Journal of
Clinical Medicine

MDPI

Article

Unveiling the Accuracy of Ultrasonographic Assessment of Thyroid Volume: A Comparative Analysis of Ultrasonographic Measurements and Specimen Volumes

Can Konca [1,*] and Atilla Halil Elhan [2]

[1] Department of General Surgery, Ankara University School of Medicine, Ankara, Turkey; cankonca@ankara.edu.tr
[2] Department of Biostatistics, Ankara University School of Medicine, Ankara, Turkey; ahelhan@yahoo.com
* Correspondence: cankonca@ankara.edu.tr

Abstract: In endocrine surgery, a precise ultrasonographic measurement of thyroid volume is crucial. However, there is limited comparative research between ultrasonographic and specimen volumes, which has left this issue open to debate. This study aims to assess the accuracy of recommended formulas for ultrasonographic thyroid volume measurement by comparing them to specimen volumes and analyzing the influencing variables. From the data of 120 eligible patients; different formulas, including ultrasonographic thyroid volume (US-TV) based on the ellipsoid formula, lower correction factor thyroid volume (LCF-TV), and calculated ultrasonographic (derived formula) thyroid volume (CU-TV), were used to estimate the thyroid volume based on measurements taken prior to surgery. The calculated pathologic thyroid volume (CP-TV) was determined from specimen measurements. These measurements were compared with the intraoperative specimen volume (IO-TV) derived using Archimedes' principle. According to our findings, mean values for US-TV and LCF-TV were significantly lower, whereas CP-TV and CU-TV were higher than IO-TV. Deviations were more significant in patients who had surgery for benign indications or compressive symptoms and in those with suppressed thyroid-stimulating hormone levels. Although the ellipsoid formula tends to underestimate volume, it remains the most accurate method for measuring ultrasonographic thyroid volume. The deviation is greater for larger volumes.

Keywords: Thyroid; Ultrasonography; Thyroid volume; Thyroidectomy; Ellipsoid formula; Specimen volume

Citation: To be added by editorial staff during production.

Academic Editor: Firstname Lastname

Received: date
Revised: date
Accepted: date
Published: date



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Thyroid ultrasound is the gold standard imaging modality for evaluating the thyroid gland in contemporary medicine [1]. It is favored over other techniques such as computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) because of its non-invasive nature, cost-effectiveness, and availability [1-3]. Beyond its diagnostic use, ultrasound also measures the thyroid gland's volume in two dimensions (2D), aiding in devising medical treatment strategies and choosing surgical approaches for patients [2,4,5]. For example, in minimally invasive thyroid surgery, a volume of 25 mL is seen as a cutoff for patient selection [6]. Moreover, removing intact thyroid specimens larger than 30 mL is expected to be challenging in the transoral endoscopic thyroidectomy vestibular approach (TOETVA), which is becoming increasingly popular among endoscopic thyroidectomy techniques [7].

The volumetric evaluation of the thyroid gland with ultrasound is performed using the ellipsoid formula [3]. According to this formula, the mediolateral diameter (ML) × anteroposterior diameter (AP) × craniocaudal diameter (CC) is multiplied by $\pi/6$, yielding the value 0.524. However, a 1981 cadaveric study by Brunn et al. suggested that using a correction factor of 0.479 rather than 0.524 provided more accurate results [8].

In studies that evaluated the consistency of 2D thyroid volume measurement using ultrasound, various imaging methods, such as CT, MRI, and scintigraphy, have been used for comparison [3,5,9-13]. Although some studies have demonstrated that CT and MRI imaging provide more accurate results for thyroid volume measurements than ultrasound, the convenience and diagnostic value of ultrasound in assessing the thyroid gland make its practical applicability in daily practice unquestionable [1,10]. However, only a few studies have compared these radiologic calculations with surgical specimen measurements, which more accurately represent the actual thyroid volume [4,10,14,15]. Three studies using Archimedes' principle for specimen measurements have shown that ultrasonographic volume measurement underestimates the actual thyroid volume, with this discrepancy being attributed to the presence of multinodularity and a nodular isthmus [4,14,15]. Based on the evaluation of 92 patients, Trimboli et al. proposed an alternative volume calculation method based on a modification of the ellipsoid formula [4]. Yet, very few studies have affirmed the consistency of these formulas, indicating a need for further investigation in this domain.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the accuracy of thyroid volume measurements, obtained using 2D ultrasound and various formulas, by comparing them to the actual volumes measured using the Archimedes' principle on surgical specimens in light of recent technological advances in ultrasonography. We also aimed to identify factors influencing the consistency of these measurements and to devise a mathematical formula based on this assessment to yield more accurate results.

2. Materials and Methods

This study retrospectively analyzed 204 patients who underwent total thyroidectomy performed by a single surgeon (CK) at a tertiary care center between January 2020 and May 2022. The study received approval from the Ethical Review Committee of Ankara University School of Medicine (approval number: I03-162-23, approval date: 05.04.2023). We included all patients who underwent total thyroidectomy for any reason, who were listed in the personal database of the responsible surgeon, and who had data available for an ultrasonographic evaluation of the thyroid gland at the beginning of surgery along with measurements of the size and volume of the thyroid specimen. Subsequently, patients were excluded from the study if they had retrosternal goiter or exophytic nodules that could affect the accuracy of the ultrasonographic size evaluation. Additionally, those who underwent preoperative cyst aspiration, intraoperative cyst drainage, exhibited isthmus nodularity, had compromised specimen integrity, or lacked data for the relevant parameters were also excluded. In total, 120 patients who met the study criteria were analyzed. Patient details such as age, gender, body mass index (BMI), thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH), thyroglobulin levels, anti-thyroglobulin antibody (anti-Tg Ab) levels, anti-thyroid peroxidase antibody (anti-TPO) levels, the indication for surgery, and pathological diagnoses were documented and assessed for the study.

This section outlines the details of the data collected through the clinical routines of the operating surgeon and the specifics of the procedure. After obtaining informed consent from all patients post-diagnostic evaluation and preoperative preparation, an experienced endocrine surgeon skilled in thyroid ultrasonography conducted thyroid ultrasounds on patients scheduled for total thyroidectomy. These patients were positioned for the operation in the operating room under anesthesia. Measurements of the craniocaudal, mediolateral, and anteroposterior dimensions of each thyroid lobe were taken and documented at their maximal points. An 8-12 MHz linear transducer (Versana Active®, GE Healthcare Inc., USA) with a 38.4 mm imaging area was used for ultrasonographic measurements.

All patients underwent an open total thyroidectomy with a cervicotomy. After the dissection, the longest measurements of the same dimensions used in ultrasonography were measured and documented from the excised thyroid specimen. The volume was then determined by submerging the specimen in a graduated cylinder filled with 100 mL

of saline; the rise in the water level was noted and the difference measured in milliliters, in line with Archimedes' principle. The measurements of the intraoperative thyroid volume (IO-TV) were documented in milliliters (mL). As part of the standard clinical follow-up for total thyroidectomy patients, postoperative ultrasonography was performed one month after the surgery to ensure no residual tissue remained.

Following data collection, thyroid volume calculations were based on the measurements from all the patients, detailed below.

The thyroid volume derived from the ultrasound dimensions was termed "Ultrasonographic Thyroid Volume (US-TV)", while the thyroid volume determined the specimen dimensions was labeled as "Calculated Pathologic Thyroid Volume (CP-TV)". The ellipsoid formula was utilized for both US-TV and CP-TV calculations. The intent behind the CP-TV calculation was to assess the correlation between ultrasonographic and specimen measurements and their reflection on volume.

Below is the ellipsoid formula used:

$$\boldsymbol{Volume(mL) = ML(cm) \times AP(cm) \times CC(cm) \times 0.524}$$

The results from the formula, calculated for each thyroid lobe separately, were aggregated to compute the total thyroid volume.

Calculations using the correction factor of 0.479, as proposed by Brunn et al., in place of the 0.524 correction factor in the ellipsoid formula, were labeled "Lower Correction Factor Thyroid Volume (LCF-TV)" [8]. Additionally, calculations using Trimboli et al.'s formula for thyroid volume measurement, expressed as "Volume=1.24×2D-US-TV+3.66", were noted as "Calculated Ultrasonographic Thyroid Volume (CU-TV)" [4].

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were summarized as counts and percentages for categorical variables, means and standard deviations for normally distributed continuous variables, and medians with 25th and 75th percentiles for ordinal or non-normally distributed continuous variables. A paired t-test was used to evaluate the differences between the methods compared. The limit of agreement was calculated using the Bland-Altman method. The degree of association between continuous variables was assessed using Pearson's correlation coefficient and the concordance correlation coefficient (CCC). McBride's strength of agreement criteria for this CCC (ϱc) were used to assess the degree of equivalence between the two methods as follows: <0.90, poor; 0.90-0.95, moderate; 0.95-0.99, substantial; >0.99, almost perfect. The dependence of one outcome variable on two or more variables was evaluated using multiple linear regression analysis. Significance was set at $p<0.05$. The R programming language (version 4.2.0) was used for the statistical analysis.

3. Results

The study comprised 120 patients (99 females and 21 males) with a mean age of 46.02±13.2 years (range 17-75). The indications for surgery were suspicion or diagnosis of malignancy in 83 (69.2%) patients, while 37 (30.8%) patients underwent surgery for benign indications such as multinodular goiter or Graves' disease. The descriptive characteristics, the calculated ultrasonographic thyroid volumes, and the intraoperative thyroid volumes of the patients are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics and Volume Measurements of the Patients.

Demographic Data (n=120)	
***Age**, years (mean±SD)*	46.02±13.20
***Sex**, F/M, n (%)*	99/21 (82.5/17.5)
***BMI** (mean±SD)*	27.55±5.31
Preoperative Diagnostic Evaluation	

Graves' Disease, *(Yes/No), n (%)*	12/108 (10.0/90.0)
Multinodular Goiter, *(Yes/No), n (%)*	92/28 (76.7/23.3)
Unilateral*, n (%)*	16 (13.3)
Bilateral*, n (%)*	76 (63.3)
Suspicion for Malignancy, *(Yes/No), n (%)*	100/20 (83.3/16.7)
Size of Dominant Nodule, *mm (mean±SD)*	18.72±12.86
Presence of Compressive Symptoms*, (Yes/No), n (%)*	18/102 (15.0/85.0)
Preoperative Laboratory Parameters, *(mean±SD)*	
TSH, *μIU/mL (0.38-5.33)*	1.75±1.60
Thyroglobulin, *ng/mL (1.15-50.03)*	95.31±225.82
Anti-Tg Ab, *IU/mL (0-4)*	117.17±384.22
Anti-TPO Ab, *IU/mL (0-9)*	64.44±115.88
Pathology, n (%)	
Benign	37 (30.8)
Malignant	83 (69.2)
Presence of Autoimmune Thyroiditis, *(Yes/No) n (%)*	50/70 (41.7/58.3)
Volume Measurements, *ml (mean±SD)*	
IO-TV	28.90±24.96
US-TV	26.15±21.58
CP-TV	30.99±25.12
LCF-TV	23.92±19.74
CU-TV	36.09±26.76

BMI: Body Mass Index, TSH: Thyroid-Stimulating Hormone, anti-Tg Ab: Anti-Thyroglobulin Antibody, anti-TPO Ab: Anti-Thyroid Peroxidase Antibody, IO-TV: Intraoperative (Specimen) Thyroid Volume, US-TV: Ultrasonographic Thyroid Volume, CP-TV: Calculated Pathologic Thyroid Volume, LCF-TV: Lower Correction Factor Thyroid Volume, CU-TV: Calculated Ultrasound Thyroid Volume.

3.1. Comparison of Calculated Volumes with Specimen Volume (IO-TV)

The mean volume measurements for IO-TV, US-TV, CP-TV, LCF-TV, and CU-TV were found to be 28.90±24.96 mL, 26.15±21.58 mL, 30.99±25.12 mL, 23.92±19.74 mL, and 36.09±26.76 mL, respectively. When the calculated thyroid volumes were compared to IO-TV, both US-TV ($p=0.005$) and LCF-TV ($p<0.001$) were significantly lower, whereas CP-TV ($p=0.045$) and CU-TV ($p<0.001$) were significantly higher than IO-TV (Table 2).

Table 2. Intraoperative Volume vs. Calculated Ultrasonographic Volume Measurements for Patients, Along with Estimation Errors.

Methods Being Compared	Mean±SD*	95% CI for Mean	Median (25th - 75th Percentile)	p values
US-TV - IO-TV (mL)	-2.75±10.65	(-4.68 - -0.83)	-0.79 (-6.87 - 2.09)	**0.005**
CP-TV - IO-TV (mL)	2.08±11.29	(0.04 - 4.12)	1.51 (-1.75 - 6.05)	**0.045**
LCF-TV - IO-TV (mL)	-4.98±10.98	(-6.96 - -3.00)	-2.28 (-10.16 - 0.60)	**<0.001**
CU-TV - IO-TV (mL)	7.18±11.39	(5.12 - 9.24)	6.25 (1.52 - 11.46)	**<0.001**

*Estimation error was calculated by subtracting the value of the reference method (IO-TV) from the compared methods (US-TV, CP-TV, LCF-TV, and CU-TV). IO-TV: Intraoperative (Specimen) Thyroid Volume, US-TV: Ultrasonographic Thyroid Volume, CP-TV: Calculated Pathologic Thyroid

Volume, LCF-TV: Lower Correction Factor Thyroid Volume, CU-TV: Calculated Ultrasound Thyroid Volume.

Compared with the thyroid specimen volumes measured by Archimedes' principle (IO-TV), US-TV underestimated the volume in 60.8% (73/120) of the thyroid glands and overestimated the volume in 39.2% (47/120). CP-TV underestimated the volume in 33.3% (40/120) and overestimated in 66.7% (80/120). LCF-TV underestimated the volume in 70.8% (85/120) and overestimated in 29.2% (35/120). CU-TV underestimated the volume in 18.3% (22/120) and overestimated in 81.7% (98/120) of the thyroid glands (Figure 1).




Figure 1. Box-and-Whisker Plot Comparing IO-TV and Calculated Thyroid Volumes. O denotes outliers, and * indicates extreme values.

The Bland-Altman plots of the calculated volume measurements versus the specimen volumes are depicted in Figure 2. The limits of agreement (Mean±1.96 SD) were narrowest for US-TV (-23.6 and 18.1 mL). Of the 120 patients, 9 (7.5%) had US-TV values outside the limits of agreement, with 5 showing underestimation and 4 overestimation. However, of the 6 (5%) patients with CP-TV values outside the limits of agreement, deviations were evenly distributed in both directions.




Figure 2. Bland-Altman Plots Comparing IO-TV and Various Calculated Ultrasonographic Thyroid Volumes. A–D, The plots show volume measurements of US-TV (A), CP-TV (B), LCF-TV (C), and CU-TV (D) against IO-TV. IO-TV: Intraoperative (Specimen) Thyroid Volume, US-TV: Ultrasonographic Thyroid Volume, CP-TV: Calculated Pathologic Thyroid Volume, LCF-TV: Lower Correction Factor Thyroid Volume, CU-TV: Calculated Ultrasound Thyroid Volume.

The correlation coefficient (r) between IO-TV and US-TV volumes was 0.905 (Table 3). Based on McBride's strength of agreement criteria for CCC, the degree of equivalence between all comparisons with IO-TV was categorized as poor (Table 3).

Table 3. Correlation Matrix for Thyroid Volume Calculation Methods with Specimen Volumes.

	IO-TV vs US-TV	IO-TV vs CP-TV	IO-TV vs LCF-TV	IO-TV vs CU-TV
CCC (ϱ_c)[a]	0.890	0.895	0.860	0.869
95% CI for CCC	0.848 - 0.920	0.853 - 0.926	0.813 - 0.896	0.821 - 0.905
Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r)	0.905	0.898	0.905	0.905
Bias Correction Factor (C_b)	0.983	0.997	0.950	0.960
McBride's Strength of Agreement Criteria[b]	Poor	Poor	Poor	Poor
p	**<0.001**	**<0.001**	**<0.001**	**<0.001**

[a]Calculated using the following formula: $\varrho c = \varrho\ Cb$
[b]McBride's strength of agreement criteria for CCC (ϱc) are as follows: <0.90: poor; 0.90–0.95: moderate; 0.95–0.99: substantial; >0.99: almost perfect.
CCC: Concordance Correlation Coefficient.

3.2. *Mathematical Formula Derived from US-TV Calculation for the Estimation of IO-TV*

All mathematical formulas used to calculate thyroid volume from ultrasonographic measurements demonstrated a strong correlation with IO-TV (Table 3). According to the linear regression analysis, US-TV, LCF-TV, and CU-TV had the highest R2 values with IO-

TV (R2=0.820 for all). The mathematical formula obtained from the linear regression analysis between IO-TV and US-TV was as follows (Figure 3):

$$(\text{IO-TV}) = 1.522 + 1.047 \times (\text{US-TV})$$




Figure 3. Linear Regression Applied Between IO-TV and US-TV. IO-TV: Intraoperative (Specimen) Thyroid Volume, US-TV: Ultrasonographic Thyroid Volume.

3.3. Analysis of the Volume Differences Between Calculated Thyroid Volumes and Specimen Volumes

The differences between the calculated thyroid volumes and the IO-TV are detailed in Table 2. The deviation from underestimation in calculations compared to IO-TV was -2.75±10.65 mL for US-TV, while it was -4.98±10.98 mL for LCF-TV, which uses a lower correction factor. Conversely, the deviation from overestimation was observed to be 2.08±11.29 mL for CP-TV and 7.18±11.39 mL for CU-TV.

Patients who underwent surgery for benign indications ($p<0.001$) or compressive symptoms ($p=0.003$) and those with suppressed TSH values ($p=0.001$) displayed significantly larger discrepancies between US-TV and IO-TV calculations. In contrast, factors like age ($p=0.350$) and gland nodularity did not significantly influence the discrepancies ($p=0.699$). Other factors such as sex ($p=0.174$), BMI ($p=0.939$), Tg ($p=0.128$), anti-Tg ($p=0.270$), anti-TPO ($p=0.112$), Graves' disease ($p=0.369$), Hashimoto's disease ($p=0.432$), and the size of the dominant nodule ($p=0.285$) did not significantly affect the discrepancy between US-TV and IO-TV. Multiple linear regression analysis revealed that only patients who underwent surgery for benign indications ($p=0.005$) and those with suppressed TSH levels ($p=0.013$) were found to be significantly related to the difference between US-TV and IO-TV.

3.4. Thyroid Specimen Weight to Volume Ratio Analysis

When comparing the weight and volume of the specimens, 1 mL of tissue equaled 1.17 g in 4 patients with Graves' disease without nodules, 1.07 g in 12 patients with Graves' disease, and 1.13 g in the whole patient group.

4. Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, our study is the only one in the current literature from the last decade that takes into account recent technological advancements in ultrasonography and compares ultrasonographic thyroid volume measurement with specimen volume. As the largest cohort in the literature to date, our findings suggest that ultrasonographic measurements of thyroid volume underestimate the actual volume. However, the deviation in measurements was not as large as current literature might suggest. Even

though the ellipsoid formula produces more accurate results than other proposed formulas, the deviation in measurements increases with higher thyroid volumes. Contrary to current literature, our data does not show gland nodularity affecting measurement deviations. However, factors such as suppressed TSH levels, benign diagnoses, and the presence of compressive symptoms—which could indicate a larger thyroid volume—significantly influenced the measurement deviations.

Calculating thyroid volume is crucial in various medical disciplines like selecting patients for minimally invasive or endoscopic thyroid surgeries, adjusting doses for thyroid suppression therapy, and radioactive iodine therapy. Few studies in the literature discuss the reliability of this calculation using the ellipsoid formula, and most compare ultrasonographic volumes with other imaging methods like 2D-3D CT or MRI [3,10,11,13]. However, these studies do not compare calculated volumes with the actual thyroid volume, which can be determined intraoperatively, leaving the true accuracy of calculated sonographic volumes uncertain.

Our study found significant differences between ultrasonography-based calculated thyroid volume calculations and intraoperatively measured thyroid volumes (IO-TV). While the US-TV and LCF-TV calculations showed underestimation, the formula proposed by Trimboli et al. (CU-TV) showed overestimation [4]. Predictably, the deviation in ultrasonographic measurements increased with larger thyroid volumes (Figure 3). Several studies have contrasted sonographic calculations with actual thyroid volumes, mainly reporting underestimations of the calculated sonographic volumes. For example, Trimboli et al., in their study with the largest volume range of patients, noted ultrasonographic volume measurement resulted in underestimation in 77% of the 92 patients. The mean volume distribution of patients in this study was 23.9±14.8 (5.8-85) mL for US-TV and 33.4±20.1 (9.7-105) mL for specimen volume [4]. In contrast, Miccoli et al., with a sample size of 101 patients—the largest in the study—found that ultrasonographic volume measurement resulted in underestimation for 89 (88.1%) patients and overestimation for 7 (6.9%) patients. Only patients with ultrasonographic volumes less than 50 mL were included in this study. The average ultrasonographic volume of all patients in the study was 28.3 (7-50) mL, with a mean specimen volume of 36.2 (7-76) mL. When patients were divided into two groups based on the 25 mL threshold, the underestimation rate was higher in the low-volume group. Based on this, the authors suggested that the consistency of ultrasonographic volume measurement improves with higher volumes [15]. Ruggieri et al. showed that ultrasonographic volume measurement led to 77% underestimation in a group of 53 patients with a mean ultrasonographic volume of 14.4±5.9 mL and a mean specimen volume of 21.7±10.3 mL [14]. Lee et al. compared volume measurements using 2D ultrasound with those from 2D and 3D computed tomography against specimen volume measurements. They found that all calculated measurements exceeded the specimen volume [10]. These studies primarily included patients with small thyroid volumes, largely aimed at patient selection for minimally invasive thyroid surgery. This makes it challenging to draw conclusions about large thyroid volumes. While Miccoli et al. focused on patients with an ultrasonographic thyroid volume <50 mL, Trimboli et al. only incorporated a limited number of patients with a thyroid volume >60 mL [4,15]. The mean specimen volume of the 47 patients in Lee et al.'s study was 18.6 mL (min-max range=8-33 mL), and 2D ultrasound volumes were reported as 19.3 mL (min-max range=9.2-34.9 mL). We hypothesize that the tendency for the US-TV measurement to underestimate in our study might be due to our higher average thyroid volume and broader volume range. Our results most closely align with those of Trimboli et al., whose patient cohort was most similar to ours [4]. In this regard, our study, with a volume range of 4-130 mL and a larger sample size of 120 patients, is thought to represent a more realistic clinical population than other studies in the literature. Additionally, we believe that the smaller volume discrepancy between ultrasonographic and specimen measurements in our study can be ascribed to advancements in ultrasonography technology, as our study is the only one conducted in this domain over the past decade.

In our study, we established a CP-TV group to assess the consistency of thyroid volume measurements using the ellipsoid formula, assuming that the ultrasonographic measurements were accurate. Reviewing the CP-TV group results, we found that the calculated CP-TV volumes were inclined towards overestimation when compared to IO-TV volumes. This suggests that the ellipsoid formula, based on the longest measurements in each axis, might compute a larger volume than the thyroid gland, which does not perfectly resemble an ellipsoid. Consequently, an overestimation bias in the measurements is anticipated. Nevertheless, potential errors in CP-TV measurements could arise because these measurements were made post thyroid gland excision in its anatomical position. But this error is more likely to manifest as a reduction in dimensions. No such comparisons were found in existing literature in this field.

We posit that the underestimation of US-TV values and overestimation of CP-TV values in our study might also be attributed to the challenges of obtaining precise measurements with ultrasound. Ultrasonographic volume measurements employed longitudinal, transverse, and anteroposterior diameters using two-dimensional images. It is believed that these measurements do not always align with the longest axes, particularly when considering the intraoperative high-volume thyroid anatomy. Based on intraoperative observations, it appears that the linearity of these axes changes when measured as planes, especially as the volume of the thyroid gland increases and the plane begins to angle. The ellipsoid formula calculation is expected to yield more accurate results if the probe is directed parallel to this angulation during measurement. Consequently, the underestimation deviation rate decreases further due to the more consistent volume calculations made in this way. According to the findings of Lee et al., which support this notion, volume measurement with 3D CT offers measurements closer to specimen volumes than 2D ultrasound and 2D CT [10].

Upon examining the linear regressions of the calculated US-TV and CP-TV results with IO-TV, both calculations exhibited a strong correlation with IO-TV. The mathematical formula based on the regression analysis of our results was determined to be IO-TV=1.522+1.047x(US-TV). A formula with a larger correction coefficient was suggested by Trimboli et al. [4]. It can be postulated that these formulae produce consistent results within the sample group for which they were designed, but this consistency might not hold outside the original sample group. In this context, when using the formula recommended by Trimboli et al. in our study group, we observed an average overestimation of 7.18±11.39 mL (compared to -2.75±10.65 mL in US-TV and 2.08±11.29 mL in CP-TV samples from our study). We, therefore, posit that the impact of the volume and size distribution of the sample group cannot be overlooked in these calculations, and the consistency of these formulae wanes without a similar distribution. As such, the ellipsoid formula remains the most consistent and reliable method for ultrasonographic volume measurement. The margin of error associated with the ellipsoid formula can be minimized by refining the measurements to better approximate the actual thyroid volume.

Furthermore, in our study's findings, when the correction factor 0.524, employed in the ellipsoid formula, is adjusted to 0.479 as proposed by Brunn et al., the calculated thyroid volume LCF-TV values intensified the underestimation amounts, which were previously -2.75±10.65, to -4.98±10.98 [8]. A similar observation was made in a study by Shabana et al., where thyroid volumes measured using multidetector computed tomography (MDCT) and ultrasonography were compared with varying correction factors in patients without thyroid pathology [9]. In that study, where the actual thyroid volume was taken as the measurement made using MDCT, the most suitable correction factor was determined to be 0.529. Viewing these findings in light of our own, and noting that Shabana et al. reported a value very close to the ellipsoid formula correction factor, it is reasoned that there is no necessity for a reduced correction factor in the ellipsoid formula calculation.

In our study, when examining the factors affecting the deviation amount in the calculation of US-TV, we observed that patients with benign diagnoses, compression symptoms, and suppressed TSH values had significantly higher deviation amounts. It appears

that a larger thyroid volume may be the common denominator among the factors affecting deviation rates in our study. In contrast to other studies, gland nodularity was found to have no significant effect on the deviation rate of US-TV measurements in our study. Ruggieri et al. have reported that gland multinodularity and nodular involvement of the isthmus significantly affected the underestimation of ultrasonographic thyroid volume measurements [14]. Twenty-one of the 53 patients included in this study had isthmus nodularity, and the mean volumes of patients with both multinodularity and isthmus nodularity were greater than the mean volumes of all study participants. As the patients in this study underwent minimally invasive thyroidectomy, their thyroid volumes were within the low-normal range.

Patients with isthmus nodules or features like retrosternal extension, cyst aspiration, or damage to the integrity of the specimen that may cause errors in volume measurements were excluded from our study. The isthmus volume is not included in the calculation of the ellipsoid formula. Therefore, we believe the observed underestimation rate in our study, which differs from the results reported by Ruggieri et al., primarily stems from isthmus nodularity and the presence of patients with higher volumes in our study [14].

In clinical practice, especially in the treatment of Graves' disease, measuring thyroid volume is crucial for determining the dose of radioactive iodine therapy [5]. For this purpose, 1 g of thyroid tissue is deemed equivalent to 1 cm3 of thyroid volume [10,13]. We observed that in patients with Graves' disease, 1 cm3 of tissue corresponds to 1.17 g in 4 patients without nodularity and 1.07 g in 12 patients with nodularity. While this discrepancy appears minimal, a variation of roughly 17% per mL could be significant in terms of treatment complications. However, validation with studies using a larger patient series is necessary for this recommendation to attain clinical significance.

The strengths of this study, compared to others that used specimen volume, include it being the largest in number and having the widest volume range cohort in the literature. It demonstrates data reflecting recent technological developments in ultrasound and includes patients who underwent a complete gland dissection by a single surgeon. Among the study's limitations is the fact that ultrasonographic volume measurement, being a 2D method, might be insufficient to capture the full benefits that 3D approaches can offer in clinical practice. Secondly, due to the retrospective design of the study, we could not evaluate the effects of factors, such as neck thickness and length, on the margin of error in patients. These factors have the potential to influence ultrasonographic measurements.

5. Conclusions

Our study findings indicate that ultrasonographic measurements of thyroid volume tend to underestimate. This deviation, which is less pronounced than what the current literature suggests, seems to be caused by factors other than nodularity, which increase the volume of the thyroid gland. We recommend the continued use of the ellipsoid formula as the most valid and accurate method for thyroid volume measurement. However, incorporating 3D imaging techniques, such as CT or MRI, may minimize the margin of error, especially in situations where precise measurements are crucial for large-volume thyroid glands. To enhance the accuracy of ultrasonographic volume measurements further, we believe that three-dimensional analysis and adjustments made during measurements can reduce the elevated margin of error, especially in the context of large-volume thyroid glands.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, C.K.; methodology, C.K.; formal analysis, C.K. and A.H.E.; investigation, C.K.; data curation, C.K. and A.H.E.; writing—original draft preparation, C.K. and A.H.E.; writing—review and editing, C.K. and A.H.E.; supervision, A.H.E. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the Institutional Review Board (or Ethics Committee) of Ankara University School of Medicine (approval number: I03-162-23, approval date: 05.04.2023).

Informed Consent Statement: The ethical committee deemed the waiver of informed consent appropriate for this study, considering its retrospective nature and absence of personal identifiers. The confidentiality and privacy of the data were strictly maintained throughout the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to the need to protect patients' confidential information.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Seifert, P.; Ullrich, S.L.; Kuhnel, C.; Guhne, F.; Drescher, R.; Winkens, T.; Freesmeyer, M. Optimization of Thyroid Volume Determination by Stitched 3D-Ultrasound Data Sets in Patients with Structural Thyroid Disease. *Biomedicines* **2023**, *11*, doi:10.3390/biomedicines11020381.
2. Russell, M.D.; Orloff, L.A. Ultrasonography of the thyroid, parathyroids, and beyond. *HNO* **2022**, *70*, 333-344, doi:10.1007/s00106-022-01162-0.
3. Kaniuka-Jakubowska, S.; Piskunowicz, M.; Zapasnik, A.; Lewczuk, A.; Kaniuka, A.; Mizan-Gross, K.; Kaszubowski, M.; Lass, P.; Sworczak, K. US not bright but right method of thyroid volume estimation even in large and substernal extended goitres. Comparison of US and three methods of CT thyroid evaluation - prospective study. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)* **2015**, *83*, 412-419, doi:10.1111/cen.12629.
4. Trimboli, P.; Ruggieri, M.; Fumarola, A.; D'Alo, M.; Straniero, A.; Maiuolo, A.; Ulisse, S.; D'Armiento, M. A mathematical formula to estimate in vivo thyroid volume from two-dimensional ultrasonography. *Thyroid* **2008**, *18*, 879-882, doi:10.1089/thy.2007.0399.
5. Fecca, C.; Moon, J.; Posocco, D.; Zhao, H.; Dadparvar, S. Accuracy of (123)I Na Thyroid Imaging in calculating thyroid volume. *J Nucl Med Technol* **2022**, doi:10.2967/jnmt.121.263395.
6. Ruggieri, M.; Straniero, A.; Genderini, M.; D'Armiento, M.; Fumarola, A.; Trimboli, P.; Gargiulo, P. The eligibility of MIVA approach in thyroid surgery. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* **2007**, *392*, 413-416, doi:10.1007/s00423-007-0155-8.
7. Karakas, E.; Klein, G.; Schopf, S. Transoral thyroid surgery vestibular approach: does size matter anymore? *J Endocrinol Invest* **2020**, *43*, 615-622, doi:10.1007/s40618-019-01149-9.
8. Brunn, J.; Block, U.; Ruf, G.; Bos, I.; Kunze, W.P.; Scriba, P.C. [Volumetric analysis of thyroid lobes by real-time ultrasound (author's transl)]. *Dtsch Med Wochenschr* **1981**, *106*, 1338-1340, doi:10.1055/s-2008-1070506.
9. Shabana, W.; Peeters, E.; De Maeseneer, M. Measuring thyroid gland volume: should we change the correction factor? *AJR Am J Roentgenol* **2006**, *186*, 234-236, doi:10.2214/AJR.04.0816.
10. Lee, S.J.; Chong, S.; Kang, K.H.; Hur, J.; Hong, B.W.; Kim, H.J.; Kim, S.J. Semiautomated thyroid volumetry using 3D CT: prospective comparison with measurements obtained using 2D ultrasound, 2D CT, and water displacement method of specimen. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* **2014**, *203*, W525-532, doi:10.2214/AJR.13.12206.
11. van Isselt, J.W.; de Klerk, J.M.; van Rijk, P.P.; van Gils, A.P.; Polman, L.J.; Kamphuis, C.; Meijer, R.; Beekman, F.J. Comparison of methods for thyroid volume estimation in patients with Graves' disease. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* **2003**, *30*, 525-531, doi:10.1007/s00259-002-1101-1.
12. Nygaard, B.; Nygaard, T.; Court-Payen, M.; Jensen, L.I.; Soe-Jensen, P.; Gerhard Nielsen, K.; Fugl, M.; Hegedus, L. Thyroid volume measured by ultrasonography and CT. *Acta Radiol* **2002**, *43*, 269-274, doi:10.1080/j.1600-0455.2002.430307.x.
13. Fujita, N.; Kato, K.; Abe, S.; Naganawa, S. Variation in thyroid volumes due to differences in the measured length or area of the cross-sectional plane: A validation study of the ellipsoid approximation method using CT images. *J Appl Clin Med Phys* **2021**, *22*, 15-25, doi:10.1002/acm2.13125.
14. Ruggieri, M.; Fumarola, A.; Straniero, A.; Maiuolo, A.; Coletta, I.; Veltri, A.; Di Fiore, A.; Trimboli, P.; Gargiulo, P.; Genderini, M.; et al. The estimation of the thyroid volume before surgery--an important prerequisite for minimally invasive thyroidectomy. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* **2008**, *393*, 721-724, doi:10.1007/s00423-008-0399-y.
15. Miccoli, P.; Minuto, M.N.; Orlandini, C.; Galleri, D.; Massi, M.; Berti, P. Ultrasonography estimated thyroid volume: a prospective study about its reliability. *Thyroid* **2006**, *16*, 37-39, doi:10.1089/thy.2006.16.37.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.