

2022-RA-221-ESGO

### HYSTERECTOMY ALONE VS. HYSTERECTOMY PLUS SENTINEL NODE MAPPING IN ENDOMETRIAL CANCER: LONG-TERM RESULTS FROM A MULTI-INSTITUTIONAL STUDY

<sup>1</sup>Giorgio Bogani, <sup>2</sup>Violante Di Donato, <sup>3</sup>Andrea Papadia, <sup>4</sup>Alessandro Buda, <sup>5</sup>Jvan Casarin, <sup>6</sup>Fabio Ghezzi, <sup>7</sup>Roberto Angioli, <sup>8</sup>Francesco Plotti, <sup>9</sup>Daniela Luvero, <sup>10</sup>Fabio Landoni, <sup>11</sup>Pierluigi Benedetti Panici, <sup>12</sup>PierAndrea de Iaco, <sup>13</sup>Myriam Perrone, <sup>14</sup>Flavia Sorbi, <sup>15</sup>Simone Ferrero, <sup>16</sup>Michel Mueller, <sup>17</sup>Francesco Raspagliesi. <sup>1</sup>*Gynecologic Oncology, La Sapienza of Rome, Rome, Italy;* <sup>2</sup>*University La Sapienza of Rome, Roma, RM, Italy;* <sup>3</sup>*University of Lugano, Lugano, Switzerland;* <sup>4</sup>*Michele e Pietro Ferrero Hospital, Verduno, Italy;* <sup>5</sup>*University of Insubria, Varese, Italy;* <sup>6</sup>*Campus Biomedico, Rome, Italy;* <sup>7</sup>*Campus Biomedico, Roma, RM, Italy;* <sup>8</sup>*University Milano Bicocca, Monza, Italy;* <sup>9</sup>*University La Sapienza of Rome, Rome, Italy;* <sup>10</sup>*University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy;* <sup>11</sup>*University of Firenze, Florence, Italy;* <sup>12</sup>*University of Genova, Genova, Italy;* <sup>13</sup>*University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland;* <sup>14</sup>*Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori di Milano, Milano, Italy*

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.207

**Introduction/Background** To compare outcomes after hysterectomy and hysterectomy plus sentinel node mapping (SNM) in endometrial cancer (EC) patients.

**Methodology** This is a retrospective study, collecting data from EC patients treated between 2006 and 2016 in nine referral centers.

**Results** The study population included 398 (69.5%) and 174 (30.5%) patients having hysterectomy and hysterectomy plus SNM. As the results of the adoption of a propensity-score matched analysis, we selected two homogeneous cohorts of patients (150 having hysterectomy only vs. 150 having hysterectomy plus SNM). The execution of sentinel node mapping correlated with longer operative time, but it is not influencing the length of hospital stay and estimated blood loss. Overall severe complication rates were similar between groups (0.7% in the hysterectomy group vs. 1.3% in the hysterectomy plus SNM group;  $p=1.00$ ). No lymphatic-specific complication occurred. Overall, 12.6% of patients having SNM were diagnosed with disease harboring in their lymph nodes. Adjuvant therapy administration rate was similar between groups. Considering patients having SNM, 4% of patients received adjuvant therapy on the basis of nodal status only; all the other patients received adjuvant therapy on the basis of uterine risk factors. Five-year disease-free ( $p=0.720$ ) and overall ( $p=0.632$ ) survival was not influenced by the surgical approach.

**Conclusion** Hysterectomy (with or without SNM) is a safe and effective method for managing EC patients. Potentially, these data support the omission of side-specific lymphadenectomy in case of unsuccessful mapping. Further evidence is warranted to confirm the role of SNM in the era of molecular/genomic profiling.

2022-RA-257-ESGO

### THE VALUE OF DIFFERENT FRAILTY INDICES IN PREDICTING SHORT-TERM POST-OPERATIVE OUTCOMES

<sup>1,2</sup>Monika Sobocan, <sup>2</sup>Kaja Gril Rogina, <sup>2</sup>Eva Pavla Malovrh, <sup>1,2</sup>Jure Knez. <sup>1</sup>*Division for Gynaecology and Perinatology, University Medical Centre Maribor, Maribor, Slovenia;* <sup>2</sup>*Faculty of Medicine, University of Maribor, Maribor, Slovenia*

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.208

**Introduction/Background** Endometrial cancer is the most common gynaecological malignancy and is treated primarily surgically. An increasing body of evidence suggests frailty is an

important predictor of postoperative morbidity. Yet, data on pre-operative assessment tool use to assist surgical decision making is limited. This study sought to assess different surgical decision making tools for assessing the impact of frailty on short-term postoperative outcomes.

**Methodology** A patient record review was performed for patients diagnosed and primarily surgically treated between January 2015 and December 2016 for endometrial cancer at the University Medical Centre Maribor, Slovenia. Records of patients were evaluated through the use of different frailty indexes; the modified Frailty Index-5 (mFI-5), 11-factor modified frailty index (mFI-11), frailty deficit index (FDI) and Memorial Sloan Kettering Frailty Index (MSK-FI). Scores were recorded and correlated with short-term patient outcomes as well as patient characteristics. Primary outcomes were 45-day Clavien-Dindo rated complications, length of postoperative stay (LOS) and 45-day emergency services visits (ER).

**Results** Seventy-three women, median age 65 years (min 41 years – max 87 years) were included. Median LOS was 4 (min 1 – max 21) days. 24 women (33%) had post-operative complications resulting in a deviation from standard early postoperative care. Amongst those, experiencing complications within 45 days after surgery, 7 (10%) had stage I complications, 16 (22%) stage II complications and 2 (3%) stage III complications. Older women (above 60 years) had significantly higher BMI ( $p<.001$ ), but age was not a significant determinant of LOS. All evaluated frailty scales showed significant increases in women above 60 as well as 70 years of age. No specific cut-off was found to be significant for predicting short-term post-operative complications.

**Conclusion** Different additional tools should be further evaluated to determine most appropriate assessment methods to assist surgical decision-making in identifying and preparing frail patients for treatment.

2022-RA-295-ESGO

### CIRCULATING CELL FREE DNA AND CITRULLINATED HISTONE H3 AS USEFUL BIOMARKERS OF NETOSIS IN ENDOMETRIAL CANCER

<sup>1</sup>Livia Ronchetti, <sup>2</sup>Irene Terrenato, <sup>2</sup>Margherita Ferretti, <sup>3</sup>Giacomo Corrado, <sup>2</sup>Frauke Goeman, <sup>2</sup>Sara Donzelli, <sup>2</sup>Chiara Mandoj, <sup>2</sup>Roberta Merola, <sup>2</sup>Ashanti Zampa, <sup>2</sup>Mariantonia Carosi, <sup>2</sup>Giovanni Blandino, <sup>2</sup>Laura Conti, <sup>2</sup>Anna Maria Lobascio, <sup>2</sup>Marcello Iacobelli, <sup>2</sup>Enrico Vizza, <sup>2</sup>Giulia Piaggio, <sup>4</sup>Aymone Gurtner. <sup>1</sup>*Regina Elena Cancer Institute, Rome, Italy;* <sup>2</sup>*Regina Elena National Cancer Institute, Rome, Italy;* <sup>3</sup>*Department of Women and Children Health, Gynecologic Oncology Unit, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli, IRCCS – Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy;* <sup>4</sup>*National Research Council (CNR), Rome, Italy*

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.209

**Introduction/Background** Cancer mortality is mainly caused by organ failure and thrombotic events. NETosis, a chromatin release mechanism implemented by neutrophils, may contribute to these systemic effects. Our aim was to determine the occurrence of NETosis in endometrial cancer (EC) and analyzing tissue and serum NETosis biomarkers in EC patient to identify possible new targets for EC stratification and treatment.

**Methodology** Experiments were conducted on 63 EC patients (ranging from G1 to G3 grade) and 21 healthy controls (HC). Immunohistochemistry (IHC) and Immunofluorescence (IF) was performed on tumor tissue sections using antibodies against citrullinated histone H3 (citH3) (a marker of NETosis), neutrophil elastase (NE) and H2B. Serum levels of circulating

free DNA (cfDNA), circulating free mitochondrial DNA (cfmtDNA) and citH3 were measured by qPCR using one microliter of deactivated serum, and by ELISA assay respectively. Fragmentation pattern of serum cfDNA was analyzed using the Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer and High Sensitivity DNA Chips. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis was used to identify a cut off for cfDNA and cfmtDNA values able to discriminate EC from HC. Multiple correspondence analysis (MCA), between cfDNA, mtcfDNA, citH3 and blood parameters were used to identify associations among serum parameters in EC.

**Results** NETosis is activated in all EC grades. In EC sera, elevated cfDNA concentration is associated with citH3 in G1 and G2 EC. Categorizing by ROC cut off cfDNA and cfmtDNA value distributions, we observed that citH3 levels are significantly higher in samples with high values of cfDNA and low values of cfmtDNA. A specific cfDNA fragmentation pattern characterizes EC and correlates with citH3 serum levels.

**Conclusion** NETosis could represent a new therapeutic target concerning EC. The combination of three serum parameters, citH3, cfDNA and cfmtDNA could be useful to monitor NETosis by non-invasive liquid biopsies opening the way for new therapeutic strategies in EC.

2022-RA-376-ESGO

**CLINICOPATHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF 'MULTIPLE-CLASSIFIERS' IN ENDOMETRIAL CANCER**

<sup>1</sup>Luigi Antonio de Vitis, <sup>1,2</sup>Gabriella Schivardi, <sup>1</sup>Giulio Bonaldo, <sup>3,4</sup>Caterina Fumagalli, <sup>5</sup>Paola Rafaniello Raviele, <sup>1</sup>Maria Teresa Achillar, <sup>1</sup>Alessia Aloisi, <sup>1</sup>Annalisa Garbi, <sup>1</sup>Mariateresa Lapresa, <sup>1</sup>Gabriella Parma, <sup>1</sup>Vanna Zanagnolo, <sup>1,6</sup>Giovanni Damiano Aletti, <sup>5,6</sup>Elena Guerini-Rocco, <sup>2</sup>Andrea Mariani, <sup>1</sup>Angelo Maggioni, <sup>5</sup>Massimo Barberis, <sup>1,7</sup>Nicoletta Colombo, <sup>1</sup>Francesco Multinu, <sup>1</sup>Ilaria Betella. <sup>1</sup>Department of Gynecology, European Institute of Oncology, Milan, Italy; <sup>2</sup>Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN; <sup>3</sup>Clinical Unit of Oncogenomics, European Institute of Oncology, Milan, Italy; <sup>4</sup>Department of Diagnostic Services, Division of Pathology, ASST Valle Olona, Gallarate, Italy; <sup>5</sup>Department of Pathology, European Institute of Oncology, Milan, Italy; <sup>6</sup>Department of Oncology and Hemato-Oncology, University of Milan, Milan, Italy; <sup>7</sup>Faculty of Medicine and Surgery, University of Milan Bicocca, Milan, Italy

10.1136/ijgc-2022-ESGO.210

**Introduction/Background** According to the molecular classification, most endometrial cancers (ECs) can be categorised based on a unique molecular signature (e.g., POLE-mutation, mismatch-repair(MMR)-deficiency, p53-abnormality). However, a small number of cases harbour more than one molecular feature and are referred as 'multiple-classifiers'. The aim of the study is to describe the clinicopathological and molecular characteristics of multiple-classifier ECs.

**Methodology** Among all ECs undergoing a comprehensive molecular analysis at European Institute of Oncology, Milan, between April 2019 and December 2021, 'multiple-classifiers' were identified. Clinicopathological and molecular characteristics were collected from electronic medical records. The molecular analysis consisted of immunohistochemistry for p53 and MMR proteins, microsatellite instability assay, and Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) for POLE exonuclease domain and TP53. ECs were considered p53-abnormal if either immunohistochemistry or NGS resulted altered, MMR-deficient if either proteins expression was abnormal or mismatch-repair unstable and POLE when pathogenic POLE mutations were found. ECs were

molecularly classified according with WHO-endorsed algorithm. To compare continuous and categorical variables Wilcoxon-Mann-Whitney test and chi-square test were used, respectively. Proportions are reported as number (percentage and 95% confidence interval(CI)).

**Abstract 2022-RA-376-ESGO Table 1 Multiple-classifier clinicopathological characteristics**

Table 1a. Multiple-classifier clinicopathological characteristics.											
Molecular group	ID	Age (years)	BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	LND Metastasis	FIGO stage	Histotype	Grade	LVS	Risk score Endometrial unknown	Risk score Endometrial known	Adjuvant Treatment
POLEmut-MMRd	1	59	21.9	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 1	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	2	47	19.6	IC	Endometrioid	Grade 2	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	3	42	25.5	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 1	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	4	31	29.1	IB	Clear cell	Grade 1	Diffuse	High	High	High	CHT + EBRT + VB
	5	75	22.7	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 3	No	Intermediate	Low	Low	No
	6	44	23.8	IB	Endometrioid	Grade 3	No	Intermediate	Low	Low	No
	7	54	24.4	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 1	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	8	57	18.5	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 2	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	9	76	26.3	Macro	ICL	Undifferentiated	Diffuse	High	High	High	CHT
	10	55	22.7	II	Endometrioid	Grade 3	No	High-intermediate	High-intermediate	High-intermediate	EBRT + VB
MMRd-p53abn	11	79	19.1	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 1	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	12	55	18.6	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 1	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	13	69	17.5	IA	Clear cell	Grade 1	No	Intermediate	Intermediate	Intermediate	No
	14	84	20.5	IA	Serous	Grade 3	No	Intermediate	Intermediate	Intermediate	No
	15	74	21	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 2	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	16	63	21.3	Macro	ICL	NS	Focal	Advanced/Metastatic	Advanced/Metastatic	Advanced/Metastatic	CHT
	17	54	26.7	Macro	ICL	Endometrioid	Grade 3	No	High	High	CHT + EBRT + VB
	18	78	26.7	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 3	No	Intermediate	Intermediate	Intermediate	No
	19	64	13.2	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 2	No	Low	Low	Low	No
	20	69	28.0	ICL	NS	Endometrioid	Grade 2	No	High	High	CHT
POLEmut-MMRd-p53abn	21	50	32.8	Macro	ICL	Endometrioid	Grade 2	No	High	High	CHT + EBRT
	22	60	27.7	Macro	ICL	Endometrioid	Grade 3	Diffuse	High	High	CHT + EBRT
	23	67	25.3	Macro	ICL	NS	Focal	Advanced/Metastatic	Advanced/Metastatic	Advanced/Metastatic	CHT + EBRT + VB
	24	58	29.1	IB	Mixed	Grade 3	No	High-intermediate	High	High	CHT + EBRT
	25	62	24.3	IA	Endometrioid	Grade 3	No	Intermediate	Low	Low	CHT + EBRT

Table 1b. Multiple-classifier molecular characteristics.										
Molecular group	ID	POLE mutation (NGS)	MMR protein immunohistochemistry	MSS	TP53 mutation (NGS)	P53 immunohistochemistry				
POLEmut-MMRd	1	POLE exon 9 p.G2079P (p.R2071L) c.890C>T	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	WT	NA				
	2	POLE exon 9 p.P2881G (p.P2881G) c.457C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	WT	absent				
	3	POLE exon 13 p.V481I (p.V481I) c.1311C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	absent				
	4	POLE exon 14 p.A461V (p.A461V) c.1366C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	5	POLE exon 13 p.V481I (p.V481I) c.1311C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 7 p.C429Y (p.C429Y) c.1271A>G	WT				
	6	POLE exon 14 p.A461V (p.A461V) c.1366C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	7	POLE exon 9 p.P2881G (p.P2881G) c.457C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	8	POLE exon 9 p.P2881G (p.P2881G) c.457C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	9	POLE exon 9 p.P2881G (p.P2881G) c.457C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	NA	absent				
	10	POLE exon 9 p.P2881G (p.P2881G) c.457C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	absent				
MMRd-p53abn	11	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	12	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	13	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	14	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	15	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	16	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	17	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	18	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	19	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
	20	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	WT				
POLEmut-MMRd-p53abn	21	POLE exon 13 p.V481I (p.V481I) c.1311C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS-high	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	absent				
	22	POLE exon 13 p.V481I (p.V481I) c.1311C>G	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	absent				
	23	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	absent				
	24	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	absent				
	25	WT	Mut 1 +, PMS2 +, MSH2 +, MSH3 +	MSS	TP53 exon 8 p.Ang217P (p.R217I) c.637C>T	absent				

**Abstract 2022-RA-376-ESGO Table 2 Clinicopathological characteristics comparison between single- and multiple-classifier**

	Multiple-classifier N = 25	Single-classifier N = 253	P-value
<b>AGE AT DIAGNOSIS</b> Median (years) ± SD	60.9 ± 10.9	61.4 ± 12.2	0.645
<b>BMI</b> Median (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ) ± SD	25.4 ± 4.5	27.6 ± 7.3	0.271
<b>Histotype</b>			
Endometrioid	19 (76%; 57.1-89.3%)	227 (90%; 85.5-93.0%)	<b>0.040</b>
Other	6 (24%; 10.4-29.9%)	26 (10%; 7.0-14.5%)	
<b>Miometrial invasion</b>			
<50 %	18 (72%; 52.7-86.5%)	167 (66%; 60.0-71.6%)	0.545
≥50 %	7 (28%; 13.5-47.3%)	86 (34%; 28.4-40.0%)	
<b>LVS</b>			
None or focal	22 (88%; 71.3-96.5%)	225 (89%; 84.6-92.4%)	0.888
Diffuse	3 (12%; 3.5-28.7%)	28 (11%; 7.6-15.4%)	
<b>Grade</b>			
Low grade (G1-2)	11 (44%; 26.1-63.2%)	183 (72%; 66.6-77.6%)	<b>0.003</b>
High grade	14 (56%; 36.8-73.9%)	70 (28%; 22.4-33.4%)	
<b>Lymph nodes metastasis</b>			
Negative	18 (72%; 52.7-86.5%)	214 (85%; 79.8-88.6%)	0.266
ITC	2 (8%; 1.7-23.3%)	10 (4%; 2.0-6.9%)	
Micro- or macro-metastasis	5 (20%; 8.1-38.4%)	29 (12%; 8.0-15.8%)	
<b>FIGO stage</b>			
I	17 (68%; 48.5-83.6%)	166 (66%; 59.6-71.3%)	0.810
II - IV	8 (32%; 16.4-51.5%)	87 (34%; 28.7-40.4%)	
<b>ESGO/ESTRO/ESP (2020) Molecular classification unknown</b>			
Low	9 (36%; 19.5-55.5%)	115 (46%; 39.4-51.6%)	0.318
Intermediate	6 (24%; 10.7-42.9%)	30 (12%; 8.3-16.3%)	
High-Intermediate	1 (4%; 0.4-17.2%)	30 (12%; 8.3-16.3%)	
High	8 (32%; 16.4-51.5%)	65 (26%; 20.6-31.3%)	
Advanced/metastatic	1 (4%; 0.4-17.2%)	13 (5%; 2.9-8.4%)	
<b>ESGO/ESTRO/ESP (2020) Molecular classification known</b>			
Low	12 (48%; 29.5-66.9%)	112 (44.3%; 38.2-50.4%)	0.919
Intermediate	3 (12%; 3.5-28.7%)	19 (7.5%; 5.2-10.3%)	
High-Intermediate	1 (4%; 0.4-17.2%)	24 (10%; 6.3-13.6%)	
High	8 (32%; 16.4-51.5%)	75 (30%; 24.3-35.5%)	
Advanced/metastatic	1 (4%; 0.4-17.2%)	13 (5%; 2.9-8.4%)	
<b>FOLLOW UP</b>			
Mean (months) ± SD	6.6 ± 6.1	6.4 ± 6.3	
Number of recurrences	1 (4%; 0.4-17.2%)	15 (6%; 3.5-9.4%)	

NOTE: Data reported as Count (Column%; 95% Confidence interval) unless otherwise indicated. Abbreviations: ITC, isolated tumour cells; MMRd, mismatch repair-deficient; p53abn, p53 abnormal; BMI, body mass index; SD, standard deviation; LVS, lympho-vascular space invasion.

**Results** A total of 278 ECs underwent molecular analysis, of which 253 (91.0%, CI 87.8–94.2) harboured a unique molecular signature, while 25 (9.0%, CI 5.8–12.2) were 'multiple-classifiers'. Among them, we identified 15 (5.4%, CI 2.9–8.3) MMRd-p53abn, 2 (2.2%, CI 0.7–4.0) POLEmut-p53abn, 2 (0.7%, CI 0.0–1.8) POLEmut-MMRd, and 2 (0.7%, CI 0.0–1.8)