

Comparative study of ultrasonographic, hysteroscopic and histopathological findings in patients with abnormal uterine bleeding

Iram Wani¹, Syed Najmul Ain^{2*}, Jabeena Ali Chalkoo³

¹Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi, India

²Department of Community Medicine, ³Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Government Medical College, Baramulla, Jammu and Kashmir, India

Received: 19 January 2023

Accepted: 08 February 2023

***Correspondence:**

Dr. Syed Najmul Ain,

E-mail: najmasyed123@gmail.com

Copyright: © the author(s), publisher and licensee Medip Academy. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ABSTRACT

Background: AUB (Abnormal uterine bleeding) is a considerable health care burden not only for women but their families and has a definite effect on their quality of life. Objective was to compare the ultrasonographic, hysteroscopic and histopathological findings in patients with abnormal uterine bleeding.

Methods: This prospective observational study was conducted at the department of obstetrics and gynecology, Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi, from July 2018 to June 2019. The women who came to the OPD with the complaint of AUB in the one year period and met the eligibility criteria were taken for the study. TVS was performed in 126 patients presenting with complaints of abnormal uterine bleeding followed by hysteroscopic biopsy or curettage. The specimens were sent for histopathologic examination.

Results: Mean age was 43.95 ± 8.48 years. Most common presenting complaint was found to be menorrhagia (n=53; 42%) followed by post-menopausal bleeding (n=30, 24.0%). The mean endometrial thickness was 9.79 ± 4.84 mm. The diagnostic specifications of TVS taking histopathological examination as gold standard were: sensitivity = $64/77 = 83.1\%$, specificity 39%, positive predictive value 68%, negative predictive value 59% and accuracy 66%. Hysteroscopy has a sensitivity of 87%, specificity of 51%, positive predictive value of 74%, negative predictive value of 71.4% and diagnostic accuracy of 73% in diagnosing aetiology of abnormal uterine bleeding.

Conclusions: Both TVS and hysteroscopy are good diagnostic modalities for investigation of AUB. However, hysteroscopy has an edge over TVS in diagnosing aetiology of AUB in terms of high sensitivity, specificity and negative predictive value.

Keywords: Diagnosis, Hysteroscopy, Sensitivity, Specificity, Ultrasound

INTRODUCTION

Menstrual disorders are a common indication for medical visits among women of reproductive age.¹ Heavy menstrual bleeding affects up to 30% of women throughout their reproductive lifetime.² Abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB) may be defined as any variation from the normal menstrual cycle, and includes changes in regularity and frequency of menses, in duration of flow, or in amount of blood loss. A menstrual cycle of fewer than 21 days or more than 35 days or a menstrual flow of less than two

days or, more than seven days is considered abnormal. AUB can be categorized as excessive menstrual bleeding, irregular bleeding and inter-menstrual bleeding including, post-coital bleeding in any age group. AUB not only affects the intimate relationships and day-to-day living but can also have serious adverse consequences as anaemia or it may be the result of an underlying malignancy.^{3,4}

AUB affects approximately one in every three women during their reproductive years.⁵ Incidence varies with age and reproductive status of the women in different

populations. Incidence generally increases with age, reaching 24% in those aged 36-40 years.⁶ It accounts for approximately 15-20% of clinic visits and 25% of gynaecological surgeries. This proportion rises to 69% when the perimenopausal and postmenopausal age groups are considered.⁷

AUB is a considerable health care burden not only for women but their families and has a definite effect on their quality of life.⁸

Objective

To compare the ultrasonographic, hysteroscopic and histopathological findings in patients with abnormal uterine bleeding.

METHODS

Study setting

This study was conducted at Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi-110076.

Study design

It was a prospective observational study.

Study period

The study was conducted from July 2018 to June 2019.

Study subjects

The subjects were the women who visited the OPD of department of obstetrics and gynaecology at Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi with the complaint of abnormal uterine bleeding in terms of volume, duration, regularity or frequency of menstrual flow.

Sample-size calculation

The women who came to the OPD with the complaint of AUB in the one year period and met the eligibility criteria were taken for the study.

Inclusion criteria

Patients with abnormal uterine bleeding. Both parous and nulliparous females. Patients who do not require any emergency management.

Exclusion criteria

Patients presenting as an emergency requiring immediate attention. Patients with genital tract infection. Pregnant women. Patients on anticoagulants, hormonal replacement

therapy and hormonal contraceptives. Patients who refuse to be part of the study.

Statistical analysis

The analysis included profiling of patients on different demographic, comorbidities, etiology, clinical, laboratory as well as radiological findings. Quantitative data was presented in terms of means and standard deviation. Qualitative/categorical data was presented as absolute numbers and proportions. Cross tables were generated and chi square test was used for testing of significance. Student t-test was used for comparison of quantitative outcome parameters for a dichotomous independent variable. Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive values were calculated to assess the accuracy of ultrasonography in diagnosis of patients with abnormal uterine bleeding. P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. IBM SPSS software version 24.0 was used for statistical analysis.

Procedures

Before proceeding for examination and investigations, detailed history was obtained, thorough general physical examination and a detailed systemic examination was undertaken. All necessary investigations were taken.

Transvaginal sonography (TVS)

It was performed with Philip ultrasonography machine without referring to the phase of cycle. Informed verbal consent was taken after explaining the procedure to the patient.

Hysteroscopy

After the patient satisfied all the criteria for the study, the procedure was explained to the patient in detail and an informed written consent was obtained. Hysteroscopy was done with KARL STORZ 5 mm diameter panoramic hysteroscope.

Histological examination of the submitted endometrial tissue remains the standard diagnostic procedure for the assessment of abnormal uterine bleeding.

Ethical clearance

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Ethics Committee Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi.

RESULTS

In the present study, TVS was performed in 126 patients presenting with complaints of abnormal uterine bleeding followed by hysteroscopic biopsy or curettage. The specimens were sent for histopathologic examination. The TVS, hysteroscopic and histopathologic patterns were

studied and the measures of validities were computed taking histopathology as the gold standard.

Table 1: General characteristics and symptoms of the study participants.

General characteristics and symptoms		Number (%)
Age-group	<30	10 (8)
	30-39	33 (26)
	40-49	59 (47)
	50-59	21 (16.5)
	≥60	3 (2.5)
Parity	0	8 (6.5)
	1	28 (22.0)
	2	53 (42.0)
	3	25 (20.0)
	4	7 (5.5)
	≥5	5 (4.0)
Menopausal status	Post-menopausal	30 (23.8)
	Pre-menopausal	96 (76.2)
Presenting symptoms	Menorrhagia	53 (42.0)
	Polymenorrhea	9 (7.0)
	Polymenorrhagia	13 (10.0)
	Metrorrhagia	15 (12.0)
	Post-menopausal bleeding	30 (24.0)
	Meno-metrorrhagia	4 (3.0)
Duration of symptoms	Heavy and prolonged menstrual bleeding	2 (1.5)
	<6 months	77 (61.0)
	6 months - 1 year	40 (32.0)
	>1 year	9 (7.0)
Endometrial thickness on TVS	≤4	11 (9.0)
	4.1-6	22 (17.0)
	6.1-8	25 (20.0)
	8.1-10	16 (12.5)
	10.1-12	18 (14.5)
	>12	34 (27.0)

Most of the cases were between the age group of 40-49 years (47%) followed by 30-39 years (26%). Mean age was 43.95±8.48 years. The range was from 25 to 60 years (Table 1).

Range of parity was from 0-10. Eight (6.5%) cases were nulliparous, while 5 cases (4%) had a parity of 5 or more. Maximum number of cases 53 (42.0%) were found to be para 2 followed by 28 (22%) cases who were para one. In our study, 30 (23.8%) were postmenopausal.

Most common presenting complaint was found to be menorrhagia (n=53; 42%) followed by post-menopausal bleeding (n=30, 24.0%), metrorrhagia (n=15; 12%), polymenorrhagia (n=13; 10.0%) and polymenorrhea (n=9; 7.0%).

In the study group, majority of the patients, 77 cases (61%) had symptoms for duration less than 6 months, 40 cases (32%) had symptoms for period between 6 months to 1 year and 9 cases (7%) had symptoms for more than 1 year.

The mean endometrial thickness was 9.79±4.84 mm with a range of 2.0 to 25.7 mm. Endometrium was classified as, thickened if ET>4 in postmenopausal women and >12 mm in premenopausal women irrespective of cycle phase, and labelled as hyperplasia if no focal pathology was detected. 11 (9%) patients had ET≤4. Endometrial thickness was >12 mm in 34 (27%) of the patients which suggested either thickened endometrium or intracavitary abnormalities such as polyp, fibroid etc.

Table 2 depicts the distribution of cases according to findings on TVS. In 32 (25.39%) study subjects, TVS could not detect any abnormality while in 35 (27.77%) cases TVS detected endometrial hyperplasia, in 29 (23%) cases endometrial polyp, in 14 (11%) cases fibroid was detected.

Table 2: Distribution of cases according to finding on TVS, histopathology and hysteroscopy.

	Finding	N (%)
TVS	Cervical polyp	5 (4.0)
	Fibroid	14 (11.0)
	Endometrial polyp	29 (23.0)
	Adnexal mass	2 (1.5)
	Adenomyosis	9 (7.14)
	Endometrial hyperplasia	35 (27.77)
	No abnormality detected	32 (25.39)
Histopathology	Normal	2 (1.5)
	Normal- proliferative	35 (27.5)
	Normal- secretory	12 (9.5)
	Simple endometrial hyperplasia	27 (21.5)
	Cystic glandular hyperplasia	5 (4.5)
	Atypical hyperplasia	2 (1.5)
	Polyp	26 (20.5)
	Fibroid	6 (5.0)
	Endometritis	1 (0.008)
	Atrophy	7 (6.0)
Hysteroscopy	Carcinoma	3 (2.5)
	Normal	35 (28.0)
	Cervical polyp	3 (2.5)
	Endometrial hyperplasia	21 (17.0)
	Endometrial polyp	40 (32.0)
	Fibroid	14 (11.5)
	Endometritis	1 (0.008)
	Atrophy	9 (7.0)
	Adenomyosis	1 (0.008)
	Growth	2 (1.5)

Table 3: Correlation of TVS finding and histopathological finding.

Histo-pathological finding	TVS finding							Total	P value
	Normal	EH	Cervical polyp	Fibroid	Endometrial polyp	Adnexal mass	Adeno-myosis		
Normal	19	3	2	10	9	0	6	49	0.01
EH	5	20	0	2	3	2	2	34	0.98
Polyp	3	4	3	1	14	0	1	26	0.16
Fibroid	3	0	0	1	2	0	0	6	0.03
Endometritis	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	-
Atrophy	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	-
Carcinoma	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3	-
Total	32	35	5	14	29	2	9	126	

EH=Endometrial Hyperplasia

Out of 49 cases with normal endometrium on histopathological examination, endometrium was proliferative in 35 (27.5%) cases and secretory in 12 (9.5%) cases, hyperplasia was seen in 34 (27.5%) cases, polyp in 26 (20.5%) cases, fibroid in 6 (5.0%) cases, carcinoma was detected in 3 (2.5%) study subjects (Table 2).

In all 126 study subjects hysteroscopic examination was done. Out of 126 study subjects, no abnormality found in 35 (28%) cases while endometrial polyp was seen in 40 (32%) cases, endometrial hyperplasia in 21 (17%) cases, fibroid in 14 (11.5%) cases, atrophy in 9 (7%) cases and irregular growth was detected in 2 (1.5%) cases (Table 2).

Table 4: Overall comparison between TVS and histopathology.

		Histopathology		
		Abnormal	Normal	Total
TVS	Abnormal	64	30	94
	Normal	13	19	32
	Total	77	49	126

Of the 32 cases showing normal endometrium on TVS, 19 patients had normal endometrium on histopathology as well while in the rest abnormality was detected as shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Of the 35 cases showing hyperplasia on TVS, only 20 had hyperplasia on histopathology as well. Of the 29 cases showing endometrial polyps on TVS, histopathology detected 14 cases and 9 cases were described as normal (Table 3).

Out of 14 cases showing fibroid on TVS, histopathology detected 1 case.

Significant difference was observed between histopathological and TVS finding with respect to number

of normal endometrium ($p < 0.01$) and fibroid detection ($p < 0.05$).

The sensitivity and specificity of TVS using the information in Table 4 were calculated as follows: sensitivity = $64/77 = 83.1\%$, specificity = $19/49 = 39\%$, positive predictive value = $64/94 = 68\%$, negative predictive value = $19/32 = 59\%$.

Accuracy = $(\text{sensitivity})(\text{prevalence}) + (\text{specificity})(1 - \text{prevalence})$

Accuracy = $(83.1)(77/126) + 39(1 - 77/126) = 65.84\% = 66\%$

Of the 35 cases showing normal endometrium on hysteroscopy, 25 patients had normal endometrium on histopathology as well and 10 cases had hyperplasia detected on histopathology (Table 5).

Of the 21 cases showing hyperplasia on hysteroscopy, 15 had hyperplasia on histopathology as well while 5 patients had normal endometrium on histopathology examination.

Of the 40 cases showing endometrial polyps on hysteroscopy, histopathology detected 24 cases as polyp and 7 cases were described as normal.

Histopathology diagnosed hyperplasia was seen in significantly higher proportion of patients as compared to hysteroscopy ($p = 0.01$). Hysteroscopy diagnosed significantly higher proportion of patients with polyp ($p < 0.01$) and fibroid ($p = 0.01$). Statistically, no significant difference between two modalities was observed with respect to other pathologies ($p > 0.05$)

Using the information in Table 6, the following were calculated for hysteroscopy: sensitivity = 87% , specificity = 51% , positive predictive value = 74% , negative predictive value = 71.4% , accuracy = 73.0% , p value < 0.001 .

Table 5: Correlation of hysteroscopic finding and histopathological finding.

Hysteroscopic finding	Histopathological finding								P value
	Normal	Hyperplasia	Polyp	Fibroid	Endometritis	Atrophy	Carcinoma	Total	
Normal	25	10	0	0	0	0	0	35	0.03
Cervical polyp	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	-
Endometrial hyperplasia	5	15	0	0	0	0	1	21	0.01
Endometrial polyp	9	7	24	0	0	0	0	40	<0.01
Fibroid	7	1	0	6	0	0	0	14	0.01
Endometritis	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	-
Atrophy	1	1	0	0	0	7	0	9	0.98
Adenomyosis	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	-
Carcinoma	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0.72
Total	49	34	26	6	1	7	3	126	

Table 6: Overall comparison between hysteroscopy and histopathology.

Hysteroscopy	Histopathology abnormal	Histopathology normal	Total
Abnormal	67	24	91
Normal	10	25	35
Total	77	49	126

DISCUSSION

The present study was a hospital based observational study conducted on 126 patients with complaints of abnormal uterine bleeding. All the patients in this study underwent ultrasonography and dilatation and curettage and the collected biopsy specimen or curettings were sent for histopathological analysis.

The age group studied was 25-60 years. Most of the patients belonged to the age group 40-49 years (47%). The mean age was 43.95±4.8 years. These findings are supported by Barman et al with maximum age incidence between 40-43 years (38.9%).⁹ Mean age of the patients enrolled in the study by Sujatha et al was 44.5±5.36 years.¹⁰

Maximum number of patients (42%) were para 2. In study by Sujatha et al maximum incidence of abnormal uterine bleeding was seen in the parity of 2 (36%) followed by parity 3 (32%).¹⁰

The commonest presenting complaint in this study was menorrhagia (42%) followed by postmenopausal bleeding (24%). Metrorrhagia comprised 12% of the cases and polymenorrhagia 10% of the cases. Study by Singh et al showed 40.6% of cases presented as complaint of menorrhagia, 14.6% as postmenopausal bleeding and 11.3% as polymenorrhea.¹¹ These findings are also supported by Rajesh et al in which 60% of the cases had menorrhagia.¹²

In transvaginal sonography, 47.0% patients showed endometrial thickness between 6.1 to 12 mm while in 27% endometrial thickness was more than 12 mm. 9% of cases showed thickness less than 4 mm. Study by Barman et al in which TVS showed endometrial thickness between 6.1 to 12 mm in 63.5% of cases while in 22.3% endometrial thickness was more than 12 mm.⁹

In the present study, transvaginal sonography was done for all study subjects with AUB, in which most of the patients (27.77%) were diagnosed to have endometrial hyperplasia, 23% cases as endometrial polyp, 11% as fibroid, 7.14% as adenomyosis, 1.5% as adenexal mass and in 25.39% no abnormality was seen on TVS. Study by Goyal et al showed 57.0% cases as normal uterine cavity by TVS while in 19% endometrial hyperplasia was seen.¹³ Endometrial polyp was seen in 16% and fibroid in 6% cases. Study by Kathuria et al detected 38% as fibroid, 16% as polyp, 26% as adenomyosis and in 16% no abnormality detected.¹⁴

In present study, on histopathology, which was the gold standard, most common finding was endometrial hyperplasia in 27.5% patients, while polyp was seen in 21.5% patients, atrophy in 6%, fibroid in 5% and endometrial carcinoma in 2.5%. Histopathology could not detect any abnormality in 38.5% of patients.

Consequently, the overall sensitivity and specificity of TVS in diagnosing causes of AUB was 83% and 39% respectively. The PPV and NPV was 68% and 59% respectively.

In a study by Pyari et al overall sensitivity and specificity of TVS in diagnosing causes of AUB was 86% and 31% respectively whereas the PPV and NPV were 78% and 44% respectively.¹⁵ In a study by Nazim et al, overall sensitivity and specificity of TVS in diagnosing causes of AUB was 100% and 63.7% respectively whereas the PPV and NPV were 56.3% and 100% respectively.¹⁶ A study by

Vitner et al found the sensitivity and specificity to be 92% and 58% respectively whereas the PPV was 84.3% and NPV was 78.3%.¹⁷

In this study most common abnormality detected on hysteroscopy was the endometrial polyp in 32% cases, followed by endometrial hyperplasia in 17% cases, fibroid in 11.5%, atrophy in 7.0%, a growth in 1.5% cases. In 28% patients no abnormality was detected. In a study by Kathuria et al, 22% patients were found to have no abnormality on hysteroscopy, 38% patients were found to have endometrial hyperplasia, 20% patients had fibroids, 14% had polyps, 4% had endometritis and 2% cases had endometrial atrophy.¹⁴ Study by Dinić et al found hysteroscopic findings normal in almost 30% of the cases, and the most common pathological finding was endometrial polyp.¹⁸ In a study by Rajesh et al, most common lesion detected on hysteroscopy was endometrial hyperplasia in 40% patients followed by endometrial polyp (32%), atrophic endometrium (12%) and submucous fibroid (8%).¹² Similarly, in a study by Pyari et al, common lesions detected in AUB patients on hysteroscopy were myoma (34%), polyp (18%), and endometrial hyperplasia (10%) while in 18% of cases no abnormality was seen in uterus.¹⁵

This study showed hysteroscopy has a sensitivity of 87%, specificity of 51%, positive predictive value of 74%, negative predictive value of 71.4% and diagnostic accuracy of 73% in diagnosing aetiology of abnormal uterine bleeding. Study by Sinha et al showed hysteroscopy to have a sensitivity of 78.3%, specificity of 63.6%, positive predictive value of 60%, negative predictive value of 80.6%.¹⁹

CONCLUSION

From the present study it may be concluded that both transvaginal sonography and hysteroscopy are good diagnostic modalities for investigation of women with abnormal uterine bleeding. However, hysteroscopy has an edge over TVS in diagnosing aetiology of AUB in terms of high sensitivity, specificity and negative predictive value. Hysteroscopy is a safe and reliable procedure and gives a magnified view of whole uterine cavity, which allows an adequate exploration of the uterine cavity under visual control.

However endometrial histopathology improves the diagnostic accuracy of both hysteroscopy and TVS and is important for confirming the diagnosis especially in peri- or postmenopausal patients. Thus hysteroscopy, TVS and histopathology do not substitute, rather complement each other.

Funding: No funding sources

Conflict of interest: None declared

Ethical approval: The study was approved by the Institutional Ethics Committee of Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi

REFERENCES

1. Kjerulff KH, Erickson BA, Langenberg PW. Chronic gynecological conditions reported by US women: findings from the national health interview survey, 1984 to 1992. *Am J Public Health.* 1996;86:195-9.
2. Market Opinion and Research International (MORI). Women's health in 1990 (Research study conducted on behalf of Parke-Davis Laboratories). London: MORI; 1990.
3. McCluggage WG. My approach to the interpretation of Endometrial biopsies and curettings. *J Clin Pathol.* 2006;59:801-12.
4. Munro MG. Abnormal uterine bleeding in reproductive years. Part I. Pathogenesis and clinical investigations. *J Am Assoc Gyno Laparosc.* 1999;6:391-428.
5. Matteson KA, Abed H, Wheeler TL, Sung VW, Rahn DD, Schaffer JJ, et al. A systematic review comparing hysterectomy with less invasive treatments for abnormal uterine bleeding. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol.* 2012;19(1):13-28.
6. Guin G, Sandhu SK, Lele A, Khare S. Hysteroscopy in evaluation of abnormal uterine bleeding *J Obstet Gynaecol India.* 2011;61(5):546-9.
7. Menacaglia L, Perino A, Hamou J. Hysteroscopy in perimenopausal and postmenopausal women with abnormal uterine bleeding. *J Reprod Med.* 1987;32(8):577-81.
8. Singh S, Best C, Dunn S, Leyland N, Wolfman WL, Clinical Practice- Gynaecology Committee. Abnormal uterine bleeding in premenopausal women *J Obstet Gynaecol Can.* 2013;35(5):473-9.
9. Barman SC, Bardhan J, Roy S, Sarkar KN, Das O. Comparative evaluation of transvaginal sonography and diagnostic hysteroscopy in abnormal uterine bleeding in perimenopausal age with their histopathological correlation. *Sch J App Med Sci.* 2017;5(3B):838-43.
10. Audimulapu S, Sudeepti M. A comparative diagnostic evaluation of hysteroscopy, transvaginal ultrasonography and histopathological examination in 50 cases of abnormal uterine bleeding. *IAIM.* 2017;4(8):1-1.
11. Singh A, Anant M. The evaluative role of diagnostic hysteroscopy and ultrasonography in abnormal uterine bleeding. *Int J Res Med Sci.* 2017;5(3):1002-6.
12. Rajesh P, Ravi R, Mule VD. Hysteroscopy as a Diagnostic Aid in Gynecology. *Int J Interdiscip Multidiscip Stud.* 2015;2(10):78-83.
13. Goyal BK, Gaur I, Sharma S, Saha A, Das NK. Transvaginal sonography versus hysteroscopy in evaluation of abnormal uterine bleeding. *Med J Armed Forces India.* 2015;71(2):120-5.
14. Kathuria R, Bhatnagar B. Correlation between D and C, USG and hysteroscopy findings in diagnosing a cause for abnormal uterine bleeding. *Indian J Clin Pract.* 2014;25(5):466-70.

15. Pyari JS, Rekha S, Srivastava PK, Goel M, Pandey M. A comparative diagnostic evaluation of hysteroscopy, transvaginal ultrasonography and histopathological examination in cases of abnormal uterine bleeding. *J Obstet Gynecol India.* 2006;56(3):240-3.
16. Nazim F, Hayat Z, Hannan A, Ikram U, Nazim K. Role of transvaginal ultrasound in identifying endometrial hyperplasia. *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad.* 2013;25(1-2):100-2.
17. Vitner D, Filmer S, Goldstein I, Khatib N, Weiner Z. A comparison between ultrasonography and hysteroscopy in the diagnosis of uterine pathology. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2013;171(1):143-5.
18. Pop-Trajković-Dinić S, Ljubić A, Kopitović V, Antić V, Stamenović S, Pjević AT. The role of hysteroscopy in diagnosis and treatment of postmenopausal bleeding. *Vojnosanit Pregl.* 2013;70(8):747-50.
19. Sinha P, Yadav N, Gupta U. Use of hysteroscopy in abnormal uterine bleeding: an edge over histopathological examination. *J Obstet Gynecol India.* 2017:1-6.

Cite this article as: Wani I, Ain SN, Chalkoo JA. Comparative study of ultrasonographic, hysteroscopic and histopathological findings in patients with abnormal uterine bleeding. *Int J Reprod Contracept Obstet Gynecol* 2023;12:639-45.