NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR HEALTH AND CLINICAL EXCELLENCE

INTERVENTIONAL PROCEDURES PROGRAMME

Interventional procedure overview of magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids

Image-guided ultrasound treatment for uterine fibroids

Uterine fibroids are non-cancerous (benign) growths that occur in the womb. They can cause heavy menstruation and reproductive problems. This non-invasive procedure uses magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to locate the fibroids and direct, high-intensity ultrasound energy to destroy fibroid tissue, with the aim of reducing symptoms.

Introduction

The National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) has prepared this overview to help members of the Interventional Procedures Advisory Committee (IPAC) make recommendations about the safety and efficacy of an interventional procedure. It is based on a rapid review of the medical literature and specialist opinion. It should not be regarded as a definitive assessment of the procedure.

Date prepared

This overview was prepared in February 2011.

Procedure name

 Magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids

Specialty societies

- British Society of Interventional Radiology
- Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists.

Description

Indications and current treatment

Uterine fibroids (also known as uterine leiomyomas or uterine myomas) are benign tumours that develop within the uterine wall. They can be single or multiple.

Uterine fibroids are one of the most common gynaecological problems among women in the UK. They are often asymptomatic but they can cause symptoms such as abnormal uterine bleeding, a feeling of pelvic pressure, pain, and urinary incontinence. They may also be associated with reproductive problems such as infertility and miscarriage.

Treatment depends on whether the fibroids cause symptoms, and on the woman's desire for future childbearing. Asymptomatic fibroids (often discovered incidentally) require no treatment. Depending on their size, number and location, symptomatic fibroids have historically been managed by hysterectomy (surgical removal of the uterus) or myomectomy (surgical removal of the fibroids). Smaller submucous fibroids can be removed by hysteroscopic resection. Uterine artery embolisation may also be used. Other treatments include endometrial ablation, using energy such as microwaves or heat, which may be suitable for some fibroid types.

Hormone-based treatments may be used on a short-term basis to relieve symptoms, or to shrink the fibroids before surgery or other interventional treatment.

What the procedure involves

Magnetic resonance image (MRI)-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids is carried out with the patient lying prone inside an MR scanner, under continuous image guidance and usually under intravenous conscious sedation. A catheter is inserted to drain the urinary bladder and to keep it empty during the procedure. Magnetic resonance imaging is used to identify the fibroid(s), and a low-power sonification (pulse) is delivered, aimed at the centre of the targeted fibroid. Once the targeting of these sonifications is confirmed, higher-power consecutive sonifications are delivered to the target area to ablate the fibroid tissue. MRI has temperature-sensitive parameters, which allow for real-time thermal mapping during the procedure. The head of the sonification device is in contact with the patient's abdominal skin and the patient has the facility to stop the procedure at any time. The patient may have to lie still for up to 3 hours.

After treatment, imaging is used to evaluate the area of the fibroid ablated, as a marker of treatment efficacy. The non-enhanced areas on imaging represent the non-perfused volume (NPV) to which the blood supply has been interrupted by the procedure. This is then compared with the pre-treatment total fibroid volume to give an NPV ratio and assess technical success.

IP overview: Magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids Page 2 of 33

The potential benefit of MRI-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound is that it is less invasive than hysterectomy and myomectomy, with a faster recovery time.

Literature review

Rapid review of literature

The medical literature was searched to identify studies and reviews relevant to MRI-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids. Searches were conducted of the following databases, covering the period from their commencement to 25/10/2010: MEDLINE, PREMEDLINE, EMBASE, Cochrane Library and other databases. Trial registries and the Internet were also searched. No language restriction was applied to the searches (see appendix C for details of search strategy). Relevant published studies identified during consultation or resolution that are published after this date may also be considered for inclusion.

The following selection criteria (table 1) were applied to the abstracts identified by the literature search. Where selection criteria could not be determined from the abstracts the full paper was retrieved.

| Characteristic | Criteria |
|-------------------|--|
| Publication type | Clinical studies were included. Emphasis was placed on identifying good quality studies. |
| | Abstracts were excluded where no clinical outcomes were reported, or where the paper was a review, editorial, or a laboratory or animal study. |
| | Conference abstracts were also excluded because of the difficulty of appraising study methodology, unless they reported specific adverse events that were not available in the published literature. |
| Patient | Patients with uterine fibroids. |
| Intervention/test | MRI-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound. |
| Outcome | Articles were retrieved if the abstract contained information relevant to the safety and/or efficacy. |
| Language | Non-English-language articles were excluded unless they were thought to add substantively to the English-language evidence base. |

Table 1 Inclusion criteria for identification of relevant studies

List of studies included in the overview

This overview is based on approximately 869 patients treated by MRI-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound from 1 non-randomised comparative study, 6 case series and 2 case reports^{1–9}.

Other studies that were considered to be relevant to the procedure but were not included in the main extraction table (table 2) have been listed in appendix A.

Table 2 Summary of key efficacy and safety findings on magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids

| significant | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| Study details | Key efficacy f | - | | | Key safety findings | Comments |
| Taran FA (2009) ¹ Non-randomised comparative study | | - | ed: 192 (109 vs gFUS group = 3 | - | The most serious complication after MRgFUS was a significant but reversible sciatic nerve palsy in 1 patient. | Patient population overlap with Stewart et al., 2007 ² |
| Non-randomised comparative study | | | or intervention | | scialic herve palsy in 1 palient. | Follow-up issues: |
| USA, Israel, UK and Germany | | | erine artery em | | Total number of significant clinical | No losses to follow-up were |
| ,, | | | ymptoms durin | | complication events (defined as fever | described. |
| Recruitment period: not reported | months of follo | | J | 9 | > 38°C on any 2 post-treatment days, blood | |
| | | • | | | transfusion, unintended major surgical | Study design issues: |
| Study population: premenopausal women | Mean SF-36 h | ealth survey | questionnaire a | and disability | procedure, discharge to a rehabilitation | • 14 centres were involved. |
| with symptomatic uterine fibroids | assessment so | cores at 1-m | onth follow-up | - | facility, discharge with an appliance such | The two patient groups were |
| | | MRgFUS | Hysterect- | р | as a drain or urinary catheter, outpatient | recruited from different |
| n = 192 (109 MRgFUS, 83 abdominal | | | omy | | interventional treatment, rehospitalisation, | centres. |
| hysterectomy) | | | scores | | life-threatening event or death within 42 | Quality of life was assessed |
| | Physical | 80.3 | 58.0 | <0.0001 | days of treatment): | using the SF-36 health |
| Mean age (years): 45 (MRgFUS), 44 | functioning | | | | • MRgFUS = 12.8% (14/109) | survey questionnaire (higher |
| (hysterectomy) | Physical | 55.3 | 20.0 | <0.0001 | • Hysterectomy = 39.8% (33/83), | scores indicate better quality |
| Patient selection criteria: all the women were | role | | | | p < 0.0001 | of life). |
| at least 18 years old and did not want | Bodily pain | 64.6 | 49.3 | <0.0001 | Fours 20°C on any 2 post tractment days | |
| children in the future. Exclusion criteria | General | 68.2 | 71.3 | NS | Fever >38°C on any 2 post-treatment days: MRgEUS = 2.8% (3/109) | Study population issues: |
| included women with a uterus larger than | health | 50.0 | 44.5 | 0.004 | MRgFUS = 2.8% (3/109) Hysterectomy = 14.5% (12/83), | Women in the hysterectomy |
| 24 weeks gestational size, haematocrit | Vitality | 53.9 | 44.5 56.3 | 0.004 | • Hysterectomy = 14.5% ($12/83$), p = 0.005 | group were less likely to be |
| <25%, a positive pregnancy test, any | Social | 74.9 | 56.3 | <0.0001 | p = 0.003 Transfusion: | Caucasian (54 vs 80%, p<0.001) and had higher |
| contraindication to surgery or MRI. | functioning Emotional | 65.4 | 48.7 | 0.01 | MRgFUS = 2.8% (3/109) | BMI on average (29.9 vs |
| | role | 05.4 | 40.7 | 0.01 | Hysterectomy = 7.2% (6/83), | 25.8, p = 0.001) than |
| Technique: MRgFUS was performed using the ExAblate 2000 system (Insightec, Israel). | Mental | 71.8 | 74.1 | NS | p = NS | women in the MRgFUS |
| | health | 71.0 | 74.1 | NO | Readmission lasting >24 h: | group. |
| Treatment time was limited to 180 minutes. | |)isahility ass | essment scores | | • MRgFUS = 7.3% (8/109) | • Women in the hysterectomy |
| Coagulation volume was limited to 150 ml | Lost work | 1.2 | 19.2 | <0.0001 | Hysterectomy = 9.6% (8/83), | group had higher levels of |
| per treatment. Prophylactic antibiotics were not used before MRgFUS. They were administered preoperatively to all women in the hysterectomy group. | days | | 10.2 | 10.0001 | p = NS | symptoms at baseline and |
| | Days late | 0.6 | 2.1 | NS | | significantly worse function |
| | for work | | | | Serious adverse events (reported 'in | on several subsections of |
| | Days spent | 1.3 | 9.9 | <0.0001 | compliance with the Standard Code of | the SF-36 questionnaire. |
| Follow-up: 6 months | in bed | | | | Federal Regulations' – not defined): | |
| | Days kept | 2.7 | 17.4 | <0.0001 | • MRgFUS = 8.3% (9/109) | |
| Conflict of interest/source of funding: not | from usual | | | | • Hysterectomy = 9.6% (8/83), | |
| reported | activities | | | | p = NS | |
| -F | | | | | (Note: these included a pre-existing brain | |

IP overview: Magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids

| Study details | Key efficacy f | ndings | | Key safety finding | Key safety findings | | | |
|---------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-------------|-------------------|--|
| | | | questionnaire and onth follow-up | tumour and 'ventricular ectopy', neither of which were considered to be related to treatment) | | | | |
| | | | Hysterectomy | р | At least 1 adverse | | | |
| | SF-36 scores | | | | MRgFUS = 80 | | | |
| | Physical functioning | 82.5 | 86.9 | NS | Hysterectomy p < 0.0001 | = 98.8% (82 | /83), | |
| | Physical role | 68.3 | 80.0 | 0.05 | | | | |
| | Bodily pain | 69.1 | 79.5 | 0.004 | Adverse event | MRgFUS | Hystere- | |
| | General health | 69.3 | 75.3 | 0.04 | | (n = 109) | ctomy (n = 83) | |
| | Vitality | 59.1 | 65.6 | 0.04 | Pain | 62.4% | 95.2%* | |
| | Social | 79.5 | 84.8 | NS | Gynaecological | 27.5% | 27.7% | |
| | functioning | | | | Urinary tract | 23.8% | 19.3% | |
| | Emotional role | 75.0 | 78.1 | NS | Gastrointestinal tract | 20.2% | 67.5%* | |
| | Mental | 73.3 | 79.6 | 0.008 | Dermatological system | 15.6% | 34.9%* | |
| | | isability ass | essment scores | 1 | Nervous system | 7.3% | 20.5%* | |
| | Lost work days | 0.2 | 1.7 | NS | Cardiovascular system | 2.8% | 8.4% | |
| | Days late for work | 0.1 | 0.0 | NS | Respiratory tract | 0% | 2.4% | |
| | Days spent in bed | 0.5 | 0.5 | NS | Systemic events | 17.4% | 20.5% | |
| | Days kept from usual | 1.4 | 1.7 | NS | Other * p < 0.05 | 0% | 7.2%* | |
| | activities | | | | P \$ 0.00 | | | |

| Study details | Key efficacy findings | Key safety fi | ndings | Comments Follow-up issues: • 21% (59/287) of patients | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Okada A (2009) ³ | Number of patients analysed: 287 | Postprocedu | | | | |
| Case series Japan Recruitment period: 2003–6 Study population: patients with symptomatic uterine fibroids n = 287 Mean age: 42.5 years (range 24–60) Patient selection criteria: exclusion criteria were pregnant women, women wishing for future pregnancy, contraindication to MRI, patients with abdominal scars, bowel in the path of the ultrasound beam or fibroids located close to the sacral surface. Technique: The ExAblate 2000 (InSightec, Israel) system was used. Follow-up: 12 months Conflict of interest/source of funding: several authors have received travel grants from Insightec. | 8.3% (19/228) patients underwent additional treatments for fibroids during the 12-month follow-up. Mean NPV ratio attained during treatment = 46.6% (n = 279, 8 patients were not included because of an allergy to the contrast agent). Mean NPV ratio Group I (2003–5) = 39.3% (range 0–91.3) Group II (2005–6) = 54% (range 0–00) p < 0.001 Alternative treatments by 6-month follow-up (n = 228): Group I (2003–5) = 5% (5/105) Group II (2005–6) = 2% (3/123) p = 0.34 Alternative treatments by 12-month follow-up (n = 228): Group I (2003–5) = 12% (13/105) Group II (2005–6) = 5% (6/123) p = 0.04 | Abdominal pain Lower back or leg pain Vaginal discharge or bleeding Fever Skin burns *p = 0.04 All skin burns without surgic All adverse ev conservatively intervention a | al intervention vents were ma v, did not requ | naged ire surgical | were lost to follow-up. There were no differences in the patients lost to follow-up with regard to age, total fibroid load and nonperfused volume ratio. Study design issues: Patients were treated at 4 different centres. The patient population was divided into 2 equal groups according to the treatment period. Study population issues: A statistically significantly higher proportion of patients in Group II reached the 6 and 12-month follow-up compared with patients in Group I. | |

| Study details | Key efficacy fin | dings | | | Key safety findings | Comments | | |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Fennessy FM (2007) ⁴ Case series | Number of patie Symptom sever assessment que effect of treatme | rity (assesse stionnaire 10 | d using the l 0-point scale | UFSQoL self- e, measuring | Adverse eventsNo serious adverse events were reported.290 adverse events were reported in total | Included in table 2 of original overview. Patient overlap with Stewart et | | |
| USA Recruitment period: 2003–4 n = 160 Population: premenopausal women with | 10-point improvement in baseline SSS score | All Original treatment (more restrictive protocol) | | Modified | (mean 1.8 per patient): - 13% of original treatment group reported no adverse events - 25% of modified treatment group reported no adverse events (p = 0.06) Pain or discomfort was the most common adverse event, reported in 54% of original | al, 2007. Follow-up issues: At 6 and 12 months after the procedure, patients returned for clinical evaluation and MRI. | | |
| symptomatic fibroids Mean age: 46 years | 3 months | (118/149) (69/91) | 85% (49/58) | 85% (49/58)treatment group and 47% of modified treatment group. | • 6% (10/160) of patients were lost to follow-up at 12 months. | | | |
| Patient selection: premenopausal women with symptomatic uterine leiomyomas who were not planning future childbearing. Pregnant women, postmenopausal women and those with MRI contraindications were excluded. Patients with extensive scars on the anterior abdominal wall were also excluded. | 6 months | 79% (114/114) 78% (59/76) | 74% (65/88) 72% (40/55) | 88% (49/56) 91% (19/21) | 2 important adverse events reported in original treatment group: – parasthesia at cannulation site which | Study design issues: Symptom severity was assessed using an eightitem section of a uterine | | |
| | The odds of a 10 treatment was 2 greater compare (p < 0.038) | .8 in those wi | th an NPV o | f 30% or | resolved within 6 weeks – mild sonification-related leg pain which resolved within 2 days | fibroid symptom and quality of life (UFSQOL) questionnaire. Study population issues: A modified treatment | | |
| Technique: MRI-guided focused ultrasound. | Non-perfused with the second s | | | R imaging | | | | |
| First 96 patients treated with original protocol, 64 patients treated with less restrictive, modified protocol. (Key | | Original treati | | dified atment | | protocol was used for the last 64 patients treated. Thi was less restrictive and permitted a greater fibroid treatment volume, longer | | |
| differences: greater fibroid treatment volume, greater treatment time, and second | | 59.4 ml (rang 349.3) | | 1.6 ml (range 352.1) | | | | |
| treatments were permitted). | | 16.6% (n = 88 | 8) 25. | 8% (n = 44) | | treatment time, and second | | |
| Follow-up: n = 144 at 6 months, 76 at 12 months (mean and range not stated) | * p < 0.001 Additional treat | ments | | | | treatments were permitted within a 14-day period). | | |
| Conflict of interest: Study was supported and | Within 12 month group had sough | nt alternative | treatment. | | | | | |
| funded by Insightec Ltd (manufacturer) | Within 12 month group had sough | s, 28% (8/29 nt alternative |) of the modi treatment. | ified protocol | | | | |
| | (assuming treatr | nent failure ir | n those lost t | o follow-up) | | | | |

| Study details | Key efficacy fin | ndings | | | Ke | y safety findings | Comments |
|--|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----|---|--|
| Gorny KR $(2011)^5$ Case series Canada Recruitment period: $2005 - 9$ Study population: women with symptomatic uterine leiomyomas n = 130 Mean age = 46 years (range 32 - 59) Patient selection criteria: not reported Technique: ExAblate 2000 device (InSightec) was used. A typical 3-hour treatment session consisted of 60–100 sonifications. Sonification energies were continually adjusted to achieve treatment temperatures sufficient for tissue ablations. 59 patients had 2 sessions performed on | Number of patie The prescribed to 1 treatment was problems and in was observed at resolved by the at 8 and 12 mon Mean NPV ratio (median 42.7%, Additional proce symptoms within 1 endometrial at Symptom relief Symptom improv No symptom relief Worsening of sy Symptom improv No symptom relief Symptom improv | | | | | Complications Mild abdominal oedema = 8.5% (11/130) Subcutaneous fat oedema = 6.2% (8/130) Subcutaneous fat and abdominal muscle oedema = 1.5% (2/130) Subcutaneous fat oedema and skin erythema = 0.8% (1/130) Lower back discomfort = 3.8% (5/130) (resolved at 12 months) | Follow-up issues: An additional 14 patients completed treatment but denied use of their data for research purposes. Six patients were excluded because the prescribed treatment was not completed (3 patients could not tolerate the prone position and 1 could not tolerate the pain). |
| Follow-up: 12 months | | | Follow-up | | | | |
| Conflict of interest/source of funding: one of the authors was a clinical trial investigator for | Degree of symptom relief | 3 months n = 63 | 6 months n = 74 | 12 months n = 70 | | | |
| Insightec Ltd (manufacturer). | Insignificant Moderate | 1 (1.6%) 8 (12.7%) | 2 (2.7%) 11 (14.9%) | 1 (1.4%) 6 (8.6%) | | | |
| | Considerable | 18 (28.6%) | 14 (18.9%) | 12 (17.1%) | | | |
| | Excellent | 36 (57.1%) | 47 (63.5%) | 51 (72.9%) | | | |

| Study details | Key efficacy fi | ndings | | Key safety findings | Comments | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| significant Study details Kim HS (2011) ⁶ Case series USA Recruitment period: not reported Study population: pre- or perimenopausal women with symptomatic uterine fibroids n = 40 (51 fibroids) Mean age: 46 years Patient selection criteria: age at least 18 years. Exclusion criteria included positive pregnancy test result and the desire to become pregnant after treatment, uterine size larger than 24 weeks' gestation, or with skin scar in the area of the expected ultrasound beam path. Technique: ExAblate 2000 (InSightec, Israel) system used. | Symptoms (tra [0–100] with lo symptoms) Time baseline 3 months 6 months 1 year 2 years 3 years Health-related [0–100] with hi of life) | ents analysed: 40 insformed symptor wer scores indicat Mean score (95% Cl) 64.8 (59.1 to 70.6) 35.3 (29.3 to 41.3) 32.2 (26.3 to 38.2) 40.5 (32.5 to 48.7) 18.0 (8.0 to 28.1) 17.0 (8.9 to 25.1) quality of life (trans gher scores indica | Image better relief of Mean change (95% Cl) -29.5 (-37.8 to -21.3) -32.6 (-40.9 to -24.3) -24.3 (-34.2 to -14.3) -46.8 (-58.4 to -35.2) -47.8 (-57.7 to -37.9, p < 0.001) sformed scores ting better quality | Key safety findings Complications: There were no long-term minor or major complications related to MRgFUS. Specifically, no chronic skin burns or tissue changes along the path of the ultrasound treatment, or chronic back or leg pain. | Comments Follow-up issues: 72.5% (29/40) of patients had completed the follow-up at 3 years. 11 patients were lost to follow-up. Study design issues: Prospective study with consecutive patients. The primary endpoint was the assessment of long-term clinical effectiveness, defined by the changes in patient symptoms. The Uterine Fibroid Symptom and Quality of Life questionnaires were used, which have been validated. Raw scores were converted to a transformed score (range 0–100) for comparison. | |
| Follow-up: 3 years | Time baseline | Mean score (95% CI) 44.1 | Mean change (95% CI) | - | | |
| Conflict of interest/source of funding: supported in part by InSightec grant. | 3 months 6 months 1 year | (37.7 to 50.6) 68.8 (62.1 to 75.6) 68.6 (61.9 to 75.4) 68.7 | 24.6 (15.4 to 34.1) 24.5 (15.2 to 33.9) 24.6 | | | |
| | 2 years | (59.6 to 77.9) 86.1 (74.8 to 97.5) | (13.4 to 35.8) 42.0 (28.9 to 51.2) | | | |
| | 3 years | 83.9 (74.5 to 93.3) | 39.8 (28.3 to 51.2, p < 0.001) | | | |

| itudy details | Key efficacy findings | Key safety findings | Comments |
|---------------|--|---------------------|----------|
| | Mean reduction in treated fibroid volume at 3 years = 32% (p < 0.001) | | |
| | Mean reduction in uterus volume at 3 years = 27.7% (p < 0.001) | | |
| | Within 3 years of MRgFUS, 9 patients received alternative treatments for failed symptom control or recurred symptoms: 2 patients had hysterectomies, 2 patients had myomectomies and 5 patients had uterine artery embolisation. | | |
| | No patient attempted pregnancy. | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Study details | Key efficacy findings | Key safety findings | Comments |
|--|--|--|---|
| Rabinovici J (2010) ⁷ Case series USA, Israel, UK, Germany, Japan, Russia and South Korea Recruitment period: not reported Study population: women who conceived after MRgFUS for symptomatic uterine fibroids n = 51 (54 pregnancies) Mean age: 37 years (range 28–49) Patient selection criteria: all women who conceived after MRgFUS. Women presented with a variety of initial symptoms for treatment by MRgFUS: 50% had menorrhagia, 38% had abdominal pressure and 38% had infertility (defined as inability to get pregnant for more than 12 months as reported by the patient). 38% of the patients had never been pregnant and 58% had never had a delivery. Technique: ExAblate 2000 (InSightec, Israel) system used. Conflict of interest/source of funding: not reported. | Number of patients analysed: 51 (54 pregnancies) Mean time to pregnancy = 8 ± 7 months after MRgFUS treatment. Post-treatment by MRgFUS 41% (22/54) of pregnancies resulted in deliveries and 20% (11/54) were ongoing at the time of reporting beyond 20 weeks. Elective pregnancy termination = 13% (7/54) Miscarriage = 26% (14/54) Of the miscarriages, 79% occurred by the 10 th week of pregnancy, 14% (2/14) occurred at 12–13 weeks and 1 woman had a 2 nd trimester loss. Term delivery rate = 93% (14/15) (1 preterm birth occurred at 36 weeks) 64% of women had a vaginal delivery and 36% a Caesarean delivery. No infant met the criteria for low birth weight (< 2.5 kg). Mean NPV after MRgFUS treatment = 117 ml Mean NPV ratio > 40% (range 5.5–100) | Pregnancy complications: Abnormal bleeding = 27% (6/22) Gestational diabetes = 14% (3/22) Myoma growth = 9% (2/22) Placenta praevia = 9% (2/22) 36% (8/22) of women had no antepartum complications. One patient had a breech presentation and an intramural fibroid that obstructed the pelvic outlet. After an elective Caesarean section with myomectomy, the patient bled vaginally and developed hypotension and disseminated intravascular coagulation. She underwent repeat laparotomy without any abnormal surgical findings. The patient then developed adult respiratory distress syndrome and spent 3 days in intensive care. Her second pregnancy was complicated by a placenta praevia. | Study design issues: All sites were required to report pregnancies to the manufacturer of the device as a part of post-approval monitoring by the FDA. Prospective data from 13 sites in 7 countries. Study population issues: 8 of these pregnancies occurred as part of clinical trials designed for women who had completed their families. One group of pregnancies (n = 20) were reported from an ongoing study specifically for women tryin to conceive. |

| Study details | Key efficacy findings | Key safety findings | Comments |
|---|---|---|----------|
| Kim KA (2011) ⁹ | A NPV ratio of 80% was obtained. | Complication | |
| Case report Korea | 3-month follow-up MRI showed a volume reduction of 36% in the treated myomas (total myoma volume of 80 ml). | Two weeks after treatment the woman presented with a palpable vaginal mass. The treated myomas were found to be situated in the vagina with a narrow stalk extending from the uterus. | |
| Study period: not stated | | Two weeks after the initial detection of vaginal myoma expulsion, there was no change in the status of the expelled myomas within the vagina. They were | |
| n = 1 | | therefore removed by hysteroscopic resection without any adverse events. | |
| Population: 38 year old woman | | Follow-up MRI at 3 months showed no residual myoma tissue or abnormality in the | |
| Indications: Had undergone focused ultrasound therapy for uterine fibroids | | endometrial lining. | |
| Technique: MRI-guided focused ultrasound therapy. | | | |
| Follow-up: not reported | | | |
| Conflict of interest: not reported | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Study details | Key efficacy findings | Key safety findings | Comments |
|---|--|---|---|
| Leon-Villapalos J (2005) ⁸ | Outcomes measured: no efficacy measures reported | Complication | Included in table 2 of original |
| Case report | (not the aim of the paper). | Two weeks after treatment the woman presented with a full thickness burn in the lower abdomen and other areas of partial thickness surrounding the area. | overview. Woman was referred 2 weeks after treatment. |
| UK Study period: not stated | | The authors noted that the burns were non- sensate, leathery white in appearance, and overlying palpable uterine fibroids. | |
| n = 1 | | Injuries were treated by elliptical excision of the burned area and direct closure. | |
| Population: 39 year old woman | | The burn had extended to the abdominal fascia where the effects of the injury were clearly visible. | |
| Indications: Had undergone focused ultrasound therapy for uterine fibroids | | The woman was discharged 1 day after surgery. | |
| Technique: MRI-guided focused ultrasound therapy. | | | |
| Follow-up: not reported | | | |
| Conflict of interest: not reported | | | |

Abbreviations used: CL confidence interval: MRgEUS_MRI-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound: MRL magnetic resonance imaging: NPV_non-perfused volume: NS_not

Efficacy

Symptom relief/quality of life

A non-randomised comparative study of 192 patients treated by MRgFUS or abdominal hysterectomy reported improvements in all 8 SF-36 domain scores for both treatment groups, although at 6 months scores were better for patients in the hysterectomy group than the MRgFUS group (significant for 5 of the 8 domains with p values from 0.004 to 0.05)¹.

A case series of 359 patients reported that the symptom severity score at 3 months after MRgFUS was significantly lower from baseline (38 for patients with a non-perfused volume ratio of 20% or less and 32 for patients with a non-perfused volume ratio greater than 20% compared with 62 and 63, respectively)².

A case series of 160 patients reported a 10-point improvement in baseline symptom severity score in 76% (69/91) and 72% (40/55) of patients treated by MRgFUS using the original protocol, and in 85% (49/58) and 91% (19/21) of patients treated by a modified protocol at 3- and 12-month follow-up, respectively⁴.

A case series of 130 patients reported that 88% (78/89) of patients had symptom relief at 12-month follow-up⁵.

A case series of 40 patients reported a mean improvement in symptom severity score of 48 (scale 0–100, p < 0.001) and a mean improvement in quality of life score of 40 (scale 0 –100, p < 0.001) at 3-year follow-up⁶.

Fibroid volume/non-perfused volume ratio

A case series of 287 patients reported a mean non-perfused volume ratio (the sum of the non-perfused volume of all treated fibroids divided by the volume of all uterine fibroids, treated and untreated) of 39% for patients treated between 2003-5 and 54% for patients treated between 2005-6 (p < 0.001)³.

A case series of 80 patients with 147 fibroids treated by MRgFUS reported a mean fibroid shrinkage of 31% at 6 months (n = 81, p < 0.0001)⁶.

A case series of 40 patients reported a mean volume decrease in treated fibroid of 32% at 3-year follow-up (p < 0.001)⁶.

Re-interventions

A non-randomised comparative study of 192 patients treated by MRgFUS or abdominal hysterectomy reported re-interventions in 4% (4/109) of patients treated by MRgFUS (3 hysterectomies, 1 UAE) at 6-month follow-up¹.

Two case series reported additional treatments in 8% (19/228) and 34% (40/116, assuming treatment failure in those lost to follow-up) of patients, respectively, at 12-months follow-up^{3,4}. A case series of 80 patients reported a re-intervention rate of 15% with a median follow-up of 34 months⁵. Two case series of 130 and 80 patients reported that 5% (7/130) and 10% (8/80), respectively, of patients had hysterectomies within 12 months after MRgFUS^{5,6}.

A case series of 359 patients reported that the probability of undergoing additional fibroid treatment significantly reduced with increasing ablation as indicated by an increased non-perfused volume ratio (p = 0.012 at 12 months)².

A case series of 40 patients reported that 23% (9/40) received alternative treatments for failed symptom control or symptom recurrence (2 hysterectomies, 2 myomectomies and 5 uterine artery ablations)⁶.

Pregnancy outcomes

A case series of 51 women who conceived after MRgFUS reported that 41% (22/54) of pregnancies resulted in deliveries and 20% (11/54) were currently ongoing beyond 20 weeks⁷. 13% (7/54) of pregnancies were electively terminated and miscarriage occurred in 26% (14/54). The mean time to pregnancy was 8 months after MRgFUS treatment.

The term delivery rate was 93% (14/15); 64% of women had a vaginal delivery and 36% a Caesarean delivery. No infant met the criteria for low birth weight.

Safety

Bowel perforation

Bowel perforation following treatment by the procedure was reported in a patient (report submitted to the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience [MAUDE] database). Surgical management was required, confirming perforations in 3 bowel sites (denominator not reported)¹⁰. **Nerve damage**

A non-randomised comparative study including 109 patients treated by MRgFUS reported sciatic nerve palsy in 1 patient after MRgFUS.¹

Skin burns

There was 1 case report of a full-thickness burn in the lower abdomen and other areas of partial thickness surrounding the area. The injuries were treated by elliptical excision of the burned area and direct closure⁸.

A case series of 287 patients reported skin burns in 7% (10/144) of patients treated between 2003–5 compared with 1% (2/143) of patients treated between

IP overview: Magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids Page 17 of 33

2005–6 (p = 0.04). All skin burns resolved within 2 weeks without surgical intervention³. A case series of 80 patients reported minor skin burns in 2.5% (2/80) (resolved with topical cream)⁶.

Deep vein thrombosis

A case series of 130 patients reported that 1 patient developed deep vein thrombosis, which was treated with anticoagulation therapy⁵.

Pain

The non-randomised comparative study of 192 patients treated by MRgFUS or abdominal hysterectomy reported pain in 62% and 95% of patients, respectively after the procedure¹. A case series of 287 patients reported abdominal pain in 11% (33/287) of patients and lower back or leg pain in 7% (20/287) of patients³. A case series of 160 patients reported mild sonification-related leg pain in 1 patient, which resolved within 2 days⁴. A case series of 130 patients reported lower back discomfort in 4% (5/140) of patients⁵. A case series of 80 patients reported mild temporary sciatica in 1 patient (1%)⁶.

Other

The case series of 160 patients reported 1 case of paraesthesia at the cannulation site, which resolved within 6 weeks⁴.

The case series of 80 patients reported 1 case of endometritis. The authors noted that it was unclear whether incomplete management of a yeast infection immediately before the onset of endometritis led to the endometritis or if it was a procedure-related complication⁶.

Spontaneous vaginal expulsion of treated fibroid tissue was reported in a patient in a case report; it required hysteroscopic removal⁹.

Validity and generalisability of the studies

- There were no randomised controlled trials.
- In the non-randomised comparative study, women treated by MRgFUS had less severe symptoms than those treated by hysterectomy. They were also more likely to be Caucasian and had a lower mean body mass index¹.
- The natural history of fibroid symptoms without treatment is difficult to predict and some of the symptom improvement reported in studies may not be attributable to the MRgFUS treatment.
- Four studies only included women who did not desire to become pregnant in the future^{1,2,3,4}.
- After 2004, treatment protocols were modified and fewer restrictions were placed on the use of MRgFUS. This included an increase in the permitted

treatment volume. Some of the studies report on patients treated before and after the change in protocol.

Existing assessments of this procedure

The Australia and New Zealand Horizon Scanning Network (ANZHSN) published a Prioritising Summary Update of MRI-guided high-intensity ultrasound for the non-invasive treatment of uterine fibroids in August 2008¹¹. The report concluded that 'The studies included for assessment in this Prioritising Summary update support the effectiveness of MRgFUS in the treatment of uterine fibroids, in terms of fibroid-related symptom improvement after treatment. The incidence of serious adverse events after MRgFUS is low and appears to decrease with increasing physician experience. In addition, MRgFUS is likely to be cost-effective among various treatment options. However, the fact that from 10–37 per cent of patients seek treatment alternatives after MRgFUS indicates the need for further research on this technology.'

Related NICE guidance

Below is a list of NICE guidance related to this procedure. Appendix B gives details of the recommendations made in each piece of guidance listed.

Interventional procedures

- Magnetic resonance image-guided focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids. NICE interventional procedures guidance 231 (2007). Available from www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG231 [current guidance]
- Uterine artery embolisation for fibroids. NICE interventional procedures guidance 367 (2010). Available from <u>www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG367</u>
- Laparoscopic techniques for hysterectomy. NICE interventional procedures guidance 239 (2007). Available from <u>www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG239</u>
- Magnetic resonance (MR) image-guided percutaneous laser ablation of uterine fibroids. NICE interventional procedures guidance 30 (2003). Available from <u>www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG30</u>
- Laparoscopic laser myomectomy. NICE interventional procedures guidance 23 (2003). Available from <u>www.nice.org.uk/guidance/IPG23</u>

Clinical guidelines

 Heavy menstrual bleeding. NICE clinical guideline 44 (2007). Available from www.nice.org.uk/guidance/CG44

Specialist Advisers' opinions

Specialist advice was sought from consultants who have been nominated or ratified by their Specialist Society or Royal College. The advice received is their individual opinion and does not represent the view of the society.

IP overview: Magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids Page 19 of 33

Dr N Hacking, Professor J Moss, Ms E O'Grady, Dr A Pankhania, Dr A Sebastian (British Society of Interventional Radiology), Professor MA Lumsden (Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists).

- None of the Specialist Advisers have ever performed the procedure.
- Two Specialist Advisers have taken part in patient selection or referred a patient at least once.
- Four Advisers described the procedure as definitely novel and of uncertain safety and efficacy; two considered it to be established practice and no longer new.
- The technology is still evolving.
- Theoretical adverse events include damage to the bladder or bowel.
- Adverse events reported in the literature include skin burns, reversible nerve injury, fibroid migration into the uterine cavity and expulsion or obstruction requiring hospitalisation.
- Theoretical adverse events or safety concerns include bowel and bladder injury, and fertility and pregnancy problems.
- There is uncertainty about subsequent fertility.
- Key efficacy outcomes include quality of life, symptom improvement, freedom from further surgery or treatment, subsequent fertility.
- The benefits of the procedure appear very limited and short lived.
- There is a lack of long-term data.
- There are only 1 or 2 centres in the UK with the equipment to perform this procedure.
- The procedure requires long MRI time (average 2–3 hours).
- Patient selection is important.
- One Adviser thought that the procedure is likely to have a major impact on the NHS, in terms of use of resources and numbers of patients eligible for treatment; three thought it would have a moderate impact and two thought the impact would be minor.

Patient Commentators' opinions

NICE's Patient and Public Involvement Programme sent 20 questionnaires to trusts for distribution to patients who had the procedure (or their carers). NICE received 4 completed questionnaires.

The Patient Commentators' views on the procedure were consistent with the published evidence and the opinions of the Specialist Advisers.

Issues for consideration by IPAC

None other than those discussed above.

References

1. Taran FA, Tempany CMC, Regan L et al. (2009) Magnetic resonanceguided focused ultrasound (MRgFUS) compared with abdominal hysterectomy for treatment of uterine leiomyomas. Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology 34: 572–8.

2. Stewart EA, Gostout B, Rabinovici J et al. (2007) Sustained relief of leiomyoma symptoms by using focused ultrasound surgery. Obstetrics and Gynecology 110: 279–87.

3. Okada A, Morita Y, Fukunishi H et al. (2009) Non-invasive magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound treatment of uterine fibroids in a large Japanese population: impact of the learning curve on patient outcome. Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology 34: 579–83.

4. Fennessy FM, Tempany CM, McDannold NJ et al. (2007) Uterine leiomyomas: MR Imaging-guided focused ultrasound surgery – results of different treatment protocols. Radiology 243: 885–93.

5. Gorny KR, Woodrum DA, Brown DL et al. (2011) Magnetic resonanceguided focused ultrasound of uterine leiomyomas: review of a 12-month outcome of 130 clinical patients. Journal of Vascular and Interventional Radiology 22: 857–64.

6. Kim HS, Baik J-H, Pham LD et al. (2011) MR-guided high-intensity focused ultrasound treatment for symptomatic uterine leiomyomata: long-term outcomes. Academic Radiology 18: 970–6.

7. Rabinovici J, David M, Fukunishi H et al. (2010) Pregnancy outcome after magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery (MRgFUS) for conservative treatment of uterine fibroids. Fertility and Sterility 93: 199–209.

8. Leon-Villapalos J, Kaniorou-Larai M, Dziewulski P. (2005) Full thickness abdominal burn following magnetic resonance guided focused ultrasound therapy. Burns 31: 1054–5.

9. Kim KA, Yoon SW, Yoon BS et al. (2011) Spontaneous vaginal expulsion of uterine myoma after magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery. Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology 18: 131–4.

10. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Manufacturer and User Facility Device Experience (MAUDE) database. Available from: <u>http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/cfdocs/cfmaude/detail.cfm?mdrfoi_id</u> =1001500

11. Australia and New Zealand Horizon Scanning Network. MRI-guided high intensity ultrasound for the non-invasive treatment of uterine fibroids. Horizon Scanning Technology Prioritising Summary Update. Adelaide, South Australia, August 2008.

IP overview: Magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids Page 21 of 33

Appendix A: Additional papers on magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids

The following table outlines the studies that are considered potentially relevant to the overview but were not included in the main data extraction table (table 2). It is by no means an exhaustive list of potentially relevant studies.

| Article | Number of patients/ follow-up | Direction of conclusions | Reasons for non-inclusion in table 2 |
|---|---|--|--|
| Arleo EK, Khilnani NM, Ng A et al. (2007) Features influencing patient selection for fibroid treatment with magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound. Journal of Vascular & Interventional Radiology 18: 681–5. | Case series n = 26 | A substantial proportion of women were anatomically ineligible, including too much fibroid volume (19%), presence of bowel in the ultrasound beam path (13%), and significant adenomyosis (12%). Overall, 14% of women inquiring about MRgFUS were eligible for it, a percentage that increased when additional institutional review board restrictions were lifted. | Focuses on factors influencing patient selection. |
| Behera MA, Leong M, Johnson L et al. (2010) Eligibility and accessibility of magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound (MRgFUS) for the treatment of uterine leiomyomas. Fertility and Sterility 94: 1864–8. | Case series n = 27 | 47% (80/169) of patients were determined clinically eligible for the procedure. Of these, 16% (27/169) were found to be eligible for MRgFUS based on imaging results. | Focuses on eligibility and accessibility of MRgFUS. |
| Bouwsma EVA, Gorny KR, Hesley GK et al. (2011) Magnetic resonance- guided focused ultrasound surgery for leiomyoma-associated infertility. Fertility and Sterility 96: e9-e12. | Case report n = 1 | Successful pregnancy with full- term vaginal delivery. | Case report. |
| de Melo FC, Diacoyannis L, Moll A et al. (2009) Reduction by 98% in uterine myoma volume associated with significant symptom relief after peripheral treatment with magnetic resonance imaging-guided focused ultrasound surgery. Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology 16: 501–3. | Case report n = 1 | MRgFUS treatment only at the periphery of the myoma resulted in a 98% reduction in tumour volume at 8 months posttreatment The patient's symptoms, as assessed using the Uterine Fibroids Symptom and Quality of life (UFS-QOL) questionnaire, were substantially improved at both 6 and 12 months posttreatment | Case report. |
| Fennessy FM, Kong CY, Tempany CM et al. (2011) Quality-of-life assessment of fibroid treatment options and outcomes. Radiology 259: 785-792. | Non- randomised comparative study n = 197 | Quality of life increased after all fibroid treatments. The waiting trade-off method is feasible for assessing the quality-adjusted morbidity of treatment procedures. | The main focus was to obtain 'utilities' for uterine fibroids and to measure short-term utilities. |
| Fukunishi H, Funaki K, Ikuma K et al. (2007) Unsuspected uterine leiomyosarcoma: magnetic resonance imaging findings before and after focused ultrasound surgery. International Journal of Gynecological Cancer 17: 724–8. | Case report n = 1 | Uterine leiomyosarcoma, initially diagnosed as leiomyoma on MRI, was disclosed after focused ultrasound surgery. The early stages of uterine leiomyosarcoma are clinically difficult to diagnose; therefore, both careful monitoring during FUS and close follow-up after the procedure are vital. | Case report. |

| Article | Number of patients/ | Direction of conclusions | Reasons for non-inclusion |
|---|---|--|--|
| | follow-up | | in table 2 |
| Funaki K, Fukunishi H, Sawada K. (2009) Clinical outcomes of magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery for uterine myomas: 24-month follow-up. Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology 34: 584–9. | Case series n = 91 Follow-up = 24 months | Reintervention rate = 15% (12/80) | Larger studies are included. |
| Funaki K, Sawada K, Maeda F et al. (2007) Subjective effect of magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery for uterine fibroids. Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology Research 33: 834–9. | Case series n = 69 Follow-up = 6 months | No severe adverse events. 7 patients required alternative treatment after MRgFUS. Mean symptom scores were all reduced after MRgFUS. | A larger, more recent study from the same centre is included. |
| Funaki K, Fukunishi H, Funaki T et al. (2007) Mid-term outcome of magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery for uterine myomas: from six to twelve months after volume reduction. Journal of Minimally Invasive Gynecology 14: 616–21. | Case series n = 35 Follow-up = 12 months | At present, type 3 myomas should be exempted from the application of MRgFUS, because the nonperfused ratio immediately after the procedure was small compared with that in type 1 and type 2 myomas, and the subsequent volume change was unfavourable | A larger, more recent study from the same centre is included. |
| Funaki K, Fukunishi H, Funaki T et al. (2007) Magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery for uterine fibroids: relationship between the therapeutic effects and signal intensity of preexisting T2-weighted magnetic resonance images. American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology 196: 184– 6. | Case series n = 63 Follow-up = 6 months | The efficacy of MRgFUS correlates with the signal intensity of T2-weighted magnetic resonance images. Type 1 and type 2 fibroids are suitable candidates for MRgFUS, whereas type 3 fibroids are not | A larger, more recent study from the same centre is included. |
| Gavrilova-Jordan LP, Rose CH, Traynor KD et al. (2007) Successful term pregnancy following MR-guided focused ultrasound treatment of uterine leiomyoma. Journal of Perinatology 27: 59–61. | Case report n = 1 | Successful term pregnancy after MRgFUS, with no complications. | Case report. |
| Hanstede MM, Tempany CM, Stewart EA. (2007) Focused ultrasound surgery of intramural leiomyomas may facilitate fertility: a case report. Fertility & Sterility 88: 497. | Case report n = 1 | MRgFUS changed the configuration of the endometrial cavity, and a subsequent pregnancy resulted in a term delivery. | Case report. |
| Harding G, Coyne KS, Thompson CL et al. (2008) The responsiveness of the uterine fibroid symptom and health- related quality of life questionnaire (UFS-QOL). Health & Quality of Life Outcomes 6: 99. | Case series n = 102 Follow-up = 6 months | Significant improvements were observed in UFS-QOL Symptom Severity and all Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQL) subscale scores at 6 months (p < 0.0001). Significant improvements were noted in all 8 SF-36 subscales. | The study focuses on the responsiveness of UFS-QOL questionnaire. |
| Hesley GK, Felmlee JP, Gebhart JB et al. (2006) Noninvasive treatment of uterine fibroids: early Mayo Clinic experience with magnetic resonance imaging-guided focused ultrasound. Mayo Clinic Proceedings 81: 936–42. | Case series n = 42 Follow-up = 6 months | 40% (17/42) women underwent additional treatments after MRgFUS. | Larger studies are included. Included in table 2 of original overview. |

| Article | Number of patients/ follow-up | Direction of conclusions | Reasons for non-inclusion in table 2 |
|---|---|--|---|
| Lanard ZM, McDannold NJ, Fennessy FM et al. (2008) Uterine leiomyomas: MR imaging-guided focused ultrasound surgery-imaging predictors of success. Radiology 249: 187–94. | Case series n = 66 Follow-up = 12 months | Fibroids with low signal intensity (SI) on pretreatment T2-weighted MR images were more likely to shrink than were ones with high SI. The larger the NPV immediately after treatment, the greater the volume reduction and symptom relief were. | Larger studies are included. |
| LeBlang SD, Hoctor K, Steinberg FL. (2010) Leiomyoma shrinkage after MRI-guided focused ultrasound treatment: report of 80 patients. American Journal of Roentgenology 194: 274–80. | Case series n = 80 Follow-up = 6 months | The average nonperfused volume ratio was 55% +/- 25% immediately after treatment. Six months after treatment, the average volume of treated fibroids had decreased to 112+/- 141 cm3 (n = 81) (p < 0.0001) with an average volume reduction of 31% +/- 28% . | Studies with longer follow-up are included. |
| Lin Y-H, Leung T-K, Wang H-J et al. (2009) Treatment of uterine fibroids by using magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound ablation: The initial experience in Taiwan. Chinese Journal of Radiology 34: 263–71. | Case series n = 3 Follow-up = 3 months | The fibroid volume reduction after 3 months was 30.8% in average, and SSS reduction after 3 months was 30.6%. | Larger studies are included. |
| Machtinger R, Tempany CM, Kanan Roddy A et al. (2011) Successful MRI- Guided Focused Ultrasound Uterine Fibroid Treatment Despite an Ostomy and Significant Abdominal Wall Scarring. ISRN Obstetrics & Gynecology 962621. | Case report n = 1 | Successful MRgFUS in a patient with extensive anterior abdominal wall scars from 2 longitudinal laparotomies, a total colectomy and ileostomy. | Case report. |
| Mikami K, Murakami T, Okada A et al. (2008) Magnetic resonance imaging- guided focused ultrasound ablation of uterine fibroids: early clinical experience. Radiation Medicine 26: 198–205. | Case series n = 48 Follow-up = 12 months | Treatment was unsuccessful in 33% (16/48) of patients, due to obesity or high signal intensity of the fibroid. | Larger studies are included. |
| Morita Y, Ito N, Hikida H et al. (2008) Non-invasive magnetic resonance imaging-guided focused ultrasound treatment for uterine fibroids - early experience. European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology, & Reproductive Biology 139: 199–203. | Case series n = 48 Follow-up = 12 months | 4% (2/28) of patients required surgical interventions after MRgFUS. Mean reduction in fibroid volume at 6 months = 33%. | Larger studies are included. |
| Morita Y, Takeuchi S, Hikida H et al. (2009) Decreasing margins to the uterine serosa as a method for increasing the volume of fibroids ablated with magnetic resonance- guided focused ultrasound surgery. European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology, & Reproductive Biology 146: 92–5. | Case series n = 83 Follow-up = 12 months | Reducing the margin between the fibroid treatment area and the uterine serosa, when possible, enables MRgFUS treatment of greater fibroid volume, while maintaining a high safety profile | Studies focuses on the effect of reducing the margin between the fibroid and uterine serosa. |

| Article | Number of patients/ follow-up | Direction of conclusions | Reasons for non-inclusion in table 2 |
|--|--|--|--|
| Rabinovici J, Inbar Y, Revel A et al. (2007) Clinical improvement and shrinkage of uterine fibroids after thermal ablation by magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery. Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology 30: 771–7. | Case series n = 35 Follow-up = 6 months | 69% (24/35) of patients reported either significant or partial improvement in symptoms. Treated fibroids decreased in volume by 12% and 15% at 1 and 6 months, respectively. Minor transient side-effects were observed in two women. 17% (6/35) women underwent hysterectomy during the follow-up period. | Larger studies are included. |
| Ren XL, Zhou XD, Zhang J et al. (2007) Extracorporeal ablation of uterine fibroids with high-intensity focused ultrasound: imaging and histopathologic evaluation. Journal of Ultrasound in Medicine 26: 201–12. | Case series n = 119 Follow-up = 12 months | 82% (51/62) biopsy specimens revealed obvious signs of necrosis under light microscopy. Follow-up images showed absence or reduction of blood supply in the lesions after HIFU ablation. Median reductions in tumor size 12 months = 49%. | Larger studies are included. |

| Article | Number of patients/ follow-up | Direction of conclusions | Reasons for non-inclusion in table 2 |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| Smart OC, Hindley JT, Regan L et al. (2006) Gonadotrophin-releasing hormone and magnetic-resonance- guided ultrasound surgery for uterine | Case series n = 49 | Symptom severity score at 6 months was reduced by 45% compared with that at enrolment and was 48% lower at 12 months | Larger studies are included. |
| leiomyomata. Obstetrics and Gynecology 108: 49–54 | Follow-up = 12 months | compared with enrolment (no absolute numbers given). | Included in table 2 of original overview. |
| Smart OC, Hindley JT, Regan L et al. (2006) Magnetic resonance guided focused ultrasound surgery of uterine fibroids. The tissue effects of GnRH agonist pre-treatment. European Journal of Radiology 59: 163–7 | Case series n = 50 | The use of hormone increased the potential of the procedure | Larger studies are included. |
| So MJ, Fennessy FM, Zou KH et al. (2006) Does the phase of menstrual cycle affect MR-guided focused ultrasound surgery of uterine leiomyomas? European Journal of Radiology 59: 203–7 | Case series n = 58 | Menstrual cycle phase does not influence treatment outcomes | Study evaluated phase of menstrual cycle to treatment |
| Stewart EA, Gedroyc WM, Tempany CM et al. (2003) Focused ultrasound treatment of uterine fibroid tumors: safety and feasibility of a noninvasive thermoablative technique. American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology 189: 48–54 | Case series n = 55 | No major complications Few clinical outcomes were reported | Larger and more recent study included. |
| Tempany CM, Stewart EA, McDannold N et al. (2003) MR imaging-guided focused ultrasound surgery of uterine leiomyomas: a feasibility study. Radiology 226: 897–905 | Case series n = 9 | No major complications Few clinical outcomes were reported | Larger and more recent study included. |
| Yoon SW, Kim KA, Kim SH et al. (2010) Pregnancy and natural delivery following magnetic resonance imaging- guided focused ultrasound surgery of uterine myomas. Yonsei Medical Journal 51: 451–3. | Case report n = 1 | Patient conceived naturally 4 months after MRgFUS. At 39 weeks, she gave birth to a healthy baby girl, via a vaginal delivery. There were no complications. | Case report. |
| Zaher S, Gedroyc WM, Regan L. (2009) Patient suitability for magnetic resonance guided focused ultrasound surgery of uterine fibroids. European Journal of Obstetrics, Gynecology, & Reproductive Biology 143: 98–102. | Case series n = 144 | 100% of patients interested in MRgFUS were deemed clinically eligible for the procedure and 74% were deemed technically suitable to proceed with treatment. | Focuses on patient suitability. |
| Zaher S, Lyons D, Regan L. (2010) Uncomplicated term vaginal delivery following magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery for uterine fibroids. Biomedical Imaging and Intervention Journal 6: e28. | Case report n = 1 | Uncomplicated term vaginal delivery after MRgFUS. | Case report. |

| Article | Number of patients/ follow-up | Direction of conclusions | Reasons for non-inclusion in table 2 |
|--|--|--|--|
| Zaher S, Lyons D, Regan L (2011) Successful in vitro fertilization pregnancy following magnetic resonance-guided focused ultrasound surgery for uterine fibroids. Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Research 37: 370-373. | Case report n = 1 | IVF pregnancy and delivery after MRgFUS for a symptomatic fibroid. | Case report. |
| Zhang L, Chen WZ, Liu YJ et al. (2010) Feasibility of magnetic resonance imaging-guided high intensity focused ultrasound therapy for ablating uterine fibroids in patients with bowel lies anterior to uterus. European Journal of Radiology 73: 396–403. | Case series n = 21 Follow-up = 3 months | After the bowel was compressed with a degassed water balloon, MRgFUS treatment is safe and feasible in ablating uterine fibroids in patients with bowel lies anterior to uterus | Larger studies are included. |

Appendix B: Related NICE guidance for magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids

| Guidance | Recommendations |
|---------------------------|---|
| Interventional procedures | Uterine artery embolisation for fibroids. NICE interventional procedures guidance 367 (2010) 1.1 Current evidence on uterine artery embolisation (UAE) for fibroids shows that the procedure is efficacious for symptom relief in the short and medium term for a substantial proportion of patients. There are no major safety concerns. Therefore this procedure may be used provided that normal arrangements are in place for clinical governance and audit. |
| | 1.2 During the consent process patients should be informed, in particular, that symptom relief may not be achieved in some women, that symptoms may return and that further procedures may therefore be required. Patients contemplating pregnancy should be informed that the effects of the procedure on fertility and on pregnancy are uncertain. |
| | 1.3 Patient selection should be carried out by a multidisciplinary team, including a gynaecologist and an interventional radiologist. |
| | 1.4 NICE encourages further research into the effects of UAE compared with other procedures to treat fibroids, particularly for women wishing to maintain or improve their fertility. |
| | Laparoscopic techniques for hysterectomy. NICE interventional procedures guidance 239 (2007) 1.1 Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of laparoscopic techniques for hysterectomy (including laparoscopically-assisted vaginal hysterectomy [LAVH], laparoscopic hysterectomy [LH], laparoscopic supracervical hysterectomy [LSH] and total laparoscopic hysterectomy [TLH]) appears adequate to support their use, provided that normal arrangements are in place for consent, audit and clinical governance. 1.2 Clinicians should advise women that there is a higher risk of urinary tract injury and of severe bleeding |
| | associated with these procedures, in comparison with open surgery. |

| 1.3 Advanced laparoscopic skills are required for these procedures, and clinicians should undergo special training and mentorship. The Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists has developed an Advanced Training Skills Module, 'Benign Gynaecological Surgery: Laparoscopy' (www.rcog.org.uk/index.asp?PageID=1951). This would need to be supplemented by further training in order to achieve the skills required for total laparoscopic hysterectomy. |
|---|
| |
| Magnetic resonance (MR) image-guided percutaneous laser ablation of uterine fibroids. NICE interventional procedures guidance 30 (2003) 1.1 Evidence on safety and efficacy outcomes of MR image-guided percutaneous laser ablation of uterine fibroids is insufficient to support its use without special arrangements for consent and for audit or research. Clinicians wishing to undertake MR image-guided percutaneous laser ablation should inform the clinical governance leads in their Trusts. They should ensure that women offered the procedure understand the uncertainty about its safety and efficacy and should provide them with clear written information. Use of the Institute's Information for the Public is recommended. Clinicians should ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place for audit or research. Publication of safety and efficacy outcomes will be useful in reducing the current uncertainty. NICE is not undertaking further investigation at present. |
| Laparoscopic laser myomectomy. NICE interventional procedures guidance 23 (2003) 1.1 Current evidence on the safety and efficacy of laparoscopic laser myomectomy does not appear adequate to support the use of this procedure without special arrangements for consent and for audit or research. Clinicians wishing to undertake laparoscopic laser myomectomy should inform the clinical governance leads in their Trusts. They should ensure that patients offered it understand the uncertainty about the procedure's safety and efficacy and should provide them with clear written information. Use of the Institute's Information for the Public is recommended. Clinicians should ensure that appropriate arrangements are in place for audit or research. Publication of safety and efficacy outcomes will be useful in reducing the current uncertainty. NICE is not undertaking further investigation at present. 1.2 Clinicians undertaking this procedure should undergo |
| |

| | training as recommended by the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists Working Party on Training in Endoscopic Surgery (www.rcog.org.uk). |
|---------------------|--|
| Clinical guidelines | Heavy menstrual bleeding. NICE clinical guideline 44 (2007). For women with large fibroids and HMB, and other significant symptoms such as dysmenorrhoea or pressure symptoms, referral for consideration of surgery or uterine artery embolisation (UAE) as first-line treatment can be recommended. UAE, myomectomy or hysterectomy should be considered in cases of HMB where large fibroids (greater than 3 cm in diameter) are present and bleeding is having a severe impact on a woman's quality of life. When surgery for fibroid-related HMB is felt necessary then UAE, myomectomy and hysterectomy must all be considered, discussed and documented. Women should be informed that UAE or myomectomy will potentially allow them to retain their fertility. UAE is recommended for women with HMB associated with uterine fibroids and who want to retain their uterus and/or avoid surgery. Prior to scheduling of UAE or myomectomy, the uterus and fibroid(s) should be assessed by ultrasound. If further information about fibroid position, size, number and vascularity is required, MRI should be considered. If a woman is being treated with gonadotrophin-releasing hormone analogue and UAE is then planned, the gonadotrophin-releasing hormone analogue should be stopped as soon as UAE has been scheduled. |

Appendix C: Literature search for magnetic resonance image-guided transcutaneous focused ultrasound for uterine fibroids

| Databases | Date searched | Version/files | No. retrieved |
|---|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews – CDSR (Cochrane Library) | 25/10/2010 | October, 2010 | 6 |
| Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects – DARE (CRD website) | 25/10/2010 | NA | 6 |
| HTA database (CRD website) | 25/10/2010 | NA | 3 |
| Cochrane Central Database of Controlled Trials – CENTRAL (Cochrane Library) | 25/10/2010 | October, 2010 | 11 |
| MEDLINE (Ovid) | 25/10/2010 | 1950 to October Week 2 2010 | 284 |
| MEDLINE In-Process (Ovid) | 25/10/2010 | October 22, 2010 | 6 |
| EMBASE (Ovid) | 25/10/2010 | 1980 to 2010 Week 42 | 522 |
| CINAHL (NLH Search 2.0 or EBSCOhost) | 25/10/2010 | NA | 65 |
| BLIC (Dialog DataStar) | 25/10/2010 | NA | 0 |

Trial sources searched on 25/10/2010

- Current Controlled Trials metaRegister of Controlled Trials mRCT
- Clinicaltrials.gov
- National Institute for Health Research Clinical Research Network Coordinating Centre (NIHR CRN CC) Portfolio Database

Websites searched on 25/10/2010

- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE)
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA) MAUDE database
- French Health Authority (FHA)
- Australian Safety and Efficacy Register of New Interventional Procedures Surgical (ASERNIP – S)
- Australia and New Zealand Horizon Scanning Network (ANZHSN)
- Conference search
- General internet search

The following search strategy was used to identify papers in MEDLINE. A similar strategy was used to identify papers in other databases.

| 1 exp Magnetic Resonance Imaging/ 2 mri.tw. 3 (therm* adj3 map*).tw. 4 (magnet* adj3 resonanc*).tw. 5 (MR adj3 (guid* or imag*)).tw. 6 or/1-5 7 Ultrasonics/ 8 Ultrasonic Therapy/ 9 High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ 10 sonicat*.tw. 11 (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. 12 Ultrasonography/ 13 ultrasonograph*.tw. 14 soundwave*.tw. 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] <tr< th=""><th>4</th><th></th></tr<> | 4 | |
|--|--------|--|
| 3 (therm* adj3 map*).tw. 4 (magnet* adj3 resonanc*).tw. 5 (MR adj3 (guid* or imag*)).tw. 6 or/1-5 7 Ultrasonics/ 8 Ultrasonic Therapy/ 9 High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ 10 sonicat*.tw. 11 (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. 12 Ultrasonography/ 13 ultrasonograph*.tw. 14 soundwave*.tw. 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumour* or maligna | 1 | exp Magnetic Resonance Imaging/ |
| 4 (magnet* adj3 resonanc*).tw. 5 (MR adj3 (guid* or imag*)).tw. 6 or/1-5 7 Ultrasonics/ 8 Ultrasonic Therapy/ 9 High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ 10 sonicat*.tw. 11 (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. 12 Ultrasonography/ 13 ultrasonograph*.tw. 14 soundwave*.tw. 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intranural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumour* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 | | |
| 5 (MR adj3 (guid* or imag*)).tw. 6 or/1-5 7 Ultrasonics/ 8 Ultrasonic Therapy/ 9 High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ 10 sonicat*.tw. 11 (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. 12 Ultrasonography/ 13 ultrasonograph*.tw. 14 soundwave*.tw. 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 | | |
| 6 or/1-5 7 Ultrasonics/ 8 Ultrasonic Therapy/ 9 High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ 10 sonicat*.tw. 11 (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. 12 Ultrasonography/ 13 ultrasonograph*.tw. 14 soundwave*.tw. 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ </td <td></td> <td></td> | | |
| 7 Ultrasonics/ 8 Ultrasonic Therapy/ 9 High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ 10 sonicat*.tw. 11 (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. 12 Ultrasonography/ 13 ultrasonograph*.tw. 14 soundwave*.tw. 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 5 | (MR adj3 (guid* or imag*)).tw. |
| 8 Ultrasonic Therapy/ 9 High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ 10 sonicat*.tw. 11 (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. 12 Ultrasonography/ 13 ultrasonograph*.tw. 14 soundwave*.tw. 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 6 | or/1-5 |
| High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ sonicat*.tw. (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. Ultrasonography/ ultrasonograph/.tw. soundwave*.tw. (sound adj3 wave*).tw. sound-wave*.tw. (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. exablat*.tw. (hifu* or fus*).tw. (ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. or/7-20 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ Myoma/ (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. or/22-27 6 and 21 and 28 animals/ not humans/ | 7 | Ultrasonics/ |
| 10sonicat*.tw.11(ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw.12Ultrasonography/13ultrasonograph*.tw.14soundwave*.tw.15(sound adj3 wave*).tw.16sound-wave*.tw.17(focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw.18exablat*.tw.19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 8 | Ultrasonic Therapy/ |
| 11(ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw.12Ultrasonography/13ultrasonograph*.tw.14soundwave*.tw.15(sound adj3 wave*).tw.16sound-wave*.tw.17(focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw.18exablat*.tw.19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 9 | High-Intensity Focused Ultrasound Ablation/ |
| 12Ultrasonography/13ultrasonograph*.tw.14soundwave*.tw.15(sound adj3 wave*).tw.16sound-wave*.tw.17(focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw.18exablat*.tw.19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 10 | sonicat*.tw. |
| 13ultrasonograph*.tw.14soundwave*.tw.15(sound adj3 wave*).tw.16sound-wave*.tw.17(focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw.18exablat*.tw.19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 11 | (ultras* adj3 (therap* or surger*)).tw. |
| 14soundwave*.tw.15(sound adj3 wave*).tw.16sound-wave*.tw.17(focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw.18exablat*.tw.19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 12 | Ultrasonography/ |
| 15 (sound adj3 wave*).tw. 16 sound-wave*.tw. 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 13 | ultrasonograph*.tw. |
| 16sound-wave*.tw.17(focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw.18exablat*.tw.19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 14 | soundwave*.tw. |
| 17 (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. 18 exablat*.tw. 19 (hifu* or fus*).tw. 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 15 | (sound adj3 wave*).tw. |
| 18exablat*.tw.19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 16 | sound-wave*.tw. |
| 19(hifu* or fus*).tw.20((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw.21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 17 | (focus* adj3 ultraso*).tw. |
| 20 ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. 21 or/7-20 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 18 | exablat*.tw. |
| 21or/7-2022leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/23Myoma/24(leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 19 | (hifu* or fus*).tw. |
| 22 leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 20 | ((ultraso* or tissue* or non?invasiv*) adj3 ablat*).tw. |
| 23 Myoma/ 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 21 | or/7-20 |
| 24 (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or fibromyoma*).tw. 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 22 | leiomyoma/ or leiomyomatosis/ |
| fibromyoma*).tw.25((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw.26Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography]27(uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 23 | Myoma/ |
| 25 ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 24 | (leiomyoma* or leiomyomat* or leiomyomatosis* or myoma* or |
| 26 Uterine Neoplasms/us [Ultrasonography] 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | fibron | nyoma*).tw. |
| 27 (uter* adj3 (neoplasm* or cancer* or carcinoma* or adenocarcinom* or tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw. 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | 25 | ((uter* or subseros* or intramural* or submucosal*) adj3 fibroid*).tw. |
| tumour* or tumor* or malignan*)).tw.28or/22-27296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | 26 | |
| 28 or/22-27 29 6 and 21 and 28 30 animals/ not humans/ | | |
| 296 and 21 and 2830animals/ not humans/ | | |
| 30 animals/ not humans/ | 28 | |
| | 29 | 6 and 21 and 28 |
| 31 29 not 30 | 30 | animals/ not humans/ |
| | 31 | 29 not 30 |