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A B S T R A C T

The data presented here is related to the research article entitled "FERTILITY-SPARING SURGERY AND REPRODUCTIVE-OUTCOMES IN PATIENTS WITH BORDERLINE OVARIAN TUMORS" by Plett et al. in Journal of Gynecologic Oncology [1] and is analysed and discussed in detail. 18 Patients
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with Recurrent Borderline Ovarian Tumors (BOT) were identified and listed in Table 1. All patients underwent treatment for primary BOT either per radical surgery (RS) or fertility sparing surgery (FSS) by the same team in Horst Schmidt Klinik (HSK) in Wiesbaden and the Department of Gynecology and Gynecologic Oncology at Kliniken Essen-Mitte between January 2000 and December 2018 and were followed up closely. Details on patients’ and surgical characteristics are given as well as management of character of recurrent disease. In Table 2 important publications from the last 20 years are listed in order to visualize better the oncologic outcomes (invasive and non-invasive relapses) and calculated risks of recurrence with the purpose to understand better the important findings of the related article cited above.
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• We also include a review of recent literature data who might be really helpful in having a thorough view of the state of the art of research in this field.

1. Data Description

Supplementary Table 1: Detailed patients' demographics of 5 patients after RS (pat. 1-5) and 13 patients after FSS (pat. 6-18) with recurrent BOT (n=13) or malignant transformation (n=4)

Supplementary Table 2: Recent published data on oncologic outcome after FSS and RS and fertility outcome after FSS. (2-12)

2. Experimental Design, Materials, and Methods

From January 2000 to December 2018, 352 Patients with primary diagnosis of BOT were treated and documented prospectively in our hospital database. All patients were subsequently treated by the same team in two locations in Germany: Horst Schmidt Klinik (HSK) in Wiesbaden between January 2000 and December 2010 and the Department of Gynecology and Oncologic Oncology at Kliniken Essen-Mitte between January 2011 and December 2018. Histopathological examination was performed by local pathologists and additional external histopathological review was carried out in all cases. Cases of BOT with invasive implants before 2014 (n=7) and therefore retrospectively considered as LGSOC, were not excluded in order to make our data comparable to other publications. FSS was performed after individual discussion. Complete surgical staging was defined according to FIGO but without lymphadenectomy and with a waiver for preservation of uterus and one ovary in case of FSS. We divided patients in 2 groups, the FSS-group and the RS-group. The records of patients are updated annually. Patients were followed up by a telephone interview directly or vicariously by their treating general gynecologist and data on recurrent disease as well as data on the reproductive outcome were collected. Pregnancy was defined on the base of ultrasound findings by the treating gynecologist. This study was exempt from an ethic approval process because of his retrospective nature. Patients gave informed consent for documentation of clinical data in the associated clinical tumor registries and for clinical research and have voluntarily agreed on a telephone interview for follow up. Patients from this series were included in prior publications.

2.1. Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 23.0 (IBM Corporation, New York, USA). The Kaplan-Meier method was used for univariate analysis of disease-free survival (DFS). Since only 1 patient had a fatal event we did not include any OS analysis in our manuscript. Different survival curves were compared using the log-rank test. DFS was calculated in months from initial surgery to the date of recurrence. The Cox proportional hazard model (Wald step-wise backward regression) was utilized to evaluate all parameters that were significant in univariate analyses. The multivariate adjusted odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) are expressed. All analyses were thought to be hypothesis generating and a p-value of <0.05 was considered being significant.
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