

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

Usefulness of apparent diffusion coefficient values and magnetic resonance imaging histogram analysis for identifying histological types of preoperative testicular tumors

8

Yuka Yasuda^{1*}, Akiyoshi Osaka¹, Keita Izumi¹, Toshiyuki Iwahata¹, Akinori Nakayama¹, Kazunori Kubota², Kazutaka Saito^a

9

10

¹Department of Urology, Dokkyo Medical University Saitama Medical Center, Koshigaya, Japan

11

²Department of Radiology, Dokkyo Medical University Saitama Medical Center, Koshigaya, Japan

12

13

*Corresponding Author

14

E-mail: yukayasu@dokkyomed.ac.jp (YY)

15

16

Short title: MRI findings of testicular tumor

17

18 **Abstract**

19 This study aimed to evaluate the ability of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), including diffusion-
20 weighted imaging with apparent diffusion coefficient values, to differentiate histological types of
21 testicular tumors. Of 156 testicular tumors diagnosed at our hospital between January 2010 and July
22 2023, 65 cases with MRI were included. Tumors were categorized as seminoma, non-seminoma, and
23 malignant lymphoma. Apparent diffusion coefficient values were calculated and analyzed using the
24 ratio to normal testes and histograms according to tumor subtypes. Among the 65 cases, 46 were
25 seminomas, 14 non-seminomas, and 5 malignant lymphomas. The apparent diffusion coefficient
26 value ratio of seminomas was significantly higher than that of malignant lymphomas ($p = 0.013$).
27 Additionally, the apparent diffusion coefficient value ratio of non-seminomas was significantly
28 higher than that of seminomas and malignant lymphomas ($p = 0.0013$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively).
29 On apparent diffusion coefficient histograms, malignant lymphomas had significantly higher values
30 of kurtosis and skewness than seminomas. Normal testes and non-seminomas had significantly
31 higher kurtosis and skewness values than that of malignant lymphomas and seminomas. A scoring
32 model for seminomas and malignant lymphomas, developed with age and apparent diffusion
33 coefficient value ratios, discriminated against the probability of seminoma and malignant
34 lymphomas. MRI using apparent diffusion coefficient values and histogram analysis may aid the
35 histological typing of seminomas, non-seminomas, malignant lymphomas.

36 **Introduction**

37 Testicular tumors are heterogeneous and include various histologic subtypes, including seminoma
38 and non-seminoma. Moreover, malignant lymphoma occurs in the testis without lymph node
39 involvement [1]. While histological subtypes are determined through pathological evaluation,
40 preoperative evaluation is crucial for developing appropriate treatment plans [2]. Imaging-based
41 testicular tumor diagnosis for tumor presence and qualitative evaluation, including the tumor
42 histological subtype, are essential. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) enables detailed internal
43 anatomical and qualitative assessments and is useful in diagnostic imaging, which is widely used
44 clinically [3–7]. However, detailed studies using MRI for the differential diagnosis of testicular
45 tumor histological subtypes are lacking. Diffusion-weighted imaging (DWI) in MRI produces an
46 apparent diffusion coefficient (ADC) map via ADC values and is useful in cancer diagnosis [8–11].
47 Tumor tissues demonstrate low ADC values owing to the restriction of free extracellular water
48 molecule diffusion caused by increased cancer cell density and irregular growth [8]. Histogram
49 analysis has attracted considerable attention in recent years. However, few studies have performed
50 histogram analysis for the differential diagnosis of testicular tumors. We herein investigated the
51 usefulness of MRI for testicular tumors using ADC values and histogram analysis for each testicular
52 tumor histological subtype.

53

54 **Materials and methods**

55 **Patients**

56 This retrospective research has been approved by the Bioethics Committee of Dokkyo Medical
57 University Saitama Medical Center (approval number: 24007). The university's website has published
58 an information release regarding this study. No patients involved in the study cases requested to refuse
59 participation. The Bioethics Committee waived the requirement for informed consent due to the
60 retrospective nature of the study. The planned research period spans from March 21, 2024, to March
61 31, 2025. Data was accessed from March 21, 2024, to October 26, 2024. During data collection, the
62 authors had access to information that could identify individual participants. Of the 156 consecutive
63 testicular tumors diagnosed at our hospital between January 2010 and July 2023, MRI with DWI
64 performed before testicular resection was included in 77 cases. Among them, 69 cases were diagnosed
65 as malignant testicular tumors, of which four cases of the single testis after orchiectomy were excluded
66 to compare tumor testes and contralateral normal testes in the same patients. Cases with MRI but
67 without DWI were excluded from the study. The remaining 65 cases were included in this study and
68 classified as follows: seminomas, n = 46 cases; non-seminomas, n = 14; and malignant lymphomas, n
69 = 5.

70

71 **MRI procedures and measuring ADC values**

72 The MAGNETOM Avanto Dot Upgr 1.5T (SIEMENS, Munich, Germany), MAGNETOM Skyra
73 3.0T (SIEMENS), and Ingenia CX 3.0T (PHILIPS, Amsterdam, the Netherlands) MRI systems were
74 used in this study. DWI was performed using echo-planar imaging with a b-value of 0 s/mm² for
75 Ingenia CX and 1,000 or 1,500 s/mm² for MAGNETOM Avanto Dot Upgr and MAGNETOM
76 Skyra. As three different ADC measurement procedures were used in this study, the ADC values of
77 normal testes differed between them. To account for this difference, the ADC value ratio of tumor
78 testis to normal testis across all three procedures was calculated. Normal testes were defined as testes
79 with no abnormal findings on MRI imaging. The mean ADC values of tumor and normal testes were
80 measured by setting a region of interest (ROI) on the largest cross-section of the testis on the ADC
81 map, regardless of the presence of hemorrhage or necrotic lesions as it is difficult to distinguish them
82 from tumor tissue on MRI images. Histogram analysis was performed to measure kurtosis and
83 skewness.

84

85 **Statistical analysis**

86 Data are presented as mean ± standard deviation. Significant differences were determined using the
87 Wilcoxon test, and multiple comparisons were conducted using the Scheffe method. To distinguish
88 testicular malignant lymphomas from seminomas, the score model was performed with the age at

89 diagnosis and ADC values. It has been reported that the typical onset ages of malignant lymphoma
90 are higher—typically in the 50s and 60s, compared to those of seminomas, which commonly occur
91 in the 30s to 40s [12,13]. The total scores for seminomas and malignant lymphomas were calculated
92 by adding their ADC value ratios. An ROC analysis was performed with a cut-off value of 0.637 for
93 the ADC, with a specificity of 0.800 and a sensitivity of 0.804.

94 One point was given for ages < 30 years and > 50 years, 0 points for those aged 30–50 years of age,
95 one point for the ADC value ratio of > 0.637, and 0 points for ≥ 0.637 .

96

97 **Results**

98 **Patient background characteristics**

99 Patients' age ranges were 24–59 (median, 38.7) years for seminomas, 19–51 (median, 33.6) years for
100 non-seminomas, and 24–74 (median, 56.8) years for malignant lymphomas. The histological types
101 for non-seminomas for each case are shown in Table 1. Of 14 non-seminoma patients, three patients
102 had pure histology of embryonal carcinoma, germ cell tumor, or teratoma. The histology of the 11
103 remaining patients was mixed non-seminomas. All five testicular malignant lymphoma patients had
104 diffuse large B-cell lymphoma histology.

105

106 **Table 1. Patients' background characteristics**

	Seminoma	Non-seminoma	Malignant lymphoma
Number of cases	46	14	5
Age (years)	24–59 (38.7)	19–51 (33.6)	24–74 (56.8)
T1WI	↓	↓	↓
T2WI	↓	↑+↓	↓
DWI	↑	↑+↓	↑
ADC	↓	↑+↓	↓
ADC values ratio	0.745±0.132	1.197±0.430	0.531±0.119
Tumor size (mm ²)	1133±973	1705±1605	1557±962

107 Data is presented as range (mean).

108 High signal: ↑, low signal: ↓

109

110 **Testicular MRI findings**

111 Normal testes showed low signal intensity on T1-weighted imaging (T1WI) and had high ADC

112 values on MRI. In contrast, seminomas and malignant lymphomas showed high signal intensity on

113 T2-weighted imaging (T2WI) and DWI (Fig 1 and 2). Non-seminomas often contained multiple

114 tissues and did not show a single signal intensity (Fig 3). However, seminomas and malignant

115 lymphomas had similar signal intensities, making it difficult to distinguish them using T2WI or DWI

116 (Fig1 and 2).

117

118 **Fig 1. Representative findings of seminoma.** T1W1 (a), T2W1 (b), DWI (c), and ADC map (d).

119 The ROI surrounded the entire tumor on the ADC map (e). Histogram of ADC value (f).

120 The histogram of the seminoma showed high kurtosis and skewness values of 15.318 and 3.21,
121 respectively.

122 It showed the distribution with peaked and heavy fringes compared with the normal distribution, and
123 the mean ADC values were skewed toward the lower end of the distribution.

124

125 **Fig 2. Representative findings of malignant lymphoma.** T1W1(a), T2W1(b), DWI (c), and ADC

126 map (d).

127 The ROI surrounded the entire tumor on the ADC map (e). Histogram of the ADC value (f).

128 It had a shape with peaked peaks and heavy fringes compared with the normal distribution.

129 Furthermore, the overall distribution of ADC values was skewed toward lower values compared with
130 that of seminoma.

131

132 **Fig 3. Representative findings of non-seminoma.** T1W1(a), T2W1(b), DWI (c), and ADC map (d).

133 The ROI surrounded the entire tumor region on the ADC map (e). Histogram of the ADC value (f).

134 The histogram of the non-seminoma showed low kurtosis and skewness values of 2.632 and 0.464,
135 respectively.

136 It showed a heavy hem, the distribution was symmetrically close, and the mean ADC values showed
137 a broad distribution.

138

139 **ADC value ratio**

140 The ADC value ratio was 0.745 ± 0.132 , 1.197 ± 0.430 , and 0.531 ± 0.119 for seminomas, non-
141 seminomas, and malignant lymphomas, respectively (Table 1). The ADC value ratio of seminomas
142 was significantly higher than those of malignant lymphomas ($p = 0.013$), and the ADC value ratios
143 of non-seminomas were significantly higher than those of seminomas and malignant lymphomas ($p =$
144 0.0013 and $p < 0.001$, respectively) (Fig 4).

145

146 **Fig 4. Distributions of the ADC value ratio.**

147

148 **The ADC histogram: kurtosis and skewness**

149 From the ADC histograms, kurtosis and skewness were measured. Kurtosis indicates the sharpness
150 or heaviness of a data distribution base, and its value is high when the data are concentrated around
151 the mean. Skewness indicates the degree of distribution asymmetry and is high when the ADC value
152 is skewed toward the lower side [8]. The kurtosis and skewness of normal and each tumor testis were
153 compared, although the shooting conditions are different. Seminomas and malignant lymphomas had

154 significantly higher kurtosis values (8.55 ± 5.76 and 18.11 ± 5.22 , respectively) compared with
155 normal testes (6.20 ± 5.02 , $p = 0.0267$ and $p = 0.0044$, respectively) and non-seminoma (4.92 ± 3.85 ,
156 $p = 0.012$ and $p = 0.0022$, respectively). Malignant lymphomas had significantly higher kurtosis
157 values than those of seminomas ($p = 0.0123$). No differences were observed between normal testes
158 and non-seminomas ($p = 0.3201$). Seminomas and malignant lymphomas had significantly higher
159 skewness values (1.77 ± 1.00 and 3.12 ± 0.28 , respectively) compared with normal testes ($0.50 \pm$
160 1.24 , $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.001$, respectively) and non-seminomas (0.52 ± 1.17 , $p = 0.0016$ and $p <$
161 0.001 , respectively). Malignant lymphomas had higher skewness than that of seminomas ($p < 0.001$).
162 No differences were observed between normal testes and non-seminomas ($p = 0.8907$) (Fig 5a–c).

163

164 **Fig 5.** Skewness (a) and kurtosis (b) of the ADC value histogram. Correlation graph of skewness and
165 kurtosis of the ADC value histogram (c).

166

167 **Scoring of seminomas and malignant lymphomas**

168 Using the scoring model with ADC value ratio and age, 34 (73.9%), 10 (21.7%), and two (4.3%)
169 patients with seminoma scored 0, 1, and 2 points, respectively (Figure 6a). In contrast, zero (0%),
170 two (40%) and three (60%) patients with malignant lymphoma scored 0, 1, and 2, respectively

171 (Figure 6b). In this scoring model, patients with scores of 0 and 1 have a high probability of
172 seminoma, whereas those with a score of ≥ 2 have a high probability of malignant seminoma.

173

174 **Fig 6.** Probability of seminoma (a) and malignant lymphoma (b) according to the score.

175

176 **Discussion**

177 This study indicated that MRI with ADC values and histograms are useful for characterizing
178 testicular tumor subtypes. To our knowledge, this study is the first to demonstrate the significance of
179 ADC values with histogram analysis in testicular tumor histological typing. MRI provides detailed
180 internal anatomical and qualitative evaluations. Moreover, DWI presents biological tissue properties
181 using the water molecules diffusion phenomenon and ADC values as parameters to evaluate the
182 diffusion limit in vivo quantitatively [8–11]. It reflects tumor cell density, and its usefulness has been
183 reported at various tumor sites [12,13]. We investigated the significance of ADC values in the
184 histological typing of testicular tumor using the ADC value ratio of tumor testis to normal testis
185 because three different procedures were used in ADC measurement during the study period. The
186 current results demonstrate that seminomas and malignant lymphomas had lower ADC values than
187 normal testes, and malignant lymphomas had even lower ADC value ratios than seminomas. Non-
188 seminomas display a wide distribution of ADC value ratios because they often contain various

189 histological types, and the ADC value ratios of each tissue type are different, as expected. Histogram
190 analysis has attracted considerable attention in recent years. Moreover, ADC enables detailed tumor
191 heterogeneity and cell density evaluation and aids histological diagnosis [14–19]. The statistical
192 indices representing the distribution characteristics were kurtosis and skewness. In the ADC
193 histogram analysis, kurtosis and skewness were high in seminomas and malignant lymphomas. The
194 specific ADC values of seminomas and malignant lymphomas were prominent, and kurtosis was
195 high, which could reflect cellular uniformity, unlike non-seminomas. Moreover, compared with
196 normal testes, seminomas and malignant lymphomas showed low ADC values, which may have
197 resulted in high skewness. Kurtosis and skewness were low in non-seminomas. Non-seminomas
198 often contain various histological types, and their ADC values are widely and gently distributed,
199 suggesting that they tend to have lower kurtosis and skewness than other malignant tumors.

200 Testicular tumors include various subtypes categorized into seminomas or non-seminomas.
201 Furthermore, malignant lymphomas are found as testicular tumors [20]. Although the diagnosis is
202 made pathologically after the testis is resected, preoperative evaluation could be essential and
203 beneficial in developing the treatment plan earlier [2]. Non-seminomas often contain multiple
204 histological types, including embryonal carcinomas, yolk sac tumors, choriocarcinomas, and
205 teratomas, and it can be challenging to distinguish non-seminomas from seminomas or malignant
206 lymphomas with a mixture of high and low signal areas on testicular MRI images [21]. On the

207 histograms, kurtosis and skewness of normal testes and non-seminomas were lower than those of
208 seminomas and malignant lymphomas, as expected. Although it is outside the scope of this study, a
209 detailed analysis of each histological type would be warranted in the future. Preoperative differential
210 diagnosis between seminoma and testicular malignant lymphoma is often complex. The current
211 results demonstrate the distinct characteristics of these based on DWI findings. Noting that the ADC
212 value ratio of seminomas and malignant lymphomas are lower than those of non-seminomas, we
213 attempted to score them using age and ADC value ratio to simply distinguish them. Among patients
214 with seminoma, 73.9% had the highest score (0 points) for the possibility of seminoma. Among the
215 malignant lymphoma cases, 60% had the highest score (2 points) for the possibility of malignant
216 lymphoma. Since all types included a case with a score of 1, it is considered necessary to study a
217 larger sample size, especially for malignant lymphoma, and to reexamine the ADC ratio value,
218 including its setting value. We confirmed significant differences among histological types by
219 measuring the ADC value ratio, analyzing ADC histograms, and scoring seminomas and malignant
220 lymphomas based on age and ADC value ratio. These values can be used as an indicator for MRI
221 diagnosis in cases like ours, where the histological type is challenging to determine. Furthermore, the
222 detailed understanding of imaging findings may further elucidate testicular tumor biology.

223 This study had some limitations. The number of patients in this study was small—46 had
224 seminomas, 14 had non-seminomas, and five had malignant lymphomas. The small number of cases

225 may have caused bias or variation in the ADC value ratio. Testicular tumors have an incidence rate
226 of 3–10 per 100,000 men [22]. It is not easy to collect enough cases to perform an adequate analysis.
227 Furthermore, the ROI setting was performed only by the author in this study. Although the
228 measurements were taken at the largest section of the tumor to avoid errors, it is thought that the
229 accuracy of the results will increase if ROIs are set at multiple locations or measurements are taken
230 by multiple persons. The accuracy of the chi-square test for scoring seminomas and malignant
231 lymphomas would also be improved by increasing the number of cases.

232

233 **Conclusion**

234 The ADC value ratio of seminomas was significantly higher than that of malignant lymphomas.
235 Additionally, the ADC value ratio of non-seminomas was significantly higher than that of
236 seminomas and malignant lymphomas. On apparent diffusion coefficient histograms, malignant
237 lymphomas had significantly higher values of kurtosis and skewness than that of seminomas. Normal
238 testes and non-seminomas had significantly higher kurtosis and skewness values than those of
239 malignant lymphomas and seminomas. In conclusion, ADC value ratio and MRI-based ADC
240 histogram analysis are useful for distinguishing between seminomas, non-seminomas, and malignant
241 lymphomas.

242

243 **Acknowledgment**

244 None.

245

246 **References**

- 247 1. Fonseca R, Habermann TM, Colgan JP, O'Neill BP, White WL, Witzig TE, et al. Testicular
248 lymphoma is associated with a high incidence of extranodal recurrence. *Cancer*. 2000;88: 154-
249 161. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1097-0142(20000101)88:1<154::aid-cnrcr21>3.0.co;2-t.
- 250 2. Tsili AC, Tsampoulas C, Giannakopoulos X, Stefanou D, Alamanos Y, Sofikitis N, et al. MRI in
251 the histologic characterization of testicular neoplasms. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;189: W331-
252 W337. doi: 10.2214/AJR.07.2267.
- 253 3. Tanimoto A, Nakashima J, Kohno H, Shinmoto H, Kuribayashi S. Prostate cancer screening: the
254 clinical value of diffusion-weighted imaging and dynamic MR imaging in combination with T2-
255 weighted imaging. *J Magn Reson Imaging*. 2007;25: 146-152. doi: 10.1002/jmri.20793.
- 256 4. Lim HK, Kim JK, Kim KA, Cho KS. Prostate cancer: apparent diffusion coefficient map with
257 T2-weighted images for detection-a multireader study. *Radiology*. 2009;250: 145-151. doi:
258 10.1148/radiol.2501080207.


- 259 5. Fütterer JJ, Heijmink SW, Scheenen TW, Veltman J, Huisman HJ, Vos P, et al. Prostate cancer
260 localization with dynamic contrast-enhanced MR imaging and proton MR spectroscopic imaging.
261 Radiology. 2006;241: 449-458. doi: 10.1148/radiol.2412051866.
- 262 6. Kitajima K, Kaji Y, Fukabori Y, Yoshida K, Suganuma N, Sugimura K. Prostate cancer detection
263 with 3 T MRI: comparison of diffusion-weighted imaging and dynamic contrast-enhanced MRI
264 in combination with T2-weighted imaging. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2010;31: 625-631. doi:
265 10.1002/jmri.22075.
- 266 7. Kim CK, Park BK, Lee HM. Prediction of locally recurrent prostate cancer after radiation
267 therapy: incremental value of 3T diffusion-weighted MRI. J Magn Reson Imaging. 2009;29: 391-
268 397. doi: 10.1002/jmri.21645.
- 269 8. Kunimatsu N, Kunimatsu A, Miura K, Mori I, Nawano S. Differentiation between solitary
270 fibrous tumors and schwannomas of the head and neck: an apparent diffusion coefficient
271 histogram analysis. Dentomaxillofac Radiol. 2019;48: 20180298. doi: 10.1259/dmfr.20180298.
- 272 9. Sun YS, Cui Y, Tang L, Qi LP, Wang N, Zhang XY, et al. Early evaluation of cancer response
273 by a new functional biomarker: apparent diffusion coefficient. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 2011;197:
274 W23-W29. doi: 10.2214/AJR.10.4912.

- 275 10. Lambregts DM, Beets GL, Maas M, Curvo-Semedo L, Kessels AGH, Thywissen T, et al.
276 Tumour ADC measurements in rectal cancer: effect of ROI methods on ADC values and
277 interobserver variability. *Eur Radiol.* 2011;21: 2567-2574. doi: 10.1007/s00330-011-2220-5.
- 278 11. Woo S, Cho JY, Kim SY, Kim SH. Histogram analysis of apparent diffusion coefficient map of
279 diffusion-weighted MRI in endometrial cancer: a preliminary correlation study with histological
280 grade. *Acta Radiol.* 2014;55: 1270-1277. doi: 10.1177/0284185113514967.
- 281 12. Gibbs P, Liney GP, Pickles MD, Zelhof B, Rodrigues G, Turnbull LW. Correlation of ADC and
282 T2 measurements with cell density in prostate cancer at 3.0 Tesla. *Invest Radiol.* 2009;44: 572-
283 576. doi: 10.1097/RLI.0b013e3181b4c10e.
- 284 13. Bakir VL, Bakir B, Sanli S, Yildiz SO, Iyibozkurt AC, Kartal MG, et al. Role of diffusion-
285 weighted MRI in the differential diagnosis of endometrioid and non-endometrioid cancer of the
286 uterus. *Acta Radiol.* 2017;58: 758-767. doi: 10.1177/0284185116669873.
- 287 14. Mimura R, Kato F, Tha KK, Kudo K, Konno Y, Oyama-Manabe N, et al. Comparison between
288 borderline ovarian tumors and carcinomas using semi-automated histogram analysis of diffusion-
289 weighted imaging: focusing on solid components. *Jpn J Radiol.* 2016;34: 229-237. doi:
290 10.1007/s11604-016-0518-6.


- 291 15. Kim YJ, Kim SH, Lee AW, Jin MS, Kang BJ, Song BJ. Histogram analysis of apparent diffusion
292 coefficients after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer. *Jpn J Radiol.* 2016;34: 657-666.
293 doi: 10.1007/s11604-016-0570-2.
- 294 16. Schob S, Meyer HJ, Pazaitis N, Schramm D, Bremicker K, Exner M, et al. ADC histogram
295 analysis of cervical cancer Aids detecting lymphatic metastases-a preliminary study. *Mol*
296 *Imaging Biol.* 2017;19: 953-962. doi: 10.1007/s11307-017-1073-y.
- 297 17. Kurokawa R, Baba A, Kurokawa M, Capizzano A, Hassan O, Johnson T, et al. Pretreatment
298 ADC histogram analysis as a prognostic imaging biomarker for patients with recurrent
299 glioblastoma treated with bevacizumab: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *AJNR Am J*
300 *Neuroradiol.* 2022;43: 202-206. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A7406.
- 301 18. Umanodan T, Fukukura Y, Kumagae Y, Shindo T, Nakajo M, Takumi K, et al. ADC histogram
302 analysis for adrenal tumor histogram analysis of apparent diffusion coefficient in differentiating
303 adrenal adenoma from pheochromocytoma. *J Magn Reson Imaging.* 2017;45: 1195-1203. doi:
304 10.1002/jmri.25452.
- 305 19. Pope WB, Mirsadraei L, Lai A, Eskin A, Qiao J, Kim HJ, et al. Differential gene expression in
306 glioblastoma defined by ADC histogram analysis: relationship to extracellular matrix molecules
307 and survival. *AJNR Am J Neuroradiol.* 2012;33: 1059-1064. doi: 10.3174/ajnr.A2917.

- 308 20. Vitolo U, Ferreri AJ, Zucca E. Primary testicular lymphoma. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol*. 2008;65:
309 183-189. doi: 10.1016/j.critrevonc.2007.08.005.
- 310 21. Sharbidre KG, Lockhart ME. Imaging of scrotal masses. *Abdom Radiol (NY)*. 2020;45: 2087-
311 2108. doi: 10.1007/s00261-019-02395-4.
- 312 22. Akyüz M, Topaktaş R, Ürkmez A, Koca O, Öztürk Mİ. Evaluation of germ-cell neoplasia in situ
313 entity in testicular tumors. *Turk J Urol*. 2019;45: 418-422. doi: 10.5152/tud.2018.48855.

a



Figure



Figure

C



Figure

d




Figure

e


ROI

A grayscale medical scan, likely a brain MRI, showing a central region of interest (ROI) outlined in green. The ROI is a dark, irregularly shaped area. The surrounding tissue is lighter and more textured. The letter 'e' is in the top left, and 'ROI' is in the bottom left.

Figure




Figure




Figure

a



Figure

b



Figure

C




Figure


d



Figure




Figure



Figure

ADC value ratio

□ Seminoma(n=46) ▨ non-Seminoma(n=14) ▩ Malignant lymphoma(n=5)




Figure

a

Kurtosis

- Normal testis (n=65) Seminoma(n=46)
non-Seminoma(n=14) Malignant lymphoma(n=5)




Figure

Skewness


b

- Normal testis (n=65) Seminoma(n=46)
non-Seminoma(n=14) Malignant lymphoma(n=5)



Figure


Kurtosis and Skewness



Figure

a


Seminoma



Figure

b


Malignant Lymphoma



Figure




Figure



Figure

C

Figure



Figure

e

ROI

A grayscale medical scan, likely an MRI, showing a central dark region. This region is outlined with a thin green line, indicating it is a Region of Interest (ROI). The surrounding tissue is shown in various shades of gray, with some brighter areas at the top. The letter 'e' is in the top left, and 'ROI' is in the bottom left.

Figure