Page 1

Pam Elliott

From:

Heather Predham

Sent:

Thursday, May 15, 2008 1:47 PM

To:

Oscar Howell; Pat Pilgrim; Sharon Dominic

Cc:

Dianne Smith; Pam Elliott

Subject:

St. Pierre Results

Attachments: St. Pierre retesting results.pdf

HI.

Please find attached a list of St. Pierre residents and their status regarding ER/PR retesting.

Sharon, you can also refer Dr. Bondonneau to the February 8, 2006 correspondence you translated for us that went to Dr. Pascal Malluret

There are more patients on Dr. Bondonneau's list than we had in our database. I went through each one's pathology and outlined why they were not included. Of course, if he needs more information, don't hesitate to contact me. Also, if it's not clear, call me

Thanks

Heather

Heather Predham Risk Management Consultant/Assistant Director Quality and Risk Management, Eastern Health 100 Forest Road, St. John's, A1A 1E5

Telephone: (709) 777-6126

Fax: (709) 777-8033

Table 1 Patients identified in Communication from Dr. Michel Bondonneau

ame	MCP#	Comment
		This lady was retested. Her original results were EF
		neg PR neg. Upon retesting, her ER was 80 and P
		30.
		This case was paneled and the letter is attached
		She was diagnosed in January 2005 with DCIS
		and as a result, no ER/PR testing was conducted.
		She was diagnosed in May 1997. Her hormonal
		status at the time was ER 90, PR 90.
		She did not meet the criteria of retesting and
		therefore is not involved in this process
		She was diagnosed in November 1999. Her
i		hormonal status at the time was ER Positive, PR
		Negative.
		She did not meet the criteria of retesting and
		therefore is not involved in this process
		She was diagnosed in November 2003. Her
		hormonal status at the time was ER 90%, PR 90%.
		She did not meet the criteria of retesting and
		•
	····	therefore is not involved in this process
		This lady was rejested.
		Her original results were ER neg PR neg.
		Upon refesting, her results were unchanged as E
		0% and PR 0%.
		This lady was retested.
		Her original results were ER neg PR neg.
		Upon refesting, her results were unchanged as E
		0% and PR 0%.
		She was diagnosed in May 2003. Her hormonal
		status at the time was ER 90%, PR >90%.
	-	She did not meet the criteria of retesting and
		therefore is not involved in this process
		She was diagnosed in February 2006. Eastern
		Health was not reporting ER/PR at that time; all
		hormonal receptor status testing and reporting
		was being done at Mount Sinai, therefore she is
		not involved in this process.
		She was diagnosed in February 1999. Her
		hormonal status at the time was ER 70%, PR 45%.
	1	She did not meet the criteria of refesting and
		therefore is not involved in this process
		I cannot locate any pathology results on this lad
		indicating a diagnosis of breast cancer.
		If you have further information, please contact
)	me.
		She was diagnosed in April 1997. Her hormonal
		status at the time was ER 60-70%, PR 80-90%.
		She did not meet the criteria of retesting and

Name	MCP#	Comment
		She was diagnosed in May 1996.
		Her hormonal receptor status was performed
1		using biochemical assay, which was the method
		used prior to the introduction of
	1	immunohistochemical testing. Her status at the
		time was ER PR Negative.
		The immunohistochemical testing method is the
\ <u>\</u>	·	subject of the ER/PR review and was introduced
		in 1997.
\		She did not meet the criteria of retesting and
	-	therefore is not involved in this process
		This lady was retested. Her original results from ER
		neg PR neg. Upon refesting, her results were
		unchanged as ER 0% and PR 0%.
		This lady was retested. Her original results from ER
		neg PR neg. Upon retesting, her ER was 80 and PR
		15.
		This case was paneled and the letter is attached.
		She was diagnosed in June 2006. Eastern Health
		was not reporting ER/PR at that time; all hormonal
1		receptor status testing and reporting was being
		done at Mount Sinai, therefore she is not involved
		in this process.

Table 2

Patients identified by Eastern Health not included in Table 3

Name	MCP#	Comment
		This lady was retested. Her original results were ER
Į.		neg PR neg. Upon retesting, her results were
		unchanged as ER 0% and PR 0%.
į.		This lady was retested. Her original results were ER
		neg PR neg. However this lady was diagnosed
		with DCIS, Mount Sinai does not test DCIS for
	_	ER/PR and therefore she was not retested
		This lady has passed away.
		She was originally ER neg PR neg. Upon refesting
		her resulfs were ER 60% PR 15%
		These results have not been disclosed to her
		family
		This lady has passed away.
		She was originally ER neg PR neg. Upon refesting
		her results were ER 0 PR 0
		These results have not been disclosed to her
		family