comprehensive understanding of the precise entire anatomy of paracolpium is feasible and applicable even in locally advanced tumors, with good functional results and convincing short-term oncologic outcomes.
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REFLEX METHYLATION TESTING IN ENDOMETRIAL CANCER: A SINGLE CENTRE RETROSPECTIVE STUDY

M Honner*, N Siddique, R McBain, F Chan, O McNally. The Royal Women’s Hospital, Australia

Introduction

Looking for evidence of microsatellite instability (MSI) through immunohistochemistry (IHC) for loss of staining for mismatch repair (MMR) proteins MLH1, PMS2, MSH2 and MSH6 at the time of histopathological examination of endometrial cancers is increasingly becoming standard of care; to guide recurrent disease treatment and identify patients whose cancers may be the result of a genetic mutation eg. Lynch syndrome. Identification of IHC as a surrogate for MSI is employed in many centres. Currently patients need referral to a Familial Cancer Centre (FCC) for counselling prior to further tumour testing including methylation testing, which is more likely to be responsible for loss of staining for MLH1 and PMS2.

Aim

Audit the practice of IHC for MMR proteins and identify efficiencies to the FCC referral pathway using reflex methylation testing.

Methods

Patients diagnosed with endometrial cancer over a five-year period were included. Data was retrieved from the in-house clinical database, FCC database and patient histories and included: completeness of IHC for MMR, type of MMR loss of expression, proportion of referrals to FCC, number of genetic mutations identified, proportion of MLH1 and PMS2 as result of methylation.

Results

Loss of staining for MMR was found in 20% of endometrial cancers. This was for MSH2/MSH6 in 1.7% and 19% for MLH1/PMS2. 95% of cases with loss of MMR proteins MLH1/PMS2 were found to be due to methylation and <5% had a germline mutation. 60% had a germline mutation in MSH2/MSH6.

Conclusion

IHC for MMR at the time of endometrial cancer diagnosis is increasingly practiced. This study highlights the importance of reflex methylation testing in cases of MLH1 and PMS2 thus reducing the burden on patients and FCCs where hitherto methylation testing is not ordered before referral.
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ENDOMETRIAL AND COLON CANCER RISK ASSESSMENT IN WOMEN WITH LYNCH SYNDROME: PROVIDER COMFORT, KNOWLEDGE, AND CURRENT PRACTICE

R Bramblet*, A Weaver, C Langstraat, S Maurer, C Swanson, M Sherman, J Kisiel, M Wick, J Bakkum-Gamez. Mayo Clinic, USA

Objective

Women with Lynch Syndrome (LS) experience a lifetime risk of endometrial (EC) and colon (CC) cancer of up to 57%, and the risk is approximately equal for each LS gene. Our objective was to determine knowledge of EC and CC risks, screening guidelines, and management recommendations among healthcare providers caring for women with LS.

Methods

An anonymous survey was sent to providers in primary care, ob/gyn, gynecologic oncology, gastroenterology, and...
clinical genomics across a healthcare enterprise. Data reported using descriptive statistics.

**Results** 215 of 1198 (18%) providers responded and 89% either had or anticipated caring for women with LS. Of 167 providers who completed the survey, 51% were primary care and 38% reported feeling at least somewhat uncomfortable with cancer screening for LS. Among the 77 (46%) currently caring for women with LS, 39% counsel that the risk of CC is approximately equivalent to the risk of EC; 34% counsel that the risk of EC is lower than the risk of CC or consistent with the general population. Additional counseling rates shown in table 1.

**Conclusions** A large portion of providers who care for LS patients feel uncomfortable with making cancer screening recommendations. One-third of providers potentially underestimate a woman’s risk of EC, and most do not recognize that EC could be the presenting cancer for women. Improved education of providers regarding cancer screening and risk reduction options for women with LS may improve adherence to management guidelines.

**Abstract 169 Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Pre-Intervention</th>
<th>Post-Intervention</th>
<th>Positive change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much have you heard or read about breast cancer?</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you know about breast cancer screening?</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>p=0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you know about the treatment of breast cancer?</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the sources of information?</td>
<td>Internet (45)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Breast cancer expert (35)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

- There is a significantly low level of awareness among breast cancer patients.
- The single short educational intervention had a significant impact on increasing awareness and knowledge particularly in terms of risk factors, screening, management, familial breast cancer, genetic testing, etc.
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**RECURRENT OF OVARIAN CANCER WITH DISTANT METASTASIS AFTER FIVE YEARS: A SINGLE INSTITUTE EXPERIENCE**

K Chew*, K Nimala, S Mohamad Nasir. Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Gynaecologic Oncology Unit, UKM Medical Centre, Malaysia

**Objective** Ovarian cancer is the commonest death of gynaecological cancer worldwide. To date, data from literature regarding recurrence with distant metastasis after 5 years is scarce. This study aim to identify the risk factors and outcome of recurrence ovarian cancer with distant metastasis.

**Methods** Form 861 medical record of patients with ovarian cancer reviewed, only one patient (0.11%) had recurrent ovarian cancer with distant metastasis to spleen.
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**A PROSPECTIVE INTERVENTIONAL STUDY EVALUATING AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE ABOUT GENETIC ASPECTS OF BREAST CANCER AND THE EFFECT OF EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTION: A REAL-LIFE EXPERIENCE**

N Kumar*, A Mishra, S Deo. AIIMS, India

**Introduction** Recent advances in understanding the genetic basis of breast cancer have opened new treatment pathways for risk reduction. Literacy rates are low in India in contrast to western societies. Hence separate studies to gauge awareness and acceptance of genetic counseling and testing are required. This is likely the first educational interventional study involving the Indian breast cancer population for assessment of knowledge regarding the genetic aspect of breast cancer.

**Methods** It was a prospective interventional study performed with a total sample size of 200 breast cancer patients, enrolled from July 2018 to December 2019 using a structured questionnaire and educational material regarding genetic factors. Institutional ethics committee approval was taken (No-IECPG-182/10.05.2018).

**Study Phases**

1. Pre-intervention assessment– Questionnaire-based assessment of awareness and knowledge had done with prior informed consent.
2. Educational Intervention– Brief descriptive educational material about breast cancer and its risk factors, screening, treatment, genetic aspects and prophylactic interventions were provided.
3. Post-Intervention assessment – After 5–7 days of educational intervention, patients were re-assessed with the same questionnaire.

**Results** Two hundred patients were recruited in the study of whom 150 (75%) were sporadic and 50 (25%) were familial or hereditary. The response of the patients to the questionnaire and the effect of the educational intervention has been depicted in the following table 1.

**Conclusion** There is a significantly low level of awareness among breast cancer patients. The single short educational intervention had a significant impact on increasing awareness and knowledge particularly in terms of risk factors, screening, management, familial breast cancer, genetic testing, etc.