Medical management of secretory syndromes related to gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumours
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Abstract

Although recent epidemiological evidence indicates that the prevalence of non-functioning gastroenteropancreatic (GEP) neuroendocrine tumours (NETs) is rising, a significant number of GEP-NETs still present with symptoms related to the secretion of biologically active substances leading to the development of distinct clinical syndromes. In the past, these syndromes were associated with substantial morbidity and mortality due to the lack of specific therapies; however, since the introduction of long-acting somatostatin analogues and medications such as proton pump inhibitors, their control has been greatly improved. As a result, nowadays, the main cause of morbidity and mortality in GEP-NETs is mostly directly related to tumour growth and the extent of metastatic disease. However, in some patients with functioning tumours and extensive disease, control of the secretory syndrome still remains problematic, necessitating the employment of several cytoreductive techniques, which may not always be sufficient. Recently, new agents directed against tumour growth, or exerting increased binding activity to receptors expressed in these tumours, or interfering with the synthetic pathway of some of the compounds secreted by these tumours, have been developed. Since there are no specific guidelines addressing the totality of the management of the secretory syndromes related to GEP-NETs, this review aims at critically analysing the medical management of previously recognised secretory syndromes; it also addresses areas of uncertainty, assesses the newer therapeutic developments and also addresses recently described but poorly characterised secretory syndromes related to GEP-NETs.
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Introduction

Gastroenteropancreatic (GEP) neuroendocrine tumours (NETs) are considered to be relatively rare, with an estimated incidence of 3–5 cases per 100,000 inhabitants; however, recent data indicate that their prevalence is increasing following the introduction of newer more sensitive biochemical and imaging modalities (Modlin et al. 2008, Huguet et al. 2015). In the past GEP-NETs came to medical attention due to their ability to secrete biologically active substances leading to the development of characteristic clinical syndromes (functioning tumours). Nowadays the majority of GEP-NETs do not cause secretory syndromes and present with metastases or symptoms of mass effect (non-functioning tumours) (Kalsas et al. 2004). Neuroendocrine tumours are considered to originate from multipotent cells scattered throughout the gastrointestinal (GI) system that belong to the diffuse endocrine system, and have the ability to synthesise and secrete peptides and amines, a number of which can be bioactive (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Modlin et al. 2008). Traditionally, secretory syndromes were attributed to tumours originating from the pancreas (pancreatic NETs, pNETs) and the so-called midgut (‘carcinoid’) tumours, the majority of which were derived from the ileum (Table 1). More recently, it has become apparent that some of these tumours are capable of secreting substances that are considered to originate from other tissues, making their diagnosis and identification difficult. Furthermore, NETs that were apparently considered to be initially non-functioning may acquire (during the course of the disease) the ability to secrete specific compounds and become functioning, whereas functioning tumours may alter their secretory profile by secreting a different compound (Tomassetti et al. 2001, Kaltsas et al. 2004, Crona et al. 2016). Very recently, a number of newly characterised secretory syndromes that are not previously recognised have been identified, highlighting the need of increased awareness of these functioning NETs and potential alterations of their secretory component in order to identify them and provide appropriate treatment.

In the past, functioning GEP-NETs were associated with increased morbidity and mortality due to the lack of any specific treatment. However, following the demonstration that the majority of GEP-NETs express somatostatin receptors (SSTRs) on their cell surface, and the introduction of long-acting somatostatin analogues (SSAs) that exhibit an overall inhibitory secretory effect in tumours bearing such receptors, significant symptomatic control was obtained in many of the functioning NETs (Kvols et al. 1985, Kaltsas et al. 2004, Modlin et al. 2010). Indeed, patients with a number of secretory syndromes related to GEP-NETs obtained substantial symptomatic and biochemical responses to these agents, although their effect on tumour growth was not as prominent (Modlin et al. 2010). In addition, proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) have also proven to be efficacious in controlling the secretory syndrome related to excessive gastrin secretion (Ito et al. 2013). The introduction of these medications along with the use of various other drugs has resulted in a significant reduction in morbidity and mortality related to functioning GEP-NETs. In addition, the development of more potent SSAs and compounds that inhibit the synthetic pathway of specific bioactive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEP-NET</th>
<th>Syndrome</th>
<th>Incidence (new/100,000 year)</th>
<th>Secretory component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carcinoid tumours</td>
<td>Carcinoid syndrome</td>
<td>2–3</td>
<td>Serotonin, tachykinins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrinoma</td>
<td>Zollinger–Ellison syndrome (ZE)</td>
<td>0.5–1.0</td>
<td>Gastrin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulinoma</td>
<td>Endogenous hyperinsulinim</td>
<td>0.5–1.0</td>
<td>Insulin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIPoma</td>
<td>Verner–Morrison syndrome, WDHA</td>
<td>0.05–0.1</td>
<td>VIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glucagonoma</td>
<td>Glucagonoma</td>
<td>0.01–0.05</td>
<td>Glucagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somatostatinoma</td>
<td>Somatostatinoma</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>Somatostatin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTHoma</td>
<td>ACTH</td>
<td>&lt;0.05</td>
<td>ACTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHRHoma</td>
<td>GHRH</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>GHRH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pNET causing carcinoid syndrome</td>
<td>Carcinoid syndrome</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Serotonin, tachykinins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pNET causing hypercalcaemia</td>
<td>LH, rennin, GLP-1, IGF-2, erythropoietin, CCK, enteroglucacon</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
<td>PTHrP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare pNETs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1–5 cases</td>
<td>Various hormones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTH, adrenocorticotrophin hormone; CCK, cholecystokinin; GHRH, growth hormone-releasing factor; GLP-1, glucagon-like peptide 1; IGF-2, insulin growth factor 2; LH, luteinising hormone; PTHrP, parathyroid hormone-releasing peptide; VIP, vasointestinal peptide; WDHA, watery diarrhoea hypokalaemia achlorhydria.
substances has further expanded our therapeutic options. However, a number of secretory syndromes related to GEP-NETs such as the carcinoid syndrome (CS), with or without an associated carcinoid crisis, and malignant insulinomas, along with malignant pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas, still comprise a significant cause of mortality, as the control of secretory component may still not be possible in many cases.

Rationale for treatment of functioning GEP-NETs with SSAs

As early as the 1980s, it was demonstrated that native somatostatin (SS-14) could ameliorate many of the symptoms of the CS (Thulin et al. 1978). Because native SS has a relatively short half-life, synthetic compounds mimicking its action but with significantly longer half-lives have been developed. Octreotide was the first synthetic SSA exhibiting high affinity for SSTRs type 2 and 5 (SSTR 2,5) to have been introduced into clinical practice (Bauer et al. 1982). Since the majority of GEP-NETs express SSTRs on their surface, it became apparent that they represent ideal targets for these compounds (Kvols et al. 1985, Kalsas et al. 2004). Initially, subcutaneous (s.c.) injection of octreotide was shown to control symptoms in patients with functioning NETs (Wood et al. 1985) and prevent the development of carcinoid crisis in patients with CS undergoing invasive procedures or surgery (Kvols et al. 1985). The development of a depot formulation of octreotide LAR (‘long-acting repeatable’) (Novartis), administered at doses of 30mg at monthly intervals, substantially reduced the need for daily octreotide injections (Rubin et al. 1999). However, the latter can still be used as ‘top-up’ doses in cases of symptom breakthrough, due to either resistance or waning of the octreotide LAR effect over the month, fluctuations of hormonal levels secreted by the tumour or tumour progression (Rubin et al. 1999, Kalsas et al. 2004, Modlin et al. 2010). A number of other octapeptide analogues with similar actions to octreotide have also been synthesised, the most extensively used being lanreotide; this is also available in a long-acting formulation, the most convenient being lanreotide autogel (Ipsen). Long-acting SSAs (octreotide and lanreotide) are the best available option for symptom relief from secretory tumours bearing SSTRs on their surface, irrespective of the secretory components being either amines or peptides (Modlin et al. 2010). Furthermore, new synthetic SSAs with affinity for additional SSTRs have been synthesised in an attempt to increase the efficacy of these compounds (Table 2). It has previously been noticed that an escape phenomenon regarding symptomatic control may develop in patients treated with SSAs over times ranging from a few months to many years (Hofland & Lamberts 2003). Although this has been merely attributed to desensitisation of tumour-related hormonal secretion by SSAs, it is most commonly encountered following tumour progression and an increase in the secretory component leading to a reduction in the efficacy of SSAs (Hofland & Lamberts 2003, Kalsas et al. 2004, Strosberg et al. 2013).

Symptomatic treatment of CS

The classical (typical) CS is usually characterised by cutaneous flushing, gut hypermobility with diarrhoea and bronchospasm, mostly encountered in patients with small intestinal carcinoids and hepatic metastases (Tomassetti et al. 2001, Kalsas et al. 2004). A less common atypical CS may be found with tumours originating from the former foregut, mainly lung carcinoids with liver metastases, and is due to the release of both histamine and serotonin (Tomassetti et al. 2001, Papadogias et al. 2007). If CS remains untreated over a prolonged period, it may lead to a number of nutritional deficiencies, the development of carcinoid heart disease (CHD) and other fibrotic changes involving the mesentery (Kalsas et al. 2004, Grozinsky-Glasberg et al. 2015).

Specific treatment directed against the symptoms of CS

Before the introduction of SSAs, several therapies aiming at ameliorating symptoms rather than specifically reducing serotonin production were used (Kalsas et al. 2004, Modlin et al. 2008). Subsequent studies using 150μg of s.c. octreotide three times a day in patients with CS showed an almost 88% response in flushing and diarrhoea that was accompanied with a greater than 50% decrease in 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid (5-HIAA) levels in 72% of the treated patients (Kvols et al. 1986, Modlin et al.
2010). Subsequent studies using s.c. octreotide at doses ranging from 50 to 1000μg, but occasionally up to 3 mg, 2–3 times per day, showed that significant symptomatic improvement of CS was obtained. An analysis of 10 studies that evaluated more than 300 patients with CS treated with s.c. octreotide, with doses ranging between 150 and 3000μg (median dose 450μg), showed 70% control of both flushing and diarrhoea (Kvols et al. 1986, Vinik & Moattari 1989, Anthony et al. 1993, Janson & Oberg 1993, Saltz et al. 1993, Arnold et al. 1996, di Bartolomeo et al. 1996, Rubin et al. 1999, O’Toole et al. 2000, Aparicio et al. 2001). A randomised study comparing daily s.c. injections of short-acting octreotide to octreotide LAR at various doses every 4 weeks demonstrated an at least equivalent symptomatic control (Rubin et al. 1999). Similar to octreotide LAR, long-acting lanreotide exhibits equal affinity for SSTR type 2 and 5 (Modlin et al. 2010). A pooled data analysis of symptomatic responses (diarrhoea and flushing) to octreotide LAR (n=122 patients) and long-acting lanreotide (n=185 patients) showed a mean symptomatic response of 74.2% (range 61.9–92.8%) and 67.5% (range 40–100%), respectively (Modlin et al. 2010). In addition, these agents have the advantage of being associated with a very low side-effect profile and are thus well tolerated (Kaltasas et al. 2004, Modlin et al. 2010, Strosberg et al. 2013). However, potential side effects may occasionally develop and need to be considered, as many patients are treated with these compounds for a prolonged period (Table 3).

When symptom control is inadequate, top-up doses of 50–100μg (up to 1000μg) of short-acting octreotide s.c. can be given or alternatively the frequency or dose of long-acting SSA administration can be increased (Rubin et al. 1999, Strosberg et al. 2014). In an initial prospective study, 28 patients with CS with disease progression during therapy with octreotide LAR 30mg every 28 days exhibited complete and partial control of symptoms after octreotide LAR 30 mg administration every 21 days in 40 and 60% of the cases, respectively; circulating biomarkers were significantly decreased in 30% (Ferolla et al. 2012). Significantly higher doses, particularly of octreotide LAR ranging from 40 to 90mg (Anthony et al. 2011, Fiebrich et al. 2010), have been used in clinical practice in patients with suboptimal symptomatic control of CS or tumour growth while being on the approved maximum label dose of 30 mg every 4 weeks (Rubin et al. 1999). An analysis of a single-centre study evaluating patients treated with 40mg octreotide LAR every 4 weeks, octreotide LAR 60mg every 4 weeks and octreotide LAR 30mg every 3 weeks showed an overall improvement of diarrhoea in 34 (63%) and flushing in 28 patients (56%) over conventional dosing (Strosberg et al. 2013). A subsequent multicentre study of 239 patients who had received a series of escalating doses of octreotide LAR also showed a similar beneficial effect in symptom control (Strosberg et al. 2014). However, these studies were hampered by their retrospective nature and the lack of quantitative measurements of changes in flushing and diarrhoea, as all information was collected after reviewing patients’ charts (Strosberg et al. 2014). Nevertheless, a significant finding from all these studies was that there was no increased toxicity with doses of octreotide even as high as 120mg/month (Anthony et al. 2011, Strosberg et al. 2014, Broder et al. 2015).

Although octreotide and lanreotide target mainly SSTRs 2 and 5, GEP-NETs express multiple subtypes of SSTRs on their surface (Bruns et al. 1994). Pasireotide is a multireceptor targeting SSA with high affinity to all SSTRs except SSTR type 4 (Bruns et al. 2002). It was hypothesised that pasireotide might ameliorate the symptoms of CS in patients inadequately controlled with 30mg octreotide LAR. In a phase II study, 45 patients with symptoms refractory to 30mg octreotide LAR, in whom specific criteria to define inadequate control of bowel movements (≥4 per day) or flushing episodes (≥2 per day) as well as response to treatment were predefined, pasireotide was administered at increasing doses (Kvols et al. 2012). Pasireotide at doses 600–900μg twice daily effectively controlled the symptoms of diarrhoea and flushing in 27% of the patients, with the most common side effects being nausea, abdominal pain, weight loss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Side effects attributed to long-acting somatostatin analogues (data from Van der Lely et al. 1997, Hovind et al. 2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequent side effects (&gt;10% of patients)</td>
<td>Headaches, fatigue, gastrointestinal symptoms (abdominal pain, cramps, nausea/vomiting, diarrhoea,constipation), biliary tree abnormalities (sludge without stones, gallstones, bile duct dilatation), arthropathy and back pain, insulin secretion abnormalities (hyperglycaemia 10%, hypoglycaemia 2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common side effects (&gt;1% of patients)</td>
<td>Slow heart rate (cardiac conduction changes), skin reactions (pruritus), hyperbilirubinaemia, hypothyroidism, dizziness, dyspnoea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare side effects</td>
<td>Anaphylactic reactions, pancreatitis, hepatitis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely rare side effects</td>
<td>Alopecia, QT abnormalities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and hyperglycaemia (Kvols et al. 2012). A subsequent phase III study that evaluated the ability of pasireotide LAR 60mg and octreotide LAR 40mg in controlling the symptoms of CS in patients refractory to currently labelled maximum doses of SSAs demonstrated that both agents showed similar symptomatic control (20.9% vs 26.9%, respectively), although pasireotide was associated with a higher incidence of side effects, particularly hyperglycaemia (28.3% vs 5.3%, respectively) (Wolin et al. 2015). From the data derived from this prospective study, the above-labelled octreotide LAR doses (at least octreotide LAR 40mg) are expected to induce an approximately 30% improvement in refractory to conventional doses of SSA symptoms rather than the previously described higher response rates (Strosberg et al. 2013, 2014).

Another agent that has been shown to have activity in controlling the symptoms in patients with CS is interferon-α (Oberg 2000). Initially, human and subsequently recombinant interferon-α were used at doses of 3–9MU daily or on alternate days (median dose 5MU titrated individually according to sex, weight and age) (Oberg 2000). Although interferon-α controls the symptoms of CS in 40–70% of the patients, its use is associated with substantial adverse effects including fever, fatigue, anorexia and weight loss, autoimmune diseases and myelosuppression and is considered as a second-line treatment (Kaltsas et al. 2004). Currently, pegylated interferon-α has been introduced that is expected to induce fewer side effects. Considering that interferon-α produces the upregulation of SSTRs in in vitro studies, and the combination with SSAs shows a stronger in vivo anti-proliferative effect than either drug alone, it was suggested that their combination might exhibit a synergistic effect (Hofland et al. 1999). This concept was addressed in two prospective studies. In one, lanreotide and interferon-α were shown to exert a superior symptomatic control compared with each compound alone, albeit with more side effects (Faiss et al. 2003). However, there was no difference in respect to symptom control when octreotide alone was compared with the combination of octreotide and interferon-α (Arnold et al. 2005). On the basis of these findings, this combination has not found wide application in clinical practice in terms of symptomatic control, although it has been suggested that lower than previously used doses of interferon-α in combination with SSA may still merit investigation in properly designed randomised trials (Fazio et al. 2007).

For refractory cases that cannot be controlled with long-acting SS analogues (either octreotide or lanreotide), a number of phase I/II and a recent phase III studies have shown that telotristat etiprate, an orally administered serotonin synthesis inhibitor, may have an additional effect (Kulke et al. 2014, Pavel et al. 2015). Telotristat etiprate is a small molecule that does not cross the blood–brain barrier and thus has no central nervous system side effects, as it does not deplete serotonin levels in the brain (Pavel et al. 2015). Its mode of action is by inhibiting tryptophan hydroxylase, the rate-limiting enzyme in the conversion of tryptophan to serotonin (Kulke et al. 2014). In an initial randomised prospective study designed to assess the safety and efficacy of telotristat in patients with predefined criteria of inadequate symptom control of CS with the highest labelled dose of octreotide LAR, 18 patients were assigned to increasing doses of telotristat etiprate (150, 250, 350, 500mg three times daily) and were compared with controls (Kulke et al. 2014). Approximately, 30% of the patients experienced a ≥30% reduction in bowel movement frequency for ≥2weeks, whereas 56% reported adequate relief of at least 1 of the 4weeks of treatment; adverse effects were generally mild and mainly GI in nature (Kulke et al. 2014). In a subsequent open label with dose escalation over 12weeks in a prospective study of responses to telotristat in patients refractory to SSAs, 14 patients were evaluated while on concomitant SSA treatment (Pavel et al. 2015). All patients experienced reductions in the number of bowel movements per day (mean decrease, 43.5%) associated with additional 5-HIAA level reductions; in addition, stool form and flushing episodes were also improved notwithstanding that the latter are not predominantly serotonin mediated (Pavel et al. 2015). It was thus suggested that telotristat etiprate could offer a further therapeutic option in patients refractory to SSAs, particularly as it is associated with minimal side effects. While these improvements may not seem dramatic, it may also be that the decrease in serotonin synthesis might reduce the onset of peritoneal and especially cardiac valvular fibrosis, which would be valuable therapeutic benefits. Irrespective of advances in currently available drugs, treatment with intravenous octreotide infusion in patients with refractory CS may still be tried, at least temporarily, to provide symptomatic control until treatment debulking options could also be considered.

Non-specific treatment and treatment directed against the sequel of CS

As diarrhoea and flushing can be induced by specific precipitants, lifestyle adjustments in patients with CS may need to be considered and implemented. Patients
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with diarrhoea should avoid known precipitants such as strenuous exercise, consumption of spicy foods and excessive alcohol intake. Loperamide and codeine phosphate can be of additional help in refractory cases of diarrhoea; loperamide in particular can be used in cases of breakthrough diarrhoea in doses up to 16 mg daily (Kaltsas et al. 2004). Diarrhoea can also result following the resection of the primary tumour and nearby normal bowel at the terminal ileum, secondary to bile acid loss and/or bacterial overgrowth from a blind enteric loop, which may cause deconjugation of bile acids (Kaltsas et al. 2004). Patients with diarrhoea secondary to bile acid deconjugation respond to treatment with cholyesteramine or related agents, whereas antibiotics should be administered in cases of bacterial overgrowth (Tomassetti et al. 2001, Kaltsas et al. 2004). The flush of typical CS is usually triggered by alcohol or tyramine-containing foods, chocolate and bananas. As serotonin is not the main secretagogue, histamine-2 receptor antagonists are also of proven value in this situation (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Papadogias et al. 2007). It should also be remembered that major pancreatic resection, in cases of pancreatic carcinoid, may lead to loss of pancreatic exocrine function, and replacement with enzymes such as Creon with meals may be beneficial. These supplements may also be used to treat SSA-induced steatorrhoea. This is particularly important as a recent study using a validated questionnaire revealed that a significant number of patients with NETs who are on treatment with SSAs are at high risk of malnutrition (Qureshi et al. 2016). Uncontrolled diarrhoea may be debilitating causing dehydration, electrolyte abnormalities, vitamin deficits and hypoproteinaemia (Kaltsas et al. 2004). In the presence of severe CS, the essential amino acid tryptophan is converted to serotonin, leaving inadequate amounts of tryptophan for conversion to niacin and proteins (Bouma et al. 2015). Niacin deficiency can lead to pellagra, with the development of dermatitis, diarrhoea and dementia (Bouma et al. 2015). Other symptoms such as aggression, ataxia, insomnia, confusion and cardiomyopathy may also be present. Diagnosis can be confirmed after rapid improvements in the symptoms in patients using high doses of niacin (50–500 mg/day) or niacin-enriched food (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Bouma et al. 2015). A combination of vitamin B supplements should be administered to patients with severe diarrhoea and any suspicion of pellagra, and/or with high 5-HIAA output. In addition, deficiencies of other fat-soluble vitamins, which may occasionally follow treatment with SSAs, should be sought and adequately substituted (Fiebrich et al. 2010).

CHD develops as a result of the fibrotic effect of the excessive amounts of serotonin on heart valvular leaflets. Patients with 5-HIAA levels ≥300 μmol/24 h and ≥3 episodes of flushing per day are at increased risk of developing CHD (Bhattarcharyya et al. 2011, Grozinsky-Glasberg et al. 2015). In case of clinically significant CHD, cardiothoracic surgical evaluation and possible surgical valvular replacement may be required before any major intervention or surgery (Connolly et al. 2001, Grozinsky-Glasberg et al. 2015). It is possible that the early use of telotristat etiprate may delay or avoid such problems.

Carcinoid crisis

Patients with CS are at risk for developing a carcinoid crisis, characterised by excessive flushing, alterations in thermoregulation, bronchospasm and haemodynamic instability, mainly in the form of hypotension (Condron et al. 2016). The crisis may occur following diagnostic or therapeutic procedures, induction of anaesthesia and/or as a result of tumour manipulation (Plöckinger et al. 2004). Intravenous continuous octreotide infusions administered 12 h before any high-risk procedure at a starting dose of 50–100 μg/h (doses up to 3 mg have been used) with dose escalation until symptom control is obtained (mean dose 100–200 μg/h) is the treatment of choice (Ramage et al. 2012). Patients pre-treated with SSAs may require even higher doses and treatment should be continued at least 48 h after the end of the procedure, as late-onset events have been described (Ramage et al. 2012). However, a recent analysis of 127 patients who underwent surgical procedures with concomitant continuous octreotide infusion demonstrated that a carcinoid crisis may still develop, particularly in patients with hepatic metastases and symptoms of CS, although neither was required for a crisis to occur (Condron et al. 2016). Combination treatment with H1 and H2 receptor blockers may also be administered, along with glucocorticoids, since histamine release and its peripheral actions are not completely blocked by SS analogues (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Plöckinger et al. 2004) (Fig. 1).

Symptomatic treatment of functioning pNETs

Insulinomas

The great majority of insulinomas (>90%) are identified early and can be surgically cured as they are non-metastatic at presentation (de Herder et al. 2011). Such patients should
preferably be submitted to surgery without delay and often without prior systemic treatment to counteract excessive insulin secretion, as this can be usually controlled with frequent small volume carbohydrate-enriched meals (Kaltsas et al. 2004, de Herder et al. 2011). In insulinoma patients with significant pre-surgical hypoglycaemia, additional symptomatic or systemic therapy may be required. The control of insulin hypersecretion may also be difficult in cases of metastatic tumours not amenable to surgery or other cytoreductive modalities. In such cases, patients may require continuous nocturnal feeding via a nasogastric tube, drugs to lower insulin hypersecretion or even continuous intravenous glucose administration (de Herder et al. 2011, Bernard et al. 2013). At times of intractable hypoglycaemia, high glucose concentration administration along with intra-muscular glucagon and potassium replacement may be required as a rescue procedure. Diazoxide, which suppresses insulin secretion from insulinoma cells via an effect on the ATP-sensitive potassium (KATP) channels, has been extensively used at doses 50–300mg/day (max dose up to 600mg/day) (Kaltsas et al. 2004, de Herder et al. 2011). This drug has several side effects including GI complaints and oedema, renal impairment and hirsutism, and is usually combined with thiazide diuretics to lower total body potassium and counteract oedema and sodium retention (Kaltsas et al. 2004, de Herder et al. 2011). In addition, there is little information regarding its long-term tolerability and its effect in metastatic insulinomas (Bernard et al. 2013). Although there have been some reports of a hypoglycaemic effect of β-blockers, calcium blockers and phenytoin, these agents have not been shown to be markedly efficacious in clinical practice (Kaltsas et al. 2004, de Herder et al. 2011). Treatment with long-acting SSAs has been used in patients with insulinomas, but these drugs may worsen hypoglycaemia in approximately 50% of the cases when tumours lack SSTR2 and 5 expression as
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**Figure 1**

glucagon secretion is also inhibited; treatment should be initiated only in patients with positive SSTR scintigraphy (SRS) and after the effect of a test dose of octreotide has been evaluated, preferably at an in-patient setting (Bruns et al. 2002, Vezzosi et al. 2005). However, octreotide was shown to be effective in controlling hypoglycaemia in more than 50% of the patients with insulinomas and a positive SRS, and in a few with negatives scans, whereas there was no relation between treatment efficacy and the expression of SSTR5 (Vezzosi et al. 2005). Other studies have also demonstrated a similar ability of SS analogues in controlling cases of hypoglycaemia (Baldelli et al. 2014). As opposed to benign insulinomas, malignant insulinomas often lack GLP-1 receptors but express SSTR2 receptors in a higher proportion compared with benign lesions, and thus paradoxically respond better to SS analogues (Wild et al. 2011). Furthermore, as pasireotide commonly induces hyperglycaemia, it can also be used in cases of hypoglycaemia not responding to first-generation SS analogues. To date, there is (to our knowledge) only a single case report supporting the beneficial effect of pasireotide in a case of hypoglycaemia refractory to other treatments due to a malignant insulinoma (Tirosch et al. 2016).

In recent years, the mTOR inhibitor everolimus has been shown to exert a specific hyperglycaemic effect and counteract refractory hypoglycaemia in cases of metastatic insulinomas (Kulke et al. 2009, de Herder et al. 2011). The mTOR pathway plays a significant role in pNET progression and also in glucose homeostasis, enhancing insulin secretion and increased glucose utilisation (Bernard et al. 2013). In a number of phase II/III trials with several mTOR inhibitors, hyperglycaemia has emerged as a common side effect suggesting that this is probably a class effect of these drugs (Kulke et al. 2009, Bernard et al. 2013). Several hypotheses have been put forward to explain their hyperglycaemic effect including a decrease in insulin production and release and/or an increase in peripheral insulin resistance (Bernard et al. 2013), but probably decreased insulin release is the predominant therapeutic effect (Korevaar et al. 2014). Everolimus was shown to control refractory hypoglycaemia in four patients with metastatic insulinomas leading to discontinuation of diazoxide and glucose infusions (Kulke et al. 2009). Subsequently, further, patients showing a similar effect have been described, while in a multicentre retrospective study including 12 heavily pre-treated patients with metastatic insulinomas, introduction of everolimus was associated with a median period of normoglycaemia of 6.5 months irrespective of changes in tumour load (Bernard et al. 2013). In this particular study, everolimus appeared to be superior to any other treatments counteracting hyperinsulinaemia, and was mostly given at doses 10mg/daily; there is, however, evidence that everolimus might still exert a hyperglycaemic effect if given at 5mg/daily or even on alternate days (Baldelli et al. 2014, Baratelli et al. 2014). In cases of refractory hypoglycaemia from insulinomas not amenable to any cytoreductive techniques, treatment with combination of all these medication may be necessary.

### Gastrinoma and the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome

Zollinger–Ellison syndrome (ZES) occurs as a result of hypersecretion of gastrin, mostly from a GEP-NET of the duodenum or pancreas, although other sources such as thymic carcinoids have been described (Somasundaram et al. 2013). These tumours occur either sporadically or in the context of multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1 (MEN 1) in approximately 25–30% of the cases (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Jensen et al. 2012). The syndrome should also be suspected in patients with peptic ulcer disease resistant to treatment with PPIs and concomitant diarrhoea, and in the presence of hyperplastic gastric folds – ‘rugal hypertrophy’ (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Ito et al. 2013). As with other functioning NETs, the therapeutic strategy aims at controlling hormonal excess and tumour growth. However, as complete tumour eradication by surgery is achieved in <50% of the patients with sporadic tumours, and in almost none of the patients with MEN 1, unless extensive surgery is performed, long-term treatment of the excessive gastrin secretion and its sequelae is mandatory (Jensen et al. 2012). Traditionally, this has been achieved with the use of medications that counteract gastrin-induced hyperchlorhydria such as histamine-2 receptor (H2R) antagonists and PPIs; H2R antagonists (cimetidine and ranitidine) were first used, but due to their short duration of action (<8–15 h), acid hypersecretion was not adequately controlled, necessitating substantial dose escalation (Schubert & Peura 2008). Currently, PPIs are regarded as first-line treatment due to their prolonged duration of action (3–4 days) and potent inhibition of gastric acid hypersecretion in the majority of patients with ZES (Nieto & Pisegna 2006, Jensen et al. 2012). High initial doses of PPIs (such as 60–80mg/day of omeprazole) are frequently prescribed, with dose adjustment as necessary based on symptom response. Additionally, the dose can also be titrated to reduce the acid hypersecretion to ≤10mEq/h, or to lower values in patients with previous acid-reducing surgery or severe
reflux disease (Ito et al. 2013). Long-term treatment with PPIs has been shown to be safe with the only potential side effects being PPI-induced achlorhydria that may lead to B12 deficiency, although there is a suggestion of an increased incidence of bone fractures (Jensen et al. 2012). SS analogues can also reduce gastrin hypersecretion and may be used in combination with PPIs in rare patients with symptoms refractory to PPIs (Rusziewski et al. 1993, Granberg et al. 2008). Gastrinomas are predisposed to GI perforation and haemorrhage, which may complicate surgery. During surgery, patients need adequate protection with PPIs to efficiently control the acid hypersecretion (Cisco & Norton 2007). In the acute setting where oral medications may be contraindicated, intravenous 80 mg of pantoprazole given by 15 min infusion every 8 h controlled gastric acid hypersecretion in all ZES patients studied both acutely and up to 7 days (Lew et al. 2000). Patients should maintain their medication with PPIs for some weeks after surgery, since many continue to hypersecrete acid for some time (Ito et al. 2013). Recently, oral gastrin receptor antagonists have also been synthesised that have a rapid mode of action and can induce prolonged gastric acid output suppression (Fossmark et al. 2012). However, their potential role in the treatment has not been investigated as PPIs have been highly active.

**Glucagonoma**

Patients with glucagonomas may present with troublesome skin disease (necrolytic migratory erythema) and some patients may be cachectic (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Kindmark et al. 2007). SSA treatment, amino acid infusion and antibiotics may improve the condition and heal the skin lesions in 50–90% of the patients with glucagonomas, although diabetes mellitus may not substantially improve (Doherty et al. 2005). In addition, parenteral nutrition may also be required to help improve concomitant cachexia, hypoaminoacidemia and weight loss (Doherty et al. 2005). Patients with glucagonomas have a substantial risk of deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism, and should perioperatively receive prophylactic high-dose molecular heparin as anticoagulation treatment as long as the disease is active (Kaltsas et al. 2004, Kindmark et al. 2007).

**VIPoma**

In VIPoma patients, secretory diarrhoea is generally extensive, with severe loss of potassium and bicarbonate leading to metabolic acidosis, dehydration and hypokalaemia (Doherty et al. 2005). VIPomas require meticulous control of high-volume fluid loss as this may lead to severe electrolyte abnormalities and dehydration. Long-acting SS analogues achieve control of the diarrhoea in the majority of such patients, whereas medications such as glucocorticoids, clonidine and loperamide, which were previously used, have, for the most part, been replaced by SSAs. Patients need to be resuscitated from life-threatening fluid losses and electrolyte abnormalities with SSA treatment, as well as intravenous and electrolyte therapy, before being subjected to surgery (Song et al. 2009). There is some evidence that sunitinib, a tyrosine kinase inhibitor, may exert a particular effect in VIP-secreting pNETs regarding symptom and biochemical control irrespective of its effect on tumour growth, and it can thus be used as an adjuvant treatment for symptomatic control in cases of SS analogue-resistant tumours (Bourcier et al. 2013, de Mestier et al. 2015b). As there is a paucity of data regarding regulation of VIP secretion by tumour cells, sunitinib may affect both cyclic adenosine monophosphate and intracellular calcium pathways that have been shown to be implicated in VIP secretion (de Mestier et al. 2015b). However, more information of a potential specific effect on sunitinib on VIP-secreting pNETs is required.

**Somatostatinoma**

Although there is no consensus regarding the true incidence of these GEP-NETs, octreotide has been shown to exert activity in cases with symptoms suggestive of an SS-secreting tumour and elevated SS levels (Angeletti et al. 1998).

**Unknown and paraneoplastic syndromes**

A number of more rare syndromes attributed to the secretion of bioactive compounds that have not been described are gradually emerging, confirming the multipotent secretory potential of NETs. Recently, a case of cholecystokinin (CCK)-secreting pNET has been identified when high CCK levels were measured in a patient with metastatic pNET, presenting with non-watery diarrhoea, severe weight loss, gallbladder and peptic ulcer disease but normal gastrin levels (Rehfell et al. 2013). In addition, approximately 3–6% of the patients with pNETs were shown to secrete multiple hormones at diagnosis, obscuring the clinical phenotype (Crona et al. 2016, de Mestier et al. 2015b). There have also been some reports in the literature of apparently non-functioning pNETs that, during the course...
### Table 4  Paraneoplastic syndromes related to GEP-NETs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syndrome</th>
<th>Bioactive substance</th>
<th>GEP-NET</th>
<th>Features distinguishing PNS from eutopic functioning tumours and their medical management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypercalcaemia</strong></td>
<td>PTHrP</td>
<td>pNET, carcinoid</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ Ca, ↓ P, ↑ cAMP urine; Endocrine: ↑ PTH, ↑ PTHrP; Radiological: Parathyroid imaging (−); Symptomatic management: Rehydration, bisphosphonates, cinacalcet, dialysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth factors/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cytokines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cushing's syndrome</strong></td>
<td>ACTH</td>
<td>pNET, carcinoid</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ ACTH – isoforms; Endocrine: ↑ ACTH, ↓ IGF1 OGT: no GH suppression; Radiological: Pituitary MRI (no adenoma); Symptomatic management: Drugs inhibiting steroidogenesis, adrenolytics SS analogues, dopamine agonists, pasireotide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acromegaly</strong></td>
<td>GHRH, GH</td>
<td>pNET, carcinoid</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ GH, ↓ IGF1; Endocrine: ↑ IGF1; Radiological: Pituitary MRI (no adenoma); Symptomatic management: SS analogues, pasireotide, dopamine agonists, pegvisomant, SS analogues, dopamine agonists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other pituitary hormones</strong></td>
<td>LH/FSH, TSH</td>
<td>pNET</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ LH, androgens; Endocrine: ↑ LH, ↓ androgens; Radiological: Pituitary MRI (no adenoma); Symptomatic management: SS analogues, pasireotide, dopamine agonists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vasoactive peptides</strong></td>
<td>CGRP, Ct</td>
<td>pNET</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ Ct; Endocrine: ↑ Ct; Radiological: Thyroid US (no nodule); Symptomatic management: SS analogues, pasireotide, everolimus, glucocorticoids, GH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gut hormones</strong></td>
<td>Ghrelin, Gastrin,</td>
<td>pNET, pNET/carcinoid</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ Ghrelin, Gastrin; Endocrine: ↑ Ghrelin, Gastrin; Radiological: SS analogues, pasireotide, everolimus, glucocorticoids, GH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIP, GLP1,2</td>
<td>pNET/carcinoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GLP1,2</td>
<td>pNET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypoglycaemia</strong></td>
<td>Insulin, IGF1, IGF2,</td>
<td>Carcinoid</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ Insulin; Endocrine: ↑ Insulin; Radiological: EUS (−); Symptomatic management: SS analogues, pasireotide, everolimus, glucocorticoids, GH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-IGF2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypertension</strong></td>
<td>Renin</td>
<td>Carcinoid</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ Renin, aldosterone; Endocrine: ↑ Renin, aldosterone; Radiological: CT adrenals (no adenoma); Symptomatic management: SS analogues, pasireotide, everolimus, glucocorticoids, GH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gynaecomastia/ menstrual irregularity</strong></td>
<td>hCG</td>
<td>pNET</td>
<td>Clinical/biochemical: ↑ hCG, androgens; Endocrine: ↑ hCG, androgens; Radiological: Normal adrenal and gonadal imaging CT/MRI (−); Symptomatic management: SS analogues, pasireotide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTH, adrenocorticotrophin hormone; CGRP, calcitonin gene-related peptide; CRH, corticotrophin-releasing hormone; CT, calcitonin; CT, computerised tomography; DDAV, desmopresin; EUS, endoscopic ultrasound; FSH, follicle-stimulating hormone; FT4, free thyroxine; GH, growth hormone; GHRH, growth hormone-releasing hormone; IGF1, insulin growth factor 1; IPSS, inferior petrosal sinus sampling; LH, luteinising hormone; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; OGTT, oral glucose-tolerance test; PC, prostaglandins; pNET, pancreatic neuroendocrine tumour; PTHrP, parathyroid hormone-related peptide; SRS, somatostatin receptor scintigraphy; SS, somatostatin; T3, triiodothyronine; TGFβ, transforming growth factor; VIP, vasointestinal peptide.
of the disease, changed their phenotype into functioning tumours (Vashi et al. 2011, Nahmias et al. 2015). Although this phenomenon was originally considered to be unique to non-functioning NETs, it has also been encountered in functioning NETs that alter their secretory component from one bioactive substance to another (Ohn et al. 2013, Nahmias et al. 2015). Recently, two studies have particularly addressed this issue (Crona et al. 2016, de Mestier et al. 2015a). Metachronous hormonal syndromes developed in 15 out of 435 (3.4%) patients with pNETs after a median of 55 months (de Mestier et al. 2015a). Five of these 15 patients developed insulin and VIP hypersecretion, respectively, whereas the remaining showed gastrin and glucagon hypersecretion; interestingly, the Ki-67 LI increased from 7 to 17.5% at transformation (de Mestier et al. 2015a). In a further study, 14 of 323 (4%) patients with pNETs developed metachronous hormonal hypersecretion, whereas this phenomenon was extremely rare in 603 patients with small intestinal NETs (Crona et al. 2016). Median survival was reduced in patients with metachronous hormonal hypersecretion in both studies, and it was worse in those with insulin hypersecretion (Crona et al. 2016, de Mestier et al. 2015a). Since the majority of these tumours had metastasised to the liver, potential therapeutic problems may arise in cases of difficult-to-manage secretory syndromes such as insulin-secreting tumours and CS. Currently, there is limited knowledge regarding the mechanism of tumour transformation and switching in its secretory potential, although NE cells are derived from a pluripotent progenitor cell, which may exhibit considerable plasticity regarding tumour phenotype (Florio 2011). Awareness of such tumoural transformation is of utmost importance for early recognition and treatment of such patients. It is possible that such transformation might be more common than currently recognised, as some of the symptoms may not be specific and difficult to recognise in patients with extensive disease.

Occasionally, the substances secreted by GEP-NET are not directly related to the tissue of origin, the corresponding clinical syndromes being called paraneoplastic (Kaltsas et al. 2010). A high index of suspicion for the presence of such syndromes is required, as, if the clinical presentation is missed, it may delay the diagnosis of the underlying neoplasia and lead to increased morbidity and mortality. The most common of these syndromes encountered in patients with GEP-NETs along with their presentation and symptomatic treatment are shown in Table 4. Some of these syndromes, such as Cushing’s syndrome due to ectopic adrenocorticotropic hormone (ACTH) and hypercalcaemia due to ectopic parathyroid hormone-related peptide (PTHrP) secretion, may significantly increase the operative risk, and need to be adequately treated before any intervention (Kaltsas et al. 2010, Somasundaram et al. 2013).

Conclusion

The symptomatic treatment of functioning GEP-NETs has markedly improved following the introduction of long-acting SSAs into clinical practice. There are, however, a number of syndromes for which cytoreductive procedures and SSAs may not be sufficient to ameliorate related symptoms, and further additive treatment is required. In patients with CS inadequately controlled, increasing the dose of the SSA or administration of top-up doses of s.c. octreotide may be needed, whereas the multiligand SSA pasireotide could be effective in patients’ refractory to octreotide or lanreotide. The newly introduced serotonin synthesis inhibitor telotristat etiprate has shown to reduce further the symptoms of CS with or without concomitant SSA treatment. Occasionally, combinations of all of these drugs may be required to obtain symptomatic control and reduce the risk of developing long-term complications such as CHD, whereas intravenous continuous octreotide infusion remains the best mean to minimise the risk of carcinoid crisis. Malignant insulinomas may require combination treatment with glucose infusion and diazoxide, whereas everolimus appears to be a new specific treatment for relieving intractable hypoglycaemia. Knowledge of new emerging syndromes, and alterations of the secretory component of previously diagnosed GEP-NETs, helps identify underlying previously unsuspected syndromes in patients with extensive disease and provide appropriate treatment.

Declaration of interest

G K D, M O W and H S R declare that there is no conflict of interest that could be perceived as prejudicing the impartiality of this review. A G and G K have received advisory board and pharma funds.

Funding

This work did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sector.

Author contribution statement

The authors of this manuscript contributed equally to its creation.

References

somatostatin-producing tumours. Gut 42 792–794. (doi:10.1136/gut.42.6.792)

Anthony L & Vinik AI 2011 Evaluating the characteristics and the management of patients with neuroendocrine tumors receiving octreotide LAR during a 6-year period. Pancreas 40 987–994. (doi:10.1097/MPA.0b013e31821f66b4)


'Secretory syndromes in GEP-NETs


Review

G K Dimitriadis et al.

Secretory syndromes in GEP-NETs

23:9

R435

Published by Bioscientifica Ltd.

http://erc.endocrinology-journals.org
DOI: 10.1530/ERC-16-0200

© 2016 Society for Endocrinology
Printed in Great Britain

Downloaded from Bioscientifica.com at 12/22/2018 08:11:53AM via free access

Received in final form 15 July 2016
Accepted 26 July 2016
Accepted Preprint published online 26 July 2016