Abstract. Mucosal melanoma (MM) is a highly lethal variant of melanoma that carries a poor prognosis. Extremely low incidence and survival rates have led to few clinical trials, and a lack of protocols and guidelines. The present study performed a survival meta-analysis for the quantitative synthesis of available evidence to search for key patterns that would help clinicians tailor optimal therapeutic strategies in MM. PubMed, EMBASE, Cochrane, MEDLINE, Google Scholar and other databases were searched. Hazard ratios, in disease-specific and overall survival, were calculated for each of the survival-determining variables. MM was 2.25 times more lethal than cutaneous melanoma (CM). The most significant threats to survival were advanced Tumor-Node-Metastasis stage, sino-nasal location, and old age. Chemotherapy was the most effective form of adjuvant therapy. Disease-specific survival, the primary measure of the effect sizes, can fluctuate depending on the accuracy of the reported cause of mortality. In conclusion, MM is a peculiar type of melanoma, with clinical and molecular profile vastly different from the much-familiar CM. In the wake of the era of precision oncology, further studies on driver mutations and oncogenic pathways would likely lead to improved patient survival.

Introduction

Mucosal melanoma (MM) represents a highly aggressive variant of malignant melanoma that arises within the resident melanocytes of mucous linings. Comprising barely one-hundredth fraction of all melanomas, it is an entity that is notorious for the infinitesimal 5-year survival rate (<25%) (1). Although MM is often understood as a blanket term for any extracutaneous melanoma, it nevertheless comes with some what hazy disease definition; some authors regard uveal or conjunctival melanomas as bona fide MM, while others are less inclined to label the ocular tumours as such. The head and neck (H&N) is cited as the region most heavily represented (~50%), followed by the ano-rectum, and the female genital tract (FGT) (2). The insidious nature of the disease compounds accurate diagnosis, depriving the affected of any remaining chance for an early detection. Failure to intervene early often boomerangs with the amplified lethality, which is the hallmark of the mucosal disease.

Given the miniscule incidence and patient survival rate, randomised clinical trials (RCT) have been understandably difficult to come by. The resulting paucity of evidence have long clouded our understanding of tumour behaviour. Field clinicians facing therapeutic decisions inevitably suffer from general lack of consensus over virtually all aspects of the disease, from staging to management. While it is tempting to extrapolate from CM-derived data, the notion, that MM is fundamentally a distinctive entity, is now considered canonical (3). Such discrepancies include female preponderance, limited role of UV (ultraviolet) light, and mutation status (4). The different makeup of mutation landscape is thought to be the impetus that drives the divergence between the two (5-7).

In the present meta-analysis and systematic review, the authors present a comprehensive assessment of available evidence to elaborate crucial factors that determine clinical outcome in MM.

Materials and methods

Data collection and inclusion criteria. Literature search was conducted using multiple engines, most notably but not
limited to, PubMed, EMBASE, Cochrane, MEDLINE, and Google Scholar, up to March of 2018. The query employed various keywords, such as ‘mucosal malignant melanom’, ‘anorectal melanoma’, ‘sino-nasal melanoma’ and ‘survival’; the search was intended to include any abstract proceedings or graduate theses [www.thesis.de], so as not to discount ‘grey’ literature from the study. No restriction was applied in terms of the language of publication. The following criteria were considered for selection: i) primary mucosal melanomas, ii) reporting of Kaplan-Meier survival analysis results, or iii) Cox regression analysis with time-to-event information. Where HR were not explicitly given, they were imputed using the method described by Tierney et al (8). Excluded were studies i) on leptomeningeal melanomatosis, ii) based on cell lines iii) performed on canine, murine or other non-human subjects. The present study was conducted in accordance to the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology guidelines for the reporting of meta-analyses of observational studies (MOOSE) (9).

Statistical analysis. The principal parameter of effect size (ES) reporting used in the study was hazard ratio (HR), in terms of melanoma-specific survival (=disease-specific survival, DSS) and overall survival (=all-cause survival, OS). The main surrogate for detecting between-study heterogeneity was the $I^2$ statistic. The assumption of homogeneity was considered valid if $I^2$ was <50%, in which cases the fixed effect model was used; for all other cases, the random effect model was used. Before incorporating a study into analysis, sensitivity testing was performed to decide if there was a pulling effect by single studies with substantial weight. Publication bias was assessed with funnel plots and Egger test. Statistical analyses were carried out with Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Software (v3.0; Biostat, Englewood, NJ, USA). P<0.05 were considered to indicate a statistically significant difference.

Results

PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) (10) flow diagram of the search strategy, and characteristics of the included studies are given in Fig. 1 and Table 1, respectively. Search query using the aforementioned keywords initially returned 1,459 articles from 8 different databases, of which 52 were deemed to suit our agenda. All the studies originated from three continent regions: North/Central America (18, 34.6%), Asia/Indian subcontinent/Oceania (21, 40.4%), and the European Union (13, 25.0%). Topographically, 27 studies (51.9%) were on head and neck region (MMHN), 4 (7.7%) on gastrointestinal tract, 3 (5.8%) on urinary/female genital tract, and 18 (34.6%) on all mucosal sites. Potential survival variables were arbitrarily categorised into three groups: i) host factors, which is demographic characteristics of the affected individual, ii) tumour factors, relating to various aspects of tumour histology, behaviour, and staging, and iii) treatment factors, which are parameters that assess the impact of differing treatment modalities on survival.
Table I. Characteristics of included studies.

| Author, year            | Country                    | Location | No. of patients | Follow-up       | Ref. |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|------|
| Abugideiri et al, 2016  | USA                        | H&N      | 39 (SRT=27; S=12) | Median 8.1 years | 17   |
| Ahn et al, 2010         | Korea                      | H&N      | 32 (SRT=16; S=16) | Median 25.3 months | 18   |
| Aiemanakit et al, 2018  | Thailand                   | All mucosal | 17 (S=14, UN=3) | Median 18.2 months | 19   |
| Ajmani et al, 2017      | USA                        | SN       | 704 (SRT=399; S=305) | NR              | 20   |
| Amit et al, 2018        | USA                        | SN       | 198 (SRT=81; S=79; SCRT=24; C or CRT=14) | Median 26 months | 21   |
| D’Angelo et al, 2016    | USA                        | All mucosal | 889 (ipilimumab and nivolumab) | 6.2 months | 22   |
| Benlyazid et al, 2010   | France                     | H&N      | 160 (SRT=78; S=82) | Median 65.2 months | 23   |
| Bishop and Olszewski, 2014 | USA                      | All, including CM | 229,976 (NR) | NR              | 24   |
| Chiu and Weinstock, 1996 | USA                        | OC      | 40,320 (NR)     | NR              | 25   |
| Ciarrocchi et al, 2017  | Italy                      | Anorectum | 208 (SRT=32; S=167) | Median 14 months | 26   |
| Ercelep et al, 2016     | Turkey                     | All mucosal | 229,976 (NR) | Median 27 months | 27   |
| Harada et al, 2016      | Japan                      | Oesophagus | 10 (S=10) | NR              | 28   |
| Hasebe et al, 2017      | Japan                      | H&N      | 85 (RT=85)      | Median 42.5 months | 29   |
| Heinzelmann-Schwarz et al, 2014 | Australia | Vulva | 33 (NR) | NR              | 30   |
| Heppt et al, 2017       | Germany                    | All mucosal | 444 (NR) | NR              | 31   |
| Hughes et al, 2013      | Australia, including CMa  |          | 485 (Lymphadenectomy) | Median 17.4 months | 32   |
| Jang et al, 2014        | Korea, including CMa       | All, including CM | 206 (S=197; C=46; RT=31) | NR              | 33   |
| Kang et al, 2018        | China                      | All mucosal | 60 (NR) | Median 36 months | 34   |
| Khan et al, 2014        | USA                        | SN       | 567 (NR)       | NR              | 35   |
| Kirchoff et al, 2016    | USA                        | All mucosal | 227 (S=53; S + other=174) | NR              | 36   |
| Kirschner et al, 2013   | USA                        | Vagina   | 201 (SRT=53; S=87; RT=30) | Median 14 months | 37   |
| Kong et al, 2016        | China, including CMa       | All, including CM | 412 (NR) | Median 31 months | 38   |
| Konuthula et al, 2017   | USA                        | SN       | 695 (SRT=271; S=206; SC=29; SCRT=49; C=21; RT=42) | NR              | 39   |
| Koto et al, 2017        | Japan                      | H&N      | 260 (RT=105; CRT=155) | Median 22 months | 40   |
| Kuk et al, 2016         | Korea                      | OC       | 39 (S=22; S + C or RT=17) | NR              | 41   |
| Lansu et al, 2018       | Netherlands                | SN       | 63 (SRT=63)    | Median 23 months | 42   |
| Lawaetz et al, 2016     | Denmark                    | H&N      | 98 (SRT=26; S=49; SC=2; SCRT=2; RT=8; None=8) | Median 24.5 months | 43   |
| Lee et al, 2017         | Korea                      | H&N      | 31 (SRT=13; S=9; SC=7; SCRT=2) | Mean 9 months | 44   |
| Lee et al, 2017         | USA                        | OC       | 232 (NR)       | NR              | 45   |
| Lombardi et al, 2016    | Italy                      | SN       | 58 (SRT=13; S=42; SCRT=3) | Median 30 months | 46   |
| Mücke et al, 2009       | Germany                    | OC       | 10 (NR)        | NR              | 47   |
| Nakamura et al, 2018    | Japan, including CMa       | All mucosal | 45 (checkpoint inhibitors) | NR              | 48   |
| Oba et al, 2011         | Japan                      | All, including CM | 78 (NR) | Median 40 months | 49   |
| Pandey et al, 2002      | India                      | H&N      | 60 (SRT=6; S=17; SC=3; SCRT=1; C=8; RT=7) | NR              | 50   |
| Pfeil et al, 2011       | Germany                    | All mucosal | 172 (NR) | Median 24 months | 51   |
| Plavc et al, 2016       | Slovenia                   | H&N      | 61 (SRT=14; S=17; C=1; RT=15) | Median 16.5 months | 52   |
| Roh et al, 2016         | Korea                      | All mucosal | 392 (NR) | Mean 55.4 months | 53   |
| Samstein et al, 2016    | USA                        | SN       | 78 (SRT=64; S=14) | Median 21 months | 54   |
Host factors

Age. With respect to younger individuals (<50 years), the HR for those in the seventh decade of life was 1.3 (HR=1.31; 95% CI, 1.19‑1.45; P=0.00). The disease‑specific hazards for patients in their 70's were 1.7 (HR=1.69; 95% CI, 1.62‑1.77; P=0.00). A similar pattern was seen with overall survival. There was no evidence of heterogeneity in any of the subgroups (Fig. 2).

Sex. The HR for males was calculated to be 1.1 (HR=1.11; 95% CI, 0.93‑1.31; P=0.26). The value was similar for OS (HR=1.12; 95% CI, 1.03‑1.23; P=0.01). No statistical heterogeneity was found (I²=32.14).

Ethnicity. Pooled HR, with non-Hispanic white Caucasians as reference, was computed for patients with African, Asian/Pacific Island, and other (including white Hispanic, Native American and Mestizos) ancestries. Compared to Caucasian individuals, the hazard to overall survival for non-Caucasians as a whole was ~1.4 (HR=1.39, 95% CI, 1.06‑1.82; P=0.02). Apart from the overall death risk, ethnicity of the affected per se did not have seem to be a major influence on survival (Table II).

Comorbidities and ‘High-risk’ lifestyle. Having one or more major comorbidities showed a weak correlation to increased risk in all-cause mortality (HR=1.43; 95% CI, 1.01‑2.04; P=0.04). On the other hand, the mode of life traditionally considered ‘high-risk’—e.g., sedentariness, obesity, smoking—was found to be a significant threat to neither disease-specific (HR=1.41, 95% CI, 0.98‑2.03; P=0.07) nor overall (HR=1.24, 95% CI, 0.98‑1.56; P=0.14) survival.

Tumour factors

Cutaneous melanoma. The relative lethality of MM vs. CM was 2.25 (HR=2.27, 95% CI, 1.96‑2.62; P=0.00). No significant heterogeneity was detected across the studies (I²=26.41; Fig. 3).

Location. A primary lesion originating within the sino-nasal (SN) cavity was found to be 1.4 times more deadly compared to other locations (HR=1.44; 95% CI, 1.28‑1.63; P=0.00). The HR for OS was nearly 2.0 (HR=1.93; 95% CI, 1.59‑2.33; P=0.00). Head and neck lesions (MMHN) as a whole showed an HR of 1.4 (HR=1.35; 95% CI, 1.02‑1.79; P=0.00) for overall survival.

Multifocal disease. MM is a devastating cancer partly because of its tendency to arise from multiple foci. The associated disease-specific death risk was nearly 3.0 (HR=2.95; 95% CI, 2.72‑3.19; P=0.00).

Clinical staging (MMHN). The TNM staging system, developed by the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC), is one of the most widely accepted standards for MMHN staging and conventionally the most accurate predictor of survival. T4 disease (T4a and T4b) was 2.4 times more fatal than T3 tumours (95% CI, 1.75‑2.98; P=0.00). Meanwhile, N1 disease had an HR of 2.0 compared to N0 (HR=1.90; 95% CI, 1.62‑2.23; P=0.00). For metastatic diseases (M1), the HR was 3.2 (HR=3.17; 95% CI, 2.72‑3.70; P=0.00; Fig. 4).

Clinical features/Macro-morphology. Elevated lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) level was associated with the greatest HR for disease-specific survival (HR=2.06; 95% CI, 1.56‑2.72; P=0.00). Higher performance score (PS) was correlated with increased risk for OS (HR=1.71; 95% CI, 1.32‑2.21; P=0.00).

Table I. Continued.

| Author, year          | Countryb | Locatiob | No. of patients | Follow-up | Ref. |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|-----------------|-----------|-----|
| Sanchez et al, 2016   | USA      | Genitourinary tract | 1,586 (NR)     | NR        | 55  |
| Schaefer et al, 2017  | Germany  | All mucosal | 75 (checkpoint inhibitors) | NR        | 56  |
| Schmidt et al, 2017   | USA      | H&N      | 1,368 (SRT=704; S=566; RT=98) | Median 55.2 months | 57  |
| Shoushtari et al, 2017| USA      | All mucosal | 81 (NR)         | NR        | 58  |
| Shuman et al, 2011    | USA      | H&N      | 52 (SRT=15; S=13; SC=18; NR=6) | Median 97 months | 59  |
| Song et al, 2016      | China    | OC       | 62 (NR)         | Median 32.5 months | 60  |
| Sun et al, 2014       | China    | SN       | 65 (SRT=13; S=18; SC=9; C=6; RT=4; CRT=2) | NR        | 61  |
| Tchelebi et al, 2016  | USA      | Rectum   | 63 (SRT=18; S=45) | Median 17 months | 62  |
| Thariat et al, 2011   | France   | SN       | 155 (NR)        | Median 37 months | 63  |
| Wang et al, 2013      | China    | OC       | 81 (NR)         | NR        | 64  |
| Wen et al, 2017       | China    | All mucosal | 52 (checkpoint and PD-1 inhibitors) | NR        | 65  |
| Won et al, 2015       | Korea    | SN       | 155 (NR)        | NR        | 66  |
| Yeh et al, 2006       | USA      | Anorectum | 46 (S=23; C=23) | Median 29 months | 67  |
| Yi et al, 2011        | Korea    | All, including CMa | 95 (NR)        | Median 41 months | 68  |

aIncluded for purpose of comparison with mucosal melanoma; bFor multi-national groups, only the nationality of 1st author was listed. H&N, head and neck; SN, sino-nasal; CM, cutaneous melanoma; OC, oral cavity; S, surgery only; C, chemotherapy only; RT, radiotherapy only; SRT, surgery plus radiotherapy; SC, surgery plus chemotherapy; CRT, chemotherapy plus radiotherapy; SCRT, surgery plus chemotherapy plus radiotherapy; NR, not reported.
Ulceration of primary lesions was also linked to unfavourable OS. The verdict on pigmentation (HR=0.87; 95% CI, 0.66-1.15; P=0.34), necrosis, and nodularity of primary tumours was inconclusive (Table III).

**Table II. Hazard ratios for non-Caucasian ethnicities.**

| Ethnicity comparison | Survival | No. of studies | Pooled HR | 95% CI | Z-value | P-value | I² |
|----------------------|----------|----------------|-----------|--------|---------|---------|----|
| Non-Caucasian vs. Caucasian | DSS | 5 | 1.12 | 1.05-1.20 | 3.534 | 0.001 | 0.0001 |
| Non-Caucasian vs. Caucasian | OS | 3 | 1.39 | 1.06-1.82 | 2.358 | 0.018 | 0.0001 |
| Afro-American vs. Caucasian | DSS | 6 | 1.13 | 0.95-1.34 | 1.421 | 0.155 | 4.451 |
| API vs. Caucasian | DSS | 2 | 1.09 | 0.80-1.49 | 0.563 | 0.574 | 91.47 |

HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; DSS, disease-specific survival; OS, overall survival; API, Asian and Pacific Islander.

**Table III. Hazard ratios for clinical/macro-morphological features.**

| Feature comparison | Survival | No. of studies | Pooled HR | 95% CI | Z-value | P-value | I² |
|--------------------|----------|----------------|-----------|--------|---------|---------|----|
| Elevated LDH vs. WNL | DSS | 4 | 2.06 | 1.56-2.72 | 5.104 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| PS>1 vs. PS<0 | OS | 4 | 1.71 | 1.32-2.21 | 4.112 | 0.001 | 0.001 |
| Ulceration vs. no ulceration | DSS | 3 | 1.32 | 0.91-1.90 | 1.465 | 0.143 | 6.401 |
| Ulceration vs. no ulceration | OS | 4 | 1.44 | 1.04-2.01 | 2.191 | 0.215 | 32.95 |
| Pigmentation vs. no pigmentation | OS | 3 | 0.93 | 0.70-1.25 | 0.464 | 0.642 | 0.001 |
| Necrosis vs. no necrosis | DSS | 2 | 1.29 | 0.96-1.73 | 1.708 | 0.088 | 0.001 |
| Necrosis vs. no necrosis | OS | 2 | 0.96 | 0.55-1.68 | 0.013 | 0.989 | 72.12 |

LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; PS, performance score HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; DSS, disease-specific survival; OS, overall survival.

Ulceration of primary lesions was also linked to unfavourable OS. The verdict on pigmentation (HR=0.87; 95% CI, 0.66-1.15; P=0.34), necrosis, and nodularity of primary tumours was inconclusive (Table III).

**Microscopic features.** Margin status was the most important micro-morphological determinant of survival. The HR attributed to margin positivity was nearly 2.0 (HR=1.85; 95% CI, 1.34-2.54; P=0.00). The effect of perineural invasion (PNI) and lympho-vascular invasion (LVI) was not statistically significant. Meanwhile, Breslow thickness, depth of invasion, and mitotic count did not seem to play a significant role in either terms of survival (Table IV).

**Treatment factors**

**Extent of treatment.** Radical operation was found to amplify overall death risk by 2.5 (HR=2.61; 95% CI, 2.04-3.34;
When surgery was the sole modality of treatment, it was associated with a significant risk elevation in both terms of survival (HR of 1.72 and 2.21, respectively). Conversely, when any modality but surgery was used, similar increase in mortality was observed. For therapeutic regimen consisted entirely of chemotherapy, the attributed risk in mortality was around 1.5. Meanwhile, radiotherapy (RT) apparently carried the least detriment to patient survival as monotherapy.

The value of lymphadenectomy for primary tumours in the cephalo-cervical subsite was dubious (HR=0.86; 95% CI, 0.73-1.02; P=0.07). Likewise, endoscopic resection showed neither inferior nor superior results compared to the more traditional approach in terms of survival benefit (P=0.83 and 0.68, respectively; Table V).

**Immunotherapy.** Immunotherapy, usually involving PD-1 (programmed death protein-1), immune checkpoint inhibitors (e.g., CTLA-4), or a combination of the two, was shown to more effective for MM than CM. The pooled HR was 0.49 (95% CI, 0.37-0.65; P=0.00; Fig. 6) for overall survival. No inter-study heterogeneity was found across the studies (I²=0.00).

**Discussion**

The present meta-analysis had aimed to provide an updated review on various aspects of MM, with data from the most recent studies. The genetic and molecular underpinning behind the distinctive biologic behaviour is believed to stem from amplification of c-Kit (11), a receptor tyrosine kinase (RTK). In contrast, b-Raf and n-Ras mutations are infrequent in MM. This oncogenic mutation profile is reminiscent of the acral lentiginous subtype of CM (ALM). Quite fittingly, ALM shares several characteristics with MM in common, namely i) infrequency (1-2% of all CM), ii) delayed detection and hence worse prognosis, and iii) relative preponderance in non-Caucasian ethnic groups.

---

Table IV. Hazard ratios for microscopic features.

| Feature comparison                        | Survival | No. of studies | Pooled HR | 95% CI       | Z-value | P-value | I² |
|------------------------------------------|----------|----------------|-----------|--------------|---------|---------|----|
| (+) Margin vs. (-) margin                | DSS      | 10             | 1.85      | 1.34-2.54    | 3.759   | 0.001   | 23.84 |
| (+) Margin vs. (-) margin                | OS       | 10             | 1.59      | 1.21-2.08    | 3.365   | 0.001   | 44.22 |
| Breslow >1 mm vs. Breslow <1 mm          | DSS      | 6              | 1.07      | 0.99-1.19    | 1.755   | 0.079   | 29.63 |
| Breslow >1 mm vs. Breslow <1 mm          | OS       | 3              | 1.07      | 0.99-1.17    | 1.621   | 0.105   | 11.23 |
| Invasion >2 mm vs. invasion <2 mm        | DSS      | 3              | 2.02      | 0.68-6.03    | 1.259   | 0.208   | 81.02 |
| Invasion >2 mm vs. invasion <2 mm        | OS       | 4              | 2.02      | 1.26-0.23    | 2.913   | 0.004   | 0.001 |
| Mitosis (+) vs. mitosis (-)              | DSS      | 4              | 1.09      | 1.03-1.15    | 2.875   | 0.004   | 0.001 |
| Mitosis (+) vs. mitosis (-)              | OS       | 4              | 1.06      | 1.01-1.12    | 2.405   | 0.016   | 0.001 |
| PNI vs. PNI (-)                          | DSS      | 2              | 2.08      | 0.97-4.4     | 1.884   | 0.06    | 42.65 |
| Lymphovascular invasion vs. no invasion  | DSS      | 3              | 1.24      | 0.94-1.64    | 1.537   | 0.124   | 0.001 |
| Epithelioid type vs. non-epithelioid      | DSS      | 3              | 1.29      | 0.94-1.78    | 1.561   | 0.118   | 0.001 |

**PNI, perineural invasion; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; DSS, disease-specific survival; OS, overall survival.**
Figure 4. Forest plots for TNM staging (DSS): (A) T4 vs. T3 disease, (B) N1 vs. N0 disease, and (C) M1 vs. M0 disease. DSS, disease specific survival; CI, confidence interval; TNM, tumor-node-metastasis.
Although what is known about MM pales in comparison to the cutaneous disease, a few generalities can be drawn from our analysis: in the authors' estimation, MM was two-and-a-quarter times more life-threatening than CM. As a whole, the influence of the 'host factors' was not imposing; one pattern that stood out was advanced age. The median age of onset for MM is higher than CM, at 67 years (vs. 55 years for CM). The death risk in this age group was more than 1.5, compared to the younger cohort (<50 years), which might partially account for the higher mortality. While the incidence tends to be higher and the prognosis grimmer for male melanoma patients in general, MM is an exception; it is reasonably well established that MM shows predilection for females (12). Moreover, there seemed to be no respect of sexes with MM when it comes to mortality, although
male individuals may be at a slight disadvantage as far as overall survival is concerned. MM is also peculiar from ethnic perspectives because the higher proportion of non-Caucasian patients (especially African and Asian races) is higher. This point is underlined by the fact that 40% of the referenced studies came from regions where the indigenous population is not of white Caucasian ancestry. Nevertheless, racial disparities did not appear to be a major deciding factor in MM-specific mortality. The higher all-cause mortality for non-white cohorts may point to either supposedly superior overall quality of care in Western facilities, or a legitimate, ethno-genetic differences in the ability of the body system to cope with the cancer or mount anti-tumour immune defence against. The fact that undesirable health-related behaviours played negligible role in survival may be one indication that the intrinsic cancer behaviour wields an overriding influence above other variables.

Mucosal melanoma of the head and neck (MMHN), cited as the most common location of MM occurrence overall, also carried the worst prognosis. Tumours in the paranasal sinuses (PNS)-maxillary and ethmoid, etc.-predisposed the individuals to significantly higher disease-specific and overall mortality, with the latter perhaps reflecting the inaccessibility of the subsite, rendering it all the more unfeasible to carry out effective surgical manoeuvres. Tumour thickness would normally be one of objective prognosticators for solid organ cancers. That said, the usefulness of the AJCC clinical staging system in CM cannot be readily engraved into mucosal patients, the reason for which is questionable validity of tumour thickness as a prognostic index. This notion has been backed by the authors' findings, that neither thickness nor depth of invasion is a significant determinant of survival (Table IV).

Although surgery constitutes the backbone of management strategy in many cases, radical excision seems to be a poor choice of treatment for the considerable morbidity and added mortality associated. Any mono-modality therapy was shown to increase death risk by at least 1.5. For inoperable cases, immunotherapeutic regimen, usually consisting of combination of CTLA-4 and PD-1 inhibitors (e.g., nivolumab and ipilimumab), may be the most rational option. Also, both chemotherapy and radiotherapy were found to be survival-benefitting adjuvant modalities. However, as of now, there is no clearly established formula for specific combination of for chemotherapeutic agents and anti-tumour biologics (‘cocktails’).

The current study was hampered by a few limitations. The validity of disease-specific survival (DSS), the primary measure of effect sizes, is grounded on the premise of the reported cause of death being accurate. This inherent risk can potentially be a limiting factor with cancers such as MM, in which the high lethality can often obscure the true cause of death. In addition, all but two of the included studies came out after the year 2010. This is mainly due to the rarity of the disease, with many studies taking several decades to complete.

In summing up, mucosal melanoma is a highly malignant entity that is difficult to detect, treat, and even study. It is accentuated by an oncogenic profile that is at odds with the more prevalent cutaneous disease. Microscopic frequency, coupled with air of pessimism surrounding the gross ineffectuality of conventional arsenal, may have pushed it into relative obscurity and disinterest. Nonetheless, a body of recent evidence indicates its incidence is on the rise, and may well be on its way to becoming a force to be reckoned with. Further studies, elaborating on the oncogenic pathways and driver mutations, are needed to improve the overall outlook of this fearsome cancer, especially now that the era of three P’s—precision, personalized, and preventive oncology—is looming over the horizon.
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