

· · ·
· · ·

= Abstract =

Role and Limit of Endoscopic Ultrasonography in Staging for Esophageal Cancer

Sang Gil Lee, M.D., Seung Woo Park, M.D., Jae Bock Chung, M.D.
Yong Chan Lee, M.D., Si Young Song, M.D., Yeong Myung Moon, M.D.
Jin Kyung Kang, M.D. and In Suh Park, M.D.

Department of Internal Medicine, Yonsei University Collage of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

Background: Despite the technical developments in diagnosis and therapy, esophageal cancer is highly lethal disease and the survival is largely dependent upon the stage of the disease. Preoperative cancer staging is crucial in choosing a therapeutic option as well as in predicting the prognosis of the patients. Staging has been based on computerized tomography (CT) and transabdominal ultrasonography. However CT has a limit in precisely discriminating the depth of invasion or the lymph node metastases. With the development of endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) and with its superiority in delineating wall structure and detecting lymph node metastases, its usefulness in staging for esophageal cancer has been acknowledged. In order to evaluate the accuracy of EUS, we compared EUS with pathologic findings in patients with esophageal carcinoma. **Methods:** From July 1990 to August 1997, 136 patients with esophageal cancer received preoperative cancer staging with EUS. Among them, 48 patients who underwent surgical procedures with the intention of radical resection were included. We compared the EUS and pathologic findings and analysed the accuracy of EUS for preoperative staging. **Results:** The overall accuracy of EUS for T-staging was 43.8%. Twenty five percents of the patients (12/48) presented high-grade tumor strictures, which precluded the passage of the endoscope. There was no statistical significance according to tumor site, size or gross morphology. However the

: 1998 6 16 , : 1998 8 6
: , 134, : 120-752,
Tel: 361-7740, 7741, Fax: 363-7690

accuracy was significantly lower in tumors with ulceration than in tumors without ulceration (35.3% vs 64.3%, p=0.004). Mainly, ulceration in tumors caused significant overstaging of the T-stage. In the assessment of regional lymph node metastasis, the overall accuracy achieved by EUS was 66.6%; the sensitivity was 95.5%, specificity 42.3%, positive predictive value 58.3%, and negative predictive value 91.7%. Tumors with more than 2 lymph nodes rendered more accurate N-staging than tumors with less than 2 lymph nodes. **Conclusions:** In conclusion, the accuracy of the EUS for preoperative staging of esophageal cancer was not satisfactory, mostly influenced by ulceration in tumors and its resultant inflammatory reactions around the tumors, therefore more systematic study will be needed to establish the precise diagnostic criteria of EUS staging. **(Korean J Gastrointest Endosc 19: 178-185, 1999)**

Key Words: Esophageal cancer, Endoscopic ultrasonography, T-staging, N-staging

가 .7) DiMagno 8)
 가
 가 가
 .569-15)
 가
 가
 (computerized CT) .13)
 tomography,
 ,
 ,
 ,4) 1)
 1990 7 1997 8
 가
 가 136 48
 .1256)
 (endoscopic ultrasonography, 2)
 EUS)
 가 Buscopan 2 cc 8

Olympus (31.2%), 14 (29.2%), 13 (27.1%),
 sector (GF-UM3) 6 (12.6%) (Table 1).
 (EU-M3) 7.5 MHz 12 MHz 4 cm(0.8 11
 cm) , 가 3 (6.4%),
 가 32 (66.6%), 가 13 (27%)
 (balloon method) 14 (29.2%),
 , 27 (56.7%), 5 (10.4%),
 2 (4.2%) ,
 Yasuda 16) 46 (95.8%), 2 (4.2%) (Table 2).
 , TNM 1992 48 12 (25%)
 AJCC (American Joint Committee on Cancer)
 17)
 TNM
 TNM
 2 T1 8 , T2 15 , T3 19 T4 6 ,
 T1 18 , T2 10
 , T3 16 T4 4 .
 T1 44.4%
 1) (8/18), T2 30% (3/10), T3 56.3% (9/16), T4 25%
 48 58.3 (37 74) (1/4) 43.8% (Table 3).
 , 15 : 1 . 48 30
 (62.5%) , T1- 18
 가 34 (70.8%) 10 T2- 10 7
 23 (47.9%), 15

Table 1. Clinical Characteristics of the Patients (n=48)

Characteristics	No. of cases
Age (years)	58.3
Sex (M/F)	45/3
Smoking history	30 (62.5%)
Drinking history	34 (70.8%)
Initial symptom	
Dysphagia	23 (47.9%)
Weight loss	15 (31.3%)
Odynophagia	14 (29.2%)
Chest pain	13 (27.1%)
Epigastric pain	6 (12.5%)

2) T-

T1 8 , T2 15 , T3 19 T4 6 ,
 T1 18 , T2 10
 , T3 16 T4 4 .
 T1 44.4%
 (8/18), T2 30% (3/10), T3 56.3% (9/16), T4 25%
 (1/4) 43.8% (Table 3).
 T1- 18
 10 T2- 10 7

Table 2. Pathologic Characteristics of the Tumors (n=48)

Characteristics	No. of cases
Location	
Upper	3 (6.3%)
Middle	32 (66.7%)
Lower	13 (27.1%)
Size (range)	4 cm (0.8 11)
Histology	
Squamous cell	46 (95.8%)
Adenocarcinoma	2 (4.2%)
Morphology	
Exophytic	14 (29.2%)
Ulcerative	27 (56.3%)
Superficial	5 (10.4%)
Depressed	2 (41.7%)

T3- 16 (p=0.883). T- 100% (3/3),
 7 5 46.2% (6/13), 37.5% (12/32)
 , 2 T4- 4 3 가
 T- 41.7% (5/12), 44.4%
 가 (4 cm) (16/36)
 T- 78.6% (11/14), 29.6% (8/27), 20%
 (1/5) 50% (1/2)
 (Table 4).

Table 3. T Staging Accuracy of EUS According to the Pathologic T-stage

Pathologic T-stage	EUS T-stage				Accuracy (%)
	T1	T2	T3	T4	
T1 (n=18)	8	10	—	—	44.4 (8/18)
T2 (n=10)	—	3	7	—	30.0 (3/10)
T3 (n=16)	—	2	9	5	56.3 (9/16)
T4 (n=4)	—	—	3	1	25.0 (1/4)
Overall (n=48)	8	15	19	6	43.8 (21/48)

34
 35.3% (12/34) 64.3% (9/14)
 (p=0.004)
 3) N-
 N0 36 N1 12

Table 4. Accuracy and Rate of Overstaging and Understaging of EUS According to the Tumor Morphology and the Pathologic T-stage

Morphology	Accuracy (%)	Rate of overstaging (%)	Rate of understaging (%)
Fungating			
T1 (n=7)	71.4 (5/7)	28.6 (2/7)	0.0 (0/7)
T2 (n=2)	100.0 (2/2)	0.0 (0/2)	0.0 (0/2)
T3 (n=4)	75.0 (3/4)	25.0 (1/4)	0.0 (0/4)
T4 (n=1)	100.0 (1/1)	0.0 (0/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Total (n=14)	78.6 (11/14)	21.4 (3/11)	0.0 (0/14)
Ulcerative			
T1 (n=5)	40.0 (2/5)	60.0 (3/5)	0.0 (0/5)
T2 (n=8)	12.5 (1/8)	87.5 (7/8)	0.0 (0/8)
T3 (n=11)	45.5 (5/11)	27.3 (3/11)	27.3 (3/11)
T4 (n=3)	0.0 (0/3)	0.0 (0/3)	100.0 (3/3)
Total (n=27)	29.6 (8/27)	48.1 (13/27)	22.2 (6/27)
Superficial			
T1 (n=4)	0.0 (0/4)	100.0 (4/4)	0.0 (0/4)
T3 (n=1)	100.0 (1/1)	0.0 (0/1)	0.0 (0/1)
Total (n=5)	20.0 (1/5)	80.0 (4/5)	0.0 (0/5)
Depressed			
T1 (n=2)	50.0 (1/2)	50.0 (1/2)	0.0 (0/2)
Overall (n=48)	43.8 (21/48)	43.8 (21/48)	12.5 (6/48)

Table 5. N Staging Accuracy of EUS According to the Pathologic N-stage

Pathologic N-Stage	EUS N-stage		Accuracy(%)
	N0	N1	
N0 (n=26)	11	15	42.3
N1 (n=22)	1	21	95.5
Overall (n=48)	12	36	66.7

N0 26 ,
 N1 22 .
 66.7%

36
 15 (41.7%),
 1 (8.3%)
 95.5%
 42.3%

(Table 5).
 58.3%,
 91.7% . N-
 가 1 59%

cm
 가 (p=0.330),
 가 2 73%, 2
 59% 2 (p=0.001)

12 (41.6%) 36
 44.4% . T-
 가 , T1, 2, 3-
 , T2, 3, 4-
 가
 가 5 5%
 ,1819

가
 T1- 44.4% (8/18)
 가
 T2- 7
 . T3-
 56.3% (9/16)
 5 , 2 , T4-
 가 25% (1/4)
 . T1
 T2- ,
 T-
 N-
 가 50 60%

.1,2,2021)
 . 1980 DiMagno 8)
 가
 , , , ,
 .45,16,2027)
 가
 Rice 23)
 Melzer 2) 100% ,
 70 90% .4,20,22,26)
 43.8%
 T-
 가 , T1, 2, 3-
 , T2, 3, 4-
 가
 T2- .28)
 T1- 44.4% (8/18)
 가
 T2- 7
 . T3-
 56.3% (9/16)
 5 , 2 , T4-
 가 25% (1/4)
 . T1
 T2- ,

가 5 mm (oblique scan) 23)

N0-

가 2

가

(p=0.001), 가 1 cm (p=0.333).

27 13 (48.1%)

Tio Tytgat3l)

가

34 35.3% (12/34)

14 64.3% (9/

14) T3-

가

(micrometastasis)

가 가

(pseudopoid)

T- 가 가

가

가

25 36%

가

2 mm

가

5

mm

가

.6230)

12 (25%)

41.7%

가

N-

Vilgrain 3)

50%

Grimm

26) 88%

70 80%

.45222326)

N-

66.6%

N-

1990 7

1997 8

N0- N1

.414)

136

36

15

48

41.7%

8.3% (1/12)

Siewert 14)

1) 48

58.3

15 : 1 . 가

2) 4 cm , 가 3 (6.4%), 가 32 (66.6%), 가 13 (27%)

14 (29.2%), 27 (56.7%), 5 (10.4%), 2 (4.2%) ,

48 12 (25%) .

3) T- N- 43.8% 66.6% .

4) T- T1 44.4% (8/18), T2 30% (3/10), T3 56.3% (9/16), T4 25% (1/4) , 43.8% (21/48), 12.5% (6/48) .

5) , , 가 , T- 35.3% (12/34), 64.3% (9/14) (p=0.004).

6) 15 (15/36), 1 (1/12) , 95.5%, 42.3% , 58.3%, 91.7% .

7) N- 가 2 73%, 2 59% (p=0.001).

- 1) Quint LE, Glazer GM, Orringer MB, Gross BH: Eso-phageal carcinoma: CT findings. *Radiology* 155: 171, 1985
- 2) Salonen O, Kivisaari L, Standertskjold-Nordenstam C-G, Somer K, Virkkunen P: Computed tomography in staging of oesophageal carcinoma. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 22: 65, 1987
- 3) Vilgrain V, Mompoin D, Palazzo L, Menu Y, Gayet B, Ollier P, Nahum H, Fekete F: Staging of oeso-phageal carcinoma. Comparison of results with endo-scopic sonography and CT. *AJR* 155: 277, 1990
- 4) Botet JF, Lightdale CJ, Zauber AG, Gerdes H, Urmacher C, Brennan MF: Preoperative staging of esophageal cancer. Comparison of endoscopic US and dynamic CT. *Radiology* 181: 419, 1991
- 5) Rosch T: Endoscopic ultrasonography. *Endoscopy* 24: 144, 1992
- 6) Tio TL, Cohen P, Coene PP, Udding J, den Hartog Jager FCA, Tytgat GNJ: Endosonography and com-puted tomography of esophageal carcinoma: preoper-ative classification compared to the new (1987) TNM system. *Gastroenterology* 96: 1478, 1989
- 7) Tio TL, Tytgat GN: Endoscopic ultrasonography of normal and pathologic upper gastrointestinal wall structure: comparison of studies in vivo and in vitro with histology. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 21: 27, 1986
- 8) DiMugno EP, Buxton JL, Regan PT, Hattery RR, Wilson DA, Suarez JR, Green PS: Ultrasonic endo-scope. *Lancet* 22: 629, 1980
- 9) , , : 가. 33: 869, 1990
- 10) , , , , . (:) TNM 가. 23: 637, 1991
- 11) , , , , , , , : : 13: 539, 1993
- 12) , , , , , , : 13: 545, 1993

- 13) : .
26: 806, 1994
- 14) Siewcher JR, Holscher AH, Dittler HJ: Preoperative staging and risk analysis in esophageal carcinoma. *Hepatogastroenterology* 37: 382, 1990
- 15) Rosch T, Lorenz R, Braig C, Classen M: Endoscopic ultrasonography in diagnosis and staging of pancreatic and biliary tumors. *Endoscopy* 24: 304, 1992
- 16) Yasuda K, Kiyota K, Mukai H, Nishimura K, Cho E, Kobayashi S, Imaoka W, Fujimoto S, Nakashima M, Kawai K: Endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) in the diagnosis of the upper digestive tract disease. Determination of the depth of invasion. *Gastroenterol Endosc* 28: 253, 1986
- 17) American Joint Committee on Cancer: Manual for staging of cancer. 4th ed. p57, Philadelphia, JB Lippincott, 1992
- 18) Galandiuk S, Hermann RE, Cosgrove DM, Gassman JJ: Cancer of the esophagus. The Cleveland Clinic experience. *Ann Surg* 203: 101, 1986
- 19) Earlam R, Cunha-Melo JR: Oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma: a critical review of surgery. *Br J Surg* 67: 381, 1980
- 20) Ziegler K, Sanft C, Zeitz M, Friedrich M, Stein H, Haring R, Riecken EO: Evaluation of endosonography in TN staging of oesophageal cancer. *Gut* 32: 16, 1991
- 21) Melzer E, Avidan B, Heyman Z, Bar-Meir S: Accuracy of endoscopic ultrasonography for preoperative staging of esophageal malignancy. *Isr J Med Sci* 31: 119, 1995
- 22) Lightdale CJ: Endoscopic ultrasonography in the diagnosis, staging, and follow-up of esophageal and gastric cancer. *Endoscopy* 24 (Suppl 1): 297, 1992
- 23) Rice TW, Boyce GA, Sivak MV: Esophageal ultrasound and the preoperative staging of carcinoma of the esophagus. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 101: 536, 1991
- 24) Catalano MF, van Dam J, Sivak MV Jr: Malignant esophageal strictures: staging accuracy of endoscopic ultrasonography. *Gastrointest Endosc* 41: 535, 1995
- 25) Brugge WR, Lee MJ, Carey RW, Mathisen DJ: Endoscopic ultrasound staging criteria for esophageal cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 45: 147, 1997
- 26) Grimm H, Hamper K, Maydeo A, Mass R, Noar M, Soehendra N: Results of endoscopic ultrasound and computed tomography in preoperative staging of esophageal cancer. A prospective controlled study. *Gastrointest Endosc* 37: 279 (Abstract), 1991
- 27) Kallimanis GE, Gupta PK, Al-Kawas FH, Tio LT, Benjamin SB, Bertagnoli ME, Nguyen CC, Gomes MN, Fleischer DE: Endoscopic ultrasound for staging esophageal cancer, with or without dilation, is clinically important and safe. *Gastrointest Endosc* 41: 540, 1995
- 28) Rosch T, Classen M: *Gastroenterologic endoscopy*. 1st ed. p45, Georg Thieme Verlag Stuttgart, New York, Thieme Medical Publisher's Inc., 1992
- 29) Ellis FH Jr, Gibb SP, Watkins E Jr: Overview of the current management of carcinoma of the esophagus and cardia. *Can J Surg* 28: 493, 1985
- 30) Heyder N, Lux G: Malignant lesions of the upper gastrointestinal tract. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 21 (suppl 123): 47, 1986
- 31) Tio TL, Tytgat GNJ: Endoscopic ultrasonography in analysing periintestinal lymph node abnormality. Preliminary results of studies in vitro and in vivo. *Scand J Gastroenterol* 2 (Suppl 123): 158, 1986
-