The Hysteroscope is my Stethoscope:

The Role of Hysteroscopy in 2022



Ted L. Anderson, MD, PhD, FACOG, FACS

Past President, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

Betty and Lonnie S. Burnett Professor Vice Chair for Gynecology, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology Medical Director for Gynecologic Surgery, Vanderbilt Hospital Perioperative Services Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN

ted.anderson@vumc.org



Disclosures

I have no financial relationships to disclose





Objectives

- Describe the benefit that hysteroscopy adds to accurate diagnosis
- List ergonomic and economic benefits of office hysteroscopy
- Outline safety and patient management concerns





Abnormal Uterine Bleeding

- Affects ~20% of reproductive age women worldwide
- ~35% of gynecology referrals
- ~60% of AUB referrals treated with hysterectomy within 5 years
 - Path of least resistance
 - (no uterus, no bleeding)







Hysterectomy for Benign Indications



- Significant change in medical culture
- Decreasing trend in hysterectomies
- More effective diagnostics
- More effective medical therapies
 - Hormonal (oral, injectable, implantable)
 - Progestin-eluting IUDs
 - Tranexamic acid
- Surgical alternatives to hysterectomy
 - Endometrial ablation



PALM-COEIN Classification of AUB

Anatomic



- Polyp (AUB-P)
- Adenomyosis (AUB-A)
- Leiomyoma (AUB-L)
 - Submucosal (AUB-LSM)
 - Other (AUB-LO)
- Malignancy/hyperplasia (AUB-M)



Non-structural Causes

- Coagulopathy (AUB-C)
- Ovulatory Dysfunction (AUB-O)
- Endometrial (AUB-E)
- latrogenic (AUB-I)
- Not yet classified (AUB-N)



Dysfunctional

Medical

Multiple Ways to Evaluate the Endometrium



(3)



First Known Hysteroscopy

- 1869 Commander DC Pantaleoni
- 60 yo patient, "therapy resistant" menopausal bleeding
- Modified cystoscope, reflected candlelight
- Detected a polypoid growth
- Cauterized with silver nitrate

"Innovator" vs "Character" Chastised by peers for "undue curiosity"

Paved the way for modern hysteroscopy







Hysteroscopy in 2022

- Why should you be doing more hysteroscopy?
- Why should you be doing hysteroscopy in the office?
 - Practical issues
 - Safety issues
 - Financial issues







Most Pressing Question – Endometrial Cancer

- The most common type of gynecological cancer
 - (2018) 61,380 new diagnoses and 10,920 deaths
 - Vaginal bleeding is presentation in >90% of cases
 - 70% diagnosed at stage I (90% 5-year survival)
- Most diagnosed at stage I (mean age 63yo)
 - 2.81% lifetime risk for Caucasian women
 - 2.48% lifetime risk for African American women
 - More likely to be type II (clear cell or serous)
 - More likely to be high grade
 - More likely to be advanced stage (III or IV) at diagnosis

All patients with postmenopausal bleeding = up to 15% chance of cancer Who is at high risk and how do we diagnose it?





Who is a High Risk Patient?

Factors Influencing Risk	Estimated Relative Risk
Older age	2–3
Residency in North America or Northern Europe	3–18
Higher level of education or income	1.5–2
White race	2
Nulliparity	3
History of infertility	2–3
Menstrual irregularities	1.5
Late age at natural menopause	2–3
Early age at menarche	1.5–2
Long-term use of unopposed estrogen	10–20
Tamoxifen use	2–3†
Obesity	2–5
Estrogen-producing tumor	>5
History of type 2 diabetes, hypertension, gallbladder disease, or thyroid disease	1.3–3
Lynch syndrome	6–20 [‡]

Premenopause Endometrial Evaluation

- Patients >45 with AUB
- Patients <45 with AUB + risk factors
- Patients at risk for hereditary cancer syndrome
- Focal endometrial irregularity
- Persistent/recurrent bleeding despite therapy

Postmenopause Endometrial Sampling

- Endometrium ≥5 mm by TVUS
- Patients at risk for hereditary cancer syndrome
- Endometrium not discretely discernible
- Endometrium has focal irregularities
- Persistent/recurrent bleeding
 - Independent of endometrial thickness





Evaluation Of the Uterine Cavity

- Transvaginal Pelvic Ultrasound (TVUS)
 - Measure thickest part measured perpendicular to longitudinal plane
 - Not always reliable for endometrial evaluation in all women
 - Axial uterus, obesity, coexisting myoma, adenomyosis, prior uterine surgery
 - Over 3/4 of bleeding patients have no obvious anatomic etiology



- Measurement of endometrial thickness in premenopausal women is not helpful in the evaluation of AUB
- This does NOT mean ultrasound is not a valuable tool in overall endometrial evaluation









Blind Endometrial Biopsy

- Pipelle Office Blind Biopsy
 - Samples an average of only 4-12% of the endometrial surface area
 - Pre-hysterectomy biopsy shown to miss known diagnosis in up to 33% of cases
 - Blind biopsy approaches 100%, but only when cancers occupy >50% of surface area

"high overall accuracy in diagnosing endometrial cancer" ...only when an adequate specimen is obtained ...only when the endometrial process is global





Hysteroscopy vs Blind Biopsy

- 112 consecutive PMB patients
 - 27% endometrium ≤5mm
 - 3% ill-defined endometrium
- D&C
 - 25% insufficient tissue
 - 71.4% "normal"

	Curettage	n (%)
	Insufficient tissue	28 (25.0)
1	Normal EM	80 (71.4)
	EMmahum	
	Simple HPL	3 (2.7) 0
	Complex HPL FM Ca	0
	Total	112 (100)





Hysteroscopy vs Blind Biopsy

 112 consecutive PMB patients 	Curettage	n (%)	Hysteroscopic biopsy	n (%)
 27% endometrium ≤5mm 3% ill-defined endometrium 	Insufficient tissue	28 (25.0)	Normal EM EM polyp Myoma/adenomyosis	15 (53.6) 10 (35.7) 3 (10.7)
• D&C	Normal EM	80 (71.4)	Normal EM EM polyp Myoma/adenomyosis	44 (55.0) 26 (32.5) 6 (7.5)
• 25% insufficient tissue			Simple HPL Complex HPL	2 (2.5) 1 (1.3)
• /1.4% "normal"	EM polyp Simple HPL	3 (2.7) 0	EM cancer EM polyp Complex HPL	1 (1.3) 3 (100) 0
 Hysteroscopy after D&C neoplastic lesions missed 	Complex HPL EM Ca Total	0 1 (0.9) 112 (100)	EM Ca	1 (100) 112

Biopsy alone may not be reliable for evaluation of endometrial pathology





Postmenopausal Bleeding

- Up to 15% of women with postmenopausal bleeding will have cancer
- 5mm (TVUS) has 99% negative predictive value
- With endometrium ≥5mm or irregular, sampling is indicated
- With endometrium <5mm, biopsy alone generally not as useful
- Failure to identify a distinct endometrium should trigger evaluation
- Endometrial cancer <0.1% in PMB women with endometrium <5mm
 - More likely to be type II (non-endometrioid)
 - More likely to be focal (endometrial irregularities?)
 - Biopsy alone often misses diagnosis
- Adequate tissue sample obtained in only 25% of cases



3



Optimum Likelihood of Neoplasm Detection





- D&C with hysteroscopic guidance is recommended over D&C alone because it has higher accuracy and superior diagnostic yield.
- Hysteroscopy is recommended with directed D&C to include any discrete lesions as well as the background endometrium.
- This combination will provide the best opportunity to confirm the diagnosis of a true premalignant endometrial lesion and exclude associated endometrial carcinoma.





Lynch Syndrome-Associated Endometrial Cancer

3



Cancer Type	Overall Cancer Risk
Colon	78%
Endometrial	60%
Stomach	19%
Biliary Tract	18%
Ovary	11%
Urinary Tract	10%
Sebaceous Gland	9%
CNS	4%

- Highly penetrant autosomal dominant USA prevalence ~ 1:600
- Defects in DNA mismatch repair genes (MLH1, MLH2, MSH6, PMS2)
- Accounts for up to 5% of endometrial cancer cases
- Disproportionate association with early onset endometrial cancer

Endometrial Cancer Risk with Lynch Syndrome	Endometrial Cancer Risk in General Population
20% risk by age 50	0.2% risk by age 50
70% risk by age 70	1.5% risk by age 70

- No role for ultrasound screening in endometrial surveillance
- Endometrial sampling every year starting at age 30
- Mostly type I but can be type II endometrial cancer
- Increase in focal and lower uterine segment lesions
- Hysteroscopy + endometrial biopsy 89.9% sensitivity for early lesions













C-section scar





Asherman's







New England Obstetrical _{and} Gynecological Society



Endometrial Polyps



- Mismatch of TVUS findings and biopsy
 - Thick / irregular endometrium, especially focal thickening
 - Minimal tissue on endometrial biopsy when unexpected

Sources of polyps

- Associated with increased estrogen stimulation
- Overexpression of aromatase activity in endometrium?
- Focal endometrial hyperplasia
- Endometrial adenocarcinoma that had become polypoid



- Present in 10% of hysterectomies
 - 47% of polyps missed at curettage
 - Limitations of blind curettage
 - Diagnostic (sort of), not therapeutic
- Associated with increased cancer risk
- Prevalence of neoplasia in polyps 3.23%
 - 4.91% in postmenopausal women
 - 1.30% in reproductive age women
 - 4.09% in women with symptomatic bleeding
 - 2.13% in women without symptomatic bleeding





Value of Pre-operative Hysteroscopic Evaluation





Original Article

The Value of Diagnostic Hysteroscopy before Operative Hysteroscopy for Suspected Abnormal Intrauterine Findings

Shiri Shinar, MD, Guy Bibi, MD, Lili Barzilay, RN, Paula Rubens, MD, Benny Almog, MD, and Ishai Levin, MD*

From The Sarah Racine IVF Unit and the Department of Gynecology, Lis Maternity Hospital, Tel Aviv Sourasky Medical Center, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel (all authors).







Value of Pre-operative Hysteroscopic Evaluation



Cost-Effectiveness of Office Hysteroscopy for Abnormal Uterine Bleeding

Nash S. Moawad, MD, MS, Estefania Santamaria, BS, Megan Johnson, MD, Jonathan Shuster, PhD

3

Table 3.Summary of Office Hysteroscopic Findings ($n = 130$)				
Finding	Frequency			
Normal	47 (36%)			
Polyp	42 (32%)			
Fibroid	20 (15%)			
Thickened endometrium	10 (8%)			
Polyp and fibroid	7 (5%)			
Polyp vs fibroid	1 (1%)			
Septum	2 (2%)			
Cavity not visualized	1 (1%)			

Table 1. Cost Breakdown				
Item	Office Hysteroscopy	Operating Room Hysteroscopy		
Physician fee	\$1356	\$1356		
Anesthesia fee	\$0	\$1190		
Hospital fee	\$0	\$2400		
Total	\$1356	\$4946		

Over 50% of patients able to avoid intervention in OR suite

Savings of over \$3500 per patient!



Polyps - Polypectomy





New England Obstetrical _{and} Gynecological Society



Polyps - Polypectomy







New England Obstetrical _{and} Gynecological Society







New England Obstetrical and Gynecological Society



Uterine Fibroids - Myomectomy

• Fibroid mapping prior to myomectomy





New England Obstetrical ^{and} Gynecological Society



STEP Assessment

5	25				1		Score	Group	Suggested treatment
ALC: N	7			00		2	0 to 4	I	Low complexity hysteroscopic myomectomy
	l			1			5 to 6	II	Complex hysteroscopic myomectomy consider preparing with GnRH
	Size (cm)	Topography	Extension of the Base	Penetration	Lateral Wall	Total			analog and/or two-stage surgery
0	< 2	Low	< 1/3	0			7 to 9	III	Recommend an alternative
1	>2-5	Middle	>1/3 - 2/3	< 50%	+ 1				nonhysteroscopic technique
2	> 5	Upper	> 2/3	> 50%					5 1 1
Score	+	+	+	+			GnRH	= gonadotro	pin-releasing hormone.

Need for Staged Procedures

- 57 myomectomies compared with ESGE system
- More accurately predicted differences between groups I and II with respect to:
 - completed procedures, fluid deficit, and operative time





Role of Office Hysteroscopy



Why NOT Do Office Hysteroscopy?

Technophobia

Uncomfortable with all the "gear" required for office hysteroscopy





Econophobia

Anxiety about cost of acquiring, maintaining equipment, additional resources, ROI

Ergonophobia

Concerns regarding optimal utilization, cleaning, sterilizing, office processes







Traditional Hysteroscopy Equipment



New England Obstetrical and Gynecological Society



E

Compact Hysteroscopy Towers





Equipment is getting smaller, more portable, less intimidating





Tabletop Hysteroscopy Configuration



Truly portable tabletop systems

LED Light Source eliminates a cord

Still requires camera connection and medium tubing





Portable Reposable Hysteroscopy System



CooperSurgical EndoSee Advance

- Disposable handheld unit
- Rechargeable larger viewing screen
- Download images/videos to computer
- Fluid inflow only
- •5 fr operative channel need special instruments

Lina OperåScope

completely disposable

3

- can connect to accessory monitor
- download images/videos to USB
- inflow/outflow fluid channels
- 5 fr operative channel (standard instruments)disposable instruments







Office Hysteroscopic Procedures

What you **can** do does not necessarily equal:

- What you **should** do
- What you will get **paid** for doing

Patients have the right to expect:

- The same level of patient safety
- The same level of procedural effectiveness



RightRightRightRightPatientProcedureSurgeonEnvironment

3





The Right Patient

- Cannot tolerate basic office procedures?
 - Prior experience with office procedures
- Psychosocial issues
 - High levels of anxiety /panic attacks
 - Realistic patient expectations
- Avoid Significant co-morbidities
 - Morbid obesity, asthma, mobility challenges
 - Limit to ASA status I or II in office
- Prescreening
 - Adverse reaction to local anesthesia (personal or FH)
 - Acute respiratory process or high-risk airway assessment
 - Substance abuse
 - Abnormal blood sugars
 - Pregnancy (unless procedure is pregnancy related)

lew England Obstetrical

Gynecological Society



Right Procedure



Appropriate for office

- Brief and focused
- Not overly complicated
- Basic technological requirements

Anticipation of patient comfort

- Length of immobilization
- Comfortable table / bed for patient
- Adequate room / time for recovery
- Anticipation of analgesia

• Expectation of safety

- Reasonable expectation of patient safety
- Plan for the unexpected
- Protocols to deal with emergencies





The Right Surgeon







Confident in abilities Calm under stress Able to filter out distractions Not unnerved when thing do not go as planned





The Right Environment

Process-Related

- Safety
- Comfort
- Space
- Time

Procedure-Related

- Equipment/supplies
- Positioning
- Analgesia
- Emergencies

- Know city / state regulations governing office procedures
- Establish and practice office protocols
- Verify adequate training of support staff
- Have adequate space(s) dedicated to intensity of procedures performed
- Leave adequate time after procedure in case needed for recovery (do not overbook or rush procedures)





A Culture of Safety

(Florida Board of Medicine Review)

Adverse incidents

- ASC 5.3 per 100,000 procedures
- Office 66 per 100,000 procedures

• Relative risk: Office vs ASC = 12.4

Death rate

- ASC 0.78 per 100,000 procedures
- Office 9.2 per 100,000 procedures
- Relative risk: Office vs ASC 11.8







A Culture of Safety

ASA Physical Status (PS) **Classification System**

PS Class	Description
I	Normal healthy patient
II	Mild systemic disease
III	Severe systemic disease
IV	Severe systemic disease that is a constant threat to life







Analgesia / Anesthesia Choices

Minimal Sedation Oral Analgesia

- Patient comfort challenge
- Slightly less safety risk
- Fewer oversight regulation
- Use existing staff
- Cost built into billing





Conscious Sedation Monitored Anesthesia

- Greater patient comfort
- Higher patient safety risk
- More oversight regulation
- Can use CRNA to oversee
- Can bill separately
- Day Prior to procedure
 - Begin NSAIDs day before procedure
- Day of Procedure (usually in your office)
 - Toradol 30 mg iv up to 1 hr before procedure
- Light IV sedation
 - Versed 2-4 mg iv
 - Fentanyl 50-100 mcg iv
 - Propofol to effect (35-45mcg/kg/min)
 - I still do a cervical block!

- Cervical Dilatation?
 - Vasopressin: 0.05 U/mL intracervical
 - Cytotec: 50 400 mcg oral vs vaginal
- Local Anesthesia paracervical, intracervical
 - Xylocaine or Marcaine: wait 10 minutes
 - 50:50 Lidocaine: Marcaine + 100 mcg Fentanyl
- Vocal analgesia
- Avoid anxiolytics





Analgesia-Related Challenges

- Cervico-uterine manipulation can be inherently painful
 - Cervical dilation pain (can be referred to low back)
 - Uterine distention causes contraction like pain
- Options for analgesia
 - Oral, local or regional parenteral, iv sedation
 - Allow time to become effective
- Intrauterine Analgesia
 - Lidocaine gels



2% Lidocaine topical gel Uro-Jet NDC 0548-3013-00







Local Analgesia Toxicity

- Sedation / Analgesia Protocols
- Know drugs you are using
 - Indications/ contraindications
 - Mechanism of action
 - Drug-drug interactions
 - Drug toxicities and treatments

Agent	Duration (min)	Maximum Dose
1% Lidocaine	30-60	4.5 mg/kg
1% Lidocaine with Epinephrine	120-360	7 mg/kg
0.25% Marcaine	120-240	2.5 mg/kg
0.25% Marcaine with Epinephrine	180-420	< 225 mg



Analgesia-Related Challenges

- Know pharmacology and toxicology
- Know potential interventions



- Lidocaine levels usually 3-5 mcg/mL
- Toxicities may be observed at 6 mcg/mL
- More commonly with levels > 10 mcg/mL

Agent	Symptoms	Intervention		
Lidocaine	 Perioral numbness and tingling Tingling of tongue, dysarthria Metallic taste Tinnitus Lightheaded, dizziness, headache seizures 	 Oxygen Benzodiazepine if needed for seizures Vasopressor support if needed (small doses epinephrine prn) IV fluids if needed 		
Opioids	 Depressed respiration Shallow and slow breathing Constricted pupils Cold, clammy skin hypotension 	 Naloxone 0.4-2 mg iv/sc/ETT q 2-3 min Oxygen Watch for hypertensive episodes and arrhythmias 		





Vasovagal Episodes

- Neurocardiogenic syncope
- Neural reflex with triggers
- Vagal tone and vasodilation
- Bradycardia, pale, nausea, diaphoresis
- Supportive care

F

- Stop procedure
- Patient supine, elevated legs,
- Oxygen, atropine if indicated
- IV fluids if indicated











Ability to Rescue Patient in Emergency

- BLS vs ACLS training
- Min of 2 staff
 - Physician, Assistant
- Equipment for CPR support
- Treatment of anaphylaxis
- Treatment of drug reaction
- Transport plan



- BP/ HR monitoring
- Pulse oximeter
- O2 source
- Suction
- Cardiac monitor, defibrillator
- Auxiliary electrical power source
- Emergency medication
- Maintenance, testing and inspection per manufacturer's recommendation





Safety and Regulatory Resources

- ACOG monograph on ambulatory procedures
 - ۲ www.acog.org
- Joint Commission
 - www.jointcommission.org
- American College of Surgeons (ACS)
 - www.facs.org •
- American Association of Anesthesiologists (ASA)
 - www.asahq.org ullet
- Professional liability insurers
- State (governmental) regulatory agencies









Coding/Billing for Office Procedures





New England Obstetrical Gynecological Society



Hysteroscopy, diagnostic (58555)	RVU in facility	2018 Medicare Allowable	Δ
In Facility	4.37	\$ 157.32	reimbursement \$116.28
Non-Facility (In Office)	7.60*	\$ 273.60	

* Down from 8.8 in 2016 (-14%)

Hysteroscopy, with biopsy or polypectomy or D&C (58558)	RVU in office	Medicare Allowable	Δ
In Facility	6.67	\$ 240.12	\$1146.58
Non-Facility (In Office)	38.52**	\$ 1,386.70	

** Up from 11.44 in 2016 (+237%)

(From CMS Website)





Procedure	RVU
Office hysteroscopy / biopsy	38.52
Office endometrial ablation	48.44





RVU
38.52
48.44
26.07
30.55





RVU
38.52
48.44
26.07
30.55
47.01











Success in Office Hysteroscopy







Success in Office Hysteroscopy



Advanced Technology Does Not Compensate For Advanced Stupidity





References

- ACOG. Quality and Safety in Women's Health Care, 2nd edition
- ACOG (2012) Diagnosis of abnormal uterine bleeding in reproductive aged women. Practice Bulletin No. 128. Obstet Gynecol 120:197.
- ACOG (2015) Endometrial Cancer. Practice Bulletin 149. Obstet Gynecol 125:1006.
- ACOG (2018) The role of transvaginal ultrasound in evaluating the endometrium of women with postmenopausal bleeding. Committee Opinion 734. *Obstet Gynecol 131:945.*
- Ben-Arie A et al. The malignant potential of endometrial polyps. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2004;115:206–10.
- Bettocchi S et al (2001) Diagnostic inadequacy of dilatation and curettage. Fertil Steril 75:803.
- Burnett JE (1964) Hysteroscopy-controlled curettage for endometrial polyps. Obstet Gynecol 24(4):621-625
- Clark TJ et al (2002) Accuracy of hysteroscopy in the diagnosis of endometrial cancer and hyperplasia: a systematic quantitative review. JAMA 288:1610.
- DeWaay DJ et al Natural history of uterine polyps and leiomyomata. Obstet Gynecol 2002;100:3–7.
- Elsandabesee D, Greenwood P (2005) The performance of pipelle endometrial sampling in a dedicated postmenopausal bleeding clinic. J Obstet Gynecol 25:32.





References

- Lasmar RB et al (2005) Submucous myomas: A new presurgical classification to evaluate the viability of hysteroscopic surgical treatment preliminary report. JMIG 12:308-311.
- Lee DO et al (2011) Prospective comparison of biopsy results from curettage and hysteroscopy in postmenopausal uterine bleeding. J Obstet Gynaecol Res 37:1423.
- Lee SC, Kaunitz AM, Sanchez-Ramos L, Rhatigan RM. The oncogenic potential of endometrial polyps: A systemic review and meta-analysis. Obstet Gynecol 2010;116:1197–205.
- Moawad NS, Santamaria E, Johnson E et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Office Hysteroscopy for Abnormal Uterine Bleeding. JSLS 2014;18:1-5.
- Smith-Birdman et al (2004) How thick it too thick? When endometrial thickness shold prompt biopsy in postmenopausal women without vaginal bleeding. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 24:558.*
- Tinelli R et al (2008) The role of hysteroscopy with eye-directed biopsy in postmenopausal women with uterine bleeding and endometrial atrophy. *Menopause 15:737.*
- van Dongen H et al (2007) Diagnostic hysteroscopy in abnormal uterine bleeding: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *BJOG 114:664.*







Ted L. Anderson, MD, PhD, FACOG, FACS

Past President, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists

Betty and Lonnie S. Burnett Professor Vice Chair for Gynecology, Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology Medical Director for Gynecologic Surgery, Vanderbilt Hospital Perioperative Services Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN

ted.anderson@vumc.org

