Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma
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Introduction

Cholangiocarcinoma (CCA) comprises a heterogeneous group of cancers with pathologic features of biliary tract differentiation, and is presumed to arise from the intra- or extrahepatic biliary tract. Two recent papers suggest these cancers may also arise directly from transdifferentiation of hepatocytes [1,2]. Gallbladder cancer is distinct from cholangiocarcinoma in epidemiology, pathobiology, clinical presentation and management, and should be considered a different form of biliary tract cancer [3]. On the basis of its anatomical origin, CCA is best classified anatomically as intrahepatic (iCCA), perihilar (pCCA), or distal (dCCA) CCA [4]. The incidence of iCCA appears to be increasing and may be as high as 2.1 per 100,000 person years in Western Countries [5]. iCCA may occur in patients with normal liver or with underlying liver disease, and in either clinical context usually is classified pathologically as an adenocarcinoma, although mixed hepatocellular – cholangiocarcinomas also occur, especially in chronic liver disease [6].

Given the increasing incidence of this complex and fatal disease, the growing recognition of iCCA as a distinct cancer, and the large number of recent publications on this disease, the International Liver Cancer Association (ILCA) governing board noted it was both timely and topical to develop practice guidelines on iCCA. These guidelines are largely based on a consensus of a multidisciplinary, geographically diverse writing committee using a data-supported approach, and subsequently reviewed by a separate Practice Guidelines committee of ILCA. The ILCA guidelines committee employed an extensive PubMed search to broadly canvas the existing literature. Each author then wrote different sections of the manuscript relative to their expertise. All authors then reviewed and edited the manuscript to ensure objectivity and evidence-based recommendations. Finally an ILCA oversight committee reviewed the document, provided recommendations, and then additional edits were made to the document. Thus, a two-tiered integrated and interactive process was employed to generate the guidelines. These recommendations suggest preferred approaches to the diagnostic and therapeutic aspects of care, and are intended to be flexible, in contrast to standards of care, which should be supported by robust evidence-based data. Thus, the guidelines have two principal goals: (1) to provide physicians with pragmatic clinical recommendations; and (2) to identify areas of interest for future research, including suggestions for conducting clinical trials. The evidence and recommendations in these guidelines have been graded according to the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) system, Table 1 [7]. The GRADE system classifies the evidence as high, moderate, low or very low quality. The strength of recommendation is either strong or weak based on the quality of underlying evidence, outcomes, and cost.

Epidemiology & risk factors

The incidence of cholangiocarcinoma varies substantially worldwide with the highest known rates in Northeast Thailand (>80 per 100,000 population) and much lower rates in the Western world, for example Canada (0.3 per 100,000) (Fig. 1) [8]. iCCA is the second most common primary liver cancer in humans, after hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). Although the frequency of iCCA worldwide is considerably less than HCC, of note, several recent studies from around the world have reported rapidly rising rates of iCCA over the last few decades [9–11].
Trends in iCCA rates worldwide

An increase in mortality rates from iCCA was concomitantly reported in studies from the US and the UK [12,13]. The study from the UK analyzed age standardized mortality rates (ASMR) per 100,000 population for hepatopancreatobiliary (HPB) tumors [12]. Between 1968 and 1996, there was a 15-fold increase in age specific mortality rates (ASpMR) from 0.1 to 1.5 per 100,000 population in ages 45 and above in both sexes. Since the mid-1990s, iCCA has become the most common cause of death from a primary liver tumor in England and Wales, overtaking HCC. Similar trends were found in incidence rates of this cancer in England and Wales [14]. A study from the US also reported a marked rise in both incidence and mortality rates from iCCA between 1973 and 1997, with an estimated annual percent change (EAPC) of 9.1% and 9.4% respectively [13]. Age-adjusted incidence rates of iCCA in the US increased by 165% from 0.3 per 100,000 in 1975–1979 to 0.9 per 100,000 in 1995–1999 [10,11]. More recent studies from Italy and Germany also reported rises in iCCA. In Italy iCCA mortality rates increased from 0.2 to 5.9 per million between 1980 and 2003 [15] and in Germany iCCA mortality more than tripled between 1998 and 2008 [16]. Incidence rates of iCCA have also recently increased in Korea, with an annual percent change (APC) of 8% in males and 11% in females, between 1999 and 2005 [17].

Two studies examining international time trends in mortality rates using the World Health Organization’s (WHO) database found that ASMR for iCCA had risen in almost all countries across all continents, albeit at different rates [18,19]. The average global estimated annual percent change (EAPC) in ASMR for males was 6.9 ± 1.5, and for females 5.1 ± 1.0 [19]. In contrast to the aforementioned data, in Denmark between 1978 and 2002, incidence

Table 1. Grading of evidence and recommendations (adapted from GRADE system) [7].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence quality</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate. Any change of estimate is uncertain</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Grading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong recommendation warranted</td>
<td>Factors influencing the strength of the recommendation included the quality of the evidence, presumed patient-important outcomes, and cost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Variability in preferences and values, or more uncertainty: more likely a weak recommendation is warranted. Recommendation is made with less certainty, higher cost or resource consumption</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Incidence of cholangiocarcinoma worldwide where reported.
rates of iCCA decreased from 1.3 to 0.5 per 100,000 people [20]. Why iCCA has decreased in Denmark in contrast to other countries is unknown.

Ethnic differences in iCCA rates

The reports so far described have found similar trends in iCCA rates in both sexes, with a slight male predominance overall (male to female ratio 1.2–1.5:1) [21]. Two studies, both from the US, have examined trends in iCCA rates based on ethnicity within geographically defined regions [22,23]. Both investigations, using data from the US Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database, noted significant racial and ethnic differences in iCCA rates. The age-adjusted prevalence of iCCA per 100,000 for males and females, respectively, for all races was 0.9 and 0.6; for Whites, 0.9 and 0.6; for Blacks, 0.5 and 0.2; and for Asian/Pacific Islanders was 1.3 and 0.8 [22,23]. iCCA prevalence was highest in Hispanics (1.2 per 100,000), and in contrast to the general male predominance, the prevalence among Hispanics was higher in females compared with males (1.5 vs. 0.9 per 100,000). Age-adjusted mortality rates for males and females were higher for American Indian/Alaska Native (1.3 per 100,000) and Asian Pacific groups (1.4 per 100,000) than for either Whites (0.8 per 100,000) or Blacks (0.7 per 100,000) [22]. However, mortality rates increased by over 3.5% per year for all ethnic groups except for American Indian/Pacific Islanders, in whom mortality rates decreased by 0.2% annually. The increase in mortality rates was greatest for Hispanic women aged between 40 and 49 years. In a separate study, iCCA incidence rates were similar for Black and White men (0.9/100,000), but higher for White women (0.6/100,000) compared to Black women (0.4/100,000) [23]. Although iCCA incidence increased among all groups, approximately doubling between 1976 and 2000, the increase was greatest for Black men (138.5%), followed by White men (124.4%), White women (111.1%), and Black women (85.7%) [23].

Are the reported rates of changing CC incidence accurate?

There is an evolving discussion in the literature about whether iCCA incidence is genuinely increasing. The possibility that rising iCCA rates may reflect improved detection, for example due to improvements in diagnostic techniques over the past few decades, has rarely been investigated. One US study addressed this question by examining SEER data between 1975 and 1999 [10,11]. iCCA incidence increased by 165%, during which time no significant changes were found in the proportion of patients with unstaged cancer, localized cancer, microscopic confirmation, or with tumor size <5 cm, suggesting a true increase in iCCA rather than earlier or improved diagnosis [10,11]. Further studies looking at this issue are warranted, particularly given that CCA can be notoriously difficult to accurately diagnose [24]. When iCCA presents at an advanced stage, which is common, it can be impossible to determine the anatomical origin, and the histological subtype, which can result in misclassification as a non hepatobiliary upper gastrointestinal tract adenocarcinoma [21]. A significant issue is the lack of histopathological confirmation in a substantial percentage of iCCA cases in most cancer registries worldwide, which makes it impossible to definitively establish the true epidemiological behavior of iCCA [25].

Another confounding factor in assessing CCA epidemiology is that of potential misclassification under serially evolving editions of the World Health Organization’s (WHO) International Classification of Disease (ICD) coding systems. Alongside the main ICD coding system is the ICD coding system for Oncology (ICD-O), which was introduced in 1979 and assigns two codes dependent upon a tumor’s anatomical topography and morphology (based on histology) [26]. Thus there are separate codes for topography and histology. Both ICD and ICD-O are updated every few years and codes are altered. Furthermore, these changes are adopted by different countries’ cancer registries at different times. There is increasing consensus that iCCA, pCCA, and dCCA are three distinct entities due to their differing epidemiology, pathobiology, clinical presentations, and management [4]. The most common type of CCA encountered in clinical practice is perihilar, historically referred to as a Klatskin tumor [27]; the definition of pCCA includes tumors above the junction of the cystic duct up to and including the second biliary branches of the right and left bile ducts that reside within the hepatic parenchyma [4,28]. However, CCA are only coded as either intra- or extrahepatic and a separate ICD topography code for perihilar tumors does not exist. pCCA are topographically extrahepatic and should have historically been coded as such [24]. However, the first edition of the ICD for Oncology (ICD-O) did not specify whether pCCA should be classified as intra- or extrahepatic. The second edition of ICD-O assigned Klatskin tumors a unique histology code for the first time, but this was cross-referenced to the topography code for intrahepatic (IHBD) rather than extrahepatic bile duct tumors (EHBD). Under the third and current edition of ICD-O-3, Klatskin tumors can be cross-referenced to either IHBD or EHBD. Thus, hilar/Klatskin tumors may have been misclassified under all versions of the ICD-O [24,29].

The impact of this misclassification on site-specific CCA incidence rates was examined using US SEER data [29]. Between 1992 and 2000, when SEER used ICD-O-2, 91% of pCCA were incorrectly coded as iCCA, resulting in an overestimation of iCCA by 13%. However, they found that the overall proportion of tumors classified as Klatskin or pCCA in the SEER database was low, at only 8%. This was a surprising finding given that in published studies, as well as clinical experience, pCCA tumors account for the majority of all CCA [27]. A study of CCA incidence in East and South-eastern Asia also found that the proportion of Klatskin/pCCA tumors among CCA was less than that reported in clinical settings [30]. Furthermore, coding practices for pCCA tumors differed between cancer registries in Asia.

A more recent study compared the impact of ICD coding changes on CCA incidence rates between 1990 and 2008 in England, Wales, and the US [24]. Coding practices by all national cancer registries in England and Wales were also assessed via questionnaire [24]. In the US, the age standardized incidence rate (ASIR) for iCCA rose from 0.6/100,000 to 0.9 between 1990 and 2001, then fell sharply before plateauing at 0.6 by 2007. ASIR for extrahepatic bile duct tumors remained stable at around 0.8/100,000 population until 2001, then increased to 1.0 by 2007. In England and Wales, between 1995 and 2008, the vast majority of pCCA tumors were coded as intrahepatic. This was also the case in the US until 2001, when the situation was reversed and subsequently most pCCA tumors were coded as extrahepatic. Of note, US trends in intra- and extrahepatic tumors began to reverse when the switch from ICD-O-2 to ICD-O-3 occurred in 2001. In the UK, the switch to ICD-O-3 only occurred in 2008, the end of the study period. Furthermore, in England and Wales, only 1% of CCA were reportedly pCCA, which is clearly a
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massive underestimation. Cancer registries in England and Wales stated they would not code a CCA described as hilar with the designated Klatskin histology code, even though they are the same entity, as the term hilar is not in the ICD classification. In the UK, the term hilar is used rather than Klatskin and most cancer registries confirmed that if the tumor site is unspecified, or simply says hilar or perihilar, the CCA would be coded as intrahepatic. Thus coding misclassification is likely to have skewed CCA registration to an intrahepatic site, thereby contributing to previously reported rises in iCCA, at least in England and Wales and likely in other countries [24]. Given CCA is relatively uncommon in most countries, subtle misclassifications can substantially affect reported rates [21].

In conclusion, close surveillance of international incidence trends for all hepatobiliary tumors is recommended. An accurate and consistent classification practice for CCA is needed internationally considering the potential misclassification of pCCA. We suggest bile duct cancers could be sub-classified as iCCA, pCCA, or dCCA with the term Klatskin being omitted altogether [4,31,32]. The terms intrahepatic vs. extrahepatic are unhelpful in this situation. Importantly, however CCA are classified, their overall incidence seems to be increasing and the reasons for this need to be investigated [24].

Recommendations 1

• CCA should be sub-classified as intrahepatic (iCCA), perihilar (pCCA), or distal (dCCA) where iCCA arises within the liver parenchyma. The terms Klatskin and extrahepatic are discouraged

Recommendation A1

Suggestions for future studies

• Overall the incidence of iCCA seems to be increasing globally and the reasons for this need to be further investigated

Risk factors for iCCA

Cholangiocarcinogenesis is likely to be a multifactorial process [33]. Significant geographical and ethnic variations in the epidemiology of CCA, globally and within the same geographical regions, likely reflect differences in genetic, environmental and/or cultural predispositions to the disease. Several risk factors for CCA have been identified, however in the vast majority of cases the disease is sporadic and known or suspected risk factors are not present [9,21]. Unfortunately, studies examining potential risk factors often do not differentiate between iCCA, pCCA or dCCA and so the effects of different risk factors on CCA sub-types are unclear [21]. Long established risk factors for CCA, such as hepatobiliary flukes, primary sclerosing cholangitis (PSC), biliary tract cysts, hepatolithiasis and toxins are associated with chronic biliary inflammation and increased cellular turnover [32]. More recently recognized risk factors for iCCA are similar to those known for HCC, such as cirrhosis, chronic hepatitis B and C, obesity, diabetes, and alcohol [34]. However, the prevalence of these risk factors is much lower for iCCA than for HCC. Suspected risk factors include inflammatory bowel disease, smoking, and genetic polymorphisms. Many known risk factors for CCA such as PSC, are associated with pCCA or dCCA, and will not be reviewed here.

In regions of the world with highest CCA incidence, such as Northeastern Thailand, where CCA is the most common cancer and a major cause of mortality, the hepatobiliary flukes Opisthorchis viverrini and Clonorchis sinensis are strongly associated with the development of CCA. In 2008, these flukes were classified as group 1 human carcinogens for CCA by the WHO’s International Agency for Research on Cancer. Human infection occurs via eating raw/undercooked freshwater fish; subsequently, the flukes inhabit the biliary tree leading to chronic irritation [35]. Several case-control studies and a recent meta-analysis have shown a strong association between liver flukes and CCA, with odds ratios (OR) of up to 27 [36]. Consumption of nitrosamine-contaminated food may be an additional risk factor [37,38]. Apparently approximately 40% of CCA associated with flukes are iCCA.

Cholelithiasis, diseases such as Caroli’s disease, are uncommon inherited abnormalities of the pancreatobiliary ducts which result in reflux of pancreatic enzymes, cholestasis, and biliary inflammation [39]. These diseases, which are more common in Asian than Western countries, are strongly associated with CCA, with an overall lifetime risk ranging from 5% to 30% [39,40]. Compared to Western peoples, Asians have a higher prevalence of cholelithiasis and also a higher incidence of CCA, up to 18% compared to 5% lifetime risk of CCA [39,41,42]. Types I (solitary, extrahepatic) and IV (intra- plus extrahepatic) bile-duct cysts have the greatest predisposition to CCA [39]. CCA incidence in these patients increases with age, the average age at CCA diagnosis is 32 years [39]. A recent Korean case-control study confirmed a strong association between bile duct cysts and CCA, with an OR of 10.7 [43]. A US SEER-based study reported strong associations between bile duct cysts and increased risk of iCCA (OR 38.9) and extraportal CCA (OR 47.1) [44]. Calculi in the biliary tree, with or without concomitant parasite infection, are a known risk factor for CCA. For reasons which are unknown, hepatolithiasis is far more common in Southeast Asia than the West (up to 20% in countries such as Thailand, compared to 2% in the US) [21]. Case-control studies have found high ORs for developing iCCA with hepatolithiasis, up to 50 in Korea [43], 6 in China [45], and 7 in Italy [46]. In a hospital based case-control study from China; smoking, a family history of cancer, and a greater than 10 year duration of symptoms were independent risk factors for iCCA development in patients with hepatolithiasis [47].

Case-control and cohort studies from Denmark, Japan, US, and Korea have reported cirrhosis, of any aetiology, as an independent risk factor for iCCA with risk estimates ranging between 5 and 14 [43,44,48–50]. A recent meta-analysis of seven case-control studies, including data on almost 400,000 patients, found that cirrhosis was associated with an overall OR of 23 for iCCA [34]. A series of recent case-control studies from Asia, the US and Europe have reported a strong association between chronic viral hepatitis and iCCA [36,43–46,50–53]. However, studies report conflicting findings as to whether HBV or HCV or both viruses were associated with CCA. Risk estimates for HBV as a risk factor for iCCA varied between 2.3 (Korea) [43,53] and 28.6 (US) [53]. In a recent meta-analysis, eight case-control studies investigating HBV as a risk factor for iCCA, including data from 1991 to 2008 and

encompassing a total study population of almost 295,000 patients were selected [34]. The meta-analysis indicated that overall, HBV was associated with iCCA with a combined OR of 5.5. There were no significant differences between studies from Eastern or Western countries. A retrospective case-control study from Taiwan reported 38% of all iCCA were Hepatitis B surface antigen positive (OR 5.0) and 13% were seropositive for HCV (OR 2.7) [54]. The mean age of iCCA patients with HBV was 9 years younger than iCCA patients with HCV. Similarly, a recent study from China found that, compared to HBV seronegative patients with iCCA, HBV seropositive iCCA patients were younger, more commonly male, and had a higher incidence of raised serum alpha-fetoprotein level and cirrhosis [55]. Regarding HCV as a risk factor for iCCA, risk estimates in individual studies varied between 2.6 (US) [51] and 9.7 (Italy) [46]. In a meta-analysis HCV was associated with iCCA, with an OR of 4.8 [34].

Obesity is increasingly linked to several cancers. In a UK study, a body mass index of >30 was significantly associated with biliary tract cancer, but this included all CCA types as well as gallbladder cancer [56]. A recent US study of SEER data between 1993 and 2005 reported that metabolic syndrome was significantly associated with an increased risk of iCCA (OR 1.6) [57]. A combined analysis of two US and one Danish study, investigating obesity as a risk factor for iCCA, revealed an overall OR of 1.6 [34]. Individual studies report conflicting results regarding diabetes as a risk factor for iCCA. Three large population-based case-control studies, two US [44,48], and one UK [56], reported a significant positive association between diabetes and CCA, with risk estimates between 1.5 and 2.0. Conversely, a population-based case-control study in Denmark [44], and three hospital-based studies from China [45], Japan [50], and the US [53] did not show a significant association. However, a meta-analysis found diabetes was associated with an overall OR of 1.9 for iCCA [34].

Individual case-control and cohort studies, including those already referenced, have reported contrasting findings regarding an association between alcohol use and CCA. In the recent meta-analysis alcohol excess was associated with an overall OR of 2.8 for iCCA [34]. In contrast to alcohol, the data linking smoking to iCCA are either negative or demonstrate a weak association [21]. A meta-analysis of these eight studies estimated an overall OR of 1.3 with confidence intervals of 0.95–1.8 [34]. However, significant heterogeneity between studies was noted, as well as inconsistencies regarding parameters of smoking frequency or duration. Further data are required to clarify if smoking is a genuine risk factor for iCCA.

Host genetic polymorphisms

Given that only a minority of people with any of the established risk factors for CCA get the disease, and given the significant ethnic and geographical variations in CCA incidence, it is likely that host genetic factors play a role in CCA predisposition [33]. There is some evidence for this from several case-control studies, which suggest that variations in genes coding for a number of enzyme systems may be associated with increased CCA risk (Table 2). These studies have involved relatively small numbers, with CCA cases ranging between 50 and 200, and CCA sub-types are usually unspecified. Larger genetic studies are required to shed further light on this important area.

Recommendations 2

Table 2. Host genetic polymorphism associated with cholangiocarcinoma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene product</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Protein function</th>
<th>[Ref.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,10-Methylenetetrahydrofolate reductase</td>
<td>MTHFR</td>
<td>Involved in folate metabolism and DNA methylation</td>
<td>[223]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thymidylate synthase</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Associated with DNA repair</td>
<td>[223]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glutathione S-transferases</td>
<td>GST01</td>
<td>Family of detoxification enzymes</td>
<td>[224]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidrug resistance-associated protein 2</td>
<td>MRP2/ABC2</td>
<td>Biliary transporter involved in clearing biliary toxins</td>
<td>[225]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATP8B1</td>
<td>FIC1</td>
<td>Biliary transporter involved in trafficking phospholipidserine in cellular membranes</td>
<td>[226]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural killer cell receptor in PSC patients</td>
<td>NKG2D</td>
<td>Role in activating NK cells, key for tumor surveillance</td>
<td>[227]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-ray repair cross-complementing group 1</td>
<td>XRCC1</td>
<td>Involved in DNA repair</td>
<td>[228]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostaglandin-endoperoxide synthase 2/cyclooxygenase-2</td>
<td>PTGS2, COX-2</td>
<td>An inflammatory mediator</td>
<td>[229]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterozygosity for the alpha1-antitrypsin Z allele</td>
<td></td>
<td>A protease inhibitor which protects against pro-inflammatory enzymes</td>
<td>[230]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Molecular pathogenesis

Overview

The molecular pathogenesis of iCCA is a complex issue involving several signal transduction pathways and molecular events (Fig. 2) [58,59]. iCCA likely results from malignant transformation of cholangiocytes, and in a subset of cases from progenitor cells, although this paradigm has been challenged [1,2]. Recent data...
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Genetic alterations in iCCA

A discrete number of mutations, chromosomal aberrations, deregulated signaling pathways, and epigenetic changes have been reported in iCCA.

Mutations

Activating mutations of KRA S represent one of the most frequent genetic mutations found in iCCA (5–54%). [58,60,65,66]. KRA S gene has been shown to be a bona fide oncogene inducing iCCA in genetically engineered mouse models [67], and these

indicate common genomic traits between iCCA and HCC, supporting the hypothesis of common cell ancestors in specific molecular subclasses: (1) Transcriptome analysis suggests that the poor prognostic subclass of iCCA shares genomic traits and signatures of poor prognosis of HCC [58,60,61]; (2) iCCA and HCC share common copy number variations including gains (1q, 8q, and 17q) and losses (4q, 8p, 13q, and 17p) of arms and high-level amplifications of 11q 13 [58,60,64]; and (3) iCCA shares dominant risk factors associated with HCC development, including cirrhosis, HBV and HCV infections, and metabolic syndrome due to diabetes and/or obesity [34,57].

Fig. 2. Signaling pathways and molecular therapies in intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma. Adapted by permission from McMillan Publishers Ltd.: Oncogene [59], Copyright (2013).
mutations have been associated with a more aggressive phenotype [60]. Loss-of-function mutations of TP53 occur in 20% of cases, and have been proven oncogenic in experimental models of iCCA [68,69]. BRAF, NRAS, PI3K, EGRF, and MET mutations are rare events involving <5% of cases [58,60,70]. Recently, mutations in isocitrate dehydrogenase 1 (IDH1) and 2 (IDH2) have been identified in 10–23% of 340 iCCA [71,72]. These mutations co-occurred with TP53 mutations and were associated with DNA hypermethylation [72]. There is no reported study assessing whole-genome sequencing in iCCA, and the sole data available include eight cases of liver fluke-related CCAs [73].

**Copy number variations**

There are only a few studies reporting chromosomal imbalances in iCCA [58,74–78]. Five studies investigated copy number variations (CNV) performing comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) in 98 patients [74–78] and one study used single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) arrays in 149 patients [58]. The main findings of these studies included frequent chromosomal gains on 8q, 17q, and 20q and deletions on 3p (60%), 4q, 9p, and 17p. The one study using SNP array technology [58] identified high-level amplifications (e.g., 1p31, 11q13) and focal deletions (e.g., 9p21, 14q22) in 4–12% of cases, pinpointing candidate regions harboring novel oncogenes and oncosuppressors.

**Protein fusions**

Fusions including the kinase domain of FGFR2 have been recently reported [79]. This observation has been confirmed by a recent study from Japan coupled with functional studies in cell culture [80]. Moreover, several groups have similar observations (unpublished observations).

**Epigenome changes**

Epigenetic silencing through promoter hypermethylation along with miRNA deregulation have been described in a few studies [63,81]. Single-gene studies define common alterations in iCCA: hypermethylation of p16INK4A in 18–83% of cases [82], SOCS-3 in 88% [83], RASSF1A in 49% [75], and p14ARF in 25% [84]. At the same time, a cluster of 38 miRNAs was identified as markedly deregulated in iCCA and some of them were associated with aberrant signaling pathways (e.g., HGF/MET, IL-6/STAT3) [81]. Amongst all miRNA deregulated, a link between miR-200c signaling, NCAM activation/stem cell gene expression trait and poor prognosis has been proposed [63]. Recent papers have been published assessing mutations in various populations with iCCA [73,85]. These studies highlight the role of chromatin modifiers especially BAP1 in the genetic pathogenesis of this disease [85,86]. Thus, epigenetic alterations appear to play a dominant role in this disease.

**Signaling pathways activated in iCCA**

Several pathways have been found to be deregulated in iCCA, including inflammatory, cell cycle, and growth factor signaling pathways (Fig. 2). Although they contain potential drivers of carcinogenesis, to date no oncogenic addiction loop has been documented.

**IL6-STAT3 pathway**

Inflammation has been closely linked to an increased risk of iCCA. Overall, JAK/STAT signaling activation occurs in 50% of iCCA, and may affect more than 70% of the iCCA inflammation subclass [58]. In particular, IL-6 is an important oncogenic player in the growth of malignant cholangiocytes [83,87,88] and its over-expression may be a consequence of the epigenetic silencing of SOCS-3, the inhibitor of cytokine signaling [83,89].

**EGFR signaling**

Members of the EGFR family have been implicated in iCCA pathogenesis, and over-expression of EGFR (10–32%) and HER-2/neu have been reported in iCCA patients [90–92]. Amplifications and/or mutations of EGFR or HER-2 are very rare in iCCA. Aberrant EGFR phosphorylation activates MAPK/ERK and p38, which in turn increases COX-2.

**Hepatocyte growth factor/Met signaling**

C-Met, the tyrosine kinase receptor for hepatocyte growth factor (HGF), is over-expressed in iCCA (12–58%) [93,94]. Cross-talk between activation of EGFR family members, particularly HER-2, with c-Met pathways has been described in experimental models and in human studies [94,95].

**Molecular classification of iCCA**

Molecular stratification can be based on biomarkers as predictors of response to targeted drugs or biomarkers as prognostic factors. Few molecular subclasses have been adopted in management guidelines, and they are typically based upon biomarker predictors of treatment response. This is the case of amplification of Her2/neu and responders to trastuzumab in breast cancer [96], EGFR mutational status or ALK status and response to erlotinib and crizotinib, respectively, in non-small cell lung cancer [97,98], and B-RAF mutations to identify responders to B-RAF inhibitors in melanoma [99]. No such case has been described in iCCA.

Recent advancements have been made in defining molecular subclasses in iCCA based on whole-transcriptome analysis and other biological parameters [58–61,63,100,101]. The first comprehensive study included 104 cholangiocarcinoma cases – including iCCA, pCCA, and dCCA – and described two molecular subclasses, one of which was associated with poor prognosis and activation of receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs), including EGFR, ERBB2, and MET [60]. An integrative genomic study of 149 iCCA identified two molecular subgroups, inflammation and proliferation, with distinct genomic profiles and clinical outcomes [58,59]. The inflammation subclass (40%) showed an enrichment of inflammation and cytokine pathway signatures, over-expression of IL6, IL10, and IL17 and constitutive activation of STAT3. The proliferation subclass (60%) was characterized by enrichment of activated oncogenic pathways including RAS/MAPK and MET, high-level DNA amplifications at 11q13, deletions at 14q22.1 and signatures of poor clinical outcomes. Further independent validation of iCCA subclasses is needed prior to adoption as stratification factors in iCCA guidelines.
Guidelines

Recommendations 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Signaling pathways, drivers of carcinogenesis, and potential targets for therapies in iCCA include KRAS/\MAPK, EGFR, IL-6/STAT, IDH1/2, FGFR2 and MET signaling. No oncogenic addiction loops have been described so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Molecular classification of iCCA based on gene signatures or molecular abnormalities is not ready for clinical application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions for future studies

• Future studies should focus on integrative genomic analysis studies combining genetic alterations with pathway identification, validating the use of genetic biomarkers to direct therapy, and further genetically stratifying patients with iCCA

Clinical diagnosis of iCCA

Clinical presentation

The clinical presentation of iCC is non-specific and insufficient to establish a diagnosis. Patients with early stage disease are usually asymptomatic. At more advanced stages, patients may present with weight loss, malaise, abdominal discomfort, jaundice, hepaticomegaly, or a palpable abdominal mass. Biliary tract obstruction occurs infrequently with iCCA. Tumor-related fever may rarely occur, although night sweats are common in advanced disease. Increased cholestasis and a declining performance status may occur in patients who develop CCA. CCA should be considered in patients with underlying hepatolithiasis or PSC with worsening performance status, unexplained loss of weight, or failure to thrive.

Pathologic diagnosis

A pathological diagnosis of iCCA is based on the WHO classification of biliary tract cancer showing an adenocarcinoma or mucinous carcinoma [102]. The most common histological findings of an iCCA are those of an adenocarcinoma showing tubular and/or papillary structures and a variable fibrous stroma [103–107]. Although it has been proposed that the diagnosis of iCCA can be made based upon a combination of clinical presentation, laboratory analysis, and radiologic evaluation, pathological diagnosis is required for definitive diagnosis in most patients, particularly those with cirrhosis and small hepatic mass lesions as radiographic studies are nonspecific [108,109]. Pathological diagnosis is recommended for all patients who will be undergoing systemic chemotherapy or radiation therapy, or enrolling in a therapeutic clinical trial.

The sensitivity of liver biopsy for pathological diagnosis will depend upon location, size, and operator expertise. Core biopsies are required for definitive diagnosis. Although a positive liver biopsy will establish a diagnosis, a negative biopsy does not exclude it because of the potential for sampling error. Tumor seeding can occur with percutaneous biopsy but the risk is not well defined.

iCCA needs to be distinguished from benign biliary lesions such as peribiliary glands, reactive ductular proliferation, biliary microhamartomas (von Meyenburg complexes) and bile duct adenomas (peribiliary tract hamartomas), particularly in the presence of inflammation which can result in reactive cellular atypia [110]. The histological appearance of iCCA is similar to that of metastatic adenocarcinoma arising from extrahepatic primary tumors and especially those of foregut origin such as lung, pancreas, esophagus, and stomach [110]. The differentiation of iCCA from metastatic adenocarcinoma cannot be readily ascertained on histological examination. Differentiation between iCCA and mixed HCC tumors may require evaluation of specific markers of hepatocellular or progenitor cell features such as Hep-Par-1, GPC3, HSP70, glutamine synthetase, EpCAM, and CK19. CK19 positivity is not specific for iCCA. The expression of cytokeratin 7 and cytokeratin 20 may be helpful to establish a biliary origin [111,112].

Diagnosis using imaging studies

iCCA may be incidentally detected by cross-sectional imaging performed for other reasons. Imaging features of iCCA are often suggestive of the diagnosis but not definitive enough to obviate the need for a biopsy. On CT scanning, the typical appearance is that of a hypodense hepatic mass in the unenhanced phase with irregular margins, peripheral rim enhancement in the arterial phase, and progressive hyperattenuation on venous and delayed phases [113]. CT can also detect the level of biliary obstruction, capsular retraction or hepatic atrophy. Dynamic CT scanning can help distinguish between iCCA and HCC. Up to 81% of iCCA are characterized by a progressive contrast uptake from the arterial to the venous and especially in the delayed phase. This effect may reflect fibrosis which is slow to enhance but retains the intravascular contrast agent. In contrast, HCC is characterized by rapid enhancement during the arterial phase and relative washout (hypoattenuation) in the venous or delayed phases. However, some small mass-forming iCCA are arteriovenously enhancing and may mimic hepatocellular carcinoma [114,115].

On MRI, iCCA appear hypointense on T1-weighted and hyperintense on T2-weighted images [116–118]; T2-weighted images may also show central hypointensity corresponding to areas of fibrosis. Dynamic images show peripheral enhancement in the arterial phase followed by progressive and concentric filling-in of the tumor with contrast material. Pooling of contrast on delayed images is indicative of fibrosis and suggestive of an iCCA in the right clinical setting. MRI with cholangiopancreatography (MRI/MRCP) can be helpful to visualize the ductal system and vascular structures and thereby to determine the anatomic extent of tumor.

Fluorodeoxyglucose positron emission tomography (FDG-PET scan) can detect cholangiocarcinomas. Mass forming iCCA as small as 1 cm can be detected with a reported sensitivity of 85–95%. However FDG-PET is less useful for infiltrating tumors [119–121]. There is limited clinical utility of CT/PET for diagnosis of iCCA in the liver when CT or MRI imaging has been performed [122].

On ultrasonography, iCCA appears as a hypoechoic mass and may be associated with peripheral ductal dilatation. These features are not specific. Hyperenhancement on contrast enhanced ultrasound can identify tumors with increased density of cancer cells but lacks specificity for iCCA [123,124].
A presumed diagnosis of iCCA can be made on radiological criteria such as venous phase contrast enhancement on dynamic imaging in the absence of other extrahepatic primary malignancies and cirrhosis. Radiological criteria are insensitive for the diagnosis of iCCA in the presence of cirrhosis. Radiological studies cannot reliably differentiate between scirrhouss HCC and iCCA, or metastatic adenocarcinoma and iCCA [125].

Tumor markers

Tumor markers in serum or bile are not specific for iCCA but may be of diagnostic value. Current tumor markers such as Carbohydrate Antigen (CA) 19-9 and carcinoembryonic antigen have significant overlap with other benign diseases and low sensitivity for early stage disease which limit their use for diagnosis. The sensitivity and specificity of CA 19-9 for iCCA is only 62% and 63%, respectively. However, patients with unresectable CCA typically have significantly higher CA 19-9 levels compared with patients with resectable CCA [126]. Other studies have noted that preoperative CA 19-9 values greater than 100 U/ml were also associated with worse recurrence-free survival after surgical resection [127]. Bile duct obstruction or acute cholangitis may affect CA 19-9 levels. In the setting of bile duct obstruction, CA 19-9 levels should be reassessed after biliary intervention/drainage since the half-life of CA 19-9 is one to three days. Other serum markers, such as serum cytokeratin-19 fragment (CYFRA 21-1) and CA-242, have been reported to have higher specificities than CA 19-9 for iCCA in a limited number of studies, but are not in routine use [128].

Genetic biomarkers

Recent studies have identified mRNA and non-coding RNA expression that are associated with iCCA [61,129–131]. At present there is insufficient evidence to support the use of gene testing in blood or tissues for these genes, either singly or in combination, for the diagnosis of CCA.

Assessment of disease extent

Radiological studies are necessary for assessment of the extent of local-regional, or distant spread, staging, and resectability. Invasion to the portal vein or hepatic artery, and volumetric assessment of uninvolved liver are important determinants of resectability. Radiographic studies have a limited ability to determine the extent of intraductal tumor spread and resectability, particularly for the periductal infiltrative type of iCCA.

Color Doppler duplex US can identify vascular invasion, encaement, or occlusion of the portal vein and the hepatic artery. In one report, preoperative US detected 13 of 16 cases of liver tumors involving the hepatic vein with 81% sensitivity and 97% specificity, and an 87% positive predictive value [132]. In another study, preoperative US detected 38 of 41 patients with CCA and portal vein involvement at surgery, with 93% sensitivity, 99% specificity, and 97% and 98% positive and negative predictive values, respectively [133]. These results were comparable to those found by angiography with computed tomographic arterial portography which identified 37 of 41 involved portal veins with 90% sensitivity, 99% specificity, 95% positive predictive value, and 97% negative predictive value.

FDG-PET cannot be used to diagnose iCCA as any adenocarcinoma involving the liver may be PET avid, rather the role of FDG-PET is that of a staging modality. The role of FDG-PET in the management of iCCA, however, is controversial. Mass-forming iCCA tend to be more FDG avid than other morphological subtypes [119]. Some data have suggested that the potential benefit of FDG-PET resides largely in its ability to detect otherwise unsuspected metastasis [119,121,134,135]. In fact, FDG-PET was found to change the surgical management in up to 30% of patients [119,121,134]. Prior to surgical resection, PET scanning may be considered to help rule out an occult primary as well as to rule out otherwise occult metastatic disease.

Recommendations 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pathological diagnosis is required for a definitive diagnosis of iCCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation A1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pathological diagnosis of iCCA is based on the WHO classification for biliary tract cancer. Differentiation of metastatic adenocarcinoma from primary iCCA may require additional clinical and radiological and endoscopic evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation B1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immunostaining to detect markers of hepatocellular carcinoma (e.g., GPC3, HSP70, and glutamine synthetase) or progenitor cell features (e.g., K19, EpCAM) is recommended to distinguish iCCA from mixed hepatocellular-cholangiocarcinoma tumors if this information will change management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation B1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A presumed radiographic diagnosis is sufficient in non-cirrhotic patients in whom a decision has been made to proceed with surgical resection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation B1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PET-scan is not accurate for early diagnosis of iCCA; its role as a staging modality remains controversial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation B2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serological tumor markers such as CA19-9 are insensitive for the diagnosis of iCCA and insufficient to establish the diagnosis, but may be of prognostic significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation B1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assessment of resectability and/or intra- and extrahepatic metastatic disease, as well as venous and arterial invasion, is best accomplished using radiographic studies such as CT and/or MRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation A1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggestions for future studies

• Future studies should focus on histopathologic features and markers to more specifically diagnose and stratify iCCA subtypes
Guidelines

Staging systems for iCCA

Traditionally, iCCA has been staged with HCC under the category of “primary liver cancers” [136]. In fact, up until the current 7th edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer/International Union Against Cancer (AJCC/UICC) staging manual, there was no distinct internationally recognized staging system for iCCA [137]. There are, however, important pathologic, etiologic, and biologic differences between iCCA and HCC [23,138]. As such, there has been an increasing realization of the importance of establishing a distinct staging system for iCCA [139].

Several staging systems have been proposed for iCCA, with two staging systems based on data from Japan [140,141]. One staging system of patients with mass-forming iCCA was based on multivariate modeling that included 14 clinical and 12 postoperative surgical and pathologic factors. Several independent factors were associated with worse long-term survival including presence of vascular invasion, symptomatic disease, regional lymph node metastasis, and multiple tumors [141]. Based on these factors, the authors proposed the following staging schema: Stage 1 disease, solitary tumor without vascular invasion; Stage 2 disease, solitary tumor with vascular invasion; Stage 3a disease, multiple tumors with or without vascular invasion; Stage 3b disease, any tumor with regional lymph node metastasis; and Stage 4 disease, iCCA with distant metastasis [141]. Of note, tumor size was not included as a factor in the staging of patients with iCCA. A different proposed staging system for iCCA that included tumor size [140], which stratified patients based on tumor size of 2 cm or less vs. more than 2 cm, solitary vs. multiple tumors, and the presence or absence of hepatic vein, portal vein, or peritoneal invasion. Each of these factors was assigned a point and the staging was based on the additive summation of points. Distant metastasis and regional lymph node metastasis were also included in a binary fashion (e.g., absent vs. present) [140].

More recently, a large population-based Western cohort of patients with iCCA was reported, which evaluated the staging systems proposed by Japanese authors, as well as the 6th edition of the AJCC/UICC staging manual [142]. In this study, the authors noted that each of the previously proposed staging systems for iCCA performed poorly in their ability to predict long-term prognosis [142]. While previous studies had reported conflicting results regarding the impact of tumor size on prognosis [140,141], they found that tumor size had no effect on survival, either in overall or in multiple subgroup analyses [142]. The authors also noted that vascular invasion and multiple tumors had similar effects on prognosis, but the presence of both factors did not result in worse prognosis. The authors therefore proposed a simplified staging system based on the number of iCCA tumors, vascular invasion, and the presence of metastatic disease in the regional lymph node basin or at distant sites.

With the recent publication of the 7th edition of the AJCC/UICC staging manual, there is now a new distinct staging system for iCCA [137]. The 7th edition AJCC/UICC staging system largely reflects many of the proposals included in previous publications [137,142]. Specifically, tumor size is no longer a prognostic factor, rather, T-classification is based on the number of lesions, vascular invasion, intrahepatic metastasis, and invasion of adjacent structures [137]. Specifically, T1 tumors are solitary without vascular invasion; T2 disease includes multiple tumors (e.g., multi-focal disease, satelliteosis, intrahepatic metastasis), as well as tumors associated with any type of vascular invasion (e.g., microvascular or major vascular invasion); T3 tumors directly invade adjacent structures; and T4 disease includes tumors with any periductal-infiltrating component. As with most other solid liver, biliary, and gastrointestinal malignancies, AJCC/UICC staging also includes both an “N” and “M” sub-classification. Regional lymph node metastasis in the hilar, periduodenal, and peripancreatic nodes are considered N1 disease, while distant disease is considered M1 disease.

Although the 7th edition of the AJCC/UICC is still relatively new, the validity of the staging system has already been independently validated [143]. The authors of the validation study noted that patients were equally distributed among the AJCC/UICC 7th edition stages, which was not the case for the other staging systems examined. In addition, the 7th edition of the AJCC/UICC staging system for iCCA was more discriminating in predicting survival than the other staging systems evaluated, including the two Japanese classifications. There are, however, undoubtedly limitations to the current 7th edition the staging system for iCCA. For example, multiple tumors are classified as T2b. From a clinical standpoint, it is difficult to distinguish among patients with “multiple” tumors who have multi-focal disease vs. those with an index lesion and intrahepatic metastasis. In addition, the classification of T4 disease needs further validation in future studies that specifically examine the impact of this prognostic factor.

Taken together, while future refinements are likely, the current 7th edition AJCC/UICC staging schema should be the accepted and preferred staging system for resected iCCA.

Recommendations 5

- The 7th edition of the AJCC/UICC staging schema is currently the preferred staging system for resected iCCA
  
**Recommendation B1**

Suggestions for future studies

- Future studies should focus on stratifying nonsurgical patients for clinical studies using a clinical as opposed to a surgical staging process. Prognostic biomarkers should be explored in the setting of clinical investigations

Treatment

Surgical resection

Surgical resection is the mainstay for treatment of iCCA. As part of the pre-operative clinical work-up of the patient with possible iCCA, laboratory exams, including tumor markers such as carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA), CA 19-9, and alpha fetoprotein (AFP) should be obtained. Pre-operative cross-sectional imaging for iCCA should include either multi-detector, contrast-enhanced helical CT, or MRI/MRCP as discussed above. On cross-sectional imaging the distinct morphologic sub-types (i.e., mass-forming, periductal-infiltrating, and intraductal-growth) may have different characteristics.
For example, while periductal-infiltrating iCCA is often characterized by growth along the bile duct without mass formation, intra-ductal-growing iCCA may manifest as diffuse and marked duct ectasia with or without a grossly visible papillary mass or a focal stricture-like lesion with proximal ductal dilatation [140,144,145]. Overall, the mass-forming type of iCCA is the most common morphological subtype (>85% of cases). Liver function should be thoroughly assessed in patients with underlying liver cirrhosis, and restrictions for resection due to impaired liver function are recommended using criteria recommended for HCC [146].

Data on the role and yield of staging laparoscopy for iCCA are lacking. Because a subset of patients with biliary malignancies will have unsuspected metastatic disease, some surgeons have suggested that staging laparoscopy should be performed at the time of surgery. The data on the use of laparoscopy in the setting of resectable iCCA are, however, very limited. In a series of 22 patients with iCCA who underwent diagnostic laparoscopy, 6 patients (27%) who had previously undetected peritoneal or intrahepatic metastasis were identified with metastatic disease [147]. While such reports warrant future validation, currently there is insufficient evidence to recommend routine staging laparoscopy for patients undergoing surgery for iCCA.

Resection should be undertaken in those patients who are appropriate surgical candidates and who have potentially resectable disease (Fig. 3). Unfortunately, only about 20-40% of patients with potentially operable disease are offered surgical resection [148]. This may be due in part to the fact that patients with iCCA often present with large, locally advanced tumors in need of technically complex and challenging operations [149]. As with other hepatic malignancies, the goal of surgical resection is to remove all the disease with negative microscopic (R0) margins while preserving an adequate remnant liver volume. Depending on the size and location of the iCCA lesion, this may require an extensive resection including adjacent structures such as the extrahepatic biliary tree. Extended hepatectomy and/or resection of the extrahepatic bile duct bifurcation has been considered necessary in 78% and 29% of iCCA cases, respectively, in order to obtain an R0 resection [150]. In another study among patients undergoing resection of iCCA, 49% of patients required an extended hepatectomy while 21% required a concomitant biliary resection and reconstruction [151]. In a separate report of one of the largest surgical series published to date that included several high volume centers, the authors noted that 73% of patients required an extended hepatectomy while 21% required a concomitant biliary resection and reconstruction [151]. In a separate report of one of the largest surgical series published to date that included several high volume centers, the authors noted that 73% of patients required an extended hepatectomy while 21% required a concomitant biliary resection and reconstruction [151].

While removal of clinically suspicious nodal disease is mandatory, the role of routine lymphadenectomy is less defined. In contrast to the practice of many Japanese centers, lymph node dissection is not routinely performed at the time of iCCA resection in most Western countries [156]. In fact, in a large population-based...
Western series of patients undergoing resection approximately one-half of patients had at least one lymph node examined [142]. Of note, however, was the finding that among patients who did have lymph nodes examined, metastatic nodal disease was found in up to 30% of patients [142]. Despite this, some investigators have argued that routine lymphadenectomy is unnecessary. For example, in a report on 68 patients with mass-forming iCCA, 36 of who underwent concomitant lymphadenectomy [155], the authors reported that among those patients without lymph node involvement, there was no difference in survival or pattern of recurrence according to the use of lymph node dissection. The authors concluded that routine lymphadenectomy was not necessary in patients with mass-forming iCCA when lymph node involvement is not clinically apparent. Other investigators have noted that N1 status adversely affects overall survival and also influences the relative effect of tumor number and vascular invasion on prognosis [149]. Specifically, in a study encompassing 248 patients with iCCA who underwent lymphadenectomy, 74 (30%) had lymph node metastasis [149]. Lymph node metastasis was associated with worse median survival; in addition, although patients with no lymph node metastasis could be stratified by tumor number and vascular invasion, among patients with N1 disease, multiple tumors and vascular invasion, either alone or together, failed to discriminate patients into discrete prognostic groups. In turn, these investigators advocated that routine lymphadenectomy should be strongly considered for iCCA as up to 30% of patients will have nodal metastasis and this information has important prognostic implications. Other investigators, including the AFC-iCCA-2009 study group, have similarly recommended that routine lymphadenectomy should be performed at the time of iCCA resection, as lymph node metastasis is more prevalent in iCCA than in other tumors that liver surgeons may be used to dealing with [143]. There is already an established role for lymph node clearance for other sub-types of hepatobiliary malignancies (e.g., fibrolamellar HCC, gallbladder cancer). Given the established strong prognostic role of lymph node metastasis for iCCA, lymphadenectomy should be strongly considered at the time of surgery.

Outcomes following surgical resection of iCCA remain relatively guarded. Recurrence has been reported to occur in up to 50–60% of patients with a median-disease free survival of 26 months [151,157,158]. Factors associated with an increase in recurrence include those factors that form the basis of staging for iCCA: multiple tumors, vascular invasion, and lymph node metastasis. While the liver is the most common site of recurrence (e.g., 50–60%), recurrence in regional lymph nodes or the peritoneum is not uncommon (e.g., 20–25%) [157,158]. A small subset of patients with liver only recurrence may be candidates for either ablation or re-resection [157,158]. Five-year survival and overall survival after surgical resection of iCCA ranges from 15% to 40% in most series [127,155,159–161].

There are several factors that are particularly associated with patient survival, and in turn, need to be considered when selecting patients for operative therapy. Several studies have reported that the presence of metastatic nodal disease is one of the most powerful, independent determinants of survival [149,162]. Specifically, patients undergoing surgical resection who are found to have lymph node metastasis have a 5-year survival of less than 20%. It is important to note that most data on the prognostic implications of lymph node metastasis are derived from surgical studies, and therefore largely include patients with microscopic lymph node disease. There is minimal data on the prognosis of patients with iCCA and clinically positive hilar lymph node disease that is identified preoperatively. However, extrapolating from colorectal data, the prognosis of patients with “gross” hilar adenopathy is particularly poor with few long-term survivors. In addition to lymph node disease, the presence of either intrahepatic metastasis or major vascular invasion similarly have a 5-year survival in the range of 20% or less with the vast majority of patients experiencing a recurrence [149,164]. Given the very poor prognosis of patients who have clinically evident lymph node metastasis, intrahepatic metastasis or major vascular invasion, these factors should be considered relatively strong contraindications to surgical resection. While surgery may be warranted in a select subset of patients with these clinical characteristics, decisions about therapy should be made in a multidisciplinary setting. Strong consideration should be given to treating these patients with some type of systemic or loco-regional therapy to allow for a better evaluation of the biology of the disease prior to any surgical consideration.

For those patients undergoing resection – especially those with N1 disease – adjuvant therapy should be strongly considered. There have been two randomized studies examining the benefit of adjuvant therapy following resection. A phase 3 randomized controlled trial evaluated the benefit of post-operative adjuvant chemotherapy compared with surgery alone in patients with resected pancreato-biliary carcinoma [165]. The primary endpoint was survival and patients were randomized to receive intravenous mitomycin C and 5-FU followed by 5-FU orally until disease recurrence or surveillance. There appeared to be an improved disease free survival (20.3% in the treatment group compared with 11.6% for surveillance) for gallbladder carcinoma (n = 140), but no benefit was found for pancreas adenocarcinoma, CCA (n = 139), or ampullary cancers; overall, the study was underpowered to prove a treatment benefit. This is in contrast to the known benefit of adjuvant treatment in pancreas cancer [166]. A similar randomized trial was conducted recruiting a population of CCA, small bowel, ampullary and peri-ampullary cancers to receive 5-FU or Gemcitabine [167]. The 96 patients in the CCA group did not appear to benefit from adjuvant chemotherapy with either drug but these data are clearly underpowered to support any significant outcome. Table 3 gives a list of current adjuvant studies that involved randomization of patients to either a specific treatment vs. surveillance, in an attempt to address formally the issue of adjuvant systemic therapy in biliary tract cancer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study title</th>
<th>CI, Location</th>
<th>Chemotherapy</th>
<th>Numbers planned</th>
<th>Primary end point</th>
<th>Completion of accrual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BILCAP</td>
<td>Primrose, UK</td>
<td>Capecitabine</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2 year disease free</td>
<td>Q1 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODIGE-12</td>
<td>Boucher, France</td>
<td>Oxaliplatin-gemcitabine</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>Disease free survival</td>
<td>Q1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTICCAA-1</td>
<td>Arnold, Germany</td>
<td>Cisplatin-gemcitabine</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>Disease free survival</td>
<td>Q1 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Liver transplantation for iCCA and mixed HCC-iCCA

Liver transplantation (LT) for iCCA is highly controversial. Although LT for pCCA is well defined in regards to selection criteria, the need for neoadjuvant therapy and long-term outcomes [168], this is not the case for iCCA. The published data regarding LT for iCCA employs non-uniform selection criteria, is limited in number of patients undergoing LT, has disparate neoadjuvant and adjuvant treatment protocols, and highly variable outcomes. Herein, we will review in more detail those studies published after the year 2000. An early study reported a 39% three-year actuarial survival on 16 patients undergoing LT for iCCA with variable and selective adjuvant chemotherapy [169]. Univariate analysis performed by combining pCCA with the iCCA patients suggested tumor size, invasion of adjacent organs, and multiple nodules were poor prognostic variables; there was an insufficient number of patients for a formal multivariate analysis. Another study reported on LT in 11 patients with iCCA who received neither adjuvant nor neoadjuvant therapy [170]. Three-year overall survival was 50% with long-term survival achieved only in those patients with Stage 1 or 2 disease (absence of lymph node metastases or vascular involvement). The collective Spanish experience was published on 23 patients with iCCA undergoing LT again in whom 7 received unspecified adjuvant anti-cancer therapy [171]. The three-year overall survival was 65% and perineural invasion was the only significant adverse prognostic factor in their patient population. Another study reported on 10 patients following LT for iCCA with a three-year overall survival of 50% without specified anti-cancer therapy [172]. The UCLA group first reported on 25 patients undergoing LT for iCCA in whom 9 underwent adjuvant or neoadjuvant therapy [173]. The adverse prognostic factors were perineural invasion and multifocality whereas neoadjuvant plus adjuvant anti-cancer therapy was associated with improved long-term survival. Overall survival for the iCCA was not reported. In a subsequent paper by this group, the outcome data were modeled to obtain a predictive index [174]. Unfortunately, this analysis grouped iCCA along with pCCA. Seven predictive features were identified including multifocality, perineural invasion, infiltrative pattern of tumor growth, lack of adjuvant or neoadjuvant anti-cancer therapy, lymphovascular invasion, and history of PSC. Patients without adverse prognostic factors who received anti-cancer therapy had excellent long-term survival; however, given that iCCA and pCCA were grouped together it is difficult to dissect how the prognostic index applies to iCCA. More recently their current protocol has been reviewed which stratifies patients according to risk of recurrence, employs neoadjuvant therapy, and advocates assessing the response to neoadjuvant therapy in high-risk patients before proceeding on to LT [175]. In summary, LT for iCCA is not a futile procedure, but the overall outcomes are suboptimal compared to the 74% five-year survival for patients with cirrhosis undergoing LT [176].

As noted above, cirrhosis and viral Hepatitis C and B are risk factors for iCCA [6], and therefore, the same risk factors which are well-established for HCC may also predispose the patient to iCCA. Indeed, certain cancers contain features of both cancers; these malignancies are referred to as mixed HCC-iCCA. In mixed tumors, the presence of cholangiocarcinoma elements can be confirmed by a positive cytokeratin 19 (CK19) and cytokeratin 7 (CK7) staining by immunohistochemistry. With the recognition that patients can harbor mixed HCC-iCCA tumors [177,178], a liver biopsy should be considered for atypical lesions (lesions not diagnostic for HCC by classical imaging criteria on cross-sectional studies) prior to LT. Mixed HCC-iCCA lesions have worse outcomes following LT than patients with HCC [177,178] with a five-year recurrence rate of 65% [178]. Such patients should either not undergo transplantation or be enrolled in research protocols combining adjuvant or neoadjuvant therapy for iCCA in the transplant setting.

Recommendations 7

- LT is not recommended for iCCA or mixed HCC-iCCA because results are well below those published for standard indications; however, this recommendation is based on limited data. LT should only be offered in centers with designed clinical research protocols employing adjuvant or neoadjuvant therapy
- Protocols examining the efficacy of LT for iCCA should be limited to lesions without lymphovascular invasion

Suggestions for future studies

- Future studies should focus on stratifying patients for surgery based on intent to treat, overall survival, and incorporating cost-effectiveness analysis
Guidelines

Loco-regional therapy in the management of iCCA

Although major hepatectomy is a potentially curative treatment for iCCA, many patients present with intrahepatic disease beyond the criteria for resection. For example, resectability rates are generally quite low and vary among series from 18% to 70% [31,179]. In addition, many patients do not qualify for resection because of comorbidities; these patients may be eligible for loco-regional therapy, as well as best supportive care. Since the current tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) staging system for iCCA is based on surgical acquisition of tissue, this staging system may be inadequate for evaluating outcomes of loco-regional therapies. An ideal classification system for iCCA should therefore not require surgical resection.

Few studies to date have evaluated the evidence-based efficacy of loco-regional treatments in patients with unresectable iCCA. Loco-regional therapy in these patients may provide symptomatic relief, and might have a positive effect on survival [180]. Loco-regional therapies for patients with unresectable iCCA include radiation therapy (RT), transarterial chemoembolization (TACE), transarterial chemoinfusion (TACI), radioembolization and radiofrequency ablation (RFA). The website www.ClinicalTrials.gov lists more than 10 clinical trials of loco-regional therapies for unresectable iCCA that are currently ongoing or recruiting, and the outcomes of these trials are awaited.

Radiation therapy

Radiation therapy consists of (i) external-beam RT (EBRT), including three-dimensional-conformal RT (3D-CRT), intensity-modulated RT (IMRT) and stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT), (ii) brachytherapy, and (iii) proton therapy. The role of EBRT in patients with unresectable iCCA is not clear. Most studies of RT have been performed on patients with biliary tract cancer, with few performed on patients with iCCA. To date, no prospective randomized studies have shown that EBRT benefits these patients, although several single institution retrospective studies have suggested that EBRT has palliative advantages, including a reduction in tumor burden and an anecdotal positive effect on survival [181–183]. One-year survival rates of iCCA patients treated with EBRT have been found to range from 36% to 73% [181–184]. Although tumor control was not generally defined, its rate varied from 36% to 100%, and grade 3-4 toxicities were infrequent in these studies. EBRT may completely or partially relieve pain and obstructive jaundice in patients with unresectable iCCA [181,182].

Although there is no clear evidence for EBRT in the treatment of iCCA patients, methods such as SBRT may be considered in multidisciplinary and adjuvant approaches in the future. A recent retrospective analysis of 3839 patients with iCCA from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database showed that adjuvant and definitive radiation treatment prolonged survival, although cure rates remained low [185]. The median overall survival in patients treated with surgery and adjuvant RT, surgery alone, RT alone, and supportive care alone was 11, 6, 7, and 3 months, respectively. Other retrospective studies also suggest that adjuvant RT following resection had a survival benefit in iCCA patients with regional lymph node metastasis [186] and that concurrent EBRT with systemic chemotherapy prolonged progression-free survival [187]. Moreover, SBRT following chemotherapy was well tolerated and early local control was promising [188]. There are no data on the use of brachytherapy and proton therapy for evaluating the outcomes in patients with iCCA.

Transarterial chemoembolization (TACE), transarterial chemoinfusion (TACI), and transarterial radioembolization (TARE)

TACE is the main treatment modality for patients with intermediate-stage HCC not amenable to surgical therapies or local ablation. The rationale for TACE is that the intra-arterial infusion of a cytotoxic agent followed by embolization of the tumor-feeding blood vessels will result in strong cytotoxic and ischemic effects [189]. Currently, there are two types of TACE procedure, conventional TACE (CTACE) and drug-eluting bead TACE (deTACE). Because HCCs are usually hypervascular, TACE may have anti-tumor effects. Although iCCAs are not overtly hypervascular on CT or MRI studies, tumor blurs on angiography are frequently identified in patients with iCCA [135]. Nonetheless, there have been limited studies of TACE in iCCA patients and there is an absence of trials systematically evaluating outcomes with TACE in this population [190]. A single-center, retrospective cohort study of 155 patients with iCCA reported a median overall survival that was significantly longer in the patients treated with CTACE group (12.2 months) than in the non-TACE treated cohort (3.3 months), and that the tumor control rate in the former group was 89%, including partial responses in 23% and stable disease in 66% [191]. A recent meta-analysis of 14 trials of transarterial therapies in patients with unresectable cholangiocarcinoma found that the calculated weighted cumulative median overall survival from date of diagnosis was 15.6 ± 1.1 months; 49.8 of all patients had stable disease by Response Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST) criteria [192]. The survival outcomes of CTACE may be improved by sequential systemic chemotherapy [193,194]. A retrospective analysis found that adjuvant CTACE after curative surgery did not delay recurrence but may prolong the overall survival of patients with early recurrence [195].

deTACE was developed to improve the anti-tumor activity and clinical benefits of chemoembolization. The efficacy of deTACE in patients with iCCA is unclear [196], although a retrospective comparative study reported an increase in median survival using combination deTACE and systemic chemotherapy (30 months) compared to those patients treated with systemic chemotherapy alone (12.7 months) [197]. A recent study found that irinotecan-debTACE prolonged survival relative to CTACE (11.7 vs. 5.7 months) [198].

Transarterial chemoinfusion (TACI) describes transcatheter intra-arterial chemotherapy without embolization, which differentiates it from TACE and systemic chemotherapy. The efficacy of TACI is unclear but retrospective studies reported the favorable survival outcomes in a small number of patients with unresectable iCCA [199–201].

Transarterial radioembolization (TARE) is defined as the infusion of radioactive substances, such as iodine-131 (131I)-labeled lipiodol or microspheres containing yttrium-90 (90Y) or similar agents, into the hepatic artery [189]. These transarterially-injected radioactive substances are delivered to hypervascular tumor-bearing areas, where they emit low-penetration, high-energy radiation (ß-particles) to tumors. To date, no randomized controlled trials have compared the efficacy of radioembolization with CTACE or systemic treatment in patients with unresectable HCC or iCCA. Several clinical trials of radioembolization in patients with unresectable iCCA are ongoing, and outcomes are awaited. Retrospective studies have reported that the disease control rates of radioembolization in patients with iCCA range from 72% to 95% and that median overall survival ranges from 9.3 to 22 months [202–204]. Prognostic factors for outcomes included Eastern
Systemic therapy

Trials with systemic therapy for CCA have been fraught with disease heterogeneity, grouping all patients with biliary tract cancers into a single disease category. Likewise, as compared to breast cancer, lung cancer, and even pancreatic cancer the trials are limited in regards to patient numbers. Thus, any extrapolation of clinical trial information regarding biliary tract cancer solely to iCCA is compromised. Therefore, positive data may be considered a current practice standard from a pragmatic perspective, but are far too limited to be a “standard of care.”

Systemic therapies

The outcome for patients with advanced and inoperable biliary tract cancer with treatment compared to best supportive care has been investigated in two randomized studies [213,214]. Although underpowered, both suggested a benefit for chemotherapy with median survivals for those receiving no chemotherapy of 2.5–6 months. A comprehensive analysis of 112 clinical trials in advanced biliary tract malignancies have been published mostly including single arm phase 2 studies [215]. They suggested that Gemcitabine and fluoropyrimidine based regimens were active but also that the addition of Cisplatin appeared to add benefit. This is consistent with the published randomized data (Table 4). These studies in themselves are not sufficiently robust to define a standard regimen, primarily because of statistical poverty and some of the difficulty in interpretation is highlighted by a dramatic difference between the response rates (9–57%) yet a relatively small effect on survival.

The UK ABC studies

Based on the potential efficacy of Gemcitabine and Cisplatin derived from the unrandomized phase 2 data, the UK NCRN ABC-01 study compared Cisplatin and Gemcitabine (Cisplatin 25 mg/m² followed by Gemcitabine 1000 mg/m², each on days 1 and 8 of a 21-day cycle, CisGem) with Gemcitabine (Gemcitabine 1000 mg/m² on days 1, 8, and 15 of a 28-day cycle) with 6-month progressive free survival (PFS) as the primary endpoint [216]. It demonstrated improved 6-month PFS in favor of CisGem compared to Gemcitabine alone (57.1% vs. 45.5%). Consequently, the study was expanded into a phase 3 study with an identical protocol except for the primary endpoint which became overall survival and the addition of quality of life analysis, the UK advanced biliary cancer 02 (ABC02) study. An additional 324 patients were recruited allowing a pre-planned combined analysis of 410 patients. Median overall survival was 11.7 months for patients receiving CisGem compared to 8.1 months in patients receiving Gem alone [217]. Subgroup analysis only including 80 patients with iCCA showed a benefit favoring the combination arm. Patients receiving CisGem benefited significantly and this regimen has become an international practice standard as well as the backbone for subsequent studies [217]. These data are supported by a randomized phase 2 study of 83 patients using the same protocol [218]. The median overall survival was 11.2 vs. 7.7 months, consistent with the ABC02 data. The ABC02 study has demonstrated that treatment defining studies can be
Guidelines

Second line therapies

There are 5 reported studies of second line therapy for biliary tract cancer. The most robust is a phase 2 study of Gemcitabine in 32 patients refractory to 5-FU based chemotherapy which reported a response rate of 7%, stable disease in 21%; a median time to progression (TTP) of 1.6 months and median survival of 4.1 months. Lower albumin levels (<3.5 g/dl) predicted shorter survival [219]. A phase 2 study of 5-FU, doxorubicin and mitomycin-C (FAM) in 31 patients with pancreas (n = 15) and biliary tract (n = 16) cancers after Gemcitabine-based chemotherapy reported a response rate of 13%, stable disease 26%, median TTP 2.3 months, and survival of 6.7 months [52]. The three remaining studies are case reports of 6, 4, and 2 patients respectively from which no conclusions can be drawn. There is therefore no significant evidence that further chemotherapy beyond progression of first-line chemotherapy improves survival.

Biological therapies in biliary tract malignancy

The efficacy of biological therapies in biliary tract cancers has been mixed. Twenty eight patients were treated with Selumetinib, a MEK1/2 inhibitor [220]. Toxicity was manageable and the disease control rate was 68% with an overall survival of 9.8 months. A different study randomized 150 patients between a Gemcitabine-Oxaliplatin chemotherapy backbone with or without the anti-EGFR antibody Cetuximab [221]. The PFS was 5.3 vs. 6 months and overall survival 12 vs. 11 months for the chemotherapy and combination arms respectively and no phase 3 study is planned. Whether this reflects a specific biliary tract effect or resembles that which has been found for Oxaliplatin and Cetuximab combinations in bowel and esophageal cancer is uncertain. A third study randomized 103 patients between a Gemcitabine chemotherapy backbone with or without Sorafenib [222]. Disease control and overall survival were not improved in the Sorafenib group and was associated with significantly more toxicity. Translational analysis to define responsive subgroups is critical to ensure that benefiting subgroups can be identified.

Recommendations
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Recommendations

- Cisplatin and Gemcitabine is a systemic therapy practice standard for iCCA in patients with ECOG performance status 0 or 1, but the data are too limited to make this an established standard of care

Recommendation B2

- There is no significant evidence that further chemotherapy beyond progression of first-line chemotherapy improves survival

Recommendation B2

Suggestions for future studies

- Randomized controlled trials selecting patients with iCCA are urgently needed. Randomized controlled trials in which patients with iCCA have sufficient statistical power to determine the standard of care are needed

- Further studies should focus on standardized selection criteria and comparator arms evaluating systemic therapy in homogenous groups of patients with iCCA

- The use of novel molecular strategies to define homogenous cohorts within the iCCA population is needed
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