

**Retrospective Analysis of the Prognostic Factors  
that Influence Treatment Response and Survival of  
Patients with Cancer of Unknown Primary**

Thesis

*Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree in  
Clinical Oncology*

By

***Fatma Mohsen Kamal Ali El-Tabakh***  
*M.B.B.Ch*

Under Supervision of

**Prof. Dr. Zeinab Mohammed Abdlelhafeez ELsayed**

*Professor of Clinical Oncology  
Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University*

**Prof. Dr. Dina Ragab Diab**

*Professor of Clinical Oncology  
Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University*

**Dr. Nervana Magdy Hussien**

*Lecturer of Clinical Oncology  
Faculty of Medicine Helwan University*

Faculty of Medicine  
Ain Shams University

**2019**

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

قالوا

سببنا أنك لا تعلم لنا  
إلا ما علمتنا إنك أنت  
العليم العظيم

صدق الله العظيم

سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

# Acknowledgment

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **Allah**, the Most Kind and Most Merciful.*

*I'd like to express my respectful thanks and profound gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Zeinab Mohammed Abdelhafeez Elsayed**, Professor of Clinical Oncology, Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University for her keen guidance, kind supervision, valuable advice and continuous encouragement, which made possible the completion of this work.*

*I am also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr. Dina Ragab Diab**, Professor of Clinical Oncology, Faculty of Medicine Ain Shams University, for her kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance throughout this work.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Dr. Mervana Magdy Hussien**, Lecturer of Clinical Oncology, Faculty of Medicine Helwan University, for her great help, active participation and guidance.*

*I would like to express my hearty thanks to all **my family** for their support till this work was completed.*

*Last but not least my sincere thanks and appreciation to all patients participated in this study.*

**Fatma Mohsen**

# *List of Contents*

Title	Page No.
List of Tables .....	i
List of Figures .....	iii
List of Abbreviations .....	vii
Introduction .....	1
Aim of the Work.....	15
Review of Literature	
☞ Epidemiology of Cancer of Unknown Primary .....	16
☞ Pathology and Immunohistochemistry .....	20
☞ Diagnosis and Work Up .....	28
☞ Staging and Prognosis.....	37
☞ Treatment Principals in Cancer of Unknown Primary .....	39
Patients and Methods .....	57
Results .....	59
Discussion .....	99
Summary.....	109
Study Limitations .....	113
Conclusion.....	114
Recommendations .....	115
References .....	116
Arabic Summary	

## *List of Tables*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table (1):</b>	Shows tumor type and potential occult primary site .....	23
<b>Table (2):</b>	Shows markers for immunohistochemical typing of CUP .....	25
<b>Table (3):</b>	Shows incidence of organ affection in cancer of unknown primary.....	29
<b>Table (4):</b>	Shows prognostically favourable subgroups for surgical intervention and their survival.....	38
<b>Table (5):</b>	Shows different chemotherapy regimen used in CUP .....	48
<b>Table (6):</b>	Shows the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group scale of performance status.....	51
<b>Table (7):</b>	Shows the World Health Organization (WHO) analgesic ladder.....	53
<b>Table (8):</b>	Shows drug Choices of anti-emetics .....	55
<b>Table (9):</b>	Demographic data of the studied patients .....	59
<b>Table (10):</b>	Shows the tumor characteristics .....	62
<b>Table (11):</b>	Shows diagnostic work-up (n=102) .....	65
<b>Table (12):</b>	Shows treatment modalities .....	69
<b>Table (13):</b>	Shows OS and PFS among study population .....	72
<b>Table (14):</b>	Shows the relation between the patients characteristics and the treatment response.....	74
<b>Table (15):</b>	Shows the relation between the tumor characteristics and the treatment response.....	75
<b>Table (16):</b>	Shows the relation between the treatment modalities and the treatment response .....	79

## *List of Tables (Cont...)*

Table No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Table (17):</b>	Uni-variate logistic regression analysis of predictors of prognostic factors affecting response to treatment .....	81
<b>Table (18):</b>	Multi-variate logistic regression analysis of prognostic factors affecting response to treatment .....	82
<b>Table (19):</b>	Shows factors influencing the PFS .....	83
<b>Table (20):</b>	Shows COX regression analysis for predictors of PFS among the studied cases n= 102.....	90
<b>Table (21):</b>	Shows the relation between the demographic and tumor data with the OS.....	91
<b>Table (22):</b>	Shows COX regression analysis for predictors of overall survival among the studied cases .....	98

## *List of Figures*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (1):</b>	Shows IHC tests to detect the primary site in cancer of unknown primary .....	24
<b>Figure (2):</b>	A 57-year-old female patient with an unclear hypodense, hypovascular mass in the pancreatic corpus .....	31
<b>Figure (3):</b>	A 68-year-old patient with increased PSA level (6.15 ng/mL). .....	32
<b>Figure (4):</b>	Shows MRI spine showing soft tissue lesion in 2nd lumbar vertebra.....	33
<b>Figure (5):</b>	Shows PET/CT fusion and CT images of a patient with LT cervical L.N metastases .....	34
<b>Figure (6):</b>	A female patient with a 2-year history of diarrhea and elevated chromogranin A for no apparent reason. SRS with OctreoScan was performed to exclude or confirm a neuroendocrine gastrointestinal tumor .....	35
<b>Figure (7):</b>	Shows the classification of the prognostic subgroup among patients with cancer of unknown primary .....	38
<b>Figure (8):</b>	Shows treatment recommendation to Favorable subsets in cancer of unknown primary.....	40
<b>Figure (9):</b>	Shows changing the nature of cancer care.....	51
<b>Figure (10):</b>	Shows different approaches to assess pain.....	52
<b>Figure (11):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to age.....	60
<b>Figure (12):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to gender. ....	60

## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (13):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to performance status. ....	61
<b>Figure (14):</b>	Shows the distribution of different histo-pathologic types in study population. ....	64
<b>Figure (15):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to number of affected organ at presentation. ....	64
<b>Figure (16):</b>	Shows distribution of patients done endoscopy.....	66
<b>Figure (17):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to imaging. ....	67
<b>Figure (18):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to laboratory abnormalities. ....	67
<b>Figure (19):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to tumor marker. ....	68
<b>Figure (20):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to treatment regimen. ....	70
<b>Figure (21):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to type of chemotherapy. ....	71
<b>Figure (22):</b>	Shows the distribution of patients according to response to treatment. ....	71
<b>Figure (23):</b>	Shows patients overall survival. ....	73
<b>Figure (24):</b>	Shows patients progression free survival. ....	73
<b>Figure (25):</b>	Shows the percentage of responders for each affected organ.....	77
<b>Figure (26):</b>	Shows the relation between S.ALB level and the treatment response. ....	78



## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (27):</b>	Shows the relation between S. ALK level and the treatment response. ....	78
<b>Figure (28):</b>	Shows the relation between treatment regimen and the treatment response. ....	80
<b>Figure (29):</b>	Shows the relation between age group and PFS.....	86
<b>Figure (30):</b>	Shows the relation between performance status and PFS.....	86
<b>Figure (31):</b>	Shows the relation between comorbidity and PFS.....	87
<b>Figure (32):</b>	Shows the relation between SALB level and PFS.....	87
<b>Figure (33):</b>	Shows the relation between S.ALK level and PFS.....	88
<b>Figure (34):</b>	Shows the relation between type of chemotherapy and PFS. ....	88
<b>Figure (35):</b>	Relation between treatment modalities and PFS.....	89
<b>Figure (36):</b>	Shows the relation between age group and OS.....	94
<b>Figure (37):</b>	Shows the relation between gender and OS.....	94
<b>Figure (38):</b>	Shows the relation between performance status and OS. ....	95
<b>Figure (39):</b>	Shows the relation between treatment modalities and OS. ....	95

## *List of Figures (Cont...)*

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
<b>Figure (40):</b>	Shows the relation between type of chemotherapy and OS. ....	96
<b>Figure (41):</b>	Shows the relation between S.ALB level and OS.....	96
<b>Figure (42):</b>	Shows the relation between S.ALK level and OS.....	97

## *List of Abbreviations*

<b>Abb.</b>	<b>Full term</b>
<i>ADT</i> .....	<i>Androgen Deprivation Therapy</i>
<i>AFP</i> .....	<i>Alpha Feto Protein</i>
<i>AKT</i> .....	<i>Protein Kinase B</i>
<i>ASUH</i> .....	<i>Ain Shams University Hospitals</i>
<i>B-HCG</i> .....	<i>Beta Sub Unit of Human Chorionic Gonadotropin</i>
<i>CA19.9</i> .....	<i>Cancer Antigen 19.9</i>
<i>CBC</i> .....	<i>Complete Blood Count</i>
<i>CEA</i> .....	<i>Carcino Embryonic Antigen</i>
<i>CK7</i> .....	<i>Cytokeratin 7</i>
<i>CTs</i> .....	<i>Computerized Topography</i>
<i>CTZ</i> .....	<i>Chemoreceptor Trigger Zone</i>
<i>CUP</i> .....	<i>Cancers of Unknown Primary</i>
<i>ENE</i> .....	<i>Extranodal Extention</i>
<i>ER</i> .....	<i>Oestrogen Receptor</i>
<i>EUS</i> .....	<i>Endoscopic Ultrasound</i>
<i>GTN</i> .....	<i>Gestational Trophoblastic Neoplasia</i>
<i>ID</i> .....	<i>Iron Deficiency</i>
<i>IHC</i> .....	<i>Immunohistochemistry</i>
<i>KFT</i> .....	<i>Kidney Function Tests</i>
<i>LCA</i> .....	<i>Leukocyte Common Antigen</i>
<i>LDH</i> .....	<i>lactate Dehydrogenase</i>
<i>LFT</i> .....	<i>Liver Function Tests</i>
<i>MAPK</i> .....	<i>Mitogen-Activated Protein Kinase</i>
<i>MDT</i> .....	<i>Multidisciplinary Team</i>
<i>MPMRI</i> .....	<i>Multiparametric MRI</i>
<i>MRI</i> .....	<i>Magnetic Resonance Imaging</i>
<i>NET</i> .....	<i>Neuroendocrine Differentiation Tumor</i>
<i>OS</i> .....	<i>Overall Survival</i>

## *List of Abbreviations (Cont...)*

Abb.	Full term
<i>PFS</i> .....	<i>Progression-Free Survival</i>
<i>PLAP</i> .....	<i>Placental Alkaline Phosphatase</i>
<i>PSA</i> .....	<i>Prostate Specific Antigen</i>
<i>PS</i> .....	<i>Performance Status</i>
<i>qRT-PCR</i> .....	<i>Quantitative Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction</i>
<i>RECIST</i> .....	<i>Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors</i>
<i>SCC</i> .....	<i>Squamous Cell Carcinoma</i>
<i>TTF-1</i> .....	<i>Thyroid Transcription Factor-1</i>
<i>VC</i> .....	<i>Vomiting Center</i>
<i>WHO</i> .....	<i>World Health Organization</i>

# Abstract

Patients' records in the period from January 2012 to December 2017 were reviewed with follow up of treatment response, progression free survival and overall survival Data.

The aim in present study was to retrospectively identify the prognostic factors that influence treatment outcome and survival of patients diagnosed with cancer of unknown primary treated patients to help improving outcome and provide better practice.

In this study, some of the parameters addressed were found to be more or less similar to worldwide incidences with little variations. The median age at diagnosis was 63 years. With slight male predominance 62 (60.8%). The most common histological subtype in biopsied specimens was adenocarcinomas that represents (59.8%).

**Keywords:** Quantitative Reverse Transcription Polymerase Chain Reaction - Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors

## INTRODUCTION

Cancers of unknown primary (CUP) are heterogeneous group of metastatic tumours for which a standardised diagnostic work-up could not recognize the site of origin at the time of diagnosis. Cancer registries around the world report the incidence of CUP in the range of 3%–5% of all malignancies, worldwide the overall age-standardized incidence per 100,000 people per year is 4–19 cases. CUP therefore ranks among the top 10 commonest malignancies (*Massard et al., 2011*). CUP occur equally in both males and females, at average age 60 years old (*Siegel et al., 2012*). Incidence of CUP in Egypt is 6.1% in males and 5.5% in females (*Symons et al., 2012*).

Many Diagnostic approaches should be applied to identify the primary site: history, physical examination, detailed histopathological examination with specific immunohistochemistry, radiological assessment and endoscopies as needed (*Greco et al., 2013*).

The pathology evaluation of a good quality tissue sample is needed. These tumours are categorised by pathology into: well- and moderately differentiated adenocarcinomas, squamous cell carcinomas, carcinomas with neuroendocrine differentiation, poorly differentiated carcinomas (including poorly differentiated adenocarcinomas), and undifferentiated neoplasms (*Pentheroudakis et al., 2013*).

Cancer of unknown primary patients are divided into subsets of favourable (20%) and unfavourable (80%) prognosis. Favourable subsets(women with papillary adenocarcinoma of the peritoneal cavity, women with adenocarcinoma involving the axillary lymph nodes, poorly differentiated carcinoma with midline distribution, poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma, squamous-cell carcinoma involving cervical lymph nodes, adenocarcinoma with a colon-cancer profile (CK20+, CK7–, CDX2+)/men with blastic bone metastases and elevated prostate-specific antigen (adenocarcinoma), isolated inguinal adenopathy (squamous carcinoma), patients with one small, potentially resectable tumors are mostly given locoregional treatment or systemic (platinum-based chemotherapy). Responses and survival are similar to those of patients with relevant known primary tumours (*Thomassen et al., 2014*).

Patients in unfavourable subsets (adenocarcinoma metastatic to the liver or other organs, non-papillary malignant ascites (adenocarcinoma), multiple cerebral metastases (adenocarcinoma or squamous carcinoma), several lung or pleural metastases (adenocarcinoma)multiple metastatic lytic bone disease(adenocarcinoma), and squamous-cell carcinoma of the abdominopelvic cavity) are treated with empirical chemotherapy based on combination regimens of platinums, taxanes, but responses and survival are generally poor (*Pavlidis et al., 2012*).