About a case of multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1. Review of some clinical manifestations and treatment controversies
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Abstract  Multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 (MEN1) is a rare hereditary syndrome known to predispose subjects to endocrine neoplasms in a variety of tissues such as the parathyroid glands, the pituitary gland, and the gastrointestinal tract. We report the case of a male patient who, in addition to the traditionally described conditions (hyperparathyroidism and gastrinoma), was found to have other tumor lesions arising from both endocrine cells (insulinoma, gastric carcinoid, adrenal adenoma, and non-functional pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors), and non-endocrine cells (lipoma and collagenoma). The frequent recurrence of lesions in not completely resected susceptible tissues (as occurs in hyperparathyroidism and duodenal gastrinoma) as well as doubts concerning their clinical significance in MEN1 has raised some questions regarding the therapeutic management of such lesions, and this controversy is briefly reviewed.
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A propósito de un caso de neoplasia endocrina múltiple tipo 1. Revisión de algunas manifestaciones clínicas y controversias en el tratamiento

Resumen  La neoplasia endocrina múltiple de tipo 1 (MEN1) es un síndrome hereditario raro conocido por la predisposición a la aparición de neoplasias endocrinas en distintos tejidos como paratiroideos, hipófisis y tracto gastrointestinal. Se presenta el caso de un varón en el que además de manifestaciones tradicionalmente descritas (hipeparatiroidismo y gastrinoma) se objetivan otras lesiones tumorales procedentes de células de estirpe endocrinológica (insulinoma, carcinoid gastrico, adenoma suprarrenal, tumores neuroendocrino no funcionantes del páncreas) y no endocrinológica (lipoma y colagenoma). La frecuente recurrencia de las lesiones
Introduction

The reported case allows for the review of two current issues related to multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 (MEN1): the diversity of potentially associated tumors other than those traditionally reported and the continuing controversy concerning their treatment, particularly for neuroendocrine tumors (NETs) in the gastrointestinal tract, such as gastrinoma.

Case report and course

A 28-year-old male patient was admitted in March 1985 for an etiological study of a tonic-clonic seizure concomitant with a capillary blood glucose value of 25 m/dL which subsided upon intravenous administration of glucose. The patient had a medical history which included recurrent renal colic over the previous year. Moreover, his father had died at 45 years from a malignant neck tumor, and had had a prior history of complicated peptic ulcer requiring gastrectomy. Laboratory tests showed a corrected calcium value of 11.9 mg/dL (normal range [NR], 8.5-10.5) attributed to primary hyperparathyroidism (PHP) and a serum PTH level of 549 pg/mL (NR: 10-65). Twenty-four hours after a fasting test, the patient experienced disorientation and drowsiness with a venous blood glucose value of 27 mg/dL which subsided upon intravenous administration of glucose. The association of endogenous hyperinsulinism and PHP suggested the presence of MEN-1 syndrome. Tests to detect insulinoma included an abdominal ultrasound which revealed a 2-cm nodule in the body of the pancreas, which was confirmed in an arteriography which showed another nodular 0.5-cm lesion in the tail of the pancreas. During surgery, additional nodules were found in the body and tail of the pancreas, and a corporocaudal pancreatectomy was therefore performed, in addition to peripancreatic lymphadenectomy and splenectomy. A pathological study confirmed the presence of 13 NETs (two of them 2.2 cm in size initially and 2 cm in size in 2009) with negative results in both cases). Enlargement of the right upper parathyroid gland since 1997.

Lesions consistent with subscapular and pleural lipomas since 2006.

A nodule suggesting a right adrenal adenoma since 1998

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gastrin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From January 2007, after biochemical confirmation of gastrinoma by a secretin test, abdominal CT and MRI showed a new hypervascularized lesion meeting radiographic criteria.
of NET, adjacent to the head of the pancreas, whose cross-sectional diameter increased from 1 cm in January 2007 to 2 cm in February 2008 and to 3 cm in May 2008 and which showed positive uptake on an octreoscan. An echoendoscopy with biopsy performed in July 2008 confirmed the presence of a 3-cm lesion adjacent to but separate from the head of the pancreas with immunohistochemistry positive for chromogranin A and gastrin. The lesion site could not be established. Obvious lesion enlargement led to a new laparotomy being performed in April 2009 and consisting of:

- Resection of a 5 x 3.5 x 1.3 cm lobulated lesion adjacent to the head which was found to be a nodal metastasis of a well-differentiated NET with Ki-67 index lower than 5% and strongly positive for gastrin at immunohistochemistry.
- Enucleation of two intrapancreatic nodules found on manual examination of the head, consistent with non-functional NETs of 0.8 and 0.3 cm (negative for gastrin and insulin at immunohistochemistry).
- Cholecystectomy. A duodenotomy was not performed.

Two months later, normal gastrin levels were found (103 pg/mL) and the proton pump inhibitor was discontinued, but a pathological increase occurred after secretin infusion (peak of 675 pg/mL), and no peripancreatic lesion was found in a control CT scan. A diagnosis of resection of nodal metastasis from a gastrinoma with persistence of primary tumor was thus established. At the time of writing, the patient is in good general health, leads an active life, and has no symptoms despite the recurrence of PHP and the biochemical persistence of gastrinoma. He is being treated with omeprazole (20 mg/day) and has been receiving somatostatin analogues (octreotide LAR 20 mg IM every 4 weeks) for the past few months in order to prevent the malignant progression of primary gastrinoma.

**Discussion and review**

While the presence of two of the three main neoplasms (PHP, enteropancreatic NET, and pituitary adenoma) is sufficient to establish the existence of MEN1, the predisposition to other neoplasms in both endocrine and non-endocrine tissues is obvious. The endocrine tumors most prevalent in the general population include carcinoids (thymic carcinoids in 5% of MEN1, and bronchial and gastric carcinoids in 2% and 10% respectively). Gastric carcinoids are usually found incidentally, as occurred with this patient. Their small size allows for complete endoscopic resection of the non-functional tumor in most cases. While sustained hypergastrinemia is a known stimulus for the proliferation of enterochromaffin-like cells, patients with sporadic Zollinger-Ellison syndrome have a slight risk of gastric carcinoid. Patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome associated to MEN1 have a 20 to 30-fold greater risk, and gastric carcinoid should therefore be included in the spectrum of endocrine tumors associated with that condition, as is confirmed by the demonstration of inactivation of both copies of the MEN1 tumor suppressor gene in cells from gastric carcinoids of MEN1 patients.

Other neoplasms found in this patient and already reported in MEN1, but of little prognostic impact, included an adrenal adenoma, found in approximately 30% of cases in some series, skin and visceral lipomas found in 40%, and collagenomas found in up to 70% of cases.

As regards PHP, it is the most common manifestation, with a penetrance close to 100% at age 50. Our patient was diagnosed at an early age, which agrees with the medical literature. The involvement of multiple parathyroid glands, not always occurring at the same time, represents another difference from sporadic PHP and explains the high 67% recurrence rate in unsectored residual parathyroid tissue (as occurred in the reported case) at 8 years of subtotal parathyroidectomy. This high recurrence rate could be the result of the inexorable evolution of genetically susceptible parathyroid glands. A different surgical approach is therefore recommended for PHP in MEN1 as compared to sporadic PHP. Surgery should consist of subtotal parathyroidectomy or even total parathyroidectomy with reimplantation of a gland in the forearm. The high rate of permanent hypoparathyroidism after total parathyroidectomy and the high recurrence rate after subtotal parathyroidectomy have resulted in different opinions as to the best surgical approach.

Insulinomas in MEN1 are often described as small and multicentric tumors along the pancreas (as suggested by the histological study of the patient). For most authors, this makes corporocaudal pancreatectomy with examination of the head (enucleating any lesions) the surgical procedure of choice. This would prevent the recurrent hypoglycemia reported in 40% of MEN1 undergoing multiple enucleations (usually sufficient in sporadic insulinoma), which mimics the genetic nature of the disease at the pancreatic level. For insulinoma, surgery is clearly indicated because of its usually curative outcome and the poor efficacy of the available medical treatments.

Among functional enteropancreatic NETs, gastrinoma is the most common neoplasm in MEN1, found in 60% of cases. Unlike in the sporadic form, indication of surgery is controversial despite the fact that gastrinoma is the main prognostic determinant because of its potential malignancy (liver or nodal metastases occur in almost half of all patients). Unlike in insulinoma, the clinical manifestations derived from acid hypersecretion induced by gastrinoma (peptic ulcer, heartburn, diarrhoea) are successfully controlled in the long term with antisecretive agents such as proton pump inhibitors, whose efficacy has made previous gastric surgery procedures for the control of acid secretion redundant. Thus, the main current objective of surgery for gastrinoma is to prevent or delay the occurrence of liver metastases in order to prolong patient survival. Indeed, liver metastases, occurring in 24% of gastrinomas, represent the main predictor of mortality in both sporadic and MEN1 forms. Survival rates are 93% at 15 years of follow-up and 26% at 10 years of follow up, respectively, in patients with or without metastasis at diagnosis. In sporadic forms, while resection often does not achieve a long-term cure (only 34% of operated patients have normal basal and post-secretin gastrin levels at 10 years), it is related to a lower rate of liver metastases (23% versus 3% at 8 years in non-surgical versus surgical patients) and specific mortality (23% versus 1% at 12 years respectively). In MEN1, the
controversy concerning the suitability of the surgical approach for gastrinoma is due to several factors:

- The poorly known natural history of the tumor, with long-term survival reported in some series (88% to 100% at 10 years) even in patients with liver metastases at diagnosis (52% at 15 years)\textsuperscript{27}.
- The unavailability of studies with adequate patient samples and follow-up times comparing surgical and nonsurgical patients.
- Biochemical cure rates even lower than in sporadic gastrinoma using standard surgical procedures (up to 0% at 5 years in some studies\textsuperscript{24,28}).

Tumor persistence is also attributed to the multiplicity of gastrinomas and their small size\textsuperscript{21}, which makes complete resection using standard procedures difficult\textsuperscript{30}. Understanding of the distribution in the duodenum of almost all MEN1 and half of the sporadic gastrinomas\textsuperscript{31} has led to duodenotomy with routine duodenal examination being recommended in addition to pancreatic examination in subjects undergoing laparotomy\textsuperscript{32}. In the case reported here, the potential risk of total pancreatectomy and its consequences (in a patient left with only the head of the pancreas after surgery performed 24 years before) led to resection of the growing peri-pancreatic lesion only, without duodenotomy, being decided upon. Thus, the lack of a duodenal examination, the high probability of gastrinoma location in this region in MEN1\textsuperscript{29,33}, and the poor sensitivity of preoperative techniques for duodenal gastrinomas\textsuperscript{34} may account for the biochemical persistence of gastrinoma in this patient after surgery. However, even in studies where duodenotomy was routinely performed together with distal pancreatectomy, head examination, and regional lymphadenectomy, cure rates of MEN1 gastrinoma continue to be poor (0% to 33\%\textsuperscript{27,35}). As occurs in PHP, only resection of all susceptible tissue has been shown to be possibly curative in a small series of patients undergoing celiacoduodenopancreatectomy, sometimes associated with total pancreatectomy\textsuperscript{36,37}. However, most authors reject routine celiacoduodenopancreatectomy because of its high morbidity rate (higher than 30\%) both in the short (fistula, abscess, dehiscence) and long term (endocrine and exocrine insufficiency) and because it makes possible repeat surgery technically difficult\textsuperscript{38}. The peri-pancreatic lesion excised from our patient turned out to be a nodal metastasis from an unregulated gastrinoma and exemplifies the high proportion of metastatic adenopathies found in gastrinomas (mainly in those located in the duodenum\textsuperscript{35,36}). Nodal metastases are not usually included in prognostic factors for mortality\textsuperscript{22,38}, unlike liver metastases, which are often the only independent risk factors for mortality in gastrinomas\textsuperscript{39}. Several studies suggest that 15\%-30\% of patients with MEN1 die due to malignant progression of NETs\textsuperscript{39,39}, and a prospective study reported mortality rates of MEN1 gastrinoma at 8 years of follow-up of 23\% and 0\% for patients with and without liver metastases respectively\textsuperscript{40}. Extrapolating to MEN1 gastrinoma the results of surgery for sporadic gastrinoma, some authors suggest that surgery could delay the occurrence of liver metastases\textsuperscript{31,42} while not achieving a biochemical cure. However, the few prospective studies of a limited number of MEN1 patients have not been able to show a beneficial effect of surgery for gastrinoma on the incidence of metastasis or mortality\textsuperscript{49}. Biological variables of both sporadic and MEN1 gastrinomas associated with a greater incidence of liver metastases and higher mortality include primary tumor size (greater than 2-3 cm) and location in the pancreas\textsuperscript{21-38}. The fact that in MEN1 these tumors are usually small and more frequently duodenal in location may account for their less aggressive biological behavior, with higher survival rates\textsuperscript{43,44} as compared to sporadic ones. However, and as occurs in 25\% to 30\% of sporadic gastrinomas\textsuperscript{21,23}, 14\% of MEN1 forms show aggressive behaviour marked by a high growth rate associated with a greater probability of liver metastases and death\textsuperscript{40}. While gastrinoma growth in the reported patient was initially slow (it could not be demonstrated in imaging tests between 1997 and 2007 despite increasing gastrin levels), the growing rate of nodal metastasis between 2007 and 2008 and the critical size of 3 cm reached led to lesion resection being indicated. Neither the Ki-67 index (less than 5\%) nor its initial progression helped predict such aggressive behavior.

The decision to use somatostatin analogues was based on the potential stabilization of metastatic disease in 40\% or more cases\textsuperscript{45}, although long-term tachyphylaxis usually occurs\textsuperscript{46} (except in isolated cases)\textsuperscript{47}. The benefit of these drugs is greater in NETs which express somatostatin receptors as can be demonstrated by using an octreoscan\textsuperscript{48}, and, in particular, in tumors with some degree of differentiation and evolution\textsuperscript{49,50}. Fulfillment of these conditions by our patient and good tolerability of these drugs as compared to other treatment modalities\textsuperscript{51,52} led us to prescribe treatment despite the fact that its prophylactic use (before the occurrence of liver metastases) has not been shown to improve survival in NETs\textsuperscript{31}.

As regards other pancreatic NETs in MEN1, nonfunctional tumors are even more prevalent than functional tumors (80\%-100\% in specimens from surgical or autopsy series\textsuperscript{18,54}). In our patient, some of the NETs found in the body and tail during initial surgery, and those found in the head in the second laparotomy, may have been nonfunctional NETs (immunohistochemistry not available). Surgery for these lesions is also controversial because of their multiplicity and small size\textsuperscript{31}, which would lead to massive resection. Thus, surgery tends to be performed only when lesions reach a size of 2-3 cm or when rapid growth is observed, in order to slow malignant progression, because some lesions may remain stable for years\textsuperscript{48}. In the case that laparotomy is required to excise functional NETs, some advise resection of both the body and tail of the pancreas because of their association with nonfunctional NETs\textsuperscript{15,55}.

This case illustrates the diversity of tumors related to this genetic syndrome and their high penetrance, as is shown by their high recurrence in some tissues. Part of the current debate revolves around the decision whether to completely remove some structures in order to prevent recurrence or whether, because of the long-term survival of most patients, to perform more conservative procedures which preserve a high quality of life despite tumor persistence.
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