CONGRESSO DE PNEUMOLOGIA DO NORTE

XXXIII JORNADAS

GALAICO DURIENSES

5 A 7 DE MARÇO DE 2020 SHERATON PORTO HOTEL

# Papel do EBUS/EUS no diagnóstico de sarcoidose e linfoma





18<sup>th</sup> October 2020

## Sarcoidosis

• The most common interstitial lung disease



Prevalence

- Diagnosis based on 3 major criteria:
  - Compatible clinical presentation
  - Finding of non-necrotizing granulomatous inflammation in ≥1 tissue samples (not always required)
  - Exclusion of alternative causes of granulomatous disease (TB, Lymphoma, etc)



Crouser et al. Diagnosis and Detection of Sarcoidosis. An Official American Thoracic Society Clinical Practice Guideline. Am J Respir Crit Care Med Vol 201, Iss 8, pp e26–e51

Duchemann et al. Prevalence and incidence of interstitial lung diseases in a multi-ethnic county of Greater Paris. Eur Respir J 2017; 50: 1602419

#### **EBUS-TBNA** (vs conventional TBNA; ± BAL, ±TBLB, ±EBB)

70-80%



#### **Conventional methods**



# endobronchial biopsy EBB 20–61%



transbronchial lung biopsy TBLB 37–90%



conventional transbronchial needle aspiration **cTBNA 6–90%** 



## **Novel methods**

EBUS-TBNA 80–94% EUS-FNA 77–94% EUS-B-FNA 86%



### TBLC 66.7-92.6%

EBUS-TBNA, endobronchialultrasound-guided transbronchial needle aspiration; EUS-FNA, endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine needle aspiration; EUS-B-FNA, transesophageal ultrasound-guided needle aspiration with the use of an echo bronchoscope; TBLC, transbronchial lung cryobiopsy

Images source: https://bronchoscopy.org/art-of-bronchoscopy | Data source: Pedro et al. J. Clin. Med. 2019, 8, 1327; Jacob et al. ERJ Open Res. 2019 Oct; 5(4): 00203-2019

## Bronchoscopic features of airway involvement in sarcoidosis



mucosal erythema, edema, capillary proliferation and granularity



Cobblestone mucosa: typical mucosal nodules (3-4 mm) in segmental bronchus



mucosal edema and whitish plaques over the RUL bronchus carina



main carina with friable mucosa and mucosal pallor, and luminal narrowing

Sampling method	Normal mucosa	Abnormal mucosa
TBLB	66.1 %	79.3 %
EBB	41.7 %	75.8 %
<b>Conventional TBNA</b>	21.3 %	26.7 %

Sampling method	Normal mucosa	Abnormal mucosa
TBLB + EBB	77.8 %	92.8 %
TBLB + TBNA	72 %	80 %
EBB + TBNA	60.3 %	71.4 %
TBLB + EBB + TBNA	85.7 %	90 %

Polychronopoulos & Prakash. Chest 2009; 136:1371–1380 | Goyal et al. J Bronchol Intervent Pulmonol 2014;21:220–226

## **Diagnostic yield varies with Scadding staging**

		Sta	age I	Sta	ge II		
TBLB	63.1%			(and	125	TBLB	75.5%
EBB	46.1%	Contraction of	AT BESS	Careto S	The second second	EBB	54.5%
cTBNA	28.6%		M.			cTBNA	36.6%
		Sta	age III	Sta	ige IV		
TBLB EBB	100% 75%	New York	1889 S			TBLB	100%
		A STATEMENT	and the	and the second			

Goyal et al. J Bronchol Intervent Pulmonol 2014;21:220-226

## Endosonography vs Conventional Bronchoscopy for the Diagnosis of Sarcoidosis The GRANULOMA Randomized Clinical Trial

Von Bartheld et al. JAMA. 2013;309(23):2457-2464

- Randomized clinical multicenter trial (14 centers in 6 countries) ٠
- 304 consecutive patients with suspected pulmonary sarcoidosis (stage I/II) ٠

Table 2. Characteristics of Endoscopy					
	No. (%)				
	Bronchosco	opy (n = 149)	Endosonogra	phy (n = 154)	
	TBLB	EBB	EUS-FNA	EBUS-TBNA	
Procedure performed	143/149 (96) <sup>a,b</sup>	138/149 (93) <sup>a</sup>	102/154 (66) <sup>c</sup>	56/154 (36) <sup>c</sup>	
No. of biopsies, mean (SD)	5.24 (1.53)	4.10 (1.03)	5.21 (1.40)	5.75 (2.01)	
Patients with ≥4 biopsy specimens collected	139/149 (93)	121/149 (81)	64/68 (94) <sup>d</sup>	42/43 (98) <sup>d</sup>	
Representative material <sup>e</sup>	138/149 (93)	132/149 (89)	97/103 (94)	51/56 (91)	



by Group		
	No. (%)	
	Bronchoscopy (n = 149)	Endosonography (n = 154)
Detection of granulomas, consistent with the diagnosis of sarcoidosis	72 (48)	114 (74)
Diagnostic yield of granuloma detection in patients with sarcoidosis	72/136 (53)	114/142 (80)
Final diagnosis Sarcoidosis	136 (91)	142 (92)

## **cTBNA vs EBUS-TBNA in sarcoidosis**

Study/Year	Study Design	No. Pts	Study Protocol	Main results
Oki et al. Respirology 2007	Prospective study Stage I and II	15	EBUS-TBNA (22G) followed by cTBNA (19G) at same site of EBUS	<ul> <li>EBUS-TBNA: 13/14 (93%);</li> <li>cTBNA: 13/14 (93%);</li> <li>both: 14/14 (100%)</li> </ul>
Tremblay et al. Chest 2009	Prospective RCT study Stage I and II	50	cTBNA (19G) vs EBUS-TBNA (22G); 50% underwent EBB and 38-40% TBLB	<ul> <li>EBUS-TBNA: 4 LN groups; DY 20/24 (83%); Sens 83%</li> <li>cTBNA: 2 LN groups; DY 14/26 (54%); Sens 61%</li> <li>EBUS-TBNA procedure time, 10 min longer.</li> </ul>
Gupta et al. Chest 2014	Prospective RCT study Stage I and II	130	cTBNA (21G) vs EBUS-TBNA (21G); 93-94% underwent EBB and 92-94% TBLB	<ul> <li>EBUS-TBNA: 41/55 (74.5%)</li> <li>EBUS-TBNA + EBB + TBLB: 92.7%</li> <li>cTBNA: 30/62 (48%)</li> <li>cTBNA + EBB + TBLB: 85.5%</li> </ul>

## Efficacy and safety of EBUS-TBNA in sarcoidosis

A systematic review and meta-analysis:

- 15 studies (553 patients of sarcoidosis)
- Diagnostic yield ranged from 54 to 93%
- Pooled diagnostic 79% (95% CI, 71-86%)
- Only five minor complications reported
  - Airway edema/hypoxemia (n=2)
  - Minimal pneumothorax
  - Minor bleeding
  - Prolonged cough



## **Our experience**

٠

•

٠

•

•

**NPV 41%** 



## **EUS in sarcoidosis**

Study/Year	No. Pts	Sensitivity
Annema et al. ERJ 2005	51	EUS-FNA: 82%
lwashita et al. Endoscopy 2008	41	EUS-FNA: 78%
Von Bartherld et al. Endoscopy 2010	101	EUS-FNA: 87% ( <b>cytology + cell-block</b> ) ( <b>stage I, 92%</b> ; stage II, 77%)
Kocoń et al. Pol Arch Intern Med 2017	100	EUS-FNA: 75% <b>EUS-b-FNA: 62%</b> EBB + TBLB + cTBNA: 64%
Filarecka et al. Pol Arch Intern Med 2020	50	EBUS-TBNA: 77% EUS-b-FNA: 70% EBUS-TBNA (≥2) + EUS-b-FNA (≥2): 92%



Tournoy et al. JTO 2009

## **ISA trial** RCT (4 continents, 9 countries, 13 hospitals)

## **EBUS vs EUS-B for diagnosing sarcoidosis**

#### Standard 22G vs ProCore 25G





Kalverda et al. ERS Congress 2018

- 85% confirmed sarcoidosis
- Granuloma detection rate was 73% overall\*
   75% EBUS-TBNA vs 70.3% EUS-b-FNA (NS)

\*independet of needle type

- Overall sensitivity 85%
  - 84% EBUS-TBNA vs 87% EUS-b-FNA (NS)
- No major complications



## **Infectious complications with EUS-FNA**

**Table 2.** Overview of SAE following EUS-FNA (n = 6,042) and EBUS-TBNA (n = 9,119) for mediastinal analysis (n = 23)

	EUS (n = 18)	EBUS (n = 5)
Infectious complications $(n = 12)$	10	2
Mediastinitis	5	0
Mediastinal abscess/abscess formation	2	1
Sepsis	1	1
Pleuropericarditis	1	0
Aspiration pneumonia	1	0
Perforations $(n = 4)$	4	0
Esophageal perforation/rupture	3	
Sinus piriformis perforation	1	
Pneumothorax (n = 2)	0	2
Hemorrhagic complications (n = 2)	2	0
Mediastinal hematoma	1	
Periesophageal bleeding	1	
Respiratory complications $(n = 3)$	2	1
Hypoxemia due to airway edema		•
Apnea under propofol		•
Required reversal medication	1	0



- Retrospective report of 5 cases with sarcoidosis (stage I/II) who developed mediastinal abscesses after EUS-FNA of subcarinal lymph nodes
- Use of prophylactic antibiotic treatment?

von Bartheld et al. Respiration 2014 | von Bartheld et al. Gastrointestinal Endoscopy 2012

## **Echoic Findings of lymph nodes with Sarcoidosis**

		Sarcoidosis	Lung cancer	P-value
Shape	Round	64%	86%	0.090
	Oval	36%	14%	0.089
Margin	Distinct	71%	56%	0 1 1 2
	Indistinct	29%	44%	0.115
Echogenicity	Homogeneous	88%	32%	<0.001
	Heterogeneous	12%	68%	<0.001
Germinal center structure	Present	71%	27%	<0.001
	Absent	29%	73%	<0.001



Imai et al. N Intern Med 2013

	Cancer (n=19)	TB (n=15)	Sarcoidosis (n=56)	P-value
Mediastinal LN size	3.96 cm	2.61 cm	2.44 cm	0.004
Hilar LN size	1.48 cm	1.81 cm	2.39 cm	0.001
Oval shape	89.5 %	86.7 %	67.9 %	0.09
Conglomeration	5.3 %	60 %	94.6 %	<0.001
Septal vessel	15.8 %	13.3 %	55.4 %	0.002
Distinct margin	47.4 %	13.3 %	73.2 %	<0.001
Heterogeneous	100 %	93.3 %	50 %	<0.001
Calcification	0	40 %	7.1%	<0.001
Central hilar sign	21.1 %	40 %	50 %	0.08
Coagulation necrosis sign	31.6 %	93.3 %	8.9 %	<0.001

Cheng et al. J Ultrasound Med 2020

## **Echoic Findings of lymph nodes with Sarcoidosis**



## **Tecnhical aspects**

#### Does needle size matters?

	Granuloma detection rate	Ref.
Conventional 22G needle	119/162 (73%)	Kalverda et al. ERS
ProCore 25G biopsy needle	117/160 (73%)	Congress 2018
21G needle	57/74 (77%)	Muthu V, Gupta N, et al.
22G needle	54/69 (78.3%)	<i>Chest</i> 2016
<b>19G needle*</b> *under investigation, no large comparative studies	14/15 (93.3%)	Balwan A. J Bronchol Interv Pulmonol 2018

#### Rapid On-Site Evaluation (ROSE)

	Granuloma detection rate
cTBNA without ROSE	68%
cTBNA with ROSE	89%
EBUS-TBNA without ROSE	84%
EBUS-TBNA with ROSE	83%

Madan et al. J Bronchol Intervent Pulmonol 2017

#### Number of needle passes

Oki et al. Respiration 2018

- EBUS-TBNA identified granulomas in 81/92 (88%) patients
- The cumulative yields of 2 passes per lesion for 2 lesions (total of 4 passes) was 86%, and of 4 passes for single lesions was 84%
- If ROSE is not available, at least 4 passes per patient for either single or multiple lesions is recommended





A.V. Cardoso<sup>a,\*</sup>, I. Neves<sup>a</sup>, A. Magalhães<sup>a</sup>, M. Sucena<sup>a</sup>, H. Barroca<sup>b</sup>, G. Fernandes<sup>a,c</sup>

#### ORIGINAL ARTICLE

The value of rapid on-site evaluation during EBUS-TBNA

CrossMark

10 patients with sarcoidosis

Table 2         Adequacy of cytological samples.			
Patients	Adequate sampling		
	ROSE group	Non-ROSE group	p-Value
Total of patients, n/total (%) Investigation of mediastinal/hilar lesions etiology, n/total (%)	38/41 (93) 27/29 (93)	32/40 (80) 24/32 (75)	0.10 0.06
Lung cancer staging, n/total (%)	11/12 (92)	8/8 (100)	1.00

#### Table 4 Diagnostic performance of EBUS-TBNA with and without ROSE.

	ROIFROJE (II - 40)
17 ( <i>n</i> = 7)	20 ( <i>n</i> = 8)
21 ( <i>n</i> = 6)	25 ( <i>n</i> = 8)
8 ( <i>n</i> = 1)	0 ( <i>n</i> = 0)
89 (71)	74 (52)
85 (65)	69 (46)
100 (88)	100 (100)
100	100
100	100
70 (41)	69 (46)
50 (25)	46 (29)
100 (80)	100
91 (76)	83 (66)
87 (69)	77 (57)
100 (92)	100 (100)
	17 (n = 7) 21 (n = 6) 8 (n = 1) 89 (71) 85 (65) 100 (88) 100 100 70 (41) 50 (25) 100 (80) 91 (76) 87 (69) 100 (92)

Data are presented as %, <sup>a</sup> p-Value = 0.08 (0.20), <sup>b</sup> p-Value = 0.10 (0.21), <sup>c</sup> p-Value = NA (0.13).







Determining Factors in Diagnosing Pulmonary Sarcoidosis by Endobronchial Ultrasound-Guided Transbronchial Needle Aspiration

(Ann Thorac Surg 2015;99:441–6)



in stage I than stage II. To obtain a higher diagnostic yield of EBUS-TBNA in pulmonary sarcoidosis without ROSE, operators should select the <u>largest mediastinal or hila</u>r lymph node accessible and puncture with preferably <u>3 but up to 5 passes.</u>

Fig 2. Yield per pass with endobronchial ultrasound-guided transbronchial needle aspiration per lymph node in patients with sarcoidosis.

## Lymphoma is a rare indication for EBUS

• 92 out of 4803 EBUS procedures (1.9%) had either suspected or proven lymphoma

Dhooria et al. J Bronchol Intervent Pulmonol 2018

### Higher diagnostic yield for recurrent lymphoma

- Only 24.2% subjects with new-onset lymphoma could be appropriately subtyped
- Among the suspected cases of recurrence, EBUS-TBNA (±EUS-B) was sufficient for management in 81.8%

TABLE 2. Final Diagnosis			Sensitivity, %	NPV, %
Final Diagnosis	n = 49	Drimary lymphoma	55	57
Malignant lymphoma [n (%)]	33 (67)	Prinary lymphoma	55	57
Lymphoma subclassification		Decourrent lymphone	00	00
Hodgkin lymphoma	9	Reccurrent lymphoma	00	90
Non Hodgkin lymphoma	21			
Follicle center lymphoma	2	Talebian-Yazdi et al. J Bronchol Intervent Pulmonol 2014		4
Chronic lymphocytic leukemia	3			
Large B-cell lymphoma	11			
Mantle cell lymphoma	1			
Nodal marginal zone B-cell lymphoma	2			
Angioimmunoblastic T-cell lymphoma	1			
T-cell lymphoma, NOS	1			
Lymphoma, NOS	3			

## **Diagnostic accuracy of EBUS in Lymphoma: meta-analysis**

- 425 cases of lymphoma
  - $\circ~$  227 cases were new diagnoses, and 177 were recurrent
- EBUS-TBNA was performed using 21G and 22 G needles
- Average number of passes ranged between 3 to 5.1

	Pooled sensitivity
Overall	66.2% (95%CI, 55-75.8%)
ROSE – Yes	66.7% (95%Cl, 53.2-78%)
No	63.3% (95%Cl, 36.6-83.7%)
Needle – 21 G	48.9% (95%Cl, 29.2-69%)
22 G	72.8% (95%Cl, 60-82.9%)

#### Ability to Subtype Lymphoma

- Sufficient samples ranged between 27% to 97%
- Pooled analysis showed that **63.9%** of samples achieved by EBUS-TBNA were sufficient for ancillary testing

#### No significant complications



## **EBUS-guided cautery-assisted transbronchial nodal forceps biopsy**





#### Diagnostic yield for lymphoma (n = 16) was 93.8%

(95% CI, 56.5%-100%) [vs EBUS-TBNA of 62.5% (95% CI, 33.6%-100%), *P* = 0.042].

Ray et al. Ann Thorac Surg 2020

## TAKE HOME MESSAGES

**EBUS allows the selection of the best possible areas for sampling** avoiding regions with increased vascularity and extensive calcification

#### EBUS/EUS-B-FNA is the first-line diagnostic tool in sarcoidosis stages I and II

- High yield (80-90%, better in stage I and when different techniques are combined)
- ≥4 needle passes per patient if no ROSE
- Safe (more complications with EUS-FNA, or when combined with EBB and TBLB)

EBUS is a minimally invasive, safe and sensitive method for the assessment of recurrent mediastinal malignant lymphoma

**EBUS-guided cautery-assisted transbronchial nodal forceps biopsy** has the potential to increase the histological yield of lymphoma





Obrigado pela atenção





