Original Article Correlation of Tertiary Lymphoid Structures in Breast Ductal Carcinoma in Situ and Adverse Pathological Parameters

Tertiary Lymphoid Structures in Breast Ductal Carcinoma

Namra Naeem, Iqra Taqi, Farwa Batool Shamsi, Aniqa Saeed and Ameer Alam

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate the tertiary lymphoid structures in ductal carcinoma in situ of breast their association with clinical outcomes, immune cell markers and pathological features.

Study Design: Prospective study

Place and Duration of Study: This study was conducted at the Pathology Department, Faisalabad Medical University, Faisalabad in one year duration from June 2022 to May 2023.

Materials and Methods: A total of 210 patients who were diagnosed with DCIS were enrolled in study. Positive tumors were labeled when there was one or more TLS in the lesion area and it was negative when no TLS found. Classification of TLS-positive tumors was made as tumors with TLSs covering less than 5% of the lesional area was categorized as having a low TLSs area percentage, while tumors with TLSs covering 5% or more of the lesion area were categorized as having a high TLSs area percentage.

Results: There were 69.0% patients with TLSs negativity and 31.0% patients with TLSs positivity. It was noted that the presence of TLSs were associated with HER2 positivity (p=0.001), triple negativity (p=0.047), TILs (25% cut-off) (p<0.001) and FoxP3 (1% cut-off) (p<0.001). Further, high TLSs (\geq 5%) was associated with calcifications (p<0.001), HER2 positivity (p=0.012), triple negativity (p<0.001), TILs (25% cut-off) (p<0.001), FoxP3 (1% cut-off) (p=0.016) and PD-L1 in TILs (1% cut-off) (p=0.043).

Conclusion: Tertiary lymphoid structures are significantly associated with negative hormone receptors, triple negativity, HER2 positivity, necrosis in situ but significance was not appropriate with recurrence and invasive behavior.

Key Words: DCIS, Breast, triple negativity, HER2, tertiary lymphoid structures

Citation of article: Naeem N, Taqi I, Shamsi FB, Saeed A, Alam A. Correlation of Tertiary Lymphoid Structures in Breast Ductal Carcinoma in Situ and Adverse Pathological Parameters. Med Forum 2023;34(7):50-54. doi:10.60110/medforum.340712.

INTRODUCTION

Tertiary lymphoid structures (TLS) are immune cell aggregates that can form in certain tissues, including tumors. They resemble lymph nodes and contain various immune cells, such as T cells, B cells, and dendritic cells¹. The presence of TLS within tumor tissues has been a subject of research interest in recent years. Breast ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) is a non-invasive form of breast cancer where abnormal cells are found in the lining of the breast ducts². The correlation between TLS and adverse pathological parameters in DCIS has been investigated in several studies³.

Department of Pathology, Faisalabad Medical University, Faisalabad.

Correspondence: Dr. Namra Naeem, Assistant Professor of Pathology, Faisalabad Medical University, Faisalabad. Contact No: 0322 6187118 Email: namran88@gmail.com

Received: Accepted: Printed:	June, 2023 June, 2023 July, 2023	
Printed:	July, 2023	

Adverse pathological parameters refer to features of the tumor that are associated with a worse prognosis or more aggressive disease⁴. Several studies have suggested that the presence of TLS in breast DCIS is associated with adverse pathological parameters. These parameters may include larger tumor size, higher histological grade, presence of necrosis, and increased proliferation of cancer cells⁵. In other words, the presence of TLS in DCIS tumors may indicate a more advanced or aggressive form of the disease⁶. Furthermore, the presence of TLS in DCIS has also been associated with an increased risk of recurrence and progression to invasive breast cancer^{7,8}. This suggests that TLS may play a role in promoting the progression of DCIS to invasive disease⁹. It is important to note that the research on TLS in breast DCIS is still evolving, and the exact mechanisms underlying their formation and their impact on disease progression are not yet fully understood¹⁰.

There is an increase in the significance of detailed assessment of radiological, histopathological and immunohistochemical features in DCIS for optimal risk stratification.

Med. Forum, Vol. 34, No. 7

These features along with accurate estimation of margin status in excised specimens is helpful for oncologist to decide management options and reliably predict outcomes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was carried out at Pathology Department, Faisalabad Medical University in one year duration from June 2022 to May 2023. Study was started after ethical approval from hospital ethical board and consent was obtained from patients after ensuring about confidentiality of their data. A total of 210 cases of DCIS were enrolled and clinicopathological parameters like tumor size, microinvasion, nuclear grade, ethnicity necrosis and calcification status were recorded. Slides (haematoxylin and eosin H & E) were made and viewed under IMS (image management system). TLSs quantity was observed around DCIS through these digital images. A pathologist having maximum experience in observation of TLSs slides was appointed for immunohistochemistry of lymphoid markers. Positive tumors were labeled when there was one or more TLS in the lesion area and it was negative when no TLS found.

Further classify TLS-positive tumor was done, tumors with TLSs covering less than 5% of the lesional area were categorized as having a low TLSs area percentage, while tumors with TLSs covering 5% or more of the lesion area were categorized as having a high TLSs area percentage. Evaluation of antibodies like progesterone receptors PR, oestrogen receptors (ER), CD4, CD8, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), FoxP3, CD68, PD-L1 were made.

SPSS version 25 for windows was used for data analysis and fisher's exact test applied to see association among TLS and clinicopathological parameters and biological markers. P value less than or equal to 0.05 was taken as significant.

RESULTS

Overall, 210 females were included in this study. There were 145 (69.0%) patients with TLSs negative and 65 (31.0%) patients with TLSs positive. It was noted that the presence of TLSs were associated with HER2 (p=0.001), triple negativity (p=0.047), TILs (25% cutoff) (p<0.001) and FoxP3 (1% cut-off) (p<0.001). (Table. 1).

Further, high TLSs (\geq 5%) was associated with calcifications (p<0.001), HER2 positivity (p=0.012), triple negativity (p<0.001), TILs (25% cut-off) (p<0.001), FoxP3 (1% cut-off) (p<0.001), CD4/CD8 ratio (1% cut-off) (p=0.016) and PD-L1 expression in TILs (1% cut-off) (p=0.043). (Table. 2).

Table	No.	1:	Association	of	TLSs	and	clinical
param	eters	& t	oiomarkers				

parameters & bioma			
Parameters and	TLSs (-)	TLSs (+)	р-
biomarkers	N (%)	N (%)	value
Age: <50 years	88 (60.7)	45 (69.2)	0.235
≥50 years	57 (39.3)	20 (30.8)	
Size: ≤50 mm	108 (74.5)	47 (72.3)	0.740
>20 mm	37 (25.5)	18 (27.7)	
Nuclear grade: Low	106 (73.1)	41 (63.1)	0.123
Intermediate	30 (20.7)	19 (29.2)	_
High	9 (6.2)	5 (7.7)	
Necrosis	n	n	1
Absent	93 (64.1)	42 (64.6)	0.947
Present	52 (35.9)	23 (35.4)	
Calcifications	n	n	1
Absent	91 (62.8)	31 (47.7)	0.041
Present	54 (37.2)	34 (52.3)	
Micro invasion			
Absent	99 (68.3)	40 (61.5)	0.340
Present	46 (31.7)	25 (38.5)	
Recurrence			
No	96 (66.2)	37 (56.9)	0.197
Yes	49 (33.8)	28 (43.1)	1
Invasive recurrence			
No	83 (57.2)	35 (53.8)	0.647
Yes	62 (42.8)	30 (46.2)	
ER		I	
Negative	70 (48.3)	34 (52.3)	0.589
Positive	75 (51.7)	31 (47.7)	
PR	I	I	1
Negative	80 (55.2)	30 (46.2)	0.226
Positive	65 (44.8)	35 (53.8)	
HER2			
Negative	123 (84.8)	42 (64.6)	0.001
Positive	22 (15.2)	23 (35.4)	
Triple negativity			
No	108 (74.5)	40 (61.5)	0.047
Yes	37 (25.5)	25 (38.5)	0.000
Basal-like: No	98 (67.6)	40 (61.5)	0.393
Yes	47 (32.4)	25 (38.5)	
TILs (25% cut-off)	105 (05 0)	41 ((2.1)	.0.00
Low	125 (86.2)	41 (63.1)	<0.00
High	20 (13.8)	24 (36.9)	1
FoxP3 (1% cut-off)	100 (04.1)	25 (52.0)	.0.00
Negative	122 (84.1)	35 (53.8)	<0.00
Positive	23 (15.9)	30 (46.2)	1
CD68 (10% cut-off)	110 (75.0)	12 ((())	0.144
Low	110 (75.9)	43 (66.2)	0.144
High	35 (24.1)	22 (33.8)	1
CD163 with cut-off 10%		27 (56 0)	0.111
Low	99 (68.3)	37 (56.9)	0.111
High CD4 with out off webe	46 (31.7)	28 (43.1)	
CD4 with cut-off value		41 ((2.1)	0.245
Low	101 (69.7)	41 (63.1)	0.346
High	44 (30.3)	24 (36.9)	1
CD4/CD8 ratio with cut		10 (75 4)	0.262
Low	119 (82.1)	49 (75.4)	0.263
High	26 (17.9)	16 (24.6)	L
PD-L1 in TILs with cut-		47 (72.2)	0.074
Negative	113 (77.9)	47 (72.3)	0.376
Positive	32 (22.1)	18 (27.7)	

Table No. 2: Association of area of TLSs and clinical	
parameters & biomarkers	

Biomarkers and Parameters Low percentage of TLSs (<5%)	parameters &	Low	High	
and Parameters of (<5%)	Biomarkers			
Parameters (<5%)	and			p-value
Age Image of the second state of the second s	Parameters			
<50 years 105 (62.5) 28 (66.7) 0.616 ≥50 years 63 (37.5) 14 (33.3)	Ago	(<370)	(2370)	
		105 (62 5)	28 (66 7)	0.616
Size Size 0.433 ≤0 mm 46 (27.4) 9 (21.4) Nuclear grade 100 10 (23.8) Low 120 (71.4) 27 (64.3) 0.366 Intermediate 40 () 10 (23.8) 0.366 High 8 () 5 (11.9) 0.471 Necrosis Absent 110 (65.5) 25 (59.5) 0.471 Present 58 (34.5) 17 (40.5) Calcifications 0.480 Absent 109 (64.9) 13 (31.0) <0.001				0.010
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		03 (37.3)	14 (33.3)	
$\begin{array}{r c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		122 (72.6)	33 (78.6)	0.433
Nuclear grade Image: Construct of the system				0.433
Low 120 (71.4) 27 (64.3) 0.366 Intermediate 40 () 10 (23.8) 110 High 8 () 5 (11.9) 0.471 Necrosis Absent 110 (65.5) 25 (59.5) 0.471 Present 58 (34.5) 17 (40.5) 0.471 Calcifications Absent 109 (64.9) 13 (31.0) <0.001		40 (27.4)) (21.4)	
Intermediate 40 () 10 (23.8) High 8 () 5 (11.9) Necrosis	v	120(714)	27 (64 3)	0.366
High8 ()5 (11.9)NecrosisAbsent110 (65.5)25 (59.5)0.471Present58 (34.5)17 (40.5)CalcificationsAbsent109 (64.9)13 (31.0)<0.001				0.500
Necrosis 110 (65.5) 25 (59.5) 0.471 Present 58 (34.5) 17 (40.5) Calcifications Absent 109 (64.9) 13 (31.0) <0.001		V		
Absent110 (65.5)25 (59.5) 0.471 Present58 (34.5)17 (40.5) $($		0()	5 (11.7)	
Present58 (34.5)17 (40.5)CalcificationsAbsent109 (64.9)13 (31.0)<0.001		110 (65 5)	25 (59 5)	0.471
Calcifications Absent 109 (64.9) 13 (31.0) <0.001				0.471
Absent109 (64.9)13 (31.0)<0.001Present59 (35.1)29 (69.0)MicroinvasionAbsent116 (69.0)23 (54.8)0.080Present52 (31.0)19 (45.2)RecurrenceNo110 (65.5)23 (54.8)0.197Yes58 (34.5)19 (45.2)Invasive recurrenceNo99 (58.9)19 (45.2)0.110Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)0.783Positive84 (50.0)20 (47.6)0.783Positive84 (50.0)22 (52.4)0.300Positive91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)HER2Negative138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)Triple negativityNo128 (76.2)20 (47.6)<0.001		38 (34.3)	17 (40.3)	
Present 59 (35.1) 29 (69.0) Microinvasion Absent 116 (69.0) 23 (54.8) 0.080 Present 52 (31.0) 19 (45.2) Recurrence No 110 (65.5) 23 (54.8) 0.197 Yes 58 (34.5) 19 (45.2) Invasive recurrence No 99 (58.9) 19 (45.2) 0.110 Yes 69 (41.1) 23 (54.8) ER Negative recurrence 84 (50.0) 20 (47.6) 0.783 Positive 84 (50.0) 22 (52.4) PR Negative 91 (54.2) 19 (45.2) 0.300 Positive 77 (45.8) 23 (54.8) HER2 Negative 91 (54.2) 19 (45.2) 0.300 Positive 77 (45.8) 23 (54.8) HER2 Negative 138 (82.1) 27 (64.3) 0.012 Positive 30 (17.9) 15 (35.7) Triple negativity No 128 (76.2) 20 (47.6) <0.001	-	100 (64.0)	12 (21 0)	<0.001
MicroinvasionAbsent116 (69.0)23 (54.8)0.080Present52 (31.0)19 (45.2)0.080RecurrenceNo110 (65.5)23 (54.8)0.197Yes58 (34.5)19 (45.2)19 (45.2)0.110Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)23 (54.8)19ERNo99 (58.9)19 (45.2)0.110Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)23 (54.8)19ERNegative84 (50.0)22 (52.4)0.783Positive84 (50.0)22 (52.4)0.300Positive91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)14HER2Negative138 (82.1)27 (64.3)No128 (76.2)20 (47.6)<0.001				<0.001
Absent116 (69.0)23 (54.8)0.080Present52 (31.0)19 (45.2)0.197RecurrenceNo110 (65.5)23 (54.8)0.197Yes58 (34.5)19 (45.2)110Invasive recurrenceNo99 (58.9)19 (45.2)0.110Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)0.197ERNegative84 (50.0)20 (47.6)0.783Positive84 (50.0)22 (52.4)0.300Positive91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)0.012Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)0.012Positive138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)0.191Yes54 (32.1)18 (42.9)0.191Yes54 (32.1)18 (42.9)0.191Yes54 (32.1)18 (42.9)0.101Yes54 (32.1)18 (42.9)11Ls (25% cut-off)Low144 (85.7)21 (50.0)<0.001		27 (22.1)	29 (09.0)	I
Present52 (31.0)19 (45.2)Recurrence0.197Yes58 (34.5)19 (45.2)Invasive recurrence0.197Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)ER99 (58.9)19 (45.2)No99 (58.9)19 (45.2)Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)ER90 (55.2)0.783Positive84 (50.0)20 (47.6)PR91 (54.2)19 (45.2)Negative91 (54.2)19 (45.2)Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)HER2128 (76.2)20 (47.6)No128 (76.2)20 (47.6)Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)Triple negativity0.012No128 (76.2)20 (47.6)Yes40 (23.8)22 (52.4)Basal-like114 (67.9)24 (57.1)No114 (67.9)24 (57.1)Yes54 (32.1)18 (42.9)TLs (25% cut-off)120 (50.0)Low144 (85.7)21 (50.0)Positive24 (14.3)21 (50.0)Positive24 (14.3)21 (50.0)CD68 (10% cut-off)126 (75.0)27 (64.3)Low126 (75.0)27 (64.3)0.163High42 (25.0)15 (35.7)CD163 (10% cut-off)120 (47.6)Low114 (67.9)22 (52.4)No126 (75.0)27 (64.3)Under High54 (32.1)20 (47.6)CD163 (10% cut-off)120 (47.6)Low114 (67.9)22 (52.4) <td></td> <td>116 (60.0)</td> <td>22 (54.9)</td> <td>0.090</td>		116 (60.0)	22 (54.9)	0.090
Recurrence No 110 (65.5) 23 (54.8) 0.197 Yes 58 (34.5) 19 (45.2) 0.110 Invasive recurrence No 99 (58.9) 19 (45.2) 0.110 Yes 69 (41.1) 23 (54.8) 0.110 Yes 69 (41.1) 23 (54.8) 0.783 ER Negative 84 (50.0) 22 (52.4) 0.783 Positive 91 (54.2) 19 (45.2) 0.300 Positive 77 (45.8) 23 (54.8) 145 HER2 Negative 138 (82.1) 27 (64.3) 0.012 Positive 30 (17.9) 15 (35.7) 15 (35.7) 17 Triple negativity No 128 (76.2) 20 (47.6) <0.001				0.080
No110 (65.5)23 (54.8)0.197Yes58 (34.5)19 (45.2)0.110Invasive recurrence099 (58.9)19 (45.2)0.110Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)00ERNegative84 (50.0)20 (47.6)0.783Positive84 (50.0)22 (52.4)00PRNegative91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)0.012HER2Negative138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)0Triple negativityNo128 (76.2)20 (47.6)<0.001		52 (31.0)	19 (45.2)	
Yes $58 (34.5)$ $19 (45.2)$ Invasive recurrence0.110Yes $69 (41.1)$ $23 (54.8)$ ER		110 (65 5)	22 (54.0)	0.107
Invasive recurrence No 99 (58.9) 19 (45.2) 0.110 Yes 69 (41.1) 23 (54.8) 0 ER Negative 84 (50.0) 20 (47.6) 0.783 Positive 84 (50.0) 22 (52.4) 0 0 PR Negative 91 (54.2) 19 (45.2) 0.300 Positive 77 (45.8) 23 (54.8) 0 0.012 Positive 77 (45.8) 23 (54.8) 0.012 Positive 138 (82.1) 27 (64.3) 0.012 Positive 30 (17.9) 15 (35.7) 0 Triple negativity No 128 (76.2) 20 (47.6) <0.001				0.197
No99 (58.9)19 (45.2)0.110Yes69 (41.1)23 (54.8)0.110ERNegative84 (50.0)20 (47.6)0.783Positive84 (50.0)22 (52.4)0.783PRNegative91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)0.012Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)0.012Positive138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)0.012Positive30 (17.9)20 (47.6)<0.001			19 (45.2)	
Yes $69 (41.1)$ $23 (54.8)$ ERNegative $84 (50.0)$ $20 (47.6)$ 0.783 Positive $84 (50.0)$ $22 (52.4)$ PRPR $91 (54.2)$ $19 (45.2)$ 0.300 Positive $77 (45.8)$ $23 (54.8)$ HER2Negative $138 (82.1)$ $27 (64.3)$ 0.012 Positive $30 (17.9)$ $15 (35.7)$ Triple negativityNo $128 (76.2)$ $20 (47.6)$ <0.001 Yes $40 (23.8)$ $22 (52.4)$ Basal-likeNo $114 (67.9)$ $24 (57.1)$ 0.191 Yes $54 (32.1)$ $18 (42.9)$ TILs (25% cut-off)Low $145 (86.3)$ $21 (50.0)$ <0.001 High $23 (13.7)$ $21 (50.0)$ <0.001 Positive $24 (14.3)$ $21 (50.0)$ <0.001 Positive $24 (14.3)$ $21 (50.0)$ <0.001 High $42 (25.0)$ $15 (35.7)$ <0.001 CD68 (10% cut-off) <0.001 <0.001 Low $126 (75.0)$ $27 (64.3)$ 0.163 High $42 (25.0)$ $15 (35.7)$ <0.001 CD163 (10% cut-off) <0.060 <0.060 High $54 (32.1)$ $20 (47.6)$ <0.060				
ER Negative 84 (50.0) 20 (47.6) 0.783 Positive 84 (50.0) 22 (52.4) PR Negative 91 (54.2) 19 (45.2) 0.300 Positive 77 (45.8) 23 (54.8) HER2 Negative 138 (82.1) 27 (64.3) 0.012 Positive 30 (17.9) 15 (35.7) Triple negativity No 128 (76.2) 20 (47.6) <0.001	-			0.110
Negative84 (50.0)20 (47.6)0.783Positive84 (50.0)22 (52.4)PRNegative91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)HER2Negative138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)Triple negativityNo128 (76.2)20 (47.6)<0.001	-	69 (41.1)	23 (54.8)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				I
PR19Negative91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)18HER2Negative138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)15 (35.7)Triple negativityNo128 (76.2)20 (47.6)<0.001				0.783
Negative91 (54.2)19 (45.2)0.300Positive77 (45.8)23 (54.8)0.012HER2Negative138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)0.012Triple negativityNo128 (76.2)20 (47.6)<0.001		84 (50.0)	22 (52.4)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				•
HER2Negative138 (82.1)27 (64.3)0.012Positive30 (17.9)15 (35.7)	Negative	91 (54.2)	19 (45.2)	0.300
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Positive	77 (45.8)	23 (54.8)	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	HER2			
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Negative	138 (82.1)	27 (64.3)	0.012
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Positive	30 (17.9)	15 (35.7)	
Yes40 (23.8)22 (52.4)Basal-like	Triple negativity			
Basal-likeNo114 (67.9)24 (57.1)0.191Yes54 (32.1)18 (42.9)1111TILs (25% cut-off)Low145 (86.3)21 (50.0)<0.001	No	128 (76.2)		< 0.001
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline No & 114 (67.9) & 24 (57.1) & 0.191 \\ \hline Yes & 54 (32.1) & 18 (42.9) \\ \hline TILs (25\% cut-off) & & & \\ \hline Low & 145 (86.3) & 21 (50.0) & <0.001 \\ \hline High & 23 (13.7) & 21 (50.0) & \\ \hline FoxP3 (1\% cut-off) & & & \\ \hline Negative & 144 (85.7) & 21 (50.0) & <0.001 \\ \hline Positive & 24 (14.3) & 21 (50.0) & \\ \hline CD68 (10\% cut-off) & & & \\ \hline Low & 126 (75.0) & 27 (64.3) & 0.163 \\ \hline High & 42 (25.0) & 15 (35.7) & \\ \hline CD163 (10\% cut-off) & & & \\ \hline Low & 114 (67.9) & 22 (52.4) & 0.060 \\ \hline High & 54 (32.1) & 20 (47.6) & \\ \hline CD4 (20\% cut-off) & & \\ \hline Low & 116 (69.0) & 26 (61.9) & 0.376 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$	Yes	40 (23.8)	22 (52.4)	
Yes $54 (32.1)$ $18 (42.9)$ TILs (25% cut-off)Low $145 (86.3)$ $21 (50.0)$ High $23 (13.7)$ $21 (50.0)$ FoxP3 (1% cut-off)Negative $144 (85.7)$ $21 (50.0)$ Positive $24 (14.3)$ $21 (50.0)$ CD68 (10% cut-off)Low $126 (75.0)$ $27 (64.3)$ High $42 (25.0)$ $15 (35.7)$ CD163 (10% cut-off)Low $114 (67.9)$ $22 (52.4)$ 0.060High $54 (32.1)$ $20 (47.6)$ CD4 (20% cut-off)Low $116 (69.0)$ $26 (61.9)$ 0.376	Basal-like			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	No	114 (67.9)	24 (57.1)	0.191
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Yes	54 (32.1)	18 (42.9)	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	TILs (25% cut-o	ff)		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$			21 (50.0)	< 0.001
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	High	23 (13.7)		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				
Positive 24 (14.3) 21 (50.0) CD68 (10% cut-off)		<i>,</i>	21 (50.0)	< 0.001
CD68 (10% cut-off) 0.163 Low 126 (75.0) 27 (64.3) 0.163 High 42 (25.0) 15 (35.7) 0.060 CD163 (10% cut-off) 0.060 0.060 Low 114 (67.9) 22 (52.4) 0.060 High 54 (32.1) 20 (47.6) 0.076 CD4 (20% cut-off) 116 (69.0) 26 (61.9) 0.376	U		· · · ·	101001
Low 126 (75.0) 27 (64.3) 0.163 High 42 (25.0) 15 (35.7) 0.060 CD163 (10% cut-off) 0.060 0.060 Low 114 (67.9) 22 (52.4) 0.060 High 54 (32.1) 20 (47.6) 0.060 CD4 (20% cut-off) 0.0376 0.0376			(30.0)	
High 42 (25.0) 15 (35.7) CD163 (10% cut-off) Low 114 (67.9) 22 (52.4) 0.060 High 54 (32.1) 20 (47.6) CD4 (20% cut-off) Low 116 (69.0) 26 (61.9) 0.376		,	27 (64.3)	0.163
CD163 (10% cut-off) 22 (52.4) 0.060 High 54 (32.1) 20 (47.6) 20 (47.6) CD4 (20% cut-off) Low 116 (69.0) 26 (61.9) 0.376				5.105
Low 114 (67.9) 22 (52.4) 0.060 High 54 (32.1) 20 (47.6) 0.020 CD4 (20% cut-off) 116 (69.0) 26 (61.9) 0.376			15 (33.1)	I
High 54 (32.1) 20 (47.6) CD4 (20% cut-off) Low 116 (69.0) 26 (61.9) 0.376	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,	22 (52 4)	0.060
CD4 (20% cut-off) Low 116 (69.0) 26 (61.9) 0.376				0.000
Low 116 (69.0) 26 (61.9) 0.376			20 (47.0)	1
			26 (61.0)	0.276
підіі 32 (31.0) 16 (38.1)				0.570
	High	52 (31.0)	10 (38.1)	

CD4/CD8 ratio with cut-off value 1%				
Low	140 (83.3)	28 (66.7)	0.016	
High	28 (16.7)	14 (33.3)		
PD-L1 in TILs with cut-off value 1%				
Negative	133 (79.2)	27 (64.3)	0.043	
Positive	35 (20.8)	15 (35.7)		

DISCUSSION

In this study 31.0% patients were TLSs positive and TLSs were associated with HER2 positivity, triple negativity, TILs (25% cut-off) and FoxP3 expression (1% cut-off). Zeng et al¹¹ conducted a study and reported that presence of TLSs in (DCIS) was associated with unfavorable prognostic features. Specifically, TLSs with high levels of certain immune cell markers, such as FoxP3+, high CD4, high (CD4/CD8) ratio, and high CD68, were identified as independent factors for poorer disease-free survival (DFS) in patients with invasive, in-situ recurrence (IIR).

A cohort study conducted by Kim et al¹² on 204 Korean patients with DCIS. The study found that a higher percentage of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TLSs) were associated with HER2+ status, negative hormone receptors and triple-negative DCIS. Additionally, they observed that more TLSs were associated with cases of DCIS with microinvasion. It is noted that the TLSpositive rate in Kim et al.'s study was 60.3%, which is significantly higher than the rate mentioned in our study.

Positive rate of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TLSs) in 248 patients with invasive breast cancer were observed in a study by Liu et al¹³, that was 37.5%. TLSs were predominantly found in the vicinity of the tumor or at the invasive tumor front. Additionally, it is mentioned that cases of ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) with high and low nuclear grades exhibit distinct genetic characteristics.

The study conducted by Hendry et al¹⁴ examined the relationship between programmed death-ligand 1 (PD-L1) expression, tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs), and various clinicopathological features in a cohort of pure ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS). It was found that the presence of TILs and/or PD-L1 expression in DCIS was associated with comedonecrosis, positivity of HER2, high nuclear grade and TP53 mutations.

The study conducted by Chen et al¹⁵ investigated the immunohistochemical expression of CD4, CD8, and PD-L1 in ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS). Their findings suggested that immune infiltrating cells, specifically CD4 and CD8 lymphocytes, as well as the expression of PD-L1, were associated with certain characteristics of DCIS and had prognostic implications for disease recurrence.

Thike et al¹⁶ also reported similar findings and reported that presence of CD4 and CD8 lymphocytes, was found to be associated with high nuclear grade, negative

52

Med. Forum, Vol. 34, No. 7

hormone receptor, HER2 positivity, and triple-negative status of DCIS. These characteristics are known to be associated with more aggressive tumor behavior and worse clinical outcomes.

There is a lack of a standardized method for identifying TLSs, with different studies utilizing diverse approaches ranging from morphological observation to the application of molecular markers¹⁷. Morphology combined with immunohistochemistry is suggested as a relatively reasonable method that has the potential for standardization in routine use. This approach involves examining the structural characteristics of TLSs under a microscope and utilizing immunohistochemistry to detect specific molecular markers associated with lymphoid tissue^{18, 19}.

CONCLUSION

Tertiary lymphoid structures in ductal carcinoma in situ of breast are significantly associated with negative hormone receptors, HER2 positivity, triple negativity, necrosis but significance was not appropriate with recurrence and invasive behavior. Furthermore, it is also associated with immune markers like CD4/CD8, PD-L1, FoxP3 and TILs.

Limitations: Unawareness about adverse consequences of disease, its late diagnosis, delay in treatment initiation and refusal of inclusion in research process from patient side are main limitations of study.

Recommendations: Further studies are needed to better understand the relationship between TLS and adverse pathological parameters in DCIS and to explore their potential as prognostic markers or therapeutic targets.

Author's Contribution:

Concept & Design of Study:	Namra Naeem		
Drafting:	Iqra Taqi, Farwa Batool		
	Shamsi		
Data Analysis:	Aniqa Saeed, Ameer		
	Alam		
Revisiting Critically:	Namra Naeem, Iqra Taqi		
Final Approval of version:	Namra Naeem		

Conflict of Interest: The study has no conflict of interest to declare by any author.

REFERENCES

- Barb AC, Pasca Fenesan M, Pirtea M, Margan MM, Tomescu L, Melnic E, et al. Tertiary Lymphoid Structures (TLSs) and Stromal Blood Vessels Have Significant and Heterogeneous Impact on Recurrence, Lymphovascular and Perineural Invasion amongst Breast Cancer Molecular Subtypes. Cells 2023;12(8):1176.
- 2. Tanaka T, Masuda A, Inoue J, Hamada T, Ikegawa T, Toyama H, et al. Integrated analysis of tertiary lymphoid structures in relation to tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes and patient survival in pancreatic

ductal adenocarcinoma. J Gastroenterol 2023; 58(3):277-91.

- 3. Chao X, Liu L, Sun P, Yang X, Li M, Luo R, et al. Immune parameters associated with survival in metaplastic breast cancer. Breast Canc Res 2020;22:1-1.
- 4. Acar E, Esendağlı G, Yazıcı O, Dursun A. Tumorinfiltrating lymphocytes (TIL), tertiary lymphoid structures (TLS), and expression of PD-1, TIM-3, LAG-3 on TIL in invasive and in situ ductal breast carcinomas and their relationship with prognostic factors. Clin Breast Cancer 2022;22(8):e901-15.
- 5. Helmink BA, Reddy SM, Gao J, Zhang S, Basar R, Thakur R et al. B cells and tertiary lymphoid structures promote immunotherapy response. Nature 2020:577:549–555.
- 6. Seow DY, Yeong JP, Lim JX, Chia N, Lim JC, Ong CC et al. Tertiary lymphoid structures and associated plasma cells play an important role in the biology of triple-negative breast cancers. Breast Cancer Res Treatment 2020;180:369-77.
- 7. Yazaki S, Shimoi T, Yoshida M, Sumiyoshi-Okuma H, Arakaki M, Saito A et al. Integrative prognostic analysis of tumor–infiltrating lymphocytes, CD8, CD20, programmed cell deathligand 1, and tertiary lymphoid structures in patients with early-stage triple-negative breast cancer who did not receive adjuvant chemotherapy. Breast Cancer Res Treatment 2023;197(2):287-97.
- 8. Zhang NN, Qu FJ, Liu H, Li ZJ, Zhang YC, Han X et al. Prognostic impact of tertiary lymphoid structures in breast cancer prognosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Cancer Cell Intern 2021;21:1.
- Briem O, Källberg E, Kimbung S, Veerla S, Stenström J, Hatschek T, et al. CD169+ Macrophages in Primary Breast Tumors Associate with Tertiary Lymphoid Structures, Tregs and a Worse Prognosis for Patients with Advanced Breast Cancer. Cancers 2023;15(4):1262.
- 10. Zhao Z, Ding H, Lin ZB, Qiu SH, Zhang YR, Guo YG, et al. Relationship between tertiary lymphoid structure and the prognosis and clinicopathologic characteristics in solid tumors. Int J Med Sci 2021;18(11):2327.
- 11. Zeng L, Koh VC, Chen XY, Tan PH. Tertiary lymphoid structures in breast ductal carcinoma in situ correlate with adverse pathologic parameters. Histopathol 2023;82:779–788.
- 12. Kim A, Heo SH, Kim YA, Gong G, Jin LH. An examination of the local cellular immune response to examples of both ductal carcinoma in situ (dcis) of the breast and dcis with microinvasion, with emphasis on tertiary lymphoid structures and tumor infiltrating lymphoctytes. Am J Clin Pathol 2016;146;137–144.

54

July, 2023

- 13. Liu X, Tsang JYS, Hlaing T. Distinct tertiary lymphoid structure associations and their prognostic relevance in her2 positive and negative breast cancers. Oncologist 2017;22:1316–1324.
- 14. Hendry S, Pang JB, Byrne DJ. Relationship of the breast ductal carcinoma in situ immune microenvironment with clinicopathological and genetic features. Clin Cancer Res 2017;23: 5210–5217.
- 15. Chen XY, Thike AA, Koh VCY, Nasir NDM, Bay BH, Tan PH. Breast ductal carcinoma in situ associated with microinvasion induces immunological response and predicts ipsilateral invasive recurrence. Virchows Arch 2021; 478:679–686.
- 16. Thike AA, Chen X, Koh VCY. Higher densities of tumour infiltrating lymphocytes and cd4(+) t cells

predict recurrence and progression of ductal carcinoma in situ of the breast. Histopathol 2020;76;852–864.

- 17. Schweiger T, Berghoff AS, Glogner C. Tumorinfiltrating lymphocyte subsets and tertiary lymphoid structures in pulmonary metastases from colorectal cancer. Clin Exp Metastasis 2016; 33:727–739.
- 18. Pagliarulo F, Cheng PF, Brugger L. Molecular, immunological, and clinical features associated with lymphoid neogenesis in muscle invasive bladder cancer Front Immunol 2021;12:793992.
- 19. Prabhakaran S, Rizk VT, Ma Z. Evaluation of invasive breast cancer samples using a 12-chemokine gene expression score: Correlation with clinical outcomes. Breast Cancer Res 2017;19:71.