

Well-Differentiated Duodenal Tumor/ Carcinoma (Excluding Gastrinomas)

Robert T. Jensen^a Guido Rindi^b Rudolf Arnold^c José M. Lopes^d
Maria Luisa Brandi^e Wolf O. Bechstein^f Emanuel Christ^g Babs G. Taal^h
Ulrich Kniggeⁱ Hakan Ahlman^j Dik J. Kwekkeboom^k Dermot O'Toole^l
and all other Frascati Consensus Conference participants

^aDigestive Diseases Branch, NIDDK, NIH, Bethesda, Md., USA; ^bDipartimento di Patologia e Medicina di Laboratorio, Università di Parma, Parma, Italy; ^cDivision of Gastroenterology and Endocrinology, Department of Internal Medicine, Philipps University, Marburg, Germany; ^dDepartment of Pathology, IPATIMUP Hospital, Porto, Portugal; ^eDipartimento di Fisiopatologia Clinica, Università di Firenze, Firenze, Italy; ^fDepartment of Surgery, Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt, Germany; ^gE. Christ, Department of Endocrinology, Inselspital, Bern, Switzerland; ^hDepartment of Oncology, Netherlands Cancer Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ⁱDepartment of Surgery, Rigshospitalet Blegdamsvej Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark; ^jDepartment of Surgery, Gothenburg University, Gothenburg, Sweden; ^kDepartment of Nuclear Medicine, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands; ^lService de Gastroentérologie-Pancréatologie, Pole des Maladies de l'Appareil Digestif, Hopital Beaujon, Clichy, France

Introduction

Duodenal neuroendocrine tumors (NETs) are located in the duodenum and may or may not be associated with a functional clinical syndrome. The term duodenal NET includes all duodenal tumors with neuroendocrine (NE) features as determined by histological/immunohistochemical methods including positivity for NET cytosolic markers [neuron-specific enolase (NSE), PGP 9.5] or secretory vesicle proteins [chromogranin A (CgA), synaptophysin] and also frequently the presence of specific gastrointestinal (GI) hormones [1–6]. The term duodenal NET in this paper refers to tumors included in different studies classified as: duodenal carcinoid; duodenal gastroenteropancreatic (GEP) tumor; duodenal pancreatic endocrine tumor (PET); duodenal gastrinoma; duodenal somatostatinoma; gangliocytic paraganglioma; ampullary carcinoid or somatostatinoma; argentaffin carcinoid producing serotonin of the duodenum; psammomatous somatostatinoma; duodenal neuroendocrine carcinoma,

poorly differentiated and small-cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the duodenum [4]. The latter will be covered in the paper on poorly differentiated tumors and thus only referred to here. The clinical and management aspect of duodenal gastrinomas are included in the 'Endocrine tumors of the pancreas – gastrinoma' section and duodenal gastrinomas will only be considered in this section in comparison with the other duodenal NETs.

Epidemiology and Clinico-Pathological Features

Minimal Consensus Statement on Epidemiology

Duodenal NETs comprise 1.8% of all carcinoid tumors in the ERG Group (1950–1969); 2–3% of the Third NCS Survey (1969–1971); 1.9% of the early SEER Registry (1973–1991); 3.8% of the Late SEER Registry (1992–1999), and 2.8% of the PAN-SEER Registry (1973–1999) [3, 7, 8]. Primary duodenal neoplasms occur in 0.03–0.05% of all autopsies [9]. Duodenal NETs comprise 1–3% of all primary duodenal tumors [2].

© **Free Author Copy – for personal use only**

ANY DISTRIBUTION OF THIS ARTICLE WITHOUT WRITTEN CONSENT FROM S. KARGER AG, BASEL IS A VIOLATION OF THE COPYRIGHT.

Written permission to distribute the PDF will be granted against payment of a permission fee, which is based on the number of accesses required. Please contact permission@karger.ch

Clinicopathological Features – General

In other studies, duodenal NETs were classified generally into five different tumor types [1]. These included duodenal gastrinomas; somatostatinomas; nonfunctional duodenal NETs which were not associated with a clinical syndrome but often demonstrated hormones with immunohistochemistry including serotonin and calcitonin; duodenal gangliocytic paragangliomas, and poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinomas [1, 4]. Many studies also differentiated ampulla of Vater or periampullary NETs because numerous studies demonstrated they differed from other duodenal NETs clinically, histologically and in their growth behaviors [10–15]. Ampullary NETs are frequently associated with von Recklinghausen's disease and often show somatostatin immunoreactivity, but almost never produce the clinical features of the somatostatinoma syndrome [4, 6, 10, 13, 16–20].

In older studies reporting on the 5 types of duodenal NETs, duodenal gastrinomas were the most frequent (mean 48.3% of all duodenal NETs, range 27–58%, 9 series) [4, 6, 10, 11, 21–27]; followed by somatostatinomas (mean 43 ± 6%, range 23–75%, 9 series) [4]; nonfunctional serotonin-containing tumors (mean 27.6 ± 7.2%, 6 series) [4]; nonfunctional calcitonin-containing NETs (mean 9 ± 2.5%, 4 series) [4], and finally rare gangliocytic paragangliomas or neuroendocrine carcinomas.

More than 90% of all duodenal NETs arise in the first and second part of the duodenum [4, 21, 22, 24, 26]. This has been well studied for duodenal gastrinomas [5, 6, 10, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28] where 58% arise in D1, 33% arise in D2, 5% in D3 and 4% in D4 [29–33]. Approximately 20% (mean 18 ± 5%, 6 series) of duodenal NETs occur in the periampullary region [4].

Duodenal NETs are generally small with a mean size of 1.2–1.5 cm in seven series [4] and >75% are <2 cm in diameter [4, 5, 10, 11, 24, 25, 28]. Duodenal NETs are usually limited to the submucosal or mucosa; however, they are associated with regional lymph node metastases in 40–60% [1, 4, 30, 34–36]. Liver metastases generally occur in <10% of all patients with duodenal NETs (mean 9 ± 6%, 5 series) [4].

Duodenal NETs are generally single lesions with multiple tumors detected in only 9 ± 3% (5 series) [4, 11, 21, 24–26]. Multiple tumors should lead to a suspicion of multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 (MEN1). MEN1 occurs in 6 ± 2.5% of all patients with duodenal NETs (mean, 8 series) [4, 6, 10, 21–23, 25–27]. However, MEN1 occurs in 20–30% of all patients with duodenal NETs with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome [34, 37–39].

Duodenal gangliocytic paragangliomas generally occur in the periampullary region [1, 12, 26, 40, 41]. These tumors may be large and invade the muscularis propria, but generally pursue a benign course [4, 11, 15, 42].

A WHO classification has recently been proposed for duodenal/jejunal NETs that will allow a better comparison to NETs in other locations [1]. This classification is summarized in the specific section below with a few other important points covered in the general clinicopathological section above.

Minimal Consensus Statement on Clinicopathological Features – Specific

Classification

- 1 Well-differentiated neuroendocrine tumor (carcinoid) (50–75%). (Percentage of all duodenal NETs. Modified from Kloppe et al. [1].)
Benign: nonfunctioning, confined to mucosa-submucosa, nonangioinvasive, ≤1 cm in size.
 - Gastrin-producing tumor (upper part of the duodenum)
 - Serotonin (5-HT)-producing tumor
 - Gangliocytic paraganglioma (any size and extension, periampullary)
Benign or low-grade malignant (uncertain malignant potential): confined to mucosa-submucosa, with or without angi-invasion, or >1 cm in size
 - Functioning gastrin-producing tumor (gastrinoma), sporadic or MEN-associated
 - Nonfunctioning somatostatin-producing tumor (ampullary region) with or without
 - Neurofibromatosis type 1 nonfunctioning serotonin-producing tumor
- 2 Well-differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma (malignant carcinoma) [25–50%]
Low-grade malignant: invasion of the muscularis propria and beyond or metastases
 - Functioning gastrin-producing carcinoma (gastrinoma), sporadic or MEN-associated
 - Nonfunctioning somatostatin-producing carcinoma (ampullary region) with or without neurofibromatosis type 1
 - Nonfunctioning or functioning carcinoma (with carcinoid syndrome)
 - Malignant gangliocytic paraganglioma
- 3 Poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma [<1–3%]
 - High-grade malignant

Clinicopathological Features

Although >95% of duodenal NETs synthesize GI peptides/amines, 90% are not associated with a functional syndrome. In the 10% that cause a functional syndrome the relative frequency is: ZES (10%) > carcinoid syndrome (4%) > other (<1%). Duodenal NETs occur in greatest frequency in the proximal duodenum and 40–60% have lymph node metastases. 20% of duodenal NETs occur in the periampullary region and these differ from other duodenal NETs in their biological behavior and also with respect to clinical, histological and immunohistochemical features.

Prognosis and Survival

Duodenal NETs characteristically metastasize first to proximal lymph nodes and only infrequently (<10%) to the liver or distant sites. For all patients with well-differentiated duodenal NETs (carcinoid) the 5-year survival rate is 80–85% [28, 43], whereas for patients with well-differentiated duodenal carcinomas or variant duodenal carcinoid it is significantly ($p < 0.01$) less at 72% [28].

For patients with duodenal NETs associated with Zollinger-Elison syndrome the 5-year survival is >90% [30, 35, 36]. The 5-year survival with different tumor extent with duodenal NETs is thought to be similar to all GI foregut NETs which is 80–95% for local disease, 65–75% with regional involvement only and 20–40% for the 5–10% of patients with liver or distant disease [8, 27, 43]. Invasion of the duodenal NET into the muscularis mucosa, increased primary tumor size, and increased mitotic activity correlate with the occurrence of metastatic disease or aggressive growth [5, 10, 11, 25]. Ampullary NETs are reported to share different growth patterns than do nonampullary duodenal NETs. Two studies report [10, 13] that there was no relationship between these tumors and the development of metastases with primary tumor size.

Clinical Presentation

The mean age of presentation is in the 6th decade (range 15–91 years) and there is a slight male predominance ($65 \pm 5\%$, 9 series) [4]. Because 90% of duodenal NETs are not associated with a functional clinical syndrome, either symptoms due to the tumor itself or the discovery of the tumor by chance (usually at upper GI endoscopy) lead to the diagnosis. The most common presenting symptoms are pain ($37 \pm 8\%$, range 9–64%, 6 series), jaundice ($18 \pm 4\%$, range 7–32%), nausea/vomiting ($4 \pm 8\%$), bleeding ($21 \pm 3\%$), anemia ($21 \pm 3\%$, range 1–28), diarrhea (4%) and duodenal obstruction (1%) [5, 10, 24, 25, 43, 44]. Symptoms due to ZES are present in $10 \pm 3\%$ of all patients with duodenal NETs followed by carcinoid syndrome in $4 \pm 2\%$, and rarely due to Cushing's syndrome, acromegaly due to a GRF-secreting tumor, somatostatinoma syndrome, insulinoma, glucagonoma or due to the development of polycythemia rubra vera [4, 16, 18, 19, 44–46]. An increasing percentage of duodenal NETs are being diagnosed in asymptomatic patients during a UGI endoscopy (up to 33%). The most common nonspecific symptom that led to the endoscopy was dyspepsia [10]. Periampullary NETs more frequently present with jaundice (50–60 vs. 7–15%) and also more frequently cause pain, nausea, diarrhea or vomiting [10, 11, 13, 15]. Periampullary NETs are more frequently associated with von Recklinghausen's disease (18%) and the presence of somatostatin immunoreactivity (25–100%); however, a clinical somatostatinoma syndrome is very rare with these tumors [4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 47].

Diagnostic Procedures: Imaging, Nuclear Medicine and Laboratory Tests

Diagnostic Imaging – General

Because duodenal NETs are generally small in size (mean 1.2–1.5 cm) (>75% <2 cm) [4, 5, 10, 11, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28], they are frequently missed (>80%) with con-

ventional imaging studies (CT, MRI, ultrasound, angiography) [15, 29, 30, 33, 48–52]. Studies in duodenal gastrinomas demonstrate that conventional imaging studies detect $\leq 15\%$ of gastrinomas <1 cm in diameter, 20–50% 1–3 cm in diameter and 95% >3 cm in diameter [48, 50, 53].

Although there are no systematic studies with all duodenal NETs, studies with somatostatin receptor scintigraphy (SRS) in duodenal gastrinomas show it is unlikely to be a more sensitive method to localize small duodenal primaries (<1 cm). SRS misses 50% of tumors <1 cm in diameter [30, 52, 54]. However, SRS will likely prove to be the most sensitive modality for detecting lymph node metastases, which occur in 40–60% of all patients with duodenal NETs [1, 4, 30, 34–36].

To detect the primary duodenal NET, UGI endoscopy with biopsy is the most sensitive modality with endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) used to confirm the diagnosis and locally stage the disease [55–59]. Some duodenal NETs such as gastrinomas may be primarily submucosal in location and these may be missed on both UGI endoscopy and/or EUS resulting in detection rates as low as 30–60% for duodenal gastrinomas causing ZES, which were diagnosed by hormone assays [60–62].

For full staging of duodenal NETs, helical CT is generally used [55, 56], although studies with gastrinomas suggest SRS may be more sensitive [52, 54, 63, 64].

In patients with advanced metastatic disease, bone metastases can develop especially in those with diffuse liver metastases. It is important they be sought because in other NETs their detection has been shown to generally change management [64–71]. Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy, bone scanning and MRI of the spine best detect them.

Minimal Consensus Statement on Diagnostic Procedures – Specific

Endoscopy

UGI endoscopy with biopsy is the most sensitive method to detect and diagnose most duodenal NETs, followed by endoscopic ultrasound to locally stage the disease extent.

Imaging and Nuclear Medicine

Helical CT or MRI of the abdomen and somatostatin receptor scintigraphy should be used to fully assess disease extent and detect possible distant metastases. In patients with advanced disease, including especially patients with liver metastases, bone, somatostatin scanning and an MRI of the spine should be performed to seek bone metastases.

Laboratory Tests

Serum chromogranin A (CgA) should be obtained in all patients with duodenal NETs. CgA is found in 75–100% of duodenal NETs [4, 5, 6, 10, 27, 28] and an elevated serum CgA occurs in 56–100% [10, 49, 72, 73]. Serum gastrin, somatostatin, GRF and cortisol with urinary 5-HIAA or cortisol determinations should be obtained if suggestive symptoms occur or if the duodenal NET contains these hormones on immunohistochemistry. Patients with MEN1 with a duodenal NET should have serum somatostatin, gastrin, CgA, prolactin, glucagon, insulin and parathormone determinations as well as serum glucose and ionized calcium assessments. Patients with von Recklinghausen's disease should have serum somatostatin, CgA, and calcitonin levels assessed.

Pathology and Genetics

Histopathology – General

Duodenal NETs demonstrate light microscopic features typical of GI NETs in having trabecular, acinar, ribbon or cribriform structures which are uniform, have few mitosis, little necrosis and are separated by stroma [1, 5, 23, 24]. On silver staining 75–80% of duodenal NETs are argyrophilic [5, 6, 23, 24], they are usually argentaffin negative (0–12% positive) [5, 6, 23], 75–100% show positivity for chromogranin A [4–6, 10, 27], 80–100% for neuron-specific enolase (NSE) [5, 6, 10, 28] and 91% for Leu-7 [6]. Greater than 85% of duodenal NETs synthesize GI peptides/amines and 40 ± 16% (7 series) synthesize >1 hormone/amine [4, 5]. Their relative frequency is: gastrinomas (48%) > somatostatinomas (43%) > nonfunctioning serotonin containing tumors (27%) > nonfunctioning calcitonin containing tumors (9%) > poorly differentiated carcinomas, gangliocytic paragangliomas [4]. Duodenal NETs uncommonly (<5%) produce insulin, PP, glucagon or ACTH.

Duodenal somatostatinomas tend to occur periampullary and histologically they frequently contain psammoma bodies (49–68%) [4, 6, 10, 25–28]. This is in contrast to other duodenal NETs, which uncommonly contain psammoma bodies (4.8%) [4, 11, 21, 24–28, 74].

Duodenal gangliocytic paragangliomas contain epithelial (with PP and somatostatin cells), ganglia, and spindle cells [4, 26, 75]. They characteristically contain gangliocytic differentiation and S-100 protein immunoreactive Schwann cells [26, 75]. They also show positive staining for NSE in 94–100%, PGP 9.5 in 100%, synaptophysin in 94–100%, S-100 in 90%, PP in 75–92%, serotonin in 48–69%, chromogranin in most series in 10–15% and infrequently (<1%) calcitonin, gastrin or ACTH [4, 40, 75, 76].

Poorly differentiated nonfunctional duodenal carcinomas characteristically invade the muscularis propria, metastasize to lymph nodes and more distant sites and show features of other poorly differentiated tumors as discussed in a separate consensus paper [1, 2, 77].

Minimal Consensus Statement on Histopathology and Genetics – Specific [1]

Histopathology

50–75% of duodenal NETs are well-differentiated, 25–50% well-differentiated carcinomas and <1–3% poorly differentiated carcinomas. All duodenal NETs should have routine histology with hematoxylin-eosin staining, as well as staining for chromogranin A, and synaptophysin. S-100 staining should be performed on suspected gangliocytic paragangliomas and gastrin, somatostatin and serotonin if the clinical setting is suggestive. Duodenal NETs should have a mitotic index determined by mitotic counting and a Ki-67 to assess proliferative rate. Cytology is not routinely recommended.

Genetics

Patients with a duodenal NET with MEN1, a family history suggestive of MEN1 or with multiple duodenal NETs should be considered for germline DNA testing for MEN1 (following genetic counseling).

Surgical Therapy

Curative Surgery – General

Potential curative resection is possible in most patients with duodenal NETs because only 9 ± 6% (5 series) [4] have distant metastases at diagnosis with the remainder having either no metastases or a primary with lymph node metastases (40–60%) [1, 4, 5, 30, 34, 35, 44, 49]. Numerous surgical/endoscopic methods have been reported to be effective at removing duodenal NETs, including endoscopic removal by snare or stripping; laparoscopic removal; transduodenal local excision or aggressive resection by a pancreaticoduodenectomy using either a Whipple resection or a pylorus-sparing pancreaticoduodenectomy [15, 28, 49, 51, 60, 78–88]. The optimal method for removing duodenal NETs remains unclear because their natural history is still largely unknown. In addition, the long-term relative results of resection performed with endoscopy, laparoscopy, transduodenal local resection or by pancreaticoduodenectomy have not yet been determined. Finally, the sensitivity of available tumor imaging modalities in assessing local progression pre- or postresection has not been determined, primarily because of the low frequency of these tumors [15, 44, 49, 60, 89].

Minimal Consensus Statement on Surgical Therapy – Specific

Curative Surgery

All duodenal NETs should be removed unless in the presence of distant metastases or of medical conditions that markedly limit life expectancy or increase surgical risk. Small duodenal NETs (≤ 1 cm) can be locally resected by endoscopy procedures if there is no evidence of lymph node metastases on tumor localization studies and preferably endoscopic ultrasound examination. However, if the duodenal NET is in the periampullary region, local surgical resection may be required. Large duodenal NETs (i.e. ≥ 2 cm) or duodenal NETs of any size with lymph node metastases should be treated surgically with local resection (1st part duodenum), distal duodenectomy (4th part duodenum) or pancreaticoduodenectomy (frequently required in the 2nd and 3rd part of the duodenum). Treatment of intermediate size duodenal NETs (i.e. 1–2 cm) is controversial with some recommending endoscopic removal if no lymph node metastases are present on tumor localization studies (helical CT/MRI, endoscopic ultrasound), whereas others recommend surgical treatment of these NETs [15, 28, 44, 49, 60]. With ampullary NETs, a number of studies report no correlation between the NET size and the presence of malignancy [13–15, 42] and thus a pancreaticoduodenectomy is generally recommended for these tumors.

Palliative Surgery

In the uncommon patient with a duodenal NET who has hepatic metastases that are potentially resectable without distant metastases and no medical conditions markedly limiting life expectancy or increasing surgical risk, surgical resection and/or ablative therapy should be considered.

Medical Therapy

Minimal Consensus Statement on Medical Therapy

For the $<10\%$ of patients with functional hormonal syndromes due to a duodenal NET, appropriate specific therapy for the hormone excess state should be instituted. Specifically, treatment of the acid hypersecretion with proton pump inhibitors in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome; treatment with somatostatin analogues for carcinoid syndrome, and treatment of ectopic Cushing's syndrome medically or by adrenalectomy. For patients with advanced metastatic disease, alpha interferon can be attempted, however, experience is limited. For patients with progressive advanced metastatic disease or with symptomatic diffuse metastatic disease, the combination of streptozotocin and 5-fluorouracil/doxorubicin is recommended in tumors with a low to moderate proliferative rate. Cisplatin/carboplatin plus etoposide is recommended in such patients with poorly differentiated tumors (see relevant consensus paper). For patients with metastatic/inoperable disease with no other options, peptide receptor radionuclide therapy (PRRT) should be considered if the octreoscan is positive. Although there is extensive experience with this therapy with other GI NETs, especially with lutetium-177- or yttrium-90-labeled somatostatin analogues [90–94], there is minimal experience specifically with duodenal NETs.

Follow-Up

Minimal Consensus Statement at Follow-Up

In patients with a nonfunctional duodenal NET completely removed at endoscopy, follow-up endoscopic examinations, abdominal ultrasound or CT and serum chromogranin A levels are recommended at 6, 24 and 36 months. In patients with postsurgical resection, helical CT, somatostatin receptor scintigraphy and serum chromogranin levels are recommended at 6 and 12 months, then yearly for at least 3 years. If any abnormalities are detected, endoscopic ultrasound should be performed. For patients with unresectable advanced metastatic disease, if no treatment is given because the disease is not progressive or symptomatic, the patient should be re-evaluated at 3- to 6-month intervals by chromogranin A, helical CT and/or ultrasound and somatostatin receptor scintigraphy. For patients with metastatic/inoperable disease receiving antitumor treatment (chemotherapy, interferon-alpha, PRRT) follow-up needs to be dictated by the protocol used and expected toxicities.

List of Participants

G. Cadiot, Department of Hepatology and Gastroenterology, CHU Bacchant – B. Claude Bernard University, Paris (France); M. Caplin, Department of Gastroenterology, Royal Free Hospital, London (UK); D. Chung, Department of Gastroenterology, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Mass. (USA); A. Couvelard, Department of Gastroenterology, Beaujon Hospital, Clichy (France); W.W. de Herder, Department of Endocrinology, Erasmus MC University, Rotterdam (the Netherlands); G. Delle Fave, Department of Digestive and Liver Disease, Ospedale S. Andrea, Rome (Italy); B. Eriksson, Department of Endocrinology, University Hospital, Uppsala (Sweden); A. Falchetti, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Florence and Centro di Riferimento Regionale Tumori Endocrini Ereditari, Azienda Ospedaliera Careggi, Florence (Italy); M. Falconi, Department of Surgery, Verona University, Verona (Italy); D. Ferone, Department of Endocrinology, Genoa University, Genoa (Italy); P. Goretzki, Department of Surgery, Städtisches Klinikum Neuss, Lukas Hospital, Neuss (Germany); D. Gross, Department of Endocrinology and Metabolism, Hadassah University, Jerusalem (Israel); D. Hochhauser, Department of Oncology, Royal Free University, London (UK); R. Hyrdel, Department of Internal Medicine, Martin University, Martin (Slovakia); G. Kaltsas, Department of Endocrinology and Metabolism, Genimatas Hospital, Athens (Greece); F. Keleştimur, Department of Endocrinology, Erciyes University, Kayseri (Turkey); R. Kianmanesh, Department of Surgery, UFR Bichat-Beaujon-Louis Mourier Hospital, Colombes (France); W. Knapp, Department of Nuclear Medicine, Medizinische Hochschule Hannover, Hannover (Germany); P. Komminoth, Department of Pathology, Kantonsspital, Baden (Switzerland); M. Körner, University of Bern, Institut für Pathologie, Bern (Switzerland); B. Kos-Kudła, Department of Endocrinology, Slaska University, Zabrze (Poland); L. Kvols, Department of Oncology, South Florida University, Tampa, Fla. (USA); V. Lewington, Department of Radiology, Royal Marsden Hospital, Sutton (UK); R. Manfredi, Department of Radiology, Istituto di Radiologia, Policlinico GB,

Verona (Italy); A.M. McNicol, Department of Oncology and Pathology, Royal Infirmary Hospital, Glasgow (United Kingdom); E. Mitry, Department of Hepatology and Gastroenterology, CHV A Pare Hospital, Boulogne (France); B. Niederle, Department of Surgery, Wien University, Vienna (Austria); G. Nikou, Department of Propaedeutic Internal Medicine, Laiko Hospital, Athens (Greece); O. Nilsson, Department of Pathology, Gothenberg University, Gothenberg (Sweden); K. Öberg, Department of Endocrinology, University Hospital, Uppsala (Sweden); J. O'Connor, Department of Oncology, Alexander Fleming Institute, Buenos Aires (Argentina); S. Pauwels, Department of Nuclear Medicine, Catholique de Louvain University, Brussels (Belgium); U.-F. Pape, Department of Internal Medicine, Charité, University of Berlin (Germany); M. Pavel, Department of Endocrinology, Erlangen University, Erlangen (Germany); A. Perren, Department of Pathology, Universitätsspital Zürich, Zürich (Switzerland); U. Plöckinger, Department of Hepatology and Gastroenterology, Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin (Germany); J. Ramage, Department of Gastroenterology, North Hampshire Hospital, Hampshire (UK); J. Ricke, Department of Radiology, Charité

Universitätsmedizin, Berlin (Germany); P. Ruszniewski, Department of Gastroenterology, Beaujon Hospital, Clichy (France); R. Salazar, Department of Oncology, Institut Català d'Oncologia, Barcelona (Spain); A. Sauvanet, Department of Surgery, Beaujon Hospital, Clichy (France); A. Scarpa, Department of Pathology, Verona University, Verona (Italy); J.Y. Scoazec, Department of Pathology, Edouard Herriot Hospital, Lyon (France); M.I. Sevilla Garcia, Department of Oncology, Virgen de la Victoria Hospital, Malaga (Spain); T. Steinmüller, Department of Surgery, Vivantes Humboldt Hospital, Berlin (Germany); A. Sundin, Department of Radiology, Uppsala University, Uppsala (Sweden); E. Van Cutsem, Department of Gastroenterology, Gasthuisberg University, Leuven (Belgium); M.P. Vullierme, Department of Gastroenterology, Beaujon Hospital, Clichy (France); B. Wiedenmann, Department of Hepatology and Gastroenterology, Charité Universitätsmedizin, Berlin (Germany); S. Wildi, Department of Surgery, Zürich Hospital, Zürich, Switzerland; J.C. Yao, Department of Oncology, University of Texas, Houston, Tex. (USA); S. Zgliczyński, Department of Endocrinology, Bielanski Hospital, Warsaw (Poland).

References

- Kloppel G, Perren A, Heitz PU: The gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine cell system and its tumors: the WHO classification. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 2004;1014:13–27.
- Attanoos R, Williams GT: Epithelial and neuroendocrine tumors of the duodenum. *Semin Diagn Pathol* 1991;8:149–162.
- Jensen RT, Doherty GM: Carcinoid tumors and the carcinoid syndrome; in DeVita VT Jr, Hellman S, Rosenberg SA (eds): *Cancer: Principles and Practice of Oncology*. Philadelphia, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2001, pp 1813–1833.
- Hoffmann KM, Furukawa M, Jensen RT: Duodenal neuroendocrine tumors: classification, functional syndromes, diagnosis and medical treatment. *Best Pract Res Clin Gastroenterol* 2005;19:675–697.
- Soga J, Yakuwa Y: Duodenal carcinoids: a statistical evaluation of 635 cases collected from the literature. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 1996;15:3–10.
- Burke AP, Federspiel BH, Sobin LH, Shekita KM, Helwig EB: Carcinoids of the duodenum. A histologic and immunohistochemical study of 65 tumors. *Am J Surg Pathol* 1989;13:828–837.
- Williams ED, Sandler M: The classification of carcinoid tumours. *Lancet* 1963;1:238–239.
- Modlin IM, Lye KD, Kidd M: A 5-decade analysis of 13,715 carcinoid tumors. *Cancer* 2003;97:934–959.
- Spinazzola AJ, Gillesby WJ: Primary malignant neoplasms of the duodenum: report of twelve cases. *Am Surg* 1963;29:405–412.
- Witzigmann H, Loracher C, Geissler F, Wagner T, Tannapfel A, Uhlmann D, Caca K, Hauss J, Hehl A: Neuroendocrine tumours of the duodenum: clinical aspects, pathomorphology and therapy. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2002;386:525–533.
- Bornstein-Quevedo L, Gamboa-Dominguez A: Carcinoid tumors of the duodenum and ampulla of Vater: a clinicomorphologic, immunohistochemical, and cell kinetic comparison. *Hum Pathol* 2001;32:1252–1256.
- Walton GF, Gibbs ER, Spencer GO, Laws HL: Carcinoid tumors of the ampulla of Vater. *Am Surg* 1997;63:302–304.
- Hatzitheoklitos E, Buchler MW, Friess H, Poch B, Ebert M, Mohr W, Imaizumi T, Berger HG: Carcinoid of the ampulla of Vater: clinical characteristics and morphologic features. *Cancer* 1994;73:1580–1588.
- Clements WM, Martin SP, Stemmerman G, Lowy AM: Ampullary carcinoid tumors: rationale for an aggressive surgical approach. *J Gastrointest Surg* 2003;7:773–776.
- Hartel M, Wente MN, Sido B, Friess H, Büchler MW: Carcinoid of the ampulla of Vater. *J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2005;20:676–681.
- Soga J, Yakuwa Y: Somatostatinoma/inhibitory syndrome: a statistical evaluation of 173 reported cases as compared to other pancreatic endocrinomas. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 1999;18:13–22.
- Taccagni GL, Carlucci M, Sironi M, Cantaboni A, DiCarlo V: Duodenal somatostatinoma with psammoma bodies: an immunohistochemical and ultrastructural study. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1986;81:33–37.
- Green BT, Rockey DC: Duodenal somatostatinoma presenting with complete somatostatinoma syndrome. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 2001;33:415–417.
- Swinburn BA, Yeong ML, Lane MR, Nicholson GI, Holdaway IM: Neurofibromatosis associated with somatostatinoma: a report of two patients. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)* 1988;28:353–359.
- Jensen RT: Endocrine tumors of the pancreas; in Yamada T, Alpers DH, Kaplowitz N, Laine L, Owyang C, Powell DW (eds): *Textbook of Gastroenterology*. Philadelphia, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2003, pp 2108–2146.
- Weichert RF 3rd, Roth LM, Kremenz ET, Hewitt RL, Drapanas T: Carcinoid-islet cell tumors of the duodenum. *Am J Surg* 1971;121:195–205.
- Lasson A, Alwmark A, Nobin A, Sundler F: Endocrine tumors of the duodenum. Clinical characteristics and hormone content. *Ann Surg* 1983;197:393–398.
- Alumets J, Sundler F, Falkmer S, Ljungberg O, Hakanson R, Martensson H, Nobin A, Lasson A: Neurohormonal peptides in endocrine tumors of the pancreas, stomach, and upper small intestine. I. An immunohistochemical study of 27 cases. *Ultrastruct Pathol* 1983;5:55–72.
- Stamm B, Hedinger CE, Saremaslani P: Duodenal and ampullary carcinoid tumors. A report of 12 cases with pathological characteristics, polypeptide content and relation to MEN 1 syndrome and von Recklinghausen's disease (neurofibromatosis). *Virchows Arch [A]* 1986;408:475–489.

- 25 Burke AP, Sobin LH, Federspiel BH, Shekita KM, Helwig EB: Carcinoid tumors of the duodenum: a clinicopathologic study of 99 cases. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 1990;114:700-704.
- 26 Capella C, Riva C, Rindi G, Usellini L, Chiaravalli A, Solcia E: Endocrine tumors of the duodenum and upper jejunum: a study of 33 cases with clinico-pathological characteristics and hormone content. *Hepatogastroenterology* 1990;37:247-252.
- 27 Heymann MF, Hamy A, Triau S, Miraille E, Toquet C, Chomarot H, Cohen C, Maitre F, Le Bodie MF: Endocrine tumors of the duodenum. A study of 55 cases relative to clinicopathological features and hormone content. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2004;51:1367-1371.
- 28 Soga J: Endocrinocarcinomas (carcinoids and their variants) of the duodenum. An evaluation of 927 cases. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 2003;22:349-363.
- 29 Thom AK, Norton JA, Axiotis CA, Jensen RT: Location, incidence and malignant potential of duodenal gastrinomas. *Surgery* 1991;110:1086-1093.
- 30 Norton JA, Alexander HR, Fraker DL, Venzon DJ, Jensen RT: Does the use of routine duodenotomy (DUODX) affect rate of cure, development of liver metastases or survival in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome (ZES)? *Ann Surg* 2004;239:617-626.
- 31 Norton JA, Jensen RT: Current surgical management of Zollinger-Ellison syndrome (ZES) in patients without multiple endocrine neoplasia-type 1 (MEN1). *Surg Oncol* 2003;12:145-151.
- 32 Gibril F, Jensen RT: Advances in evaluation and management of gastrinoma in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Curr Gastroenterol Rep* 2005;7:114-121.
- 33 Zogakis TG, Gibril F, Libutti SK, Norton JA, White DE, Jensen RT, Alexander HR: Management and outcome of patients with sporadic gastrinomas arising in the duodenum. *Ann Surg* 2003;238:42-48.
- 34 Jensen RT, Gardner JD: Gastrinoma; in Go VLW, DiMagno EP, Gardner JD, Lebenthal E, Reber HA, Scheele GA (eds): *The Pancreas: Biology, Pathobiology and Disease*. New York, Raven Press, 1993, pp 931-978.
- 35 Weber HC, Venzon DJ, Lin JT, Fishbein VA, Orbuch M, Strader DB, Gibril F, Metz DC, Fraker DL, Norton JA, Jensen RT: Determinants of metastatic rate and survival in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome: a prospective long-term study. *Gastroenterology* 1995;108:1637-1649.
- 36 Yu F, Venzon DJ, Serrano J, Goebel SU, Doppman JL, Gibril F, Jensen RT: Prospective study of the clinical course, prognostic factors and survival in patients with longstanding Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:615-630.
- 37 Gibril F, Schumann M, Pace A, Jensen RT: Multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 and Zollinger-Ellison syndrome: a prospective study of 107 cases and comparison with 1009 patients from the literature. *Medicine* 2004;83:43-83.
- 38 Jensen RT: Management of the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome in patients with multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1. *J Intern Med* 1998;243:477-488.
- 39 Norton JA, Fraker DL, Alexander HR, Venzon DJ, Doppman JL, Serrano J, Goebel SU, Peghini P, Roy PK, Gibril F, Jensen RT: Surgery to cure the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 1999;341:635-644.
- 40 Burke AP, Helwig EB: Gangliocytic paraganglioma. *Am J Clin Pathol* 1985;92:1-9.
- 41 Cohen T, Zweig SJ, Tallis A, Tuazon R, Reich M: Paraganglioma of the duodenum: report of a case with radiographic findings, angiographic findings and a review of the literature. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1981;75:197-203.
- 42 Makhlof HR, Burke AP, Sobin LH: Carcinoid tumors of the ampulla of Vater: a comparison with duodenal carcinoid tumors. *Cancer* 1999;85:1241-1249.
- 43 Kirshbom PM, Kherani AR, Onaitis MW, Hata A, Kehoe TE, Feldman C, Feldman JM, Tyler DS: Foregut carcinoids: a clinical and biochemical analysis. *Surgery* 1999;126:1105-1110.
- 44 Zyromski NJ, Kendrick ML, Nagorney DM, Grant CS, Donohue JH, Farnell MB, Thompson GB, Farley DR, Sarr MG: Duodenal carcinoid tumors: how aggressive should we be? *J Gastrointest Surg* 2001;5:588-593.
- 45 Wang HY, Chen MJ, Yang TL, Chang MC, Chan YJ: Carcinoid tumor of the duodenum and accessory papilla associated with polycythemia vera. *World J Gastroenterol* 2005;11:3794-3796.
- 46 Amano S, Hazama F, Haebara H, Tsurusawa M, Kaito H: Ectopic ACTH-MSH producing carcinoid tumor with multiple endocrine hyperplasia in a child. *Acta Pathol Jpn* 1978;28:721-730.
- 47 Dayal Y, Tallberg KA, Nunnemacher G, DeLellis RA, Wolfe HJ: Duodenal carcinoids in patients with and without neurofibromatosis: a comparative study. *Am J Surg Pathol* 1986;10:348-357.
- 48 Maton PN, Miller DL, Doppman JL, Collen MJ, Norton JA, Vinayek R, Slaff JI, Wank SA, Gardner JD, Jensen RT: Role of selective angiography in the management of Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Gastroenterology* 1987;92:913-918.
- 49 Mullen JT, Wang H, Yao JC, Lee JH, Perrier ND, Pisters PW, Lee JE, Evans DB: Carcinoid tumors of the duodenum. *Surgery* 2005;138:971-977.
- 50 Orbuch M, Doppman JL, Strader DB, Fishbein VA, Benya RV, Metz DC, Jensen RT: Imaging for pancreatic endocrine tumor localization: recent advances; in Mignon M, Jensen R T (eds): *Endocrine Tumors of the Pancreas: Recent Advances in Research and Management*. Front Gastrointest Res. Basel, Karger, 1995, vol 23, pp 268-281.
- 51 Norton JA, Doppman JL, Jensen RT: Curative resection in Zollinger-Ellison syndrome: results of a 10-year prospective study. *Ann Surg* 1992;215:8-18.
- 52 Alexander HR, Fraker DL, Norton JA, Barrett DL, Tio L, Benjamin SB, Doppman JL, Goebel SU, Serrano J, Gibril F, Jensen RT: Prospective study of somatostatin receptor scintigraphy and its effect on operative outcome in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 1998;228:228-238.
- 53 Frucht H, Doppman JL, Norton JA, Miller DL, Dwyer AJ, Frank JA, Vinayek R, Maton PN, Jensen RT: Gastrinomas: comparison of MR imaging with CT, angiography and US. *Radiology* 1989;171:713-717.
- 54 Gibril F, Jensen RT: Diagnostic uses of radio-labelled somatostatin-receptor analogues in gastroenteropancreatic endocrine tumors. *Dig Liver Dis* 2004;36:S106-S120.
- 55 Acs G, McGrath CM, Gupta PK: Duodenal carcinoid tumor: report of a case diagnosed by endoscopic ultrasound-guided fine-needle aspiration biopsy with immunocytochemical correlation. *Diagn Cytopathol* 2000;23:183-186.
- 56 Yoshikane H, Tsukamoto Y, Niwa Y, Goto H, Hase S, Mizutani K, Nakamura T: Carcinoid tumors of the gastrointestinal tract: evaluation with endoscopic ultrasonography. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1993;39:375-383.
- 57 Dalenback J, Havel G: Local endoscopic removal of duodenal carcinoid tumors. *Endoscopy* 2004;36:651-655.
- 58 Yoshikane H, Suzuki T, Yoshioka N, Ogawa Y, Hamajima E, Hasegawa N, Hasegawa C: Duodenal carcinoid tumor: endosonographic imaging and endoscopic resection. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1995;90:642-644.
- 59 Yoshikane H, Goto H, Niwa Y, Matsui M, Ohashi S, Suzuki T, Hamajima E, Hayakawa T: Endoscopic resection of small duodenal carcinoid tumors with strip biopsy technique. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1998;47:466-470.
- 60 Norton JA, Jensen RT: Resolved and unresolved controversies in the surgical management of patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 2004;240:757-773.
- 61 Proye C, Malvaux P, Pattou F, Filoche B, Godchaux JM, Maunoury V, Palazzo L, Huglo D, Lefebvre J, Paris JC: Noninvasive imaging of insulinomas and gastrinomas with endoscopic ultrasonography and somatostatin receptor scintigraphy. *Surgery* 1998;124:1134-1144.

- 62 Ruzsniowski P, Amouyal P, Amouyal G, Grange JD, Mignon M, Bouch O, Bernades P: Localization of gastrinomas by endoscopic ultrasonography in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Surgery* 1995;117:629–635.
- 63 Gibril F, Reynolds JC, Doppman JL, Chen CC, Venzon DJ, Termanini B, Weber HC, Stewart CA, Jensen RT: Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy: its sensitivity compared with that of other imaging methods in detecting primary and metastatic gastrinomas: a prospective study. *Ann Intern Med* 1996; 125:26–34.
- 64 Termanini B, Gibril F, Reynolds JC, Doppman JL, Chen CC, Stewart CA, Sutliff V, Jensen RT: Value of somatostatin receptor scintigraphy: a prospective study in gastrinoma of its effect on clinical management. *Gastroenterology* 1997;112:335–347.
- 65 Gibril F, Doppman JL, Reynolds JC, Chen CC, Sutliff VE, Yu F, Serrano J, Venzon DJ, Jensen RT: Bone metastases in patients with gastrinomas: a prospective study of bone scanning, somatostatin receptor scanning, and MRI in their detection, their frequency, location and effect of their detection on management. *J Clin Oncol* 1998;16:1040–1053.
- 66 Meijer WG, van der Veer E, Jager PL, van der Jagt EJ, Piers BA, Kema IP, de Vries EGE, Willemse PHB: Bone metastases in carcinoid tumors: Clinical features, imaging characteristics, and markers of bone metabolism. *J Nucl Med* 2003;44:184–191.
- 67 Lebtahi R, Cadiot G, Delahaye N, Genin R, Daou D, Peker MC, Chosidow D, Faraggi M, Mignon M, LeGuludec D: Detection of bone metastases in patients with endocrine gastroenteropancreatic tumors: bone scintigraphy compared with somatostatin receptor scintigraphy. *J Nucl Med* 1999;40:1602–1608.
- 68 Hubalewska-Dydejczyk A, Szybinski P, Fross-Baron K, Mikolajczak R, Huszno B, Sowa-Staszczak A: (99m)Tc-EDDA/HYNIC-octreotate: a new radiotracer for detection and staging of NET: a case of metastatic duodenal carcinoid. *Nucl Med Rev Cent East Eur* 2005;8:155–156.
- 69 Taal BG, Smits M: Developments in diagnosis and treatment of metastatic midgut carcinoid tumors: a review. *Minerva Gastroenterol Dietol* 2005;51:335–344.
- 70 Oo TH, Aish LS, Schneider D, Hassoun H: Carcinoid tumor presenting with bone marrow metastases. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:2995–2996.
- 71 Zuetenhorst JM, Hoefnagel CA, Boot H, Valdes Olmos RA, Taal BG: Evaluation of (111)In-pentetreotide, (131)I-MIBG and bone scintigraphy in the detection and clinical management of bone metastases in carcinoid disease. *Nucl Med Commun* 2002;23: 735–741.
- 72 Goebel SU, Serrano J, Yu F, Gibril F, Venzon DJ, Jensen RT: Prospective study of the value of serum chromogranin A or serum gastrin levels in assessment of the presence, extent, or growth of gastrinomas. *Cancer* 1999;85: 1470–1483.
- 73 Nikou GC, Toubanakis C, Nikolaou P, Giannatou E, Marinou K, Safioleas M, Karamanolis D: Gastrinomas associated with MEN-1 syndrome: new insights for the diagnosis and management in a series of 11 patients. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2005;52: 1668–1676.
- 74 Tanaka S, Yamasaki S, Matsushita S, Ozawa Y, Kurosaki A, Takeuchi K, Hoshihara Y, Doi T, Watanabe G, Kawaminami K: Duodenal somatostatinoma: a case report and review of 31 cases with special reference to the relationship between tumor size and metastasis. *Pathol Int* 2000;50:146–152.
- 75 Barbareschi M, Frigo B, Aldovini D, Leonardi E, Cristina S, Falleni M: Duodenal gangliocytic paraganglioma. Report of a case and review of the literature. *Virchows Arch [A]* 1989;416:81–89.
- 76 Altavilla G, Chiarelli S, Fassina A: Duodenal periampullary gangliocytic paraganglioma: report of two cases with immunohistochemical and ultrastructural study. *Ultrastruct Pathol* 2001;25:137–145.
- 77 Sata N, Tsukahara M, Koizumi M, Yoshizawa K, Kurihara K, Nagai H, Someya T, Saito K: Primary small-cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the duodenum: a case report and review of literature. *World J Surg Oncol* 2004; 2:28.
- 78 Pyun DK, Moon G, Han J, Kim MH, Lee SS, Seo DW, Lee SK: A carcinoid tumor of the ampulla of Vater treated by endoscopic snare papillectomy. *Korean J Intern Med* 2004;19: 257–260.
- 79 Bowers SP, Smith CD: Laparoscopic resection of posterior duodenal bulb carcinoid tumor. *Am Surg* 2003;69:792–795.
- 80 Perng CL, Lin HJ, Wang K, Lai CR, Lee SD: Treatment of duodenal carcinoid by strip biopsy. *J Clin Gastroenterol* 1995;20:168–171.
- 81 Sato T, Fukunaga T, Ohyama S, Ueno M, Oya M, Yamamoto J, Saiura A, Yamaguchi T, Muto T, Kato Y: Endoscopic total layer resection with laparoscopic sentinel node dissection and defect closure for duodenal carcinoid. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2005; 52: 678–679.
- 82 Horsley GW, Golden BN: Carcinoid tumors of the duodenum. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1957; 105:417–424.
- 83 Thompson GB, Van Heerden JA, Martin JK Jr, Schutt AJ, Ilstrup DM, Carney JA: Carcinoid tumors of the gastrointestinal tract: presentation, management, and prognosis. *Surgery* 1985;98:1054–1063.
- 84 Toyonaga T, Nakamura K, Araki Y, Shimura H, Tanaka M: Laparoscopic treatment of duodenal carcinoid tumor: wedge resection of the duodenal bulb under endoscopic control. *Surg Endosc* 1998;12:1085–1087.
- 85 Blanc P, Porcheron J, Pages A, Breton C, Mosnier JF, Balique JG: Laparoscopic excision of a duodenal neuroendocrine tumor. *Ann Chir* 2000;125:176–178.
- 86 Yamamoto C, Aoyagi K, Suekane H, Iida M, Hizawa K, Kuwano Y, Nakamura S, Fujishima M: Carcinoid tumors of the duodenum: report of three cases treated by endoscopic resection. *Endoscopy* 1997;29:218–221.
- 87 Sugg SL, Norton JA, Fraker DL, Metz DC, Pisegna JR, Fishbeyn V, Benya RV, Shawker TH, Doppman JL, Jensen RT: A prospective study of intraoperative methods to diagnose and resect duodenal gastrinomas. *Ann Surg* 1993;218:138–144.
- 88 Norton JA, Doppman JL, Collen MJ, Harmon JW, Maton PN, Gardner JD, Jensen RT: Prospective study of gastrinoma localization and resection in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 1986;204:468–479.
- 89 Yoshikane H, Tsukamoto Y, Niwa Y, Goto H, Hase S, Mizutani K, Nakamura T: Carcinoid tumors of the gastrointestinal tract: evaluation with endoscopic ultrasonography. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1993;39:375–383.
- 90 Krenning EP, Kwekkeboom DJ, Valkema R, Pauwels S, Kvols LK, de Jong M: Peptide receptor radionuclide therapy. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 2004;1014:234–245.
- 91 deJong M, Kwekkeboom D, Valkema R, Krenning EP: Radiolabelled peptides for tumour therapy: current status and future directions Plenary lecture at the EANM 2002. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2003;30:463–469.
- 92 Kwekkeboom DJ, Mueller-Brand J, Paganelli G, Anthony LB, Pauwels S, Kvols LK, O'Dorisio TM, Valkema R, Bodei L, Chinol M, Maecke HR, Krenning EP: Overview of results of peptide receptor radionuclide therapy with 3 radiolabeled somatostatin analogs. *J Nucl Med* 2005;46(suppl 1):62S–66S.
- 93 Valkema R, Pauwels S, Kvols LK, Barone R, Jamar F, Bakker WH, Kwekkeboom DJ, Bouterfa H, Krenning EP: Survival and response after peptide receptor radionuclide therapy with [(90)Y-DOTA(0),Tyr(3)]octreotide in patients with advanced gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *Semin Nucl Med* 2006;36:147–156.
- 94 Kwekkeboom DJ, Teunissen JJ, Bakker WH, Kooij PP, de Herder WW, Feelders RA, van Eijck CH, Esser JP, Kam BL, Krenning EP: Radiolabeled somatostatin analog [177Lu-DOTA0,Tyr3]octreotate in patients with endocrine gastroenteropancreatic tumors. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:2754–2762.