

## Scoring for BLPG EQA, Round 11

At the last BLPG meeting (Cardiff, May 2019) it was decided that:

1. Any cases with less than 80% consensus would be excluded from scoring
2. The EQA organisers would provide a brief commentary with each case.

### **CASE 1**

This case had 112 responses that were spread over the following broad diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. CLL/SLL
2. CLL with expanded proliferation centres
3. CLL with frank histological transformation to high grade lymphoma
4. Other (mainly high grade lymphoma)

#### **Submitted diagnosis:**

B-SLL/CLL with expanded proliferation centres.

#### **Result:**

All diagnosis with CLL to be scored 2.

All diagnosis with unequivocal transformation of CLL to high grade lymphoma and other diagnosis (B-cell lymphoma, NOS or DLBCL without mentioning CLL) to be scored 0.

#### **COMMENTS:**

This diagnosis is described as having clinical outcome intermediate between CLL and CLL with frank histological transformation (Richter's transformation) and therefore is an important .

Ref: WHO Classification of Tumours of Haematopoietic and Lymphoid tissue, page 219-220.

### **CASE 2**

This case had 111 responses that were spread over the following diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. ALCL, Alk negative (including with differential diagnosis)
2. ATLL and differential diagnosis with consideration of ATLL
3. Differential diagnosis without consideration of ATLL
4. PTCL

#### **Submitted diagnosis:**

ATLL

#### **Result:**

Non-scoring/educational case.

#### **COMMENTS:**

None

### **CASE 3**

This case had 112 responses that were spread over the following diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. Leishmaniasis
2. Histoplasmosis
3. Infection with histoplasmosis and Leishmaniasis considered in the differential diagnoses
4. Infection without Leishmaniasis in differential diagnosis
5. Toxoplasmosis
6. Plasma cell neoplasm
7. Plasma cell hyperplasia
8. P. Jirovecii
9. Inflammatory changes

#### **Submitted diagnosis:**

Leishmaniasis

#### **Result:**

Non-scoring/educational case.

#### **COMMENTS:**

None

### **CASE 4**

This case had 111 responses that were spread over the following diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. Mycosis fungoides
2. Mycosis fungoides with transformation/tumour stage
3. Cutaneous T-cell lymphoma
4. Sezary Syndrome
5. Peripheral T cell lymphoma
6. Angioimmunoblastic T-cell lymphoma (AITL)
7. Adult T cell lymphoma/leukemia (ATLL)
8. Lymphomatoid papulosis
9. Gamma delta T cell lymphoma
10. PTCL with cutaneous involvement

#### **Submitted diagnosis:**

Primary cutaneous T-cell lymphoma, mycosis fungoides or Sezary syndrome

#### **Result:**

Diagnosis 1-4 to be scored 2. Remaining diagnosis to be scored 0.

#### **COMMENTS:**

Scoring agreed after discussion.

### **CASE 5**

This case had 112 responses that were spread over the following diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. Lymphoplasmacytic lymphoma
2. Lymphoplasmacytic lymphoma/Waldenström's macroglobulinemia
3. Low grade B-cell lymphoma with lymphoplasmacytic and marginal zone lymphoma in differential diagnoses
4. Lymphoplasmacytic lymphoma with co-existing plasma cell myeloma
5. CD5+ B-cell lymphoma.
6. Not part of my practice (myeloma and CLL nodules).

### **Submitted diagnosis:**

Lymphoplasmacytic lymphoma

### **Result:**

All diagnoses including low grade B-cell lymphoma with LPL in differential diagnosis (categories 1-4 above) to be given a score of 2.

### **COMMENTS:**

None

### **CASE 6**

This case had 112 responses that were spread over the following diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. Hodgkin lymphoma
2. Suspicious of Hodgkin lymphoma
3. CLL with transformation to Hodgkin lymphoma
4. Not reported
5. Not much to go by but suppose it's a small focus of Hodgkin lymphoma!
6. CLL with EBV infection
7. Not part of my practice but looks reactive
8. Reactive/post treatment reactive changes
9. Very difficult to assess slides
10. Hodgkin +/- MDS
11. Normal

### **Submitted diagnosis:**

Focal involvement by classic Hodgkin lymphoma. NO evidence of CLL in the background.

### **Result:**

Non-scoring/educational case.

### **COMMENTS:**

None

### **CASE 7**

This case had 75 responses that were spread over the following diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. MDS EB (1/2)
2. AML (on a background of MDS)
3. CMML (some with grading, CMML1 or CMML2)
4. Differential including MPN, MDS
5. Therapy related MPN
6. No response

### **Submitted diagnosis:**

Chronic myelomonocytic leukaemia 2 (CMML 2)

### **Result:**

Non-scoring/educational case.

### **COMMENTS:**

None

### **CASE 8**

This case had 71 responses that were spread over the following diagnostic categories in order of popularity:

1. Myelodysplasia EB1
2. Therapy related myeloid neoplasm
3. AML
4. Erythroid leukemia
5. Differential diagnoses (MDS EB, AML and t-MN)
6. Megaloblastic change
7. Parvovirus B19
8. No response

### **Submitted diagnosis:**

Myelodysplastic syndrome with excess blasts 2 (MDS-EB2); consistent with therapy related myeloid neoplasm.

### **Result:**

All diagnoses with Non-scoring educational case.

Discussion at the EQA meeting was around inclusion of categories 1, 2 and 5 above as a score of 2. However, the total number of respondents in the above categories is 70%.

Therefore, this will be a non-scoring case.

### **COMMENTS:**

None