A Rare Occurrence of Ewing’s Sarcoma Presenting as Breast Mass: A Case Report and Literature Review
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Abstract: Ewing’s sarcoma (EWS) typically involves the bony structures in adolescents and young adults. Extraskeletal sarcoma is a rare, aggressive, and malignant soft-tissue tumor with high recurrence rate. EWS of the breast is a rare entity with <1% cases reported in literature. A 55-year-old lady who complained of the gradual onset painless breast lump lasting for 1 year was referred to our institute in August 2021. Diagnostic ultrason sound of bilateral breast identified a cystic lesion measuring 1.8 × 1.5 cm in lower inner quadrant of right breast. Diagnostic excisional biopsy of the right breast lump, which was conducted outside of the institute, showed malignant small round cell tumor. Post-excisional biopsy whole body 18-fluoro-deoxy-glucose positron emission tomography showed no residual uptake with no evidence of metastatic disease elsewhere. Immunohistochemistry work revealed positive expression of NKX2.2 and MIC2, which is consistent with the histopathological feature of EWS. Fluorescent in situ hybridization showed EWSR1 rearrangement, which is consistent with the diagnosis of EWS. The patient underwent a wide local excision of the right breast, followed by adjuvant chemotherapy consisting of 18 weekly vincristine/adriamycin D/cyclophosphamide regimen (vincristine, total dose of 2 mg; adriamycin D 100 mg; and cyclophosphamide 1.6 g). The patient was disease free after follow-up of 1 year. The rarity of primary breast EWS poses a diagnostic dilemma and hence the treatment. Local control with systemic therapy is the cornerstone of the treatment, in which breast conservation surgery is equivalent to mastectomy in patient with a good/average breast volume.
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1. Background

Ewing’s sarcoma (EWS) or peripheral primitive neuroectodermal tumors (PNETs) are rare, malignant, and small blue round cell tumor belonging to the Ewing’s family of tumors characterized by the presence of translocation (11;22) (9q24;q12) and immunohistochemistry positivity for CD99. EWS typically involves the bony structures in adolescents and young adults, primarily in males. EWS family of tumors includes extraosseous EWS, PNET, malignant small cell tumors of the thoracopulmonary region (Askin tumor), and atypical EWS. Extraskeletal sarcoma is a rare, aggressive, and malignant soft-tissue tumor with high recurrence rate. Patients typically present with localized pain or swelling of a duration of a few weeks or months. Primary PNETs mainly affect the truncal and axial soft tissue, including chest wall, extremities, and paravertebral region. More than 85% of EWS cases are characterized by the presence of the typical translocation t(11;22) (q24;q12).
Immunophenotyping further establishes the diagnosis of EWS/PNET, which shows positivity for vimentin, Fli-1, and CD99 (MIC2) (1). Multi-modality treatment including local control with R0 resection followed by adjuvant systemic treatment is advised. EWS of the breast is a rare entity with <1% cases reported in the literature[2]. To the best of our knowledge, only 16 cases of extraskeletal EWS have been reported in the literature worldwide.

2. Case presentation

A 55-year-old lady who complained of gradual onset painless breast lump lasting for 1 year was referred to our institute in August 2021. Diagnostic ultrasound of bilateral breast identified a cystic lesion measuring 1.8 × 1.5 cm in the lower inner quadrant of the right breast. Diagnostic excisional biopsy of the right breast lump, which was conducted outside of the institute, showed malignant small round cell tumor, but details about margins were not available. Microscopic review suggested that it was malignant round cell tumor with open chromatin with inconspicuous nucleoli. Mitosis was >10/10 hpf. Tumor cell showed focal positivity for CD99, synaptophysin, S100, BCL2 FL1, and Ki-67 (30 – 35%).

Blocks review suggested a malignant round cell tumor with undifferentiated cells with high nuclear-cytoplasmic (NC) ratio, coarse chromatin, and scanty cytoplasm (Figure 1). Immunohistochemistry works showed positive NKX2 expression with diffuse nuclear positivity and positivity for MIC2, which are consistent with histopathological features of EWS (Figure 2). Fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH) was performed using dual-color break-apart probes for EWSR1 gene to show separate green (3’ EWSR1) and red (5’ EWSR1) signals which indicate EWSR1 rearrangement (red-green) (×1000 magnification).

Post-excisional biopsy whole body 18-fluoro-deoxy-glucose positron emission tomography showed no residual uptake with no evidence of metastatic disease elsewhere (Figure 4). Post-excisional mammogram showed normal scan with no architectural distortion or mass lesion (Figure 5).

Treatment plan for this case was breast conservation surgery (wide local excision) followed by adjuvant therapy in view of unknown margin status. The patient underwent a wide local excision of the right breast (Figure 6) followed by adjuvant chemotherapy consisting of 18 weekly vincristine/adriamycin D/cyclophosphamide (VAC) regimen (vincristine, total dose of 2 mg; adriamycin D 100 mg; and cyclophosphamide 1.6 g).

3. Discussion

EWS or PNET belongs to a group of rare malignant neoplasm with blue round cell morphology commonly occurring in...
adolescent and younger age group. Primary PNETs mainly affect the truncal and axial soft tissue, including the chest wall (Askin tumor), the extremities, and the paravertebral region. More than 85% of EWS is characterized by the presence of the typical translocation t(11;22) (q24;q12). Immunophenotyping further establishes the diagnosis of EWS/PNET, which shows positivity for vimentin, Fli-1, and CD99 (MIC2). Majority of patients with EWS/PNET belongs to the age group of 10 – 20 years. It has been reported in several studies on EWS in adult patients from Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center and the Royal Marsden School that the patients had a median age of 24 – 27 years. However, the patient reported in this case was 55 years old. EWS presenting as a primary breast lesion in older age group is very rare and poses a diagnostic dilemma. Findings from ultrasonography and mammography may vary. Similar cases have been reported and were initially misdiagnosed as fibroadenoma, phyllodes tumor, and mammary carcinoma. This diagnostic dilemma may cause a delay in treatment. In our patient, a cystic mass with iso- to hyperechoic content was initially identified on ultrasonography and was misdiagnosed as cystic lesion and therefore considered benign. Excisional biopsy confirmed the diagnosis of small round cell tumor. Immunohistochemistry results further corroborated the diagnosis of EWS. However, the unusual site of EWS in the non-typical age groups poses a challenge to the timeliness of the diagnosis and hence the treatment.

EWS/PNET is an aggressive tumor with high incidence of local recurrence and distant metastasis. Multi-modality treatment including local control with R0 resection followed by adjuvant systemic treatment is advised. Systemic chemotherapy improves the 5-year survival rate in localized PNET from 10% to 65% by preventing micrometastasis.

EWS/PNET of the breast is extremely rare. Sixteen cases of breast EWS have been reported thus far (Table 1) and had been managed by multi-modality treatment approach, including breast conservation surgery or mastectomy. Out of the 16 reported cases, three cases underwent mastectomy, followed by systemic chemotherapy in two cases. Seven cases underwent wide local excision or breast conservation surgery, three cases underwent systemic chemotherapy and one case received neoadjuvant chemotherapy. On follow-up, these patients remained disease-free. The remaining six cases received either chemotherapy alone or a combination of

Figure 4. Post-excisional biopsy positron emission tomography-computed tomography (positron emission tomography-computed tomography) scan of thorax region showing normal scan with no evidence of residual tumor in the right breast.

Figure 5. Post-excisional mammogram of bilateral breast (mediolateral view) with normal scan showing no architectural distortion or mass lesion.

Figure 6. Intraoperative images of breast conservation surgery. (A) Defect created after wide local excision. (B) Good cosmesis after immediate closure of defect.
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Table 1. Summary of previously reported cases of breast Ewing’s sarcoma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case report</th>
<th>Age of patient (years)</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>Size (cm)</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tamura et al.[3]</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>2.1 × 1.8</td>
<td>Mastectomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell et al.[4]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Lumpectomy + chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da Silva et al.[5]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>12 × 7.5</td>
<td>Chemotherapy + radiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko et al.[6]</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>2.5 × 2</td>
<td>Lumpectomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vindal and Kakkar[7]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>3 × 2</td>
<td>Wide local excision + chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwak et al.[8]</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Axillary mass</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhingra et al.[9]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>3.5 × 3</td>
<td>Wide local excision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suebwong et al.[10]</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Radiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majid et al.[11]</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>7 (right), 5 (left)</td>
<td>Chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahajan et al.[12]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>10 × 14</td>
<td>Mastectomy + chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranade et al.[13]</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>6 × 6</td>
<td>Chemotherapy + radiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meddeb et al.[14]</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Breast conservation surgery + chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim et al.[15]</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Recurrent lump</td>
<td>2 × 2</td>
<td>Modified radical mastectomy + chemotherapy + radiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popli et al.[16]</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>9.5 × 7 × 5</td>
<td>Wide local excision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srivastava et al.[17]</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Lump</td>
<td>11.6 × 9.2 × 6</td>
<td>Neoadjuvant chemotherapy + wide local excision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikhwan et al.[18]</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Metastatic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chemotherapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chemotherapy and radiotherapy. As reported by Suebwong et al.[10] and da Silva et al.[5], the patients treated by chemotherapy combined with radiotherapy developed local and systemic relapse, further suggesting that surgery remains the cornerstone for local control. At present, no definite treatment of breast EWS has been reported. The role of radiotherapy in the treatment of PNET is unclear, but it can achieve local control if combined with surgery. If tumor-free margins are achievable after wide local excision or breast conservation surgery, then mastectomy can be avoided for management of EWS. Our reported case was managed with breast conservation surgery followed by adjuvant chemotherapy consisting of 18 weekly VAC regimen. During the 1-year follow-up, the patient remained disease-free. Our case showed that small tumors in patients with good breast volume can be managed with breast conservation surgery, and similar results can be achieved for mastectomy followed by adjuvant treatment.

4. Conclusion

The rarity of the primary breast EWS poses a diagnostic dilemma and hence the treatment. Local control with systemic therapy is the cornerstone of the treatment, in which breast conservation surgery is equivalent to mastectomy in local control in patient with good/average breast volume.
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