

## Current oncologic applications of radiofrequency ablation therapies

Dhruvil R Shah, Sari Green, Angelina Elliot, John P McGahan, Vijay P Khatri

Dhruvil R Shah, Angelina Elliot, Vijay P Khatri, Division of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, University of California Davis, Sacramento, CA 95815, United States

Sari Green, Department of Surgery, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Torrance, CA 90502, United States

John P McGahan, Department of Radiology, University of California Davis, Sacramento, CA 95815, United States

**Author contributions:** Shah DR analyzed the data and wrote the paper; Green S performed the background research and created a portion of the tables for the paper; Elliot A performed the background research and created a portion of the tables for the paper; McGahan JP critically reviewed the manuscript; Khatri VP designed the research and critically revised it.

**Correspondence to:** Vijay P Khatri, MBChB, FACS, Professor of Surgery, Division of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, University of California, 4501 X Street, Sacramento, CA 95817, United States. [vijay.khatri@ucdmc.ucdavis.edu](mailto:vijay.khatri@ucdmc.ucdavis.edu)

Telephone: +1-916-7342172 Fax: +1-916-7035267

Received: February 1, 2013 Revised: March 10, 2013

Accepted: March 15, 2013

Published online: April 15, 2013

### Abstract

Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) uses high frequency alternating current to heat a volume of tissue around a needle electrode to induce focal coagulative necrosis with minimal injury to surrounding tissues. RFA can be performed *via* an open, laparoscopic, or image guided percutaneous approach and be performed under general or local anesthesia. Advances in delivery mechanisms, electrode designs, and higher power generators have increased the maximum volume that can be ablated, while maximizing oncological outcomes. In general, RFA is used to control local tumor growth, prevent recurrence, palliate symptoms, and improve survival in a subset of patients that are not candidates for surgical resection. It's equivalence to surgical resection has yet to be proven in large randomized control trials. Currently, the use of RFA has been well described as a

primary or adjuvant treatment modality of limited but unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma, liver metastasis, especially colorectal cancer metastases, primary lung tumors, renal cell carcinoma, boney metastasis and osteoid osteomas. The role of RFA in the primary treatment of early stage breast cancer is still evolving. This review will discuss the general features of RFA and outline its role in commonly encountered solid tumors.

© 2013 Baishideng. All rights reserved.

**Key words:** Radiofrequency ablation; Hepatocellular carcinoma; Colorectal cancer liver metastasis; Lung cancer; Renal cell carcinoma

**Core tip:** We have described the technical aspects of radiofrequency ablation (RFA), advances in delivery mechanisms, indications for usage, and its equivalence or lack of equivalence to surgical resection. We emphasized studies that reported long term oncologic outcomes associated with RFA use for primary and metastatic liver and lung tumors, and described the evolving role of RFA for breast and solid renal tumors.

Shah DR, Green S, Elliot A, McGahan JP, Khatri VP. Current oncologic applications of radiofrequency ablation therapies. *World J Gastrointest Oncol* 2012; 5(4): 71-80 Available from: URL: <http://www.wjgnet.com/1948-5204/full/v5/i4/71.htm> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4251/wjgo.v5.i4.71>

### INTRODUCTION

Surgical resection of all malignant cells remains the gold standard for treatment of most solid tumors<sup>[1]</sup>. However, surgical resection is not always an option in patients with coexistent morbidities or poor functional status where

resection would be associated with a high morbidity and mortality. As a result, a variety of local ablative methods, including chemical (ethanol, acetic acid, hot saline) and thermal (radiofrequency ablation, microwave ablation, laser ablation, cryoablation), have been developed to destroy cancer cells *in situ*. Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) has risen to the forefront amongst these local ablative modalities due to refinements in technology that maximize effectiveness and simplicity of use while minimizing associated morbidity. RFA is now used in the treatment, both curative and palliative, for solid tumors throughout the body. This minimally invasive technique can serve both as treatment for patients who are not surgical candidates, as well as an adjunct to surgery, facilitating resection or in combination with surgery achieving total tumor burden control.

## TECHNICAL FEATURES OF RFA

RFA uses radiowaves, which are of low frequency (460–480 kHz) and long wavelength, to generate heat within a tumor mass causing thermal coagulative necrosis. RFA differs from other local methods in that the electrode itself does not supply the heat. Needle electrodes supply an alternating electric current, which travels from the electrode to a grounding pad (monopolar) or between two electrodes (bipolar). As the ions within the tissue attempt to follow the alternating path of the current, ionic agitation creates frictional heat. This friction heats the surrounding tissue to 50–100 °C, inducing instantaneous coagulative necrosis. Temperatures greater than 100 °C result in tissue desiccation and charring with loss of ions thus stopping current flow. This leads to a sudden rise of impedance<sup>[2]</sup>, thus limiting the volume of tissue that can be successfully ablated.

The energy from the electrode tip produces a temperature that is proportional to the square of the radiofrequency current, which in turn decreases as the square of the diameter from the electrode<sup>[2]</sup>. Larger tumors require overlapping spheres, which increases the risk of incomplete necrosis and, therefore, local recurrence. Over the past several years, advances in delivery mechanisms that can either increase the amount of energy deposited or the conduction of heat through the tissue have increased the sphere of tissue that can be ablated<sup>[3]</sup>. There are currently five companies that produce commercially available RFA systems, four of which are approved by the Food and Drug Administration and available in the United States<sup>[4]</sup>. The specifications of each system are presented in Table 1.

Multiprobe array electrodes, in which multiple tines apply current simultaneously, achieve coagulation zones of 3–5 cm. Internally cooled (or cool-tip) electrodes also allow for greater ablation volumes. While it seems paradoxical to cool the electrode with a continuous infusion of fluid within the lumen, this cooling results in no local charring around the uninsulated electrode tip, thus allow-

ing longer flow of current. Longer duration of current flow allows for a larger volume of local tissue coagulation, compared to non-internally cooled electrodes. Wet electrodes using saline (either isotonic or hypertonic) infused through the electrode into surrounding tissue, increase conductivity with greater amounts of infusion of ions in the tissue, increasing current flow and thus allowing longer duration of current flow and increasing volume of coagulation.

Several strategies have been developed to decrease tumor tolerance to heat and increase the effectiveness of thermal ablative techniques. The “heat-sink” effect created by proximity of tumors to large vessels that can dissipate heat is a primary mechanism by which the extent of thermal injury can be limited<sup>[5,6]</sup>. The Pringle maneuver, which involves occluding portal inflow during open RFA. This has been shown to improve volume of tissue (tumor) coagulation by increasing local heat deposition, rather than having heat being dissipated in the portal vein<sup>[6,7]</sup>. Tissue damage from chemotherapy and hypoxic injury to tumors cells from embolization have also been shown to increase tumor sensitivity to hyperthermia. A synergistic effect between neoadjuvant transarterial chemoembolization and RFA in the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma has also been demonstrated<sup>[7]</sup>.

### RFA technique

RFA can be performed percutaneously, or during laparoscopic or open surgery. There are advantages and disadvantages to each, and the approach will depend on the condition of the patient, tumor characteristics such as location, size, number and growth pattern, and experience and preference of the provider<sup>[8]</sup>. There is insufficient evidence as of date indicating which delivery method is the preferred due to a lack of randomized control trials and varying patient and tumor characteristics between single technique studies. In a study comparing open, laparoscopic, and percutaneous approaches for liver tumors, there was no difference in mortality, major complications, or overall survival; but open compared to percutaneous approach resulted in improved disease free survival and decreased local tumor recurrence<sup>[9]</sup>.

The percutaneous approach has the advantage of being performed under conscious or deep sedation, providing an option for patients who are higher surgical risk. This can usually be done as an outpatient or with a very short hospital stay, and can be performed multiple times if needed. The percutaneous approach can also be performed under anesthesia. Other advantages of this technique are the use of sonographic, computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to guide precise electrode placement. At the same setting, contrast enhanced sonography or contrast enhanced CT can be done during the procedure to check for adequacy of ablation. Disadvantages of the percutaneous technique are lack of visualization of small surface tumors or deeper tumors which can be better identified with the

**Table 1** Radiofrequency ablation systems commercially available in the United States<sup>[4,8]</sup>

RFA system	Electrodes	Generator power/ frequency	Control system	Algorithm used to maximize volumes
Boston scientific	14 gauge, 10-12 tines, umbrella shaped	200 W/460 kHz	Impedance controlled	Coaxial system
Valleylab (radionics)	17.5 gauge, single cooled needle or three cooled needles in triangular cluster	200 W/480 kHz	Impedance controlled	Cool-tip
RITA medical systems		250 W/460 kHz	Temperature controlled	
Starburst XL	14 gauge, 9 tines, Christmas tree shape max diameter 5 cm			Expandable
Starburst XLi	14 gauge, 9 tines, max diameter 7 cm			
Starburst Flex	13 gauge, flexible			Expandable, wet electrode
Berchtold	18-14 gauge	60 W/375 kHz	Impedance or temperature controlled	Wet electrode

Modified from<sup>[48]</sup>. Cool-tip: Cooled electrode achieved with chilled water flowing through electrode but not entering tissue; Wet-electrode: Saline infusion into tissue adjacent to electrode creates larger "virtual" electrode around metal electrode tip.

open technique. Percutaneous RFA has shown excellent results for small < 3 cm neoplasms in the liver, lung or kidney. However, higher local recurrence has been shown with the percutaneous approach for larger tumors<sup>[10]</sup> and tumors in close proximity to major vessels, such as the portal vein.

Open RFA allows for better visualization and the ability to manipulate adjacent structures. It has the advantage of being able to detect occult metastatic disease with use of intra-operative ultrasound (US) and allows for treatment within a greater anatomic range. With hepatic RFA, another advantage is the ability to occlude portal inflow (Pringle maneuver) which, as described above, reduces heat dissipation and, therefore, increases the volume of tissue ablated. This technique is particularly valuable when tumors are located in proximity to vascular structures.

Laparoscopic RFA combines many of the benefits of both the percutaneous and open approaches. It is minimally invasive with less morbidity of a large incision while still allowing better visualization of the tumor and of adjacent structures to optimize staging. Pneumoperitoneum may also work in a similar manner to the Pringle maneuver and decrease the heat sink effect in tumors in proximity to large vessels by decreasing portal flow<sup>[11]</sup>. It also allows resection or displacement of structures adjacent to tumors that cannot be performed with the percutaneous technique.

### Imaging

Imaging plays an important role in the diagnosis and localization of the tumor, in real-time monitoring of the ablation zone, in assessment of tissue response to RFA therapy, and finally in patient follow-up. The RF probe is usually placed under CT or US guidance, and the RFA procedure monitored with real-time US. Ablation zones are seen on US as hyperechogenic areas which represent microbubbles created from the vaporization of interstitial fluid from ablated tissue. However, these hyperechogenic areas do not completely parallel the ablated zone. To determine the extent of necrosis following RFA in countries outside of the United States, US con-

trast is used at the time of the procedure to check for complete ablation and whether re-treatment is needed at the setting<sup>[12]</sup>. In the United States, a follow-up contrast-enhanced CT or MR is typically used, with successfully ablated areas failing to enhance. A thin enhancing rim representing either inflammation or hemorrhagic granulation tissue may surround the ablated zone for several weeks following treatment<sup>[13]</sup>. Follow-up may be done with CT, MRI or positron emission tomography scan, depending on the type, size and location of tumor.

The goal of RFA is usually to ablate 1 cm margin of normal tissue surrounding the tumor on all sides<sup>[8,14,15]</sup>. This surgical margin is necessary because of the difficulty of accurately determining the extent of the coagulation zone, and because of the possibility of microscopic malignancy surrounding the gross tumor<sup>[8]</sup>. Exceptions to the 1 cm margin rule may include organs such as the kidney, in which preservation of normal renal parenchyma would be a priority, or when tumor debulking for palliation or relief of neuroendocrine symptoms is the goal of treatment or when surrounding vital structures limit the extent of ablation.

### Complications

RFA has been shown to be a relatively safe procedure, with mortality between 0.3% and 0.8% and morbidity 2% and 10%<sup>[16,17]</sup>. Complications include post-procedural pain, post-RFA syndrome with fever and flu-like symptoms that usually resolves within the first 24 h, skin burns from improperly placed grounding pads, thermal injury to adjacent structures, bleeding, secondary infection, and tumor seeding, which can be prevented by cauterization of the needle tract on withdrawal of the probe<sup>[8]</sup>.

## SOLID TUMOR ABLATIVE EXPERIENCE

### Liver

The most extensive body of literature on RFA for the treatment of solid tumors involves its use with hepatic malignancies, both primary and metastatic. Currently, RFA is considered a first line treatment modality for local control of hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with

**Table 2 Studies reporting survival after use of radiofrequency ablation for colorectal liver metastases**

Ref.	Patients (tumors) <i>n</i>	Median tumor size (cm)	Extra-hepatic disease	Chemotherapy	Method	% complete ablation	Local recurrence	Overall survival		
								1 yr	3 yr	5 yr
Abdalla <i>et al</i> <sup>[26]</sup>	57 (110) for RFA 190 for HR 101 for RFA + HR	2.5	No	NR	0	NR	9% for RFA 5% for HR + RFA 2% for HR	NR	37% for RFA 43% for HR + RFA 73% for HR	NR
Siperstein <i>et al</i> <sup>[27]</sup>	234 (665)	3.9 (mean)	Yes	80% before RFA	L	NR	NR	NR	20% <sup>2</sup>	18% <sup>2</sup>
Park <i>et al</i> <sup>[28]</sup>	30 for RFA 59 for HR	2.0 for RFA 3.1 for HR	No	73% after RFA 81% after HR	P	NR	23% for RFA 2% for HR	NR	NR	19% <sup>2</sup> for RF1 48% <sup>2</sup> for HR
Abitabile <i>et al</i> <sup>[54]</sup>	47 (147)	2	Yes	After RFA	O, P	97%	9% for overall 0%-5% for < 3 cm	88% <sup>1</sup>	57% <sup>1</sup>	21% <sup>1</sup>
Gillams <i>et al</i> <sup>[55]</sup>	167 (167)	3.9 (mean)	Yes	80% before RFA	P	NR	14.00%	99% <sup>1</sup> 91% <sup>2</sup>	58% <sup>1</sup> 28% <sup>2</sup>	30% <sup>1</sup> 25% <sup>2</sup>
Jakobs <i>et al</i> <sup>[56]</sup>	68 (183)	2.28 (mean)	No	78% parallel or after	P	NR	18.00%	96% <sup>2</sup>	71% <sup>2</sup>	
Machi <i>et al</i> <sup>[57]</sup>	100 (507)	3.0 (mean)	NR		O, L, P		7%	90%	42%	31%
Schindera <i>et al</i> <sup>[58]</sup>	14 (20)	1.8	No	NR	P	89%	15%	72% <sup>2</sup>	60% <sup>2</sup>	NR
White <i>et al</i> <sup>[59]</sup>	30 (56)	3.0 (0.8-7)	No	36% before, 50% after	P	89%	17%	75% <sup>2</sup>	45% <sup>2</sup>	NR
Solbiati <i>et al</i> <sup>[60]</sup>	117 (179)	2.6	Yes	72% parallel	P	98%	39%	93% <sup>2</sup>	46% <sup>2</sup>	NR

<sup>1</sup>Calculated from time of diagnosis of liver metastases; <sup>2</sup>Calculated after radiofrequency ablation (RFA) treatment of liver metastases. P, L, O: Percutaneous, laparoscopic, open; NR: Not reported; HR: Hazard ratio.

Child-Pugh B or higher cirrhosis where resection would have a higher associated mortality. It is indicated in patients with 3 or fewer tumors that are 3 cm or smaller (Milan criteria)<sup>[18]</sup>. It has recently been shown to be superior to percutaneous ethanol injection with regards to survival and local recurrence<sup>[19]</sup>. It's equivalence to surgical resection in patients who satisfy the Milan criteria remains controversial. A prospective randomized trial and a large retrospective analysis comparing local ablative techniques with surgical resection for patients with small solitary tumors, stage T1, found no difference in overall survival between RFA and surgical resection<sup>[20-22]</sup>. Smaller observational studies have demonstrated similar results<sup>[11]</sup>. A meta-analysis comparing RFA to hepatic resection in all subsets of patients found improved 3 and 5 year overall and disease free survival and decreased local recurrence in patients who underwent hepatic resection<sup>[23]</sup>. However, in patients with tumors smaller than 3 cm, the overall survival was comparable. In patients with larger tumors (> 3 cm), the combination of chemoembolization with RFA has been demonstrated to be superior to RFA alone in improving survival<sup>[24,25]</sup>. This is based on the hypothesis that RFA results in a zone of inflammation that can then be strategically used for targeted delivery of chemotherapeutic agents *via* chemoembolization.

The majority of the literature regarding hepatic metastases comes from single arm, retrospective or prospective studies evaluating RFA for treatment of unresectable colorectal metastases. In such studies, hepatic resection is superior to both RFA alone or combination of RFA with hepatic resection in regards to local recurrence and overall survival<sup>[26]</sup>. However, during open resection, ad-

ditional tumors may be detected on the liver surface or deep metastases may be seen with intra-operative US. These additional lesions can be resected or treated with intra-operative RFA. Randomized control trials directly comparing RFA to hepatic resection for resectable disease have yet to be performed.

There is considerable overlapping variability in the 5 year survival and the local recurrence rates due to differences in definition of local recurrence, inclusion criteria for unresectability, extent of extrahepatic disease, and patient and tumor characteristics between the studies. Local recurrence rates varied between 9% and 40% and 5 year overall survival varied between 18% and 30% (Table 2). The best outcomes were in patients with solitary tumors less than 3 cm and slightly less in patients with 3 or fewer tumors less than 3 cm<sup>[27]</sup>. Local recurrence was significantly larger in patients with tumors between 3-5 cm<sup>[20]</sup>. Retrospective studies comparing hepatic resection to RFA for patients who were potentially resectable but poor candidates for surgery due to co-morbidities or refusal, demonstrated decreased local recurrence and improved overall survival with hepatic resection<sup>[28]</sup>. Therefore it is evident that surgical resection remains the gold standard; but for those who are not candidates for surgery, an alternative such as RFA is valuable.

**Lung**

RFA is increasingly being applied to malignant lung nodules for local control as well as for palliation as its feasibility and efficacy is becoming more established in the literature. Surgical resection remains the gold standard for curative treatment of primary lung cancers and malignant metastasis. However, only about 30% of

**Table 3** Studies involving survival using radiofrequency ablation for primary lung tumors and metastases

Ref.	Patients (tumors) <i>n</i>	Mean tumor size (cm)	Tumor type	Median local progression free interval	Overall survival			Complications
					1 yr	2 yr	3 yr	
Ambroggi <i>et al</i> <sup>[11]</sup>	54 (64)	2.4	40 for NSCLC 24 for Mets	< 3 cm - 15.8 mo > 3 cm - 6.6 mo	72% for NSCLC <sup>1</sup> 88% for Met <sup>1</sup>	46% for NSCLC <sup>1</sup> 72% for Mets <sup>1</sup>	30% for NSCLC <sup>1</sup> NR for Mets <sup>1</sup>	6 for PTX 1 for chest wall hematoma
Kim <i>et al</i> <sup>[30]</sup>	8 for RFA 14 for SR	3.66 for RFA 3.99 for SR	All stage I NSCLC	NR	88% for RFA 93% for SR	50% for RFA 77% for SR	25% for RFA 67% for SR	1 for PTX 4 for hemoptysis
Simon <i>et al</i> <sup>[35]</sup>	153 (189)	2.7	75 for stage I NSCLC 57 for Mets	< 3 cm - 45 mo > 3 cm - 12 mo	78% for NSCLC 70% for Met	57% for NSCLC <sup>1</sup> 54% for Mets <sup>1</sup>	36% for NSCLC <sup>1</sup> 44% for Mets <sup>1</sup>	18 for PTX 5 for hemoptysis 4 for death
Chua <i>et al</i> <sup>[37]</sup>	148	4	108 for CRCM Other 40 for Mets	11 mo	NR	NR	60%	16 for pleural effusion 1 for vbleeding 27 for PTX 4 for effusion
Lencioni <i>et al</i> <sup>[61]</sup>	106 (183)	3.5	33 for NSCLC 73 for Mets	NR	70% for NSCLC 89% for CRCM 92% for Other	48% for NSCLC 66% for CRCM 64% for Other		16 for PTX/ 9 requiring drainage 5 for hemoptysis 13 for PTX/ 1 requiring drainage
Yan <i>et al</i> <sup>[62]</sup>	55	2.1	All CRCM	NR	85%	64%	46%	
Hiraki <i>et al</i> <sup>[63]</sup>	20	2.4	All stage I NSCLC	9 mo	90%	84%	74%	

<sup>1</sup>Calculated based on Kaplan-Meier survival curves. NR: Not reported; NSCLC: Non-small cell lung cancer; CRCM: Colorectal cancer metastasis; Mets: Other tumor metastases; PTX: Pneumothorax; SR: Surgical resection; RFA: Radiofrequency ablation.

patients with primary lung cancer are eligible for surgery at the time of diagnosis due to poor functional status and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease<sup>[29]</sup>. In patients with pulmonary metastasis, multiple lesions and advanced stage usually precludes curative surgical resection.

Currently, there is insufficient evidence to prove that RFA is comparable to surgical resection. There are currently no prospective randomized controlled trials comparing RFA with standard surgical treatment options in patients with malignant lung nodules. Data is limited to case series with differences in number of primary and secondary lung lesions, criteria for unresectability, number of prior resections, history of prior radiation therapy, differences in follow-up protocols, and criteria for determining extent of response to RFA treatment.

However, a small matched case series of 22 patients comparing RFA to resection in patients with stage I non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) demonstrated comparable survival in RFA patients at 1, 2, and 5 years<sup>[30]</sup>. The RAPTURE study, a large prospective multicenter single arm trial, using RFA in patients with early stage NSCLC or lung metastases demonstrated 1 and 2 year overall survival rates of 70% and 48% respectively in patients with primary lung tumors, and 89% and 66% 1 and 2 year overall survival in patients with colorectal metastases. The cancer specific survival was higher in both groups; 92% and 73% at 1 and 2 years in the NSCLC cohort and 91% and 68% in the cohort with colorectal metastases.

The 1, 2, 3 year overall survival for patients with early stage primary lung cancer treated with RFA varies from 70% to 90%, 48% to 84%, 25% to 74%, respectively (Table 3). This is comparable to the 1, 3, 5 year overall sur-

vival of patients who undergo lobectomy or segmental resection for early stage lung cancer<sup>[31-34]</sup>. In most studies that compare outcomes based on size of tumor ablated, patients with tumors smaller than 3 cm had longer median progression free intervals and overall survival<sup>[35]</sup>.

The median procedure related morbidity and mortality are 37.5% and 0% respectively<sup>[36]</sup>. The majority of complications from thoracic RFA are minor with the most frequently encountered being pneumothorax and pleural effusions (4.5%-61%) and hemoptysis. Others include pain, fever and pneumonia. Despite the high incidence of pneumothorax, only a minority, 11%, require pleural drainage<sup>[36]</sup>. The incidence of pneumothorax increases as the number of lesions ablated<sup>[37]</sup>.

### Breast

The role of RFA in breast cancer is still emerging. There is a growing trend towards breast conservation techniques that minimize scarring, breast deformity, and improve overall post procedure cosmesis. Several small single institution studies have established the feasibility of RFA and outlined potential complications (Table 4). In majority of these studies, RFA was followed by lumpectomy or mastectomy, either immediately or in a delayed fashion. The procedure was done under local or general anesthesia depending on whether resection was delayed or followed immediately after RFA, respectively. Response was assessed by pre- and post-procedural MRI which correlated better with pathologic response than US<sup>[38]</sup>. HE staining, immunohistochemistry with CK 18/8, or nicotine adenine dinucleotide-diaphorase cell viability assay were used to assess histopathologic response. There

**Table 4** Studies involving survival using radiofrequency ablation for primary lung tumors and metastases

Ref.	Patients	Range tumor size (cm)	Mean tumor size (cm)	Complete coagulation necrosis n (%)	Resection	Assessment of cell viability	Complications
Burak <i>et al</i> <sup>[38]</sup>	10	0.8-1.6	1.2	9 (90)	Delayed	HE CK8/18	None
Singletary <i>et al</i> <sup>[40]</sup>	29	≤ 2.0	-	25 (86)	Immediate	HE NADH-diaphorase	1 skin burn
Oura <i>et al</i> <sup>[41]</sup>	52	0.5-2.0	1.3	52 (100)	Delayed	NR	1 skin burn
Khatri <i>et al</i> <sup>[64]</sup>	15	0.8-1.5	1.28	13 (93)	Immediate	HE NADH-diaphorase	2 skin puckering
Noguchi <i>et al</i> <sup>[65]</sup>	10	0.5-2.0	1.1	10 (100)	Immediate	HE NADH-diaphorase	None
Fornage <i>et al</i> <sup>[66]</sup>	20	0.6-2.0	1.2	21 (100)	Immediate	HE NADH-diaphorase	None
Hayashi <i>et al</i> <sup>[67]</sup>	22	0.5-2.6	0.9 (median)	19 (86)	Delayed	HE NADH-diaphorase	1 skin burn
Izzo <i>et al</i> <sup>[68]</sup>	26	0.7-3.0	1.8	25 (96)	Immediate	HE NADH-diaphorase	1 skin burn

NR: Not reported; HE: Hematoxylin and eosin stain; NADH: Nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide.

are several studies that have reported HE staining maybe inadequate to assess histopathologic response since it gives a broad spectrum of necrosis and that techniques that assess cell viability are better<sup>[38,39]</sup>. Complete coagulative necrosis was achieved in 80%-100% of the patients, with skin burn being the most common complication in a very small subset of patients.

Patient selection criteria were strict, including mostly patients with invasive tumors less than 2 cm in size; a few studies had a small portion of patient with non-invasive tumors. The presence of extensive intraductal component was also a relative contraindication to RFA. In addition, estrogen and progesterone receptor status, her 2 status, grade, histology, and need for chemotherapy had to be known prior to RFA since no residual tumor cells would be available post-procedure if 100% successful. Superficial tumors within 1 cm of the skin are a relative contraindication as well, due to increased risk for skin burns. Various strategies to minimize skin burns have been employed in the studies including cooling the breast with sterile ice packs and subcutaneous injection of sterile saline or a high resistance solution to displace the tumor away from the skin. In addition, preoperative chemotherapy is a contraindication since it can lead to an underestimation of tumor size and leave occult foci of residual carcinoma<sup>[40]</sup>.

There are currently no studies comparing RFA to surgical resection, and no long term studies depicting local recurrence rates or survival in patients who receive RFA instead of surgical resection. Very few studies have evaluated RFA as an alternative to surgical resection. Oura *et al*<sup>[41]</sup> reported their experience treating 52 patients, with a mean tumor size of 1.3 cm (range 0.5-2.0 cm), with RFA following sentinel node biopsy. There was no local-regional or distant recurrence after an average 15-mo follow-up (range 6-30 mo).

Patient response to RFA has been favorable. Oura *et al*<sup>[41]</sup> retrospectively evaluated cosmetic results, which were found to be excellent in 43 patients (83%), good in 6 patients (12%) and fair in 3 patients (6%). The authors found that a major factor leading to poor cosmesis was mass formation at the site of RFA, especially in women with small breasts. This can lead to increased patient anxiety as well.

Progress in the application of RFA for breast tumors is at present hampered by our ability to accurately judge the margin status which is a critical variable in local recurrence rate. Evolution in imaging technology will foster such advancements. Nonetheless, as more breast cancers are being diagnosed at a smaller size, a focused image-guided ablation can minimize destruction of normal breast tissue and thus may positively impact cosmesis.

### Kidney

As with other solid tumors, RFA is increasingly being applied for the therapy for renal tumors as less invasive and nephron-sparing techniques, including partial nephrectomy and laparoscopic nephrectomy, have proven to have comparable 5-year and disease-free survival<sup>[42]</sup>.

Currently, RFA as primary treatment for renal malignancy is limited in study to a select group of patients with early T1a disease or for whom surgical resection is not an option. These include patients with only one kidney, multifocal disease, Von Hippel Lindau, limited renal function, elderly patients or patients with comorbidities that are poor candidates for surgery<sup>[8,43-45]</sup>. Contraindications include a life expectancy less than one year, the presence of distant metastases, tumors > 5 cm, or tumors in the hilum or central collecting system. Studies have consistently shown 91%-97% complete first ablation success for small (< 3-4 cm), exophytic, peripherally located tumors (Table 5). This is due to the fact that peripherally located tumors are surrounded by peri-renal fat that provides insulation, allowing the high temperatures necessary for successful ablation to be achieved. Conversely, hilar blood flow creates a heat-sink effect making treatment of central tumors more challenging. The recurrence free survival varies from 79%-91% in biopsy proven renal cell cancers, while the 3 and 5 year cancer specific survival ranges from 95%-100% in the few long term studies.

### Bone tumors and metastatic bone lesions

RFA has been long proven efficacious for the treatment of osteoid osteomas. It is performed in patients with typical clinical and radiographic characteristics of an osteoid osteoma (radiolucent nidus surrounded by reactive sclerosis) for treatment of bone pain. It is successful initially in 73%-98% of patients with 92%-100% secondary

**Table 5** Studies involving survival after radiofrequency ablation for solid renal tumors

Ref.	Patients (tumors) <i>n</i>	Method	Mean tumor size (cm)	RCC	Complete first ablation	Recurrence free survival	Overall survival (yr)			Cancer specific survival (yr)		Complications
							1	3	5	3	5	
Tracy <i>et al</i> <sup>[69]</sup>	208 (243)	P, L, O	2.4	79%	97%	90% at 3 yr <sup>2</sup>	99% <sup>1</sup>	93% <sup>1</sup>	85%	95% for RCC	99% for RCC	NR
Levinson <i>et al</i> <sup>[70]</sup>	31 (34)	P, L	2.1	58%	91%	80% at 5 yr <sup>2</sup>	NR	NR	63% for all <sup>3</sup> 58% for RCC <sup>4</sup>	NR	100% for all 100% for RCC	4 for perinephric hematoma ; 1 for liver burn; 1 for death from pneumonia
Zagoria <i>et al</i> <sup>[71]</sup>	41 (48)	P	2.6	100%	NR	88% at 5 yr	NR	NR	66%	NR	NR	2 for pneumothorax no drainage; 2 for ureteral strictures
Stern <i>et al</i> <sup>[72]</sup>	40	P, L	2.4	81%	97%	91% at 3 yr <sup>2</sup>	NR	NR	NR	100% for RCC	NR	2 for minor; 3 for major

<sup>1</sup>Calculated based on Kaplan-Meier curve and life table; <sup>2</sup>In biopsy proven renal cell carcinoma (RCC); <sup>3</sup>80 mo overall survival; <sup>4</sup>57 mo overall survival. P, L, O: Percutaneous, laparoscopic, open; NR: Not reported.

success rates and majority of patients experiencing pain relief within the first 1-2 wk of treatment<sup>[46-49]</sup>. Complication rates are minimal with skin necrosis and burns being the most common. It has been demonstrated to be comparable to surgical resection with regards to recurrence<sup>[50]</sup>. RFA has also been described in case reports for the treatment of other benign bone tumors.

More recently, RFA has been applied as a palliative modality for the treatment of painful metastatic bone lesions. External beam radiation remains the gold standard for treatment of localized bone pain from a metastatic focus. However, 20%-30% of patients don't respond and are recalcitrant to pharmacotherapy<sup>[51,52]</sup>. In addition, patients previously irradiated at a recurrent site, may not be eligible for repeat radiation therapy. Ninety percent to ninety-five percent of patients treated with RFA experience a clinically significant reduction in pain that can be seen within the first week of treatment lasting up to 24 wk<sup>[52,53]</sup>. Complication rates are minimal and can vary from bleeding, pathologic fractures, skin and muscle burns and damage to adjacent neurovascular structures<sup>[46]</sup>.

## CONCLUSION

RFA has been demonstrated to be an effective local ablative technique in patients with a variety of solid tumors. More prospective randomized studies are needed before RFA will replace surgical resection for small, limited tumors involving the lung or liver. Long term studies establishing its oncological effectiveness in breast and solid renal tumors are still needed. The future of thermal ablative techniques may or may not involve radiofrequency waves as newer ablative techniques involving microwaves are currently being developed which offer the advantages of higher intratumoral temperatures, larger ablative volumes, and faster ablation times while minimizing energy dissipation. However, the safety and efficacy of microwave ablation is still under evaluation. Regardless of the ablative technique, proper patient selection remains a key

factor in determining who will most likely benefit.

## REFERENCES

- Ambrogio MC**, Lucchi M, Dini P, Melfi F, Fontanini G, Faviana P, Fanucchi O, Mussi A. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of lung tumours: results in the mid-term. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2006; **30**: 177-183 [PMID: 16723242 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejcts.2006.03.067]
- Mirza AN**, Fornage BD, Sneige N, Kuerer HM, Newman LA, Ames FC, Singletary SE. Radiofrequency ablation of solid tumors. *Cancer J* 2011; **7**: 95-102 [PMID: 11324771]
- Goldberg SN**, Gazelle GS. Radiofrequency tissue ablation: physical principles and techniques for increasing coagulation necrosis. *Hepatogastroenterology* 2001; **48**: 359-367 [PMID: 11379309]
- Ni Y**, Mulier S, Miao Y, Michel L, Marchal G. A review of the general aspects of radiofrequency ablation. *Abdom Imaging* 2005; **30**: 381-400 [PMID: 15776302 DOI: 10.1007/s00261-004-0253-9]
- Curley SA**, Davidson BS, Fleming RY, Izzo F, Stephens LC, Tinkey P, Cromeens D. Laparoscopically guided bipolar radiofrequency ablation of areas of porcine liver. *Surg Endosc* 1997; **11**: 729-733 [PMID: 9214320]
- Patterson EJ**, Scudamore CH, Owen DA, Nagy AG, Buczkowski AK. Radiofrequency ablation of porcine liver in vivo: effects of blood flow and treatment time on lesion size. *Ann Surg* 1998; **227**: 559-565 [PMID: 9563546]
- Veltri A**, Moretto P, Doriguzzi A, Pagano E, Carrara G, Gandini G. Radiofrequency thermal ablation (RFA) after transarterial chemoembolization (TACE) as a combined therapy for unresectable non-early hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). *Eur Radiol* 2006; **16**: 661-669 [PMID: 16228211 DOI: 10.1007/s00330-005-0029-9]
- Friedman M**, Mikityansky I, Kam A, Libutti SK, Walther MM, Neeman Z, Locklin JK, Wood BJ. Radiofrequency ablation of cancer. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2004; **27**: 427-434 [PMID: 15383844 DOI: 10.1007/s00270-004-0062-0]
- Eisele RM**, Neumann U, Neuhaus P, Schumacher G. Open surgical is superior to percutaneous access for radiofrequency ablation of hepatic metastases. *World J Surg* 2009; **33**: 804-811 [PMID: 19184639 DOI: 10.1007/s00268-008-9905-1]
- Decadt B**, Siriwardena AK. Radiofrequency ablation of liver tumours: systematic review. *Lancet Oncol* 2004; **5**: 550-560 [PMID: 15337485 DOI: 10.1016/s1470-2045(04)01567-0]
- Smith MK**, Mutter D, Forbes LE, Mulier S, Marescaux J. The physiologic effect of the pneumoperitoneum on radiofre-

- quency ablation. *Surg Endosc* 2004; **18**: 35-38 [PMID: 14625745 DOI: 10.1007/s00464-001-8235-2]
- 12 **Solbiati L**, Ierace T, Tonolini M, Cova L. Guidance and monitoring of radiofrequency liver tumor ablation with contrast-enhanced ultrasound. *Eur J Radiol* 2004; **51** Suppl: S19-S23 [PMID: 15311434]
  - 13 **Cioni D**, Lencioni R, Rossi S, Garbagnati F, Donati F, Crocetti L, Bartolozzi C. Radiofrequency thermal ablation of hepatocellular carcinoma: using contrast-enhanced harmonic power doppler sonography to assess treatment outcome. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2001; **177**: 783-788 [PMID: 11566673]
  - 14 **Goldberg SN**. Radiofrequency tumor ablation: principles and techniques. *Eur J Ultrasound* 2001; **13**: 129-147 [PMID: 11369525]
  - 15 **Ni Y**, Chen F, Marchal G. Differentiation of residual tumor from benign periablation tissues after radiofrequency ablation: the role of MR imaging contrast agents. *Radiology* 2005; **237**: 745-747; author reply 748-749 [PMID: 16244283 DOI: 10.1148/radiol.2372050400]
  - 16 **Livraghi T**, Solbiati L, Meloni F, Ierace T, Goldberg SN, Gazelle GS. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of liver metastases in potential candidates for resection: the "test-of-time approach". *Cancer* 2003; **97**: 3027-3035 [PMID: 12784338 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.11426]
  - 17 **Gillams AR**, Lees WR. Radiofrequency ablation of colorectal liver metastases. *Abdom Imaging* 2005; **30**: 419-426 [PMID: 15759208 DOI: 10.1007/s00261-004-0256-6]
  - 18 **Kudo M**. Radiofrequency ablation for hepatocellular carcinoma: updated review in 2010. *Oncology* 2010; **78** Suppl 1: 113-124 [PMID: 20616593 DOI: 10.1159/000315239]
  - 19 **Bouza C**, López-Cuadrado T, Alcázar R, Saz-Parkinson Z, Amate JM. Meta-analysis of percutaneous radiofrequency ablation versus ethanol injection in hepatocellular carcinoma. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2009; **9**: 31 [PMID: 19432967 DOI: 10.1186/1471-230X-9-31]
  - 20 **Wang JH**, Wang CC, Hung CH, Chen CL, Lu SN. Survival comparison between surgical resection and radiofrequency ablation for patients in BCLC very early/early stage hepatocellular carcinoma. *J Hepatol* 2012; **56**: 412-418 [PMID: 21756858 DOI: 10.1016/j.jhep.2011.05.020]
  - 21 **Chen MS**, Li JQ, Liang HH, Lin XJ, Guo RP, Zheng Y, Zhang YQ. [Comparison of effects of percutaneous radiofrequency ablation and surgical resection on small hepatocellular carcinoma]. *Zhonghua Yixue Zazhi* 2005; **85**: 80-83 [PMID: 15774210]
  - 22 **Lü MD**, Kuang M, Liang LJ, Xie XY, Peng BG, Liu GJ, Li DM, Lai JM, Li SQ. [Surgical resection versus percutaneous thermal ablation for early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma: a randomized clinical trial]. *Zhonghua Yixue Zazhi* 2006; **86**: 801-805 [PMID: 16681964]
  - 23 **Zhou Y**, Zhao Y, Li B, Xu D, Yin Z, Xie F, Yang J. Meta-analysis of radiofrequency ablation versus hepatic resection for small hepatocellular carcinoma. *BMC Gastroenterol* 2010; **10**: 78 [PMID: 20618937 DOI: 10.1186/1471-230X-10-78]
  - 24 **Takaki H**, Yamakado K, Uraki J, Nakatsuka A, Fuke H, Yamamoto N, Shiraki K, Yamada T, Takeda K. Radiofrequency ablation combined with chemoembolization for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinomas larger than 5 cm. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2009; **20**: 217-224 [PMID: 19097810 DOI: 10.1016/j.jvir.2008.10.019]
  - 25 **Wang W**, Shi J, Xie WF. Transarterial chemoembolization in combination with percutaneous ablation therapy in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma: a meta-analysis. *Liver Int* 2010; **30**: 741-749 [PMID: 20331507 DOI: 10.1111/j.1478-3231.2010.02221.x]
  - 26 **Abdalla EK**, Vauthey JN, Ellis LM, Ellis V, Pollock R, Broglio KR, Hess K, Curley SA. Recurrence and outcomes following hepatic resection, radiofrequency ablation, and combined resection/ablation for colorectal liver metastases. *Ann Surg* 2004; **239**: 818-825; discussion 825-827 [PMID: 15166961 DOI: 10.1097/01.sla.0000128305.90650.71]
  - 27 **Siperstein AE**, Berber E, Ballem N, Parikh RT. Survival after radiofrequency ablation of colorectal liver metastases: 10-year experience. *Ann Surg* 2007; **246**: 559-565; discussion 565-567 [PMID: 17893492 DOI: 10.1097/SLA.0b013e318155a7b6]
  - 28 **Park IJ**, Kim HC, Yu CS, Kim PN, Won HJ, Kim JC. Radiofrequency ablation for metachronous liver metastasis from colorectal cancer after curative surgery. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008; **15**: 227-232 [PMID: 17882491 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-007-9625-z]
  - 29 **Kelekis AD**, Thanos L, Mylona S, Ptohis N, Malagari K, Nikita A, Christodoulidou J, Kelekis N. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of lung tumors with expandable needle electrodes: current status. *Eur Radiol* 2006; **16**: 2471-2482 [PMID: 16703312 DOI: 10.1007/s00330-006-0270-x]
  - 30 **Kim SR**, Han HJ, Park SJ, Min KH, Lee MH, Chung CR, Kim MH, Jin GY, Lee YC. Comparison between surgery and radiofrequency ablation for stage I non-small cell lung cancer. *Eur J Radiol* 2012; **81**: 395-399 [PMID: 21310562 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejrad.2010.12.091]
  - 31 **Ginsberg RJ**, Rubinstein LV. Randomized trial of lobectomy versus limited resection for T1 N0 non-small cell lung cancer. Lung Cancer Study Group. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1995; **60**: 615-22; discussion 622-623 [PMID: 7677489]
  - 32 **Whitson BA**, Groth SS, Andrade RS, Maddaus MA, Habermann EB, D'Cunha J. Survival after lobectomy versus segmentectomy for stage I non-small cell lung cancer: a population-based analysis. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2011; **92**: 1943-1950 [PMID: 21962268 DOI: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2011.05.091]
  - 33 **El-Sherif A**, Gooding WE, Santos R, Pettiford B, Ferson PF, Fernando HC, Urda SJ, Luketich JD, Landreneau RJ. Outcomes of sublobar resection versus lobectomy for stage I non-small cell lung cancer: a 13-year analysis. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2006; **82**: 408-415; discussion 415-416 [PMID: 16863738 DOI: 10.1016/j.athoracsur.2006.02.029]
  - 34 **Landreneau RJ**, Sugarbaker DJ, Mack MJ, Hazelrigg SR, Luketich JD, Fetterman L, Liptay MJ, Bartley S, Boley TM, Keenan RJ, Ferson PF, Weyant RJ, Naunheim KS. Wedge resection versus lobectomy for stage I (T1 N0 M0) non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 1997; **113**: 691-698; discussion 698-700 [PMID: 9104978]
  - 35 **Simon CJ**, Dupuy DE, DiPetrillo TA, Safran HP, Grieco CA, Ng T, Mayo-Smith WW. Pulmonary radiofrequency ablation: long-term safety and efficacy in 153 patients. *Radiology* 2007; **243**: 268-275 [PMID: 17392258]
  - 36 **Zhu JC**, Yan TD, Morris DL. A systematic review of radiofrequency ablation for lung tumors. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008; **15**: 1765-1774 [PMID: 18368456 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-008-9848-7]
  - 37 **Chua TC**, Sarkar A, Saxena A, Glenn D, Zhao J, Morris DL. Long-term outcome of image-guided percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of lung metastases: an open-labeled prospective trial of 148 patients. *Ann Oncol* 2010; **21**: 2017-2022 [PMID: 20335366 DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdq098]
  - 38 **Burak WE**, Agnese DM, Povoski SP, Yanssens TL, Bloom KJ, Wakely PE, Spigos DG. Radiofrequency ablation of invasive breast carcinoma followed by delayed surgical excision. *Cancer* 2003; **98**: 1369-1376 [PMID: 14508822 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.11642]
  - 39 **Ohtani S**, Kochi M, Ito M, Higaki K, Takada S, Matsuura H, Kagawa N, Hata S, Wada N, Inai K, Imoto S, Moriya T. Radiofrequency ablation of early breast cancer followed by delayed surgical resection--a promising alternative to breast-conserving surgery. *Breast* 2011; **20**: 431-436 [PMID: 21641802 DOI: 10.1016/j.breast.2011.04.007]
  - 40 **Singletary ES**. Feasibility of radiofrequency ablation for primary breast cancer. *Breast Cancer* 2003; **10**: 4-9 [PMID: 12525756]
  - 41 **Oura S**, Tamaki T, Hirai I, Yoshimasu T, Ohta F, Nakamura



- R, Okamura Y. Radiofrequency ablation therapy in patients with breast cancers two centimeters or less in size. *Breast Cancer* 2007; **14**: 48-54 [PMID: 17244994]
- 42 **Gervais DA**, Arellano RS, Mueller PR. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Radiol* 2005; **15**: 960-967 [PMID: 15756553 DOI: 10.1007/s00330-005-2651-y]
- 43 **Gervais DA**, McGovern FJ, Arellano RS, McDougal WS, Mueller PR. Radiofrequency ablation of renal cell carcinoma: part 1, Indications, results, and role in patient management over a 6-year period and ablation of 100 tumors. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2005; **185**: 64-71 [PMID: 15972400]
- 44 **Farrell MA**, Charboneau WJ, DiMarco DS, Chow GK, Zincke H, Callstrom MR, Lewis BD, Lee RA, Reading CC. Imaging-guided radiofrequency ablation of solid renal tumors. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003; **180**: 1509-1513 [PMID: 12760910]
- 45 **Mayo-Smith WW**, Dupuy DE, Parikh PM, Pezzullo JA, Cronan JJ. Imaging-guided percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of solid renal masses: techniques and outcomes of 38 treatment sessions in 32 consecutive patients. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003; **180**: 1503-1508 [PMID: 12760909]
- 46 **Santiago FR**, Del Mar Castellano García M, Montes JL, García MR, Fernández JM. Treatment of bone tumours by radiofrequency thermal ablation. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med* 2009; **2**: 43-50 [PMID: 19468917 DOI: 10.1007/s12178-008-9042-3]
- 47 **Rimondi E**, Mavrogenis AF, Rossi G, Ciminari R, Malaguti C, Tranfaglia C, Vanel D, Ruggieri P. Radiofrequency ablation for non-spinal osteoid osteomas in 557 patients. *Eur Radiol* 2012; **22**: 181-188 [PMID: 21842430 DOI: 10.1007/s00330-011-2240-1]
- 48 **Lindner NJ**, Ozaki T, Roedel R, Gosheger G, Winkelmann W, Wörtler K. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation in osteoid osteoma. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2001; **83**: 391-396 [PMID: 11341426]
- 49 **Torriani M**, Rosenthal DI. Percutaneous radiofrequency treatment of osteoid osteoma. *Pediatr Radiol* 2002; **32**: 615-618 [PMID: 12200642 DOI: 10.1007/s00247-002-0727-2]
- 50 **Rosenthal DI**, Hornicek FJ, Wolfe MW, Jennings LC, Gebhardt MC, Mankin HJ. Percutaneous radiofrequency coagulation of osteoid osteoma compared with operative treatment. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 1998; **80**: 815-821 [PMID: 9655099]
- 51 **Tordiglione M**, Luraghi R, Antognoni P. [Role of palliative and symptomatic radiotherapy in bone metastasis]. *Radiol Med* 1999; **97**: 372-377 [PMID: 10432969]
- 52 **Goetz MP**, Callstrom MR, Charboneau JW, Farrell MA, Maus TP, Welch TJ, Wong GY, Sloan JA, Novotny PJ, Petersen IA, Beres RA, Regge D, Capanna R, Saker MB, Grönemeyer DH, Gevargez A, Ahrar K, Choti MA, de Baere TJ, Rubin J. Percutaneous image-guided radiofrequency ablation of painful metastases involving bone: a multicenter study. *J Clin Oncol* 2004; **22**: 300-306 [PMID: 14722039 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2004.03.097]
- 53 **Callstrom MR**, Charboneau JW, Goetz MP, Rubin J, Atwell TD, Farrell MA, Welch TJ, Maus TP. Image-guided ablation of painful metastatic bone tumors: a new and effective approach to a difficult problem. *Skeletal Radiol* 2006; **35**: 1-15 [PMID: 16205922 DOI: 10.1007/s00256-005-0003-2]
- 54 **Abitabile P**, Hartl U, Lange J, Maurer CA. Radiofrequency ablation permits an effective treatment for colorectal liver metastasis. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2007; **33**: 67-71 [PMID: 17174059 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejso.2006.10.040]
- 55 **Gillams AR**, Lees WR. Radio-frequency ablation of colorectal liver metastases in 167 patients. *Eur Radiol* 2004; **14**: 2261-2267 [PMID: 15599547 DOI: 10.1007/s00330-004-2416-z]
- 56 **Jakobs TF**, Hoffmann RT, Trumm C, Reiser MF, Helmberger TK. Radiofrequency ablation of colorectal liver metastases: mid-term results in 68 patients. *Anticancer Res* 2006; **26**: 671-680 [PMID: 16739337]
- 57 **Machi J**, Oishi AJ, Sumida K, Sakamoto K, Furumoto NL, Oishi RH, Kylstra JW. Long-term outcome of radiofrequency ablation for unresectable liver metastases from colorectal cancer: evaluation of prognostic factors and effectiveness in first- and second-line management. *Cancer J* 2006; **12**: 318-326 [PMID: 16925977]
- 58 **Schindera ST**, Nelson RC, DeLong DM, Clary B. Intrahepatic tumor recurrence after partial hepatectomy: value of percutaneous radiofrequency ablation. *J Vasc Interv Radiol* 2006; **17**: 1631-1637 [PMID: 17057005 DOI: 10.1097/01.RVI.0000239106.98853.B8]
- 59 **White TJ**, Roy-Choudhury SH, Breen DJ, Cast J, Maraveyas A, Smyth EF, Hartley JE, Monson JR. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation of colorectal hepatic metastases - initial experience. An adjunct technique to systemic chemotherapy for those with inoperable colorectal hepatic metastases. *Dig Surg* 2004; **21**: 314-320 [PMID: 15365230 DOI: 10.1159/000080886]
- 60 **Solbiati L**, Livraghi T, Goldberg SN, Ierace T, Meloni F, Dellanoce M, Cova L, Halpern EF, Gazelle GS. Percutaneous radio-frequency ablation of hepatic metastases from colorectal cancer: long-term results in 117 patients. *Radiology* 2001; **221**: 159-166 [PMID: 11568334]
- 61 **Lencioni R**, Crocetti L, Cioni R, Suh R, Glenn D, Regge D, Helmberger T, Gillams AR, Frilling A, Ambrogi M, Bartolozzi C, Mussi A. Response to radiofrequency ablation of pulmonary tumours: a prospective, intention-to-treat, multicentre clinical trial (the RAPTURE study). *Lancet Oncol* 2008; **9**: 621-628 [PMID: 18565793 DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(08)70155-4]
- 62 **Yan TD**, King J, Sjarif A, Glenn D, Steinke K, Al-Kindy A, Morris DL. Treatment failure after percutaneous radiofrequency ablation for nonsurgical candidates with pulmonary metastases from colorectal carcinoma. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2007; **14**: 1718-1726 [PMID: 17285398 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-006-9271-x]
- 63 **Hiraki T**, Gobara H, Iishi T, Sano Y, Iguchi T, Fujiwara H, Tajiri N, Sakurai J, Date H, Mimura H, Kanazawa S. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation for clinical stage I non-small cell lung cancer: results in 20 nonsurgical candidates. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2007; **134**: 1306-1312 [PMID: 17976467 DOI: 10.1016/j.jtcvs.2007.07.013]
- 64 **Khatri VP**, McGahan JP, Ramsamooj R, Griffey S, Brock J, Cronan M, Wilkendorf S. A phase II trial of image-guided radiofrequency ablation of small invasive breast carcinomas: use of saline-cooled tip electrode. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2007; **14**: 1644-1652 [PMID: 17508251 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-006-9315-2]
- 65 **Noguchi M**, Earashi M, Fujii H, Yokoyama K, Harada K, Tsuneyama K. Radiofrequency ablation of small breast cancer followed by surgical resection. *J Surg Oncol* 2006; **93**: 120-128 [PMID: 16425291 DOI: 10.1002/jso.20398]
- 66 **Fornage BD**, Sneige N, Ross MI, Mirza AN, Kuerer HM, Edeiken BS, Ames FC, Newman LA, Babiera GV, Singletary SE. Small (< or = 2-cm) breast cancer treated with US-guided radiofrequency ablation: feasibility study. *Radiology* 2004; **231**: 215-224 [PMID: 14990810]
- 67 **Hayashi AH**, Silver SF, van der Westhuizen NG, Donald JC, Parker C, Fraser S, Ross AC, Olivetto IA. Treatment of invasive breast carcinoma with ultrasound-guided radiofrequency ablation. *Am J Surg* 2003; **185**: 429-435 [PMID: 12727562]
- 68 **Izzo F**, Thomas R, Delrio P, Rinaldo M, Vallone P, DeChiara A, Botti G, D' Aiuto G, Cortino P, Curley SA. Radiofrequency ablation in patients with primary breast carcinoma: a pilot study in 26 patients. *Cancer* 2001; **92**: 2036-2044 [PMID: 11596017]
- 69 **Tracy CR**, Raman JD, Donnally C, Trimmer CK, Cadeddu JA. Durable oncologic outcomes after radiofrequency ablation: experience from treating 243 small renal masses over 7.5 years. *Cancer* 2010; **116**: 3135-3142 [PMID: 20564644 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.25002]
- 70 **Levinson AW**, Su LM, Agarwal D, Sroka M, Jarrett TW, Kavoussi LR, Solomon SB. Long-term oncological and overall

outcomes of percutaneous radio frequency ablation in high risk surgical patients with a solitary small renal mass. *J Urol* 2008; **180**: 499-504; discussion 504 [PMID: 18550123 DOI: 10.1016/j.juro.2008.04.031]

- 71 **Zagoria RJ**, Pettus JA, Rogers M, Werle DM, Childs D, Leyendecker JR. Long-term outcomes after percutaneous radiofrequency ablation for renal cell carcinoma. *Urology* 2011;

77: 1393-1397 [PMID: 21492910 DOI: 10.1016/j.urology.2010.12.077]

- 72 **Stern JM**, Svatek R, Park S, Hermann M, Lotan Y, Sagalowsky AI, Cadeddu JA. Intermediate comparison of partial nephrectomy and radiofrequency ablation for clinical T1a renal tumours. *BJU Int* 2007; **100**: 287-290 [PMID: 17617136 DOI: 10.1111/j.1464-410X.2007.06937.x]

**P- Reviewers** Regina ED, Quirino L **S- Editor** Gou SX  
**L- Editor** A **E- Editor** Xiong L

