ISSN 2515-8260

Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020

Non-invasive Techniques for Detection of Oral Potentially Malignant Disorders (OPMDs) - Detect Early to Treat Early- A Review

S Swathi¹, Swetha P², Ravikanth Manyam³

¹Post graduate, Department of Oral Pathology, Vishnu Dental College. ²Professor, Department of Oral Pathology, Vishnu Dental College (Corresponding Author) ³Professor & HOD, Department of Oral Pathology, Vishnu Dental College

Abstract:

Oral potentially malignant disorders (OPMDs), the group of conditions with the risk of malignancy being present in a lesion or condition either at the time of early diagnosis or future date. Oral carcinoma is a major global, health care issue with high morbidity and mortality rates to date. Leukoplakia, Erythroplakia, Palatal lesion associated with reverse smoking, Oral Lichen Planus, Oral Sub Mucous Fibrosis, Actinic Keratosis, Discoid Lupus Erythematosus are other OPMDs. The aetiology varies from exogenous factors such as tobacco and various autoimmune disorders or inherited genetic aberrations. Early detection of the lesion is essential to prevent malignant transformation, and also to improve the chances of the patient's survival. Though tissue biopsy and histological assessment is the gold standard diagnosis for OPMDs, in recent years, demand for non - invasive adjunctive diagnostic techniques are increasing for early detection. With this in view, the early diagnostic methods were divided into 3 main categories such as vital Staining, light-based detection systems, and optical diagnostic technologies. Among the recent developments in optical imaging systems, the tissue autofluorescence, optical coherence tomography have been proved to be considerably efficient. These techniques have proven valuable for screening and monitoring OPMDs. Awareness should be created in public in employing screening methods that are non-invasive, robust and economic thereby it would enhance early detection of oral cancer which gives a positive impact on patient's survival. This review explains the sensitivity, specificity and limitations as well as their advantages, disadvantages and clinical applications of these techniques and to identify which one is better advisable and adaptable for all population groups. Keywords: Oral potentially malignant disorders, Sensitivity, Specificity, Vital Staining, Light-based detection, Optical based detection systems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Despite advances in cancer therapies, oral malignancies have high mortality and morbidity rates due to varied reasons. Oral potentially malignant disorders (OPMDs) are a group of conditions, which include leukoplakia, erythroplakia, oral lichen planus, oral submucous fibrosis, palatal lesions associated with reverse smoking, actinic keratosis, and discoid lupus erythematosus. OPMDs occur due to exogenous factors like tobacco, autoimmune disorders or inherited genetic aberrations are prone to increased risk for malignant transformation to oral cancer with a low survival rate for not being diagnosed at early stages [1],[2]. Oral Squamous cell Carcinoma (OSCC) is one such OPMD with a challenging note to diagnose at an early stage accounting with an overall 5 year survival rate since decades. Regardless of standard scalpel biopsies with the histopathological examination, these are invasive and incompliant with a high degree of intra and inter-observer variability. Hence new non-invasive adjunctive diagnostic techniques like vital Staining, light-based detection systems, and optical imaging systems like tissue autofluorescence imaging, optical coherence tomography have been proven efficient and becoming popular for screening and monitoring OPMDs[3]. This review gives an overview of promising new commercially available non-invasive adjunctive diagnostic techniques early detection and diagnosis of OPMDs. Vital Staining is an efficient chair-side diagnostic technique helps in identifying the clinically non-apparent lesions with a focus on cells with high

ISSN 2515-8260 Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020 reproductive rate, thereby indicating the most suitable area for biopsy used in staining tissues and cells with a range of pigments (table I). Although this method is easy to use, it is not conclusive and commonly used as an adjunctive diagnostic tool [4]. Light-based detection systems hand-held diagnostic technique using special light sources to detect the abnormal metabolic and structural changes occurring in mucosal

diagnostic systems offer better advantages based on biochemical changes rather than tissues with different absorbance & reflectance properties [11] (table II) Optical based visual or microscopic changes in cellular tissue morphology with quantitative information that can be rapidly analyzed to yield a diagnosis, even in the hands of a non-expert [15] (table III).

Nowadays, advanced research using salivary biomarkers were exploring. Salivary mRNA's and Interleukin 6 are most widely used in differentiating OSCC with epithelial dysplasia[19], [20]. Patients with OPMDs are often encountered in clinical settings. The challenge of the clinician lies in detecting the oral mucosal abnormality with malignant potential at the earliest stage to improve the productive longevity of the individuals. Early detection is necessary before it progresses into cancer and also for disease management. Early detection is the best way of improving the quality of life & survival rates for oral cancer patients worldwide. Presently, there is no widely accepted technique for the application of non-invasive methods in the detection and diagnosis of OPMDs. More research studies on large no of subjects are needed using these non-invasive detection techniques due to its limited evidence. Long term follows up also helps in understanding the efficacy of these detection techniques.

ISSN 2515-8260

Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020

1208

| Stains | Principle | Sensitivity | Specificity | Advantages | Limitations | Interpretation |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Toluidine | High | 38-100% | 9-100% | Sensitive, | Lack of | Adjunctive aid for |
| blue | affinity for | | | chair-side, | sufficient | dental care |
| | acidic | | | rapid, Low | randomized | providers in |
| | compounds | | | cost | control trials | clinical |
| | , stains the | | | | evidence and | assessment of |
| | cells or | | | Disadvantages | long-term | OPMDs and |
| | tissues blue | | | High false- | prospective | selection of the |
| | with | | | positive rates | data can further | biopsy site. Positive - Lesions |
| | greater nucleic | | | | improve our | with dark blue |
| | acid | | | | understanding. | color |
| | content [5] | | | | understanding. | Negative - lightly |
| | | | | | | or faintly stained |
| | | | | | | areas |
| Methylene | Stains | 90-91.4% | 66.6-69% | Sensitive, | False positive | To screen oral |
| blue | tissue with | | | chair-side, | rates reported | malignancy in |
| | large | | | rapid, Low | due to the | high-risk cases. |
| | quantities | | | cost | retention of | |
| | of nucleic | | | | stain in | |
| | acids | | | Disadvantages | traumatic and | |
| | | | | High false- | inflamed | |
| | T 11 | 00.100% | 70 7 | positive rates | areas [6] | |
| Rose | Tetrachlor | 90-100% | 73.7- 89.09% | Sensitive, | Very few | To diagnose ocular |
| bengal | o and tetraiodo | | 89.09% | chair-side, rapid, Low | studies have been | surface disorders, detection of |
| | derivative | | | cost | conducted so | OPMDs and oral |
| | of | | | COSt | far to assess | cancer. |
| | fluorescei | | | Disadvantages | the efficacy | |
| | n [7] | | | High false- | of this | |
| | | | | positive rates | method in | |
| | | | | 1 | detecting oral | |
| | | | | | PMDs | |
| Lugol's | Reaction | 87.5-94.7% | 83.8- | Sensitive, | Gingiva and | Adjunctive aid in |
| iodine | of iodine | | 84.2% | chair-side, | hard palate | selection of biopsy |
| | with | | | rapid, Low | have high | site and clinical |
| | glycogen | | | cost | keratinization | assessment of |
| | present | | | D'andaran ta ana | and lack of | OPMDs. Normal |
| | within the cytoplasm | | | Disadvantages High false- | glycogen, stain can't be | mucosa - Mahogany or |
| | , which is | | | positive rates | localized [8] | brown due to its |
| | visualized | | | Positive rates | | high glycogen. |
| | by color | | | | | No stain/Pale - |
| | change | | | | | Dysplastic lesions |
| | | | | | | when compared |
| | | | | | | with the |
| | | | | | | surrounding tissue. |

ISSN 2515-8260

Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020

1209

Table I: Vital StainingTable II: Light-based detection systems

| Light based | Principle | Sensitivity | Specificity | Advantages | Limitations | Interpretation |
|--------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Chemi- | Produce | ViziLite: | ViziLite: | Effective | Fails to | Presence of an |
| luminescence | bluish-white | 77-100% | 0- | chair-side, | detect oral | "ace to white" |
| | light with a | ViziLite | 84.6%(11) | Rapid, high | red patches. | lesion after a one- |
| | wave length | Plus(ViziLi | ViziLite | sensitivity in | | minute rinse with |
| | of 430- | te& | Plus: | diagnosing | | 1% acetic acid |
| | 580nm, | toluidine | 27.8% | OPMD's and | | solution is |
| | absorbed by | blue): | Microlux/ | Oral cancer. | | considered as |
| | normal cells | 77.3%, | DL: 70.7 – | | | positive(11). |
| | and reflected | Microlux/ | 99.6% | Disadvantages | | |
| | by abnormal | DL: 77.8 – | | Low | | |
| | cells that have | 94.3% | | specificity | | |
| | a higher | | | | | |
| | nuclear- | | | | | |
| | cytoplasmic | | | | | |
| | ratio(12). | | | | | |
| Velscope | Hand held | 30–100% | 15-100% | Rapid, | Insufficient | Normal cells |
| | device, aids in | | | chair-side & | evidence that | exhibit pale green |
| | visualization | | | easy to operate | it can | fluorescence |
| | of oral | | | | distinguish | whereas abnormal |
| | mucosal | | | Disadvantages | between | cells appear dark |
| | changes by | | | Moderate | dysplastic/ | due to loss of auto f_{1} |
| | activating tissue | | | false-positive | cancerous | fluorescence(13). |
| | Auto- | | | rates. | tissue from inflammatory | |
| | fluorescence. | | | | oral lesion; | |
| | nuorescence. | | | | frequent false | |
| | | | | | positive | |
| | | | | | results. | |
| Photodynami | Based on the | | | Real-time & | Low | Tissues exhibiting |
| c diagnosis | fluorescence | | | cost-effective | specificity – | fluores-cence are |
| • angliosis | generated by | | | | 50–99%,(14) | considered to |
| | administration | | | Disadvantages | | possess malignant |
| | of an | | | Strict patient | required for | |
| | exogenous | | | management, | the test. | 1 |
| | photo- | | | high false- | | |
| | activated | | | positive rates. | | |
| | compound | | | - | | |
| | that | | | | | |
| | accumulates | | | | | |
| | in cells with | | | | | |
| | malignant | | | | | |
| | potential, | | | | | |

ISSN 2515-8260

Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020

| 1 | 2 | 1 | ი |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | T | υ |

| 12 | 10 | |
|----|----|--|

| n | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | | |

| _ | | 1210 | | |
|---|--|------|--|--|
| | followed by appropriate photo- irradiation. | | | |
| | appropriate | | | |
| | photo- | | | |
| | irradiation. | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Optical | Principle | Sensitivity | Specificity | Advantages | Limitations | Interpretation |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|
| based | &procedure | | | | | |
| Optical | Uses "L" shape | 62-85% | 51-81% | High | Only small | Produces |
| Coherence | probe upto 1mm | | | sensitivity& | area can be | imaging of |
| Tomography | of depth for | | | specificity. | examined at | near surface |
| (830nm) | 0.2seconds | | | Cross sectional | a time | abnormalities |
| | produces cross | | | images of the | because of | in complex |
| | sectional images | | | normal/abnormal | probe size | tissues |
| | of tissue with a | | | tissues can be | | |
| | high spatial | | | obtained without | | |
| | resolution of | | | biopsy | | |
| | 10-20um, | | | | | |
| | enables optical | | | Disadvantages | | |
| | biopsy & | | | Examines only a | | |
| | provides | | | very small area | | |
| | immediate and | | | at a time | | |
| | localized | | | | | |
| | diagnostic | | | | | |
| | information.(15) | | | | | |
| Raman | Provides real | 86% | 94% | Can be used by | Difficulty of | |
| Spectroscopy | time histology | | | non-specialists | capturing | |
| (vibrational | information | | | with suitable | inherently | |
| spectroscopy | about molecular | | | diagnostic | weak tissue | |
| of tissue) | composition of | | | algorithms. No | Raman | |
| | tissue used in | | | reagents are | signals and | |
| | analysis of | | | required, as | the relatively | |
| | biological tissue | | | based on a | slow speed | |
| | to know the | | | fingerprint of the | of spectrum | |
| | exact | | | biochemical | acquisitions | |
| | localization, | | | composition | | |
| | extent and | | | | | |
| | borders of | | | Disadvantages | | |
| | lesion with | | | Time consuming | | |
| | spatial & high | | | | | |
| | resolution(16) | | | | | |
| Narrow | Highlights | 97.7% | 98.9% | Advantage of | Chronic | Abnormal |

ISSN 2515-8260

. . . .

Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020

| | | 1211 | | | |
|------------|------------------|------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Band | abnormalities in | | detecting | infections & | vasculature |
| Imaging | superficial | | superficial | postoperative | will be seen as |
| (Novel | vasculature of | | cancers when | radiotherapy | scattered spots |
| method of | mucosal lesions | | compared to | may lead to | with well |
| imaging) | so that | | conventional | false positive | demarcated |
| | precancerous or | | techniques. | results | borders |
| | cancerous | | | | |
| | lesions can be | | Disadvantages | | |
| | identified more | | Moderate false- | | |
| | easily(17) | | positive rates | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Colposcopy | Direct oral | | High | Technique | High grade |
| | microscope with | | resolution, | sensitive and | lesions: |
| | focal length of | | good | expensive | Persistent |
| | 200 mm | | magnification | | duller shade of |
| | providing 3- | | and | | white & |
| | dimensional | | illumination. | | straighter, |
| | image of tissue | | Detects lesions | | sharper |
| | surfaces. | | at an early | | outlines with |
| | 3-5% Acetic | | stage with an | | well-defined |
| | acid and iodine | | accuracy of 80- | | borders |
| | solution are | | 90%. | | Low-grade |
| | applied to the | | | | lesions: |
| | surface to | | Disadvantages | | Translucent or |
| | improve the | | Expensive | | bright white& |
| | visualization of | | | | fade quickly& |
| | abnormal | | | | have feathery |
| | areas(18) | | | | margins and |
| | | | | | irregular |
| | | | | | borders. |

CONCLUSION: Considering all the non-invasive techniques, the dentist/clinician should be aware of the best method that can be applied in routine chairside practice. It is essential for the method to be accurate and economical. More research has to be conducted using a larger sample size on the available techniques to determine the best technique. Previous literature comparing the sensitivity, specificity and cost of the available methods, toluidine blue, ViZiLite, and VELScope have shown to be reasonable in clinical practice. Recently developed optical imaging techniques the best detection techniques but are expensive. As toluidine blue has high sensitivity but low specificity, hence it can be used as an adjunctive tool for early detection. It can be used along with ViZiLite and VELScope, for accurate results. Early referral and collaboration with dental professionals and owing to these various advances, able to provide quick and efficient care to the patients, thus improving their quality of life and in the prevention of specific health hazards and also reduces the possibility of further complications. Future directions are to identify those at risk of cancer, saliva in advanced genomic, proteomic technologies, alignment of optical imaging technologies with biomarker strategies, automation & objective point of care diagnostics.

REFERENCES

- J Liu, D., Zhao, X., Zeng, X., Dan, H., & Chen, Q. (2016). Non-invasive techniques for detection and diagnosis of oral potentially malignant disorders. Tohoku Journal of Experimental Medicine, 238(2), 165–177.
- [2] Warnakulasuriya, S., Johnson, N.W. & van der Waal, I. (2007) Nomenclature and classification of potentially malignant disorders of the oral mucosa. J. Oral Pathology and Medicine., 36, 575-580
- [3] Madhura, M. G., Rao, R. S., Patil, S., Alhazmi, Y. A., Jafer, M., Habib, S. R., & Awan,
 K. H. (2020). Minimally invasive procedures for the recognition and diagnosis of oral precancer and cancer. Disease-a-Month, 1–5.
- [4] Panta, P. (2019). Oral cancer detection: Novel strategies and clinical impact. Oral Cancer Detection: Novel Strategies and Clinical Impact, 1–314.
- [5] Singh D, Shukla RK. Utility of toluidine blue test in accessing and detecting intra-oral malignancies. Indian J Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg.
 2015;67:47–50.
- [6] Mascitti, M., Orsini, G., Tosco, V., Monterubbianesi, R., Balercia, A., Putignano, A., Santarelli, A. (2018). An overview on current non- invasive diagnostic devices in oral oncology. Frontiers in Physiology, 9(OCT), 1–8.
- [7] Petruzzi M, Lucchese A, Baldoni E, Grassi FR, Serpico R. Use of Lugol's iodine in oral cancer diagnosis: an overview. Oral Oncol 2010;46:811–3.
- [8] Mittal N, Palaskar S, Shankari M. Rose Bengal staining– diagnostic aid for potentially malignant and malignant disorders: a pilot study Indian J Dent Res. 2012;23:561–4.
- [9] Nagi, R., Reddy-Kantharaj, Y. B., Rakesh, N., Janardhan-Reddy, S., & Sahu, S.

ISSN 2515-8260 Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020

```
1213
```

(2016). Efficacy of light-based detection systems for early detection of oral cancer and oral potentially malignant disorders: Systematic review. Medicina Oral Patologia Oral y Cirugia Bucal, 21(4), e447–e455.

- [10] Ram S, Siar CH. Chemiluminescence as a diagnostic aid in the detection of oral cancer and potentially malignant epithelial lesions. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2005;34:521-7.
- [11] Kerr, A.R., Sirois, D.A. & Epstein, J.B. (2006) Clinical evaluation of chemiluminescent lighting: an adjunct for oral mucosal examinations.

J. Clin. Dent., 17, 59-63.

- [12] McNamara KK, Martin BD, Evans EW, Kalmar JR. The role of direct visual fluorescent examination (VELscope) in routine screening for potentially malignant oral mucosal lesions. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. 2012;114:636-43.
- [13] Chang CJ, Wilder-Smith P. Topical application of photofrin for photodynamic diagnosis of oral neoplasms. Plast Re- constr Surg.

2005;115:1877-1886

- [14] Sharwani A , Jerjes W , Salih V , MacRobert AJ , El-Maaytah M , Khalil HS , et al. Fluorescence spectroscopy combined with 5- aminolevilinic acid-induced protoporphyrin IX fluorescence in detecting oral premalignancy. J Photochem Pho- tobiol B . 2006;83:27–33 a.
- [15] Green, B., Cobb, A.R., Brennan, P.A. & Hopper, C. (2014) Optical diagnostic techniques for use in lesions of the head and neck: a review of the latest developments. Br. J. Oral Maxillofac Surg., 52, 675-680
- [16] Carreras-Torras, C., & Gay-Escoda, C. (2015). Techniques for early diagnosis of oral squamous cell carcinoma: Systematic review.

Medicina Oral, Patologia Oral y Cirugia Bucal, 20(3), e305-e315.

[17] Nguyen, P., Bashirzadeh, F., Hodge, R., Agnew, J., Farah, C.S., Duhig, E., Clarke, B., Perry-Keene, J., Botros, D., Masters, I.B. & Fielding, ISSN 2515-8260 Volume 07, Issue 05, 2020

```
1214
```

D. (2013) High specificity of combined narrow-band imaging and autofluorescence mucosal assessment of patients with head and neck cancer. Head Neck, 35, 619-625

- [18] Biopsy, K. (2014). Colposcopy A Novel Diagnostic Technique for Oral Mucosal Lesions. Journal of clinical and Diagnostic Research2014, October: Volume 8(10) 25– 28.
- [19] PM. Pavani, N., Srinivas, P., Rani Kothia, N., & Chaitanya Chandu, V. (2018). Recent Advances in the Early Diagnosis of Oral Cancer: A Systematic Review. International Journal of Medical Reviews, 4(4), 119–125.
- [20] Wong DT. Salivary diagnostics powered by nanotechnologies, proteomics and genomics. Journal of American Dental Association 2006; 137(3): 313–32