

Comparison of Cd105 (Endoglin) Expression In Odontogenic Keratocyst And Dentigerous Cyst – An Immunohistochemistry Study

¹Dr. A. K. Anjali, Post graduate student. Department of Oral Pathology, D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University.

²Dr. Suresh Yadav, Postgraduate Student, Department of Oral Pathology, D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University.

³Dr. Sourabh Kumar, Reader, Department of Oral Pathology, D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University.

⁴Dr. Mayura Chande, Reader. Department of Oral Pathology, D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University.

⁵Dr. Abhishek Jadhav, Lecturer, Department of Oral Pathology, D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University.

⁶Dr. Treville Pereira, Professor, HOD, Department of Oral Pathology, D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Treville Pereira, Professor, HOD, Department of Oral Pathology, D.Y.Patil Dental College, D.Y.Patil University.

Citation of this Article: Dr. A. K. Anjali, Dr. Suresh Yadav, Dr. Sourabh Kumar, Dr. Mayura Chande, Dr. Abhishek Jadhav, Dr. Treville Pereira, “Comparison of Cd105 (Endoglin) Expression In Odontogenic Keratocyst And Dentigerous Cyst – An Immunohistochemistry Study”, IJDSIR- November - 2021, Vol. – 4, Issue - 6, P. No. 327 – 338.

Copyright: © 2021, Dr. A. K. Anjali, et al. This is an open access journal and article distributed under the terms of the creative commons attribution noncommercial License. Which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Type of Publication: Review Article

Conflicts of Interest: Nil

Introduction

Kysitis, a Greek word from which the term cyst was derived simply means a sac or a bladder.

Cysts are more common in the head and neck region explicitly in the jaws. The formation of cyst can be attributed to the opulent amount of epithelial remnants which are left inside the bones of the jaws. The embryologic process wherein the ectodermal tissues are trapped along the line of fusion, which later undergoes atrophy is credited to be forming a cyst.¹ These have 2 origins which are either from the tissues that develop into teeth, namely odontogenic cyst and the other termed as non-odontogenic cyst. Among the other cysts that arise in the jaw, Odontogenic Keratocyst (OKC) has been ascribed to be the third most common because of its high

recurrence rate (38%) and also their antero posterior growth pattern which extends to the medullary spaces with Radicular and Follicular cysts occupying the first and second place respectively. OKC as defined by WHO (1971) is, “a benign uni- or multicystic, intraosseous tumour of odontogenic origin, with a characteristic lining of parakeratinized stratified squamous epithelium and potential for aggressive, infiltrative behaviour”. Even though OKC was reclassified and renamed by WHO (2005) as Keratocystic Odontogenic Tumor due to its neoplastic nature, it gained its pioneer name as OKC in the classification proposed by WHO of Head and Neck Pathology (2017). Dentigerous Cyst (DC) on the other hand, is a developmental cyst with fluid accumulation between the reduced enamel epithelium and an unerupted

crown of a tooth preferably a third molar. With an equal sex predilection, it is mostly seen among first to third decade of life. Being a cyst commonly seen in the mandible than in maxilla, most authors favor the development of this cyst from the tooth follicle.

Firstly interpreted by Philipsen in 1956², the histological characteristics were described by Pindborg and Hansen in 1963³. The incidence of OKC has been observed at any age with peak incidence in the 2nd and 4th decade of life, and with a slight male predilection. Also, the mandible constitutes for the formation of cyst two times more than the maxilla. According to Toiler, after impeded eruption the breakdown of proliferating cells is the main reason for the development of Dentigerous cyst⁴ whereas in 1928, Bloch-Jorgensen was the researcher who propounded that the overlying necrotic primary tooth is the origin for the development of cyst⁵.

The molecular basis of such cysts have to be evaluated and compared with others in order to prevent its malignant transformation. The connective tissue stroma hosts various epithelial alterations such as angiogenesis^{5,6}. Parameters such as Microvessel density (MVD), Microvessel area (MVA), Microvessel perimeter (MVP) are measured with respect to its normal gingiva counterpart aside from the Endoglein CD105 levels. The current review focussed upon these issues to add to the writing proof for a superior pathologic comprehension of the lesions and extra separation of the equivalent.

Aims And Objectives Of The Study

The aim of the present study was to determine the angiogenic potential of OKC AND DC compared with normal mucosa using CD 105 marker immunohistochemically. The objectives of the present study were:

1. To study the expression of endoglin marker CD 105 in clinical types of OKC and DC.

2. To compare the MVD, MVA, MVP in OKC and DC and normal oral mucosa.

3. To compare the MVD, MVA, MVP in OKC and DC using CD105 marker immunohistochemically.

Materials and Method

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Institutional Ethics Committee . The study was conducted in the department of Oral and Maxillofacial Pathology of D.Y Patil Deemed to be University, School Of Dentistry, Nerul, Navi Mumbai. 70 paraffin embedded tissue samples were retrieved for the study purpose. Of the 60, group 1 comprised 25 samples of OKC, group 2 comprised 25 samples of DC, group 3 comprised 10 samples of pyogenic granuloma and group 4 comprised 10 samples of healthy gingiva.

Inclusion criteria: Clinically histopathologically diagnosed cases of OKC, DC and Pyogenic granuloma and healthy gingival tissue samples.

Exclusion Criteria: No medically compromised patients like Hypertension, Diabetes or Cancer.

Procedure

Tissue harvest and formalin fixation was done followed by fixing and paraffin embedding. The paraffin was cut into sections of 3-4 micron thickness and taken on positively charged poly -l-lysine coated slides. The slide was warmed on a hot plate at 60 degrees for 1 hour prior to staining. The slides were then deparaffinized slides in 3 changes of xylene. Then they were hydrated in 3 changes of decreasing grades of alcohol ie.95%, 80%and 60%. They were washed in running tap water for 4-5 minutes. The slides were placed in the decloaking chamber in a container containing Tris -EDTA as an antigen retrieval solution .Select the antigen retrieval program and the cycle was started. After the completion of this cycle the slide container was removed from the decloaking chamber and allowed to cool down for 20 minutes. Then

it was washed in 2-3 chambers of distilled water of 5 minutes each. The slides were marked with PAP Pen. After that it was washed with a TBS wash buffer for 5mins. The slides were incubated with Horseradish peroxidase block for 10 minutes. After that again the slides were washed in 2 changes of TBS wash buffer 5 minutes each. The slides were arranged in the humidity chamber. The protein block was poured on the slides and kept for 5 minutes at room temperature. TBS wash buffer was used for 5 minutes on the stopwatch. The primary antibody CD 105 -EP 274-Rabbit monoclonal PR 188 - 6ml antibody 1-2 drops was poured on each slide for 30-60 minutes and incubated at room temperature. Again the slides were washed with a TBS buffer for 5 minutes each. Diluted Betazoid DAB chromogen in DAB substrate buffer was poured on the slides and kept for 1-3 minutes at room temperature. The slides were checked under the microscope to confirm color development in the test and control slides. The slides were rinsed with distilled water. It was later counter stained with haematoxylin for 20-30 seconds and washed with distilled water. The slides were later dipped in a TBS wash buffer for bluing approximately 5 minutes. The slides were dehydrated, cleared and mounted in DPX and labelled accordingly (Figure 1-14).

Criteria for observation

Quantification of MVD, MVA, MVP-

Two investigators determined MVD, MVA, MVP in each slide independently. In brief, microvessels were highlighted by immunostaining with CD105 monoclonal antibodies. Any single brown-stained cell or cluster of endothelial cells that were clearly separated from adjacent microvessels, histiocytes, and $\mu\mu$ were counted as a single vessel unless there was a discontinuity in the structure. Slides were screened at 40X magnification on a research microscope and 3 areas with the highest number of

stained microvessels were identified ("hot spots"). Then, the MVA, MVD, MVP of the blood vessels were counted in the 3 spot areas using LES -4 software in a leica research microscope. Microvessel density was expressed as the mean number of vessels in these areas. Microvessel area was expressed as the mean number of vessel areas in (μm^2). Microvessel perimeter was expressed as the mean number of vessel perimeter in (m).

Results

The present study is a cross sectional study of archived samples comprising of 4 groups; group 1- 25 samples of OKC, group 2- 25 samples of DC, group 3- 10 samples of pyogenic granuloma and group 4- 10 samples of healthy gingiva. The data was coded and entered in Microsoft Excel 2007. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Studies) 24.0 (IBM, Analytics, New York, U.S.A) was used to carry out the statistical analysis. All p values less than 0.05 was considered to be statistically significant. Since the data was not normally distributed, Mann Whitney U test was performed. The mean MVD of the OKC group was 13.25 ± 2.94 , of the DC group was 12.87 ± 2.4 , of the pyogenic granuloma group was 13.02 ± 1.07 and of the normal gingiva group was 8.01 ± 4.01 . The mean MVA of the OKC group was 113.89 ± 24.89 , of the DC group was 115.5 ± 24.6 , of the pyogenic granuloma group was 113.5 ± 18.7 and of the normal gingiva group was 54.7 ± 21.03 . The mean MVP of the OKC group was 50.7 ± 12.45 , of the DC group was 49.43 ± 14.56 , of the pyogenic granuloma group was 49.3 ± 12.46 and of the normal gingiva group was 32.04 ± 5.07 (Table 01). There was no statistically significant difference in the mean MVD values of OKC, DC and pyogenic granuloma groups. The mean values of KC, DC and Pyogenic granuloma was significantly higher than that of the healthy gingiva ($p < 0.05$) (Table 02). There was no statistically significant difference in the mean MVA

values of OKC, DC and pyogenic granuloma groups. The mean values of KC, DC and Pyogenic granuloma was significantly higher than that of the healthy gingiva ($p < 0.05$) (Table 03). There was no statistically significant difference in the mean MVP values of OKC, DC and pyogenic granuloma groups. The mean values of KC, DC and Pyogenic granuloma were significantly higher than that of the healthy gingiva ($p < 0.05$) (Table 04).

Discussion

Tumorigenesis is marked by invasion and metastasis of tumors with an increase in Myofibroblasts (MF), blood vessels, and inflammatory cells in the tumor stroma⁷ regulated by various molecules such as CD31, CD34, Factor VIII and CD105 (also known as pan-endothelial markers) which are expressed differentially in angiogenic and normal vessel endothelial cells as propounded by Legan⁸. OKCs and DC though cystic lesions exhibit invasiveness into the connective tissue as some suggested unknown factor consolidated in the epithelium might be responsible for the same. For the survival of the neoplastic tissues, nutrition is essential which happens by recruiting new microvessels as suggested by Folkman⁹.

In the present study, the mean MVD was highest in OKC followed by DC and pyogenic granuloma. The mean MVD in the present study for OKC was 13.25 ± 2.94 apparently due to the level of inflammation present while collecting the tissue samples in the present study that raised the MVD mean values. This was much higher than that reported by Kumar DV et al¹⁰, where the mean MVD was 6.25 ± 2.88 and in Jamshidi et al where the values were 9.6 ± 2.9 . Another study by Sefi et al¹¹ also reported that mean MVD in keratocystic odontogenic tumors was higher than follicular cyst ($p < 0.001$) but it was much lower when compared to that of the Ameloblastoma. The mean MVD value for DC in the present study was 12.87 ± 2.4 while it was 3.75 ± 1.72 in a Kumar DV et al¹⁰.

Also the value for PG was 13.02 ± 1.07 , which was lower than the value reported by Kumar DV et al.¹⁰ which was 15.02 ± 0.64 and Vasconcelos MG et al¹² who reported a value of 20.22. The Vasconcelos MG et al¹² study reported that the mean MVD values were significantly higher with OKC as compared to DC, which was in contrast to our results.

We observed that the mean MVA was higher with DC than with OKC and PG. But there was no statistically significant difference. This was in complete contrast to the findings of another Indian study where OKC values were significantly higher than that of DC and normal mucosa¹³. We also observed that there was no significant difference between MVP of the 3 groups but was higher as compared to the normal mucosa. Since tissues require oxygen and nutrients to continue their growth and development, they induce neovascularization. On the other hand, angiogenesis is not only necessary for the growth of the tumor, it is also necessary for cellular metastasis¹⁴⁻¹⁶.

Conclusion

The present study was a retrospective analysis of the tissue samples carried out with the aim of determining the angiogenic potential of OKC, DC as well as pyogenic granuloma compared with normal mucosa using CD 105 marker immunohistochemically in terms of MVD, MVA and MVP. There was no statistically significant difference in the mean MVD, MVP and MVA values of OKC, DC and pyogenic granuloma groups but it was definitely higher than that of the normal mucosa. MVD, MVP and MVA can predict the growth of the tumor, metastasis and patient's survival and this value is related to the aggressiveness of the tumor. CD105 expression is a prominent feature of newly formed blood vessels and could reflect as the primary indicator for an increased potency towards recurrence and further expansion among the odontogenic cysts.

Limitations

Nevertheless, this cannot be the sole gold standard for a definitive conclusion since a mere inflammation also can raise up CD105 counts. Hence carefully coordinated and systematic evaluation of the lesion and its correlation both clinically and histopathologically should go hand in hand for a better treatment plan. We were able to better understand the expression of CD105 with the different conditions when compared to normal mucosa. Nevertheless, the study had certain limitations-

1. Most of the literature reports the use of other markers like CD34, which was not assessed in the present study.
2. The level of inflammation was not compared. There is definitely a chance of more inflamed tissue specimens in the sample that gave higher mean values compared to the other previous literature evidence.
3. Factors contributing to inflammation and angiogenesis were not considered into the study.

Acknowledgement: I am sincerely thankful to D.Y.Patil Dental College for providing me the opportunity to write a case study on the above topic.

I am also thankful to Dr.Treville Pereira for guiding me in every stage of this research paper. Without his support, it would've been extremely difficult for me to prepare the paper so meaningful and interesting.

References

1. Vij H, Vij R, Gupta V, Sengupta S. Odontogenic keratocyst: a peripheral variant. Niger J Clin Pract. 2011 Oct;14(4):504–7.
2. Gaitán-Cepeda LA, Quezada-Rivera D, Tenorio-Rocha F, Leyva-Huerta ER. Reclassification of odontogenic keratocyst as tumour. Impact on the odontogenic tumours prevalence [Internet]. Vol. 16, Oral Diseases. 2010. p. 185–7. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1601-0825.2009.01625.x>
3. Pindborg JJ, Hansen J. STUDIES ON ODONTOGENIC CYST EPITHELIUM. 2. CLINICAL AND ROENTGENOLOGIC ASPECTS OF ODONTOGENIC KERATOCYSTS. Acta Pathol Microbiol Scand. 1963;58:283–94.
4. Toller P. Origin and growth of cysts of the jaws. Ann R Coll Surg Engl. 1967 May;40(5):306–36.
5. Gillette R, Weinmann JP. Extrafollicular stages in dentigerous cyst development. Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol. 1958 Jun;11(6):638–45.
6. Khot K, Deshmukh SB, Alex S. Comparative analysis of the immunohistochemical expression of vascular endothelial growth factor and matrix metalloproteinase-9 in keratocystic odontogenic tumor, dentigerous cyst and radicular cyst. J Cancer Res Ther. 2015 Jul;11(3):635–40.
7. Raouâa B, Samèh S, Dorsaf T, Rahma A, Jamil S. Recurrence challenge in odontogenic keratocyst variants, two clinical cases [Internet]. Vol. 20, Médecine Buccale Chirurgie Buccale. 2014. p. 203–8.
8. Zerrin E, Peruze C, Husniye D. Dentigerous cysts of the jaws: Clinical and radiological findings of 18 cases [Internet]. Vol. 2, Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology. 2014. p. 77. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/2321-3841.144673>
9. Mohan KR, Natarajan B, Mani S, Sahuthullah YA, Kannan AV, Doraiswamy H. An infected dentigerous cyst associated with an impacted permanent maxillary canine, inverted mesiodens and impacted supernumerary teeth. J Pharm Bioallied Sci. 2013 Jul;5(Suppl 2):S135–8.
10. Kumar DV, Hemavathy S, Kulkarni D, Rudraiah PM, Sidramayya Mathpati SK, Priya S. Expression of CD105 in tumor angiogenesis a comparative study (ameloblastoma, keratocystic odontogenic tumor and

dentigerous cyst). J Int Oral Health. 2015 Jun;7(6):23–7.

11. Seifi S, Shafaie S, Ghadiri S. Microvessel density in follicular cysts, keratocystic odontogenic tumours and ameloblastomas. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2011;12(2):351–6.

12. Vasconcelos MG, Alves PM, Vasconcelos RG, da Silveira ÉJD, Medeiros AMC, de Queiroz LMG. Expression of CD34 and CD105 as markers for angiogenesis in oral vascular malformations and pyogenic granulomas. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 2011 Aug;268(8):1213–7.

13. Miyata Y, Sagara Y, Watanabe S-I, Asai A, Matsuo T, Ohba K, et al. CD105 is a more appropriate marker for evaluating angiogenesis in urothelial cancer of the upper urinary tract than CD31 or CD34 [Internet]. Vol. 463, Virchows Archiv. 2013. p. 673–9. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00428-013-1463-8>

14. Acharya S, Goyal A, Rattan V, Vaiphei K, Kaur Bhatia S. Dentigerous cyst or adenomatoid odontogenic tumor: clinical radiological and histopathological dilemma. Case Rep Med. 2014 Jul 1;2014:514720.

15. Gupta P, Jawanda M, Narula R, Singh J. Inflammatory dentigerous cyst mimicking a periapical cyst [Internet]. Vol. 8, Journal of the International Clinical Dental Research Organization. 2016. p. 63. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4103/2231-0754.176258>

16. Khajuria N, Metgud R, Naik S, Lerra S, Tiwari P, Mamta, et al. Immunohistochemical expression of vascular endothelial growth factor in keratocystic odontogenic tumor, dentigerous cyst, and radicular cyst: A comparative study. Indian J Dent Res. 2016 Jan;7(1):17–22.

Legend Tables and Figures

Table 1: Distribution of the samples across the 4 different groups based upon their mean scores and standard deviation for MVD, MVA and MVP-

	Group 1 (OKC)	Group 2 (DC)	Group 3 (PG)	Group 4 (control)
MVD	13.25±2.94	12.87±2.4	13.02±1.07	8.01± 4.01
MVA	113.89±24.89	115.5±24.6	113.5±18.7	54.7±21.03
MVP	50.7±12.45	49.43±14.56	49.3±12.46	32.04±5.07

Table 2: Comparison of MVD mean values between the 4 groups (Mann Whitney U test)

MVD		
Groups	P value	Interpretation
Group 1 Vs Group 2	0.76	No significant difference
Group 1 Vs Group 3	0.87	No significant difference
Group 1 Vs Group 4	0.004	Statistically significant difference
Group 2 Vs Group 3	0.56	No significant difference
Group 2 Vs Group 4	0.00	Statistically significant difference
Group 3 Vs Group 4	0.0032	Statistically significant difference

Table 3: Comparison of MVA mean values between the 4 groups (Mann Whitney U test)

MVA		
Groups	P value	Interpretation
Group 1 Vs Group 2	0.57	No statistically significant difference
Group 1 Vs Group 3	0.67	No statistically significant difference
Group 1 Vs Group 4	0.001	Statistically significant difference
Group 2 Vs Group 3	0.46	No statistically significant difference
Group 2 Vs Group 4	0.001	Statistically significant difference
Group 3 Vs Group 4	0.001	Statistically significant difference

Table 4: Comparison of MVP means values between the 4 groups (Mann Whitney U test)

MVP		
Groups	P value	Interpretation
Group 1 Vs Group 2	0.068	No statistically significant difference
Group 1 Vs Group 3	0.843	No statistically significant difference
Group 1 Vs Group 4	0.004	Statistically significant difference
Group 2 Vs Group 3	0.08	No statistically significant difference
Group 2 Vs Group 4	0.003	Statistically significant difference
Group 3 Vs Group 4	0.002	Statistically significant difference



Figure 1: Poly l lysin precoated positively charged microscope slides.



Figure 2: Paraffin embedded formalin fixed tissue block



Figure 3: Rotary microtome (Leica- RM 2245 Germany)



Figure 4: Slide rack



Figure 5: Warm water bath (500)



Figure 6: EZ Retriever system v . 2.2 x Biogenex



Figure 7: CD 105 endoglin marker from Pathnsitu lab.



Figure 8: Horse Radish Peroxidase from Pathnsitu lab.



Figure 9: Tris-EDTA from Pathnsitu lab



Figure 10: Leica Research Microscope (Model No.Dm1000led)



Figure 11: D Incubator



Figure 12: Harris Haematoxylin stain



Figure 13: DPX



Figure 14: PAP PEN