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Introduction

Neuroendocrine neoplasms (NENs) of the small intestine (i.e. the ileum and jejunum; Si-NENs) [1] comprise at least the third largest subgroups of NENs within the gastroenteropancreatic system [2]. Because of a better knowledge of the molecular and cell-biological aspects as well as the clear pathohistological characterization of this tumor entity [3], a worldwide overall increase of NENs is reported [4]; the location in the small intestine reaches in some publications the largest absolute number [5, 6].

Si-NENs derive from serotonin-producing enterochromaffin cells. The biology of these tumors is different from other NENs of the digestive tract, characterized by a low proliferation rate [the vast majority are grade 1 (G1) and G2], they are often indolent; G3 tumors are exceptional. However, classified as G1 or G2, Si-NENs are often discovered at an advanced disease stage – regional disease (36%) and distant metastasis (48%) are present – and percutaneous biopsy of a liver lesion is often the diagnostic procedure performed [2, 7].

Previous ENETS guidelines [1, 8, 9] have discussed extensively the clinical symptomology, diagnosis and treatment of localized, regionalized as well as distant Si-NENs. This fourth edition of the ENETS guidelines is an update of the third version for the management of patients with Si-NENs published in 2012 [1] in order to further standardize and improve the early diagnosis and treatment of Si-NEN patients. This guideline deals with non-meta-
static NENs originating from the small bowel, originally described as ‘carcinoid’ tumors by Oberndorfer in 1907 [10].

This update does not include metastatic disease which is covered in a separate paper of this issue; this other paper also discusses guidelines for medical and other treatment options of the ‘carcinoid syndrome’, since this occurs almost exclusively when the tumor is metastatic. The carcinoid heart disease (CHD or Hedinger syndrome), however, is covered in this paper, since early recognition and treatment is important for this complication of the carcinoid syndrome.

Epidemiology and Prognosis

Si-NENs are an overall relatively rare entity with a reported incidence between 0.32/100,000 in England [11], 0.33/100,000 in Japan [12], 0.67/100,000 in the USA [6], 0.81/100,000 in Norway [13] and 1.12/100,000 in Sweden [14] according to the most recent literature. Malignant Si-NENs have been reported with an incidence of 0.29/100,000 [2]; in this study, malignant Si-NENs made up approximately half of all NENs, while other studies have shown lower numbers, i.e. 20–35% [1, 6, 13]. The mean age at initial diagnosis is in the late 50s in several cohorts, with the majority of cases occurring in the 7th decade [12, 15–17]. The incidence of Si-NENs has not shown a gender preference in some series [11, 15, 17] with a slight male preponderance in others [12, 16, 18]. While the incidence of Si-NENs may be lower in persons of Asian descent [6, 12], it seems to be higher in African Americans in the SEER data-base [6]. Si-NENs constitute up to one third or even half of all small bowel neoplasms [2, 16]. The ‘true’ incidence of Si-NENs in post-mortem studies is much higher (1.22/100) and suggests that these NENs may be much more abundant at early or very early stages but do not manifest themselves clinically and are not diagnosed during life [19].

The prognosis of Si-NENs depends on both staging and grading, which is reflected in the WHO classification of 2010 [20]. This has also been shown in a recent study in which the Ki-67 grading system as well as TNM staging for Si-NENs have been validated; Jann et al. [21] reported 5-year tumor-specific survival rates for jeuno-ileal NENs from an oncological cohort of 100% for stage I and II, 97.1% for stage III and 84.8% for stage IV Si-NENs. Grading-dependent 5-year tumor-specific survival rates are 93.8% for G1, 83.0% for G2 and 50.0% for the very rare G3 Si-NENs [21]. The SEER analysis for Si-NENs performed by Boudreaux et al. revealed 5-year overall survival rates of approximately 72% for locoregional spread and approximately 55% for NENs with distant metastases [22]. In the Spanish NET registry, 5-year survival for the whole cohort of ‘enteric carcinoid tumors’ was 77.6% [15], and this figure was only 61% in the Netherlands Cancer Registry (NCR) reported approximately 10 years earlier [23]. The SEER data do not suggest a significant survival difference between different ethnicities [6]. The prognosis for Si-NENs is, thus, considerably better than for other small intestinal neoplasms such as lymphomas, adenocarcinomas and sarcomas [16]. In the older patient group of more than 60 years at initial diagnosis, the outcome figures may be worse as was suggested by an analysis of the population-based Florida Cancer Data System (FCDS) [24], but this may not be exclusively related to NENs but rather other secondary neoplasms or other age-related causes of death [18].

Although recent data [25] suggest better overall or tumor-specific outcome figures, the data sets are not completely comparable as they are analyzed at different tumor stages. However, as has been suggested by Yao et al. [6], the overall outcome has probably improved over the last 25 years which may be related to better diagnosis, effective treatment options and multimodal sequential or simultaneous treatments. This aspect, however, has not been specifically shown by every study [18], and will also undoubtedly be very hard to prove.

Localized mesenteric lymph node metastases, distant abdominal lymph node metastases, liver tumor burden and extra-abdominal metastases seem independent prognostic factors by multivariate analysis [26].

Minimal Consensus Statement on Epidemiology and Prognosis

The former terminology of midgut and hindgut origin is inaccurate and hence these tumors are classified as jeuno-ileal, appendiceal, cecal, colonic or rectal NENs. The clinical incidence of Si-NENs is considerably lower than the incidence at autopsy (approx. 1:100). It is probably higher than stated earlier in the literature. Figures from the SEER and other registries indicate a significant rise of the reported annual incidence of 0.67–0.81/100,000/year for Si-NENs. The incidence rate may be considerably lower in Asia with 0.20/100,000/year as suggested by Japanese data. Si-NENs represent 30–50% of all small bowel neoplasms. The incidence rates have increased in more recent years. The average age at diagnosis for patients with these tumors is between 60 and 65 years. According to the literature, there is a slight male preponderance, and there are some ethnic differences. African Americans have a higher incidence rate than Caucasians.

Ki-67 grading is an important prognostic stratifier and is therefore mandatory in pathological reporting. Survival rates

Niederle et al.
Clinical Presentation

Nonspecific symptoms (vague abdominal pain or weight loss) were evident in 37% of all Si-NEN patients. Retrospectively, specific clinical symptoms either local (e.g., local stenosis or melena) or systemic (e.g., diarrhea or flushing) were reported in 21.5%, respectively [7]. Landerholm et al. [14] reported that even Si-NENs with distant metastasis may present without symptoms and the ‘carcinoid syndrome’ is infrequently seen. Therefore, it is recommended that primary-care physicians should keep in mind NENs and their vague nonspecific clinical features and start appropriate diagnostic testing early [27].

Si-NENs are frequently detected only when searching for a primary tumor in either asymptomatic or symptomatic patients (e.g., with carcinoid syndrome) with metastases; they can rarely be found incidentally, for example on screening colonoscopy in the terminal ileum or on a CT scan performed in another clinical context. The most frequent clinical symptom from single- or multi-centric series as well as from population-based data sources is nonspecific abdominal pain [7, 14, 28–31] which may be due to various reasons: dysmotility of the small bowel wall, small bowel obstruction, intermittent mesenteric ischemia caused by mesenteric root fibrosis, but also functional causes such as secretory diarrhea and bacterial overgrowth. Other nonspecific symptoms such as weight loss, fatigue and (rarely) fever of unknown origin may also occur. Tumor-mass-related symptoms due to bowel obstruction with nausea and vomiting, jaundice in case of metastatic cholestasis and even GI bleeding may also occur, but in a smaller proportion of patients [7, 14, 28–31].

The desmoplastic reaction leading to visceral fibrosis may culminate in small bowel ischemia or hydronephrosis from some degree of retroperitoneal fibrosis, although these are rare problems. Tumor-specific hormone-hypersecretion-related symptoms from the carcinoid syndrome comprise secretory diarrhea (60–80%), flushing (60–85%) and intermittent bronchial wheezing (which is frequently not clinically apparent; <10%) and most importantly right heart valve fibrosis with CHD (Hedinger syndrome; in up to 20%) [18, 29–31]. These manifestations are always associated with metastatic disease and by far most often with liver metastasis, which allows bypassing of hepatic clearance of serotonin from the portal circulation [28, 31, 32].

There is no evidence that the carcinoid syndrome per se, independent of metastatic disease, has an influence on prognosis [21] except for clinically manifest right-sided heart failure of CHD (see below).

A ‘carcinoid crisis’ is a severe and potentially fatal exacerbation stemming from hormone or peptide hypersecretion, leading to symptoms and signs often provoked by anesthesia or invasive procedures such as surgery [33]. The clinical picture includes flushing, hypo- or hypertension, diarrhea, severe bronchospasm and cardiac arrhythmias.

Minimal Consensus Statement on Clinical Presentation

Abdominal pain is the most frequent initial symptom in patients presenting with Si-NENs from the small bowel (often assimilating irritable bowel syndrome). The carcinoid syndrome is seen in approximately 20–30% of patients with metastases, this percentage is higher than previously stated. Small bowel ischemia can be another cause of diarrhea and pain besides hormone-hypersecretion-related diarrhea. Flushing and diarrhea are thought to be the cardinal symptoms in functional tumors and are equally (80%) present. It is emphasized that the carcinoid syndrome is usually seen in patients with liver metastases (in 95% of all patients), but excess tachykinin or serotonin production from retroperitoneal metastases or ovarian tumors/metastases can bypass the liver, enter the systemic circulation and cause the typical carcinoid syndrome (in up to 5% of the patients).

Imaging

Cross-sectional imaging by either CT following modern protocols (3-phase contrast-enhanced multi-slice CT) or MRI (also with the use of contrast media) is the cornerstone of indirect imaging of the abdomen for initial staging as well as preoperative diagnosis [34, 35]. By this approach, the primary tumor may sometimes be imaged, but lymph node and/or distant metastases can regularly be either detected or ruled out, respectively. In the case of an unknown primary tumor, thoracic scanning (preferably with CT) may also be necessary to either detect or rule out a bronchial primary NEN. CT or MR enteroclysis may provide additional benefit for primary tumor detection in the small intestine with very good sensitivities and specificities in institutions where either...
of them is available [36, 37]. Transabdominal ultrasoundography may be used for screening of hepatic metastases with good results [38], but the technique is investigator-dependent; in individual cases, transabdominal ultrasonography of the small bowel with high-frequency probes (10 or 12 MHz) may also detect a small intestinal primary tumor and/or mesenteric lymph node metastases. However, for long-term follow-up purposes and reliable comparability, CT or MRI provides a better investigator-independent basis.

Direct visualization may be possible with regular colonoscopy if the tumor is prolapsed through the ileocecal valve into the colon, or if intubation of the ileum is performed during the investigation. For investigations of more proximal parts of the ileum or of the jejunum, the newer modalities of enteroscopy including video-capsule endoscopy (VCE) [39] or double-balloon enteroscopy [40] may be effective, although their role in routine staging still has to be established, and they are not widely available. The use of VCE as part of the diagnostic work-up in selected patients presenting with metastatic NENs of unknown primary is suggested. However, the clinical utility of this technology requires clearer definition [41]. There are no data on potential procedural risks of these methods in NEN which should always be weighed against the benefits of tumor localization and/or even histological confirmation by luminal biopsy. At least, in the case of impending small bowel occlusion, VCE is absolutely contraindicated.

Somatostatin receptor imaging (SRI) of Si-NENs depends on the presence of somatostatin receptors in NEN, particularly of subtype 2 (SSR-2), which is the receptor to which the currently used ligands for these modalities bind with the highest affinity. Linked to the ligand are either radionuclides that can be detected by somatostatin receptor scintigraphy (SRS; e.g. 111Indium) or by positron emission tomography (PET; e.g. 68Galium) scanning [42–54]. For Si-NEN PET scanning, the use of 68fluorodeoxyglucose cannot be recommended, since it has a low sensitivity for well-differentiated low-grade NEN, which comprise by far the majority of Si-NENs. However, it is recommended in G3 NENs independent of the location of the tumor. Other newer traces such as 11carbon-5-hydroxtryptophane or 18fluoro-dihydroxyphenylalanine (DOPA) have shown promising results but are even less available and await further study [49, 55]. SRI has sensitivities of approximately 90% for primary/nodal Si-NENs and of >95% for liver metastases and is, therefore, an important tool for initial staging as well as for follow-up. 68Ga PET, preferably with simultaneous contrast CT (functional imaging), see figure 1, may be even more sensitive and change management in an additional 20–30% of the cases. Particularly for the detection of small tumors within the jeuno-ileum, as well as for the preoperative exclusion of distant metastases not detected by other direct or indirect imaging modalities, PET scanning may be useful, but this requires further prospective studies.

68Ga-DOTATOC PET/CT was found to be more useful to 111In-DTPA octreotide SPECT/CT when searching for a primary NEN in patients with unknown or suspected disease [56].

SRI may also be useful in detecting silent or clinically suspected bone metastases, which represent the fourth most frequent metastatic localization (after lymph nodes, liver and the lungs in descending frequency) [17, 30]; although conventional bone scintigraphy using 99m-technetium-DPD scintigraphy may also be useful [57].

A rational step-wise approach of diagnostic modalities, as suggested in figure 1, is recommended to make the optimal use of the available methods and limited resources, with the least invasive methodology for the patient and the most effective outcome for patient management.

**Minimal Consensus Statement on Imaging**

In the search for a primary tumor, cross-sectional imaging with CT and/or MRI should be followed by 68Ga-DOTATOC PET in combination with native or preferably 3-phase contrast-enhanced CT (functional imaging) or if not available SRS SPECT/CT. In general, fusion imaging with CT is always preferable. Newer PET imaging techniques may be useful but require a cyclotron and are unlikely to become generally available. 18Fluorodeoxyglucose PET is not usually useful in these lower-grade tumors. If localizing a primary tumor is required in surgical candidates prior to bowel resection, either CT-/MR-water enteroclysis or endoscopic techniques such as VCE or double-balloon enteroscopy may be used according to local expertise, but potential risks need to be weighed against benefits such as precise preoperative localization particularly of multi-centric NENs. Colonoscopy should be performed because it may detect primary tumors in the distal ileum and is necessary to rule out synchronous neoplastic disease (particularly colorectal cancer). For cardiac diagnostics to investigate for CHD, please see the section below.

**Laboratory Tests**

Serum chromogranin A (CgA) remains a relatively sensitive marker for NENs of all origins including Si-NENs [58–60]. CgA has also more recently been shown to prognostically predict significantly differing groups, with higher levels of CgA indicating a worse prognosis, probably related to increased tumor cell mass [61, 62]. For longitudinal follow-up purposes, it is important to
note that absolute CgA values may differ significantly between different assays [63], and therefore it is recommended to perform repeated measurements in the same laboratory or at least with the same assay whenever possible. Furthermore, the differential diagnosis of elevated CgA values such as in patients on proton pump inhibitors (PPIs), with chronic atrophic gastritis, chronic renal failure, liver cirrhosis or congestive heart failure, as well as other CgA-secreting neoplasms (e.g. hepatocellular carcinoma, medullary thyroid carcinoma) needs to be considered when CgA values are interpreted [64–66]. CgA may signal NEN recurrence after successful curative resection early in patients with a small tumor burden [59, 67].

Endocrine tumors of the jejun-ileum produce serotonin and elevated 24-hour urinary 5-hydroxy indole acetic acid (5-HIAA) levels as a product of the metabolism of serotonin [68, 69]. 5-HIAA has a sensitivity of up to 100% and a specificity of 85–90% for detecting a carcinoid syndrome, and a sensitivity of 70–75% and a specificity of close to 100% for predicting a primary tumor in the jejun-ileum [58, 60]. Urinary 5-HIAA should be collected with strict dietary restrictions to avoid false positive levels [70]. Serum serotonin determinations are less sensitive and specific and are, therefore, not recommended; serotonin measurements in platelets, where serotonin is stored depending on its availability in the systemic circulation, may be even more sensitive, but is not widely available and therefore currently impractical [69].

**Minimal Consensus Statement on Laboratory Tests**

The minimally required biochemical tests include plasma CgA and urinary 5-HIAA. These tests should be performed at the first visit and then for follow-up or on suspicion of NEN recurrence or progression. Newer markers, either biochemical or based on circulating NEN cells, require further validation. Neuron-specific enolase has no role for the diagnosis of these almost always well- to moderately differentiated NEN (G1/2 NET).

---

**Fig. 1.** Diagnostic algorithm of Si-NENs. Mets = Metastasis; Ln = lymph nodes; NT-pro-BNP = B-type natriuretic peptide; 5-HIAA – 5-hydroxyindoleacetic acid is a biochemically determinable metabolite of serotonin, a specific mediator of the carcinoid syndrome; CgA – chromogranin A is non-specific for the carcinoid syndrome; SSR = somatostatin receptor; PET = positron emission tomography; CT = X-ray computed tomography; FDG = fluorodeoxyglucose (18F). *If not performed previously: colonoscopy including the terminal ileum and to exclude a secondary primary.**
A pathological diagnosis is mandatory in all cases and usually obtained on ultrasonography-guided liver biopsy or surgical biopsy. A pathological diagnosis of jejunal-ileal tumors is achieved using hematoxylin-eosin staining and immunohistochemical staining with CgA and synaptophysin [3, 20, 71, 72]. As opposed to serum levels of CgA, weaker CgA staining on immunohistochemistry may indicate a poorer prognosis [30, 73]. A determination of the mitotic index and a calculation of the Ki-67 index by immunohistochemistry are mandatory and prognostically relevant in jejuno-ileal NENs [3, 21]. The tumors should be classified according to the WHO system [20] including TNM staging [3, 72] and Ki-67 grading [3, 20, 72] (table 1). Immunohistochemical staining for somatostatin receptors 2 (SSR-2) has been suggested by several studies [74] to correlate with, or at least be indicative of, a therapeutic response to somatostatin analogue (SSA) treatment. However, currently it can only be considered optional, since methodological variations and current data do not show a completely conclusive pattern. Thus, SSA treatment may be initiated although SSR-2 staining may be weak or even absent on immunohistochemistry.

In patients with liver metastases from a NEN of unknown primary tumor localization, nuclear immunohistochemical positivity for cdx-2 and/or serotonin with negativity for TTF-1 and ISL-1 is supportive of intestinal especially jejuno-ileal origin [75]. Other markers such as E-cadherin, p53, p27, VEGF and others have not been established as yet for routine diagnostics, although they may play a role in the future [76–78].

A familial or genetic predisposition to Si-NEN has not been established; however, recent reports have shown some familial associations which strongly suggest that a genetic predisposition may exist in rare instances [79–81]. Other changes such as allelic loss of chromosome 18q have been reported to indicate adverse prognosis, but currently they have no role outside of research studies [82, 83]. There is no indication to perform germline or somatic DNA testing and genetic counseling in the absence of other tumors or a family history.

**Minimal Consensus Statement on Pathology**

**Histopathology**

Histology is always necessary to establish the diagnosis of a NEN. Cytology may be helpful, particularly in a metastatic setting. The minimal ancillary tests to support a histological diagnosis include immunohistochemistry for CgA, synaptophysin and, optionally, serotonin. The mitotic count in 10 HPF (2 mm²) evaluated in areas of highest mitotic density, the Ki-67 index (MIB1 antibody; percentage of 2,000 cells in areas of highest nuclear labeling) and TNM staging according to the UICC classification and ENETS guidelines should be reported. Immunohistochemistry for cdx-2, p53 and SSR-2 is optional. The histopathology report should allow for a correct classification according to the current WHO criteria. In the future, it should also provide information for a correct TNM classification and grading (table 1a–c). Figure 1 summarizes the diagnostic algorithm of Si-NEN.

### Table 1. TNM classification, staging and grading of Si-NENs according to the ENETS guidelines and UICC classification [3, 20, 72]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Ki-67 index (%)</th>
<th>Mitotic index (mitoses/10 HPF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>≤2</td>
<td>&lt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>3–20</td>
<td>2–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
<td>&gt;20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 1.** TNM classification, staging and grading of Si-NENs according to the ENETS guidelines and UICC classification [3, 20, 72]

- **Pathology**

A pathological diagnosis is mandatory in all cases and usually obtained on ultrasonography-guided liver biopsy or surgical biopsy. A pathological diagnosis of jejunal-ileal tumors is achieved using hematoxylin-eosin staining and immunohistochemical staining with CgA and synaptophysin [3, 20, 71, 72]. As opposed to serum levels of CgA, weaker CgA staining on immunohistochemistry may indicate a poorer prognosis [30, 73]. A determination of the mitotic index and a calculation of the Ki-67 index by immunohistochemistry are mandatory and prognostically relevant in jejuno-ileal NENs [3, 21]. The tumors should be classified according to the WHO system [20] including TNM staging [3, 72] and Ki-67 grading [3, 20, 72] (table 1). Immunohistochemical staining for somatostatin receptors 2 (SSR-2) has been suggested by several studies [74] to correlate with, or at least be indicative of, a therapeutic response to somatostatin analogue (SSA) treatment. However, currently it can only be considered optional, since methodological variations and current data do not show a completely conclusive pattern. Thus, SSA treatment may be initiated although SSR-2 staining may be weak or even absent on immunohistochemistry.

In patients with liver metastases from a NEN of unknown primary tumor localization, nuclear immunohistochemical positivity for cdx-2 and/or serotonin with negativity for TTF-1 and ISL-1 is supportive of intestinal especially jejuno-ileal origin [75]. Other markers such as E-cadherin, p53, p27, VEGF and others have not been established as yet for routine diagnostics, although they may play a role in the future [76–78].

A familial or genetic predisposition to Si-NEN has not been established; however, recent reports have shown some familial associations which strongly suggest that a genetic predisposition may exist in rare instances [79–81]. Other changes such as allelic loss of chromosome 18q have been reported to indicate adverse prognosis, but currently they have no role outside of research studies [82, 83]. There is no indication to perform germline or somatic DNA testing and genetic counseling in the absence of other tumors or a family history.

**Minimal Consensus Statement on Pathology**

**Histopathology**

Histology is always necessary to establish the diagnosis of a NEN. Cytology may be helpful, particularly in a metastatic setting. The minimal ancillary tests to support a histological diagnosis include immunohistochemistry for CgA, synaptophysin and, optionally, serotonin. The mitotic count in 10 HPF (2 mm²) evaluated in areas of highest mitotic density, the Ki-67 index (MIB1 antibody; percentage of 2,000 cells in areas of highest nuclear labeling) and TNM staging according to the UICC classification and ENETS guidelines should be reported. Immunohistochemistry for cdx-2, p53 and SSR-2 is optional. The histopathology report should allow for a correct classification according to the current WHO criteria. In the future, it should also provide information for a correct TNM classification and grading (table 1a–c). Figure 1 summarizes the diagnostic algorithm of Si-NEN.
**Curative Surgery**

Figure 2 summarizes a proposed therapeutic algorithm for Si-NENs.

**Resection of Localized and Regional Disease (Stage I–III)**

All patients with Si-NENs should be considered potential candidates for curative surgery of the primary tumor and regional lymph-node metastasis [76, 78–81, 83]. Patients should be evaluated in a multidisciplinary setting including an experienced visceral surgeon [7, 25, 30, 31, 84–91]. Curative resection of the primary tumor and dissection of the locoregional lymph node metastasis along the superior mesenteric root and around the mesentery, aiming to preserve the vascular supply [92], improve the outcome in these patients resulting in excellent 5- and 10-year survival rates of 100% in stage I and II patients and >95% and >80%, respectively, in stage III Si-NEN patients [21]. The review of a large number of surgical patients demonstrated that regional mesenteric lymphadenectomy in conjunction with the resection of the primary tumor is associated with improved survival of Si-NEN patients [93].

Any surgical procedure should follow the principles of oncological surgery in the small intestinal tract [84–91], but sometimes a concomitant right-sided hemicolecotomy may be required if the tumor is located in the terminal ileum. Age, disease stage and complete resection were identified as independent prognostic factors for survival in Si-NEN patients. Localized and regionally restricted (Stage I–III) Si-NENs have an excellent prognosis after radical surgical treatment. The importance of achieving R0 resection is therefore emphasized [94, 95]. To limit the extent of small intestinal resection, lymphatic mapping has been suggested to be helpful, but it is not a standardized procedure and therefore not generally recommended [96, 97].

---

**Fig. 2.** Therapeutic algorithm for Si-NENs. Pts = Patients; mets = metastasis. *For details, see the text. **Caution: multiple primaries.
A minimally invasive approach can be considered, provided that oncological surgical standards can be achieved; however, patients with large mesenteric infiltration and multiple tumors are probably not optimal candidates for laparoscopic resection. The level of evidence for the role of laparoscopic surgery for Si-NEN is low. There is a lack of randomized trials. Only few single-center studies describe small numbers of patients after laparoscopic resection of primary Si-NENs [98]. Laparoscopic techniques are feasible and safe and are to be favored due to the general advantages of a laparoscopic surgical approach; however, the potential benefits of minimally invasive surgery have to be weighed against the risk of incomplete (i.e. noncurative) tumor resection (especially in the event of multiple small Si-NENs).

Postoperative malabsorption and/or bile-salt-induced diarrhea due to the resection of more or less extensive parts of the distal small intestine, and particularly the terminal ileum, may be observed and require either medical (e.g. cholestyramine) or nutritional therapy. However, postoperative mortality should be <2% and significant morbidity <20% [28, 87].

Concomitant Cholecystectomy

Since cholelithiasis appears to be increased in NEN patients, particularly in those on SSA therapy, cholecystectomy has been recommended even for nonsymptomatic patients in the past [99]. However, prospective proof of this concept has never been produced, and there is an ongoing debate as to whether routine cholecystectomy is required or not [100, 101] because the increased incidence of cholelithiasis does not consistently lead to cholecystitis. It may therefore be individually decided by the surgeon, depending on technical and clinical aspects (e.g. the presence of cholelithiasis, previous episodes of cholecystitis or cholangitis, presumed cholecystitis-associated right upper abdominal pain, planned transarterial chemotherapy or selective internal radiotherapy and the intraoperative risk of cholecystectomy in an emergency situation). However, a prophylactic cholecystectomy should be performed at laparotomy if patients are planned to undergo treatment with SSAs [100].

Minimal Consensus Statement on Curative Surgery

Curative surgery is always recommended whenever feasible. Surgery of the primary should be performed as segmental resection with wide lymphadenectomy. In case of lymph node involvement around the superior mesenteric artery, high lymph node dissection is recommended. In cases with severe desmoplastic reaction around the artery, radical tumor resection may not be possible.

Cholecystectomy may be performed during the initial session as prophylaxis against the development of gallstones (frequent in patients that will require SSA treatment), although the benefit of cholecystectomy has never been prospectively proven. In emergency situations, cholecystectomy may therefore not be enforced.

Tumor multicentricity, which may occur in 20% of all cases, demonstrated by SRS, cross-sectional imaging, intraoperative palpation and/or endoscopy, does not change the indication for surgery. A minimally invasive (laparoscopic) approach may be considered, provided that oncological surgical standards can realistically be achieved; patients with large mesenteric infiltration and multiple tumors are not candidates for extended laparoscopic procedures.

The outcome of surgery may be worse in cases with distant metastases other than in the liver, as well as in cases with the so-called frozen mesenteric root and peritoneal carcinomatosis. Careful pre- and perioperative symptomatic control of any carcinoid syndrome can be achieved by medical treatment (s.c. or i.v. SSAs).

After curative surgery, there is no indication for specific medical treatment, and there is no proven role for neoadjuvant or adjuvant medical treatment in Si-NEN patients.

Palliative Surgery in Distant Disease (Stage IV)

Palliative (Prophylactic) Resection of the Primary Tumor in Metastatic Disease

In cases with distant metastases, the decision of whether to resect the primary tumor or not is influenced by three considerations: (1) if a curative approach including the curative resection of the distant metastases (mostly liver metastases) [102] can still be reasonably achieved, then a primary tumor resection should be performed following oncological standards as outlined above [103]. (2) In symptomatic patients with symptoms due to small intestinal obstruction, (impeding) occlusion or tumor bleeding, the palliative resection of the primary tumor is obviously mandatory to prevent clinical deterioration or death. To avoid local vessel occlusion with ischemic bowel complications by intra-abdominal fibrosis, mesenteric lymph node metastases should also be removed as completely as possible. (3) If a curative approach seems no longer achievable, primary tumor resection may still improve the overall outcome and can therefore be considered [28, 104], although this has not been shown to be reproducible in all series [25]. However, these data are all influenced by their retrospective nature and a potential ‘surgical’ bias favoring resectable and thus less morbid patients. Thus, in the third setting, comorbidities should be carefully
considered, probably best in an interdisciplinary setting to avoid unnecessary risks to the patient.

As shown recently, available data from six comparable clinical observational studies suggest a possible benefit of local resection of the primary Si-NEN and the regional metastasis in patients with unresectable liver metastases, but the studies included in the systematic review of the literature have several limitations, and the results should therefore be considered with caution [105].

The aspects of debulking surgery were discussed in the previous guidelines [102, 106].

**Minimal Consensus Statement on Palliative Resection in Stage IV**

Palliative resection for patients with endocrine tumors of the jejunum and ileum has the objective to make liver metastases the only persisting problem or to improve prognosis.

A resection of the small intestinal primary tumor should be attempted because the overall outcome is better in patients after primary tumor resection, although a direct causal relationship has not been proven to date; a multidisciplinary discussion is recommended for such a decision. Resection should also be considered in symptomatic patients and in patients in whom imaging (bowel dilatation, mesenteric fibrosis) suggests that obstruction will probably occur.

Patients suitable for palliative debulking procedures are those presumed to benefit from tumor reduction performed in accordance with given guidelines. Palliative surgery should mainly be done for symptomatic reasons or to facilitate other therapeutic modalities, i.e., medical and radionuclide treatment. The type of surgery should be individualized, no general approach can be recommended. If liver metastasis requires a minor resection, this can be done at the same procedure as the primary, otherwise it should be done at a second operation.

In the palliative setting, medical therapy is frequently required pre-, peri- and postoperatively. For further recommendations, please refer to the paper on metastasis [102].

**CHD (Hedinger Syndrome)**

CHD can be detected in 25–50% of all patients with the carcinoid syndrome [28, 30, 107–114]. Recently, the current knowledge of its pathophysiology and treatment has been summarized by Grozinsky-Glasberg et al. [114]. CHD indicates a poor prognosis and is associated with clinical signs of right-sided heart failure, echocardiographic signs of right ventricular dilatation or tricuspid valve regurgitation depending on the duration of CHD. Prognosis has improved over the last 20 years from a 5-year survival from <30% in the 1980s to now approximately 55%. The most important reason for this improvement is successful cardiac surgery with valve replacement [108, 109, 111, 115]. CHD is characterized by plaque-like fibrous endocardial thickening that principally involves the right side of the heart, causing retraction and fixation of the leaflets of the tricuspid and pulmonary valves as well as diminished right ventricular function [115–118]. These changes are thought to be elicited by excess serotonin release (patients usually have very high levels of serotonin and/or urinary 5-HIAA levels) and co-secretion of other fibrogenic factors such as tachykinins, connective tissue growth factor, transforming growth factor-β and/or substance P [113, 115, 116].

Transcatheter echocardiography is the most important diagnostic modality [107, 110, 111], although cardiac MRI [119] and other newer techniques such as tissue Doppler imaging [120] may play a role in the future. Natriuretic peptides such as brain natriuretic peptide and its precursors have also been shown to be quite sensitive indicators of early CHD and may be monitored regularly for early detection of CHD when available [120]. Screening for CHD should be performed on a regular basis, particularly prior to planned surgical procedures. If it develops, heart failure rather than metastatic disease may be the cause of death. Medical therapy for heart failure should be introduced when necessary. SSAs are mandatory and have shown improvement in cardiac reserve, although they may not prevent CHD progression, and cardiac surgery with valve replacement (bioprosthesis) should be considered for patients in whom control of hormonal symptoms and tumor growth has been achieved. Cardiac surgery should be performed before major liver surgery or liver embolization, while on the other hand early liver metastasis resection may slow the progression of CHD particularly in its earlier stages.

More recently, the coexistence of a patent foramen ovale (PFO) has been described together with CHD [121–123], and it may increase the chance of left-sided heart lesions; its closure has also improved functional outcome in CHD patients. A PFO should therefore be ruled out in clinically progressing CHD and prior to cardiac surgery.

**Minimal Consensus Statement on CHD**

For patients with the carcinoid syndrome and CHD, transcatheter echocardiography should be performed annually; cardiac MRI may be helpful but its usefulness has not been proven as yet. SSAs are usually indicated in these patients presenting with often advanced carcinoid syndrome. For the timing of cardiac surgery with replacement of the tricuspid (and pulmonary) valves, brain natriuretic peptide measurements may be helpful, since they reflect the load on the right side of the heart. At cardiac imaging, a PFO should be ruled out; if present, its closure should be considered although only sparse data exist for this ap-
A precise follow-up strategy is described in the ENETS standards of care [124]. Briefly, for patients having undergone surgery with a curative intent, the schedule for follow-up should be every 6–12 months, with the exception of G3 tumors, which should be followed every 3 months. Patients treated without curative intent should be followed initially at 3–6 months’ intervals for G1/G2 neuroendocrine tumors, and this can be lengthened in very slowly progressive tumors. In very rare G3 neuroendocrine carcinomas, the intervals should not exceed 3 months. Minimal examination includes the measurement of CgA and 5-HIAA and a triphasic CT. SRI (SRS or PET/CT) should be performed in suspected recurrences before any therapeutic decisions are made, or even after curative resection with unknown NEN prior to surgery to rule out distant metastases. The follow-up should be life-long, considering that after 25 years only approximately 20% of all patients are free of disease [30, 125].

**Minimal Consensus Statement on Follow-up**

For guidelines regarding follow-up strategies, we recommend to follow the ENETS standards of care.

Please also refer to the consensus guideline updates for other gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumors [126–131, this issue].

**Appendix**

**All Other Vienna Consensus Conference Participants**

Anlauf, M. (Institut für Pathologie und Zytologie, St. Vincenz Krankenhaus, Limburg, Germany); Bartsch, D.K. (Department of Surgery, Philippus University, Marburg, Germany); Baudin, E. (Institut Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, France); Capdevila, J. (Institute of Oncology, Vall d’Hebron University Hospital, Barcelona, Spain); Caplin, M. (Neuroendocrine Tumour Unit, Royal Free Hospital, London, UK); Coviola, J.B. (Department ofRadiology, Faculty of Medical Sciences, University of Warmia and Mazury, Olsztyn, Poland); De Herder, W.W. (Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Nuclear Medicine, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands); Delle Fave, G. (Department of Digestive and Liver Disease, Ospedale Sant’Andrea, Rome, Italy); Eriksson, B. (Department of Endocrine Oncology, University Hospital, Uppsala, Sweden); Falconi, M. (Department of Surgery, San Raffaele Hospital, Università Vita e Salute, Milan, Italy); Ferolla, P. (NET Center, Umbria Regional Cancer Network, Università degli Studi di Perugia, Perugia, Italy); Ferone, D. (Department of Endocrine and Metabolic Sciences, University of Genoa, Genoa, Italy); Garcia-Carbonero, R. (Medical Oncology Department, Hospital Universitario Doce de Octubre, Madrid, Spain); Ito, T. (Pancreatic Diseases Branch, Kyushu University Hospital, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka, Japan); Jensen, R.T. (Digestive Diseases Branch, NIH, Bethesda, Md., USA); Kaltas, G. (Department of Pathophysiology, Division of Endocrinology, National University of Athens, Athens, Greece); Klöppel, G. (Institute of Pathology, Technische Universität München, Munich, Germany); Kos-Kudla, B. (Department of Endocrinology, Medical University of Silesia, Katowice, Poland); Kwakkeboom, D. (Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Nuclear Medicine, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands); Pascher, A. (Department of Visceral and Transplant Surgery, Campus Virchow Klinikum, Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany); Ramage, J.K. (Gastroenterology Department, Hampshire Hospitals NHS Trust, Hampshire, UK); Raymond, E. (Oncologie Médicale, Hôpitaux Universitaires Paris Nord Val de Seine, Paris, France); Rindi, G. (Institute of Anatomical Pathology, Policlinico A. Gemelli, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy); Ruszniewski, P. (Department of Gastroenterology, Beaujon Hospital, Clichy, France); Sedlackova, E. (Department of Oncology, First Faculty of Medicine and General Teaching Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic); Sorbye, H. (Department of Oncology, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen, Norway); Sundin, A. (Department of Radiology, Section for Molecular Imaging, University Hospital, Uppsala, Sweden); Taal, B. (Netherlands Cancer Centre, Ljnden, The Netherlands); Weber, W. (Department of Radiology, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, N.Y., USA); Wiedenmann, B. (Department of Hepatology and Gastroenterology, Campus Virchow Klinikum, Charité Universitätmedizin Berlin, Berlin, Germany); Zheng-Pei, Z. (Department of Endocrinology, Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Beijing, China).
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