

Notes on "elastography for the diagnosis of high-suspicion thyroid nodules based on the 2015 American Thyroid Association guidelines: A multicenter study"

Ilker Sengul,¹ Demet Sengul²

¹Division of Endocrine Surgery, Department of General Surgery, Giresun University Faculty of Medicine, Giresun, Turkey

²Department of Pathology, Giresun University Faculty of Medicine, Giresun, Turkey

Cite this article as: Sengul I, Sengul D. Notes on "elastography for the diagnosis of high-suspicion thyroid nodules based on the 2015 American Thyroid Association guidelines: A multicenter study". North Clin Istanb 2021;8(1):109–110.

7 read with a great interest the research article entitled: 'Elastography for the diagnosis of high suspicion thyroid nodules based on the 2015 American Thyroid Association guidelines: a multicenter study' [1], April 2020. This updated research intended to cast light on the competency for malignancy estimation of elastography based on the 2015 American Thyroid Association (ATA) management guidelines [2], particularly regarding the cutoff size of 10 mm, in the Chinese population. They stated that the area under the curve (AUC) for elasticity score for the thyroid nodules ≥ 1 cm was higher than the ones <1 cm with excellent sensitivity, accuracy, PPV, NPV, and good specificity (0.875 vs. 0.800, 95.0%) vs. 90.4%, 85.9% vs. 74.4%, 85.2% vs. 69.9%, 87.8% vs. 84.2%, and 68.8% vs. 56.8%, respectively). The authors deduced that the strain elastography (SE) was being an effective technique for the prediction of malignancy concerning the thyroid nodules with high suspicion, 2015 ATA management guidelines, particularly in nodules ≥ 1 cm. The cutoff size of 10 mm for the thyroid nodules has been set by some recommendations on the size selection

criteria for ultrasonography (US)-guided fine-needle aspiration (FNA) (US-guided FNA). FNA is recommended for the nodules over 10 mm, solid and hypoechoic on US; the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists (AACE)/Associazione Medici Endocrinologi (Italian Association of Clinical Endocrinologists) (AME) [Grade B; BEL (best evidence level) 3]. The novel European Thyroid Imaging and Reporting Data System (EU-TIRADS) [3] proposed FNA for thyroid nodules >10 mm, high-risk category (EU-TIRADS 5). The Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound (SRU) [4] suggested FNA application for the ones ≥10 mm, including microcalcifications. The 2009 ATA guidelines recommended that for the nodules ≥10 mm, possessing microcalcifications and hypoechoic solid natures, while it was offered for the nodules ≥10 mm with high to intermediate suspicion sonographic pattern by the 2015 ATA managements guidelines, the last ATA guidelines (Recommendation 8, IID). However, we recently studied whether the cutoff size 10 and 15 mm, as the largest diameters, are prepotentials for three diagnostic tools; SE, US-guided FNA



Received: September 18, 2020 Accepted: November 24, 2020 Online: December 09, 2020

110 North Clin Istanb

cytology, and histopathology, May 2020. The outcomes on the basis of the size (≥ 10 and ≥ 15 mm) revealed no significance with AUC 0.531 and 0.623, respectively, regarding Tsukuba elasticity score (TES) 4&5. The AUC of TES 4&5 for over 15 was higher than over 10 which leads to the possible correlation between the cutoff size of 15 mm and TES 4&5. Eventually, we found SE might not be beneficial to discriminate benign and malign thyroid nodules with a size over 10 mm [5].

Conclusively, this emerging contradiction may probably is derived from: i) the selected study population, which were the nodules ≥10 mm in greatest dimension, necessitating US-guided FNA, based on the last ATA management guidelines (i.e., intermediate&high suspicion), emerging from our study [5], while the ones ≥10 mm with high suspicion, based on 2015 ATA management guidelines, arising in Hairu and colleagues' study [1] and ii) the designated cutoff for TES for the statistical analyses was 3.5 in Hairu et al.'s study [1], while 4.0 in our study [5]. This issue merits further investigation. We thank Hairu et al. [1] for their valuable study.

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest was declared by the authors.

Financial Disclosure: The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

Authorship Contributions: Concept – IS, DS; Design – IS, DS; Supervision – IS, DS; Data collection and/or processing – IS, DS; Analysis and/or interpretation – IS, DS; Literature review – IS, DS; Writing – IS, DS; Critical review – IS, DS.

REFERENCES

- Hairu L, Yulan P, Yan W, Hong A, Xiaodong Z, Lichun Y, et al. Elastography for the diagnosis of high-suspicion thyroid nodules based on the 2015 American Thyroid Association guidelines: a multicenter study. BMC Endocr Disord 2020;20:43. [CrossRef]
- Haugen BR, Alexander EK, Bible KC, Doherty GM, Mandel SJ, Nikiforov YE, et al. 2015 American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines for Adult Patients with Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer: The American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on Thyroid Nodules and Differentiated Thyroid Cancer. Thyroid 2016;26:1–133. [CrossRef]
- 3. Gharib H, Papini E, Paschke R, Duick DS, Valcavi R, Hegedüs L, et al; AACE/AME/ETA Task Force on Thyroid Nodules. American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists, Associazione Medici Endocrinologi, and European Thyroid Association Medical guidelines for clinical practice for the diagnosis and management of thyroid nodules: executive summary of recommendations. Endocr Pract 2010;16:468–75.
- 4. Frates MC, Benson CB, Charboneau JW, Cibas ES, Clark OH, Coleman BG, et al; Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound. Management of thyroid nodules detected at US: Society of Radiologists in Ultrasound consensus conference statement. Radiology 2005;237:794–800. [CrossRef]
- 5. Sengul D, Sengul I, Egrioglu E, Ozturk T, Aydin I, Kesicioglu T, et al. Can cut-off points of 10 and 15 mm of thyroid nodule predict malignancy on the basis of three diagnostic tools: i) strain elastography, ii) the Bethesda System for Reporting Thyroid Cytology with 27-gauge fine-needle, and iii) histopathology? J BUON 2020;25:1122–9.