

ORIGINAL RESEARCH

# Colour Doppler Transvaginal Ultrasonography and Histopathological Diagnosis in Abnormal Uterine Bleeding Cases

<sup>1</sup>Megha Tripathi, <sup>2</sup>Charu Chandra, <sup>3</sup>Rahul Mangal, <sup>4</sup>Shakuntla Godara

<sup>1,2</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of obstetrics and gynecology, Ananta Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Center, Rajsamand, Rajasthan, India

<sup>3</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Radiodiagnosis, Ananta Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Center, Rajsamand, Rajasthan, India

<sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Radiodiagnosis, Ananta Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Center, Rajsamand, Rajasthan, India

## Corresponding Author

Megha Tripathi

Assistant Professor, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ananta Institute of Medical Sciences and Research Center, Rajsamand, Rajasthan, India

Received: 08 March, 2023

Accepted: 13 April, 2023

## Abstract

**Objectives-** To find out role of colour Doppler transvaginal ultrasonography (CDTU) in diagnosis of abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) cases and to confirm etiological diagnosis by histopathological examination.

**Methods-** In this cross sectional study, 141 patients with AUB arriving in Gynaecology OPD of Santokba Durlabhji Memorial Hospital underwent CDTU. Then endometrial biopsy was done. Endometrial thickness, pulsatility index (PI) and resistive index (RI) of uterine arteries were measured.

**Results-** The sensitivity of CDTU in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking RI and/or PI abnormal- 62.86 %, specificity- 92.45%, positive predictive value- 73.33%, negative predictive value- 88.29% and diagnostic accuracy- 85.11%. Endometrial carcinoma had minimum RI ( $0.524 \pm 0.135$ ) and minimum PI ( $1.054 \pm 0.534$ ).

**Conclusions-** CDTU can be used to select women with AUB who would further benefit from use of endometrial biopsy to make a definite diagnosis at an earlier stage and to identify those who do not need further invasive procedures

**Keyword-** Colour Doppler, Transvaginal ultrasonography, Resistive index, Pulsatility index, Endometrial thickness

## Introduction

Abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) is one of the most common problems that challenge the gynaecologists. To diagnose endometrial pathology women are subjected to diagnostic curettage. However, diagnostic curettage is an invasive procedure and not without danger especially in the elderly. The false negative rate for curettage is 2-6% because curettage may not empty the uterine cavity completely. Therefore, non invasive technique like ultrasonography is being utilized nowadays to detect endometrial pathologies. Recently, transvaginal colour and pulsed doppler ultrasound has increased the reliability of ultrasonographic diagnosis of women with certain endometrial pathologies.<sup>1</sup>

It is able to detect subtle changes in the endometrium and it has been observed that endometrial thickness <4 mm is usually associated with normal morphology.<sup>2</sup> This would help in selecting those patients who require diagnostic curettage, thus preventing an unnecessary operation. It also helps in localizing the tumour prior to diagnostic curettage there by minimizing the chances of missing the lesion.<sup>1</sup>

It also helps in the distinction between benign and malignant conditions based on the detection of low impedance and high diastolic blood flow in tumoral blood vessels in malignant pathologies. Correlation between ultrasound estimated endometrial thickness and pathologically confirmed thickness may be as close as one millimeter.<sup>3</sup>

CDTU is non-invasive, low in cost procedure that does not cause patient discomfort and can be performed without extensive preparation.<sup>4</sup> It is used to obtain a better image of the endometrium, allowing visualization of abnormal thicknesses, polyps, and leiomyomas, which may not be detected by endometrial biopsy.<sup>5</sup> CDTU of

the genital vessels can improve the sensitivity and specificity of TVS for the prediction of endometrial pathologies<sup>6,7</sup>The presence or absence of flow is considered and the values of resistivity index (RI) and the pulsatility index (PI) are measured.

This study aimed at role of colour dopplertransvaginalsonographic findings in abnormal uterine bleeding cases and to establish etiological diagnosis of abnormal uterine bleeding cases by histopathological examination.

### Materials and methods

The present study was conducted indepartment of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, SantokbaDurlabhji Memorial Hospital cum Medical Research Institute, Jaipur, India. It was a descriptive type of observational study. Sample size was calculated at 95% confidence level assuming standard deviation of 0.55 in pulsatility index as observed in the study of Kucuret al.<sup>8</sup>

At precision of 0.1 in pulsatility index minimum 121 abnormal uterine bleeding cases are required as sample size.It was further enhanced and rounded off to 140 cases assuming 15% drop outs/attrition.This study was conducted on patients with abnormal uterine bleeding during the period of 1<sup>st</sup> June 2014 to 30<sup>th</sup> April 2015.Women with a known genital tract malignancy, pelvic pathology like endometriosis, fibroid, pelvic inflammatory disease, pregnancy, any bleeding diathesis, drugs intake or history of intra uterine device insertion were excluded.

Patients with abnormal uterine bleeding arriving in Obstetrics and Gynaecology department of our hospital were evaluated initially with complete history regarding bleeding per vaginum,other routine history and examination.Thentheywere referred to radiology department for transvaginalsonography with colour doppler. The patients were examined by standard B mode transvaginalsonography with colour doppler in the mid follicular phase.The primary outcome measures were endometrial thickness, pulsatility index (PI) and resistive index (RI) of uterine arteries.All ultrasound scans were performed by the same examiner to avoid interobservervariability.Radiological findings like endometrial thickness >8 mm<sup>9</sup>, RI < 0.715<sup>10</sup> and PI < 1.450<sup>10</sup> were considered as abnormal in this study.

After thatpatients were prepared for endometrial biopsy, specimens were sent to histopathology department of our hospital. Processing, paraffin embedding, section cutting and staining was done by standardized methods in the department. Slides were stained by Hematoxylin (Meyer's) and Eosin.The results of the radiological examinations were compared with the histopathological diagnosis of the endometrial specimen.

Parametric tests like unpaired t test and anova test were used for comparison of continuous variables while chi-square test was used for categorical variables.P value < 0.05 was taken as significant.Medcalc 14.0.0 version software was used for statistical analysis. No additional tests/ procedures were carried out specifically for the requirement of the study. Hence, there was no additional financial inputs required from the part of the patient.

### Observations and Results

**Table 1-Histopathological (HPR) distribution**

HPR	No.	%
Endometrial carcinoma	4	2.84
Sub mucous myoma	9	6.38
Endometrial polyp	9	6.38
Proliferative phase	51	36.17
Secretory phase	55	39.01
Endometrial hyperplasia	13	9.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Maximum patients had normal endometrium i.e. secretory (39.01%) and proliferative (36.17%) while only 2.84 % patients had endometrial carcinoma (Table-1)

**Table 2-Color Doppler distribution**

Doppler	No.	%
Abnormal	30	21.28
Normal	111	78.72
<b>Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100.00</b>

Out of 30 abnormal color doppler , 20 patients had both RI and PI abnormal, while 6 had only abnormal RI and 4 had only abnormal PI and 78.72% patients had normal color doppler i.e. both RI and PI normal (Table-2).

**Table 3- Comparison of endometrial thickness with histopathology**

Endometrial Thickness	HPR	Total
-----------------------	-----	-------

	Abnormal		Normal			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<8	11	10.9	90	89.1	101	100
≥8 mm	24	60.0	16	40.0	40	100.00
<b>Total</b>	35	24.8	106	75.2	141	100.00

Chi-square = 37.029 with 1 degree of freedom; P <0.001

60 % patients having ET ≥ 8 mm had abnormal HPR while 89.1 % patients having ET < 8 mm had normal HPR making this correlation significant (Table 3).

**Table 4- Comparison of color doppler with histopathology**

Doppler	HPR				Total	
	Abnormal		Normal		No.	%
	No.	%	No.	%		
<b>Abnormal</b>	21	70.00	9	30.00	30	100.00
<b>Normal</b>	14	12.60	97	87.40	111	100.00
<b>Total</b>	35	24.82	106	75.18	141	100.00

Chi-square = 41.679 with 1 degree of freedom; P <0.001

70 % patients having abnormal HPR had abnormal color doppler while 87.40 % patients having normal HPR had normal color dopplermaking this correlation significant (Table-4)

**Table 5-Efficacy of RI, PI, color doppler and ET in diagnosis of abnormal HPR**

	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Dignostic Accuracy
<b>RI</b>	18/35	98/106	18/26	98/115	116/141
	51.43%	92.45%	69.23%	85.22%	82.27%
<b>PI</b>	16/35	98/106	16/24	98/117	114/141
	45.71%	92.45%	66.67%	83.76%	80.85%
<b>Doppler</b>	22/35	98/106	22/30	98/111	120/141
	62.86%	92.45%	73.33%	88.29%	85.11%

The sensitivity of RI in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking 0.715 as cut off value was 51.43 %, specificity was 92.45 %, positive predictive value was 69.23%, negative predictive value was 85.22% and diagnostic accuracy was 82.27 % (Table-5).

The sensitivity of PI in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking 1.450 as cut off value was 45.71 %, specificity was 92.45 %, positive predictive value was 66.67 %, negative predictive value was 83.76% and diagnostic accuracy was 80.85 % (Table-5).

The sensitivity of color doppler in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking RI and/or PI abnormal was 62.86 %, specificity was 92.45 %, positive predictive value was 73.33 %, negative predictive value was 88.29% and diagnostic accuracy was 85.11 % (Table-5).

**Table 6-Comparison of the uterine artery resistive indices (RI) in between various endometrial pathologies**

Endometrial histology	Mean	SD	P value*
Endometrial carcinoma	0.524	0.135	<0.001
Sub mucous myoma	0.701	0.169	
Endometrial polyp	0.728	0.158	
Proliferative phase	0.768	0.093	
Secretory phase	0.787	0.101	
Endometrial hyperplasia	0.653	0.166	

Mean RI of various endometrial pathologies, endometrial carcinoma had minimum RI (0.524±0.135) making P value significant (Table-6).

**Table 7- Comparison of the uterine artery pulsatility indices (PI) in between various endometrial pathologies**

Endometrial histology	Mean	SD	P value*
Endometrial carcinoma	1.054	0.534	<0.001
Sub mucous myoma	1.446	0.650	
Endometrial polyp	1.568	0.489	
Proliferative phase	1.731	0.363	

Secretory phase	1.802	0.372	
Endometrial hyperplasia	1.327	0.549	

Mean PI of various endometrial pathologies, endometrial carcinoma had minimum PI ( $1.054 \pm 0.534$ ) making P value significant (Table-7).

### Discussion

Over recent years colour doppler sonography (CDTU) is being used to predict endometrial pathologies<sup>11,12</sup> In this study we enrolled 141 patients with abnormal uterine bleeding and compared the doppler indices of uterine arteries with the final histopathological diagnoses.

In our study, mean endometrial thickness (ET) was 6.7 mm, with minimum ET 2.0 mm and maximum ET 14.0 mm. Out of 141 patients, 51 (36.17 %) patients had proliferative endometrium, 55 (39.01 %) had secretory endometrium, 13(9.22%) had endometrial hyperplasia, 9 (6.38%) had sub mucous myoma, 9 (6.38%) had endometrial polyp and 4 (2.84%) had endometrial carcinoma . Secretory and proliferative endometrium were considered as normal endometrium including 106 i.e. 75.18% patients and rest all others as abnormal endometrium including 35 i.e. 24.82% patients. Malignant endometrium included 4 i.e. 2.84% patients and rest all were benign endometrium including 137 i.e. 97.16% patients

Among 141 patients, 26 i.e. 18.4 % had abnormal resistive index i.e.  $RI < 0.715$ , mean RI was 0.71, minimum RI 0.410, maximum 0.890. 24 patients i.e. 17.02% had abnormal pulsatility index i.e.  $PI < 1.450$ , mean PI 1.67, minimum PI 0.700, maximum PI 2.875. 30 patients i.e. 21.28% had abnormal colour doppler i.e. any patient with  $RI < 0.715$  and/or  $PI < 1.450$ . Out of 30 abnormal colour doppler, 20 patients had both RI and PI abnormal, while 6 had only abnormal RI and 4 had only abnormal PI.

In our study, out of 40 patients with abnormal ET i.e.  $\geq 8$ , 24 (60%) had abnormal HPR and out of 101 patients with normal ET i.e.  $< 8$ , 90 (89.1 %) patients had normal HPR. The sensitivity of ET in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking 8 mm as cut off value was 68.57%, specificity was 84.91%, positive predictive value was 60%, negative predictive value was 89.11% and diagnostic accuracy was 80.85%.

In our study, out of 26 patients with abnormal RI, 18 patients i.e. 69.23% had abnormal HPR, and out of 115 patients with normal RI, 98 patients i.e. 85.22% had normal HPR , out of 24 patients with abnormal PI, 15 patients i.e. 62.5% had abnormal HPR, and out of 117 patients with normal PI, 97 patients i.e. 82.9% had normal HPR , out of 30 patients with abnormal colour doppler, 21 patients i.e. 70 % had abnormal HPR, and out of 111 patients with normal colour doppler, 97 patients i.e. 87.40% had normal HPR. This shows that the abnormal RI, PI and doppler are associated with abnormal HPR with significant p value.

So the sensitivity of RI in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking 0.715 as cut off value was 51.43%, specificity was 92.45%, positive predictive value was 69.23%, negative predictive value was 85.22% and diagnostic accuracy was 82.27%. The sensitivity of PI in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking 1.450 as cut off value was 45.71%, specificity was 92.45%, positive predictive value was 66.67%, negative predictive value was 83.76% and diagnostic accuracy was 80.85%. The sensitivity of colour doppler in diagnosis of abnormal HPR taking RI and/or PI abnormal was 62.86%, specificity was 92.45%, positive predictive value was 73.33%, negative predictive value was 88.29% and diagnostic accuracy was 85.11 % In our study, among mean RI and PI of various endometrial pathologies, endometrial carcinoma had minimum RI ( $0.524 \pm 0.135$ ) and minimum PI ( $1.054 \pm 0.534$ ) making P value significant predictive value was 88.29% and diagnostic accuracy was 85.11 %

### Conclusion

Colour doppler transvaginal ultrasonography of the endometrium has become an important part of the evaluation of women presenting with abnormal uterine bleeding. It is a sensitive, specific, non invasive, low cost procedure that does not cause patient discomfort. In this cross sectional study, colour doppler in evaluation of abnormal uterine bleeding is compared with histopathology after endometrial biopsy. It was concluded that endometrial pathologies are associated significantly with uterine artery doppler changes.

In conclusion our data shows that colour doppler transvaginal ultrasonography can be used to select women with abnormal uterine bleeding who would further benefit from the use of endometrial biopsy to make a definite diagnosis at an earlier stage and to identify those who do not need further invasive procedures.

The role of colour doppler sonography to discriminate between benign and malignant endometrial condition in women presenting with abnormal bleeding and thickened endometrium is significant in this study but further study in a large population may be conducted to substantiate its significance.

Colour doppler has a good role in supplementing the diagnosis after transvaginal ultrasonography has been performed for visualizing endometrial thickness and to predict endometrial carcinoma at an earlier stage.

**References**

1. Bano I, Mittal G, Khalid M, Akhtar N, Arshad Z. A Study of Endometrial Pathology by Transvaginal Color Doppler Ultrasonography and its Correlation with Histopathology in Post-menopausal Women. *Indian Medical Gazette* APRIL 2013.
2. Osmer R, Volkens M, Rath W, Kuhn W. Vaginosonographic detection of endometrial cancer in postmenopausal women. *Int. J. Gynecol. Obst.* 1990 May; 32(1):35 – 37.
3. Fleischer AC, Mendelson EB, Bohm-Velez M, Entman SS. Transvaginal and transabdominal sonography of endometrium. *Semin Ultrasound CT MR.* 1988 Apr;9(2):81 – 101.
4. Langer RD, Pierce JJ, O'Hanlan KA, Johnson SR, Espeland MA, Trabala 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 Dec;337(25):1792–1798.
5. Curcic A, Segedi D, Belopavlovic Z, Petrovic D. Transvaginal sonography of the postmenopausal endometrium. *Med Pregl.* 2000;53 (1-2):59-63.
6. Wilailak S1, Jirapinyo M, Theppisai U. Transvaginal Doppler sonography: is there a role for this modality in the evaluation of women with postmenopausal bleeding? *Maturitas.* 2005 Feb 14;50 (2):111-116.
7. Wilczak M, Samulak D, Englert-Golon M, Pieta B. Clinical usefulness of evaluation of quality parameters of blood flow: pulsation index and resistance index in the uterine arteries in the initial differential diagnostics of pathology within the endometrium. *Eur J Gynecol Oncol* 2010;31(4):437-439.
8. Kucur S K, Aydın A A, Temizkan O, Gözükarı I, Uludag E U, Acar C et al. Contribution of spiral artery blood flow changes assessed by transvaginal color doppler sonography for predicting endometrial pathologies. *Dicle Medical Journal* 2013; 40 (3): 345-349.
9. Aleem F, Predanic M, Calame R, Moukhtar M, Pennisi J. Transvaginal color and pulsed doppler sonography of the endometrium: a possible role in reducing the number of dilatation and curettage procedures. *J Ultrasound Med.* 1995 Feb;14(2):139-145; quiz 147-148.
10. Bezircioglu I, Baloglu A, Cetinkaya B, Yigit S, Oziz E. The diagnostic value of the doppler ultrasonography in distinguishing the endometrial malignancies in women with postmenopausal bleeding. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2012 May;285(5):1369-1374.
11. Chan FY, Chau MT, Pun TC, Lam C, Ngan HY, Leong L et al. Limitations of transvaginal sonography and color doppler imaging in the differentiation of endometrial carcinoma from benign lesions. *J Ultrasound Med* 1994 Aug;13(8):623-628.
12. Kanat-Pektas M, Gungor T, Mollamahmutoglu L. The evaluation of endometrial tumors by transvaginal and doppler ultrasonography. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* 2008 Jun;277(6):495-499.