



Pituitary neuroendocrine tumors (PitNETs): nomenclature evolution, not clinical revolution

Sylvia L. Asa¹ · Sofia Asioli² · Suheyla Bozkurt³ · Olivera Casar-Borota⁴ · Laura Chinezu⁵ · Nil Comunoglu⁶ · Giulia Cossu⁷ · Michael Cusimano⁸ · Etienne Delgrange⁹ · Peter Earls¹⁰ · Shereen Ezzat⁸ · Nurperi Gazioglu⁶ · Ashley Grossman¹¹ · Federica Guaraldi² · Richard A. Hickman¹² · Hidetoshi Ikeda¹³ · Marie-Lise Jaffrain-Rea¹⁴ · Niki Karavitaki¹⁵ · Ivana Kraljević¹⁶ · Stefano La Rosa⁷ · Emilija Manojlović-Gačić¹⁷ · Niki Maartens¹⁸ · Ian E. McCutcheon¹⁹ · Mahmoud Messerer⁷ · Ozgur Mete⁸ · Hiroshi Nishioka²⁰ · Buge Oz²¹ · Sara Pakbaz⁸ · Melike Pekmezci²² · Arie Perry²² · Lilla Reiniger²³ · Federico Roncaroli²⁴ · Wolfgang Saeger²⁵ · Figen Söylemezoğlu²⁶ · Osamu Tachibana²⁷ · Jacqueline Trouillas²⁸ · John Turchini²⁹ · Silvia Uccella³⁰ · Chiara Villa³¹ · Shozo Yamada²⁰ · Sema Yarman³²

Published online: 13 December 2019
© Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, part of Springer Nature 2019

Dear Editor,

We read with interest “A tale of pituitary adenomas: to NET or not to NET” published in *Pituitary* [1]. The members of the International Pituitary Pathology Club (IPPC) who proposed the term “pituitary neuroendocrine tumor” (PitNET) [2] are Pathologists, Endocrinologists and Neurosurgeons who diagnose and treat patients with pituitary diseases. We proposed this change to address problems that result from classification of adenohypophysial-cell tumors as “adenomas”. While new terminology generates challenges and may have unforeseen implications, it is our opinion that change is appropriate when there is a clinicopathological basis. Here we address a number of issues raised by Ho et al.

Ho et al. suggest that the term tumor “embeds a sinister tone to neutral nomenclature”. In fact, tumors may be benign or malignant; the term itself has no sinister connotation. Perhaps the concern is rather about “neuroendocrine tumor”, which implies at least some potential for aggressive behavior. This is true in the pituitary, an argument in favor of the term PitNET. The use of “tumor” alone remains non-specific, and includes other pituitary tumors that are not of adenohypophysial-cell derivation.

The Pituitary Society endorses the term “adenoma”, because these tumors are “benign” in about 99.9% of cases. The Merriam–Webster dictionary defines benign as “of a

mild type or character that does not threaten health or life”, as “having no significant effect”. The Oxford Medical Dictionary defines “benign” as “a tumour that does not invade and destroy the tissue in which it originates”, a “disorder or condition that does not produce harmful effects”. We respectfully emphasize that pituitary adenohypophysial-cell tumors may invade and destroy the tissue in which they originate as well as adjacent tissues, and have significant impact on patients’ health and quality of life. It should also be noted that “malignant” is not restricted to neoplasms that metastasize; it also applies to tumors that invade adjacent structures.

The incidence of aggressive pituitary tumors is not entirely clear but is significantly higher than the 0.1% suggested by the Pituitary Society. Population studies indicate that 40–56% of patients with clinically-diagnosed adenohypophysial-cell tumors require surgery [3, 4], and 23% of those have persistent disease that cannot be cured by surgery [5]. Non-functioning tumors that fail primary treatment have > 60% risk of progression at 5 years [6]. The IPPC proposal addresses the frustration of patients who have persistent pituitary tumors requiring expensive, life-long medical treatment and sometimes radiation, therapies that may not be readily available for patients with a “benign” disorder”. The PitNET terminology avoids this clinical contradiction as well as that encountered when an “adenoma” develops metastasis.

✉ Sylvia L. Asa
Pathlady01@gmail.com

The World Health Organization has proposed the term “neuroendocrine neoplasm” to describe neuroendocrine proliferations throughout the body [7] and distinguishes aggressive undifferentiated “neuroendocrine carcinoma” (NEC) from well-differentiated, generally low grade “neuroendocrine tumor” (NET). Our proposal for PitNET is consistent with this classification.

Interestingly, Ho et al. argue that “replacing “adenoma” with “tumor” creates additional ambiguity because it implies that pituitary adenomas do not necessarily originate from the glandular structures of epithelial tissues”. Contemporary understanding of NETs indicates that most derive from specialized neuroendocrine cells of glandular epithelium [7]. While other groups, including the European Taskforce on Endocrine Cancers, classify tumors of the pituitary, adrenal cortex, thyroid and parathyroid glands as separate from ‘neuroendocrine’, in our view this is incorrect. The pituitary and parathyroid glands are composed of epithelial cells whose main function (unlike thyroid follicular epithelium and adrenal cortical steroidogenic cells) is uptake of amines for processing into peptide hormones that are packaged into double membrane-bound “neurosecretory” granules where they are stored until they are secreted. These functional and morphological features, along with expression of neuroendocrine biomarkers such as chromogranins and somatostatin receptors, support the view that the hormone-secreting cells of the adenohypophysis are indeed neuroendocrine, as proposed many years ago by Ferrand, LeDouarin, Takor-Takor and Pearse.

We maintain that it is appropriate to define primary tumors of adenohypophysial cells as PitNETs. We emphasise that all NETs have variable clinico-pathologic characteristics, and that PitNETs, like other NETs, are heterogeneous in morphology, hormone production, proliferation and invasive behavior. In this respect, the proposed term “tumor” best reflects the heterogeneity and clinical spectrum of primary adenohypophysial neoplasms.

The change in terminology does not imply a change in the clinical responsibilities of members of the multidisciplinary care team that deals with patients. Rather, the change emphasises the need for an integrated approach that has evolved for all NETs, including the use of current and novel therapeutic paradigms that are common to these tumors at all sites.

Funding This statement received no funding.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest All authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.


Ethical approval This article does not contain any studies with human participants or animals performed by any of the authors.

References

1. Ho KKY, Fleseriu M, Wass J, van der Lely A, Barkan A, Giustina A, Casanueva FF, Heaney AP, Biermasz N, Strasburger C, Melmed S (2019) A tale of pituitary adenomas: to NET or not to NET: Pituitary Society position statement. *Pituitary* 22(6):569–573
2. Asa SL, Casar-Borota O, Chanson P, Delgrange E, Earls P, Ezzat S, Grossman A, Ikeda H, Inoshita N, Karavitaki N, Korbonits M, Laws ER Jr, Lopes MB, Maartens N, McCutcheon IE, Mete O, Nishioka H, Raverot G, Roncaroli F, Saeger W, Syro LV, Vasiljevic A, Villa C, Wierinckx A, Trouillas J (2017) From pituitary adenoma to pituitary neuroendocrine tumor (PitNET): an International Pituitary Pathology Club proposal. *Endocr Relat Cancer* 24(4):C5–C8
3. Tjornstrand A, Gunnarsson K, Evert M, Holmberg E, Ragnarsson O, Rosen T, Nystrom HF (2014) The incidence rate of pituitary adenomas in western Sweden for the period 2001–2011. *Eur J Endocrinol* 171:519–526
4. Daly AF, Rixhon M, Adam C, Dempegioti A, Tichmirowa MA, Beckers A (2006) High prevalence of pituitary adenomas: a cross-sectional study in the province of Liege, Belgium. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 91:4769–4775
5. Asioli S, Righi A, Iommi M, Baldovini C, Ambrosi F, Guaraldi F, Zoli M, Mazzatenta D, Faustini-Fustini M, Rucci P, Giannini C, Foschini MP (2019) Validation of a clinicopathological score for the prediction of post-surgical evolution of pituitary adenoma: retrospective analysis on 566 patients from a tertiary care centre. *Eur J Endocrinol* 180:127–134
6. Tampourlou M, Ntali G, Ahmed S, Arlt W, Ayuk J, Byrne JV, Chavda S, Cudlip S, Gittoes N, Grossman A, Mitchell R, O’Reilly MW, Paluzzi A, Toogood A, Wass JAH, Karavitaki N (2017) Outcome of nonfunctioning pituitary adenomas that regrow after primary treatment: a study from two large UK centers. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 102(6):1889–1897
7. Rindi G, Klimstra DS, Abedi-Ardekani B, Asa SL, Bosman FT, Brambilla E, Busam KJ, de Krijger RR, Dietel M, El-Naggar AK, Fernandez-Cuesta L, Kloppel G, McCluggage WG, Moch H, Ohgaki H, Rakha EA, Reed NS, Rous BA, Sasano H, Scarpa A, Scoazec JY, Travis WD, Tallini G, Trouillas J, van Krieken JH, Cree IA (2018) A common classification framework for neuroendocrine neoplasms: an International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) and World Health Organization (WHO) Expert Consensus proposal. *Mod Pathol* 31(12):1770–1786

Publisher’s Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Affiliations

Sylvia L. Asa¹  · Sofia Asioli² · Suheyly Bozkurt³ · Olivera Casar-Borota⁴ · Laura Chinezu⁵ · Nil Comunoglu⁶ · Giulia Cossu⁷ · Michael Cusimano⁸ · Etienne Delgrange⁹ · Peter Earls¹⁰ · Shereen Ezzat⁸ · Nurperi Gazioglu⁶ · Ashley Grossman¹¹ · Federica Guaraldi² · Richard A. Hickman¹² · Hidetoshi Ikeda¹³ · Marie-Lise Jaffrain-Rea¹⁴ · Niki Karavitaki¹⁵ · Ivana Kraljević¹⁶ · Stefano La Rosa⁷ · Emilija Manojlović-Gačić¹⁷ · Niki Maartens¹⁸ · Ian E. McCutcheon¹⁹ · Mahmoud Messerer⁷ · Ozgur Mete⁸ · Hiroshi Nishioka²⁰ · Buge Oz²¹ · Sara Pakbaz⁸ · Melike Pekmezci²² · Arie Perry²² · Lilla Reiniger²³ · Federico Roncaroli²⁴ · Wolfgang Saeger²⁵ · Figen Söylemezoğlu²⁶ · Osamu Tachibana²⁷ · Jacqueline Trouillas²⁸ · John Turchini²⁹ · Silvia Uccella³⁰ · Chiara Villa³¹ · Shozo Yamada²⁰ · Sema Yarman³²

Sofia Asioli
sofia.asioli3@unibo.it

Suheyly Bozkurt
subozkurt@gmail.com

Olivera Casar-Borota
olivera.casar-borota@igp.uu.se

Laura Chinezu
laura_chinezu@yahoo.com

Nil Comunoglu
nilcomunoglu@gmail.com

Giulia Cossu
Giulia.Cossu@chuv.ch

Michael Cusimano
CUSIMANOM@smh.ca

Etienne Delgrange
etienne.delgrange@uclouvain.be

Peter Earls
Peter.Earls@svha.org.au

Shereen Ezzat
Shereen.Ezzat@sinaihealthsystem.ca

Nurperi Gazioglu
nurperi.gazioglu@gmail.com

Ashley Grossman
ashley.grossman@ocdem.ox.ac.uk

Federica Guaraldi
federica.guaraldi@yahoo.it

Richard A. Hickman
rh2850@cumc.columbia.edu

Hidetoshi Ikeda
ikedat07@hotmail.co.jp

Marie-Lise Jaffrain-Rea
marielise.jaffrain@univaq.it

Niki Karavitaki
n.karavitaki@bham.ac.uk

Ivana Kraljević
ivana.kraljevic@gmail.com

Stefano La Rosa
stefano.larosa@chuv.ch

Emilija Manojlović-Gačić
emanojlovicgacic@gmail.com

Niki Maartens
N.Maartens@alfred.org.au

Ian E. McCutcheon
imccutch@mdanderson.org

Mahmoud Messerer
mahmoud.messerer@chuv.ch

Ozgur Mete
ozgurmete77@gmail.com

Hiroshi Nishioka
nishioka@tokyo-med.ac.jp

Buge Oz
ozbuge@gmail.com

Sara Pakbaz
Sara.Pakbaz@uhn.ca

Melike Pekmezci
melike.pekmezci@ucsf.edu

Arie Perry
Arie.Perry@ucsf.edu

Lilla Reiniger
lillareiniger@yahoo.com

Federico Roncaroli
federico.roncaroli@manchester.ac.uk

Wolfgang Saeger
w.saeger@uke.de

Figen Söylemezoğlu
figensoylemezoglu@gmail.com

Osamu Tachibana
taczzz@kanazawa-med.ac.jp

Jacqueline Trouillas
jacqueline.trouillas@univ-lyon1.fr

John Turchini
jtur3651@uni.sydney.edu.au

Silvia Uccella
silvia.uccella@uninsubria.it

Chiara Villa
cm.villa@hopital-foch.org

Shozo Yamada
syamadays11@hotmail.com

Sema Yarman
sema.yarman@gmail.com

- 1 Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA
- 2 Università degli Studi di Bologna Scuola di Medicina e Chirurgia, Bologna, Italy
- 3 Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 4 Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
- 5 University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Târgu-Mureș, Mures, Romania
- 6 İstanbul Üniversitesi-Cerrahpasa, İstanbul, Turkey
- 7 l'Université de Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland
- 8 University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
- 9 University de Louvain, Ottignies-Louvain-La-Neuve, Belgium
- 10 Saint Vincents Hospital, University of Sydney, Darlinghurst, Australia
- 11 Oxford University, Oxford, UK
- 12 Columbia University, New York, USA
- 13 Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan
- 14 University of Aquila, L'Aquila, Italy
- 15 University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- 16 University Hospital Centre Zagreb, Zagreb, Croatia
- 17 University of Belgrade, Beograd, Serbia
- 18 Alfred Hospital, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia
- 19 MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, USA
- 20 Toranomon Hospital, Tokyo, Japan
- 21 Cerrahpasa University, İstanbul, Turkey
- 22 UCSF, San Francisco, USA
- 23 Semmelweis U Budapest, Budapest, Hungary
- 24 Manchester University, Manchester, UK
- 25 Marienkrankenhaus, Hamburg, Germany
- 26 Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
- 27 Kanazawa Medical University, Kahoku, Japan
- 28 University of Lyon, Lyon, France
- 29 University of Sydney, Darlinghurst, Australia
- 30 Università degli studi dell'Insubria Varese, Varèse, Italy
- 31 Hopital Foch, Suresnes, France
- 32 İstanbul University, İstanbul, Turkey