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Preoperative 3D Reconstruction Model in Slow Mohs Surgery for Dermatofibrosarcoma Protuberans
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Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans (DFSP) is a type of skin cancer that is extremely rare. Its standard treatment is either surgical wide-local excision (WLE) or Mohs micrographic surgery (MMS). Which method has the lowest recurrence rate is unknown. Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans is an uncommon soft tissue sarcoma with a high propensity for recurrence. It has always remained a clinical challenge. More technology is needed to treat the disease. We reviewed our cases and published experience and evaluated whether 3D modeling could precisely define tumor morphological characteristics and assist excision in slow Mohs surgery. There were 18 dermatofibrosarcoma protuberan cases enrolled. They were treated in Shanghai Ninth People’s Hospital from 2014 to 2019. All the 18 included patients presented with primary disease and no metastasis. All subjects had undergone thorough imaging examinations including CT and MRI. The 3D tumor reconstruction models were created for their tumors. We precisely estimated tumor boundaries and sizes according to those 3D models. Afterward, patients underwent slow Mohs surgery and surgical repair of tissue defects following tumor resection. The 3D tumor reconstruction models were successfully established. The predicted tumor volumes were measured in all 18 cases. The average volume was 38.5 cm³ (range: 8.4 cm³–183.6 cm³), which allowed for accurately locating the tumor. Tumors were completely removed in one stage of slow MMS surgery. In the second-stage surgery, the defects were repaired by different surgical methods including direct soft tissue closure, skin grafting, local flaps, or free flaps. Most patients experienced no significant complications. This practice indicated that the combination of a 3D reconstruction model and slow Mohs surgery achieves more precise and complete DFSP resection to decrease the recurrence rate.

1. Introduction

Dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans is a rare and low-grade dermal sarcoma that affects between 0.8 and 4.5 people per million per year. It is responsible for about 4% of all soft tissue sarcomas [1, 2]. Although metastasis is uncommon, DFSP can infiltratively grow and has a proclivity for local recurrence [3]. The tumor most often presents in adults between the ages of 30 and 50 years and may arise anywhere on the body. Most often they arise on the trunk, extremities, and head [4, 5].

Clinically, DFSP presents as an asymptomatic, indurated plaque-like lesion that slowly enlarges over months, sometimes with a telangiectatic surface. The tumors are covered by skin color to red tinged. As DFSP slowly enlarges, it becomes firm and nodular. The nodule is usually fixed to the dermis but freely moves over deeper tissues. The effective treatment for DFSP is surgical, but its margins are hard to define. Their pseudopod-like projections can invade surrounding tissues. These projections make it difficult to perform proper surgical management and make it uneasy to thoroughly clear the tumor, which is responsible for the high rate of recurrence [6].
Surgical resection methods reported in the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines include Mohs micrographic surgery (MMS), the modified Mohs surgery, and the wide excisional surgery with 2 to 4 cm margins to the fascia or muscle. MMS and modified Mohs surgery are recommended to achieve lower recurrence rates [7]. In MMS, the excised fresh specimen is frozen and horizontally or tangentially sliced into serial sections. Microscopic examinations of these sections are then evaluated for complete margins [8]. However, a high likelihood of tissue tearing and fat loss during frozen section preparation makes it difficult to identify negative margins, especially in cases with spindle cell infiltration [9]. To get around this constraint, several researchers used modified MMS with paraffin-embedded sections, sometimes known as slow Mohs surgery, and got better results than with normal MMS [10]. Regardless of the surgical method, surgeons aspire to achieve all surgical margins free of malignancy and to maximize tissue preservation in a single-stage surgery. However, several repeat surgeries may be required until margins are clear because of the preoperatively undefined invasion extent of DFSP. Therefore, preoperative precise estimation of the DFSP boundaries is a promising way to achieve negative margins and reduce the recurrence rates at the same time. The NCCN guidelines recommend magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to ascertain the extent of deep tumor invasion, particularly in patients with large recurrent lesions. Computed tomography (CT) is not indicated except in rare cases in which underlying bone involvement is suspected [7, 11]. Unfortunately, these two-dimensional imaging modalities provide insufficient information and nonintuitive contours in DFSP.

We looked back on 18 patients for whom we developed three-dimensional (3D) tumor reconstruction models in this study. To aid DFSP excision in slow Mohs surgery as a one-stage operation, 3D modeling can precisely identify tumor morphological traits. To our knowledge, few previous studies have presented such detailed information using combined 3D tumor reconstruction models and slow Mohs surgery, as in our study.

The remainder of the study is organized as follows: the next section will describe the patients and the methods used on them. The findings of these procedures will be subsequently presented. Finally, there will be a debate and some concluding remarks.

2. Patients and Methods

The details of the patients involved and the methods implemented on them are explained below.

2.1. Patients. This study involved 18 primary patients who underwent lesion tissue biopsy with a confirmed diagnosis of DFSP at the Shanghai Ninth People’s Hospital between January 2014 and June 2019. These patients presented with primary disease and no metastasis. We obtained detailed medical histories and performed physical examinations and recorded the findings. The largest tumor diameter on the skin surface was measured using a measuring tape. Later, ultrasonography, CT, and MRI were performed, and 3D tumor reconstruction models were created. After we precisely estimated tumor boundaries and sizes, patients underwent slow Mohs surgery and surgical repair of tissue defects following tumor resection. Patients were completely assessed by imaging examinations. Table 1 summarizes their clinical features. The hospital database and telephone interviews were used to acquire patient follow-up information.

2.2. Preoperative 3D Tumor Model Reconstruction. We performed preoperative MRI and CT. We used data from CT images to acquire the surface contour of the body and the landmarks of the bone. Then, we used MRI data to form the model of the tumor. The DICOM files of sequential MR images were loaded into the Mimics software 19.0 (Materialise NV, Belgium) to generate the 3D imaging model. The intensity of the tumor was relatively low in MR. The thresholding function was used to separate the sarcoma from normal soft tissue. To further precise the sarcoma, the region-growing function was used to mark only the suspected regions attached to its center. Finally, we manually adjusted the tumor regions and created the three-dimensional model with the help of a radiologist (Figure 1). The range of tumor invasion was determined by the registration of MR and CT images, which involved transforming the MR and CT image data into the same coordinate system. It was registered according to the anatomical landmarks. For some tumors, their actual transverse diameters in 3D space were much larger than seen from the surface [12].

2.3. Slow Mohs Surgery. The DFSP treatment aimed to completely remove the tumor using one-stage slow Mohs surgery and to preserve as many normal tissues as possible. Based on the patient’s 3D tumor reconstruction model, the skin boundary and infiltrative depth were marked first. Then, to improve the possibility of negative margins after excision, we drew a second line around 1 cm of the perimeter (Figure 2(a)). The tumor was excised along the second boundary line with a 1 cm wide lateral and deep layer (Figure 2(b)). If the area of the tumor infiltrating the derma was less than the area in the subcutaneous tissue, the tumor was obliquely cut from the derma to deep tissues, and the dissection plane was parallel to the lateral side of the tumor. Then, the inner part of the tumor was debulked (Figure 2(c)), and the outlays were cut with a scalpel at 3- to 5 mm thicknesses. To make several incisions at 3, 6, 9, and 12 o’clock, the outlay was expanded to form planar tissue (Figure 2(d) and E), and outlays were fixed in formalin for 12 hours. Then, they were cut into small pieces smaller than 2 cm. Adjacent cut edges were marked with different colors of dye; then, the relative position of each tissue specimen was mapped on the pathology sheet (Davidson Marking System; Bradley Products, Bloomington, MN, USA). The paraffin-embedded tissue was then sequentially dissected. We scanned the slices after hematoxylin and eosin staining and noted the tumor cells in each slice. Finally, we evaluate the margins and determine the tumor’s location. It took 3–5 days for two professional pathologists to complete this process. If tumor cells were detected, resection was expanded by 5 mm in the
following stage(s) and we repeat these steps until all clear margins were achieved [1, 12].

2.4. Surgical Reconstruction of the Secondary Defect. The wound defect after excising the tumor was covered with iodoform gauze and petrolatum gauze because the Mohs pathological results were not immediately available. After 3–5 days, if the pathological results confirmed that all margins were negative, patients subsequently underwent reconstructive surgery. During the second-stage operation, direct soft tissue closure, skin grafting, local flaps, or free flaps were used to heal the wounds, depending on their characteristics. Patients’ surgical problems were documented, and they were followed up on a regular basis.

3. Results

The following are the outcomes of the techniques that were implemented.

3.1. Patients’ Characteristics. Eighteen primary DFSP patients were included in this study. There were 10 men and 8 women, with an average age of 33.8 years (range: 18–58 years). DFSP was located on the breast in four cases; abdomen in three cases; head, back, arm, and cheek in two cases each; and the waist, shoulder, and groin in one case each. The average duration of DFSP was 2.6 years (range: 1–6 years). The median clinical tumor surface’s largest diameter was 5.7 cm (range: 2.2–16.5 cm) (Table 1).

DFSP was typically characterized by a red sclerotic bulging nodule protruding from the skin surface. It is similar to a scar or keloid. Therefore, tumor biopsy and histopathological analysis were necessary to confirm the diagnosis of DFSP. No patients reported pain in the lesion except two patients who reported occasional itch in the lesion. All patients underwent physical examination, ultrasonography, CT, and MRI to confirm that the DFSP was not ulcerated and to identify metastasis.

3.2. The 3D Tumor Reconstruction Model. The 3D tumor reconstruction models allowed for accurately locating the tumor in all the 18 DFSP cases. The depth and extent of tumor infiltration were observed, and the interaction between the muscle, bone, and tumor. The predicted tumor
volumes were measured in all 18 cases, and the average volume was 38.5 cm³ (range: 8.4 cm³–183.6 cm³) (Table 1).

3.3. Surgical Treatment and Complications. All 18 DFSP patients underwent slow Mohs surgery, and the pathological results confirmed that all margins were negative. Tumors were completely removed in the one-stage surgery. In the second-stage surgery, the defects were repaired by different surgical methods, namely, six soft tissue closures, five split-thickness skin grafts, five local flaps, and two anterolateral thigh (ALT)-free flaps.

Most patients experienced no significant complications, and only two patients developed necrosis in a small part of the skin graft. One patient experienced poor wound healing because of high tension in the breast local flap. With

Table 1: Patient characteristics in 18 cases of dermatofibrosarcoma protuberans.

| Case | Age (years)/Sex | Site  | Evolution time (years) | Largest diameter (cm) | 3D tumor volume (cm³) | Reconstruction         |
|------|----------------|------|------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1    | 32/M           | Head | 2                      | 3.2                   | 14.4                  | Local flap             |
| 2    | 23/M           | Waist| 2                      | 5.3                   | 37.6                  | Local flap             |
| 3    | 40/M           | Breast| 3                     | 7.1                   | 39.4                  | Skin graft             |
| 4    | 27/F           | Arm  | 1                      | 2.8                   | 8.4                   | Soft tissue closure    |
| 5    | 33/F           | Abdomen| 3                    | 11                    | 67.2                  | Soft tissue closure    |
| 6    | 30/M           | Shoulder| 3                    | 4.7                   | 25.1                  | Skin graft             |
| 7    | 58/M           | Breast| 2                      | 3                     | 13.6                  | ALT-free flap          |
| 8    | 32/F           | Breast| 4                      | 9.5                   | 24.4                  | Local flap             |
| 9    | 42/M           | Abdomen| 6                     | 16.5                  | 183.6                 | Skin graft             |
| 10   | 40/M           | Back | 3                      | 5.6                   | 51.52                 | Local flap             |
| 11   | 46/F           | Breast| 3                      | 4.5                   | 25.2                  | Skin graft             |
| 12   | 30/M           | Back | 2                      | 3.5                   | 19.6                  | Soft tissue closure    |
| 13   | 26/F           | Head | 3                      | 6.6                   | 27.7                  | Local flap             |
| 14   | 18/M           | Abdomen| 1                    | 3.8                   | 22.7                  | Soft tissue closure    |
| 15   | 29/F           | Breast| 2                      | 2.5                   | 9.4                   | Soft tissue closure    |
| 16   | 46/F           | Groin| 4                      | 11.5                  | 96.6                  | Skin graft             |
| 17   | 25/M           | Arm  | 3                      | 4                     | 13.5                  | Soft tissue closure    |
| 18   | 31/F           | Cheek| 2                      | 2.2                   | 13.6                  | ALT-free flap          |

ALT-free flap: anterolateral thigh-free flap.

Figure 2: The slow Mohs surgical plan. (a) The preoperative surgical design to mark the margin of excision detected by 3D tumor model reconstruction. (b) Excision of the DFSP. (c) The inner part of tumor was debulked. ((d), (e)) The outlays were cut and were expanded to form planar tissue. (f) The outer layer was cut into small sections and marked for orientation with red, yellow, and green dye.
minimal dressing changes, all problems resolved within a month of surgery.

3.4. Follow-Up. All 18 patients completed follow-up, which was a median of 3.7 years (range: 1–5 years). No patients developed recurrence.

3.5. Typical Case. A 58-year-old male patient suffered a DFSP in the right nasolabial sulcus for 2 years (Table 1, Case 7). Using a tape measure, the biggest tumor diameter was 3 cm prior to surgery (Figure 3(a)). An accurate infiltrative depth and extent were visualized using a preoperative 3D tumor reconstruction model. The 3D tumor volume was 13.6 cm³, and the tumor infiltrated the skin, subcutaneous tissue, and muscle but not the right maxilla (Figure 3(b)–3(d)). According to palpation, ultrasonography, and the 3D tumor reconstruction model, the skin boundary and infiltrative depth were marked first. We then marked a second 1 cm line around this boundary to increase the likelihood of achieving negative margins with excision (Figure 3(e)). Slow Mohs surgery was performed, and the lesion was excised (Figure 3(f)). Subsequently, the inner part of the tumor was debulked, and the outlays were cut and expanded to form planar tissue (Figure 3(g)); afterward, they were fixed in formalin for 12 hours (h) and cut into small pieces measuring no more than 2.0 cm in diameter (Figure 3(h)). After 3 days, the pathological results confirmed that all margins were negative, and the secondary defect was repaired using an anterolateral thigh-free flap. Postoperatively, the free flap survived, and the patients were satisfied with the surgical outcomes (Figure 3(i)). After 3 years of follow-up, the DFSP has not recurred.

4. Discussion

The DFSP presents as an asymptomatic growing indurated plaque-like lesion in the skin, and the surrounding skin may appear telangiectatic [13]. It has been described as an “iceberg tumor” owing to the extensive degree of microscopic tumor extension not visually appreciated or by surface palpation [14]. Typically, DFSP is fixed to the dermis but freely moves over the deeper planes and occasionally may primarily involve the deeper subcutaneous tissues. The lesion does not usually become nodular until late in the disease course when the overlying skin may become stretched and shiny [11]. This finding may be easily confused with scar, keloid, and lipoma [13, 15].

The primary treatment for DFSP is surgical resection. Because of the uneven projections of the tumor-infiltrating surrounding tissues, it is difficult to entirely eradicate DFSP. There is a considerable probability of local recurrence as a result of this. If initial surgery yields positive margins, resection must be recommended whenever possible, with the goal of achieving clear margins. Therefore, the surgical approach to DFSP resection must be meticulously planned to completely remove the tumor in a one-stage surgery. References [7, 11]. Several authors have suggested that the surgical margin in wide large excision (WLE) for DFSP should be more than 3 cm to achieve clear histological margins and a low rate of recurrence [16–18]. However, this imprecise excision surgery may damage adjacent normal tissues, which increases the difficulty of reconstructing the secondary defect in the second-stage surgery. Even with MMS and slow Mohs surgery, the ambiguous DFSP boundaries lead to repeated Mohs pathological examinations to define whether surgical margins are clear. As a result, a detailed preoperative tumor model could help define correct boundaries and depth, and make more precise excisions, and reduce surgery time and burdens for surgeons and patients.

Haycox et al. [19] first proposed the imaging-based reconstruction of DFSP in 1997; however, the authors were limited by the radiologic technologies and only created a hand-drawn model. Gradual developments in CT and MRI technology and software allowed these examinations to be used in DFSP patients. Nowadays, 3D reconstruction models based on CT and MRI data are used to construct the tri-dimensional structure of tumors and organs [20–22]. As a result, we elected to design 3D DFSP reconstruction models, which were really useful:

(1) First, 3D tumor models made it possible to generate a precise size and configuration to define the tumor boundaries, particularly the depth of invasion. Marking a 1 cm wide second line around this boundary permitted complete removal of the DFSP using slow Mohs as a one-stage surgery. The objective was achieved that the tumor was totally removed with fewer Mohs stages.

(2) Second, the 3D tumor model may give insight into the shape and location. The relationship with the surrounding tissues of complex tumors allows us to formulate surgical planning with multidisciplinary cooperation.

(3) Third, 3D imaging provides more information. Some pseudopod-like projections in DFSP can be seen invading surrounding tissue using 3D modeling. It indicated that we cannot intraoperatively ignore these invading tissues. However, not all pseudopod-like projections can be precisely observed because of limitations in image resolution and the software calculation procedure. Ultrasonography is a useful tool for defining tumor borders in suspicious tissue. Negative margins are more likely when the tumor is resected 1 cm distant from the expected tumor boundary. Indeed, the subsequent Mohs pathological results in our 18 patients confirmed that all tumors were completely removed in the one-stage surgery.

In this study, we preferred slow Mohs surgery to MMS because slow Mohs surgery can achieve excellent margin outcomes more often. In 1988, Breuninger [23] first described slow Mohs surgery as a modification of MMS. Compared with MMS, slow Mohs provides a 3D histological analysis of the margins. Additionally, the 3D specimens are embedded in paraffin rather than made from serial frozen sections [24]. Although Lee et al. [10] suggested that frozen section MMS was as effective as paraffin section for the
treatment of 71 DFSP patients during a mean 25.4-month follow-up, some scholars hold different opinions. Tan, Serra-Guillen, and Wacker et al. [25–27] reported a remarkably higher rate of DFSP recurrence with MMS using frozen sections compared with paraffin sections. This could be due to the difficulty in distinguishing extremely minute tumor residues in frozen dermal tissue from healthy dermal tissue, especially when tissue freezing affects the dermal architecture [28]. Fusiform arrangement of DFSP cells along with tumor infiltrates distributed throughout the healthy dermis that may be misinterpreted as granulation tissue growing secondary to the first surgery is another factor impacting the frozen section [25, 28]. In addition, immunohistochemical staining for CD34 is an option with paraffin-embedded tissue, if necessary, whereas special stains are not possible with frozen sections [29]. Further advantages of slow Mohs are the high quality of the resulting slides, the accuracy for discriminating fine tumor strands from normal skin, and the clear survey of the excised tumor [27]. The most significant downside of slow Mohs surgery is that it takes longer than MMS. Some patients in our study underwent prolonged hospitalization and delayed defect closure until pathological results were postoperatively available 3–5 days. However, we believe that slow Mohs pathological results regarding tumor margins are more reliable and accurate.

Another issue with DFSP is that it requires the closure of flaws generated by tumor excision to be delayed, which could lead to infection. Marjan et al. used a vacuum-assisted closure (VAC) system with continuous pressure of 75–125 mmHg between the surgical interventions to prevent infection and avoid early wound adhesion [30]. Eduardo Bertolli et al. [31] reported using an artificial dermal graft for

**Figure 3:** (a). DFSP was located in the right nasolabial sulcus. ((b)–(d)) The preoperative 3D tumor model reconstruction. (e) The preoperative surgical design to mark the margin of excision. (f) Excision of the DFSP. (g) The inner part of tumor was debulked, and the outlay was expanded to form planar tissue. (h) The outer layer was cut into small sections and marked for orientation with red, yellow, and green dye. (i) The secondary defect was repaired using an anterolateral thigh-free flap, and this free flap survived.
In a nutshell, this is the first study to use 3D tumor reconstruction models in DFSP slow Mohs surgery. We looked back on our experience treating 18 DFSP patients in this retrospective research. The preoperative assessment of the DFSP borders is a viable technique to attain negative margins while also lowering recurrence rates. Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is recommended by the NCCN recommendations to determine the amount of deep tumor infiltration, especially in patients with large recurring lesions. Except in rare cases where underlying bone involvement is suspected, computed tomography (CT) is not recommended [7, 11]. Unfortunately, in DFSP, these two-dimensional imaging methods provide insufficient information and contours that are not comprehensible.

In this study, we looked back at 18 patients for whom we created three-dimensional (3D) tumor reconstruction models. The 3D modeling can precisely detect tumor morphological features to improve DFSP excision in slow Mohs surgery as a one-stage operation. Few earlier studies have offered this information to our knowledge. The use of a 3D reconstruction model in conjunction with slow Mohs surgery results in more precise and complete DFSP excision, lowering the recurrence rate.

5. Conclusions
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