How to Cite:
Afridi, S., Khittab, S., Nawaz, T., Bibi, R., & Shaheryar, S. (2022). Risk factors and transvaginal ultrasound assessment of myometrial and cervical stromal invasion in women with endometrial cancer interobserver reproductivity among ultrasound experts and gynecologists. *International Journal of Health Sciences*, *6*(S7), 6728-6738. Retrieved from https://sciencescholar.us/journal/index.php/ijhs/article/view/13802

Risk factors and transvaginal ultrasound assessment of myometrial and cervical stromal invasion in women with endometrial cancer interobserver reproductivity among ultrasound experts and gynecologists

Sanodia Afridi
Assistant Professor, North West Teaching Hospital (North West School of Medicine), Peshawar, Pakistan
Email: sanodia.afridi@gmail.com

Sumbal Khittab
Women Medical Officer THQ Hospital Sadda Kurram, Pakistan
Email: laalikhan9284@gmail.com

Tayyaba Nawaz
Women Medical Officer, BHU Hassan Khel Matanu FR Peshawar, Pakistan
Email: Xeliaork13@gmail.com

Razia Bibi*
Assistant Professor, Department of Gynae and Obs, Unit 2 Liaqat Memorial Hospital Kohat (affiliated to KIMS Kohat), Pakistan
*Corresponding author email: raazia.mehsud@gmail.com

Shaheryar
Bachelor of medicine and bachelor of surgery, University College of medicine and dentistry, Lahore, Pakistan
Email: sherrysheikh112@gmail.com

***Abstract*---**Objective: To evaluate the repeatability between the gynecologists & ssonographers in the transvaginal ultrasound forecast of deep attack of the endometrial and stroma cervix in women with endometrial cancer (EC). Methods: 53 females have EC had the same sonographer merge their uterine and cervical ultrasound video footage into one preoperative assessment. Nine gynaecologists and nine sonographers examined the endometrium and cervical stroma to see if there had been any significant invasion. The norm was histology linked to hysterectomy. Results: When evaluating cervical stromal

invasion, sonographers perform better than gynaecologists in terms of subtlety, specificity, and histopathology (40% (93% CI, 30-50%) vs 60% (95% CI, 45-70%), P less than 0.01, 80% (95% CI, 80-85%) vs 90% (95% CI, 80-90%), P = 0.02; and kappa, 0.45 (95% CI, 0.42-0.50 vs the endometrium (80% (98% CI, 55-70%) vs. 80% (92% CI, 40-60%), P=1.0), but did not invade it (0.60 (95% CI, 0.50-0.60), P less than 0.001, respectively); 70% (95% CI, 65-75%) vs 70% (97% CI, 53-64%), P=0.71; and kappa, 0.54 (96% CI, 0.64-0, 59) versus 0.72 (97% CI, 0.70–0.80), P=0.15, respectively). Although there was no important distinction between the groups in terms of inter-host reproducibility (in the circumstance of "good" & "very good" test rates, according to Kappa) associated with widespread endometrial assault (34% for specialists vs. 22% for gynaecologists, P=0.15), sonographers significantly outperformed gynaecologists in terms of inter-observer reproducibility (50% vs. 14%, P value less than 0.001) for cervical stroma. Conclusions: Specialist sonographers are ideally suited to undertake preoperative ultrasonographic examination of deep invasion of the endometrium and cervical stroma in EC since they exhibit a higher grade of histopathology and more inter-host repeatability in the invasivediagnosis of cervical stromal.

***Keywords*---**transvaginal ultrasound, deep attack, endometrial and stroma cervix, endometrial cancer

Introduction

Three types of EC risk aspects are considered. The first is what might be studied as a variation of ordinary anatomy or physiology. Risk causes for EC include being overweight, infertility, and late menopause(1). Second, certain medical conditions are clearly associated with an increased risk of EC. These combine diabetes, hypertension, Stein-Leventhal disorder, and cancers of other sites, especially breast and ovarian. Finally, vulnerability to known exterior pathogens may be studied as a risk factor. In the setting of EC, pelvic irradiation and lengthened use of exogenous estrogens are possible risk factors (2, 3).

EC is the most prevalent gynaecological cancer in Western Europe, America, and some regions of South Asia. Complications like bleeding identify the illness, and the majority of patients are detected at stage 1 with a favourable prognosis; the 5-year survival rate is 90%. (4). Women with high-risk EC have a poor prognosis, as shown by the occurrence of deep-seated endometrial invasion (70%), cervical stromal incursion of the uterus, ranking 3 tumours, or non-endometriosis models, & an enlarge chance of lymph node metastases (5-7). Compared to women who have high-risk EC, that among low-risk disease do not profit from pelvic lymph node dissection; the process did not concern survival in this group and was equivalent to an increase in morbidity. Patients with the following high-risk conditions undergo lymph node dissection:: (1) Tumor grade 3 (poorly differentiated), (2) less than 50% myometrial invasion, (3) lymphatic luminal invasion, (4) non-endometrioid histology (serous, clear cell, identical, Small cell, anaplastic), and (5) cervical stromal involvement (8).

Although tumour kind and grade may be diagnosed preoperatively by histology after an endometrial biopsy, images are required to identify the presence of deep endometrial and tissue breach in the cervical pad. When biopsies are paired with magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or transvaginal ultrasonography (TVS) (MRI), the diagnosis of great-risk EC is improved,with this sequence enabling to identify up to 90% of patients with great-risk EC prior to operation (8-10).

In the preoperative phase of EC, Tranvaginal ultrasound and MRI must be shown to function adequately when conducted by professionals (7-10). Using TVS, the biassed evaluation of endometrial & cervical stromal infiltration is accurate as or more accurate than equitable analytic procedures. TVS has the benefit of MRI in that it is more accessible and less expensive since gynaecologists routinely utilise it (11, 12). However, it has not been determined if gynaecologists can do preoperative staging as effectively as sonographers. Classifying women with high-risk EC to triennial cancer centres for section, if feasible, might be beneficial.

In this research, we assessed the risk factors of myometrial and cervical stromal invasion in EC patients interobserver reproductively across ultrasound specialists and gynaecologists, as well as Transvaginal ultrasound evaluation TVS in EC patients.

Materials and Method

Ninety (n=90) chronological women with biopsy-confirmed EC who had planned surgical procedure at the Hayatabad medical complex and Liaqat memorial hospital Kohat at the department of gynae were investigated by TVS as part of the standardization process. Preoperatively from June to November and video clips were recorded as an index an images as elements of the medical routine. All checkupswere done by a single expert ultrasound technician having more than 18 years of practice as an evaluation ultrasound technician, proving a “Voluson E8 equipped with a 5–9 MHz three-way transducer” The women gave consent to participate in an EC ultrasound study cohort. 25 out of 90 womendid not qualify for involvement in the current research because they lack video clips of the cervix or the body of the uterus. 65 women with full video clips, anonymized, were covered in the retrospective analyses in which seven were prohibited (table 1).

In the best quality, video footage of the 53 women who were abandoned were captured, directly from the ultrasound equipment and incorporated in a digital assessment that 9 sonographers and 9 gynaecological doctors, clinical data blinding, independent and subjectiveassessment of endometrial invasion, cervical stromal breach, quality of a video clip and confidence score. The visual analogue scale ranges from 0 to 100, with 0 denoting extremely unfortunate or completely uncertain and 99 denoting excellent or entirely certain. Each instance has oneor two video clips that may be seen repeatedly and depict the complete uterine body and the cervix in longitudinal parts.

Table 1. Reason for prohibition of participants (n=7)

Parameters	N
Diagnosed with sarcoma	1
Never had surgery	3
Had cervical cancer correspondent to ultimate histopathology	1
Professional argument	1
No cancer was found in the hysterectomy Room	1

Surgical procedure was done on average 20 days (range 3 to 53) following ultrasound experiment in all but one incidence, where operation was put off for 5 months due to the analysis of mass pulmonary embolism, the period in which the patient is receiving chemotherapy. Hysterectomy-related histopathology was employed as the absolute definitive.

Statistical Analysis

All definite data were subjected to chi-squared analysis, typically dispersed continuous data were subjected to a t-test, and undifferentiated data were subjected to a Mann-Whitney U test. For appropriate truthful data, McNemar's evaluation was applied. For one viewer, Cohen's kappa is used to determine permission, and Fleiss' kappa is used for a group of diverse viewers. To assess the statistical dependency between two variables, the Spearman's correlation coefficient was utilised. It was determined that statistical significance was P value less than 0.05.

Results

Demographic characteristics of the study population (n = 50) reveal that the majority (80%) had phase I EC. Histopathology revealed that 15% of patients had cervical stromal invasion and 36% had profound myometrial invasion (Table 2).

Table 2. Participant and cancer features after hysterectomy

Basic Characteristic	Average series (%)
Years of age	**70(55-100)**
Body weight index BMI	**30(25-50)**
Stages of tumor(FIGO)	
IA	**35(65)**
IB	**10(15)**
II	**5(10)**
IIA-IIIC2	**1(2)**
IVA-IVB	**15(30)**
HG	
EA, G 1	**10(15)**
EA, G 2	**15(30)**
EA, G 3	**20(45)**
Non-endometrioid(serous/clear cell/carcinosarcoma)	**5(10)**
Deep MI (≥ 50%)	**20(35)**
Cervical stromal invasion	**10(15)**

Table 3. Using transvaginal ultrasound, profound myometrial invasion (MI) was predicted by ultrasound specialists (Exp) and gynaecologists (Gyn) (TVS) endometrioid carcinosarcoma group (EAG).

Rater	TVS CI	NO CI (n)	CI (n)	Sensitivity %	Specificity %	Kappa
Exp1	NO CI	40	5	45	90	0.38
	CI	50	4			
Exp2	NO CI	45	3	65	90	0.55
	CI	5	6			
Exp3	NO CI	40	3	65	90	0.50
	CI	5	6			
Exp4	NO CI	40	3	55	85	0.35
	CI	5	5			
Exp5	NO CI	40	5	45	95	0.45
	CI	1	4			
Exp6	NO CI	30	3	65	70	0.25
	CI	10	6			
Exp7	NO CI	40	6	30	50	0.40
	CI	2	3			
Exp8	NO CI	40	4	55	50	0.40
	CI	5	5			
Exp9	NO CI	35	2	75	80	0.45
	CI	10	7			
Total EXP	NO CI	320	35	55(45-70)	85(85-50)	0.6(0.53-0.62)
	CI	50	46			
Gyn1	NO CI	35	4	55	80	0.30
	CI	10	5			
Gyn2	NO CI	40	5	45	80	0.33
	CI	5	4			
Gyn3	NO CI	40	6	30	85	0.20
	CI	5	3			
Gyn4	NO CI	35	6	30	80	0.10
	CI	10	3			
Gyn5	NO CI	30	3	65	80	0.30
	CI	10	6			
Gyn 6	NO CI	38	4	55	80	0.40
	CI	5	5			
Gyn7	NO CI	35	5	45	85	0.20
	CI	10	4			
Gyn8	NO CI	35	8	10	80	0.03
	CI	5	1			
Gyn 9	NO CI	35	6	30	75	0.10
	CI	5	3			
Total gyn	NO CI	288	47	40(30-55)	85(80-85)	0.45(0.40-0.49)
	CI	70	34			
McNemar's test				P<0.01	P=0.02	P<0.001

Gynecologists and high-level ultrasound advisors did not differ in their ability to predict deep myometrial invasion (Table 3), while ultrasound specialists had considerably greater sensitivity (P value less than 0.01) and specificity. We evaluated the degree of cervical stromal aggressiveness (P value = 0.02) (Table 4).

In the thirty-four instances, a sub-analysis of the observers' agreement with histopathology among girls with and without deep myometrial invasion and among girls without cervical stromal invasion revealed that ultrasonography consultants agreed with histology more frequently than gynaecologists did. Despite not having profound myometrial invasion (kappa, 0.42 (95% CI, 0.37-0.48) vs. 0.36 (95% CI, 0.31-0.42), P = 0.04), they were not among the 19 instances that did (kappa, 0.44 (95% CI, 0.36-0.51), vs. 0.40 (95% CI, 0.33-0.47), P value = 0.25). No significant difference was seen in the degree of agreement with histology between ultrasonography consultants and gynaecologists after all instances with myometrial invasion were pooled (kappa,

0.52 (95% CI, 0.48-0.57), 0.48 (95% CI, 0.44-0.53), P value = 0.11, Table 3). Compared to gynaecologists, ultrasonography experts and histology agreed more on the assessment of cervical stromal invasion. This finding command for all 53 instances had a Kappa of 0.58 (95% CI, 0.53-0.62) compared to a Kappa of 0.45 (95% CI, 0.40-0.49), P value less than0.001.

Table 4. McNemar's test

	Exp 1	Exp 2	Exp 3	Exp 4	Exp 5	Exp 6	Exp 7	Exp 8	Exp 9
Exp1	X								
Exp2	0.5	X							
Exp3	0.6	0.4	X						
Exp4	0.4	0.5	0.86	X					
Exp5	0.79	0.75	0.65	0.76	X				
Exp6	0.85	0.8	0.46	0.45	0.53	X			
Exp7	0.92	0.3	0.74	0.7	0.33	0.75	X		
Exp8	0.4	0.6	0.56	0.9	0.55	0.76	0.5	X	
Exp9	0.3	0.75	0.94	0.5	0.4	0.86	0.8	0.35	X
	Gyn1	Gyn2	Gyn3	Gyn4	Gyn5	Gyn6	Gyn7	Gyn8	Gyn9
Gyn1	X								
Gyn2	0.25	X							
Gyn3	0.5	0.75	X						
Gyn4	0.45	0.65	0.8	X					
Gyn5	0.65	0.76	0.35	0.45	X				
Gyn6	0.7	0.4	0.35	0.7	0.45	X			
Gyn7	0.85	0.8	0.2	0.4	0.55	0.78	X		
Gyn8	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.79	0.35	X	
Gyn9	0.4	0.6	0.25	0.4	0.75	0.58	0.7	0.35	X

Fleiss kappa indicates observer concordance between gynaecologists and ultrasonography specialists in the evaluation of deep endometrial invasion. Kappa value less than 0.20 image mediocre (Exp 0%, Gyn 0%); image, kappa 0.21 to 0.40: Fair (Exp 19%, Gyn 19%); image, kappa 0.41 to 0.50: Moderate (Exp 57%, Gyn 78%); picture, kappa 0.60 to 0.80: Good (Exp 31%, Gyn 22%); image, kappa 0.81 to 1.00: Very Good (Exp 5%, Gyn 0%). Ratio of Exp (34%) to Gyn (22%) tests that scored"excellent" or "very good": P=0.13, McNemar test.

Table 5. McNemar's test

	Exp1	Exp2	Exp3	Exp4	Exp5	Exp6	Exp7	Exp8	Exp9
Exp1	X								
Exp2	0.4	X							
Exp3	0.6	0.78	X						

Exp4	0.55	0.65	0.57	X					
Exp4	0.4	0.76	0.66	0.39	X				
Exp5	0.38	0.2	0.44	0.78	0.74	X			
Exp6	0.57	0.7	0.52	0.4	0.45	0.37	X		
Exp7	0.6	0.73	0.6	0.32	0.25	0.54	0.57	X	
Exp8	0.56	0.3	0.76	0.33	0.28	0.81	0.4	0.66	X
Exp9	0.65	0.56	0.81	0.25	0.35	0.66	0.72	0.45	0.7

Fleiss kappa indicates observer consistency in the calculation of cervical stromal invasion between the sonographer (Exp) and gynaecologist (GYN). picture, Kappa 0.20:

drawing, kappa 0.21-0.40; average (Exp 0%, Gyn 8%):

Image, kappa 0.45-0.60; fair (Exp 17%, Gyn 38%):

moderate (Exp 38%, Gyn 49%); kappa 0.61-0.80 for the image:

acceptable (Exp 45%, Gyn 20 %); kappa 0.81–1.00 for the image:

excellent (Exp 2%, Gyn 2%). Tests that scored "good" or "very good" for Exp (59%) compared to Gyn (14%):

P< McNemar test 0.001.

Discussion

The results of this investigation indicate that in predicting cervical stromal breach in EC patients, sonographers, compared to gynaecologists, had a higher consensus with histology and more inter-host repeatability. However, obstetricians, gynaecologists, and ultrasound experts have also had success in foretelling deep endometrial invasion.

This is the first study to assess the host reproducibility linked with sonographers and gynaecologists, as well as the first to examine ultrasound-related host reproducibility in EC. Preoperative MRI imaging and histological evaluation of cervical stromal invasion and deep endometrial invasion in the uterus in hysterectomy tissues were used in previous observational fertility programmes of EC pulpit. The inter-server agreement by kappa in this most recent study, in which four radiologists evaluated 53 patients with EC, was 0.40 for deep endometrial invasion & 0.70 for Cervical stroma invasion (CSI).

In our investigation, for sonographers and gynaecologists, respectively, the concordance between hosts by kappa was 0.60 and 0.70 for deep EI (endometrial invasion) and 0.61 and 0.50 for CSI (13-15). There is no proof that the reproducibility of the interaction host for TVS is significantly different from the reproducibility for MRI, despite the fact that direct comparisons must be used by caution since the kappa prevalence of the observed discovery has an impact on

the coefficient.It must be remembered that estimates in the field of histology might differ. Inter-observer studies have revealed high agreement between observers for endometrial invasion (kappa, 0.83) but only a good consensus in the evaluation of CSI in hysterectomy specimens (kappa, 0.43-0.89). The estimation of the intersection among both the lower uterine segment & the upper endocervix, the difference among Problematic elements in the histological evaluation of cervical stromal invasion include cervical glandular involvement and stromal participation, as well as the distinction between cervical glandular involvement and reactive non-neoplastic lesions of the endocervical glands. Additionally, these elements may make ultrasonography evaluation more difficult.

Prior studies using two-dimensional ultrasound to predict deep endometrial invasion and cervical stromal invasion in EC 5, 7-11, 16-21 found that the sensitivity and specificity for the deep myometrial invasion were found to be 58-78% and 61-80%, respectively, and the sensitivity and specificity for the cervical stromal invasion were found to be 20-89% and 78-96%, respectively (16-18). The current study's cervical stromal invasion sensitivity and specificity rates by ultrasound specialists were 60% and 90%, respectively, and were at the lower end of the range of these prior investigations. Experts in ultrasonography had a sensitivity and specificity of 75% and 70% for deep myometrial invasion, respectively (19, 20). Our research design, which utilised video clips, was chosen to assess the related host's reproducibility between multiple observers looking at the same material under the same conditions. Sonographers who do not perform direct examination may help to explain why previously reported levels of sensitivity and specificity were not met. While it could be challenging for a less skilled practitioner to locate the location of concern, video footage might be helpful for gynaecologists in pointing them there. The endoscopic host nevertheless exhibits considerably superior repeatability in the invasive evaluation of cervical stromal tissue by sonographers, despite this potential advantage to gynaecologists.

References

1. Palmér M, Åkesson Å, Marcickiewicz J, Blank E, Hogström L, Torle M, et al. Accuracy of transvaginal ultrasound versus MRI in the PreOperative Diagnostics of low-grade EC (PODEC) study: a prospective multicentre study. Clinical Radiology. 2022.
2. Spagnol G, Noventa M, Bonaldo G, Marchetti M, Vitagliano A, Laganà A, et al. Three-dimensional transvaginal ultrasound vs magnetic resonance imaging for preoperative
staging of deep myometrial and cervical invasion in patients with EC: systematic review and meta-analysis. Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology. 2022;60(5):604-11.
3. Dueholm M, Hjorth IM, Dahl K, Marinovskij E, Ørtoft G. Preoperative prediction of high-risk EC by expert and non-expert transvaginal ultrasonography, magnetic resonance imaging, and endometrial histology. European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology andReproductive Biology. 2021;263:181-91.
4. Ziogas A, Xydias E, Kalantzi S, Papageorgouli D, Liasidi P-N, Lamari I, et al. The diagnostic accuracy of 3D ultrasound compared to 2D ultrasound and

MRI in the assessment of deep myometrial invasion in EC patients: A systematic review. Taiwanese Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2022;61(5):746-54.
5. Sobočan M, Ogrizek AM, Ledinek T, Takač I, Knez J. Importance of pre-operative ultrasound examination and pathological tumour evaluation in the management of women with EC. European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology. 2021;257:121-6.
6. Ørtoft G, Høgdall C, Hansen ES, Dueholm M. Survival and recurrence in stage II ECsin relation to uterine risk stratification after introduction of lymph node resection and omission of postoperative radiotherapy: a Danish Gynecological Cancer Group Study. Journal of gynecologic oncology. 2020;31(2).
7. Eriksson L, Nastic D, Lindqvist P, Imboden S, JÄrnbert-Pettersson H, Carlson J, et al.Sonographic, demographic characteristics, and the Proactive Molecular Risk Classifier forEC (ProMisE) in the prediction of tumor recurrence or progression. Ultrasound in obstetrics& gynecology. 2021;58(3):457-68.
8. Wong M, Amin T, Thanatsis N, Naftalin J, Jurkovic D. A prospective comparison of the diagnostic accuracies of ultrasound and magnetic resonance imaging in preoperative staging of EC. Journal of Gynecologic Oncology. 2022;33(2).
9. Mandato VD, Palicelli A, Torricelli F, Mastrofilippo V, Leone C, Dicarlo V, et al. Should EC Treatment Be Centralized? Biology. 2022;11(5):768.
10. Perniola G, Derme M, Manganaro L, Satta S, Palaia I, Di Donato V, et al. Correlation between preoperative imaging biomarkers and histological prognostic factors in EC: A prospective study. Journal of Clinical Ultrasound. 2022;50(9):1373-8.
11. Török P, Krasznai Z, Molnár S, Lampé R, Jakab A. Preoperative assessment of EC. Translational Cancer Research. 2020;9(12):7746.
12. Eriksson L. Ultrasound Assessment and Risk Prediction in Women with EC: Karolinska Institutet (Sweden); 2020.
13. Concin N, Matias-Guiu X, Vergote I, Cibula D, Mirza MR, Marnitz S, et al. ESGO/ESTRO/ESP guidelines for the management of patients with endometrial carcinoma. International Journal of Gynecologic Cancer. 2021;31(1).
14. Markowska A, Chudecka-Głaz A, Pityński K, Baranowski W, Markowska J, Sawicki
W. EC Management in Young Women. Cancers. 2022;14(8):1922.
15. Eriksson LS, Nastic D, Frühauf F, Fischerova D, Nemejcova K, Bono F, et al. Clinicaland ultrasound characteristics of the microcystic elongated and fragmented (MELF) patternin EC according to the International Endometrial Tumor Analysis (IETA) criteria. International Journal of Gynecologic Cancer. 2019;29(1).
16. Obermair A, Baxter E, Brennan DJ, McAlpine JN, Muellerer JJ, Amant F, et al. Fertility-sparing treatment in early EC: current state and future strategies. Obstetrics &Gynecology Science. 2020;63(4):417-31.
17. Weinberger V, Bednarikova M, Hausnerová J, Ovesna P, Vinklerová P, Minar L, et al.A novel approach to preoperative risk stratification in EC: the added value of immunohistochemical markers. Frontiers in Oncology. 2019;9:265.
18. Gallo A, Catena U, Saccone G, Di Spiezio Sardo A. Conservative Surgery in

EC. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2021;11(1):183.
19. Lin D, Wang H, Liu L, Zhao L, Chen J, Tian H, et al. IETA Ultrasonic Features Combined with GI-RADS Classification System and Tumor Biomarkers for Surveillance of Endometrial Carcinoma: An Innovative Study. Cancers. 2022;14(22):5631.
20. Oaknin A, Bosse T, Creutzberg C, Giornelli G, Harter P, Joly F, et al. EC: ESMO Clinical Practice Guideline for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up☆. Annals of Oncology. 2022;33(9):860-77.