ID Design Press, Skopje, Republic of Macedonia Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences. 2019 Sep 30; 7(18):3090-3092. https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2019.828 eISSN: 1857-9655 Global Dermatology



New Trends in Cutaneous Melanoma Surgery

Jacopo Scala¹, Aleksandra Vojvodic², Petar Vojvodic³, Tatjana Vlaskovic-Jovicevic³, Zorica Peric-Hajzler⁴, Dusica Matovic⁴, Sanja Dimitrijevic⁵, Jovana Vojvodic³, Goran Sijan⁶, Nenad Stepic⁷, Uwe Wollina⁸, Michael Tirant¹, Nguyen Van Thuong⁹, Massimo Fioranelli^{10*}, Torello Lotti¹¹

¹University G. Marconi, Rome, Italy; ²Department of Dermatology and Venereology, Military Medical Academy, Belgrade, Serbia; ³Clinic for Psychiatric Disorders "Dr. Laza Lazarevic", Belgrade, Serbia; ⁴Military Medical Academy, Belgrade, Serbia; ⁵Department of Gynecology, Military Medical Academy, Belgrade, Serbia; ⁶Clinic for Plastic Surgery and Burns, Military Medical Academy, Belgrade, Serbia; ⁷Chief of Clinic for Plastic Surgery and Burns, Military Medical Academy, Belgrade, Serbia; ⁸Department of Dermatology and Allergology, Städtisches Klinikum Dresden, Dresden, Germany; ⁹Vietnam National Hospital of Dermatology and Venereology, Hanoi, Vietnam; ¹⁰Department of Nuclear Physics, Subnuclear and Radiation, G. Marconi University, Rome, Italy; ¹¹Department of Dermatology, University of G. Marconi, Rome, Italy

Abstract

Citation: Scala J, Vojvodic A, Vojvodic P, Vlaskovic-Jovicevic T, Peric-Hajzler Z, Matovic D, Dimitrijevic S, Vojvodic J, Sijan G, Stepic N, Wollina U, Tirant M, Thuong NV, Fioranelli M, Lotti T. New Trends in Cutaneous Melanma Surgery. Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2019 Sep 30: 7(18):3090-3092. https://doi.org/10.3889/camjms.2019.828

Keywords: Cutaneous; Melanoma; Surgery

*Correspondence: Massimo Fioranelli. Department of Nuclear Physics, Sub-nuclear and Radiation, G. Marconi University, Rome, Italy. E-mail: massimo.fioranelli@gmail.com

Received: 12-Jul-2019; Revised: 08-Aug-2019; Accepted: 09-Aug-2019; Online first: 14-Sep-2019

Copyright: © 2019 Jacopo Scala, Aleksandra Vojvodic, Petar Vojvodic, Tatjana Vlaskovic-Jovicevic, Zorica Perichajzler, Dusica Matovic, Sanja Dimitrjevic, Jovana Vojvodic, Goran Sijan, Nenad Stepic, Uwe Wollina, Michael Tirant, Nguyen Van Thuong, Massimo Fioranelli, Torello Lotti. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0) Funding: This research did not receive any financial

support

Competing Interests: The authors have declared that no competing interests exist

Introduction

Surgical removal was the mainstay of therapy in early melanoma, and historically there has been only a marginal role for surgery in managing patients with regional or distant metastases, even if some Authors suggested that metastasectomy could improve survival in stage IV melanoma if compared to therapy In present times non-surgical [1]. management of melanoma is rapidly evolving with the introduction of new systemic therapies, like BRAF inhibitors, MEK inhibitors and antibodies anti-PD-1 that show good results in controlling even advanced

The main surgical treatment for melanoma consists in wide surgical excision of the primary lesion and the sentinel node but in recent times management of melanoma is rapidly evolving with the introduction of new systemic therapies, like BRAF inhibitors, MEK inhibitors and antibodies anti-PD-1 that show good results in controlling even advanced stages of the disease. This review aims to present data for the optimal surgical management of patients with malignant melanoma.

stages of the disease [2], [3]. It's easy to forecast that new treatment algorithms will be developed to utilise all new drugs, but there's still much to debate about the role of surgical treatment in combination with the most recent discoveries in biological therapies.

Management of primary lesion

The main surgical treatment for invasive malignant melanoma consists of complete surgical

excision and removal and examination of the first draining lymph node possibly affected by metastatic disease. Surgical margins to be removed are based on the maximal melanoma Breslow thickness of the melanoma [4]. Usually, all suspicious pigmented lesions should be removed with a clear clinical margin of least 2mm but not exceeding 5 mm not to damage the lymphatic drainage to be assessed by a later SLNB. Usually, the excision should go through the skin and subcutaneous tissue and stop to the fascia/periosteum/ perichondrium, only for suspected melanoma in situ surgical excision could stop at the superficial subcutaneous tissue [5]. Partial biopsies are to be avoided mainly to not under stage the lesion.

For melanoma in situ, according to a late expert consensus statement, an excision margin of 5 mm is considered sufficient to have a radical treatment. However, more recent data recommends excisions up to 9 mm to obtain clear histological margins [5], [6]. There is no indication to widen surgical margins if histological free margins have already been achieved.

For invasive melanomas with less than 1 mm thickness, a 1 cm surgical margin is considered a sufficient margin according to three randomised control trials (RCTs) [7], [8], [9], [10]. For intermediate and thick melanomas, many RCTs comparing narrow (1 cm) and wide excision (up to 5 cm) have been published. A recent meta-analysis found no difference in overall survival (HR 1.09; 95% CI 0.98 – 1.22; p = 0.1) between patients treated with narrow or wide excision, nor in loco-regional recurrence (HR 1.10; 95% CI 0.96 – 1.26; p = 0.2). However, in a subgroup analysis including four trials only, reporting on melanoma-specific survival wide excision was favored HR 1.17 (95% CI 1.03 – 1.34; p = 0.02) [11], [12], [13].

Surgical excision can in almost every case be performed under local anaesthesia and local flaps should be performed to cover after wide excision only if the surgeon is confident that histologically free margins have been achieved.

Sentinel lymph node biopsy and Complete lymph node dissection

Sentinel node biopsy (SLNB) is the surgical procedure where the sentinel lymph node is identified and then removed using a radioactive tracer or a biological pigment and could be made even in small hospitals not needing advanced technological resources. SLNB became popular in the 1990s because it was supposed that with lymph node metastases a block dissection of their nodes would have improved survival but the two most important long-term prospective randomised trials of SLNB (MSLT1 and MSLT2) showed that SLNB and subsequent completion lymphadenectomy does not improve 10-year melanoma-specific survival [14], [15] nevertheless the treatment is still offered because it can detect occult disease and improve staging and prognosis [16]. The complication rate associated with SLNB is approximately 10% [14]. SNB has a false negative rate of approximately 10 - 20% [17] A positive SN has been found in approximately 5% of melanomas \leq 1 mm thickness and in approximately 14 - 20% in intermediate-thickness melanomas [18], [19], [20] thus SLNB may be considered for patients with melanomas with a thickness from 0.8 to 1.0 mm or less than 0.8 mm thickness with ulceration, classified as T1b lesion, or for intermediate-thickness melanomas as reported in AJCC 8th edition [18]. For melanomas > 4 mm thickness, SLNB could be proposed only for staging because for potential disease control its therapeutic benefit is perhaps more limited. In certain cases of very thick melanomas, imaging could archive an appropriate staging, and thus surgery could be avoided [21].

Complete lymph node dissection (CLND) was considered a cornerstone in the management of melanoma patients with a positive SLNB both to prevent the melanoma from spreading and to attain accurate staging [22]. Two RCTs have been published: DeCOG and MSLT-2 comparing the CLND with observation after positive SNB. Even if DeCOG was stopped prematurely and the study finished underpowered, it didn't find any differences in survival. The MSLT-2 meta-analysis compared immediate CLND with observation / delayed CLND and also showed no survival benefit from CLND. However, melanoma-specific survival was higher after immediate CLND compared with delayed CLND in patients with nodal metastasis (HR = 0.63, 95% CI = 0.35 - 0.74, p = 0.0004) [15], [23].

Review studies reported a complication rate after CLND variable between 24%-37% and a worse quality of life after CLND compared with SNB only so appears to be important to avoid completion lymphadenectomy to prevent unnecessary complications [15], [24], [25].

Conclusions

Survival for patients with invasive melanoma still depends mostly on early diagnosis and surgery maintain his undisputed therapeutic role in small and intermediate lesions.

The role of surgery remains to be determined with advanced lesions and lymph nodal metastasis because is unclear if there is a benefit with node dissection compared with observation in combination with adjuvant treatment such as BRAF / MEK inhibition or PD-1 inhibition. Treatment for invasive melanoma confirms to be a complex and multidisciplinary task that require oncologists and surgeons cooperation to guide treatment decisions.

References

1. Wasif N, Bagaria SP, Ray P, Morton DL. Does metastasectomy improve survival in patients with Stage IV melanoma? A cancer registry analysis of outcomes. J Surg Oncol. 2011; 104(2):111-115. https://doi.org/10.1002/jso.21903 PMid:21381040 PMCid:PMC3199373

2. Tchernev G, Chokoeva AA, Wollina U, Lotti T. De novo congenital malignant melanoma: whats new in diagnosis and treatment? Dermatol Ther. 2016; 29(1):13-4. https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.12279 PMid:26279460

3. França K, Lotti T. Stress coping strategies for the optimal treatment of melanoma. Dermatol Ther. 2017; 30(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.12421 PMid:27592687

4. Breslow A. Thickness, cross-sectional areas and depth of invasion in the prognosis of cutaneous melanoma. Ann Surg. 1970; 172(5): 902-8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1097/00000658-197011000-00017</u> PMid:5477666 PMCid:PMC1397358

5. Kunishige JH, Brodland DG, Zitelli JA. Margins for standard excision of melanoma in situ. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2013; 69(1):164. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2013.01.040</u> PMid:23768291

6. Sober AJ. Diagnosis and management of early melanoma: a con- sensus view. Semin Surg Oncol. 1993; 9(3):194-7.

7. Managing melanoma. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2018.

8. Malignt Melanom. Swedish National Treament Guidelines. Regional Cancer Centrum, 2017.

9. Work G, Swetter SM, Tsao H, Bichakjian CK, Curiel-Lewandrowski C, Elder DE, et al. Guidelines of care for the management of primary cutaneous melanoma. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2018.

10. Sladden MJ, Balch C, Barzilai DA, Berg DA, Freiman A, Handiside T, et al. Surgical excision margins for primary cutaneous melanoma. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2009; (4):CD004835. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD004835.pub2</u> PMid:19821334

11. Wheatley K, Wilson JS, Gaunt P, Marsden JR. Surgical excision margins in primary cutaneous melanoma: a meta-analysis and Bayesian probability evaluation. Cancer Treat Rev. 2016; 42:73- 81. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctrv.2015.10.013</u> PMid:26563920

12. Balch CM, Soong SJ, Smith T, Ross MI, Urist MM, Karakousis CP, et al. Long-term results of a prospective surgical trial comparing 2 cm vs. 4 cm excision margins for 740 patients with 1-4 mm melanomas. Ann Surg Oncol. 2001; 8(2):101-8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10434-001-0101-x PMid:11258773

13. Hayes AJ, Maynard L, Coombes G, Newton-Bishop J, Timmons M, Cook M, et al. Wide versus narrow excision margins for high- risk, primary cutaneous melanomas: long-term follow-up of surviv- al in a randomized trial. Lancet Oncol. 2016; 17(2):184-92. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00482-9</u>

14. Morton DL, Thompson JF, Cochran AJ, et al. Final trial report

of sentinel-node biopsy versus nodal observation in melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2014; 370(7):599-609. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1310460 PMid:24521106 PMCid:PMC4058881

15. Faries MB, Thompson JF, Cochran AJ, et al. Completion dissection or observation for sentinel-node metastasis in melanoma. N Engl J Med. 2017; 376(23):2211-22. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1613210 PMid:28591523 PMCid:PMC5548388

16. Leiter U, Stadler R, Mauch C, Hohenberger W, Brockmeyer N, Berking C, German Dermatologic Cooperative Oncology Group (DeCOG), et al. Complete lymph node dissection versus no dissection in patients with sentinel lymph node biopsy positive melanoma (DeCOG-SLT): a multi-centre, randomised, phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2016; 17(6):757e67. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(16)00141-8

17. Lee DY, Huynh KT, Teng A, Lau BJ, Vitug S, Lee JH, et al. Predictors and survival impact of false-negative sentinel nodes in melanoma. Ann Surg Oncol. 2016; 23(3):1012-8. https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-015-4912-6 PMid:26586498 PMCid:PMC4984404

18. Wong SL, Faries MB, Kennedy EB, Agarwala SS, Akhurst TJ, Ariyan C, et al. Sentinel lymph node biopsy and management of regional lymph nodes in melanoma: American Society of Clinical Oncology and Society of Surgical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline Update. J Clin Oncol. 2018; 36(4):399-413. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.75.7724 PMid:29232171

19. Bartlett EK, Peters MG, Blair A, Etherington MS, Elder DE, Xu XG, et al. Identification of patients with intermediate thickness melanoma at low risk for sentinel lymph node positivity. Ann Surg Oncol. 2016; 23(1):250-6. <u>https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-015-4766-y</u> PMid:26215202 PMCid:PMC4697873

20. Han D, Zager JS, Shyr Y, Chen H, Berry LD, Iyengar S, et al. Clinicopathologic predictors of sentinel lymph node metastasis in thin melanoma. J Clin Oncol. 2013; 31(35):4387-93. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2013.50.1114 PMid:24190111

21. Forschner A, Olthof SC, Guckel B, Martus P, Vach W, Ia Fougere C, et al. Impact of (18)F-FDG-PET/CT on surgical management in patients with advanced melanoma: an outcome based analysis. Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging. 2017; 44(8):1312-8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00259-017-3674-8 PMid:28315947

22. Fioranelli M, Roccia MG, Pastore C, Aracena CJ, Lotti T. Completion dissection or observation for sentinel-node metastasis in melanoma. Dermatol Ther. 2017; 30(6). https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.12544 PMid:28836714

23. Delgado AF, Delgado AF. Complete lymph node dissection in melanoma: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Anticancer Res. 2017; 37(12):6825-9.

https://doi.org/10.21873/anticanres.12143

24. Moody JA, Botham SJ, Dahill KE, Wallace DL, Hardwicke JT. Complications following completion lymphadenectomy versus therapeutic lymphadenectomy for melanoma - a systematic review of the literature. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2017; 43(9):1760-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejso.2017.07.003 PMid:28756017

25. de Vries M, Hoekstra HJ, Hoekstra-Weebers JE. Quality of life after axillary or groin sentinel lymph node biopsy, with or without completion lymph node dissection, in patients with cutaneous melanoma. Ann Surg Oncol. 2009; 16(10):2840-7. https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-009-0602-6 PMid:19639366 PMCid:PMC2749179