

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE 1

An overview of the items that will be scored by the pathologists and their possible response options. The references column indicates which articles were used for the respective item definitions.

Item	Answer	References
Is there invasive tumor present for revision?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	
Which tumor slide was assessed? <i>When there were multiple representative slides containing tumor; the pathologist was asked to select the section that would reflect a patients prognosis best</i>	<i>Free text</i>	
What is the tumor percentage of the demarcated area?	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0% • 10% • 20% • 30% • 40% • 50% • 60% • 70% • 80% • 90% • 100% 	
What is the histological subtype?	<i>Checkbox:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adenoid Cystic Carcinoma • Apocrine Carcinoma • Ductolobular carcinoma • Glycogen-rich clear cell carcinoma • Inflammatory Carcinoma • Invasive Cribriform Carcinoma • Invasive Ductal Carcinoma • Invasive Lobular Carcinoma • Invasive Micropapillary Carcinoma • Invasive Papillary Carcinoma • Lipid-rich Carcinoma • Lymphoma • Malignant Myoepithelioma • Medullary Carcinoma • Metaplastic Carcinoma • Mucinous Carcinoma type A • Mucinous Carcinoma type B • Neuroendocrine tumor • Paget's disease • Phyllodes tumor • Sarcoma • Secretory Carcinoma • Tubular Carcinoma • Other 	1

Lymphovascular invasion (LVI)?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present • Absent 	2,3
Pushing borders?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absent • Not assessable • Present: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <25% of the tumor perimeter - 25% - 75% of the tumor perimeter - >75% of the tumor perimeter 	4
Lymphocytic infiltrate?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absent • Weak • Moderate • Dense/Strong 	5,6
Fibrotic focus? Size in mm of the largest Focus	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> 0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21, 22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39, 40	7,8
Central necrosis?	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0% • 10% • 20% • 30% • 40% • 50% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60% • 70% • 80% • 90% • 100% 	9-11
Grade - Mitotic count (MAI)?	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ≤7 mitoses per 2mm² • 8-12 mitoses per 2mm² • ≥13 mitoses per 2mm² 	12
Grade - Glandular/Tubular differentiation?	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • >75% of tumor area • 10% - 75% of tumor area • <10% of tumor area 	
Grade - Nuclear pleomorphism?	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nuclei with minimal variation in size and shape • Nuclei with moderate variation in size and shape • Nuclei with marked variation in size and shape 	
In-situ carcinoma present?	Radio button: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	
In-situ carcinoma containing slide assessed?	<i>Free text</i>	

Subtype of in-situ carcinoma?	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Micropapillary type DCIS • Papillary type DCIS • Solid type DCIS • Cribriform type DCIS • Comedo type DCIS • Classical LCIS • Non-classical LCIS • DCIS/LCIS 	13
Microcalcifications?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absent • Present 	14
Comedonecrosis?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absent • Present: 	15
Grade of in-situ carcinoma?	<i>Dropdown menu:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade I (Well differentiated) • Grade II (Intermediately differentiated) • Grade III (Poorly differentiated) 	13,16
Normal tissue present?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	
Normal tissue containing slide assessed?	<i>Free text</i>	
Lymph nodes present?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	
Normal lymph node(s) containing slide assessed?	<i>Free text</i>	
Lymph node metastasis present?	<i>Radio button:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • No 	
Lymph node metastasis containing slide assessed?	<i>Free text</i>	
Remarks?	<i>Free text (Maximum of 100 characters)</i>	

REFERENCES

1. Lakhani SR, I.O. E, Schnitt SJ, Tan PH, van de Vijver MJ. *WHO Classification of Tumours of the Breast* Vol 4. 4 ed: IARC Press; 2012.
2. Rakha EA, Martin S, Lee AH, et al. The prognostic significance of lymphovascular invasion in invasive breast carcinoma. *Cancer*. Aug 01 2012;118(15):3670-3680.
3. Mohammed ZM, McMillan DC, Edwards J, et al. The relationship between lymphovascular invasion and angiogenesis, hormone receptors, cell proliferation and survival in patients with primary operable invasive ductal breast cancer. *BMC clinical pathology*. Nov 25 2013;13(1):31.
4. Lakhani SR, Jacquemier J, Sloane JP, et al. Multifactorial analysis of differences between sporadic breast cancers and cancers involving BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*. Aug 05 1998;90(15):1138-1145.
5. Aaltomaa S, Lipponen P, Eskelinen M, et al. Lymphocyte infiltrates as a prognostic variable in female breast cancer. *European journal of cancer*. 1992;28A(4-5):859-864.
6. Yamaguchi R, Tanaka M, Yano A, et al. Tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes are important pathologic predictors for neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with breast cancer. *Human pathology*. Oct 2012;43(10):1688-1694.
7. Hasebe T, Sasaki S, Imoto S, Mukai K, Yokose T, Ochiai A. Prognostic significance of fibrotic focus in invasive ductal carcinoma of the breast: a prospective observational study. *Modern pathology : an official journal of the United States and Canadian Academy of Pathology, Inc*. May 2002;15(5):502-516.
8. Van den Eynden GG, Colpaert CG, Couvelard A, et al. A fibrotic focus is a prognostic factor and a surrogate marker for hypoxia and (lymph)angiogenesis in breast cancer: review of the literature and proposal on the criteria of evaluation. *Histopathology*. Oct 2007;51(4):440-451.
9. Yu L, Yang W, Cai X, Shi D, Fan Y, Lu H. Centrally necrotizing carcinoma of the breast: clinicopathological analysis of 33 cases indicating its basal-like phenotype and poor prognosis. *Histopathology*. Aug 2010;57(2):193-201.
10. Tsuda H, Takarabe T, Hasegawa T, Murata T, Hirohashi S. Myoepithelial differentiation in high-grade invasive ductal carcinomas with large central acellular zones. *Human pathology*. Oct 1999;30(10):1134-1139.
11. Jimenez RE, Wallis T, Visscher DW. Centrally necrotizing carcinomas of the breast: a distinct histologic subtype with aggressive clinical behavior. *The American journal of surgical pathology*. Mar 2001;25(3):331-337.
12. Elston CW, Ellis IO. Pathological prognostic factors in breast cancer. I. The value of histological grade in breast cancer: experience from a large study with long-term follow-up. *Histopathology*. Sep 2002;41(3A):154-161.
13. Stuart J. Schnitt LCC. *Biopsy Interpretation of the Breast*. 2 ed: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2013.

14. Henrot P, Leroux A, Barlier C, Genin P. Breast microcalcifications: the lesions in anatomical pathology. *Diagnostic and interventional imaging*. Feb 2014;95(2):141-152.
15. Yagata H, Harigaya K, Suzuki M, et al. Comedonecrosis is an unfavorable marker in node-negative invasive breast carcinoma. *Pathology international*. Aug 2003;53(8):501-506.
16. Holland R, Peterse JL, Millis RR, et al. Ductal carcinoma in situ: a proposal for a new classification. *Seminars in diagnostic pathology*. Aug 1994;11(3):167-180.