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**Aim:**

The aim of this study was to assess the performance of transvaginal ultrasound (TVS) to predict hydatidiform molar pregnancy (HMP) prior to surgical evacuation.

**Method:**

A retrospective analysis was performed on all women presenting with HMP to the Early Pregnancy Unit (EPU) between February 2011 and February 2017. All cases classified with PMP and CMP that were diagnosed on pre-surgical TVS and had confirmatory histopathology were included in the final analysis. TVS diagnosis of PMP was defined as: presence of fetal parts, or an empty gestational sac with small cystic spaces adjacent to the gestational sac (9). TVS diagnosis of CMP was defined as: complex, echogenic intra-uterine mass/es containing multiple small cystic areas (8). The performance of TVS to predict HMP, PMP and CMP were calculated in terms of sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV). Histological confirmation of PMP and CMP was used as the reference standard.

**Results:**

7 193 women had a TVS. 1622 underwent surgical curettage.

**Conclusion:**

This study shows demonstrates approximately half of HMP is suspected on TVS. CMP TVS sensitivity is high, while PMP is low - this is despite advances in TVS technology. Histological diagnosis remains the gold standard for HMP, but certain TVS findings should raise an index of suspicion and treatment should be guided towards surgical evacuation to confirm the diagnosis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pregnancy Type</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%)</th>
<th>Specificity (%)</th>
<th>PPV (%)</th>
<th>NPV (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1585.5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Diagnostic performance of TVS for molar pregnancy.