

ovary. This finding has not been reported previously in the limited number of cases published so far. Nevertheless, in contrast to the infiltrating carcinoma of no specific type, the clinical and imaging features and the prognostic factors of the tumor are still poorly understood, and all published isolated case reports failed to draw a definite conclusion in this regard.

CONCLUSION:

The biological behavior of mucinous cystadenocarcinoma of the breast is reportedly favorable despite having a high proliferation index and triple-negative biomarker status. The tumor usually occurs in older female patients, displays unique pathologic and immunohistochemical characteristics simulating its ovarian counterparts, and seems to have a good prognosis after complete resection. However, very few cases have been reported so far. More cases and longer follow-up will be necessary for a better understanding of the disease.

REFERENCES:

1. Kim SE, Park JH, Hong S, Koo JS, Jeong J, Jung WH. Primary mucinous cystadenocarcinoma of the breast: cytologic finding and expression of MUC5 are different from mucinous carcinoma. *Korean journal of pathology*. 2012 Dec;46(6):611.
2. Koenig C, Tavassoli FA. Mucinous cystadenocarcinoma of the breast. *Am J Surg Pathol* 1998;22:698-703.
3. Koufopoulos N, Goudeli C, Syrios J, Filopoulos E, Khaldi L. Mucinous cystadenocarcinoma of the breast: the challenge of diagnosing a rare entity. *Rare tumors*. 2017 Oct 3;9(3):98-100.
4. Domoto H, Terahata S, Yamazaki T, Sato K, Takeo H, Tamai S. Mucinous cystadenocarcinoma of the breast showing sulfomucin production. *Histopathology*. 2000;36:567–569.
5. Honma N, Sakamoto G, Ikenaga M, et.al. Mucinous cystadenocarcinoma of the breast: a case report and review of the literature.