

# **Protocol for the Examination of Specimens from Patients with Carcinoma of the Uterine Cervix**

**Protocol applies to all invasive carcinomas of the cervix.**

---

**Based on AJCC/UICC TNM, 7th edition**

Protocol web posting date: October 2009

## **Procedures**

- Excision (Cone/LEEP)
- Radical Trachelectomy
- Radical Hysterectomy
- Pelvic Exenteration

## **Author**

Alexandra N. Kalof, MD \*

Pathology Department, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT

Farnaz Dadmanesh, MD

Pathology Department, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA

Teri A. Longacre, MD

Pathology Department, Stanford University, California

Marisa R. Nucci, MD

Pathology Department, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

Esther Oliva, MD

Pathology Department, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA

Kumarasen Cooper, MBChB, DPhil, FRCPath †

Pathology Department, University of Vermont, Burlington, VT

For the Members of the Cancer Committee, College of American Pathologists

\* denotes primary author. † denotes senior author. All other contributing authors are listed alphabetically.

**Previous lead contributors:** Philip A. Branton, MD; Robert J. Kurman, MD; Mahul B. Amin, MD

© 2009 College of American Pathologists (CAP). All rights reserved.

The College does not permit reproduction of any substantial portion of these protocols without its written authorization. The College hereby authorizes use of these protocols by physicians and other health care providers in reporting on surgical specimens, in teaching, and in carrying out medical research for nonprofit purposes. This authorization does not extend to reproduction or other use of any substantial portion of these protocols for commercial purposes without the written consent of the College.

The CAP also authorizes physicians and other health care practitioners to make modified versions of the Protocols solely for their individual use in reporting on surgical specimens for individual patients, teaching, and carrying out medical research for non-profit purposes.

The CAP further authorizes the following uses by physicians and other health care practitioners, in reporting on surgical specimens for individual patients, in teaching, and in carrying out medical research for non-profit purposes: (1) **Dictation** from the original or modified protocols for the purposes of creating a text-based patient record on paper, or in a word processing document; (2) **Copying** from the original or modified protocols into a text-based patient record on paper, or in a word processing document; (3) The use of a **computerized system** for items (1) and (2), provided that the Protocol data is stored intact as a single text-based document, and is not stored as multiple discrete data fields.

Other than uses (1), (2), and (3) above, the CAP does not authorize any use of the Protocols in electronic medical records systems, pathology informatics systems, cancer registry computer systems, computerized databases, mappings between coding works, or any computerized system without a written license from CAP. Applications for such a license should be addressed to the SNOMED Terminology Solutions division of the CAP.

Any public dissemination of the original or modified Protocols is prohibited without a written license from the CAP.

The College of American Pathologists offers these protocols to assist pathologists in providing clinically useful and relevant information when reporting results of surgical specimen examinations of surgical specimens. The College regards the reporting elements in the "Surgical Pathology Cancer Case Summary (Checklist)" portion of the protocols as essential elements of the pathology report. However, the manner in which these elements are reported is at the discretion of each specific pathologist, taking into account clinician preferences, institutional policies, and individual practice.

The College developed these protocols as an educational tool to assist pathologists in the useful reporting of relevant information. It did not issue the protocols for use in litigation, reimbursement, or other contexts. Nevertheless, the College recognizes that the protocols might be used by hospitals, attorneys, payers, and others. Indeed, effective January 1, 2004, the Commission on Cancer of the American College of Surgeons mandated the use of the checklist elements of the protocols as part of its Cancer Program Standards for Approved Cancer Programs. Therefore, it becomes even more important for pathologists to familiarize themselves with these documents. At the same time, the College cautions that use of the protocols other than for their intended educational purpose may involve additional considerations that are beyond the scope of this document.

The inclusion of a product name or service in a CAP publication should not be construed as an endorsement of such product or service, nor is failure to include the name of a product or service to be construed as disapproval.

**Surgical Pathology Cancer Case Summary (Checklist)**

---

Protocol web posting date: October 2009

**UTERINE CERVIX: Excision (Cone/LEEP)**

Select a single response unless otherwise indicated.

**Specimen (select all that apply)**

- ☐ Cervix  
☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Not specified

**Procedure**

- ☐ Cold knife cone excision  
☐ Loop electrical excision procedure (LEEP) / large loop excision of the transformation zone (LLETZ)  
☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Not specified

**Tumor Site (select all that apply) (Notes A, B, and C)**

- ☐ Right superior quadrant (12 to 3 o'clock)  
☐ Right inferior quadrant (3 to 6 o'clock)  
☐ Left inferior quadrant (6 to 9 o'clock)  
☐ Left superior quadrant (9 to 12 o'clock)  
☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Not specified

**Tumor Size**

- Greatest dimension: \_\_\_\_ cm  
Additional dimensions: \_\_\_\_ x \_\_\_\_ cm  
☐ Cannot be determined (see Comment)

*Note: all dimensions are important; see definition for "microinvasive carcinoma" under T1a1/IA1*

\* Data elements with asterisks are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

**Histologic Type (select all that apply) (Note D)**

- ☐ Squamous cell carcinoma  
     \* ☐ Keratinizing  
     \* ☐ Nonkeratinizing  
     \* ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Adenocarcinoma  
     ☐ Mucinous  
         \* ☐ Endocervical type  
         \* ☐ Intestinal type  
         \* ☐ Other  
     ☐ Endometrioid  
     ☐ Clear cell  
     ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Carcinoma, type cannot be determined

**Histologic Grade (Note E)**

- ☐ Not applicable  
☐ GX: Cannot be assessed  
☐ G1: Well differentiated  
☐ G2: Moderately differentiated  
☐ G3: Poorly differentiated

**Stromal Invasion**

- Depth: \_\_\_\_ mm  
 Horizontal extent: \_\_\_\_ mm  
☐ Extent cannot be assessed

**Margins (select all that apply) (Note F)**

- ☐ Margins cannot be assessed (eg, obscuring electrocautery artifact)

Endocervical Margin

- ☐ Not involved by invasive carcinoma  
     \* Distance of invasive carcinoma from margin: \_\_\_\_ mm  
     \* Specify location, if possible: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Involved by invasive carcinoma  
     \* Specify location, if possible: \_\_\_\_\_  
     \* ☐ Focal  
     \* ☐ Diffuse  
☐ Not involved by intraepithelial squamous neoplasia  
☐ Involved by intraepithelial squamous neoplasia  
     \* Specify grade: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Not involved by adenocarcinoma in situ  
☐ Involved by adenocarcinoma in situ

\* Data elements with asterisks are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

Exocervical Margin

- ☐ Not involved by invasive carcinoma  
    \*Distance of invasive carcinoma from margin: \_\_\_\_ mm  
    \*Specify location, if possible: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Involved by invasive carcinoma  
    \*Specify location, if possible: \_\_\_\_\_  
    \* ☐ Focal  
    \* ☐ Diffuse
- ☐ Not involved by intraepithelial squamous neoplasia  
☐ Involved by intraepithelial squamous neoplasia  
    \*Specify grade: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Not involved by adenocarcinoma in situ  
☐ Involved by adenocarcinoma in situ

Deep Margin

- ☐ Not involved by invasive carcinoma  
    \*Distance of invasive carcinoma from margin: \_\_\_\_ mm  
    \*Specify location, if possible: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Involved by invasive carcinoma  
    \*Specify location, if possible: \_\_\_\_\_
- \* ☐ Not involved by intraepithelial squamous neoplasia  
\* ☐ Involved by intraepithelial squamous neoplasia  
    \*Specify grade: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Not involved by adenocarcinoma in situ  
☐ Involved by adenocarcinoma in situ

**Lymph-Vascular Invasion (Note G)**

- ☐ Not identified  
☐ Present  
☐ Indeterminate

**\*Additional Pathologic Findings (select all that apply)**

- \* ☐ None identified  
\* ☐ Koilocytosis  
\* ☐ Inflammation  
\* ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**\*Comment(s)**

\* Data elements with asterisks are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

**Surgical Pathology Cancer Case Summary (Checklist)**

---

Protocol web posting date: October 2009

**UTERINE CERVIX: Trachelectomy, Hysterectomy, Pelvic Exenteration****Select a single response unless otherwise indicated.****Specimen (select all that apply) (Note H)**

- ☐ Cervix
- ☐ Uterine corpus
- ☐ Right ovary
- ☐ Left ovary
- ☐ Right fallopian tube
- ☐ Left fallopian tube
- ☐ Vagina
- ☐ Urinary bladder
- ☐ Rectum
- ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Not specified

**Procedure**

- ☐ Trachelectomy
- ☐ Radical hysterectomy
- ☐ Pelvic exenteration
- ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Not specified

**Tumor Size**

Greatest dimension: \_\_\_\_ cm

\*Additional dimensions: \_\_\_\_ x \_\_\_\_ cm

☐ Cannot be determined (see Comment)**Tumor Site (select all that apply)**

- ☐ Right superior quadrant (12 to 3 o'clock)
- ☐ Right inferior quadrant (3 to 6 o'clock)
- ☐ Left inferior quadrant (6 to 9 o'clock)
- ☐ Left superior quadrant (9 to 12 o'clock)
- ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Not specified

\* Data elements with asterisks are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

**Histologic Type (select all that apply) (Note D)**

- ☐ Squamous cell carcinoma  
    \* ☐ Keratinizing  
    \* ☐ Nonkeratinizing  
    \* ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Adenocarcinoma  
    ☐ Mucinous  
        \* ☐ Endocervical type  
        \* ☐ Intestinal type  
        \* ☐ Other  
    ☐ Endometrioid  
    ☐ Clear cell  
    \* ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Carcinoma, type cannot be determined

**Histologic Grade (Note E)**

- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ GX: Cannot be assessed
- ☐ G1: Well differentiated
- ☐ G2: Moderately differentiated
- ☐ G3: Poorly differentiated

**Margins (select all that apply) (Note F)**

- ☐ Cannot be assessed
- ☐ Margins uninvolved by invasive carcinoma  
    Distance of invasive carcinoma from closest margin: \_\_\_\_ mm  
    Specify margin, if possible: \_\_\_\_\_  
        ☐ Carcinoma in situ not identified at distal margin  
        ☐ Carcinoma in situ present at distal margin
- ☐ Margin(s) involved by invasive carcinoma  
    Specify margin(s), if possible: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Not applicable

**Lymph-Vascular Invasion (Note G)**

- ☐ Not identified
- ☐ Present
- ☐ Indeterminate

\* Data elements with asterisks are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

**Pathologic Staging (pTNM [FIGO]) (Notes H, I, and J)**

TNM Descriptors (required only if applicable) (select all that apply)

- ☐ m (multiple primary tumors)  
☐ r (recurrent)  
☐ y (post-treatment)

Primary Tumor (pT)

- ☐ pTX [--]: Cannot be assessed
- pT1 [I]: Cervical carcinoma confined to uterus (extension to corpus should be disregarded)
- ☐ pT1a [IA]: Invasive carcinoma diagnosed by microscopy only. All macroscopically visible lesions (even with superficial invasion) are pT1b/1B.
- ☐ pT1a1 [IA1]: Stromal invasion  $\leq 3.0$  mm in depth and horizontal spread  $\leq 7.0$  mm
- ☐ pT1a2 [IA2]: Stromal invasion  $> 3.0$  mm but not more than 5.0 mm in depth and horizontal spread  $\leq 7.0$  mm
- ☐ pT1b [IB]: Clinically visible lesion confined to the cervix or microscopic lesion greater than T1a2/IA2
- ☐ pT1b1 [IB1]: Clinically visible lesion  $\leq 4.0$  cm in greatest dimension
- ☐ pT1b2 [IB2]: Clinically visible lesion  $> 4.0$  cm in greatest dimension
- pT2 [II]: Tumor invades beyond the uterus but not to pelvic wall or to lower third of vagina
- ☐ pT2a [IIA]: Tumor without parametrial invasion
- ☐ pT2a1 [IIA1]: Clinically visible lesion  $\leq 4.0$  cm in greatest dimension
- ☐ pT2a2 [IIA2]: Clinically visible lesion  $> 4.0$  cm in greatest dimension
- ☐ pT2b [IIB]: Tumor with parametrial invasion
- pT3 [III]: Tumor extends to the pelvic wall and/or involves the lower third of the vagina and/or causes hydronephrosis or non-functioning kidney
- ☐ pT3a [IIIA]: Tumor involves lower third of vagina, but not pelvic wall
- ☐ pT3b [IIIB]: Tumor extends to pelvic wall and/or causes hydronephrosis or non-functioning kidney
- ☐ pT4 [IVA]: Tumor invades the mucosa of bladder or rectum and/or extends beyond true pelvis (bullous edema is not sufficient evidence to classify a tumor as pT4)

Regional Lymph Nodes (pN)

- ☐ pNX: Cannot be assessed
- ☐ pN0: No regional lymph node metastasis
- ☐ pN1: Regional lymph node metastasis
- Specify: Number examined: \_\_\_\_
- Number involved: \_\_\_\_

Distant Metastasis (pM)

- ☐ Not applicable
- ☐ pM1 [IVB]: Distant metastasis
- \*Specify site(s), if known: \_\_\_\_\_

\* Data elements with asterisks are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.



**\*Additional Pathologic Findings (select all that apply)**

\* ☐ None identified

\* ☐ Intraepithelial neoplasia (specify type and grade): \_\_\_\_\_

\* ☐ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

**\*Ancillary Studies**

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

**\*Comment(s)**

\* Data elements with asterisks are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

## Explanatory Notes

---

### A. Specimen Orientation

If the specimen is the product of a cone biopsy or an excisional biopsy, it is desirable for the surgeon to orient the specimen to facilitate assessment of the resection margins (eg, stitch at 12 o'clock). However, specimens frequently are received without orientation. In these cases, the clock face orientation is designated by the pathologist and it is arbitrary.

### B. Specimen Handling (Cone/LEEP)

Specimens should have their margins inked and be step-sectioned with orientation by quadrant. For large, unfixed cervical cone/ loop electrical excision procedure (LEEP) specimens, the endocervical margin may be marked with ink and pinned on a corkboard with the mucosa facing up. Three hours of fixation before cutting is optimal. The specimen should be sectioned entirely at 1- to 3-mm intervals. Each tissue section may be marked with India ink or a dye such as eosin in order to orient embedding and facilitate evaluation of margins. For optimal evaluation, the sections are placed into separate cassettes, which are numbered consecutively.

### C. Absence of Tumor

If no tumor or precursor lesion is present in a cytology or biopsy specimen, the adequacy of the specimen (ie, its content of both glandular and squamous epithelium) should receive comment. The absence of tumor or precursor lesions in resections must always be documented.

### D. Histologic Type

For consistency in reporting, the histologic classification proposed by the World Health Organization (WHO) is recommended<sup>1</sup>; other classification systems may be used, however.

## WHO Histologic Classification of Cervical Carcinoma and Precursor Lesions

### Epithelial Tumors and Related Lesions

#### Squamous lesions

- Squamous intraepithelial lesions (cervical intraepithelial neoplasia/ squamous intraepithelial lesion [CIN/SIL])

  - Mild dysplasia (CIN 1/low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion [LSIL])

  - Moderate dysplasia (CIN 2/high-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion [HSIL])

  - Severe dysplasia (CIN 3/HSIL)

  - Carcinoma in situ (CIN 3/HSIL)

- Early invasive squamous cell carcinoma

- Squamous cell carcinoma, not otherwise specified (NOS)

  - Keratinizing

  - Non-keratinizing

  - Basaloid

  - Verrucous

  - Warty

  - Papillary

  - Lymphoepithelioma-like

  - Squamotransitional

## Glandular lesions

- Adenocarcinoma in-situ
- Early invasive adenocarcinoma
- Adenocarcinoma
  - Mucinous adenocarcinoma
    - Endocervical
    - Intestinal
    - Signet-ring cell
    - Minimal deviation
    - Villoglandular
  - Endometrioid adenocarcinoma
  - Clear cell adenocarcinoma
  - Serous adenocarcinoma
  - Mesonephric adenocarcinoma

## Other epithelial tumors

- Adenosquamous carcinoma
  - Glassy cell carcinoma variant
- Adenoid cystic carcinoma
- Adenoid basal carcinoma
- Neuroendocrine tumors
  - Carcinoid
  - Atypical carcinoid
  - Small cell carcinoma
  - Large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma
- Undifferentiated carcinoma

**E. Histologic Grade**

A wide variety of grading systems, including some that evaluate only the extent of cellular differentiation and others that assess additional features such as the appearance of the tumor margin, the extent of inflammatory cell infiltration, and vascular invasion, have been used for squamous cell carcinoma of the cervix. However, there is no consensus emerging from the literature that any of these systems are reproducible or that they provide useful prognostic information. Grading is considered optional at the present time.

For the grading of invasive squamous tumors, it is suggested that 3 grades be used:

GX	Cannot be assessed
G1	Well differentiated
G2	Moderately differentiated
G3	Poorly differentiated

In contrast to squamous cell carcinoma, most authors who grade cervical adenocarcinoma on the basis of its architecture (glandular and papillary versus solid areas) and its nuclear features have found the grade to have prognostic value.<sup>2-4</sup>

G1	Small component of solid growth and mild to moderate nuclear atypia
G2	Intermediate between grades 1 and 3
G3	Solid pattern with severe nuclear atypia

Tumors with no differentiation or minimal differentiation that is discernible only in rare, tiny foci (undifferentiated carcinomas by WHO classification) are categorized as grade 4.

#### **F. Resection Margins**

Margins can be involved, negative, or indeterminate for carcinoma. If a margin is involved, whether endocervical, ectocervical, deep, or other, it should be specified. If indeterminate, the reason should be specified (eg, cautery artifact in electroexcision specimens may preclude evaluation of the status of the margin). The severity and extent of a precursor lesion (eg, focal or diffuse) involving a resection margin of a cone should be specified.

If an invasive tumor approximates but does not directly involve a resection margin, the distance between the tumor and the margin should be measured in millimeters. If the tumor involves the uterine corpus, a determination of whether the cervix or corpus is the primary site should be made.

#### **G. Lymph-Vascular Invasion**

Many gynecologists feel that the presence of vascular/lymphatic vessel invasion is important because it may change the extent of their surgical treatment. Specifically, the Society of Gynecologic Oncologists (SGO) differs with the Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) in the definition of early invasive carcinoma. The SGO defines such tumors as being invasive to a depth <3 mm, with a width of <7 mm, but most importantly lacking lymphovascular invasion. At times, it may be difficult to determine whether vascular/lymphatic vessel invasion is present; in such cases, its presence should be categorized as indeterminate.<sup>5</sup>

#### **H. Examination of Bladder and Rectum**

Currently, pelvic exenterations are rarely seen, but typically when performed indicate advanced tumor stage. In these cases, the extent of tumor involvement of the urinary bladder and rectum and the relation of the tumor to the cervical carcinoma should be described. To evaluate these features, sections of the rectum and bladder should be taken perpendicular to the mucosa directly overlying the tumor in the cervix. A method that provides excellent orientation of the tumor to adjacent structures consists of inflation of the urinary bladder and rectum with formalin and fixation of the specimen for several hours. The entire specimen can then be hemisected through the neoplasm, and appropriate sections can be obtained.

#### **I. Staging**

The TNM staging system for cervical cancer endorsed by the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) and the International Union Against Cancer (UICC), and the parallel system formulated by the International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) are recommended as shown below.<sup>6-8</sup>

By AJCC/UICC convention, the designation “T” refers to a primary tumor that has not been previously treated. The symbol “p” refers to the pathologic classification of the TNM, as opposed to the clinical classification, and is based on gross and microscopic examination. pT entails a resection of the primary tumor or biopsy adequate to evaluate the highest pT category, pN entails removal of nodes adequate to validate lymph node metastasis, and pM implies microscopic examination of distant lesions. Clinical classification (cTNM) is usually carried out by the referring physician before treatment during initial evaluation of the patient or when pathologic classification is not possible.

Pathologic staging is usually performed after surgical resection of the primary tumor. Pathologic staging depends on pathologic documentation of the anatomic extent of disease, whether or not the primary tumor has been completely removed. If a biopsied tumor is not resected for any reason (eg, when technically unfeasible) and if the highest T and N categories or the M1 category of the tumor can be confirmed microscopically, the criteria for pathologic classification and staging have been satisfied without total removal of the primary cancer.

Of note, tumor size has been shown to have prognostic utility for stage I-II lesions, and the most recent 2008 FIGO staging classification has adopted T subclassifications for T2 lesions (cervical carcinoma spreading beyond the cervix but not to the pelvic side wall or lower one-third of the vagina), based on tumor size  $\leq 4$  cm (T2a1) and  $>4$  cm (T2a2).<sup>6</sup>

### TNM Classification and FIGO Staging System for Cervical Carcinoma

#### Primary Tumor (T)

TNM Category	FIGO Stage	Definition
TX	(--)	Primary tumor cannot be assessed
T1	I	Cervical carcinoma confined to the uterus (extension to the corpus should be disregarded)
T1a	IA	Invasive carcinoma, diagnosed by microscopy only (all macroscopically visible lesions even those with superficial invasion are pT1b/stage IB) <sup>#</sup>
T1a1	IA 1	Measured stromal invasion 3.0 mm or less in depth <sup>###</sup> and 7.0 mm or less in horizontal spread
T1a2	IA 2	Measured stromal invasion more than 3.0 mm in depth <sup>###</sup> and not more than 5.0 mm <sup>##</sup> with a horizontal spread 7.0 mm or less
T1b	IB	Clinically visible lesion confined to the cervix or microscopic lesion greater than T1a2/IA2
T1b1	IB 1	Clinically visible lesion 4.0 cm or less in greatest dimension
T1b2	IB 2	Clinically visible lesion more than 4.0 cm in greatest dimension
T2	II	Tumor invades beyond the uterus but not to pelvic wall or to lower third of vagina
T2a	IIA	Tumor without parametrial invasion
T2a1	IIA1	Clinically visible lesion 4.0 cm or less in greatest dimension
T2a2	IIA2	Clinically visible lesion more than 4.0 cm in greatest dimension
T2b	IIB	Tumor with parametrial invasion
T3	III	Tumor extends to the pelvic wall and/or involves the lower third of the vagina, and/or causes hydronephrosis or non-functioning kidney
T3a	IIIA	Tumor involves lower third of vagina, no extension to pelvic wall
T3b	IIIB	Tumor extends to pelvic wall and/or causes hydronephrosis or non-functioning kidney
T4 <sup>###</sup>	IVA	Tumor invades the mucosa of bladder or rectum and/or extends beyond true pelvis <sup>###</sup>
M1	IVB	Distant metastasis

<sup>#</sup> The current FIGO staging omits specific reference to glandular lesions in stage IA.<sup>9</sup>

## The depth of invasion is measured from the base of the epithelium, either surface or glandular, from which it originates. The depth of invasion is defined as the measurement of the tumor from the epithelial-stromal junction of the adjacent most superficial epithelial papilla to the deepest point of invasion. Vascular space involvement, either venous or lymphatic, does not alter the staging.

### Presence of bullous edema is not sufficient evidence to classify a tumor as T4. The lesion should be confirmed by biopsy.

#### **Regional Lymph Nodes (N)<sup>#</sup> (TNM Staging System)**

NX Regional lymph nodes cannot be assessed  
 N0 No regional lymph node metastasis  
 N1 Regional lymph node metastasis

<sup>#</sup> Regional lymph nodes include paracervical, parametrial, hypogastric (obturator); common, internal and external iliac; presacral, sacral and para-aortic nodes. Metastasis to lymph nodes outside of the regional nodal group is classified as distant metastasis.

#### **Distant Metastasis (M) (TNM Staging System)**

M0 No distant metastasis  
 M1 Distant metastasis (including peritoneal spread, involvement of supraclavicular or mediastinal lymph nodes, lung, liver or bone)<sup>#</sup>

<sup>#</sup> Classified as stage IVB in the FIGO staging system.

#### **TNM Stage Groupings (FIGO 2008)**

Stage IA	T1a	Any N <sup>#</sup>	M0
Stage IA1	T1a1	Any N	M0
Stage IA2	T1a2	Any N	M0
Stage IB	T1b	Any N	M0
Stage IB1	T1b1	Any N	M0
Stage IB2	T1b2	Any N	M0
Stage IIA	T2a	Any N	M0
Stage IIB	T2b	Any N	M0
Stage III	T3	Any N	M0
Stage IIIA	T3a	Any N	M0
Stage IIIB	T1	Any N	M0
	T2	Any N	M0
	T3a	Any N	M0
	T3b	Any N	M0
Stage IVA	T4	Any N	M0
Stage IVB	Any T	Any N	M1

<sup>#</sup> Nodal status does not affect stage.

#### **TNM Descriptors**

For identification of special cases of TNM or pTNM classifications, the “m” suffix and “y,” “r,” and “a” prefixes are used. Although they do not affect the stage grouping, they indicate cases needing separate analysis.

The “m” suffix indicates the presence of multiple primary tumors in a single site and is recorded in parentheses: pT(m)NM.

The “y” prefix indicates those cases in which classification is performed during or following initial multimodality therapy (ie, neoadjuvant chemotherapy, radiation therapy, or both chemotherapy and radiation therapy). The cTNM or pTNM category is identified by a “y” prefix. The ycTNM or ypTNM categorizes the extent of tumor actually present at the time of that examination. The “y” categorization is not an estimate of tumor prior to multimodality therapy (ie, before initiation of neoadjuvant therapy).

The “r” prefix indicates a recurrent tumor when staged after a documented disease-free interval, and is identified by the “r” prefix: rTNM.

The “a” prefix designates the stage determined at autopsy: aTNM.

### **Additional Descriptors**

#### Residual Tumor (R)

Tumor remaining in a patient after therapy with curative intent (eg, surgical resection for cure) is categorized by a system known as R classification, shown below.

RX	Presence of residual tumor cannot be assessed
R0	No residual tumor
R1	Microscopic residual tumor
R2	Macroscopic residual tumor

For the surgeon, the R classification may be useful to indicate the known or assumed status of the completeness of a surgical excision. For the pathologist, the R classification is relevant to the status of the margins of a surgical resection specimen. That is, tumor involving the resection margin on pathologic examination may be assumed to correspond to residual tumor in the patient and may be classified as macroscopic or microscopic according to the findings at the specimen margin(s).

#### Lymph-Vascular Invasion (LVI)

LVI indicates whether microscopic lymph-vascular invasion is identified. LVI includes lymphatic invasion, vascular invasion, or lymph-vascular invasion. By AJCC/UICC convention, LVI does not affect the T category indicating local extent of tumor unless specifically included in the definition of a T category.

#### **Regional Lymph Nodes (pN0): Isolated Tumor Cells**

Isolated tumor cells (ITC) are single cells or small clusters of cells not more than 0.2 mm in greatest dimension. Lymph nodes or distant sites with ITC found by either immunohistochemical (eg, cytokeratin) examination or non-morphological/molecular techniques (eg, flow cytometry, DNA analysis, polymerase chain reaction [PCR] amplification of a specific tumor marker) should be so identified.<sup>10</sup> There is currently no guidance in the literature as to how these patients should be coded (in contrast to similar patients with breast carcinoma); until further studies are available, these patients should be coded as N1, with a comment noting how the cells were identified.

**L. Examination of Parametria**

The parametria may be measured grossly, but their width varies according to the elasticity of the tissue. Careful microscopic examination of the parametria is important for evaluation of the lateral margins and/or soft tissue extension.

**K. Cytology Diagnosis**

The updated Bethesda System of cytologic classification<sup>11</sup> is strongly recommended for consistency in reporting of Papanicolaou smears and is shown below. Although other classification systems may be used, the Papanicolaou class designation system is archaic and not recommended. The Bethesda System has been adopted by most cytology and pathology organizations for the classification of cytologic specimens from the female genital tract. According to this system, the terms “low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion” (LSIL) and “high-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion” (HSIL) are used to encompass the spectrum of intraepithelial lesions otherwise classified as dysplasia/cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN). Cellular changes characteristic of human papilloma virus (HPV), mild dysplasia, and a combination of both are classified as LSIL; and moderate (CIN 2) and severe dysplasia-carcinoma in situ (CIN 3) are classified as HSIL.

**The Bethesda System 2001 Cervical/Vaginal Classification**Negative for Intraepithelial Lesion or MalignancyOrganisms

- *Trichomonas vaginalis*
- Fungal organisms morphologically consistent with *Candida* spp
- Shift in flora suggestive of bacterial vaginosis
- Bacteria morphologically consistent with *Actinomyces* spp
- Cellular changes associated with Herpes simplex virus

Other non-neoplastic findings (optional to report, list not inclusive)

- Reactive cellular changes associated with
  - inflammation (includes typical repair)
  - Intrauterine contraceptive device (IUD)
  - irradiation
- Glandular cells status post hysterectomy
- Atrophy

Other

- Endometrial cells (in a woman greater than or equal to 40 years of age; specify if “negative for squamous intraepithelial lesion”)

Epithelial Cell AbnormalitiesSquamous Cell

- Atypical squamous cells (ASC)
  - of undetermined significance (ASC-US)
  - cannot exclude HSIL (ASC-H)
- Low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (LSIL)
  - encompassing: HPV/mild dysplasia/CIN I
- High-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (HSIL)
  - encompassing: moderate and severe dysplasia/ CIN2/CIN3/carcinoma in situ (CIS)



- with features suspicious for invasion (if invasion suspected)
- Squamous cell carcinoma
- Glandular Cell
  - Atypical
    - endocervical cells (NOS or specify in comment)
    - endometrial cells (NOS or specify in comment)
    - glandular cells (NOS or specify in comment)
  - Atypical
    - endocervical cells, favor neoplastic
    - glandular cells, favor neoplastic
  - Endocervical Adenocarcinoma *in situ* (AIS)
  - Adenocarcinoma
    - endocervical
    - endometrial
    - extrauterine
    - not otherwise specified (NOS)

#### Other Malignant Neoplasms

Specify

### **L. Special Studies**

#### HPV Testing

Human papillomaviruses are uniformly accepted to play an etiologic role in cervical carcinogenesis and are detectable in greater than 90% of preinvasive and invasive cervical epithelial neoplasms, with HPV types 16 and 18 being the most frequent types associated with invasive carcinoma.<sup>12</sup> While HPV genotyping assays to determine specific high-risk HPV type(s) have not yet become standard practice, the most recent 2006 consensus guidelines published through the American Society for Colposcopy and Cervical Pathology (ASCCP) have expanded the clinical indications for HPV testing. Based on large screening studies showing an improved sensitivity and negative predictive value of high-risk HPV testing in combination with cytology, the ASCCP is currently recommending the use of molecular testing for high-risk subtypes of HPV together with cervical cytology for screening in women 30 years of age and older.<sup>13</sup> Women who are negative on both tests can defer further screening for 3 years. Women who are positive for high-risk HPV DNA but show no evidence of dysplasia on cytology or colposcopic biopsy remain a particular management conundrum. Since the majority of HPV-positive women, even those 30 years and older, will clear the infection and become HPV negative on re-screening, the current consensus guidelines recommend conservative follow-up for the HPV-positive, cytology-negative patients, with repeat cytology and HPV testing at 12-month intervals.<sup>13</sup> Persistent high-risk HPV positivity at subsequent re-screening then warrants colposcopy.

#### p16 Immunohistochemistry

Immunohistochemistry has served as an important adjunct to the histologic diagnosis of CIN in difficult lesions, with p16 immunoreactivity being a good surrogate marker for high-risk HPV infection.<sup>14,15</sup> p16 immunostaining in the squamous epithelium, however, should be diffuse; strong nuclear and cytoplasmic staining, as focal strong p16 reactivity, may be identified not only in dysplastic squamous epithelium but also in benign squamous epithelium (Table 1). p16 immunostaining is also considered a better candidate (rather than HPV *in situ* hybridization) for the initial assessment of cervical

biopsies that are histologically indeterminate for dysplasia given its wide availability, easy interpretation, and high sensitivity and specificity.<sup>16</sup> Given the heterogeneous staining patterns seen in low-grade CIN lesions, however, immunohistochemistry for p16 is generally reserved for lesions that are morphologically suspicious or indeterminate for high-grade dysplasia. ProEx C, an immunohistochemical assay targeting both topoisomerase II- $\alpha$  and minichromosome maintenance protein-2 (MMP-2), has recently been shown to have high sensitivity and specificity for HPV-associated lesions of the cervix, with similar staining patterns as those seen for p16 and MIB-1 (Ki-67).<sup>17</sup>

#### Immunohistochemistry: Endocervical versus Endometrial Adenocarcinoma

Immunohistochemistry can also be helpful in the differential diagnosis between endocervical and endometrial carcinoma, especially in curettage specimens, as endometrial carcinomas may show mucinous differentiation. A panel of antibodies, rather than one antibody, is most useful; in most instances this includes vimentin, ER, p16 and monoclonal CEA.<sup>18,19</sup>

**Table 1. p16 Immunohistochemistry in the Differential Diagnosis of Squamous and Glandular Lesions of the Uterine Cervix**

	p16 <sup>#</sup>	MIB-1 (Ki-67)
LSIL (CIN I)	+/-	increased
HSIL (CIN II-III)	+	increased (full thickness)
AIS	+	+
AIM	-/+	-/+
Reactive squamous or glandular atypia	-/+	+
Tubal metaplasia	+/-	-

LSIL, low-grade squamous intraepithelial neoplasia; HSIL, high-grade squamous intraepithelial neoplasia; CIN, cervical intraepithelial neoplasia; AIS, adenocarcinoma in situ; AIM, atypical immature metaplasia.

<sup>#</sup> p16 expression (nuclear and cytoplasmic) is a surrogate marker of high-risk HPV (eg, HPV 16, 18). In LSIL, the p16 expression may be confined to the lower one-third/lower one-half of the squamous epithelium or show focal immunoreactivity (the latter being a pattern of expression, albeit cytoplasmic only, that may also be seen in reactive squamous epithelia). HSIL p16 immunoreexpression usually involves two-thirds or full thickness of the squamous epithelium. Despite these generalizations, the pattern of p16 expression should not be used to stratify dysplastic squamous intraepithelial lesions into LSIL versus HSIL; this distinction should be made on the basis of standard histologic criteria.

#### **References**

1. Tavassoli FA, Devilee P, eds. *World Health Organization Classification of Tumours: Pathology and Genetics of the Breast and Female Genital Organs*. Lyon, France: IARC Press; 2003.
2. Kosary CL. FIGO stage, histology, histologic grade, age and race as prognostic factors in determining survival for cancers of the female gynecological system: an analysis of 1973-87 SEER cases of cancers of the endometrium, cervix, ovary, vulva, and vagina. *Semin Surg Oncol*. 1994;10:31-46.

3. Baalbergen A, -Ewing-Graham PC, Hop WC, Struijk P, Helmerhorst TJ. Prognostic factors in adenocarcinoma of the uterine cervix. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2004;92:262-7.
4. Takeda N, Sakuragi N, Takeda M, Okamoto K, Kuwabara M, Negishi H, Oikawa M, Yamamoto R, Yamada H, Fujimoto S. Multivariate analysis of histopathologic prognostic factors for invasive cervical cancer treated with radical hysterectomy and systematic retroperitoneal lymphadenectomy. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2002;8:1144-51.
5. Kodama J, Mizutani Y, Hongo A, Yoshinouchi M, Kudo T, Okuda H. Optimal surgery and diagnostic approach of stage IA2 squamous cell carcinoma of the cervix. *Eur J Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2002;101(2):192-195.
6. Edge SB, Byrd DR, Carducci MA, Compton CC, eds. *AJCC Cancer Staging Manual*. 7th ed. New York, NY: Springer; 2009.
7. Sobin LH, Gospodarowicz M, Wittekind Ch, eds. *UICC TNM Classification of Malignant Tumours*. 7th ed. New York, NY: Wiley-Liss; in press.
8. Pecorelli S, Zigliani L, Odicino F. Revised FIGO staging for carcinoma of the cervix. *Int J of Gynaecol Obstet*. 2009; 105: 107-108.
9. International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics. Modifications in the staging for stage I vulvar and stage I cervical cancer: reports of the FIGO Committee on Gynecologic Oncology. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 1995;50:215-216.
10. Wittekind C, Henson DE, Hutter RVP, Sobin LH, eds. *TNM Supplement: A Commentary on Uniform Use*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Wiley-Liss; 2001.
11. Solomon D, Davey D, Kurman RJ, Moariarty A, O'Connor D, Prey M, et al. The 2001 Bethesda System: terminology for reporting results of cervical cytology. *JAMA*. 2002;287:2114-2119.
12. Wheeler CM, Hunt WC, Joste NE, Key CR, Quint WG, Castle PE. Human papillomavirus genotype distributions: implications for vaccination and cancer screening in the United States. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2009; 101(7):475-87.
13. Wright T, Massad S, Dunton CJ, Spitzer M, Wilkinson EJ, Solomon D. 2006 consensus guidelines for the management of women with abnormal cervical cancer screening tests. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2007; 197(4): 346-355.
14. Kalof AN, Evans MF, Simmons-Arnold L, Beatty BG, Cooper K. p16INK4A immunoexpression and HPV in situ hybridization signal patterns: potential markers of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2005; 29:674-679.
15. Kalof AN, Cooper K. p16INK4a immunoexpression: surrogate marker of high-risk HPV and high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia. *Adv Anat Pathol*. 2006; 13:190-4.
16. Kong CS, Balzer BL, Troxell ML, Patterson BK, Longacre TA. p16INK4A immunohistochemistry is superior to HPV in situ hybridization for the detection of high-risk HPV in atypical squamous metaplasia. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2007 ;31:33-43.
17. Badr RE, Walts AE, Chung F, Bose S. BD ProEx C: a sensitive and specific marker of HPV-associated squamous lesions of the cervix. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2008;32:899-906.
18. Castrillon DH, Lee KR, Nucci MR. Distinction between endometrial and endocervical adenocarcinoma: an immunohistochemical study. *Int J Gynecol Pathol*. 2002;21:4-10.
19. Kamoi S, AlJuboury MI, Akin MR, Silverberg SG. Immunohistochemical staining in the distinction between primary endometrial and endocervical adenocarcinomas: another viewpoint. *Int J Gynecol Pathol*. 2002;21:217-23.
20. Fox H, Wells M, eds. *Haines and Taylor Obstetrical and Gynecological Pathology*. Vol 1. 4th ed. New York: Churchill Livingstone; 1995.

21. Kurman RJ, ed. *Blaustein's Pathology of the Female Genital Tract*. 5th ed. New York: Springer-Verlag; 2002.