

Updates In The Modalities Of Gastrointestinal Cancers

Screening Programs

Essay

Submitted for the partial fulfillment of Master
Degree in Tropical medicine

Presented by

Dr. Maha Hussein Mohammed

M.B.,B.Ch

Supervised by

Dr. Iman Ramzy

Professor of Tropical medicine

Faculty of Medicine- Cairo University

Dr. Mohammed Mahmoud Nabeel

Lecturer of Tropical medicine

Faculty of Medicine

Cairo University

Dr. Hanan Abd Elhafez

Lecturer of Tropical medicine

Faculty of Medicine

Cairo University

Faculty of Medicine

Cairo University

2009

Acknowledgement

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and highest thankful prayers to dearest GOD who helped me with his kindness, mercy, and a given power to accomplish my whole work.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my dear professor ***Prof. DR. Iman Ramzy***, Professor of Endemic Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, for her gracious supervision, valuable guidance, generous help, tremendous efforts and remarkable patience in improving this work making it such a valuable piece of research.

I am deeply affected by her noble character, perfection, caring, and consideration, and I am very honored to have her as my supervisor.

My deepest appreciation goes to ***DR. Mohammed Mahmoud***, lecturer of Endemic Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, for his wisdom filled guidance, strict supervision and precious advices who helped me to go on the right course all the way in this work from its early beginning.

I would also like to give all the thanks to ***DR. Hanan Abd Elhafez*** lecturer of Tropical Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Cairo University, the person whom I am in debt to and who cared about every single detail written down in this work. It was impossible for me to finish this work without her wise instructions and valuable: advices, and for that I will be ever grateful.

Finally, words could not describe my appreciation to my dearest family who gave me love and support all my way through.

Abstract

Key words: Gastrointestinal cancers, screening programs, endoscopic surveillance.

Gastrointestinal cancers comprise one of the most rising incidence cancers worldwide. Owing to their late clinical presentation, the prognosis of these malignancies has a very grave outcome. From this piece of information came the thought of introducing a mass screening programs to identify true high risk population for the development of such cancers and those with precancerous lesions, and then to enroll them into an intensified surveillance protocol with well defined separation intervals to monitor any neoplastic transformation in these population.

Endoscopic surveillance modalities have been always regarded as the golden surveillance measures for these patients, and the newer endoscopic modalities such as chromoendoscopy, autofluorescence endoscopy, confocal endomicroscopy, and narrow band imaging, have largely replaced conventional esophagogastroduodenoscopy (EGD), and colonoscopy. But since most of these measures are invasive, costly, and may not be applicable, another non invasive screening and surveillance protocol has emerged which relies mainly upon serum biomarkers for different gastrointestinal cancers or genetic susceptibility tests. However , neither of these tools have proven the same or even the near efficacy and accuracy of endoscopic measures, and that lead to the invention of non invasive endoscopic modalities such as optical coherence tomography (OCT), FICE system, and virtual colonoscopy

Contents

List of Tables.....	II
List of Figures.....	III
List of Pictures.....	V
Medical abbreviations.....	VI
<i>Introduction and aim of work.....</i>	1
<i>Cancer esophagus.....</i>	4
<i>Cancer stomach.....</i>	44
<i>Small intestinal neoplasia.....</i>	86
<i>Colorectal cancer.....</i>	122
<i>Anal cancer.....</i>	171
<i>Summary.....</i>	174
<i>Conclusion and recommendations.....</i>	176
<i>References.....</i>	178
<i>Arabic summary.....</i>	211

List of Tables

<i>No</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table 1: Symptoms of GERD.....	7
Table 2: Guideline for endoscopic surveillance for BE according to ACG.	24
Table 3: Summary of recommendations for surveillance endoscopies in BE.	25
Table 4: Endoscopic modalities for surveillance protocol for BE.....	42
Table 5: Non invasive (non endoscopic) modalities for surveillance for BE	43
Table 6: Main differences between intestinal and diffuse type GC.....	46
Table 7: Spigelman scoring for duodenal polyps surveillance.....	103
Table 8: Management protocol by spigelman stage.....	103
Table 9: Hereditary CRC syndromes, CRC risk, and associated cancers....	141
Table 10: Modified Kudo criteria for the classification of colorectal crypts.	158

List of Pictures

NO	Page
Pic 1: HGD with light image and FICE system.....	21
Pic 2: chromoendoscopy (logol's solution) of squamous HGD.....	28
Pic 3: Chromoendoscopy (methylene blue) of HGD in a patient with BE....	29
Pic 4: BE with EGD, indigo carmine chromoendoscopy, acetic acid, NBI...	30
Pic 5: Autofluorescence image of small area of HGD in BE.....	32
Pic 6: Short segment BE detected by NBI.....	33
Pic 7: SCC detected by white light endoscopy, Lugol's solution, and NBI...	33
Pic 8: Doppler OCT of normal esophagus and non-dysplastic BE.....	40
Pic 9: Endoscopic resection of early gastric cancer.....	59
Pic 10: EGC shown by white-light endoscopy and chromoendoscopy.....	72
Pic 11: Elevated EGC before and after staining with indigo carmine	72
Pic 12: A FICE system image of gastric cancer.....	74
Pic 13: FICE score for color changes between normal mucosa and cancer....	74
Pic 14: GIST mass in the ileum.....	81
Pic 15: Large ampullary adenoma	88
Pic 16: Crohn's disease	89
Pic 17: Duodenal polyps	92
Pic 18: Ileoanal pouch polyps	93
Pic 19: Capsule endoscopy	100
Pic 20: DBE, showing a large submucosal tumor with an ulcer	101
Pic 21: DBE, showing a jejunal polypoid lesion missed by CE	102

Pic 22: Gross morphology of colorectal adenocarcinoma	123
Pic 23 Tubular and villous adenomas	128
Pic 24 Dysplasia associated lesion DALM in a patient with chronic UC .	130
Pic 25: Virtual colonoscopy	153
Pic 26: Early CRC before and after indigo carmine staining	159
Pic 27: chromoendoscopy with methylene blue for vilous adenoma ..	159
Pic 28 : Confocal endomicroscopy	161
Pic 29: Magnifying NBI for a tubular adenoma	163

List of Figures

No	Page
Fig 1: Pathogenesis of Barrett's progression to adenocarcinoma	13
Fig 2: Management protocol for HGD	22
Fig 3: Serological biomarkers for atrophic gastritis	67
Fig 4: Algorithm for screening protocol for gastric cancer	77
Fig 5: Algorithm for GIST screening	85
Fig 6: Algorithm for the screening protocol for intestinal adenocarcinoma	106
Fig 7: Algorithm for CRC screening	170

Introduction

Gastrointestinal malignancies compromise more than 40% of total human malignancies with the incidence of gastric cancer for instance rising to be the third most common cancer affecting males (after lung and prostate) and the fifth most common cancer affecting females (after breast, cervical, large bowel, and thyroid) cancers (*Ferlay et al., 2004*).

Gastrointestinal cancers are also responsible for over 60% of cancer related mortality with colorectal cancer for example being the third most common cause of cancer death in both genders after prostate and breast cancers. The latter information was not just related to the multi-factorial causation in the etiology of gastrointestinal malignancies involving many adverse environmental and negative life style habits which might also obstruct their treatment course, but also due to the late presentation of the disease at the time of diagnosis and that might carry a very poor prognosis regarding operability and curative modalities (*Levin et al., 2008*).

Recently, most of the researches concerned with the curative treatment modalities of gastrointestinal cancers are focusing on the importance of their prevention by detection of their preneoplastic lesions and earliest discovery of any neoplastic transformation in which the tumor is highly curable (*Levin et al., 2008*).

Early diagnosis of gastrointestinal cancers has been an obstacle for many years owing to their late clinical presentation and reliance on complex radiological investigations for their diagnosis that may even progress to an open laparotomy to achieve a true diagnosis and staging. From here came the thought of introducing a reliable screening and surveillance protocol that would enable the physician to

diagnose the tumors in the earliest time and with the simplest means (*Chiu et al., 2000*).

By definition; a **screening program** involves the assessment of an asymptomatic population to determine whether they can be classified as a high risk or not for a cancer. The purpose of a screening program is to identify the patients at a disease stage in which treatment offers a substantial advantage over that needed when the disease becomes clinically apparent (*Kenneth and Wang, 2005*).

A **surveillance program** entails periodic examination of individual patients who have already been identified as having a high risk for cancer development. The purpose of surveillance also is to identify cancer at an early stage to permit curative therapy (*Kenneth and Wang, 2005*).

Screening programs have already been suggested for several types of gastrointestinal malignancies (e.g. esophageal, gastric, and colorectal cancers) in which middle and old age individuals with long standing preneoplastic illness but still asymptomatic or negative for any true sign of malignancy, these individuals are enrolled in a screening program to decide whether they are a true high risk or not for cancer and then become enrolled into the appropriate surveillance protocol (*Greenberger et al., 2009*).

However, such screening and surveillance programs have been faced by many debates regarding its cost effectiveness and the availability of the tools required for its' application, but all these debates couldn't deny its grave importance for early tumor detection (*Fennerty, 2005*).

From this point of view, multiple scenarios for the ideal screening program have been proposed by many high incidence countries to achieve the maximum

benefit from such a program which relay on: earliest diagnosis with the least invasion and the most applicable techniques. Unfortunately, none of the current screening tools has achieved such benefit; however, advances in endoscopic measures as well as non invasive serum tests have crossed along distance in the way to achieve higher accuracy with minimal invasion (*Leung et al., 2008*).

Aim of work

In this essay, an overview on the epidemiology of the most common and important gastrointestinal malignancies will be discussed with a particular focus upon lifestyle and pathological risk factors for these cancers and precancerous lesions that may predispose for such cancers. This is followed by an overview over the latest modalities of screening programs for different types of gastrointestinal malignancies that provide the privilege of their earliest detection and to be discussed regarding sensitivity, specificity, availability and cost effectiveness coming out finally to an algorithm explaining when to use each screening method for a given cancer at a time that best match each patient criteria.

Chapter I

CANCER ESOPHAGUS

Incidence:

The incidence of esophageal cancers has been rising steadily since the late 1970's up to this day on and became considered by some authors as the most rapidly rising incidence of all cancers in the world (*Zhang et al., 2009*).

Among the two major histological types of esophageal cancers: esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC) and squamous cell carcinoma (SCC); the major change in incidence occurred in EAC compared with a relative stable incidence of SCC (*Dibaise, 2008*). The reason for this change is mainly the diagnosis of a very large number of patients with gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD) becoming complicated by Barrett's esophagus (BE) the major predisposing factor for EAC (*Pace et al., 2007*).

Historically, SCC was the predominant histological type, but the incidence of EAC has raised 3.5 folds over the last quarter century accounting from 16 % in mid Eighties to over 56% of all diagnosed esophageal cancer cases and EAC has raised from being a rare tumor to one of the top 15 cancers affecting white males (*Deresa et al., 2008*). Males are often affected more than females (ratio 3:1) and Caucasians are more affected than black Africans (4:1) (*Hay, 2006*).

Risk factors:

A) Squamous cell carcinoma (SCC):

Life style risk factors:

These factors induce chronic epithelial irritation which increases cellular mitotic activity followed by metaplasia, dysplasia and carcinoma. They include:

- 1. Smoking:** There is 5 folds increase in risk of SCC in smokers versus non smokers, and 10 folds increase in risk in heavy smokers versus non smokers (*Freedman et al., 2007*).
- 2. Alcohol:** There is 20-50 folds increase in risk of SCC in heavy drinkers versus non drinkers (*Freedman et al., 2007*).
- 3. Diet:** Hot and spicy foods, dietary toxins [Nitrosamines in pickled vegetable, betel nut chewing, barbecued food and salted fish, and mycotoxins in moldy foods (*Iijima et al., 2002*).
- 4. Plummer Vinson syndrome,** rings and strictures (*Hay, 2006*).

Pathological risk factors:

- 1. Achalesia:** The risk of cancer in achalesa is about 10-30 folds greater than that in the general population. Cancer occurs 10-20 years earlier (mean age 45) than in patients without achalesia and typically occurs about 20 years after the diagnosis of achlesia has been mad. The esophageal malignancy is SCC in about 95% of cases (*Dibaise, 2008*).
- 2. Tylosis:** this rare condition presents with hyperkeratosis of the skin on the palms and soles, and papilloma of the esophagus that progress to SCC in virtually 100% of cases (*Dibaise, 2008*).

B) Esophageal adenocarcinoma (EAC):

Life style risk factors:

Obesity: Multiple case control studies support the rule of obesity as a major risk factor for EAC via increasing the intra gastric pressure which affects gastroesophageal pressure gradient and that causes increase in transient lower esophageal sphincter relaxation (TLESR) and esophageal acid exposure predisposing to the occurrence of GERD. However, precise biological mechanisms underlying the reported associations between increased body mass, GERD, and EAC have yet to be defined (*El-Serag, 2008*).

Pathological risk factors:

1- Gastroesophageal reflux disease (GERD):

Definition:

Gastro-esophageal reflux is the retrograde movement of gastric contents into the esophagus. It is the normal physiological movement of gastric contents in to the esophagus. It's a normal physiological event that occurs particularly after eating. GERD is an abnormal degree of gastroesophageal reflux that exposes the patient to the risk of complications (BE, ulcerative esophagitis, and carcinoma) or symptoms that impair wellbeing or quality of life (*Gotley, 2006*).

Etiology:

Most gastro-esophageal reflux is due to transient relaxations of the lower esophageal sphincter, but most patients with severe GERD have resting basal lower esophageal sphincter hypotension as the principal cause of excessive reflux (*Gotley, 2006*). The contribution of a co-existent hiatus hernia does not cause reflux via lower esophageal sphincter hypotension by mechanical factors (*Van Herwarden et al., 2000*).

Pathogenesis of which GERD induces adenocarcinoma:

GERD results in acute mucosal injury (esophagitis), thereby promoting cellular proliferation and inducing specialized columnar metaplasia of the normal squamous epithelium lining the esophagus (Barrett epithelium) (*Williams et al., 2006*). This is followed by the development of dysplasia which is regarded as the precursor of invasive cancer, and high grade dysplasia (HGD) in Barrett epithelium is frequently associated with esophageal adenocarcinoma (*Williams et al., 2006*).

Clinical presentation of GERD:

- a. **Typical symptoms:** Heartburn and regurgitation are the main symptoms, but 50% of patients with sever GERD also have intermittent dysphagia (*Talwar and De Caestecker, 2007*). Excessive salivation due to exposure of the esophagus to acid “water brush” is also a common symptom (*Gotley, 2006*).
- b. **A typical symptoms:** About 10% o patients present with chest pain that may even mimic ischemic heart pain (*Talwar and De Caestecker, 2007*). Another group may present with cough and other laryngeal symptoms (e.g. dysphonia) (*Gotley, 2006*).

<i>Typical symptoms</i>	<i>A typical symptom</i>	<i>Alarm symptom</i>
Heart burn	Flatulence	Chest pain
regurgitation	cough	Nausea, dyspepsia
Water brush	Dysphonia	Bloting, Belching
Odynophagia	Sorethroat	Nocturnal shocking
Dysphagia		Weight loss

Table 1: symptoms of GERD (*Gotley, 2006*).