



Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Version

This is the Accepted Manuscript version of the following article. This version is defined in the NISO recommended practice RP-8-2008

<http://www.niso.org/publications/rp/>

Suggested Reference

Elston, M. S., Meyer-Rochow, G. Y., Conaglen, H. M., Clarkson, A., Clifton-Bligh, R. J., Conaglen, J. V., & Gill, A. J. (2015). Increased SSTR2A and SSTR3 expression in succinate dehydrogenase-deficient pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas. *Human Pathology*, 46(3), 390-396.

doi: [10.1016/j.humpath.2014.11.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.humpath.2014.11.012)

Copyright

Items in ResearchSpace are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated. Previously published items are made available in accordance with the copyright policy of the publisher.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives](#) License.

For more information, see [General copyright](#), [Publisher copyright](#), [SHERPA/RoMEO](#).

Increased SSTR2A and SSTR3 expression in SDH deficient pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas

Marianne S Elston^{1,2} MB ChB, PhD, Goswin Y Meyer-Rochow^{2,3} MB ChB, PhD, Helen M Conaglen² PhD, Adele Clarkson⁵ BSc, Roderick J Clifton-Bligh⁴ MB BS, PhD, John V Conaglen^{1,2} MB ChB, MD, Anthony J Gill^{5,6} MD FRCPA

¹Department of Endocrinology, Waikato Hospital, Hamilton 3240, New Zealand; ²Waikato Clinical Campus, University of Auckland, New Zealand; ³Department of Surgery, Waikato Hospital, Hamilton, New Zealand; ⁴Hormones and Cancer Group, Kolling Institute of Medical Research, Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney 2065, Australia; ⁵Department of Anatomical Pathology, Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney 2065, Australia; ⁶Cancer Diagnosis and Pathology Research Group, Kolling Institute of Medical Research, University of Sydney, 2006 and Sydney Vital Translational Research Centre, Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney 2065, Australia

Corresponding author and person to whom reprint requests should be addressed:

Dr Marianne Elston

Department of Endocrinology, Waikato Hospital, Private Bag 3200, Hamilton 3240, New Zealand

Email: Marianne.Elston@waikatodhb.health.nz Phone: +647 839 8899 Fax: +647 839 8733

Key words: pheochromocytoma; paragangliomas; receptors, somatostatin; succinate dehydrogenase; octreotide

Running head: Somatostatin receptors in phaeochromocytomas

Disclosure/Conflict of interest: The authors acknowledge Novartis Pharmaceuticals Ltd for donating monoclonal antibodies against SSTR1, SSTR3, SSTR4. The authors declare no

conflict of interest that could be perceived as prejudicing the impartiality of the research reported.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by a Waikato Medical Research Foundation project grant (WMRF grant number 188, 2011) to MSE and by the Cancer Institute NSW through the translational cancer research centre program. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Ltd for donating the monoclonal antibodies against SSTR1, SSTR3, SSTR 4.

Abstract

Many neuroendocrine tumors, including pheochromocytomas (PCs) and paragangliomas (PGLs), express one or more somatostatin receptors (SSTR) 1-5. A number of studies have reported SSTR expression in PCs and PGLs. However, receptor expression patterns have been conflicting and until recently specific monoclonal antibodies were not available against SSTR1-5.

The aim of this study was to compare SSTR1-5 expression in succinate dehydrogenase (SDH) deficient PCs and PGLs (defined as having absent SDHB immunostaining) to those tumors with normal SDHB staining.

Immunohistochemistry for SDHB and SSTRs 1-5 was performed using specific monoclonal antibodies on archived formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue from patients who had undergone surgery for pheochromocytoma or paragangliomas.

182 PC/PGLs were included (129 adrenal, 44 extra-adrenal, 9 metastases); 32 tumors were SDH-deficient whereas 150 tumors had positive SDHB staining. SDH-deficient tumors were more likely to demonstrate moderate or strong staining for SSTR2A and SSTR3 when compared to SDH-sufficient tumors (91% vs 49%, $p < 0.0001$ and 50% vs 21%, $p = 0.0008$, respectively). Immunostaining for the other SSTRs was not different between SDH-deficient and tumors with preserved SDHB staining.

SSTR2A and SSTR3 are more likely to be expressed in SDH-deficient PC/PGLs as compared with tumors demonstrating normal SDHB staining pattern. These findings suggest that the

role of somatostatin analogue therapy (unlabeled or radiolabeled) should be re-examined in the context of the underlying SDHB immunohistochemistry pattern.

Key words: pheochromocytoma; paraganglioma; receptor, somatostatin; succinate dehydrogenase; octreotide

1. Introduction

Pheochromocytomas (PCs) and paragangliomas (PGLs) are rare catecholamine-producing tumors arising from chromaffin cells in the adrenal glands or extraadrenal neural crest tissue. These catecholamine-secreting tumors are frequently hereditary, resulting from germline mutations in various tumor predisposition genes. Of these genes, *succinate dehydrogenase subunit B (SDHB)* is of particular interest due to increased malignant potential of associated PC/PGLs (metastatic rate of 30% vs 10% of all PC/PGLs) [1]. Determining whether PC/PGLs are benign or malignant in the absence of metastatic disease is limited by lack of reliable criteria to predict malignant behaviour. Currently the only effective treatment for PC/PGLs is surgery. Patients with inoperable malignant PC/PGLs, may die of metastatic disease or from complications due to excess catecholamine production such as sudden death or heart failure. Nonsurgical treatment options for malignant disease are limited and there is a lack of survival data available from randomised controlled trials using chemotherapy and radiolabelled therapies [2-4], in part resulting from the rarity of these tumors. Improved understanding of the biology of SDHB-associated and/or malignant PC/PGLs would assist identifying new non-surgical therapies.

Many neuroendocrine tumors, including PC/PGLs, express one or more somatostatin receptor subtypes (SSTR1-5). Somatostatin is a neuropeptide with affinity for all five receptor

subtypes and can inhibit both hormone secretion and cell proliferation. Analogues of somatostatin (octreotide, octreotide LAR and lanreotide) demonstrate high affinity for SSTR2 and to a lesser extent SSTR5. Whilst they are very successfully used in the treatment of some tumors types, such as SSTR2-expressing growth hormone-secreting pituitary tumors, and have been demonstrated to not only control symptoms but also increase progression-free survival in patients with metastatic small intestinal neuroendocrine tumors [5, 6], treatment of patients with chromaffin cell tumors have been variable and overall disappointing [7-13].

A number of studies have assessed SSTR subtypes in pheochromocytoma/PGL [14-26]. Results have been conflicting as to the frequency of receptor subtype expression. Whilst SSTR3 has been detected in the majority of tumors studied, SSTR2A expression has varied from <15% [15, 16] to up to 100% of tumors [18, 24]. Similarly, results for SSTR1 have varied and, when assessed, SSTR5 has been shown to be positive in <50% of tumors in the majority of studies [14-16, 18]. Differences in SSTR subtypes between tumors from patients with familial tumor syndromes and those with sporadic tumors have only been assessed in one study with only small numbers of hereditary tumors, and differences in SSTR expression were not identified [18]. A further study identified SSTR2a staining in two patients with a germline *SDHD* mutation but there was no control group [25]. Studies assessing SSTR expression have used a variety of methods including RT-PCR and immunohistochemistry (IHC). In addition to varying methods used, until recently interpretation has further been hampered by the lack of specific monoclonal antibodies against the five SSTR subtypes. Fischer *et al.* briefly reported the use of the monoclonal antibody UMB-1 against SSTR2A in a number of normal and neoplastic tissues including PCs, in which the majority of tumors demonstrated positive staining [27]. Use of monoclonal antibodies against the other SSTRs has not been reported in PC/PGLs. Recently, a novel somatostatin analogue has been developed, pasireotide, which has activity at a wider range of SSTRs than octreotide (all SSTRs with the exception of SSTR4) [28]. The role of pasireotide in patients with metastatic and/or inoperable PC/PGL is not known but cell culture studies have suggested that it is more

promising than octreotide [21]. Based on the results of SSTR status, evidence of expression of SSTRs other than SSTR4 would support a targeted trial of this agent (unlabelled and/or labelled to radionuclides) in patients with metastatic/inoperable PC/PGL.

The aims of this study were: (1) to assess the somatostatin receptor status of PC/PGLs using specific monoclonal antibodies against somatostatin receptor subtypes 1-5; (2) to determine whether somatostatin receptor subtype expression varies in SDH-deficient tumors when compared to tumors showing a normal pattern of SDHB staining.

2. Materials and Methods

Patients who had undergone previous surgery for PC or PGL were identified from the Waikato Hospital endocrine unit, Hamilton, New Zealand and the Royal North Shore Hospital anatomical pathology department, Sydney, Australia. Ethical approval was obtained from the Northern Y Regional Ethics Committee (NTY/11/05/049) and in accordance with the Human Tissue Act for the New Zealand and Australian samples, respectively. Results of germline genetic testing for PC/PGL predisposition genes (*SDHA*, *SDHB*, *SDHC*, *SDHD*, *SDHAF2*, *RET*, *VHL*, *TMEM127*) were available on selected patients. Diagnosis of PC/PGL was confirmed by clinical, biochemical and histological assessment.

Immunohistochemistry for SDHB, SDHA and SSTRs was performed on tissue microarrays containing duplicate 1mm cores of tissue from archived formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissue blocks using rabbit monoclonal antibodies (dilutions and clones provided in Table 1). Slides were stained using the LeicaBondIII autostainer (Leica Microsystems, Mount Waverley, Victoria, Australia). Heat-induced epitope retrieval was carried out at 97°C for 30 minutes in the manufacturer's acidic retrieval solution ER1 (VBS part no.AR9961). SSTR immunostaining was scored using a scheme similar to that reported by Körner *et al.* [29]. Briefly, cases were scored as 0 (negative) if no cells demonstrated positive staining, and then

semiquantitatively if staining was present from 1+ (weak staining, in less than 10% of cells) to 2+ (moderate staining, for example positive at low power but not circumferential at high power) to 3+ (moderate diffuse and strong staining including circumferential staining) to 4+ (intense diffuse and strong staining including circumferential staining). Islets of Langerhans from non-neoplastic pancreas were used as external positive controls, with other tissue from the same sections including pancreatic acinar cells acting as external negative controls. Immunostaining was evaluated by a single observer (AJG) who was blinded as to the results of genetic testing and SDHB IHC at the time of scoring.

Statistical analysis was performed using non-parametric statistics due to the non-normality of the data; Kolmogorov-Smirnov two-sample tests, and difference of proportion testing where appropriate, were carried out using Statistica version 11 (Statsoft Inc, Tulsa, OK, USA).

3. Results

A total of 182 PC/PGL specimens were identified from 174 patients. Of the 182 tumors, 129 were adrenal, 44 extra-adrenal (of which 18 were head and neck) and 9 metastases (all from PC).

3.1 SDH staining

Thirty-two tumors had absent SDHB staining and two also had loss of SDHA staining. All patients with tumours which demonstrated negative staining for SDHB (i.e. 'SDH-deficient') who underwent germline mutation testing were shown to have a mutation in *SDHA*, *SDHB*, *SDHC* or *SDHD*. Of the two patients with negative staining for SDHA both were found to have a germline *SDHA* mutation.

Of SDH-deficient tumors, there were 32 specimens from 30 patients (6 adrenal lesions, 22 paragangliomas, of which 9 were arising from the head or neck, and 4 metastases). The median age of patients with an SDH-deficient tumor was 45 years (19-79 years) as compared to 52 years (range 19-84 years) in the SDH sufficient patients, $p < 0.05$.

3.2 SSTR receptor status

SSTR immunohistochemistry results are shown in Table 2 and illustrated in Figure 1.

3.2.1 SSTR1

179 tumors had SSTR1 staining performed. Overall 159/179 (89%) of all PCs and PGLs demonstrated strong (3+) staining for SSTR1. All SDH-deficient tumors ($n=32$) demonstrated strong (3+) staining, as did 127/147 (86%) of SDH-sufficient tumors. No significant difference in SSTR1 staining was present between SDH-deficient tumors and those with normal SDH staining ($p > 0.10$). No differences in SSTR1 status were identified within different lesions from the same patient.

3.2.2 SSTR2a

179 tumors had SSTR2a staining performed. Overall 82/179 (46%) of all PCs and PGLs demonstrated strong (3 or 4+) staining for SSTR2a. This staining was accentuated along the membrane, but was also cytoplasmic (Figure 1).

SSTR2a staining was moderate (2+) or strong (3 or 4+) in 29/32 (91%) of SDH-deficient tumors compared to 72/147 (49%) of SDH sufficient tumors ($p=0.0000$). This differentiation was independent of the size of the two tumor groups ($\chi^2=19.58$, $p<.001$). No staining was observed in 54/147 (37%) of SDH sufficient patients as compared to 3/32 SDH-deficient tumors (9%).

Comparing adrenal vs extra-adrenal lesions, PCs demonstrated moderate (2+) or strong (3 or 4+) staining in 61/128 (49%) tumors (5/6 SDH-deficient PCs and 56/122 SDH-sufficient PCs); moderate or strong staining was present in 36/47 (77%) PGLs (20/22 SDH-deficient PGLs and 14/21 SDH-sufficient PGLs); and all 9 HNPGL SDH-sufficient tumors showed very strong staining (4+) as did 5/9 SDH-deficient tumors. Of the six patients in whom multiple tumors were studied SSTR2a status varied in only one SDH-sufficient patient (one of two metastases assessed had weak (1+) staining whereas both the other metastasis and primary lesion were negative).

All four metastases from SDH-deficient tumors demonstrated strong SSTR2a staining compared to none of the SDH sufficient metastases.

3.2.3 SSTR3

SSTR3 immunostaining was performed in 180 tumors. Overall 46/180 (26%) had moderate (2+) or strong (3 or 4+) staining. Moderate or strong staining was present in 16/32 (50%) tumors from SDH-deficient tumors compared to 30/148 (20%) of SDH sufficient tumors ($p=0.004$). This differentiation was also independent of the group sizes ($\chi^2=13.84$, $p<.01$). PCs demonstrated moderate (2+) or strong (3 or 4+) SSTR3 staining in 26/127 (20%) tumors (1/6 SDH-deficient PCs and 25/121 SDH-sufficient PCs). Moderate or strong staining was present in 17/44 (39%) of PGLs (12/22 SDH mutated PGLs and 5/22 non-SDH mutated

PGLs). There was a significantly different proportion of moderate and strongly stained PCs compared with PGLs, $p=0.012$.

All five metastases demonstrating SDH-sufficiency had absent SSTR3 staining as compared to 1/4 with SDH-deficiency. Six patients had more than one tumor included. Of these, one SDH-deficient patient had absent SSTR3 staining in one pheochromocytoma metastasis, whereas the other metastasis had strong (3+) staining. Two SDH-sufficient patients also demonstrated variation between PC tumors (0 vs 3+ and 0 vs 1+, respectively).

3.2.4 SSTR4

SSTR4 IHC was performed in 180 tumors. Overall immunostaining was positive in 3 PGLs (2 SDH deficient). All PCs and metastases demonstrated negative staining. No significant differences were seen between SDH-deficient and SDH-sufficient tumors ($p>0.10$). SSTR4 status was identical when different lesions from the same patient were compared (including metastases).

3.2.5 SSTR5

SSTR5 IHC was performed in 174 tumors. Immunostaining was positive in 2/174 tumors (both SDH sufficient – 1 PC and 1 PGL). No significant staining differences were seen between SDH-deficient and SDH-sufficient tumors ($p>0.10$). No differences in SSTR5 status were identified within different lesions from the same patient.

4. Discussion

SSTR immunostaining of PC or PGLs varies according to receptor subtype. The majority of tumors demonstrated positive staining for SSTR1 whereas most tumors did not stain for SSTR4 or SSTR5 irrespective of whether tumors were SDH-deficient or not. SSTR2a and SSTR3 expression patterns were more variable.

Both SSTR2A and SSTR3 staining was significantly different between SDH-deficient and those with normal SDH staining patterns. We have found SDHB immunohistochemistry to be a robust and reliable marker of *SDH* mutation [30, 31], and all patients in our SDH-deficient cohort who underwent full genetic testing for the *SDH* genes as part of their clinical care have been shown to harbor a mutation in one of the *SDH* genes [30]. SDH-deficient tumors were more likely to demonstrate moderate or strong SSTR2a and SSTR3 staining when compared to tumors with preserved SDH staining. Of note, SSTR staining was not exclusively membranous in our cohort as most cases demonstrated some cytoplasmic staining but with membranous accentuation (Figure 1) – a similar pattern to that reported by Körner et al. in meningiomas but not gastrointestinal neuroendocrine tumours [29].

Of the small numbers of patients with more than one tumor studied there was some variation in SSTR3 staining whereas the other SSTRs showed good correlation. Although data were limited, there was a suggestion that within the group of SDH-sufficient tumors strong SSTR2a staining was more likely in head and neck PGLs (HNPGs) than thoraco-abdominal PGLs. Conversely, in SDH-deficient PGLs strong SSTR2a staining was more likely in abdominal PGLs. This data would suggest that the role of somatostatin analogues, both labeled and unlabeled should be reviewed in context of the underlying SDH status.

The outcomes of treating patients with PCs and PGLs with somatostatin analogues have been variable and overall disappointing [7-13, 32] despite in vivo data suggesting that these agents may be effective [33]. However, assessment of response to treatment based on specific SSTR subtype was not included in previous trials, as specific monoclonal antibodies against the SSTRs were not available at the time. Similarly, assessment of germline *SDH* mutation status

was not reported in these trials of somatostatin analogues as the publications mostly predated widespread availability of genetic testing. A single case reported by Tonyukuk *et al.* with multiple somatostatin receptor scintigraphy (SRS)-positive HNPGLs, secretory disease and a positive family history was most likely *SDH*-associated [12]. In this case a partial tumor response, an improvement in performance status and decreased frequency of “attacks” in response to octreotide therapy (short-acting, followed by depot preparation) was noted over 26 months of treatment [12]. A recent paper reported a dramatic clinical and biochemical response of a SRS positive noradrenaline- and dopamine- secreting HNPGL to high dose long-acting octreotide but neither the *SDH* mutation nor SSTR status was reported [34]. In papers in which SRS was performed there appeared to be a trend to improved biochemical and/or clinical status (blood pressure, performance status) in some SRS-positive patients in response to either short-acting or depot preparations of octreotide [8, 11, 12] but the presence of mixed disease (both SRS positive and negative tumors) may have affected response in some series [7]. There have been no reports specifically assessing the use of unlabeled SST analogues in *SDH* mutation positive patients with positive SSTR2a expression. Safe, effective treatment options for patients with metastatic PC/PGL are currently very limited. The findings from the current study suggest that if a randomized controlled trial of SSTR agonists of patients with metastatic PC/PGL is performed this should include assessment of the underlying SSTR status and *SDH* status.

Pasireotide is a new somatostatin analogue, which has activity at all SSTRs apart from SSTR4 [28]. *In vitro* data suggest that it may be more promising than octreotide [21] but to date there is no published literature assessing biochemical or tumor response to this agent. The current study demonstrates that *SDH*-associated tumors are more likely to show SSTR3 immunostaining in addition to SSTR2a. If pasireotide is to be trialed in PC/PGL patients it would seem prudent to select *SDH*-associated tumors with positive SSTR2a and SSTR3 staining as this group would seem the most likely to demonstrate benefit. Tumors with

preserved SDH staining are less likely to express SSTR2A or SSTR3 therefore pasireotide is less likely to be effective in this patient group.

Radiolabelled somatostatin analogues have been used in a number of small series of patients with metastatic or inoperable PC/PGLs [3, 35-40]. Similar to the studies using unlabeled somatostatin analogues most patients are not classified according to SSTR status and do not have their *SDH* status described. In a small case series of four *SDHD* germline mutation positive patients with non-secretory PGLs assessing the response to peptide receptor radionuclide therapy (PRRT) using (¹⁷⁷Lu) DOTATATE there were two responses according to RECIST criteria and the other two individuals had reduced uptake on somatostatin receptor scintigraphy (SRS) [35]. At best some patients with progressive disease do appear to have partial response to PRRT [3, 35-38], however description of secretory status of tumors is surprisingly lacking in most of these series.

SRS, using either traditional ¹¹¹In-octreotide or other octreotide derivatives e.g. DOTATATE, has been described to be more sensitive than MIBG scanning in patients with an underlying *SDH* mutation with a sensitivity of 69.5% vs 42.7% [41]. The higher rate of SSTR2a positivity demonstrated in this study support the use of SRS, to complement anatomical imaging, in the diagnostic algorithm of patients with *SDH* positive tumors.

There are a number of limitations of this study. This is a retrospective study and fresh frozen tissue was not available to confirm the findings using an alternative method such as Western blotting or in vitro autoradiography. No patients had received somatostatin analogues (radiolabeled or unlabeled) to see if the response correlated with the SSTR staining. Only a small number of patients had more than one lesion available so we are limited in being able to assess the heterogeneity of SSTRs between tumors within the same patient. However, this study is the first to suggest that SSTR subtypes appears to vary according to SDH status. The mechanism for the difference in SSTR status is not known. It would seem prudent in those

patients who are receiving PRRT to check SSTR status of all lesions in which tissue is available and to see if this correlates with treatment response (clinical, biochemical and radiological).

5. Conclusion

SDH deficient tumors are more likely to demonstrate positive SSTR2a and SSTR3 immunostaining than tumors with a normal SDH staining pattern. These findings suggest that the role of somatostatin analogue therapy (unlabeled or radiolabeled) should be re-examined in the context of the underlying SDH status. Somatostatin analogue therapy may have a particular therapeutic role in patients with an underlying *SDH* germline mutation and for HNPGLs in patients without an underlying *SDH* mutation.

Acknowledgements This work was supported by a Waikato Medical Research Foundation project grant (WMRF grant number 188, 2011) to MSE and the Cancer Institute NSW through the Sydney Vital Translational research centre. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Ltd for donating the monoclonal antibodies against SSTR1, SSTR3, SSTR 4.

References

1. Welander J, Soderkvist P, Gimm O. Genetics and clinical characteristics of hereditary pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas. *Endocr Relat Cancer*. 2011;18:R253-76.
2. Loh KC, Fitzgerald PA, Matthay KK, Yeo PP, Price DC. The treatment of malignant pheochromocytoma with iodine-131 metaiodobenzylguanidine (131I-MIBG): a comprehensive review of 116 reported patients. *J Endocrinol Invest*. 1997;20:648-58.
3. Forrer F, Riedweg I, Maecke HR, Mueller-Brand J. Radiolabeled DOTATOC in patients with advanced paraganglioma and pheochromocytoma. *Q J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2008;52:334-40.
4. Ayala-Ramirez M, Feng L, Habra MA, et al. Clinical benefits of systemic chemotherapy for patients with metastatic pheochromocytomas or sympathetic extra-adrenal paragangliomas: insights from the largest single-institutional experience. *Cancer*. 2012;118:2804-12.
5. Caplin ME, Pavel M, Ruszniewski P. Lanreotide in metastatic enteropancreatic neuroendocrine tumors. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371:1556-7.
6. Rinke A, Muller HH, Schade-Brittinger C, et al. Placebo-controlled, double-blind, prospective, randomized study on the effect of octreotide LAR in the control of tumor growth in patients with metastatic neuroendocrine midgut tumors: a report from the PROMID Study Group. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009;27:4656-63.
7. Kopf D, Bockisch A, Steinert H, et al. Octreotide scintigraphy and catecholamine response to an octreotide challenge in malignant phaeochromocytoma. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 1997;46:39-44.
8. Lamarre-Cliche M, Gimenez-Roqueplo AP, Billaud E, Baudin E, Luton JP, Plouin PF. Effects of slow-release octreotide on urinary metanephrine excretion and plasma chromogranin A and catecholamine levels in patients with malignant or recurrent phaeochromocytoma. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 2002;57:629-34.
9. Invitti C, De Martin I, Bolla GB, et al. Effect of octreotide on catecholamine plasma levels in patients with chromaffin cell tumors. *Horm Res*. 1993;40:156-60.

10. Plouin PF, Bertherat J, Chatellier G, et al. Short-term effects of octreotide on blood pressure and plasma catecholamines and neuropeptide Y levels in patients with pheochromocytoma: a placebo-controlled trial. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 1995;42:289-94.
11. Tenenbaum F, Schlumberger M, Lumbroso J, Parmentier C. Beneficial effects of octreotide in a patient with a metastatic paraganglioma. *Eur J Cancer*. 1996;32A:737.
12. Tonyukuk V, Emral R, Temizkan S, Sertcelik A, Erden I, Corapcioglu D. Case report: patient with multiple paragangliomas treated with long acting somatostatin analogue. *Endocr J*. 2003;50:507-13.
13. Koriyama N, Kakei M, Yaekura K, et al. Control of catecholamine release and blood pressure with octreotide in a patient with pheochromocytoma: a case report with in vitro studies. *Horm Res*. 2000;53:46-50.
14. Mundschenk J, Unger N, Schulz S, Holtt V, Steinke R, Lehnert H. Somatostatin receptor subtypes in human pheochromocytoma: subcellular expression pattern and functional relevance for octreotide scintigraphy. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2003;88:5150-7.
15. Unger N, Serdiuk I, Sheu SY, et al. Immunohistochemical localization of somatostatin receptor subtypes in benign and malignant adrenal tumours. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 2008;68:850-7.
16. Unger N, Serdiuk I, Sheu SY, et al. Immunohistochemical determination of somatostatin receptor subtypes 1, 2A, 3, 4, and 5 in various adrenal tumors. *Endocr Res*. 2004;30:931-4.
17. Ruggeri RM, Ferrau F, Campenni A, et al. Immunohistochemical localization and functional characterization of somatostatin receptor subtypes in a corticotropin releasing hormone- secreting adrenal pheochromocytoma: review of the literature and report of a case. *Eur J Histochem*. 2009;53:1-6.
18. Saveanu A, Muresan M, De Micco C, et al. Expression of somatostatin receptors, dopamine D(2) receptors, noradrenaline transporters, and vesicular monoamine transporters in 52 pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas. *Endocr Relat Cancer*. 2011;18:287-300.

19. Reubi JC, Waser B, Khosla S, et al. In vitro and in vivo detection of somatostatin receptors in pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 1992;74:1082-9.
20. Epelbaum J, Bertherat J, Prevost G, et al. Molecular and pharmacological characterization of somatostatin receptor subtypes in adrenal, extraadrenal, and malignant pheochromocytomas. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 1995;80:1837-44.
21. Pasquali D, Rossi V, Conzo G, et al. Effects of somatostatin analog SOM230 on cell proliferation, apoptosis, and catecholamine levels in cultured pheochromocytoma cells. *J Mol Endocrinol.* 2008;40:263-71.
22. Hofland LJ, Liu Q, Van Koetsveld PM, et al. Immunohistochemical detection of somatostatin receptor subtypes sst1 and sst2A in human somatostatin receptor positive tumors. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 1999;84:775-80.
23. Ueberberg B, Tourne H, Redmann A, et al. Differential expression of the human somatostatin receptor subtypes sst1 to sst5 in various adrenal tumors and normal adrenal gland. *Horm Metab Res.* 2005;37:722-8.
24. Kimura N, Pilichowska M, Date F, Kimura I, Schindler M. Immunohistochemical expression of somatostatin type 2A receptor in neuroendocrine tumors. *Clin Cancer Res.* 1999;5:3483-7.
25. Kimura N, Tateno H, Saijo S, Horii A. Familial cervical paragangliomas with lymph node metastasis expressing somatostatin receptor type 2A. *Endocr Pathol.* 2010;21:139-43.
26. Kolby L, Bernhardt P, Johanson V, et al. Can quantification of VMAT and SSTR expression be helpful for planning radionuclide therapy of malignant pheochromocytomas? *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2006;1073:491-7.
27. Fischer T, Doll C, Jacobs S, Kolodziej A, Stumm R, Schulz S. Reassessment of sst2 somatostatin receptor expression in human normal and neoplastic tissues using the novel rabbit monoclonal antibody UMB-1. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2008;93:4519-24.

28. Bruns C, Lewis I, Briner U, Meno-Tetang G, Weckbecker G. SOM230: a novel somatostatin peptidomimetic with broad somatotropin release inhibiting factor (SRIF) receptor binding and a unique antisecretory profile. *Eur J Endocrinol.* 2002;146:707-16.
29. Korner M, Waser B, Schonbrunn A, Perren A, Reubi JC. Somatostatin receptor subtype 2A immunohistochemistry using a new monoclonal antibody selects tumors suitable for in vivo somatostatin receptor targeting. *Am J Surg Pathol.* 2012;36:242-52.
30. Gill AJ, Benn DE, Chou A, et al. Immunohistochemistry for SDHB triages genetic testing of SDHB, SDHC, and SDHD in paraganglioma-pheochromocytoma syndromes. *Hum Pathol.* 2010;41:805-14.
31. Gill AJ. Succinate dehydrogenase (SDH) and mitochondrial driven neoplasia. *Pathol.* 2012;44:285-92.
32. Duet M, Guichard JP, Rizzo N, Boudiaf M, Herman P, Tran Ba Huy P. Are somatostatin analogs therapeutic alternatives in the management of head and neck paragangliomas? *Laryngoscope.* 2005;115:1381-4.
33. Zatelli MC, Piccin D, Bondanelli M, et al. An in vivo OctreoScan-negative adrenal pheochromocytoma expresses somatostatin receptors and responds to somatostatin analogs treatment in vitro. *Horm Metab Res.* 2003;35:349-54.
34. Elshafie O, Al Badaai Y, Alwahaibi K, et al. Catecholamine-secreting carotid body paraganglioma: successful preoperative control of hypertension and clinical symptoms using high-dose long-acting octreotide. *Endocrinol Diabetes Metab Case Rep.* 2014;2014:140051.
35. Zovato S, Kumanova A, Dematte S, et al. Peptide receptor radionuclide therapy (PRRT) with ¹⁷⁷Lu-DOTATATE in individuals with neck or mediastinal paraganglioma (PGL). *Horm Metab Res.* 2012;44:411-4.
36. van Essen M, Krenning EP, Kooij PP, et al. Effects of therapy with [¹⁷⁷Lu-DOTA⁰, Tyr³]octreotate in patients with paraganglioma, meningioma, small cell lung carcinoma, and melanoma. *J Nucl Med.* 2006;47:1599-606.

37. Cecchin D, Schiavi F, Fanti S, et al. Peptide receptor radionuclide therapy in a case of multiple spinal canal and cranial paragangliomas. *J Clin Oncol.* 2011;29:e171-4.
38. Baulieu J, Resche I, Bardies M, et al. [¹³¹I]-TYR3-octreotide: clinical dosimetry and use for internal radiotherapy of metastatic paraganglioma and carcinoid tumors. *Nucl Med Biol.* 2000;27:809-13.
39. Poeppel TD, Yucee A, Boy C, et al. Novel SDHD gene mutation (H102R) in a patient with metastatic cervical paraganglioma effectively treated by peptide receptor radionuclide therapy. *J Clinical Oncol.* 2011;29:e812-5.
40. Menda Y, O'Dorisio MS, Kao S, et al. Phase I trial of ⁹⁰Y-DOTATOC therapy in children and young adults with refractory solid tumors that express somatostatin receptors. *J Nucl Med.* 2010;51:1524-31.
41. Gimenez-Roqueplo AP, Caumont-Prim A, Houzard C, et al. Imaging work-up for screening of paraganglioma and pheochromocytoma in SDHx mutation carriers: a multicenter prospective study from the PGL.EVA Investigators. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2013;98:E162-73.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Serial sections of pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma stained with H&E (A,E), SDHB (B, F), SSTR2A (C, G) and SSTR3 (D, H).

A-D shows an *SDHB* mutated paraganglioma with completely negative staining for SDHB (B) but diffuse strong positive staining for SSTR2A (C) which is predominantly membranous and SSTR3 (D) which is granular and cytoplasmic. In contrast, E-H shows a pheochromocytoma which lacks *SDH* mutation and therefore shows positive staining for SDHB (F) and negative staining for SSTR2A (C) and SSTR3 (D). The presence of positive staining of endothelial cells (arrows) for SDHB (B) and SSTR2A (G) act as a positive internal control in cases which otherwise show negative staining. (Original magnifications 400x).

Table 1. Details of the antibodies used for immunohistochemical studies

Antibody	Clone	Type	Supplier	Dilution
SDHA	2E	Mouse monoclonal	Abcam	1:1000
SDHB	21A11	Mouse Monoclonal	Abcam	1:500
SSTR1	UMB-7	Rabbit monoclonal	Epitomics Inc, Burlingame, CA	1:1000
SSTR2a	UMB-1	Rabbit monoclonal	Epitomics Inc, Burlingame, CA	1:100
SSTR3	UMB-5	Rabbit monoclonal	Epitomics Inc, Burlingame, CA	1:300
SSTR4	ACE29616	Rabbit monoclonal	Novartis, Basel, Switzerland	1:1000
SSTR5	UMB-4	Rabbit monoclonal	Epitomics Inc, Burlingame, CA	1:100

Table 2. SSTR immunohistochemistry results

Receptor	Grade	SDH deficient			SDH sufficient			Total
		A	EA	Met	A	EA	Met	
SSTR1	0	0	0	0	0	1/21	0	1/179 (0.6%)
	1	0	0	0	5/121	0	0	5/179 (3%)
	2	0	0	0	12/121	2/21	0	14/179 (8%)
	3	6/6	22/22	4/4	104/121	18/21	5/5	159/179 (89%)
SSTR2a	0	1/6	2/22	0	48/122	5/21	1/4	57/179 (32%)
	1	0	0	0	18/122	2/21	1/4	21/179 (12%)
	2	1/6	4/22	0	9/122	3/21	2/4	19/179 (11%)
	3	3/6	3/22	2/4	15/122	0	0	23/179 (13%)
	4	1/6	13/22	2/4	32/122	11/21	0	59/179 (33%)
SSTR3	0	3/6	8/22	1/4	79/121	16/22	5/5	112/180 (62%)
	1	2/6	2/22	0	17/121	1/22	0	22/180 (12%)
	2	1/6	7/22	2/4	18/121	1/22	0	29/180 (16%)
	3	0	5/22	1/4	7/121	3/22	0	16/180 (9%)
	4	0	0	0	0	1/22	0	1/180 (0.6%)
SSTR4	0	6/6	20/22	4/4	123/123	20/21	4/4	177/180 (98%)
	1	0	1/22	0	0	1/21	0	2/180 (1%)
	2	0	1/22	0	0	0	0	1/180 (0.6%)
SSTR5	0	6/6	20/20	4/4	118/119	20/21	4/4	172/174 (99%)
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0/174 (0%)
	2	0	0	0	1/119	0	0	1/174 (0.6%)
	3	0	0	0	0	1/21	0	1/174 (0.6%)

SDH = succinate dehydrogenase; EA = extra-adrenal (paraganglioma); A = adrenal; met = metastasis