After surgery, blood pressure came back to normal levels. The patient was translated to the Intensive Care Unit, five days later was discharged home without additional complications.

Placental mesenchymal dysplasia (PMD) is a rare placental stromal lesion, characterized by placentomegaly, cysts lesions, ectasia, tortuosity and thrombosis of chorionic plate and stem villous vessels [1]. Pathogenesis is not well elucidated, however, some theories have been proposed, including the mesoderm congenital malformation, molecular disruption of the imprinting genes of chromosome 11p15.5 associated with Beckwith-Wiedemann Syndrome (BWS) and androgenetic/biparental mosaicism [2]. The definitive diagnosis of PMD is made by histological examination, which shows mesenchymal hyperplasia, enlarged edematous stem-cell villi, dilated stem vessels with thickened vasculature and absence of trophoblastic proliferation of the placenta [3].

Ultrasound is the most effective diagnostic tool in prenatal monitoring. The multicystic placental lesion can be detected after the thirteenth week of pregnancy. The aneurysmal and varicose dilatation of the fetal chorionic vessels is another key sign that appears until the late second trimester [4].On the other hand, the ultrasonography can be useful to detect the structural anomalies associated with this pathology such as fetal skeletal dysplasia, fetal tumors (mostly hamartomas), Beckwith-Wiedemann syndrome, intrauterine growth restriction, and intrauterine fetal death [3].

The differentiation of PMD from molar pregnancy is crucial to prevent unneeded termination of pregnancy [4]. Heterogeneity and partially solid sonographic areas, finding by 2D ultrasonography, as well as high-velocity, and low impedance flow with low resistance, represent key findings to differentiate partial mole placenta [5].

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors certify that they have no involvement in any organization with any financial or non-financial interest, in the subject matter discussed in the manuscript.

References

[1] Faye-Petersen OM, Kapur RP. Placental mesenchymal dysplasia. Surg Pathol Clin 2013;6(1):127–51.
[2] Nayeri UA, West AB, Grossetta Nardini HK, Copel JA, Sfakianaki AK. Systematic review of sonographic findings of placental mesenchymal dysplasia and subsequent pregnancy outcome. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2013;41(4):366–74.
[3] Ohira S, Ookubo N, Tanaka K, Takatsu A, Kobara H, Kikuchi N, et al. Placental mesenchymal dysplasia: chronological observation of placental images during gestation and review of the literature. Gynecol Obstet Invest 2013;75(4):217–23.
[4] Guenot C, Kingdom J, De Rham M, Osterheld M, Keating S, Vial Y, et al. Placental mesenchymal dysplasia: an underdiagnosed placental pathology with various clinical outcomes. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2019;234:155–64.
[5] Vaisbuch E, Romero R, Kusanovic JP, Erez O, Mazaki-Tovi S, Gotsch F, et al. Three-dimensional sonography of placental mesenchymal dysplasia and its differential diagnosis. J Ultrasound Med 2009;28(3):359–68.

Roberto López Quintana
Hospital Integral de la Mujer del Estado de Sonora, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mexico

Carlos Armando Félix Báez
Hospital Integral de la Mujer del Estado de Sonora, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mexico

Francisco Alberto Leyva Moraga
Universidad de Sonora, Department of Medicine and Health Science, Hermosillo, Mexico

Eduardo Leyva Moraga*
Universidad de Sonora, Department of Medicine and Health Science, Mexico

José Heliodoro Gonzáles Zepeda
Hospital Integral de la Mujer del Estado de Sonora, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mexico

Fernando Leyva
Universidad de Sonora, Department of Medicine and Health Science, Hermosillo, Mexico

Rafael Enrique Anaya Manjarrez
Hospital Integral de la Mujer del Estado de Sonora, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mexico

* Corresponding author at: Universidad de Sonora, Av Luis Donaldo Colosio, Centro, 83000 Hermosillo, Son. Mexico.
E-mail address: leyvamoragaeduardo@gmail.com (E. Leyva Moraga).

Proposal for a new ICD-11 coding classification system for endometriosis

Dear Editor,

We report on work from our international taskforce established to improve the documentation of endometriosis in the upcoming 11th edition of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11). Our taskforce comprised representation from the World Endometriosis Society, World Endometriosis Research Foundation, European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology, American Society for Reproductive Medicine, Society for Endometriosis and Uterine Disorders, European Society for Gynaecological Endoscopy, and British Society for Gynaecological Endoscopy.

The goal of ICD is to leverage information collected through health care systems to better understand predictors of clinical outcomes, implement data-driven strategies to improve outcomes and cost-effectiveness, and evaluate the changing impact of these strategies as health care evolves. Although new methodologies have been developed, and computing power has grown exponentially, the fundamental ingredient required for these analyses is high quality data, of which ICD coding remains a key component. For women with endometriosis, systematic ICD coding is clearly crucial to advance clinical care: it is a condition that has a high prevalence and is associated with a considerable diagnostic delay, high societal/personal burden, and no known cure.

Our taskforce noted the urgent need for improvement in the mechanics/focus of the coding process and in the structure/content of the codes for endometriosis. Classification systems for endometriosis exist including the revised American Society for Reproductive Medicine (r-ASRM) classification [1] and the Enzian classification [2,3]. There is also one validated outcomes prediction tool – the Endometriosis Fertility Index [4]. At present, no one single classification system has fully encompassed anatomic distribution and disease phenotypes nor a staging system that predicts or directs clinical outcomes such as symptom management, response to therapy, lesion and symptom recurrence, association with other disorders, or quality of life.

The nature of ICD coding lends itself to anatomical classification but even within this scope there were significant limitations with the ICD-10 classification. First and foremost, endometriosis was coded within 'noninflammatory disorders of female genital tract',

which is entirely inconsistent with its current categorisation [5]. There was no clear distinction between superficial or deep disease, and there was an absence of further descriptors of location of peritoneal lesions such as the Pouch of Douglas, uterosacral ligaments, and the pelvic side wall. Peritoneal pockets were not included, nor disease affecting the bladder or ureters. Ovarian disease was not subclassified into endometrioma or superficial disease overlying the ovarian cortex, and there was no facility to reflect unilateral or bilateral disease. Furthermore, there was no specific classification for more unusual presentations, such as thoracic endometriosis and endometriosis lesions within the CNS, making estimates of prevalence challenging.

Following a consensus meeting held on 14 March 2018, we have worked closely together, following rigorous pre- and post-meeting processes, and have developed a proposal for a new ICD systematic classification of endometriosis (see Supplementary file). We believe that our proposal is both logical, inclusive of all phenotypes, and allows accurate description of anatomical distribution, within the confines of the ICD coding system. It includes specific classification of superficial and deep disease, and extended options for describing distribution. In addition, it offers structured classification of extra-abdominal lesions, particularly within the thorax, abdominal wall, central/peripheral nervous systems. ICD coding does not facilitate further description with respect to size of lesions or extent of adhesions, and so this system may have some limitations with regard to linking fertility outcomes with endometrioma size, nor can it be used to calculate Enzian or r-ASRM scores.

We submitted our proposal to WHO in June 2018 and believe that our proposed ICD classification system will facilitate the diagnostic process and lead to improved tailoring of treatments and more accurate epidemiological data.

Disclosure of interests

Lucy H.R. Whitaker has received travel funding from Ethicon. Lone Hummelshoj has served as a consultant for AbbVie. Stacey A. Missmer has received research support from the NIH, AbbVie and the Marriott Family Foundations, and has served as a consultant for AbbVie and Celmatix. Lucky Saraswat has received research support from the National Institute for Health Research and Chief Scientist Office for endometriosis research. Ertan Saridogan received honoraria from Olympus UK, Gedeon Richter and Hologic. Carla Tomassetti has received research support from FWO Flanders, Ferring and Merck, and has served as a consultant for Gedeon Richter and Nordic Pharma. Andrew W. Horne has received research support from the MRC, NIHR, CSO, Wellbeing of Women, Roche Diagnostics, Astra Zeneca and Ferring, and has served as a consultant for AbbVie, Roche Diagnostics, Ferring and Nordic Pharma. Dominic Byrne and Carla Tomassetti have no conflicts on interest.

Funding

AWH and LHRW are supported by an MRC Centre grant (MR/N022556/1).

Contribution to authorship

The project was coordinated by Lucy H.R. Whitaker. All other authors contributed equally to the project and the correspondence.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2019.08.015.

References

[1] Revised American Society for Reproductive Medicine classification of endometriosis: 1996. Fertil Steril 1997;67(5):817–21.
[2] Tuttlies F, Keckstein J, Ulrich U, Possover M, Schweppe KW, Wustlich M, et al. Tinneberg HR. ENZIAN-score, a classification of deep infiltrating endometriosis. Zentralbl Gynakol 2005;127(5):275–81.
[3] Haas D, Shebl O, Shamiyeh A, Oppelt P. The rASRM score and the Enzian classification for endometriosis: their strengths and weaknesses. Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand 2013;92(1):3–7.
[4] Adamson GD, Pasta DJ. Endometriosis fertility index: the new, validated endometriosis staging system. Fertil Steril 2010;94(5):1609–15.
[5] Johnson NP, Hummelshoj L. World Endometriosis Society Montpellier consortium. Consensus on current management of endometriosis. Hum Reprod 2013;28(6):1552–68.

Lucy H.R. Whitaker
Clinical Lecturer, UK

Dominic Byrne
Endopelvic Surgeon, UK

Lone Hummelshoj
Endometriosis Advocate, UK

Stacey A. Missmer
Scientist Academic, USA

Lucky Saraswat
Endopelvic Surgeon, UK

Ertan Saridogan
Endopelvic Surgeon, UK

Carla Tomassetti
Endopelvic Surgeon, Reproductive Endocrinologist, Belgium

Andrew W. Horne[*]
Clinical Academic, UK

[*] Corresponding author at: MRC Centre for Reproductive Health, University of Edinburgh, Queen's Medical Research Institute, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TJ, UK.
E-mail address: Andrew.horne@ed.ac.uk (A. Horne).

Received 17 July 2019

Unilateral superficial external pudendal artery (SEPA) propeller perforator flap (PPF) for vulvar reconstruction after cancer treatment

Dear Editor,

We found that this case of vulvar reconstruction after wide resection for gynecological cancer was of particular interest thanks to the use of the uncommonly described superficial external pudendal artery (SEPA) propeller perforator flap (PPF), and to its particularly good aesthetic and functional outcomes.

Vulvar reconstruction in this context is a real challenge because of difficult healing due to moderated skin laxity, contamination by perineal secretions, and frequent history of neoadjuvant radiotherapy. That's why surgeons have to use reliable techniques such