Retrospectively Speaking

A bit of back to the future

Retrospective diagnosis

Dictionary:

- directed to the past; contemplative of past situations, events, etc.
- looking or directed backward.

STORE: Date of Initial diagnosis

If the physician states that in retrospect the patient had cancer at an earlier date, use the earlier date as the date of diagnosis.

STORE: Date of initial diagnosis

- Bullet 2: If the physician states that in retrospect the patient had cancer at an earlier date, use the earlier date as the date of diagnosis
- Example
 - Diagnosis from a 2005 MRI scan of the brain: meningioma
 - It's reportable based on the rules. Non-malign CNS tumors became reportable in 2004
 - But the physician reviewed past imaging and stated in retrospect the meningioma
 - Had been present since 2003.
 - Now its not reportable.

STORE: Date of initial diagnosis

- Bullet 2: If the physician states that in retrospect the patient had cancer at an earlier date, use the earlier date as the date of diagnosis
- Another example

5/10/xx CT abd/pelvis. 14.9 cm Right retroperitoneal space occupying fat attenuating lesion with internal linear hyperattenuation without suspicious nodularity statistically <u>representing a large retroperitoneal lipoma, however a liposarcoma cannot be definitively excluded.</u>

(5/17/xx ofc visit: Surgeon. incidentally discovered large retroperitoneal mass encasing her right kidney that is radiographically consistent with a well-differentiated liposarcoma

(WD liposarcoma dx date is 5/10/17)

STORE: Date of initial diagnosis

- Bullet 2: If the physician states that in retrospect the patient had cancer at an earlier date, use the earlier date as the date of diagnosis
- Another example

8/6/xx ** Lung LUL <u>3.7cm suspicious nodule</u>. Minimal enlargement LNs more likely reactive rather than malignant w/i mediastinum. advanced emphysema

9/28/xx inpt consult 8/6/xx imaging reviewed left sided lung mass <u>very suspicious for primary lung cancer</u>. 2nd left sided lung mass, smooth borders and unchanging in size less suspicious

Diagnosis date: 8/6/xx

Now the new one for this starting dx 2022.

CYTOLOGY:

- EXCEPTION: If cytology is identified only with an ambiguous term, do not interpret it as a diagnosis of cancer. (same old, same old)
- Abstract the case only if a positive biopsy or a physician's clinical impression of cancer supports the cytology findings (new)
 - This would be a retrospective diagnosis.
 - 3/10/xx 1000 mL ascites compatible with those derived from adenocarcinoma
 - 3/16/20XX per Dr.'s office note: Tumor markers came back notable for a CA 125
 5000 so the combination of cytologic diagnosis. I think is adequate to establish the diagnosis adenocarcinoma of gyn origin. (Physician statement)

Canswer forum

- Q) If a patient has **an FNA at our facility**, and the cytology is suspicious for low grade neuroendocrine tumor, then patient goes back to their hometown, where their managing physician states "biopsy-proven small distal pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor", would this case be reportable for my facility?
- A) Yes the FNA procedure was done at your facility.

https://cancerbulletin.facs.org/forums/node/137380

Example

- https://cancerbulletin.facs.org/forums/forum/fords-national-cancer-database/store/case-eligibility-patient-identification-cancer-identification-stage-ofdisease-at-diagnosis-tumor-size-and-mets/142671-benign-brain-retrospective-dateof-diagnosis
- COMPARISON with these MRIs April 15, 2016, January 16, 2006
 FINDINGS Again noted is a focal hyperostosis of the inner table of the superior left frontal bone associated with a dural based soft tissue mass, consistent with a meningioma. This is approximately 16 mm in diameter and has local mass effect, without underlying edema. This is similar to April 2016 and larger compared to 2006 IMPRESSION Presumed left superior frontal meningioma, approximately 16 mm. This is unchanged compared to April 2016 but larger compared to 2006.

What is the date of diagnosis?

■ Going by the information in your post, the date of diagnosis would be 1/16/2006 due to the radiologist statement regarding the comparison with films from 1/16/2006. "Presumed left superior frontal meningioma, approximately 16 mm. This is unchanged compared to April 2016 but larger compared to (Jan 16) 2006.#

Re-Read of Imaging

- Other facility imaging 5/30/XX: CT Lower Extremity: Large heterogeneous mass in the adductor compartment of the RT thigh, highly concerning for sarcoma.
- Re-Read of the imaging at your facility 6/10/XX 19.7 cm heterogeneous mass in the posterior compartment of the RT thigh consistent with sarcoma
- 6/20/XX: RT Thigh Mass, BX. Dedifferentiated liposarcoma.
- Date of diagnosis: 5/30/XX
- Why: The original imaging was preformed at the Outside facility and only reread at your facility, so where the imaging took place is the place and date of dx.

Re-Read of biopsy:

- Other facility bx 6/20/XX: RT Thigh Mass, BX. Non-dx.
- Bx path re-read at your facility 7/1/XX: RT Thigh Mass, BX. Dedifferentiated liposarcoma
- Date of diagnosis: 6/20/XX
- Why: The original biopsy was preformed at the Outside facility and only re-read at your facility, so where the bx took place is the place and date of dx.

Biopsy preformed at your facility Re-Read at another facility

- Biopsy preformed at your facility bx 6/20/XX: RT Thigh Mass, BX. Non-dx
- Specimen sent to different facility to be read
- Bx path read at different facility 6/30/XX: RT Thigh Mass, BX. Dedifferentiated liposarcoma
- Date of diagnosis: 6/20/XX (your facility)
- Why: The original biopsy was preformed at the your facility and only read at the Outside facility, so where the bx took place is the place and date of dx.

Biopsy preformed at your facility Re-Read at another facility

- Biopsy preformed at your facility bx 6/20/XX
 - Biopsy specimen sent to outside Path Lab: RT Thigh Mass, BX. Dedifferentiated liposarcoma
- Date of diagnosis: 6/20/XX (your facility)
- Why: The original biopsy was preformed at the your facility and only read at the Outside Lab, so where the bx took place is the place and date of dx.

Summary

- Retrospective diagnoses
 - May make a case reportable at an earlier date
 - Make a case not reportable
 - Like the meningioma on the my 1st experience
 - Change the class of case
 - Re-reads of imaging and path
- And now, included is a non-dx cytology with ambiguous terminology
 - That is not diagnostic
 - Unless
 - When later biopsy proven to be cancer
 - physician's clinical impression of cancer supports the cytology findings.

QUESTIONS

