

# Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention



## Pathology of Breast and Ovarian Cancers among *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* Mutation Carriers: Results from the Consortium of Investigators of Modifiers of *BRCA1/2* (CIMBA)

Nasim Mavaddat, Daniel Barrowdale, Irene L. Andrulis, et al.

*Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2012;21:134-147. Published OnlineFirst December 5, 2011.

**Updated version** Access the most recent version of this article at:  
doi:[10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-11-0775](https://doi.org/10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-11-0775)

**Supplementary Material** Access the most recent supplemental material at:  
<http://cebp.aacrjournals.org/content/suppl/2011/11/22/1055-9965.EPI-11-0775.DC1.html>

**Cited Articles** This article cites by 46 articles, 18 of which you can access for free at:  
<http://cebp.aacrjournals.org/content/21/1/134.full.html#ref-list-1>

**Citing articles** This article has been cited by 13 HighWire-hosted articles. Access the articles at:  
<http://cebp.aacrjournals.org/content/21/1/134.full.html#related-urls>

**E-mail alerts** [Sign up to receive free email-alerts](#) related to this article or journal.

**Reprints and Subscriptions** To order reprints of this article or to subscribe to the journal, contact the AACR Publications Department at [pubs@aacr.org](mailto:pubs@aacr.org).

**Permissions** To request permission to re-use all or part of this article, contact the AACR Publications Department at [permissions@aacr.org](mailto:permissions@aacr.org).

## Research Article

Pathology of Breast and Ovarian Cancers among *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* Mutation Carriers: Results from the Consortium of Investigators of Modifiers of *BRCA1/2* (CIMBA)

Nasim Mavaddat<sup>1</sup>, Daniel Barrowdale<sup>1</sup>, Irene L. Andrulis<sup>2,5</sup>, Susan M. Domchek<sup>9</sup>, Diana Eccles<sup>11</sup>, Heli Nevanlinna<sup>12</sup>, Susan J. Ramus<sup>15</sup>, Amanda Spurdle<sup>17</sup>, Mark Robson<sup>3</sup>, Mark Sherman<sup>18</sup>, Anna Marie Mulligan<sup>6,7</sup>, Fergus J. Couch<sup>20</sup>, Christoph Engel<sup>24</sup>, Lesley McGuffog<sup>1</sup>, Sue Healey<sup>17</sup>, Olga M. Sinilnikova<sup>25,26</sup>, Melissa C. Southey<sup>28</sup>, Mary Beth Terry<sup>4</sup>, David Goldgar<sup>30</sup>, Frances O'Malley<sup>2,5</sup>, Esther M. John<sup>31</sup>, Ramunas Janavicius<sup>32</sup>, Laima Tihomirova<sup>33</sup>, Thomas V. O. Hansen<sup>34</sup>, Finn C. Nielsen<sup>34</sup>, Ana Osorio<sup>36</sup>, Alexandra Stavropoulou<sup>38</sup>, Javier Benítez<sup>36</sup>, Siranoush Manoukian<sup>39</sup>, Bernard Peissel<sup>39</sup>, Monica Barile<sup>41</sup>, Sara Volorio<sup>42</sup>, Barbara Pasini<sup>43</sup>, Riccardo Dolcetti<sup>44</sup>, Anna Laura Putignano<sup>45</sup>, Laura Ottini<sup>46</sup>, Paolo Radice<sup>40,42</sup>, Ute Hamann<sup>47</sup>, Muhammad U. Rashid<sup>47,49</sup>, Frans B. Hogervorst<sup>50</sup>, Mieke Krieger<sup>52</sup>, Rob B. van der Luit<sup>53</sup>, for HEBON<sup>51</sup>; Susan Peock<sup>1</sup>, Debra Frost<sup>1</sup>, D. Gareth Evans<sup>54</sup>, Carole Brewer<sup>55</sup>, Lisa Walker<sup>56</sup>, Mark T. Rogers<sup>57</sup>, Lucy E. Side<sup>58</sup>, Catherine Houghton<sup>59</sup>, for EMBRACE<sup>1</sup>; JoEllen Weaver<sup>10</sup>, Andrew K. Godwin<sup>60</sup>, Rita K. Schmutzler<sup>61</sup>, Barbara Wappenschmidt<sup>61</sup>, Alfons Meindl<sup>62</sup>, Karin Kast<sup>63</sup>, Norbert Arnold<sup>64</sup>, Dieter Niederacher<sup>65</sup>, Christian Sutter<sup>48</sup>, Helmut Deissler<sup>66</sup>, Doroteha Gadzicki<sup>67</sup>, Sabine Preisler-Adams<sup>68</sup>, Raymonda Varon-Mateeva<sup>69</sup>, Ines Schönbuchner<sup>70</sup>, Heidrun Gevensleben<sup>71</sup>, Dominique Stoppa-Lyonnet<sup>72,73,74</sup>, Muriel Belotti<sup>72</sup>, Laure Barjhoux<sup>26</sup>, for GEMO Study Collaborators<sup>27</sup>; Claudine Isaacs<sup>75</sup>, Beth N. Peshkin<sup>75</sup>, Trinidad Caldes<sup>37</sup>, Miguel de al Hoya<sup>37</sup>, Carmen Cañadas<sup>37</sup>, Tuomas Heikkinen<sup>12</sup>, Päivi Heikkilä<sup>13</sup>, Kristiina Aittomäki<sup>14</sup>, Ignacio Blanco<sup>77</sup>, Conxi Lazaro<sup>77</sup>, Joan Brunet<sup>78</sup>, Bjarni A. Agnarsson<sup>79</sup>, Adalgeir Arason<sup>79</sup>, Rosa B. Barkardottir<sup>79</sup>, Martine Dumont<sup>80</sup>, Jacques Simard<sup>81</sup>, Marco Montagna<sup>82</sup>, Simona Agata<sup>82</sup>, Emma D'Andrea<sup>83</sup>, Max Yan<sup>84</sup>, Stephen Fox<sup>29</sup>, for kConFab Investigators<sup>29</sup>; Timothy R. Rebbeck<sup>8</sup>, Wendy Rubinstein<sup>85</sup>, Nadine Tung<sup>86</sup>, Judy E. Garber<sup>87</sup>, Xianshu Wang<sup>21</sup>, Zachary Fredericksen<sup>20</sup>, Vernon S. Pankratz<sup>20</sup>, Noralane M. Lindor<sup>23</sup>, Csilla Szabo<sup>88</sup>, Kenneth Offit<sup>3</sup>, Rita Sakr<sup>3</sup>, Mia M. Gaudet<sup>89</sup>, Christian F. Singer<sup>90</sup>, Muy-Kheng Tea<sup>90</sup>, Christine Rappaport<sup>90</sup>, Phuong L. Mai<sup>19</sup>, Mark H. Greene<sup>19</sup>, Anna Sokolenko<sup>91</sup>, Evgeny Imyanitov<sup>91</sup>, Amanda Ewart Toland<sup>92</sup>, Leigha Senter<sup>93</sup>, Kevin Sweet<sup>93</sup>, Mads Thomassen<sup>94</sup>, Anne-Marie Gerdes<sup>35</sup>, Torben Kruse<sup>94</sup>, Maria Caligo<sup>95</sup>, Paolo Aretini<sup>95</sup>, Johanna Rantala<sup>96</sup>, Anna von Wachenfeld<sup>97</sup>, Karin Henriksson<sup>99</sup>, for SWE-BCRA Collaborators<sup>98</sup>; Linda Steele<sup>100</sup>, Susan L. Neuhausen<sup>100</sup>, Robert Nussbaum<sup>101</sup>, Mary Beattie<sup>102</sup>, Kunle Odunsi<sup>103</sup>, Lara Sucheston<sup>104</sup>, Simon A. Gayther<sup>15</sup>, Kate Nathanson<sup>9</sup>, Jenny Gross<sup>16</sup>, Christine Walsh<sup>16</sup>, Beth Karlan<sup>16</sup>, Georgina Chenevix-Trench<sup>17</sup>, Douglas F. Easton<sup>1</sup>, and Antonis C. Antoniou<sup>1</sup>; for the Consortium of Investigators of Modifiers of *BRCA1/2*

**Authors' Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Centre for Cancer Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Public Health and Primary Care, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom; <sup>2</sup>Fred A. Litwin Center for Cancer Genetics, Samuel Lunenfeld Research Institute, Mount Sinai Hospital; <sup>3</sup>Departments of Medicine, Surgery, and Epidemiology-Biostatistics, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center; <sup>4</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Columbia University, New York; Departments of <sup>5</sup>Molecular Genetics and <sup>6</sup>Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto; <sup>7</sup>St Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; <sup>8</sup>Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics and Abramson Cancer Center, <sup>9</sup>University of Pennsylvania; <sup>10</sup>Bio-sample Repository, Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; <sup>11</sup>Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, Southampton University Hospitals, NHS Trust, Southampton, United Kingdom; Departments of <sup>12</sup>Obstetrics and Gynecology, <sup>13</sup>Pathology, and <sup>14</sup>Clinical Genetics, Helsinki University Central Hospital, Helsinki, Finland; <sup>15</sup>Department of Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California; <sup>16</sup>Women's Cancer Program at the Samuel Oschin Cancer Institute and Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Cedars Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, California; <sup>17</sup>Queensland Institute of Medical Research, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia; <sup>18</sup>Hormonal and Reproductive Epidemiology Branch, <sup>19</sup>Clinical Genetics Branch, Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Rockville, Maryland; <sup>20</sup>Department of Health Sciences Research, <sup>21</sup>Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, and <sup>23</sup>Department of Medical Genetics, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota; <sup>24</sup>Institute for Medical Informatics, Statistics and Epidemiology, University of Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany; <sup>25</sup>Unité Mixte de Génétique Constitutionnelle des Cancers Fréquents, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Lyon/Centre Léon Bérard; <sup>26</sup>INSERM U1052, CNRS UMR5286, Université Lyon 1, Cancer Research Center of Lyon; <sup>27</sup>Cancer Genetics Network "Groupe Génétique et Cancer",

Fédération Nationale des Centres de Lutte Contre le Cancer, Lyon, France; <sup>28</sup>Genetic Epidemiology Laboratory, Department of Pathology, University of Melbourne; <sup>29</sup>Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia; <sup>30</sup>Department of Dermatology, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah; <sup>31</sup>Department of Epidemiology, Cancer Prevention Institute of California, Fremont, California; <sup>32</sup>Dept. of Molecular and Regenerative medicine, Hematology, Oncology and Transfusion Medicine Center, Vilnius University Hospital Santariskiu Clinics, Vilnius, Lithuania; <sup>33</sup>Latvian Biomedical Research and Study Centre, Riga, Latvia; <sup>34</sup>Genomic Medicine, Department of Clinical Biochemistry, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital; <sup>35</sup>Department of Clinical Genetics, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University, Denmark; <sup>36</sup>Human Genetics Group, Human Cancer Genetics Programme, Spanish National Cancer Research Centre and Spanish Network on Rare Diseases (CIBERER); <sup>37</sup>Molecular Oncology Laboratory, Hospital Clinico San Carlos, Madrid, Spain; <sup>38</sup>Molecular Diagnostics Laboratory, IRRP, National Centre of Scientific Research "Demokritos," Athens, Greece; <sup>39</sup>Unit of Medical Genetics, <sup>40</sup>Unit of Molecular Bases of Genetic Risk and Genetic Testing, Department of Preventive and Predictive Medicine, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale Tumori (INT); <sup>41</sup>Division of Cancer Prevention and Genetics, Istituto Europeo di Oncologia (IEO); <sup>42</sup>IFOM, Fondazione Istituto FIRC di Oncologia Molecolare, Milan; <sup>43</sup>Department of Genetics, Biology and Biochemistry, University of Turin, Turin; <sup>44</sup>Cancer Bioimmunotherapy Unit, Centro di Riferimento Oncologico, IRCCS, Aviano (PN); <sup>45</sup>Department of Clinical Physiopathology, University of Florence, Florence; <sup>46</sup>Department of Molecular Medicine, "Sapienza" University of Rome, Rome, Italy; <sup>47</sup>Molecular Genetics of Breast Cancer, Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum (DKFZ); <sup>48</sup>Institute of Human Genetics, Department of Human Genetics, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany; <sup>49</sup>Department of Basic Sciences, Shaikat Khanum Memorial Cancer Hospital & Research Centre, Lahore, Pakistan; <sup>50</sup>Family

## Abstract

**Background:** Previously, small studies have found that *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* breast tumors differ in their pathology. Analysis of larger datasets of mutation carriers should allow further tumor characterization.

**Methods:** We used data from 4,325 *BRCA1* and 2,568 *BRCA2* mutation carriers to analyze the pathology of invasive breast, ovarian, and contralateral breast cancers.

**Results:** There was strong evidence that the proportion of estrogen receptor (ER)-negative breast tumors decreased with age at diagnosis among *BRCA1* ( $P$ -trend =  $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ ), but increased with age at diagnosis among *BRCA2* carriers ( $P$ -trend =  $6.8 \times 10^{-6}$ ). The proportion of triple-negative tumors decreased with age at diagnosis in *BRCA1* carriers but increased with age at diagnosis of *BRCA2* carriers. In both *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* carriers, ER-negative tumors were of higher histologic grade than ER-positive tumors (grade 3 vs. grade 1;  $P = 1.2 \times 10^{-13}$  for *BRCA1* and  $P = 0.001$  for *BRCA2*). ER and progesterone receptor (PR) expression were independently associated with mutation carrier status [ER-positive odds ratio (OR) for *BRCA2* = 9.4, 95% CI: 7.0–12.6 and PR-positive OR = 1.7, 95% CI: 1.3–2.3, under joint analysis]. Lobular tumors were more likely to be *BRCA2*-related (OR for *BRCA2* = 3.3, 95% CI: 2.4–4.4;  $P = 4.4 \times 10^{-14}$ ), and medullary tumors *BRCA1*-related (OR for *BRCA2* = 0.25, 95% CI: 0.18–0.35;  $P = 2.3 \times 10^{-15}$ ). ER-status of the first breast cancer was predictive of ER-status of asynchronous contralateral breast cancer ( $P = 0.0004$  for *BRCA1*;  $P = 0.002$  for *BRCA2*). There were no significant differences in ovarian cancer morphology between *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* carriers (serous: 67%; mucinous: 1%; endometrioid: 12%; clear-cell: 2%).

**Conclusions/Impact:** Pathologic characteristics of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* tumors may be useful for improving risk-prediction algorithms and informing clinical strategies for screening and prophylaxis. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*; 21(1); 134–47. ©2011 AACR.

Cancer Clinic, <sup>51</sup>Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam; <sup>52</sup>Department of Medical Oncology, Family Cancer Clinic, Erasmus University Medical Center, Rotterdam; <sup>53</sup>Department of Medical Genetics, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands; <sup>54</sup>Genetic Medicine, Manchester Academic Health Sciences Centre, Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester; <sup>55</sup>Department of Clinical Genetics, Royal Devon & Exeter Hospital, Exeter; <sup>56</sup>Oxford Regional Genetics Service, Churchill Hospital, Oxford; <sup>57</sup>All Wales Medical Genetics Services, University Hospital of Wales, Cardiff; <sup>58</sup>North East Thames Regional Genetics Service, Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children NHS Trust, London; <sup>59</sup>Cheshire & Merseyside Clinical Genetics Service, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, United Kingdom; <sup>60</sup>Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, Kansas; <sup>61</sup>Centre of Familial Breast and Ovarian Cancer, Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics and Centre for Integrated Oncology (CIO), University Hospital of Cologne, Cologne; <sup>62</sup>Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, Division of Tumor Genetics, Klinikum rechts der Isar, Technical University Munich, Munich; <sup>63</sup>Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, University Hospital Carl Gustav Carus, Technical University Dresden, Dresden; <sup>64</sup>Institute of Human Genetics, University Hospital of Schleswig-Holstein, Campus Kiel, Christian-Albrechts University Kiel, Kiel; <sup>65</sup>Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, University Hospital Düsseldorf, Heinrich-Heine University Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf; <sup>66</sup>Department of Gynaecology and Obstetrics, University Hospital Ulm, Ulm; <sup>67</sup>Institute of Cell and Molecular Pathology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover; <sup>68</sup>Institute of Human Genetics, University of Münster, Münster; <sup>69</sup>Institute of Human Genetics, Campus Virchow Klinikum, Charité Berlin; <sup>70</sup>Centre of Familial Breast and Ovarian Cancer, Department of Medical Genetics, Institute of Human Genetics, University Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany; <sup>71</sup>Institute of Cancer Research, Surrey, United Kingdom; <sup>72</sup>Service de Génétique Oncologique, <sup>73</sup>Unité INSERM U830, Institut Curie; <sup>74</sup>Université Paris Descartes, Faculté de Médecine, Paris, France; <sup>75</sup>Lombardi Comprehensive Cancer Center, Georgetown University, Washington, District of Columbia; <sup>76</sup>Hereditary Cancer Program, Institut Català d'Oncologia, Germans Trias i Pujol Biomedical research Institute (IGTP), Badalona; <sup>77</sup>Hereditary Cancer Program, Institut Català d'Oncologia, Hospital Duran i Reynals - Bellvitge Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBELL), L'Hospitalet de Llobregat, Barcelona; <sup>78</sup>Hereditary Cancer Program, Institut Català d'Oncologia, Hospital Josp Trueta - Girona Biomedical Research Institute (IdiBGi), Girona, Spain; <sup>79</sup>Department of Pathology, Landspítali, University Hospital and Faculty of Medicine, University of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland; <sup>80</sup>Cancer Genomics

Laboratory, <sup>81</sup>Canada Research Chair in Oncogenetics, Cancer Genomics Laboratory, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Québec and Laval University, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada; <sup>82</sup>Immunology and Molecular Oncology Unit, Istituto Oncologico Veneto IOV - IRCCS; <sup>83</sup>Department of Oncology and Surgical Sciences, University of Padua and Istituto Oncologico Veneto IOV - IRCCS, Padua, Italy; <sup>84</sup>Department of Anatomical Pathology, Prince of Wales Hospital, Randwick, New South Wales, Australia; <sup>85</sup>Center for Medical Genetics, North Shore University Health System, Evanston, Illinois; <sup>86</sup>Medical Oncology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center; <sup>87</sup>Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, Massachusetts; <sup>88</sup>University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware; <sup>89</sup>Epidemiology Research Program, American Cancer Society, Atlanta, Georgia; <sup>90</sup>Dept. of OB/GYN and Comprehensive Cancer Center, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria; <sup>91</sup>Laboratory of Molecular Oncology, N.N. Petrov Institute of Oncology and Department of Medical Genetics, St. Petersburg Pediatric Medical Academy, St. Petersburg, Russia; <sup>92</sup>Department of Molecular Virology, Immunology and Medical Genetics, <sup>93</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Human Genetics, Comprehensive Cancer Center, The Ohio State University Medical Center, Columbus, Ohio; <sup>94</sup>Department of Clinical Genetics, Odense University Hospital, Odense, Denmark; <sup>95</sup>Section of Genetic Oncology, Dept. of Laboratory Medicine, University and University Hospital of Pisa, Pisa, Italy; Departments of <sup>96</sup>Clinical Genetics and <sup>97</sup>Oncology, Karolinska University Hospital; <sup>98</sup>Karolinska University, Stockholm; <sup>99</sup>Oncological Centre, Lund University Hospital, Lund, Sweden; <sup>100</sup>Department of Population Sciences, Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope, Duarte; <sup>101</sup>Department of Medicine, Division of Medical Genetics; <sup>102</sup>Departments of Medicine, Epidemiology, and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, California; and Departments of <sup>103</sup>Gynecologic Oncology and <sup>104</sup>Cancer Prevention and Control, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Buffalo, New York

**Note:** Supplementary data for this article are available at *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention* Online (<http://cebp.aacrjournals.org/>).

**Corresponding Author:** Antonis C. Antoniou, Strangeways Research Laboratory, Worts Causeway, Cambridge CB1 8RN, United Kingdom. Phone: 44-0-1223-740-145; Fax: 44-0-1223-740-163; E-mail: antoniou@srl.cam.ac.uk

**doi:** 10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-11-0775

©2011 American Association for Cancer Research.

## Introduction

The tumor suppressor genes *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* are associated with high risks of breast, ovarian, and contralateral breast cancer. Tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers display characteristic pathologic features (1–3). Cancers occurring among *BRCA1* carriers are more frequently classified as medullary (1, 4, 5) and exhibit higher grade and mitotic count than sporadic controls (2, 6–8). Numerous studies have linked the estrogen receptor (ER)-negativity of breast tumors with *BRCA1* mutation carrier status (6, 9–16). In addition, tumors arising in *BRCA1* carriers tend to lack progesterone receptors (PR) and HER2, and therefore, display the "triple negative" (TN) phenotype (6, 10). The majority of *BRCA1* tumors express basal cytokeratins (17) and fall into the 'basal' subtype in gene expression studies (18).

Breast cancers arising in *BRCA2* mutation carriers tend to be more heterogeneous than those arising in *BRCA1* mutation carriers (19). They exhibit higher grade than tumors from age-matched sporadic controls (6, 7, 20). Several investigators have reported similar prevalence of ER-positive tumors in *BRCA2* carriers compared with sporadic controls (6, 9, 16, 17), although in 1 study (20) *BRCA2* tumors were more often ER-positive. *BRCA2* tumors are less likely to be HER2 overexpressing/amplified compared with sporadic tumors (6, 17). However, most studies of *BRCA2* mutation carriers have been small, and detailed tumor pathology information from *BRCA2* carriers has been sparse.

Similarly, pathology studies conducted on contralateral breast cancer (21) and ovarian cancer (22–24) arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers have been small in size. In this study, we report pathology data from the Consortium of Investigators of Modifiers of *BRCA1/2* (CIMBA), which is the largest collaborative study of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers of its kind. We assessed the morphology, grade, and pathologic markers in breast tumors arising in *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* carriers, and estimated age-specific distributions of the different disease subtypes. Where possible, these distributions were compared with published data for the general population. In addition, we compared the pathology of tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers to identify characteristics that could distinguish between *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers. Such information is relevant for developing algorithms that predict mutation carrier status or breast cancer risk. For ovarian cancer, we assessed grade and morphologic features of tumors. For contralateral breast cancer, we examined the relationship between pathology of the second and first invasive breast cancer. The size of the present dataset allowed the study of smaller subsets of disease, such as ER-positive tumors in *BRCA1* mutation carriers or TN tumors in *BRCA2* mutation carriers and the estimation of age-specific proportions of tumor subtypes in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers, which are currently imprecise. One of the aims of this work was to replicate findings on the basis of single

reports or much smaller studies. The results of these analyses should be useful for improving breast cancer risk-prediction algorithms and may inform screening practices for, and prophylaxis of, cancers arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers.

## Materials and Methods

### Study participants

Eligibility to CIMBA is restricted to female *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* pathogenic mutation carriers who are 18 years or older (25). Thirty-seven groups from North America, Australia, and Europe submitted data for this analysis (Supplementary Table S1). Information collected included year of birth, age at diagnosis of breast and/or ovarian cancer, age at last observation, family membership, race/ethnicity, and information on bilateral prophylactic mastectomy and oophorectomy. All centers obtained informed consent from study participants and the protocols were approved by local ethical review committees.

The present analysis was restricted to mutation carriers who had been diagnosed with breast or ovarian cancer for whom information on tumor pathologic characteristics was available, and to women of self-reported white European ancestry. The number of mutation carriers of non-European ancestry with data on tumor pathology was too small to allow a meaningful analysis. Information on at least 1 tumor characteristic was available for 4,325 *BRCA1* and 2,568 *BRCA2* mutation carriers.

### Tumor pathology data

Data on pathology were derived from medical, pathology, or tumor registry records or confirmed by pathologic review. For some cases, tumor pathology was based on immunohistochemical staining and scoring of tissue microarrays (TMA). The sources of the data collected by each center are shown in Supplementary Table S1. For approximately 1,000 cases, detailed information on breast cancer pathology, for example, staining intensity or proportion of cells staining, accompanied the summary result in the pathology records. This information was cross-checked against the marker status provided. In case of any discrepancies, the most widely used definitions for the receptor status, shown in Supplementary Table S2, were used. Grades 1, 2, and 3 represent well-differentiated, moderately differentiated, and poorly/undifferentiated tumors, respectively. However, no information was available on the tumor grading system used at each center. Data were analyzed by individual hormone receptor status, joint expression of ER and PR, and HER2.

### Mutation class and position

Mutations in the *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* genes can be classified according to their potential functional effect (26–28). Class 1 mutations are loss-of-function mutations, expected to result in a reduced transcript or protein level because of mRNA nonsense-mediated decay and/or degradation or instability of truncated proteins, translation

re-initiation but no production of stable protein, or the absence of expression because of the deletion of transcription regulatory regions. Class 2 mutations are those likely to generate potentially stable mutant proteins that might have dominant negative action, partially preserved normal function, or loss of function. Class 2 mutations include missense substitutions, in-frame deletions and insertions, as well as truncating mutations with premature stop codons occurring in the last exon. Mutations whose consequences at the transcript or protein level could not be inferred were not considered for this classification.

Mutations occurring in the central portion of the *BRCA2* gene (NG\_012772), previously referred to as the "ovarian cancer cluster region" (OCCR), are associated with a higher ratio of ovarian: breast cancer versus mutations outside this region (29, 30). We used the definition of the OCCR determined by Thompson and Easton (30), as bounded by nucleotides corresponding to regions c.2831 to c.3847, and c.6275 to c.6401 according to the HGVS nomenclature. As there is uncertainty in defining precise boundaries, the wider region c.2831 to c.6401 was used.

### Statistical methods

Logistic regression was used to assess the association between pathologic characteristics and *BRCA* mutation carrier status. For assessment of continuous or ordered variables such as grade and age, tests for trend were also carried out. When comparing the pathologic characteris-

tics of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers, cases from countries where the mutation carriers had a mutation exclusively in either *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* (e.g., Iceland) were excluded. All analyses were adjusted for age at diagnosis and for country of origin. A robust variance approach was used to allow for dependencies between related individuals. All analyses were carried out with Stata v10 software.

### Results

#### Pathologic characteristics of breast tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers

The analysis was based on 3,797 *BRCA1* mutation carriers and 2,392 *BRCA2* mutation carriers diagnosed with invasive breast cancer. Median age at diagnosis of invasive breast cancers was 40 years [interquartile range (IQR): 12.3] among *BRCA1* and 43 years (IQR: 13) among *BRCA2* mutation carriers. The majority of invasive breast cancers arising in both *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* carriers were ductal/no special-type carcinomas (Table 1). Furthermore, 78% of tumors arising in *BRCA1* carriers were ER-negative, 79% were PR-negative, 90% HER2-negative, and 69% were TN. However, 23% of tumors arising in *BRCA2* mutation carriers were ER-negative, 36% were PR-negative, 87% were HER2-negative, and 16% were TN.

Age-specific proportions of invasive breast tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers that were of histologic grades 1, 2, or 3 are shown in Fig. 1. The number

**Table 1.** Pathology of invasive breast cancer in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers and ORs for predicting *BRCA2* mutation carrier status

	<i>BRCA1</i> , n (%) <sup>a</sup>	<i>BRCA2</i> , n (%) <sup>a</sup>	OR <sup>b</sup> (95% CI)	OR <sup>c</sup> (95% CI)
<b>Morphology</b>				
Invasive ductal	2,387 (80)	1,515 (83)	1.00	- (-)
Invasive lobular	67 (2.2)	153 (8.4)	3.3 (2.4–4.4)	- (-)
Medullary <sup>d</sup>	281 (9.4)	40 (2.2)	0.25 (0.18–0.35)	- (-)
Other	258 (8.6)	116 (6.4)	0.81 (0.63–1.02)	- (-)
<b>ER, PR, HER2, TN</b>				
ER-positive	625 (22)	1,475 (77)	11.4 (9.8–13.2)	10.0 (8.2–12.1)
PR-positive	539 (21)	1,084 (64)	6.8 (5.8–7.9)	5.5 (4.5–6.6)
HER2-positive	138 (10)	121 (13)	1.5 (1.1–2.1)	1.3 (0.9–1.9)
Non-TN (vs. TN)	411 (31)	700 (84)	11.0 (8.8–13.8)	9.0 (6.8–11.8)
<b>Grade</b>				
Grade 1	64 (3)	100 (7)	1.0 (-)	1.0 (-)
Grade 2	481 (20)	603 (43)	1.01 (0.72–1.44)	1.1 (0.67–1.8)
Grade 3	1,822 (77)	711 (50)	0.32 (0.23–0.45)	0.71 (0.44–1.17)

<sup>a</sup>Number of tumors (*n*) of each morphology type or tumor grade, or number of receptor-positive tumors, and as percentage (%) of all *BRCA1*- or *BRCA2*-related tumors.

<sup>b</sup>ORs for *BRCA2* mutation carrier status, compared with *BRCA1* mutation carrier status, associated with tumor morphology, receptor-positive tumors, or grade 2 versus grade 1, and grade 3 versus grade 1 tumors; analyses were adjusted for country and age at diagnosis.

<sup>c</sup>Analyses adjusted for country, age at diagnosis, and tumor grade; ORs for analysis of grade, adjusted for country, age at diagnosis, and ER status.

<sup>d</sup>Includes atypical medullary carcinomas.




Figure 1. Age-specific proportions of grade 1, 2, and 3 breast tumors arising among (A) *BRCA1* and (B) *BRCA2* mutation carriers. Error bars represent robust CIs associated with each proportion.

of women included in these analyses is shown in Supplementary Table S3. Age at diagnosis was associated with grade in *BRCA1* mutation carriers, in whom grade decreased with increasing age (ordered logistic regression,  $P$ -trend =  $1.4 \times 10^{-15}$ ). There was no evidence of a similar trend among *BRCA2* mutation carriers (ordered logistic regression,  $P$ -trend = 0.07); however, the ratio of grade 1 to grade 3 tumors increased with increase in age ( $P = 6 \times 10^{-5}$ ).

Age-specific proportions of ER-negative, PR-negative, HER2-negative, and TN invasive breast tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers are shown in Fig. 2. The frequency of ER-negative tumors decreased with the age at breast cancer diagnosis in *BRCA1* mutation carriers ( $P$ -trend =  $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ ), and increased with the age at diagnosis in *BRCA2* mutation carriers ( $P$ -trend =  $6.8 \times 10^{-6}$ ). The distribution of PR status showed similar trends, decreasing with age at diagnosis in *BRCA1* ( $P$ -trend = 0.02) and increasing with age at diagnosis in *BRCA2* ( $P$ -trend =  $6.1 \times 10^{-5}$ ) carriers. There was no evidence of variation in the distribution of HER2 status by age at

diagnosis ( $P$ -trend = 0.8 and  $P = 0.9$  for *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers, respectively). However, the number of tumors with HER2 information was limited at the extreme age groups. The proportion of TN tumors decreased with age at breast cancer diagnosis in *BRCA1* mutation carriers ( $P$ -trend = 0.01), and increased with age at diagnosis in *BRCA2* carriers ( $P$ -trend = 0.001).

The analyses described above were adjusted for grade; analyses without this adjustment yielded similar results. In addition, the associations were not confounded by calendar time of diagnosis. For example, after adjusting for 5-year cohorts based on calendar year of diagnosis, the associations between ER status and age at diagnosis were still significant for both *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers ( $P$ -trend =  $2 \times 10^{-5}$  and  $P$ -trend =  $1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ , respectively).

For both *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers, there were significant differences in the distribution of tumor grade by ER status (Table 2; Fig. 3) ER-negative tumors were associated with higher grade than ER-positive tumors. For example, in *BRCA1* mutation carriers, grade 3 tumors were less likely to be ER-positive than grade 1 tumors [odds ratio (OR) for ER-positivity 0.12; 95% CI: 0.07–0.21;  $P = 1.2 \times 10^{-13}$ ]. For *BRCA2* mutation carriers, grade 3 tumors were less likely to be ER-positive compared with grade 1 tumors (OR for ER-positivity, 0.33; 95% CI: 0.17–0.63;  $P = 0.001$ ). The distribution of tumor morphology by ER status is also shown in Table 2.


We tested the hypothesis that mutation class or intragenic position influences tumor characteristics. Approximately 66% of *BRCA1* mutation carriers harbored Class 1 mutations and 25% had Class 2 mutations. Class 2 mutations were infrequent among *BRCA2* mutation carriers. There were no significant differences between class of *BRCA1* mutation and tumor pathology of *BRCA1*-related tumors. There were also no differences in characteristics of *BRCA2*-related tumors according to whether the mutation was within the OCCR region (32% of mutation carriers) or outside the OCCR (68% of mutation carriers; results not shown).

Information was also available on a small number of preinvasive, ductal carcinomas *in situ* (DCIS). Compared with invasive breast tumors, a higher proportion of DCIS arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers were ER-positive (Supplementary Table S4).

### Comparison of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* tumors

We compared the morphologic characteristics of tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers. There were significantly more lobular carcinomas among *BRCA2* carriers than among *BRCA1* carriers ( $P = 4.4 \times 10^{-14}$ ), and significantly more medullary or atypical medullary carcinomas among *BRCA1* mutation carriers than among *BRCA2* carriers ( $P = 2.3 \times 10^{-15}$ ; Table 1).

Logistic regression analysis, treating receptor status (positive/negative) as the explanatory variable and *BRCA1/BRCA2* mutation status as the outcome variable, was used to test association between tumor characteristics



**Figure 2.** Age-specific proportions of pathologic subtypes of breast tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers. Age-specific proportions of (A) receptor-negative (ER, PR), (B) HER2-negative, and (C) triple-negative tumors arising in *BRCA1* mutation carriers, and of (D) receptor-negative (ER, PR), (E) HER2-negative, and (F) triple-negative tumors arising in *BRCA2* mutation carriers. Error bars represent robust CIs associated with each proportion.

and *BRCA* mutation carrier status. ER-positive tumors were more likely to arise in *BRCA2* than *BRCA1* (Table 1; OR for *BRCA2* = 11.4; 95% CI: 9.8–13.2) and this was true in all morphologic categories (OR for *BRCA2* = 10.2; 95% CI: 8.2–12.6 among ductal/no special-type carcinoma

tumors; OR = 26.6, 95% CI: 4.4–159 among lobular carcinoma tumors; and OR = 5.6; 95% CI: 1.8–17.2 among medullary carcinoma tumors). PR-positive (OR = 6.8; 95% CI: 5.8–7.9), HER2-positive (OR = 1.5; 95% CI: 1.1–2.1) and non-TN tumors (OR = 11.0; 95% CI: 8.8–13.8)

**Table 2.** Distribution of grade and morphology of ER-positive and ER-negative tumors in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers

Type	<i>BRCA1</i> Mutation Carriers			<i>BRCA2</i> Mutation Carriers		
	ER-Negative, n (%) <sup>a</sup>	ER-Positive n (%)	OR <sup>b</sup> (95% CI)	ER-Negative n (%)	ER-Positive n (%)	OR (95% CI)
Grade						
Grade 1	18 (1.2)	28 (6.9)	1.00	12 (4.3)	68 (7.4)	1.00
Grade 2	191 (13.1)	170 (41.6)	0.57 (0.31–1.05)	67 (24)	442 (48.2)	1.2 (0.60–2.4)
Grade 3	1,246 (85.7)	210 (51.5)	0.12 (0.07–0.21)	200 (71.7)	408 (44.4)	0.33 (0.17–0.6)
Morphology						
Ductal	1,353 (58.8)	385 (86.5)	—	266 (85.8)	889 (84)	—
Lobular	16 (2.7)	21 (4.7)	—	15 (4.8)	110 (10.4)	—
Medullary <sup>c</sup>	141 (23.5)	17 (3.8)	—	14 (4.6)	13 (1.2)	—
Other	91 (15)	22 (5)	—	15 (4.8)	46 (4.3)	—

<sup>a</sup>Number of tumors (*n*) of each grade or morphology type by ER-status as a percentage (%) of all ER-negative or ER-positive tumors where this information is available.

<sup>b</sup>OR and 95% CI are for ER-positive versus ER-negative disease in grade 2 or grade 3 tumors compared with grade 1 tumors. These analyses were adjusted for age at diagnosis of breast cancer and country of origin.

<sup>c</sup>Includes medullary and atypical medullary tumors.




Figure 3. Distribution of grade within ER-positive and ER-negative *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers. Age-specific proportions of grade 1, 2, and 3 (A) ER-negative and (C) ER-positive breast tumors arising in *BRCA1* mutation carriers, as well as (B) ER-negative and (D) ER-positive breast tumors arising in *BRCA2* mutation carriers.

were also more likely to be *BRCA2* than *BRCA1* (Table 1). The associations remained significant after adjusting for tumor grade, with the exception of HER2. Tumors arising in *BRCA1* mutation carriers were of significantly higher histologic grade than those arising in *BRCA2* mutation carriers (Table 1). However, this difference was not significant when the analysis was adjusted for ER status.

Although ER and PR are highly correlated, expression of these hormone receptors is discordant in a small proportion of tumors. The tumors were, therefore, analyzed by joint ER and PR status (Supplementary Table S5). PR-positivity was associated with *BRCA2* mutation carrier status in ER-negative tumors. In addition, PR-positivity was associated with *BRCA2* mutation carrier status in the ER-positive subset of tumors (OR for *BRCA2* = 1.5; 95% CI: 1.1–2.0;  $P = 0.01$ ). There was no statistically significant difference in the distribution of HER2 among *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers when ER- and/or PR-positive tumors were analyzed separately, but TN tumors were

significantly associated with *BRCA1* carrier status when compared with HER2-positive–ER-negative–PR-negative tumors (Supplementary Table S5). In a model incorporating the joint effects of ER, PR, and HER2 in predicting *BRCA2* versus *BRCA1* mutation carrier status, both ER and PR remained significant although HER2 status was not (ER: OR = 9.4; 95% CI: 7.0–12.6; PR: OR = 1.7; 95% CI: 1.3–2.3; HER2: OR = 1.1; 95% CI: 0.7–1.6).

#### Pathologic characteristics of first and contralateral breast tumors

Information on pathology was available for 720 *BRCA1* and 302 *BRCA2* mutation carriers diagnosed with invasive contralateral breast cancer (CBC). The median time interval between first breast cancer and CBCs was 5.2 years (IQR: 7.5) for *BRCA1* and 5.0 years (IQR: 9.3) for *BRCA2* carriers. The median age at diagnosis of asynchronous CBC occurring more than 1 year after diagnosis of the first breast cancer, was 46 years (IQR: 13.6) for *BRCA1* and 51



**Table 3.** Distribution of morphology and grade of ovarian tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers

Factor	<i>BRCA1</i> , n (%)	<i>BRCA2</i> , n (%)	Total, n (%)
<b>Morphology</b>			
Serous	534 (66)	191 (70)	725 (67)
Mucinous	11 (1)	4 (1)	15 (1)
Endometrioid	94 (12)	33 (12)	127 (12)
Clear cell	8 (1)	8 (3)	16 (1)
Other	166 (20)	36 (13)	202 (19)
Total	813	272	1,085
<b>Grade</b>			
1	17 (3)	11 (6)	28 (4)
2	104 (20)	37 (21)	141 (20)
3	407 (77)	128 (73)	535 (76)
Total	528	176	704

NOTE: Number of tumors (*n*) of each morphology type or grade, and as percentage (%) of all *BRCA1*- or *BRCA2*-related tumors where this information is available.

years (IQR: 13.9) for *BRCA2* mutation carriers. Morphology, grade, and ER and PR status of the first invasive and asynchronous cancers are summarized in Supplementary Tables S6–S9. For *BRCA1* mutation carriers, 91% of women with ER-negative first breast cancer developed ER-negative asynchronous CBC occurring more than a year after the first cancer, whereas 70% of women with ER-positive first cancer developed ER-negative asynchronous CBC. For *BRCA2* mutation carriers, 52% of women with ER-negative first cancer developed ER-negative asynchronous CBC and 12% of women with ER-positive first cancer developed ER-negative asynchronous CBC. Logistic regression analysis, treating receptor status (positive/negative) of the second cancer as the outcome variable and receptor status of the first cancer as the explanatory variable, indicated that the ER status of the first breast cancer was predictive of ER status of the CBC for *BRCA1* mutation carriers (OR = 5.8; 95% CI: 2.8–11.7;  $P = 1.2 \times 10^{-6}$ ; Supplementary Table S8) as well as for *BRCA2* mutation carriers (OR = 11.0; 95% CI: 4.3–28.6;  $P = 7.8 \times 10^{-7}$ ). The conclusions were similar when the analyses were restricted to asynchronous contralateral cancers (OR = 4.3; 95% CI: 1.9–9.7;  $P = 0.0004$  for *BRCA1*; and OR = 6.4; 95% CI: 2.0–20.9;  $P = 0.002$  for *BRCA2* carriers; Supplementary Table S8). There were smaller numbers of carriers with information on both ER status and grade. When adjusted for grade, the association remained significant in *BRCA1*, but was attenuated in *BRCA2* carriers; however, the OR estimate was in the same direction (Supplementary Table S8). In addition, PR status of the first breast cancer was also associated with PR status of the second cancer (data not shown).

#### Pathologic characteristics of ovarian cancers

This dataset included 838 *BRCA1* mutation carriers and 281 *BRCA2* mutation carriers who had been diagnosed

with ovarian cancer. The distribution of pathologic characteristics of the ovarian cancers are shown in Table 3. The majority (67%) of all cancers (*BRCA1* and *BRCA2*) were serous. More than 70% of ovarian cancers in *BRCA1* mutation carriers were classified as grade 3. There was no association between grade and age at cancer diagnosis ( $P = 0.4$ ). In *BRCA2* carriers, the proportion of grade 3 tumors increased slightly with age, whereas the proportion of grade 1 tumors decreased (ordered logistic regression,  $P$ -trend = 0.03). Furthermore, 310 *BRCA1* and 105 *BRCA2* mutation carriers had developed breast cancer before developing ovarian cancer. History of breast cancer did not influence morphology or grade of ovarian cancer (data not shown). There were no significant differences in ovarian cancer morphology or grade between *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers ( $P > 0.05$ , for all tests).

#### Discussion

We analyzed data on the pathology of breast and ovarian tumors arising in a large series of women with *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutations from the CIMBA consortium. Previous studies that have assessed tumor pathology in mutation carriers have been limited by small numbers, particularly among *BRCA2* carriers. The present analysis of more than 4,000 *BRCA1* and 2,000 *BRCA2* carriers is the largest of its kind and allowed for accurate assessment of tumor pathology in mutation carriers, and more powerful comparisons between *BRCA1* and *BRCA2*-related tumors.

We confirmed that the majority of *BRCA1* breast cancers are ER-negative and TN tumors. We calculated age-specific proportions of tumors expressing pathologic markers including ER, PR, and HER2. The proportion of ER-positive and PR-positive tumors increased with age among *BRCA1* mutation carriers, and decreased with age among

*BRCA2* mutation carriers. Analyses adjusting for grade or for calendar year of diagnosis to allow for changes in screening patterns over time yielded similar results.

Tung and colleagues (8) as well as Foulkes and colleagues (12) reported higher prevalence of ER-positive tumors among *BRCA1* carriers diagnosed with breast cancer at an older age. Foulkes and colleagues found that, at every age group, the proportion of ER-negative tumors was higher in *BRCA1* mutation carriers than non-carriers (12). We made similar observations comparing with the publicly available SEER data (31). We further confirmed differences in the distribution of grade between ER-positive and ER-negative *BRCA1* tumors previously seen in smaller studies (8, 12). Tung and colleagues also reported differences in pathology between sporadic ER-positive tumors and ER-positive tumors arising in *BRCA1* carriers (8). More recently, they reported that a similar percentage (80%) of ER-positive and ER-negative *BRCA1*-associated tumors showed loss of heterozygosity with loss of the wild-type *BRCA1* allele (32). They suggested that ER-positive tumors in *BRCA1* carriers could be a heterogeneous group, in some cases developing from complete loss of *BRCA1* function, whereas in others, they developed with intact *BRCA1* (8). Lakhani and colleagues further proposed that environmental exposures together with predisposition of the cells to genomic instability could result in the same cell populations producing different tumor subtypes (33). However the cell (or cells) of origin of *BRCA1*-related tumors have not been determined. These data suggest that ER-positive cancers in *BRCA1*-carriers are related to mutation carrier status rather than being incidental. A more definitive resolution of this question could be obtained by comparing the incidence of ER-positive tumors in *BRCA1* mutation carriers with the incidence of ER-positive tumors in the general population. This is not yet possible reliably; however, in future prospective studies of cancer incidence, it should be possible to stratify analyses by tumor subtype.

Several investigators have reported similar prevalence of ER- and PR-positive disease in *BRCA2* carriers compared with sporadic controls (6, 9, 16, 17). Bane and colleagues reported higher prevalence of ER-positive tumors in a series of 64 *BRCA2* mutation carriers compared with age-matched non-carrier controls (20). We found a statistically significant decrease in the proportion of ER-positive tumors with age at diagnosis of breast cancer in *BRCA2* mutation carriers, consistent with observations in a few much smaller studies (12, 34). Compared to the publicly available SEER data from the United States, the proportion of ER-negative tumors in *BRCA2* mutation carriers appeared to be somewhat higher than that in women of the same age group in the general population (31). Although we could not directly compare the distribution of pathologic markers in mutation carriers and non-carriers in this dataset, this observation contrasts with the well-established increase in the relative incidence of ER-positive as compared with ER-negative

breast cancers at older ages observed in the general population (35).

A number of risk-prediction models have recently been extended to include tumor pathology information (36–38). In most of these models, variation in the expression of pathologic markers with age at breast cancer diagnosis was not taken into account. Our results indicate that using age-specific pathologic data in risk-prediction models may provide more accurate mutation carrier predictions. Furthermore, precise characterization of the distribution of tumor pathology in mutation carriers may influence prophylactic and treatment strategies. For example, although it is known that TN status is associated with *BRCA1* mutations, in our study 16% (and up to 25% in women in the age group of 50–60 years) of tumors in *BRCA2* mutation carriers were TN. Consistent with the above observations on ER status, we also found that the proportion of TN tumors in *BRCA2* carriers increased with age at diagnosis of breast cancer. This confirms the observation of Atchley and colleagues (10) in a smaller series, and contradicts the assumption that a diagnosis of TN disease is ‘synonymous’ with *BRCA1* carrier status. TN tumors would be expected to have poorer prognosis than ER-positive tumors and require chemotherapy. In addition, knowing the likelihood of developing a TN tumor in a *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* mutation carrier may influence the decision to undergo prophylactic surgery.

We confirmed that there are significant differences in the distribution of ER status between *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* breast cancers, and also found that PR is independently associated with mutation carrier status. Our results also suggest that ER-positive, PR-negative tumors were less likely to be *BRCA2*-related than double-positive tumors, and ER-negative, PR-positive tumors were more likely to be *BRCA2*-related than double-negative tumors. The ER-negative and PR-positive subset of tumors, previously considered a technical artifact, has now been shown in the general population to exhibit unique clinical characteristics, indicating that it is a distinct biologic entity (39). We found no significant association between HER2 status and *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* mutation carrier status. However, the number of HER2-overexpressing tumors may have been too small to address this reliably. TN tumors are more likely to be *BRCA1* rather than *BRCA2*. In addition, we confirmed data showing that high-grade cancers are more frequent among *BRCA1* carriers and that these women have a higher percentage of medullary cancers. By contrast, lobular cancers are substantially more frequent among *BRCA2* carriers.

We found no difference in the distribution of tumor characteristics of *BRCA1* mutation carriers by mutation category, defined by their functional effects. This analysis may be confounded by the fact that tumor characteristics may be used (together with other factors) to infer pathogenicity of a small subset of missense Class 2 *BRCA1* mutations. In this dataset, only 2% of all *BRCA1* mutations would have been in this category. In addition, we found no difference in the distribution of tumor characteristics of

*BRCA2* carriers by mutation position (OCCR vs. non-OCCR). Establishing tumor pathology associated with mutations in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* will further aid in the evaluation of unclassified variants.

We further assessed the pathology of invasive CBCs occurring in mutation carriers. Weitzel and colleagues reported strong concordance in ER status between first and CBC in a study of 211 *BRCA1* and 75 *BRCA2* carriers (21). These investigators did not detect a relationship between history of tamoxifen use or risk-reducing salpingo-oophorectomy and ER status of CBC in *BRCA1/2* mutation carriers (21). However, Swain and colleagues found that patients in the general population with an ER-positive primary cancer receiving tamoxifen exhibited lower concordance rate with fewer ER-positive CBCs (40). In our study, we confirmed the association between ER and PR status of first invasive breast tumors and CBC, indicating that second breast cancers arising against the same genetic and environmental background are of similar pathology. However, the majority (70%) of *BRCA1* mutation carriers diagnosed with ER-positive first breast cancers developed ER-negative CBC. Future CIMBA studies will aim to compare the tumor pathology of cancers occurring after RRSO.

In agreement with other reports, most ovarian cancers arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers in our series were invasive epithelial cancers of serous histology, and we found no significant difference in morphology and grade of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2*-related tumors (22–24).

CIMBA, an international collaboration, was represented by more than 37 groups from more than 20 countries in the present study. Tumor pathology data were collected through several mechanisms, including medical records, pathology reports, and TMAs. Laboratory methods for tissue preparation, immunohistochemistry, and biochemical assays, scoring systems and data interpretation vary widely (Supplementary Table S1). However, data collated by CIMBA are more representative of typical assessment of pathology conducted in routine practice, and the distributions of ER and PR status across different study centers and countries in CIMBA were generally consistent. There was some variation in the distribution of HER2 status across centers. This could perhaps be explained by technical issues relating to testing of HER2 and differences in the definition of HER2 status between centers. In addition, there was some variation in the distribution of grade and morphology across countries. Unfortunately, details of scoring for all mutation carriers were not available to standardize definitions across centers. Furthermore, data on the methods of detection of each tumor or treatment before pathologic analysis were not available, and these factors may influence the distribution of tumor subtypes detected (41). Future CIMBA studies will aim to collect TMA data and fixed tissue samples for rapid analysis of other markers, such as basal cytokeratins, p53, or novel candidates, and to further standardize collation of information on established markers.

A further limitation of our study is that CIMBA collects data only *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers. Therefore, we were unable to contrast the tumor characteristics in mutation carriers against the characteristics of breast cancers from the general population or from breast cancer patients without *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutations. Such an analysis would require careful selection of control subjects from the same populations who are sampled under similar conditions as *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers.

The genetic factors underlying etiology of breast cancer subtypes are still not fully understood. Previous studies have reported that ER-negative tumors arising in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers presented higher genomic instability and patterns of genomic alteration than ER-positive tumors (42, 43). Many of the common breast cancer susceptibility alleles identified through GWAS are predominantly associated with either ER-positive or ER-negative disease. The pattern of association with ER-positive and ER-negative disease parallels those observed in *BRCA2* and *BRCA1* mutation carriers, respectively (44), indicating that common mechanisms underlie the phenotype of tumors in both mutation carriers and the general population. Recently, associations between the common breast cancer susceptibility alleles and separate disease subtypes in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers were assessed, using data on the tumor subtype distributions presented here (47). Mulligan and colleagues showed differences in the associations of genetic modifiers with the risk of developing ER-positive or ER-negative breast cancer in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers. These associations mirror similar differences in genetic susceptibility to ER-positive or ER-negative disease seen in the general population (45, 46). The apparent differences in single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) associations between *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* carriers, and non-carriers observed previously, may be explained by differences in the prevalence of tumor subtypes.

The present CIMBA study is the largest of its kind, allowing more accurate characterization of the pathology of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* tumors. As participants were collated from diverse countries and study centers, the findings should be widely applicable. We were able to calculate precise age-specific distributions of markers expressed, and replicate findings reported in only a few small studies to date. This information should be helpful for improving the performance of breast cancer risk-prediction models that calculate *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carrier probabilities, or for developing algorithms that predict the risk of specific breast cancer subtypes for mutation carriers. These may be of clinical use in guiding screening and prophylactic practices for mutation carriers.

#### Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

Timothy R. Rebbeck is the Editor-in-Chief of *Cancer, Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention*. In keeping with the AACR's editorial policy, the paper was peer reviewed and a member of the AACR's Publications Committee rendered the decision with regard to acceptability. The content of this manuscript does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the National Cancer Institute or any of

the collaborating centers in the Breast Cancer Family Registry (BCFR), nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the US Government or the BCFR.

### Study-Specific Acknowledgments

#### Breast Cancer Family Registry (BCFR)

Samples from the FCCC, HCI, and CPIC were processed and distributed by the Coriell Cell Repositories through cooperative agreements.

#### Breast Cancer Family Registry (BCFR)—Ontario site

The authors thank Gord Glendon, Teresa Selander, Mona Gill, Lucine Collins, Nayana Weerasooriya, and members of the Ontario Familial Breast Cancer Registry for their contributions to the study.

#### Baltic Familial Breast Ovarian Cancer Consortium (FBBOCC)

The authors thank the Genome Database of Latvian Population, Latvian Biomedical Research and Study Center for providing data and DNA samples.

#### Copenhagen Breast Cancer Study (CBCS)

The authors thank Bent Ejlersen for providing clinical data.

#### Spanish National Cancer Center (CNIO)

The authors thank R.M. Alonso, G. Pita, and R.M. Milne for their assistance.

#### The Hereditary Breast and Ovarian Cancer Research Group Netherlands (HEBON)

HEBON Collaborating Centers: Coordinating center: Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam, NL: F.B.L. Hogervorst, S. Verhoef, M. Verheus, L.J. van 't Veer, F.E. van Leeuwen, M.A. Rookus; Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, NL: M. Collée, A.M.W. van den Ouweland, A. Jager, M.J. Hoening, M.M.A. Tilanus-Linthorst, C. Seynaeve; Leiden University Medical Center, NL, Leiden: C.J. van Asperen, J.T. Wijnen, M.P. Vreeswijk, R.A. Tollenaar, P. Devilee; Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Center, Nijmegen, NL: M.J. Ligtenberg, N. Hoogerbrugge; University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, NL: M.G. Ausems, R.B. van der Luijt; Amsterdam Medical Center, NL: C.M. Aalfs, T. A. van Os; VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, NL: J.J.P. Gille, Q. Waisfisz, H.E.J. Meijers-Heijboer; University Hospital Maastricht, Maastricht, NL: E.B. Gomez-Garcia, C.E. van Roozendaal, Marinus J. Blok, B. Caanen; University Medical Center Groningen University, NL: J.C. Oosterwijk, A.H. van der Hout, M.J. Mourits; The Netherlands Foundation for the detection of hereditary tumors, Leiden, NL: H.F. Vasen.

#### Epidemiological study of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers (EMBRACE)

Douglas Easton is the principal investigator of the study. EMBRACE Collaborating Centers are: Coordinating Centre, Cambridge: Susan Peock, Debra Frost, Steve Ellis, Elena Fineberg. North of Scotland Regional Genetics Service, Aberdeen: Zosia Miedzybrodzka, Helen Gregory. Northern Ireland Regional Genetics Service, Belfast: Patrick Morrison, Lisa Jeffers. West Midlands Regional Clinical Genetics Service, Birmingham: Trevor Cole, Kai-ren Ong, Jonathan Hoffman. South West Regional Genetics Service, Bristol: Alan Donaldson, Margaret James. East Anglian Regional Genetics Service, Cambridge: Joan Paterson, Sarah Downing, Amy Taylor. Medical Genetics Services for Wales, Cardiff: Alexandra Murray, Mark T. Rogers, Emma McCann. St James's Hospital, Dublin & National Centre for Medical Genetics, Dublin: M. John Kennedy, David Barton. South East of Scotland Regional Genetics Service, Edinburgh: Mary Porteous, Sarah Drummond. Peninsula Clinical Genetics Service, Exeter: Carole Brewer, Emma Kivuva, Anne Searle, Selina Goodman, Kathryn Hill. West of Scotland Regional Genetics Service, Glasgow: Rosemarie Davidson, Victoria Murday, Nicola Bradshaw, Lesley Snadden, Mark Longmuir, Catherine Watt, Sarah Gibson, Eshika Haque, Ed Tobias, Alexis Duncan. South East Thames Regional Genetics Service, Guy's Hospital London: Louise Izatt, Chris Jacobs, Caroline Langman, Anna White. North West Thames Regional Genetics Service, Harrow: Huw Dorkins. Leicestershire Clinical Genetics Service, Leicester: Julian Barwell. Yorkshire Regional Genetics Service, Leeds: Julian Adlard, Carol Chu, Julie Miller. Cheshire & Merseyside Clinical Genetics Service, Liverpool: Ian Ellis, Catherine Houghton. Manchester Regional Genetics Service, Manchester: D. Gareth Evans, Fiona Laloo, Jane Taylor. North East Thames Regional Genetics Service, NE Thames, London: Lucy Side, Alison Male, Cheryl Berlin. Nottingham Centre for Medical Genetics, Nottingham: Jacqueline Eason, Rebecca Collier. Northern Clinical

Genetics Service, Newcastle: Fiona Douglas, Oonagh Claber, Irene Jobson. Oxford Regional Genetics Service, Oxford: Lisa Walker, Diane McLeod, Dorothy Halliday, Sarah Durell, Barbara Stayner. The Institute of Cancer Research and Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust: Ros Eeles, Susan Shanley, Nazneen Rahman, Richard Houlston, Elizabeth Bancroft, Lucia D'Mello, Elizabeth Page, Audrey Ardern-Jones, Kelly Kohut, Jennifer Wiggins, Elena Castro, Anita Mitra, Lisa Robertson. North Trent Clinical Genetics Service, Sheffield: Jackie Cook, Oliver Quarrell, Cathryn Bardsley. South West Thames Regional Genetics Service, London: Shirley Hodgson, Sheila Goff, Glen Brice, Lizzie Winchester, Charlotte Eddy, Vishakha Tripathi, Virginia Attard. Wessex Clinical Genetics Service, Princess Anne Hospital, Southampton: Diana Eccles, Anneke Lucassen, Gillian Crawford, Donna McBride, Sarah Smalley.

#### Fox Chase Cancer Center (FCCC) Fox Chase Cancer Center Biosample Repository

The authors thank M. Pat Gilroy, Lesley Cruz, Diane Faison, Barbara Dettore, Mary Donovan, and Meghan Butler for their help in collecting patient data and samples.

#### University of Kansas Medical Center (KUMC)

The author, A.K. Godwin, thanks the support from The University of Kansas Cancer Center and the Kansas Bioscience Authority Eminent Scholar Program. A. K. Godwin is the Chancellors Distinguished Chair in Biomedical Sciences-endowed Professor.

#### Genetic Modifiers of cancer risk in BRCA1/2 mutation carriers (GEMO) study

The GEMO study was conducted at Cancer Genetics Network "Groupe Génétique et Cancer", Fédération Nationale des Centres de Lutte Contre le Cancer, Lyon, France. The authors thank all the GEMO collaborating groups for their contribution to this study. GEMO Collaborating Centers are: Coordinating Centres, Unité Mixte de Génétique Constitutionnelle des Cancers Fréquents, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Lyon/Centre Léon Bérard, & Equipe «Génétique du cancer du sein», Centre de Recherche en Cancérologie de Lyon: Olga Sinilnikova, Sylvie Mazoyer, Laure Barjhoux, Carole Verny-Pierre, Sophie Giraud, Mélanie Léone; and Service de Génétique Oncologique, Institut Curie, Paris: Dominique Stoppa-Lyonnet, Marion Gauthier-Villars, Bruno Buecher, Claude Houdayer, Virginie Moncoutier, Muriel Belotti, Carole Tirapo, Antoine de Pauw, Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif: Brigitte Bressac-de-Pailletres, Audrey Remenieras, Véronique Byrde, Olivier Caron, Gilbert Lenoir. Centre Jean Perrin, Clermont-Ferrand: Yves-Jean Bignon, Nancy Uhrhammer. Centre Léon Bérard, Lyon: Christine Lasset, Valérie Bonadona. Centre François Baclesse, Caen: Agnès Hardouin, Pascaline Berthet. Institut Paoli Calmettes, Marseille: Hagay Sobol, Violaine Bourdon, Tetsuro Noguchi, François Eisinger. Groupe Hospitalier Pitié-Salpêtrière, Paris: Florence Coulet, Chrystelle Colas, Florent Soubrier. CHU de Arnaud-de-Villeneuve, Montpellier: Isabelle Coupier, Pascal Pujol. Centre Oscar Lambret, Lille: Jean-Philippe Peyrat, Joëlle Fourmier, Françoise Révillion, Philippe Vennin, Claude Adenis. Hôpital René Huguenin/Institut Curie, St Cloud: Etienne Rouleau, Rosette Lidereau, Liliane Demange, Catherine Nogues. Centre Paul Strauss, Strasbourg: Danièle Muller, Jean-Pierre Fricker. Institut Bergonié, Bordeaux: Michel Longy, Nicolas Sevenet. Institut Claudius Regaud, Toulouse: Christine Toulas, Rosine Guimbaud, Laurence Gladiéff, Viviane Feillel. CHU de Grenoble: Dominique Leroux, Hélène Dreyfus, Christine Rebischung, Magalie Peysselon. CHU de Dijon: Fanny Coron, Laurence Faivre. CHU de St-Etienne: Fabienne Prieur, Marine Lebrun, Caroline Kientz. Hôtel Dieu Centre Hospitalier, Chambéry: Sandra Fert Ferrer. Centre Antoine Lacassagne, Nice: Marc Fréney. CHU de Limoges: Laurence Vénat-Bouvet. CHU de Nantes: Capucine Delnatte. CHU Bretonneau, Tours: Isabelle Mortemousque. Creighton University, Omaha, USA: Henry T. Lynch, Carrie L. Snyder.

#### Helsinki Breast Cancer Study (HEBCS)

HEBCS thanks Drs. Kirsimari Aaltonen and Carl Blomqvist and research nurse Irja Erkkilä for their help with the patient data.

#### Interdisciplinary Health Research International Team Breast Cancer Susceptibility (INHERIT BRCA)

The authors thank Martine Tranchant for skillful technical assistance. J. Simard is Chairholder of the Canada Research Chair in Oncogenetics

#### Kathleen Cuningham Consortium for Research into Familial Breast Cancer (kConFab)

The authors thank Heather Thorne, Eveline Niedermayr, all the kConFab research nurses and staff, the heads and staff of the Family Cancer Clinics, and

the Clinical Follow Up Study for their contributions to this resource, and the many families who contribute to kConFab.

### Memorial Sloane Kettering Cancer Center (MSKCC)

The MSKCC thanks the contributions of The Breast Cancer Research Foundation, The Niehaus, Weissenbach, Southworth Cancer Research Initiative, The Sharon Levine Corzine Research Fund, and The Esther and Hyman Rapport Philanthropic Trust.

### Swedish Breast Cancer Study (SWE-BRCA)

SWE-BRCA collaborators (in Lund and Stockholm): Åke Borg, Niklas Loman, Håkan Olsson, Ulf Kristoffersson, Helena Jernström, Katja Harbst and Karin Henriksson, Lund University Hospital; Annika Lindblom, Brita Arver, Anna von Wachenfeldt, Annelie Liljegren, Gisela Barbany-Bustinza and Johanna Rantala, Stockholm, Karolinska University Hospital.

### UK and Gilda Radner Familial Ovarian Cancer Registries (UKGRFOCR)

The authors thank Paul Pharoah, Carole Pye, Patricia Harrington, and Eva Wozniak for their contributions toward the UKFOCR. The authors would like to acknowledge the Roswell Park Alliance Foundation for their continued support of the Gilda Radner Ovarian Family Cancer Registry. GRFOCR would like to acknowledge Kirsten Moysich (Department of Cancer Prevention and Control).

### Grant Support

This work was supported by Cancer Research UK grants C12292/A11174 and C1287/A10118. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement no 223175 (HEALTH-F2-2009-223175). NM was funded by a scholarship from the Medical Research Council. ACA is a CR-UK Senior Cancer Research Fellow. DFE is a CR-UK Principal Research Fellow.

### BCFR

This work was supported by the National Cancer Institute, NIH, under RFA-CA-06-503 and through cooperative agreements with members of the Breast Cancer Family Registry and Principal Investigators, including Cancer Care Ontario (U01 CA69467), Columbia University (U01 CA69398), Fox Chase Cancer Center (U01 CA69631), Huntsman Cancer Institute (U01 CA69446), Cancer Prevention Institute of California (U01 CA69417), University of Melbourne (U01 CA69638), and Research Triangle Institute Informatics Support Center (RFP No. N02PC45022-46).

### BCFR—Ontario site

This work was supported by Cancer Care Ontario and the U.S. National Cancer Institute, NIH, under RFA # CA-06-503 and through cooperative agreements with members of the Breast Cancer Family Registry (BCFR) and principal investigators.

### BFB0CC

Lithuania: This work is financially supported by the Research Council of Lithuania grant LIG-19/2010 to R. Janavicius.

Latvia: L. Tihomirova was financially supported by LSC grants 05.0023.04. and 10.0010.08.

### CBCS

The authors thank NEYE Foundation for financial support

### Spanish National Cancer Center (CNIO)

This study was partially supported financially by the Fundación Mutua Madrileña, Asociación Española Contra el Cáncer and the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (FIS PI08 1120). This was funded, in part, by the Basque Foundation for Health Innovation and Research (BIOEF): BIO07/CA/006.

### DKFZ study

The DKFZ study was supported by the DKFZ.

### HEBON

The HEBON study is supported by the Dutch Cancer Society grants NKI1998-1854, NKI2004-3088, and NKI2007-3756 and the ZonMW grant 91109024.

### EMBRACE

EMBRACE is financially supported by Cancer Research UK Grants C1287/A10118 and C1287/A11990. D.G. Evans and F. Lalloo are financially supported by an NIHR grant to the Biomedical Research Centre, Manchester, UK. The investigators at The Institute of Cancer Research and The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust are financially supported by an NIHR grant to the Biomedical Research Centre at the Institute of Cancer Research and the Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust. R. Eeles, E. Bancroft, and L. D'Mello are also financially supported by a Cancer Research UK grant C5047/A8385.

### KUMC

A.K. Godwin was funded by U01CA69631, 5U01CA113916, and the Eileen Stein Jacoby Fund.

### GC-HBOC

GC-HBOC is financially supported by a grant of the German Cancer Aid (grant 109076) the Centre of Molecular Medicine Cologne (CMMC).

### GEMO

This study was supported by The Ligue National Contre le Cancer and The Association "Le cancer du sein, parlons-en!" Award.

### Georgetown University (GEORGETOWN)

C. Isaacs and B.N. Peshkin are supported by National Cancer Institute Grant (NCI P30 CA51008-12) and by the Fisher Center for Familial Cancer Research.

### HEBCS

The HEBCS study has been financially supported by the Helsinki University Central Hospital Research Fund, Academy of Finland (132473), the Finnish Cancer Society, and the Sigrid Juselius Foundation.

### Iceland Landspítali—University Hospital (ILUH)

The ILUH group was supported by the Icelandic Association "Walking for Breast Cancer Research" and by the Landspítali University Hospital Research Fund.

### INHERIT BRCA

This work was supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research for the "CIHR Team in Familial Risks of Breast Cancer" program and by the Canadian Breast Cancer Research Alliance-grant #019511.

### Istituto Oncologico Veneto—Hereditary Breast Ovarian Cancer Study (IOVHBOCS)

This study was supported by "Ministero della Salute" (grant numbers RFPS 2006-5-341353, ACC2/R6.9 and "Progetto Tumori Femminili").

### kConFab

kConFab is supported by grants from the National Breast Cancer Foundation, the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) and by the Queensland Cancer Fund, the Cancer Councils of New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia, and the Cancer Foundation of Western Australia (funded by NHMRC grants 145684, 288704, and 454508).

### Mayo Clinic (MAYO)

The MAYO study was supported by NIH grants CA116167, CA128978, a Specialized Program of Research Excellence (SPOR) in Breast Cancer (CA116201), and awards from the Komen Foundation for the Cure and the Breast Cancer Research Foundation.

### National Cancer Institute (NCI)

The research of Drs. P.L. Mai and M.H. Greene was supported by the Intramural Research Program of the U.S. National Cancer Institute

Mavaddat et al.

and by support services contracts NO2-CP-11019-50 and N02-CP-65504 with Westat, Inc.

#### N.N. Petrov Institute of Oncology (NNPIO)

This work has been supported by the Russian Federation for Basic Research (grants 10-04-92601, 11-04-00250, 11-04-00227), the Federal Agency for Science and Innovations (contract 02.740.11.0780), and the Commission of the European Communities (grant PITN-GA-2009-238132).

#### Ohio State University Clinical Cancer Genetics (OSU-CCG)

This work was supported by the OSU Comprehensive Cancer Center. Caroline Craven and Michelle O'Connor were responsible for patient accrual and data management.

#### Universita de Pisa (PBCS)

M. Caligo was supported by an ITT (Tuscany Institute for Tumors) grant 2010-2012.

#### University of California Irvine (UCI)

S.L. Neuhausen was partially supported by NIH CA74415 and the Morris and Horowitz Families Endowed Professorship.

#### University of California San Francisco (UCSF)

The grant funding was obtained from the NIH, NCI Bay Area Breast Cancer SPORE (P50-CA058207), and the Avon Foundation. Support was also provided from the UCSF Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center.

#### UKGRFOCR

UKGRFOCR was supported by a project grant from CRUK to Paul Pharoah.

#### University of Pennsylvania (UPENN)

The funding was obtained from Breast Cancer Research Foundation (to K.L. Nathanson); and Cancer Genetics Network and Marjorie Cohen Foundation (to S.M. Domchek).

#### Women's Cancer Research Institute (WCRI)

WCRI acknowledges support from the American Cancer Society, SIOP-06-258-01-CCE.

Received August 11, 2011; revised October 18, 2011; accepted November 14, 2011; published OnlineFirst December 5, 2011.

## References

- Armes JE, Egan AJ, Southey MC, Dite GS, McCredie MR, Giles GG, et al. The histologic phenotypes of breast carcinoma occurring before age 40 years in women with and without BRCA1 or BRCA2 germline mutations: a population-based study. *Cancer* 1998;83:2335-45.
- Lakhani SR, Jacquemier J, Sloane JP, Gusterson BA, Anderson TJ, Van De Vijver MJ, et al. Multifactorial analysis of differences between sporadic breast cancers and cancers involving BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1998;90:1138-45.
- Southey MC, Ramus SJ, Dowty JG, Smith LD, Tesoriero AA, Wong EE, et al. Morphological predictors of BRCA1 germline mutations in young women with breast cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2011;104:903-9.
- Eisinger F, Jacquemier J, Charpin C, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, Bressac-de PB, Peyrat JP, et al. Mutations at BRCA1: the medullary breast carcinoma revisited. *Cancer Res* 1998;58:1588-92.
- Iau PT, Marafie M, Ali A, Sng JH, Macmillan RD, Pinder S, et al. Are medullary breast cancers an indication for BRCA1 mutation screening? A mutation analysis of 42 cases of medullary breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2004;85:81-8.
- Lakhani SR, Van De Vijver MJ, Jacquemier J, Anderson TJ, Osin PP, McGuffog L, et al. The pathology of familial breast cancer: predictive value of immunohistochemical markers estrogen receptor, progesterone receptor, HER-2, and p53 in patients with mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:2310-8.
- Phillips KA. Immunophenotypic and pathologic differences between BRCA1 and BRCA2 hereditary breast cancers. *J Clin Oncol* 2000;18:107S-12S.
- Tung N, Wang Y, Collins LC, Kaplan J, Li H, Gelman R, et al. Estrogen receptor positive breast cancers in BRCA1 mutation carriers: clinical risk factors and pathologic features. *Breast Cancer Res* 2010;12:R12.
- Armes JE, Trute L, White D, Southey MC, Hammet F, Tesoriero A, et al. Distinct molecular pathogenesis of early-onset breast cancers in BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers: a population-based study. *Cancer Res* 1999;59:2011-7.
- Atchley DP, Albarracin CT, Lopez A, Valero V, Amos CI, Gonzalez-Angulo AM, et al. Clinical and pathologic characteristics of patients with BRCA-positive and BRCA-negative breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:4282-8.
- Cortesi L, Turchetti D, Bertoni C, Bellei R, Mangone L, Vinceti M, et al. Comparison between genotype and phenotype identifies a high-risk population carrying BRCA1 mutations. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 2000;27:130-5.
- Foulkes WD, Metcalfe K, Sun P, Hanna WM, Lynch HT, Ghadirian P, et al. Estrogen receptor status in BRCA1- and BRCA2-related breast cancer: the influence of age, grade, and histological type. *Clin Cancer Res* 2004;10:2029-34.
- Johannsson OT, Idvall I, Anderson C, Borg A, Barkardottir RB, Egilsson V, et al. Tumour biological features of BRCA1-induced breast and ovarian cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 1997;33:362-71.
- Karp SE, Tonin PN, Begin LR, Martinez JJ, Zhang JC, Pollak MN, et al. Influence of BRCA1 mutations on nuclear grade and estrogen receptor status of breast carcinoma in Ashkenazi Jewish women. *Cancer* 1997;80:435-41.
- Loman N, Johannsson O, Bendahl PO, Borg A, Ferno M, Olsson H. Steroid receptors in hereditary breast carcinomas associated with BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutations or unknown susceptibility genes. *Cancer* 1998;83:310-9.
- Palacios J, Honrado E, Osorio A, Cazorla A, Sarrio D, Barroso A, et al. Phenotypic characterization of BRCA1 and BRCA2 tumors based in a tissue microarray study with 37 immunohistochemical markers. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2005;90:5-14.
- Lakhani SR, Reis-Filho JS, Fulford L, Penault-Llorca F, van der Vijver M, Parry S, et al. Prediction of BRCA1 status in patients with breast cancer using estrogen receptor and basal phenotype. *Clin Cancer Res* 2005;11:5175-80.
- Sorlie T, Tibshirani R, Parker J, Hastie T, Marron JS, Nobel A, et al. Repeated observation of breast tumor subtypes in independent gene expression data sets. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2003;100:8418-23.
- Vargas AC, Silva LD, Lakhani SR. The contribution of breast cancer pathology to statistical models to predict mutation risk in BRCA carriers. *Fam Cancer* 2010;9:545-53.
- Bane AL, Beck JC, Bleiweiss I, Buys SS, Catalano E, Daly MB, et al. BRCA2 mutation-associated breast cancers exhibit a distinguishing phenotype based on morphology and molecular profiles from tissue microarrays. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2007;31:121-8.
- Weitzel JN, Robson M, Pasini B, Manoukian S, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, Lynch HT, et al. A comparison of bilateral breast cancers in BRCA carriers. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2005;14:1534-8.
- Lakhani SR, Manek S, Penault-Llorca F, Flanagan A, Arnout L, Merrett S, et al. Pathology of ovarian cancers in BRCA1 and BRCA2 carriers. *Clin Cancer Res* 2004;10:2473-81.
- Rubin SC, Benjamin I, Behbakht K, Takahashi H, Morgan MA, LiVolsi VA, et al. Clinical and pathological features of ovarian cancer in women with germ-line mutations of BRCA1. *N Engl J Med* 1996;335:1413-6.
- Shaw PA, McLaughlin JR, Zweemer RP, Narod SA, Risch H, Verheijen RH, et al. Histopathologic features of genetically determined ovarian cancer. *Int J Gynecol Pathol* 2002;21:407-11.

25. Chenevix-Trench G, Milne RL, Antoniou AC, Couch FJ, Easton DF, Goldgar DE. An international initiative to identify genetic modifiers of cancer risk in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers: the Consortium of Investigators of Modifiers of *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* (CIMBA). *Breast Cancer Res* 2007;9:104.
26. Perrin-Vidoz L, Sinilnikova OM, Stoppa-Lyonnet D, Lenoir GM, Mazoyer S. The nonsense-mediated mRNA decay pathway triggers degradation of most *BRCA1* mRNAs bearing premature termination codons. *Hum Mol Genet* 2002;11:2805–14.
27. Mazoyer S, Puget N, Perrin-Vidoz L, Lynch HT, Serova-Sinilnikova OM, Lenoir GM. A *BRCA1* nonsense mutation causes exon skipping. *Am J Hum Genet* 1998;62:713–5.
28. Buisson M, Anczukow O, Zetoune AB, Ware MD, Mazoyer S. The 185delAG mutation (c.68\_69delAG) in the *BRCA1* gene triggers translation reinitiation at a downstream AUG codon. *Hum Mutat* 2006;27:1024–9.
29. Gayther SA, Mangion J, Russell P, Seal S, Barfoot R, Ponder BA, et al. Variation of risks of breast and ovarian cancer associated with different germline mutations of the *BRCA2* gene. *Nat Genet* 1997;15:103–5.
30. Thompson D, Easton D. Variation in cancer risks, by mutation position, in *BRCA2* mutation carriers. *Am J Hum Genet* 2001;68:410–9.
31. Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) Program Limited-Use Data (1973–2006), National Cancer Institute, DCCPS, Surveillance Research Program, Cancer Statistics Branch, released April 2009, based on the November 2008 submission. [www.seer.cancer.gov/](http://www.seer.cancer.gov/).
32. Tung N, Miron A, Schnitt SJ, Gautam S, Fette K, Kaplan J, et al. Prevalence and predictors of loss of wild type *BRCA1* in estrogen receptor positive and negative *BRCA1*-associated breast cancers. *Breast Cancer Res* 2010;12:R95.
33. Lakhani SR, Khanna KK, Chenevix-Trench G. Are estrogen receptor-positive breast cancers in *BRCA1* mutation carriers sporadic? *Breast Cancer Res* 2010;12:104.
34. Eerola H, Heikkilä P, Tamminen A, Aittomäki K, Blomqvist C, Nevanlinna H. Relationship of patients' age to histopathological features of breast tumours in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* and mutation-negative breast cancer families. *Breast Cancer Res* 2005;7:R465–9.
35. Anderson WF, Chatterjee N, Ershler WB, Brawley OW. Estrogen receptor breast cancer phenotypes in the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 2002;76:27–36.
36. Evans DG, Lalloo F, Cramer A, Jones EA, Knox F, Amir E, et al. Addition of pathology and biomarker information significantly improves the performance of the Manchester scoring system for *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* testing. *J Med Genet* 2009;46:811–7.
37. Mavaddat N, Rebbeck TR, Lakhani SR, Easton DF, Antoniou AC. Incorporating tumour pathology information into breast cancer risk prediction algorithms. *Breast Cancer Res* 2010;12:R28.
38. Tai YC, Chen S, Parmigiani G, Klein AP. Incorporating tumor immunohistochemical markers in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* carrier prediction. *Breast Cancer Res* 2008;10:401.
39. Rakha EA, El-Sayed ME, Green AR, Paish EC, Powe DG, Gee J, et al. Biologic and clinical characteristics of breast cancer with single hormone receptor positive phenotype. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4772–8.
40. Swain SM, Wilson JW, Mamounas EP, Bryant J, Wickerham DL, Fisher B, et al. Estrogen receptor status of primary breast cancer is predictive of estrogen receptor status of contralateral breast cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2004;96:516–23.
41. Sherman ME, Howatt W, Blows FM, Pharoah P, Hewitt SM, Garcia-Closas M. Molecular pathology in epidemiologic studies: a primer on key considerations. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2010;19:966–72.
42. Melchor L, Honrado E, Huang J, Alvarez S, Naylor TL, Garcia MJ, et al. Estrogen receptor status could modulate the genomic pattern in familial and sporadic breast cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2007;13:7305–13.
43. Melchor L, Honrado E, Garcia MJ, Alvarez S, Palacios J, Osorio A, et al. Distinct genomic aberration patterns are found in familial breast cancer associated with different immunohistochemical subtypes. *Oncogene* 2008;27:3165–75.
44. Milne RL, Antoniou AC. Genetic modifiers of cancer risk for *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers. *Ann Oncol* 2011;22 Suppl 1:i11–17.
45. Garcia-Closas M, Hall P, Nevanlinna H, Pooley K, Morrison J, Richesson DA, et al. Heterogeneity of breast cancer associations with five susceptibility loci by clinical and pathological characteristics. *PLoS Genet* 2008;4:e1000054.
46. Broeks A, Schmidt MK, Sherman ME, Couch FJ, Hopper JL, Dite GS, et al. Low penetrance breast cancer susceptibility loci are associated with specific breast tumor subtypes: findings from the Breast Cancer Association Consortium. *Hum Mol Genet* 2011;20:3289–303.
47. Mulligan AM, Couch FJ, Barrowdale D, Domchek SM, Eccles D, Nevanlinna H, et al. Common breast cancer susceptibility alleles are associated with tumor subtypes in *BRCA1* and *BRCA2* mutation carriers: results from the Consortium of Investigators of Modifiers of *BRCA1/2*. *Breast Cancer Res* 2011;13:R110.