



Student's Journal of Health Research Africa

e-ISSN: 2709-9997, p-ISSN: 3006-1059

Vol.6 No. 6 (2025): June 2025 Issue

<https://doi.org/10.51168/sjhrafrica.v6i6.1914>

Original Article

Molecular subtyping of breast carcinomas in urban and rural Indian population – A cross-sectional study.

Ajaya Kumar Sahu¹, Chandra Sekhar Behera², Swaraj Sambit Samal², Sujit Kumar Mohanty^{3,*}

¹Associate Professor, Department of General Surgery, Bhima Bhoi Medical College & Hospital, Balangir, Odisha, India.

²Assistant Professor, Department of General Surgery, S.C.B Medical College & Hospital, Cuttack, Odisha, India.

³Associate Professor, Department of General Surgery, Government Medical College & Hospital, Phulbani, Kandhamal, India.

Page | 1

Abstract

Background

Consequently, one crucial aspect for the treatment profile of breast cancer is the classification of breast cancer into pertinent molecular subgroups. Breast cancer is divided into four primary clinical subtypes based on gene expression profiles, receptor status, and proliferative status. There hasn't been much research done on how common these molecular subtypes are among Indian people.

Objectives

The purpose of conducting this analysis was to evaluate the molecular subtyping of breast cancer in Indians living in both urban and rural areas.

Materials and Methods

It was a prospective, observational study. The study was carried out in SCB Medical College & Hospital, Odisha, India. The study was conducted for two years, that is, from January 2023 to April 2025. In all, 150 patients were enrolled. Study participants included all females with breast cancer.

Results

With 83 (55.3%) patients older than 50, the mean age at diagnosis was skewed toward older patients. Metastases from lymph nodes were found in 89 patients, or 59.3%. In 32 (21.3%) of the cases, distant metastases were discovered at the time of initial presentation. Of the population, 24 (16.0%) had luminal A-like tumors.

Conclusion

This study uses immunohistochemistry surrogate markers to show the distribution of subtypes that are molecular in breast cancer in an Indian population living in both urban and rural areas. The majority of patients come with high-grade tumors and substantial nodal involvement, and the results show a preponderance of aggressive subtypes, including TNBC and Luminal B-like cancers.

Recommendation

Routine molecular subtyping using immunohistochemistry should be incorporated into the diagnostic evaluation of all invasive breast cancer cases to guide treatment decisions effectively.

Keywords: Triple-negative breast tumors, Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2 (HER2), breast cancer, Molecular subtyping, Triple-Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC).

Submitted: 2025-04-12 **Accepted:** 2025-06-07 **Published:** 2025-06-30

Corresponding Author: Sujit Kumar Mohanty,

Email: drsujit.mohanty@gmail.com

Associate Professor, Department of General Surgery, Government Medical College & Hospital, Phulbani, Kandhamal, India.

Introduction

In almost all cases of women having breast cancer, it is the most prevalent cancer worldwide [1]. North America, Europe, and Australia have the highest rates of breast cancer.



Recent evidence indicates that the rates of mortality among cancer are declining, even though it is still the top cause of cancer death in women [2].

Increased awareness, screening initiatives, and improvements in focused treatment are to blame for this. According to gene expression research, the intrinsic molecular features of the tumor, not morphological prognostic markers, are the primary determinants of the tumor's response to treatment. With the development of high-throughput platforms for gene expression investigation, like microarrays, these intrinsic molecular characteristics can be investigated utilizing molecular techniques [3].

Consequently, one crucial aspect for the treatment profile of breast cancer is the classification of breast cancer into pertinent molecular subgroups. Breast cancer is divided into four primary clinical subtypes based on gene expression profiles, status of receptor, and status that is proliferative as determined by Ki67, estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) [4].

Luminal A, luminal B, HER2-enriched, and triple-negative breast tumors (TNBC) are some of these clinical subgroups. The chance of an early recurrence is higher for breast tumors that are not luminal A. TNBCs are aggressive, showing advanced illness and a higher histological grade.

Over the past few decades, the incidence of breast cancer has been steadily rising, with Asian countries seeing the biggest increases. With an overall change in incidence of roughly 0.4–0.6, breast cancer has become the most frequent cancer in women in India over the past 20 years [5].

The profiling of gene expressions is not widely used in ordinary clinical practice because of issues of cost and complexity observed technically. Cheang et al. proposed a more useful immunohistochemistry surrogate categorization [6].

There hasn't been much research done on how common these molecular subtypes are among Indian people. The purpose of conducting this study was to evaluate the molecular subtyping of breast cancer in Indians living in both urban and rural areas.

Methodology

Study Design

This was a prospective, cross-sectional observational study conducted to assess receptor status in patients with invasive breast cancer.

Study Setting

The study was conducted at SCB Medical College & Hospital, Odisha, India, over two years, from January 2023 to April 2025.

Study Population

A total of 150 female patients diagnosed with invasive breast cancer were enrolled in the study.

Inclusion Criteria

- Female patients diagnosed with invasive breast cancer.
- Patients who underwent reflex fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) testing, when indicated.
- Patients with complete receptor status data (ER/PR/HER2).

Exclusion Criteria

- Patients without reflex FISH testing.
- Patients with bilateral breast cancer (either synchronous or metachronous).
- Patients with missing receptor status data (ER/PR/HER2).

Data Collection

Information about the pathology results and baseline clinical features of the selected cases was gathered from the electronic medical records. Age at diagnosis, tumor size,



histological subtype, and tumor grade were among the parameters evaluated. The radiographic size of the tumor before neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT) was taken into account in patients who had surgery.

Study Procedure

Immunohistochemistry (IHC) slides that were stained were used to undergo processing for the identification of receptors. Also, the cases with unclear HER2 staining were forwarded to FISH for additional analysis, and the outcomes were recorded. The study did not include cases where FISH testing was not possible.

Bias

To minimize selection bias, consecutive sampling was employed for all eligible patients meeting the inclusion criteria. Data extraction followed standardized procedures by trained personnel to reduce information bias.

Statistical Analysis

Data were initially entered in Microsoft Excel. The data has been presented as the number of participants (n) and percentages (%).

Ethical Clearance

Informed consent was taken from all participants.

Results

A total of 180 patients with invasive breast cancer were initially screened for eligibility during the study period. Following the initial screening, 165 patients were examined for eligibility. Among these, 15 patients were excluded due to the following reasons: lack of reflex fluorescence in-situ hybridization (FISH) testing in 6 patients, presence of bilateral breast cancer (either synchronous or metachronous) in 5 patients, and incomplete receptor status data in 4 patients. Consequently, 150 patients were confirmed eligible, enrolled in the study, and all participants completed follow-up and were included in the final analysis.

The clinicopathological profile of patients with breast cancer is displayed in Table 1 according to age and tumor features. With 83 (55.3%) patients older than 50, the mean age at diagnosis was skewed toward older patients. Metastases from lymph nodes were found in 89 patients, or 59.3%. In 32 (21.3%) of the cases, distant metastases were discovered at the time of initial presentation.

Table 1. Clinicopathological Profile of Breast Carcinoma Patients Based on Tumor Characteristics and Age

Parameters	Number of Participants (n)	Percentages (%)
Size of Tumor		
≤ 2.0 cm	15	10.0%
> 2.0 – 5.0 cm	95	63.3%
> 5.0 cm	40	26.7%
Tumor Grade		
Grade I	01	0.7%
Grade II	36	24.0%
Grade III	113	75.3%
Age at Diagnosis		
≤ 50 years	67	44.7%
> 50 years	83	55.3%
Distant Metastasis at Diagnosis	32	21.3%
Lymph Node Metastasis	89	59.3%

The Luminal B-like subtype, which accounted for 42.0% of cases overall and was further subdivided into Her2-negative 36 (24.0%) and Her2-positive 27 (18.0%) categories, was

the next most prevalent group. Of the population, 24 (16.0%) had luminal A-like tumors. The distribution of



subtypes of molecular receptors in cancer of breast is shown in Table 2

Table 2. Distribution of Molecular Subtypes of Breast Cancer

Molecular Subtype	Number of Patients (n)	Percentage (%)
Triple Negative (TNBC)	40	27.0%
Luminal A-like	24	16.0%
Luminal B-like (Her2-negative)	36	24.0%
Luminal B-like (Her2-positive)	27	18.0%
Her2-positive (non-luminal)	23	15.0%

Page | 4

Discussion

The study shows subtypes of molecular receptors among participants with breast cancer. The average age of all the included participants was found to be 55 years, which is comparable to earlier studies conducted in India but around ten years younger than the average age in the Western population [7]. A small percentage of patients (n = 30, 1.84%) presented at a younger age (≤ 30 years). However, a different study found that 10% of the participants were young people with breast cancer [8].

Compared to data reported in the western community, our research population's patients had more frequent nodal involvement and higher tumor sizes at presentation [7]. Due to the absence of a screening program, many women who cannot afford the proper testing lack a diagnosis on time, which further leads to ignorance of breast cancer.

According to the majority of Indian studies, 50–60% of malignancies are ER/PR positive [8, 9, 10]. However, this is less than the ER/PR positive found in other investigations conducted in the West [7]. This discrepancy can be explained by the various epidemiological characteristics of the Indian population, and it has been observed that many participants suffer from high-grade cancer while they are young [11].

Thirty-three percent of the study participants had HER2-positive. This finding is consistent with the published Indian literature, which reports that between 20 and 30 percent of breast tumors are HER2 positive [8, 9, 10]. According to subanalyses of the luminal B-like (HER2-negative) and luminal A-like subtypes, luminal B-like (HER2-negative) cancers were more likely to have node-negative disease and

a lower tumor grade than luminal A-like tumors. These results are consistent with prior research [12, 13].

In another study, Prat et al reported that positivity of PR more than 20% determines the luminal A types of tumors through the processing of IHC. The conclusion that a poorer prognosis for luminal tumors is linked to low or negative PR expression served as the basis for this [14].

In the current analysis, the least prevalent molecular subtype was the HER2-positive (non-luminal) subtype. Similar results were also observed by Kunheri et al. in their study [13]. As the tumors were categorized equally, it was considered the main strength of the respective study.

Conclusion

This study uses immunohistochemistry surrogate markers to show the distribution of subtypes that are molecular in breast cancer in an Indian population living in both urban and rural areas. The majority of patients come with high-grade tumors and substantial nodal involvement, and the results show a preponderance of aggressive subtypes, including TNBC and Luminal B-like cancers. These findings highlight the value of early detection and the necessity of economical molecular subtyping in directing treatment choices, especially in environments with limited resources.

Limitations

There are a couple of significant drawbacks to this study, though. One of the limitations was the small number of patients, which might affect the efficiency and the duration of time.



Recommendations

Further research, including larger-scale studies, is necessary to validate these observations and enhance our understanding of the role of molecular subtypes in assessing breast carcinoma. Improving results in this population requires expanding access to diagnostic and focused treatment approaches.

List of Abbreviations

ER- Estrogen receptor
PR- Progesterone receptor
HER 2- Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2
TNBC- Triple-negative breast cancers
FISH- Fluorescence in-situ hybridization
NACT- Neoadjuvant chemotherapy
IHC- Immunohistochemistry

Generalizability

The findings of this study are applicable to breast cancer patients attending tertiary care centers in India with similar clinical settings. However, the results may not be fully generalizable to rural populations or other regions with differing healthcare access.

Acknowledgment

We thank the faculty and staff of the Department of Pathology and Oncology at SCB Medical College & Hospital for their valuable support. We also acknowledge the medical records team for assistance in data collection.

Source of Funding

This study did not receive any external funding and was fully self-supported by the investigators.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to this study.

Availability of Data

Data generated or analysed during this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Authors' Contribution

All authors contributed to study design and manuscript preparation. Data collection and analysis were primarily performed by the first author, with all authors reviewing and approving the final manuscript.

References

1. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians*. 2018 Nov;68(6):394-424. <https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21492> PMID:30207593
2. Printz C. Breast cancer mortality rates decline internationally, with some major exceptions. *Cancer*. 2017 Apr 1;123(7):1085-. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.30670> PMID:28323345
3. Weigelt B, Baehner FL, Reis-Filho JS. The contribution of gene expression profiling to breast cancer classification, prognostication and prediction: a retrospective of the last decade. *The Journal of Pathology: A Journal of the Pathological Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. 2010 Jan;220(2):263-80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/path.2648> PMID:19927298
4. Perou CM, Sørlie T, Eisen MB, Van De Rijn M, Jeffrey SS, Rees CA, Pollack JR, Ross DT, Johnsen H, Akslen LA, Fluge Ø. Molecular portraits of human breast tumours. *nature*. 2000 Aug 17;406(6797):747-52. <https://doi.org/10.1038/35021093> PMID:10963602
5. Asthana S, Chauhan S, Labani S. Breast and cervical cancer risk in India: an update. *Indian journal of public health*. 2014 Jan 1;58(1):5-10. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-557X.128150> PMID:24748350



6. Cheang MC, Chia SK, Voduc D, Gao D, Leung S, Snider J, Watson M, Davies S, Bernard PS, Parker JS, Perou CM. Ki67 index, HER2 status, and prognosis of patients with luminal B breast cancer. *JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute*. 2009 May 20;101(10):736-50.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djp082>
PMid:19436038 PMCID:PMC2684553
7. Onitilo AA, Engel JM, Greenlee RT, Mukesh BN. Breast cancer subtypes based on ER/PR and Her2 expression: comparison of clinicopathologic features and survival. *Clinical medicine & research*. 2009 Jun 1;7(1-2):4-13.
<https://doi.org/10.3121/cmr.2008.825>
8. Gogia A, Deo SV, Shukla NK, Mathur S, Sharma DN, Tiwari A. Clinicopathological profile of breast cancer: An institutional experience. *Indian journal of cancer*. 2018 Jul 1;55(3):210-3.
https://doi.org/10.4103/ijc.IJC_73_18
PMid:30693880
9. Verma S, Bal A, Joshi K, Arora S, Singh G. Immunohistochemical characterization of molecular subtypes of invasive breast cancer: a study from North India. *Apmis*. 2012 Dec;120(12):1008-19.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0463.2012.02933.x>
PMid:23030684
10. Doval DC, Sharma A, Sinha R, Kumar K, Dewan AK, Chaturvedi H, Batra U, Talwar V, Gupta SK, Singh S, Bhole V. Immunohistochemical profile of breast cancer patients at a tertiary care hospital in New Delhi, India. *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention*. 2015;16(12):4959-64.
<https://doi.org/10.7314/APJCP.2015.16.12.4959>
PMid:26163622
11. Shet T, Agrawal A, Nadkarni M, Palkar M, Havaladar R, Parmar V, Badwe R, Chinoy RF. Hormone receptors over the last 8 years in a cancer referral center in India: what was and what is?. *Indian journal of pathology and microbiology*. 2009 Apr 1;52(2):171-4.
<https://doi.org/10.4103/0377-4929.48909>
PMid:19332904
12. Sali AP, Sharma N, Verma A, Beke A, Shet T, Patil A, Pai T, Nair N, Parmar V, Gupta S, Hawaldar R. Identification of luminal subtypes of breast carcinoma using surrogate immunohistochemical markers and ascertaining their prognostic relevance. *Clinical Breast Cancer*. 2020 Oct 1;20(5):382-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clbc.2020.03.012>
PMid:32467058
13. Kunheri B, Raj RV, Vijaykumar DK, Pavithran K. Impact of St. Gallen surrogate classification for intrinsic breast cancer sub-types on disease features, recurrence, and survival in South Indian patients. *Indian Journal of Cancer*. 2020 Jan 1;57(1):49-54.
https://doi.org/10.4103/ijc.IJC_437_18
PMid:31929235
14. Prat A, Cheang MC, Martín M, Parker JS, Carrasco E, Caballero R, Tyldesley S, Gelmon K, Bernard PS, Nielsen TO, Perou CM. Prognostic significance of progesterone receptor-positive tumor cells within immunohistochemically defined luminal A breast cancer. *Journal of clinical oncology*. 2013 Jan 10;31(2):203-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2012.43.4134>
PMid:23233704 PMCID:PMC3532392



Student's Journal of Health Research Africa
e-ISSN: 2709-9997, p-ISSN: 3006-1059
Vol.6 No. 6 (2025): June 2025 Issue
<https://doi.org/10.51168/sjhrafrica.v6i6.1914>
Original Article

PUBLISHER DETAILS

Page | 7

Student's Journal of Health Research (SJHR)

(ISSN 2709-9997) Online

(ISSN 3006-1059) Print

Category: Non-Governmental & Non-profit Organization

Email: studentsjournal2020@gmail.com

WhatsApp: +256 775 434 261

Location: Scholar's Summit Nakigalala, P. O. Box 701432,
Entebbe Uganda, East Africa

