

Semsarian Caitlin R (Orcid ID: 0000-0001-8691-0248)
 Scolyer Richard (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-8991-0013)
 Thompson John F (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-2816-2496)
 Bell Katy JL (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-0137-3218)

Do we need to rethink the diagnoses melanoma in situ and severely dysplastic naevus?

Caitlin R. Semsarian,¹ Tara Ma,¹ Brooke Nickel,¹ Richard A. Scolyer,^{2,3,4} Peter M. Ferguson,^{2,3,4} H. Peter Soyer,^{5,6,7} Lisa Parker,^{8,9} Alexandra Barratt,¹ John F. Thompson^{2,3,10} and Katy J.L. Bell¹

¹ Sydney School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney

² Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of Sydney

³ Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney

⁴ Tissue Pathology and Diagnostic Oncology, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital & NSW Health Pathology

⁵ The University of Queensland Diamantina Institute, The University of Queensland

⁶ Dermatology Research Centre, The University of Queensland

⁷ Dermatology Department, Princess Alexandra Hospital

⁸ Sydney School of Pharmacy, Charles Perkins Centre, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney

⁹ Department of Radiation Oncology, Royal North Shore Hospital

¹⁰ Department of Melanoma and Surgical Oncology, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital

Corresponding author: Katy J.L. Bell, MBChB, MMed (Clin Epi), PhD

Email: katy.bell@sydney.edu.au

Funding

This project was funded through a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC)

Investigator Grant (#1174523). BN is supported by a National Health and Medical Research

Council (NHMRC) Investigator Grant (#1113532). HPS holds an NHMRC MRFF Next Generation

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1111/bjd.21010](https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.21010)

Clinical Researchers Program Practitioner Fellowship (APP1137127). RAS and JFT are recipients of an NHMRC Program Grant (APP1093017), and RAS is supported by a NHMRC Practitioner Fellowship (APP1141295). KJLB is supported by a NHMRC Investigator Grant (#1174523).

Conflicts of interest

HPS is a shareholder of MoleMap NZ Limited and e-derm consult GmbH, and undertakes regular teledermatological reporting for both companies. HPS is a Medical Consultant for Canfield Scientific Inc., Revenio Research Oy and a Medical Advisor for First Derm.

RAS has received fees for professional services from Provectus Biopharmaceuticals Australia, Qbiotics, Novartis, Merck Sharp & Dohme, NeraCare, AMGEN Inc., Bristol-Myers Squibb, Myriad Genetics, GlaxoSmithKline.

JFT has received honoraria for advisory board participation from BMS Australia, MSD Australia, GSK and Provectus Inc, travel support from GSK and Provectus Inc, and support for conference attendance from Novartis.

Many countries have seen a dramatic increase in the reported incidence of cutaneous melanoma in recent decades, largely driven by increased diagnoses of melanoma in situ and thin invasive melanoma. The incidence of thick and metastatic melanomas, and melanoma mortality have remained relatively stable. While aging populations could be causing some true increase in melanoma incidence, much of this increase may represent overdiagnosis: diagnosis of lesions that would never have caused harm if left undetected and untreated.¹ If it occurs, melanoma overdiagnosis may result in potential psychological and physical harms to individuals, as well as significant cost to the healthcare system from procedures and long-term surveillance.¹⁻³ The use of new diagnostic labels (e.g. “melanocytic neoplasm”²) and/or the recalibration of diagnostic thresholds for the diagnosis of melanoma in situ could reduce these harms.^{4,5} These strategies could also be applied to the diagnosis of severely dysplastic naevus, whereby the diagnostic label and

apparent equivalence to melanoma in situ in the MPATH-Dx reporting schema (with associated treatment recommendations)⁶ may also cause substantial anxiety for patients and clinicians.³

We undertook a search and review of the published evidence to support or reject a change to the diagnostic thresholds and/or terminology used for these low-risk melanocytic lesions and provide a detailed report on our findings [link], which we summarise here. Three lines of evidence were evaluated. First was evidence on the natural history of these lesions, which we found was sparse since both melanoma in situ and severely dysplastic naevus are usually managed with excision. We found four studies on natural history, all at high risk of bias. One statistical modelling study estimated that at most 3.5% of lentigo maligna (a type of melanoma in situ) may progress to lentigo maligna melanoma (a type of invasive melanoma) each year. Three retrospective studies reported on patients with severely dysplastic naevi who were observed following incomplete excision. None of the collective 127 patients with positive or close margins developed an invasive melanoma at the same site as the severely dysplastic naevus, or metastases, after follow-up periods of between 6 months and 29.9 years.

Second was evidence on the reliability of diagnostic criteria for the two types of lesions. We found 14 reproducibility studies, three of which were at low risk of bias. The largest of these by Elmore and colleagues found poor reproducibility for diagnoses of melanoma in situ and severely dysplastic naevus (MPATH-Dx class III), with 40% agreement between study pathologists and an expert panel consensus, 45% inter-observer agreement, and 59.5% intra-observer agreement. Other studies also demonstrated poor reproducibility of both melanoma in situ and severely dysplastic naevus diagnoses.

Third was evidence of diagnostic drift in the diagnostic threshold over time, such that a more “malignant” diagnostic label would now be applied even though the same melanocytic lesion was

judged benign previously. We found two studies providing evidence on diagnostic drift, both at high risk of bias. These provided evidence of a downward shift of the diagnostic thresholds, and expansion of disease definitions, for both melanoma in situ and severely dysplastic naevus. The first retrospective study compared the original diagnoses made for 40 melanocytic lesions in 1988-1990, to diagnoses made by dermatopathologists in 2008-2009 who were blinded to the original diagnoses. Of the 40 lesions, 29 were diagnosed as severely dysplastic naevi and 11 as superficial spreading melanomas in 1988-1990. The mean proportion upgraded to melanoma in 2008-2009 was 7/40 (17.5%), with no lesions downgraded. In another study, 1179 lesions originally diagnosed as junctional or compound naevus in 1980-1989 were re-reviewed in 2011-2012. Using contemporary histopathological criteria, 117/1179 (10%) were re-classified as dysplastic naevi (7 severely dysplastic naevi, 42 moderately dysplastic naevi, and 66 mildly dysplastic naevi, 2 excluded). These studies both suggest an implicit lowering of the diagnostic thresholds for melanoma and severely dysplastic naevus over time, causing expansion of the disease definition.

In summary, sparse natural history evidence suggests uncertain but likely low risk of progression from melanoma in situ to invasive melanoma, and negligible risk of progression from severely dysplastic naevus to invasive melanoma. These types of lesions may be better conceptualised as risk factors for, rather than obligate precursors to, invasive melanoma. There is strong evidence of low reproducibility for diagnosis of both types of lesions, and some evidence that disease definitions have expanded over time. Our review supports the need for robust discussion in both clinical and pathology communities, on the benefits and downsides of changing diagnostic thresholds and/or terminology to address potential overdiagnosis. Such discussions could be facilitated through an international summit on the topic, which would inform next steps towards achieving change in policy and practice for pathology diagnosis.

References

- 1 Glasziou PP, Jones MA, Pathirana T *et al.* Estimating the magnitude of cancer
overdiagnosis in Australia. *Med J Aust* 2020; **212**: 163-8.
- 2 Welch HG, Mazer BL, Adamson AS. The Rapid Rise in Cutaneous Melanoma Diagnoses.
The New England journal of medicine 2021; **384**: 72-9.
- 3 Bell KJL, Mehta Y, Turner RM *et al.* Fear of new or recurrent melanoma after treatment for
localised melanoma. *Psychooncology* 2017; **26**: 1784-91.
- 4 Esserman LJ, Varma M. Should we rename low risk cancers? *BMJ* 2019; **364**: k4699.
- 5 Nickel B, Moynihan R, Barratt A *et al.* Renaming low risk conditions labelled as cancer.
BMJ 2018; **362**: k3322.
- 6 Piepkorn MW, Barnhill RL, Elder DE *et al.* The MPATH-Dx reporting schema for
melanocytic proliferations and melanoma. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2014; **70**: 131-41.

Table 1: Evidence identified to support or reject a change to diagnostic thresholds and/or terminology used for melanoma in situ (MIS) and severely dysplastic naevus (SDN).

Natural history studies: observation of MIS or SDN not actively treated or incompletely excised (partial or close margins) for ≥ 6 months. The collective 127 cases are underlined.				
Author, date	Country	Study design	Key findings	Overall risk of bias
Engeln, 2017	USA	Retrospective chart review	286 people with SDN (140 with negative margins, <u>47 with close margins</u> , <u>40 with positive margins</u> , <u>3 with indeterminate margins</u> , 56 margins not reported) observed for ≥ 5 years. 0 cases of invasive melanoma at same site, metastasis, or deaths from melanoma.	High
Fleming, 2020	USA	Retrospective chart review	30 people with SDN (<u>26 with negative margins</u> , <u>4 with positive margins</u>) observed for 0.6-17.5 years (median 7.5 years). 0 cases of invasive melanoma at same site, metastasis, or deaths from melanoma.	High
Hocker, 2013	USA	Retrospective chart review	<u>7 people with SDN with close or positive margins</u> observed for mean 14.7 years. 0 cases of invasive melanoma at same site, metastasis, or deaths from melanoma.	High
Menzies, 2020	Australia	Statistical modelling study	Estimated risk of progression of lentigo maligna (a type of MIS) to lentigo maligna melanoma (a type of invasive melanoma) is 3.5%, based on population-based cancer registry data and retrospective patient surveys.	High
Reproducibility studies: independent readings of the same MIS or SDN histopathological slides by ≥ 3 pathologists at the same time point for the purpose of diagnostic classification.				
Author, date	Country	Study design	Key findings	Overall risk of bias
Elmore, 2017	USA	Cross-sectional study	187 pathologists provided diagnoses for 240 melanocytic lesions. For MPATH-Dx class III lesions, there was 40% agreement between study pathologists and expert consensus, 45% inter-observer agreement, and 59.5% intra-observer agreement.	Low
Diagnostic drift studies: ≥ 2 independent readings of the same MIS or SDN histopathological slides at ≥ 2 time points for the purpose of diagnostic classification.				
Author, date	Country	Study design	Key findings	Overall risk of bias
Frangos, 2012	USA	Repeated cross-sectional study	The diagnoses of 40 lesions (29 SDN, 11 superficial spreading melanoma) by 6 dermatopathologists in 1988-90 were compared to diagnoses made by 9 dermatopathologists in 2008-09 who were blinded to the original diagnoses. The mean proportion of lesions upgraded to melanoma in 2008-09 was 7/40 (17.5%), with no lesions downgraded.	High
Hocker, 2013	USA	Repeated cross-sectional study	The diagnoses of 1179 melanocytic lesions (junctional or compound naevus extending to within 0.2mm of a microscopic border) by pathologists in 1980-89 were compared to diagnoses made by 2 dermatopathologists in 2011-12 who were blinded to the original diagnoses. 117/1179 (10%) of lesions were upgraded to dysplastic naevi (66 mild, 42 moderate, 7 severe, 2 excluded).	High

The full evidence review (including additional papers identified) is available at: xyz.