Preprints.org

Article

Using Ultrasonography to Definitively Diagnose Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules

Sofia Guerreiro [*] , Mariana Mourão , Isabel Loureiro , Rosário Eusébio , Hugo Pinto Marques

Article

Using Ultrasonography to Definitively Diagnose Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules

Running Title: Ultrasonography for Definitive Diagnosis of Indeterminate Thyroid Nodules

Sofia Guerreiro [1,*], **Mariana Mourão** [1], **Isabel Loureiro** [2], **Rosário Eusébio** [3] and **Hugo Pinto Marques** [1]

[1] Serviço de Cirurgia Geral, Centro Hospitalar Universitário Lisboa Central, Hospital Curry Cabral, Lisboa, Portugal

[2] Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal

[3] Serviço de Cirurgia Geral, Centro Hospitalar de Setúbal, EPE, Setúbal, Portugal

[*] Correspondence: sofiacuco@gmail.com; Tel.: 912782550

Abstract: Introduction: Thyroid nodules are extremely common and require complex management to prevent unnecessary surgical intervention and ensure that no malignant disease is overlooked. Several diagnostic tools and scoring systems are available to evaluate the Risk of Malignancy (ROM). The goal is to assess variables that can aid and support the clinical recommendations suggested by the updated Bethesda System for Reporting Thyroid Cytopathology (TBSRTC), such as the ultrasonographic features of thyroid nodules, particularly for indeterminate categories III (atypia of undetermined significance) and IV (follicular neoplasm). **Methods:** We retrospectively analysed the correlation of the demographic and ultrasonographic characteristics of thyroid nodules with the cytopathological and histopathological diagnoses of TBSRTC categories III (atypia of undetermined significance), IV (follicular neoplasm), V (suspicious for malignancy), and VI (malignant) in patients who underwent surgery in a single Portuguese centre over a 10-year period. **Results:** In total, 360 nodules were evaluated in 341 patients and 57% were histopathologically malignant or borderline. The majority were included in the TBSRTC indeterminate categories III and IV with an ROM of 44% and 43%, respectively. The ultrasonographic characteristics associated with a higher TBSRTC category and a greater ROM value were hypoechogenicity, presence of microcalcifications, irregular margins, and the presence of cervical adenopathy. When correlating with a malignant histology, only adenopathy and the presence of microcalcifications were observed to be statistically significant. **Discussion**: The indeterminate categories of the TBSRTC have been the most challenging ones to manage. The new TBSRTC (2023) guidelines as well as the ultrasonographic characteristics of a patient can be helpful in assessing the ROM and deciding on an appropriate course of treatment. Other resources, such as molecular tests, are also gaining a more important role in the clinical decision process and may become crucial in the future. **Conclusion:** The clinical management of thyroid nodules requires a careful analysis of clinical history and an evaluation of demographic details, the symptoms of the patient, comorbidities, personal and family history, ultrasonographic features, and the results of cytopathology, thyroid function, and molecular/genetic tests to provide the best care possible. Patients with thyroid nodules of an indeterminate character can obtain a definitive diagnosis through surgery. However, by employing a complete analysis of all relevant data, some patients may be suitable for active surveillance instead of a surgical intervention.

Keywords: the bethesda system for reporting thyroid cytopathology; thyroid nodules; risk of malignancy; grey area; ultrasonographic characteristics

Introduction

Thyroid nodules are extremely common and are present in 19%-68% of randomly selected individuals subjected to thyroid ultrasonography. However, only a small percentage of these (7%-15%) constitute thyroid cancer. [1]Ultrasonography is the most widely used imaging modality for the assessment of thyroid diseases. It is an easily available, inexpensive, and radiation-free diagnostic tool that allows for the evaluation of the thyroid parenchyma, measurement of size, location, and characterisation of nodules, and evaluation of cervical lymph nodes. Thyroid nodules are evaluated based on their size, echogenicity, presence of calcifications, shape (taller-than-wide), vascularity, halos, and margins. [2] Since none of these yield results that are 100% predictive of thyroid cancer and ultrasonography has poor reproducibility with significant inter- and intra-operator variability, several classification systems have been proposed by medical researchers to aid the decision to perform ultrasonographically guided fine needle aspiration cytology (FNAC), estimating the risk of thyroid cancer. One such cancer risk assessment system is termed the Thyroid Imaging Reporting and Data System (TI-RADS) and is named after the widely accepted Breast Imaging Reporting and Data System used for breast imaging. Several versions of TI-RADS, such as the European Thyroid Association (EU TI-RADS), the American College of Radiology TI-RADS, the Chinese TI-RADS, and the Korean Society of Thyroid Radiology TI-RADS have been validated and have demonstrated diagnostic value in predicting thyroid malignancy. However, the studies conducted for these validations were mostly retrospective and showed poor reproducibility owing to the variability in operators and equipment. For EU TI-RADS category 5 (high-risk: at least one of the following features: irregular shape, irregular margins, microcalcifications, or marked hypoechogenicity), the estimated malignancy risk according to the European Thyroid Association guidelines is 26%-87%.

The Bethesda System for Reporting Thyroid Cytopathology (TBSRTC) was created to report thyroid cytopathology after FNA, categorise the Risk of Malignancy (ROM), and standardise the management of thyroid nodules. [3] There are six TBSRTC categories: I - Non-Diagnostic (ND); II – Benign (B); III - Atypia of Undetermined Significance (AUS); IV - Follicular Neoplasm (FN); V, Suspicious for Malignancy (SM); and VI – Malignant (M), each associated with clinical recommendations. The TBSRTC categories III (AUS) and IV (FN) are termed the indeterminate categories, with ROMs that vary greatly in the literature, and present the most challenging clinical management decisions. [3] Current guidelines suggest repeating FNAC, molecular testing, or lobectomy for AUS, and molecular testing or lobectomy for FN. [4] Even with the updated 3rd version of the TBSRTC, published in 2023 that further scrutinises these categories, the management of these nodules remains challenging.[4]

Combining the ultrasonography-based overdiagnosis of thyroid nodules with the lack of a clear course of action associated with TBSRTC categories III (AUS) and IV (FN) may result in the unnecessary surgical excision of benign nodules, thereby exposing patients to the potential risks of a surgical procedure and its complications.

This study aimed to assess variables (such as clinical, demographic, and ultrasonographic characteristics) that can aid in deciding between a surgical or active surveillance approach for the indeterminate TBSRTC categories, supporting and complementing the recommendations provided by the updated TBSRTC and its new ROMs.

Methods

Study Design and Participants

A retrospective review was carried out of all patients who underwent FNAC, whose cytopathology corresponded to TBSRTC categories III, IV, V, and VI, and who underwent partial or total thyroidectomy in the Endocrine Surgery Section, Department of General Surgery, of a single Portuguese hospital, over a 10-year period (between January 2009 and January 2019).

Only patients who underwent all cytological examinations, surgery, and histopathological analyses at the hospital were included in the study sample. Data were accessed from the hospital records for research purposes in 2019 (June to December).

Measurements

Patient age, sex, type of surgery, number of nodules evaluated, ultrasonographic characteristics, and cytological and histological diagnoses of the nodules were recorded, and the ROM was calculated.

The results of ultrasonography and the FNAC findings were reviewed by a single endocrine surgeon.

Statistical Analysis

A statistical analysis was performed using the SPSS PASW Statistics 18 software package, release version 18.0.0, by employing a Pearson chi-square independence test. This test uncovers the relationship between two categorical variables, where each variable can have two or more categories. It considers a crosstabulation table, with cases classified according to the categories in each variable. This work considered two crosstabulation tables: (1) between the ultrasonography characteristics and the cytopathological classification and (2) between the ultrasonography characteristics and the histological classification.

The null hypothesis states there is no association between the two variables, while the alternative hypothesis states there is an association. To obtain the conclusion of this test and assess its statistical significance, the p-value is evaluated and compared with the threshold defined for the significance level (5%). For a p-value higher than this threshold, there is no statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis, indicating that the variables do not have any association between them. For a p-value lower than the threshold, there is statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis, which means there is statistical evidence of an association between the variables tested.

Ethical Statement

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of our Hospital, and written informed consent was obtained from all patients (Ethical Approval Number:001/2019F).

Results

A total of 341 patients were included in the study, of whom 88% were women and 56% were older than 55 years. Among the women in the study sample, 56% had a malignant disease, while this percentage increased to 66% in the male patients. Regarding the variable of age, the ROM values were similar between individuals under- and above-55 years of age (58% and 56%, respectively). The age cutoff was based on the American Joint Committee on Cancer Tumour, Node, Metastasis staging system classification(5).

The most prevalent comorbidity was hypertension (46%), followed by dyslipidaemia (23%) and diabetes (15%). Previous radiation exposure was present in 4% of patients, with an ROM of 72%.

The majority of the nodules had sizes ranging from 10-40 mm (71%), followed by nodules larger than 40 mm (9%), with the remainder being smaller than 10 mm.

The surgical procedure was total thyroidectomy in 94% of the patients and lobectomy with isthmectomy in the remaining patients.

FNAC was performed for one nodule in 322 patients and for two nodules in 19 patients (n=360 index nodules). Hereafter, all data are referred to in terms of nodules from a total of 360 nodules.

Regarding histopathological diagnoses, the majority (55%) were diagnosed with malignant tumours, of which the largest proportion was Papillary Thyroid Cancer (PTC) (180/197). In this patient cohort, 43% had a benign diagnosis and 2.1% were borderline (Table 1). The new TBSRTC guidelines were taken into consideration, and the AUS and FN categories were divided into two subcategories: AUS with nuclear atypia vs. AUS-other (architectural atypia, oncocytic atypia, nuclear changes not suggestive of PTC, psammoma bodies, and atypical lymphoid cells) and FN with and without oncocytic features.

In the cytological diagnoses, FN dominated (48%) with the majority being "without oncocytic cells", followed by AUS (22%) (Table 1).

Malignancy was most common in the malignant category (TBSRTC VI) (97%), followed by the Suspicious for Malignancy category (TBSRTC V) (77%). For AUS (TBSRTC III) and FN (TBSRTC IV), the percentages of malignant tumours were 44% and 43%, respectively (Table 2).

The malignancy rates among unilateral and bilateral nodules were 60% and 67%, respectively. Regarding focality, the ROM was 57% and 69% for unifocal and multifocal nodules, respectively. Adenopathy (without assessment of the ultrasonographic features of each adenopathy) was present in only 7% of the malignant cases; however, when present, 94% were malignant.

The various ultrasonographic characteristics, namely echogenicity, calcification, margins, shape (taller-than-wide), halo, and vascularisation were evaluated. The results were correlated with the cytological (Table 3) and histopathological classifications (Table 4).

Table 1. Number of histopathological and cytological diagnoses.

	Characteristics	n	% (n/360)
	Benign histology/tumours	**155**	**43**
	Borderline tumours	**8**	**2**
	NIFTP	6	2
	WDT-UMP	2	1
	Malignant tumours	**197**	**55**
Histopathological	miPTC**	10	3
diagnoses	PTC	180	50
	FTC	2	1
	MTC	1	0
	HCC**	4	1
	AUS*	**79**	**22**
	AUS-nuclear atypia	(11)	(3)
	AUS-other	(68)	(19)
	FN*	**173**	**48**
	FN without oncocytic cells	(95)	(26)
Cytological diagnoses	FN with oncocytic cells	(78)	(22)
	SM	**44**	**12**
	M	**64**	**18**

NIFT-P, non-invasive follicular tumour with papillary-like nucleus; WDT-UMP, well differentiated tumour of uncertain malignant potential; miPTC, papillary thyroid microcarcinoma; PTC, papillary thyroid carcinoma; FTC, follicular thyroid carcinoma; MTC, medullary thyroid carcinoma; HCC, hürthle cell carcinoma; AUS, atypia of undetermined significance; FN, follicular neoplasm; SM, suspicious for malignancy; M, malignant. *According to the 3rd TBSRTC guidelines, the AUS and FN categories are each split into two subcategories. The number of nodules in these subcategories are given in parentheses. ** Since the 2022 WHO Classification of Thyroid Neoplasms [5], these histopathological terms are no longer in use. However, for the purpose of this article, they are retained.

Table 2. Histopathological results following FNAC diagnoses.

	Benign histology	Malignant (or borderline) histology	Total number	Risk of malignancy* (%)
AUS	44	35	79	44
AUS-nuclear atypia	(5)	(6)	(11)	(55)
AUS-other	(39)	(29)	(68)	(43)
FN				
FN without oncocytic cells	99	74	173	43
	(45)	(50)	(95)	(53)
FN – with oncocytic cells	(54)	(24)	(78)	(31)
SM	10	34	44	77
M	2	62	64	97

AUS, atypia of undetermined significance; FN, follicular neoplasm; SM, suspicious for malignancy; M, malignant; NIFT-P, non-invasive follicular tumour with papillary-like nucleus; WDT-UMP, well differentiated tumour of uncertain malignant potential; * The risk of malignancy (ROM) was calculated, including borderline (WDT-UMP and NIFT-P) tumours.

Table 3. Crosstabulation tables between ultrasonographic characteristics and cytopathological classification.

Ultrasonographic characteristics:	AUS n (%)	SFN n (%)	SM n (%)	M n (%)	p-value (for Pearson Chi-Square Independence test)
Echogenicity					
Cystic	-	2 (1.4)	-	2 (3.8)	
Hypoechoic	16 (21.9)	49 (33.8)	14 (35)	32 (61.5)	
Isoechoic	55 (75.3)	94 (64.8)	26 (65)	18 (34.6)	<0.001
Hyperechoic	2 (2.7)	-	-	-	
Calcification					
No calcification	52 (75.4)	105(73.9)	27 (73)	19 (39.6)	
Macrocalcification	8 (11.6)	14 (9.9)	7 (18.9)	13 (27.1)	<0.001
Microcalcification	9 (13)	23 (16.2)	3 (8.1)	16 (33.3)	
Margins					
Regular	54 (79.4)	114(80.9)	29 (74,4)	23 (52.3)	0.001
Irregular	14 (20.6)	27 (19.1)	10 (25.6)	21 (47.7)	
Shape					
Wider-than-tall	68 (94.4)	137(91.3)	34 (87.2)	42 (79.2)	0.036
Taller-than-wide	4 (5.6)	13 (8.7)	5 (12.8)	11 (20.8)	
Halo					
No halo	36 (49.3)	88 (57.9)	29 (69)	41 (69.5)	
Complete hypoechoic	33 (45.2)	56 (36.8)	11 (26.2)	12 (20.3)	
Incomplete hypoechoic	3 (4.1)	7 (4.6)	2 (4.8)	4 (6.8)	0.135
Hyperechoic	1 (1.4)	1 (0.7)	-	2 (3.4)	
Adenopathy					
Absent	77 (97.5)	169(97.7)	43 (97.7)	55 (85.9)	0.001
Present	2 (2.5)	4 (2.3)	1 (2.3)	9 (14.1)	
TOTAL	65	135	36	38	

AUS, atypia of undetermined significance; FN/SFN, follicular neoplasm/suspicion of follicular neoplasm; SM, suspicious for malignancy; M, malignant. A total of 274 nodules have the following radiological features: Echogenicity, calcification, halo, irregular shape, margins, and adenopathy. Vascularization is excluded because of the high number of "not applicable (N/A)" cases, and a very high p-value.

Table 4. Crosstabulation tables between ultrasonographic findings and histological characteristics (malignant includes low risk tumours).

Ultrasonographic characteristics:	Benign n (%)	Malignant n (%)	p-value (for Pearson Chi-Square Independence test)
Echogenicity			
Cystic	1 (0.7)	3 (1.8)	
Hypoechoic	40 (28.8)	71 (41.5)	
Isoechoic	97 (69.8)	96 (56.1)	0.093
Hyperechoic	1 (0.7)	1 (0.6)	
Calcification			
No calcification	112 (81.2)	91 (57.6)	
Macrocalcification	13 (9.4)	29 (18.4)	<0.001
Microcalcification	13 (9.4)	38 (24.1)	
Margins			
Regular	109 (80.7)	111 (70.7)	0.047
Irregular	26 (19.3)	46 (29.3)	
Shape			
Wider-than-tall	135 (94.4)	146 (85.4)	0.009

Taller-than-wide	8 (5.6)	25 (14.6)	
Halo			
No halo	82 (56.2)	112 (62.2)	
Complete hypoechoic	57 (39)	55 (30.6)	
Incomplete hypoechoic	7 (4.8)	9 (5)	0.142
Hyperechoic	-	4 (2.2)	
Adenopathies			
Absent	154 (99.4)	190 (92.7)	
Present	1 (0.6)	15 (7.3)	0.002

Discussion

All patients (TBSRTC categories III, IV, V, and VI) underwent surgical intervention, with the majority undergoing total thyroidectomy. However, 43% of the cases proved to be benign tumours. This raises the question of how surgeons may limit unnecessary surgical interventions while ensuring that no malignant cases are overlooked.

While evaluating a patient and deciding how to manage thyroid nodule disease, multiple factors should be considered, including patient demographics, personal and family histories, and the results of the diagnostic tools available.

Historically, women have been associated with a greater presence of thyroid nodules, and men with higher malignancy rates. Nevertheless, the meta-analysis of autopsy studies for subclinical thyroid cancer conducted by LeClair et al. led to the belief that this is an oversimplification, and that sex disparity is mostly confined to the detection of small subclinical PTCs that are equally common in both sexes in autopsy studies, but are identified much more often in women. According to their findings, as cancer lethality increases, the ratio of detection by sex approaches 1:1. This data trend may be associated with sex differences in healthcare utilisation and may pose a danger for both sexes, with over- and under-detection in women and men, respectively. [6] Other retrospective studies continue to confirm the higher prevalence in women, but with a tendency to fade in the older age groups and with poorer prognoses in men, along with poorer survival and more aggressive disease at presentation. However, no clear reasons have been reported for these disparities.[7–9]

Hypertension was the most common comorbidity in patients with thyroid nodules. Although this aligns with the findings reported in the literature, no direct correlation between these two diseases has been demonstrated. [7,10,11] However, previous radiation exposure has been shown to have a positive correlation with the occurrence of thyroid nodules, especially if exposure occurs at an early age, with the most notable studies being the ones focused on survivors of the atomic bomb attacks in Japan and the reactor disaster in Chernobyl [12,13]. Although our present study sample has a limited number of cases of radiation exposure, the ROM was still high in this subgroup (72%).

Several diagnostic instruments guide surgeons in selecting the optimal course of action. The TI-RADS scoring system and some of its variations based on ultrasonographic characteristics indicate the need for FNAC.[14] In this study, this decision was based on the Portuguese Direção Geral de Saúde guidelines. [15]

The cytopathology report, especially if it follows the TBSRTC guidelines, will further guide the course of treatment based on the ROM for each category.

The indeterminate categories (TBSRTC III and IV) remain problematic, without a clear consensus on treatment options. The calculated ROM was observed to be similar between both categories: 44% and 43% for categories III and IV, respectively. These values are considerably higher than those reported in the literature, including the ROM values for malignancies like non-invasive follicular tumour with papillary-like nucleus and well differentiated tumour of uncertain malignant potential. The literature reports a 10-30% ROM for TBSRTC III and 25-40% for TBSRTC IV categories. [3] A possible reason for this disparity is that only nodules that underwent surgery were evaluated, suggesting that other factors could have been considered. For the Suspicious for Malignancy (V) and Malignant (VI) TBSRTC categories, the ROM was in agreement with that reported in the literature. [1,16]

To improve the discriminatory power of the cytopathological classification, the TBSRTC 2023 guidelines (that separate each of the two indeterminate categories into two sub-categories) makes it possible to further scrutinise the risk of malignancy. The TBSRTC category III (ROM 13-30%) is now

divided into Atypia of Undetermined Significance with Nuclear Atypia and Other Atypia of Undetermined Significance. The calculated ROM was 55% for AUS nuclear atypia and 43% for AUS other, and this agrees with the original purpose of this subdivision, as it emphasises a relatively higher ROM in the presence of nuclear atypia. Regarding TBSRTC Category IV (23-34%) that is now divided into Follicular Neoplasm with and without oncocytic cells to further align with the 2022 World Health Organization Classification of Thyroid Neoplasms, the calculated ROM was 31% and 53%, respectively. [4]

Most published studies correlate the ultrasonographic features with the cytological results, given their relevance in the scoring systems that guide the decision to perform FNAC. Similarly, we have correlated the individual ultrasonographic characteristics with the cytological results in the present study. The ultrasonographic characteristics that were statistically significant for pre-surgery characterisation in the higher TBSRTC categories were the presence of hypoechoic nodules ($p<0.001$), microcalcifications (p-0.001), irregular margins (p-0.001) and the presence of adenopathy (p-0.001).

Hypoechogenicity is known to be highly specific for malignancy (92-94%) [18]. Microcalcifications have a specificity for malignancy of 86-95% in the literature[18]. Evaluation of margins also plays an important role in assessing malignancy, with previous studies reporting that spiculated or micro-lobulated margins (92% specificity) and poorly defined margins suggest malignancy[18]. Only the regularity of the margins was evaluated, and irregular margins were associated with a higher TBSRTC classification score. In future, a further division into regular, spiculated, and ill-defined margins may enhance nodule description and provide information about the ROM.

The presence of adenopathy is also associated with malignancy; thus, ultrasonographic examination of cervical lymph nodules and reporting their location and characteristics are essential for all ultrasonographic thyroid evaluations.

Although not helpful, the size of the nodule should be monitored over time, because malignant nodules usually grow more quickly. [19,20] The progression of nodule growth was also studied.

Characteristics such as a taller-than-wide shape and the halo sign, although usually associated with an increased ROM [21,22], showed no statistical significance in this study. The significance of central vascularity was not assessed because it was not reported in the ultrasonographic results for the majority of this patient cohort.

To further test the possible role of ultrasonographic features as a deciding factor between surgery and surveillance, they were correlated with the final histopathological results. In this analysis, only the presence of microcalcifications and adenopathies were observed to be significantly associated with a higher ROM. These results agree with a systematic review conducted by Remonti et al., where only the presence of microcalcifications was significantly correlated with the histopathological diagnosis of indeterminate cytology nodules. [23] The assessment of microcalcifications can be particularly challenging because they are often similar to colloids. Considering its importance, it is essential that professionals performing ultrasonography are highly trained and that they correctly document the presence of microcalcifications and/or colloids.

According to the American Thyroid Association guidelines, a comprehensive cervical lymph node survey is advisable for all thyroid cancer cases, and a preoperative map highlighting possible adenopathies should be prepared [16].

The present study highlights the essential role that ultrasonography can play, not only when deciding the diagnostic approach, but also when managing treatment options, and this is especially important in the TBSRTC indeterminate categories.

Regarding the limitations of this study, this was a retrospective study that excluded patients in the Non-Diagnostic and Benign TBSRTC categories (TBSRTC categories I and II) as well as all those patients who were not subjected to thyroidectomy. This sampling strategy precluded the calculation of other parameters, such as specificity and predictive values. Regarding the relative prevalence of each TBSRTC category in our study sample, there was an increase in the prevalence of the remaining categories because of the exclusions mentioned above. In a normal setting, to ensure the reliability of the cytological results, TBSRTC III should account for no more than 10% of all specimens, whereas it amounts to 22% of the present study sample.[16] Although not evaluated, family history should not be overlooked, as it is extremely important in malignant disease diagnoses. Finally, no international grading system, such as the TI-RADS system, was used.

Ultrasonographic characteristics should be reported in a standardised manner to ensure that every relevant parameter is evaluated, easily understandable, and useful in the decision-making process. This would decrease inter-operator variability in the data, facilitate surveillance strategies, be helpful for research purposes, and simplify the processing and sharing of data.

Moving forward, other diagnostic tools such as molecular and genetic tests should be considered to help evaluate the ROM and prevent unnecessary surgical interventions[24,25]. Elastosonography also has an important role to play and should be employed and evaluated, with "stiffness" or hard consistency being reported to have a sensitivity for malignancy of up to 97%. [18,23]

When deciding on the best clinical and surgical approach for thyroid nodules, patient demographics, symptoms, comorbidities, personal and family histories, and the results of ultrasonography, cytopathology, thyroid function, and molecular/genetic tests should be considered to provide the best possible care.

This study contributes data for evaluation of the new TBSRTC guidelines as well as ultrasonographic factors that can influence the ROM.

Conclusion

Selecting the best intervention strategy for indeterminate-category thyroid nodules remains challenging, even after the release of the updated 2023 TBSRTC classification. Therefore, clinicians and surgeons must rely on other factors to make evidence-based decisions. This study supports the importance of identifying the presence of microcalcifications and adenopathy as significant features associated with an increased ROM, highlighting the association between these ultrasonographic characteristics and the histopathological diagnosis of malignancy.

Abbreviations

Histopathological diagnoses of nodules:
Benign;
- CLT: Chronic lymphocytic thyroiditis
- BFN: Benign follicular nodule
- FA: Follicular adenoma
- PA: Papillary adenoma
- HCA: Hürthle cell adenoma (Oncocytic adenoma is preferred term)
Borderline:
- NIFT-P: Non-invasive follicular tumour with papillary nucleus
- WDT-UMP: Well differentiated tumour of uncertain malignant potential
Malignant:
- PTC: Papillary thyroid carcinoma
- Sub-cm: Subcentimeter Papillary thyroid carcinoma
- FTC: Follicular thyroid carcinoma
- MTC: Medullary thyroid carcinoma
- HCC: Hürthle cell carcinoma (Oncocytic carcinoma is preferred term)
Cytological categorization of nodules according to Bethesda:
ND: Non-diagnostic (Category 1)
B: Benign (Category 2)
AUS: Atypia of undetermined significance (Category 3)
FN/SFN: Follicular neoplasm or Suspicious for follicular neoplasm (Category 4)
SM: Suspicious for malignancy (Category 5)
M: Malignant (Category 6)

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Kuo JH, McManus C, Graves CE, Madani A, Khokhar MT, Huang B, et al. Updates in the management of thyroid nodules. Current Problems in Surgery. 2019 Mar;56(3):103–27.

2. Papini E, Guglielmi R, Bianchini A, Crescenzi A, Taccogna S, Nardi F, et al. Risk of Malignancy in Nonpalpable Thyroid Nodules: Predictive Value of Ultrasound and Color-Doppler Features. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism. 2002 May;87(5.

3. Cibas ES, Ali SZ. The 2017 Bethesda System for Reporting Thyroid Cytopathology. Thyroid: official journal of the American Thyroid Association [Internet]. 2017;27(11):1341–6.

4. Ali SZ, Baloch ZW, Beatrix Cochand-Priollet, Schmitt FC, Philippe Vielh, VanderLaan PA. The 2023 Bethesda System for Reporting Thyroid Cytopathology. 2023 Jul 8.

5. Tuttle RM, Haugen B, Perrier ND. Updated American Joint Committee on Cancer/Tumor-Node-Metastasis Staging System for Differentiated and Anaplastic Thyroid Cancer (Eighth Edition): What Changed and Why? Thyroid. 2017 Jun;27(6):751–6.

6. LeClair K, Bell KJL, Furuya-Kanamori L, Doi SA, Francis DO, Davies L. Evaluation of Gender Inequity in Thyroid Cancer Diagnosis. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2021 Oct 1;181(10):1351.

7. Lee YK, Hong N, Park SH, Shin DY, Lee CR, Kang SW, et al. The relationship of comorbidities to mortality and cause of death in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Scientific Reports. 2019 Aug 7;9(1).

8. Li P, Ding Y, Liu M, Wang W, Li X. Sex disparities in thyroid cancer: a SEER population study. Gland Surgery. 2021 Dec;10(12):3200–10.

9. Rahbari R, Zhang L, Kebebew E. Thyroid cancer gender disparity. Future Oncology. 2010 Nov;6(11):1771–9.

10. Branimir Ljubic, Pavlovski M, Shoumik Roychoudhury, Christophe Van Neste, Adil Salhi, Magbubah Essack, et al. Genes and comorbidities of thyroid cancer. 2021 Jan 1;25:100680–0.

11. uijpens JLP, Janssen-Heijnen MLG, Lemmens VEPP, Haak HR, Heijckmann AC, Coebergh JWW. Comorbidity in newly diagnosed thyroid cancer patients: a population-based. study on prevalence and the impact on treatment and survival. Clinical Endocrinology. 2006 Apr;64(4):450–5.

12. Iglesias ML, Schmidt A, Ghuzlan AA, Lacroix L, Vathaire F de, Chevillard S, et al. Radiation exposure and thyroid cancer: a review. Archives of Endocrinology and Metabolism [Internet]. 2017 Mar 1;61(2):180–7.

13. Moysich KB, Menezes RJ, Michalek AM. Chernobyl-related ionising radiation exposure and cancer risk: an epidemiological review. Lancet Oncol. 2002;3:269–279.

14. Tessler FN, Middleton WD, Grant EG, Hoang JK, Berland LL, Teefey SA, et al. ACR Thyroid Imaging, Reporting and Data System (TI-RADS): White Paper of the ACR TI-RADS Committee. Journal of the American College of Radiology. 2017 May;14(5):587–95.

15. Abordagem Diagnóstica do Nódulo da Tiroide em Idade Pediátrica e no Adulto Número 019/2013 Data: 26/11/2013 Atualização 16/06/2015.

16. 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 Guidel.

17. Brito JP, Gionfriddo MR, Al Nofal A, Boehmer KR, Leppin AL, Reading C, et al. The Accuracy of Thyroid Nodule Ultrasound to Predict Thyroid Cancer: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism. 201. 4 Apr 1;99(4):1253–63.

18. Moon WJ, Jung SL, Lee JH, Na DG, Baek JH, Lee YH, et al. Benign and Malignant Thyroid Nodules: US Differentiation—Multicenter Retrospective Study. Radiology. 2008 Jun;247(3):762–70.

19. Kuma K, Fumio Matsuzuka, Tamotsu Yokozawa, Miyauchi A, Sugawara M. Fate of untreated benign thyroid nodules: Results of long-term follow-up. 1994 Jan 1;18(4):495–8.

20. Durante C, Costante G, Lucisano G, Bruno R, Meringolo D, Paciaroni A, et al. The Natural History of Benign Thyroid Nodules. JAMA 2015 Mar 3;313(9):926–35.

21. Kim KM, Park JB, Kang SJ, Bae KS. Ultrasonographic guideline for thyroid nodules cytology: single institute experience. Journal of the Korean Surgical Society. 2013;84(2):73.

22. Alexander EK, Marqusee E, Orcutt J, Benson CB, Frates MC, Doubilet PM, et al. Thyroid Nodule Shape and Prediction of Malignancy. Thyroid. 2004 Nov;14(11):953–8.

23. Remonti LR, Kramer CK, Leitão CB, Pinto LCF, Gross JL. Thyroid Ultrasound Features and Risk of Carcinoma: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Observational Studies. Thyroid. 2015 May;25(5):538–50.

24. Smith-Bindman R, Lebda P, Feldstein VA, Sellami D, Goldstein RB, Brasic N, et al. Risk of Thyroid Cancer Based on Thyroid Ultrasound Imaging Characteristics. JAMA Internal Medicine. 2013 Oct 28;173(19):1788.

25. Stewardson P, Eszlinger M, Paschke R. DIAGNOSIS OF ENDOCRINE DISEASE: Usefulness of genetic testing of fine-needle aspirations for diagnosis of thyroid cancer. European Journal of Endocrinology. 2022 Sep 1;187(3):R41–52.

26. Bongiovanni M, Spitale A, Faquin WC, Mazzucchelli L, Baloch ZW. The Bethesda System for Reporting Thyroid Cytopathology: A Meta-Analysis. Acta Cytologica. 2012;56(4):333–9.

27. 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 : official journal of the American Thyroid Association [Internet]. 2016;26(1):1–133.

28. Baloch ZW, Asa SL, Barletta JA, Ghossein RA, Juhlin CC, Jung CK, et al. Overview of the 2022 WHO Classification of Thyroid Neoplasms. Endocrine Pathology. 2022 Mar;33(1):27–63.

29. Ferrari SM, Fallahi P, Ruffilli I, Elia G, Ragusa F, Paparo SR, et al. Molecular testing in the diagnosis of differentiated thyroid carcinomas. Gland Surgery. 2018 Aug;7(S1):S19–29.

30. Kuo JH, McManus C, Graves CE, Madani A, Khokhar MT, Huang B, et al. Updates in the management of thyroid nodules. Current Problems in Surgery. 2019 Mar;56(3):103–27.

31. Kwak JY, Han KH, Yoon JH, Moon HJ, Son EJ, Park SH, et al. Thyroid Imaging Reporting and Data System for US Features of Nodules: A Step in Establishing Better Stratification of Cancer Risk. Radiology. 2011 Sep;260(3):892–9.