

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/171980/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Macbeth, Fergus, Williams, Norman, Ahmad, Irfan and Treasure, Tom 2024. Lung surveillance following colorectal cancer pulmonary metastasectomy: Utilization of clinicopathologic risk factors to guide strategy. *The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery* 168 (1) , e10-e11. 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2023.10.033

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2023.10.033>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



Reply: Lung surveillance following colorectal cancer pulmonary metastasectomy: Utilization of clinicopathologic risk factors to guide strategy

Fergus Macbeth DM FRCP; Centre for Trials Research, Cardiff University, Cardiff UK.  
[fergus.macbeth@btinternet.com](mailto:fergus.macbeth@btinternet.com)

Norman Williams PhD; Surgical and Interventional Trials Unit, University College London, London UK. [norman.williams@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:norman.williams@ucl.ac.uk)

Irfan Ahmad MBBS, DNB (Radiotherapy); Department of Radiation Oncology, Rajiv Gandhi Cancer Institute & Research Centre, New Delhi, India. [irfan.a@me.com](mailto:irfan.a@me.com)

Tom Treasure MD FRCS; Clinical Operational Research Unit, University College London, UK.  
[tom.treasure@gmail.com](mailto:tom.treasure@gmail.com)

Tom Treasure

0000-0001-9358-7610

Norman R Williams

0000-0001-6496-312X

Fergus Macbeth

0000-0002-5434-8534

Corresponding author: Fergus Macbeth, Centre for Trials Research, Cardiff University, Cardiff CF14 4YS, UK. [fergus.macbeth@btinternet.com](mailto:fergus.macbeth@btinternet.com)

Disclosures: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Word count 499

Abbreviated legend for Central Picture:

PulMiCC survival: Red line-selected for surgery; blue-rejected; orange, green-randomised.

1 Sir

2 The paper by Deboever et al <sup>1</sup> on pulmonary metastasectomy (PM) for colorectal cancer (CRC) starts:  
3 ‘The survival benefit associated with resection following colorectal pulmonary metastasis in selected  
4 patients is well accepted.’ It is true that it is ‘well accepted’ but this acceptance is due to a professional  
5 consensus based solely on weak observational evidence and the systematic ignoring or dismissal of  
6 evidence from PulMiCC <sup>2</sup>, the only randomized trial directly addressing this issue. This showed no  
7 difference in overall survival and had sufficient power to rule out a major survival benefit from PM <sup>3</sup>.  
8 It was nested within a much larger, prospective observational study of patients selected or turned  
9 down for surgery, suggesting that the major determinant of survival after PM is likely to be careful  
10 selection of patients with favorable prognostic factors, not the intervention <sup>4</sup> (Figure).

11 Deboever et al describe a retrospective study looking at time to reappearance of lung metastases after  
12 PM and they identified several factors associated with earlier local recurrence. They concluded that  
13 these high-risk patients should have early CT imaging for ‘surveillance’. But there are problems with  
14 this paper.

15 Important information is missing. These are all probably highly selected patients, not representative of  
16 most patients in this situation. Their median age was 55 years and the majority had a single  
17 metastasis, but there was no description of known prognostic factors such as stage at first presentation  
18 nor of the time from surgery to PM. There is no date of data analysis which would indicate the  
19 maximum and minimum lengths of follow. There is no mention of attrition due to death or loss to  
20 follow up. Most reports suggest 10-20% of patients die within 2 years of PM and it is likely that all  
21 patients in this cohort were followed for at least 2 years. Did any die or become lost to follow up?  
22 Was the survival analysis actuarial?

23 Finally, there is no justification for a policy of surveillance for any patient after PM, especially those  
24 with the identified risk factors for early relapse. Deboever et al found that 52.3% of these highly  
25 selected patients developed a new pulmonary metastasis during the period of observation. These

26 patients clearly had occult metastases at the time of PM and now have disseminated disease. It is  
27 likely that the rest will also manifest new metastases somewhere eventually.

28 The evidence supporting the use of ‘primary’ PM is weak, and despite the authors’ belief that a second  
29 PM ‘may achieve survival benefit’, there is no evidence to support that nor for early intervention with  
30 chemotherapy. We have shown that PM is associated with decreased lung function<sup>4</sup> and it is an  
31 intervention, even with modern anesthetic and surgical techniques, associated with real risks  
32 (including death). What is the point of any surveillance given the costs and probable increase in  
33 patient anxiety?

34 We suggest that the policy advocated by Deboever et al represents overinvestigation and  
35 overtreatment and is very unlikely to give patients any survival or quality of life benefit.

36 1. Deboever N, Bayley EM, Eisenberg MA, et al. Lung surveillance following colorectal cancer  
37 pulmonary metastasectomy: Utilization of clinicopathologic risk factors to guide strategy. *The*  
38 *Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery*. Published online July 24, 2023.  
39 doi:10.1016/j.jtcvs.2023.07.017

40 2. Milosevic M, Edwards J, Tsang D, et al. Pulmonary Metastasectomy in Colorectal Cancer: updated  
41 analysis of 93 randomized patients – control survival is much better than previously assumed.  
42 *Colorectal Disease*. 2020;22(10):1314-1324. doi:10.1111/codi.15113

43 3. Treasure T, Leonard P, Milosevic M, Williams NR, Macbeth F, Farewell V. Pulmonary  
44 Metastasectomy in Colorectal Cancer: the PulMiCC randomised controlled trial. *British Journal of*  
45 *Surgery*. 2020;107(11):e489-e490. doi:10.1002/bjs.11948

46 4. Treasure T, Farewell V, Macbeth F, et al. The Pulmonary Metastasectomy in Colorectal Cancer  
47 cohort study: Analysis of case selection, risk factors and survival in a prospective observational  
48 study of 512 patients. *Colorectal Dis*. 2021;23(7):1793-1803. doi:10.1111/codi.15651

49

