



Efficacy of Hysteroscopy as a Screening Method in Patients with Abnormal Uterine Bleeding

Prof.Dr.M.
Vijayalakshmi

D.G.O ; M.D OG, Department Of Obstetrics And Gynaecology ,
Madurai Medical college , Madurai

ABSTRACT

Abnormal uterine bleeding is a common gynaecological problem. The study is to compare the efficacy of hysteroscopy in diagnosing of endometrial pathology with transvaginal sonography and its correlation with histopathology. 50 patients were first evaluated with transvaginal sonography followed by hysteroscopy and traditional curettage with cervix biopsy performed after 2 days. Most of the endometrial hyperplasia , myomas and polyps were diagnosed by diagnostic hysteroscopy when compared to TVS or D&C. Hence,hysteroscopy combined with histological examination is considered as gold standard for evaluating a case with abnormal uterine bleeding.

KEYWORDS : Transvaginal sonography , Endometrial hyperplasia , Myoma

INTRODUCTION:

Abnormal uterine bleeding is a common gynaecological problem. Hysteroscopy and USG are now being increasingly used not only for detecting functional disorders of endometrium , but also for excluding various unsuspected organic diseases of the endometrium like cancer and tuberculosis.

AIM:

The objectives of the present study is

(i) To evaluate the usefulness of hysteroscopy as a screening method in patients with abnormal uterine bleeding.

(ii) To compare the efficacy of hysteroscopy in diagnosing of endometrial pathology with transvaginal sonography and its correlation with histopathology.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

Our study includes 50 women of age group varying between 28 to 55 yrs admitted with duration of symptoms more than 6 months at Government Rajaji Hospital during the year 2008 to 2009. All 50 patients were first evaluated with transvaginal sonography followed by hysteroscopy and traditional curettage with cervix biopsy performed after 2 days following transvaginal sonography. Patients in pubertal age group , lactating mothers, patients with any other medical or surgical illness were excluded.

CASE DISCUSSION:

There was no complications encountered during the above said procedures. Among the reproductive age group , 20% belong to the age of 20-30 yrs and 50% belong to age between 30-40 yrs.

Comparing the distribution and diagnosis of intrauterine pathology according to transvaginal sonography , D&C and hysteroscopy showed that 30% hyperplasia was detected by combination of hysteroscopy and D&C whereas TVS and D&C could detect only 18% of hyperplasia.

Combination of hysteroscopy and D&C could detect 24% of cases with endometrial polyp while TVS and D&C could detect only 10% of cases with endometrial polyp.

40% of cases showed no pathology according to diagnostic hysteroscopy and D&C could not detect any pathology in 68% of AUB cases.

CONCLUSION:

Diagnostic hysteroscopy can be done in an office setting as a day care procedure. Most of the endometrial hyperplasia , myomas and polyps were diagnosed by diagnostic hysteroscopy when compared to TVS or D&C. Intrauterine pathologies that are not commonly identified by blind dilatation and curettage are diagnosed readily by hysteroscopy.

Hence,hysteroscopy combined with histological examination is considered as gold standard for evaluating a case with abnormal uterine bleeding.

REFERENCES:

1. Brooks PG , Serden SP , Hysteroscopic findings after unsuccessful D and C for abnormal uterine bleedings. Am J Obstet Gynecol 1988;158:1354-57
2. Valle RE Hysteroscopic evaluation of patients with abnormal uterine bleeding. Surg Gynecol Obstet 1981;153:521-23.
3. Laffer FD. Hysteroscopy with selective endometrial sampling compared with D and C for c: abnormal uterine bleeding. Obstet Gynecol 1989;16-20
4. Widrich T , Bradley LD , Mitchi_on AR, Collins RL. Comparison of saline infusion sonography with office hysteroscopy for the evaluation of the endometrium.
5. Bakour SH, Dwarakanath LS, Khan KS ,Newton JR. The diagnostic accuracy of outpatient miniature hysteroscopy in predicting premalignant and malignant endometrial lesions. Gynaecological endoscopy 1999;8:143-48.