

ABSTRACT Aims: 1. To study the incidence and age wise occurrence of carcinoma of breast, 2. To correlate ER and PR expression with Bloom Richardsons grading and TNM staging, 3. To help in therapeutic management and prognosis of the carcinoma of breast. Materials And Methods: 3Yrs study conducted in the department of Pathology, Kurnool Medical College, Kurnool. Out of 106 carcinoma of breast cases, 60 were subjected for ER and PR expression. Results: Among 60 cases, both ER+/PR+ were 34(56.66%) cases and both ER-/PR- were 21(35%) cases. Conclusion: Present study establish a correlation between ER and PR expression with tumor histomorphology, Grading and Staging of the tumor.

KEYWORDS: Carcinoma Breast, Boom-Richardson grading, TNM staging, ER/PR expression

INTRODUCTION:

Breast cancer is the second most common cancer among women in India after Cervical cancers and accounts for 7% of the global burden of breast cancer and one-fifth of all cancers among women in India¹. At present breast cancer is regarded as a unique disease in oncology and the specific markers like Estrogen Receptor(ER), Progesterone Receptor(PR) and HER2/neu are used to predict the treatment response to guide the therapeutic plan². The tumors that are both ER and PR positive have lower risk of mortality than compared to both ER and PR negative³.

MATERIALS AND METHODS:

A three years study was conducted in the department of Pathology, Kurnool medical college, Kurnool, after approval from the ethics committee of KMC, Kurnool. Out of 106 carcinoma breast specimens, 60 cases were subjected for Estrogen and Progesterone receptor expression. Entire clinical details of the cases were obtained from the Department of Surgery, Govt. General Hospital, Kurnool. Specimens were fixed in 10% formalin, submitted for processing and H&E staining done. After histological grading and staging, best sections representing the tumor were selected for ER and PR expression.

RESULTS:

In the present study, age of the patients ranged from 26 to 80yrs, with mean age was 49.73yrs, maximum number of cases were seen between 41-50yrs(40%) with right side predominence 48cases(45.2%). Out of 106 carcinoma cases, commonest hisological type was Duct cell carcinoma 101cases(95.28%), followed by medullary, mucinous and Papillary. According to modified scarf-Bloom-Richardson grading system, grade I were 26(24.5%)cases, grade II 34(32.07%)cases and grade III 10(9.43%)cases. According to TNM staging, Stage I were 32(30.18%), stage II 48(45.28%) and Stage III 26(24.52%)cases.

Table1:	Combinded	ER/PR	Status	Correlation	With	Age,	Grade
And Sta	ge						

		ER+/ PR+	ER+/ PR-	ER- /PR+	ER-/PR-	X ² value	df	P value
Age (Yrs)	<50	21 (35%)	2 (3.3%)	1 (1.7%)	10 (16.7%)	1.22	3	0.749
	>50	13 (21.7%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (1.7%)	11 (18.3%)			
Grade	Ι	9 (15%)	-	-	5 (8.3%)	10.8	6	0.095
	II	20 (33.3%)	3 (5%)	2 (3.3%)	7 (11.7%)			
	III	5 (8.3%)	-	-	9 (15.0%)			

6	0.036
	6

On comparison of combined ER/PR status with age, grade and stage, the statistical correlation found only with TNM staging (P-value 0.036). both ER/PR positive tumors were 21(35%) in <50yrs age group where as both ER/PR negative tumours were more 11(18.33%) in >50yrs age group. Majority of moderate Grade and stage II tumors were both ER/PR positive.

DISCUSSION:

In the present study the average age was 49.17yrs with a peak incidence in the 5th decade, where as in the western countries decade later when compare with Indian studies⁴. In various studies conducted in the world, invasive duct cell carcinoma not otherwise specified (IDC NOS) was found to be the most common type, the present study is correlated with other studies. In various studies conducted in the world, incidence of Grade I tumors varies from 9.4-29%, Grade II tumors vary from 36-57.3% and Grade III varies from 27-46%. In our study Grade I, Grade II and Grade III accounts for 24.54%, 56.60% and 18.66% respectively, correlating well with other studies. In the present study 45.28% of the tumours were in Stage II, which is similar to the studies conducted by Geethamala et al, shelbaya et al and Vasudha et al.

 Table2: Combined Hormone Receptor Status Compared With Other Studies

	ER+/ PR+%	ER+/ PR-%	ER-/ PR+%	ER-/ PR-%
Rashmikaul et al5	18.4%	16.3%	20.4%	49.9%
Geethamala et al6	52%	2%	0%	20%
Ambrose et al ⁷	47%	12.2%	4%	36.8%
Dunnwald et al8	63%	13%	3%	21%
Present study	56.7%	5%	3.33%	35%

In our study, we reported both ER+/PR+ tumors were 56.66%, ER+/PR-tumors 5%, ER-/PR+ 3.33% and ER-/PR- were 35%. The percentage of ER+/PR+(56.66%), is similar to Dunnwald et al(63%), Geethamala et al (52%) and Ambrose et al (47%). The percentage of both ER-/PR- tumors, is correlated well with Ambrose et al(36.8%).

Most of the studies conducted were shown that, Grade I tumors are both ER+/PR+ range from 5.7% to 78.9% and both ER-/PR- range from 8.33 to 55.5%. while Grade II tumors were both ER+/PR+ range from 21.5% to 64.9% and both ER-/PR- range from 11.66% to 27.8%. while Grade III both ER+/PR+ range from 5.26% to 15.1% and both ER-/PR- range from 15% to 57.8%. Our study correlated well

INDIAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED RESEARCH

49

with Geethamala et al and Suvearchala et al.

Table3: Comparision Of Hormone Receptor Status With A Grade Of The Tumor.

	Grade I		Grade II		Grade III	
	ER+/ PR+	ER-/ PR-	ER+/ PR+	ER-/ PR-	ER+/ PR+	ER-/ PR-
Geetham ala et al	(78.9%)	(15.8%)	(64.9%)	(27.8%)	(07.4%)	(26.4%)
Suvarch ala et al ⁹	(33.3%)	(55.5%)	(51.8%)	(22.2%)	(05.3%)	(57.8%)
Masood et al ¹⁰	(05.7%)	(21.0%)	(21.5%)	(19.4%)	(15.1%)	(21.5%)
Present study	(15.0%)	(8.33%)	(33.3%)	(11.7%)	(8.33%)	(15.0%)

Table4: Comparision Of Stage And ER/PR

Study	ER+/PR+	ER-/PR-
Adedayo et al ¹¹	StageI	StageIII
Rai et al ¹²	StageI	StageIII
Zhou et al ¹³	StageII	StageIII
Urmila Devi et al ¹⁴	StageII	StageII
Present study	StageII	StageIII

Most of the studies shown that early stages (stage I & stage II) of the tumor correlated well with both ER+/PR+. Advanced tumors stage III correlated with both ER-/PR- receptor negativity.

Figures:



1.ER positivity 2+ to 3+ of the tumor cell nuclei (10X)



2.ER positivity3+ of the tumor cell nuclei (10X)



3.PR positivity 3+ in 100% of tumour cell nuclei (10X) INDIAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED RESEARCH 50



4 PR Positivity 2+ to 3+ Of The Tumor Cell Nuclei(10X)



5.ER Positivity 3+ In Mucinous Carcinoma(40X)



6. Papillary Carcinoma With 3+ER Positivity(40X)

CONCLUSIONS:

The age group of the patients ranges from 26 to 80yrs with mean age was 47.19yrs. Left breast commonly involved (54.7%) than the right. Infiltrating duct cell carcinoma NOS type was most common histological type. Younger age group were associated with higher histological grade. Stage of the carcinoma did not show any correlation with the age of the patients. Most of the Grade II and Stage II tumors showed both ER+/PR+, while Grade III and Stage III were both ER-/PR-negative.

REFERENCES:

- Ferlay J, Shin HR, Bray F, Forman D, Mathers C, Parkin DM: Estimates of worldwide burden of cancer in 2008: GLOBOCAN 2008. Int J Cancer 2010, in the press. Allred DC. Issues and updates: evaluating estrogen receptor-a, progesterone receptor,
- 3.
- Amen DC. issues and updates: evaluating schopen receptor-a, progesterone receptor, and C-era-B2 in breast cancer. Mod. Pathol.2010; 23; S22–S59. Varghese C, The significance of estrogen and progesterone receptors in breast cancer, Journal of clinical and diagnostic research, 2007 | June | Volume 1 | Issue3 Stanley P. L. Leong, Zhen-Zhou Shen, Tse-Jia Liu, Gaurav Agarwal, Tomoo Tajima, Nam-Sun Paik, Kerstin Sandelin, Anna Derossis, Hiram Cody, and William D. Foulkes. J. Breast Concert he Same Discover in Action and Water Constrained Viscal R Surg. 2010 4. Is Breast Cancer the Same Disease in Asian and Western Countries?. World J Surg. 2010 October; 34(10): 2308–2324.
- 5. Dunnwald LK¹, Rossing MA, Li CI. Hormone receptor status, tumor characteristics, and prognosis: a prospective cohort of breast cancer patients. Breast Cancer Res. 2007;9(1): R6.
- Geethamala K*, Srinivasa Murthy V, BR Vani, and Sudha Rao. Histopathological Grade versus Hormone Receptor Status in Breast Carcinoma- Treasure The Past. International 6. Journal of Biomedical Research 2015; 6(07): 466-471.

- 7. Ambroise M, Ghosh M, Mallikarjuna VS, Kurian A. Immunohistochemical Profile of Breast Cancer Patients at a Tertiary Care Hospital in South India Immunohistochemical Profile of Breast Cancer Patients at a Tertiary Care Hospital in South India. Asian Pacific J Cancer Prev 2011; 12:625-629.
- Dunnwald LK¹, Rossing MA, Li CI. Hormone receptor status, tumor characteristics, and 8. prognosis: a prospective cohort of breast cancer patients. Breast Cancer Res. 2007;9(1): R6.
- Suvarchala SB, Nageshwararao R. Carcinoma Breast-Histopathological and hormone receptors correlation. *J Biosci Tech* 2011:2; 340-48. 9.
- 10.
- receptors correlation. J Biosci Tech 2011:2; 340-48.
 Nabi MG, Ahangar A, Kaneez S. Estrogen receptors, progesterone receptors and their correlation with respect to Her-2/neu status, histological grade, size of the lesion, lymph node metastasis, lymphovascular involvement and age in breast cancer patients in a hospital in north India. Asian Journal of Medical Sciences. 2016;7(3):28-34.
 Adedayo A. Onitilo, MD, MSCR, FACP, Jessica M. Engel, MSN, FNP-BC, Robert T. Greenlee, Ph.D., and Bickel N. Mukesh, PhDBreast Cancer Subtypes Based on ER/PR and Her2 Expression: Comparison of Clinicopathologic Features and Survival. Clinical Medicine & Research Vol 7, Number 1-2: 4-13.
 Goyanes RIA, Perez XE, Rodriguez RC, Lopez MO, Odio SF, Fernandez LL, Yi MG, Padilla CR. Hormone Receptors and Other Prognostic Factors in Breast Cancer in Cuba. MEDICC Review, 2010; 12: 36-40.
 Zhou XL: Fam W, Yane G, Yu MX (2014). The clinical significance of PR. ER. NF-KB. 11.
- 12.
- 13.
- MEDICC Review, 2010; 12: 56-40. Zhou XL, Fan W, Yang G, Yu MX (2014). The clinical significance of PR, ER, NF-κB, and TNF-α in breast cancer. *Dis Markers*, 2014, 494581. P. Urmila Devi, Uma Prasad, A. Bhagya Lakshmi, G. Santa Rao. A study of correlation of expression of ER, PR and HER2/neu receptor status with clinicopathological parameters in breast carcinoma at a tertiary care center. International Journal of Research in Medical Sciences. 2015 Jan; 3(1):165-173. 14.

51