

# Standards and datasets for reporting cancers Dataset for histopathological reporting of ocular retinoblastoma

January 2018

Authors: Dr Hardeep Singh Mudhar, National Specialist Ophthalmic Pathology

Service, Sheffield

Professor Philip J Luthert, UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, London

Unique document number	G055	
Document name	Dataset for histopathological reporting of ocular retinoblastoma	
Version number	4	
Produced by	Dr Hardeep Singh Mudhar, Consultant Histopathologist at Royal Hallamshire Hospital and member of the National Specialist Ophthalmic Pathology Service, and Professor Philip Luthert, Professor of Ophthalmic Pathology, UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, London, and member of the National Specialist Ophthalmic Pathology Service, on behalf of the Working Group for Cancer Services of The Royal College of Pathologists	
Date active	January 2018	
Date for review	January 2021	
Comments	This document will replace the 3 <sup>rd</sup> edition of <i>Dataset for ocular retinoblastoma histopathology reports</i> published in 2014.  In accordance with the College's pre-publications policy, this document was on The Royal College of Pathologists' website for consultation from 1 November to 29 November 2017. Responses and authors' comments are available to view on request.  Dr Lorna Williamson  Director of Publishing and Engagement	

The Royal College of Pathologists Fourth Floor, 21 Prescot Street, London, E1 8BB Tel: 020 7451 6700

Fax: 020 7451 6701 Web: www.rcpath.org

Registered charity in England and Wales, no. 261035 © 2018, The Royal College of Pathologists

This work is copyright. You may download, display, print and reproduce this document for your personal, non-commercial use. All other rights reserved. Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights should be addressed to The Royal College of Pathologists at the above address. First published: 2018





CEff 180118 1

## **Contents**

Fore	word		3
1	Introduct	ion	4
2	Clinical ir	nformation required on request form	5
3	Specime	n receipt and fresh tumour sampling	5
4	Specime	n handling and block selection	5
5	Core data	a items	6
6	Non-core	data items	9
7	TNM pati	nological staging (UICC 8 <sup>th</sup> edition)	9
8	SNOME	O coding	9
9	Reporting	g of small biopsy specimens	9
10	Reporting	g of frozen sections	9
11	Audit crit	eria	10
12	Referenc	es	11
Арре	endix A	TNM pathological classification of ocular retinoblastoma (UICC 8 <sup>th</sup> edition)	14
Арре	endix B	SNOMED codes	15
Арре	endix C	Reporting proforma for ocular retinoblastoma	16
Арре	endix D	Reporting proforma for ocular retinoblastoma in list format	17
Арре	endix E	Summary table – explanation of grades of evidence	20
Appe	endix F	AGREE guideline monitoring sheet	21



NICE has accredited the process used by The Royal College of Pathologists to produce its Cancer Datasets and Tissue Pathways guidance. Accreditation is valid for 5 years from July 2012. More information on accreditation can be viewed at www.nice.org.uk/accreditation.

For full details on our accreditation visit: www.nice.org.uk/accreditation.

#### **Foreword**

The cancer datasets published by The Royal College of Pathologists (RCPath) are a combination of textual guidance, educational information and reporting proformas. The datasets enable pathologists to grade and stage cancers in an accurate, consistent manner in compliance with international standards and provide prognostic information thereby allowing clinicians to provide a high standard of care for patients and appropriate management for specific clinical circumstances. This guideline has been developed to cover most common circumstances. However, we recognise that guidelines cannot anticipate every pathological specimen type and clinical scenario. Occasional variation from the practice recommended in this guideline may therefore be required to report a specimen in a way that maximises benefit to the patient.

Each Dataset contains core data items that are mandated for inclusion in the Cancer Outcomes and Services Dataset (COSD – previously the National Cancer Data Set) in England. Core data items are items that are supported by robust published evidence and are required for cancer staging, optimal patient management and prognosis. Core data items meet the requirements of professional standards (as defined by the Information Standards Board for Health and Social Care [ISB]) and it is recommended that at least 90% of reports on cancer resections should record a full set of core data items. Other non-core data items are described. These may be included to provide a comprehensive report or to meet local clinical or research requirements. All data items should be clearly defined to allow the unambiguous recording of data.

Approval from the following stakeholders has been obtained:

- · Members of the British Association of Ophthalmic Pathology
- National Specialist Ophthalmic Pathology Service
- UK paediatric pathologists involved in retinoblastoma reporting (Birmingham and London)
- UK ocular oncologists who look after ocular retinoblastoma patients (Birmingham and London)
- Retinoblastoma Group of the Children's Cancer and Leukaemia Group (CCLG) UK.

The original literature search was conducted from PubMed. Some of the evidence is classed as Grade A, many of the papers as Grade B and some as Grade C according to the adapted SIGN criteria published by Palmer and Nairn<sup>1</sup> (Appendix E). Therefore, the dataset is evidence based and robust.

No major organisational changes or cost implications have been identified that would hinder the implementation of the dataset.

A formal revision cycle for all cancer datasets takes place on a three-yearly basis. However, each year, the College will ask the author of the dataset, in conjunction with the relevant subspecialty adviser to the College, to consider whether or not the dataset needs to be updated or revised. A full consultation process will be undertaken if major revisions are required, i.e. revisions to core data items (the only exception being changes to international tumour grading and staging schemes that have been approved by the Specialty Advisory Committee on Cellular Pathology and affiliated professional bodies; these changes will be implemented without further consultation). If minor revisions or changes to non-core data items are required, an abridged consultation process will be undertaken whereby a short note of the proposed changes will be placed on the College website for two weeks for members' attention. If members do not object to the changes, the short notice of change will be incorporated into the dataset and the full revised version (incorporating the changes) will replace the existing version on the College website.

The dataset has been reviewed by the Clinical Effectiveness department, Working Group on Cancer Services and Lay Governance Group and placed on the College website for consultation

CEff 180118 3 V4 Final

with the membership from 1 November to 29 November 2017. All comments received from the Working Group and membership have been addressed by the authors to the satisfaction of the Chair of the Working Group and the Director of Publishing and Engagement.

This dataset was developed without external funding to the writing group. The College requires the authors of datasets to provide a list of potential conflicts of interest; these are monitored by the Clinical Effectiveness department and are available on request. The authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

#### 1 Introduction

The proper handling of an eye enucleated for retinoblastoma is critical because certain macroscopic and microscopic features contribute to the staging of the tumour that determines prognosis and post-enucleation therapy. Enucleation for retinoblastoma is done in patients with advanced intraocular disease and if there has been failure of conservative treatment.

This proposal for the reporting of ocular retinoblastoma should be implemented for the following reasons:

- staging of the disease
- the determination of whether adjuvant treatment (chemotherapy or radiotherapy) is required,<sup>2</sup> based on the histological identification of 'histological high-risk factors' (HHRFs) for metastasis. These HHRFs include involvement of the anterior chamber, iris, ciliary body, trabecular meshwork, Schlemm's canal, choroid, sclera, extraocular spread, retrolaminar optic nerve involvement and involvement of the optic nerve surgical resection margin.
- to provide prognostic information
- to provide accurate data for cancer registration
- to potentially assist in selecting patients for future trials of adjuvant therapy
- to provide data for clinical audit and effectiveness
- to provide a database for research.

The synoptic proforma (Appendix C) is based on the *TNM Classification of Malignant Tumours (8<sup>th</sup> edition)* from the Union for International Cancer Control (UICC).<sup>3</sup> The synoptic proforma may be used as the main reporting format or may be combined with free text. Further guidelines on how to dissect ophthalmic specimens for the diagnosis of ocular retinoblastoma can be found in the references at the end of this document.<sup>4,5</sup>

## 1.1 Target users and health benefits of this guideline

The target primary users of the dataset are trainee and consultant cellular pathologists and, on their behalf, the suppliers of IT products to laboratories. The secondary users are surgeons, oncologists, cancer registries and the National Cancer Intelligence Network. Standardised cancer reporting and multidisciplinary team working reduce the risk of histological misdiagnosis and help to ensure that clinicians have all of the relevant pathological information required for tumour staging, management and prognosis. Collection of standardised cancer specific data also provides information for healthcare providers and epidemiologists, and facilitates international benchmarking and research.

CEff 180118 4 V4 Final

## 2 Clinical information required on request form

The clinical information needed includes:

- clinical staging
- laterality of eye that has been enucleated/exenterated
- previous therapy to enucleated/exenterated eye
- status of other eye (unilateral/bilateral tumour)
- · family history of retinoblastoma
- extraocular spread noted by surgeon during enucleation
- any history of extraocular malignancy.

## 3 Specimen receipt and fresh tumour sampling

The commonest specimen type is an enucleation for retinoblastoma. Very rarely, exenterations will be received.

#### 3.1 Fresh tumour sampling

In specialist ocular pathology or paediatric pathology centres, the eyeball is usually received fresh, in order for the tumour to be sampled for molecular analysis, to determine whether the tumour is of hereditary type or sporadic type. Recent international guidelines have defined a consensus approach of how to best sample fresh tumour and pathologists are encouraged to refer to this publication. <sup>5</sup> Briefly, the optic nerve is measured and the surgical resection margin is sampled first. This prevents contamination of the optic nerve margin by friable retinoblastoma tumour tissue if the globe is opened first.

The preferred technique is the opening of a window in the sclera at the edge of the area containing most of the tumour. The window can be made using a trephine or with a sharp blade. Fresh tumour is obtained from areas without necrosis.

#### 3.2 Fixation of specimens

After sampling, enucleations usually require 24 hours fixation in 10% buffered formalin and exenterations usually 48 hours. Exenteration specimens may be complete or limited. For orientation purposes, the lashes of the upper lid are longer than those of the lower lid and the upper lid possesses a fold; the medial canthus possesses a caruncle and puncta.

## 4 Specimen handling and block selection

#### 4.1 Macroscopic description

Enucleation specimens should have the following measurements taken:

- antero–posterior globe diameter (normal 22–23 mm)
- horizontal globe diameter (normal 22–23 mm)
- vertical globe diameter (normal 22–23 mm).

External inspection may reveal leukocoria, a pseudohypopyon, iris rubeosis, tumour expansion of the optic nerve surgical margin and areas of extraocular spread.

CEff 180118 5 V4 Final

The globe may be transilluminated with a bright light source (fibre optic). Any transillumination defects are noted in terms of location and size, and should be outlined on the scleral surface by ink. The tumour sampling site should be noted.

Exenteration specimens are performed in some cases of gross extraocular retinoblastoma spread. The specimen usually has the following measurements taken: maximum anteroposterior, horizontal and vertical. Any relevant external features are described. The external soft tissue margins should be painted in suitable dye for margin assessment and orientation purposes.

## 4.2 Block taking

#### 4.2.1 Enucleation specimens

The following four blocks should be taken:<sup>5</sup>

- optic nerve margin
- main tumour block with pupil and optic nerve (PO block)
- two blocks containing the calottes (remainder of ocular tissue after obtaining the PO block). The calottes should be bread-sliced and put on edge in order to maximise the chances of detecting choroidal, scleral and extrascleral invasion.<sup>5</sup>

#### 4.2.2 Exenteration specimens

For exenteration specimens, similar blocks to the above are taken:

- optic nerve resection margin
- tumour with the nearest orbital soft tissue and/or cutaneous margins.

#### 4.3 Microtomy of the specimen

The most important aspect of the microtomy is obtaining 'multiple' longitudinal sections through the optic nerve head and optic nerve (PO block). This is to assess the degree of any optic nerve invasion. There is no evidence base to inform how many sections need to be cut and examined to detect optic nerve invasion. If macroscopic extraocular spread and/or choroidal invasion are observed, these areas should be sampled for histological confirmation. There is no evidence base to support how many sections need to be cut or examined to detect massive or focal choroidal invasion, microscopic intrascleral and microscopic extraocular spread. Some authorities serially section the entire eyeball<sup>6</sup> – this is expensive in terms of time and resources.<sup>7</sup> Until an evidence base is established, this dataset is not prescriptive, as long as the PO block, the callotes and optic nerve resection margin are cut at multiple levels. Such sectioning is in line with recent international guidelines.<sup>5</sup>

#### 5 Core data items

#### 5.1 Macroscopic data

State specimen type (enucleation, partial or complete exenteration).

## 5.1.1 Number of tumour foci<sup>8-12</sup>

State whether unifocal or multifocal (bilateral is usually derived from clinical history). This requires histological confirmation. Sometimes, it is difficult to determine this macroscopically owing to tumour size or confluence. True multifocality indicates a germline mutation in the retinoblastoma gene<sup>9</sup> (see section 5.2).

CEff 180118 6 V4 Final

[Level of evidence B and C – tumour multifocality indicates germline mutation in retinoblastoma gene.]

## 5.1.2 Choroidal invasion<sup>5,13–18</sup>

Macroscopically observed choroidal invasion should be confirmed histologically (see section 5.2).

[Level of evidence - B and C.]

## 5.1.3 Extraocular spread<sup>5,14,19,20</sup>

Extraocular spread is the worst prognostic factor for death from retinoblastoma. It is associated with a 10-times greater risk of metastasis compared to intraocular confined tumours and carries a 90% mortality within two years of the diagnosis. <sup>19</sup> Macroscopically observed trans-scleral/extraocular extension should be confirmed histologically (see section 5.2).

[Level of evidence B and C – extraocular spread is an indicator of poor prognosis.]

## 5.2 Microscopic data

## 5.2.1 Number of tumour foci<sup>8-12</sup>

A macroscopic observation of suspected multifocal tumour requires histological confirmation. Sometimes, an apparently macroscopic unifocal tumour reveals microscopic multifocal tumour. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish true multifocal tumour from extensive seeding from a unifocal endophytic tumour. Artefactual seeding is composed of small groups of tumour cells, usually with many necrotic cells present inside natural spaces of the eye (e.g. vascular, choroidal and suprachoroidal space, anterior chamber, or subarachnoid space of the optic nerve).<sup>5</sup> It is important to distinguish a unifocal tumour from a multifocal one, as multifocality indicates a germline mutation in the retinoblastoma gene.<sup>8</sup> This has long-term prognostic implications, since the heritable form carries a greater risk of developing second malignant neoplasm, the commonest being osteosarcoma.<sup>8–12</sup>

[Level of evidence B and C – tumour multifocality indicates germline mutation in retinoblastoma gene.]

## 5.2.2 The degree of optic nerve invasion 13-15,19-22

The histopathological presence of optic nerve invasion is a highly predictive factor for death from metastatic retinoblastoma. Mortality increases with increasing extent of optic nerve invasion.

The following grading applies to degree of optic nerve invasion:<sup>5</sup>

- pre-laminar
- laminar
- post-laminar
- tumour at optic nerve surgical margin
- involvement of meningeal space.

Retrolaminar invasion and tumour at the surgical margin carry a worse prognosis, with respect to metastatic rate and mortality. Once the tumour crosses the lamina cribrosa, there is a higher chance of tumour cells having easy access to the pia-arachnoid, with spread to the central nervous system via the cerebrospinal fluid.<sup>13</sup> In the *TNM Classification of Malignant Tumours* (8<sup>th</sup> edition) from the UICC,<sup>3</sup> pre-laminar and laminar invasion are classed as pT2a, post-laminar as pT3b and involvement of the optic nerve surgical margin and meningeal space as pT4.<sup>3</sup>

CEff 180118 7 V4 Final

[Level of evidence – B and C.]

## 5.2.3 Choroidal invasion<sup>5,13–18</sup>

Massive or significant choroidal invasion is a solid tumour nest measuring more than 3 mm in width or thickness <u>or</u> multiple foci of tumour totalling more than 3 mm, or any full thickness choroidal involvement.

Focal choroidal invasion is a solid nest of tumour <3 mm in any diameter (thickness or width).

[Level of evidence - B and C.]

## **5.2.4 Intrascleral infiltration**<sup>5,14,16,23,24</sup>

Any degree of intrascleral invasion (via any route) is associated with choroidal invasion and extraocular recurrence and death from metastatic tumour.

[Level of evidence – B and C.]

## **5.2.5 Microscopic extraocular spread**<sup>5,14,19,20</sup>

Extraocular spread is the worst prognostic factor for death from retinoblastoma. It is associated with a 10-times greater risk of metastasis compared to intraocular confined tumours and carries a 90% mortality within two years of the diagnosis. <sup>19</sup> It is an indication for adjuvant chemotherapy.

[Level of evidence – B and C.]

## 5.3 Unfavourable HHRFs for metastasis 14,18,23-32

Several studies have shown that adjuvant chemotherapy, with or without radiotherapy, in children with unfavourable histological features can reduce the risk of developing metastatic disease. However, there continues to be debate within the retinoblastoma clinical community about which children to treat.

Currently identified high-risk histopathological features are:

- invasion of the anterior chamber, iris, ciliary body, trabecular meshwork and Schlemm's canal
- involvement of the optic nerve surgical resection margin
- retrolaminar optic nerve invasion
- intrascleral invasion
- massive choroidal invasion
- extraocular spread.

In the UK, the presence of anterior chamber invasion, massive choroidal invasion, post-laminar optic nerve invasion and intrascleral invasion are considered to be indications for adjuvant chemotherapy following enucleation. Involvement of the optic nerve surgical margin is an indication for more intensive chemotherapy and orbital radiotherapy. <sup>29</sup> Children with focal choroidal invasion have an event-free survival of 99% compared with 94% in those with massive choroidal invasion. <sup>30</sup>

[Level of evidence – B and C.]

## 5.4 Retinocytoma<sup>33–36</sup>

Rarely, a retinocytoma tumour may be encountered. This is a benign retinal tumour with characteristic clinical features. These tumours are composed of benign appearing cells and

CEff 180118 8 V4 Final

fleurettes, without necrosis or mitotic figures. In the largest series to date, there was a 4% transformation to malignant retinoblastoma. The presence of a retinocytoma has similar genetic implications to retinoblastoma. 33–36

[Level of evidence – B and C.]

#### 6 Non-core data items

#### 6.1 Macroscopic data

The macroscopic data required is size of tumour.<sup>37</sup>

## 6.2 Microscopic data

Items include:

- degree of tumour differentiation:<sup>16</sup>
  - in the Cancer Staging Manual (8<sup>th</sup> edition) from the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC), G1 is defined as tumour with areas of retinoma (flueurettes or neuronal differentiation); G2 as tumour with many rosettes (Flexner-Wintersteiner or Homer-Wright); G3 as tumour with occasional rosettes (Flexner-Wintersteiner or Homer-Wright); and G4 as tumour with poorly differentiated cells without rosettes and/or extensive areas (more than half of the tumour) of anaplasia<sup>38</sup>
- tumour anaplasia
  - grading of anaplasia may be a useful measurement to standard histopathologic criteria in identifying retinoblastoma that does not have high-risk histologic features but still has an increased risk of metastasis and may need adjuvant therapy<sup>39</sup>
- presence of vitreous seeds, which are predictive of tumour recurrence post chemotherapy<sup>15,19</sup>
- tumour growth pattern (exophytic or endophytic).<sup>3</sup>

## 7 TNM pathological staging (UICC 8<sup>th</sup> edition)<sup>3</sup>

The recommendation is to use the *TNM Classification of Malignant Tumours (8<sup>th</sup> edition)* from the UICC (see Appendix A).<sup>3</sup>

## 8 SNOMED coding

See Appendix B.

## 9 Reporting of small biopsy specimens

This is not applicable because fine needle aspiration cytology or open flap biopsies can seed the tumour, therefore these biopsy techniques are not recommended.

## 10 Reporting of frozen sections

Not applicable.

CEff 180118 9 V4 Final

## 11 Audit criteria

As recommended by the RCPath as key performance indicators (see Key Performance Indicators – Proposals for implementation, July 2013, <a href="https://www.rcpath.org/profession/clinical-effectiveness/key-performance-indicators-kpi.html">www.rcpath.org/profession/clinical-effectiveness/key-performance-indicators-kpi.html</a>):

- cancer resections must be reported using a template or proforma, including items listed
  in the English COSD which are, by definition, core data items in RCPath cancer
  datasets. English Trusts are required to implement the structured recording of core
  pathology data in the COSD.
  - standard: 95% of reports must contain structured data
- histopathology cases should be reported, confirmed and authorised within seven and ten calendar days of the procedure
  - standard: 80% of cases must be reported within seven calendar days and 90% within ten calendar days.

CEff 180118 10 V4 Final

#### 12 References

- 1 Palmer K, Nairn M. Management of acute gastrointestinal blood loss: summary of SIGN guidelines. *BMJ* 2008;337:1832.
- 2 Chantada G, Doz F, Antoneli CB, Grundy R, Clare Stannard FF, Dunkel IJ *et al.* A proposal for an international retinoblastoma staging system. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2006;47:801–805.
- Brierley JD, Godpodarowicz MK, Wittekind C. *TNM Classification of Malignant Tumours* (8<sup>th</sup> edition). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2017.
- 4 Ford AL, Mudhar HS, Farr R, Parsons MA. The ophthalmic pathology cut-up Part 1: The enucleation and exenterations specimen. *Curr Diagn Pathol* 2005;11:284–290.
- Sastre X, Chantada GL, Doz F, Wilson MW, de Davila MT, Rodriguez-Galindo C *et al.* Proceedings of the consensus meetings from the International Retinoblastoma Staging Working Group on the Pathology Guidelines for the examination of enucleated eyes and evaluation of prognostic risk factors in retinoblastoma. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2009;133: 1199–1202.
- 6 Walton DS, Grant WM. Retinoblastoma with iris neovascularization. *Am J Ophthalmol* 1968;65:598–599.
- 7 Redler LD, Ellsworth RM. Prognostic importance of choroidal invasion in retinoblastoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1973;90:294–296.
- 8 Knudson AG Jr. Mutation and cancer: statistical study of retinoblastoma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1971;68:820–823.
- 9 Abramson DH. Second non-ocular cancers in retinoblastoma: a unified hypothesis. The Franceschetti Lecture. *Ophthalmic Genet* 1999;20:193–204.
- 10 MacCarthy A, Bayne AM, Brownhill PA, Bunch KJ, Diggens NL, Draper GJ *et al.* Second and subsequent tumours among 1927 retinoblastoma patients diagnosed in Britain 1951–2004. *Br J Cancer* 2013;108:2455–2463.
- 11 Draper GJ, Sanders BM, Kingston JE. Second primary neoplasms in patients with retinoblastoma. *Br J Cancer* 1986;53:661–671.
- Moll AC, Imhof SM, Bouter LM, Tan KE. Second primary tumours in patients with retinoblastoma. A review of literature. *Ophthalmic Genet* 1997;18:27–34.
- 13 Magramm I, Abramson DH, Ellsworth RM. Optic nerve involvement in retinoblastoma. *Ophthalmology* 1989;96:217–222.
- 14 Khelfaoui F, Validire P, Auperin A, Quintana E, Michon J, Pacquement H *et al.* Histopathologic risk factors in retinoblastoma: a retrospective study of 172 patients treated in a single institution. *Cancer* 1996;77:1206–1213.
- 15 Messmer EP, Heinrich T, Höpping W, de Sutter E, Havers W, Sauerwein W. Risk factors for metastases in patients with retinoblastoma. *Ophthalmology* 1991;98:136–141.
- 16 Tosi P, Cintorino M, Toti P, Ninfo V, Montesco MC, Frezzotti R *et al.* Histopathological evaluation for the prognosis of retinoblastoma. *Ophthalmic Paediatr Genet* 1989;10:173–177.

CEff 180118 11 V4 Final

- 17 Shields CL, Shields JA, Baez KA, Cater J, De Potter PV. Choroidal invasion of retinoblastoma: metastatic potential and clinical risk factors. *Br J Ophthalmol* 1993;77: 544–548.
- 18 Uusitalo MS, Van Quill KR, Scott IU, Matthay KK, Murray TG, O'Brien JM. Evaluation of chemoprophylaxis in patients with unilateral retinoblastoma with high-risk features on histopathologic examination. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2001;119:41–48.
- 19 Kopelman JE, McLean IW, Rosenberg SH. Multivariate analysis of risk factors for metastasis in retinoblastoma treated by enucleation. *Ophthalmology* 1987;94:371–377.
- 20 Rootman J, Ellsworth RM, Hofbauer J, Kitchen D. Orbital extension of retinoblastoma: a clinicopathological study. *Can J Ophthalmol* 1978;13:72–80.
- 21 Rootman J, Hofbauer J, Ellsworth RM, Kitchen D. Invasion of the optic nerve by retinoblastoma: a clinicopathological study. *Can J Ophthalmol* 1976;11:106–114.
- 22 Shields CL, Shields JA, Baez K, Cater JR, De Potter P. Optic nerve invasion of retinoblastoma. Metastatic potential and clinical risk factors. *Cancer* 1994;73:692–698.
- Chantada GL, Dunkel IJ, de Dávila MT, Abramson DH. Retinoblastoma patients with high risk ocular pathological features: who needs adjuvant therapy? *Br J Ophthalmol* 2004;88:1069–1073.
- Cuenca A, Giron F, Castro D, Fandiño A, Guitter M, de Dávila MT *et al.* Microscopic scleral invasion in retinoblastoma: clinicopathological features and outcomes. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2009;127:1006–1010.
- Hanover SG, Singh AD, Shields CL, Meadows AT, Demirci H, Cater J *et al.* Post-enucleation adjuvant therapy in high-risk retinoblastoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2002;120:923–931.
- Wolff JA, Boesel CP, Dyment PG. Treatment of retinoblastoma: a preliminary report. *Int Congress Series* 1981;570:364–368.
- 27 Keith CG. Chemotherapy in retinoblastoma management. *Ophthalmic Paediatr Genet* 1989;10:93–98.
- 28 Haik BG, Dunleavy SA, Cooke C, Ellsworth RM, Abramson DH, Smith ME *et al.* Retinoblastoma with anterior chamber extension. *Ophthalmology* 1987;94:367–370.
- Jenkinson H. Retinoblastoma: diagnosis and management the UK perspective. *Arch Dis Child* 2015;100:1070–1075.
- 30 Bosaleh A, Sampor C, Saloernou V, Fandiño A, Domínguez J, de Dávila MTG *et al.* Outcome of children with retinoblastoma and isolated choroidal invasion. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2012;130:724–729.
- 31 Aerts I, Sastre-Garau X, Savignoni A, Lumbroso-Le Rouic L, Thebaud-Leculée E, Frappaz D et al. Results of a multicentre prospective study on the post-operative treatment of unilateral retinoblastoma after primary enucleation. *J Clin Oncol* 2013;31:1458–1463.
- Chantada G, Luna-Fineman S, Sitorus RS, Kruger M, Israels T, Leal-Leal C *et al.* SIOP-PODC recommendations for graduated-intensity treatment of retinoblastoma in developing countries. *Pediatr Blood Cancer* 2013;60:719–727.
- 33 Margo C, Hidayat A, Kopelman J, Zimmerman LE. Retinocytoma. A benign variant of retinoblastoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1983;101:1519–1531.

CEff 180118 12 V4 Final

- 34 Abramson DH. Retinoma, retinocytoma, and the retinoblastoma gene. *Arch Ophthalmol* 1983:101:1517–1518.
- Kratzke RA, Otterson GA, Hogg A, Coxon AB, Geradts J, Cowell JK *et al.* Partial inactivation of the RB product in a family with incomplete penetrance of familial retinoblastoma and benign retinal tumors. *Oncogene* 1994;9:1321–1326.
- 36 Singh AD, Santos CM, Shields CL, Shields JA, Eagle RC Jr. Observations of 17 patients with retinocytoma. *Arch Ophthalmol* 2000;118:199–205.
- Palazzi M, Abramson DH, Ellsworth RM. Endophytic vs exophytic unilateral retinoblastoma: is there any real difference? *J Pediatr Ophthalmol Strabismus* 1990;27:255–258.
- Amin MB, Edge S, Greene F, Byrd DR, Brookland RK, Washington MK *et al.* (eds.) *American Joint Cancer Committee Cancer Staging Manual* (8<sup>th</sup> edition). Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, 2017.
- Mendoza PR, Specht CS, Hubbard GB, Wells JR, Lynn MJ, Zhang Q *et al.* Histopathologic grading of anaplasia in retinoblastoma. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2015;159:764–776.

CEff 180118 13 V4 Final

## Appendix A TNM pathological classification of ocular retinoblastoma (UICC 8<sup>th</sup> edition)<sup>3</sup>

In bilateral cases, the eyes should be classified separately. The classification does not apply to complete spontaneous regression of the tumour. There should be histological confirmation of the disease in an enucleated eye.

The regional lymph nodes are the pre-auricular, submandibular and cervical lymph nodes.

Т	Primary tumour		
XTq	Primary tumour cannot be assessed		
оТ0	No evidence of primary tumour		
pT1	Tumour confined to the eye with no optic nerve or choroidal invasion		
pT2	Tumoui	r with intraocular invasion	
	pT2a	Focal choroidal invasion and pre- or intra-laminar invasion of the optic nerve	
	pT2b	head Tumour invasion of stroma of iris and/or trabecular meshwork and/or Schlemm's canal	
рТ3	Tumoui	r with significant local invasion	
	рТ3а	Choroidal invasion larger than 3 mm in diameter or multiple foci of invasion totalling more than 3 mm or any full thickness involvement	
	pT3b	Retrolaminar invasion of optic nerve without invasion of transected end of optic nerve	
	pT3c pT3d	Partial thickness involvement of sclera within the inner two-thirds Full thickness invasion into outer third of the sclera and/or invasion into or around emissary channels	
pT4	Extraocular extension: Tumour invades optic nerve at transected end, in meningeal spac around the optic nerve, full thickness invasion of the sclera with invasion of episclera, adipose tissue, extraocular muscle, bone, conjunctiva or eyelid		
pΝ	Regional lymph nodes		
ρNX	Regional lymph nodes cannot be assessed		
oN0	No regional lymph node involvement		
oN1	Regional lymph node involvement		
рМ	Distant metastasis		
сМО	No dista	ant metastasis	
pM1	Distant	metastasis	
	pM1a pM1b	Single or multiple metastasis to sites other than CNS Metastasis to CNS parenchyma of CSF fluid	

CEff 180118 14 V4 Final

## Appendix B SNOMED codes

#### **SNOMED T codes**

Topographical codes	SNOMED	SNOMED-CT terminology	SNOMED- CT code
Eye	TAA000 (SNOMED 3/RT)	Structure of eye proper (body structure)	81745001
Both eyes	TAA180 (SNOMED 3/RT)	Structure of both eyes (body structure)	40638003
Orbit	TD1480 (SNOMED 3) T-D14AD (SNOMED RT)	Entire orbital region (body structure)	39607008

#### **SNOMED M codes**

Morphological codes	SNOMED	SNOMED-CT terminology	SNOMED- CT code
Retinoblastoma	M95103	Retinoblastoma (morphologic abnormality)	19906005
Retinoblastoma, differentiated	M95113	Retinoblastoma, differentiated (morphologic abnormality)	26019009
Retinoblastoma, diffuse	M95133	Retinoblastoma, diffuse (morphologic abnormality)	128793008
Retinoblastoma, spontaneously regressed	M95141	Retinoblastoma, spontaneously regressed (morphologic abnormality)	128794002
Retinocytoma	M95100	Retinocytoma (morphologic abnormality)	128913004
Radiation effect on tissue	M11600	Radiation injury (morphologic abnormality)	81018009

## **SNOMED P (Procedure) codes**

These are used in SNOMED 2 and SNOMED 3 to distinguish biopsies, partial resections and radical resections to indicate the nature of the procedure.

Local P codes should be recorded. At present, P codes vary according to the SNOMED system in use in different institutions.

CEff 180118 15 V4 Final

Appendix C	Reporting profo	rma for ocular re	tinoblastoma	
Surname:	Forenam	es:	Date of birth:	Sex: M / F
Hospital:	Hospital	no:	NHS/CHI num	ber:
Date specimen taken:	Date of re	ceipt:	Date of reporti	ng:
Report no:Surgeon:		st:		
MACROSCOPIC DES	SCRIPTION			
Specimen type:	Enucleation   Other		n □ Complete €	exenteration
Site:	Left eye □	Right eye □		
After sectioning:				
Number of tumour fo	oci: Unifocal □	Multifocal	□ Cannot b	e assessed □
Site of tumour: Clock	c hours:			
Ocular structures in	volved			
Anterior chamber □ Optic disc □	Iris □ Angle Choroid □ Sclera		Vitreo	ous □ ot be assessed □
Optic disc	Chorola   Sciera	Extraocular spi	lead/orbit   Cariff	ot be assessed b
MACROSCOPIC COM	MMENTS			
HISTOLOGY Retinoblastoma pres	sent: Yes □	No □		
Retinocytoma prese		No 🗆		
Structures involved	by tumour:			
Anterior chamber/iris		Present □ (pT2b)		Not identified □
meshwork/Schlemm				
Focal choroidal inva Massive choroidal in		Present □ (pT2a) Present □ (pT3a)		Not identified □  Not identified □
Scleral invasion:	ivasion.	Yes, Inner two-third	 s □ (pT3c)	Not identified
		Yes, Outer third/full		
Invasion into or arou channels:	ınd emissary	Present □ (pT3d)		Not identified
Extrascleral/orbit inv	vasion (pT4):	Present □		Not identified □
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·
Number of tumour fo	oci: Unifocal 🗆 Mult	ifocal □ Cannot be as	sessed -	
Optic nerve invasion  If optic nerve in		ent □ Not io	dentified	
Degree of optic	nerve invasion: Pre-la	aminar (pT2a) 🛭 Lai	minar (pT2a) □ Post	t-laminar (pT3b) □
Optic nerve res Meningeal spac		ved (pT4) $\qquad \Box$ ved (pT4) $\qquad \Box$	Not involve Not involve	
Resection margins (	for exenterations): Not involved □	Cannot be asses	ssed □ Not a	pplicable □
HISTOLOGY COMME	ENTS			
Pathological staging	рТ	pN	pM (TNM 8 <sup>th</sup> edit	ion)
SNOMED codes	T/ [	и		
Signature	Date			

## Appendix D Reporting proforma for ocular retinoblastoma in list format

Element name	Values	Implementation notes
Specimen type	Single selection value list:	
Specimen type, other, specify	Free text	Only applicable if 'Specimen type, Other' is selected.
Site	Single selection value list:  Left eye Right eye	
Number of tumour foci (macroscopic)	Single selection value list:	
Site of tumour, clock hours	Free text	
Ocular structures involved	Multiple select value list (choose all that apply)  • Anterior chamber  • Iris  • Angle  • Ciliary body  • Vitreous  • Optic disc  • Choroid  • Sclera  • Extraocular spread/orbit  • Cannot be assessed	
Retinoblastoma present	Single selection value list: • Yes • No	
Retinocytoma present	Single selection value list: • Yes • No	
Anterior chamber/iris/trabecular meshwork/Schlemm's canal invasion	Single selection value list:     Present     Not identified	
Focal choroidal invasion	Single selection value list:     Present     Not identified	

CEff 180118 17 V4 Final

Massive choroidal invasion	Single selection value list:     Present     Not identified	
Scleral invasion	Single selection value list:  • Yes, Inner two-thirds  • Yes, Outer third/ full thickness  • Not identified	
Extrascleral/orbit invasion	Single selection value list:     Present     Not identified	
Number of tumour foci (microscopic)	Single selection value list:	
Optic nerve invasion	Single selection value list:     Present     Not identified	
Degree of optic nerve invasion	Single selection value list:     Pre-laminar     Laminar     Post-laminar     Not applicable	Not applicable if optic nerve invasion not identified.
Optic nerve resection margin	Single selection value list:     Involved     Not involved     Not applicable	Not applicable if optic nerve invasion not identified.
Meningeal space	Single selection value list:     Involved     Not involved     Not applicable	Not applicable if optic nerve invasion not identified.
Resection margins	Single selection value list:     Involved     Not involved     Cannot be assessed     Not applicable	
UICC TNM version 8 pT stage	Single selection value list:     pTX     pT0     pT1     pT2a     pT2b	

CEff 180118 18 V4 Final

	• pT3a	
	• pT3b	
	• pT3c	
	• pT3d	
	• pT4	
	• ypTX	
	• ypT0	
	• ypT1	
	• ypT2a	
	• ypT2b	
	• ypT3a	
	• ypT3b	
	• ypT3c	
	• ypT3d	
	• ypT4	
UICC TNM version 8 pN	Single selection value list:	
stage	• pNX	
	• pN0	
	• pN1	
	• ypNX	
	• ypN0	
	• ypN1	
UICC TNM version 8 pM	Single selection value list:	
stage	Not applicable	
	• pM1a	
	• pM1b	
SNOMED Topography code	May have multiple codes. Look up from SNOMED tables.	
SNOMED Morphology code	May have multiple codes. Look up from SNOMED tables.	

CEff 180118 19 V4 Final

## Appendix E Summary table – explanation of grades of evidence

(modified from Palmer K et al. BMJ 2008;337:1832)

Grade (level) of evidence	Nature of evidence
Grade A	At least one high-quality meta-analysis, systematic review of randomised controlled trials or a randomised controlled trial with a very low risk of bias and directly attributable to the target cancer type
	or
	A body of evidence demonstrating consistency of results and comprising mainly well-conducted meta-analyses, systematic reviews of randomised controlled trials or randomised controlled trials with a low risk of bias, directly applicable to the target cancer type.
Grade B	A body of evidence demonstrating consistency of results and comprising mainly high-quality systematic reviews of case-control or cohort studies and high-quality case-control or cohort studies with a very low risk of confounding or bias and a high probability that the relation is causal and which are directly applicable to the target cancer type
	or
	Extrapolation evidence from studies described in A.
Grade C	A body of evidence demonstrating consistency of results and including well-conducted case-control or cohort studies and high-quality case-control or cohort studies with a low risk of confounding or bias and a moderate probability that the relation is causal and which are directly applicable to the target cancer type
	or
	Extrapolation evidence from studies described in B.
Grade D	Non-analytic studies such as case reports, case series or expert opinion
	or
	Extrapolation evidence from studies described in C.
Good practice point (GPP)	Recommended best practice based on the clinical experience of the authors of the writing group.

CEff 180118 20 V4 Final

## Appendix F AGREE guideline monitoring sheet

The cancer datasets of The Royal College of Pathologists comply with the AGREE II standards for good quality clinical guidelines. The sections of this dataset that indicate compliance with each of the AGREE II standards are indicated in the table.

Scope and purpose  1 The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described Introduction  2 The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described  3 The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to appty is specifically described  5 The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to appty is specifically described  5 The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought  5 The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought  6 The target users of the guideline are clearly defined  7 Systematic methods were used to search for evidence  8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described  9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described  10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described  11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations  12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence  13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication  4 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided  6 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  5 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  Foreword  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline interest of guideline development group members have been recorded and addressed	AG	REE standard	Section of guideline
The overall objective(s) of the guideline is (are) specifically described Introduction The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described Introduction The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to apply is specifically described  Stakeholder involvement  The guideline development group includes individuals from all the relevant professional groups The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought The target users of the guideline are clearly defined The target users of the guideline are clearly defined The target users of the guideline are clearly described The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication To reword The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations have been considered The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria The guideline presents functioning and/or auditing criteria Caltrical independence The guideline development group members have been The provent			garaemie
Introduction  3 The population (patients, public, etc.) to whom the guideline is meant to appty is specifically described  Stakeholder involvement  4 The guideline development group includes individuals from all the relevant professional groups  5 The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought  6 The target users of the guideline are clearly defined  Rigour of development  7 Systematic methods were used to search for evidence  8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described  9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described  10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described  11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations  12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence  13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication  14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided  Clarity of presentation  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  2-7  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  Foreword  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  5 Foreword			
is specifically described  Stakeholder involvement  4 The guideline development group includes individuals from all the relevant professional groups  5 The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought  6 The target users of the guideline are clearly defined  Rigour of development  7 Systematic methods were used to search for evidence  8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described  9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described  10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described  11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations  12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence  13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication  14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided  Clarity of presentation  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  2-7  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  Foreword  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been	2	The health question(s) covered by the guideline is (are) specifically described	
4 The guideline development group includes individuals from all the relevant professional groups 5 The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought 6 The target users of the guideline are clearly defined Introduction  Rigour of development 7 Systematic methods were used to search for evidence Foreword 8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described Foreword 9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described Foreword 10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described Foreword 11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations 12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence 13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication Foreword 14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided Foreword  Clarity of presentation 15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous 2-7 16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented 17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable 2-7  Applicability 18 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice 20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered 21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria 21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria 21 The wises of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline Foreword	3		Foreword
professional groups  5 The views and preferences of the target population (patients, public, etc.) have been sought  6 The target users of the guideline are clearly defined  Rigour of development  7 Systematic methods were used to search for evidence  8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described  9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described  10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described  11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations  12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence  13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication  14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  Foreword  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The yiews of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	Sta	keholder involvement	
have been sought 6 The target users of the guideline are clearly defined  Rigour of development 7 Systematic methods were used to search for evidence Foreword 8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described Foreword 9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described Foreword 10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described Foreword 11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations 12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence 13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication Foreword 14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided Foreword  Clarity of presentation 15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous 2–7 16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented 17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable 2–7  Applicability 18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application Foreword 19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice 20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered 21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria 11  Editorial independence 22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline Foreword	4		Foreword
Rigour of development         7       Systematic methods were used to search for evidence       Foreword         8       The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described       Foreword         9       The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described       Foreword         10       The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described       Foreword         11       The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations       Foreword and introduction         12       There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence       5         13       The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication       Foreword         14       A procedure for updating the guideline is provided       Foreword         Clarity of presentation       2-7         15       The recommendations are specific and unambiguous       2-7         16       The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented       2-7         17       Key recommendations are easily identifiable       2-7         Applicability       Applicability         18       The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application       Foreword         19       The guideline provides advice and/or tools on	5		Foreword
7 Systematic methods were used to search for evidence 8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described 9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described 10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described 11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations 12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence 13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication 14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided 15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous 16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented 17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable 2-7  Applicability 18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application 19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice 20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered 21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria 22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline 23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	6	The target users of the guideline are clearly defined	Introduction
8 The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described 9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described 10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described 11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations 12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence 13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication 14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided 15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous 16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented 17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable 2-7  Applicability 18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application 19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice 20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered 21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria 22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline 23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been Foreword	Rig	our of development	
9 The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described 10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described 11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations 12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence 13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication 14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided 15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous 16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented 17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable 2-7  Applicability 18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application 19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice 20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered 21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria 22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline erroword 23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been 24 Foreword	7	Systematic methods were used to search for evidence	Foreword
10 The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described 11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations 12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence 13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication 14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided 15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous 16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented 17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable 2-7  Applicability 18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application 19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice 20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered 21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria 22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline erroword 23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been 25 Foreword	8	The criteria for selecting the evidence are clearly described	Foreword
11 The health benefits, side effects and risks have been considered in formulating the recommendations  12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence  13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication  14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline proverd  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	9	The strengths and limitations of the body of evidence are clearly described	Foreword
formulating the recommendations  Introduction  12 There is an explicit link between the recommendations and the supporting evidence  13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication  Foreword  14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided  Foreword  Clarity of presentation  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  2-7  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  Foreword  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  11  Editorial independence  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	10	The methods for formulating the recommendations are clearly described	Foreword
evidence  13 The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication  14 A procedure for updating the guideline is provided  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	11		
Clarity of presentation  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  2-7  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  11  Editorial independence  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	12		5
Clarity of presentation  15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  2-7  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  Foreword  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  11  Editorial independence  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	13	The guideline has been externally reviewed by experts prior to its publication	Foreword
15 The recommendations are specific and unambiguous  2-7  16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2-7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	14	A procedure for updating the guideline is provided	Foreword
16 The different options for management of the condition or health issue are clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2–7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	Cla	rity of presentation	
clearly presented  17 Key recommendations are easily identifiable  2–7  Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  11  Editorial independence  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	15	The recommendations are specific and unambiguous	2–7
Applicability  18 The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  21 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  22 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	16		2–7
The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application  The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	17	Key recommendations are easily identifiable	2–7
19 The guideline provides advice and/or tools on how the recommendations can be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  21 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  22 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	Ар	plicability	
be put into practice  20 The potential resource implications of applying the recommendations have been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  Editorial independence  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	18	The guideline describes facilitators and barriers to its application	Foreword
been considered  21 The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria  Editorial independence  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	19		Appendices A–D
Editorial independence  22 The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been  Foreword	20		Foreword
<ul> <li>The views of the funding body have not influenced the content of the guideline</li> <li>Competing interest of guideline development group members have been</li> </ul>	21	The guideline presents monitoring and/or auditing criteria	11
guideline  23 Competing interest of guideline development group members have been Foreword	Ed	torial independence	
	22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Foreword
	23		Foreword

CEff 180118 21 V4 Final