Ki-67 Index and response to chemotherapy in patients with neuroendocrine tumours

Alexa Childs[1], Amy Kirkwood[2],Julien Edeline[6], Tu Vinh Luong[3], Jennifer Watkins[3], Angela Lamarca[8], Doraid Alrifai[7], Phyllis Nsiah-Sarbeng[4], Roopinder Gillmore[1], Astrid Mayer[1], ChristinaThirlwell[1,6], Debashis Sarker[7], Juan W Valle[8], Tim Meyer[1,6]

[1] Department of Oncology, Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, London

[2] Cancer Research UK & UCL Cancer Trials Centre, London

[3]Department of Pathology, Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, London

[4]Department of Radiology, Royal Free London NHS Foundation Trust, London

[6] UCL Cancer Institute, UCL, London

[7]Kings College Hospital, London

[8]Institute of Cancer Sciences, University of Manchester/The Christie NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester

Address for correspondence

Professor Tim Meyer, UCL Cancer Institute, University College London

72 Huntley Street, London WC1E 6DD

email; t.meyer@ucl.ac.uk Tel; +44 207 679 6731,

Short title: Ki67 as response marker in NETS

Key words: Neuroendocrine tumour, chemotherapy, Ki-67, response

Abstract

Background: Chemotherapy (CT) is widely used for neuroendocrine tumours (NET) but there are no validated biomarkers to predict response. The Ki-67 proliferation index has been proposed as a means of selecting patients for CT but robust data are lacking.

Aim: To investigate the relationship between response to chemotherapy and Ki-67 in NET.

Method: We reviewed data from 222 NET patients treated with CT. Tumours were graded according to Ki-67 index: G1 ≤2%, G2 3-20%, and G3 >20%. Response was assessed according to RECIST and survival calculated from start of chemotherapy to death. To explore Ki-67 as a marker of response, we calculated the likelihood ratio and performed receiver operating characteristic analysis.

Results: Overall, 193 patients had a documented Ki-67 index, of which 173 were also evaluable for radiological response; 10% were G1, 46% G2 and 43% G3; 46% were pancreatic NET (PNET). Median overall survival was 22.1 months. Overall response rate was 30% (39% in PNET vs 22% in non-PNET) and 43% of patients had stable disease. Response rate increased with grade; 6% in G1 tumours, 24% in G2 and 43% in G3. However, maximum likelihood ratio was 2.3 at Ki-67=35%, and the area under the ROC curve was 0.60. As previously reported, a high Ki-67 was an adverse prognostic factor for overall survival.

Conclusion: Response to CT increases with Ki-67 index, but Ki-67 alone is an unreliable means to select patients for CT. Improved methods to stratify patients for systemic therapy are required.

Introduction

Neuroendocrine tumours (NET) are exceptional in terms of their heterogeneity with respect to clinical behaviour and prognosis. Patients may live with low-grade, indolent tumours for 20 years whilst the outlook for high-grade tumours can be as little as 6 months[1]. Although still considered a rare disease entity, the incidence of NET is increasing and the prevalence is now greater than that of many other tumours of the gastrointestinal tract[1].They therefore represent a significant public health burden.

The majority of NET patients present with metastatic disease and are not suitable for surgical resection with curative intent. In these cases, palliative treatments are required with the aim of controlling symptoms, delaying disease progression and improving survival and a range of therapeutic interventions are now available. Somatostatin analogues (SSA) have been used for many years to control symptoms associated with well differentiated functional tumours and recent studies have also demonstrated an anti-proliferative effect resulting in delayed progression rather than tumour response[2,3]. Radiolabelled SSA using lutetium[4] and yttrium[5,6] have also been widely used and recently shown to have a significantly improved progression free survival (PFS) compared with SSA alone[7]. For pancreatic NET (PNET), sunitinib and everolimus have been shown to delay progression and are associated with response rates of 9% and 5% respectively[8,9]. Cytotoxic chemotherapy is the standard of care for poorly differentiated, high-grade tumours but the overall prognosis is poor despite its use. Additionally streptozocin-based chemotherapy has an established role in the management of PNET based on the seminal studies of Moertel and colleagues which demonstrated an improvement in

survival for multi-agent therapy along with radiological, clinical and biochemical responses[10,11]. Recent studies applying RECIST or WHO criteria alone, report response rates for PNET varying between 17 and 38%[12-16] whilst non-PNET appear to have a lower response rate of 16%[17,18].

A key challenge for clinicians is to define the optimal therapeutic algorithm for such diverse tumours with a range of therapeutic options. While SSA therapy is only applicable to somatostatin receptor positive tumours, we have no reliable predicative markers to select patients for sunitinib, everolimus or chemotherapy. The proliferation marker, Ki-67, has been suggested as a means to select patients for chemotherapy and a threshold for Ki-67 of 10% has been proposed but no data provided to support this[19]. A recent study in high-grade tumours defined a threshold Ki-67 index of 55%, above which the response rate was 42% compared with 14% for those below 55%[20]. However chemotherapy clearly has a role in lower grade tumours and we have previously demonstrated a correlation between grade and response in these categories[13]. We have therefore analysed a large multicentre cohort of NET patients treated with chemotherapy to explore the validity of Ki-67 as a robust method of stratifying patients for chemotherapy.

Patients and Methods

We identified 222 NET patients treated with chemotherapy between May 1999 and June 2015 from the following three centres; Royal Free Hospital, London, The Christie NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester and King's College Hospital, London. Patients were required to have a histological diagnosis of NET and be receiving first line chemotherapy with palliative intent.

Two independent radiologists assessed response according to RECIST 1.0. CT scans were performed at baseline (within 6 weeks of commencing chemotherapy) and after three cycles of treatment. In the absence of disease progression or unacceptable toxicity, patients went on to complete a total of 6 cycles with repeat imaging at this time. Thereafter, they were scanned at 3 monthly intervals until radiological progression of disease was confirmed. Overall (OS) and progression free survival (PFS) were defined as the interval between the start of chemotherapy and death or radiological progression, as assessed by independent review.

Ki-67 immunohistochemical staining was performed with the NovoLink™ Polymer detection system (Novocastra, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, UK) [21] and patients were categorised according to the European Neuroendocrine Tumour Society (ENETS) grading system[22,23].

Statistics

The statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 22.0. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis was used to calculate median duration of response, time to progression and OS. Fisher's exact test and $\chi 2$ test for trend were used for predictive markers of response to chemotherapy. Cox regression analyses were used to test the influence of baseline characteristics of grade, ECOG performacnce status (PS), and primary site on PFS and OS. Hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals were calculated. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis was used to define the best cut-off value for Ki-67 index with regards to response rate (response = complete response (CR)+ partial response (PR), no response = stable disease (SD)+ progressive disease (PD).

Results

Patient Characteristics

We reviewed 222 patients in total, of whom 193 had Ki-67 data, and 173 were evaluable for radiological response and Ki-67 index. The patient characteristics are shown in Table 1. Overall, 43% had G3 grade tumours but, for both pancreatic and non-pancreatic primaries, the majority of patients were classified as G1 or G2 grade according to Ki-67 index. The most common non-PNET sites were the GI tract and lung, but 19% had an unknown primary site. Patients with PNET were more likely to have positive octreotide scans than non-PNET (65% vs 46%, p=0.008). First-line chemotherapy was given with platinum/etoposide (n=27), streptozocin/fluoropyrimidine (n=21) or streptozocin/fluropyrimidine/platinum (n=125) and the median number of chemotherapy cycles received was 6 with 58% completing the full course of 6 cycles.

Response

In the 173 patients evaluable, the overall response rate was 30%. Stable disease was the best response in 48%, and 22% had disease progression. Among those with pancreatic primaries, the response rate was 39% (31 out of 79 patients) compared to 22% (21 out of 94 patients) for non-pancreatic tumours (P= 0.02, Fisher's exact test). Of those patients who had stable disease, 79% (60 out of 83 patients) remained progression free at 6 months. The median duration of response was 7.5 months.

There was evidence that response to chemotherapy was associated with grade defined by Ki-67 using the ENETS criteria cut-off of 20% between G2 and G3, with a response rate of 20% for G1-2 and 43% for G3 (P=0.002 Fisher's and P=0.002 Chi-squared test for trend respectively; Table 2). In order to explore the ability of Ki-67 to reliably predict response, we performed ROC analysis. The area under the ROC curve (Figure 1) was 0.66 (95% CI 0.57 - 0.74) implying a 66% chance that a randomly chosen responder would have a higher Ki-67 value than a randomly chosen non-responder. As demonstrated in Table 3, there are no cut-off points which combine satisfactory detection and false positive rates. The maximum likelihood ratio was 2.33 at a cut-off of ≥35%, corresponding to a false positive rate of 24% (predicting a response in a patient who does not respond) and a modest detection rate of 54% (correctly predicting a response). Response rate was lower in tumours with Ki-67 <35% as compared to those with Ki-67 ≥35% (21% vs 50%; P<0.001) and 68% of all tumours had a Ki-67 <35%. Both the ROC curve and likelihood ratio analysis demonstrated that Ki-67 alone is not an accurate predictor of response.

Survival

Patients were followed up for a median of 55 months (range 0.88-88 months). The median OS was 22.1 months (95% CI: 18.7 - 25.5) (Figure 2), one-year survival was 69% (95% CI; 62 – 76) and 2-year survival was 44% (95% CI; 37 – 51). Median PFS was 8.4 months (95% CI: 7.6 – 9.2), 1 and 2 year PFS was 35% (95% CI 28–42) and 18% (95% CI 12–24) respectively. According to univariate analysis, median OS was superior for PNET as compared to non-PNET (29 vs 20 months, HR = 0.65, 95%CI; 0.48-0.89; p= 0.006) but this difference was not significant when adjusted for other factors (Table 4). In multivariable analysis, both age greater than 58 years and a

poor PS were associated with a worse survival. Increasing grade according to Ki-67 was also associated with a significantly higher risk of death, with grade 3 patients having a 2.6 fold increased risk of death compared to patients with grade 1 tumours. The median survival for patients with ENETS grade G1, G2 and G3 was 29, 30 and 13 months respectively.

Discussion

It is generally accepted that high-grade, poorly differentiated NET should be treated with platinum-based chemotherapy and that PNET are relatively sensitive to multi-agent streptozocin-based chemotherapy[24,25]. However, the role of chemotherapy for non-PNET has not been fully defined and, with the approval of sunitinib and everolimus for PNET, the position of chemotherapy in the therapeutic algorithm for PNET also needs to be clarified. The proliferation marker Ki-67 has been proposed as a means of selecting patients for chemotherapy and some evidence that response rate increases with increasing grade has been reported previously[13,20]. Here we sought to establish the predictive value to Ki-67% and define a meaningful threshold to aid patient selection. The patient population was evenly split between PNET and non-PNET and overall, 46% had G1 or G2 tumours. The ratio of G3 to G1 tumours was higher in the non-PNET (5:1) compared to the PNET group (3:1). We found an association between response and Ki-67 grade which ranged from 6% to 43% as grade increased from G1 to G3 according to the ENETS definition. However we were unable to define a clinically useful threshold for Ki-67 index which would permit selection of patients for chemotherapy. Applying a Ki-67 of 35%, which gave the highest likelihood ratio, would deny 70% patients chemotherapy despite a response rate of 21% in this group. The ROC curve analysis confirmed the poor

sensitivity and specificity of Ki-67 to predict response. Even among the 18 patients with a Ki-67 of ≤2% there was one responder. Interestingly we demonstrated that the response rate in non-PNET was lower at 22% compared to 39% despite the tendency to a higher grade in the non-PNET and this is consistent with previous findings[16]. While we have shown that increasing Ki-67 grade is associated with a higher response rate to chemotherapy, we have also confirmed previous reports that it is a negative prognostic factor for survival with G3 grade tumours associated with a three fold increased risk of death compared to G1 grade tumours after correcting for other variables[21-23].

Although there has been no comparable study across the grade spectrum, our data concord with those of Sorbye et al who looked exclusively at G3 tumours defined by Ki-67>20[20]. In that study, response rate also rose as Ki-67 grade increased, while overall survival decreased. ROC curve analysis again suggested low sensitivity and specificity but a cut-off of 55% was defined to distinguish those with a high chance of response (42%) versus low (15%). However those with Ki-67 of 41-50 % had a response rate of 21% suggesting that Ki-67 alone cannot be used to select patients. In contrast, a recent single centre study evaluating the combination of streptozocin and fluorouracil in patients with PNETs, reported a lower response rate for patients with a Ki-67 index of ≥15% at 25% compared with 46% for those with a Ki-67 <15%[26]. However, in this study only 6% had a Ki-67 of >20% and therefore the higher grade tumours were poorly represented in this patient sample. Additionally, in our series and that of Sorbye et al, the majority of patients received platinum based chemotherapy and Ki-67 may be a better predictor of response for this agent.

The expression of the DNA repair enzyme O6-methylguanine DNA methyltransferase (MGMT) has also been proposed as a potential marker of response to alkylating agents such as temozolomide which is increasingly used for NET with response rates as high as 70% reported in PNET[27]. However the data for MGMT expression or promoter methylation in NET are conflicting. Kulke et al found that MGMT was deficient by immunohistochemistry in 57% PNET and 0% of carcinoid tumours and that low MGMT expression was associated with response to temozolomide[28]. However, another study reported MGMT promoter methylation to be more common in carcinoids and absent in PNET[29] while another in poorly differentiated NET reported a response rate of 33% despite only one of the 25 treated patients having MGMT promoter methylation[30]. The discrepancy between studies may arise from non-standardised methods of assessing MGMT and the lack of correlation between promotor methylation and protein expression has been reported in NET [31]. In summary, we have demonstrated that increasing Ki-67 index is associated with increased response rates to chemotherapy, but cannot be used alone to select patients for this therapy. It may, however, provide a useful guide to inform patients of their likely chance of response and allow them to make informed choices about therapy. Achieving a response remains an important endpoint for patients who are symptomatic from tumour burden or may benefit from pre-operative down-staging therapy. Improved methods of patient stratification are therefore required for in neuroendocrine tumours in order to provide benefit for those who will respond and spare toxicity in those who will not.

Conflict of Interest: None

Acknowledgments

This work was funded in part by the NIHR UCLH/UCL Biomedical Research Centre (TM) and Cancer Research UK (CT). Angela Lamarca is part-funded by a Pancreatic Cancer Research Fund fellowship grant and Spanish Society of Medical Oncology (SEOM) translational grant.

The Authorship Statement

The guarantor of this article is Professor Tim Meyer.

Specific Author Contributions
a Collected data
b Analysed data
c Designed the research study
d Wrote the paper
e Performed statistical analysis
f Reviewed and modified final manuscript

Alexa Childs a,b,d,f

Amy Kirkwood e,f

Julien Edeline e,f

Tu Vinh Luong b,f

Jennifer Watkins b,f

Angela Lamarca a,f

Doraid Alrifai a,f

Phyllis Nsiah-Sarbeng b,f

Roopinder Gillmore a,f

Astrid Mayer a,f

Christina Thirlwell a,f

Debashis Sarker a,f

Juan W Valle a,f

Tim Meyer a,b,c,d,f

All authors approved the final version of the manuscript

Table 1 Patient Characteristics

Characteristics		All patients N(%) N= 173	Pancreatic N(%) N=79	Non-Pancreatic N(%) N=94
Age (median (range))		58 (22 – 84)	55 (23 -83)	60 (22-84)
Gender				
	Male	97 (56.1)	43 (54.4)	54 (57.4)
	Female	76 (43.9)	36 (45.6)	40 (42.6)
Treatment				
	Platinum-Etoposide	27 (15.6%)	8 (10.1)	19 (20.2)
	Streptozocin-Fluoropyrimidine	21 (12.1%)	9 (11.4)	12 (12.8)
	Streptozocin-Fluoropyrimidine-Platinum	125 (72.3%)	62 (78.5)	63 (67.0)
Grade				
(ENETS)	G1 (Ki-67 ≤2%)	18 (10.4)	9 (11.4)	9 (9.6)
	G2 (Ki-673-≤20%)	80 (46.2)	40 (50.6)	40 (42.6)
	G3 (Ki-67>20%)	75 (43.4)	3 (38.0)	45 (47.9)
Primary Site				
	Midgut	23 (13.3)	-	23 (24.5)
	Unknown	33 (19.1)	-	33 (35.1)
	Hindgut	19 (11.0)	-	19 (20.2)
	Lung	16 (9.2)	-	16 (17.0)
	Pancreas	79 (45.7)	79 (100)	-
	Other	3 (1.7)	-	3 (3.2)
Octreotide scan				
	Positive	94 (54.3)	51 (64.6)	43 (45.7)
	Negative	33 (19.1)	9 (11.4)	24 (25.5)
	Unknown	46 (26.6)	19 (24.1)	27 (28.7)
Performance status				
	0	45 (26.0)	22 (27.8)	23 (24.5)
	1	102 (59.0)	45 (57.0)	57 (60.6)
	2	17 (9.8)	7 (8.9)	10 (10.6)
	3	6 (3.5)	2 (2.5)	4 (4.3)
	4	1 (0.6)	1 (1.3)	0
	Unknown	2 (1.2)	2 (2.5)	0

Table 2 Response and baseline characteristics

Baseline characteristic	Non-responder	Responder	P-value
Primary site			
Non-Pancreatic	73 (77.7)	21 (22.3)	0.016
Pancreatic	48 (60.8)	31 (39.2)	
Ki-67			
ENETS			
Ki-67≤2%	17 (94.4)	1 (5.6)	0.002
Ki-67 3-≤20%	61 (73.3)	19 (23.8)	
Ki-67 >20%	43 (57.3)	32 (42.7)	
Octreotide scan			
Negative	23 (69.7)	10 (30.3)	0.953
Positive	65 (69.1)	29 (30.9)	
Age			
<58	58 (68.6)	27 (31.4)	0.703
≥58	62 (71.3)	25 (28.7)	
Performance status			
0	30 (66.7)	15 (33.3)	0.712
1	74 (72.5)	28 (27.5)	
2-4	16 (66.7)	8 (33.3)	

Table 3 Response and Ki-67

Ki-67 (%)	DR	FPR	LR
≥5	96.1	81.0	1.19
≥10	84.6	65.3	1.29
≥15	78.8	56.2	1.40
≥20	69.2	46.3	1.49
≥25	61.5	35.5	1.73
≥30	57.7	33.1	1.74
≥35	53.8	23.1	2.33
≥40	48.1	22.3	2.16
≥45	38.5	19.8	1.94
≥50	32.7	19.8	1.65
≥55	23.1	14.9	1.55
≥60	23.1	14.9	1.55

DR detection rate
FPR false positive rate
LR likelihood ratio

Table 4 Overall Survival and Baseline characteristics

Baseline characteristic		Univariate analysis			Multivariable analysis (n=190)		
		Events/n	OS HR 95%CI)	P-value	Events/n	OS HR (95%CI)	P-value
Primary site (n=193)							
	Non-Pancreatic	91/106	1.00	0.006	90/105	1.00	0.052
	Pancreatic	74/87	0.65 (0.48, 0.89)		72/85	0.73 (0.53-1.00)	
Ki-67 (n=193)							
ENETS grade							
	Ki-67≤2%	12/20	1.00	<0.001	12/20	1.00	<0.001
	Ki-673-≤20%	72/87	1.32 (0.71, 2.44)		69/84	1.23 (0.66-2.30)	
	Ki-67>20%	81/86	2.58 (1.40, 4.76)		81/86	2.61 (1.39-4.90)	
Octreotide scan (n=135)							
	Negative	37/39	1.00	0.001			
	Positive	83/96	0.51 (0.34, 0.75)				
Age (n=193)							
	<58	82/93	1.00	0.067	80/91	1.00	0.038
	≥58	83/100	1.33 (0.98, 1.81)		82/99	1.40 (1.02-1.93)	
Performance status (n=190)							
	0	42/48	1.00	0.004	42/48	1.00	0.027
	1	90/110	1.20 (0.83 , 1.73)		90/110	1.20 (0.82-1.74)	
	2-4	30/32	2.24 (1.39, 3.61)		30/32	2.01 (1.23-3.31)	
Treatment (n=193)							
	Doublets	47/59	1.00	0.032	44/56	1.00	0.54
	Streptozocin-Fluoropyrimidine -Platinum	118/134	0.69 (0.49-0.97)		118/134	0.89 (0.62-1.29)	

Octreotide scan result not included in multivariate analysis due to missing data.

Figure legends

Figure 1 ROC analysis of Ki-67 with regards to response rate

Figure 2 Overall survival stratified by grade as defined by Ki-67 index using ENETs grading

Reference List

1 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**:3063–72. doi:10.1200/JCO.2007.15.4377

2 Caplin ME, Pavel M, Ćwikła JB, *et al.* Lanreotide in metastatic enteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *N Engl J Med* 2014;**371**:224–33. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1316158

3 Rinke A, Müller H-H, Schade-Brittinger C, *et al.* Placebo-controlled, double-blind, prospective, randomized study on the effect of octreotide LAR in the control of tumor growth in patients with metastatic neuroendocrine midgut tumors: a report from the PROMID Study Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2009;**27**:4656–63. doi:10.1200/JCO.2009.22.8510

4 Kwekkeboom DJ, de Herder WW, Kam BL, *et al.* Treatment with the radiolabeled somatostatin analog [177 Lu-DOTA 0,Tyr3]octreotate: toxicity, efficacy, and survival. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;**26**:2124–30. doi:10.1200/JCO.2007.15.2553

5 Imhof A, Brunner P, Marincek N, *et al.* Response, survival, and long-term toxicity after therapy with the radiolabeled somatostatin analogue [90Y-DOTA]-TOC in metastasized neuroendocrine cancers. *J Clin Oncol* 2011;**29**:2416–23. doi:10.1200/JCO.2010.33.7873

6 Villard L, Romer A, Marincek N, *et al.* Cohort study of somatostatin-based radiopeptide therapy with [(90)Y-DOTA]-TOC versus [(90)Y-DOTA]-TOC plus [(177)Lu-DOTA]-TOC in neuroendocrine cancers. *J Clin Oncol* 2012;**30**:1100–6. doi:10.1200/JCO.2011.37.2151

7 Ruszniewski P. 177Lu-DOTATATE significantly improves progression-free survival in patients with mid-gut neuroendocrine tumours: results of the phase III NETTER-1 trial [abstract LBA 6]. 2015;**advance online publication SP - EP** . doi:10.1038/nrclinonc.2015.182

8 Yao JC, Shah MH, Ito T, *et al.* Everolimus for advanced pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *N Engl J Med* 2011;**364**:514–23. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1009290

9 Raymond E, Dahan L, Raoul J-L, *et al.* Sunitinib malate for the treatment of pancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *N Engl J Med* 2011;**364**:501–13. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1003825

10 Moertel CG, Hanley JA, Johnson LA. Streptozocin alone compared with streptozocin plus fluorouracil in the treatment of advanced islet-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 1980;**303**:1189–94. doi:10.1056/NEJM198011203032101

11 Moertel CG, Lefkopoulo M, Lipsitz S, *et al.* Streptozocin-doxorubicin, streptozocin-fluorouracil or chlorozotocin in the treatment of advanced islet-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 1992;**326**:519–23. doi:10.1056/NEJM199202203260804

12 Delaunoit T, Ducreux M, Boige V, *et al.* The doxorubicin-streptozotocin combination for the treatment of advanced well-differentiated pancreatic endocrine carcinoma; a judicious option? *Eur J Cancer* 2004;**40**:515–20. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2003.09.035

13 Turner NC, Strauss SJ, Sarker D, *et al.* Chemotherapy with 5-fluorouracil, cisplatin and streptozocin for neuroendocrine tumours. *British Journal of Cancer* 2010;**102**:1106–12. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6605618

14 Kouvaraki MA, Ajani JA, Hoff P, *et al.* Fluorouracil, doxorubicin, and streptozocin in the treatment of patients with locally advanced and metastatic pancreatic endocrine carcinomas. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;**22**:4762–71. doi:10.1200/JCO.2004.04.024

15 Meyer T, Qian W, Caplin ME, *et al.* Capecitabine and streptozocin ± cisplatin in advanced gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumours. *Eur J Cancer* 2014;**50**:902–11. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2013.12.011

16 Weatherstone K, Meyer T. Streptozocin-based chemotherapy is not history in neuroendocrine tumours. *Target Oncol* 2012;**7**:161–8. doi:10.1007/s11523-012-0224-y

17 Sun W, Lipsitz S, Catalano P, *et al.* Phase II/III study of doxorubicin with fluorouracil compared with streptozocin with fluorouracil or dacarbazine in the treatment of advanced carcinoid tumors: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Study E1281. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;**23**:4897–904. doi:10.1200/JCO.2005.03.616

18 Engstrom PF, Lavin PT, Moertel CG, *et al.* Streptozocin plus fluorouracil versus doxorubicin therapy for metastatic carcinoid tumor. *J Clin Oncol* 1984;**2**:1255–9.

19 Vilar E, Salazar R, Pérez-García J, *et al.* Chemotherapy and role of the proliferation marker Ki-67 in digestive neuroendocrine tumors. *Endocr Relat Cancer* 2007;**14**:221–32. doi:10.1677/ERC-06-0074

20 Sorbye H, Welin S, Langer SW, *et al.* Predictive and prognostic factors for treatment and survival in 305 patients with advanced gastrointestinal neuroendocrine carcinoma (WHO G3): the NORDIC NEC study. *Ann Oncol* 2013;**24**:152–60. doi:10.1093/annonc/mds276

21 Khan MS, Luong TV, Watkins J, *et al.* A comparison of Ki-67 and mitotic count as prognostic markers for metastatic pancreatic and midgut neuroendocrine neoplasms. *British Journal of Cancer* 2013;**108**:1838–45. doi:10.1038/bjc.2013.156

22 Rindi G, Klöppel G, Alhman H, *et al.* TNM staging of foregut (neuro)endocrine tumors: a consensus proposal including a grading system. Springer-Verlag 2006. 395–401. doi:10.1007/s00428-006-0250-1

23 Rindi G, Klöppel G, Couvelard A, *et al.* TNM staging of midgut and hindgut (neuro) endocrine tumors: a consensus proposal including a grading system. Springer-Verlag 2007. 757–62. doi:10.1007/s00428-007-0452-1

24 Eriksson B, Annibale B, Bajetta E, *et al.* ENETS Consensus Guidelines for the Standards of Care in Neuroendocrine Tumors: chemotherapy in patients with neuroendocrine tumors. Karger Publishers 2009. 214–9. doi:10.1159/000225950

25 Ramage JK, Ahmed A, Ardill J, *et al.* Guidelines for the management of gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine (including carcinoid) tumours (NETs). Gut. 2012;**61**:6–32. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2011-300831

26 Dilz L-M, Denecke T, Steffen IG, *et al.* Streptozocin/5-fluorouracil chemotherapy is associated with durable response in patients with advanced pancreatic neuroendocrine tumours. *Eur J Cancer* 2015;**51**:1253–62. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2015.04.005

27 Strosberg JR, Fine RL, Choi J, *et al.* First-line chemotherapy with capecitabine and temozolomide in patients with metastatic pancreatic endocrine carcinomas. *Cancer* 2011;**117**:268–75. doi:10.1002/cncr.25425

28 Kulke MH, Hornick JL, Frauenhoffer C, *et al.* O6-methylguanine DNA methyltransferase deficiency and response to temozolomide-based therapy in patients with neuroendocrine tumors. *Clin Cancer Res* 2009;**15**:338–45. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-08-1476

29 Chan AO-O, Kim SG, Bedeir A, *et al.* CpG island methylation in carcinoid and pancreatic endocrine tumors. *Oncogene* 2003;**22**:924–34. doi:10.1038/sj.onc.1206123

30 Welin S, Sorbye H, Sebjornsen S, *et al.* Clinical effect of temozolomide-based chemotherapy in poorly differentiated endocrine carcinoma after progression on first-line chemotherapy. *Cancer* 2011;**117**:4617–22. doi:10.1002/cncr.26124

31 Schmitt AM, Pavel M, Rudolph T, *et al.* Prognostic and predictive roles of MGMT protein expression and promoter methylation in sporadic pancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms. *Neuroendocrinology* 2014;**100**:35–44. doi:10.1159/000365514