### THE FUTURE OF CANCER DATA: UNLOCKING INSIGHTS WITH PATHOLOGY REPORTING



Data to Discovery: Novel **Applications of Pathology Data** 

Michael Gurley, Brigette Rabel, Ross Simpson, MD, Peter Paul Yu, MD, FACP, FASCO

ОСТОВЕR 6 | 2:15-3:00 рм CT



COLLEGE of AMERICAN PATHOLOGISTS Laboratory Quality Solutions

CAP23 | CHICAGO **#PATHDATA** 



# Pathology Synoptic Data

**Local Usages** 

### **Ross W. Simpson, MD Park Nicollet / Methodist Hospital** St. Louis Park, MN



## **Disclosures**

• No relevant disclosures

# Validation/Curation

- Are the forms being filled out consistently?
- Is the dataset complete?
- Is the data accurate especially in complicated cases with multiple tumors?
- Are Biomarkers correctly mapped?





### Specimen A Tumor 1 Block A3



### **Biomarker Block A3**

Specimen A Tumor 2 Block A7



### **Biomarker Block A7**

© College of American Pathologists.



# **Example: Breast Cancer Margins**

₽ ₽	•	1 1 2 2 ✓ ▼ ₹ ୯ #	🔹 📄 🗢 📥 🖶 🔮 🚹 ד 🖶 Ti			
		FOCI	INVASIVE_MARGIN	LESSTHAN1MM	LESSTHANX	DCIS_MARGIN
	103	Multiple foci of invasive carcinoma	Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			
	104		Positive for invasive carcinoma			
	105		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			
	106	Multiple foci of invasive carcinoma	Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma	Less than (specify in Millimeters (mm))	1	
	107		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			
	108		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			Positive for DCIS
	109	Multiple foci of invasive carcinoma 📟	Positive for invasive carcinoma			
	110		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			
	111	Multiple foci of invasive carcinoma 📟	Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	112		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			
	113		Positive for invasive carcinoma			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	114		Not applicable (residual invasive carcinoma not present in specimen) *			
	115		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	116		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			
	117		Uninvolved by invasive carcinoma			
/			···· · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · ·		

Variation by: Surgeon, PA (grossing), Pathologist, tumor type, tumor size, tumor grade

Sample Size

# **CAP / AP-LIS Vendor Goal**

• To make use of the data easy

© College of American Pathologists.





# **Provincial AP** Synoptic Reporting Program

# **Brigette Rabel**

Provincial AP Strategic Lead and Synoptic Reporting Program Coordinator



### **Disclosure Statement**

I have no financial disclosure or conflicts of interest with the material in this presentation.



As expected

٠

# Synoptic Reporting Pathologist Dashboard 2022

Tissue	Metric Description		P160		Site		Health Authority		Province	
Breast	Number of checklists submitted			30		251		693		3438
	% Cases with invasive ductal carcinoma	70-90%	0	70%	0	71%	0	74%	0	72%
	% Cases with invasive lobular carcinoma	10-15%	0	10%	0	15%	0	11%	0	12%
	% Cases where biomarkers are resulted as performed	> 95%	$\circ$	100%		99%	$\circ$	99%	0	99%
Colorectal	Number of checklists submitted			9		132		334		1715
	% Colon resections with at least 12 lymph nodes examined	> 90%	0	100%	$\Delta$	89%		91%	0	93%
	% Cases with serosal penetration (pT4a and pT4b)	> 20%	$\Delta$	0%	$\Delta$	20%	$\Delta$	20%	0	21%
	% Cases with lymphovascular invasion	> 30%	$\circ$	33%		49%	0	33%	0	33%
Endometrium	Number of checklists submitted			1		26		94		739
	% Cases with lymphovascular invasion			0%		15%		17%		23%
Lung	Number of checklists submitted			31		154		154		581
	% Cases with visceral pleural invasion			13%		24%		24%		24%
Prostate	Number of checklists submitted			4		33		152		1196
	% Cases with extra prostatic extension			0%		36%		45%		50%
Quality	% all tissues 14 day TAT met	> 85%	$\Delta$	60%	$\Delta$	49%	$\Delta$	61%	Δ	72%
	% all tissues 6 working day TAT met	> 85%	Δ	13%	$\Delta$	16%	$\Delta$	34%	Δ	54%

Fictitious Data for Demonstration Purposes



### Legend

Observed value may deviate from the target

### No target or < 5 cases



Δ

٠

As expected

No target or < 5 cases

# Synoptic Reporting Surgeon Dashboard 2022

Tissue	Metric Description	Target	G7403	Hospital(s)	Health Authority	Province
Breast	Number of checklists submitted		18	61	823	3438
	% Cases with margins positive for invasive carcinoma (excisions)		20%	9%	11%	15%
	% Cases with margins positive for in situ carcinoma (excisions)		10%	9%	6%	7%
Colorectal	Number of checklists submitted		8	20	408	1715
	% Checklists - colon		75%	90%	79%	77%
	% Checklists - rectal	- 126	25%	10%	21%	23%
	% Colon resections with at least 12 lymph nodes examined	> 90%	🔺 83%	94%	96%	93%
	% Rectal resections (with y) with at least 12 lymph nodes examined	ig- net net	50%	50%	95%	86%
	% Cases with macroscopic intactness of mesorectum incomplete	< 10 %	0%	0%	3%	8%
	% Cases with macroscopic intactness of mesorectum complete or near complete	> 90 %	100%	100%	96%	🔺     90%
	% Cases with radial/mesenteric margin positive for tumour		0%	5%	5%	5%
Prostate	Number of checklists submitted		1	1	248	1196
	% cases pT2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	100%	100%	51%	47%
	% cases pT3a	1 N 12	0%	0%	36%	35%
	% cases pT3b		0%	0%	13%	18%
	% pT2 cases with positive margins	< 20 %	0%	0%	17%	🔺 24%
	% Cases with lymph nodes submitted or found		0%	0%	96%	91%

Fictitious Data for Demonstration Purposes

### Provincial Health Services Authority

Legend

Observed value may deviate from the target



### Synoptic Reporting Dashboard Deep Dive



P156: Colorectal % Colon resections with at least 12 lymph nodes examined 2020Q4 to 2022Q2



### Synoptic Reporting Dashboard **Deep Dive**



P156: Colorectal % Colon resections with at least 12 lymph nodes examined 2020Q4 to 2022Q2



### What we are measuring

We are counting the number of Colon and Rectum Resection checklists. submitted where the number of lymph nodes examined is 12 or more. This number is divided by the number of Colon and Rectum Resection checklists with lymph nodes received. - Excludes cases where "Rectum" is listed as a primary tumour site

### Why it matters

The accuracy and predictive value of stage II assignment are directly proportional to the thoroughness of the surgical technique in removing all regional nodes and the pathologic examination of the resection specimen in identifying and harvesting all regional lymph nodes for microscopic assessment. The National Quality Forum lists the presence of at least 12 lymph nodes in a surgical resection among the key quality. measures for colon cancer care. The likelihood of detecting metastasis increases with the number of lymph nodes examined; hence 12 lymph nodes should be considered the minimum target, but all possible lymphnodes should be retrieved and examined. The clinical outcome is linked to lymph node harvest in stage II disease, indicating a positive effect of optimal mesenteric resection by the surgeon, optimal lymph node harvest from the resection specimen by the pathologist, or both.

### What you can do

The number of lymph nodes recovered from a resection specimen is dependent on several factors. Surgical technique, surgery volume, and patient factors (e.g., age and anatomic variation) alter the actual number of nodes in a resection specimen, but the diligence and skill of the pathologist in identifying and harvesting lymph nodes in the resection specimen also are major factors. Lymph nodes may be more difficult to identify in specimens from patients who are obese or elderly, or after neoadjuvant therapy. Because it has been shown that nodal metastasis in colorectal cancer is often found in small lymph nodes (<5 mm in diameter), diligent search for lymph nodes is required on gross. examination of resection specimens. If fewer than 12 lymph nodes are found, re-examining the specimen for additional lymph nodes, with or without visual enhancement techniques, should be considered. The pathology report should clearly state the total number of lymph nodes. examined and the total number involved by metastases. Data are

### Synoptic Reporting Data is used to Inform **Research Projects and Quality Initiatives**





# Histopathologic response to neoadjuvant

### ARCHIVES of Pathology & Laboratory Medicine

### Using Pathology Synoptic Reporting Data to Create Individual Dashboards for Pathologists and Surgeons



Gurpal Bisra, MMOR, MSc, BASc; Brigette Rabel, MLT; Nick van der Westhuizen, MB, FRCPC

 Context.—Electronic synoptic pathology reporting using xPert from mTuitive is available to all pathologists in British Columbia, Canada. Comparative feedback reports for pathologists and surgeons were created by using the synoptic reporting software.

*Objective.*—To use data stored in a single central data repository to provide nonpunitive confidential comparative feedback reports (dashboards) to individual pathologists and surgeons for reflection on their practice and to use aggregate data for quality improvement initiatives.

Design.—Integration of mTuitive middleware in 5 different laboratory information systems to have 1 software solution (xPert) sending discrete data elements to the central data repository. Microsoft Office products were used to build comparative feedback reports and made the infrastructure sustainable. Two different types of reports

ancer is the leading cause of death in Canada and is responsible for 30% of all deaths.<sup>1</sup> Lung, breast, colorectal, and prostate cancer are the most commonly diagnosed types of cancer in Canada (excluding nonmelanoma skin cancer).1 These cancers account for about half (48%) of all new cancer cases<sup>1</sup> so these were the cancer types we focused on in this study.

The pathology report for resected cancer specimens forms the basis for evaluating the need for adjuvant therapy and for patient prognostication.2 The pathology reporting of cancer specimens needs to be standardized, complete, and structured so that therapeutic dilemmas and delays do not were developed: individual confidential feedback reports (dashboards) and aggregated data reports.

Results.—Pathologists have access to an individual confidential live feedback report for the 5 major cancer sites. Surgeons get an annual confidential emailed PDF report. Several quality improvement initiatives were identified from the aggregate data.

Conclusions.---We present 2 novel dashboards: a live pathologist dashboard and a static surgeon dashboard. Individual confidential dashboards incentivize use of nonmandated electronic synoptic pathology reporting tools and have increased adoption rates. Use of dashboards has also led to discussions about how patient care may be improved.

(Arch Pathol Lab Med. doi: 10.5858/arpa.2021-0542-OA)

occur because of incomplete pathology reports.<sup>2,3</sup> The use of standardized structured datasets for pathology cancer reporting has been shown to improve patient care and clinical outcomes.4,5 In particular, standardized electronic synoptic reporting using the College of American Pathologists (CAP)-approved cancer checklists ensures complete reports, reduces clinical errors, and provides reliable aggregate data as discrete data elements to analyze for laboratory quality assurance, research, cancer registry surveillance, and other secondary uses.6-8 The electronic version of the CAP Cancer Protocols (eCCs) is currently used by 35% to 40% of all practicing anatomic pathologists in the United States and Canada.4 CAP Cancer Protocols and Checklists have been endorsed by the Canadian Association of Pathologists (CAP-ACP) and are now a pan-Canadian content standard for pathology reporting in Canada.<sup>9</sup>

Health care organizations and professional groups are being asked to develop clear quality measures and metrics that can lead to performance improvements at provider and

https://meridian.allenpress.com/a plm/article/doi/10.5858/arpa.2021 -0542-OA/492384/Using-Pathology-Synoptic-Reporting-Data-to-Create

Accepted for publication January 27, 2023.

Supplemental digital content is available for this article. See text for hyperlink.

From Data Science, Bisrey Analytics Ltd, Delta, British Columbia, Canada (Bisra); Anatomical Pathology, Provincial Health Services Authority, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada (Rabel); the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Royal Jubilee

### **Colorectal Resection Lymph Node Harvest Rates** in British Columbia





Harvesting a minimum of 12 lymph nodes is a key quality measure for colon cancer care

This measures both:

Optimal mesenteric resection by surgeon

 $\sqrt{}$ 

 $\sqrt{}$ 

Optimal lymph node harvest from the resection specimen by the pathologist **British Columbia's Renal Pathology Service** 



### BC's Medical Kidney Biopsy (Non-Cancer) Synoptic Report

# Statistics

# Transplant biopsies

# Native biopsies

# Biopsies from community hospitals

# Quality

Biopsy adequacy by community site

→ Support with education/training as needed

Diagnoses by Nephrologist → Assist nephrologists with their QA

# Research

PROMIS codes linked to clinical databases

Various histologic features captured– easy to identify cases for research







ROBERT H. LURIE COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER OF NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

### Future of Cancer Data Summit Unlocking Insights with Pathology Reporting

Michael Gurley | m-gurley@northwestern.edu Administrative Director of Cancer Informatics Robert H. Lurie Comprehensive Cancer Center of Northwestern University 10/6/2023





• Ownership Interest in Textractor, Inc.





### Synoptic Pathology at Northwestern Medicine

- This discrete capture of CAP cancer protocol data as synoptic reports has been ongoing since 2020 at Northwestern Medicine (NM).
- The synoptic reports contain discrete representations of desired fundamental oncology data points.





### Synoptic Case Growth



Northwestern Medicine<sup>®</sup>

ROBERT H. LURIE COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER OF NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

### 24

### Finding the Data

- NM research data analysts noticed 'Synoptic Reports' sections appearing in many pathology cases.
- First at tempts at using 'synoptic' data involved regular expressions and NLP to extract this new consistently formatted, tableized data.
- In late 2022, NM Research Analytics investigated if and how this new nicely formatted data might be discretely stored within the Epic Clarity data model.
- NM research analytics discovered that the CAP cancer protocols are implemented as synoptic reports that leverage Epic Smart Data Elements within the Epic Beaker module.
- NM Research Analytics developed boilerplate SQL that could extract the discrete fundamental oncology data points for incorporation into analytic data sets.



- The native Epic Smart Data Elements data structures containing synoptic data can be queried in Clarity but the retrieval is not intuitive or performant.
- To optimize the use of discrete synoptic data, NM Research Analytics has built an extension data model and ETL to its existing pathology data mart that represents discrete synoptic data in a simple entity attribute value (EAV) structure.
- Share our pathology data mart ETL that incorporates the synoptic pathology data from Clarity Smart Data Elements with other Epic hostages (customers).



- The pathology finding extension tables are integrated into the existing NM pathology data mart by adding a new fact PATHOLOGY FINDING table hanging off the existing PATHOLOGY CASE REPORT SECTION table.
- Synoptic reports are represented in Epic Beaker as a textual report section and discrete Smart Form concepts. The data mart transforms the discrete Smart Form concepts into a compact discrete representation in the PATHOLOGY FINDING table.
- The connection of discrete findings to the textual representation in the pathology case report section enables querying a pathology case based on discrete values.



- Each finding is implemented as a question and answer. The data type of the answer depends on the data type of the question. Supported question data types include: 'category', and 'string'.
- CAP cancer protocols often allow for answers to be supplemented with free text. So, a categorical answer will specify if it can detour to free text.
- The data mart contains dimension tables that set up the expectations for each CAP cancer protocol: PATHOLOGY\_FINDING\_FORM, PATHOLOGY\_FINDING QUESTION, and PATHOLOGY FINDING ANSWER. These tables function like REDCap instruments.



- The tables define each CAP cancer protocol's questions, answers, and dependencies. Each  ${\color{black}\bullet}$ CAP cancer protocol has multiple published versions. Each version has a begin and end date of clinical applicability. For the most part, questions, answers and dependencies remain constant across published versions, but additions and removals can occur.
- Epic Smart forms use stable identifiers for questions and answer concepts across versions that are sourced from the CAP eCP Ckeys. So, querying for data across multiple published versions of the same CAP cancer protocol is possible.
- The data mart supports the tracking of published versions of a CAP cancer protocol in  ${\color{black}\bullet}$ PATHOLOGY\_FINDING FORM table.





- Often It is desirable to map CAP cancer protocol data to standardized healthcare vocabularies. Both the PATHOLOGY\_FINDING\_QUESTION and PATHOLOGY FINDING ANSWER can be related to a polymorphic mapping table that allows for specifying a map to concepts in external, standardized vocabularies.
- CAP itself provides maps of answers to ICD-O-3 site and histology in their CAP eCC distribution. NM has incorporated the mappings into its pathology data mart.
- Future plans include mappings to all Ckey concepts to SNOMED via the Nebraska Lexicon.







### 31

- Surgical Volume Based on Histology.
  - ICD-10 diagnosis codes provide no support for partitioning diagnoses by histology.
  - Cancer programs want to know how many surgeries spawned what types of pathology-confirmed histologies.
  - Using NM pathology data mart's connection of pathology cases to synoptic data and to surgeries enables the reporting of surgical volume by histology.





- Clinical Trials Recruitment.
  - Many of the fundamental oncology data points that are essential in matching patients to clinical trial eligibility criteria can be sourced from discrete synoptic pathology data. For example: ICD-O-3.2 site/histology; AJJCC TNM staging; grading; and biomarkers
  - NM Research Analytics has incorporated the querying of discrete synoptic pathology data into its delivery of clinical trial recruitment reports.
  - Connecting prior treatment Epic Beacon episodes and MOSAIQ treatment plans via problem list diagnoses joined to synoptic ICD-O-3.2 sites.



Tumor Registry Case Finding and Case Abstraction. 

- Tumor registry casefinding and case abstraction can be sourced from discrete synoptic pathology data. For example: ICD-O-3.2 site/histology; AJJCC TNM staging; grading; and biomarkers
- NM IT has set up a direct feed of synoptic pathology results from Epic to our tumor registry vendor NeuralFrame.





- **Clinical Specimen Archive Annotation.** 
  - Many of the attributes requested by investigators for identifying cohorts of patients with clinical specimens residing in the NM clinical specimen archive can be sourced from discrete synoptic pathology data. For example: ICD-O-3.2 site/histology; AJJCC TNM staging; grading; and biomarkers
  - NM Research Analytics has incorporated the querying of discrete synoptic pathology data into its delivery of accession numbers for submission to the NM Clinical Specimen Release Committee.



- Automating Imports into REDCap Data Repositories.
  - Many of the attributes that are manually abstracted by data coordinators for input into REDCap data repositories (for example, SPORE data repositories) can be sourced from discrete synoptic pathology data. For example: ICD-O-3.2 site/histology; AJJCC TNM staging; grading; and biomarkers
  - NM Research Analytics has incorporated the querying of discrete synoptic pathology data for export into REDCap via the REDCap API.



Automating Imports into REDCap Data Repositories. 





37

### 🚆 Surgeries Endometrium

		10.0
- Care	2.4	
-	1.1	10.00
		_

REDCap Messenger S Contact REDCap administrator

Project Home and Design

Project Home · IE Project Setup

🕑 Designer - 🛄 Dictionary - 🗮 Coo Project status: Development

Select other reco

Q.Seanth Doganize /Edit (

IE View Logs

III Record Status Dashboard Add / Edit Records

Record ID 10

 Demographics Surgeries Endome Outside Systemic Trea utside Radiation Tr Disease Status (4) (+) Survival Date of Last Review

> ubject Exclusion For Specimen Collection

Editing existing Record ID 10. (Instance #1)	
Record ID	10
Surgery Date	SH-D
Surgical Pathology Accession Number	
Procedure	BILATERAL SALPINGECTOMY     BILATERAL SALPINGO-OPHORECTOMY     LETS GOPHORECTOMY     LETS MURING-OPHORECTOMY     OPHORECTOMY     OPHORECTOMY     OPHORECTOMY     OPHORECTOMY SIDE NOT SPECIFIED     OPHORELENDA     OPHORELENDA     PRATONAL BIOPSYNER)     PRATONAL BIOPSYNER)     PRATONAL MORSHING     ADJOLAL HISTERECTOMY     RIGHT SALPINGCOOPHORECTOMY     RIGHT SALPINGCOOPHORECTOMY     SALPINGO-OPHORECTOMY     SALPINGO-OPHORECTOMY
Procedure (Other)	
Hysteractomy Type	ABDOMINAL  ARABOSCORIC  ARABOSCORIC, ASDIGTIC, ASSISTED  OTHER (SPECIPY)  VAGINAL  VAGINAL  VAGINAL ARABOSCOPIC, ASSISTED  OAND TIE DETERMINED
Hysterectomy Type (Other)	
Tumor Site	CANNOT BE DETERMINED ENDOMETRIAL POLYP ENDOMETRIAN CLOWER UTERMES SEGMENT OTHER (SPECIPY)
fumor Site (Other)	
rumor Size Greatest Dimension (Centimeters)	4.2
Additional Dimension (Centimeters)	
Histologic Type	CARCINOSARCOMA     CLARA CELL ADENO CARCINOMA, NOS     DEDIFERIENTIATEO CARCINOMA, NOS     DEDIFERIENTIATEO CARCINOMA MOS     DENO METRIO IC ARCINOMA MITH SECRETORY     DIFERENTIATION     ENDOMETRIO IC ARCINOMA, NOS     ENDOMETRIO IC ARCINOMA, NOS     ENDOMETRIO IC ARCINOMA, NOS     NOSOMETRIO IC ARCINOMA, NOS     NOSOMETRIO, NOS     NOSOMETRIO, NOS     NOSOMETRIO, NOS     NOSOMETRIO, NOS     NOSOMETRIO, NOS
Histologic Type (Other)	
Histologic Grade	FIGO GRADE 1     FIGO GRADE 2     FIGO GRADE 2     FIGO GRADE 3     NOT APPLICABLE     OTHER (SPECIFY)
Histologic Grade (Other)	
ymphovascular Invasion	CANNOT BE DETERMINED     ONT IDENTIFIED     @ PRESENT
Primary Tumor (pT)	PT1A V
Regional Lymph Nodes (pN)	PN0.
pM Category	NOT APPLICABLE - PM CANNOT BE DETE
FIGO Stage	a IA 👻

- Automating Imports into Investigator-Initiated Clinical Trial Case Report Forms.
  - Many of the attributes that are manually abstracted by data coordinators for input into Northwestern's (NU) eCRF system to support investigator-initiated clinical trials can be sourced from discrete synoptic pathology data. For example: ICD-O-3.2 site/histology; AJJCC TNM staging; grading; and biomarkers
  - NM Research Analytics is in the process of developing the querying of discrete synoptic pathology data for import into the NU's eCRF system.



# Challenges

- CAP eCC is Not an Ontology
  - The lack of ontology in the synoptic pathology concept Smart Form hierarchy as imported from CAP eCC makes querying across protocol templates a hardcoded affair.
  - Example: the concept 'Acinar adenocarcinoma' does not have the same internal identifier (cKey) across all templates or templates for the same cancer type. For example:

Template Name	Item Title	Item Ckey
Prostate Gland: Needle Biopsy (Case Level)	Acinar adenocarcinoma	330696.1
Prostate Gland: Needle Biopsy (Specimen Level)	Acinar adenocarcinoma	330451.1
Prostate Gland: Radical Prostatectomy	Acinar adenocarcinoma	56746.1
Prostate Gland: Transurethral Prostatic Resection (TURP), Enucleation Specimen (Simple or Subtotal Prostatectomy)	Acinar adenocarcinoma	40264.1





### **Future Plans**

- Incorporating ino the NM pathology data mart the Nebraska Lexicon ontology mappings of Ckeys to SNOMED concepts To improve flexibility in querying. The missing ontology!
- Harmonizing NLP-derived pathology findings from pre-synoptic pathology reports in our  ${\color{black}\bullet}$ data mart to be able to deliver pathology findings across time. The hope is CAP eCC will serve as a knowledge graph to aid LLMs with retrieval augmented generation (RAG).
- Mapping CAP Ckeys to SNOMED for AJCC staging
  - https://build.fhir.org/ig/HL7/fhir-mCODE-ig/ValueSet-mcode-cancer-stage-value- ${}^{\bullet}$ vs.html





40

## Takeaway

- For the longest time, data has been missing from the EHR.
  - No histology!
  - No pathological staging!
  - No grading!
  - No biomarkers!
- The data is finally there in the EHR! We need to start delivering the data from synoptic  ${}^{\bullet}$ reports to accelerate research, clinical care, and operations.
- Using the data will motivate the expansion of synoptic reporting to biopsies and resistant  ${}^{\bullet}$ disease types.





### 41



ROBERT H. LURIE COMPREHENSIVE CANCER CENTER OF NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

M





The Future of Cancer Data: **Unlocking Insights With Pathology Reporting Summit** October 6, 2023