Protocol for the Examination of Biopsy Specimens From Patients With Invasive Carcinoma of the Breast

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Version:** Breast Invasive Biopsy 1.0.0.1 | **Protocol Posting Date:** August 2019 |

**Accreditation Requirements**

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Procedure** | **Description** |
| Biopsy | Includes specimens designated needle biopsy, fine needle aspiration and others (for excisional biopsy, see below) |
| **Tumor Type** | **Description** |
| Invasive breast carcinoma of any type, with or without ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) | Includes microinvasive carcinoma and carcinoma with neuroendocrine features |

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

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure**  |
| Resection (consider Breast Invasive Carcinoma Resection protocol) |
| Excisional biopsy (consider Breast Invasive Carcinoma Resection protocol) |
| **Tumor Type** |
| Ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) without invasive carcinoma (consider the DCIS Biopsy protocol) |
| Paget disease of the nipple without invasive carcinoma (consider the DCIS Biopsy protocol) |
| Encapsulated or solid papillary carcinoma without invasion (consider the Breast DCIS Biopsy protocol) |
| Phyllodes tumor  |
| Lymphoma (consider the Hodgkin or non-Hodgkin Lymphoma protocols) |
| Sarcoma (consider the Soft Tissue protocol) |
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**Accreditation Requirements**

The use of this biopsy case summary is recommended for clinical care purposes, but is not required for accreditation purposes. The core and conditional data elements are routinely reported for biopsy specimens. Non-core data elements are included to allow for reporting information that may be of clinical value.

**Summary of Changes**

1.0.0.1 – Edits to DCIS Explanatory Notes

Surgical Pathology Cancer Case Summary

Protocol posting date: August 2019

INVASIVE CARCINOMA OF THE BREAST: Biopsy

**Notes:**

**This case summary is recommended for reporting biopsy specimens but is** **NOT REQUIRED for accreditation purposes. Core data elements are bolded to help identify routinely reported elements.**

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

**Procedure, Laterality, and Site may be listed separately or on 1 line.**

## Procedure

\_\_\_ Needle biopsy

\_\_\_ Fine needle aspiration

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

\_\_\_ Not specified

## Specimen Laterality

\_\_\_ Right

\_\_\_ Left

\_\_\_ Not specified

## Tumor Site (select all that apply)

\_\_\_ Upper outer quadrant

\_\_\_ Lower outer quadrant

\_\_\_ Upper inner quadrant

\_\_\_ Lower inner quadrant

\_\_\_ Central

\_\_\_ Nipple

\_\_\_ Clock position (specify): \_\_\_\_\_o’clock

\_\_\_ Distance from nipple (centimeters):\_\_\_\_\_\_cm

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

\_\_\_ Not specified

## Histologic Type (Note A)

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma of no special type (invasive ductal carcinoma, not otherwise specified)

\_\_\_ Micro-invasive carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive lobular carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma with lobular features

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma with ductal and lobular features (“mixed type carcinoma”)

\_\_\_ Mucinous carcinoma

\_\_\_ Tubular carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma, tubulo-lobular variant

\_\_\_ Invasive cribriform carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive micropapillary carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive papillary carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma with medullary features

\_\_\_ Metaplastic carcinoma

\_\_\_ Low-grade adenosquamous carcinoma

\_\_\_ Fibromatosis-like metaplastic carcinoma

\_\_\_ Metaplastic carcinoma, spindle cell type

\_\_\_ Metaplastic carcinoma, mixed epithelial and mesenchymal type

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma with metaplastic features

\_\_\_ Squamous cell carcinoma

\_\_\_ Adenoid cystic carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma with apocrine features

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma with clear cell (glycogen rich) features

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma with neuroendocrine features

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma, with signet-ring cell features

\_\_\_ Secretory carcinoma

\_\_\_ Invasive carcinoma, type cannot be determined

\_\_\_ Other histologic type not listed (specify): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Histologic Grade (Nottingham Histologic Score) (Note B)**

\_\_\_ Not applicable (microinvasion only)

##### **Glandular (Acinar)/Tubular Differentiation**

\_\_\_ Score 1 (>75% of tumor area forming glandular/tubular structures)

\_\_\_ Score 2 (10% to 75% of tumor area forming glandular/tubular structures)

\_\_\_ Score 3 (<10% of tumor area forming glandular/tubular structures)

\_\_\_ Score cannot be determined

##### **Nuclear Pleomorphism**

\_\_\_ Score 1 (nuclei small with little increase in size in comparison with normal breast epithelial cells, regular outlines, uniform nuclear chromatin, little variation in size)

\_\_\_ Score 2 (cells larger than normal with open vesicular nuclei, visible nucleoli, and moderate variability in both size and shape)

\_\_\_ Score 3 (vesicular nuclei, often with prominent nucleoli, exhibiting marked variation in size and shape, occasionally with very large and bizarre forms)

\_\_\_ Score cannot be determined

##### **Mitotic Rate (see Table 1)**

\_\_\_ Score 1

\_\_\_ Score 2

\_\_\_ Score 3

\_\_\_ Score cannot be determined

##### **Overall Grade**

\_\_\_ Grade 1 (scores of 3, 4, or 5)

\_\_\_ Grade 2 (scores of 6 or 7)

\_\_\_ Grade 3 (scores of 8 or 9)

\_\_\_ Score cannot be determined (explain: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_)

**Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS) (Note C)**

\_\_\_ Not identified

\_\_\_ Present

\_\_\_ Cannot be excluded

**Architectural Patterns (if DCIS is present select all that apply)**

\_\_\_ Comedo

\_\_\_ Paget disease (DCIS involving nipple skin)

\_\_\_ Cribriform

\_\_\_ Micropapillary

\_\_\_ Papillary

\_\_\_ Solid

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

**Nuclear Grade (if DCIS is present)**

\_\_\_ Grade I (low)

\_\_\_ Grade II (intermediate)

\_\_\_ Grade III (high)

**Necrosis (if DCIS is present)**

\_\_\_ Not identified

\_\_\_ Present, focal (small foci or single cell necrosis)

\_\_\_ Present, central (expansive “comedo” necrosis)

Lymphovascular Invasion

\_\_\_ Not identified

\_\_\_ Present

\_\_\_ Cannot be determined

## Additional Pathologic Findings (Note D)

Specify: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

## Microcalcifications (select all that apply) (Note E)

\_\_\_ Not identified

\_\_\_ Present in DCIS

\_\_\_ Present in invasive carcinoma

\_\_\_ Present in non-neoplastic tissue

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

Ancillary Studies

*Note: For hormone receptor and HER2 reporting, the CAP Breast Biomarker Template should be used.* [*www.cap.org/cancerprotocols*](http://www.cap.org/cancerprotocols)*.*

Biomarker Studies

\_\_\_ Pending

## Comment(s)

## A. Histologic Type

This protocol applies to all invasive carcinomas of the breast. The World Health Organization (WHO) classification of breast carcinoma is presented below, although the protocol does not preclude the use of other classifications or histologic types. Carcinomas may be classified based on the H&E appearance without the use of immunohistochemical studies.

A modified list is presented in the protocol, based on the most frequent types of invasive carcinomas and terminology that is in widespread usage. The modified list is intended to capture the majority of tumors and reduce the classification of tumors being reported as “other.” The WHO classification is presented for completeness.

## WHO Classification of Invasive Carcinoma of the Breast1

Microinvasive carcinoma

Invasive carcinoma of no special type (NST)

Pleomorphic carcinoma

Carcinoma with osteoclast-like stromal giant cells

Carcinoma with choriocarcinomatous features

Carcinoma with melanotic features

Invasive lobular carcinoma

Classic lobular carcinoma

Solid lobular carcinoma

Alveolar lobular carcinoma

Pleomorphic lobular carcinoma

Tubulolobular carcinoma

Mixed lobular carcinoma

Tubular carcinoma

Cribriform carcinoma

Mucinous carcinoma

Carcinoma with medullary features

Medullary carcinoma

Atypical medullary carcinoma

Invasive carcinoma NST with medullary features

Carcinoma with apocrine differentiation

Carcinoma with signet-ring-cell differentiation

Invasive micropapillary carcinoma

Metaplastic carcinoma of no special type

Low-grade adenosquamous carcinoma

Fibromatosis-like metaplastic carcinoma

Squamous cell carcinoma

Spindle cell carcinoma

Metaplastic carcinoma with mesenchymal differentiation

Chondroid differentiation

Osseous differentiation

Other types of mesenchymal differentiation

Mixed metaplastic carcinoma

Myoepithelial carcinoma

Papillary carcinoma

Encapsulated papillary carcinoma with invasion

Solid papillary carcinoma, invasive

Epithelial-myoepithelial tumors

Adenomyoepithelioma with carcinoma

Adenoid cystic carcinoma

Rare types

Carcinoma with neuroendocrine features

Neuroendocrine tumor, well-differentiated

Neuroendocrine carcinoma poorly differentiated (small cell carcinoma)

Carcinoma with neuroendocrine differentiation

Secretory carcinoma

Invasive papillary carcinoma

Acinic cell carcinoma

Mucoepidermoid carcinoma

Polymorphous carcinoma

Oncocytic carcinoma

Lipid-rich carcinoma

Glycogen-rich clear cell carcinoma

Sebaceous carcinoma

References
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## B. Histologic Grade

All invasive breast carcinomas should be graded.1 The Nottingham combined histologic grade (Elston-Ellis modification of Scarff-Bloom-Richardson grading system) should be used for reporting. Within each stage grouping there is a relation between histologic grade and outcome.

The Nottingham combined histologic grade evaluates the amount of tubule formation, the extent of nuclear pleomorphism, and the mitotic count (or mitotic rate). Each variable is given a score of 1, 2, or 3, and the scores are added to produce a grade. The mitotic score is determined by the number of mitotic figures found in 10 consecutive high-power fields (HPF) in the most mitotically active part of the tumor. Only clearly identifiable mitotic figures should be counted; hyperchromatic, karyorrhectic, or apoptotic nuclei are excluded. Because of variations in field size, the HPF size must be determined for each microscope and the appropriate point score determined accordingly. It is recommended that the size be measured by using a micrometer. However, the diameter of an HPF can also be calculated by using the method below.

**Measuring the Size of a High-Power Field (HPF) With a Ruler**

Use a clear ruler to measure the diameter of a low-power field. This number can be used to calculate a constant based on the following formula:

Eyepiece Magnification x Objective Magnification x Microscopic Field Diameter = A Constant

When the value of the constant is known, the diameter of an HPF can be calculated for other objectives by using the following formula:

Unknown Field Diameter = Constant/(Eyepiece Magnification x Objective Magnification)

Half of the field diameter is the radius of the field (*r*), which can then be used to calculate the area of the HPF:

3.1415 x *r* 2 = Area of Microscopic Field

If the microscopic field diameter or the area of the field is known, Table 1 can be used to determine the number of mitoses corresponding to different scores.

**Table 1. Score Categories According to Field Diameter and Mitotic Count**

| **Scoring Categories of Mitotic Counts** |
| --- |
| Field diameter (mm) | Area (mm2) | Number of mitoses per 10 fields corresponding to: |
| Score 1 | Score 2 | Score 3 |
| 0.40 | 0.125 | ≤4 | 5 to 9 | ≥10 |
| 0.41 | 0.132 | ≤4 | 5 to 9 | ≥10 |
| 0.42 | 0.139 | ≤5 | 6 to 10 | ≥11 |
| 0.43 | 0.145 | ≤5 | 6 to 10 | ≥11 |
| 0.44 | 0.152 | ≤5 | 6 to 11 | ≥12 |
| 0.45 | 0.159 | ≤5 | 6 to 11 | ≥12 |
| 0.46 | 0.166 | ≤6 | 7 to 12 | ≥13 |
| 0.47 | 0.173 | ≤6 | 7 to 12 | ≥13 |
| 0.48 | 0.181 | ≤6 | 7 to 13 | ≥14 |
| 0.49 | 0.189 | ≤6 | 7 to13 | ≥14 |
| 0.50 | 0.196 | ≤7 | 8 to 14 | ≥15 |
| 0.51 | 0.204 | ≤7 | 8 to 14 | ≥15 |
| 0.52 | 0.212 | ≤7 | 8 to 15 | ≥16 |
| 0.53 | 0.221 | ≤8 | 9 to 16 | ≥17 |
| 0.54 | 0.229 | ≤8 | 9 to 16 | ≥17 |
| 0.55 | 0.238 | ≤8 | 9 to 17 | ≥18 |
| 0.56 | 0.246 | ≤8 | 9 to 17 | ≥18 |
| 0.57 | 0.255 | ≤9 | 10 to 18 | ≥19 |
| 0.58 | 0.264 | ≤9 | 10 to 19 | ≥20 |
| 0.59 | 0.273 | ≤9 | 10 to 19 | ≥20 |
| 0.60 | 0.283 | ≤10 | 11 to 20 | ≥21 |
| 0.61 | 0.292 | ≤10 | 11 to 21 | ≥22 |
| 0.62 | 0.302 | ≤11 | 12 to 22 | ≥23 |
| 0.63 | 0.312 | ≤11 | 12 to22 | ≥23 |
| 0.64 | 0.322 | ≤11 | 12 to 23 | ≥24 |
| 0.65 | 0.332 | ≤12 | 13 to 24 | ≥25 |
| 0.66 | 0.342 | ≤12 | 13 to 24 | ≥25 |
| 0.67 | 0.353 | ≤12 | 13 to 25 | ≥26 |
| 0.68 | 0.363 | ≤13 | 14 to 26 | ≥27 |
| 0.69 | 0.374 | ≤13 | 14 to 27 | ≥ 28 |

*From* Pathology Reporting of Breast Disease*.*2 *Copyright 2005 National Health Service Cancer Screening Programme and The Royal College of Pathologists. Adapted with permission.*
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## C. Ductal Carcinoma In Situ

## Architectural Pattern of DCIS

The architectural pattern has traditionally been reported for DCIS. However, nuclear grade and the presence of necrosis are more predictive of clinical outcome.

## Nuclear Grade of DCIS

## The nuclear grade of DCIS is determined using 6 morphologic features (Table 1).1

**Table 2. Nuclear Grade of Ductal Carcinoma in Situ**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature** | **Grade I (Low)** | **Grade II (Intermediate)** | **Grade III (High)** |
| **Pleomorphism** | Monotonous (monomorphic) | Intermediate | Markedly pleomorphic |
| **Size** | 1.5 to 2 x the size of a normal red blood cell or a normal duct epithelial cell nucleus | Intermediate | >2.5 x the size of a normal red blood cell or a normal duct epithelial cell nucleus |
| **Chromatin** | Usually diffuse, finely dispersed chromatin | Intermediate | Usually vesicular with irregular chromatin distribution |
| **Nucleoli** | Only occasional | Intermediate | Prominent, often multiple |
| **Mitoses** | Only occasional | Intermediate | May be frequent |
| **Orientation** | Polarized toward luminal spaces | Intermediate | Usually not polarized toward the luminal space |

**Necrosis**

The presence of necrosis is correlated with the finding of mammographic calcifications (ie, most areas of necrosis will calcify). Ductal carcinoma in situ that presents as mammographic calcifications often recurs as calcifications. Necrosis can be classified as follows:

* Central (“comedo”): The central portion of an involved ductal space is replaced by an area of expansive necrosis that is easily detected at low magnification. Ghost cells and karyorrhectic debris are generally present. Although central necrosis is generally associated with high-grade nuclei (ie, comedo DCIS), it can also occur with DCIS of low or intermediate nuclear grade.
* Focal: Small foci, indistinct at low magnification, or single cell necrosis.

Necrosis should be distinguished from secretory material, which can also be associated with calcifications, but does not include nuclear debris.
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**D. Additional Pathologic Findings**

## In some cases, additional pathologic findings are important for the clinical management of patients. If multiple invasive carcinomas are present and differ in histologic type, grade, or the expression of ER, PgR, or HER2, this information should be included as text in this section.

## E. Microcalcifications

Cancer found in biopsies performed for microcalcifications will almost always be at the site of the calcifications or in close proximity. The presence of the targeted calcifications in the specimen should be confirmed by specimen radiography. The pathologist must be satisfied that the specimen has been sampled in such a way that the lesion responsible for the calcifications has been examined microscopically. The relationship of the radiologic calcifications to the invasive carcinoma and the DCIS should be indicated.

If calcifications can be seen in the specimen radiograph but not in the initial histologic sections, deeper levels should be examined. If needed, radiographs of the paraffin block(s) may be obtained to detect calcifications remaining in the block(s). If microcalcifications cannot be confirmed by routine microscopic evaluation, polarized light may be helpful, since calcium oxalate crystals are refractile and polarizable but usually clear or tinged yellow in H&E sections. On rare occasions, calcifications do not survive tissue processing or prolonged fixation in formalin. Foreign material can sometimes simulate calcifications (eg, metallic fragments after surgery or trauma).