

Protocol for the Examination of Specimens From Patients With Merkel Cell Carcinoma of the Skin

Protocol applies to Merkel cell carcinoma of cutaneous surfaces
only.

Based on AJCC/UICC TNM, 7th edition

Protocol web posting date: June 2012

Procedures

- Biopsy (use of case summary optional)
- Excision
- Sentinel node examination
- Regional node examination

Authors

Priya Rao, MD, FCAP*

Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California

Bonnie L. Balzer, MD, PhD, FCAP

Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California

Bianca D. Lemos, MD

Division of Dermatology, University of Washington Medical Center, Seattle, Washington

Nanette J. Liegeois, MD

Department of Dermatology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland

Jennifer M. McNiff, MD, FASCP

Departments of Dermatology and Pathology, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

Paul Nghiem, MD, PhD

Division of Dermatology, University of Washington Medical Center, Seattle, Washington

Victor G. Prieto, MD, PhD, FCAP

Departments of Pathology and Dermatology, MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Texas, Houston, Texas

M. Timothy Smith, MD

Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina

Bruce Robert Smoller, MD, FCAP

Department of Pathology, University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences, Little Rock, Arkansas

Mark R. Wick, MD, FCAP

Department of Pathology, University of Virginia Health System, Charlottesville, Virginia

David P. Frishberg, MD, FCAP†

Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California

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

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

© 2012 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" 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 required data 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.

CAP Merkel Cell Carcinoma Protocol Revision History

Version Code

The definition of the version code can be found at www.cap.org/cancerprotocols.

Version: MerkelCell 3.0.1.1

Summary of Changes

The following changes have been made since the February 2012 release.

Incisional Biopsy, Excision, Re-Excision, Lymphadenectomy

Note

The word "checklist" was changed to "case summary."

Mitotic Index

"Mitotic Index" was changed to "Mitotic Rate."

Explanatory Notes

"Mitotic Index" was changed to "Mitotic Rate" (note B).

The word "checklist" was changed to "case summary" and "protocol" (notes B and C, respectively).

Surgical Pathology Cancer Case Summary

Protocol web posting date: June 2012

MERKEL CELL CARCINOMA OF THE SKIN: Incisional Biopsy, Excision, Re-Excision, Lymphadenectomy

Note: Use of case summary is not required for punch or shave biopsies.

Select a single response unless otherwise indicated.

Procedure

- Biopsy, incisional
 Excision
 Re-excision
 Lymphadenectomy, sentinel node(s)
 Lymphadenectomy, regional nodes (specify): _____
 Other (specify): _____
 Not specified

Macroscopic Tumor

- Present
 Not identified

Tumor Site

- Specify (if known): _____
 Not specified

Tumor Size

- Greatest dimension: ___ cm
 + Additional dimensions: ___ x ___ cm
 Indeterminate (see "Comment")

+ Tumor Thickness (Note A)

- + Thickness: ___ mm
 + Thickness: at least ___ mm (see "Comment")

Margins

Peripheral Margins

- Cannot be assessed
 Uninvolved by carcinoma
 Distance of carcinoma from closest margin: ___ mm
 Specify location(s), if possible: _____
 Involved by carcinoma
 Specify location(s), if possible: _____

+ Data elements preceded by this symbol are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

Deep Margin

- Cannot be assessed
 Uninvolved by carcinoma
 Distance of carcinoma from closest margin: ___ mm
 Specify location(s), if possible: _____
 Involved by carcinoma
 Specify location(s), if possible: _____

Lymph-Vascular Invasion

- Not identified
 Present
 Indeterminate

Invasion of Bone, Muscle, Fascia, or Cartilage

- Present (specify structures involved): _____
 Not identified
 Not applicable (eg, for superficial biopsy)

+ Mitotic Rate (Note B)

- + <1/mm²
 + Specify: ___ /mm²

+ Tumor-Infiltrating Lymphocytes (Note C)

- + Not identified
 + Present, nonbrisk
 + Present, brisk

+ Tumor Growth Pattern (Note D)

- + Nodular
 + Infiltrative

+ Presence of Second Malignancy (Note E)

- + Present (specify type): _____
 + Not identified

Lymph Nodes (required only if lymph nodes are present in the specimen) (Note F)

- Number of sentinel nodes examined: ____
 Total number of nodes examined (sentinel and nonsentinel): ____
 Number of lymph nodes with metastases: ____

Macroscopic tumor:

- Present
 Not identified
 Indeterminate

+ Size of largest metastatic focus: ___ mm

+ Extranodal extension:

- + Present
 + Not identified

+ Data elements preceded by this symbol are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

Pathologic Staging (pTNM) (Note G)

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

- m (multiple)
 r (recurrent)
 y (posttreatment)

Primary Tumor (pT)

- pTX: Primary tumor cannot be assessed
 pT0: No evidence of primary tumor (eg, nodal/metastatic presentation without associated primary)
 pTis: In situ primary tumor
 pT1: Less than or equal to 2 cm maximum tumor dimension
 pT2: Greater than 2 cm but not more than 5 cm maximum tumor dimension
 pT3: Over 5 cm maximum tumor dimension
 pT4: Primary tumor invades bone, muscle, fascia, or cartilage

Regional Lymph Nodes (pN)

- pNX: Nodes not examined pathologically
 pN0: Nodes negative by pathologic exam
 pN1: Metastasis in regional lymph node(s)
+ pN1a: Micrometastasis
+ pN1b: Macrometastasis
 pN2: In transit metastasis

Distant Metastasis (pM)

- Not applicable
 pM1: Metastasis beyond regional lymph nodes
+ pM1a: Metastasis to skin, subcutaneous tissues, or distant lymph nodes
+ pM1b: Metastasis to lung
+ pM1c: Metastasis to all other visceral sites

+ Additional Pathologic Findings

+ Specify: _____

+ Comment(s)

+ Data elements preceded by this symbol are not required. However, these elements may be clinically important but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.

Explanatory Notes

A. Tumor Thickness

There are published¹ and unpublished data from 3 independent prospective cohorts of Merkel cell carcinoma patients examining tumor thickness (measured in millimeters from the stratum granulosum to the deepest infiltrating tumor cells) as a prognostic indicator for outcome. All 3 centers have data that find that tumor thickness is more predictive of outcome than maximum tumor diameter (a current staging parameter). In 2 of the studies, the outcome thus far examined was nodal metastasis; the third study evaluated disease-specific survival.

If the tumor is transected at the deep margin of the specimen, the depth may be indicated as "at least ___ mm" with a comment explaining the limitation of thickness assessment.

B. Mitotic Rate

The presence of >10 mitotic figures/high-power field (HPF) has been shown to correlate with large tumor size as well as a poor prognosis.^{2,3} The definition of what constitutes a high-power field was not specified in these reports; typically a 10X ocular and a 40X objective will yield a field area of approximately 0.15 mm², but this will differ from microscope to microscope and should be determined on an individual basis by direct measurement and calculation of the field or manufacturer's specifications. Reporting mitotic figures per square millimeter should have the advantage of greater reproducibility. The identification of no mitotic figures may be reported as "<1/mm²."

Uniformly accepted thresholds for low- or high-risk mitotic counts are not established for either reporting method (number per HPF versus number per square millimeter), and this case summary item remains optional at this time.

It has also been suggested that an MIB-1 proliferation index of greater than 50% is associated with a significantly worse prognosis.³

C. Tumor-Infiltrating Lymphocytes


Tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) are defined as lymphocytes present at the interface of the tumor and the stroma. Some authors have suggested that the presence of TILs has been shown to portend a poor prognosis, especially when considered in concurrence with a tumor depth of >5 mm.⁴ However, there are conflicting data on the subject.³

In the absence of specific accepted guidelines for assessment of TILs, it is recommended in this protocol that, for purposes of uniformity, pathologists choosing to report TILs employ guidelines used for assessment of TILs as in cutaneous melanomas, given below:

TILs not identified: No lymphocytes present, or lymphocytes present but do not infiltrate tumor at all.

TILs nonbrisk: Lymphocytes infiltrate tumor only focally or not along the entire base of the vertical growth phase.

TILs brisk: Lymphocytes diffusely infiltrate the entire base of the dermal tumor (Figure, A) or the entire invasive component of the tumor (Figure, B).



Brisk tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes. A, Lymphocytes diffusely infiltrate the entire base of the invasive tumor. B, Lymphocytes infiltrate the entire invasive component of the carcinoma.

D. Tumor Growth Pattern

In a series of 156 patients with Merkel cell carcinoma, nodular tumor growth pattern was found on both uni- and multivariate analysis to correlate with better survival.¹ Nodular pattern is defined as tumors with a relatively well-circumscribed interface with the surrounding tissue, typically composed of one or multiple nodules.

Infiltrative pattern is defined as tumors without a well-circumscribed interface with the surrounding tissue, composed of single cells, rows, trabeculae or strands of cells infiltrating through dermal collagen or deeper soft tissue.

A tumor exhibiting both nodular and infiltrative patterns should be classified as infiltrative.

E. Presence of Second Malignancy

Merkel cell carcinoma has been shown to be strongly associated with a number of cutaneous and hematological malignancies, chiefly squamous cell carcinomas and chronic lymphocytic leukemia.⁵ The largest series studying the relationship of second neoplasms with Merkel cell carcinoma spanned a period of 16 years and 67 patients, and found that the presence of any second neoplasm with Merkel cell carcinoma, whether concurrent or not, conferred a poor prognosis.

F. Lymph Node Examination

Clinical detection of nodal disease may be via inspection, palpation, and/or imaging.

"Micrometastases" are defined by identification of metastasis on pathologic examination of sentinel or regional lymphadenectomy specimens. "Macrometastases" are defined as clinically detectable nodal metastases, confirmed by pathologic examination of therapeutic lymphadenectomy specimens. Because the pathologist may not have this clinical information, subdivision of N categories in the pathology report is optional.

In transit metastasis is defined as a tumor distinct from the primary lesion and located either (1) between the primary lesion and the draining node bed or (2) distal to the primary lesion.

Metastatic merkel cell carcinoma to the lymph node may be difficult to identify on routine hematoxylin-eosin (H&E)-stained sections. The use of immunostains has been shown to increase the sensitivity of identifying occult lymph node metastases.⁶ It is strongly recommended that at least 1 immunostain be

performed before designating a lymph node as negative. Depending on the experience or preference of the laboratory, stains may include but are not limited to AE1/AE3, CK116, Cam 5.2, CD56, CK20, synaptophysin, and/or chromogranin, many of which show a perinuclear dot-like staining pattern. All immunohistochemical results should be documented in the final pathology report.

Isolated tumor cells in a lymph node are classified as micrometastases (pN1a).

G. TNM Staging

Recent analysis of more than 4000 patients with Merkel cell carcinoma (MCC) in the National Cancer Database was used to derive a 4-tier staging system to be adopted by the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC). Primary tumor dimension as a single variable was only weakly correlated with survival. The staging system takes into account tumor size (≤ 2 cm versus larger), nodal status, and metastatic disease for stratification.⁷

Those patients with MCC presentations that are indeterminate should be categorized as TX. Merkel cell carcinoma in situ (ie, completely limited to epidermis or adnexal epithelium) is categorized as Tis. The T category of MCC is classified primarily by measuring the maximum dimension of the tumor with a threshold of ≤ 2 cm (T1), >2 cm but ≤ 5 cm (T2), or >5 cm (T3). Extracutaneous invasion by the primary tumor into bone, muscle, fascia, or cartilage is classified as T4.

Regional metastases most commonly present in the regional lymph nodes. A second staging definition is related to nodal tumor burden: microscopic versus macroscopic. Therefore, patients without clinical or radiologic evidence of lymph node metastases, but who have pathologically documented nodal metastases, are defined by convention as exhibiting "microscopic" or "clinically occult" nodal metastases. In contrast, MCC patients with both clinical evidence of nodal metastases *and* pathologic examination confirming nodal metastases are defined by convention as having "macroscopic" or "clinically apparent" nodal metastases.

Distant metastases are defined as metastases that have spread beyond the draining lymph node basin, including cutaneous, nodal, and visceral sites.

Primary Tumor (T)

TX	Primary tumor cannot be assessed
T0	No evidence of primary tumor (eg, nodal/metastatic presentation without associated primary)
Tis	In situ primary tumor
T1	Less than or equal to 2 cm maximum tumor dimension
T2	Greater than 2 cm but not more than 5 cm maximum tumor dimension
T3	Over 5 cm maximum tumor dimension
T4	Primary tumor invades bone, muscle, fascia, or cartilage

Regional Lymph Nodes (N)

cN0	Nodes not clinically detectable
cN1	Nodes clinically detectable
pNX	Regional lymph nodes not examined pathologically
pN0	Nodes negative by pathologic examination
pN1	Metastasis in regional lymph node(s)
pN1a	Micrometastasis
pN1b	Macrometastasis
pN2	In transit metastasis

Distant Metastasis (M)

M0	No distant metastasis
M1	Metastasis beyond regional lymph nodes
M1a	Metastasis to skin, subcutaneous tissues, or distant lymph nodes
M1b	Metastasis to lung
M1c	Metastasis to all other visceral sites

Stage Groupings

Patients with primary Merkel cell carcinoma with no evidence of regional or distant metastases (either clinically or pathologically) are divided into 2 stages: stage I for primary tumors ≤ 2 cm in size and stage II for primary tumors > 2 cm in size. Stages I and II are further divided into A and B substages based on method of nodal evaluation. Patients who have pathologically proven node-negative disease (by microscopic evaluation of their draining lymph nodes) have improved survival (substaged as "A") as compared with patients who are only evaluated clinically (substaged as "B"). Stage II has an additional substage ("IIC") for tumors with extracutaneous invasion (T4) and negative node status regardless of whether the negative node status was established microscopically or clinically. Stage III is also divided into A and B categories for patients with microscopically positive and clinically occult nodes ("IIIA") and macroscopic nodes ("IIIB"). There are no subgroups of stage IV Merkel cell carcinoma.

Stage Groupings

Stage 0	Tis	cN0, pN0/pNx	M0
Stage IA	T1	cN0, pN0	M0
Stage IB	T1	cN0, pNx	M0
Stage IIA	T2/T3	cN0, pN0	M0
Stage IIB	T2/T3	cN0, pNx	M0
Stage IIC	T4	cN0, pN0/pNx	M0
Stage IIIA	Any T	cN0, pN1	M0
Stage IIIB	Any T	cN1, pN1/N2	M0
Stage IV	Any T	Any N	M1

References

1. Andea AA, Coit DG, Amin B, Busam KJ. Merkel cell carcinoma: histologic features and prognosis. *Cancer*. 2008;113(9):2549-2558.
2. Skelton HG, Smith KJ, Hitchcock CL, McCarthy WF, Lupton GP, Graham JH. Merkel cell carcinoma: analysis of clinical, histologic, and immunohistologic features of 132 cases with relation to survival. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 1997;37(5 Pt 1):734-739.
3. Llombart B, Monteagudo C, Lopez-Guerrero JA, et al. Clinicopathological and immunohistochemical analysis of 20 cases of Merkel cell carcinoma in search of prognostic markers. *Histopathology*. 2005;46(6):622-634.
4. Mott RT, Smoller BR, Morgan MB. Merkel cell carcinoma: a clinicopathologic study with prognostic implications. *J Cutan Pathol*. 2004;31(3):217-223.
5. Brenner B, Sulkes A, Rakowsky E, et al. Second neoplasms in patients with Merkel cell carcinoma. *Cancer*. 2001;91(7):1358-1362.
6. Allen PJ, Busam K, Hill AD, Stojadinovic A, Coit DG. Immunohistochemical analysis of sentinel lymph nodes from patients with Merkel cell carcinoma. *Cancer*. 2001;92(6):1650-1655.
7. Merkel cell carcinoma. In: Edge SB, Byrd DR, Carducci MA, Compton CC, eds. *AJCC Cancer Staging Manual*. 7th ed. New York, NY: Springer; 2009.