



## Protocol for the Examination of Resection Specimens From Pediatric Patients With Rhabdomyosarcoma

**Version:** 4.1.1.1

**Protocol Posting Date:** September 2022

The use of this protocol is recommended for clinical care purposes but is not required for accreditation purposes.

**This protocol should be used for the following procedures AND tumor types:**

Procedure	Description
Resection	Includes specimens designated marginal resection, wide local resection, radical resection, amputation, or other
Tumor Type	Description
Rhabdomyosarcoma	Includes pediatric patients with all rhabdomyosarcoma variants and ectomesenchymoma

**The following should NOT be reported using this protocol:**

Procedure
Biopsy (consider Rhabdomyosarcoma Biopsy protocol)
Tumor Type
Adult Rhabdomyosarcoma <sup>#</sup> (consider using soft tissue protocol)

<sup>#</sup>Rhabdomyosarcoma in adults may be treated differently than pediatric rhabdomyosarcoma and use of the AJCC TNM staging system remains appropriate for adult patients.

### Authors

Jessica L. Davis, MD\*; Michael A. Arnold, MD, PhD; Archana Shenoy, MD; Lea Surrey, MD; Aaron R. Weiss, DO; Erin R. Rudzinski, MD.

With guidance from the CAP Cancer and CAP Pathology Electronic Reporting Committees.

\* Denotes primary author.

### Accreditation Requirements

The use of this case summary is recommended for clinical care purposes but is not required for accreditation purposes. The core and conditional data elements are routinely reported. Non-core data elements are indicated with a plus sign (+) to allow for reporting information that may be of clinical value.

**Summary of Changes**

**v 4.1.1.1**

- The 'Expert Consultation' question was made optional
- Added Explanatory 'Note A' and associated with the 'Expert Consultation' question

**Reporting Template**

**Protocol Posting Date: September 2022**

**Select a single response unless otherwise indicated.**

**CASE SUMMARY: (RHABDOMYOSARCOMA AND RELATED NEOPLASMS: Resection)**

**EXPERT CONSULTATION**

**+Expert Consultation (Note [A](#))**

- Pending - Completion of this CAP Cancer Protocol is awaiting expert consultation
- Completed - This CAP Cancer Protocol or some elements have been performed following expert consultation
- Not applicable

**CLINICAL**

**Preoperative Treatment (select all that apply)**

- No known preoperative therapy
- Chemotherapy given
- Radiation therapy given
- Preoperative therapy given, type not specified
- Not specified

**SPECIMEN (Note [B](#))**

**Procedure (Note [C](#))**

- Marginal resection
- Wide local resection
- Radical resection
- Amputation (specify type): \_\_\_\_\_
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Not specified

**TUMOR**

**Tumor Site**

- Bile duct
- Bladder / prostate
- Cranial / parameningeal
- Extremity
- Genitourinary (excluding bladder / prostate)
- Head and neck (excluding parameningeal)
- Orbit
- Other(s) (includes trunk, retroperitoneum, etc.) (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Not specified

**Tumor Size**

\_\_\_ Greatest dimension in Centimeters (cm): \_\_\_\_\_ cm

**+Additional Dimension in Centimeters (cm):** \_\_\_ x \_\_\_ cm

\_\_\_ Cannot be determined (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

**Histologic Type (Note D)**

\_\_\_ Embryonal

\_\_\_ Alveolar

\_\_\_ Spindle cell / sclerosing

\_\_\_ Ectomesenchymoma

\_\_\_ Rhabdomyosarcoma, not otherwise specified (NOS): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**+Histologic Type Comment:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Anaplasia (Note E)**

\_\_\_ Not identified

\_\_\_ Focal (single or few scattered anaplastic cells)

\_\_\_ Diffuse (clusters or sheets of anaplastic cells)

\_\_\_ Cannot be determined: \_\_\_\_\_

**+Treatment Effect (Note F)**

\_\_\_ Not identified

\_\_\_ Present

**+Percentage of Treatment Effect**

\_\_\_ Specify percentage: \_\_\_\_\_ %

\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Cannot be determined: \_\_\_\_\_

**+Percentage of Therapy-Induced Cytodifferentiation**

\_\_\_ Specify percentage: \_\_\_\_\_ %

\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Cannot be determined: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Cannot be determined: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ Not applicable

**+Tumor Comment:** \_\_\_\_\_

**MARGINS**

**Margin Status (Note G)**

\_\_\_ All margins negative for tumor

**Distance from Tumor to Closest Margin**

*Specify in Centimeters (cm)*

\_\_\_ Exact distance: \_\_\_\_\_ cm

\_\_\_ Greater than: \_\_\_\_\_ cm

\_\_\_ At least: \_\_\_\_\_ cm

\_\_\_ Less than: \_\_\_\_\_ cm

\_\_\_ Less than 1 cm

\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined: \_\_\_\_\_

**Closest Margin(s) to Tumor**

\_\_\_ Specify closest margin(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined (explain): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Tumor present at margin

**Margin(s) Involved by Tumor**

\_\_\_ Specify involved margin(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined (explain): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined (explain): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Not applicable

**+Margin Comment:** \_\_\_\_\_

**REGIONAL LYMPH NODES**

**Regional Lymph Node Status**

\_\_\_ Not applicable (no regional lymph nodes submitted or found)  
\_\_\_ Regional lymph nodes present  
\_\_\_ All regional lymph nodes negative for tumor  
\_\_\_ Tumor present in regional lymph node(s)

**Number of Lymph Nodes with Tumor**

\_\_\_ Exact number (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ At least (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined (explain): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

**Number of Lymph Nodes Examined**

\_\_\_ Exact number (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ At least (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

**+Regional Lymph Node Comment:** \_\_\_\_\_

**DISTANT METASTASIS**

**Distant Site(s) Involved, if applicable**

\_\_\_ Not applicable  
\_\_\_ Specify site(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ Cannot be determined: \_\_\_\_\_

**PATHOLOGIC STAGE (Note [H](#))****The Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study Postsurgical Clinical Grouping System (Note [H](#))**

*Grouping is based on pretreatment tumor characteristics. Clinical information required to definitively assign stage group (e.g., gross residual disease or distant metastatic disease) may not be available to the pathologist. Alternatively, this checklist may not be applicable to some situations (e.g., group IIIA). If applicable, the appropriate stage group may be assigned by the pathologist.*

Not applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

Cannot be assessed (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

*Group I*

Group IA Localized tumor, confined to site of origin, completely resected

Group IB Localized tumor, infiltrating beyond site of origin, completely resected

*Group II*

Group IIA Localized tumor, gross total resection, but with microscopic residual disease

Group IIB Locally extensive tumor (spread to regional lymph nodes), completely resected

Group IIC Locally extensive tumor (spread to regional lymph nodes), gross total resection, but microscopic residual disease

*Group III*

Group IIIA Localized or locally extensive tumor, gross residual disease after biopsy only

Group IIIB Localized or locally extensive tumor, gross residual disease after major resection (greater than 50% debulking)

*Group IV*

Group IV Any size primary tumor, with or without regional lymph node involvement, with distant metastases, without respect to surgical approach to primary tumor.

**Modified Site, Size, Metastasis Staging for Rhabdomyosarcoma (for relevant stage) (Note [H](#))**

*Staging is based on pretreatment tumor characteristics. Clinical information required to definitively assign stage (e.g., nodal status or distant metastatic disease) may not be available to the pathologist.*

Not applicable: \_\_\_\_\_

Cannot be assessed (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

Stage I (requires all of the following to be true: Tumor involves favorable site (i.e., biliary tract / liver, orbit, head and neck [excluding parameningeal] or genitourinary site [excluding bladder / prostate]), and; Tumor metastatic to distant site not identified)

Stage II (requires all of the following to be true: Tumor involves unfavorable site (i.e., bladder / prostate, extremity, parameningeal or other site not mentioned in stage I), and; Tumor size less than or equal to 5 cm, and; Tumor involvement of lymph nodes not identified, and; Tumor metastatic to distant site not identified)

Stage III (requires that one of the following be true: Tumor involves unfavorable site, is less than or equal to 5 cm, and involves regional lymph nodes, but distant metastases are not identified, or; Tumor involves unfavorable site and is greater than 5 cm, with or without regional lymph node involvement, but distant metastases are not identified)

**Stage III Findings**

Tumor involves unfavorable site, is less than or equal to 5 cm, and involves regional lymph nodes, but distant metastases are not identified

Tumor involves unfavorable site and is greater than 5 cm, with or without regional lymph node involvement, but distant metastases are not identified

Stage IV (requires that distant metastases be present)

**ADDITIONAL FINDINGS**

**+Additional Findings (specify) (Note I):** \_\_\_\_\_

**SPECIAL STUDIES**

**Gene Fusion Studies (Note J)**

- Not performed
- Results pending
- No FOXO1 rearrangement
- FOXO1 rearrangement present
  - Fusion partner not known
  - FOXO1-PAX3 gene rearrangement
  - FOXO1-PAX7 gene rearrangement
  - Other (e.g., PAX3-NCOA1 or other variant translocation) (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**Method for Gene Fusion Studies**

- Not applicable (Gene Fusion Studies not performed)
- Conventional karyotyping
- Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH)
- Reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
- Sequencing (specify type, if known): \_\_\_\_\_
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Not known

**+Molecular Genetic Studies (Note K) (select all that apply)**

- Not performed
- Pending
- DICER1 mutation
- MyoD1 L122R point mutation
- VGLL2 / NCOA2 gene fusions (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- EWSR1 / FUS-TFCP2 gene fusion (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**+Method for Molecular Genetic Studies (select all that apply)**

- Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH)
- Reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)
- Sequencing (specify type, if known): \_\_\_\_\_
- Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**COMMENTS**

**Comment(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

## Explanatory Notes

---

### A. Expert Consultation

Expert consultation is not required. This question has been added to annotate, if so desired, that the case has been sent out for consultation and thus items of the CAP protocol could not be completed pending expert consultation. Completion of the CAP protocol will then be performed following consultation.

### B. Submission of Tissue

If feasible, a minimum of 100 mg of viable tumor should be snap-frozen for potential molecular studies.<sup>1</sup> If tissue is limited, the pathologist can keep the frozen tissue aliquot used for frozen section (usually done to determine sample adequacy and viability) in a frozen state (-80°C or lower), with the proviso that routine examination of this tissue may be required if the tissue is otherwise inadequate. Molecular studies to evaluate fusion status, FISH or RT-PCR, may be performed on paraffin sections or frozen tissue. When material is scant, FISH can also be performed on touch preparations made from fresh material obtained at the time of biopsy.

#### References

1. Qualman SJ, Morotti RA. Risk assignment in pediatric soft-tissue sarcoma: an evolving molecular classification. *Curr Oncol Rep.* 2002;4:123-130.

### C. Procedures

Core needle biopsies can obtain sufficient material for special studies and morphologic diagnosis, but sampling problems may limit tumor subtyping. Inadequate sampling with needle biopsies may be related to specimen size, necrosis, hemorrhage, crush artifact, and specimen adequacy.<sup>1</sup> Open incisional biopsy consistently provides a larger sample of tissue and maximizes the opportunity for a specific pathologic diagnosis.<sup>2</sup> Excisional biopsy may not include an adequate margin of normal tissue, even with an operative impression of total gross removal.<sup>2</sup> For all types of resections, marking (inking followed by use of a mordant) and orientation of the specimen (prior to cutting) are mandatory for accurate pathologic evaluation.<sup>2</sup>

#### References

1. Willman JH, White K, and Coffin CM. Pediatric core needle biopsy: strengths and limitations in evaluation of masses. *Pediatr Dev Pathol.* 2001;4(1):46-52.
2. Coffin CM, Dehner LP. Pathologic evaluation of pediatric soft tissue tumors. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 1998;109(suppl 1):S38-S52.

### D. Histologic Type

The International Classification of Rhabdomyosarcoma classified childhood rhabdomyosarcoma (RMS) into prognostically useful histologic categories.<sup>1</sup> However, studies show that *FOXO1* fusion status drives unfavorable outcome for children with rhabdomyosarcoma, and histologic classification is no longer the primary tool for determining prognosis and risk stratification.<sup>2,3</sup> That notwithstanding, a consistent and appropriate designation of histologic subtype remains important due to its universal applications. The 5th edition of *WHO Classification of Tumours of Soft Tissue and Bone* defines the histologic classification of rhabdomyosarcoma in 4 categories: embryonal (including botryoid), alveolar, spindle cell/sclerosing, and pleomorphic subtypes.<sup>4</sup> Pleomorphic RMS is exceedingly rare and not well characterized in the pediatric population; many of these cases can be considered RMS with diffuse anaplasia. In addition to these subtypes, recent studies have further characterized the clinicopathologic and molecular subtypes of



spindle cell rhabdomyosarcoma; however, to-date all biologic subtypes still fall within in the histologic category of spindle cell RMS in the WHO Classification.<sup>4</sup> This pattern, as well as ectomesenchymoma (RMS with ganglion cell or neuroblastic differentiation) and other histologic patterns are discussed in more detail below. Finally, RMS, not otherwise specified (NOS), is reserved for cases where there is insufficient material for confident histologic classification.

#### Embryonal Rhabdomyosarcoma

Embryonal RMS (ERMS) includes the typical, dense and botryoid patterns of RMS. These patterns account for over one-half of all RMS. Embryonal RMS is composed of mesenchymal cells that show variable degrees of cytoplasmic skeletal muscle differentiation. They are moderately cellular, but in the typical pattern often contain both hypo- and hypercellular areas with a loose, myxoid stroma. Either of these components may predominate, particularly in limited biopsies. Sampling of uniformly hypercellular regions produces a dense pattern of embryonal RMS that may resemble solid alveolar RMS. The typical immunohistochemical staining pattern of ERMS, with myogenin (*myf4*) staining most often seen in less than half of embryonal RMS nuclei, absent AP2 beta staining and strong diffuse expression of HMGA2 support this diagnosis.<sup>5</sup> Testing for *PAX-FOXO1* translocations may also assist in making this distinction.<sup>6</sup>

In embryonal RMS, tumor cells may be rounded, stellate, or spindle-shaped. Nuclei are generally small with a light chromatin pattern and inconspicuous nucleoli, although occasionally large central nucleoli may be seen. They typically have more irregular or spindled outlines than those of alveolar RMS. Many tumor cells contain generous amounts of eosinophilic cytoplasm, a feature of rhabdomyoblastic differentiation. Cells with elongated tails of cytoplasm (“tadpole cells”) and cells with cytoplasm in the shape of a ribbon or “strap” are helpful in the light-microscopic diagnosis. Cross-striations can be seen in less than one-half of the cases and are not a prerequisite for diagnosis. The dense pattern of embryonal RMS shows similar cytologic features, although rhabdomyoblastic differentiation is minimal.<sup>6</sup> Adjacent to an epithelial surface, embryonal RMS shows a botryoid pattern, particularly in the bladder, vagina, nasal cavity and sinuses, and biliary tract. These botryoid variants demonstrate a cambium layer (condensed layer of rhabdomyoblasts) underlying an intact epithelium. A subset of embryonal RMS are associated with either sporadic or germline *DICER1* mutations.<sup>7</sup> These *DICER1* mutated embryonal RMS are most commonly located in the uterine corpus or uterine cervix,<sup>7,8</sup> although they are also described less frequently in other locations including the ovary, fallopian tube, or intracranial sites.<sup>9,10</sup> Histologically, *DICER1* mutated embryonal RMS often contain heterologous elements to include nodules of cartilage, osteoid, or other non-rhabdomyomatous components; these tumors are often histologically similar to that seen in pleuropulmonary blastoma (PPB).<sup>7,8,9,10</sup> Rarely, embryonal RMS may be predominantly epithelioid (or rhabdoid-like).<sup>11</sup>

The differential diagnosis of embryonal RMS includes the sclerosing and spindle cell variants of RMS, as well as the solid pattern of alveolar RMS. Embryonal RMS is often quite heterogeneous, and small foci of a spindled or sclerosing pattern are commonly seen, particularly in primary resections of large paratesticular or retroperitoneal masses. A dominant (at least 80%) spindled or sclerosing pattern is required for diagnosis of this RMS subtype. Ectomesenchymoma (discussed below) typically has embryonal RMS along with a neuroblastic or ganglion cell component. Undifferentiated embryonal sarcoma of the liver has some morphologic and phenotypic overlap, but it generally does not express MYOD1 (*myf3*) or myogenin by immunohistochemistry and contains characteristic cytoplasmic hyaline globules. Embryonal RMS-like differentiation is a common component of the multipatterned pediatric lung tumor pleuropulmonary blastoma. Occasional Wilms tumors show marked skeletal muscle differentiation, particularly after chemotherapy, and may even have a cambium layer in tumors abutting the renal pelvis.

Well-differentiated embryonal RMS can also have some morphologic overlap with fetal rhabdomyoma. The finding of increased mitoses (>15 per 50 high-power fields), marked hypercellularity, a “cambium layer,” and atypical nuclear features are more characteristic of RMS. Giant cell tumors of tendon sheath may lack giant cells, contain cells with eosinophilic cytoplasm, and show desmin positivity; however, they are strongly CD68 positive and myogenin negative. Pseudosarcomatous fibroepithelial polyps of the lower female genital tract are particularly treacherous and should be considered in botryoid lesions occurring in adolescents and adults, particularly during pregnancy. These hypercellular lesions contain pleomorphic cells with a variable mitotic rate and frequently express desmin; however, they lack a cambium layer or striated cells and do not express myogenin.

#### Alveolar Rhabdomyosarcoma

Alveolar RMS is histologic pattern composed of malignant small rounded cells that are typically discohesive with a tendency to attach to and line up along thin fibrous septa. The tumor cells have some variation in size. Tumor cell nuclei are round and lymphocyte-like with coarse chromatin and one or more indistinct nucleoli. Tumor cells may show a thin rim of eosinophilic cytoplasm. Morphologic evidence of rhabdomyoblastic differentiation including strap cells or cells with cross-striations is often lacking, although multinucleate myoblasts may be seen. It is important to recognize the “solid variant,” in which the tumor cells grow in solid masses of closely aggregated cells. Classification as alveolar RMS is based on histologic features, as approximately 15 to 20% of all alveolar RMS will lack *FOXO1* fusion genes.

The differential diagnosis of alveolar RMS includes the panoply of malignant small round cell neoplasms, particularly Ewing sarcoma, poorly differentiated or undifferentiated neuroblastoma, desmoplastic small round cell tumor, poorly differentiated monophasic synovial sarcoma, and lymphoma. A panel of immunohistochemical stains including myogenin, desmin, MYOD1, cytokeratin, CD99, WT1, synaptophysin, chromogranin, and leukocyte common antigen (CD45) will distinguish alveolar RMS from these other entities, but unexpected staining with antigens such as cytokeratin may occur. In contrast to dense ERMS, ARMS shows strong diffuse staining with myogenin (typically >80%) and AP2beta, with weak to absent HMGA2. Molecular studies show *PAX3-* and *PAX7-FOXO1* fusion gene products occur in approximately 80-85% of alveolar RMS cases. Molecular testing is required for risk stratification in all alveolar RMS cases.

#### Spindle Cell/Sclerosing Rhabdomyosarcoma

In the 5th edition of *WHO Classification of Tumours of Soft Tissue and Bone*, spindle cell and sclerosing RMS are considered in the same diagnostic category.<sup>4</sup> Spindle cell / sclerosing RMS is uncommon, accounting for 3% to 10% of all cases of RMS. Spindle cell/sclerosing rhabdomyosarcoma includes three distinct genetic subtypes. First, in infants, spindle cell RMS is often associated with recurrent non-*FOXO1* gene fusions involving *VGLL2* or *NCOA2*; these are of unclear prognosis.<sup>12,13</sup> Initial studies demonstrated these tumors to have a favorable prognosis. However, a recent study showed a subset of tumors with a more aggressive biology including recurrence, metastasis and death from disease, to include late events.<sup>13</sup> This remains an evolving area with, to-date, an uncertain overall prognosis. Second, *MYOD1* mutated spindle cell/sclerosing RMS occurs more frequently in adolescents and adults.<sup>5</sup> These tumors are more common in the head and neck region (particularly parameningeal) and are associated with a poor prognosis, including a recurrence and metastasis rate of 40%-50%.<sup>14</sup> One study of patients with *MYOD1* mutated RMS showed 68% died of disease.<sup>15</sup> Third, recent series describe an intraosseous spindle cell RMS involving fusions of the *TFCP2* gene to either *EWSR1* or *FUS* genes, which also demonstrate immunoreactivity to keratins and ALK.<sup>16,17</sup> These tumors are also associated with a poor outcome, although there are few cases published to date.<sup>16,17</sup>

Of note, in children, a subset of spindle cell RMS located in the paratesticular region, do not have known recurrent genetic aberrations. Spindle cell RMS account for 26.7% of RMS in the paratesticular site, the remainder mostly being typical embryonal RMS; these spindle cell RMS may also represent a spindled variant of embryonal RMS.<sup>18,19</sup> The 5-year survival for patients with spindle cell RMS in the paratesticular location is excellent.<sup>18,19</sup>

Histologically, spindle cell / sclerosing RMS is somewhat variable. The spindle cell morphologic pattern is that of ovoid to fusiform spindle cells, arranged in fascicles or bundles, sometimes with a herringbone like growth pattern. Spindle cell RMS of infancy can have a more myoid appearance which can resemble a smooth muscle tumor. Some cases may contain rhabdomyoblastic differentiation; however, this tends to not be as pronounced as typically observed in embryonal RMS. Infantile spindle cell RMS and the spindled pattern of ERMS are exclusively spindled, without regions of sclerosis. In contrast, spindle or sclerosing patterns may be seen in *MYOD1* mutated tumors. Sclerosing RMS is characterized by a dense hyalinizing collagenous matrix with rounded or spindle-shaped tumor cells arranged in small nests, single-file rows, and pseudovascular, microalveolar profiles.<sup>12,14,20</sup> Spindle cell/sclerosing RMS may have only focal positivity for desmin and myogenin (myf4) but typically strongly expresses MYOD1 (myf3).

The primary differential diagnosis of spindle cell RMS includes embryonal RMS NOS, leiomyosarcoma, fibrosarcoma, undifferentiated spindle cell sarcoma, and the more bland entities, rhabdomyoma, leiomyoma, and nodular fasciitis. In general, smooth muscle neoplasms are uncommon in childhood and adolescence. The presence of specific skeletal muscle antigens (e.g. myoglobin, MYOD1, myogenin) and the ultrastructural presence of skeletal myofilaments or sarcomeric structures help in distinguishing spindle cell RMS from leiomyosarcoma, fibrosarcoma, and undifferentiated spindle cell sarcoma. The histologic differential for the sclerosing pattern RMS includes sclerosing epithelioid fibrosarcoma, infiltrating carcinoma, osteosarcoma, and angiosarcoma.

#### Ectomesenchymoma

Ectomesenchymoma is a rare malignant tumor that generally consists of an RMS component (embryonal greater than alveolar) and a ganglionic and/or neuroblastic component. The name originates from the belief that these tumors arise from pluripotent migrating neural crest cells or “ectomesenchyme.” They have a similar age, sex, and site distribution and outcome to embryonal RMS and are treated with RMS-based therapy. Ectomesenchymomas may be further subclassified based on the subtype of RMS seen.

#### Other

In very rare occasions, an alveolar RMS pattern can be seen in a tumor that would otherwise be classified as embryonal RMS. These mixed alveolar and embryonal tumors resemble “collision” tumors, with differential myogenin expression between alveolar and embryonal components.<sup>5</sup> These tumors may be fusion positive (most frequently *PAX7-FOXO1*) or fusion negative, although when tested separately each component shows the same genetic profile.

Posttreatment RMS may show extensive cytodifferentiation mimicking a highly differentiated embryonal RMS (see Note G).

#### RMS, Not Otherwise Specified

RMS, NOS, is reserved for cases in which a diagnosis of RMS can be made based on immunohistochemistry, but the case cannot be confidently further classified due to extensive necrosis, crush, or other aspect of the specimen that limits histologic interpretation.

### Immunohistochemistry

In cases where histological diagnosis of rhabdomyosarcoma is difficult, immunostaining with monoclonal antibodies against the intranuclear myogenic transcription factors MYOD1 and myogenin, and the cytoplasmic intermediate filament desmin is suggested. Nearly all RMS tumors are positive for desmin, myogenin (nuclear), and MyoD1 (nuclear).<sup>21,22</sup> On occasion, anti-myogenin reacts with other spindle cell neoplasms<sup>23</sup>, and rare RMS cases may be myogenin negative and desmin positive.<sup>24</sup> Of note, desmin expression is frequent in certain round cell tumors, such as blastemal Wilms tumor, tenosynovial giant cell tumor, and desmoplastic small round cell tumor. Myogenin is more specific but may occur in rare lesions such as melanotic neuroectodermal tumor of infancy, as well as, any lesion capable of skeletal myogenesis such as Wilms tumor, teratoma, pleuropulmonary blastoma, or malignant Triton tumor (malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor with rhabdomyoblastic differentiation). Caution should also be taken when interpreting myogenin reactivity in tumors that interface with normal skeletal muscle, as injured muscle fibers can express myogenin.

### References

1. Coffin CM. The new International Rhabdomyosarcoma Classification, its progenitors, and consideration beyond morphology. *Adv Anat Pathol*. 1997;4:1-16.
2. Missiaglia E, Williamson D, Chisholm J, et al. PAX3/FOXO1 fusion gene status is the key prognostic molecular marker in rhabdomyosarcoma and significantly improves risk stratification. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012;30:1670-77.
3. Skapek SX, Anderson JR, Barr FG, et al. PAX/FOXO1 fusion status drives unfavorable outcome for children with rhabdomyosarcoma. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2013;60(9):1411-1417.
4. WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board, editors. WHO Classification of Tumours of Soft tissue and Bone. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Lyon: IARC, 2020.
5. Rudzinski ER, Anderson JR, Lyden ER, Bridge JA, Barr FG, Gastier-Foster JM, Bachmeyer K, Skapek SX, Hawkins DS, Teot LA, Parham DM. Myogenin, AP2B, NOS-1 and HMGA2 are surrogate markers of fusion status in rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the soft tissue sarcoma committee of the children's oncology group. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2014;38(5):654-659.
6. Rudzinski ER, Teot LA, Anderson JR, et al. Dense pattern of embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma, a lesion easily confused with alveolar rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the Soft Tissue Sarcoma Committee of the Children's Oncology Group. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2013;140:82-90.
7. Doros L, Yang J, Dehner L, Rossi CT, Skiver K, Jarzembowski JA, Messinger Y, Schultz KA, Williams G, André N, Hill DA. DICER1 mutations in embryonal rhabdomyosarcomas from children with and without familial PPB-tumor predisposition syndrome. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2012 Sep;59(3):558-60.
8. Apellaniz-Ruiz M, McCluggage WG, Foulkes WD. DICER1-associated embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma and adenocarcinoma of the gynecologic tract: Pathology, molecular genetics, and indications for molecular testing. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer*. 2021 Mar;60(3):217-233.
9. Koelsche C, Mynarek M, Schimpf D, Bertero L, Serrano J, Sahm F, Reuss DE, Hou Y, Baumhoer D, Vokuhl C, Flucke U, Petersen I, Brück W, Rutkowski S, Zambrano SC, Garcia Leon JL, Diaz Coronado RY, Gessler M, Tirado OM, Mora J, Alonso J, Garcia Del Muro X, Esteller M, Sturm D, Ecker J, Milde T, Pfister SM, Korshunov A, Snuderl M, Mechttersheimer G, Schüller U, Jones DTW, von Deimling A. Primary intracranial spindle cell sarcoma with rhabdomyosarcoma-like features share a highly distinct methylation profile and DICER1 mutations. *Acta Neuropathol*. 2018 Aug;136(2):327-337.
10. McCluggage WG, Apellaniz-Ruiz M, Chong AL, Hanley KZ, Velázquez Vega JE, McVeigh TP, Foulkes WD. Embryonal Rhabdomyosarcoma of the Ovary and Fallopian Tube: Rare Neoplasms

- Associated With Germline and Somatic DICER1 Mutations. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2020 Jun;44(6):738-747.
11. Zin A, Bertorelle R, Dall'Igna P, Manzitt C, Gambini C, Bisogno G, Rosolen A, Alaggio R. Epithelioid rhabdomyosarcoma: a clinicopathologic and molecular study. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2014; 38(2):273-278.
  12. Cavazzana AO, Schmidt D, Ninfo V, et al. Spindle cell rhabdomyosarcoma: a prognostically favorable variant of rhabdomyosarcoma. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 1992;16:229-235.
  13. Cyrta J, Gauthier A; Karanian M, Vieira AF, Cardoen L, Jehanno N et al. Infantile Rhabdomyosarcomas With VGLL2 Rearrangement Are Not Always an Indolent Disease. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2021. Epub.
  14. Mentzel T, Katenkamp D. Sclerosing, pseudovascular rhabdomyosarcoma in adults: clinico-pathological and immunohistochemical analysis of three cases. *Virchows Arch*. 2000;436:305-311.
  15. Agaram NP, LaQuaglia MP, Alaggio R, Zhang L, Fujisawa Y, Ladanyi M, Wexler LH, Antonescu CR. MYOD1-mutant spindle cell and sclerosing rhabdomyosarcoma: an aggressive subtype irrespective of age. A reappraisal for molecular classification and risk stratification. *Mod Pathol*. 2019 Jan;32(1):27-36.
  16. Watson S, Perrin V, Guillemot D, et al. Transcriptomic definition of molecular subgroups of small round cell sarcomas. *J Pathol*. 2018 May;245(1):29-40.
  17. Dashti NK, Wehrs RN, Thomas BC, et al. Spindle cell rhabdomyosarcoma of bone with FUS-TFCP2 fusion: confirmation of a very recently described rhabdomyosarcoma subtype. *Histopathology*. 2018 Sep;73(3):514-520.
  18. Leuschner I, Newton WA Jr, Schmidt D, et al. Spindle cell variants of embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma in the paratesticular region: a report of the Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 1993;17:221-230.
  19. Rudzinski ER, Anderson JR, Hawkins DS, Skapek SX, Parham DM, Teot LA. The World Health Organization Classification of skeletal muscle tumors in pediatric rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the Children's Oncology Group. *Arch Pathol Lab Med*. 2015;139(10):1281-1287.
  20. Folpe AL, McKenney JK, Bridge JA, Weiss SW. Sclerosing rhabdomyosarcoma in adults: report of four cases of a hyalinizing, matrix-rich variant of rhabdomyosarcoma that may be confused with osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, or angiosarcoma. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2002;26(9):1175-1183.
  21. Qualman SJ, Coffin CM, Newton WA, et al. Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study: update for pathologists. *Pediatr Dev Pathol*. 1998;1:550-561.
  22. Parham DM. Pathologic classification of rhabdomyosarcomas and correlations with molecular studies. *Mod Pathol*. 2001;14:506-514.
  23. Cessna MH, Zhou H, Perkins SL, et al. Are myogenin and myoD1 expression specific for rhabdomyosarcoma? A study of 150 cases, with emphasis on spindle cell mimics. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2001;25(9):1150-1157.
  24. Morotti RA, Nicol KK, Parham DM, et al. An immunohistochemical algorithm to facilitate diagnosis and subtyping of rhabdomyosarcoma: the Children's Oncology Group experience. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2006;30(8):962-968.

### E. Anaplasia

Anaplasia is found in up to 16% of RMS and may be found in any histologic subtype.<sup>1,2,3</sup> Anaplastic tumors are defined as having large, lobate, hyperchromatic nuclei (at least 3 times the size of neighboring nuclei) or atypical (obvious, multipolar) mitotic figures.



Anaplasia is further described based on distribution of the anaplastic cells: focal (group I) anaplasia, which consists of a single or a few cells, scattered amongst nonanaplastic cells; or diffuse (group II), in which clusters or sheets of anaplastic cells are evident. These features should be visible at low power (10X objective) to avoid confusing it with “nuclear unrest,” characterized by mild degrees of hyperchromatism and nuclear atypia that do not qualify as 3X enlargement, do not contain atypical mitoses.<sup>4</sup> Care must also be taken to distinguish anaplasia from the changes of myogenic differentiation, ie, multinucleation, overlapping nuclei, and nuclear atypia. However, this can be avoided by identifying atypical, multipolar mitoses and using caution in cells with abundant cytoplasm.<sup>5</sup> Anaplasia is more common in tumors arising at favorable sites, and in stage 1 and clinical group I and II tumors.<sup>2</sup> A recent large study showed no difference in failure-free or overall survival in patients with RMS having no anaplasia, focal anaplasia or diffuse anaplasia, and anaplasia was not an independent adverse prognostic factor.<sup>3</sup> Anaplasia is associated with TP53 mutations, and 69% of tumors with TP53 mutations showed histologic anaplasia in this same series.<sup>3</sup> Because of the correlation between anaplastic embryonal RMS and TP53 mutations (both tumor and germline), screening for germline TP53 mutations may be indicated in these patients.<sup>6</sup>

#### References

1. Kodet R, Newton WA Jr, Hamoudi A, Asmar L, Jacobs DL, Maurer H. Childhood rhabdomyosarcoma with anaplastic (pleomorphic) features: a report of the Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study. *Am J Surg Pathol.* 1993;17:443-453.
2. Qualman S, Lynch J, Bridge J, Parham D, Teot L, Meyer W, Pappo A. Prevalence and clinical impact of anaplasia in childhood rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the Soft Tissue Sarcoma Committee of the Children's Oncology Group. *Cancer.* 2008;113(11):3242-3247.
3. Shenoy A, Alvarez E, Chi YY, Li M, Shern JF, Khan J, Hiniker SM, Granberg CF, Hawkins DS, Parham DM, Teot LA, Rudzinski ER. The prognostic significance of anaplasia in childhood rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the Children's Oncology Group. *Eur J Cancer* 2021;143:127-133.
4. Faria P, Beckwith JB, Mishra K et al. Focal versus diffuse anaplasia in Wilms tumor: A report from the National Wilms Tumor Study Group. *Am J Surg Pathol.* 1996;20:909-920.
5. Zuppan CW, Beckwith JB, Luckey DW. Anaplasia in unilateral Wilms tumor: a report from the National Wilms Tumor Study Pathology Center. *Hum Pathol.* 1998;19(10):1199-1209.
6. Hettmer S, Archer NM, Somers GR et al. Anaplastic rhabdomyosarcoma in TP53 germline mutation carriers. *Cancer.* 2014;120(7):1068-1075.

#### F. Treatment Effect

Posttreatment (chemotherapy or radiation), RMS may undergo extensive cytodifferentiation.<sup>1</sup> This appears to be more common in embryonal RMS than alveolar RMS. Studies suggest that tumor cells that have undergone maturation have little, if any, malignant potential. The significance of cytodifferentiation on outcome in RMS is not clear but may be a predictor of improved survival.<sup>2</sup>

#### References

1. Smith LM, Anderson JR, Coffin CM. Cytodifferentiation and clinical outcome after chemotherapy and radiation for rhabdomyosarcoma. *Med Pediatr Oncol.* 2002;38:398-404.
2. Coffin CM, Rulon J, Smith L, Bruggers C, White FV. Pathologic features of rhabdomyosarcoma before and after treatment: a clinicopathologic and immunohistochemical analysis. *Mod Pathol.* 1997 Dec;10(12):1175-87.

### G. Margins

The extent of resection (ie, gross residual disease versus complete resection) has the strongest influence on local control of malignancy.<sup>1,2</sup> The definition of what constitutes a sufficiently “wide” margin of normal tissue in the management of RMS has evolved over time from resection of the whole muscle to resection with a 2-3 cm margin.

#### References

1. Marcus KC, Grier HE, Shamberger RC, et al. Childhood soft tissue sarcoma: a 20-year experience. *J Pediatr.* 1997;131:603-607.
2. Fletcher C, Kempson RL, Weiss S. Recommendations for reporting soft tissue sarcomas. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 1999;111:594-598.

### H. Clinical Grouping and Modified “TNM” Staging

The American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) and the International Union Against Cancer (UICC) TNM staging systems currently do not apply to pediatric RMS. The Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study Postsurgical Clinical Grouping System is recommended by this protocol. The Clinical Grouping System is a surgical-pathological grouping system. It categorizes patients into groups I-IV based on the extent of disease after initial surgical procedure(s) and prior to initiation of radiation therapy and/or systemic therapy. This includes consideration of the extent of the disease at the primary site as well as regional lymph node and distant metastatic involvement.<sup>1</sup>

Also provided in this protocol is the “TNM” staging system modified for use with rhabdomyosarcoma. This system is a clinical staging system. The TNM staging system categorizes patients into stages 1-4 based on physical exam and imaging findings prior to any therapeutic intervention (i.e. prior to surgery, radiation or systemic therapy). It considers primary site, tumor size, and regional lymph nodes and distant metastatic involvement. This modified staging system is predictive of outcome in rhabdomyosarcoma.<sup>1,2,3</sup>

Clinical classification usually is carried out by the referring physician before treatment, during initial evaluation of the patient or when pathologic classification is not possible.

#### References

1. Raney RB, Anderson JR, Barr FG, et al. Rhabdomyosarcoma and undifferentiated sarcoma in the first two decades of life: a selective review of Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study Group experience and rationale for Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study V. *Am J Pediatr Hematol Oncol.* 2001;23(4):215-220.
2. Willman JH, White K, and Coffin CM. Pediatric core needle biopsy: strengths and limitations in evaluation of masses. *Pediatr Dev Pathol.* 2001;4(1):46-52.
3. Coffin CM. The new International Rhabdomyosarcoma Classification, its progenitors, and consideration beyond morphology. *Adv Anat Pathol.* 1997;4:1-16.

### I. Relevant History

Relevant historical factors include any previous therapy, family history of malignancy, and the presence of congenital anomalies. If preoperative therapy has been given, assessment may be limited to the estimate of viable and necrotic RMS.<sup>1</sup> The tumor may also show extreme cytodifferentiation and nuclear pleomorphism. These factors may preclude accurate subtyping of the RMS.

There is a specific concern for increased risk of a familial cancer when the specific diagnosis of embryonal RMS or other soft tissue sarcoma is made within the first 2 years of life, especially in a male

child.<sup>2</sup> Such syndromes include Li-Fraumeni syndrome, basal cell nevus syndrome, neurofibromatosis, and pleuropulmonary blastoma syndrome (pleuropulmonary blastoma plus malignancies associated with germline *DICER1* mutations).<sup>1,3</sup> A genetic predisposition to cancer is thought to be present in 7%-33% of children with soft tissue sarcomas.<sup>4,5</sup>

Rhabdomyosarcoma is specifically associated with a variety of congenital anomalies.<sup>6</sup> These include congenital anomalies of the central nervous system, genitourinary tract, gastrointestinal tract, and cardiovascular system.

#### References

1. Willman JH, White K, and Coffin CM. Pediatric core needle biopsy: strengths and limitations in evaluation of masses. *Pediatr Dev Pathol*. 2001;4(1):46-52.
2. Birch JM, Hartley AL, Blair V, et al. Cancer in the families of children with soft tissue sarcoma. *Cancer*. 1990;66:2239-2248.
3. Dehner LP, Jarzembowski JA, Hill DA. Embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma of the uterine cervix: a report of 14 cases and a discussion of its unusual clinicopathological associations. *Mod Pathol*. 2012;25:602-614.
4. Hartley AL, Birch JM, Blair V, et al. Patterns of cancer in the families of children with soft tissue sarcoma. *Cancer*. 1993;72:923-930.
5. Li H, Sisoudiya SD, Martin-Giacalone BA, Khayat MM, Dugan-Perez S, Marquez-Do DA, Scheurer ME, Muzny D, Boerwinkle E, Gibbs RA, Chi YY, Barkauskas DA, Lo T, Hall D, Stewart DR, Schiffman JD, Skapek SX, Hawkins DS, Plon SE, Sabo A, Lupo PJ. Germline cancer-predisposition variants in pediatric rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the Children's Oncology Group. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2020;doi:10:1093/jcni/djaa204
6. Ruyman FB, Maddux HR, Ragab A, et al. Congenital anomalies associated with rhabdomyosarcoma. *Med Pediatr Oncol*. 1988;16:33-39.

#### J. Fusion Status

The presence of a t(1;13) (resulting in a *PAX7-FOXO1* (*FKHR*) gene fusion) or a t(2;13) (*PAX3-FOXO1* gene fusion) is strongly correlated with the alveolar subtype of rhabdomyosarcoma. These translocations may be found in as many as 85% of alveolar RMS cases, while embryonal RMS cases lack evidence of these gene fusions (with rare exceptions).<sup>1</sup> Some tumors with alveolar histology lack a demonstrable *PAX* fusion. By gene expression profiling, they do not cluster with *PAX* fusion-positive tumors and have a genetic signature that more closely resembles embryonal RMS.<sup>2,3</sup> Recent studies have confirmed that the presence of a *PAX-FOXO1* fusion transcript drives outcome in children with rhabdomyosarcoma.<sup>4,5</sup> Accordingly, future cooperative group studies conducted by both the Children's Oncology Group and European Pediatric Soft Tissue Sarcoma Group will use *FOXO1* fusion status rather than alveolar histology to assign risk stratification and treatment for patients with RMS. Fusion status is therefore a required element for all patients with alveolar rhabdomyosarcoma. In contrast, embryonal and non-alveolar patterns of rhabdomyosarcoma are nearly always *FOXO1* fusion negative and testing is not required. However, fusion studies can be extremely useful in cases with limited or questionable material, those in which histologic classification is difficult or those with unusual clinical characteristics (e.g., embryonal subtype arising in an extremity).<sup>6</sup> *PAX-FOXO1* gene fusions have also been described in mixed alveolar and embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma and ectomesenchymoma with an alveolar RMS component.



Of fusion-positive RMS cases, approximately 30% are positive for *PAX7-FOXO1*, and the remaining 70% are positive for *PAX3-FOXO1*. If RT-PCR using *PAX3*- or *PAX7*-specific probes is not used to determine fusion status, amplification of *FOXO1* on break-apart FISH studies can act as a surrogate marker of *PAX7-FOXO1* fusion status.<sup>7</sup> Studies suggest that patients with alveolar RMS expressing the *PAX3-FOXO1* gene product have a lower event-free survival than *PAX7-FOXO1*-positive alveolar RMS,<sup>8</sup> but the significance of the translocations must still be elucidated. Some data indicate that when gene fusion status is compared in patients with metastatic disease at diagnosis, a striking difference in outcome is seen between *PAX7-FOXO1* and *PAX3-FOXO1* (estimated 4-year overall survival of 75% for *PAX7-FOXO1* and 8% for *PAX3-FOXO1*; P=.002).<sup>9</sup>

Although rare, several variant fusion transcripts have been described in alveolar RMS. Most include fusion of *PAX3* with an alternate partner, such as *NCOA1*, *NCOA2*, or *FOXO4*. Less often *FOXO1* is preserved and fused with another partner, such as *FGFR1*. Due to the low incidence of these variant fusion transcripts, the prognostic significance is unknown. Some evidence suggests different fusion transcripts may confer different prognostic effects,<sup>10</sup> but until more is known these tumors are treated under fusion-positive RMS protocols.

#### References

1. Coffin CM, Dehner LP. Pathologic evaluation of pediatric soft tissue tumors. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 1998;109(suppl 1):S38-S52.
2. Davicioni E, Anderson MJ, Finckenstein FG, et al. Molecular classification of rhabdomyosarcoma-genotypic and phenotypic determinants of diagnosis: a report from the Children's Oncology Group. *Am J Pathol*. 2009;174(2):550-564.
3. Williamson D, Missiaglia E, de Reynies A, et al. Fusion gene negative alveolar rhabdomyosarcoma is clinically and molecularly indistinguishable from embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:2151-2158.
4. Missiaglia E, Williamson D, Chisholm J, et al. *PAX3/FOXO1* fusion gene status is the key prognostic molecular marker in rhabdomyosarcoma and significantly improves risk stratification. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012;30:1670-77.
5. Skapek SX, Anderson JR, Barr FG, et al. *PAX/FOXO1* fusion status drives unfavorable outcome for children with rhabdomyosarcoma. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2013;60(9):1411-1417.
6. Rudzinski ER, Teot LA, Anderson JR, et al. Dense pattern of embryonal rhabdomyosarcoma, a lesion easily confused with alveolar rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the Soft Tissue Sarcoma Committee of the Children's Oncology Group. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2013;140:82-90.
7. Duan F, Smith LM, Gustafson DM, et al. Genomic and clinical analysis of fusion gene amplification in rhabdomyosarcoma: a report from the Children's Oncology Group. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 2012;51:662-674.
8. Kodet R, Newton WA Jr, Hamoudi A, Asmar L, Jacobs DL, Maurer H. Childhood rhabdomyosarcoma with anaplastic (pleomorphic) features: a report of the Intergroup Rhabdomyosarcoma Study. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 1993;17:443-453.
9. Kelly KM, Womer RB, Sorensen PH, Xiong QB, Barr FG. Common and variant gene fusions predict distinct clinical phenotypes in rhabdomyosarcoma. *J Clin Oncol*. 1997;15(5):1831-1836.
10. Wilson RA, Teng L, Bachmeyer KM, et al. A novel algorithm for simplification of complex gene classifiers in cancer. *Cancer Res*. 2013;73:5625-5632.

### K. Molecular Genetic Studies

As noted in the histologic types section (Note C), some molecular alterations may be associated with particular RMS subtypes. Additionally, some alterations may have prognostic or germline implications. *DICER1* mutations are associated with a subset of embryonal RMS and may be somatic or germline; identification of a *DICER1* mutation in an embryonal RMS tumor warrants additional exploration for the possibility of *DICER1* syndrome/PPB-tumor predisposition syndrome (germline mutations associated with PPB, ERMS, cystic nephroma, sex cord stromal tumors, pineal blastoma, among other tumors).<sup>1</sup> In spindle cell / sclerosing RMS, *MYOD1 L122R* point mutations are of prognostic significance, with those tumors containing this alterations demonstrating a more aggressive biology.<sup>2</sup> Both *DICER1* and *MYOD1* alterations are point mutations and the sensitivity for detecting these mutations in next-generation sequencing panels designed to detect RNA fusions may be variable; detection of these mutations using targeted DNA sequencing may be considered as an alternative. In spindle cell RMS in infants, detection of a *VGLL2* or *NCOA2* gene fusion may be helpful in diagnosis as well as predictive of a favorable prognosis. Intraosseous spindle cell RMS is an evolving diagnostic area; identification of either a *EWSR1-TFCP2* or *FUS-TFCP2* fusion may aid in the diagnosis of this rare subtype.<sup>3,4,5</sup>

### References

1. Doros L, Yang J, Dehner L, Rossi CT, Skiver K, Jarzembowski JA, Messinger Y, Schultz KA, Williams G, André N, Hill DA. *DICER1* mutations in embryonal rhabdomyosarcomas from children with and without familial PPB-tumor predisposition syndrome. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2012 Sep;59(3):558-60.
2. Agaram NP, LaQuaglia MP, Alaggio R, Zhang L, Fujisawa Y, Ladanyi M, Wexler LH, Antonescu CR. *MYOD1*-mutant spindle cell and sclerosing rhabdomyosarcoma: an aggressive subtype irrespective of age. A reappraisal for molecular classification and risk stratification. *Mod Pathol*. 2019 Jan;32(1):27-36.
3. Whittle SB, Hicks MJ, Roy A, Vasudevan SA, Reddy K, Venkatramani R. Congenital spindle cell rhabdomyosarcoma. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2019 Nov;66(11):e27935.
4. Watson S, Perrin V, Guillemot D, et al. Transcriptomic definition of molecular subgroups of small round cell sarcomas. *J Pathol*. 2018 May;245(1):29-40.
5. Dashti NK, Wehrs RN, Thomas BC, et al. Spindle cell rhabdomyosarcoma of bone with *FUS-TFCP2* fusion: confirmation of a very recently described rhabdomyosarcoma subtype. *Histopathology*. 2018 Sep;73(3):514-520.