

---

# Oncological and survival outcomes following transoral robotic surgery versus transoral laser microsurgery for the treatment of oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma: a systematic review of case series

---

Dr. Sabapathy Giridhar Suren Krishnan MBBS

Master of Clinical Science

Joanna Briggs Institute

Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences

The University of Adelaide

Australia

January 2017

## Acknowledgements

I extend my immeasurable appreciation and gratitude to the following people whose support has made this thesis possible.

To my mother, thank you for being my first teacher, for the study lessons you taught me as a child, and for providing me with every opportunity to learn.

To my father, thank you for being an incredible role model; I hope that this manuscript makes you proud.

To my girlfriend, Belle, thank you for your sacrifices, support, grace and guidance.

To my friend and colleague, Dr. Stephen Kao, thank you for your input and for giving me a mind to bounce ideas off.

To my teachers, or 'Gurus' as they are called in my culture, Mr. JC Hodge, Dr. Kandiah Umaphysivam, A/Prof. Craig Lockwood, A/Prof. Ed Aromataris, Dr. Catalin Tufanaru, Ms. Maureen Bell and Alex Mignone. I will always cherish the generosity, care, thoughtful consideration and support you have given me during this process. You have helped me on this journey and inspired me. I hope one day to show the same kindness you have shown me to younger disciples of my own.

## Declaration

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University's digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

I acknowledge the support I have received for my research through the provision of an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship.

Dr. Sabapathy Giridhar Suren Krishnan

13<sup>th</sup> July 2017

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	2
Declaration	3
List of tables	6
List of figures	6
Executive summary	7
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1. Context of the review	9
1.2. Anatomy of the oropharynx	9
1.3. Oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma	11
1.3.1. <i>Epidemiology</i>	11
1.3.2. <i>Etiology of OPSCC and the significance of HPV</i>	11
1.3.3. <i>Clinical presentation and patterns of spread</i>	12
1.3.4. <i>Diagnostic evaluation</i>	12
1.4. Staging of OPSCC	13
1.5. Prognostication of OPSCC	14
1.6. Historic perspective on treatment of oropharyngeal SCC	14
1.7. Modern minimally invasive surgical approaches to OPSCC	15
1.7.1. <i>Transoral laser microsurgery (TLM)</i>	16
1.7.2. <i>Transoral robotic surgery (TORS)</i>	17
1.8. Alternatives to surgery for treatment and adjuvant therapy	18
1.9. Justification of need for evidence synthesis in this area	19
<b>Chapter 2: Systematic review protocol</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1. Objective and statement of review questions	21
2.2. Inclusion criteria	21
2.2.1. <i>Types of participants</i>	21
2.2.2. <i>Types of interventions</i>	22
2.2.3. <i>Types of outcomes</i>	22
2.2.4. <i>Types of studies</i>	23
2.3. Search strategy	24
2.4. Study selection	24
2.5. Critical appraisal	25
2.6. Data extraction	25

2.7. Data synthesis	25
<b>Chapter 3: Results</b>	<b>27</b>
3.1. Search results	27
3.2. Assessment of methodological quality	27
Included	28
Eligibility	28
Identification	28
Screening	28
3.3. Description of included studies	30
3.4. Oncological outcomes	31
3.5. Survival outcomes	33
<b>Chapter 4: Discussion</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1. Overview of findings	34
4.2. Limitations to the study	35
4.3. Implications for practice	37
4.4. Implications for research	38
<b>Chapter 5: Conclusion</b>	<b>39</b>
5.1. Future directions	39
5.2. Recommendations	39
<b>References</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>50</b>
Appendix I: Search strategy for different databases	50
Appendix II: Critical appraisal instruments	53
Appendix III: Data extraction instruments	54
Appendix IV: Included studies – study characteristics/participants characteristics	56
Appendix V: Included studies – Bibliographic details and study characteristics	60
Appendix VI: Included studies – outcomes data summary	62
Appendix VII: Five-year outcome data by technique	64
Appendix VIII: Three-year outcome data by technique	65
Appendix IX: Two-year outcome data by technique	66
Appendix X: One-year outcome data by technique	67
Appendix XI: Excluded studies on full text review	68
Appendix XII: Authors contacted	70

## List of tables

Table 1: Stage grouping for all head and neck sites except the nasopharynx and thyroid (pg. 12)

Table 2: Results of critical appraisal of case series (pg. 24)

Table 3: Comparison of available margin outcomes (pg. 27)

## List of figures

Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram illustrating the process of including and excluding studies from the systematic review (pg. 29)

## Executive summary

### Background

Transoral laser microsurgery (TLM) and transoral robotic surgery (TORS) are two principal minimally invasive transoral surgical techniques for the treatment of patients with oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC). Currently this increasingly common disease is more often caused by exposure to the human papilloma virus (HPV) rather than tobacco or alcohol. This condition affects younger patients who have a much better prognosis. These minimally invasive techniques have superseded traditional open surgical techniques in the management of head and neck cancer, and also provide a genuine alternative to radiotherapy for definitive treatment. While both TLM and TORS have been shown in case series to have good oncological outcomes, the key differences between both approaches warrant a detailed comparison.

### Objectives

The objective of this systematic review was to synthesize the best available evidence regarding the oncological and survival outcomes (as measured by DC, DFS, DSS and OS) of TORS versus TLM for the treatment of oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma in adults.

### Inclusion criteria

The patient populations studied were male and female adults who had undergone transoral endoscopic surgery with TORS or TLM for the treatment of primary squamous cell carcinoma arising from the oropharyngeal mucosa. The tumor could be of any T-stage and HPV status, but surgical treatment had to have been aimed at curative intent rather than palliation.

### Methods

A comprehensive search strategy was employed to find both published and unpublished studies that evaluated local, regional and distant control, tumor margins, and disease free, disease specific and overall survival outcomes. Databases that were searched included PubMed, CINAHL, Embase, Web

of Knowledge and Scopus. Grey Literature was searched through the Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), Scirus, MedNar and ProQuest.

## **Results**

Seventeen cases series were included in this review, of which 11 studies had TLM as the intervention of interest and six studies examined TORS. There were a total of 1,257 patients included in this review with ages ranging between 27 and 92 with 65% of patients being male and 35% female. Follow-up periods ranged from one to 132 months and outcomes were measured at one, two, three and five years. Differences in oncological outcomes between TLM and TORS could not be elucidated generally, and with respect to particular patient sub-groups, such as patients with a positive HPV status or patients with different tumor T-stages.

## **Conclusions**

Both TORS and TLM can achieve complete tumor resection. Significant heterogeneity of extracted data and inclusion of studies with low levels of evidence eliminated valid comparison of oncological and survival outcomes between TORS and TLM, therefore there was no means to show superiority of one approach over the other. Operator and institution experience, as well as factors relating to cost and availability, will likely dictate which surgical platform is used. With ever expanding minimally invasive surgical technology and ongoing development of competing surgical platforms, the imperative will lie with leading surgeons around the globe to construct and execute well-designed trials.