

EXPRESSIONS OF p16INK4a, P27Kip1 AND p21WAF1
IN DIFFERENTIATING PRIMARY
ADENOCARCINOMA OF ENDOCERVIX FROM
ENDOMETRIUM

BY

DR. FARVEEN MARICAN ABU BACKER MARICAR

Dissertation Submitted In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Pathology
(Anatomic Pathology)

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA
2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to the following persons who have contributed to the successful completion of this study.

- My husband, my three lovely children and parents for all the sacrifice and understanding.
- My supervisor, Prof. Dr. Nor Hayati Othman
- My co-supervisor, Datin Dr. Nik Raihan Nik Mustapha
- Dr. Wan Anna, Dr. Meor Zamari in Hospital Sultanah Bahiyah
- Dr. Mukarramah Che Ayub
- Medical Lab Technologists- Bainoryati, Marzeyah, Aini, Moganavali,
- Dr. Ch'ng for helping in statistical analysis
- All my colleagues in Pathology Dept of HUSM, HSBAS and HRPZ II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	x
ABBREVIATIONS	xii
ABSTRACT	xiii
ABSTRAK	xv
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW	4
3.0 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	30
3.1 General Objectives	30
3.1.1 Specific objectives	30
4.0 METHODOLOGY	31
4.1 Study Design	31
4.2 Samples	31
4.3 Inclusion criteria	31
4.4 Exclusion criteria	31
4.5 Clinicopathological review	31
4.6 Primary antibodies	32
4.6.1 p16INK4a	32
4.6.2 p21 ^{WAF1}	32

4.6.3	p27Kip1	33
4.7	Instruments	33
4.8	Immunoperoxidase staining	33
4.9	Immunohistochemical assessment	36
4.10	Statistical analysis	37
5.0	RESULTS	38
5.1	ANALYSIS OF ENDOCERVICAL ADENOCARCINOMA	39
5.1.1	Age distribution in patients with ECA	39
5.1.2	Race breakdown in patients with ECA	39
5.1.3	Age distribution according to race	40
5.1.4	Histological subtype of ECA	41
5.1.5	FIGO staging	42
5.1.6	Histologic grade	43
5.1.7	Tumor infiltration depth	43
5.1.8	Tumor length in ECA	44
5.1.9	Tumor thickness in ECA	45
5.1.10	Corpus infiltration, vascular and lymph node invasion	45
5.1.11	Histological type according to FIGO stage	46
5.1.12	Histological grade according to FIGO stage	47
5.1.13	Vascular invasion according to histologic type	48
5.1.14	Vascular invasion according to histologic grade	49
5.1.15	Vascular invasion according to FIGO stage	50
5.1.16	Lymph node invasion according to histologic type	51

5.1.17	Lymph node invasion according to histologic grade	51
5.1.18	Lymph node invasion according to FIGO stage	52
5.1.19	Summary of the clinicopathological parameters in ECA	53
5.1.20	Immunohistochemical staining results for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 in ECA	54
5.1.21	Association of p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 expressions with the clinicopathologic parameters in ECA.	55
5.1.21.1	Associations between p16INK4a expression and clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases	56
5.1.21.2	Associations between p21WAF1 expression and clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases	57
5.1.21.3	Associations between p27Kip1 expression and clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases.	58
5.1.21.4	Associations between positive p16INK4a and p27Kip1 expressions with clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases	59
5.1.22	Inter-relationship between clinicopathologic parameters in patients with ECA	61
5.2	ANALYSIS OF ENDOMETRIAL ADENOCARCINOMA	62
5.2.1	Age distribution in patients with EMA	62
5.2.2	Race breakdown in patients with EMA	63
5.2.3	Age distribution according to race	63
5.2.4	Histologic subtypes of EMA	65
5.2.5	FIGO Staging in EMA	65
5.2.6	Histologic Grade	66

5.2.7	Myometrial invasion	67
5.2.8	Menopausal status	67
5.2.9	Histologic type according to menopausal status	68
5.2.10	Histologic type according to age group	69
5.2.11	Histologic type according to FIGO stage	70
5.2.12	Histologic grade according to FIGO stage	71
5.2.13	Summary of the clinicopathological parameters in EMA	72
5.2.14	Immunohistochemical staining results for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 in EMA	73
5.2.15	Association of p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 expressions with the clinicopathologic parameters in EMA.	74
5.2.15.1	Associations between P16INK4a expression and clinicopathologic parameter for EMA cases	74
5.2.15.2	Associations between p21WAF1 expression and clinicopathologic parameters for EMA cases	75
5.2.15.3	Associations between p27Kip1 expression and clinicopathologic parameter for EMA cases	76
5.2.16	Inter-relationship between the clinicopathological parameters in patients with ECA and EMA	77
5.3	ANALYSIS OF p16INK4a, p21WAF1 & p27Kip1 EXPRESSIONS IN DIFFERENTIATING ECA FROM EMA	78
5.3.2	Statistical analysis for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 expressions in ECA and EMA.	78
5.3.2	Statistical analysis for combined p16INK4a and p27Kip1 expressions in ECA and EMA.	79

6.0 DISCUSSIONS	80
7.0 REFERENCES	108

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE

- 2.1 WHO histological classification of glandular tumours of the uterine cervix
- 2.2 Comparison of major genetic alterations between type 1 and type 2 endometrial carcinomas
- 2.3 WHO histological classification of epithelial tumours of the uterine corpus
- 4.1 Clinicopathological parameters for both ECA and EMA cases
- 4.2 Scoring scale for immunohistochemical assessment
- 5.1 Summary of the clinicopathological parameters in ECA
- 5.2 Immunohistochemical staining results for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 in ECA
- 5.3 Immunohistochemical staining results for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 in ECA according to positive and negative category
- 5.4 Associations between p16INK4a expression and clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases
- 5.5 Associations between p21WAF1 expression and clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases
- 5.6 Associations between p27Kip1 expression and clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases
- 5.7 Associations between positive p16INK4a and p27Kip1 expressions with clinicopathologic parameter for ECA cases
- 5.8 Associations between combined p16INK4a and p27Kip1 expressions with lymph node invasion for ECA cases
- 5.9 Inter-relationship between clinicopathologic parameters in patients with ECA
- 5.10 Summary of the clinicopathological parameters in EMA

- 5.11 Immunohistochemical staining results for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 in EMA
- 5.12 Immunohistochemical staining results for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 in EMA according to positive and negative category
- 5.13 Associations between P16INK4a expression and clinicopathologic parameter for EMA cases
- 5.14 Association between p21WAF1 expression and clinicopathologic parameters for EMA cases
- 5.15 Associations between p27Kip1 expression and clinicopathologic parameter for EMA cases
- 5.16 Inter-relationship between clinicopathologic parameters in patients with EMA
- 5.17 Statistical analysis for p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 expressions in ECA and EMA
- 5.18 Statistical analysis for combined p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27Kip1 expressions in ECA and EMA

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE

- 2.1 Molecular basis of type 1 and type 2 endometrial cancers. Solid lines indicates type 1 causes and dashed lines indicate causes for type 2 endometrial cancers
- 2.2 Gross anatomy of uterus
- 2.3 Cell cycle landmarks
- 2.4 Schematic illustration of the role of cyclins, CDKs, and cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitors in regulating the G₁/S cell-cycle transition
- 2.5 Role of Retinoblastoma gene as a cell-cycle regulator
- 5.1 Case distribution per year according to center for EMA
- 5.2 Case distribution per year according to center for ECA
- 5.3 Age distribution in patients with ECA
- 5.3 Race breakdown in ECA cases
- 5.4 Age distribution according to race
- 5.6 Histological subtype in ECA
- 5.7 FIGO staging in ECA cases
- 5.8 Histologic grading in ECA cases
- 5.9 Tumor infiltration depth in ECA
- 5.10 Tumor length in ECA
- 5.11 Tumor thickness in ECA
- 5.12 Corpus infiltration, vascular and lymph node invasion in ECA
- 5.13 Histological type according to FIGO stage

- 5.14 Histological grade according to FIGO stage
- 5.14 Vascular invasion according to histologic type
- 5.16 Vascular invasion according to histologic grade
- 5.17 Vascular invasion according to FIGO stage
- 5.18 Lymph node invasion according to histologic type
- 5.19 Lymph node invasion according to histologic grade
- 5.20 Lymph node invasion according to FIGO stage
- 5.21 Age distribution in patients with EMA
- 5.22 Race breakdown in patients with ECA
- 5.23 Age distribution according to race
- 5.24 Histologic subtype of EMA
- 5.25 FIGO staging in EMA
- 5.26 Histologic grade in EMA
- 5.27 Myometrial invasion
- 5.28 Menopausal status
- 5.29 Histologic type according to menopausal status
- 5.30 Histologic type according to age group
- 5.31 Histologic type according to FIGO stage
- 5.32 Histologic grade according to FIGO stage
- 5.33 Positive control for p16INK4a immunohistochemical stain (x10 objective).
- 5.34 Positive control for p21WAF1 immunohistochemical stain (x10 objective).
- 5.35 Positive control for p27Kip1 immunohistochemical stain (x10 objective)

- 5.36 ECA with both nuclear and cytoplasmic staining for p16INK4a (x10 objective)
- 5.37 p21WAF1 immunostain showing nuclear positivity in almost all the tumor cells.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AIS	Adenocarcinoma in situ
CEA	Carcinoembryonic antigen
CDK	Cyclin Dependent Kinase
CDKI	Cyclin Dependent Kinase Inhibitor
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
ECA	Endocervical adenocarcinoma
EMA	Endometrial adenocarcinoma
ER	Estrogen receptor
FIGO	International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics
H&E	Hematoxylin and eosin
HPV	Human Papilloma Virus
HSB	Hospital Sultanah Bahiyah
HUSM	Hospital Universiti Sains Malaysia
IHC	Immunohistochemistry
MI	Microsatellite instability
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
RB	Retinoblastoma
WHO	World Health Organization

ABSTRAK

Ekspresi p16INK4a, P27Kip1 dan P21WAF1 dalam membezakan adenokarsinoma primer dari endoservix dan endometrium.

Pembezaan di antara adenokarsinoma endoservix (ECA) dan adenokarsinoma endometrium (EMA) boleh menjadi masalah pada biopsi kecil atau apabila ada tumor di dalam biopsi endometrium dan endoservix; atau apabila tumor telah merebak ke segmen bawah endometrium. Penilaian adalah terhad apabila bergantung kepada histomorfologi sahaja kerana kedua-dua tumor ini boleh mempunyai histologi yang sama.

Kami mengkaji imunohistokimia bagi p16INK4a, P27Kip1 dan P21WAF1 dalam membezakan ECA dan EMA. Kami telah menjalankan pewarnaan imunohistokimia ke atas sampel hirisan tisu dari tahun 2005 hingga 2008 dari HSBAS dan HUSM. Kadar pewarnaan imunohistokimia tadi kemudiannya di kaitkan dengan parameter patologi klinikal.

Sebanyak 40 kes ECA and 92 kes EMA telah diperiksa. p16INK4a dan P27Kip1 didapati menunjukkan ekspresi yang tinggi ($[p < 0.001]$ (80% versus 25%) and $[p = 0.001]$ (43% versus 15%)) dalam kes ECA berbanding EMA. Kes ECA juga boleh dibezakan dengan kombinasi ekspresi p16INK4a dan P27Kip1. Manakala p21WAF1 tidak dapat membezakan antara ECA dan EMA (70% versus 78%, $p = 0.312$). Hubungan yang signifikan didapati antara ekspresi negatif p16INK4a dan histologi tahap rendah dalam

EMA ($p=0.014$). Di dalam kes ECA, ekspresi p21 WAF1 menunjukkan hubungan yang signifikan dengan penglibatan korpus rahim ($p=0.043$), manakala ekspresi negatif p27Kip1 adalah berkaitan dengan penglibatan nodus limfa ($p=0.030$). Analisis multivariat menunjukkan bahawa tiada hubungan antara penglibatan nodus limfa dan ekspresi p27Kip1 dengan bangsa, tahap histologi, penglibatan salur darah, ekspresi p21WAF1 dan penglibatan korpus rahim.

Kesimpulannya, kombinasi ekspresi p16INK4a dan P27Kip1 boleh membantu dalam membezakan antara ECA daripada EMA. Pada biopsi kecil, ekspresi p21WAF1 mungkin dapat membantu dalam menentukan penglibatan korpus rahim. P27Kip1 pula boleh membantu dalam menjangkakan penglibatan nodus limfa

ABSTRACT

The distinction between an endocervical adenocarcinoma (ECA) and an endometrial adenocarcinoma (EMA) can be problematic on small biopsies or when there is tumor in both endocervical and endometrial specimens or when the tumor has extended into the lower uterine segment. The judgment is difficult to be based on histomorphology alone because these tumors can have similar histologic appearance.

We investigated the value of p16INK4a, p21WAF1 and p27kip1 immunohistochemistry for distinguishing ECA and an EMA. We immunostained tissue sections of archival samples from 2005 to 2008 from HUSM and HSB. The immunohistochemical staining scores were correlated with their clinicopathologic parameters.

There were 40 ECA and 92 EMA cases examined. We observed significant higher expressions of p16INK4a and p27kip1 ([$p < 0.001$] (80% versus 25%) and [$p = 0.001$] (43% versus 15%)) in ECA than in EMA. ECA could be differentiated from EMA based on the combination expressions of p16INK4a and p 27kip1. p21WAF1 expression did not differentiate these two carcinomas (70% versus 78%, $p = 0.312$). There was significant association seen between negative p16INK4a expression and low histologic grade in EMA ($p = 0.014$). In ECA, p21WAF1 expression shows significant association with corpus infiltration ($p = 0.043$) while negative p27kip1 expression with lymph node invasion ($p = 0.030$). Multivariate analysis however shows no association between lymph node invasion and p27kip1 expression adjusted by race, histologic grade, vascular invasion,

p21WAF1 expression and extension into the uterine corpus.

In conclusions, combination of p16INK4a and p27kip1 expression is helpful in differentiating ECA from EMA. In small biopsy, the expression of p21WAF1 may help in assessing the presence of corpus infiltration. P27kip1 expression is helpful in predicting presence of lymph node invasion.