Examining the WHO and HOW to investigate for upper GI cancers: Diagnostic work up for Esophageal, Gastric and Pancreatic cancer

Dana Moffatt MD FRCPC Section of Gastroenterology University of Manitoba Director Pancreaticobiliary Endoscopy program

Presenter Disclosure

aculty: Dana C. Moffatt MD FRCPC

- elationships with commercial interests:
- Investigator: Cook Medical/Endoscopy

Mitigating Potential Bias

lot applicable

<u>ohageal cancer:</u>

creasing squamous cell (less smoking): 3/100,000. NOTE: 3x more mmon in men, and 6x more common in blacks

reasing adenocarcinoma (obesity, GERD, other factors?): 3-5/100,00 DTE: 7-10x more common in men

<u>tric cancer:</u> stable or decreasing rates in North America. Increasing a high rates in Asia. Canada: 4-9/100,000/year, less in women (down ⁻ (100,000 in the 1970's/80's)

tter treatment of H.pylori, and decreased reliance on salt preservation
od? Better hygiene? Refrigeration?

<u>creatic cancer</u>: Slow steady increase in rates over time (aging popula /100,000/year or 4-5000 new cases in Canada/year

cancers are relatively rare, but have very high mortality rates, and a

Esophageal Cancer

Vho should we investigate for esophageal cancer?

Abdominal pain?

GERD? Non responsive GERD, long standing GERD, atypical GERD?

Family history of cancers?

Alcohol and smoking use/abusers?

Dysphagia?



Iron deficiency anemia?



THE GERD QUESTION

<u>hypothesis:</u> Longstanding or severe GERD -> Barrett's esophagus astic Barrett's -> Esophageal adenocarcinoma

uidelines recommended screening pts. with GERD >10years , for Ba

study has ever shown this is effective at reducing cancer or mortality

expensive, it is stressful for patients and all it does is increase the # ients with Barrett's that need further testing. <u>With NO benefit.</u>

guidelines from AGA, ACG, and European GI consortium all explicitly nmend against the routine screening for Barrett's.

tead patients with a combo of GERD >10 years plus other risk factors hoking, severe obesity, ETOH abuse, family history, etc) or a concern nptom (dysphagia, weight loss, anemia etc) should be screened.

Who should we screen in Barrett's esophagus

	Barrett prevalence	Cancer incidence/ 100,000	Cancer distributio n Adeno- Carcinom a	Annual cancer risk with this type	NNT f scree in Barre
ent ı)	1%	4.6	56%	0.32%	316
ent n)	5%	1.9	24%	0.04%	2421
ent	15%	1.7	20%	0.01%	9008

-77

with Barrett's?

rently, guidelines in America: short segment Barrett's (<3cm) is ommended for a gastroscopy every 3-5 years (if risk factors?), a ment every 2 years (or longer if stable for 2 scopes)

tients with documented LGD: repeat within 1 year and or refer for lation strategies

atients with HGD: need either ablation with RFA, endoscopic res f HGD areas OR surgery.

e main problem is that AGAIN, no study in the Barrett's surveillar ulation has shown mortality benefit, survival benefit or cost bene

ut new data is coming, this year that may show some benefit in argetted screening.

esophageal cancer?

Patients with new or progressive dysphagia.

Patients with known Barrett's esophagus AND risk factors (smoking, ETOH use, family history prior toxic ingestion etc), or Barrett's with dysplasia.

Patients with unexplained weight loss, anorexi and anemia (as part of pan endoscopy).



ngth c

iy be erral 1

<u>scan</u> in is gain τη

troscc

scan

nultiple biopsies 5%.

psies to increas

(a)

ן-

de

3,

ik up ior established esophayear Gan

Biopsies confirm either SSCa or AdenoCa:

usually takes 4-7 days even if sent rush.

CT scan of the chest/abdomen for staging is standard of care: Assess local and distant nodes, and metastasis.

NOTE: Endoscopic ultrasound has good evidence for staging local lymph noc (95% accuracy vs. 45% CT for celiac nodes), and is far superior for determini T2-T4 lesions, except post radiation therapy.

PET/CT often required, to differentiate malignant liver cysts and/or lung nodules /ery high sensitivity and accuracy for distant mets.

PET activity ALSO can be used to predict response to chemo and radiation AND has been shown to predict survival overall survival.

Romangolo J - GIE 2



BMJ 2



nging demographics all over the world.

ificant decrease in the last 60 years, due to less H.pylori, better food preservat smoking?

doxical increase in younger patients in the last 15 years?





С



Thickened gastric wall

Cross-sectional location of CT image

- /hat symptoms/signs predict gastric cancer?
- Abdominal pain?
- Early satiety?
- Weight loss?
- Vomiting?
- Dysphagia?
- Abdominal mass?
- Iron def. anemia?
- Lymph node abnormalities?
- Gastric ulcers?

- ptoms experienced by patients newly diagnosed with Gastric CA type:
- dominal pain: 30-67%
- rly satiety:45%
- ight loss: 60-75%
- miting: 7-17%
- sphagia: 5-25%
- n def. anemia: 20-39%
- stric ulcers: <15%
- dominal mass: 7% (always advanced disease)
- mph node abnormalities: <5% (always advanced disease)
- st pretest probability: Anemia +weight loss + early satiety: PPV =

Screening

% of cases, are diagnosed with advanced disease, and are incura

eening is beneficial in HIGH risk populations.

ata from Japan/Korea/China, shows decrease in advanced cancer nortality by 30% with biannual gastroscopy

Costs of \$28,000/life year saved

eening is not beneficial and is extremely costly in low risk groups (s North americans)

osts of >\$240,000/life year saved (best case scenario from data!)

lored approach to screen at risk individuals and those with concern nptoms is recommended in North America

ri (HP) infection	Odds ratio (OR): 2.3	High risk area - mass screening	
		Low risk area - mass screening r	
ophic gastritis	1. Hazard ratio 7.13 (compared with no HP)	See above	
nic gastritis	2. Hazard ratio 14.5	HP eradication	
itis and extensive intestinal metaplasia	3. Hazard ratio 61.9	HP eradication	
a	Standardized incidence ratio: 5	Screening by upper endoscopy (
ny	15-24 years, RR = 9.4	Screening by UE recommended	
	25-46 years, RR = 55.6		
nas	Not available	Surveillance post polypectomy for	
atous polyposis	Not available	Screening by UE recommended	
olyposis colorectal cancer	Not available	Screening by UE recommended	
story of gastric cancer	OR: 2.5-5.1	HP eradication +/- UE screening	
		2	

O Chan, MD, and Benjamin C Y Wong, MD.

OR 1.22 OR 1.55 up A: OR 1.2 intake: OR 1.15 e intake: OR <u>1.4</u>

Other more rare signs of Gastric (a)DVT/thrombophelbitis (Trousse sign) b)Eruptive sebborheic keratosis c back (Sign of lesar trelat) c)Membranous nephropathy



Nork up for established gastric cance

. CT scan (chest/abd/pelvis) with IV contrast: Looks for local, and idespread metastasis.

EUS: most effective staging for depth of invasion, and can sample ossible nodal spread with FNA.

T stage Accuracy compared to CT scanning 95% vs. 73% p<0.0001.

N stage accuracy compared to CT: 80% vs. 65% p<0.05

PET/CT: Most sensitive for distant mets, in one study post EUS and T, PET/CT upstaged disease state in 10% of cases... used very equently to complete the staging, pre chemotherapy and surgery.

Staging laparoscopy: still the gold standard for N staging...



Pancreatic cancer

and our our off off and oyn plone

ymptoms	%	Signs	%
eight loss	85	Jaundice	55
ominal Pain	79	Henatomedally	30
anorexia	76	ricpatomegany	
cholestasis	50-59	RUQ mass	15
ack pain	49	malnutrition	13
diarrhea	44	Courvosier's	13
omiting	33	sign	
eatorrhea	25	Ascites	5
nbophlebitis	3	Lymph nodes	5

dividual symptom or sign if can effectively screen for Panc Ca.

Other symptoms/signs

- <u>ppathic pancreatitis</u> in those> 50 yo: follow up CT is rranted. New pancreatic lesions found in ~10-12% of lividuals.
- w onset diabetes >50 years old: Association has been s several cohort studies.
- Not cost effective to screen all diabetics, but if they are le oosing weight, have no family history, or have symptoms steatorrhea -> consider a CT scan.

Intal lesting for particeand da

SMV

A

SMA

A120

b work

24.000

imor m

<u>Sabdor</u> (if tum

s sensitiv

reatic ŝ

ows as liac, he

nsitivity ion pancieas protocor or

Duo

IVC

15 100 /0 101 LUI 1101'S >2cm

), spec:

512

on for

%). SMA,





lumor markers

- optimal serologic marker doesn't exist.
- 9-9 is the best option, but still has limited sensitivity (70-90%) ar cificity (68-80%)
- mited by needing + Lewis blood group antigen (90 of the populat
- mited by tumor size (levels increase with tumor size)
- alse positive in any kind of biliary obstruction, or biliary infection.
- he magnitude of elevation is associated with long term survival, or respectability, and CAN be followed for signs of recurrence post rgery... so useful to have a baseline value.

pancreatic cancer

- 1) CT chest, abdomen/pelvis: for staging
- MRI liver: to accurately assess for mets and help with respectability staging
- 3) PET/CT: useful in some cases, but not routinely ordered
- 4) Baseline CA-19-9.





hageal cancer: Investigate patients with new/progressive dysphate tanding GERD with risk factors (smoking, ETOH, family history,

troscopy is the test of choice. No serologic markers.

ric cancer: Difficult disease to screen for in North America. Patie satiety, anemia and weight loss OR one symptom AND a family stric CA OR H.pylori infection.

stroscopy is the test of choice. No reliable tumor markers. Bariur can be supportive but not definitive.

<u>reatic cancer:</u> Investigate for painless jaundice, or weight loss + orrhea. Note idiopathic pancreatitis in >50yo and late onset diab

t test US, but CT of the pancreas is superior for diagnosis and st is best for diagnosis and biopsy.

CP can biopsy but is best for palliation of obstructive symptoms.

