

Review Article



OPEN ACCESS

Received: Jan 30, 2017

Revised: Feb 23, 2017

Accepted: Mar 4, 2017

Correspondence to

Jong-Min Lee

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology,
Kyung Hee University Hospital at Gangdong,
Kyung Hee University College of Medicine,
892 Dongnam-ro, Gangdong-gu, Seoul 05278,
Korea.
E-mail: kgo02@hanmail.net

*Current affiliation: Division of Gynecologic
Oncology, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre,
University Health Network, University of
Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Copyright © 2017. Asian Society of
Gynecologic Oncology, Korean Society of
Gynecologic Oncology

This is an Open Access article distributed
under the terms of the Creative Commons
Attribution Non-Commercial License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)
which permits unrestricted non-commercial
use, distribution, and reproduction in any
medium, provided the original work is properly
cited.

ORCID iDs

Myong Cheol Lim <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8964-7158>
Maria Lee <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8017-3176>
Seung Hyuk Shim <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8043-2257>
Eun Ji Nam <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0189-3560>
Jung Yun Lee <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7948-1350>
Kwang Beom Lee <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4634-176X>

Practice guidelines for management of cervical cancer in Korea: a Korean Society of Gynecologic Oncology Consensus Statement

Myong Cheol Lim ¹, Maria Lee ², Seung Hyuk Shim ³, Eun Ji Nam ⁴,
Jung Yun Lee ⁴, Hyun Jung Kim ⁵, Yoo-Young Lee ^{6,*}, Kwang Beom Lee ⁷,
Jeong Yeol Park ⁸, Yun Hwan Kim ⁹, Kyung Do Ki ¹⁰, Yong Jung Song ¹¹,
Hyun Hoon Chung ², Sunghoon Kim ⁴, Jeong-won Lee ^{6,*}, Jae-Weon Kim ²,
Duk-Soo Bae ^{6,*}, Jong-Min Lee ¹⁰

¹Gynecologic Cancer Branch, Center for Uterine Cancer, and Center for Clinical Trials, Research Institute and Hospital and Cancer Control and Policy, Graduate School of Cancer Science and Policy, National Cancer Center, Goyang, Korea

²Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Seoul National University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

³Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Konkuk University School of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

⁴Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Yonsei University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

⁵Department of Preventive Medicine, College of Medicine, Korea University, Seoul, Korea

⁶Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Samsung Medical Center, Sungkyunkwan University School of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

⁷Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Gil Medical Center, Gachon University, Incheon, Korea

⁸Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Ulsan College of Medicine, Asan Medical Center, Seoul, Korea

⁹Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ewha Womans University Mokdong Hospital, Ewha Womans University School of Medicine, Seoul, Korea


¹⁰Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Kyung Hee University Hospital at Gangdong, Kyung Hee University College of Medicine, Seoul, Korea

¹¹Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Pusan National University School of Medicine, Pusan, Korea


ABSTRACT

Clinical practice guidelines for gynecologic cancers have been developed by academic society from several countries. Each guideline reflected their own insurance system and unique medical environment, based on the published evidence. The Korean Society of Gynecologic Oncology (KSGO) published the first edition of practice guidelines for gynecologic cancer treatment in late 2006; the second edition was released in July 2010 as an evidence-based recommendation. The Guidelines Revision Committee was established in 2015 and decided to develop the third edition of the guidelines in an advanced format based on evidence-based medicine, embracing up-to-date clinical trials and qualified Korean data. These guidelines cover strategies for diagnosis and treatment of primary and recurrent cervical cancer. The committee members and many gynecologic oncologists derived key questions through discussions, and a number of relevant scientific literature were reviewed in advance. Recommendations for each specific question were developed by the consensus conference, and they are summarized here, along with the details. The objective of these practice guidelines is to establish standard policies on issues in clinical practice related to the management in cervical cancer based on the results in published papers to date and the consensus of experts as a KSGO Consensus Statement.


Keywords: Uterine Cervical Neoplasms; Practice Guideline; Consensus; General Surgery; Chemotherapy; Irradiation

Jeong Yeol Park 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-2475-7123>

 Yun Hwan Kim 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9498-2938>

 Yong Jung Song 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6103-2466>

 Hyun Hoon Chung 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5158-7492>

 Sunghoon Kim 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1645-7473>

 Jeong-won Lee 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6945-0398>

 Jae-Weon Kim 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1835-9436>

 Jong-Min Lee 
<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0562-5443>

Funding

All costs related to the consensus conference were covered from the Korean Society of Gynecologic Oncology central funds. There was no external funding of the event or manuscript production.

Conflict of Interest

Jae-Weon Kim, Myong Cheol Lim, Jeong-Yeol Park, and Seung-Hyuk Shim serve as editors of the Journal of Gynecologic Oncology (JGO), but have no role in the decision to publish this article. No other conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Data curation: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Formal analysis: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Funding acquisition: L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Investigation: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Methodology: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Project administration: L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Resources: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Software: K.H.J.; Supervision: L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Validation: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.; Visualization: K.H.J.;

INTRODUCTION

In 2012, cervical cancer was ranked the fourth in incidence and mortality among female cancers worldwide. Globally, cervical cancer had an estimated 528,000 new cases and was responsible for 266,000 deaths in 2012 [1]. Recently, the decreased incidence and mortality rates in developed countries have been attributed to the effectiveness of the screening test for cervical cancer. However, the incidence rate remains high in developing countries, where it accounts for 85% of all cervical cancer cases [2].

According to the Korea Central Cancer Registry data, there were 224,177 new cases of cancer in Korea in the year 2012. After excluding carcinoma in situ cases, cervical cancer was diagnosed in 3,584 cases, which comprised 1.7% of total cancer incidence, and ranking cervical cancer as the seventh most common cancer among females [3].

Although the incidence rate of cervical cancer shows a gradually decreasing trend, the incidence increased from 1993 through 2002 in women in their 20s and in those who were 70 years or older. As the incidence of cervical cancer decreased, an increase in the incidence of cervical cancer with carcinoma in situ was observed in all ages (20–80 years) [4]. This is due to early diagnosis and treatment at a precancerous stage rather than a decrease in de facto incidence of cervical cancer [2,5].

The most important risk factor for cervical cancer is the persistent high-risk human papillomavirus (HPV) infection. The rate of chronic HPV infection is approximately 10%–20% in countries with a high occurrence of cervical cancer and approximately 5%–10% [6] in countries with the low occurrence of cervical cancer. In Korea, the infection rate is reported to be approximately 10%–15%, although different results have been reported [7–10].

The test for HPV, which is a recognized cause of cervical cancer, has been recently included in the screening for cervical cancer. Additionally, the bivalent and quadrivalent HPV vaccines are being administered clinically. With effective treatments like surgery or concurrent chemoradiation therapy (CCRT), the cure rate of cervical cancer is up to 80%–90% in the early stages (stages I–II), and 60% in stage III. However, the prognosis is still poor with cancer progression to an advanced stage or recurrence.

The present guidelines are based on “The Practice Guidelines for Gynecological Cancers V2” (2010) and recent changes have been added. Key questions from clinical situation were put to thorough discussion with experts in such diverse fields as oncology, pathology, radiation oncology, radiology, and nuclear medicine. We also added an appendix with the evidence tables and the levels of evidence/recommendation.

The present practice guidelines for cervical cancer used the pathological classification (**Table 1**, modified World Health Organization [WHO] classification) recommended by the Gynecological Pathology Study Group of the Korean Society of Pathologist (GPSGKSP). There are 2 classification systems available for cervical cancer staging, the tumor, node, and metastasis (TNM) and International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) classification systems. The guidelines that used the FIGO staging were revised in early 2009 (**Table 2**).

The objective of these practice guidelines is to establish standard policies on issues in clinical practice related to the management in cervical cancer based on the results in published

Writing - original draft: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., L.J.M.; Writing - review & editing: L.M.C., L.M., S.S.H., N.E.J., L.J.Y., K.H.J., L.Y.Y., L.K.B., P.J.Y., K.Y.H., K.K.D., S.Y.J., C.H.H., K.S., L.J.W., K.J.W., B.D.S., L.J.M.

Table 1. Modified WHO histological classification of malignant tumors of the uterine cervix by the GPSGKSP

A. Epithelial tumors
• Squamous tumors
SCC
Keratinizing
Nonkeratinizing
Basaloid
Verrucous
Warty
Papillary
Lymphoepithelioma-like
Squamotransitional
Microinvasive SCC
CIN 3/SCC in situ
• Glandular tumors
Adenocarcinoma
Mucinous adenocarcinoma (Endocervical, intestinal, signet ring cell, minima deviation, villoglandular)
Endometrioid
Clear cell adenocarcinoma
Serous adenocarcinoma
Mesonephric adenocarcinoma
Early invasive adenocarcinoma
Adenocarcinoma in situ
• Other epithelial tumors
Adenosquamous carcinoma
Glassy cell carcinoma variant
Adenoid cystic carcinoma
Adenoid basal carcinoma
Neuroendocrine tumors
Undifferentiated carcinoma
B. Mesenchymal tumors
• Leiomyosarcoma
• Stromal sarcoma
• Sarcoma botryoides
• Others
C. Mixed epithelial and mesenchymal tumors
• Carcinosarcoma (MMMT)
• Adenosarcoma
D. Melanocytic tumors
E. Miscellaneous tumors
F. Lymphoid and hematopoietic tumors
G. Secondary tumors

CIN, cervical intraepithelial neoplasia; GPSGKSP, Gynecological Pathology Study Group of the Korean Society of Pathologist; MMT, malignant müllerian mixed tumor; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma; WHO, World Health Organization.

papers to date and the consensus of experts as a KSGO Consensus Statement.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The methods are same for those of endometrial cancer as followings [11]. The KSGO has revised the previously published practice guidelines for management of gynecologic cancer. The first edition of the practice guidelines for gynecologic cancer treatment was published in late 2006 and the second was released in July 2010 as an evidence-based recommendation. In 2015, the Guidelines Revision Committee, which was established within the KSGO, decided to produce the third edition of the guidelines. They: 1) considered the rapidly advancing developments in precision medicine and analyzed and applied the results of up-to-date

Table 3. Levels of evidence and grades of recommendation

	Grade and recommendation strength
Levels of evidence	
A	High-quality evidence
B	Moderate-quality evidence
C	Low-quality evidence
D	Very low-quality evidence
E	No evidence or difficult to analyze
Grade and recommendation strength	
1	Strong recommendation
2	Weak recommendation

After debates in a public hearing with all members of the KSGO and invited representatives of related academies, a draft version of the guidelines was evaluated and supplemented. For an internal and external review, the KSGO sent the final version of the guidelines to related organizations, including the Korean Society for Radiation Oncology (KOSRO), Korean Society of Pathologists (KSP), Korean Cancer Study Group (KCSG), Korean Society of Urogenital Radiology (KSUR), Korean Society of Nuclear Medicine (KSNM), Korean Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology (KSOG), and Korean Gynecologic Oncology Group (KGOG). Subsequent to these reviews, there were no objections or requests for revision.

The histopathological classification recommended by the GPSGKSPs was used as the histopathological classification of these guidelines on cervical cancer. Regarding the staging system of cervical cancer, the FIGO stage classification was applied in these revised guidelines.

CLINICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Diagnosis

Cervical cancer is usually asymptomatic in the early stages, and later may be accompanied by an increase in vaginal discharge, bleeding after sexual intercourse, and intermittent spotty bleeding. Cytology and HPV test can be used for screening for cervical cancer, and colposcopy-guided biopsy is used to accurately make a diagnosis. Cervical conization is recommended to determine the depth of infiltration or microscopic infiltration. In FIGO stage IA, the tumor is latent and invisible to bare eyes. Stage IA1 is defined as stromal infiltration that is less than or equal to 3.0 mm, and stage IA2 is defined as stromal infiltration that is greater than 3.0 mm and less than or equal to 5.0 mm. In both stages IA1 and IA2, the horizontal spread of tumor should be less than or equal to 7.0 mm. These diagnoses must be made with cervical conization. Following the pathologic diagnosis of cervical cancer, basic tests are performed such as blood tests (complete blood count, the biochemical analysis including tests for liver and kidney functions), urine test, chest X-rays, and echocardiography.

Imaging tests can be performed in addition to colposcopy, punch biopsy, cervical conization, cystoscopy, and colonoscopy, which FIGO currently presents as methods for determining the stage of cervical cancer. Although imaging tests like computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), positron emission tomography (PET), PET/CT (1C) or surgical staging are not included in the methods that FIGO acknowledges for the staging of cervical cancer, these can be selectively performed in order to decide the direction of treatment [12-14]. Cystoscopy and colonoscopy are performed for stage IB2 or higher lesions, particularly when invasive cancer to the bladder or colon is suspected.

The squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) antigen, a tumor marker, is a useful serologic marker for SCC. The SCC antigen level prior to treatment is related to cancer stage, tumor size, depth of infiltration in the cervix, presence or absence of infiltration in the lymphovascular space, presence or absence of lymph node metastasis, and clinical results. Thus, tumor markers such as SCC antigen can be measured before treatment and during follow-up [15].

KQ 01. Are PET/ CT scans more sensitive than the CT or MRI in predicting lymph node metastasis for the treatment of cervical cancer?

There is insufficient evidence that PET/CT is more sensitive than CT or MRI to predict pelvic or para-aortic lymph node metastasis. PET/CT shows discrepant results in terms of sensitivity in selected studies for meta-analysis. As per the study protocol, CT, MRI, and PET/CT have different sensitivity, specificity, negative predictive value and positive predictive value [12,13]. Overall, when metastases are not identified in the CT or MRI scans or when the results are uncertain, PET/CT could be helpful in predicting pelvic or aortic lymph node metastasis.

Recommendation: PET/CT could be performed prior to the treatment for cervical cancer.

Level of evidence: C (low).

Strength of recommendation: 1 (strong).

2. Treatment

The primary treatment of early stage cervical cancer is either surgery or radiation therapy after clinical staging work-up. Conization or simple hysterectomy (1B) is the primary treatment for stage IA1 disease [16]. For stage IA1 patients with no evidence of involved resection margin and lymphovascular space invasion (LVSI) after conization, observation is an option for selected patients who desire fertility preservation. In stage IA1 with involved resection margin or LVSI after conization, options include repeat-conization with negative margin, simple hysterectomy or type II radical hysterectomy in addition to pelvic lymphadenectomy (2D) [17-19]. For stage IA1 patients with LVSI who desire to preserve fertility, radical trachelectomy with pelvic lymphadenectomy is recommended. Conization or simple trachelectomy is a reasonable option (2D).

Radical hysterectomy with pelvic lymph node dissection is preferred for patients with stage IA2 cervical cancer. Pelvic radiation therapy is a treatment option for patients who are medically inoperable or depending on clinician's discretion. For patients with stage IA2-IB1 disease who desire fertility preservation, radical trachelectomy, and pelvic lymph node dissection is recommended [20,21]. Minimally invasive surgical approaches such as laparoscopic or robotic surgery are recommended for treatment (1D). For a patient with early staged cervical cancer, nerve-sparing radical hysterectomy is an option (2C). In addition, less radical surgery like type 1 hysterectomy may offer a treatment option for carefully selected patients with lesions less than 2 cm in diameter that have no parametrial and nodal involvement (2D) [22,23].

Radical hysterectomy plus pelvic lymph node dissection with or without para-aortic lymph node sampling is typically reserved for patients with stage IB1 or IIA1. For patients who desire fertility preservation, radical trachelectomy and pelvic lymph node dissection could be an option for selected cases with early stage disease. Adjuvant pelvic radiation therapy is recommended after radical hysterectomy in patients who have at least 2 of the following intermediate risk factors: cervical tumor diameter of more than 4 cm, greater than two-

third stromal invasion, and LVSI. The role of CCRT in these patients group is currently being evaluated in an international phase III randomized trial (GOG 263, NCT01101451, www.gog.org). Adjuvant CCRT is indicated for patients with high-risk factors (positive resection margins, positive lymph nodes, parametrial extension) who underwent the radical hysterectomy and pelvic lymphadenectomy [24]. In the case of radical hysterectomy with therapeutic lymph node dissection, chemotherapy alone or observation with omitting radiotherapy could be one of the options even with high-risk-factors [25].

For patients with stage IB2–IIA2 disease, concurrent cisplatin-containing CCRT is recommended [26,27]. In patients treated with CCRT, adjuvant hysterectomy may be considered depending on clinical situation. For patients with stage IB2–IIA2 disease, radical hysterectomy followed by tailored adjuvant treatment (radiation or CCRT) is an option because this strategy shows comparable survival outcomes to primary CCRT (2C). In retrospective data on patients with stage IB2–IIA2 cervical cancer, neoadjuvant chemotherapy may show equal or prolonged 5-year overall survival compared to radiation therapy or surgery alone [26,28,29]. However, the role of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in these patients group is deferred until the analysis of current European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) phase III randomized trial is completed (<http://groups.eortc.be/gcg/studyprotocols.htm>).

It is essential to evaluate the involvement of para-aortic lymph nodes in planning treatment strategies for patients with stage IIB to IVA disease. Surgical staging like extraperitoneal or laparoscopic lymph node dissection is the most accurate modality to evaluate the nodal involvement, and therefore should be considered. Radiologic imaging studies including CT/MRI/PET-CT could be one of the options to evaluate the lymph node status based on the institutional environments (1C) [30]. These patients with no evidence of para-aortic nodal involvement are treated with pelvic radiation plus concurrent cisplatin based-chemotherapy [27]. Those with para-aortic nodal involvement could be treated with extended field radiation plus concurrent chemotherapy. However, systemic chemotherapy and individualized radiation therapy could be considered depending on the physician's discretion and the clinical situations. For patients who present with stage IVB, systemic chemotherapy and individualized radiation therapy are recommended (1B).

The methodology of radiation therapy recommended by this KGOG guideline are as follows. With the use of 3D imaging, 3D conformal radiation therapy plans are designed to adequately cover soft tissue regions at risk and minimize the dose to the bowel and other normal structures. Intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) may be helpful in minimizing the dose to the normal structures and delivering high dose to regions at risk. IMRT could be used as primary therapy since this modality resulted in similar survival and less gastrointestinal and urologic toxicity compared with conventional radiation therapy (2C). When tumor involves the lower third of the vagina, irradiation of inguinal lymph nodes is needed. Intracavitary brachytherapy is an essential component of treatment for cervical cancer and interstitial brachytherapy is a critical component for treatment of cervical cancer with parametrial invasion, especially for stage IIIB or more disease.

It is necessary to minimize the radiation dose to the bladder, rectum, colon and other normal structures. The coned-down shaped field may be considered in patients with gross disease in the parametria or unresected nodes. With the use of individualized central blocking techniques, it can be minimized to exposure to small intestine, rectum and bladder that are irradiated from intracavitary brachytherapy. It is recommended that total duration of

radiation therapy treatment should be completed within 8 weeks. Once after initiation of radiation therapy, it should be avoided to delay or split the radiation therapy.

Five randomized clinical trials have shown that the use of CCRT results in a significantly improved overall survival in patients with locally advanced cervical cancer compared with radiation therapy alone [31]. Therefore, CCRT is the first line treatment for patients with locally advanced cervical cancer. Concurrent chemotherapeutic regimens include weekly cisplatin or the combination of cisplatin and 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) every 3 to 4 weeks. Concurrent paclitaxel-based CCRT can be considered based on the recent data [32-35]. Further researches are needed regarding the optimal radiation field. In patients with confirmed or suspicious para-aortic node involvement, extended field radiation therapy is recommended. Adjuvant chemotherapy following definitive CCRT is not recommended in patients with locally advanced cervical cancer since there is a lack of data supporting the benefit of consolidation chemotherapy (2C).

There are insufficient data regarding the treatment guideline for patients with incidental cervical cancer after simple hysterectomy. Work-up for these patients include history taking, physical examination, and imaging such as CT, MRI, and/or PET/CT. For patients with stage IB2 or more disease, cystoscopy and rectoscopy may be performed. For patients with pathologically proven stage IA1 disease, observation is recommended. For patients with stage IA1 with LVSI and these with stage IA2, further treatment strategy is based on the surgical margin status and the imaging work-up. If the positive surgical margin and no lymph node from image study, CCRT including individualized brachtherapy is recommended. If the patients with stage IA2 or more disease have negative surgical margin and no nodal involvement on the imaging, options include as follows [36]: 1) external beam radiation therapy with or without brachytherapy with concurrent cisplatin-based chemotherapy; and 2) parametrectomy and lymphadenectomy. If the surgical margin is involved or residual disease/nodal involvement is found on the imaging, CCRT including brachytherapy. In a case of positive parametrial resection margin or nodal involvement after parametrectomy and lymphadenectomy, adjuvant CCRT is recommended.

KQ 02. Does laparoscopic or robotic surgery have similar survival outcomes compared to open surgery for radical hysterectomy in cervical cancer stage IB–IIA?

There is no randomized trial comparing laparoscopic or robotic surgery and open surgery. Based on the meta-analysis, relative risk reduction (RRR)=27%, event rate (ER)=7.4%, optimal information size (OIS)=600, and the number of death=50 is needed to have statistically significant results. This means that larger number of the study population is needed to clarify the differentiation in the death. From several retrospective studies, treatment outcome in terms of progression-free and overall survival is comparable between 2 groups [37-40].

Recommendation: Laparoscopic or robotic radical hysterectomy can be performed in cervical cancer stage IB–IIA.

Level of evidence: D (very low).

Strength of recommendation: 1 (strong).

KQ 03. Does the nerve sparing radical hysterectomy have similar survival outcome compared to type III hysterectomy in early staged cervical cancer?

Meta-analysis was reported investigating the survival outcome in early cervical cancer. In early cervical cancer, survival outcome after nerve sparing radical hysterectomy is similar to that of type III hysterectomy and results in decreased urinary difficulty. Based on the meta-analysis, RRR=39%, ER=6.8%, OIS=200, and the number of death=5 is needed to have statistical analysis. One randomized trial and one non-randomized trial showed no impact of nerve sparing radical hysterectomy on survival outcome [41,42].

Recommendation: Nerve sparing radical hysterectomy could be performed in early staged cervical cancer.

Level of evidence: C (low).

Strength of recommendation: 2 (weak).

KQ 04. Can we have similar survival outcome with type I hysterectomy compared to radical hysterectomy in women with cervical cancer ≤ 2 cm?

Although based on the limited study results including one prospective randomized trial, we do not observe the definitive loss of survival outcome from type I hysterectomy compared to radical hysterectomy in women with cervical cancer ≤ 2 cm and type I hysterectomy shows better outcome for complication [43]. RRR=62%, ER=26%, OIS=100, and the number of death=22 is needed for the near future prospective study.

Recommendation: Type I hysterectomy might be performed in a case of higher estimation of postoperative complication based on the clinical decision.

Level of evidence: D (very low).

Strength of recommendation: 2 (weak).

KQ 05. Does IMRT result in less complications compared to standard radiotherapy in women with cervical cancer?

Three non-randomized prospective studies support primary use of IMRT for cervical cancer [44-46]. Toxicity has been reduced with similar survival outcomes. However, there is risk of bias related randomization and allocation concealment for the previous results. RRR=83%, ER=50%, OIS=50, and the number of death=7 is needed for the near future prospective study.

Recommendation: IMRT could be used as primary treatment for cervical cancer, based on the similar treatment outcome in terms of recurrence and survival with fewer complication rate.

Level of evidence: C (low).

Strength of recommendation: 2 (weak).

KQ 06. Does radical hysterectomy result in similar survival outcome like concurrent chemoradiotherapy in cervical cancer stage IB2 and IIA2?

Similar survival outcome has been observed between radical hysterectomy with selective adjuvant treatment and primary concurrent chemoradiotherapy in cervical cancer stage IB2 and IIA2 [25,47-50]. Although the result of one randomized trial is not consistent to that of 4 non-randomized study, decrease of survival has not been observed in primary surgical group.

Recommendation: Radical hysterectomy and concurrent chemoradiotherapy could be selectively used considering the clinical situation of patients.

Level of evidence: C (low).

Strength of recommendation: 2 (weak).

KQ 07. Does simple trachelectomy or conization have similar survival outcome with radical hysterectomy in cervical cancer stage IA1 with lymphovascular space invasion?

From the 2 comparison studies and 2 non-comparison studies, similar survival outcomes have been identified in total 61 patients [17,51-53].

Recommendation: Simple trachelectomy and conization could be performed for women with cervical cancer IA1 with lymphovascular space invasion, based on the similar survival outcomes from the radical hysterectomy.

Level of evidence: D (very low).

Strength of recommendation: 2 (weak).

KQ 08. Does addition of adjuvant chemotherapy after concurrent chemoradiotherapy improve survivals in patients with locally advanced cervical cancer?

Although statistical heterogeneity is not significant ($I^2=23\%$) from the 2 randomized trials, estimated direction of effect is the opposite each other. Addition of adjuvant chemotherapy after concurrent chemoradiotherapy in patients with locally advanced cervical cancer has not been supported from the previous studies [54].

Recommendation: The addition of adjuvant chemotherapy after concurrent chemoradiotherapy has not been recommended.

Level of evidence: C (low).

Strength of recommendation: 2 (weak).

3. Surveillance

The basic principle for patient's surveillance after treatment is every 3–4 months for initial 2 years and every 6 months following 3 years. The surveillance strategies should be modified based on the patients' clinical situation and the environment. History taking and physical examination including pelvic examination might be considered. PAP smear might be examined at least every year. PAP smear, laboratory test, image tests such as chest X-ray, CT, MRI, PET/CT, or tumor marker could be tested based on the clinical decision [55]. PET/CT is helpful to identify a metastasis with the conventional image or to confirm the extent of recurrence (1C). Use of dilator is recommended for sexually active women after radiation therapy to preserve sexual function and evaluate the cervix efficiently with PAP smear.

4. Treatment for recurrence

Recurrence of cervical cancer could be identified with image study; invasive procedures are selectively used to confirm the recurrences.

1) Recurrence in the pelvis or local recurrence

In a case of naïve radiation therapy, CCRT should be considered, with selective use of brachytherapy [56]. Pelvic exenteration might be selectively considered in the case of the previous radiation therapy in the pelvis [57]. Re-administration of radiation therapy might be selectively used [58-60].

2) Extra-pelvic recurrence

Chemotherapy or palliative care could be considered in the case of extra-pelvic recurrence, para-aortic lymph node recurrence, multiple metastases, or surgically unresectable metastasis. Chemotherapy, surgical resection, radiation therapy or CCRT could be considered in the case of isolated recurrence [61,62].

Salvage chemotherapy could be considered in women with recurrent cervical cancer who does not candidates for radiation therapy or pelvic exenteration. Cisplatin-doublet is recommended for recurrent or metastatic cervical cancer patients as the first line treatment, and single cisplatin (50 mg/m² q 3 weeks) could be used in case of unavailable of cisplatin-double.

Paclitaxel is recommended as the combination drug with cisplatin, and other suggested drugs are topotecan and gemcitabine. The current guideline recommended the chemotherapeutic agents like in **Table 4**. The suggested drug as the second line treatment for recurrent and metastatic cervical cancer is bevacizumab [35], ifosfamide [57], topotecan [61], irinotecan [62-64], mitomycin [63], gemcitabine [65], and 5-fluorouracil [66,67]. Addition of bevacizumab decrease the mortality 29% (1B). Comprehensive approaches including palliative and supportive care are needed for intractable cervical cancer.

KQ 09. Does PET/CT improve the accuracy of diagnosis of recurrence compared to CT or MRI in cervical cancer?

Statistical analysis for the diagnostic accuracy of CT, MRI, and PET/CT has not been performed due to heterogeneity of the statistical analysis from each studie [68-71]. From the review of each study, PET/CT could be used to identify the recurrence of cervical cancer when recurrence is not identified or recurrence is suspicious with conventional image. And PET/CT might be used to confirm the field of recurrence.

Recommendation: PET/CT could be performed clinically if diagnosis of recurrent cervical cancer with CT/MRI is uncertain or PET/CT is needed to confirm the field of recurrence.

Level of evidence: C (low).

Strength of recommendation: 1 (strong).

KQ 10. Does addition of bevacizumab to conventional chemotherapy improve survival in patients with recurrent or persistent cervical cancer?

Table 4. Chemotherapeutic agent used for recurrent or metastatic cervical cancer

First line therapy
Cisplatin+paclitaxel+bevacizumab
Cisplatin+paclitaxel
Cisplatin+topotecan+bevacizumab
Cisplatin+topotecan
Cisplatin (preferred as a single agent)
Cisplatin+vinorelbine
Cisplatin+gemcitabine
Cisplatin+isocyanide
Carboplatin+paclitaxel
Carboplatin
Paclitaxel

One randomized trial suggests that addition of bevacizumab improve survival outcome (HR, 0.29) [72].

Recommendation: Bevacizumab could be used for recurrent or persistent cervical cancer to improve survival outcomes.

Level of evidence: B (moderate).

Strength of recommendation: 1 (strong).

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION AND CONCLUSIONS

The following recommendations and conclusions are based on 4 levels of evidence (A, high; B, moderate; C, low; D, very low) and 2 strengths of recommendation (1, strong; 2, weak).

1. There is insufficient evidence that PET/CT is more sensitive than CT or MRI to predict pelvic or para-aortic lymph node metastasis. However, when metastases are not identified in the CT or MRI scans or when the results are uncertain, PET/CT could be helpful in predicting pelvic or aortic lymph node metastasis. Thus, PET/CT could be performed prior to the treatment for cervical cancer (**1C**).
2. Treatment outcome in terms of progression-free and overall survival is comparable between 2 groups. Based on the results, laparoscopic or robotic radical hysterectomy can be performed in cervical cancer stage IB–IIA (**1D**).
3. In early cervical cancer, survival outcome after nerve sparing radical hysterectomy is similar to that of type III hysterectomy and results in decreased urinary difficulty. Therefore, nerve sparing radical hysterectomy could be performed in early staged cervical cancer (**2C**).
4. Although based on the limited study results, we do not observe the definitive loss of survival outcome from type I hysterectomy compared to radical hysterectomy in women with cervical cancer ≤ 2 cm and type I hysterectomy shows better outcome for complication. For these reasons, type I hysterectomy might be performed in a case of higher estimation of postoperative complication based on the clinical decision (**2D**).
5. IMRT could be used as primary treatment for cervical cancer, based on the similar treatment outcome in terms of recurrence and survival with fewer complication rate (**2C**).
6. Similar survival outcome has been observed between radical hysterectomy and concurrent chemoradiotherapy in cervical cancer stage IB2 and IIA2. Therefore, 2 treatment options could be selectively used considering the clinical situation of patients (**1C**).
7. Simple trachelectomy and conization could be performed for women with cervical cancer IA1 with lymphovascular space invasion, based on the similar survival outcomes from the radical hysterectomy (**2D**).
8. The addition of adjuvant chemotherapy has not been recommended as the standard treatment after concurrent chemoradiotherapy in patients with locally advanced cervical cancer because of unavailable evidence to support it (**2C**).

9. Statistical analysis for the diagnostic accuracy of CT, MRI and PET/CT has not been performed due to heterogeneity of the study performance. PET/CT could be performed clinically if diagnosis of recurrent cervical cancer with CT/MRI is uncertain or PET/CT is needed to confirm the field of recurrence (**1C**).
10. Bevacizumab could be used for recurrent or persistent cervical cancer to improve survival outcomes (**1B**).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank the Korean Society for Radiation Oncology (KOSRO), Korean Society of Pathologists (KSP), Korean Cancer Study Group (KCSG), Korean Society of Urogenital Radiology (KSUR), Korean Society of Nuclear Medicine (KSNM), Korean Society of Obstetrics and Gynecology (KSOG), and Korean Gynecologic Oncology Group (KGOG) for their support. Further, the authors thank all Korean Society of Gynecologic Oncology (KSGO) staff for their support throughout the whole consensus process. The authors would like to thank Enago (<http://www.enago.co.kr>) for medical writing assistance and English language review.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Supplementary

Guideline development process in accordance with the evidence-based medicine

[Click here to view](#)

REFERENCES

1. International Agency for Research on Cancer. Cervical cancer: estimated incidence, mortality and prevalence worldwide in 2012 [Internet]. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer; 2015 [cited 2017 Jan 10]. Available from: <http://globocan.iarc.fr/old/FactSheets/cancers/cervix-new.asp>.
2. Miller KD, Siegel RL, Lin CC, Mariotto AB, Kramer JL, Rowland JH, et al. Cancer treatment and survivorship statistics, 2016. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2016;66:271-89.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
3. Jung KW, Won YJ, Kong HJ, Oh CM, Cho H, Lee DH, et al. Cancer statistics in Korea: incidence, mortality, survival, and prevalence in 2012. *Cancer Res Treat* 2015;47:127-41.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
4. Lim MC, Moon EK, Shin A, Jung KW, Won YJ, Seo SS, et al. Incidence of cervical, endometrial, and ovarian cancer in Korea, 1999-2010. *J Gynecol Oncol* 2013;24:298-302.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
5. Shin HR, Jung KW, Won YJ, Kong HJ, Yim SH, Sung J, et al. National cancer incidence for the year 2002 in Korea. *Cancer Res Treat* 2007;39:139-49.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
6. Forman D, de Martel C, Lacey CJ, Soerjomataram I, Lortet-Tieulent J, Bruni L, et al. Global burden of human papillomavirus and related diseases. *Vaccine* 2012;30 Suppl 5:F12-23.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
7. Shin HR, Lee DH, Herrero R, Smith JS, Vaccarella S, Hong SH, et al. Prevalence of human papillomavirus infection in women in Busan, South Korea. *Int J Cancer* 2003;103:413-21.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
8. Kim YT. Current status of cervical cancer and HPV infection in Korea. *J Gynecol Oncol* 2009;20:1-7.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)

9. Oh JK, Franceschi S, Kim BK, Kim JY, Ju YH, Hong EK, et al. Prevalence of human papillomavirus and Chlamydia trachomatis infection among women attending cervical cancer screening in the Republic of Korea. *Eur J Cancer Prev* 2009;18:56-61.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
10. Kim K, Kim JJ, Kim SM, No JH, Kim YB. Prevalence and determinants of high-risk human papillomavirus infection in women with high socioeconomic status in Seoul, Republic of Korea. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2012;13:269-73.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
11. Lee SW, Lee TS, Hong DG, No JH, Park DC, Bae JM, et al. Practice guidelines for management of uterine corpus cancer in Korea: a Korean Society of Gynecologic Oncology Consensus Statement. *J Gynecol Oncol* 2017;28:e12.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
12. Chung HH, Kang KW, Cho JY, Kim JW, Park NH, Song YS, et al. Role of magnetic resonance imaging and positron emission tomography/computed tomography in preoperative lymph node detection of uterine cervical cancer. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2010;203:156.e1-5.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
13. Lv K, Guo HM, Lu YJ, Wu ZX, Zhang K, Han JK. Role of 18F-FDG PET/CT in detecting pelvic lymph-node metastases in patients with early-stage uterine cervical cancer: comparison with MRI findings. *Nucl Med Commun* 2014;35:1204-11.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
14. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. ACOG practice bulletin. Diagnosis and treatment of cervical carcinomas. Number 35, May 2002. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2002;78:79-91.
[PUBMED](#)
15. Duk JM, Groenier KH, de Bruijn HW, Hollema H, ten Hoor KA, van der Zee AG, et al. Pretreatment serum squamous cell carcinoma antigen: a newly identified prognostic factor in early-stage cervical carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 1996;14:111-8.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
16. Koliopoulos G, Sotiriadis A, Kyrgiou M, Martin-Hirsch P, Makrydimas G, Paraskevidis E. Conservative surgical methods for FIGO stage IA2 squamous cervical carcinoma and their role in preserving women's fertility. *Gynecol Oncol* 2004;93:469-73.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
17. Bekkers RL, Keyser KG, Bulten J, Hanselaar AG, Schijf CP, Boonstra H, et al. The value of loop electro-surgical conization in the treatment of stage IA1 microinvasive carcinoma of the uterine cervix. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2002;12:485-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
18. Itsukaichi M, Kurata H, Matsushita M, Watanabe M, Sekine M, Aoki Y, et al. Stage Ia1 cervical squamous cell carcinoma: conservative management after laser conization with positive margins. *Gynecol Oncol* 2003;90:387-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
19. Mota F. Microinvasive squamous carcinoma of the cervix: treatment modalities. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 2003;82:505-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
20. Bernardini M, Barrett J, Seaward G, Covens A. Pregnancy outcomes in patients after radical trachelectomy. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2003;189:1378-82.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
21. Boss EA, van Golde RJ, Beerendonk CC, Massuger LF. Pregnancy after radical trachelectomy: a real option? *Gynecol Oncol* 2005;99:S152-6.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
22. Lee JY, Youm J, Kim JW, Cho JY, Kim MA, Kim TH, et al. Identifying a low-risk group for parametrial involvement in microscopic Stage IB1 cervical cancer using criteria from ongoing studies and a new MRI criterion. *BMC Cancer* 2015;15:167.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
23. Lee JY, Youm J, Kim TH, Cho JY, Kim MA, Suh DH, et al. Preoperative MRI criteria for trials on less radical surgery in Stage IB1 cervical cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* 2014;134:47-51.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
24. Peters WA 3rd, Liu PY, Barrett RJ 2nd, Stock RJ, Monk BJ, Berek JS, et al. Concurrent chemotherapy and pelvic radiation therapy compared with pelvic radiation therapy alone as adjuvant therapy after radical surgery in high-risk early-stage cancer of the cervix. *J Clin Oncol* 2000;18:1606-13.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)

25. Landoni F, Maneo A, Colombo A, Placa F, Milani R, Perego P, et al. Randomised study of radical surgery versus radiotherapy for stage Ib-IIa cervical cancer. *Lancet* 1997;350:535-40.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
26. Keys HM, Bundy BN, Stehman FB, Muderspach LI, Chafe WE, Suggs CL 3rd, et al. Cisplatin, radiation, and adjuvant hysterectomy compared with radiation and adjuvant hysterectomy for bulky stage IB cervical carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:1154-61.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
27. Morris M, Eifel PJ, Lu J, Grigsby PW, Levenback C, Stevens RE, et al. Pelvic radiation with concurrent chemotherapy compared with pelvic and para-aortic radiation for high-risk cervical cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:1137-43.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
28. Kinney WK, Hodge DO, Egorshin EV, Ballard DJ, Podratz KC. Identification of a low-risk subset of patients with stage IB invasive squamous cancer of the cervix possibly suited to less radical surgical treatment. *Gynecol Oncol* 1995;57:3-6.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
29. Sardi JE, Boixadera MA, Sardi JJ. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy in cervical cancer: a new trend. *Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol* 2005;17:43-7.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
30. Choi HJ, Ju W, Myung SK, Kim Y. Diagnostic performance of computer tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, and positron emission tomography or positron emission tomography/computer tomography for detection of metastatic lymph nodes in patients with cervical cancer: meta-analysis. *Cancer Sci* 2010;101:1471-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
31. Thomas GM. Improved treatment for cervical cancer--concurrent chemotherapy and radiotherapy. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:1198-200.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
32. Martínez-Monge R, Gaztañaga M, Aramendía JM, Cambeiro M, Arbea L, Espinós J, et al. A phase II trial of less than 7 weeks of concomitant cisplatin-paclitaxel chemoradiation in locally advanced cervical cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2010;20:133-40.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
33. Umayahara K, Takeshima N, Nose T, Fujiwara K, Sugiyama Y, Utsugi K, et al. Phase I study of concurrent chemoradiotherapy with weekly cisplatin and paclitaxel chemotherapy for locally advanced cervical carcinoma in Japanese women. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2009;19:723-7.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
34. Prasad E, Viswanathan PN, Rangad VF, Pavamani S, Ram TS. Maximum tolerated dose and early response - results of a phase I trial of paclitaxel and cisplatin with radiation therapy in carcinoma of the cervix. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)* 2009;21:488-93.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
35. Tewari KS, Monk BJ. Recent achievements and future developments in advanced and recurrent cervical cancer: trials of the Gynecologic Oncology Group. *Semin Oncol* 2009;36:170-80.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
36. Koh HK, Jeon W, Kim HJ, Wu HG, Kim K, Chie EK, et al. Outcome analysis of salvage radiotherapy for occult cervical cancer found after simple hysterectomy. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2013;43:1226-32.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
37. Nam JH, Park JY, Kim DY, Kim JH, Kim YM, Kim YT. Laparoscopic versus open radical hysterectomy in early-stage cervical cancer: long-term survival outcomes in a matched cohort study. *Ann Oncol* 2012;23:903-11.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
38. Bogani G, Cromi A, Serati M, Uccella S, Donato VD, Casarin J, et al. Predictors and patterns of local, regional, and distant failure in squamous cell carcinoma of the vulva. *Am J Clin Oncol*. Forthcoming 2014.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
39. Ditto A, Martinelli F, Bogani G, Gasparri ML, Di Donato V, Zanaboni F, et al. Implementation of laparoscopic approach for type B radical hysterectomy: a comparison with open surgical operations. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2015;41:34-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
40. Hong JH, Choi JS, Lee JH, Eom JM, Ko JH, Bae JW, et al. Can laparoscopic radical hysterectomy be a standard surgical modality in stage IA2-IIA cervical cancer? *Gynecol Oncol* 2012;127:102-6.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
41. Ditto A, Martinelli F, Mattana F, Reato C, Solima E, Carcangiu M, et al. Class III nerve-sparing radical hysterectomy versus standard class III radical hysterectomy: an observational study. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2011;18:3469-78.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)

42. Roh JW, Lee DO, Suh DH, Lim MC, Seo SS, Chung J, et al. Efficacy and oncologic safety of nerve-sparing radical hysterectomy for cervical cancer: a randomized controlled trial. *J Gynecol Oncol* 2015;26:90-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
43. Landoni F, Maneo A, Zupardiel I, Zanagnolo V, Mangioni C. Class I versus class III radical hysterectomy in stage IB1-IIA cervical cancer. A prospective randomized study. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2012;38:203-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
44. Gandhi AK, Sharma DN, Rath GK, Julka PK, Subramani V, Sharma S, et al. Early clinical outcomes and toxicity of intensity modulated versus conventional pelvic radiation therapy for locally advanced cervix carcinoma: a prospective randomized study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2013;87:542-8.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
45. Chen LA, Kim J, Boucher K, Terakedis B, Williams B, Nickman NA, et al. Toxicity and cost-effectiveness analysis of intensity modulated radiation therapy versus 3-dimensional conformal radiation therapy for postoperative treatment of gynecologic cancers. *Gynecol Oncol* 2015;136:521-8.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
46. Liang JA, Chen SW, Hung YC, Yeh LS, Chang WC, Lin WC, et al. Low-dose, prophylactic, extended-field, intensity-modulated radiotherapy plus concurrent weekly cisplatin for patients with stage IB2-IIIb cervical cancer, positive pelvic lymph nodes, and negative para-aortic lymph nodes. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2014;24:901-7.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
47. Ryu HS, Kang SB, Kim KT, Chang KH, Kim JW, Kim JH. Efficacy of different types of treatment in FIGO stage IB2 cervical cancer in Korea: results of a multicenter retrospective Korean study (KGOG-1005). *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2007;17:132-6.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
48. Park JY, Kim DY, Kim JH, Kim YM, Kim YT, Kim YS, et al. Comparison of outcomes between radical hysterectomy followed by tailored adjuvant therapy versus primary chemoradiation therapy in IB2 and IIA2 cervical cancer. *J Gynecol Oncol* 2012;23:226-34.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
49. Alleyne-Mike K, van Wijk L, Hunter A. A retrospective review of patients with stage IB2 cervical cancer treated with radical radiation versus radical surgery as a primary modality. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2013;23:1287-94.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
50. Zivanovic O, Alektiar KM, Sonoda Y, Zhou Q, Iasonos A, Tew WP, et al. Treatment patterns of FIGO Stage IB2 cervical cancer: a single-institution experience of radical hysterectomy with individualized postoperative therapy and definitive radiation therapy. *Gynecol Oncol* 2008;111:265-70.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
51. Lee SW, Kim YM, Son WS, You HJ, Kim DY, Kim JH, et al. The efficacy of conservative management after conization in patients with stage IA1 microinvasive cervical carcinoma. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand* 2009;88:209-15.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
52. Plante M, Gregoire J, Renaud MC, Sebastianelli A, Grondin K, Noel P, et al. Simple vaginal trachelectomy in early-stage low-risk cervical cancer: a pilot study of 16 cases and review of the literature. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2013;23:916-22.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
53. Andikyan V, Khoury-Collado F, Denesopolis J, Park KJ, Hussein YR, Brown CL, et al. Cervical conization and sentinel lymph node mapping in the treatment of stage I cervical cancer: is less enough? *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2014;24:113-7.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
54. Dueñas-González A, Zarbá JJ, Patel F, Alcedo JC, Beslija S, Casanova L, et al. Phase III, open-label, randomized study comparing concurrent gemcitabine plus cisplatin and radiation followed by adjuvant gemcitabine and cisplatin versus concurrent cisplatin and radiation in patients with stage IIB to IVA carcinoma of the cervix. *J Clin Oncol* 2011;29:1678-85.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
55. Elit L, Fyles AW, Devries MC, Oliver TK, Fung-Kee-Fung M Gynecology Cancer Disease Site Group. Follow-up for women after treatment for cervical cancer: a systematic review. *Gynecol Oncol* 2009;114:528-35.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
56. Haasbeek CJ, Uitterhoeve AL, van der Velden J, González DG, Stalpers LJ. Long-term results of salvage radiotherapy for the treatment of recurrent cervical carcinoma after prior surgery. *Radiother Oncol* 2008;89:197-204.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)

57. Chiva LM, Lapuente F, González-Cortijo L, González-Martín A, Rojo A, García JF, et al. Surgical treatment of recurrent cervical cancer: state of the art and new achievements. *Gynecol Oncol* 2008;110:S60-6.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
58. Randall ME, Evans L, Greven KM, McCuniff AJ, Doline RM. Interstitial reirradiation for recurrent gynecologic malignancies: results and analysis of prognostic factors. *Gynecol Oncol* 1993;48:23-31.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
59. Wang CJ, Lai CH, Huang HJ, Hong JH, Chou HH, Huang KG, et al. Recurrent cervical carcinoma after primary radical surgery. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1999;181:518-24.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
60. Jhingran A. Potential advantages of intensity-modulated radiation therapy in gynecologic malignancies. *Semin Radiat Oncol* 2006;16:144-51.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
61. Friedlander M, Grogan MU.S. Preventative Services Task Force. Guidelines for the treatment of recurrent and metastatic cervical cancer. *Oncologist* 2002;7:342-7.
[PUBMED](#)
62. Dreyer G, Snyman LC, Mouton A, Lindeque BG. Management of recurrent cervical cancer. *Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol* 2005;19:631-44.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
63. Rose PG, Blessing JA, Gershenson DM, McGehee R. Paclitaxel and cisplatin as first-line therapy in recurrent or advanced squamous cell carcinoma of the cervix: a gynecologic oncology group study. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:2676-80.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
64. Piver MS, Ghamande SA, Eltabbakh GH, O'Neill-Coppola C. First-line chemotherapy with paclitaxel and platinum for advanced and recurrent cancer of the cervix--a phase II study. *Gynecol Oncol* 1999;75:334-7.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
65. Moore DH, Blessing JA, McQuellon RP, Thaler HT, Cella D, Benda J, et al. Phase III study of cisplatin with or without paclitaxel in stage IVB, recurrent, or persistent squamous cell carcinoma of the cervix: a gynecologic oncology group study. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:3113-9.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
66. Fiorica J, Holloway R, Ndubisi B, Orr J, Grendys E, Boothby R, et al. Phase II trial of topotecan and cisplatin in persistent or recurrent squamous and nonsquamous carcinomas of the cervix. *Gynecol Oncol* 2002;85:89-94.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
67. Long HJ 3rd, Bundy BN, Grendys EC Jr, Benda JA, McMeekin DS, Sorosky J, et al. Randomized phase III trial of cisplatin with or without topotecan in carcinoma of the uterine cervix: a Gynecologic Oncology Group Study. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:4626-33.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
68. Kitajima K, Murakami K, Yamasaki E, Domeki Y, Kaji Y, Sugimura K. Performance of FDG-PET/CT for diagnosis of recurrent uterine cervical cancer. *Eur Radiol* 2008;18:2040-7.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
69. Lee M, Lee Y, Hwang KH, Choe W, Park CY. Usefulness of F-18 FDG PET/CT in assessment of recurrence of cervical cancer after treatment. *Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2011;45:111-6.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
70. Kim JY, Kim HO, Kim JS, Moon DH, Kim YH, Kim DK, et al. (18)F-FDG PET/CT is useful for pretreatment assessment of the histopathologic type of thymic epithelial tumors. *Nucl Med Mol Imaging* 2010;44:177-84.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)
71. Yen TC, See LC, Chang TC, Huang KG, Ng KK, Tang SG, et al. Defining the priority of using 18F-FDG PET for recurrent cervical cancer. *J Nucl Med* 2004;45:1632-9.
[PUBMED](#)
72. Tewari KS, Sill MW, Long HJ 3rd, Penson RT, Huang H, Ramondetta LM, et al. Improved survival with bevacizumab in advanced cervical cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:734-43.
[PUBMED](#) | [CROSSREF](#)