

Patricia Pilgrim

From: Heather Predham
Sent: Friday, January 13, 2006 1:54 PM
To: Sharon Smith; Patricia Pilgrim; Pam Elliott; Robert Williams
Subject: FW: ER/PR update

Hi,

As an update to my e-mail below...

The good news is that it was my mistake, the two samples that I was worried about below is not a concern. I misread the Mount Sinai report and it was HER-2neu results not ER/PR.

The lady that came back negative after being identified as positive seems to be an interpretation issues from Carbonear. Dr. Cook and Dr. Carter reviewed the slides. they were interpreted as positive in Carbonear, but on their review they felt there was a lot of background staining and they read it as being <1%.

We did panel three cases: 1 their is no impact as she was already interpreted as positive based on the PR, one is still considered negative as the ER is <10% and 1 is a conversion and Tamoxifen is recommended.

Also, Kara informed us that she had gotten a call from the medical oncologist in Fredericton. they have just discovered an issue with their staining and was inquiring about our retesting process.

Thanks

Heather

-----Original Message-----

From: Heather Predham
Sent: Wednesday, January 11, 2006 9:00 AM
To: Sharon Smith; Patricia Pilgrim; Pam Elliott; Robert Williams
Subject: ER/PR update

Hi all,

I just wanted to give you a heads up on another facet of the ER/PR crystal.....

As you know, we have sent all the samples that were negative for ER from 1997 to April 2004 for retesting at Mount Sinai. These are the samples that were originally processed using our Dako system (the manual system with all the steps). Mount Sinai uses the same system, but is the only lab in Canada to be accredited and participate in internal and external proficiency testing.

We also stopped all our testing in August 2005 and have sent all samples to Mount Sinai since that time.

That left a group of samples that were done on our automated Ventana system from April 2004 to August 2005 that were not validated by Mount Sinai. The decision was made in the Fall to send these samples up to Mount Sinai as well. We now have a lady whose original sample showed a degree of positivity (under the 10% level so it was sent to Mount Sinai) but came back completely negative. She has been informed and she has been taken off Arimedex. We now have two more results back with the same situation....I guess you can say that they are false positives. These two will be paneled at this Thursday's meeting.

The explanation from the lab is that this can be expected because of the different platforms for testing, but it is of course is a totally new aspect of this situation.....I just wanted to make you aware and I'll keep you updated.

Heather