

Neuroendocrine Differentiated Breast Cancer Cases: A Retrospective Analysis and Literature Review

Özlem Özdemir (✉ ozdemirozlem.md@gmail.com)

University of Health Sciences Izmir Bozyaka Education and Research Hospital: Department of Medical Oncology <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2520-5953>

Baha Zengel

University of Health Sciences Izmir Bozyaka Education and Research Hospital, Department of General Surgery

Yaşar Yıldız

Department of Medical Oncology, Izmir Katip Celebi University, Atatürk Research and Training Hospital

Seray Saray

Department of Medical Oncology, Katip Celebi University, Izmir Ataturk Training and Research Hospital

Ahmet Alacacioglu

Department of Medical Oncology, Katip Celebi University, Atatürk Training and Research Hospital

Funda Taşlı

University of Health Sciences Izmir Bozyaka Education and Research Hospital, Department of Pathology

Züleyha Can

Izmir Bozyaka Training and Research Hospital, Department of Internal Medicine

Utku Oflazoglu

Department of Medical Oncology, Katip Celebi University, Izmir Ataturk Training and Research Hospital

Halil Taskaynatan

Department of Medical Oncology, Katip Celebi University, Izmir Ataturk Training and Research Hospital

Tarik Salman

Department of Medical Oncology, Katip Celebi University, Izmir Ataturk Training and Research Hospital

Umut Varol

Department of Medical Oncology, Katip Celebi University, Izmir Ataturk Training and Research Hospital

Raika Durusoy

Department of Public Health, Ege University

Yüksel Küçükzeybek

Department of Medical Oncology, Katip Celebi University, Izmir Ataturk Training and Research Hospital

Keywords: Neuroendocrine breast carcinoma (NEBC), breast cancers, IDC/NOS, neuroendocrine , ultrasound (USG), magnetic resonance (MR), mammographic (MMG)

Posted Date: May 4th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-433514/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Purpose: Neuroendocrine breast carcinoma (NEBC) is a rare subgroup of breast cancer, which makes up 2 to 5% of all invasive breast cancers. The aim of this retrospective analysis is to present and analyze our own data of primary NEBCs.

Methods: We retrospectively analyzed clinical, pathological, and radiological characteristics of 36 patients diagnosed with Neuroendocrine differentiated breast cancer between 2008-2019 compared to that of 925 patients with invasive ductal carcinoma (IDC/NOS) along with a literature review.

Result: In this study, 36 patients with neuroendocrine differentiated breast carcinoma and 961 patients with invasive ductal carcinoma (IDC/NOS), as the comparison group, were identified, clinics between 2008-2019. In NEBC patients, 7 were premenopausal and 29 postmenopausal. Patients whose ultrasound (USG), magnetic resonance (MR), and mammographic (MMG) images available in our hospital, high-density masses were detected in the MMG with irregular (77%), microlobulated (80%) and spiculated margins (63%), unaccompanied by asymmetry and structural distortion. Calcifications were less common than invasive breast cancer, present only in 4 patients (17%). When NEBC were compared to ductal carcinomas (n = 925), NEBC were more often HER2 negative (p = 0.039), ER positive (p = 0.05), PR positive (0.03) and the NEBC patients were older (p :0.02). Age, grade, metastatic status, lymph node number and molecular type were identified as prognostic factors that significantly affect survival in both groups (p<0.05).

Conclusion: NEBC is a subtype that is both histopathologically and radiologically distinct from other breast cancer subtypes, and neuroendocrine differentiation will become more predictive in the future.

Introduction

Breast cancer is the second most common type of cancer worldwide. The most common type of breast cancer is invasive ductal carcinoma. Neuroendocrine neoplasia (NEN) is a rare, heterogeneous tumor group with variable clinical behavior due to the differentiation of the tumor, which originates from the endocrine system. It is reported that the primary neuroendocrine tumors of the breast are caused by early-stage variable differentiation of breast cancer stem cells. Stem cells are considered to differentiate into both neuroendocrine and epithelial lines as a result of this phenomenon. Primary neuroendocrine tumor of the breast is generally diagnosed by the microscopic detection of neuroendocrine structure in the cancer cell and the presence of neuroendocrine markers such as chromogranin A and synaptophysin. Neurone-specific enolase and CD56 may also be positive, but they are not as sensitive and specific as the former two [1]. The 2003 World Health Organization classification of breast cancers stated that neuroendocrine markers being more than 50% was adequate for diagnosis. In the 2012 version, this threshold was omitted, and expressing neuroendocrine markers were considered adequate. In the 2012 classification, 3 types of tumors were defined: well differentiated NEBC (NETs, which included low- and intermediate-grade tumors), poorly differentiated NEBC/small cell carcinoma, and NEBC determined by

histochemistry or immunohistochemistry (IHC) [2]. Briefly, in 2012, WHO classified primary NET and NECs together with grade 1 or 2 breast carcinomas that express neuroendocrine indicators in a single group under the heading “Breast carcinoma with Neuroendocrine differentiation.” However, in 2019, WHO recommended a grouping similar to the Neuroendocrine Carcinoma classification in other organs. In the 2019 WHO classification, the primary neuroendocrine tumors of breast were defined in 3 categories as neuroendocrine tumors (NET), large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma (LCNEC) and small cell neuroendocrine carcinoma (SCNEC). These breast tumors are sporadic subtypes, and their common characteristics are uniform neuroendocrine morphology, presence of neurosecretory granules in cells, and diffuse-uniform neuroendocrine marker staining. 2019 WHO classification recommended defining the tumors with invasive breast carcinoma having nonspecific and specific morphology types (mucinous carcinoma, solid papillary carcinoma, etc.) and non-uniform neuroendocrine morphology and neuroendocrine marker expression as “Invasive carcinomas of the breast with neuroendocrine differentiation” [2]. In very few cases, the secretion of hormones such as ACTH, norepinephrine, or calcitonin and associated findings were observed [3]. Neuroendocrine neoplasms (NENs) can occur in almost all organ systems. In most cases, NEN occurs within the gastroenteropancreatic system (70% of all cases) and the bronchopulmonary system (25%) [4]. Mammary origin accounts for less than 1% of neuroendocrine tumors [5-7]. Breast cancer incidence rates are reported to vary between 0.1 and 5%, and these tumors are thought to arise from endocrine differentiation of breast carcinoma rather than from pre-existing endocrine cells with malignant transformation [8,9]. Because it is a rare breast carcinoma, there are limited studies on its prognosis with conflicting results. In an epidemiological study, Cloyd et al. analyzed the long-term outcomes of 284 neuroendocrine breast carcinoma patients and reported a more advanced disease and less favorable prognosis compared to invasive ductal carcinoma [10]. In a compilation of 53 articles, including 108 cases in total, Adams et al. showed that prognosis is usually quite favorable with small tumors and no nodal involvement [11]. There is still no consensus on the effect of neuroendocrine breast carcinoma on prognosis. In the present study, we retrospectively analyzed the clinicopathological characteristics of NEBC and breast carcinoma.

Materials And Methods

In this study, among the patients diagnosed with breast cancer in Bozyaka Training and Research Hospital (TRH) and Katip Çelebi University Atatürk TRH oncology outpatient clinics between 2008-2019, 36 patients with neuroendocrine differentiated breast carcinoma and 925 patients with invasive ductal carcinoma (IDC/NOS), as the comparison group, were identified. Information on demographic data (including name, gender, age, and contact information), physical examination, radiological findings, surgical procedures, histopathological and immunohistochemical characteristics, systemic adjuvant/neoadjuvant therapy and follow-up were retrospectively collected. The American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) TNM was used for staging. The estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER-2), Ki-67 proliferation index, and oncoprotein P53, which are associated with breast cancer, were immunohistochemically evaluated. At least 1% of tumor cells being stained were considered ER and PR positive, and immunohistochemical

staining 3+ was considered HER-2 positive. On the other hand, in cases with immunohistochemical HER-2 +2, fluorescent in situ hybridization (FISH) was checked. For cases in the study, the threshold value for Ki67 immunohistochemical staining was taken as 14% [12]. Tumors with a profile of ER and/or PgR (+)/HER2(-)/Ki67 \leq 14% were classified as Luminal A, ER and/or PgR (+)/HER2 (+) or (-)/Ki67 $>$ 14% tumors Luminal B, ER(-)/PgR(-)/HER2 (+) tumors HER2 overexpressed, and ER(-)/PgR(-)/HER2(-) Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC). Besides, the expression of neuroendocrine markers with immunohistochemical staining was assessed, including chromogranin A (CGA), synaptophysin (SYN), neuron-specific enolase (NSE), and CD56. In immunohistochemical staining, the presence of at least 1 non-uniform expression of Chromogranin A (CGA) or synaptophysin (SYN) was considered neuroendocrine marker-positive. In the survival analysis of patients, disease-free survival (DFS) was assessed by calculating the time from diagnosis to relapse and overall (OS) survival from diagnosis to death.

Statistical analysis:

Statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS Statistics Software. Descriptive statistics were calculated for demographic and clinicopathological factors. Differences in these factors between NEBC and IDC, NOS of the breast were compared using chi-square or Fisher exact test, where appropriate, for categorical variables and using the Student t test to compare means. Disease-free (DFS), survival were calculated from the time of diagnosis to disease recurrence at any site (DFS), overall (OS) survival were calculated from the time of diagnosis to death from any reason (OS). Survival curves were constructed using the Kaplan–Meier method, and differences between curves were analyzed using the Log-rank test. Multivariate analysis for survival time was performed using the Cox proportional hazards model. In statistical analysis, p-values less than 0.05 were considered significant.

Findings

All the patients included in the present study were female and presented with palpable breast mass at a rate of 82%. Regarding the age of diagnosis, the median age was 59 (min: 33, max: 86) in cases with neuroendocrine differentiated breast carcinoma and 51 (min: 23, max: 93) in the comparison group IDC/NOS (n: 925). The difference between them was statistically significant ($p=0.02$). The mean tumor size was 31 mm in the NEBC group and 28 mm in the comparison group, which was not statistically significant ($p>0.05$). According to the AJCC (pTNM) staging system, in the NEBC group, the number of stage I patients was 6 (16.6%), stage II 14 (38.8%), stage III 11 (30.5%), and stage IV 5 (13.6%). In the IDC/NOS group, the number of stage I patients was 173 (18.7%), stage II 469 (50.7%), stage III 255 (27.5%), and stage IV 28 (3%). The difference between the two groups for all stages was statistically significant ($p=0.005$). In NEBC patients, 7 were premenopausal and 29 postmenopausal (Table1), and in the comparison group, 485 patients were premenopausal and 440 postmenopausal. The difference between the groups was statistically significant ($p<0.001$). Regarding the MRI of patients, in the NEBC group, 2 were multicentric, 11 multifocal, and 23 unifocal. In the comparison group, 41 multicentric, 132

multifocal, and 752 unifocal. The difference between the groups was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$). Besides, out of the 36 cases with NECB, in 23 patients with ultrasound (USG), magnetic resonance (MR), and mammographic (MMG) images available in our hospital, high-density masses were detected in the MMG with irregular (77%), microlobulated (80%) and spiculated margins (63%), unaccompanied by asymmetry and structural distortion. Calcifications were less common than invasive breast cancer, present only in 4 patients (17%). In USG, common findings were hypoechoic (68%), borderless (63%), and no posterior acoustic features (59%). The MRI showed masses with irregular (100%), microlobulated (54%) and spiculated (27%) margins, and isointensity to parenchyma on T1 (100%). Regarding the molecular subtypes of NECB patients, 16 were Luminal A, 13 Luminal B HER2(-), and 7 Luminal B HER2(+). 7 patients (19.4%) were HER-2+ in the NECB group. NECB were compared to ductal carcinomas ($n = 925$), NECB were more often HER2 negative ($p = 0.039$), ER positive ($p = 0.05$), PR positive (0.03). The mean follow-up time was 66 months in the NECB group and 107 months in the IDC/NOS group. The difference between the groups was significant ($p < 0.001$). Two of 31 non-metastatic patients received neoadjuvant therapy and 29 adjuvant therapy. Four (11.2%) of patients with NECB follow up, and 252 (27.2%) of IDC/NOS patients died. The difference was statistically significant ($p = 0.034$). However, there was no significant difference between the two groups in terms of histological grade, e-cadherin, vascular invasion, neural invasion, relapse, metastasis or disease-free survival. Survival analysis excluding the number of metastatic patients also revealed no difference between the groups in terms of DFS and OS. Age, grade, metastatic status, lymph node number and molecular type were identified as prognostic factors that significantly affect survival in both groups ($p < 0.05$).

Table 1

Clinicopathological characteristics of neuroendocrine carcinomas and IDC at the time of diagnosis

Mean age	59.0
Menopausal status	
Premenopause	7 (%19.4)
Postmenopause	29 (%80.5)
T Stage	
T1	11 (%30.5)
T2	18 (%50)
T3	6 (%16.6)
T4	1 (%2.7)
N Stage	
N0	12 (%33.3)
N1	14 (%38.8)
N2	7 (%19.4)
N3	3 (%8.3)
Diagnosis Stage	
Stage I	6 (%16.6)
Stage II	14 (%38.8)
Stage III	11 (%30.5)
Stage IV	5 (%13.8)
Molecular Type	
Luminal A	16 (%44.4)
Luminal B HER2(-)	13 (36.1%)
Luminal B HER2(+)	7 (19.4%)
Grade	
Grade 1	3 (%8.3)
Grade 2	25 (%69)
Grade 3	8 (%22)
Synaptophysin expression	
Yes	33 (91.6%)

No	3 (8.3%)
Chromogranin expression	
Yes	21 (%58.3)
No	15(41.6%)
MR	
Multicentric	2 (%5.5)
Multifocal	11 (%30.5)
Unifocal	23 (%63.8)
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy	
Yes	2 (%5.5)
No	34 (94.5%)
Adjuvant chemotherapy	
Yes	29 (%80.5)
No	7 (19.4%)

Discussion

The neuroendocrine tumor of the breast was first described in 1963 by Feyrter and Hartmann [13]. In 1977, Cubilla and Woodruff presented the first case series and identified breast cancers with neuroendocrine differentiation as primary carcinomas of breast [14]. The histogenesis of the tumor has not been fully clarified yet and is often thought to result from the differentiation of multipotent stem cells into the neuroendocrine carcinoma phenotype [15]. The diagnosis of neuroendocrine tumor of the breast is generally established by microscopic detection of the neuroendocrine structure in the cancer cell and the positive neuroendocrine markers such as chromogranin A and synaptophysin. Neuron-specific enolase and CD56 can also be checked, but they are not as sensitive and specific as the former two [1]. In the 2003 classification, the prevalence of these tumors was estimated to be between 2% and 5%. However, in the Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) database, only 142 NEBC cases were identified between 2003 and 2009, which corresponds to a prevalence of <0.1% [16]. In sum, a full literature review shows that the incidence of neuroendocrine breast tumors has been reported in rates ranging between 0.3% and 20%. In our case series, this rate was 3%, and the lack of uniform morphological and immunohistochemical diagnostic criteria could account for the different prevalence results reported in the literature. In most cases, NECB appears as a painless palpable retroareolar mass with secondary symptoms such as skin ulcers, bloody nipple discharge, lymphadenopathy, or retraction of the nipple [8,17]. All of our patients had presented to our clinic for palpable mass. Most NECB patients are postmenopausal women of advanced age, and the incidence of the disease is lower in men and

younger women [8]. In the literature, the age of onset has been reported as most frequent in the 6th and 7th decades. Hence, the mean age 61.1 in the present study is consistent with literature. In NEBC patients, 7 were premenopausal and 29 postmenopausal, and in the comparison group, 485 patients were premenopausal and 440 postmenopausal. The difference between the groups was statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Radiological features of NECB are nonspecific in most cases. Some investigators have stated that NEBCs are observed as hypoechoic masses with irregular morphology in mammography and ultrasound, as well as small-sized lesions not associated with microcalcifications [18-20]. In the present study, high-density masses were detected in the MMG with irregular (77%), microlobulated (80%) and spiculated margins (63%), unaccompanied by asymmetry and structural distortion, along with microcalcification in 4 patients (18%). It may also appear in USG as hypervascular, hypoechoic solid masses, with irregular form and enhanced posterior echogenicity [18]. In our study, hypoechoic (68%), borderless (63%), no posterior acoustic characteristics (59%) were common findings in the Ultrasound. The most frequent findings in MR are irregular masses with irregular margins and wash-out time-intensity kinetics, which are features highly suspicious for malignancy [21]. Some studies also noted that irregular lesions are often detected by hypointense on NECB-T1 weighted sequences with early and intense enhancement [18-20]. In our study, the MRI showed masses with irregular (100%), microlobulated (54%) and spiculated (27%) margins, and isointensity to parenchyma on T1 (100%). Fine needle aspiration cytology is not recommended due to the similarity of NECB's cytological features to invasive ductal carcinoma and intraductal papilloma [1,22]. The use of detailed immunohistochemical staining and various imaging techniques is essential for an accurate diagnosis. Chromogranin A (CgA) and synaptophysin (SYN) are the most sensitive neuroendocrine markers [23,24], whereas neuron-specific enolase (NSE) and CD56 are less sensitive and less specific [9,25]. While NECB is usually positive for hormone receptors (ER, PR), HER2 is almost always negative, although there have been reports of HER2(+) NECB [21,26]. In 2008, Weigelt et al. described a limited cohort of 5 luminal A and 1 luminal B tumor cases, and 6 NEBCs [27]. In a larger series, Bogine et al. subdivided 112 NEBCs with luminal phenotype into 42% luminal A and 58% luminal B [28]. However, HER2 is only amplified in sporadic cases [21,29,30]. In the present study, regarding the molecular subtypes of the 36 NEBC patients, 16 were Luminal A, 13 Luminal B HER2(-), and 7 Luminal B HER2(+). 7 patients (19.4%) were HER-2(+) in the NECB group. When NEBC were compared to ductal carcinomas ($n = 925$), NEBC were more often HER2 negative ($p = 0.039$), ER positive ($p = 0.05$), PR positive (0.03).

Due to the similarity to neuroendocrine tumors, the NECB can easily be confused with metastases of neuroendocrine tumors to the breast. The presence of a ductal in situ component is a histological evidence that the breast is the primary organ of origin [31]. Besides, an expression of transcription factors such as GATA3, a more sensitive and specific marker than mammaglobin, also indicates breast origin. Although GATA3 is also expressed in urothelial, renal, germ cell tumors and paragangliomas [32-34], a positive expression has not been defined in the extramamary NEN. In addition, positive expression of hormone receptors (PR, ER) in well/moderately differentiated NECB are instrumental in differentiating primary and secondary lesions [35,36]. In the present study, the expression neuroendocrine markers were investigated with immunohistochemical staining, including chromogranin A (CGA), synaptophysin (SYN),

neuron-specific enolase (NSE), and CD56. In immunohistochemical staining, the presence of at least 1 non-uniform expression of Chromogranin A (CGA) or synaptophysin (SYN) was considered neuroendocrine marker-positive. The prognostic implications of neuroendocrine differentiation in breast carcinoma are still debated. Historically, based on small-scale studies, NEBC was thought to have a prognosis that is similar [37,39], or even better [40, 41], compared to invasive ductal carcinoma. However, recent studies have suggested that NEBC could be associated with worse long-term outcomes [8, 42-46]. Among these, the population-based study from SEER database has demonstrated that overall survival (OS) and disease-specific survival (DSS) were significantly shorter in NEBC compared with non-NEBC at the same stage [8]. In addition, a large retrospective study by Zhang et al. reported a higher probability of local recurrence and poorer OS for NEBCs [44]. Some studies have claimed that the most important factor is tumor grade (G) and there is no difference in prognosis of NEBC and other mammary carcinomas [46,47]. In the available literature, the prognostic factors affecting survival are indicated as disease stage, number of lymph-node metastases, and ER and PR status [46-49]. In the present study, age, grade, metastatic status, number of lymph nodes and molecular type were identified as prognostic factors that significantly affect survival in both groups. The limited number of studies in the literature and lack of standardization in definition and classification may account for these conflicting results concerning the clinical outcome of NEBC. Similarly, some authors have investigated the possible effect of histological subtyping of NEBC according to the 2012 WHO classification on prognosis, providing different evidence. Cloyd et al. have shown that small cell carcinoma subtype is associated with worse DSS and OS compared to well-differentiated NEBC and invasive carcinoma with neuroendocrine characteristics [45]. Four (11.2%) the patients with NEBC follow up, and 252 (26.4%) the IDC/NOS patients died. The difference was statistically significant ($p=0.034$). However, the difference in terms of survival was not significant between the groups. The absence of a significant sign or symptom and the lack of standards in diagnosis brings about challenges in diagnosing NEBC. Very rarely, NEBC can demonstrate particular clinical features associated with hormonal hypersecretion [50]. In fact, anecdotal cases with symptoms secondary to ectopic secretion of calcitonin, norepinephrine or ACTH have been reported in the literature [51-53]. Similar to typical luminal subtypes of breast cancer, NEBC can metastasize to multiple sites, the most frequent being bone and liver [50,54]. In terms of stage IV disease, there was metastasis in 5 patients (13.9%) in the NEBC group and 38 (4.1%) in the comparison group. The difference was statistically significant ($p=0.005$). However, there was no significant difference with regard to location of metastasis. There is no established standard treatment protocol because there are no large clinical studies in the literature [55]. Treatment is similar to that for other conventional types of invasive breast carcinomas and depend on tumor size, location, and clinical stage [55-57]. There is a general consensus on treating small cell NEBC with chemotherapy regimens similar to these for small cell lung carcinoma [58,59]. While most NEBC treatments reported in the literature (regarding well/moderately differentiated NEBC) are similar to ductal type treatment, Anlauf et al. emphasize the importance of treatment according to NET guidelines [60]. According to both guidelines, surgery is the first-line treatment for early NEBC. The surgical procedure (breast conserving partial mastectomy, total mastectomy) depends on the location of the tumor and the clinical stage [61]. In well/moderately differentiated NEBC, surgery usually follows radiotherapy depending on tumor size and lymph node

status [1,62]. Chemotherapy is used as adjuvant therapy in cases with high risk of relapse, or as neoadjuvant therapy in cases of locally advanced or inoperable NECB [1]. Up to date, there is not sufficient data to determine the most effective chemotherapy regimen. In general, poorly differentiated or small cell NEBCs are treated with regimens containing platinum/etoposide, whereas anthracyclines and/or taxanes-based chemotherapy are used for other types of NEBCs [63]. The effectiveness of antihormonal treatment has been demonstrated in patients with hormone receptor-positive breast carcinoma. Richter-Ehrenstein et al. suggested using adjuvant antihormonal therapy as the standard treatment approach in the hormone receptor-positive NECB [55]. On the other hand, in a study by Lopez et al., all patients with NECB (n=7) received antihormonal therapy [26]. The prognostic role of HER-2 in NECB is not clear, but it can be assumed that it is analogous to other invasive breast carcinomas, meaning that anti-HER2 therapy is recommended for HER2-positive NECB. Somatostatin receptors (SSTRs) are G-protein-coupled receptors expressed by NET cells at lung, prostate and gastrointestinal level, as well as by ductal breast cancer cells. There are 5 known subtypes of SSTRs (named SSTR1 to SSTR5), with SSTR2A being the subtype most commonly expressed in breast cancer and most closely associated with luminal tumors [64]. In SSR-positive tumors, peptide receptor radionuclide treatment (PRRT), a tumor-targeted systemic radiotherapy, has been recommended as a treatment alternative in unresponsive cases [65]. In the present study, no somatostatin analogues or PRRT were administered in the treatment of patients, and they have been treated like invasive breast carcinoma. In recent years, studies have been conducted to determine new therapeutic approaches and potential targets in NEBC. In 2014, the first molecular target was identified by Ang et al., who detected a PIK3CA (phosphoinositide-3-kinase, catalytic, alpha polypeptide) mutation in 20% of the NEBCs [66]. In metastatic NECB, targeting PIK3CA by alpelisib has become a prominent therapeutic approach [67], and Vranic et al. found a TROP-2 (Trophoblast cell-surface antigen 2) protein expression in 21% of NEBC cases, which is a novel molecular target. This suggests that that a small proportion of NEBCs may be sensitive to therapy with Sacituzumab govitecan [68,69]. However, since all currently approved biomarkers of response to immune checkpoint inhibitors (PD-L1 expression, high tumor mutational burden and microsatellite instability status) have proven negative, NEBC patients are not considered ideal candidates for immunotherapy [70]. As a result, many studies have shown that these adjuvant systemic treatments, such as chemotherapy, radiotherapy and endocrine therapy, can play an important role and should be administered according to the individual characteristics of NEBC patients [55,63].

Conclusion

Primary neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast is a rare tumor, classified as a subtype of invasive breast carcinoma with particular histopathological features. Recent developments in oncology and targeted treatment plans have shown that molecular biology of tumor cells is crucial. However, there is no consensus on the prognosis of neuroendocrine tumors of the breast compared to other breast tumors. They are treated like invasive breast carcinoma due to their rarity, the absence of randomized data, and limited evidence to guide treatment selection. Despite the lack of significant survival data due to the limited number of patients in the present study, we think NEBC is a subtype that is both

histopathologically and radiologically distinct from other breast cancer subtypes, and neuroendocrine differentiation will become more predictive in the future.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

References

1. Patricia M., Liv S. , Ivar S. N. , et al. Neuron-Specific Enolase as an Immunohistochemical Marker Is Better Than Its Reputation, *Journal of Histochemistry & Cytochemistry* 2017, Vol. 65(12) 687 –703 © The Author(s) 2017
2. Lakhani SR, Ellis IO, Schnitt SJ, et al. WHO classification of tumours of the breast, vol. 4. 4th ed. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2012.
3. Woodard BH, Eisenbarth G, Wallace NR, et al. Adrenocorticotropin production by a mammary carcinoma. *Cancer*. 1981;47:1823–7.
4. Günter K., Neuroendocrine Neoplasms: Dichotomy, Origin and Classifications, *Visc Med* 2017;33:324–330, October 16, 2017
5. Modlin, I.M.; Shapiro, M.D.; Kidd, M. An analysis of rare carcinoid tumors: Clarifying these clinical conundrums. *World J. Surg.* 2005, 29, 92–101. [CrossRef]
6. Hauso, O.; Gustafson, B.I.; Kidd, M.; Waldum, H.L.; Drozdov, I.; Chan, A.K.C.; Modlin, I.M. Neuroendocrine Tumor Epidemiology Contrasting Norway and North America. *Cancer* 2008, 113, 2655–2664. [CrossRef]
7. Ogawa, H.; Nishio, A.; Satake, H.; Naganawa, S.; Imai, T.; Sawaki, M.; Yamamoto, E.; Miyata, T. Neuroendocrine tumor in the breast. *Radiat. Med.* 2008, 26, 28–32. [CrossRef]
8. Kawasaki T., Kondo T., Nakazawa T., Mochizuki K., Yamane T., Murata S., Inoue S., Tsunoda H., Katoh R. Is CD56 a specific and reliable neuroendocrine marker for discriminating between endocrine/neuroendocrine ductal carcinoma in situ and intraductal papilloma of the breast? *Pathol. Int.* 2011;61:49–51. doi: 10.1111/j.1440-1827.2010.02604.x. [PubMed] [CrossRef] [Google Scholar]
9. Lopez-Bonet E., Alonso-Ruano M., Barraza G., Vazquez-Martin A., Bernadoo L., Menendez J.A. Solid neuroendocrine breast carcinomas: Incidence, clinico-pathological features and immunohistochemical profiling. *Oncol. Rep.* 2008;20:1369–1374. doi: 10.3892/or_00000154
10. Cloyd J.M., Yang R.L., Allison K.H., Norton J.A., Hernandez-Boussard T., Wapnir I.L. Impact of histological subtype on long-term outcomes of neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast. *Breast Cancer Res. Treat.* 2014;148:637–644. doi: 10.1007/s10549-014-3207-0
11. Adams RW, Dyson P, Barthelmes L. Neuroendocrine breast tumors: breast cancer or neuroendocrine cancer presenting in the breast? *Breast*. 2014;23:120–7. doi: 10.1016/j.breast.2013.11.005.

12. Howell, S. J., Wardley, A. M., & Armstrong, A. C. (2009). Re: Ki67 Index, HER2 Status, and Prognosis of Patients With Luminal B Breast Cancer. *JNCI Journal of the National Cancer Institute*, 101(24), 1730–1730. doi:10.1093/jnci/djp390
13. Feyrter F and Hartmann G. On the carcinoid growth form of the carcinoma mammae, especially the carcinoma solidum gelatinosum mammae. *Frankf Z Pathol* 1963; 73: 24-39.
14. Cubilla AL, Woodruff JM. Primary carcinoid tumor of the breast: a report of eight patients. *Am Surg Pathol*. 1997;1:283–92.
15. Hüseyin P, Mehmet Z.S .A rare breast tumor: primary neuroendocrine carcinoma, *Turk J Surg* 2019; 35 (3): 236-240
16. Wang J, Wei B, Albarracín CT, et al. Invasive neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast: a population-based study from the surveillance, epidemiology and end results (SEER) database. *BMC Cancer*. 2014;14:147–56
17. Li Y.Q., Du F., Zhu W.J., Xu B.H. Neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast: A review of 126 cases in China. *Chin. J. Cancer*. 2017;36:45. doi: 10.1186/s40880-017-0211-x.
18. Ji-Eun K. , Ji-Young K. Primary Breast Carcinoma with Neuroendocrine Features: Imaging Features on Mammography and Ultrasonography- *J Korean Soc Radiol* 2019;80(1):129-134
19. Valentim MH, Monteiro V, Marques JC. Primary neuroendocrine breast carcinoma: a case report and literature review. *Radiol Bras*. 2014 Mar/ Abr;47(2):125–127.
20. Chang E.D., Kim K.M., Primary Neuroendocrine Tumor of the Breast: Imaging Features , *Korean J Radiol* 2013;14(3):395-399
21. Jeon C.H., Kim S.M. Clinical and Radiologic Features of Neuroendocrine Breast Carcinomas *Journal of ultrasound in medicine: official journal of the American Institute of Ultrasound in Medicine (J Ultrasound Med)* August 2014, 33(8):1511-8
22. Tsai T-H., Hsieh P-P, Metastatic primary neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast (NECB) *Journal of Cancer Research and Practice* xxx (2017) 1-5, 24 October 2017
23. Giovanella L., Marelli M. Evaluation of chromogranin A expression in serum and tissues of breast cancer patients *The International Journal of Biological Markers*, October 2001 ,Vol. 16 no. 4, pp. 268-272
24. Righi L., Sapino A. Neuroendocrine differentiation in breast cancer: Established facts and unresolved problems February 2010 *Seminars in Diagnostic Pathology* 27(1):69-76
25. Trevisi E., Salvia A.L. Neuroendocrine breast carcinoma: a rare but challenging entity, *Medical Oncology* (2020) 37:70
26. Inno A., Bogina G. Neuroendocrine Carcinoma of the Breast: Current Evidence and Future Perspectives *The Oncologist* 2016;21:28–32
27. Weigelt B, Horlings HM, Kreike B, et al. Refinement of breast cancer classification by molecular characterization of histological special types. *J Pathol*. 2008;216:141–50.

28. Bogina G, Munari E, Brunelli M, et al. Neuroendocrine differentiation in breast carcinoma: clinicopathological features and outcome. *Histopathology*. 2016;68:422–32.
29. Yavas G, Karabagli P, Araz M, et al. HER-2 positive primary solid neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast: a case report and review of the literature. *Breast Cancer*. 2015;22:432–6.
30. Gevorgyan A, Bregni G, Galli G, et al. HER2-positive neuroendocrine breast cancer: case report and review of literature. *Breast Care*. 2016;11:424–6.
31. Tajima S., Horiuchi H. Neuroendocrine tumor, well differentiated, of the breast: a relatively high-grade case in the histological subtype. *Case Reports Pathology*. 2013;2013:3.
32. Miettinen M., McCue P.A, GATA3: A Multispecific But Potentially Useful Marker in Surgical Pathology A Systematic Analysis of 2500 Epithelial and Nonepithelial Tumors, October 2013 [The American journal of surgical pathology](#) 38(1)
33. Takaku M., Grimm S.A GATA3 in Breast Cancer: Tumor Suppressor or Oncogene? 2015;16(4):163-8
34. Asch-Kendrick R, Cimino-Mathews A. The role of GATA3 in breast carcinomas: a review, *Hum Pathol*. 2016 Feb;48:37-47
35. Burçin Ö., Kayser A. Primary Neuroendocrine Neoplasms of the Breast: Case Series and Literature Review, *Cancers* 2020, 12(3), 733
36. Alkaied H., Harris K. Primary neuroendocrine breast cancer, how much do we know so far? *Medical Oncology* 29, pages 2613–2618 (2012)
37. Miremadi A, Pinder SE, Lee AH, et al. Neuroendocrine differentiation and prognosis in breast adenocarcinoma. *Histopathology*. 2002;40:215–22.
38. Makretsov N, Gilks CB, Coldman AJ, et al. Tissue microarray analysis of neuroendocrine differentiation and its prognostic significance in breast cancer. *Hum Pathol*. 2003;34:1001–8.
39. van Krimpen C, Elferink A, Broodman CA, et al. The prognostic influence of neuroendocrine differentiation in breast cancer: results of a long-term follow-up study. *Breast*. 2004;13(4):329–33.
40. Rovera F, Masciocchi P, Coglitore A, et al. Neuroendocrine carcinomas of the breast. *Int J Surg*. 2008;6(Suppl. 1):S113–S11515.
41. Rovera F, Lavazza M. Neuroendocrine breast cancer: retrospective analysis of 96 patients and review of literature, *International Journal of Surgery* (2013)11(S1), S79–S83
42. Wei B, Ding T, Xing Y, et al. Invasive neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast: a distinctive subtype of aggressive mammary carcinoma. *Cancer*. 2010;116:4463–73.
43. Tian Z, Wei B, Tang F, et al. Prognostic significance of tumor grading and staging in mammary carcinomas with neuroendocrine differentiation. *Hum Pathol*. 2011;42:1169–77.
44. Zhang Y, Chen Z, Bao Y, et al. Invasive neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast: a prognostic research of 107 Chinese patients. *Neoplasma*. 2013;60:215–22
45. Roininen N, Takala S, Haapasaari K-M, et al. Primary neuroendocrine breast carcinomas are associated with poor local control despite favourable biological profile: a retrospective clinical study. *BMC Cancer*. 2017;17:72.

46. Patel G, Bipte S. Updates in primary neuroendocrine breast carcinoma – A case report and review of literature. *J Can Res Ther* 2020;16:1528-31.
47. Marinova L, Malinova D. Primary Neuroendocrine Carcinoma of the Breast: Histopathological Criteria, Prognostic Factors, and Review of the Literature, Hindawi Publishing Corporation Volume 2016, Article ID 6762085, 4 pages
48. Soerjomataram I., Louwman MWJ. An overview of prognostic factors for long-term survivors of breast cancer, *Breast Cancer Res Treat* (2008) 107:309–330
49. Singh DK., Mandal A. The prognostic value of lymph node ratio in survival of non-metastatic breast carcinoma patients *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 184, pages 839–848 (2020)
50. Coombes RC., Easty GC. Secretion of immunoreactive calcitonin by human breast carcinomas. *British Medical Journal*, 1975, 4, 197-199
51. Kaneko H, Hojo H, Ishikawa S, et al. Norepinephrine-producing tumors of bilateral breasts: a case report. *Cancer*. 1978;41:2002–7.
52. Woodard BH, Eisenbarth G, Wallace NR, et al. Adrenocorticotropin production by a mammary carcinoma. *Cancer*. 1981;47:1823–7.
53. Nesland JM, Holm R. Neuroendocrine differentiation in breast lesions, *Pathol Res Pract*. 1988 Apr;183(2):214-21
54. Manes K., Delis S. Neuroendocrine breast carcinoma metastatic to the liver: Report of a case and review of the literature, *International Journal of Surgery Case Reports* 5 (2014) 540–543
55. Pagano M, Asensio SN, Zanelli F, et al. Is there a role for hormonal therapy in neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast? A Paradigmatic case report. *Clin Breast Cancer*. 2014;14(5):e99–e101.
56. Buttar A, Mittal K, Khan A, et al. Effective role of hormonal therapy in metastatic primary neuroendocrine breast carcinoma. *Clin Breast Cancer*. 2011;11:342–5.
57. Angarita FA, Rodríguez JL, Meek E, et al. Locally advanced primary neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast: case report and review of the literature. *World J Surg Oncol*. 2013;11:128–38.
58. Roininen N, Takala S, Haapasaari K-M, et al. Primary neuroendocrine breast carcinomas are associated with poor local control despite favourable biological profile: a retrospective clinical study. *BMC Cancer*. 2017;17:72.
59. Nicoletti S, Papi M, Drudi F, et al. Small cell neuroendocrine tumor of the breast in a 40 year-old woman: a case report. *J Med Case Rep*. 2010;4:201.
60. Anlauf M, Neumann M. Neuroendocrine neoplasms of the breast *Pathologe*. 2015 May;36(3):261-70
61. Thiessen FEF, Tjalma WA. Breast reconstruction after breast conservation therapy for breast cancer, *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2018 Nov;230:233-238. doi: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2018.03.049. Epub 2018 Mar 27.
62. Yildirim Y., Elagoz S., Koyuncu A., Aydin C., Karadayi K. Management of neuroendocrine carcinomas of the breast: A rare entity. *Oncol. Lett*. 2011;2:887–890. doi: 10.3892/ol.2011.320.

63. Wei X, Chen C, Xi D, et al. A case of primary neuroendocrine breast carcinoma that responded to neo-adjuvant chemotherapy. *Front Med*. 2015;9:112–116.
64. Frati A, Rouzier R, Lesieur B, et al. Expression of somatostatin type-2 and -4 receptor and correlation with histological type in breast cancer. *Anticancer Res*. 2014;34:3997–4003.
65. Fani M, Maecke HR, Okarvi SM. Radiolabeled peptides: Valuable tools for the detection and treatment of cancer. *Theranostics*. 2012;2:481–501. doi: 10.7150/thno.4024.
66. Ang D, Ballard M, Beadling C, et al. Novel mutations in neuroendocrine carcinoma of the breast: Possible therapeutic targets. *Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol*. 2015;23:97–103
67. André F, Ciruelos E, Rubovszky G, et al. Alpelisib for PIK3CA mutated, hormone receptor–positive advanced breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380:1929–1940.
68. Vranic S, Palazzo J, Sanati S, et al. Potential novel therapy targets in neuroendocrine carcinomas of the breast. *Clin Breast Cancer*. 2019;19(2):131–136.
69. Bardia A, Mayer IA, Diamond JR, et al. Efficacy and safety of anti-trop-2 antibody drug conjugate sacituzumab govitecan (IMMU-132) in heavily pretreated patients with metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2017;35:2141–2148
70. McCullar B, Pandey M, Yaghmour G, et al. Genomic landscape of small cell carcinoma of the breast contrasted to small cell carcinoma of the lung. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2016;158:195–202.