

Chapter 3. Gastrinoma

Roger R. Perry, MD, FACS Robert L Payne, Jr., Professor of Surgery, Chief, Division of Surgical Oncology
Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA

Eric Feliberti, MD, FACS Assistant Professor, Surgical Oncology, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA

Aaron I. Vinik, MD, PhD, FCP, MACP, FACE Professor of Medicine/Pathology/Neurobiologist, Murray Waitzer
Endowed Chair for Diabetes Research, Director of Research and Neuroendocrine Unit, Eastern Virginia Medical School
Norfolk, VA

Updated November 3, 2013

INCIDENCE

The gastrinoma syndrome, or Zollinger-Ellison syndrome, has traditionally been associated with a severe, fulminant ulcer diathesis, often with multiple ulcers, and ulcers in unusual locations such as the post-bulbar region of the duodenum and proximal jejunum. However, with increasing recognition of this syndrome, as well as the availability of a radioimmunoassay for serum gastrin, most patients with gastrinoma now present with either milder forms of peptic ulcer disease, or with secretory diarrhea. The syndrome can exist in multiple forms, including benign sporadic, malignant metastatic, and as part of the MEN-I syndrome. Approximately 66% of gastrinomas are sporadic(1). Sporadic tumors are reported to be malignant in approximately 40-85% of cases. Sporadic gastrinomas occur primarily in the gastrinoma triangle, defined as the confluence of the cystic and common bile duct superiorly, the second and third portions of the duodenum inferiorly, and the neck and body of the pancreas medially(2). Although they can occur in the pancreas, the duodenum has been shown to be the most common site of gastrinomas, based on the pioneering work of Debas and colleagues(3), Thompson and colleagues(4), and others. Duodenal wall gastrinomas have been identified in 43-77% of patients(4-6). These duodenal wall tumors are frequently small and multiple. Sporadic tumors occurring in the pancreas tend to be solitary. Primary tumors may also occur in a variety of ectopic sites, including the body of the stomach, jejunum, peripancreatic lymph nodes, splenic hilum, root of the mesentery, omentum, liver, gallbladder, common bile duct, and the ovary(1); (7-13). A recent immunohistochemical study in 20 autopsy patients suggests that primary lymph node gastrinomas are due to entrapment of neuroendocrine cells during development(14). Overall, about 5.6% of patients have a primary gastrinoma located in an ectopic site(15). Another study suggests that up to 10% of sporadic gastrinomas are lymph node primaries (16). Solitary tumors in ectopic sites are less likely to be malignant than solitary tumors in pancreatic sites (13). Although traditionally surgical cure rates have been less than 50%, the increasing recognition of the duodenal wall as the most common location of gastrinoma has resulted in an increasing number of surgical cures.

GASTRINOMAS IN MEN-1

About 33% of gastrinomas are associated with the MEN-I syndrome (17-22). Gastrinomas in MEN-I patients present a variety of unique problems. The tumors are usually multiple, and often small and undetectable (17)(18)(20)(23)(24). Most cases are discovered at a younger age than in sporadic cases. Although these tumors are less frequently (7-12%) malignant, the frequency of malignancy may truly be considerably higher than this. Because of the multiplicity of the tumors and their small size, it is generally quite difficult to find the specific tumor(s) that is/are secreting gastrin. Thus, the likelihood of surgical cure in MEN-I patients is considerably less than in sporadic patients, unless a specific site or sites responsible for the hypergastrinemia has been identified preoperatively.

CLINICAL COURSE

Gastrinoma can metastasize to a variety of locations, including the lymph nodes and liver. The presence of gastrinoma in peripancreatic lymph nodes is not evidence of incurability (11)(12)(24-26), if the nodes can be

completely resected at the time of surgery for the primary tumor. Some have advocated an aggressive approach to liver metastases, including debulking procedures. The tumor related mortality in patients with metastatic gastrinoma can be as high as 79% (11).

The search for better prognostic markers continues. In a study of 27 gastrinomas, 12 (44%) had chromosome 1q loss of heterozygosity (LOH). Such LOH was associated with aggressive tumor growth and development of liver metastases (27). Other than the initial presence of distant metastases, or the development of disease progression on long-term follow-up, it has been difficult to establish whether a particular gastrinoma is malignant. A recent study examined 21 consecutive patients with neuroendocrine pancreatic tumors. Of the different biological markers examined, increased levels of topoisomerase II alpha had a 88% sensitivity, and 100% specificity for predicting malignancy (28).

DIAGNOSIS

Prior to the development of the radioimmunoassay for serum gastrin, 80% of gastrinoma patients presented with a severe ulcer diathesis, bleeding, obstruction, or perforation. Two thirds of patients had at least one operation. Currently, only 20% of patients present with severe ulcer complications, and only one third have had prior surgery (29). *H. pylori* infection is not a risk factor for peptic ulceration in patients with gastrinoma (30). In a study of 84 gastrinoma patients, the prevalence of *H. pylori* exposure was only 23%, 10% with active infection(30), less than the general population. The possibility of gastrinoma should be considered in all patients with peptic ulcer disease, and those with unexplained secretory diarrhea. All such patients should undergo measurement of fasting serum gastrin levels. An aggressive testing policy has been shown to be cost effective.

Diagnosis of gastrinoma syndrome depends on the demonstration of: 1) elevated serum gastrin levels; 2) a positive secretin stimulation test; and 3) gastric acid hypersecretion. Hypergastrinemia in the absence of increased acid production is not due to gastrinoma. It is vital to stop H2 blockers, proton pump inhibitors, and octreotide at least 24 hours before performing these tests for gastrinoma. (Assay available at Inter Science Institute-800-255-2873).

Indeed, NCCN guidelines suggest that gastrin levels should be measured while fasting and off proton pump inhibitors for 1 week (31). It should be noted that most clinical chemistry laboratories have switched to commercial kits. However, the accuracy of many of these kits has been brought into question. A recent study of 40 patients suspected or known to have ZES found that 7 of 12 tested commercial kits inaccurately measured plasma concentrations of gastrin, with 4 kits finding false low concentrations and 3 kits finding false high concentrations. This can result in misdiagnosis or delay in diagnosis of patients with gastrinoma (32).

Serum gastrin levels are usually greater than 150 pg/ml in patients with gastrinoma syndrome. The exception is a small fraction of patients who secrete a biologically active variant not recognized by the antiserum used for the assay(33). A careful history and physical is required, as gastrin levels may be elevated for a variety of other reasons (table 1). Measurement of gastric pH is also useful, because in the absence of antisecretory drugs, a pH of 3.0 or higher excludes Zollinger-Ellison Syndrome.

Table 1. Causes of Hypergastrinemia

With increased acid	With decreased acid
MEN-1 = Multiple endocrine neoplasia type 1; ZE = Zollinger-Ellison	
Gastrinoma	Atrophic gastritis
G-cell hyperfunction	Pernicious anemia
Gastric outlet obstruction	Vagotomy
Short bowel syndrome	Gastric carcinoma

With increased acid	With decreased acid
Retained antrum	Renal disease
Hypercalcemia	Rheumatoid arthritis
Hyperparathyroidism	Vitiligo
MEN-1	Diabetic pseudo ZE syndrome

Establishment of the presence of gastric acid hypersecretion should include measurements of volume as well as basal and pentagastrin-stimulated acid secretion. The diagnosis is confirmed if: a) the volume of gastric secretion is large, typically greater than 10 liters per 24 hours; b) the basal acid output is over 15 mmol/h. Values in the 10-15 range are borderline, and less than 10 mmol/h exclude diagnosis of Zollinger-Ellison Syndrome. In patients who have previously undergone vagotomy, basal acid output in gastrinoma is over 3 mmol/h; c) the ratio of basal acid output to maximal pentagastrin stimulated acid output is greater than 0.6.

The most accurate and sensitive test remains the Secretin Stimulation test for gastrin secretion. No new test has emerged with a greater sensitivity or specificity. Secretin, 2 mcg/kg is given intravenously, and blood samples for gastrin are drawn at 2, 5, 10, 20, and 30 minutes. A rise of more than 100 pg/ml is strongly suggestive of Zollinger-Ellison Syndrome. False positive results are rare, and are usually found in hypochlorhydric states (34).

Mention must be made of the G-cell (gastrin cell) hyperplasia syndrome, which can be sometimes confused with the gastrinoma syndrome. Patients with G-cell hyperplasia typically have an equivocal response to secretin stimulation, and an exaggerated response to food ingestion, thus distinguishing them from patients with gastrinoma(24).

The possibility of gastrinoma should be considered in all patients with Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia type I, since 50-60% of such patients will develop gastrinoma. Patients with hyperparathyroidism should also be screened for gastrinoma, since up to 38% of patients will be found to have gastrinoma (19)(35)(36).

LOCALIZATION

Tumor localization is important in gastrinoma patients, as it may have a direct bearing on patient management. A variety of non-invasive and invasive techniques have been used, with varying levels of success (see table 2). Non-invasive techniques include ultrasound, CT scan, MRI, and most recently somatostatin receptor scintigraphy. Transabdominal ultrasound(1)(37) and CT(37) have proven to be of limited value, as these tumors are frequently small and below the resolution of the techniques. In addition, the density of these tumors is similar to that of surrounding pancreatic tissue, making them difficult to detect. MRI has not been shown to be superior to the previous techniques(38)(39). Perhaps the greatest value of CT scan is that it identifies most patients with liver metastases.

Some have advocated endoscopic ultrasound. In experienced hands, localization rates of 80-100% in patients with pancreatic gastrinomas have been reported (45)(46). However, the ability to detect small lesions less than 5 millimeters in size, or occult duodenal lesions, is uncertain. The pancreatic head is examined with the scanner positioned in the duodenum, and the body and tail of the pancreas are studied with the scanner in the stomach. Some have used a special saline filled balloon at the tip of the instrument with installation of approximately 400 cc of saline into the stomach to provide an interface between the ultrasonic unit and the stomach wall(45)(46).

Table 2. Methods of Tumor Localization in Gastrinoma

Factor	Ultrasound	Infusional CT	Computed tomography	SRS	Selective angiography	Secretin angiography	PTHVS	
							Local	Regional
Sensitivity	21	40	31	71	60, 29	89	35	94
Specificity	92	100	66	86	100, 100	100	89	97
Positive predictive value	80	100	83	85	100, 100	---	---	94
Negative predictive value	44	50	15	52	60, 100	---	89	---
PTHVS = percutaneous transhepatic portal, pancreatic, and hepatic venous gastrin sampling. Data from Norton and colleagues, (37) Jensen (38), as well as Vinik and colleagues (39-41).								

The development of somatostatin receptor scintigraphy has been an important advance in the imaging of pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors, and specifically gastrinoma. Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy should be obtained in all patients with a diagnosis of gastrinoma. The results with this technique approach those obtained with more invasive localization methods (see table 2). A recent study of 146 patients by Gibril and colleagues from the National Institutes of Health revealed a sensitivity of 71%, specificity of 86%, and a positive predictive value of 85%, higher than any other non-invasive modality(47). Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy altered management in 47% of patients overall. Like most imaging modalities, somatostatin receptor scintigraphy tends to miss small duodenal tumors less than 1cm in diameter (48). False positives do occur in about 10% of patients, thus the clinical context must be considered and the results interpreted carefully. Our current approach is to combine somatostatin receptor scintigraphy, along with either CT scan or MRI, to provide anatomic information and to help exclude liver metastases.

Indeed, this is consistent with current NCCN guidelines, where measurement of gastrin levels, and multiphasic CT or MRI are recommended. Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy , EUS, and Chromogranin A measurements are done “as appropriate” (31).

With the advent of somatostatin receptor scintigraphy, there is currently less need for the use of invasive techniques. The invasive techniques are highly accurate, however they involve discomfort, considerable expense, and require the expertise of an experienced angiographer. Selective visceral angiography has been shown to be useful for localizing tumors in patients with gastrinoma, as well as identify occult metastatic disease. The addition of intra-arterial injection of secretin to selective angiography greatly improves the accuracy of the technique (3)(49). This requires the insertion of a catheter in a hepatic vein and a peripheral vein to sample gastrin levels. When secretin is injected into a vessel that supplies the gastrinoma, the hepatic vein levels of gastrin greatly exceed the peripheral levels. It may also increase the number of patients who show a tumor blush on angiography. This technique may be more accurate than percutaneous transhepatic venous sampling (PTHVS) alone (49).

Percutaneous transhepatic venous sampling (PTHVS) is a highly accurate technique, however it is both costly and time consuming(33). This technique has been shown to be of value in those with a primary gastrinoma not detected by conventional imaging methods(39)(50-53). It has clearly been shown that PTHVS is a useful method to regionalize a tumor. However, the success of this technique is highly operator dependent, and requires a detailed understanding of the variable venous anatomy present in the region(24)(52)(53). A variety of technical issues, including placement of cannulae to avoid vessel obstruction, and streaming of portal blood flow, can affect the results of the study. Because of potentially rapid changes in the secretory rate of gastrinomas, it is important to simultaneously measure gastrin in pancreatic veins and central arteries, to determine gradients.

For the first time, a staging system has been developed for pancreatic and neuroendocrine tumors by the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC). (AJCC 7th edition). This staging system has been derived from that for exocrine pancreatic carcinomas. A recent study of 425 patients with pancreatic NETS, comparing histopathologic grade, the ENETS classification, and AJCC classification, found that both the AJCC classification and ENETS classification were highly prognostic for survival (54).

TREATMENT

With the increasing recognition of the duodenum as the most common site for gastrinomas, and with the improved localization methods, at least 50% of patients with sporadic gastrinoma can be cured by tumor resection (1)(11)(13)(55). Thus, an aggressive approach to tumor localization is useful in selecting patients for operative treatment.

The goals of treatment of gastrinoma include: 1) management of the gastric acid hypersecretion; 2) resection of what are commonly malignant tumors with the risk of distant spread, and ultimately death of the patient.

Treatment has undergone significant changes since the syndrome was originally described in 1955(13). Most patients underwent emergency surgery for complications such as massive hemorrhage or perforation. It became rather clear that partial gastrectomy with or without vagotomy was ineffective treatment. Total gastrectomy became the standard operation for patients with gastrinoma (1)(11)(12)(17). Although this operation was effective in controlling acid hypersecretion, many patients went on to suffer morbidity and mortality from the tumor itself. Approximately 60% of patients with gastrinoma have malignant tumors, which, although relatively slowly growing, are the major contributing factor to mortality with long-term follow-up(1). Occasional cases in which the primary tumor was excised, usually combined with total gastrectomy, resulted in long-term cures.

The development of potent antisecretory drugs has changed the management of patients with gastrinoma(56-59). In most patients gastric acid hypersecretion can be controlled with long-term omeprazole. Patients on long-term omeprazole can develop gastric carcinoid tumors. In addition, significant decreases in serum vitamin B12 have been observed (60). Thus vitamin B12 levels should be monitored in these patients. Because current antisecretory agents are so effective, surgery for the control of gastric acid hypersecretion is no longer required. A study of 212 patients from the National Institute of Health at a mean follow-up of nearly 14 years showed that none of the patients suffered an acid related death (61). Overall, 31% of patients died, one half due to the gastrinoma itself. Thus, the current role of surgery is to identify and remove the responsible tumor or tumors, to prevent tumor progression and ultimately death. In early surgical series, the cure rate was relatively modest, ranging from 15-30% (12)(20)(36)(62-65). Those with extra-pancreatic tumors were noted to have a cure rate as high as 50% with surgical excision(1)(11)(12)(55). With improvements in preoperative imaging studies, the increasing recognition of the duodenum as a site for gastrinoma, and an aggressive surgical approach, the number of positive explorations has increased in one group from 64% to over 90%, primarily through the identification and resection of duodenal wall gastrinomas (5)(6). Even after successful resection, many patients do recur with long-term follow-up. In a study of 151 patients by Norton and colleagues, in patients with sporadic gastrinoma the 10 year disease free survival was 34%, and the disease specific survival was 95% (66).

SURGERY

Surgery for gastrinoma includes meticulous technique and a thorough exploration. The lesser sac is widely opened, and the entire pancreas is mobilized throughout its length. This allows for careful bimanual palpation of the gland. Although many of the lesions are palpable, some are quite deeply located in the gland, and may not feel dissimilar to the adjacent normal pancreatic parenchyma. Intraoperative ultrasound has been shown by a number of investigators to be useful, and should be performed in any patient undergoing exploration for gastrinoma. Intraoperative ultrasound is useful in identifying difficult to palpate and non-palpable lesions. It is also may detect signs suggestive of malignancy, as well as the relationship of the tumor to the main pancreatic

duct and major blood vessels(67)(68). Intraoperative ultrasound is not particularly useful in identifying duodenal wall gastrinomas, however. Intraoperative endoscopy with transillumination of the duodenum is capable of locating duodenal wall gastrinomas (69). However it is not useful in identifying the more than 50% of duodenal wall gastrinomas located along the medial wall. The most accurate method of detecting duodenal wall gastrinomas remains duodenotomy with careful palpation, a technique employed by experienced teams during surgical exploration for gastrinoma Thompson 1989 (4)(6). Duodenotomy has been shown to increase the gastrinoma detection rate to 98% compared to 76% without duodenotomy, as well as the short term cure rate (65% vs. 44%), and long term cure rate (52% vs. 26%) (70). Because primary duodenal gastrinomas are associated with lymph node metastases in 60% of patients, a more aggressive lymphadenectomy has been recommended (71).

Major vascular involvement is not a contraindication to attempt at resection. A recent study of 273 patients showed 46 (17%) had evidence of major vascular involvement on pre-operative imaging. Forty-two of these 46 patients underwent successful resection (72)

Despite improvement of surgical techniques, and despite higher identification rates of gastrinoma at the initial operation, many or most patients with gastrinoma will suffer from persistent or recurrent disease in long term follow up. The management of such patients with recurrent or persistent ZES remains controversial. However, it has been shown that excellent long term survival and biochemical cure can be obtained in selected patients who undergo re-operation for ZES (73).

The use of endoscopic and/or laparoscopic approaches for the management of neuroendocrine tumors including gastrinomas has been recorded in small numbers of patients(74-77). However, the role for such an approach in gastrinoma patients appears to be limited for a variety of technical issues including the multiplicity of lesions, the small size of duodenal tumors, the frequent presence of lymph node metastases, and the presence of critical structures in the usual gastrinoma location in the pancreatic head region. These difficulties tend to favor an open surgical approach (78).

Not surprisingly, the laproscopic approach to gastrinoma is associated with a higher conversion rate to an open procedure. The use of endoscopic techniques would also appear to be fairly limited, for similar reasons. There have been occasional reports of patients who underwent endoscopic removal of gastrinoma. Duodenal gastrinomas tend to occur in a submucosal location, making removal or banding of these lesions more difficult. Also, since up to 60% of gastrinomas can be associated with lymph node metastases, endoscopic treatment of the duodenal gastrinoma alone would result in incomplete removal of disease (79).

The treatment of the patient with MEN-I and gastrinoma remains controversial(17)(21)(80). Few data are available on patients with MEN-I syndrome and gastrinomas who have undergone careful preoperative evaluation followed by possible palliative or curative surgery. Therefore, a definitive statement about optimal management in these patients cannot be made at the present time, and treatment should be individualized. If a clear-cut source of the hypergastrinemia can be identified using functional and anatomic studies, then surgical exploration, with enucleation or resection, should be strongly considered. Such an approach may offer excellent palliation, if not cure. Other groups take an even more aggressive posture (See MEN-1 Section). The malignant potential of these lesions should also be taken into account. Patients with tumors more than 3cm in size should be considered for resection, even in the absence of clear-cut function. The relatively low incidence of malignancy in gastrinoma patients with MEN-I compared to those without MEN-I does not mean that a more cavalier approach can be taken in these patients. Traditionally gastrinoma in patients with MEN-I has been associated with a better prognosis than in patients with sporadic gastrinoma. However, a recent European study of 758 symptomatic MEN-I patients showed that most deaths were related to MEN-I. Thymic tumors, duodenal pancreatic tumors and gastrinoma increased the risk of death compared to non-affected patients with a hazard ratio of 1.89 (81)

In addition to the indications for resection in MEN-I patients with gastrinoma, the extent of the resection in MEN-I also remains controversial. A multi-national European group of 27 patients suggest that partial pancreatectomy is superior to enucleation resulting in a higher rate of biochemical cure (82). However another group which studied 20 patients suggests that is not the extent of the pancreatic resection, but rather a formal duodenal evaluation and anatomic regional lymphadenectomy which are the important factors for achieving biochemical cure and long term eugastrinemia (83).

SURGERY FOR ADVANCED DISEASE

Because of the poor outcome of patients with advanced and metastatic gastrinomas, and the overall disappointing results with systemic therapy, a number of groups have advocated a very aggressive management approach. In 20 patients with locally advanced and metastatic neuroendocrine tumors (10 gastrinomas), aggressive resectional procedures were associated with no operative deaths and a five year actuarial survival of 80%, but most patients will recur(78). Aggressive liver resection/ablation has also been advocated by the same group(84). A study of 60 patients with neuroendocrine liver metastases compared patients with medical ("non-aggressive") treatment, resection/ablation, and chemoembolization +/- resection/ablation. Median survival increased significantly from 20 months to greater than 96 months and 50 months respectively, and 5-year survival from 25% to 72% and 50%, respectively (85). Those with greater than 50% liver involvement had a poor outcome regardless of approach. A review of 85 patients with liver metastases suggests a more selective approach. Unless a cure with surgical resection is possible, or 90% of tumor volume can be removed, the liver surgery group at Memorial prefers chemoembolization(86). Bi-lobar disease and patients with greater than 75% liver involvement were least likely to benefit from surgery.

The group from MD Anderson has reviewed their experience in 172 patients undergoing surgery for neuroendocrine liver metastasis, including resections and radiofrequency ablation. Fifty five (32%) of the group had a metastasis from a pancreas primary however histologic information is not given. Regardless, they showed significant and durable long term survival in this group of patients (87). The role of liver transplantation in these patients remains controversial. An analysis of the UNOS database showed that of 87,280 liver transplantations performed, 150 were done for patients with liver metastasis from neuroendocrine tumors. This group included 11 (7.3%) with gastrinoma. Overall survival rates were similar to those who underwent transplantation for hepatocellular carcinoma, thus the study concluded that excellent results can be obtained in a highly selected patients with liver metastasis from neuroendocrine tumors (88).

Thus, the literature would suggest that there appears to be some benefit to an aggressive approach in selected patients with advanced and metastatic gastrinoma. However, the selection criteria are unclear, most of the studies are small and non-randomized, and it is a bit difficult to determine if there is a survival benefit.

LIVER DIRECTED THERAPY

Liver directed therapies including chemoembolization, radioembolization, bland embolization, and percutaneous radiofrequency ablation continue to play a role in the management of neuroendocrine tumors metastatic to the liver, including metastatic gastrinomas. Indeed, with the multiple therapies available, it is recommended that a multi-disciplinary treatment team be involved in management decisions. In general transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) has been shown to be a relatively safe procedure, with improvements in symptom control, time to progression, and survival (89). Radio embolization with Yttrium-90 has also shown to be effective, and may be even better tolerated than chemoembolization (90).

SYSTEMIC CHEMOTHERAPY

There is little experience with the use of adjuvant chemotherapy following surgical resection. The small number of patients treated, the relatively indolent nature of these tumors, and the short follow-up times are insufficient to recommend adjuvant chemotherapy outside of clinical trials. However, it may be appropriate to consider

adjuvant chemotherapy in selected patients felt to be at high risk of subsequent recurrence, understanding that there is little data to show benefit with this approach.

The activity of chemotherapy in patients with metastatic gastrinomas is difficult to determine since most published series have studied chemotherapy for all histologic types of pancreatic endocrine tumors grouped together. In addition, the growth rate of metastatic gastrinoma varies markedly (91), further complicating assessment of response to therapy. Streptozotocin appears to be the most active single agent in patients with metastatic gastrinoma, with objective response rates reported in up to 50% of patients (92-96). There is no evidence that the addition of 5-FU with or without doxorubicin improves the outcome compared to streptozotocin alone (94)(97). Differences in the doses used, the schedules of administration, and the criteria used to assess tumor responses, make firm management recommendations difficult. A more recent study in 79 patients from Britain studied the combination 5-FU, cis-platinum, and streptozocin for metastatic or locally advanced neuroendocrine tumors of a variety of sites. The overall response rate was 33% (38% for pancreatic primary sites, and 25% for non-pancreatic primary sites), stable disease 51%, and progression in 16%. Thus, overall results are not superior to streptozocin alone (98). Octreotide, either alone or combined with interferon, appears to have a role in management of these patients. The development of a long-acting somatostatin analogue (lanreotide) has greatly facilitated management, and is effective in reducing symptoms in 38-64% of patients (99). A known side effect is the development of gallstones. In a small study of 21 pancreatic neuroendocrine tumor patients from Marburg, Germany, 14 patients responded to combined octreotide and alpha-interferon, primarily with disease stabilization (100). Of note, 16 of the patients failed to respond to octreotide alone.

Overall response rates to systemic therapy remain disappointing. A multi-center clinical trial randomized 80 patients with metastatic neuroendocrine tumors to lanreotide, interferon alpha, or both. There was no significant difference between the treatment arms, with partial remission rates of 4.0 to 7.1%, disease stabilization rates from 28-17.9% and progression of disease from 56-50% (101). Another smaller study of 15 patients with progressive hepatic metastases showed slightly better results with long-acting octreotide, with partial response rates of 6% (one patient), and stabilization in 47% (102).

A study of 16 patients with disseminated neuroendocrine tumors examined the efficacy of high activity (111) In-pentetreotide. There was minimal toxicity, and at six months there were two complete responses, and three partial responses. Disease progression was 30% at six months, and 69% at eighteen months (103).

Other small studies have shown similar results. A study of 14 patients with disseminated neuroendocrine tumors, who were treated, with indium in-111 octreotide therapy resulted in stable disease in 50 % of the patients, partial response in 14%, and disease progression in 36%, including the 1 gastrinoma patient (104). Peptide receptor radioligand therapy (PRRT) was studied in 11 gastrinoma patients with progressive disease. Symptomatic improvement was noted in all patients with complete response in 1, partial response in 5, and stabilization in 5 (105). A quality of life study in 13 such patients, also including 1 with gastrinoma, showed marked improvements in quality of life (106). For further information on this topic, readers are encouraged to review the ENETS consensus guidelines (107).

The early results of radioembolization with resin 90 Y-microspheres in liver metastases from a variety of neuroendocrine tumors has been encouraging, with early responses noted to be 22.7% stable, partial response 60.5%, complete response 2.7%, and progressive disease in 4.9%. Significantly, no radiation liver failure occurred and median survival was 70 months (90). A randomized multi institutional double blind placebo control trial studying the vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) inhibitor sunitinib was recently reported in 171 advanced well-differentiated neuroendocrine tumors, including 19 patients with gastrinoma. Progression free survival was 11.4 months in the sunitinib group compared to 5.5 months in the placebo group. Objective response rate was 9.3% in the sunitinib group versus 0% in the placebo group. Nine deaths were reported in the sunitinib group (10%) versus 21 in the placebo group (25%). These results would appear to be comparable to those obtained with systemic chemotherapy, but with less toxicity (108). (109)

The use of mTOR inhibitors, either alone or combined with octreotide therapy, have recently been studied in patients with pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. mTOR is a serine-threonine kinase involved in regulation of cell growth and death through apoptosis. Its actions are mediated through PI3K/Akt pathway, and activates downstream protein kinases vital in cell cycle progression. The RADIANT 1 trial, a multi national phase II study, studied the efficacy of everolimus alone and in combination with octreotide in patients with metastatic PNETs that have progressed on chemotherapy (110). Treatment with everolimus alone resulted in stable disease in 67.8% of patients, and partial response in 9.6%. Combination therapy with everolimus and octreotide LAR resulted in stable disease in 80% and partial response in 4.4%. The results of the RADIANT III trial was recently reported (111). In this study a total of 410 patients with radiologic progression of disease were randomized to everolimus 10 mg daily or usual therapy which could include somatostatin. . The median progression free survival was 11 months with everolimus compared to 4.6 months with usual therapy. The proportion of patients alive and progression free at 18 months was 34% with everolimus compared to 9% with placebo.

FOLLOW-UP

Follow up of patients with gastrinoma has traditionally depended upon use of biochemical studies such as fasting serum gastrin levels, and imaging studies such as computed tomography and somatostatin receptor scintigraphy. A study of 72 consecutive gastrinoma patients revealed that serum chromogranin A and gastrin are not sufficiently sensitive to replace serial imaging studies to detect changes in tumor burden(112).Per recently published NCCN guidelines (31) a follow up strategy has been recommended for neuroendocrine tumors. In general, at 3 to 12 month intervals post-resection, the guidelines recommend history and physical examination, and “consider” appropriate markers as indicated, as well as multi-phasic CT or MRI. At more than 1 year post-resection a similar strategy is recommended every 6 to 12 months thereafter.

Bibliography

1. McCarthy DM, Jensen RT. Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Current Issues* 1985;25.
2. Passaro E Jr, Howard TJ, Sawicki MP, Watt PC, Stabile BE. The origin of sporadic gastrinomas within the gastrinoma triangle: a theory. *Arch Surg* 1998; 133(1):13-16.
3. Debas HT, Soon-Shiong P, McKenzie AD et al. Use of secretin in the roentgenologic and biochemical diagnosis of duodenal gastrinoma. *Am J Surg* 1983; 145(3):408-411.
4. Thompson NW, Vinik AI, Eckhauser FE. Microgastrinomas of the duodenum. A cause of failed operations for the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 1989; 209:396-404.
5. Norton JA, Doppman JL, Jensen RT. Curative resection in Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. Results of a 10-year prospective study. *Ann Surg* 1992; 215(1):8-18.
6. Sugg SL, Norton JA, Fraker DL et al. A prospective study of intraoperative methods to diagnose and resect duodenal gastrinomas. *Ann Surg* 1993; 218(2):138-144.
7. Bhagavan BS, Slavin RE, Goldberg J, Rao RN. Ectopic gastrinoma and Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Hum Pathol* 1986; 17(6):584-592.
8. Fox PS, Hofmann JW, Decosse JJ, Wilson SD. The influence of total gastrectomy on survival in malignant Zollinger-Ellison tumors. *Ann Surg* 1974; 180(4):558-566.
9. Friesen SR, Bolinger RE, Pearse AG, McGuigan JE. Serum gastrin levels in malignant Zollinger-Ellison Syndrome after total gastrectomy and hypophysectomy. *Ann Surg* 1970; 172(3):504-521.

10. Sircus W. Vagotomy in ZE syndrome. *Gastroenterology* 1980; 79(3):607-608.
11. Stabile BE, Passaro E Jr. Benign and malignant gastrinoma. *Am J Surg* 1985; 149(1):144-150.
12. Wolfe MM, Alexander RW, McGuigan JE. Extrapaneatic, extraintestinal gastrinoma: effective treatment by surgery. *N Engl J Med* 1982; 306(25):1533-1536.
13. Zollinger RM. Gastrinoma: factors influencing prognosis. *Surgery* 1985; 97(1):49-54.
14. Herrmann ME, Ciesla MC, Chejfec G, DeJong SA, Yong SL. Primary nodal gastrinomas. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2000; 124(6):832-835.
15. Wu PC, Alexander HR, Bartlett DL et al. A prospective analysis of the frequency, location, and curability of ectopic (nonpancreaticoduodenal, nonnodal) gastrinoma. *Surgery* 1997; 122(6):1176-1182.
16. Norton JA, Alexander HR, Fraker DL, Venzon DJ, Gibril F, Jensen RT. Possible primary lymph node gastrinoma: occurrence, natural history, and predictive factors: a prospective study. *Ann Surg* 2003; 237(5):650-657.
17. Deveney CW, Deveney KE, Stark D, Moss A, Stein S, Way LW. Resection of gastrinomas. *Ann Surg* 1983; 198(4):546-553.
18. Friesen SR. The development of endocrinopathies in the prospective screening of two families with multiple endocrine adenopathy, type I. *World J Surg* 1979; 3(6):753-764.
19. Lamers CB, Buis JT, van TJ. Secretin-stimulated serum gastrin levels in hyperparathyroid patients from families with multiple endocrine adenomatosis type I. *Ann Intern Med* 1977; 86(6):719-724.
20. Malagelada JR, Edis AJ, Adson MA, van Heerden JA, Go VL. Medical and surgical options in the management of patients with gastrinoma. *Gastroenterology* 1983; 84(6):1524-1532.
21. Mignon M, Ruszniewski P, Haffar S, Rigaud D, Rene E, Bonfils S. Current approach to the management of tumoral process in patients with gastrinoma. *World J Surg* 1986; 10(4):703-710.
22. Thompson NW, Lloyd RV, Nishiyama RH et al. MEN I pancreas: a histological and immunohistochemical study. *World J Surg* 1984; 8:561-574.
23. Friesen SR. Update on the diagnosis and treatment of rare neuroendocrine tumors. *Surg Clin North Am* 1987; 67(2):379-393.
24. Vinik A, Strodel W, Cho K, Eckhauser F, Thompson N. Localization of hormonally active gastrointestinal tumors. *Endocrine Surgery Update* 1983.
25. Landor JH. Control of the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome by excision of primary and metastatic tumor. *Am J Surg* 1984; 147(3):406-409.
26. Stabile BE, Morrow DJ, Passaro E Jr. The gastrinoma triangle: operative implications. *Am J Surg* 1984; 147(1):25-31.
27. Chen YJ, Vortmeyer A, Zhuang Z, Huang S, Jensen RT. Loss of heterozygosity of chromosome 1q in gastrinomas: occurrence and prognostic significance. *Cancer Res* 2003; 63(4):817-823.
28. Diaz-Rubio JL, Duarte-Rojo A, Saqui-Salces M, Gamboa-Dominguez A, Robles-Diaz G. Cellular

proliferative fraction measured with topoisomerase IIalpha predicts malignancy in endocrine pancreatic tumors. *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 2004; 128(4):426-429.

29. Ellison EC, Carey LC, Sparks J et al. Early surgical treatment of gastrinoma. *Am J Med* 1987; 82(5B):17-24.
30. Weber HC, Venzon DJ, Jensen RT, Metz DC. Studies on the interrelation between Zollinger-Ellison syndrome, *Helicobacter pylori*, and proton pump inhibitor therapy. *Gastroenterology* 1997; 112(1):84-91.
31. Kulke MH, Benson AB, III, Bergsland E et al. Neuroendocrine tumors. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2012; 10(6):724-764.
32. Rehfeld JF, Gingras MH, Bardram L, Hilsted L, Goetze JP, Poitras P. The Zollinger-Ellison syndrome and mismeasurement of gastrin. *Gastroenterology* 2011; 140(5):1444-1453.
33. Kothary PC, Fabri PJ, Gower W, O'Dorisio TM, Ellis J, Vinik AI. Evaluation of NH₂-terminus gastrins in gastrinoma syndrome. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 1986; 62:970-974.
34. Vinik A. Endocrine tumors of the gastroenteropancreatic axis. In *Diagnosis and Management of Endocrine-Related Tumors* 1984;305.
35. Betts JB, O'Malley BP, Rosenthal FD. Hyperparathyroidism: a prerequisite for Zollinger-Ellison syndrome in multiple endocrine adenomatosis Type 1--report of a further family and a review of the literature. *Q J Med* 1980; 49(193):69-76.
36. Friesen SR. Treatment of the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. A 25 year assessment. *Am J Surg* 1982; 143(3):331-338.
37. Dunnick NR, Doppman JL, Mills SR, McCarthy DM. Computed tomographic detection of nonbeta pancreatic islet cell tumors. *Radiology* 1980; 135(1):117-120.
38. Cho KJ, Vinik AI, Thompson NW et al. Localization of the source of hyperinsulinism: percutaneous transhepatic portal and pancreatic vein catheterization with hormone assay. *Am J Roentgenol* 1982; 139:237-245.
39. Ingemansson S, Larsson LI, Lunderquist A, Stadil F. Pancreatic vein catheterization with gastrin assay in normal patients and in patients with the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Am J Surg* 1977; 134(5):558-563.
40. Norton JA, Doppman JL, Collen MJ et al. Prospective study of gastrinoma localization and resection in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 1986; 204(4):468-479.
41. Jensen RT, Gibril F. Somatostatin receptor scintigraphy in gastrinomas. *Ital J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 1999; 31 Suppl 2:S179-S185.
42. Vinik AI, Achem-Karam S, Owyang C. Gastrointestinal hormones in clinical medicine. *Spec Top Endocrinol Metab* 1982; 4:93-138.
43. Vinik AI, Delbridge L, Moattari R, Cho K, Thompson N. Transhepatic portal vein catheterization for localization of insulinomas: a ten-year experience. *Surgery* 1991; 109:1-11.
44. Vinik A, Strodel W, Lloyd R, Thompson N. Unusual gastroenteropancreatic tumors and their hormones.

Endocrine Surgery Update 1983;293.

45. Rosch T, Lightdale CJ, Botet JF et al. Localization of pancreatic endocrine tumors by endoscopic ultrasonography. *N Engl J Med* 1992; 326(26):1721-1726.
46. Zimmer T, Ziegler K, Liehr RM, Stolzel U, Riecken EO, Wiedenmann B. Endosonography of neuroendocrine tumors of the stomach, duodenum, and pancreas. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 1994; 733:425-436.
47. Gibril F, Reynolds JC, Chen CC et al. Specificity of somatostatin receptor scintigraphy: a prospective study and effects of false-positive localizations on management in patients with gastrinomas. *J Nucl Med* 1999; 40(4):539-553.
48. Alexander HR, Fraker DL, Norton JA et al. Prospective study of somatostatin receptor scintigraphy and its effect on operative outcome in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 1998; 228(2):228-238.
49. Thom AK, Norton JA, Doppman JL, Miller DL, Chang R, Jensen RT. Prospective study of the use of intraarterial secretin injection and portal venous sampling to localize duodenal gastrinomas. *Surgery* 1992; 112(6):1002-1008.
50. Burcharth F, Stage JG, Stadil F, Jensen LI, Fischermann K. Localization of gastrinomas by transhepatic portal catheterization and gastrin assay. *Gastroenterology* 1979; 77(3):444-450.
51. Glaser B, Vinik A, Sive A, et al. Evidence for extravagal cholinergic dependence of pancreatic polypeptide responses to beef ingestion in man [abstract]. *Diabetes* 1979;414.
52. Passaro E Jr. Localization of pancreatic endocrine tumors by selective portal vein catheterization and radioimmunoassay. *Gastroenterology* 1979; 77(4 Pt 1):806-807.
53. Vinik A, Glowniack J, Glaser B, et al. Localization of gastroenteropancreatic (GEP) tumors. In *Surgery 2. Endocrine Surgery* 1983;76.
54. Strosberg JR, Cheema A, Weber J, Han G, Coppola D, Kvols LK. Prognostic validity of a novel American Joint Committee on Cancer Staging Classification for pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *J Clin Oncol* 2011; 29(22):3044-3049.
55. Glowniak JV, Shapiro B, Vinik AI, Glaser B, Thompson NW, Cho KJ. Percutaneous transhepatic venous sampling of gastrin: value in sporadic and familial islet-cell tumors and G-cell hyperfunction. *N Engl J Med* 1982; 307:293-297.
56. Deveney CW, Stein S, Way LW. Cimetidine in the treatment of Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Am J Surg* 1983; 146(1):116-123.
57. Maton PN, Vinayek R, Frucht H et al. Long-term efficacy and safety of omeprazole in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome: a prospective study. *Gastroenterology* 1989; 97(4):827-836.
58. McCarthy DM. Report on the United States experience with cimetidine in Zollinger-Ellison syndrome and other hypersecretory states. *Gastroenterology* 1978; 74(2 Pt 2):453-458.
59. Mignon M, et al. Ranitidine versus cimetidine in the management of Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ranitidine, Proceedings of an International Symposium. Excerpta Medica* 1982.

60. Termanini B, Gibril F, Sutliff VE, Yu F, Venzon DJ, Jensen RT. Effect of long-term gastric acid suppressive therapy on serum vitamin B12 levels in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Am J Med* 1998; 104(5):422-430.
61. Yu F, Venzon DJ, Serrano J et al. Prospective study of the clinical course, prognostic factors, causes of death, and survival in patients with long-standing Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *J Clin Oncol* 1999; 17(2):615-630.
62. Barreras RF, Mack E, Goodfriend T, Damm M. Resection of gastrinoma in the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Gastroenterology* 1982; 82(5 Pt 1):953-956.
63. Deveney CW, Deveney KS, Way LW. The Zollinger-Ellison syndrome--23 years later. *Ann Surg* 1978; 188(3):384-393.
64. Stage JG, Stadil F. The clinical diagnosis of the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Scand J Gastroenterol Suppl* 1979; 53:79-91.
65. Thompson JC, Lewis BG, Wiener I, Townsend CM, Jr. The role of surgery in the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 1983; 197(5):594-607.
66. Norton JA, Fraker DL, Alexander HR et al. Surgery to cure the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *N Engl J Med* 1999; 341(9):635-644.
67. Norton JA, Cromack DT, Shawker TH et al. Intraoperative ultrasonographic localization of islet cell tumors. A prospective comparison to palpation. *Ann Surg* 1988; 207(2):160-168.
68. Norton JA, Sigel B, Baker AR et al. Localization of an occult insulinoma by intraoperative ultrasonography. *Surgery* 1985; 97(3):381-384.
69. Frucht H, Norton JA, London JF et al. Detection of duodenal gastrinomas by operative endoscopic transillumination. A prospective study. *Gastroenterology* 1990; 99(6):1622-1627.
70. Norton JA, Alexander HR, Fraker DL, Venzon DJ, Gibril F, Jensen RT. Does the use of routine duodenotomy (DUODX) affect rate of cure, development of liver metastases, or survival in patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome? *Ann Surg* 2004; 239(5):617-625.
71. Zogakis TG, Gibril F, Libutti SK et al. Management and outcome of patients with sporadic gastrinoma arising in the duodenum. *Ann Surg* 2003; 238(1):42-48.
72. Norton JA, Harris EJ, Chen Y et al. Pancreatic endocrine tumors with major vascular abutment, involvement, or encasement and indication for resection. *Arch Surg* 2011; 146(6):724-732.
73. Grobmyer SR, Vogel SB, McGuigan JE, Copeland EM, Hochwald SN. Reoperative surgery in sporadic Zollinger-Ellison Syndrome: longterm results. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009; 208(5):718-722.
74. Assalia A, Gagner M. Laparoscopic pancreatic surgery for islet cell tumors of the pancreas. *World J Surg* 2004; 28(12):1239-1247.
75. Gilhool WJ. Endoscopic diagnosis and removal of a duodenal wall gastrinoma. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1984; 79(9):679-683.

76. Fernandez-Cruz L, Herrera M, Saenz A, Pantoja JP, Astudillo E, Sierra M. Laparoscopic pancreatic surgery in patients with neuroendocrine tumours: indications and limits. *Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2001; 15(2):161-175.
77. Straus E, Raufman JP, Samuel S et al. Endoscopic cure of the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Gastrointest Endosc* 1992; 38(6):709-711.
78. Norton JA, Jensen RT. Resolved and unresolved controversies in the surgical management of patients with Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Ann Surg* 2004; 240(5):757-773.
79. Morrow EH, Norton JA. Surgical management of Zollinger-Ellison syndrome; state of the art. *Surg Clin North Am* 2009; 89(5):1091-1103.
80. van Heerden JA, Smith SL, Miller LJ. Management of the Zollinger-Ellison syndrome in patients with multiple endocrine neoplasia type I. *Surgery* 1986; 100(6):971-977.
81. Goudet P, Murat A, Biquet C et al. Risk factors and causes of death in MEN1 disease. A GTE (Groupe d'Etude des Tumeurs Endocrines) cohort study among 758 patients. *World J Surg* 2010; 34(2):249-255.
82. Lopez CL, Falconi M, Waldmann J et al. Partial Pancreaticoduodenectomy Can Provide Cure for Duodenal Gastrinoma Associated With Multiple Endocrine Neoplasia Type 1. *Ann Surg* 2012.
83. Dickson PV, Rich TA, Xing Y et al. Achieving eugastrinemia in MEN1 patients: both duodenal inspection and formal lymph node dissection are important. *Surgery* 2011; 150(6):1143-1152.
84. Norton JA, Warren RS, Kelly MG, Zuraek MB, Jensen RT. Aggressive surgery for metastatic liver neuroendocrine tumors. *Surgery* 2003; 134(6):1057-1063.
85. Touzios JG, Kiely JM, Pitt SC et al. Neuroendocrine hepatic metastases: does aggressive management improve survival? *Ann Surg* 2005; 241(5):776-783.
86. Chamberlain RS, Canes D, Brown KT et al. Hepatic neuroendocrine metastases: does intervention alter outcomes? *J Am Coll Surg* 2000; 190(4):432-445.
87. Glazer ES, Tseng JF, Al-Refaie W et al. Long-term survival after surgical management of neuroendocrine hepatic metastases. *HPB (Oxford)* 2010; 12(6):427-433.
88. Gedaly R, Daily MF, Davenport D et al. Liver transplantation for the treatment of liver metastases from neuroendocrine tumors: an analysis of the UNOS database. *Arch Surg* 2011; 146(8):953-958.
89. Liu DM, Kennedy A, Turner D et al. Minimally invasive techniques in management of hepatic neuroendocrine metastatic disease. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2009; 32(2):200-215.
90. Kennedy AS, Dezarn WA, McNeillie P et al. Radioembolization for unresectable neuroendocrine hepatic metastases using resin 90Y-microspheres: early results in 148 patients. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2008; 31(3):271-279.
91. Sutliff VE, Doppman JL, Gibril F et al. Growth of newly diagnosed, untreated metastatic gastrinomas and predictors of growth patterns. *J Clin Oncol* 1997; 15(6):2420-2431.
92. Broder LE, Carter SK. Pancreatic islet cell carcinoma. II. Results of therapy with streptozotocin in 52 patients. *Ann Intern Med* 1973; 79(1):108-118.

93. Friesen SR. Tumors of the endocrine pancreas. *N Engl J Med* 1982; 306(10):580-590.
94. Maton PN, Gardner JD, Jensen RT. Diagnosis and management of Zollinger-Ellison syndrome. *Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am* 1989; 18(2):519-543.
95. Moertel CG, Hanley JA, Johnson LA. Streptozocin alone compared with streptozocin plus fluorouracil in the treatment of advanced islet-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 1980; 303(21):1189-1194.
96. Moertel CG, Lavin PT, Hahn RG. Phase II trial of doxorubicin therapy for advanced islet cell carcinoma. *Cancer Treat Rep* 1982; 66(7):1567-1569.
97. von ST, Howard JM, Doppman JL et al. Prospective study of chemotherapy in patients with metastatic gastrinoma. *Gastroenterology* 1988; 94(6):1326-1334.
98. Turner NC, Strauss SJ, Sarker D et al. Chemotherapy with 5-fluorouracil, cisplatin and streptozocin for neuroendocrine tumours. *Br J Cancer* 2010; 102(7):1106-1112.
99. Wymenga AN, Eriksson B, Salmela PI et al. Efficacy and safety of prolonged-release lanreotide in patients with gastrointestinal neuroendocrine tumors and hormone-related symptoms. *J Clin Oncol* 1999; 17(4):1111.
100. Frank M, Klose KJ, Wied M, Ishaque N, Schade-Brittinger C, Arnold R. Combination therapy with octreotide and alpha-interferon: effect on tumor growth in metastatic endocrine gastroenteropancreatic tumors. *Am J Gastroenterol* 1999; 94(5):1381-1387.
101. Faiss S, Pape UF, Bohmig M et al. Prospective, randomized, multicenter trial on the antiproliferative effect of lanreotide, interferon alfa, and their combination for therapy of metastatic neuroendocrine gastroenteropancreatic tumors--the International Lanreotide and Interferon Alfa Study Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2003; 21(14):2689-2696.
102. Shojamanesh H, Gibril F, Louie A et al. Prospective study of the antitumor efficacy of long-term octreotide treatment in patients with progressive metastatic gastrinoma. *Cancer* 2002; 94(2):331-343.
103. Buscombe JR, Caplin ME, Hilson AJ. Long-term efficacy of high-activity 111in-pentetreotide therapy in patients with disseminated neuroendocrine tumors. *J Nucl Med* 2003; 44(1):1-6.
104. Ozkan E, Tokmak E, Kucuk NO. Efficacy of adding high-dose In-111 octreotide therapy during Sandostatin treatment in patients with disseminated neuroendocrine tumors: clinical results of 14 patients. *Ann Nucl Med* 2011; 25(6):425-431.
105. Grozinsky-Glasberg S, Barak D, Fraenkel M et al. Peptide receptor radioligand therapy is an effective treatment for the long-term stabilization of malignant gastrinomas. *Cancer* 2011; 117(7):1377-1385.
106. Traub-Weidinger T, Raderer M, Uffmann M et al. Improved quality of life in patients treated with Peptide radionuclides. *World J Nucl Med* 2011; 10(2):115-121.
107. Kwekkeboom DJ, Krenning EP, Lebtahi R et al. ENETS Consensus Guidelines for the Standards of Care in Neuroendocrine Tumors: peptide receptor radionuclide therapy with radiolabeled somatostatin analogs. *Neuroendocrinology* 2009; 90(2):220-226.
108. Raymond E, Dahan L, Raoul JL et al. Sunitinib malate for the treatment of pancreatic neuroendocrine

- tumors. *N Engl J Med* 2011; 364(6):501-513.
109. Vinik AI, Raymond E. Pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors: approach to treatment with focus on sunitinib. *Therap Adv Gastroenterol* 2013; 6(5):396-411.
 110. Yao JC, Lombard-Bohas C, Baudin E et al. Daily oral everolimus activity in patients with metastatic pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors after failure of cytotoxic chemotherapy: a phase II trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2010; 28(1):69-76.
 111. Yao JC, Shah MH, Ito T et al. Everolimus for advanced pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *N Engl J Med* 2011; 364(6):514-523.
 112. Abou-Saif A, Gibril F, Ojeaburu JV et al. Prospective study of the ability of serial measurements of serum chromogranin A and gastrin to detect changes in tumor burden in patients with gastrinomas. *Cancer* 2003; 98(2):249-261.