431 is typically based on medical history, physical examination, and exclusion
432 diagnosis, which are minimally invasive, and the control group should comprise
433 individuals without the condition ideally. Additionally, although there is a report
434 indicating a prevalence of xiphodynia in hospitalized cases at 2% [23], the exact
435 prevalence is unknown, and there is a possibility that a considerable number of
436 xiphodynia patients may be included in the control group. In the future,
437 investigations into the prevalence are necessary, and if a study is to be
438 conducted with an increased sample size, using a prospective control group
439 without the disease would be appropriate. Secondly, the sample size was
440 insufficient to compare findings such as compression signs of soft tissues and
441 anatomical features of the xiphoid process tip. Xiphodynia is a relatively rare

442 condition, and evaluation in a single institution has its limitations, thus
443 collaborative research across multiple institutions to increase the sample size is
444 desirable. Thirdly, there is a possibility that the definition of the sternal baseline
445 used for measuring the xiphisternal angle was not appropriate. While a linear
446 sternum poses no issues, if the sternum is arc-shaped, the angle may vary
447 slightly depending on whether the baseline is defined as in this study or
448 tangentially to the circular sternum. Since tangential direction assessment may
449 lead to variability among evaluators, we opted for our original definitions for
450 this study, which is easier to judge as a landmark. Fourthly, regarding
451 compression signs of soft tissues, there is a potential for variation depending on
452 the position, but CT examination is limited to the supine position, possibly
453 missing patients with compression signs appearing in the upright or seated
454 positions. Ultrasound examinations can be performed regardless of position,
455 suggesting their potential usefulness in evaluating compression signs of soft
456 tissues, which warrants further investigation.

457

458

459 **Conclusion**

460 The xiphisternal angle was suggested to be ineffective in the imaging diagnosis
461 of xiphodynia. The compression signs of soft tissues and anatomical features of
462 the xiphoid process tip set in this study warrant a reassessment with an
463 increased number of cases. Additionally, xiphoid process reversing is frequently
464 observed regardless of the presence of xiphodynia, with forward curvature likely
465 influenced by pressure from internal organs and backward curvature by
466 pressure from the abdominal wall. For confirming these, CT conditions involving
467 axial slices of 1.25mm thickness or less in the abdominal region are
468 recommended.

469



470



471 **References**



- 472 1. Noor N, Amgalan A, Vij N, Habib K, Anantuni L, An D, et al. Treatment and
473 Management of Xiphoidalgia. *Orthopedic Reviews*. 2022;14(3):37070. doi:
474 10.52965/001c.37070.


- 475 2. Shilo L, Hadari R, Shabun A, Shilo D, Kitay-Cohen Y. Xiphodynia: An easily
476 diagnosed but frequently overlooked cause of non-cardiac chest pain. J
477 Musculoskelet Pain. 2014;22(4):378-381.
478 doi:10.3109/10582452.2014.962212.
- 479 3. Simpson JK, Hawken E. Xiphodynia: A diagnostic conundrum. Chiropr
480 Osteopat. 2007;15:1-6. doi:10.1186/1746-1340-15-13.
- 481 4. Sklaroff HJ. Xiphoidynia-another cause of atypical chest pain: six case
482 reports. Mt Sinai J Med. 1979;46(6):546-548.
- 483 5. Koren W, Shahar A. Xiphodynia masking acute myocardial infarction: A
484 diagnostic Cul-de-Sac. Am J Emerg Med. 1998;16(2):177-178.
485 doi:10.1016/s0735-6757(98)90041-9.
- 486 6. Maigne JY, Vareli M, Rousset P, Cornelis P. Xiphodynia and prominence of
487 the xyphoid process. Value of xiphosternal angle measurement: Three case
488 reports. Jt Bone Spine. 2010;77(5):474-476. doi:10.1016/j.jbspin.2010.04.009.
- 489 7. Ono R, Hamano H, Yarita T. Xiphodynia. Intern Med. 2022;61(1):131.
- 490 8. Ishizuka K, Yokokawa D, Mori T, Kato T, Yamamoto D, Ikusaka M.
491 Xiphodynia. Am J Med 2021;134(3):e215-e216.
- 492 9. Eulálio Filho WMN, Barbosa DJM, de Sousa Junior EC. Xiphodynia: a rare
493 cause of epigastric pain. Internal and Emergency Medicine 2018;13:127-128.
- 494 10. Ono R, Horibata K. Xiphodynia with limited decrease in the xiphoid process-
495 sternal angle but recognised compression of the rectus abdominis. BMJ
496 Case Rep. 2024 Feb 7;17(2):e259176. doi: 10.1136/bcr-2023-259176.
- 497 11. J Keith Simpson, Erin Hawken. Xiphodynia: A diagnostic conundrum. Chiropr
498 Osteopat. 2007;15:13.
- 499 12. Y Kanda. Investigation of the freely available easy-to-use software 'EZR' for
500 medical statistics. Bone Marrow Transplantation 2013;48:452-458.
- 501 13. Torimitsu S, Nakazawa A, Flavel A, Swift L, Makino Y, Iwase H, et al.
502 Population affinity estimation using pelvic measurements based on
503 computed tomographic data acquired from Japanese and Western
504 Australian populations. Int J Legal Med. 2024 Feb 6. doi: 10.1007/s00414-
505 024-03178-3.
- 506 14. Patel K, Olson K, Peeraphatdit TB. An Unusual Case of Refractory Abdominal
507 Pain: Don't Miss the Point. Gastroenterology. 2023 May;164(6):891-892. doi:
508 10.1053/j.gastro.2021.06.028. Epub 2021 Jun 17.

- 509 15. Ismail Dal, Eyup Halit Yardimci, Zahide Doganay. Xiphodyna. Indian Journal
510 of Surgery. April 2023;85(2):436–437 [https://doi.org/10.1007/s12262-022-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12262-022-03409-0)
511 03409-0
- 512 16. Hogerzeil DP, Hartholt KA, de Vries MR. Xiphoidectomy: A Surgical
513 Intervention for an Underdocumented Disorder. Case Rep Surg.
514 2016;2016:9306262. doi: 10.1155/2016/9306262.
- 515 17. Yapici Ugurlar O, Ugurlar M, Ozel A, Erturk SM. Xiphoid syndrome: an
516 uncommon occupational disorder. Occup Med (Lond). 2014 Jan;64(1):64-6.
517 doi: 10.1093/occmed/kqt132.
- 518 18. Tsuchida T, Ishizuka K, Ohira Y. Xiphodynia Caused by a Large Xiphoid
519 Process. Cureus. 2023 Sep 1;15(9):e44516. doi: 10.7759/cureus.44516.
- 520 19. Bakens MJAM, Andel PCM, Daemen JHT, Hulsewé KWE, Vissers YLJ, de Loos
521 ER. A caseseries: xiphoidectomy for xiphodynia, a rare thoracic wall disorder.
522 J Thorac Dis. 2021 Apr;13(4):2216-2223. doi: 10.21037/jtd-20-3396.
- 523 20. Dorn P, Kuhn MA, Schweizer BA, Schmid RA, Kocher GJ. Xiphoidectomy for
524 Intractable Xiphodynia. World J Surg. 2018 Nov;42(11):3646-3650. doi:
525 10.1007/s00268-018-4668-9.
- 526 21. Akin K, Kosehan D, Topcu A, Koktener A. Anatomic evaluation of the xiphoid
527 process with 64-row multidetector computed tomography. Skeletal Radiol.
528 2011 Apr;40(4):447-52. doi: 10.1007/s00256-010-1022-1.
- 529 22. Migliore M, Signorelli M. Episodic abdominal and chest pain in a young
530 adult. JAMA. 2012 Apr 25;307(16):1746-7. doi: 10.1001/jama.2012.506.
- 531 23. LIPKIN M, FULTON LA, WOLFSON EA. The syndrome of the hypersensitive
532 xiphoid. N Engl J Med. 1955 Oct 6;253(14):591-7. doi:
533 10.1056/NEJM195510062531403.









Shape	F	FB	FBF	FBFB	FBB	S
ASRA	+	+	-	+	+	-
ASSS	+	-	-	-	+	-
TST	+	+	-	-	-	-
PXTRA	+	-	+	-	-	-
HRA	-	-	-	-	-	-

