Intraductal papilloma of the breast — management
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ABSTRACT

In light of the growing availability of ultrasound testing and invasive diagnostic methods of the breast in everyday gynecologic practice, lesions of uncertain malignant potential, classified histologically as B3, have become a significant health issue. Intraductal papillomas (IPs) are the most common pathology in that group of lesions. Despite their benign histologic appearance, IPs may accompany malignant growths and the diagnosis made on the basis of biopsy material carries the risk of breast cancer (BC) underestimation. The article presents a review of the available literature on the management of patients diagnosed with intraductal papilloma at a standard core needle biopsy or vacuum-assisted core needle biopsy. The management is not uniform and depends not only on the verification technique or the accompanying pathological growths, but also on the result of clinical-pathological correlations. As it turns out, open surgical biopsy should not necessarily be recommended to every affected woman, and a growing number of sources have recently suggested that a control program would be sufficient in many cases. Thus, it is vital for gynecologists to be able to differentiate between those women who may be included in the annual ultrasound control program and those who require further surgical management.
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INTRODUCTION

Ultrasound imaging of the breast is one of the components of complex gynecologic care offered to a patient. In Poland, as in many other European countries, gynecologic care is not limited to secondary prevention of breast cancer, and the number of gynecologists who perform histopathological verification of the focal lesions using different biopsy techniques continues to grow. Thus, it is vital that they are able to interpret the histologic result of a biopsy, conduct clinical-pathological correlations, and identify those patients who require further surgical management. An intraductal papilloma (IP), a benign growth originating from the epithelium of the milk duct, is an example of a problematic histologic diagnosis. Owing to its heterogeneity and the risk for coexisting malignant growths, IP is classified as B3, i.e. a lesion of uncertain malignant potential [1].

Over the last century, the management of patients diagnosed with IPs has undergone a radical change. Initially, clinical suspicion of IP, with an accompanying sanguinous nipple discharge, was a direct indication for mastectomy. In the years to follow, segmental resection of the breast tissue, removal of the papillary tissue or isolated resection of the milk ducts, have been recommended [2]. The aforementioned radical management was directly responsible why nipple discharge, especially sanguinous, was believed to be indicative of malignant neoplasm of the breast for decades. Nowadays, in the era of advanced diagnostic techniques and minimally invasive procedures, the number of indications for surgical management of IP has notably decreased. Apparently, open surgical biopsy should not necessarily be recommended to all patients with IP and numerous publications suggest that follow-up program would be sufficient in many cases.
**EPIDEMIOLOGY**

Intraductal papillomas (IPs) constitute approximately 10% of all benign growths within the breast [3]. Their incidence has been estimated at 2–3% among the female population, but the risk increases to 40–70% in case of nipple discharge [4]. Papillomas may develop in women of all ages, most often between 30–77 years of age [5]. Almost 90% of IPs are central, single lesions localized within the large collective ducts, usually developing in the older women and manifesting as nipple discharge (serous, serosanguinous, or sanguinous) [6]. Coexisting atypical growths are rare and IPs do not significantly increase the risk for the development of BC (breast cancer) [7]. Peripheral papillomas are significantly less common; they usually develop in young women and typically have multiple, occasionally bilateral, presentation. They may present as palpable tumors but are most often clinically silent, and are diagnosed accidentally during preventive screening tests [8]. Unlike central papillomas, they usually coexist with atypical growths, e.g. atypical ductal hyperplasia (ADH), atypical lobular hyperplasia (ALH), lobular carcinoma *in situ* (LCIS), or even ductal carcinoma *in situ* (DCIS), and notably increase the risk for developing invasive breast cancer [8–10].

**ULTRASOUND AND PATHOLOGY DIAGNOSIS**

Intraductal papillomas have various imaging presentations, from hyperechogenic growths in the ducts or cysts, to hypoechogenic, well-differentiated hypervascular solid masses [5, 11]. In some cases, IP morphology may resemble that of clustered breast microcysts [12] (Fig. 1).

As far as pathology is concerned, papillary lesions include hyperplastic lesions, presumably benign or malignant tumors. Benign presumed neoplastic papillary lesions include large duct papilloma, peripheral duct papilloma, sclerosing papilloma, nipple adenoma, papilloma with low-grade neoplastic atypia and rare adenomyoepithelioma with papillary morphology [13, 14]. Structurally, they bear resemblance to papillary malignant lesions such as low-grade papillary DCIS, encapsulated papillary carcinoma or solid papillary carcinoma, and the use of immunohistochemistry is required in differential diagnosis [14]. Significant heterogeneity of papillary lesions is the reason why fine needle aspiration biopsy is not applicable in the diagnosis of IPs (high rate of false negative results), and even core needle biopsy presents a challenge for the pathologist [14]. In contrast, a vacuum-assisted core needle biopsy may generate an almost unlimited number of specimens. In terms of tissue volume, vacuum-assisted core needle biopsy is more similar to surgical biopsy than core needle biopsy, and its diagnostic accuracy reaches 98–100% [15]. Nevertheless, material fragmentation makes it impossible to determine the histologic evaluation of resection margins.

**INTRADUCTAL PAPILLOMA DIAGNOSED AT BIOPSY — THE NEXT STEPS**

The diagnosis of intraductal papilloma at biopsy requires careful management. First, sample representativeness needs to be evaluated, followed by the analysis of adequate clinical-pathological correlations, meaning that a reanalysis of the biopsy material needs to be performed to verify whether the result corresponds to the most probable diagnosis made on the basis of the imaging tests. That particular course of action is undertaken due to the significant heterogeneity of the lesions in question. In case of doubt, the biopsy should be repeated, or surgical excision should be performed.

The method of verification is the next parameter to be considered. The literature reports indicate that the diagnosis of intraductal papilloma without atypia at a standard core needle biopsy is associated with a 2.3–16% risk of BC underestimation [16, 17]. Despite the fact that some authors, in case of clinical pathological concordance, advocate in favor of follow-up program [18], most clinicians lean towards radical local excision, either with the use of vacuum-assisted core biopsy or open surgical biopsy [19, 20]. When IP is accompanied by atypical ductal hyperplasia, the risk for BC underestimation increases to 13–92%, in which case surgical excision is common practice [3, 21]. The rate of false negative results for breast cancer at core needle biopsy is distinctly lower and has been estimated at 0%–2.6% for IPs without atypia [22, 23], and at 9–21% for IPs with accompanying atypia [24, 25]. According to the current recommendations, surgical excision is still mandatory in case of atypical lesions, whereas vacuum-assisted core needle biopsy may be considered as a therapeutic option in case of IPs without atypia, on condition that a 5-year follow-up program is implemented [21, 22] (Fig. 2).
CONCLUSIONS

According to the literature, after the diagnosis of IP without atypia at a standard core needle biopsy, surgical excision, either using vacuum-assisted core needle biopsy or open surgical biopsy, should be immediately recommended. Both methods have high reliability and although the biopsy method does not allow for histologic evaluation of the resection margins, lower invasiveness of the procedure is an undeniable asset. In case of primary vacuum-assisted core needle biopsy and clinical pathological concordance, the management may be considered as definitive. Still, it is vital to remember about the annual ultrasound follow-up for the affected women, not only due to the risk for recurrence but also for the development of breast cancer. Regardless of the verification method, the diagnosis of intraductal papilloma with atypia at biopsy is always and without question an indication for further surgical management.
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