

# Editorial Comment from Dr Izumi to Clinicopathological features and outcomes in patients with late recurrence of renal cell carcinoma after radical surgery

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 著者                              | Izumi Kouji   |
| journal or<br>publication title | International Journal of Urology  |
| volume                          | 23  |
| number                          | 2   |
| page range                      | 138-139   |
| year                            | 2016-02-01  |
| URL                             | <a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2297/43900">http://hdl.handle.net/2297/43900</a> |

doi: 10.1111/iju.13011

**Editorial comment to Clinicopathological features and outcomes in patients with late recurrence of renal cell carcinoma after radical surgery**

\*Kouji Izumi

\*Department of Integrative Cancer Therapy and Urology, Kanazawa University Graduate School of Medical Science, Kanazawa, Japan

**Corresponding Author:** \*Kouji Izumi, MD, PhD. Department of Integrative Cancer Therapy and Urology, Kanazawa University Graduate School of Medical Science, 13-1 Takara-machi, Kanazawa, Ishikawa 920-8641, Japan.

Telephone: +81-76-265-2393; Fax: +81-76-222-6726

E-mail: [azuizu2003@yahoo.co.jp](mailto:azuizu2003@yahoo.co.jp)

Word Count: 471

Renal cell carcinoma (RCC) has some unique characteristics that are not observed in other cancers, such as a relatively high frequency of late recurrence (LR) after radical surgery.<sup>1</sup> In a study by Kobayashi et al.,<sup>2</sup> the Kaplan–Meier curves of overall survival (OS), disease-specific survival (DSS), and recurrence-free survival went linearly down for 15 years after radical surgery and did not plateau. Although some clinicopathological features of LR in RCC have been revealed in recent studies, their cause remains unclear.

LR is usually defined as recurrence more than 5 years after radical surgery. To characterize the clinical outcomes of all patients treated with radical surgery, it is reasonable to compare patients with LR to not only patients with early recurrence (ER; within 5 years after radical surgery) but also those without recurrence. A large study by Kroger et al.<sup>3</sup> including 1,210 patients reported that compared with patients with ER, patients with LR were younger and showed fewer sarcomatoid features, more clear cell histology, and lower Fuhrman grade. The latest study on Japanese patients by Fujii et al.<sup>4</sup> revealed the following parameters to be independent predictive factors of ER: positive symptoms at diagnosis,  $\geq$ pT2, positive lymphovascular invasion, and histological grade 3; these results were similar to those of Kobayashi et al.<sup>2</sup> However, both Kroger et al.<sup>3</sup> and Fujii et al.<sup>4</sup> did not include patients without recurrence after 5 years of radical surgery. It might be difficult to compare patients with LR to those without recurrence because the latter have the potential to relapse any time. Kobayashi et al.<sup>2</sup> reported that vascular invasion alone was the predictor of LR in multivariate analysis of patients who remained free of recurrence at 5 years after radical surgery. This result might be clinically significant with regard to follow-up schedule of such patients. Kaplan–Meier curves of OS and DSS in patients with LR further went linearly

down by at least 5 years after recurrence. Moreover, non-recurrence may contribute to the extension of survival. To appropriately treat recurrence, it should be detected as early as possible, and clinicians can shorten the follow-up interval of patients with vascular invasion.

Regardless of the study backgrounds, a common result of comparison between ER and LR was that patients with LR had a much better survival after recurrence. Bozkurt et al.<sup>5</sup> reported that patients with LR had a better response to sunitinib than did those with ER. Although slow growth may be a characteristic of LR, it is still unclear whether there are differences in responses to treatments such as molecular targeted therapies, cytokine therapies, and metastasectomy between ER and LR. Further larger studies are warranted to clarify the difference of response to treatments between ER and LR and the best follow-up schedule to appropriately identify recurrence in patients with RCC during a long follow-up time.

#### **Conflict of interest**

None declared

## References

1. Oya M. Renal cell carcinoma: biological features and rationale for molecular-targeted therapy. *Keio J Med* 2009; **58**: 1-11.
2. Kobayashi K, Kitamura Y, Bilim V *et al.* Clinicopathological features and outcomes in patients with late recurrence of renal cell carcinoma after radical surgery. *Int J Urol* 2015 In press (this article)
3. Kroeger N, Choueiri TK, Lee JL *et al.* Survival outcome and treatment response of patients with late relapse from renal cell carcinoma in the era of targeted therapy. *Eur Urol* 2014; **65**: 1086-92.
4. Fujii Y, Ikeda M, Kurosawa K *et al.* Different clinicopathological features between patients who developed early and late recurrence following surgery for renal cell carcinoma. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2015; **20**: 802-7.
5. Bozkurt O, Hacibekiroglu I, Kaplan MA *et al.* Is late recurrence a predictive clinical marker for better sunitinib response in metastatic renal cell carcinoma patients? *Clin Genitourin Cancer* 2015 Aug 3. pii: S1558-7673(15)00178-0. doi: 10.1016/j.clgc.2015.07.005. [Epub ahead of print]