Tissue screening after breast reduction

Patients who undergo breast reduction surgery have a low risk of being found to have breast cancer, but they need to be made aware of it—and doctors need to debate whether routine histological examination of tissue specimens is a good idea say **Mohammed Keshtgar and colleagues**. We also sought the views of **Tom Treasure**, a surgeon, **Jeremy Sugarman**, an ethicist, and **Tessa Boase**, a lay person

Reduction mammoplasty is one of the most common procedures performed by plastic surgeons all around the world.¹ For decades, it has been a common practice to send even normal looking surgical specimens for histopathological analysis because of the possibility of finding asymptomatic breast cancer. A postal questionnaire sent to consultant members of the British Association of Plastic Surgeons in 1994 found that 89% routinely sent breast reduction tissue for histopathology, and 42% of respondents had seen at least one case of breast cancer from these tissues.²

Pathological findings of breast cancer at the time of reduction mammoplasty have been reported.3 In 1960 the incidence of breast carcinoma found after breast reduction surgery was reported to be 0.38%.4 In different series, occult carcinoma has been found in 0.05-1.66% of breast reduction specimens, and the chance of finding such a cancer is affected by thoroughness of preoperative and postoperative examinations.5 Other authors have described in detail the pathological findings in breast reduction specimens but not found breast cancer in their studies.²⁶⁷ In 27500 women in Ontario, Canada, who had reduction mammoplasty, 0.06% (95% confidence interval 0.03% to 0.09%) had invasive carcinoma.8 In our institution a retrospective review of a prospectively maintained database of over a five year period found positive histology in 0.8% of 391 patients.

The decrease in detection of occult cancer in breast reduction specimens in recent years has been explained by advances in early detection of cancers, improvement in patient education, a younger group of patients undergoing this surgery, and more thorough preoperative screening of patients.^{9 10}

Case history

A 37 year old woman with no known risk factors for breast cancer underwent bilateral reduction mammoplasty and mastopexy for cosmetic reasons. Recovery was uneventful, but histology of the right breast showed noncomedo small cell type ductal carcinoma in



Woman's breasts with incision guidelines prior to reduction

situ with cancer in the lobules. The left breast specimen showed no abnormality.

As the specimens were not oriented the pathologist was unable to be precise about the site of the lesion, but excision was thought to be complete. Follow-up mammograms were done annually, along with physical examination. After her first assessment, microcalcifications were seen in the right breast and interpreted as benign. Three years later new microcalcifications in the midline of the lower right breast were seen; mammotome biopsy showed an area of mixed lobular carcinoma in situ and ductal carcinoma in situ.

A wide local excision was performed, but histology showed that the lesion had not been excised completely. Furthermore, the cosmetic result of this procedure was not satisfactory.

The patient was offered a choice of further excision and radiotherapy or mastectomy and immediate reconstruction, and she chose the latter. The mastectomy with a free flap reconstruction was uneventful, but she will have to undergo further surgery to reconstruct the nipple.

Discussion

Currently, screening for breast cancer by any modality is not recommended in the UK for women under the age of 50—but young women throughout the world are in effect undergoing a "screening" procedure after cosmetic reduction surgery without their informed consent. In this case, a 37 year old woman, as a result of this screening, was found to have pathology of uncertain clinical importance and has undergone years of anxiety and multiple surgical procedures. Furthermore, she cannot be reassured that this surgery has benefited her.

Several authors have reported that part of the clinical difficulty arises because specimens are not oriented during surgery and therefore it is not possible to identify the exact area affected. Intraoperative tailoring, which includes mobilisation of the tissues, will distort the normal architecture of the breast.⁹ ¹¹ ¹² Thus, the subsequent radiological assessment is not simple, and the surgical decision is often not easy.⁸

The concern is always to achieve complete clearance of the disease. In the survey from Ontario, even though cancers found after breast reduction were detected in an earlier stage than symptomatic cancers in the same region, patients who had had breast reduction were more likely to have mastectomy (67%) than conservative surgery (52%).⁸

Either the routine practice of screening the excised breast tissue should be abandoned completely, or women should be given the opportunity of informed consent for an unproved and potentially harmful screening practice.

Mohammed Keshtgar consultant breast surgeon Alireza Hamidian Jahromi clinical fellow in breast surgery Tim Davidson consultant breast surgeon

Paula Escobar clinical fellow in breast surgery

Patrick Mallucci consultant plastic surgeon

Afshin Mosahebi consultant plastic surgeon

Michael Baum emeritus professor of breast surgery, University Department of Surgery, Royal Free Hampstead NHS Trust and Royal Free and University College Medical School, London NW3 2QG

Correspondence to: M Keshtgar mo.keshtgar@royalfree.nhs.uk Accepted: 19 November 2008

Contributors and sources: All senior authors have extensive experience in oncological and aesthetic aspects of breast surgery. Data came from their own patient and from a PubMed search using keywords "breast reduction", "cancer screening", "reduction mammoplasty", "breast cancer", and "ethics". Fundine: None.

Funding: None.

Competing interests: None declared. Provenance and peer review: Not commissioned; externally peer

reviewed.

Patient consent obtained.

- Colwell AS, Kukreja J, Breuing KH, Lester S, Orgill DP. Occult breast carcinoma in reduction mammaplasty specimens: 14-year experience. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2004;113:1984-8.
- 2 Titley OG, Armstrong AP, Christie JL, Fatah MF. Pathological findings in breast reduction surgery. *Br / Plast Surg* 1996;49:447-51.
- 3 Maliniac JW. Use of pedicle dermofat flap in mammoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1953;12:110-5.
- 4 Snyderman RK, Lizardo JG. Statistical analysis of malignancies found before, during or after routine breast plastic operations. *Plast Reconstr Surg Transplant Bull* 1960;25:253-6.
- 5 Hage JJ, Karim RB. Risk of breast cancer among reduction mammoplasty patients and the strategies used by plastic surgeons to detect such cancer. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 2006;117:727-35.
- 6 Cruz NI, Guerrero A, Gonzalez CI. Current findings in the pathological evaluation of breast reduction specimens. *Bol Asoc Med P R* 1989;81:387-9.
- 7 Strombeck JO. Macromastia in women and its surgical treatment. *Acta Chir Scan Suppl* 1964;341:1-214.
- 8 Tang CI, Brown MH, Levine R, Sloan M, Chong N, Holowaty E. Breast cancer found at the time of breast reduction. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1999;103:1682-6.
- 9 Jansen DA, Murphy M, Kind GM, Sands K. Breast cancer in reduction mammoplasty: case reports and a survey of plastic surgeons. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1998;101:361-4.
- 10 White RR IV. Incidence of breast carcinoma in patients having reduction mammoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1998;102:1774-5.
- 11 Van der Torre PM, Butzelaar RM. Breast cancer and reduction mammoplasty: the role of routine pre-operative mammography. *EurJ* Surg Oncol 1997;23: 341-2.
- 12 Dinner MI, Artz JS. Carcinoma of the breast occurring in routine reduction mammoplasty. *Plast Reconstr Surg* 1989;83:1042-4.

Cite this as: BMJ 2009;338:b630

COMMENTARY The lay view

If my life had been made unbearable by outsize breasts, and I was finally to undergo the operation leading to their reduction, I think I would be feeling a mixture of anxiety and euphoria as I waited for the anaesthetic. At last, I'd be thinking, life was about to improve immeasurably. No more back ache, chafing, embarrassment, unflattering clothes. Furthest from my mind would be the thought that the surgeons might find cancerous tissue in my breast.

Imagine coming round from the operation: yes, the weight has literally been lifted from your chest. The operation has worked. But there is something else: the surgeon wishes to have a little chat with you. In private. Still tender from surgery, you're told that cancerous cells were found in your breast tissue after routine screening. Would you like to opt for radiotherapy, or perhaps a complete mastectomy?

I exaggerate the brutality of this little interview—but for the woman

in this case report, this is essentially what she will have understood. She went in to acquire more flattering curves. She came out with cancer. Nothing prepared her for this discovery.

Why, she asks, didn't you warn her that there was a risk, no matter how slight, of finding cancer? Why was there no counselling, if you knew you were going to send part of her breast away for histological screening? It would have helped her with the shock, and perhaps encouraged her to think of the operation less as a little cosmetic nip and tuck (as cosmetic surgery is so often presented to women) and more of a surgical procedure.

The other disturbing aspect to this report is the apparently random nature of the sampling and screening. It seems nearly impossible to identify exactly where in the breast the tissue came from (the specimens were not oriented). If you're going to bother with histological screening, surely it should be done as conscientiously as possible, given the chance (however slight) of discovering cancer?

Like any potential patient, I welcome any procedures made to safeguard my health and would appreciate being informed of every aspect (and associated risk) of an operation. I would not appreciate being left in the dark.

This is supposedly an era of accountability and transparency—of the patient being put first. The current practice of screening of breast tissue after reduction mammoplasty should be maintained and perhaps refined, but the patient should, from start to finish, be kept in the loop. Who else, after all, is this screening supposed to benefit?

Tessa Boase London tessa.boase@tiscali.co.uk Competing interests: None declared. Provenance and peer review: Commissioned; not externally peer reviewed.

Cite this as: *BMJ* 2009;338:b776

A call for preventive ethics

The current practice of sending reduction mammoplasty specimens for routine histological examination can result in a complicated set of circumstances that raise important ethical issues. As described by Keshtgar and colleagues, a small but measurable subset of these specimens show malignancy of uncertain clinical significance.1 Since patients undergoing this reconstructive procedure apparently are not informed about screening of the tissue removed during surgery, they may be understandably surprised that cancer was found and also face difficult questions about management. This situation is an opportunity for preventive ethicswhich seeks to avoid vexing ethical issues by taking steps to avert them.

The authors wonder whether

patients should be told explicitly about histological examination and the potential consequences if it turns out to be positive. It would be hard to imagine a justification for not including this sort of information in the consent process for reduction mammoplasty. Even though the likelihood of the specimens being malignant is small, discussing this issue in advance should help to prepare patients to receive the news and to face the complex decisions that follow.

The authors also describe that clinical management may be complicated by the fact that most specimens are not orientated and they ask whether surgeons should make an effort to orientate the specimens as far as possible. If the tissue is going to be analysed the answer seems to be an unequivocal yes. The primary intent of mammoplasty is cosmetic, but it is a medical procedure, taking place in a medical setting, and those performing it have a fiduciary obligation towards their patients' health and wellbeing. Orientating the specimen would seem to need little extra work and would seem to increase the clinical utility of the information.

Nevertheless, since the proper management of incidentally detected early stage breast cancer is unsettled, there is a crucial lingering important question regarding the appropriateness of routine histological review of these specimens. This matter warrants careful, expert review of available data and the potential implications of alternative approaches. In the meantime, obtaining informed consent for the histological examination of mammoplasty specimens and orientating these specimens should help to mitigate some of the difficult ethical issues that are encountered in practice.

Jeremy Sugarman Harvey M Meyerhoff professor of bioethics and medicine, Berman Institute of Bioethics and Department of Medicine, 624 N Broadway, Baltimore, MD 21205, USA jsugarm1@jhmi.edu

Competing interests: None declared.

Provenance and peer review: Commissioned; not externally peer reviewed.

1 Keshtgar M, Hamidian Jahromi A, Davidson T, Escobar P, Malluci P, Mosahebi A, et al. Tissue screening after

Mosahebi A, et al. Iissue screening afte breast reduction. *BMJ* 2009;338:b630. Cite this as: *BMJ* 2009;338:b753

COMMENTARY The big question remains unanswered

Keshtgar and colleagues tell the story of a team of breast surgeons who started out doing a routine cosmetic operation; then, an unexpected discovery of cancer led to a succession of further operations, including loss of the patient's breast.¹ They have misgivings about whether this surgery was of benefit and the experience threw up questions for them about cancer screening, the nature of consent, and the ethical dilemmas surrounding it. For me the striking feature is that they lacked evidence. It may not be easy to obtain such evidence, but it is surely the lack of evidence that is the root cause of their dilemma.

Increasingly, investigations are performed on apparently well people. Handling the findings can be difficult within a well considered, evidence based screening programme, and it may be an impossible dilemma for a clinical team confronted with a test result of uncertain pathological significance and expected to act on it. In thoracic surgery we are sent patients who are found on routine follow-up to have pulmonary metastases. These patients are sent to chest surgeons to have the nodules removed.2 but we have no evidence for benefit.3 The radiolucent lung is a backdrop

against which nodules can be seen more easily than in any other organ, but why should that lead us to break a basic element of consent to operation-to be able to state the expected benefit of the procedure? It is easy to fall into the trap of presuming efficacy in cancer surgery,⁴ but such is the degree of selection of patients for surgery that survival may be associated with having had an operation, but not due to the operation. In cancer treatment "doing something" is seen as caring and "giving hope"-while "leaving well alone" is wrongly dismissed as nihilistic.

What should be done with removed breast tissue in the future? The narrative of clinical teaching includes two well worn clinical maxims that are somewhat at odds with each other. One is that all tissue removed at surgery should be sent to the pathology laboratory, as was done in this case; the other is an injunction to request an investigation only if you know how to use the result. In the context of mammoplasty the breast tissue should perhaps be discarded, since detecting occult malignancy was not the objective of surgery. This policy would have spared the patient repeated operations of unproved benefit and saved the team much soul

2 The condition is spontaneous intracranial

half that of subarachnoid haemorrhage. The

estimated annual incidence of spontaneous

disappears when the patient is recumbent,

resonance imaging (MRI).

hypotension, which has an incidence of around

intracranial hypotension is 5/50 000. The classic

presentation is an orthostatic headache, which

together with stereotypical findings on magnetic

3 Treatment should be directed towards stopping the

CSF leak. Computed tomography myelography is the

searching. But deliberately not knowing is not an easy decision; the consensus view might well come down on the side of routinely sending the material to the laboratory. This requires ensuring that the patient is aware of possible consequences and that the pathologist receives adequate information.

The big question remains unanswered: what is the best management of a patient with these findings in the future? Not putting the tissue under the microscope may seem unacceptable, but so is continuing surgical practices that may result in harm, without having evidence of benefit.

Tom Treasure professor of cardiothoracic surgery, Clinical Operational Research Unit, University College London, London WC1H OBT tom.treasure@gmail.com

Competing interests: None declared.

Provenance and peer review: Commissioned; not externally peer reviewed.

- Keshtgar M, Hamidian Jahromi A, Davidson T, Escobar P, 1 Malluci P, Mosahebi A, et al. Tissue screening after breast reduction. BMI 2009:338:b630.
- 2 Internullo E, Cassivi SD, Van Raemdonck D, Friedel G, Treasure T. Pulmonary metastasectomy: a survey of current practice amongst members of the European Society of Thoracic Surgeons. J Thorac Oncol 2008;3:1257-66.
- 3 Treasure T, Utley M, Hunt I. When professional opinion is not enough. BMJ 2007;334:831-2.
- Treasure T, Utley M. Ten traps for the unwary in surgical series: a case study in mesothelioma reports. J Thorac Cardiovasc Sura 2007:133:1414-8.

Cite this as: BMI 2009:338:b759

ANSWERS TO ENDGAMES, p 723

PICTURE QUIZ

1 The axial view of the brain (fig 1) shows bilateral subdural haematomas and venous engorgement of the superior sagittal sinus. The sagittal view (fig 2) shows caudal descent of the brainstem with protrusion of the cerebellar tonsils. The ventricles are reduced in size because of a decrease in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF). The net effect is that the brain seems to sag. In addition, the pons is flattened. A sagittal view of the lumbrosacral spine (fig 3) shows a capacious vertebral canal consistent with dural ectasia and a large meningocele at the second sacral vertebra.







include bed rest, "blind" or targeted epidural blood patching after computed tomography myelography, and surgical repair of the CSF leak. It is thought to recur in 10% of patients, irrespective of the management strategy used.

STATISTICAL QUESTIONS **Crossover trials** a, d

Screening c,e

For long answers use advanced search at bmj.com and enter question details

Fig 1 T2 weighted magnetic resonance imaging of the brain: axial view showing bilateral subdural haematomas and venous engorgement of the superior sagittal sinus

Fig 2 T2 magnetic resonance imaging of the brain: sagittal view showing caudal descent of the brainstem with protrusion of the cerebellar tonsils. In addition, the ventricles are reduced as a result of a decrease in cerebrospinal fluid. The net effect is that the brain seems to sag. Note also that the pons is flattened

Fig 3 T2 magnetic resonance imaging of the lumbosacral spine: sagittal view showing a capacious vertebral canal consistent with dural ectasia and a large meningocele at the second sacral vertebra