

Evaluating Intravital CT versus Autopsy Findings in Fatal Trauma Cases

Marijon Olmo*

Department of Biomedical and Clinical Sciences, Capitol Technology University, Laurel, MD 20708, USA

Introduction

Understanding the intricacies of fatal traumatic cases is crucial not only for forensic investigations but also for medical advancements aimed at improving patient care and safety. In recent years, technological advancements have significantly enhanced our ability to investigate such cases. Two prominent methods in this regard are intravital Computed Tomography (CT) and traditional autopsy. This article aims to explore and compare the insights provided by these two approaches in fatal traumatic cases, highlighting their respective strengths and limitations. Intravital CT, also known as Postmortem Ct Angiography (PMCTA), has emerged as a powerful tool in forensic medicine. It involves the use of CT scanning techniques to examine the body postmortem, providing detailed anatomical information. One of the significant advantages of intravital CT is its ability to visualize injuries and pathologies in situ, without the need for invasive procedures. Unlike traditional autopsies, intravital CT does not require invasive procedures, making it suitable for cases where preserving the body's integrity is crucial [1].

Intravital CT can be performed relatively quickly, allowing for rapid assessment and decision-making in forensic investigations. CT imaging offers excellent visualization of soft tissues, making it particularly useful for identifying internal injuries and hemorrhages. While intravital CT is excellent for visualizing skeletal injuries and major organ damage, it may have limited sensitivity for detecting subtle injuries, such as small contusions or microfractures. Interpreting intravital CT scans requires expertise, as artifacts and postmortem changes can sometimes mimic pathological findings, leading to misinterpretation. The equipment and expertise required for intravital CT can be costly, limiting its accessibility in some settings. Autopsy, or postmortem examination, remains the gold standard for investigating the cause and manner of death in forensic cases. It involves a systematic examination of the body, including external and internal structures, to identify injuries, diseases and other abnormalities. Autopsy allows for a thorough examination of the body, including palpation, dissection and histological analysis, providing a comprehensive understanding of the injuries and their underlying mechanisms [2].

Description

Autopsy can confirm or refute findings from other imaging modalities, helping to validate the accuracy of diagnostic procedures. Autopsy allows for the collection of tissue samples for further analysis, such as toxicological studies or genetic testing, which may provide additional insights into the case. Autopsy is an invasive procedure that involves cutting into the body, which may not be suitable for cases where preservation of the body is desired. Autopsies can be time-consuming, requiring careful dissection and analysis, which may delay the release of findings in time-sensitive cases. The accuracy and

*Address for Correspondence: Marijon Olmo, Department of Biomedical and Clinical Sciences, Capitol Technology University, Laurel, MD 20708, USA; E-mail: rijonolmo@mao.edu

Copyright: © 2024 Olmo M. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Received: 25 June, 2024, Manuscript No. JFM-24-146356; Editor assigned: 27 June, 2024, PreQC No. P-146356; Reviewed: 09 July, 2024, QC No Q-146356; Revised: 15 July, 2024, Manuscript No. R-146356; Published: 22 July, 2024, DOI: 10.37421/2472-1026.2024.9.369

reliability of autopsy findings depend heavily on the expertise of the examiner and interpretations may vary between practitioners. Both intravital CT and autopsy play essential roles in investigating fatal traumatic cases, offering complementary strengths and limitations. Intravital CT excels in providing rapid, non-invasive imaging of skeletal and soft tissue injuries, making it invaluable for initial assessments and triage in forensic settings. However, it may lack the sensitivity and specificity required for detecting subtle injuries or confirming complex pathological processes [3].

On the other hand, autopsy provides a comprehensive examination of the body, allowing for detailed analysis and confirmation of findings. It is particularly useful for identifying subtle injuries, determining the sequence of events leading to death and collecting samples for additional testing. However, autopsies are invasive and time-consuming and their accuracy depends on the skill and experience of the examiner. Both intravital CT and autopsy are valuable tools in investigating fatal traumatic cases, each offering unique insights into the cause and manner of death. Combining these approaches in a multidisciplinary approach can enhance the accuracy and reliability of forensic investigations, ultimately contributing to improved patient care and safety. As technology continues to advance, further research and development in imaging modalities and forensic techniques will continue to refine our understanding of fatal traumatic cases [4].

Intravital CT is highly sensitive in detecting skeletal injuries, such as fractures and major organ damage. However, it may miss subtle injuries or early-stage pathologies. Autopsy, with its comprehensive examination, can identify both obvious and subtle injuries, providing a more accurate assessment of the extent and nature of trauma. Intravital CT offers a rapid imaging process, making it suitable for time-sensitive cases or situations where immediate information is crucial. Autopsy, while time-consuming, may require scheduling and specialized facilities, potentially causing delays in obtaining results. Intravital CT is particularly valuable in mass casualty incidents or cases where rapid assessment is needed to prioritize resources. Autopsy remains indispensable for complex cases where detailed examination and correlation of findings are necessary to establish the cause and manner of death conclusively. Intravital CT may incur lower costs in certain scenarios, especially considering the reduced need for specialized personnel and facilities compared to autopsies [5].

Conclusion

Autopsy costs can vary widely depending on factors such as the extent of examination, additional tests required and personnel involved. Both intravital CT and autopsy findings can be admissible as evidence in legal proceedings, but their weight may vary depending on jurisdiction and case specifics. Autopsy findings, with their detailed documentation and thorough examination process, may carry more weight in court due to their established reliability and comprehensiveness. Both intravital CT and autopsy techniques continue to evolve with advancements in technology and forensic science, leading to improved accuracy, efficiency and accessibility over time. In essence, while both intravital CT and autopsy are indispensable in forensic investigations, their optimal use depends on the specific characteristics of each case, including the nature of injuries, available resources and time constraints. Integrating these modalities within a multidisciplinary approach can maximize the benefits of each technique, ultimately enhancing the quality of forensic examinations and the pursuit of justice.

Acknowledgement

We thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive criticisms of the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares there is no conflict of interest associated with this manuscript.

References

1. Sharma, B. R., Manisha Gupta, D. Harish and Virender Pal Singh. "Missed diagnoses in trauma patients vis-à-vis significance of autopsy." *Injury* 36 (2005): 976-983.
2. Xiao, Jianguo, Gerhard RF Krueger, L. Maximilian Buja and Michael Covinsky. "The impact of declining clinical autopsy: Need for revised healthcare policy." *Am J Med Sci* 337 (2009): 41-46.
3. Murken, Douglas R., Michelle Ding, Barton F. Branstetter IV and Larry Nichols. "Autopsy as a quality control measure for radiology and vice versa." *Am J Roentgenol* 199 (2012): 394-401.
4. Christe, Andreas, Patricia Flach, Steffen Ross and Danny Spendlove, et al. "Clinical radiology and postmortem imaging (Virtopsy) are not the same: Specific and unspecific postmortem signs." *Leg Med* 12 (2010): 215-222.
5. Martín, JM Artigas, M. Martí de Gracia, LM Claraco Vega and P. Parrilla Herranz. "Radiology and imaging techniques in severe trauma." *Med Intensiva* 39 (2015): 49-59.

How to cite this article: Olmo, Marijon. "Evaluating Intravital CT versus Autopsy Findings in Fatal Trauma Cases." *J Forensic Med* 9 (2024): 369.