The role of oestrogen and progesterone receptors in gigantomastia

Anna Kasielska-Trojan1, Marian Danilewicz2, Jerzy Strużyna1, Magdalena Bugaj3, Bogusław Antoszewski1

1 Plastic, Reconstructive and Aesthetic Surgery Clinic, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
2 Department of Pathology, Medical University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland
3 Eastern Centre of the Burns Treatment and Reconstructive Surgery, Łęczna, Poland

Submitted: 4 December 2018; Accepted: 22 April 2019
Online publication: 26 September 2019

Arch Med Sci 2022; 18 (4): 1016–1020
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5114/aoms.2019.88280
Copyright © 2019 Termedia & Banach

Abstract

Introduction: Gigantomastia is a rare condition characterised by excessive breast growth. The pathophysiology of mammary enlargement varies depending on the type of gigantomastia: gestational, juvenile virginal, or idiopathic. The study aimed at examining the receptor status (oestrogen receptor α (ERα) and progesterone receptor (PR)) of breast tissue in adult women with juvenile or idiopathic gigantomastia.

Material and methods: The study involved 70 women who underwent breast reduction due to juvenile or idiopathic gigantomastia. Control breast specimens were obtained from 18 female cadavers. ERα and PR expressions were detected immunohistochemically in breast gland samples.

Results: Categorised and uncategorised ERα and PR expression did not differ between women with gigantomastia and control women. It was found that in both groups weak (0–30%) ERα and PR expression was the most common. Analysis of categorised data also did not reveal any significant correlations between ERα or PR and the women’s age: for the whole group: \( p = 0.795 \) (ERα), \( p = 0.207 \) (PR), for women with gigantomastia: \( p = 0.934 \) (ERα), \( p = 0.43 \) (PR), and for control women: \( p = 0.638 \) (ERα), \( p = 0.805 \) (PR).

Conclusions: Gigantomastia is not caused by increased expression of ERα and PR. Analysing abnormal sensitivity of these receptors to hormones may be crucial in establishing the increased risk of breast cancer in women with gigantomastia.
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Introduction

Gigantomastia is a rare condition characterised by excessive breast growth. It can be physically disabling for a patient due to mastalgia, neck and back pain, headaches, trophic lesions of the breast skin with ulceration and infection, difficulty finding well-fitting clothes, and limited ability to exercise. It can also cause psychosocial problems, such as depression and sociophobia, related to the cosmetic defect. To date, there has not been a universal classification or definition for gigantomastia. It used to be defined as breast enlargement that requires reduction of over 1500 g per breast; however, currently physical and psychological symptoms seem to be the major criteria for the diagnosis rather than the volume of excess breast tissue that needs to be removed [1–5].
The pathophysiology of mammary enlargement varies depending on the type of gigantomastia. It can be the result of hormonal disturbances and changes due to some disorders or physiological conditions like pregnancy – gestational gigantomastia (GG) [6–8]. The aetiology of GG remains elusive. Although some theories have been proposed, including excessive production of oestrogen or prolactin, hormone receptor sensitivity, or underlying autoimmune disease triggered by pregnancy, none was scientifically verified [9, 10]. It was also hypothesised, that GG in women with normal hormone levels (the most common type) may be explained by increased hormonal sensitivity in the target organ, but this theory was not verified [11–13].

The second most common type of gigantomastia is juvenile virginal enlargement of the breast, which can be seen as early as in late childhood and is often present between the ages of 11 and 14 years [1, 14]. Some authors also identify spontaneous idiopathic gigantomastia, defined as breast enlargement not related to puberty or pregnancy [15, 16]. These are, however, case-reports, which makes it difficult to recognise this type of gigantomastia. Moreover, recent case-studies show that the reason for such a presentation may be pseudoangiomatous stromal hyperplasia (PASH) [17, 18].

The aim of this research was to examine the receptor status (oestrogen receptor α (ERα) and progesterone receptor (PR)) of breast tissue in adult women with juvenile or idiopathic gigantomastia.

**Material and methods**

**Participants**

The study involved 70 patients who underwent breast reduction due to juvenile or idiopathic gigantomastia in two plastic surgery centres located in different regions of the country (27 women from one centre and 43 from the other). The average age of the studied individuals was 39.9 ±10.35 years (range: 19–59). All patients qualified for surgical treatment had undergone endocrine examinations, and a detailed medical interview had also been conducted to exclude other possible reasons for breast enlargement. Breast ultrasonography or mammography examinations were performed. All procedures were carried out because of therapeutic indications and were financed by the National Health Fund. To meet these criteria patients provided referrals from a neurosurgeon, neurologist, or orthopaedist confirming a cervical or spine disorder due to heavy breasts. Exclusion criteria included: any hormonal disturbances or treatment (current or past, excluding contraceptives), obesity (BMI > 30 kg/m²), pregnancy-related gigantomastia, operation disabling general state of health, any abnormalities in breast imaging, history of breast malignancy, no clinical physical symptoms of gigantomastia, and aesthetic reasons. Surgical techniques involved breast reduction with nipple-areola complex transposition with upper, lower, or upper-medial pedicles or as a free graft. Histopathological examinations of removed tissues were done routinely. Tissue samples for the examination of receptors were obtained after a histopathological analysis. ERα and PR expressions were detected immunohistochemically. This examination was done in the case of all samples from both clinics, in one centre, by one histopathology specialist.

The control breast samples were obtained from 18 female cadavers (mean age ± SD: 66.3 ±10.52 years) on whom obligatory post-mortem examinations were performed due to national law. A sample of breast gland was harvested by a histopathology specialist, in addition to the routine procedure, for the purpose of the study. The specialist excluded women who had a history of breast cancer or had macromastia.

The protocol for the study was approved by the Local Ethics Committee (of the Medical University of Lodz, RNN/191/17/KE).

**Immunohistochemistry**

Immunohistochemical staining for ERα and PR was performed on 3 μm sections from archive paraffin blocks. The sections were deparaffinised and antigen retrieval was performed using DakoTPlink. The slides were then loaded on a Dako Autostainer Plus (the elements of the automatic Dako line for standardised immunohistochemistry) and incubated with primary “ready to use” anti-ERα and anti-PR (PR clone PgR636 binding with PR-A and PR-B) antibodies according to the manufacturer’s instructions. As a positive control, the sections from ERα and PR-positive breast carcinoma were used. In each case two slides were evaluated and 200 nuclei were counted. The nuclear immunoreexpression of ERα and PR was observed in glandular epithelium of breast tissue.

**Oestrogen and progesterone receptor concentration measurements**

ERα- and PR-positive nuclei were evaluated using a computer image analysis system consisting of a PC computer equipped with a Pentagram graphic tablet, Indeo Fast card (frame grabber, true colour, real-time), produced by Indeo (Taiwan), and a Panasonic colour TV camera (Japan) coupled with Carl Zeiss microscope (Germany). This system was programmed (MultiScan 18.03 software, produced by Computer Scanning Systems, Poland) to calculate the number of objects (semiautomatic function) (Figures 1 and 2). The results were pre-
sent as the percentage of positive nuclei from all nuclei counted in the glandular epithelium.

**Statistical analysis**

An analysis was conducted in the aspect of the differences in the ER\(\alpha\) and PR expression in breast glands in women with gigantomastia and in the control glands. The normality of distribution of the tested variables was examined using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Due to the lack of normality of distribution of data concerning ER\(\alpha\) and PR expression, the non-parametric Mann-Whitney test was used. To examine correlations between ER\(\alpha\) and PR expression and patients’ age, Spearman’s correlation coefficients were calculated.

For statistical purposes we categorised ER\(\alpha\) and PR expression as weak (0–30%), moderate (31–60%), high (61–90%), or very high (91–100%) and compared the categorised data.

**Results**

All glands were subjected to a routine histopathological examination, which did not reveal any cases of tumours. Categorised and uncategorised ER\(\alpha\) and PR expression did not differ between women with gigantomastia and control women. It was found that in both groups weak (0–30%) ER\(\alpha\) and PR expression was the most common (Table I). Statistical analysis did not reveal any correlations between ER\(\alpha\) and PR expression and the age of the examined women (Table II). Analysis of categorised data also did not reveal any significant correlations between ER\(\alpha\) or PR and the women’s age – for the whole group: \(p = 0.795\) (ER\(\alpha\)), \(p = 0.207\) (PR), for women with gigantomastia:

![Figure 1. Immunohistochemistry. Expression of oestrogen receptor α in nuclei of glandular epithelium. Magnification 100×](image1)

![Figure 2. Immunohistochemistry. Expression of progesterone receptor in nuclei of glandular epithelium. Magnification 100×](image2)

### Table I. Categorised and uncategorised oestrogen receptor α (ER\(\alpha\)) and PR expression in women with gigantomastia and control women

| ER\(\alpha\) expression | G (n = 70) | W (n = 18) | Test/\(p\) | PR expression | G (n = 70) | W (n = 18) | Test/\(p\) |
|------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| 0–30%                  | 46         | 10         | \(\chi^2 = 4.736\) \(p = 0.192\) | 0–30%        | 48         | 17         | \(\chi^2 = 5.059\) \(p = 0.08\) |
| 31–60%                 | 16         | 8          |             | 31–60%       | 16         | 1          |             |
| 61–90%                 | 7          | 0          |             | 61–90%       | 6          | 0          |             |
| 91–100%                | 1          | 0          |             | 91–100%      | 0          | 0          |             |
| The mean (SD)          | 31 (23.3)  | 32.78 (8.4) | MW = 492.5 \(p = 0.156\) | The mean (SD) | 28.21 (21.3) | 23.89 (8.3) | MW = 600.5 \(p = 0.762\) |

MW – Mann-Whitney test, G – gigantomastia, W – control women.

### Table II. Oestrogen receptor α (ER\(\alpha\)) and PR expression correlation with age in women with gigantomastia and control women

| Variable     | G and W (n = 88) | G (n = 70) | W (n = 18) |
|--------------|------------------|------------|------------|
|              | \(r\)  \(t\)  \(p\) | \(r\)  \(t\)  \(p\) | \(r\)  \(t\)  \(p\) |
| ER\(\alpha\) vs. age | 0.191  1.800  0.075 | 0.143  1.198  0.235 | 0.116  0.467  0.647 |
| PR vs. age   | 0.066  0.61  0.544 | 0.082  0.675  0.502 | 0.028  0.113  0.911 |

\(r\) – Spearman’s correlation coefficient, G – gigantomastia, W – control women.
with idiopathic gynaecomastia present primary mastia in men, because we found out that men different from our findings of idiopathic gynaecomastia. The results revealed that ER and PR overexpression in breast glands. Also, this condition was not related to hormonal abnormalities or hormonal drug intake because such women were excluded from the studied group. Moreover, all participants had routine histopathological examination of the selected breast tissue performed, and no pathological findings were detected. Other condition that may present as isolated macromastia – excess aromatase syndrome – is a very rare genetic syndrome, and usually some other clinical manifestations are present. On the basis of the conducted studies, it can be presumed that ER and/or PR in women with gigantomastia may be “oversensitive” to hormones, or there are other receptor and hormone anomalies responsible for breast enlargement (i.e. growth hormone, cytokines). Additionally, apart from the mammary gland, the major component of the enlarged breast is fatty tissue, which seems to be hypertrophic or hyperplastic, so further studies concerning the aetiology of gigantomastia could focus on the cause and type of fat accumulation in breasts.

In conclusion, hypothesis concerning ERα and PR oversensitivity in women with gigantomastia should be verified by looking for specific gene polymorphisms that could cause this condition. Moreover, analysing abnormal sensitivity of receptors to hormones may also be crucial in establishing the increased risk of breast cancer in women with gigantomastia, because receptor polymorphisms causing receptor hypersensitivity related to increased breast cancer risk were detected [29–31].
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