




## Research Article

# Prevalence of abnormal pap smears in the western region of Saudi Arabia from 2010 to 2022

Abdulbasit A. Andijany, MSc<sup>1</sup>, Daliah A. Abdulhafeez, MBBS<sup>1</sup>, Rehab B. Fadag, MD<sup>1</sup>, Abdullah M. Al Harbi, MBBS<sup>1</sup> ,  
Rasha A. Alsahafi, MLQAM<sup>1</sup>, Elham S. Bin Abbas, MBBS, SB-AP<sup>1</sup>, Walaa A. Felemban, MBBS<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Pathology, King Fahd Armed Forces Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.



### \*Corresponding author:

Abdulbasit A. Andijany,  
Department of Pathology, King  
Fahd Armed Forces Hospital,  
Jeddah, Saudi Arabia.

[andijany@hotmail.com](mailto:andijany@hotmail.com)

Received: 21 February 2023

Accepted: 26 September 2023

Published: 23 November 2023

### DOI

[10.25259/Cytojournal\\_17\\_2023](https://doi.org/10.25259/Cytojournal_17_2023)

### Quick Response Code:



## ABSTRACT

**Objectives:** The objectives of the study were to assess the prevalence of abnormal Pap smears and their quality metrics in a tertiary health-care facility in the western region of Saudi Arabia and to share our data with other researchers in Saudi Arabia to potentially establish benchmark data based on a Saudi population.

**Material and Methods:** A retrospective study was carried out by the Department of Pathology at King Fahd Armed Forces Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, on Pap smear statistics for 14,376 Pap smears of both conventional and liquid-based cytology (LBC) between 2010 and 2022.

**Results:** The prevalence of abnormal Pap smears of both conventional and LBC was 3.05% (438 Pap smears). The percentages of adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma were 0.08% and 0.02%, respectively, and the ratio of atypical squamous cells (ASCs) to squamous intraepithelial lesions (SILs) (ASC/SIL) was 2.61.

**Conclusion:** The prevalence of abnormal Pap smears and the ASC/SIL ratio were consistent with the international benchmark data provided by the College of American Pathologists for each preparation type and within the range of the data provided by published studies, highlighting the need for greater focus on glandular abnormalities.

**Keywords:** Prevalence, Pap smears, Saudi Arabia, Gynecology, Cytopathology

## INTRODUCTION

Cervical cancer (CC) is one of the three most common cancers that affect women globally. The two most common subtypes are squamous cell carcinoma (SQCCA), constituting most of the cases, and adenocarcinoma (ADCA). Fortunately, in Saudi Arabia, which follows strict conservative religious restrictions regarding sexual behaviors, CC has a very low incidence, with 358 diagnosed cases and 179 deaths annually.<sup>[1,2]</sup> When diagnosed at an early stage, CC is curable by various methods,<sup>[3]</sup> and Pap smear screening is considered a valuable tool, along with human papillomavirus (HPV) cotesting, in detecting precancerous and cancerous lesions and reducing the CC incidence rate and mortality.<sup>[4]</sup>

In cytology, the method of communicating Pap smear interpretations to clinicians is very important for patient follow-up and management plans, and the best method is using The Bethesda System for Reporting Cervical Cytology (TBSRCC).<sup>[5]</sup> The TBSRCC was last updated in 2014, and it categorizes the results into the following categories: (i) Negative for intraepithelial lesion or malignancy;

(ii) other, for endometrial cells of >45-year-old women (with specification of whether it is negative for squamous intraepithelial lesion [SIL]); (iii) epithelial cell abnormality (ECA); and (iv) other malignant neoplasm. ECA is further classified into the following categories: Atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance (ASC-US), atypical squamous cells that cannot exclude HSIL (ASC-H), low-grade SIL (LSIL), high-grade SIL (HSIL), SQCCA, atypical glandular cells (AGCs), and adenocarcinoma *in situ* (AIS) and ADCA.<sup>[6,7]</sup>

There are numerous metrics for quality assurance in cytology laboratories that are required by certification and/or accreditation bodies. One method is to compare the percentages of each Pap smear category with benchmark data and provide an explanation of any outlier and calculate the ASC to SIL (ASC/SIL) ratio.<sup>[8,9]</sup> In this paper, we will share our data from a tertiary health-care facility in the western region of Saudi Arabia with other researchers in this field to potentially establish benchmark data based on a Saudi population.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Pap smear data at King Fahd Armed Forces Hospital, Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, were collected from the laboratory information system for the period between 2010 and 2022. All Pap smears were reported by pathologists. Even after a cytotechnologist joined the facility in May 2019, 100% of Pap smears were rescreened and reported by pathologists. Using an Excel sheet, we distributed the data according to the designated year and then to its designated category. The total number

and prevalence of abnormal Pap smears were ASCUS or higher were calculated. The ASC/SIL ratio was calculated as follows:  $ASC/SIL \text{ ratio} = (ASC-US + ASC-H)/(LSIL + HSIL + ADCA + SQCCA)$ . The prevalence of abnormal Pap smears and the ASC/SIL ratio were compared to the College of American Pathologists (CAP) benchmark data and published studies in Saudi Arabia.

## RESULTS

Out of 14376 of pap smears, 11241 were conventional while 3135 were as LBC between 2019 – 2022 only [Table 1]. The ASC/SIL ratio and the prevalence of abnormal pap smears in our study were compared to published studies in Saudi Arabia covering the same period [Table 2].

## DISCUSSION

Our institute shifted to liquid-based cytology (LBC) in late 2019, as it was proven to reduce the rate of unsatisfactory results.<sup>[10-12]</sup> However, our unsatisfactory rate remained high due to the intermittent supply of re-preparation reagents. The scope of the high unsatisfactory rate and cytologic-histologic correlations will be the focus of our next published studies. LBC also allows for the molecular testing of HPV from the same vial, as long as approximately 2 mL of sample is sent for molecular biology first (to avoid contamination), and then routine LBC preparation is carried out.<sup>[13,14]</sup> For laboratories accredited by CAP, the cytopathology checklist provides benchmarking data for

**Table 1:** Numbers and percentages of abnormal Pap smears from 2010–2022.

Category		Conv. + LBC 2010–2022		Conv. only 2010–2022		LBC only 2019–2022	
		n	%	n	%	n	%
Total Pap smears		14376	-	11241	-	3135	-
Abnormal Pap smears	Unsatisfactory	1040	7.23	793	7.05	247	7.88
	ASCUS	207	1.44	64	0.57	143	4.56
	AGC	124	0.86	93	0.83	31	0.99
	LSIL	38	0.26	21	0.19	17	0.54
	ASC-H	20	0.14	12	0.11	8	0.26
	HSIL	35	0.24	13	0.12	22	0.70
	ADCA	11	0.08	8	0.07	3	0.10
	SQCCA	3	0.02	3	0.03	0	0.00
TOTAL APS		438	3.05	214	1.90	224	7.15
ASC/SIL RATIO (AGC EXCLUDED)		2.61		1.69		3.60	

Conv.: Conventional method, LBC: Liquid-based cytology, ASCUS: Atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance, AGC: Atypical glandular cell, LSIL: Low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion, ASC-H: Atypical squamous cells that cannot exclude HSIL, HSIL: High-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion, ADCA: Adenocarcinoma, SQCCA: Squamous cell carcinoma, APS: Abnormal Pap smear

**Table 2:** Comparison of the number of Pap smears, prevalence of abnormal Pap smears, and ASC/SIL ratio between our study and published articles.

Published study	Years covered	Number of Pap smears	Prevalence of abnormal Pap smears	ASC/SIL ratio
Mufti and Altaf, 2014	2000–2012	15805	14.52%	2.57
Al-Kadri <i>et al.</i> , 2015	2008–2011	19650	4.28%	2.26
Nasser <i>et al.</i> , 2017	2006–2016	19759	1.97%	2.19
Our study (this paper)	2010–2022 including LBC	14376	3.05%	2.61

ASC/SIL: Atypical squamous cell/squamous intraepithelial lesion, LBC: Liquid-based cytology

the acceptable reporting-percentile rate (RPR) for each category and ASC/SIL ratio for each preparation type.<sup>[9]</sup> Our data, percentages and ASC/SIL ratios, as shown in [Table 1], were within the 5–95<sup>th</sup> RPR; due to copyright, we cannot share the CAP's RPR in our study. Remarkably, in our study, LBC detected more abnormalities than the conventional method, except for SQCCA, which was not detected by LBC. The rate of adenocarcinomas was higher than that of SQCCAs (0.08% and 0.02%, respectively). This finding concurs with the findings of Al-Kadri *et al.*, 2015 and Nasser *et al.*, 2017, where  $n = 19,650$  and  $19,759$ , respectively, highlighting the need for greater focus on glandular abnormalities.<sup>[15,16]</sup> As shown in [Table 2], the prevalence of abnormal Pap smears in our study was 3.05% (conventional and LBC methods); in Saudi Arabia, the prevalence rate was 14.52% in a single study due to a high rate of ASCUS, which was within the range according to their ASC/SIL ratio.<sup>[17]</sup> For detailed statistical data, see Appendix 1 and 2.

## SUMMARY

The prevalence of abnormal pap smears and the ASC/SIL ratio was within the ranges of the CAP benchmark data and published studies, highlighting the need for greater focus on glandular abnormalities.

## COMPETING INTEREST STATEMENT BY ALL AUTHORS

The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

## AUTHORSHIP STATEMENT BY ALL AUTHORS

All authors follow the 4 criteria in ICMJE guidelines. All authors (AA, DA, RF, AA, RA, EBA and WF) contributed equally in the design of the research study, performed the research, provided help in the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the statistical data, drafting, revising and approval of the manuscript. All authors contributed to editorial changes in the manuscript. All authors have

participated sufficiently in the work and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

## AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

All data points generated or analyzed during this study are included in this article and there are no further underlying data necessary to reproduce the results.

## ETHICS STATEMENT BY ALL AUTHORS

The Research Ethics Committee of King Fahd Armed Forces Hospital-Jeddah reviewed and approved this study (REC560).

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS (In alphabetic order)

ADCA - Adenocarcinoma  
 AGC - Atypical glandular cell  
 AIS - Adenocarcinoma in situ  
 APS - Abnormal Pap smear.  
 ASC/SIL - Atypical squamous cell/squamous intraepithelial lesion  
 ASC-H - Atypical squamous cells that cannot exclude HSIL  
 ASCUS - Atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance  
 CAP - College of American Pathologists  
 CC - Cervical cancer  
 Conv - Conventional method  
 ECA - Epithelial cell abnormality  
 HPV - Human papillomavirus  
 HSIL - High-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion  
 LBC - Liquid-based cytology  
 LIS - Laboratory information system  
 LSIL - Low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion  
 NILM - Negative for intraepithelial lesion or malignancy  
 SQCCA - Squamous cell carcinoma  
 TBSRCC - The Bethesda system for reporting cervical cytology

## EDITORIAL/PEER REVIEW STATEMENT

To ensure the integrity and highest quality of CytoJournal publications, the review process of this manuscript was

conducted under a **double-blind model** (authors are blinded for reviewers and *vice versa*) through the automatic online system.

## REFERENCES

1. Alsbeih G. HPV Infection in cervical and other cancers in Saudi Arabia: Implication for prevention and vaccination. *Front Oncol* 2014;4:65.
2. Bruni L, Albero G, Serrano B, Mena M, Collado JJ, Gómez D, *et al.* Human papillomavirus and related diseases report in Saudi Arabia. ICO/IARC Information centre on HPV and CANCER (HPV Information Centre); 2021. Available from: <https://hpvcentre.net/statistics/reports/SAU.pdf?t=1676197987058> [Last accessed on 2022 Jan 05].
3. van de Vooren K, Curto A, Garattini L. Curing cervical cancer or preventing it: A case of opportunity cost in the long run? *Vaccine* 2014;32:6867-9.
4. Saslow D, Solomon D, Lawson HW, Killackey M, Kulasingam SL, Cain J, *et al.* American Cancer Society, American Society for Colposcopy and Cervical Pathology, and American Society for Clinical Pathology screening guidelines for the prevention and early detection of cervical cancer. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2012;62:147-72.
5. Nayar R, Wilbur DC. The Bethesda system for reporting cervical cytology: A historical perspective. *Acta Cytol* 2017;61:359-72.
6. Nayar R, Wilbur DC. The Pap Test and Bethesda 2014. "The reports of my demise have been greatly exaggerated." (after a quotation from Mark Twain). *Acta Cytol* 2015;59:121-32.
7. Wilbur DC, Nayar R. Bethesda 2014: Improving on a paradigm shift. *Cytopathology* 2015;26:339-42.
8. Davey DD, Austin RM, Birdsong G, Zaleski S. The impact of the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 on cytopathology practice: A 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary review. *J Am Soc Cytopathol* 2014;3:188-98.
9. College of American Pathologists. Cytopathology checklist. CAP accreditation program, cytopathology checklist 2022. United States: College of American Pathologists; 2022.
10. Sigurdsson K. Is a liquid-based cytology more sensitive than a conventional Pap smear? *Cytopathology* 2013;24:254-63.
11. Haghghi F, Ghanbarzadeh N, Ataee M, Sharifzadeh G, Mojarrad JS, Najafi-Semnani F. A comparison of liquid-based cytology with conventional Papanicolaou smears in cervical dysplasia diagnosis. *Adv Biomed Res* 2016;5:162.
12. Pankaj S, Nazneen S, Kumari S, Kumari A, Kumari A, Kumari J,

*et al.* Comparison of conventional Pap smear and liquid-based cytology: A study of cervical cancer screening at a tertiary care center in Bihar. *Indian J Cancer* 2018;55:80-3.

13. Barbieri D, Venturoli S, Costa S, Landini MP. Improving laboratory efficiency by automation of preanalytic processing of thinprep specimens for real-time PCR high-risk HPV testing. *J Lab Autom* 2016;21:432-8.
14. Barodawala SM, Chadha K, Kavishwar V, Murthy A, Shetye S. Cervical cancer screening by molecular Pap-transformation of gynecologic cytology. *Diagn Cytopathol* 2019;47:374-81.
15. Al-Kadri HM, Kamal M, Bamuhair SS, Omair AA, Bamefleh HS. Prevalence and characteristics of abnormal Papanicolaou smear in Central Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Med J* 2015;36:117-22.
16. Nasser H, AlAyyaf M, Atallah A, Aminulislam M, Rizwan L, Aodah A, *et al.* Eleven-year review of data on Pap smears in Saudi Arabia: We need more focus on glandular abnormalities! *Ann Saudi Med* 2017;37:265-71.
17. Mufti ST, Altaf FJ. Changing pattern of epithelial cell abnormalities using revised Bethesda system. *Iran J Basic Med Sci* 2014;17:779-84.

**How to cite this article:** Andijany AA, Abdulhafeez DA, Fadag RB, Al Harbi AM, Alshahfi RA, Bin Abbas ES, *et al.* Prevalence of abnormal pap smears in the western region of Saudi Arabia from 2010 to 2022. *CytoJournal*. 2023;20:44. doi: 10.25259/Cytojournal\_17\_2023.

HTML of this article is available FREE at:

[https://dx.doi.org/10.25259/Cytojournal\\_17\\_2023](https://dx.doi.org/10.25259/Cytojournal_17_2023)

The **FIRST Open Access** cytopathology journal

Publish in *CytoJournal* and **RETAIN** your *copyright* for your intellectual property

**Become Cytopathology Foundation Member** to get all the benefits

Annual membership fee is nominal US \$ 50 (US \$ 1000 for life)

**In case of economic hardship it is free**

For details visit <https://cytojournal.com/cf-member>

PubMed indexed

**FREE** world wide open access

**Online processing** with rapid turnaround time.

**Real time** dissemination of time-sensitive technology.

Publishes as many **colored high-resolution images**

Read it, cite it, bookmark it, use RSS feed, & many----



**CYTOJOURNAL**

[www.cytojournal.com](http://www.cytojournal.com)

Peer-reviewed academic cytopathology journal



APPENDIX

**Appendix 1:** Statistical data for Pap smears from 2010 to 2018.

Categories	2010 CONV	%	2011 CONV	%	2012 CONV	%	2013 CONV	%	2014 CONV	%	2015 CONV	%	2016 CONV	%	2017 CONV	%	2018 CONV	%
NILM	1095	95.47	1224	93.65	968	92.19	1022	94.45	909	91.27	858	87.91	990	88.24	1061	92.02	1119	90.02
UNSAT	44	3.84	73	5.59	70	6.67	54	4.99	68	6.83	101	10.35	102	9.09	65	5.64	101	8.13
ASCUS	1	0.09	4	0.31	4	0.38	0	0.00	4	0.40	4	0.41	10	0.89	11	0.95	5	0.40
AGC	1	0.09	1	0.08	6	0.57	4	0.37	6	0.60	6	0.61	15	1.34	10	0.87	18	1.45
LSIL	3	0.26	3	0.23	1	0.10	2	0.18	1	0.10	2	0.20	1	0.09	2	0.17	0	0.00
ASC-H	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.30	2	0.20	3	0.27	0	0.00	0	0.00
HSIL	1	0.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.30	1	0.10	1	0.09	3	0.26	0	0.00
ADCA	1	0.09	2	0.15	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.10	2	0.20	0	0.00	1	0.09	0	0.00
SQCCA	1	0.09	0	0.00	1	0.10	0	0.00	1	0.10	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
TOTAL	1147	100	1307	100	1050	100	1082	100	996	100	976	100	1122	100	1153	100	1243	100

CONV: Conventional method, ASCUS: Atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance, AGC: Atypical glandular cell, LSIL: Low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion, ASC-H: Atypical squamous cells that cannot exclude HSIL, HSIL: High-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion, ADCA: Adenocarcinoma, SQCCA: Squamous cell carcinoma

**Appendix 2:** Statistical data for Pap smears from 2019 to 2022.

Categories	2019 CONV	%	2019 LBC	2019 LBC	%	2020 CONV	2020 LBC	2020 LBC	2020 LBC	%	2021 CONV	2021 LBC	2021 LBC	2021 LBC	2021 LBC	2021 LBC	2022 CONV	2022 LBC	2022 LBC	2022 LBC	%
NILM	940	86.56	154	13	88.51	27	79.41	410	82.00	9	60.00	730	86.39	12	40.00	1370	12	1370	84.78		
UNSAT	87	8.01	13	5	7.47	4	11.76	36	7.20	6	40.00	61	7.22	18	60.00	137	18	137	8.48		
ASCUS	19	1.75	5	2.87	2	5.88	27	5.40	27	5.40	0	0.00	37	4.38	0	0.00	0	74	4.58		
AGC	25	2.30	2	1.15	1	2.94	14	2.80	14	2.80	0	0.00	2	0.24	0	0.00	0	13	0.80		
LSIL	6	0.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.60	3	0.60	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	14	0.87		
ASC-H	4	0.37	0	0.00	0	0.00	4	0.80	4	0.80	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	4	0.25		
HSIL	4	0.37	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	1.00	5	1.00	0	0.00	15	1.78	0	0.00	0	2	0.12		
ADCA	1	0.09	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.20	1	0.20	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	2	0.12		
SQCCA	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0	0.0+0		
TOTAL	1086	100	174	100	100	34	100	500	100	100	15	845	100	30	100	1616	30	1616	100		

CONV: Conventional method, ASCUS: Atypical squamous cells of undetermined significance, AGC: Atypical glandular cell, LSIL: Low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion, ASC-H: Atypical squamous cells that cannot exclude HSIL, HSIL: High-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion, ADCA: Adenocarcinoma, SQCCA: Squamous cell carcinoma



# NextGen CelBloking™ Kits

**Frustrated with your cell blocks?  
We have a better solution!**

**Nano**

## Nano NextGen CelBloking™

Cell block kit to process single scattered cell specimens and tissue fragments of **any** cellularity.



**PATENT PENDING**



**Pack #1**



**Pack #2**

**Micro**

## Micro NextGen CelBloking™

For cellular specimens (more than 1 ml concentrated specimen with Tissuecrit more than 50%)



**PATENT PENDING**



**Pack #2**