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PURPOSE
We aimed to investigate multimodality imaging findings of intraductal tubulopapillary neoplasms (ITPN) of the pancreas.

METHODS
This study was approved by the institutional review board with waived informed consent. A total of eight patients were histopathologically diagnosed with pancreatic ITPN in a single institution over a 6-year period. The imaging findings of dynamic contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP), endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS), and positron emission tomography-computed tomography (PET-CT) were reviewed and correlated with clinicopathologic findings.

RESULTS
Histopathologically, an invasive carcinoma component was found in 5 of 8 patients (62.5%). The median diameter of the lesions and the main pancreatic ducts were larger in ITPN with invasive carcinoma (19 mm, 13.3–98.0 mm and 13 mm, 5.9–16.3 mm, respectively) than in ITPN without invasive carcinoma (13 mm, 12.7–18.5 mm and 6 mm, 5.6–6.1 mm, respectively), but not significantly (lesions, \( P = 0.229 \) and main pancreatic ducts, \( P = 0.143 \)). Pancreatolithiasis accompanied invasive carcinoma in 3 of 5 patients (60%). Intraductal solid tumors were demonstrated on CT (5/8, 62.5%), MRCP (5/7, 71.4%), and EUS (7/7, 100%). In addition, various imaging findings mimicking chronic autoimmune pancreatitis or pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma were found in 3 patients (37.5%) on multimodality imaging. The lesion multiplicity and synchronous or metachronous biliary cancer occurred in 3 patients (37.5%), respectively.

CONCLUSION
Patients with associated invasive carcinoma from pancreatic ITPN may have presented a trend toward larger tumor size and dilated pancreatic duct with pancreatoliths, but the difference was not statistically significant. Further studies with a larger number of patients are needed to provide better insight into these findings. Pancreatic ITPN can show various atypical imaging findings as well as typical intraductal solid tumor on multimodality imaging. The presence of lesion multiplicity and synchronous or metachronous biliary cancer can be helpful for assisting with the diagnosis of pancreatic ITPN.

Intraductal tubulopapillary neoplasm (ITPN) of the pancreas is a relatively recently established intraductal neoplasm of the pancreas that was first described in 2009 by Yamaguchi et al. (1). According to the current 2010 WHO classification (2), pancreatic intraductal neoplasms are classified into two groups: intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm (IPMN) and ITPN. These two neoplasms are pancreatic intraductal epithelial tumors with the potential for malignancy (3). Pancreatic ITPN is histopathologically defined as an intraductal tubule-forming epithelial neoplasm with high-grade dysplasia without overt mucin production, in contrast to pancreatic IPMN. However, the rarity of this disease, which constitutes only 3% of intraductal neoplasms of the pancreas, limits the availability of pancreatic ITPN for study (1). In recent years, several researchers have reported clinicopathologic and immunohistochemical analysis of pancreatic ITPN and the correlation between clinicopathologic features and surgical outcomes in patients with pancreatic ITPN (4–9).
With the application of advanced imaging techniques, pancreatic intraductal lesions are being detected at an enormously increasing rate, but the majority of these lesions belong to pancreatic IPMN. Imaging studies of pancreatic ITPN have been limited to clinical case reports except for one study suggesting “2-tone duct sign” and “cork-of-wine-bottle sign” as characteristic imaging findings of ITPN (10). However, to our knowledge, there has been no report evaluating the imaging findings of ITPN according to its invasiveness.

The aim of this study is to evaluate the imaging findings of pancreatic ITPN according to its invasiveness using various imaging modalities.

**Methods**

**Patients and imaging studies**

This retrospective study was approved by our institutional review board (protocol no. 4-2018-0239) and the requirement for informed consent was waived. Between January 2012 and January 2017, 8 patients were histopathologically diagnosed with pancreatic ITPN in our institution. Clinical characteristics of these patients were collected and reviewed from the electronic medical records.

All 8 patients underwent multidetector computed tomography (CT) examinations with either a 16- or 64-channel CT scanner (Sensation 16 or 64; Siemens). After performing pre-contrast CT images, two-phase contrast-enhanced CT images were obtained with intravenous administration of nonionic contrast medium (Ultravist 300; Schering). Pancreatic phase images were obtained at 18 s after the time of peak abdominal aortic enhancement calculated near the hepatic hilum, and portal venous phase images at 18 s after the end of the pancreatic phase. The scanning parameters were as follows: rotation time, 0.5 s; beam collimation, 0.75 and 0.625 mm; slice thickness, 5 and 3 mm; reconstruction interval, 5 and 3 mm; effective tube current-time charge, 150–250 mAs; 120 kVP for the 16- and 64-channel CT scanner, respectively.

Seven patients underwent magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) with a 1.5 T (Intera Achieva; Philips Medical Systems) or 3.0 T (Magnetom Trio Tim; Siemens Medical Solutions) scanner with a 4- or 16-channel body coil. Pre-contrast magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) protocol consisted of breath-hold axial T1-weighted dual fast-gradient-recalled echo sequence and T2-weighted single- or multi-shot turbo spin-echo with spectral fat suppression. All two-dimensional (2D) and three-dimensional (3D) MRCP imaging was obtained with 2D thick-slab single-shot turbo spin-echo with a relaxation enhancement sequence and with 3D T2-weighted respiratory-triggered fast spin-echo sequence using a navigator technique. Contrast-enhanced dynamic T1-weighted imaging was obtained after administration of extracellular contrast agent as a bolus injection of 0.2 mL/kg gadoterate meglumine (Dotarem, Guerbet), followed by 20 mL saline flush using a power injector. The arterial phase began 5 s after the peak aortic enhancement was determined. Portal (50 s) and equilibrium (3 min) phase images were obtained after contrast agent administration, respectively. Diffusion-weighted imaging was performed using a navigator-triggered single-shot echoplanar sequence with b values of 0, 50, 400, and 800 s/mm². Imaging parameters for MRCP sequences are summarized in Table 1.

Seven patients underwent endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) using an ultrasound scanner (EU-M30, Olympus) with 12 MHz transducers (GFUM-240; Olympus Optical Co) with variable frequencies of 5, 7.5, 12, and 20 MHz by an experienced gastroenterologist (16 years of experience).

Four patients underwent positron emission tomography-CT (PET-CT) (Discovery STE, GE Healthcare). After CT scan was performed from the skull base to the proximal thighs for attenuation purpose, PET scan was performed with an acquisition time of 3 min per bed position in 3D mode after injection of 5.5 MBq/kg of 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose (18F-FDG). The PET scans were reconstructed using ordered subset expectation maximization with attenuation correction.

**Imaging analysis**

CT and MRCP images were retrospectively evaluated in consensus by two board certified abdominal radiologists with 13 and 17 years of experience. The following imaging features were analyzed: location (head including uncinated process, body, or tail), size, extent (focal or diffuse), and presence of intraductal solid tumor, attenuation/signal intensity/echogenicity of solid nodule compared with those of the normal pancreatic parenchyma, main pancreatic duct dilatation, chronic pancreatitis, pancreaticolithiasis, presence of diffusion restriction on MRI, and FDG uptake on PET-CT.

**Statistical analysis**

Statistical analyses were performed by one author using a commercial statistical software package (SPSS for Windows, version 23.0; IBM Corp.). The Mann-Whitney U test was used to evaluate differences between cancer and noncancer groups for continuous variables. All reported P values were two sided, and P < 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant.

**Results**

Clinical and pathologic characteristics of patients with pancreatic ITPN are summarized in Table 2. Five patients had symptoms of abdominal pain (n=4) or jaundice with elevated cancer antigen 19-9 level caused by synchronous bile duct cancer (n=1). Seven patients underwent surgical resection and one patient underwent biopsy for both pancreatic and hepatic lesions. One patient had synchronous triple primary biliary cancers of different histopathologic types: well-differentiated common bile duct (CBD) cancer; poorly differentiated ampulla of Vater cancer; and pancreatic ITPN associated with an invasive carcinoma. Three patients had metastatic gallbladder (n=2) and CBD (n=1) cancer.

Histopathologic analysis showed an invasive carcinoma component in 5 of 8 patients (62.5%). The maximal diameter of the pathologic specimens ranged from 1.3 to 8.0 cm (median, 2.5 cm). Imaging characteristics of CT, MRCP, and EUS are summarized in Table 2. The lesions were located in the pancreatic head (n=3),
body (n=2), head to body (n=1), and body
to tail (n=2) (Fig. 1).

The median diameter of the lesions was
19 mm (13.3–98.0 mm) in ITPN with invasive
carcinoma and 13 mm (12.7–18.5 mm) in
ITPN without invasive carcinoma. The me-
dian diameter of the main pancreatic ducts
was 13 mm (5.9–16.3 mm) in ITPN with in-
vasive carcinoma and 6 mm (5.6–6.1 mm) in
ITPN without invasive carcinoma. However,
there was no significant difference in the
median diameter of the lesions ($P = 0.229$)
and the pancreatic ducts ($P = 0.143$) ac-
cording to the invasiveness. Four of 5 (80%)
patients with ITPN associated with invasive

Table 1. MRI and MRCP imaging parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>3D T1W GRE sequence</th>
<th>Dual-echo T1W GRE sequence</th>
<th>Respiratory-triggered TSE T2W sequence</th>
<th>Breath-hold HASTE T2W sequence</th>
<th>2D MRCP</th>
<th>3D MRCP</th>
<th>DWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imaging plane</td>
<td>Axial</td>
<td>Axial</td>
<td>Axial</td>
<td>Axial</td>
<td>Coronal</td>
<td>Coronal</td>
<td>Axial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition time (ms)*</td>
<td>3.3/4.1</td>
<td>140/150</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo time (ms)*</td>
<td>1.2/1.5</td>
<td>1.2/2.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flip angle (degrees)</td>
<td>9–13</td>
<td>65–70</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrix</td>
<td>256×192</td>
<td>256×192</td>
<td>384×207</td>
<td>384×216</td>
<td>256×256</td>
<td>256×256</td>
<td>192×156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of view (mm$^2$)</td>
<td>320×240–280</td>
<td>300×240–400</td>
<td>370×240–280</td>
<td>370×240–280</td>
<td>300×300</td>
<td>340×340</td>
<td>370×240–280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received band width (kHz)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>1446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section thickness (mm)</td>
<td>3–6</td>
<td>3–6</td>
<td>3–6</td>
<td>3–6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of signal acquisitions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo-train length</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration factor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; MRCP, magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography; 3D, three-dimensional; 2D, two-dimensional; T1W, T1-weighted; T2W, T2-weighted; GRE, gradient-recalled echo; TSE, turbo-spin echo; HASTE, half-Fourier acquisition single-shot TSE; DWI, diffusion-weighted imaging; NA, not available.

*Repetition and echo times represent the respective values of the 1.5 and 3.0 T MRIs.

Table 2. Clinical, pathologic, and imaging characteristics of patients with pancreatic ITPN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Age/Sex</th>
<th>Pathologic diagnosis</th>
<th>Identifiable mass within the pancreatic duct</th>
<th>Lesion/P-duct diameter*</th>
<th>Elevated CA19-9°</th>
<th>Pancreatolith</th>
<th>Diffuse/Multifocal lesions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>47/M</td>
<td>ITPN with high-grade dysplasia</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53/M</td>
<td>ITPN with high-grade dysplasia</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65/M</td>
<td>ITPN with multifocal adenocarcinoma transformation</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>71/F</td>
<td>ITPN with an associated invasive carcinoma</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>53/M</td>
<td>ITPN with an associated invasive carcinoma</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>98.0 / 14.5</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>65/F</td>
<td>ITPN with an associated invasive carcinoma</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>23.1 / 13.0</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>50/F</td>
<td>ITPN with high-grade dysplasia</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>12.7 / 6.0</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>34/M</td>
<td>ITPN with an associated invasive carcinoma &amp; hepatic metastases</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>NA / 16.3</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITPN, intraductal tubulopapillary neoplasm; P-duct, pancreatic duct; CA 19-9, cancer antigen 19-9; CT, computed tomography; MRCP, magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography; EUS, endoscopic ultrasonography; M, male; F, female; (-), negative findings; (+), positive findings; NA, not available.

*The largest lesion and P-duct diameter were selected from either CT or MRI modalities.

°Elevated CA 19-9 level was defined as >37 U/mL.
carcinoma had pancreatic duct dilatation greater than 10 mm and 3 of 5 patients had impacted pancreatolithiasis. The 3 patients without invasive carcinoma did not have pancreatolithiasis.

Intraductal solid tumor within the main (n=7) or branch (n=1) pancreatic duct was detected in 62.5% of cases with CT (5 of 8), 71.4% with MRCP (5 of 7), and 100% with EUS (7 of 7). In two patients intraductal solid tumor was not detected on either CT and MRI, but was detected on EUS. One patient showed diffuse involvement of ITPN with irregular main pancreatic duct dilatation, mimicking chronic autoimmune pancreatitis on MRCP (Fig. 1). The other patient showed a small mass with upstream duct dilatation, which was preoperatively interpreted as pancreas cancer (Fig. 2). In one patient with invisible intraductal tumor at CT, MRCP demonstrated a small intraductal solid tumor with both upstream and downstream duct dilatation, similar to the “2-tone duct sign” (Fig. 3). In another patient, CT, MRCP, and EUS showed a large solid tumor within the cystic lesion and stones within the dilated duct in the pancreas head/uncinated process, mimicking branch duct type of IPMN with chronic pancreatitis (Fig. 4).

Compared with the adjacent pancreatic parenchyma, all of the solid tumors showed low or iso-enhancement on CT (n=6) (Fig. 5)
Pancreatic ITPN is a very rare and relatively slowly growing intraductal pancreatic tumor. According to previously published literature, pancreatic ITPN has a favorable clinical outcome with overall 5-year survival rate greater than 70% to 80% regardless of an invasive carcinoma component (6, 7). Therefore, there has been an effort to differentiate ITPN from other intraductal pancreatic lesions such as IPMN or pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma with a focus on the immunohistochemical and clinicopathologic features (5–8).

In our study, 62.5% of the patients (5 of 8) showed ITPN with invasive carcinoma. This is similar to previous reports that up to 50% of ITPN cases are associated with invasive carcinoma (5, 8). Patients with invasive carcinoma showed a tendency to have larger tumor size and more main duct dilatation. This result is consistent with previous reports (1, 8). In addition, 3 of 5 cases of ITPN with invasive carcinoma were accompanied by pancreatoliths, whereas no cases of ITPN without invasive carcinoma had pancreatoliths. This might be because slowly growing intraductal tumors gradually obstruct the main pancreatic duct leading to insufficient drainage of pancreatic juice and stone formation during the disease course transformed from high grade dysplasia to invasive carcinoma. Therefore, the presence of pancreatoliths in invasive ITPN can reflect the long disease course with less aggressive nature. This is also supported by the lack of standardized uptake value (SUV) and no diffusion restriction in the cases of invasive ITPN in our study.

The previous literature (10) suggested that the marked pancreatic duct dilatation caused by abundant mucin secretion in pancreatic IPMN could be a key imaging finding in the differential diagnosis from pancreatic ITPN with same intraductal tumor growth. However, our study results showed that marked pancreatic duct dilatation is also possible in ITPN with invasive carcinoma, which could be due to impacted pancreatoliths associated with a very slow-growing intraductal tumor. On the other hand, solid component in pancreatic IPMN rarely replaces the cyst or dilated main pancreatic duct even if it is in advanced state, whereas solid tumor in pancreatic ITPN tends to focally or diffusely occupy the dilated main pancreatic duct (10). This is possibly due to the fact that abundant mucin from IPMN replaces the pancreatic duct first rather than intraductal solid tumor. From our study, ITPN nearly replacing the pancreatic duct...
was radiologically misdiagnosed as autoimmune pancreatitis or ductal adenocarcinoma instead of rare pancreatic ITPN.

Our case series demonstrated that EUS detected all intraductal solid tumors compared with CT or MRCP. The high resolution of EUS and close proximity to the target lesion of the pancreas could provide higher sensitivity for small solid tumors in the duct (11). However, CT or MRCP can provide additional information regarding the presence of synchronous biliary cancer, distinct metastases, or concomitant chronic pancreatitis including pancreaticoliths that assists diagnosis of pancreatic ITPN.

In our case series, half of the patients had synchronous or metachronous biliary cancer. Currently, there has been no report demonstrating the relationship between development of biliary cancers of different histologic type and pancreatic ITPN and further investigation is needed.

Pancreatic ITPN showed various imaging findings beyond the typical imaging findings of intraductal solid tumor, as reported in previous studies. In the present study, preoperative imaging diagnoses were chronic autoimmune pancreatitis, pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, or IPMN instead of pancreatic ITPN. Diffuse small intraductal tumors rendered the pancreatic duct dilatation irregular, mimicking autoimmune pancreatitis, and the solid component within the cystic mass of the pancreas led the radiologist to misdiagnose the malignant pancreatic IPMN on multimodality imaging. These various atypical imaging findings in addition to the rare disease incidence make it difficult for radiologists to achieve an imaging diagnosis for pancreatic ITPN (6, 12).

There are only two case reports of PET-CT study of pancreatic ITPN (13, 14). Our study showed varied 18F-FDG uptake ranging from no to strong uptake in 4 patients regardless of invasive carcinoma component. Therefore, further study is required to determine the utility of PET-CT in patients with pancreatic ITPN.

There are several limitations to our study. First, this is a retrospective study of a small number of patients. Pancreatic ITPN is a very rare disease that has recently been categorized as one of the pancreatic intraductal neoplasms, so multicenter studies involving a large number of patients are needed to obtain accurate imaging information of this disease. Second, we did not compare pancreatic ITPN with pancreatic IPMN, which is its counterpart.

In conclusion, patients with associated invasive carcinoma from pancreatic ITPN may have presented a trend toward larger tumor size and dilated pancreatic duct with pancreaticoliths, but the differences were not statistically significant. Further studies with a larger number of patients are needed to provide better insight into these findings. Pancreatic ITPN can show various atypical imaging findings as well as typical intraductal solid tumor on multimodality imaging. The presence of lesion multiplicity and synchronous or metachronous biliary cancer can be helpful for assisting with the diagnosis of pancreatic ITPN.
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