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High-risk HPV E6/E7 mRNA in situ hybridization in endocervical glandular neoplasia: performance compared with p16INK4a and Ki67 immunochemistry
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Abstract: Objective: HR-HPV E6/E7 mRNA in situ hybridization (HR-HPV RISH) can detect HPV-driven endocervical glandular neoplasia. Our aim was to compare its diagnostic performance with the conventional p16INK4a and Ki67 immunochemistry (IHC). Methods: HR-HPV RISH and IHC were performed in normal cervix (n = 70), reactive cervix (n = 60), adenocarcinoma in situ (AIS) (n = 92), endocervical adenocarcinoma (ECA) and adenosquamous carcinoma (n = 21) samples (n = 163). The sensitivities and specificities of the three markers were compared in the benign, AIS, HPV-associated adenocarcinoma (HPVA) and non HPV-associated adenocarcinoma (NHPVA) samples, and in 39 endocervical curettage specimens containing endometrial and HPV-associated neoplastic glands. Finally, the inter-observer agreement rate for the three markers were calculated. Results: The sensitivities of HR-HPV RISH, P16INK4a and Ki67 were 100% for the HPV-related glandular neoplasia and HPVAs in ECAs, while the specificity of HR-HPV RISH (100%) were higher than the other two (88.89% and 17.77% for P16INK4a and Ki67 respectively) in the HPVAs. Furthermore, HR-HPV RISH was more specific than either p16INK4a block+ or Ki67 in the endocervical curetage specimens and in HPVAs with poor differentiation. Finally, the inter-observer agreement rate for HR-HPV RISH was higher than that for the morphological, p16INK4a block+ and Ki67 markers (99.67% vs. 95.10%, 99.35% and 90.85% respectively). Conclusions: HR-HPV RISH is highly sensitive and specific for HPV-driven endocervical glandular neoplasia compared to p16INK4a and Ki67, and should be incorporated for ECA diagnosis.
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Introduction
High-risk human papillomaviruses (HR-HPVs) are the cause of nearly all cervical squamous cell carcinomas and more than 75% of the endocervical adenocarcinomas (ECAs) [1, 2]. Despite the ambiguous correlation between HR-HPV infection and the carcinogenic mechanisms of ECAs, the International Endocervical Adenocarcinoma Criteria and Classification (IECC) recommends evaluating the HPV status prior to the conventional morphological classification, since the HPV-associated adenocarcinomas (HPVAs) show better prognosis than the non-HPV adenocarcinomas (NHPVAs) [3]. Therefore, accurate detection of HR-HPVs in the cervical glandular malignancies is crucial for predicting the prognosis of ECAs.

Presence of p16INK4a/Ki67 is a surrogate marker of HR-HPV infection in the HPV-associated endocervical neoplasias [4, 5]. However, the scoring system of p16INK4a is at present controversial, and often leads to misinterpretation of the staining results [6, 7], while the diagnostic value of Ki67 in ECAs is still ambiguous. Based on the tumorigenic significance of the highly type-specific E6 and E7 genes of HR-HPVs in cervical squamous cell carcinomas [8, 9], E6/E7 mRNA in situ hybridization (HR-HPV RISH) has been developed to detect type-specific HR-HPVs in cervical squamous cell carcinomas [8, 9], E6/E7 mRNA in situ hybridization (HR-HPV RISH) has been developed to detect type-specific HR-HPVs [10-12]. A recent study also showed that HR-HPV RISH effectively diagnosed HPVAs [13]. The aim of our study was to compare the diagnostic efficiencies of RISH and p16INK4a/Ki67 immunohistochemistry (IHC) by testing their performance in normal and reactive cervic-
cal tissues, as well as in adenocarcinoma in situ (AIS), ECA subtypes and adenosquamous carcinomas.

**Material and methods**

**Case selection**

A total of 406 formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) cervical tissue blocks were collected from August 1st 2017 to March 31st 2019 at the Obstetrics and Gynecology Hospital of Fudan University, which included samples of normal cervix (n = 70), reactive cervix (n = 60), AIS (n = 92), ECA (n = 163) and adenosquamous carcinomas (n = 21). Samples from patients who had received preoperative neoadjuvant chemotherapy and/or radiotherapy were excluded. Depending on the procedure, samples included 117 from endocervical curettage and cervical biopsies, 80 from loop electrosurgical excision procedure (LEEPs), and 201 from hysterectomies or radical hysterectomies. All patients signed the written informed consent, and the study was approved by the ethics committee of Obstetrics and Gynecology Hospital of Fudan University. The tissue blocks were cut into sections for the following assays: (1) H&E staining for morphological identification, (2) p16INK4a IHC, (3) Ki67 IHC, (4) HR-HPV RISH, (5) DapB RISH (negative control), (6) Hs-PPIB RISH (housekeeping/positive control), and (7) IHC for p53, Napsin-A and HNF-1β for subtype identification.

**Morphological evaluation**

Two senior pathologists reviewed the H&E stained slides independently, and any ambiguity was resolved by co-examination using a multi-head microscope. Based on the IECC and WHO 2014 criteria, the usual (n = 109), mucinous-not otherwise specified (NOS) (n = 6) and mucinous-intestinal (n = 3) types were classified as HPVAs, while the endometrioid (n = 2), mucinous gastric (n = 36), serous (n = 2) and clear cell (CCC, n = 3) types as NHPVAs. The morphological criteria for the gastric type were based on the existing as well as revised recommendations [14], which also include the minimal deviation adenocarcinoma. All patients diagnosed with the endometrioid, gastric, serous and CCC subtypes underwent radical hysterectomy along with salpingo-oophorectomy. The diagnoses of these subtypes were determined after excluding the possibility of other original sites by the sufficient sampling of endometrium, fallopian tubes and ovaries.

**Immunohistochemistry (IHC)**

IHC was performed as per standard protocols, and the antibodies used to target p16INK4a, Ki67, p53, Napsin-A and HNF-1β are listed in Table S1. PBS buffer was used in lieu of the primary antibody as a negative control. The IHC results were analyzed independently by two pathologists blinded to the samples. The p16INK4a staining pattern was classified as negative (no staining), patchy (patchy+, focal and uneven staining in the nuclei and cytoplasm) and block-like (block+, diffuse and even staining in the nuclei and cytoplasm in 100% of the tumor cells). For Ki67, the cells with nuclear staining were counted in at least 10 fields per slide and the average was calculated.

**Human papillomavirus E6/E7 RNA in situ hybridization (HR-HPV RiSH)**

HR-HPV RISH was performed using the RNA scope 2.5 HD Detection Reagent-BROWN (#322310, Advanced Cell Diagnostics, USA) and Multiplex Fluorescent (#323100) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. The DapB probe (#310043) was used as the negative control and Hs-PPIB (#313901) as the positive control. Probe-HPV-HR18 (16, 18, 26, 31, 33, 35, 39, 45, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 66, 68, 73, and 82) (#312591) was used for the test samples. Images were taken at 40× magnification using the BX45 (Olympus, Japan) light microscope, Leica inverted fluorescence microscope with ProRes Image Capture Software (JENOPTIK Optical System, Jena, Germany) & Leica Confocal LAS-AF SP5 System. Dark-brown, punctuate dots in the nucleus and/or cytoplasm under the light microscope, and green (Fluor 488) signals under the fluorescence systems were considered positive. The HR-HPV RISH slides were evaluated by two pathologists blinded to the morphological diagnoses in order to exclude any possible influences of the morphology.

**Statistical analysis**

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 20.0 (SPSS, IBM). The Student t-test and one-way ANOVA were used to compare Ki67
between two or multiple groups. The Kappa coefficient test was used to analyze the interobserver agreement. \( P < 0.05 \) was considered statistically significant.

**Results**

None of the normal and reactive cervix samples were positive for HR-HPV RISH+ or p16\(^{INK4a} \) block+. (Table 1; Figure 1), while 1/70 (1.43%) of the normal cervix and 26/60 (43.33%) of the reactive cervix samples showed p16\(^{INK4a} \) patch+ staining (Table 1; Figure 1). The average Ki67 positive rates in the normal and reactive samples were 1.57% ± 2.07% and 7.40% ± 6.2% respectively, which were significantly lower than that in the AIS (34.53% ± 14.78%) and invasive adenocarcinoma (39.56% ± 21.15%) samples \( P < 0.01 \), Table 1). Within the ECAs, the average Ki67 positive rates of the adenocarcinoma-NOS (15% ± 7.07%) and gastric (16.38% ± 10.8%) types were significantly lower compared to the other types, but higher than that of the normal/reactive samples \( P < 0.01 \), Table 1). Therefore, we chose Ki67 ≥ 10% as the cutoff value for demarcating samples into Ki67+ or Ki67− (Table 1), based on this criteria, all normal cervix samples were negative and only 17/60 of the reactive samples (28.33%) were positive (Table 1).

All AIS samples were HR-HPV RISH+/p16\(^{INK4a} \) block+/Ki67+ (Figures 2 and S1), as were the usual, mucinous-NOS and mucinous-intestinal

---

**Table 1. Expressions of RISH, P16\(^{INK4a} \) and Ki67 performances in benign and neoplastic cervical glands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesion</th>
<th>N(^a)</th>
<th>RISH+</th>
<th>p16</th>
<th>Ki67</th>
<th>Ki67 ≥ 10%</th>
<th>RISH+/p16</th>
<th>RISH+/Ki67 ≥ 10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.57 ± 2.07 (0.00-5.00)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.40 ± 6.20 (0.00-30.00)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34.53 ± 14.78 (15.00-80.00)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39.56 ± 21.15 (5.00-90.00)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>118/123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPVs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usual type</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47.55 ± 18.10 (20.00-90.00)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>109/109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucinous, NOS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45.00 ± 22.80 (15.00-70.00)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucinous, Intestinal(^b)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.67 ± 5.77 (30.00-40.00)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPVAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endometrioid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.50 ± 17.68 (15.00-40.00)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucinous, Gastric</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.38 ± 10.80 (5.00-50.00)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0/0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65.00 ± 7.07 (60.00-70.00)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00 ± 8.66 (15.00-30.00)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adenocarcinoma, NOS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.00 ± 7.07 (10.00-20.00)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)The cases of adenosquamous carcinoma (n = 21) were not included. \(^b\)The mucinous-intestinal subtype was confirmed by excluding the diagnosis of usual and the mucinous-NOS subtypes. \(^*\)One-way ANOVA, \( P < 0.01 \).
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**Table 1** and **Figures 2 and S1**, and the adenosquamous carcinoma samples (**Figure S2**).

Not surprisingly, all the NHPVAs were HR-HPV RISH- (**Figure 2**).

In addition, 100% of the mucinous-gastric type and endometrioid types were p16\textsuperscript{INK4a}+, although 100% of the endometrioid and 16.67% of the mucinous-gastric type ECAs still presented some patchy p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} staining, while 100% of the serous and 33.33% of the CCC types were p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+ (**Table 1**; **Figure 2**). All endometrioid, serous and CCC adenocarcinomas were Ki67+, while 22.22% of the mucinous-gastric ECAs were Ki67- (**Table 1**; **Figure 2**). Furthermore, 100% of the serous adenocarcinoma were p53+ (**Figure 2**), and all the CCC types were HNF-1β+ and Napsin-A+ (**Figure S3**). Two cases classified as adenocarcinoma NOS were HR-HPV RISH-/p16\textsuperscript{INK4a}-/Ki67+. Interestingly, the histological diagnosis of 2 cases was contradicted by the molecular features: a sample diagnosed as the serous type on account of severe nuclear atypia and papillary-like growth pattern (**Figure 4A**) was identified as HR-HPV RISH+/p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+/p53 wild-type/Ki67+ (**Figure 4B-E**), and another diagnosed as the CCC type for its tubule-cystic growth pattern and clear cell-like changes (**Figure 4F**) exhibited HR-HPV RISH+/p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+/Napsin-A-/HNF-1β- (**Figures 4G-J, S3**). Therefore, both cases were re-classified as HPVAs of usual type with poor differentiation.

The overall sensitivity of HR-HPV RISH in cervical glandular neoplasia was 82.35%, which was lower than that of either p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} (block+: 84.31%; patchy+/block+: 88.24%) or Ki67+ (96.86%) (**Table 2**), while the specificities of all markers were similar (HR-HPV RISH: 100%; p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+: 100%; Ki67+: 86.92%; p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} patchy+/block+: 80%; **Table 2**). The sensitivities of all three markers for HPV-related neoplasia and HPVAs were 100% (**Table 2**), but the specificity of HR-HPV RISH (100%) was superior to that of p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} (block+: 88.89%; patchy+/block+: 66.67%, **Table 2**) as well as Ki67+ (17.77%, **Table 2**).
We also assessed the performance of HR-HPV RISH, p16\(^{INK4a}\) and Ki67 in the endocervical curettage specimens containing the HPV-related neoplastic glands and proliferative endometrium. In 39 endocervical curettage specimens (31 AIS and 8 HPVAs), the morphological features of the neoplastic cervical glands mimicked the proliferative endometrial glands (Figure 5A-C). While 100% of the endometrioid glands were p16\(^{INK4a}\) patchy+, 100% of the HPV-related neoplastic endocervical glands were p16\(^{INK4a}\) block+ (Table 3; Figure 3).
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In addition, 100% of the neoplastic cervi-
cal glands and 87.18% of the prolifer-
ative endometrium were Ki67+ (Table 3), and the average
Ki67 positive rates were similar in the prolifer-
ative endometrial glands and neoplastic glands (21.43% ± 7.57% vs. 34.89% ± 15.15%) (Figure 5J-L). However, all endometrial glands were negative for HR-HPV RISH, while all the HPV-
related neoplastic endocervical glands were HR-HPV RISH+ (Table 3, Figure 5D-F).

There was 95.1% inter-observer agreement
between the two pathologists regarding the presence of glandular neoplasia ($K = 0.934$; 95% $CI$: 0.900-0.967), and that for HR-HPV RISH was near perfect at 99.67% ($K = 0.993$; 95% confidence interval, 0.979-1.006). The inter-observer agreement for Ki67+, p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} (patchy+/block+) and p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+ only were respectively 90.85% ($K = 0.810$; 95% $CI$: 0.743-0.877), 91.5% ($K = 0.852$, 95% $CI$: 0.799-

---

**Table 2. The comparison of sensitivities and specificities of the detected markers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%)</th>
<th>Specificity (%)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%)</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%)</th>
<th>Specificity (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall neoplasia</td>
<td>Overall neoplasia</td>
<td>HPV-related neoplasia</td>
<td>HPVA in ECAs</td>
<td>HPVA in ECAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR-HPV RISH</td>
<td>82.35% (210/255)</td>
<td>100% (130/130)</td>
<td>100% (210/210)</td>
<td>100% (118/118)</td>
<td>100% (45/45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHC of p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} (patchy+/block+)</td>
<td>88.24% (225/255)</td>
<td>80.00% (104/130)</td>
<td>100% (210/210)</td>
<td>100% (118/118)</td>
<td>66.67% (30/45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHC of p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} (block+ only)</td>
<td>84.31% (215/255)</td>
<td>100% (130/130)</td>
<td>100% (210/210)</td>
<td>100% (118/118)</td>
<td>88.89% (40/45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHC of Ki67 ≥ 10%+</td>
<td>96.86% (247/255)</td>
<td>86.92% (113/130)</td>
<td>100% (210/210)</td>
<td>100% (118/118)</td>
<td>17.77% (8/45)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 5.** HR-HPV RISH, p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} and Ki67 performances in the endocervical curettage specimens. The representative images of endometrial glands and HPV-related neoplastic cervical glands in the curettage specimens. Each parts were also shown under high magnification separately. (B, E, H and K): Scale bars = 200 $\mu$m. (A, C, D, F, G, I, J and L): Scale bars = 50 $\mu$m.
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Discussion

Compared to p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} and Ki67 IHC, HR-HPV RISH showed a similar sensitivity of 100% but higher specificity for the HPV-related cervical neoplasia. In addition, HR-HPV RISH showed superior ability to discriminate between curettage specimens and HPVAs with poor differentiation. Therefore, HR-HPV RISH has a distinct diagnostic advantage for ECAs.

The 2014 version of the WHO classification system for ECAs is based on histological features and IHC, which identifies several subtypes including usual, mucinous, endometrioid, serous, CCC etc. Recent evidence also points to an HPV-driven influence on the clinical outcomes of these subtypes. IECC recently reclassified ECAs into HPVAs and NHPVAs on the basis of both morphology (compatible with the 2014 WHO classification) and etiology [13]. Stolnicu et al. found that HPVAs showed superior overall survival, disease-free survival and progression-free survival compared to the NHPVAs, indicating that detection of HR-HPVs can significantly affect the clinical outcomes of ECAs [3].

The conventional p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} and Ki67 panel is highly sensitive and relatively specific to endocervical neoplasia [5, 15], and can partly predict HPV association. However, Ki67 positivity is highly dependent on reactive changes and cell proliferation [16, 17]. In our study, Ki67 showed the highest sensitivity for cervical glandular neoplasia compared to the other two markers. However, since 28.33% of the reactive cervix samples and 87.18% of the proliferative endometrium samples were also positive for Ki67, it reduced the specificity of the ≥ 10% cutoff. Furthermore, the Ki67 status had the lowest inter-observer agreement in our study. Similarly, the inconsistent scoring system of p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} has also led to misdiagnosis in previous studies [18]. Han et al. designed a scoring system from 0 to 12 for p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} in the ECAs [19], while McCluggage set the scores from 0 to 9 [7]. Until recently, IECC recommended that only p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+ be considered positive [13]. In our study, the sensitivity and specificity of p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+ was 100% for all the HPV-related endocervical glandular neoplasia with a relatively excellent inter-observer agreement. However, its specificity for HPVAs in ECAs was only 88.89%. Furthermore, the combination of Ki67 and p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} failed to distinguish HPVAs with poor differentiation (Figure 3). Taken together, p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} block+ is a sensitive marker for cervical glandular neoplasia, but a deficient surrogate for HPVAs.

HR-HPV RISH is a robust technique for HR-HPV diagnosis [12, 13], and detects the full-length or fragments of E6 and E7 transcripts using cascade signal amplification [12, 20]. Studies show that persistent infection with HR-HPVs results in integration of the viral genome fragments into host chromosomes, thus facilitating the transcription of type-specific E6/E7 genes and protein overexpression, which eventually activate the downstream carcinogenic signaling pathways [21, 22]. Therefore, the high specificity of HR-HPV RISH for HPV-driven cervical neoplasia is expected. In this study, HR-HPV RISH was highly sensitive and specific for cervical glandular neoplasia and HPVAs in ECAs, and unaffected by reactive changes or the NHPVA subtypes. Furthermore, the inter-observer agreement rate for HR-HPV RISH was the highest at 99.35% (K = 0.987, 95% CI: 0.969-1.005).

Table 3. Comparison of HR-HPV RISH, p16\textsuperscript{INK4a} and Ki67 IHC in 39 endocervical curettage specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Histology</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>RISH+</th>
<th>p16+ score</th>
<th>Ki67</th>
<th>Ki67 ≥ 10%+</th>
<th>RISH+/P16 (Patchy+)/ Block+</th>
<th>RISH+/ Ki67 ≥ 10%+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proliferative Endometrial</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21.43% ± 7.57% (10.00-35.00)</td>
<td>34/39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS/HPVA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34.89% ± 15.15% (15.00-60.00)*</td>
<td>39/39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Paired student’s t-test, \( P < 0.01 \).

Based on our results, we strongly recommend HR-HPV RISH to distinguish AIS from reactive cervix, since the latter can mimic AIS with mild...
nuclear enlargement, increased nucleus/cytoplasm ratio and visible mitotic figures. The p16$^{\text{INK4a}}$/Ki67 expression pattern is usually ambiguous in these lesions (Figure 1). Secondly, HR-HPV RISH can discriminate AIS from the endometrium in endocervical curettage specimens, while p16$^{\text{INK4a}}$ and Ki67 staining in the endometrial epithelium can confound the HPV+ status in neoplastic cervical glands [23] (Figure 5). Finally, unlike p16$^{\text{INK4a}}$/Ki67 IHC, HR-HPV RISH can distinguish poorly differentiated HPVAs from HPVAs (Figure 4). Further studies have to be conducted on larger cohorts to validate our findings.

Conclusion

HR-HPV RISH is a highly sensitive and specific technique for HPV-associated endocervical glandular neoplasia, and can supplement differential diagnosis of HPVAs currently used in clinical practice.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibodies</th>
<th>Dilution</th>
<th>CLONE</th>
<th>Manufacturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p16(^{\text{INK4a}})</td>
<td>1:200</td>
<td>E6H4</td>
<td>Roche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ki67</td>
<td>1:100</td>
<td>MIB-1</td>
<td>Dako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p53</td>
<td>1:1000</td>
<td>FL-393</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napsin-A</td>
<td>1:200</td>
<td>IP64</td>
<td>Novocastra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNF-1β</td>
<td>1:2000</td>
<td>EPR18644-13</td>
<td>Abcam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**HR-HPV RISH validation against p16\textsuperscript{INK4a}/Ki67**

**Figure S1.** HR-HPV RISH performances in the HPVAs by fluorescence. The fluorescence representative images of HR-HPV RISH expressions in the AIS, adenocarcinoma of usual type and adenocarcinoma of mucinous-NOS type. Scale bars = 50 μm. The fluorescent signals of HR-HPV were stained by green (Fluor 488). DAPI was used to staining for the nucleus. AIS: adenocarcinoma in situ; NOS: not otherwise specified.

**Figure S2.** HR-HPV RISH, p16\textsuperscript{INK4a}, Ki67 and p63 performances in 21 cases of endocervical adenosquamous carcinoma. The representative images of H&E, HR-HPV RISH, p16INK4a, Ki67 and p63 expressions in the endocervical adenosquamous carcinoma. A-E: Scale bars = 100 μm. F-J: Scale bars = 50 μm.
Figure S3. The HNF-1β and Napsin-A performances in the NHPVA of clear cell type and HPVA with similar morphology. The representative images of H&E, HR-HPV RISH, p16INK4a and Ki67 expressions in the NHPVA of clear cell type (A-N) and the HPVA with similar morphology (O-U). p53 (G, N and U), HNF-1β (E, L and S) and Napsin-A (F, M and T) were used to confirm the CCC type. The expressions of p16INK4a (C and J) were various in the NHPVA of clear cell type. Scale bars = 50 μm. NHPVA: non HPV-associated adenocarcinoma. HPVA: HPV-associated adenocarcinoma.