Multiple metastases after laparoscopic surgery for early-stage endometrial cancer: A case report
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ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION: Laparoscopic surgery for early-stage endometrial cancer is associated with lower morbidity compared to open surgery and has comparable oncologic outcomes. We observed unexpected multiple metastases after laparoscopic surgery for endometrial cancer, the recurrence risk of which has previously been estimated to be low. Herein, we present this case and discuss the optimal management of endometrial cancer.

PRESENTATION OF CASE: A 58-year-old woman complaining of atypical genital bleeding lasting for 5 months was diagnosed with stage IA endometrioid carcinoma grade 1. According to our primary strategy, she underwent a total laparoscopic hysterectomy and bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy. The post-operative diagnosis was consistent with the pre-operative diagnosis. Since the recurrence risk was post-operatively revised to an intermediate level, she was administered adjuvant chemotherapy. However, multiple metastases were observed 4 months post-operatively, and despite treatment for recurrent disease, she died 2 months later. The uterine specimen was re-examined after the diagnosis of recurrence, and the post-operative diagnosis was revised to endometrioid carcinoma grade 3, indicating that her recurrence risk might have been underestimated.

DISCUSSION: The multiple metastases observed in this case, including those in the subcutaneous tissue, were presumably caused by pneumoperitoneum. Aspiration biopsy was used to confirm the histological diagnosis pre-operatively. However, dilation and curettage would have been preferable, considering aspiration biopsy provides limited diagnostic accuracy in some cases. Laparoscopic surgery is less invasive; however, it leads to a peculiar recurrence pattern, which is sometimes difficult to assess pre-operatively.

CONCLUSION: Physicians should carefully consider indications for laparoscopic surgery for malignant diseases.

© 2020 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of IJS Publishing Group Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Total laparoscopic hysterectomy (TLH) is recommended for endometrial cancer confined to the uterus because it results in lower morbidity and similar outcomes relative to total abdominal hysterectomy (TAH) [1–5]. Accordingly, our primary strategy for stage IA endometrioid carcinoma (EC) grade 1 or 2 (G1/2) was TLH and bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy (BSO). We herein report a rare case of unexpected multiple metastases after laparoscopic surgery for endometrial cancer and discuss the optimal management for endometrial cancer. This study has been reported in line with the Surgical Case Report (SCARE) 2018 criteria [6].
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**Fig. 2.** MRI Images Pre-operative MRI T2-weighted image (A) and contrast MRI (B). MRI, magnetic resonance imaging.

**Fig. 3.** Imaging of metastases Multiple metastases of the lumbar vertebrae (A), left mammary glands (B), and subcutaneous tissue (C).
2. Presentation of case

A 58-year-old Japanese woman presented with a complaint of atypical genital bleeding for 5 months. Her medical history included hypertension treated with cilnidipine 20 mg and valsartan 160 mg, daily. She was gravida 2 para 2 and had no relevant family history or allergies. The endometrial cytology was positive, and she was referred to our hospital. She was diagnosed with stage IA EC G1 by aspiration biopsy (Fig. 1), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) (Fig. 2), and computed tomography (CT). Her recurrence risk was estimated to be low. According to our basic strategy, she underwent TLH and BSO, performed by a gynaecologic oncologist with 3 years of laparoscopic surgery training. The operation was performed under general anaesthesia in a lithotomy position, and we used CO₂ for pneumoperitoneum. Although the use of uterine manipulators does not reportedly influence oncologic outcomes [7–10], we still did not use them. We pre-operatively irrigated the vaginal cavity and performed the figure of eight suture on the cervix. Isolation bags were used in the course of removing the uterus through the vagina from the abdominal cavity. The operation was completed with no adverse effects. The post-operative diagnosis was stage IA EC G1. Her recurrence risk was revised post-surgery to intermediate because of lymphatic vessel invasion.

Consequently, she underwent three cycles of chemotherapy with doxorubicin (60 mg/m²) and cisplatin (50 mg/m²) every 3 weeks. She complained of back pain 4 months post-operatively, and multiple metastases were detected by MRI and CT (Fig. 3). The sites of recurrent disease included the lumbar vertebrae; right clavicle; left mammary glands; liver; right common iliac; internal iliac and external iliac lymph nodes; urethra; vagina; and subcutaneous
adipose tissue. A left mammary gland biopsy confirmed recurrence (Fig. 4). Another pathologist re-examined the uterine specimen, and the patient’s post-operative diagnosis was revised to EC G1+G3 (Fig. 5). She underwent one cycle of chemotherapy with paclitaxel (175 mg/m²), carboplatin (AUC = 5), and denosumab (120 mg, every 4 weeks), and radiation therapy (24 Gy/6 Fr for the right clavicle and 21 Gy/7 Fr for the right pelvis). However, she died of the disease 2 months later.

3. Discussion

We treated a patient with unexpected multiple metastases after a very short disease-free interval following laparoscopic surgery for endometrial cancer, although the recurrence risk had been estimated to be low pre-operatively. The strength of this case report is discussing such a rare pattern of recurrence. The recurrence risk is estimated based on lymphatic vessel invasion, depth of the lesion, cervical stromal invasion, extraperitoneal lesions, and histological type. In this case, the recurrence risk was revised post-operatively because of the occurrence of lymphatic vessel invasion, which cannot be estimated pre-operatively. However, based on the revised post-operative diagnosis, this patient should not have undergone TLH. Our primary strategies for EC G3 are TAH, BSO, pelvic lymphadenectomy, and para-aortic lymphadenectomy. Although aspiration biopsy has an accuracy nearly equal to that of dilation and curettage (D&C), it provides limited diagnostic accuracy in some cases [11,12]. Hence, the pre-operative histological diagnosis should have been confirmed with D&C. Additionally, accurately detecting the depth of the lesion and cervical stromal invasion is sometimes difficult. When opting for minimally invasive surgery, physicians should consider that the pre-operative recurrence risk might be underestimated.

Pre-operatively, our patient might have already developed metastases that could not be radiologically detected. However, it is unlikely that metastases had completely occurred pre-operatively. Oncologic outcomes depend on the stage and nature of the tumour. Considering the final diagnosis of stage IA EC G3 with lymphatic vessel invasion, which had an intermediate recurrence risk, the tumour was not estimated to be very aggressive. Therefore, factors other than the nature of the tumour itself might have affected the recurrence. Port-site metastases following robot-assisted laparoscopic surgery for gynaecological malignancies are reportedly more likely to develop in a specimen retrieval port than in a robotic port [13]. This implies that contact with the specimen is strongly associated with metastases. However, we used isolation bags, and contact with the specimen could not have occurred. Moreover, even if contact had occurred, this could only have caused metastases at the retrieval site or in the pelvic cavity. The use of pneumoperitoneum could explain the multiple metastases observed in this case, including those in the subcutaneous tissue. We pre-operatively irrigated the vaginal cavity and performed the figure of eight suture on the cervix to prevent tumour leakage from the uterine cavity. However, the complete prevention of tumour leakage from the uterine cavity remains uncertain. If the tumour had leaked into the vaginal cavity during the operation, the tumour could be scattered intraoperatively or pushed into blood vessels and lymphatic vessels. Although no evidence has been found for pneumoperitoneum affecting tumour growth, cancer cell seeding, and metastases [14,15], it has been reported to provoke cancer cell implantation and growth in an animal model [16] and may trigger ovarian cancer cell proliferation in subcutaneous tissues [17]. It is also reported that viable tumour cells are produced in the surgical smoke from tumour dissection by powered devices, and they grow when implanted in mice [18]. Considering these factors, the pneumoperitoneum could explain why multiple metastases occurred and grew so rapidly. However, there are no means to prove this hypothesis which is a limitation of this case report. Although metastases caused by pneumoperitoneum might be rare, especially in the early stages, they are peculiar to laparoscopic surgery, and physicians should not ignore such a possibility when opting for laparoscopic surgery to treat malignancies.

4. Conclusion

TLH is a beneficial treatment for endometrial cancer because it is minimally invasive. However, it is associated with poor oncologic outcomes when performed on patients with moderate to high recurrence risk. Physicians should be prudent when opting for TLH for malignancies because it is challenging to evaluate the recurrence risk accurately. Histological accuracy could improve if the diagnosis is confirmed with D&C. Similarly, it is noteworthy that a peculiar recurrence pattern is associated with laparoscopic surgery, although it is rare.
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