RESEARCH ARTICLE

Editorial Process: Submission:05/26/2022 Acceptance:12/02/2022

Minilaparotomy, Cyfra21-1, and Other Predicting Factors for Suboptimal Cytoreductive Surgery in Advanced Epithelial **Ovarian Cancer: A Pilot Study**

Chalaithorn Nantasupha¹, Suwalee Pojchamarnwiputh², Kittipat Charoenkwan^{1*}

Abstract

Background: Currently, there is no reliable method to predict the result of the primary cytoreduction to decide whether to go on primary cytoreductive surgery or receive neoadjuvant chemotherapy. This study aimed to identify candidate predicting factors from clinical data, serum biomarkers, CT/MRI imaging, and minilaparotomy for suboptimal cytoreduction in women with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. Methods: Women who were clinically suspicious of advanced-stage epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, and peritoneal cancer undergoing primary cytoreductive surgery were recruited. Clinical data, abdominopelvic CT/MRI, and serum biomarkers, including CA125, HE4, and Cyfra21-1, were collected preoperatively. At the start of the surgery, a minilaparotomy incision was made, the peritoneal cavity was assessed, and the operating surgeons gave the impression of whether the optimal cytoreductive surgery would be attainable. Subsequently, the incision was extended as necessary, and the standard cytoreductive surgery was attempted. After the procedure completion, the surgical outcome (optimal vs. suboptimal cytoreduction) and other operative outcomes were recorded. The association between the potential predicting factors and the surgical outcome was examined. Results: Fourteen patients were included in this pilot study. Twelve patients were diagnosed with primary ovarian or fallopian tube cancer, while two had ovarian metastasis from colorectal cancer. The optimal cytoreduction was achieved in eight women. After minilaparotomy, the surgeons could predict suboptimal surgery correctly in five out of six cases (OR: 24.12, 95%CI: 2.34-Inf., p<0.01). Moreover, no patient with the finding of rectosigmoid invasion from CT had optimal surgery (OR: 12.96, 95%CI: 1.26-Inf., p=0.03). Lastly, increased serum cyfra21-1(>8 ng/mL) and HE4 (>83 pmol/L) were significantly associated with suboptimal cytoreduction, with OR: 35.00, 95%CI: 1.74-702.99, p=0.02 and OR: 15.00, 95%CI: 1.03-218.30, p=0.05, respectively. Conclusion: The finding of rectosigmoid invasion from abdominal CT, increased serum cyfra21-1 and HE4, and the initial minilaparotomy impression were potentially associated with suboptimal cytoreduction.

Keywords: cyfra21-1- epithelial ovarian cancer- HE4- minilaparotomy- suboptimal cytoreduction

Asian Pac J Cancer Prev, 23 (12), 4119-4124

Introduction

Epithelial ovarian cancer is the second leading cause of death among gynecologic cancer in Thailand (Sung et al., 2021). More than two-thirds of the patients are diagnosed at an advanced stage resulting in poor survival outcomes. Primary cytoreductive surgery followed by adjuvant chemotherapy is the main treatment for advanced-stage epithelial ovarian cancer. Complete tumor resection with no gross residuum results in the best prognosis and the most extended survival (Glasser, 2005; Brun et al., 2008). On the other hand, the presence of a residual tumor is one of the most important prognostic factors negatively affecting survival outcomes. Currently, neoadjuvant chemotherapy (up-front chemotherapy) has a role as an alternative treatment approach in patients who are medically unfit for surgery and those whose chance for optimal cytoreductive surgery, having residual tumors < 1 cm in largest diameter, seems implausible. The potential benefits of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in this situation include the opportunity to improve the general condition and correct medical problems preventing the patients from undergoing primary surgery, the higher chance of optimal cytoreduction with subsequent surgery given rapid clinical and radiologic responses, and the decrease in operative morbidity associated with less extensive surgery following a few cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (Wright et al., 2016). Therefore, an ability to

¹Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand. ²Department of Radiology, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand. *For Correspondence: kittipat.c@cmu.ac.th

predict the outcome of surgical cytoreduction, optimal vs. suboptimal (residual tumors > 1 cm in largest diameter), with high accuracy, would be beneficial, particularly for the patients who are fit enough for primary surgery. If the probability of optimal cytoreductive surgery is high, it would be sensible to proceed with primary debulking surgery. Nevertheless, if suboptimal cytoreduction is more likely, neoadjuvant chemotherapy could be offered reasonably. However, preoperative measures or model that can effectively predict optimal cytoreduction remains to be identified. Hence, selecting patients to undergo primary surgical cytoreduction or receive neoadjuvant chemotherapy is still challenging and depends mainly on attending physicians' preferences.

Over the last decade, several trials attempted to find reliable assessment tools that predict optimal cytoreduction using serum markers, such as CA125 and human epididymis factor 4 (HE4) (Dehn et al., 2003; Pergialiotis et al., 2018), or preoperative imaging using CT or MRI. Unfortunately, the results were heterogeneous and still lacked accuracy when using each method alone (Dowdy et al., 2004; Fagotti et al., 2008; Chudecka-Glaz et al., 2014).

Cyfra21-1 is cytokeratin 19 fragment 21.1, found in serum and body fluid. It was studied as a tumor marker for cancer diagnosis and a prognostic factor for survival in bladder, lung, nasopharyngeal, and ovarian cancer. Its serum level was higher in metastatic disease compared with local disease (Gadducci et al., 2001; Risum et al., 2008).

Diagnostic laparoscopy has been reasonably employed to select advanced ovarian cancer patients to undergo primary debulking surgery or receive neoadjuvant chemotherapy (du Bois et al., 2009). Nevertheless, the procedure requires laparoscopic skills and has additional expenses compared to laparotomy. Alternatively, minilaparotomy, a minimally invasive open procedure for gynecologic abdominal surgery, could be more straightforward, practical, and less expensive than laparoscopy (Gadducci et al., 2001).

We hypothesized that preoperative serum biomarkers, imaging, and minilaparotomy could accurately predict suboptimal cytoreductive surgery in advanced epithelial ovarian cancer.

Materials and Methods

This pilot study aims to initially examine the preoperatively recognized factors associated with suboptimal surgery in clinically advanced ovarian cancer patients, including serum biomarkers (CA125, HE4, and Cyfra21-1), CT/MRI imaging, and minilaparotomy impression.

Since there was no study using Cyfra21-1 or minilaparotomy impression in suboptimal cytoreductive surgery prediction, an observational, prospective cohort pilot study was designed. Women that were clinically suspicious for advanced-stage (FIGO stage III/IV) epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube, or primary peritoneal cancer and planned to undergo primary surgical cytoreduction at the Faculty of Medicine,

Chiang Mai University, between 2018 and 2019 were included. Exclusion criteria were receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy, no preoperative abdominopelvic CT/MRI results, unable to collect blood specimens, and unfit for surgery.

After approval by the Faculty of Medicine, Research Ethics Committee, women who met the inclusion criteria were recruited. Informed consent was obtained from each participant. A clinical examination was done, and the results were recorded. Preoperative serum CA125, HE4, and Cyfra21-1 were collected one day before surgery. Abdominopelvic (with or without chest) CT/ MRI, done within four weeks before surgery, was reviewed separately to define the disease spreading and organ metastases by the designated radiologist. Before primary surgical cytoreduction, the surgeon made a midline 4-6-cm incision (minilaparotomy) below the umbilicus. Then, intraperitoneal/retroperitoneal disease was assessed as thoroughly as possible by visualization and palpation. After the exploratory minilaparotomy, the operating surgeons gave the impression of whether the optimal cytoreductive surgery would be achievable. Subsequently, standard surgical cytoreductive procedures were performed, including total hysterectomy, bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy, and tumor debulking attempting to remove all gross visible tumors. The primary outcome was the status of surgical cytoreduction expressed as the proportion of the participants that had suboptimal cytoreduction. The association between preoperative serum markers, imaging, and minilaparotomy impression with suboptimal cytoreduction was examined.

Statistical analysis was performed using Stata® program version 15 (StataCorp LP, College Station, Texas, USA). Hypothesis testing for the continuous variables between the suboptimal and optimal groups was done using the Mann-Whitney U test. The factors associated with suboptimal surgery were analyzed using logistic regression. The P-value of < 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Assay method

The 5-mL blood was drawn (Lithium heparin tube) from patients with clinically suspected advanced ovarian cancer one day before the surgery. The blood samples were separated by centrifugation, and the serum samples were aliquoted and stored at -20°C until tested. Cyfra21-1 was measured with electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (ECLIA) using Cobas e 411 analyzers (Roche Diagnostics, USA). HE4 and CA125 were measured with automatic chemiluminescence analyzer Cobas 8000 and the corresponding kit (Roche Diagnostics, USA).

Results

Table 1 shows the characteristics of the participants. Fourteen patients were included in this pilot study. Twelve patients (85.7%) had primary tubo-ovarian tumors, while the other two had colorectal cancer with ovarian metastasis. Six patients (42.9%) had suboptimal cytoreductive surgery. Four patients in the suboptimal surgery group had FIGO stage III-IV tubo-ovarian cancer,

Table 1. Patients' Characteristics and Cytoreductive Surgery Outcomes

Characteristics	Number (%) or Mean ± Standard deviation (SD)				
	Overall	Suboptimal Surgery			
Age (year)	56.29 ± 4.94	56.00 ± 5.39	56.80 ± 4.55		
Body Mass Index	23.38 ± 3.52	23.06 ± 3.41	23.96 ± 4.06		
ECOG					
0	8 (57.1)	5 (62.5)	3 (50.0)		
1	4 (28.6)	3 (37.5)	1 (16.7)		
2	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (16.7)		
3	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (16.7)		
Primary Site					
Ovary	9 (64.3)	7 (87.5)	2 (33.3)		
Fallopian Tube	2 (14.3)	1 (12.5)	1 (16.7)		
Tubo-Ovarian	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (16.7)		
Ovarian Metastasis	2 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (33.3)		
Histology					
High-grade Serous	4 (28.6)	1 (12.5)	3 (50.0)		
Endometrioid	2 (14.3)	2 (25.0)	0 (0.0)		
Clear Cell	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (16.7)		
Mucinous	1 (7.1)	1 (12.5)	0 (0.0)		
Adenocarcinoma, unspecified	3 (21.4)	1 (12.5)	2 (33.3)		
Others	3 (21.4)	3 (37.5)	0 (0.0)		
FIGO Stage of the Tubo-Ovarian Can	cer				
I	5 (41.7)	5 (62.5)	0 (0.0)		
II	2 (16.7)	2 (25.0)	0 (0.0)		
III	4 (33.3)	1 (12.5)	3 (75.0)		
IV	1 (8.3)	0 (0.0)	1 (25.0)		
Computed Tomography					
Carcinomatosis Peritonei					
No	12 (85.7)	7 (87.5)	5 (83.3)		
Yes	2 (14.3)	1 (12.5)	1 (16.7)		
Rectosigmoid Invasion					
No	10 (71.4)	8 (100.0)	2 (33.3)		
Yes	4 (28.6)	0 (0.0)	4 (66.7)		
Omental Cake					
No	9 (64.3)	7 (87.5)	2 (33.3)		
Yes	5 (35.7)	1 (12.5)	4 (66.7)		
Ascites					
None - Minimal	11 (78.6)	6 (75.0)	5 (83.3)		
Moderate - Massive	3 (21.4)	2 (25.0)	1 (16.7)		
Serum Markers					
CA125 (U/mL)	$980.47 \pm 1,\!695.58$	$745.62 \pm 1,479.20$	$1,403.20 \pm 2,149.47$		
HE4 (pmol/L)	407.57 ± 803.34	160.80 ± 148.97	$851.76 \pm 1,292.04$		
Cyfra21-1 (ng/mL)	27.40 ± 66.49	6.17 ± 7.09	65.61 ± 106.91		
Minilaparotomy Prediction					
Optimal Probability	9 (64.3)	8 (100.0)	1 (16.7)		
Suboptimal Probability	5 (35.7)	0 (0.0)	5 (83.3)		

Data are expressed as mean \pm standard deviation or N (%).

Table 2. Association between Preoperative Predicting Factors and Cytoreductive Surgery Outcomes

Preoperative factors	Suboptimal surgery N (%)	Optimal surgery N (%)	Univariable logistic regression analysis		
			Odds ratio ^a (95% Confidence Interval)	P-value	
Minilaparotomy Impression					
Optimal	1 (11.1)	8 (88.9)	1		
Suboptimal	5 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	24.12 ^a (2.34 - Inf.)		
Computed Tomography					
Carcinomatosis Peritonei				0.83	
No	5 (41.7)	7 (58.3)	1		
Yes	1 (50.0)	1 (50.0)	1.40 (0.07 - 28.12)		
Peritoneal/Organ Involve	ement			0.55	
No	2 (22.2)	7 (77.8)	1		
Yes	4 (80.0)	1 (20.0)	14.00 (0.94 – 207.60)		
Rectosigmoid Invasion				0.03*	
No	2 (20.0)	8 (80.0)	1		
Yes	4 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	12.96 ^a (1.26 – inf.)		
Ascites				0.71	
Absent or Minimal	5 (45.5)	6 (54.5)	1		
Moderate or Massive	1 (33.3)	2 (66.6)	0.60(0.41 - 8.73)		
Serum Markers					
CA125 (U/mL)				0.54	
≤ 168	2 (33.3)	4 (66.6)	1		
> 168	4 (50.0)	4 (50.0)	2.00 (0.22 - 17.89)		
HE4 (pmol/L)				0.05*	
≤ 83	1 (14.3)	6 (85.7)	1		
> 83	5 (71.4)	2 (28.6)	15.00 (1.03 - 218.30)		
Cyfra21-1 (ng/mL)				0.02*	
≤ 8	1 (12.5)	7 (87.5)	1		
> 8	5 (83.3)	1 (16.7)	35.00 (1.74 - 702.99)		

^aOdds ratio estimated by exact logistic regression. *, Statistically significant.

while the other two in this group were those who had advanced colorectal cancer with ovarian metastasis. The most common histologic type for those with tubo-ovarian cancer was high-grade serous carcinoma. All patients had preoperative abdominal CTs. The results were similar between the optimal and suboptimal surgery groups except for the higher prevalence of rectosigmoid invasion in the suboptimal surgery group. Of note, no patient in the optimal surgery group was found to have rectosigmoid invasion from the preoperative imaging study. Regarding the serum markers, the median serum CA125 appeared higher in the suboptimal groups. Furthermore, HE 4 and Cyfra21-1 were notably different between groups. Serum HE 4 and Cyfra21-1 in the suboptimal surgery group were approximately 3 and 5 times higher than in the optimal surgery group. After minilaparotomy, the surgeons predicted optimal cytoreduction for all patients who were finally optimally cytoreduced. On the other hand, suboptimal surgery was predicted based on minilaparotomy findings in five out of six participants in the suboptimal cytoreduction group.

Table 2 illustrates the association between preoperative factors of interest and suboptimal cytoreductive surgery status. Minilaparotomy impression, Cyfra21-1, HE4, and rectosigmoid invasion on abdominal CT were significantly

associated with suboptimal primary cytoreductive surgery in univariable analysis. All five patients predicted to have suboptimal surgery from minilaparotomy impression finally had suboptimal cytoreduction (p <0.01). Preoperative serum HE4 and Cyfra21-1 were significantly associated with suboptimal surgery with the cut-off of 83 pmol/L and 8 ng/mL for HE4 and Cyfra21-1, respectively. In contrast, this pilot study could not demonstrate the association between CA125 and suboptimal surgery. Of all preoperative CT findings, only the presence of rectosigmoid invasion was significantly associated with suboptimal surgery.

Discussion

In this pilot study, we found that minilaparotomy impression appeared to be the most promising factor for the prediction of suboptimal cytoreductive surgery with 100% positive predictive value, 100% specificity, 88.9% negative predictive value, and 83% sensitivity. Other factors potentially associated with suboptimal cytoreduction were the presence of rectosigmoid invasion on abdominopelvic CT, serum HE4 and Cyfra 21-1. Of note, only five of 12 patients (41.7%) were finally diagnosed with advanced (FIGO stage III-IV) epithelial

ovarian cancer from histopathological findings of the surgical specimens. Two cases were ovarian metastasis from colorectal cancer.

Most studies showed that the diseases involving peritoneum and large bowel mesentery on CT imaging were significantly associated with suboptimal surgery (Dowdy et al., 2004; Axtell et al., 2007; Chudecka-Glaz et al., 2014). However, both a multi-institutional validation study and the latest meta-analysis in 2018 (including seven retrospective studies and three prospective studies) concluded that preoperative CT had a poor discriminative capacity to predict suboptimal cytoreduction. Therefore, it should be used cautiously (Axtell et al., 2007; Chudecka-Glaz et al., 2014). In this study, only rectosigmoid invasion was significantly associated with suboptimal cytoreductive surgery in univariable analysis. The potential impact of peritoneal and organ involvement from CT on surgical cytoreduction outcomes could not be statistically demonstrated in this small pilot study.

Although some meta-analyses showed that CA125 and HE4 might be promising predicting factors for suboptimal cytoreductive surgery in epithelial ovarian cancer (Dehn et al., 2003; Pergialiotis et al., 2018), the data on accuracy in predicting suboptimal surgery are limited. Also, there was significant heterogeneity among the studies. This pilot study showed a significant association between HE4, Cyfra21-1, and suboptimal cytoreductive surgery. However, significantly different cut-off levels of serum markers were employed among studies. HE4 cut-off level was higher in previous studies, ranging from 154 to 473 pM (Tang et al., 2015; Shen and Li, 2016; Hu et al., 2018), compared to the 83 pM value calculated from our data. Also, the values of the serum markers in general varied among studies. The median level of Cyfra21-1 in this study in the optimal and suboptimal surgery groups was 3.4 and 18.6, compared with 1.9 and 10.2 in the previous study (Gadducci et al., 2001). The difference in the cutoff and median value between studies may be from the different proportions of histological cell types, FIGO stages, and tumor aggressiveness within the particular study population.

Currently, laparoscopy has a growing role in predicting the probability of optimal surgical cytoreduction in epithelial ovarian cancer, determining who should go on primary cytoreductive surgery or receive neoadjuvant chemotherapy (du Bois et al., 2009; Fagotti et al., 2016). Nevertheless, laparoscopy needs extra cost and a well-trained surgeon, so it might not suit patients in developing countries. Minilaparotomy is also a minimally invasive procedure that is easy to perform, provides an opportunity for tissue biopsy, and could be done even before primary cytoreductive surgery. Through minilaparotomy evaluation, if the optimal cytoreduction is likely, the surgeon could extend the incision and proceed with the standard cytoreductive procedures. If this is not the case, the procedure could be abandoned, and neoadjuvant chemotherapy is offered instead. This pilot study showed a promising role of minilaparotomy in predicting suboptimal cytoreductive surgery. Since serum markers and imaging alone have certain limitations

in suboptimal surgery prediction due to various cut-off values of serum markers and lacking accuracy between study cohorts, a predictive model using a combination of serum markers, imaging and minilaparotomy might be helpful and should be further studied.

The promising predicting factors for suboptimal cytoreductive surgery in clinically advanced ovarian cancer patients were rectosigmoid colon invasion from abdominal CT, serum cyfra21-1 and HE4, and minilaparotomy impression. A predictive model using a combination of preoperative imaging, serum biomarkers, and minilaparotomy might be valuable and should be further studied.

Author Contribution Statement

All authors contributed to the study's conceptualization and design. CN performed material preparation and data collection. SP reviewed the preoperative abdominopelvic CT/MRI. KC analyzed and interpreted the patient data. CN was a major contributor to writing the manuscript. All authors read, revised, and approved the final manuscript.

Availability of data and material: The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Acknowledgments

We thank Tanarat Muangmool for statistical consulting and analysis.

Funding

This study was funded by the Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University (Grant number 038/2562)

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All subjects gave their informed consent for inclusion before participating in the study. The study was conducted following the Declaration of Helsinki, and the protocol was approved by the Faculty of Medicine, Research Ethics Committee (OBG-2561-05699).

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

Axtell AE, Lee MH, Bristow RE, et al (2007). Multi-institutional reciprocal validation study of computed tomography predictors of suboptimal primary cytoreduction in patients with advanced ovarian cancer. J Clin Oncol, 25, 384-9.

Brun JL, Rouzier R, Uzan S, et al (2008). External validation of a laparoscopic-based score to evaluate resectability of advanced ovarian cancers: clues for a simplified score. Gynecol Oncol, 110, 354-9.

Chudecka-Glaz AM, Cymbaluk-Ploska AA, Menkiszak JL, et al (2014). Serum HE4, CA125, YKL-40, bcl-2, cathepsin-L and prediction optimal debulking surgery, response to chemotherapy in ovarian cancer. J Ovarian Res, 7, 62.

Dehn H, Hogdall EV, Johansen JS, et al (2003). Plasma YKL-40,

- as a prognostic tumor marker in recurrent ovarian cancer. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*, **82**, 287-93.
- Dowdy SC, Mullany SA, Brandt KR, et al (2004). The utility of computed tomography scans in predicting suboptimal cytoreductive surgery in women with advanced ovarian carcinoma. *Cancer*, **101**, 346-52.
- Du Bois A, Reuss A, Pujade-Lauraine E, et al (2009). Role of surgical outcome as prognostic factor in advanced epithelial ovarian cancer: a combined exploratory analysis of 3 prospectively randomized phase 3 multicenter trials: by the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Gynaekologische Onkologie Studiengruppe Ovarialkarzinom (AGO-OVAR) and the Groupe d'Investigateurs Nationaux Pour les Etudes des Cancers de l'Ovaire (GINECO). *Cancer*, 115, 1234-44.
- Fagotti A, Ferrandina G, Fanfani F, et al (2008). Prospective validation of a laparoscopic predictive model for optimal cytoreduction in advanced ovarian carcinoma. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*, **199**, 642.e1-.e6.
- Fagotti A, Ferrandina G, Vizzielli G, et al (2016). Phase III randomised clinical trial comparing primary surgery versus neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced epithelial ovarian cancer with high tumour load (SCORPION trial): Final analysis of peri-operative outcome. *Eur J Cancer*, **59**, 22-33.
- Gadducci A, Ferdeghini M, Cosio S, et al (2001). The clinical relevance of serum CYFRA 21-1 assay in patients with ovarian cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*, **11**, 277-82.
- Glasser MH (2005). Minilaparotomy: a minimally invasive alternative for major gynecologic abdominal surgery. *Perm J.* **9**, 41-5.
- Hu TWY, Nie D, Gou JH, et al (2018). Predictive significance of preoperative CT findings for suboptimal cytoreduction in advanced ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Cancer Manag Res*, **10**, 2019-30.
- Pergialiotis V, Karampetsou N, Bellos I, et al (2018). The diagnostic accuracy of Human Epididymis Factor 4 for the prediction of optimal debulking in patients with ovarian cancer: A meta-analysis of observational studies. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*, **28**, 1471-7.
- Risum S, Hogdall C, Loft A, et al (2008). Prediction of suboptimal primary cytoreduction in primary ovarian cancer with combined positron emission tomography/computed tomography--a prospective study. *Gynecol Oncol*, **108**, 265-70.
- Shen Y, Li L (2016). Serum HE4 superior to CA125 in predicting poorer surgical outcome of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Tumour Biol*, **37**, 14765-72.
- Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al (2021). Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*, **71**, 209-49.
- Tang Z, Chang X, Ye X, et al (2015). Usefulness of human epididymis protein 4 in predicting cytoreductive surgical outcomes for advanced ovarian tubal and peritoneal carcinoma. *Chin J Cancer Res*, **27**, 309-17.
- Wright AA, Bohlke K, Armstrong DK, et al (2016). Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for newly diagnosed, advanced ovarian cancer: Society of Gynecologic Oncology and American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline. J Clin Oncol, 34, 3460-73.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.