

Guidelines on Renal Cell Carcinoma

B. Ljungberg (Chair), K. Bensalah, A. Bex (Vice-chair), S. Canfield, S. Dabestani (Guidelines Associate), R.H. Giles (Patient Advocate), F. Hofmann (Guidelines Associate), M. Hora, M.A. Kuczyk, T. Lam, L. Marconi (Guidelines Associate), A.S. Merseburger, T. Powles, M. Staehler, A. Volpe

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Aims and scope	5
1.2 Panel composition	5
1.3 Available publications	5
1.4 Publication history and summary of changes	5
1.4.1 Publication history	5
1.4.2 Summary of changes	5
2. METHODS	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Future goals	7
2.3 Peer review	7
3. EPIDEMIOLOGY, AETIOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY	8
3.1 Epidemiology	8
3.1.1 Conclusion and recommendation	8
3.2 Histological diagnosis	8
3.2.1 Clear cell (ccRCC)	8
3.2.2 Papillary (pRCC)	8
3.2.3 Chromophobe (chRCC)	9
3.3 Other renal tumours	9
3.3.1 Carcinoma associated with end-stage renal disease; acquired cystic disease-associated RCC	9
3.3.2 Papillary adenoma	9
3.3.3 Hereditary kidney tumours	9
3.3.4 Angiomyolipoma (AML)	9
3.3.4.1 Treatment	10
3.3.4.2 Summary	11
3.4 Conclusions and recommendations	11
4. STAGING AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS	12
4.1 Staging	12
4.2 Anatomic classification systems	12
5. DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION	13
5.1 Symptoms	13
5.1.1 Physical examination	13
5.1.2 Laboratory findings	13
5.2 Imaging investigations	13
5.2.1 Presence of enhancement	13
5.2.2 CT or MRI	13
5.2.3 Other investigations	14
5.2.4 Radiographic investigations for metastatic RCC	14
5.2.5 Bosniak classification of renal cystic masses	14
5.3 Renal tumour biopsy	15
5.4 Recommendations for the diagnostic assessment of renal cell carcinoma	15
6. PROGNOSTIC FACTORS	16
6.1 Anatomical factors	16
6.2 Histological factors	16
6.3 Clinical factors	17
6.4 Molecular factors	17
6.5 Prognostic systems and nomograms	17
6.6 Conclusion and recommendations	17
7. DISEASE MANAGEMENT	19
7.1 Treatment of localised RCC	19
7.1.1 Introduction	19

7.1.2	Surgical treatment	19
7.1.2.1.	Nephron-sparing surgery versus radical nephrectomy	19
7.1.2.2	Associated procedures	20
7.1.2.2.1	Adrenalectomy	20
7.1.2.2.2	Lymph node dissection for clinically negative lymph nodes (cN0)	20
7.1.2.2.3	Embolisation	20
7.1.2.2.4	Conclusions and recommendations	20
7.1.3	Radical and partial nephrectomy techniques	20
7.1.3.1	Radical nephrectomy techniques	20
7.1.3.2	Partial nephrectomy techniques	21
7.1.3.3	Conclusions and recommendations	21
7.1.4	Therapeutic approaches as alternatives to surgery	21
7.1.4.1	Surgical versus non-surgical treatment	21
7.1.4.2	Surveillance	22
7.1.4.3	Ablative therapies	22
7.1.4.3.1	Cryoablation	22
7.1.4.3.2	Cryoablation versus PN	22
7.1.4.3.3	Radiofrequency ablation	22
7.1.4.3.4	RFA versus PN	23
7.1.4.3.5	Cryoablation versus RFA	23
7.1.4.3.6	Other ablative techniques	23
7.1.4.3.7	Conclusions and recommendations	23
7.2	Treatment of locally advanced RCC	23
7.2.1	Introduction	23
7.2.2	Management of clinically positive lymph nodes (cN+)	23
7.2.3	Management of locally advanced unresectable RCC	23
7.2.4	Management of RCC with venous thrombus	23
7.2.4.1	The evidence base for surgery in patients with VTT	24
7.2.4.2	The evidence base for different surgical strategies	24
7.2.4.3	Conclusions and recommendations	24
7.2.5	Adjuvant therapy	24
7.2.5.1	Conclusion and recommendation	24
7.3	Advanced/metastatic RCC	24
7.3.1	Local therapy of advanced/metastatic RCC	24
7.3.1.1	Cytoreductive nephrectomy	24
7.3.1.1.1	Embolisation of the primary tumour	25
7.3.1.1.2	Conclusions and recommendation	25
7.3.2	Local therapy of metastases in mRCC	25
7.3.2.1	Complete versus no/incomplete metastasectomy	25
7.3.2.2	Local therapies for RCC bone metastases	25
7.3.2.3	Local therapies for RCC brain metastases	26
7.3.2.4	Embolisation of metastases	26
7.3.2.5	Conclusions and recommendations	26
7.4	Systemic therapy for advanced/metastatic RCC	26
7.4.1	Chemotherapy	26
7.4.1.1	Conclusion and recommendation	26
7.4.2	Immunotherapy	26
7.4.2.1	IFN- α monotherapy and combined with bevacizumab	26
7.4.2.2	Interleukin-2	27
7.4.2.3	Vaccines and targeted immunotherapy	27
7.4.2.4	Conclusions and recommendations	27
7.4.3	Targeted therapies	27
7.4.3.1	Tyrosine kinase inhibitors	28
7.4.3.1.1	Sorafenib	28
7.4.3.1.2	Sunitinib	28
7.4.3.1.3	Pazopanib	28
7.4.3.1.4	Axitinib	29
7.4.4	Monoclonal antibody against circulating VEGF	29
7.4.4.1	Bevacizumab monotherapy and bevacizumab + IFN- α	29

7.4.5	mTOR inhibitors	29
7.4.5.1	Temsirolimus	29
7.4.5.2	Everolimus	29
7.4.6	Therapeutic strategies and recommendations	30
7.4.6.1	Therapy for treatment-naïve patients with clear-cell mRCC	30
7.4.6.1.1	Sequencing targeted therapy	30
7.4.6.1.1.1	Following progression of disease with VEGF-targeted therapy	30
7.4.6.1.1.2	Treatment after progression of disease with mTOR inhibition	30
7.4.6.1.1.3	Treatment after progression of disease with cytokines	30
7.4.6.1.1.4	Treatment after second-line targeted therapy	30
7.4.6.1.1.5	Combination of targeted agents	30
7.4.6.2	Non-clear-cell renal cancer	30
7.4.6.3	Conclusions and recommendations for systemic therapy in mRCC	32
7.5	Recurrent RCC	32
7.5.1	Introduction	32
7.5.2	Conclusions and recommendation for advanced/metastatic RCC	33
8.	FOLLOW-UP AFTER RADICAL NEPHRECTOMY OR PARTIAL NEPHRECTOMY OR ABLATIVE THERAPIES FOR RCC	33
8.1	Introduction	33
8.2	Which investigations for which patients, and when?	33
8.3	Conclusions and recommendations for surveillance following RN or PN or ablative therapies in RCC	34
8.4	Research priorities	34
9.	REFERENCES	35
10.	CONFLICT OF INTEREST	57

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Aims and scope

The European Association of Urology (EAU) Renal Cell Cancer (RCC) Guidelines Panel has compiled these clinical guidelines to provide urologists with evidence-based information and recommendations for the management of RCC.

1.2 Panel composition

The RCC panel is an international group of clinicians consisting of urological surgeons, an oncologist, methodologists, a pathologist and a radiologist, with particular expertise in the field of urological care. For the 2015 guideline update, the panel incorporated a patient advocate to provide a consumer perspective for its guidelines.

All experts involved in the production of this document have submitted potential conflict of interest statements.

The panel is most grateful for the methodological and scientific support provided by the following individuals in specific parts of the guideline document:

- Prof. Dr. O. Hes, pathologist, Plzen (CZ) (Other renal tumours);
- Dr. T. Adewuyi, Aberdeen, UK: (systematic review - Systemic therapy for metastatic disease and providing general assistance for various aspects of the systematic review);
- Dr. H. Bekema, Groningen (NL): (systematic review - Lymph node dissection in localised and locally advanced RCC);
- Dr. F. Stewart, Aberdeen (UK): (systematic review - Tumour thrombus)
- Prof. Dr. A. Graser, radiologist, Munich (DE): (development of a systematic review for the diagnosis and follow-up chapters [in progress]).

1.3 Available publications

A quick reference document (Pocket guidelines) is available, both in print and in a number of versions for mobile devices. These are abridged versions which may require consultation together with the full text versions. Several scientific publications are available as are a number of translations of all versions of the EAU RCC Guidelines [1-3]. All documents are available free access through the EAU website Uroweb: <http://www.uroweb.org/guidelines/online-guidelines/>.

1.4 Publication history and summary of changes

1.4.1 Publication history

The EAU RCC Guidelines were first published in 2000. This 2015 RCC Guidelines document presents a limited update of the 2014 publication.

1.4.2 Summary of changes

All chapters of the 2015 RCC Guidelines have been updated, based on the 2014 update. The consistency of the data work-up will differ between sections. An overview is presented in Table 1.1.

Table 1.1: Description of update and summary of review methodology for the 2015 update

Chapter	Brief description of review methodology
1. Introduction	Not applicable
2. Methods	Not applicable
3. Epidemiology, Aetiology and Pathology	Updated using a structured data assessment. Of particular note is the inclusion of the new Vancouver Classification in the Histology section [4, 5].
4. Staging and grading classification systems	Updated using a traditional narrative review.
5. Diagnostic evaluation	Updated using a systematic review on tumour biopsy. Updated using a structured data assessment [6].
6. Prognosis	Updated using a traditional narrative review, based on a structured literature search.
7. Treatment (Disease management)	Updated using a systematic review mostly based on a literature search from 2000. A new section, 'Management of RCC with venous thrombus' has been added which is based on a systematic review [7]. A new section on recurrent RCC was added.
8. Surveillance following radical or partial nephrectomy or ablative therapies	Updated using a traditional narrative review, based on a structured data search.

Changed recommendations

Recommendations have been rephrased and added to throughout the current document, not resulting in a change in the grade of recommendation (GR). New recommendations have been included in Sections:

3.4 Recommendations for other renal tumours

Recommendations	GR
<p>AMLs, active surveillance is the most appropriate option for most AMLs. Treatment with selective arterial embolisation (SAE) or NSS can be considered in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large tumours (recommended threshold of intervention does not exist, the formerly recommended size of > 4 cm wide is disputed); • females of childbearing age; • patients in whom follow-up or access to emergency care may be inadequate. 	C

7.1.2.2.4 Conclusions and recommendations

Recommendation	GR
PN should be favoured over RN in patients with T1b tumour, whenever feasible.	B

7.2.4.3 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	LE
In patients with locally advanced disease due to clinically enlarged LNs the survival benefit of LND is unclear. In these cases LND can be performed for staging purposes.	3

7.3.3.8 Conclusions and recommendations for systemic therapy in mRCC

Recommendation	GR
Sunitinib can be recommended as first-line therapy for non-clear-cell mRCC.	B

2. METHODS

2.1 Introduction

For sections of the guidelines that have been updated using a systematic review, the review methodology is outlined in detail elsewhere [8]. Briefly, a systematic review of the literature was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines [9]. Important topics and questions were prioritised for the present update. Elements for inclusion and exclusion, including patient population, intervention, comparison, outcomes, study design, and search terms and restrictions were developed using an iterative process involving all members of the panel, to achieve consensus. Individual literature searches were conducted separately for each update question, and in most instances the search was conducted up to the end of November 2013. Two independent reviewers screened abstracts and full texts, carried out data abstraction and assessed risk of bias. The results were presented in tables showing baseline characteristics and summaries of findings. Meta-analyses were performed only for randomised controlled trials (RCTs) which demonstrated consistency and homogeneity of data. When this was not possible, a narrative synthesis of the evidence was provided.

The remaining sections of the guidelines were updated using a traditional narrative review strategy. Structured literature searches using an expert information specialist were designed. Searches of the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, the Cochrane Library of Controlled Clinical Trials, and Medline and Embase on the Dialog-Datastar platform were performed. The controlled terminology of the respective databases was used, and both Mesh and Emtree were analysed for relevant entry terms. The search strategies covered the last 3 years (from 2011). An update was carried out before the publication of this document. Other data sources were also consulted, including the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE), and relevant reference lists from other guidelines producers such as the National Institute for Clinical Excellence (NICE) and the American Urological Association (AUA).

The majority of studies in this guideline update are retrospective analyses that include some larger multicentre studies and well-designed controlled studies. As only a few RCTs are available, most of the data are not based on high levels of evidence. Conversely, in the systemic treatment of metastatic RCC, a number of randomised studies have been performed, resulting in more reliable recommendations based on higher levels of evidence.

In this 2015 EAU Guidelines compilation, all standard information on levels of evidence (LE) and grading of recommendations (GR) has been taken out of the individual guidelines topics for the sake of brevity. This information is included in the introductory section of this print.

2.2 Future goals

In addition to further systematic data work-up, the RCC panel intend to focus on patient-reported outcomes.

The use of clinical quality indicators is an area of interest. A number of key quality indicators for this patient group have been selected:

1. Thorax CT for staging of pulmonary metastasis.
2. Proportion of patients with T1aN0M0 tumours undergoing nephron sparing surgery as first treatment.
3. The proportion of patients treated within 6 weeks after diagnosis.
4. The proportion of patients with metastatic RCC offered treatment with targeting agents.
5. Proportion of patients who undergo minimally invasive or operative treatment as first treatment who die within 30 days.

2.3 Peer review

This document was subjected to double-blind peer review prior to publication.

3. EPIDEMIOLOGY, AETIOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY

3.1 Epidemiology

Renal cell carcinoma (RCC) represents 2-3% of all cancers [10], with the highest incidence in Western countries. Over the last two decades until recently, the incidence of RCC increased by about 2% both worldwide and in Europe, although a continuing decrease has been observed in Denmark and Sweden [11]. In 2012, there were approximately 84,400 new cases of RCC and 34,700 kidney cancer-related deaths in the European Union [12]. In Europe, overall mortality rates for RCC increased up to the early 1990s, and stabilised or declined thereafter [13]. Mortality has decreased since the 1980s in Scandinavian countries and since the early 1990s in France, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, and Italy. However, in some European countries (Croatia, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Slovakia), mortality rates still show an upward trend [13].

Different RCC types have specific histopathological and genetic characteristics [14]. There is a 1.5:1 male predominance, with peak incidence between 60 and 70 years. Aetiological factors include smoking, obesity, and hypertension [15-18]. Having a first-degree relative with kidney cancer also increases the risk of RCC [19]. A number of other factors associated with higher or lower RCC risk include specific dietary habits and occupational exposure to specific carcinogens, however, literature results are inconclusive [20, 21]. Moderate alcohol consumption appears to have a protective effect for unknown reasons [22, 23]. Effective prophylaxis includes avoidance of cigarette smoking and obesity.

Due to increased detection of tumours by ultrasound (US) and computed tomography (CT), the number of incidentally diagnosed RCCs has increased. These tumours are usually smaller and of lower stage [24-26].

3.1.1 Conclusion and recommendation

Conclusion	LE
Several verified risk factors have been identified including smoking, obesity and hypertension. These are considered definite risk factors for RCC.	2a

Recommendation	GR
The most important primary prevention for RCC is elimination of cigarette smoking and obesity reduction.	B

3.2 Histological diagnosis

Renal cell carcinomas comprise a broad spectrum of histopathological entities described in 2004 WHO classification [4] and modified by ISUP Vancouver Classification [5]. There are three main RCC types: clear cell (ccRCC), papillary (pRCC - type I and II) and chromophobe (chRCC). RCC type classification has been confirmed by cytogenetic and genetic analyses [27-29] (LE: 2b). Collecting duct carcinoma and other infrequent renal tumours are discussed in Section 3.3.

Histological diagnosis includes, besides RCC type, evaluation of nuclear grade, sarcomatoid features, vascular invasion, tumour necrosis, and invasion of the collecting system and perirenal fat. Fuhrman nuclear grade has been the most widely accepted grading system [30]. At the ISUP conference, a simplified, nuclear grading system, based only on size and shape of nucleoli, has been proposed which will replace the Fuhrman grading system [5].

3.2.1 Clear cell (ccRCC)

Grossly, ccRCC is well circumscribed, capsule is usually absent. The cut surface is golden-yellow, often with haemorrhage and necrosis. The Fuhrman nuclear grading system is generally used [30]. Loss of chromosome 3p and mutation of the VHL (von Hippel-Lindau) gene at chromosome 3p25 are frequently found. ccRCC has a worse prognosis compared with pRCC and chRCC [31, 32] even after stratification for stage and grade [33]. The 5-year CSS rate was 91%, 74%, 67% and 32% for TNM stages I, II, III and IV (patients treated 1987-98) [34]. The indolent variant of ccRCC is multilocular cystic and accounts for approximately 4% of all ccRCC [5].

3.2.2 Papillary (pRCC)

Macroscopically, pRCC is well circumscribed with pseudocapsule, yellow or brown in colour, and a soft structure. Genetically, pRCC shows trisomies of chromosomes 7 and 17 and the loss of chromosome Y. Papillary RCCs are heterogeneous, with three different subtypes; two basic (1 and 2) and a third type,

oncocytic. Compared with ccRCC, pRCC has a significantly higher rate of organ confined tumour (pT1-2N0M0) and higher 5-year CSF [35]. Prognosis of pRCC type 2 is worse than for type 1 [36-38]. Exophytic growth, pseudonecrotic changes and pseudocapsule are typical signs of pRCC type 1. Pseudocapsules and extensive necrotic changes cause a spherical tumour in the extrarenal section. Tumours with massive necroses are fragile and vulnerable to spontaneous rupture or rupture resulting from minimal trauma followed by retroperitoneal bleeding. A well-developed pseudocapsule in pRCCs type 1 probably prevents these tumours from rupturing despite necroses. Necroses cohere with a hypodense central area of tumour on postcontrast CT. This area is surrounded by a vital tumour tissue, seen as a serpiginous contrast-enhancing margin on CT [39]. Some authors consider type 3; oncocytic pRCC, to have no pseudocapsule or massive necrosis, rare extrarenal growth and low malignant potential [38], although this type is not generally accepted [5].

3.2.3 **Chromophobe (chRCC)**

Grossly, chRCC is a pale tan, relatively homogenous and tough, well-demarcated mass without a capsule. Instead of the Fuhrman grading system, a special histopathological grading system by Paner et al. was proposed in 2010 [40, 41]. Loss of chromosomes 2, 10, 13, 17 and 21 are typical genetic changes [42]. The prognosis is relatively good, with high 5-year recurrence-free survival, CSS and 10-year CSS [43].

3.3 **Other renal tumours**

Other renal tumours constitute the remaining 10-15 % of renal cortical tumours. These include a variety of uncommon, sporadic, and familial carcinomas, some only recently described, and a group of unclassified carcinomas. A summary of these tumours are given in Table 3.1, but some clinically relevant tumours and extremely rare entities are mentioned below.

3.3.1 **Carcinoma associated with end-stage renal disease; acquired cystic disease-associated RCC**

Cystic degenerative changes (acquired cystic kidney disease [ACKD]) and a higher incidence of RCC are typical features of ESKD (end-stage kidney disease). RCCs of native end-stage kidneys are found in about 4% of patients. The lifetime risk of developing RCCs is at least 10 times higher than in the general population. Compared with sporadic RCCs, ACKDs generally are multicentric and bilateral, found in younger patients (mostly male), and are less aggressive [44, 45]. The relatively indolent outcome of tumours in ESKD is due to the mode of diagnosis and a specific ACKD related molecular pathway still to be determined [45]. Although the histological spectrum of ACKD tumours is similar to that in sporadic RCC, the predominant form is pRCC. The remaining tumours are mostly ccRCC [44-46]. A specific subtype of RCC occurring in end-stage kidneys only was described as Acquired Cystic Disease-associated RCC (ACD-RCC) [5].

3.3.2 **Papillary adenoma**

These tumours have papillary or tubular architecture of low nuclear grade and are 5 mm in diameter or smaller [4]. They are found incidentally in nephrectomy specimens.

3.3.3 **Hereditary kidney tumours**

Hereditary kidney tumours are found in the following entities: Von Hippel-Lindau syndrome, hereditary pRCC, Birt-Hogg-Dubé syndrome (see Hybrid oncocytoma-chromophobe carcinoma), hereditary leiomyomatosis and renal cell cancer (HLRCC), tuberous sclerosis complex, germline succinate dehydrogenase (SDH) mutation, nonpolyposis colorectal cancer syndrome, hyperparathyroidism-jaw tumour syndrome, PTEN hamartoma syndrome, constitutional chromosome 3 translocation, and familial nonsyndromic ccRCC. RMC can be included because of its association with hereditary haemoglobinopathies [4, 5, 36, 47].

3.3.4 **Angiomyolipoma (AML)**

Angiomyolipoma is a benign mesenchymal tumour, can occur sporadically, and is four times more likely in women. It also occurs in tuberous sclerosis (TS). It accounts for approximately 1% of surgically removed tumours. Ultrasound, CT, and MRI often lead to diagnosis due to the presence of adipose tissue. Biopsy is rarely useful. Pre-operatively, it may be difficult to differentiate between smooth muscle cell tumours and epithelial tumours. AML can be found in TS in LNs, but is not metastases, and has a multicentric genesis. AML can be due to angiotrophic-type growth in the renal vein or the IVC. AML with LN involvement and tumorous thrombus is benign. Only epithelioid AML is potentially malignant [4, 48]. AML has a slow and consistent growth rate, and minimal morbidity [49]. The main complications of renal AML are retroperitoneal bleeding or bleeding into the urinary collection system, which can be life-threatening [50]. The bleeding tendency is related to the angiogenic component of the tumour that includes irregular and aneurysmatic blood vessels [50]. The major risk factors for bleeding are tumour size, grade of the angiogenic component, and the presence of TS [50, 51]. Indications for intervention are pain, bleeding, or suspected malignancy.

3.3.4.1 Treatment

Active surveillance (AS) is the most appropriate option for most AMLs [49, 52] (LE: 3). Risk factors for delayed intervention include tumour size ≥ 4 cm and symptoms at diagnosis [52]. Selective arterial embolisation (SAE) seems to be the first-line option used for active treatment after AS was discontinued [52] (LE: 3). SAE is an efficient treatment for AML devascularisation but only volume reduction [53]. And although SAE controls haemorrhage in the acute setting, it has limited value in the longer-term [49, 50]. If surgery is selected, most cases of AML can be managed by conservative NSS, although some patients may require complete nephrectomy [51] (LE: 3). Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) can be option as well [49, 50, 54]. The volume of AML can be reduced by the m-Tor inhibitor everolimus [55] and sirolimus can be combined with deferred surgery [56].

Table 3.1: Other renal cortical tumours, and recommendations for treatment (GR: C)

Entity [4, 5]	Clinical relevant notes	Malignant potential	Treatment of localised tumour/metastatic tumour
Sarcomatoid variants of RCC	Sign of high-grade transformation without being a distinct histological entity	High	Surgery/sunitinib, option of gemcitabine plus doxorubicin [57].
Multilocular ccRCC		Low, no metastasis	Surgery, NSS*
Carcinoma of the collecting ducts of Bellini	Rare, often presenting at an advanced stage (N+ 44% and M1 33% at diagnosis). The hazard ratio in CSS in comparison with ccRCC is 4.49 [32].	High, very aggressive. Median survival 30 months [58].	Surgery/Response to targeted therapies was poor [59].
Renal medullary carcinoma	Very rare. Mainly young black men with sickle cell trait	High, very aggressive, median survival is 5 months [58].	Surgery/different chemotherapy regimes, radiosensitive.
Translocation RCC (TRCC) Xp11.2	Rare, mainly younger patients under 40, more common in females. It constitutes with TRCC 6p21 MiT translocation renal cell carcinomas [60].	High	Surgery/VEGF-targeted therapy.
Translocation RCC t(6;11)		Low/intermediate	Surgery, NSS/VEGF-targeted therapy.
Mucinous tubular and spindle cell carcinoma	Tumour is associated with the loop of Henle	Intermediate	Surgery, NSS
Acquired cystic disease-associated RCC		Low	Surgery
Clear cell (tubulo) papillary RCC	It has been reported under the term renal angiomyomatous tumour (RAT) as well.	Low	Surgery, NSS
Tubulocystic RCC	Mainly men, imaging can be Bosniak III or IV.	Low (90% indolent)	Surgery, NSS
Hybrid oncocytic chromophobe tumour	Mixture of cells of chRCC and renal oncocytoma. Three clinicopathological situations: sporadic, in association with renal oncocytosis/oncocytomatosis or in patients with Birt-Hogg-Dubé syndrome.	Low or benign	Surgery, NSS
Metanephric tumours	Divided into metanephric adenoma, adenofibroma, and metanephric stromal tumours.	Benign	Surgery, NSS

Cystic nephroma/ Mixed Epithelial and Stromal Tumour	Term renal epithelial and stromal tumours (REST) is used as well. Imaging – Bosniak type III or II/IV.	Low/benign	Surgery, NSS
Oncocytoma	3-7% of all renal tumours. Imaging characteristics alone are unreliable when differentiating between oncocytoma and RCC. Histopathological diagnosis remains the reference standard [61, 62].	Benign	Observation (when histologically confirmed) [63, 64]/NSS.
Hereditary kidney tumours	Details see above	High	Surgery, NSS
Angiomyolipoma	Details see above	Benign	Consider treatment only in very well selected patients.
Carcinoma associated with neuroblastoma	Long-term survivors of childhood neuroblastoma have a 329-fold increased risk of renal carcinoma.	Variable	Surgery, NSS
Thyroid-like follicular carcinoma of the kidney (TLFC)	Succinate Dehydrogenase B Mutation-associated RCC, ALK Translocation RCC (ALK - anaplastic lymphoma kinase).	Low	Surgery, NSS
Unclassified RCC	RCC that cannot be assigned to any other category of RCC- type carcinoma [4].	Variable	Surgery, NSS

*NSS = *nephron-sparing surgery*; CSS = *cancer specific survival*.

3.3.4.2 Summary

A variety of renal tumours exist, and about 15% are benign. All kidney lesions require examination for malignant behaviour.

3.4 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	LE
Except for AML, most other renal tumours cannot be differentiated from RCC by radiology and should be treated in the same way as RCC.	3
In biopsy-proven oncocytomas, watchful waiting is an option.	3
In advanced uncommon renal tumours, a standardised oncological treatment approach does not exist.	3

Recommendations	GR
Bosniak cysts \geq type III should be regarded as RCC and treated accordingly.	C
AMLs, active surveillance is the most appropriate option for most AMLs. Treatment with selective arterial embolisation (SAE) or NSS can be considered in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large tumours (recommended threshold of intervention does not exist, the formerly recommended size of > 4 cm is disputed); • females of childbearing age; • patients in whom follow-up or access to emergency care may be inadequate. 	C

4. STAGING AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

4.1 Staging

The TNM classification system is recommended for clinical and scientific use [65], but requires continuous improvements [66]. The latest version was published in 2009 with supplement 2012 (Table 4.1), and its prognostic value was confirmed in single and multi-institution studies [67, 68]. Tumour size, venous invasion, renal capsular invasion, adrenal involvement, and lymph node (LN) and distant metastasis are included in the TNM classification system (Table 4.1). However, some uncertainties remain:

- The sub-classification of T1 tumours using a cut-off of 4 cm might not be optimal in NSS for localised cancer.
- The value of size stratification of T2 tumours has been questioned [69].
- Since the 2002 version, tumours with renal sinus fat invasion have been classified as pT3a. However, renal sinus fat invasion might carry a worse prognosis than perinephric fat invasion but is included in the same pT3a stage group [70-72] (LE: 3).
- Sub T-stages (pT2b, pT3a, pT3c and pT4) may overlap [68].
- For adequate M staging, accurate preoperative imaging (chest and abdominal CT) should be performed [73, 74] (LE: 4).

Table 4.1: 2009 TNM classification system [65] and TNM supplement 2012 [75]

T - Primary tumour			
TX	Primary tumour cannot be assessed		
T0	No evidence of primary tumour		
T1	Tumour ≤ 7 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney		
T1a	Tumour ≤ 4 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney		
T1b	Tumour > 4 cm but ≤ 7 cm in greatest dimension		
T2	Tumour > 7 cm in greatest dimension, limited to the kidney		
T2a	Tumour > 7 cm but ≤ 10 cm in greatest dimension		
T2b	Tumours > 10 cm limited to the kidney		
T3	Tumour extends into major veins or perinephric tissues but not into the ipsilateral adrenal gland or beyond Gerota's fascia		
T3a	Tumour grossly extends into the renal vein or its segmental (muscle-containing) branches, or invades perirenal and/or renal sinus fat (peripelvic), but not beyond Gerota's fascia		
T3b	Tumour grossly extends into the vena cava (VC) below the diaphragm		
T3c	Tumour grossly extends into vena cava above the diaphragm or invades the wall of the VC		
T4	Tumour invades beyond Gerota's fascia (including contiguous extension into the ipsilateral adrenal gland)		
N - Regional LNs			
NX	Regional LNs cannot be assessed		
N0	No regional LN metastasis		
N1	Regional LN metastasis		
M - Distant metastasis			
M0	No distant metastasis		
M1	Distant metastasis		
TNM stage grouping			
Stage I	T1	N0	M0
Stage II	T2	N0	M0
Stage III	T3	N0	M0
	T1, T2, T3	N1	M0
Stage IV	T4	Any N	M0
	Any T	Any N	M1

A help desk for specific questions about TNM classification is available at <http://www.uicc.org/tnm>.

4.2 Anatomic classification systems

Objective anatomic classification systems, such as the Preoperative Aspects and Dimensions Used for an Anatomical (PADUA) classification system, the R.E.N.A.L. nephrometry score and the C-index have been

proposed, to standardise the description of renal tumours [76-78]. These systems include assessment of tumour size, exophytic/endophytic properties, nearness to the collecting system and renal sinus, and anterior/posterior location.

The use of such a system is helpful as it allows objective prediction of potential morbidity of NSS and tumour ablation techniques. These tools provide information for treatment planning, patient counselling, and comparison of PN and tumour ablation series. However, when selecting the best treatment option, anatomic scores must always be considered together with patient features and surgeon experience.

5. DIAGNOSTIC EVALUATION

5.1 Symptoms

Many renal masses remain asymptomatic until the late disease stages. More than 50% of RCCs are detected incidentally by non-invasive imaging used to investigate various nonspecific symptoms and other abdominal diseases [68, 79] (LE: 3). The classic triad of flank pain, gross haematuria, and palpable abdominal mass is rare (6-10%) and correlates with aggressive histology and advanced disease [80, 81] (LE: 3).

Paraneoplastic syndromes are found in approximately 30% of patients with symptomatic RCCs (LE: 4). Some symptomatic patients present with symptoms caused by metastatic disease, such as bone pain or persistent cough [82] (LE: 3).

5.1.1 *Physical examination*

Physical examination has a limited role in RCC diagnosis. However, the following findings should prompt radiological examinations:

- Palpable abdominal mass;
- Palpable cervical lymphadenopathy;
- Non-reducing varicocele and bilateral lower extremity oedema, which suggests venous involvement.

5.1.2 *Laboratory findings*

Commonly assessed laboratory parameters are serum creatinine, glomerular filtration rate (GFR), complete cell blood count, erythrocyte sedimentation rate, liver function study, alkaline phosphatase, lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), serum corrected calcium [83, 84], coagulation study, and urinalysis (LE: 4).

For central renal masses abutting or invading the collecting system, urinary cytology and possibly endoscopic assessment should be considered in order to exclude urothelial cancer (LE: 4).

Split renal function should be estimated using renal scintigraphy in the following situations [85, 86] (LE: 2b):

- when renal function is compromised, as indicated by increased serum creatinine or significantly decreased GFR;
- when renal function is clinically important - e.g., in patients with a solitary kidney or multiple or bilateral tumours.

Renal scintigraphy is an additional diagnostic option in patients at risk of future renal impairment due to comorbid disorders.

5.2 Imaging investigations

Most renal tumours are diagnosed by abdominal US or CT performed for other medical reasons [79] (LE: 3). Renal masses are classified as solid or cystic based on imaging findings.

5.2.1 *Presence of enhancement*

With solid renal masses, the most important criterion for differentiating malignant lesions is the presence of enhancement [87] (LE: 3). Traditionally, US, CT, or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) are used for detecting and characterising renal masses. Most renal masses are diagnosed accurately by imaging alone. Contrast-enhanced US can be helpful in specific cases [88-90] (LE: 3).

5.2.2 *CT or MRI*

CT or MRI are used to characterise renal masses. Imaging must be performed before and after administration of intravenous contrast material to demonstrate enhancement. In CT imaging, enhancement in renal masses is determined by comparing Hounsfield units (HUs) before and after contrast administration. A change of 15 or more HUs demonstrates enhancement [91] (LE: 3). To maximise differential diagnosis and detection, the

evaluation should include images from the nephrographic phase for best depiction of renal masses, which do not enhance to the same degree as the renal parenchyma.

CT or MRI allow accurate diagnosis of RCC, but cannot reliably distinguish oncocytoma and fat-free angiomyolipoma from malignant renal neoplasms [61, 92-94] (LE: 3). Abdominal CT provides information on:

- Function and morphology of the contralateral kidney [95] (LE: 3);
- Primary tumour extension;
- Venous involvement;
- Enlargement of locoregional lymph nodes;
- Condition of the adrenal glands and other solid organs (LE: 3).

Abdominal contrast-enhanced biphasic CT angiography is useful in selected cases for detailed information on renal vascular supply [96, 97].

If the results of CT are indeterminate, MRI may provide additional information on:

- enhancement in renal masses [98];
- locally advanced malignancy [99-101];
- venous involvement if the extent of an inferior vena cava (IVC) tumour thrombus is poorly defined on CT [99-102] (LE: 3). Doppler US is less accurate for identifying the extent of a venous tumour thrombus [101] (LE: 3).

MRI is indicated in patients who are allergic to intravenous CT contrast medium and in pregnancy without renal failure [100, 103] (LE: 3). Advanced MRI techniques such as diffusion-weighted and perfusion-weighted imaging are being explored for renal mass assessment [104].

In patients with hereditary RCC who are worried about the radiation exposure of frequent CT scans, MRI may be offered as alternative.

5.2.3 **Other investigations**

Renal arteriography and inferior venacavography have a limited role in the work-up of selected RCC patients (LE: 3). In patients with any sign of impaired renal function, an isotope renogram and total renal function evaluation should be considered to optimise treatment decision-making [85, 86] (LE: 2a).

The value of positron-emission tomography (PET) in the diagnosis and follow-up of RCC remains to be determined, and PET is not currently recommended [105] (LE: 3).

5.2.4 **Radiographic investigations for metastatic RCC**

Chest CT is accurate for chest staging [73, 74, 106-108] (LE: 3). However, routine chest radiography must be performed for metastases, but is less accurate than chest CT (LE: 3). There is a consensus that most bone and brain metastases are symptomatic at diagnosis, thus routine bone or brain imaging is not generally indicated [106, 109, 110] (LE: 3). However, bone scan, brain CT, or MRI may be used in the presence of specific clinical or laboratory signs and symptoms [110-112] (LE: 3).

5.2.5 **Bosniak classification of renal cystic masses**

This classification system classifies renal cysts into five categories, based on CT imaging appearance, to predict malignancy risk [113, 114] (LE: 3). This system also advocates treatment for each category (Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Bosniak classification of renal cysts [113]

Bosniak category	Features	Work-up
I	Simple benign cyst with a hairline-thin wall without septa, calcification, or solid components. Same density as water and does not enhance with contrast medium.	Benign
II	Benign cyst that may contain a few hairline-thin septa. Fine calcification may be present in the wall or septa. Uniformly high-attenuation lesions < 3 cm in size, with sharp margins without enhancement.	Benign
IIF	These may contain more hairline-thin septa. Minimal enhancement of a hairline-thin septum or wall. Minimal thickening of the septa or wall. The cyst may contain calcification, which may be nodular and thick, with no contrast enhancement. No enhancing soft-tissue elements. This category also includes totally intrarenal, non-enhancing, high attenuation renal lesions ≥ 3 cm. Generally well-marginated.	Follow-up. Some are malignant.

III	These are indeterminate cystic masses with thickened irregular walls or septa with enhancement.	Surgery or active surveillance – see Chapter 7. Over 50% are malignant
IV	Clearly malignant containing enhancing soft-tissue components.	Surgery. Most are malignant.

5.3 Renal tumour biopsy

Percutaneous renal tumour biopsy can reveal histology of radiologically indeterminate renal masses and should be considered to select patients with small masses for active surveillance, to obtain histology before ablative treatments and to select the most suitable form of medical and surgical treatment strategy in the setting of metastatic disease [115-124] (LE: 3). Due to the high diagnostic accuracy of abdominal imaging, renal tumour biopsy is not necessary in patients with a contrast-enhancing renal mass for whom surgery is planned (LE: 4).

Percutaneous sampling can be performed under local anaesthesia with needle core biopsy and/ or fine needle aspiration (FNA). Biopsies can be performed with US or CT guidance, with a similar diagnostic yield [120, 123] (LE: 2b). Eighteen-gauge needles are ideal for core biopsies, as they result in low morbidity and provide sufficient tissue for diagnosis [115-123, 125] (LE: 2b). A coaxial technique allowing multiple biopsies through a coaxial cannula should always be used to avoid potential tumour seeding [115, 116-123] (LE: 3).

Core biopsies should be preferred for the characterization of solid renal masses (LE: 2b). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the diagnostic performance and complications of RTB was recently performed by the panel. Fifty-seven articles including a total of 5228 patients were included in the analysis. Needle core biopsies were found to have better accuracy for the diagnosis of malignancy compared with FNA [6]. Other studies showed that solid pattern and larger tumour size are predictors of a diagnostic core biopsy [120, 123] (LE: 2b).

In experienced centres, core biopsies have a high diagnostic yield, specificity, and sensitivity for the diagnosis of malignancy [6] (LE: 2b). However, 0-22.6% of core biopsies are non-diagnostic [115-123, 126-142] (LE: 2b). If a biopsy is non-diagnostic, and radiologic findings are suspicious for malignancy, a further biopsy or surgical exploration should be considered (LE: 4). Assessment of tumour grade on core biopsies is challenging. The accuracy of nuclear grading of biopsies is poor (62.5% on average), but can be improved (87% on average) using a simplified two-tier system (high-grade vs. low grade) [6] (LE: 2b).

The ideal number and location of core biopsies are undefined. However, at least two good quality cores should be obtained, and necrotic areas should be avoided to maximise diagnostic yield [115, 117, 120, 121, 123] (LE: 4). Peripheral biopsies are preferable for larger tumours, to avoid areas of central necrosis [143] (LE: 2b).

Core biopsies have a low diagnostic yield for cystic masses and are not recommended alone, unless areas with a solid pattern are present (Bosniak IV cysts) [120, 123] (LE: 2b). Combined FNA and core biopsies can provide complementary results, especially for complex cystic lesions [122, 127-129, 140, 144, 145] (LE: 3).

Overall, percutaneous biopsies have low morbidity [6]. Spontaneously resolving subcapsular/ perinephric haematoma are frequent complications, while clinically significant bleeding is unusual (0.0-1.4%) and generally self-limiting.

5.4 Recommendations for the diagnostic assessment of renal cell carcinoma

	GR
Contrast-enhanced multi-phasic abdominal CT and MRI are recommended for the work-up of patients with RCC and are considered equal both for staging and diagnosis.	B
Contrast-enhanced multi-phasic abdominal CT and MRI are the most appropriate imaging modalities for renal tumour characterization and staging prior to surgery.	C
A chest CT is recommended for staging assessment of the lungs and mediastinum.	C
Bone scan is not routinely recommended.	C
Renal tumour biopsy is recommended before ablative therapy and systemic therapy without previous pathology.	C
Percutaneous biopsy is recommended in patients in whom active surveillance is pursued.	C
Percutaneous renal tumour biopsy should be obtained with a coaxial technique.	C

6. PROGNOSTIC FACTORS

Prognostic factors can be classified into: anatomical, histological, clinical, and molecular.

6.1 Anatomical factors

Tumour size, venous invasion, renal capsular invasion, adrenal involvement, and lymph node (LN) and distant metastasis are included in the TNM classification system [65] (Table 4.1).

6.2 Histological factors

Histological factors include Fuhrman grade, RCC subtype, sarcomatoid features, microvascular invasion, tumour necrosis, and invasion of the collecting system. Fuhrman nuclear grade is the most widely accepted grading system [30]. Although affected by intra- and inter-observer discrepancies, it is an independent prognostic factor [146]. A simplified two- or three-strata system may be as accurate for prognostication as the classical four-tiered grading scheme [147, 148] (LE: 3). In univariate analysis, patients with chRCC vs. pRCC vs. ccRCC had a better prognosis [149, 150]. However, prognostic information provided by the RCC type is lost when stratified to tumour stage [31, 150] (LE: 3).

Differences in tumour stage, grade and cancer specific survival (CSS) between the RCC types are illustrated in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Basic characteristics of three main types of RCC [31, 32, 151]

Type	Percentage of RCC (~)	Advanced disease at diagnosis (T3-4, N+, M+)	Fuhrman Grade 3 or 4 [30]	CSS (HR)
ccRCC	80-90%	28%	28.5%	referent
pRCC	6-15%	17.6%	28.8%	0.64 - 0.85
chRCC	2-5%	16.9%	32.7%*	0.24 - 0.56

CSS = cancer-specific survival; HR = hazard ratio.

*The Fuhrman grading system is validated for ccRCC, but is unreliable for chRCC. Data based on the Paner et al. grading system are not available yet [30, 40, 41].

In all RCC types, prognosis worsens with stage and histopathological grade (Tables 6.2 and 6.3).

The 5-year overall survival (OS) for all types of RCC is 49%, which has improved since 2006 probably due to an increase in incidentally detected RCCs and the introduction of TKI inhibitors [152]. Sarcomatoid changes can be found in all RCC types and are equivalent of high grade and very aggressive tumours.

Table 6.2: CSS by stage and histopathological grade in RCCs - hazard ratio (95% CI) (Keegan et al, 2012 [32]).

T1N0M0	Referent
T2N0M0	2.71 (2.17-3.39)
T3N0M0	5.20 (4.36-6.21)
T4N0M0	16.88 (12.40-22.98)
N+M0	16.33 (12.89-20.73)
M+	33.23 (28.18-39.18)
Grade 1	Referent
Grade 2	1.16 (0.94-1.42)
Grade 3	1.97 (1.60-2.43)
Grade 4	2.82 (2.08-3.31)

CI = confidential interval.

Long-term survival in RCC patients treated by radical (RN) or partial nephrectomy (PN) between 1970 and 2003; for unilateral, sporadic ccRCC, pRCC or chRCC in a cohort study [151] (Table 6.3).

Table 6.3: CSS of surgically treated patients by RCC type (estimated survival rate in percentage [95% CI])

Survival time	5 years (%)	10 years (%)	15 years (%)	20 years (%)
ccRCC	71 (69-73)	62 (60-64)	56 (53-58)	52 (49-55)
pRCC	91 (88-94)	86 (82-89)	85 (81-89)	83 (78-88)
chRCC	88 (83-94)	86 (80-92)	84 (77-91)	81 (72-90)

Two subgroups of pRCC with different outcomes have been identified [153]: Type 1 are low-grade tumours with a chromophilic cytoplasm and a favourable prognosis. Type 2 are mostly high-grade tumours with an eosinophilic cytoplasm and a propensity for metastases (LE: 3).

RCC with Xp 11.2 translocation has a poor prognosis [154]. Its incidence is low, but should be systematically addressed in young patients.

RCC type classification has been confirmed by cytogenetic and genetic analyses [27-29] (LE: 2b).

6.3 Clinical factors

These include performance status, localised symptoms, cachexia, anaemia, and platelet count [82, 155-157] (LE: 3).

6.4 Molecular factors

Numerous molecular markers such as carbonic anhydrase IX (CalX), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), hypoxia-inducible factor (HIF), Ki67 (proliferation), p53, PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homolog) (cell cycle), E-cadherin, C-reactive protein (CRP), osteopontin [158] and CD44 (cell adhesion) [159, 160] have been investigated (LE: 3). None of these markers have improved the predictive accuracy of current prognostic systems and their use is not recommended in routine practice. Although gene expression profiling seems promising, it has not identified new relevant prognostic factors [161].

6.5 Prognostic systems and nomograms

Postoperative prognostic systems and nomograms combining independent prognostic factors have been developed and externally validated [162-168]. These may be more accurate than TNM stage or Fuhrman grade alone for predicting survival (LE: 3). An advantage of nomograms is their ability to measure predictive accuracy (PA), allowing all new predictive parameters to be objectively evaluated. Before being adopted, new prognostic variables or systems should demonstrate that its PA is superior to conventional postoperative histo-prognostic schemes [169]. Recently, new preoperative nomograms with excellent PAs have been designed [170, 171]. Table 6.4 summarises the current most relevant prognostic systems.

6.6 Conclusion and recommendations

Conclusion	LE
In RCC patients, TNM stage, Fuhrman nuclear grade, and RCC subtype (WHO, 2004; [21]), provide important prognostic information.	2

Recommendations	GR
Use of the current TNM classification system.	B
Grading systems and classification of RCC subtype.	B
Prognostic systems in the metastatic setting.	B
In localised disease, the use of integrated prognostic systems or nomograms is not routinely recommended, although they can provide a rationale for enrolling patients into clinical trials.	C
Molecular prognostic markers are not recommended for routine clinical use.	C

Table 6.4: Anatomical, histological, and clinical variables in the commonly used prognostic models for localised and metastatic RCC

Prognostic Models	Variables												
	TNM Stage	ECOG PS	Karnofsky PS	RCC related symptoms	Fuhrman grade	Tumour necrosis	Tumour size	Delay between diagnosis and treatment	LDH	Corrected calcium	Hemoglobin	Neutrophil count	Platelet count
Localised RCC	UISS	X			X								
	SSIGN	X			X	X							
	Post operative Karakiewicz's nomogram	X		X	X	X							
Metastatic RCC	MSKCC prognostic system		X					X	X	X			
	Heng's model							X	X	X	X	X	X

ECOG PS = Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status; LDH = lactate dehydrogenase; MSKCC = Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center; PS = performance status; SSIGN = Stage Size Grade Necrosis; UISS = University of California Los Angeles integrated staging system.

7. DISEASE MANAGEMENT

7.1 Treatment of localised RCC

7.1.1 Introduction

A systematic review underpins the findings of Sections 7.1.2 through 7.2.4.2. This review included all relevant published literature comparing surgical management of localised RCC (T1-2N0M0) [172, 173]. Randomised or quasi-randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were included. However, due to the very limited number of RCTs, nonrandomised studies (NRS), prospective observational studies with controls, retrospective matched-pair studies, and comparative studies from the databases of well-defined registries were also included. For this Guidelines version, an updated search was performed up to May 31st, 2013 [174].

7.1.2 Surgical treatment

7.1.2.1 Nephron-sparing surgery versus radical nephrectomy

Based on current available oncological and QoL outcomes, localised renal cancers are better managed by NSS (partial nephrectomy, PN) rather than radical nephrectomy (RN), irrespective of the surgical approach.

The estimated CSS rates at 5 years were comparable using these surgical techniques [175-179]. This was recently confirmed in a study of solitary T1-2 N0M0 renal tumours \leq 5 cm with normal contralateral kidney function and WHO PS 0-2. At 9.3 years survival follow-up, 198 patients were alive after RN and 173 after PN. The CSS was 98.5 vs 97%, respectively. Local recurrence occurred in one and 6 patients in the RN and PN group, respectively [180].

A number of studies compared PN vs. RN (open or laparoscopic) for renal carcinoma (\leq 4 cm) [180-184]. RN was associated with increased mortality from any cause after adjusting for patient characteristics. In a prematurely closed randomised study of RCC \leq 5 cm, comparing PN and RN, there was no difference in OS in the targeted population [179]. In studies analysing RCCs of 4-7 cm, no differences in CSS was observed between PN and RN [183, 185-192]. When laparoscopic PN was compared with laparoscopic RN in RCCs $>$ 4 cm, there was no difference in OS, CSS and recurrence-free survival (RFS) rates [193]. Furthermore, a retrospective matched-pair analysis in elderly patients [194] reported a CSS of 98% for PN vs. 95% for RN.

Other studies have compared various aspects of QoL and safety in open PN and RN [175-178, 190, 192, 195-197].

There was no difference in the length of hospital stay [176, 177, 196], blood transfusions [176, 196, 197], or mean blood loss [176, 196]. Complication rates were inconsistently reported and one intervention was not favoured over another [198]. One study found that mean operative time was longer for open PN [198], but other research found no difference [199]. Three studies consistently reported worse renal function after RN compared to PN [175, 178]. More patients had impaired post-operative renal function after RN after adjustment for diabetes, hypertension and age [178].

One database review compared open PN with laparoscopic RN in RCCs 4-7 cm. A significantly lower mean increase in post-operative creatinine levels was found [186]. Another study comparing laparoscopic PN vs. laparoscopic RN found that estimated GFR (eGFR) decreased less in the PN group, while the RN group had significantly more patients with a two-stage increase in CKD [193]. Another database review [200] compared safety and efficacy of laparoscopic PN in RCCs $>$ 2 cm (2-4 cm versus $>$ 4 cm). The laparoscopic PN group had a greater post-operative decrease in eGFR compared to the patients with smaller RCCs.

Two studies reported QoL post-surgery for RCC. Patients who underwent PN reported better scores, in many aspects of QoL [195]. Those who underwent RN reported more fear associated with living with only one kidney. Regardless of the intervention, patients with RCCs $<$ 4 cm and a normal contralateral kidney showed the highest QoL scores after treatment, which matched their pre-diagnosis scores. Those with more complications had lower QoL scores [176].

No prospective comparative studies reporting oncological outcomes for minimally invasive ablative procedures compared with RN were identified. One trial reported on RFA vs. RN or PN for T1a RCC, resulting in CSS of 100% for all three treatments [201].

Patient and tumour characteristics permitting, the current oncological outcomes evidence base suggests that localised RCCs are best managed by PN than RN, irrespective of the surgical approach. Where open surgery is necessary, the oncological outcomes following open PN are at least as good as open RN and should be the preferred option when feasible.

PN is unsuitable in some patients with localised RCC due to:

- locally advanced tumour growth;
- partial resection is not feasible due to unfavourable tumour location;
- significant deterioration in patient health.

In these situations, the curative therapy is RN, including removal of the tumour-bearing kidney. Complete resection of the primary tumour by open or laparoscopic surgery offers a reasonable chance of cure.

7.1.2.2 Associated procedures

7.1.2.2.1 Adrenalectomy

One prospective NRS compared the outcomes of RN or PN with, or without, ipsilateral adrenalectomy [202]. Multivariate analysis showed that upper pole location was not predictive of adrenal involvement, but tumour size was. No difference in OS at 5 or 10 years was seen, with, or without, adrenalectomy. Adrenalectomy was justified using criteria based on radiographic and intra-operative findings. Only 48 of 2,065 patients underwent concurrent ipsilateral adrenalectomy of which 42 were for benign lesions.

7.1.2.2.2 Lymph node dissection for clinically negative lymph nodes (cN0)

Lymph node dissection (LND) in RCC is controversial [203]. Clinical assessment of LNs status is based on enlargement of LNs on CT/MRI and intraoperative assessment by direct palpation. Less than 20% of clinically positive (cN+) LNs are confirmed to be metastatic at pathology (pN+) [204]. CT/MRI do not allow detection of small metastases in normal sized LNs [205] and extended LND (e-LND) with histopathological examination is the only way to assess LNs status. For clinically positive LNs (cN+) see Section 7.2. on locally advanced RCC. In patients with clinically negative LNs (cN0) six clinical trials have been reported [203], one RCT [204] and five comparative studies [206-210].

Retrospective series support the hypothesis that LND may be beneficial in high-risk patients [205, 211]. However, in the EORTC study only 4% of cN0 patients had positive LNs at final pathology, suggesting that LND represents overtreatment in the majority [204].

Clinical trials of lower quality suggest that e-LND should involve the LNs surrounding the ipsilateral great vessel and the interaortocaval region from the crus of the diaphragm to the common iliac artery. Involvement of interaortocaval LNs without regional hilar involvement is reported in up to 35-45% of cases [205, 206, 212]. At least 15 LNs should be removed [213, 214]. Sentinel LND is an investigational technique [215, 216]. Better survival outcomes are seen in patients with a low number of positive LNs (< 4) and no extranodal extension [217, 218]. A preoperative nomogram to predict pN+ LNs status has been proposed [219].

7.1.2.2.3 Embolisation

Before routine nephrectomy, tumour embolisation has no benefit [220, 221]. In patients unfit for surgery, or with non-resectable disease, embolisation can control symptoms, including gross haematuria or flank pain [222-224]. These indications will be repeated in Sections 7.2 and 7.3 with cross reference to the conclusions and recommendations below.

7.1.2.2.4 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	LE
PN achieves similar oncological outcomes to RN for clinically localised tumours (cT1).	1b
Ipsilateral adrenalectomy during RN or PN has no survival advantage.	3
In patients with localised disease without evidence of LN metastases, there is no survival advantage of LND in conjunction with RN.	1b
In patients unfit for surgery with massive haematuria or flank pain, embolisation can be a beneficial palliative approach.	3

Recommendations	GR
Surgery is recommended to achieve cure in localised RCC.	B
PN is recommended in patients with T1a tumours.	A
PN should be favoured over RN in patients with T1b tumour, whenever feasible.	B
Ipsilateral adrenalectomy is not recommended when there is no clinical evidence of invasion of the adrenal gland.	B
LND is not recommended in localised tumour without clinical evidence of LN invasion.	A

7.1.3 Radical and partial nephrectomy techniques

7.1.3.1 Radical nephrectomy techniques

No RCTs have assessed oncological outcomes of laparoscopic vs. open RN. A cohort study [225] and retrospective database reviews are available, mostly of low methodological quality [176, 226, 227]. Similar

oncological outcomes for laparoscopic vs. open RN were found. Data from one RCT [228] and two NRSs [176, 225] showed a significantly shorter hospital stay and lower analgesic requirement for the laparoscopic RN group compared with the open group. Convalescence time was also significantly shorter [225]. No difference in the number of patients receiving blood transfusions was observed, but peri-operative blood loss was significantly less in the laparoscopic arm in all three studies [176, 225, 228]. Surgical complications were marked by low event rates and very wide confidence intervals. There was no difference in complications, but operation time was significantly shorter in the open nephrectomy arm. Post-operative QoL scores were similar [176].

The best approach for RN was the retroperitoneal or transperitoneal with similar oncological outcomes in the two RTCs [229, 230] and one quasi-randomised study [231]. QoL variables were similar in the two approaches.

Hand-assisted vs. standard laparoscopic RN was compared in one RCT [231] and one database review [198]. Estimated 5-year OS, CSS, and RFS rates were comparable. Duration of surgery was significantly shorter in the hand-assisted approach, while length of hospital stay and time to non-strenuous activities were shorter for the standard laparoscopic RN [198, 231]. However, the sample size was small.

Robot-assisted laparoscopic RN vs. laparoscopic RN was compared in one small study [232]. There were no local recurrences, port-site or distant metastases, but the sample size was small and follow-up was short. Similar results were seen in observational cohort studies comparing 'portless' and 3-port laparoscopic RN [233, 234]. Peri-operative outcomes were similar.

7.1.3.2 *Partial nephrectomy techniques*

Studies comparing laparoscopic PN and open PN found no difference in PFS [235-238] and OS [237, 238] in centres with laparoscopic expertise. The mean estimated blood loss is lower with the laparoscopic approach [235, 237, 239], while post-operative mortality, DVT, and pulmonary embolism events are similar [235, 237]. Operative time is generally longer with the laparoscopic approach [236-238] and warm ischaemia time is shorter with the open approach [235, 237, 239, 240]. In a matched-pair comparison, GFR decline was greater in the laparoscopic PN group in the immediate post-operative period [238], but not after a follow-up of 3.6 years. In another comparative study, the surgical approach was not an independent predictor for post-operative CKD [240]. Retroperitoneal and transperitoneal laparoscopic PN have similar peri-operative outcomes [241]. Simple tumour enucleation has similar PFS and CSS rates compared to standard PN and RN in a large study [242, 243].

The feasibility of off-clamp laparoscopic PN and laparoendoscopic single-site PN has been shown in selected patients, but larger studies are needed to confirm their safety and clinical role [244, 245].

No studies have compared the oncological outcomes of robot-assisted vs. laparoscopic PN. A comparison of surgical outcomes after robotic or pure laparoscopic PN in moderate-to-complex renal tumours showed a significantly lower estimated blood loss and a shorter warm ischaemia time in the robotic group [246]. Two recent meta-analyses of relatively small series showed comparable peri-operative outcomes and a shorter warm ischaemia time for robot-assisted PN [247, 248].

7.1.3.3 *Conclusions and recommendations*

Conclusions	LE
Laparoscopic RN has lower morbidity than open surgery.	1b
Oncological outcomes for T1-T2a tumours are equivalent between laparoscopic and open RN.	2a
PN can be performed, either with an open, pure laparoscopic or robot-assisted approach, based on surgeon's expertise and skills.	2b

Recommendations	GR
Laparoscopic RN is recommended for patients with T2 tumours and localised masses not treatable by PN.	B
RN should not be performed in patients with T1 tumours for whom PN is indicated.	B

7.1.4 *Therapeutic approaches as alternatives to surgery*

7.1.4.1 *Surgical versus non-surgical treatment*

Population-based studies compared the oncological outcomes of surgery (RN or PN) and non-surgical management for tumours < 4 cm. The analyses showed a significantly lower cancer-specific mortality for patients treated with surgery [249, 250]. However, the patients assigned to the surveillance arm were older and

likely to be more frail and less suitable candidates for surgery to be addressed. Other cause mortality rates in the non-surgical group significantly exceeded that of the surgical group [249]. Analyses of older patients (> 75 years) failed to show the same benefit in cancer-specific mortality for surgical treatment [251-253].

7.1.4.2 Surveillance

Elderly and comorbid patients with incidental small renal masses have a low RCC-specific mortality and significant competing-cause mortality [254, 255]. Active surveillance is defined as the initial monitoring of tumour size by serial abdominal imaging (US, CT, or MRI) with delayed intervention reserved for tumours showing clinical progression during follow-up [256].

In the largest reported series of active surveillance, the growth of renal tumours was low and progression to metastatic disease was reported in a limited number of patients [257, 258].

A single-institutional comparative study evaluating patients aged ≥ 75 years showed decreased OS for those who underwent surveillance and nephrectomy relative to NSS for clinically T1 renal tumours; however, patients selected for surveillance were older with greater comorbidity. At multivariable analysis, management type was not associated with OS after adjusting for age, comorbidity, and other variables [254]. No statistically significant difference in OS and CSS were observed in another study of RN vs. PN vs. active surveillance for T1a renal masses with a follow-up of 34 months [259]. Overall, both short- and intermediate-term oncological outcomes indicate that in selected patients with advanced age and/or comorbidities, active surveillance is appropriate to initially monitor small renal masses, followed if required, by treatment for progression [256-258, 260-263].

A multicentre study assessed patient QoL undergoing immediate intervention vs. active surveillance. Patients undergoing immediate intervention had higher QoL scores at baseline, specifically for physical health. The perceived benefit in physical health persisted for at least 1 year following intervention. Mental health, which includes domains of depression and anxiety, was not adversely affected while on active surveillance [264].

7.1.4.3 Ablative therapies

7.1.4.3.1 Cryoablation

Cryoablation is performed using either a percutaneous or a laparoscopic-assisted approach. In comparative studies, there was no significant difference in the overall complication rates between laparoscopic and percutaneous cryoablation [265-267]. One comparative study reported similar OS, CSS, and RFS in 172 laparoscopic patients with a longer follow-up compared with 123 percutaneous patients with a shorter follow-up [266]. A shorter average length of hospital stay was found with the percutaneous technique [266, 267]. No studies compared surveillance strategies to cryoablation.

7.1.4.3.2 Cryoablation versus PN

Studies compared open, laparoscopic or robotic PN with percutaneous or laparoscopic cryoablation. Oncological outcomes were mixed, with some studies showing no difference in OS, CSS, RFS, DFS, local recurrence or progression to metastatic disease [268, 269], and some showing significant benefit for the PN techniques for some or all of these outcomes [270-273]. Not all studies reported all outcomes listed, and some were small and included benign tumours. No study showed oncological benefit for the cryoablation technique over PN.

Perioperative outcomes, complication rates and other quality of life measures were also mixed. Some studies found the length of hospital stay was shorter and surgical blood loss was less with cryoablation [268-270], while also finding no differences in other peri-operative outcomes, recovery times, complication rates or post-operative serum creatinine levels. Two studies [272, 273] reported specific Clavien rates, with mostly non-significant differences, which were mixed for intra-operative vs. post-operative complications. Estimated GFRs were not significantly different in two studies, but in favour of cryoablation in a third [271-273]. Estimates of new CKD were also mixed, with one study in favour of cryoablation [271], another strongly in favour of PN [272], and the third showing no difference [273]. One study compared PN with ablation therapy, either cryoablation or RFA [274], and showed significantly improved DSS at both 5 and 10 years for PN.

7.1.4.3.3 Radiofrequency ablation

RFA is performed laparoscopically or percutaneously. Three studies compared patients with T1a tumours treated by laparoscopic or percutaneous RFA [275-277]. Complications occurred in up to 29% of patients but were mostly minor. Complication rates were similar in patients treated laparoscopically or percutaneously. One study with a limited number of patients [277] found a higher rate of incomplete ablation in patients treated by percutaneous RFA. However, no differences in recurrence or CSS were found in the three comparative studies.

7.1.4.3.4 RFA versus PN

Most publications about RFA are retrospective cohort studies with a low number of patients and limited follow-up. Three studies retrospectively compared RFA to surgery in patients with T1a tumours [201, 278, 279].

One study [278] compared T1a patients who underwent either RFA (percutaneous or laparoscopic) or partial nephrectomy and found no difference in OS and CSS. Another study retrospectively reviewed 105 T1a patients treated by percutaneous RFA or radical nephrectomy. CSS was 100% in both groups. OS was lower in the RFA group but patients treated with surgery were younger [201].

In a monocentric study that compared 34 RFA patients to 16 open partial nephrectomy patients, there was a higher rate of complications and transfusions in the PN group. Although the tumours were larger in PN patients, progression rates were similar (0%) [279].

7.1.4.3.5 Cryoablation versus RFA

Two studies compared RFA and cryoablation [280, 281]. No significant differences were reported for OS, CSS, or RFS in either study. For local RFS at 5 years, one study [280] reported improvement with RFA, while the other [281] reported a benefit with cryoablation. One study [280] reported no differences in Clavien complication rates between the techniques.

7.1.4.3.6 Other ablative techniques

Some studies have shown the feasibility of other ablative techniques, such as microwave ablation, laser ablation, and high-intensity focused US ablation. However, these techniques are considered experimental.

7.1.4.3.7 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	LE
Population-based analyses show a significantly lower cancer-specific mortality for patients treated with surgery compared to non-surgical management. However, the same benefit in cancer-specific mortality is not confirmed in analyses focusing on older patients (> 75 years).	3
In active surveillance cohorts, the growth of small renal masses is low in most cases and progression to metastatic disease is rare (1-2%).	3
Quality of the available data does not allow definitive conclusions regarding morbidity and oncological outcomes of cryoablation and RFA.	3
Low quality studies suggest a higher local recurrence rate for minimally invasive therapies compared to PN.	3

Recommendations	GR
Due to the low quality of available data no recommendation can be made on RFA and cryoablation.	C
In the elderly and/or comorbid patients with small renal masses and limited life expectancy, active surveillance, RFA and cryoablation can be offered.	C

7.2 Treatment of locally advanced RCC

7.2.1 Introduction

In addition to the conclusions and recommendations outlined in Section 7.1 for localised RCC certain therapeutic strategies arise in specific situations of locally advanced disease.

7.2.2 Management of clinically positive lymph nodes (cN+)

In the presence of clinically positive LNs (cN+), LND is always justified [34]. However, the extent of LND is controversial [205].

7.2.3 Management of locally advanced unresectable RCC

In patients with non-resectable disease, embolisation can control symptoms, including gross haematuria or flank pain [222-224]. The use of neoadjuvant targeted therapy to downsize tumours is experimental and cannot be recommended outside controlled clinical trials.

7.2.4 Management of RCC with venous thrombus

Tumour thrombus formation in the IVC in RCC patients is a significant adverse prognostic factor. Traditionally, patients with venous tumour thrombus (VTT) undergo surgery to remove the kidney and tumour thrombus (TT). Aggressive surgical resection is widely accepted as the default management option for patients with VTT [282-290]. However, uncertainties remain over the best approach for surgical treatment of these patients.

7.2.4.1 The evidence base for surgery in patients with VTT

The data on whether patients with VTT should undergo surgery is derived from case series. In one of the largest published studies [287] a higher level of thrombus was not associated with increased tumour dissemination to LNs, perinephric fat or distant metastasis. Thus, all patients with non-metastatic disease and VTT, and an acceptable performance status (PS), should be considered for surgical intervention, irrespective of the extent of TT at presentation (LE: 3). The surgical technique and approach for each case should be selected based on the extent of TT (LE: 3).

7.2.4.2 The evidence base for different surgical strategies

A systematic review was undertaken which included comparison-only studies on the management of VTT in non-metastatic RCC [174]. Only 5 studies were eligible for final inclusion. There were high risks of bias across all studies.

Minimal access techniques resulted in significantly shorter operating time compared with traditional median sternotomy [291, 292]. Pre-operative embolisation [293] was associated with increased operating time, blood loss, hospital stay and peri-operative mortality in patients with T3 RCC.

No significant differences in oncological and process outcomes were observed between cardiopulmonary bypass with deep hypothermic circulatory arrest or partial bypass under normothermia or single caval clamp without circulatory support [294].

No surgical method was shown to be superior for the excision of VTT. The surgical method was dependent on the level of TT, and the grade of occlusion of the IVC [291, 292, 294]. The relative benefits and harms of other strategies and approaches regarding access to the IVC and the role of IVC filters and bypass procedures remain uncertain.

7.2.4.3 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	LE
In patients with locally advanced disease due to clinically enlarged LNs the survival benefit of LND is unclear. In these cases LND can be performed for staging purposes.	3
Low quality data suggest that tumour thrombus in non-metastatic disease should be excised.	3
Tumour embolisation or IVC filter do not appear to offer any benefits.	3

Recommendations	GR
In patients with clinically enlarged LNs, LND can be performed for staging purposes or local control.	C
Excision of the kidney tumour and caval thrombus is recommended in patients with non-metastatic RCC.	C

7.2.5 Adjuvant therapy

Confirmation is needed regarding the impact on OS of adjuvant tumour vaccination in selected patients undergoing nephrectomy for T3 renal carcinomas [295-299] (LE: 1b). Several RCTs of adjuvant sunitinib, sorafenib, pazopanib, axitinib and everolimus are ongoing. At present, there is no evidence for the use of adjuvant VEGF-R or mTOR inhibitors.

7.2.5.1 Conclusion and recommendation

Conclusions	LE
Adjuvant cytokines do not improve survival after nephrectomy.	1b

Recommendations	GR
Outside controlled clinical trials, there is no indication for adjuvant therapy following surgery.	A

7.3 Advanced/metastatic RCC

7.3.1 Local therapy of advanced/metastatic RCC

7.3.1.1 Cytoreductive nephrectomy

Tumour nephrectomy is curative only if all tumour deposits are excised. This includes patients with the primary tumour in place and single- or oligo-metastatic resectable disease. For most patients with metastatic disease, cytoreductive nephrectomy (CN) is palliative and systemic treatments are necessary. In a meta-analysis comparing CN + immunotherapy versus immunotherapy only, increased long-term survival was found in patients treated with CN [300]. Only retrospective non-comparative data for CN combined with targeting

agents, such as sunitinib, sorafenib and others are available. CN is currently recommended in mRCC patients with good PS, large primary tumours and low metastatic volume. In patients with poor PS or IMDC risk, those with small primaries and high metastatic volume and/or a sarcomatoid tumour CN is not recommended.

7.3.1.1.1 Embolisation of the primary tumour

In patients unfit for surgery, or with non-resectable disease, embolisation can control symptoms, including gross haematuria or flank pain [222-224] (see recommendation Section 7.1.2.2.4).

7.3.1.1.2 Conclusions and recommendation

Conclusions	LE
Cytoreductive nephrectomy combined with interferon-alpha improves survival in patients with mRCC and good performance status.	1a
Cytoreductive nephrectomy for patients with simultaneous complete resection of a single metastasis or oligometastases may improve survival and delay systemic therapy.	3

Recommendations	GR
Cytoreductive nephrectomy is recommended in appropriately selected patients with metastatic RCC.	C

7.3.2 Local therapy of metastases in mRCC

A systematic review of the local treatment of metastases from RCC in any organ was undertaken [301]. Interventions included metastasectomy, various radiotherapy modalities, and no local treatment. The outcomes were OS, CSS and PFS, local symptom control and adverse events. A risk-of-bias assessment was conducted [302]. Of 2,235 studies identified only 16 non-randomised comparative studies were included.

Eight studies reported on local therapies of RCC-metastases in various organs [303-310]. This included metastases to any single organ or multiple organs. Three studies reported on local therapies of RCC-metastases in bone, including the spine [311-313], two in the brain [314, 315] and one each in the liver [316] lung [317] and pancreas [318]. Three studies [307, 309, 317] were abstracts. Data were too heterogenous for a meta-analysis. There was considerable variation in the type and distribution of systemic therapies (cytokines and VEGF-inhibitors) and in reporting the results.

7.3.2.1 Complete versus no/incomplete metastasectomy

All eight studies [303-310] on RCC metastases in various organs compared complete versus no and/or incomplete metastasectomy. However, in one study [306], complete resections were achieved in only 45% of the metastasectomy cohort, which was compared with no metastasectomy. Non-surgical modalities were not applied. Six studies [303, 305-307, 309, 310] reported a significantly longer median OS or CSS following complete metastasectomy (the median value for median OS or CSS was 40.75 months, range 23-122 months) compared with incomplete and/or no metastasectomy (the median value for median OS or CSS was 14.8 months, range 8.4-55.5 months). Of the two remaining studies, one [304] showed no significant difference in CSS between complete and no metastasectomy, and one [308] reported a longer median OS for metastasectomy albeit no p-value was provided.

Three studies reported on treatment of RCC metastases to the lung [317], liver [316], and pancreas [318], respectively. The lung study reported a significantly higher median OS for metastasectomy versus medical therapy only for both target therapy and immunotherapy. Similarly, the liver and pancreas study reported a significantly higher median OS and 5-year OS for metastasectomy versus no metastasectomy.

7.3.2.2 Local therapies for RCC bone metastases

Of three studies identified, one [313] compared single-dose image-guided radiotherapy (IGRT) with hypofractionated IGRT in patients with RCC bone metastases. Single-dose IGRT (≥ 24 Gray) had a significantly better 3-year actuarial local PFS rate, also shown by Cox regression analysis. Another study [311] compared metastasectomy/curettage and local stabilization with no surgery of solitary RCC bone metastases in various locations. A significantly higher 5-year CSS rate was observed in the intervention group.

After adjusting for prior nephrectomy, gender and age, multivariate analysis still favoured metastasectomy/curettage and stabilization. A third study [312] compared the efficacy and durability of pain relief between single-dose stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) and conventional radiotherapy (CRT) in patients with RCC bone metastases to the spine. Pain ORR, time-to-pain relief and duration of pain relief were similar.

7.3.2.3 Local therapies for RCC brain metastases

Two studies on RCC brain metastases were included. A three-armed study [314] compared stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS) versus whole brain radiotherapy (WBRT) versus SRS + WBRT. Each group was further subdivided into recursive partitioning analysis (RPA) classes I to III (I favourable, II moderate and III poor patient status). Two-year OS and intracerebral control were equivalent in patients treated with SRS alone and SRS + WBRT. Both treatments were superior to WBRT alone in the general study population and in the RPA subgroup analyses. A comparison of SRS versus SRS + WBRT in a subgroup analysis of RPA class I showed significantly better 2-year OS and intracerebral control for SRS + WBRT based on only three participants. The other study [315] compared fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy (FSRT) with metastasectomy + CRT or CRT alone. Several patients in all groups underwent alternative surgical and non-surgical treatments after initial treatment. 1-, 2- and 3-year survival rates were higher but not significantly so for FSRT than for metastasectomy + CRT or CRT alone. FSRT did not result in a significantly better 2-year local control rate compared with MTS + CRT.

7.3.2.4 Embolisation of metastases

Embolisation prior to resection of hypervascular bone or spinal metastases can reduce intra-operative blood loss [319]. In selected patients with painful bone or paravertebral metastases, embolisation can relieve symptoms [320] (see recommendation Section 7.1.2.2.4)

7.3.2.5 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	LE
All included studies were retrospective non-randomised comparative studies, resulting in a high risk of bias associated with non-randomization, attrition, and selective reporting.	3
With the exception of brain and possibly bone metastases, metastasectomy remains by default the most appropriate local treatment for most sites.	3
Retrospective comparative studies consistently point towards a benefit of complete metastasectomy in mRCC patients in terms of overall survival, cancer-specific survival and delay of systemic therapy.	3
Radiotherapy to bone and brain metastases from RCC can induce significant relief from local symptoms (e.g. pain).	3

Recommendations	GR
No general recommendations can be made. The decision to resect metastases has to be taken for each site, and on a case-by-case basis; performance status, risk profiles, patient preference and alternative techniques to achieve local control, must be considered.	C
In individual cases, stereotactic radiotherapy for bone metastases, and stereotactic radiosurgery for brain metastases can be offered for symptom relief.	C

7.4 Systemic therapy for advanced/metastatic RCC

7.4.1 Chemotherapy

Chemotherapy is moderately effective only if 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) is combined with immunotherapeutic agents [321]. However, in one study, interferon-alpha (IFN- α) showed equivalent efficacy to IFN- α + interleukin-2 (IL-2) + 5-FU [322].

7.4.1.1 Conclusion and recommendation

Conclusion	LE
In mRCC 5-FU combined with immunotherapy has equivalent efficacy to IFN- α .	1b

Recommendation	GR
In patients with clear-cell mRCC, chemotherapy is not considered effective.	B

7.4.2 Immunotherapy

7.4.2.1 IFN- α monotherapy and combined with bevacizumab

Conflicting results exist for IFN- α in clear-cell (cc) mRCC. Several studies showed that IFN- α in mRCC has a survival advantage similar to that of hormonal therapy [323]. IFN- α resulted in a response rate of 6-15%, a 25% decrease in tumour progression risk and a modest survival benefit compared to placebo [83, 324]. However, patients with intermediate-risk disease, failed to confirm this benefit [325].

IFN- α may only be effective in some patient subgroups, including patients with ccRCC, favourable-risk criteria, as defined by the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center (MSKCC) and lung metastases only [324]. The moderate efficacy of immunotherapy was confirmed in a Cochrane meta-analysis [324]. Bevacizumab + IFN- α increased response rates and PFS in first-line therapy compared with IFN- α monotherapy [326]. All studies comparing targeted drugs to IFN- α monotherapy therapy showed superiority for sunitinib, bevacizumab + IFN- α , and temsirolimus [326-329]. IFN- α has been superseded by targeted therapy in cc-mRCC.

Table 7.1: MSKCC (Motzer) criteria [83]

Risk factors*	Cut-off point used
Karnofsky PS	< 80
Time from diagnosis to treatment	< 12 months
Haemoglobin	< Lower limit of laboratory reference range
LDH	> 1.5 times the upper limit of laboratory range
Corrected serum calcium	> 10.0 mg/dL (2.4 mmol/L)

* Favourable (low) risk, no risk factors; intermediate risk, one or two risk factors; poor (high) risk, three or more risk factors.

7.4.2.2 Interleukin-2

IL-2 has been used to treat mRCC since 1985, with response rates ranging from 7% to 27% [329-331]. Complete responses have been achieved with high-dose bolus IL-2 [332]. The toxicity of IL-2 is substantially greater than that of IFN- α , ranging from 7% to 27% [324].

7.4.2.3 Vaccines and targeted immunotherapy

A vaccine trial with tumour antigen 5T4 + first-line standard therapy (i.e. sunitinib, IL-2 or IFN- α) showed no survival benefit compared with placebo and first-line standard therapy [333]. Several vaccination studies are ongoing. Monoclonal antibodies against programmed death-1 (PD-1) or its ligand (PD-1L), which have efficacy and acceptable toxicity in patients with RCC [334], are currently investigated in phase III trials, as first- and second line.

7.4.2.4 Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusions	LE
IFN- α monotherapy is inferior to targeted therapy in MRCC.	1b
IL-2 monotherapy may have a role in selected cases (good PS, ccRCC, lung metastases only).	2
IL-2 has more side-effects than IFN- α .	2-3
High dose IL-2 is associated with durable complete responses in a limited number of patients. However, no clinical factors or biomarkers exist to accurately predict a durable response in patients treated with HD-IL2.	1b
Bevacizumab plus IFN- α is more effective than IFN- α in treatment-naïve, low-risk and intermediate-risk tumours.	1b
Vaccination therapy with tumour antigen 5T4 showed no survival benefit over first-line standard therapy.	1b
Cytokine combinations, with or without additional chemotherapy, do not improve OS compared with monotherapy.	1b

Recommendation	GR
Monotherapy with IFN- α or HD bolus IL-2 is not routinely recommended as first-line therapy in mRCC.	A

7.4.3 Targeted therapies

In sporadic ccRCC, hypoxia-inducible factor (HIF) accumulation due to von Hippel-Lindau (VHL) inactivation results in overexpression of vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF and platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), which promote neoangiogenesis [335-337]. This process substantially contributes to the development and progression of RCC. There are several targeting drugs approved for treating mRCC in both the USA and Europe:

- sorafenib (Nexavar®);

- sunitinib (Sutent[®]);
- bevacizumab (Avastin[®]) combined with IFN- α ;
- pazopanib (Votrient[®]);
- temsirolimus (Torisel[®]);
- everolimus (Afinitor[®]);
- axitinib (Inlyta[®]).

Most published trials have selected for clear-cell carcinoma subtypes, thus no robust evidence-based recommendations can be given for non-ccRCC subtypes.

In major trials leading to registration of the approved targeted agents, patients were stratified according to the MSKCC risk model [323] (Table 7.1). Since the MSKCC (Motzer) criteria were developed during the cytokine era, the International Metastatic Renal Cancer Database Consortium (IMDC) risk model has been established and validated to yield an accurate prognosis for patients treated in the era of targeted therapy. Neutrophilia and thrombocytosis have been added to the list of MSKCC risk factors, while LDH has been removed [338].

The IMDC published data on conditional survival which may be used in patient counselling [339]. The IMDC risk model has been validated and compared with the Cleveland Clinic Foundation (CCF) model, the French model, MSKCC model, and the International Kidney Cancer Working Group (IKCWG) model. The IMDC model did not differ from the other models, indicating that a ceiling has been reached in predicting prognosis based solely on clinical factors [340].

Table 7.2: Median OS and patients surviving 2 years treated in the era of targeted therapy per IMDC risk group (based on references [338, 340])

IMDC Model ***	Patients**		2-y OS (95% CI) **	
	n	Median OS* (months)		
Favourable	157	18	43.2	75% (65-82%)
Intermediate	440	52	22.5	53% (46-59%)
Poor	252	30	7.8	7% (2-16%)

* Based on [340]; ** based on [338]; CI = confidence interval; OS = overall survival.

7.4.3.1 Tyrosine kinase inhibitors

7.4.3.1.1 Sorafenib

Sorafenib is an oral multikinase inhibitor. A trial compared sorafenib and placebo after failure of prior systemic immunotherapy or in patients unfit for immunotherapy. Sorafenib improved PFS [341] (HR: 0.44; 95% CI: 0.35-0.55; $p < 0.01$). OS improved in patients who crossed over from placebo to sorafenib [342]. In patients with previously untreated mRCC sorafenib was not superior to IFN- α . A number of studies have used sorafenib as the control arm in sunitinib-refractory disease versus axitinib, dovitinib and temsirolimus. None showed superior survival compared to sorafenib.

7.4.3.1.2 Sunitinib

Sunitinib is an oral tyrosine kinase (TK) inhibitor and has antitumour and anti-angiogenic activity. Sunitinib as second-line monotherapy in patients with mRCC demonstrated a partial response in 34-40% and stable disease > 3 months in 27-29% of patients [343]. First-line monotherapy with sunitinib demonstrated longer PFS compared with IFN- α . OS was greater in patients treated for 26.4 and 21.8 months with sunitinib despite crossover [344].

In the EFFECT trial, sunitinib 50 mg/day (4 weeks on/2 weeks off) was compared with continuous uninterrupted sunitinib 37.5 mg/day in patients with clear-cell mRCC [345]. Median time to progression (TTP) with sunitinib 50 mg was numerically longer than the 37.5 mg arm (9.9 months versus 7.1 months). No significant differences in OS were seen (23.1 vs. 23.5 months; $p = 0.615$). Toxicity was comparable in both arms. Because of the non-significant, but numerically longer TTP with the standard 50 mg dosage, the authors recommended using this regimen. Alternate scheduling of sunitinib (2 weeks on/1 week off) is being used to manage toxicity.

7.4.3.1.3 Pazopanib

Pazopanib is an oral angiogenesis inhibitor. In a trial of pazopanib versus placebo in treatment-naïve mRCC patients and cytokine-treated patients, a significant improvement in PFS and tumour response was observed

[346]. Median PFS with pazopanib compared with placebo was:

- 9.2 vs. 4.2 months in the overall study population;
- 11.1 vs. 2.8 months for the treatment-naïve subpopulation;
- 7.4 vs. 4.2 months for the cytokine-pretreated subpopulation.

A trial comparing pazopanib with sunitinib (COMPARZ) established pazopanib as another first-line option. It showed that pazopanib was not associated with significantly worse PFS or OS compared to sunitinib. The two drugs had different toxicity profiles [347], and QoL was better with pazopanib. In another patient-preference study (PISCES), patients preferred pazopanib to sunitinib due to symptomatic toxicity [348]. Both studies were limited in that intermittent therapy (sunitinib) was compared with continuous therapy (pazopanib).

7.4.3.1.4 Axitinib

Axitinib is an oral selective second-generation inhibitor of VEGFR-1, -2, and -3. Axitinib was first evaluated as second-line treatment. In the AXIS trial (axitinib versus sorafenib in patients with previously failed cytokine treatment or targeted agents), the sample size calculation was based on a 40% improvement in median PFS from 5-7 months in patients receiving axitinib [349].

The overall median PFS was greater for axitinib than sorafenib. The difference in PFS was greatest in patients in whom cytokine treatment had failed. For those in whom sunitinib had failed, axitinib was associated with a greater PFS than sorafenib (4.8 vs. 3.4 months). Axitinib showed > grade 3 diarrhoea in 11%, hypertension in 16%, and fatigue in 11%. Across all grades, nausea was recorded in 32%, vomiting in 24%, and asthenia in 21%. OS was a secondary end-point of the trial in which crossover was not permitted. Final analysis of OS showed no significant differences between the groups in second-line treatment [350, 351].

Axitinib was investigated in two first-line studies [352, 353]. One investigated the efficacy and safety of axitinib dose titration in previously untreated patients with mRCC. Although the objective RR was higher in patients treated to toxicity, median PFS was 14.5 months in the axitinib titration group, 15.7 months in the placebo titration group, and 16.6 months in nonrandomised patients [352]. This supports the hypothesis that dose escalation is associated with higher RRs.

In a trial of axitinib vs. sorafenib in first-line treatment-naïve cc-mRCC, a significant difference in median PFS between the treatment groups was not demonstrated [353]. As a result of this study, axitinib is not approved for first-line therapy.

7.4.4 **Monoclonal antibody against circulating VEGF**

7.4.4.1 *Bevacizumab monotherapy and bevacizumab + IFN- α*

Bevacizumab is a humanised monoclonal antibody. The AVOREN study compared bevacizumab + IFN- α with IFN- α monotherapy in mRCC [326]. Median OR was higher in the bevacizumab + IFN- α group. Median PFS increased from 5.4 months with IFN- α to 10.2 months with bevacizumab + IFN- α . No benefit was seen in MSKCC poor-risk patients. Median OS in this trial, which allowed crossover after progression, was not greater in the bevacizumab-IFN- α group (23.3 vs. 21.3) [354].

A similarly designed trial (CALGB 90206) [355, 356], of bevacizumab + IFN- α vs. IFN- α showed a higher median PFS for the combination group. ORR was also higher in the combination group. Overall toxicity was greater for bevacizumab + IFN- α , with significantly more grade 3 hypertension, anorexia, fatigue, and proteinuria.

7.4.5 **mTOR inhibitors**

7.4.5.1 *Temsirolimus*

Temsirolimus is a specific inhibitor of mTOR [357]. Patients with modified high-risk mRCC in the NCT00065468 trial received first-line temsirolimus or IFN- α monotherapy, or a combination of both [328]. Median OS was higher in the temsirolimus group. However, OS in the temsirolimus + IFN- α group was not significantly superior to IFN- α alone [328]. IFN- α toxicity was marked, partly due to the high doses used. The INTORSECT trial investigated temsirolimus vs. sorafenib in patients who had previously failed sunitinib. Although no benefit in PFS was observed, a significant OS benefit for sorafenib was noted [358]. Based on these results, temsirolimus is not recommended in patients with VEGF TKI refractory disease.

7.4.5.2 *Everolimus*

Everolimus is an oral mTOR inhibitor, which is established in the treatment of VEGF-refractory disease. The RECORD-1 study compared everolimus + best supportive care (BSC) vs. placebo + BSC in patients with previously failed anti-VEGFR treatment (or previously intolerant of VEGF targeted therapy) [359]. The initial data showed a median PFS of 4.0 months v.s. 1.9 months for everolimus and placebo, respectively [359]. This

was extended to 4.9 months in the final analysis HR=0.33 [360]. Subset analysis of PFS for patients receiving only 1 previous VEGF TKI was 5.4 months [361]. This included some patients who were intolerant rather than progressed on therapy (PFS also 5.4 months) [362]. RECORD-1 included patients who failed multiple lines of VEGF-targeted therapy, and received everolimus in third- and fourth-line setting [359].

The RECORD-3 study of sunitinib vs. everolimus in treatment-naïve mRCC followed by either sunitinib or everolimus upon progression reported a higher median PFS for first-line treatment in the sunitinib group [363]. A large number of the crossover patients did not receive the planned subsequent therapy making further analysis complex and underpowered. Survival in the sunitinib-followed-by-everolimus-arm was high, mature analysis is awaited.

7.4.6 Therapeutic strategies and recommendations

7.4.6.1 Therapy for treatment-naïve patients with clear-cell mRCC

Pivotal trials have established sunitinib and bevacizumab plus IFN- α as first-line treatment options in treatment-naïve patients with cc-mRCC and a favourable-to-intermediate risk score. The COMPARZ study demonstrated that pazopanib and sunitinib have similar efficacy and different toxicity profiles. This study firmly establishes pazopanib as another first-line option [347].

7.4.6.1.1 Sequencing targeted therapy

7.4.6.1.1.1 Following progression of disease with VEGF-targeted therapy

Several trials investigated therapeutic options for patients who progressed on first-line VEGF-targeted therapy. RECORD-1 established VEGF TKI until disease progression followed by everolimus as one of the treatment options for patients with mRCC [359]. AXIS was the only trial to compare two TKIs after failure of a prior TKI. The results and interpretation are described under 7.3.1.4 above [349-351]. Comparison of RECORD-1 data with AXIS data is not advised due to differences in patient populations [349-351, 359].

INTORSECT was the only trial to directly compare an mTOR inhibitor and TKI (temsirolimus vs. sorafenib) after disease progression on sunitinib [358]. Median PFS was higher, but not significant, in the temsirolimus group. However, there was a significant difference in OS in favour of sorafenib. These data are not necessarily relevant to other mTOR inhibitors such as everolimus.

No firm recommendations can currently be made as to the best sequence of targeted therapy. However, VEGF-targeted therapy should be used for patients with favourable- and intermediate-risk disease in the first-line setting.

7.4.6.1.1.2 Treatment after progression of disease with mTOR inhibition

There are limited data addressing this issue. In view of the efficacy of VEGF-targeted therapy in renal cancer, a switch to VEGF-targeted therapy is advised (expert opinion and [364].

7.4.6.1.1.3 Treatment after progression of disease with cytokines

Trials have established sorafenib, axitinib and pazopanib as therapeutic options in this setting with a median PFS of 5.5, 12.1 and 7.4 months, respectively. Based on trial data, axitinib is superior to sorafenib in patients previously treated with cytokine therapy [349-351].

7.4.6.1.1.4 Treatment after second-line targeted therapy

The RECORD-1 study demonstrated the activity of everolimus in patients who had received more than one line of targeted therapy. 26% of patients were treated with two or more lines of VEGF-targeted therapy and significant benefits were seen. Although the GOLD trial failed to demonstrate superior efficacy of dovitinib over sorafenib in patients with mRCC who experienced disease progression after receiving prior VEGF- and mTOR-targeted therapies, the results suggest efficacy and safety of sorafenib in the third-line setting [364].

7.4.6.1.1.5 Combination of targeted agents

There have been a number of trials with VEGF targeted therapy and mTOR inhibitors [365-369]. The results have all been negative. No combinations of targeted agents are currently recommended.

7.4.6.2 Non-clear-cell renal cancer

No phase III trials of patients with non-clear-cell RCC have been reported. Expanded access programmes and subset analysis from RCC studies suggest the outcome of these patients with targeted therapy is poorer than for ccRCC. Targeted treatment in non-clear-cell RCC has focused on temsirolimus, everolimus, sorafenib and sunitinib [328, 370-372].

The most common non-clear-cell subtypes are papillary type 1 and 2 RCCs. There are small single-arm data for sunitinib and everolimus [372-375]. A trial of both types of papillary RCC treated with everolimus (RAPTOR) [375], showed median PFS of 3.7 months per central review in the intention-to-treat population with a median OS of 21.0 months.

Another trial investigated foretinib (a dual MET/VEGFR2 inhibitor) in patients with papillary RCC. Toxicity was acceptable with a high RR in patients with germline MET mutations [376]. However, a randomised phase II trial of everolimus vs. sunitinib with crossover design in non-clear-cell mRCC included 73 patients (27 with papillary RCC) and was stopped after a futility analysis for PFS and OS. Median OS for everolimus was 10.5 months but not reached for sunitinib [377]. The final results presented at the 2014 annual meeting of the American Society of Clinical Oncology showed a nonsignificant trend favouring sunitinib. Both sunitinib and everolimus remain options in this population, with a preference for sunitinib. Patients with ncc-mRCC should be referred to a clinical trial where appropriate.

Collecting-duct cancers are resistant to systemic therapy. There is a lack of data to support specific therapy in these patients. There is limited data supporting the use of targeted therapy in other histological subtypes such as chromophobe tumours [328, 370].

Table 7.3: EAU 2015 evidence-based recommendations for systemic therapy in patients with mRCC

RCC type	MSKCC risk group [323]	First-line	LE [^]	Second-line*	LE [^]	Third-line*	LE [^]	Later lines	LE
Clear cell*	Favourable, Intermediate and poor	sunitinib pazopanib bevacizumab + IFN Favourable-intermediate only)	1b 1b 1b	after VEGFR: axitinib sorafenib# everolimus after cytokines: sorafenib# axitinib pazopanib	2a 2a 2a 1b 2a 2a	after VEGFR: everolimus after mTOR: sorafenib	2a 1b	any targeted agent	4
Clear cell*	poor [¶]	temsirolimus	1b	any targeted agent	4				
Non-clear-cell §	any	sunitinib everolimus temsirolimus	2a 2b 2b	any targeted agent	4				

IFN-α = interferon alpha; LE = level of evidence; MSKCC = Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center; mTOR = mammalian target of rapamycin inhibitor; RCC = renal cell carcinoma; TKI = tyrosine kinase inhibitor.

* Doses: IFN-α - 9 MU three times per week subcutaneously, bevacizumab 10 mg/kg biweekly intravenously; sunitinib 50 mg daily orally for 4 weeks, followed by 2 weeks of rest (37.5 mg continuous dosing did not show significant differences); temsirolimus 25 mg weekly intravenously; pazopanib 800 mg daily orally. Axitinib 5 mg twice daily, to be increased to 7 mg twice daily, unless greater than grade 2 toxicity, blood pressure higher than 150/90 mmHg, or the patient is receiving antihypertensive medication. Everolimus, 10 mg daily orally.

§ No standard treatment available. Patients should be treated in the framework of clinical trials or a decision can be made in consultation with the patient to perform treatment in line with ccRCC.

¶ Poor risk criteria in the NCT00065468 trial consisted of MSKCC [323] risk plus metastases in multiple organs.

Sorafenib was inferior to axitinib in a RCT in terms of PFS but not OS [351].

^ Level of evidence was downgraded in instances when data were obtained from subgroup analysis within an RCT.

7.4.6.3 Conclusions and recommendations for systemic therapy in mRCC

Conclusions	LE
TKIs increase PFS and/or OS as both first-line and second-line treatments for clear-cell mRCC.	1b
Axitinib has proven efficacy and superiority in PFS as a second-line treatment after failure of cytokines and VEGF-targeted therapy in comparison with sorafenib.	1b
Sunitinib is more effective than IFN- α in treatment-naïve patients.	1b
Bevacizumab plus IFN- α is more effective than IFN- α in treatment-naïve low-risk and intermediate-risk patients.	1b
Pazopanib is superior to placebo in both naïve mRCC patients and post-cytokine patients.	1b
Pazopanib is not inferior to sunitinib in clear-cell mRCC patients.	1b
Temsirolimus monotherapy prolongs OS compared to IFN- α in poor-risk mRCC.	1b
Everolimus prolongs PFS in patients who have previously failed or are intolerant of VEGF-targeted therapy.	1b
Sorafenib has broad activity in a spectrum of settings in clear-cell patients previously treated with cytokine or targeted therapies.	4
Both mTOR inhibitors (everolimus and temsirolimus) and VEGF-targeted therapies (sunitinib or sorafenib) can be used in non-clear-cell RCC.	3
No combination has proven to be better than single-agent therapy.	1a

Recommendations	GR
Systemic therapy for mRCC should be based on targeted agents.	A
Sunitinib and pazopanib are recommended as first-line therapy for advanced/metastatic clear-cell RCC.	A
Bevacizumab + IFN- α recommended as first-line therapy for advanced/metastatic RCC in favourable-risk and intermediate-risk ccRCC.	A
Temsirolimus is recommended as first-line treatment in poor-risk RCC patients.	A
Axitinib is recommended as second-line treatment for mRCC.	A
Everolimus is recommended for ccRCC patients who have failed VEGF-targeted therapy.	A
Pazopanib and sorafenib are alternatives to axitinib and are recommended as second-line therapy after failure of prior cytokines.	B
Sequencing of targeted agents is recommended.	A
Sunitinib can be recommended as first-line therapy for non-clear-cell mRCC.	B

7.5 Recurrent RCC

7.5.1 Introduction

Locally recurrent disease can occur either after partial nephrectomy, nephrectomy and thermal ablation. After nephron sparing treatment approaches the recurrence may be intrarenal or in addition regional, e.g. venous tumour thrombi or retroperitoneal lymph node metastases. Both are often summarised as locoregional recurrences. Recurrence rates for pT1 tumours after partial nephrectomy are observed in 2.2% and are generally managed surgically depending on the extent of the locoregional recurrence [378]. After thermal ablation locoregional recurrences (intrarenal and regional) have been described in up to 12% [379]. Repeated ablation has often been recommended for intrarenal recurrences following thermal ablation. For locoregional recurrences surgical resection is mandatory as has been described for isolated local recurrences following nephrectomy.

After nephrectomy locally recurrent disease is defined as recurrent disease in the former kidney rest. However, metastasis in the not removed ipsilateral adrenal or non-resected lymph nodes makes interpretation of the true incidence of isolated recurrence in the renal fossa difficult. Treatment of adrenal metastases or lymph node metastases are often described in series of metastasectomy (Section 7.3). Isolated local recurrence however is rare.

The largest series on the treatment of isolated recurrence was published in 2009 [380]. Of 2,945 patients who underwent nephrectomy the authors identified 54 isolated local recurrences in the renal fossa. These however included those to the ipsilateral adrenal and lymph nodes. Exclusively retrospective non-comparative data exist which suggest that aggressive local resection offers durable local tumour control and improves survival. Adverse prognostic factors were a positive surgical margin after resection, the size of the recurrence and sarcomatoid histologic features [380]. In cases where complete surgical removal is not feasible due to advanced tumour growth and pain, palliative treatments including radiation treatment can be considered.

Conclusions	LE
Isolated recurrence in the local renal fossa is rare.	3
Patients with resectable local recurrences and absent sarcomatoid features may benefit from resection.	3

Recommendation	GR
Surgical resection of local recurrent disease may result in durable local control and improved survival	C

8. FOLLOW-UP AFTER RADICAL NEPHRECTOMY OR PARTIAL NEPHRECTOMY OR ABLATIVE THERAPIES FOR RCC

8.1 Introduction

Surveillance after treatment for RCC allows the urologist to monitor or identify:

- Postoperative complications;
- Renal function;
- Local recurrence after PN or ablative treatment;
- Recurrence in the contralateral or ipsilateral (after PN) kidney;
- Development of metastases.

The method and timing of examinations have been the subject of many publications. There is no consensus on surveillance after RCC treatment, and there is no evidence that early vs. later diagnosis of recurrences improves survival. However, follow-up is important to increase the available information on RCC, and should be performed by the urologist, who should record the time to recurrence or the development of metastases. Postoperative complications and renal function are readily assessed by the patient's history, physical examination, and measurement of serum creatinine and eGFR. Repeated long-term monitoring of eGFR is indicated if there is impaired renal function before surgery, or postoperative deterioration. Renal function [381, 382] and non-cancer survival [180-182] can be optimised by performing NSS whenever possible for T1 and T2 tumours [383] (LE: 3). Tumour-bed recurrence is rare, but early diagnosis is useful, as the most effective treatment is cytoreductive surgery [384, 385]. Recurrence in the contralateral kidney is also rare and is related to positive margins, multifocality, and grade [386] (LE: 3). Surveillance can identify local recurrences or metastases at an early stage. This is particularly important with ablative therapies such as cryotherapy and RFA. Although the local recurrence rate is higher than after conventional surgery, the patient may still be cured using repeat ablative therapy or RN [387] (LE: 3). In metastatic disease, extended tumour growth can limit the opportunity for surgical resection, considered the standard therapy in cases of resectable and preferably solitary lesions. In addition, early diagnosis of tumour recurrence may enhance the efficacy of systemic treatment if the tumour burden is low.

8.2 Which investigations for which patients, and when?

Intensive radiological surveillance for all patients is unnecessary. The outcome after surgery for T1a low-grade tumours is almost always excellent. It is therefore reasonable to stratify the follow-up, taking into account the risk of developing recurrence or metastases. Although there is no randomised evidence, large studies have examined prognostic factors with long follow-up periods, from which conclusions can be drawn [31, 388, 389] (LE: 4):

- The sensitivity of chest radiography for small metastases is poor and US has limitations. Surveillance should not be based on these imaging modalities [390]. With low-risk tumours, surveillance intervals should be adapted relative to radiation exposure and benefit. To reduce radiation exposure, MRI can be used.
- When the risk of relapse is intermediate or high, CT of the chest and abdomen should be performed, although significant morbidity associated with the radiation exposure involved in repeated CT scans should be taken into account [391]. CT can clearly reveal metastatic lesions from RCC [392].
- Surveillance should also include clinical evaluation of renal function and cardiovascular risk factors.

- Positron-emission tomography (PET) and PET-CT as well as bone scintigraphy are not the standard of care in RCC surveillance, due to limited specificity and sensitivity.
- Depending on the availability of effective new treatments, more strict follow-up schedules may be required, particularly as there is a higher local recurrence rate after cryotherapy and RFA.

There is controversy over the optimal duration of follow-up. Some argue that follow-up with imaging is not cost-effective after 5 years; however, late metastases are more likely to be solitary and justify more aggressive therapy with curative intent. In addition, patients with tumours that develop in the contralateral kidney can be treated with NSS if the tumours are detected when small. For tumours < 4 cm, there is no difference between PN and RN with regard to recurrences during follow-up [189] (LE: 3).

Several authors [165, 167, 393, 394], have designed scoring systems and nomograms to quantify the likelihood of patients developing tumour recurrences, metastases, and subsequent death. These systems have been compared and validated [395] (LE: 2). Using prognostic variables, several stage-based surveillance regimens have been proposed [396, 397], but do not include ablative therapies. A postoperative nomogram is available for estimating the likelihood of freedom from recurrence at 5 years [162]. Recently, a preoperative prognostic model based on age, symptoms, and TNM staging has been published and validated [171] (LE: 3). A surveillance algorithm for monitoring patients after treatment for RCC is needed, recognising not only the patient risk profile, but also efficacy of the treatment given (Table 8.1).

Table 8.1: Proposed surveillance schedule following treatment for RCC, taking into account patient risk profile and treatment efficacy

Risk profile	Treatment	Surveillance						
		6 mo	1 y	2 y	3 y	4 y	5 y	> 5 y
Low	RN/PN only	US	CT	US	CT	US	CT	Discharge
Intermediate	RN/PN/cryo/RFA	CT	CT	CT	US	CT	CT	CT once every 2 years
High	RN/PN/cryo/RFA	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT	CT once every 2 years

Cryo = cryotherapy; CT = computed tomography of chest and abdomen, or MRI = magnetic resonance imaging; PN = partial nephrectomy; RFA = radiofrequency ablation; RN = radical nephrectomy; US = ultrasound of abdomen, kidneys and renal bed.

8.3 Conclusions and recommendations for surveillance following RN or PN or ablative therapies in RCC

Conclusions	LE
Surveillance can detect local recurrence or metastatic disease while the patient is still surgically curable. Renal function should be assessed.	4
Risk stratification should be based on preexisting classification systems such as the UISS integrated risk assessment score (http://urology.ucla.edu/body.cfm?id=443 [163]).	4

Recommendations	GR
Follow-up after treatment for RCC should be based on a patient's risk factors and type of treatment.	C
For low-risk disease, CT/MRI can be used infrequently.	C
In intermediate-risk patients, intensified follow-up should be performed, including CT/MRI scans at regular intervals in accordance with a risk-stratified nomogram.	C
In high-risk patients, the follow-up examinations should include routine CT/MRI scans.	C
There is an increased risk of intrarenal recurrences in larger (> 7 cm) tumours treated with NSS, or when there is a positive margin. Follow-up should be intensified in these patients.	C

8.4 Research priorities

There is a clear need for future research to determine whether follow-up can optimise patient survival. Further information should be sought at what time point restaging has the highest chance to detect recurrence. Prognostic markers at surgery should be investigated to determine the risk of relapse over time.

9. REFERENCES

1. Mickisch G, Carballido J, Hellsten S, et al. Guidelines on renal cell cancer. *Eur Urol* 2001 Sep;40(3):252-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11684839>
2. Ljungberg B, Hanbury DC, Kuczyk M, et al. EAU Renal Cell Carcinoma Guidelines. *Eur Urol* 2007 Jun;51(6):1502-10.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17408850>
3. Ljungberg B, Cowan C, Hanbury DC, et al. EAU Guidelines on Renal Cell Carcinoma; The 2010 Update. *Eur Urol* 2010 Sep;58(3):398-406.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20633979>
4. Eble JN, Sauter G, Epstein JI, et al. (eds). In: Pathology and genetics of tumours of the urinary system and male genital organs. World Health Organization Classification of Tumours. Lyon: IARC Press, 2004.
<http://www.iarc.fr/en/publications/pdfs-online/pat-gen/bb7/>
5. Srigley JR, Delahunt B, Eble JN, et al. The ISUP Renal Tumor Panel. The International Society of Urological Pathology (ISUP) Vancouver Classification of Renal Neoplasia. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2013 Oct;37(10):1469-1489.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24025519>
6. Marconi L DS, Lam T, Stewart F, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy of percutaneous renal tumour biopsy. in press, 2015.
7. Lardasa M SF, Scrimgeoura D, Hofmann F, et al. Systematic review of surgical management of non-metastatic renal cell carcinoma with vena caval thrombus. Submitted, 2015.
8. Ljungberg B, Bensalah K, Bex A, et al. Systematic Review Methodology for the European Association of Urology Guidelines for Renal Cell Carcinoma (2014 update).
<http://www.uroweb.org/guidelines/online-guidelines/>
9. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta analyses:the PRISMA statement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2009 Oct;62(10):1006-12. [No abstract available]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19631508>
10. European Network of Cancer Registries. Eurocim version 4.0. European incidence database V2.3, 730 entity dictionary (2001), Lyon, 2001.
11. Lindblad P. Epidemiology of renal cell carcinoma. *Scand J Surg* 2004;93(2):88-96.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15285559>
12. Ferlay J, Steliarova-Foucher E, Lortet-Tieulent J, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality patterns in Europe: estimates for 40 countries in 2012. *Eur J Cancer* 2013 Apr;49(6):1374-403.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23485231>
13. Levi F, Ferlay J, Galeone C, et al. The changing pattern of kidney cancer incidence and mortality in Europe. *BJU Int* 2008 Apr;101(8):949-58.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18241251>
14. Kovacs G, Akhtar M, Beckwith BJ, et al. The Heidelberg classification of renal cell tumours. *J Pathol* 1997 Oct;183(2):131-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9390023>
15. Lipworth L, Tarone RE, McLaughlin JK. The epidemiology of renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2006 Dec;176(6 Pt 1):2353-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17085101>
16. Bergstrom A, Hsieh CC, Lindblad P, et al. Obesity and renal cell cancer-a quantitative review. *Br J Cancer* 2001 Sep;85(7):984-90.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11592770>
17. International Agency for Research on cancer (IARC). WHO IARC monographs. Vol. 83, 2004. Available at:
<http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol83/index.php> [Accessed January 2015].
18. Weikert S, Boeing H, Pischon T, et al. Blood pressure and risk of renal cell carcinoma in the European prospective investigation into cancer and nutrition. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008 Feb;167(4):438-46.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18048375>
19. Clague J, Lin J, Cassidy A, et al. Family history and risk of renal cell carcinoma: results from a case control study and systematic meta-analysis. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2009 Mar;18(3):801-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19240244>

20. Daniel CR, Cross AJ, Graubard BI, et al. Large prospective investigation of meat intake, related mutagens, and risk of renal cell carcinoma. *Am J Clin Nut* 2012 Jan;95(1):155-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22170360>
21. Weikert S, Boeing H, Pischon T, et al. Fruits and vegetables and renal cell carcinoma: findings from the European prospective investigation into cancer and nutrition (EPIC). *Int J Cancer* 2006 Jun;118(12):3133-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16425278>
22. Bellocco R, Pasquali E, Rota M, et al. Alcohol drinking and risk of renal cell carcinoma: results of a meta-analysis. *Ann Oncol* 2012 Sep;23(9):2235-44.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22398178>
23. Song DY, Song S, Song Y, et al. Alcohol intake and renal cell cancer risk: a meta-analysis. *Br J Cancer* 2012 May;106(11):1881-90.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22516951>
24. Patard JJ, Rodriguez A, Rioux-Leclercq N, et al. Prognostic significance of the mode of detection in renal tumours. *BJU Int* 2002 Sep;90(4):358-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12175389>
25. Kato M, Suzuki T, Suzuki Y, et al. Natural history of small renal cell carcinoma: evaluation of growth rate, histological grade, cell proliferation and apoptosis. *J Urol* 2004 Sep;172(3):863-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15310984>
26. Tsui KH, Shvarts O, Smith RB, et al. Renal cell carcinoma: prognostic significance of incidentally detected tumors. *J Urol* 2000 Feb;163(2):426-30.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10647646>
27. Yang XJ, Tan MH, Kim HL, et al. A molecular classification of papillary renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer Res* 2005 Jul;65(13):5628-37.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15994935>
28. Linehan WM, Vasselli J, Srinivasan R, et al. Genetic basis of cancer of the kidney: disease specific approaches to therapy. *Clin Cancer Res* 2004;10(18 Pt 2):6282S-9S.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15448018>
29. Furge KA, Tan MH, Dykema K, et al. Identification of deregulated oncogenic pathways in renal cell carcinoma: an integrated oncogenomic approach based on gene expression profiling. *Oncogene* 2007 Feb;26(9):1346-50.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17322920>
30. Fuhrman SA, Lasky LC, Limas C. Prognostic significance of morphologic parameters in renal cell carcinoma. *Am J Surg Pathol* 1982 Oct;6(7):655-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7180965>
31. Capitanio U, Cloutier V, Zini L, et al. A critical assessment of the prognostic value of clear cell, papillary and chromophobe histological subtypes in renal cell carcinoma: a population-based study. *BJU Int* 2009 Jun;103(11):1496-500.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19076149>
32. Keegan KA, Schupp CW, Chamie K, et al. Histopathology of surgically treated renal cell carcinoma: survival differences by subtype and stage. *J Urol* 2012 Aug;188(2):391-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22698625>
33. Beck SD, Patel MI, Snyder ME, et al. Effect of papillary and chromophobe cell type on disease-free survival after nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2004 Jan;11(1):71-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14699037>
34. Tsui KH, Shvarts O, Smith RB, et al. Prognostic indicators for renal cell carcinoma: a multivariate analysis of 643 patients using the revised 1997 TNM staging criteria. *J Urol* 2000;163:1090-5. quiz 1295.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10737472>
35. Steffens S, Janssen M, Roos FC, et al. Incidence and long-term prognosis of papillary compared to clear cell renal cell carcinoma--a multicentre study. *Eur J Cancer* 2012 Oct;48(15):2347-52.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22698386>
36. Pignot G, Elie C, Conquy S, et al. Survival analysis of 130 patients with papillary renal cell carcinoma: prognostic utility of type 1 and type 2 subclassification. *Urology* 2007 Feb;69(2):230-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17275070>
37. Gontero P, Ceratti G, Guglielmetti S, et al. Prognostic factors in a prospective series of papillary renal cell carcinoma. *BJU Int* 2008 Sep;102(6):697-702.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18489525>
38. Sukov WR, Lohse CM, Leibovich BC, et al. Clinical and pathological features associated with prognosis in patients with papillary renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2012 Jan;187(1):54-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22088335>

39. Üрге T, Hes O, Ferda J, et al. Typical signs of oncocytic papillary renal cell carcinoma in everyday clinical praxis. *World J Urol* 2010 Aug;28(4):513-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20454896>
40. Paner GP, Amin MB, Alvarado-Cabrero I, et al. A novel tumor grading scheme for chromophobe renal cell carcinoma: prognostic utility and comparison with Fuhrman nuclear grade. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2010 Sep;34(9):1233-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20679882>
41. Cheville JC, Lohse CM, Sukov WR, et al. Chromophobe renal cell carcinoma: the impact of tumor grade on outcome. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2012 Jun;36(6):851-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22367296>
42. Vera-Badillo FE, Conde E, Duran I. Chromophobe renal cell carcinoma: a review of an uncommon entity. *Int J Urol* 2012 Oct;19(10):894-900.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22715810>
43. Volpe A, Novara G, Antonelli A, et al; Surveillance and Treatment Update on Renal Neoplasms (SATURN) Project; Leading Urological No-Profit Foundation for Advanced Research (LUNA) Foundation. Chromophobe renal cell carcinoma (RCC): oncological outcomes and prognostic factors in a large multicentre series. *BJU Int* 2012 Jul; 110(1):76-83.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22044519>
44. Hora M, Hes O, Reischig T, et al. Tumours in end-stage kidney. *Transplant Proc* 2008 Dec;40(10):3354-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19100388>
45. Neuzillet Y, Tillou X, Mathieu R, et al; Comité de Transplantation de l'Association Française d'Urologie; Comité de Cancérologie de l'Association Française d'Urologie. Renal cell carcinoma (RCC) in patients with end-stage renal disease exhibits many favourable clinical, pathologic, and outcome features compared with RCC in the general population. *Eur Urol* 2011 Aug;60(2):366-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21377780>
46. Srigley JR, Delahunt B. Uncommon and recently described renal carcinomas. *Mod Pathol* 2009 Jun;22 Suppl 2:S2-S23.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19494850>
47. Przybycin CG, Magi-Galluzzi C, McKenney JK. Hereditary syndromes with associated renal neoplasia: a practical guide to histologic recognition in renal tumor resection specimens. *Adv Anat Pathol* 2013 Jul;20(4):245-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23752087>
48. Nese N, Martignoni G, Fletcher CD, et al. Pure epithelioid PEComas (so-called epithelioid angiomyolipoma) of the kidney: A clinicopathologic study of 41 cases: detailed assessment of morphology and risk stratification. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2011 Feb;35(2):161-76.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21263237>
49. Mues AC, Palacios JM, Haramis G, et al. Contemporary experience in the management of angiomyolipoma. *J Endourol* 2010 Nov;24(11):1883-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20919915>
50. Ramon J, Rimon U, Garniek A, et al. Renal angiomyolipoma: long-term results following selective arterial embolization. *Eur Urol* 2009 May;55(5):1155-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18440125>
51. Nelson CP, Sanda MG. Contemporary diagnosis and management of renal angiomyolipoma. *J Urol* 2002 Oct;168(4 Pt 1):1315-25.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12352384>
52. Ouzaid I, Autorino R, Fatica R et al. Active surveillance for renal angiomyolipoma: outcomes and factors predictive of delayed intervention. *BJU Int* 2014 Sep;114(3):412-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24325283>
53. Hocquelet A, Cornelis F, Le Bras Y, et al. Long-term results of preventive embolization of renal angiomyolipomas: evaluation of predictive factors of volume decrease. *Eur Radiol* 2014 Aug;24(8):1785-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24889998>
54. Castle SM, Gorbatiy V, Ekwenna O, et al. Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) therapy for renal angiomyolipoma (AML): an alternative to angio-embolization and nephron-sparing surgery. *BJU Int* 2012 Feb;109(3):384-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22176671>
55. Bissler JJ, Kingswood JC, Radzikowska E, et al. Everolimus for angiomyolipoma associated with tuberous sclerosis complex or sporadic lymphangiomyomatosis (EXIST-2): a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2013 Mar;381(9869):817-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23312829>

56. Staehler M, Sauter M, Helck A, et al. Nephron-sparing resection of angiomyolipoma after sirolimus pretreatment in patients with tuberous sclerosis. *Int Urol Nephrol* 2012 Dec;44(6):1657-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23054313>
57. Roubaud G, Gross-Goupil M, Wallerand H, et al. Combination of gemcitabine and doxorubicin in rapidly progressive metastatic renal cell carcinoma and/or sarcomatoid renal cell carcinoma. *Oncology* 2011;80(3-4):214-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21720184>
58. Abern MR, Tsivian M, Polascik TJ, et al. Characteristics and outcomes of tumors arising from the distal nephron. *Urology* 2012 Jul;80(1):140-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22626576>
59. Husillos A, Herranz-Amo F, Subirá D, et al. [Collecting duct renal cell carcinoma]. *Actas Urol Esp* 2011 Jun;35(6):368-71. [Article in Spanish]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21450372>
60. Hora M, Urge T, Trávníček I, et al. MiT translocation renal cell carcinomas: two subgroups of tumours with translocations involving 6p21 [t (6; 11)] and Xp11.2 [t (X;1 or X or 17)]. *Springerplus* 2014 May;3:245.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24877033>
61. Choudhary S, et al. Renal oncocytoma: CT features cannot reliably distinguish oncocytoma from other renal neoplasms. *Clin Radiol*, 2009. 64(5): p. 517-22.
62. Bird VG, Kanagarajah P, Morillo G, et al. Differentiation of oncocytoma and renal cell carcinoma in small renal masses (<4 cm): the role of 4-phase computerized tomography. *World J Urol* 2011 Dec;29(6):787-92.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20717829>
63. Kurup AN, Thompson RH, Leibovich BC, et al. Renal oncocytoma growth rates before intervention. *BJU Int* 2012 Nov;110(10):1444-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22520366>
64. Kawaguchi S, Fernandes KA, Finelli A, et al. Most renal oncocytomas appear to grow: observations of tumor kinetics with active surveillance. *J Urol* 2011 Oct;186(4):1218-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21849182>
65. Sobin LH, Gospodariwicz M, Wittekind C (eds). TNM classification of malignant tumors. UICC International Union Against Cancer. 7th edn. Wiley-Blackwell, 2009: pp. 255-257.
<http://www.uicc.org/tnm>
66. Gospodarowicz MK, Miller D, Groome PA, et al. The process for continuous improvement of the TNM classification. *Cancer* 2004 Jan;100(1):1-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14692017>
67. Kim SP, Alt AL, Weight CJ, et al. Independent validation of the 2010 American Joint Committee on Cancer TNM classification for renal cell carcinoma: results from a large, single institution cohort. *J Urol* 2011 Jun;185(6):2035-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21496854>
68. Novara G, Ficarra V, Antonelli A, et al; SATURN Project-LUNA Foundation. Validation of the 2009 TNM version in a large multi-institutional cohort of patients treated for renal cell carcinoma: are further improvements needed? *Eur Urol* 2010 Oct;58(4):588-95
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20674150>
69. Waalkes S, Becker F, Schrader AJ, et al. Is there a need to further subclassify pT2 renal cell cancers as implemented by the revised 7th TNM version? *Eur Urol* 2011 Feb;59(2):258-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21030143>
70. Bertini R, Roscigno M, Freschi M, et al. Renal sinus fat invasion in pT3a clear cell renal cell carcinoma affects outcomes of patients without nodal involvement or distant metastases. *J Urol* 2009 May;181(5):2027-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19286201>
71. Poon SA, Gonzalez JR, Benson MC, et al. Invasion of renal sinus fat is not an independent predictor of survival in pT3a renal cell carcinoma. *BJU Int* 2009 Jun;103(12):1622-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19154464>
72. Bedke J, Buse S, Pritsch M, et al. Perinephric and renal sinus fat infiltration in pT3a renal cell carcinoma: possible prognostic differences. *BJU Int* 2009 May;103(10):1349-54.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19076147>
73. Heidenreich A, Ravery V; European Society of Oncological Urology. Preoperative imaging in renal cell cancer. *World J Urol* 2004 Nov;22(5):307-15.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15290202>

74. Sheth S, Scatarige JC, Horton KM, et al. Current concepts in the diagnosis and management of renal cell carcinoma: role of multidetector CT and three-dimensional CT. *Radiographics* 2001 Oct;21. Spec No:S237-54.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11598260>
75. B.J. Wittekind, C. Compton CC, Sobin LH (eds). *A Commentary on Uniform Use. UICC International Union against cancer. 4th edition. Wiley-Blackwell. P. 106-106.*
<http://eu.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-1444332430.html>
76. Ficarra V, Novara G, Secco S, et al. Preoperative aspects and dimensions used for an anatomical (PADUA) classification of renal tumours in patients who are candidates for nephron-sparing surgery. *Eur Urol* 2009 Nov;56(5):786-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19665284>
77. Kutikov A, Uzzo RG. The R.E.N.A.L. nephrometry score: a comprehensive standardized system for quantitating renal tumor size, location and depth. *J Urol* 2009 Sep;182(3):844-53.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19616235>
78. Simmons MN, Ching CB, Samplaski MK, et al. Kidney tumor location measurement using the C index method. *J Urol* 2010 May;183(5):1708-13.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20299047>
79. Jayson M, Sanders H. Increased incidence of serendipitously discovered renal cell carcinoma. *Urology* 1998 Feb;51(2):203-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9495698>
80. Lee CT, Katz J, Fearn PA, et al. Mode of presentation of renal cell carcinoma provides prognostic information. *Urol Oncol* 2002 Jul-Aug;7(4):135-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12474528>
81. Patard JJ, Leray E, Rodriguez A, et al. Correlation between symptom graduation, tumor characteristics and survival in renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2003 Aug;44(2):226-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12875943>
82. Kim HL, Belldegrin AS, Freitas DG, et al. Paraneoplastic signs and symptoms of renal cell carcinoma: implications for prognosis. *J Urol* 2003 Nov;170(5):1742-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14532767>
83. Motzer RJ, Bacik J, Murphy BA, et al. Interferon-alfa as a comparative treatment for clinical trials of new therapies against advanced renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2002 Jan;20(1):289-96.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11773181>
84. Sufrin G, Chasan S, Golio A, et al. Paraneoplastic and serologic syndromes of renal adenocarcinoma. *Semin Urol* 1989 Aug;7(3):158-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2690260>
85. Uzzo RG, Novick AC. Nephron sparing surgery for renal tumors: indications, techniques and outcomes. *J Urol* 2001 Jul;66(1):6-18.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11435813>
86. Huang WC, Levey AS, Serio AM, et al. Chronic kidney disease after nephrectomy in patients with renal cortical tumours: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet Oncol* 2006 Sep;7(9):735-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16945768>
87. Israel GM, Bosniak MA. How I do it: evaluating renal masses. *Radiology* 2005 Aug;236(2):441-50.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16040900>
88. Fan L, Lianfang D, Jinfang X, et al. Diagnostic efficacy of contrast-enhanced ultrasonography in solid renal parenchymal lesions with maximum diameters of 5 cm. *J Ultrasound Med* 2008 Jun;27(6):875-85.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18499847>
89. Correas JM, Tranquart F, Claudon M. [Guidelines for contrast enhanced ultrasound (CEUS)-update 2008]. *J Radiol* 2009 Jan;90(1 Pt 2):123-38. [Article in French]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19212280>
90. Mitterberger M, Pelzer A, Colleselli D, et al. Contrast-enhanced ultrasound for diagnosis of prostate cancer and kidney lesions. *Eur J Radiol* 2007 Nov;64(2):231-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17881175>
91. Israel GM, Bosniak MA. Pitfalls in renal mass evaluation and how to avoid them. *Radiographics* 2008 Sep-Oct;28(5):1325-38.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18794310>
92. Rosenkrantz AB, Hindman N, Fitzgerald EF, et al. MRI features of renal oncocytoma and chromophobe renal cell carcinoma. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2010 Dec;195(6):W421-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21098174>

93. Hindman N, Ngo L, Genega EM, et al. Angiomyolipoma with minimal fat: can it be differentiated from clear cell renal cell carcinoma by using standard MR techniques? *Radiology* 2012 Nov;265(2):468-77.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23012463>
94. Pedrosa I, Sun MR, Spencer M, et al. MR imaging of renal masses: correlation with findings at surgery and pathologic analysis. *Radiographics* 2008 Jul-Aug;28(4):985-1003.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18635625>
95. Gong IH, Hwang J, Choi DK, et al. Relationship among total kidney volume, renal function and age. *J Urol* 2012 Jan;187(1):344-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22099987>
96. Ferda J, Hora M, Hes O, et al. Assessment of the kidney tumor vascular supply by two-phase MDCT angiography. *Eur J Radiol* 2007 May;62(2):295-301.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17324548>
97. Shao P, Tang L, Li P, et al. Precise segmental renal artery clamping under the guidance of dualsource computed tomography angiography during laparoscopic partial nephrectomy. *Eur Urol* 2012 Dec;62(6):1001-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22695243>
98. Adey GS, Pedrosa I, Rofsky NM, et al. Lower limits of detection using magnetic resonance imaging for solid components in cystic renal neoplasms. *Urology* 2008 Jan;71(1):47-51.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18242363>
99. Janus CL, Mendelson DS. Comparison of MRI and CT for study of renal and perirenal masses. *Crit Rev Diagn Imaging* 1991;32(2):69-118.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1863349>
100. Krestin GP, Gross-Fengels W, Marincek B. [The importance of magnetic resonance tomography in the diagnosis and staging of renal cell carcinoma.] *Radiologe* 1992;32(3):121-6. [Article in German]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1565792>
101. Mueller-Lisse UG, Mueller-Lisse UL. Imaging of advanced renal cell carcinoma. *World J Urol* 2010 Jun;28(3):253-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20458484>
102. Kabala JE, Gillatt DA, Persad RA, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging in the staging of renal cell carcinoma. *Br J Radiol* 1991;64(764):683-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1884119>
103. Putra LG, Minor TX, Bolton DM, et al. Improved assessment of renal lesions in pregnancy with magnetic resonance imaging. *Urology* 2009 Sep;74(3):535-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19604560>
104. Giannarini G, Petralia G, Thoeny HC. Potential and limitations of diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging in kidney, prostate, and bladder cancer including pelvic lymph node staging: a critical analysis of the literature. *Eur Urol* 2012 Feb;61(2):326-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22000497>
105. Park JW, Jo MK, Lee HM. Significance of 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose positron-emission tomography/computed tomography for the postoperative surveillance of advanced renal cell carcinoma. *BJU Int* 2009 Mar;103(5):615-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19007371>
106. Bechtold RE, Zagoria RJ. Imaging approach to staging of renal cell carcinoma. *Urol Clin North Am* 1997;24(3):507-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9275976>
107. Miles KA, London NJ, Lavelle JM, et al. CT staging of renal carcinoma: a prospective comparison of three dynamic computed tomography techniques. *Eur J Radiol* 1991;13(1):37-42.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1889427>
108. Lim DJ, Carter MF. Computerized tomography in the preoperative staging for pulmonary metastases in patients with renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 1993;150(4):1112-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8371366>
109. Koga S, Tsuda S, Nishikido M, et al. The diagnostic value of bone scan in patients with renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2001 Dec;166(6):2126-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11696720>
110. Marshall ME, Pearson T, Simpson W, et al. Low incidence of asymptomatic brain metastases in patients with renal cell carcinoma. *Urology* 1990 Oct;36(4):300-2.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2219605>
111. Henriksson C, Haraldsson G, Aldenborg F, et al. Skeletal metastases in 102 patients evaluated before surgery for renal cell carcinoma. *Scand J Urol Nephrol* 1992;26(4):363-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1292074>

112. Seaman E, Goluboff ET, Ross S, et al. Association of radionuclide bone scan and serum alkaline phosphatase in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Urol* 1996;48(5):692-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8911510>
113. Warren KS, McFarlane J. The Bosniak classification of renal cystic masses. *BJU Int* 2005 May;95(7):939-42.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15839908>
114. Bosniak MA. The use of the Bosniak classification system for renal cysts and cystic tumors. *J Urol* 1997 May;157(5):1852-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9112545>
115. Neuzillet Y, Lechevallier E, Andre M, et al. Accuracy and clinical role of fine needle percutaneous biopsy with computerized tomography guidance of small (less than 4.0 cm) renal masses. *J Urol* 2004 May;171(5):1802-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15076280>
116. Shannon BA, Cohen RJ, de Bruto H, et al. The value of preoperative needle core biopsy for diagnosing benign lesions among small, incidentally detected renal masses. *J Urol* 2008 Oct;180(4):1257-61; discussion 1261.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18707712>
117. Schmidbauer J, Remzi M, Memarsadeghi M, et al. Diagnostic accuracy of computed tomography-guided percutaneous biopsy of renal masses. *Eur Urol* 2008 May;53(5):1003-11.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18061339>
118. Leuret T, Poulain JE, Molinie V, et al. Percutaneous core biopsy for renal masses: indications, accuracy and results. *J Urol* 2007 Oct;178(4 Pt 1):1184-8; discussion 1188.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17698122>
119. Maturen KE, Nghiem HV, Caoili EM, et al. Renal mass core biopsy: accuracy and impact on clinical management. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007 Feb;188(2):563-70.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17242269>
120. Volpe A, Mattar K, Finelli A, et al. Contemporary results of percutaneous biopsy of 100 small renal masses: a single center experience. *J Urol* 2008 Dec;180(6):2333-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18930274>
121. Wang R, Wolf JS Jr, Wood DP Jr, et al. Accuracy of percutaneous core biopsy in management of small renal masses. *Urology* 2009 Mar;73(3):586-90; discussion 590-1.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19118884>
122. Veltri A, Garetto I, Tosetti I, et al. Diagnostic accuracy and clinical impact of imaging-guided needle biopsy of renal masses. Retrospective analysis on 150 cases. *Eur Radiol* 2011 Feb;21(2):393-401.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20809129>
123. Leveridge MJ, Finelli A, Kachura JR, et al. Outcomes of small renal mass needle core biopsy, nondiagnostic percutaneous biopsy, and the role of repeat biopsy. *Eur Urol* 2011 Sep;60(3):578-84.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21704449>
124. Abel EJ, Culp SH, Matin SF, et al. Percutaneous biopsy of primary tumor in metastatic renal cell carcinoma to predict high risk pathological features: comparison with nephrectomy assessment. *J Urol* 2010 Nov;184(5):1877-81.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20850148>
125. Breda A, Treat EG, Haft-Candell L, et al. Comparison of accuracy of 14-, 18- and 20-G needles in ex-vivo renal mass biopsy: a prospective, blinded study. *BJU Int* 2010 Apr;105(7):940-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19888984>
126. Beland MD, Mayo-Smith WW, Dupuy DE, et al. Diagnostic yield of 58 consecutive imaging-guided biopsies of solid renal masses: should we biopsy all that are indeterminate? *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2007 Mar;188(3):792-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17312070>
127. Li G, Cuilleron M, Zhao A, et al. Combination of core biopsy and fine-needle aspiration increases diagnostic rate for small solid renal tumors. *Anticancer Res* 2012 Aug;32(8):3463-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22843931>
128. Parks GE, Perkins LA, Zagoria RJ, et al. Benefits of a combined approach to sampling of renal neoplasms as demonstrated in a series of 351 cases. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2011 Jun;35(6):827-35.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21552112>
129. Wood BJ, Khan MA, McGovern F, et al. Imaging guided biopsy of renal masses: indications, accuracy and impact on clinical management. *J Urol* 1999 May;161(5):1470-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10210375>
130. Caoili EM, Bude RO, Higgins EJ, et al. Evaluation of sonographically guided percutaneous core biopsy of renal masses. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2002 Aug;179(2):373-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12130435>

131. Eshed I, Elias S, Sidi AA. Diagnostic value of CT-guided biopsy of indeterminate renal masses. *Clin Radiol* 2004 Mar;59(3):262-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15037139>
132. Rybicki FJ, Shu KM, Cibas ES, et al. Percutaneous biopsy of renal masses: sensitivity and negative predictive value stratified by clinical setting and size of masses. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003 May;180(5):1281-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12704038>
133. Sofikerim M, Tatlisen A, Canoz O, et al. What is the role of percutaneous needle core biopsy in diagnosis of renal masses? *Urology* 2010 Sep;76(3):614-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20110106>
134. Somani BK, Nabi G, Thorpe P, et al. Image-guided biopsy-diagnosed renal cell carcinoma: critical appraisal of technique and long-term follow-up. *Eur Urol* 2007 May;51(5):1289-95; discussion 1296-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17081679>
135. Tan HJ, Jacobs BL, Hafez KS, et al. Understanding the role of percutaneous biopsy in the management of patients with a small renal mass. *Urology* 2012 Feb;79(2):372-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22310755>
136. Vasudevan A, Davies RJ, Shannon BA, et al. Incidental renal tumours: the frequency of benign lesions and the role of preoperative core biopsy. *BJU Int* 2006 May;97(5):946-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16643475>
137. Thuillier C, Long JA, Lapouge O, et al. [Value of percutaneous biopsy for solid renal tumours less than 4 cm in diameter based on a series of 53 cases]. *Prog Urol* 2008 Jul;18(7):435-9. [Article in French]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18602603>
138. Shah RB, Bakshi N, Hafez KS, et al. Image-guided biopsy in the evaluation of renal mass lesions in contemporary urological practice: indications, adequacy, clinical impact, and limitations of the pathological diagnosis. *Hum Pathol* 2005 Dec;36(12):1309-15.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16311125>
139. Reichelt O, Gajda M, Chyhrai A, et al. Ultrasound-guided biopsy of homogenous solid renal masses. *Eur Urol* 2007 Nov;52(5):1421-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17306920>
140. Torp-Pedersen S, Juul N, Larsen T, et al. US-guided fine needle biopsy of solid renal masses--comparison of histology and cytology. *Scand J Urol Nephrol Suppl* 1991;137:41-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1947839>
141. Jaff A, Molinié V, Mellot F, et al. Evaluation of imaging-guided fine-needle percutaneous biopsy of renal masses. *Eur Radiol* 2005 Aug;15(8):1721-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15627185>
142. Kroeze SG, Huisman M, Verkooijen HM, et al. Real-time 3D fluoroscopy-guided large core needle biopsy of renal masses: a critical early evaluation according to the IDEAL recommendations. *Cardiovasc Intervent Radiol* 2012 Jun;35(3):680-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21822769>
143. Wunderlich H, Hindermann W, Al Mustafa AM, et al. The accuracy of 250 fine needle biopsies of renal tumors. *J Urol* 2005 Jul;174(1):44-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15947574>
144. Harisinghani MG, Maher MM, Gervais DA, et al. Incidence of malignancy in complex cystic renal masses (Bosniak category III): should imaging-guided biopsy precede surgery? *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2003 Mar;180(3):755-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12591691>
145. Lang EK, Macchia RJ, Gayle B, et al. CT-guided biopsy of indeterminate renal cystic masses (Bosniak 3 and 2F): accuracy and impact on clinical management. *Eur Radiol* 2002 Oct;12(10):2518-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12271393>
146. Lang H, Lindner V, de Fromont M, et al. Multicenter determination of optimal interobserver agreement using the Fuhrman grading system for renal cell carcinoma: assessment of 241 patients with > 15-year follow-up. *Cancer* 2005 Feb;103(3):625-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15611969>
147. Rioux-Leclercq N, Karakiewicz PI, Trinh QD, et al. Prognostic ability of simplified nuclear grading of renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer* 2007 Mar;109(5):868-74.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17262800>

148. Sun M, Lughezzani G, Jeldres C, et al. A proposal for reclassification of the Fuhrman grading system in patients with clear cell renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2009 Nov;56(5):775-81.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19573980>
149. Cheville JC, Lohse CM, Zincke H, et al. Comparisons of outcome and prognostic features among histological subtypes of renal cell carcinoma. *Am J Surg Pathol* 2003 May;27(5):612-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12717246>
150. Patard JJ, Leray E, Rioux-Leclercq N, et al. Prognostic value of histological subtypes in renal cell carcinoma: a multicenter experience. *J Clin Oncol* 2005 Apr;23(12):2763-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15837991>
151. Leibovich BC, Lohse CM, Crispen PL, et al. Histological subtype is an independent predictor of outcome for patients with renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2010 Apr;183(4):1309-15.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20171681>
152. Wahlgren T, Harmenberg U, Sandström P, et al. Treatment and overall survival in renal cell carcinoma: a Swedish population-based study (2000-2008). *Br J Cancer* 2013 Apr;108(7):1541-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23531701>
153. Delahunt B, Eble JN, McCredie MR, et al. Morphologic typing of papillary renal cell carcinoma: comparison of growth kinetics and patient survival in 66 cases. *Hum Pathol* 2001 Jun;32(6):590-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11431713>
154. Klatte T, Streubel B, Wrba F, et al. Renal cell carcinoma associated with transcription factor E3 expression and Xp11.2 translocation: incidence, characteristics, and prognosis. *Am J Clin Pathol* 2012 May;137(5):761-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22523215>
155. Bensalah K, Leray E, Fergelot P, et al. Prognostic value of thrombocytosis in renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2006 Mar;175(3 Pt 1):859-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16469566>
156. Kim HL, Han KR, Zisman A, et al. Cachexia-like symptoms predict a worse prognosis in localized T1 renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2004 May;171(5):1810-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15076282>
157. Patard JJ, Leray E, Cindolo L, et al. Multi-institutional validation of a symptom based classification for renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2004 Sep;172(3):858-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15310983>
158. Sim SH, Messenger MP, Gregory WM, et al. Prognostic utility of pre-operative circulating osteopontin, carbonic anhydrase IX and CRP in renal cell carcinoma. *Br J Cancer* 2012 Sep;107(7):1131-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22918393>
159. Sabatino M, Kim-Schulze S, Panelli MC, et al. Serum vascular endothelial growth factor and fibronectin predict clinical response to high-dose interleukin-2 therapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2009 Jun;27(16):2645-52.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19364969>
160. Li G, Feng G, Gentil-Perret A, et al. Serum carbonic anhydrase 9 level is associated with postoperative recurrence of conventional renal cell cancer. *J Urol* 2008 Aug;180(2):510-3; discussion 513-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18550116>
161. Zhao H, Ljungberg B, Grankvist K, et al. Gene expression profiling predicts survival in conventional renal cell carcinoma. *PLoS Med* 2006 Jan;3(1):e13.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16318415>
162. Sorbellini M, Kattan MW, Snyder ME, et al. A postoperative prognostic nomogram predicting recurrence for patients with conventional clear cell renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2005 Jan;173(1):48-51.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15592023>
163. Zisman A, Pantuck AJ, Dorey F, et al. Improved prognostication of renal cell carcinoma using an integrated staging system. *J Clin Oncol* 2001 Mar;19(6):1649-57.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11250993>
164. Frank I, Blute ML, Cheville JC, et al. An outcome prediction model for patients with clear cell renal cell carcinoma treated with radical nephrectomy based on tumor stage, size, grade and necrosis: the SSIGN score. *J Urol* 2002 Dec;168(6):2395-400.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12441925>
165. Leibovich BC, Blute ML, Cheville JC, et al. Prediction of progression after radical nephrectomy for patients with clear cell renal cell carcinoma: a stratification tool for prospective clinical trials. *Cancer* 2003 Apr;97(7):1663-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12655523>

166. Patard JJ, Kim HL, Lam JS, et al. Use of the University of California Los Angeles integrated staging system to predict survival in renal cell carcinoma: an international multicenter study. *J Clin Oncol* 2004 Aug;22(16):3316-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15310775>
167. Karakiewicz PI, Briganti A, Chun FK, et al. Multi-institutional validation of a new renal cancer-specific survival nomogram. *J Clin Oncol* 2007 Apr;25(11):1316-22.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17416852>
168. Zigeuner R, Hutterer G, Chromecki T, et al. External validation of the Mayo Clinic stage, size, grade, and necrosis (SSIGN) score for clear-cell renal cell carcinoma in a single European centre applying routine pathology. *Eur Urol* 2010 Jan;57(1):102-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19062157>
169. Isbarn H, Karakiewicz PI. Predicting cancer-control outcomes in patients with renal cell carcinoma. *Curr Opin Urol* 2009 May;19(3):247-57.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19325492>
170. Raj GV, Thompson RH, Leibovich BC, et al. Preoperative nomogram predicting 12-year probability of metastatic renal cancer. *J Urol* 2008 Jun;179(6):2146-51;discussion 2151.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18423735>
171. Karakiewicz PI, Suardi N, Capitanio U, et al. A preoperative prognostic model for patients treated with nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2009 Feb;55(2):287-95.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18715700>
172. MacLennan S, Imamura M, Lapitan MC, et al; UCAN Systematic Review Reference Group; EAU Renal Cancer Guideline Panel. Systematic review of perioperative and quality-of-life outcomes following surgical management of localised renal cancer. *Eur Urol* 2012 Dec;62(6):1097-117.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22841673>
173. MacLennan S, Imamura M, Lapitan MC, et al; UCAN Systematic Review Reference Group; EAU Renal Cancer Guideline Panel. Systematic review of oncological outcomes following surgical management of localised renal cancer. *Eur Urol* 2012 May;61(5):972-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22405593>
174. Ljungberg B, Bensalah K, Bex A, et al. Systematic Review Methodology for the European Association of Urology Guidelines for Renal Cell Carcinoma (2014 update).
http://www.uroweb.org/gls/refs/Systematic_methodology_RCC_2014_update.pdf
175. Butler BP, Novick AC, Miller DP, et al. Management of small unilateral renal cell carcinomas: radical versus nephron-sparing surgery. *Urology* 1995 Jan;45(1):34-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7817478>
176. Gratzke C, Seitz M, Bayrle F, et al. Quality of life and perioperative outcomes after retroperitoneoscopic radical nephrectomy (RN), open RN and nephron-sparing surgery in patients with renal cell carcinoma. *BJU Int* 2009 Aug;104(4):470-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19239445>
177. D'Armiento M, Damiano R, Feleppa B, et al. Elective conservative surgery for renal carcinoma versus radical nephrectomy: a prospective study. *Br J Urol* 1997 Jan;79(1):15-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9043488>
178. Lee JH, You CH, Min GE et al. Comparison of the surgical outcome and renal function between radical and nephron-sparing surgery for renal cell carcinomas. *Korean J Urol* 2007;48:671-676.
179. Van Poppel H, Da Pozzo L, Albrecht W, et al. A prospective, randomised EORTC intergroup phase 3 study comparing the oncologic outcome of elective nephron-sparing surgery and radical nephrectomy for low-stage renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2011 Apr;59(4):543-52.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21186077>
180. Huang WC, Elkin EB, Levey AS, et al. Partial nephrectomy versus radical nephrectomy in patients with small renal tumors--is there a difference in mortality and cardiovascular outcomes? *J Urol* 2009 Jan;181(1):55-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19012918>
181. Zini L, Perrotte P, Capitanio U, et al. Radical versus partial nephrectomy: effect on overall and noncancer mortality. *Cancer* 2009 Apr;115(7):1465-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19195042>
182. Thompson RH, Boorjian SA, Lohse CM, et al. Radical nephrectomy for pT1a renal masses may be associated with decreased overall survival compared with partial nephrectomy. *J Urol* 2008 Feb;179(2):468-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18076931>
183. Patard JJ, Bensalah KC, Pantuck AJ, et al. Radical nephrectomy is not superior to nephron sparing surgery in PT1B-PT2N0M0 renal tumours: A matched comparison analysis in 546 cases. *Eur Urol Suppl* 2008;7:194.

184. Jang HA, park YH, Hong S-H. Oncologic and functional outcomes after partial nephrectomy versus radical nephrectomy in T1b renal cell carcinoma: a multicentre, matched case-control study in Korean patients. *J Urol* 2013 May;189(4S):e675.
185. Thompson RH, Kaag M, Vickers A, et al. Contemporary use of partial nephrectomy at a tertiary care center in the United States. *J Urol* 2009 Mar;181(3):993-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19150552>
186. Dash A, Vickers AJ, Schachter LR, et al. Comparison of outcomes in elective partial vs radical nephrectomy for clear cell renal cell carcinoma of 4-7 cm. *BJU Int* 2006 May;97(5):939-45.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16643474>
187. Weight CJ, Larson BT, Fergany AF, et al. Nephrectomy induced chronic renal insufficiency is associated with increased risk of cardiovascular death and death from any cause in patients with localized cT1b renal masses. *J Urol* 2010 Apr;183(4):1317-23.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20171688>
188. Crépel M, Jeldres C, Perrotte P, et al. Nephron-sparing surgery is equally effective to radical nephrectomy for T1BN0M0 renal cell carcinoma: a population-based assessment. *Urology* 2010 Feb;75(2):271-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19962740>
189. Patard JJ, Shvarts O, Lam JS, et al. Safety and efficacy of partial nephrectomy for all T1 tumors based on an international multicenter experience. *J Urol* 2004 Jun;171(6 Pt 1):2181-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15126781>
190. Antonelli A, Ficarra V, Bertini R, et al; members of the SATURN Project - LUNA Foundation. Elective partial nephrectomy is equivalent to radical nephrectomy in patients with clinical T1 renal cell carcinoma: results of a retrospective, comparative, multi-institutional study. *BJU Int* 2012 Apr;109(7):1013-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21883829>
191. Iizuka J, Kondo T, Hashimoto Y, et al. Similar functional outcomes after partial nephrectomy for clinical T1b and T1a renal cell carcinoma. *Int J Urol* 2012 Nov;19(11):980-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22735049>
192. Badalato GM, Kates M, Wisnivesky JP, et al. Survival after partial and radical nephrectomy for the treatment of stage T1bN0M0 renal cell carcinoma (RCC) in the USA: a propensity scoring approach. *BJU Int* 2012 May;109(10):1457-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21933334>
193. Simmons MN, Weight CJ, Gill IS. Laparoscopic radical versus partial nephrectomy for tumors >4 cm: intermediate-term oncologic and functional outcomes. *Urology* 2009 May;73(5):1077-82.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19394509>
194. Tan HJ, Norton EC, Ye Z, et al. Long-term survival following partial vs radical nephrectomy among older patients with early-stage kidney cancer. *JAMA* 2012 Apr;307(15):1629-35.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22511691>
195. Poulakis V, Witzsch U, de Vries R, et al. Quality of life after surgery for localized renal cell carcinoma: comparison between radical nephrectomy and nephron-sparing surgery. *Urology* 2003 Nov;62(5):814-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14624900>
196. Shekarriz B, Upadhyay J, Shekarriz H, et al. Comparison of costs and complications of radical and partial nephrectomy for treatment of localized renal cell carcinoma. *Urology* 2002 Feb; 59(2):211-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11834387>
197. Van Poppel H, Da Pozzo L, Albrecht W, et al. A prospective randomized EORTC intergroup phase 3 study comparing the complications of elective nephron-sparing surgery and radical nephrectomy for low-stage renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2007 Jun;51(6):1606-15.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17140723>
198. Gabr AH, Gdor Y, Strobe SA, et al. Approach and specimen handling do not influence oncological perioperative and long-term outcomes after laparoscopic radical nephrectomy. *J Urol* 2009 Sep;182(3):874-80.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19616234>
199. Imamura M, MacLennan S, Lapitan MC, et al. Systematic review of the clinical effectiveness of surgical management for localised renal cell carcinoma. University of Aberdeen, Academic Urology Unit, 2011. Aberdeen, UK. Available from:
<http://www.uroweb.org/?id=217&tyid=1&oid=4>
200. Simmons MN, Chung BI, Gill IS. Perioperative efficacy of laparoscopic partial nephrectomy for tumors larger than 4 cm. *Eur Urol* 2009 Jan;55(1):199-208.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18684555>

201. Takaki H, Yamakado K, Soga N, et al. Midterm results of radiofrequency ablation versus nephrectomy for T1a renal cell carcinoma. *Jpn J Radiol* 2010 Jul;28(6):460-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20661697>
202. Lane BR, Tiong HY, Campbell SC, et al. Management of the adrenal gland during partial nephrectomy. *J Urol* 2009 Jun;181(6):2430-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19371896>
203. Bekema HJ, MacLennan S, Imamura M, et al. Systematic review of adrenalectomy and lymph node dissection in locally advanced renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2013 Nov;64(5):799-810.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23643550>
204. Blom JH, Van Poppel H, Maréchal JM, et al. Radical Nephrectomy with and without Lymph-Node-Dissection: Final Results of European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) Randomized Phase 3 Trial 30881. *Eur Urol* 2009 Jan;55(1):28-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18848382>
205. Capitano U, Becker F, Blute ML, et al. Lymph node dissection in renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2011 Dec;60(6):1212-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21940096>
206. Herrlinger A, Schrott KM, Schott G, et al. What are the benefits of extended dissection of the regional renal lymph nodes in the therapy of renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 1991 Nov;146(5):1224-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1942267>
207. Peters PC, Brown GL. The role of lymphadenectomy in the management of renal cell carcinoma. *Urol Clin North Am* 1980 Oct;7(3):705-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7456182>
208. Yamashita Y AA, Sakamoto K. The therapeutic value of lymph node dissection for renal cell carcinoma. *Nishinohon J Urol* 1989;51:777-81.
209. Sullivan LD, Westmore DD, McLoughlin MG. Surgical management of renal cell carcinoma at the Vancouver General Hospital: 20-year review. *Can J Surg* 1979 Sep;22(5):427-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/497910>
210. Siminovitch JP, Montie JE, Straffon RA. Lymphadenectomy in renal adenocarcinoma. *J Urol* 1982 Jun;127(6):1090-1.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7087013>
211. Kim S, Thompson HR, Weight C, et al. The relationship of lymph node dissection with recurrence and survival for patients treated with nephrectomy for high-risk renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2012;187(4S):e233.
213. Chapin BF, Delacroix SE Jr, Wood CG. The role of lymph node dissection in renal cell carcinoma. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2011 Jun;16(3):186-94.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21523561>
213. Capitano U, Abdollah F, Matloob R, et al. When to perform lymph node dissection in patients with renal cell carcinoma: a novel approach to the preoperative assessment of risk of lymph node invasion at surgery and of lymph node progression during follow-up. *BJU Int* 2013 Jul;112(2):E59-66
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23795799>
214. Kwon T, Song C, Hong JH, et al. Reassessment of renal cell carcinoma lymph node staging: analysis of patterns of progression. *Urology* 2011 Feb;77(2):373-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20817274>
215. Bex A, Vermeeren L, Meinhardt W, et al. Intraoperative sentinel node identification and sampling in clinically node-negative renal cell carcinoma: initial experience in 20 patients. *World J Urol* 2011 Dec;29(6):793-9
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21107845>
216. Sherif AM, Eriksson E, Thörn M, et al. Sentinel node detection in renal cell carcinoma. A feasibility study for detection of tumour-draining lymph nodes. *BJU Int* 2012 Apr;109(8):1134-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21883833>
217. Dimashkieh HH, Lohse CM, Blute ML, et al. Extranodal extension in regional lymph nodes is associated with outcome in patients with renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2006 Nov;176(5):1978-82; discussion 1982-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17070225>
218. Terrone C, Cracco C, Porpiglia F, et al. Reassessing the current TNM lymph node staging for renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2006 Feb;49(2):324-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16386352>
219. Hutterer GC, Patard JJ, Perrotte P, et al. Patients with renal cell carcinoma nodal metastases can be accurately identified: external validation of a new nomogram. *Int J Cancer* 2007 Dec;121(11):2556-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17691107>

220. May M, Brookman-Amissah S, Pflanz S, et al. Pre-operative renal arterial embolisation does not provide survival benefit in patients with radical nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma. *Br J Radiol* 2009 Aug;82(981):724-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19255117>
221. Subramanian VS, Stephenson AJ, Goldfarb DA, et al. Utility of preoperative renal artery embolization for management of renal tumors with inferior vena caval thrombi. *Urology* 2009 Jul;74(1):154-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19428069>
222. Maxwell NJ, Saleem Amer N, Rogers E, et al. Renal artery embolization in the palliative treatment of renal carcinoma. *Br J Radiol* 2007 Feb;80(950):96-102.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17495058>
223. Hallscheidt P, Besharati S, Noeldge G, et al. Preoperative and palliative embolization of renal cell carcinomas: follow-up of 49 patients. *Rofo* 2006 Apr;178(4):391-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16612730>
224. Lamb GW, Bromwich EJ, Vasey P, et al. Management of renal masses in patients medically unsuitable for nephrectomy-natural history, complications and outcome. *Urology* 2004 Nov;64(5):909-13.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15533476>
225. Hemal AK, Kumar A, Kumar R, et al. Laparoscopic versus open radical nephrectomy for large renal tumors: a long-term prospective comparison. *J Urol* 2007 Mar;177(3):862-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17296361>
226. Brewer K, O'Malley RL, Hayn M, et al. Perioperative and renal function outcomes of minimally invasive partial nephrectomy for T1b and T2a kidney tumors. *J Endourol* 2012 Mar;26(3):244-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22192099>
227. Sprenkle PC, Power N, Ghoneim T, et al. Comparison of open and minimally invasive partial nephrectomy for renal tumors 4-7 centimeters. *Eur Urol* 2012 Mar;61(3):593-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22154728>
228. Peng B, Zheng J-H, Xu D-F, Ren J-Z. Retroperitoneal laparoscopic nephrectomy and open nephrectomy for radical treatment of renal cell carcinoma: A comparison of clinical outcomes. *Academic Journal of Second Military Medical University* 2006;27:1167-9.
229. Desai MM, Strzempkowski B, Matin SF, et al. Prospective randomized comparison of transperitoneal versus retroperitoneal laparoscopic radical nephrectomy. *J Urol* 2005 Jan;173(1):38-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15592021>
230. Nambirajan T, Jeschke S, Al-Zahrani H et al. Prospective, randomized controlled study: transperitoneal laparoscopic versus retroperitoneoscopic radical nephrectomy. *Urology* 2004 Nov;64(5):919-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15533478>
231. Nadler RB, Loeb S, Clemens JQ et al. A prospective study of laparoscopic radical nephrectomy for T1 tumors--is transperitoneal, retroperitoneal or hand assisted the best approach? *J Urol* 2006 Apr;175(4):1230-3.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16515966>
232. Hemal AK, Kumar A. A prospective comparison of laparoscopic and robotic radical nephrectomy for T1-2N0M0 renal cell carcinoma. *World J Urol* 2009 Feb;27(1):89-94.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18704439>
233. Soga N, Kato M, Masui S, et al. Comparison of radical nephrectomy techniques in one center: Minimal incision portless endoscopic surgery versus laparoscopic surgery. *Int J Urol* 2008 Oct;15(11):1018-21.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19138194>
234. Park Y, Lee S, Ku J et al. Laparoendoscopic single-site radical nephrectomy for localized renal cell carcinoma: comparison with conventional laparoscopic surgery. *J Endourol* 2009;23(Suppl):A19.
235. Gill IS, Kavoussi LR, Lane BR, et al. Comparison of 1,800 laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomies for single renal tumors. *J Urol* 2007 Jul;178(1):41-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17574056>
236. Lane BR, Gill IS. 7-year oncological outcomes after laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy. *J Urol* 2010 Feb;183(2):473-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20006866>
237. Gong EM, Orvieto MA, Zorn KC, et al. Comparison of laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy in clinical T1a renal tumors. *J Endourol* 2008 May;22(5):953-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18363510>
238. Marszalek M, Meixl H, Polajnar M, et al. Laparoscopic and open partial nephrectomy: a matched-pair comparison of 200 Patients. *Eur Urol* 2009 May;55(5):1171-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19232819>

239. Kaneko G, Miyajima A, Kikuchi E, et al. The benefit of laparoscopic partial nephrectomy in high body mass index patients. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2012 Jul;42(7):619-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22561514>
240. Muramaki M, Miyake H, Sakai I, et al. Prognostic factors influencing postoperative development of chronic kidney disease in patients with small renal tumors who underwent partial nephrectomy. *Curr Urol* 2012;6:129-35.
241. Tugcu V, Bitkin A, Sonmezay E, et al. Transperitoneal versus retroperitoneal laparoscopic partial nephrectomy: initial experience. *Arch Ital Urol Androl* 2011 Dec;83(4):175-80.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22670314>
242. Minervini A, Serni S, Tuccio A, et al. Simple enucleation versus radical nephrectomy in the treatment of pT1a and pT1b renal cell carcinoma. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2012 Feb;19(2):694-700.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21861225>
243. Minervini A, Ficarra V, Rocco F, et al; SATURN Project-LUNA Foundation. Simple enucleation is equivalent to traditional partial nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma: results of a nonrandomized, retrospective, comparative study. *J Urol* 2011 May;185(5):1604-10
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21419454>
244. Rais-Bahrami S, George AK, Herati AS, et al. Off-clamp versus complete hilar control laparoscopic partial nephrectomy: comparison by clinical stage. *BJU Int* 2012 May;109(9):1376-81.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21992566>
245. Bazzi WM, Stroup SP, Kopp RP, et al. Comparison of laparoendoscopic single-site and multiport laparoscopic radical and partial nephrectomy: a prospective, nonrandomized study. *Urology* 2012 Nov;80(5):1039-45.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22990064>
246. Masson-Lecomte A, Bensalah K, Seringe E, et al. A prospective comparison of surgical and pathological outcomes obtained after robot-assisted or pure laparoscopic partial nephrectomy in moderate to complex renal tumours: results from a French multicentre collaborative study. *BJU Int* 2013 Feb;111(2):256-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23279002>
247. Aboumarzouk OM, Stein RJ, Eyraud R, et al. Robotic versus laparoscopic partial nephrectomy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Urol* 2012 Dec;62(6):1023-33.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22771266>
248. Bi L, Zhang C, Li K, et al. Robotic partial nephrectomy for renal tumors larger than 4 cm: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2013 Oct;8(10):e75050.
249. Zini L, Perrotte P, Jeldres C, et al. A population-based comparison of survival after nephrectomy vs nonsurgical management for small renal masses. *BJU Int* 2009 Apr;103(7):899-904.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19154499>
250. Sun M, Bianchi M, Trinh QD, et al. Comparison of partial vs radical nephrectomy with regard to othercause mortality in T1 renal cell carcinoma among patients aged >75 years with multiple comorbidities. *BJU Int* 2013 Jan;111(1):67-73.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22612472>
251. Sun M, Becker A, Roghmann F, et al. Management of localized kidney cancer: calculating cancerspecific mortality and competing-risks of death tradeoffs between surgery and active surveillance. *J Urol* 2013;189(4S):e672.
252. Huang WC, Pinheiro LC, Lowrance WT, et al. Surveillance for the management of small renal masses: outcomes in a population-based cohort. *J Urol* 2013;189(4S):e483.
253. Hyams ES, Pierorazio PM, Mullins JP, et al. Partial nephrectomy vs. Non-surgical management for small renal masses: a population-based comparison of disease-specific and overall survival. *J Urol* 2012;187(4S):e678.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24116024>
254. Lane BR, Abouassaly R, Gao T, et al. Active treatment of localized renal tumors may not impact overall survival in patients aged 75 years or older. *Cancer* 2010 Jul;116(13):3119-26.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20564627>
255. Hollingsworth JM, Miller DC, Daignault S, et al. Five-year survival after surgical treatment for kidney cancer: a population-based competing risk analysis. *Cancer* 2007 May;109(9):1763-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17351954>
256. Volpe A, Panzarella T, Rendon RA, et al. The natural history of incidentally detected small renal masses. *Cancer* 2004 Feb;100(4):738-45.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14770429>
257. Jewett MA, Mattar K, Basiuk J, et al. Active surveillance of small renal masses: progression patterns of early stage kidney cancer. *Eur Urol* 2011 Jul;60(1):39-44.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21477920>

258. Smaldone MC, Kutikov A, Egleston BL, et al. Small renal masses progressing to metastases under active surveillance: a systematic review and pooled analysis. *Cancer* 2011 Feb;118(4):997-1006. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21766302>
259. Patel N, Cranston D, Akhtar MZ, et al. Active surveillance of small renal masses offers short-term oncological efficacy equivalent to radical and partial nephrectomy. *BJU Int* 2012 Nov;110(9):1270-5. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22564495>
260. Abou Youssif T, Kassouf W, Steinberg J, et al. Active surveillance for selected patients with renal masses: updated results with long-term follow-up. *Cancer* 2007 Sep;110(5):1010-4. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17628489>
261. Abouassaly R, Lane BR, Novick AC. Active surveillance of renal masses in elderly patients. *J Urol* 2008 Aug;180(2):505-8;discussion 8-9. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18550113>
262. Crispin PL, Viterbo R, Boorjian SA, et al. Natural history, growth kinetics, and outcomes of untreated clinically localized renal tumors under active surveillance. *Cancer* 2009 Jul;115(13):2844-52. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19402168>
263. Rosales JC, Haramis G, Moreno J, et al. Active surveillance for renal cortical neoplasms. *J Urol* 2010 May;183(5):1698-702. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20299038>
264. Pierorazio P, McKiernan J, Allaf M. Quality of life on active surveillance for small renal masses versus immediate intervention: interim analysis of the DISSRM (delayed intervention and surveillance for small renal masses) registry. *J Urol* 2013;189(3S):e259. [http://www.jurology.com/article/S0022-5347\(13\)00461-8/abstract](http://www.jurology.com/article/S0022-5347(13)00461-8/abstract)
265. Sisul DM, Liss MA, Palazzi KL, et al. RENAL nephrometry score is associated with complications after renal cryoablation: a multicenter analysis. *Urology* 2013 Apr;81(4):775-80. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23434099>
266. Kim EH, Tanagho YS, Bhayani SB, et al. Outcomes of laparoscopic and percutaneous cryoablation for renal masses. *J Urol* 2013 May;189(4S):e492.
267. Goyal J, Verma P, Sidana A, et al. Single-center comparative oncologic outcomes of surgical and percutaneous cryoablation for treatment of renal tumors. *J Endourol* 2012 Nov;26(11):1413-9. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22642574>
268. O'Malley RL, Berger AD, Kanofsky JA, et al. A matched-cohort comparison of laparoscopic cryoablation and laparoscopic partial nephrectomy for treating renal masses. *BJU Int* 2007 Feb;99(2):395-8. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17092288>
269. Ko YH, Park HS, Moon du G, et al. A matched-cohort comparison of laparoscopic renal cryoablation using ultra-thin cryoprobes with open partial nephrectomy for the treatment of small renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer Res Treat* 2008 Dec;40(4):184-9. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19688128>
270. Desai MM, Aron M, Gill IS. Laparoscopic partial nephrectomy versus laparoscopic cryoablation for the small renal tumor. *Urology* 2005 Nov;66(5 Suppl):23-8. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16194703>
271. Haber GP, Lee MC, Crouzet S, et al. Tumour in solitary kidney: laparoscopic partial nephrectomy vs laparoscopic cryoablation. *BJU Int* 2012 Jan;109(1):118-24. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21895929>
272. Guillotreau J, Haber GP, Autorino R, et al. Robotic partial nephrectomy versus laparoscopic cryoablation for the small renal mass. *Eur Urol* 2012 May;61(5):899-904. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22264680>
273. Klatte T, Mauermann J, Heinz-Peer G, et al. Perioperative, oncologic, and functional outcomes of laparoscopic renal cryoablation and open partial nephrectomy: a matched pair analysis. *J Endourol* 2011 Jun;25(6):991-7. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21568698>
274. Whitson JM, Harris CR, Meng MV. Population-based comparative effectiveness of nephron-sparing surgery vs ablation for small renal masses. *BJU Int* 2012 Nov;110(10):1438-43;discussion 1443. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22639860>
275. Lian H, Guo H, Zhang G, et al. Single-center comparison of complications in laparoscopic and percutaneous radiofrequency ablation with ultrasound guidance for renal tumors. *Urology* 2012 Jul;80(1):119-24. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22633890>

276. Young EE, Castle SM, Gorbatiy V, et al. Comparison of safety, renal function outcomes and efficacy of laparoscopic and percutaneous radio frequency ablation of renal masses. *J Urol* 2012 Apr;187(4):1177-82.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22357170>
277. Kim SD, Yoon SG, Sung GT. Radiofrequency ablation of renal tumors: four-year follow-up results in 47 patients. *Korean J Radiol* 2012 Sep-Oct;13(5):625-33
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22977331>
278. Olweny EO, Park SK, Tan YK, et al. Radiofrequency ablation versus partial nephrectomy in patients with solitary clinical T1a renal cell carcinoma: comparable oncologic outcomes at a minimum of 5 years of follow-up. *Eur Urol* 2012 Jun;61(6):1156-61
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22257424>
279. Arnoux V, Descotes JL, Sengel C, et al. [Perioperative outcomes and mid-term results of radiofrequency ablation and partial nephrectomy in indications of renal tumor treatment and imperative nephron-sparing procedure]. *Prog Urol* 2013 Feb;23(2):99-104. [Article in French]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23352302>
280. Atwell TD, Schmit GD, Boorjian SA, et al. Percutaneous ablation of renal masses measuring 3.0 cm and smaller: comparative local control and complications after radiofrequency ablation and cryoablation. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2013 Feb;200(2):461-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23345372>
281. Samarasekera D, Khalifeh A, Autorino R, et al. Percutaneous radiofrequency ablation versus percutaneous cryoablation: long-term outcomes following ablation for renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2013 Apr;189(4S):e737-e738.
282. Nesbitt JC, Soltero ER, Dinney CP, et al. Surgical management of renal cell carcinoma with inferior vena cava tumor thrombus. *Ann Thorac Surg* 1997 Jun;63(6):1592-600.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9205155>
283. Hatcher PA, Anderson EE, Paulson DF, et al. Surgical management and prognosis of renal cell carcinoma invading the vena cava. *J Urol* 1991 Jan;145(1):20-3;discussion 23-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1984092>
284. Neves RJ, Zincke H. Surgical treatment of renal cancer with vena cava extension. *Br J Urol* 1987 May;59(5):390-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/3594097>
285. Haferkamp A, Bastian PJ, Jakobi H, et al. Renal cell carcinoma with tumor thrombus extension into the vena cava: prospective long-term followup. *J Urol* 2007 May;177(5):1703-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17437789>
286. Kirkali Z, Van Poppel H. A critical analysis of surgery for kidney cancer with vena cava invasion. *Eur Urol* 2007 Sep;52(3):658-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17548146>
287. Moinzadeh A, Libertino JA. Prognostic significance of tumor thrombus level in patients with renal cell carcinoma and venous tumor thrombus extension. Is all T3b the same? *J Urol* 2004 Feb;171(2 Pt1):598-601.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14713768>
288. Kaplan S, Ekici S, Dogan R, et al. Surgical management of renal cell carcinoma with inferior vena cava tumor thrombus. *Am J Surg* 2002 Mar;183(3):292-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11943130>
289. Bissada NK, Yakout HH, Babanouri A, et al. Long-term experience with management of renal cell carcinoma involving the inferior vena cava. *Urology* 2003 Jan;61(1):89-92.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12559273>
290. Skinner DG, Pritchett TR, Lieskovsky G, et al. Vena caval involvement by renal cell carcinoma. Surgical resection provides meaningful long-term survival. *Ann Surg* 1989 Sep;210(3):387-92;discussion 392-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2774709>
291. Wotkowicz C, Libertino JA, Sorcini A, et al. Management of renal cell carcinoma with vena cava and atrial thrombus: minimal access vs median sternotomy with circulatory arrest. *BJU Int* 2006 Aug;98(2):289-97.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16879667>
292. Faust W, Ruthazer R, Topjian L, et al. Minimal access versus median sternotomy for cardiopulmonary bypass in the management of renal cell carcinoma with vena caval and atrial involvement. *J Urol* 2013;189 (Suppl.):e255.
293. Chan AA, Abel J, Carrasco A, et al. Impact of preoperative renal artery embolization on surgical outcomes and overall survival in patients with renal cell carcinoma and inferior vena cava thrombus. *J Urol* 2011;185(Suppl.):e707-e708.

294. Orihashi K, Sueda T, Usui T, et al. Deep hypothermic circulatory arrest for resection of renal tumor in the inferior vena cava: beneficial or deleterious? *Circ J* 2008 Jul;72(7):1175-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18577831>
295. Galligioni E, Quaia M, Merlo A, et al. Adjuvant immunotherapy treatment of renal carcinoma patients with autologous tumor cells and bacillus Calmette-Guerin: five-year results of a prospective randomized study. *Cancer* 1996 Jun;77(12):2560-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8640706>
296. Figlin RA, Thompson JA, Bukowski RM, et al. Multicenter, randomized, phase III trial of CD8(+) tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes in combination with recombinant interleukin-2 in metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 1999 Aug;17(8):2521-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10561318>
297. Clark JI, Atkins MB, Urba WJ, et al. Adjuvant high-dose bolus interleukin-2 for patients with high-risk renal cell carcinoma: a cytokine working group randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2003 Aug;21(16):3133-40.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12810695>.
298. Atzpodien J, Schmitt E, Gertenbach U, et al; German Cooperative Renal Carcinoma Chemo-Immunotherapy Trials Group (DGCIN). Adjuvant treatment with interleukin-2- and interferonalpha2a-based chemoimmunotherapy in renal cell carcinoma post tumour nephrectomy: results of a prospectively randomised trial of the German Cooperative Renal Carcinoma Chemoimmunotherapy Group (DGCIN). *Br J Cancer* 2005 Mar;92(5):843-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15756254>
299. Jocham D, Richter A, Hoffmann L, et al. Adjuvant autologous renal tumour cell vaccine and risk of tumour progression in patients with renal-cell carcinoma after radical nephrectomy: phase III, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2004 Feb;363(9409):594-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14987883>
300. Flanigan RC, Mickisch G, Sylvester R, et al. Cytoreductive nephrectomy in patients with metastatic renal cancer: a combined analysis. *J Urol* 2004 Mar;171(3):1071-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14767273>
301. Dabestani S, et al. Local treatments for metastases of renal cell carcinoma: a systematic review. *Lancet Oncol* 2014 Nov;15(12):e549-61.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25439697>
302. Dabestani S, Hofmann F, Marconi L, et al; EAU Renal Cell Carcinoma Guideline Panel. Systematic review methodology for the EAU RCC Guideline 2013 update.
<http://www.uroweb.org/guidelines/online-guidelines/>
303. Alt AL, Boorjian SA, Lohse CM, et al. Survival after complete surgical resection of multiple metastases from renal cell carcinoma. *Cancer* 2011 Jul;117(13):2873-82.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21692048>
304. Brinkmann OA, Semik M, Goshgerger G, et al. The role of residual tumor resection in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma and partial remission following immunotherapy. *Eur Urol* 2007;Suppl 6:641-5.
305. Kwak C, Park YH, Jeong CW, et al. Metastasectomy without systemic therapy in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: comparison with conservative treatment. *Urol Int* 2007;79(2):145-51.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17851285>
306. Lee SE, Kwak C, Byun SS, et al. Metastasectomy prior to immunochemotherapy for metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Urol Int* 2006;76(3):256-63.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16601390>
307. Petralia G, Roscigno M, Zigeuner R, et al. Complete metastasectomy is an independent predictor of cancer-specific survival in patients with clinically metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol Suppl* 2010;9:162.
308. Russo P, Synder M, Vickers A, et al. Cytoreductive nephrectomy and nephrectomy/complete metastasectomy for metastatic renal cancer. *ScientificWorldJournal* 2007 Feb;7:768-78.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17619759>
309. Staehler M, Kruse J, Haseke N, et al. Metastasectomy significantly prolongs survival in patients with metastatic renal cancer. *Eur Urol Suppl* 2009;8:181.
310. Eggener SE, Yossepowitch O, Kundu S, et al. Risk score and metastasectomy independently impact prognosis of patients with recurrent renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2008;180:873-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18635225>
311. Fuchs B, Trousdale RT, Rock MG. Solitary bony metastasis from renal cell carcinoma: significance of surgical treatment. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2005 Feb;(431):187-92.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15685074>

312. Hunter GK, Balagamwala EH, Koyfman SA, et al. The efficacy of external beam radiotherapy and stereotactic body radiotherapy for painful spinal metastases from renal cell carcinoma. *Practical Radiation Oncology* 2012;2:e95-e100.
313. Zelefsky MJ, Greco C, Motzer R, et al. Tumor control outcomes after hypofractionated and single-dose stereotactic image-guided intensity-modulated radiotherapy for extracranial metastases from renal cell carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2012 Apr;82(5):1744-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21596489>
314. Fokas E, Henzel M, Hamm K, et al. Radiotherapy for brain metastases from renal cell cancer: should whole-brain radiotherapy be added to stereotactic radiosurgery?: analysis of 88 patients. *Strahlenther Onkol* 2010 Apr;186(4):210-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20165820>
315. Ikushima H, Tokuyue K, Sumi M, et al. Fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy of brain metastases from renal cell carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2000 Dec;48(5):1389-93.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11121638>
316. Staehler MD, Kruse J, Haseke N, et al. Liver resection for metastatic disease prolongs survival in renal cell carcinoma: 12-year results from a retrospective comparative analysis. *World J Urol* 2010 Aug;28(4):543-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20440505>
317. Amiraliev A, Pikin O, Alekseev B, et al. Treatment strategy in patients with pulmonary metastases of renal cell cancer. *Interactive Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgery* 2012;15 (Suppl.):S20.
318. Zerbi A, Ortolano E, Balzano G, et al. Pancreatic metastasis from renal cell carcinoma: which patients benefit from surgical resection? *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008 Apr;15(4):1161-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18196343>
319. Kickuth R, Waldherr C, Hoppe H, et al. Interventional management of hypervascular osseous metastasis: role of embolotherapy before orthopedic tumor resection and bone stabilization. *AJR Am J Roentgenol* 2008 Dec;191(6):W240-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19020210>
320. Forauer AR, Kent E, Cwikiel W, et al. Selective palliative transcatheter embolization of bony metastases from renal cell carcinoma. *Acta Oncol* 2007;46(7):1012-18.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17851849>
321. Stadler WM, Huo D, George C, et al. Prognostic factors for survival with gemcitabine plus 5-fluorouracil based regimens for metastatic renal cancer. *J Urol* 2003 Oct;170(4 Pt 1):1141-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14501711>
322. Gore ME, Griffin CL, Hancock B, et al. Interferon alfa-2a versus combination therapy with interferon alfa-2a, interleukin-2, and fluorouracil in patients with untreated metastatic renal cell carcinoma (MRC RE04/EORTC GU 30012): an open-label randomised trial. *Lancet* 2010 Feb;375(9715):641-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20153039>
323. Medical Research Council Renal Cancer Collaborators. Interferon-alpha and survival in metastatic renal carcinoma: early results of a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 1999 Jan;353(9146):14-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10023944>
324. Coppin C, Porzsolt F, Awa A, et al. Immunotherapy for advanced renal cell cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2005 Jan;(1):CD001425.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15674877>
325. Negrier S, Perol D, Ravaud A, French Immunotherapy Intergroup, et al. Medroxyprogesterone, interferon alfa-2a, interleukin 2, or combination of both cytokines in patients with metastatic renal carcinoma of intermediate prognosis: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Cancer* 2007 Dec;110(11):2468-77.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17932908>
326. Escudier B, Pluzanska A, Koralewski P, et al; AVOREN Trial investigators. Bevacizumab plus interferon alfa-2a for treatment of metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a randomised, double-blind phase III trial. *Lancet* 2007 Dec;370(9605):2103-11.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18156031>
327. Motzer RJ, Hutson TE, Tomczak P, et al. Sunitinib versus interferon alfa in metastatic renal-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 2007 Jan;356(2):115-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17215529>
328. Hudes G, Carducci M, Tomczak P, et al; Global ARCC Trial. Temsirolimus, interferon alfa, or both for advanced renal-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 2007 May;356(22):2271-81.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17538086>

329. Rosenberg SA, Lotze MT, Yang JC, et al. Prospective randomized trial of high-dose interleukin-2 alone or in conjunction with lymphokine-activated killer cells for the treatment of patients with advanced cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1993 Apr;21(85):622-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8468720>
330. Fyfe G, Fisher RI, Rosenberg SA, et al. Results of treatment of 255 patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma who received high-dose recombinant interleukin-2 therapy. *J Clin Oncol* 1995 Mar;13(3):688-96.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7884429>
331. McDermott DF, Regan MM, Clark JI, et al. Randomized phase III trial of high-dose interleukin-2 versus subcutaneous interleukin-2 and interferon in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2005 Jan;23(1):133-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15625368>
332. Yang JC, Sherry RM, Steinberg SM, et al. Randomized study of high-dose and low-dose interleukin-2 in patients with metastatic renal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2003 Aug;21(16):3127-32.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12915604>
333. Amato RJ, Hawkins RE, Kaufman HL, et al. Vaccination of metastatic renal cancer patients with MVA-5T4: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase III study. *Clin Cancer Res* 2010 Nov;16(22):5539-47.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20881001>
334. Brahmer JR, Tykodi SS, Chow LQ, et al. Safety and activity of anti-PD-L1 antibody in patients with advanced cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2012 Jun;366(26):2455-65.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22658128>
335. Patel PH, Chadalavada RS, Chaganti RS, et al. Targeting von Hippel-Lindau pathway in renal cell carcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res* 2006 Dec;12(24):7215-20.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17189392>
336. Yang JC, Haworth L, Sherry RM, et al. A randomized trial of bevacizumab, an anti-vascular endothelial growth factor antibody, for metastatic renal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2003 Jul;349(5):427-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12890841>
337. Patard JJ, Rioux-Leclercq N, Fergelot P. Understanding the importance of smart drugs in renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2006 Apr;49(4):633-43.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16481093>
338. Heng DY, Xie W, Regan MM, et al. Prognostic factors for overall survival in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma treated with vascular endothelial growth factor-targeted agents: results from a large, multicenter study. *J Clin Oncol* 2009 Dec;27(34):5794-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19826129>
339. Harshman LC, Xie W, Bjarnason GA, et al. Conditional survival of patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma treated with VEGF-targeted therapy: a population-based study. *Lancet Oncol* 2012 Sep;13(9):927-35.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22877847>
340. Heng DY, Xie W, Regan MM, et al. External validation and comparison with other models of the International Metastatic Renal-Cell Carcinoma Database Consortium prognostic model: a populationbase study. *Lancet Oncol* 2013 Feb;14(2):141-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23312463>
341. Escudier B, Eisen T, Stadler WM, et al; TARGET Study Group. Sorafenib in advanced clear-cell renal cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 2007 Jan;356(2):125-34.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17215530>
342. Bellmunt J, Négrier S, Escudier B, et al. The medical treatment of metastatic renal cell cancer in the elderly: position paper of a SIOG Taskforce. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2009 Jan;69(1):64-72.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18774306>
343. Motzer RJ, Michaelson MD, Redman BG, et al. Activity of SU11248, a multitargeted inhibitor of vascular endothelial growth factor receptor and platelet-derived growth factor receptor, in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2006 Jan;24(1):16-24.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16330672>
344. Figlin RA, Hutson TE, Tomczac P, et al. Overall survival with sunitinib versus interferon alfa as first-line treatment in metastatic renal-cell carcinoma. *ASCO Annual Meeting Proceedings* 2008. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26(Suppl.):Abstr 5024.
http://www.asco.org/ASCO/Abstracts+%26+Virtual+Meeting/Abstracts?&vmview=abst_detail_view&confID=55&abstractID=32895

345. Motzer RJ, Hutson TE, Olsen MR, et al. Randomized phase II trial of sunitinib on an intermittent versus continuous dosing schedule as first-line therapy for advanced renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2012 Apr;30(12):1371-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22430274>
346. Sternberg CN, Davis ID, Mardiak J, et al. Pazopanib in locally advanced or metastatic renal cell carcinoma: results of a randomized phase iii trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2010 Feb;28(6):1061-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20100962>
347. Motzer RJ, Hutson TE, Cella D, et al. Pazopanib versus sunitinib in metastatic renal-cell carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 2013 Aug;369(8):722-31.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23964934>
348. Bernard J, Escudier CP, Petri Bono, Ugo De Giorgi, Omi Parikh, Robert E. Hawkins, Emmanuel Sevin, Sylvie Negrier, Sadya Khan, Lauren McCann, Faisal Mehmud and David Cella. Patient preference between pazopanib (Paz) and sunitinib (Sun): Results of a randomized double-blind, placebo-controlled, cross-over study in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC)—PISCES study, NCT 01064310. *J Clin Oncol* 2012. 30(18 (June 20 Suppl)).
349. Rini BI, Escudier B, Tomczak P, et al. Comparative effectiveness of axitinib versus sorafenib in advanced renal cell carcinoma (AXIS): a randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2011 Dec;378(9807):1931-9.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22056247>
350. Dror Michaelson M, Rini BI, Escudier BJ, et al. Phase III AXIS trial of axitinib versus sorafenib in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: Updated results among cytokine-treated patients. *J Clin Oncol* 2012;30:abstr 4546.
<http://meetinglibrary.asco.org/content/94426-114>
351. Motzer RJ, Escudier B, Tomczak P, et al. Axitinib versus sorafenib as second-line treatment for advanced renal cell carcinoma: overall survival analysis and updated results from a randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2013 May;14(6):552-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23598172>
352. Rini BI, Melichar B, Ueda T, et al. Axitinib with or without dose titration for first-line metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a randomised double-blind phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2013 Nov;14(12):1233-42.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24140184>
353. Hutson TE, Lesovoy V, Al-Shukri S, et al. Axitinib versus sorafenib as first-line therapy in patients with metastatic renal-cell carcinoma: a randomised open-label phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2013 Dec;14(13):1287-94.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24206640>
354. Escudier B, Bellmunt J, Négrier S, et al. Phase III trial of bevacizumab plus interferon alfa-2a in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma (AVOREN): final analysis of overall survival. *J Clin Oncol* 2010 May;28(13):2144-50.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20368553>
355. Rini BI, Halabi S, Rosenberg JE, et al. Phase III trial of bevacizumab plus interferon alfa versus interferon alfa monotherapy in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma: final results of CALGB 90206. *J Clin Oncol* 2010 May;28(13):2137-43.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20368558>
356. Rini BI, Halabi S, Rosenberg JE, et al. Bevacizumab plus interferon alfa compared with interferon alfa monotherapy in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma: CALGB 90206. *J Clin Oncol* 2008 Nov; 26(33):5422-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18936475>
357. Larkin JM, Eisen T. Kinase inhibitors in the treatment of renal cell carcinoma. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2006 Dec;60(3):216-26.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16860997>
358. Hutson TE, Escudier B, Esteban E, et al. Randomized phase III trial of temsirolimus versus sorafenib as second-line therapy after sunitinib in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2014 Mar 10;32(8):760-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24297950>
359. Motzer RJ, Escudier B, Oudard S, et al; RECORD-1 Study Group. Efficacy of everolimus in advanced renal cell carcinoma: a double-blind, randomised, placebo controlled phase III trial. *Lancet* 2008 Aug;372(9637):449-56.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18653228>
360. Motzer RJ, Escudier B, Oudard S, et al. Phase 3 trial of everolimus for metastatic renal cell carcinoma : final results and analysis of prognostic factors. *Cancer* 2010 Sept;116(18):4256-65.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20549832>

361. Calvo E, Escudier B, Motzer RJ, et al. Everolimus in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: Subgroup analysis of patients with 1 or 2 previous vascular endothelial growth factor receptor-tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapies enrolled in the phase III RECORD-1 study. *Eur J Cancer* 2012 Feb;48(3):333-9. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22209391>
362. Bracarda S, Hutson TE, Porta C, et al. Everolimus in metastatic renal cell carcinoma patients intolerant to previous VEGFr-TKI therapy: a RECORD-1 subgroup analysis. *Br J Cancer* 2012 Apr;106(9):1475-80. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22441644>
363. Motzer RJ, Barrios CH, Kim TM, et al. Record-3: Phase II randomized trial comparing sequential firstline everolimus (EVE) and second-line sunitinib (SUN) versus first-line SUN and second-line EVE in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC). *J Clin Oncol* 2013 May;31(S15):abstr 4504. http://meeting.ascopubs.org/cgi/content/abstract/31/15_suppl/4504
364. Motzer R SC, Vogelzang NJ, Sternberg CN, et al. Phase 3 trial of dovitinib vs sorafenib in patients with metastatic renal cell carcinoma after 1 prior VEGF pathway-targeted and 1 prior mTOR inhibitor therapy. *Eur J Cancer*, 2013, 49(3 Suppl): abstract 34.
365. Bukowski RM, Kabbinavar FF, Figlin RA, et al. Randomized phase II study of erlotinib combined with bevacizumab compared with bevacizumab alone in metastatic renal cell cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2007 Oct;25(29):4536-4541. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17876014>
366. Négrier S, Gravis G, Pérol D, et al. Temsirolimus and bevacizumab, or sunitinib, or interferon alfa and bevacizumab for patients with advanced renal cell carcinoma (TORAVA): a randomised phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2011 Jul;12(7):673-80. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21664867>
367. McDermott DF, Manola J, Pins M, et al. The BEST trial (E2804): A randomized phase II study of VEGF, RAF kinase, and mTOR combination targeted therapy (CTT) with bevacizumab (bev), sorafenib (sor), and temsirolimus (tem) in advanced renal cell carcinoma (RCC). *J Clin Oncol* 2013;31suppl 6;abstr 345. <http://meetinglibrary.asco.org/content/107093-134>
368. Rini BI, Bellmunt J, Clancy J, et al. Randomized Phase III Trial of Temsirolimus and Bevacizumab Versus Interferon Alfa and Bevacizumab in Metastatic Renal Cell Carcinoma: INTORACT Trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2013 Dec. [Epub ahead of print] <http://jco.ascopubs.org/content/early/2013/12/02/JCO.2013.50.5305.abstract>
369. Ravaud A, Barrios C, Anak, O, et al. Randomized phase II study of first-line everolimus (EVE) + bevacizumab (BEV) versus interferon alfa-2a (IFN) + BEV in patients (pts) with metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC): record-2. ESMO Annual Meeting 2012, abstract 7830 <https://www.webges.com/cslide/library/esmo/mylibrary/search/package//47> [Access date January 2015]
370. Gore ME, Szczylik C, Porta C, et al. Safety and efficacy of sunitinib for metastatic renal-cell carcinoma: an expanded-access trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2009 Aug;10(8):757-63. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19615940>
371. Sánchez P, Calvo E, Durán I. Non-clear cell advanced kidney cancer: is there a gold standard? *Anticancer Drugs* 2011 Jan;22 Suppl 1:S9-14. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21173605>
372. Koh Y, Lim HY, Ahn JH, et al. Phase II trial of everolimus for the treatment of nonclear-cell renal cell carcinoma. *Ann Oncol* 2013 Apr;24(4):1026-31. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23180114>
373. Tannir NM, Plimack E, Ng C, et al. A phase 2 trial of sunitinib in patients with advanced non-clear cell renal cell carcinoma. *Eur Urol* 2012 Dec;62(6):1013-9 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22771265>
374. Ravaud A, Oudard S, Gravis-Mescam G, et al. First-line sunitinib in type I and II papillary renal cell carcinoma (PRCC): SUPAP, a phase II study of the French Genito-Urinary Group (GETUG) and the Group of Early Phase trials (GEP). *J Clin Oncol* 2009;27 suppl 15:5146.
375. Escudier B, Bracarda S, Maroto JP, et al. Open-label phase II trial of first-line everolimus monotherapy in patients with papillary metastatic renal cell carcinoma: RAPTOR final analysis. *European Cancer Congress 2013*;abstract 2706. <http://eccamsterdam2013.ecco-org.eu/Scientific-Programme/Abstract-search.aspx?abstractid=6277>
376. Choueiri TK, Vaishampayan U, Rosenberg JE, et al. Phase II and biomarker study of the dual MET/VEGFR2 inhibitor foretinib in patients with papillary renal cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2013 Jan;31(2):181-6. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23213094>

377. Tannir NM, Altinmakas E, Ng CS, et al. Everolimus versus sunitinib prospective evaluation in metastatic non-clear cell renal cell carcinoma (The ESPN Trial): A multicenter randomized phase 2 trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2014, 32:5s, 2014 (suppl; abstr 4505).
<http://meetinglibrary.asco.org/content/134866-144>
378. Kreshover JE, Richstone L, Kavoussi LR. Renal cell recurrence for T1 tumors after laparoscopic partial nephrectomy. *J Endourol* 2013 Dec;27(12):1468-70.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24074156>
379. Wah TM, Irving HC, Gregory W, et al. Radiofrequency ablation (RFA) of renal cell carcinoma (RCC): experience in 200 tumours. *BJU Int* 2014 Mar;113(3):416-28.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24053769>
380. Margulis V, McDonald M, Tamboli P, et al. Predictors of oncological outcome after resection of locally recurrent renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2009 May;181(5):2044-2051.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19286220>
381. Pettus JA, Jang TL, Thompson RH, et al. Effect of baseline glomerular filtration rate on survival in patients undergoing partial or radical nephrectomy for renal cortical tumors. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2008 Oct;83(10):1101-6.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18828969>
382. Snow DC, Bhayani SB. Chronic renal insufficiency after laparoscopic partial nephrectomy and radical nephrectomy for pathologic T1A lesions. *J Endourol* 2008 Feb;22(2):337-41.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18257672>
383. Jeldres C, Patard JJ, Capitano U, et al. Partial versus radical nephrectomy in patients with adverse clinical or pathologic characteristics. *Urology* 2009 Jun;73(6):1300-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19376568>
384. Bruno JJ, Snyder ME, Motzer RJ, et al. Renal cell carcinoma local recurrences, impact of surgical treatment and concomitant metastasis on survival. *BJU Int* 2006 May;97(5):933-8.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16643473>
385. Sandhu SS, Symes A, A'Hern R, et al. Surgical excision of isolated renal-bed recurrence after radical nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma. *BJU Int* 2005 Mar;95(4):522-5.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15705072>
386. Bani-Hani AH, Leibovich BC, Lohse CM, et al. Associations with contralateral recurrence following nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma using a cohort of 2,352 patients. *J Urol* 2005 Feb;173(2):391-4.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15643178>
387. Matin SF, Ahrar K, Cadeddu JA, et al. Residual and recurrent disease following renal energy ablative therapy: a multi-institutional study. *J Urol* 2006 Nov;176(5):1973-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17070224>
388. Lam JS, Shvarts O, Leppert JT, et al. Renal cell carcinoma 2005: new frontiers in staging, prognostication and targeted molecular therapy. *J Urol* 2005 Jun;173(6):1853-62.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15879764>
389. Scoll BJ, Wong YN, Egleston BL, et al. Age, tumor size and relative survival of patients with localized renal cell carcinoma: a surveillance, epidemiology and end results analysis. *J Urol* 2009 Feb;181(2) 506-11.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19084868>
390. Doornweerd BH, de Jong IJ, Bergman LM, et al. Chest X-ray in the follow-up of renal cell carcinoma. *World J Urol* 2013 Oct 6. [Epub ahead of print]
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24096433>
391. Ionising Radiation (Medical Exposures) Regulations 2000. National Radiation Protection Board 2000.
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2000/1059/contents/made>
392. Coquia SF, Johnson PT, Ahmed S, et al. MDCT imaging following nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma: Protocol optimization and patterns of tumor recurrence. *World J Radiol* 2013 Nov;5(11):436-45.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24349648>
393. Kattan MW, Reuter V, Motzer RJ, et al. A postoperative prognostic nomogram for renal cell carcinoma. *J Urol* 2001 Jul;166(1):63-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11435824>
394. Lam JS, Shvarts O, Leppert JT, et al. Postoperative surveillance protocol for patients with localized and locally advanced renal cell carcinoma based on a validated prognosticated nomogram and risk group stratification system. *J Urol* 2005 Aug;174(2):466-72; discussion 472; quiz 801.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16006866392>

395. Cindolo L, Patard JJ, Chiodini P, et al. Comparison of predictive accuracy of four prognostic models for nonmetastatic renal cell carcinoma after nephrectomy: a multicenter European study. *Cancer* 2005 Oct;104(7):1362-71.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16116599>
396. Skolarikos A, Alivizatos G, Laguna P, et al. A review on follow-up strategies for renal cell carcinoma after nephrectomy. *Eur Urol* 2007 Jun;51(6):1490-500; discussion 1501.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17229521>
397. Chin AI, Lam JS, Figlin RA, et al. Surveillance strategies for renal cell carcinoma patients following nephrectomy. *Rev Urol* 2006 Winter;8(1):1-7.
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16985554>

10. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

All members of the Renal Cell Cancer working group have provided disclosure statements of all relationships that they have that might be perceived as a potential source of a conflict of interest. This information is publically accessible through the European Association of Urology website: <http://www.uroweb.org/guidelines/>. This guidelines document was developed with the financial support of the European Association of Urology. No external sources of funding and support have been involved. The EAU is a non-profit organisation and funding is limited to administrative assistance and travel and meeting expenses. No honoraria or other reimbursements have been provided.

