Endoscopic Treatment In Rectal Neuroendocrine Tumor -NET registry multicenter study

Young Kwan Cho¹, Seong Hwan Kim¹, II Hyun Baek², Seun Ja Park³,

1. Department of Internal Medicine, *Eulji University* College of Medicine, 2. Department of Internal Medicine Kyung Hee University School of Medicine 3. Department of Internal Medicine, Kosin University College of Medicine

Introduction

Rectal neuroendocrine tumor(NET) incidence is low. So previous studies of Endoscopic treatment in rectal NET have been small sample size studies.

 Table 2. Baseline characteristics between Complete resection group and Incomplete resection group

	Complete resection	Incomplete resection	p-value
Age (year)	49.8 ± 11.2	48.5 ± 11.6	0.410
Gender (male)	200(58.1%)	38(56.7%)	0.829
Symptom	48(14%)	11(16.4%)	0.599
Carcinoid symptom	9(2.6%)	4(6%)	0.151
Underlying disease	48(14%)	7(10.4%)	0.441
Family history of NET	2(0.6%)	2(3.0%)	0.067
ECOG 0 1 2 5	325(94.5%) 17(4.9%) 1(0.3%) 1(0.3%)	66(98.5%) 1(1.5%) 0(0%) 0(0%)	0.571
Multiple lesion	10(2.9%)	5(7.5%)	0.069
Morphology Elevated Flat Depressed	341(99.1%) 1(0.3%) 2(0.6%)	66(98.5%) 1(1.5%) 0(0%)	0.358
Lesion size (cm)	0.57 ± 0.33	0.62 ± 0.26	0.252

Aim & Method

The aim of this study was to investigate effectiveness of endoscopic treatment in rectal NET below 2cm.

<Method>

January, 2003 –December, 2012 Rectal NET (24 Center) N= 1366 <Inclusion criteria>

: Endoscopic treatment

Age >18 year

Size < 2cm</td>

N=411

<Exclusion Criteria> : No treatment Operation Chemotherapy Octreotide therapy Incomplte data N=955

 Table 3. Binary logistic regression results for Predicting

 Incomplete resection

Wald

Sig.

df

Exp(B)

95% C.I.for Exp(B)

S.E.

Β

Clinicopathologic analysis

We analyzed the clinicopathologic data and factors affecting incomplete resection. We used Ki-squre, T-test, **Result**

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of Rectal NET

Characteristics	
Age (years)	49.6 ± 11.3
Sex (M:F)	238(57.9%): 173(42.1%)
Symptom (No:Yes)	352(85.6%): 59(14.4%)
Carcinoid syn (No:Yes)	398(96.8%): 13(3.2%)
Family history of NET (No:Yes)	407(99%): 4(1%)
Underlying disease (No:Yes)	356(86.6%): 55(13.4%)
Multiple lesion (No:Yes)	396(96.4%): 15(3.6%)

							Lower	Upper
Patholgy(WHO2000) Neuroendocrine tumor	-1.156	.743	2.423	1	.120	.315	0.730	1.350
Morphology Elevated Flat	19.561 21.203	28420.614 28420.614	1.336 .000 .000	2 1 1	.513 .999 .999	312671501 1615E+0.9	.000 .000	
Lesion size 0-1 1-2 2	19.526 19.922 -21.203	23025.201 23205.201 23205.201	1.057 .000 .000 .000	2 1 1 1	.589 .999 .999 .999	31904456 448737126 .000	.000 .000	•
Depth of invasion Mucosa Submucosa	-4.70 .120	1.134 1.106	3.176 .172 .012	2 1 1	.204 .679 .913	.625 .128	.068 .129	5.772 9.853
Lymphovascular invasion	-22.900	2069.467	.000	1	.999	.000	.000	
Endoscopic treatment ESD	.659	.280	5.529	1	0.019	1.932	1.116	3.346
Recurrence	2.216	.743	8.886	1	0.003	9.167	2.136	39.342

Table 4. Multinomial logistic regression results forPredicting Incomplete resection

В	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95% C.I.for Exp(B)		
						Lower	Upper	

Elevated:Flat:Depressed	407(99%): 2(0.5%): 2(0.5%)
Lesion size (cm)	0.58 ± 0.32
WHO Classsfication(2000) Well differentiated tumor: Well differentiated carcinoma	403(98.1%): 8(1.9%)
Invasion of Depth Mucosa:Submucosa:Proper muscle	117(28.5%): 288(70.1%): 6(1.5%)
EMR:ESD	300(73%): 117(27%)
Complete resection: Incomplete resection	344(73%): 117(27%)
Lymphovascular invasion (No:Yes)	407(99%): 4(1%)
Additional treatment after Incomplete resection	5(1.5%)
Recurrence	8(1.9%)

Endoscopic treatment ESD	.646	.285	5.145	1	0.023	1.908	1.092	3.335
Recurrence	2.189	.751	8.488	1	0.004	8.925	2.047	38.912
Constant	-2.553	.411	38.543	1	.000	0.78		

Conclusion

We suggest endoscopic treatment was effective in rectal neuroendocrine tumor below 2cm size. But further prospective study including complication result will be need.

