

Author response to: Survival after active surveillance versus upfront surgery for incidental small pancreatic neuroendocrine tumours

Claudio Ricci^{1,2,*}, Stefano Partelli^{3,4}, Luca Landoni⁵, Claudio Bassi⁵, Roberto Salvia⁵, Massimo Falconi^{3,4} and Riccardo Casadei^{1,2}

¹Division of Pancreatic Surgery, IRCCS, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria di Bologna, Bologna, Italy

²Department of Internal Medicine and Surgery (DIMEC), Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

³Pancreatic Surgery Unit, Pancreas Translational and Clinical Research Centre, San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milan, Italy

⁴'Vita-Salute' San Raffaele University, Milan, Italy

⁵General and Pancreatic Surgery Department, Pancreas Institute, University of Verona Hospital Trust, Verona, Italy

*Correspondence to: Claudio Ricci, Department of Internal Medicine and Surgery (DIMEC), Alma Mater Studiorum, University of Bologna, Division of Pancreatic Surgery, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Di Bologna, via Albertoni 15, Bologna, Italy (e-mail: claudio.ricci6@unibo.it)

Dear Editor

We welcome the comments from Yuan *et al.* The critical point is how to identify small non-functioning pancreatic neoplasms (NF-PanNENs) that are at risk of progression. Indeed, no reliable diagnostic tools are available, apart from those that identify clinical or radiological signs of malignancy. We agree with Yuan *et al.* on the promising role of genetic and epigenetic markers. Unfortunately, no study supports the routine assessment of genetic and epigenetic signatures in tissue samples obtained by fine-needle endoscopic ultrasound-guided biopsy (FNB). Thus, the inclusion criteria for our study reproduced a real-life clinical scenario, excluding patients with a reasonable clinical or radiological risk of malignancy.

Our study¹ clarified three crucial key points. First, active surveillance did not increase the mortality risk expected in a healthy population. We demonstrated that patients with low-risk small NF-PanNENs (without radiological or clinical signs of malignancy) could be considered healthy subjects, except for the need for active surveillance. This should lead to a change in mentality among physicians, discouraging both inappropriate and rushed indications for pancreatic resection. Second, the

study showed that the risk of stage progression is negligible. In other words, despite a very limited number of small aggressive tumours, NF-Pan-NENs could be left in follow-up. Their indolent behaviour, characterized by very slow growth, mitigates the risks of this choice. Finally, the pathological results for the surgical group suggested that the actual rate of malignant small NF-Pan-NENs is small. Thus, even assuming that we will have a valid genetic screening test shortly to be used on FNB tissue samples, the real question is: in how many patients should fine-needle aspiration/FNB be performed in order to recognize and resect one aggressive small NF-PanNEN? The number of patients needed to screen would likely be too high, such that this engaging strategy would not be cost-effective for small and low-risk NF-Pan-NENs.

Reference

1. Ricci C, Partelli S, Landoni L, Rinzivillo M, Ingaldi C, Andreasi V *et al.* Survival after active surveillance versus upfront surgery for incidental small pancreatic neuroendocrine tumours. *Br J Surg* 2022;**109**:733–738



European Colorectal Congress

3 – 6 December 2023, St.Gallen, Switzerland

OVERVIEW

Sun, 3 Dec 2023

MASTERCLASS

PROCTOLOGY DAY

ROBOTIC COURSE

DAVOSCOURSE@ECC

SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMME

Mon, 4 Dec – Wed, 6 Dec 2023

DIVERTICULAR DISEASE

Gut microbiome and surgery

Phil Quirke, Leeds, UK

Diet in diverticular disease

Pamela Buchwald, Lund, SE

Decision making in the management of acute complicated Diverticulitis beyond the guidelines

Seraina Faes, Zurich, CH

Diverticular Abscess – Always drainage or who benefits from Surgery?

Johannes Schultz, Oslo, NO

Perforated Diverticulitis: Damage Control, Hartmann's Procedure, Primary Anastomosis, Diverting Loop

Reinhold Kafka-Ritsch, Innsbruck, AT

When to avoid protective stoma in colorectal surgery

Antonino Spinelli, Milano, IT

ENDOMETRIOSIS

Endometriosis – what is the role of the abdominal surgeon

Tuyman Juriaan, Amsterdam, NL

Challenges in Surgery of Endometriosis – always interdisciplinary?

Peter Oppelt, Linz, AT; Andreas Shamiyeh, Linz, AT

A gaze in the crystal ball: Where is the role of virtual reality and artificial Intelligence in colorectal surgery

Müller Beat, Basel, CH

MALIGNANT COLORECTAL DISEASE

Cytoreductive Surgery

and Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy – facts and hopes

Michel Adamina, Winterthur, CH

Metastatic Colorectal Cancer – surgical approaches and limits

Jürgen Weitz, Dresden, DE

Extended lymph node dissection for rectal cancer, is it still under debate?

Miranda Kusters, Amsterdam, NL

Organ preservation functional outcome in rectal cancer treatment – in line with patient's needs? (Robot – laparoscopic – open surgery?)

Hans de Wilt, Nijmegen, NL

ROBOTICS

Advances in Robotic Surgery and what we learnt so far

Parvaiz Amjad, Portsmouth, UK

Challenging the market: Robotic (assistant) Devices and how to choose wisely (Da Vinci – Hugo Ras – Distalmotion ua)

Khan Jim, London, UK

TAMIS - Robotic Transanal Surgery, does it make it easier?

Knol Joep, Genk, BE

Live Surgery – Contonal Hospital of St.Gallen

Walter Brunner, St.Gallen, CH;

Salvadore Conde Morales, Sevilla, ES;

Friedrich Herbst, Vienna, AUT;

Amjad Parvaiz, Portsmouth, UK

Video Session

Lars Pahlmann Lecture

Markus Büchler, Lisboa, PRT

Honorary Lecture

Bill Heald, Lisboa, PRT

Information & Registration www.colorectalsurgery.eu