

The progress and prospect of sentinel lymph node mapping in endometrial carcinoma

qianrun Chen¹, Danhua Ruan², Jiayan Shi³, Dongru Du², and ce Bian¹

¹Sichuan University West China Second University Hospital

²Sichuan University

³Affiliation not available

June 2, 2022

Abstract

Sentinel lymph node (SLN) refers to the initial site of the lymphatic drainage from a primary tumor area. Accordingly, sentinel lymph node mapping (SLNM) has been brought up and widely applied to cancer therapy for its illuminating role in clinical lymph node resection. Furthermore, sufficient information to guide surgical pathological staging and adjuvant treatment in endometrial cancer can be rendered by SLNM, hence minimizing surgery injury and reducing the incidence of complications. This review aims to systematically summarize the advances and application prospects of SLNM in endometrial cancer, with an expectation of furnishing reference for the clinical application.

The progress and prospect of sentinel lymph node mapping in endometrial carcinoma

Qianrun Chen^{1#}, Danhua Ruan^{1#}, Jiayan Shi¹, Dongru Du¹, Ce Bian^{1*}

¹Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Key Laboratory of Birth Defects and Related Diseases of Women and Children, Ministry of Education, West China Second Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, China.

#These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Correspondence: Ce Bian; E-mail address: biance@scu.edu.cn

Abstract

Sentinel lymph node (SLN) refers to the initial site of the lymphatic drainage from a primary tumor area. Accordingly, sentinel lymph node mapping (SLNM) has been brought up and widely applied to cancer therapy for its illuminating role in clinical lymph node resection. Furthermore, sufficient information to guide surgical pathological staging and adjuvant treatment in endometrial cancer can be rendered by SLNM, hence minimizing surgery injury and reducing the incidence of complications. This review aims to systematically summarize the advances and application prospects of SLNM in endometrial cancer, with an expectation of furnishing reference for the clinical application.

Keywords:sentinel lymph node, endometrial cancer, sentinel lymph node mapping

Introduction

Initially put forward in 1960, sentinel lymph node (SLN) is defined as the first site of lymphatic pathway passing lymphatic metastasis from a primary malignant tumor, which can forecast the involvement of lymph nodes across the drainage area^[1]. And it has been widely acknowledged that in the lymphatic system, lymph drains away from the primary tumor site in an orderly manner, thus suggesting that the metastatic state of SLN (negative or positive) can indicate the state of subsequent lymph nodes and the metastasis of tumor^[2].

Based on the notion stated above, sentinel lymph node mapping (SLNM) as an image-guided procedure to provide ideas for clinical decision of lymph node resection, has been brought up and widely applied to cancer therapy, such as penile carcinoma^[3], breast cancer^[4] and melanoma^[5]. As for endometrial cancer, although the application of SLNM was raised as early as in 1996^[6], it has only been given unprecedented attention in recent years.

Endometrial cancer is one of the most common malignant tumors of the female reproductive system with rapidly increasing incidence these years^[7]. According to the National Cancer Institute (NIH), there will be an estimated 65,950 new cases of the uterine cancer diagnosed and more than 12,550 deaths in 2022, making uterine cancer the ninth most prevalent cancer in the United States (<https://seer.cancer.gov>). Currently, the standard surgical management (NCCN guidelines version 1.2022 - uterine neoplasms) is still the mainstay of endometrial cancer treatment, basically covering total hysterectomy, bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy (BSO) and pelvic lymphadenectomy (LAD), occasionally coupled with para-aortic lymphadenectomy (PALAD). However, two large randomized controlled clinical studies all revealed that despite its statistically outstanding efficacy, it turned out that LAD not beneficial to ameliorate progression free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) for patients with early-stage endometrial cancer^[8, 9]. Therefore, selective lymphadenectomy (SLAD), generally guided by SLNM, provides an alternative to LAD by precisely removing a small number of high-quality lymph nodes and minimizing surgical injury without affecting patient prognosis^[2, 10]. Conclusively, this review aims to systematically introduce the advances of SLNM in endometrial cancer and discuss potential application, looking forward to its future development.

2. Thetechnique advances of SLNM

The most primary objective of SLNM is to directly demonstrate the metastatic status of lymph nodes during surgeries in a visible way, hence precisely limiting the dissection of lymph nodes and avoiding systemic lymphadenectomy to the maximum extent^[11]. Whether this objective can be achieved or not in endometrial cancer largely depends on the selection of tracer and its injection methods.

2.1 Injection tracer

Currently, common tracers of SLNM include fluorescent dyes, blue dyes, radioactive dyes and carbon nanoparticles^[12, 13]. These dyes can be used alone or in combination^[14].

Fluorescent dye indocyanine green (ICG), a safe and effective agent for SLNM, has emerged as the most recommended tracer for intraoperative detection of SLN in endometrial cancer owing to its higher sensitivity and specificity compared with conventional tracers (blue dye and radiotracer)^[15, 16, 17]. In fact, Backes *et al.* found that in contrast with ISB, ICG was conspicuously more effective in detecting SLN (ICG's detection rate is 83% while ISB's is 64%)^[18]. Under the stimulation of near-infrared ray (700-900 nm), fluorescence can be emitted from lymphatic drainage vessels and lymph nodes due to the presence of ICG^[19]. And thanks to its low autofluorescence and high tissue penetration, ICG possesses superior signal-to-noise ratio and can show deep-lying lymph nodes, hence making it particularly appropriate for obese patients^[20]. Furthermore, Papadia *et al.* reported that in the application of SLNM in high-risk endometrial cancer patients, ICG had acceptable sensitivity, false-negative rate, and negative predictive value as well^[21]. Yet notably, ICG can result in more interstitial fluid to enter lymphatic channels since it is albumin-bound and causes oncotic pressure. In a consequence, lymphatics can probably and sometimes easily be mistaken for lymph nodes because of their seemingly bigger and swollen appearance^[22], suggesting that surgeons ought to be alert of this pitfall in the application of ICG.

Blue dyes encompass methylene blue, patent blue and isosulfan blue. These dyes can bind to serum proteins following interstitial administration, which can reach peritumoral lymphatic vessels and lymph nodes through lymphatic drainage^[12]. With no need for advanced imaging system equipment, it merely relies on visual identification of SLNs, which promotes its feasibility^[23]. Nonetheless, blue dyes' slow diffusion in lymphatic vessels possibly leads to a lower detection rate^[24]. What's more, the possibility of anaphylactic reactions to patent blue and isosulfan blue during SLN biopsy has been reported^[25, 26], together with the negative effects of intradermal isosulfan dye injection on declined pulse oximetry^[27].

Radioactive tracers, such as technetium-99 ((99m)Tc) can reach the peritumoral lymph nodes through lymphatic drainage and emits gamma rays with a high concentration in the SLN [28]. And its rays can be detected by gamma detector and single-photon emission computed tomography (SPECT-CT) during the operation. It has been reported that the combinative use of technetium-99m and dyes (ICG or blue dyes) has a remarkable detection rate [29]. Despite the reality that Tc(99m) can penetrate into deep tissue, it still has several drawbacks that cannot be neglected. In particular, its detection depends on special imaging equipment, which results in a higher cost and inconvenience. Moreover, radioactive contamination can potentially occur. All these shortcomings collectively limit its clinical use. But surprisingly, evidence has confirmed that based on Nanotop compound ((99m)Tc Nanotop), the combination of radiocolloid and ICG is feasible and safe [30, 14].

Carbon nanoparticles (CNPs), a sort of nanosized polymeric carbon granules with an average diameter of 150 nm, are a novel injected suspension [31]. Previously, it was mostly used in superficial tumors such as breast cancer [32] and thyroid cancer [33]. As an emerging tracer, it has been applied in tracing lymph nodes and sentinel lymph node detection of endometrial cancer [34]. Having been injected into the submucosal layer around the tumor, CNPs can selectively enter lymphatic system due to the interstitial-lymphatic fluid transport effect [31]. And since there is a difference in respective permeabilities between lymph and blood systems, CNPs would not permeate into the blood capillaries for its overlarge size, thus implying that CNPs lead to few toxic side effects [35].

2.2 Injection method

While direct peritumoral injection uniformly applies to melanoma, vulvar cancer, and cervical cancer, controversies remain over selecting injection methods for SLNM in endometrial cancer due to the complex lymphatic drainage pattern [36, 37, 38]. At present, main injection techniques have been evaluated for SLNM in endometrial cancer, including cervical injection, hysteroscopic or transvaginal ultrasound-guided injection and sub-serosal or myometrial injection.

Cervical injection has been accepted and recognized by most surgeons for its simple operation without hysteroscopic surgery and high pelvic detection rate [38]. In cervical injection, superficial injection can penetrate uterine vessels, isthmus, parametrial, and uterine body, while deep injection can reach para-aortic lymph nodes through pelvic funnel ligament [28]. Therefore, a combined superficial (1–3 mm) and deep (1–2 cm) cervical injection is adequate [2]. The different options for cervical injection include a 2-sided option (3- and 9-o'clock) and 4-quadrant options (3-, 6-, 9-, and 12- o'clock; 2-, 4-, 8- and 10-o'clock). Niikura *et al.* considered that if lymphatic flow from the uterine cervix was comparable to that from the uterine body in the same patient, then the injection into the cervix would theoretically be more precise [39]. Additionally, cervical injection is stable because of the rarity of cervical deformation caused by anatomic variations (such as myomas) and cervical scar from prior procedures (such as conization history or bulky tumor infiltration) [2]. However, the probability of missing occult para-aortic lymph nodes is the main argument against the cervical injection [39]. Inspiringly, patients with any site lymph node metastases will receive adjuvant therapy, which theoretically eliminates potential metastatic lesions in para-aortic region [40].

Conceptually, hysteroscopic or transvaginal ultrasound-guided peritumoral injection can directly visualize the tumor and reflect the lymphatic drainage pathway, making them reasonable approaches to detect SLN. Comparing hysteroscopic injection with cervical injection, Ditto *et al.* have revealed that detection rate of SLN in the para-aortic area was slightly higher in patients receiving hysteroscopic injection (29% vs. 19.5, $p=0.18$), however, this difference did not reach statistical significance [41]. Transvaginal ultrasound-guided myometrial injection of radiotracer exhibited a detection rate of para-aortic SLNs (greater than 45%), together with a high sensitivity (87.5%) and negative predictive value (97.0%) for para-aortic metastases in women with intermediate and high-risk endometrial cancer [42]. Both hysteroscopic and transvaginal ultrasound-guided injections were complicated, time-consuming, and technically challenging, hence setting a limitation for a wide acceptance and utilization in real clinical routine. Besides, the potential risk that hysteroscopic injection can cause intraperitoneal dissemination of tumor cells through fallopian tubes has been brought into focus [43].

In 1996, Burke et al. firstly used sub-serosal injection of blue dye into the uterine fundus to perform SLNM [6]. And the detection rate of sub-serosal injection varies from 73% to 95% in recent year's reports [28]. Though this technique is relatively easy to perform, sub-serosal injection has lower sensitivity and overall detection rate.

Apart from those mentioned above, researchers have proposed novel injection methods. Mücke *et al.* evaluated the clinical feasibility of transcervical subepithelial injection into the isthmocervical region of the myometrium for sentinel detection in endometrial cancer [44]. The outcome demonstrated that injection of 10 MBq Technetium-99m-nanocolloid via isthmocervical myometrium led to high intra-operative detection rates (90.3%), bilateral pelvic detection rates (57%), and para-aortic detection rates (25%). A 5-year single-center prospective study uncovered that the detection rates of dual cervical and fundal indocyanine green injection in endometrial cancer were 93.5 % overall for SLNs, 90.7 % overall for pelvic SLN, 68.0 % for bilateral SLN, 66.9 % for paraaortic SLN, and 2.9 % for isolated paraaortic SLN [45].

3. SLN mappingalgorithm

The main goal of SLNM is to identify the state of SLN, thereby limiting the need for comprehensive lymphadenectomy [38]. To achieve this, it's a necessity for SLNM to have a high bilateral SLN detection rate and a high sensitivity for detection of metastatic lymph nodes, coupled with a low false negative rate. In order to enhance the detection rate and accordingly lower false negative rate, strictly hewing to an appropriate SLN algorithm is of significance [46]. The development of SLN algorithm is based upon the lymph drainage pathways of SLNs in pelvic cavity of endometrial carcinoma patients. Notably, the lymphatic drainage of uterus is considerably complicated [47]. This drainage is presumed to be bilateral since uterus is considered a midline structure [48]. There are three channels for pelvic SLN drainage in endometrial cancer: the upper paracervical pathway (UPP), which drains medial external iliac and/or obturator lymph nodes; the lower paracervical pathway (LPP), which drains the internal iliac and/or presacral lymph nodes along the uterine vein; the infundibulo-pelvic pathway (IPP), which drains the para-aortic lymph nodes along the infundibulo-pelvic ligament [49].

It has been reported that the lymph drainage imaging mostly focuses on the UPP pathway. Yet taking the fact that some high-risk patients may have presacral lymph node metastasis into account, the SLN detection of the LPP pathway should not be ignored. In addition, generally, UPP and LPP pathways continuously drain pelvic lymph nodes to the para-aortic lymph node region. Therefore, according to Geppert and his colleagues, tracer-imaging lymph nodes in IPP pathway ought to be regarded as SLN only under the premise that neither in UPP pathway nor LPP pathway can tracer-imaging lymph nodes be found, which helps ensure that the para-aortic lymph nodes taken during surgery are SLN rather than secondary lymph nodes [47]. In 2017, Persson *et al.* [50] proposed an SLN algorithm to achieve bilateral visualization in UPP and LPP pathways. Albeit that the detection effect is excellent, the procedure is cumbersome. And repeated tracer injections conducted in the study may passively affect the detection rate of SLNs due to the influence of adjacent lymph node imaging. Subsequently, Bollino *et al.* [51] optimized the SLN algorithm based on histology and lymphatic anatomy. Specifically, detection of SLN along the UPP and LPP can be restricted to high-risk patients and a full pre-sacral lymphadenectomy should be performed if the LPP pathway cannot be visualized. However, the above SLN algorithm has not been widely applied in the detection of SLN in endometrial cancer, calling for further relevant research.

The current research mostly follows the SLN algorithm put forward in the NCCN guidelines, that is, if bilateral imaging cannot be achieved, the undeveloped lateral lymph nodes should be dissected [52]. And suspicious lymph nodes ought to be removed during surgery. Removing para-aortic lymph nodes or not depends on the decision of the surgeon. Strictly following the SLN algorithm can boost the detection rate of SLN and reduce the false negative rate, thereby providing accurate information for clinical decision-making.

4.Pathological evaluation andLow-Volume Metastasis

For the pathological evaluation of SLN, the NCCN guidelines recommend the use of pathological ultra-staging [52]. Pathological ultra-staging refers to a combinative assessment approach of both multiple serial

sectioning and immunohistochemical staining for surgically removed lymph nodes [53]. Not only can this method improve the detection rate of lymph node metastasis, but also identify low volume metastatic disease (LVMD) according to the size of the metastases. In accordance with their diameter, metastases can be divided into macro-metastasis (> 2 mm) and low-volume metastases (LVM) (< 2 mm). And LVM can be further subdivided into isolated tumor cells (ITCs) (< 0.2 mm) and micro-metastasis (MM) (0.2-2 mm) [54]. Pathological ultra-staging improves the detection of lymph node micro-metastases in endometrial cancer and can assess the staging of endometrial cancer patients [55, 56]. The NCCN guidelines also affirmed the potential value of pathological ultra-staging to detect endometrial cancer low-volume metastases [56]. However, pathological ultra-staging takes a considerable consumption of time and requires experienced pathologists to operate, which is not conducive to guiding intraoperative decision-making. And the specific implementation process and application indications need further study.

The clinical significance and management of LVM remain controversial. According to the 2021 NCCN guidelines, LVM is not a basis for staging upgrade, but LVM can guide the formulation of adjuvant therapy [57, 58, 59]. Studies have found that patients with LVM frequently received adjuvant chemotherapy and had improved oncologic outcomes in comparison to those with macro-metastasis to the lymph nodes, however, low-risk patients with LVM have limited benefit from adjuvant therapy [60]. Additionally, there is a possibility of over-treatment in LVM guided adjuvant chemotherapy [60, 61]. Therefore, adjuvant therapy should be formulated based on histopathological findings, uterine status, and the overall situation of the patient. In conclusion, at present, the management of LVM patients in clinical practice should be individualized based on the specific situation of patients.

5. The application of SLNM in endometrial cancer

5.1 SLNM in low-risk endometrial cancer

The lesions of low-risk patients are mostly confined to uterine corpus, with a low risk of lymph node metastasis. And the ESMO-ESGO-ESTRO proposed that LND is not recommended for low-risk patients (histological grade 1 or 2, superficial myometrial invasion $< 50\%$) [62]. In the 2018 NCCN guidelines, that SLNM can be used for surgical staging when endometrial cancer patients have no metastasis or no obvious extrauterine disease [56]. Correspondingly, burgeoning evidence has emerged to support the extraordinary potential of SLNM in low-risk endometrial cancer treatment [63, 64]. For instance, a FIRES trial investigated 385 patients with stage I endometrial cancer, eventually concluding that the detection rate and negative predictive value of SLN were 86% and 99.6%, respectively [10]. Furthermore, study evaluating the cost-effectiveness of three types of lymphadenectomies (systematic LAD, selective LAD, SLNM) in low-risk endometrial cancer found that SLNM ultimately outshined other two methods [65]. In conclusion, the advantages of low cost and high effectiveness of SLNM make it a consensus to replace systematic LAD in patients with early-stage and low-risk endometrial cancer.

5.2 SLNM in high-risk endometrial cancer

Compared with low-risk endometrial cancer, when it comes to high-risk endometrial cancer, the application value of SLNM still vary wildly. On the one hand, SLNM may increase the risk of missed diagnosis of isolated para-aortic lymph node metastases, which appears to be unacceptable in clinical practice [66]. Yet on the contrary, a meta-analysis showed that SLNM can accurately detect lymph node metastasis in high-risk endometrial cancer, and its performance characteristics (detection rate, false negative rate, sensitivity, *etc.*) were not statistically different from those of low-risk endometrial cancer [67]. Conformably, Gu *et al.* thought that in high-risk endometrial cancer, SLNM's evaluation effect of para-aortic lymph nodes was by no means inferior to that in low-risk endometrial cancer [68]. Meanwhile, increasing evidence have manifested the feasibility of applying SLNM in high-risk endometrial cancer [69]. The application of SLNM can shorten the time of laparotomy and laparoscopic surgery as well. Beyond this, the 2022 NCCN guidelines further proposed that SLNM can be considered as a method for surgical staging in patients with no extra-uterine metastatic lesion. This suggests that this edition of the NCCN guidelines recognizes the potential application value of SLNM in high-risk endometrial cancer patients. More large-scale, multicenter prospective studies

are still needed to further settle this controversy.

6. Significances of SLNM in EC

Numerous clinical and experimental studies have confirmed the positive significances of SLNM in endometrial cancer. Evidence of the high accuracy and feasibility of SLNM has been presented in the retrospective study of Barlin *et al.*^[46]. After the application of surgical SLN algorithm recommended in NCCN guideline, the sensitivity could reach 98.1%, together with a clinically acceptably low false negative rate of 1.9%. Furthermore, there is an obvious contrast of the incidence of intraoperative complications such as lymphedema between systematic lymphadenectomy and SLNM. According to a perioperative study performed by Geppert *et al.*, the incidence of having lower leg lymphedema in SLN group (1.3%) is astonishingly lower than in the group receiving infrarenal paraaortic and pelvic lymphadenectomy (18.1%)^[70]. Another noticeable superiority of SLNM lies in the reality that it did not compromise the survival prognosis of endometrial cancer patients. In line with a comparative study launched by two Italian institutions, no statistically significant difference of disease-free survival was observed between SLNM group and SLAD group among a total of 802 patients with early-stage endometrial cancer^[71]. Coincidentally, Eriksson *et al.* carried out research by respectively applying SLNM algorithm and complete pelvic and para-aortic lymphadenectomy, eventually obtaining a similar survival prognosis^[72].

7. Conclusion and Perspective

In conclusion, as a guided procedure for clinical decision of lymph node resection, SLNM is cumulatively maturing and its application in endometrial cancer becomes pyramidally promising. Nowadays, based on studies and guidelines, ICG is the most recommended tracer while cervical injection is favored due to its operational simplicity, reproducibility and high detection rate. Besides, maintaining a low false-negative rate is a major priority in any SLNM program. However, controversies pertaining to the application of SLN detection in patients with endometrial cancer still exist and await to be tackled with, such as the standard clinical application of SLN detection in high-risk endometrial cancer, the best algorithm for SLN, and the clinical significance of low-volume metastasis. Therefore, more profound studies are still needed to clarify these extant contentions and more large-scale clinical research are expected to guide the application of SLNM in endometrial cancer.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from the Medical Technology Project, Health Commission of Sichuan Province (no.21PJ051), and Development and Related Diseases of Women and Children Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province (no. 2021YJ0011).

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Contribution to Authorship

Conceptualization, C.B. and Q.C.; investigation, C.B. and R.D.; writing—original draft preparation, Q.C. and J.S.; writing—review and editing, Q.C. and D.R.; supervision, C.B. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

References

- (1) GOULD, E. A.; WINSHIP, T.; PHILBIN, P. H.; KERR, H. H. Observations on a "sentinel node" in cancer of the parotid. *Cancer***1960**, *13*, 77-78. DOI: 10.1002/1097-0142(196001/02)13:1<77::aid-cnrcr2820130114>3.0.co;2-d.
- (2) Abu-Rustum, N. R. Sentinel lymph node mapping for endometrial cancer: a modern approach to surgical staging. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* **2014**, *12* (2), 288-297. DOI: 10.6004/jnccn.2014.0026.

- (3) Cabanas, R. M. An approach for the treatment of penile carcinoma. *Cancer* **1977** , 39 (2), 456-466. DOI: 10.1002/1097-0142(197702)39:2<456::aid-cnrcr2820390214>3.0.co;2-i.
- (4) Giuliano, A. E.; Ballman, K. V.; McCall, L.; Beitsch, P. D.; Brennan, M. B.; Kelemen, P. R.; Ollila, D. W.; Hansen, N. M.; Whitworth, P. W.; Blumencranz, P. W.; et al. Effect of Axillary Dissection vs No Axillary Dissection on 10-Year Overall Survival Among Women With Invasive Breast Cancer and Sentinel Node Metastasis: The ACOSOG Z0011 (Alliance) Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA* **2017** ,318 (10), 918-926. DOI: 10.1001/jama.2017.11470.
- (5) Faries, M. B.; Thompson, J. F.; Cochran, A. J.; Andtbacka, R. H.; Mozzillo, N.; Zager, J. S.; Jahkola, T.; Bowles, T. L.; Testori, A.; Beitsch, P. D.; et al. Completion Dissection or Observation for Sentinel-Node Metastasis in Melanoma. *N Engl J Med* **2017** ,376 (23), 2211-2222. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1613210.
- (6) Burke, T. W.; Levenback, C.; Tornos, C.; Morris, M.; Wharton, J. T.; Gershenson, D. M. Intraabdominal lymphatic mapping to direct selective pelvic and paraaortic lymphadenectomy in women with high-risk endometrial cancer: results of a pilot study. *Gynecol Oncol* **1996** , 62 (2), 169-173. DOI: 10.1006/gyno.1996.0211.
- (7) Lu, K. H.; Broaddus, R. R. Endometrial Cancer. *N Engl J Med* **2020** , 383 (21), 2053-2064. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra1514010.
- (8) Benedetti Panici, P.; Basile, S.; Maneschi, F.; Alberto Lissoni, A.; Signorelli, M.; Scambia, G.; Angioli, R.; Tateo, S.; Mangili, G.; Katsaros, D.; et al. Systematic pelvic lymphadenectomy vs. no lymphadenectomy in early-stage endometrial carcinoma: randomized clinical trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst* **2008** , 100(23), 1707-1716. DOI: 10.1093/jnci/djn397.
- (9) Kitchener, H.; Swart, A. M.; Qian, Q.; Amos, C.; Parmar, M. K.; group, A. s. Efficacy of systematic pelvic lymphadenectomy in endometrial cancer (MRC ASTEC trial): a randomised study. *Lancet* **2009** , 373 (9658), 125-136. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61766-3.
- (10) Rossi, E. C.; Kowalski, L. D.; Scalici, J.; Cantrell, L.; Schuler, K.; Hanna, R. K.; Method, M.; Ade, M.; Ivanova, A.; Boggess, J. F. A comparison of sentinel lymph node biopsy to lymphadenectomy for endometrial cancer staging (FIRES trial): a multicentre, prospective, cohort study. *Lancet Oncol* **2017** , 18 (3), 384-392. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30068-2.
- (11) Holloway, R. W.; Abu-Rustum, N. R.; Backes, F. J.; Boggess, J. F.; Gotlieb, W. H.; Jeffrey Lowery, W.; Rossi, E. C.; Tanner, E. J.; Wolsky, R. J. Sentinel lymph node mapping and staging in endometrial cancer: A Society of Gynecologic Oncology literature review with consensus recommendations. *Gynecol Oncol* **2017** , 146 (2), 405-415. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.05.027.
- (12) Papadia, A.; Gasparri, M. L.; Buda, A.; Mueller, M. D. Sentinel lymph node mapping in endometrial cancer: comparison of fluorescence dye with traditional radiocolloid and blue. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* **2017** , 143 (10), 2039-2048. DOI: 10.1007/s00432-017-2501-8.
- (13) Wang, Y.; Dan, Z.; Yuan, G.; Zhang, G.; Liu, S.; Zhang, Y.; Li, B. Detection of sentinel lymph node in laparoscopic surgery for uterine cervical cancer using carbon nanoparticles. *J Surg Oncol* **2020** , 122 (5), 934-940. DOI: 10.1002/jso.26100.
- (14) Manca, G.; Garau, L. M.; Mazzarri, S.; Mazzuca, L.; Muccioli, S.; Ghilli, M.; Naccarato, G.; Colletti, P. M.; Rubello, D.; Roncella, M.; et al. Novel Experience in Hybrid Tracers: Clinical Evaluation of Feasibility and Efficacy in Using ICG-99mTc Nanotop for Sentinel Node Procedure in Breast Cancer Patients. *Clin Nucl Med* **2021** ,46 (4), e181-e187. DOI: 10.1097/RLU.0000000000003478.
- (15) Hou, H.; Dai, Y.; Liang, S.; Wang, Z.; Wang, J. Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy Is Feasible in Cervical Cancer Laparoscopic Surgery: A Single-Center Retrospective Cohort Study. *J Oncol* **2021** ,2021 , 5510623. DOI: 10.1155/2021/5510623.
- (16) How, J.; Gotlieb, W. H.; Press, J. Z.; Abitbol, J.; Pelmus, M.; Ferenczy, A.; Probst, S.; Gotlieb, R.; Brin, S.; Lau, S. Comparing indocyanine green, technetium, and blue dye for sentinel lymph node mapping

- in endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2015** ,137 (3), 436-442. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2015.04.004.
- (17) Darin, M. C.; Gómez-Hidalgo, N. R.; Westin, S. N.; Soliman, P. T.; Escobar, P. F.; Frumovitz, M.; Ramirez, P. T. Role of Indocyanine Green in Sentinel Node Mapping in Gynecologic Cancer: Is Fluorescence Imaging the New Standard? *J Minim Invasive Gynecol* **2016** ,23 (2), 186-193. DOI: 10.1016/j.jmig.2015.10.011.
- (18) Backes, F. J.; Cohen, D.; Salani, R.; Cohn, D. E.; O'Malley, D. M.; Fanning, E.; Suarez, A. A.; Fowler, J. M. Prospective clinical trial of robotic sentinel lymph node assessment with isosulfane blue (ISB) and indocyanine green (ICG) in endometrial cancer and the impact of ultrastaging (NCT01818739). *Gynecol Oncol* **2019** ,153 (3), 496-499. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.03.252.
- (19) Kim, J. H.; Ku, M.; Yang, J.; Byeon, H. K. Recent Developments of ICG-Guided Sentinel Lymph Node Mapping in Oral Cancer. *Diagnostics (Basel)* **2021** , 11 (5). DOI: 10.3390/diagnostics11050891.
- (20) Egloff-Juras, C.; Bezdetnaya, L.; Dolivet, G.; Lassalle, H. P. NIR fluorescence-guided tumor surgery: new strategies for the use of indocyanine green. *Int J Nanomedicine* **2019** , 14 , 7823-7838. DOI: 10.2147/IJN.S207486.
- (21) Papadia, A.; Gasparri, M. L.; Radan, A. P.; Stämpfli, C. A. L.; Rau, T. T.; Mueller, M. D. Retrospective validation of the laparoscopic ICG SLN mapping in patients with grade 3 endometrial cancer. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* **2018** , 144 (7), 1385-1393. DOI: 10.1007/s00432-018-2648-y.
- (22) Body, N.; Grégoire, J.; Renaud, M. C.; Sebastianelli, A.; Grondin, K.; Plante, M. Tips and tricks to improve sentinel lymph node mapping with Indocyanin green in endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2018** , 150 (2), 267-273. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2018.06.001.
- (23) Biliatis, I.; Thomakos, N.; Koutroumpa, I.; Haidopoulos, D.; Sotiropoulou, M.; Antsaklis, A.; Vlachos, G.; Akrivos, N.; Rodolakis, A. Subserosal uterine injection of blue dye for the identification of the sentinel node in patients with endometrial cancer: a feasibility study. *Arch Gynecol Obstet* **2017** , 296 (3), 565-570. DOI: 10.1007/s00404-017-4468-8.
- (24) Gien, L. T.; Kwon, J. S.; Carey, M. S. Sentinel node mapping with isosulfan blue dye in endometrial cancer. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* **2005** , 27 (12), 1107-1112. DOI: 10.1016/s1701-2163(16)30393-0.
- (25) Aurich, S.; Seitz, A. T.; Tomm, J.; Simon, J. C.; Treudler, R. A Case of Anaphylaxis to Patent Blue in a Patient with Sentinel Lymph Node Excision. *Iran J Allergy Asthma Immunol* **2016** , 15(6), 547-550.
- (26) Cinar, H.; Koca, B.; Kesicioglu, T.; Karabulut, K.; Karabicak, I.; Polat, C.; Tur, A. H. Isosulfan blue-induced anaphylactic reaction during sentinel lymph node biopsy in breast cancer. *Breast* **2012** , 21 (2), 220-222. DOI: 10.1016/j.breast.2011.11.008.
- (27) Momeni, R.; Ariyan, S. Pulse oximetry declines due to intradermal isosulfan blue dye: a controlled prospective study. *Ann Surg Oncol* **2004** , 11 (4), 434-437. DOI: 10.1245/ASO.2004.05.015.
- (28) Zhai, L.; Zhang, X.; Cui, M.; Wang, J. Sentinel Lymph Node Mapping in Endometrial Cancer: A Comprehensive Review. *Front Oncol* **2021** , 11 , 701758. DOI: 10.3389/fonc.2021.701758.
- (29) Nagar, H.; Wietek, N.; Goodall, R. J.; Hughes, W.; Schmidt-Hansen, M.; Morrison, J. Sentinel node biopsy for diagnosis of lymph node involvement in endometrial cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* **2021** , 6 , CD013021. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD013021.pub2.
- (30) van den Berg, N. S.; Brouwer, O. R.; Klop, W. M.; Karakullukcu, B.; Zuur, C. L.; Tan, I. B.; Balm, A. J.; van den Brekel, M. W.; Valdés Olmos, R. A.; van Leeuwen, F. W. Concomitant radio- and fluorescence-guided sentinel lymph node biopsy in squamous cell carcinoma of the oral cavity using ICG-(99m)Tc-nanocolloid. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging* **2012** , 39 (7), 1128-1136. DOI: 10.1007/s00259-012-2129-5.
- (31) Liu, S.; Wang, H.; Zhang, C.; Dong, J.; Xu, R.; Tian, C. In Vivo Photoacoustic Sentinel Lymph Node Imaging Using Clinically-Approved Carbon Nanoparticles. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* **2020** ,67 (7), 2033-2042. DOI: 10.1109/TBME.2019.2953743.

- (32) Jiang, Y.; Lin, N.; Huang, S.; Lin, C.; Jin, N.; Zhang, Z.; Ke, J.; Yu, Y.; Zhu, J.; Wang, Y. Tracking non-palpable breast cancer for breast-conserving surgery with carbon nanoparticles: implication in tumor location and lymph node dissection. *Medicine (Baltimore)* **2015** , *94* (10), e605. DOI: 10.1097/MD.0000000000000605.
- (33) Wang, L.; Yang, D.; Lv, J. Y.; Yu, D.; Xin, S. J. Application of carbon nanoparticles in lymph node dissection and parathyroid protection during thyroid cancer surgeries: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Onco Targets Ther* **2017** , *10* , 1247-1260. DOI: 10.2147/OTT.S131012.
- (34) Liang, S.; Wang, Z.; Chen, J.; Yang, X.; Liang, X.; Sun, X.; Li, X.; Zhou, R.; Li, Y.; Wang, J. Carbon nanoparticles combined with indocyanine green for sentinel lymph node detection in endometrial carcinoma. *J Surg Oncol* **2021** , *124* (3), 411-419. DOI: 10.1002/jso.26518.
- (35) Liu, P.; Tan, J.; Tan, Q.; Xu, L.; He, T.; Lv, Q. Application of Carbon Nanoparticles in Tracing Lymph Nodes and Locating Tumors in Colorectal Cancer: A Concise Review. *Int J Nanomedicine* **2020** , *15* , 9671-9681. DOI: 10.2147/IJN.S281914.
- (36) Tardelli, E.; Mazzarri, S.; Rubello, D.; Gennaro, M.; Fantechi, L.; Duce, V.; Romanini, A.; Chondrogianis, S.; Volterrani, D.; Colletti, P. M.; et al. Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy in Cutaneous Melanoma: Standard and New Technical Procedures and Clinical Advances. A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Clin Nucl Med* **2016** , *41* (12), e498-e507. DOI: 10.1097/RLU.0000000000001370.
- (37) Zivanovic, O.; Khoury-Collado, F.; Abu-Rustum, N. R.; Gemignani, M. L. Sentinel lymph node biopsy in the management of vulvar carcinoma, cervical cancer, and endometrial cancer. *Oncologist* **2009** , *14* (7), 695-705. DOI: 10.1634/theoncologist.2009-0075.
- (38) Eriksson, A. G. Z.; Davidson, B.; Bjerre Trent, P.; Eyjólfssdóttir, B.; Dahl, G. F.; Wang, Y.; Staff, A. C. Update on Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy in Surgical Staging of Endometrial Carcinoma. *J Clin Med* **2021** , *10* (14). DOI: 10.3390/jcm10143094.
- (39) Niikura, H.; Kaiho-Sakuma, M.; Tokunaga, H.; Toyoshima, M.; Utsunomiya, H.; Nagase, S.; Takano, T.; Watanabe, M.; Ito, K.; Yaegashi, N. Tracer injection sites and combinations for sentinel lymph node detection in patients with endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2013** , *131* (2), 299-303. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2013.08.018.
- (40) Brooks, R. A.; Fleming, G. F.; Lastra, R. R.; Lee, N. K.; Moroney, J. W.; Son, C. H.; Tatebe, K.; Veneris, J. L. Current recommendations and recent progress in endometrial cancer. *CA Cancer J Clin* **2019** , *69* (4), 258-279. DOI: 10.3322/caac.21561.
- (41) Ditto, A.; Casarin, I.; Pinelli, C.; Perrone, A. M.; Scollo, P.; Martinelli, F.; Bogani, G.; Leone Roberti Maggiore, U.; Signorelli, M.; Chiappa, V.; et al. Hysteroscopic versus cervical injection for sentinel node detection in endometrial cancer: A multicenter prospective randomised controlled trial from the Multicenter Italian Trials in Ovarian cancer (MITO) study group. *Eur J Cancer* **2020** , *140* , 1-10. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejca.2020.08.030.
- (42) Angeles, M. A.; Migliorelli, F.; Vidal-Sicart, S.; Saco, A.; Ordi, J.; Ros, C.; Fusté, P.; Munmany, M.; Escura, S.; Carreras, N.; et al. Paraaortic sentinel lymph node detection in intermediate and high-risk endometrial cancer by transvaginal ultrasound-guided myometrial injection of radiotracer (TUMIR). *J Gynecol Oncol* **2021** , *32* (4), e52. DOI: 10.3802/jgo.2021.32.e52.
- (43) Perrone, A. M.; Casadio, P.; Formelli, G.; Levorato, M.; Ghi, T.; Costa, S.; Meriggiola, M. C.; Pelusi, G. Cervical and hysteroscopic injection for identification of sentinel lymph node in endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2008** , *111* (1), 62-67. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2008.05.032.
- (44) Mücke, J.; Klapdor, R.; Schneider, M.; Länger, F.; Gratz, K. F.; Hillemanns, P.; Hertel, H. Isthmocervical labelling and SPECT/CT for optimized sentinel detection in endometrial cancer: technique, experience and results. *Gynecol Oncol* **2014** , *134* (2), 287-292. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2014.05.001.

- (45) Ruiz, R.; Gorostidi, M.; Jaunarena, I.; Cobas, P.; Lekuona, A. Maximizing sentinel node detection in endometrial cancer with dual cervical and transcervical fundal indocyanine green injection: 5-year single-center prospective study. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* **2021** , 261 , 59-64. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejogrb.2021.04.015.
- (46) Barlin, J. N.; Khoury-Collado, F.; Kim, C. H.; Leita, M. M.; Chi, D. S.; Sonoda, Y.; Alektiar, K.; DeLair, D. F.; Barakat, R. R.; Abu-Rustum, N. R. The importance of applying a sentinel lymph node mapping algorithm in endometrial cancer staging: beyond removal of blue nodes. *Gynecol Oncol* **2012** , 125 (3), 531-535. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2012.02.021.
- (47) Geppert, B.; Lönnerfors, C.; Bollino, M.; Arechivo, A.; Persson, J. A study on uterine lymphatic anatomy for standardization of pelvic sentinel lymph node detection in endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2017** , 145 (2), 256-261. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.02.018.
- (48) Levenback, C. F. Status of sentinel lymph node biopsy in gynecological cancers. *Ann Surg Oncol* **2008** , 15(1), 18-20. DOI: 10.1245/s10434-007-9516-3.
- (49) Dabi, Y.; Bendifallah, S.; Kolanska, K.; Boudy, A. S.; Querleu, D.; Akladios, C.; Zilberman, S.; Darai, E.; Touboul, C. Anatomical basis of lymph node detection in gynecologic cancers: a review from a surgical perspective. *Chin Clin Oncol* **2021** , 10 (2), 15. DOI: 10.21037/cco-20-228.
- (50) Persson, J.; Geppert, B.; Lönnerfors, C.; Bollino, M.; Måsbäck, A. Description of a reproducible anatomically based surgical algorithm for detection of pelvic sentinel lymph nodes in endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2017** , 147 (1), 120-125. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.07.131.
- (51) Bollino, M.; Geppert, B.; Lönnerfors, C.; Falconer, H.; Salehi, S.; Persson, J. Pelvic sentinel lymph node biopsy in endometrial cancer—a simplified algorithm based on histology and lymphatic anatomy. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* **2020** , 30 (3), 339-345. DOI: 10.1136/ijgc-2019-000935.
- (52) Abu-Rustum, N. R.; Yashar, C. M.; Bradley, K.; Campos, S. M.; Chino, J.; Chon, H. S.; Chu, C.; Cohn, D.; Crispens, M. A.; Damast, S.; et al. NCCN Guidelines® Insights: Uterine Neoplasms, Version 3.2021. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* **2021** , 19 (8), 888-895. DOI: 10.6004/jnccn.2021.0038.
- (53) Cibula, D.; Abu-Rustum, N. R.; Dusek, L.; Slama, J.; Zikán, M.; Zaal, A.; Sevcik, L.; Kenter, G.; Querleu, D.; Jach, R.; et al. Bilateral ultrastaging of sentinel lymph node in cervical cancer: Lowering the false-negative rate and improving the detection of micrometastasis. *Gynecol Oncol* **2012** , 127 (3), 462-466. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2012.08.035.
- (54) Kim, C. H.; Soslow, R. A.; Park, K. J.; Barber, E. L.; Khoury-Collado, F.; Barlin, J. N.; Sonoda, Y.; Hensley, M. L.; Barakat, R. R.; Abu-Rustum, N. R. Pathologic ultrastaging improves micrometastasis detection in sentinel lymph nodes during endometrial cancer staging. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* **2013** , 23(5), 964-970. DOI: 10.1097/IGC.0b013e3182954da8.
- (55) Multinu, F.; Casarin, J.; Cappuccio, S.; Keeney, G. L.; Glaser, G. E.; Cliby, W. A.; Weaver, A. L.; McGree, M. E.; Angioni, S.; Faa, G.; et al. Ultrastaging of negative pelvic lymph nodes to decrease the true prevalence of isolated paraaortic dissemination in endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2019** , 154 (1), 60-64. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.05.008.
- (56) Koh, W. J.; Abu-Rustum, N. R.; Bean, S.; Bradley, K.; Campos, S. M.; Cho, K. R.; Chon, H. S.; Chu, C.; Cohn, D.; Crispens, M. A.; et al. Uterine Neoplasms, Version 1.2018, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* **2018** , 16 (2), 170-199. DOI: 10.6004/jnccn.2018.0006.
- (57) Altin, D.; Taskin, S.; Tokgozoglu, N.; Vatansever, D.; Guler, A. H.; Gungor, M.; Tasci, T.; Turan, H.; Kahramanoglu, I.; Yalcin, I.; et al. Can risk groups accurately predict non-sentinel lymph node metastasis in sentinel lymph node-positive endometrial cancer patients? A Turkish Gynecologic Oncology Group Study (TRSGO-SLN-004). *J Surg Oncol* **2021** , 123 (2), 638-645. DOI: 10.1002/jso.26310.
- (58) Plante, M.; Stanleigh, J.; Renaud, M. C.; Sebastianelli, A.; Grondin, K.; Grégoire, J. Isolated tumor cells identified by sentinel lymph node mapping in endometrial cancer: Does adjuvant treatment matter?

Gynecol Oncol **2017** , *146* (2), 240-246. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.05.024.

(59) Bogani, G.; Mariani, A.; Paolini, B.; Ditto, A.; Raspagliesi, F. Low-volume disease in endometrial cancer: The role of micrometastasis and isolated tumor cells. *Gynecol Oncol* **2019** , *153*(3), 670-675. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.02.027.

(60) St Clair, C. M.; Eriksson, A. G.; Ducie, J. A.; Jewell, E. L.; Alektiar, K. M.; Hensley, M. L.; Soslow, R. A.; Abu-Rustum, N. R.; Leitao, M. M. Low-Volume Lymph Node Metastasis Discovered During Sentinel Lymph Node Mapping for Endometrial Carcinoma. *Ann Surg Oncol* **2016** , *23* (5), 1653-1659. DOI: 10.1245/s10434-015-5040-z.

(61) Ignatov, A.; Lebius, C.; Ignatov, T.; Ivros, S.; Knueppel, R.; Papatthemelis, T.; Ortmann, O.; Eggemann, H. Lymph node micrometastases and outcome of endometrial cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* **2019** , *154* (3), 475-479. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.07.018.

(62) Colombo, N.; Creutzberg, C.; Amant, F.; Bosse, T.; González-Martín, A.; Ledermann, J.; Marth, C.; Nout, R.; Querleu, D.; Mirza, M. R.; et al. ESMO-ESGO-ESTRO Consensus Conference on Endometrial Cancer: diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol* **2016** , *27* (1), 16-41. DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdv484.

(63) Mathevet, P.; Lécuru, F.; Uzan, C.; Boutitie, F.; Magaud, L.; Guyon, F.; Querleu, D.; Fourchotte, V.; Baron, M.; Bats, A. S.; et al. Sentinel lymph node biopsy and morbidity outcomes in early cervical cancer: Results of a multicentre randomised trial (SENTICOL-2). *Eur J Cancer* **2021** , *148* , 307-315. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejca.2021.02.009.

(64) Sponholtz, S. E.; Mogensen, O.; Hildebrandt, M. G.; Schledermann, D.; Parner, E.; Markauskas, A.; Frøding, L. P.; Fuglsang, K.; Vilstrup, M. H.; Bjørnholt, S. M.; et al. Sentinel lymph node mapping in early-stage cervical cancer - A national prospective multicenter study (SENTIREC trial). *Gynecol Oncol* **2021** , *162* (3), 546-554. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2021.06.018.

(65) Suidan, R. S.; Sun, C. C.; Cantor, S. B.; Mariani, A.; Soliman, P. T.; Westin, S. N.; Lu, K. H.; Giordano, S. H.; Meyer, L. A. Three Lymphadenectomy Strategies in Low-Risk Endometrial Carcinoma: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *Obstet Gynecol* **2018** , *132* (1), 52-58. DOI: 10.1097/AOG.0000000000002677.

(66) Ye, L.; Li, S.; Lu, W.; He, Q.; Li, Y.; Li, B.; Wang, X.; Yan, Q.; Wan, X. A Prospective Study of Sentinel Lymph Node Mapping for Endometrial Cancer: Is It Effective in High-Risk Subtypes? *Oncologist* **2019** , *24* (12), e1381-e1387. DOI: 10.1634/theoncologist.2019-0113.

(67) Marchocki, Z.; Cusimano, M. C.; Clarfield, L.; Kim, S. R.; Fazelzad, R.; Espin-Garcia, O.; Bouchard-Fortier, G.; Rossi, E. C.; Stewart, K. I.; Soliman, P. T.; et al. Sentinel lymph node biopsy in high-grade endometrial cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of performance characteristics. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* **2021** , *225* (4), 367.e361-367.e339. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajog.2021.05.034.

(68) Gu, Y.; Cheng, H.; Zong, L.; Kong, Y.; Xiang, Y. Operative and Oncological Outcomes Comparing Sentinel Node Mapping and Systematic Lymphadenectomy in Endometrial Cancer Staging: Meta-Analysis With Trial Sequential Analysis. *Front Oncol* **2020** , *10* , 580128. DOI: 10.3389/fonc.2020.580128.

(69) Cusimano, M. C.; Vicus, D.; Pulman, K.; Maganti, M.; Bernardini, M. Q.; Bouchard-Fortier, G.; Laf-ramboise, S.; May, T.; Hogen, L. F.; Covens, A. L.; et al. Assessment of Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy vs Lymphadenectomy for Intermediate- and High-Grade Endometrial Cancer Staging. *JAMA Surg* **2021** , *156* (2), 157-164. DOI: 10.1001/jamasurg.2020.5060.

(70) Geppert, B.; Lönnerfors, C.; Bollino, M.; Persson, J. Sentinel lymph node biopsy in endometrial cancer-Feasibility, safety and lymphatic complications. *Gynecol Oncol* **2018** , *148*(3), 491-498. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.12.017.

(71) Buda, A.; Di Martino, G.; Restaino, S.; De Ponti, E.; Monterossi, G.; Giuliani, D.; Ercoli, A.; Dell'Orto, F.; Dinoi, G.; Grassi, T.; et al. The impact on survival of two different staging strategies in apparent early

stage endometrial cancer comparing sentinel lymph nodes mapping algorithm and selective lymphadenectomy: An Italian retrospective analysis of two reference centers. *Gynecol Oncol***2017** , 147 (3), 528-534. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2017.09.033.

(72) Zahl Eriksson, A. G.; Ducie, J.; Ali, N.; McGree, M. E.; Weaver, A. L.; Bogani, G.; Cliby, W. A.; Dowdy, S. C.; Bakkum-Gamez, J. N.; Abu-Rustum, N. R.; et al. Comparison of a sentinel lymph node and a selective lymphadenectomy algorithm in patients with endometrioid endometrial carcinoma and limited myometrial invasion. *Gynecol Oncol* **2016** , 140 (3), 394-399. DOI: 10.1016/j.ygyno.2015.12.028.