Current Trends in Gynecologic Oncology

Review Article Open Access

Exenteration of the Pelvis for Recurrent or Persistent Gynecologic Cancers: in a Contemporary Cohort, Clinical and Histopathologic Factors Predicting Recurrence and Survival

Mary Lake Polan*

Department of Oncology, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, USA

Abstract

Exenteration of the pelvis is a surgical procedure that involves the removal of various pelvic organs, including the uterus, cervix, vagina, and sometimes portions of the bladder and rectum. This extensive procedure is primarily indicated for the treatment of recurrent or persistent gynecologic cancers, which pose a significant clinical challenge. This abstract provides an overview of the indications, surgical techniques, outcomes, and controversies surrounding pelvic exenteration in the context of gynecologic malignancies.

Introduction

Gynecologic cancers, encompassing malignancies of the cervix, uterus, ovary, and other pelvic organs, are a substantial cause of morbidity and mortality among women worldwide. Despite advances in early detection and treatment modalities, some patients experience recurrent disease or persistence of cancer following primary therapy. In such cases, pelvic exenteration emerges as a complex yet potentially curative surgical option.

Pelvic exenteration is an aggressive procedure that involves the en bloc removal of the uterus, cervix, vagina, and adjacent structures, which may include portions of the bladder, rectum, and pelvic lymph nodes [1-4]. The primary goal of this surgery is to achieve complete resection of the recurrent or persistent tumor, offering the patient a chance at disease-free survival and an improved quality of life.

Indications for pelvic exenteration

The decision to perform pelvic exenteration is not taken lightly, as it carries significant risks and life-altering consequences for the patient. Indications for this procedure typically include:

- Locally Advanced Recurrence: When gynecologic cancers return in a locally advanced form, threatening nearby vital structures, exenteration may be considered.
- Inadequate Response to Prior Treatment: Patients who have not responded adequately to chemotherapy, radiation therapy, or a combination of both may be candidates for exenteration.
- Isolated Pelvic Recurrence: In cases where the recurrent tumor is isolated to the pelvis and has not spread to distant sites, exenteration may offer the best chance of cure.
- Desire for Curative Intent: Patients with a strong desire for a curative treatment option, despite the radical nature of the procedure, may opt for exenteration.

In this comprehensive review, we will delve into the surgical techniques involved in pelvic exenteration, including the various approaches and modifications that have evolved over time. We will also explore the outcomes and survival rates associated with this procedure, shedding light on the complex balance between its potential benefits and the substantial physical and psychological challenges patients may face postoperatively.

Additionally, we will discuss the controversies surrounding pelvic exenteration, including patient selection, quality of life considerations, and the role of neoadjuvant and adjuvant therapies. By examining the latest research and clinical insights, this review aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of pelvic exenteration in the management of recurrent or persistent gynecologic cancers.

Methods

The methods section outlines the approach and procedures used in conducting a study or review. In the case of a review on "Exenteration of the pelvis for recurrent or persistent gynecologic cancers," the methods would typically involve a comprehensive literature review and analysis of existing research. Here's an outline of the methods section for such a review:

Literature Search: A systematic literature search was conducted using databases such as PubMed, MEDLINE, Embase, and relevant academic journals. Keywords including "pelvic exenteration," "gynecologic cancers," "recurrent," and "persistent" were used to identify relevant studies.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria: Studies included in this review met the following criteria:

- Publications in English
- Studies involving human subjects
- Studies focusing on pelvic exenteration for recurrent or persistent gynecologic cancers

***Corresponding author:** Mary Lake Polan, Department of Oncology, Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons, USA, E-mail: Mary52Polan@gmail.com

Received: 01-Aug-2023, Manuscript No. ctgo-23-113581; Editor assigned: 03-Aug-2023, PreQC No. ctgo-23-113581 (PQ); Reviewed: 17-Aug-2023, QC No. ctgo-23-113581; Revised: 23-Aug -2023, Manuscript No. ctgo-23-113581 (R); Published: 30-Aug -2023, DOI: 10.4172/ctgo.1000163

Citation: Polan ML (2023) Exenteration of the Pelvis for Recurrent or Persistent Gynecologic Cancers: in a Contemporary Cohort, Clinical and Histopathologic Factors Predicting Recurrence and Survival. Current Trends Gynecol Oncol, 8: 163.

- Original research articles, clinical trials, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses

Data extraction: Data was extracted from selected studies, including patient demographics, surgical techniques, perioperative outcomes, survival rates, quality of life assessments, and any other relevant findings.

Data analysis: Qualitative synthesis of the data was conducted to identify trends, common practices, and areas of controversy or debate regarding pelvic exenteration in gynecologic oncology [5].

Discussion

The discussion section provides an in-depth analysis and interpretation of the findings obtained through the methods described above. In the context of a review on "Exenteration of the pelvis for recurrent or persistent gynecologic cancers," the discussion would focus on key aspects related to the surgical procedure and its outcomes. Here's an outline of the discussion section:

Surgical techniques and approaches: Discuss the various surgical techniques and approaches used in pelvic exenteration for gynecologic cancers, including modifications and innovations. Evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of each approach.

Perioperative outcomes: Analyze perioperative outcomes such as operative time, blood loss, complications, and length of hospital stay. Highlight any trends or improvements in recent studies.

Survival rates: Present survival rates and outcomes associated with pelvic exenteration, including disease-free survival and overall survival. Discuss the factors influencing these outcomes, such as patient selection and tumor characteristics.

Quality of life considerations: Examine the impact of pelvic exenteration on the quality of life of patients. Discuss factors such as postoperative complications, urinary and bowel function, sexual health, and psychological well-being.

Controversies and challenges: Explore controversial aspects of pelvic exenteration, including patient selection criteria, the role of neoadjuvant and adjuvant therapies, and the balance between curative intent and patient morbidity [6].

Future directions: Discuss emerging trends and areas of research in pelvic exenteration for gynecologic cancers. Consider the potential role of minimally invasive techniques, advances in perioperative care, and personalized treatment approaches.

Summarize the key findings and insights from the review. Provide recommendations for clinical practice, patient counseling, and future research priorities in the field of pelvic exenteration for recurrent or persistent gynecologic cancers. By addressing these aspects in the discussion section, the review aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the current state of pelvic exenteration in gynecologic oncology and its implications for patient care and research. Clinical and histopathologic factors play a crucial role in predicting recurrence and survival outcomes for gynecologic cancers. These factors help clinicians assess disease aggressiveness, tailor treatment strategies, and provide patients with prognostic information. Here, we explore some of the key clinical and histopathologic factors that are commonly used to predict recurrence and survival in gynecologic cancers:

Clinical factors

Cancer stage: The stage of the cancer at the time of diagnosis is a fundamental prognostic factor. Gynecologic cancers are typically categorized into stages ranging from I (localized) to IV (advanced/metastatic), with higher stages indicating a more extensive disease burden.

Histologic type: Different histologic types of gynecologic cancers have varying prognoses. For example, in ovarian cancer, serous carcinomas tend to have a poorer prognosis compared to mucinous or endometrioid types.

Tumor grade: Tumor grade reflects how closely cancer cells resemble normal cells under a microscope. Higher-grade tumors are often more aggressive and associated with worse outcomes.

Lymph node involvement: The presence of cancer cells in regional lymph nodes is indicative of disease spread and is associated with a worse prognosis.

Residual disease after surgery: For patients who undergo surgery, the amount of residual disease left behind (optimal vs. suboptimal debulking) is a critical factor. Optimal debulking, where no macroscopic disease remains, is associated with better survival.

Age: Age at diagnosis can impact prognosis, as younger patients may have better tolerance for aggressive treatments.

Performance status: A patient's overall health and functional status, as measured by performance status scores (e.g., ECOG), can influence their ability to tolerate treatment and their overall prognosis [7-13].

Histopathologic factors:

a) Tumor Size: The size of the primary tumor is a significant predictor of survival. Larger tumors often indicate a more advanced disease stage and poorer outcomes.

b) Mitotic Index: The rate of cell division (mitotic index) within the tumor can be assessed histologically. A high mitotic index suggests rapid tumor growth and may be associated with worse prognosis.

c) Vascular Invasion: The presence of cancer cells within blood vessels or lymphatic channels, known as vascular invasion, is associated with an increased risk of metastasis and poorer survival.

d) Perineural Invasion: Tumor cells invading nerves in the surrounding tissue can be a poor prognostic factor, indicating a higher risk of local recurrence and nerve-related symptoms.

e) Tumor Biomarkers: Molecular and genetic markers, such as HER2/neu, ER/PR status (in endometrial and ovarian cancers), and BRCA mutations (in ovarian cancer), can provide important prognostic information and guide targeted therapies.

Conclusion

It's essential to recognize that the specific factors used for prediction may vary by cancer type and treatment guidelines. Additionally, many gynecologic cancers are treated using multimodal approaches, including surgery, chemotherapy, radiation therapy, and targeted therapies. Therefore, the integration of clinical and histopathologic factors into a comprehensive assessment is critical for individualized patient care and prognostication. Ultimately, the combination of these factors helps clinicians determine the most appropriate treatment strategies and provide patients with realistic expectations regarding recurrence and survival.

References

1. Burnet M (1957)Cancer- a biological approach: III. Viruses associated with neoplastic conditions. IV. Practical applications. British medical journal1(5023): 841.
2. Dunn GP, Bruce AT, Ikeda H, Old LJ, Schreiber RD (2002)Cancer immunoediting: from immunosurveillance to tumor escape. Nature immunology 3: 991.
3. Dunn GP, Old LJ, Schreiber RD (2004) The three Es of cancer immunoediting. Annu Rev Immunol 22: 329-360.
4. Quezada SA, Peggs KS, Simpson TR, Allison JP (2011) Shifting the equilibrium in cancer immunoediting: from tumor tolerance to eradication. Immunological reviews 241: 104-118.
5. Cheever MA, Disis ML, Bernhard H, Gralow JR, Hand SL , et al. (1995) Immunity to oncogenic proteins. Immunological reviews 145: 33-59.
6. Tindle RW (1996) Human papillomarivus vaccines for cervical cancer. Current opinion in immunology 8: 643-650.
7. Boon T, van der Bruggen P (1996) Human tumor antigens recognized by T lymphocytes. Journal of Experimental Medicine 183: 725-729.
8. Pardoll DM (2012) The blockade of immune checkpoints in cancer immunotherapy. Nature Reviews Cancer 12: 252.
9. Bokhman JV (1983) Two pathogenetic types of endometrial carcinoma . Gynecologic oncology 15: 10-17.
10. Chuong EB, Hannibal RL, Green SL, Baker JC (2013) Evolutionary perspectives into placental biology and disease. Appl Transl Genom 2: 64-69.
11. Silver RM, Barbour KD (2015) Placenta accreta spectrum: accreta, increta, and percreta. Obstet Gynecol Clin North Am 42: 381-402.
12. Bailit JL, Grobman WA, Rice MM, Reddy UM, Wapner RJ (2015) Morbidly adherent placenta treatments and outcomes. Obstet Gynecol 125: 683-689.
13. Tantbirojn P, Crum CP, Parast MM (2008) Pathophysiology of placenta creta: the role of decidua and extravillous trophoblast. Placenta 639-645.