Metastatic cancer of unknown primary in 21 dogs

METASTATIC CANCER OF UNKNOWN PRIMARY IN 21 DOGS

F. Rossi,[1] L. Aresu,[2] M. Vignoli,[1] P. Buracco,[3] G. Bettini,[4] S. Ferro,[2] F. Gattino,[3] F. Ghiani,[5] R. Costantino,[6] L. Ressel,[7] E. Bellei,[8] and L. Marconato.[1]

1. Centro Oncologico Veterinario, Sasso Marconi, Italy
2. Department of Comparative Biomedicine and Nutrition, University of Padova, Legnaro, Italy
3. Department of Animal Pathology, Veterinary School, Grugliasco, Italy
4. Department of Veterinary Medical Sciences, University of Bologna, Italy
5. Studio Veterinario Associato Costa-Ghiani-Spallarossa, Genova, Italy
6. Clinica Veterinaria Orobica, Bergamo, Italy
7. Diagnostica Veterinaria di Laboratorio, Sasso Marconi, Italy
8. Centro Medico Veterinario, Finale Emilia, Italy

Short title: MCUP in dogs

Key words: MCUP, prognosis, metastatic cancer, carcinoma, dog

Corresponding author:

Laura Marconato, DVM, DECVIM-CA (Oncology)

Centro Oncologico Veterinario

Via San Lorenzo 1-4

40037 Sasso Marconi, Bologna, Italy

lauramarconato@yahoo.it

Abstract

The aim of this retrospective study was to describe clinical features, treatment and outcome of 21 dogs with metastatic cancer of unknown primary (MCUP), a biopsy-proven malignancy being diagnosed at a metastatic stage, in which the anatomical origin of the primary tumor cannot be detected. All dogs underwent total-body CT. Signalment, type and duration of clinical signs, metastasis site, pathology results, treatment and outcome were recorded. Carcinoma was the most common diagnosis (57,1%), followed by sarcoma, melanoma and mast cell tumor. The median number of disease sites per dog was 2, with bones, lymph nodes, lungs, and spleen being the most frequent metastatic locations. The median survival for all dogs was 30 days. Overall, a primary site was not identified in 20 (95,2%) dogs. MCUP encompasses a variety of different pathologic entities and harbors a poor prognosis.

Metastatic carcinoma of unknown primary (MCUP) is the seventh most frequently occurring cancer and the fourth commonest cause of cancer-related death in people.[1] It refers to a biopsy-proven malignancy in which the anatomical origin of the primary tumor cannot be detected after a thorough patient history, careful physical examination, and extensive work-up including laboratory testing, chest radiographs, endoscopy, abdominal ultrasound and/or computed tomography (CT) of the head, chest, abdomen and pelvis and, in selected cases, mammography.[2] Serum tumor markers are commonly of no help, since non-specific elevations occur in the majority of MCUP patients.[3,4] In people only 20% of primary sites are identified by extensive diagnostic work-up before the patients die.[5] In approximately 70% of patients, the primary site cannot be identified even at necropsy.[4,6] Typically, MCUP progresses and spreads rapidly, with signs related to the metastatic site. Due to the lack of consensus on diagnostic guidelines and optimal treatment, patients with MCUP have a poor prognosis, with a median survival time of 6-12 months, thereby rendering this disease a dilemma for oncologists.[4] Standard management is based on empiric chemotherapy, including several taxane/platinum regimens; nevertheless as the tumor recurs or progresses after first-line chemotherapy, effective second-line treatments are not available.[3,7,8]

To the authors' knowledge, there are no studies in veterinary medicine addressing MCUP. In dogs, conventional techniques for evaluating primary tumor sites include laboratory testing, radiographs, ultrasound, endoscopy, CT scan and/or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), depending on tumor site. Serum tumor markers being clinically useful in cancer diagnosis are not available in veterinary medicine.[9]

Advanced diagnostic procedures in pathology, such as immunohistochemistry (IHC), may enable diagnosis of the origin of primary tumors by biopsy of the metastasis in selected cases. Some markers have been used in dogs to classify tumors according to their site of origin and distinguish metastatic carcinomas, including thyroid transcription factor-1 (TTF-1) and

uroplakin III.[10,11] Nevertheless, as IHC is not 100% specific and its interpretation may be challenging, it is important to use markers for guidance in conjunction with the clinical presentation and imaging studies.

The aim of this retrospective study was to describe clinical characteristics, treatment, and outcome of dogs with MCUP.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Criteria for selection of cases

Medical records of all contributing institutions were retrospectively searched to identify dogs with a presumed diagnosis of MCUP. Determining whether the primary site is unknown or whether it will be possible to detect it with further evaluation is difficult. In the present study, members of the Italian Society of Veterinary Oncology (SIONCOV) were asked to look through their records to identify MCUP cases. Once a possible case was identified, the histological sample of the metastatic site was retrieved and reviewed in concert by skilled pathologists with oncologic expertise (GB, SF, LR).

For the purposes of this study, dogs were considered to have MCUP if the following diagnostic procedures did not reveal a primary tumor site: a detailed medical history; complete physical examination; complete blood cell count and biochemistry; urinalysis; histopathological review of biopsy material, and total body (TB) CT. Pathologic evaluation included light microscopic evaluation in all cases. Poorly differentiated tumors had additional immunohistochemical staining.

Dogs with tumors having the capability of arising at multiple sites simultaneously, such as lymphoma or histiocytic sarcoma, were excluded from the study. In particular, to rule out

these tumors, additional immunohistochemical staining, including CD20, CD79, CD3 and CD18, were performed whenever indicated.

Procedures

Data obtained from the medical records of dogs enrolled in this retrospective study included signalment (i.e., age, sex, body weight, and breed), type and duration of clinical signs, results of imaging, site of metastasis, pathology results, treatment, response to therapy, outcome and necropsy data (if performed). Responses to treatment were defined according to the World Health Organization criteria and were required to last for at least 28 days.

RESULTS

Twenty-one dogs fulfilled the inclusion criteria. There were 2 Beagles, 2 German shepherd dogs, 2 Labrador retriever, 2 Corso dogs, 2 mixed breeds, and one each of Schnauzer, Cocker spaniel, Basset hound, Mongrel, Siberian husky, Boxer, American Staffordshire terrier, Weimaraner, Rhodesian Ridgeback, West Highland white terrier, and Beauceron. There were 12 males (1 of which was castrated) and 9 females (7 of which were spayed). Median age at presentation was 10 years (range, 7 to 15 years), whereas median weight was 24 kg (range, 6 to 42 kg). Patients' characteristics are listed in Table 1.

When considering clinical signs, 3 (14,3%) dogs were asymptomatic and their tumors were diagnosed incidentally. Two of them had a painless enlargement of a peripheral lymph node (mandibular: n=1, axillary: n=1), and the other dog developed multiple, painless, subcutaneous nodules. Eighteen (85,7%) dogs showed clinical signs, such as dyspnea (n=7), lameness (n=5), depression/lethargy/weakness (n=2), tenesmus (n=1), abdominal pain (n=1),

lethargy (n=1), and polyuria/polydipsia (n=1); in these dogs clinical signs had been present for a median of 14 days (range, 3 to 150 days) prior to presentation.

All enrolled dogs underwent complete history, physical examination, CBC, chemistry profile, urinalysis, and contrast-enhanced TBCT scan, showing metastatic disease without obvious primary. The CT scan images were acquired with dogs in sternal recumbancy in order to minimize lung collapse/hypostasis, which may hide small peripheral metastatic lesions. The patients were scanned before and after the intravenous administration of a non ionic contrast medium (Ioversol, Covedian, Milan, Italy) at the dose of 600-800 mgI/kg through a power injector at a speed of 3 ml/sec. Different scanners were used. These included a single-slice CT (GE, HiSpeed FX/I) in 3 dogs, and a 16-slice multidetector scanner (GE, BrightSpeed) in 18 dogs. The slice thickness was 1.25 to 3.0 mm, depending on the machine used. All images were reviewed by two board-certified radiologists (FR, MV), who were unaware of the histopathological diagnosis in the cases for which it was available. All cases included in this study had multiple nodules of similar size and vascularization, located in different organs, confirmed to be neoplastic in origin based on histopathological evaluation. An evaluation of the CT did not suggest that any of these lesions could be the primary tumor. The metastatic origin of the pulmonary lesions was supported by the finding of multiple nodules of soft tissue density and similar size, growing in the pulmonary interstitium in an expansive way and compressing the surrounding structures. CT features typically associated with primary neoplasia, like the presence of a larger single mass or a focal area of soft tissue lung infiltrate, associated with signs of local aggressiveness, were never observed in this group of patients.[12] The sites of metastasis are listed in Table 1. The median number of disease sites per dog was 2 (range, 1 to 11). Ten (47,6%) dogs had a single metastatic organ site, 3 (14,2%) had 2, 2 (9,6%) had 4, 1 (4,8%) had 3, 1 (4,8%) had 5, 1 (4,8%) had 6, 1 (4,8%) had 7, and 1

142 (4,8%) had 11. Bones, lymph nodes, lungs, and spleen were the most frequent metastatic
143 locations (Table 1).
144 Pathologic samples were obtained by surgical excision (n=3) or core needle biopsy (n=18).
145 All biopsy specimens were of good quality allowing for accurate histological interpretation.
146 Twelve (57,1%) dogs were diagnosed with carcinoma (undifferentiated carcinoma: n=11;
147 squamous cell carcinoma: n=1), 7 (33,3%) with sarcoma (undifferentiated sarcoma: n=3;
148 fibrosarcoma: n=2; hemangiosarcoma: n=2), 1 (4,8%) with amelanotic melanoma and 1
149 (4,8%) with mast cell tumor. Immunohistochemical analysis to better characterize poorly
150 differentiated tumors was performed in 17 cases. Tests performed included cytokeratin,
151 vimentin, S-100 as standard panel, and PNL2 for amelanotic melanomas. Additional
152 pathologic evaluation (including TTF-1, Factor VIII and CD18) was individualized on the
153 basis of clinical and pathologic features. The pathological diagnoses of the dogs and details
154 on immunohistochemistry are reported in Table 1.
155 When considering histological type and metastatic pattern detected after TBCT, 8 out of 12
156 (66,7%) dogs with carcinoma had a single metastatic site. All dogs with sarcoma had multiple
157 metastatic sites, whereas both the dog with melanoma and the one with mast cell tumor also
158 had a single metastatic site.
159 Eleven (52,4%) dogs received no treatment and were euthanized shortly after diagnosis. Four
160 (19%) dogs received systemic chemotherapy (2 of which were treated with metronomic
161 chemotherapy), 2 (9,5%) dogs were treated with firocoxib (Previcox, Merial, Milanofiori,
162 Italy), 1 (4,8%) underwent surgery, 1 (4,8%) was treated with palliative radiation therapy and
163 immunotherapy with the canine melanoma vaccine (Oncept, Merial, Milanofiori, Italy), 1
164 (4,8%) dog was treated with surgery, chemotherapy and radiation therapy, and 1 (4,8%) dog
165 was treated with surgery and toceranib (Palladia, Pfizer, Italy).

166 The median survival time was 30 days for all dogs diagnosed with MCUP. Eighteen (85,7%)
167 dogs were dead at the end of the study for cancer-related causes after a median of 12 days
168 (range, 1 to 504 days). Seven of them underwent therapy; in five dogs the metastatic tumors
169 did not respond to any form of treatment, thereby being classified as progressive; 1 was
170 stable, and 1 obtained a partial remission before developing pulmonary metastases The
171 median survival time for dogs undergoing any form of treatment was 80 days (range, 30 to
172 504 days). Necropsy was only performed in a single case; no primary tumor site was found.
173 Three dogs were still alive at data analysis closure, after 882, 101 and 80 days. Among these,
174 one dog had a metastatic amelanotic melanoma in the mandibular lymph node with no
175 evidence of a primary tumor based on physical examination and complete work-up, including
176 TBCT. Seven months after radiation therapy and immunotherapy, the dog developed a
177 melanoma in the ipsilateral footpad and was irradiated again, thereby obtaining a complete
178 response. It was hypothesized that the footpad was the primary site, possibly having remained
179 occult when the metastasis first appeared. The IHC staining pattern was similar between the
180 melanoma in the footpad and the lymph node.
181 The second dog had a metastatic carcinoma involving peripheral, intrathoracic and abdominal
182 lymph nodes, both adrenal glands, liver, pancreas, lungs, and muscles. At the time of writing,
183 the dog was still receiving daily firocoxib; however, the metastatic tumor was shown to be
184 progressive according to follow-up imaging.
185 The third dog had a carcinoma metastatic to the medial iliac lymph node. Due to
186 hypercalcemia, a clinically occult anal sac carcinoma was suspected, and the dog underwent
187 lymphadanectomy and bilateral anal sacculectomy. However, based on histopathology, both
188 anal sacs were morphologically normal, thereby prompting the diagnosis of MCUP metastatic
189 to the medial iliac lymph node. After surgery the hypercalcemia resolved, and at the time of

writing the dog is being treated with toceranib and is considered to be in complete remission based on clinical and imaging features.

DISCUSSIONMCUP is perceived to be a very aggressive disease carrying a poor prognosis. It refers to a biopsy-proven metastatic cancer in the absence of an identifiable primary tumor despite a complete diagnostic work-up.[1] Although the biologic characteristics of MCUP remain to be determined, some hypothesis have been postulated. The primary tumor may remain diminutive, thereby escaping clinical detection, or it may undergo spontaneous immune-mediated regression or dormancy after seeding the metastasis.[12] Alternatively, the angiogenic incompetence of the primary tumor may lead to marked apoptosis and cell turnover, resulting in a cancer that acquires a metastatic phenotype.[13] Other explanations include various theories, including stem cell and embryologic migration hypotheses.[14] Nevertheless, all these theories cannot be clinically tested and remain speculative.

MCUP is not rare in people, representing 3-5% of all malignancies diagnosed in oncology practice.[4] There are no studies in veterinary oncology focusing on MCUP, therefore its prevalence is unknown. In this case series, we described 21 dogs with MCUP for which TBCT and tumor histology were available. Only dogs undergoing TBCT were included, as conventional radiography and ultrasound may miss tumors located in the head and neck region, pelvic cavity or intracardiac structures, thereby being inadequate for diagnosing MCUP. It is unknown whether the use of more sophisticated imaging studies (such as, for instance, MRI or PET, if available) would be beneficial and appropriate in these cases. Indeed, the poor prognosis typically being associated with metastatic cancer raises issues of cost effectiveness for intensive diagnostic work-up, which may be unrevealing and of unclear

benefit in terms of improving prognosis. Therefore, the list of investigations for MCUP is difficult to define, and requires continual updating.

In this case series, in one single dog the primary site was suspected to be found antemortem, being in accordance with most studies conducted in people.[4-6] This dog had a metastatic melanoma in the mandibular lymph node and 7 months later developed a melanoma in the ipsilateral footpad, which was hypothesized to be the primary site. Although the mandibular lymph node is not the draining lymph node for the footpad, nodal metastases may also occur in a random process, with the second and third level lymph nodes being involved with metastatic disease when compared with the nodes closest to the tumor. Beside the identification of the neoplastic anatomical site of origin, great interest has been given to the recognition of specific histological subtypes, as the chemotherapeutic regimens chosen to treat MCUP cases in people depend not only on the site of primary origin, but also on the cancer subtype.[14] While epithelial histotypes are more frequently diagnosed,[1,3,4] malignant melanomas and sarcomas occasionally occur as apparent metastasis to lymph nodes or viscera without a detectable or known primary lesion.[15-21] IHC stains are an important complement to light microscopy in the investigation of MCUP. Several panels of stains are recognized as important in the diagnosis of specific subtypes of cancer by predicting with greater certainty the likely tissue of origin of the malignancy.[3] Several examples include GCDFP-15, mammoglobulin, oestrogen and progesterone receptors,in breast cancer, TTF-1 in pulmonary carcinoma, HEPAR-1 in hepatocellular carcinoma, thyroglobulin/TTF-1 in thyroid carcinoma placental alkaline phosphatase/OCT-4 in germ-cell tumors, CDX-2 in colorectal cancer, and synaptophysin and chromogranin in neuroendocrine tumors (OIEN). Because the morphological and immunohistochemical features are often not characteristic, gene expression-based analysis are an emerging tool to help in identifying the primary site and, possibly, selecting targeted treatment.[22] Gene expression profiling is a new

frontier in veterinary oncology, and usually not routinely offered. In this retrospective series of cases, we limited the pathological evaluation to morphology and, in selected cases, immunohistochemistry. In agreement with the human counterpart, carcinomas were the most frequently diagnosed tumors in this case series, followed by sarcoma, melanoma and mast cell tumor. It must be stressed that a limited panel of IHC tests were used here, mainly due to financial concern and to the lack of site-specific markers with high sensitivity and specificity, thereby precluding the possibility to further characterize some of the tumors. Whether the use of a large panel of antibodies is associated with clinical gain and change in management is not known and cannot be recommended at the moment.

In human oncology, it appears that patients with MCUP have a limited life expectancy with a median survival approximately of 6-12 months, and with fewer than 25% of patients surviving beyond 1 year.[4] The same holds true for dogs, as a median survival time of 30 days was recorded here. This data is not unexpected, as proven metastatic cancer is typically associated with a poor outcome, regardless of the recognition of the tumor's primary site.

In human patients, several clinical and biologic variables have been demonstrated to have significant impact on survival, including performance status, weight loss, histological subtype, presence of liver metastases, more than two metastatic sites, elevated levels of serum alkaline phosphatase and lactate dehydrogenase, thereby allowing the inclusion of patients into groups requiring specific guidelines that translate into prolonged survival.[23-25] Favourable subsets are usually treated with locoregional treatment or systemic platinum-based chemotherapy, achieving responses and survival times that are similar to those of patients with relevant known primary tumours.[14,26] Conversely, patients in unfavourable subsets are treated with empirical chemotherapy based on various combination regimens, but responses and survival are generally poor.[14, 26] Due to the small size of our population and the non uniformity of treatment, prognostic factors were not identified in this work. More information

needs to accumulate to verify whether these data may provide useful diagnostic and therapeutic information for dogs with MCUP as well.

The purpose of this study was to describe a collection of eclectic, previously unreported cases; however, the retrospective nature of this study and the small population size represent main limitations. Many questions still need to be answered: not only MCUP is a rare disease entity, but it is also neglected, more over because of the lack of information and understanding about the disease. The uncertainty which surrounds almost all aspects of care for dogs with MCUP is most clearly seen when decisions need to be made about investigations and treatment, as shown in this series of cases. Additionally, the consistently poor prognosis is a further disadvantage when discussing options with the owners or when trying to support research. Collaborative studies are warranted to improve the knowledge and, possibly, the care of animals with MCUP.

References

1. Pavlidis N, Fizazi K. Carcinoma of unknown primary (CUP). *Critical Reviews in Oncology/ Hematology* 2009; **69**: 271–278.

2. Muir C. Cancer of unknown primary site. *Cancer* 1995; **75**: S353-S356.

3. Pavlidis N, Briasoulis E, Hainsworth J, Greco FA: Diagnostic and therapeutic management of cancer of an unknown primary. *European Journal of Cancer* 2003; **39**: 1990-2005.

4. Pavlidis N. Cancer of unknown primary: biological and clinical characteristics. *Annals of Oncology* 2003; **14**: iii11-8.

5. Le Chevalier T, Cvitkovic E, Caille P, Harvey J, Contesso G, Spielmann M, Rouesse J. Early metastatic cancer of unknown primary origin at presentation. A clinical study of 302 consecutive autopsied patients. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 1988, **148**: 2035-2039.

289 6. van de Wouw AJ, Jansen RL, Speel EJ, Hillen HF. The unknown biology of the unknown
290 primary tumor: a literature review. *Annals of Oncology* 2003; **14**: 191-196.
291 7. Briasoulis E, Kalofonos H, Bafaloukos D, Samantas E, Fountzilas G, Xiros N, Skarlos D,
292 Christodoulou C, Kosmidis P, Pavlidis N. Carboplatin plus paclitaxel in unknown primary
293 carcinoma: a phase II Hellenic Cooperative Oncology Group Study. *Journal of Clinical*
294 *Oncology* 2000; **18**:3101-3117.
295 8. Greco FA, Gray J, Burris HA III, Erland JB, Morrissey LH, Hainsworth JD. Taxane-based
296 chemotherapy for patients with carcinoma of unknown primary site. *Cancer Journal* 2001; **7**:
297 203-212.
298 9. Henry CJ. Biomarkers in veterinary cancer screening: Applications, limitations and
299 expectations. *Vet Journal* 2010; **185**: 10-14.
300 10. Bettini G, Marconato L, Morini M, Ferrari F. Thyroid transcription factor-1
301 immunohistochemistry: diagnostic tool and malignancy marker in canine malignant lung
302 tumours. *Veterinary and Comparative Oncology* 2009; **7**: 28-37.
303 11. Ramos-Vara JA, Miller MA, Boucher M, Roudabush A, Johnson GC.
304 Immunohistochemical detection of uroplakin III, cytokeratin 7, and cytokeratin 20 in canine
305 urothelial tumors. *Veterinary Pathology* 2003; **40**: 55-62.
306 12. FEDE
307 12. Karlsson M, Lindberg K, Karlen P, Ost A, Thörn M, Winqvist O, Eberhardson M.
308 Evidence for immunosurveillance in intestinal premalignant lesions. *Scandinavian Journal of*
309 *Immunology* 2010; **71**: 362-368.
310 13. Naresh KN. Do metastatic tumours from an unknown primary reflect angiogenic
311 incompetence of the tumour at the primary site?--a hypothesis. *Medical Hypotheses* 2002; **59**:
312 357-360.
313 14. Greco FA, Hainsworth JD. Cancer of unknown primary site. In DeVita VT Jr, Hellman S,

Rosenberg S (eds), Cancer: Principles and Practice of Oncology, 8th edition. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott 2008; 2363–2387.

14. Pavlidis N, Kosmidis P, Skarlos D, Briassoulis E, Beer M, Theoharis D, Bafaloukos D, Maraveyas A, Fountzilas G. Subsets of tumors responsive to cisplatin or carboplatin combination in patients with carcinoma of unknown primary site. *Annals of Oncology* 1992; **3**: 631-634.

15. Katz KA, Jonasch E, Hodi FS. Melanoma of unknown primary: Experience at Massachusetts General Hospital and Dana-Farber Cancer Institute. *Melanoma Research* 2005; **15**: 77-82.

16. Panagopoulos E, Murray D. Metastatic malignant melanoma of unknown primary origin: a study of 30 cases. *Journal of Surgical Oncology* 1983; **23**: 8-10.

17. Rutkowski P, Nowecki ZI, Dziewirski W, Zdzienicki M, Pieñkowski A, Salamacha M, Michej W, Trepka S, Bylina E, Ruka W. Melanoma without a detectable primary site with metastases to lymph nodes. *Dermatologic Surgery* 2010; **36**: 868-876.

18. Oien KA. Pathologic evaluation of unknown primary cancer. *Seminas in Oncology* 2009; **36**: 8-37.

19. Brantsch KD, Moehrle M. Acanthosis nigricans in a patient with sarcoma of unknown origin. *Journal of the American academy of Dermatology* 2010; **62:** 527-528.

20. Rong R, Doxtader EE, Tull J, de la Roza G, Zhang S. Metastatic poorly differentiated monophasic synovial sarcoma to lung with unknown primary: a molecular genetic analysis. *International Journal of Clinical and Experimental Pathol*ogy 2009; **3**: 217-221.

21. Etcubanas E, Peiper S, Stass S, Green A. Rhabdomyosarcoma, presenting as disseminated malignancy from an unknown primary site: a retrospective study of ten pediatric cases. *Medical and Pediatric Oncology* 1989; **17**: 39-44.22. Motzer RJ, Rodriguez E, Reuter VE, Bosl GJ, Mazumdar M, Chaganti RS. Molecular and cytogenetic studies in the diagnosis of

patients with poorly differentiated carcinomas of unknown primary site. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 1995;**13**: 274-282.

23. Kambhu SA, Kelsen DP, Fiore J. Niedzwiecki D, Chapman D, Vinciguerra V, Rosenbluth R. Metastatic adenocarcinomas of unknown primary site: prognostic variables and treatment results. *American Journal of Clinical Oncology* 1990; **13**: 55-60.

24. Abbruzzese JL, Abbruzzese MC, Hess KR, Raber MN, Lenzi R, Frost P. Unknown primary carcinoma: natural history and prognostic factors in 657 patients. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 1994; **12**: 1272-1280.

25. Van der Gaast A, Verweij J, Planting AST, Hop WC, Stoter G. Simple prognostic model to predict survival in patients with undifferentiated carcinoma of unknown primary site. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 1995; **13**: 1720-1725.

26. Massard C, Loriot Y, Fizazi K. Carcinomas of an unknown primary origin--diagnosis and treatment. *Nature Reviews. Clinical Oncology* 2011; **8**: 701-710.

Oien KA. Pathologic evaluation of unknown primary cancer. Semin Oncol 2009; 36: 8–37.