



HAL
open science

Narrow resection margins are not associated with mortality or recurrence in patients with Merkel cell carcinoma: a retrospective study

Frédéric Jaouen, Thibault Kervarrec, Agnès Caille, Yannick Le Corre, Brigitte Dreno, Eric Esteve, Ewa Wierzbicka-Hainaut, Hervé Maillard, Monica Dinulescu, Astrid Blom, et al.

► To cite this version:

Frédéric Jaouen, Thibault Kervarrec, Agnès Caille, Yannick Le Corre, Brigitte Dreno, et al.. Narrow resection margins are not associated with mortality or recurrence in patients with Merkel cell carcinoma: a retrospective study. *Journal of The American Academy of Dermatology*, 2021, 84 (4), pp.921-929. 10.1016/j.jaad.2020.11.038 . hal-03151003

HAL Id: hal-03151003

<https://hal.inrae.fr/hal-03151003>

Submitted on 15 Mar 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **Narrow resection margins are not associated with mortality or recurrence in patients with**
2 **Merkel cell carcinoma: a retrospective study**

3 **Authors:** Frédéric Jaouen, MD^{1,2}, Thibault Kervarrec, MD PhD^{1,3,4}, Agnès Caille, MD PhD^{1,5}, Yannick
4 Le Corre, MD⁶, Brigitte Dreno, MD PhD⁷, Eric Esteve, MD⁸, Ewa Wierzbicka-Hainaut, MD⁹, Hervé
5 Maillard, MD¹⁰, Monica Dinulescu, MD¹¹, Astrid Blom, MD¹², Philippe Saïag, MD PhD¹², Mahtab
6 Samimi, MD PhD^{1,2,4}

7
8 ¹Université François Rabelais, Tours, France, 37044 Tours Cedex, France

9 ²CHU Tours, Dermatology Department, Avenue de la République 37170 Tours Cedex, France ; Institut
10 Dermatologique du Grand Ouest (IDGO)

11 ³CHU Tours, Pathology Department, Avenue de la République 37170 Tours Cedex, France

12 ⁴Biologie des Polyomavirus, ISP 1282 INRA University of Tours, 37044 Tours Cedex, France

13 ⁵Université de Tours, Université de Nantes, INSERM, SPHERE U1246, Tours, France ; INSERM CIC1415, CHRU de
14 Tours, Tours, France

15 ⁶CHU Angers, Dermatology Department, 4 rue Larrey 49100 Angers Cedex, France ; Institut Dermatologique du
16 Grand Ouest (IDGO)

17 ⁷CHU Nantes, Dermatology Department, 5 allée de l'île Gloriette 44093 Nantes Cedex, France ; Institut
18 Dermatologique du Grand Ouest (IDGO)

19 ⁸CHR Orléans, Dermatology Department, 14 avenue de l'Hôpital 45067 Orléans Cedex, France ; Institut
20 Dermatologique du Grand Ouest (IDGO)

21 ⁹CHU Poitiers, Dermatology Department, 2 rue de la Milétrie, 86021 Poitiers Cedex, France ; Institut Dermatologique
22 du Grand Ouest (IDGO)

23 ¹⁰CHR Le Mans, Dermatology Department, 194 avenue Rubillard 72037 Le Mans Cedex, France ; Institut
24 Dermatologique du Grand Ouest (IDGO)

25 ¹¹CHR Rennes, Dermatology Department, 2 rue Henri le Guilloux 35000 Rennes Cedex, France ; Institut
26 Dermatologique du Grand Ouest (IDGO)

27 ¹²AP-HP Ambroise Paré, Dermatology Department, 9 avenue Charles de Gaulle 92100 Boulogne-Billancourt Cedex,
28 France & EA4340, university of Paris-Saclay-UVSQ, Versailles France

29
30 **Corresponding author:** Mahtab Samimi, Université François Rabelais, Tours, France ; INRA, UMR
31 1282, Tours, France ; Department of Dermatology, CHU Tours, Avenue de la République, 37170 Tours,
32 France ; Phone: +332 47 47 46 25 Fax: +332 34 38 95 15 E-mail: mahtab.samimi@univ-tours.fr

33

34

35 **Abstract word count: 194**

36 **Capsule Summary word count: 45**

37 **Word count text: 2497**

38 **Figure count:3**

39 **Table count:2**

40 **References count: 30**

41 **Supplemental Tables and Figures: 6 (<https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/5df3rpd4hb/1>)**

42

1 **Fundings.** This work was supported by La Ligue Contre le Cancer (Indre-et-Loire, France) and HUGO
2 (Hopitaux Universitaires du Grand Ouest). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and
3 analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

4

5 **Conflict of interest statement.**

6 F Jaouen, T Kervarrec, Y Le Corre, A Blom, E Esteve, E Wierzbicka-Hainault, H Maillard, M
7 Dinulescu, M Samimi : Declarations of interest: none.

8 Philippe Saiag: Pr Saiag reports personal fees from Novartis, grants and personal fees from Pierre
9 Fabre, personal fees from BMS, grants and personal fees from MSD, personal fees from Merk
10 Serono, personal fees from Pfizer, outside the submitted work.

11 Brigitte Dreno: Pr. DRENO reports personal fees from Board MERCK Pfizer, outside the
12 submitted work.

13

14 **IRB statement.** The work was approved by the Ethics Committee of Tours, France (N° ID RCB 2009-
15 A01056-51).

16 **Attachments for editor/reviewer reference only:** STROBE checklist, IRB approval

17

18

19

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ABSTRACT

Background. Wide local excision constitutes the standard of care for Merkel cell carcinoma, but the optimal margin width remains controversial.

Objectives. To assess whether narrow margins (0.5 - 1 cm) were associated with outcome.

Methods. Patients were recruited from a retrospective French multicentric cohort and included if they had had excision of primary tumor with minimum lateral margins of 0.5 cm. Factors associated with mortality and recurrence were assessed by multivariate regression.

Results. Among the 214 patients included, 58 (27.1%) had undergone excision with narrow margins (0.5-1cm) versus 156 (72.9%) with wide margins (>1cm). During a median follow-up of 50.7 months, cancer-specific survival did not differ between groups [5-year specific survival rate 76.8% (95% CI 61.7-91.9) and 76.2% (95% CI 68.8-83.6)]. Overall survival, any recurrence-free survival and local recurrence-free survival did not significantly differ between groups. Cancer-specific mortality was associated with age, male sex, AJCC stage III, positive margins.

Limitations. Retrospective design, heterogenous baseline characteristics between groups.

Conclusion. Excision with narrow margins was not associated with outcome in this cohort, in which most patients had clear margins and post-operative radiation therapy. Residual tumor, mostly found on deep surgical margins, was independently associated with prognosis.

Keywords: Skin neoplasms; Merkel Cell Carcinoma; General surgery; Surgical margins; Wide Local Excision; Prognosis; Mortality

1 **CAPSULE SUMMARY**

2 • **Wide local excision constitutes the standard of care for Merkel cell carcinoma. In**
3 **this retrospective study, 0.5 to 1 cm margins were not associated with recurrence**
4 **or death.**

5 • **Excision of Merkel cell carcinoma with narrow margins does not impact outcome**
6 **when clear margins are obtained.**

7

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 Merkel cell carcinoma (MCC) is a rare primary neuroendocrine skin cancer whose risk factors
3 include older age, fair skin, ultraviolet exposure and immunosuppression [1–4]. Disease stage is
4 the major determinant of prognosis and was recently updated (8th Edition American Joint
5 Committee on Cancer [AJCC] Staging System) [5]. MCC carries high metastatic potential, and
6 patients typically have poor prognosis, with 5-year survival rates of 51%, 35% and 14% for
7 local, regional and distant metastatic disease, respectively [5]. Although wide local excision
8 (WLE) of the primary tumor is the standard of care for patients with local and nodal disease
9 [3,4,6,7], the optimal surgical margins, achieving minimal risk of recurrence together with
10 limited morbidity, remain debated. Given the aggressiveness of MCC, surgical clearance of the
11 tumor is a high priority while procedures should also take into account the frequent location of
12 MCC on the head and neck, as well as the frailty of these elderly patients. Margins of 2 to 3 cm
13 were historically excised [6,8–11], but margins of 1 to 2 cm are currently recommended [3,4,7].
14 Such change in practice is supported by the widespread administration of adjuvant radiotherapy
15 (aRT) on the tumor bed [12–17]. According to a large study from the Surveillance,
16 Epidemiology and End Results database, margins > 2 cm were associated with improved
17 survival as compared with narrow margins (≤ 1 cm), including procedures such as shave, punch
18 or incisional biopsies, which are likely incomplete [18]. However, several studies suggest that
19 lateral margins of 1 cm do not affect either local recurrences [2,19], any recurrences [20,21] or
20 survival [19,21,22], but were limited by small cohorts [21,23], the unavailability of
21 confounding factors such as disease stage [2,19,24] and histological margin status [21,23], or
22 lack of data on survival [2] or recurrence rates [21,27]. This study assessed whether narrow
23 margins (0.5 to 1 cm) were associated with outcome in a retrospective cohort of MCC patients,
24 excluding procedures such as biopsies, and taking into account determinant confounding factors
25 such as disease stage, margin status and aRT. The primary objective was to evaluate whether
26 margins were associated with disease-specific survival (DSS). Secondary objectives were to

1 assess whether margins were associated with overall survival (OS), recurrence-free survival
2 (RFS) and pattern of recurrences, and whether narrow margins would decrease reconstruction
3 procedures and delay to aRT.

4 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

5 **Study design, participants and settings**

6 This study was based on an ongoing cohort of MCC cases diagnosed between 1998 and 2019 in
7 the dermatology departments of ten French hospitals [25,26] and approved by the Ethics
8 Committee of Tours, France (N° ID RCB 2009-A01056-51). As previously described [25,26],
9 patients were included in the cohort if review of the histological data confirmed the diagnosis of
10 MCC. Follow-up had been performed as recommended in the National French Guidelines[6].

11 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

12 Patients were included if they had WLE of the primary tumor, with minimum lateral margins of
13 0.5 cm, according to the surgical report. Patients with excision of margins <0.5 cm were
14 considered to have had excision biopsy or palliative surgery and were excluded. Patients with
15 nodal disease were included if they had also undergone potentially curative treatment by lymph
16 node dissection, radiation therapy or both [3,7]. Exclusion criteria were AJCC stage IV, absence of
17 primary tumor (occult or regressive primary), no surgical treatment of the primary tumor (refusal,
18 contraindications, exclusive radiation therapy), excision biopsy or palliative surgery (excision of
19 margins < 0.5 cm), two concomitant MCC primary tumors, no treatment of nodal disease at
20 baseline, rapid disease progression before completion of initial treatment, missing surgical margins
21 and/or no follow up visit after surgery.

22 **Clinical data**

23 Data were collected on age, sex, AJCC tumor stage [5], primary location, WHO performance status,
24 immunosuppression (solid organ transplant, current hematological or solid malignancies, HIV
25 infection, immunosuppressive drugs [27]), surgical lateral margins of WLE (in case of re-excisions,
26 cumulative excision margin was calculated), reconstruction procedures (flap and/or graft),

1 histological margin status (negative or positive), sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB), aRT (tumor
2 bed, node area or both) and time from surgery to initiation of aRT. Death was categorized as being
3 related to MCC (MCC-specific death) or not (other cause) based on patients' medical files in each
4 hospital. DSS was defined as the time from the initial confirmed diagnosis of MCC to the date of
5 death related to MCC; OS as the time from diagnosis to the date of death regardless of cause; RFS
6 as the time from diagnosis to the date of a clinical or paraclinical event related to MCC recurrence.
7 Pattern of first recurrence was categorized as local (within 2 cm of the primary site); in-transit (>2
8 cm from the primary site); regional (draining lymph node basin) or distant (beyond the draining
9 lymph node basin). The database was locked on November 20, 2019.

10 **Outcomes**

11 The primary outcome was DSS with excision of narrow margins (0.5-1 cm) and wide margins
12 (>1 cm). Secondary outcomes were OS, RFS, pattern of first recurrence, proportion of
13 reconstruction procedures and delay between surgery and aRT.

14 **Statistics**

15 Continuous data are described with mean and standard deviation or median (Q1–Q3; range) and
16 categorical data with number (percentage). Patients were classified as excision of narrow margins
17 (0.5-1 cm) and excision of margins > 1 cm. Qualitative data were compared by two-tailed Fisher
18 exact test and quantitative data by Mann-Whitney U test. Median follow-up, local and any RFS,
19 OS and DSS with 95% confidence intervals (CI) were analyzed by Kaplan-Meier survival analysis
20 with log-rank tests. Univariate and multivariate Cox proportional hazards analyses were used to
21 identify factors associated with recurrence and death, estimating hazard ratios (HRs) and 95%
22 confidence intervals (CIs). For DSS, deaths from MCC were considered to be events, deaths from
23 other causes were censored at the day of death, and living patients were censored on the date of
24 last follow-up. Covariates were identified as potential prognostic factors on Cox univariate
25 regression at $p \leq 0.10$ and were included in the multivariate analysis. The proportional hazards
26 assumption was assessed by a non-significant relationship between scaled Schoenfeld residuals

1 and time for each of the covariates and for the global test. Statistical analysis involved using XL-
2 Stat-Life (Addinsoft, Paris, France). $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

3 **RESULTS**

4 **Patient characteristics by size of margins at baseline**

5 Among the 357 MCC patients included in the cohort, 214 met inclusion criteria (**Figure 1**).
6 Patient characteristics are presented in **Table I**. Median lateral margin was 2 cm (Q1-Q3 1-2.8,
7 range 0.5-6). Overall, 58 (27.1%) patients had undergone excision with narrow margins versus
8 156 (72.9%) with wide margins. Most patients had clear histological margins ($n=198$, 92.5%) and
9 aRT ($n=169$, 79.0%). Overall, 34 (15.9%) patients had nodal macrometastases at baseline (AJCC
10 stage IIIB) and 180 (84.1%) had no evidence of macrometastases; 69/180 (38.3%) had undergone
11 SLNB, 14 (20.3%) showing nodal micrometastases (AJCC stage IIIA). The 48 patients with
12 evidence of nodal disease had undergone lymph node dissection ($n=10$, 20.8%), radiation therapy
13 of lymph nodes ($n=11$, 22.9%) or both ($n=27$, 56.3%). Patients with excision of ≤ 1 -cm margins
14 were significantly older ($p=0.0005$) and more frequently were female ($p=0.010$) and
15 immunosuppressed ($p=0.018$) and had head and neck tumors ($p=0.001$) than those with 1-cm
16 margins. AJCC stages, PS, margin status, reconstruction procedures, frequency of aRT and time
17 to initiation of aRT did not differ between groups (**Table I**).

18 **Size of margins and death from MCC**

19 The median follow up after diagnosis was 50.7 months (95% CI 44.3-62.1). Follow up was
20 significantly longer for those treated with wide (median 67.6 months, 95% CI 50.8-79.1) versus
21 narrow margins (median 28.9 months, 95% CI 19.7-44.4) (log rank test, < 0.0001). Overall, 76
22 patients (35.5%) had died, including 40 (18.7%) due to MCC (**Figure 1**). The median OS was
23 107.7 months (95% CI 77.4-158.3) and the median DSS was not reached. DSS did not
24 significantly differ between margin groups (log-rank test, $p=0.78$). As such, 1- and 5-year specific
25 survival rates were 91.2% (95% CI 83.0-99.5) and 76.8% (95% CI 61.7-91.9) in the narrow-
26 margin group, versus 92.3 (95% CI 88.0-96.7) and 76.2% (95% CI 68.8-83.6) in the wide-margin

1 group (**Figure 2**). OS did not significantly differ between margin groups (log-rank test, $p=0.93$)
2 (**Supplemental Figure 1**). When stratifying patients on AJCC stage, DSS did not differ between
3 margin groups (**Supplemental Figure 2, A-C**). On multivariate analysis, risk of death due to
4 MCC was associated with age (HR 1.04, 95% CI 1.00-1.08), male sex (HR 2.06, 95% CI 1.05-
5 4.05), AJCC stage III (HR 2.97, 95%CI 1.23-7.20) and positive margins (HR 6.04 (2.21-16.54)
6 (**Table II**). On multivariate analysis, age (HR 1.06, 95% CI 1.02-1.09), male sex (2.06, 95% CI
7 1.25-3.39), AJCC stage II (HR 2.26, 95% CI 1.25-4.08) and positive margins (HR 3.02, 95% CI
8 1.42-6.43) were associated with death of any cause (**Supplemental Table I**).

9 **Size of margins and MCC recurrence**

10 Disease recurred in 72 (33.6%) patients (median time to recurrence: 8.0 [Q1-Q3 6.0-13.3] months)
11 (**Figure 1**). RFS did not significantly differ between margin groups (log-rank test, $p=0.86$). As
12 such, 1- and 5-year RFS rates were 76.0% (95%CI 64.1-87.9) and 64.3% (95%CI 49.6-79.0) in the
13 narrow margin group versus 75.0% (95%CI 68.0-82.0) and 61.1 (95%CI 53.0-69.3) in the wide
14 margin group (**Figure 3**). RFS did not differ significantly between margin groups when stratifying
15 by AJCC stage (**Supplemental Figure 2, D-F**). On multivariate analysis, risk of recurrence was
16 increased with age (HR 1.03, 95% CI 1.00-1.06), male sex (HR 2.00, 95% CI 1.22-3.29) and
17 positive margins (HR 3.49 95% CI 1.61-7.58) (**Table II**).

18 **Size of margins and pattern of recurrence.**

19 Among the 72 patients who had recurred, first recurrence was local ($n=5$), in-transit (16), regional
20 ($n=23$) or distant ($n=26$) (unknown, $n=2$) (**Supplemental Table II**). Local recurrence occurred in 1
21 (1.7%) and 4 (2.6%) patients from the narrow and wide margin groups, respectively ($p=0.78$). In-
22 transit recurrence occurred in 4 (6.8%) and 11 (7.0%) patients from the narrow and wide margin
23 groups, respectively ($p=1.0$). Local and in-transit RFS did not differ between groups (log-rank test,
24 $p=0.56$ and $p=0.53$, respectively). Overall, recurrences patterns did not differ significantly between
25 the four treatment groups (narrow or wide margins, with or without aRT) (**Supplemental Table II**).

26 **Characteristics of patients with positive margins**

1 Among the 15 (7.5%) patients with positive margins, margin excised were narrow (0.5-1cm) (n=4)
2 (26.6%) or wide (>1cm) (n=11) (73.3%) (**Supplemental Table III**). Residual tumor was located
3 more frequently on deep rather than lateral sections (n=12 vs n=4). Recurrences occurred in 7/11
4 patients (63%) who had received aRT versus 3/4 patients (75%) who had not (p=0.63). Among
5 patients with recurrences, location was either local or in-transit in 4/7 patients who had received
6 aRT and 1/3 in those who had not (**Supplemental Table III**).

7 **Discussion**

8 In this retrospective study of 214 MCC patients, WLE of the primary tumor with narrow margins
9 (0.5-1 cm) was not associated with increased risk of local recurrence, any recurrence, death from
10 MCC or death from any cause, as compared with excision with wide margins (>1cm). Overall, 15
11 (7.5%) patients had positive margins after WLE, which was independently associated with
12 increased risk of MCC recurrence and death due to MCC.

13 Studies which had previously assessed whether size of surgical margins was associated with
14 outcome in MCC patients are reported in **Supplemental Table IV**. In most of the recent studies
15 [2,19–21,22, 23,24], decreasing margins below 2 cm did not affect outcome. Accordingly, recent
16 guidelines [3,4,7] recommend margins between 1 to 2 cm. A few retrospective series suggest that
17 MCC can be removed with 1-cm margins. In one study reporting 224 MCC patients, Allen et al did
18 not find increased risk of local recurrence between margin groups (<1-cm versus \geq 1cm margins)
19 [2]. Similarly, Perez et al did not evidence increased risk of local recurrence, in-transit recurrence or
20 death between MCC patients treated with margins of 1cm, 1.1 to 1.9cm or \geq 2cm [19]. One
21 limitation was the absence of comparisons of confounding factors between groups, such as AJCC
22 stage at baseline[2,19], margin status [2] or aRT on tumor bed [2]. The necessity of aRT for
23 decreasing local recurrences in case of narrow margins was suggested by Tarabadkar et al, based on
24 188 MCC patients from Seattle [22]. Accordingly, aRT on the tumor bed was previously found to
25 improve local control in MCC [12,13,17,28]. Bearing in mind that only 5 local recurrences (2.3%)
26 occurred in our cohort, we did not observe differences in local control between the four treatment

1 groups (wide or narrow margins, with or without aRT). Given that aRT was widely administered in
2 our cohort - 76% of patients had had aRT on the primary tumor bed, similar to the Moffitt
3 (69%)[19] and Seattle (74%) [22] cohorts - we can extrapolate our findings only in settings where
4 most patients receive aRT of the tumor bed.

5 Importantly, positive margins were clearly associated with increased risk of recurrence and death
6 from MCC, in line with previous studies [2,17,20,29]. In our cohort, i) the proportion of patients
7 with positive margins was similar between margin groups, and ii) among these high-risk patients,
8 recurrence rates – including local/in-transit recurrences - were similar between those who had
9 received aRT on tumor bed and those who did not. To note, residual tumoral cells were mostly
10 located on the deep histological section, which highlights the crucial importance of removing the
11 underlying fascia layer [3,4,6,7]. Depth of excision is rarely retrievable from surgical reports, which
12 limits the retrospective assessment of surgical procedures. Overall, our data suggest that patients
13 with positive resection margins should be re-excised when possible, as stated by others[14] and
14 provided as an option in the algorithm proposed by Tarabadkar et al [22].

15 Although reducing margins aims to minimize surgical morbidity, we did not find wide margins to
16 be associated with increased reconstructive procedures, which is likely related with the frequent
17 practice of secondary closure in our cohort. To note, narrow margins did not either allow shorter
18 delays before aRT, which suggests that such delays are related to logistical issues rather than the
19 surgical procedure itself.

20 Some authors suggest that 1cm margins should be limited to patients with small tumors [3,7,30].
21 To our knowledge, there are no data to support which patients are eligible for narrow margins. In
22 our cohort, narrow margins were not associated with increased risk of recurrence or death when
23 stratifying patients according to disease stage at baseline, although our sample size in each group
24 was rather small.

25 Overall, our study is limited by its retrospective design with heterogenous baseline characteristics
26 between groups; the limited number and shorter follow up of patients treated with narrow

1 margins, which might have underestimated the number of events; the limited number of patients
2 in the subgroup analysis based on AJCC stages.

3 To conclude, removing primary MCC tumor with a narrow margin (0.5-1 cm) was not associated
4 with increased risk of local recurrence, any recurrence or death in this cohort where most patients
5 had achieved clear margins and had had aRT of the tumor bed. Residual microscopic tumor,
6 mostly found on deep margins, remained associated with prognosis. These findings highlight the
7 necessity of extending the surgery down to the underlying fascia and would support re-excisions
8 of positive margins when feasible.

9

1

2 **References**

- 3 [1] Stang A, Becker JC, Nghiem P, Ferlay J. The association between geographic location and incidence of
4 Merkel cell carcinoma in comparison to melanoma: An international assessment. *Eur J Cancer*
5 2018;94:47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2018.02.003>.
- 6 [2] Allen PJ, Bowne WB, Jaques DP, Brennan MF, Busam K, Coit DG. Merkel Cell Carcinoma: Prognosis and
7 Treatment of Patients From a Single Institution. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:2300–9.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2005.02.329>.
- 9 [3] Bichakjian CK, Olencki T, Aasi SZ, Alam M, Andersen JS, Blitzblau R, et al. Merkel Cell Carcinoma,
10 Version 1.2018, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2018;16:742–
11 74. <https://doi.org/10.6004/jnccn.2018.0055>.
- 12 [4] Lebbe C, Becker JC, Grob J-J, Malvehy J, del Marmol V, Pehamberger H, et al. Diagnosis and treatment
13 of Merkel Cell Carcinoma. European consensus-based interdisciplinary guideline. *Eur J Cancer*
14 2015;51:2396–403. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2015.06.131>.
- 15 [5] Harms KL, Healy MA, Nghiem P, Sober AJ, Johnson TM, Bichakjian CK, et al. Analysis of Prognostic
16 Factors from 9387 Merkel Cell Carcinoma Cases Forms the Basis for the New 8th Edition AJCC Staging
17 System. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2016;23:3564–71. <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-016-5266-4>.
- 18 [6] Boccara O, Girard C, Mortier L, Bens G, Saiag P, Guillot B. Recommandations du groupe de cancérologie
19 cutanée de la Société française de dermatologie pour la prise en charge diagnostique et thérapeutique
20 du carcinome à cellules de Merkel. *Ann Dermatol Vénéréologie* 2011;138:475–82.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annder.2011.01.029>.
- 22 [7] Becker JC, Eigentler T, Frerich B, Gambichler T, Grabbe S, Höller U, et al. S2k guidelines for Merkel cell
23 carcinoma (MCC, neuroendocrine carcinoma of the skin) – update 2018. *JDDG J Dtsch Dermatol Ges*
24 2019;17:562–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ddg.13841>.
- 25 [8] Yiengpruksawan A. Merkel Cell Carcinoma: Prognosis and Management. *Arch Surg* 1991;126:1514.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1001/archsurg.1991.01410360088014>.
- 27 [9] Kokoska ER, Kokoska MS, Collins BT, Stapleton DR, Wade TP. Early aggressive treatment for Merkel cell
28 carcinoma improves outcome. *Am J Surg* 1997;174:688–93. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9610\(97\)00193-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0002-9610(97)00193-1).
- 29 [10] Ott MJ, Tanabe KK, Gadd MA, Stark P, Smith BL, Finkelstein DM, et al. Multimodality Management of
30 Merkel Cell Carcinoma. *ARCH SURG* 1999;134:6.
- 31 [11] Dancey AL, Rayatt SS, Soon C, Ilchshyn A, Brown I, Srivastava S. Merkel cell carcinoma: a report of 34
32 cases and literature review. *J Plast Reconstr Aesthet Surg* 2006;59:1294–9.
33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjps.2006.03.044>.
- 34 [12] Fields RC, Busam KJ, Chou JF, Panageas KS, Pulitzer MP, Allen PJ, et al. Recurrence after complete
35 resection and selective use of adjuvant therapy for stage I through III Merkel cell carcinoma:
36 Recurrence in Merkel Cell Carcinoma. *Cancer* 2012;118:3311–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.26626>.
- 37 [13] Strom T, Naghavi AO, Messina JL, Kim S, Torres-Roca JF, Russell J, et al. Improved local and regional
38 control with radiotherapy for Merkel cell carcinoma of the head and neck: Improved local and regional
39 control for Merkel cell carcinoma. *Head Neck* 2017;39:48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hed.24527>.
- 40 [14] Boyer JD, Zitelli JA, Brodland DG, D'Angelo G. Local control of primary Merkel cell carcinoma: Review of
41 45 cases treated with Mohs micrographic surgery with and without adjuvant radiation. *J Am Acad*
42 *Dermatol* 2002;47:885–92. <https://doi.org/10.1067/mjd.2002.125083>.
- 43 [15] Han AY, Patel PB, Anderson M, Diaz MFP, Chin R, St. John MA. Adjuvant radiation therapy improves
44 patient survival in early-stage merkel cell carcinoma: A 15-year single-institution study. *The*
45 *Laryngoscope* 2018;128:1862–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.27031>.
- 46 [16] Decker RH, Wilson LD. Role of Radiotherapy in the Management of Merkel Cell Carcinoma of the Skin. *J*
47 *Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2006;4:713–8. <https://doi.org/10.6004/jnccn.2006.0061>.
- 48 [17] Harrington C, Kwan W. Radiotherapy and Conservative Surgery in the Locoregional Management of
49 Merkel Cell Carcinoma: The British Columbia Cancer Agency Experience. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2016;23:573–
50 8. <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-015-4812-9>.
- 51 [18] Yan L, Sun L, Guan Z, Wei S, Wang Y, Li P. Analysis of cutaneous Merkel cell carcinoma outcomes after
52

- 1 different surgical interventions. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2020;82:1422–34.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2018.10.001>.
- 3 [19] Perez MC, de Pinho FR, Holstein A, Oliver DE, Naqvi SMH, Kim Y, et al. Resection Margins in Merkel Cell
4 Carcinoma: Is a 1-cm Margin Wide Enough? *Ann Surg Oncol* 2018;25:3334–40.
5 <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-018-6688-y>.
- 6 [20] Kukko H, Böhling T, Koljonen V, Tukiainen E, Haglund C, Pokhrel A, et al. Merkel cell carcinoma – A
7 population-based epidemiological study in Finland with a clinical series of 181 cases. *Eur J Cancer*
8 2012;48:737–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2011.06.001>.
- 9 [21] Sattler E, Geimer T, Sick I, Flaig MJ, Ruzicka T, Berking C, et al. Sentinel lymph node in Merkel cell
10 carcinoma: To biopsy or not to biopsy? *J Dermatol* 2013;40:374–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1346-8138.12072>.
- 11 [22] Tarabardkar ES, Fu T, Lachance K, Hippe DS, Pulliam T, Thomas H, et al. Narrow excision margins are
12 appropriate for Merkel cell carcinoma when combined with adjuvant radiation: Analysis of 188 cases of
13 localized disease and proposed management algorithm. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2020.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2020.07.079>.
- 15 [23] Gillenwater. Merkel Cell Carcinoma of the Head and Neck: Effect of Surgical Excision and Radiation on
16 Recurrence and Survival. *ARCH OTOLARYNGOL HEAD NECK SURG* 2001;127:6.
- 17 [24] Frohm ML, Griffith KA, Harms KL, Hayman JA, Fullen DR, Nelson CC, et al. Recurrence and Survival in
18 Patients With Merkel Cell Carcinoma Undergoing Surgery Without Adjuvant Radiation Therapy to the
19 Primary Site. *JAMA Dermatol* 2016;152:1001. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamadermatol.2016.1428>.
- 20 [25] Samimi M, Molet L, Fleury M, Laude H, Carlotti A, Gardair C, et al. Prognostic value of antibodies to
21 Merkel cell polyomavirus T antigens and VP1 protein in patients with Merkel cell carcinoma. *Br J*
22 *Dermatol* 2016;174:813–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjd.14313>.
- 23 [26] Kervarrec T, Zaragoza J, Gaboriaud P, Le Gouge A, Beby-Defaux A, Le Corre Y, et al. Differentiating
24 Merkel cell carcinoma of lymph nodes without a detectable primary skin tumor from other metastatic
25 neuroendocrine carcinomas: The ELECTHIP criteria. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 2018;78:964-972.e3.
26 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2017.11.037>.
- 27 [27] Paulson KG, Iyer JG, Blom A, Warton EM, Sokil M, Yelistratova L, et al. Systemic Immune Suppression
28 Predicts Diminished Merkel Cell Carcinoma–Specific Survival Independent of Stage. *J Invest Dermatol*
29 2013;133:642–6. <https://doi.org/10.1038/jid.2012.388>.
- 30 [28] Petrelli F, Ghidini A, Torchio M, Prinzi N, Trevisan F, Dallera P, et al. Adjuvant radiotherapy for Merkel
31 cell carcinoma: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Radiother Oncol* 2019;134:211–9.
32 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2019.02.015>.
- 33 [29] Bhatia S, Storer BE, Iyer JG, Moshiri A, Parvathaneni U, Byrd D, et al. Adjuvant Radiation Therapy and
34 Chemotherapy in Merkel Cell Carcinoma: Survival Analyses of 6908 Cases From the National Cancer
35 Data Base. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2016;108:djw042. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djw042>.
- 36 [30] Ellis DL, Davis RS. Evidence-based management of primary and localized Merkel cell carcinoma: a
37 review. *Int J Dermatol* 2013;52:1248–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijd.12091>.
- 38
39
40

1 **Tables.**2 **Table I. Clinical characteristics, surgical and radiotherapy outcome of the 214**
3 **patients, according to surgical margins of the primary tumor.**

4

	All (N,%)	Margins ≤ 1cm (N,%) (n=58)	Margins > 1cm (N,%) (n=156)	<i>P-value</i> (Fisher's exact test)
Age (N, %)				0.020
<77.6 years	105 (49.1)	21 (36.2)	84 (53.8)	
≥77.6 years	109 (50.9)	37 (63.8)	72 (46.2)	
Sex (N, %)				0.010
Female	121 (56.5)	41 (70.7)	80 (51.3)	
Male	93 (43.5)	17 (29.3)	76 (48.7)	
Primary location (N, %)				0.001
Head and neck	77 (36)	32 (55.2)	45 (28.8)	
Limb	109 (50.9)	23 (39.6)	86 (55.1)	
Trunk	28 (13.1)	3 (5.2)	25 (16.1)	
AJCC stage (N, %)				NS
I	97 (45.3)	34 (58.6)	63 (40.4)	
II	69 (32.3)	12 (20.7)	57 (36.5)	
III	48 (22.4)	12 (20.7)	36 (23.1)	
Immunosuppression (N,%)				0.018
Present	28 (13.1)	13 (22.4)	15 (9.6)	
Absent	1860 (86.9)	45 (77.6)	141 (90.4)	
Performance Status (N, %)				NS
0-1	191 (89.2)	54 (93.1)	137 (87.8)	
2-3	16 (7.5)	4 (6.9)	12 (7.7)	
Unknown	7 (3.3)	0 (0)	7 (4.5)	
Type of surgery (N,%)				NS
WLE only	101 (47.2)	30 (51.7)	71 (45.5)	
Graft	67 (31.3)	13 (22.4)	54 (34.6)	
Flap	38 (17.8)	12 (20.7)	26 (16.7)	
Flap and Graft	8 (3.7)	3 (5.2)	5 (3.2)	
Margins status (N, %)				NS
Negative	198 (92.5)	54 (93.1)	144 (92.3)	
Positive	15 (7)	4 (6.9)	11 (7.1)	
Unknown	1 (0.5)	0 (0)	1 (0.6)	
Sentinel lymph node biopsy(*) (N,%)				NS
Done	69 (38.3)	20 (40.8)	49 (37.4)	
Not done	111 (61.7)	29 (59.2)	82 (62.6)	
Adjuvant radiotherapy (N,%)				NS
Done, primary bed only	86 (40.2)	29 (50)	57 (36.5)	
Done, node area only	3 (1.4)	0 (0)	3 (1.9)	
Done, primary bed and node area	76 (35.5)	19 (32.8)	57 (36.5)	
Done, location unknown	4 (1.9)	0 (0)	4 (2.7)	
Not done	45 (21)	10 (17.2)	35 (22.4)	
Delay before radiation therapy (median Q1-Q3) (weeks)	8 (6-12)	8 (6-12)	8 (6-12)	NS

5

6 (*) Data provided for the 180 patients who had no evidence of macrometastases at baseline

Table II. Univariate and multivariate Cox proportional hazard analysis for death and recurrence from MCC

Covariate	Death		from		MCC recurrence			
	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis		Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
	HR (95% CI)	p	aHR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p	aHR (95% CI)	p
Sex								
male vs female	1.75 (0.93-3.28)	0.08	2.01 (1.03-3.95)	0.04	1.83 (1.15-2.92)	0.01	1.93 (1.18-3.18)	0.09
Age								
< 77.6 versus ≥ 77.6	1.55 (0.82-2.91)	0.17	1.50 (0.72-3.15)	0.28	1.57 (0.98-2.51)	0.06	1.67 (0.99-2.80)	0.052
AJCC								
II versus I	3.68 (1.66-8.16)	0.001	2.29 (0.94-5.55)	0.07	1.90 (1.11-3.24)	0.01	1.32 (0.72-2.42)	0.38
III versus I	3.03 (1.28-7.19)	0.012	2.87 (1.18-6.97)	0.02	1.65 (0.90-3.02)	0.10	1.66 (0.87-3.05)	0.12
Immunosuppression								
yes versus no	1.32 (0.55-3.13)	0.054	0.86 (0.29-2.49)	0.78	1.09 (0.56-2.12)	0.80	0.87 (0.41-1.85)	0.72
Performance status								
0-1 versus 2-3	2.06 (0.80-5.30)	0.13	1.95 (0.69-5.49)	0.20	1.19 (0.51-1.52)	0.65	1.03 (0.43-2.47)	0.95
Margins size								
≤ 1cm versus > 1cm	0.90 (0.41-1.95)	0.78	1.06 (0.45-2.47)	0.90	0.95 (0.54-1.66)	0.85	1.10 (0.60-2.02)	0.74
Adjuvant radiotherapy								
yes versus no	1.31 (0.58-2.95)	0.52	1.47 (0.63- 3.42)	0.37	0.88 (0.51-1.52)	0.65	0.89 (0.51-1.56)	0.70
Margins status								
positive versus negative	5.83 (2.56-13.34)	< 0.0001	6.51 (2.37-17.91)	0.0003	3.28 (1.67-6.46)	0.001	3.54 (1.63-7.70)	0.01

HR, Hazard Ratio; aHR, adjusted HR ; CI, confidence interval; MCC, Merkel cell carcinoma

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Flow chart diagram. Of the 357 patients included in the cohort, 214 patients had wide local excision of primary tumor with minimal margins of 0.5cm, and curative treatment of nodal disease when indicated.

Figure 2. MCC-specific survival, according to surgical margins (≤ 1 cm versus > 1 cm) of the primary tumor.

Figure 3. Recurrence-free survival, according to surgical margins (≤ 1 cm versus > 1 cm) of the primary tumor.

**357 patients with Merkel Cell Carcinoma diagnosis included in the cohort
between 1998 and 2019**

112 patients excluded:

- No surgery of primary tumor (n=33) : regression of primary tumour (n=2), occult primary (n=22), exclusive radiotherapy (n=9)
- Stage IV AJCC (n=24)
- Two concomitant MCC primary tumors (n=1)
- Missing data at baseline and/or lost to follow up (n=54)

**245 MCC patients who had surgery of a primary MCC tumor
(local disease, n=187 ; nodal disease, n=58)**

31 patients excluded:

- Surgical margins < 0.5cm (n=19)
- No treatment of nodal disease (n=7)
- Rapid progression of disease before treatment is completed (n=5)


**214 MCC patients who had WLE of primary tumor
and curative treatment of nodal disease when indicated
(local disease, n=166 ; nodal disease, n=48)**

**58 MCC patients treated with
narrow margins ≤ 1 cm**

**16 recurrences
15 deaths (8 from MCC)**


**156 MCC patients treated with
wide margins >1cm**

**56 recurrences
61 deaths (32 from MCC)**



Nb at risk

Margins ≤ 1cm	58	30	11	5	2	2	2	1					
Margins > 1cm	156	103	64	45	21	11	7	6	4	3	2	2	1



Nb at risk

Margins \leq 1cm	58	24	9	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Margins $>$ 1cm	156	85	52	37	20	11	7	5	4	3	2	2	1