medicinska revija

medical review



UDK: 616.61-006.6-089.87

COBISS.SR-ID 220641548

Marić P. et al. ■ MD-Medical Data 2015;7(4): 291-294

Aktuelne teme/ Current topics

PARTIAL AND RADICAL NEPHRECTOMY IN PATIENTS WITH RENAL CELL CARCINOMA

PARCIJALNA I RADIKALNA NEFREKTOMIJA U BOLESNIKA SA KARCINOMOM BUBREGA

Correspondence to:

Dr Predrag Marić

Klinika za urologiju VMA Crnotravska 17, 11000 Beograd Tel 064 1869602 maricpredrag8@gmail.com Predrag Marić¹, Branko Košević¹, Dušica Stamenković²

- ¹ Department of urology, Military Medical Academy, Belgrade, Serbia
- ² Department of anesthesiology and intensive care, Military Medical Academy, Belgrade, Serbia

Abstract

Renal cell carcinoma is one of the more frequently represented malignancies. It is the third most frequent urological cancer with participation of 2-3% of all adult malignancies. In addition to hereditary diseases its appearance is often associated with smoking. Lately clinical presentation is of little importance for its diagnosis which is usually accidental during routine ultrasound examinations. The major role in confirming the diagnosis, making treatment decisions or the type of surgical techniques has the multi slice CT scan. In advanced renal carcinomas the patient prognosis without treatment is poor. Considering treatment modalities, surgery is the most effective method of treatment. Depending on the size and location of the tumor, partial or radical nephrectomy is performed. For decades, radical nephrectomy presented the standard surgical treatment option for treatment of localized renal carcinoma. However in the last decade for treatment of localized renal cell carcinoma, partial nephrectomy is more practiced, as well as laparoscopic and minimal invasive surgical techniques which offer the same oncological results as radical nephrectomy but with decreased morbidity. Approximately 20-30% of patients present with metastasis at the time the diagnosis of renal carcinoma is first made. In the remaining two thirds, 20-30 % develop metastasis after surgical treatment. Metastasis are the main cause of death in these patients. Of all diagnosed patients with renal carcinoma 30-40% die of this illness.

Key words

renal cell carcinoma, partial nephrectomy, radical nephrectomy, metastasis, survival

Ključne reči

karcinom bubrega, parcijalna nefrektomija, radikalna nefrektomija, metastaze, preživljavanje

FREQUENCY AND MORTALITY

Renal cell carcinoma (RCC) is the third most frequent urological cancer with participation of 2-3% of all adult malignancies ^(1,2). Worldwide 270 000 new cases are diagnosed and around 116 000 patients die every year from RCC ⁽³⁾. The incidence of RCC correlates with age with the highest incidence in the sixth and seventh decade. Approximately 80% of patients are between 40 and 69 years of age. Mortality rates in RCC are in constant decrease in the last 10 years. In the period 1990-1994 4.8 /100 000 patients died, but in the period 2000-2004 4, 1 patients/100 000 died of RCC (4,5). The explanation for this decrease in mortality rates probably lies in the early and more frequent incidental diagnosis of small RCC. Thus the overall five year survival rate increases. RCC is more common in males, with the male - to – female ratio of 2:1 ^(5,6).

Aetiology and pathogenesis

Smoking is a major risk factor for development of RCC. The risk for developing this tumor is increased for 54% in male and 22% in female smokers. There is also a proven direct dose-risk relationship for development of RCC in smokers. Numerous studies have shown an increased risk for RCC in obese patients and in special dietary habits ⁽⁶⁻⁸⁾.

There are a few hereditary illnesses as von Hippel-Lindau (VHL), hereditary papillary RCC, hereditary leiomyomatosis and RCC, Birt-Hogg-Dube syndrome, Tuberous sclerosis, translocation of chromosome 3, associated with RCC and with identified genetic and epigenetic mutations

Different histological types have different prognosis. The most common, and also the most aggressive type is clear cell RCC. It appears in 70-80% of all RCC with the

highest rate of local invasion, metastasis and mortality. Papillary RCC is the second most frequent (15%), followed by chromophobe (5%) and carcinoma of the collecting ducts (1%) (10-12).

More than 30% of patients have metastatic disease at the time the diagnosis of renal carcinoma is first made, and 30% of patients with localized renal carcinoma develop metastasis after surgical treatment (13).

Diagnosis

Many of the patients with RCC are asymptomatic and classic triad of pain, hematuria and flank mass is very rare. So that in more than 50% of patients with renal tumors the diagnosis is accidental during radiological examinations of the abdomen for various diagnostic reasons. The most commonly used diagnostic methods are ultrasound and computed thomography (14-17).

Treatment

Surgical resection is the standard option for treatment of localized renal carcinoma. For decades *radical nephrectomy* (RN) presented the first choice of surgical treatment option of localized renal carcinoma. RN generally implies the excision of Gerota's fascia and its contents (kidney, fat tissue and adrenal gland) and includes extensive lymphadenectomy from the diaphragm to the bifurcation of the aorta (18,19).

However in the last decade for treatment of localized renal cell carcinoma (RCC), partial nephrectomy (PN) is more often practiced, including laparoscopy, due to its minimal invasive surgical techniques offering the same oncological results as RN but with decreased morbidity (20).

Partial nephrectomy (PN) implies the excision of the tumor with a part of surrounding normal renal parenchyma. Initially PN was performed in absolute indications, i.e. in anatomical and functional solitary kidneys. Relative indications are renal tumors in patients who have co morbidities that can compromise present and future renal function (diabetes, hypertension, calculosis, chronic pyelonephritis and renal artery stenosis of the contra lateral kidney). Because of good oncological outcomes and results following PN in absolute indications, as well as in widespread use of ultrasound and accidental detection of low stage and grade tumors, indications for PN are rapidly expanded and include patients with a normal contra lateral kidney (21-24).

PN nephrectomy has overtaken the lead in the treatment of renal tumors up to 4 cm (Tla stage), in selected patients with tumors from 4-7 cm (stage Tlb) and is equally reliable as RN. So far there isn't a adopted unique and definite approach considering the role of PN in treatment of tumors 4-7 cm when there are no absolute indications for this type of surgery. The majority of referent studies provide data that from the oncological point of view considering "cancer free survival" PN is equally reliable as RN (25-31).

Partial nephrectomy can preserve more renal function and reduce the risk of development of chronic kidney disease compared with RN. Excellent cancer control and a low local recurrence rate can still be achieved with PN for T1 tumours (32).

Processing 6042 patients with renal tumors during 2012 in Great Britain, 1768 where stage T1, respectively with tumors up to 7 cm. Of this number in stage T1a 55, 6%

patients were treated by PN whereas 18.9% of patients in stage T1b were treated by conservative surgery. Results obtained showed that conservative surgery was mostly used in small tumors up to 4cm, whereas in tumors from 4-7cm in more than 80 % of cases RN was the method of choice ⁽³³⁾. This study shows the reality and preference of the surgeon to RN in larger tumors, either due to their localization or fear of possible complications or local recurrence.

Van Poppel et al. in the EORTC study in over 500 patients with renal tumors stage T1a and T1b up to 5cm and normal contra lateral kidney showed that both methods have outstanding oncological results. Respectively PN from the oncological point of view is as effective as RN. They also note that the trend favored RN for treating larger tumors is now obsolete (34).

Also, if one takes out as criteria quality of life, renal function and overall survival, most authors agree that PN has an significant advantage over RN (35-37).

Locally advanced tumors invade renal veins, vena cava, peripelvic and perirenal fat tissue, adrenal gland or extending out of the Gerota fascia ⁽³⁸⁾.

There is no doubt that treatment of choice for locally advanced RCC is surgery because of significantly incerased cancer-specific survival ⁽³⁹⁾. Despite RN, there is a significant risk of reccurence and progression compared to localized RCC. The overall ten- year survival rate for these patients is about 12-36% ⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Approximately 40-50% of patients present or develop metastasis. Untreated patients with disseminated disease have an average survival time less than 12 months, with a five- year survival of less than 10%.⁽⁴¹⁾ If metastasis are confined to one organ or can be surgically removed, surgical resection is the standard treatment option ⁽⁴²⁾. The discovery of specific genetic alterations has lead to development of new drugs that block some of the paths responsible for progression of RCC, primarily vascular endothelial growth factor or mammalian target of rapamycin. In such patients, the average specific tumor survival of several years can be doubled. However, the treatment with these novel drugs is still palliative and very expensive ^(43,44).

CONCLUSION

Renal cell carcinoma participates to 2-3% of all adult malignancies. It is usually asymptomatic and often accidentally discovered during radiological procedures for other reasons. For diagnosis, to determine the extent of the disease as well as the optimal treatment, multi-slice CT scan has a significant role. Surgical resection is a standard treatment option. Sparing surgery in the last decade takes precedence in treating patients with tumors up to 4 cm and in selected patients with tumors 4-7 cm and larger. Metastasis is the main cause of death in patients with RCC. They are present in one third of patients at the time of diagnosis, and in 20-30% of the others develop postoperatively. Survival depends on the severity of the illness at the time of diagnosis and of co morbidities. Unlike the patients with localized tumor whose prognosis is good, treatment of patients with invasive and metastatic disease is still inadequate. The prognosis of these patients is poor with a small survival rate.

Sažetak

Karcinom bubrega spada u češće zastupljene malignitete. On je je treći najčešći urološki kancer. Sa učešćem od 2-3% svih malignih tumora kod odraslih, zauzima trinaesto mesto. Pored hereditarnih oboljenja, njegova pojava se često vezuje za pušenje. U poslednje vreme klinička slika je od malog značaja za njegovo otkrivanje. Dijagnoza se postavlja najčešće slučajno i to pri rutinskim ultrazvučnim pregledima. Za potvrđivanje dijagnoze i donošenju odluke o načinu lečenja, odnosno o vrsti operativne tehnike značajnu ulogu ima multislajsni skener. Kod uznapredovalih slučajeva, prognoza bolesnika bez terapije je infaustna. U terapijskom pogledu, metoda izbora je hirurški zahvat. U zavisnosti od veličine i lokalizacije tumora, vrše se poštedne(parcijalne) ili totalne(radikalne) nefrektomije. Decenijama unazad radikalna nefrektomija je predstavljala operaciju izbora za lečenje organ-ograničenog karcinoma bubrega. Međutim, u poslednjoj deceniji u lečenju lokalizovanog karcinoma bubrežnih ćelija najčešće se koristi parcijalna nefrektomija, kao i laparoskoske i minimalno invazivne hirurške tehnike koje nude iste onkološke rezultate kao i radikalna nefrektomija, ali uz manji morbiditet. Najčešća komplikacija oboljenja su metastaze. One se verifikuju kod 20-30% bolesnika na prvom pregledu, a kod ostale dve trećine takođe 20-30 % bolesnika razvije metastaze nakon operativnog lečenja. Metastaze su i glavni uzrok smrtnog ishoda. Od svih dijagnostikovanih bolesnika sa karcinom bubrega oko 30-40% umire od ove bolesti.

REFERENCES

- 1. Lipovorth L, Tarone RE, Lund L, McLaughlin JK. Epidemiologic characteristic and risk factors for renal cell cancer. Clin Epidemiol 2009;1:33-43
- 2. Kovacs G, Akhtar M, Beckwith BJ, et al. The Heidelberg calassification of renal cell tumors. J Pathol 1997;183:131-3.
- 3. Ferlay J, Shin HR, Bray F, Forman D, Mathers C, Parkin DM. Estimates of worldwide burden of cancer in 2008:GLOBOCAN 2008. Int J Cancer 2008;127:2893-917.
- 4. Pascual D, Borque A. Epidemiology of kidney cancer . Adv Urol 2008;782381
- 5. King SC, Pollack LA, Li J, King JB, Master VA. Continued increase in incidence of renal cell carcinoma, especially in young patients and high grade disease: United States 2001 to 2010. J Urol 2014; 191: 1665-70.
- 6. Lungberg BC, Campabell SC, Choi HY, et al. Ethiology and epidemiology. In: Kirkali Z,Mulders P,editors. Kidney cancer. Paris, France: International Consultation on Urological Diseases-European Association of Urology; 2011.
- 7. Chow WH, Linehan WM, Devesa SS. Re: Rising incidence of small renal masses: a need to reasses treatment effect. J Natl Cancer Inst 2007;99:569-70
- 8. Leiba A, Kark JD, Afek A, Derazne E, Barchana M, Tzur D, et al. Adolescent obesity and paternal country of origin predict renal cell carcinoma: a cohort study of 1.1 million 16 to 19-year-old males. J Urol 2013, 189: 25–9.
- 9. Verine J, Pluvinage A, Bousquet G, et al. Hereditary renal cell cancer syndromes: an update of a systematic review. Eur Urol 2010;58:701-10.
- Atkins MB, Bukowski RM, Escudier BJ, Figlin RA, Hudes GH, Kaelin WG JR et al. Innovations and challenges in renal cancer:sum-

- mary statement from the Third Cambridge Conference. Cancer 2009;115:2247-2251.
- 11. Amin MB, Tamboli P, Javidan J, et al. Prognostic impact of histologic subtyping of adult renal epithelial neoplasms: an expirience of 405 cases. Am J Surg Pathol 2002;26:281-91.
- 12. Moch H, Gasser T, Amin MB, Torhorst J, Sauter G, Mihatsch MJ. Prognostic utility of the recently recommended histologic classification and revised TNM staging system of renal cell carcinoma: a Swiss experience with 588 tumors. Cancer 2000;89:604-14.
- 13. Gupta K, Miller JD, Li JZ, Russell MW, Charbonneau C. Epidemiologic and socioeconomic burden of metastatic renal cell carcinoma(mRCC): a literature review. Cancer Treat Rev 2008;34:193-205.
- 14. Dyer R, Disantis DJ, McClennan BL. Simplified imaging approuch for evaulation of the solid renal mass in adults. Radiology 2008;247:331-43.
- 15. Hock LM, Lynch J, Balaji KC. Increasing incidence of all stages of kidney cancer in the last 2 decades in the United States: an analysis of the Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results Program data. J Urol 2002;167:57-60.
- 16. Dushene DA, Lotan Y, Cadeddu JA, Sagalowsky AI, Koeneman KS. Histopatology of surgically managed renal tumors: analysis of a contemporary series. Urology 2003;62:827-30
- 17. Jemal A,Siegel R, Xu J, Ward E. Cancer statistic.2010. CA Cancer J Clin 2010;60:277-300.
- 18. Robson CJ. Radical nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma . J Urol 1963;89:37-41.
- 19. Ljunberg B, Almdari FI, Holmberg G, Granfors T, Duchek M. Radical nephrectomy is stil preferable in the treatment of localized renal cell carcinoma. Eur Urol 1998;33:79-85.
- 20. Weinberg AC , $\,$ Woldu SL , Wen T , Deibert CM , $\,$ Korets R, $\,$ Badani KK.

- Utilization and perioperative complications of laparoscopic cryoablation vs. robotic partial nephrectomy for localized renal tumors Int Braz J urol 2015;41: 473-485,
- 21. Lau WK, Blute ML, Weaver AL, Torres VE, Zincke H. Matched comparison of radical nephrectomy vs nephron- sparing surgery in patients with unilateral renal cell carcinoma and a normal contralateral kidney. Mayo Clin Proc. 2000;75:1236-42.
- 22. Butler BP, Novick AC, Miller DP, Campbel SA, Licht MR. Managment of small unilateral renal cell carcinomas: radical versus nephron-sparing surgery. Urology 1995;45:34-40.
- 23. Patard JJ, Shvarts O, Lam JS, et al. Safety and efficacy of partial nephrectomy for T1 tumours based on an international multicenter experience. Urol 2004;171(6pt1):2181-5.
- 24. Weight CJ, Larson BT, Gao T, et al. Elective partial nephrectomy in patients with clinical T1b renal tumors is associated with improved overall survival. Urology. 2010;76:631-7.
- 25. Crepel M, Jeldres C, Sun M et al. A population-based comparison of cancer-control rates between radical and partial nephrectomy for T1a renal cell carcinoma. Urology 2010;76: 883-8.
- 26. Becker F, Siemer S, Humke U, Hack M, Ziegler M, Stockle M. Elective nephron sparing surgery should become standard treatment for small unilateral renal cell carcinoma: Long-term survival data of 216 patients. Eur Urol.2006;49:308-13.
- 27. Huang WC, Levey AS, Serio AM, et al. Chronic kidney disease after nephrectomy in patines with renal cortical tumours: retro spective cohort study. Lancet Oncol. 2006;7:735.
- 28. Thompson RH, Boorjian SA, Lohse CM, et al. Radical nephrectomy for pT1a renal masses may be associated with decreased overall survival compared with partial nephrectomy. J Urol.2008;179:468.

- 29. Dash A, Vickers AJ, Schachter LR, et al. Comparison of outcomes in elective partial vs radical nephrectomy of clear cell renal cell carcinoma of 4-7 cm. BJU Int. 2006; 97:939.
- 30. Mitchell RE, Gilbert SM, MurphyAM, et al. Partial nephrectomy and radical nephrectomy offer similar cancer outcomes in renal cortical tumors 4 centimetres or larger. Urology. 2006:67:260.
- 31. Leibovich BC, Blute ML, Cheville JC, et al. Nephron sparing surgery for appropriately selected renal cell carcinoma between 4 and 7 cm results in outcome similar to radical nephrectomy. J Urol. 2004;171:1066.
- 32. Lai TC, Ma WK, Yiu MK. Partial nephrectomy for T1 renal cancer can achieve an equivalent oncological outcome to radical nephrectomy with better renal preservation: the way to go. Hong Kong Med J 2015;21:Epub 23 Oct 2015
- 33. Hadjipavlou M, Khan F, Fowler S, Joyce A, Keeley FX, Sriprasad S; BAUS Sections of Endourology and Oncology. Partial vs radical nephrectomy for T1 renal tumours: an analysis from the British Association of Urological Surgeons Nephrectomy Audit. BJU Int. 2015 Mar 6.
- 34. Van Poppel H, Da Pozzo L, Albrecht W, et al. A prospective randomized EORTC intergroup phase 3 study comparing oncologic outcome of elective nephron sparing surgery and radical nephrectomy for low stage renal cell carcinoma. Eur Urol. 2011; 59:543-52.

- 35. Sun M, Trinh QD, Bianchi M, Hansen J, Hanna N, Abdollah F, Shariat SF, Briganti A, Montorsi F, Perrotte P, Karakiewicz PI. A non-cancer-related survival benefit is associated with partial nephrectomy. Eur Urol. 2012;61:725-31.
- 36. MacLennan S, Imamura M, Lapitan MC, Omar MI, Lam TB, Hilvano-Cabungcal AM, Royle P, et al; UCAN Systematic Review Reference Group; EAU Renal Cancer Guideline Panel. Systematic review of perioperative and quality-of-life outcomes following surgical management of localised renal cancer. Eur Urol. 2012;62:1097-117.
- 37. Jang HA, Kim JW, Byun SS, Hong SH, Kim YJ, Park H, Yang KS, Cho S, Cheon J,Kang SH. Oncologic and Functional Outcomes after Partial Nephrectomy Versus Radical Nephrectomy in T1b Renal Cell Carcinoma: A Multicenter, Matched Case-Control Study in Korean Patients. Cancer Research and Treatment: Official Journal of Korean Cancer Association 2015; crt.2014.122.
- 38. Ficcara V, Novara G, Iafrate M, et al. Proposal for reclassification of the TNM stading system in patients with locally advanced (pT3-4) renal cell carcinoma according to the cancer-related outcome. Eur Urol 2007;51:722-31.
- 39. Zini L, Perrotte P, Jeldres C, et al. Nephrectomy improves the survival of patients with locally advanced renal cell carcinoma .BJU Int 2008;102:1610-4.

- 40. Kim SP, Alt AL, Veight C J, et al. Indipendent validation of the 2010 American Joint Committee of Cancer TNM clasification for renal cell carcinoma :result from a large, single institution cohort. J, Urol 2011;185:2035-9.
- 41. Amato RJ. Chemoterapy for renal cell carcinoma. Semin Oncol 2000;27:177-86.
- 42. Kwak C, Park YH, Jeong CW, Lee SE, Ku JH. Metastasectomy without systemic therapy in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: comparison with conserative treatment. Urol Int 2007;79:145-51.
- 43. Harshman LC, Kroeger N, Rha SY, Donskov F,et al. First-line Mammalian target of rapamycin inhibition in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: an analysis of practice patterns from the International Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma Database Consortium.Clin Genitourin Cancer. 2014;12:335-40.
- 44. Hutson TE, Escudier B, Esteban E, Bjarnason GA,et al. Randomized phase III trial of temsirolimus versus sorafenib as second-line therapy after sunitinib in patients withmetastatic renal cell carcinoma. J Clin Oncol. 2014;32:760-7.