Iran J Pathol. 2027;22(1):1–3 | ISSN 2345-3656 | MAIN SUBJECTS Molecular Pathology

Morphology and Molecular Pathology: Partners in Precision Medicine

Alireza Abdollahi[1,2*], **Mohammad Reza Jalali Nadoushan**[3,4]

1. Department of Pathology, School of Medicine, Imam Khomeini Hospital Complex, Tehran, Iran
2. Associate Editor, Iranian Journal of Pathology, Tehran, Iran
3. Department of Pathology, Shahed University, Tehran, Iran
4. Editor-in-Chief, Iranian Journal of Pathology, Tehran, Iran

RECEIVED 09 Jul 2026 ACCEPTED 04 Aug 2026 PUBLISHED ONLINE 01 Sep 2026 DOI 10.22034/ijp.2026.2088737.3687

Corresponding Information: Alireza Abdollahi, Department of Pathology, School of Medicine, Imam Khomeini Hospital Complex, Tehran, Iran, Associate Editor, Iranian Journal of Pathology, Tehran, Iran, dr_p_abdollahi@yahoo.com

Copyright © 2027 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the CC BY 4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

For more than a century, morphologic evaluation has served as the cornerstone of diagnostic pathology. The microscopic examination of tissue architecture, cytologic characteristics, and histologic patterns has enabled pathologists to classify diseases, predict biological behavior, and guide clinical management with remarkable accuracy. Despite unprecedented technological advances in genomics, transcriptomics, epigenomics, proteomics, and artificial intelligence, morphology has not lost its central role. Rather, it has evolved from being the final diagnostic endpoint into the foundation upon which molecular pathology is interpreted. Precision medicine has therefore transformed pathology not by replacing morphology but by redefining its partnership with molecular diagnostics.

The remarkable expansion of molecular testing over the last decade has fundamentally changed diagnostic algorithms across virtually every subspecialty of pathology. Next-generation sequencing (NGS), fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH), polymerase chain reaction (PCR), RNA sequencing, DNA methylation profiling, and liquid biopsy have become integral components of routine practice. These technologies identify genomic alterations that serve as diagnostic biomarkers, prognostic indicators, predictive markers for targeted therapy, and tools for disease monitoring. However, molecular findings rarely exist in isolation. Their biological significance can only be interpreted within the morphologic context of the tumor, emphasizing that histopathology remains the indispensable framework for molecular medicine (1).

This complementary relationship is perhaps most evident in thoracic pathology. The diagnosis of lung adenocarcinoma illustrates how morphology directs molecular investigation. Histologic classification not only establishes tumor type but also determines tissue allocation for biomarker testing, including EGFR, ALK, ROS1, RET, MET, KRAS, BRAF, NTRK, and HER2 (2).

Similarly, breast pathology demonstrates that morphology and molecular biology are inseparable rather than competing disciplines. Histologic grade, architectural subtype, lymphovascular invasion, and tumor microenvironment remain powerful prognostic variables. Yet therapeutic decisions increasingly depend upon genomic information, including HER2 amplification, PIK3CA mutations, ESR1 alterations, BRCA-associated homologous recombination deficiency, and multigene expression assays.

The evolving WHO Classification of Tumors exemplifies this conceptual shift. Across organ systems, tumor classification has progressively transitioned from purely morphologic taxonomy toward integrated diagnoses combining morphology, immunophenotype, molecular genetics, and clinical information. Central nervous system tumors represent perhaps the most dramatic example, where diffuse gliomas are now defined by IDH mutation status, 1p/19q codeletion, CDKN2A/B deletion, and additional molecular alterations that supersede traditional histologic grading in many circumstances. Nevertheless, microscopic evaluation remains indispensable because molecular findings without appropriate morphologic correlation may lead to erroneous interpretation (3).

Molecular pathology increasingly refines morphologic interpretation. Numerous tumors previously considered morphologically homogeneous are now recognized as collections of biologically distinct molecular entities. Endometrial carcinoma provides a compelling illustration. The TCGA molecular classification has identified four biologically meaningful groups —POLE-ultramutated, mismatch repair-deficient, p53-abnormal, and no specific molecular profile—which exhibit markedly different prognoses despite overlapping morphologic appearances. Contemporary pathology practice therefore requires simultaneous integration of histologic assessment and molecular subclassification to optimize patient management (4).

Another critical contribution of morphology lies in recognizing intratumoral heterogeneity. Spatial variation in differentiation, clonal evolution, treatment-induced alterations, and microenvironmental diversity directly influence molecular profiling results. Pathologists determine which tumor regions should undergo molecular analysis, thereby minimizing sampling bias and maximizing clinical relevance. Without careful morphologic guidance, genomic analyses risk becoming technically accurate but biologically misleading.

Another transformative development in contemporary pathology is the convergence of digital pathology, artificial intelligence (AI), and molecular diagnostics. Whole-slide imaging has expanded the role of morphology beyond conventional microscopic examination, enabling computational analysis of tissue architecture and cellular phenotypes. Deep learning algorithms are increasingly capable of predicting molecular alterations directly from hematoxylin and eosin (H&E)-stained

doi:10.22034/ijp.2026.2088737.3687

slides, including microsatellite instability, tumor mutational burden, IDH mutation, EGFR mutation, BRAF mutation, and homologous recombination deficiency in selected tumor types (5).

Recent advances in spatial biology have further blurred the boundaries between histology and molecular science. Spatial transcriptomics, multiplex immunofluorescence, imaging mass cytometry, and spatial proteomics enable simultaneous visualization of tissue architecture and molecular activity within their native spatial context. Unlike bulk genomic analyses, these technologies preserve cellular localization, allowing investigators to study tumor heterogeneity, immune microenvironment, stromal interactions, and clonal evolution while maintaining direct correlation with histologic structures. Consequently, pathology is evolving from a discipline centered on morphologic observation into one capable of integrating multidimensional spatial information with conventional microscopic interpretation (6).

This paradigm shift also redefines the professional role of the pathologist. The modern pathologist is no longer merely the interpreter of morphologic patterns but increasingly serves as an integrative diagnostic consultant who synthesizes morphologic findings, immunophenotypic characteristics, molecular alterations, radiologic information, and clinical context into a unified diagnostic report. Such integrated interpretation is particularly critical in multidisciplinary oncology, where therapeutic decisions increasingly depend upon the comprehensive evaluation of complex biomarker profiles rather than isolated laboratory results.

The concept of an integrated diagnosis, initially emphasized in neuropathology, has now expanded across virtually all organ systems. Rather than issuing separate morphologic and molecular reports, pathology laboratories are progressively adopting integrated reporting models in which histologic diagnosis, molecular classification, predictive biomarkers, and relevant clinicopathologic correlations are presented as a single coherent diagnostic entity. This approach enhances communication with clinicians, reduces diagnostic ambiguity, and facilitates personalized therapeutic decision-making.

Despite these remarkable technological advances, several challenges remain. Comprehensive molecular profiling requires substantial financial resources, sophisticated laboratory infrastructure, standardized quality assurance programs, and highly trained personnel. Moreover, the exponential increase in genomic information has generated numerous variants of uncertain significance whose clinical interpretation often depends upon careful morphologic correlation. False-positive molecular findings, tumor contamination, inadequate cellularity, sampling bias, and preanalytical variables continue to pose significant challenges in routine practice. Under these circumstances, the expertise of the surgical pathologist remains indispensable for ensuring both the analytical validity and clinical relevance of molecular testing.

Education represents another important consideration. Future pathology training programs must prepare residents and fellows to become proficient in both morphologic interpretation and molecular medicine. Competency in genomic technologies, bioinformatics, biomarker interpretation, quality management, digital pathology, and artificial intelligence should complement —not replace—the rigorous morphologic training that has historically defined the specialty. The future pathologist will therefore require a unique combination of morphologic expertise, molecular literacy, and computational understanding.

Ultimately, the perceived competition between morphology and molecular pathology represents a false dichotomy. Precision medicine does not diminish the importance of morphology; rather, it elevates its significance by placing histopathologic evaluation at the center of an increasingly complex diagnostic ecosystem. Every molecular result requires morphologic context, just as every morphologic diagnosis benefits from molecular refinement. The future of pathology therefore lies not in choosing between morphology and molecular diagnostics but in seamlessly integrating both disciplines into a unified approach that maximizes diagnostic accuracy, prognostic precision, and therapeutic relevance.

As precision oncology continues to evolve, pathology will remain the discipline that bridges microscopic phenotype with molecular genotype. The most successful pathology laboratories of the future will be those capable of integrating morphology, immunophenotyping, molecular genetics, digital pathology, artificial intelligence, and spatial biology into a single diagnostic workflow. In this new era, morphology is no longer simply the beginning of diagnosis, nor is molecular pathology its endpoint; together, they constitute complementary partners in delivering truly personalized medicine.

Although the promise of precision medicine is universal, its implementation remains heterogeneous across different healthcare systems. In many low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), including those in the Middle East, access to comprehensive molecular diagnostics continues to be constrained by financial limitations, restricted reimbursement policies, uneven laboratory infrastructure, and shortages of specialized expertise. Under these circumstances, morphology assumes an even greater strategic importance. Careful histopathologic evaluation, judicious selection of ancillary studies, and appropriate triage of tissue specimens allow pathologists to maximize the diagnostic yield of limited molecular resources. Rather than indiscriminate application of high-cost technologies, a morphology-driven approach can prioritize patients who are most likely to benefit from targeted molecular testing, thereby improving both diagnostic efficiency and cost-effectiveness. Consequently, the integration of morphology with molecular pathology should be viewed not only as a scientific necessity but also as a practical strategy for delivering equitable precision medicine in resource-constrained environments.

The expanding role of molecular pathology also highlights the importance of national collaboration and capacity building. Establishing standardized biomarker testing algorithms, strengthening external quality assessment programs, developing regional molecular reference laboratories, and fostering multidisciplinary education are essential steps toward harmonizing precision diagnostics. Equally important is the incorporation of molecular pathology, digital pathology, and bioinformatics into residency and fellowship curricula, ensuring that future pathologists possess the competencies required for integrated diagnostics. Countries with developing healthcare systems have a unique opportunity to adopt emerging technologies strategically, combining their well-established expertise in diagnostic morphology with carefully implemented molecular platforms. Such an approach may ultimately provide a

sustainable model for precision oncology that balances scientific innovation with local healthcare realities.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors

Conflict of interest

The authors declared no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Cree IA, White VA, Indave BI, Lokuhetty D. Revising the WHO classification: female genital tract tumours. Histopathology. 2020;76(1):151-156. [DOI:10.1111/his.13977] [PMID:31846528]
2. Lindeman NI, Cagle PT, Aisner DL, Arcila ME, Beasley MB, Bernicker EH, et al. Updated molecular testing guideline for the selection of lung cancer patients for treatment with targeted tyrosine kinase inhibitors: guideline from the College of American Pathologists, the International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer, and the Association for Molecular Pathology. J Thorac Oncol. 2018;13(3):323-358. [DOI:10.1016/j.jtho.2017.12.001] [PMID:29396253]
3. Louis DN, Perry A, Wesseling P, Brat DJ, Cree IA, Figarella-Branger D, et al. The 2021 WHO classification of tumors of the central nervous system: a summary. Neuro Oncol. 2021;23(8):1231-1251. [DOI:10.1093/neuonc/noab106] [PMCID:PMC8328013] [PMID:34185076]
4. León-Castillo A, de Boer SM, Powell ME, Mileshkin LR, Mackay HJ, Leary A, et al. Molecular classification of the PORTEC-3 trial for high-risk endometrial cancer: impact on prognosis and benefit from adjuvant therapy. J Clin Oncol. 2020;38(29):3388-3397. [DOI:10.1200/jco.20.00549] [PMCID:PMC7527156] [PMID:32749941]
5. Bera K, Schalper KA, Rimm DL, Velcheti V, Madabhushi A. Artificial intelligence in digital pathology—new tools for diagnosis and precision oncology. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2019;16(11):703-715. [DOI:10.1038/s41571-019-0252-y] [PMCID:PMC6880861] [PMID:31399699]
6. He S, Bhatt R, Brown C, Brown EA, Buhr DL, Chantranuvatana K, et al. High-plex imaging of RNA and proteins at subcellular resolution in fixed tissue by spatial molecular imaging. Nat Biotechnol. 2022;40(12):1794-1806. [DOI:10.1038/s41587-022-01483-z] [PMID:36203011]