

## Bölüm 4

# İNTRABDOMİNAL/ RETROPERİTONEAL SARKOMLARDA GÖRÜNTÜLEME EŞLİĞİNDE BİYOPSİ

Gökhan YÜCE<sup>5</sup>

### GİRİŞ

Retroperitoneal yumuşak doku sarkomları (RYS) genellikle hastalıkla ilişkisiz semptomlar nedeni ile yapılan görüntülemeler sırasında insidental olarak saptanan ve karın ağrısı, sırt ağrısı, barsak obstrüksiyonu ve palpe edilebilen abdominal kitleler oluşana kadar retroperitoneal alanda çok büyük çaplarda tanı alan tümörlerdir. RYS genellikle nadir görülür. Tüm yumuşak doku tümörlerinin yaklaşık %12-15'ini oluştururlar (1). Ortalama insidans 2.7 milyonda 1'dir (2,3).

RYS'un en sık görülen iki alt subtipi liposarkom (%63) ve leiomyosarkomdur (%19). Bunun dışında sinovial sarkom, soliter fibröz tümör ve malign periferik sinir kılıfı tümörleri daha az sıklıkta görülür (4). Hastalığın alt tipi yapılacak cerrahinin de belirleyicisidir örneğin liposarkomlarda, leiomyosarkomlara veya soliter fibröz tümörlere göre daha ekstansif bir cerrahi gerekir (5). Bunlara ek olarak, rekürens paterni, uzak metastaza olan yatkınlık ve tedaviye yanıt; tümör derecesi, anatomik lokasyon, tümör çapı ve histolojik tip ile direkt ilişkilidir (6).

RYS'lar nadir görülen hastalıklar olmaları nedeniyle klinisyen ve radyologların kolayca dikkatinden kaçabilir veya yanlış tanı alabilirler. Bu tümörler aynı bölgeden köken alabilen lenfomalar, primer germ hücreli tümörler ve metastatik testiküler kanser ile karışabilirler. Bu bölgede görülebilecek benign natürlü diğer kitleler ise retroperitoneal fibrosis, schwannom ve ganliyonöromlardır. Tanının gecikmesi ve hastaların deneyimsiz merkezlerce takip edilmesinin katastrofik sonuçları olabilir. Örneğin hastaya inkomplet rezeksiyon yapılabilir veya peritoneal kavite tümörle kirletilerek hastanın küratif operasyon şansı ortadan kaldırılabilir (7,8,9). Tümör evresinden sonra uzun vadeli sağ kalımın en önemli belirleyici-

<sup>5</sup> Uzman Dr, Ankara Atatürk EAH Radyoloji Kliniği, drgkhan85@gmail.com

kanama olmuştur (32). Bunun dışında diğer biyopsiler sırasında da görülebilen organ perforasyonları gelişebilir. Ancak işlem genellikle güvenlidir, komplikasyon oranı düşüktür ve hospitalizasyon gerektirmez.

## **KAYNAKLAR**

1. Bonvalot S, Rivoire M, Castaing M, et al. Primary retroperitoneal sarcomas: a multivariate analysis of surgical factors associated with local control. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009;27:31–37
2. Morosi C, Stacchiotti S, Marchianò A, et al. Correlation between radiological assessment and histopathological diagnosis in retroperitoneal tumors: analysis of 291 consecutive patients at a tertiary reference sarcoma center. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2014;40:1662-70
3. Mullinax JE, Zager JS, Gonzalez RJ, et al. Current diagnosis and management of retroperitoneal sarcoma. *Cancer Control.* 2011;18: 177–187
4. Trans-Atlantic RPS Working Group. Management of primary retroperitoneal sarcoma (RPS) in the adult: a consensus approach from the Trans-Atlantic RPS Working Group. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015; 22: 256–263.
5. Gronchi A, Bonvalot S, Le Cesne A, et al. Resection of uninvolved adjacent organs can be part of surgery for retroperitoneal soft tissue sarcoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2009; 27: 2106–2107.
6. Bonvalot S, Miceli R, Berselli M, et al. Aggressive surgery in retroperitoneal soft tissue sarcoma carried out at high-volume centers is safe and is associated with improved local control. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2010;17:1507–1514.
7. Gronchi A, Colombo C, Raut CP. Surgical management of localized soft tissue tumors. *Cancer* 2014; 120: 2638–2648. 4
8. Gronchi A, Strauss DC, Miceli R, Bonvalot S, Swallow CJ, Hohenberger P et al. Variability in patterns of recurrence after resection of primary retroperitoneal sarcoma (RPS): a report on 1007 patients from the multi-institutional collaborative RPS Working Group. *Ann Surg* 2016; 263: 1002–1009.
9. Evans HL. Atypical lipomatous tumor, its variants, and its combined forms: a study of 61 cases, with a minimum follow-up of 10 years. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2007; 31: 1–14
10. Malinka T, Nebrigg M, Klein F, Pratschke J, Bahra M, Andreou A Analysis of outcomes and predictors of long-term survival following resection for retroperitoneal sarcoma. *BMC Surg.* 2019;10:19:61.
11. Bonvalot S, Gagnard E, Stoeckle E, et al. Survival Benefit of the Surgical Management of Retroperitoneal Sarcoma in a Reference Center: A Nationwide Study of the French Sarcoma Group from the NetSarc Database. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2019;26(7):2286-2293
12. Thway K. Well-differentiated liposarcoma and dedifferentiated liposarcoma: An updated review. *Semin Diagn Pathol.* 2019 ;36(2):112-121
13. Knelson M, Haaga J, Lazarus H, et al. Computed tomography-guided retroperitoneal biopsies. *J Clin Oncol : Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol.* 1989; 7(8):1169–73.
14. Agid R, Sklair-Levy M, Bloom AI, et al. CT-guided biopsy with cutting-edge needle for the diagnosis of malignant lymphoma: experience of 267 biopsies. *Clin Radiol.* 2003; 58(2):143–7
15. Tomozawa Y, Inaba Y, Yamaura H, et al. Clinical value of CT-guided needle biopsy for retroperitoneal lesions. *Korean J Radiol.* 2011;12(3):351–7
16. Willen H, Akerman M, Carlen B. Fine needle aspiration (FNA) in the diagnosis of soft tissue tumours; a review of 22 years experience. *Cytopathology* 1995;6(4):236–47
17. Nikolaidis P, Silverman SG, Cibas ES, et al. Liposarcoma subtypes: identification with computed tomography and ultrasound-guided percutaneous needle biopsy. *Eur Radiol.* 2005; 15(2):383–9
18. Ikoma N, Torres KE, Somaiah N, et al. Accuracy of preoperative percutaneous biopsy for the diagnosis of retroperitoneal liposarcoma subtypes. *Ann Surg Oncol.* 2015 ;22(4):1068-72

19. Heesewijk JPM. Effective dose during needle interventions: conebeam CT guidance compared with conventional CT guidance. *J Vasc Interv Radiol: JVIR*. 2011;22(4):455-61
20. Yarram SG, Nghiem HV, Higgins E, et al. Evaluation of imaging-guided core biopsy of pelvic masses. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*. 2007;188(5):1208-11
21. Shah J, Kirshenbaum M, Shah K. CT characteristics of primary Retroperitoneal tumors and the importance of differentiation from secondary retroperitoneal tumors. *Curr Probl Diagn Radiol*. 2008;31(17):1-5.
22. Nishimura H, Zhang Y, Ohkuma K, et al. MR imaging of soft-tissue masses of the extraperitoneal spaces. *Radiographics*. 2001;21:1141-54
23. Rajiah P, Sinha R, Cuevas C, Dubinsky TJ, Bush WH, Kolokythas O. Imaging of uncommon retroperitoneal masses. *Radiographics*. 2011;31:949-76
24. Lu DS, Silverman SG, Raman SS. MR-guided therapy. Applications in the abdomen. *Magn Reson Imaging Clin North Am*. 1999;7(2):337-48
25. Kariniemi J, Blanco Sequeiros R, Ojala R, Tervonen O. MRI- guided abdominal biopsy in a 0.23-T open-confi guration MRI system. *Eur Radiol*. 2005;15:1256-62
26. Kitajima K, Kono A, Konishi J, Suenaga Y, Takahashi S, Sugimura K. 18 F-FDG-PET/CT findings of retroperitoneal tumors: a pictorial essay. *Jpn J Radiol*. 2013;31:301-9
27. Wallace MJ, Gupta S, Hicks ME. Out-of-plane computedtomography- guided biopsy using a magnetic-fi eld-based navigationsystem. *Cardiovasc Interv Radiol*. 2006;29: 108-13
28. Elliot Levi. *Retroperitoneal Biopsy: Indications and Imaging Approach*. © Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016 395. A.R. Rastinehad, D.N. Siegel (eds.), *Interventional Urology*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-23464-9\_29
29. Conyers R, Young S, Thomas DM. Liposarcoma: molecular genetics and therapeutics. *Sarcoma*. 2011;2011:483154
30. Robertson EG, Baxter G. Tumour seeding following percutaneous needle biopsy: the real story! *Clin Radiol*. 2011;66(11): 1007-14
31. Chew C, Reid R, O'Dwyer PJ. Value of biopsy in the assessment of a retroperitoneal mass. *Surgeon*. 2006;4(2):79-81
32. Wilkinson MJ, Martin JL, Khan AA, Hayes AJ, Thomas JM, Strauss DC. Percutaneous core needle biopsy in retroperitoneal sarcomas does not influence local recurrence or overall survival. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2015;22(3):853-8
33. Bonvalot S, Raut CP, Pollock RE, et al. Technical considerations in surgery for retroperitoneal sarcomas: position paper from ESurge, a master class in sarcoma surgery, and EORTC-STBSG. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2012;19(9):2981-91