**Tumours of the Central Nervous System**

**Elements in black text are CORE Elements in grey text are NON-CORE o indicates single select values □ indicates multi-select values**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Definition of Core elements | CORE elements are those which are essential for the clinical management, staging or prognosis of the cancer. These elements will either have evidentiary support at Level III-2 or above (based on prognostic factors in the National Health and Medical Research Council levels of evidence1). In rare circumstances, where level III-2 evidence is not available an element may be made a CORE element where there is unanimous agreement by the Dataset Authoring Committee (DAC).  Molecular and immunohistochemical testing is a growing feature of cancer reporting. However, in many parts of the world this type of testing is limited by the available resources. In order to encourage the global adoption of ancillary tests for patient benefit, International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (ICCR) includes the most relevant ancillary testing in ICCR Datasets as CORE elements, especially when they are necessary for the diagnosis. Where the technical capability does not yet exist, laboratories may consider temporarily using these data elements as NON-CORE items.  The summation of all CORE elements is considered to be the minimum reporting standard for a specific cancer. Reference 1 Merlin T, Weston A and Tooher R (2009). Extending an evidence hierarchy to include topics other than treatment: revising the Australian 'levels of evidence'. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 9:34. |
| Definition of Non-core elements | NON-CORE elements are those which are unanimously agreed should be included in the dataset but are not supported by level III-2 evidence. These elements may be clinically important and recommended as good practice but are not yet validated or regularly used in patient management.  Key information other than that which is essential for clinical management, staging or prognosis of the cancer such as macroscopic observations and interpretation, which are fundamental to the histological diagnosis and conclusion e.g., macroscopic tumour details, may be included as either CORE or NON-CORE elements by consensus of the DAC. |

| **Core/**  **Non-core** | **Element name** | **Values** | **Commentary** | **Implementation notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Histological Assessment Reporting Guide** | | | | |
| Scope of this dataset section  Histological Assessment Reporting Guide | | This dataset section has been developed for the histological assessment of benign and malignant primary tumours of the central nervous system (CNS) and its coverings, as well as tumours from those structures of the peripheral nervous system immediately adjacent to the CNS. This dataset applies to both biopsy and resection specimens of adult and paediatric CNS tumours. Haematological lesions involving the CNS and germ cell tumours are not covered in detail as these are not the primary focus of the CNS dataset. Most sarcomas are not included and are covered by separate International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (ICCR) datasets.[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) Secondary tumours of the CNS (for example, metastatic tumours from carcinomas, sarcomas or melanomas in other organs) are not covered in this dataset. Tumours of the pituitary gland are included as the majority of these tumours are reported by neuropathologists worldwide.  This dataset section on histological assessment should be used in conjunction with the ICCR dataset sections on **Molecular information** and the **Integrated final diagnosis**, where appropriate.  The 2nd edition of this dataset incorporates the World Health Organisation (WHO) Classification of Tumours of the CNS, 5th edition (CNS5), 2021.[3](#_ENREF_3) The ICCR dataset includes 5th edition Corrigenda, July 2024.[4](#_ENREF_4) A complete diagnosis of CNS tumours should ideally conform to the final integrated diagnoses in the 2021 WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification, which for most tumour types now requires integration of elements from histological and ancillary analyses. Nonetheless, it is realised that some diagnoses may not fit precisely within existing diagnostic categories.[5](#_ENREF_5) References 1 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Biopsy Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-biopsy-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024).  2 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Resection Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-resection-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024).  3 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2024). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6 - Corrigenda July 2024*. Available from: file:///C:/Users/tinas/Downloads/CNS5%20Corrigenda%20doc\_2024-07-08-1.pdf (Accessed 1st August 2024).  5 Louis DN, Wesseling P, Paulus W, Giannini C, Batchelor TT, Cairncross JG, Capper D, Figarella-Branger D, Lopes MB, Wick W and van den Bent M (2018). cIMPACT-NOW update 1: Not Otherwise Specified (NOS) and Not Elsewhere Classified (NEC). *Acta Neuropathol.* 135(3):481-484. | | |
| Core and Non-core | CLINICAL INFORMATION | * Information not provided * Information provided   (select all that apply)   * Previous therapy, *specify* * Previous history of tumour, *specify* * History of known cancer predisposition syndrome,   *specify*   * Relevant familial history, *specify* * Other clinical information, *specify* | For optimal tissue diagnosis and patient treatment, it is important that pathologists receive key clinical information with the specimen. Therefore, the clinical information received with the specimen is a core element for reporting. However, in acknowledging that the pathologist is only capable of documenting the clinical information that they receive, the clinical information sub-values (e.g., previous therapy) are classified as non-core.  Details on previous treatment may not be available at the time of tumour diagnosis. Nonetheless, in some situations it is crucial to know whether the patient has had specific therapies such as radiation therapy, chemotherapy, corticosteroid therapy, embolisation, or radiosurgery. In particular, knowledge of such previous therapy may help to interpret changes such as necrosis, vasculature changes, cellular atypia and inflammatory cells.  Several genetic conditions (such as neurofibromatosis type 1 and 2, congenital mismatch repair deficiency syndrome Lynch syndrome, tuberous sclerosis, von-Hippel-Lindau, Cowden, Li-Fraumeni and naevoid basal cell carcinoma/Gorlin syndromes) are known to predispose individuals to specific primary CNS tumours. Knowledge of this information may therefore be relevant in differential diagnoses. In addition, the behaviour of tumours in such syndromes may differ from those of their sporadic counterparts. Therefore, knowledge of a genetic condition may inform prognostic estimation, guide clinical management and trigger genetic counselling. |  |
| Non-Core | OPERATIVE PROCEDURE | * Not specified * Biopsy, *specify* * Resection, *specify* * Other, *specify* | The physical size of tissue specimens submitted for pathological assessment varies greatly depending on the operative procedure. Specimens obtained by stereotactic or endoscopic biopsy are typically the smallest and may be crushed during handling. Those from open biopsy are more ample and typically less damaged. Resection specimens are largest and require careful macroscopic inspection in order to sample properly.[1](#_ENREF_1) Importantly, the size of the submitted sample does not always reflect the procedure. Use of ultrasonic surgical aspirators, for example, may decrease the size of the submitted material relative to the total amount of resected material.  As the reliability of neuropathological diagnosis depends heavily on the representative nature and adequacy of material assessed, it is important to pay attention to any discrepancy between submitted material and clinical information, including operative procedures and imaging findings. Doing so can help to minimise the influence of sampling errors and/or regional heterogeneity on the rendered diagnosis.[1](#_ENREF_1) Reference 1 Fuller GN and Ballester LY (2018). Intraoperative Consultation and Optimal Processing In: *Practical Surgical Neuropathology*, Perry A and Brat DJ (eds), Elsevier, Philadelphia, 39-51. |  |
| **RADIOLOGICAL INFORMATION** | | | | |
| Core | TUMOUR SITEa | (select all that apply)   * Not specified * Indeterminate * No macroscopically visible tumour * Skull, *specify site(s) if known* * Dura, *specify site(s) if known* * Leptomeninges, *specify site(s) if known* * Cerebrum * Cerebral lobes, *specify site(s) if known* * Midline, *specify site(s) if known* * Ventricle, *specify site(s) if known* * Pineal, *specify site(s) if known* * Sellar/suprasellar/pituitary, *specify site(s) if known* * Brain stem, *specify site(s) if known* * Cerebellum, *specify site(s) if known* * Spine/vertebral column, *specify site(s) if known* * Spinal cord, *specify site(s) if known* * Spinal nerve root(s), *specify site(s) if known* * Peripheral nerve, *specify site(s) if known* * Other, *specify site(s) if known* | Tumour site is a core element for tumour entities where the information is essential for making the correct diagnosis. Examples include medulloblastomas, ependymal tumours, diffuse midline gliomas, and pineal region tumours. For other tumour entities, tumour site should ideally be recorded as well, as this can aid in the differential diagnosis and may correlate with outcome.  Imaging studies are crucial in guiding neurosurgical and radiotherapeutic management of CNS tumours.[1](#_ENREF_1) Imaging and intra-operative findings can be used to designate a CNS tumour as being:   * intra-axial (intraparenchymal tumour in cerebrum, cerebellum, brain stem, spinal cord); * extra-axial (dural/leptomeningeal, cerebellopontine angle, intraventricular, intra- or extradurally in the spinal canal); or * located in the skull, skull base, sellar/suprasellar region, pineal gland, spine, etc.  Reference 1 Vincentelli C, Hwang SN, Holder CA and Brat DJ (2012). The use of neuroimaging to guide the histologic diagnosis of central nervous system lesions. *Adv Anat Pathol* 19(2):97-107. | a Core for medulloblastomas, ependymal tumours, diffuse midline gliomas and pineal region tumours and others (refer to Note); in all other tumours it is non-core. |
| Non-core | TUMOUR LATERALITY | * Not specified * Left * Right * Midline * Bilateral | Tumour laterality, as determined by imaging studies and as indicated by the surgeon, should be indicated as occurring on the right or left side of the CNS (e.g., right frontal lobe, left occipital convexity, right lateral ventricle, etc.). The term ‘midline’ in diffuse midline glioma, H3 K27-altered, refers to tumours that originate in the brainstem, thalamic region, spinal cord or cerebellum. Tumours arising in other midline structures such as third or fourth ventricle, (supra)sellar region or pineal region, should also be recorded as such. Occasionally, tumours may involve both sides of the brain and should be referred to as bilateral; a ‘butterfly’ glioblastoma crossing the corpus callosum and involving both sides of the cerebrum is an example. |  |
| Non-core | TUMOUR FOCALITY | * Unifocal * Multifocal   Specify number of lesions | While most CNS tumours are solitary (unifocal), multifocal examples exist, often representing malignant brain tumours (e.g., glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype and primary CNS lymphoma). For tumours to be considered multifocal, they should be noncontiguous, as determined by neuroimaging studies. However, it is recognised that autopsy studies of such radiologically multifocal tumours may histologically reveal contiguity between lesions. Gliomatosis cerebri, previously recognised as a distinct diffuse glioma entity involving multiple cerebral lobes, is in the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification recognised as a growth pattern and not a distinct tumour type.[1](#_ENREF_1) Reference 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. |  |
| Non-core | TUMOUR DIMENSIONS | Largest/dominant lesion  \_\_\_ mm x \_\_\_ mm x \_\_\_ mm | Preoperative radiological tumour dimensions serve as approximate guidance as to whether tumours have been sampled adequately, particularly when dealing with small biopsies. Post-surgery, they also give information regarding how much of the tumour has been resected. For example, radiologic-pathologic correlations can guard against making a diagnosis of low grade glioma on a stereotactic biopsy sample obtained from the edge of a large, heterogeneously enhancing cerebral lesion. |  |
| Non-core | RELATIONSHIP OF TUMOUR TO ADJACENT TISSUE | * Well demarcated * Diffuse/infiltrative * Mixed (Well-demarcated and diffuse in different areas)   **Peritumoral edema**   * Absent * Present | The interface between tumour and adjacent brain as depicted by neuroimaging (magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), computed tomography (CT)) provides information on the growth pattern and on the dynamics of tumour growth. Hyperintensity on fluid-attenuated inversion recovery (FLAIR) images may indicate infiltrative tumour growth and reflect invasiveness of the tumour. This may also be reflected by diffuse or patchy contrast enhancement at the interface between tumour and normal brain (see **CONTRAST ENHANCEMENT**). Absence of peritumoural alterations on T2 and FLAIR sequences suggests a more benign lesion.  The MRI patterns may also vary within the tumour with partly well-demarcated areas and partly infiltrative growth. Oedema is visualised as a hypointense signal alteration on T1-weighted sequences without contrast and, similar to infiltrative growth, as hyperintense signal on FLAIR sequences. Differentiation between infiltrative growth and oedema is often impossible, notably in diffuse gliomas. Slowly growing, more benign tumours induce relatively less oedema than fast growing malignant tumours. Information provided by the surgeon on where the tissue specimens were collected relative to the MRI changes also aids the pathologist in interpreting the histological findings. |  |
| Non-core | CONTRAST ENHANCEMENT | * Non-enhancing * Enhancing * Diffuse/solid * Patchy/heterogeneous * Ring or rim | Contrast enhancement of intra-axial tumours is commonly interpreted as reflecting blood-brain barrier disturbance. Extra-axial tumours (growing outside the brain parenchyma, e.g., meningiomas) commonly take up contrast vividly. For intrinsic brain tumours such as diffuse gliomas, contrast enhancement is commonly interpreted as a sign of increasing malignancy, but this correlation is far from complete. For example, pilocytic astrocytomas, gangliogliomas, and other tumours take up contrast, but are assigned to CNS WHO grade 1 and carry a favourable prognosis. Vice versa, lack of contrast-enhancement may occur in high-grade IDH-wildtype diffuse glioma/glioblastoma. Ring enhancement is commonly associated with extensive central necrosis and reflects a high grade of histological malignancy but is rarely seen in benign tumours as well.  Contrast enhancement is subject to pharmacological modification (e.g., by corticosteroids) or antiangiogenic agents, (e.g., bevacizumab). Thus, pharmacotherapy may be a challenge for MRI interpretation. Changes in contrast enhancement have traditionally played a central role in response assessment in neuro-oncology, (e.g., in the Macdonald criteria[8](#_ENREF_8)), but the additional consideration of T2 and FLAIR sequences has increasingly been implemented into response assessment.[1](#_ENREF_1) Reference 1 Wen PY, Chang SM, Van den Bent MJ, Vogelbaum MA, Macdonald DR and Lee EQ (2017). Response Assessment in Neuro-Oncology Clinical Trials. *J Clin Oncol* 35(21):2439-2449. |  |
| **SPECIMEN DETAILS** | | | | |
| Core | SPECIMEN DIMENSIONS | \_\_\_ mm x \_\_\_ mm x \_\_\_ mm   * Cannot be assessed, *specify* | Intrinsic tumours grow diffusely within the brain and in many instances cannot be completely removed. Clinical factors (e.g., performance status), tumour location, and where relevant, intraoperative diagnosis, often determine the extent of resection, ranging from a stereotactic biopsy to a resection of a lobe. Surgical technique may result in a discrepancy of the amount of tissue resected and received in the pathology department, in particular when a surgical ultrasonic aspirator is used, and the collected tissue is partly discarded.  It is important to record the volume of tissue arriving in the pathology department and thus the amount of tissue available for diagnosis (and where possible for frozen tissue banking for subsequent studies). If a tumour, for example a schwannoma or meningioma, arrives in one piece, it can be measured relatively accurately. Brain tumour surgery, however, often results in tissue fragments, making an accurate assessment difficult. Where possible, the size of large resection specimens should be recorded in three dimensions and piecemeal resections should be estimated by their aggregate size in three dimensions. Alternatively, an accurate and reproducible determination of the tissue volume may be achieved by weighing tissue fragments, compared to visual estimates in three dimensions. | Record for each specimen  submitted. |
| Non-core | SPECIMEN DESCRIPTION | Text  \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | The description of resection margins is generally not applicable for intra-axial CNS tumours as surgical technique results in fragmented specimens in most instances, except when complete resection of a lobe can be achieved. Therefore, staging and assessment of resection margins is generally not possible and thus not included in published protocols. Additionally, diffusely infiltrative tumours have often invaded well beyond designated surgical margins, even when tumour cells are not evident at that margin. Extra-axial tumours, such as meningiomas, schwannomas, and other well-demarcated tumours can often be resected and submitted intact. This allows a description of the lesion itself, and adherent structures, such as meninges, nerve roots, and CNS tissue. However, when arriving in fragmented state, the report may necessarily be limited to a description of individual components, and the degree of fragmentation.  When applicable, description should also include the presence of other components, such as CNS tissue, dura mater, skin, bone, blood clot and extrinsic components such as haemostatic material, metal clips, synthetic bone, mesh, shunt ducts, etc.  Specimens may arrive fresh or in fixative. This should be indicated when describing the colour of the specimen as it changes with fixation.  Specimens may also arrive in already processed forms, such as blocks or slides. In such situations, description should be given for blocks and slides, indicating the number of blocks and/or slides. Slides may be described in greater detail, for example, total number of glass slides, comprising number of haematoxylin and eosin and other slides (e.g., immunohistochemistry, smears, controls), as well as other materials (e.g., neuroimaging files). |  |
| Non-core | ADEQUACY OF SPECIMEN FOR HISTOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT | * Specimen is adequate for analysis * Specimen is adequate but limited by, *specify* * Specimen is inadequate for analysis (select all that apply) * Crush * Autolysis * Cautery * Necrosis * Other, *specify* | The adequacy of a specimen for histological assessment can be affected by various intraoperative procedures, tissue fixation issues (duration in/volume of fixative), and technical processing issues in the histology laboratory. These include, but are not limited to, electrocautery/heat/laser treatment intraoperatively, distortion of tissue due to surgical instrumentation, delay in placing wet tissue into fixative by the surgeon/operating room technician, less than 10:1 fixative-to-tissue volume ratio, and excessive fracturing/knife chatter in tissue during cutting of the frozen tissue/paraffin block.  Tiny size of a biopsy can lead to tissue exhaustion during processing. Highly necrotic, mucinous, fibrous, calcified, lipidised, or ossified specimens may cause suboptimal processing/sectioning. Any of these conditions can obscure nuclear/nucleolar features, distort degree of cellularity, blur tumour margins, and/or make mitotic activity impossible to assess. Prior freezing of the tissue for frozen section intraoperative diagnosis may negatively impact cytological assessment in the fixed, embedded tissues and immunohistochemistry for some antibodies.  In each case, the pathologist should state which of these conditions make the tissue inadequate/suboptimal for histological assessment. |  |
| Non-core | ADEQUACY OF SPECIMEN FOR DIAGNOSTIC PURPOSES | * Specimen is adequate for diagnostic purposes * Specimen is adequate but limited by, *specify* * Specimen is inadequate for diagnostic purposes (e.g., not   representative of likely clinicoradiological diagnosis), *specify* | Many intraparenchymal brain lesions are surgically assessed by either small open excisional biopsy or stereotactic biopsy. While navigational equipment is usually employed to optimise targeting, the known ability of brain tissue to swell during an operative procedure can cause shifting of brain tissue during the procedure, which can result in biopsies that are suboptimally centred on the area(s) of interest. Examples of suboptimally centred tissues include: biopsies from diffuse infiltrating gliomas taken from the edge (not centre) of the tumour; biopsies adjacent to a tumour (gliosis with Rosenthal fibres next to a craniopharyngioma); and biopsies from infections in which the necrotic/purulent centre may be submitted by the surgeon for culture(s), leaving the pathologist with reactive, but not organism-containing, edges of the process. Occasionally, tissue lost to intraoperative suctioning or lesional tissues given in overly generous amounts to brain banks can render the tissue sent to the pathologist suboptimal for diagnosis.  Any of these situations can leave the pathologist with tissue that can be misleading in terms of type of tumour, grade of tumour, or inability to detect organisms, if present. The diagnosis possible on the submitted tissues may be under-representative or misrepresentative of the lesion based on the neuroimaging studies. In some instances, small tissue size, tissue processing issues, or suboptimal targeting of biopsy materials may make molecular testing impossible. The pathologist should specify the limitations of the tissue in achieving optimal diagnosis. |  |
| Core | HISTOLOGICAL APPEARANCEb | * Cannot be determined   Describe the histological appearance according to the World  Health Organization (WHO) Classification of Central Nervous  System Tumours (2021) | This element is core if it is an essential component of the final (integrated) diagnosis. Histological features that are essential for diagnosing the tumour according to the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification should be reported.  In nearly all pathology reports of CNS neoplasms, the diagnosis should ideally include one of the >100 tumour types listed in the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification (see Table 1). [1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) The information on haematolymphoid tumours in Table 2 is based on the WHO 5th edition classification of those tumours.[3](#_ENREF_3) For many CNS tumours, the histological assessment should be combined with molecular (or surrogate immunohistochemical biomarker) testing for signature molecular alterations to reach an ‘integrated diagnosis’ (e.g., diffuse astrocytoma, IDH-mutant, CNS WHO grade 2; see ICCR dataset section on Integrated final diagnosis). For other tumour types, the final diagnosis can still be based on classical histopathology alone. In either approach (purely histological or integrated histological-molecular), obtaining as precise a final diagnosis as possible is critically important, as this forms the basis for all subsequent patient management decisions, accruing patients to the appropriate clinical trials, epidemiologically assessing disease trends over time, and establishing valid research conclusions.[4-6](#_ENREF_4) As such, the strict application of WHO CNS5 diagnostic guidelines is required to enhance both accuracy and interobserver reproducibility across the globe.  For cases that, after adequate ancillary testing, do not neatly conform to a well-recognised tumour type (see last category listed as ‘Other, specify’), a descriptive diagnosis should be rendered instead, providing as much information as possible including relevant molecular information (e.g., low grade neuroepithelial tumour with oligodendroglial-like histological features suggestive of dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumour; high grade glioneuronal neoplasm; poorly differentiated malignancy; etc.). Such cases should be designated ’not elsewhere classified’ (NEC). And in a situation where the necessary ancillary testing could not be performed or was performed but was technically inconclusive, ‘not otherwise specified’ (NOS) can be added to the histological diagnosis.[7](#_ENREF_7)  It should be noted that in some cases the results are not clear cut, and the addition of a secondary diagnosis may be of benefit to record in the report.  A tentative or provisional grade may be assigned after histological evaluation alone, but in an increasing number of tumour types, molecular findings need to be integrated for a definitive, ‘integrated’ grade (see ICCR dataset section on Integrated final diagnosis - **TUMOUR GRADE**).  **Table 1 and 2 (See end of the document for tables)** References 1 Louis DN, Perry A, Wesseling P, Brat DJ, Cree IA, Figarella-Branger D, Hawkins C, Ng HK, Pfister SM, Reifenberger G, Soffietti R, von Deimling A and Ellison DW (2021). The 2021 WHO Classification of Tumors of the Central Nervous System: a summary. *Neuro Oncol* 23(8):1231-1251.  2 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  3 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2022). *Haematolymphoid Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 11*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  4 Fuller CE, Jones DTW and Kieran MW (2017). New Classification for Central Nervous System Tumors: Implications for Diagnosis and Therapy. *Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book* 37:753-763.  5 Louis DN, Perry A, Burger P, Ellison DW, Reifenberger G, von Deimling A, Aldape K, Brat D, Collins VP, Eberhart C, Figarella-Branger D, Fuller GN, Giangaspero F, Giannini C, Hawkins C, Kleihues P, Korshunov A, Kros JM, Beatriz Lopes M, Ng HK, Ohgaki H, Paulus W, Pietsch T, Rosenblum M, Rushing E, Soylemezoglu F, Wiestler O and Wesseling P (2014). International Society Of Neuropathology-Haarlem consensus guidelines for nervous system tumor classification and grading. *Brain Pathol* 24(5):429-435.  6 Horbinski C, Berger T, Packer RJ and Wen PY (2022). Clinical implications of the 2021 edition of the WHO classification of central nervous system tumours. *Nat Rev Neurol* 18(9):515-529.  7 Louis DN, Wesseling P, Paulus W, Giannini C, Batchelor TT, Cairncross JG, Capper D, Figarella-Branger D, Lopes MB, Wick W and van den Bent M (2018). cIMPACT-NOW update 1: Not Otherwise Specified (NOS) and Not Elsewhere Classified (NEC). *Acta Neuropathol.* 135(3):481-484.  8 Fritz A, Percy C, Jack A, Shanmugaratnam K, Sobin L, Parkin DM, Whelan S (eds) (2020). *International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, Third edition, Second revision ICD-O-3.2*. Available from: http://www.iacr.com.fr/index.php?option=com\_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=100&Itemid=577 (Accessed 1st March 2024).  9 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2024). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6 - Corrigenda July 2024*. Available from: file:///C:/Users/tinas/Downloads/CNS5%20Corrigenda%20doc\_2024-07-08-1.pdf (Accessed 1st August 2024). | b Core if histological appearance is an essential component of the final  (integrated) diagnosis (refer to Note). |
| Non-core | INVASION INTO SURROUNDING TISSUE/STRUCTURES | * Not identified (i.e., tumour is well-demarcated from   surrounding brain or other tissues)   * Present, *specify type* * Cannot be assessed (e.g., no surrounding tissue present),   *specify* | Most neuroepithelial tumours, particularly diffuse gliomas, demonstrate diffuse infiltration of tumour cells beyond grossly discernible margins. Isolated tumour cells are often present in grossly normal-appearing parenchyma surrounding the lesions. Involvement of leptomeninges and Virchow-Robin spaces are also common in gliomas, but may be observed also in some benign tumours such as pilocytic astrocytoma and ganglioglioma. These ‘invasions’ provide no prognostic significance beyond the given biological malignancy of each tumour. Direct invasion into adjacent structures such as dura and skull, is quite exceptional in gliomas.    On the other hand, invasion of adjacent structures may be relevant in some non-neuroepithelial tumours, meningioma in particular, and can be assessed if the interface between the tumour and the adjacent tissue is appropriately submitted for assessment. Brain invasion is still a criterion for atypical CNS WHO grade 2) meningioma in the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification,[1](#_ENREF_1) and is characterised by irregular, tongue-like protrusions of tumour tissue into underlying parenchyma without an intervening layer of leptomeninges. However, extension along Virchow-Robin spaces does not constitute brain invasion. Bone involvement has been associated with increased recurrence rates in the setting of atypical meningioma.[1](#_ENREF_1) Reference 1 Sahm F, Perry A, von Deimling A, Claus EB, Priscilla CM, Brastianos K and Santagata S (2021). Meningiomas. In: *WHO Classification of Tumours. Central Nervous System Tumours. 5th Ed*, Louis DN (ed), IARC, Lyon. |  |
| Non-core | HISTOLOGICAL EVIDENCE OF PREVIOUS THERAPY | * No evidence of previous therapy * Evidence of previous therapy (select all that apply) * Vascular changes * Reactive glial changes * Inflammatory changes * Radiation type necrosis * Granulation and/or scar tissue * Ischemic type of necrosis * Foreign material (e.g., embolisation/procoagulant * material) * Other, *specify* | Previous therapy, including previous surgery, embolisation, chemotherapy, corticosteroid therapy and radiotherapy, may significantly alter the histological appearance of tissues and result in difficulties in tumour typing and grading.[1](#_ENREF_1) Information on previous therapy is, however, not always available to the pathologist and the absence of histological evidence does not necessarily imply absence of previous therapy (see **CLINICAL INFORMATION**).  Therapy-associated histological findings are often non-specific, except for iatrogenically introduced foreign materials such as embolic agents, and are not always adequately distinguished form tumour-associated findings. In this regard, CNS WHO grades may not be readily assigned to the specimens after some previous therapies. Histological changes of radiation damage are particularly common in specimens from recurrent diffuse gliomas. These include large foci of coagulative necrosis with hypocellular edges and microcalcifications; hyalinised or necrotic vessels with enlarged, atypical endothelial cells; and pale, rarefied parenchyma with fibrin deposits. The presence of such changes is highly suggestive of previous radiation therapy, even if a clear clinical history of previous radiation has not been provided. A notoriously difficult situation is created by the pre-surgical application of high-dose corticosteroids in patients with intracerebral aggressive B-cell lymphoma as this treatment may result in complete vanishment of the neoplastic B-cells leaving only inflammatory and other reactive changes upon histology (corticoid-mitigated primary CNS lymphoma). Reference 1 Perry A (2018). Therapy-Associated Neuropathology. In: *Practical Surgical Neuropathology*, Perry A and Brat DJ (eds), Elsevier, Philadelphia, 493-503. |  |
| **Molecular Information Reporting Guide** | | | | |
| **REFER TO Tables 3-5 FOR CORE ELEMENTS REQUIRED FOR CENTRAL NERVOUS SYSTEM TUMOUR CLASSIFICATION**  **(Elements from *ALK/ROS1/MET*/NTRK FAMILY ALTERATIONS to OTHER IMMUNOHISTOCHEMISTRY FINDINGS are only required for some tumours)**  (Based on the World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of the Central Nervous System (2021)) | | | | |
| Scope of this dataset section  Molecular Information Reporting Guide | | This dataset section has been developed for the molecular assessment of primary CNS tumours, whether that molecular assessment is nucleic acid or protein based. This section is to be used for those tumours in which molecular information is captured for diagnostic purposes. However, as this dataset section applies to a growing subset of CNS tumours, it is anticipated that its use will increase over time.  This dataset section has been developed for the molecular assessment of benign and malignant primary tumours of the CNS and its coverings, as well as tumours from those structures of the peripheral nervous system immediately adjacent to the CNS. This dataset applies to both biopsy and resection specimens of adult and paediatric CNS tumours. Haematological lesions involving the CNS and germ cell tumours are not covered in detail as these are not the primary focus of the CNS dataset. Most sarcomas are not included and are covered by separate ICCR datasets.[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2). Secondary tumours of the CNS (for example, metastatic tumours from carcinomas, sarcomas or melanomas in other organs) are not covered in this dataset. Tumours of the pituitary gland are included as the majority of these tumours are reported by neuropathologists worldwide.  This dataset section on molecular assessment should be used in conjunction with the dataset sections on **Histological assessment** and the **Integrated final diagnosis**.  The 2nd edition of this dataset incorporates the WHO Classification of Tumours of the CNS, 5th edition (CNS5), 2021.[3](#_ENREF_3) The ICCR dataset includes 5th edition Corrigenda, July 2024.[4](#_ENREF_4) A complete diagnosis of CNS tumours should ideally conform to the final integrated diagnoses in the 2021 WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification, which for most tumour types now require integration of elements from histological and ancillary analyses. References 1 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Biopsy Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-biopsy-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024).  2 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Resection Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-resection-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024).  3 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2024). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6 - Corrigenda July 2024*. Available from: file:///C:/Users/tinas/Downloads/CNS5%20Corrigenda%20doc\_2024-07-08-1.pdf (Accessed 1st August 2024). | | |
|  | | **Overview of selected molecular (including protein) diagnostic markers for CNS tumours**  Tables 3-5 describe the molecular and immunohistochemistry (IHC) markers listed as essential or desirable criteria for tumours in the WHO Central Nervous System 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification.[1](#_ENREF_1) The tables should be used as a reference to determine which markers are core (in bold) or non-core (non-bold) for each tumour entity. Molecular and IHC alterations which are core versus non-core correspond to WHO essential and desirable diagnostic criteria, respectively.  While these elements are deemed core, in some jurisdictions, consideration should be given to temporarily downgrading them to a non-core element until resources allow. Practical and economical guidelines, which include a comprehensive list of IHC markers, for diagnosing CNS tumours in resource-restrained jurisdictions are being developed by the Asian Oceanian Society of Neuropathology for Adapting Diagnostic Approaches for Practical Taxonomy in Resource-Restrained Regions (AOSNP-ADAPTR).[2](#_ENREF_2)  The list of alterations is not exhaustive and other markers or assays may be helpful in some diagnostic circumstances. In addition, the tests listed are mostly related to ‘ruling in’ the corresponding diagnoses. However, it should be realised that the assays may also be used in particular diagnostic situations to ‘rule out’ other diagnoses. An example of this would be ATRX IHC showing a loss of nuclear expression, which is commonly used to support a diagnosis of IDH-mutant astrocytoma, but which is also used to rule out a possible diagnosis of oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted.  Some specific alterations recommended in the commentaries below represent one of several validated and equivalent approaches to the evaluation of the described molecular variable. For those alterations that have multiple testing modalities (e.g., sequencing for *BRAF* p.V600E and IHC for the mutant protein), it is assumed that only one of these testing modalities would be used per case unless one test yields equivocal results (e.g., a result of weak IHC positivity versus nonspecific background staining should be followed by gene sequencing). For some tests, relevance may be related to the age of the patient (e.g., *IDH1/IDH2* gene testing of a diffuse glioma that is negative for the IDH1 R132H variant protein in elderly versus young adult patients). The reader is referred to the commentaries under each molecular parameter for further information.  In many instances in this dataset, the term ‘variant’ or ‘sequence alteration’ is used in place of the term ‘mutation’, based on the consensus recommendations of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics, the Association for Molecular Pathology, the Clinical Genome Resource, Cancer Genomics Consortium and the Variant Interpretation for Cancer Consortium.[3](#_ENREF_3),[4](#_ENREF_4)  The use of published algorithms may be helpful in some situations, such as for [molecular biomarker testing for the diagnosis of diffuse gliomas](https://documents.cap.org/documents/diffuse_gliomas_algorithm.pdf).[5](#_ENREF_5) Diagnostic algorithms can be beneficial to assist with stepwise decisions, especially when resources are limited. However, diagnostic algorithms can be overly rigid and have the potential to skew usage towards select molecular assays in place of acceptable alternative surrogate markers.  In many jurisdictions, it is a requirement to maintain records associated with molecular diagnostic marker testing, which can include the molecular platform used, the antibody clone, controls, validation, and specific methodology deployed etc. Documentation of these details should be considered according to local requirements and best practice procedures.  In addition to reporting the significant alterations found in multi-gene molecular tests, consideration should be given to reporting ‘negative’ or non-significant findings in summary format, for example, that ‘no other relevant gene alterations were observed’.[6](#_ENREF_6) Documentation of the method and full gene list will allow for future retrieval and review if required.  Table 6 describes genetic CNS tumour syndromes summarised from the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification.[1](#_ENREF_1)  **Tables 3-6** (See end of the document for tables) References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Buckland ME, Sarkar C, Santosh V, Al-Hussaini M, Park SH, Tihan T, Ng HK and Komori T (2023). Announcing the Asian Oceanian Society of Neuropathology guidelines for Adapting Diagnostic Approaches for Practical Taxonomy in Resource-Restrained Regions (AOSNP-ADAPTR). *Brain Pathol*:e13201.  3 Horak P, Griffith M, Danos AM, Pitel BA, Madhavan S, Liu X, Chow C, Williams H, Carmody L, Barrow-Laing L, Rieke D, Kreutzfeldt S, Stenzinger A, Tamborero D, Benary M, Rajagopal PS, Ida CM, Lesmana H, Satgunaseelan L, Merker JD, Tolstorukov MY, Campregher PV, Warner JL, Rao S, Natesan M, Shen H, Venstrom J, Roy S, Tao K, Kanagal-Shamanna R, Xu X, Ritter DI, Pagel K, Krysiak K, Dubuc A, Akkari YM, Li XS, Lee J, King I, Raca G, Wagner AH, Li MM, Plon SE, Kulkarni S, Griffith OL, Chakravarty D and Sonkin D (2022). Standards for the classification of pathogenicity of somatic variants in cancer (oncogenicity): Joint recommendations of Clinical Genome Resource (ClinGen), Cancer Genomics Consortium (CGC), and Variant Interpretation for Cancer Consortium (VICC). *Genet Med* 24(5):986-998.  4 Richards S, Aziz N, Bale S, Bick D, Das S, Gastier-Foster J, Grody WW, Hegde M, Lyon E, Spector E, Voelkerding K and Rehm HL (2015). Standards and guidelines for the interpretation of sequence variants: a joint consensus recommendation of the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and the Association for Molecular Pathology. *Genet Med* 17(5):405-424.  5 Brat DJ, Aldape K, Bridge JA, Canoll P, Colman H, Hameed MR, Harris BT, Hattab EM, Huse JT, Jenkins RB, Lopez-Terrada DH, McDonald WC, Rodriguez FJ, Souter LH, Colasacco C, Thomas NE, Yount MH, van den Bent MJ and Perry A (2022). Molecular Biomarker Testing for the Diagnosis of Diffuse Gliomas. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 146(5):547-574.  6 Sahm F, Brandner S, Bertero L, Capper D, French PJ, Figarella-Branger D, Giangaspero F, Haberler C, Hegi ME, Kristensen BW, Kurian KM, Preusser M, Tops BBJ, van den Bent M, Wick W, Reifenberger G and Wesseling P (2023). Molecular diagnostic tools for the World Health Organization (WHO) 2021 classification of gliomas, glioneuronal and neuronal tumors; an EANO guideline. *Neuro Oncol* 25(10):1731-1749.  7 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Biopsy Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-biopsy-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024).  8 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Resection Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-resection-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024). | | |
| Non-core | ADEQUACY OF SPECIMEN FOR HISTOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT | * Specimen is adequate for analysis * Specimen is inadequate for analysis (select all that apply) * Crush * Autolysis * Cautery * Necrosis * Decalcification * Tumour cell quantity * Fixation issues, *specify* * Other, *specify*   **Representative blocks for ancillary studies**, specify those blocks best representing tumour and/or normal tissue for further study | The 2021 WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification uses histology, immunohistochemistry (IHC) and molecular parameters to define many tumour entities.[1](#_ENREF_1) Procuring viable and adequate tumour tissue allows appropriate histological and molecular assessment. However, the requirements for an adequate specimen for molecular assessment are not always the same as those for histological assessment. For example, ischemic times are critical for the quality of nucleic acid in general; the sooner samples can be frozen or fixed, the better. If immediate freezing or immediate appropriate fixation is not possible, placement in a refrigerator may reduce the degradation of nucleic acids.  Crush or freezing artefacts may affect adequacy for histopathology, including IHC or in situ hybridisation (ISH) testing, but do not often affect adequacy for molecular assays. Samples embedded in optimal cutting temperature (OCT) compound for cryostat sectioning can be a good source, and an advantage of using such samples is that one can evaluate tumour cell quantity as well as quality by checking histological sections of each sample.  Formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue samples also often provide a valuable source of information for molecular assessment. FFPE samples, however, can sometimes be more difficult for molecular biology assays because of fixation issues (such as overfixation and decalcification) that often cause nucleic acid degradation, resulting in fragmented DNA and RNA transcripts. Nonetheless, many laboratories have optimised molecular assays for FFPE tissue, given its commonplace nature.  Histological examination of tissue specimens used for nucleic acid extraction and subsequent molecular testing is essential to assure that vital tumour tissue with sufficient neoplastic cell content is being analysed. In certain cases, microdissection of cellular tumour areas may be required to ensure sensitivity of molecular analysis. Reference 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. |  |
| Core | ***ALK/ROS1/MET/*NTRK FAMILY ALTERATIONSc** | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHODd  (select all that apply)   * Immunohistochemistry (IHC) * In situ hybridisation (ISH) * Next generation sequencing (NGS) * Other, *specify* | ***ALK* fusion or rearrangement**  The *ALK* (Anaplastic Lymphoma Kinase) gene (2p23) belongs to the insulin receptor superfamily of receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs) and activates multiple downstream signal transduction pathways, including MAPK/PI3K/AKT/mTOR and JAK/STAT pathways.[1](#_ENREF_1) In cancer, *ALK* can be activated by gene fusions or point mutations/variants. Among gliomas, *ALK* fusions are mostly restricted to Infant-type hemispheric glioma (IHG) that are characterised by RTK gene fusions involving *ALK, ROS1, NTRK* or *MET*.[2](#_ENREF_2),[3](#_ENREF_3)  *ALK* fusions have been reported in about a third (39/130) of IHGs.[2](#_ENREF_2) Thirteen different fusion partners have been observed.[2](#_ENREF_2) All *ALK* fusions contain the complete ALK kinase domain at the C-terminal end, while the N-terminal partners retain variable domains in the chimeric protein, although most N-terminal partners have a coiled-coil or dimerisation domain.[4](#_ENREF_4)  *ALK* fusions can be detected by ISH using dual-label break apart probes, next generation sequencing (NGS)-based gene fusion panel sequencing or whole transcriptome sequencing. Fusions lead to increased ALK protein expression that can be detected by IHC, a common method used to identify ALK-activated tumours.  In a number of jurisdictions, IHC assays have been approved as companion diagnostics to aid in the identification of patients eligible for treatment with ALK inhibitors like crizotinib.[5](#_ENREF_5),[6](#_ENREF_6)  The most common indications for *ALK* fusion testing in CNS tumour diagnostics include intracerebral metastases of NSCLC (non-small cell lung carcinoma) in adults and a differential diagnosis of IHG in children.[7](#_ENREF_7) Among non-glial tumours that occasionally involve the CNS, ALK-positive anaplastic large cell lymphomas are characterised by oncogenic *ALK* fusions. *ALK* fusions have also been noted in ALK-positive histiocytosis, which is a novel type of systemic histiocytic proliferative disorder occurring predominantly in young children, rarely showing exclusive involvement of the CNS.[8](#_ENREF_8),[9](#_ENREF_9)  In addition to being a diagnostic marker for IHGs, *ALK* fusions also appear to be prognostic in this tumour type, although additional investigation is needed. One study observed a higher 5-year overall survival rate in patients with *ALK* rearranged tumours (53.8%), as compared to *ROS* and *NTRK* altered tumours.[3](#_ENREF_3) *ALK* rearranged tumours with low grade histology were diagnosed at an older age and had better survival rates, as compared to those of patients with *ALK* altered high grade gliomas.    The presence of *ALK* fusions also provides opportunity for targeted therapy using ALK inhibitors, and early experience has demonstrated responses.[7](#_ENREF_7),[10](#_ENREF_10) Interestingly, different *ALK* fusion-positive tumours have varying sensitivity to ALK inhibitors.[4](#_ENREF_4)  Investigation of *ALK* alteration is a core element for infant-type hemispheric glioma.  ***ROS1* fusion or rearrangement**  The *ROS1* (ROS proto-oncogene 1) gene (6q22.1) closely resembles *ALK* both in sequence and structure. Both receptors signal via the RAS/MAPK as well as the JAK/STAT and PI3K/AKT/mTOR pathways.[7](#_ENREF_7) *ROS1* fusions arise through intrachromosomal 6q micro-deletions in IDH-wildtype glioblastomas, although they are very rare as indicated by only 3 of 520 tumours in the Cancer Genome Atlas cohort.[7](#_ENREF_7) *ROS1* fusions are also reported in IHG.[2](#_ENREF_2),[3](#_ENREF_3) In a series of 118 infants with IHG, 7 (4%) were diagnosed with a *ROS1* fusion.[3](#_ENREF_3) Clark et al[2](#_ENREF_2) (2020) showed *ROS1* fusion as a driving alteration in 9 out of 130 cases.  Immunohistochemistry (IHC), ISH (break apart probes), and DNA- or RNA-based NGS (custom panels or commercially available panels) can be used to detect *ROS1* fusion. However, each of these methods has limitations. IHC can be used as a screening method, yet it may identify tumours with increased protein expression in the absence of a fusion. Therefore, in case of a positive ROS1 immunostaining, confirmation with either ISH or NGS should be performed.[11](#_ENREF_11)  *ROS1* fusions, though rare, are a diagnostic marker for IHGs in the appropriate clinical and radiological setting and also provide options for targeted therapy. Furthermore, one study reported that patients with tumours that harboured *ROS1* alterations had a lower 5-year overall survival rate, as compared to those with *ALK* alterations (25% versus 53.8%).[3](#_ENREF_3)  Reports on successful targeted treatment of CNS tumours in children with *ROS1*-positive fusions such as IHG are anecdotal, but responses have been reported.[12](#_ENREF_12),[13](#_ENREF_13)  Investigation of *ROS1* alteration is a core element for infant-type hemispheric glioma.  **NTRK family alterations**  The neurotrophic tyrosine receptor kinase (NTRK) genes include *NTRK1* (1q23.1)*, NTRK2* (9p21.33)*, and NTRK3* (15q25.3) and encode tropomyosin receptor kinases (TRKs), a family of RTKs involved in the development and maturation of the central and peripheral nervous system.  Although oncogenic variants and alternative splicing occur, fusions are the most common alterations of NTRKin tumours. The most common alteration is a fusion between an NTRK gene and another N-terminal partner. All these aberrations result in the constitutive activation of the kinase due to loss of the extracellular domain.[4](#_ENREF_4)  NTRK fusions are reported in about 4% of paediatric gliomas and most of these are high grade. They are most prevalent in IHG.[2](#_ENREF_2),[3](#_ENREF_3),[14](#_ENREF_14) Clark et al[2](#_ENREF_2) (2020) reported that the most commonly targeted genes in their series were in *NTRK1/2/3*. *NTRK2* was found with numerous novel partners but was largely seen in other glioma subtypes (e.g., H3K27M in midline regions), suggesting an important difference in *NTRK2* compared to *NTRK1/3* fusion–positive cases.  Among adult CNS tumours, NTRK fusions have been reported at a frequency of 1-2% in glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype.[15](#_ENREF_15) They have also been described in approximately 2% of pilocytic astrocytomas (PAs)[16](#_ENREF_16), and rarely in diffuse low grade gliomas, MAPK pathway-altered.[17](#_ENREF_17)  NTRK fusion genes in CNS tumours can be assessed by ISH, reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) or RNA-based sequencing (either panel based or whole transcriptome). Endogenous and physiological NTRK expression renders assessment by IHC in the nervous system challenging and thus molecular techniques are recommended.[18](#_ENREF_18)  NTRKfusions are diagnostic markers of IHGs and also appear to carry prognostic significance. In one study,[3](#_ENREF_3) it was reported that NTRK fusion-positive tumours had an intermediate prognosis, as compared to *ALK*- and *ROS*-altered tumours in that the 5-year overall survival rate was 42.9%.  NTRK fusion provides an opportunity for targeted therapy with specific small molecule inhibitors. Larotrectinib and entrectinib have been conditionally approved by both the European Medicines Agency and the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for NTRK fusion-positive cancers. Additional data regarding the efficacy of NTRK inhibitors in adult and paediatric CNS tumour patients are needed.[4](#_ENREF_4),[7](#_ENREF_7)  Investigation of NTRK alteration is a core element for infant-type hemispheric glioma.  ***MET* alterations**  The *MET* oncogene (7q31.2) encodes hepatocyte growth factor/HGF, an RTK that plays a pivotal role in differentiation, cell proliferation, angiogenesis, migration, invasion, genomic stability and resistance to therapy.[7](#_ENREF_7) Dysregulation of MET signalling and activation of downstream pathways (RAS/MAPK, PI3K/AKT, and STAT pathways) can be caused by various mechanisms, including *MET* amplification, point mutation, fusion and *MET* exon skipping alteration.[7](#_ENREF_7),[19](#_ENREF_19),[20](#_ENREF_20)  Amplifications of *MET* have been reported in 0.7-6.2 % of IDH-wildtype glioblastomas and 5.2-17 % of IDH-mutant astrocytomas. They have also been identified in 20% of diffuse midline gliomas H3 K27-altered, in 10% of diffuse hemispheric gliomas H3 G34-mutant, and in gliomas arising after irradiation.[21](#_ENREF_21),[22](#_ENREF_22)  A variety of *MET* fusions have been detected in CNS tumours. *MET* fusions with variable N -terminal fusion partners have been described mainly in diffuse paediatric-type high grade gliomas, H3-wildtype and IDH-wildtype, IHG and in 3% of IDH-wildtype glioblastoma.[2-4](#_ENREF_2),[7](#_ENREF_7),[23](#_ENREF_23) Rarely, *MET* alterations have been reported in diffuse low grade gliomas, MAPK pathway-altered.[17](#_ENREF_17)  *MET* fusions in adult patients have been reported in a small subset of IDH-mutant astrocytomas (mainly in high grade and recurrent tumours) and in IDH-wildtype glioblastomas.[4](#_ENREF_4),[24](#_ENREF_24),[25](#_ENREF_25)  Exon skipping alterations of MET exon 14 and exon 7-8 have not been analysed to any significant extent in CNS tumours. However, few studies have reported these alterations in 6%-8% of high grade gliomas.[7](#_ENREF_7),[25](#_ENREF_25) Similarly, the frequency of *MET*sequence variants in CNS tumours has not been precisely defined.[7](#_ENREF_7)  There is no established and validated diagnostic test to assess *MET* alterations in CNS tumours by IHC. Specific MET protein antibodies have been tested to detect *MET* amplifications in gliomas, but standardised methods do not exist. Furthermore, the usefulness of MET IHC to detect *MET* fusions and exon skipping alterations is unclear. Hence, the preferred method is molecular detection of *MET* alterations.  Due to the frequent occurrence of multiple *MET* alterations simultaneously (e.g., amplifications, fusions with various breakpoints, exon skipping etc.), a hybrid capture based (targeted) DNA/RNA sequencing approach is recommended.[7](#_ENREF_7),[20](#_ENREF_20)  The detection of a *MET* fusion can aid in establishing the diagnosis of IHGs and also provides options for targeted therapy. The effectiveness of MET inhibitors in CNS tumours have been investigated in several phase I and II studies, but the effectiveness in biomarker-stratified cohorts with *MET* alterations has largely not been assessed.[26](#_ENREF_26)  Investigation of *MET* alteration is a core element for infant-type hemispheric glioma. References 1 Hallberg B and Palmer RH (2016). The role of the ALK receptor in cancer biology. *Ann Oncol* 27 Suppl 3:iii4-iii15.  2 Clarke M, Mackay A, Ismer B, Pickles JC, Tatevossian RG, Newman S, Bale TA, Stoler I, Izquierdo E, Temelso S, Carvalho DM, Molinari V, Burford A, Howell L, Virasami A, Fairchild AR, Avery A, Chalker J, Kristiansen M, Haupfear K, Dalton JD, Orisme W, Wen J, Hubank M, Kurian KM, Rowe C, Maybury M, Crosier S, Knipstein J, Schüller U, Kordes U, Kram DE, Snuderl M, Bridges L, Martin AJ, Doey LJ, Al-Sarraj S, Chandler C, Zebian B, Cairns C, Natrajan R, Boult JKR, Robinson SP, Sill M, Dunkel IJ, Gilheeney SW, Rosenblum MK, Hughes D, Proszek PZ, Macdonald TJ, Preusser M, Haberler C, Slavc I, Packer R, Ng HK, Caspi S, Popović M, Faganel Kotnik B, Wood MD, Baird L, Davare MA, Solomon DA, Olsen TK, Brandal P, Farrell M, Cryan JB, Capra M, Karremann M, Schittenhelm J, Schuhmann MU, Ebinger M, Dinjens WNM, Kerl K, Hettmer S, Pietsch T, Andreiuolo F, Driever PH, Korshunov A, Hiddingh L, Worst BC, Sturm D, Zuckermann M, Witt O, Bloom T, Mitchell C, Miele E, Colafati GS, Diomedi-Camassei F, Bailey S, Moore AS, Hassall TEG, Lowis SP, Tsoli M, Cowley MJ, Ziegler DS, Karajannis MA, Aquilina K, Hargrave DR, Carceller F, Marshall LV, von Deimling A, Kramm CM, Pfister SM, Sahm F, Baker SJ, Mastronuzzi A, Carai A, Vinci M, Capper D, Popov S, Ellison DW, Jacques TS, Jones DTW and Jones C (2020). Infant High-Grade Gliomas Comprise Multiple Subgroups Characterized by Novel Targetable Gene Fusions and Favorable Outcomes. *Cancer Discov* 10(7):942-963.  3 Guerreiro Stucklin AS, Ryall S, Fukuoka K, Zapotocky M, Lassaletta A, Li C, Bridge T, Kim B, Arnoldo A, Kowalski PE, Zhong Y, Johnson M, Li C, Ramani AK, Siddaway R, Nobre LF, de Antonellis P, Dunham C, Cheng S, Boué DR, Finlay JL, Coven SL, de Prada I, Perez-Somarriba M, Faria CC, Grotzer MA, Rushing E, Sumerauer D, Zamecnik J, Krskova L, Garcia Ariza M, Cruz O, Morales La Madrid A, Solano P, Terashima K, Nakano Y, Ichimura K, Nagane M, Sakamoto H, Gil-da-Costa MJ, Silva R, Johnston DL, Michaud J, Wilson B, van Landeghem FKH, Oviedo A, McNeely PD, Crooks B, Fried I, Zhukova N, Hansford JR, Nageswararao A, Garzia L, Shago M, Brudno M, Irwin MS, Bartels U, Ramaswamy V, Bouffet E, Taylor MD, Tabori U and Hawkins C (2019). Alterations in ALK/ROS1/NTRK/MET drive a group of infantile hemispheric gliomas. *Nat Commun* 10(1):4343.  4 Roosen M, Odé Z, Bunt J and Kool M (2022). The oncogenic fusion landscape in pediatric CNS neoplasms. *Acta Neuropathol* 143(4):427-451.  5 Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration (2015). *Letter to Ventana Medical Systems on approval of premarket authorization application for the VENTANA ALK (D5F3) CDx Assay*. Available from: http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/cdrh\_docs/pdf14/P140025a.pdf (Accessed 1st March 2024).  6 Marchetti A, Di Lorito A, Pace MV, Iezzi M, Felicioni L, D'Antuono T, Filice G, Guetti L, Mucilli F and Buttitta F (2016). ALK Protein Analysis by IHC Staining after Recent Regulatory Changes: A Comparison of Two Widely Used Approaches, Revision of the Literature, and a New Testing Algorithm. *J Thorac Oncol* 11(4):487-495.  7 Capper D, Reifenberger G, French PJ, Schweizer L, Weller M, Touat M, Niclou SP, Euskirchen P, Haberler C, Hegi ME, Brandner S, Le Rhun E, Rudà R, Sanson M, Tabatabai G, Sahm F, Wen PY, Wesseling P, Preusser M and van den Bent MJ (2023). EANO guideline on rational molecular testing of gliomas, glioneuronal and neuronal tumors in adults for targeted therapy selection. *Neuro Oncol* 25(5):813-826.  8 Deckert M, Batchelor T, Ferry JA, Paulus W, Weller M, Hoang-Xuan K and Nagane M (2021). Anaplastic large cell lymphoma (ALK+/ALK-). In: *Central Nervous System Tumours. WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition*, Reifenberger G and Soffietti R (eds), IARC Press, Lyon, France.  9 Lucas CG, Gilani A, Solomon DA, Liang X, Maher OM, Chamyan G, Kleinschmidt-Demasters BK and Perry A (2019). ALK-positive histiocytosis with KIF5B-ALK fusion in the central nervous system. *Acta Neuropathol* 138(2):335-337.  10 Pearson ADJ, Barry E, Mossé YP, Ligas F, Bird N, de Rojas T, Zimmerman ZF, Wilner K, Woessmann W, Weiner S, Weigel B, Venkatramani R, Valteau D, Trahair T, Smith M, Singh S, Selvaggi G, Scobie N, Schleiermacher G, Richardson N, Park J, Nysom K, Norga K, Merino M, McDonough J, Matloub Y, Marshall LV, Lowe E, Lesa G, Irwin M, Karres D, Gajjar A, Doz F, Fox E, DuBois SG, Donoghue M, Casanova M, Caron H, Buenger V, Bradford D, Blanc P, Barone A, Reaman G and Vassal G (2021). Second Paediatric Strategy Forum for anaplastic lymphoma kinase (ALK) inhibition in paediatric malignancies: ACCELERATE in collaboration with the European Medicines Agency with the participation of the Food and Drug Administration. *Eur J Cancer* 157:198-213.  11 Davies KD, Le AT, Sheren J, Nijmeh H, Gowan K, Jones KL, Varella-Garcia M, Aisner DL and Doebele RC (2018). Comparison of Molecular Testing Modalities for Detection of ROS1 Rearrangements in a Cohort of Positive Patient Samples. *J Thorac Oncol* 13(10):1474-1482.  12 Mayr L, Guntner AS, Madlener S, Schmook MT, Peyrl A, Azizi AA, Dieckmann K, Reisinger D, Stepien NM, Schramm K, Laemmerer A, Jones DTW, Ecker J, Sahm F, Milde T, Pajtler KW, Blattner-Johnson M, Strbac M, Dorfer C, Czech T, Kirchhofer D, Gabler L, Berger W, Haberler C, Müllauer L, Buchberger W, Slavc I, Lötsch-Gojo D and Gojo J (2020). Cerebrospinal Fluid Penetration and Combination Therapy of Entrectinib for Disseminated ROS1/NTRK-Fusion Positive Pediatric High-Grade Glioma. *J Pers Med* 10(4).  13 Papusha L, Zaytseva M, Panferova A, Druy A, Valiakhmetova A, Artemov A, Salnikova E, Kislyakov A, Imyanitov E, Karachunsky A, Maschan A, Hwang EI, Novichkova G and Packer RJ (2022). Two clinically distinct cases of infant hemispheric glioma carrying ZCCHC8:ROS1 fusion and responding to entrectinib. *Neuro Oncol* 24(6):1029-1031.  14 Wu G, Diaz AK, Paugh BS, Rankin SL, Ju B, Li Y, Zhu X, Qu C, Chen X, Zhang J, Easton J, Edmonson M, Ma X, Lu C, Nagahawatte P, Hedlund E, Rusch M, Pounds S, Lin T, Onar-Thomas A, Huether R, Kriwacki R, Parker M, Gupta P, Becksfort J, Wei L, Mulder HL, Boggs K, Vadodaria B, Yergeau D, Russell JC, Ochoa K, Fulton RS, Fulton LL, Jones C, Boop FA, Broniscer A, Wetmore C, Gajjar A, Ding L, Mardis ER, Wilson RK, Taylor MR, Downing JR, Ellison DW, Zhang J and Baker SJ (2014). The genomic landscape of diffuse intrinsic pontine glioma and pediatric non-brainstem high-grade glioma. *Nat Genet* 46(5):444-450.  15 Gambella A, Senetta R, Collemi G, Vallero SG, Monticelli M, Cofano F, Zeppa P, Garbossa D, Pellerino A, Rudà R, Soffietti R, Fagioli F, Papotti M, Cassoni P and Bertero L (2020). NTRK Fusions in Central Nervous System Tumors: A Rare, but Worthy Target. *Int J Mol Sci* 21(3).  16 Tihan T, Figarella-Branger D, Giannini C, Pfister SM, Rodriguez FJ, Jacques TS, Hawkins CE, Tabori U, Varlet P, Gupta K and DTW J (2021). Pilocytic astrocytoma. In: *Central Nervous System Tumours. WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition*, Reifenberger G and Perry A (eds), IARC Press, Lyon, France.  17 Ryall S, Zapotocky M, Fukuoka K, Nobre L, Guerreiro Stucklin A, Bennett J, Siddaway R, Li C, Pajovic S, Arnoldo A, Kowalski PE, Johnson M, Sheth J, Lassaletta A, Tatevossian RG, Orisme W, Qaddoumi I, Surrey LF, Li MM, Waanders AJ, Gilheeney S, Rosenblum M, Bale T, Tsang DS, Laperriere N, Kulkarni A, Ibrahim GM, Drake J, Dirks P, Taylor MD, Rutka JT, Laughlin S, Shroff M, Shago M, Hazrati LN, D'Arcy C, Ramaswamy V, Bartels U, Huang A, Bouffet E, Karajannis MA, Santi M, Ellison DW, Tabori U and Hawkins C (2020). Integrated Molecular and Clinical Analysis of 1,000 Pediatric Low-Grade Gliomas. *Cancer Cell* 37(4):569-583.e565.  18 Marchiò C, Scaltriti M, Ladanyi M, Iafrate AJ, Bibeau F, Dietel M, Hechtman JF, Troiani T, López-Rios F, Douillard JY, Andrè F and Reis-Filho JS (2019). ESMO recommendations on the standard methods to detect NTRK fusions in daily practice and clinical research. *Ann Oncol* 30(9):1417-1427.  19 Cheng F and Guo D (2019). MET in glioma: signaling pathways and targeted therapies. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 38(1):270.  20 Guo R, Luo J, Chang J, Rekhtman N, Arcila M and Drilon A (2020). MET-dependent solid tumours - molecular diagnosis and targeted therapy. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 17(9):569-587.  21 Brennan CW, Verhaak RG, McKenna A, Campos B, Noushmehr H, Salama SR, Zheng S, Chakravarty D, Sanborn JZ, Berman SH, Beroukhim R, Bernard B, Wu CJ, Genovese G, Shmulevich I, Barnholtz-Sloan J, Zou L, Vegesna R, Shukla SA, Ciriello G, Yung WK, Zhang W, Sougnez C, Mikkelsen T, Aldape K, Bigner DD, Van Meir EG, Prados M, Sloan A, Black KL, Eschbacher J, Finocchiaro G, Friedman W, Andrews DW, Guha A, Iacocca M, O'Neill BP, Foltz G, Myers J, Weisenberger DJ, Penny R, Kucherlapati R, Perou CM, Hayes DN, Gibbs R, Marra M, Mills GB, Lander E, Spellman P, Wilson R, Sander C, Weinstein J, Meyerson M, Gabriel S, Laird PW, Haussler D, Getz G and Chin L (2013). The somatic genomic landscape of glioblastoma. *Cell* 155(2):462-477.  22 Kwak Y, Kim SI, Park CK, Paek SH, Lee ST and Park SH (2015). C-MET overexpression and amplification in gliomas. *Int J Clin Exp Pathol* 8(11):14932-14938.  23 International Cancer Genome Consortium PedBrain Tumor Project (2016). Recurrent MET fusion genes represent a drug target in pediatric glioblastoma. *Nat Med* 22(11):1314-1320.  24 Shirahata M, Ono T, Stichel D, Schrimpf D, Reuss DE, Sahm F, Koelsche C, Wefers A, Reinhardt A, Huang K, Sievers P, Shimizu H, Nanjo H, Kobayashi Y, Miyake Y, Suzuki T, Adachi JI, Mishima K, Sasaki A, Nishikawa R, Bewerunge-Hudler M, Ryzhova M, Absalyamova O, Golanov A, Sinn P, Platten M, Jungk C, Winkler F, Wick A, Hänggi D, Unterberg A, Pfister SM, Jones DTW, van den Bent M, Hegi M, French P, Baumert BG, Stupp R, Gorlia T, Weller M, Capper D, Korshunov A, Herold-Mende C, Wick W, Louis DN and von Deimling A (2018). Novel, improved grading system(s) for IDH-mutant astrocytic gliomas. *Acta Neuropathol* 136(1):153-166.  25 Woo HY, Na K, Yoo J, Chang JH, Park YN, Shim HS and Kim SH (2020). Glioblastomas harboring gene fusions detected by next-generation sequencing. *Brain Tumor Pathol* 37(4):136-144.  26 Hu H, Mu Q, Bao Z, Chen Y, Liu Y, Chen J, Wang K, Wang Z, Nam Y, Jiang B, Sa JK, Cho HJ, Her NG, Zhang C, Zhao Z, Zhang Y, Zeng F, Wu F, Kang X, Liu Y, Qian Z, Wang Z, Huang R, Wang Q, Zhang W, Qiu X, Li W, Nam DH, Fan X, Wang J and Jiang T (2018). Mutational Landscape of Secondary Glioblastoma Guides MET-Targeted Trial in Brain Tumor. *Cell* 175(6):1665-1678.e1618. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5.  d Repeat for each alteration. |
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| Core | *BRAF* ALTERATIONSc | ***BRAF* variant**   * Indeterminate * Absent * BRAF p.V600E (c.1799T>A) variant present * Other BRAF sequence variant present, *specify*   VARIANTS ASSESSED  (select all that apply)   * p.V600E * Any variant in exon 15 * Other *BRAF* variant, *specify*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * NGS * PCR-based method * IHC   **BRAF p.V600E expression**   * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive * Other, *specify*   ***BRAF* rearrangement/duplication**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   VARIANTS ASSESSED  (select all that apply)   * *KIAA1549::BRAF* fusion * *BRAF::RAF1* fusion * Other, *specify*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * ISH * RT-PCR * Array-based method * RNA-sequencing * Other, *specify* | ***BRAF* genetic alterations**  The *BRAF* (V-Raf Murine Sarcoma Viral Oncogene Homolog B protooncogene; 7q34) p.V600E sequence variant in exon 15, which is the most common *BRAF* alteration, affects a large variety of CNS tumours. It has been reported in 96% of papillary craniopharyngiomas, 65-75% of pleomorphic xanthoastrocytomas with and without anaplasia, 25-60% of gangliogliomas, 20-25% of dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumours, and 7% of pilocytic astrocytomas (PAs).[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) *BRAF* variants have also been detected in about one-half of epithelioid glioblastomas and in up to 25% of diffuse astrocytic gliomas in children and young adults.[3](#_ENREF_3) The detection of a *BRAF* sequence variant has diagnostic implications in specific tumours, such as pleomorphic xanthoastrocytomas, ganglioglioma, dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumour, or epithelioid glioblastoma. Moreover, the detection of the variant can help to distinguish a ganglioglioma from the cortical infiltration of a diffuse glioma.  Besides its diagnostic value, *BRAF* sequence variants may allow for targeted therapy against mutant BRAF p.V600 protein. In paediatric low grade gliomas, the *BRAF* p.V600E sequence variant has been linked to poor response to conventional cytotoxic therapy and poor prognosis.[4](#_ENREF_4) In routine settings, BRAF p.V600E can be identified by IHC or by molecular approaches, such as high-resolution melting analysis, pyrosequencing, allele-specific quantitative polymerase chain reaction (ASQ-PCR), droplet-based digital PCR (ddPCR), NGS and Sanger sequencing.[5](#_ENREF_5) Although Sanger sequencing is a well-established tool to detect *BRAF* p.V600E and other rarer *BRAF* variants, it has a detection threshold of 20% (of mutant alleles). In samples that contain a minority of mutant cells, molecular methods with much lower thresholds, such as ASQ-PCR, ddPCR , or NGS, are more sensitive.  **BRAF p.V600E immunohistochemistry**  Immunohistochemistry (IHC) is a commonly used method to detect BRAF p.V600E mutant protein in formalin fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tissue of CNS tumours. Monoclonal antibodies (such as clone VE1 and clone V600E) against BRAF p.V600E are commercially available. Clone VE1 is the most widely used and is sensitive and specific.[6](#_ENREF_6) The concordance between IHC and detection of the BRAF p.V600E variant by molecular genetic techniques demonstrates variability between studies in different types of neoplasms, but the overall concordance is strong.[6](#_ENREF_6) IHC plays a key role when FFPE material available is not sufficient for molecular genetic analysis and when low tumour cell content may lead to false-negative results.  ***BRAF* rearrangement/duplication**  Circumscribed duplication of the *BRAF* locus is a common copy number variation (CNV) that occurs in PAs of the cerebellum, hypothalamus, or optic chiasm, but may occur in PAs from other sites as well.  The mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) signalling pathway is a key signalling pathway in the development of PA. The major alterations leading to constitutive activation of MAPK in PAs are gene fusions and missense variants involving *BRAF*, in particular *BRAF* p.V600E.  Identification of the *KIAA1549*::*BRAF* fusion has been used as a diagnostic marker for PAs. It has also been observed in pilomyxoid astrocytoma, ganglioglioma and diffuse leptomeningeal glioneuronal tumour (DLGNT). *KIAA1549*::*BRAF* fusions, while all coding for a fusion protein that includes the activating *BRAF* kinase domain, can be derived from at least nine different fusion site combinations. This makes RT-PCR a difficult method to identify or exclude all variants of the fusion gene. ISH analysis or ddPCR, which demonstrates the tandem duplication at 7q34, is an indirect way to indicate the presence of a *KIAA1549*::*BRAF* fusion. However, *BRAF* copy number gains due to trisomy 7 or whole 7q gains are common in glioblastomas, IDH-wildtype, and should not be mistaken as circumscribed *BRAF* duplication or *BRAF* fusion.  RNA sequencing can identify all types of *BRAF* and *RAF1* fusion variants in a single experiment. Also, because of its association with a tandem duplication, the presence of a *KIAA1549::BRAF* fusion can often be inferred from the CNV plot as obtained by methylation profiling.[7](#_ENREF_7)  Investigation of *BRAF* alteration is a core element for polymorphous low grade neuroepithelial tumour of the young and ganglioglioma; also, *BRAF* alteration is a frequent cause MAPK pathway activation which is a core element for PA. References 1 Brastianos PK, Taylor-Weiner A, Manley PE, Jones RT, Dias-Santagata D, Thorner AR, Lawrence MS, Rodriguez FJ, Bernardo LA, Schubert L, Sunkavalli A, Shillingford N, Calicchio ML, Lidov HG, Taha H, Martinez-Lage M, Santi M, Storm PB, Lee JY, Palmer JN, Adappa ND, Scott RM, Dunn IF, Laws ER, Jr., Stewart C, Ligon KL, Hoang MP, Van Hummelen P, Hahn WC, Louis DN, Resnick AC, Kieran MW, Getz G and Santagata S (2014). Exome sequencing identifies BRAF mutations in papillary craniopharyngiomas. *Nat Genet* 46(2):161-165.  2 Schindler G, Capper D, Meyer J, Janzarik W, Omran H, Herold-Mende C, Schmieder K, Wesseling P, Mawrin C, Hasselblatt M, Louis DN, Korshunov A, Pfister S, Hartmann C, Paulus W, Reifenberger G and von Deimling A (2011). Analysis of BRAF V600E mutation in 1,320 nervous system tumors reveals high mutation frequencies in pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma, ganglioglioma and extra-cerebellar pilocytic astrocytoma. *Acta Neuropathol* 121(3):397-405.  3 Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Aisner DL, Birks DK and Foreman NK (2013). Epithelioid GBMs show a high percentage of BRAF V600E mutation. *Am J Surg Pathol* 37(5):685-698.  4 Lassaletta A, Zapotocky M, Mistry M, Ramaswamy V, Honnorat M, Krishnatry R, Guerreiro Stucklin A, Zhukova N, Arnoldo A, Ryall S, Ling C, McKeown T, Loukides J, Cruz O, de Torres C, Ho CY, Packer RJ, Tatevossian R, Qaddoumi I, Harreld JH, Dalton JD, Mulcahy-Levy J, Foreman N, Karajannis MA, Wang S, Snuderl M, Nageswara Rao A, Giannini C, Kieran M, Ligon KL, Garre ML, Nozza P, Mascelli S, Raso A, Mueller S, Nicolaides T, Silva K, Perbet R, Vasiljevic A, Faure Conter C, Frappaz D, Leary S, Crane C, Chan A, Ng HK, Shi ZF, Mao Y, Finch E, Eisenstat D, Wilson B, Carret AS, Hauser P, Sumerauer D, Krskova L, Larouche V, Fleming A, Zelcer S, Jabado N, Rutka JT, Dirks P, Taylor MD, Chen S, Bartels U, Huang A, Ellison DW, Bouffet E, Hawkins C and Tabori U (2017). Therapeutic and Prognostic Implications of BRAF V600E in Pediatric Low-Grade Gliomas. *J Clin Oncol* 35(25):2934-2941.  5 Ihle MA, Fassunke J, Konig K, Grunewald I, Schlaak M, Kreuzberg N, Tietze L, Schildhaus HU, Buttner R and Merkelbach-Bruse S (2014). Comparison of high resolution melting analysis, pyrosequencing, next generation sequencing and immunohistochemistry to conventional Sanger sequencing for the detection of p.V600E and non-p.V600E BRAF mutations. *BMC Cancer* 14:13.  6 Ritterhouse LL and Barletta JA (2015). BRAF V600E mutation-specific antibody: A review. *Semin Diagn Pathol* 32(5):400-408.  7 Stichel D, Schrimpf D, Sievers P, Reinhardt A, Suwala AK, Sill M, Reuss DE, Korshunov A, Casalini BM, Sommerkamp AC, Ecker J, Selt F, Sturm D, Gnekow A, Koch A, Simon M, Hernáiz Driever P, Schüller U, Capper D, van Tilburg CM, Witt O, Milde T, Pfister SM, Jones DTW, von Deimling A, Sahm F and Wefers AK (2021). Accurate calling of KIAA1549-BRAF fusions from DNA of human brain tumours using methylation array-based copy number and gene panel sequencing data. *Neuropathol Appl Neurobiol* 47(3):406-414. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | C19MCALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present with low level gain * Present, *describe including copy number*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * Array-based method * NGS * Other, *specify*   **LIN28A expression (IHC)c**   * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive | Demonstration of C19MC (C19MC microRNA cluster) alteration is required for the diagnosis of the most frequent molecular subtype of embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes (ETMR).[1](#_ENREF_1) This alteration consists of C19MC amplification or fusion, typically a focal high-level amplicon of chromosome 19q13.42 covering a large, poorly characterised microRNA cluster and the miR-371-373 locus, which map about 100 kb apart. The width and the level of gains at this locus, as assessed by array-comparative genomic hybridisation (array-CGH), are variable but always encompass the same miRNA cluster.  Even in the absence of multilayered rosettes, a CNS embryonal tumour with C19MC alteration is diagnosed as ETMR, C19MC-altered.[2](#_ENREF_2) In routine neuropathological practice, fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH) or chromogenic ISH, or high-resolution cytogenetic techniques (e.g., array-CGH, single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) arrays, methylation arrays) can be used to detect amplification of the C19MC region.  A small subset of ETMRs carry *DICER1* sequence variants. ETMRs lacking C19MC and *DICER1* alterations are designated as ETMR, NEC, and those that are not tested for these alterations or in which the test results are inconclusive as ETMR, NOS.[2](#_ENREF_2)  Investigation of C19MC alteration is a core element for embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes. References 1 Ceccom J, Bourdeaut F, Loukh N, Rigau V, Milin S, Takin R, Richer W, Uro-Coste E, Couturier J, Bertozzi AI, Delattre O and Delisle MB (2014). Embryonal tumor with multilayered rosettes: diagnostic tools update and review of the literature. *Clin Neuropathol* 33(1):15-22.  2 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *CDKN2A/B* DELETIONc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Homozygous deletion * Hemizygous/heterozygous deletion   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * Array-based method * NGS * Other, *specify* | Homozygous deletion of the *CDKN2A/B* (cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor 2A/B; 9p21.3) genes are associated with higher grade diffuse gliomas and have been introduced in the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification as a marker for CNS WHO grade 4 IDH-mutant astrocytomas.[1](#_ENREF_1)  In addition, *CDKN2A/B* homozygous deletions have been shown to be a characteristic genetic feature in pleomorphic xanthoastrocytomas, occurring in up to 87% of cases in one series. In this situation, along with *BRAF* p.V600E variant, the *CDKN2A/B* homozygous deletions do not connote more aggressive behaviour.[2](#_ENREF_2)  In meningiomas, homozygous deletion of *CDKN2A/B* is associated with aggressive clinical behaviour and has been introduced as a genetic marker for CNS WHO grade 3 in the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification.  In neuropathological practice, high-resolution cytogenetic and molecular techniques (e.g., array-comparative genomic hybridisation (CGH), single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) arrays, methylation arrays, NGS arrays with copy number plots, ddPCR) can be used to detect homozygous *CDKN2A/B* deletions.  The *CDKN2A* gene encodes the p16 protein, which can be detected using IHC. However, loss of p16 nuclear staining cannot be recommended as a substitute for assessing homozygous *CDKN2A* deletion. In contrast, in one study IHC for MTAP (S-methyl-50-thioadenosinephosphorylase, a product of the *MTAP* gene which is located on chromosome 9p21 in close proximity to the *CDKN2A* and *CDKN2B* loci) was found to show an excellent correlation with *CDKN2A/B* status.[3](#_ENREF_3)  Investigation of *CDKN2A/B* alteration is a core element for astrocytoma, IDH-mutant; diffuse low grade glioma, MAPK pathway-altered; desmoplastic infantile ganglioglioma; and meningioma. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Vaubel RA, Caron AA, Yamada S, Decker PA, Eckel Passow JE, Rodriguez FJ, Nageswara Rao AA, Lachance D, Parney I, Jenkins R and Giannini C (2018). Recurrent copy number alterations in low-grade and anaplastic pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma with and without BRAF V600E mutation. *Brain Pathol* 28(2):172-182.  3 Maragkou T, Reinhard S, Jungo P, Pasquier B, Neuenschwander M, Schucht P, Vassella E and Hewer E (2023). Evaluation of MTAP and p16 immunohistochemical deficiency as surrogate marker for CDKN2A/B homozygous deletion in gliomas. *Pathology* 55(4):466-477. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | CHROMOSOMAL ARM 1p/19q CODELETIONc | * Indeterminate * Absent * None detected * 1p/19q codeletion * 1p only deletion * 19q only deletion * Polysomy, *specify*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * Array-based method (including methylation arrayse) * PCR/Loss of heterozygosity assay * NGS * Other, *specify* | Whole-arm deletions of chromosome arms 1p and 19q together with *IDH1* (isocitrate dehydrogenase (NADP(+)) 1) or *IDH2* missense variants constitute the diagnostic criteria for oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted, CNS WHO grades 2 or 3.[1](#_ENREF_1)  Of note, only whole-arm 1p/19q codeletion combined with an IDH missense variant is diagnostically relevant. Partial deletions on either chromosome arm may be found in other types of diffuse gliomas, includingIDH-wildtype glioblastomas, and are neither diagnostic for IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted oligodendroglial tumours[1](#_ENREF_1) nor associated with favourable patient outcome.[2](#_ENREF_2)Moreover, detection of 1p/19q codeletion in the absence of IDH mutation is suspicious of partial deletions which can be encountered in IDH-wildtype glioblastoma.  Various techniques are being used for the diagnostic assessment of 1p/19q codeletion. Commonly used methods include microsatellite analysis for loss of heterozygosity (LOH), FISH or chromogenic in situ hybridisation (CISH), and multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA), and methylation arrays.  Fluorescence or chromogenic in situ hybridisation can be applied to routine FFPE sections. However, analysis is often restricted to single loci on each chromosome arm, which may not reliably distinguish whole-arm losses from partial deletions. In addition, polysomies of chromosomes 1 or 19 may complicate diagnostic assessment and have been associated with less favourable outcomes.[3](#_ENREF_3)  Loss of heterozygosity (LOH) analysis and MLPA assess multiple loci along each chromosome arm and thereby reduce the risk of false-positive findings due to partial deletions. However, extraction of tumour DNA (and for LOH ideally also of non-tumour DNA extracted from a blood or buccal swab sample) is required for these techniques.  Microarray-based approaches may also be used for diagnostic purposes, including DNA methylation bead arrays that allow for simultaneous detection of 1p/19q codeletion, *MGMT* promoter methylation, and glioma CpG island methylator phenotype (G-CIMP) status indicative ofIDH mutation.[4](#_ENREF_4)  Panel-based NGS approaches have been used for 1p/19q detection and simultaneous sequence alteration analyses of *IDH1* and *IDH2*, as well as other alterations commonly associated with 1p/19q codeletion, such as *TERT* promoter and *CIC* variants. In addition, droplet-based digital PCR (ddPCR) approaches based on single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) on 1p and 19q may be used.  The use of an antibody panel including H3K28me3 (H3K27me3), H3 p.K28M (H3 p.K27M) mutant protein, IDH1 p.R132H,[5](#_ENREF_5) vimentin, and ATRX,[6](#_ENREF_6) has been reported as greatly facilitating recognition of oligodendrogliomas, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted. However, these immunohistochemical approaches are not sufficient to substitute for 1p/19q codeletion testing and hence establishing the diagnosis of IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted oligodendroglioma.  Investigation of 1p/19q alteration is a core element for oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted as was for astrocytoma, IDH-mutant; investigation of 1p copy number loss is a core element for diffuse leptomeningeal glioneuronal tumour. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Vogazianou AP, Chan R, Backlund LM, Pearson DM, Liu L, Langford CF, Gregory SG, Collins VP and Ichimura K (2010). Distinct patterns of 1p and 19q alterations identify subtypes of human gliomas that have different prognoses. *Neuro Oncol* 12(7):664-678.  3 Wiens AL, Cheng L, Bertsch EC, Johnson KA, Zhang S and Hattab EM (2012). Polysomy of chromosomes 1 and/or 19 is common and associated with less favorable clinical outcome in oligodendrogliomas: fluorescent in situ hybridization analysis of 84 consecutive cases. *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol* 71(7):618-624.  4 Wiestler B, Capper D, Hovestadt V, Sill M, Jones DT, Hartmann C, Felsberg J, Platten M, Feiden W, Keyvani K, Pfister SM, Wiestler OD, Meyermann R, Reifenberger G, Pietsch T, von Deimling A, Weller M and Wick W (2014). Assessing CpG island methylator phenotype, 1p/19q codeletion, and MGMT promoter methylation from epigenome-wide data in the biomarker cohort of the NOA-04 trial. *Neuro Oncol* 16(12):1630-1638.  5 Filipski K, Braun Y, Zinke J, Roller B, Baumgarten P, Wagner M, Senft C, Zeiner PS, Ronellenfitsch MW, Steinbach JP, Plate KH, Gasparoni G, Mittelbronn M, Capper D and Harter PN (2019). Lack of H3K27 trimethylation is associated with 1p/19q codeletion in diffuse gliomas. *Acta Neuropathol* 138(2):331-334.  6 Felix M, Friedel D, Jayavelu AK, Filipski K, Reinhardt A, Warnken U, Stichel D, Schrimpf D, Korshunov A, Wang Y, Kessler T, Etminan N, Unterberg A, Herold-Mende C, Heikaus L, Sahm F, Wick W, Harter PN, von Deimling A and Reuss DE (2022). HIP1R and vimentin immunohistochemistry predict 1p/19q status in IDH-mutant glioma. *Neuro Oncol* 24(12):2121-2132. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5.  e Methylation array-based methods may provide strong but circumstantial evidence. |
| Core | CHROMOSOME 7 GAIN (COMBINED WITH CHROMOSOME  10 LOSS)c | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * Array-based method * NGS * Other, *specify* | Based on robust evidence in the literature, the Consortium to Inform Molecular and Practical Approaches to CNS Tumour Taxonomy – Not Official WHO (cIMPACT-NOW) update 3 recommended in 2018 the use of combined whole arm chromosome 7 gain and whole arm chromosome 10 loss (+ 7/− 10) as a molecular criterion sufficient for identifying a histologically lower grade appearing (grade 2 or 3) IDH-wildtype diffuse astrocytic glioma, as glioblastoma IDH-wildtype (CNS WHO grade 4), especially in the elderly.[1](#_ENREF_1) This recommendation has been adopted by the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification.[2](#_ENREF_2)  Partial gains on chromosome 7 and partial losses on chromosome 10 exhibited a diagnostic and prognostic value similar to that of complete +7 (trisomy 7) or complete -10 (monosomy 10).[3](#_ENREF_3) Methods to detect the +7/-10 marker include ISH, droplet-based digital PCR (ddPCR), multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA), NGS, and array-based techniques including those used for methylome profiling.  Investigation of chromosome 7 gain combined with chromosome 10 loss (+7/-10) is a core element for glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype. References 1 Brat DJ, Aldape K, Colman H, Holland EC, Louis DN, Jenkins RB, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Perry A, Reifenberger G, Stupp R, von Deimling A and Weller M (2018). cIMPACT-NOW update 3: recommended diagnostic criteria for "Diffuse astrocytic glioma, IDH-wildtype, with molecular features of glioblastoma, WHO grade IV". *Acta Neuropathol* 136(5):805-810.  2 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  3 Stichel D, Ebrahimi A, Reuss D, Schrimpf D, Ono T, Shirahata M, Reifenberger G, Weller M, Hänggi D, Wick W, Herold-Mende C, Westphal M, Brandner S, Pfister SM, Capper D, Sahm F and von Deimling A (2018). Distribution of EGFR amplification, combined chromosome 7 gain and chromosome 10 loss, and TERT promoter mutation in brain tumors and their potential for the reclassification of IDHwt astrocytoma to glioblastoma. *Acta Neuropathol* 136(5):793-803. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5 |
| Core | *CIC* ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | The *CIC* (capicua transcriptional repressor) gene (19q13.2), or rarely *ATNX1/ATNXL1* (ataxin-1; 6p22.3) gene fusion, is currently considered a requirement for the diagnosis of *CIC*-rearranged sarcoma, regardless of whether it arises within the CNS, soft tissue, bone, or viscera. Although originally considered ‘Ewing-like’ or part of the ‘Ewing sarcoma family’ of related undifferentiated round cell sarcomas, it has since been distinguished as a unique tumour type with a significantly worse prognosis than that of Ewing sarcoma.[1](#_ENREF_1)  Potentially useful surrogate immunostains include CD99 (less extensive than Ewing sarcoma), WT1, ETV4, calretinin, MYC, NUT (for *CIC*::*NUTM1* fusion cases), and DUX4 (for *CIC*::*DUX4* fusion cases).[2-7](#_ENREF_2) However, a definitive diagnosis requires molecular confirmation to detect gene fusions via different techniques, such as ISH, RT-PCR, NGS (RNA or DNA), or anchored multiplex PCR. Methylation profiling may also be diagnostically useful, given that these tumours have a unique cluster that is distinct from other tumour types in the differential diagnosis.  *CIC*-rearranged and *ATNX1*-rearranged sarcomas of the CNS cluster together with their soft tissue counterparts, suggesting that they are likely the same tumour type despite the differing frequencies of fusion partners.[6](#_ENREF_6),[8](#_ENREF_8) Nevertheless, additional cases need to be studied to confirm this initial impression.  *CIC* gene alterations are also common in IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted oligodendrogliomas, although they typically consist in sequence variants in that tumour type.[9-11](#_ENREF_9)  Investigation of *CIC* alteration is a core element for *CIC*-rearranged sarcoma. References 1 Kallen ME and Hornick JL (2022). From the ashes of "Ewing-like" sarcoma: A contemporary update of the classification, immunohistochemistry, and molecular genetics of round cell sarcomas. *Semin Diagn Pathol* 39(1):29-37.  2 Hung YP, Fletcher CD and Hornick JL (2016). Evaluation of ETV4 and WT1 expression in CIC-rearranged sarcomas and histologic mimics. *Mod Pathol* 29(11):1324-1334.  3 Mangray S, Kelly DR, LeGuellec S, Fridman E, Aggarwal S, Shago M, Matoso A, Madison R, Pramanik S, Zhong S, Li R, Lombardo KA, Cramer S, Pressey J, Ross JS, Corona RJ, Bratslavsky G, Argani P, Coindre JM, Somers GR, Ali SM and Yakirevich E (2018). Clinicopathologic Features of a Series of Primary Renal CIC-rearranged Sarcomas With Comprehensive Molecular Analysis. *Am J Surg Pathol* 42(10):1360-1369.  4 Schaefer IM, Dal Cin P, Landry LM, Fletcher CDM, Hanna GJ and French CA (2018). CIC-NUTM1 fusion: A case which expands the spectrum of NUT-rearranged epithelioid malignancies. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 57(9):446-451.  5 Siegele B, Roberts J, Black JO, Rudzinski E, Vargas SO and Galambos C (2017). DUX4 Immunohistochemistry Is a Highly Sensitive and Specific Marker for CIC-DUX4 Fusion-positive Round Cell Tumor. *Am J Surg Pathol* 41(3):423-429.  6 Tauziède-Espariat A, Hasty L, Métais A and Varlet P (2023). Mesenchymal non-meningothelial tumors of the central nervous system: a literature review and diagnostic update of novelties and emerging entities. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 11(1):22.  7 Yoshida A, Goto K, Kodaira M, Kobayashi E, Kawamoto H, Mori T, Yoshimoto S, Endo O, Kodama N, Kushima R, Hiraoka N, Motoi T and Kawai A (2016). CIC-rearranged Sarcomas: A Study of 20 Cases and Comparisons With Ewing Sarcomas. *Am J Surg Pathol* 40(3):313-323.  8 Pratt D, Kumar-Sinha C, Cieślik M, Mehra R, Xiao H, Shao L, Franson A, Cantor E, Chinnaiyan AM, Mody R, Abdullaev Z, Aldape K, Quezado M and Camelo-Piragua S (2021). A novel ATXN1-DUX4 fusion expands the spectrum of 'CIC-rearranged sarcoma' of the CNS to include non-CIC alterations. *Acta Neuropathol* 141(4):619-622.  9 Bettegowda C, Agrawal N, Jiao Y, Sausen M, Wood LD, Hruban RH, Rodriguez FJ, Cahill DP, McLendon R, Riggins G, Velculescu VE, Oba-Shinjo SM, Marie SK, Vogelstein B, Bigner D, Yan H, Papadopoulos N and Kinzler KW (2011). Mutations in CIC and FUBP1 contribute to human oligodendroglioma. *Science* 333(6048):1453-1455.  10 Jiao Y, Killela PJ, Reitman ZJ, Rasheed AB, Heaphy CM, de Wilde RF, Rodriguez FJ, Rosemberg S, Oba-Shinjo SM, Nagahashi Marie SK, Bettegowda C, Agrawal N, Lipp E, Pirozzi C, Lopez G, He Y, Friedman H, Friedman AH, Riggins GJ, Holdhoff M, Burger P, McLendon R, Bigner DD, Vogelstein B, Meeker AK, Kinzler KW, Papadopoulos N, Diaz LA and Yan H (2012). Frequent ATRX, CIC, FUBP1 and IDH1 mutations refine the classification of malignant gliomas. *Oncotarget* 3(7):709-722.  11 Wong D and Yip S (2020). Making heads or tails - the emergence of capicua (CIC) as an important multifunctional tumour suppressor. *J Pathol* 250(5):532-540. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5 |
| Core | *DICER1* ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | The *DICER1* (dicer 1, ribonuclease III; 14q32.13) gene encodes the Dicer protein - a ribonuclease (RNase) III endoribonuclease that assists in producing microRNA (miRNA), which regulates gene expression at the posttranscriptional level. Most sequence variants in this gene lead to an abnormally short DICER protein, which is likely unable to produce miRNA. Without regulation by miRNA, genes may be expressed abnormally, causing cells to grow and divide uncontrollably, leading to tumour formation.  A heterozygous *DICER1* germline variant with low penetrance causes DICER1 syndrome, a rare autosomal dominant genetic tumour syndrome.[4](#_ENREF_4) Individuals with such a variant have an increased risk of developing many types of tumours due to the acquisition of a secondary somatic missense variant in *DICER1* in one of the five hotspot codons in the RNase IIIb domain.[4](#_ENREF_4)  Primary intracranial *DICER1*-altered lesions include pineoblastoma, pituitary blastoma, primary intracranial sarcoma, and ETMRs lacking C19MC alteration. These tumours can have overlapping histological features, with primitive mesenchymal differentiation, rhabdomyoblastic and chondroid features, as well as spindle cell patterns.  Identification of a somatic *DICER1* pathogenic variant in tumour tissue may suggest the presence of a germline *DICER1* pathogenic variant.[4](#_ENREF_4) Identifying a heterozygous germline pathogenic variant in *DICER1* establishes the diagnosis of *DICER1* syndrome. Molecular genetic testing approaches include gene-targeted and more comprehensive genomic testing, such as exome and genome sequencing.  Investigation of *DICER1* alteration is a core element for embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes; primary intracranial sarcoma, *DICER*-mutant; and pituitary blastoma. References 1 Kallen ME and Hornick JL (2022). From the ashes of "Ewing-like" sarcoma: A contemporary update of the classification, immunohistochemistry, and molecular genetics of round cell sarcomas. *Semin Diagn Pathol* 39(1):29-37.  2 Hung YP, Fletcher CD and Hornick JL (2016). Evaluation of ETV4 and WT1 expression in CIC-rearranged sarcomas and histologic mimics. *Mod Pathol* 29(11):1324-1334.  3 Mangray S, Kelly DR, LeGuellec S, Fridman E, Aggarwal S, Shago M, Matoso A, Madison R, Pramanik S, Zhong S, Li R, Lombardo KA, Cramer S, Pressey J, Ross JS, Corona RJ, Bratslavsky G, Argani P, Coindre JM, Somers GR, Ali SM and Yakirevich E (2018). Clinicopathologic Features of a Series of Primary Renal CIC-rearranged Sarcomas With Comprehensive Molecular Analysis. *Am J Surg Pathol* 42(10):1360-1369.  4 Schaefer IM, Dal Cin P, Landry LM, Fletcher CDM, Hanna GJ and French CA (2018). CIC-NUTM1 fusion: A case which expands the spectrum of NUT-rearranged epithelioid malignancies. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 57(9):446-451.  5 Siegele B, Roberts J, Black JO, Rudzinski E, Vargas SO and Galambos C (2017). DUX4 Immunohistochemistry Is a Highly Sensitive and Specific Marker for CIC-DUX4 Fusion-positive Round Cell Tumor. *Am J Surg Pathol* 41(3):423-429.  6 Tauziède-Espariat A, Hasty L, Métais A and Varlet P (2023). Mesenchymal non-meningothelial tumors of the central nervous system: a literature review and diagnostic update of novelties and emerging entities. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 11(1):22.  7 Yoshida A, Goto K, Kodaira M, Kobayashi E, Kawamoto H, Mori T, Yoshimoto S, Endo O, Kodama N, Kushima R, Hiraoka N, Motoi T and Kawai A (2016). CIC-rearranged Sarcomas: A Study of 20 Cases and Comparisons With Ewing Sarcomas. *Am J Surg Pathol* 40(3):313-323.  8 Pratt D, Kumar-Sinha C, Cieślik M, Mehra R, Xiao H, Shao L, Franson A, Cantor E, Chinnaiyan AM, Mody R, Abdullaev Z, Aldape K, Quezado M and Camelo-Piragua S (2021). A novel ATXN1-DUX4 fusion expands the spectrum of 'CIC-rearranged sarcoma' of the CNS to include non-CIC alterations. *Acta Neuropathol* 141(4):619-622.  9 Bettegowda C, Agrawal N, Jiao Y, Sausen M, Wood LD, Hruban RH, Rodriguez FJ, Cahill DP, McLendon R, Riggins G, Velculescu VE, Oba-Shinjo SM, Marie SK, Vogelstein B, Bigner D, Yan H, Papadopoulos N and Kinzler KW (2011). Mutations in CIC and FUBP1 contribute to human oligodendroglioma. *Science* 333(6048):1453-1455.  10 Jiao Y, Killela PJ, Reitman ZJ, Rasheed AB, Heaphy CM, de Wilde RF, Rodriguez FJ, Rosemberg S, Oba-Shinjo SM, Nagahashi Marie SK, Bettegowda C, Agrawal N, Lipp E, Pirozzi C, Lopez G, He Y, Friedman H, Friedman AH, Riggins GJ, Holdhoff M, Burger P, McLendon R, Bigner DD, Vogelstein B, Meeker AK, Kinzler KW, Papadopoulos N, Diaz LA and Yan H (2012). Frequent ATRX, CIC, FUBP1 and IDH1 mutations refine the classification of malignant gliomas. *Oncotarget* 3(7):709-722.  11 Wong D and Yip S (2020). Making heads or tails - the emergence of capicua (CIC) as an important multifunctional tumour suppressor. *J Pathol* 250(5):532-540. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5 |
| Core | *EGFR* ALTERATIONSc | ***EGFR* amplification**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Absent with low level gain * Present, *describe including copy number*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * Array-based method * NGS * Other, *specify*   ***EGFR* variants (e.g., *EGFRvIII* or *EGFR* single nucleotide variants)**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * NGS * PCR-based method * IHC * Other, *specify* | The *EGFR* (epidermal growth factor receptor; 7p12) gene is the most commonly amplified proto-oncogene in gliomas.[1](#_ENREF_1) *EGFR* amplification is detectable in approximately 40% of IDH-wildtype glioblastomas (CNS WHO grade 4) and is particularly common in tumours from adult patients with the classic or RTK2 molecular subtype of glioblastoma.[2](#_ENREF_2),[3](#_ENREF_3) Other CNS tumours that may carry *EGFR* amplifications include subsets of paediatric-type high grade glioma, IDH-wildtype and H3-wildtype, and rare instances of diffuse midline glioma, H3 K27-altered.  *EGFR* amplification is commonly associated with missense variants and genetic rearrangements, the most common of which, *EGFRvIII*, being detectable in about 50% of *EGFR*-amplified glioblastomas.[4](#_ENREF_4),[5](#_ENREF_5) *EGFRvIII* carries a unique peptide encoded by the fusion site of exons 1 and 8 that has served as a tumour-specific epitope for anti-EGFRvIII immunotherapy.[6](#_ENREF_6)  In adult-type diffuse gliomas, *EGFR* amplification (+/- *EGFR*vIII) is virtually restricted to glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype. The Consortium to Inform Molecular and Practical Approaches to CNS Tumour Taxonomy – Not Official WHO (cIMPACT-NOW) update 3 recommended in 2018 the use of *EGFR* amplification as a molecular criterion sufficient for identifying a histologically lower grade appearing (grade 2 or 3) IDH-wildtype diffuse astrocytic glioma as glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype (CNS WHO grade 4).[7](#_ENREF_7) This recommendation has been adopted by the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification.  Detection of *EGFR* amplification or *EGFRvIII* positivity also may be clinically relevant as a predictive marker of response to molecularly-guided therapies targeting EGFR and/or *EGFRvIII*.[8](#_ENREF_8),[9](#_ENREF_9)  *EGFR* amplification is usually seen in the majority of neoplastic cells in a given tumour and can be readily detected by ISH on routine FFPE tissue sections, although amplification levels may be heterogeneous from cell to cell. Targeted molecular techniques based on extracted tumour DNA, such as RT-PCR and multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA), are also suitable for diagnostic detection of *EGFR* amplification. Microarray-based genomic or epigenetic analyses, as well as NGS approaches, are increasingly being used.[10](#_ENREF_10)  Gene amplification (defined by a circumscribed high-level copy number gain of the *EGFR* gene at 7p12) needs to be distinguished from low-level copy number gains of chromosome 7 caused by numerical chromosomal abnormalities, in particular trisomy 7, which is a frequent alteration in IDH-wildtype glioblastomas[11](#_ENREF_11) (see also **CHROMOSOME 7 GAIN (COMBINED WITH CHROMOSOME 10 LOSS**). To date, there is no evidence that different levels of *EGFR* gene amplification (e.g., increases in copy number of 10-fold versus 100-fold) have distinct diagnostic or prognostic impact.  Detection of *EGFRvIII* in *EGFR*-amplified glioblastomas can also be performed at the DNA level, e.g., by MLPA, microarray-based techniques and NGS. However, detection at the mRNA or protein level using RT-PCR or IHC with EGFRvIII-specific antibodies appears to be more sensitive.[4](#_ENREF_4) This is due to the fact that EGFRvIII positivity usually shows regional heterogeneity and sometimes affects only a minor subset of the tumour cells.[4](#_ENREF_4) Thus, representative sampling of tumour tissue is an important issue to avoid false-negative testing for EGFRvIII. Unfortunately, precise cut-off values for the distinction between high- and low-level copy number gains have not been defined and may need to be adjusted for each testing method.  Investigation of *EGFR* alteration is a core element for glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype; diffuse midline glioma, H3K27-altered; and diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3- and IDH-wildtype. References 1 Aldape K, Zadeh G, Mansouri S, Reifenberger G and von Deimling A (2015). Glioblastoma: pathology, molecular mechanisms and markers. *Acta Neuropathol* 129(6):829-848.  2 Sturm D, Witt H, Hovestadt V, Khuong-Quang DA, Jones DT, Konermann C, Pfaff E, Tonjes M, Sill M, Bender S, Kool M, Zapatka M, Becker N, Zucknick M, Hielscher T, Liu XY, Fontebasso AM, Ryzhova M, Albrecht S, Jacob K, Wolter M, Ebinger M, Schuhmann MU, van Meter T, Fruhwald MC, Hauch H, Pekrun A, Radlwimmer B, Niehues T, von Komorowski G, Durken M, Kulozik AE, Madden J, Donson A, Foreman NK, Drissi R, Fouladi M, Scheurlen W, von Deimling A, Monoranu C, Roggendorf W, Herold-Mende C, Unterberg A, Kramm CM, Felsberg J, Hartmann C, Wiestler B, Wick W, Milde T, Witt O, Lindroth AM, Schwartzentruber J, Faury D, Fleming A, Zakrzewska M, Liberski PP, Zakrzewski K, Hauser P, Garami M, Klekner A, Bognar L, Morrissy S, Cavalli F, Taylor MD, van Sluis P, Koster J, Versteeg R, Volckmann R, Mikkelsen T, Aldape K, Reifenberger G, Collins VP, Majewski J, Korshunov A, Lichter P, Plass C, Jabado N and Pfister SM (2012). Hotspot mutations in H3F3A and IDH1 define distinct epigenetic and biological subgroups of glioblastoma. *Cancer Cell* 22(4):425-437.  3 Brennan CW, Verhaak RG, McKenna A, Campos B, Noushmehr H, Salama SR, Zheng S, Chakravarty D, Sanborn JZ, Berman SH, Beroukhim R, Bernard B, Wu CJ, Genovese G, Shmulevich I, Barnholtz-Sloan J, Zou L, Vegesna R, Shukla SA, Ciriello G, Yung WK, Zhang W, Sougnez C, Mikkelsen T, Aldape K, Bigner DD, Van Meir EG, Prados M, Sloan A, Black KL, Eschbacher J, Finocchiaro G, Friedman W, Andrews DW, Guha A, Iacocca M, O'Neill BP, Foltz G, Myers J, Weisenberger DJ, Penny R, Kucherlapati R, Perou CM, Hayes DN, Gibbs R, Marra M, Mills GB, Lander E, Spellman P, Wilson R, Sander C, Weinstein J, Meyerson M, Gabriel S, Laird PW, Haussler D, Getz G and Chin L (2013). The somatic genomic landscape of glioblastoma. *Cell* 155(2):462-477.  4 Weller M, Kaulich K, Hentschel B, Felsberg J, Gramatzki D, Pietsch T, Simon M, Westphal M, Schackert G, Tonn JC, von Deimling A, Davis T, Weiss WA, Loeffler M and Reifenberger G (2014). Assessment and prognostic significance of the epidermal growth factor receptor vIII mutation in glioblastoma patients treated with concurrent and adjuvant temozolomide radiochemotherapy. *Int J Cancer* 134(10):2437-2447.  5 Gan HK, Cvrljevic AN and Johns TG (2013). The epidermal growth factor receptor variant III (EGFRvIII): where wild things are altered. *Febs j* 280(21):5350-5370.  6 Weller M, Butowski N, Tran DD, Recht LD, Lim M, Hirte H, Ashby L, Mechtler L, Goldlust SA, Iwamoto F, Drappatz J, O'Rourke DM, Wong M, Hamilton MG, Finocchiaro G, Perry J, Wick W, Green J, He Y, Turner CD, Yellin MJ, Keler T, Davis TA, Stupp R and Sampson JH (2017). Rindopepimut with temozolomide for patients with newly diagnosed, EGFRvIII-expressing glioblastoma (ACT IV): a randomised, double-blind, international phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 18(10):1373-1385.  7 Brat DJ, Aldape K, Colman H, Holland EC, Louis DN, Jenkins RB, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Perry A, Reifenberger G, Stupp R, von Deimling A and Weller M (2018). cIMPACT-NOW update 3: recommended diagnostic criteria for "Diffuse astrocytic glioma, IDH-wildtype, with molecular features of glioblastoma, WHO grade IV". *Acta Neuropathol* 136(5):805-810.  8 Desai R, Suryadevara CM, Batich KA, Farber SH, Sanchez-Perez L and Sampson JH (2016). Emerging immunotherapies for glioblastoma. *Expert Opin Emerg Drugs* 21(2):133-145.  9 Thorne AH, Zanca C and Furnari F (2016). Epidermal growth factor receptor targeting and challenges in glioblastoma. *Neuro Oncol* 18(7):914-918.  10 Masui K, Mischel PS and Reifenberger G (2016). Molecular classification of gliomas. *Handb Clin Neurol* 134:97-120.  11 Ceccarelli M, Barthel FP, Malta TM, Sabedot TS, Salama SR, Murray BA, Morozova O, Newton Y, Radenbaugh A, Pagnotta SM, Anjum S, Wang J, Manyam G, Zoppoli P, Ling S, Rao AA, Grifford M, Cherniack AD, Zhang H, Poisson L, Carlotti CG, Jr., Tirapelli DP, Rao A, Mikkelsen T, Lau CC, Yung WK, Rabadan R, Huse J, Brat DJ, Lehman NL, Barnholtz-Sloan JS, Zheng S, Hess K, Rao G, Meyerson M, Beroukhim R, Cooper L, Akbani R, Wrensch M, Haussler D, Aldape KD, Laird PW, Gutmann DH, Noushmehr H, Iavarone A and Verhaak RG (2016). Molecular Profiling Reveals Biologically Discrete Subsets and Pathways of Progression in Diffuse Glioma. *Cell* 164(3):550-563. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | EZHIP EXPRESSION (IHC)c | * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive | Nuclear overexpression of EZHIP protein (enhancer of zest homologs inhibitory protein; *EZHIP* gene located on Xp11.22) protein results in loss of nuclear H3 p.K28me3 (K27me3) expression in posterior fossa group A (PFA) ependymomas and in a subset of diffuse midline gliomas, H3 K27-altered. In these tumours, the EZHIP protein conformationally mimics the structure of oncogenic H3 p.K28M variants and disrupts the activity of the PRC2 complex.[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) EZHIP overexpression can be demonstrated by antibodies for the EZHIP protein[3](#_ENREF_3),[4](#_ENREF_4) or by RNA expression analysis.  Investigation of EZHIP expression is a core element for diffuse midline glioma, H3K27-altered. References 1 Hübner JM, Müller T, Papageorgiou DN, Mauermann M, Krijgsveld J, Russell RB, Ellison DW, Pfister SM, Pajtler KW and Kool M (2019). EZHIP/CXorf67 mimics K27M mutated oncohistones and functions as an intrinsic inhibitor of PRC2 function in aggressive posterior fossa ependymoma. *Neuro Oncol* 21(7):878-889.  2 Jain SU, Rashoff AQ, Krabbenhoft SD, Hoelper D, Do TJ, Gibson TJ, Lundgren SM, Bondra ER, Deshmukh S, Harutyunyan AS, Juretic N, Jabado N, Harrison MM and Lewis PW (2020). H3 K27M and EZHIP Impede H3K27-Methylation Spreading by Inhibiting Allosterically Stimulated PRC2. *Mol Cell* 80(4):726-735.e727.  3 Antin C, Tauziède-Espariat A, Debily MA, Castel D, Grill J, Pagès M, Ayrault O, Chrétien F, Gareton A, Andreiuolo F, Lechapt E and Varlet P (2020). EZHIP is a specific diagnostic biomarker for posterior fossa ependymomas, group PFA and diffuse midline gliomas H3-WT with EZHIP overexpression. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 8(1):183.  4 Panwalkar P, Clark J, Ramaswamy V, Hawes D, Yang F, Dunham C, Yip S, Hukin J, Sun Y, Schipper MJ, Chavez L, Margol A, Pekmezci M, Chung C, Banda A, Bayliss JM, Curry SJ, Santi M, Rodriguez FJ, Snuderl M, Karajannis MA, Saratsis AM, Horbinski CM, Carret AS, Wilson B, Johnston D, Lafay-Cousin L, Zelcer S, Eisenstat D, Silva M, Scheinemann K, Jabado N, McNeely PD, Kool M, Pfister SM, Taylor MD, Hawkins C, Korshunov A, Judkins AR and Venneti S (2017). Immunohistochemical analysis of H3K27me3 demonstrates global reduction in group-A childhood posterior fossa ependymoma and is a powerful predictor of outcome. *Acta Neuropathol* 134(5):705-714. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | FET ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | Fusions between members of the FET (nearly always *EWSR1*, but rarely *FUS*) and CREB (*CREB1*, *CREM* or *ATF1*) gene families help define a novel CNS tumour type referred to as intracranial mesenchymal tumour, FET::CREB fusion-positive.[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) Given the histopathologic and genetic overlap with another rare soft tissue tumour type, prior cases have often been diagnosed as angiomatoid fibrous histiocytoma;[3](#_ENREF_3) however, recent methylation profiling studies suggest that these are likely two different entities.[2](#_ENREF_2)  An immunohistochemical profile with combined EMA, CD99, and desmin should raise suspicion for this tumour type, but is not entirely specific.[1](#_ENREF_1),[3](#_ENREF_3) As such, confirmation of a FET::CREB fusion should be attained using various methodologies, including ISH, RT-PCR, NGS (RNA or DNA), and anchored multiplex PCR. Methylation profiling studies suggest that there may be two distinct epigenetic subtypes with differing clinicopathologic and prognostic associations.[2](#_ENREF_2) However, further studies are needed to confirm these findings in larger cohorts.  Investigation of FET alteration is a core element for intracranial mesenchymal tumour, FET::CREB fusion-positive; and Ewing sarcoma. References 1 Sloan EA, Chiang J, Villanueva-Meyer JE, Alexandrescu S, Eschbacher JM, Wang W, Mafra M, Ud Din N, Carr-Boyd E, Watson M, Punsoni M, Oviedo A, Gilani A, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Coss DJ, Lopes MB, Raffel C, Berger MS, Chang SM, Reddy A, Ramani B, Ferris SP, Lee JC, Hofmann JW, Cho SJ, Horvai AE, Pekmezci M, Tihan T, Bollen AW, Rodriguez FJ, Ellison DW, Perry A and Solomon DA (2021). Intracranial mesenchymal tumor with FET-CREB fusion-A unifying diagnosis for the spectrum of intracranial myxoid mesenchymal tumors and angiomatoid fibrous histiocytoma-like neoplasms. *Brain Pathol* 31(4):e12918.  2 Sloan EA, Gupta R, Koelsche C, Chiang J, Villanueva-Meyer JE, Alexandrescu S, Eschbacher JM, Wang W, Mafra M, Ud Din N, Carr-Boyd E, Watson M, Punsoni M, Oviedo A, Gilani A, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Coss DJ, Lopes MB, Reddy A, Mueller S, Cho SJ, Horvai AE, Lee JC, Pekmezci M, Tihan T, Bollen AW, Rodriguez FJ, Ellison DW, Perry A, von Deimling A, Chang SM, Berger MS and Solomon DA (2022). Intracranial mesenchymal tumors with FET-CREB fusion are composed of at least two epigenetic subgroups distinct from meningioma and extracranial sarcomas. *Brain Pathol* 32(4):e13037.  3 Vizcaino MA, Giannini C, Chang HT, Kipp BR, Fritchie K and Vaubel R (2021). Intracranial angiomatoid fibrous histiocytoma with rhabdoid features: a mimic of rhabdoid meningioma. *Brain Tumor Pathol* 38(2):138-144. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | FGFR FAMILY ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHODd  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | The FGFR (fibroblast growth factor receptor) family comprises four highly conserved transmembrane tyrosine kinase receptors, encoded by *FGFR1* (8p11.23), *FGFR2* (10q26.13), *FGFR3* (4p16.3) and *FGFR4* (5q35.2), and one kinase-lacking core receptor (FGFR5; gene location 4p16.3). These growth factor receptors trigger downstream signalling pathways implicated in tumourigenesis, including the mitogen activated protein kinase (MAPK) pathway and the phosphoinositide-3-kinase (PI3K)/Akt pathways. FGFR plays key roles in CNS development, and in the context of neoplastic transformation it modulates tumour cell migration, differentiation, proliferation, and survival as well as angiogenesis.  FGFR gene alterations involve a broad spectrum of mutational types, such as hotspot point variants, fusions, internal domain duplication (ITD).[1](#_ENREF_1) They are most commonly found in low grade glial or glioneuronal tumours, and less frequently in high grade gliomas. *FGFR1* hotspot variants are found across multiple tumour types, such as in pilocytic astrocytomas (PA), rosette forming glioneuronal tumour, dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumour, occasionally ganglioglioma and the rare diffuse low grade glioma, MAPK pathway-altered.[1](#_ENREF_1) These hotspot variants have also been described in H3 K27M-altered diffuse midline gliomas and in diffuse gliomas in children and adults.  *FGFR1::TACC1* fusions are common in extraventricular neurocytoma. *FGFR2::CTNNA3* fusions are characteristic of polymorphous low grade neuroepithelial tumour of the young.[1](#_ENREF_1) In IDH-wildtype glioblastomas, *FGFR3::TACC3* fusions are rare events but are associated with distinct morphologic features (e.g., calcification, ‘chicken-wire’ capillaries, and bland oligodendrocyte-like cytology) and a better prognosis;[2](#_ENREF_2) they are also mutually exclusive with *EGFR* amplifications.[1](#_ENREF_1)  Histologically, many tumours with FGFR alterations show neurocytic or oligodendroglioma-like histological features.[1](#_ENREF_1)  There are no single useful histological or immunohistochemical surrogate markers to detect FGFR alterations. Therefore, the diagnostic approach usually requires a combination of methylome profiling, to narrow down or determine the tumour type (methylation class), and NGS to confirm DNA sequence variants or fusions (e.g., by DNA or RNA NGS, respectively).  FGFR alterations are clinically relevant, not only because of their diagnostic implications, but also because they may represent targets for cancer therapies,[3](#_ENREF_3),[4](#_ENREF_4) although evidence of efficacy in CNS tumours needs further evaluation.[5](#_ENREF_5)  Investigation of FGFR alteration is a core element for polymorphous low grade neuroepithelial tumour of the young; and dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumour. References 1 Bale TA (2020). FGFR- gene family alterations in low-grade neuroepithelial tumors. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 8(1):21.  2 Métais A, Tauziède-Espariat A, Garcia J, Appay R, Uro-Coste E, Meyronet D, Maurage CA, Vandenbos F, Rigau V, Chiforeanu DC, Pallud J, Senova S, Saffroy R, Colin C, Edjlali M, Varlet P and Figarella-Branger D (2023). Clinico-pathological and epigenetic heterogeneity of diffuse gliomas with FGFR3::TACC3 fusion. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 11(1):14.  3 Ardizzone A, Scuderi SA, Giuffrida D, Colarossi C, Puglisi C, Campolo M, Cuzzocrea S, Esposito E and Paterniti I (2020). Role of Fibroblast Growth Factors Receptors (FGFRs) in Brain Tumors, Focus on Astrocytoma and Glioblastoma. *Cancers (Basel)* 12(12):3825.  4 Chioni AM and Grose RP (2021). Biological Significance and Targeting of the FGFR Axis in Cancer. *Cancers (Basel)* 13(22):5681.  5 Capper D, Reifenberger G, French PJ, Schweizer L, Weller M, Touat M, Niclou SP, Euskirchen P, Haberler C, Hegi ME, Brandner S, Le Rhun E, Rudà R, Sanson M, Tabatabai G, Sahm F, Wen PY, Wesseling P, Preusser M and van den Bent MJ (2023). EANO guideline on rational molecular testing of gliomas, glioneuronal and neuronal tumors in adults for targeted therapy selection. *Neuro Oncol* 25(5):813-826. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5  d Repeat for each alteration. |
| Core | *FOXR2* ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | Fusions accompanied by high levels of expression of the *FOXR2* (forkhead box R2; Xp11.21) gene in a CNS neoplasm with primitive neuroectodermal morphologic features are diagnostic of CNS neuroblastoma, *FOXR2*-activated.  *FOXR2* fusions and resulting overexpression are best demonstrated using RNA sequencing techniques. The alterations are most commonly intragenic duplication events involving the *FOXR2* gene, or less commonly, intergenic translocations with non-recurrent partner genes.[1](#_ENREF_1) Where RNA sequencing is not available, methylome profiling may be used to classify CNS neuroblastoma, *FOXR2*-activated. Surrogate immunohistochemical profiles combined with copy number alterations have also been proposed as sensitive and specific surrogate markers for CNS neuroblastoma, *FOXR2*-activated, namely: OLIG2, synaptophysin and SOX10 immunopositivity; vimentin negativity; and 1q gain.[2](#_ENREF_2)  Investigation of *FOXR2* alteration is a core element for CNS neuroblastoma, *FOXR2*-activated. References 1 Korshunov A, Okonechnikov K, Schmitt-Hoffner F, Ryzhova M, Sahm F, Stichel D, Schrimpf D, Reuss DE, Sievers P, Suwala AK, Kumirova E, Zheludkova O, Golanov A, Jones DTW, Pfister SM, Kool M and von Deimling A (2021). Molecular analysis of pediatric CNS-PNET revealed nosologic heterogeneity and potent diagnostic markers for CNS neuroblastoma with FOXR2-activation. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 9(1):20.  2 Tauziède-Espariat A, Figarella-Branger D, Métais A, Uro-Coste E, Maurage CA, Lhermitte B, Aline-Fardin A, Hasty L, Vasiljevic A, Chiforeanu D, Chotard G, Adle-Biassette H, Meurgey A, Saffroy R, Guillemot D, Pierron G, Sievers P and Varlet P (2023). CNS neuroblastoma, FOXR2-activated and its mimics: a relevant panel approach for work-up and accurate diagnosis of this rare neoplasm. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 11(1):43. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5 |
| Core | **HISTONE H3 VARIANTS AND LOSS OF H3 p.K28me3 (K27me3)c** | **Histone H3 gene family variants**   * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive for K27M * Positive for G34R or G34V * Positive, for other H3 variants, *specify*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * NGS * PCR-based method * IHC   **Histone H3 K27M expression**   * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive   **Histone H3 G34R expression**   * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive   **Histone H3 K27me3 expression**   * Indeterminate * Intact expression * Loss of expression * Other, *specify* | Various molecular methods can be used to detect the H3 p.K28M (K27M) variant, including pyrosequencing, TaqMan PCR, droplet-based digital PCR (ddPCR), Sanger sequencing, and NGS. A similar array of methods can be used for H3.3 p.G35 (G34) variants; however, due to the GC rich nature of this region, targeted methods can be more difficult to design. For detection of both variants using targeted methods (and alignment of non-targeted methods), consideration needs to be given to the high degree of homology among the H3 genes (human H3 variants include H3.3, H3.1, H3.2, CENP-A, H3t, H3.X and H3.Y) and the number of genes encoding each protein (H3.3 is encoded by two genes, *H3F3A* and *H3F3B*, while H3.1 and H3.2 are each encoded by multiple genes found within gene clusters). The exact gene being tested, and the method used should be provided in the report. In addition, variant-specific antibodies are available that can reliably be used on FFPE tissue to detect H3 p.K28M (K27M), H3 p.G35R (G34R) and H3 p.G35V (G34V) variants. Of note, according to the recently revised nomenclature of (human) histone genes *H3F3A* (1q42.12) is now *H3-3A*, and *H3F3B* (17q25.1) is now *H3-3B*.[1](#_ENREF_1)  **Histone H3 p.K28M (K27M) variant (sequencing) and expression (immunohistochemistry)**  Recurrent sequence variants in *H3-3A* (H3.3) or *H3C2/3/11* (H3.1) are characteristic of diffuse midline gliomas, H3K27-altered. Very rarely *H3C14* (H3.2), with lysine 28 (27) substituted for methionine (H3 p.K28M (K27M)) or isoleucine (H2 p.K27I) also indicate diffuse midline glioma, H3 K27-altered.  These tumours can arise across a broad spectrum of ages and midline locations, including older adults, but are most frequently encountered in the paediatric age group in the pons. In teenagers and young adults, non-pontine locations are more frequent, including the spinal cord, thalamus and cerebellum.[2](#_ENREF_2) These tumours overall have a poor prognosis (median survival approximately 12 months) with older age at presentation and receipt of radiotherapy associated with modestly better survival.  The H3 p.K27M variant can also be found in diffuse astrocytomas without classic high grade features that generally behave more aggressively than their wild type counterparts. In occasional cases, this variant has been found in other tumour types, including ganglioglioma, pilocytic astrocytoma (PA) and ependymoma. The outcome for patients with circumscribed low grade gliomas with H3 p.K27M variants is worse than their wildtype counterparts. Data on a small number of cases shows no outcome difference between posterior fossa group A (PFA) ependymomas with and without the H3 K27M variant, however.[3-5](#_ENREF_3)  Testing for this alteration should be considered, in patients with midline diffuse gliomas. These alterations can be identified by sequencing or a variant-specific antibody. Detection of the variant by either IHC or sequencing is required for the diagnosis of the H3 p.K27M mutant subtypes of diffuse midline glioma, H3 K27-altered. Lack of H3 K27me3 is not a specific marker for H3 p.K27M.  Immunohistochemistry (IHC) with an antibody against the N-terminus of the mutant protein is highly sensitive and specific for detection of the H3 p.K28M (K27M) protein from either H3.3 or H3.1. In practice, the antibody can produce a fair amount of background cytoplasmic staining in non-tumour cells and only diffuse strong nuclear staining in most (or all) tumour cells should be considered positive. Further, poorly fixed tissue or tissue from post-mortem or older blocks may be false negative. If equivocal, a molecular method should be considered as the standard of care.  **Histone H3 p.G35R (G34R) or p.G35V (G34V) variants (sequencing) and expression (immunohistochemistry)**  Recurrent variants in *H3-3A* (H3.3) with glycine 35 substituted for arginine (H3 p.G35R) or infrequently valine (H3 p.G35V) are found most commonly in diffuse hemispheric high grade gliomas of the adolescent and young adult population.[6](#_ENREF_6) The H3 p.G35R variant is found in approximately 15-20% of hemispheric high grade glioma cases in the paediatric age group.[7](#_ENREF_7) Testing for this alteration should be considered, in hemispheric, IDH-wildtype, high grade gliomas, particularly if ATRX is lost and p53 is diffusely immunopositive. These alterations can be identified by sequencing, PCR or variant-specific antibodies against H3.3 p.G35R or H3.3 p.G35V.  In practice, the antibody works well for IHC on FFPE tissue with specific nuclear staining but does not stain all tumour cells; as a result, sensitivity may be an issue. If IHC results are equivocal or if suspicion for an H3 p.G35R/V variant is high, a molecular method should be considered as the standard of care.  **Loss of H3 p.K28me3 (H3 K27me3) expression (immunohistochemistry)**  The presence of the H3 p.K28M (K27M) mutant protein is associated with a fairly widespread (and thus detectable on Western blot or IHC) loss of the repressive trimethyl (me3) mark on H3 lysine 28 (H3 p.K28me3), often written as H3K27me3 when referring to the protein or antibody. Tumour cells harbouring the H3 p.K28M variant (either H3.1 or H3.3 p.K28M) will typically show loss of nuclear expression of H3K27me3 on IHC with retention of staining in entrapped non-neoplastic cells, e.g., endothelial cells (similar to the pattern seen with ATRX or INI1). However, it should be noted that while loss of H3K27me3 is sensitive for detection of H3 p.K27M variant tumours, it is not specific.  Other tumours, notably malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumours and PFA ependymomas,[8](#_ENREF_8) will also show loss of H3 K27me3. In fact, this lack of nuclear H3 K27me3 immunoreactivity is considered an essential diagnostic criterion for PFA ependymomas.[8-10](#_ENREF_8)  Similarly, in some H3-wildtype cases, partial loss may be seen. Thus, while helpful for confirmation when combined with an H3 p.K27M stain, loss of H3K27me3 staining by itself should be considered a non-specific surrogate marker for identifying H3 p.K27M-mutant diffuse midline gliomas.  In non-H3 pK27M-mutant subtypes of diffuse midline glioma, H3K27me3 is typically lost in combination with either EZHIP overexpression or an *EGFR* gene alteration.  Investigation of histone H3 variants and/or of H3 p.K28me3 alteration is a core element for glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype; diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB*- or *MYBL1*-altered; diffuse low grade glioma, MAPK pathway-altered; diffuse midline glioma, H3K27-altered; diffuse hemispheric glioma, H3G34-mutant; diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3- and IDH-wildtype; and posterior fossa ependymoma, group A. References 1 Seal RL, Denny P, Bruford EA, Gribkova AK, Landsman D, Marzluff WF, McAndrews M, Panchenko AR, Shaytan AK and Talbert PB (2022). A standardized nomenclature for mammalian histone genes. *Epigenetics Chromatin* 15(1):34.  2 Vuong HG, Ngo TNM, Le HT, Jea A, Hrachova M, Battiste J, McNall-Knapp R and Dunn IF (2022). Prognostic Implication of Patient Age in H3K27M-Mutant Midline Gliomas. *Front Oncol* 12:858148.  3 Pratt D, Natarajan SK, Banda A, Giannini C, Vats P, Koschmann C, Mody R, Chinnaiyan A and Venneti S (2018). Circumscribed/non-diffuse histology confers a better prognosis in H3K27M-mutant gliomas. *Acta Neuropathol* 135(2):299-301.  4 Ryall S, Krishnatry R, Arnoldo A, Buczkowicz P, Mistry M, Siddaway R, Ling C, Pajovic S, Yu M, Rubin JB, Hukin J, Steinbok P, Bartels U, Bouffet E, Tabori U and Hawkins C (2016). Targeted detection of genetic alterations reveal the prognostic impact of H3K27M and MAPK pathway aberrations in paediatric thalamic glioma. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 4(1):93.  5 Mariet C, Castel D, Grill J, Saffroy R, Dangouloff-Ros V, Boddaert N, Llamas-Guttierrez F, Chappé C, Puget S, Hasty L, Chrétien F, Métais A, Varlet P and Tauziède-Espariat A (2022). Posterior fossa ependymoma H3 K27-mutant: an integrated radiological and histomolecular tumor analysis. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 10(1):137.  6 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  7 Mackay A, Burford A, Carvalho D, Izquierdo E, Fazal-Salom J, Taylor KR, Bjerke L, Clarke M, Vinci M, Nandhabalan M, Temelso S, Popov S, Molinari V, Raman P, Waanders AJ, Han HJ, Gupta S, Marshall L, Zacharoulis S, Vaidya S, Mandeville HC, Bridges LR, Martin AJ, Al-Sarraj S, Chandler C, Ng HK, Li X, Mu K, Trabelsi S, Brahim DH, Kisljakov AN, Konovalov DM, Moore AS, Carcaboso AM, Sunol M, de Torres C, Cruz O, Mora J, Shats LI, Stavale JN, Bidinotto LT, Reis RM, Entz-Werle N, Farrell M, Cryan J, Crimmins D, Caird J, Pears J, Monje M, Debily MA, Castel D, Grill J, Hawkins C, Nikbakht H, Jabado N, Baker SJ, Pfister SM, Jones DTW, Fouladi M, von Bueren AO, Baudis M, Resnick A and Jones C (2017). Integrated Molecular Meta-Analysis of 1,000 Pediatric High-Grade and Diffuse Intrinsic Pontine Glioma. *Cancer Cell* 32(4):520-537.e525.  8 Bayliss J, Mukherjee P, Lu C, Jain SU, Chung C, Martinez D, Sabari B, Margol AS, Panwalkar P, Parolia A, Pekmezci M, McEachin RC, Cieslik M, Tamrazi B, Garcia BA, La Rocca G, Santi M, Lewis PW, Hawkins C, Melnick A, David Allis C, Thompson CB, Chinnaiyan AM, Judkins AR and Venneti S (2016). Lowered H3K27me3 and DNA hypomethylation define poorly prognostic pediatric posterior fossa ependymomas. *Sci Transl Med* 8(366):366ra161.  9 Panwalkar P, Clark J, Ramaswamy V, Hawes D, Yang F, Dunham C, Yip S, Hukin J, Sun Y, Schipper MJ, Chavez L, Margol A, Pekmezci M, Chung C, Banda A, Bayliss JM, Curry SJ, Santi M, Rodriguez FJ, Snuderl M, Karajannis MA, Saratsis AM, Horbinski CM, Carret AS, Wilson B, Johnston D, Lafay-Cousin L, Zelcer S, Eisenstat D, Silva M, Scheinemann K, Jabado N, McNeely PD, Kool M, Pfister SM, Taylor MD, Hawkins C, Korshunov A, Judkins AR and Venneti S (2017). Immunohistochemical analysis of H3K27me3 demonstrates global reduction in group-A childhood posterior fossa ependymoma and is a powerful predictor of outcome. *Acta Neuropathol* 134(5):705-714.  10 Chapman RJ, Ghasemi DR, Andreiuolo F, Zschernack V, Tauziede Espariat A, Buttarelli FR, Giangaspero F, Grill J, Haberler C, Paine SML, Scott I, Jacques TS, Sill M, Pfister S, Kilday JP, Leblond P, Massimino M, Witt H, Modena P, Varlet P, Pietsch T, Grundy RG, Pajtler KW and Ritzmann TA (2023). Optimising biomarkers for accurate ependymoma diagnosis, prognostication and stratification within International Clinical Trials: A BIOMECA study. *Neuro Oncol* 25(10):1871-1882. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *IDH1/IDH2* ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * NGS * PCR-based method * IHC   **IDH1 R132H expression**   * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive * Other, *specify* | IDH (isocitrate dehydrogenase) is an enzyme that exists in five isoforms, each of which catalyses the reaction of isocitrate to α-ketoglutarate. Hotspot missense variants in *IDH1* (2q34) or *IDH2* (15q26.1) diagnostic markers for astrocytomas, IDH-mutant, CNS WHO grades 2-4 and oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted, CNS WHO grade 2 or 3.[1](#_ENREF_1)  The mutant IDH1 and IDH2 proteins lead to the production of the oncometabolite 2-hydroxyglutarate, which inhibits the function of numerous α-ketoglutarate–dependent enzymes. Inhibition of the family of histone demethylases and the ten-eleven translocation (TET) family of 5-methylcytosine hydroxylases has profound effects on the epigenetic status of mutated cells and leads to G-CIMP.  *IDH2* variants are much less frequent than *IDH1* variants in diffuse gliomas, but are enriched in IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted oligodendrogliomas and in infratentorial IDH-mutant astrocytomas.[2](#_ENREF_2)  A monoclonal antibody has been developed to the IDH1 p.R132H protein that allows for the detection of the most common type of IDH variant by IHC. The ability of the antibody to detect individual IDH R132H-mutant cells within a normal background (e.g., in the infiltration zone of an IDH-mutant diffuse glioma), makes this method more sensitive than Sanger sequencing for identifying p.R132H-mutant gliomas.[3](#_ENREF_3) However, *IDH2* variants and other less common *IDH1* variants cannot be detected using IHC with this antibody, and in the appropriate clinical setting, it may be necessary to test for other *IDH1* and *IDH2* variants by sequencing analysis. The WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Classification recommends that sequencing may not be warranted in the setting of a negative p.R132H immunostain in glioblastomas arising in patients older than 55 years due to the rarity of non-R132H *IDH1* and *IDH2* variants in patients in this age group.[4](#_ENREF_4) By contrast, all diffusely infiltrating gliomas with CNS WHO grade 2 and 3 histology that lack IDH1 p.R132H positivity by IHC should be assessed for less common *IDH1* or *IDH2* variants by sequencing or other appropriate methods. Methylome profiling does not detect an *IDH1* or *IDH2* oncogenic variant as such, but the DNA methylome ‘fingerprint’ is a very reliable surrogate marker for IDH-mutant status of diffuse gliomas.[5](#_ENREF_5)  Investigation of IDH alteration is a core element for astrocytoma, IDH-mutant; oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-co-deleted; glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype; diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB*- or *MYBL1*-altered; polymorphous low grade neuroepithelial tumour of the young; diffuse low grade glioma, MAPK pathway-altered; diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3- and IDH-wildtype; and extraventricular neurocytoma. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Banan R, Stichel D, Bleck A, Hong B, Lehmann U, Suwala A, Reinhardt A, Schrimpf D, Buslei R, Stadelmann C, Ehlert K, Prinz M, Acker T, Schittenhelm J, Kaul D, Schweizer L, Capper D, Harter PN, Etminan N, Jones DTW, Pfister SM, Herold-Mende C, Wick W, Sahm F, von Deimling A, Hartmann C and Reuss DE (2020). Infratentorial IDH-mutant astrocytoma is a distinct subtype. *Acta Neuropathol* 140(4):569-581.  3 Brandner S and von Deimling A (2015). Diagnostic, prognostic and predictive relevance of molecular markers in gliomas. *Neuropathol Appl Neurobiol* 41(6):694-720.  4 Louis DN, Perry A, Reifenberger G, von Deimling A, Figarella-Branger D, Cavenee WK, Ohgaki H, Wiestler OD, Kleihues P and Ellison DW (2016). The 2016 World Health Organization Classification of Tumors of the Central Nervous System: a summary. *Acta Neuropathologica* 131(6):803-820.  5 Sahm F, Brandner S, Bertero L, Capper D, French PJ, Figarella-Branger D, Giangaspero F, Haberler C, Hegi ME, Kristensen BW, Kurian KM, Preusser M, Tops BBJ, van den Bent M, Wick W, Reifenberger G and Wesseling P (2023). Molecular diagnostic tools for the World Health Organization (WHO) 2021 classification of gliomas, glioneuronal and neuronal tumors; an EANO guideline. *Neuro Oncol* 25(10):1731-1749. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | MAPK PATHWAY ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * NF1 loss*,* *describe*   For *BRAF-KIAA1549* alterations refer to ***BRAF* ALTERATIONS**  For *FGRFR* alterations refer to ***FGFR* FAMILY ALTERATIONS**   * Positive for other MAPK alteration, *describe*   TESTING METHODd  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | The MAPK signalling pathway is a complex cellular signalling system involved in regulating a wide variety of cellular processes, including cell growth, differentiation, apoptosis, and response to stress. The pathway translates a diverse range of extracellular stimuli - including growth factors, cytokines, and environmental stressors - into cellular responses.  Different mechanisms can lead to dysregulation of the MAPK pathway in cancer. One common mechanism is the activation of growth factor receptors, which can stimulate MAPK pathway activation through various downstream signalling molecules. Genetic alterations in the MAPK pathway genes, such *as BRAF, NRAS*, *KRAS* and *NF1*, can also lead to hyperactivation and contribute to cancer development.  The MAPK pathway is frequently dysregulated in gliomas,[1](#_ENREF_1) and this dysregulation is associated with increased proliferation and reduced apoptosis, leading to tumour growth and progression. The activation of the MAPK pathway is often driven by alterations in genes encoding the BRAF protein or the NF1 protein.  The importance of the MAPK pathway in cancer has led to the development of targeted therapies that inhibit its activity. Drugs inhibiting BRAF and/or MEK signalling, two critical components of the pathway, have been approved for treating melanoma and other cancers, including gliomas. However, resistance to these drugs can develop, highlighting the need for continued research into the complex mechanisms that regulate MAPK pathway activity in CNS tumours.  Investigation of MAPK pathway alteration is a core element for polymorphous low grade neuroepithelial tumour of the young; diffuse low grade glioma, MAPK pathway-altered; PA; ganglioglioma; and diffuse leptomeningeal glioneuronal tumour. Reference 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5.  d Repeat for each alteration. |
| Core | METHYLOME PROFILINGc | ***See table in the next column Commentary note for value options.***  ***MGMT* promoter status**   * Indeterminate * Unmethylated * Methylated   **Most informative copy number variations, *specify*** | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Classifier (e.g., Heidelberg Brain Tumour Classifier)*** | ***Version (e.g., 12.5)*** | ***Methylation class*** | ***Score*** | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |   The categorisation of CNS tumours based on their genome-wide methylome profiles greatly aids their precise classification,[1](#_ENREF_1) often in combination with the DNA copy number profile derived from the same array.[2](#_ENREF_2) Methylome profiling can:   1. establish a methylation class (often a surrogate for a diagnosis) for most CNS tumour types including histologically ambiguous CNS tumours of both adult and paediatric patients; 2. provide a detailed whole genome copy number variation (CNV) profile; 3. subclassify or risk stratify established tumour types, such as ependymomas, medulloblastomas, or meningiomas based on their methylation fingerprint +/- CNV alterations; and 4. provide information on *MGMT* promoter methylation status.   Methylome profiling can also be useful as a diagnostic tool for very small biopsies. CNS tumours classified on the basis of their methylome profile generally behave clinically more homogenously than those classified by histology alone.  The determination to perform methylation profiling depends on (i) local availability or access to supra-regional centres, (ii) availability of funding in the respective healthcare system, (iii) ability/knowledge to integrate data by a neuropathologist, as well as (iv) clinical need and relevance to therapy (e.g., risk prognostication of meningiomas).  The technology used for methylome-based tumour classification is currently mainly based on hybridisation of bead chip arrays from a single supplier. However, other approaches, such as long-read sequencing have been established.[3](#_ENREF_3) The processing of the methylation data requires a classification tool, and currently the gold standard for the diagnostic implementation is the DKFZ/Heidelberg classifier for CNS tumours (www.molecularneuropathology.org),[1](#_ENREF_1) although alternatives based on the same principle have been established to address accreditation issues or to refine classification.[4](#_ENREF_4)  The implementation and acceptance of this technology has substantially empowered the neuropathology community by enabling more accurate, reliable, and reproducible diagnoses. Thus, DNA methylome-based classification has been widely introduced as a diagnostic tool in the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification.[5](#_ENREF_5) In fact, unequivocal classification of certain tumour types, such as high grade astrocytoma with piloid features and paediatric-type high grade diffuse gliomas IDH-wildtype and H3-wildtype, require the demonstration of a tumour type-specific methylome profile.[5](#_ENREF_5)  The use of the DNA methylome classifier requires caution and awareness of potential pitfalls.[4](#_ENREF_4) Technical and operational risks include recognition of sample mix-up, low DNA amount and poor quality DNA. It is recommended to process reasonably distinct tumour entities on each chip (currently eight samples per chip), and results that cannot be reconciled with patient sex, histology, location, or clinical presentation may require repeat investigation. Interpretational pitfalls arise from incorrect classification results, due to low tumour content, e.g., admixture of CNS tissue, inflammatory cells, tumour recurrences/post-radiotherapy, and tumours arising in genetic tumour syndromes.    Generally, low grade glial and glioneuronal tumours can be difficult to classify with the current algorithms.[6](#_ENREF_6) The DKFZ/Heidelberg classifier uses calibrated classifier scores to indicate likelihood of the assignment of a tumour to a distinct methylation class,[1](#_ENREF_1) with classifier scores >0.9 indicating a significant match. Lower calibrated classifier scores need to be interpreted with caution and may not be reliable indicators of a certain diagnosis but can still provide useful guidance when integrated with results from orthogonal tests.[1](#_ENREF_1),[4](#_ENREF_4)  Copy number variations (CNV) are returned as part of the readout from the methylation array (or from long-read whole genome sequencing), and can complement the diagnosis, provide additional confidence in establishing a diagnosis when the methylome profile is returned with a low calibrated score,[2](#_ENREF_2) or form part of a prognostication algorithm, such as in meningiomas.[7](#_ENREF_7) Therefore, CNVs (including specific gene deletions or amplifications) should also be included in the report if diagnostically relevant. Gene duplication and/or gene fusions can sometimes also be inferred from the plot but may need confirmation by other methods. Low amplitudes of CNVs may indicate low tumour cell content or clonal heterogeneity in the investigated tissue sample.  No specific formal recommendations exist currently for how methylome data should be reported. It has been suggested that pathology reports should contain information on:   1. estimated tumour cell content of the extracted DNA; 2. amount of DNA input; 3. estimated tumour cell fraction; 4. quality of bisulphite conversion; 5. CNS tumour classifier version(s) used; 6. highest scoring methylation category with the respective calibrated score(s); and 7. sub-classification with score(s), if applicable.[8](#_ENREF_8)   In addition to the DNA copy number profile and assignment to distinct methylation families, classes and subclasses - the DKFZ/Heidelberg classifier provides the *MGMT* promoter methylation status based on a specific algorithm.[9](#_ENREF_9) Generally, there is good concordance with other methods of targeted assessment of *MGMT* promotor methylation.[10](#_ENREF_10),[11](#_ENREF_11) However, there is currently no consensus as to which testing method best predicts response to alkylating agent chemotherapy.[12](#_ENREF_12)  Methylome profiling (MP) is a core element (especially for unresolved lesions) for diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB-* or *MYBL1*-altered; diffuse midline glioma, H3K27-altered; diffuse hemispheric glioma, H3G34-mutant; diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3- and IDH-wildtype; infant-type hemispheric glioma; high grade astrocytoma with piloid features; astroblastoma, *MN1*-altered; ganglioglioma; desmoplastic infantile ganglioglioma; dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumour; diffuse glioneuronal tumour with oligodendroglioma-like features and nuclear clusters; papillary glioneuronal tumour; rosette-forming glioneuronal tumour; diffuse leptomeningeal glioneuronal tumour; central neurocytoma; extraventricular neurocytoma; cerebellar liponeurocytoma; posterior fossa ependymoma, group A; posterior fossa ependymoma, group B; myxopapillary ependymoma; subependymoma; medulloblastoma, WNT-activated; medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-wildtype; medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-mutant; medulloblastoma, non-WNT/non-SHH; atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumour; embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes; CNS neuroblastoma, *FOXR2*-activated; CNS tumour with *BCOR* internal tandem duplication; malignant melanotic nerve sheath tumour; malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumour; cauda equina neuroendocrine tumour; meningioma; pineal parenchymal tumour of intermediate differentiation; papillary tumour of the pineal region; and desmoplastic myxoid tumour of the pineal region, *SMARCB1*-mutant. References 1 Capper D, Jones DTW, Sill M, Hovestadt V, Schrimpf D, Sturm D, Koelsche C, Sahm F, Chavez L, Reuss DE, Kratz A, Wefers AK, Huang K, Pajtler KW, Schweizer L, Stichel D, Olar A, Engel NW, Lindenberg K, Harter PN, Braczynski AK, Plate KH, Dohmen H, Garvalov BK, Coras R, Holsken A, Hewer E, Bewerunge-Hudler M, Schick M, Fischer R, Beschorner R, Schittenhelm J, Staszewski O, Wani K, Varlet P, Pages M, Temming P, Lohmann D, Selt F, Witt H, Milde T, Witt O, Aronica E, Giangaspero F, Rushing E, Scheurlen W, Geisenberger C, Rodriguez FJ, Becker A, Preusser M, Haberler C, Bjerkvig R, Cryan J, Farrell M, Deckert M, Hench J, Frank S, Serrano J, Kannan K, Tsirigos A, Bruck W, Hofer S, Brehmer S, Seiz-Rosenhagen M, Hanggi D, Hans V, Rozsnoki S, Hansford JR, Kohlhof P, Kristensen BW, Lechner M, Lopes B, Mawrin C, Ketter R, Kulozik A, Khatib Z, Heppner F, Koch A, Jouvet A, Keohane C, Muhleisen H, Mueller W, Pohl U, Prinz M, Benner A, Zapatka M, Gottardo NG, Driever PH, Kramm CM, Muller HL, Rutkowski S, von Hoff K, Fruhwald MC, Gnekow A, Fleischhack G, Tippelt S, Calaminus G, Monoranu CM, Perry A, Jones C, Jacques TS, Radlwimmer B, Gessi M, Pietsch T, Schramm J, Schackert G, Westphal M, Reifenberger G, Wesseling P, Weller M, Collins VP, Blumcke I, Bendszus M, Debus J, Huang A, Jabado N, Northcott PA, Paulus W, Gajjar A, Robinson GW, Taylor MD, Jaunmuktane Z, Ryzhova M, Platten M, Unterberg A, Wick W, Karajannis MA, Mittelbronn M, Acker T, Hartmann C, Aldape K, Schuller U, Buslei R, Lichter P, Kool M, Herold-Mende C, Ellison DW, Hasselblatt M, Snuderl M, Brandner S, Korshunov A, von Deimling A and Pfister SM (2018). DNA methylation-based classification of central nervous system tumours. *Nature* 555(7697):469-474.  2 Capper D, Stichel D, Sahm F, Jones DTW, Schrimpf D, Sill M, Schmid S, Hovestadt V, Reuss DE, Koelsche C, Reinhardt A, Wefers AK, Huang K, Sievers P, Ebrahimi A, Scholer A, Teichmann D, Koch A, Hanggi D, Unterberg A, Platten M, Wick W, Witt O, Milde T, Korshunov A, Pfister SM and von Deimling A (2018). Practical implementation of DNA methylation and copy-number-based CNS tumor diagnostics: the Heidelberg experience. *Acta Neuropathol* 136(2):181-210.  3 Euskirchen P, Bielle F, Labreche K, Kloosterman WP, Rosenberg S, Daniau M, Schmitt C, Masliah-Planchon J, Bourdeaut F, Dehais C, Marie Y, Delattre J-Y and Idbaih A (2017). Same-day genomic and epigenomic diagnosis of brain tumors using real-time nanopore sequencing. *Acta Neuropathol* 134(5):691-703.  4 Wu Z, Abdullaev Z, Pratt D, Chung HJ, Skarshaug S, Zgonc V, Perry C, Pack S, Saidkhodjaeva L, Nagaraj S, Tyagi M, Gangalapudi V, Valdez K, Turakulov R, Xi L, Raffeld M, Papanicolau-Sengos A, O'Donnell K, Newford M, Gilbert MR, Sahm F, Suwala AK, von Deimling A, Mamatjan Y, Karimi S, Nassiri F, Zadeh G, Ruppin E, Quezado M and Aldape K (2022). Impact of the methylation classifier and ancillary methods on CNS tumor diagnostics. *Neuro Oncol* 24(4):571-581.  5 Louis DN, Perry A, Wesseling P, Brat DJ, Cree IA, Figarella-Branger D, Hawkins C, Ng HK, Pfister SM, Reifenberger G, Soffietti R, von Deimling A and Ellison DW (2021). The 2021 WHO Classification of Tumors of the Central Nervous System: a summary. *Neuro Oncol* 23(8):1231-1251.  6 Ryall S, Zapotocky M, Fukuoka K, Nobre L, Guerreiro Stucklin A, Bennett J, Siddaway R, Li C, Pajovic S, Arnoldo A, Kowalski PE, Johnson M, Sheth J, Lassaletta A, Tatevossian RG, Orisme W, Qaddoumi I, Surrey LF, Li MM, Waanders AJ, Gilheeney S, Rosenblum M, Bale T, Tsang DS, Laperriere N, Kulkarni A, Ibrahim GM, Drake J, Dirks P, Taylor MD, Rutka JT, Laughlin S, Shroff M, Shago M, Hazrati LN, D'Arcy C, Ramaswamy V, Bartels U, Huang A, Bouffet E, Karajannis MA, Santi M, Ellison DW, Tabori U and Hawkins C (2020). Integrated Molecular and Clinical Analysis of 1,000 Pediatric Low-Grade Gliomas. *Cancer Cell* 37(4):569-583.e565.  7 Hielscher T, Sill M, Sievers P, Stichel D, Brandner S, Jones DTW, von Deimling A, Sahm F and Maas SLN (2023). Clinical implementation of integrated molecular-morphologic risk prediction for meningioma. *Brain Pathol* 33(3):e13132.  8 Sahm F, Brandner S, Bertero L, Capper D, French PJ, Figarella-Branger D, Giangaspero F, Haberler C, Hegi ME, Kristensen BW, Kurian KM, Preusser M, Tops BBJ, van den Bent M, Wick W, Reifenberger G and Wesseling P (2023). Molecular diagnostic tools for the World Health Organization (WHO) 2021 classification of gliomas, glioneuronal and neuronal tumors; an EANO guideline. *Neuro Oncol* 25(10):1731-1749.  9 Bady P, Sciuscio D, Diserens AC, Bloch J, van den Bent MJ, Marosi C, Dietrich PY, Weller M, Mariani L, Heppner FL, McDonald DR, Lacombe D, Stupp R, Delorenzi M and Hegi ME (2012). MGMT methylation analysis of glioblastoma on the Infinium methylation BeadChip identifies two distinct CpG regions associated with gene silencing and outcome, yielding a prediction model for comparisons across datasets, tumor grades, and CIMP-status. *Acta Neuropathol* 124(4):547-560.  10 Braczynski AK, Capper D, Jones DTW, Schittenhelm J, Stichel D, von Deimling A, Harter PN and Mittelbronn M (2020). High density DNA methylation array is a reliable alternative for PCR-based analysis of the MGMT promoter methylation status in glioblastoma. *Pathol Res Pract* 216(1):152728.  11 Tzaridis T, Schafer N, Weller J, Steinbach JP, Schlegel U, Seidel S, Sabel M, Hau P, Seidel C, Krex D, Goldbrunner R, Tonn JC, Grauer O, Kebir S, Schneider M, Schaub C, Vatter H, Coch C, Glas M, Fimmers R, Pietsch T, Reifenberger G, Herrlinger U and Felsberg J (2021). MGMT promoter methylation analysis for allocating combined CCNU/TMZ chemotherapy: Lessons learned from the CeTeG/NOA-09 trial. *Int J Cancer* 148(7):1695-1707.  12 Brandner S, McAleenan A, Kelly C, Spiga F, Cheng HY, Dawson S, Schmidt L, Faulkner CL, Wragg C, Jefferies S, Higgins JPT and Kurian KM (2021). MGMT promoter methylation testing to predict overall survival in people with glioblastoma treated with temozolomide: a comprehensive meta-analysis based on a Cochrane Systematic Review. *Neuro Oncol* 23(9):1457-1469. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *MN1* ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present*,* *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | According to the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification, demonstration of an *MN1* (meningioma 1; 22q12.1) gene alteration is required for the diagnosis of astroblastoma, *MN1*-altered.[1](#_ENREF_1) These rare glial neoplasms have a strong female predominance and are characterised by relatively compact growth, predominantly perivascular tumour cell arrangement (astroblastic rosette) and perivascular fibrous stroma.  Fusions between *MN1* (22q12.1) and BEN domain containing 2 (*BEND2*; Xp22.13) or more rarely with *CXXC5* (CXXC-type zinc finger protein 5) are characteristic. MN1 is a transcriptional coregulator important in development and is implicated in the pathogenesis of meningioma and acute myeloid leukemia.[2](#_ENREF_2),[3](#_ENREF_3) Astroblastomas, *MN1*-altered display a distinct DNA methylome profile. Tumours with astroblastoma-like histology and DNA methylome profile, often located in the spinal cord, have been identified which lack *MN1* fusions but feature *BEND2* fusions, in particular *EWSR1::BEND2* or *MAMLD1::BEND2*. These tumours likely represent a molecular subtype of astroblastoma, however, have not yet been considered in the WHO CNS5 classification.  Molecular studies are necessary to evaluate for characteristic *MN1* or *BEND2* fusions by break apart ISH, PCR, RNA or DNA sequencing.  Nuclear MN1 immunoreactivity has been described in *MN1::BEND2* tumours but not in non-*MN1::BEND2* astroblastomas.[4](#_ENREF_4) However, the specificity and sensitivity of this biomarker remains to be evaluated.  Investigation of *MN1* alteration is a core element for astroblastoma, *MN1*-altered. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Heuser M, Argiropoulos B, Kuchenbauer F, Yung E, Piper J, Fung S, Schlenk RF, Dohner K, Hinrichsen T, Rudolph C, Schambach A, Baum C, Schlegelberger B, Dohner H, Ganser A and Humphries RK (2007). MN1 overexpression induces acute myeloid leukemia in mice and predicts ATRA resistance in patients with AML. *Blood* 110(5):1639-1647.  3 Lekanne Deprez RH, Riegman PH, Groen NA, Warringa UL, van Biezen NA, Molijn AC, Bootsma D, de Jong PJ, Menon AG, Kley NA and et al. (1995). Cloning and characterization of MN1, a gene from chromosome 22q11, which is disrupted by a balanced translocation in a meningioma. *Oncogene* 10(8):1521-1528.  4 Lehman NL, Spassky N, Sak M, Webb A, Zumbar CT, Usubalieva A, Alkhateeb KJ, McElroy JP, Maclean KH, Fadda P, Liu T, Gangalapudi V, Carver J, Abdullaev Z, Timmers C, Parker JR, Pierson CR, Mobley BC, Gokden M, Hattab EM, Parrett T, Cooke RX, Lehman TD, Costinean S, Parwani A, Williams BJ, Jensen RL, Aldape K and Mistry AM (2022). Astroblastomas exhibit radial glia stem cell lineages and differential expression of imprinted and X-inactivation escape genes. *Nat Commun* 13(1):2083. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *MYB, MYBL1* ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present*,* *describe*   TESTING METHODd  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | *MYB* (v-myb avian myeloblastosis viral oncogene homolog; 6q23.3)and *MYBL1* (8q13.1) rearrangements, most commonly gene fusions of *MYB* or *MYBL1* with various partner genes, are diagnostic alterations in diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB/MYBL1*-altered and in angiocentric glioma, with the latter typically featuring *QKI::MYB* fusions.[113](#_ENREF_113),[122](#_ENREF_122) *MYB* gene amplification is rare.[123](#_ENREF_123),[124](#_ENREF_124)  Diagnostic detection of *MYB* or *MYBL1* fusions can be performed by targeted next generation fusion panel sequencing or by whole transcriptome sequencing. Alternatively, *MYB/MYBL1* alterations can be detected by using interphase ISH. DNA methylome analysis also identifies gliomas with *MYB* or *MYBL1* alterations but cannot distinguish between diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB/MYBL1*-altered versus angiocentric glioma.[123](#_ENREF_123),[125](#_ENREF_125)  Investigation of *MYB* or *MYBL1* alteration is a core element for diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB*- or *MYBL1*-altered. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Heuser M, Argiropoulos B, Kuchenbauer F, Yung E, Piper J, Fung S, Schlenk RF, Dohner K, Hinrichsen T, Rudolph C, Schambach A, Baum C, Schlegelberger B, Dohner H, Ganser A and Humphries RK (2007). MN1 overexpression induces acute myeloid leukemia in mice and predicts ATRA resistance in patients with AML. *Blood* 110(5):1639-1647.  3 Lekanne Deprez RH, Riegman PH, Groen NA, Warringa UL, van Biezen NA, Molijn AC, Bootsma D, de Jong PJ, Menon AG, Kley NA and et al. (1995). Cloning and characterization of MN1, a gene from chromosome 22q11, which is disrupted by a balanced translocation in a meningioma. *Oncogene* 10(8):1521-1528.  4 Lehman NL, Spassky N, Sak M, Webb A, Zumbar CT, Usubalieva A, Alkhateeb KJ, McElroy JP, Maclean KH, Fadda P, Liu T, Gangalapudi V, Carver J, Abdullaev Z, Timmers C, Parker JR, Pierson CR, Mobley BC, Gokden M, Hattab EM, Parrett T, Cooke RX, Lehman TD, Costinean S, Parwani A, Williams BJ, Jensen RL, Aldape K and Mistry AM (2022). Astroblastomas exhibit radial glia stem cell lineages and differential expression of imprinted and X-inactivation escape genes. *Nat Commun* 13(1):2083. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5.  d Repeat for each alteration. |
| Core | *MYC* GENE FAMILY AMPLIFICATION (*MYC* and/or *MYCN*)c | * Indeterminate * Absent * Absent with low level gain * Present, *describe including copy number*   TESTING METHODd  (select all that apply)   * ISH * Array-based method * NGS * Other, *specify* | The MYC (v-myc avian myelocytomatosis viral oncogene homolog; 8q24.21) protein has a fundamental role in cell proliferation, cell size, differentiation, stem cell self-renewal, and apoptosis. Its deregulation occurs in many cancers including a range of CNS tumours. The MYC transcription factor family also includes its paralogues MYCN and MYCL.[1](#_ENREF_1)  *MYC*, *MYCN,* and *MYCL* amplifications are prognostically relevant in medulloblastomas.[2](#_ENREF_2) *MYC* and *MYCN* gene amplification and fusions are seen in SHH-activated and in non-WNT/non-SHH medulloblastomas, but almost never in the WNT-activated type.[2](#_ENREF_2),[3](#_ENREF_3) Furthermore, *MYCN*-amplification is listed in the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification as an essential diagnostic criterion for spinal ependymoma, *MYCN*-amplified.[4](#_ENREF_4) Rarely, such aggressive spinal ependymomas may show amplification of *MYC*.[5](#_ENREF_5)  A commonly used laboratory method to detect MYC gene family amplifications is FISH or CISH. Other approaches include RT-PCR, droplet-based digital PCR (ddPCR), NGS, multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA), or array technologies.  Investigation of *MYC* or *MYCN* alteration is a core element for diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3- and IDH-wildtype; and spinal ependymoma, *MYCN*-amplified. References 1 Dang CV (2013). MYC, metabolism, cell growth, and tumorigenesis. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med* 3(8).  2 Northcott PA, Shih DJ, Peacock J, Garzia L, Morrissy AS, Zichner T, Stutz AM, Korshunov A, Reimand J, Schumacher SE, Beroukhim R, Ellison DW, Marshall CR, Lionel AC, Mack S, Dubuc A, Yao Y, Ramaswamy V, Luu B, Rolider A, Cavalli FM, Wang X, Remke M, Wu X, Chiu RY, Chu A, Chuah E, Corbett RD, Hoad GR, Jackman SD, Li Y, Lo A, Mungall KL, Nip KM, Qian JQ, Raymond AG, Thiessen NT, Varhol RJ, Birol I, Moore RA, Mungall AJ, Holt R, Kawauchi D, Roussel MF, Kool M, Jones DT, Witt H, Fernandez LA, Kenney AM, Wechsler-Reya RJ, Dirks P, Aviv T, Grajkowska WA, Perek-Polnik M, Haberler CC, Delattre O, Reynaud SS, Doz FF, Pernet-Fattet SS, Cho BK, Kim SK, Wang KC, Scheurlen W, Eberhart CG, Fevre-Montange M, Jouvet A, Pollack IF, Fan X, Muraszko KM, Gillespie GY, Di Rocco C, Massimi L, Michiels EM, Kloosterhof NK, French PJ, Kros JM, Olson JM, Ellenbogen RG, Zitterbart K, Kren L, Thompson RC, Cooper MK, Lach B, McLendon RE, Bigner DD, Fontebasso A, Albrecht S, Jabado N, Lindsey JC, Bailey S, Gupta N, Weiss WA, Bognar L, Klekner A, Van Meter TE, Kumabe T, Tominaga T, Elbabaa SK, Leonard JR, Rubin JB, Liau LM, Van Meir EG, Fouladi M, Nakamura H, Cinalli G, Garami M, Hauser P, Saad AG, Iolascon A, Jung S, Carlotti CG, Vibhakar R, Ra YS, Robinson S, Zollo M, Faria CC, Chan JA, Levy ML, Sorensen PH, Meyerson M, Pomeroy SL, Cho YJ, Bader GD, Tabori U, Hawkins CE, Bouffet E, Scherer SW, Rutka JT, Malkin D, Clifford SC, Jones SJ, Korbel JO, Pfister SM, Marra MA and Taylor MD (2012). Subgroup-specific structural variation across 1,000 medulloblastoma genomes. *Nature* 488(7409):49-56.  3 Roussel MF and Robinson GW (2013). Role of MYC in Medulloblastoma. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med* 3(11).  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  5 Shatara M, Schieffer KM, Klawinski D, Thomas DL, Pierson CR, Sribnick EA, Jones J, Rodriguez DP, Deeg C, Hamelberg E, LaHaye S, Miller KE, Fitch J, Kelly B, Leraas K, Pfau R, White P, Magrini V, Wilson RK, Mardis ER, Abdelbaki MS, Finlay JL, Boué DR, Cottrell CE, Ghasemi DR, Pajtler KW and Osorio DS (2021). Clinically aggressive pediatric spinal ependymoma with novel MYC amplification demonstrates molecular and histopathologic similarity to newly described MYCN-amplified spinal ependymomas. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 9(1):192. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5.  d Repeat for each alteration. |
| Core | *PDGFRA* ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe including copy number*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | *PDGFRA* (platelet-derived growth factor receptor, alpha polypeptide; 4q12) gene alterations have been described in several CNS tumour types, including low grade and high grade gliomas as well as glioneuronal tumours. These alterations include gains/amplifications and/or DNA sequence variants of *PDGFRA*.  *PDGFRA* amplifications and/or sequence alterations are found in variable frequency in both paediatric-type and adult-type high grade gliomas, including:   * diffuse paediatric-type high grade gliomas, H3-wildtype and IDH-wildtype;[1](#_ENREF_1) * diffuse midline gliomas, H3 K27-altered;[2](#_ENREF_2) * diffuse hemispheric gliomas, H3 G34-mutant;[3](#_ENREF_3) * glioblastomas, IDH-wildtype;[4](#_ENREF_4) and * astrocytomas, IDH-mutant (roughly a third of the CNS WHO grade 4 tumours);[5](#_ENREF_5) and * myxoid glioneuronal tumour, (within the right context) dinucleotide mutation in *PDGFRA* resulting in p.K385L (or p.K385I) being diagnostic for this diagnosis.[6-8](#_ENREF_6)   Investigation of *PDGFRA* alteration is a core element for diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3- and IDH-wildtype. References 1 Korshunov A, Schrimpf D, Ryzhova M, Sturm D, Chavez L, Hovestadt V, Sharma T, Habel A, Burford A, Jones C, Zheludkova O, Kumirova E, Kramm CM, Golanov A, Capper D, von Deimling A, Pfister SM and Jones DTW (2017). H3-/IDH-wild type pediatric glioblastoma is comprised of molecularly and prognostically distinct subtypes with associated oncogenic drivers. *Acta Neuropathol* 134(3):507-516.  2 Khuong-Quang DA, Buczkowicz P, Rakopoulos P, Liu XY, Fontebasso AM, Bouffet E, Bartels U, Albrecht S, Schwartzentruber J, Letourneau L, Bourgey M, Bourque G, Montpetit A, Bourret G, Lepage P, Fleming A, Lichter P, Kool M, von Deimling A, Sturm D, Korshunov A, Faury D, Jones DT, Majewski J, Pfister SM, Jabado N and Hawkins C (2012). K27M mutation in histone H3.3 defines clinically and biologically distinct subgroups of pediatric diffuse intrinsic pontine gliomas. *Acta Neuropathol* 124(3):439-447.  3 Chen CCL, Deshmukh S, Jessa S, Hadjadj D, Lisi V, Andrade AF, Faury D, Jawhar W, Dali R, Suzuki H, Pathania M, A D, Dubois F, Woodward E, Hébert S, Coutelier M, Karamchandani J, Albrecht S, Brandner S, De Jay N, Gayden T, Bajic A, Harutyunyan AS, Marchione DM, Mikael LG, Juretic N, Zeinieh M, Russo C, Maestro N, Bassenden AV, Hauser P, Virga J, Bognar L, Klekner A, Zapotocky M, Vicha A, Krskova L, Vanova K, Zamecnik J, Sumerauer D, Ekert PG, Ziegler DS, Ellezam B, Filbin MG, Blanchette M, Hansford JR, Khuong-Quang DA, Berghuis AM, Weil AG, Garcia BA, Garzia L, Mack SC, Beroukhim R, Ligon KL, Taylor MD, Bandopadhayay P, Kramm C, Pfister SM, Korshunov A, Sturm D, Jones DTW, Salomoni P, Kleinman CL and Jabado N (2020). Histone H3.3G34-Mutant Interneuron Progenitors Co-opt PDGFRA for Gliomagenesis. *Cell* 183(6):1617-1633.e1622.  4 Fujimoto K, Arita H, Satomi K, Yamasaki K, Matsushita Y, Nakamura T, Miyakita Y, Umehara T, Kobayashi K, Tamura K, Tanaka S, Higuchi F, Okita Y, Kanemura Y, Fukai J, Sakamoto D, Uda T, Machida R, Kuchiba A, Maehara T, Nagane M, Nishikawa R, Suzuki H, Shibuya M, Komori T, Narita Y and Ichimura K (2021). TERT promoter mutation status is necessary and sufficient to diagnose IDH-wildtype diffuse astrocytic glioma with molecular features of glioblastoma. *Acta Neuropathol* 142(2):323-338.  5 Wong QH, Li KK, Wang WW, Malta TM, Noushmehr H, Grabovska Y, Jones C, Chan AK, Kwan JS, Huang QJ, Wong GC, Li WC, Liu XZ, Chen H, Chan DT, Mao Y, Zhang ZY, Shi ZF and Ng HK (2021). Molecular landscape of IDH-mutant primary astrocytoma Grade IV/glioblastomas. *Mod Pathol* 34(7):1245-1260.  6 Chiang JCH, Harreld JH, Tanaka R, Li X, Wen J, Zhang C, Boué DR, Rauch TM, Boyd JT, Chen J, Corbo JC, Bouldin TW, Elton SW, Liu LL, Schofield D, Lee SC, Bouffard JP, Georgescu MM, Dossani RH, Aguiar MA, Sances RA, Saad AG, Boop FA, Qaddoumi I and Ellison DW (2019). Septal dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumor: a comprehensive clinical, imaging, histopathologic, and molecular analysis. *Neuro Oncol* 21(6):800-808.  7 Lucas CG, Villanueva-Meyer JE, Whipple N, Oberheim Bush NA, Cooney T, Chang S, McDermott M, Berger M, Cham E, Sun PP, Putnam A, Zhou H, Bollo R, Cheshier S, Poppe MM, Fung KM, Sung S, Glenn C, Fan X, Bannykh S, Hu J, Danielpour M, Li R, Alva E, Johnston J, Van Ziffle J, Onodera C, Devine P, Grenert JP, Lee JC, Pekmezci M, Tihan T, Bollen AW, Perry A and Solomon DA (2020). Myxoid glioneuronal tumor, PDGFRA p.K385-mutant: clinical, radiologic, and histopathologic features. *Brain Pathol* 30(3):479-494.  8 Solomon DA, Korshunov A, Sill M, Jones DTW, Kool M, Pfister SM, Fan X, Bannykh S, Hu J, Danielpour M, Li R, Johnston J, Cham E, Cooney T, Sun PP, Oberheim Bush NA, McDermott M, Van Ziffle J, Onodera C, Grenert JP, Bastian BC, Villanueva-Meyer JE, Pekmezci M, Bollen AW and Perry A (2018). Myxoid glioneuronal tumor of the septum pellucidum and lateral ventricle is defined by a recurrent PDGFRA p.K385 mutation and DNT-like methylation profile. *Acta Neuropathol* 136(2):339-343. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | PITUITARY HORMONES AND TRANSCRIPTION FACTORS IMMUNO-HISTOCHEMISTRYc | **Tumour cells are reactive for**  (select all that apply)   * Indeterminate * Prolactin * Human growth hormone * ß-TSH * ß-FSH * ß-LH * Alpha subunit * ACTH * PIT1 * TPIT * SF1 * Other, *specify* | Standard IHC evaluation of pituitary neuroendocrine tumours/pituitary adenomas can include immunostaining for specific anterior pituitary hormones (prolactin, growth hormone, follicle stimulating hormone, luteinising hormone, thyroid stimulating hormone, alpha-subunit of glycoproteins, adrenocorticotrophic hormone (PRL, GH, FSH, LH, TSH, ASU, ACTH, respectively) and pituitary transcription factors (PIT1, TPIT, SF1).[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) Other transcriptions factors, including GATA3 and ERα, may be useful in certain instances.[1](#_ENREF_1) Practical suggestions for evidence-based IHC workup have been published by McDonald (2024).[3](#_ENREF_3)  Immunohistochemistry (IHC) for these proteins, coupled with cytokeratin (AE1/AE3 or CAM5.2) staining, for presence or absence of rounded cytoplasmic inclusions known as fibrous bodies, allows classification of pituitary tumours/pituitary adenomas for prognosis and medical treatment purposes.  For diagnostic purposes, some advocate first screening with three antibodies (PIT1, SF1, and TPIT) and then using the other anterior pituitary hormone assays based on initial results.[4-6](#_ENREF_4) Others utilise the full panel initially and may variably supplement the panel.[7](#_ENREF_7) The proliferation-associated marker Ki-67 (MIB1) is used for evaluation of the proliferative potential of tumours.[1](#_ENREF_1),[7](#_ENREF_7) There appears to be little utility for p53 IHC, with rare exceptions, such as corticotroph tumours/adenomas.[1](#_ENREF_1),[8](#_ENREF_8),[9](#_ENREF_9)  The WHO 5th edition CNS[10](#_ENREF_10)) and Endocrine[11](#_ENREF_11) Classification systems note that: “Special tumour/adenoma subtypes that commonly show aggressive behaviour…include sparsely granulated somatotroph tumour/adenoma, lactotroph tumours/adenomas in men, Crooke cell tumour/adenoma and silent corticotroph tumour/adenoma, and immature PIT1-lineage adenoma (previously called ‘silent subtype 3 adenoma’).”  For tumours of the posterior pituitary gland (granular cell tumour of the sellar region, pituicytoma, spindle cell oncocytoma), nuclear staining for the transcription factor TTF1 is used as a diagnostic marker.[12](#_ENREF_12)  Investigation of pituitary hormones and transcription factors by IHC is a core element for pituicytoma; granular cell tumour of the sellar region; spindle cell oncocytoma; and pituitary adenoma/pituitary neuroendocrine tumour. References 1 Asa SL, Mete O, Perry A and Osamura RY (2022). Overview of the 2022 WHO Classification of Pituitary Tumors. *Endocr Pathol* 33(1):6-26.  2 Lopes MBS, Asa SL, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Mete O, Osuamura Y and Villa C (2021). Pituitary adenoma/pituitary neuroendocrine tumour. In: *Central Nervous System Tumours. WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition*, DJ B (ed), IARC Press, Lyon, France.  3 McDonald WC (2024). Pituitary adenoma classification: Tools to improve the current system. *Free Neuropathol* 5.  4 McDonald WC, Banerji N, McDonald KN, Ho B, Macias V and Kajdacsy-Balla A (2017). Steroidogenic Factor 1, Pit-1, and Adrenocorticotropic Hormone: A Rational Starting Place for the Immunohistochemical Characterization of Pituitary Adenoma. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 141(1):104-112.  5 Lenders NF, Chui J, Low J, Inder WJ, Earls PE and McCormack AI (2022). Development of a cost-effective diagnostic algorithm incorporating transcription factor immunohistochemistry in the evaluation of pituitary tumours. *Pituitary* 25(6):997-1003.  6 McDonald WC, McDonald KN, Helmer JA, Ho B, Wang A and Banerji N (2021). The Role of T-box Transcription Factor in a Pituitary Adenoma Diagnostic Algorithm. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 145(5):592-598.  7 Villa C, Vasiljevic A, Jaffrain-Rea ML, Ansorge O, Asioli S, Barresi V, Chinezu L, Gardiman MP, Lania A, Lapshina AM, Poliani L, Reiniger L, Righi A, Saeger W, Soukup J, Theodoropoulou M, Uccella S, Trouillas J and Roncaroli F (2019). A standardised diagnostic approach to pituitary neuroendocrine tumours (PitNETs): a European Pituitary Pathology Group (EPPG) proposal. *Virchows Arch* 475(6):687-692.  8 Casar-Borota O, Boldt HB, Engström BE, Andersen MS, Baussart B, Bengtsson D, Berinder K, Ekman B, Feldt-Rasmussen U, Höybye C, Jørgensen JOL, Kolnes AJ, Korbonits M, Rasmussen Å K, Lindsay JR, Loughrey PB, Maiter D, Manojlovic-Gacic E, Pahnke J, Poliani PL, Popovic V, Ragnarsson O, Schalin-Jäntti C, Scheie D, Tóth M, Villa C, Wirenfeldt M, Kunicki J and Burman P (2021). Corticotroph Aggressive Pituitary Tumors and Carcinomas Frequently Harbor ATRX Mutations. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 106(4):1183-1194.  9 Trouillas J, Jaffrain-Rea ML, Vasiljevic A, Raverot G, Roncaroli F and Villa C (2020). How to Classify the Pituitary Neuroendocrine Tumors (PitNET)s in 2020. *Cancers (Basel)* 12(2):514.  10 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  11 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2022). *Endocrine and Neuroendocrine Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 10*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  12 Lopes MB, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Mete O, Roncaroli F and Shibuya M (2021). Pituicytoma, granular cell tumour of the sellar region, and spindle cell oncocytoma. In: *Central Nervous System Tumours. WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition*, Brat DJ and Wesseling P (eds), IARC Press, Lyon, France. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | PRC2 ALTERATIONc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | PRC2 (polycomb Repressive Complex 2) is an epigenetic regulator that is frequently inactivated in malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumours (MPNSTs).  In MPNSTs, loss-of-function genetic alterations or epigenetic silencing of PRC2 components, such as EZH2 (Enhancer of Zeste Homolog 2) or SUZ12 (Suppressor of Zeste 12), results in reduced H3K27me3 levels at target gene promoters. Consequently, this dysregulation leads to the activation of genes promoting tumour progression.  H3K27me3 loss has been shown to be a relatively specific marker for MPNSTs and may be helpful in the differential diagnosis to distinguish MPNSTs from histologic mimics, especially when supportive Schwann cell markers are absent.[1](#_ENREF_1)  Components of the PRC2 complex, such as EZH2, represent therapeutic targets undergoing clinical trials and further research.  Investigation of PRC2 alteration is a core element for malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumour. Reference 1 Schaefer IM, Fletcher CD and Hornick JL (2016). Loss of H3K27 trimethylation distinguishes malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumors from histologic mimics. *Mod Pathol* 29(1):4-13. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *PRKAR1A* ALTERATIONc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | *PRKAR1A* (protein kinase, cAMP-dependent, regulatory, type I, alpha; 17q24.2) encodes the regulatory subunit of cyclic AMP-dependent protein kinase A (PKA) and is associated with Carney complex, a syndrome characterised by an increased risk of several types of tumours, including malignant melanotic nerve sheath tumours. These nerve sheath tumours demonstrate frequent loss of function alterations in *PRKAR1A*.[1](#_ENREF_1) *PRKAR1A* alterations can be in the form of single base pair substitutions, deletions and insertions, or rearrangements.  Loss of PRKAR1A expression can also be detected using IHC.  Investigation of *PRKAR1A* alteration is a core element for malignant melanotic nerve sheath tumour. Reference 1 Wang L, Zehir A, Sadowska J, Zhou N, Rosenblum M, Busam K, Agaram N, Travis W, Arcila M, Dogan S, Berger MF, Cheng DT, Ladanyi M, Nafa K and Hameed M (2015). Consistent copy number changes and recurrent PRKAR1A mutations distinguish Melanotic Schwannomas from Melanomas: SNP-array and next generation sequencing analysis. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 54(8):463-471. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *PRKCA* ALTERATIONc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | *PRKCA* (protein kinase C alpha; 17q24.2) encodes a protein kinase involved in cellular signalling pathways related to proliferation and differentiation. *PRKCA* alterations, including gene rearrangements, are diagnostic for papillary glioneuronal tumours,[1](#_ENREF_1) which can be challenging to classify and thus are an essential WHO criterium for these tumours.[2](#_ENREF_2)  In addition, the hotspot *PRKCA* missense variant p.D463H is highly specific for chordoid gliomas and is considered a desirable diagnostic WHO criterium for these tumours.[2](#_ENREF_2)  Investigation of *PRKCA* alteration is a core element for papillary glioneuronal tumour. References 1 Hou Y, Pinheiro J, Sahm F, Reuss DE, Schrimpf D, Stichel D, Casalini B, Koelsche C, Sievers P, Wefers AK, Reinhardt A, Ebrahimi A, Fernández-Klett F, Pusch S, Meier J, Schweizer L, Paulus W, Prinz M, Hartmann C, Plate KH, Reifenberger G, Pietsch T, Varlet P, Pagès M, Schüller U, Scheie D, de Stricker K, Frank S, Hench J, Pollo B, Brandner S, Unterberg A, Pfister SM, Jones DTW, Korshunov A, Wick W, Capper D, Blümcke I, von Deimling A and Bertero L (2019). Papillary glioneuronal tumor (PGNT) exhibits a characteristic methylation profile and fusions involving PRKCA. *Acta Neuropathol* 137(5):837-846.  2 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | SHH PATHWAY ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHODd  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | About 30% of all medulloblastomas are characterised by SHH (sonic hedgehog) pathway activation, caused by genetic alterations in *PTCH1*, *SUFU*, *SMO*, or other genes encoding components of the SHH signalling pathway.  In SHH-activated medulloblastomas, the *TP53* status needs to be assessed for a precise diagnosis as this group encompasses two very different disease entities. *TP53*-wildtype SHH-activated medulloblastomas occur mostly in adolescents/adults and young children and are associated with a favourable prognosis if adequately treated. In contrast, *TP53*-mutant SHH-activated medulloblastomas typically occur in older children and have a dismal prognosis.  A substantial subset of the SHH-activated medulloblastomas has the desmoplastic/nodular (D/N) phenotype and a small minority concerns medulloblastomas with extensive nodularity. The large cell/anaplastic (LC/A) phenotype is relatively frequent in the group of *TP53*-mutant SHH-activated medulloblastomas.  SHH activation can reliably be assessed by immunohistochemical cytoplasmatic staining for the SHH target proteins GAB1 and p75NGFR. Furthermore, these medulloblastomas share expression of nuclear YAP1 with WNT-activated medulloblastomas but lack OTX2 expression as well as nuclear accumulation of β-catenin protein. DNA methylation and mRNA expression profiles can be used for detecting SHH-activated medulloblastomas as well. As germline alterations are relatively frequent in patients with SHH-activated medulloblastoma, patients with this tumour requires genetic counselling.  The canonical inherited syndrome associated with *TP53*-wildtype SHH-activated medulloblastoma is naevoid basal cell carcinoma (Gorlin) syndrome, which is mostly due to inactivating germline alterations in *PTCH1* (9q22.32; encoding the receptor for the SHH protein), and more rarely due to a *SUFU* (10q24.32) or *PTCH2* (1p34.1) mutation. Germline alterations in *ELP1* (9q31.3) and in *GPR161* (1q24.2) have also been reported in SHH-activated medulloblastomas. More than half of the patients with a SHH-activated and *TP53*-mutant medulloblastomas have germline rather than somatic *TP53* alterations (Li-Fraumeni syndrome).  Widespread and strong immunohistochemical staining for p53 in an SHH-activated medulloblastomas strongly indicates a *TP53*-mutant tumour. Most of these tumours show cytological anaplasia, at least focally. Ideally, because of the important consequences for treatment decisions and possible germ line alterations, SHH-activated tumours should be sequenced for presence/absence of *TP53* (17p13.1) alterations.[1-5](#_ENREF_1)  Non-WNT/non-SHH medulloblastomas express OTX2 but lack staining of tumour cells for YAP1, GAB1, p75NGFR and nuclear β-catenin. Also, non-WNT/non-SHH medulloblastomas are generally not associated with genetic tumour syndromes (only rare cases have been reported in individuals with a germline alteration in *CREBBP* (Rubinstein–Taybi syndrome) or in the DNA repair genes *PALB2* (16p12.2) or *BRCA2* (13q13.1)).[2](#_ENREF_2)  Investigation of SHH pathway alteration is a core element for medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-wildtype; medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-mutant; and medulloblastoma, non-WNT/non-SHH. References 1 Begemann M, Waszak SM, Robinson GW, Jäger N, Sharma T, Knopp C, Kraft F, Moser O, Mynarek M, Guerrini-Rousseau L, Brugieres L, Varlet P, Pietsch T, Bowers DC, Chintagumpala M, Sahm F, Korbel JO, Rutkowski S, Eggermann T, Gajjar A, Northcott P, Elbracht M, Pfister SM, Kontny U and Kurth I (2020). Germline GPR161 Mutations Predispose to Pediatric Medulloblastoma. *J Clin Oncol* 38(1):43-50.  2 Pietsch T and Haberler C (2016). Update on the integrated histopathological and genetic classification of medulloblastoma - a practical diagnostic guideline. *Clin Neuropathol* 35(6):344-352.  3 Waszak SM, Northcott PA, Buchhalter I, Robinson GW, Sutter C, Groebner S, Grund KB, Brugières L, Jones DTW, Pajtler KW, Morrissy AS, Kool M, Sturm D, Chavez L, Ernst A, Brabetz S, Hain M, Zichner T, Segura-Wang M, Weischenfeldt J, Rausch T, Mardin BR, Zhou X, Baciu C, Lawerenz C, Chan JA, Varlet P, Guerrini-Rousseau L, Fults DW, Grajkowska W, Hauser P, Jabado N, Ra YS, Zitterbart K, Shringarpure SS, De La Vega FM, Bustamante CD, Ng HK, Perry A, MacDonald TJ, Hernáiz Driever P, Bendel AE, Bowers DC, McCowage G, Chintagumpala MM, Cohn R, Hassall T, Fleischhack G, Eggen T, Wesenberg F, Feychting M, Lannering B, Schüz J, Johansen C, Andersen TV, Röösli M, Kuehni CE, Grotzer M, Kjaerheim K, Monoranu CM, Archer TC, Duke E, Pomeroy SL, Shelagh R, Frank S, Sumerauer D, Scheurlen W, Ryzhova MV, Milde T, Kratz CP, Samuel D, Zhang J, Solomon DA, Marra M, Eils R, Bartram CR, von Hoff K, Rutkowski S, Ramaswamy V, Gilbertson RJ, Korshunov A, Taylor MD, Lichter P, Malkin D, Gajjar A, Korbel JO and Pfister SM (2018). Spectrum and prevalence of genetic predisposition in medulloblastoma: a retrospective genetic study and prospective validation in a clinical trial cohort. *Lancet Oncol* 19(6):785-798.  4 Waszak SM, Robinson GW, Gudenas BL, Smith KS, Forget A, Kojic M, Garcia-Lopez J, Hadley J, Hamilton KV, Indersie E, Buchhalter I, Kerssemakers J, Jäger N, Sharma T, Rausch T, Kool M, Sturm D, Jones DTW, Vasilyeva A, Tatevossian RG, Neale G, Lombard B, Loew D, Nakitandwe J, Rusch M, Bowers DC, Bendel A, Partap S, Chintagumpala M, Crawford J, Gottardo NG, Smith A, Dufour C, Rutkowski S, Eggen T, Wesenberg F, Kjaerheim K, Feychting M, Lannering B, Schüz J, Johansen C, Andersen TV, Röösli M, Kuehni CE, Grotzer M, Remke M, Puget S, Pajtler KW, Milde T, Witt O, Ryzhova M, Korshunov A, Orr BA, Ellison DW, Brugieres L, Lichter P, Nichols KE, Gajjar A, Wainwright BJ, Ayrault O, Korbel JO, Northcott PA and Pfister SM (2020). Germline Elongator mutations in Sonic Hedgehog medulloblastoma. *Nature* 580(7803):396-401.  5 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5.  d Repeat for each alteration. |
| Core | SMARC FAMILY ALTERATIONSc | ***SMARCA4/BRG1* alteration**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe* *sequence variant(s)*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * NGS * PCR-based method * Other, *specify*   **BRG1 loss of expression (IHC)**   * Indeterminate * Intact nuclear expression * Loss of nuclear expression   ***SMARCB1/INI1/SNF5* alteration**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe* *sequence variant(s)*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * NGS * PCR-based method * Other, *specify*   **INI1 (BAF47) loss of expression (IHC)**   * Indeterminate * Intact nuclear expression * Loss of nuclear expression | Atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumour (AT/RT) is defined as a CNS embryonal tumour that frequently (but not invariably) contains rhabdoid cells and demonstrates inactivation of the SMARC(SWI/SNF related, matrix associated, actin dependent regulator of chromatin) genes *SMARCB1* (INI1) or *SMARCA4* (BRG1).  ***SMARCB1*/INI1/SNF5 alterations**  Inactivation of the *SMARCB1* (*INI1*, *BAF47*, *SNF5*) gene (22q11.23) is present in almost all cases of AT/RT, resulting in nuclear loss of SMARCB1 protein which can be evaluated by IHC. Genetic aberrations of the *SMARCB1* locus may include homozygous or heterozygous deletions and a variety of coding sequence variants, leading to inactivation of both alleles. However, genetic testing is usually not required for making the diagnosis of AT/RT because IHC is highly sensitive.  Since SMARCB1 is a constitutively expressed protein, IHC staining for SMARCB1 in the nuclei of non-neoplastic cells (such as vascular and inflammatory cells) serves as an internal positive control. Some AT/RTs with nuclear loss of SMARCB1 exhibit cytoplasmic staining, possibly representing dysfunctional truncated protein.  In tumours with histological features of AT/RTs but without demonstration of *SMARCB1* or *SMARCA4* alterations, a diagnosis of ‘CNS embryonal tumour with rhabdoid features, NEC’ can be made.  A variety of other tumour types that involve the nervous system may exhibit loss of nuclear SMARCB1, including cribriform neuroepithelial tumour, poorly differentiated chordoma, rhabdoid tumour of the sellar region, myxoid meningeal tumours, and sinonasal carcinoma.[1](#_ENREF_1) The molecular and nosologic relationship of these tumours to AT/RT is unclear. Furthermore, complete or incomplete (reduced, mosaic) loss of nuclear SMARCB1 protein expression has been found in some cases of choroid plexus carcinoma, synovial sarcoma, epithelioid schwannoma, and schwannoma associated with schwannomatosis.  ***SMARCA4*/BRG1 alterations**  The *SMARCA4* gene (19p13.2) encodes the transcription activator BRG1, also known as adenosine triphosphate (ATP)-dependent chromatin remodeller SMARCA4. AT/RTs with *SMARCA4* alterations are extremely rare. Loss of BRG1 expression (and retention of INI1 expression) in these tumours can be readily demonstrated by IHC. Associated genetic alterations of *SMARCA4*, whether copy number alterations or mutations, can be detected by a variety of array or sequencing methods.  Investigation of SMARC alteration is a core element for atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumour; cribriform neuroepithelial tumour; poorly differentiated chordoma; and desmoplastic myxoid tumour of the pineal region, *SMARCB1*-mutant. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | STAT6 ALTERATIONSc | **STAT6 expression (IHC)**   * Indeterminate * Absence of nuclear expression * Positive nuclear expression   ***STAT6* rearrangement**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | In-frame *NAB2::STAT6* gene fusions result from chromosome 12q13 inversions and represent highly sensitive and specific signature alterations of meningeal solitary fibrous tumours (SFT) of grade 1, 2, or 3. These fusions are also characteristic of the analogous soft tissue/extracranial counterparts.  STAT6 (signal transducer and activator of transcription 6) staining of tumour cell nuclei is a highly reliable and practical surrogate for detecting this signature alteration, with nearly 100% sensitivity and specificity regardless of the fusion variant,[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) and is listed as essential diagnostic criterion for SFT in the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification.[3](#_ENREF_3)  ***NAB2::STAT6* gene fusion**  *NAB2::STAT6* gene fusions are detectable using RT-PCR, ISH or various sequencing techniques, including NGS if designed appropriately.[1](#_ENREF_1),[4](#_ENREF_4) Over 40 fusion variants have been detected to date, with the most common meningeal SFT-associated fusions bringing together exon 6 of *NAB2* (NGFI-A-binding protein 2; 2q13.3) with exons 16, 17, or 18 of *STAT6* (2q13.3) in approximately half of all cases.[4](#_ENREF_4)  **STAT6 nuclear expression (immunohistochemistry)**  The STAT6 protein is normally expressed in the cytoplasm of cells, whereas NAB2 is expressed in nuclei; however, the *NAB2::STAT6* fusions cause the STAT6 protein to translocate to the nucleus. Nearly all meningeal and extracranial SFTs display strong and extensive/diffuse nuclear positivity, whereas other diagnostic considerations, such as meningiomas, nerve sheath tumours, and various sarcomas, either lack expression or show only cytoplasmic staining. As such, the pathologist is cautioned against rendering a diagnosis of SFT in the absence of nuclear STAT6 immunoreactivity.  Investigation of STAT6 alteration is a core element for solitary fibrous tumour. References 1 Schweizer L, Koelsche C, Sahm F, Piro RM, Capper D, Reuss DE, Pusch S, Habel A, Meyer J, Gock T, Jones DT, Mawrin C, Schittenhelm J, Becker A, Heim S, Simon M, Herold-Mende C, Mechtersheimer G, Paulus W, Konig R, Wiestler OD, Pfister SM and von Deimling A (2013). Meningeal hemangiopericytoma and solitary fibrous tumors carry the NAB2-STAT6 fusion and can be diagnosed by nuclear expression of STAT6 protein. *Acta Neuropathol* 125(5):651-658.  2 Koelsche C, Schweizer L, Renner M, Warth A, Jones DT, Sahm F, Reuss DE, Capper D, Knosel T, Schulz B, Petersen I, Ulrich A, Renker EK, Lehner B, Pfister SM, Schirmacher P, von Deimling A and Mechtersheimer G (2014). Nuclear relocation of STAT6 reliably predicts NAB2-STAT6 fusion for the diagnosis of solitary fibrous tumour. *Histopathology* 65(5):613-622.  3 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  4 Nakada S, Minato H and Nojima T (2016). Clinicopathological differences between variants of the NAB2-STAT6 fusion gene in solitary fibrous tumors of the meninges and extra-central nervous system. *Brain Tumor Pathol* 33(3):169-174. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *TERT* PROMOTER ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Hotspot variant (C228T or C250T) * Other sequence variant, *specify*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * NGS * PCR-based method * Other, *specify* | The *TERT* (telomerase reverse transcriptase; 5p15.33) gene encodes a major component of the protein complex telomerase and contributes to maintaining telomere length. Sequence variants in the *TERT* promoter create new binding sites for erythroblast transformation specific transcription factors and subsequently increase expression and activity of telomerase.  *TERT* promoter variants are detectable in the majority of glioblastomas, IDH-wildtype and of oligodendrogliomas, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted, but are typically absent in astrocytomas, IDH-mutant.[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2)  In 2018, Consortium to Inform Molecular and Practical Approaches to CNS Tumour Taxonomy – Not Official WHO (cIMPACT-NOW) update 3 recommended the use of *TERT* promoter alteration as a molecular criterion for identifying a histologically lower grade appearing (grade 2 or 3) IDH-wildtype, adult-type diffuse astrocytic glioma as glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype (CNS WHO grade 4).[3](#_ENREF_3) This recommendation has been adopted by the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification.[4](#_ENREF_4) However, others have suggested using caution when assimilating IDH-wildtype, histologically grade 2 gliomas to ‘molecular glioblastomas’ in case of ‘isolated *TERT* promoter mutation’ (lacking *EGFR* amplification as well as combined gain of whole chromosome 7 and loss of whole chromosome 10).[5](#_ENREF_5),[6](#_ENREF_6) DNA methylome profiling and NGS may substantiate the diagnosis in such cases by demonstrating methylome profiles and additional genetic alterations of IDH-wildtype glioblastoma.  Approximately 20% of medulloblastomas carry *TERT* promoter alterations, and they are more common in adult patients and in the SHH-activated molecular type.[1](#_ENREF_1) In meningiomas, *TERT* promoter alterations have been found in 6% of tumours where they represent a marker of poor prognosis and according to the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification can be used to assign a CNS WHO grade 3.[7](#_ENREF_7) Approximately 50% of SFTs carry a *TERT* promoter alteration while other tumours of the CNS only uncommonly exhibit these alterations.[1](#_ENREF_1)  Two hotspot missense variants (abbreviated as C228T and C250T) represent the vast majority of *TERT* promoter alterations in CNS tumours. Other variants have been rarely detected in CNS tumours, such as C228A and C249T in gliomas.[1](#_ENREF_1) TERT promoter variants can be detected by various molecular techniques, with Sanger sequencing, NGS and RT-PCR being most commonly used.  Investigation of *TERT* promoter alteration is a core element for glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype; and meningioma. References 1 Koelsche C, Sahm F, Capper D, Reuss D, Sturm D, Jones DT, Kool M, Northcott PA, Wiestler B, Bohmer K, Meyer J, Mawrin C, Hartmann C, Mittelbronn M, Platten M, Brokinkel B, Seiz M, Herold-Mende C, Unterberg A, Schittenhelm J, Weller M, Pfister S, Wick W, Korshunov A and von Deimling A (2013). Distribution of TERT promoter mutations in pediatric and adult tumors of the nervous system. *Acta Neuropathol* 126(6):907-915.  2 Arita H, Narita Y, Takami H, Fukushima S, Matsushita Y, Yoshida A, Miyakita Y, Ohno M, Shibui S and Ichimura K (2013). TERT promoter mutations rather than methylation are the main mechanism for TERT upregulation in adult gliomas. *Acta Neuropathol* 126(6):939-941.  3 Brat DJ, Aldape K, Colman H, Holland EC, Louis DN, Jenkins RB, Kleinschmidt-DeMasters BK, Perry A, Reifenberger G, Stupp R, von Deimling A and Weller M (2018). cIMPACT-NOW update 3: recommended diagnostic criteria for "Diffuse astrocytic glioma, IDH-wildtype, with molecular features of glioblastoma, WHO grade IV". *Acta Neuropathol* 136(5):805-810.  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  5 Berzero G, Di Stefano AL, Ronchi S, Bielle F, Villa C, Guillerm E, Capelle L, Mathon B, Laurenge A, Giry M, Schmitt Y, Marie Y, Idbaih A, Hoang-Xuan K, Delattre JY, Mokhtari K and Sanson M (2021). IDH-wildtype lower-grade diffuse gliomas: the importance of histological grade and molecular assessment for prognostic stratification. *Neuro Oncol* 23(6):955-966.  6 Giannini C and Giangaspero F (2021). TERT promoter mutation: is it enough to call a WHO grade II astrocytoma IDH wild-type glioblastoma? *Neuro Oncol* 23(6):865-866.  7 Sahm F, Schrimpf D, Olar A, Koelsche C, Reuss D, Bissel J, Kratz A, Capper D, Schefzyk S, Hielscher T, Wang Q, Sulman EP, Adeberg S, Koch A, Okuducu AF, Brehmer S, Schittenhelm J, Becker A, Brokinkel B, Schmidt M, Ull T, Gousias K, Kessler AF, Lamszus K, Debus J, Mawrin C, Kim YJ, Simon M, Ketter R, Paulus W, Aldape KD, Herold-Mende C and von Deimling A (2016). TERT Promoter Mutations and Risk of Recurrence in Meningioma. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 108(5). | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *TP53* ALTERATIONSc | ***TP53* variant**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   EXONS ANALYSED   * Exons 5-8 * All exons * Other, *specify*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * Sanger sequencing * NGS * PCR-based method * IHC   **p53 expression**   * Negative or rare, lightly positive cells * Intermediate (intermediate numbers of predominantly   lightly positive cells)   * Positive (diffuse and strong nuclear positivity) * Other, *specify* | Sequence variants in the *TP53* (tumour protein p53; 17p13.1) gene are found in a variety of cancers including >80% of IDH-mutant diffuse astrocytic gliomas.[1](#_ENREF_1) *TP53* variants are less common in IDH-wildtype glioblastomas (23-28%) and are notably uncommon in oligodendrogliomas, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted.  Detection of a *TP53* variant may be used to support the diagnosis of IDH-mutant astrocytoma. However, exclusion of 1p/19q codeletion and ATRX loss of expression is not sufficient to establish this diagnosis, as rare cases of usually high grade and/or recurrent oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted may also feature *TP53* variants. Furthermore, *TP53* variants are important for classifying medulloblastomas, SHH pathway-activated and *TP53*-mutant. *TP53* alterations are common in some other types of brain tumours but are not listed as essential or desirable diagnostic criterion for these latter tumours.  Different DNA sequencing techniques may be used for detecting *TP53* variants, with NGS covering the entire coding sequence being most reliable, as sequence alterations tend to cluster in exons 5 to 8 but may also affect other exons. The vast majority of alterations are missense variants.  Immunohistochemistry (IHC) is a useful screening tool, given that most *TP53* missense variants result in increased p53 protein half-life that produces strong immunoreactivity in the majority of tumour cell nuclei (rather than scattered positivity and/or light nuclear staining). Strong p53 positivity in >10% of the tumour cell nuclei has been found to have a sensitivity of 77.4-78.8% and a specificity of 78.6-96.7% when compared to sequencing.[2](#_ENREF_2),[3](#_ENREF_3) Positive nuclear p53 staining correlates well with missense sequence variants with a sensitivity of 92% and a specificity of 79.4%, whereas only 33% of tumours with truncating *TP53* alterations show p53 positivity,[3](#_ENREF_3) with such alterations typically leading to negative staining.[4](#_ENREF_4)  Investigation of *TP53* alteration is a core element for medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-wildtype; and medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-mutant. References 1 Brat DJ, Verhaak RG, Aldape KD, Yung WK, Salama SR, Cooper LA, Rheinbay E, Miller CR, Vitucci M, Morozova O, Robertson AG, Noushmehr H, Laird PW, Cherniack AD, Akbani R, Huse JT, Ciriello G, Poisson LM, Barnholtz-Sloan JS, Berger MS, Brennan C, Colen RR, Colman H, Flanders AE, Giannini C, Grifford M, Iavarone A, Jain R, Joseph I, Kim J, Kasaian K, Mikkelsen T, Murray BA, O'Neill BP, Pachter L, Parsons DW, Sougnez C, Sulman EP, Vandenberg SR, Van Meir EG, von Deimling A, Zhang H, Crain D, Lau K, Mallery D, Morris S, Paulauskis J, Penny R, Shelton T, Sherman M, Yena P, Black A, Bowen J, Dicostanzo K, Gastier-Foster J, Leraas KM, Lichtenberg TM, Pierson CR, Ramirez NC, Taylor C, Weaver S, Wise L, Zmuda E, Davidsen T, Demchok JA, Eley G, Ferguson ML, Hutter CM, Mills Shaw KR, Ozenberger BA, Sheth M, Sofia HJ, Tarnuzzer R, Wang Z, Yang L, Zenklusen JC, Ayala B, Baboud J, Chudamani S, Jensen MA, Liu J, Pihl T, Raman R, Wan Y, Wu Y, Ally A, Auman JT, Balasundaram M, Balu S, Baylin SB, Beroukhim R, Bootwalla MS, Bowlby R, Bristow CA, Brooks D, Butterfield Y, Carlsen R, Carter S, Chin L, Chu A, Chuah E, Cibulskis K, Clarke A, Coetzee SG, Dhalla N, Fennell T, Fisher S, Gabriel S, Getz G, Gibbs R, Guin R, Hadjipanayis A, Hayes DN, Hinoue T, Hoadley K, Holt RA, Hoyle AP, Jefferys SR, Jones S, Jones CD, Kucherlapati R, Lai PH, Lander E, Lee S, Lichtenstein L, Ma Y, Maglinte DT, Mahadeshwar HS, Marra MA, Mayo M, Meng S, Meyerson ML, Mieczkowski PA, Moore RA, Mose LE, Mungall AJ, Pantazi A, Parfenov M, Park PJ, Parker JS, Perou CM, Protopopov A, Ren X, Roach J, Sabedot TS, Schein J, Schumacher SE, Seidman JG, Seth S, Shen H, Simons JV, Sipahimalani P, Soloway MG, Song X, Sun H, Tabak B, Tam A, Tan D, Tang J, Thiessen N, Triche T, Jr., Van Den Berg DJ, Veluvolu U, Waring S, Weisenberger DJ, Wilkerson MD, Wong T, Wu J, Xi L, Xu AW, Yang L, Zack TI, Zhang J, Aksoy BA, Arachchi H, Benz C, Bernard B, Carlin D, Cho J, DiCara D, Frazer S, Fuller GN, Gao J, Gehlenborg N, Haussler D, Heiman DI, Iype L, Jacobsen A, Ju Z, Katzman S, Kim H, Knijnenburg T, Kreisberg RB, Lawrence MS, Lee W, Leinonen K, Lin P, Ling S, Liu W, Liu Y, Liu Y, Lu Y, Mills G, Ng S, Noble MS, Paull E, Rao A, Reynolds S, Saksena G, Sanborn Z, Sander C, Schultz N, Senbabaoglu Y, Shen R, Shmulevich I, Sinha R, Stuart J, Sumer SO, Sun Y, Tasman N, Taylor BS, Voet D, Weinhold N, Weinstein JN, Yang D, Yoshihara K, Zheng S, Zhang W, Zou L, Abel T, Sadeghi S, Cohen ML, Eschbacher J, Hattab EM, Raghunathan A, Schniederjan MJ, Aziz D, Barnett G, Barrett W, Bigner DD, Boice L, Brewer C, Calatozzolo C, Campos B, Carlotti CG, Jr., Chan TA, Cuppini L, Curley E, Cuzzubbo S, Devine K, DiMeco F, Duell R, Elder JB, Fehrenbach A, Finocchiaro G, Friedman W, Fulop J, Gardner J, Hermes B, Herold-Mende C, Jungk C, Kendler A, Lehman NL, Lipp E, Liu O, Mandt R, McGraw M, McLendon R, McPherson C, Neder L, Nguyen P, Noss A, Nunziata R, Ostrom QT, Palmer C, Perin A, Pollo B, Potapov A, Potapova O, Rathmell WK, Rotin D, Scarpace L, Schilero C, Senecal K, Shimmel K, Shurkhay V, Sifri S, Singh R, Sloan AE, Smolenski K, Staugaitis SM, Steele R, Thorne L, Tirapelli DP, Unterberg A, Vallurupalli M, Wang Y, Warnick R, Williams F, Wolinsky Y, Bell S, Rosenberg M, Stewart C, Huang F, Grimsby JL, Radenbaugh AJ and Zhang J (2015). Comprehensive, Integrative Genomic Analysis of Diffuse Lower-Grade Gliomas. *N Engl J Med* 372(26):2481-2498.  2 Takami H, Yoshida A, Fukushima S, Arita H, Matsushita Y, Nakamura T, Ohno M, Miyakita Y, Shibui S, Narita Y and Ichimura K (2015). Revisiting TP53 Mutations and Immunohistochemistry--A Comparative Study in 157 Diffuse Gliomas. *Brain Pathol* 25(3):256-265.  3 Gillet E, Alentorn A, Doukoure B, Mundwiller E, van Thuijl HF, Reijneveld JC, Medina JA, Liou A, Marie Y, Mokhtari K, Hoang-Xuan K, Sanson M, Delattre JY and Idbaih A (2014). TP53 and p53 statuses and their clinical impact in diffuse low grade gliomas. *J Neurooncol* 118(1):131-139.  4 Tanboon J, Williams EA and Louis DN (2016). The Diagnostic Use of Immunohistochemical Surrogates for Signature Molecular Genetic Alterations in Gliomas. *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol* 75(1):4-18. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | TTF1 EXPRESSION (IHC)c | * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive | The TTF1 (thyroid transcription factor 1; 14q13.3) protein, encoded by the homeobox gene *NKX2-1* (14q13.3),[1](#_ENREF_1) is essential for organogenesis of the lung and thyroid gland. Furthermore, in the human embryonic and adult brain nuclear TTF1 expression appears to be restricted to the ventral forebrain and diencephalic origin structures, including normal pituicytes of the neurohypophysis,[2](#_ENREF_2) ependymal cells of the third ventricle and glial cells of the organum vasculosum of the lamina terminalis.[3](#_ENREF_3)  TTF1 nuclear expression in CNS tumours has been reported in posterior pituitary tumours including pituicytomas, spindle cell oncocytomas and granular cell tumours of the neurohypophysis, in ependymomas of the third ventricle, subependymal giant cell astrocytomas, and chordoid gliomas.[2-9](#_ENREF_2) In addition, glioblastomas with primitive neuronal components may express TTF1 in the embryonal, GFAP-negative tumour cell component depending which antibody clone is being utilised.[10](#_ENREF_10)  Investigation of TTF1 expression is a core element for pituicytoma; granular cell tumour of the sellar region; and spindle cell oncocytoma. References 1 Thorwarth A, Schnittert-Hübener S, Schrumpf P, Müller I, Jyrch S, Dame C, Biebermann H, Kleinau G, Katchanov J, Schuelke M, Ebert G, Steininger A, Bönnemann C, Brockmann K, Christen HJ, Crock P, deZegher F, Griese M, Hewitt J, Ivarsson S, Hübner C, Kapelari K, Plecko B, Rating D, Stoeva I, Ropers HH, Grüters A, Ullmann R and Krude H (2014). Comprehensive genotyping and clinical characterisation reveal 27 novel NKX2-1 mutations and expand the phenotypic spectrum. *J Med Genet* 51(6):375-387.  2 Lee EB, Tihan T, Scheithauer BW, Zhang PJ and Gonatas NK (2009). Thyroid transcription factor 1 expression in sellar tumors: a histogenetic marker? *J Neuropathol Exp Neurol* 68(5):482-488.  3 Bielle F, Villa C, Giry M, Bergemer-Fouquet AM, Polivka M, Vasiljevic A, Aubriot-Lorton MH, Bernier M, Lechapt-Zalcman E, Viennet G, Sazdovitch V, Duyckaerts C, Sanson M, Figarella-Branger D and Mokhtari K (2015). Chordoid gliomas of the third ventricle share TTF-1 expression with organum vasculosum of the lamina terminalis. *Am J Surg Pathol* 39(7):948-956.  4 Dutta R, Sharma MC, Suri V, Sarkar C, Garg A, Suri A and Kale SS (2022). TTF-1: A Well-Favored Addition to the Immunohistochemistry Armamentarium as a Diagnostic Marker of SEGA. *World Neurosurg* 159:e62-e69.  5 Hewer E, Beck J, Kellner-Weldon F and Vajtai I (2015). Suprasellar chordoid neoplasm with expression of thyroid transcription factor 1: evidence that chordoid glioma of the third ventricle and pituicytoma may form part of a spectrum of lineage-related tumors of the basal forebrain. *Hum Pathol* 46(7):1045-1049.  6 Hewer E and Vajtai I (2015). Consistent nuclear expression of thyroid transcription factor 1 in subependymal giant cell astrocytomas suggests lineage-restricted histogenesis. *Clin Neuropathol* 34(3):128-131.  7 Mete O, Lopes MB and Asa SL (2013). Spindle cell oncocytomas and granular cell tumors of the pituitary are variants of pituicytoma. *Am J Surg Pathol* 37(11):1694-1699.  8 Michotte A, Van Der Veken J, Huylebrouck M, Duerinck J, D'Haens J and Hoorens A (2014). Expression of thyroid transcription factor 1 in a chordoid glioma. *J Neurol Sci* 346(1-2):362-363.  9 Zamecnik J, Chanova M and Kodet R (2004). Expression of thyroid transcription factor 1 in primary brain tumours. *J Clin Pathol* 57(10):1111-1113.  10 Suwala AK, Stichel D, Schrimpf D, Maas SLN, Sill M, Dohmen H, Banan R, Reinhardt A, Sievers P, Hinz F, Blattner-Johnson M, Hartmann C, Schweizer L, Boldt HB, Kristensen BW, Schittenhelm J, Wood MD, Chotard G, Bjergvig R, Das A, Tabori U, Hasselblatt M, Korshunov A, Abdullaev Z, Quezado M, Aldape K, Harter PN, Snuderl M, Hench J, Frank S, Acker T, Brandner S, Winkler F, Wesseling P, Pfister SM, Reuss DE, Wick W, von Deimling A, Jones DTW and Sahm F (2021). Glioblastomas with primitive neuronal component harbor a distinct methylation and copy-number profile with inactivation of TP53, PTEN, and RB1. *Acta Neuropathol* 142(1):179-189. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | WNT PATHWAY ALTERATIONSc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHODd  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | Approximately 10% of all medulloblastomas are characterised by WNT pathway activation by an activating variant in exon 3 of the *CTNNB1* gene (catenin (cadherin-associated protein), beta 1; 3p22.1), or rarely, sequence variants in *APC* (adenomatous polyposis coli; 5q22.2) or other genes encoding components of this pathway. These medulloblastomas cannot be identified as such based on haematoxylin-eosin stained sections alone. Most of them have classic morphology. The precise identification of these tumours is important because of their favourable prognosis in the paediatric age (<16 years) under current treatment regimens, and the evaluation of possible reduction of treatment intensity.    Immunohistochemically, WNT-activated medulloblastomas typically show YAP1 staining of tumour nuclei, nuclear expression of OTX2, and are negative for the SHH target proteins GAB1 and p75NGFR. Furthermore, in most WNT-activated medulloblastomas at least some tumour cell nuclei are positive for β-catenin protein, but discrimination from strong cytoplasmic staining of the tumour cells may be challenging. It has been recommended to use at least two of the following methods for reliable identification of WNT-activated medulloblastomas: IHC, sequencing of *CTNNB1* exon 3, methylome profiling and RNA profiling.  Rarely, WNT-activated medulloblastomas are diagnosed within the setting of constitutional mismatch repair deficiency syndrome or in individuals with germline *APC* alterations and a predisposition to colon cancer, but the vast majority of these medulloblastomas are sporadic.[1-4](#_ENREF_1)  Investigation of WNT pathway alteration is a core element for medulloblastoma, WNT-activated; and medulloblastoma, non-WNT/non-SHH. References 1 Pietsch T and Haberler C (2016). Update on the integrated histopathological and genetic classification of medulloblastoma - a practical diagnostic guideline. *Clin Neuropathol* 35(6):344-352.  2 Surun A, Varlet P, Brugières L, Lacour B, Faure-Conter C, Leblond P, Bertozzi-Salomon AI, Berger C, André N, Sariban E, Raimbault S, Prieur F, Desseigne F, Zattara H, Guimbaud R, Polivka M, Delisle MB, Vasiljevic A, Maurage CA, Figarella-Branger D, Coulet F, Guerrini-Rousseau L, Alapetite C, Dufour C, Colas C, Doz F and Bourdeaut F (2020). Medulloblastomas associated with an APC germline pathogenic variant share the good prognosis of CTNNB1-mutated medulloblastomas. *Neuro Oncol* 22(1):128-138.  3 Waszak SM, Northcott PA, Buchhalter I, Robinson GW, Sutter C, Groebner S, Grund KB, Brugières L, Jones DTW, Pajtler KW, Morrissy AS, Kool M, Sturm D, Chavez L, Ernst A, Brabetz S, Hain M, Zichner T, Segura-Wang M, Weischenfeldt J, Rausch T, Mardin BR, Zhou X, Baciu C, Lawerenz C, Chan JA, Varlet P, Guerrini-Rousseau L, Fults DW, Grajkowska W, Hauser P, Jabado N, Ra YS, Zitterbart K, Shringarpure SS, De La Vega FM, Bustamante CD, Ng HK, Perry A, MacDonald TJ, Hernáiz Driever P, Bendel AE, Bowers DC, McCowage G, Chintagumpala MM, Cohn R, Hassall T, Fleischhack G, Eggen T, Wesenberg F, Feychting M, Lannering B, Schüz J, Johansen C, Andersen TV, Röösli M, Kuehni CE, Grotzer M, Kjaerheim K, Monoranu CM, Archer TC, Duke E, Pomeroy SL, Shelagh R, Frank S, Sumerauer D, Scheurlen W, Ryzhova MV, Milde T, Kratz CP, Samuel D, Zhang J, Solomon DA, Marra M, Eils R, Bartram CR, von Hoff K, Rutkowski S, Ramaswamy V, Gilbertson RJ, Korshunov A, Taylor MD, Lichter P, Malkin D, Gajjar A, Korbel JO and Pfister SM (2018). Spectrum and prevalence of genetic predisposition in medulloblastoma: a retrospective genetic study and prospective validation in a clinical trial cohort. *Lancet Oncol* 19(6):785-798.  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5.  d Repeat for each alteration. |
| Core | *YAP1* REARRANGEMENTc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | In the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification, supratentorial ependymoma, *YAP1* (yes-associated protein 1; 11q22.1) fusion-positive, has been introduced as a separate tumour type.[1](#_ENREF_1) Supratentorial ependymomas with *YAP1* fusion are rare and mostly restricted to young children.[2](#_ENREF_2)  Fusions involving the *YAP1* gene can be detected by a variety of methods; however, an IHC approach is currently not available. Transcriptome sequencing can detect *YAP1* fused to several gene partners, such as *MAMLD1* (Xq.28)*.*[2](#_ENREF_2) Methods using RT-PCR or interphase ISH are alternatives.[2](#_ENREF_2)  Investigation of *YAP1* rearrangement is a core element for supratentorial ependymoma, *YAP1* fusion-positive. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Pajtler KW, Witt H, Sill M, Jones DT, Hovestadt V, Kratochwil F, Wani K, Tatevossian R, Punchihewa C, Johann P, Reimand J, Warnatz HJ, Ryzhova M, Mack S, Ramaswamy V, Capper D, Schweizer L, Sieber L, Wittmann A, Huang Z, van Sluis P, Volckmann R, Koster J, Versteeg R, Fults D, Toledano H, Avigad S, Hoffman LM, Donson AM, Foreman N, Hewer E, Zitterbart K, Gilbert M, Armstrong TS, Gupta N, Allen JC, Karajannis MA, Zagzag D, Hasselblatt M, Kulozik AE, Witt O, Collins VP, von Hoff K, Rutkowski S, Pietsch T, Bader G, Yaspo ML, von Deimling A, Lichter P, Taylor MD, Gilbertson R, Ellison DW, Aldape K, Korshunov A, Kool M and Pfister SM (2015). Molecular Classification of Ependymal Tumors across All CNS Compartments, Histopathological Grades, and Age Groups. *Cancer Cell* 27(5):728-743. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | *ZFTA* REARRANGEMENTc | * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * IHC * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify*   **L1CAM expression (IHC)**   * Indeterminate * Negative * Positive   ***RELA* rearrangement**   * Indeterminate * Absent * Present, *describe*   TESTING METHOD  (select all that apply)   * ISH * NGS * Other, *specify* | In the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification, the supratentorial ependymomas formerly coined as *RELA* (v-rel avian reticuloendotheliosis viral oncogene homolog A; 11q13.1) fusion-positive are now listed as supratentorial ependymoma, *ZFTA* (zinc finger translocation associated; 11q13.1) fusion-positive (with *ZFTA* being the new designation for *C11orf95*).[1](#_ENREF_1) Approximately two-thirds of supratentorial ependymomas in children are *ZFTA* fusion-positive, with in the vast majority of these harbouring *RELA*as the fusion partner.[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) Demonstration of a *ZFTA* fusion is required for their diagnosis in the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification.[1](#_ENREF_1)  These fusions can be identified by RNA sequencing, RT-PCR based techniques, or ISH; whole genome sequencing can also detect the fusion. Targeted RNA sequencing and RT-PCR design should take into consideration the complex nature of the fusion events generated by chromothripsis on chromosome 11.  In situ hybridisation (ISH) probes against either *ZFTA* or *RELA* may be used to detect chromosome 11 rearrangements.[3](#_ENREF_3) *ZFTA* fusion-positive ependymomas with or without *RELA* represent the same tumour entity in the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification. It is known that a broader spectrum of tumours than classic ependymomas exhibit *ZFTA* fusions without *RELA*.[4](#_ENREF_4) Supratentorial ependymomas without *ZFTA* (and without *YAP1*) fusion also exist.[5](#_ENREF_5)  L1CAM (cytoplasmic staining) and p65 (nuclear staining) in cases with *ZFTA::RELA* fusions, represent surrogate IHC markers for *ZFTA* fusion-positive tumours. Strong and diffuse L1CAM immunopositivity is a sensitive but not a specific surrogate marker as it can also be expressed by other tumour types. Nonetheless, L1CAM IHC is recommended for indicating that a supratentorial ependymoma likely belongs to the *ZFTA* fusion-positive category, whenfusion testing is not possible or yields equivocal results.  Investigation of *ZFTA* rearrangement is a core element for supratentorial ependymoma, *ZFTA* fusion-positive. References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Pajtler KW, Witt H, Sill M, Jones DT, Hovestadt V, Kratochwil F, Wani K, Tatevossian R, Punchihewa C, Johann P, Reimand J, Warnatz HJ, Ryzhova M, Mack S, Ramaswamy V, Capper D, Schweizer L, Sieber L, Wittmann A, Huang Z, van Sluis P, Volckmann R, Koster J, Versteeg R, Fults D, Toledano H, Avigad S, Hoffman LM, Donson AM, Foreman N, Hewer E, Zitterbart K, Gilbert M, Armstrong TS, Gupta N, Allen JC, Karajannis MA, Zagzag D, Hasselblatt M, Kulozik AE, Witt O, Collins VP, von Hoff K, Rutkowski S, Pietsch T, Bader G, Yaspo ML, von Deimling A, Lichter P, Taylor MD, Gilbertson R, Ellison DW, Aldape K, Korshunov A, Kool M and Pfister SM (2015). Molecular Classification of Ependymal Tumors across All CNS Compartments, Histopathological Grades, and Age Groups. *Cancer Cell* 27(5):728-743.  3 Parker M, Mohankumar KM, Punchihewa C, Weinlich R, Dalton JD, Li Y, Lee R, Tatevossian RG, Phoenix TN, Thiruvenkatam R, White E, Tang B, Orisme W, Gupta K, Rusch M, Chen X, Li Y, Nagahawhatte P, Hedlund E, Finkelstein D, Wu G, Shurtleff S, Easton J, Boggs K, Yergeau D, Vadodaria B, Mulder HL, Becksfort J, Gupta P, Huether R, Ma J, Song G, Gajjar A, Merchant T, Boop F, Smith AA, Ding L, Lu C, Ochoa K, Zhao D, Fulton RS, Fulton LL, Mardis ER, Wilson RK, Downing JR, Green DR, Zhang J, Ellison DW and Gilbertson RJ (2014). C11orf95-RELA fusions drive oncogenic NF-kappaB signalling in ependymoma. *Nature* 506(7489):451-455.  4 Zheng T, Ghasemi DR, Okonechnikov K, Korshunov A, Sill M, Maass KK, Benites Goncalves da Silva P, Ryzhova M, Gojo J, Stichel D, Arabzade A, Kupp R, Benzel J, Taya S, Adachi T, Shiraishi R, Gerber NU, Sturm D, Ecker J, Sievers P, Selt F, Chapman R, Haberler C, Figarella-Branger D, Reifenberger G, Fleischhack G, Rutkowski S, Donson AM, Ramaswamy V, Capper D, Ellison DW, Herold-Mende CC, Schüller U, Brandner S, Driever PH, Kros JM, Snuderl M, Milde T, Grundy RG, Hoshino M, Mack SC, Gilbertson RJ, Jones DTW, Kool M, von Deimling A, Pfister SM, Sahm F, Kawauchi D and Pajtler KW (2021). Cross-Species Genomics Reveals Oncogenic Dependencies in ZFTA/C11orf95 Fusion-Positive Supratentorial Ependymomas. *Cancer Discov* 11(9):2230-2247.  5 Zschernack V, Jünger ST, Mynarek M, Rutkowski S, Garre ML, Ebinger M, Neu M, Faber J, Erdlenbruch B, Claviez A, Bielack S, Brozou T, Frühwald MC, Dörner E, Dreschmann V, Stock A, Solymosi L, Hench J, Frank S, Vokuhl C, Waha A, Andreiuolo F and Pietsch T (2021). Supratentorial ependymoma in childhood: more than just RELA or YAP. *Acta Neuropathol* 141(3):455-466. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Core | OTHER IMMUNO-HISTOCHEMISTRY FINDINGSc | * None identified * Present, *record test(s), methodology and results* | A growing number of IHC tests represent core ICCR or essential WHO diagnostic criteria, including IHC for Brachyury, CD34, GFAP, S100, class III β-tubulin, neurofilament, synaptophysin, NeuN, OLIG2, HuC/HuD, non-phosphorylated 200kDa NFP, SOX10, EMA, claudin-1, GLUT1, OCT4, KIT, CD30 loss, AFP loss, hCG, cytokeratin, inhibin, CD99, ETV6, WT1, SPDEF, CD56, β-catenin and others.  Practical and economical guidelines, which include a comprehensive list of IHC markers, for diagnosing CNS tumours in resource-restrained jurisdictions are being developed by the Asian Oceanian Society of Neuropathology for Adapting Diagnostic Approaches for Practical Taxonomy in Resource-Restrained Regions (AOSNP-ADAPTR).[1](#_ENREF_1)  To achieve ideal results, IHC should involve careful optimisation of antigen retrieval techniques and appropriate antibody selection. The inclusion of appropriate positive and negative controls, including on-slide controls, will ensure accurate and reliable results, enhance interpretation of staining patterns and minimise the risk of false-positive or false-negative findings.  Investigation of other IHC findings is a core element for supratentorial ependymoma, *ZFTA* fusion-positive; supratentorial ependymoma, *YAP1* fusion-positive; posterior fossa ependymoma, group A; posterior fossa ependymoma, group B; spinal ependymoma; spinal ependymoma, *MYCN*-amplified; embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes; choroid plexus papilloma; atypical choroid plexus papilloma; choroid plexus carcinoma; hybrid nerve sheath tumours; pineocytoma; pineal parenchymal tumour of intermediate differentiation; papillary tumour of the pineal region; and pituitary adenoma/pituitary neuroendocrine tumour. Reference 1 Buckland ME, Sarkar C, Santosh V, Al-Hussaini M, Park SH, Tihan T, Ng HK and Komori T (2023). Announcing the Asian Oceanian Society of Neuropathology guidelines for Adapting Diagnostic Approaches for Practical Taxonomy in Resource-Restrained Regions (AOSNP-ADAPTR). *Brain Pathol*:e13201. | c Only core for some tumours - refer to Tables 3-5. |
| Non-core | OTHER MOLECULAR FINDINGS | * None identified * Present, *record test(s), methodology and results* | These sections should be used for documenting findings for other genetic alterations and/or for other tumour types, such as metastases and haematological lesions. |  |
| **Integrated Final Diagnosis Reporting Guide** | | | | |
| Scope of this dataset section  Integrated Final Diagnosis Reporting Guide | | This dataset section has been developed for the integrated final diagnosis of benign and malignant primary tumours of the CNS and its coverings, as well as tumours from those structures of the peripheral nervous system immediately adjacent to the CNS. The CNS dataset applies to both biopsy and resection specimens of adult and paediatric CNS tumours. Haematological lesions involving the CNS and germ cell tumours are not covered in detail as these are not the primary focus of the CNS dataset. Most sarcomas are not included and are covered by separate ICCR datasets.[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2) Secondary tumours of the CNS (for example metastatic tumours from carcinomas, sarcomas or melanomas in other organs) are not covered in this dataset. Tumours of the pituitary gland are included as the majority of these tumours are reported by neuropathologists worldwide.  This dataset section should be used in conjunction with the ICCR dataset sections on **Histological assessment** and **Molecular information**, where appropriate.  The 2nd edition of this dataset incorporates the WHO Classification of Tumours of the CNS, 5th edition (CNS5), 2021.[3](#_ENREF_3) The ICCR dataset includes 5th edition Corrigenda, July 2024.[4](#_ENREF_4) Reports should incorporate these three dataset sections into a single layered report format (see **INTEGRATED FINAL DIAGNOSIS**). References 1 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Biopsy Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-biopsy-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024).  2 International Collaboration on Cancer Reporting (2021). *Soft Tissue Sarcoma Histopathology Reporting Guide – Resection Specimens. 1st edition*. Available from: https://www.iccr-cancer.org/datasets/published-datasets/soft-tissue-bone/soft-tissue-sarcoma-resection-specimens/ (Accessed 1st March 2024).  3 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2024). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6 - Corrigenda July 2024*. Available from: file:///C:/Users/tinas/Downloads/CNS5%20Corrigenda%20doc\_2024-07-08-1.pdf (Accessed 1st August 2024). | | |
| Core | INTEGRATED FINAL DIAGNOSIS | *Text*   * Diagnosis not classified elsewhere | All reports should strive to render a diagnosis from the WHO CNS 5th edition (CNS5) Tumour Classification,[1](#_ENREF_1) although it is recognised that this may not be possible in all instances (i.e., that more descriptive diagnoses may be needed for tumours that do not meet criteria for WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification entities).[1](#_ENREF_1),[2](#_ENREF_2)  In many situations, CNS WHO[1](#_ENREF_1) diagnoses ‘integrate’ histological and molecular information; for these entities, both histological and molecular information is needed. In this context, ’molecular’ refers to the detection of molecular alterations in nucleic acids that can be detected at the nucleic acid or protein level. In some scenarios, there may be differences between histological appearance and the WHO CNS5[1](#_ENREF_1) diagnosis (e.g., a diffuse glioma without overt oligodendroglial features but with IDH sequence variant and 1p/19q codeletion).  To capture this nosological heterogeneity and to provide as much clinically relevant information in each report, it is recommended that layered diagnostic formatting be utilised in reports, typically with four layers:   * Integrated diagnosis, ideally corresponding to a WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification diagnosis (as per this dataset section), and supplemented with CNS WHO grade; * Histological appearance (as per ‘Histological assessment of CNS specimens’ dataset section); * Molecular parameters (as per ‘Molecular information for CNS specimens’ dataset section); * CNS WHO grade (as per ‘Histological assessment of CNS specimens’ and ‘Molecular information for CNS specimens’ dataset sections);   Increasingly, the CNS WHO grade is based on a combination of histological and molecular features. Therefore, CNS WHO grade is now more logically presented in the 4th layer (rather than in the 3rd layer as was initially proposed).[3](#_ENREF_3) CNS WHO grade should also be included (or purposefully omitted) in the first layer in order to increase the visibility of this parameter.  For some entities, the WHO CNS5[1](#_ENREF_1) diagnosis may be identical to the histological appearance (e.g., choroid plexus tumours), but for others there may be differences such as the following:   * WHO CNS5 Classification diagnosis: Diffuse astrocytoma, IDH-mutant, CNS WHO grade 4 * Histological appearance: Diffuse glioma, histologically grade 3 * Molecular parameters:   + *IDH1* R132H alteration   + *ATRX* alteration   + *TP53* alteration   + 1p/19q retention   + *CDKN2A/B* homozygous deletion * CNS WHO grade 4 (due to homozygous CDKN2A/B deletion)   **Tables 1 and 2** (See end of the document for tables)  In the event that all diagnostic information is present but the tumour still does not meet criteria for a tumour type defined by the 2021 WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification,[1](#_ENREF_1) a ‘descriptive’ or ‘not elsewhere classified’ (NEC) diagnosis can be issued, which draws attention to the unusual nature of the lesion. Such designations are distinct from ‘not otherwise specified’ (NOS) diagnoses, which are cases in which necessary diagnostic information is not available (e.g., in the case of resource-limited settings, limited tissue volume that was exhausted before molecular testing could be performed, or unreliable results of molecular testing).[6](#_ENREF_6) References 1 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  2 Fritz A, Percy C, Jack A, Shanmugaratnam K, Sobin L, Parkin DM, Whelan S (eds) (2020). *International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, Third edition, Second revision ICD-O-3.2*. Available from: http://www.iacr.com.fr/index.php?option=com\_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=100&Itemid=577 (Accessed 1st March 2024).  3 Louis DN, Perry A, Burger P, Ellison DW, Reifenberger G, von Deimling A, Aldape K, Brat D, Collins VP, Eberhart C, Figarella-Branger D, Fuller GN, Giangaspero F, Giannini C, Hawkins C, Kleihues P, Korshunov A, Kros JM, Beatriz Lopes M, Ng HK, Ohgaki H, Paulus W, Pietsch T, Rosenblum M, Rushing E, Soylemezoglu F, Wiestler O and Wesseling P (2014). International Society Of Neuropathology-Haarlem consensus guidelines for nervous system tumor classification and grading. *Brain Pathol* 24(5):429-435.  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2024). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6 - Corrigenda July 2024*. Available from: file:///C:/Users/tinas/Downloads/CNS5%20Corrigenda%20doc\_2024-07-08-1.pdf (Accessed 1st August 2024).  5 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2022). *Haematolymphoid Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 11*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  6 Louis DN, Wesseling P, Paulus W, Giannini C, Batchelor TT, Cairncross JG, Capper D, Figarella-Branger D, Lopes MB, Wick W and van den Bent M (2018). cIMPACT-NOW update 1: Not Otherwise Specified (NOS) and Not Elsewhere Classified (NEC). *Acta Neuropathol.* 135(3):481-484. |  |
| Core | TUMOUR GRADE | * Not applicable * CNS World Health Organization (WHO) grade 1 * CNS WHO grade 2 * CNS WHO grade 3 * CNS WHO grade 4 * Cannot be determined, *specify* | **References**  1 Louis DN, Perry A, Wesseling P, Brat DJ, Cree IA, Figarella-Branger D, Hawkins C, Ng HK, Pfister SM, Reifenberger G, Soffietti R, von Deimling A and Ellison DW (2021). The 2021 WHO Classification of Tumors of the Central Nervous System: a summary. *Neuro Oncol* 23(8):1231-1251.  2 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2021). *Central Nervous System Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 6*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.  3 Louis DN, Perry A, Burger P, Ellison DW, Reifenberger G, von Deimling A, Aldape K, Brat D, Collins VP, Eberhart C, Figarella-Branger D, Fuller GN, Giangaspero F, Giannini C, Hawkins C, Kleihues P, Korshunov A, Kros JM, Beatriz Lopes M, Ng HK, Ohgaki H, Paulus W, Pietsch T, Rosenblum M, Rushing E, Soylemezoglu F, Wiestler O and Wesseling P (2014). International Society Of Neuropathology-Haarlem consensus guidelines for nervous system tumor classification and grading. *Brain Pathol* 24(5):429-435.  4 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2022). *Haematolymphoid Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 11*. IARC Press, Lyon, France. |  |
| Core | INTEGRATED FINAL DIAGNOSIS BASED ON | (Select all that apply)   * CNS WHO Tumour Classification * Histology * CNS WHO grade - refer to **TUMOUR GRADE** * Immunohistochemistry * Molecular findings | The final integrated diagnosis is a core element and may be based on the following information:   * CNS WHO Tumour Classification * Histology * Immunohistochemistry * Molecular findings * CNS WHO grade (refer to **TUMOUR GRADE**).   Pathology reports optimally include an integrated assessment of all available information in a layered diagnostic format. |  |

**Tables**

**Table 1. World Health Organization classification and grade of central nervous system tumours.**[**2**](#_ENREF_2)

| **Descriptor** | **ICD-O codesa** | **CNS WHO Grade** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Gliomas, glioneuronal tumours and neuronal tumours** |  |  |
| *Adult-type diffuse gliomas* |  |  |
| Astrocytoma, IDH-mutant | 9400/3, 9401/3, 9445/3 | 2, 3, or 4 |
| Oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted | 9450/3, 9451/3 | 2 or 3 |
| Glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype | 9440/3 | 4 |
| *Paediatric-type diffuse low grade gliomas* |  |  |
| Diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB*- or *MYBL1*-altered | 9421/1 | 1 |
| Angiocentric glioma | 9431/1 | 1 |
| Polymorphous low grade neuroepithelial tumour of the young | 9413/0 | 1 |
| Diffuse low grade glioma, MAPK pathway-altered | 9421/1 | n/a |
| *Paediatric-type diffuse high grade gliomas* |  |  |
| Diffuse midline glioma, H3 K27-altered | 9385/3 | 4 |
| Diffuse hemispheric glioma, H3 G34-mutant | 9385/3 | 4 |
| Diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3-wildtype and IDH-wildtype | 9385/3 | 4 |
| Infant-type hemispheric glioma | 9385/3 | n/a |
| *Circumscribed astrocytic gliomas* |  |  |
| Pilocytic astrocytoma | 9421/1 | 1 |
| High grade astrocytoma with piloid features | 9421/3 | n/a |
| Pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma | 9424/3 | 2 or 3 |
| Subependymal giant cell astrocytoma | 9384/1 | 1 |
| Chordoid glioma | 9444/1 | 2 |
| Astroblastoma, *MN1*-altered | 9430/3 | n/a |
| *Glioneuronal and neuronal tumours* |  |  |
| Ganglioglioma | 9505/1 | 1 |
| Gangliocytoma | 9492/0 | 1 |
| Desmoplastic infantile ganglioglioma/desmoplastic infantile astrocytoma | 9412/1 | 1 |
| Dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumour | 9413/0 | 1 |
| Diffuse glioneuronal tumour with oligodendroglioma-like features and nuclear clusters\* |  | n/a |
| Papillary glioneuronal tumour | 9509/1 | 1 |
| Rosette-forming glioneuronal tumour | 9509/1 | 1 |
| Myxoid glioneuronal tumour | 9509/1 | 1 |
| Diffuse leptomeningeal glioneuronal tumour | 9509/3 | n/a |
| Multinodular and vacuolating neuronal tumour | 9509/0 | 1 |
| Dysplastic cerebellar gangliocytoma (Lhermitte-Duclos disease) | 9493/0 | 1 |
| Central neurocytoma | 9506/1 | 2 |
| Extraventricular neurocytoma | 9506/1 | 2 |
| Cerebellar liponeurocytoma | 9506/1 | 2 |
| *Ependymal tumours* |  |  |
| Supratentorial ependymoma | 9391/3 | 2 or 3 |
| Supratentorial ependymoma, *ZFTA* fusion-positive | 9396/3 | 2 or 3† |
| Supratentorial ependymoma, *YAP1* fusion-positive | 9396/3 | n/a |
| Posterior fossa ependymoma | 9391/3 | 2 or 3 |
| Posterior fossa group A (PFA) ependymoma | 9396/3 | 2 or 3† |
| Posterior fossa group B (PFB) ependymoma | 9396/3 | 2 or 3† |
| Spinal ependymoma | 9391/3 | 2 or 3† |
| Spinal ependymoma, *MYCN*-amplified | 9396/3 | n/a |
| Myxopapillary ependymoma | 9394/1 | 2 |
| Subependymoma | 9383/1 | 1 |
| **Choroid plexus tumours** |  |  |
| Choroid plexus papilloma | 9390/0 | 1 |
| Atypical choroid plexus papilloma | 9390/1 | 2 |
| Choroid plexus carcinoma | 9390/3 | 3 |
| **Embryonal tumours** |  |  |
| *Medulloblastomas, molecularly defined* |  |  |
| Medulloblastoma, WNT-activated | 9475/3 | 4† |
| Medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-wildtype | 9471/3 | 4 |
| Medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-mutant | 9476/3 | 4 |
| Medulloblastoma, non-WNT/non-SHH | 9477/3 | n/a |
| *Medulloblastomas, histologically defined* |  |  |
| Medulloblastomas, histologically defined | 9470/3 | n/a |
| *Other CNS embryonal tumours* |  |  |
| Atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumour | 9508/3 | 4 |
| Cribriform neuroepithelial tumour\* |  | n/a |
| Embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes | 9478/3 | 4 |
| CNS Neuroblastoma, *FOXR2*-activated | 9500/3 | 4 |
| CNS tumour with *BCOR* internal tandem duplication | 9500/3 | n/a |
| CNS Embryonal tumour NEC/NOS | 9473/3 | n/a |
| **Pineal tumours** |  |  |
| Pineocytoma | 9361/1 | 1 |
| Pineal parenchymal tumour of intermediate differentiation | 9362/3 | 2 or 3 |
| Pineoblastoma | 9362/3 | 4 |
| Papillary tumour of the pineal region | 9395/3 | 2 or 3 |
| Desmoplastic myxoid tumour of the pineal region, *SMARCB1*-mutant\* |  | n/a |
| **Cranial and paraspinal nerve tumours** |  |  |
| Schwannoma | 9560/0 | 1 |
| Neurofibroma | 9540/0 | 1 |
| Perineurioma | 9571/0 | 1 |
| Hybrid nerve sheath tumour | 9563/0 | n/a |
| Malignant melanotic nerve sheath tumour | 9540/3 | n/a |
| Malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumour | 9540/3 | n/a |
| Cauda equina neuroendocrine tumour (previously paraganglioma) | 8693/3 | 1† |
| **Meningioma** |  |  |
| Meningioma | 9530/0 | 1, 2 or 3 |
| **Mesenchymal, non-meningothelial tumours involving the CNS** |  |  |
| *Fibroblastic and myofibroblastic tumours* |  |  |
| Solitary fibrous tumour | 8815/1 | 1, 2 or 3† |
| *Vascular tumours* |  |  |
| Hemangiomas and vascular malformations | 9121/0, 9131/0, 9123/0 | n/a |
| Haemangioblastoma | 9161/1 | 1 |
| *Skeletal muscle tumours* |  |  |
| Rhabdomyosarcoma | 8910/3 | n/a |
| *Tumours of uncertain differentiation* |  |  |
| Intracranial mesenchymal tumour, FET::CREB fusion-positive |  | n/a |
| *CIC*-rearranged sarcoma | 9367/3 | 4† |
| Primary intracranial sarcoma, *DICER1*-mutant | 9480/3 | n/a |
| Ewing sarcoma | 9364/3 | 4† |
| *Chondrogenic tumours* |  |  |
| Mesenchymal chondrosarcoma | 9240/3 | n/a |
| Chondrosarcoma | 9220/3 | 1, 2 or 3† |
| *Notochordal tumours* |  |  |
| Chordoma | 9370/3 | n/a |
| **Melanocytic tumours** |  |  |
| *Diffuse meningeal melanocytic neoplasms* |  |  |
| Meningeal melanocytosis | 8728/0 | n/a |
| Meningeal melanomatosis | 8728/3 | n/a |
| *Circumscribed meningeal melanocytic neoplasms* |  |  |
| Meningeal melanocytoma | 8728/1 | n/a |
| Meningeal melanoma | 8720/3 | n/a |
| **Tumours of the sellar region** |  |  |
| Adamantinomatous craniopharyngioma | 9351/1 | 1† |
| Papillary craniopharyngioma | 9352/1 | 1† |
| Pituicytoma, granular cell tumour of the sellar region, and spindle cell oncocytoma | 9432/1, 9582/0, 8290/0 | n/a |
| Pituitary adenoma/pituitary neuroendocrine tumour | 8272/3 | n/a |
| Pituitary blastoma | 8273/3 | n/a |

a These morphology codes are from the International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, Third Edition, second revision (ICD-O-3.2).[8](#_ENREF_8) Behaviour is coded /0 for benign tumours; /1 for unspecified, borderline, or uncertain behaviour; /2 for carcinoma in situ and grade III intraepithelial neoplasia; and /3 for malignant tumours, primary site; and /6 for malignant tumours, metastatic site. Subtype labels are indented. Incorporates all relevant changes from the 5th edition Corrigenda, July 2024.[9](#_ENREF_9)

CNS WHO grades marked ‘n/a’ do not have grade included in the tumour definition.

\*Provisional entity.

† These CNS WHO grades are described in the chapter but not in the definition.

© World Health Organization/International Agency for Research on Cancer. Reproduced with permission.
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**Table 2. World Health Organization classification of haematological tumours involving the central nervous system.**[**3**](#_ENREF_3)

| **Descriptor** | **ICD-O codesa** |
| --- | --- |
| **Lymphomas** |  |
| *Lymphomas with predominant primary CNS presentation* |  |
| Primary large B-cell lymphoma of the CNS | 9680/3 |
| Lymphomas arising in immune deficiency/dysregulation |  |
| Lymphomatoid granulomatosis | 9766/1, 9766/3 |
| Intravascular large B-cell lymphoma | 9712/3 |
| Extranodal NK/T-cell lymphoma | 9712/3 |
| Extranodal marginal zone lymphoma of mucosa-associated lymphoid tissue (EMZL) of the dura | 9699/3 |
| Lymphoplasmacytic lymphoma (Bing-Neel syndrome) | 9671/3 |
| *Other rare lymphomas with predominant primary CNS presentation* |  |
| Other indolent B-cell lymphomas of the CNS | 9690/3, 9823/3 |
| Other aggressive B-cell lymphomas | 9687/3 |
| Peripheral T-cell lymphoma, NOS | 9702/3 |
| ALK-negative and ALK-positive anaplastic large cell lymphoma | 9715/3, 9714/3 |
| **Histiocytic tumours** |  |
| Erdheim-Chester disease | 9749/3 |
| Rosai-Dorfman disease | 9749/3 |
| Juvenile xanthogranuloma | 9749/1 |
| Langerhans cell histiocytosis | 9751/1 |
| Histiocytic sarcoma | 9755/3 |
| ALK-positive histiocytosis | 9750/3 |

a These morphology codes are from the International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, Third Edition, second revision (ICD-O-3.2).[8](#_ENREF_8) Behaviour is coded /0 for benign tumours; /1 for unspecified, borderline, or uncertain behaviour; /2 for carcinoma in situ and grade III intraepithelial neoplasia; and /3 for malignant tumours, primary site; and /6 for malignant tumours, metastatic site. Subtype labels are indented.

© World Health Organization/International Agency for Research on Cancer. Reproduced with permission.

# References

3 WHO Classification of Tumours Editorial Board (2022). *Haematolymphoid Tumours, WHO Classification of Tumours, 5th Edition, Volume 11*. IARC Press, Lyon, France.

8 Fritz A, Percy C, Jack A, Shanmugaratnam K, Sobin L, Parkin DM, Whelan S (eds) (2020). *International Classification of Diseases for Oncology, Third edition, Second revision ICD-O-3.2*. Available from: http://www.iacr.com.fr/index.php?option=com\_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=100&Itemid=577 (Accessed 1st March 2024).

**Table 3. Molecular and immunohistochemical alterations listed as essential or desirable diagnostic criteria for gliomas, glioneuronal and neuronal tumours in the 2021 World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of the Central Nervous System.**[**1**](#_ENREF_1)**#**

Note: Alterations in **bold** correspond to core ICCR/essential WHO criteria; non-bold alterations correspond to non-core ICCR/desirable WHO criteria. Alterations in [brackets] are not derived from the tables of essential or desirable WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification criteria but are considered important predictive or prognostic markers by the ICCR CNS DAC. Refer to the hyperlinked specific notes for further details on core criteria. Refer to the 2021 WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification for full diagnostic criteria.[1](#_ENREF_1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TUMOUR FAMILY/tumour type** | **Alterations** |
| **ADULT-TYPE DIFFUSE GLIOMAS** | |
| Astrocytoma, IDH-mutant | ***IDH1* p.R132**a or ***IDH2* p.R172**a; ***ATRX***b,c or exclusion of **chr 1p/19q**d;[***CDKN2A/B***e]; *TP53*c,f; MP |
| Oligodendroglioma, IDH-mutant and 1p/19q-codeleted | ***IDH1* p.R132**a or ***IDH2* p.R172**a; **chr 1p/19q**d;MP, ATRXf*, TERT* promoterc |
| Glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype | ***IDH***wt/***H3***wt; ***TERT* promoter**c or ***EGFR***g or **chr +7**/**-10**h; MP; [*MGMT* promoter methylation] |
| **PAEDIATRIC-TYPE DIFFUSE LOW GRADE GLIOMAS** | |
| Diffuse astrocytoma, *MYB*- or *MYBL1*-altered | ***IDH***wt**/*H3***wt; ***MYB***i/***MYBL1***i **or MP**; absence of OLIG2f and MAP2f |
| Angiocentric glioma | *MYB*i; MP |
| Polymorphous low grade neuroepithelial tumour of the young (PLNTY) | **CD34**f; **IDH**wt; ***BRAF* p.V600**f,j or ***FGFR2***k/***FGFR3***k or **other MAPK pathway alteration**; absence of 1p/19qd; [MP] |
| Diffuse low grade glioma, MAPK pathway-altered | **MAPK pathway alteration**; **IDH**wt; **H3**wt; **absence of *CDKN2A***e; MP |
| **PAEDIATRIC-TYPE DIFFUSE HIGH GRADE GLIOMAS** | |
| Diffuse midline glioma, H3K27-altered | **H3 p.K28me3 (K27me3**b**)**; **H3 p.K28M (K27M**c**)/pK28I (K27I**c**)** or ***EGFR***c,g or **EZHIP**l or **MP**;discrimination of H3.1 or H3.2 versus H3.3p.K28 (K27)-mutant subtypes |
| Diffuse hemispheric glioma, H3G34-mutant | ***H3F3A* p.G35 (G34R**j **or G34V**j**)**; (for unresolved lesions) [**MP**](#Note_19_Methylome_profiling); ATRXb, diffuse p53f; OLIG2f; |
| Diffuse paediatric-type high grade glioma, H3- and IDH-wildtype | [**IDH**](#Note_17_IDH)wt; **H3**wt; **MP or *PDGFRA***c,g/***EGFR***c,g/***MYCN***g; H3 p.K28me3 (K27me3) retained |
| Infant-type hemispheric glioma | **RTK family member abnormality** e.g., NTRK family gene, *ROS1*k, *MET*k, *ALK*kor **MP** |
| **CIRCUMSCRIBED ASTROCYTIC GLIOMAS** | |
| Pilocytic astrocytoma | **MAPK pathway alteration**, such as *BRAF*c,j,k most frequent *KIAA1549*::*BRAF*; [*NF1*j, *FGFR1*j,k; *NTRK1/2/3*k; MP] |
| High grade astrocytoma with piloid features | **MP**; MAPK pathway alteration e.g., *NF1*b,c, *BRAF*k esp. *KIAA1549::BRAF*, *FGFR1*c; *CDKN2A/B*c,e or *CDK4*g; *ATRX*b,c |
| Pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma | MAPK pathway alteration (e.g., *BRAF* p.V600j, *BRAF*c,k*, NTRK1/2/3*, *RAF1*, *NF1*), combined with *CDKN2A/B*e; MP |
| Subependymal giant cell astrocytoma | **GFAP**f; **S100**f; variable **neuronal markers**fe.g., class III β-tubulinf, neurofilamentf, synaptophysinf, NeuNf; TTF1f, tuberinb, harmarinb, phosphorylated S6f, *TSC1*c or *TSC2*c; MP |
| Chordoid glioma | TTF1f, *PRKCA* p.D463Hc or MP |
| Astroblastoma, *MN1*-altered | ***MN1***h; (for unresolved lesions) **MP**;GFAPf, EMAf , [*BEND2*k] |
| **GLIONEURONAL AND NEURONAL TUMOURS** | |
| Ganglioglioma | ***BRAF***c,j,k or **other MAPK pathway alteration** e.g., *RAF1*k, *KRAS*j, *NF1*b,jor (for unresolved lesions) **MP**; absence of IDHc |
| Gangliocytoma | - |
| Desmoplastic infantile ganglioglioma | **MP** or ***RAF***c,k or ***RAF1***c,k **in the absence of *CDKN2A/B***e |
| Dysembryoplastic neuroepithelial tumour | ***FGFR1***a,k,m or(for unresolved lesions) [**MP**](#Note_19_Methylome_profiling) |
| Diffuse glioneuronal tumour with oligodendroglioma-like features and nuclear clusters\*† | **MP**; **OLIG2**f; **synaptophysin**f; **GFAP**b; chr 14n |
| Papillary glioneuronal tumour | ***PRKCA***k(mostly *SLC44A1*::*PRKCA*); (for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| Rosette-forming glioneuronal tumour | (for unresolved lesions) [**MP**](#Note_19_Methylome_profiling); *FGFR1*cwith *PIK3CA*c and/or *NF1*c |
| Myxoid glioneuronal tumour | *PDGFRA* p.K385j; *PDGFRA*c; MP |
| Diffuse leptomeningeal glioneuronal tumour‡ | **OLIG2**f; **synaptophysin**f; **chr 1p**d; **MAPK alteration**,mostly *BRAF*k such as *KIAA1549::BRAF*;(for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| Multinodular and vacuolating neuronal tumour | **Synaptophysin**,f **HuC/HuD**f **or non-phosphorylated 200kDa NFP**f; OLIG2f; internexin Af, NeuNb or chromograninb, MAPK alteration esp. *MAP2K1*c,; *FGFR2*k; *BRAF*c |
| Dysplastic cerebellar gangliocytoma (Lhermitte-Duclos disease) | *PTEN*b,c |
| Central neurocytoma | **Synaptophysin**f; (for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| Extraventricular neurocytoma | **Absence of IDH**h; **Synaptophysin**f;(for unresolved lesions) **MP**; *FGFR1* alteration, mostly *FGFR1::TACC1*, [*FGFR3*k] |
| Cerebellar liponeurocytoma | **Synaptophysin**f;(for unresolved lesions) **MP**; focal GFAPf |
| **EPENDYMAL TUMOURS** | |
| Supratentorial ependymoma, *ZFTA* fusion-positive | **IHC features of ependymoma; *ZFTA*** (***C11orf95***k)mostly *ZFTA::RELA*; MP, p65 (RELAf) or L1CAMf |
| Supratentorial ependymoma, *YAP1* fusion-positive | **IHC features of ependymoma**; ***YAP1***k; MP, negative for p65 (RELA)f or L1CAMf |
| Posterior fossa ependymoma, group A (PFA) | **IHC features of ependymoma;MP or global reduction of H3 p.K28me3 (K27me3**f**) in tumour cell nuclei**;stable genome on genome-wide copy-number analysis |
| Posterior fossa ependymoma, group B (PFB) | **IHC features of ependymoma;MP**; chromosomal instability and aneuploidy on genome-wide copy-number analysis, retained H3 p.K28me3 (K27me3f) in tumour cell nuclei |
| Spinal ependymoma | **IHC features of ependymoma**;MP, 22qd, absence of *MYCN*g |
| Spinal ependymoma, *MYCN*-amplified | **IHC features of ependymoma; *MYCN***g; MP |
| Myxopapillary ependymoma | **GFAP**f;(for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| Subependymoma | (for unresolved lesions) **MP** |

MP – Methylome profiling; IHC – immunohistochemistry; MAPK – Mitogen-activated protein kinase; wt wildtype; a missense mutation/variant; b loss/absence of expression; c mutation/variant; d combined whole-arm deletion; e homozygous deletion; f expression; g gene amplification; h copy number alteration; i structural variant; j hotspot mutation/variant; k gene fusion; l overexpression; m internal tandem duplication; n monosomy. \* Provisional tumour type; † Methylation profiling is so far the only method to clearly identify diffuse glioneuronal tumour with oligodendroglioma-like features and nuclear clusters, but if not available, morphological features may provide an approximation; ‡ This tumour type shows molecular overlap with pilocytic astrocytoma (*KIAA1549::BRAF* fusion) and oligodendroglioma (1p/19q codeletion). All diffuse leptomeningeal glioneuronal tumours are wildtype in *IDH1* and *IDH2*.

Of note, this list of alterations is not exhaustive, and some of the alterations are generally mutually exclusive (e.g., *IDH1* versus *IDH2* variant), while others can occur in combination in the same tumour (e.g., *TERT* promoter variant, *EGFR* amplification, and +7/-10). Furthermore, while this table lists the alterations, demonstration of lack of particular alteration(s) can also be essential to establish the correct diagnosis (e.g., absence of complete 1p/19q codeletion in IDH-mutant astrocytomas).

# Modified from Table 1 in Sahm et al. Molecular diagnostic tools for the WHO 2021 classification of gliomas, glioneuronal and neuronal tumours; an EANO guideline (licenced under [CC-BY-NC 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)).[6](#_ENREF_6) This table does not represent a diagnostic algorithm and one should refer to the WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification on how to use this information.[1](#_ENREF_1)
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**Table 4. Molecular and immunohistochemical alterations listed as essential and desirable diagnostic criteria for embryonal tumours in the 2021 World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of the Central Nervous System.**[**1**](#_ENREF_1)

Note: Alterations in **bold** correspond to core/essential WHO criteria; non-bold alterations correspond to non-core/desirable WHO criteria. Refer to the hyperlinked specific notes for further details on core criteria. Refer to the 2021 WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification for full diagnostic criteria.[1](#_ENREF_1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TUMOUR FAMILY/tumour type** | **Alterations** |
| **MEDULLOBLASTOMA, MOLECULARLY DEFINED** | |
| Medulloblastoma, WNT-activated | **WNT pathway activation** or **MP** |
| Medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-wildtype | **SHH pathway activation** or **MP**; ***TP53***wt |
| Medulloblastoma, SHH-activated and *TP53*-mutant | **SHH pathway activation** or **MP**; ***TP53***a |
| Medulloblastoma, non-WNT/non-SHH | **No WNT or SHH pathway activation** or **MP** |
| **OTHER CNS EMBRYONAL TUMOURS** | |
| Atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumour | **SMARCB1/SMARCA4**b or (for unresolved lesions) **MP**; *SMARCB1*c; *SMARCA4*c |
| Cribriform neuroepithelial tumour\* | **SMARCB1**b; EMAd |
| Embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes (ETMR) | **IHC features of ETMR**; **C19MC**cor ***DICER1***a; (for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| CNS neuroblastoma, *FOXR2*-activated | ***FOXR2***e,f or (for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| CNS tumour with *BCOR* internal tandem duplication | ***BCOR*****exon 15**g;(for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| CNS embryonal tumour, NEC/NOS | Neuronal markersd; absence of glial markersd |

MP – Methylome profiling; IHC – immunohistochemistry; ETMR – embryonal tumour with multilayered rosettes; wt wildtype; a mutation/variant; b loss/absence of expression; c alteration; d expression; e structural variant; f gene fusion; g internal tandem duplication.

\* Provisional tumour type.
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**Table 5. Molecular and immunohistochemical alterations listed as essential or desirable diagnostic criteria for other central nervous system tumours in the 2021 World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of the Central Nervous System.**[**1**](#_ENREF_1)

Note: Alterations in **bold** correspond to WHO essential criteria; non-bold alterations correspond to WHO desirable criteria. Alterations in [brackets] are not derived from the tables of essential or desirable WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification criteria but are considered important predictive or prognostic markers by the ICCR CNS DAC. Refer to the hyperlinked specific notes for further details on core criteria. Refer to the 2021 WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification for full diagnostic criteria.[1](#_ENREF_1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TUMOUR FAMILY/tumour type** | **Alterations** |
| **CHOROID PLEXUS TUMOURS** | |
| Choroid plexus papilloma | **IHC features of choroid plexus differentiation** |
| Atypical choroid plexus papilloma | **IHC features of choroid plexus differentiation**;in select cases: hyperploidy by genome-wide chromosomal copy-number analysis |
| Choroid plexus carcinoma | **IHC features of choroid plexus differentiation**;*TP53*a; MP; in select cases: demonstration of hypoploidy by genome-wide chromosomal copy-number analysis |
| **CRANIAL & SPINAL NERVE TUMOURS** | |
| Schwannoma | **S100**bor **SOX10**b; absence of lattice-like CD34b; SMARCB1c (INI1) in epithelioid schwannoma or mosaic pattern of SMARCB1b (INI1) in syndrome associated schwannoma |
| Neurofibroma | S100b; lattice-like CD34b; p16c in particular in the NF1 related subgroup |
| Perineurioma | **EMA**bor **claudin-1**bor **GLUT1**b; absence of **S100**b |
| Hybrid nerve sheath tumours | [**IHC**](#Note_37_Other_IHC) **for intermingled features of two types of benign nerve sheath tumours** |
| Malignant melanotic nerve sheath tumour | **S100/SOX10**b; **melanocytic markers**b(e.g., **HMB45,** [**melan-A**](#Note_37_Other_IHC))or ***PRKAR1A2***a,c; (for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| Malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumour | **No more than focal/patchy S100/SOX10**b; **absence of *SS18::SSX1/SSX2/SSX3***d# or ***PRC2* inactivation (molecularly or via H3 p.K28me3**c**)** or (for unresolved lesions) **MP**;absence ofH3 p.K28me3b,c; neurofibrominc |
| Cauda equina neuroendocrine tumour (previously paraganglioma) | **Synaptophysin**bor **chromogranin**b in chief cells;(for unresolved lesions) **MP**; S100b in sustentacular cells; cytokeratinb in chief cells, reticulin silver stain |
| **GERM CELL TUMOURS** | |
| Mature teratoma | - |
| Immature teratoma | - |
| Teratoma with somatic-type malignancy | **-** |
| Germinoma | Nuclear **OCT4**b; widespread membranous **KIT**bor **podoplanin**b**(D2-40)** or **absence of 5-methylcytosine**b; **absence of CD30**b; **absence of AFP**b; **hCG**b |
| Embryonal carcinoma | **CD30**b; nuclear **OCT4**b; **absent or focal KIT**b; **absence of hCG**b; **absence of AFP**b;cytokeratinb |
| Yolk sac tumour | **AFP**b; **absent or focal non-membranous KIT**b; **absent or focal CD30**b; **absence of β-hCG**b |
| Choriocarcinoma | **β-hCG**c; **absence of** **KIT**bor **absence of podoplanin**b(**D2-40**); **absence of AFP**b; **absence of OCT4**b |
| Mixed germ cell tumour | - |
| **MELANOCYTIC TUMOURS** | |
| Meningeal melanocytosis/meningeal melanomatosis | In children often *NRAS*a; rarely *BRAF*a |
| Meningeal melanocytoma/meningeal melanoma | *GNAQ*a; *GNA11*a; *PLCB4*a or *CYSLTR2*a (for corroborating CNS origin of the neoplasm); *SF3B1*a, *EIFAX*a, *BAP1*a, chr 3e, complex copy-number variations (as an indicator of aggressive behaviour) |
| **MENINGIOMAS** | |
| Meningioma | [***TERT* promoter**a; ***CDKN2A/B***c features of CNS WHO grade 3 meningioma]; **MP**; **demonstration of** **biallelic inactivation of *NF2* or alterations in other drivers of conventional meningioma** (*TRAF7*, *AKT1*, *KLF4*, *SMO*, *PIK3CA*, *SMARCE1* in clear cell meningioma, *BAP1* in rhabdoid meningioma*)*; EMAb; SSTR2Ab; chr. 22/22q in lower grade meningiomaf; loss of chr. 1p; chr. 6; chr. 10q; chr. 14q; chr. 18 in higher grade meningioma |
| **MESENCHYMAL, NON-MENINGOTHELIAL TUMOURS** | |
| Solitary fibrous tumour | **STAT6**b; *NAB2::STAT6*d |
| Haemangiomas and vascular malformations | - |
| Hemangioblastoma | **Inhibin**b; loss or inactivation of ***VHL***a,c,#; absence of IHC staining for markers of renal cell carcinoma |
| Intracranial mesenchymal tumour, FET::CREB fusion-positive | **FET::CREB**d; CD99b; EMAb; desminb |
| *CIC*-rearranged sarcoma | ***CIC***d; **CD99**b; **ETV4**b; **WT1**b; MP |
| Primary intracranial sarcoma, *DICER1*-mutant | ***DICER1***a; (for unresolved lesions) MP |
| Ewing sarcoma | Diffuse and membranous **CD99**b; ***FET::ETS***d;NKX2-2b; PAX7b |
| Chordoma | **Brachyury**b;in poorly differentiated chordoma **SMARCB1**c(**INI1**) |
| **PINEAL TUMOURS** | |
| Pineocytoma | [**IHC**](#Note_37_Other_IHC) **for pineal parenchymal differentiation** e.g., synaptophysinb |
| Pineal parenchymal tumour of intermediate differentiation | **IHC for pineal parenchymal differentiation** e.g., synaptophysinb;(for unresolved lesions) **MP**; *KBTBD4*g |
| Pineoblastoma | SMARCB1b (INI1); MP |
| Papillary tumour of the pineal region | **Characteristic IHC** e.g., cytokeratinsb, SPDEFb, CD56b; **MP** |
| Desmoplastic myxoid tumour of the pineal region, *SMARCB1*-mutant\* | **SMARCB1**c;(for unresolved lesions) **MP** |
| **TUMOURS OF THE SELLAR REGION** | |
| Adamantinomatous craniopharyngioma | Nuclear β-cateninb; *CTNNB1*a; absence of *BRAF* p.V600Ea |
| Papillary craniopharyngioma | *BRAF* p.V600Ea, b; absence of nuclear β-cateninb; absence of *CTNNB1*a |
| Pituicytoma | **TTF1**b; **absence of pituitary hormone**b **and hormone transcription factor**b; **absence of neuronal and neuroendocrine marker**b |
| Granular cell tumour of the sellar region | **TTF1**b; **absence of pituitary hormone**b **and hormone transcription factor**b; **absence of neuronal and neuroendocrine marker**b; CD68b or α1-antitrypsinb |
| Spindle cell oncocytoma | **TTF1**b; **absence of pituitary hormone**b **and hormone transcription factor**b**; absence of neuronal and neuroendocrine marker**b;antimitochondrial antigenb |
| Pituitary adenoma/Pituitary neuroendocrine tumour | **IHC for pituitary hormones and/or lineage-specific transcription factors**; Ki-67b (MIB1), [cytokeratins] |
| Pituitary blastoma | ***DICER1***h |

MP – Methylome profiling; IHC – immunohistochemistry; a mutation/variant; b expression; c loss/absence of expression; d gene fusion; e monosomy; f copy number alteration; g insertion; h alteration.

\* Provisional tumour type, # ***VHL*** and absence of ***SS18::SSX1/SSX2/SSX3*** have been designated non-core alterations by the ICCR CNS DAC.

Mesenchymal chondrosarcoma and chondrosarcoma are not included as they are covered in the ICCR Soft tissue sarcoma datasets.[7](#_ENREF_7),[8](#_ENREF_8)
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**Table 6. Genetic central nervous system (CNS) tumour syndromes and alterations from the 2021 World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of the CNS.**[**1**](#_ENREF_1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Genetic tumour syndromes** | **Genes involved (chromosomal location)** | **Tumours of the nervous system** |
| Neurofibromatosis type 1 | *NF1* (17q11.2)a | Neurofibroma; ANNUBP; hybrid neurofibroma/schwannoma; MPNST; pilocytic astrocytoma; other gliomas |
| Neurofibromatosis type 2 | *NF2* (22q12.2)a | (Bilateral) schwannoma; meningioma; spinal ependymoma; hybrid neurofibroma/schwannoma; |
| Schwannomatosis | *SMARCB1* (22q11.23)a or *LZTR1* (22q11.21)a; and *NF2* (22q12.2)a  (‘four-hit, three-step mechanism’) | Schwannoma; meningioma; hybrid neurofibroma/schwannoma; MPNST |
| Von Hippel-Lindau syndrome | *VHL* (3p25.3)a | Hemangioblastoma |
| Tuberous sclerosis | *TSC1* (9q34.13)a or *TSC2* (16p13.3)a | Subependymal giant cell astrocytoma |
| Li-Fraumeni syndrome | *TP53* (17p13.1)a,d,e | Choroid plexus carcinoma; IDH-wildtype glioblastoma; IDH-mutant astrocytoma, medulloblastoma |
| Cowden syndrome | *PTEN* (10q23.31)a | Dysplastic cerebellar gangliocytoma (Lhermitte-Duclos disease) |
| CMMRD syndrome, Lynch syndrome | *PMS2* (7p22.1)a,e or *MSH~~1~~2* (2p21)a,e; or *MSH6* (2p16.3)a,e or *MLH1* (3p22.2)a,e; genomic profiling of MMRD; absence of MMRf , *POLE*a etc. | IDH-wildtype high grade glioma; IDH-mutant astrocytoma; medulloblastoma |
| Familial adenomatous polyposis 1 | *APC* (5q22.2)a | Medulloblastoma, WNT-activated |
| Nevoid basal cell carcinoma syndrome | *PTCH1* (9q22.32)a, [*PTCH2* (1p34.1)a] or *SUFU* (10q24.32)a | Medulloblastoma, SHH-activated |
| Rhabdoid tumour predisposition syndrome | *SMARCB1* (22q11.23)*/SMARCA4* (19p13.2)a | Atypical teratoid/rhabdoid tumour |
| Carney complex | Inactivating *PRKAR1A* (17q24.2)a | Malignant melanotic nerve sheath tumour |
| DICER1 syndrome | *DICER1* (14q32.13)a; *DICER1*a,c involving remaining allele | Pituitary blastoma; pineoblastoma; ciliary body medulloepithelioma; DICER1-associated CNS sarcoma; ETMR-like infantile cerebellar embryonal tumour |
| Familial paraganglioma syndrome | Germline susceptibility gene variant; *SDHB* (1p36.13)g (high predictive value for *SDHB/C/D*a) | Paraganglioma |
| Melanoma-astrocytoma syndrome | *CDKN2A/2B* (9p21.3)a | Pleomorphic xanthoastrocytoma, low grade diffuse astrocytoma; IDH—wildtype glioblastoma; schwannoma; neurofibroma |
| Familial retinoblastoma | *RB1* (13q14.2)h | Retinoblastoma; pineoblastoma |
| BAP1 tumour predisposition syndrome | *BAP1* (3p21.1)a | Meningioma, rhabdoid or papillary |
| Fanconi anaemia | Positive chr breakage analysis (diepoxybutane test); *FANC*a | Medulloblastoma |
| ELP1-medulloblastoma syndrome | *ELP1* (9q31.3)h | Medulloblastoma, SHH-activated |

ANNUBP – Atypical neurofibromatosis neoplasm with uncertain biologic potential; MPNST – Malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumour; CMMRD – Constitutional mismatch repair deficiency; MP – Methylome profiling; wt wildtype; a mutation/variant; b combined whole-arm deletion; c loss of heterozygosity; d structural variant; e partial/complete deletion; f expression; g loss/absence of expression; h alteration.

For more information refer to the 2021 WHO CNS5 Tumour Classification.[1](#_ENREF_1)
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