



HAL
open science

Merkel cell carcinoma of lymph nodes without a skin primary tumor: a potential metastatic neoplasia associated with a brisk immune response

Thibault Kervarrec, Julia Zaragoza, Pauline Gaboriaud, Patricia Berthon, Gaelle Fromont, Yannick Le Corre, Eva Hainaut-Wierzbicka, Francois Aubin, Guido Bens, Patrick Michenet, et al.

► To cite this version:

Thibault Kervarrec, Julia Zaragoza, Pauline Gaboriaud, Patricia Berthon, Gaelle Fromont, et al.. Merkel cell carcinoma of lymph nodes without a skin primary tumor: a potential metastatic neoplasia associated with a brisk immune response. *Journal of The American Academy of Dermatology*, 2020, 83 (6), pp.1789-92. 10.1016/j.jaad.2020.03.108 . hal-02951619

HAL Id: hal-02951619

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-02951619>

Submitted on 21 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

Merkel cell carcinoma of lymph nodes without a skin primary tumor: a potential metastatic neoplasia associated with a brisk immune response.

Thibault Kervarrec, MD, PhD^{1,2}, Julia Zaragoza, MD³, Pauline Gaboriaud², Patricia Berthon, PhD², Gaele Fromont, MD, PhD⁴, Yannick Le Corre, MD⁵, Eva Hainaut-Wierzbicka, MD⁶, Francois Aubin, MD, PhD⁷, Guido Bens, MD³, Patrick Michenet, MD⁸, Hervé Maillard, MD⁹, Roland Houben, PhD¹⁰, David Schrama, PhD¹⁰, Agnes Caille, MD¹¹, Antoine Touzé, PhD², Serge Guyétant, MD, PhD(*)^{1,2}, Mahtab Samimi, MD, PhD(*)^{2,12}

- (1) Department of Pathology, Université de Tours, CHU de Tours, avenue de la République, 37170, Chambray-les-tours, France
- (2) UMR INRA ISP 1282, team "Biologie des infections à polyomavirus", Université de Tours, Faculté des Sciences Pharmaceutiques 31, avenue Monge 37200 Tours, France
- (3) Dermatology Department, CHR d'Orléans, 14 avenue de l'Hôpital, 45100 Orléans, France
- (4) Department of Pathology, Université de Tours, CHU de Tours, Boulevard Tonnelé, 37000, Tours, France
- (5) Dermatology Department, LUNAM Université, CHU Angers, 4 rue Larrey 49933 Angers, France
- (6) Dermatology Department, Université de Poitiers, CHU de Poitiers, 2 rue de la Milétrie, 86021 Poitiers, France
- (7) Dermatology Department, Université de Franche Comté, CHU Besançon, EA3181, IFR133, 2 boulevard Fleming 25030 Besançon, France
- (8) Department of Pathology, CHR d'Orléans, 14 avenue de l'Hôpital, 45100 Orléans, France
- (9) Dermatology Department, CHR Le Mans, 194 avenue Rubillard 72037 Le Mans Cedex 09, France
- (10) Department of Dermatology, Venereology and Allergology, University Hospital Würzburg, Josef-Schneider-Straße 2, 97080 Würzburg, Germany
- (11) Clinical Investigation Center, INSERM CIC 1415, University Hospital of Tours, Tours, France; Université de Tours, Université de Nantes, INSERM U1246-SPHERE, France
- (12) Dermatology Department, Université Francois Rabelais, CHU de Tours, avenue de la République, 37170, Chambray-les-tours, France

(*) M. Samimi and S. Guyétant contributed equally to the present study.

Corresponding author: Dr Thibault Kervarrec

Department of Pathology, Hôpital Trousseau, CHRU de Tours, 37044 TOURS Cedex 09 France. Tel: +33 (2) 47 47 80 69/Fax: +33 (2) 47 47 46 22, Email: thibaultkervarrec@yahoo.fr

Disclosure/Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Grant numbers and sources of support: project POCAME, Axe Immunothérapies, Cancéropole Grand Ouest-Région Centre Val de Loire (France), Ligue contre le cancer.

Prior presentation: none

Institutional review board: The local Ethics Committee of Tours (France) approved the study (N° ID RCB2009-A01056-51)

Manuscript Word count : 495

References: 5 , **Figure:** 1, **Table:** 1

Supplements: Supplementary Table: 2, Supplementary Figure: 2, Supplementary Methods
DOI : 10.17632/sn964fs2dp.2

Key words: Merkel cell carcinoma; Merkel cell carcinoma without primary; lymph node; CD8; CD33; ZEB1; epithelial–mesenchymal transition; metastasis

To the Editor,

Merkel cell carcinoma (MCC) is a rare neuroendocrine cutaneous carcinoma frequently caused by Merkel cell polyomavirus (MCPyV). In 10% of cases, MCC presents as lymph-node metastasis (LNM) without a primary skin tumor (MCCWOP)¹. We and others¹ confirmed that MCCWOP share a common phenotype with their cutaneous counterparts. However, whether MCCWOP constitutes an intranodal primitive neoplasia or a nodal metastasis from an occult or totally regressive skin MCC, remains unknown.

The metastatic process is related to epithelial–mesenchymal transition (EMT) characterized by a loss of epithelial markers such as E-cadherin and acquisition of a mesenchymal phenotype, with expression of N-cadherin or vimentin². In addition, zinc finger E-box binding homeobox 1 (ZEB1)³ is a crucial determinant of EMT. We hypothesized that investigating EMT markers in MCCWOP would help to determine whether they constitute a primary neoplasia, or a metastatic process. Expression of four EMT markers were evaluated by immunohistochemistry (**Supplementary Methods, Supplementary Figure 1**) in 60 cutaneous primary MCC, 18 LNM from cutaneous MCC and 15 MCCWOP. In the whole cohort (n=93), loss of E-cadherin, aberrant expression of N-cadherin and vimentin, expression of ZEB1 were observed in 91% (n=82), 88% (n=75), 6% (n=5) and 74.5% (n=61) of interpretable cases, respectively (**Supplementary Tables 1-2, Supplementary Figure 2**). Among the 78 MCC cases with an identified primary, only ZEB1 harbored a significant differential expression between primary tumors and LNM (p= 0.047) and was therefore considered as a surrogate of metastatic process in MCC. As such, 74% of the LNM from cutaneous MCC (n=11/15) but only 36% of primary tumors (n=19/52) showed high and diffuse expression of ZEB1 (score 2) (p=0.017). We found a similar pattern of ZEB1 (score 2) in 67% of MCCWOP cases (n=10/15),

(**Table 1, Figure 1**) suggesting that MCCWOP result from a metastatic process. Such scenario would therefore imply a complete regression of a skin primary tumor, as a result from an efficient anti-tumoral immune response⁴. We investigated this hypothesis by assessing intra-tumoral immune populations previously associated with better outcome and/or regression (CD8⁴, CD33^{brisk}/CD8⁺⁵) in the MCC cases from the same cohort (n=93) (**Table 1, Figure 1, Supplementary Table 1**). Among the 87 interpretable cases, 34 did not harbor CD8 lymphocytes (score 0, 39%), 45 displayed low infiltrates (score 1, 52%), 8 had brisk infiltrates (scores 2-5, 9%) and CD33^{brisk}/CD8⁺ immune infiltrates were identified in 32 cases (42%). Among the 78 MCC cases with an identified skin primary, primary tumors more frequently harbored CD8 infiltrates (scores 1-5) (66% vs 31%, p=0.04) and CD33^{brisk}/CD8^{high} infiltrates (48% vs 7%, p=0.005) than LNM (**Supplementary Table 1**). However, MCC cases with an identified primary were less frequently immune-infiltrated than MCCWOP. Indeed, CD8 and CD33^{brisk}/CD8⁺ infiltrates were observed in 73% and 69% of MCCWOP (p=0.03 and 0.001 respectively) (**Table 1/Figure 1**), reflecting a brisker immune response in such cases. To conclude, this descriptive study favors the view of MCCWOP as a metastatic process, associated with a marked immune response that may account for the regression of a primary skin tumor.

Acknowledgments:

The authors sincerely thank the patients who gave their approval for the study. They also thank Roseline Guibon (Tours, France), Dr Micheline Chargeboeuf (Lons le Saunier, France), Dr Benjamin Linot (Angers, France), and Dr Isabelle Valo (Angers, France) for their help and contributions to the study.

Abbreviation and acronym list:

CD: Cluster of differentiation

EMT: Epithelial-mesenchymal transition

LMN: Lymph node metastasis

MCC: Merkel cell carcinoma

MCCWOP: Merkel cell carcinoma of lymph nodes without skin primary tumor

TMA: Tissue micro array

ZEB1: Zinc Finger E-Box Binding Homeobox 1

References

1. Kervarrec T, Zaragoza J, Gaboriaud P, et al. Differentiating Merkel cell carcinoma of lymph nodes without a detectable primary skin tumor from other metastatic neuroendocrine carcinomas: The ELECTHIP criteria. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2018;78(5):964-972.e3. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2017.11.037
2. De Craene B, Berx G. Regulatory networks defining EMT during cancer initiation and progression. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2013;13(2):97-110. doi:10.1038/nrc3447
3. Zhang P, Sun Y, Ma L. ZEB1: at the crossroads of epithelial-mesenchymal transition, metastasis and therapy resistance. *Cell Cycle*. 2015;14(4):481-487. doi:10.1080/15384101.2015.1006048
4. Inoue T, Yoneda K, Manabe M, Demitsu T. Spontaneous regression of merkel cell carcinoma: a comparative study of TUNEL index and tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes between spontaneous regression and non-regression group. *J Dermatol Sci*. 2000;24(3):203-211.
5. Kervarrec T, Gaboriaud P, Berthon P, et al. Merkel cell carcinomas infiltrated with CD33+ myeloid cells and CD8+ T cells are associated with improved outcome. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. December 2017. doi:10.1016/j.jaad.2017.12.029

Tables and figures legends:

Table 1. Immunohistochemical detection of ZEB1 expression and immune infiltrates in primary cutaneous MCC, LNM from cutaneous MCC and MCCWOP.

Figure 1. Representative immunohistochemical stainings of ZEB1 (a,b,c), CD8 (d,e,f) and CD33 infiltration (g,h,i) in primary cutaneous tumor (a,d,g), metastasis of cutaneous MCC (b,e,h) and MCCWOP (c,f,i).

Table 1. Immunohistochemical detection of ZEB1 expression and immune infiltrates in primary cutaneous MCC, LNM from cutaneous MCC and MCCWOP.

Metastatic marker	All MCC cases (n=93)	Primary MCC (n=60)	LNM from cutaneous MCC (n=18)	MCCWOP (n=15)	p
ZEB1					0.01
Score 0-1	42 (51%)	33 (64%)	4 (26%)	5 (33%)	
Score 2	40 (49%)	19 (36%)	11 (74%)	10 (67%)	
Missing data	11	8	3	0	
Immune infiltrates	All MCC cases (n=93)	Primary MCC (n=60)	LNM from cutaneous MCC (n=18)	MCCWOP (n=15)	p
CD8 infiltrates					0.03
Absent	34	19 (34%)	11 (69%)	4 (27%)	
Present	53	37 (66%)	5 (31%)	11 (73%)	
Missing data	6	4	2	0	
CD33^{brisk}/CD8⁺ infiltrates:					0.001
No	42	24 (52%)	14 (93%)	4 (31%)	
Yes	32	22 (48%)	1 (7%)	9 (69%)	
Missing data	19	14	3	2	

Score 0, lack of expression; 1, low staining of tumor cells or high staining of less than 50% of the tumor cells; 2, high staining of more than 50% of tumor cells.

