Differentiation of oncocytoma from chromophobe renal cell carcinoma (RCC): can novel molecular biomarkers help solve an old problem?
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ABSTRACT
Standard treatment of renal neoplasms remains surgical resection, and nephrectomy for localised renal cell carcinoma (RCC) still has the best chance of cure with excellent long-term results. For smaller renal masses, especially stage T1a tumours less than 4 cm, nephron-sparing surgery is often employed. However, small incidentally detected renal masses pose an important diagnostic dilemma as a proportion of them may be benign and could be managed conservatively. Renal oncocytoma is one such lesion that may pose little risk to a patient if managed with routine surveillance rather than surgery. Additionally, lower-risk RCC, such as small chromophobe RCC, may be managed in a similar way, although with more caution than the renal oncocytomas (RO). The ability to differentiate ROs from chromophobe RCCs, and from other RCCs with a greater chance of metastasis, would guide the physician and patient towards the most appropriate management, whether nephron-sparing surgical resection or conservative surveillance. Consistent accurate diagnosis of ROs is likely to remain elusive until modern molecular biomarkers are identified and applied routinely. This review focuses on the differentiation of renal oncocytomas and chromophobe RCCs. It summarises the history, epidemiology and clinical presentation of the renal neoplasms, explains the diagnostic dilemma, and describes the value, or not, of current molecular markers that are in development to assist in diagnosis of the renal neoplasms.

INTRODUCTION
The incidence of renal tumours has been increasing steadily in Europe, USA and Australia over the past three decades.1 The widespread use of cross-sectional imaging has increased the detection of incidental smaller tumours,2 while the 20–30% incidence of advanced tumours has remained relatively constant.3 Despite current imaging techniques and the availability of renal lesion biopsy, most contemporary surgical series continue to report significant rates of benign lesions among resected small renal masses.4 Preoperative biopsy of these small lesions is not widely employed, and one contributing factor is potential diagnostic uncertainty in the differentiation of benign renal oncocytomas (RO) from malignant chromophobe renal cell carcinomas (cRCC)5 and, as an added difficulty, eosinophilic clear-cell RCCs (cRCC). Consequently, there is a group of small renal lesions where increased confidence in characterisation may defer or obviate the need for surgical intervention. ROs and small cRCCs are two such lesions.

ChRCCs, although having a more favourable prognosis than other RCC subtypes, is a malignant tumour with the potential for metastatic spread and death. By comparison, there appears to be only one confirmed case report of metastases from ROs.5 Thus, due to its benign nature, ROs can usually be monitored and treated expectantly. Similarly, small renal masses found to be cRCCs may, in some situations, be suitable for active surveillance rather than immediate resection or ablation. ROs and cRCCs are often considered to be extremes of the same morphological spectrum.7 Proper differentiation largely relies on H&E histohistochemistry of sections, and an experienced histopathologist to discern the characteristic histomorphologic features between the two entities. Immunohistochemistry is used in selected instances. Electron microscopy was commonly performed in the past, but is done only in rare cases now, given the prominent overlap of staining patterns. There is also the coexistence of ROs with cRCCs seen in sporadic cases of hybrid tumours, renal oncocyosis and Birt-Hogg-Dube (BHD) syndrome. Differentiation of ROs and cRCCs, especially as small renal masses, from other more sinister forms of RCCs, like cRCCs, is also important for the appropriate management of these patients.

HISTORY
RO was first described by Zippel in 1942 as a neoplasm entirely composed of large eosinophilic cells called oncocyes.8 Later, in 1976, Klein and Valens6 identified another 13 cases as a distinct clinical pathological entity with a typical benign histological presentation and clinical course. RO was originally thought to derive from renal proximal tubules, but most pathologists now suggest a distal origin,9 most likely arising from intercalated cells of collecting ducts. The first description of cRCCs, as distinct from cRCCs, was made by Theones et al in 1985,10 and a year later, they added the cRCC subtype to the classification of renal tumours.11 The cell characteristic had been described prior to the 1985 publication but only in experimentally induced adenomas in animals. The chromophobe cells had slightly opaque or finely reticular cytoplasm that resisted staining with haematoxylin and eosin. They were able to be distinguished from cRCCs by a strongly positive reaction within their cytoplasm to Hale’s colloidal iron, and a weaker positive reaction with Alcian Blue, a
distinction that has since been found to be unreliable. The authors, however, made a step forward for classification of RCCs by suggesting that the descriptive term ‘light cell’ RCC should be discarded and replaced by either ‘clear cell’ or ‘chro-

mophobe cell’ as appropriate. They pointed out that chromo-

phobe cell tumours were likely to have a different derivation
from ccRCCs and other RCCs, and that they may also have a
different prognosis, a fact that has since been established. Since
the description of chRCCs came a decade later than ROs, there
were many instances in that era where renal tumours, which
were likely to be chRCCs, were described as ROs. This may
have contributed to the confusion surrounding the original rec-

ognition of the benign nature of ROs.

EPIDEMOLOGY

Renal tumours are highly heterogeneous with at least 16 known
subtypes, of which four subtypes predominate.13–14 ccRCCs,
arising from the proximal tubular epithelial cells, is the most
common subtype constituting 70–80% of RCCs, followed by
papillary (10–15%), chRCCs (5%) and collecting duct RCCs
(<1%).15–16 RO accounts for approximately 3–7% of all adult
renal neoplasms. The peak age of incidence for detection of
ROs tends to be in the seventh decade of life. For chRCCs, the
peak incidence occurs in the sixth decade. For cases of RO, men
seem to be affected twice as often as women. For chRCCs, the
disease tends to affect men and women equally.17

ROs and chRCCs can develop as either sporadic or familial
forms, and both can be associated with distinct genetic mutations.
The majority of ROs and chRCCs occur as sporadic cases.18–19
There is also the occasional occurrence of familial renal cancers of oncocyto-

ma with BHD syndrome. Familial oncocyto-
a is due to partial or complete loss of multiple chro-

mosomes. BHD syndrome is an autosomal dominant inherited
syndrome with the BHD gene locus located in the short arm of
chromosome 17.20–21 This syndrome is characterised by fibro-

folliculomas, lung cysts that can lead to spontaneous pneu-

mothoraces, and various subtypes of renal tumours including
hybrid tumours, ROs, chRCCs and ccRCCs.

Sometimes in rare instances, patients can present with renal
oncocyto-
da was first described in 198222: m-

multiple and bilateral oncotypic nodules and a spectrum of
oncocytic changes are found diffusely throughout the renal par-

enchyma. A large series investigating renal oncocyto-
a revealed that hybrid development of ROs and chRCCs was most
common.23

CLINICAL PRESENTATION

Generally, patients with ROs tend to be asymptomatic and
present incidentally following cross-sectional imaging for an
unrelated complaint. Similarly, the majority of patients with
chRCCs present incidentally with asymptomatic renal masses.24
Less commonly, chRCCs may present with local symptoms of
haematuria, flank mass and loin pain, and constitutional symp-
toms of weight loss and loss of appetite.25 chRCCs Can also
present with paraneoplastic syndrome and metastases with pre-
dilection to the liver.23 In the largest published series to date,
chRCCs present with metastases at a rate of 1.3%.24 Generally,
patients with chRCCs tend to present in less advanced stages
(I and II), less frequently with metastases and are usually of
better performance status25 compared with other subtypes of
RCCs. It should be noted, however, that the local and constitu-
tional symptoms for chRCCs are similar to those seen for other
RCCs.

ROs will almost always follow a benign clinical course with
no significant risk of metastases, whereas malignant chRCCs can
subsequently progress to metastases. There have been a few iso-
cated isolated cases of metastatic ROs on initial presentation or
following resection of the ROs. However, these case reports
have not been substantiated with proper histopathological con-
firmation of the metastatic deposits, except for one liver metas-
tasis.6 Therefore, the distinction of almost exclusively benign
ROs from malignant, potentially metastatic, chRCCs is needed
to guide the management of these often difficult-to-separate
entities.

Renal tumours can be detected by radiological imaging using
ultrasonography, CT, MRI and positron emission tomography
(PET). Usually, following the suspicion of a renal mass, either
clinically or via ultrasound, a 4-phase CT scan will be performed
to delineate its nature. Multiphase CT scans can clearly delineate
the renal tumour, its local extension to surrounding tissues and
detect any metastases to regional lymph nodes or other organs.
Cases of small renal masses (lesions <4 cm) detected inciden-
tally are increasing in incidence largely owing to the widespread
use of ultrasonas and CT scans. Generally, there is no accurate
differentiation between benign and malignant renal lesions using
CT scans (except angiomyolipoma), but retrospectively, about
20% of these small renal masses will be found to be benign
lesions. Percutaneous biopsy of these small renal masses provides
an enticing strategy to identify lesions of no or low malignant

Figure 1 (A) H&E-stained section of an example of eosinophilic
variant of chromophobe renal cell carcinoma, showing typical large,
pale, polygonal cells with prominent cell membranes. Nuclei tend to be
irregular and wrinkled, and cells are sometimes binucleated (asterisks).
Perinuclear clearing can be prominent. (B) H&E stained section of an
example of renal oncocyto-
a, showing large oncocytes with densely
granular eosinophilic cytoplasm. Cells are round to polygonal and
nuclei are round and monotonous. Nucleoli are small and
inconspicuous.
potential, however, widespread uptake of biopsy into clinical practice has been limited.

Predicting whether a small renal mass is malignant, based on its growth velocity, has been reported, but there is no good correlation of malignancy with growth rate. A recent meta-analysis of small renal masses which included benign and malignant lesions, showed a mean growth rate of 0.28 cm annually (range 0.09 to 0.86) for small renal masses followed with imaging. ROs increase in size with variable velocity, with one case series reporting an observed growth rate of 0.20 cm annually. The largest pool of 33 biopsy-proven benign ROs demonstrated a growth rate similar to reported growth rates for RCCs, thus highlighting again that observation of growth cannot distinguish between the benign or malignant nature of such lesions. The locality and size of tumours may also be variable. Uncommonly, there have been case reports of large ROs (25.5 ± 15.0 cm), but the average size is normally around 4.9 ± 2.7 cm. Published reports worldwide show that ROs can be multifocal in 6–11% and bilateral was reported in about 3–5%. By comparison, the median size of chRCCs is about 6.0 cm, which is larger compared with other subtypes of RCCs.

**Table 1** Comparison of macroscopic, microscopic and ultrastructural features for oncocytoma and chromophobe renal cell carcinoma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Oncocytoma</th>
<th>Chromophobe RCC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macrosopic</td>
<td>Well circumscribed, tan or mahogany brown, sometimes with a central stellate scar</td>
<td>Usually circumscribed, homogenous, light brown, beige, yellow or tan colour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microscopic</td>
<td>Cells arranged in a nested or organoid pattern, but tubular, trabecular or solid structure can also be seen.</td>
<td>Variants: classic, eosinophilic and mixed. Cells arranged in sheets, with distinct or accentuated cell borders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cytoplasm</td>
<td>Granular eosinophilic cytoplasm</td>
<td>Granular eosinophilic (eosinophilic variant) or pale, reticular and almost transparent appearance (classical).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclei</td>
<td>Round, uniform nuclei</td>
<td>Presence of perinuclear halos, wrinkled nuclei.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultrastructural</td>
<td>Abundant mitochondria with lamellar or focally stacked cristae. Absent or sparse vesicles.</td>
<td>Scant mitochondria with tubule-vesicular cristae. Abundant microvesicles between mitochondria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2** Histochemistry and immunohistochemistry (IHC) to differentiate chromophobe renal cell carcinomas (RCC) and renal oncocytomas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Success as biomarker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hale’s colloidal iron stain</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>Colloidal iron was diffusely and strongly positive in 9/11 of chRCC, focally and weakly positive in 5/12 of RO, and negative in all granular cell variants of ccRCC (0/6).</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified Mowry’s colloidal iron stain better characterised chRCC</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>Positive colloidal iron stain was not limited to chRCC, however a diffuse and strong, reticular staining pattern was observed only in chRCC (100%). Staining patterns less consistent in all other renal neoplasms. Most RO (84%) had focal, weak, fine dust-like positivity. 100% ccRCC had focal, coarse, droplet-like positivity.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD10</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>Positive CD10, 79% ccRCC, 6.3% chRCC and 0% RO. CD10 reactivity favours ccRCC, and the absence of CD10 in RO shows CD10 could differentiate between chRCCs and RO in a panel of biomarkers.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome of CD10 to distinguish between chRCC and ROs is variable.</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>CD10 positive, 91% ccRCC, 45% chRCC and 84% RO. Not useful as a biomarker.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC marker (RCCma)</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>RCCma, positive in 62.5% ccRCC, 12.5% RO, but negative in chRCC. Holds potential as part of a panel to differentiate between chRCC and RO.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCCma is a relatively new IHC marker that has variable results.</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>RCCma, positive in most RCC with granular/eosinophilic features. ccRCC (71%), pRCC (76%), negative in RO.</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal cell neoplasm TMA</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>RCCma was positive in 37/80 RO.</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimentin</td>
<td>28 cases</td>
<td>Vimentin positive exclusively in ccRCC. Positive in most RCC with granular/eosinophilic features (ccRCC 78%, pRCC 85%). Negative in RO and chRCC.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and relatively high signal intensity on T2-weighted images. Stellate scar, and rarely show any extension to the renal vein, central area of hypoattenuation due to the presence of a central angiomyolipoma, 21 pRCC.

86 retrospective nephrectomy specimens (15 ccRCCs, 15 pRCCs, 10 ROs, 6 cdc)

76 cases (30 ccRCC, 16 pRCC, 21 chRCC, 8 RO, 1 cdc)

CA IX was highly sensitive for ccRCCs (90% positivity) and was negative in all other renal epithelial tumours except for 1 chRCC.

CA IX was highly sensitive for ccRCCs (90% positivity) and was negative in all other renal epithelial tumours except for 1 chRCC.

and relatively high signal intensity on T2-weighted images. Stellate scar, and rarely show any extension to the renal vein, central area of hypoattenuation due to the presence of a central angiomyolipoma, 21 pRCC.

By contrast, on CT scanning, ROs typically show a well-defined, smooth, relatively homogeneous solid mass with a central area of hypoattenuation due to the presence of a central stellate scar, and rarely show any extension to the renal vein, inferior vena cava or the adrenals. MRI scan will typically reveal low to moderate homogeneous intensity on T1-weighted images and relatively high signal intensity on T2-weighted images.

Classically, if renal angiography on ROs were performed, it would show a typical spoke-wheel pattern, highlighting the marked peripheral vascularity in contrast with the relatively hypovascular central part of the tumour. However, classical hypoattenuation of the central stellate scar on CT scan is seen in less than one-third of ROs, and although characteristic of ROs, it is not diagnostic. Moreover, there are no consistently reliable pathologic CT scan features that can safely differentiate ROs from RCCs. Therefore, most ROs are treated as suspicious of RCCs based on imaging, and thereafter, are subjected to surgical resection.

A recent study on the ability of MRI to discriminate ROs from chRCCs showed that these two entities exhibited similar findings, and no MRI features were reliable in distinguishing between the two. The ability of any renal lesion to uptake the 18-fluorodeoxyglucose (FDG) is the basis of 18-FDG PET/CT scans. However, in detection of renal tumours, the role of FDG}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Biomarkers used to differentiate chromophobe renal cell carcinoma (RCC) (chRCC) from oncocytoma (RO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Number of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCA2</td>
<td>158 patients (104 ccRCC, 8 chRCC, 2 pRCC, 38 RO, 6 oncocytic neoplasms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-kit (encodes the membrane-bound tyrosine kinase KIT)</td>
<td>mRNA levels, 17 chRCC, 20 RO from cDNA microarrays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMA</td>
<td>86 retrospective nephrectomy specimens (15 ccRCCs, 15 pRCCs, 10 ROs, 6 cdc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbonic anhydrase IX (CA IX)</td>
<td>TMA, 20 cases of each ccRCC, chRCC, pRCC and RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galectin-3</td>
<td>TMA, 20 cases of each ccRCC, chRCC, pRCC and RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glutathione S-transferase alpha (GST-α)</td>
<td>22 chRCC, 17 RO, 45 ccRCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIT (CD117)</td>
<td>256 ccRCC, 29 chRCC, 25 pRCC, 6cdc, 6 unclassified RCC, 7 RO, 20 UC, 7 NB, 2 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD15</td>
<td>10 ccRCC, pRCC, chRCC and RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGE-A3/4 cancer testis antigens/CTA</td>
<td>35 patients (17 RO, 18 chRCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RON proto-oncogene, encoding a receptor tyrosine kinase,</td>
<td>TMA5 (55 RO, 52 chRCCs),15 &amp; 6 conventional tumours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY-ESO-1 CTA</td>
<td>35 patients (17 RO, 18 chRCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interphase fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH)</td>
<td>11 chRCC, 12 RO, 6 ccRCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endogenous avidin-binding activity (EABA)</td>
<td>Renal TMA5 (30 RO, 18 chRCC, 64 ccRCC, 50 pRCC, 31 benign renal tissues)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAX8 and MUC-1</td>
<td>TMA5 of 36 chRCC, 20 RO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AM, angiomyolipomas; BCA2, a RING H2 finger protein of RING E3 ligases; ccRCC, clear cell renal cell carcinoma; ccRCC, collecting duct renal cell carcinoma; chRCC, chromophobe renal cell carcinoma; NB, nephroblastomas; pRCC, papillary renal cell carcinoma; RO, renal oncocytoma; UC, urothelial carcinomas.
PET is limited as there are high false negative rates.\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{8} Benign ROs are also often FDG-avid, and thus, this cannot be used in separating them from malignant renal tumours.\textsuperscript{3}\textsuperscript{9} Recently, multiphasic multidetector CT scans have helped to discriminate ccRCCs from ROs, papillary RCCs and chRCCs, by using the different enhancements at various phases of the scans.\textsuperscript{40} This will aid somewhat in the distinction of ccRCCs from ROs, but not the discrimination of ROs from chRCCs. Arterial phase enhancements $>$500\% and washout values $>$50\% in Hounsfield units obtained in multiphase CT scans can be seen exclusively in ROs and can aid in distinguishing ROs from other subtypes of RCCs.\textsuperscript{41}

**PATHOLOGY**

Despite the non-invasive discriminatory features of multiphasic CT scans, renal mass biopsy provides the best opportunity for preoperative diagnosis. However, there are numerous potential shortcomings for this procedure, leading to the inevitability of surgical excision. One of the main drawbacks of renal mass biopsy is the relative difficulty faced by pathologists to accurately and conclusively diagnose renal tumour subtype from the limited tissue biopsy samples, as usually an entire range of cytoarchitectural features is necessary for examination to arrive at a diagnosis.\textsuperscript{42} However, as a general rule, if the lesion looks like chRCCs on needle biopsy, it can be confidently reported as such. By comparison, a lesion that looks like an RO may be incompletely sampled, with other areas merging into the eosinophilic variant of chRCCs. This may be a hybrid tumour or simply oncocytoïd-like areas in a chRCC. Therefore, most pathologists would not diagnose an RO outright on a needle biopsy, and make a comment as to the possibility of having chRCCs elsewhere in the tumour. In addition to the difficulties in differentiating ROs from chRCCs clinically, the pathological features following surgical resection of these tumours often overlap and pose a diagnostic challenge to pathologists.

ChRCCs are well-circumscribed encapsulated tumours which have a light-brown to tan cut surface. These are typically solid but cystic areas can be found. Central scarring may be seen. Histologically, there are two types. The classic type has large polygonal cells with finely granular cytoplasm. These have prominent plant-like thick cell membranes. The eosinophilic variant is composed of polygonal cells with abundant eosinophilic cytoplasm. Nuclei are irregular, crinkled and angulated, often with perinuclear clearing. Binucleation is common. A solid sheet-like pattern with poor cellular cohesion is commonly found. ROs are also well circumscribed, but unencapsulated tumours which are typically mahogany brown but sometimes tan coloured. A central stellate scar is present in about one-third of cases. Rarely, cystic change or haemorrhage can be found. Histologically, there are large round polygonal cells with abundant eosinophilic cytoplasm and round nuclei. Nucleoli are inconspicuous. Cells form nests, tubules, acini and microcysts. Focal degenerative nuclear atypia may be seen. Figure 1 demonstrates histopathology of chRCCs and ROs.

Hybrid tumours have zones classic for ROs and chRCCs as described above. Some cases of chRCCs have features overlapping with ccRCCs in which the component cells have granular cytoplasm. In ccRCCs, at least some areas have cells with completely clear cytoplasm with high vascularity and typical, delicate, thin-walled, vascular structure throughout the tumour, contrasting with thick-walled blood vessels present in chRCCs. Also, a ccRCC lacks the plant-like architecture seen in chRCCs.

Table 1 describes the macroscopic and microscopic features of ROs and chRCCs. Despite having some subtle distinguishing macroscopic, microscopic and ultrastructural differences, there is often need to use ancillary histochemical and immunohistochemical (IHC) stains to differentiate these two entities. Recently, a new oncocytic variant of a chRCC was described, that morphologically resembles RO, but has the biological characteristics of a chRCC.\textsuperscript{43} This further adds to the difficulties for pathologists to discern ROs from all these variants of chRCCs.

To date, none of the histochemical, IHC or cytogenetic features has been proven to be reliable and specific.\textsuperscript{44} However, IHC markers may be a cost-effective and valuable form of information for monitoring disease for both prognosis and treatment-planning regimens. Tables 2–4 list some of the histochemical and IHC markers that have been published. Hale’s colloidal iron staining is still used. Currently, the most useful IHC markers for the differentiation of renal tumours are vimentin, cytokeratin (CK)\textsuperscript{7}, CD10 and marker for RCC (RCCMa). Vimentin has been shown to be positive in ccRCCs and negative in chRCCs and ROs, and CK7 is positive in ROs and ccRCCs. RCCMa and CD10 are positive in ccRCCs and negative in both chRCCs and ROs. Hale’s colloidal iron staining with diffuse reticular pattern and perinuclear halo is present in chRCCs but non-existent in ROs and ccRCCs.\textsuperscript{45}

### Table 4: Biomarkers from the cadherin family (also known as calcium-dependent adhesion)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Significance of success as biomarker</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kidney-specific cadherin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ksp-cad was expressed almost exclusively in chRCCs (97.7% of cases).</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ksp-cad)</td>
<td>102 ccRCC, 46 pRCC, 30 chRCC, 3 ccRCC, 31 RO, 42 ccRCC, 30 pRCC, 13 chRCC, 20 RO using whole sections</td>
<td>Ksp-cad offers a quick, dependable approach for differentiating between RO and chRCCs. By contrast with Mazal et al. 2004, here both chRCC (13/13) and RO (19/20) were positive for Ksp-cad. Ksp-cad was not a useful marker for differentiating. Ksp-cad differentiate RO from chRCC. Ksp-cad was present in chRCCs and ROs at mRNA and IHC on TMAs containing 36 chRCC, 41 RO</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Cadherin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep-CAM (epithelial cell adhesion molecule)</td>
<td>22 ccRCC, 17 RO,45 ccRCC</td>
<td>Ep-CAM was expressed in all chRCC in more than 90% of cells. Ep-CAM-positive RO (5/17; 29%) had single cell or small cell cluster positivity. The homogeneous EpCAM expression assists to diagnose chRCC from RO. Ep-CAM distinguished between RO and chRCC. RO were negative for EpCAM but positive in 8/10 (80%) of chRCC.</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 each of ccRCC, pRCC, chRCCs, RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

ccRCC, clear cell renal cell carcinoma; pRCC, papillary renal cell carcinoma; chRCC, chromophobe renal cell carcinoma; RO, renal oncocytoïd; ccRCC, collecting duct renal cell carcinoma.
Colloidal iron and widespread CK7 positivity have been suggested to be useful in distinguishing chRCCs from ROs. In ROs, colloidal iron staining is usually negative and CK7 shows only focal positivity. However, there is overlap in the staining patterns, preventing these stains to be of much practical value. Negative staining for vimentin and widespread staining for CK7 versus negative staining for CK7 and positive staining for vimentin can be useful in distinguishing chRCCs from ccRCCs.

However, as seen in table 2, these IHC markers still have their pitfalls in distinguishing between chRCCs and ROs. For instance, the problems with Hale’s colloidal iron in certain instances is its failure to stain adequately, or the staining pattern (diffuse cytoplasmic vs luminal) could not be adequately assessed.46 However, vimentin may be useful in discriminating chRCCs from other RCCs, and a panel of vimentin with GST-p and EpCAM may achieve 100% sensitivity and specificity for the differential diagnosis of chRCCs, ROs and ccRCCs.47

ROs and chRCCs share histologic and cytologic features, and also share IHC markers for S100A1 and CD117 (KIT).48 Several other studies with IHC markers, including kidney-specific cadherin, CK7, EMA, CD10, RCC, c-KIT, and RON proto-oncogene have been used to distinguish chRCCs from ROs, but the results of these studies are inconsistent and unsatisfactory.49 Table 3 illustrates current biomarkers used to differentiate chRCCs from ROs, directly or indirectly. BCA2, a RING H2 finger protein RING E3 ligase, holds potential as a tool to distinguish ROs from its mimickers, like chRCCs.50 Additionally, RO has significantly higher expression of the cancer-testis antigens (CTAs), such as MAGE-A3/4 and NY-ESO-1.51 Further investigation is needed to evaluate the potential diagnostic implications for these markers.

The cadherins comprise of a family of transmembrane glycoproteins that function as calcium-dependent homotypic adhesion molecules and are expressed by the majority of epithelium. Currently, over 20 different tissue-specific cadherins have been identified.52 The promise of cadherin proteins in distinguishing chRCCs from ROs is shown in table 4. CKs are a family of intermediate filaments that are characteristic markers of epithelial differentiation. Currently, 20 distinct CKs have been identified. They can be useful in the differential diagnosis of neoplasms of epithelial origin, and consequently, several CKs have been investigated in renal neoplasms.53 The CKs that have been trialled to discriminate chRCCs from other RCCs and also ROs, are listed in table 5, but none holds major promise, including CK7. Caveolin-1 is a scaffolding protein encoded by the Cav-1 protein. This has demonstrated better promise in differentiating chRCCs from ROs than CK7.47

**Table 5 Biomarkers from the cytokeratin family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
<th>Significance of success as biomarker</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CK7 (Basic or neutral cytokeratin)</td>
<td>6 chRCC, 11 RO</td>
<td>All chRCC, strong cytoplasmic staining with peripheral cell accentuation. 8/11 RO, negative, 3 weakly staining.</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21 chRCC, 26 RO</td>
<td>chRCCs (100%) and almost all RO (96%) were positive for CK7.</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 chRCC, 21 RO from 4 hospitals</td>
<td>73% chRCC, 25% RO positive for CK7; 33% RO focally positive for CK7. No consistency in differentiating the 2 neoplasms.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 chRCC, 17 RO, 45 ccdRCC</td>
<td>Positive in 100% chRCC, 8% ccRCC and negative in RO.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMAs (20 each chRCC, chRCC, pRCC, RO)</td>
<td>Positive in pRCC (80%), chRCC (89%), and RO (90%).</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TMAs (36 chRCC, 20 RO)</td>
<td>Positive in chRCC than RO, both diffusely (53% vs 10%) and focally (42% vs 15%).</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 each ccRCC, pRCC, chRCC, RO</td>
<td>81% pRCC, 63% chRCC, essentially negative in ccRCC and RO</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK8 (Basic or neutral cytokeratin)</td>
<td>76 cases (30 ccRCC, 16 pRCC, 21 chRCC, 8 RO, 1 ccdRCC)</td>
<td>Distinguished RO and chRCC. RO were not stained 80% chRCCs were positive.</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK18 (Acidic cytokeratin)</td>
<td>76 cases (30 ccRCC, 16 pRCC, 21 chRCC, 8 RO, 1 ccdRCC)</td>
<td>Positive in 87% ccRCC, 100% chRCC and 87.5% RO.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK19 (Acidic cytokeratin)</td>
<td>76 cases (30 ccRCC, 16 pRCC, 21 chRCC, 8 RO, 1 ccd)</td>
<td>Positive in 41% ccRCC, 37.5% chRCC and 62.5% RO. Not a useful marker for differentiation among these subtypes.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK20 (Acidic cytokeratin)</td>
<td>15 RO only from archives</td>
<td>12/15 RO were positive for CK20</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11 chRCC, 21 RO from 4 hospitals</td>
<td>chRCC and RO were uniformly negative for CK20</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76 cases (30 ccRCC, 16 pRCC, 21 chRCC, 8 RO, 1 ccdRCC)</td>
<td>Positive in only 8% ccRCCs, 12.5% chRCCs, negative in RO. Not a useful marker for differentiation among these subtypes.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key messages

- Clinical diagnostic dilemma and difficult histopathological differentiation of renal oncocyoma from chromophobe renal cell carcinoma still persist.
- The ability to achieve confident accurate diagnosis of these renal tumors via non-surgical means remain elusive until new specific molecular biomarkers are discovered.
- Better preoperative non-invasive characterisation of specific biomarkers for renal oncocyoma and chromophobe renal cell carcinoma may lead to reduced rates of surgical intervention for benign renal lesions.
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