

# Risk factors for lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis

# Hongyuan Hu<sup>1#</sup>, Mingru Fu<sup>2#</sup>, Xiujin Huang<sup>3</sup>, Ju Huang<sup>1</sup>, Jinniao Gao<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Obstetrics, People's Hospital of Wanning Hainan, Wanning, China; <sup>2</sup>Department of Gynecology, Danzhou People's Hospital, Danzhou, China; <sup>3</sup>Department of Traditional Chinese Medicine, the First Affiliated Hospital of Hainan Medical University, Haikou, China *Contributions:* (I) Conception and design: H Hu, M Fu, J Gao; (II) Administrative support: X Huang; (III) Provision of study materials or patients: H Hu, M Fu, J Gao; (IV) Collection and assembly of data: H Hu, M Fu, J Gao; (V) Data analysis and interpretation: H Hu, M Fu, J Gao; (VI) Manuscript writing: All authors; (VII) Final approval of manuscript: All authors.

<sup>#</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Correspondence to:* Jinniao Gao. Department of Traditional Chinese Medicine, the First Affiliated Hospital of Hainan Medical University, No. 31 Longhua Road, Longhua District, Haikou 570102, China. Email: gaojinniao6572@163.com.

**Background:** The main risk factors for the development of lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment are controversial. Our aim was to evaluate the main risk factors of lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment.

**Methods:** We searched the English database PubMed, Embase, Medline, Central and the Chinese database CNKI to obtain relevant studies. Inclusion criteria: (I) the subjects were cervical cancer patients receiving treatment; (II) cohort studies or case-control studies; (III) exposure factors were not limited; (IV) the outcome was lower extremity lymphedema after treatment; (V) the odds ratio (OR) value and 95% confidence interval of exposure factors can be obtained. The chi-square test was used to test for heterogeneity. The Egger test was used to test for publication bias. OR (95% CI) was calculated using inverse variance.

**Results:** A total of 12 retrospective studies with a total of 3,401 patients were included in this literature review. The incidence of lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment was between 12.6% and 43.1%. Meta-analysis results demonstrated that the main risk factors were: body mass index (BMI) (OR =1.37, 95% CI: 1.10–1.71, P=0.005), age (OR =1.68, 95% CI: 1.07–2.64, P=0.02), International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) stage (OR =1.50, 95% CI: 1.24–1.82, P<0.001), radiotherapy (OR =2.87, 95% CI: 1.71–4.82, P<0.001), lymph node (LN) dissection (OR =3.24, 95% CI: 1.44–7.31, P=0.005), and the number of LNs dissected (OR =2.34, 95% CI: 1.80–3.05, P<0.001). Egger's test showed that there was no publication bias among the literatures (P>0.05).

**Conclusions:** BMI, age, FIGO stage, radiotherapy, LN dissection and the number of LNs removed are the main risk factors for lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment. When treating patients with cervical cancer, effective interventions should be sought to reduce the risk of lower extremity edema.

Keywords: Cervical cancer; lower extremity lymphedema; meta-analysis; risk factors

Submitted Apr 13, 2022. Accepted for publication Jun 09, 2022. doi: 10.21037/tcr-22-1256 View this article at: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-22-1256

# Introduction

Cervical cancer is the fourth most common cancer and the fourth leading cause of cancer death in women. It has high incidence and mortality rates, inferior only to those for breast cancer. According to the latest data released by the International Agency for Research on Cancer of the World Health Organization, there were 604,000 new cases of cervical cancer and 342,000 deaths worldwide in 2020 (1). With continuous progress in cervical cancer treatment and the popularization of screening technology, the survival rate and survival time of cervical cancer patients have been improved to a certain extent, so medical staff now need to pay more attention to patients' quality of life after treatment.

Early-stage cervical cancer is mainly treated by surgery, often accompanied by pelvic lymphadenectomy. The standard treatment for advanced cervical cancer is radiotherapy and chemotherapy (2,3), which, although having a good therapeutic effect, can affect lymphatic drainage and result in lower extremity lymphedema (4). Lymphedema is defined as dysfunction of the lymphatic system and is diagnosed by subjective or objective methods. When the body tissue contains excessive protein-rich interstitial fluid, it leads to increased limb volume. Lower limb lymphedema is characterized by swelling, unilateral or bilateral, heaviness, pain, pruritus, numbness, skin changes, infection, etc. The condition affects the patient's activities of daily life, and seriously affects quality of life (5,6).

Understanding the risk factors of lower limb lymphedema is of great significance to the clinical outcome of cervical cancer patients, but current research conclusions on the main risk factors are inconsistent (7,8). A study pointed out (9) that body mass index (BMI) and receiving radiotherapy are risk factors for lower extremity edema after cervical cancer treatment. International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) stage was not associated with lymph node metastasis and lower extremity edema. Another study (10) pointed out that radiotherapy, FIGO staging, lymph node metastasis, and lymph node dissection are risk factors for lower extremity edema after cervical cancer treatment. We believe the existence of such differences is related to the small sample size and inconsistent diagnostic criteria for lower extremity edema. A meta-analysis is necessary. Therefore, we performed a meta-analysis of studies from China and abroad with the aim of providing clinicians some certainty on the best postoperative management of these patients. We present the following article in accordance with the MOOSE reporting checklist (available at https:// tcr.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tcr-22-1256/rc).

## Methods

## Literature retrieval

The English database PubMed, Embase, Medline, Central and the Chinese database CNKI were searched for studies in Chinese and English from database establishment time to March 2022. The retrieval method was medical subject words combined with free words. Search terms and subjects included "cervical cancer OR cervical neoplasm" AND "lymphedema OR lower limb lymphedema OR lower extremity lymphedema" AND "risk factor.

# Literature screening

Inclusion criteria: (I) patients treated for cervical cancer; (II) cohort study or case-control study; (III) subject exposure factors are not limited; (IV) the observed outcome of the study was lower extremity lymphedema after treatment; (V) odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) of the risk factors could be ascertained indirectly or directly from the study.

Exclusion criteria: (I) lymphedema <6 months after surgery or radiotherapy; (II) case reports; (III) republished studies; (IV) incomplete data for analysis.

## Data extraction

Based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria, two researchers independently screened and determined the final included studies, and extracted the data according to a predetermined table. The main data extracted included (I) basic information such as title, publication date, authors' name, etc.; (II) research type, research population, intervention measures, outcome indicators, etc.; (III) research methods, subject characteristics, data results. Questions or differences in the process of literature screening and extraction were resolved through discussion with a third researcher.

# Literature quality evaluation

The quality of the observational studies was evaluated by the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS), which is divided into the NOS evaluation criteria of a cohort study and the NOS evaluation criteria of a case-control study. It is further divided into three blocks (population selection, comparability, exposure evaluation or result evaluation), comprising 8 items and scoring by a star system. The total score of a cohort study is 13 stars, and the total score of a disease case-control study is 9 stars. Two researchers independently evaluated the quality of the included literature and then cross-checked it. If there were any differences, an agreement was reached after discussion with the third researcher.



Figure 1 Flowchart of document screening process.

## Statistical analysis

We used Cochrane software RevMan5.4 to statistically analyze all data. OR (95% CI) was calculated using Inverse Variance. The Chi-square test was used to test heterogeneity between studies. When the I<sup>2</sup> corrected by degrees of freedom was >50%, it was considered to be heterogeneous, and the random-effects model was used. When the I<sup>2</sup> corrected by degrees of freedom was  $\leq$ 50%, it was considered there was no heterogeneity, and the fixed-effects model was adopted. Potential publication bias was estimated by Egger test. Two-sided P<0.05 indicated statistical significance.

## Results

## Literature retrieval

In this study, 171 relevant studies were obtained and then deduplicated by EndNote X9 management software. The researchers then screened the literature according to the predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria and read the full text as further screening. Finally, 12 studies were included. The specific screening process and results are shown in *Figure 1*.

#### Literature quality evaluation

The basic information of the included studies is shown in *Table 1*. Of them, 6 articles were in English. The research populations were from the USA, Japan, South Korea, the Czech Republic and Romania. The other 6 articles were in Chinese, and the research population was Chinese. All studies were published between 2010 and 2022, so were relatively new, and they were all retrospective. The incidence of lower extremity lymphedema after treatment of cervical cancer ranged from 12.6% to 43.1%. All studies had evaluated the risk factors of lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment, including BMI,

Study	Country	Research type	Test method	Edema criteria	Sample size	Incidence rate	Treatment	Risk factors
Halaska <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2010 (9)	Czech Republic	Cohort study	Self-reporting questionnaire, clinical testing	Subjective judgment	60	25.80%	Surgery and radiotherapy	BMI, radiotherapy
Kim <i>et al.</i> , 2012 (10)	South Korea	Cohort study	Clinical examination	CTCAE3.0	596	12.60%	Surgery and radiotherapy	BMI, age, radiotherapy, FIGO stage, LN metastasis, LN dissection
Mendivil <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2016 (11)	America	Cohort study	Clinical examination	CTCAE4.0	30	18.80%	Surgery and radiotherapy	BMI, FIGO staging, radiotherapy
Ohba <i>et al.</i> , 2011 (12)	Japan	Cohort study	Clinical examination	Subjective judgment	155	20.00%	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	BMI, age, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, FIGO stage, LN metastasis
Rebegea <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2020 (13)	Romania	Cohort study	Clinical examination	NR	186	15.05%	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	Age
Yamazaki et <i>al.</i> , 2015 (14)	Japan	Cohort study	NR	NR	398	NR	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	FIGO staging, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, LN dissection
Liu <i>et al.,</i> 2021 (15)	China	Case control study	Self-reporting	GCLQ	109	43.10%	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	BMI, age, FIGO stage, chemotherapy, number of LNs dissected
Sun <i>et al.</i> , 2015 (16)	China	Cohort study	Self-reporting	GCLQ	218	19.30%	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	Radiotherapy, chemotherapy, LN dissection
Wang <i>et al.</i> , 2015 (17)	China	Cohort study	Self-reporting	GCLQ	492	20.93%	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	Age, FIGO stage, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, LN dissection
Yin <i>et al.</i> , 2021 (18)	China	Case control study	Self-reporting	GCLQ	110	33.64%	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	BMI, age, FIGO stage, number of LNs dissected
Zhang <i>et al.</i> , 2021 (19)	China	Case control study	Self-reporting	GCLQ	949	22.60%	Surgery	BMI, age, FIGO stage, radiotherapy, LN dissection, number of LNs dissected
Zhou, 2022 (20)	China	Case control study	Self-reporting	GCLQ	98	33.67%	Surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy	BMI, age, FIGO stage

Table 1 Basic characteristics of the included literature

BMI, body mass index; CTCAE, common terminology criteria for adverse events; FIGO, International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics; GCLQ, gynecological cancerlymphedema questionnaire; LN, lymph node; NR, not reported.

age, International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) stage, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, lymph node (LN) metastasis, LN dissection and the number of LNs dissected. In addition, the researchers evaluated the quality of all retrospective studies according to the NOS standards, and the quality of the 12 included studies was high.

# Meta-analysis of main risk factors for lower extremity lymphedema after treatment of cervical cancer

A meta-analysis of the included studies was conducted. Of the risk factors, 8 reported BMI, 8 included age, 9 included FIGO stage, 8 included radiotherapy, 5 included chemotherapy, 2 included LN metastasis, 5 included

Table 2 Results of meta-analysis of risk factors for lower limb lymphedema after treatment of cervical cancer

Factor	No. of studies	No. of patients	OR (95% CI)	P value
BMI (≥25, <25 kg/m²)	8	756/1,351	1.37 (1.10, 1.71)	0.005
Age (≥50/60, <50/60 years)	8	753/1,829	1.68 (1.07, 2.64)	0.02
FIGO stage (≥II, <ii)< td=""><td>9</td><td>1,023/1,914</td><td>1.50 (1.24, 1.82)</td><td>&lt;0.001</td></ii)<>	9	1,023/1,914	1.50 (1.24, 1.82)	<0.001
Radiotherapy (yes, no)	8	834/1,993	2.87 (1.71, 4.82)	<0.001
Chemotherapy (yes, no)	5	606/674	1.64 (0.78, 3.42)	0.19
Lymph node metastasis (yes, no)	2	154/597	1.40 (0.86, 2.26)	0.17
Lymph node dissection (yes, no)	5	1,287/1,268	3.24 (1.44, 7.31)	0.005
Lymph node clearance (≥20, <20)	4	588/678	2.34 (1.80, 3.05)	<0.001





LN dissection, and 4 included LN clearance. The heterogeneity test results showed that the I<sup>2</sup> of age, FIGO stage, radiotherapy, chemotherapy and LN dissection was 68%, 8%, 77%, 75% and 79%, respectively, which was heterogeneous, so the random-effects model was adopted. BMI, LN metastasis and the number of LNs dissected were not heterogeneous, so the fixed-effects model was adopted. The results of the meta-analysis results showed that BMI, age, FIGO stage, radiotherapy, LN dissection and number of LNs dissected were the main risk factors of lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment (*Table 2, Figures 2-9*). Egger's test showed that there was no publication bias among the literatures (P>0.05).

## Discussion

Although the factors related to the occurrence of lower extremity lymphedema in patients after treatment of cervical cancer have been discussed, a consistent conclusion has not been reached. Searching the published systematic reviews at home and abroad, Bona et al. (21) included 23 relevant studies. However, due to lack of data and heterogeneity, only a descriptive systematic literature review was conducted in this study. The results of the descriptive analysis of this study showed that the main factors causing lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment were the number of lymph nodes dissected, adjuvant radiation therapy, cellulitis, lymphocyst formation, increasing age, invasive lymph node staging, higher body mass index and insufficient physical activity (21). The meta-analysis results of 8 relevant studies reported by Deng (22) showed that radiotherapy, LN dissection, LN metastasis and FIGO stage were the main risk factors for lower limb lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment.

Our study included the latest research and combined the results for a meta-analysis. There were great differences in

age≥50or60			age<50	or60		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		
Kim 2012	6	86	69	516	11.4%	0.49 [0.20, 1.16]			
Liu Yun 2021	29	54	18	55	12.4%	2.38 [1.10, 5.18]			
Ohba 2011	9	55	22	100	11.5%	0.69 [0.29, 1.63]			
Rebegea 2020	19	81	9	105	11.5%	3.27 [1.39, 7.69]			
Wang Xia 2015	11	103	32	389	13.0%	1.33 [0.65, 2.75]	- <b>+</b>		
Yin Huixiang 2021	18	33	19	77	11.5%	3.66 [1.55, 8.65]			
Zhangyanmei 2021	95	312	119	518	17.9%	1.47 [1.07, 2.01]			
Zhou Xiaozhen 2022	16	29	17	69	10.9%	3.76 [1.51, 9.39]	_ <b>_</b>		
Total (95% Cl)		753		1829	100.0%	1.68 [1.07, 2.64]	•		
Total events	203		305						
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.27; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	= 22.12,	df = 7 (P	= 0.002	, D				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.25 (P	= 0.02)				F	avours [experimental] Favours [control]	]	

# Figure 3 Forest diagram of age.

	stage≥II		stage<	Π	Odds Ratio			Odds	s Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% (		M-H, Fix	<u>ed, 95% Cl</u>		
Kim 2012	22	151	53	445	13.5%	1.26 [0.74, 2.15]	]	-	╆┱──		
Liu Yun 2021	23	56	24	53	8.5%	0.84 [0.39, 1.80]	]		<u> </u>		
Mendivil 2016	1	5	0	25	0.1%	17.00 [0.59, 486.41]	]	_	1	•	<b>→</b>
Ohba 2011	12	45	19	110	4.7%	1.74 [0.76, 3.97]	]	-	<b></b>		
Wang Xia 2015	30	102	73	390	12.5%	1.81 [1.10, 2.97]	]				
Yamazaki 2015	27	114	53	284	13.6%	1.35 [0.80, 2.29]	]	-	┼╍──		
Yin Huixiang 2021	16	31	21	79	3.4%	2.95 [1.24, 6.99]	]				
Zhangyanmei 2021	125	489	89	460	40.1%	1.43 [1.05, 1.95]	]		<b> </b>		
Zhou Xiaozhen 2022	14	30	19	68	3.6%	2.26 [0.93, 5.50]	]		<b>—</b>		
Total (95% CI)		1023		1914	100.0%	1.50 [1.24, 1.82]	I		•		
Total events	270		351								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8	3.70, df = 8	8 (P = 0	).37); l² =	8%						0 1	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.22 (F	o < 0.00	001)			0.01 Favours	0.1 [experimental]	Favours [c	u 1 :ontrol]	00	

Figure 4 Forest diagram of FIGO stage. FIGO, International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics.

	YES		NO			Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio Odd			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	I	M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl	
Halaska 2010	19	39	15	21	10.1%	0.38 [0.12, 1.18]			-	
Kim 2012	33	129	42	467	16.5%	3.48 [2.10, 5.77]				
Mendivil 2016	1	16	0	41	2.2%	8.03 [0.31, 207.85]				<b>→</b>
Ohba 2011	8	16	23	139	10.6%	5.04 [1.72, 14.81]				
Sun Xiaohong 2015	22	75	4	45	10.1%	4.25 [1.36, 13.31]				
Wang Xia 2015	81	243	22	249	16.5%	5.16 [3.09, 8.61]				
Yamazaki 2015	26	61	54	337	15.7%	3.89 [2.17, 6.99]				
Zhangyanmei 2021	76	255	138	694	18.2%	1.71 [1.23, 2.37]				
Total (95% CI)		834		1993	100.0%	2.87 [1.71, 4.82]			•	
Total events	266		298							
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.35; Chi²	= 29.8	6, df = 7 (	P = 0.0	001); l² =	77%			10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.00 (F	<b>&gt;</b> < 0.0	001)		F	Eavours [experimental] Eavours [control]				

Figure 5 Forest diagram of radiotherapy.

	YES	NO		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events To	otal Events Total	Weight M-	-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl			
Liu Yun 2021	1	3 46 106	7.1%	0.65 [0.06, 7.42]				
Ohba 2011	16	70 15 85	22.7%	1.38 [0.63, 3.04]	- <b>+</b>			
Sun Xiaohong 2015	4	18 22 108	16.9%	1.12 [0.33, 3.73]	<b>_</b>			
Wang Xia 2015	83 2	271 20 221	26.5%	4.44 [2.62, 7.52]	<b>--</b> -			
Yamazaki 2015	51 2	244 29 154	26.8%	1.14 [0.69, 1.89]	-			
Total (95% CI)	6	606 674	100.0%	1.64 [0.78, 3.42]	-			
Total events	155	132						
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.46; Chi² = 1	16.04, df = 4 (P = 0.0	003); l² = 75%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.31 (P =	0.19)		Fa	avours [experimental] Favours [control]			

Figure 6 Forest diagram of chemotherapy.

	YES NO			Odds Ratio			Odds Ratio				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, F	ixed, 95	5% CI	
Kim 2012	18	122	57	474	75.3%	1.27 [0.71, 2.24]			-		
Ohba 2011	9	32	22	123	24.7%	1.80 [0.73, 4.41]			+	_	
Total (95% Cl)		154		597	100.0%	1.40 [0.86, 2.26]					
Total events	27		79								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0 Test for overall effect:	).41, df = Z = 1.36 (I	1 (P = ( P = 0.1	0.52); l² = 7)	0%		Fa	0.01 0.01	0.1 experimenta	1 I] Favo	10 Durs [cont	100 rol]

Figure 7 Forest map of LN metastasis. LN, lymph node.

	YES	;	NO			Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95%	CI	M-H, Rand	dom, 95% Cl	
Kim 2012	7	63	68	533	23.3%	0.85 [0.37, 1.95	5]		<b></b>	
Sun Xiaohong 2015	24	86	2	34	15.0%	6.19 [1.38, 27.88	3]			-
Wang Xia 2015	103	427	0	65	6.7%	41.78 [2.56, 681.05	5]			<b>_-</b> →
Yamazaki 2015	68	228	12	170	25.7%	5.60 [2.92, 10.74	4]		<b>—</b>	
Zhangyanmei 2021	143	483	71	466	29.4%	2.34 [1.70, 3.22	2]		-	
Total (95% CI)	1287			1268	100.0%	3.24 [1.44, 7.31	]		•	
Total events	345		153							
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.56; Chi²	= 18.7	6, df = 4 (	P = 0.0	0009); I <sup>2</sup> =	79%				400
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.84 (	P = 0.0	05)			Favours	experimental]	Favours [con	trol]	

Figure 8 Forest map of LN dissection. LN, lymph node.

	≥20		<20	)		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		M-H, Fixed, 95% CI		
Liu Yun 2021	35	57	12	52	6.7%	5.30 [2.30, 12.25]				
Yin Huixiang 2021	16	30	21	80	7.4%	3.21 [1.34, 7.69]			_	
Zhangyanmei 2021	134	475	80	474	79.5%	1.94 [1.42, 2.65]				
Zhou Xiaozhen 2022	14	26	19	72	6.4%	3.25 [1.28, 8.27]				
Total (95% Cl)		588		678	100.0%	2.34 [1.80, 3.05]			•	
Total events	199		132							
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6	.07, df = 3	3 (P = 0	).11); I <sup>2</sup> =	51%				+		
Test for overall effect: 2	z = 6.29 (F	<b>P</b> < 0.00	0001)			Fa	avours [exp	erimental]	Favours [c	ontrol]

Figure 9 Number of LNs dissected. LN, lymph node.

1720

the incidence of lower limb lymphedema in patients after treatment of cervical cancer. The incidence abroad was between 12.6% and 25.8%, while in China it was between 19.3% and 43.1%, which was relatively high and might be related to inconsistency of detection methods, diagnostic criteria and follow-up of lower limb lymphedema. The risk factors in the meta-analysis included cervical-related factors such as FIGO stage and LN metastasis. FIGO stage was a risk factor for lymphedema (OR =1.50, 95% CI: 1.24-1.82, P<0.001), but LN metastasis was not. Patient-related factors included BMI and age, which were risk factors (OR =1.37, 95% CI: 1.10-1.71, P=0.005; OR =1.68, 95% CI: 1.07-2.64, P=0.02). Treatment-related factors included radiotherapy, chemotherapy, LN dissection and the number of LNs dissected, all of which, except chemotherapy, were risk factors of lower limb lymphedema. The risk of lower limb lymphedema among cervical cancer patients in the radiotherapy group was 2.87-fold higher than that in the non-chemotherapy group, which may be due to the obstruction of lymphatic drainage caused by vein occlusion and lymphatic damage caused by radiotherapy. In addition, the risk of lower extremity lymphedema in patients with LN dissection was 2.24-fold higher than that in patients without LN dissection. The more LNs that were dissected, the greater the risk of lymphedema. Taking 20 LNs as the boundary value, the risk of >20 LNs dissected was 2.34-fold that of <20 LNs. Therefore, strict evaluation should be carried out to determine the appropriate LN dissection.

This study has some limitations. First of all, the number of Chinese and English studies included was equal, representing combined results of domestic and foreign studies to a certain extent. However, the included studies were all retrospective, and uneven in methodology and quality, which might lead to some bias in the results. Second, the literature included in our analysis was heterogeneous in some of the results. We have not been able to elucidate the source of heterogeneity. The generation of heterogeneity in our analysis may be related to the inconsistency of the criteria for lower extremity edema among studies. The existence of heterogeneity may have some influence on the results.

# Conclusions

In conclusion, lower extremity lymphedema is a common complication after treatment of cervical cancer and has a high incidence, which merits greater attention from medical staff. This study showed that the main risk factors were BMI, age, FIGO stage, radiotherapy, LN dissection and the number of LNs. When treating patients with cervical cancer, we should aim to control these variables as much as possible and seek effective intervention measures to reduce the risk of lower limb edema and thus improve patients' health-related quality of life after treatment.

# Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

# Footnote

*Reporting Checklist:* The authors have completed the MOOSE reporting checklist. Available at https://tcr. amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tcr-22-1256/rc

*Conflicts of Interest:* All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at https://tcr.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tcr-22-1256/coif). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

*Ethical Statement:* The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

*Open Access Statement:* This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/.

# References

- Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2021;71:209-49.
- Koh WJ, Abu-Rustum NR, Bean S, et al. Cervical Cancer, Version 3.2019, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2019;17:64-84.
- 3. Marth C, Landoni F, Mahner S, et al. Cervical cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis,

treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol 2017;28:iv72-83.

- Biglia N, Zanfagnin V, Daniele A, et al. Lower Body Lymphedema in Patients with Gynecologic Cancer. Anticancer Res 2017;37:4005-15.
- Hareyama H, Hada K, Goto K, et al. Prevalence, classification, and risk factors for postoperative lower extremity lymphedema in women with gynecologic malignancies: a retrospective study. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2015;25:751-7.
- Deura I, Shimada M, Hirashita K, et al. Incidence and risk factors for lower limb lymphedema after gynecologic cancer surgery with initiation of periodic complex decongestive physiotherapy. Int J Clin Oncol 2015;20:556-60.
- Beesley V, Janda M, Eakin E, et al. Lymphedema after gynecological cancer treatment: prevalence, correlates, and supportive care needs. Cancer 2007;109:2607-14.
- Kizer NT, Thaker PH, Gao F, et al. The effects of body mass index on complications and survival outcomes in patients with cervical carcinoma undergoing curative chemoradiation therapy. Cancer 2011;117:948-56.
- 9. Halaska MJ, Novackova M, Mala I, et al. A prospective study of postoperative lymphedema after surgery for cervical cancer. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2010;20:900-4.
- Kim JH, Choi JH, Ki EY, et al. Incidence and risk factors of lower-extremity lymphedema after radical surgery with or without adjuvant radiotherapy in patients with FIGO stage I to stage IIA cervical cancer. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2012;22:686-91.
- Mendivil AA, Rettenmaier MA, Abaid LN, et al. Lower-extremity lymphedema following management for endometrial and cervical cancer. Surg Oncol 2016;25:200-4.
- Ohba Y, Todo Y, Kobayashi N, et al. Risk factors for lower-limb lymphedema after surgery for cervical cancer. Int J Clin Oncol 2011;16:238-43.
- 13. Rebegea LF, Stoleriu G, Manolache N, et al. Associated risk factors of lower limb lymphedema after treatment of cervical and endometrial cancer. Exp Ther Med

**Cite this article as:** Hu H, Fu M, Huang X, Huang J, Gao J. Risk factors for lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Transl Cancer Res 2022;11(6):1713-1721. doi: 10.21037/tcr-22-1256 2020;20:181.

- Yamazaki H, Todo Y, Takeshita S, et al. Relationship between removal of circumflex iliac nodes distal to the external iliac nodes and postoperative lower-extremity lymphedema in uterine cervical cancer. Gynecol Oncol 2015;139:295-9.
- Liu Y, Zheng Z, Huang Y. Study on the risk factors of perineal and lower extremity lymphedema after radiotherapy for cervical cancer. Chinese Journal of Clinical Oncology and Rehabilitation 2021;28:710-4.
- Sun X, Kong W. Analysis of lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment. Journal of Practical Cancer 2015;30:108-11.
- 17. Wang X, Ding Y. Analysis of the occurrence and risk factors of lower extremity lymphedema in patients with cervical cancer after surgery. Journal of Nursing 2015;30:21-5.
- Yin H, Liu Y, Dong X. Risk factors for lower extremity lymphedema in patients with cervical cancer during concurrent chemoradiotherapy. Nursing Practice and Research 2021;18:989-92.
- Zhang Y, Chen Y, Yan M. Risk factors of lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer surgery and its impact on quality of life. Chinese and Foreign Medical Research 2021;19:14-7.
- 20. Zhou X. Analysis of risk factors for lower extremity lymphedema in patients with postoperative adjuvant chemoradiotherapy for cervical cancer. General Nursing 2022;20:119-21.
- Bona AF, Ferreira KR, Carvalho RBM, et al. Incidence, prevalence, and factors associated with lymphedema after treatment for cervical cancer: a systematic review. Int J Gynecol Cancer 2020;30:1697-704.
- 22. Deng Y. Meta-analysis of risk factors for lower extremity lymphedema after cervical cancer treatment. Journal of Advanced Nursing Studies 2019;34:498-502.

(English Language Editor: K. Brown)