

World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Oncology*

World J Gastrointest Oncol 2017 August 15; 9(8): 314-340





ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Retrospective Study

- 314 S-1 induced hepatic steatosis in patients with pancreatic cancer: Retrospective analysis

Tsuji K, Doyama H

- 319 Does the discrepancy in histologic differentiation between a forceps biopsy and an endoscopic specimen necessitate additional surgery in early gastric cancer?

Soh JS, Lim H, Kang HS, Kim JH, Kim KC

Observational Study

- 327 Gastric xanthoma is a predictive marker for metachronous and synchronous gastric cancer

Shibukawa N, Ouchi S, Wakamatsu S, Wakahara Y, Kaneko A

Randomized Controlled Trial

- 333 Impact of tumour histological subtype on chemotherapy outcome in advanced oesophageal cancer

Davidson M, Chau I, Cunningham D, Khabra K, Iveson T, Hickish T, Seymour M, Starling N

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*, Otto Schiueh-Tzang Lin, MD, MSc, Doctor, Gastroenterology Section, Mailstop C3-Gas, Virginia Mason Medical Center, Seattle, WA 98101, United States

AIM AND SCOPE

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology (World J Gastrointest Oncol, WJGO), online ISSN 1948-5204, DOI: 10.4251 is a peer-reviewed open access academic journal that aims to guide clinical practice and improve diagnostic and therapeutic skills of clinicians.

WJGO covers topics concerning carcinogenesis, tumorigenesis, metastasis, diagnosis, prevention, prognosis, clinical manifestations, nutritional support, molecular mechanisms, and therapy of benign and malignant tumors of the digestive tract. The current columns of *WJGO* include editorial, frontier, diagnostic advances, therapeutics advances, field of vision, mini-reviews, review, topic highlight, medical ethics, original articles, case report, clinical case conference (Clinicopathological conference), and autobiography. Priority publication will be given to articles concerning diagnosis and treatment of gastrointestinal oncology diseases. The following aspects are covered: Clinical diagnosis, laboratory diagnosis, differential diagnosis, imaging tests, pathological diagnosis, molecular biological diagnosis, immunological diagnosis, genetic diagnosis, functional diagnostics, and physical diagnosis; and comprehensive therapy, drug therapy, surgical therapy, interventional treatment, minimally invasive therapy, and robot-assisted therapy.

We encourage authors to submit their manuscripts to *WJGO*. We will give priority to manuscripts that are supported by major national and international foundations and those that are of great clinical significance.

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology is now indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (also known as SciSearch[®]), PubMed, and PubMed Central.

FLYLEAF

I-IV Editorial Board

EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Responsible Assistant Editor: *Xiang Li*
Responsible Electronic Editor: *Ya-Jing Lu*
Proofing Editor-in-Chief: *Lian-Sheng Ma*

Responsible Science Editor: *Jin-Xin Kong*
Proofing Editorial Office Director: *Jin-Lei Wang*

NAME OF JOURNAL
World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

ISSN
ISSN 1948-5204 (online)

LAUNCH DATE
February 15, 2009

FREQUENCY
Monthly

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF
Hsin-Chen Lee, PhD, Professor, Institute of Pharmacology, School of Medicine, National Yang-Ming University, Taipei 112, Taiwan

Dimitrios H Roukos, MD, PhD, Professor, Personalized Cancer Genomic Medicine, Human Cancer Biobank Center, Ioannina University, Metabatiko Ktiro Panepistimiou Ioanninon, Office 229, Ioannina, TK 45110, Greece

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS
All editorial board members resources online at <http://www.wjgnet.com>

www.wjgnet.com/1948-5204/editorialboard.htm

EDITORIAL OFFICE
Xiu-Xia Song, Director
World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology
Baishideng Publishing Group Inc
7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-2238242
Fax: +1-925-2238243
E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com
Help Desk: <http://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>
<http://www.wjgnet.com>

PUBLISHER
Baishideng Publishing Group Inc
7901 Stoneridge Drive,
Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-2238242
Fax: +1-925-2238243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
Help Desk: <http://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>
<http://www.wjgnet.com>

PUBLICATION DATE
August 15, 2017

COPYRIGHT
© 2017 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. Articles published by this Open-Access journal are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial License, which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non commercial and is otherwise in compliance with the license.

SPECIAL STATEMENT
All articles published in journals owned by the Baishideng Publishing Group (BPG) represent the views and opinions of their authors, and not the views, opinions or policies of the BPG, except where otherwise explicitly indicated.

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS
<http://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

ONLINE SUBMISSION
<http://www.f6publishing.com>

Retrospective Study

Does the discrepancy in histologic differentiation between a forceps biopsy and an endoscopic specimen necessitate additional surgery in early gastric cancer?

Jae Seung Soh, Hyun Lim, Ho Suk Kang, Jong Hyeok Kim, Kab Choong Kim

Jae Seung Soh, Hyun Lim, Ho Suk Kang, Jong Hyeok Kim, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Hallym College of Medicine, Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital, Anyang 14068, South Korea

Kab Choong Kim, Department of Surgery, University of Hallym College of Medicine, Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital, Anyang 14068, South Korea

Author contributions: Soh JS and Kim KC designed the research; Soh JS, Lim H, Kang HS, Kim JH and Kim KC performed the research; Soh JS and Kim KC collected and analyzed data; Soh JS and Lim H performed the literature review; Soh JS wrote the manuscript; Kim KC supervised the review.

Institutional review board statement: The study was reviewed and approved by the local ethics committee at Hallym Sacred Heart Medical Center (IRB 2016-I129).

Informed consent statement: Patients were not required to give informed consent to the study because the analysis used anonymous clinical data that were obtained after each patient agreed to treatment by written consent.

Conflict-of-interest statement: We have no financial relationships to disclose.

Data sharing statement: No additional data are available.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article which was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Manuscript source: Unsolicited manuscript

Correspondence to: Kab Choong Kim, MD, PhD, Department

of Surgery, University of Hallym College of Medicine, Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital, 22 Gwanpyeong-ro 170-gil, Dongan-gu, Anyang 14068, South Korea. stonebody@hallym.or.kr
Telephone: +82-31-3803710
Fax: +82-31-3803772

Received: March 24, 2017

Peer-review started: March 29, 2017

First decision: May 5, 2017

Revised: May 9, 2017

Accepted: June 6, 2017

Article in press: June 7, 2017

Published online: August 15, 2017

Abstract**AIM**

To investigate the clinicopathological variables in early gastric cancer (EGC) patients in relation to differentiation discrepancy.

METHODS

The data of 265 specimens from 240 patients with EGC, who had undergone radical operation at Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital from 2010 to 2015, were retrospectively analyzed. We evaluated clinical, endoscopic, and histopathological data according to histological discrepancy.

RESULTS

Clinically significant discrepancy rate showed the difference in differentiated type (well and moderately differentiated) and undifferentiated type (poorly differentiated and signet ring cell) between endoscopic biopsies and postoperative specimens was 9.4% (25/265). There were no differences in tumor location, size, gross pattern, and number of biopsies. Specimens having histological discrepancy

showed more submucosal invasion (72.0% *vs* 49.6%, $P = 0.033$) and lymph node involvement (24.0% *vs* 7.9%, $P = 0.009$) than specimens having non-discrepancy. The rate of a positive epidermal growth factor receptor status was higher in specimens having discrepancy than in specimens having non-discrepancy (81.0% *vs* 55.4%, $P = 0.035$).

CONCLUSION

The discordance of histologic differentiation is associated with higher submucosal invasion and lymph node metastases in EGC. Patients having histological discrepancy may require additional surgical treatments.

Key words: Early gastric cancer; Histological discrepancy; Differentiation; Clinicopathological factor; Endoscopic treatment; Surgical treatment

© The Author(s) 2017. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core tip: The discordance of differentiation between forceps biopsies and endoscopically resected specimens may necessitate a radical gastrectomy and predict poor outcomes. We analyzed clinicopathological variables of early gastric cancer patients in relation to differentiation discrepancy. Clinically significant discrepancy rate between endoscopic biopsies and postoperative specimens was 9.4%. Specimens having histological discrepancy showed more submucosal invasion and lymph node metastases than specimens having non-discrepancy. Patients who have histological discrepancy detected in endoscopically resected specimens may require additional surgical treatments.

Soh JS, Lim H, Kang HS, Kim JH, Kim KC. Does the discrepancy in histologic differentiation between a forceps biopsy and an endoscopic specimen necessitate additional surgery in early gastric cancer? *World J Gastrointest Oncol* 2017; 9(8): 319-326 Available from: URL: <http://www.wjgnet.com/1948-5204/full/v9/i8/319.htm> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4251/wjgo.v9.i8.319>

INTRODUCTION

Endoscopic resection is widely used to treat early gastric cancer (EGC), accompanying the development of techniques for endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD). The *en-bloc* resection method for a large superficial lesion by using a needle knife requires the application of appropriate indications due to fear of lymph node metastasis and incomplete submucosal dissection. The standard and expanded indications for endoscopic treatment of EGC are determined based on the size, depth of invasion, ulcer, and histology of the lesion^[1,2]. The histopathological type, which is divided into two types; differentiated and undifferentiated, according to the presence or absence of tubular structures, is one of the important factors for choosing ESD, and the histologic diagnosis based on a forceps biopsy is critical.

The discrepancy in histologic differentiation between a forceps biopsy and an endoscopic resection specimen necessitates further treatment such as additional radical gastrectomy in EGC patients. Previous studies showed a 1.5%-8.0% rate of histologic discrepancy between the differentiated and undifferentiated types after endoscopic treatment^[3-7]. The need for additional surgery in cases of histologic discrepancy is based on the likelihood of deep submucosal invasion and lymph node metastasis^[8,9]. However, little is known about whether histologic discrepancy between a pre-treatment forceps biopsy and a surgical specimen is associated with more submucosal invasion and lymph node metastasis in EGC.

The aim of the present study is to investigate the clinicopathological factors for histological discrepancy in differentiation between preoperative endoscopic biopsies and surgical specimens in EGC patients who underwent gastrectomy and lymph node dissection, and to identify the prognostic factors according to the presence or absence of histological discrepancy.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Patients

We initially included the patients who underwent curative radical gastrectomy with extended lymphadenectomy for EGC at the Hallym University Sacred Heart Hospital in Anyang, South Korea, from 2010 to 2015. All patients received an esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD) with forceps biopsy before treatment. We excluded five patients who were found to have advanced gastric cancer with EGC, four patients who had undergone operation for recurrent cancer, and one patient in whom there was lack of data for evaluating the surgical tissues. Finally, 265 EGC specimens from 240 patients were included and retrospectively analyzed. Information on clinical characteristics, including age at operation, sex, underlying disease, pathologic, and outcome data, was collected by reviewing the patient medical records. Underlying diseases included hypertension, diabetes, and cardiovascular, cerebrovascular, and pulmonary diseases. The local ethics committee at Hallym Sacred Heart Medical Center approved the use of clinical data for this study (IRB 2016-I129).

Endoscopic evaluation

The following endoscopic findings were reviewed by two experienced endoscopists: Tumor location, gross pattern, ulceration, erythema, fold change, easy friability, exudate, and number of biopsies. Tumor location was determined based on the Japanese Classification of Gastric Cancer as upper, middle, or lower third of the stomach^[10]. The gross pattern was classified into six types: Elevated (types I and II a), flat (type II b), depressed (types II c and III), mixed elevated (types II a + II b and II a + II c), mixed flat (types II b + I, II b + II a, II b + II c, and II b + III), and mixed depressed (types II c + II b, II c + I, and III

Table 1 Tumor differentiation between preoperative biopsies and postoperative specimens

After surgery		Before surgery		
		Differentiated		Undifferentiated
		WD	MD	PD
Differentiated	WD	56	12	0
	MD	24	45	2
Undifferentiated	PD	4	19	103

PD: Poorly differentiated; MD: Moderately differentiated; WD: Well differentiated.

+ II c), considering the dominant pattern. Ulceration was defined as discontinuity of gastric mucosa with a creator, which is not a superficial erosion. Fold change was defined as a change in the folds including cutting, fusion, and clubbing. Easy friability was defined as bleeding on slight touch or aeration.

Histopathological evaluation

A gastrointestinal pathologist from our hospital evaluated and reviewed the histological slides of tissues obtained by endoscopic forceps biopsy before the operation and those of the entire resected specimens obtained by radical operation. The histologic type was determined according to the World Health Organization (WHO) classification of gastrointestinal tumors^[11]. The differentiation of the tumor was determined according to the proportion of the tumor that exhibited glandular structures between differentiated (well and moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma) and undifferentiated types (poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma, signet ring cell carcinoma, and mucinous adenocarcinoma). After surgery, the following histopathological parameters were evaluated: Tumor size, tumor staging of tumor confined to mucosa (I a) or submucosal invasion (I b), lymph node metastasis, lymphatic invasion, vascular invasion, and Ki-67, p53, human epidermal growth factor 2 (HER2), and epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) status. Based on the hematoxylin and eosin-stained slide review, the available formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tumor tissue blocks from the 243 available specimens were subjected to immunohistochemical (IHC) staining for D2-40, Ki-67, p53, HER2 and EGFR. HER2 positivity was regarded as tumor score of $\geq 2+$ on HER2 IHC staining.

Outcome data

Abdominal computed tomography (CT) and EGD with a biopsy were scheduled at 6 mo after surgery to detect recurrence. After the initial evaluation, abdominal CT was performed every 6 mo and EGD was performed annually for 5 years. Recurrence and death were evaluated during the follow-up period.

Statistical analysis

Clinical and histopathological characteristics were

compared between the discrepancy and non-discrepancy groups. Categorical variables were analyzed with the χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test, and continuous variables were compared by the Student *t*-test. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, United States) was used for all statistical analyses. A *P* value of < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

RESULTS

Comparison of the characteristics of patients and tumors between the discrepancy and non-discrepancy groups

Of the 265 specimens, 137 (51.7%) showed the same pathological results of differentiated type in both the preoperative endoscopic biopsy and the postgastrectomy specimen, and 103 (38.9%) showed undifferentiated results on both histological examinations. Of the remaining 25 specimens (9.4%), 23 showed differentiated histology on preoperative biopsy, but they showed undifferentiated histology after surgery. Conversely, two specimens having poorly differentiated histology on preoperative biopsy exhibited moderately differentiated histology in the postoperative specimen (Table 1). There was excellent agreement between preoperative and postoperative histology (kappa coefficient = 0.809, *P* < 0.001). Twenty-five specimens from 24 patients were included in the discrepancy group, and 240 specimens from 216 patients were included in the non-discrepancy group.

Table 2 shows a comparison of the characteristics of patients and tumors between the discrepancy and non-discrepancy groups. The median ages of the discrepancy group and the non-discrepancy group were 58 years (range, 31-83 years) and 61 years (range, 35-90 years), respectively. Sex, underlying disease, and tumor location were not significantly different between the two groups. Depressed feature was the most common gross pattern in both discrepancy and non-discrepancy groups (40.0% vs 38.8%, respectively, *P* = 0.668). With respect to endoscopic tumor characteristics, fold change was significantly higher in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group (80.0% vs 45.4%, *P* = 0.001). The remaining characteristics including ulcer, erythema, easy friability, and exudate were not different between the two groups. The median number of biopsies in the two groups did not show any difference. The median follow-up duration in the discrepancy group was 41 mo (range, 2-72 mo), and the median follow-up in the non-discrepancy group was 36 mo (range, 2-76 mo) (*P* = 0.629). Recurrence was detected in one patient of the discrepancy group and in two patients of the non-discrepancy group during the follow-up period without statistical significance (*P* = 0.272). All three patients developed recurrence at the anastomosis site and underwent additional surgery with chemotherapy. Death occurred in four patients of the non-discrepancy

Table 2 Clinical characteristics of 240 patients and tumor characteristics in 265 specimens *n* (%)

Variables	Discrepancy	Non-discrepancy	<i>P</i> value
Age (<i>n</i> = 240)			
Median, yr (range)	58 (31-83)	61 (35-90)	0.073
Sex (<i>n</i> = 240)			
Male	17 (70.8)	147 (68.1)	0.781
Female	7 (29.2)	69 (31.9)	
Underlying disease ¹ (<i>n</i> = 240)			
Yes	12 (50.0)	100 (46.3)	0.730
No	12 (50.0)	116 (53.7)	
Location (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Upper	4 (16.0)	17 (7.1)	0.776
Middle	10 (40.0)	130 (54.2)	
Lower	11 (44.0)	93 (38.8)	
Gross pattern (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Elevated	1 (4.0)	22 (9.2)	0.668
Flat	5 (20.0)	42 (17.5)	
Depressed	10 (40.0)	93 (38.8)	
Mixed elevated	2 (8.0)	24 (10.0)	
Mixed flat	4 (16.0)	31 (12.9)	
Mixed depressed	3 (12.0)	28 (11.7)	
Ulcer (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	12 (48.0)	100 (41.7)	0.542
Negative	13 (52.0)	140 (58.3)	
Erythema (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	5 (20.0)	52 (21.7)	0.847
Negative	20 (80.0)	188 (78.3)	
Fold change (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	20 (80.0)	109 (45.4)	0.001
Negative	5 (20.0)	131 (54.9)	
Easy friability (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	9 (36.0)	84 (35.0)	0.921
Negative	16 (64.0)	156 (65.0)	
Exudate (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	5 (20.0)	36 (15.0)	0.511
Negative	20 (80.0)	204 (85.0)	
Number of biopsies (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Median (range)	3 (2-6)	3 (1-10)	0.332
Follow-up period (mo) (<i>n</i> = 240)			
Median (range)	41 (2-72)	36 (2-76)	0.629
Recurrences during follow-up (<i>n</i> = 240)	1 (4.2)	2 (0.9)	0.272
Death during follow-up (<i>n</i> = 240)	0 (0.0)	4 (1.9)	1.000

¹Underlying diseases include hypertension, diabetes, and cardiovascular, cerebrovascular, and pulmonary diseases.

group during the follow-up period, but it was not EGC-related death. Two patients died of lung cancer, one patient died of infection, and the remaining one patient died of cardiomyopathy.

Comparison of histopathological parameters between the discrepancy and non-discrepancy groups

The median size of specimens in the discrepancy group was larger than that of specimens in the non-discrepancy group, but this difference was not statistically significant (3.0 cm vs 2.2 cm, $P = 0.252$). The proportion of submucosal involvement was significantly higher in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group (72.0% vs 49.6%, $P = 0.033$). In addition, the rate of positivity of lymph node metastasis was significantly higher in the discrepancy group (24.0% vs 7.9%, $P = 0.009$). The rate of lymphatic invasion was slightly higher in the discrepancy group without

statistical significance (28.0% vs 17.1%, $P = 0.177$); however, the rate of vascular invasion was similar between the two groups. The rate of positive EGFR status was significantly higher in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group (81.0% vs 55.4%, $P = 0.035$) (Table 3).

Comparison of histopathological parameters between the discrepancy and non-discrepancy groups with undifferentiated postoperative histology

We performed a subgroup analysis in patients with poorly differentiated histology of postoperative specimens. There were 23 specimens in the discrepancy group and 103 specimens in the non-discrepancy group. The median size of specimens, number of biopsies, tumor location, and gross pattern were not different between the two groups. The rates of submucosal involvement and lymph node metastasis were signi-

Table 3 Histopathological characteristics of surgical specimens *n* (%)

Variables	Discrepancy	Non-discrepancy	<i>P</i> value
Tumor size in the specimen (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Median, cm (range)	3.0 (0.8-5.5)	2.2 (0.4-8.5)	0.252
Tumor staging (<i>n</i> = 265)			
I a	7 (28.0)	121 (50.4)	0.033
I b	18 (72.0)	119 (49.6)	
Nodal staging (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	6 (24.0)	19 (7.9)	0.009
Negative	19 (76.0)	221 (92.1)	
Lymphatic invasion (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	7 (28.0)	41 (17.1)	0.177
Negative	18 (72.0)	199 (82.9)	
Vascular invasion (<i>n</i> = 265)			
Positive	2 (8.0)	17 (7.1)	0.697
Negative	23 (92.0)	223 (92.9)	
Ki-67 (<i>n</i> = 243)			
High	20 (95.2)	186 (83.8)	0.215
Low	1 (4.8)	36 (16.2)	
p53 (<i>n</i> = 243)			
Positive	15 (71.4)	138 (62.2)	0.401
Negative	6 (28.6)	84 (37.8)	
HER2 (<i>n</i> = 243)			
Positive (2+ and 3+)	7 (33.3)	41 (18.5)	0.102
Negative (0 and 1+)	14 (66.7)	181 (81.5)	
EGFR (<i>n</i> = 243)			
Positive	17 (81.0)	123 (55.4)	0.035
Negative	4 (19.0)	99 (44.6)	

HER2: Human epidermal growth factor 2; EGFR: Epidermal growth factor receptor.

ificantly higher in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group (73.9% vs 49.5%, $P = 0.034$, and 26.1% vs 8.7%, $P = 0.020$, respectively). The rate of lymphatic invasion was also significantly higher in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group (30.4% vs 11.7%, $P = 0.023$). The rates of positive HER2 status and EGFR status were significantly higher in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group (36.8% vs 15.8%, $P = 0.033$, and 84.2% vs 51.5%, $P = 0.011$) (Table 4).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, discrepancy between an endoscopic forceps biopsy and a postgastrectomy specimen was associated with higher submucosal invasion, lymph node metastases, and positive EGFR status than non-discrepancy in EGC. In the subgroup analysis performed in undifferentiated post-surgical specimens, the discrepancy group showed a higher rate of lymphatic invasion, positive EGFR, and HER2 status, along with a higher proportion of submucosal invasion and lymph node metastases. These results suggested that discordance between an endoscopic biopsy and a surgical specimen could be a predictive factor related to poor outcome in EGC.

Currently, histologic diagnosis of gastric cancer is determined according to the WHO classification. An EGC lesion consisting of both differentiated and undifferentiated carcinomas is classified based on

the quantitatively predominant type. Histological heterogeneity presenting a mixture of differentiated and undifferentiated components is the most important factor for histological discrepancy between a preoperative biopsy and a post-procedural specimen. Cases of a mixed predominantly undifferentiated type showed higher lymph node metastases than cases of a pure undifferentiated type in EGC patients (19.0% vs 6.0%)^[12]. In a study of predominantly differentiated type of EGC, the mixed type was significantly associated with large tumor size, more frequent submucosal invasion, and lymphovascular invasion compared to the pure type^[13]. Therefore, EGC with a mixed histologic type affects the therapeutic outcomes and the consequent clinical course^[14,15]. In our study, mixed type specimens according to the Lauren classification were more frequently found in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group (45.0% vs 11.6%, $P < 0.001$). Although all specimens in the discrepancy group were not of the mixed histology type, the results showing more submucosal invasion and lymph node metastases in histological discordance between a biopsy sample and a resected specimen corresponded with those of the above studies.

The rate of discrepancy between a forceps biopsy and an endoscopically resected specimen in EGC was 2.3%-5.2%^[3,5,6,16]. In a study that evaluated post-surgical specimens of mucosal gastric cancer, the discrepancy rate was 11.9%^[17], which was slightly higher than the rate of 9.4% in our study. These studies

Table 4 Comparison of histopathological characteristics between 23 specimens having discrepancy and 103 specimens having non-discrepancy along with undifferentiated postoperative histology *n* (%)

Variables	Discrepancy	Non-discrepancy	<i>P</i> value
Tumor size in the specimen (<i>n</i> = 126)			
Median, cm (range)	3.0 (0.8-5.5)	2.5 (0.5-8.0)	0.343
Number of biopsies (<i>n</i> = 126)			
Median, No. (range)	3 (2-6)	3 (1-8)	0.374
Location (<i>n</i> = 126)			
Upper	3 (13.0)	10 (9.7)	0.481
Middle	10 (43.5)	62 (60.2)	
Lower	10 (43.5)	31 (30.1)	
Gross pattern (<i>n</i> = 126)			
Elevated	1 (4.3)	1 (1.0)	0.615
Flat	4 (17.4)	20 (19.4)	
Depressed	9 (39.1)	51 (49.5)	
Mixed elevated	2 (8.7)	6 (5.8)	
Mixed flat	4 (17.4)	16 (15.5)	
Mixed depressed	3 (13.0)	9 (8.7)	
Tumor staging (<i>n</i> = 126)			
I a	6 (26.1)	52 (50.5)	0.034
I b	17 (73.9)	51 (49.5)	
Nodal staging (<i>n</i> = 126)			
Positive	6 (26.1)	9 (8.7)	0.020
Negative	17 (73.9)	94 (91.3)	
Lymphatic invasion (<i>n</i> = 126)			
Positive	7 (30.4)	12 (11.7)	0.023
Negative	16 (69.6)	91 (88.3)	
Vascular invasion (<i>n</i> = 126)			
Positive	2 (8.7)	2 (1.9)	0.152
Negative	21 (91.3)	101 (98.1)	
Ki-67 (<i>n</i> =120)			
High	48 (94.7)	77 (76.2)	0.119
Low	1 (5.3)	24 (23.8)	
p53 (<i>n</i> = 120)			
Positive	13 (68.4)	59 (58.4)	0.414
Negative	6 (31.6)	42 (41.6)	
HER2 (<i>n</i> = 120)			
Positive (2+ and 3+)	7 (36.8)	16 (15.8)	0.033
Negative (0 and 1+)	12 (63.2)	85 (84.2)	
EGFR (<i>n</i> = 120)			
Positive	16 (84.2)	52 (51.5)	0.011
Negative	3 (15.8)	49 (48.5)	

HER2: Human epidermal growth factor 2; EGFR: Epidermal growth factor receptor.

reported that the factors associated with histological discrepancy were lesion location in the upper or middle third of the stomach, easy friability, depressed type, and large tumor size. This indicated that the likelihood of mixed histology or misdiagnosis on biopsy could increase according to tumor location, morphology, gross pattern, or size. Our study did not show significant differences in the above factors between the groups with or without discrepancy. However, in the present study, fold change and positive EGFR status were predictable factors related to discordance. The surrounding fold change in the malignant lesion was an associated factor of invasion of the deeper layer than the confined mucosal layer^[5]. The discrepancy group showed more fold change than the non-discrepancy group, resulting in more submucosal invasion. EGFR, a group of transmembrane tyrosine kinase receptors that regulate cellular proliferation, survival migration, and differentiation, was expressed in 30%-50% of

gastric cancer cases and it is known to be correlated with poor prognosis^[18]. More positive EGFR status in the discrepancy group could be a factor related to poor outcomes such as submucosal invasion and lymph node metastasis. Moreover, the rate of HER2 overexpression was higher in the discrepancy group than in the non-discrepancy group in the subgroup analysis performed in specimens having an undifferentiated postoperative histology. HER2 is one of the EGFR family members and it is associated with decreased survival and clinicopathological features of tumor progression in gastric cancer^[19]. Higher rate of positive HER2 and EGFR status might predict a poor prognosis, and therefore, patients showing discrepancy can be treated with monoclonal antibodies directed against these receptors.

The 5-year overall survival rates of EGC patients who underwent endoscopic resection or surgical resection were 93.6%-97.5%^[20,21]. Because of high survival rates and good prognosis of EGC, recurrences were observed

in one patient of the discrepancy group and in two patients of the non-discrepancy group and disease-related deaths did not occur in both groups during the median 36-mo follow-up period.

Our study had several limitations. First, the analysis was retrospective and it was a small sized study conducted in a single center. There may be unrecognized or unmeasured biases and we could not generalize the property of discrepancy between an endoscopic biopsy and a surgical specimen based on these results. Second, HER2 overexpression was regarded as $\geq 2+$ on IHC staining. Other studies defined HER2 overexpression as 3+ on IHC staining and positivity of fluorescence in situ hybridization in 2+ on IHC staining^[22,23].

In conclusion, the discrepancy in histologic differentiation between a forceps biopsy and a postoperative specimen was associated with submucosal invasion and lymph node metastases in EGC patients. The discordance was also associated with a more positive EGFR and HER2 status. Accordingly, patients who have histological discrepancy could be predicted to achieve a poor outcome and patients who have histological discrepancy detected in an endoscopically resected specimen might be considered to require additional surgical treatments.

COMMENTS

Background

Endoscopic resection is widely used for the treatment of early gastric cancer (EGC). The histologic differentiation type is one of important factor for deciding endoscopic procedure and the discordance of differentiation between a forceps biopsy and endoscopically resected specimen can need a radical gastrectomy. In addition, histologic discrepancy may a predictive factor for predicting poor outcomes. Therefore, it is needed to investigate clinicopathological variables of EGC patients in relation to differentiation discrepancy.

Research frontiers

The discordance of histologic differentiation between a forceps biopsy and an endoscopic specimen is associated with higher submucosal invasion and lymph node metastases in EGC patients.

Innovations and breakthroughs

In previous studies, the factors associated with histological discrepancy in EGC were tumor location, morphology, gross pattern, and size. In the present study, histological discrepancy was associated with higher submucosal invasion, lymph node metastases, and positive epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) status. In the subgroup analysis performed in undifferentiated post-surgical specimens, the discrepancy was associated with higher lymphatic invasion, positive EGFR, and human epidermal growth factor 2 (HER2) status, along with higher submucosal invasion and lymph node metastases. These results suggested that discordance of histologic differentiation could be a predictive factor related to poor outcome in EGC.

Applications

The histological discrepancy between a forceps biopsy and an endoscopic specimen could be a predictive factor for a poor outcome. Patients who have histological discrepancy detected in an endoscopically resected specimen might be considered to require additional surgical treatments.

Terminology

EGFR is a group of transmembrane tyrosine kinase receptors that regulate cellular proliferation, survival migration, and differentiation. HER2 is one of

the EGFR family members and it is associated with decreased survival and clinicopathological features of tumor progression in gastric cancer.

Peer-review

The present study showed that discrepancy between an endoscopic forceps biopsy and a postgastrectomy specimen was associated with higher submucosal invasion, lymph node metastasis, and positive EGFR status than non-discrepancy in EGC. The authors concluded that discordance between an endoscopic biopsy and a surgical specimen could be a predictive factor related to poor outcome in EGC. Based on their findings, the authors suggested that patients who have histological discrepancy detected in an endoscopically resected specimen might be considered to require additional surgery.

REFERENCES

- 1 **Ono H**, Kondo H, Gotoda T, Shirao K, Yamaguchi H, Saito D, Hosokawa K, Shimoda T, Yoshida S. Endoscopic mucosal resection for treatment of early gastric cancer. *Gut* 2001; **48**: 225-229 [PMID: 11156645]
- 2 **Gotoda T**, Yanagisawa A, Sasako M, Ono H, Nakanishi Y, Shimoda T, Kato Y. Incidence of lymph node metastasis from early gastric cancer: estimation with a large number of cases at two large centers. *Gastric Cancer* 2000; **3**: 219-225 [PMID: 11984739]
- 3 **Shim CN**, Kim H, Kim DW, Chung HS, Park JC, Lee H, Shin SK, Lee SK, Lee YC. Clinicopathologic factors and outcomes of histologic discrepancy between differentiated and undifferentiated types after endoscopic resection of early gastric cancer. *Surg Endosc* 2014; **28**: 2097-2105 [PMID: 24488356 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-014-3441-x]
- 4 **Takao M**, Kakushima N, Takizawa K, Tanaka M, Yamaguchi Y, Matsubayashi H, Kusafuka K, Ono H. Discrepancies in histologic diagnoses of early gastric cancer between biopsy and endoscopic mucosal resection specimens. *Gastric Cancer* 2012; **15**: 91-96 [PMID: 21814828 DOI: 10.1007/s10120-011-0075-8]
- 5 **Choi JM**, Kim SG, Yang HJ, Lim JH, Choi J, Im JP, Kim JS, Kim WH, Jung HC. Endoscopic predictors for undifferentiated histology in differentiated gastric neoplasms prior to endoscopic resection. *Surg Endosc* 2016; **30**: 89-98 [PMID: 25814072 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-015-4165-2]
- 6 **Min BH**, Kang KJ, Lee JH, Kim ER, Min YW, Rhee PL, Kim JJ, Rhee JC, Kim KM. Endoscopic resection for undifferentiated early gastric cancer: focusing on histologic discrepancies between forceps biopsy-based and endoscopic resection specimen-based diagnosis. *Dig Dis Sci* 2014; **59**: 2536-2543 [PMID: 25107443 DOI: 10.1007/s10620-014-3196-1]
- 7 **Lee CK**, Chung IK, Lee SH, Kim SP, Lee SH, Lee TH, Kim HS, Park SH, Kim SJ, Lee JH, Cho HD, Oh MH. Is endoscopic forceps biopsy enough for a definitive diagnosis of gastric epithelial neoplasia? *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2010; **25**: 1507-1513 [PMID: 20796147 DOI: 10.1111/j.1440-1746.2010.006367.x]
- 8 **Yamao T**, Shirao K, Ono H, Kondo H, Saito D, Yamaguchi H, Sasako M, Sano T, Ochiai A, Yoshida S. Risk factors for lymph node metastasis from intramucosal gastric carcinoma. *Cancer* 1996; **77**: 602-606 [PMID: 8616749 DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1097-0142(19960215)77:4<602::AID-CNCR3>3.0.CO;2-I]
- 9 **Kurihara N**, Kubota T, Otani Y, Ohgami M, Kumai K, Sugiura H, Kitajima M. Lymph node metastasis of early gastric cancer with submucosal invasion. *Br J Surg* 1998; **85**: 835-839 [PMID: 9667719 DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2168.1998.00743.x]
- 10 **Japanese Gastric Cancer Association**. Japanese Classification of Gastric Carcinoma. 2nd English Edition. *Gastric Cancer* 1998; **1**: 10-24 [PMID: 11957040 DOI: 10.1007/s101209800016]
- 11 **Flejou JF**. [WHO Classification of digestive tumors: the fourth edition]. *Ann Pathol* 2011; **31**: S27-31 [PMID: 22054452 DOI: 10.1016/j.anpat.2011.08.001]
- 12 **Takizawa K**, Ono H, Kakushima N, Tanaka M, Hasuie N, Matsubayashi H, Yamaguchi Y, Bando E, Terashima M, Kusafuka K, Nakajima T. Risk of lymph node metastases from intramucosal gastric cancer in relation to histological types: how to manage the mixed histological type for endoscopic submucosal dissection. *Gastric Cancer* 2013; **16**: 531-536 [PMID: 23192620 DOI: 10.1007/s10120-

012-0220-z]

- 13 **Min BH**, Kim KM, Park CK, Lee JH, Rhee PL, Rhee JC, Kim JJ. Outcomes of endoscopic submucosal dissection for differentiated-type early gastric cancer with histological heterogeneity. *Gastric Cancer* 2015; **18**: 618-626 [PMID: 24801199 DOI: 10.1007/s10120-014-0378-7]
- 14 **Hanaoka N**, Tanabe S, Mikami T, Okayasu I, Saigenji K. Mixed-histologic-type submucosal invasive gastric cancer as a risk factor for lymph node metastasis: feasibility of endoscopic submucosal dissection. *Endoscopy* 2009; **41**: 427-432 [PMID: 19418397 DOI: 10.1055/s-0029-1214495]
- 15 **Shim CN**, Chung H, Park JC, Lee H, Shin SK, Lee SK, Lee YC. Early gastric cancer with mixed histology predominantly of differentiated type is a distinct subtype with different therapeutic outcomes of endoscopic resection. *Surg Endosc* 2015; **29**: 1787-1794 [PMID: 25277481 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-014-3861-7]
- 16 **Lee JH**, Kim JH, Rhee K, Huh CW, Lee YC, Yoon SO, Youn YH, Park H, Lee SI. Undifferentiated early gastric cancer diagnosed as differentiated histology based on forceps biopsy. *Pathol Res Pract* 2013; **209**: 314-318 [PMID: 23598070 DOI: 10.1016/j.prp.2013.02.014]
- 17 **Lee IS**, Park YS, Lee JH, Park JY, Kim HS, Kim BS, Yook JH, Oh ST, Kim BS. Pathologic discordance of differentiation between endoscopic biopsy and postoperative specimen in mucosal gastric adenocarcinomas. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013; **20**: 4231-4237 [PMID: 23959053 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-013-3196-y]
- 18 **Atmaca A**, Werner D, Pauligk C, Steinmetz K, Wirtz R, Altmannsberger HM, Jager E, Al-Batran SE. The prognostic impact of epidermal growth factor receptor in patients with metastatic gastric cancer. *BMC Cancer* 2012; **12**: 524 [PMID: 23153332 PMID: DOI: 10.1186/1471-2407-12-524]
- 19 **Jorgensen JT**, Hersom M. HER2 as a Prognostic Marker in Gastric Cancer - A Systematic Analysis of Data from the Literature. *J Cancer* 2012; **3**: 137-144 [PMID: 22481979 DOI: 10.7150/jca.4090]
- 20 **Choi IJ**, Lee JH, Kim YI, Kim CG, Cho SJ, Lee JY, Ryu KW, Nam BH, Kook MC, Kim YW. Long-term outcome comparison of endoscopic resection and surgery in early gastric cancer meeting the absolute indication for endoscopic resection. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2015; **81**: 333-341.e331 [PMID: 25281498 DOI: 10.1016/j.gie.2014.07.047]
- 21 **Kim YI**, Kim YW, Choi IJ, Kim CG, Lee JY, Cho SJ, Eom BW, Yoon HM, Ryu KW, Kook MC. Long-term survival after endoscopic resection versus surgery in early gastric cancers. *Endoscopy* 2015; **47**: 293-301 [PMID: 25625697 DOI: 10.1055/s-0034-1391284]
- 22 **Hoang MP**, Sahin AA, Ordonez NG, Sneige N. HER-2/neu gene amplification compared with HER-2/neu protein overexpression and interobserver reproducibility in invasive breast carcinoma. *Am J Clin Pathol* 2000; **113**: 852-859 [PMID: 10874886 DOI: 10.1309/VACP-VLQA-G9DX-VUDF]
- 23 **Abrahao-Machado LF**, Scapulatempo-Neto C. HER2 testing in gastric cancer: An update. *World J Gastroenterol* 2016; **22**: 4619-4625 [PMID: 27217694 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v22.i19.4619]

P- Reviewer: Guo XZ S- Editor: Qi Y L- Editor: A
E- Editor: Lu YJ





Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
Help Desk: <http://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>
<http://www.wjgnet.com>

