1		
4	Ļ	

2	
3	Usefulness of apparent diffusion coefficient values and
4	magnetic resonance imaging histogram analysis for identifying
5	histological types of preoperative testicular tumors
6	
7	Yuka Yasuda ¹ *, Akiyoshi Osaka ¹ , Keita Izumi ¹ , Toshiyuki Iwahata ¹ , Akinori Nakayama ¹ , Kazunori
8	Kubota ² , Kazutaka Saito ^a
9	
10	¹ Department of Urology, Dokkyo Medical University Saitama Medical Center, Koshigaya, Japan
11	² Department 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	

2

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.

3

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.

4

54 Materials and methods

55 **Patients**

This retrospective research has been approved by the Bioethics Committee of Dokkyo Medical 56 57 University Saitama Medical Center (approval number: 24007). The university's website has published an information release regarding this study. No patients involved in the study cases requested to refuse 58 59 participation. The Bioethics Committee waived the requirement for informed consent due to the retrospective nature of the study. The planned research period spans from March 21, 2024, to March 60 31, 2025. Data was accessed from March 21, 2024, to October 26, 2024. During data collection, the 61 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 performed before testicular resection was included in 77 cases. Among them, 69 cases were diagnosed 64 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 classified as follows: seminomas, n = 46 cases; non-seminomas, n = 14; and malignant lymphomas, n 68

69 = 5.

5

MRI procedures and measuring ADC values 71

- 72 The MAGNETOM Avanto Dot Upgr 1.5T (SIEMENS, Munich, Germany), MAGNETOM Skyra
- 3.0T (SIEMENS), and Ingenia CX 3.0T (PHILIPS, Amsterdam, the Netherlands) MRI systems were 73
- 74 used in this study. DWI was performed using echo-planar imaging with a b-value of 0 s/mm² for
- Ingenia CX and 1,000 or 1,500 s/mm² for MAGNETOM Avanto Dot Upgr and MAGNETOM 75
- 76 Skyra. As three different ADC measurement procedures were used in this study, the ADC values of
- normal testes differed between them. To account for this difference, the ADC value ratio of tumor 77
- 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
- map, regardless of the presence of hemorrhage or necrotic lesions as it is difficult to distinguish them 81
- 82 from tumor tissue on MRI images. Histogram analysis was performed to measure kurtosis and
- 83 skewness.
- 84

Statistical analysis 85

Data are presented as mean \pm standard deviation. Significant differences were determined using the 86 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

	1	-	
1	ļ	`	
1	ι	J	
		7	

89	diagnosis and ADC	values. It has	been reported	that the typical	onset ages	of malignant lymph	noma
----	-------------------	----------------	---------------	------------------	------------	--------------------	------

- 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
- the ADC, with a specificity of 0.800 and a sensitivity of 0.804.
- One point was given for ages < 30 years and > 50 years, 0 points for those aged 30–50 years of age,
- one point for the ADC value ratio of > 0.637, and 0 points for \ge 0.637.

96

97 **Results**

98 Patient background characteristics

Patients' age ranges were 24–59 (median, 38.7) years for seminomas, 19–51 (median, 33.6) years for non-seminomas, and 24–74 (median, 56.8) years for malignant lymphomas. The histological types for non-seminomas for each case are shown in Table 1. Of 14 non-seminoma patients, three patients had pure histology of embryonal carcinoma, germ cell tumor, or teratoma. The histology of the 11 remaining patients was mixed non-seminomas. All five testicular malignant lymphoma patients had 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	\downarrow	Ļ	\downarrow
T2WI	\downarrow	$\uparrow + \downarrow$	↓
DWI	1	$\uparrow + \downarrow$	1
ADC	Ļ	$\uparrow + \downarrow$	\downarrow
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: \uparrow , low signal: \downarrow

109

110 **Testicular MRI findings**

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

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

1	C	1)
4	٢	1	١
5	L,	,	

118	Fig 1. Representative findings of seminon	a. 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.
- Furthermore, the overall distribution of ADC values was skewed toward lower values compared withthat 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.

9

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-
- 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**

From the ADC histograms, kurtosis and skewness were measured. Kurtosis indicates the sharpness or heaviness of a data distribution base, and its value is high when the data are concentrated around the mean. Skewness indicates the degree of distribution asymmetry and is high when the ADC value is skewed toward the lower side [8]. The kurtosis and skewness of normal and each tumor testis were 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 \pm 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%)

patients with seminoma scored 0, 1, and 2 points, respectively (Figure 6a). In contrast, zero (0%),

two (40%) and three (60%) patients with malignant lymphoma scored 0, 1, and 2, respectively

11

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 testicular tumor subtypes. To our knowledge, this study is the first to demonstrate the significance of 178 179 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 reported at various tumor sites [12,13]. We investigated the significance of ADC values in the 183 histological typing of testicular tumor using the ADC value ratio of tumor testis to normal testis 184 185 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 normal testes, and malignant lymphomas had even lower ADC value ratios than seminomas. Non-187 188 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

14

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.

- 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
- 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
- lymphomas.

15

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-cncr21>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.

- 8. Kunimatsu N, Kunimatsu A, Miura K, Mori I, Nawano S. Differentiation between solitary
- fibrous tumors and schwannomas of the head and neck: an apparent diffusion coefficient
- histogram analysis. Dentomaxillofac Radiol. 2019;48: 20180298. doi: 10.1259/dmfr.20180298.
- 9. Sun YS, Cui Y, Tang L, Qi LP, Wang N, Zhang XY, et al. Early evaluation of cancer response
- 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, Cur	vo-Semedo L,	Kessels AGH,	Thywissen T, et	al.
-----	------------------	-------------	-------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------	-----

- 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
- 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
- T2 measurements with cell density in prostate cancer at 3.0 Tesla. Invest Radiol. 2009;44: 572-
- 283 576. doi: 10.1097/RLI.0b013e3181b4c10e.
- 13. Bakir VL, Bakir B, Sanli S, Yildiz SO, Iyibozkurt AC, Kartal MG, et al. Role of diffusion-
- 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
- borderline ovarian tumors and carcinomas using semi-automated histogram analysis of diffusion-
- weighted imaging: focusing on solid components. Jpn J Radiol. 2016;34: 229-237. doi:
- 290 10.1007/s11604-016-0518-6.

1	8
	-

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.









e

ROI













e

Figure

R

N



ADC value ratio

🖸 Seminoma(n=46) 📓 non-Seminoma(n=14) 🕟 Malignant lymphoma(n=5)







Kurtosis and Skewness















