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ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** the diagnosis of asymptomatic sporadic nonfunctioning pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors (NF-PNETs) has increased significantly due to the widespread use of high-resolution imaging tests, which is why the most appropriate management at the time of diagnosis is the subject of debate, as is how to follow-up patients.

**Aims:** the objective of this study was to analyze the frequency of imaging and endoscopic studies performed during long-term follow-up.

**Methods:** a retrospective review was performed of a database collected between January 2008 and December 2020 of patients with an incidental diagnosis of small NF-PNETs; follow-up was closed in March 2023. The imaging tests performed at the time of diagnosis and long-term follow-up were recorded. Growing less than 1 mm per year has not been considered as a worrisome feature. Follow-up was performed through imaging tests, considering endoscopic cytology for lesions with a faster growth rate.

**Results:** fifty-eight patients were included; the median age was 69 years. The initial mean size of the lesions studied was 12.79 mm (5-27). Follow-up was carried out only with computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). The initial size did not influence the behavior of the lesion in a statistically significant manner. Twenty-eight tumors (45%) increased in size, with a growth equal to or less than 4 mm in 24 cases. The mean follow-up time was 82.41 months (12-164). No patient developed metastasis or died from PNET progression.

**Conclusions:** the follow-up of neuroendocrine tumors of small size can be performed safely with only imaging tests.

**Keywords:** Pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor. Conservative treatment. Surveillance. Small tumors.

INTRODUCTION

The diagnosis of pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors (PNETs) has increased significantly due to the widespread use of high-resolution imaging tests for the study of multiple pathologies. Recent studies of the population have shown an increasing incidence,
rising from 3.2 cases per million inhabitants in 2003 to eight cases per million inhabitants in 2012 (1,2). Likewise, a high occurrence of PNET in pancreatic resection samples and in autopsy studies suggests a high prevalence of PNET in the undiagnosed general population (3). The above observations suggest an underestimation of the problem until the improvement of radiological techniques (3), especially with regard to small and asymptomatic lesions (4). Studies carried out on various groups demonstrated that follow-up without resection is acceptable in incidental lesions smaller than 2 cm, which has been accepted by the international community (5-9).

However, a dilemma arises: what is the most appropriate management for this type of patient? (10) Should we perform a pancreatic resection in these patients based on an incidental diagnosis, with the associated morbidity? (11). Finally, what tests should we perform at the time of diagnosis, and which ones should we use during follow-up? The objective of this study was to analyze the frequency of imaging and endoscopic studies performed during long-term follow-up.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

A retrospective analysis was performed with a prospective database of patients with an incidental diagnosis of non-functioning PNET, including patients diagnosed from January 2008 to December 2020 in the Hepatobiliarypancreatic Surgery Unit of our center, follow-up was closed in March 2023. Each patient was analyzed at the time of diagnosis, and the study was performed during long-term follow-up. All patients with suspected small non-functioning PNET are referred to our unit. The initial study was based on a 4-phase computed tomography (CT) and octreotid scintigraphy, incorporating the study with positron emission tomography (PET) Gallium-68-DOTATOC in 2019. Subsequently, all the cases were commented during a clinical-radiological session for discussion. In case of suspicion of hormonal functionalism or multifocality, the patient was referred to the Endocrinology Service. An endoscopic ultrasound and fine needle aspiration (EUS-FNA) study was not carried out systematically; these were only indicated in cases of a doubtful diagnosis.

PNET size < 2 cm was considered as eligible for medical follow-up using imaging tests. In patients under 60 years of age and lesions smaller than 1 cm, follow-up is
considered. For lesions between 1-2 cm, EUS and subsequent follow-up are considered. In all these cases, a directed meeting is held informing the patient and joint decision-making is proposed. In our opinion, an exquisite process of information and awareness of the disease on the part of the patient is essential. In case of distrust in the proposed follow-up or cancerphobia, surgery would be considered. In the case of PNET size > 2 cm, patients were referred for surgical resection. However, in elderly or fragile patients, with lesions between 2 and 3 cm, the treatment was determined individually (Fig. 1). In these cases, an informative meeting is also held to make the patient aware of the proposed follow-up. The presented series encompasses all patients undergoing follow-up with lesions < 3 cm. The location of the lesion has not affected the decision making.

Follow-up was the same for all patients, with an abdominal CT scan with contrast or MRI being performed every six months for the first two years, and annually thereafter. Changes in size, characteristics of the lesion in the radiological study, and ductal dilation were recorded, as were clinical changes observed in the patient which were noted at check-ups or periodic visits to the hospital with imaging tests or clinical monitoring. The procedure in the presence of lesion growth depends on the change evidenced and the final size of the lesion. Endoscopic puncture would be considered in case of a growth of more than 1 mm per year or diagnostic doubts.

The data were entered in a Microsoft Office Access and Microsoft Office Excel database and processed using SPSS. A descriptive statistical analysis of the results was carried out. The continuous variables were compared using the Student’s t-test and the Mann-Whitney test, according to the type of distribution. The series was divided according to the initial size of the diagnosed lesion (smaller than and larger than 15 mm, 20 mm) and the age of the patient (more than and less than 65, 70, and 75 years old) at the time of diagnosis. Likewise, changes in size of the lesions and the relationship with the variables recorded in the study were analyzed. A value of $p < 0.05$ was considered to be significant.

**RESULTS**

Fifty-eight patients were included in the study, with NF-PNET < 3 cm, all diagnosed via
CT. Fifty-seven per cent were female (Table 1). Regarding the imaging technique used for diagnosis, 100% of the patients underwent abdominal CT, subsequently completing the study in 67.2% of the cases with MRI. Octreotide scintigraphy was performed in 74.1% of cases, being positive for somatostatin receptors in 53.5% of the cases. EUS-FNA was performed in ten patients (17.24%), being PNET-positive in nine (90%) and inconclusive in one (10%) of the cases. Of the ten patients in whom EUS-FNA was performed, a Ki 67 < 2% was seen in four patients, between 2-10% in one case, and inconclusive results were observed in five cases. Sixty-nine percent of the patients presented a PNET located in the pancreatic body or tail, while the PNET was located in the pancreatic head or neck in 31%. Three cases were associated with ductal dilation, none of them with biliary dilation.

**Initial study**

The mean size of the PNET at the time of diagnosis was 12.7 mm (5-27), with six cases (10%) > 2 cm. The lesion was in the pancreatic body-tail in 70% of cases. The mean age of the patients in the series was 69 (39-89) years, eight were younger than 60 years old (Table 2). No statistically significant differences were seen between PNET size and gender, despite the fact that 83% (5/6) of the patients with PNET > 2 cm were female. The size was slightly larger in cases > 70 years compared to the youngest cases (14 mm ± 6.1 vs 11 mm ± 4.2, p = 0.058). Furthermore, these patients had a higher percentage of large tumors (> 2 cm) than did younger patients (19% vs 3%, p = 0.05) (Fig. 2).

**Evolution of the lesion**

When studying the evolution of the lesion, 45% increased in size. The recorded growth was equal to or less than 4 mm in most cases, while in five cases it was 11 mm, 8 mm, 6 mm, and 5 mm, respectively. The final mean size was 14.07 mm (5-32). The initial size did not influence the behavior of the lesion in a statistically significant manner; however, there was 43% growth of the tumors < 2 cm and 67% of those > 2 cm. The age of the patient did not influence tumor growth. Thus, we can conclude that the growth of the lesions was similar between the groups of patients younger and older
than 70 years (47% [15/32] vs 42% [11/26]), respectively (Fig. 3).

Long-term follow-up

The long-term study was performed with CT or MRI, performing between three and 12 examinations per patient. The mean follow-up time was 82.41 months (12-164). At the end of follow-up, eleven patients had died, eight due to a medical cause and three due to various neoplasms. The causes of death were respiratory failure (five), heart failure (one), liver cirrhosis decompensation (one) and severe acute cholecystitis (one). Of the three patients who died from neoplasm progression, one died from progression of lung cancer and one from urinary bladder cancer. One 84-year-old patient who was being followed up for a pancreatic head PNET (25 mm) developed pancreatic tail adenocarcinoma with stability of the pancreatic head lesion. The study of the initial size showed that 37% of the patients with lesions > 2 cm died during follow-up, compared to 10% of the patients with lesions < 2 cm (p = 0.039), probably in relation to the advanced age in the group of patients with PNET > 2 cm. The causes of death were not related to the lesion size. No patient developed metastasis during follow-up. The growth rate was very low in all cases with registered growth. Only two cases grew more than 1 mm per year, which we will discuss below among the large lesions. Four patients presented growth of more than 4 mm during follow-up. One patient was diagnosed at 70 years of age with a 27 mm PNET, presented growth of 5 mm in nine years, and died due to medical causes already mentioned and associated dementia, without a cytology puncture. A 69-year-old patient with a 20 mm lesion presented worrisome growth (6 mm/4 years) and underwent surgery (pancreatoduodenectomy). Histology showed a PNET (well differentiated pT2N0). A 69-year-old female patient with a 20 mm lesion presented sustained growth (8 mm/4 years) without other radiological changes. This case is currently pending the information meeting and the shared decision, endoscopic puncture or surgery will be advised if in doubt. A 76-year-old patient with an 18 mm lesion presented 11 mm growth in 13 years. The patient remains asymptomatic and has not undergone puncture during follow-up; she is currently 89 years old.
DISCUSSION

After the initial experiences, published between 2011 and 2016, by the MSKCC American groups from New York and the Mayo Clinic and the European groups of Paris and Verona (5,6,12,13), it became accepted as valid practice to follow-up patients with small incidental NF-PNET. Years later, various sets of clinical guidelines included the possibility of follow-up as an acceptable strategy in this type of lesion (7,8,14,15). Resected PNETs < 2 cm are rarely associated with lymph node metastasis or G3 neuroendocrine carcinoma (13,16), and it has been determined that aggressive tumor behavior and lymph node metastasis are present in only 5% of small PNETs (4,17). Therefore, the risk of dissemination was shown to be related to tumor size (16,18). In the present study, a total of 58 patients were followed up for more than four years, and none of them had distant disease progression. None of the included cases died due to progression of the disease. Therefore, it seems safe to follow up patients with a small incidental PNET, although the size threshold for indicating resection remains controversial (13,18).

We have shown that large tumors (larger than 2 cm) corresponded to older patients with higher mortality during long-term follow-up, even though the causes of death were not related to the pancreatic lesion. These findings seem to be consistent with the philosophy discussed in our algorithm. Thus, being more aggressive among the younger population, it seems logical to have large lesions among the older population. Our series seems to have a clear aggregation among the older population, as shown by a mean age close to 70 years.

Follow-up of PNET

There is controversy regarding which tests to carry out during follow-up in these patients. In our center, due to the growth of the lesion, the interval between imaging tests is reduced until the measurement stabilizes, without any case of hepatic or extrapancreatic progression arising to date (19). EUS-FNA was not indicated in any cases. Partelli (20) et al. reviewed their experience with 101 PNET < 2 cm. Four patients underwent surgery for a PNET-G2 compatible cytology; however, it was only confirmed in one of these cases. The authors maintain that its use should be restricted so as not
to indicate unnecessary surgery, which is consistent with our way of thinking. Recently, Barenboim (21) et al. published a series of PNET < 2 cm with EUS-FNA in all those cases undergoing follow-up, and in 89 % of those that underwent surgery. The two patients who presented growth during follow-up were referred to surgery, confirming that they had a low potential for malignancy, without presenting distant disease. This group, in contrast to ours, proposed EUS-FNA for all patients, and referring younger patients to surgery. The PANDORA study protocol (22) included a strict follow-up every three months alternating among clinical follow-up, imaging tests, and EUS. However, the authors concluded that the use of EUS was excessive, and that it should be indicated only in carefully selected cases. As we noted previously, in our series we did not perform EUS-FNA in a systematic way. We carried out follow-up with only CT or MRI in a systematic way, reserving EUS for doubtful cases, all of them performed at diagnosis. In half of the cases, an increase in the size of the lesion was observed, being more frequent in large lesions, which was not statistically significant, and independent of the patient’s age. According to our management, the patient with a growth less than 1 mm per year could be followed by imaging tests. Evidence of growth greater than 1 mm per year must be considered on an individual basis.

Limitations
Our study has limitations, such as the fact that it is a retrospective study in a single center and with a small sample size. Another limitation is the scarce performance of PET-Ga in our series, which is now being carried out in all patients as from 2020.

CONCLUSIONS
With the data we have so far, we can conclude that the conservative management of patients with small and asymptomatic NF-PNETs is reasonable in previously selected patients. In addition, follow-up of this type of lesion, with imaging tests only and in experienced centers, is an option to be considered in subsequent studies.
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Table 1. Small incidental non-functioning pancreatic non-functioning neuroendocrine tumors. Bellvitge University Hospital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient characteristics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of patients</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean age in years</td>
<td>69 (39-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localization (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head/uncinate</td>
<td>31 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body/tail</td>
<td>69 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duct dilatation</td>
<td>5 % (3/58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial size (mm)</td>
<td>12.7 (5-27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in lesion size</td>
<td>45 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up time (months)</td>
<td>55.95 (3-149)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age at diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CT: computed tomography; NMR: nuclear magnetic resonance; PET-GA: positron emission tomography Gallium-68-DOTATOC; EUS: endoscopic ultrasound; FNA: fine needle aspiration.
Fig. 1. Algorithm for the treatment of incidental pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors (NF-PNETs) (PET-GA: positron emission tomography Gallium-68-DOTATOC; EUS: endoscopic ultrasound).
Fig. 2. Size of the pancreatic lesion (mm) at the time of diagnosis depending on the age of the patient (age dx). The size was slightly higher in those > 70 years compared to the youngest cases (14 mm ± 6.1 vs 11 mm ± 4.2, p = 0.058). Furthermore, these patients had a higher percentage of large tumors (> 2 cm) than the younger patients (19 % vs 3 %, p = 0.05).
Fig. 3. Change in size of the pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor according to the patient’s age and the initial size of the lesion (mm). Tumors that presented tumor growth are expressed with change in size (TM) greater than 0, those with no growth presented growth equal to 0, and those with decrease are expressed with change in TM less than 0. Growth was observed in lesions larger than 2 cm at the time of diagnosis, without statistically significant differences. There were no differences in the behavior of the lesion in relation to the patient’s age. H: male; M: female.