

v řezu z cytobloku. Imunocytochemické vyšetření materiálu z cytobloku s adekvátní buněčností má stejnou výpovědní hodnotu jako imunohis-

tochemické vyšetření nádorové tkáně. Tím rozšiřuje možnosti neinvazivního vyšetření pacientů s uroteliálními nádory.

LITERATURA

1. Ondič O, Slunéčko R, Švadler M ml. Postavenie a význam cytologie moča v diagnostike uroteliálních nádorov. *Cesk Patol* 2014; 50(4): 142–145.
2. Yafi FA, Brimo F, Steinberg J, et al. Prospective analysis of sensitivity and specificity of urinary cytology and other urinary biomarkers for bladder cancer. *Urol Oncol* 2015; 33(2): 66.e25–31.
3. Yafi FA, Brimo F, Auger M, et al. Is the performance of urinary cytology as high as reported historically? A contemporary analysis in the detection and surveillance of bladder cancer. *Urol Oncol* 2013; 32: e1–6.
4. Rosenthal DL, Wojcik EM, Kurtycz DFI. The Paris system for reporting urinary cytology. Switzerland Springer; 2016.
5. Luthra UK, Dey P, George J. Comparison of ThinPrep and conventional preparations: urine cytology evaluation. *Diagn Cytopathol* 1999; 21: 364–366.
6. Nassar H, Ali-Fehmi R, Madan S. Use of ThinPrep monolayer technique and cytospin preparation in urine cytology: a comparative analysis. *Diagn Cytopathol* 2003; 28: 115–118.
7. Piaton E, Faynel J, Hutin K, Ranchin MC, Cottier M. Conventional liquid-based techniques versus Cytoc Thinprep processing of urinary samples: a qualitative approach. *BMC Clin Pathol* 2005; 5: 9.
8. Böhm M, Schostak M, Hakenberg OW. Urinary immunocytology – promise or nonseller? A review with an opinion. *Urol Oncol* 2014; 32(4): 383–390.
9. Brisuda A, Háček J, Čechová M, Škapa P, Babjuk M. Clinical and cytopathological factors affecting the cellularity of urinary cell blocks and the implication for the diagnosis and follow-up of the urinary bladder urothelial carcinoma. *Cytopathology* 2018; 6. doi: 10.1111/cyt.12580.
10. Courtade-Saïdi M, Aziza J, d'Aure D, et al. Immunocytochemical staining for p53 and Ki-67 helps to characterise urothelial cells in urine cytology. *Cytopathology* 2016; 27(6): 456–464.
11. Kelly JD, Dudderidge TJ, Wollenschlaeger A, et al. Bladder cancer diagnosis and identification of clinically significant disease by combined urinary detection of Mcm5 and nuclear matrix protein 22. *PLoS One* 2012; 7(7): e40305.
12. Saeb-Parsy K, Wilson A, Scarpini C, et al. Diagnosis of bladder cancer by immunocytochemical detection of minichromosome maintenance protein-2 in cells retrieved from urine. *Br J Cancer* 2012; 107(8): 1384–1391.
13. Burger M, Denzinger S, Hartmann A, et al. Mcm2 predicts recurrence hazard in stage Ta/T1 bladder cancer more accurately than CK20, Ki67 and histological grade. *Br J Cancer* 2007; 96(11): 1711–1715.
14. Hainaut P, Hernandez T, Robinson A, et al. IARC database of p53 gene mutations in human tumors and cell lines: Updated compilation, revised formats, and new visualization tools. *Nucleic Acids Res* 1998; 26: 205–213.
15. Moch H, Humphrey PA, Ulbright TM, Reuter VE. WHO classification of tumours of the urinary system and male genital organs. Lyon: IARC; 2016.
16. Bastacky S, Ibrahim S, Wilczynski SP, Murphy WM. The accuracy of urinary cytology in daily practice. *Cancer* 1999; 87(3): 118–128.
17. Saqi A. The state of cell blocks and ancillary testing: past, present and future. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2016; 140(12): 1318–1322.
18. Barkan GA. Enough is enough: adequacy of voided urine cytology. *Cancer Cytopathol* 2016; 124(3): 163–166.