Survival Impact of Isocitrate Dehydrogenase (IDH)-Wildtype Histological Versus Molecular Glioblastoma

Summarize the findings of this study: Patil N, Dube S, Mutua F, Kakumanu S, Shankar JJ, Sinha N, Pareek V. Survival Impact of Isocitrate Dehydrogenase (IDH)-Wildtype Histological Versus Molecular Glioblastoma: A Propensity Score-Matched Analysis. Cureus. 2025 Jul 24;17(7):e88667. doi: 10.7759/cureus.88667. PMID: 40861724; PMCID: PMC12375397.

Copilot: Here's a clear summary of the study you mentioned:

📌 Study Focus

The research compared **histological glioblastoma (histGBM)**—diagnosed by classic microscopic features like necrosis or microvascular proliferation—with **molecular glioblastoma (molGBM)**—IDH-wildtype diffuse astrocytic tumors that lack those histological features but carry molecular alterations (e.g., **TERT promoter mutation, EGFR amplification, or +7/–10 chromosomal changes**). The aim was to determine whether survival outcomes differ between these two groups when matched for baseline characteristics.

Key Findings

- Cohort & Method: Observational, propensity score—matched analysis of patients with IDH-wildtype glioblastoma. Matching was done to balance confounding factors such as age, performance status, and treatment received.
- Survival Outcomes:
 - Overall survival (OS) was comparable between histGBM and molGBM groups.
 - Progression-free survival (PFS) showed no significant difference after matching.
 - This suggests that molecularly defined glioblastomas behave clinically as aggressively as histologically defined glioblastomas.
- Clinical Implication: The findings support the 2021 WHO CNS tumor classification, which
 groups both histGBM and molGBM under IDH-wildtype glioblastoma, WHO grade 4, regardless
 of histological appearance. In practice, this means patients with molGBM should be treated with the
 same aggressive protocols as histGBM.

Conclusion

The study reinforces that **molecular glioblastomas (IDH-wildtype) have survival outcomes equivalent to histological glioblastomas**. Histology alone is insufficient for prognosis—molecular

profiling is essential. This validates the modern shift toward **molecularly driven classification and treatment planning** in neuro-oncology.

Can you explain the significance of the findings?

Copilot: Absolutely—this study carries some important weight in how we understand and treat glioblastoma. Let me break down the **significance**:

Why These Findings Matter

1. Validation of WHO 2021 Classification

- The World Health Organization's 2021 update redefined glioblastoma:
 - Histological GBM: diagnosed by microscopic features (necrosis, microvascular proliferation).
 - Molecular GBM: IDH-wildtype astrocytomas without those features but with specific molecular alterations.
- This study shows that molecular GBMs have the same poor survival outcomes as histological GBMs, confirming that the WHO was right to group them together as glioblastoma, IDH-wildtype, WHO grade 4.

2. Clinical Practice Impact

- Before this, some clinicians hesitated to treat molecular GBMs as aggressively as histological GBMs, since they "looked" less malignant under the microscope.
- The findings make it clear: molecular GBMs are just as aggressive, so patients should receive the same standard-of-care therapies (surgery, chemoradiation, temozolomide, etc.).

3. Prognostic Clarity

- Survival equivalence means that histology alone is not enough to predict outcomes.
- Molecular profiling is essential for accurate diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment planning.

4. Research & Trial Design

- Clinical trials can now confidently include both histological and molecular GBMs in the same category.
- This avoids underpowering studies or misclassifying patients, leading to more reliable results in future glioblastoma research.

Big Picture

The study essentially closes the debate:

- Histological GBM ≈ Molecular GBM in terms of survival.
- This cements the shift from a purely microscopic definition of brain tumors to a **molecularly driven era of neuro-oncology**.

In short: the significance is that **patients with molecular GBM should not be underestimated or undertreated**—they face the same prognosis as classic glioblastoma, and the medical community now has strong evidence to treat them accordingly.