Major keywords: Dermatofibroma, Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans, Immunohistochemistry, Diagnostic markers

Title: Immunohistochemical profiles of dermatofibroma and dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: A scoping review

Authors: Céline S. C. Hardy^{1,2#}, Ali Razavi¹, Natalie Nunez¹, William Fitzmaurice¹, Loma Dave¹, Amy R. Slutzky³, Kaitlin Vanderbeck⁴, Ramsay Farah⁵.

Affiliations: ¹ College of Medicine, Upstate Medical University, Syracuse, New York.
²Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Upstate Medical University, Syracuse, New York, USA. ³ Health Sciences Library, Upstate Medical University, Syracuse, New York.
⁴Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.
⁵ Division of Dermatology, Upstate Medical University, Syracuse, New York

#Adress correspondence to <u>hardyce@upstate.edu</u>

Conflicts of interest: the authors have no conflicts to declare. **Acknowledgements:** the authors have no acknowledgements to report.

Author contributions: Céline S. C. Hardy, Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review and editing | Ali S. Razavi, Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – review and editing | Natalie Nunez, Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review and editing | William Fitzmaurice, Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review and editing | Loma Dave, Data curation, Investigation, Writing – review and editing | Amy R. Slutzky, Data curation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review and editing | Kaitlin Vanderbeck, Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review and editing | Ramsay Farah, Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – review and editing | Nethodology, Supervision, Writing – review and editing | Ramsay Farah, Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision,

1 Immunohistochemical profiles of dermatofibroma and dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans:

2		•	•
2	A	sconing	review
_		See Prins	

3

4 Keywords: Dermatofibroma, Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans, Immunohistochemistry,

- 5 Diagnostic markers
- 6

7 ABSTRACT

8 This review summarizes the immunohistochemical profiles of dermatofibroma (DF) and

9 dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans (DFSP) as reported by primary literature in the past 10 years.

10 63 studies were included in the review, with staining information for a total of 99 unique IHC

11 markers reported. The most commonly reported stains were CD34, SMA, S100, and FXIIIa.

12 Most studies applied IHC either to explore descriptive features of DF or DFSP or to determine

13 their utility in diagnostic identification of the lesions. A number of studies applied novel

14 biomarkers which may hold promise for distinguishing DF and DFSP, namely WT1, Cx43, LSP-

15 1, and PHH3, which demonstrated considerable expression differences between the two lesions.

16 This review highlights the need for validation of existing and emerging IHC markers for the

17 diagnosis of DF and DFSP.

18

19 1.INTRODUCTION

20 Dermatofibroma (DF) and dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans (DFSP) are spindle cell lesions with

21 overlapping clinical and histologic features. DF, also known as benign fibrous histiocytoma

22 (BFH), are benign soft tissue tumors with good prognosis. Contrastingly, DFSP are locally

23 aggressive tumors which frequently recur. Additionally, DFSPs may undergo fibrosarcomatous

transformation, which portends a higher rate recurrence and increased risk of metastasis^{1,2}.

25 Appropriate identification of DFs and DFSPs from each other and their histologic mimics is of

26 critical importance to ensure proper clinical management. Despite their clinical divergence, these

27 two lesions share many histologic and morphologic features. Morphologically, both are spindled

28 lesions which may show increased cellularity and mixed fascicular, whorled or storiform growth

29 patterns. Given their clinical and histologic similarities, it may be challenging to differentiate

30 these two entities on histologic grounds alone, particularly in limited biopsies. Therefore,

31 immunohistochemistry (IHC) is often used to differentiate DF from DFSP and is a mainstay in

32 their diagnosis. Key immunohistochemical markers classically include cluster of differentiation

33 34 (CD34) and Factor XIIIa (FXIIIa), where CD34 is known to be strongly positive in over 90%

of DFSP^{3,4}, while DFs are known to be negative for CD34 but positive for factor XIIIa ^{5,6}.

35 Additional markers used to distinguish between these lesions from each other and their mimics

36 include smooth muscle actin (SMA), S-100, and Desmin. Within both DF and DFSP, IHC can

37 also inform or validate the presence of histologic subtypes, pathogenic/driving gene fusions, and

38 specific pathogenic mechanisms within these lesions.

39

40 However, despite the elaborate use of IHC in classifying and studying DF and DFSP, the

41 diagnostic specificity of the currently employed markers is imperfect. Although a number of

42 novel markers have been suggested, constantly emerging literature coupled with a lack of

43 validated data can lead to confusion about which markers are the most effective. For this reason,

44 we conducted a scoping review of the literature in order to systematically report IHC staining

45 data on these lesions, summarize the utility of existing markers, and highlight emerging markers

46 specifically useful for distinguishing DF and DFSP. An effective summary of the current

47 literature on the IHC staining profiles of these lesions is useful for consolidating information and

48 providing insight into prospective biomarkers which require additional validation.

49

50 **2.METHODS**

51 2.1 Study design

52 This review was conducted and reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for

53 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR)

54 guidelines⁷. An a priori study protocol was registered in the Open Science Framework

55 (<u>https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/92EWY</u>).

56

57 2.2 Information sources and search strategy

58 Four databases – PubMed, Embase (Elsevier), Scopus (Elsevier), and the Cochrane Library –

59 were searched for relevant articles. For each database, key concepts were defined using

60 combinations of controlled vocabulary (where available) and keywords, to maximize search

61 sensitivity. The PubMed search strategy is given below; full search strategies are given in

62 Appendix X.

2

63	PubMed search strategy:
64	("Histiocytoma, Benign Fibrous"[Mesh] OR "Dermatofibrosarcoma"[Mesh]
65	OR "histiocytoma*"[tiab] OR dermatofibro*[tiab] OR DFSP[tiab] OR "nodular
66	subepidermal fibrosis"[tiab])
67	AND
68	("Immunohistochemistry"[Mesh] OR immunohistochem*[tiab] OR IHC[tiab] OR
69	immunostain*[tiab])
70	Database search strategies limited search results to publication dates over the past 20 years
71 72	(2003-present). Final searches for all databases were run on June 24, 2024.
73	2.3 Eligibility criteria
74	Studies were selected for inclusion in the review if they:
75	• evaluated protein expression by immunohistochemistry (IHC), specifically
76	immunoperoxidase staining, of tissue specimens from human subjects of histologically
77	confirmed cases of cutaneous DF (including benign fibrous histiocytoma, cutaneous
78	fibrous histiocytoma, and epithelioid fibrous histiocytoma) or DFSP;
79	• reported the number of lesions evaluated and the fraction of lesions positive or negative
80	for a given marker for greater than 5 lesions;
81	• focused on evaluating the tumor cell compartment (as opposed to stromal or immune cell
82	profiling); and
83	• were published in English, French, or Spanish.
84	The following types of studies were excluded from the review: review articles, case reports,
85	conference abstracts, in vitro studies, and animal studies.
86	
87	2.4 Article screening
88	Results from all database searches were uploaded to Covidence (Veritas Health Innovation,
89	Melbourne, Australia). Duplicate records were identified and removed automatically by
90	Covidence, with all duplicate pairs manually confirmed (AS). Then two reviewers (AR, WF,
91	NN, and/or LD) independently screened each title/abstract for inclusion in the review, with any
92	conflicts resolved via discussion with content experts (RF and/or KV). After title/abstract
93	screening was complete, a decision was made to limit the review to studies published over the

3

- 94 past 10 years (2013-present), and to exclude case studies and case series evaluating fewer than
- 95 five lesions. These decisions were made both due to practical/time constraints and in
- 96 consideration of the relevance of IHC markers evaluated, pertinence and consistency of antibody
- 97 clones and staining protocols used. Full-text articles were then screened independently by two
- 98 reviewers (AR, WF, NN, and/or CH), with any conflicts resolved as described above.
- 99

100 **2.5 Data abstraction**

- Data collection was performed first by one of two independent reviewers (CH, AR) and then
 independently verified by the second reviewer. The following data were collected and charted
 using Microsoft Excel:
- Study characteristics (article title, publication date, study aim, study geographic location)
- Lesion information (type and number of lesions studied, sample/specimen type,
- 106histologic information if available)
- IHC characteristics (IHC stains performed, method of IHC evaluation, specific antibodies
 used, staining expression results for lesions of interest)
- 109

110 **3.RESULTS**

111 **3.1** Selection and characteristics of sources of evidence

- 112 Database searches identified 2506 distinct articles. Following title/abstract and full text
- screening, 63 articles were selected for inclusion in the review^{8–70} (**Fig. 1**). Of those 63 studies,
- 114 15 contained IHC data for DF only, 28 for DFSP only, and 20 studies contained data for both DF
- and DFSP. Complete characteristics of data extracted from all articles -- including geographic
- 116 location, date of sample collection, and study aim -- are summarized in supplemental Table S1.
- 117

118 **3.2 Immunohistochemical markers applied in DF and DFSP**

- 119 Across all studies, a total of 99 IHC markers were evaluated, of which the most discussed
- 120 markers included CD34, SMA, S100, FXIIIa, Desmin, and Ki-67 (Fig. 2). Cluster of
- 121 differentiation 68 (CD68), anaplastic lymphoma kinase (ALK), epithelial membrane antigen
- 122 (EMA), and pan-cytokeratin (PanCK) were also frequently discussed (Fig. 2). The purpose of
- 123 IHC application in these studies could be broadly categorized as descriptive, diagnostic, or
- 124 prognostic. Summary tables of IHC biomarkers applied and their indication or purpose of

application in DF and DFSP are summarized in **Table 1** and **Table 2**, respectively. The majority

126 of IHC markers were applied for descriptive or diagnostic purposes. Descriptive studies focused

127 primarily on characterizing expression of a given marker in specific entities, determining

128 associations of expression with variant histology, or evaluating the role of expression in disease

129 pathogenesis. Of the studies evaluating IHC staining with respect to its diagnostic utility, 37

130 studies assessed a role for IHC in distinguishing histologic mimics from either DF or DFSP,

131 while 15 studies contained data focused specifically on distinguishing DF and DFSP from each

- 132 other.
- 133

134 **3.3 Immunohistochemical markers for distinguishing DF and DFSP**

When focusing on studies aiming to characterize differences in immunohistochemical expression 135 between DF and DFSP (n=13), a total of 30 IHC markers were evaluated. CD34 and Factor XIIIa 136 137 were the most frequently employed markers for distinguishing DF and DFSP in the reviewed studies (Fig. S1). Summary statistics of the staining expression of classical markers in DF 138 139 compared to DFSP across all studies are provided in **Table 3**. CD34 was frequently strongly 140 positive in DFSPs (95.8%), while negative in DF (15.5%), and contrastingly Factor XIIIa was 141 positive in DF (86.2%) but more frequently negative in DFSP (24.9%) (Table 3). SMA, ALK, 142 CD99, and CD68 were more frequently positive in DF than DFSP, while S100 and Desmin 143 tended to be negative in both (Table 3). Many studies also provided data regarding more novel 144 markers evaluated for distinguishing between the two lesions, these included: Wilm's tumor 1 145 (WT1), ETS transcription factor (ERG), podoplanin (D2-40), phosphohistone H3 (PHH3), p75, 146 connexin 43 (Cx43), fibroblast growth factor 2 (FGF2), fibroblast growth factor receptor 4 147 (FGFR4), lymphocyte specific protein 1 (LSP-1), p16, and Ki-67 (Table 4). Of these, studies 148 evaluating WT1, Cx43 and LSP-1 demonstrated the greatest difference in expression between 149 DF and DFSP. Complete expression data for all markers across all studies are available in 150 supplemental Table S2.

151

152 4.DISCUSSION

153 In this study, we summarize the applications of IHC markers in DF and DFSP and their utility

154 for distinguishing these lesions as reported in the literature over the past 10 years. In this review

a total of 99 unique IHC markers were reported in the 63 studies evaluated. Interpretation of the

- expression data of these markers and the utility of key markers for distinguishing DF and DFSPwill be elaborated upon in the following sections.
- 158

159 4.1 Accuracy of classical markers for distinguishing DF and DFSP

160 Classical markers for diagnosis of DF and DFSP such as CD34, FXIIIa, S-100, and Desmin all 161 demonstrated expression in expected proportions and patterns according to the literature⁷¹. 162 However, it is important to note that despite these overall trends there was marked intra-study variability for most markers. For example, even CD34, one of the most specific markers positive 163 in DFSP, was weakly or focally positive in $\sim 15\%$ of DFs^{42,53,64}. Most commonly, conventional 164 DFs did show negativity for CD34, however many DFs which contained variant histology were 165 166 specifically noted to have focal CD34 expression. This highlights previous observations that 167 application of CD34 alone is insufficient, and the need for additional markers to clarify the 168 identity of lesions where CD34 expression is ambiguous or present focally. Interestingly, expression of classical markers CD99 and CD68 were reported of variable diagnostic utility to 169 170 distinguish DF and DFSP. While one study showed that DFs have higher frequency of CD99 positivity compared to DFSPs³⁷ and additional data supports there being evidently low 171 expression of CD99 in DFSPs (0% positivity)^{23,69}, data from Song et al. shows 50% positivity in 172 both lesions^{23,37,60,69}. Altogether, there remains work to be done to determine the expression in 173 174 DF compared to DFSP of classical markers using additional sample sets. Beyond these 175 diagnostic applications, there is a need to better understand the expression of classical markers 176 within these lesion types in regions with variant histology.

177

178 4.2 Emerging markers for distinguishing DF and DFSP

Given the imperfect specificity of classical markers, there is an inherent need to identify and validate the utility of more novel markers for diagnostic dilemmas. A number of the reviewed studies assessed a role for novel markers in distinguishing DF and DFSP from each other or their mimics. Promising emerging IHC markers included WT1, LSP-1, Cx43, and a combined Ki67 and PHH3 score, which warrant further investigation^{12,26,34,50}.Piombino et al. assessed the expression of WT1, a master transcriptional/translational regulator in cell differentiation in a series of soft tissue neoplasms of mesenchymal origin. They found that cytoplasmic WT1

expression was absent in all evaluated DFs, but positive in 94.7% of DFSPs⁵⁰. Similar to WT1,

connexin 43 (Cx43) was evaluated by Fernandez-Flores et al. because of its suspected role in
pathogenesis. Specifically, with respect to propensity for invasion given that connexins are
involved in mediating cell-cell adhesion. Cx43 demonstrated excellent specificity for the lesions,
with 100% positivity in DF and 0% positivity in DFSP²⁶. Another promising marker studied was
Leukocyte specific protein 1 (LSP-1) which was also highly positive in DF, while negative in
DFSP³⁴.

193 Although Ki-67 is traditionally thought of as a prognostic, rather than diagnostic biomarker, Agarwal et al. identify potential utility of Ki-67 for distinguishing DF and DFSP in a 194 195 combined scoring system with PHH3¹². PHH3 is expressed in M phase and is therefore useful in 196 determining mitotic counts. The goal of this study was to assess the utility of a combined scoring 197 system incorporating both the Ki67 index and PHH3 mitotic count, where they found that the mean Ki67 proliferation index and mitotic count were significantly higher in DF compared to 198 199 DFSP¹². Interestingly, this study may highlight that the integration of multiple features or 200 biomarkers can provide more comprehensive information than looking for one "silver bullet" 201 IHC marker to clarify the diagnosis.

202 D2-40 is another emerging marker for which a number of studies suggested utility, however these data were contradictory and require additional validation. A number of studies 203 204 suggest D2-40 for aiding in the differential diagnosis of DF and DFSP, where D2-40 is positive in DF and negative in DFSP^{14,53}. However, data from Song et al. demonstrated only 33% 205 positivity in DF⁶⁰. Like D2-20, markers such as ERG, CD10, and p75 have some data to indicate 206 207 utility, but require further investigation due to conflicting data, or low sample numbers. Across 208 all markers, it should be noted that small sample size, differences in antibody clones, staining 209 protocols, and staining evaluation methodology remain a challenge that likely contribute greatly 210 to the observed variability across studies evaluating a given marker.

211

212 5. Conclusions

In this review, we report the IHC expression in DF and DFSP of traditional diagnostic markers
as well as novel markers which may hold diagnostic utility according to the literature from the
past 10 years. Of the markers discussed with diagnostic relevance, traditional markers such as
CD34, SMA, and FXIIIa were the most common and demonstrated expected expression patterns
in DF and DFSP. Additionally, studies investigated novel markers for distinguishing DF and

7

- 218 DFSP such as WT1, Cx43, LSP-1, and PHH3/Ki-67. Future studies should seek to continue
- 219 investigating the expression of these markers and their potential utility for diagnostic application.
- 220

221 Data availability

- 222 Data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article and/or its
- supplementary material.
- 224

225 **REFERENCES**

- Abbott JJ, Oliveira AM, Nascimento AG. The Prognostic Significance of Fibrosarcomatous
 Transformation in Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2006;30(4).
 https://journals.lww.com/ajsp/fulltext/2006/04000/the_prognostic_significance_of_fibrosa
 rcomatous.2.aspx
- Reifs CMA, Salido-Vallejo R. Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans with fibrosarcomatous
 transformation. *An Bras Dermatol*. 2016;91(5):700-701. doi:10.1590/abd1806 4841.20164886
- Abenoza P, Lillemoe T. CD34 and Factor XIII a in the Differential Diagnosis of
 Dermatofibroma and Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans: *Am J Dermatopathol*.
 1993;15(5):429-434. doi:10.1097/00000372-199310000-00003
- Llombart B, Sanmartín O, López-Guerrero JA, et al. Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans:
 clinical, pathological, and genetic (*COL1A1-PDGFB*) study with therapeutic implications.
 Histopathology. 2009;54(7):860-872. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2559.2009.03310.x
- CERIO R, SPAULL J, JONES EW. Histiocytoma cutis: a tumour of dermal dendrocytes (dermal dendrocytoma). *Br J Dermatol*. 1989;120(2):197-206. doi:10.1111/j.1365 2133.1989.tb07783.x
- RAMANI P, BRADLEY NJ, FLETCHER CDM. QBEND/10, a new monoclonal antibody to
 endothelium: assessment of its diagnostic utility in paraffin sections. *Histopathology*.
 1990;17(3):237-242. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2559.1990.tb00713.x
- Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR):
 Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(7):467-473. doi:10.7326/M18-0850
- Abdaljaleel MYO, North JP. Sclerosing Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans Shows Significant
 Overlap With Sclerotic Fibroma in Both Routine and Immunohistochemical Analysis: A
 Potential Diagnostic Pitfall. *Am J Dermatopathol*. 2017;39(2):83-88.
- 250 doi:10.1097/DAD.000000000000584

 Abdaljaleel M, North JP. Positive MITF and NKI/C3 Expression in Cellular Neurothekeoma and Dermatofibroma. *Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol*. 2021;29(6):440-445.
 doi:10.1097/PAI.0000000000889

- 10. Adem D, Yazici S, Ozsen M, et al. The Ki-67 proliferation index predicts recurrence-free
 survival in patients with dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *Bosn J Basic Med Sci*. Published
 online October 20, 2020. doi:10.17305/bjbms.2020.5088
- 257 11. Afifi MM, Elnouaem MI, Omar EM, El-Komary I. Oral and Extraoral Intermediate Tumors:
 258 Are MMP-9 and Ki-67 Biomarkers Correlated to Their High Recurrence Rates? *Appl* 259 *Immunohistochem Mol Morphol.* 2020;28(3):229-236. doi:10.1097/PAI.0000000000000703
- 12. Agarwal A, Gopinath A, Tetzlaff MT, Prieto VG. Phosphohistone-H3 and Ki67: Useful
 Markers in Differentiating Dermatofibroma From Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans and
 Atypical Fibrohistiocytic Lesions. *Am J Dermatopathol*. 2017;39(7):504-507.
 doi:10.1097/DAD.0000000000690
- 13. AlOtaibi MN, Basfar AS, Jawhari AM, et al. The Burden of Skin Cancers in Saudi Arabia
 Through 2011-2022. *Cureus*. Published online September 11, 2023.
 doi:10.7759/cureus.45052
- 14. Aslam M, Khan FW, Chughtai AS, Naeem A, Bashir A, Khan A. Frequency of Expression of
 D240 in Dermatofibroma A diagnostic study. *Pak J Med Health Sci.* 2022;16(1):37-39.
 doi:10.53350/pjmhs2216137
- 15. Berklite L, Ranganathan S, John I, Picarsic J, Santoro L, Alaggio R. Fibrous
 histiocytoma/dermatofibroma in children: the same as adults? *Hum Pathol*. 2020;99:107115. doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2020.03.012
- 16. Berklite L, John I, Ranganathan S, Parafioriti A, Alaggio R. SOX9 Immunohistochemistry in
 the Distinction of Angiomatoid Fibrous Histiocytoma From Histologic Mimics: Diagnostic
 Utility and Pitfalls. *Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol*. 2020;28(8):635-640.
 doi:10.1097/PAI.00000000000809
- 17. Brčić I, Godschachner TM, Bergovec M, et al. Broadening the spectrum of NTRK rearranged
 mesenchymal tumors and usefulness of pan-TRK immunohistochemistry for identification
 of NTRK fusions. *Mod Pathol*. 2021;34(2):396-407. doi:10.1038/s41379-020-00657-x
- 18. Cammareri C, Beltzung F, Michal M, et al. PRAME immunohistochemistry in soft tissue
 tumors and mimics: a study of 350 cases highlighting its imperfect specificity but potentially
 useful diagnostic applications. *Virchows Arch*. 2023;483(2):145-156. doi:10.1007/s00428023-03606-6
- 284 19. Campione E, Di Prete M, Costanza G, et al. Increased Occurrence of Cutaneous Leiomyomas
 285 and Dermatofibromas in Patients with Uterine Leiomyomas without Fumarate Hydratase

- 286 Gene Mutations. *Dermatopathology*. 2023;10(3):231-243.
- 287 doi:10.3390/dermatopathology10030032
- 20. Cheah AL, Billings SD, Goldblum JR, Carver P, Tanas MZ, Rubin BP. STAT6 rabbit monoclonal
 antibody is a robust diagnostic tool for the distinction of solitary fibrous tumour from its
 mimics. *Pathology (Phila*). 2014;46(5):389-395. doi:10.1097/PAT.00000000000122
- 291 21. Cleven AHG, Sannaa GAA, Briaire-de Bruijn I, et al. Loss of H3K27 tri-methylation is a
 292 diagnostic marker for malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumors and an indicator for an
 293 inferior survival. *Mod Pathol*. 2016;29(6):582-590. doi:10.1038/modpathol.2016.45
- 22. Dahiya S, Tomar R, Ahuja M, et al. Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: Clinicopathological
 spectrum with emphasis on lymph node metastasis and fibrosarcomatous transformation. J
 Cancer Res Ther. 2022;18(9):439. doi:10.4103/jcrt.JCRT_370_20
- 23. Dai Z, He Y, Zhang X, et al. Head-and-neck dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: Survival
 analysis and Clinically relevant immunohistochemical indicators. *Oral Dis*. 2024;30(3):10401051. doi:10.1111/odi.14495
- 24. Doyle LA, Mariño-Enriquez A, Fletcher CD, Hornick JL. ALK rearrangement and
 overexpression in epithelioid fibrous histiocytoma. *Mod Pathol*. 2015;28(7):904-912.
 doi:10.1038/modpathol.2015.49
- 25. Effiom OA, Olurotimi Olojede AC, Akinde OR, Olawuyi AB, Amoo AT, Arotiba GT.
 Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: clinicopathologic presentation in Nigerians. *Pan Afr Med J.* 2018;31. doi:10.11604/pamj.2018.31.25.13665
- 306 26. Fernandez-Flores A, Varela-Vazquez A, Mayan MD, Fonseca E. Connexin 43 in
 307 Dermatofibroma and Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans: Diagnostic, Pathogenic, and
 308 Therapeutic Implications. *Am J Dermatopathol*. 2023;45(12):812-815.
 309 doi:10.1097/DAD.0000000002562
- 27. Ha SY, Lee SE, Kwon MJ, et al. PDGFB rearrangement in dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans:
 correlation with clinicopathologic characteristics and clinical implications. *Hum Pathol.* 2013;44(7):1300-1309. doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2012.09.021
- 28. Han Q, Chen M, Yang J, Du T, Peng H. Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans of the face: A
 clinicopathologic and molecular study of 34 cases. *JDDG J Dtsch Dermatol Ges*.
 2022;20(11):1463-1473. doi:10.1111/ddg.14882
- 29. Hengy M, Veenstra J, Perry K, Ozog DM, Friedman BJ. ETS-related Gene (ERG) is
 Differentially Expressed in Dermatofibroma (Fibrous Histiocytoma) as Compared With
 Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans and Hypertrophic Scars: A Pilot Immunohistochemical
 Study. Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol. 2022;30(6):453-458.
- 320 doi:10.1097/PAI.000000000001030

30. Hiraki-Hotokebuchi Y, Yamada Y, Kohashi K, et al. Alteration of PDGFRβ-Akt-mTOR pathway
 signaling in fibrosarcomatous transformation of dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *Hum Pathol.* 2017;67:60-68. doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2017.07.001

- 31. Hung YP, Fletcher CDM, Hornick JL. FOSB is a Useful Diagnostic Marker for Pseudomyogenic
 Hemangioendothelioma. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2017;41(5):596-606.
 doi:10.1097/PAS.00000000000795
- 32. Ishigami T, Hida Y, Matsudate Y, Murao K, Kubo Y. The involvement of fibroblast growth
 factor receptor signaling pathways in dermatofibroma and dermatofibrosarcoma
 protuberans. *J Med Invest*. 2013;60(1.2):106-113. doi:10.2152/jmi.60.106
- 33. Jahanseir K, Xing D, Greipp PT, et al. PDGFB Rearrangements in Dermatofibrosarcoma
 Protuberans of the Vulva: A Study of 11 Cases Including Myxoid and Fibrosarcomatous
 Variants. *Int J Gynecol Pathol*. 2018;37(6):537-546. doi:10.1097/PGP.00000000000472
- 34. Jin SY, Choi JS, Choi YL, Choi YL, Kim DH, Lee SH. Identification of Leukocyte-Specific Protein
 1-Positive Cells: A Clue to the Cell of Origin and a Marker for the Diagnosis of
 Dermatofibroma. *Ann Dermatol*. 2015;27(2):157. doi:10.5021/ad.2015.27.2.157
- 336 35. Karanian M, Pérot G, Coindre JM, Chibon F, Pedeutour F, Neuville A. Fluorescence in situ
 hybridization analysis is a helpful test for the diagnosis of dermatofibrosarcoma
 protuberans. *Mod Pathol.* 2015;28(2):230-237. doi:10.1038/modpathol.2014.97
- 36. Kazakov DV, Kyrpychova L, Martinek P, et al. ALK Gene Fusions in Epithelioid Fibrous
 Histiocytoma: A Study of 14 Cases, With New Histopathological Findings. *Am J Dermatopathol.* 2018;40(11):805-814. doi:10.1097/DAD.00000000001085
- 37. Kazlouskaya V, Malhotra S, Kabigting FD, Lal K, Elston DM. CD99 Expression in
 Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans and Dermatofibroma. *Am J Dermatopathol*.
 2014;36(5):392-396. doi:10.1097/DAD.0b013e3182a15f3e
- 38. Kim JE, Lee JH, Jeong KH, Kim GM, Kang H. Notch Intracellular Domain Expression in Various
 Skin Fibroproliferative Diseases. *Ann Dermatol*. 2014;26(3):332.
 doi:10.5021/ad.2014.26.3.332
- 348 39. Kouki N, Ben Rejeb S, Cherif I, et al. Comparative expression profile of CD10 and cyclin D1 in
 349 cutaneous histiocytofibroma and dermatofibrosarcoma. *J Immunoassay Immunochem*.
 350 2021;42(4):347-358. doi:10.1080/15321819.2020.1868000
- 40. Kreicher KL, Honda KS, Kurlander DE, Bordeaux JS. Hormone receptor expression in patients
 with dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2016;75(6):1205-1209.
 doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2016.07.011
- 41. Li FZ, Ye Q, Ran LW, Fang S. Adipophilin expression in skin lesions with clear cell histology. J
 Clin Pathol. 2022;75(9):627-631. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2021-207443

- 42. Liu F, Wang H, Wu G, Li C. Clinical and pathological studies of eight cases of lipidized fibrous
 histiocytoma. *Exp Ther Med*. 2023;25(2):93. doi:10.3892/etm.2023.11792
- 43. Lo C hai, Tsang P man, Cheng S ying, Ling C nam, Ho C lam. Myoid differentiation in
 dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans and its fibrosarcomatous variant: 10 years experience in
 a tertiary hospital. *Autopsy Case Rep.* 2022;12:e2021368. doi:10.4322/acr.2021.368
- 44. Meng T, Shi X, Wu S, Luo Y, Wang X, Long X. Hormone receptors analysis in Chinese patients
 with dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *J Surg Oncol.* 2018;118(1):157-166.
 doi:10.1002/jso.25117
- 45. Moayed-Alaei L, Vargas AC, Adybeik D, Maclean F, Moir D. Analyzing the morphological
 spectrum of epithelioid fibrous histiocytoma and the immunohistochemical performance of
 the ALK D5F3 and ALK1 clones. *Hum Pathol*. 2022;120:46-56.
 doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2021.12.004
- 368 46. Nakamura I, Kariya Y, Okada E, et al. A Novel Chromosomal Translocation Associated With
 369 *COL1A2 PDGFB* Gene Fusion in Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans: PDGF Expression as a
 370 New Diagnostic Tool. *JAMA Dermatol*. 2015;151(12):1330.
 371 doi:10.1001/jamadermatol.2015.2389
- 47. Nam KH, Park SW, Yun SK. A clinicohistopathological analysis of cutaneous fibrous
 histiocytomas of the finger. *Indian J Dermatol*. 2020;65(5):401. doi:10.4103/ijd.IJD_366_18
- 48. Pan H, Byers J, Yin H, et al. The utility of TLE1 and BCOR as immunohistochemical.
- 49. Park S, Cho S, Kim M, et al. Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: A retrospective study of
 clinicopathologic features and related Akt/mTOR, STAT3, ERK, cyclin D1, and PD-L1
 expression. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2018;79(5):843-852. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2018.05.016
- 50. Piombino E, Broggi G, Barbareschi M, et al. Wilms' Tumor 1 (WT1): A Novel Immunomarker
 of Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans—An Immunohistochemical Study on a Series of 114
 Cases of Bland-Looking Mesenchymal Spindle Cell Lesions of the Dermis/Subcutaneous
 Tissues. *Cancers*. 2021;13(2):252. doi:10.3390/cancers13020252
- 51. Pukhalskaya T, Smoller BR. TLE1 expression fails to distinguish between synovial sarcoma,
 atypical fibroxanthoma, and dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *J Cutan Pathol*.
 2020;47(2):135-138. doi:10.1111/cup.13596
- S2. Russell-Goldman E, Dong F, Laga A, Hanna J. A Novel Fusion Partner, SP100, Drives Nuclear
 Dot Localization of ALK in Epithelioid Fibrous Histiocytoma. *Am J Dermatopathol*.
 2023;45(8):539-543. doi:10.1097/DAD.0000000002475
- Sadullahoglu C, Dere Y, Atasever TR, Oztop MT, Karaaslan O. The role of cd34 and d2-40 in
 the differentiation of dermatofibroma and dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *Turk J Pathol*. Published online 2017. doi:10.5146/tjpath.2017.01402

Saeed O, Zhang S, Cheng L, Lin J, Alruwaii F, Chen S. STAT6 Expression in Solitary Fibrous
 Tumor and Histologic Mimics: a Single Institution Experience. *Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol.* 2020;28(4):311-315. doi:10.1097/PAI.00000000000745

- Sandell RF, Carter JM, Folpe AL. Solitary (juvenile) xanthogranuloma: a comprehensive
 immunohistochemical study emphasizing recently developed markers of histiocytic lineage.
 Hum Pathol. 2015;46(9):1390-1397. doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2015.025
- 397 56. Schechter SA, Bresler SC, Patel RM. Fat necrosis with an associated lymphocytic infiltrate
 398 represents a histopathologic clue that distinguishes cellular dermatofibroma from
 399 dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *J Cutan Pathol.* 2020;47(10):913-916.
 400 doi:10.1111/cup.13744
- 401 57. Serra-Guillén C, Llombart B, Nagore E, et al. High immunohistochemical nestin expression is
 402 associated with greater depth of infiltration in dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: a study
 403 of 71 cases. *J Cutan Pathol.* 2013;40(10):871-878. doi:10.1111/cup.12203
- 58. Shah KK, McHugh JB, Folpe AL, Patel RM. Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans of Distal
 Extremities and Acral Sites: A Clinicopathologic Analysis of 27 Cases. *Am J Surg Pathol.*2018;42(3):413-419. doi:10.1097/PAS.0000000000998
- 59. Smith EH, Lowe L, Harms PW, Fullen DR, Chan MP. Immunohistochemical evaluation of P16
 expression in cutaneous histiocytic, fibrohistiocytic and undifferentiated lesions. *J Cutan Pathol.* 2016;43(8):671-678. doi:10.1111/cup.12730
- 60. Song JS, Kim EJ, Park CS, Cho KJ. Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans: An Immunomarker
 Study of 57 Cases That Included Putative Mesenchymal Stem Cell Markers. *Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol.* 2017;25(8):586-591. doi:10.1097/PAI.00000000000348
- 61. Thangaiah JJ, Westling BE, Roden AC, et al. Loss of dimethylated H3K27 (H3K27me2)
 expression is not a specific marker of malignant peripheral nerve sheath tumor (MPNST):
 An immunohistochemical study of 137 cases, with emphasis on MPNST and melanocytic
 tumors. *Ann Diagn Pathol.* 2022;59:151967. doi:10.1016/j.anndiagpath.2022.151967
- 417 62. Üyetürk Ü. Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans: A Rare Malignancy. *Turk J Oncol*. Published
 418 online 2017. doi:10.5505/tjo.2017.1635
- 419 63. Vivero M, Doyle LA, Fletcher CDM, Mertens F, Hornick JL. GRIA 2 is a novel diagnostic
 420 marker for solitary fibrous tumour identified through gene expression profiling.
 421 *Histopathology*. 2014;65(1):71-80. doi:10.1111/his.12377
- 422 64. West KL, Cardona DM, Su Z, Puri PK. Immunohistochemical Markers in Fibrohistiocytic
 423 Lesions: Factor XIIIa, CD34, S-100 and p75. *Am J Dermatopathol*. 2014;36(5).

- 424 65. Xiong JX, Cai T, Hu L, et al. Risk factors related to postoperative recurrence of
- dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: A retrospective study and literature review. *World J Clin Cases*. 2021;9(20):5442-5452. doi:10.12998/wjcc.v9.i20.5442
- 427 66. Xu S, Zhao L, Wang J. Atrophic dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: a clinicopathological
 428 study of 16 cases. *Pathology (Phila)*. 2019;51(6):615-620. doi:10.1016/j.pathol.2019.06.002
- 429 67. Yamada Y, Ichiki T, Susuki Y, et al. Diagnostic utility of ERG immunostaining in
 430 dermatofibroma. *J Clin Pathol*. 2023;76(8):536-540. doi:10.1136/jclinpath-2022-208158
- 431 68. Zhang X, Sun D, Zheng H, et al. Comprehensive analysis of transcriptome characteristics and
 432 identification of TLK2 as a potential biomarker in dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans. *Front*433 *Genet*. 2022;13:926282. doi:10.3389/fgene.2022.926282
- 434 69. Zhang Z, Lu Y, Shi C, Chen M, He X, Zhang H. Pediatric dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans: A
 435 clinicopathologic and genetic analysis of 66 cases in the largest institution in Southwest
 436 China. *Front Oncol.* 2023;13:1017154. doi:10.3389/fonc.2023.1017154
- 70. Zhou L, Xu H, Zhou J, et al. Nuclear TFE3 expression is a diagnostic marker for Desmoid-type
 fibromatosis. *Diagn Pathol*. 2019;14(1):34. doi:10.1186/s13000-019-0814-4
- 439 71. Haycox CL, Odland PB, Olbricht SM, Piepkorn M. dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans with
 440 practical applications for diagnosis and treatment.
- 441

442 TABLES

- 443
- 444 **Table 1.** Immunohistochemical biomarkers applied in DF and their primary indication as
- 445 evaluated in the studies reviewed.

Indication	Markers	Utility/Findings
Diagnostic	CD34, FXIIIa, S100, SMA, Desmin, Vimentin	Classical diagnostic markers
	FOSB	Distinguish from pseudomyogenic
		hemagioendothelioma ³¹
	SOX9	Distinguish from AFH ¹⁶
	TLE1, BCOR	Distinguish from AFH ⁴⁸
	STAT6	Distinguish from SFT ²⁰
	MITF, NKI/C3	Compare to expression in cellular
		neurothekoma ⁹
	TFE3	Compare expression to desmoid type
		fibromatosis ⁷⁰ and evaluate histopathologic
		features ^{36,45}
	ERG ^{29,67} , WT1 ⁵⁰ , p75 ⁶⁴ , D2-40 ^{14,53}	Distinguish from DFSP and its mimics
	CD10 ^{39,60} , CCND1 ³⁹ , LSP1 ³⁴ , CD68 ^{34,42,45,47}	Distinguish from DFSP
	CD99	Distinguish from DFSP and describe
		expression ^{37,60}
Descriptive	MUC4	Describe features of lipidized fibrous
		histiocytoma ⁴²
	FGFR1-4, FGF2	Understand expression patterns and role in
		pathogenesis ³²

Prognostic	Ki-67, MMP9	Association with high recurrence rate ¹¹
	ALK ⁶⁰ , PDGFR α/β , PDGF $\alpha/\beta^{46,60}$, Nestin ⁴⁶	
	P53 ^{33,41} , CD105, CD133, Oct3/4, CD117, and	-
	PanCK ^{42,45} , SOX10, p63, and EMA ⁴⁵ , P16 ^{59,69} ,	Describe expression
		leiomyomas, and uterine leiomyomas ¹⁹
	TGFb, TGFRb-1/2, SMAD3, VDR	Describe expression in DF, cutaneous
		fibroproliferative diseases
	NCID ³⁸ , PRAME ¹⁸	Describe expression in various
		differential diagnoses (including BFH)
	and CD4 ⁵⁵	xanthogranuloma in comparison to its
	CD163 ^{45,55} , CD11c,CD31,CD45, lysozyme,	Characterize the immunophenotype of solitary
		in recurrence ⁴⁹
	Akt, mTOR, STAT3, ERK, CCND1	Understand expression pattern and assess role

446

Abbreviations: AFH, angiomatoid fibrous histiocytoma; Akt, protein kinase B; ALK, anaplastic lymphoma kinase;
BCOR, BCL6 corepressor; BHF, benign fibrous histiocytoma; CCND1, cyclin D1; CD, cluster of differentiation
(CD34, CD10, CD68, CD99, CD163, CD11c, CD31, CD45, CD4, CD105, CD133, CD117); D2-40, podoplanin;
DF, dermatofibroma; DFSP, dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans; EMA, Epithelial membrane antigen; ERG,
erythroblast transformation specific related gene; ERK, extracellular signal-regulated kinase; FXIIIa, factor XIIIa;
FGF2, fibroblast growth factor 2; FGFR1-4, fibroblast growth factor receptors 1-4; FOSB, FBJ murine
osteosarcoma viral oncogene homolog B; Ki-67, Antigen Kiel 67; LSP1, lymphocyte-specific protein 1; MITF,

454 microphthalmia-associated transcription factor; MMP, matrix metalloproteinase; mTOR, mammalian target of 455 rapamycin; MUC4, mucin 4; NICD, notch intracellular domain; NKI/C3, also known as cluster of differentiation 68 456 (CD68); Oct3/4, octamer-binding transcription factor 3/4; P, protein (p75, p63, p16, p53); PanCK, pan-cytokeratin; 457 PDGF α/β , platelet derived growth factor alpha and beta; PDGFR α/β , platelet derived growth factor receptor alpha 458 and beta; PRAME, Preferentially expressed Antigen in Melanoma; SFT, solitary fibrous tumor; SMA, smooth 459 muscle actin; SMAD3, suppressor of mothers against decapentaplegic homolog 3; SOX, SRY-related HMG box 460 gene (SOX9, SOX10); STAT3, signal transducer and activator of transcription 3; STAT6, signal transducer and 461 activator of transcription 6; TFE3, transcription factor binding to IGHM enhancer 3; TGFb, transforming growth 462 factor beta; TGFRb-1/2, transforming growth factor beta receptor 1 and 2; TLE1, transducin-like enhancer of split 1;

- 463 VDR, vitamin D receptor; WT1, Wilms tumor gene 1
- 464

465 **Table 2.** Immunohistochemical markers applied in DFSP and their primary indication as

466 evaluated in the studies reviewed.

Indication	Markers	Utility/Findings	
Diagnostic	CD34, FXIIIa, SMA, S100, Desmin,	Classical diagnostic markers	
	Vimentin		
	GRIA2 ⁶³ , STAT6 ^{20,54,66}	Distinguish from SFT ²⁰ and describe expression	
	H3K27me3, H3K27me2	Distinguish PNST from its mimics ^{21,61}	
	TLE1	Distinguish AFX and synovial sarcoma ⁵¹	
	EVG	Compare to expression in sclerotic fibroma and	
perineuromERGDistinguishWT1Distinguish		perineuroma ⁸	
		Distinguish from its mimics ^{29,67}	
		Distinguish from DFSP and its mimics ⁵⁰	
	LSP1 ³⁴ , CD68 ^{37,66} , p75 ⁶⁴ , D2-40 ^{53,60} ,	Distinguish from DF	
	CD10 ^{39,41,60} , CCND1 ^{39,49}		
Descriptive	Melan-A ^{37,66} , PanCK and HMB45 ⁶⁶	Study features of atrophic DFSP	
	ER, PR	Describe role in pathogenesis/tumor growth ^{40,44}	
	FGFR1-4, FGF2	Understand expression patterns and role in	
		pathogenesis ³²	
	Akt ^{30,49} , mTOR, STAT3, and ERK ⁴⁹ , p-	Understand expression patterns and role in	
	4EBP1, p-S6RP, p-and mTOR ³⁰	pathogenesis	
	NTRK ¹⁷	Describe expression in soft tissue sarcomas	
	P16 ^{59,69}	Describe expression patterns	

	BCL-2 ^{23,65,69} , CD99 ^{23,37,60,69} , p63,	Describe expression patterns/understand
	Myogenin ⁶⁹ , MSA ²³	clinicopathologic features
	EMA	Describe expression ^{8,28,69} and assess relevance
		to fibrosarcomatous transformation ⁴¹
	CD105, CD133, ALK, Oct3/4, and	Describe expression
	CD117 ⁶⁰ , PDGFR $\alpha/\beta^{23,30,60}$, PDGF α/β^{2}	3,60,
	FAM118B and TLK2 ⁶⁸ , PRAME ¹⁸	
Progno	stic Ki-67	Independent predictor of RFS ¹⁰
	EZH2, EGFR, PD-L1, VEGF	Investigation as therapeutic targets ²³
	Nestin ^{46,57}	Association of expression with degree of
		invasion ⁵⁷
467Abbrevi468cell leul469CD105,470EGFR,471erythrol472Gieson;473fibrobla474ionotrop475Histone476melanor477recogniz478tyrosine479eukaryo480rapamyo481and beta482PNST, j483Melano484transduc485like enh	invasion ⁵⁷ where the set of the probability of	

488

Table 3. General trends of immunohistochemical expression for classical/well described markers
 for distinguishing DF and DFSP.

Listed		DF	Ι	DFSP
markers	General	In evaluated studies	General	In evaluated studies
	expression (+/-)	n/total, (%)	expression (+/-)	n/total, (%)
CD34	-	35/226 (15.5)	+	980/1023 (95.8)
FXIIIa	+	163/189 (86.2)	-	28/108 (25.9)
SMA	+	63/183 (34.4)	-	26/370 (7)
S100	-	15/114 (13.1)	-	12/432 (2.8)
ALK	+	71/154 (46.1)	-	0/57 (0)
CD99	+	30/36 (83.3)	-	56/176 (31.8)
CD68	+	25/59 (42.4)	-	5/27 (18.5)
Desmin	-	0/41(0)	-	0/332 (0)
Vimentin	N/A	N/A	+	123/126 (97.6)

491 n/total where n=number of positive samples. Abbreviations: (+), positive for expression; (-),

492 negative for expression; ALK, anaplastic lymphoma kinase; CD, cluster of differentiation

493 (CD34, CD99, CD68); DF, dermatofibroma; DFSP, dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans; FXIIIa,

494 factor XIIIa; N/A, not available; SMA, smooth muscle actin.

495

496 Table 4. General trends of immunohistochemical expression for novel/emerging markers497 evaluated in distinguishing DF and DFSP.

Marker	Evidence (n positive/total)	Study
WT1	Negative in DF (0/15), positive in DFSP (54/57)	Piombino et al. (2021) ⁵⁰
Cx43	Positive in DF (16/16), Negative in DFSP (0/13 positive)	Fernandez-flores et al. $(2023)^{26}$
LSP-1	Positive in DF (18/20), negative in DFSP (2/20)	Jin et al. (2015) ³⁴
ERG	87/97 DF positive with variable (50-89% cells) positive, 0/64 DFSP positive	Yamada et al. (2023) ⁶⁷
	15/15 DF positive, 6/9 DFSP positive	Hengy et al. $(2022)^{29}$
РНН3	DF mean mitotic count 1.8 mm ² , DFSP mean mitotic count $0.5/mm^2$	Agarwal et al. $(2017)^{12}$
Ki-67	Mean proliferative index in DF: 39.2mm ² , DFSP: 12.6 mm ²	Agarwal et al. $(2017)^{12}$
P75	0/30 DF positive, 17/32 DFSP positive	West et al. (2014) ⁶⁴
	Positive in DF (49/70)	Aslam et al. (2021) ¹⁴
D2-40	Positive in DF (23/30) and negative in DFSP (2/15 positive)	Sadullahoglu 2017 ⁵³
	DF 4/12 positive, DFSP 2/57 positive	Song et al. (2017) ⁶⁰
Oct3/4	0/12 DF, 0/57 DFSP	Song et al. (2017) ⁶⁰
CD10	12/12 DF, 23/57 DFSP	Song et al. (2017) ⁶⁰
	13/15 DF, 15/15 DFSP	Kouki et al. (2021) ³⁹
	12/15 DF, 15/15 DFSP	Kouki et al. (2021) ³⁰
FGF2 and FGFR4	Positive in DF (20/20), variable expressivity in DFSP (4/6 positive)	Ishigami et al. (2013) ³²
FGFR1-3	All cases negative in both DF (0/20) and DFSP (0/6)	Ishigami et al. (2013) ³²
P16	Positive in both DF (18/19) and DFSP (4/5)	Smith et al. (2016) ⁵⁹
Abbreviations: CD cluster of differentiation (CD10): Cv43 connexin 43: D2-40 nodonlarin:		

Abbreviations: CD, cluster of differentiation (CD10); Cx43, connexin 43; D2-40, podoplanin;
 DF, dermatofibroma; DFSP, dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans; ERG, erythroblast

transformation specific related gene; FGF2, fibroblast growth factor 2; FGFR1-3, fibroblast

growth factor receptors 1-3; FGFR4, fibroblast growth factor receptor 4; Ki-67, Antigen Kiel 67;

502 LSP1, lymphocyte-specific protein 1; Oct3/4, octamer-binding transcription factor 3/4; P, protein

503 (p75, p16);PHH3, phosphohistone H3; WT1, Wilms tumor gene 1.

504

505

506

507 FIGURE LEGENDS

- 508 Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram indicating the article selection process.
- 509 Figure 2. Frequency of IHC biomarker use across all studies (n=63). Bar plot indicating the
- 510 frequency of IHC biomarkers assessed across all studies. Bars indicate the number of studies
- 511 which evaluated a given marker.
- 512

513 SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

- **Table S1.** Study characteristics data extracted from the included studies (n=63).
- **Table S2.** IHC expression data extracted from the included studies (n=63).
- 516 Figure S1. Frequency of IHC biomarker use in studies distinguishing between DF and
- 517 **DFSP (n=15).** Bar plot indicating the frequency of IHC biomarkers assessed across studies
- 518 which aimed to differentiate DF and DFSP. Bars indicate the number of studies which evaluated
- 519 a given marker.
- 520
- 521
- 522

Figure 1.



Included studies ongoing (n = 0) Studies awaiting classification (n = 0)





MARKERS ASSESSED IN ALL STUDIES (n=63)