Clinicopathological spectrum of renal neuroendocrine neoplasms.

Roger Burdett*

Department of Nephrology, University of Houston, Texas United States.

Introduction

Renal Neuroendocrine Neoplasms (NENs) are a rare subset of tumors originating from the kidney, characterized by their neuroendocrine differentiation. These tumors can range from well-differentiated, low-grade neoplasms to poorly differentiated, high-grade malignancies. Given their rarity and diverse presentation, a thorough understanding of their cytopathology and clinicopathological correlation is crucial for accurate diagnosis and management [1].

Cytopathologically, renal NENs exhibit distinctive features that aid in their identification. Fine-Needle Aspiration (FNA) cytology is a minimally invasive technique frequently used to evaluate these tumors. Cytological smears typically reveal cohesive clusters of cells with scant cytoplasm and stippled "salt-and-pepper" chromatin [2]. The presence of rosettes, pseudorosettes, and nuclear molding are characteristic findings. Immunocytochemical staining is essential for confirming the neuroendocrine nature of the cells, with markers such as chromogranin A, synaptophysin, and CD56 being positive. The Ki-67 proliferation index is also assessed to determine the tumour's grade and potential aggressiveness [3].

Histopathologically, renal NENs are classified based on their differentiation and proliferative activity into well-differentiated neuroendocrine tumors (NETs) and poorly differentiated Neuroendocrine Carcinomas (NECs). Well-differentiated NETs exhibit organoid nesting, trabecular patterns, and ribbon-like structures [4]. The cells have uniform round nuclei with finely granular chromatin and inconspicuous nucleoli. In contrast, NECs demonstrate a more disorganized architecture with marked pleomorphism, increased mitotic activity, and areas of necrosis. Small cell and large cell variants of NECs are identified based on the cell morphology [5].

The clinical presentation of renal NENs varies, often leading to delayed diagnosis. Patients may present with non-specific symptoms such as flank pain, hematuria, or a palpable abdominal mass. Some cases are discovered incidentally during imaging studies for unrelated conditions [6]. Imaging modalities such as ultrasound, computed tomography (CT), and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are crucial for tumor localization and staging. Functional imaging using positron emission tomography (PET) with somatostatin receptor analogs (e.g., Ga-68 DOTATATE PET/CT) can provide additional information regarding the tumor' s neuroendocrine activity [7].

The correlation of cytopathological findings with clinical and radiological data is pivotal in formulating a comprehensive diagnosis. For instance, a well-differentiated NET on cytology with low Ki-67 index correlates with indolent behavior and favorable prognosis, whereas a poorly differentiated NEC with high Ki-67 index suggests aggressive disease with a poorer outcome. Surgical resection remains the primary treatment for localized renal NENs, with nephron-sparing surgery preferred in cases of well-differentiated NETs. Advanced or metastatic disease may require a multimodal approach including surgery, systemic therapy (e.g., somatostatin analogs, peptide receptor radionuclide therapy), and targeted treatments [8].

Advances in molecular pathology have provided deeper insights into the genetic alterations associated with renal NENs. Mutations in genes such as MEN1, DAXX, ATRX, and TSC2 have been identified in well-differentiated NETs. Poorly differentiated NECs often harbour mutations in TP53 and RB1, akin to other high-grade neuroendocrine carcinomas. Understanding these genetic alterations not only aids in diagnosis but also opens avenues for targeted therapies and personalized medicine [9].

Prognostic factors for renal NENs include tumor size, grade, stage, and Ki-67 proliferation index. Well-differentiated NETs generally have a better prognosis compared to poorly differentiated NECs. The presence of metastasis, particularly to the liver, lymph nodes, and bones, significantly impacts survival outcomes. Regular follow-up with imaging and biochemical markers is essential for early detection of recurrence or progression. Serum chromogranin A levels can serve as a useful biomarker for monitoring disease activity [10].

Conclusion

Renal Neuroendocrine Neoplasms are a complex and heterogeneous group of tumors with distinct cytopathological features and varied clinical presentations. Accurate diagnosis requires a combination of cytological, histopathological, and molecular assessments. The integration of these findings with clinical and radiological data is essential for appropriate management and prognostication. Advances in molecular pathology hold promise for targeted therapies, improving outcomes for patients with these rare neoplasms. Continued research and collaborative efforts are needed to enhance our understanding and treatment of renal NENs.

***Correspondence to:** Roger Burdett**,** Department of Nephrology, University of Houston, Texas United States, E-mail: gerburdett@yahoo.com

***Received:** 06-June-2024, Manuscript No. AACPLM-24-141970; **Editor assigned:** 08-June-2024, PreQC No. AACPLM-24-141970 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 22-June-2024, QC No AACPLM-24-141970; **Revised:** 26-June-2024, Manuscript No. AACPLM -24-141970 (R); **Published:** 29-June-2024, DOI: 10.35841/aacplm-6.3.214*

***Citation:** Burdett R. Clinicopathological Spectrum of Renal Neuroendocrine Neoplasms. J Clin Path Lab Med. 2024;6(3):214.*

References

1. Modica R, Liccardi A, Minotta R, et al. Therapeutic strategies for patients with neuroendocrine neoplasms: current perspectives. Expert Review of Endocrinol Metab. 2022;17(5):389-403.
2. Shehabeldin AN, Ro JY. Neuroendocrine tumors of genitourinary tract: recent advances .Ann Diagn Pathol. 2019;42:48-58.
3. Maxwell JE, Howe JR. Imaging in neuroendocrine tumors: an update for the clinician. Int. J. Endocr. Oncol. 2015;2(2):159-68.
4. Paisey SA, Weerasuriya S, Palmer K, et al. Primary renal neuroendocrine neoplasms: A systematic literature review, report of four local cases, and original survival analysis of 63 patients from a national registry 2012–2018. J Neuroendocrinol. 2022;34(12):e13215.
5. Yao JC, Hassan M, Phan A, et al. One hundred years after "carcinoid": epidemiology of and prognostic factors for neuroendocrine tumors in 35,825 cases in the United States. J Clin Oncol. 2008;26(18):3063-72.
6. Bocchini M, Nicolini F, Severi S, et al. Biomarkers for pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms (PanNENs) management—an updated review. Front Oncol. 2020;10:831..
7. Travis WD. Pathology and diagnosis of neuroendocrine tumors: lung neuroendocrine. Thorac. Surg. Clin. 2014;24(3):257-66.
8. Lopes MB. The 2017 World Health Organization classification of tumors of the pituitary gland: a summary. Acta Neuropathol. 2017;134:521-35.
9. Chakrabarti J, Pandey R, Churko JM, et al. Development of human pituitary neuroendocrine tumor organoids to facilitate effective targeted treatments of Cushing's disease. Cells. 2022;11(21):3344.
10. Eriksson B, Klöppel G, Krenning E, et al. Consensus guidelines for the management of patients with digestive neuroendocrine tumors–well-differentiated jejunal-ileal tumor/carcinoma. Neuroendocrinol. 2008;87(1):8-19.

Citation: *Burdett R. Clinicopathological Spectrum of Renal Neuroendocrine Neoplasms. J Clin Path Lab Med. 2024;6(3):214.*