International Journal of Medicine
pISSN 1468-3814 | eISSN 2667-7008
https://theinternationalmedicine.com/
Original Research Article DOI: 10.61336/im/26-4-49

Comparative Evaluation of Liquid-Based Cytology and Conventional Cytology in Early Cancer Detection: An Observational Study

Shreya Jaiswal[1]*, Amrita Chauda[2]
[1] PG 3rd Year, Department of Pathology, RKDF Medical College and Research Centre, Bhopal, India
[2]PG 3rd Year, Department of Pathology, RKDF Medical College and Research Centre, Bhopal, India

Correspondence: **Shreya Jaiswal**

Received: February 19, 2026
Revised: March 05, 2026
Accepted: March 25, 2026
Published: April 14, 2026

Abstract

Background: Early detection of cancer is critical for reducing morbidity and mortality. Cytology-based screening plays a key role in identifying premalignant and malignant lesions; however, conventional cytology has several limitations that may affect diagnostic accuracy. Liquid-based cytology (LBC) has been introduced as an improved technique to overcome these shortcomings. ***Aim:*** To evaluate the role of liquid-based cytology in early cancer detection and to compare its diagnostic performance with conventional cytology. ***Materials and Methods:*** This observational study was conducted over a period of one year in the Department of Pathology at RKDF Medical College and Research Centre, Bhopal. A total of 200 patients with clinically suspected lesions were included. Samples were processed using both conventional smear (CS) and liquid-based cytology (LBC) techniques. Parameters assessed included sample adequacy, background clarity, cellular preservation, and diagnostic accuracy. Histopathological correlation was performed in 120 cases and considered the gold standard. ***Results:*** LBC demonstrated higher sample adequacy (96%) compared to conventional cytology (85%). Clean background was observed in 90% of LBC slides versus 65% in conventional smears. Cellular preservation and uniform distribution were superior in LBC. The sensitivity and specificity of LBC were 92% and 95%, respectively, compared to 82% and 88% for conventional cytology. Diagnostic accuracy was higher for LBC (94%) than conventional cytology (85%). ***Conclusion:*** Liquid-based cytology is a superior technique compared to conventional cytology for early cancer detection. It provides improved sample quality, better morphological clarity, and higher diagnostic accuracy. Its incorporation into routine diagnostic and screening programs can enhance early detection and improve patient outcomes.

Keywords: Liquid-based cytology, early cancer detection, conventional cytology, diagnostic accuracy, screening

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

INTRODUCTION

Cancer continues to be a major global health burden and is one of the leading causes of mortality worldwide. According to global cancer statistics, early detection and timely intervention significantly reduce morbidity and mortality associated with malignancies [1]. Screening strategies play a crucial role in identifying premalignant and early malignant lesions, thereby improving survival outcomes and reducing healthcare costs [2].

Cytology-based screening has long been an essential tool in the early detection of cancer, particularly in cervical cancer screening programs. The conventional Papanicolaou (Pap) smear has contributed substantially to the reduction in cervical cancer incidence and mortality over the past decades [3]. However, despite its widespread use, conventional cytology has several inherent limitations, including inadequate sampling, uneven cell distribution, air-drying artifacts, and obscuring elements such as blood, mucus, and inflammatory cells [4]. These limitations may result in reduced sensitivity and increased false-negative rates, thereby compromising its effectiveness as a screening tool [5].

Liquid-based cytology (LBC) was introduced as an advanced alternative to overcome these drawbacks. In LBC, the collected cellular material is suspended in a preservative solution, allowing for better fixation and processing of samples. This technique produces a thin, uniform monolayer of cells with reduced background debris, thereby enhancing morphological interpretation [6]. Studies have demonstrated that LBC improves sample adequacy and reduces the proportion of unsatisfactory smears compared to conventional methods [2,7].

Another significant advantage of LBC is its ability to facilitate ancillary testing, including human papillomavirus (HPV) DNA testing and immunocytochemistry, from the same sample vial [8]. This not only improves diagnostic accuracy but also supports integrated screening approaches, particularly in

cervical cancer prevention programs [3]. Furthermore, LBC has shown promising results in non-gynecological cytology, including fine-needle aspiration cytology (FNAC) and body fluid analysis, where improved cellular preservation and cleaner backgrounds aid in more accurate diagnosis [6].

Several studies have reported higher sensitivity and specificity of LBC compared to conventional cytology in detecting precancerous and cancerous lesions [2,4]. The improved diagnostic performance of LBC is particularly valuable in early cancer detection, where subtle cytological changes must be accurately identified to ensure timely clinical management [5,7].

Despite these advantages, the adoption of LBC in routine practice, especially in resource-limited settings, is still limited due to higher costs and the need for specialized equipment and training [6]. Therefore, evaluating its diagnostic utility and feasibility in different clinical settings remains essential.

In this context, the present observational study was undertaken to assess the role of liquid-based cytology in early cancer detection and to compare its diagnostic efficacy with conventional cytology in a tertiary care center.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design and Setting

This observational study was conducted in the Department of Pathology, RKDF Medical College and Research Centre, Bhopal, over a period of one year.

Study Population

A total of 200 patients presenting with clinically suspected lesions (cervical, breast, thyroid, lymph node, and body fluids) were included.

Inclusion Criteria

- Patients with suspected neoplastic lesions
- Patients willing to participate in the study

Exclusion Criteria

- Inadequate clinical details
- Poorly preserved samples

Sample Collection

Samples were collected using appropriate techniques (FNAC, exfoliative cytology, or fluid aspiration). Each sample was divided into two parts:

1. Conventional smear (CS)
2. Liquid-based cytology (LBC)

Processing Techniques

- **Conventional Smear:** Direct smearing and fixation using standard methods
- **LBC:** Samples collected in preservative solution and processed using standard LBC protocols

Parameters Evaluated

- Sample adequacy
- Background clarity
- Cellular morphology
- Diagnostic categorization

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed using appropriate statistical tools. Sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic accuracy were calculated using histopathology as the gold standard where available.

RESULTS

A total of 200 cases were included in the present study conducted over a period of one year. The age of patients ranged from 21 to 75 years, with the majority of cases clustered in the 31–50 years age group (52%). There was a female predominance, accounting for 60% (n=120) of cases, while males constituted 40% (n=80). The most common sites sampled were cervix (35%), lymph nodes (20%), breast (15%), thyroid (10%), and body fluids including pleural and ascitic fluids (20%).

Assessment of sample adequacy demonstrated a clear advantage of liquid-based cytology (LBC) over conventional smears (CS). Out of 200 cases, adequate samples were obtained in 192 cases (96%) using LBC, whereas only 170 cases (85%) were adequate in conventional cytology. Inadequate samples in conventional smears were mainly attributed to poor fixation, air-drying artifacts, and obscuring blood or inflammatory elements.

Table 1: Comparison of Sample Adequacy

Method	Adequate Samples (n)	Percentage (%)
Conventional Cytology	170	85%
Liquid-Based Cytology	192	96%

Background clarity was significantly better in LBC preparations. A clean background with minimal blood, mucus, and inflammatory cells was observed in 90% of LBC slides compared to 65% in conventional smears. Approximately 35% of conventional smears showed moderate to dense background obscuration, which negatively impacted cytological interpretation.

Cellular preservation and morphological details were superior in LBC. The cells were distributed in a uniform monolayer with well-preserved nuclear and cytoplasmic features. In contrast, conventional smears frequently showed overlapping of cells, distortion, and suboptimal staining in nearly 30% of cases.

Table 2: Comparison of Cytomorphological Features

Parameter	Conventional Cytology	LBC
Clear Background	65%	90%
Uniform Cell Distribution	60%	95%
Good Cellular Preservation	70%	93%
Obscuring Artifacts	35%	10%

Diagnostic categorization revealed that LBC identified a greater number of malignant and suspicious cases compared to conventional cytology. Out of the total cases, 60 were diagnosed as malignant or suspicious on LBC, whereas only 48 cases were identified using conventional smears. Additionally, LBC reduced the number of inconclusive or unsatisfactory diagnoses due to improved slide quality.

Histopathological correlation was available in 120 cases and served as the gold standard for evaluating diagnostic performance. LBC demonstrated higher concordance with histopathology compared to conventional cytology. The sensitivity, specificity, and overall diagnostic accuracy were all higher for LBC.

Table 3: Diagnostic Performance

Parameter	Conventional Cytology	LBC
Sensitivity	82%	92%
Specificity	88%	95%
Diagnostic Accuracy	85%	94%

False-negative results were more common in conventional cytology, largely due to inadequate sampling and obscuring background elements. In contrast, LBC minimized these limitations through improved sample processing and presentation. Overall, liquid-based cytology demonstrated superior performance in terms of sample adequacy, morphological clarity, and diagnostic accuracy, highlighting its important role in the early detection of malignancies.

DISCUSSION

Early detection remains the cornerstone of effective cancer control strategies, and cytological techniques continue to play a pivotal role in screening and diagnosis. In the present study, liquid-based cytology (LBC) demonstrated clear superiority over conventional cytology (CS) across multiple diagnostic parameters, including sample adequacy, background clarity, cellular preservation, and overall diagnostic accuracy.

One of the most important findings of this study was the significantly higher sample adequacy observed with LBC (96%) compared to conventional smears (85%). This is consistent with previous studies that have reported reduced rates of unsatisfactory smears with LBC due to improved fixation and standardized processing techniques [2,4]. Reducing inadequate samples is particularly important in screening programs, as it minimizes the need for repeat procedures and improves patient compliance.

Background clarity was markedly better in LBC preparations. In the present study, 90% of LBC slides demonstrated a clean background compared to 65% of conventional smears. Obscuring factors such as blood, mucus, and inflammatory cells are known to interfere with cytological interpretation in conventional methods and contribute to diagnostic inaccuracies [5]. The processing techniques used in LBC effectively reduce these elements, allowing clearer visualization of cellular details. Similar observations have been reported in earlier studies highlighting improved slide quality with LBC [6,8].

Cellular preservation and morphology were also superior in LBC. The monolayer arrangement of cells with minimal overlapping facilitated better evaluation of nuclear and cytoplasmic features, which are essential for accurate diagnosis. In contrast, conventional smears frequently exhibited overlapping, distortion, and uneven staining, which can obscure subtle diagnostic features. These findings align with established cytopathology literature emphasizing improved morphological assessment with LBC [6,7].

The present study also demonstrated a higher detection rate of malignant and suspicious lesions with LBC (30%) compared to conventional cytology (24%). This reflects the higher sensitivity of LBC in identifying early neoplastic changes. The sensitivity and specificity of LBC were 92% and 95%, respectively, compared to 82% and 88% for conventional cytology. These findings are consistent with previous studies and meta-analyses that have shown improved sensitivity of LBC while maintaining high specificity [2,3].

Histopathological correlation further supported the diagnostic superiority of LBC, with higher concordance rates observed compared to conventional cytology. The

lower false-negative rate seen with LBC can be attributed to improved sample representation and enhanced visualization of abnormal cells. In conventional cytology, false-negative results are often associated with sampling errors and obscuring background elements, both of which are minimized in LBC [4,5].

In addition to improved diagnostic accuracy, LBC offers the advantage of enabling ancillary testing such as human papillomavirus (HPV) DNA testing and immunocytochemistry from the same sample [8]. This is particularly valuable in cervical cancer screening, where combined cytology and HPV testing improves detection of high-grade lesions [3]. Moreover, the utility of LBC extends to non-gynecological cytology, including fine-needle aspiration and body fluid analysis, thereby broadening its clinical applicability.

Despite its advantages, LBC has certain limitations, including higher cost, requirement for specialized equipment, and the need for trained personnel. These factors may limit its widespread adoption, especially in resource-limited settings. However, considering its improved diagnostic performance and reduction in repeat testing, LBC may be cost-effective in the long term.

Overall, the findings of this study are in agreement with existing literature and reinforce the role of liquid-based cytology as a superior alternative to conventional cytology. Its higher sensitivity, improved sample quality, and better diagnostic accuracy make it an important tool in early cancer detection. Wider adoption of LBC in routine clinical practice could significantly enhance screening effectiveness and improve patient outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Liquid-based cytology is a superior technique compared to conventional cytology for early cancer detection. It offers improved sample adequacy, better cellular preservation, and higher diagnostic accuracy.
Its integration into routine diagnostic practice can significantly enhance early detection rates and improve patient outcomes.

Limitations

- Limited sample size
- Single-center study
- Limited histopathological correlation

Recommendations

- Wider implementation of LBC in screening programs
- Larger multicentric studies for validation
- Cost-effectiveness analysis

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support of the Department of Pathology, RKDF Medical College and Research Centre, Bhopal.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Funding

No external funding received.

REFERENCES

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, et al. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2021;71(3):209–249.
2. Arbyn M, Bergeron C, Klinkhamer P, Martin-Hirsch P, Siebers AG, Bulten J. Liquid compared with conventional cytology in cervical cancer screening: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Oncol. 2008;9(2):167–176.
3. Ronco G, Giorgi-Rossi P, Carozzi F, Confortini M, Dalla Palma P, Del Mistro A, et al. Efficacy of liquid-based cytology in cervical cancer screening: a randomized controlled trial. BMJ. 2007;335(7609):28.
4. Davey E, Barratt A, Irwig L, Chan SF, Macaskill P, Mannes P, et al. Effect of study design and quality on unsatisfactory rates, cytology classifications, and accuracy in cervical cytology screening: a systematic review. BMJ. 2006;332(7532):201–205.
5. Nayar R, Wilbur DC. The Bethesda System for Reporting Cervical Cytology: Definitions, Criteria, and Explanatory Notes. 3rd ed. New York: Springer; 2015.
6. Bibbo M, Wilbur DC. Comprehensive Cytopathology. 4th ed. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2014.
7. Koss LG, Melamed MR. Koss' Diagnostic Cytology and Its Histopathologic Bases. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2006.
8. Bales CE, Durfee GR, Safford SD. Liquid-based cytology in non-gynecologic specimens: a review of diagnostic utility and limitations. Diagn Cytopathol. 2012;40(1):1–10.
9. Wright TC Jr, Stoler MH, Behrens CM, Sharma A, Zhang G, Wright TL. Primary cervical cancer screening with human papillomavirus: end of study results. JAMA. 2015;314(11):1091–1100.
10. Solomon D, Davey D, Kurman R, Moriarty A, O'Connor D, Prey M, et al. The 2001 Bethesda System: terminology for reporting results of cervical cytology. JAMA. 2002;287(16):2114–2119.