

# Minutes 22nd Working Committee Meeting Morphology/Tumor biology/Molecular genetics

Malmö, 22.-23. January 2018

1. Review meetings - when and where?

*Upcoming review meeting Lund, 15.-16. March 2018*

*Meetings twice per year. The date and place for the next meeting is agreed upon at the end of the ongoing meeting. A tentative agenda for the meeting in Lund was decided upon.*

*-Agenda for the upcoming meeting will be review of epithelioid sarcomas and other SMARCB1 mutated soft tissue tumors that can be extracted from the central registry and files at the local departments.*

*-Revision of proformas for the reporting of soft tissue and bone sarcomas*

*-Start the revision and update of documents pertaining to pathology/tumor biology/molecular genetics on the SSG homepage*

*-Election of new chairperson*

2. When difficult cases to classify; is it possible to establish procedures for genetic testing?

*This will represent diagnostic testing and the cost will have to be covered by the remitting department/institution. It is not problematic to send to another institution for testing.*

*Reviewed series – would it be beneficial to add genetic information?*

*Smaller series will be possible from a financial standpoint. Larger series will need funding. There are certain resources for testing at the Department of Genetics in Lund. This will have to be viewed as research and will need sanctioning in ethical boards and informed consent.*

3. Accreditation of diagnosis within the field of bone and soft tissue tumors.

An important issue is the possibility to have some type of accreditation of given diagnoses. This is often done by either exchanging cases between accredited laboratories, or a central body produces cases that are sent to laboratories for review and then returned with diagnosis.

For sarcomas, there are natural hurdles to ensure this type of activity within each of the countries in SSG, but could this be achieved if we exchanged cases between laboratories in the Nordic countries?

*The issue was touched upon, but will have to be discussed during forthcoming morphology meetings.*

4. Evaluation of response after neoadjuvant treatment, chemo- and radiotherapy.

EORTC-STBSG published in 2016 recommendations for pathological examination and reporting of the response to radiation therapy in STS (Wardelmann E, et al. Eur J Cancer. 2016; 53:84-95)

An assessment of the EORTC-STBSG response score was performed by an American group (Schaefer IM, et al. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2017; 98:375-383). They found no correlation between RFS/OS and the response score in a cohort of 100 patients with STS in trunk/extremities that had been treated with RT followed by resection.

*Further studies are needed for validation of the findings. Before we consider any adoption of guidelines in SSG, further studies are needed.*

5. Standardization of pathology reports – possible to adapt developed proformas from CAP, RCPATH etc?

CAP, RCPATH and RCPA have all updated datasets for soft tissue and bone sarcoma. ICCR has not published on sarcomas as of yet.

*There seem to be a general interest in the topic among the SSG pathologists. Will have to be discussed further in the forthcoming morphology meetings.*

6. Revision and update of documents pertaining to pathology/tumor biology/molecular genetics on the SSG homepage – should we make an effort? Proformas for STS and BS as recommendations on the SSG homepage?

*A general interest among the participants and will be discussed during our meeting in Lund.*