Virginia Piper Cancer Institute Clinical Service Line
System-wide Consensus Guidelines: Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (DCIS): Management of Surgical Margins and Recommendations for Margin Re-excisions in Patients Having Breast Conserving Therapy

These guidelines apply to clinical interventions that have well-documented outcomes, but whose outcomes may not be desirable for all patients.

Reference #: SYS-PC-OCSL-CG-005

Origination Date: June 2011
Next Review Date: June 2020
Effective Date: June 2017

Approved Date: June 2017
Approval By: Allina Health Quality Council

System-wide Ownership Group: Allina Health Breast Program Committee
System-wide Information Resource: Director of Clinical Programs

| Hospital Division Quality Council Review: May 2017 |
| Allina Health Group Quality Council Review: May 2017 |

SCOPE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites, Facilities, Business Units</th>
<th>Departments, Divisions, Operational Areas</th>
<th>People applicable to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allina – All Facilities that perform breast conserving therapy for invasive carcinoma; Abbott Northwestern Hospital, Buffalo Hospital, Cambridge Medical Center, District One Hospital, Mercy Hospital, New Ulm Medical Center, River Falls Area Hospital, Regina Hospital, St. Francis Medical Center, United Hospital</td>
<td>Breast Surgeons Pathology Radiation Oncology Medical Oncology</td>
<td>Physicians, Advanced Practice Providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidelines are not meant to replace clinical judgment or professional standards of care. Clinical judgment must take into consideration all the facts in each individual and particular case, including individual patient circumstances and patient preferences. They serve to inform clinical judgment, not act as a substitute for it. These guidelines were developed by a Review Organization. These guidelines may be disclosed only for the purposes of the Review Organization according to Minn. Statutes §145.64 and are subject to the limitations described at Minn. Statutes §145.65.
PICO(TS) FRAMEWORK
Population DCIS patients undergoing breast conserving therapy
Intervention Management of surgical margins
Comparison n/a
Outcomes Ensure adequacy of tumor renewal to reduce risk of recurrence
Timing During surgical procedure and subsequent pathologic review
Setting Hospitals where procedure is performed

CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES:
1. Wire or seed localization procedures will be utilized intra-operatively in non-palpable lesions, with confirmatory specimen radiographs obtained to assess adequacy of removal of designated lesion.

2. The surgeon will orient the lumpectomy margins using the standard inking scheme (see below). The surgeon will orient the mastectomy specimen with a stitch at 12 o’clock.

3. Specimens will be sent immediately to pathology for evaluation of margins (for known cancers) and for handling of specimens according ASCO/CAP guidelines.
   a. If a pathologist is not available on site at the time of surgery, the surgeon is responsible for handling the specimen according to ASCO/CAP guidelines (see attached flow charts for mastectomies and lumpectomies).

4. Pathologist will grossly assess margin status of known cancers. Frozen sections may be obtained at pathologist’s discretion. Pathologists will report to surgeons any close margins requiring immediate re-excision.
   a. Pathologist will record time specimen placed in formalin on requisition slip.

5. For DCIS cases that will be treated with whole-breast radiation therapy (WBRT), all margins involved with DCIS and all DCIS margins at less than 0.2 cm should be considered for re-excision when possible. The grade of the DCIS, age of the patient, and the volume of DCIS at or near the margin may also influence the decision for re-excision.

6. DCIS with microinvasion (defined as no invasive focus greater than 0.1 cm in size) should be considered as DCIS when considering the optimal margin width.

7. For invasive cancers (greater than 0.1 cm) with a DCIS component, the adequacy for margin assessment should follow the invasive cancer guidelines (no tumor on ink) since these patients are typically treated with systemic therapy.
8. **For patients with invasive tumor and extensive intraductal component (EIC),** there should be further consideration for determining margin adequacy. Since EIC may be a marker for a potential heavy burden of residual DCIS, post-excision mammography to evaluate for residual targeted calcifications, the presence of multiple close margins, and young patient age can be used to select patients who may benefit from re-excision.

9. **Exceptions should be discussed by the surgeon, radiation oncologist and pathologist, and perhaps presented at a multi-disciplinary conference** (if there are still questions regarding the need for re-excision).

**SUPPORTING EVIDENCE:**
Margin status is an important issue in the management of patients undergoing breast conserving therapy (BCT) for treatment of invasive carcinoma and ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS). Most patients are also treated with whole-breast radiation therapy (WBRT). The incidence of ipsilateral breast tumor recurrence (IBTR) in patients with breast cancer who undergo lumpectomy or partial mastectomy has been shown to be directly affected by margin status.

Re-excision of margins for both invasive breast cancer and DCIS in clinical practice is determined by the closeness of the surgical resection margin. Controversy surrounds the recommendations for re-excision for both invasive carcinoma and DCIS since multiple factors including pathologic handling of specimens, tumor characteristics and biology can have an effect on local recurrence.

Intra-operative and pathologic examination of breast specimens has been standardized for Allina Health that are served by Hospital Pathology Associates (HPA). These include orientation of lumpectomy specimens intra-operatively by using a standardized multi-colored inking scheme (blue=superior, red=inferior, green=medial, yellow=lateral, orange=anterior, black=deep). All mastectomy specimens should be oriented with a stitch at 12 o’clock.

A standardized protocol developed by HPA for sectioning the lumpectomy and mastectomy specimens for gross assessment of margins is utilized on all specimens. Specimens are cut at approximately 0.5 cm sections along the long axis of the specimen. Shaved tangential margins are not used since this overestimates the “positive margin rate” and increases the likelihood of unnecessary re-excisions. Intra-operative touch preps are also not advocated for margin assessment because of inconsistent results. The pathologist evaluates the closeness of the margins on gross examination (and when necessary by frozen section). The decision for immediate re-excision is made by joint decision of the pathologist and surgeon. Final margin status for both invasive and non-invasive breast cancer is reported in pathology report for all 6 margins less than 1 cm from tumor.
Following gross evaluation, the specimens are placed in 10% neutral buffered formalin within 60 minutes from removal from the patient, and are fixed in formalin for a minimum of 6 hours, not to exceed 72 hours, according to American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) and College of American Pathology (CAP) guidelines.

Scientific information regarding margin status and recurrence for DCIS include a recent Consensus Guideline on Margins for Breast-Conserving Surgery with Whole-Breast Irradiation in Ductal Carcinoma In Situ (1).

1. A positive margin, defined as ink on DCIS, is associated with a significant increase in IBTR. This increased risk is not nullified by the use of WBRT.

2. DCIS margins of at least 2 mm are associated with a reduced risk of IBTR relative to narrower negative margin widths in patients receiving WBRT. The routine practice of obtaining negative margin widths wider than 2 mm is not supported by the evidence.

3. Treatment with excision alone, regardless of margin width, is associated with substantially higher rates of IBTR than treatment with excision and WBRT, even in predefined low-risk patients. The optimal margin width for treatment with excision alone is unknown, but should be at least 2 mm. Some evidence suggests lower rates of IBTR with margin widths wider than 2 mm but that rate has not reached statistical significance.

4. Rates of IBTR are reduced with endocrine therapy, but there is a lack of studies examining the association between endocrine therapy and negative margin width.

5. Multiple factors have been shown to be associated with the risk of IBTR in patients treated with and without WBRT, but there are no data addressing whether margin widths should be influenced by these factors.

6. Choice of WBRT delivery technique, fractionation, and boost dose should not be dependent upon negative margin width. There is insufficient evidence to address optimal margin widths for accelerated partial breast irradiation (APBI).

Additional supporting evidence:

In a review of 4,660 patients treated with BCT and radiation therapy (RT) for DCIS, a negative margin significantly reduced the incidence of IBTR. When margin thresholds were examined, a 2 mm margin was superior to a <2mm margin. However margins >2 mm did not show a decrease IBTR. (2, 5, 12, 25, 28-34)

The volume of tumor near the margin is also important in regards to IBTR. One duct involved within a 2 mm margin is less likely to recur than multiple ducts near or at a margin. And, forty percent of patients with DCIS will have skip lesions, making it common to have residual DCIS in the breast following “clear margins”. (6)
Other biological factors may also affect the risk of IBTR irrespective of the tumor margins. Size and grade of DCIS, presence of necrosis, as well as patient age, have all been shown to increase risk of local recurrence irrespective of the margin status. (2, 12, 25)

Many studies have shown that BCT without radiation therapy is associated with a marked increase in IBTR. Thus, radiation therapy has been proven to be necessary to control residual DCIS in the breast of patients undergoing BCT. (23)

Adjuvant hormonal therapy reduces the risk of local recurrence even further in patients with estrogen receptor positive DCIS. (2, 22-24)

Silverstein’s studies with the Van Nuys nomogram have shown that for small low grade DCIS, excision with a 1 cm margin may not require RT with no increase in local recurrence. (25) However, subsequent studies have been unable to duplicate his results. All randomized studies have shown an increase in IBTR for all grades of DCIS in which RT is eliminated. (26)

Invasive cancer with extensive DCIS also referred to as extensive intraductal component (EIC) has a higher rate of local recurrence than invasive cancer without EIC and the recurrences may manifest as DCIS or invasive cancer. Thus, the margin status of DCIS in patients with invasive carcinoma associated with EIC is extremely important in predicting IBTR. (12, 27, 35)

**DEFINITIONS:** N/A

**SPECIAL ENTITIES:**

Lobular carcinoma in situ

Lobular carcinoma in situ (LCIS) is a pathological finding associated with an increased risk of developing breast cancer in either breast. However, classic LCIS at or near a margin does not increase the risk of local recurrence, and thus classic LCIS does not require re-excision for margin involvement or proximity. The exceptions to this are special types of LCIS, such as pleomorphic LCIS, and LCIS with necrosis. These “high grade” types of LCIS are thought to behave similarly to DCIS. Thus, re-exCISION of margins is recommended for pleomorphic type LCIS or LCIS with necrosis located near or at surgical margins (following the guidelines above for DCIS). (36, 37)

Atypical ductal hyperplasia

Atypical ductal hyperplasia (ADH) has been found to be associated with an increased risk of cancer in the breast. And, in some cases, the classification of ADH may be based on a quantitative assessment of atypical ducts. There may be quantitatively insufficient atypical ducts in a particular specimen to qualify for a diagnosis of DCIS. Thus, if ADH is present at an excised margin in an excisional biopsy specimen, or at an excised margin in a BCT specimen, re-excision will be recommended to exclude the possibility of DCIS at that margin. (38)

**FORMS:** N/A

*Guidelines are not meant to replace clinical judgment or professional standards of care. Clinical judgment must take into consideration all the facts in each individual and particular case, including individual patient circumstances and patient preferences. They serve to inform clinical judgment, not act as a substitute for it. These guidelines were developed by a Review Organization. These guidelines may be disclosed only for the purposes of the Review Organization according to Minn. Statutes §145.64 and are subject to the limitations described at Minn. Statutes §145.65*
ALGORITHM:

**Allina Breast Committee Guideline for Handling of breast Lumpectomy Specimens**

1. Record time specimen removed from patient on pathology requisition slip
2. Orientate lumpectomy specimen with inks and adhere inks with vinegar/acetic acid
3. Color coding:
   - Anterior - Orange
   - Superior - Blue
   - Medial - Green
   - Posterior - Black
   - Inferior - Red
   - Lateral - Yellow
4. Is pathologist on site?
5. If Yes:
   1. Send specimen immediately to pathology
   2. Request pathologist assessment of margins (gross consult)
6. If No:
   1. Section lumpectomy through tumor
   2. Place tissue into formalin (10 x's formalin per volume of breast tissue)
   3. Record time specimen was placed into formalin
   4. Send specimen to pathology

Guidelines are not meant to replace clinical judgment or professional standards of care. Clinical judgment must take into consideration all the facts in each individual and particular case, including individual patient circumstances and patient preferences. They serve to inform clinical judgment, not act as a substitute for it. These guidelines were developed by a Review Organization. These guidelines may be disclosed only for the purposes of the Review Organization according to Minn. Statutes §145.64 and are subject to the limitations described at Minn. Statutes §145.65
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**ADDENDUM:**

**Plan for Monitoring and Adherence**

Who will be measured for guideline adherence?

- Breast Surgeons

What will be measured? Just in time monitoring will be performed to make certain appropriate handling of specimens is followed. Outliers will be addressed. And, re-excision rates will ultimately be gathered for surgeons.

Where is the data located? The data will be obtained from pathology reports, and additional information may be obtained from the surgeon’s operative note.

How will the guideline adherence be monitored?

- It will be monitored through the Breast Program Committee

When will adherence data be collected? TBD – need the dashboard to be built…..
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