Table C-18a. Reported data: MRI versus ERUS for rectal staging N

| **Study,**  **N Patients,**  **Author’s Conclusion** | **Outcomes** | **MRI**  **Reported N Stage Data** | **ERUS**  **Reported N Stage Data** | **Stage by Pathology** | **MRI Stage** | **ERUS versus Pathological Stage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yimei et al. 201293  69 MRI, 60 ERUS  Conclusion: **ERUS is better for early stage, but MRI is better for locally advanced** | Accuracy | 76.8% | 70.0% | pN0 | N0: 31  N1+2: 4 | N0: 31  N1+2: 9 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Sensitivity | 64.7% | 55.0% | pN1+2 | N0: 12  N1+2: 22 | N0: 9  N1+2: 11 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Specificity | 88.6% | 77.5% |
| Halefoglu et al. 2008228  34 patients  Conclusion: **MRI is as good as ERUS** | Accuracy | 74.50% | 76.47% | pN0 | N0: 8  N1: 11  N2:0 | N0:7  N1: 12  N2: 0 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Sensitivity | 61.76% | 52.94% | pN1 | N0:1  N1: 8  N2: 0 | N0: 2  N1: 7  N2: 0 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Specificity | 80.88% | 84.31% | pN2 | N0: 1  N1: 0  N2: 5 | N0: 2  N1: 0  N2:4 |
| Starck et al. 199596  35 MRI; 34 of these also had ERUS  Conclusion: **Neither was reliable for N stage** | Accuracy | 72% | 71% | pN0 | N0: 14  N1+2: 4 | N0: 13  N1+2: 4 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Sensitivity | 64.3% | 64.3% | pN1+2 | N0: 5  N1+2: 9 | N0: 5  N1+2: 9 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Specificity | 77.8% | 76.5% |
| Thaler et al. 199497  25 patients  Conclusion: **Neither was reliable for Nstage** | Accuracy | 60.0% | 80.0% | pN0 | N0: 10  N1+2: 1 | N0: 11  N1+2: 0 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Sensitivity | 35.7% | 64.3% | pN1+2 | N0: 9  N1+2: 5 | N0: 5  N1+2: 9 |
| N0 vs. N1/2  Specificity | 90.9% | 100.0% |

CI=Confidence interval; ERUS=endorectal ultrasound; MRI=magnetic resonance imaging; N=nodal stage; pN=pathologic nodal stage; pT=pathologic tumor stage; T=tumor stage.