



Interpretive Diagnostic Error Reduction Guideline Update

References Included in the Evidence Table

1. Abro S, Nomani L, Wojcik EM, Pambuccian SE, Chatt G, Barkan GA. Outcome analysis and negative predictive value of the "unsatisfactory/nondiagnostic" category of The Paris System for Reporting Urinary Cytology. *J Am Soc Cytopathol*. 2021;10(1):64-70. doi:10.1016/j.jasc.2020.09.014.
2. Adhya AK, Kar M, Mohanty R. Touch Imprint Cytology: A Rapid and Accurate Method for Diagnosis of Oral Cancer. *Acta Cytol*. 2019;63(5):411-416. doi:10.1159/000500006.
3. Agrawal M, Uppin MS, Uppin SG, Challa S, Agrawal S, Dharmrakshak AK. Thymoma diagnosis and categorization in the current scenario: Morphological analysis based on interobserver variability. *Ann Thorac Med*. 2020;15(2):90-94. doi:10.4103/atm.ATM_350_19.
4. Agrawal N, Kothari K, Tummidi S, Sood P, Agnihotri M, Shah V. Fine-Needle Aspiration Biopsy Cytopathology of Breast Lesions Using the International Academy of Cytology Yokohama System and Rapid On-Site Evaluation: A Single-Institute Experience. *Acta Cytol*. 2021;65(6):463-477. doi:10.1159/000518375.
5. Ahmad Z, Idrees R, Uddin N, Ahmed A, Fatima S. Errors in Surgical Pathology Reports: a Study from a Major Center in Pakistan. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2016;17(4):1869-74. doi:10.7314/apjcp.2016.17.4.1869.
6. Al-Adnani M, Marnerides A, George S, Nasir A, Weber MA. "Delayed Villous Maturation" in Placental Reporting: Concordance among Consultant Pediatric Pathologists at a Single Specialist Center. *Pediatr Dev Pathol*. 2015;18(5):375-9. doi:10.2350/12-02-1604-OA.1.
7. Amin A, Carr N. Diagnostic concordance in cases of appendiceal mucinous neoplasia referred to a tertiary referral centre. *J Clin Pathol*. 2019;72(9):639-641. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2019-205945.
8. Azara CZ, Manrique EJ, Tavares SB, Alves de Souza NL, Magalhaes JC, Amaral RG. Reproducibility of cervical cytopathology following an intervention by an external quality control laboratory. *Diagn Cytopathol*. 2016;44(4):305-10. doi:10.1002/dc.23445.
9. Bailey GE, Graham A, Kahler J, Williamson B, Adams C, Maleki Z, Rodriguez EF. The Value of Second-Opinion Consultation in Nongynecologic Cytopathology. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2022;157(5):724-730. doi:10.1093/ajcp/qaqab182.
10. Balasubramanian P, Chandrashekar L, Thappa DM, Jaisankar TJ, Malathi M, Ganesh RN, Singh N. A retrospective audit of skin biopsies done in a tertiary care center in India. *Int J of Dermatol*. 2015;54(8):939-43. doi:10.1111/ijd.12718.
11. Banet N, Levinson KL, VandenBussche CJ. Concordance of Expert Consultation Diagnoses in the Review of Pelvic Washing Specimens. *Acta Cytol*. 2015;59(6):452-6. doi:10.1159/000443715.
12. Bellevicine C, Migliatico I, Vigliar E, Serra N, Troncone G. Intra-institutional second opinion diagnosis can reduce unnecessary surgery for indeterminate thyroid FNA: A preliminary report on 34 cases. *Cytopathology*. 2017;28(4):254-258. doi:10.1111/cyt.12431.
13. Bhojrul B, Brent G, Elliott F et al. Pathological review of primary cutaneous malignant melanoma by a specialist skin cancer multidisciplinary team improves patient care in the UK. *J Clin Pathol*. 2019;72(7):482-486. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2019-205767.

14. Boennelycke M, Peters EEM, Leon-Castillo A et al. Prognostic impact of histological review of high-grade endometrial carcinomas in a large Danish cohort. *Virchows Arch.* 2021;479(3):507-514. doi:10.1007/s00428-021-03133-2.
15. Bulten W, Balkenhol M, Belinga JA et al. Artificial intelligence assistance significantly improves Gleason grading of prostate biopsies by pathologists. *Mod Pathol.* 2021;34(3):660-671. doi:10.1038/s41379-020-0640-y.
16. Choi KY, Amit M, Tam S et al. Clinical Implication of Diagnostic and Histopathologic Discrepancies in Sinonasal Malignancies. *Laryngoscope.* 2021;131(5):E1468-E1475. doi:10.1002/lary.29102.
17. Cocks M, Gru AA. Quality assurance in dermatopathology: A review of report amendments. *J Cutan Pathol.* 2021;48(1):34-40. doi:10.1111/cup.13827.
18. Confortini M, Di Stefano C, Biggeri A et al. Daily peer review of abnormal cervical smears in the assessment of individual practice as an additional method of internal quality control. *Cytopathology.* 2016;27(1):35-42. doi:10.1111/cyt.12195.
19. Crescenzi A, Trimboli P, Basolo F et al. Exploring the Inter-observer Agreement Among the Members of the Italian Consensus for the Classification and Reporting of Thyroid Cytology. *Endocr Pathol.* 2020;31(3):301-306. doi:10.1007/s12022-020-09636-z.
20. Dessauvagie BF, Lee AHS, Meehan K et al. Interobserver variation in the diagnosis of fibroepithelial lesions of the breast: a multicentre audit by digital pathology. *J Clin Pathol.* 2018;71(8):672-679. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2017-204977.
21. de Moraes LSF, Magalhaes JC, Braga IDS, Marega LA, Tavares S, Amaral RG. Performance of Laboratories after 10 Years of Participating in External Quality Monitoring in Cervical Cytology. *Acta Cytol.* 2020;64(3):224-231. doi:10.1159/000502433.
22. El Sharouni MA, Laeijendecker AE, Suijkerbuijk KP et al. High discordance rate in assessing sentinel node positivity in cutaneous melanoma: Expert review may reduce unjustified adjuvant treatment. *Eur J Cancer.* 2021;149:105-113. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2021.03.001.
23. Elmore JG, Barnhill RL, Elder DE et al. Pathologists' diagnosis of invasive melanoma and melanocytic proliferations: observer accuracy and reproducibility study. *BMJ.* 2017;357:j2813. doi:10.1136/bmj.j2813.
24. Elmore JG, Longton GM, Carney PA et al. Diagnostic concordance among pathologists interpreting breast biopsy specimens. *JAMA.* 2015;313(11):1122-32. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.1405.
25. Endo C, Nakashima R, Taguchi A et al. Inter-rater agreement of sputum cytology for lung cancer screening in Japan. *Diagn Cytopathol.* 2015;43(7):545-50. doi:10.1002/dc.23253.
26. Galli G, Trama A, Abate-Daga L, Brambilla M, Garassino MC, Fabbri A. Accuracy of pathologic diagnosis for thymic epithelial tumors: a brief report from an Italian reference Center. *Lung Cancer.* 2020;146:66-69. doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2020.05.007.
27. Gavrielides MA, Miller M, Hagemann IS et al. Clinical Decision Support for Ovarian Carcinoma Subtype Classification: A Pilot Observer Study With Pathology Trainees. *Arch Pathol Lab Med.* 2020;144(7):869-877. doi:10.5858/arpa.2019-0390-OA.
28. Gerhard R, Boemer SL. Evaluation of indeterminate thyroid cytology by second-opinion diagnosis or repeat fine-needle aspiration: which is the best approach? *Acta Cytol.* 2015;59(1):43-50. doi:10.1159/000369332.
29. Giunchi F, Jordahl K, Bollito E et al. Interpathologist concordance in the histological diagnosis of focal prostatic atrophy lesions, acute and chronic prostatitis, PIN, and prostate cancer. *Virchows Arch.* 2017;470(6):711-715. doi:10.1007/s00428-017-2123-1.
30. Gordetsky J, Collingwood R, Lai WS, Del Carmen Rodriguez Pena M, Rais-Bahrami S. Second Opinion Expert Pathology Review in Bladder Cancer: Implications for Patient Care. *Int J Surg Pathol.* 2018;26(1):12-17. doi:10.1177/1066896917730903.
31. Govind D, Jen KY, Matsukuma K et al. Improving the accuracy of gastrointestinal neuroendocrine tumor grading with deep learning. *Sci Rep.* 2020;10(1):11064. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-67880-z.

32. Goyal A, Abdul-Karim FW, Yang B, Patel JB, Brainard JA. Interobserver agreement in the cytologic grading of atypia in neoplastic pancreatic mucinous cysts with the 2-tiered approach. *Cancer Cytopathol.* 2016;124(12):909-916. doi:10.1002/cncy.21767.
33. Grevenkamp F, Kommoss F, Kommoss F et al. Second Opinion Expert Pathology in Endometrial Cancer: Potential Clinical Implications. *Int J Gynecol Cancer.* 2017;27(2):289-296. doi:10.1097/IGC.0000000000000870.
34. Groen R, Abe K, Yoon HS et al. Application of microscope-based scanning software (Panoptiq) for the interpretation of cervicovaginal cytology specimens. *Cancer Cytopathol.* 2017;125(12):918-925. doi:10.1002/cncy.21921.
35. Gru AA, Kim J, Pulitzer M et al. The Use of Central Pathology Review With Digital Slide Scanning in Advanced-stage Mycosis Fungoides and Sezary Syndrome: A Multi-institutional and International Pathology Study. *Am J Surg Pathol.* 2018;42(6):726-734. doi:10.1097/PAS.0000000000001041.
36. Hekler A, Utikal JS, Enk AH et al. Pathologist-level classification of histopathological melanoma images with deep neural networks. *Eur J Cancer.* 2019;115:79-83. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2019.04.021.
37. Hekler A, Utikal JS, Enk AH et al. Deep learning outperformed 11 pathologists in the classification of histopathological melanoma images. *Eur J Cancer.* 2019;118:91-96. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2019.06.012.
38. Henna N, Fakhar SA, Akhter N, Afzal MM, Khan KAA, Rashid T, Aziz F. Relationship of cytological with histopathological examination of palpable thyroid nodule. *Pakistan J Med and Health Sci.* 2017;11(4):1395-1398.
39. Hernandez-Prera JC, Machado RA, Asa SL et al. Pathologic Reporting of Tall-Cell Variant of Papillary Thyroid Cancer: Have We Reached a Consensus? *Thyroid.* 2017;27(12):1498-1504. doi:10.1089/thy.2017.0280.
40. Hescot S, Sheikh-Alard H, Kordahi M et al. Impact of expert review of histological diagnosis of papillary and follicular thyroid cancer. *Endocrine.* 2021;72(3):791-797. doi:10.1007/s12020-020-02531-x.
41. Hohnen H, Dessauvagie B, Hardie M, McCallum D, Oehmen R, Latham B. Diagnostic concordance among pathologists interpreting breast core biopsies on secondary review over a 1-year period at an Australian tertiary hospital. *Breast J.* 2021;27(8):664-670. doi:10.1111/tbj.14267.
42. Jimeno M, Domingo A, Salas I et al. Pathologist Experience and Concordance in the Diagnosis of Dysplasia in Long-standing Inflammatory Bowel Disease. *Am J Surg Pathol.* 2020;44(7):955-961. doi:10.1097/PAS.0000000000001475.
43. Johnson SM, Samulski TD, O'Connor SM, Smith SV, Funkhouser WK, Broaddus RR, Calhoun BC. Clinical and Financial Implications of Second-Opinion Surgical Pathology Review. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 2021;156(4):559-568. doi:10.1093/ajcp/aqaa263.
44. Kang HJ, Kwon SY, Kim A et al. A multicenter study of interobserver variability in pathologic diagnosis of papillary breast lesions on core needle biopsy with WHO classification. *J Pathol Transl Med.* 2021;55(6):380-387. doi:10.4132/jptm.2021.07.29.
45. Khazai L, Middleton LP, Goktepe N, Liu BT, Sahin AA. Breast pathology second review identifies clinically significant discrepancies in over 10% of patients. *J Surg Oncol.* 2015;111(2):192-7. doi:10.1002/jso.23788.
46. Kuijpers CC, Burger G, Al-Janabi S, Willems SM, van Diest PJ, Jiwa M. Improved quality of patient care through routine second review of histopathology specimens prior to multidisciplinary meetings. *J Clin Pathol.* 2016;69(10):866-71. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2015-203488.
47. Kuijpers CC, Visser M, Sie-Go DM, de Leeuw H, de Rooij MJ, van Diest PJ, Jiwa M. Improved cytodiagnosics and quality of patient care through double reading of selected cases by an expert cytopathologist. *Virchows Arch.* 2015;466(6):617-24. doi:10.1007/s00428-015-1738-3.

48. Layfield LJ, Frazier SR. Quality assurance of anatomic pathology diagnoses: Comparison of alternate approaches. *Pathol Res Pract*. 2017;213(2):126-129. doi:10.1016/j.prp.2016.11.007.
49. Layfield LJ, Hammer RD, Frazier SR et al. Impact of Consensus Conference Review on Diagnostic Disagreements in the Evaluation of Cervical Biopsy Specimens. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2017;147(5):473-476. doi:10.1093/ajcp/aqx024.
50. Layfield LJ, Pearson L, Walker BS, White SK, Schmidt RL. Diagnostic Accuracy of Fine-Needle Aspiration Cytology for Discrimination of Squamous Cell Carcinoma from Adenocarcinoma in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Acta Cytol*. 2018;62(5-6):318-326. doi:10.1159/000493942.
51. Layfield LJ, Schmidt RL, Chadwick BE, Esebua M, Witt BL. Interobserver reproducibility and agreement with original diagnosis in the categories "atypical" and "suspicious for malignancy" for bile and pancreatic duct brushings. *Diagn Cytopathol*. 2015;43(10):797-801. doi:10.1002/dc.23305.
52. Liu YJ, Rogers J, Liu YZ et al. Interobserver agreement in pathologic evaluation of bile duct biopsies. *Hum Pathol*. 2021;107:29-38. doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2020.10.003.
53. Lobo C, Costa J, Petronilho S, Monteiro P, Leca L, Schmitt F. Cytohistological correlation in serous effusions using the newly proposed International System for Reporting Serous Fluid Cytopathology: Experience of an oncological center. *Diagn Cytopathol*. 2021;49(5):596-605. doi:10.1002/dc.24440.
54. Lohman ME, Grekin RC, North JP, Neuhaus IM. Impact of second-opinion dermatopathology reviews on surgical management of malignant neoplasms. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2021;84(5):1385-1392. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2020.12.022.
55. Lucas M, Jansen I, Savci-Heijink CD et al. Deep learning for automatic Gleason pattern classification for grade group determination of prostate biopsies. *Virchows Arch*. 2019;475(1):77-83. doi:10.1007/s00428-019-02577-x.
56. Magalhaes JC, Azara CZS, Tavares S, Manrique EJC, Amaral RG. Impact of Implementing 100% Rapid Review as a Quality Control Tool in Cervical Cytology. *Acta Cytol*. 2018;62(2):115-120. doi:10.1159/000487426.
57. Makela K, Hodgson U, Piilonen A et al. Analysis of the Histologic Features Associated With Interobserver Variation in Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2018;42(5):672-678. doi:10.1097/PAS.0000000000001031.
58. Marshall C, Mounzer R, Hall M et al. Suboptimal Agreement Among Cytopathologists in Diagnosis of Malignancy Based on Endoscopic Ultrasound Needle Aspirates of Solid Pancreatic Lesions: A Validation Study. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2018;16(7):1114-1122 e2. doi:10.1016/j.cgh.2017.09.013.
59. Mastracci L, Piol N, Molinaro L et al. Interobserver reproducibility in pathologist interpretation of columnar-lined esophagus. *Virchows Arch*. 2016;468(2):159-67. doi:10.1007/s00428-015-1878-5.
60. Matheus WE, Ferreira U, Brandao EA, Ferruccio AA, Billis A. The importance of histopathologic review of biopsies in patients with prostate cancer referred to a tertiary uro-oncology center. *Int Braz J Urol*. 2019;45(1):32-37. doi:10.1590/S1677-5538.IBJU.2018.0099.
61. Matsuda A, Kawabata H, Tohyama K et al. Interobserver concordance of assessments of dysplasia and blast counts for the diagnosis of patients with cytopenia: From the Japanese central review study. *Leuk Res*. 2018;74:137-143. doi:10.1016/j.leukres.2018.06.003.
62. Mazariegos GV, Shneider BL, Shemesh E et al. Approaches to Research Determination of Late Acute Cellular Rejection in Pediatric Liver Transplant Recipients. *Liver Transpl*. 2021;27(1):106-115. doi:10.1002/lt.25903.
63. McHugh K, Bird P, Sturgis C. Concordance of breast fine needle aspiration biopsy interpretation with subsequent surgical pathology: An 18-year 9 month retrospective review from a single sub-saharan African institution. *Mod Pathol*. 2019;32(3). doi:10.1111/cyt.12696.

64. Middleton LP, Mayo TL, Spinks TE et al. The value of secondary pathology review. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016;34(7). doi:10.1200/jco.201634.7_suppl.7
65. Mullin MH, Brierley DJ, Speight PM. Second opinion reporting in head and neck pathology: the pattern of referrals and impact on final diagnosis. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol*. 2015;119(6):656-60. doi:10.1016/j.oooo.2014.12.020.
66. Orlando L, Viale G, Bria E et al. Discordance in pathology report after central pathology review: Implications for breast cancer adjuvant treatment. *Breast*. 2016;30:151-155. doi:10.1016/j.breast.2016.09.015.
67. Packer MDC, Ravinsky E, Azordegan N. Patterns of Error in Interpretive Pathology. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2022;157(5):767-773. doi:10.1093/ajcp/aqab190.
68. Patrawala S, Maley A, Greskovich C, Stuart L, Parker D, Swerlick R, Stoff B. Discordance of histopathologic parameters in cutaneous melanoma: Clinical implications. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2016;74(1):75-80. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2015.09.008.
69. Peck M, Moffat D, Latham B, Badrick T. Review of diagnostic error in anatomical pathology and the role and value of second opinions in error prevention. *J Clin Pathol*. 2018;71(11):995-1000. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2018-205226.
70. Piepkorn MW, Longton GM, Reisch LM et al. Assessment of Second-Opinion Strategies for Diagnoses of Cutaneous Melanocytic Lesions. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(10):e1912597. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.12597.
71. R SA, B NP, Hegde U, K U, G S, G K, Sil S. Inter- and Intra-Observer Variability in Diagnosis of Oral Dysplasia. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*. 2017;18(12):3251-3254. doi:10.22034/APJCP.2017.18.12.3251.
72. Raju K, Sunanda SM, Rajanna VS. Cytology-histology correlation of gynecologic and non-gynecologic samples at a tertiary health care center: A two-year study. *Biomed Res and Ther*. 2019;6(4):3096-3106. doi:10.15419/bmrat.v6i4.534.
73. Rakha EA, Ahmed MA, Aleskandarany MA, Hodi Z, Lee AH, Pinder SE, Ellis IO. Diagnostic concordance of breast pathologists: lessons from the National Health Service Breast Screening Programme Pathology External Quality Assurance Scheme. *Histopathology*. 2017;70(4):632-642. doi:10.1111/his.13117.
74. Ronchi A, Pagliuca F, Zito Marino F et al. Second Diagnostic Opinion by Experienced Dermatopathologists in the Setting of a Referral Regional Melanoma Unit Significantly Improves the Clinical Management of Patients With Cutaneous Melanoma. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2020;7:568946. doi:10.3389/fmed.2020.568946.
75. Schollenberg EL, Sapp HL, Huang WY. Inaccurate and incomplete diagnoses of malignant polyps as a cause of pathologic tumor stage T0 colectomy. *Ann Diagn Pathol*. 2015;19(1):16-9. doi:10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2014.11.003.
76. Soofi Y, Khoury T. Inter-Institutional Pathology Consultation: The Importance of Breast Pathology Subspecialization in a Setting of Tertiary Cancer Center. *Breast J*. 2015;21(4):337-44. doi:10.1111/tbj.12420.
77. Stewart CJR, Stewart LM, Holman CDJ, Jordan S, Semmens J, Spilsbury K, Threlfall T. Value of Pathology Review in a Population-based Series of Ovarian Tumors. *Int J Gynecol Pathol*. 2017;36(4):377-385. doi:10.1097/PGP.0000000000000342.
78. Strosberg C, Gibbs J, Braswell D, Leslie RR, Messina J, Centeno BA, Coppola D. Second Opinion Reviews for Cancer Diagnoses in Anatomic Pathology: A Comprehensive Cancer Center's Experience. *Anticancer Res*. 2018;38(5):2989-2994. doi:10.21873/anticancer.12551.
79. Szecsei CM, Oxley JD. Errors in prostate core biopsy diagnosis in an era of specialisation and double reporting. *J Clin Pathol*. 2021;74(5):327-330. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2020-206726.
80. Tosteson ANA, Tapp S, Titus LJ et al. Association of Second-Opinion Strategies in the Histopathologic Diagnosis of Cutaneous Melanocytic Lesions With Diagnostic Accuracy and Population-Level Costs. *JAMA Dermatol*. 2021;157(9):1102-1106. doi:10.1001/jamadermatol.2021.1779.

81. Tosteson ANA, Yang Q, Nelson HD et al. Second opinion strategies in breast pathology: a decision analysis addressing over-treatment, under-treatment, and care costs. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* 2018;167(1):195-203. doi:10.1007/s10549-017-4432-0.
82. Van Der Wel M, Coleman HG, Bergman J, Jansen M, Meijer SL. Histopathologic features predictive of diagnostic concordance at expert level amongst a large international sample of pathologists diagnosing Barrett's dysplasia. *Gastroenterology.* 2019;156(6):S-282. doi:10.1016/S0016-5085(19)37522-5.
83. van der Wel MJ, Coleman HG, Bergman J, Jansen M, Meijer SL, group Bw. Histopathologist features predictive of diagnostic concordance at expert level among a large international sample of pathologists diagnosing Barrett's dysplasia using digital pathology. *Gut.* 2020;69(5):811-822. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2019-318985.
84. van der Wel MJ, Klaver E, Pouw RE et al. Significant variation in histopathological assessment of endoscopic resections for Barrett's neoplasia suggests need for consensus reporting: propositions for improvement. *Dis Esophagus.* 2021;34(12):24. doi:10.1093/dote/doab034.
85. van Santvoort BWH, van Leenders G, Kiemeny LA et al. Histopathological re-evaluations of biopsies in prostate cancer: a nationwide observational study. *Scand J Urol.* 2020;54(6):463-469. doi:10.1080/21681805.2020.1806354.
86. van Seijen M, Jozwiak K, Pinder SE et al. Variability in grading of ductal carcinoma in situ among an international group of pathologists. *J Pathol Clin Res.* 2021;7(3):233-242. doi:10.1002/cjp.2.201.
87. VandenBussche CJ, Adams C, Ali SZ, Olson MT. Cytotechnologist Performance for Screening Hurthle Cell Atypia in Indeterminate Thyroid Fine-Needle Aspirates. *Acta Cytol.* 2015;59(5):377-83. doi:10.1159/000441939.
88. Vats K, Spafford M, Groot G, Graham P, Banerjee T, Deobald R, Osmond A. Moving towards the optimization of diagnosis for patients with sarcoma: A 10-year review of externally consulted sarcoma cases in a general anatomical pathology service. *Ann Diagn Pathol.* 2022;60:151958. doi:10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2022.151958.
89. Vennalaganti P, Kanakadandi V, Goldblum JR et al. Discordance Among Pathologists in the United States and Europe in Diagnosis of Low-Grade Dysplasia for Patients With Barrett's Esophagus. *Gastroenterology.* 2017;152(3):564-570 e4. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2016.10.041.
90. Villa I, Mathieu MC, Bosq J et al. Daily Biopsy Diagnosis in Surgical Pathology: Concordance Between Light Microscopy and Whole-Slide Imaging in Real-Life Conditions. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 2018;149(4):344-351. doi:10.1093/ajcp/aqx161.
91. Villanacci V, Lorenzi L, Donato F et al. Histopathological evaluation of duodenal biopsy in the PreventCD project. An observational interobserver agreement study. *APMIS.* 2018;126(3):208-214. doi:10.1111/apm.12812.
92. Witt BL, Cohen MB, Chadwick BE, Stephenson PD, Abasolo P, Schmidt RL. Cytomorphology is often insufficient to categorize non-small-cell lung carcinoma on FNA specimens. *Diagn Cytopathol.* 2016;44(2):73-9. doi:10.1002/dc.23387.
93. Yoshida H, Kikuchi A, Tsuda H et al. Discrepancies in pathological diagnosis of endometrial stromal sarcoma: a multi-institutional retrospective study from the Japanese clinical oncology group. *Hum Pathol.* 2022;124:24-35. doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2022.03.007.
94. Yue SYP, Lucas SB, Brown M, Chiodini PL, Walker SL, Mahadeva U. Utility of an infectious and tropical disease histopathology diagnostic review service. *J Clin Pathol.* 2020;73(12):836-839. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2020-206546.

Disclaimer

The information, data, and draft recommendations provided by the College of American Pathologists are presented for informational and public feedback purposes only.

The draft recommendations and supporting documents will be removed on November 20, 2024.

The draft recommendations along with the public comments received and completed evidence review will be reassessed by the expert panel in order to formulate the final recommendations.

These draft materials should not be stored, adapted, or redistributed in any manner.

Please note: comments are not posted automatically. All comments will be posted on a weekly basis beginning October 30, 2024.