

# Sentinel lymph node mapping in early-stage cervical cancer

### **Meta-analysis**

Lijun Wang, MD<sup>a</sup>, Shanshan Liu, PhD<sup>b</sup>, Ting Xu, Master<sup>a</sup>, Linnan Yuan, Bachelor<sup>a</sup>, Xinyuan Yang, PhD<sup>a,\*</sup> D

#### Abstract

**Background:** The value of sentinel lymph node (SLN) mapping for early-stage cervical cancer remains controversial. Therefore, we collected data to investigate the feasibility and diagnostic accuracy of SLN in patients with early-stage (IA-IIA) cervical cancer.

**Methods:** We searched Embase, PubMed, and the Cochrane Library databases issued before June 1, 2020. The sample size of the selected study was at least 10 patients with early-stage (IA-IIA) cervical cancer, the pooled detection rates and the separate detection rate (overall detection rate, bilateral detection rate) using blue dye with Tc, technetium 99 (Tc) and indocyanine green (ICG) technique of early-stage cervical cancer was reported. R-3.6.1 software was used to evaluate pooled detection rate and sensitivity.

**Results:** Two thousand one hundred sixty-four patients included for analysis in 28 studies ranging from 12 to 405 patients. The combined overall detection rate of SLN mapping was 95% with a 72% pooled bilateral detection rate. The sensitivity of the combined overall detection rate of SLN mapping was 94.99% as well as a sensitivity of 72.43% bilateral detection rate. The overall detection rate of SLN was 96% for blue dye with Tc, 95% for Tc, 98% for ICG technique. The bilateral detection rate of SLN was 97.76% as well as a sensitivity of the overall detection rate of SLN was 97.76% as well as a sensitivity of 84.96% bilateral detection rate of ICG technique.

**Conclusion:** In early-stage cervical cancer, overall detection rate of SLN mapping is elevated while bilateral detection rate is lower. The overall detection rate (98%) as well as bilateral rate (85%) of ICG seems to be a better SLN mapping technique among the method of SLN mapping (using blue dye with Tc, Tc or ICG). We believe SLN mapping may be considered contemporary technique which could provide additional benefits over traditional pelvic lymphadenectomy. While promising results in SLN mapping has been found, larger patient samples, including randomized studies, are required at the same time.

**Abbreviations:** CI = confidence interval, FIGO = Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics stage, ICG = indocyanine green, SLN = sentinel lymph node, Tc = technetium 99.

Keywords: bilateral detection rate, early-stage cervical cancer, meta-analysis, overall detection rate, sentinel lymph node

#### Editor: Kamalika Mojumdar.

The studies we have included are all published documents and do not involve patients, so ethical approval is not required.

This work was supported by the fund of "Project A of the First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University (XJTU-2021-01).

The authors have no conflicts of interest.

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are publicly available.

<sup>a</sup> Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, P.R. China, <sup>b</sup> Department of Clinical Laboratory, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, P.R. China.

<sup>\*</sup> Correspondence: Xinyuan Yang, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, Shaanxi 710061, P.R. China (e-mail: m189912322845@163.com).

Copyright © 2021 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial License 4.0 (CCBY-NC), where it is permissible to download, share, remix, transform, and buildup the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be used commercially without permission from the journal.

How to cite this article: Wang L, Liu S, Xu T, Yuan L, Yang X. Sentinel lymph node mapping in early-stage cervical cancer: meta-analysis. Medicine 2021;100:34(e27035).

Received: 20 November 2020 / Received in final form: 8 July 2021 / Accepted: 9 August 2021

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.000000000027035

#### Highlights

- The combined overall detection rate of SLN mapping was 95% with a 72% pooled bilateral detection rate. The overall detection rate of SLN was 96% for blue dye with Tc, 95% for Tc, 98% for ICG technique.
- The overall detection rate (98%) as well as bilateral rate (85%) of ICG seems to be a better sentinel lymph node mapping technique among the method of SLN mapping (using blue dye with Tc, Tc or ICG).
- We believe sentinel lymph node mapping may be considered contemporary technique which could provide benefits over traditional pelvic lymphadenectomy.

#### 1. Introduction

Cervical cancer is the leading cause of cancer-related mortality in women.<sup>[1]</sup> Lymph nodal status is used as the major predictor of survival. In addition, it guides postoperative treatment planning in early cervical cancer.<sup>[2]</sup> Pelvic lymphadenectomy procedure as well as radical hysterectomy procedure is routinely used as the

treatment in order to avoid the under diagnosis of lymph node metastasis. From the past to the present, removal of pelvic lymph nodes has shown poor clinical effects, including nerve damage, lymphedema and lymphocyst formation, contributing to increased operative time, blood loss.<sup>[3]</sup> Lymph nodes status is the most significant indicator of cervical cancer surgery which can determine the prognosis of surgery. Moreover, studies show that the pelvic sentinel lymph node (SLN) can predict the state of the regional lymph nodes accurately.<sup>[4]</sup>

SLN is recognized as the first lymph node pass through when tumor cells metastasize in the primary lymphatic drainage area. SLN biopsy has been found to play the important role in 1977 by Cabanas and has been accepted in the treatment of human cancers such as melanoma, breast and vulvar cancers.<sup>[5]</sup> SLN can be indicated with lymphatic mapping, and a certain bioactive dye or radioactive tracer is injected around the primary malignant tumor, which can be drained to the regional lymph nodes with the lymph, and then recognized by visual inspection or special instruments. SLN biopsy can be considered as a novel method for staging of gynecological malignancy.<sup>[6]</sup> What is the most important is to identify major lymphatic pathways which drain the uterus as well as existing the primary identified node. The aim of SLN biopsy technique is to reduce the morbidity associated with lymphadenectomy while reducing negatively affecting of surgical staging and outcomes.

Despite numerous studies demonstrate that pelvic SLNs can predict the state of regional lymph nodes accurately in early-stage cervical cancer.<sup>[7]</sup> However, the use of the SLN technique in cervical cancer that to detect lymph node metastasis remains controversial. Meanwhile, the detection rate of this method requires validation. This study assessed the diagnostic performance of SLN mapping in early-stage cervical cancer through combined overall detection rate, bilateral detection rate and sensitivity. Since the SLNs can be identified during surgery by lymphoscintigraphy using technetium 99 (<sup>99m</sup>Tc), blue dye, indocyanine green (ICG) and so on. To clear that each method has different sensitivity and detection rate, we assessed different tracer methods for the technique using a combined technique (blue dye with Tc), Tc or ICG.

#### 2. Materials and methods

#### 2.1. Literature search strategy

Two authors related to this current study have searched PubMed, Embase and the Cochrane Library from database inception to June 1, 2020 independently. Language of studies was restricted to official publication in English only. Details of identifying studies for this study are presented in Figure 1. The following medical subject heading terms was used: "cervical cancer", "sentinel lymph node", "sentinel lymph node biopsy", "early-stage cervical cancer". Furthermore, the combination of "cervical cancer", "sentinel lymph node", "sentinel lymph node biopsy" and "early-stage cervical cancer" were used as a free text term.

#### 2.2. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Studies were included if they had the following criteria: (1) including a sample size at least 10 patients diagnosed with International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics stage (FIGO) IA-IIA cervical cancer; (2) studies mainly focus on SLN mapping; (3) studies reported outcomes measures including the detection rate of the SLN biopsy (overall SLN detection rate: the percentage of patients in which at least 1 SLN was identified;



Figure 1. Flow diagram of study selection.

| tuthor, year  | Study<br>size | Time period   | Stage (FIGO)                           | Median<br>Age (yr)         | Histology                                      | Overall DR<br>(per patient)<br>(%) | bilateral<br>DR (per<br>patient)<br>(%) | Median<br>number<br>of SLN /<br>patient | Sensitivity <sup>*</sup><br>(%) | Specificity <sup>*</sup><br>(%) | Negative<br>prediçtive<br>value (%)<br>(by patient) | Tracer                               |
|---|---------------|---|--|----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| undrea Papadia, 2015 <sup>(8)</sup> 6   | 52            | Between April 2008 and July 2015                                    | IA-IIA                                 | 44 (25–72)                 | SCC43; 'AC17; Other2                           | 95.1                               | 87                                      | 3 (0–15)                                | NR                              | NR                              | 100   | ICG+blue                             |
| ierta Diaz-Feijoo, 2019 <sup>[9]</sup> 1  | 128           | Between September 2000 to October                                   | 1A2,IB1,IIA1                           | 48.4±12.2                  | SCC79; AC49                                    | 98.4                               | 76                                      | 2.0                                     | 79.2                            | 100                             | 95.4  | Blue dye+Tc                          |
| <sup>2</sup> Balaya, 2019 <sup>[10]</sup> 2<br>sloria Salvo, 2017 <sup>[11]</sup>                       | 405<br>188    | Between 2005 and 2012<br>From August 1997 to October 2015           | IA-IIA<br>IA1-IIA1                     | 45.4 (22–85)<br>38 (21–68) | SCC250; AC95; other:60<br>SCC95; AC65; AS15;   | 94.1<br>90                         | 80.5<br>62                              | 3 (1–11)<br>3 (1–18)                    | 91.2<br>96.4                    | NR<br>NR                        | 97.2<br>99.3  | Blue+isotopic<br>ICG+blue dye+Tc     |
| nna L. Beavis, 2016 <sup>[12]</sup> 5<br>Marrije R. Buist, 2002 <sup>[13]</sup> 2                       | 30<br>25      | From10/2012 to 02/2016<br>Between December 2000 and May             | ≤IA2,IB1,IB2<br>IB1,IB2,IIA            | 42.5 (28–77)<br>41 (22–55) | omer:13<br>SCC20; AC7; AS:3<br>SCC18; AC7      | 100<br>100                         | 86.7<br>88                              | 2 (0–11)<br>NR                          | NR<br>96                        | NR<br>NR                        | NR<br>NR  | ICG<br>Blue dye+Tc                   |
| ndrea B. DiStefano, 2005 <sup>[14]</sup> E  | 50            | 2002<br>Between January 2003 and January                            | IA2-IIA                                | 45.9 (28–65)               | SCC42; AC2; AS:6                               | 06                                 | 60                                      | 1.9 (1-4) 45                            | NR                              | NR                              | 97.2  | Blue dye                             |
| litoshi Niikura, 2004 <sup>[15]</sup> 2   | 20            | 2005<br>Between January 2001 and May                                | IB1,IB2,and IIA                        | 47.5 (31–65)               | SCC12; AC:6; AS:2                              | 90                                 | 75                                      | patients<br>2.3 (1-5)                   | 100                             | 100                             | 100   | Blue dye+Tc                          |
| <sup>-</sup> Lantzsch, 2001 <sup>[16]</sup>   | 14            | Between January 1999 and  | BI                                     | 46 (28–67)                 | SCC12; AC2                                     | 93                                 | 36                                      | 1.86                                    | NR                              | NR                              | NR  | Tc                                   |
| ohn D. O'Boyle, 2000 <sup>[17]</sup> 2  | 20            | Septernber 2000<br>NR   | IB -IIA                                | 40 (23–65)                 | SCC13; AC1; AS:4;                              | 60                                 | 25                                      | 1.15                                    | NR                              | NR                              | NR  | lsosulfan<br>bluc de co              |
| ric Lambaudie, 2002 <sup>[18]</sup> 7<br>Aarie Plante, 2003 <sup>[19]</sup> 7                           | 12<br>70      | Between April 2001 and March 2002<br>From October 2000 to September | IB1,IA2 IB1<br>IA,IB,IIA               | 45.3±11.6<br>42 (21–63)    | SCC10; AC2<br>SCC48; AC22                      | 91.7<br>87                         | 83<br>60                                | 2.92<br>1.93                            | 66<br>93                        | 100<br>NR                       | 90<br>100   | blue dye<br>Blue dye<br>Blue dye     |
| u-Hyun Kim, 2018 <sup>(20)</sup>  | 103           | 2002<br>From August 2015 to January 2017                            | IA1-IIA                                | 45 (29–77)                 | SCC72; AC23; AS:4;                             | 100                                | 85.44                                   | 2.34                                    | 71.43                           | 100                             | 93.98   | ICG                                  |
| vndrea Papadia, 2017 <sup>[21]</sup> 6  | 30            | between December 2008 and   | IA1-IIA                                | 47 (27–72)                 | outer:4<br>SCC45; AC1; AS11;                   | 91.7                               | 83.4                                    | 3 (0–15)                                | 93                              | 100                             | 97  | ICG                                  |
| laoto Furukawa, 2010 <sup>[22]</sup> 1  | 12            | From August 2010 through  | IA1,IB1,IIA,IIB                        | 58 (36–68)                 | ouner:3<br>SCC9; AC3                           | 83                                 | 83                                      | 7 (3-10)                                | NR                              | NR                              | NR  | ICG                                  |
| ). WYDRA, 2006 <sup>[23]</sup>  | 100           | Between January 2002 and May  | IB1,IB2, IIA                           | 51.2 (26–82)               | SCC94; AC5; AS:1                               | 84                                 | 66                                      | 1.5                                     | 86.4                            | 100                             | 95.5  | Blue dye+Tc                          |
| . Hauspy, 2007 <sup>[24]</sup> 3  | 39            | From April 2004 to April 2006                                       | IA1,IA2,IB1                            | 38 (20–67)                 | SCC18; AC19; AS:2                              | 98                                 | 72                                      | 2 (0–8)                                 | 100                             | 100                             | 100   | Tc and/or                            |
| hinji Ogawa, 2009 <sup>[25]</sup> E   | 32            | Between May 2003 and December                                       | A1,A2,IB1,                             | 39 (20–79)                 | SCC58; AC22; other:2                           | 88                                 | 66                                      | 1.92 (0–6)                              | 100                             | NR                              | 100   | тс<br>Тс                             |
| Aichel Roy, 2011 <sup>[26]</sup> 2  | 211           | From October 2000 to December                                       | 182,113,115<br>1A1,1A2,1B1<br>1D2,114  | 39 (21–76)                 | SCC132; AC69; AS:10                            | 99.1                               | 85.8                                    | NR                                      | 87.9#                           | NR                              | 100   | Tc+ISB                               |
| Aichel Roy, 2011 <sup>[26]</sup> 1  | 166           | From October 2000 to December                                       | 182,11A<br>1A1,1A2,1B1,1B2,<br>11A,11D | NR                         | NR   | 96.9 (161)                         | 86.7 (144)                              | NR                                      | NR                              | NR                              | 100   | Tc                                   |
| ierangelo Marchiole,  | 29            | Euro<br>Between January 2001 and May                                | IIA,IIB<br>IA1,IA2,IB1                 | 41 (25–60)                 | SCC18; AC+AS:11                                | 100                                | 89.6                                    | NR                                      | NR                              | NR                              | 87.5  | Blue dye                             |
| Z004<br>otten Darlin, 2010 <sup>[28]</sup> 1  | 105           | zuuz<br>From March 2005 to April 2009                               | IA1-IIA                                | 40 (24–76)                 | SCC60; AC44; other:1                           | 06                                 | 59                                      | 2 (0-4)                                 | 94 metastatic                   | NR                              | 100 cancers   | Tc                                   |
| 2. Pelin Kara, 2008 <sup>[29]</sup> 3<br>Dmer Devaja, 2012 <sup>[30]</sup> 8                            | 32<br>36      | NR<br>From January 2005 to September                                | IA2—IIA<br>IA1—IIA                     | 46 (38–80)<br>37 (23–66)   | SCC24; AC3; AS1; other:4<br>SCC57; AC23; AS:5; | 100<br>97.7                        | 50<br>73.3                              | 2.09 (1–5)<br>3 (1–7)                   | NR<br>NR<br>NR                  | NR<br>NR                        | NR<br>100   | Tc<br>Blue dye+Tc                    |
| <ul> <li>Nickles Fader, 2008<sup>[31]</sup></li> <li>Alichael Frumovitz, 2012<sup>[32]</sup></li> </ul> | 20 38         | NR<br>NR<br>From March 2009 to June 2011                            | IA1-IIA, IIB (1)<br>IA1-IIA            | NR<br>35 (21–68)           | SCC26; AC10; AS:2<br>SCC14; AC2; AS:3;         | 92.1<br>85                         | 47.4<br>60                              | 2.1 <sup>*</sup><br>3 (0–8)             | NR<br>NR                        | NR<br>NR                        | NR<br>NR  | Blue dye+Tc<br>Blue dye+Tc+India ink |
| bavid M. Kushner, 2007 <sup>[33]</sup> 2  | 20            | Between December 2003 and   | IA2-IIA                                | 39.3 (22–66)               | ouner:1<br>SCC11; AC8; other:1                 | 100                                | 100                                     | 1.6 (1-4)                               | NR                              | NR                              | 100   | Blue dye+Tc                          |
| teatrice Cormier, 2011 <sup>[34]</sup>  | 122           | Between March 2003 and September                                    | IA1 withLVI to IIA                     | 35 (15–68)                 | SCC40; AC80; other:2                           | 93                                 | 75                                      | 3 (0–13)                                | 87.5                            | NR                              | 96.8  | Blue dye+Tc                          |
| ohn P. Diaz, 2010 <sup>[35]</sup> 2<br>otal 2   | 81<br>2164    | June 2003 to August 2009  | IA1-IIA                                | 36 (15–68)                 | SCC28; AC53                                    | 95                                 | 72                                      | 3 (0–10)                                | 88                              | 100                             | 95  | Blue dye+Tc                          |

3

Table 1

technetium 99. \* Calculated on a per-patient basis. # Sensitivity of Tc99.

| Andres Press 2010       99       92       90   | Study Events Total   | Weight Weight<br>Proportion 95%-Cl (fixed) (random)  | Study Evente Total  | Weight Weight<br>Properties 95% CL (fixed) (random)   |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| $ \frac{1}{4} 1$ | Study         Events Total           Andrea Papadia,2015         59         62           Berta Diraz-Fejioo,2019         126         128           V. Balaya,2019         126         128           V. Balaya,2019         126         128           Anna L. Beavs,2016         030         30           Marrie R. Buist,2002         25         25           Andrea B. Disteano,2005         45         50           Hotshi Niliwa,2004         18         20           T.Lantzsch,2001         12         20         —           Eric Lambaudie,2002         11         12         —           Marei Plante,2003         61         70         Jul-Hyun Kim,2018         100         13           Jul-Hyun Kim,2018         103         103         103         Andrea Papadia,2017         56         60           Natot Funkawa,2010         10         12         —         —         —         —           Jul-Hyun Kim,2018         103         103         103         103         =         2           Ju-Hyun Kim,2018         100         10         12         —         —         —         —         —         —         =         11   | Propertion         95%-Cl (fixed) (random)           0.95 [0.87, 0.99]         1.8%         4.0%           0.95 [0.87, 0.99]         1.8%         4.0%           0.96 [0.94, 1.00]         9.8%         6.0%           0.96 [0.94, 1.06]         8.4%         5.9%           0.90 [0.85, 0.94]         2.5%         4.8%           0.90 [0.85, 0.94]         2.5%         4.8%           0.90 [0.78, 0.97]         0.6%         2.8%           0.90 [0.78, 0.97]         0.6%         2.8%           0.90 [0.78, 0.97]         0.6%         2.8%           0.90 [0.78, 0.97]         0.6%         2.8%           0.90 [0.78, 0.97]         0.9%         1.9%           0.90 [0.82, 0.97]         0.9%         1.9%           0.90 [0.82, 0.97]         0.9%         1.9%           0.90 [0.82, 0.97]         0.9%         1.9%           0.92 [0.82, 0.87]         0.9%         1.9%           0.92 [0.82, 0.97]         0.9%         1.9%           0.92 [0.82, 0.97]         0.9%         3.1%           0.92 [0.82, 0.97]         0.9%         3.9%           0.92 [0.82, 0.97]         0.9%         3.1%           0.97 [0.87, 1.001]         1.9%         4.2%     <  | Study         Events Total           Andrea Papadia.2015         54         62           Borta Diaz-Feijoo.2019         97         128           V. Balaya.2019         326         405           Gloria Salvo.2017         117         188           Anna L. Beavis.2016         26         306           Margia R. Buist.2002         22         25           Andrea B. Di Stafano.2005         30         50           Hoshi Nikura.2004         15         20           John D. O Boyle.2002         52         40           Andrea P. Buist.2002         20         50           Marci P. Bayada.2017         10         12           John D. O Boyle.2002         52         40           Juhyun Kim.2018         48         103           Juhyun Kim.2018         48         103           Juhyun Kang.2006         66         106           D WYDRA.2006         66         106           Jak-Hyun Kim.2010         21         42           Juhen Draina.2010         62         125           Lotten Darina.2010         62         125           Lotten Darina.2010         62         125           Lotten Darina.2010         8   | Proportion         95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl<br>95%-Cl |
| And material analysis (Rankom effects model)       Description       Distribution       Distribution <thdistribution< th="">       Distribution       &lt;</thdistribution<>  | Fixed effect model 2164<br>Random effects model Heterogeneity: $t^2 = 75\%$ , $t^2 = 0.0011$ , $p < 0.01$  | 0.98 [0.97; 0.98] 100.0%<br>0.95 [0.93; 0.97] 100.0%   | Fixed effect model<br>Random effects model<br>Heterogenetity, I <sup>2</sup> = 87%, c <sup>2</sup> = 0.0147, p < 0.01<br>0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8<br>B   | 0.78 (0.76; 0.79) 100.0%<br>0.72 [0.67; 0.78] 100.0%  |
| proportion         98-H-CI         p-waim         tar"         tar"         tar         '''           Nitting Netting Netting Netting Netting Networks         0.4946         (0.2821         0.4971         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031         0.4032         0.4031 <t< td=""><td>Influential analysis (Random effects</td><td>model)</td><td>Influential analysis (Random effects model)</td><td></td></t<>   | Influential analysis (Random effects   | model)   | Influential analysis (Random effects model)   |   |
| Pooled estimate 0.9499 [0.9329; 0.9649] 0.0011 0.0335 75.34 Pooled estimate 0.7243 [0.6736; 0.7780] 0.0147 0.1224 87.54  | <pre>http://www.sec.org/action.or</pre> | propertions         954-c1 p-value         twill         twill         ft           0.94945         [0.3322]         0.94571         0.0013         0.0235         74.94           0.94945         [0.3320]         0.94671         0.0013         0.0235         74.94           0.94957         [0.3320]         0.94671         0.0013         0.0235         74.94           0.94570         [0.3350]         0.94671         0.0011         0.0235         71.94           0.94570         [0.32572]         0.94971         0.0011         0.0235         74.04           0.9471         [0.32572]         0.94911         0.0011         0.0333         74.04           0.9531         [0.34512]         0.94911         0.0011         0.0333         74.94           0.9531         [0.34512]         0.94911         0.0011         0.0333         74.94           0.9531         [0.34512]         0.94711         0.0011         0.0333         74.94           0.9531         [0.34512]         0.94711         0.0011         0.0333         74.94           0.9531         [0.34372]         0.94711         0.0011         0.0333         74.94           0.9532         [0.33372] <td< td=""><td>Distiling Andress Pagnedis,2015         0.465           Constituing Desta Blass-Feijos,2019         0.7171         0.465           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7171         0.465           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.450           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.450           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.7192         0.460           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.7192         0.450           Constituing Markens D. 101         0.7191         0.7192         0.450         0.7192         0.450           Constituing Andress D. 101         1.81246,2002         0.7234         0.471         0.450         0.7234         0.471           Constituing John D. 0'Soyle.2000         0.7219         0.646         0.471         0.472         0.472           Constituing Marces Papedise,2013         0.7195         0.4716         0.472         0.472         0.472           Constituing J. Hautopy,2007         0.7246         0.4724         0.472         0.4724         0.472           Constituing J. Hautopy,2011         0.7175         0.474         0.4725         0.474         0.4725           Constituing J. Hautopy,2011         0.7175         0.4724</td><td>554-CI         p-value         tau'I         tau         I'I           50         0.7152         0.1251         0.1254         0.744           50         0.7152         0.0151         0.1252         0.744           50         0.7154         0.0176         0.1253         0.744           50         0.7445         0.0176         0.1253         0.744           50         0.7746         0.0176         0.1251         0.7454           50         0.7706         0.0146         0.1221         0.755           50         0.7706         0.0146         0.1221         0.755           50         0.7702         0.0146         0.1221         0.755           50         0.7703         0.0146         0.1201         0.755           50         0.7703         0.0146         0.1201         0.747           50         0.7703         0.0125         0.123         0.744           50         0.7703         0.0152         0.123         0.744           50         0.7703         0.0152         0.123         0.744           50         0.7780         0.0164         0.1214         0.743           50</td></td<> | Distiling Andress Pagnedis,2015         0.465           Constituing Desta Blass-Feijos,2019         0.7171         0.465           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7171         0.465           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.450           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.450           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.7192         0.460           Constituing V. Baiaya,2013         0.7192         0.7192         0.450           Constituing Markens D. 101         0.7191         0.7192         0.450         0.7192         0.450           Constituing Andress D. 101         1.81246,2002         0.7234         0.471         0.450         0.7234         0.471           Constituing John D. 0'Soyle.2000         0.7219         0.646         0.471         0.472         0.472           Constituing Marces Papedise,2013         0.7195         0.4716         0.472         0.472         0.472           Constituing J. Hautopy,2007         0.7246         0.4724         0.472         0.4724         0.472           Constituing J. Hautopy,2011         0.7175         0.474         0.4725         0.474         0.4725           Constituing J. Hautopy,2011         0.7175         0.4724 | 554-CI         p-value         tau'I         tau         I'I           50         0.7152         0.1251         0.1254         0.744           50         0.7152         0.0151         0.1252         0.744           50         0.7154         0.0176         0.1253         0.744           50         0.7445         0.0176         0.1253         0.744           50         0.7746         0.0176         0.1251         0.7454           50         0.7706         0.0146         0.1221         0.755           50         0.7706         0.0146         0.1221         0.755           50         0.7702         0.0146         0.1221         0.755           50         0.7703         0.0146         0.1201         0.755           50         0.7703         0.0146         0.1201         0.747           50         0.7703         0.0125         0.123         0.744           50         0.7703         0.0152         0.123         0.744           50         0.7703         0.0152         0.123         0.744           50         0.7780         0.0164         0.1214         0.743           50   |
|  | Pooled estimate  | 0.9499 [0.9329; 0.9669] 0.0011 0.0335 75.34  | Pooled estimate 0.7243 [0.673   | 6/ 0.7750] 0.0147 0.1214 87.24  |

**Figure 2.** Forrest plot and sensitivity of the pooled overall and bilateral SLN detection rate. (A) Forrest plot of the pooled overall SLN detection rate  $[l^2 = 75\%, a random effects model was used to estimate the combined overall detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 95\% (95\% CI: 93%–97%)]. SLN = sentinel lymph node.). (B) Forrest plot of the combined bilateral SLN detection rate <math>[l^2 = 87\%, a random effects model was used to estimate the pooled bilateral detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 72% (95% CI: 67%-78%)]. (C) Sensitivity of the pooled overall SLN detection rate; (D) Sensitivity of the combined bilateral SLN detection rate.$ 

bilateral SLN detection rate: the percentage of patients with bilateral sentinel node identification).

The following information was exclusion criteria: sample size less than 10 patients, reviews, comments, case reports, editorials or meeting abstracts. The article lack of core data or incomplete information, advanced cervical cancer, articles included endometrial adenocarcinoma and cervical cancer. To avoid duplicating sample size of patient data in publications, we used articles with the largest sample size.

Working independently, 2 reviewers screened titles and abstracts, if necessary, reviewed full-text articles for inclusion exclusion, disagreements were settled by consensus.

#### 2.3. Data extraction and quality assessment

Summary information includes first author, publication year, study size, stage (FIGO), number and median age of patients, tumor histology, median number of SLN. The sensitivity associated with SLN surgery is described as the true positive total number of histopathologically positive patients. Wherever possible, to evaluate the performance, the sensitivity, specificity, negative predictive value was extracted.

The QUADAS-2 tool was used by 2 reviewers independently to assess the risk of bias for included studies. When have disagreements in the process of study selection or data collection, problems were solved by review of the original articles.

#### 2.4. Statistical analysis

R-3.6.1 software for Windows was using for statistical analysis. The heterogeneity of the studies was evaluated using the inconsistency statistic ( $I^2$ ), results were considered homogenous when  $I^2 < 50\%$  and the *P* value  $\geq$ .10, in these conditions fixed-effect model was calculated. Otherwise ( $I^2 > 50\%$  or *P* value <.10), the studies were considered heterogeneous. At the same time, a random-effect model was employed. When heterogeneity exists, sensitivity analysis will be used to analyze the possible causes of heterogeneity. After checking for consistency, the





Metaprop module in the R-3.6.1 statistical software package was used for the meta-analysis. The consequences were depicted graphically as forest plots. Publication bias was displayed graphically using funnel plots and Egger's regression.

#### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Characteristics of studies

A total of 2164 patients in 28 studies.<sup>[8–35]</sup> that met the inclusion criteria published between 2000 and 2019 were enrolled in our study. Figure 1 displays flow chart of the search process. 28 studies were included ranging from 12 to 405 patients with a median age between 35 and 58 years old. The characteristics of

the 28 studies, including patient age, study size, clinical study time period, stage (FIGO), median age, tumor histology, overall detection rate, bilateral detection rate, sensitivity, specificity, negative predictive value are listed in Table 1. We calculate the SLN detection rate including blue dye with Tc, Tc, and ICG according to the different tracer methods.

#### 3.2. Combined detection rate, sensitivity of SLNs

All 28 studies submitted data for the analysis of detection rate.  $I^2$  value was 75% of the combined overall detection rate as well as 87% of the combined bilateral detection rate reflecting a high heterogeneity among the studies. Thence, a random effects model was used to estimate the combined overall detection rate of SLN

| Study   | Events  | Total   |  | Proportion  | 95%-CI  | Weight<br>(fixed)   | Weight<br>(random)  | Study   | Events Total  |  | Proportion   | 95%-CI  | (fixed)   | Weight<br>(random)   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Berta Diaz-Feijoo, ?2019[9]<br>Marrije R. Buist, 2002[13]<br>Hitosh Nikura, 2004[15]<br>Enc. Lambaudie, 2002[18]<br>D. WYDFA, 2006[23]<br>Omer Dewaja, ?2011[30]<br>A. Nickles Fader, ?2006[31]<br>David M. Kushner, ?2007[33]<br>Beatrice Corrier, ?2011[34]<br>John P. Duaz, ?2011[35]  | 126<br>25<br>18<br>11<br>84<br>84<br>35<br>20<br>114<br>77                          | 128<br>25<br>20<br>12<br>100<br>86<br>38<br>20<br>122<br>81 |  | 0 98<br>1.00<br>0 90<br>0 92<br>0.84<br>0 98<br>0 92<br>1.00<br>0 93<br>0.95    | $\begin{array}{c} [0 \ 94, \ 1.00] \\ [0.86, \ 1.00] \\ [0.68, \ 0.99] \\ [0.62, \ 1.00] \\ [0.75, \ 0.91] \\ [0.75, \ 0.91] \\ [0.79, \ 0.98] \\ [0.83, \ 1.00] \\ [0.87, \ 0.97] \\ [0.88, \ 0.99] \end{array}$ | 42 1%<br>7 0%<br>1 1%<br>0.8%<br>3 8%<br>19 2%<br>2 6%<br>4 6%<br>10 1%<br>8 7%                         | 18.0%<br>11.3%<br>3.4%<br>2.5%<br>8.1%<br>15.7%<br>6.5%<br>9.1%<br>13.1%<br>12.4%             | Berta Diaz-Fejoo, ?2019[3]<br>Mamije R. Bust, 2002[13]<br>Hitoshi Nikura, 2004[15]<br>Dr. V. DRA, 2006[23]<br>D. W. DRA, 2006[23]<br>O'mer Devaja, ?2017[30]<br>A. Nickles Feder, ?2007[33]<br>David M. Kushner, ?2007[33]<br>Beatrice Commer, ?2011[34]<br>John P. Diaz, ?2010[35] | 97 128<br>22 25<br>15 20<br>10 12<br>66 100<br>63 86<br>18 88<br>-20 20<br>91 122<br>58 81                  |  | 0.76<br>0.88<br>0.75<br>0.83<br>0.66<br>0.73<br>0.47<br>1.00<br>0.75<br>0.72                                     | $\begin{array}{l} [0.67, 0.83] \\ [0.69, 0.97] \\ [0.51, 0.91] \\ [0.52, 0.98] \\ [0.56, 0.75] \\ [0.63, 0.82] \\ [0.31, 0.64] \\ [0.83, 1.00] \\ [0.66, 0.82] \\ [0.60, 0.81] \end{array}$ | 17.0%<br>5.8%<br>2.6%<br>2.1%<br>10.8%<br>10.7%<br>3.7%<br>22.0%<br>15.7%<br>9.7% | 11.3%<br>9.8%<br>7.9%<br>7.3%<br>10.8%<br>10.8%<br>8.8%<br>11.5%<br>11.2%<br>10.6% |
| Fixed effect model<br>Random effects model<br>Heterogeneity $r^2 = 60\%$ , $\tau^2 = 0.0$<br>A  | 0009 <i>, p</i>   | 632<br>< 0.01   | 065070750808509095 1   | 0.97<br>0.96  | [0.95; 0.98]<br>[0.93; 0.98]  | 100.0%  | 100.0%  | Fixed effect model<br>Random effects model<br>Heterogeneity $l^2 = 87\%$ , $c^2 = 0.0$  | <b>632</b><br>0174. <i>p</i> < 0.01   | 04 05 06 07 08 09  | 0.79<br>0.76   | [0.76; 0.82]<br>[0.67; 0.85]  | 100.0%  | 100.0%   |
| Influential analysis (Ram   | ndos e:   | ffects  | model)   |   |   |   |   | Influential analysis (R   | andom effects   | model)   |  |   |   |  |
| Contting Nerta Dias-Feij<br>Omitting Marrijs R. Buist<br>Omitting Mitoshi Mikuma,<br>Omitting Frio Lambaudis,<br>Omitting D. WTDAA, 20061;<br>Omitting Omer Devela, 720<br>Omitting A. Niodies Fade<br>Omitting Pavid R. Kushne<br>Omitting Devid R. Kushne<br>Omitting Demitting Commiss | 00,720<br>6,2004<br>2002[<br>23]<br>12[30]<br>6,7200<br>6,7200<br>6,7201<br>010[35] | 19[9]<br>2[13]<br>[15]<br>18]<br>8[31]<br>7[33]<br>1[34]    | propertion         955           0.9479         [0.9168         0.97           0.9491         [0.92041         0.7           0.9491         [0.92041         0.7           0.9491         [0.92041         0.8           0.9491         [0.92041         0.8           0.9491         [0.92041         0.8           0.9491         [0.92041         0.8           0.9491         [0.92041         0.8           0.9491         [0.92041         0.8           0.9491         [0.92041         0.8           0.9492         [0.92041         0.8           0.9493         [0.92041         0.9           0.9593         [0.92031         0.9           0.9594         [0.92031         0.9 | -CI p-val<br>93]<br>79]<br>42]<br>33]<br>78]<br>16]<br>51]<br>87]<br>69]<br>46] | <pre>tau^2 0.0011 0.0010 0.0009 0.0009 0.0001 0.0013 0.0009 0.0010 0.0019 0.0010 0.0009 0.0011</pre>  | tau<br>0.0339<br>0.0311<br>0.0301<br>0.0308<br>0.0110<br>0.0358<br>0.0304<br>0.0311<br>0.0306<br>0.0327 | 1^2<br>57.05<br>61.75<br>62.65<br>63.65<br>17.65<br>63.75<br>62.35<br>62.75<br>59.85<br>63.35 | Omitting Berts Dist-Fei,<br>Omitting Harrije R. Bui<br>Omitting Hitoshi Nilkur<br>Omitting Eric Lambaulie<br>Omitting D. WTPA, 2006<br>Omitting Omer Devyls, 22<br>Omitting A. Nickles Fed<br>Omitting Bestrice Cormi<br>Omitting Devil R. Fushn<br>Omitting John P. Piss, 7        | joo, 72019[9]<br>st, 2002[13]<br>a, 2004[15]<br>(20]<br>(20]<br>(20]<br>(20]<br>(20]<br>(20]<br>(20]<br>(20 | Proportion<br>0.7576 (0.6529; 0<br>0.7580 (0.6424; 0<br>0.7580 (0.6424; 0<br>0.7521 (0.6567; 0<br>0.7501 (0.6761; 0<br>0.7609 (0.6601; 0<br>0.7609 (0.6994; 0<br>0.7276 (0.6702; 0<br>0.7582 (0.6555; 0<br>0.7582 (0.6555; 0 | 95%-CI p-vm<br>.8624]<br>.0422]<br>.0540]<br>.05475]<br>.0661]<br>.0617]<br>.0719]<br>.7849]<br>.8620]<br>.8626] | lue   |   |  |
| Pooled estimate<br>C  |   |   | 0.9552 [0.9288; 0.96   | 17]   | 0.0009  | 0.0299  | 59.81   | Pooled estimate<br>Omitting Berta Dins-Fei<br>Omitting Mirrije R. Bui<br>Omitting Hitcohi Nikur<br>Omitting Eric Lambauite<br>Omitting Omer Beviaga, 27<br>Omitting Omer Beviaga, 27<br>Omitting A. Nickles Pad<br>Omitting David H. Kushn  | joo,72019(9)<br>st,2002[13]<br>s,2004[15]<br>s,2001[18]<br>[23]<br>012[30]<br>st,72007[33]<br>st,72007[33]  | 0.7582 [0.6680; 0<br>tau'2 tau 12<br>0.0215 0.1467 88.5<br>0.0184 0.1358 88.3<br>0.0182 0.1351 88.6<br>0.0181 0.1346 88.6<br>0.0181 0.1346 88.6<br>0.0198 0.1406 89.4<br>0.0198 0.1406 89.4<br>0.0198 0.156 85.5             | .0405]   |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | Omitting John P. Dias, 7  | 2010[35]  | 0.0193 0.1388 88.2   | •  |   |   |  |
|   |   |   |  |   |   |   |   | D   |   | 0.0174 0.1319 87.2   |  |   |   |  |

**Figure 4.** Forrest plot and sensitivity of the overall and bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique. (A) Forrest plot of the overall SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique. [ $l^2 = 60\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the overall detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 96%]; (B) Forrest plot of the bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique. [ $l^2 = 80\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the overall detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 96%]; (B) Forrest plot of the bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique. [ $l^2 = 87\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the bilateral detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 76%]; (C) Sensitivity of the overall SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique; (D) Sensitivity of the bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique.



Figure 5. Publication bias of the overall and bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique. (A) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the overall SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique; (B) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique; (B) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique; (B) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique; (B) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the bilateral SLN detection rate using blue dye with Tc technique.



Figure 6. Forrest plot, sensitivity and publication bias of the overall and bilateral SLN detection rate using Tc technique. [ $l^2 = 65\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the overall detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 95%]; (B) Forrest plot of the bilateral SLN detection rate using Tc technique. [ $l^2 = 65\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the overall detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 95%]; (B) Forrest plot of the bilateral SLN detection rate using Tc technique. [ $l^2 = 90\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the bilateral detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 63%]; (C) Sensitivity of the overall SLN detection rate using Tc technique; (D) Sensitivity of the bilateral SLN detection rate using Tc technique; (E) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the overall SLN detection rate using Tc technique; (F) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the overall SLN detection rate using Tc technique.

mapping, with a result of 95% (95% confidence interval (CI): 93%-97%) (Fig. 2A). A random effects model was designed to estimate the pooled bilateral detection rate of SLN mapping, with a consequence of 72% (95% CI: 67%-78%) (Fig. 2B).

Figure 2C and D demonstrate the sensitivity of the detection rates in SLN mapping. The pooled sensitivity of SLN overall detection rate was 94.99% (95% CI, 93.29%–96.69%,  $I^2 = 75.3\%$ ) (Fig. 2C) with a sensitivity of 72.43% (95% CI, 67.36%–77.50%,  $I^2 = 87.2\%$ ) bilateral sentinel node detection rate (Fig. 2D).

## 3.3. Detection rate, sensitivity of SLNs for different technologies

We evaluated the diagnostic accuracy SLN biopsy specimens collected from patients using blue dye with Tc (10 studies), Tc (6 studies), ICG (4 studies).  $I^2$  value ( $I^2 > 50\%$ ) reflecting a high heterogeneity among the studies, thence, a random effects model was used to estimate the detection rate of SLN mapping except ICG bilateral rate detection ( $I^2=0\%$ , P=.97). The SLN overall detection rates using blue dye with Tc, Tc, ICG were 96% (Fig. 3A), 95% (Fig. 4A) and 98% (Fig. 5A). The SLN bilateral detection rates using blue dye with Tc, Tc, ICG were 76% (Fig. 3B), 63% (Fig. 4B), and 85% (Fig. 5B), respectively.

The sensitivity of SLN overall detection rate using blue dye with Tc, Tc, ICG were 95.52% (Fig. 3C), 94.99% (Fig. 4C), and 97.76%% (Fig. 5C) while the bilateral detection rate were 75.82% (Fig. 3D), 63.45% (Fig. 4D), and 84.96% (Fig. 5D).

#### 3.4. Publication bias of the included studies

We included 28 studies to analysis publication bias. Additionally, we generated funnel plots and Egger's regression intercepts for overall detection rate and bilateral detection rate for the SLN mapping in order to assess the publication bias of aggregated data. Every point is a separate study. Funnel plots and Egger's regression revealed noticeable evidence of publication bias (Fig. 6A, B). However, based on the plots, The results indicate that no significant different publication bias was emerged in the meta-analysis using blue dye with Tc, Tc, ICG (Figs. 7A, B, 4E, F, and 5E, F).



**Figure 7.** Forrest plot, sensitivity and publication bias of the overall and bilateral SLN detection rate using ICG technique. (A) Forrest plot of the overall SLN detection rate using ICG technique. ( $l^2 = 60\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the overall detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 98%]; (B) Forrest plot of the bilateral SLN detection rate using ICG technique. [ $l^2 = 60\%$ , A random effects model was used to estimate the overall detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 98%]; (B) Forrest plot of the bilateral SLN detection rate using ICG technique. [ $l^2 = 0\%$ , P = .97, A fixed effects model was used to estimate the bilateral detection rate of SLN mapping, with a result of 85%]; (C) Sensitivity of the overall SLN detection rate using ICG technique; (D) Sensitivity of the bilateral SLN detection rate using ICG technique; (E) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the overall SLN detection rate using ICG technique. (F) Funnel plots, inverse of standard error and Egger's regression of the overall SLN detection rate using ICG technique.

#### 4. Discussion

#### 4.1. Main findings

The pathologic status of lymph nodes is a major prognostic factor in patients with early-stage cervical cancer.<sup>[36]</sup> Therefore, pelvic lymphadenectomy and radical hysterectomy still remain the standard for women with early-stage cervical cancer. However, the incidence of lymph node metastases in early-stage cervical cancer is just 15% to 20%.<sup>[37]</sup> Patients undergo unnecessary pelvic lymph node dissection, which enhances complications of the procedure. To reduce the number of patients undergoing lymphadenectomy together with the occurrence of early and late complications after surgery. Clinical trials have established the procedure as an indispensable part of the treatment of patients with melanoma and breast cancer.<sup>[38]</sup> Lymphatic mapping together with SLN biopsy of early-stage cervical cancer has been assessed in numerous trials. There was no difference in the overall detection rates between mapping agents, surgical method, patients with and without conization or between patients with tumors <2 and  $\geq 2 \text{ cm}$ ,<sup>[11]</sup> the sensitivity can be >99% in wellselected patients at the mean time.<sup>[39]</sup> In cervical cancer, the clinical research of SLN biopsy is also actively carried out and has achieved ideal clinical treatment results. It has been incorporated into the cervical cancer National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) treatment guidelines, which are a very prospective surgical approach. Despite a large number of women with early-stage cervical cancer in some regions and countries, such as China, the SLN mapping technique has not been promoted in the hospital. The reason largely due to the role of SLN evaluation and the detection rates together with techniques of SLN biopsy in early-stage cervical cancer remains unclear.

Therefore, our article summarizes an overview of the published literature of SLN including pooled detection rates of early-stage cervical cancer and analyzes the separate detection rate (overall detection rate, bilateral detection rate) using blue dye with Tc, Tc and ICG technique. Additionally, Jerry reports that the average detection rate ranges from 78% to 100%.<sup>[40]</sup> This is in agreement with the recent meta-analysis by Kadkhodayan which reported pooling detection rate of 89.2% and sensitivity was 90% when compiling data from 67 published studies of uterine cervix cancer SLN mapping.<sup>[41]</sup> The observed results of this meta-analysis compare favorably with those reported in previous studies. In our

study, the combined overall detection rate of SLN mapping was 95% with a 72% bilateral SLN detection rate. The sensitivity of the combined overall detection rate was 94.99% together with 72.43% bilateral SLN detection rate. Moreover, based on the results of our study, the overall detection rate (98%) as well as bilateral rate (85%) of ICG seems to be a better SLN mapping technique among the method of SLN mapping (using blue dye with Tc, Tc or ICG). The latest detailed data shows that the pooled specific side detection rates were 85% in tumors up to 2 cm, 67% in tumors over 2 cm, 75.2% for blue dye, 74.7% for Tc, 84% for combined technique, and 85.5% for ICG.<sup>[42]</sup> These consequences consistent with the results of other authors. Despite caveats in current evidence and discrepancies in available data, there is growing evidence that SLN mapping is feasible and results in an excellent detection rate in patients with cervical cancer.

#### 4.2. Limitations

There are certain limitations in this meta-analysis. First of all, although our study can detect the difference in the detection rate through cartographic technology among blue dye with Tc (632 patients included in 10 studies), Tc (438 patients included in 6 studies) and ICG technique (206 patients included in 4 studies). Based on the results of the current study, we believe that SLN biopsy using ICG is the most useful method of SLN detection in patients with uterine cervical cancer, many studies have shown that using ICG is associated with high detection rates in early-stage cervical cancer compared with other modalities, such as <sup>99</sup>mTc with blue dye, blue dye alone.<sup>[43]</sup> Other studies showed<sup>[44]</sup> that the detection rates of SLN using <sup>99</sup>m tech (<sup>99</sup>mTc)-tincolloid, indigo carmine and ICG were 85.8%, 20.2% and 61.6%, respectively. Because of fewer articles and insufficient cases, the reliability of the results in our article needs further verification.

Secondly, publication bias is a major issue that could be taken into account in some systematic reviews. Therefore, we evaluated the publication bias through a funnel plots together with Egger's regression. Funnel plots of detection rate revealed some asymmetry of publication bias. Egger's regression intercept made the overall detection rate 2.15 (P < .05) while the bilateral detection rate was 3.007 (P < .01), which indicates that Egger's tests were also statistically significant. This indicates publication bias may be a fundamental limitation in this meta-analysis and deserves attention as well. However, after adjusting for possible publication bias or utilizing fixed models, the combined detection rate and sensitivity hardly changed. In a nutshell, publication bias may not be considered as a major limitation in our meta-analysis.

#### 4.3. Significance

In conclusion, our research demonstrates SLN mapping has high detection rates of patients with early-stage cervical cancer and ICG has the highest detection rate of the 3 tracers. SLN mapping has been a sensitive method, which can be an alternative standard for staging and management of select patients with cervical cancer. Whether SLN mapping can replace a more complete lymphatic assessment has to be assessed in a larger, prospective, randomized, follow-up study of patient with early-stage cervical cancer.

#### **Author contributions**

Lijun Wang: Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Software, Writing – original draft.

Shanshan Liu: Formal analysis, Software.

Ting Xu: Investigation.

Linnan Yuan: Software.

Xinyuan Yang: Resources, Supervision, Funding acquisition, Project administration.

Data curation: Lijun Wang.

Formal analysis: Lijun Wang, Shanshan Liu.

Funding acquisition: Xinyuan Yang.

Investigation: Lijun Wang, Ting Xu.

Project administration: Xinyuan Yang.

Resources: Xinyuan Yang.

Software: Lijun Wang, Shanshan Liu, Linnan Yuan.

Supervision: Xinyuan Yang.

Writing - original draft: Lijun Wang.

#### References

- Abbas KM, van Zandvoort K, Brisson M, Jit M. Effects of updated demography, disability weights, and cervical cancer burden on estimates of human papillomavirus vaccination impact at the global, regional, and national levels: a PRIME modelling study. Lancet Glob Health 2020;8: e536–44. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30022-X.
- [2] Margolis B, Cagle-Colon K, Chen L, Tergas AI, Boyd L, Wright JD. Prognostic significance of lymphovascular space invasion for stage IA1 and IA2 cervical cancer. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2020;30:735–43. doi:10.1136/ijgc-2019-000849.
- [3] Matsuura Y, Kawagoe T, Toki N, Tanaka M, Kashimura M. Longstanding complications after treatment for cancer of the uterine cervixclinical significance of medical examination at 5 years after treatment. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2006;16:294–7. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1438.2006.00354.x.
- [4] Dargent D, Enria R. Laparoscopic assessment of the sentinel lymph nodes in early cervical cancer. Technique – preliminary results and future developments. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol 2003;48:305–10. doi:10.1016/ s1040-8428(03)00129-x.
- [5] Yost KJ, Cheville AL, Alhilli MM, et al. Lymphedema after surgery for endometrial cancer: prevalence, risk factors, and quality of life. Obstet Gynecol 2014;124(2 Pt 1):307.
- [6] Levinson KL, Auer M, Escobar PF. Evolving technologies in robotic surgery for minimally invasive treatment of gynecologic cancers. Expert Rev Med Devices 2013;10:603–10.
- [7] Mueller JJ, Dauer LT, Murali R, et al. Positron lymphography via intracervical 18F-FDG injection for pre-surgical lymphatic mapping in cervical and endometrial malignancies. J Nucl Med 2020;61:1123–30. doi:10.2967/jnumed.119.230714.
- [8] Papadia A, Imboden S, Fink A, Gasparri ML, Bolla D, Mueller MD. Accuracy of sentinel lymph node mapping after previous hysterectomy in patients with occult cervical cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2016;23:2199–205. doi:10.1245/s10434-015-5066-2.
- [9] Diaz-Feijoo B, Temprana-Salvador J, Franco-Camps S, et al. Clinical management of early-stage cervical cancer: the role of sentinel lymph node biopsy in tumors ≤2 cm. Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol 2019;241:30–4. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2019.07.038.
- [10] Balaya V, Bresset A, Guani B, et al. Risk factors for failure of bilateral sentinel lymph node mapping in early-stage cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2020;156:93–9. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2019.10.027.
- [11] Salvo G, Ramirez PT, Levenback CF, et al. Sensitivity and negative predictive value for sentinel lymph node biopsy in women with earlystage cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2017;145:96–101. doi:10.1016/j. ygyno.2017.02.005.
- [12] Beavis AL, Salazar-Marioni S, Sinno AK, et al. Sentinel lymph node detection rates using indocyanine green in women with early-stage cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2016;143:302–6. doi:10.1016/j. ygyno.2016.08.236.
- [13] Buist MR, Pijpers RJ, van Lingen A, et al. Laparoscopic detection of sentinel lymph nodes followed by lymph node dissection in patients with early stage cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2003;90:290–6. doi:10.1016/ s0090-8258(03)00277-4.
- [14] Di Stefano AB, Acquaviva G, Garozzo G, et al. Lymph node mapping and sentinel node detection in patients with cervical carcinoma: a 2-year experience. Gynecol Oncol 2005;99:671–9. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2005. 07.115.

- [15] Niikura H, Okamura C, Akahira J, et al. Sentinel lymph node detection in early cervical cancer with combination <sup>99m</sup>Tc phytate and patent blue. Gynecol Oncol 2004;94:528–32. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2004.05.016.
- [16] Lantzsch T, Wolters M, Grimm J, et al. Sentinel node procedure in Ib cervical cancer: a preliminary series. Br J Cancer 2001;85:791–4. doi:10.1054/bjoc.2001.2005.
- [17] O'Boyle JD, Coleman RL, Bernstein SG, Lifshitz S, Muller CY, Miller DS. Intraoperative lymphatic mapping in cervix cancer patients undergoing radical hysterectomy: a pilot study. Gynecol Oncol 2000;79:238–43. doi:10.1006/gyno.2000.5930.
- [18] Lambaudie E, Collinet P, Narducci F, et al. Laparoscopic identification of sentinel lymph nodes in early stage cervical cancer: prospective study using a combination of patent blue dye injection and technetium radiocolloid injection. Gynecol Oncol 2003;89:84–7. doi:10.1016/ s0090-8258(03)00059-3.
- [19] Plante M, Renaud MC, Têtu B, Harel F, Roy M. Laparoscopic sentinel node mapping in early-stage cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2003;91:494–503. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2003.08.024.
- [20] Kim JH, Kim DY, Suh DS, et al. The efficacy of sentinel lymph node mapping with indocyanine green in cervical cancer. World J Surg Oncol 2018;16:52doi:10.1186/s12957-018-1341-6.
- [21] Papadia A, Gasparri ML, Genoud S, Bernd K, Mueller MD. The combination of preoperative PET/CT and sentinel lymph node biopsy in the surgical management of early-stage cervical cancer. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 2017;143:2275–81. doi:10.1007/s00432-017-2467-6.
- [22] Furukawa N, Oi H, Yoshida S, Shigetomi H, Kanayama S, Kobayashi H. The usefulness of photodynamic eye for sentinel lymph node identification in patients with cervical cancer. Tumori 2010;96:936–40.
- [23] Wydra D, Sawicki S, Wojtylak S, Bandurski T, Emerich J. Sentinel node identification in cervical cancer patients undergoing transperitoneal radical hysterectomy: a study of 100 cases. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2006;16:649–54. doi:10.1111/j.1525-1438.2006.00402.x.
- [24] Hauspy J, Beiner M, Harley I, Ehrlich L, Rasty G, Covens A. Sentinel lymph nodes in early stage cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2007;105:285–90. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2007.02.008.
- [25] Ogawa S, Kobayashi H, Amada S, et al. Sentinel node detection with <sup>99m</sup>Tc phytate alone is satisfactory for cervical cancer patients undergoing radical hysterectomy and pelvic lymphadenectomy. Int J Clin Oncol 2010;15:52–8. doi:10.1007/s10147-009-0010-8.
- [26] Roy M, Bouchard-Fortier G, Popa I, et al. Value of sentinel node mapping in cancer of the cervix. Gynecol Oncol 2011;122:269–74. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2011.04.002.
- [27] Marchiolè P, Buénerd A, Scoazec JY, Dargent D, Mathevet P. Sentinel lymph node biopsy is not accurate in predicting lymph node status for patients with cervical carcinoma. Cancer 2004;100:2154–9. doi:10.1002/cncr.20212.
- [28] Darlin L, Persson J, Bossmar T, et al. The sentinel node concept in early cervical cancer performs well in tumors smaller than 2 cm. Gynecol Oncol 2010;117:266–9. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2010.01.035.
- [29] Kara PP, Ayhan A, Caner B, et al. Sentinel lymph node detection in early stage cervical cancer: a prospective study comparing preoperative lymphoscintigraphy, intraoperative gamma probe, and blue dye. Ann Nucl Med 2008;22:487–94. doi:10.1007/s12149-008-0144-1.
- [30] Devaja O, Mehra G, Coutts M, et al. A prospective single-center study of sentinel lymph node detection in cervical carcinoma: is there a place in

clinical practice? Int J Gynecol Cancer 2012;22:1044–9. doi:10.1097/ IGC.0b013e318253a9c9.

- [31] Fader AN, Edwards RP, Cost M, et al. Sentinel lymph node biopsy in early-stage cervical cancer: utility of intraoperative versus postoperative assessment. Gynecol Oncol 2008;111:13–7. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2008. 06.009.
- [32] Frumovitz M, Euscher ED, Deavers MT, et al. Triple injection" lymphatic mapping technique to determine if parametrial nodes are the true sentinel lymph nodes in women with cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2012;127:467–71. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2012.08.015.
- [33] Kushner DM, Connor JP, Wilson MA, et al. Laparoscopic sentinel lymph node mapping for cervix cancer – a detailed evaluation and time analysis. Gynecol Oncol 2007;106:507–12. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2007.04.031.
- [34] Cormier B, Diaz JP, Shih K, et al. Establishing a sentinel lymph node mapping algorithm for the treatment of early cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2011;122:275–80. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2011.04.023.
- [35] Diaz JP, Gemignani ML, Pandit-Taskar N, et al. Sentinel lymph node biopsy in the management of early-stage cervical carcinoma. Gynecol Oncol 2011;120:347–52. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2010.12.334.
- [36] Balaya V, Guani B, Bonsang-Kitzis H, et al. Place du ganglion sentinelle dans les cancers du col utérin débutants [Sentinel lymph node biopsy in early-stage cervical cancer: current state of art]. Bull Cancer 2020; 107:696–706. doi:10.1016/j.bulcan.2019.06.011.
- [37] Diaz JP, Sonoda Y, Leitao MM, et al. Oncologic outcome of fertilitysparing radical trachelectomy versus radical hysterectomy for stage IB1 cervical carcinoma. Gynecol Oncol 2008;111:255–60. doi:10.1016/j. ygyno.2008.07.014.
- [38] Levenback CF, Ali S, Coleman RL, et al. Lymphatic mapping and sentinel lymph node biopsy in women with squamous cell carcinoma of the vulva: a gynecologic oncology group study. J Clin Oncol 2012;30:3786–91. doi:10.1200/JCO.2011.41.2528.
- [39] Tax C, Rovers MM, de Graaf C, Zusterzeel PL, Bekkers RL. The sentinel node procedure in early stage cervical cancer, taking the next step; a diagnostic review. Gynecol Oncol 2015;139:559–67. doi:10.1016/j. ygyno.2015.09.076.
- [40] Cheng-Yen Lai J, Lai KJ, Yi-Yung Yu E, Hung ST, Chu CY, Wang KL. Sentinel lymphatic mapping among women with early-stage cervical cancer: A systematic review. Taiwan J Obstet Gynecol 2018;57:636–43. doi:10.1016/j.tjog.2018.08.004.
- [41] Kadkhodayan S, Hasanzadeh M, Treglia G, et al. Sentinel node biopsy for lymph nodal staging of uterine cervix cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of the pertinent literature. Eur J Surg Oncol 2015;41:1–20. doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2014.09.010.
- [42] Zhang X, Bao B, Wang S, Yi M, Jiang L, Fang X. Sentinel lymph node biopsy in early stage cervical cancer: a meta-analysis. Cancer Med 2021;10:2590–600. doi: 10.1002/cam4.3645.
- [43] Buda A, Crivellaro C, Elisei F, et al. Impact of indocyanine green for sentinel lymph node mapping in early stage endometrial and cervical cancer: comparison with conventional radiotracer (99m)Tc and/or blue dye. Ann Surg Oncol 2016;23:2183–91. doi:10.1245/s10434-015-5022-1.
- [44] Tanaka T, Terai Y, Ashihara K, et al. The detection of sentinel lymph nodes in laparoscopic surgery for uterine cervical cancer using 99mtechnetium-tin colloid, indocyanine green, and blue dye. J Gynecol Oncol 2017;28:e13doi:10.3802/jgo.2017.28.e13.