RHABDOMYOSARCOMA OF THE CERVIX IN TEENAGERS – IS FERTILIZATION PRESERVATION A FEASIBLE OPTION?
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Abstract 346 Table 1 Comparison of LEEP margin positive vs. negative cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (mean)</th>
<th>Margin positive (+) n(%)</th>
<th>Margin negative (-) n(%)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤40</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;40</td>
<td>40(50.0)</td>
<td>11(24.6)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pap-smear</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>21(26.6)</td>
<td>12(35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASC-US</td>
<td>58(74.0)</td>
<td>118(49.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPV</td>
<td>≥16/18</td>
<td>60(75.9)</td>
<td>105(43.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>19(24.1)</td>
<td>75(56.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesion size</td>
<td>≤2 cm</td>
<td>58(74.0)</td>
<td>180(40.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;2 cm</td>
<td>21(26.6)</td>
<td>62(59.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results A total of 321 patients constituted the study group. Among the study group, 79 (24.6%) patients had margin positivity. Comparison of this group with 242 (75.4%) margin negative patients revealed that abnormal pap-smear and HPV 16 and/or 18 positivity were significantly associated with margin positivity (table 1). Pap-smear abnormality (≥ASC-US) was seen in 58 (73.4%) of margin positive cases whereas only 118 (49.0%) with margin negativity had abnormal smear (p<0.001, OR: 3.1; 95% CI: 1.7–5.6). This risk association did not differ for different Pap-smear abnormality thresholds (LSIL, HSIL etc). Being positive for HPV 16–18 was also a risk factor for margin positivity (75.9% vs. 43.4%, p<0.001, OR: 4.4; 95%CI: 2.45–7.96). However, neither age (p=0.5) nor the lesion size (p=0.8) was a significant factor for margin positivity. Among 79 margin positive cases, 33 (41.7%) had re-LEEP, 13 (16.5%) had cold-knife conization, 13 (16.5%) had hysterectomy, and 12 (15.1%) were just followed-up while 8 (10.2%) were lost to follow up after the LEEP procedure. Among patients who had re-LEEP or conization (n=46), 7 patients (15.2%) had still positive surgical margin after the second procedure (5 in re-LEEP (15.1%), 2 in cold knife conization (15.4%)).

Conclusion Patients with HPV 16–18 and/or Pap-smear abnormality (≥ASC-US) should be carefully evaluated before LEEP procedure for a possible margin positivity. In such cases, larger excisions may be considered to decrease the risk of margin positivity especially if the patient has no future fertility desire.
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Introduction/Background Loop electrosurgical excision procedure (LEEP) is the most frequently used therapeutic approach in pre-invasive cervical diseases. Surgical margin positivity is a big debate among gynecologists and there are several reports showing the importance of HPV 16–18, pap-smear results, age of the patient, or size of the lesion. This study evaluates the risk factors for surgical margin positivity among patients who were subjected to LEEP for pre-invasive cervical lesions in a tertiary colposcopy center.

Methodology Patients with pre-invasive cervical lesions who underwent LEEP were retrospectively evaluated. Patients who were not tested for high-risk HPV were excluded. Patients were evaluated for margin positivity with respect to pap-smear result (normal vs. ≥ASC-US), age (≤40 vs. >40 years), lesion size (≤2 cm vs. >2 cm) and HPV type (16–18 vs. other high-risk HPV). Student-t test and chi-square test were used for comparison.
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Introduction/Background Definitive concurrent chemoradiation [dChR] is the standard treatment for locally advanced cervical cancer [LACC]. Although there’s insufficient clinical evidence to support it, induction chemotherapy [ICH]