ISSN 1007-9327 (print)
ISSN 2219-2840 (online)

World Journal of *Gastroenterology*

World J Gastroenterol 2024 April 7; 30(13): 1780-1933

Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

World Journal of Gastroenterology

Contents

Weekly Volume 30 Number 13 April 7, 2024

EDITORIAL

REVIEW

MINIREVIEWS

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Retrospective Cohort Study

Retrospective Study

Contents

NAME OF JOURNAL
World Journal of Gastroenterology

ISSN
ISSN 1007-9327 (print) ISSN 2219-2840 (online)

LAUNCH DATE
October 1, 1995

FREQUENCY
Weekly

EDITORS-IN-CHIEF
Andrzej S Tarnawski

EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATE EDITORS-IN-CHIEF
Xian-Jun Yu (Pancreatic Oncology), Jian-Gao Fan (Chronic Liver Disease), Hou-Bao Liu (Biliary Tract Disease)

EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS
http://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/editorialboard.htm

PUBLICATION DATE
April 7, 2024

PUBLISHING PARTNER
Shanghai Pancreatic Cancer Institute and Pancreatic Cancer Institute, Fudan University
Biliary Tract Disease Institute, Fudan University

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204

GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287

GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240

PUBLICATION ETHICS
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288

PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208

POLICY OF CO-AUTHORS
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/310

ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242

STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS
https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239

ONLINE SUBMISSION
https://www.f6publishing.com

PUBLISHING PARTNER's OFFICIAL WEBSITE
https://www.shca.org.cn
https://www.zs-hospital.sh.cn

World Journal of Gastroenterology

Submit a Manuscript: https://www.f6publishing.com

World J Gastroenterol 2024 April 7; 30(13): 1926-1933

DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v30.i13.1926

ISSN 1007-9327 (print) ISSN 2219-2840 (online)

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumors: The importance of preoperative diagnosis

Shuai Yan, Jia-Jie Lu, Lin Chen, Wei-Hua Cai, Jin-Zhu Wu

Specialty type: Gastroenterology and hepatology

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

Peer-review report's scientific quality classification

Grade A (Excellent): 0
Grade B (Very good): 0
Grade C (Good): C
Grade D (Fair): 0
Grade E (Poor): 0

P-Reviewer: Uhlmann D, Germany

Received: January 22, 2024
Peer-review started: January 22, 2024
First decision: January 31, 2024
Revised: March 17, 2024
Accepted: March 19, 2024
Article in press: March 19, 2024
Published online: April 7, 2024

Shuai Yan, Jia-Jie Lu, Wei-Hua Cai, Jin-Zhu Wu, Department of Medical School, Nantong University, Nantong 226300, Jiangsu Province, China

Shuai Yan, Jia-Jie Lu, Wei-Hua Cai, Jin-Zhu Wu, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Affiliated Nantong Hospital 3 of Nantong University, Nantong 226006, Jiangsu Province, China

Lin Chen, Nantong Institute of Liver Disease, Affiliated Nantong Hospital 3 of Nantong University, Nantong 226006, Jiangsu Province, China

Corresponding author: Jin-Zhu Wu, MD, Chief, Chief Doctor, Professor, Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Affiliated Nantong Hospital 3 of Nantong University, Nantong University, No. 19 Qixiu Road, Chongchuan District, Nantong 226300, Jiangsu Province, China. wjz1258@163.com

Abstract

Accurate preoperative diagnosis is highly important for the treatment of perivascular epithelioid cell tumors (PEComas) because PEComas are mainly benign tumors and may not require surgical intervention. By analyzing the causes, properties and clinical manifestations of PEComas, we summarize the challenges and solutions in the diagnosis of PEComas.

Key Words: Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumors; Liver; Preoperative diagnosis; Angiomyolipomas; Mesenchymal tissue-derived tumors

Core Tip: Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumors (PEComas) are mesenchymal tumors composed of histologically and immunohistochemically unique perivascular epithelioid cells. They have nonspecific clinical manifestations, inconspicuous and variable imaging features and complex pathological phenotypes, which make preoperative diagnosis very difficult. By enumerating the practical problems faced by clinicians in the diagnosis and treatment of PEComa patients, we analyzed the methods and ideas used to improve the accuracy of preoperative diagnosis of PEComas and provided new insights into the choice of conservative treatment and surgical treatment.

Citation: Yan S, Lu JJ, Chen L, Cai WH, Wu JZ. Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumors: The importance of preoperative diagnosis. *World J Gastroenterol* 2024; 30(13): 1926-1933
URL: https://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/full/v30/i13/1926.htm
DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v30.i13.1926

TO THE EDITOR

We read the recently published papers of Kou *et al*[1] and express our satisfaction and congratulations on their excellent work. This is a well-written case report. By introducing three rare cases of hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumors (PEComas), they further noted the practical challenges faced by clinicians in the face of hepatic PEComas (HPEComas). We fully understand Kou *et al*'s concerns about the preoperative misdiagnosis of HPEComas[1]. Although the accuracy of a single examination may be insufficient to meet diagnostic requirements, combined examination of multiple imaging and immunohistochemical markers may be an effective method for improving accuracy. Accurate preoperative diagnosis is highly important for the treatment of HPEComas because PEComas are mainly benign tumors and may not require surgical intervention. Blind surgery without adequate diagnosis may introduce unnecessary treatment risks to patients.

In 2002, the World Health Organization (WHO) formally defined "PEComas" as mesenchymal tumors composed of histologically and immunohistochemically unique perivascular epithelioid cells (PECs), and PEComas include many different clinicopathological entities. Among them are angiomyolipoma, lymphangioma, lymphangioleiomyomatosis, clear cell tumor sugar and tumor types not otherwise specified[2]. Although PEComas and angiomyolipomas (AMLs) are theoretically subordinate, many clinical experts believe that the two are actually different manifestations of the same disease[3]. Therefore, in the following, we will discuss AMLs and PEComas as unified concepts and no longer make a special distinction.

DEFINITION AND TUMOR PROPERTIES

It is currently clear that PEComas are mesenchymal tissue-derived tumors that are usually composed of blood vessels, smooth muscle and adipocytes[4]. However, the proportions of these tissue components tissue components differ among patients[5]. These patients often complain of abdominal discomfort but do not present accompanying abnormal serological test results[6-8]. At present, the pathogenesis of this tumor has not been elucidated[5,6]. Although more than 50% of renal AMLs are associated with tuberous sclerosis (TSC), it is estimated that only 5%-15% of patients with solitary liver tumors have such a link[4]. The vast majority of PEComas are benign, and malignant forms are extremely rare[9]. In view of the relatively few reports on malignant PEComas, a clear malignant standard has not yet been established[9]. However, even if PEComas are identified as benign, their boundary with malignant tumors is not very clear. First, cytological atypia, a characteristic of malignant tumors, is present in benign liver PEComas[10], while the consistent characteristic of malignant liver PEComas is considered to be coagulative necrosis[9]. Therefore, only when the tumor has necrosis, a large mass (> 10 cm), CD117 negativity, invasive behavior or other clinical evidence may it be considered a malignant liver PEComa[10]. Second, it has been reported that benign PEComas may even undergo malignant transformation during development, eventually displaying sarcomatoid or cancer-like characteristics[11]. Moreover, some patients have also been found to have advanced metastasis many years after the diagnosis of primary benign tumors[11]. Furthermore, in a recently proposed classification system, Folpe *et al*[12] divided PEComas into benign, uncertain malignant potential (UMP) and malignant tumor categories. We think that this classification may be appropriate because it identifies a variety of tumor behaviors shown during the development of PEComas, clearly specifying UMP and recognizing that malignant tumors may occur given malignant behaviors or features. When there are multiple malignant changes, the tumor can be defined as malignant. Finally, regarding the factors that lead to the malignant transformation of PEComas, several hypotheses have been proposed. It has been reported that malignant behavior occurs mainly in epithelioid PEComas and can be observed in the early stage of tumorigenesis[13]. The diagnosis of epithelioid PEComa in a patient by clinical examination indicates that there is a greater possibility of malignant transformation, and a treatment strategy for malignant tumors should be provided.

PREOPERATIVE DIAGNOSIS

As discussed by Kou *et al*[1], PEComas have a very high preoperative misdiagnosis rate. According to Yang *et al*[14], Zeng *et al*[15] and Jung *et al*[16], only 18%-26% of patients with histopathologically confirmed PEComas were correctly diagnosed before surgery. This phenomenon may be due to many factors.

Imaging examination

In terms of preoperative imaging data, according to two case reports covering 92 patients[17] and 94 patients[18], the accuracy of ultrasound was 0%-33%, that of computed tomography (CT) was 15.7%-18.2%, and that of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) was 4.3%-22.7%. This may be due to the variability of the proportion and distribution of different tissue components on the image, hindering the diagnosis[8]. For example, the most prominent imaging features

of PEComas are mature adipose tissue and central thick-walled blood vessels[4]. This makes PEComas that are characterized by adipose tissue easy to diagnose. However, PEComas are variable and can also manifest as tumors containing low-fat tissue or nonfat tissue[4]. Moreover, the presence of fats has been found to be unreliable because some hydrocarbons contain fat, and these fats may also mimic PEComas during presentation[7]. This will negatively affect imaging experts and easily lead to incorrect diagnoses. To solve this problem, many clinical experts have adopted various approaches. For example, Ding *et al*[19], through the combined examination of ultrasound, CT, MRI and angiography in 79 patients, achieved a diagnostic accuracy of 52%. Wang *et al*[20] used complementary B-ultrasound and contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) to distinguish PEComas from other benign liver tumors. This may suggest that the combined examination of multiple images can improve the diagnostic rate. In a recent report, positron emission tomography (PET)/CT appeared to be an effective tool for diagnosing PEComas. The authors reported that PEComas exhibited strong 68Ga-FAPI uptake and slight 18F-FDG activity. This means that 68Ga-FAPI PET/CT has the potential to become a diagnostic tool for PEComas[21].

Laboratory examination

Preoperative laboratory tests may only meet the requirements for excluding certain diseases. For example, in the three patients reported by Kou *et al*[1], except for the increase in CA-125 in Patient 3 with an ovarian tumor, the patients did not have abnormal serum tumor marker levels, which was consistent with previous findings that PEComas were not accompanied by abnormal serological results[7,8]. This approach may help clinicians rule out the diagnosis of some common tumors or simply make them doubt the proposed diagnosis.

Liver biopsy

However, in a recent multicenter study, even histological analysis of preoperative liver biopsy data yielded a misdiagnosis rate of approximately 15%[22]. However, liver biopsy is still the best way to determine the diagnosis of such liver lesions before surgery. The presence of adipose tissue is helpful for distinguishing this disease from other malignant entities. However, due to the variability of the lesion and the small amount of tissue obtained by puncture, the fat area may be sampled or not, making diagnosis from puncture biopsies challenging[3]. However, compared with that of conventional imaging, the diagnostic accuracy of biopsy has increased considerably. Notably, almost all the PEComas were strongly positive for Human melanoma Black-45 (HMB-45), S-adenosyl methionine (SAM) and melan-A[23-25]. Ameurtesse *et al*[26] also reported that HMB-45 cells were generally positive; melan-A and SMA were frequently expressed. The negative expression of S100, desmin and vimentin may be specific signs of HPEComas. If preoperative puncture or intraoperative frozen pathological examination can comprehensively account for the difference between the imaging and microscopic examination results of such patients and common tumors and if HMB-45, Melan-A and other rare liver cancer histopathological immunohistochemical indicators are used, the accuracy of preoperative diagnosis may also increase considerably.

PREOPERATIVE DIFFERENTIAL DIAGNOSIS

According to the misdiagnosis results, the main preoperative misdiagnosis of liver PEComas is hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)[27]. The reasons are diverse. The multiple components of PEComas vary among individuals, and the proportion of fat and hemangioma components in the tumor volume varies from less than 10% to more than 90%[28,29]. Variable imaging results can confound the diagnosis and thus increase the probability of misdiagnosis as common HCC[10]. As mentioned above, benign PEComas are characterized by cytological atypia and are easily confused with other malignant tumors. The most common confounding factor is HCC[30]. As a representative malignant PEComa, epithelioid angiomyolipoma (EAML) does not contain or contains only a small amount of eye fat; this feature manifests as arterial enhancement and delayed washout and is also consistent with the general characteristics of HCC. Even if there are many complex disturbance factors, the identification of HCC and PEComas is not straightforward. First, unlike in general, the patient's conventional serum tumor marker, hepatitis marker, and alpha-fetoprotein results are negative. Second, in imaging, compared with HCC, PEComas lack a capsule, have reduced peripheral enhancement of the tumor, and may not exhibit use of the portal vein as a feature of their drainage, which might otherwise facilitate identification[31-33]. In a recent study, gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI was also used to distinguish PEComas from HCC[34]. Kim *et al*[34] reported that 100% of PEComas and 85% of HCCs showed arterial enhancement and delayed washout on gadoxetic acid-enhanced MRI. Compared with HCC, PEComas showed a greater frequency of homogeneous low signals in delayed hepatobiliary phase (HBP) imaging (83% *vs* 41%). These authors believe that this is due to the lack of hepatocytes in PEComas, which results in a more uniform low SI on HBP images, while HCC may contain some poorly developed hepatocytes, resulting in more uneven high signal intensity on HBP images. Therefore, HBP examination *via* GA-enhanced MRI will be a powerful way to differentiate PEComas from HCC. Finally, due to the rarity of PEComas, many pathologists or imaging experts are not familiar with these tumors, leading to the most common HCC often being considered the final result. However, although the clinical and radiological features of these lesions often overlap, careful observation of histological clues can help to eliminate various diseases of the same species to obtain the most accurate diagnosis.

TREATMENT AND COMPLICATIONS

Treatment

As stated above, if a patient has been clearly diagnosed with PEComa before surgery, the treatment is not only as simple as surgical resection. First, the study data showed that the risk of metastasis and death from surgical treatment was estimated to be 0.8% (2/247 for metastasis and death, mortality = 0.8%). Progression occurred in 6/35 (21.4%) patients who received conservative treatment[4].

Conservative treatment: The basis for choosing conservative treatment is as follows. First, PEComas can be not only single tumors but also manifestations of TSC. TSC is a hereditary disease characterized by seizures, tumor development in the the brain, heart, kidney and skin, and a unique set of neurodevelopmental syndromes known as TSC-associated neurological disease (TAND)[35]. PEComas occur in TSC patients due to biallelic inactivation of TSC2 (more common) or TSC1[36]. The first mutation event (HIT) in TSC2 is a germline mutation, which is the cause of an individual TSC. The second 'HIT' event leads to excessive activation of mTORC1 (a mammalian target of rapamycin complex 1) and promotes tumor development[37,38]. The changes caused by these genes have been proven to be related to the etiology of PEComas. In view of the above findings, inhibitors of the mTOR signaling pathway, such as sirolimus or everolimus, are considered likely to play a role in the treatment of PEComas[24,39]. A study by Martignoni *et al*[24] showed that activated mTORC1 has important functions regardless of whether it is associated with PEComas. In an animal TSC model study before the clinical stage study, the mTOR inhibitor sirolimus showed substantial efficacy[27]. In further experimental studies, Wagner *et al*[40] reported the positive efficacy of the oral mTOR inhibitor sirolimus in the treatment of three patients with malignant PEComas based on changes in tumor imaging data, indicating that this drug may be useful as an immunotherapy for PEComas. Italiano *et al*[41] also reported this. Moreover, in PEComas, which are unresectable in clinical surgery, the use of the mTOR inhibitor sirolimus for neoadjuvant therapy can help the tumor shrink tumors and enable surgical resection[42]. In a recent study, immunohistochemistry and multiple immunofluorescence analyses revealed that HPEComas contain a large number of nontumor cells, mainly lymphocytes and CD68+ macrophages. This phenomenon indicates that HPEComas have a high level of immune cells, which may suggest that the tumor has inert behavior[43]. This provides additional indications for conservative treatment. In summary, conservative treatment and follow-up examination may be effective ways to treat PEComas, especially for patients who are asymptomatic, have small tumors or are considered unsuitable for surgery[6]. Overall, the vast majority of PEComas are benign and tend to grow slowly, while malignant PEComas are extremely rare. Moreover, long-term conservative treatment and follow-up may also have a positive effect or timely effect on the malignant transformation of PEComas at a certain node in the development process. Thus, the survival time of patients should be prolonged. However, additional clinical trials are still needed to confirm these findings.

Surgical treatment: The choice of direct surgical treatment is mainly due to the following considerations. First, in patients undergoing surgical treatment, the risk is estimated to be 0.8% (2/247 metastasis and death, mortality rate = 0.8%)[4]. This approach can completely reach the standard of clinical remission. Second, if the preoperative diagnosis of liver PEComas is confirmed by imaging technology or fine needle aspiration biopsy and if the patient has symptoms or may rupture due to a substantial increase in the size of the lesion under continuous observation, surgical resection should be recommended[9]. Furthermore, because the risk of malignant transformation during the development process is unknown, surgical resection should be selected when there is no definite treatment for advanced PEComas[44]. Moreover, Panahova *et al*[45] reported that performing only perforation biopsy may not be sufficient to assess whether a PEComa is a malignant tumor because only surgical resection specimens can reveal the ratio of invasive growth to mitosis. Finally, liver transplantation is the final treatment for unresectable PEComas with large or numerous liver tumors[17,46]. If the patient's tumor cannot be surgically removed, neoadjuvant conversion therapy seems to be a good strategy for treating PEComas that are positive for PET tracers according to imaging, as this approach can transform the tumor and make the patient eligible for surgical treatment[47].

Based on the above analysis, the treatment strategy proposed by Yang *et al*[14] may be appropriate. The authors advocated imaging observation and conservative treatment for patients who: (1) Had a first diagnosis of PEComa; (2) had a lesion size < 5 cm, (3) were expected to have good compliance with follow-up; and (4) did not have viral hepatitis. Because the cumulative estimated increase in the size of these tumors is only 0.77 cm/year, the first surveillance imaging can be performed 1 year after diagnosis, followed by two years of surveillance. When the imaging diagnosis is uncertain, biopsy can be performed. Resection is recommended if the biopsy provides an uncertain diagnosis or if the patient has malignant risk factors such as epithelioid features or high proliferative activity. Other indications for resection include symptoms or invasive growth[4]. In addition, TSC patients may require longer or more frequent monitoring because TSC appears to be a risk factor for progression[4].

Complications

In terms of complications during tumor development, the most common complication of PEComas is malignant behavior, although there is no consensus on what factors constitute invasive or malignant PEComas[3]. At present, imaging evidence of liver PEComa invasion is rare. To date, only 16 patients with liver, omentum, lung or bone metastases have been reported in the literature[14,15,19,30,48-60]. In addition, spontaneous bleeding may also occur in liver AML patients, but the risk of occurrence seems to be lower in liver AML patients than in renal AML patients, possibly because a single vessel is usually involved in the latter and is associated with aneurysms[61]. Arterial embolization is sometimes necessary when spontaneous bleeding occurs[62]. At present, only 8 cases of hepatic angiomyolipoma (HAML) have been reported to cause spontaneous rupture and hemorrhage. The median size of these tumors was 8.5 cm (range: 2.5 cm to 12.5 cm),

and 3 of them were treated with hepatectomy after arterial embolization; these patients were formally diagnosed with HAML[39]. This may indicate that spontaneous bleeding usually occurs from larger lesions[28].

In conclusion, Kou *et al*'s concern about the preoperative misdiagnosis of liver PEComas is entirely reasonable and necessary[1]. The preoperative diagnosis of HPEComas is very important. Accurate diagnosis can change the treatment and prognosis of patients. Imaging and serological tests are the first step, followed by biopsy. However, we also need to point out that the clinical reality is often more complex than theoretical accounts, as in the three cases reported by Kou *et al*[1]. Although all the patients were subjected to ultrasound, three-phase enhanced tomography, enhanced MRI, and intraoperative frozen pathology, the results still suggested HCC. This suggests that clinicians, imaging experts, and surgical pathologists must be aware of other rare disease entities that may be involved in the diagnosis of liver tumors and should not directly ignore suspicious signs that may point to other diagnoses, such as normal serum tumor markers. Maintaining a skeptical attitude toward the diagnostic results and carefully verifying them are the keys to revealing additional unknown clinical problems. In 2002, WHO formally defined "PEComas" as mesenchymal tumors composed of histologically and immunohistochemically unique PECs, and PEComas include many different clinicopathological entities. Among them are angiomyolipoma, lymphangioma, lymphangioleiomyomatosis, clear cell tumor sugar and tumor types not otherwise specified[2]. Although PEComas and AMLs are theoretically subordinate, many clinical experts believe that the two are actually different manifestations of the same disease[3]. Therefore, in the following, we will discuss AMLs and PEComas as unified concepts and no longer make a special distinction.

Definition and tumor properties: It is currently clear that PEComas are mesenchymal tissue-derived tumors that are usually composed of blood vessels, smooth muscle and adipocytes[4]. However, the proportions of these tissue components tissue components differ among patients[5]. These patients often complain of abdominal discomfort but do not present accompanying abnormal serological test results[6-8]. At present, the pathogenesis of this tumor has not been elucidated[5,6]. Although more than 50% of renal AMLs are associated with TSC, it is estimated that only 5%-15% of patients with solitary liver tumors have such a link[4]. The vast majority of PEComas are benign, and malignant forms are extremely rare[9]. In view of the relatively few reports on malignant PEComas, a clear malignant standard has not yet been established[9]. However, even if PEComas are identified as benign, their boundary with malignant tumors is not very clear. First, cytological atypia, a characteristic of malignant tumors, is present in benign liver PEComas[10], while the consistent characteristic of malignant liver PEComas is considered to be coagulative necrosis[9]. Therefore, only when the tumor has necrosis, a large mass (> 10 cm), CD117 negativity, invasive behavior or other clinical evidence may it be considered a malignant liver PEComa[10]. Second, it has been reported that benign PEComas may even undergo malignant transformation during development, eventually displaying sarcomatoid or cancer-like characteristics[11]. Moreover, some patients have also been found to have advanced metastasis many years after the diagnosis of primary benign tumors[11]. Furthermore, in a recently proposed classification system, Folpe *et al*[12] divided PEComas into benign, UMP and malignant tumor categories. We think that this classification may be appropriate because it identifies a variety of tumor behaviors shown during the development of PEComas, clearly specifying UMP and recognizing that malignant tumors may occur given malignant behaviors or features. When there are multiple malignant changes, the tumor can be defined as malignant. Finally, regarding the factors that lead to the malignant transformation of PEComas, several hypotheses have been proposed. It has been reported that malignant behavior occurs mainly in epithelioid PEComas and can be observed in the early stage of tumorigenesis[13]. The diagnosis of epithelioid PEComa in a patient by clinical examination indicates that there is a greater possibility of malignant transformation, and a treatment strategy for malignant tumors should be provided.

Preoperative diagnosis: As discussed by Kou *et al*[1], PEComas have a very high preoperative misdiagnosis rate. According to Yang *et al*[14], Zeng *et al*[15] and Jung *et al*[16], only 18%-26% of patients with histopathologically confirmed PEComas were correctly diagnosed before surgery. This phenomenon may be due to many factors.

Imaging examination: In terms of preoperative imaging data, according to two case reports covering 92 patients[17] and 94 patients[18], the accuracy of ultrasound was 0%-33%, that of CT was 15.7%-18.2%, and that of MRI was 4.3%-22.7%. This may be due to the variability of the proportion and distribution of different tissue components on the image, hindering the diagnosis[8]. For example, the most prominent imaging features of PEComas are mature adipose tissue and central thick-walled blood vessels[4]. This makes PEComas that are characterized by adipose tissue easy to diagnose. However, PEComas are variable and can also manifest as tumors containing low-fat tissue or nonfat tissue[4]. Moreover, the presence of fats has been found to be unreliable because some hydrocarbons contain fat, and these fats may also mimic PEComas during presentation[7]. This will negatively affect imaging experts and easily lead to incorrect diagnoses. To solve this problem, many clinical experts have adopted various approaches. For example, Ding *et al*[19], through the combined examination of ultrasound, CT, MRI and angiography in 79 patients, achieved a diagnostic accuracy of 52%. Wang *et al*[20] used complementary B-ultrasound and CEUS to distinguish PEComas from other benign liver tumors. This may suggest that the combined examination of multiple images can improve the diagnostic rate. In a recent report, PET/CT appeared to be an effective tool for diagnosing PEComas. The authors reported that PEComas exhibited strong 68Ga-FAPI uptake and slight 18F-FDG activity. This means that 68Ga-FAPI PET/CT has the potential to become a diagnostic tool for PEComas[21].

FOOTNOTES

Author contributions: Yan S and Lu JJ were responsible for the revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content; Wu JZ and

Cai WH reviewed the literature and contributed to drafting the manuscript; Chen L critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content. All the authors provided final approval for the version to be submitted for publication.

Supported by Nantong Municipal Health Commission, No. MSZ2022036.

Conflict-of-interest statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as potential conflicts of interest.

Country/Territory of origin: China

ORCID number: Shuai Yan 0009-0000-3691-2077; Jia-Jie Lu 0009-0007-1789-8004; Lin Chen 0000-0002-1108-4735; Wei-Hua Cai 0009-0002-9550-2558; Jin-Zhu Wu 0000-0002-7295-2030.

S-Editor: Zhang L
L-Editor: A
P-Editor: Guo X

REFERENCES

1 **Kou YQ**, Yang YP, Ye WX, Yuan WN, Du SS, Nie B. Perivascular epithelioid cell tumors of the liver misdiagnosed as hepatocellular carcinoma: Three case reports. *World J Clin Cases* 2023; **11**: 426-433 [PMID: 36686362 DOI: 10.12998/wjcc.v11.i2.426]
2 **Jo VY**, Doyle LA. Refinements in Sarcoma Classification in the Current 2013 World Health Organization Classification of Tumours of Soft Tissue and Bone. *Surg Oncol Clin N Am* 2016; **25**: 621-643 [PMID: 27591490 DOI: 10.1016/j.soc.2016.05.001]
3 **Petrolla AA**, Xin W. Hepatic angiomyolipoma. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2008; **132**: 1679-1682 [PMID: 18834230 DOI: 10.5858/2008-132-1679-HA]
4 **Klompenhouwer AJ**, Verver D, Janki S, Bramer WM, Doukas M, Dwarkasing RS, de Man RA, IJzermans JNM. Management of hepatic angiomyolipoma: A systematic review. *Liver Int* 2017; **37**: 1272-1280 [PMID: 28177188 DOI: 10.1111/liv.13381]
5 **Kamimura K**, Nomoto M, Aoyagi Y. Hepatic angiomyolipoma: diagnostic findings and management. *Int J Hepatol* 2012; **2012**: 410781 [PMID: 23320180 DOI: 10.1155/2012/410781]
6 **Yang X**, Li A, Wu M. Hepatic angiomyolipoma: clinical, imaging and pathological features in 178 cases. *Med Oncol* 2013; **30**: 416 [PMID: 23292871 DOI: 10.1007/s12032-012-0416-4]
7 **Cai PQ**, Wu YP, Xie CM, Zhang WD, Han R, Wu PH. Hepatic angiomyolipoma: CT and MR imaging findings with clinical-pathologic comparison. *Abdom Imaging* 2013; **38**: 482-489 [PMID: 22996326 DOI: 10.1007/s00261-012-9932-0]
8 **Yang L**, Xu Z, Dong R, Fan J, Du Y, Zhang Y, Wang X, Cheng X, Guo J. Is surgery necessary for patients with hepatic angiomyolipoma? Retrospective analysis from eight Chinese cases. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2013; **28**: 1648-1653 [PMID: 23731017 DOI: 10.1111/jgh.12289]
9 **Liu Z**, Qi Y, Wang C, Zhang X, Wang B. Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumor: five case reports and literature review. *Asian J Surg* 2015; **38**: 58-63 [PMID: 25554668 DOI: 10.1016/j.asjsur.2012.06.010]
10 **Nonomura A**, Mizukami Y, Shimizu K, Kadoya M, Matsui O. Angiomyolipoma mimicking true lipoma of the liver: report of two cases. *Pathol Int* 1996; **46**: 221-227 [PMID: 10846574 DOI: 10.1111/j.1440-1827.1996.tb03602.x]
11 **Lazăr DC**, Avram MF, Romoşan I, Văcariu V, Goldiş A, Cornianu M. Malignant hepatic vascular tumors in adults: Characteristics, diagnostic difficulties and current management. *World J Clin Oncol* 2019; **10**: 110-135 [PMID: 30949442 DOI: 10.5306/wjco.v10.i3.110]
12 **Folpe AL**, Mentzel T, Lehr HA, Fisher C, Balzer BL, Weiss SW. Perivascular epithelioid cell neoplasms of soft tissue and gynecologic origin: a clinicopathologic study of 26 cases and review of the literature. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2005; **29**: 1558-1575 [PMID: 16327428 DOI: 10.1097/01.pas.0000173232.22117.37]
13 **Nese N**, Martignoni G, Fletcher CD, Gupta R, Pan CC, Kim H, Ro JY, Hwang IS, Sato K, Bonetti F, Pea M, Amin MB, Hes O, Svec A, Kida M, Vankalakunti M, Berel D, Rogatko A, Gown AM. Pure epithelioid PEComas (so-called epithelioid angiomyolipoma) of the kidney: A clinicopathologic study of 41 cases: detailed assessment of morphology and risk stratification. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2011; **35**: 161-176 [PMID: 21263237 DOI: 10.1097/PAS.0b013e318206f2a9]
14 **Yang CY**, Ho MC, Jeng YM, Hu RH, Wu YM, Lee PH. Management of hepatic angiomyolipoma. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2007; **11**: 452-457 [PMID: 17436129 DOI: 10.1007/s11605-006-0037-3]
15 **Zeng JP**, Dong JH, Zhang WZ, Wang J, Pang XP. Hepatic angiomyolipoma: a clinical experience in diagnosis and treatment. *Dig Dis Sci* 2010; **55**: 3235-3240 [PMID: 20165978 DOI: 10.1007/s10620-010-1144-2]
16 **Jung DH**, Hwang S, Hong SM, Kim KH, Ahn CS, Moon DB, Alshahrani AA, Lee SG. Clinico-pathological correlation of hepatic angiomyolipoma: a series of 23 resection cases. *ANZ J Surg* 2018; **88**: E60-E65 [PMID: 28122404 DOI: 10.1111/ans.13880]
17 **Yang X**, Lei C, Qiu Y, Shen S, Lu C, Yan L, Wang W. Selecting a suitable surgical treatment for hepatic angiomyolipoma: a retrospective analysis of 92 cases. *ANZ J Surg* 2018; **88**: E664-E669 [PMID: 29241297 DOI: 10.1111/ans.14323]
18 **Chang Z**, Zhang JM, Ying JQ, Ge YP. Characteristics and treatment strategy of hepatic angiomyolipoma: a series of 94 patients collected from four institutions. *J Gastrointestin Liver Dis* 2011; **20**: 65-69 [PMID: 21451800 DOI: 10.1007/s11749-010-0230-2]
19 **Ding GH**, Liu Y, Wu MC, Yang GS, Yang JM, Cong WM. Diagnosis and treatment of hepatic angiomyolipoma. *J Surg Oncol* 2011; **103**: 807-812 [PMID: 21283992 DOI: 10.1002/jso.21814]
20 **Wang Z**, Xu HX, Xie XY, Xie XH, Kuang M, Xu ZF, Liu GJ, Chen LD, Lin MX, Lu MD. Imaging features of hepatic angiomyolipomas on

real-time contrast-enhanced ultrasound. *Br J Radiol* 2010; **83**: 411-418 [PMID: 19723766 DOI: 10.1259/bjr/81174247]

21 **Li Z**, Su D, Zhou S, Wang Y, Chen Y. Comparison of 18 F-FDG and 68 Ga-FAPI PET/CT in a Patient With Hepatic Perivascular Epithelioid Cell Neoplasm. *Clin Nucl Med* 2023; **48**: 1124-1126 [PMID: 37801595 DOI: 10.1097/RLU.0000000000004909]

22 **Klompenhouwer AJ**, Dwarkasing RS, Doukas M, Pellegrino S, Vilgrain V, Paradis V, Soubrane O, Beane JD, Geller DA, Nalesnik MA, Tripke V, Lang H, Schmelzle M, Pratschke J, Schöning W, Beal E, Sun S, Pawlik TM, de Man RA, Ijzermans JNM. Hepatic angiomyolipoma: an international multicenter analysis on diagnosis, management and outcome. *HPB (Oxford)* 2020; **22**: 622-629 [PMID: 31619346 DOI: 10.1016/j.hpb.2019.09.004]

23 **Martignoni G**, Pea M, Reghellin D, Gobbo S, Zamboni G, Chilosi M, Bonetti F. Molecular pathology of lymphangioleiomyomatosis and other perivascular epithelioid cell tumors. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2010; **134**: 33-40 [PMID: 20073603 DOI: 10.5858/2008-0542-RAR1.1]

24 **Martignoni G**, Pea M, Reghellin D, Zamboni G, Bonetti F. PEComas: the past, the present and the future. *Virchows Arch* 2008; **452**: 119-132 [PMID: 18080139 DOI: 10.1007/s00428-007-0509-1]

25 **Lan YZ**, Hua XE. Hepatic multiple perivascular epithelioid cell neoplasm: A case report and literature review. *Mol Clin Oncol* 2016; **4**: 619-621 [PMID: 27073677 DOI: 10.3892/mco.2016.735]

26 **Ameurtesse H**, Chbani L, Bennani A, Toughrai I, Beggui N, Kamaoui I, Elfatemi H, Harmouch T, Amarti A. Primary perivascular epithelioid cell tumor of the liver: new case report and literature review. *Diagn Pathol* 2014; **9**: 149 [PMID: 25034830 DOI: 10.1186/1746-1596-9-149]

27 **Wang ZS**, Xu L, Ma L, Song MQ, Wu LQ, Zhou X. Hepatic falciform ligament clear cell myomelanocytic tumor: A case report and a comprehensive review of the literature on perivascular epithelioid cell tumors. *BMC Cancer* 2015; **15**: 1004 [PMID: 26698563 DOI: 10.1186/s12885-015-1992-4]

28 **Seow J**, McGill M, Wang W, Smith P, Goodwin M. Imaging hepatic angiomyolipomas: key features and avoiding errors. *Clin Radiol* 2020; **75**: 88-99 [PMID: 31677881 DOI: 10.1016/j.crad.2019.09.135]

29 **Park YS**, Lee CH, Kim JW, Shin S, Park CM. Differentiation of hepatocellular carcinoma from its various mimickers in liver magnetic resonance imaging: What are the tips when using hepatocyte-specific agents? *World J Gastroenterol* 2016; **22**: 284-299 [PMID: 26755877 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v22.i1.284]

30 **Xu PJ**, Shan Y, Yan FH, Ji Y, Ding Y, Zhou ML. Epithelioid angiomyolipoma of the liver: cross-sectional imaging findings of 10 immunohistochemically-verified cases. *World J Gastroenterol* 2009; **15**: 4576-4581 [PMID: 19777618 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.15.4576]

31 **Jeon TY**, Kim SH, Lim HK, Lee WJ. Assessment of triple-phase CT findings for the differentiation of fat-deficient hepatic angiomyolipoma from hepatocellular carcinoma in non-cirrhotic liver. *Eur J Radiol* 2010; **73**: 601-606 [PMID: 19200676 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2009.01.010]

32 **Lee SJ**, Kim SY, Kim KW, Kim JH, Kim HJ, Lee MG, Yu ES. Hepatic Angiomyolipoma Versus Hepatocellular Carcinoma in the Noncirrhotic Liver on Gadoxetic Acid-Enhanced MRI: A Diagnostic Challenge. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2016; **207**: 562-570 [PMID: 27248975 DOI: 10.2214/AJR.15.15602]

33 **Wang SY**, Kuai XP, Meng XX, Jia NY, Dong H. Comparison of MRI features for the differentiation of hepatic angiomyolipoma from fat-containing hepatocellular carcinoma. *Abdom Imaging* 2014; **39**: 323-333 [PMID: 24389893 DOI: 10.1007/s00261-013-0070-0]

34 **Kim R**, Lee JM, Joo I, Lee DH, Woo S, Han JK, Choi BI. Differentiation of lipid poor angiomyolipoma from hepatocellular carcinoma on gadoxetic acid-enhanced liver MR imaging. *Abdom Imaging* 2015; **40**: 531-541 [PMID: 25231411 DOI: 10.1007/s00261-014-0244-4]

35 **Agaram NP**, Sung YS, Zhang L, Chen CL, Chen HW, Singer S, Dickson MA, Berger MF, Antonescu CR. Dichotomy of Genetic Abnormalities in PEComas With Therapeutic Implications. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2015; **39**: 813-825 [PMID: 25651471 DOI: 10.1097/PAS.0000000000000389]

36 **Henske EP**, Neumann HP, Scheithauer BW, Herbst EW, Short MP, Kwiatkowski DJ. Loss of heterozygosity in the tuberous sclerosis (TSC2) region of chromosome band 16p13 occurs in sporadic as well as TSC-associated renal angiomyolipomas. *Genes Chromosomes Cancer* 1995; **13**: 295-298 [PMID: 7547639 DOI: 10.1002/gcc.2870130411]

37 **Algashaamy K**, Montgomery EA, Garcia-Buitrago M. Liver mesenchymal neoplasms: something old, something new. *Pathology* 2022; **54**: 225-235 [PMID: 34965900 DOI: 10.1016/j.pathol.2021.09.022]

38 **El-Hashemite N**, Zhang H, Henske EP, Kwiatkowski DJ. Mutation in TSC2 and activation of mammalian target of rapamycin signalling pathway in renal angiomyolipoma. *Lancet* 2003; **361**: 1348-1349 [PMID: 12711473 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(03)13044-9]

39 **Calame P**, Tyrode G, Weil Verhoeven D, Félix S, Klompenhouwer AJ, Di Martino V, Delabrousse E, Thévenot T. Clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients with hepatic angiomyolipoma: A literature review. *World J Gastroenterol* 2021; **27**: 2299-2311 [PMID: 34040323 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v27.i19.2299]

40 **Wagner AJ**, Malinowska-Kolodziej I, Morgan JA, Qin W, Fletcher CD, Vena N, Ligon AH, Antonescu CR, Ramaiya NH, Demetri GD, Kwiatkowski DJ, Maki RG. Clinical activity of mTOR inhibition with sirolimus in malignant perivascular epithelioid cell tumors: targeting the pathogenic activation of mTORC1 in tumors. *J Clin Oncol* 2010; **28**: 835-840 [PMID: 20048174 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2009.25.2981]

41 **Italiano A**, Delcambre C, Hostein I, Cazeau AL, Marty M, Avril A, Coindre JM, Bui B. Treatment with the mTOR inhibitor temsirolimus in patients with malignant PEComa. *Ann Oncol* 2010; **21**: 1135-1137 [PMID: 20215136 DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdq044]

42 **Bergamo F**, Maruzzo M, Basso U, Montesco MC, Zagonel V, Gringeri E, Cillo U. Neoadjuvant sirolimus for a large hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumor (PEComa). *World J Surg Oncol* 2014; **12**: 46 [PMID: 24575738 DOI: 10.1186/1477-7819-12-46]

43 **Giannikou K**, Klonowska K, Tsuji J, Wu S, Zhu Z, Probst CK, Kao KZ, Wu CL, Rodig S, Marino-Enriquez A, Zen Y, Schaefer IM, Kwiatkowski DJ. TSC2 inactivation, low mutation burden and high macrophage infiltration characterise hepatic angiomyolipomas. *Histopathology* 2023; **83**: 569-581 [PMID: 37679051 DOI: 10.1111/his.15005]

44 **Matrood S**, Görg C, Safai Zadeh E, Alhyari A. Hepatic perivascular epithelioid cell tumor (PEComa): contrast-enhanced ultrasound (CEUS) characteristics-a case report and literature review. *Clin J Gastroenterol* 2023; **16**: 444-449 [PMID: 36964879 DOI: 10.1007/s12328-023-01779-w]

45 **Panahova S**, Rempp H, Sipos B, Malek NP, Boozari B. [Primary perivascular epitheloid cell tumour (PEComa) of the liver - is a new entity of the liver tumors?]. *Z Gastroenterol* 2015; **53**: 399-408 [PMID: 25965987 DOI: 10.1055/s-0034-1399391]

46 **Black ME**, Hedgire SS, Camposano S, Paul E, Harisinghani M, Thiele EA. Hepatic manifestations of tuberous sclerosis complex: a genotypic and phenotypic analysis. *Clin Genet* 2012; **82**: 552-557 [PMID: 22251200 DOI: 10.1111/j.1399-0004.2012.01845.x]

47 **Kirste S**, Kayser G, Zipfel A, Grosu AL, Brunner T. Unresectable hepatic PEComa: a rare malignancy treated with stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) followed by complete resection. *Radiat Oncol* 2018; **13**: 28 [PMID: 29463266 DOI: 10.1186/s13014-018-0974-5]

48 **Zhou YM**, Li B, Xu F, Wang B, Li DQ, Zhang XF, Liu P, Yang JM. Clinical features of hepatic angiomyolipoma. *Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int* 2008; **7**: 284-287 [PMID: 18522883]

49 **Wang B**, Ye Z, Chen Y, Zhao Q, Huang M, Chen F, Li Y, Jiang T. Hepatic angiomyolipomas: ultrasonic characteristics of 25 patients from a single center. *Ultrasound Med Biol* 2015; **41**: 393-400 [PMID: 25542497 DOI: 10.1016/j.ultrasmedbio.2014.09.014]

50 **O'Malley ME**, Chawla TP, Lavelle LP, Cleary S, Fischer S. Primary perivascular epithelioid cell tumors of the liver: CT/MRI findings and clinical outcomes. *Abdom Radiol (NY)* 2017; **42**: 1705-1712 [PMID: 28246920 DOI: 10.1007/s00261-017-1074-y]

51 **Ahmadi T**, Itai Y, Takahashi M, Onaya H, Kobayashi T, Tanaka YO, Matsuzaki Y, Tanaka N, Okada Y. Angiomyolipoma of the liver: significance of CT and MR dynamic study. *Abdom Imaging* 1998; **23**: 520-526 [PMID: 9841067 DOI: 10.1007/s002619900391]

52 **Croquet V**, Pilette C, Aubé C, Bouju B, Oberti F, Cervi C, Arnaud JP, Rousselet MC, Boyer J, Calès P. Late recurrence of a hepatic angiomyolipoma. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2000; **12**: 579-582 [PMID: 10833105 DOI: 10.1097/00042737-200012050-00018]

53 **Dalle I**, Sciot R, de Vos R, Aerts R, van Damme B, Desmet V, Roskams T. Malignant angiomyolipoma of the liver: a hitherto unreported variant. *Histopathology* 2000; **36**: 443-450 [PMID: 10792486 DOI: 10.1046/j.1365-2559.2000.00891.x]

54 **Flemming P**, Lehmann U, Becker T, Klempnauer J, Kreipe H. Common and epithelioid variants of hepatic angiomyolipoma exhibit clonal growth and share a distinctive immunophenotype. *Hepatology* 2000; **32**: 213-217 [PMID: 10915726 DOI: 10.1053/jhep.2000.9142]

55 **McKinney CA**, Geiger JD, Castle VP, Ruiz RE, Strouse PJ. Aggressive hepatic angiomyolipoma in a child. *Pediatr Hematol Oncol* 2005; **22**: 17-24 [PMID: 15770828 DOI: 10.1080/08880010590896206]

56 **Nguyen TT**, Gorman B, Shields D, Goodman Z. Malignant hepatic angiomyolipoma: report of a case and review of literature. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2008; **32**: 793-798 [PMID: 18391749 DOI: 10.1097/PAS.0b013e3181607349]

57 **Parfitt JR**, Bella AJ, Izawa JI, Wehrli BM. Malignant neoplasm of perivascular epithelioid cells of the liver. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2006; **130**: 1219-1222 [PMID: 16879028 DOI: 10.5858/2006-130-1219-MNOPEC]

58 **Rouquie D**, Eggenspieler P, Algayres JP, Béchade D, Camparo P, Baranger B. [Malignant-like angiomyolipoma of the liver: report of one case and review of the literature]. *Ann Chir* 2006; **131**: 338-341 [PMID: 16386232 DOI: 10.1016/j.anchir.2005.11.014]

59 **Hu WG**, Lai EC, Liu H, Li AJ, Zhou WP, Fu SY, Pan ZY, Huang G, Lei Y, Lau WY, Wu MC. Diagnostic difficulties and treatment strategy of hepatic angiomyolipoma. *Asian J Surg* 2011; **34**: 158-162 [PMID: 22464831 DOI: 10.1016/j.asjsur.2011.11.005]

60 **Deng YF**, Lin Q, Zhang SH, Ling YM, He JK, Chen XF. Malignant angiomyolipoma in the liver: a case report with pathological and molecular analysis. *Pathol Res Pract* 2008; **204**: 911-918 [PMID: 18723294 DOI: 10.1016/j.prp.2008.06.007]

61 **Butte JM**, Do RK, Shia J, Gönen M, D'Angelica MI, Getrajdman GI, Allen PJ, Fong Y, Dematteo RP, Klimstra DS, Jarnagin WR. Liver angiomyolipomas: a clinical, radiologic, and pathologic analysis of 22 patients from a single center. *Surgery* 2011; **150**: 557-567 [PMID: 21621235 DOI: 10.1016/j.surg.2011.03.006]

62 **Kim SH**, Kang TW, Lim K, Joh HS, Kang J, Sinn DH. A case of ruptured hepatic angiomyolipoma in a young male. *Clin Mol Hepatol* 2017; **23**: 179-183 [PMID: 28449573 DOI: 10.3350/cmh.2016.0027]

Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-3991568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
Help Desk: https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk
https://www.wjgnet.com