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Abstract
Four cases of epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma of the salivary glands arose as painless masses in patients over 60 years old, three in the parotid and one in the submandibular gland. Histologically, all the tumours were composed of small ducts with a double cell lining surrounded by a basement membrane. The inner cells were epithelial and the outer cells myoepithelial, the latter usually possessing clear cytoplasm. There was a variable degree of intervening hyalised stroma. All the tumours were partly encapsulated, but also displayed local invasiveness. One of the tumours also showed areas of dedifferentiation when it later recurred and metastasised. The other three were apparently cured by initial excision, with adjuvant radiotherapy in one instance. In the past this tumour has been described as clear cell adenoma, and it was only recently that its true malignant nature, albeit low grade, was recognised.

Reports of epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma are still relatively few, with only one case described from Britain. It is recommended that this histologically distinct neoplasm deserves wider recognition.

The 1972 WHO classification of salivary gland tumours lists adenocarcinoma, but does not attempt further subdivision. It has since become increasingly clear, however, that there is considerable variation within this group, both in histological appearance and in clinical behaviour. One distinctive subtype was first described as epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma (Epithelial-myoepithelial Schaltstückcarcinom) by Donath in 1972, although several similar tumours had previously been documented under other names. This neoplasm was illustrated in the WHO classification and the AFIP Tumor Fascicle as clear cell monomorphic adenoma, but this was before its truly malignant nature had been realised. By 1987, a review of published findings had identified 35 cases, and a 1989 study from Germany and Sweden added a further 21. The entity was not specifically referred to either in a 1976 Scottish survey of 643 salivary tumours, or among the 2410 cases of the British Salivary Gland Tumour Panel reported in 1985. We have found only one case from the United Kingdom described as epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma, although the parotid clear cell adenoma reported by Corrigan in 1956 was almost certainly another.

The purpose of this study was to present four new cases of epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma and to document the clinical, histopathological, and immunohistochemical findings, and thus permit wider recognition of this distinctive tumour.

Methods
The Area Department of Pathology in Exeter serves a population of about 300 000 in East Devon. The surgical pathology archives contained 212 parotid tumours between 1978 and June 1990, of which three were classified on review as epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma. One was found among 25 submandibular neoplasms, but none among 43 minor salivary gland tumours. Paraffin wax embedded blocks were available from all four cases. Sections were prepared in the conventional manner and stained with haematoxylin and eosin, periodic acid Schiff (PAS) (before and after diastase digestion) alcian blue at pH 2-5, Masson's trichrome, Weigert's stain for elastin, and Gordon and Sweet's reticulin. A panel of commercially available antibodies (table 1) was applied to sections using the streptavidin-biotin technique. Appropriate positive and negative controls were used. Immuneroxidase staining was assessed semiquantitatively, with O as negative, ± as equivocal, and +, + +, and + + + indicating different intensities of positive reaction. "F" indicated that the pattern was focal. Where mitotic counts are given, the area of a high power field is 0·16 mm².

Results

CLINICAL FINDINGS
These are summarised in table 2. All the patients were British and white, and there were no common factors in their medical or occupational histories. All presented with a painless salivary gland mass. None had enlarged lymph nodes at presentation, and there was no evidence of nerve symptoms. The overlying skin appeared normal in each case. General clinical and radiological examination excluded the possibility that any was a metastasis. Surgical excision was considered complete in each patient, and case 1 received a course of postoperative radiotherapy. One of the patients (case 3) developed a local
recurrence 18 months later, which was completely excised. At the same time she was noted to have an enlarged supraclavicular lymph node, which was not biopsied. Two patients (cases 1 and 2) died of presumed cerebrovascular disease, and case 4 was lost at sea in a boating accident. None had any clinical evidence of persistent tumour. Post mortem examinations were not performed.

PATHOLOGICAL FINDINGS
Macroscopically, all the tumours were well circumscribed masses with a grey cut surface. Haemorrhagic areas were noted in case 3.

Microscopically, each tumour was composed of small ducts, some of which contained small quantities of intraluminal inspissated mucin. The lining consisted of two layers: the inner comprised small cuboidal or low columnar cells with generally cosinophilic cytoplasm, and was surrounded by an outer mantle of cells, almost all of which had clear cytoplasm. The nuclei in both cell types were single with evenly dispersed chromatin, and rare almost inconspicuous nucleoli. Glycogen could be shown in both layers, especially the outer, but no intracellular mucin was seen. The outer layer was surrounded by prominent, PAS positive basement membrane material, and the intervening stroma were composed of almost acellular collagen, with neither elastin nor alcian blue positive mucin.

The relative prominence of the stroma and both cell types varied not only from case to case, but also within each individual tumour. Three basic morphological patterns could be recognised, as well as transitional areas. In the first, or classic pattern (fig 1) the two layers lining the ducts were easily discernable, as were the surrounding basement membranes. In the second, or clear cell predominant pattern (fig 2) sheets of cells resembling the outer layer of the classic pattern were divided into alveolar structures by thin strands of stroma. An inner layer of cells was present, but was often difficult to identify. Zones with this pattern were observed in all four tumours, and were particularly prominent in case 1. The third, or sclerotic pattern (figs 3 and 4) consisted of abundant hyalised stroma separating relatively sparse double-layered ducts. There was no myxoid or chondroid change, as seen in a pleomorphic adenoma: Small cyst formation (cases 3 and 4), scantly microcalcification (cases 2 and 4), and focal necrosis (case 4) were uncommon findings.

Although the tumours were well circumscribed and partly encapsulated, each showed invasion into surrounding tissue including blood vessels and nerves (fig 5). There was no pleomorphism, and mitotic figures were rare (fewer than 3 per 20 high power fields). An exception was the recurrent tumour in case 3 which showed areas of dedifferentiation with pleomorphic spindle and polygonal clear cells (fig 6), prominent haemorrhage, and necrosis and numerous mitotic figures (36 per 20 high power fields).

IMMUNOHISTOCHEMISTRY
The findings are summarised in table 1. In all cases there was a noticeable difference in the reactions of the two ducal cell layers: the inner cells showed luminal staining with HMFG 1 and 2 antibody, and cytoplasmic positivity with low molecular weight cytokeratins (AE1 and CAM 5-2); the outer layer stained almost exclusively with S100 protein (fig 7) indicating myoepithelial differentiation. Myosin (ICN, dilution 1 in 10) was applied to cases 3 and 4 and was completely negative in each case. This biphasic staining reaction was best seen in the classic pattern, but was preserved even in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dilution</th>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
<th>Case 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE1</td>
<td>ICN</td>
<td>1:200</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE3</td>
<td>ICN</td>
<td>1:800</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM 5-2</td>
<td>Becton-Dickinson</td>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keratin</td>
<td>Dako</td>
<td>1:150</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMFG 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Oxoid</td>
<td>1:600</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA</td>
<td>Dako</td>
<td>1:400</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S100</td>
<td>Dako</td>
<td>1:150</td>
<td>F±</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimentin</td>
<td>Dako</td>
<td>1:50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Clinical findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at diagnosis</th>
<th>Clinical presentation</th>
<th>Size (cm)</th>
<th>Initial treatment</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Left parotid swelling many years; recent growth over 2 months; at operation firm, lobulated tumour superficial lobe</td>
<td>5 x 4 x 3.5</td>
<td>Superficial parotidectomy</td>
<td>DOC 8 yr 7 m NED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Left parotid nodule 6 weeks</td>
<td>3.5 x 3 x 2</td>
<td>Total parotidectomy</td>
<td>DOC 4 m NED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Left submandibular mass 1 year; rapid growth 2 months</td>
<td>6 x 5 x 3</td>
<td>Excision</td>
<td>Recurrence 1 yr 6 m; supra-clavicular lymph node; alive 2 yr 6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Left parotid mass 10 years; recent growth 3 months</td>
<td>3.5 x 2.5</td>
<td>Superficial parotidectomy</td>
<td>DOC 2 yr NED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOC: died of other causes  NED: no evidence of disease
Salivary epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma

Figure 1 Case 4: classic pattern illustrating ducts lined by inner low columnar cells and an outer mantle of clear cells surrounded by a basement membrane (PAS diastase).

Figure 2 Case 1: clear cell predominant pattern with clear cell-filled alveolar structures, some of which contain small lumina (haematoxylin and eosin).

Figure 3 Case 4: sclerotic area, showing relatively sparse double lined ducts separated by hyalinised stroma (haematoxylin and eosin).

Figure 4 Case 2: transition between clear cell predominant pattern on the left and sclerotic pattern on the right, with thickened basement membranes (PAS diastase).

Figure 5 Case 4: invasion of a nerve by tumour. The outer cell layer also shows positive staining (S100 protein).

Figure 6 Case 3: recurrence showing a solid mass of cells with increased pleomorphism and mitotic activity (haematoxylin and eosin).

clear cell predominant areas (fig 8), where the inner ductal cells were often difficult to identify. The dedifferentiated areas in the recurrent tumour in case 3 showed a patchy reaction with cytokeratins, HMFG 1 and 2 and CEA, but negative staining for S100 protein and all other markers.

Discussion
Epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma is a rare tumour accounting for slightly fewer than 1% of salivary gland neoplasms. Our four cases among 280 salivary tumours (1.4%) indicated a broadly similar relative incidence.

Previous studies have shown that it is some-
what more prevalent in women, and that the mean age at presentation is about 60 years, with a range of 27 to 103, the latter being our case 3. Most tumours arise in the major salivary glands, especially the parotid, but cases have been described in the minor glands of the mouth, and even in the maxillary sinus. The history is typically that of a mass enlarging over several months or even years. Pain and facial nerve palsy have been reported on occasion, but were not noted in our cases.

The tumours are solitary and range in size from 2 to 8 cm maximal diameter. The microscopic appearances, as in our cases, encompass classic, sclerotic, and clear cell predominant patterns, and any particular tumour may show one or more of these zones. A constant feature is the double layer ductal lining of inner small epithelial cells and outer clear myoepithelial cells. Immunohistochemistry can help to identify the two layers when they are morphologically indistinct. We found AE1 and S100 protein to be the best combination of markers for this. Electron microscopical examination has confirmed the inner epithelial and outer myoepithelial differentiation. Although the tumours are locally invasive, they do not exhibit nuclear pleomorphism or a high mitotic rate, an exception being the recurrent tumour in our case 3 which resembled a malignant spindle cell myoepithelioma.

The morphological features of epithelial-myoeipithelial carcinoma are generally quite distinct from other salivary tumours. Mono-
one or more recurrence. In contrast, both patients treated with surgical excision plus immediate postoperative radiotherapy remained tumour free after nine years. In the present study all four patients were treated with surgical excision, including the one who later had a recurrence. Of the other three, only one had received a course of radiation shortly after surgery.

The prognostic value of other factors is also not established. The histological differentiation (cellular anaplasia and mitotic activity) is said not to matter, but tumour size may. In one series the recurrence rate was higher in tumours larger than 4 cm. In another none of the tumours smaller than 3 cm in maximum diameter recurred, while all the larger ones did. Among our cases the recurrence happened in the largest tumour, but in case 1, a carcinoma of 5 × 4 × 3.5 cm failed to recur in over eight and a half years (initial treatment included radiotherapy).

In conclusion, epithelial-myoepithelial carcinoma of salivary glands is a low grade malignancy with a distinct histological appearance. It deserves wider recognition.
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