

# World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Surgery*

*World J Gastrointest Surg* 2023 July 27; 15(7): 1262-1558



## Contents

Monthly Volume 15 Number 7 July 27, 2023

## REVIEW

- 1262 Pathophysiological consequences and treatment strategy of obstructive jaundice  
*Liu JJ, Sun YM, Xu Y, Mei HW, Guo W, Li ZL*

## MINIREVIEWS

- 1277 Carbon footprints in minimally invasive surgery: Good patient outcomes, but costly for the environment  
*Chan KS, Lo HY, Shelat VG*

## ORIGINAL ARTICLE

## Basic Study

- 1286 Primary animal experiment to test the feasibility of a novel Y-Z magnetic hepatic portal blocking band  
*Zhang MM, Li CG, Xu SQ, Mao JQ, Ren YX, Zhang YH, Ma J, Shi AH, Lyu Y, Yan XP*
- 1294 Magnetic compression anastomosis for reconstruction of digestive tract after total gastrectomy in beagle model  
*Zhang MM, Li CG, Xu SQ, Mao JQ, Zhang YH, Shi AH, Li Y, Lyu Y, Yan XP*
- 1304 Differences in metabolic improvement after metabolic surgery are linked to the gut microbiota in non-obese diabetic rats  
*Luo X, Tan C, Tao F, Xu CY, Zheng ZH, Pang Q, He XA, Cao JQ, Duan JY*
- 1317 Intervention effects and related mechanisms of glycyrrhizic acid on zebrafish with Hirschsprung-associated enterocolitis  
*Liu MK, Chen YJ, Chen F, Lin ZX, Zhu ZC, Lin Y, Fang YF, Wu DM*
- 1331 Histological study of the structural layers around the esophagus in the lower mediastinum  
*Saito T, Muro S, Fujiwara H, Umebayashi Y, Sato Y, Tokunaga M, Akita K, Kinugasa Y*

## Case Control Study

- 1340 Liver transplantation for combined hepatocellular carcinoma and cholangiocarcinoma: A multicenter study  
*Kim J, Joo DJ, Hwang S, Lee JM, Ryu JH, Nah YW, Kim DS, Kim DJ, You YK, Yu HC*
- 1354 Optimal choice of stapler and digestive tract reconstruction method after distal gastrectomy for gastric cancer: A prospective case-control study  
*Wu Z, Zhou ZG, Li LY, Gao WJ, Yu T*

## Retrospective Cohort Study

- 1363 Impact of perioperative blood transfusion on oncological outcomes in ampullary carcinoma patients underwent pancreaticoduodenectomy  
*Fei H, Zhang XJ, Sun CY, Li Z, Li ZF, Guo CG, Zhao DB*

**Retrospective Study**

- 1375** Nomogram based on clinical characteristics for predicting overall survival in gastric cancer patients with preoperative anemia  
*Long Y, Zhou XL, Zhang CL, Wang YN, Pan WS*
- 1388** Major complications after ultrasound-guided liver biopsy: An annual audit of a Chinese tertiary-care teaching hospital  
*Chai WL, Lu DL, Sun ZX, Cheng C, Deng Z, Jin XY, Zhang TL, Gao Q, Pan YW, Zhao QY, Jiang TA*
- 1397** Different percutaneous transhepatic biliary stent placements and catheter drainage in the treatment of middle and low malignant biliary obstruction  
*Yang YB, Yan ZY, Jiao Y, Yang WH, Cui Q, Chen SP*
- 1405** Utilization of deep neuromuscular blockade combined with reduced abdominal pressure in laparoscopic radical gastrectomy for gastric cancer: An academic perspective  
*Zhang YW, Li Y, Huang WB, Wang J, Qian XE, Yang Y, Huang CS*
- 1416** Efficacy of peritoneal drainage in very-low-birth-weight neonates with Bell's stage II necrotizing enterocolitis: A single-center retrospective study  
*Shen Y, Lin Y, Fang YF, Wu DM, He YB*
- 1423** Emergency exploratory laparotomy and radical gastrectomy in patients with gastric cancer combined with acute upper gastrointestinal bleeding  
*Kuang F, Wang J, Wang BQ*
- 1434** Correlation of serum albumin level on postoperative day 2 with hospital length of stay in patients undergoing emergency surgery for perforated peptic ulcer  
*Xie D, Lu PL, Xu W, You JY, Bi XG, Xian Y*

**Clinical Trials Study**

- 1442** Laboratory scoring system to predict hepatic indocyanine green clearance ability during fluorescence imaging-guided laparoscopic hepatectomy  
*Chen ZR, Zeng QT, Shi N, Han HW, Chen ZH, Zou YP, Zhang YP, Wu F, Xu LQ, Jin HS*

**Observational Study**

- 1454** Incidence, characteristics and risk factors for alveolar recruitment maneuver-related hypotension in patients undergoing laparoscopic colorectal cancer resection  
*Zhang NR, Zheng ZN, Wang K, Li H*
- 1465** New classification system for radical rectal cancer surgery based on membrane anatomy  
*Jiang HH, Ni ZZ, Chang Y, Li AJ, Wang WC, Lv L, Peng J, Pan ZH, Liu HL, Lin MB*

**Randomized Controlled Trial**

- 1474** Transcutaneous electrical acupoint stimulation in adult patients receiving gastrectomy/colorectal resection: A randomized controlled trial  
*Hou YT, Pan YY, Wan L, Zhao WS, Luo Y, Yan Q, Zhang Y, Zhang WX, Mo YC, Huang LP, Dai QX, Jia DY, Yang AM, An HY, Wu AS, Tian M, Fang JQ, Wang JL, Feng Y*

## SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

- 1485 Combined and intraoperative risk modelling for oesophagectomy: A systematic review  
*Grantham JP, Hii A, Shenfine J*
- 1501 Spleen-preserving distal pancreatectomy from multi-port to reduced-port surgery approach  
*Hsieh CL, Tsai TS, Peng CM, Cheng TC, Liu YJ*
- 1512 Resection of isolated liver oligometastatic disease in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: Is there a survival benefit? A systematic review  
*Halle-Smith JM, Powell-Brett S, Roberts K, Chatzizacharias NA*

## META-ANALYSIS

- 1522 Outcome of split liver transplantation *vs* living donor liver transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis  
*Garzali IU, Akbulut S, Aloun A, Naffa M, Aksoy F*

## CASE REPORT

- 1532 Idiopathic hypereosinophilic syndrome with hepatic sinusoidal obstruction syndrome: A case report and literature review  
*Xu XT, Wang BH, Wang Q, Guo YJ, Zhang YN, Chen XL, Fang YF, Wang K, Guo WH, Wen ZZ*
- 1542 Reoperation for heterochronic intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasm of the pancreas after bile duct neoplasm resection: A case report  
*Xiao G, Xia T, Mou YP, Zhou YC*
- 1549 Successful resection of colonic metastasis of lung cancer after colonic stent placement: A case report and review of the literature  
*Nakayama Y, Yamaguchi M, Inoue K, Hamaguchi S, Tajima Y*

**ABOUT COVER**

Editorial Board Member of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*, Georgios Tsoulfas, AGAF, FACS, FICS, MD, PhD, Professor, Transplant Surgery, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki School of Medicine, Thessaloniki 54124, Greece. tsoulfasg@gmail.com

**AIMS AND SCOPE**

The primary aim of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery* (WJGS, *World J Gastrointest Surg*) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of gastrointestinal surgery with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJGS mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of gastrointestinal surgery and covering a wide range of topics including biliary tract surgical procedures, biliopancreatic diversion, colectomy, esophagectomy, esophagostomy, pancreas transplantation, and pancreatectomy, etc.

**INDEXING/ABSTRACTING**

The WJGS is now abstracted and indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (SCIE, also known as SciSearch®), Current Contents/Clinical Medicine, Journal Citation Reports/Science Edition, PubMed, PubMed Central, Reference Citation Analysis, China National Knowledge Infrastructure, China Science and Technology Journal Database, and Superstar Journals Database. The 2023 Edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2022 impact factor (IF) for WJGS as 2.0; IF without journal self cites: 1.9; 5-year IF: 2.2; Journal Citation Indicator: 0.52; Ranking: 113 among 212 journals in surgery; Quartile category: Q3; Ranking: 81 among 93 journals in gastroenterology and hepatology; and Quartile category: Q4.

**RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE**

Production Editor: Rui-Rui Wu, Production Department Director: Xiang Li, Editorial Office Director: Jia-Ru Fan.

**NAME OF JOURNAL**

*World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*

**ISSN**

ISSN 1948-9366 (online)

**LAUNCH DATE**

November 30, 2009

**FREQUENCY**

Monthly

**EDITORS-IN-CHIEF**

Peter Schemmer

**EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/editorialboard.htm>

**PUBLICATION DATE**

July 27, 2023

**COPYRIGHT**

© 2023 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

**INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204>

**GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287>

**GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>

**PUBLICATION ETHICS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288>

**PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208>

**ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242>

**STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS**

<https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239>

**ONLINE SUBMISSION**

<https://www.f6publishing.com>





## Resection of isolated liver oligometastatic disease in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: Is there a survival benefit? A systematic review

James M Halle-Smith, Sarah Powell-Brett, Keith Roberts, Nikolaos A Chatzizacharias

**Specialty type:** Gastroenterology and hepatology

**Provenance and peer review:**

Invited article; Externally peer reviewed.

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Peer-review report's scientific quality classification**

Grade A (Excellent): A

Grade B (Very good): 0

Grade C (Good): C, C

Grade D (Fair): 0

Grade E (Poor): 0

**P-Reviewer:** Li S, China; Rossi RE, Italy; Yu CZ, China

**Received:** January 26, 2023

**Peer-review started:** January 26, 2023

**First decision:** February 7, 2023

**Revised:** February 22, 2023

**Accepted:** May 5, 2023

**Article in press:** May 5, 2023

**Published online:** July 27, 2023



**James M Halle-Smith, Sarah Powell-Brett, Keith Roberts, Nikolaos A Chatzizacharias**, Department of HPB and Liver Transplant, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2GW, United Kingdom

**Corresponding author:** Nikolaos A Chatzizacharias, MD, PhD, FRCS, FACS, Consultant Surgeon, Department of HPB and Liver Transplant, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, University Hospitals of Birmingham NHS Trust, Mindelsohn Way, Birmingham B15 2TH, United Kingdom. [nikolaos.chatzizacharias@uhb.nhs.uk](mailto:nikolaos.chatzizacharias@uhb.nhs.uk)

### Abstract

#### BACKGROUND

Presence of liver metastatic disease in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC), either synchronous or metachronous after pancreatic resection, is a terminal diagnosis that warrants management with palliative intent as per all international practice guidelines. However, there is an increasing interest on any potential value of surgical treatment of isolated oligometastatic disease in selected cases.

#### AIM

To present the published evidence on surgical management of PDAC liver metastases, synchronous and metachronous, and compare the outcomes of these treatments to the current standard of care.

#### METHODS

A systematic review was performed in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses guidelines to compare the outcomes of both synchronous and metachronous liver metastases resection to standard care.

#### RESULTS

356 studies were identified, 31 studies underwent full-text review and of these 10 were suitable for inclusion. When synchronous resection of liver metastases was compared to standard care, most studies did not demonstrate a survival benefit with the exception of one study that utilised neoadjuvant treatment. However, resection of metachronous disease appeared to confer a survival advantage when compared to treatment with chemotherapy alone.

#### CONCLUSION

A survival benefit may exist in resection of selected cases of metachronous liver

oligometastatic PDAC disease, after disease biology has been tested with time and systemic treatment. Any survival benefit is less clear in synchronous cases; however an approach with neoadjuvant treatment and consideration of resection in some selected cases may confer some benefit. Future studies should focus on pathways for selection of cases that may benefit from an aggressive approach.

**Key Words:** Pancreas cancer; Liver metastases; Surgical resection; Systematic review

©The Author(s) 2023. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

**Core Tip:** The focus of management for isolated liver oligometastatic disease in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) has typically been palliative. However, recently there is an increasing number of series reporting promising results from resection of oligometastatic disease limited in the liver. The findings of this systematic review, which summarises the current available literature, indicate that a survival benefit may exist in resection of selected cases of metachronous liver oligometastatic PDAC disease, after disease biology has been tested with time and systemic treatment. Any survival benefit is less clear in synchronous cases; however an approach with neoadjuvant treatment and consideration of resection in some selected cases may confer some benefit. Future studies should focus on pathways for selection of cases that may benefit from an aggressive approach.

**Citation:** Halle-Smith JM, Powell-Brett S, Roberts K, Chatzizacharias NA. Resection of isolated liver oligometastatic disease in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: Is there a survival benefit? A systematic review. *World J Gastrointest Surg* 2023; 15(7): 1512-1521

**URL:** <https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-9366/full/v15/i7/1512.htm>

**DOI:** <https://dx.doi.org/10.4240/wjgs.v15.i7.1512>

## INTRODUCTION

Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) remains a leading cause of cancer death globally, with less than 10% 5-year survival rates[1-3]. One of the reasons behind this poor prognosis is that a substantial number of patients have distant metastatic disease at presentation, with the majority been hepatic due to the portal drainage of the pancreas[4-6].


International practice guidelines consistently advise against resection of PDAC in the setting of liver metastases, instead favouring palliative systemic treatments or best supportive care[7-11], with a typical survival of less than 12 mo [12]. This is in contrast to other malignancies with more favourable biology, such as colorectal or breast, for which resection of liver metastases has been shown to confer a survival advantage in selected cases with an acceptable safety profile[13-16]. Nonetheless, there is an increasing body of evidence in the form of small case series and reports that present promising oncological outcomes following resection of metachronous and even synchronous isolated liver metastases from PDAC primary. Any potential oncological benefits from such an aggressive approach need to be considered, especially as up to 75% of patients who undergo surgical resection and adjuvant therapy for primary PDAC will experience disease recurrence within 2 years[1,17,18] and two thirds of those will have metastatic disease[19,20].

The aim of this systematic review is to present the published evidence on the surgical management of PDAC isolated liver metastases, synchronous and metachronous; and compare the outcomes of these treatments to the current standard of care.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Literature search

A systematic literature search was performed for studies reporting outcomes of resection of isolated liver metastases in patients with PDAC, in either a synchronous or metachronous setting, according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses[21]. Synchronous lesions were defined those appearing within 6 mo of the primary diagnosis, whilst metachronous those diagnosed after 6 mo[22]. Medical subject headings terms, keywords and synonyms for 'pancreatic cancer', 'liver metastases' and 'surgical resection' were combined to search Medline, Embase, Cochrane, PubMed and *Reference Citation Analysis* (<https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>) databases. Database searches included all results from inception of each database to October 30, 2022. The search term was applied to titles and abstracts and was limited to English language articles. Conference abstracts and letters to the Editor were excluded. Following the removal of duplicates two independent reviewers (Sarah Powell-Brett and James Halle-Smith) screened by title and abstract and then by full text review. Articles were considered appropriate if they reported outcomes following resection of either synchronous or metachronous liver metastases in PDAC patients. Any disputes were resolved by a third, independent, reviewer, the senior author (NC) (Figure 1). The full search term is available in [Supplementary Figure 1](#).



**Figure 1 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses Flowchart.** PDAC: Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma.

## Data collection

The primary endpoint for this systematic review was median overall survival (OS) in PDAC patients with synchronous or metachronous isolated liver metastases treated with either surgical resection or an alternative treatment modality, for example chemotherapy. Secondary outcomes included disease free survival (DFS), peri-operative morbidity and mortality. As such, for each study survival data were collected in addition to relevant demographic, primary tumour and perioperative details. Data extraction elements were defined in advance and two reviewers independently extracted data using a pre-piloted extraction template (Sarah Powell-Brett and James Halle-Smith).

## RESULTS

### Literature search

The literature search identified a total of 356 studies, of which 31 full-text articles were screened and of these 10 articles were suitable for inclusion with a total of 449 patients [23-32] (Figure 1 and Table 1). Of these, 9 reported outcomes of surgical resection for synchronous isolated liver metastases [23-25,27-32] and 4 reported outcomes for resection of metachronous metastases [23,26,30,31]. There were 3 studies that reported outcomes for both synchronous and metachronous metastases [23,30,31] (Table 1). There was a mix of single- and multicentre studies included and all resections were performed in specialist hepato-pancreato-biliary centres. There were no criteria mentioned for the diagnosis or operability of PDAC liver metastases.

### Outcomes of resection for synchronous isolated liver metastases

In the 9 studies that reported outcomes of synchronous liver metastases resection, there were a total of 393 patients. The median number of metastases resected ranged 2-3 and the diameter 1-9 cm when reported. Non-anatomical resections (NAR) were the most common type of liver resection (133/152, 88%), with segmentectomies (15/152 10%) and hemihepatectomies (4/152, 3%) also been performed (Table 2). The postoperative morbidity rates ranged between 15% and 68% and mortality between 0 and 4.1%. DFS was reported in 2 studies with a range of 5.2 to 20.9 mo. OS was reported in all studies and ranged from 7.8 to 33 mo. Two of the studies also reported 5-year survival results at 3.3% and 5.8% (Table 2). The extent of liver resection and its relationship to survival was reported in 3 studies but was not found to be significant [26,30,31].

### Resection of synchronous isolated liver metastases compared to standard care

There were 5 studies that compared operative and non-operative treatment of patients with synchronous isolated liver metastases. The control groups varied between the studies, with some comparing the resection group to PDAC patients without liver metastases, whilst others compared to patients receiving chemotherapy only or surgical palliative bypass



**Table 1 Characteristics of included studies**

| Ref.                              | Country and Units                  | Single or multicentre | Metastasectomy timing        | Control group? | Total patients included | Total no controls | Gender (% male) | Pancreas resection types included |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| Dünschede <i>et al</i> [23], 2010 | Germany                            | Single                | Metachronous and synchronous | Yes            | 13                      | 10                | 54              | PD, DP, TP                        |
| Hackert <i>et al</i> [31], 2017   | Germany                            | Single                | Metachronous and synchronous | No             | 85                      | -                 | 55              | PD, DP, TP                        |
| Hamad <i>et al</i> [24], 2022     | United States                      | Single                | Synchronous only             | Yes            | 137                     | -                 | -               | PD only                           |
| Klein <i>et al</i> [25], 2012     | Germany                            | Single                | Synchronous only             | Yes            | 22                      | 22                | 64              | PD, DP, TP                        |
| Shi <i>et al</i> [32], 2016       | China                              | Single                | Synchronous only             | Yes            | 30                      | 39                | 67              | PD, DP, TP                        |
| Schwarz <i>et al</i> [26], 2020   | Germany, Austria and United States | Multicentre           | Metachronous only            | Yes            | 25                      | 8                 | 42              | NR                                |
| Tachezy <i>et al</i> [27], 2016   | Greece, France, Italy and Germany  | Multicentre           | Synchronous only             | Yes            | 69                      | 69                | 63              | PD, DP, TP                        |
| Takeda <i>et al</i> [28], 2023    | Japan                              | Single                | Synchronous only             | Yes            | 5                       | -                 | 80              | NR                                |
| Yang <i>et al</i> [29], 2020      | China                              | Single                | Synchronous only             | Yes            | 48                      | 10                | 58              | PD, DP                            |
| Zanini <i>et al</i> [30], 2015    | Italy                              | Single                | Metachronous and synchronous | No             | 15                      | -                 | 53              | PD, DP, TP                        |

PDAC: Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma; PD: Pancreatoduodenectomy; DP: Distal pancreatectomy; TP: Total pancreatectomy; NR: Not reported.

only. A formal meta-analysis was therefore not appropriate owing to the heterogenous nature of the control groups. Instead, median OS is reported in Table 3. Two studies reported reduced OS amongst the resection group[23,25], two similar OS[29,32] and one superior OS in the synchronous liver metastases resection group[27].

### Outcomes of resection for metachronous isolated liver metastases

In the 4 studies that reported outcomes of metachronous isolated liver metastases resection, a total of 56 patients were included. The time from primary resection to detection of liver metastases was given in two studies and ranged 8-13 mo. The remaining two studies reported the time from primary resection to liver metastasectomy and the median values were 17.8 and 18.4 mo. The number of lesions resected ranged 1-2 and the diameter of these lesions was 1.0-2.5 cm. NAR was the most common (28/56, 50%) type of liver resection reported, followed by segmentectomy (19/56, 34%) and hemihepatectomy (9/56, 16%). The postoperative morbidity ranged 32%-75% and mortality 0%-4.3%. OS from metastasectomy was reported in 3 of the 4 studies, with one reporting OS from time of detection of liver metastases, and ranged from 14.8-31 mo. DFS was reported in 2 studies and ranged from 8 to 14.9 mo (Table 4). One study reported patients surviving longer than 5 years after resection of metachronous liver metastases[31].

### Resection of metachronous isolated liver metastases compared to standard care

There were 2 studies that compared operative and non-operative treatment of patients presenting with metachronous liver metastases after PDAC resection. Meta-analysis was not possible due to the format in which OS was reported. Both studies reported a survival benefit with resection, with a median OS of 31 mo from LM detection in the resection group compared to 11 mo in one study[23] and 36.8 mo from LM resection compared to 9.2 mo in the other one[26] (Table 5).

## DISCUSSION

Diagnosis of metastatic disease in the liver from primary PDAC is a palliative diagnosis. Nonetheless, with the advances in systemic treatment and surgical techniques, a question that is recently becoming more and more relevant is whether a more aggressive approach with surgical resection of PDAC oligometastatic disease could confer survival benefit in selected cases. This question becomes more prominent in cases of synchronous isolated and limited liver metastases that are identified intra-operatively despite full pre-operative staging investigations or in cases of metachronous liver oligometastatic disease where tumour biology has been assessed with monitoring and systemic treatment. This systematic review analyses the published evidence on the surgical management of PDAC isolated liver metastases,

**Table 2 Synchronous isolated liver metastases resection outcomes**

| Ref.                              | n of patients | n of metastases (median, IQR) | Mean diameter of LM, cm | Type of liver resection   | Primary resection R0 rate | Post op morbidity     | Post op mortality | DFS (months) | OS (months) | 5-yr survival |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
| Dünschede <i>et al</i> [23], 2010 | 9             | 3 (1-5)                       | 3.5 (1-9)               | NAR (6), Seg (1), HH (2)  | 100%                      | 33%                   | 0%                | -            | 8           | 0%            |
| Hackert <i>et al</i> [31], 2017   | 62            | -                             | -                       | NAR (59), Seg (2), HH (1) | -                         | 47%                   | 1.60%             | -            | 10.6        | -             |
| Hamad <i>et al</i> [24], 2022     | 137           | -                             | -                       | -                         | -                         | -                     | -                 | -            | 15.6        | -             |
| Klein <i>et al</i> [25], 2012     | 22            | -                             | -                       | NAR (15), Seg (7)         | 32%                       | 27%                   | 0%                | -            | 7.4         | 0%            |
| Shi <i>et al</i> [32], 2016       | 30            | -                             | -                       | -                         | -                         | -                     | -                 | -            | 15.7        | 3.3%          |
| Tachezy <i>et al</i> [27], 2016   | 69            | 2 (1-2)                       | -                       | -                         | 58%                       | 68%                   | 1%                | -            | 14.5        | 5.8%          |
| Takeda <i>et al</i> [28], 2023    | 5             | 2 (2-2)                       | -                       | -                         | -                         | 23% CD3+              | 0%                | 20.9         | 33          | -             |
| Yang <i>et al</i> [29], 2020      | 48            | -                             | -                       | NAR (43), Seg (4), HH (1) | 100%                      | 15%                   | 4.1%              | -            | 7.8         | 0%            |
| Zanini <i>et al</i> [30], 2015    | 11            | 2 (1-2)                       | 2.4 (1.75-2.5)          | NAR (1), Seg (10)         | -                         | 27% CD3+; 54% overall | 0%                | 5.2          | 9.1         | 0%            |

Seg: Segmentectomy; HH: Hemihepatectomy; NAR: Non-anatomical resection; CD: Clavien-Dindo; DFS: Disease free survival; OS: Overall survival.

synchronous and metachronous, and how these compare to the current standard of care.

The identification of metastatic disease during the laparotomy in patients with PDAC and no evidence of metastases in pre-operative staging investigations upgrades the disease stage and changes the management intent from potentially curative to palliative as per all the international guidelines. Despite utilising all modern imaging staging modalities, this can still occur in around 15% [33,34] of the cases. Nonetheless, a number of series reported outcomes with a more aggressive approach, resecting isolated oligometastatic liver disease at the same time as the pancreatic resection. The reported OS was generally poor and ranged between 7.8 and 15.7 mo, with only one study reporting OS of 33 mo. Of note, long-term survival following synchronous resection was reported in some of the included studies [27,32]. It is unsurprising that OS was reduced in patients undergoing synchronous liver metastases resection when compared to PDAC patients without metastatic disease [25], given the more advanced stage of the disease. Interestingly though when resection of liver metastases was compared to palliative treatment (surgical bypass and chemotherapy) [23,32], survival after bypass and gemcitabine was superior to that of the groups treated with simultaneous resection of the primary and liver metastases in both of these studies. This may be explained by the likely longer time interval from surgery to chemotherapy in patients that had synchronous resection owing to the more complex post-operative course with higher risk for complications and prolonged recovery. Furthermore, the current suggested standard chemotherapy regimen is FOLFIRINOX [12,35], which also has a more cytotoxic profile and therefore even less likely to be tolerated well early in the post-operative period after major resection. Only one study reported superior survival amongst patients undergoing synchronous resection compared to palliative treatment [27]. However, in this study the majority of patients received neoadjuvant chemotherapy so only those with a favourable response and therefore less aggressive tumour biology proceeded to synchronous resection. On the contrary, patients who did not respond to neoadjuvant therapy and therefore likely had more aggressive disease biology did not proceed to resection and were included in the non-resection group. Therefore, any survival advantage reported is likely mainly attributed to the benefits of the systemic treatment, as well as the patient and disease biology selection by the neoadjuvant approach, rather than the surgical treatment. Indeed, the prognostic significance of response to preoperative chemotherapy has recently also been shown in another study reporting outcomes of chemotherapy and resection in metastatic PDAC patients with liver, lung and peritoneal spread [36].

The survival outcomes reported after resection of metachronous liver metastases were more promising and ranged between 11.4 and 31 mo. Most of the patients included in these studies have received adjuvant chemotherapy (mainly gemcitabine based) after the pancreatic primary resection and had liver metastasectomy about 1.5 years later [26,31]. Therefore, the likely more favourable disease biology, with stability on and after systemic treatment can once again possibly explain the recorded survival. Whilst it was not possible to perform a formal meta-analysis comparing the outcomes after resection of metachronous liver metastases to the control group (palliative chemotherapy), a survival benefit of over one year was observed in both studies included. Of note, both studies used gemcitabine based chemotherapy regimens, known to have inferior results to the current standards of care (FOLFIRINOX) [12,35]. More

**Table 3 Synchronous isolated liver metastases resection outcomes vs controls**

| Ref.                              |              | Treatment modality                                                                       | n of patients | Median age | n of mets | Max met diameter | Adjuvant chemotherapy | OS             | P value |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------|-----------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------|
| Dünschede <i>et al</i> [23], 2010 | Control      | Gemcitabine, no surgical resection                                                       | 5             | 63         | 1         | 3.5 (1-9)        | NR                    | Median 11 mo   | NR      |
|                                   | Intervention | Synchronous resection of pancreatic primary and liver metastases                         | 9             | 55         | 3         | Mean 3.5 cm      | NR                    | Median 8 mo    |         |
| Klein <i>et al</i> [25], 2012     | Control      | Pancreatic primary resection only. No liver metastases                                   | 22            | Mean 57.5  | -         | -                | 22 (100)              | Median 14.6 mo | 0.015   |
|                                   | Intervention | Synchronous resection of pancreatic primary and liver metastases                         | 22            | Mean 57.5  | -         | -                | 22 (100)              | Median 7.6 mo  |         |
| Shi <i>et al</i> [32], 2016       | Control      | Palliative bypass and gemcitabine                                                        | 39            | Mean 63    | -         | -                | NR                    | Median 16.9 mo | 0.085   |
|                                   | Intervention | Synchronous resection of pancreatic primary and liver metastases                         | 30            | Mean 62.2  | -         | -                | NR                    | Median 15.7 mo |         |
| Tachezy <i>et al</i> [27], 2016   | Control      | No resection, palliative bypass/exploration and chemotherapy (FOLFIRINOX or Gemcitabine) | 69            | Median 62  | 2 (1-8)   | -                | 58 (84)               | Median 7.5 mo  | < 0.001 |
|                                   | Intervention | Synchronous resection of pancreatic primary and liver metastases                         | 69            | Median 65  | 2 (1-11)  | -                | 58 (84)               | Median 14.5 mo |         |
| Yang <i>et al</i> [29], 2020      | Control      | Systemic gemcitabine-based chemotherapy, no surgery                                      | 31            | Mean 61.1  | -         | -                | NR                    | Median 7.6 mo  | 0.37    |
|                                   | Intervention | Synchronous resection of pancreatic primary and liver metastases                         | 48            | Mean 61.1  | -         | -                | NR                    | Median 7.8 mo  |         |

NR: Not reported; OS: Overall survival.

**Table 4 Metachronous isolated liver metastases resection outcomes**

| Ref.                              | n of patients | Age (median IQR)           | n of Mets (median, IQR) | Mean diameter of LM, cm | Type of liver resection   | Time to metastases detection or resection | Postop morbidity      | Postop mortality | OS <sup>1</sup> (median, months) | 5-yr survival |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| Dünschede <i>et al</i> [23], 2010 | 4             | 42 (41–81)                 | 1.75 (1–2)              | 2.2 (1–3)               | NAR (3), Seg (1), HH (6)  | 9 <sup>2</sup>                            | 0                     | 0                | 31                               | 0%            |
| Hackert <i>et al</i> [31], 2017   | 23            | 60.4 (mean, for SM and MM) |                         |                         | NAR (14), Seg (3), HH (6) | 18.4 <sup>3</sup>                         | 34%                   | 4.30%            | 14.8                             | -             |
| Schwarz <i>et al</i> [26], 2020   | 25            | 63.8                       | 1 (1,2)                 | -                       | NAR (8), Seg (15), HH (2) | 17.8 <sup>3</sup>                         | 32% CD1; 12% CD3      | 0%               | 36.8                             | 0%            |
| Zanini <i>et al</i> [30], 2015    | 4             | 48 (40.5–55.25)            | 1 (1-1)                 | 2.2 (2-2.5)             | NAR (3), HH (1)           | 8.0 <sup>2</sup>                          | 25% CD3+; 75% overall | 0%               | 11.4                             | 0%            |

<sup>1</sup>All median overall survival values are from liver metastases resection except Dünschede *et al* [23]. Which is reported from time of diagnosis.<sup>2</sup>Time from primary resection to detection of LM.<sup>3</sup>Time from primary resection to resection of LM.

Seg: Segmentectomy; HH: Hemihepatectomy; NAR: Non-anatomical resection; CD: Clavien-Dindo; OS: Overall survival.

importantly one study also reported a 8.1% 5-year survival rate with metastasectomy[31]. Even though the study included both synchronous and metachronous liver metastases resections and the 5-year survival rates were not reported separately for the two groups, it is more likely that the metachronous group had longer OS.

The limitations of this review include its narrative descriptive nature, as well as the retrospective nature of the studies included with limited number of patients introducing patient and treatment selection bias. It is also focused on surgical resection as opposed to ablation, radiotherapy or other forms of liver directed therapies. The type, timing and duration of systemic treatment were not standardised or consistent among the studies. Younger or fit patients with less aggressive

**Table 5 Metachronous isolated liver metastases resection outcomes vs controls**

| Ref.                              |              | Treatment modality                              | n of patients | Median age  | n of mets | Max met diameter | Overall survival <sup>1</sup> (median, months) | P value |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------------------|---------|
| Dünschede <i>et al</i> [23], 2010 | Control      | Systemic chemotherapy (gemcitabine), no surgery | 5             | 42          | 1.75      | 2.2 cm (average) | 11 (8-19)                                      | < 0.05  |
|                                   | Intervention | Resection of liver metastases                   | 4             | 42          | 1.75      | 2.2 cm (average) | 31 (20-51)                                     |         |
| Schwarz <i>et al</i> [26], 2020   | Control      | Systemic chemotherapy (gemcitabine), no surgery | 8             | Median 69.4 | 2         | -                |                                                | 0.0007  |
|                                   | Intervention | Resection of liver metastases                   | 25            | Median 63.8 | 1         | -                | 36.8                                           |         |

<sup>1</sup>All median overall survival values are from liver metastases resection except Dünschede *et al* [23]. Which is reported from time of diagnosis.

disease were therefore more likely to have received a more aggressive treatment approach including surgical resection. A meta-analysis was not appropriate, due to heterogeneity between the 5 studies in the synchronous group and the lack of reported OS confidence intervals in the one of the two studies in the metachronous group. Finally, most patients in the included studies received gemcitabine based chemotherapy regimens, which confer inferior outcomes to FOLFIRINOX which is the current standard of care [12]. Nonetheless, this review presents and analyses the best current available evidence on the resection of PDAC isolated liver oligometastatic disease.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the evidence on surgical management of PDAC isolated liver metastases is scarce and inconclusive. A survival benefit may exist in selected metachronous cases when disease biology has been tested with time and systemic treatment. Survival benefit is less clear in synchronous cases; however an approach with neoadjuvant treatment and consideration of resection in some selected cases may confer some benefit. Future studies should focus on pathways for selection of cases that may benefit from an aggressive approach, including patient selection, tumour genetic testing and individualised systemic treatment, as well as novel markers for treatment response.

## ARTICLE HIGHLIGHTS

### Research background

Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) remains a leading cause of cancer death globally, with a substantial number of patients presenting with metastatic disease and typical survival of less than 12 mo. Furthermore, up to 75% of patients who undergo surgical resection and adjuvant therapy for primary PDAC will experience disease recurrence within 2 years and two thirds of those will have metastatic disease. International practice guidelines consistently suggest palliative treatment pathways for these patients. Nonetheless, there is an increasing body of evidence in the form of small case series and reports that present promising oncological outcomes following resection of metachronous and even synchronous isolated liver metastases from PDAC primary.

### Research motivation

A number of patients with oligometastatic disease may benefit from an aggressive approach which includes surgical resection.

### Research objectives

The aim of this systematic review is to present the published evidence on the surgical management of PDAC isolated liver metastases, synchronous and metachronous; and compare the outcomes to the current standard of care (palliative treatment).

### Research methods

A systematic literature search was performed for studies reporting outcomes of resection of isolated liver metastases in patients with PDAC, in either a synchronous or metachronous setting, according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analyses. Synchronous lesions were defined those appearing within 6 mo of the primary diagnosis, whilst metachronous those diagnosed after 6 mo. The primary endpoint for this systematic review was median overall survival in PDAC patients with synchronous or metachronous isolated liver metastases treated with either surgical resection or an alternative treatment modality, for example chemotherapy. Secondary outcomes included disease

free survival, peri-operative morbidity and mortality.

### Research results

The literature search identified a total of 356 studies, of which 31 full-text articles were screened and of these 10 articles were suitable for inclusion with a total of 449 patients. Nine studies reported outcomes of surgical resection for synchronous isolated liver metastases and 4 reported outcomes for resection of metachronous metastases (3 studies reported outcomes for both).

### Research conclusions

In conclusion, the evidence on surgical management of PDAC isolated liver metastases is scarce and inconclusive. A survival benefit may exist in selected metachronous cases when disease biology has been tested with time and systemic treatment. Survival benefit is less clear in synchronous cases; however an approach with neoadjuvant treatment and consideration of resection in some selected cases may confer some benefit.

### Research perspectives

Future studies should focus on pathways for selection of cases that may benefit from an aggressive approach, including patient selection, tumour genetic testing and individualised systemic treatment, as well as novel markers for treatment response.

## FOOTNOTES

**Author contributions:** Halle-Smith JM and Powell-Brett S performed the literature search, data collection and initial manuscript preparation; Roberts K and Chatzizacharias NA wrote and reviewed the manuscript; All authors have read and approve the final manuscript.

**Conflict-of-interest statement:** All the authors report no relevant conflicts of interest for this article.

**PRISMA 2009 Checklist statement:** The authors have read the PRISMA 2009 Checklist, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the PRISMA 2009 Checklist.

**Open-Access:** This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

**Country/Territory of origin:** United Kingdom

**ORCID number:** Keith Roberts 0000-0003-1799-9829; Nikolaos A Chatzizacharias 0000-0002-4864-189X.

**S-Editor:** Fan JR

**L-Editor:** A

**P-Editor:** Xu ZH

## REFERENCES

- Oettle H, Neuhaus P, Hochhaus A, Hartmann JT, Gellert K, Ridwelski K, Niedergethmann M, Zülke C, Fahlke J, Arning MB, Sinn M, Hinke A, Riess H. Adjuvant chemotherapy with gemcitabine and long-term outcomes among patients with resected pancreatic cancer: the CONKO-001 randomized trial. *JAMA* 2013; **310**: 1473-1481 [PMID: 24104372 DOI: 10.1001/jama.2013.279201]
- Neoptolemos JP, Palmer DH, Ghane P, Psarelli EE, Valle JW, Halloran CM, Faluy O, O'Reilly DA, Cunningham D, Wadsley J, Darby S, Meyer T, Gillmore R, Anthony A, Lind P, Glimelius B, Falk S, Izbicki JR, Middleton GW, Cummins S, Ross PJ, Wasan H, McDonald A, Crosby T, Ma YT, Patel K, Sherriff D, Soomal R, Borg D, Sothi S, Hammel P, Hackert T, Jackson R, Büchler MW; European Study Group for Pancreatic Cancer. Comparison of adjuvant gemcitabine and capecitabine with gemcitabine monotherapy in patients with resected pancreatic cancer (ESPAC-4): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2017; **389**: 1011-1024 [PMID: 28129987 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32409-6]
- Kleeff J, Korc M, Apte M, La Vecchia C, Johnson CD, Biankin AV, Neale RE, Tempero M, Tuveson DA, Hruban RH, Neoptolemos JP. Pancreatic cancer. *Nat Rev Dis Primers* 2016; **2**: 16022 [PMID: 27158978 DOI: 10.1038/nrdp.2016.22]
- Matsuda Y, Hagio M, Naito Z, Ishiwata T. Clinicopathological features of 30 autopsy cases of pancreatic carcinoma. *J Nippon Med Sch* 2012; **79**: 459-467 [PMID: 23291845 DOI: 10.1272/jnms.79.459]
- Mierke F, Hempel S, Distler M, Aust DE, Saeger HD, Weitz J, Welsch T. Impact of Portal Vein Involvement from Pancreatic Cancer on Metastatic Pattern After Surgical Resection. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2016; **23**: 730-736 [PMID: 27554501 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-016-5515-6]
- Bissolati M, Sandri MT, Burtulo G, Zorzino L, Balzano G, Braga M. Portal vein-circulating tumor cells predict liver metastases in patients with resectable pancreatic cancer. *Tumour Biol* 2015; **36**: 991-996 [PMID: 25318603 DOI: 10.1007/s13277-014-2716-0]
- Conroy T, Galais MP, Raoul JL, Bouché O, Gourgou-Bourgade S, Douillard JY, Etienne PL, Boige V, Martel-Lafay I, Michel P, Llacer-Moscardo C, François E, Créhange G, Abdelghani MB, Juzyna B, Bedenne L, Adenis A; Fédération Francophone de Cancérologie Digestive



- and UNICANCER-GI Group. Definitive chemoradiotherapy with FOLFOX versus fluorouracil and cisplatin in patients with oesophageal cancer (PRODIGE5/ACCORD17): final results of a randomised, phase 2/3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2014; **15**: 305-314 [PMID: [24556041](#) DOI: [10.1016/S1470-2045\(14\)70028-2](#)]
- 8 **Von Hoff DD**, Ervin T, Arena FP, Chiorean EG, Infante J, Moore M, Seay T, Tjulandin SA, Ma WW, Saleh MN, Harris M, Reni M, Dowden S, Laheru D, Bahary N, Ramanathan RK, Tabernero J, Hidalgo M, Goldstein D, Van Cutsem E, Wei X, Iglesias J, Renschler MF. Increased survival in pancreatic cancer with nab-paclitaxel plus gemcitabine. *N Engl J Med* 2013; **369**: 1691-1703 [PMID: [24131140](#) DOI: [10.1056/NEJMoa1304369](#)]
  - 9 **Tempero MA**, Malafa MP, Behrman SW, Benson AB 3rd, Casper ES, Chiorean EG, Chung V, Cohen SJ, Czito B, Engebretson A, Feng M, Hawkins WG, Herman J, Hoffman JP, Ko A, Komanduri S, Koong A, Lowy AM, Ma WW, Merchant NB, Mulvihill SJ, Muscarella P 2nd, Nakakura EK, Obando J, Pitman MB, Reddy S, Sasson AR, Thayer SP, Weekes CD, Wolff RA, Wolpin BM, Burns JL, Freedman-Cass DA. Pancreatic adenocarcinoma, version 2.2014: featured updates to the NCCN guidelines. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2014; **12**: 1083-1093 [PMID: [25099441](#) DOI: [10.6004/JNCCN.2014.0106](#)]
  - 10 **Bellon E**, Gebauer F, Tachezy M, Izbicki JR, Bockhorn M. Pancreatic cancer and liver metastases: state of the art. *Updates Surg* 2016; **68**: 247-251 [PMID: [27832445](#) DOI: [10.1007/s13304-016-0407-7](#)]
  - 11 **Seufferlein T**, Bachet JB, Van Cutsem E, Rougier P; ESMO Guidelines Working Group. Pancreatic adenocarcinoma: ESMO-ESDO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol* 2012; **23** Suppl 7: vii33-vii40 [PMID: [22997452](#) DOI: [10.1093/annonc/mds224](#)]
  - 12 **Conroy T**, Castan F, Lopez A, Turpin A, Ben Abdelghani M, Wei AC, Mitry E, Biagi JJ, Evesque L, Artru P, Lecomte T, Assenat E, Bauguion L, Ychou M, Bouché O, Monard L, Lambert A, Hammel P; Canadian Cancer Trials Group and the Unicancer-GI-PRODIGE Group. Five-Year Outcomes of FOLFIRINOX vs Gemcitabine as Adjuvant Therapy for Pancreatic Cancer: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Oncol* 2022; **8**: 1571-1578 [PMID: [36048453](#) DOI: [10.1001/jamaoncol.2022.3829](#)]
  - 13 **Pagani O**, Senkus E, Wood W, Colleoni M, Cufer T, Kyriakides S, Costa A, Winer EP, Cardoso F; ESO-MBC Task Force. International guidelines for management of metastatic breast cancer: can metastatic breast cancer be cured? *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2010; **102**: 456-463 [PMID: [20220104](#) DOI: [10.1093/jnci/djq029](#)]
  - 14 **Lillemoe HA**, Vauthey JN. Surgical approach to synchronous colorectal liver metastases: staged, combined, or reverse strategy. *Hepatobiliary Surg Nutr* 2020; **9**: 25-34 [PMID: [32140476](#) DOI: [10.21037/hbsn.2019.05.14](#)]
  - 15 **Cetin B**, Bilgetekin I, Cengiz M, Ozet A. Managing Synchronous Liver Metastases in Colorectal Cancer. *Indian J Surg Oncol* 2018; **9**: 461-471 [PMID: [30538373](#) DOI: [10.1007/s13193-018-0765-3](#)]
  - 16 **Adam R**, de Gramont A, Figueras J, Kokudo N, Kunstlinger F, Loyer E, Poston G, Rougier P, Rubbia-Brandt L, Sobrero A, Teh C, Tejpar S, Van Cutsem E, Vauthey JN, Pahlman L; of the EGOSLIM (Expert Group on OncoSurgery management of Liver Metastases) group. Managing synchronous liver metastases from colorectal cancer: a multidisciplinary international consensus. *Cancer Treat Rev* 2015; **41**: 729-741 [PMID: [26417845](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.ctrv.2015.06.006](#)]
  - 17 **Sinn M**, Bahra M, Liersch T, Gellert K, Messmann H, Bechstein W, Waldschmidt D, Jacobasch L, Wilhelm M, Rau BM, Grützmann R, Weinmann A, Maschmeyer G, Pelzer U, Stieler JM, Striefler JK, Ghadimi M, Bischoff S, Dörken B, Oettle H, Riess H. CONKO-005: Adjuvant Chemotherapy With Gemcitabine Plus Erlotinib Versus Gemcitabine Alone in Patients After R0 Resection of Pancreatic Cancer: A Multicenter Randomized Phase III Trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2017; **35**: 3330-3337 [PMID: [28817370](#) DOI: [10.1200/JCO.2017.72.6463](#)]
  - 18 **Neoptolemos JP**, Stocken DD, Bassi C, Ghaneh P, Cunningham D, Goldstein D, Padbury R, Moore MJ, Gallinger S, Mariette C, Wente MN, Izbicki JR, Friess H, Lerch MM, Dervenis C, Oláh A, Butturini G, Doi R, Lind PA, Smith D, Valle JW, Palmer DH, Buckels JA, Thompson J, McKay CJ, Rawcliffe CL, Büchler MW; European Study Group for Pancreatic Cancer. Adjuvant chemotherapy with fluorouracil plus folinic acid vs gemcitabine following pancreatic cancer resection: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2010; **304**: 1073-1081 [PMID: [20823433](#) DOI: [10.1001/jama.2010.1275](#)]
  - 19 **Groot VP**, Daamen LA, Hagendoorn J, Borel Rinkes IHM, Busch OR, van Santvoort HC, Besselink MG, Molenaar IQ; Dutch Pancreatic Cancer Group. Current Strategies for Detection and Treatment of Recurrence of Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma After Resection: A Nationwide Survey. *Pancreas* 2017; **46**: e73-e75 [PMID: [28902799](#) DOI: [10.1097/MPA.0000000000000899](#)]
  - 20 **Ratnayake B**, Savastyuk AY, Nayar M, Wilson CH, Windsor JA, Roberts K, French JJ, Pandanaboyana S. Recurrence Patterns for Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma after Upfront Resection Versus Resection Following Neoadjuvant Therapy: A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Med* 2020; **9** [PMID: [32640720](#) DOI: [10.3390/jcm9072132](#)]
  - 21 **Moher D**, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA; PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev* 2015; **4**: 1 [PMID: [25554246](#) DOI: [10.1186/2046-4053-4-1](#)]
  - 22 **Moertel C**. Introduction and Presentation of Data. In Multiple Primary Malignant Neoplasms. *Cancer* 1966; 1-21
  - 23 **Dünschede F**, Will L, von Langsdorf C, Möhler M, Galle PR, Otto G, Vahl CF, Junginger T. Treatment of metachronous and simultaneous liver metastases of pancreatic cancer. *Eur Surg Res* 2010; **44**: 209-213 [PMID: [20571276](#) DOI: [10.1159/000313532](#)]
  - 24 **Hamad A**, Underhill J, Ansari A, Thayaparan V, Cloyd JM, Li Y, Pawlik TM, Tsung A, Abushahin L, Ejaz A. Surgical treatment of hepatic oligometastatic pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: An analysis of the National Cancer Database. *Surgery* 2022; **171**: 1464-1470 [PMID: [35115154](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.surg.2021.12.029](#)]
  - 25 **Klein F**, Puhl G, Guckelberger O, Pelzer U, Pullankavumkal JR, Guel S, Neuhaus P, Bahra M. The impact of simultaneous liver resection for occult liver metastases of pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2012; **2012**: 939350 [PMID: [23258977](#) DOI: [10.1155/2012/939350](#)]
  - 26 **Schwarz C**, Fitschek F, Primavesi F, Stättner S, Margonis GA, Weiss MA, Stavrou GA, Oldhafer KJ, Kornprat P, Wundsam H, Fischer I, Längle F, Függer R, Hauer A, Klug R, Kieler M, Prager G, Schindl M, Stremitzer S, Bodingbauer M, Sahara K, Kaczirek K. Metachronous hepatic resection for liver only pancreatic metastases. *Surg Oncol* 2020; **35**: 169-173 [PMID: [32889249](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.suronc.2020.08.005](#)]
  - 27 **Tachezy M**, Gebauer F, Janot M, Uhl W, Zerbi A, Montorsi M, Perinel J, Adham M, Dervenis C, Agalianos C, Malleo G, Maggino L, Stein A, Izbicki JR, Bockhorn M. Synchronous resections of hepatic oligometastatic pancreatic cancer: Disputing a principle in a time of safe pancreatic operations in a retrospective multicenter analysis. *Surgery* 2016; **160**: 136-144 [PMID: [27048934](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.surg.2016.02.019](#)]
  - 28 **Takeda T**, Sasaki T, Okamoto T, Kasuga A, Matsuyama M, Ozaka M, Inoue Y, Takahashi Y, Saiura A, Sasahira N. Outcomes of pancreatic cancer with liver oligometastasis. *J Hepatobiliary Pancreat Sci* 2023; **30**: 229-239 [PMID: [35593731](#) DOI: [10.1002/jhbp.1184](#)]
  - 29 **Yang J**, Zhang J, Lui W, Huo Y, Fu X, Yang M, Hua R, Wang L, Sun Y. Patients with hepatic oligometastatic pancreatic body/tail ductal adenocarcinoma may benefit from synchronous resection. *HPB (Oxford)* 2020; **22**: 91-101 [PMID: [31262486](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.hpb.2019.05.015](#)]

- 30 **Zanini N**, Lombardi R, Masetti M, Giordano M, Landolfo G, Jovine E. Surgery for isolated liver metastases from pancreatic cancer. *Updates Surg* 2015; **67**: 19-25 [PMID: [25702263](#) DOI: [10.1007/s13304-015-0283-6](#)]
- 31 **Hackert T**, Niesen W, Hinz U, Tjaden C, Strobel O, Ulrich A, Michalski CW, Büchler MW. Radical surgery of oligometastatic pancreatic cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2017; **43**: 358-363 [PMID: [27856064](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.ejso.2016.10.023](#)]
- 32 **Shi HJ**, Jin C, Fu DL. Preoperative evaluation of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma with synchronous liver metastasis: Diagnosis and assessment of unresectability. *World J Gastroenterol* 2016; **22**: 10024-10037 [PMID: [28018110](#) DOI: [10.3748/wjg.v22.i45.10024](#)]
- 33 **Vargas R**, Nino-Murcia M, Trueblood W, Jeffrey RB Jr. MDCT in Pancreatic adenocarcinoma: prediction of vascular invasion and resectability using a multiphasic technique with curved planar reformations. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2004; **182**: 419-425 [PMID: [14736675](#) DOI: [10.2214/ajr.182.2.1820419](#)]
- 34 **De Rosa A**, Cameron IC, Gomez D. Indications for staging laparoscopy in pancreatic cancer. *HPB (Oxford)* 2016; **18**: 13-20 [PMID: [26776846](#) DOI: [10.1016/j.hpb.2015.10.004](#)]
- 35 **Primrose PJ**. Pancreatic cancer in adults: diagnosis and management NICE guideline. (e-pub ahead of print 2018). United Kingdom: ELSEVIER, 2020: e3
- 36 **Hank T**, Klaiber U, Hinz U, Schütte D, Leonhardt CS, Bergmann F, Hackert T, Jäger D, Büchler MW, Strobel O. Oncological Outcome of Conversion Surgery After Preoperative Chemotherapy for Metastatic Pancreatic Cancer. *Ann Surg* 2022; **277**: e1089-e1098 [PMID: [35758505](#) DOI: [10.1097/SLA.0000000000005481](#)]



Published by **Baishideng Publishing Group Inc**  
7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

**Telephone:** +1-925-3991568

**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

**Help Desk:** <https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk>

<https://www.wjgnet.com>

