Extent of Neck Dissection and Cervical Lymph Node Involvement in Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma
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Introduction: Tumor resection combined with neck dissection (ND) or radiotherapy are established methods for the treatment of patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC). However, the extent of ND can lead to postoperative complications. Therefore, for the first time, this study aims to identify lymph node involvement in OSCC performed in a bilateral systematic approach based on oncologic board meetings relying on presurgical magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computed tomography (CT).

Materials and Methods: In a retrospective single-center study, patients with primary OSCC resection and systematic ND performed in 4 different manners (MRND III bilateral, MRND III left and SND right, MRND III right, SND left, and SND bilateral) were examined. Lymph node involvement allocated to levels was evaluated depending on primary localization and T-stage.

Results: A total of 177 consecutive patients (mean age 63.64; 92 female, male 85) were enrolled in this study. A total of 38.98% showed cervical lymph node involvement, and metastases were found in levels 1–4. The distribution of positive lymph node metastases (n=190 LNs) was 39.47% in level 1, 38.95% in level 2, 10.53% in level 3, and 11.05% in level 4.

Discussion: In a cohort of OSCC patients with systematic bilateral ND, levels 1 and 2 had positive lymph node involvement, and no lymph node involvement was seen at level 5. Without any clinical or imaging suspicion, ND expanding 5-level MRND should be avoided regardless of the primary tumor localization, T-stage and intraoperative proof of cervical metastases.
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INTRODUCTION

According to the current guidelines, primary tumor resection and neck dissection (ND) are established methods for healing and prolonging the life of patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC). A therapy recommendation is made after discussing the patient case in an interdisciplinary oncologic board meeting. The verdict is based on a histological examination of the malignant tumor as well as numerous staging examinations leading to a preoperative classification of TNM and UICC classification. These include clinical examination and imaging procedures such as orthopantomography/panorex (OPG), ultrasound, computed tomography (CT) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI). Ultrasound, CT and MRI are important for diagnostics in cervical lymph node involvement of oral squamous cell carcinoma (1). Especially with MRI, a high specificity for the assessment of cervical lymph node metastases is possible (2, 3). In addition to tumor resection, surgical therapy comprises ND, which is possible in many variants. Additionally, radiotherapy is often conducted as an adjuvant therapy option. The indication for adjuvant radiation therapy depends on several factors, i.e., status of resection or particular nodal status (4, 5). Consequently, the findings after lymph node removal are of eminent importance for the proposal of any radiation therapy.

The extent of cervical lymph node removal is dependent on the clinical and imaging classification of cervical metastasis, the “T” stage, and the localization of the primary tumor. In Germany, the recommendation is based on the national guidelines for tumors of the oral cavity (1). Lymph node metastases are seen as the most important prognostic factor (6).

ND is differentiated into elective and therapeutic. Elective ND is performed in case there is no clinical hint for lymph node involvement. Therapeutic ND is conducted in cases of clinical evidence for lymph node involvement at first diagnosis or in cases of nodal relapse. The latter is also called salvage ND (7). This classification is independent of the extent of ND. The extent of ND is determined by anatomical regions introduced by Robbins as a general classification on the topography of 6 levels of cervical lymph nodes. The levels are defined within anatomical structures of the head and neck area (see Table 1). According to this classification, 4 types of ND have been described: radical neck dissection (RND), modified radical neck dissection (MRND), selective neck dissection (SND), and extended neck dissection (END) (8, 9) (Table 2).

Some data exist about the rate and extent of lymph node metastases in OSCC (13–16). These data, however, include OSCC not solely of the oral cavity and show either no or a limited collection of primary localization. Others do not give any exact information about the types of ND performed ipsi- and bilaterally.

Accordingly, for the first time, the present study intends to depict the occurrence of lymph node involvement of a single center observation on a specific systematic and reproducible bilateral approach based on an interdisciplinary oncologic board meeting relying on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computed tomography (CT).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A review of all patients with histopathological proof of OSCC and primary surgery in the Department of Craniomaxillofacial and Plastic Surgery, University Medical Center Frankfurt, Germany, from January 1, 2014 until December 31, 2020 was conducted. Patients were identified by analyzing internal databases and confirmed manually. Ethics approval was given (03/2013; 40/18; 2021–76). The study has been registered in the German Clinical Trials Register (DRKS) Number 00016654.

The inclusion criteria were first diagnosis histopathological proof of OSCC and operable primary manifestation in treatment naïve patients, bilateral SND (level I to IV), MRND III (level I to V) or a combination of those. The following parameters were recorded and evaluated: age, sex, anatomical localization of the tumor, TNM classification as T-stage, grading, lymph node

---

**Table 1** | Levels and their boundaries according to Robbins classification (5).

| Level | Name and boundaries |
|-------|---------------------|
| Level IA | Submental (anterior: symphysis; inferior: hyoid; medial: anterior belly of contralateral digastic muscle; lateral: anterior belly of ipsilateral digastic muscle) |
| Level IB | Submandibular (mandible; posterior belly of muscle; anterior belly of digastic muscle; stylohyoid muscle) |
| Level II | Upper jugular nodes (skull base; inferior body of the hyoid bone; stylohyoid muscle/vertical plane of the spinal accessory nerve; vertical plane of the spinal A and B accessory nerve/lateral border of the sternocleidomastoid muscle) |
| Level III | Middle jugular group (inferior body of the hyoid; inferior border of the cricoid cartilage; lateral border of sternohyoid muscle; lateral border of sternocleidomastoid muscle or sensory branches of cervical plexus) |
| Level IV | Lower jugular group (inferior border of the cricoid cartilage; clavicle; lateral border of sternohyoid muscle; lateral border of sternocleidomastoid muscle or sensory branches of cervical plexus) |
| Level VA | Posterior triangle group (apex of convergence of sternocleidomastoid and trapezius muscle/lower border of the cricoid cartilage; lower border of the cricoid cartilage/and B clavicle; posterior border of sternocleidomastoid muscle or sensory branches of cervical plexus; anterior border of trapezius muscle (?) |
| Level VI | Anterior compartment group (hyoid bone; suprasternal; common carotid artery; common carotid artery) |
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Extent of Neck Dissection in OSCC

 Nine different localizations of the primary tumor were defined: lower lip, floor of mouth (FOM), alveolar process of upper jaw, alveolar process of lower jaw, tongue, buccal, soft palate, hard palate, and retromolar region.

 Follow-up period has a range from 3 to 63 months.

 All patients’ cases have been discussed after surgery with the definite histopathological results. Depending on these results, follow-up or adjuvant radio or radiochemotherapy, according to the current German guidelines have been administered (1).

 A survival analysis has been conducted and was depicted in a Kaplan-Meier-Graph (Figure 1). As no statistical relevant information could be gained by dividing the cohort into subgroups, a graph was plotted for the complete cohort of patients (n=177).

 All statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad (GraphPad, USA). Descriptive statistics for quantitative variables are given as the mean value.

 RESULTS

 The study reviewed a cohort of patients with primary tumor resection of oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) with systematic bilateral neck dissection (ND).

 Patient Collective

 A total of 177 consecutive patients (92 women, 85 men) who fit the inclusion criteria with a mean age of 63.64 years (SD 11.98, range 29–92 y), female 63.32 years (SD 11.98, 29–92 y), male 62.45 years (SD 10.47; 37–87 y) were included in this study (Table 3). A total of 49.63 (SD 22.79, min 9, max 142) lymph nodes were dissected on average per patient. Survival was 91% in the first year after diagnosis, 79.1% in the second year, 77.54% in third year, 76.47% in the fourth year, and 72.27% after the fifth year (Figure 1).

 Tumor Stage

 All resected tumors were histopathologically analyzed and classified in all cases as oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC). Tumors were characterized according to T-size (Table 4), lymph node involvement (Table 5), and grading (1–3; data not shown). The T-size distribution of the primary tumors ranged from T1 to T4 (T1 = 54 (30.51%), T2 = 53 (29.94%), T3 = 37 (20.91%), T4 = 43 (24.29%)).

 Primary localization of the tumor was divided into nine groups, anatomically defined from front to retromolar region: lower lip, floor of mouth (FOM), alveolar process of upper jaw, alveolar process of lower jaw, tongue, buccal, soft palate, hard palate, and retromolar region.

 The distribution of primary tumor localization is shown in Figure 2A for all patients and in Figure 2B differentiated by sex. The highest occurrence was observed in the tongue (53 cases, 29.94%) and FOM (47 cases, 26.55%), followed by the alveolar process of the lower jaw (35 cases, 19.77%). Lower frequencies were found for other locations: alveolar process of upper jaw (13 cases, 7.34%), buccal (10 cases, 5.65%), retromolar region

 Table 2 | Types of ND according to Robbins and Medina.

| Types of neck dissection (ND) | Extent |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| Radical neck dissection (RND) | lymphatic structures and 1 or more of SAN, IJV, SOM |
| Selective neck dissection (SNd) Lateral/ anterolateral/posterolateral | defined levels (I to III, I to IV) of lymphatic structures without other structures |
| Modified radical neck dissection (MRND) MRND I | RND without SAN |
| MRND II | without SAN, IJV |
| MRND III (“functional ND”) | without SAN, IJV, SOM |
| Extended neck dissection | RND with 1 or more lymphatic or other anatomical structures |

SAN, Spinal accessory nerve; IJF, internal jugular vein; SCM, sternocleido muscle; MRND, modified radical neck dissection; SND, selective neck dissection.
(9 cases, 5.08%), hard palate (5 cases, 2.82%), lower lip (3 cases, 1.69%), and soft palate (2 cases, 1.13%). Figure 2B shows high discrepancy between genders concerning localization of FOM, with the nearly double amount in men than in women.

In 54 of all cases (30.51%), the tumor exceeded the midline and was present on both sides.

### Types of ND

ND was performed in 4 different manners (as previously defined in “Materials and Methods”). The distribution of ND performed is shown in Figure 3, with a total distribution of SND bilateral=71 cases (40.11%), MRND III bilateral=57 cases (32.2%), MRND III right, SND left=29 cases (16.38%), MRND III left and SND right=20 cases (11.3%).

### Lymph Node Metastases

Most patients showed no lymph node involvement (108 cases, 61.02%). In the remaining patient cohort (69 cases, 38.98%), up to 11 lymph node metastases in one patient were found, with no significant differences between sexes. Most patients with lymph node metastasis showed 1–2 lymph nodes with metastasis. Fifteen (8.47%) patients had bilateral cervical metastases. Lymph node metastases were found in levels 1–4. The distribution of positive lymph nodes (total 190 LNs) showed 75 metastases at level 1

| TABLE 3 | Patient and age distribution of the patient cohort. |
|---------|------------------------------------------|
|         | Female | Male  |
| Frequency | 92     | 85    |
| Mean Age  | 64.75  | 62.45 |
| Minimum   | 29     | 37    |
| Maximum   | 92     | 87    |
| Std. Deviation | 13.14 | 10.47 |

| TABLE 4 | pT-stage for primary diagnosis in the whole patient cohort. |
|---------|------------------------------------------|
|         | Frequency | Percent |
| T1      | 54        | 30.51   |
| T2      | 53        | 29.94   |
| T3      | 37        | 20.90   |
| T4      | 33        | 18.64   |

Data are represented as total and relative values, based on n=177 patients.
of a German university hospital in the location of lymph node involvement after systematic bilateral neck dissection (ND). To the best of our knowledge, this investigation is the first based on a systematic bilateral approach based on the recommendation of an interdisciplinary oncologic board meeting relying on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and computed tomography (CT). This is to provide an indication of the extent of ND of OSCC and possible adjuvant radiation therapy.

A total of 38.98% of the examined patients had histologically confirmed lymph node involvement. The study shows that cervical lymph node involvement in primarily surgically treated OSCC with concomitant ND is extended to levels 1 to 4. In total, 78.48% of tumor-positive lymph nodes were found in levels 1 and 2. Additionally, 11.05% of patients in level 4 showed lymph node involvement. No lymph node involvement was found in level 5.

Concerning the overall rate of cervical lymph node involvement, the results of the study are similar to those in the literature. Sagheb et al., retrospectively reviewed a German cohort of 204 patients with early stage T1 and T2 tumors of the tongue alone and found a rate of lymph node involvement of 23% (13). Moratin et al., found a rate of 42.6% for carcinoma in the mandible and 35.3% for the maxilla at initial diagnosis (17, 18).

Shah et al., examined a cohort of 501 patients with 516 cervical lymph node dissections in 1965 to 1986 with OSCC under radical ND. They found levels 1 to 3 to be major sites of lymphogenic metastasis (14). Kakei et al., reported positive lymph nodes in 100 patients with cN1 neck undergoing unilateral supraomohyoid ND regularly up to level 3, concerning tongue cancer also including level 4 (19). In particular, the results concerning the tongue as the primary localization of the tumor were similar to those of the present study.

Wharshawsky et al., 2019, postulated that for the clinical cN0 neck situation on the grounds of a meta-analysis, SND is

### DISCUSSION

The present study was designed to retrospectively investigate the population of patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC)
adequate (20). Woolgar 1997, examined the localization of lymph node involvement depending on the localization of OSCC in 154 patients. Of these, 73 patients had a total of 347 tumor-positive lymph nodes; 20% of them were found in level 1, 47% in level 2, 16% in level 3, 13% in level 4, and 3% in level 5 (15). Although the extent of involvement in level 1 and level 2 is lower than that in the underlying study, the results also indicate that mainly the upper levels are affected by cervical metastases. However, a general recommendation for only a 3-level ND based on these findings might be dangerous. De Zinis et al., found in a retrospective study of 89 otolaryngology department patients with bilateral complete ND occult or skip metastases in levels 3, 4 and 5 (21). In a large-scale study from 2015, D’Cruz highlighted the special importance of elective cervical lymph node dissection, which provides a survival advantage in T-stadiums 1 and 2 (7). However, this study relies only on an ultrasound scan of the neck after randomization and is thus inferior to general cervical objective and reproducible staging performed with CT or MRI.

Medina proposes to name any individual kind of ND by the parts additionally removed (22). For general comparability, it is important to define these subgroups. The patients included in the present study underwent only two different and defined forms of ND: SND and MRND. However, more subgroups make a statistical analysis difficult. Werner – as an otolaryngologist – points out that a comprehensive examination could only be carried out on the basis of uniform standards such as bilateral RND (23). Conversely, the case numbers for RND are too small to be inferred because radicality and patient impairment prohibit this form of ND today.

In addition, it can be assumed that imaging diagnostics as a therapy-critical precondition for surgical intervention ensures objective findings and high accuracy in the prediction of cervical lymph node involvement. The patients observed in the study invariably received local staging by MRI or CT examination. Ultrasound as an investigator-dependent method was not considered in the routine workflow of the clinic (24). In contrast to comparable studies, the surgery is also based on decisions of an interdisciplinary oncologic board meeting, with the result that precise therapy and extent of ND can be assumed preoperatively.

The aim of every therapeutic decision on the extent of ND should be, in addition to tumor-free survival, the least possible postoperative restrictions and complications. The results of the present study are, therefore, of particular interest as postoperative complications or limitations depend directly on the extent of ND (12). For example, the larger the anatomical area, the greater the risk of nerve injury and restriction of movement (25, 26). Recently, Ferreli et al., discovered that the amount of isolated lymph node metastases in level IIb is low.

| pN-classification of all patients. |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| Frequency | Percent |
| N0 | 108 | 61.01 |
| N1 | 22 | 12.43 |
| N2 | 1 | 0.6 |
| N2b | 22 | 12.43 |
| N2c | 12 | 6.78 |
| N3 | 11 | 6.21 |

Data are represented as total and relative values, based on n=177 patients.
Accordingly, sparing level IIb is associated with a potentially lower risk of any impairment of the spinal accessory nerve (27) which is also involved in level V neck dissection. Thus, the extent to an ipsilateral MRND including level 5 without pathological evidence of metastasis should be questioned in order to improve postoperative quality of life.

The same holds true concerning the role of adjuvant radiation therapy; according to the high-risk factors such as positive margins and/or extracapsular nodal extension, adjuvant postoperative radiotherapy should be delivered. Lymphovascular invasion, perineural invasion, positive nodes, and Stadium T3 and 4 count for intermediate risk (5). Adjuvant radiotherapy should be applied in cases of positive margins, extranodal extension, T3 or T4, N2 and N3 and may be applied in cases of N1 without extranodal extension and adjusted to patients’ individual parameters and preferences (5). In the case of adjuvant radiotherapy, attention should be directed to the extent of the radiation field: a general recommendation for adjuvant radiation therapy with 54 Gy, an additional 12 Gy for special cases, is made for all draining lymph nodes at risk and dissected lymph node regions (4). However, there is still no sufficient and detailed definition for the included levels according to Robbins for these areas.

**CONCLUSION**

In a cohort of 177 OSCC patients with systematic bilateral ND, levels 1 and 2 had positive lymph node involvement and no lymph node involvement was seen at level 5. Without any clinical or imaging suspicion, ND beyond level 4 and expanding to level 5 should be avoided regardless of the primary localization and T-stage of the tumor. Additionally, under the circumstances of finding positive lymph nodes intraoperatively, a standard approach for the extent to ipsilateral MRND should be prevented. Analogously, the extent of the radiation field in adjuvant radiation therapy needs to be questioned and limited when there is no sign of lymph node involvement in the primary staging.
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