The role of surgery in the treatment of gastrointestinal lymphomas other than low-grade MALT lymphomas
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ABSTRACT

Background and Objectives. A bias in clinical investigations on gastrointestinal lymphomas is the lack of testing the intention to treat as to resection, emergency conditions at presentation and selection brought about by the evaluation of feasibility of surgery.

Design and Methods. A prospective study involved 154 patients with gastrointestinal nodular or high-grade MALT lymphomas, 111 with a gastric and 43 with an intestinal presentation. The decision to resect or treat conservatively was left to clinicians, on condition that it was previously defined for each patient.

Results. Failure-free survival was significantly higher in the 106 resected patients than in the 48 unresected ones but did not differ according to whether primary intention to treat or emergency surgery/ elective treatment. Survival was similar in patients operated on by choice and in those because of an emergency. Intentionally unresected patients had a significantly better survival than those not undergoing surgery despite the initial intention, for a number of clinical reasons. Patients with gastric lymphoma survived longer than those with intestinal disease and prognostic factors were analyzed separately in the two groups. The best predictors of prognosis were performance status and serum lactate dehydrogenase level in gastric lymphomas, resection alone in intestinal ones.

Interpretations and Conclusions. The prognosis of gastrointestinal lymphomas depends on lymphoma-related factors and not on surgical treatment. The prognosis of intestinal ones is exclusively related to surgery. These data support the appropriateness of different clinical approaches to gastric and intestinal lymphomas.

©2000, Ferrata Storti Foundation

Key words: gastric lymphoma, intestinal lymphoma, prognosis, therapy

CONTROVERSIES SURROUND THE CLINICAL APPROACH TO PRIMARY GASTROINTESTINAL LYMPHOMAS (PGL) AND PROBLEMS REMAIN CONCERNING THEIR THERAPEUTIC MANAGEMENT. THE INCREASING POSSIBILITY OF ENDOSCOPIC BIOPSIES, ALLOWING PRE-OPERATIVE DIAGNOSIS IN MOST PATIENTS, HAS SO FAR FAILED TO DEFINE THE EXACT THERAPEUTIC VALUE OF SURGICAL RESSECTION, SEPARATE FROM THIS LATTER’S DIAGNOSTIC ROLE.1,3 THE IDENTIFICATION OF LYMPHOMAS DERIVING FROM MUCOSA-ASSOCIATED LYMPHOID TISSUE (MALT)4,5 WITH PARTICULAR BIOLOGICAL AND CLINICAL BEHAVIOR HAVING BEEN FURTHER DIFFERENTIATED AND MULTIPLIED THERAPEUTIC POSSIBILITIES, WHILE INTRODUCING OTHER PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE TRUE EFFECTIVENESS AND CORRECT TIMING OF THE NEW TREATMENTS.6 CONFLICTING RESULTS HAVE BEEN YIELDED FROM STUDIES INVESTIGATING THE MOST IMPORTANT CLINICAL FACTORS THAT SHOULD GUIDE TREATMENT: EXTENT OF DISEASE, SIZE OF LOCAL TUMOR, INVOLVEMENT OF LOCAL OR REGIONAL LYMPH NODES, DEPTH OF DIGESTIVE WALL INVASION, AND HISTOLOGIC FEATURES HAVE BEEN SEPARATELY INDICATED AS THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTORS. THE BIASES THAT OFTEN RECUR IN SUCH STUDIES ARE RETROSPECTIVENESS AND OR VARIABLE SELECTION OF PATIENTS (WITH INCLUSION LIMITED TO PATIENTS EITHER WITH EARLY STAGE DISEASE, OR WHO HAVE HAD THEIR DISEASE SUCCESSFULLY RESECTED OR THOSE WITH INVOLVEMENT OF ONLY A SECTION OF THE GASTROINTESTINAL TRACT). THE VARIABLE COMPONENT OF LOW-GRADE MALT LYMPHOMAS IN THESE SERIES IS VERY ATTRACTION FOR INVESTIGATORS AND READERS, BECAUSE OF THE MANY INTERESTING ASPECTS REGARDING EPIDEMIOLOGY, HISTOPATHOLOGY, CANCER MODELLING, AND MODULATION OF CLONAL CELL POPULATION. HOWEVER, THE PROBLEMS OF CLINICAL MANAGEMENT OF PRIMARY GASTROINTESTINAL LYMPHOMAS ARE NOT EXHAUSTED BY LOW-GRADE MALT LYMPHOMA WHICH REPRESENT ONLY 24-50% OF THIS GROUP OF DISEASES.12,13

In 1990 the Gruppo Italiano di Studio dei Linfomi (GISL) started a prospective study with the main purpose of testing the actual, specific, therapeutic value of surgical resection. Since the associated centers did not reach an agreement on a uniform treatment strategy regarding surgical and conservative options, it was considered acceptable for the aim of the study that the decision to resect or not was left to each
Design and Methods

From January 1990 to June 1997 the GISL Centers observed and treated 534 patients who fulfilled Lewin’s criteria for diagnosing PGL: presenting gastrointestinal signs and symptoms and prevalent - though not exclusive - lymphomatous lesions of the digestive tract. No exclusion criteria (age, comorbidity, etc.) were previously fixed in order to avoid any patient selection prior to the evaluation of surgical operability, that had to be an important conclusive judgement after the staging procedures. Table 1 illustrates the patients’ main characteristics.

Disease staging was investigated according to the requirements of the Cotswolds Meeting. In particular, staging workup included radiologic and/or endoscopic examination with multiple biopsies of the upper or lower gastrointestinal tract, and computed tomography of the thorax and abdomen. Endoscopic ultrasound was carried out in 10 patients. Patients were staged according to Musshoff’s categories. Pathologists were called on to revise the histologic assessment of all cases of their own center and to submit equivocal specimens to external pathologists; 41 cases underwent such intercenter re-evaluation.

Low-grade MALT lymphomas were excluded from this study because of their favorable biological and clinical characteristics and mainly because of their ability to respond to antibiotic therapy and even to be definitively cured by surgery alone in cases of unifocal presentation. High-grade MALT lymphomas, including cases with variable co-existing low- and high-grade MALT components, were considered as nodular lymphomas for the purposes of this study, since they have a worse prognosis than low-grade MALT lymphomas, probably because of the observed lack of response of the high-grade component to antibiotics.

Apart from cases requiring emergency surgery, the clinical approach towards nodular and high-grade MALT lymphomas, as far as concerned primary resection or preservation of the involved gastrointestinal tract, was left to the decision and experience of each participating center and/or clinician. Preliminary information had to be provided by each clinician about the surgical emergency level of each patient’s presentation (life threatening, risk of major complications, comorbidity, etc.) and the conservative or surgical policy adopted in non-emergency conditions.

Treatment was differentiated according to histology until June 1994; thus 8 patients with small cell, lymphocytic or lymphoplasmacytoid lymphoma were treated with intermittent chlorambucil, 2 patients with follicular small cleaved cell lymphoma received BACOP multiple drug therapy, while subjects with histologic types in the intermediate- or high-grade group of the Working Formulation received Pro-M ECE-CytaBOM (65 patients) or MACOP-B chemotherapy (16 patients). After June 1994 the Group decided that PGLs should receive a uniform chemotherapy regimen irrespective of histology because of the prevalent specific needs of the gastrointestinal presentation over those of different histologic subtypes in terms of manageability and uniformity of administration intervals: thus a CHOP variant (CNOP) was chosen in which mitoxantrone (12 mg/m²) substituted adriamycin (50 mg/m²). This regimen was administered to 63 patients.

Radiotherapy was optionally given only when residual tumor masses seemed to persist at restaging after primary therapy or when bulky masses were present at onset. In these cases only the involved field was irradiated with a total dose ranging from 28 to 38 Gy.

Complete remission (CR) was defined as complete regression of measured lesions and disappearance of any other objective evidence of lymphoma for at least 3 months. Partial remission (PR) consisted of a decrease of more than 50% in the sum of the products of the diameters of the measurable lesions. No response (NR) was anything less than a 50% decrease in measurable lesions. According to the Cotswolds Meeting recommendations for extramediastinal masses, gastrointestinal lesions were evaluated as bulky when their largest diameter was greater than 10 cm.

For the purposes of this work the failure-free survival (FFS) was considered the most appropriate event/time parameter, since it computes time from the start of treatment to any one of the following events: death from any cause, disease progression during treatment, no CR at the end of treatment, relapse. In this way, it is a better reflection of true effectiveness of a clinical approach than overall survival, which may not record the lack of success of a first line treatment when an effective salvage therapy is available.

Many clinical features were scrutinized to evaluate their individual role in discriminating FFS. The Kaplan and Meier estimate was used in univariate analysis for qualitative variables, whereas a simple linear regression applied to the proportional hazard model was used for quantitative parameters. A multiple regression analysis was also performed, within the same proportional hazard model, to select the best clinical features related to FFS.

Results

Figure 1 shows a comparison of the FFS of the 106 patients who were surgically resected with that of the 48 cases in whom surgery was not a first step in their clinical management. On the whole, the clinical response of resected cases seems better than that of unresected ones. One peri-operative death was recorded among operated cases, a 49-year old man with an intestinal large cell, anaplastic lymphoma who had severe intestinal bleeding 9 days after surgery and who died despite a second operation. The only recorded major complication after surgery was intestinal obstruction from multiple perivascular inflammatory adhesions which required further surgery. On the other hand, among non-resected patients a 55-year old patient with gastric large cell lymphoma (immunoblastic type) died of massive sudden gastric bleeding during chemotherapy. Another man aged 39 with a Burkitt-like intestinal lymphoma had intestinal perforation after 4 cycles of chemotherapy to which he was
poorly responding; he had to be operated upon. Second line chemotherapy was then administered with no response and the patient died of his disease 10 months after diagnosis and 7 after surgery.

No differences became evident in relation to the types of chemotherapy used, nor to the addition of radiotherapy after chemotherapy, which was performed in 12 patients.
Surgery and gastrointestinal lymphomas

Emergency surgery at onset was required in 28 patients, 12 with gastric and 16 with intestinal presentation, because of conditions which were evaluated by the clinicians as being directly life-threatening or having too high a risk of major complications with conservative therapy. These conditions can be summarized in partial or complete bowel obstruction (14 patients), severe active gastrointestinal bleeding (10 cases) and painful and large, clinically unmanageable, ulcerative lesions (4 subjects). Figure 2 shows that the FFS of these 28 patients was not significantly different from that of the 78 who underwent elective surgery whose FFS was decidedly better than that of the 48 who were not operated on.

Figure 3 demonstrates that in the overall study population there were no differences in FFS in relation to the clinician’s primary intention to treat with or without surgery. However, in the group of the 48 patients not operated upon (Figure 4), the prognosis was significantly different between those in whom the conservative program was actually carried out (30 patients) and the 18 who, despite being identified as potential candidates for surgery were not operated upon: this happened because of either extreme abdominal diffusion with multiple visceral involvement (7 cases), or bulk excess (7), or too high an anesthesiologic risk (4) due to heavy comorbidity, advanced age, or poor general conditions. In contrast, in the group of 106 operated patients illustrated in Figure 5 the prognosis was not different in the 90 who were programmed for surgical resection and in the 16 who, in spite of an initial intention to treat conservatively, had to be operated upon because of emergency situations or major complications at diagnosis.

A first univariate analysis on the whole population of 154 patients was carried out to select clinical factors that might most probably be related to prognosis. Table 2 summarizes the results of this first screening. The result of this univariate analysis regarding gastric or intestinal presentation, together with some clinical observations, led us to perform the subsequent mandatory step of multivariate analysis separating...
gastric from intestinal lymphomas. As a matter of fact, patients with intestinal lymphoma generally fare worse (Figure 6) than those with a gastric presentation, have a lower prevalence of both good performance levels (Karnofsky index ≥90: 21% vs. 39%) and early stages (I+II1: 18% vs. 35%), and present with bulky tumor with a higher frequency (44% vs. 23%). However, no differences were found in the distribution of the main prognostic factors (stage, histology, age, bulky masses, lactic dehydrogenase) between patients admitted to either a conservative or surgical policy, both in the group with a gastric presentation and in that with an intestinal presentation.

Table 3 reports the results of the proportional hazard multiple regression analysis performed separately in gastric and in intestinal lymphomas utilizing all the clinical factors indicated as potentially important in the previous univariate study. In the gastric group only performance status and serum lactic dehydrogenase level demonstrated a statistically significant correlation with FFS, even considering all stages cumulated and the early stage subset separately, while surgical resection was the only statistically significant prognostic parameter in the patient group with an intestinal presentation. This should mean that the apparently important role of surgery, emerging from univariate analysis of the whole population with gastrointestinal lymphoma, may be substantial only in the subset of patients with an intestinal presentation, while in those with gastric primary involvement the currently adopted decision criteria for surgical resection cover more important clinical factors which actually have a stronger influence on prognosis.
Discussion

The consequence of choosing a rather extensive definition of PGL, like Lewin’s one, is that advanced stages are also included in the study population. From a general point of view, the restriction of analyses to early stage disease is very popular among PGL investigators, mainly because it is considered a guarantee of true primary onset of the lymphoma from the gastrointestinal tract. However, the search for such a guarantee should be strictly justified when exploring the relationship of a lymphoma with epidemiologic, environmental or dietary factors. Selection of only early stages for clinical trials is currently widely accepted but limits the general validity of the results of such trials, since the treatment of advanced stage PGLs may not necessarily be extrapolated from the experience related to early stage patients. One can expect that an early stage lymphoma has a higher probability of response to localized treatment measures than advanced stage disease. In contrast, as far as the value of surgical resection in the treatment policy is concerned (debulking, reduction of the risk of perforation or hemorrhage related to treatment), clinical information from advanced stages must be considered homogeneous to that from early stages, since both stages share risks and consequences regarding the management of bulky tumor, gastrointestinal wall bleeding and/or perforation. From this point of view, there seem to be no reasons why stage III and IV patients (many of whom are stage IV due to multifocal gastrointestinal involvement) have to be discharged because of the uncertainty about the primary site of onset when dealing with therapeutic problems of gastrointestinal wall localization (bulky mass, perforation or bleeding during chemotherapy).

As a matter of fact, considering the intention to treat with or without surgery proved to be a potential clue to explain the differences between the conclusions of a number of studies. Like the GISL study, the German Multicenter Study Group on GI-NHL also left the decision to resect surgically or not to each associated center. This is a strategy that allows a co-operative group to collect and study patients differently treated according to a few available choices in a definite protocol, on condition that the decision in each case is previously defined and formally transmitted by the clinician to the monitoring trial office, and any other prognostic factor can be reasonably considered under control in the study. However, the German Group did not exploit this information thoroughly and analyzed patients only according to resections actually carried out instead of also taking into account the original intention for surgery. The present demonstration (Figure 4) that patients who cannot be operated upon – in spite of a systematic intention to operate whenever possible – do much worse than those who are not resected with a conservative policy, may seem entirely likely – and even expectable – but did not receive attention in previous studies. It is probable that any comparison between resected and unresected PGL patients is potentially affected by such a negative selection for subjects who would benefit from surgery according to the clinician’s preset criteria, but who are unable to undergo such surgery because of a variety of reasons which are prognostically adverse (severe comorbidity, anesthesiologic risks, heavy bulky mass, multiple visceral infiltration). Resection, with the preceding unavoidable evaluation of feasibility, works as a selective factor and in studies which compare survival in resected and unresected patients such a bias must be considered the greater, the more invasive the policy adopted. Under this point of view, the demonstration that lactic dehydrogenase and performance status are the main prognostic factors in gastric lymphomas, just overcoming the importance of surgery, appears to be logically explainable. In fact, the former is one of the best indices of tumor growth and invasive potential in non-Hodgkin’s lymphomas; the latter reflects both the impact of the disease on the organism and the body’s response to the tumor and, moreover, is commonly considered in the evaluation of a patient’s operability. Thus, it does not seem surprising that in gastric lymphomas these two parameters play a predominant role over all the others considered.

The corresponding comparison (Figure 5), among resected patients, of those managed according to a surgically oriented clinical policy with those coming from an intentionally conservative approach, but operated upon because of true emergency or high risk conditions, failed to demonstrate any survival difference. This comparison involved only very few cases of intestinal lymphoma. This might simply mean that lactic dehydrogenase and performance status are the best indices of tumor growth and invasive potential in non-Hodgkin’s lymphomas; the latter reflects both the impact of the disease on the organism and the body’s response to the tumor and, moreover, is commonly considered in the evaluation of a patient’s operability. Thus, it does not seem surprising that in gastric lymphomas these two parameters play a predominant role over all the others considered.

As a matter of fact, considering the intention to treat with or without surgery proved to be a potential clue to explain the differences between the conclusions of a number of studies. Like the GISL study, the German Multicenter Study Group on GI-NHL also left the decision to resect surgically or not to each associated center. This is a strategy that allows a co-operative group to collect and study patients differently treated according to a few available choices in a definite protocol, on condition that the decision in each case is previously defined and formally transmitted by the clinician to the monitoring trial office, and any other prognostic factor can be reasonably considered under control in the study. However, the German Group did not exploit this information thoroughly and analyzed patients only according to resections actually carried out instead of also taking into account the original intention for surgery. The present demonstration (Figure 4) that patients who cannot be operated upon – in spite of a systematic intention to operate whenever possible – do much worse than those who are not resected with a conservative policy, may seem entirely likely – and even expectable – but did not receive attention in previous studies. It is probable that any comparison between resected and unresected PGL patients is potentially affected by such a negative selection for subjects who would benefit from surgery according to the clinician’s preset criteria, but who are unable to undergo such surgery because of a variety of reasons which are prognostically adverse (severe comorbidity, anesthesiologic risks, heavy bulky mass, multiple visceral infiltration). Resection, with the preceding unavoidable evaluation of feasibility, works as a selective factor and in studies which compare survival in resected and unresected patients such a bias must be considered the greater, the more invasive the policy adopted. Under this point of view, the demonstration that lactic dehydrogenase and performance status are the main prognostic factors in gastric lymphomas, just overcoming the importance of surgery, appears to be logically explainable. In fact, the former is one of the best indices of tumor growth and invasive potential in non-Hodgkin’s lymphomas; the latter reflects both the impact of the disease on the organism and the body’s response to the tumor and, moreover, is commonly considered in the evaluation of a patient’s operability. Thus, it does not seem surprising that in gastric lymphomas these two parameters play a predominant role over all the others considered.

The corresponding comparison (Figure 5), among resected patients, of those managed according to a surgically oriented clinical policy with those coming from an intentionally conservative approach, but operated upon because of true emergency or high risk conditions, failed to demonstrate any survival difference. This comparison involved only very few cases of intestinal lymphoma. This might simply mean that the possible emergencies (presented mainly by gastric lymphomas) are easily and successfully managed in the available national health organization, but intrinsically confirms that the ultimate prognosis of gastric lymphomas is related more to its clinical presentation than to effective resection. In other words, surgery...
Table 4. Comparison of literature data on gastric lymphoma series between peri-operative mortality (during operation and/or in the following 30 days) in resected patients and non-resection-related major complications in unresected ones (i.e. perforation or gastric bleeding which were cause of death or required emergency surgery).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Resected patients</th>
<th>Peri-operative deaths</th>
<th>Un-resected patients</th>
<th>Non-resection-related major complications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orlando et al. 19</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulson et al. 19</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimm et al. 20</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaubert et al. 21</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farell et al. 22</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorens et al. 44</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taal et al. 45</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marfe et al. 46</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azab et al. 47</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobbi et al. 48</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossini et al. 49</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maro et al. 50</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chieti et al. 51</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ailes et al. 52</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosca et al. 53</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaque et al. 54</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morton et al. 55</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valicenti et al. 56</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasini et al. 57</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigacci et al. 58</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortalian et al. 59</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haim et al. 60</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinzani et al. 61</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koch et al. 62</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takanaka et al. 63</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tondini et al. 64</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sano et al. 65</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobbi et al. (present series)</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1,609 75 587 27 (4.7%) (4.6%)


Table 4. Comparison of literature data on gastric lymphoma series between peri-operative mortality (during operation and/or in the following 30 days) in resected patients and non-resection-related major complications in unresected ones (i.e. perforation or gastric bleeding which were cause of death or required emergency surgery).

According to our data, bulky mass should not be included among prognostically important features. Some doubts on the true prognostic significance of bulky tumor have already been raised,54,55 since its supposed significance was noted to be derived from studies on systematically resected patients. Now, we know that a frequent reason why a surgeon does not perform a gastrectomy is an excess of tumor bulk or, which is nearly the same, too wide an infiltration of contiguous viscera. It is not clear why in a number of preceding works tumor bulk was considered important, and debulking mandatory, only when surgery was feasible, disregarding the fact that patients who are inoperable because their masses were too large, in spite of a putatively less favorable prognosis, actually retain a discrete possibility of cure. Thus, it seems reasonable and justified that when unresected patients are also taken into account, bulky mass is no longer important as a prognostic factor.

On the whole, the results from gastric lymphomas support the idea that prognosis of these patients is not affected by initial surgery, not even when it is unavoidable for emergency conditions, but is mostly influenced by very common and simple clinical parameters – performance status and lactic dehydrogenase – which mainly depend on lymphoma aggressiveness and host reaction. As long as the risk related to surgery (especially if a total gastrectomy is needed) is comparable with that of perforation and hemorrhage related to conservative management, both treatment policies are strictly justified, even though the probable (but here not demonstrated) better quality of life of the unresected patients might weigh in favor of a conservative option. Thus, in gastric lymphomas surgery should be strictly limited to possible emergencies at presentation, and can be avoided in the large majority of cases.

Intestinal lymphomas yielded different results, with tumor resection being the unique significant prognostic factor, as recently pointed out by Zinzani et al. 56 This probably has a number of reasons. First of all, in intestinal lymphomas surgery still retains an important and largely unavoidable diagnostic role, thus the number of unresected patients tends to be low anyhow. Endoscopic biopsies are possible only in the duodenum and in the large intestine; unfortunately, the majority (59%) of the intestinal presentations involve the jejunum and ileum, and the cecum, a site which can be endoscopically biopsied only with some difficulty, is primarily involved in another 11% of patients. These patients must undergo laparotomy in order to make a diagnosis, and there are no available data advising against tumor resection after intraoperative diagnosis of lymphoma. Second, by virtue of these surgery-aided diagnostic requirements, it can be expected that there are proportionally fewer unresected cases in intestinal lymphomas than in gastric lymphomas, thus leaving too few cases for correct comparison. Third, the prevalence of large intestine involvement must be verified in a series of
unresected intestinal lymphomas, since according to some investigators previous papers. In our 8 patients with unresected intestinal disease, 6 of whom are dead, 4 had lymphoma developing in the colon; this is a higher proportion than in resected patients. We do not know whether the higher concentration of colorectal presentations in patients with unresected intestinal disease might explain their worse prognosis. Severe hemorrhagic complications or perforation of the intestinal wall cannot account for the fate of our unresected patients, since only one case of bowel perforation occurred. This perforation happened in a 45-year old man who was not initially operated upon because of an enormous and quickly growing bulky tumor of the ileum; chemotherapy was preferred to a very complex and mutilating operation. The patient achieved a 16-month complete remission then relapsed and died of resistant and progressive disease.

In conclusion, the small number of observed patients with intestinal lymphoma makes the results regarding this presentation worth verifying in a larger population. Intestinal lymphomas seem to have a more severe presentation than their gastric counterparts, and it has not been clarified whether the poorer prognosis of unresected patients is related to the omission of surgery in the treatment sequence or other associated unfavorable factors in these subjects. In the meantime, contrary to the advice for their gastric counterparts, it appears appropriate and cautious to ressect intestinal lymphomas whenever possible.
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