Well-Differentiated Neuroendocrine Tumors with a Morphologically Apparent High-Grade Component: A Pathway Distinct from Poorly Differentiated Neuroendocrine Carcinomas
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Abstract

Purpose: Most well-differentiated neuroendocrine tumors (WD-NET) of the enteropancreatic system are low-intermediate grade (G1, G2). Elevated proliferation demonstrated by either a brisk mitotic rate (>20/10 high power fields) or high Ki-67 index (>20%) defines a group of aggressive neoplasms designated as high-grade (G3) neuroendocrine carcinoma (NEC). High-grade NEC is equated with poorly differentiated NEC (PD-NEC) and is associated with a dismal outcome. Progression of WD-NETs to a high-grade neuroendocrine neoplasm very rarely occurs and their clinicopathologic and molecular features need to be characterized.

Experimental Design: We investigated 31 cases of WD-NETs with evidence of a component of a high-grade neoplasm. The primary sites included pancreas, small bowel, bile duct, and rectum. Histopathology of the cases was retrospectively reviewed and selected IHC and gene mutation analyses performed.

Results: The high-grade component occurred either within the primary tumor (48%) or at metastatic sites (52%). The clinical presentation, radiographic features, biomarkers, and the genotype of these WD-NETs with high-grade component remained akin to those of G3–G2 WD-NETs. The median disease-specific survival (DSS) was 55 months (16–119 months), and 2-year and 5-year DSS was 88% and 49%, respectively—significantly better than that of a comparison group of true PD-NEC (DSS 11 months).

Conclusions: Mixed grades can occur in WD-NETs, which are distinguished from PD-NECs by their unique phenotype, proliferative indices, and the genotype. This phenomenon of mixed grade in WD-NET provides additional evidence to the growing recognition that the current WHO G3 category contains both WD-NETs as well as PD-NECs. Clin Cancer Res; 22(4); 1011–7. ©2015 AACR.
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Results
Clinical presentation of WD-NET with HG component (Table 1)

Thirty-one cases satisfied the criteria for WD-NETs with HG
component. The mean age was 54.5 ± 2.6 years with a female
prevalence of 68%. The primary sites included pancreas, small
bowel, bile duct, and rectum (Table 1). Most patients were
generally well at the time of initial presentation, either
asymptomatic or presenting with unrelated symptoms. Neuroendocrine tumor-related symptoms occurred in 41%, which included carcinoid syndrome and other symptoms characteristic of functional pancreatic NETs (insulinoma, glucagonoma) were evident in pancreatic primaries. Plasma neuroendocrine markers were elevated in 83% patients who had the tests performed. In contrast, plasma carcinoma-related biomarkers were abnormal in only 11% patients tested. Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy (OctreoScan) was performed in 25 patients and 88% demonstrated avidity in the tumors. Fluorodeoxyglucose (18F)-positron emission tomography (FDG-PET) was positive in all 10 patients who had the test performed with an average standardized uptake value (SUV) is 2.9 (2.2–5.9).

Pathologic features of WD-NET with HG component (Table 2)

Resection specimens constituted 25 of 31 cases, and the remaining six were biopsies of metachronous metastases. Regardless of the grade of the tumors, all cases exhibited diffuse positive immunoreactivity for both synaptophysin and chromogranin. The staining intensity and extent did not appear to be reduced in the high-grade regions.

HG component of WD-NET occurred locally in 15 of 31 cases; in the remaining 16 of 31 cases, high-grade regions were found in distant metastatic sites, with liver being the most common location (75%) followed by ovary, bone, and lung. The majority (74%) of the cases presented with HG component at the time of initial diagnosis and the remainder occurred metachronously with a mean time to progression of 50 ± 37 months (10–135 months) following the initial diagnosis (Table 2). It is of note that 68% of tumors at the site of metastasis had both the low/intermediate grade and the high-grade components; six cases with mixed grades at the primary site had high-grade tumor only in metastases; in one case the G1–G2 tumor had exclusively metastasized to the distant location although approximately 40% of the primary tumor was high grade.

The hallmark of WD-NETs with HG component was the presence of a significant component of the tumor with low to intermediate grade in resection specimens. The morphologically distinct high-grade areas had increased mitotic activity and Ki-67 indices (Fig. 1A–D and Table 2). It is of note that WD-NETs with high-grade component were more than just microscopic foci, and in most cases they constituted at least 20% of the entire tumor. Both the mitotic rate and the Ki-67 index were rather heterogeneous in the high-grade areas, although focal homogenous high Ki-67 indices were observed (Fig. 1). Although the G1–G2 component of the tumor maintained the histologic phenotype of a WD-NET, areas of HG component revealed architectural alterations including: (i) confluent growth pattern with reduced tumor stroma and vasculature; (ii) ischemic-type tumor necrosis; (iii) increased nuclear size and atypia, nuclear membrane abnormalities, and chromatin clumping (Fig. 2A–D). In none of the cases did the high-grade components display classic histologic features of small cell carcinoma, although there was some degree of histologic overlap between the high-grade portions in WD-NET with large cell NEC. Nevertheless, the presence of a lower grade counterpart or a clinical history of a lower grade WD-NET confirmed in a previous specimen separated this group of WD-NET with HG component from PD-NEC. Although the evidence of high-grade component could be seen on microscopic scanning by architectural alterations and the presence of tumor necrosis (Figs. 1A and Fig. 2B and C), the grade transition from low to high was better appreciated on Ki-67 IHC stains (Fig. 1B).

When the high-grade features of WD-NETs were seen in small biopsy specimens, the morphologic evidence of grade progression was difficult to assess in the absence of the lower grade component. However, all the patients in this setting had previously established diagnoses of WD-NETs of G1–G2 and subsequently developed metastases in which biopsies revealed increased mitotic activity to the level of G3.

Treatment of WD-NET with HG component

Twenty-one of 31 patients received chemotherapy, including platinum-based regimens as neoadjuvant therapy, adjuvant therapy, or at the time of disease progression (Table 1). Eleven percent received no adjuvant therapy following resection of the primary tumor. Given the diversity of the therapeutic regimens and primary sites of origin, it was difficult to compare the tumor response between different treatment groups. Nevertheless, of all the patients who received chemotherapy, 30% had partial responses, 10% had stable disease or no evidence of recurrence, and 60% had disease progression while on chemotherapy. Of 11 patients who

### Table 1. Clinical features of NET with high-grade transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformed NET</th>
<th>Elevated NE markers</th>
<th>Abnormal carcinoma markers</th>
<th>PET positive</th>
<th>Generally well at the initial presentation</th>
<th>NET-related symptoms</th>
<th>Medical treatment</th>
<th>Surgical Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas = 21</td>
<td>19/23 (83%)</td>
<td>2/19 (11%)</td>
<td>14/21 (67%)</td>
<td>12/29 (41%)</td>
<td>Incidental or nonrelated symptoms</td>
<td>Chemo 21/31 (68%)</td>
<td>Biopsy 6/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bowel = 6</td>
<td>2/19 (11%)</td>
<td>12/29 (41%)</td>
<td>Incidental or nonrelated symptoms</td>
<td>Chemo 21/31 (68%)</td>
<td>Biopsy 6/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile Duct = 2</td>
<td>2/19 (11%)</td>
<td>12/29 (41%)</td>
<td>Incidental or nonrelated symptoms</td>
<td>Chemo 21/31 (68%)</td>
<td>Biopsy 6/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectum = 2</td>
<td>2/19 (11%)</td>
<td>12/29 (41%)</td>
<td>Incidental or nonrelated symptoms</td>
<td>Chemo 21/31 (68%)</td>
<td>Biopsy 6/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Pathologic features of NET with high-grade transformation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformed NET</th>
<th>Average mitosis/10 HPF</th>
<th>Average Ki-67%</th>
<th>Site of transformation</th>
<th>Time of transformation</th>
<th>Metastasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pancreas = 21</td>
<td>Low: 2.9 ± 2.8 (0–10)</td>
<td>Low: 7.3 ± 3.3 (1–20)</td>
<td>Primary = 12</td>
<td>Synchronous 74%</td>
<td>29/31 (94%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bowel = 6</td>
<td>High: 20.4 ± 6.4 (7–40)</td>
<td>High: 50.2 ± 17.5 (25–80)</td>
<td>Local/LN = 3</td>
<td>Metachronous 26%</td>
<td>No Met = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bile Duct = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distant = 16</td>
<td>Time to transform:</td>
<td>Local/LN = 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectum = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 ± 37 months (10–35)</td>
<td>Distant = 26/31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were treated with platinum-based chemotherapy, (i) one had adjuvant therapy after the complete surgical removal of the primary tumor and did recur; (ii) 5 patients had either stable disease or an initial partial response at the primary site and subsequent tumor progression in the liver metastasis; and (iii) the remaining 5 patients had disease progression while on therapy.

Outcome of WD-NET with HG component
Clinical follow-up information was available for all 31 patients (mean follow-up of 35 ± 5 months, range of 16–119 months). The median DSS for the entire cohort of WD-NETs with HG component was 55 months, with 2-year and 5-year DSSs of 89% and 49%, respectively.

Comparison of WD-NET with HG component and PD-NEC of the pancreas
Because the majority cases of NETs with HG component in this series were pancreatic primaries, we compared their clinicopathological features with those of WD-NETs of low/intermediate grade (n = 329) and PD-NECs of the pancreas (n = 35); data related to some cases have been previously published (4, 12). The onset age was similar between the two groups of WD-NETs, 56 ± 1 years in the low/intermediate-grade group and 52 ± 3 years in the group with HG component, respectively (Table 3). In contrast, patients with PD-NECs were one decade older (65 ± 6 years). WD-NETs with HG component were larger than low/intermediate-grade NETs. In the absence of HG component, 34% of pancreatic WD-NETs had distant metastatic disease, whereas 81% of WD-NET with HG component demonstrated either synchronous (82%) or metachronous (18%) distant metastases. The incidence of distant metastasis observed in PD-NEC was 100%.

The median DSS of all stages of pancreatic WD-NET of G1–G2, WD-NET with HG component, and PD-NEC were 162 months, 55 months, and 16 months, respectively (P < 0.001, CI 95%); and the 2-year and 5-year DSSs for the three groups were 97%, 88%, 24%, and 90%, 48%, 24%, respectively (Table 3, Fig. 3). While the presence of high-grade component in WD-NET was associated with an unfavorable clinical outcome, its prognosis was not nearly as dismal as that of a true PD-NEC. However, in stage-matched (stage IV) analysis, pancreatic WD-NET of G1–G2 and with HG component revealed no statistical significance in DSS; and as a group, they demonstrated survival advantage over that of pancreatic PD-NEC (median survival of 61 months vs. 16 months, P < 0.001, CI 95%). Furthermore, Cox proportional hazards model showed similar results in which WD-NET of G1–G2 group and with HG component group of had an HR of 0.17 and 0.16, respectively, relative to the PD-NEC group with a reference of 1 (P < 0.001).

Figure 1.
WD-NET with HG component is characterized (in the direction from upper to lower) by subtle architectural alterations (A) and a markedly increased Ki-67 proliferative index (B). In comparison with the lower grade component (C), areas with HG component within the same tumor reveal increased nuclear to cytoplasmic ratio and brisk mitotic activity (D).

Figure 2.
Compared with the lower grade regions (A), a WD-NET with HG component shows a more solid and confluent growth pattern with loss of stroma and vasculature (B), and tumor necrosis can be present as either geographic (C) or punctuate patterns or as single cell necrosis (D).
High-Grade Progression of Neuroendocrine Tumors

Table 3. Features of pancreatic NET and NEC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumor type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Tumor size</th>
<th>Average mitotic rate</th>
<th>Average Ki-67%</th>
<th>Average PS3 by IHC</th>
<th>TP53 mutation</th>
<th>Rb protein loss by IHC</th>
<th>DAXX/ATRX/MEN1 mutation</th>
<th>Distinct Met</th>
<th>Median survival (months)</th>
<th>2 Year DDS</th>
<th>5 Year DDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WD pancreatic NET (low-intermediate grade), n = 329</td>
<td>56 ± 1</td>
<td>3.6 ± 3</td>
<td>&lt;1/10 HPF (3/50 HPF)</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>0/63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35/63</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformed WD pancreatic NET (mixed grade), n = 21</td>
<td>52 ± 3</td>
<td>5.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>20/10 HPF</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0/4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD NEC of pancreas (high grade), n = 35</td>
<td>65 ± 6</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>42/10 HPF</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5/7*</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>0/28*</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yachida et al. (8).

Assessment of tumor genotype in the pancreatic cases revealed that DAXX/ATRX/MEN1 mutations were detected in three of four pancreatic WD-NETs in the HG component as well as its lower grade counterpart, and this frequency was comparable with the counterpart low/intermediate grade WD-NETs (57%; Table 3). IHC studies reveal loss of DAXX/ATRX protein expression in cases with corresponding gene mutation (data not shown). In contrast, RB1 gene mutation and loss of Rb protein expression by IHC were not detected in WD-NETs of any grade; but Rb protein loss was found in 59% of PD-NECs (Table 3). Although mutational analysis of TP53 was not performed in this study, p53 immuno-reactivity, as a surrogate measure of p53 mutation, was negative in WD-NETs of low/intermediate grades, as well as in those with HG component; in contrast, it was positive in 56% of PD-NECs (Table 3).

**Discussion**

We have documented that there exists uncommon WD-NETs that can exhibit low/intermediate-grade neoplasm and a higher grade phenotype, breaching the threshold for the WHO classification of a high-grade (G3) NEC, but not possessing the clinical, pathologic, and genotypical features of a true PD-NEC.

WD-NET and PD-NEC represent distinct groups of neoplasms from their clinical presentations to their pathologic characteristics. Although they exhibit a neuroendocrine phenotype, PD-NECs in the enteropancreatic system are commonly (up to 50%) associated with a conventional carcinoma (10, 11); these combinations are extremely rare in WD-NETs. This phenomenon suggests that PD-NECs represent a neoplastic transformation from conventional carcinoma counterparts or their precursor lesions. Furthermore, recent genomic investigation has established that DAXX/ATRX and MEN1 gene mutations are present in 43% and 44% of pancreatic WD-NETs (15), respectively, but they are not identified in pancreatic PD-NECs (8). In contrast, RB1 and other commonly mutated genes in conventional adenocarcinomas are frequently seen in PD-NECs but not in WD-NETs (8).

The data from this study support these findings and further suggest that PD-NEC represents a neoplastic entity that is genetically more closely related to a conventional carcinoma than to a WD-NET. Therefore, from histogenetic point of view, it appears that WD-NETs have a neuroendocrine/endocrine cell lineage (16, 17); in contrast, PD-NECs are likely of either squamous or glandular cell origin. Thus, in most cases, PD-NEC does not represent genetic progression of a low or intermediate-grade WD-NET.

The appearance of morphologically recognizable high-grade components in WD-NETs can be explained in several ways. Commonly, higher grade regions in epithelial neoplasms are regarded to reflect neoplastic progression, implying that, over time, additional molecular and genetic events have occurred in the higher grade region. An alternative explanation is that regional variations in morphology reflect epigenetic variations or multiclonality. These explanations can be explored by the ongoing genomic analysis of the regions of different tumor grades within WD-NETs.

Clinically, WD-NET and PD-NEC are also distinct based on their presenting symptoms, serum biomarkers, radiographic characteristics, and prognosis (18, 19). Most WD-NETs (>85%) are evident on somatostatin receptor scintigraphy imaging (Octreoscan; refs. 20–22). In contrast, given their low proliferative activity, WD-NETs of low/intermediate grade are usually negative on FDG-PET imaging.
PET scans (23). Patients with PD-NEC may present with neoplastic syndromes secondary to ectopic hormone production, such as ACTH, but they uncommonly exhibit carcinoid syndrome or conditions-associated functional hormone hypersecretion; they may have elevated serum carcinoma-associated markers but uncommonly have measurable chromogranin-A. PD-NECs are detectable on FDG-PET scans with a high SUV and are uncommonly avid on Octreoscan. Patients with PD-NEC require cytotoxic chemotherapy, usually with platinum-based regimens, and they are likely to have at least a transient response, particularly those with small cell carcinomas (24).

One particular issue with the current WHO classification is the so-called high-grade NEC category, designated as G3. It has been well recognized that grade heterogeneity exists within WD-NETs, particularly pancreatic primaries, in which the proliferative rate (usually the Ki-67 index) crosses the threshold of high grade (25). Our currently reported cases of WD-NECs with HG component also fit into the category of high-grade WD-NETs. Even when the high-grade regions may resemble large cell neuroendocrine carcinomas, the association with a low-grade component and the genetic features we describe clearly relate these neoplasms to the WD-NET group, rather than the PD-NEC category. Thus, it must be acknowledged that classification of a high-grade neuroendocrine neoplasm based on proliferative activity alone may fail to reveal the underlying pathologic basis of different neoplastic entities.

Without consideration of other relevant clinical and pathological features, a tumor with either a mitotic rate of ≥20/10 HPF or a Ki-67 index of >20% could be classified a high-grade neuroendocrine neoplasm, which may be clinically assumed to be synonymous with a PD-NEC, and the patient may be subjected to platinum-based chemotherapy. It is thus not unexpected that G3 neuroendocrine neoplasms exhibit diverse clinical behavior and mixed responses to chemotherapy regimens (9). In fact, results from a number of investigations including data in this study suggest that patients with WD-NECs, even with HG component, are unlikely to have long-term benefit from platinum-based chemotherapy (9, 24).

It has been well recognized that grade heterogeneity exists within WD-NETs (14, 26, 27). There is also clinical evidence supporting the concept of grade progression in WD-NETs. Some WD-NETs can achieve a proliferative rate in the G3 range comparable to the counterpart, the component of the WD-NET with HG component and clinical signiﬁcance when dealing with biopsies in which the comprehensive features of the tumor cannot be appreciated. Genotyping or immunoprofile sequencing of gene mutations or altered protein expression (e.g., DAXX/ATRX, MEN1, TP53, KRAS, RB1) would not be helpful. With the evolving molecular and genetic/epigenetic information, additional genomic investigation of WD-NET with HG component and PD-NEC has already been initiated. We anticipate the establishment of the “gold standard” to separate the pathologic distinct entities of well-differentiated and poorly differentiated neoplasms particularly those which are difﬁcult to assess on the morphologic basis alone. Furthermore, as delineated in this study, the combined systematic evaluation of clinical history, laboratory data, radiology, and pathologic assessment can facilitate the correct diagnosis of these two pathologically and therapeutically distinct diseases.

It is important to emphasize that tumor grading is only one component of disease assessment in neuroendocrine malignancies, and clinical management of the disease requires multidisciplinary input. Grading of WD-NETs is necessary for the projection of clinical outcome, although there is currently no indication for a specific chemotherapy regimen based on tumor grade alone within group of WD-NECs. In contrast, PD-NEC has clear differences in outcome and therapeutic approach that justify its separation from the well-differentiated group. The recognition that WD-NECs can achieve a proliferative rate in the G3 range complicates the therapeutic stratification of neuroendocrine neoplasms and suggests that modiﬁcation of the WHO grading scheme would be necessary.
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