ORIGINAL RESEARCH

Adenosquamous carcinoma of the bile duct: a population-based study

Bao-Dong Qin* Xiao-Dong Jiao* Ling-Yan Yuan Ke Liu Yuan-Sheng Zang

Department of Medical Oncology, Changzheng Hospital, Second Military Medical University, Shanghai, China

*These authors contributed equally to this work

Correspondence: Yuan-Sheng Zang Department of Medical Oncology, Changzheng Hospital, Second Military Medical University, 64 Hetian Road, Shanghai, China Tel/fax +86 21 6654 0109 8039 Email doctorzangys@163.com



Cancer Management and Research downloaded from https://www.dovepress.com/

Introduction: Adenosquamous carcinoma (ASC) of the bile duct is a rare diagnosis with poorly understood clinicopathological characteristics and disease progression, so identification of the features associated with ASC patient survival is warranted.

Materials and methods: A population cohort study was performed using prospectively extracted data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) database for patients with histological diagnoses of ASC of the bile duct from 1973 to 2013.

Results: A total of 106 patients with ASC of the bile duct were included (mean age 68.1 ± 13.5 years). Lesions from 58 patients were in the extrahepatic bile duct and 34 were located at the ampulla of Vater. Fifty-seven patients were categorized with a regional stage, 15 had localized disease, and 30 had distant disease. Most (60.4%) patients received cancer-directed surgery, and radiation was performed in 14.1% of cases. The 1-year, 2-year, and 5-year overall survival (OS) for patients with ASC of the bile duct was 30.1%, 11.3%, and 3.7%, respectively. Cancer-directed surgery offered 10 additional months of OS for patients with ASC of the bile duct and median OS was 14.0, 6.0, and 6.0 months for ampulla of Vater, extrahepatic bile duct, and intrahepatic bile duct cases, respectively. A multivariate Cox analysis showed that lesions in the ampulla of Vater (HR=0.51, 95% CI 0.26-0.99) and having surgery (HR=0.34, 95% CI 0.14-0.81) were independent protective prognostic factors for these patients.

Conclusion: Cancer-directed surgery and a primary lesion site of the ampulla of Vater may suggest favorable prognosis for patients with ASC of the bile duct.

Keywords: adenosquamous carcinoma, bile duct, prognosis, SEER database

Introduction

Adenosquamous carcinoma (ASC) is a rare bile duct cancer characterized by the presence of variable proportions of two malignant components: adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma (SCC).¹ ASC can arise from primary sites with a glandular epithelium such as the stomach, pancreas, colon and rectum, and breast.^{2–6} ASC of the bile duct has been described as an infiltrative bile duct cancer composed of a squamous component and a glandular component. Based on the WHO classification of tumors of the digestive system, ASC of the ampulla of Vater is defined as having a tumor of at least 25% SCC.^{7,8}

ASC of the extrahepatic bile duct has been reported to account for approximately 2% of extrahepatic bile duct carcinomas, and ASC of the ampulla of Vater is more rare and most studies on ASC at this site focused on a small series or case report^{9–11} and prognosis is rarely mentioned. The SCC component of ASC of the bile duct is associated with local invasiveness, tumor progression, and metastasis.⁷ Also, ASC of this

Cancer Management and Research 2018:10 439-446

© 02018 Qin et al. This work is published and licensed by Dove Medical Press Limited. The full terms of this license are available at https://www.dovepress.com/terms. php and incorporate the Creative Commons Attribution — Non Commercial (unported, v3.0) License (http://creative.commons.org/licenses/by-no/3.0). By accessing the work you hereby accept the Terms. Non-commercial uses of the work are permitted without any further permission from Dove Medical Press Limited, provided the work is properly attributed. For permission for commercial use of this work, please see paragraphs 4.2 and 5 of our Terms (https://www.dovepress.com/terms.php). nature is clinically more aggressive with a worse prognosis than those with adenocarcinoma. Even so, clinicopathological characteristics and prognosis for ASC of the bile duct remains unclear due to a scarcity of reports. To address this, we offer a descriptive, retrospective analysis of patients with ASC of bile duct registered in the Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) database. The purpose of this report is to characterize overall survival (OS) for these patients and delineate features influencing OS.

Methods and materials

Participants

The SEER program is supported by the National Cancer Institute and collects information including cancer incidence and survival from 18 population-based cancer registries throughout the US which covers approximately 28% of the US population. All patients with a diagnosis of ASC of the bile duct according to the ICD-0-3/WHO 2008 were identified in the SEER database between 1973 and 2013. Demographic features and clinicopathological characteristics of these patients were collected including age, gender, ethnicity, primary site, pathological differentiation, TNM stage, lymph node metastases, distant metastases, and types of therapeutic strategy (radiation and surgery). The SEER database reported cancer-specific survival, which was defined as the interval from diagnosis until death due to this kind of cancer or until the last follow-up. The SEER database holds no identifying patient information, all data are anonymous and the Institutional Review Board of Shanghai Changzheng Hospital approved this study.

Statistical analysis

Continuous data were compared using a Student's *t*-test, and categorical data were compared using a Chi-square test. Age at diagnosis, gender, ethnicity, primary site, pathological differentiation, TNM stage, lymph node metastases, distant metastases, surgery and radiation were included in the survival analysis. Survival probabilities were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method and a log-rank test was used to assess any significant differences in OS stratified by each covariate. Cox proportional hazards models were used to analyze associations between clinicopathological characteristics with patient survival. HRs and 95% CIs were estimated using univariate and multivariable models. Statistical analysis was performed using the software MedCalc (version 15.2.2; MedCalc Software, Mariakerke, Belgium), and p<0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results Patients' characteristics

A total of 106 cases of ASC of the bile duct were identified and patient data appear in Table 1. Eighty-nine patients were white and 55 were women. The age at diagnosis for all patients with ASC of the bile duct was 68.1 ± 13.5 years. Lesions from 58 patients were in the extrahepatic bile duct, 34 were located at the ampulla of Vater, and six were in the intrahepatic bile duct. According to the SEER historic staging, 57 patients were categorized with a regional stage, 15 had localized disease, and 30 had distant disease.

Next, we compared characteristics across SEER historic stages and distribution by stage of ASC did not differ significantly by age, gender, ethnicity, pathological differentiation, lymph node metastases, primary site, or radiation (Table 2). However, patients who presented with distant disease were more likely to be at a later stage and with distant metastases, and less likely to undergo surgical resection (p<0.01 for all).

Treatment

Table 3 shows treatment data. Of all patients, 60.4% received cancer-directed surgery, radiation treatment was performed in 14.1% of all included patients, and both surgery and radiation were performed in 11.3%. Due to limited data, surgery types were not clear but comparison analysis revealed that patients who received surgery were more likely to be without distant metastases and a regional summary stage.

OS

We extracted survival data for patients with adenocarcinoma. SCC of the bile duct from the SEER database and patients with ASC of the bile duct had a significantly poorer prognosis than those with adenocarcinoma (p<0.01). Conversely, patients with ASC had a relatively better prognosis than those with SCC, but this was not significant (p=0.135, Figure 1A). However, the multivariate Cox analysis did not demonstrate that ASC tumor type was an independent prognostic factor for these patients (HR=0.65, 95% CI 0.34–1.24).

The 1-year, 2-year, and 5-year OS of all patients with ASC of the bile duct were 30.1%, 11.3%, and 3.7%, respectively. Kaplan-Meier curves for survival stratified by SEER historic stage A classification appear in Figure 1B. The 1-year, 2-year, and 5-year survival rates for patients with localized, regional disease were 45.6%, 15.8%, 5.2% and 40.0%, 20%, 6.6%, respectively. Patients with distant stages did not survive more than 1 year so they had significantly poorer prognoses than those with localized or regional disease (p<0.01 for both).

Table I Characteristics of patients with ASC, AC, and SCC of the bile duct

Number 106 17,054 35 Age (years) 68,1±13.5 69,2±12.6 67,7±13.2 0.20 Gender	Characteristics	ASC	AC	scc	p-value
Age (pars)68.1±13.569.9±12.667.2±13.20.02Gender	Number	106	17,054	35	
Gender Signal Sign	Age (years)	68.1±13.5	69.9±12.6	67.7±13.2	0.20
Female 55 (18%) 8040 (47.3%) 17 (48.6%) 0.629 Male 51 (482%) 8.944 (52.7%) 18 (51.4%) 6 White 79 (74.6%) 13.918 (81.8%) 22 (62.9%) 0.02 Back 10 (9.4%) 1.215 (7.1%) 4 (11.4%) 6 Other (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander) 17 (16%) 1.881 (11.1) 9 (25.7%) 0.03 Minnown 0 40 0 0 10 Primary site 1.215 (7.1%) 4 (11.4%) 0.03 Anpulia of Vater 58 (59.2%) 7.447 (48.6%) 19 (70.4%) 0.03 Intrapeatic bile duct 6 (6.1%) 1.310 (8.6%) 3 (11.1%) 10 Bile duct, not otherwise specified 8 1.313 (8.2%) 10 (8.6%) 10 (11.5%) Poological differentiation 1 (3.3%) 4.202 (4.8) 1 (5.3%) <0.01	Gender				
Male SI (48.2%) 8,994 (52.7%) I8 (51.4%) Ethnicity	Female	55 (51.8%)	8,060 (47.3%)	17 (48.6%)	0.629
Ethnicity Part (PA (AS)) Part (PA (AS	Male	51 (48.2%)	8,994 (52.7%)	18 (51.4%)	
White 79 (74 6%) 13,918 (81.8%) 22 (62.9%) 0.02 Black 10 (9.4%) 1.215 (7.1%) 4 (11.4%) 4 (11.4%) Other (American Indian/Alastan Native, Asian/Pacific Island) 17 (16%) 4 40 0 Primary site 5 (65.2%) 7.447 (48.6%) 19 (70.4%) 0.03 Ampulla of Vater 3 (43.7%) 6.562 (42.8%) 5 (18.5%) 11.1%) Bile duct, not otherwise specified 6 (6.1%) 1.31 (06.5%) 3 (11.8%) 400 Bile duct, not otherwise specified 3 (4.8%) 6.826 (44.8%) 1 (5.3%) -<0.01	Ethnicity	()		(
Bick IO (9.4%) I.215 (7.1%) 4 (11.4%) Other (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander) I7 (16%) I.881 (11.1) 9 (25.7%) Other (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander) I7 (16%) I.881 (11.1) 9 (25.7%) Primary site Extrahegatic bile duct 58 (59.2%) 7.447 (48.6%) 19 (70.4%) 0.03 Ampulla of Vater 34 (34.7%) 6.562 (42.8%) 5 (18.5%) 111.1%) Bile duct, not otherwise specified 8 1.310 (8.6%) 3 (11.1%) 18 Bile duct, not otherwise specified 8 1.310 (8.6%) 7 (36.8%) <0.01	White	79 (74.6%)	13,918 (81.8%)	22 (62.9%)	0.02
Other (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander) I7 (16%) I.881 (11.1) 9 (25.7%) Unknown 0 40 0 Primary site	Black	10 (9.4%)	1,215 (7.1%)	4 (11.4%)	
Unknown 0 40 0 Primary site Extrahepatic bile duct 58 (59.2%) 7.447 (48.6%) 19 (70.4%) 0.03 Ampulla of Vater 34 (34.7%) 6.562 (42.8%) 5 (18.5%) 1 Intrahepatic bile duct 6 (6.1%) 1.310 (8.6%) 3 (11.1%) B Pathological differentiation 1 (3.3%) 4.920 (32.3%) 1 (5.3%) <0.01	Other (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander)	17 (16%)	1,881 (11.1)	9 (25.7%)	
Primary siteFxrahepatic bile duct54 (34.7%)6.552 (42.8%)19 (70.4%)0.31Ampulia OY Vater64 (61.3%)1.310 (8.6%)3 (11.1%)1Bile duct, not otherwise specified81.310 (8.6%)3 (11.1%)1Bile duct, not otherwise specified81.310 (8.6%)1 (5.3%).011Phological differentiation1 (33.3%)4.920 (32.3%)1 (5.3%).001Moderate21 (33.3%)4.920 (32.3%)11 (57.9%).011Poor37 (8.6%)3.374 (22.1%)11 (57.9%).011Undifferentiated24.2%124 (0.8%)0 (0).021Unknown431.8100.031Summary stage15 (14.7%)3.082 (20.7%)13 (44.8%).031Localized15 (14.7%)1.082 (20.7%)4 (13.8%).031Unstaged5 (10.4%)1.898 (26.7%)3 (33.3%).012I11 (22.9%)1.989 (26.7%)3 (33.3%).012I11 (22.9%)1.989 (26.7%)3 (33.3%).012I11 (22.9%)1.991 (0.9%)4 (44.5%).013Unknown10 (22.9%)1.991 (0.9%)4 (44.5%).014Unknown20 (47.8%)2.313.3%).014.014Unknown20 (47.8%)2.199 (0.9%)4 (44.5%).014Unknown20 (22.9%)1.912 (22.9%)3 (33.3%).014Unknown20 (21.9%)4.44.5%).014.014No11 (22.9%)2.199 (0.9%)4	Unknown	0	40	0	
Extrahepatic bile duct 58 (59.2%) 7,447 (48.6%) 19 (70.4%) 0.03 Ampulla of Vater 34 (34.7%) 6,552 (42.8%) 5 (18.5%) Intrahepatic bile duct 6 (1.5%) 1.310 (8.6%) 3 (11.1%) Bile duct, not otherwise specified 8 1.735 8 Pathological differentiation 3 (4.8%) 6.826 (44.8) 1 (5.3%) <0.01	Primary site				
Ampulla of Vater 34 (34.7%) 6,562 (42.8%) 5 (18.5%) Intrahepatic bile duct 6 (6.1%) 1,310 (8.6%) 3 (11.1%) Bile duct, not otherwise specified 8 1.735 8 Pathological differentiation 1 (3.3%) 6,826 (44.8) 1 (5.3%) <0.01	Extrahepatic bile duct	58 (59.2%)	7,447 (48.6%)	19 (70.4%)	0.03
Incrahepatic bile duct 6 (6.1%) 1,310 (8.6%) 3 (11.1%) Bile duct, not otherwise specified 8 1,735 8 Pathological differentiation 3 (4.8%) 6.826 (44.8) 1 (5.3%) <0.01	Ampulla of Vater	34 (34.7%)	6,562 (42.8%)	5 (18.5%)	
Bile duct, not otherwise specified 8 1,735 8 Pathological differentiation -<	Intrahepatic bile duct	6 (6.1%)	1,310 (8.6%)	3 (11.1%)	
Pathological differentiation 3 (4.8%) 6.826 (44.8) 1 (5.3%) <0.01	Bile duct, not otherwise specified	8	1,735	8	
Well 3 (4.8%) 6,826 (44.8) 1 (5.3%) <0.01 Moderate 21 (33.3%) 4,920 (23.3%) 7 (36.8%) Poor 37 (58.7%) 3,374 (22.1%) 11 (57.9%) Undifferentiated 2 (32.7%) 124 (0.8%) 0 (0) Unknown 43 1,810 16 Summary stage 30 (29.4%) 4.294 (29.0%) 12 (41.4%) 0.31 Regional 50 (55.9%) 7,454 (50.3%) 13 (44.8%) Unstaged 15 (14.7%) 3.082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) Unstaged 15 (14.7%) 3.082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) Unstaged 12 (41.8%) 1.244.8%) 6 INN stage 1 11 (22.9%) 1.848 (26.0%) 0 (0) 0.02 II 11 (22.9%) 1.948 (26.5%) 3 (33.3%) Vondnown 58 9.944 26	Pathological differentiation				
Moderate 21 (33.3%) 4,920 (32.3%) 7 (36.8%) Poor 37 (85.7%) 3.374 (21.1%) 11 (57.9%) Undifferentiated 2 (3.2%) 124 (0.8%) 0 (0) Unknown 43 1.810 16 Summary stage 30 (29.4%) 4.294 (29.0%) 12 (41.4%) 0.31 Regional 57 (55.9%) 7.454 (50.3%) 13 (44.8%) Localized 15 (14.7%) 3,082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) Unstaged 4 2.24 6	Well	3 (4.8%)	6,826 (44.8)	l (5.3%)	<0.01
Poor 37 (58.7%) 3,374 (22.1%) 11 (57.9%) Undifferentiated 2 (3.2%) 124 (0.8%) 0 (0) Unknown 43 1,810 16 Summary stage 12 (41.4%) 0.31 Distant 30 (29.4%) 4,294 (29.0%) 12 (41.4%) 0.31 Regional 57 (55.9%) 7,454 (50.3%) 13 (44.8%) 10 Localized 15 (14.7%) 3,082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) 10 Unstaged 4 2,224 6 11 TNM stage 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) 11 III 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) 11 Unknown 28 9,944 26 11 Unknown 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) 11 Unknown 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) 11 Unknown 22 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 0.201 26 20 20	Moderate	21 (33.3%)	4,920 (32.3%)	7 (36.8%)	
Undifferentiated Unknown 2 (3.2%) 124 (0.8%) 0 (0) Unknown 43 1,810 16 Summary stage	Poor	37 (58.7%)	3,374 (22.1%)	11 (57.9%)	
Unknown 43 1,810 16 Summary stage	Undifferentiated	2 (3.2%)	124 (0.8%)	0 (0)	
Summary stage jostant 30 (29.4%) 4.294 (29.0%) 12 (41.4%) 0.31 Regional 57 (55.9%) 7.454 (50.3%) 13 (44.8%) 1 Localized 15 (14.7%) 3.082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) 1 Unstaged 4 2.224 6 1 TNM stage 1 21 (43.6%) 10 (0) 0.02 II 1 21 (22.9%) 1.65 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) IV 11 (22.9%) 1.165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) IV 11 (22.9%) 1.99 (30.9%) 4 (44.5%) 3 (33.3%) Unknown 22 (47.8%) 2.432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 10 (20.2%) 4.12 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) 10 (30.3%) 0.04 Unknown 60 10.210 2 10 (30.3%) 0.06	Unknown	43	1,810	16	
Distant 30 (29.4%) 4.294 (29.0%) 12 (41.4%) 0.31 Regional 57 (55.9%) 7.454 (50.3%) 13 (44.8%) 1 Localized 15 (14.7%) 3.082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) 1 Unstaged 4 2.224 6 1 TNM stage 5 (10.4%) 1.848 (26.0%) 0 (0) 0.02 II 21 (43.8%) 1.898 (26.7%) 3 (33.3%) 1 IV 11 (22.9%) 1.165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) IV 11 (22.9%) 2.199 (30.9%) 4 (44.5%) 1 Unknown 58 9.944 26 1 Lymph node metastases 7 543 (25.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4.412 (64.5%) 3(33.3%) 1 Unknown 60 10.210 26 1 Start metastases 7 9.423 25 1 Yes 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%)	Summary stage				
Regional 57 (55.%) 7,454 (50.3%) 13 (44.8%) Localized 15 (14.7%) 3,082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) Unstaged 4 2,224 6 TNM stage 5 (10.4%) 1,848 (26.0%) 0 (0) 0.02 I 5 (10.4%) 1,848 (26.0%) 0 (0) 0.02 II 21 (43.8%) 1,898 (26.7%) 3 (33.3%) - III 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) - V 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) - Unknown 58 9,40 2 - V Unknown 58 9,41 - - Lymph node metastases 22 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 22 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (60.0%) 0.04 Unknown 20 4 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Ves No 3 (37.6%) 5 (33.2 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) - Unknown 38 (77.6%)	Distant	30 (29.4%)	4,294 (29.0%)	12 (41.4%)	0.31
Localized Unstaged 15 (14.7%) 3,082 (20.7%) 4 (13.8%) Unstaged 4 2,224 6 TNM stage 5 1,848 (26.0%) 0 (0) 0.02 I 5 (10.4%) 1,848 (26.0%) 3 (33.3%) 5 II 21 (43.8%) 1,898 (26.7%) 3 (33.3%) 5 III 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) 5 IV 11 (22.9%) 2,199 (30.9%) 4 (44.5%) 5 Unknown 58 9,944 26 5 Lymph node metastases 22 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4,12 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) 5 Unknown 60 10,210 26 Distant metastases 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.5%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) 5 Surgery 7 9,423 25 5 Surgery 7 9,574 (57.6%) 23 (69.7)<	Regional	57 (55.9%)	7,454 (50.3%)	13 (44.8%)	
Unstaged 4 2,224 6 TNM stage TSNB stage TS	Localized	15 (14.7%)	3,082 (20.7%)	4 (13.8%)	
TNM stage 5 (10.4%) 1,848 (26.0%) 0 (0) 0.02 I 21 (43.8%) 1,898 (26.7%) 3 (33.3%) - III 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) - IV 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) - IV 11 (22.9%) 9,944 26 - Lymph node metastases 2 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Yes 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - - Distant metastases 2 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Ves 0 0,210 26 - - Distant metastases - - - - Yes 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 9,423 25 - Surgery - - - - Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0,01	Unstaged	4	2,224	6	
I 5 (10.4%) 1,848 (26.0%) 0 (0) 0.02 II 21 (43.8%) 1,898 (26.7%) 3 (33.3%)	TNM stage				
II 21 (43.8%) 1,898 (26.7%) 3 (33.3%) III 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) IV 11 (22.9%) 2,199 (30.9%) 4 (44.5%) Unknown 58 9,944 26 Lymph node metastases 2 2 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) 0.03 Unknown 60 10,210 26 2 Distant metastases 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) 0 Unknown 57 9,423 25 5 Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	1	5 (10.4%)	1,848 (26.0%)	0 (0)	0.02
III 11 (22.9%) 1,165 (16.4%) 2 (22.2%) IV 11 (22.9%) 2,199 (30.9%) 4 (44.5%) Unknown 58 9,944 26 Lymph node metastases 22 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Unknown 60 10,210 26 Distant metastases - - - Yes 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) - Unknown 57 9,423 25 - Surgery - - - - Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	П	21 (43.8%)	1,898 (26.7%)	3 (33.3%)	
IV I1 (22.9%) 2,199 (30.9%) 4 (44.5%) Unknown 58 9,944 26 Lymph node metastases 2 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Unknown 60 10,210 26 Distant metastases - - - Yes 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 Distant metastases - - - - Yes 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) - Unknown 57 9,423 25 - Surgery - - - - Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	III	11 (22.9%)	1,165 (16.4%)	2 (22.2%)	
Unknown 58 9,944 26 Lymph node metastases 2 (4.7.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Unknown 60 10,210 26 - Distant metastases 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) - Unknown 57 9,423 25 - Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	IV	11 (22.9%)	2,199 (30.9%)	4 (44.5%)	
Lymph node metastases 22 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Unknown 60 10,210 26 - Distant metastases 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) - Unknown 57 9,423 25 - Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	Unknown	58	9,944	26	
Yes 22 (47.8%) 2,432 (35.5%) 6 (66.7%) 0.03 No 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) - Unknown 60 10,210 26 - Distant metastases 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) - Unknown 57 9,423 25 - Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	Lymph node metastases				
No 24 (52.2%) 4,412 (64.5%) 3 (33.3%) Unknown 60 10,210 26 Distant metastases 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) 10 Unknown 57 9,423 25 Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	Yes	22 (47.8%)	2,432 (35.5%)	6 (66.7%)	0.03
Unknown 60 10,210 26 Distant metastases 11 (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) 10 Unknown 57 9,423 25 Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	No	24 (52.2%)	4,412 (64.5%)	3 (33.3%)	
Distant metastases II (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) Unknown 57 9,423 25 Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	Unknown	60	10,210	26	
Yes II (22.4%) 2,199 (28.9%) 6 (60.0%) 0.06 No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) 10 Unknown 57 9,423 25 Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	Distant metastases				
No 38 (77.6%) 5,432 (71.1%) 4 (40.0%) Unknown 57 9,423 25 Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01 No 42 (39.6%) 9,574 (57.6%) 23 (69.7) 23 (69.7) Unknown 0 421 2 Radiation Yes 14 (13.7%) 3,176 (19.0%) 2 (5.9%) 0.07 No 88 (86.3%) 13,569 (81.0%) 32 (94.1%) 10	Yes	11 (22.4%)	2,199 (28.9%)	6 (60.0%)	0.06
Unknown 57 9,423 25 Surgery -	No	38 (77.6%)	5,432 (71.1%)	4 (40.0%)	
Surgery Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01	Unknown	57	9,423	25	
Yes 64 (60.4%) 7,059 (42.4%) 10 (30.3%) <0.01 No 42 (39.6%) 9,574 (57.6%) 23 (69.7) Unknown 0 421 2 Radiation 7 7 3,176 (19.0%) 2 (5.9%) 0.07 No 88 (86.3%) 13,569 (81.0%) 32 (94.1%) 10	Surgery				
No 42 (39.6%) 9,574 (57.6%) 23 (69.7) Unknown 0 421 2 Radiation 7es 14 (13.7%) 3,176 (19.0%) 2 (5.9%) 0.07 No 88 (86.3%) 13,569 (81.0%) 32 (94.1%) 14 (13.7%)	Yes	64 (60.4%)	7,059 (42.4%)	10 (30.3%)	<0.01
Unknown 0 421 2 Radiation 7es 14 (13.7%) 3,176 (19.0%) 2 (5.9%) 0.07 No 88 (86.3%) 13,569 (81.0%) 32 (94.1%)	No	42 (39.6%)	9,574 (57.6%)	23 (69.7)	
Radiation 14 (13.7%) 3,176 (19.0%) 2 (5.9%) 0.07 No 88 (86.3%) 13,569 (81.0%) 32 (94.1%)	Unknown	0	421	2	
Yes 14 (13.7%) 3,176 (19.0%) 2 (5.9%) 0.07 No 88 (86.3%) 13,569 (81.0%) 32 (94.1%)	Radiation	-		_	
No 88 (86.3%) 13,569 (81.0%) 32 (94.1%) University 4 300 1	Yas	14 (13 7%)	3 176 (19.0%)	2 (5 9%)	0.07
	No	88 (86 3%)	13.569 (81.0%)	32 (94 1%)	0.07
UNKNOWN 4 KUM I	Linknown	4	309	1	

Abbreviations: ASC, adenosquamous carcinoma; AC, adenocarcinoma; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma.

Figure 1C shows the Kaplan-Meier curves grouped by surgery. Cancer-directed surgery improved OS for patients with ASC of the bile duct by almost 10 months. However, there was no significant difference in prognosis between patients who received radiation and those who did not (p=0.30). Patients with a lesion of the ampulla of Vater had better survival compared to those with extrahepatic bile duct lesion (p<0.01) and intrahepatic bile duct lesion (p=0.10). Figure 1D depicts OS for these three groups and the median OS was 14.0, 6.0, and 6.0 months, respectively. Table 2 Patient characteristics by the SEER historic stage

Characteristics	Localized	Regional	Distant	p-value
Number	15	57	30	
Age	70.7±12.1	66.4±13.2	69.8±13.9	0.37
Gender				
Female	5 (33.3%)	28 (49.1%)	20 (66.7%)	0.09
Male	10 (66.7%)	29 (50.9%)	10 (33.3%)	
Ethnicity	()	()	()	
White	12 (80.0%)	40 (70.2%)	23 (76.7%)	0.92
Black	l (6.7%)	6 (10.5%)	3 (10.0%)	
Other (American Indian/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander)	2 (13.3%)	11 (19.3%)	4 (13.3%)	
Primary site	X Y	x y	(
Extrahepatic bile duct	8 (53.3%)	36 (63.2%)	11 (47.8%)	0.50
Ampulla of Vater	6 (40.0%)	19 (33.3%)	9 (39.1%)	
Intrahepatic bile duct	l (6.7%)	2 (3.5%)	3 (13.1%)	
Bile duct, not otherwise specified	0	0	7	
Pathological differentiation				
Well	l (16.7%)	I (2.2%)	l (8.4%)	0.28
Moderate	2 (33.3%)	15 (33.3%)	4 (33.3%)	
Poor	2 (33.3%)	28 (62.3%)	7 (58.3%)	
Undifferentiated	l (16.7%)	I (2.2%)	0	
Unknown	9	12	18	
TNM stage				
I	3 (100.0%)	2 (6.5%)	0	<0.01
II	0 (43.8%)	21 (67.7.3%)	0	
III	0 (22.9%)	8 (25.8%)	3 (21.4%)	
IV	0 (22.9%)	0	11 (78.6%)	
Unknown	12	26	16	
Lymph node metastases				
Yes	0 (0.0%)	16 (50.0%)	6 (60.0%)	0.19
No	3 (100.0%)	16 (50.0%)	4 (40.0%)	
Unknown	12	25	20	
Distant metastases				
Yes	0 (0%)	0	(78.6%)	<0.01
No	3 (100.0%)	31 (100.0%)	3 (21.4%)	
Unknown	12	26	16	
Surgery				
Yes	7 (46.7%)	49 (86.0%)	7 (23.3%)	<0.01
No	8 (53.3%)	8 (14.0%)	23 (76.7%)	
Radiation	. ()	- (,	()	
Yes	(7.1%)	11 (20.0%)	3 (10.3%)	0.33
No	13 (92.9%)	44 (80.0%)	26 (89.7%)	
Unknown	I Í	2	I Ý	

Abbreviation: SEER, Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results.

Variables potentially influencing OS were analyzed using univariate Cox proportional hazards analysis and Table 4 shows that distant SEER historic stage, late TNM stage (III and IV), lymph node and distant metastasis were significantly associated with poor prognosis for patients with ASC of the bile duct (p<0.01 for all). Conversely, lesions at the ampulla of Vater and surgery were protective factors (p<0.01 for both). TNM stage and lymph node and distant metastases were omitted for multivariate Cox analysis due to covariance with SEER historic stage. The results of multivariate Cox analysis are presented in Table 5, which show that lesions at the ampulla of Vater (HR=0.51, 95% CI 0.26–0.99) and surgery (HR=0.34, 95% CI 0.14–0.81) were independent protective factors for ASC patients.

Discussion

Most studies of ASC of the bile duct have been small series or single case reports because of its rarity. Therefore, clinicopathological features and outcomes of this entity remain unclear. In the present study, we described clinical characteristics of patients with ASC of the bile duct and identified variables affecting OS using data from SEER. Only 106

Characteristics	Surgery	Non-surgery	p-value
Number		42	p=value
Number	64	42	0.01
Age (years)	65.3±12.5	72.2±13.8	0.01
Gender	22 (50 00()	22 (54.000)	o / o
Female	32 (50.0%)	23 (54.8%)	0.69
Male	32 (50.0%)	19 (54.2%)	
Ethnicity	17 (74 404)	22 (74 200)	0.00
vvhite	47 (74.6%)	32 (76.2%)	0.92
Black	6 (9.4%)	4 (9.5%)	
Other (American Indian/	11 (16%)	6 (14.3%)	
Alaskan Native, Asian/			
Pacific Islander)			
Primary site	27 (50 70)	21 (50 200)	0.07
Extrahepatic bile duct	37 (59.7%)	21 (58.3%)	0.27
Ampulla of Vater	23 (37.1%)	11 (30.5%)	
Intrahepatic bile duct	2 (3.2%)	4 (11.2%)	
Bile duct, not otherwise	2	6	
specified			
Pathological differentiation			
Well	2 (10.4%)	1 (7.1%)	0.74
Moderate	17 (43.8%)	4 (28.6%)	
Poor	29 (22.9%)	8 (57.2%)	
Undifferentiated	l (22.9%)	l (7.1%)	
Unknown	15	28	
Summary stage			
Distant	7 (29.4%)	23 (59.0%)	<0.01
Regional	49 (55.9%)	8 (20.5%)	
Localized	7 (14.7%)	8 (20.5%)	
Unstaged	I	3	
TNM stage			
I	3 (10.4%)	2 (13.3%)	<0.01
II	21 (43.8%)	0	
III	8 (22.9%)	3 (20.0%)	
IV	l (22.9%)	10 (66.7%)	
Unknown	31	27	
Lymph node metastases			0.32
Yes	18 (47.8%)	4 (33.3%)	
No	16 (52.2%)	8 (66.7%)	
Unknown	30	30	
Distant metastases			
Yes	l (22.4%)	10 (62.5%)	<0.01
No	32 (77.6%)	6 (37.5%)	
Unknown	31	26	
Radiation			
Yes	12 (13.7%)	2 (4.9%)	0.04
No	49 (86.3%)	39 (95.1%)	
Unknown	3	1	

 Table 3 Patient characteristics by surgery treatment

patients recorded in SEER between 1973 and 2013 were extracted from the database. Compared with 17,069 cases with adenocarcinoma of the bile duct, the prevalence of ASC of the bile duct was very low.

According to our results, age at diagnosis of patients ranged from 32 to 97 years, and the mean age of all patients was 58 years, which agrees with Hong et al and Okabayashi et al's reports of an average age of 60 years.^{9,12} In this cohort,

white patients accounted for the largest proportion (~74.6%), which was consistent with the distribution of races in the Western population. Although the sample size was smaller, only 36 and 12 cases, Okabayashi et al and Hong et al reported series of patients with ASC of the bile duct with a female to male ratio of 1.4:1 and 2:1, respectively. We found 106 cases with more females affected than males, but the difference was small (55:51). Lesions of most ASC of the bile duct were located in the extrahepatic bile duct, and next to the ampulla of Vater. Most ASC patients received surgery and 13.7% received radiation. Early stage patients with regional and localized tumors accounted for 70.9% of ASC patients.

ASC is more clinically aggressive and offers less favorable prognosis than adenocarcinoma (AC) of other origins. The median OS for patients with ASC of the pancreas was nearly half that of patients with pancreatic ductal adenocarcinomas.¹³ We found that ASC patients have poorer prognosis than those with AC, but better prognosis than SCC patients. Thus, ASC has greater malignant potential than adenocarcinoma of the bile duct. Likely, SCC grows twice as fast as adenocarcinoma and once adenocarcinoma transforms to AC, the carcinoma is highly malignant.^{12,14} Moreover, previous studies have reported significantly shorter doubling times of SCC than adenocarcinomas in lung cancer.^{15,16}

Univariate analysis revealed that distant stages of SEER historic stages, late TNM stages (III and IV), lymph node and distant metastasis were associated with poor prognosis for patients with ASC of the bile duct. The American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) method is more commonly used in the clinical setting, and the SEER historic stage has standardized and simplified staging to ensure consistent definitions over time. Both can be used to provide a measure of disease progression and both were associated with poor prognosis of ASC patients. Among 106 ASC patients, 58 and four patients had not been categorized by AJCC stage or SEER historic staging, respectively. Thus, we included SEER historic stage in the multivariate Cox analysis and after adjusting for other variables, the analysis showed that SEER historic stage likely portends a less favorable prognosis, but without statistically significant difference. Although ASC of the bile duct has a different etiology and biological features compared with AC, treatment of ASC patients is similar to that for AC patients. Because ASCs are relatively uncommon tumors with a poor prognosis, outcomes related to various therapeutic interventions are not well defined and no standard therapeutic strategies have been established. In the present study, a significantly longer OS was found for patients who received surgery. Similar to other



Figure I (A) OS for patients with ASC and other bile duct cancer; (B) OS for patients with distant, regional, localized stages; (C) OS for patients who received surgery and those who did not; (D) OS for ASC patients with different primary lesion sites.

Abbreviations: ASC, adenosquamous carcinoma; AC, adenocarcinoma; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma; OS, overall survival.

Table 4Univariate	Cox proportional haza	d analyses of clinical c	characteristics for OS in	patients with ASC of the bile duct
		,		

Factor	Category	Univariate	Univariate	
		HR (95% CI)	p-value	
Age	>58/<58	1.44 (0.96–2.17)	0.08	
Gender	Male/female	1.22 (0.82-1.83)	0.33	
Race	White/Black and other	0.67 (0.42-1.07)	0.10	
Primary site	Ampulla of Vater/extrahepatic, intrahepatic bile duct	0.50 (0.31–0.81)	<0.01	
Pathological differentiation	Poor and undifferentiated/well and moderate	1.35 (0.76-2.39)	0.31	
Summary stage	Distant/localized and regional	3.60 (2.15-6.02)	<0.01	
TNM stage	III and IV/I and II	2.43 (1.24-4.77)	0.01	
Lymph node metastases	Yes/No	2.00 (1.23-3.23)	<0.01	
Distant metastases	Yes/No	6.54 (2.66–16.0)	<0.01	
Surgery	Yes/No	0.32 (0.21-0.50)	<0.01	
Radiation	Yes/No	0.75 (0.42–1.32)	0.31	

Abbreviations: ASC, adenosquamous carcinoma; OS, overall survival.

Factor	Category	Multivariate		
		HR (95% CI)	p-value	
Age (years)	>58/<58	1.41 (0.79–2.53)	0.25	
Gender	Male/female	1.44 (0.62–3.36)	0.25	
Race	White/black and other	0.59 (0.30-1.13)	0.11	
Primary site	Ampulla of Vater/extrahepatic and intrahepatic bile duct	0.51 (0.26-0.99)	0.04	
Pathological differentiation	Poor and undifferentiated/well and moderate	1.60 (0.87-2.95)	0.13	
Summary stage	Distant/localized and regional	2.40 (0.93-6.17)	0.07	
Surgery	Yes/No	0.34 (0.14–0.81)	0.02	
Radiation	Yes/No	0.69 (0.30–1.61)	0.39	

Abbreviations: ASC, adenosquamous carcinoma; OS, overall survival.

cancers, younger patients with early disease stage (regional and localized disease, or early TNM stage) and non-distant metastases were more likely to be managed with surgery. Except for these factors, there was no difference in features between patients who had surgery and patients who did not. However, we did not observe that radiation significantly affected OS of ASC patients. This result is consistent with Guglielmi et al's report that curative resection of intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma is the only therapy that can achieve long-term survival.¹⁷

We noted that the ampulla of Vater was an independent prognostic protective factor for ASC patients. Several case reports of ASC of the ampulla of Vater suggest that resection and surgery remains the mainstay therapy for this disease. Surgical interventions do not appear to improve patient survival and most patients experienced early distal metastasis and short survival after surgery. OS ranged from 6 to 48 months and median OS was 10 months.^{11,18,19} In our study, the median OS of ASC patients of the ampulla of Vater was relatively longer; almost 16 months. Okabayashi et al's group reported the median survival of patients with ASC of extrahepatic bile duct was 13 months, which is relatively longer than that in our cohort (6 months). This may be explained by racial differences as Okabayashi et al's study included East Asian people. Also, 36.2% of patients did not receive surgery in our cohort, whereas all patients received surgery in Okabayashi et al's study.

Besides, tumor etiology is unclear, but several hypotheses have been offered to explain the histogenesis of ASC. Currently, the most reliable theories are persistent adenocarcinoma undergoing squamous metaplasia or transformation, and squamous metaplasia of the bile duct epithelium caused by chronic inflammation due to infection, gall stones or a choledochal cyst undergoing a malignant transformation.^{14,20-22} Other potential mechanisms included pluripotent stem cells capable of inducing adenocarcinoma and SCC transformation, or a collision of both malignant tumor types.²³

Similar to other studies using SEER as a data source, we had limitations that require clarification for accurate interpretation of the results. First, we lacked a pathological grade and TNM stage for some patients. For example, there were 43 patients with unknown pathological differentiation, and 58 patients had no recorded TNM stage. Therefore, when we conducted multivariate Cox analysis, we included SEER historic stage rather than TNM stage. Second, the retrospective nature of this study and the inability to account for other relevant variables such as performance status were weaknesses. We also lacked information about chemotherapy, and we could not account for the effect of potential advances in chemotherapy, thus limiting our ability to describe treatment patterns for ASC. Responses to treatment and recurrence rates could not be ascertained from SEER.

Conclusion

Despite the exceptionally rare occurrence of this disease, a population-based approach provided reasonable statistical utility for crude stratification of prognosis based on commonly identified variables. Cancer-directed surgery and a primary site of the ampulla of Vater may be favorable for prognosis for patients with ASC of the bile duct.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the Shanghai Sailing Program (grant number 17YF1425200, 2017); the Young Start-up Foundation of Changzheng Hospital (grant number 2015CZQN07, 2015); Shanghai Municipal health and Family Planning Commission Foundation (grant number 201540174, 2015); Chinese National Natural Science Foundation (grant number 81702249, 2017). We also thank LetPub (www.letpub.com) for its linguistic assistance during the preparation of this manuscript.

Disclosure

The authors report no conflicts of interest in this work.

References

- 1. Albores-Saavedra J, Scoazec JC, Wittekind C, Sripa B. Tumours of the gallbladder and extrahepatic bile ducts. In: Hamilton SR, Aaltonen LA, editors. World Health Organization classification of tumours. Pathology and Genetics of Tumours of the Digestive System. Lyon: IARC. 2000;203-217.
- 2. Chen YY, Li AF, Huang KH, et al. Adenosquamous carcinoma of the stomach and review of the literature. Pathol Oncol Res. 2015;21(3): 547-551
- 3. Hsu JT, Chen HM, Wu RC, et al. Clinicopathologic features and outcomes following surgery for pancreatic adenosquamous carcinoma. World J Surg Oncol. 2008;6:95.
- 4. Masoomi H, Ziogas A, Lin BS, Barleben A, Mills S, Stamos MJ, Zell JA. Population-based evaluation of adenosquamous carcinoma of the colon and rectum. Dis Colon Rectum. 2012;55(5):509-514.
- 5. Soo K, Tan PH. Low-grade adenosquamous carcinoma of the breast. J Clin Pathol. 2013;66(6):506-511.
- 6. Wang J, Wang FW, Lagrange CA, Hemstreet GP. Clinical features and outcomes of 25 patients with primary adenosquamous cell carcinoma of the prostate. Rare Tumors. 2010;2(3):e47.
- 7. Hoshimoto S, Hoshi S, Hishinuma S, et al. Adenosquamous carcinoma in the biliary tract: association of the proliferative ability of the squamous component with its proportion and tumor progression. Scand J Gastroenterol. 2017;52(4):425-430.
- 8. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer Statistics, 2017. CA Cancer J Clin. 2017;67(1):7-30.
- 9. Hong SM, Kim MJ, Jang KT, Yoon GS, Cho H, Frierson HF, Yu E. Adenosquamous carcinoma of extrahepatic bile duct: clinicopathologic study of 12 cases. Int J Clin Exp Pathol. 2008;1(2):147-156.
- 10. Ueno N, Sano T, Kanamaru T, et al. Adenosquamous cell carcinoma arising from the papilla major. Oncol Rep. 2002;9(2):317-320.
- 11. Yang SJ, Ooyang CH, Wang SY, Liu YY, Kuo IM, Liao CH, Wu TJ. Adenosquamous carcinoma of the ampulla of Vater - a rare disease at unusual location. World J Surg Oncol. 2013;11:124.

- 12. Okabayashi T, Kobayashi M, Nishimori I, Namikawa T, Okamoto K, Onishi S, Araki K. Adenosquamous carcinoma of the extrahepatic biliary tract: clinicopathological analysis of Japanese cases of this uncommon disease. J Gastroenterol. 2005;40(2):192-199.
- 13. Imaoka H, Shimizu Y, Mizuno N, et al. Clinical characteristics of adenosquamous carcinoma of the pancreas: a matched case-control study. Pancreas. 2014;43(2):287-290.
- 14. Iemura A, Yano H, Mizoguchi A, Kojiro M. A cholangiocellular carcinoma nude mouse strain showing histologic alteration from adenocarcinoma to squamous cell carcinoma. Cancer. 1992;70(2):415-422.
- 15. Honda O, Johkoh T, Sekiguchi J, et al. Doubling time of lung cancer determined using three-dimensional volumetric software: comparison of squamous cell carcinoma and adenocarcinoma. Lung Cancer. 2009;66(2):211-217.
- 16. Wilson DO, Ryan A, Fuhrman C, Schuchert M, Shapiro S, Siegfried JM, Weissfeld J. Doubling times and CT screen-detected lung cancers in the Pittsburgh Lung Screening Study. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2012:185(1):85-89.
- 17. Guglielmi A, Ruzzenente A, Campagnaro T, et al. Intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma: prognostic factors after surgical resection. World J Surg. 2009;33(6):1247-1254.
- 18. Ri YM, Orihata M, Moriwaki M. A case of adenosquamous cell carcinoma of the ampulla of Vater. J Japanese Coll Surg. 2005;30:169-173.
- 19. Lee DK, Park CK, Ahn GH, et al. Adenosquamous carcinoma of the ampulla of Vater A Report of Two Cases. Korean J Pathol. 2006;40:160-164.
- 20. Okamura K, Hayakawa H, Kuze M, Takahashi H, Kosaka A, Mizumoto R, Katsuta K. Triple carcinomas of the biliary tract associated with congenital choledochal dilatation and pancreaticobiliary maljunction. J Gastroenterol. 2000;35(6):465-471.
- 21. Ochiai T, Yamamoto J, Kosuge T, et al. Adenosquamous carcinoma with different morphologic and histologic components arising from the intrahepatic bile duct: report of a case. Hepatogastroenterology. 1996;43(9):663-666.
- 22. Kardon DE, Thompson LD, Przygodzki RM, Heffess CS. Adenosquamous carcinoma of the pancreas: a clinicopathologic series of 25 cases. Mod Pathol. 2001;14(5):443-451.
- 23. Hoshimoto S, Aiura K, Shito M, Kakefuda T, Sugiura H. Adenosquamous carcinoma of the ampulla of Vater: a case report and literature review. World J Surg Oncol. 2015;13:287.

a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit

http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php to read real quotes from

published authors.

Cancer Management and Research

Publish your work in this journal

Cancer Management and Research is an international, peer-reviewed open access journal focusing on cancer research and the optimal use of preventative and integrated treatment interventions to achieve improved outcomes, enhanced survival and quality of life for the cancer patient. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes **Dove**press

Submit your manuscript here: https://www.dovepress.com/cancer-management-and-research-journal

446