Extended lymph node dissection in robot-assisted radical prostatectomy: lymph node yield and distribution of metastases
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INTRODUCTION
Radical prostatectomy is a mainstay treatment for men with localized prostate cancer. Following the first descriptions of the robot-assisted laparoscopic technique,1 the use of surgical robots for treating prostate cancer has diffused rapidly over the past decade. Although there has been no large randomized clinical trial comparing robotic and open radical prostatectomy, robot-assisted radical prostatectomy (RARP) seems to offer oncologic outcomes comparable to those of open surgery even in patients with high-risk prostate cancer.2 Case volume, rather than surgical modality, is often considered a primary contributor to surgical outcome.3 However, there has recently been a statistically significant decline in the use of lymph node dissection (LND). Furthermore, LND is 5 times less likely in minimally invasive surgery than in open surgery even after controlling for tumor characteristics.4 This trend is particularly worrisome because surgical modality should not be a factor in deciding whether or not to perform LND.

Although the advent of prostate specific antigen (PSA) has resulted in stage migration with decreased incidence of LN metastases, the presence of LN metastases remain an adverse prognostic factor. Unfortunately, recent sophisticated imaging procedures have limited ability for nodal staging.5,6 In addition, most well-known nomograms might be imprecise as a result of differing extents of LND.7,8 Currently, LND is the gold standard for determining nodal staging.9

Debates about the indication and extent of LND are ongoing. Despite the benefits of staging accuracy and its possible therapeutic role in eliminating microscopic metastases, LND is also associated with several disadvantages, such as increased morbidity, longer operation time, and higher cost.9,10 Therefore, current guidelines do not recommend performing LND in all patients; however, extended LND (eLND) should be performed in patients with a risk of LN metastases.11–13 Until date, several studies have reported the experiences and outcomes of eLND using robotic systems.14–16 With the growing use of RARP even in patients with high-risk of prostate cancer, it is valuable to share robotic eLND experiences as the role of LND should not be ignored in RARP. The objective of the current study is to present our robotic eLND experiences in prostate cancer surgery.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
From May 2008 to December 2011, a total of 234 patients with intermediate or high-risk prostate cancer who underwent RARP with eLND. A single surgeon performed all procedures and the patient database was collected prospectively after obtaining Institutional Review Board Approval (1-2012-0024). Of the 234 patients, 47 with neoadjuvant hormonal treatment and 40 with incomplete LN information (including location or number) were excluded from the analysis. Thus, 147 patients were finally included in this study. Risk stratification was...
Robotic extended lymph node dissection
KH Kim et al

Table 1: Clinicopathological characteristics of all patients

| Age (year) | All (n=147) | LN (−) (n=123) | LN (+) (n=24) | P |
|------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|---|
| Mean±s.d.  | 65.3±7.0    | 65.3±6.4       | 66.4±7.2      | 0.468 |
| Median, IQR| 66, 62–70   | 66, 62–70      | 66, 62–70     |     |
| BMI (kg m⁻²) | 24.2±2.3   | 24.2±2.2       | 24.0±2.8      | 0.704 |
| Mean±s.d.  | 24.2, 22.4–25.6 | 24.2, 22.5–25.6 | 24.3, 21.4–25.8 |     |
| PSA (ng ml⁻¹) | 15.6±17.9 | 13.2±11.6      | 28.1±33.9     | 0.043 |
| Mean±s.d.  | 10.7, 6.5–17.4 | 10.1, 6.1–15.7 | 16.7, 10.1–25.8 |     |

| Biopsy Gleason score, n (%) | 6 | 7 | 8–10 | 10, 11–14 |
|----------------------------|---|---|------|---------|
| Mean±s.d.                  | 19 (12.9) | 57 (38.8) | 71 (48.3) | 18 (14.6) |
| Median, IQR                | 18 (14.6) | 52 (42.3) | 53 (43.1) | 18 (75.0) |

| Total biopsied cores | Mean±s.d. | Median, IQR |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|
| Mean±s.d.            | 11.6±3.5   | 11.5±3.4    |
| Median, IQR          | 12, 10–12  | 12, 10–12   |

| Number positive cores | Mean±s.d. | Median, IQR |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|
| Mean±s.d.            | 4.2±2.9    | 3.8±2.5     |
| Median, IQR          | 3, 2–6     | 3, 2–5      |

| Percentage of positive cores | Mean±s.d. | Median, IQR |
|------------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Mean±s.d.                   | 37.9±25.2  | 34.6±22.8   |
| Median, IQR                 | 33, 17–50  | 30, 16–50   |

| Clinical T stage, n (%) | T1 | T2 | T3 |
|-------------------------|----|----|----|
| Mean±s.d.               | 80 (54.4) | 44 (29.9) | 23 (15.7) |
| Median, IQR             | 75 (61.0) | 37 (30.1) | 11 (8.9) |

| D’Amico risk group, n (%) | Intermediate | High |
|---------------------------|--------------|------|
| Mean±s.d.                 | 39 (26.5)    | 108 (73.5) |
| Median, IQR               | 37 (30.1)    | 86 (69.9) |

| Number LNs removed | Mean±s.d. | Median, range |
|--------------------|------------|---------------|
| Mean±s.d.          | 22.5±7.18  | 22, 18–26     |
| Median, range      | 22, 18–26  | 21, 16–26     |

| Pathologic Gleason score, n (%) | 6 | 7 | 8–10 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|------|
| Mean±s.d.                       | 15 (10.2) | 78 (53.1) | 54 (36.7) |
| Median, IQR                     | 14 (11.4) | 70 (56.9) | 39 (31.7) |

| Pathologic T stage, n (%) | T2 | T3a | T3b |
|---------------------------|----|-----|-----|
| Mean±s.d.                 | 82 (55.8) | 39 (26.5) | 26 (17.7) |
| Median, range             | 77 (62.6) | 35 (28.5) | 11 (8.9) |

Results that predict LN invasion after eLND. The Statistical Package for Social Science for Windows, version 12.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for all statistical analyses. P < 0.05 was considered as significant, and all P values were two-sided.

RESULTS

Robotic eLND was performed in 147 patients; patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Mean age at surgery was 65.3 years and median PSA was 10.7 ng ml⁻¹. A total of 108 patients (73.5%) were classified in the D’Amico high-risk group. The median operation time was 24.3, 21.4–25.8 minutes, and no patient received a blood transfusion. Of the 147 patients, 22 (16.3%) had LN metastases. The incidence of LN metastases was 73.5%. All patients underwent preoperative staging with computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging and bone scan, which confirmed the absence of metastatic disease.

All procedures, including eLND, were conducted through a transperitoneal approach using the daVinci Surgical System (Intuitive Surgical, Sunnyvale, CA, USA). The port configuration is described in detail in our previous report. The eLND template consisted of the external iliac, obturator, internal iliac, and common iliac up to the ureteric crossing. In addition, the lymphofatty tissue of the periprostatic area was sent separately to pathology. All eLNDs were performed prior to radical prostatectomy. The peritoneal incisions commenced from the lateral to medial umbilical ligament. After the bladder was lowered, fatty tissues covering the vesicoprostatic junction and periprostatic area were removed. The peritoneal incision proceeded proximally up to the ureteric crossing over the iliac vessel, and the lymphatic tissue covering the common iliac artery was removed. Dissection of the external iliac packet was limited by the lateral border of the external iliac artery and inferiorly by the node of Cloquet. After dissecting the tissues around the common iliac artery and its bifurcation area, the internal iliac artery was identified and nodal tissues around the internal iliac were removed. Lymphatic tissues within the obturator fossa were also removed, sparing the obturator nerve. The LNs were retrieved by laparoscopic forceps through a 12 mm assistant trocar site. LN specimens from each packet were sent separately for pathological analysis.

Next, LN specimens were fixed in 10% neural buffered formalin and embedded in a paraffin block. Slides were then stained with hematoxylin and eosin and examined microscopically. Harvested nodes were identified by a pathologist and all LN specimens were examined by a single genitourinary pathologist with >15 years of experience. The total number of LNs removed and the number of positive LNs for each anatomical location were recorded. Packets without any nodal tissue were regarded as containing zero LNs.

Clinicopathologic characteristics and perioperative outcomes were evaluated. Complications that were presumably associated with eLND were also recorded and defined according to the Clavien classification system. Quantitative variables were compared using the Mann–Whitney U-test and qualitative variables were compared using the Chi-squared test or Fisher exact test. Uni- and multi-variate logistic regression analyses were conducted to identify preoperative variables that predict LN invasion after eLND. The Statistical Package for Social Science for Windows, version 12.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) was used for all statistical analyses. P < 0.05 was considered as significant, and all P values were two-sided.
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with LN metastases (12/24) had a positive LN in the obturator fossa (Figure 2). However, only four patients (16.7%, 4/24) had a single positive LN packet in the obturator fossa. The internal iliac area was the most common area to find a single positive LN packet (20.8%, 5/24). Eight patients (33.3%, 8/24) had positive LNs at the common iliac area, and three of these patients (12.5%, 3/24) had no intrapelvic LN involvement. Of the 12 patients who had LNs in the periprostatic area, only one had positive LNs. This patient had 14 positive LNs in both the pelvic and common iliac area. The rate of LN positivity did not differ between groups when patients were stratified by the median number of LNs removed (<22 vs ≥22; Table 2). On univariate logistic regression analysis, PSA, clinical stage, biopsy Gleason score, and percentage of positive cores were significantly associated with LN metastases. On multivariate analysis, PSA (P = 0.021) and clinical stage (P = 0.017) were independent predictors of LN metastases, while biopsy Gleason score and percentage of positive cores lost statistical significance after controlling for other variables (Table 3).

Complications associated with LND occurred in 21 patients (14.3%). Clavien Grade 3 complications were observed in three patients (2.0%) who underwent percutaneous drainage for symptomatic lymphocele. Symptomatic lymphocele was found in five patients (3.4%) and two patients were treated conservatively. Of the five patients with symptomatic lymphocele, one was diagnosed 3 months after surgery owing to spiking fever, while the others were diagnosed during their postoperative hospital stay. Lymphedema was observed in 15 patients (10.2%), which resolved after physical treatment in most patients. Only three patients (2.0%) showed mild persistent symptoms. Neuropraxia was observed in one patient (0.7%), which resolved spontaneously 3 months after surgery.

Table 2: Clinicopathological characteristics of patients according to the number of LNs removed

|                      | LNs removed<22 (n=73) | LNs removed≥22 (n=74) | P   |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----|
| Mean age (year±s.d.) | 65.5±6.8              | 65.5±6.2              | 0.995|
| Mean BMI (kg m⁻²±s.d.) | 24.3±2.2         | 24.0±2.4              | 0.442|
| Mean PSA (ng ml⁻¹±s.d.) | 14.0±13.2      | 17.3±21.7             | 0.267|
| Pathologic Gleason score, n (%) | 6   | 8 (11.0) | 7 (9.5) | 0.722|
| Pathologic T stage, n (%) | 7   | 39 (53.4) | 39 (52.7) | 0.967|
| T2                   | 41 (56.2)            | 41 (55.4)            | 0.999|
| T3a                  | 19 (26.0)            | 20 (27.0)            | 0.999|
| T3b                  | 13 (17.8)            | 13 (17.6)            | 0.999|
| LN metastases, n (%) | 12 (16.4)            | 12 (16.2)            | 0.999|
| Mean number LN removed±s.d. (median, IQR) | 17.1±3.0 | 27.8±6.0 | <0.001|
|                      | (18, 15–20)         | (26, 24–31)          |     |

s.d.: standard deviation; BMI: body mass index; PSA: prostate-specific antigen; IQR: interquartile range; LNs: lymph nodes

Table 3: Uni- and multi-variate logistic regression analysis for prediction of LN metastases

|                      | Univariate | Multivariate |
|----------------------|------------|--------------|
|                      | OR (95% CI) | P            | OR (95% CI) | P     |
| PSA                  | 1.04 (1.01–1.07) | 0.005         | 1.04 (1.00–1.07) | 0.021 |
| Clinical stage (≥T2 vs T1) | 5.93 (2.07–16.9) | 0.001         | 3.93 (1.27–12.1) | 0.017 |
| Biopsy Gleason score | 0.024      | 0.070        |              |       |
| ≤6                   | 1          |              | 1            |       |
| 7                    | 1.73 (0.18–15.8) | 0.627         | 1.95 (0.14–26.5) | 0.614 |
| ≥1                   | 6.11 (0.76–49.1) | 0.089         | 6.68 (0.55–80.9) | 0.135 |
| Percentage positive cores | 1.02 (1.01–1.04) | 0.001         | 1.01 (0.99–1.03) | 0.072 |

PSA: prostate-specific antigen; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval

Figure 1: Mean number of lymph nodes removed from each anatomic location.

Figure 2: (a) Anatomical distribution of 97 positive lymph nodes (LNs) in 24 patients with LN metastases, (b) and the number of patients with positive LNs and a single positive LN packet from each anatomic location.
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LND.

While the biochemical outcome in the aforementioned study did not

the impact of LND extent on biochemical outcome was published.

systemically. Recently, the first randomized controlled study to assess
disease that might otherwise progress and subsequently disseminate
prostate cancer treatment to date. Some authors have suggested that LND
might improve LND staging accuracy.

We found that another patient had up to five LNs in the periprostatic
area, and three patients (12.5%, 3/24) had positive LNs exclusively in
this area without intrapelvic involvement.

While no consistent conclusion has been reached regarding the
extent of LND, it is generally agreed that the LNs in the internal iliac
area should be removed. Many researchers have demonstrated that up
to 50% of positive LNs are found in the internal iliac area.9,44,25 Even
though the mean number of LNs in the internal iliac area was almost
one-fifth of those in the external iliac area in this study, the number of
positive LNs was not significantly different between the external
iliac and internal iliac areas (17 and 15 positive LNs, respectively).
While a portion of the internal iliac LNs can be sent as obturator LNs,
approximately 75% of all prostate primary lymphatic landing sites,
that extending the template up to the ureteric crossing removes
a multimodality mapping study.21 The mapping study demonstrated
that the common iliac area is based on the results of
a consistent template and dissection
template that includes the common iliac area is established on the basis of
the detection rate of LN metastases when conventional histopathology is negative.21,32 Finally, data on nerve sparing or postoperative erectile function were not included
in the analysis owing to incomplete information. Thus, we could not
evaluate the impact of eLND on postoperative erectile function. Despite
these limitations, the strengths of our study include the fact that the
surgeries were all performed by a single, experienced surgeon, that
LND was performed using a consistent technique and template during
the study period, and that all patients adhering to a uniform protocol.
In this study, we assessed the technical feasibility of robotic eLND
and evaluated LN yield and metastasis distribution. Further studies
are needed to evaluate the oncologic outcome of LND with different
dissection templates and longer-term follow-up.

CONCLUSIONS
Robotic eLND is technically feasible and can be performed with
minimal morbidity. Furthermore, the LN yield and node positive rate
achieved using the robotic technique is comparable to those of open
series. Rates of LN metastases were not influenced by the number of
LNs removed when a consistent extended template and dissection
technique were applied. The robotic technique is not a prohibitive
factor for performing eLND.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
KHK conceived study design, performed statistical analysis and drafted
the manuscript. SKL and KCK helped to draft the manuscript. WKH
and SJH provided critical revision of the manuscript for important
intellectual content. KHR conceived study design and supervised
writing of the manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS
All authors declare no competing interests.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
We are grateful to Mr. Dong-Su Jang for the illustrations. This work was
supported by the Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the
Korean government (MEST) (2011–0029348).

REFERENCES
1. Abbou CC, Hoznek A, Salomon L, Olsson LE, Lobontiu A, et al. Laparoscopic radical
prostatectomy with a remote controlled robot. J Urol 2001; 165: 1964–6.
2. Jayram G, Decastro GJ, Large MC, Razmaria A, Zagaja GP, et al. Robotic radical
prostatectomy in patients with high-risk disease: a review of short-term outcomes
from a high-volume center. J Endourol 2011; 25: 455–7.
Robotic extended lymph node dissection

KH Kim et al

3 Klein EA, Bianco FJ, Serio AM, Eastham JA, Kattan MW, et al. Surgeon experience is strongly associated with biochemical recurrence after radical prostatectomy for all preoperative risk categories. J Urol 2008; 179: 2212–6.

4 Fefer AH, Elkin EB, Lowrance WT, Denton B, Jacks L, et al. Temporal trends and predictors of pelvic lymph node dissection in open or minimally invasive radical prostatectomy. Cancer 2011; 117: 3933–42.

5 Harisinghani MG, Barentsz J, Hahn PF, Deserno WM, Tabatabaeei S, et al. Noninvasive detection of clinically occult lymph-node metastases in prostate cancer. N Engl J Med 2003; 348: 2491–9.

6 Schiavina R, Scattoni V, Castellucci P, Picchio M, Corti B, et al. 11C-choline positron emission tomography/computed tomography for preoperative lymph-node staging in intermediate-risk and high-risk prostate cancer: comparison with clinical staging nomograms. Eur Urol 2008; 54: 392–401.

7 Partin AW, Kattan MW, Subong EN, Walsh PC, Wojciak JI, et al. Combination of prostate-specific antigen, clinical stage, and Gleason score to predict pathological stage of localized prostate cancer. A multi-institutional update. JAMA 1997; 277: 1445–51.

8 Kattan MW, Stapleton AM, Wheeler TM, Scardino PT. Evaluation of a nomogram used to predict the pathologic stage of clinically localized prostate carcinoma. Cancer 1997; 79: 528–37.

9 Briganti A, Blute ML, Eastham JH, Graefen M, Heidenreich A, et al. Pelvic lymph node dissection in prostate cancer. Eur Urol 2009; 55: 1251–65.

10 Briganti A, Chun FK, Salonia A,uardi N, Gallina A, et al. Complications and other surgical outcomes associated with extended pelvic lymphadenectomy in men with localized prostate cancer. Eur Urol 2006; 50: 1006–13.

11 Heidenreich A, Bellmunt J, Bolla M, Joniau S, Mason M, et al. EAU guidelines on prostate cancer. Part 1: screening, diagnosis, and treatment of clinically localised disease. Eur Urol 2011; 59: 61–7.

12 Thompson I, Thrasher JB, Aus G, Burnett AL, Canby-Hagino ED, et al. Guideline for the management of clinically localized prostate cancer: 2007 update. J Urol 2007; 177: 2106–31.

13 NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology 2014. Prostate Cancer. Available from: http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf.

14 Feicke A, Baumgartner M, Talimi S, Schmid DM, Seifert HH, et al. Robotic-assisted laparoscopic extended pelvic lymph node dissection for prostate cancer: surgical technique and experience with the first 99 cases. Eur Urol 2009; 55: 876–83.

15 Yee DS, Katz DJ, Godoy G, Negreira L, Chong KT, et al. Extended pelvic lymph node dissection in robotic-assisted radical prostatectomy: surgical technique and initial experience. Urology 2010; 75: 1199–204.

16 Yuh BE, Ruel NH, Mejia R, Wilson CM, Wilson TG. Robotic extended pelvic lymphadenectomy for intermediate- and high-risk prostate cancer. Eur Urol 2012; 61: 1004–10.

17 D’Amico AV, Whittington R, Malkowicz SB, Schultz D, Blank K, et al. Biochemical outcome after radical prostatectomy, external beam radiation therapy, or interstitial radiation therapy for clinically localized prostate cancer. JAMA 1998; 280: 969–74.

18 Jeong W, Araki M, Park SY, Lee YH, Kumon H, et al. Robot-assisted laparoscopic radical prostatectomy in the Asian population: modified port configuration and ultradissection. Int J Urol 2010; 17: 297–300.

19 Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. Ann Surg 2004; 240: 205–13.

20 Heidenreich A, Varga Z, Von Knoobch R. Extended pelvic lymphadenectomy in patients undergoing radical prostatectomy: high incidence of lymph node metastasis. J Urol 2002; 167: 1681–6.

21 Mattei A, Fuechs FG, Bhatta Dhar N, Warncke SH, Thalmann GN, et al. The template of the primary lymphatic landing sites of the prostate should be revisited: results of a multimodality mapping study. Eur Urol 2008; 53: 118–25.

22 Weingärtner K, Ramaswamy A, Bittinger A, Gerharz EW, Väge D, et al. Anatomical basis for pelvic lymphadenectomy in prostate cancer: results of an autopsy study and implications for the clinic. J Urol 1996; 156: 1969–71.

23 Dorin RP, Dameshmand S, Eisenberg MS, Chandrasoma S, Cai J, et al. Lymph node dissection technique is more important than lymph node count in identifying nodal metastases in radical cystectomy patients: a comparative mapping study. Eur Urol 2011; 60: 946–52.

24 Heidenreich A, Öhlmann CH, Poyakos S. Anatomical extent of pelvic lymphadenectomy in patients undergoing radical prostatectomy. Eur Urol 2007; 52: 29–37.

25 Bader P, Burkhard FC, Markwalder R, Studer UE. Is a limited lymph node dissection an adequate staging procedure for prostate cancer? J Urol 2002; 168: 514–8.

26 Yuh B, Wu H, Ruel N, Wilson TW. Analysis of regional lymph nodes in peri-prostatic fat following robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. BJU Int 2012; 109: 603–7.

27 Ji J, Yuan H, Wang L, Hou J. Is the impact of the extent of lymphadenectomy in radical prostatectomy related to the disease risk? A single center prospective study. J Surg Res 2012; 178: 779–84.

28 Yousif KA, Mazzola CR, Sjogberg DO, Scardino PT, Eastham JA. Long-term outcomes of patients with lymph node metastasis treated with radical prostatectomy without adjuvant androgen-deprivation therapy. Eur Urol 2014; 65: 20–5.

29 Boorjian SA, Thompson RH, Siddiqui S, Baginewski S, Bengstrath EJ, et al. Long-term outcome after radical prostatectomy for patients with lymph node positive prostate cancer in the prostate specific antigen era. J Urol 2007; 178: 864–70.

30 Schumacher MC, Burkhard FC, Thalham GN, Fleischmann A, Studer UE. Is pelvic lymph node dissection necessary in patients with serum PSA<10 ng/ml undergoing radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer? Eur Urol 2006; 50: 272–9.

31 Pagliarulo V, Hawes D, Brands FH, Grosen S, Cai J, et al. Detection of occult lymph node metastases in locally advanced node-negative prostate cancer. J Clin Oncol 2006; 24: 2375–82.

32 Ferrari AC, Stone NN, Kurek R, Mulligan E, McGregor R, et al. Molecular load of pathologically occult metastases in pelvic lymph nodes is an independent prognostic marker of biochemical failure after localized prostate cancer treatment. J Clin Oncol 2006; 24: 3081–8.

How to cite this article: Kim KH, Lim SK, Koo KC, Han WK, Hong SJ, Rha KH. Extended lymph node dissection in robot-assisted radical prostatectomy: lymph node yield and distribution of metastases. Asian J Androl 08 July 2014. doi: 10.4103/1008-682X.133319. [Epub ahead of print]