

.

= Abstract =

Transvaginal ultrasonographic analysis of endometrial pattern
and thickness changes during normal menstrual cycle

Chang Suk Suh, M.D., Seok Hyun Kim, M.D., Young Min Choi, M.D.,
Jung Gu Kim, M.D., Shin Yong Moon, M.D., Jin Yong Lee, M.D.

*Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, College of Medicine,
Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea*

The objective of this retrospective study was to evaluate whether the transvaginal ultrasonographical analysis of endometrial pattern and thickness could predict the stage of menstrual cycle. Endometrial pattern and thickness were observed in those patients with infertility during infertility work up from April, 1994 to July, 1998 at Seoul National University Hospital.

The study group was 185 patients with normal regular menstrual cycles. Among them, 44 patients received endometrial biopsy that the date of endometrium was compared with observed endometrial pattern and thickness. The observed endometrial pattern was presence or absence of central cavity echogenicity, triple line sign, endometrial hypoechogenicity, ring sign, endometrial hyperechogenicity and posterior acoustic sonic enhancement.

The results were as follows; Central cavity echogenicity was seen throughout menstrual cycle. Triple line sign was observed in 81.1% of patients during early secretory phase. However, in mid to late secretory phase, triple line sign was appeared in only 6.8%.

The percentage of positive endometrial hypoechogenicity was highest in early secretory phase. In contrast to hypoechogenicity, positive endometrial hyperechogenicity was highest in mid to late secretory phase. Ring sign was observed in 73.5% of the patients during early secretory phase with peak incidence. Posterior acoustic enhancement was seen in 72.7% of the patients during late secretory phase. The sensitivity and specificity of being a secretory phase if the patients showed hyperechogenic endometrium, were 84.2%, 83.3% respectively. The sensitivity and specificity of being a secretory phase if the patients showed posterior acoustic enhancement were 93.8%, 58.3% respectively. Endometrial thickness was not correlated with endometrial dating.

In conclusion, transvaginal ultrasonographical delineation of the endometrial pattern might be useful tool in predicting endometrial status during normal menstrual cycle. But, endometrial thickness could not predict the endometrial dating.

Key Words : Transvaginal ultrasonography, endometrial pattern, endometrial thickness

(01-96-021)

가 , (Noyes et al., 1950).

가 (invasive)

가

가 (myometrium) (echogenicity) , (estradiol)

가

(hypoechogenic shadow) .

(glands) 가 , (hypoechogenic) (hyperechogenic) (Sakamoto, 1985).

(basalis layer) (functionalis layer)

가, (Grunfeld et al., 1987, Forrest et al., 1988).

5가

가

(spiral arteriole) , (stroma) 가 가

(early and mid-proliferative phase) 가 6mm

10-12mm , (secretory phase) 14mm

(Yee, 1993).

1.

1994 4 1998 7
가 185

, 44

2..

1)

6 가 28
2-5 (menstrual phase), 6-10
(early and mid-proliferative phase), 11-14 (late proliferative
phase), 15-19 (early secretory), 20 (mid and
late-secretory)

2)

(central cavity echogenicity), triple
line sign, (hypoechoogenicity), ring sign, (hyperechogenicity) posterior
acoustic enhancement . 5.0 MHz(Cretz 310, Austria) transducer
, (longitudinal) (transverse) scan
, scan .

. Triple line sign ,

3 (line)

. Ring sign scan
(hypoechoic layer)

(decidual cast)

Posterior acoustic enhancement

sonic enhancement

3)

scan

(Randall and

Templeton, 1991).

4)

Novak curet

(fundus)

(posterior uterine body)

2-3

2-3

5)

Kruskal-Wallis

²-test

1.

		71.4% (30/42),
90.3% (28/31),	84.3% (70/83),	90.4% (66/73),
31.8% (14/44)		
(p <0.05)(Table 1).		
Triple line sign	24.4% (10/41),	51.6% (16/31),
74.7% (62/83),	81.1% (60/74),	6.8% (3/44)
		(p <0.05).
가		28.2% (11/39),
37.9% (11/29),	63.6% (49/77),	68.1% (49/72),
15.9% (7/44)		
(p <0.05).		
Ring sign	3.4% (1/29),	8.7% (2/23),
54.8% (34/62),	73.5% (50/68),	18.2% (8/44)
		.
가		58.6% (17/29),
32.0% (8/25),	34.8% (23/66),	38.4% (28/73),
86.4% (38/44)		
(p <0.05).		
Posterior acoustic enhancement	24.0% (6/25),	0% (0/20),
1.8% (1/55),	19.0% (11/58),	72.7% (32/44)
		(p <0.05).

2.

	20	(Figure 1).
가 9mm	36.8% (16/44), 9mm	63.2% (28/44)
	가	.
		.

3.

20

44 가 42 , triple line
sign 41 , posterior acoustic enhancement 32 (Table 1).
가
84.2% (32/38) , 83.3% (5/6) .
가 posterior acoustic enhancement
93.8% (30/32) , 58.3% (7/12) .

Table 1. Observed patterns of endometrium by TV-USG in normal menstrual cycle

MCD	day 2-5	day 6-10	day 11-14	day 15-19	day 20-
CCE (%)	30/42(71.4)	28/31(90.3)	70/83(84.3)	66/73(90.4)	14/44(31.8) ^a
Triple line (%)	10/41(24.4)	16/31(51.6)	62/83(74.7)	60/74(81.1)	3/44(6.8) ^a
EHO (%)	11/39(28.2)	11/29(37.9)	49/77(63.6)	49/72(68.1)	7/44(15.9) ^a
Ring sign (%)	1/29(3.4)	2/23(8.7)	34/62(54.8)	50/68(73.5)	8/44(18.2) ^a
EHP (%)	17/29(58.6)	8/25(32.0)	23/66(34.8)	28/73(38.4)	38/44(86.4) ^b
PAE (%)	6/25(24.0)	0/20(0.0)	1/55(1.8)	11/58(19.0)	32/44(72.7) ^b

MCD : Menstrual cycle day

CCE : Central cavity echogenicity

EHO : Endometrial hypoechogenicity

EHP : Endometrial hyperechogenicity

PAE : Posterior acoustic enhancement

a, b: p <0.05 compared to proliferative and early secretory phases

Figure 1. Endometrial thickness in early and late secretory phases.

가 (Bakos et al., 1993).
(Fleischer et al., 1988;
Jansen and van Os, 1989; Gonen et al., 1991).

(progesterone)
(Gonen and Casper, 1990).

100% (Callen et al.,
1979; Yoshimitsu et al., 1989).
가 (Moon et al., 1985).

가 (Table 1).

Triple line sign
3
triple line
가 (Forrest et al., 1988). triple
line 52% (25/48)
(Forrest et al., 1988). 51.6% - 81.1%
6.8% (3/44) triple
line 가

가

80% (20/25)

(Forrest et al., 1988).

(glycogen)

가

(Fleischer et al., 1986).

77% (37/48)

, 20% (5/25)

(Forrest et al., 1988).

37.9% (11/29)

63.6% (49/77)

가

86.4% (38/44)

가

84.2% (32/38)

83.3% (5/6)

Ring sign

scan

Ring sign

(superficial layer)

(Moon et al., 1985; Picker et al., 1983).

ring sign

54.8% (34/62), 73.5% (50/68)

Posterior acoustic enhancement

(Brandt et al.,

1985),

(Forrest et al., 1988).

72.7% (33/44) 가

24.0% (6/25)

가

posterior acoustic enhancement

93.8% (30/32)

58.3% (7/12)

posterior acoustic enhancement가

가

가

posterior acoustic enhancement가

scan
, (halo)
. 3 가
, (oblique) scan (Li et al., 1992).
8mm , 9mm
(Fleischer et al., 1988; Randall et al., 1989; Li et al., 1992). (
) 6mm , 10-12mm , ()
14mm (Yee, 1993). 가 10mm
(Deichert et al., 1986),
,
(Glissant et al., 1985; Fleischer et al., 1986; Gonen et al., 1989), 가
(Yee et al., 1993; Oliveira et al., 1997;
Sterzik et al., 1997). 가

가 (Figure 1).

가

,
가 185
44
, triple line sign,
, ring sign
posterior acoustic enhancement
가 84.2% (32/38)
, 83.3% (5/6)

Bakos O, Lunkkvist O, Bergh L. Transvaginal sonographic evaluation of endometrial growth and texture in spontaneous ovulatory cycles - a descriptive study. Hum Reprod 1993;8(6):799-806

Brandt TD, Levy EB, Grant TH, Marut E, Leland J. Endometrial echo and its significance in female infertility. Radiology 1985;157:225-229.

Callen PW, DeMartini WJ, Filly RA. The central uterine echo: A useful anatomic sign in the ultrasonographic evaluation of the female pelvis. Radiology 1979;131:187-190.

Deichert U, Hackeloer BJ, Daume E. The sonographic and endocrinologic evaluation of the endometrium in the luteal phase. Hum Reprod 1986;1:219-222.

Fleischer al., Kalemeris GC, Entman SS. Sonographic depiction of the endometrium during normal cycles. Ultrasound Med Biol 1986;12:271-277.

Fleischer AC, Mendelson EB, Bohn-Velez M, Entman SS. Transvaginal and transabdominal sonography of the endometrium. Sem Ultrasound, CT and MR 1988;9:81-101.

Forrest TS, Elyaderani MK, Muilenburg MI, Bewtra C, Kable WT, Sullivan P. Cyclic endometrial changes: US assessment with histologic correlation. Radiology 1988;167:233-237.

Glissant A, de Mouzon J, Frydman R. Ultrasound study of the endometrium during in vitro fertilization cycles. Fertil Steril 1985;44:786-790.

Gonen Y, Casper RF, Jacobson W, Blankier J. Endometrial thickness and growth during ovarian stimulation: a possible predictor of implantation in in vitro fertilization. Fertil Steril 1989;52:446-450.

Gonen Y, Casper RT. Prediction of implantation by the sonographic appearance of the endometrium during the controlled ovarian hyperstimulation for in vitro fertilization (IVF). J In Vitro Fertil Embryo Transfer 1990;7:146-152.

Gonen Y, Calderon I, Dirnfeld M, Abbramovici H. The impact of sonographic appearance of the endometrium and meticulous hormonal monitoring during natural cycles in patients with failed donor artificial insemination. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol* 1991;1:122-126

Grunfeld L, Walker B, Bergh P, Sandler B, Hofmann G, Navot D. High resolution endovaginal ultrasonography of the endometrium: A noninvasive test for endometrial adequacy. *Obstet Gynecol* 1991;78:200-204.

Jansen CAM, van Os HS. Value and limitations of vaginal ultrasonography - a review. *Hum Reprod* 1989;4:858-868.

Li TC, Nuttall L, Klentzeris L, Cooke ID. How well does ultrasonographic measurement of endometrial thickness predict the results of histological dating? *Hum Reprod* 1992;7(1):1-5.

Moon SY, Lim YT, Lee JY, Chang YS. Uterine evaluation of uterine endometrial morphology in the normal menstrual cycle. *Seoul J of Med* 1985;26(1):81-87.

Noyes RW, Hertig AT, Rock J. Dating the endometrial biopsy. *Fertil Steril* 1950;1:3-25.

Oliveira JB, Franco JG Jr, Borges MC, Petersen CG, Mauri AL, Baruffi RL. Endometrial ultrasonography as a predictor of pregnancy in an in-vitro fertilization programme after ovarian stimulation and gonadotrophin-releasing hormone and gonadotrophins. *Hum Reprod* 1997;12(11):2515-8.

Picker RH, Smith DH, Tucker MH, Saunders DM. Ultrasonic signs of imminent ovulation. *J Clin Ultrasound* 1983;11:1-2.

Randall JM, Fisk NM, McTavish A, Templton AA. Transvaginal ultrasonic assessment of endometrial growth in spontaneous and hyperstimulated menstrual cycles. *Br J Obstet Gynaecol* 1989;96:954-959.

Randall JM, Templton A. Transvaginal sonographic assessment of follicular and endometrial growth in spontaneous and clomiphene citrate cycles. *Fertil Steril* 1991;56:208-212

Sakamoto C. Sonographic criteria of phase changes in human endometrial tissue. *Int J Gynecol Obstet* 1985;23:7-12.

Sterzik K, Rosenbusch BE, Gagsteiger F, Strehler EJ, Schneider V, Grab D. Lack of correlation between ultrasonography and histologic staging of the endometrium in in vitro fertilization (IVF) patients. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 1997;23(2):165-70.

Yee B. In Course VI, assisted reproductive technology controversies and dilemma: ultrasound and endometrium. 26th annual postgraduate course, Montreal Canada. 1993;79-88.

Yoshimitsu K, Nakamura G, Nakano H. Dating sonographic endometrial images in the normal ovulatory cycle. *Int J Gynecol Obstet* 1989;28:33-39.