Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Ricardo D. Coletta, Campinas State University, Brazil

REVIEWED BY Ali-Farid Safi, Craniologicum—Center for Craniomaxillofacial Surgery, Switzerland Arnab Pal, Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research (PGIMER), India

\*CORRESPONDENCE Gabriela Anaya-Saavedra 🖂 iganaya@correo.xoc.uam.mx

RECEIVED 31 December 2023 ACCEPTED 30 January 2024 PUBLISHED 16 February 2024

#### CITATION

Anaya-Saavedra G and Vázquez-Garduño M (2024) Oral HPV-associated dysplasia: is koilocytic dysplasia a separate entity? Front. Oral. Health 5:1363556. doi: 10.3389/froh.2024.1363556

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Anaya-Saavedra and Vázquez-Garduño. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Oral HPV-associated dysplasia: is koilocytic dysplasia a separate entity?

## Gabriela Anaya-Saavedra\* and Marcela Vázquez-Garduño

Oral Pathology and Medicine Postgraduate Program, Health Care Department, Metropolitan Autonomous University, Mexico City, Mexico

Oral epithelial dysplasia associated with high-risk HPV infection has received different names since its initial description, such as oral Bowenoid lesions, HPV-associated intraepithelial neoplasia, and oral koilocytic dysplasia. Some features, identified in more or less quantity in some of the descriptions, like apoptotic keratinocytes, karyorrhexis, and mitosoid figures, are intricately connected to viral transcriptional status and, consequently, viral load. Since the variety in terminology has introduced diagnostic confusion within medical and research communities, establishing a uniform and standardized approach to diagnosing HPV-oral epithelial dysplasia is crucial for accurate and early diagnoses and holds significant implications for patient outcomes, particularly in high-risk individuals.

#### KEYWORDS

HPV, oral dysplasia, koilocytic dysplasia, oral cancer, p16

# Introduction

The Greek term dysplasia, denoting abnormal tissue growth, was initially introduced in the context of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia, and is distinguished by the distortion of cellular uniformity and architectural structure in a particular tissue (1). In the realm of cytological changes, particularly in smears, the appropriate term to employ is "atypia", as opposed to "dysplasia" (2).

The progression of the oral carcinogenic process unfolds through a series of stages, beginning with epithelial hyperplasia. This progression can traverse various grades of epithelial dysplasia, ranging from mild to severe or, as currently designated, from low-to high-grade squamous intraepithelial lesions (3, 4). Oral epithelial dysplasia (OED) stands out as a well-established risk factor for developing of oral cancer, exhibiting a 12% malignant transformation rate, with a range from 0% to 36%, depending on the severity of dysplasia (5–7).

The diagnosis of OED is inherently subjective, related to the intra- and inter-observer variability (3, 8). Over the years, numerous efforts have been undertaken to pursue our philosopher's stone—a biomarker capable of identifying cases fated for progression into oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC), to facilitate timely intervention and mitigate comorbidities associated with oral malignancy. Among the biomarkers under investigation, human papillomavirus (HPV) infection has been a focal point of research over the past four decades.

#### HPV and carcinogenesis

The role of HPV in oral carcinogenesis has generated considerable debate within the scientific community. Nowadays, it is recognized that merely detecting HPV-DNA in an

10.3389/froh.2024.1363556

oral sample is not sufficient to establish HPV as a carcinogenic agent, as the presence of HPV DNA may signify a transient infection. The potential significance lies in the presence of episomal HPV-DNA, which has been implicated in the malignant transformation of oral epithelial dysplasia (9).

In contrast to the unequivocal causal role of HPV in anogenital and oropharyngeal carcinogenesis, the prevalence of high-risk HPV (HR-HPV) in OSCC has been reported in a wide range from 0% to 58% (10, 11). Adding complexity to this variability is the ongoing controversy surrounding the prognosis of patients with HPVrelated oral cancer. While specific studies find no discernible differences (12, 13), others assert significantly worse survival outcomes for patients with HPV-16 non-associated OSCC compared to their HPV16-positive counterparts (14).

Moreover, there is a persistent debate about the role of p16, a tumor suppressor protein, as a surrogate marker for HPV infection. While p16 is a valuable tool for identifying HPV infection in anogenital and oropharynx areas, its utility in studies focused on OED and OSCC is debated. Some studies report high sensitivity (15, 16), while others assert its null effectiveness in HPV identification (13, 17). The diverse definitions of p16-positivity further contribute to potential misinterpretations of this biomarker's utility (10).

#### HPV-oral epithelial dysplasia

In this context, a distinct subset of OED, linked to HR-HPV (mainly HPV-16), has been identified and characterized by specific histological features (16, 18, 19). While epidemiological data on its prevalence is lacking, McCord and Bradley (16) suggest that approximately 18% of severe oral epithelial dysplasia cases are associated with biologically significant HR-HPV infection. Table 1 provides a comprehensive overview of studies focused on HPV-oral epithelial dysplasia, the clinical and histological characteristics, and the HPV prevalence informed.

In their report from 1986, Fornatora et al. (20) introduced a distinctive variant of oral epithelial dysplasia that, based on light microscopic features, appeared to harbor HPV. These lesions demonstrated concurrent histologic features of cytopathic damage, including acanthosis, koilocytosis, and keratinocyte multinucleation, in addition to conventional OED characteristics such as basilar hyperplasia and nuclear pleomorphism. Previously, a crucial manuscript by Koss and Durfee (2), preceding the molecular biology and virology era, set the basis for unveiling HPV infection's role in the etiology of cervical cancer. They described large cells with irregular, hyperchromatic nuclei surrounded by clear cytoplasm, coining the term "koilocytotic atypia" from the Greek "koilos," meaning hollow or cavity. Intriguingly, these cells were initially identified in uterine cervical smears before tissue recognition, preceding their identification in the oral mucosa. Building on the pioneering work of Koss and Durfee (2), Fornatora et al. (20) brought the term koilocytic dysplasia to the oral mucosa, outlining a distinct subtype of oral epithelial dysplasia characterized by unique clinical and histologic features indicative of the presence of HPV-DNA.

Later, Daley et al. (21) revising previous studies, reported seven cases of oral lesions exhibiting bowenoid histological alike features to Bowen's disease, a solitary, irregular, erythematous macule of the skin or glans penis (erythroplasia of Queyrat), that histologically exhibits carcinoma *in situ* (CIS), characterized by disordered maturation and scattered large and atypical cells, and mitosis throughout all layers of the epithelium. These oral lesions displayed various histologic features and biological behavior, suggesting an association with the p53/WAF-1 apoptotic pathway.

In subsequent years, studies analyzing HPV prevalence in OED were published, leading to two meta-analyses in 2011 (33, 34). Jayaprakash et al. (33) reported an overall prevalence of HPV-16/ 18 in OED of 24.5% (CI: 16.4–36.7), with a threefold increase in OED compared to normal biopsies. However, no differences in HPV-16/18 between dysplastic lesions and cancers or between mild, moderate, or severe dysplastic lesions were found, supporting the assumption that HR-HPV infection occurs during the early phase of oral carcinogenesis. Likewise, Sirjänen et al. (34) demonstrated a significantly increased risk of HPV among individuals with OED when compared to controls, presenting a pooled estimate across all studies of 3.87 (95% CI 2.9–5.2).

In 2013, McCord et al. (16) revisited the term koilocytic dysplasia. They conducted a retrospective study involving immunohistochemical (IHC) staining for the p16 protein and in situ hybridization (ISH) for HPV-DNA in 40 high-grade and 37 low-grade dysplastic samples. Within this cohort, they identified a small subset of OEDs (n = 7) associated with HR-HPV infection. These cases exhibited distinctive features, including a loss of squamous differentiation, abnormal proliferation indicative of the oncogenic effects of high-risk HPV, mitotic-like structures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratotic cells throughout the epithelial thickness-reminiscent of Bowen disease of the skin. Integrating micromorphological findings with molecular results, they underscored a clear correlation between HPV detection and histomorphology. Notably, they acknowledged their cases did not align with the criteria for koilocytic dysplasia described in 1956 by Koss and Durfee (2) and reiterated by Daley et al. (21) under the term "oral Bowenoid lesions."

In the same year, Woo et al. (19) presented the findings of a study involving 20 cases of epithelial dysplasia characterized by a substantial presence of apoptotic cells. Their observations included karyorrhexis and apoptosis, featuring brightly eosinophilic apoptotic cells distributed throughout the epithelial thickness. The apoptotic cells were surrounded by keratinocytes displaying conventional dysplastic changes. Although *in situ* hybridization studies confirmed the presence of HR-HPV in all cases, the authors noted the scarcity of typical koilocytes when using the rigorous criteria of peri-nuclear halos and nuclear enlargement. Consequently, they proposed the term "HPV-associated intraepithelial neoplasia" to maintain nomenclature consistency with HPV-associated lesions in the lower anogenital tract.

Subsequently, the study by Zhang et al. (24) broadened the understanding of HPV-associated oral epithelial dysplasia by introducing a novel nonkeratinizing pattern of severe dysplasia/ CIS. The analysis involved 98 patients diagnosed with severe dysplasia/CIS, revealing that 3% exhibited a nonkeratinizing

Frontiers in Oral Health

sia.
ā
sp
ş
al
Jeli
_
epit
oral
onfirmed
firt
U C
C
ally
<u>0</u>
g
6
list
ч ц
o
ssio
pres
X
Xaor
ň
immur
⊒.
16
<u>_</u>
nd
A an
NA a
⊿
V-DNA a
HPV-DNA a
of HPV-DNA a
ce of HPV-DNA a
nce of HPV-DNA a
alence of HPV-DNA a
alence of HPV-DNA a
prevalence of HPV-DNA a
ie prevalence of HPV-DNA a
g the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
g the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
Irding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
Irding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
udies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
: of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
cs of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
stics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
ristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
cteristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
aracteristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
racteristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
haracteristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
E 1 Characteristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
E 1 Characteristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a
LE 1 Characteristics of the studies regarding the prevalence of HPV-DNA a

Histological HPV IHQ diagnosis p16+		(%0)			(0%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (17.5%) (100%)	(0%) ISH (71%) ISH (17.5%) (17.5%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) RT-PCR + DS (0%)	(0%) ISH (71%) ISH (17.5%) ISH (17.5%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) (100%) PCR + DS (0%) PCR + DS (0%)	(71%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (17.5%) (17.5%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (10%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%	(0%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (17.5%) (17.5%) (10.0%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%)	(0%) (71%) (71%) (71%) (17.5%) (17.5%) (10%) (10%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (100%) (10	(0%)           ISH           (71%)           ISH           (100%)           ISH           (100%)           (100%)           ISH           (100%)	(0%)           ISH           ISH           (71%)           ISH           (100%)           PCR+DS           (9%)           (100%)           ISH           PCR+DS           (100%)           1SH           (100%)           1SH           (100%)           PCR           (91%)           (100%)           1SH           (100%)           (91%)           (100%)           PCR           (100%)           (100%)           (100%)           (100%)           (100%)	(0%) ISH (71%) (71%) ISH (17.5%) ISH (100%) (100%) (0%) PCR+DS (0%) (0%) PCR+DS (91%) (100%) ISH (100%) (100%) PCR+DS (3%) (100%) ISH (100%) (100%) (100%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (110%) (	(0%) ISH (71%) ISH (17.5%) ISH (100%) PCR+DS (0%) PCR+DS (0%) PCR+DS (0%) PCR+DS (100%) ISH (100%) (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) PCR+DS (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (100%) ISH (10
diagnosis	anthosis, KD (64%) romatic COED (36%)	L	skeratotic HG-D (57%) tered											
	Variable findings according to dysplasia grade. Acanthosis, orto/parakeratosis, anastomotic rete pegs, hyperchromatic nuclei and mitosoid figures. Koilocytosis and binucleated cells.	Large, sometimes multinucleated, atypical and dyskeratotic	ts, atypical mitoses scattered 	<ul> <li>ts, atypical mitoses scattered</li> <li>of squamous differentiation.</li> <li>ated cells, and dyskeratosis.</li> <li>o fit KD criteria.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>ts, atypical mitoses scattered</li> <li>of squamous differentiation.</li> <li>ated cells, and dyskeratosis.</li> <li>o fit KD criteria.</li> <li>n marked karyorrhexis and</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>ts, atypical mitoses scattered</li> <li>of squamous differentiation.</li> <li>ated cells, and dyskeratosis.</li> <li>o fit KD criteria.</li> <li>n marked karyorrhexis and</li> </ul>	cells or apoptotic fragments, atypical mitoses scattered throughout the epithelium. Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells.	cells or apoptotic fragments, atypical mitoses scattered throughout the epithelium. Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear to cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and little to no surface maturation.	cells or apoptotic fragments, atypical mitoses scattered throughout the epithelium. Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear to cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and apotosis throughout the hyperplastic stratified squamous epithelium.	cells or apoptotic fragments, atypical mitoses scattered throughout the epithelium. Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear to cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and little to no surface maturation. Parakeratosis (94%), karyorrhexis and apoptosis throughout the hyperplastic stratified squamous epithelium. Morphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic features plus mitosoid bodies.	cells or apoptotic fragments, atypical mitoses scattered throughout the epithelium. Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of kollocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered kollocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells. Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear to cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and little to no surface maturation. Dysproptic severe dysplastic features plus mitosoid bodies. Karyorrhexis, apoptotic cells, ortho/parakeratinization, The remainder of the cells were basaloid, showing "wind- blown" atypia.	<ul> <li>ts, atypical mitoses scattered</li> <li>of squamous differentiation. ated cells, and dyskeratosis.</li> <li>o fit KD criteria.</li> <li>i marked karyorrhexis and</li> <li>amounts of karyorrhectic and</li> <li>amounts of karyorrhectic and</li> <li>cell borders and little to no</li> <li>ct cell borders and spoptosis throughout</li> <li>squamous epithelium.</li> <li>c severe dysplastic features plus</li> <li>c were basaloid, showing "wind- is were basaloid, showing "wind- g to dysplasti grade.</li> </ul>	cells or apoptotic fragments, atypical mitoses scattered throughout the epithelium. Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells. Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic and apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear to cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and little to no surface maturation. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear to cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and little to no surface maturation. Morphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic features plus mitosoid bodies. Morphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic features plus mitosoid bodies. Variable findings according to dysplasia grade. Variable findings according to dysplasia grade. Characteristics of OED, apoptotic bodies, abnormal mitotic figures which can be difficult to distinguish.	<ul> <li>ts, atypical mitoses scattered</li> <li>of squamous differentiation. ated cells, and dyskeratosis.</li> <li>o fit KD criteria.</li> <li>i marked karyorrhexis and</li> <li>a amounts of karyorrhectic and</li> <li>b amounts of karyorrhectic and</li> <li>a amounts of karyorrhectic and</li> <li>b amounts and amounts of karyorrhectic and</li> <li>c and apoptosis throughout</li> <li>c and apoptosi</li></ul>
Variable findings according to	orto/parakeratosis, anastomotic ret nuclei and mitosoid figures. Koilocytosis and binucleated cells.	Large, sometimes multinucleated, atypical and dyskerat cells or apoptotic fragments, atypical mitoses scattered throughout the epithelium.		Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiatio Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of s Mitotic figures, multinucleated Absence of koilocytosis, no fit Epithelial hyperplasia with man apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of s Mitotic figures, multinucleated Absence of kollocytosis, no fit Epithelial hyperplasia with man apoptosis. Scattered kollocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable an apoptotic cells.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of kollocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered kollocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic a apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and little to no surface maturation.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differen Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dysker Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyor apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, higl cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and litt surface maturation. Parakeratosis (94%), karyorrhexis and apoptosis the hyperplastic stratified squamous epithelium.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of s Mitotic figures, multinucleated Absence of kollocytosis, no fit Epithelial hyperplasia with man apoptosis. Scattered kollocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable an apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spi cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cel surface maturation. Parakeratosis (94%), karyorrher the hyperplastic stratified squat the hyperplastic stratified squat the hyperplastic stratified squat mitosoid bodies.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differentiation. Mitoric figures, multinucleated cells, and dyskeratosis. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexis and apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic apoptotic cells. Dysplastic signs plus variable amounts of karyorrhectic apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nucle cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and little to n surface maturation. Parakeratosis (94%), karyorrhexis and apoptosis throug the hyperplastic stratified squamous epithelium. Morphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic features pl mitosoid bodies. Karyorrhexis, apoptotic cells, ortho/parakeratinization, The remainder of the cells were basaloid, showing "wit blown" atypia.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differe Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyske Absence of kollocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhexi apoptosis. Scattered kollocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyo apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, hig cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders and li surface maturation. Parakeratosis (94%), karyorrhexis and apoptosi the hyperplastic stratified squamous epithelium Morphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic fei mitosoid bodies. Karyorrhexis, apoptotic cells, ortho/parakeratin The remainder of the cells were basaloid, show blown" atypia. Variable findings according to dysplasia grade.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous diff. Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dy. Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorth apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of ka apoptotic cells, with oval to spindled nuclei, cryolaamic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, cryolastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, cryopastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, cryopastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, tryopastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, worphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic mitosoid bodies. Morphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic mitosoid bodies. Variable findings according to dysplasia gra Variable findings according to dysplasia gra figures which can be difficult to distinguish, figures which can be difficult to distinguish.	Diffuse, full-thickness loss of squamous differe Mitotic figures, multinucleated cells, and dyske Absence of koilocytosis, no fit KD criteria. Epithelial hyperplasia with marked karyorrhex apoptosis. Scattered koilocytes. NS Dysplasia signs plus variable amounts of karyo apoptotic cells. Dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, hi crycolastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, hi trycolastic stratified squamous epitheliun Morphologic and cytologic severe dysplastic fe mitosoid bodies. Karyorrhexis, apoptotic cells, ortho/pankeratti The remainder of the cells were basaloid, show blown" atypia. Variable findings according to dysplasia grade. Variable findings according to dysplasia grade. Variable findings according to dysplasia grade. Variable findings according to dysplasia grade.
appearance	Fiat or slightly V elevated white lesions 0 n	Leukoplakia (71%) L		NS	koplakia (85%)	koplakia (85%) koplakia (74%)	koplakia (85%) koplakia (74%) koplakia (74%) ite or red/white ue variably ace							
Anatomical sites	Tongue, lips, and oral mucosa	Tongue (28%) Buccal mucosa (28%)		Tongue 40% Floor of the mouth 40%	Tongue 40% Floor of the mouth 40% Tongue, buccal mucosa.	Tongue 40% Floor of the mouth 40% Tongue, buccal mucosa. Tongue (25%) Buccal mucosa (30%)	Tongue 40% Floor of the mouth 40% Tongue, buccal mucosa. Tongue (25%) Buccal mucosa (30%) Lateral tongue or floor of the mouth (52%)	Tongue 40% Floor of the mouth 40% Tongue, buccal mucosa. Tongue (25%) Buccal mucosa (30%) Lateral tongue or floor of the mouth (52%) Floor of the mouth (60%) (include oropharyngeal sites)	of the m ue, bucca ue, bucca ue (25%) d mucosa al tongue h (52%) of the m de oroph h	<ul> <li>40%</li> <li>40%</li> <li>5. bucca</li> <li>5. bucca</li> <li>(55%)</li> <li>(52%)</li> <li>(52%)</li></ul>	f the m f the m core (52%) (52%) (52%) f the m f the m f the m f the m f the m f the m	<ul> <li>40%</li> <li>40%</li> <li>40%</li> <li>(25%)</li> <li>(52%)</li> <li>(52%)</li> <li>and fl</li> <li>the m</li> <li>e lesion</li> <li>(12%)</li> <li>(12%)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>40%</li> <li>40%</li> <li>40%</li> <li>5 bucca</li> <li>(25%)</li> <li>mucosa</li> <li>mucosa</li> <li>(52%)</li> <li>f the m</li> <li>e oroph</li> <li>e lesion</li> <li>t ongue</li> <li>(43%)</li> </ul>	f the m f the m huccas , bucca , bucca (52%) (52%) (52%) , tongue e lesion , tongue e lesion (13%) , tongue (13%)
(years)	39 (21–65)	47 (29–69)	59 (15-84)											
	84%	100%	) 57%		85%	85% 50%	85% 50% 82%	85% 50% 82% 70%	85% 50% 82% 70%	85% 50% 82% 70% 89% Male	85% 50% 82% 82% 89% 89% Male	85% 50% 82% 82% 89% 89% 100% 21%	85% 50% 82% 82% 89% 100% 21% 60%	85% 50% 82% 82% 89% 100% 21% 60%
	48*4 PVV	~	40HG-D		20	59	38 29 20	20 38 10	20 53 53	20 59 53 10	20 59 10 12 12	20 59 38 38 10 12 12 30 30 30	20         38         59         20           33         30         12         1         38	20     38       33     30       33     31
	Retrospective (1986–1995)	Case series	Retrospective (2007–2009)		Bidirectional (2008–2012)	Bidirectional (2008–2012) Cross sectional	Bidirectional (2008–2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003–2015)	Bidirectional (2008-2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003-2015) Retrolective (2012-2015)	Bidirectional (2008-2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003-2015) Retrolective (2012-2015) Case series (2008- 2016)	Bidirectional (2008-2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003-2015) Retrolective (2012-2015) Case series (2008- 2016) Case report	Bidirectional (2008-2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003-2015) Retrolective (2012-2015) Case series (2008- 2016) Case report Case report Retrospective (2013-2017)	Bidirectional (2008-2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003-2015) Retrolective (2012-2015) Case series (2008- 2016) Case report Retrospective (2013-2017) Cross sectional	Bidirectional (2008-2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003-2015) Retrolective (2012-2015) Case series (2008- 2016) Case report Retrospective (2013-2017) Cross sectional Cross sectional Cross sectional Cross sectional	Bidirectional (2008-2012) Cross sectional Retrolective (2003-2015) Retrolective (2012-2015) Case series (2008- 2016) Case report Retrospective (2013-2017) Cross sectional Cross sectional (2014-2016) Cross sectional (2014-2016) (2011-2017)
	Fornatora et al. (20)	Daley et al. (21)	McCord et al. 1 (16)		Woo et al. 1 (19)	et al. 1 et al.	et al. 1 et al. 1al et al.	et al. 1 et al. 1al et al. 1g et al.	et al. l et al. lal et al. g et al. lan et al.	et al. l et al. lal et al. g et al. lan et al.				

	Type of study	u	Males	Males Mean age (years)	Anatomical sites	Clinical appearance	Histologic features	Histological diagnosis	ΛdΗ	IHQ p16+
Sri et al. (30)	Sri et al. (30) Cross sectional comparative (2010–2012)	20	NS	SN	NS	Leukoplakia (50%)	NS	Mild (30%) Moderate (50%) Severe (20%)	PCR (5%)	1
Jawahar et al. (31)	Jawahar et al. Retrospective (31)	30	97%	>60: 63%		Homogeneous leukoplakia (93%)	Variable findings according to dysplasia grade.	Mild (30%) Moderate (57%) Severe (13%)	IHC-E6 (36%)	10%
Roza et al. (32)	Case series (2011-2022)	5*4 PVV	80%		55 (51–60) Buccal mucosa (60%)	Leukoplakia (60%)	Karyorrhectic cells (mitosoid bodies) and apoptotic keratinocytes with dense eosinophilic cytoplasm.	Severe dysplasia	ISH (80%)	100%
HPV, human pa	apillomavirus; KD, koi	ilocytic dysp	olasia; CO	ED, convention	al oral epithelial dysplasia; HC	3-D, high grade dysplas	HPV, human papiltomavirus; KD, koilocytic dysplasia; COED, conventional oral epithelial dysplasia; HG-D, high grade dysplasia; LG-D, low grade dysplasia; CIS, Carcinoma in situ. OSCC, Oral squamous cell carcinoma; PCR, polymerase	CC, Oral squamous cell carc	inoma; PCR,	poly

specified not with HIV; NS, Immunohistochemistry; PVV, People living chain reaction; ISH, In situ hybridization; IHC, reverse transcriptase polymerase RT-PCR, Direct sequencing; Ŋ, reaction; Ę

histological type. This subtype was characterized by dysplastic cells with oval to spindled nuclei, high nuclear-to-cytoplasmic ratios, indistinct cell borders, and limited surface maturation. Notably, most non-keratinized cases were predominantly located in the oropharynx and subglottic area, where epithelia either include or resemble transitional epithelium.

10 3389/froh 2024 1363556

The significant diversity in histopathological characteristics linked to dysplasia grade has resulted in using multiple terms such as oral koilocytic dysplasia, oral Bowenoid lesions, oral intraepithelial neoplasia, and HPV16-specific dysplasia. The histological presentation of HPV-associated dysplasia is intricately connected to the viral transcriptional status and the number of viral copies; thus, it is reasonable to expect that lesions may or may not exhibit koilocytosis and varying degrees of apoptosis. In addition, using the term "intraepithelial neoplasia" might lead to confusion, especially among surgeons, potentially resulting in more aggressive management than necessary.

Therefore, to mitigate potential confusion and ensure appropriate treatment strategies, we propose adopting the unified term "HPV-oral epithelial dysplasia" to this entity. A standardized nomenclature aims to enhance clarity, facilitate accurate communication, and promote a cohesive understanding of this distinct subset of oral epithelial dysplasia associated with high-risk HPV infection (Figure 1).

### Clinical and histopathological findings of HPV-OED

As described in Table 1 and verified by prior systematic reviews and meta-analyses (33-35), HPV-oral epithelial dysplasia exhibits a preference for males, mainly manifesting after the sixth decade of life. The lesions were predominantly consistent with leukoplakia and located in the tongue, buccal mucosa, and the floor of the mouth.

Microscopically, HPV-OED stands out markedly from conventional severe oral dysplasia due to its distinctive fullthickness basaloid morphology. The basal layer displays hypercellularity, condensed coarse chromatin (reflecting degenerate mitoses), occasional multinucleation, dense eosinophilic cytoplasm, a high nucleus-to-cytoplasm ratio, and a blurred boundary between the basal and spinous layers, resulting in the dark basaloid cell morphology. Another essential feature is the pronounced epithelial hyperplasia with deeply invading rete ridges, presenting a corrugated eosinophilic parakeratin or orthokeratin surface. A frequent observation is the presence of sharply defined lateral borders between dysplastic and normal epithelium (8, 32).

Although the presence of karyorrhectic and apoptotic keratinocytes typically located within the superficial layers of the epithelium has been described as a surrogate microscopic feature for HPV-OED (19, 20, 32, 35), some studies contend that koilocytes and multinucleated keratinocytes are inconspicuous and encountered only occasionally (16, 18, 23), recommending further confirmation of HPV infection in routine practice (32).

Interpretation of abnormal nuclear morphology, including karyorrhexis and mitosis figures, is subjective, challenging to distinguish, and occasionally overlaps with those observed in severe epithelial dysplasia (28). These features have demonstrated poor

**FABLE 1** Continued



Timeline showing the evolution of the term HPV-oral epithelial dysplasia, from its adoption from cervical cytological samples, to the present. The histopathological image at the end shows one of the many faces of HPV-OD (Archives of the laboratory of Oral Pathology of UAM-X, Mexico).

performance as a standalone test, underscoring the insufficiency of relying solely on specific histological features (28). In simpler terms, the presence of karyorrhexis and apoptotic bodies is not universal in all cases of HPV-oral epithelial dysplasia. Conversely, not all conventional cases of OED displaying these characteristics are necessarily associated with viral cytopathic damage.

Hence, recent publications propose refraining from applying grading criteria for cytological and architectural features of conventional OED to HPV-OED, given its unique etiology and morphology (8, 32). In particular, the involvement of the full thickness of the epithelium does not inherently signify severe dysplasia in terms of its risk of malignant transformation (8).

### HPV in OED

While most studies on HPV-OED employed DNA *in situ* hybridization for identifying high-risk HPV (HR-HPV) (16, 19, 21, 24, 28, 29, 32), others employed diverse methods such as polymerase chain reaction (PCR) (27, 30), real-time PCR (RT-PCR) (26), and even DNA sequencing (22, 23). Despite their high sensitivity, it's important to note that a positive test from these assays might signify sample contamination or a low-level transient infection rather than the presence of active high-risk HPV.

Studies on oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma have suggested that the most effective stratification for detecting high-risk HPV is through RNA RT-PCR, RNA ISH, and p16 immunohistochemistry (32). Taking this into consideration is advisable for a more accurate assessment of active high-risk HPV presence.

The HPV oncoproteins E6 and E7 can potentially disrupt the activity of tumor suppressor proteins p53 and pRB within the cell cycle, leading to malignant transformation and facilitating uncontrolled proliferation (27, 36), even at early stages (23). Therefore, the expression of HPV-E6 is considered a more valuable diagnostic test, demonstrating higher specificity for detecting high-grade oral epithelial dysplasia than the sole detection of HPV-DNA (31).

Based on a systematic review encompassing 31 studies (832 cases) conducted by de la Cour et al. (35), the overall pooled prevalence of HPV DNA in oral epithelial dysplasia was determined to be 27.2% (95% CI: 17.6–38.1). A sensitivity analysis focusing on 14 studies, which included a control group, revealed an overall pooled HPV-DNA prevalence in oral dysplasia of 32.6% (95% CI: 18.1–49.0). The pooled HPV DNA prevalence among control subjects was 11.1% (95% CI: 3.5–22.2).

Similarly, findings from Jayaprakash et al. (33) indicate that the presence of HR-HPV in one-fourth of HPV-OED aligns with the hypothesis that HPV plays a substantial role in the early phases of oral and oropharyngeal carcinogenesis. However, it is crucial to underscore that detecting HPV alone does not establish a causal association, as it can also be identified in normal oral tissue.

The pursuit of HPV testing is expressly advised in instances where histological evidence strongly indicates HPV-OED. Screening for HPV infection in isolation is discouraged due to an imperfect balance of advantages and potential drawbacks (37). This imbalance is primarily attributed to the transient nature of most oral HPV DNA, increasing the probability of false positives. Hence, it underscores the significance of adopting a prudent and contextually informed approach to HPV testing in assessing oral dysplasia.

#### P16 immunoexpression

Immunohistochemistry has been widely used to assess p16 immunoreactivity as a reliable surrogate marker of HPV in anogenital and head and neck cancers (17). Despite its utility, conflicting data has emerged, suggesting a notable risk of falsepositive results in the context of HPV-related oral lesions. This discrepancy is attributed to the need for a standardized cut-off for interpreting p16 immunoreactivity in the oral cavity, contributing to challenges in its accurate application.

Moreover, previous studies, including those by McCord and Bradley (16), Khanal et al. (23), and Buajeb et al. (38), have reported that p16 immunoreactivity is infrequent or nearly absent in oral dysplastic lesions. These findings underscore the complexity of relying solely on p16 as a biomarker for HPV-associated oral dysplasia.

While most studies on HPV-OED have reported typical diffuse and strong p16 positivity, recognizing this biomarker as a valuable predictor of the presence of transcriptionally active high-risk HPV infection (18, 19, 24, 26, 28, 29, 32), other investigations have observed lower immunoreactivity in HPV-OED cases (31) or elevated p16 levels in HPV-negative oral epithelial dysplasia samples (17).

The varied outcomes in p16 immunoreactivity across different studies emphasize the need for a standardized approach to defining positivity, prompting further investigation into its specificity and sensitivity in the context of oral dysplastic lesions. In addition, it is crucial to highlight the importance of a cautious and comprehensive evaluation when interpreting p16 immunoreactivity results in the diagnostic and prognostic assessment of HPV-related oral epithelial dysplasia.

#### Prognosis of HPV-OED

While the progression characteristics are not fully elucidated, some authors (19, 35) suggest that HPV-associated oral dysplasia has the potential to progress into HPV-associated oral cancer. Nevertheless, conservative surgical excision appears curative in most cases, demonstrating no signs of recurrence after an average followup of 39 months (32). Notably, Allam et al. 2008 (39) reported promising results with imiquimod, an immunomodulatory drug successfully used to treat HPV infections in the anogenital area.

Additionally, a potential contributing factor to the progression of HPV-OED to cancer could be the microbiome, a complex ecosystem of microorganisms that has been implicated in the advancement of HPV infection to cancer in other HPV-related carcinogenesis contexts (40). Understanding the interplay between the oral microbiome and HPV-associated dysplasia is crucial for elucidating the underlying mechanisms and identifying potential therapeutic targets. Further research should explore and dissect the intricate relationships between the microbiome and HPV-associated oral dysplasia to provide comprehensive insights into the factors influencing disease progression and potential avenues for intervention.

We consider the need to improve the diagnosis of HPV-OED, particularly among high-risk patients, to facilitate early

intervention and offer a critical advantage in managing this condition. HPV-OED has been documented in people living with HIV (20, 32) and in recipients of allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) (40), thus, regular screening for potentially malignant disorders identification is critical. It underscores the importance of integrating HPV-OED surveillance into the routine care of immunocompromised individuals.

Moreover, a key consideration is the role of HPV vaccination in mitigating the currently low incidence of HPV-OED and reducing the associated risk of cancer in these patient populations (8, 25), contributing to a comprehensive strategy for minimizing the impact of HPV-OED, ultimately advancing the well-being of at-risk individuals.

# Conclusions

- Clinically, it is not possible to distinguish between conventional OED and HPV-OED.
- HPV-OED is typically distinguishable from conventional OED on histopathologic grounds, representing a minority of cases.
- A minority of severe dysplasia cases was identified to contain transcriptionally active HR-HPV, emphasizing the need for targeted investigation in this subset.
- While histological characteristics are considered hallmarks, they are not deemed essential for predicting HPV status in OED, underscoring the complexity of the disease.
- The presence of karyorrhexis and apoptotic bodies is associated with HPV status in OED. Yet, their use as a predictive marker needs to be more robust, necessitating further exploration of more reliable indicators.
- p16, often utilized as a biomarker, is found to be insufficiently robust for predicting HPV status in OED, highlighting the need for alternative and more accurate molecular markers.
- Clinical monitoring and extensive molecular studies within this subgroup are imperative to unravel how HPV initiates or influences the progression of OED to oral cancer.
- The multifaceted nature of HPV-OED demands a nuanced understanding of its molecular underpinnings and clinical implications, guiding the development of more precise diagnostic tools and targeted interventions for this challenging condition.

## Author contributions

GA-S: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. MV-G: Data curation, Writing – review & editing, Formal Analysis.

# Funding

The author(s) declare that no financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

# Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

The author(s) declared that they were an editorial board member of Frontiers, at the time of submission. This had no impact on the peer review process and the final decision.

# References

1. Gupta S, Jawanda MK, Madhushankari GS. Current challenges and the diagnostic pitfalls in the grading of epithelial dysplasia in oral potentially malignant disorders: a review. J Oral Biol Craniofac Res. (2020) 10:788–99. doi: 10.1016/j.jobcr.2020.09.005

2. Koss LG, Durfee GR. Unusual patterns of squamous epithelium of the uterine cervix: cytologic and pathologic study of koilocytotic atypia. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* (1956) 63:1245–61. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.1956.tb32134.x

3. Müller S. Oral epithelial dysplasia, atypical verrucous lesions and oral potentially malignant disorders: focus on histopathology. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* (2018) 125:591–602. doi: 10.1016/j.0000.2018.02.012

4. Speight PM, Khurram SA, Kujan O. Oral potentially malignant disorders: risk of progression to malignancy. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* (2018) 125:612–27. doi: 10.1016/j.0000.2017.12.011

5. Gilvetti C, Soneji C, Bisase B, Barrett AW. Recurrence and malignant transformation rates of high grade oral epithelial dysplasia over a 10 year follow up period and the influence of surgical intervention, size of excision biopsy and marginal clearance in a UK regional maxillofacial surgery unit. *Oral Oncol.* (2021) 121:105462. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2021.105462

6. Mehanna HM, Rattay T, Smith J, McConkey CC. Treatment and follow-up of oral dysplasia—a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Head Neck*. (2009) 31:1600–9. doi: 10.1002/hed.21131

7. Tilakaratne WM, Jayasooriya PR, Jayasuriya NS, De Silva RK. Oral epithelial dysplasia: causes, quantification, prognosis, and management challenges. *Periodontol.* (2000) 80:126–47. doi: 10.1111/prd.12259

8. Odell E, Kujan O, Warnakulasuriya S, Sloan P. Oral epithelial dysplasia: recognition, grading and clinical significance. *Oral Dis.* (2021) 27:1947–76. doi: 10. 1111/odi.13993

9. Shigeishi H. Association between human papillomavirus and oral cancer: a literature review. Int J Clin Oncol. (2023) 28:982–9. doi: 10.1007/s10147-023-02327-9

10. Katirachi SK, Grønlund MP, Jakobsen KK, Grønhøj C, von Buchwald C. The prevalence of HPV in oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma. *Viruses*. (2023) 15::451. doi: 10.3390/v15020451

11. Syrjänen S, Syrjänen K. HPV in head and neck carcinomas: different HPV profiles in oropharyngeal carcinomas—why? *Acta Cytol.* (2019) 63:124–42. doi: 10. 1159/000495727

12. Nauta IH, Heideman DAM, Brink A, van der Steen B, Bloemena E, Koljenović S, et al. The unveiled reality of human papillomavirus as risk factor for oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma. *Int J Cancer*. (2021) 149:420–30. doi: 10.1002/ijc.33514

13. Tokuzen N, Nakashiro KI, Tojo S, Goda H, Kuribayashi N, Uchida D. Human papillomavirus-16 infection and p16 expression in oral squamous cell carcinoma. *Oncol Lett.* (2021) 22:528. doi: 10.3892/ol.2021.12789

14. Shenker RF, Razavian NB, D'Agostino RB Jr, Mowery YM, Brizel DM, Hughes RT. Clinical outcomes of oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma stratified by human papillomavirus subtype: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Oral Oncol.* (2024) 148:106644. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2023.106644

15. Singh RP, Verma SK, Ganesh RN, Raman A, Natarajan G, Kasthuri D, et al. A study on H-score threshold for p16ink4a immunoperoxidase expression in squamous cell tumours of oral cavity. *J Oral Maxillofac Pathol.* (2023) 27:602–6. doi: 10.4103/jomfp.jomfp\_522\_22

16. McCord C, Xu J, Xu W, Qiu X, McComb RJ, Perez-Ordonez B, et al. Association of high-risk human papillomavirus infection with oral epithelial dysplasia. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* (2013) 115(4):541–9. doi: 10. 1016/j.0000.2013.01.020

17. Tomo S, Biss SP, Crivelini MM, de Oliveira SHP, Biasoli ÉR, Tjioe KC, et al. High p16INK4a immunoexpression is not HPV dependent in oral leukoplakia. *Arch Oral Biol.* (2020) 115:104738. doi: 10.1016/j.archoralbio.2020.104738

18. Lerman MA, Woo SB. Histopathologic features of high risk human papillomavirus-associated oral epithelial dysplasia. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* (2014) 117:20. doi: 10.1016/j.0000.2013.05.024

## Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

19. Woo SB, Cashman EC, Lerman MA. Human papillomavirus-associated oral intraepithelial neoplasia. *Mod Pathol.* (2013) 26:1288–97. doi: 10.1038/modpathol. 2013.70

20. Fornatora M, Jones AC, Kerpel S, Freedman P. Human papillomavirusassociated oral epithelial dysplasia (koilocytic dysplasia): an entity of unknown biologic potential. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod. (1996) 82:47–56. doi: 10.1016/s1079-2104(96)80377-5

21. Daley T, Birek C, Wysocki GP. Oral bowenoid lesions: differential diagnosis and pathogenetic insights. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol Endod*. (2000) 90:466–73. doi: 10.1067/moe.2000.107975

22. Chen XJ, Sun K, Jiang WW. Absence of high-risk HPV 16 and 18 in Chinese patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma and oral potentially malignant disorders. *Virol J.* (2016) 13:81. doi: 10.1186/s12985-016-0526-2

23. Khanal S, Trainor PJ, Zahin M, Ghim SJ, Joh J, Rai SN, et al. Histologic variation in high grade oral epithelial dysplasia when associated with high-risk human papillomavirus. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol. (2017) 123:566–85. doi: 10.1016/j.0000.2017.01.008

24. Zhang L, Jr LJ, El-Mofty SK, Gandhi M, Chernock RD. Nonkeratinizing squamous cell carcinoma in situ of the upper aerodigestive tract: an HPV-related entity. *Head Neck Pathol.* (2017) 11:152–61. doi: 10.1007/s12105-016-0749-y

25. Saleh W, Cha S, Indraneel B, Moreb J, Katz J. HPV-related oral dysplasia in a multiple myeloma patient after stem cell transplantation. *Spec Care Dentist.* (2019) 39:51–5. doi: 10.1111/scd.12344

26. Alsabbagh A, Robins TL, Harriman A, Jackson-Boeters L, Darling MR, Khan ZA, et al. Surrogate markers for high-risk human papillomavirus infection in oral epithelial dysplasia: a comparison of p16, ki-67, and ProExC. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol.* (2020) 129:246–59.e1. doi: 10.1016/j.0000.2019.09.019

27. Erira AT, Navarro AFR, Robayo DAG. Human papillomavirus, epstein-barr virus, and Candida albicans co-infection in oral leukoplakia with different degrees of dysplasia. *Clin Exp Dent Res.* (2021) 7:914–23. doi: 10.1002/cre2.435

28. Hendawi N, Niklander S, Allsobrook O, Khurram SA, Bolt R, Doorbar J, et al. Human papillomavirus (HPV) can establish productive infection in dysplastic oral mucosa, but HPV status is poorly predicted by histological features and p16 expression. *Histopathology*. (2020) 76:592–602. doi: 10.1111/his.14019

29. Argyris PP, Wilkinson PE, Jarvis MC, Magliocca KR, Patel MR, Vogel RI, et al. Endogenous APOBEC3B overexpression characterizes HPV-positive and HPVnegative oral epithelial dysplasias and head and neck cancers. *Mod Pathol.* (2021) 34:280–90. doi: 10.1038/s41379-020-0617-x

30. Sri S, Ramani P, Premkumar P, Ramshankar V, Ramasubramanian A, Krishnan RP. Prevalence of human papillomavirus (HPV) 16 and 18 in oral malignant and potentially malignant disorders: a polymerase chain reaction analysis—a comparative study. *Ann Maxillofac Surg.* (2021) 11:6–11. doi: 10.4103/ams.ams\_376\_20

31. Jawahar G, Narayana Rao G, J BR, J A, Nandhinipriya B, Swetha S. Predictive value of anti- E6 oncoprotein (high risk- human papilloma virus) and p16 Ink4a for detecting HPV in oral epithelial dysplasia. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev.* (2022) 23:3915–22. doi: 10.31557/APJCP.2022.23.11.3915

32. Roza ALOC, Fonsèca TC, Mariz BALA, Penafort PVM, Martínez-Flores R, Marshall-Baburizza M, et al. Human papillomavirus-associated oral epithelial dysplasia: report of 5 illustrative cases from Latin America. *Head Neck Pathol.* (2023) 17:921–31. doi: 10.1007/s12105-023-01589-z

33. Jayaprakash V, Reid M, Hatton E, Merzianu M, Rigual N, Marshall J, et al. Human papillomavirus types 16 and 18 in epithelial dysplasia of oral cavity and oropharynx: a meta-analysis, 1985-2010. *Oral Oncol.* (2011) 47:1048–54. doi: 10. 1016/j.oraloncology.2011.07.009

34. Syrjänen S, Lodi G, von Bültzingslöwen I, Aliko A, Arduino P, Campisi G, et al. Human papillomaviruses in oral carcinoma and oral potentially malignant disorders: a systematic review. *Oral Dis.* (2011) 17(Suppl 1):58–72. doi: 10.1111/j.1601-0825.2011. 01792.x 35. de la Cour CD, Sperling CD, Belmonte F, Syrjänen S, Verdoodt F, Kjaer SK. Prevalence of human papillomavirus in oral epithelial dysplasia: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Head Neck*. (2020) 42:2975–84. doi: 10.1002/hed.26330

36. Rampias T, Sasaki C, Weinberger P, Psyrri A. E6 and e7 gene silencing and transformed phenotype of human papillomavirus 16-positive oropharyngeal cancer cells. J Natl Cancer Inst. (2009) 101:412–23. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djp017

37. D'Souza G, Tewari SR, Troy T, Waterboer T, Struijk L, Castillo R, et al. Prevalence of oral and blood oncogenic human papillomavirus biomarkers among an enriched screening population: baseline results of the MOUTH study. *Cancer.* (2023) 129:2373–84. doi: 10.1002/cncr.34783 38. Buajeeb W, Poomsawat S, Punyasingh J, Sanguansin S. Expression of p16 in oral cancer and premalignant lesions. *J Oral Pathol Med.* (2009) 38:104–8. doi: 10.1111/j. 1600-0714.2008.00710.x

39. Allam JP, Erdsach T, Wenghoefer M, Bieber T, Appel TR, Novak N. Successful treatment of extensive human papillomavirus-associated oral leucoplakia with imiquimod. *Br J Dermatol.* (2008) 158:644–6. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2133.2007.08374.x

40. Elnaggar JH, Huynh VO, Lin D, Hillman RT, Abana CO, El Alam MB, et al. HPV-related anal cancer is associated with changes in the anorectal microbiome during cancer development. *Front Immunol.* (2023) 14:1051431. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2023.1051431