Case study

Intrahepatic multicyctic biliary hamartoma: presentation of a case report and magnetic resonance imaging / magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography findings

Abstract : Biliary hamartomas, known as von Meyenburg complexes (VMCs), are benign liver malformations. They are histologically characterized by cystic dilated bile ducts surrounded by numerous fibrous stromal elements measuring up to 5 mm in diameter. Incidental detection of VMCs by autopsy is difficult. Detection of VMCs by imaging is also difficult because of their asymptomatic nature and small size and also rarity. Moreover, they are easily confused with metastatic diseases of the liver, especially in imaging .

A 39-year-old man presented to our hospital with a 6-month history of recurrent nonspecific abdominal pain. Abdominal ultrasonography (US) revealed multiple cystic lesions in the liver. The diagnosis of metastases was suggested. However, final diagnosis of VMCs was confirmed by magnetic resonance imaging and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography.

This case report highlights the routine differential diagnosis of biliary microhamartomas by magnetic resonance imaging and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography.

Key words : biliary microhamartomas, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography(MRCP)

Introduction

Biliary hamartomas, known as von Meyenburg complexes (VMCs), are benign liver malformations. They are histologically characterized by cystic dilated bile ducts surrounded by numerous fibrous stromal elements [1,2] measuring up to 5 mm in diameter. Incidental detection of VMCs by autopsy is difficult. Detection of VMCs by imaging is also difficult because of their asymptomatic nature and small size [3]. VMCs are also rare. Moreover, they are easily confused with metastatic diseases of the liver, especially in imaging [4].

Therefore, an understanding of the imaging traits of VMCs is needed to establish a list of differential diagnoses, which will decrease the need for methods such as biopsy or laparotomy

[5]. We herein report a case of VMCs and describe the routine diagnostic magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography (MRCP) findings of biliary microhamartomas.

Case report

A 39-year-old man presented to our hospital with a 6-month history of recurrent nonspecific abdominal pain. Physical examination findings were unremarkable. Laboratory examination results were normal with the exception of a slight elevation of gamma-glutamyl transferase (142 mg/dL; reference range, 0–55 mg/dL).Tumor markers were normal His mother has history of biliary hamartoma Patient has no alarm symptoms and has no weight loss Body mass index was normal .Abdominal ultrasonography (US) revealed multiple cystic lesions in the liver that appeared similar to metastases. Subsequent MRI showed multiple small cysts that were hypointense on T1-weighted images (Fig. 1a, b) and hyperintense on T2-weighted images; they were scattered in the liver parenchyma (Fig. 2a, b). MRCP showed small cysts distributed uniformly within the contour of the liver, creating a “starry sky” configuration (Fig. 3a, b).

The patient was diagnosed with multiple VMCs based on the typical MRI features.
Verification using these imaging techniques within the 6-month follow-up confirmed the diagnosis of VMCs.
After 6 months of follow-up, the lesions remained stable.

Discussion

A VMC is a benign congenital malformation of the biliary duct. It was first defined in 1918 by von Meyenburg [6]. They originate from embriyonic bile ducts that fail to involute . VMC are ductal plate malformations. Ductal plate malformations include different polycystic liver and kidney diseases, Caroli disease and Caroli syndrome, congenital hepatic fibrosis, and biliary atresia. VMC may be isolated or associated with one or several of these malformations.Biliary hamataromas are rare , clinically asymptomatic ,and diagnosis is usually incidental.Techical advances in radiologyhave made them easily detectable ,providing

more accuracy rate diagnosis to avoid biopsy, which should be performed for confirmation of diagnosis when ,in doubt [7). Von Meyenburg complexes is one of the polycystic liver diseases, characterized by bile duct hamartoma. These cysts come from the biliary tract but the cysts do not communicate with them. Because of asymptomatic course of the lesions usually are diagnosed in the course of diagnostic for another reason. It is not possible to define the entire diagnosis based upon ultrasonography imaging, as cyst could mimic metastasis, micro-abscesses and multiple focal nodular lesions. Because of the small size of the lesion (0.5-15 mm) usually inconclusive is also computed tomography. On the basis of magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and cholangio-MRI we can determine the diagnosis of the complexes. Liver biopsy is obligatory in case of suspicion of neoplastic process. These complexes do not require treatment, but long-term follow-up is indicated because of the possibility to more frequent cholangiocarcinoma in patient with von Meyenburg complexes[8]

Although jaundice and portal hypertension may be caused by a mass effect, patients are usually asymptomatic [8]. VMCs may be single or multiple, with sizes ranging from 1 to 15 mm [1]. Because of the small size of the lesions, an ultimate description is difficult to attain.

The prevalence of VMCs by autopsy ranges from 0.6% to 2.8% [9]. Histologically, the lesions include disorganized and dilated bile ducts and ductules surrounded by fibrous stroma [10]. US imaging shows hypoechoic, hyperechoic, or mixed heterogenic echoic structures [1,3,4]. The multiple comet-tail sign is considered to be a specific US finding of VMCs [3]. Additionally, lesional echogenicity might be related to the number and size of dilated bile ducts and the degree of fibrosis [10]. Sonographic findings of VMC vary and are not very specific. Liver parenchymal echotexture often appears heterogeneous and coarse. VMC appear as multiple micro-nodules, either hypo- or hyperechoic These micronodules are often very tiny and may show comet-tail artifacts, which explains why they are difficult to differentiate from aerobilia and from intrahepatic stones [6,9,12]. Variations in imaging findings may be explained by the difference in number and size of the dilated bile duct (hypoechoic lesions), and by the different density of the fibrous tissue surrounding them (hyperechoic) This explains why on sonography VMC can be confused with liver metastases, micro-abscesses, biliary stones or fibrosis[5]

In contrast, enhanced computed tomography shows that VMCs are usually of low attenuation with irregular margins. Most reported cases have suggested that VMCs do not demonstrate contrast enhancement [3,10]. They are difficult to characterize due to their small size, often below the centimeter. It is impossible to exclude the possibility that the lesions are small metastases, in particular in a patient with known primary neoplasm[13].On MRI, VMCs are defined as hypointense on T1 and hyperintense on T2 compared to the surrounding liver parenchyma [1,10]. VMC are often irregular in shape with welldefined margins. On diffusion-weighted MRI, they mimic cystic lesions. On heavily T2-weighted sequences, the contrast with liver parenchyma is more marked, and the signal intensity is identical to that of the cerebrospinal fluid [9,12]. Because of a high contrast resolution, MR cholangiography reveals more VMC and highlights those that are smaller [12,15]. MR cholangiography also makes it possible to see if there is any communication between VMC and the biliary tree. Intra- and extrahepatic bile ducts look normal [6,14]. On T1-weighted MR images obtained after intravenous administration of gadolinium chelate, VMC may display different patterns. They can show no enhancement [6,9] or display a thin, regular rim of enhancement on early dynamic images that persists on late images . This enhancement correlates with compressed liver parenchyma that surrounds the lesions [5]. Finally, in a recent study, a small enhancing mural nodule can be observed in 9/11 patients, correlating at histopathologic examination with polypoid projection [14]. VMC do not communicate with the intrahepatic bile ducts. The administration of contrast material that has biliary excretion does not result in change of the signal inside VMC, unlike saccular dilatations observed in Caroli disease. To date, MRI is considered as the best imaging tool to assess VMC. MR cholangiography sequences and, more generally, heavily T2-weighted sequences are essential for differential diagnosis

MRCP can alsıo help the differantion of VMCs from liver metastases,polycysticdiseaseand Caroli Diseasae, requiring the admistration of intravenous gadolinium.Contrast enhancement is seen metyastatic lesions and Caroli Disease , and lack of communication the biliary tree can be observed in the later [16,17]

Although VMCs are benign, some reports have described hepatic malignancies with a background of VMCs, including hepatocellular carcinoma and cholangiocarcinoma [18]. VMCs are rare and usually only seen as multiple small nodules. They are sometimes confused with metastatic liver disease, microabscesses, diffuse primary hepatocellular carcinoma, biliary cysts, or Caroli disease [1,6,9].When it is diagnosed patients require monitoring

because malignant transformation to hepatic cholangiocarcinoma.The use of Ca 19-9 to diagnose malignant transformation should be discouraged , since persistent elevation of this tumor marker has been described with multıple biliary hamartoma without malignancy[19,20]. In case of alarm symptoms or elevation of tumor marker , perform MRCP. If a suspicious lesion is found consider biopsy.

There was no significant lesion and elevation of tumor marker after 6 months of follow-up.

ConclusionV

VMC are not so rare imaging findings in everyday practice and are easily recognizable and differentiated from other intrahepatic conditions by MRI and MR cholangiography. Once diagnosed, may be present in more complex pathologies and have a potential for malignant transformation.VMC could easily be considered as minor malformations. Although it is impossible to consider genetic screening for diffuse VMC or regularly monitor patients with VMC, it is important to remember that VMC

The use of various imaging modalities with follow-up has proven helpful for the diagnosis of VMCs. A correct diagnosis is easier to reach when typical imaging findings are present. Otherwise, histological verification may be needed.

Consent Disclaimer:

As per international standard or university standard, patient's consent has been collected and preserved by the author.

References

1. Lev-Toaff AS, Bach AM, Wechsler RJ, Hilpert PL, Gatalica Z, Rubin R. The radiologic and pathologic spectrum of biliary hamartomas. AJR Am J Roentgenol 1995; 165: 309-313

2. Wei SC, Huang GT, Chen CH, Sheu JC, Tsang YM, Hsu HC, Chen DS. Bile duct hamartomas. A report of two cases. J Clin Gastroenterol 1997; 25: 608-611

3. Luo TY, Itai Y, Eguchi N, Kurosaki Y, Onaya H, Ahmadi Y, Niitsu M, Tsunoda HS. Von Meyenburg complexes of the liver: imaging findings. J Comput Assist Tomogr 1998; 22: 372-378

4. Cooke JC, Cooke DA. The appearances of multiple biliary hamartomas of the liver (von Meyenberg complexes) on computed tomography. Clin Radiol 1987; 38: 101-102

5. Mortelé B, Mortelé K, Seynaeve P, Vandevelde D, Kunnen M, Ros PR. Hepatic bile duct hamartomas (von Meyenburg Complexes): MR and MR cholangiography findings. J Comput Assist Tomogr 2002; 26: 438-443

6. Zheng RQ, Zhang B, Kudo M, Oanda H, Inoue H. Imagingfindings of biliary hamartomas.World J Gastroenterol, 2005; 13(40):6354-6359.

7. Quentin M, Scherer A. The "von Meyenburg Complex". Hepatology 2010; 52: 1167-8. 4. Davidoff S, Kim S, Friedman B. Von Meyenburg Complexes (Bile duct hamartomas). Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 2006; 4: xxvl

8.Wajtryt O, Tomczak E, Zielonka TM, Rusinowicz T, Kaszyńska A, Życińska K.

Von Meyenburg complexes. case report. Wiad Lek. 2017;70(6 pt 1):1137-1141.

9. Wohlgemuth WA, Bottger J, Bohndorf JB. MRI, CT, US and ERCP in the evaluation of bile duct hamartomas (von Meyenburgcomplex): A case report. Eur Radiol, 1998; 8:1623-1626.

10. Markhard BK, Rubens DJ, Huang J, DograVS. Sonographic,Features of Biliary Hamartomas with Histopathologic Correlation.J Ultrasound Med, 2006; 25:1631-1633.

11. Yong Moon Shin. Biliary hamartroma presented as a single mass.The Korean Journal of Hepatology, 2011; 17:331-334.

12.Erlinger S. Low phospholipid-associated cholestasis and cholelithiasis. Clin Res Hepatol Gastroenterol 2012;36:S36—40.

13.Legou F, Chiaradia M, Baranes L, Pigneur F, Zegai B, Djabbari M, et al. Imaging strategies before beginning treatment of colorectal liver metastases. Diagn Interv Imaging 2014;95:505-12

14.Tohmé-Noun C, Cazals D, Noun R, Menassa L, Valla D, Vilgrain V. Multiple biliary hamartomas: magnetic resonance features with histopathologic correlation. Eur Radiol 2008;18:493-9. [12]

15.Nagano Y, Matsuo K, Gorai K, Sugimori K, Kunisaki C, Ike H, et al. Bile duct hamartomas (von Mayenburg complexes) mimicking liver metastases from bile duct cancer: MRC findings. World J Gastroenterol 2006;12:1321—3.[14]

Krausé D, Cercueil J-P, Dranssart M, Cognet F, Piard F, Hillon P. MRI for evaluating congenital bile

16. Spiller R. Multiple cystic liver lesions on CT. Gut 2008; 57: 144.

17. Hain D, Ahrens W, Finkelstein S. Molecular evidence for the neoplastic potential of Hepatic Von-Meyenburg Complexes

18. Maher MM, Dervan P, Keogh B, Murray JG. Bile ducthamartomas (von Meyenburg complexes): Value of MR imaging indiagnosis. Abdominal Imaging, 1999; 24:171-173.

19. Souza-Gallardo LM, de la Fuente-Lira M, Galaso-Trujillo R, Martínez-Ordaz JL. Elevación persistente de Ca 19-9 y un hallazgo inesperado. Reporte de un caso. Cirugía y Cirujanos 2016; Epub.

20. Morinagaa T, Katsunoria I, Yamashitaa YI, Yamaoa T, Kaidaa T, Nakagawaa S, Hashimoto D, et al. Multicystic biliary hamartoma with extremely elevated CA 19-9: a case report. Scand J Gastroenterol 2017; 52: 916-9.).

Figure1A: T2-weighted three-dimensional magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography images (coronal plane). Multiple hyperintense cysts with scattered placement are observed in the liver parenchyma, the largest diameter reaching about 2 cm. No significant association between the cysts and biliary ducts is present.

Figure 1b: T2-weighted three-dimensional magnetic resonance cholangiopancreatography images (coronal plane). Multiple hyperintense cysts with scattered placement are observed in the liver parenchyma, the largest diameter reaching about 2 cm. No significant association between the cysts and biliary ducts is present.

Figure2a :T1-weighted contrast-enhanced axial fat-suppressed sequences. (a, b) Multiple hypointense cysts, the largest of which is 2 cm in diameter, are observed in the liver parenchyma without contrast enhancement.

Figure 2b :T1-weighted contrast-enhanced axial fat-suppressed sequences. (a, b) Multiple hypointense cysts, the largest of which is 2 cm in diameter, are observed in the liver parenchyma without contrast enhancement.

Figure 3a :Multiple hyperintense cysts in the liver parenchyma. (a) Coronal-plane T2-weighted sequence, (b) axial fat-suppressed T2-weighted sequence

Figure 3b: Multiple hyperintense cysts in the liver parenchyma. (a) Coronal-plane T2-weighted sequence, (b) axial fat-suppressed T2-weighted sequence.



Figure1A



Figure 1b



Figure2a



Figure 2b



Figure 3a



Figure 3b