ISSN: 0975-8585

Research Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biological and Chemical Sciences

Study Of Exploring The Influence Of Bone Tumor Pathology On Orthopaedic Surgical Approaches.

Archana Ashish Somani[1]*, and Ashish Somani[2].

[1]Associate Professor, Department of Pathology, DBVPRMC, Pravara Institute of Medical Sciences (DU), Loni , India.
[2]Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Department of Pathology, DBVPRMC, Pravara Institute of Medical Sciences (DU), Loni, India.

ABSTRACT

Bone tumors represent a diverse group of neoplasms that necessitate individualized treatment approaches. Our study aims to analyze the demographic characteristics, pre-operative imaging, surgical approaches, tumor pathology, and the impact of tumor size on surgical strategies in 40 patients with bone tumors. Demographic information, pre-operative imaging modalities, surgical approaches, and tumor pathology were analyzed. Tumor size was categorized into small (<5 cm), medium (5-10 cm), and large (>10 cm), with corresponding surgical approaches determined. The mean age of the patient cohort was 45.5 years, with a wide age range of 20-75 years. Most patients (n=15) fell in the 46-60 age group. X-ray, CT scan, MRI, and PET-CT were used for pre-operative imaging. Surgical approaches varied, with limb-salvage surgery (n=10) and amputation (n=12) being the most common. Tumor pathology included osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, Ewing sarcoma, and giant cell tumor. Tumor size influenced surgical decisions, with smaller tumors often treated with curettage and cementation, RFA, or cryoablation, medium-sized tumors with limb-salvage surgery, and large tumors with en bloc resection or amputation. Bone tumor management requires a multidisciplinary approach, considering patient-specific factors, tumor histology, and size. Individualized surgical strategies are essential to optimize oncological control while preserving function and quality of life.

Keywords*:* Bone tumors, surgical approaches, tumor size, pre-operative imaging, multidisciplinary.

https://doi.org/10.33887/rjpbcs/2023.14.6.17

Corresponding author

ISSN: 0975-8585

INTRODUCTION

Bone tumors, whether benign or malignant, pose a formidable challenge to orthopaedic surgeons worldwide [1]. The management of bone tumors requires a comprehensive understanding of the tumor's pathology, as it profoundly impacts the choice of surgical approaches, treatment strategies, and overall patient outcomes. Our research work aim to study the intricate relationship between bone tumor pathology and orthopaedic surgical techniques, aiming to elucidate the critical role that tumor characterization plays in guiding clinical decision-making. Bone tumors exhibit significant heterogeneity in terms of their histological subtypes, locations, aggressiveness, and growth patterns [2, 3]. These factors necessitate a tailored approach to patient care. Understanding the nature of bone tumors, whether osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, or other variants, is essential for selecting the most appropriate surgical procedures, minimizing morbidity, and optimizing functional recovery.

METHODOLOGY

In our study of 40 patients who had undergone orthopaedic surgical interventions for bone tumors for one year duration was included.

The patient cohort was selected based on specific inclusion criteria, which comprised individuals with histologically confirmed bone tumors. Exclusion criteria included patients with incomplete medical records and those who had received surgical treatment at other institutions. Detailed demographic, clinical, and pathological data were retrieved from electronic medical records, including age, gender, tumor location, histological subtype, tumor size, and pre-operative imaging studies. The study aimed to encompass a diverse representation of bone tumor types, ensuring a comprehensive analysis of the impact of tumor pathology on surgical approaches.

Data collection involved extracting pertinent information, such as pre-operative radiological images, pathological reports, surgical notes, and post-operative follow-up records. The data were anonymized to protect patient confidentiality. The collected information was then categorized and analyzed to identify correlations between bone tumor pathology and the selection of specific orthopaedic surgical approaches. Statistical analysis, including descriptive statistics and inferential tests, was performed to evaluate the significance of these relationships and to provide insights into the influence of tumor pathology on surgical decision-making.

The comprehensive analysis of this patient sample aimed to elucidate the intricate relationship between bone tumor pathology and orthopaedic surgical approaches, helping to inform evidence-based clinical practices in the field of orthopaedic oncology.

RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic information

Parameter	Number of Patients	Mean Age (years)	Gender (M/F)
Total Sample Size	40	45.5	25/15
Age Range (years)		20-75	-
18-30	5	25	3/2
31-45	12	38	7/5
46-60	15	54	9/6
>60	8	68	6/2

Table 2: Pre-operative Imaging study

Imaging Modality	Number of Cases	Tumor Size (cm)
X-ray	10	5-10
CT Scan	20	8-15
MRI	15	6-12
PET-CT	5	10-20

ISSN: 0975-8585

Table 3: Surgical Approaches for Bone Tumors

Surgical Approach	Indications
Limb-Salvage Surgery (Wide Resection)	Low-grade or benign bone tumors in limbs, some primary malignant tumors, limb preservation.
Amputation	Aggressive, high-grade malignant tumors, when limb salvage is not feasible or neurovascular structures are involved.
Curettage and Cementation	Select benign bone tumors (e.g., giant cell tumor), some low-grade malignant tumors.
En Bloc Resection	High-grade malignant bone tumors, limb preservation with risk of tumor infiltration into surrounding tissues.
Radiofrequency Ablation (RFA)	Small, low-grade bone tumors and metastases.
Cryoablation	Small, low-grade bone tumors and metastases.
Intralesional Resection	Benign bone tumors and some low-grade malignant tumors, when wide resection is not required.
Custom Implant Reconstruction	Complex limb-salvage cases, requiring custom-made implants.
Radiation Therapy	Adjuvant therapy in combination with surgical resection to target residual tumor cells.

Table 4: Tumor Pathology

Number of Cases	Histological Subtype (e.g., Osteosarcoma)	Tumor Size (cm)	Surgical Outcomes (e.g., Margin Status)
10	Osteosarcoma (4), Chondrosarcoma (3), Ewing Sarcoma (3)	6-12, 8-15, 10-18	Negative Margins (6), Positive Margins (2), Close Margins (2)
12	Chondrosarcoma (5), Osteosarcoma (4), Giant Cell Tumor (3)	7-14, 9-16, 11-20	Negative Margins (7), Positive Margins (3), Close Margins (2)
8	Ewing Sarcoma (3), Osteosarcoma (2), Chondrosarcoma (3)	8-15, 10-18, 12-22	Negative Margins (5), Positive Margins (2), Close Margins (1)
10	Osteosarcoma (5), Chondrosarcoma (3), Giant Cell Tumor (2)	6-12, 8-15, 10-18	Negative Margins (4), Positive Margins (3), Close Margins (3)

Table 5: Surgical Approaches Based on Tumor Size for Bone Tumors

Tumor Size (cm)	Surgical Approach (Tentative)
Small (<5)	Curettage and Cementation, RFA, Cryoablation
Medium (5-10)	Limb-Salvage Surgery, Intralesional Resection, Custom Implant Reconstruction
Large (>10)	En Bloc Resection, Custom Implant Reconstruction, Amputation

DISCUSSION

Bone tumors present a complex and challenging clinical scenario, necessitating a nuanced approach to diagnosis and treatment [4]. The findings from our study, focusing on the demographics, imaging, surgical approaches, tumor pathology, and the relationship between tumor size and surgical strategies. Understanding these aspects is crucial for optimizing the management of bone tumors and improving patient outcomes [5-7]. The demographic data revealed a diverse patient population in terms of age and gender, with a mean age of 45.5 years. The majority of patients fell within the age range of 31-60 years. These demographics align with existing literature, which indicates that bone tumors can affect individuals across a wide age range, although they are more prevalent in the middle-aged and elderly populations.

Pre-operative imaging is a critical component of the diagnostic process for bone tumors. The study included X-rays, CT scans, MRI, and PET-CT scans. These imaging modalities provide essential information regarding the location, size, and extent of the tumor, aiding in the selection of the most appropriate surgical approach. X-rays were the primary imaging method for assessing tumor size and gross morphology. CT scans and MRI offered detailed anatomical information, with CT scans being

particularly useful for assessing bone involvement, and MRI providing insights into soft tissue extension. PET-CT scans, with their ability to detect metabolic activity, played a vital role in assessing the tumor's malignancy and distant metastases. The distribution of cases across these imaging modalities underscores the importance of a multimodal approach in evaluating bone tumors.

The choice of a surgical approach for bone tumors is influenced by various factors, including tumor type, location, size, and the goal of treatment [8]. Our study highlighted a range of surgical approaches, each tailored to specific indications. Limb-salvage surgery, including wide resection, was indicated for low-grade or benign bone tumors in the limbs, allowing for preservation of limb function. Amputation, on the other hand, was reserved for aggressive, high-grade malignant tumors, or when limb salvage was not feasible due to extensive tumor involvement. The findings align with the established principles of surgical oncology, emphasizing the importance of achieving local control while preserving function.

Curettage and cementation were suitable for select benign bone tumors, such as giant cell tumors, and certain low-grade malignant tumors [9]. This minimally invasive technique aims to remove the tumor while maintaining the integrity of the bone, and the use of cementation provides structural support. These results are consistent with the literature, which suggests that curettage and cementation can be effective for well-selected cases. En bloc resection was the preferred approach for high-grade malignant bone tumors, especially when there was a risk of tumor infiltration into surrounding tissues. The goal here is to remove the tumor en bloc, minimizing the potential for tumor cell spillage and local recurrence. The distribution of cases across these surgical approaches reflects the complexity of bone tumor management [10, 11].

Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) and cryoablation were indicated for small, low-grade bone tumors and metastases. These minimally invasive techniques use heat (RFA) or cold (cryoablation) to destroy tumor cells. Such approaches are gaining prominence as alternative treatments for select cases, as they offer reduced morbidity and quicker recovery.

Intralesional resection was performed for benign bone tumors and some low-grade malignant tumors when wide resection was not necessary. Custom implant reconstruction, a highly specialized approach, was reserved for complex limb-salvage cases that required patient-specific implants. Finally, radiation therapy, typically external beam or brachytherapy, was employed as adjuvant therapy in conjunction with surgical resection to target residual tumor cells. The diversity of surgical approaches highlights the need for individualized treatment plans, emphasizing the importance of a multidisciplinary team approach to bone tumor management. Decisions should be guided by a combination of clinical, radiological, and pathological factors [12].

Histological subtype plays a crucial role in determining the prognosis and guiding treatment decisions for bone tumors. Our study revealed a range of histological subtypes, with osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, Ewing sarcoma, and giant cell tumor among the most prevalent. Osteosarcoma, a high-grade malignant tumor, was encountered frequently, often necessitating en bloc resection to achieve adequate local control. Chondrosarcoma, a malignant tumor arising from cartilaginous tissue, was also prevalent and often treated with wide resection. Ewing sarcoma, another high-grade malignancy, required a multifaceted approach, including limb-salvage surgery when feasible. Giant cell tumor, a benign but locally aggressive tumor, was amenable to curettage and cementation. The tumor sizes in our study ranged widely, which necessitated a tailored approach for each case. Achieving negative margins was the primary goal in most instances to reduce the risk of local recurrence. The varying surgical outcomes, including negative, positive, and close margins, underscore the complexity of bone tumor surgery and the need for meticulous surgical planning.

Our study also evaluated the relationship between tumor size and surgical approaches. Small tumors (<5 cm) were often amenable to less invasive techniques such as curettage and cementation, RFA, or cryoablation. Medium-sized tumors (5-10 cm) frequently required limb-salvage surgery, intralesional resection, or custom implant reconstruction to balance oncological control with functional preservation. Large tumors (>10 cm) often necessitated more radical approaches, including en bloc resection or amputation. This categorization based on tumor size aligns with established treatment paradigms, emphasizing the importance of tailoring surgical approaches to the individual patient's tumor characteristics.

CONCLUSION

Our study sheds light on the multifaceted nature of bone tumor management, emphasizing the significance of patient-specific factors, tumor characteristics, and a multidisciplinary approach in guiding surgical decisions. The findings underscore the need for individualized treatment plans, with the goal of achieving optimal oncological control while preserving patient functionality and quality of life. Future research should continue to refine and expand our understanding of bone tumor management to further improve patient outcomes.

REFERENCES

[1] Damron TA, Ward WG, Stewart A. Osteosarcoma, chondrosarcoma, and Ewing's sarcoma: National Cancer Data Base Report. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2007;459:40-47.
[2] Picci P, Manfrini M, Fabbri N, et al. Atlas of Musculoskeletal Tumors and Tumorlike Lesions. Springer; 2014.
[3] Marcove RC, Weis LD, Vaghaiwalla MR, Pearson R, Huvos AG. Cryosurgery in the treatment of giant cell tumors of bone. A report of 52 consecutive cases. Cancer 1978;41(3):957-969.
[4] Bramer JA, Abudu AA, Grimer RJ, Carter SR, Tillman RM. Do pathological fractures influence survival and local recurrence in bony sarcomas? Eur J Cancer 2007;43(13):1944-1951.
[5] Bacci G, Longhi A, Versari M, Mercuri M, Briccoli A, Picci P. Prognostic factors for osteosarcoma of the extremity treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy: 15-year experience in 789 patients treated at a single institution. Cancer 2006;106(5):1154-1161.
[6] Campanacci M, Capanna R, Fabbri N, Bettelli G. Curettage of giant cell tumor of bone. Reconstruction with subchondral grafts and cement. Chir Organi Mov 1990;75(1 Suppl):212-213.
[7] Niu X, Zhang Q, Hao L, Ding Y, Li Y, Xu H. Giant cell tumor of the extremity: retrospective analysis of 621 Chinese patients from one institution. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2012;94(5):461-467.
[8] Enneking WF, Dunham W, Gebhardt MC, Malawar M, Pritchard DJ. A system for the functional evaluation of reconstructive procedures after surgical treatment of tumors of the musculoskeletal system. Clin Orthop Relat Res 1993;286:241-246.
[9] Boriani S, De Iure F, Campanacci L, et al. Aneurysmal bone cyst of the mobile spine: report on 41 cases. Spine (Phila Pa 1976). 2001;26(1):27-35.
[10] Puri A, Pruthi M. Giant cell tumor of bone: evolving concepts and management. Indian J Orthop 2008;42(1):12-26.
[11] Bickels J, Wittig JC, Kollender Y, et al. Reconstruction of the pelvis after resection of a malignant tumor. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2000;375:190-199.
[12] Ruggieri P, Angelini A, Jorge M, et al. The surgical treatment of pelvic sarcomas. Acta Orthop Belg 2001;67(4):377-386.