CASE REPORT

Repeat hepatectomy for liver metastases from bile duct neuroendocrine tumor: a case report

Mamiko Miyashita¹, Yoshihiro Ono^{1*}, Manabu Takamatsu², Yosuke Inoue¹, Takafumi Sato¹, Hiromichi Ito¹, Yu Takahashi¹ and Akio Saiura^{1,3}

Abstract

Background: Primary neuroendocrine tumor (NET) originating from the extrahepatic bile duct is rare, although liver metastasis from gastroenteropancreatic NET is frequently observed. We herein report a case who successfully underwent repeat hepatectomy for liver metastases from bile duct NET grade 2 (G2).

Case presentation: A 75-year-old man presented with jaundice and was suspected of perihilar cholangiocarcinoma by computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). He underwent extended left hepatectomy, extrahepatic bile duct resection, and hepaticojejunostomy. Pathological findings showed a NET G2 of the biliary tract arising from the common bile duct. Two years and 11 months after surgery, a liver metastasis was detected and hepatectomy was performed. During the surgery, another liver metastasis was detected, and limited liver resection for the two lesions was performed. Pathological findings showed four liver metastases of NET G2. Five years and 4 months after the first surgery (2 years and 5 months after the second hepatectomy), four liver metastases were detected. Thereafter, he received somatostatin analogues for 1 year. Although the size of tumors increased slightly, the number did not change. He underwent limited liver resections and was diagnosed with 7 liver metastases of NET G2. Finally, another hepatectomy (fourth hepatectomy) was performed and long-term survival without recurrence was obtained for as long as 8 years after the first surgery.

Conclusions: Repeat hepatectomy is a good option to obtain long-term survival for liver metastases from bile duct NET G2 in select patients.

Keywords: Neuroendocrine tumor (NET), Liver metastasis, Repeat hepatectomy, Bile duct

Background

A primary neuroendocrine tumor (NET) of the bile duct is rare. It has been reported that NETs originating from the extrahepatic bile duct account for only 0.2–2% of the primary NET sites in gastroenteropancreatic NET [1, 2].

The most common metastatic site of all NETs is the liver. Liver metastasis is an important prognostic factor in patients with NET. In terms of treatment, debulking

* Correspondence: yoshihiro.ono@jfcr.or.jp

Springer Open

¹Department of Gastroenterological Surgery, Cancer Institute Hospital, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research, 3-8-31 Ariake, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-8550, Japan

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

surgery and radical resection are recommended [3]. There has been no report that details repeat hepatectomy of NET grade 2 (G2) that originated from the bile duct. We herein report a patient with liver metastases from the bile duct NET G2, who successfully underwent hepatectomy three times and recovered 8 years after the first operation.

Case presentation

A 75-year-old man presented with upper abdominal pain. The blood biochemical tests showed the following: total bilirubin, 2.3 mg/dL; direct bilirubin, 1.6 mg/dL; gamma-glutamyl transferase (γ -GTP), 194 u/L; alkaline

© The Author(s). 2020 **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.







phosphatase (ALP), 1057 u/L; aspartate aminotransferase (AST), 56 u/L; and alanine aminotransferase (ALT), 54 u/L; without abnormalities in amylase. Computed tomography (CT) showed dilation of the intrahepatic and extrahepatic bile ducts, soft tissue density in the common bile duct, wall thickening of the common bile duct, and atrophy of left lobe of the liver (Fig. 1a). Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP) demonstrated defects in the left intrahepatic and common bile ducts (Fig. 1b). Although the cytological analysis obtained from the bile duct did not detect the presence of cancer cells, perihilar cholangiocarcinoma was suspected and the patient underwent left hepatectomy combined with caudate lobectomy and extrahepatic bile duct resection (Fig. 1c, d). Biliary continuity was established by a right hepaticojejunostomy. The operative time was 610 min, and blood loss during surgery was 670 mL. The postoperative course was good, and the patient was discharged 23 days after surgery. The resected specimen showed a whitish and irregularly shaped tumor arising from the common bile duct invading the left hepatic duct (Fig. 2). Histologically, the tumor consisted of welldifferentiated neuroendocrine cells forming nest or cord-like pattern. The number of mitoses was 2.4 per 10 high power fields (Fig. 2b). Immunohistochemical staining showed that all the tumor cells were positive for CD56, synaptophysin, and chromogranin A and the Ki67 index was 7% (Fig. 2c). Collectively, we diagnosed the tumor as NET G2. Surgical margin was negative, and 7 out of 25 lymph nodes were positive for metastasis.

Two years and 9 months after the first operation, a liver metastasis was detected by follow-up CT (Fig. 3a). The patient underwent a limited liver resection of segment 8. Another liver metastasis was newly detected intraoperatively at segment 8 by contrast-enhanced intraoperative ultrasound (CE-IOUS) using perflubutane (Fig. 3b). It was difficult to find this tumor by CT, MRI, or contrastenhanced ultrasound (CEUS) before surgery. Limited liver resections were performed for these two lesions. Pathological findings showed two other metastases in the resected lesions (Fig. 3c), and a total of four metastases were included in the specimen. All four liver metastases were diagnosed as NET G2 (Fig. 3d).

Five years and 4 months after the first operation (2 years and 5 months after the second hepatectomy), four liver metastases were detected by CT (Fig. 4a) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). In-pentetreotide scintigraphy (OctreoScan) showed uptake in liver tumors. Octreotide long-acting release (LAR) 30 mg was given monthly for 3 months, and the tumor size increased slightly. Then, octreotide LAR was replaced with lanreotide depot/autogel 120 mg at monthly intervals. Seven months later, the tumor grew more but the number of tumors did not change. Then, the third hepatectomy



Fig. 1 Contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT) and endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography (ERCP). **a** CT shows dilation of the intrahepatic and extrahepatic bile ducts, wall thickening of the common bile duct, and atrophy of the left liver lobe. **b** ERCP demonstrates a defect in the left intrahepatic and common bile ducts. Furthermore, a mass in the common bile duct is indicated. **c** Intraoperative findings showed atrophy of the left lobe. **d** Left hepatectomy, caudate lobectomy, and extrahepatic bile duct resection were performed



duct. **b** Hematoxylin and eosin staining. The tumor nest consists of eosinophilic cells with round nuclei (left). A mitotic figure is indicated by the arrow (middle). Rosette formation is apparent (right). **c** Immunohistochemistry. The tumor cells are positive for all the neuroendocrine markers (CD56, chromogranin A, and synaptophysin). Ki-67 index is 7% (scale bars, 200 µm)

was performed for the four tumors (6 years and 3 months after the first operation). Three other metastases located at segments 5 and 8 were newly detected by intraoperative CEUS, and eventually, five limited liver resections of segments 5, 6, and 8 were performed (Fig. 4d). Pathological findings showed 7 liver metastases with NET G2 recurrence.

Seven years and 1 month after the first hepatectomy (10 months after the third hepatectomy), four liver metastases were detected. After 6 months of everolimus (10 mg/day) administration, all tumors shrank (Fig. 5). Although everolimus seemed to be effective, it was difficult to continue the chemotherapy because of its side effects, such as nausea, anorexia, and taste disorder. In the fourth surgery, no newly detected tumor by CE-IOUS nor pathological findings were noted. After the fourth hepatectomy, the patient had no recurrence and obtained long-term survival for as long as 8 years after the first surgery (Fig. 6).

Discussion

NET of the extrahepatic bile duct reportedly accounts for only 0.2-2% of primary NET sites [1, 4, 5]. According to a recent analysis of 13,715 carcinoid tumors from the National Cancer Institute database, the incidence of primary extrahepatic bile duct involvement was only 0.32% among all gastrointestinal carcinoid tumors [6]. In a literature review on extrahepatic bile duct NET, 150 cases from 100 articles from 1959 to 2012 were summarized [1]; it showed that the median age was 47 years (range, 6–79 years), with a female (61.5%) predominance. The tumors were symptomatic in 88.5% of the patients. The most common symptoms were jaundice (60.3%), followed by hormone- or vasoactive peptide-related symptoms (9%). The symptoms were mostly related to tumor mass growth, invasion of adjacent structures, or metastases rather than hormone and vasoactive peptide secretion [1]. Surgical excision was considered as the main and only curative treatment for the extrahepatic



Pathological findings showed four tumors in the resected specimen. The dotted circles represent the metastases newly detected by CE-IOUS or pathological findings. The arrow points the metastasis detected before operation. **d** Histopathological findings were almost the same as the specimen from the last operation

bile duct NETs. The type of procedure depended on the tumor location. The most frequent procedure was excision of extrahepatic bile duct (62.8%) with portal lymphadenectomy (43.6%). Pancreatoduodenectomy was performed in 19.2% of the patients, hepatectomies or radiofrequency ablation (RFA) in 14.1%, and liver transplantation in 3.85%. In 6.4% of the patients, only biopsies were conducted [1].

Pathologically, NETs may arise from argentaffin or Suschitzky cells, which are believed to be endodermal in origin [7–9]. These cells are present in the gastrointestinal tract, but also exist in extremely low numbers in the bile duct, resulting in the lower occurrence of bile duct NET [8]. Chronic inflammation within the bile duct may cause intestinal metaplasia of the biliary epithelium [10]. The most frequent sites of extrahepatic biliary NETs are the common hepatic duct (19.2%) and the distal common bile duct (19.2%), followed by the middle of the common bile duct (17.9%), the cystic duct (16.7%), and the proximal common bile duct (11.5%) [1].

The liver is the most common site for NET metastasis. At initial diagnosis, about 65-95% of gastroenteropancreatic NET shows hepatic metastasis [11]. Indeed, liver metastases represent the most crucial prognostic factor, irrespective of the primary NET site. In historical series, 5-year survival was 13-54% in patients with hepatic metastases compared with 75-99% in patients without hepatic metastases [12]. In terms of treatment, hepatic resection was associated with high favorable survival compared to chemotherapy [13]. Even cytoreduction hepatectomy was reported to have a comparable outcome to complete resection (R0 or R1) [3]. In a systematic review of the extrahepatic bile duct NETs describing 78 adequately documented cases, metastases were present in one third of all the patients. Lymph node metastasis was 19.5%, followed by liver metastases (16.9%) [1]. Since bile duct NETs or liver metastasis of bile duct NETs is quite rare, standard treatment for this disease has not been established yet.



We reviewed cases involving the bile duct NET G1 or G2 with liver metastasis to study the treatments and prognoses. Literature review using PubMed was employed using the following keywords: [carcinoid] [Neuroendocrine tumor] [Neuroendocrine carcinoma] and [bile duct] [biliary tract] [cystic duct] (Table 1). We identified G1/G2 from the description of mitotic findings or Ki-67. The word "carcinoid" was coined by the pathologist Siegfried Oberndorfer to mean "carcinomalike" [14]; the description was in reference to the benign behavior of morphologically atypical small bowel tumors [15]. However, the word "carcinoid" led to terminological confusion and diagnostic unreliability because despite the presence of innocuous-appearing cell with uniform nuclei and few mitoses, these tumors sometimes behave malignantly with metastasis, local invasion, and recurrence after resection. Since 2000, the WHO has been revising the gastroenteropancreatic classification to avoid the term "carcinoid" in favor of NET; currently, NET is classified by tumor differentiation, mitotic rate, and Ki-67 in the pathology report [16]. As a result, "carcinoid" nearly represents NET G1/G2, but not the same and has some possibility to contain NET G3 and neuroendocrine carcinoma (NEC) (G3). In this review, the term "carcinoid" was included without NET grading.

Eighty-four cases from 76 articles were sorted under bile duct NETG1/G2 and carcinoid. Among them, 11 cases are with liver metastases. Table 1 summarizes these bile duct NET G1/G2 and carcinoid with liver metastasis [10, 17–25]. The female to male ratio was 4/7 with a median age of 44 years (ranging from 19 to 76 years). The most frequent sites were the common bile duct (36%) followed by hilar (18%) and proximal common bile duct (18%). Nine patients had synchronous liver metastasis, while two had metachronous ones. In the nine patients with synchronous liver metastasis, seven underwent hepatectomy and two were judged to have unresectable metastases. After hepatectomy for synchronous liver metastasis, one of these seven patients developed recurrence of liver metastasis and died 6



months after the operation. In the two cases with metachronous liver metastasis, one was diagnosed with liver metastasis 8 months after the first operation without detailed reports of treatment for the recurrence. The other patient had liver metastasis 1 year after the primary resection and underwent CT-guided percutaneous RFA. Although the prognosis had not been well documented in most cases, median follow-up time was 7 months (ranging from 0 to 240 months). One patient with curative surgery obtained long-term survival of 20 years [21].

In our case, we performed upfront hepatectomy for the first liver metastases, since CT and MRI showed solitary tumor (although the number of tumors increased during surgery). In the second recurrence, multiple liver metastases were detected by CT and MRI, which were



| Gase Muthor/ Set Age Location Liver met. Telement Returment Returment Follow-up ime 1 D.M. Judge/1976 M 19 PCBD n/a (arcrinoid) Synchronous BSC (cholesysectomy biopsy) Ante for 5 months 2 Gastinger/11991 M 36 CHDB n/a (arcrinoid) Synchronous Elver resection Na Ante for 5 months 3 B hodriguez/1991 M 36 CHDB n/a (arcrinoid) Synchronous Elver resection, PPD Na Ante for 18 months 4 Genchala RB/1993 M 28 PLD-CHD n/a (arcrinoid) Synchronous Elver resection, PPD Na Ante for 18 months 6 Okowa/1986 F 40 CDD Na Elver coperation 7 Behala RB/1993 M 28 PLD-CHD Na Elver coperation 8 Cholesysteromy laparatomy laparatomy laparatomy laparatomy laparatomy laparatomy laparatom Na Elver coperation 7 El Rassi Zx2004 | שוחפ | DIIG ANCLINET GIV | קל אווו | וואפו | cicplcplai | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 DM. Judge / 196 M 19 Castinger / 196 M 10 Castinger / 196 M 10 Castinger / 196 M | Case | Author/ year | Sex | Age | Location | G1/G2 | Liver met. | Treatment | Recurrence | Re-treatment | Follow-up time and prognosis |
| 2 Gastinger 1/1987 F 66 FGB0 r/a (actinud) Synchronouts Bycersection r/a Aive for 5 months 3 B Rodriguez 7/1991 M 36 CHD-B r/a (actinud) Synchronouts Byc.essection Pole Deceased 4 days 4 Gembala RN1935 M 36 HD-CHD r/a (actinud) Synchronouts Byc.essection PDD r/a Pice section 5 Kopelman D/1996 F 49 CBD r/a (actinud) Synchronouts Byc.essection PDD r/a Aive for 18months 6 Okawa V1998 F 49 CBD r/a (actinud) Synchronouts Byc.essection PDD r/a Aive for 18months 7 E Rasi Z/2/004 F Aive CBD Synchronouts Byc.essection Aive for 18months Aive for 18months Aive for 18months 7 E Rasi Carinolut Synchronouts Byc.hite.esection Byc.hite.esection Aive for 18months Aive for 18months Aive for 18months 7 E Rasi Carinolut Synchronouts Byt. | - | D.M. Judge /1976 | M | 19 | PCBD | n/a (carcinoid) | Synchronous | BSC (cholecystectomy, biopsy) | | | Deceased 4 months after operation |
| 3 B Bodriguez /1931 M 36 CHDB Va (acrichoid) Synchronous BC (exploratory)BDA Mater operation 4 Gembala RB/1933 M 28 RHDCHD Va (acrichoid) Synchronous BDR (hytersentory)BDA Mate Mater operation 5 Kopelman D/1996 F 44 CBD Na (acrichoid) Synchronous Limited luker resection, PPDD Na Mater for 8 months 7 El Rassi Zs/2004 F 41 Hilar G1/G2 Synchronous Left luker resection, LMR, HJ Na Na Mate for 3 years 8 Timas GN/2006 F 41 Hilar G1/G2 Synchronous Left luker resection, LMR, HJ Na Na Mate for 3 years 8 Timas GN/2006 F 41 Hilar G1/G2 Synchronous Left luker resection, LMB, HJ Na | 2 | Gastinger /1987 | ш | 65 | PCBD | n/a (carcinoid) | Synchronous | Liver resection | n/a | | Alive for 5 months |
| 4 Cembala RK1'93 M 28 RHD-CHD Vad (action)did Synchronous Right trisegnenetectom, BDR Na Na Na 5 Kopelman D/1996 F 44 CBD Na (action)did Synchronous BDR, Inver resection, RPPD Na Alve for 18 months 7 El Rassi Zx2004 F 41 Hila G1/C2 Synchronous BDR, Inver resection (audal lobs) Uver Name for appeading 7 El Rassi Zx2004 F 41 Hila G1/C2 Synchronous Left Inver, caudate lobs Uver Name for appeading 8 Tzimas GN/2006 F 29 Hila G1/C2 Synchronous Left Inver, caudate lobs Uver Name for appeading 10 Taimas GN/2006 F Alb Hila Calculo SIR Ploated calculo SIR Alb | m | B Rodriguez /1991 | X | 36 | CHD-B | n/a (carcinoid) | Synchronous | BSC (exploratory laparotomy) | | | Deceased 4 days after operation |
| 5 Kopelman D/1996 F 44 CBD r/a (arcinoid) Synchronous Immed liver resection, PPD n/a Alle for 18 months 7 El Rasis ZY2004 F 41 Hilar Gl/cus Synchronous Left liver, caudate lobe Liver None Deceased 6 months 7 El Rasis ZY2004 F 41 Hilar Gl/cus Synchronous Left liver, caudate lobe Liver None Deceased 6 months 8 Tzimas GN/2006 F 29 Hilar Gl/cus Synchronous Left liver, caudate lobe Liver None None for 20 years 9 Honda H/2006 M 76 GBD Gl/cus Synchronous Pol None None None for 20 years 9 Honda H/2006 M 76 CBD Gl/cus Synchronous Pol None None for 20 years None None for 20 years 9 Honda H/2006 M 7 None None None None None None | 4 | Gembala RB/1993 | X | 28 | RHD-CHD | n/a (carcinoid) | Synchronous | Right trisegmentectomy, BDR, LNR, HJ | n/a | | n/a |
| 6 Olawa V1996 N 70 CD-CBD G1 Synchronous BR, Iver resection (audal lobe) Uver None Deceased 6 months after operation 7 El Raszi Z>2004 F 41 Hiar G1/G2 Synchronous Left hepatectomy, LNR, HJ n/a Alive for 2years 8 Tzimas GN/2006 F 29 Hilar n/a (arcrinoid) Synchronous Left hepatectomy, LNR, HJ n/a Alive for 2years 9 Honda H/2006 M 76 GBD G1/G2 Synchronous Patectom, BDR, HJ veeks re-op. Tainsplantation Alive for 2years 9 Honda H/2006 M 76 GBD G1/G2 Synchronous Patectom, BDR, HJ veeks re-op. Tainsplantation Alive for 3years 10 Ferrone CR2007 M 76 CBD G1/G2 Synchronous Patectom, BDR, HJ No Pate standon Alive for ayears Alive for ayears 10 Ferrone CR2007 M 50 RBD Alive for ayears Alive for ayears <td>5</td> <td>Kopelman D/1996</td> <td>ш</td> <td>4</td> <td>CBD</td> <td>n/a (carcinoid)</td> <td>Synchronous</td> <td>Limited liver resection, PPPD</td> <td>n/a</td> <td></td> <td>Alive for 18 months</td> | 5 | Kopelman D/1996 | ш | 4 | CBD | n/a (carcinoid) | Synchronous | Limited liver resection, PPPD | n/a | | Alive for 18 months |
| 7 El Rasi Z5/2004 F 41 Hiar G1/G2 Synchronous Left hepatectomy, LN, HJ n/a Aim Aim Aim For 20 years 8 Tzimas GN/2006 F 29 Hilar n/a (carcinold) Synchronous Left liver, caudate lobe 1 year and 2 Onthotopic liver Aims for 3 years 9 Honda H/2006 M 76 GB0 G1/G2 Metachronous PD Liver Na Aims for 2 years 10 Ferrone CR/2007 M 76 GB0 G1/G2 Metachronous PD Liver Na Aim for 7 years 10 Ferrone CR/2007 M 57 Bight trisegmentectomy, Ma Na Aim for 7 years Aim for 7 years 11 Felekouras L2009 M 60 GB0 G3 Aim for 7 years Na 12 Felekouras L2003 M 60 GB0 G1/G2 Metachronous BDR, LN Na Na 13 Felekouras L2003 M 60 <td< td=""><td>9</td><td>Oikawa I/1998</td><td>×</td><td>70</td><td>CD-CBD</td><td>01</td><td>Synchronous</td><td>BDR, liver resection (caudal lobe)</td><td>Liver</td><td>None</td><td>Deceased 6 months after operation</td></td<> | 9 | Oikawa I/1998 | × | 70 | CD-CBD | 01 | Synchronous | BDR, liver resection (caudal lobe) | Liver | None | Deceased 6 months after operation |
| 8 Tzimas GN/2006 F 29 Hilar Iva (carcinoid) Synchronous Left liver, caudate lobe 1 year and 2 Orthotopic liver Alive for 3 years 9 Honda H/2006 M 76 CBD GI/G2 Metachronous PD Liver Ivar Ivar Alive for 3 years 10 Ferrone CR/2007 M 52 RHD-H GI Synchronous Right trisegmentectomy, Iva Ivar Na Alive for more than 8 11 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 CBD G2 Metachronous BDR, LNR Ivar Ivar Ivar Alive for more than 8 11 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 CBD G2 Metachronous BDR, LNR Ivar Ivar Ivar Ivar 11 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 CBD G2 Metachronous BDR, LNR Ivar Ivar Ivar Ivar Ivar 12 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 CBD G2 Metachronous BDR, LNR Ivar Ivar Ivar Ivar Ivar Iv | 7 | El Rassi ZS/2004 | ш | 41 | Hilar | G1/G2 | Synchronous | Left hepatectomy, LNR, HJ | n/a | | Alive for 20 years |
| 9 Honda H/2006 M 76 GBD G1/G2 Metachronous PD Liver Na Alive for more than 8 10 Ferrone CR/2007 M 52 RHD-H G1 Synchronous Right trisegmentectomy, n/a n/a Na 11 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 GBD G2 Metachronous BDR, LNR N/a n/a Na 13 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 GBD G2 Metachronous BDR, HJ Na Na Alive for more than 10 14 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 GBD G2 Metachronous BDR, HJ I/vean Alive for more than 10 14 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 GBD G2 Metachronous BDR, HJ I/vean Alive for more than 10 I/vean I/vean Alive for more than 10 I/vean I/vean I/vean | 00 | Tzimas GN/2006 | ш | 29 | Hilar | n/a (carcinoid) | Synchronous | Left liver, caudate lobe resection, BDR, HJ | 1 year and 2 weeks re-op. | Orthotopic liver transplantation | Alive for 3 years (alive for 2 years after 2nd operation) |
| 10 Ferrone CR/2007 M 52 RID-H G1 Synchronous Right trisegmentectomy, n/a n/a 11 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 CBD G2 Metachronous BDR, HJ Liver RFA Alive for more than (1 year after second after op). CBD common bie duct. CHD common heatic duct. RPD proximal common bie duct. CHD-B common heatic duct. RPD proving pancreateduodenectomy. BDR bie duct resection. LMR hymph node resection. HJ hepaticojejunostomy | 6 | Honda H/2006 | Σ | 76 | CBD | G1/G2 | Metachronous | PD | Liver (8 months after op.) | n/a | Alive for more than 8 months after operation |
| 11 Felekouras E/2009 M 60 CBD G2 Metachronous BDR, HJ Liver RFA Alive for more than 1 year after 1 year after 1 year after second after after 0) 1 treatment CBD common bile duct, CHD common hepatic duct, RHD right hepatic duct, PCBD proximal common bile duct, CHD-B common hepatic duct bilitar, PD pancreateduodenectomy, BDR bile duct resection, LNR lymph node resection, HJ hepaticojejunostomy | 10 | Ferrone CR/2007 | × | 52 | RHD-H | 01 | Synchronous | Right trisegmentectomy, BDR, LNR | n/a | | n/a |
| CBD common bile duct, CHD common hepatic duct, RHD right hepatic duct, CD cystic duct, PCBD proximal common bile duct, CHD-B common hepatic duct bifurcation, RHD-H right hepatic duct-hilar, PD pancreated pancreated pancreated undenectomy, PPPD pylorus-preserving pancreated undenectomy, PPPD pylorus-preserving pancreated undenectomy, BDR bile duct resection, LNR lymph node resection, HJ hepaticojejunostomy | 1 | Felekouras E/2009 | Z | 60 | CBD | 62 | Metachronous | BDR, HJ | Liver (1 year after op.) | RFA | Alive for more than 1 year after second treatment |
| | CBD cor pancrea | mmon bile duct, CHD cor toduodenectomy, PPPD ₁ | mmon he pylorus-p | patic duct reserving | t, <i>RHD</i> right hepa pancreateduode | atic duct, CD cystic du nectomy, BDR bile du | uct, PCBD proximal co uct resection, LNR lyn | ommon bile duct, <i>CHD-B</i> common hepati ph node resection, <i>HJ</i> hepaticojejunosto | c duct bifurcation, my | <i>RHD-H</i> right hepatic d | uct-hilar, <i>PD</i> |

cta at a ith し)/ じ) T NET -Table 1 Bile avid on the OctreoScan. To confirm that the number of tumors was not increasing rapidly, or the metastases were limited to the liver, we chose somatostatin analogues (SSA) for the second liver recurrence, including octreotide LAR and lanreotide depot/autogel. According to the previous report, SSA achieved stable disease in 87% of the patients and a partial response of 5-8% for gastroenteropancreatic NET [26]. This effect is limited from 6 to 18 months [27]. In our case, octreotide LAR was given for 3 months followed by lanreotide depot/ autogel for 7 months. Although the size of tumors increased, the number of tumors did not change, and third hepatectomy was indicated. For the third recurrence (before fourth hepatectomy), we chose everolimus instead of SSA. Six months of everolimus caused the side reactions, so the fourth operation was planned. The main reason for chemotherapy induction for the multiple liver metastases was to see whether the tumors got worse rapidly or slowly. In the second recurrence, the chemotherapy could not give good response (the size of tumor increased); the number of tumors did not increase for more than 10 months. Then, the surgery was planned. In the third recurrence, although the tumors shrank, chemotherapy could not be continued because of the side effects, and surgery was planned. In both situations, chemotherapy took an important role of watching disease control.

It is important to resect as many tumors as possible for long-term survival. CE-IOUS may be effective to find new tumors that are difficult to identify via CT, EOB-MRI, or CEUS before surgery [12]. CEUS was routinely performed a day before the surgery. In the repeat hepatectomy cases, although we could not find new tumors by the CEUS before the surgery, we identified new tumors by CE-IOUS during the second and third surgeries. Hereby, CE-IOUS was quite useful to detect new liver metastases from NET.

Conclusion

Liver resection can contribute to long-term survival in the context of a multidisciplinary approach in patients with liver metastases of NET. In selected patients, repeat hepatectomy should be considered for liver metastases originating from bile duct NET G2 as well as other gastroenteropancreatic NETs.

Abbreviations

CT: Computed tomography; CEUS: Contrast-enhanced ultrasonography; CE-IOUS: Contrast-enhanced intraoperative ultrasound; ERCP: Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography; EOB-MRI: Gadolinium ethoxybenzyl diethylenetriamine penta-acetic acid-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging; NET: Neuroendocrine tumor; RFA: Radiofrequency ablation; SSA: Somatostatin analogues

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.

Authors' contributions

MM and YO reported the case and wrote the manuscript. AS, YO, and MM performed the surgery and perioperative management of the patient and helped draft the manuscript. AS and YT participated in revising the manuscript critically. MT reviewed all the histological findings. All authors declare that they contributed to this article and that they read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

The authors declare that they have no financial support in association with this case report.

Availability of data and materials

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Consent for publication

Informed consent was obtained from the patient for the publication of this case report and any accompanying images.

Competing interests

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author details

¹Department of Gastroenterological Surgery, Cancer Institute Hospital, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research, 3-8-31 Ariake, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-8550, Japan. ²Department of Pathology, Cancer Institute Hospital, Japanese Foundation for Cancer Research, 3-8-31 Ariake, Koto-ku, Tokyo 135-8550, Japan. ³Present Address: Department of Hepatobiliary-Pancreatic Surgery, Juntendo University School of Medicine, 2-1-1 Bunkyoku, Hongo, Tokyo 113-8421, Japan.

Received: 30 May 2020 Accepted: 29 July 2020 Published online: 08 August 2020

References

- Michalopoulos N, Papavramidis TS, Karayannopoulou G, Pliakos I, Papavramidis ST, Kanellos I. Neuroendocrine tumors of extrahepatic biliary tract. Pathol Oncol Res. 2014;20(4):765–75.
- Godwin JD 2nd. Carcinoid tumors. An analysis of 2,837 cases. Cancer. 1975; 36(2):560–9.
- Frilling A, Modlin IM, Kidd M, Russell C, Breitenstein S, Salem R, et al. Recommendations for management of patients with neuroendocrine liver metastases. The Lancet Oncology. 2014;15(1):e8–e21.
- Chamberlain RS, Blumgart LH. Carcinoid tumors of the extrahepatic bile duct. A rare cause of malignant biliary obstruction. Cancer. 1999;86(10): 1959–65.
- Albores-Saavedra J, Batich K, Hossain S, Henson DE, Schwartz AM. Carcinoid tumors and small-cell carcinomas of the gallbladder and extrahepatic bile ducts: a comparative study based on 221 cases from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program. Ann Diagn Pathol. 2009;13(6):378–83.
- Modlin IM, Lye KD, Kidd M. A 5-decade analysis of 13,715 carcinoid tumors. Cancer. 2003;97(4):934–59.
- Abe T, Nirei A, Suzuki N, Todate Y, Azami A, Waragai M, et al. Neuroendocrine tumor of the extrahepatic bile duct: a case report. Int J Surg Case Rep. 2017;40:6–9.
- Dancygier H, Klein U, Leuschner U, Hubner K, Classen M. Somatostatincontaining cells in the extrahepatic biliary tract of humans. Gastroenterology. 1984;86(5 Pt 1):892–6.
- Judge DM, Dickman PS, Trapukdi S. Nonfunctioning argyrophilic tumor (APUDoma) of the hepatic duct: simplified methods of detecting biogenic amines in tissue. Am J Clin Pathol. 1976;66(1):40–5.
- Barrón-Rodríguez LP, Manivel JC, Méndez-Sánchez N, Jessurun J. Carcinoid tumor of the common bile duct: evidence for its origin in metaplastic endocrine cells. Am J Gastroenterol. 1991;86(8):1073–6.
- Saxena A, Chua TC, Sarkar A, Chu F, Liauw W, Zhao J, et al. Progression and survival results after radical hepatic metastasectomy of indolent advanced neuroendocrine neoplasms (NENs) supports an aggressive surgical approach. Surgery. 2011;149(2):209–20.

- 12. Kulke MH, Benson AB 3rd, Bergsland E, Berlin JD, Blaszkowsky LS, Choti MA, et al. Neuroendocrine tumors. J Natl Compr Canc Netw. 2012;10(6):724–64.
- Fairweather M, Swanson R, Wang J, Brais LK, Dutton T, Kulke MH, et al. Management of neuroendocrine tumor liver metastases: long-term outcomes and prognostic factors from a large prospective database. Ann Surg Oncol. 2017;24(8):2319–25.
- Modlin IM, Shapiro MD, Kidd M. Siegfried Oberndorfer: origins and perspectives of carcinoid tumors. Hum Pathol. 2004;35(12):1440–51.
- 15. Rosai J. The origin of neuroendocrine tumors and the neural crest saga. Mod Pathol. 2011;24(Suppl 2):S53–7.
- Kloppel G. Classification and pathology of gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms. Endocr Relat Cancer. 2011;18(Suppl 1):S1–16.
- Gastinger I, Schutze U, Beetz G, Lippert H. Obstructive jaundice caused by a carcinoid tumor of the hepatocholedochal duct. Zentralbl Chir. 1987; 112(18):1170–5.
- Gembala RB, Arsuaga JE, Friedman AC, Radecki PD, Ball DS, Hartman GG, et al. Carcinoid of the intrahepatic ducts. Abdom Imaging. 1993;18(3):242–4.
- 19. Kopelman D, Schein M, Kerner H, Bahuss H, Hashmonai M. Carcinoid tumor of the common bile duct. HPB Surg. 1996;10(1):41–3.
- Oikawa I, Hirata K, Katsuramaki T, Mukaiya M, Sasaki K, Satoh M. Neuroendocrine carcinoma of the extrahepatic biliary tract with positive immunostaining for gastrin-releasing peptide: report of a case. Surg Today. 1998;28(11):1192–5.
- El Rassi ZS, Mohsine RM, Berger F, Thierry P, Partensky CC. Endocrine tumors of the extrahepatic bile ducts. Pathological and clinical aspects, surgical management and outcome. Hepatogastroenterology. 2004;51(59):1295–300.
- Tzimas GN, Vali K, Deschênes M, Marcus VA, Barkun JS, Tchervenkov JI, et al. Liver transplantation for metastases from a bile duct carcinoid. HPB (Oxford). 2006;8(1):67–8.
- Honda H, Hayashi S, Sekiguchi Y, Tsukadaira T, Nakamura K. A case of the extrahepatic bile duct carcinoid tumor. Nihon Shokakibyo Gakkai Zasshi. 2006;103(10):1169–75.
- 24. Ferrone CR, Tang LH, D'Angelica M, DeMatteo RP, Blumgart LH, Klimstra DS, et al. Extrahepatic bile duct carcinoid tumors: malignant biliary obstruction with a good prognosis. J Am Coll Surg. 2007;205(2):357–61.
- Felekouras E, Petrou A, Bramis K, Prassas E, Papaconstantinou I, Dimitriou N, et al. Malignant carcinoid tumor of the cystic duct: a rare cause of bile duct obstruction. Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int. 2009;8(6):640–6.
- Massironi S, Conte D, Rossi RE. Somatostatin analogues in functioning gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumours: literature review, clinical recommendations and schedules. Scand J Gastroenterol. 2016;51(5):513–23.
- 27. Oberg KE. Gastrointestinal neuroendocrine tumors. Ann Oncol. 2010; 21(Suppl 7):vii72–80.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Submit your manuscript to a SpringerOpen[®] journal and benefit from:

- Convenient online submission
- Rigorous peer review
- Open access: articles freely available online
- ► High visibility within the field
- Retaining the copyright to your article

Submit your next manuscript at > springeropen.com