Nigerian Medical Journal

Current issue Instructions Submit article

Home

Niger Med J. 2015 Sep-Oct; 56(5): 353–356. doi: <u>10.4103/0300-1652.170390</u> PMCID: PMC4698852

Role of transvaginal ultrasonography in diagnosing endometrial hyperplasia in preand post-menopause women

Behrooz Shokouhi

Women's Reproductive Health Research Center, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran

Address for correspondence: Dr. Behrooz Shokouhi, Department of Pathology, Tabriz University of Medical Sciences, Tabriz, Iran. E-mail: <u>ri.ca.demzbt@bihuokohS</u> <u>Copyright</u> : © 2015 Nigerian Medical Journal

This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as the author is credited and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Abstract

Background:

Abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) is the most common presenting symptom of endometrial hyperplasia (EH). Transvaginal ultrasonography (TVS) is a diagnostic tool in the evaluation of AUB and EH with various sensitivity and specificity. However, the exact accuracy of TVS in diagnosing EH had not been evaluated. In this study, we aim to evaluate the accuracy of TVS in detecting EH.

Materials and Methods:

In this retrospective study, 120 women (mean age of 48.64 ± 6.74 years) with AUB with suspicious/or possible EH were evaluated. TVS and pathology findings of possible EH were recorded. Sensitivity, specificity, positive, and negative predictive value (PPV and NPV) was calculated.

Results:

Sixty-eight patients were premenopause, and 52 were postmenopause. TVS reported EH in 85 cases (70.83%). Pathology results showed EH in 85 cases (70.83%) including simple cystic hyperplasia in 82 cases, atypical, simple hyperplasia in one case and complex hyperplasia in two cases. Among these 85 cases, EH was confirmed by pathology in 81 cases.

The accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV were 88.25%, 90.7%, 84%, 97.7%, and 84% in premenopause and 100% in postmenopause women.

Conclusion:

TVS is an appropriate diagnostic tool in premenopause and postmenopause women presenting with AUB, especially in detecting EH. However, further studies are needed to determine the exact accuracy of TVS in diagnosing TVS.

Keywords: Abnormal uterine bleeding, endometrial hyperplasia, transvaginal ultrasonography

INTRODUCTION

Abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) is the most common presenting symptom of endometrial hyperplasia (EH).^{1,2} EH is clinically important as it can progress to endometrial carcinoma or occur concurrently with it.^{3,4,5} EH is typically diagnosed by endometrial biopsy or curettage during normal evaluations for AUB in premenopause and postmenopause women. Hysteroscopic evaluation is the gold standard for AUB, and endometrial sampling is a preferred procedure for diagnosis of the endometrial pathology.⁶

Transvaginal ultrasonography (TVS) has been used as a diagnostic tool for various gynecological disorders including the disease of ovaries, uterus, and endometrium $\frac{7.8}{10}$ and plays an important role in the evaluation of AUB.^{9,10} It is a noninvasive and relatively inexpensive diagnostic procedure with good accuracy in the diagnosis of endometrial abnormalities.^{11,12,13}

In our region, most patients do not agree with invasive evaluation and prefer noninvasive methods. Although TVS is a noninvasive method for evaluating AUB, its sensitivity and specificity is varied in different studies.^{14,15,16,17} As patient satisfaction is a key factor in patient care and they prefer noninvasive methods, in this study, we aim to evaluate the accuracy of TVS in detecting EH.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this retrospective study, 120 women with AUB who were evaluated at Alavi Hospital, Ardebil, Iran during 2010–2012 were selected. Subjects with isolated endometrial causes of AUB were included, and those with fibroids, cervical, and vaginal and hemostatic disorders or those receiving hormone therapy were excluded. We also included only patients whom their TVS evaluation was performed by the same radiologist. This study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Ardebil University of Medical Sciences.

The ultrasound was performed transvaginally, and evaluated the endometrial lining, uterine size and volume, and abnormalities in uterine cavity and muscles, in addition to ovaries. Endometrial biopsy was performed using hysteroscopy and was examined by a pathologist. All patients underwent a hysterectomy, and the final diagnosis was based on its results. The final findings by TVS and pathology defined as having EH or not. The pathological findings were then correlated with ultrasonographic findings.

Many classifications of EH have been proposed over the years. The WHO classification $\frac{18}{18}$ is currently preferred and more widely used than other ones which were used in this study.

Data analysis

All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences, version 17.0 (SPSS, Chicago, Illinois, USA). Baseline data are reported as mean \pm standard deviation (continuous data) or percentages (categorical data), depending on the data level. The value of TVS in diagnosing EH was evaluated by sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value (NPV).

RESULTS

In this study, we evaluated 120 women with AUB. Patients' mean age was 48.64 ± 6.74 years (range 24–73 years). Sixty-eight (56.7%) were premenopause and 52 (43.3%) were postmenopause.

TVS reported EH also in 85 cases (70.83%). Pathology results showed EH in 85 cases (70.83%) including simple cystic hyperplasia in 82 cases, atypical, simple hyperplasia in one case, and complex hyperplasia in two cases. Among these 85 cases, EH was confirmed by pathology in 81 cases.

We evaluated TVS efficacy in premenopause and postmenopause women, separately. EH was reported in 43 of 68 premenopause and 42 of 52 postmenopause women by TVS, which was confirmed by pathology in 39 and 42 cases, respectively. Sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of TVS in diagnosing EH in premenopause women were 90.7%, 84%, 90.7%, and 84% and in postmenopause women was 100% for each. The accuracy of TVS in premenopause and postmenopause was 88.25% and 100%, respectively.

DISCUSSION

Common findings in AUB are endometrial polyp, submucosal leiomyomas and EH.¹⁹ Although TVS is used as the evaluation test for AUB, especially in postmenopause women, but its sensitivity and specificity was relatively high ranging from 24–96% to 29–93%, respectively which is mostly depended on the operator's experience.^{19,20,21,22,23} Published studies mostly focus on comparing TVS with other methods or on the predictive value of TVS in intrauterine disorders, in general, but few studies have evaluated the subtype disorders. As in some reports, the sensitivity and specificity of TVS for EH differ from the overall reported sensitivity and specificity.^{19,20,21,22,23}

In this study, we evaluated the efficacy of TVS in detecting EH in premenopause and postmenopause women visited for AUB. We compared the diagnostic accuracy of TVS in a subgroup of premenopause and postmenopause women, separately. The diagnostic accuracy in premenopause women was lower than postmenopause patients.

In this study, in premenopause women, sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV of TVS in diagnosing EH were 90.7%, 84%, 90.7%, and 84%, respectively. Similar to our findings, Dijkhuizen *et al.*²⁴ reported similar sensitivity (88%) but lower specificity for diagnosing endometrial abnormalities in premenopause women. Unlike these findings, Mukhopadhayay

*et al.*²⁵ observed lower sensitivity (43.75%) and higher specificity (95.65%) with PPV and NPV of 70% and 88%, respectively. This difference would be because of the difference in the population evaluated in each study, as well as the difference in the years of the studies. As the TVS technique has improved during these recent years, it is not impossible to observe better diagnostic results.

Unlike premenopause women, many studies have studied the accuracy of TVS in diagnosing endometrial abnormalities especially EH among postmenopause women and has become an essential screening in gynecological practice in these women. $\frac{11,14,26}{14,20}$ However, different studies have yielded different levels of sensitivity and specificity ranging from 59.7%–100% to 7.4%–91.7%, respectively. $\frac{14,20,27,28,29,30,31,32}{14,20,27,28,29,30,31,32}$ In this study, we observed a high accuracy for TVS in diagnosing EH in postmenopause women with sensitivity, specificity, PPV and NPV of 100% for each. Similarly, a high NPV (99%) is reported for TVS in untreated postmenopausal women, $\frac{16,33}{5}$ but there is reported poor NPV in some studies. $\frac{33}{5}$

In this study, we only studied those patients with possible EH as a cause for AUB and patients with other known or possible causes were excluded. Hence, it was possible to observe these results. Overall, it could be concluded that TVS is a good diagnostic and screening method in evaluating AUB and detecting EH with high and acceptable accuracy. However, TVS has some difficulties. There is variability of the technique which has limited the standardization of measurements. As a modality dependent to the operator, TVS quality and accuracy is mostly related to the operators' experience. Moreover, finally, TVS is a diagnostic modality and can indicate some abnormality in the uterine cavity or endometrium, and pathologic evaluation is needed for accurate diagnosis.

CONCLUSION

TVS is an appropriate diagnostic tool in premenopause and postmenopause women presenting with AUB, especially in detecting EH. However, further studies are needed to determine the exact accuracy of TVS in diagnosing TVS.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Espindola D, Kennedy KA, Fischer EG. Management of abnormal uterine bleeding and the pathology of endometrial hyperplasia. Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am. 2007;34:717–37, ix. [PubMed: 18061866]

2. Marret H, Fauconnier A, Chabbert-Buffet N, Cravello L, Golfier F, Gondry J, et al. Clinical practice guidelines on menorrhagia: Management of abnormal uterine bleeding before menopause. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol. 2010;152:133–7. [PubMed: 20688424] 3. Lacey JV, Jr, Chia VM. Endometrial hyperplasia and the risk of progression to carcinoma. Maturitas. 2009;63:39–44. [PubMed: 19285814]

4. Trimble CL, Kauderer J, Zaino R, Silverberg S, Lim PC, Burke JJ, 2nd, et al. Concurrent endometrial carcinoma in women with a biopsy diagnosis of atypical endometrial hyperplasia: A gynecologic oncology group study. Cancer. 2006;106:812–9. [PubMed: 16400639]

5. Eddib A, Allaf B, Lee J, Yeh J. Risk for advanced-stage endometrial cancer in surgical specimens from patients with complex endometrial hyperplasia with atypia. Gynecol Obstet Invest. 2012;73:38–42. [PubMed: 22056948]

6. Balik G, Kagitci M, Ustuner I, Akpinar F, Guvendag Guven ES. Which endometrial pathologies need intraoperative frozen sections? Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2013;14:6121–5. [PubMed: 24289636]

7. de Vries LD, Dijkhuizen FP, Mol BW, Brölmann HA, Moret E, Heintz AP. Comparison of transvaginal sonography, saline infusion sonography, and hysteroscopy in premenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding. J Clin Ultrasound. 2000;28:217–23. [PubMed: 10799999]

8. Dueholm M, Forman A, Jensen ML, Laursen H, Kracht P. Transvaginal sonography combined with saline contrast sonohysterography in evaluating the uterine cavity in premenopausal patients with abnormal uterine bleeding. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol. 2001;18:54–61. [PubMed: 11489227]

9. Dubinsky TJ, Parvey HR, Maklad N. The role of transvaginal sonography and endometrial biopsy in the evaluation of peri- and postmenopausal bleeding. AJR Am J Roentgenol. 1997;169:145–9. [PubMed: 9207515]

10. Fleischer AC. Sonographic assessment of endometrial disorders. Semin Ultrasound CT MR. 1999;20:259–66. [PubMed: 10457566]

11. Davidson KG, Dubinsky TJ. Ultrasonographic evaluation of the endometrium in postmenopausal vaginal bleeding. Radiol Clin North Am. 2003;41:769–80. [PubMed: 12899491]

12. Gupta JK, Chien PF, Voit D, Clark TJ, Khan KS. Ultrasonographic endometrial thickness for diagnosing endometrial pathology in women with postmenopausal bleeding: A metaanalysis. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 2002;81:799–816. [PubMed: 12225294]

13. Tabor A, Watt HC, Wald NJ. Endometrial thickness as a test for endometrial cancer in women with postmenopausal vaginal bleeding. Obstet Gynecol. 2002;99:663–70. [PubMed: 12039131]

14. Yela DA, Ravacci SH, Monteiro IM, Pereira KC, Gabiatti JR. Comparative study of transvaginal sonography and outpatient hysteroscopy for detection of pathologic endometrial lesions in postmenopausal women. Rev Assoc Med Bras. 2009;55:553–6. [PubMed: 19918655]

15. Pieta W, Radowicki S. Usefulness of ultrasound endometrium thickness measurement in diagnosis of endometrium pathology in women with abnormal peri- and postmenopausal bleeding. Ginekol Pol. 2009;80:503–7. [PubMed: 19697813]

16. Fleischer AC, Wheeler JE, Lindsay I, Hendrix SL, Grabill S, Kravitz B, et al. An assessment of the value of ultrasonographic screening for endometrial disease in postmenopausal women without symptoms. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 2001;184:70–5. [PubMed: 11174482]

17. Starczewski A, Brodowska A, Strojny K, Puchalski A, Mieczkowska E, Szydlowska I. The value of ultrasonography in diagnosis of atypical endometrial hyperplasia in postmenopausal women. Przegl Lek. 2005;62:227–9. [PubMed: 16229240]

18. Silverberg SG. Tumors of the uterine corpus: Epithelial tumors and related lesions. In: Tavassoli FA, Stratton MR, editors. WHO Classification of Tumors: Pathology and Genetics

of Tumors of the Breast and Female Genital Organs. Lyon, France: IARC Press; 2003. pp. 221–32.

19. Aslam M, Ijaz L, Tariq S, Shafqat K, Meher-Un-Nisa, Ashraf R, et al. Comparison of transvaginal sonography and saline contrast sonohysterography in women with abnormal uterine bleeding: Correlation with hysteroscopy and histopathology. Int J Health Sci (Qassim) 2007;1:17–24. [PMCID: PMC3068651] [PubMed: 21475448]

20. Ryu JA, Kim B, Lee J, Kim S, Lee SH. Comparison of transvaginal ultrasonography with hysterosonography as a screening method in patients with abnormal uterine bleeding. Korean J Radiol. 2004;5:39–46. [PMCID: PMC2698112] [PubMed: 15064558]

21. Bree RL. Ultrasound of the endometrium: Facts, controversies, and future trends. Abdom Imaging. 1997;22:557–68. [PubMed: 9321440]

22. Lalchandani S, Phillips K. Evaluation of endometrial cavity-investigation options. Rev Gynaecol Pract. 2003;3:165–70.

23. Soares SR, Barbosa dos Reis MM, Camargos AF. Diagnostic accuracy of sonohysterography, transvaginal sonography, and hysterosalpingography in patients with uterine cavity diseases. Fertil Steril. 2000;73:406–11. [PubMed: 10685551]

24. Dijkhuizen FP, Brölmann HA, Potters AE, Bongers MY, Heinz AP. The accuracy of transvaginal ultrasonography in the diagnosis of endometrial abnormalities. Obstet Gynecol. 1996;87:345–9. [PubMed: 8598952]

25. Mukhopadhayay S, Bhattacharyya SK, Ganguly RP, Patra KK, Bhattacharya N, Barman SC. Comparative evaluation of perimenopausal abnormal uterine bleeding by transvaginal sonography, hysteroscopy and endometrial biopsy. J Indian Med Assoc. 2007;105:624, 626, 628. [PubMed: 18405088]

26. Dijkhuizen FP, Mol BW, Brölmann HA, Heintz AP. Cost-effectiveness of the use of transvaginal sonography in the evaluation of postmenopausal bleeding. Maturitas. 2003;45:275–82. [PubMed: 12927314]

27. Goncharenko VM, Beniuk VA, Kalenska OV, Demchenko OM, Spivak MY, Bubnov RV. Predictive diagnosis of endometrial hyperplasia and personalized therapeutic strategy in women of fertile age. EPMA J. 2013;4:24. [PMCID: PMC3866390] [PubMed: 24314145] 28. La Sala GB, Blasi I, Gallinelli A, Debbi C, Lopopolo G, Vinci V, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of sonohysterography and transvaginal sonography as compared with hysteroscopy and endometrial biopsy: A prospective study. Minerva Ginecol. 2011;63:421–7. [PubMed: 21926951]

29. Tinelli R, Tinelli FG, Cicinelli E, Malvasi A, Tinelli A. The role of hysteroscopy with eye-directed biopsy in postmenopausal women with uterine bleeding and endometrial atrophy. Menopause. 2008;15(4 Pt 1):737–42. [PubMed: 18202590]

30. Gimpelson RJ, Rappold HO. A comparative study between panoramic hysteroscopy with directed biopsies and dilatation and curettage. A review of 276 cases. Am J Obstet Gynecol. 1988;158(3 Pt 1):489–92. [PubMed: 3348309]

31. Cacciatore B, Ramsay T, Lehtovirta P, Ylöstalo P. Transvaginal sonography and hysteroscopy in postmenopausal bleeding. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand. 1994;73:413–6. [PubMed: 8009974]

32. Karlsson B, Granberg S, Hellberg P, Wikland M. Comparative study of transvaginal sonography and hysteroscopy for the detection of pathologic endometrial lesions in women with postmenopausal bleeding. J Ultrasound Med. 1994;13:757–62. [PubMed: 7823337]

33. Langer RD, Pierce JJ, O'Hanlan KA, Johnson SR, Espeland MA, Trabal JF, et al. Transvaginal ultrasonography compared with endometrial biopsy for the detection of endometrial disease. Postmenopausal Estrogen/Progestin Interventions Trial. N Engl J Med. 1997;337:1792–8. [PubMed: 9400035] Articles from Nigerian Medical Journal : Journal of the Nigeria Medical Association are provided here courtesy of **Medknow Publications**

٠