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Colonic polyps and their place in CRC screening

Familiarity with Gastroenterologists’ lexicon

How polyps are removed

Pathologists’ role in polyp assessment

Malignancy in a polyp – what next?
Colonic polyps and screening for CRC

Colon carcinoma is one of the most prevalent and also preventable cancers

CRC does not occur de-novo, but it is preceded by an adenomatous or serrated polyp

Colonoscopy is a unique screening tool: identification, prevention, treatment, and early detection of CRC

About 65% of at-risk population is currently compliant

Beginning to see decline in CRC incidence and deaths
“Dwell” time = 7-10 years
The History of Colorectal Cancer Screening: A Personal Perspective

Sidney J. Winawer
# Colonic polyps and screening for CRC

Size, type and number of polyps impacts surveillance

## Table 1. 2012 Recommendations for Surveillance and Screening Intervals in Individuals With Baseline Average Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline colonoscopy: most advanced finding(s)</th>
<th>Recommended surveillance interval (y)</th>
<th>Quality of evidence supporting the recommendation</th>
<th>New evidence stronger than 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No polyps</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (&lt;10 mm) hyperplastic polyps in rectum or sigmoid</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 small (&lt;10 mm) tubular adenomas</td>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–10 tubular adenomas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 adenomas</td>
<td>&lt;3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more tubular adenomas ≥10 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more villous adenomas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenoma with HGD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrated lesions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessile serrated polyp(s) &lt;10 mm with no dysplasia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessile serrated polyp(s) ≥10 mm OR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessile serrated polyp with dysplasia OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditioanal serrated adenoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrated polyposis syndromea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE. The recommendations assume that the baseline colonoscopy was complete and adequate and that all visible polyps were completely removed.

NA, not applicable.

*aBased on the World Health Organization definition of serrated polyposis syndrome, with one of the following criteria: (1) at least 5 serrated polyps proximal to sigmoid, with 2 or more ≥10 mm; (2) any serrated polyps proximal to sigmoid with family history of serrated polyposis syndrome; and (3) >20 serrated polyps of any size throughout the colon.*
Size: Diminutive, small, advanced and large polyps

Shape: The Paris classification of polyps

Depth & Resectability: Saline lift

Excision: Cold and hot forceps, cold and hot snare

Retrieval: Forceps, suction, Roth net

Interval CRC: CRC occurring between screenings

Proficiency: Adenoma detection rate, cecal intubation
Diminutive polyp = 3-5 mm

Small polyp = 3-7 mm

About 90% of all colonic polyps are diminutive or small

Advanced polyp = > 10 mm

Large polyp = > 20 mm

Formalin fixation does not significantly alter the size
Shape of polyp: Paris classification

Ip

Ia

Ib

Ic
**Type I**
(protruded)

- **Type Ip**
  (pedunculated)

- **Type Isp**
  (subpedunculated)

- **Type Is**
  (sessile)

**Type II**
(superficial / flat)

- **Type IIa**
  (superficial elevated)

- **Type IIb**
  (superficial flat)

- **Type IIc**
  (superficial depressed)

- **Type IIc+IIa**
  (superficial elevated with depression)

- **Type IIa+IIc**
  (superficial depressed with marginal elevation)
Methylene blue - Saline lift –
Good lift is a sign of *benignity* and *resectability*
“How are polyps removed”

Cold forceps (regular, jumbo)

Hot forceps

Cold snare

Hot snare

EMR (endoscopic mucosal resection)

Retrieved (forceps, suction, Roth net)
Interval CRC

- Poor prep (poor visibility)
- Suboptimal colonoscopy
- Inadequately excised polyp
- ?? Fast growing CRC (unlikely)
Documentation of ‘Crow’s feet’ and appendiceal orifice
Pathologist’s role in polyp assessment

Recognize small and large polyps as distinct

CRC risk & resection adequacy applies to large polyps

Understand how polyp retrieval causes fragmentation

Understand how interpretation impacts surveillance
Figure 3

- Pedicle or stalk
- Second lateral margin
- One lateral margin
- Cauterized base of pedicle or stalk
Final Diagnosis

A. (Proximal transverse colon polyp, EMR): 1.5 cm (after fixation) sessile serrated adenoma. No dysplasia. Completely excised with free cauterized base and edges showing normal colonic mucosa. See note.

Attending Pathologist: Shirram Jakate, MD
Pathology Resident: Hussein Alnajjar, MBChB

Note

The endoscopic report and images are reviewed (2.5 to 3 cm polyp, Paris IIa, in the proximal transverse colon, excellent lift with mixture of saline and methylene blue, snared using ERBE coagulation and cutting current, retrieved with Rothnet). Morphologically, this is a typical sessile serrated adenoma with significant length of normal colonic mucosa at the edges (completely excised). There is no dysplasia.
HP – 10 yrs

1.5 cm SSA – 3 yrs
Serrated lesions

- Sessile serrated polyp(s) <10 mm with no dysplasia
  - 5
  - Low
  - NA
- Sessile serrated polyp(s) ≥10 mm
  - 3
  - Low
  - NA
- Sessile serrated polyp with dysplasia
  - OR
- Traditional serrated adenoma
  - OR
- Serrated polyposis syndrome
  - 1
  - Moderate
  - NA

NOTE: The recommendations assume that the baseline colonoscopy was complete and adequate and that all visible polyps were completely removed.

NA, not applicable.

*aBased on the World Health Organization definition of serrated polyposis syndrome, with one of the following criteria: (1) at least 5 serrated polyps proximal to sigmoid, with 2 or more ≥10 mm; (2) any serrated polyps proximal to sigmoid with family history of serrated polyposis syndrome; and (3) >20 serrated polyps of any size throughout the colon.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesion Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥10 adenomas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more tubular adenomas ≥10 mm</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more villous adenomas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenoma with HGD</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrated lesions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessile serrated polyp(s) ≤10 mm with no dysplasia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moderate

High

Moderate

Moderate

Low
Malignancy in a polyp – what next?

Endoscopic suspicion of malignancy in a polyp

Pathological evaluation of carcinoma in a polyp

When is surgery recommended?
Endoscopic suspicion of malignancy in a polyp

Advanced polyp or large size (> 20 mm)

Puckering (scarring) or depression

Poor saline lift

Resectability assessment and tattoo

Snare cautery polypectomy
Pathological evaluation of carcinoma in a polyp

True invasion or pseudoinvasion (invagination)?

Usual type (moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma)?

Lymphovascular invasion (unequivocal?)

How deep into the submucosa (Haggitt level)?

How far from the cauterized base?

Free cauterized base and lateral margins?
True invasion or pseudoinvasion (invagination)?
Paris IIa, endoscopically estimated 4 cm
C. (Sigmoid colon polyp): The main 3.2 cm (after fixation) polyp fragment shows invasive moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma arising in tubulovillous adenoma. The tumor invades the superficial aspect of the submucosal stalk (Stage T1). No lymphovascular invasion. The cauterized base of the polyp is free and 0.5 cm away from the invading tumor. The lateral edges of the stalk show normal colonic mucosa and no adenoma. Additional separate small fragments show a tubulovillous adenoma with high grade dysplasia and no invasive carcinoma. See note.

**Note**
The endoscopic report and images are reviewed (4 cm sigmoid polyp, Paris classification Ip + Ila, mass removed with hot snare polypectomy, 7 mm of residual adenomatous appearing tissue at the base of the stalk removed). The entire polyp material is histologically examined.

- 4 cm sigmoid polyp
- Invasive moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma arising in tubulovillous adenoma
- Free base of the polyp
Figure 1. Classification of polyps with invasive carcinoma. (From R. C. Haggitt, Glotzbach RE, Soffer EE, Wruble LD.

Haggitt, Gastro 1985
- 129 malignant polyps
- 49% polypectomy alone, 51% some type of colectomy

### Table 4. Level of Invasion Compared With Other Prognostic and Follow-up Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of invasion</th>
<th>No. of cases</th>
<th>Lymphatic invasion</th>
<th>Poorly differentiated</th>
<th>Positive nodes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dead of disease</th>
<th>Mean follow-up (mo)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4/13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>129</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>4/44&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Number of patients with positive nodes/number with nodes available.  
<sup>b</sup> One of these 4 patients died of disease; the other 3 patients are alive without disease at 48, 63, and 75 mo.

Haggitt, Gastro 1985
Sm1: 1%
Sm2: 6%
Sm3: 14%

% lymph node metastasis

differentiated, no lymph nodes
Consider surgery in the following situations:

Deep submucosal invasion (level 3 or 4)

Unequivocal lymphovascular invasion

Deep resection margin < 1mm

Poor differentiation or unusual type (NE)
Summary

Colon polyps and their relationship to CRC screening

Gastroenterologists’ lexicon related to polyp screening

How polyps are removed and retrieved

Pathological assessment of polyp and its impact on screening

How to deal with malignancy in a resected polyp