



Survival comparison between thymic carcinoma and thymic carcinoid: does it matter in clinical practice?

Tomoyuki Hishida

Division of Thoracic Surgery, Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

Correspondence to: Tomoyuki Hishida, MD. Division of Thoracic Surgery, Department of Surgery, Keio University School of Medicine, 35 Shinanomachi, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160-8582, Japan. Email: thishida@nifty.com.

Comment on: Zhao Y, Gu H, Fan L, *et al.* Comparison of clinical features and survival between thymic carcinoma and thymic carcinoid patients. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2017;52:33-8.

Received: 20 April 2018; Accepted: 15 May 2018; Published: 15 January 2019.

doi: 10.21037/med.2019.01.01

View this article at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/med.2019.01.01>

Thymic carcinoma (TC), a cancer derived from thymic epithelial cells, was first recognized by Shimamoto and associates in 1977 in a study of 8 squamous cell carcinomas of the thymus (1). Thymic carcinoid was initially described by Rosai and Higa in 1972 as a “mediastinal endocrine neoplasm”, a separate entity from thymoma (2). Both TC and thymic carcinoid were previously categorized as Type C thymoma. However, in 2004, the WHO classification distinguished thymic carcinoid from TC, and the entity of thymic neuroendocrine tumor (TNET) was established (3). Thymic carcinoid, which includes low-grade typical carcinoid and intermediate-grade atypical carcinoid, is the main component of TNET. TNET also includes high-grade large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma (LCNEC) and small cell carcinoma (4).

The article “*Comparison of clinical features and survival between TC and thymic carcinoid patients*,” which was recently published in the *European Journal of Cardio-thoracic Surgery* by Zhao and associates (Department of Thoracic Surgery, Shanghai Chest Hospital, Shanghai, China), compared the clinical characteristics and survival outcomes of between TC and TNET (5). The authors retrospectively analyzed a total of 287 patients with TC and 56 patients with TNET who were mainly treated by surgical resection in a single institution in China over 11 years. The TNET group only included typical and atypical carcinoids, and it was unclear whether high-grade neuroendocrine carcinomas (LCNEC and small cell carcinoma) were included in the TC group or excluded from the analysis. In both groups, most patients presented with advanced stage III–IV disease and were

treated with a multidisciplinary approach such as adjuvant radiotherapy and chemotherapy in addition to surgery. Compared to the TC group, the TNET group included significantly more males, large tumors, and node disease. With respect to overall and disease-free survival (OS and DFS), the tumors shared a similar survival course (5-year OS: 80.7% for TNET and 60.7% for TC, $P=0.159$; 5-year DFS: 37.6% for TNET and 41.1% for TC, $P=0.696$), with a median follow-up of 47 months for TC and 55 months for TNET. Multivariate analyses showed that younger age, completeness of resection, and adjuvant radiotherapy were associated with OS, and the histological classification (TC or TNET) did not affect OS in this study. Propensity score matching produced 46 patients in each group and also showed no significant difference in OS or DFS between the two groups.

This was the largest single-institutional study to compare the prognosis between TC and TNET, and the results were consistent with those of a recent international database study by the International Thymic Malignancy Interest Group (ITMIG) and the European Society of Thoracic Surgeons (ESTS). In the joint ITMIG/ESTS database study, a total of 1,042 TCs and 205 TNETs including thymic carcinoids, LCNECs, and small cell carcinomas were retrospectively compared in terms of clinical characteristics and survival (6). The median OS was 6.6 years in TC and 7.5 years in TNET. In multivariate analyses, pathologic stage, resection status, and the use of radiotherapy were significant prognostic factors associated with OS and recurrence-free survival (RFS). However, the histology (TC or TNET) did

not influence either OS or RFS. Zao's study may provide external validation for the international database study, and the histology (TC or TNET) may not affect the prognosis for surgical cases. However, all previous comparative studies were conducted retrospectively, and a centralized histological review was not generally available. Other studies have shown contrasting results favoring TNET (7,8). Due to a selection bias, definitive conclusions could not be drawn regarding this comparison. Dose this survival comparison matter in clinical practice? The most clinically important aspect is the fact that TNET including thymic carcinoid, as well as TC, is a more biologically aggressive thymic epithelial tumor than thymoma. The main subgroup of TNET is not typical but rather atypical carcinoid, unlike NET in other organs. Although TC has been known as a high-grade malignancy, TNET is also a high-grade tumor which frequently tend to metastasize to regional lymph nodes and distant organs. In the largest ITMIG/ESTS studies of 205 TNET patients, the cumulative incidence of recurrence was 39% at 5 years, which was much higher than 8% reported in the recent ESTS database for all thymic malignancies (9). As the current Zao's study mentioned, complete surgical resection is essential to provide patients with localized thymic carcinoids a chance of cure (5,10,11), but the high risk of systemic relapse even after complete resection especially in advanced-stage disease emphasizes the needs for the development of drugs for those rare tumors.

The pharmacotherapeutic treatment of choice for thymic carcinoids has been very limited. However, a recent multicenter trial indicated that the long-acting somatostatin analogue pasireotide, either alone or in combination with the mammalian target of rapamycin (mTOR) inhibitor everolimus, might be a new treatment strategy for advanced or recurrent bronchopulmonary and thymic carcinoids (12). A global effort should be made to establish an effective multidisciplinary approach for these rare aggressive tumors.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned and reviewed by Section Editor Dr. Zhuoqi Jia (Thoracic Department, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong

University, Xi'an, China).

Conflicts of Interest: The author has completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/med.2019.01.01>). The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The author is accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

References

1. Shimamoto Y, Kameya T, Nagai K, et al. Squamous cell carcinoma of the thymus. An analysis of eight cases. *Am J Surg Pathol* 1977;1:109-21.
2. Rosai J, Higa E. Mediastinal endocrine neoplasm, of probable thymic origin, related to carcinoid tumor. *Clinicopathologic study of 8 cases. Cancer* 1972;29:1061-74.
3. Muller-Hermelink HK, Engel P, Kuo TT, et al. Tumours of the thymus: Introduction. In: Travis WD, Brambilla E, Muller-Hermelink HK et al. Editors. *Pathology and genetics of tumours of the lung, pleura, thymus, and heart.* Lyon: IARC Press, 2004:148.
4. Travis WD, Brambilla E, Burke AP, et al. WHO classification of tumours of the lung, pleura, thymus and heart. Fourth edition. Lyon: IARC Press, 2015.
5. Zhao Y, Gu H, Fan L, et al. Comparison of clinical features and survival between thymic carcinoma and thymic carcinoid patients. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2017;52:33-8.
6. Filosso PL, Yao X, Ruffini E, et al. Comparison of outcomes between neuroendocrine thymic tumours and other subtypes of thymic carcinomas: a joint analysis of the European Society of Thoracic Surgeons and the International Thymic Malignancy Interest Group. *Eur J*

- Cardiothorac Surg 2016;50:766-71.
7. Kondo K, Monden Y. Therapy for thymic epithelial tumors: a clinical study of 1,320 patients from Japan. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2003;76:878-84; discussion 84-5.
 8. Gaur P, Leary C, Yao JC. Thymic neuroendocrine tumors: a SEER database analysis of 160 patients. *Ann Surg* 2010;251:1117-21.
 9. Ruffini E, Detterbeck F, Van Raemdonck D, et al. Thymic carcinoma: A cohort study of patients from the European Society of Thoracic Surgeons Database. *J Thorac Oncol* 2014;9:541-8.
 10. Filosso PL, Yao X, Ahmad U, et al. Outcome of primary neuroendocrine tumors of the thymus: a joint analysis of the International Thymic Malignancy Interest Group and the European Society of Thoracic Surgeons databases. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2015;149:103-9.e2.
 11. Ose N, Maeda H, Inoue M, et al. Results of treatment for thymic neuroendocrine tumours: multicentre clinicopathological study. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg* 2018;26:18-24.
 12. Ferolla P, Brizzi MP, Meyer T, et al. Efficacy and safety of long-acting pasireotide or everolimus alone or in combination in patients with advanced carcinoids of the lung and thymus (LUNA): an open-label, multicentre, randomised, phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2017;18:1652-64.

doi: 10.21037/med.2019.01.01

Cite this article as: Hishida T. Survival comparison between thymic carcinoma and thymic carcinoid: does it matter in clinical practice? *Mediastinum* 2019;3:2.