

72754\_Auto\_Edited - check.docx

**Name of Journal:** *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

**Manuscript NO:** 72754

**Manuscript Type:** SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

**Endoscopic techniques for the diagnosis and treatment of gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms: where we are**

endoscopy in gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms

Roberta Elisa Rossi, Alessandra Elvevi, Camilla Gallo, Andrea Palermo, Pietro Invernizzi, Sara Massironi

## Abstract

### BACKGROUND

The correct localization of the primary tumor site and a complete histologic diagnosis represent the milestones for the proper management of gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms (GEP-NENs).

### AIM

As endoscopy plays a key role, the present review is aimed at analyzing current evidence on the role of endoscopy in the diagnosis/treatment of GEP-NENs.

### METHODS

An extensive bibliographical search was performed in PubMed to identify guidelines and primary literature (retrospective and prospective studies, systematic reviews, case series) published in the last 15 years, using both medical subject heading (MeSH) terms and free-language keywords: gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms; endoscopy; ultrasound endoscopy; capsule endoscopy; double-balloon enteroscopy; diagnosis; therapy; staging.

### RESULTS

In the diagnostic setting, ultrasound endoscopy (EUS) represents the diagnostic gold standard for pancreatic NENs (Pan-NENs) and the technique of choice for the loco-regional staging of gastric, duodenal, and rectal NENs. The diagnosis of small bowel (Sb) NENs has been <sup>15</sup>improved with the advent of video capsule endoscopy and double-balloon enteroscopy, which allow for direct visualization of the entire Sb; however, data regarding the efficacy/safety of these techniques in the detection of SbNENs are scanty and often inconclusive. From a therapeutic point of view, endoscopic removal is the treatment of choice for the majority of gastric NENs (type 1/2), <sup>7</sup>for well-differentiated localized non-metastatic duodenal NENs <1 cm, confined to the submucosa layer and for < 10 mm, stage T1-T2, rectal NENs. EUS-guided pancreatic loco-regional ablative

<sup>3</sup> treatments have been proposed in recent studies with promising results in order to control symptoms or reduce tumor burden in selected patients.

## CONCLUSION

Standard axial endoscopy and EUS still play a pivotal role in several GEP-NENs. Advanced resection techniques aimed at increasing the rate of R0 resection should be reserved to high-volume referral centers. The multidisciplinary management remains the gold standard to offer the patient the best therapeutic approach.

**Key Words:** gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms; endoscopy; ultrasound endoscopy; capsule endoscopy; double-balloon enteroscopy; diagnosis; therapy; staging

Rossi RE, Elvevi A, Gallo C, Palermo A, Invernizzi P, Massironi S. Endoscopic techniques for the diagnosis and treatment of gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms: where we are. *World J Gastroenterol* 2022; In press

<sup>2</sup> **Core Tip:** Standard axial endoscopy and endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) play a pivotal role in gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms (GEP-NENs). Upper/Lower gastrointestinal endoscopy is essential for the detection of gastrointestinal NENs. EUS represents the diagnostic gold standard for pancreatic NENs and the technique of choice for the loco-regional staging of gastric, duodenal and rectal NENs. <sup>5</sup> The diagnosis of small bowel NENs has been improved with the advent of capsule endoscopy and double-balloon enteroscopy, however, their use is limited in clinical practice. In selected localized GEP-NENs, endoscopic therapy is appropriate with radical intent. The multidisciplinary management and the referral to high-volume tertiary centers remain fundamental.

## INTRODUCTION

Gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms (GEP-NENs) represent heterogeneous and rare tumors, whose incidence has been progressively improving in the last decades [1]. The prognosis of these neoplasms is widely variable depending on several factors including the site of the primary tumor, the grading as assessed by the specific WHO classification, and the stage, as classified in a specific TNM system (TNM ENETs) [2]. It is therefore clear that the correct localization of the primary tumor site, as well as a complete histologic diagnosis, represent the milestones for the proper management and the prognosis of these tumors [3-5].

In this scenario, despite advances in radiological and metabolic imaging, standard axial endoscopy and endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) still play a pivotal role in several GEP-NENs. Upper gastrointestinal (GI) endoscopy is essential for the detection and characterization of esophageal, gastric, and duodenal NENs. Ileocolonoscopy allows the assessing and diagnosing of rectal, colonic and rarely distal ileal lesions. Small bowel NENs (SbNENs) have proven difficult to diagnose, given their nonspecific presentation and poor accessibility of the distal Sb to common endoscopic techniques. The diagnosis of SbNENs has been largely improved with the advent of video capsule endoscopy (CE) in 2000 and double-balloon enteroscopy (DBE), the most promising device-assisted enteroscopy (DAE) system, in 2001, which allow for direct visualization of the entire Sb [6]. Finally, endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) is the modality of choice for both diagnosing pancreatic NENs (Pan-NENs) and for the loco-regional staging of several NENs, including gastric, duodenal, pancreatic and rectal NENs; of note, in the setting of Pan-NENs, it has demonstrated higher accuracy in tumor detection than other imaging modalities [7,8].

The current review is aimed at analyzing current evidence on the role of endoscopy in the management of GEP-NENs, with a specific focus on CE and DBE for sbNENs and EUS for the diagnosis and staging of Pan-NENs and other NENS. Furthermore, we summarized available evidence on the role of endoscopy in the radical treatment of selected GEP- NENs.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

An extensive bibliographical search was performed in PubMed to identify guidelines and primary literature (retrospective and prospective studies, systematic reviews, case series) published in the last 15 years, using both medical subject heading (MeSH) terms and free-language keywords: gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms; endoscopy; ultrasound endoscopy; capsule endoscopy; double-balloon enteroscopy; diagnosis; therapy; staging. The reference lists from the studies returned by the electronic search were manually searched to identify further relevant reports. The reference lists from all available review articles, primary studies, and proceedings of major meetings were also considered. Articles published as abstracts were included, whereas non-English language papers were excluded.

## **RESULTS**

### **Diagnosis**

#### **Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS)**

Endoscopy ultrasound (EUS) represents the diagnostic gold standard for Pan-NENs and the technique of choice for the loco-regional staging of gastric, duodenal, and rectal NENs.

According to the latest European Neuroendocrine Tumor Society (ENETS) Consensus guidelines, EUS proved to be the most accurate diagnostic technique in Pan-NENs detection, leading to an up-to-94% sensitivity <sup>[9]</sup>; Pan-NENs usually appear rounded and homogeneously hypoechoic at EUS examination (**Figure 1**). EUS sensitivity in detecting Pan-NENs is even higher than non-invasive computed tomography (CT)-scan or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) pancreatic lesion detection rate <sup>[10]</sup>; in fact, EUS proved to consistently increase the overall Pan-NEN detection rate by over 25% in case of negative CT-scan or MRI <sup>[11]</sup>. EUS is also extremely accurate in locating the lesions, even very small ones, within the pancreatic parenchyma <sup>[12]</sup>, and it can describe the distance between the lesion and the main pancreatic duct, which represents an independent predictor of aggressive tumor behavior and of developing pancreatic

4  
fistulas [13]. EUS overall complication rate is about 1-2%, higher for pancreatic cysts rather than for solid masses [14].

Advanced EUS techniques allow to study specific morphological and histological details of the detected lesions that may be helpful in the differential diagnosis of Pan-NENs and in the choice of the corresponding best-suited treatment [7]. Contrast-enhanced harmonic EUS (CH-EUS) allows real-time visualization of parenchymal perfusion and, thus, helps in distinguishing hypo-vascular carcinomas from hyper-vascular less aggressive lesions. It consists of harmonic detectors that register microbubbles produced by contrast agents administrated intravenously; this method allows the identification of micro-vessels even with a very slow blood flow [15]. As demonstrated for non-functioning Pan-NENs, the CH-EUS vascular pattern of neuroendocrine lesions represents an indirect reliable surrogate predictor of their aggressiveness and, thus, of their prognosis; a statistically significant positive correlation was, in fact, proven between the inhomogeneous sonographic pattern of the lesions and their Ki67 proliferative index, which in turn represents the most reliable independent predictor of malignancy [16]. Sonographic heterogeneity at CH-EUS, and especially hypo-enhancement in the early arterial phase, corresponds to lower intratumoral microvascular density and to a greater degree of fibrosis on pathological specimens, which were demonstrated to be typical features of tumor aggressiveness on par with tumor grading [17]; according to a Japanese retrospective study [18], in fact, hypo-enhancement at CH-EUS proved to be a reliable predictor of tumor aggressiveness and poor prognosis also for G1 and G2 Pan-NENs, with sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value (NPV) and accuracy of 94.7%, 100%, 100%, 96.6%, and 97.9%, respectively.

16  
EUS-Fine Needle Aspiration (EUS-FNA) is another diagnostic advanced EUS technique, which represents the gold standard least invasive option to obtain the histological identification of a suspected pancreatic neoplasm or peri-pancreatic lymph node, with a sensitivity ranging between 80% and 90% and a specificity of nearly 96% [19] (Figure 2); it is also the operative technique of choice to aspirate the contents of cystic lesions for

serological analysis and for the tumor marker dosage, which might help in the differential diagnosis of pancreatic cystic lesions. It can be performed with different diameter needles, mainly depending on the type and site of the lesion, its consistency, and echogenicity [20]. There are several techniques described, which make different use of the suction: some of them suggest not to apply any suction due to the high risk of contaminating the specimen with blood (especially in case of highly vascularized lesions) [21], some others apply wet or dry negative-pressure suction to guarantee sufficient material for histological diagnosis [22], and others again proposed a slow-pull fanning technique to ensure at the same time a greater collection of pathological cells and a low blood contamination risk [23,24]; to date, even if still no consensus has been reached on the optimal strategy [25], overall FNA-EUS sampling adequacy rates up to 94% [26,27] and its diagnostic sensitivity proved to be significantly higher than CT and/or MRI specifically in case of solid, cystic and combined solid-cystic Pan-NENs (84% vs. 42%, 70% vs. 10% and 81% vs. 36% respectively) [28]; its overall diagnostic superiority has been confirmed also when compared to image-guided FNA, especially in case of smaller lesions [29,30].

The Ki-67 index histological expression of the suspected pancreatic lesion plays a fundamental role in defining the aggressiveness of the tumor, together with its radiological aspect, its localization and distance from the pancreatic duct, and its CH-EUS vascular behavior. Therefore, the Ki-67 index also drives the choice of the best-suited therapeutic approach. Data about the concordance rate between EUS-FNA and surgical specimens in terms of G1, G2, or G3 Pan-NEN and G3 Pan-neuroendocrine carcinoma (NEC) differentiation based on the Ki-67 index are discordant, ranging from a 78% of accordance rate (k-statistic: 0.65, 95%CI: 0.3, 0.9) [13], to a relatively significant discrepancy, especially for G2 Lesions [31]. This discordance may be first attributed to the fact that endoscopic sampling of large lesions >20mm, often included in the studies available to date, may not be representative of the area with the highest concentration of malignant cells and, thus, that the measured Ki-67 index might be not indicative of the



most proliferative area of the neoplasm. There is a strong necessity for further studies that sub-classify more accurately the included lesions depending on their size.

New EUS needle acquisition techniques (i.e. 19/22/25- G ProCore™ needle, Cook Endoscopy, Winston-Salem, NC, USA; 19-G fine-needle biopsy, Cook Endoscopy Inc., Limerick, Ireland; Acquire® Endoscopic Ultrasound Fine Needle Biopsy (FNB) Device 22/25-G, Boston Scientific, Natick, MA, USA; SharkCore™, Covidien, Dublin, Leinster, Ireland) have been proposed to overcome the rare cases of EUS-FNA inadequate tissue sampling; these devices are designed to maximize tissue capture and minimize bleeding and tissue fragmentation and some of them are thought to provide both cytological and histological sampling [32]. However, further studies are needed to validate these approaches in the specific setting of NENs.

EUS real-time elastography (EUS-RTE) allows not only a qualitative but also a quantitative assessment of the elasticity of the suspected pancreatic lesion compared to the one of the normal surrounding pancreatic parenchyma. Based on the evidence of higher tissue stiffness in the case of malignant lesions when compared to the normal parenchyma [33], some authors have proposed different quantitative elastography cut-offs to stratify the risk of malignancy. Havre *et al* [34] observed a EUS-RTE sensitivity of 67% and specificity of 71% in detecting pancreatic malignant lesions with a strain ratio cut-off of 4.4; Iglesias-García *et al* [35] showed a EUS-RTE sensitivity of 100% and specificity of 88% in differentiating specifically pancreatic adenocarcinomas from Pan-NENs with a 26.6 strain ratio cut-off value. Even if, according to the European Federation of Societies for Ultrasound in Medicine and Biology (EFSUMB) guidelines, EUS-RTE cannot yet replace the histo-cytopathologic diagnosis of carcinoma [36], this technique may facilitate the differentiation from benign to malignant pancreatic lesions. Another advanced technique in EUS that can drive in the diagnostic orientation is represented by the needle-based confocal laser endomicroscopy (nCLE), which allows the real-time direct in-vivo visualization of the histological aspect of the GI mucosa overlying Pan-NENs, which is traditionally described as clusters of compact cells on a dark background surrounded by numerous small and irregular vessels and fibrotic

areas<sup>[37]</sup>. Giovannini *et al*<sup>[38]</sup>, observed a negative NPV of 100% for the characterization of Pan-NENs in EUS nCLE, therefore supporting the concept that it cannot be considered as an alternative to the histological diagnosis, but that it may help to rule out malignancy.

Further applications of EUS in Pan-NENs is represented by the pre-operative EUS-guided fine-needle tattooing (EUS-FNT) and EUS-guided fiducial implantation (EUS-F), which may help surgeons find little pancreatic lesions during laparoscopic surgery, limiting the laparoscopic resection to the lesion itself, sparing the normal surrounding parenchyma, and reducing the operating time<sup>[39,40]</sup>.

As regards GI-NENs, EUS mainly plays a diagnostic and staging role; its sensitivity in detecting GI-NENs leads up to 94%<sup>[41]</sup>; they usually appear as submucosal rounded, hypoechoic, well-demarcated lesions and can be detected when smaller than 10 mm, especially rectal NENs (rNENs) thanks to the growing sensibility to colorectal carcinoma (CRC) screening. According to the ENETS most recent guidelines, in case of the endoscopic identification of a GI lesion that is compatible with a GI-NEN, EUS is recommended in case of lesions >10mm in order to study the depth of the lesion, to stage the hypothetical presence of loco-regional lymph nodes and, thus, to drive the choice of the most appropriate endoscopic or surgical treatment<sup>[42]</sup>. Less than 10 mm GI-NENs, in fact, have a very low risk of both lymphatic invasion and distant metastases, which is reported to be around 1-2%<sup>[43]</sup>. GI-NENs measuring 10–19 mm at their first endoscopic diagnosis deserve more accurate EUS evaluation because of the reported higher incidence rate of lymph node invasion or distant metastases, leading up to 5-15%<sup>[42]</sup>. If the GI-NENs is limited to the submucosa and does not invade the muscularis mucosae (which corresponds to a T1 Lesion), regardless of its lateral spreading, a simple en bloc endoscopic resection treatment has proved to be effective in guaranteeing a radical resection and a very limited recurrence rate during the follow-up<sup>[44]</sup>, otherwise, a surgical approach is suggested. T2 or N+ stage lesions should be accurately studied with total body imaging such as 68-Ga-DOTATATE- positron

emission tomography (PET) and a CT scan in order to plan the best therapeutic approach.

### **Capsule endoscopy and double-balloon enteroscopy (DBE)**

<sup>6</sup> The small intestine is the most common NEN site in the human body. Historically, sbNENs have proved difficult to diagnose because of both the lack of specific symptoms at presentation and the poor accessibility of the distal sb <sup>[45]</sup>. Conventional radiology [both <sup>5</sup> CT and MRI either in the standard technique or in combination with enteroclysis] are often not accurate enough in the detection of sbNENs <sup>[46]</sup>, whereas <sup>6</sup> PET/CT with <sup>68</sup>Ga-DOTA peptides remains the most sensitive modality in the detection of well-differentiated NENs <sup>[47]</sup>, although it does not allow to get a histological diagnosis and might not be fully accurate in the anatomical location of the primary tumor being, for instance, unable to differentiate between intestinal and mesenteric localization <sup>[48]</sup>. Furthermore, in the <sup>6</sup> case of metastatic disease, the detection of the primary tumor is recommended in both resectable and non resectable diseases. However, in up to 10% of the cases after the discovery of liver or lymph node metastases, the primary tumor site remains unknown despite an extensive workup <sup>[49,50]</sup>.

With the advent of CE and DBE the diagnosis of sbNENs has hugely improved, even if data regarding the efficacy and safety of these techniques in the detection of SbNENs are scanty and mainly based on small retrospective series, given the rarity of the disease <sup>18</sup> and the still-limited use of these techniques in routine clinical practice. Most of the available studies are focused on sb tumors in general and only a small percentage of included patients displayed a sbNEN <sup>[51-53]</sup>. In a study comparing CT, enteroclysis, nuclear imaging, and CE of the Sb <sup>[48]</sup>, <sup>5</sup> CE showed a high diagnostic yield (45%) in identifying primary tumors. Of note, in 12 of 20 patients (60%), CE showed small-intestinal lesions that were then confirmed histologically as NEN in six of seven patients who underwent surgery.

When considering the few studies specifically focused on NENs, the results came back to be inconclusive. In a retrospective study by Frilling *et al* <sup>[54]</sup>, including 390 patients

with metastatic NENs of whom 11 with unknown primary tumor, CE identified lesions suggestive of sb primary in 8/10 patients in whom it was successful and these tumors were all histologically confirmed. On the other hand, in a recent prospective study [55], the diagnostic yield of CE was reported to be limited. In twenty-four patients with a histological diagnosis of metastatic NEN of unknown origin, CE, which was preferred to DBE as less invasive and less expensive, was requested before explorative laparotomy and its diagnostic yield was compared to the surgical exploration. CE identified a primary sbNEN in 11 subjects. However, diagnosis of sbNEN was confirmed only in 5 (41%) cases after surgical and ultrasound exploration were performed. The high number of false-positive results could have been related to small bowel contractions, extrinsic compression, lymph stasis, or submucosal lesion of another type.

Although CE is less invasive, DBE is necessary for determining the precise location, number of tumors, and pathological diagnosis [56]. DBE can be carried out through the oral (antegrade) or the anal (retrograde) route and with a combined oral and anal approach a complete Sb examination can be achieved in up to 86% of patients [57].

Bellutti *et al* [58], in a study involving 12 consecutive patients with suspected sbNEN or with liver NEN metastases, who underwent DBE, found a diagnostic yield of DBE for primary tumor of 33%.

In a case series by Scherubl *et al* [59], five consecutive patients with metastatic midgut carcinoids underwent DBE and a NEN of the ileum was detected in four out of the five patients; the histopathologic evaluation of their biopsy specimens confirmed the diagnosis revealing well-differentiated NENs. Conversely, conventional radiologic imaging did not visualize any of the primary tumors.

In our recent prospective study [60], we reported sensitivity and specificity of 60 and 100%, respectively for DBE in detecting sbNEN in 6 patients with unknown primary, showing that DBE is a safe and effective procedure in diagnosing sbNENs. We suggested that when a sbNEN is suspected, DBE should be taken into account as an accurate diagnostic tool in order both to collect biopsies for final diagnosis and to make



tattoos before surgery; of note, DBE should be preferred over CE in the pre-surgical setting given the high specificity.

Considering the limited available data, further studies are needed to better define the actual role of CE and DBE in the diagnosis of sbNENs.

## **Treatment**

### **Gastric neuroendocrine neoplasms (gNENs)**

Gastric NENs (gNENs) are usually sub-classified into three types, according to their pathophysiology and behavior [42,61].

Type I tumors correspond to the majority of gNENs (approximately 80%) and are associated with autoimmune atrophic gastritis. Histologically, type I gNENs are composed of enterochromaffin-like (ECL) cells. The diagnosis is made by upper digestive endoscopy with biopsy. The majority of type I gNENs present as small, multiple tumors, located in the gastric body or fundus, and limited to the mucosal or submucosal layers of the stomach wall [61,62]. Since the risk of metastasis is less than 5% in type I gNENs, a conservative approach based on endoscopic follow-up with lesion resection is advised for this kind of tumors; treatment of choice for type I gNENs is endoscopic resection for lesions > 0,5 cm and endoscopic surveillance for lesions < 0,5 cm [61,63,64]. This approach has been shown to be safe and effective in a prospective series of 33 type I gNENs, with no significant procedure-related complications, no development of metastases, and a 100% long-term survival rate [65].

The ENETS guidelines [42] suggest performing EUS in case of lesions >1 cm. A staging EUS is frequently performed to confirm the appropriateness of endoscopic resection, which applies to lesions not infiltrating beyond the muscularis propria [7]. For lesions larger than 1 cm, EUS is excellent for determining the exact tumor size and for excluding infiltration of the type I gNENs into the muscularis propria (T2) or enlarged regional lymph nodes [62,66].

Type II GNENs correspond to 5-10% of gNENs; they usually develop when multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 (MEN-1) is present and are often associated with Zollinger-

Ellison Syndrome (ZES) [61,64]. Like type I gNENs, type II gNENs<sup>11</sup> originate from ECL cells. They are small, multiple, and relatively benign tumors, even though about 10% to 30% of patients present as metastatic at the diagnosis [67]. For type II gNENs local excision is recommended, preferentially by endoscopy; as well as for type I gNENs EUS plays a pivotal role in determining the tumor size, the lymph node involvement, and the depth of invasion; endoscopic treatment is again reserved to lesions not infiltrating beyond the muscularis propria, without lymph nodes involvement [7,66].

Type III gNENs are usually larger sporadic tumors with an infiltrative and metastatic tendency and account for 15% of all gNENs. They are generally characterized by being single lesions, larger than 1 cm in size and with a greater likelihood of evolving to regional and systemic metastases as more than half of patients with type III gNEN are metastatic at diagnosis, mainly to the liver [61,63]. From a therapeutic point of view, surgery is the standard treatment, i.e. total or subtotal gastrectomy together with lymphadenectomy, as recommended in gastric adenocarcinoma; for patients with any surgical contraindication, endoscopic resection may be an alternative, but the risk of regional lymph node spread remains high [61]. Of note, in highly selected cases of small (< 1 cm) type III G1/G2 (Ki-67 < 5%) gNENs fully resected (R0) by endoscopy with no risk factors for metastatic disease, endoscopic resection might be sufficient [68]. As for other gNENs, EUS is a useful tool for loco-regional staging, particularly to stage the disease by assessing the presence of regional lymph node involvement.

Conventional polypectomy with a snare for flat mucosal lesions should be avoided because complete resection is often not achieved. Early gNENs are generally removed by endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) or endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) [62,69]. In EMR, snare resection is preceded by the submucosal injection of saline in order to raise the tumor and cut into the submucosa below the tumor [62].

ESD is preferred over EMR in case of suspicion of limited submucosal invasion or a tumor larger than 2 cm [70]. After submucosal injection of saline, the submucosa is dissected with specific knives in order to achieve endoscopic en bloc resection of the whole neoplasm.

<sup>2</sup> The resected specimen has to be carefully evaluated regarding grade, angioinvasion, and infiltration of the deep resection margin. In case of angioinvasion, histological infiltration of the muscularis propria (T2), or grade G2/G3, radicalization with surgery with lymph node dissection is the therapy of choice in localized neuroendocrine disease [62].

### *Duodenal neuroendocrine neoplasms (dNENs)*

Duodenal neuroendocrine neoplasms (dNENs) are rare, usually small tumors well-differentiated in most of the cases, however, according to a recent multicentre retrospective study <sup>13</sup>, dNENs prognosis may be highly variable as these tumors can be metastatic in up to 50% of cases at the time of the first diagnosis and can develop metastases thereafter, despite the small sample size, with functioning neoplasms expressing high metastatic potential.

Upper GI endoscopy with biopsy is necessary for dNEN diagnosis and EUS should be performed to assess the local extent of tumor depth.

In view of this heterogeneous behavior, <sup>8</sup> surgical resection has been suggested as the preferred treatment modality over endoscopic treatment, and <sup>8</sup> surgery is generally recommended <sup>7</sup> for ampullary dNENs and lesions > 2 cm in size [42]. Endoscopic resection is the treatment of choice for well-differentiated localized non-metastatic tumors with a diameter <1 cm and confined to the submucosa layer and the rationale for preferring the endoscopic treatment for tumors less than 1 cm relies on the fact that they seem to have a low rate of nodal disease <sup>7</sup> [64,72]. In this setting, there is no current evidence to prefer an endoscopic approach over another as prospective studies comparing the available techniques (i.e. ESD vs. EMR) are still lacking.

However, there is still controversy regarding the management of tumors between 1 and 2 cm which is mainly <sup>8</sup> based on the tumor location and the presence of nodal involvement on imaging. <sup>8</sup> Furthermore, according to some authors more than 10% of patients with dNENs smaller than < 1 cm in size develop lymph node metastases, thus suggesting the need for a radical surgical approach for all dNENs despite the size of the primary tumor <sup>8</sup> [73–75]. Another issue to be taken into account is the high risk of

conventional and functional imaging of understaging mainly due to the presence of nodal and distant micrometastases as recently reported [76]. These results represent a sign of warning for conservative approaches including endoscopy, suggesting as a possible strategy, the inclusion of EUS in the preoperative phase, although prospective studies are necessary to draw solid conclusions.

In summary, all considered, endoscopic resection either EMR or ESD should be reserved to dNENs < 1 cm, limited to the submucosal layer without evidence of lymph node or distant metastases, whereas surgery might be advised for dNENs larger than >10mm with evidence of muscular layer invasion or nodal involvement [77]. EUS should be encouraged for all dNENs in order to plan the best therapeutic approach.

### **Rectal neuroendocrine neoplasms (rNENs)**

Endoscopic treatment for rectal NENs (rNENs) is indicated if there is no evidence of invasion beyond submucosa and presence of loco-regional disease since it aims to achieve a complete oncological resection [78].

The ENETS guidelines [43] suggest that well-differentiated (G1-G2) rNENs that are smaller than 10 mm in stage T1 and T2 and rNENs between 10 mm and 20 mm in stage T1 without lymph node metastasis should be removed endoscopically. On the contrary, surgical resection is indicated in cases of G3 rNENs, size of 10-19 mm with muscularis propria invasion (stage T2) and for tumors larger than 20 mm and/or in presence of lymph node metastasis.

Endoscopic techniques for treating rNENs include standard polypectomy, EMR, modified EMR (m-EMR), ESD, and endoscopic full-thickness resection (EFTR).

Standard polypectomy does not offer an adequate and complete resection of the lesion, therefore it is not indicated in rNEN treatment [79]. Of note, a large number of rNENs is still removed by an improper method, such as routine snare polypectomy, during colorectal cancer screening making management more complex and putting patients at risk of metastatic spread [80].

EMR is largely used in the resection of small and superficial neoplasia confined to the mucosa and submucosal layer, but its application in rNENs is still debated since m-



EMR and ESD are superior in terms of <sup>1</sup>en bloc resection rate and histologic complete resection rate (defined as en bloc resection with no margin involved)<sup>[81,82]</sup>.

Recently, Park *et al* <sup>[83]</sup> observed that when EMR is performed underwater (underwater EMR, UEMR), the histological complete resection rate of NENs < 10 mm is similar to ESD (86.1% *vs* 86.1%, respectively,  $P = 0.996$ ) but with a shorter time of the procedure ( $5.8 \pm 2.9$  *vs*  $26.6 \pm 13.4$  minutes, respectively,  $P < 0.001$ ).

EMR performed with a dual-channel endoscope (EMR-D) allows a deeper resection compared to conventional EMR by lifting the lesion with forceps. Lee *et al* <sup>[84]</sup> observed that EMR-D reaches a complete histological resection rate similar to ESD for rNENs < 16 mm (86.3 *vs.* 88.4 %, respectively), but with a shorter procedure time ( $9.75 \pm 7.11$  *vs.* <sup>26</sup> $22.38 \pm 7.56$  min, respectively,  $P < 0.001$ ) and fewer complications.

Modified endoscopic mucosal resection (m-EMR) techniques include the use of special devices that allow a better resection of the tumor. Endoscopic Mucosal Resection after circumferential pre-cutting (EMR-P) is performed by lifting the submucosal with saline injection, <sup>1</sup>pre-cutting using the tip of the snare or special endoknife and resecting the tumor with a snare. Cap-assisted Endoscopic Mucosal Resection (EMR-C) is performed by lifting the mucosa with saline injection, suctioning the lesion with a transparent cap fitted to the scope and then removing it with a snare looped along the ridge of the cap. Endoscopic Mucosal Resection with a ligation device (EMR-L) is conducted by lifting the lesion with saline injection, deploying an elastic band around its base, and resecting with a snare. Histological complete resection rate for EMR-P is superior to EMR and no difference was found between EMR-P and the other m-EMR techniques, even if it required a longer procedure time <sup>[85]</sup>.

Park *et al* <sup>[86]</sup> demonstrated that EMR-C is a safe and effective technique for rNENs, with a histological complete resection rate even better than ESD (92.3% *vs* 78.4%, respectively,  $P = 0.042$ ).

EMR-L is only applicable for tumors of < <sup>23</sup>10 mm due to the short diameter of the caps fitted to colonoscopes but it is significantly superior to EMR in terms of complete

resection of rNENs (93.3% vs 65.5%, respectively,  $P = 0.001$ ), regardless of the tumor location [87].

Histological complete resection rate is similar between EMR-C and EMR-L. However, Lee *et al* [88] demonstrated that EMR-L might be preferable as achieving a higher rate of en bloc resection (100% vs. 92.9%, respectively,  $P = 0.003$ ), but this could be due to the fact that the band thickness used in EMR-L is larger than the snare thickness of EMR-C.

ESD is an interventional procedure suitable for en bloc resection of slightly invasive GI lesions. After injection of the submucosal with a viscous solution, an endoknife is used to incise the mucosa surrounding the lesion and to dissect it from the submucosal layer. ESD is an effective technique to treat rectal lesions, even if it is associated with a high risk of complication and a long procedure time. As it concerns rNENs, ESD has been demonstrated to be superior to EMR in terms of histological complete resection rate, but there are no significant differences between ESD and m-EMR [81].

Moreover, Niimi *et al* [89] observed that ESD is associated with a longer time of procedure and hospitalization period rather than EMR-L, with a similar complete resection rate.

In order to reduce procedure time, Wang *et al* [90] proposed a hybrid ESD, in which the mucosal incision is performed with a polypectomy snare instead of an endoknife. This technique showed a similar en bloc resection rate (99.2% vs. 98.2%,  $P = 0.373$ ) and complete resection rate (94.1% vs. 90.9%,  $P = 0.641$ ) to ESD but with a shorter procedure time (13.2±8.3 vs. 18.1±9.7 min,  $P = 0.000$ ).

Endoscopic full-thickness resection (EFTR) is a technique mainly used in lesions that are difficult to resect and its application in rNENs has recently been proposed. A full-thickness resection device (FTRD) is fitted over the scope and, after placement of a modified over-the-scope-clip (OTSP), allows a single step EFTR (Figure 3).

Meier *et al* [91] collected data on 40 EFTRs in rNENs and observed that resection was macroscopically and histologically complete in all cases without major events, but prospective comparative studies between different resection techniques are still missing.

To conclude, rNENs smaller than 10 mm should be treated endoscopically, and EMR-L should be considered as the first-line treatment; ESD can be used as second-line therapy when EMR-L is not applicable. EFTR can be an effective and safe technique in lesions that are difficult to treat. Treatment of rNENs with a size of 10-19 mm should be chosen after assessing the stage and the grade of differentiation.

### **Pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms (Pan-NENs)**

In recent years there has been a great development of EUS techniques, not only used as diagnostic, but also as therapeutic tools. These methods find application in the management of Pan-NENs, given the direct approach to the pancreas through the echoendoscope. The incidentally discovered small Pan-NENs, mainly non-functional, represent a therapeutic challenge because surgery could be very complex in the face of neoplasms with indolent biological behavior, and active surveillance may represent an option for G1 or low G2 neoplasms, asymptomatic, mainly localized in the head of the pancreas, without radiological signs suspicious for malignancy [9,92]. In this setting, however, EUS-guided pancreatic loco-regional ablative treatments, using either ethanol injection or radiofrequency ablation, have been proposed in recent studies with promising results in order to control symptoms or reduce tumor burden in selected patients [93].

The thermo-ablative techniques are the most used, mainly the radiofrequency methods. EUS-guided radiofrequency ablation (RFA) is reported to be a potentially effective and safe treatment of Pan-NENs [94].

Several RFA devices for EUS-guided applications are currently available. The Habib EUS-guided RFA probe (EndoHPB, EMcision UK, London, UK; recently purchased by Boston Scientific) is a 1 Fr (0.33 mm), monopolar catheter, which can be inserted through a regular 19 or 22-gauge FNA needle and connected to a standard radiofrequency generator. The other systems are needle-electrodes, and the most commonly used in literature is the one from Taewoong Medical (EUSRA, Taewoong Medical Co., Ltd., Gimpo-si, Gyeonggi-do, South Korea), an 18G or 19G needle with a long electrode lacking insulation over the terminal tip, connected to a dedicate RF

current source, and an inner cooling system that circulates chilled saline inside the needle to avoid tissue charring. Under the EUS guide, the needle is inserted into the target lesion that is been treated by using high-frequency alternating current, and the energy release is applied when the needle tip of the electrode is within the lesion, while maintaining a distance of at least 2 mm from the pancreatic and bile ducts and vessels, to avoid injury or duct strictures. A recent systematic literature review explored the feasibility, effectiveness, and safety of EUS-RFA in the treatment of Pan-NENs [94]: 12 articles describing 61 patients and 73 Pan-NENs were analyzed and the overall effectiveness of EUS-RFA resulted in 96 % (75 %–100%) without any difference between functional and non-functional Pan-NENs and without relevant side effects (mild AEs 13.7 %) [95–104].

The same conclusions were also confirmed by a further systematic review which included 14 studies with a total of 158 patients with solid pancreatic tumors [105]. However, even if the results of these studies are encouraging, especially for non-functioning Pan-NENs and insulinomas < 2 cm, EUS-RFA is a relatively recent technique and long-term data are thus lacking [94,105]. Larger studies with longer follow-up are needed to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of EUS-RFA. Moreover, the specific setting of patients and the actual indication for the radiofrequency has not been standardized.

As concerned EUS-guided ethanol injection for small Pan-NENs, this option has been proposed and studied for the treatment of patients with small Pan-NENs not suitable for surgery or who refused surgical approach. Using pure ethanol or ethanol-lipiodol emulsion, the complete ablation rate has been reported to be approximately 50% up to 80% by performing more sessions [106–108].

In view of these results, a study protocol for a multicentre prospective study has been published [109] and the results will become available in due time.

Finally, possible future intriguing perspectives can be represented by the application, also in Pan-NENs, of the novel techniques of loco-regional delivery of drugs, such as Local Drug EluteR (LODER(TM)) which is a novel biodegradable polymeric matrix that



shields drugs. Moreover also Pan-NENs may be considered as a possible future field of application of locoregional radiotherapy by using fiducial markers implantation, similarly to other pancreatic cancers.

## DISCUSSION

The incidence of GEP-NENs has hugely increased over the last decades mainly due to better disease knowledge and to an improvement in diagnostic techniques, including endoscopy. Standard axial endoscopy and EUS still play a pivotal role in several GEP-NENs. Upper GI endoscopy is essential for the detection and characterization of esophageal, gastric and duodenal NENs. EUS represents the diagnostic gold standard for Pan-NENs and the technique of choice for the loco-regional staging of gastric, duodenal and rectal NENs. Ileocolonoscopy allows the assessing and diagnosing of rectal, colonic and rarely distal ileal lesions. However, the diagnosis of sbNENs has been largely improved with the advent of CE and DBE, although data regarding the safety and efficacy of these techniques in the neuroendocrine setting are still scanty and their use is still limited in clinical practice. In terms of treatment, in selected localized GI-NENs with the absence of features associated with lymph node metastases, endoscopic therapy is generally an appropriate treatment with radical intent. In highly selected G1 or low G2 small neoplasms without radiological signs suspicious for malignancy EUS-guided pancreatic loco-regional ablative treatments, using either ethanol injection or radiofrequency ablation, have been proposed in recent studies with promising results in order to control symptoms or reduce tumor burden. Table 1 summarizes available endoscopic treatment options for GEP-NENs.

## CONCLUSION

In summary, endoscopy plays a key-role in GEP-NENs for both the diagnosis and the treatment. In selected localized GEP-NENs, endoscopic therapy is appropriate with radical intent. Advanced resection techniques aimed at increasing the rate of R0 resection should be reserved to high-volume referral centers. The multidisciplinary

management remains the gold standard to offer the patient the best therapeutic approach.

# 25%

SIMILARITY INDEX

### PRIMARY SOURCES

- |          |  |                       |
|----------|--|-----------------------|
| <b>1</b> | <a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov">www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov</a><br><small>Internet</small>  | 257 words — <b>4%</b> |
| <hr/>    |  |                       |
| <b>2</b> | <a href="http://www.karger.com">www.karger.com</a><br><small>Internet</small>  | 238 words — <b>4%</b> |
| <hr/>    |  |                       |
| <b>3</b> | <a href="http://encyclopedia.pub">encyclopedia.pub</a><br><small>Internet</small>  | 183 words — <b>3%</b> |
| <hr/>    |  |                       |
| <b>4</b> | Alessandra Zilli, Paolo Giorgio Arcidiacono, Dario Conte, Sara Massironi. "Clinical impact of endoscopic ultrasonography on the management of neuroendocrine tumors: lights and shadows", Digestive and Liver Disease, 2018<br><small>Crossref</small> | 174 words — <b>3%</b> |
| <hr/>    |  |                       |
| <b>5</b> | <a href="http://journals.sagepub.com">journals.sagepub.com</a><br><small>Internet</small>  | 173 words — <b>3%</b> |
| <hr/>    |  |                       |
| <b>6</b> | Roberta Elisa Rossi, Luca Elli, Federica Branchi, Dario Conte, Sara Massironi. "Double-Balloon Enteroscopy in Detecting Small-Bowel Neuroendocrine Neoplasms: A Single-Center Prospective Study", Digestion, 2021<br><small>Crossref</small>           | 113 words — <b>2%</b> |
| <hr/>    |  |                       |
| <b>7</b> | Roberta Elisa Rossi, Emanuele Rausa, Federica Cavalcoli, Dario Conte, Sara Massironi. "Duodenal  | 78 words — <b>1%</b>  |

neuroendocrine neoplasms: a still poorly recognized clinical entity", Scandinavian Journal of Gastroenterology, 2018

Crossref

---

8 R. E. Rossi, A. C. Milanetto, V. Andreasi, D. Campana et al. "Risk of preoperative understaging of duodenal neuroendocrine neoplasms: a plea for caution in the treatment strategy", Journal of Endocrinological Investigation, 2021

76 words — 1%

Crossref

---

9 Francesco Panzuto, Sara Massironi, Stefano Partelli, Davide Campana et al. "Gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasia: The rules for non-operative management", Surgical Oncology, 2020

51 words — 1%

Crossref

---

10 [www.thieme-connect.com](http://www.thieme-connect.com)

Internet

47 words — 1%

---

11 [docksci.com](http://docksci.com)

Internet

42 words — 1%

---

12 Lorenzo Fuccio, Thierry Ponchon. "Colorectal endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD)", Best Practice & Research Clinical Gastroenterology, 2017

32 words — < 1%

Crossref

---

13 Sara Massironi, Davide Campana, Stefano Partelli, Francesco Panzuto et al. "Heterogeneity of Duodenal Neuroendocrine Tumors: An Italian Multi-center Experience", Annals of Surgical Oncology, 2018

27 words — < 1%

Crossref

---

14 Kazuyuki Matsumoto, Hironari Kato, Masayuki Kitano, Kazuo Hara et al. "Study protocol for endoscopic ultrasonography-guided ethanol injection therapy

18 words — < 1%



for patients with pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasm: a multicentre prospective study", BMJ Open, 2021

Crossref

15 Nicola Fazio, Francesca Spada, Roberta Elisa Rossi, Valentina Ambrosini et al. "Chapter 60 Neuroendocrine Neoplasms (NENs)", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2021

18 words — < 1%

Crossref

16 Alberto Larghi, Julio Iglesias-Garcia, Jan-Werner Poley, Geneviève Monges et al. "Feasibility and yield of a novel 22-gauge histology EUS needle in patients with pancreatic masses: a multicenter prospective cohort study", Surgical Endoscopy, 2013

14 words — < 1%

Crossref

17 [www.mysciencework.com](http://www.mysciencework.com)

Internet

14 words — < 1%

18 Berge T, Trifan A, Robles EP, Li XB. "Endoscopic techniques to detect small-bowel neuroendocrine tumors: A literature review", 'SAGE Publications'

13 words — < 1%

Internet

19 Krzysztof Dąbkowski, Marek Szczepkowski, Beata Kos-Kudła, Teresa Starzynska. "Endoscopic management of rectal neuroendocrine tumours. How to avoid a mistake and what to do when one is made?", Endokrynologia Polska, 2020

13 words — < 1%

Crossref

20 Laura Giuseppina Di Pasqua, Marta Cagna, Clarissa Berardo, Mariapia Vairetti, Andrea Ferrigno. "Detailed Molecular Mechanisms Involved in Drug-Induced Non-Alcoholic Fatty Liver Disease and Non-Alcoholic Steatohepatitis: An Update", Biomedicines

13 words — < 1%

Internet

- 
- 21 [journals.viamedica.pl](https://journals.viamedica.pl) 13 words — < 1%  
Internet
- 
- 22 Diane Lorenzo, Frédérique Maire, Olivia Hentic, Frédéric Prat, Philippe Ruszniewski, Louis de Mestier. "Endoscopic diagnosis and treatment of neuroendocrine tumors", Current Opinion in Endocrine and Metabolic Research, 2021 12 words — < 1%  
Crossref
- 
- 23 HYUNG HUN KIM. "EFFICACY OF ENDOSCOPIC SUBMUCOSAL RESECTION WITH A LIGATION DEVICE FOR REMOVING SMALL RECTAL CARCINOID TUMOR COMPARED WITH ENDOSCOPIC MUCOSAL RESECTION: ANALYSIS OF 100 CASES : ESMR-L FOR SMALL RECTAL CARCINOID TUMORS", Digestive Endoscopy, 05/2012 12 words — < 1%  
Crossref
- 
- 24 Roberta Elisa Rossi, Dario Conte, Luca Elli, Federica Branchi, Sara Massironi. "Endoscopic techniques to detect small-bowel neuroendocrine tumors: A literature review", United European Gastroenterology Journal, 2016 12 words — < 1%  
Crossref
- 
- 25 [atm.amegroups.com](https://atm.amegroups.com) 12 words — < 1%  
Internet
- 
- 26 [www.aecirujanos.es](https://www.aecirujanos.es) 12 words — < 1%  
Internet
-