

correspondence

The influence of anaesthesia on cancer growth

Publish: March 1st, 2024.

Radiol Oncol 2024; 58(1): 9-14.

doi: 10.2478/raon-2024-0012

Radiol Oncol 2024; 58(2): 311-312.

To the editor

I read with a great interest the review recently published in Radiology and Oncology by Potocnik et al.¹ Upon examination, I have identified a critical discrepancy between the review's main text and the cited meta-analysis² results, which seems to have led to a significant misunderstanding in the presentation of the findings.

The review states that in a recent meta-analysis², patients with breast, esophageal, or non-small cell lung cancer had improved recurrence-free survival after receiving volatile anesthesia (VA) and that overall survival was longer after VA than after total intravenous anesthesia (TIVA). This statement contradicts the findings of the cited meta-analysis, which actually shows that TIVA is associated with improved outcomes both in terms of recurrence-free survival (pooled Hazard Ratio [HR], 0.78; 95% Confidence Interval [CI], 0.65 to 0.94; $P < 0.01$) and overall survival (pooled HR, 0.76; 95% CI, 0.63 to 0.92; $P < 0.01$) across several cancer types, including breast, esophageal, colorectal, gastric, and non-small cell lung cancer.

Interestingly, the conclusion section of the review correctly highlights the potential anti-inflammatory, antioxidant, and possibly antitumor effects of propofol (a common TIVA agent) compared to the proinflammatory effects of volatile anesthetics, which could accelerate metastasis. This conclusion aligns with the meta-analysis findings that favor TIVA over VA, suggesting a potential oversight or error in the review's main text.

Given the significance of these findings for clinical practice and the potential impact on patient care, I believe a clarification and correction of the discrepancy in the review's main text is crucial. Accurate representation of the meta-analysis results is essential for guiding future research and clinical decisions regarding anesthesia choice in cancer surgery.

Muhammet Selman Söğüt, M.D.

Koç University Hospital, Istanbul/Turkey

E-mail: ssogut@kuh.ku.edu.tr.

Notes

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this letter was report.

References

1. Potocnik I; Kerin-Povsic M, Markovic-Bozic J. The influence of anaesthetic technique on cancer growth. *Radiol Oncol* 2024; **58(1)**: 9–14. Available at: <https://www.radioloncol.com/index.php/ro/article/view/4210>
2. Yap A, Lopez-Olivo MA, Dubowitz J, Hiller J, Riedel B; Global OncoAnesthesia Research Collaboration Group. Anesthetic technique and cancer outcomes: a meta-analysis of total intravenous versus volatile anesthesia. *Can J Anaesth* 2019; 66: 546-61. doi: 10.1007/s12630-019-01330-x

Responses

The authors reply

While reviewing the article¹, we realised that we had made a mistake. Instead of VIMA, we should have written TIVA. Please, accept our apology. In the article, we also cited studies that concluded that volatile anaesthetics have anti-inflammatory action and so might act anti carcinogenic.²⁻⁶ In the conclusion we also wrote that this area is still quite unexplored and that studies have led to very controversial results. Regarding that please, find enclosed an additional reference of Wang J *et al.*⁷, who proved that volatile anaesthetics have a role in the anti-cancer relevant signalling. Therefore, above mentioned mistake luckily did not have an effect on the message of the article.

Assist. Prof. Iztok Potocnik, M.D., Ph.D.

Institute of Oncology Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

E-mail: vpotocnik@onko-i.si

Prof. Jasmina Markovic-Bozic, M.D., Ph.D.

University Clinical Centre Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia

E-mail: jasmina.markovicbozic@mf.uni-lj.si

Notes

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this letter was report.

References

1. Potocnik I; Kerin-Povsic M, Markovic-Bozic J. The influence of anaesthetic technique on cancer growth. *Radiol Oncol* 2024; **58**(1): 9–14. Available at: <https://www.radiol Oncol.com/index.php/ro/article/view/4210>
2. El Azab SR, Rosseel PM, De Lange JJ, van Wijk EM, van Strik R, Scheffer GJ. Effect of VIMA with sevoflurane versus TIVA with propofol or midazolamsufentanil on the cytokine response during CABG surgery. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2002; **19**: 276–82. doi: 10.1017/s0265021502000443 41
3. Minou AF, Dzyadzko AM, Shcherba AE, Rummo OO. The influence of pharmacological preconditioning with sevoflurane on incidence of early allograft dysfunction in liver transplant recipients. *Anesthesiol Res Pract* 2012; **2012**: 930487. doi: 10.1155/2012/930487 42
4. Jerin A, Pozar-Lukanovic N, Sojar V, Stanisavljevic D, Paver-Erzen V, Osredkar J. Balance of pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines in liver surgery. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2003; **41**: 899–903. doi: 10.1515/CCLM.2003.136 43
5. Jabaudon M, Zhai R, Blondonnet R, Bonda WLM. Inhaled sedation in the intensive care unit. *Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med* 2022; **41**: 101133. doi: 10.1016/j.accpm.2022.101133 44
6. Song Z, Tan J. Effects of anesthesia and anesthetic techniques on metastasis of lung cancers: a narrative review. *Cancer Manag Res* 2022; **14**: 189–204. doi: 10.2147/CMAR.S343772 45
7. Oh CS, Park HJ, Piao L, Sohn KM, Koh SE, Hwang DY, et al. Expression profiles of immune cells after propofol or sevoflurane anesthesia for colorectal cancer surgery: a prospective double-blind randomized trial. *Anesthesiology* 2022; **136**: 448–58. doi: 10.1097/ALN.0000000000004119
8. Wang J, Cheng CS, Lu Y, Sun S, Huang S. Volatile anesthetics regulate anti-cancer relevant signalling. *Front Oncol* 2021; **26**: 11: 610514. doi: 10.3389/fonc.2021.610514