

Melanoma

A Modern Multidisciplinary
Approach

Adam I. Riker
Editor

 Springer

Melanoma

Adam I. Riker
Editor

Melanoma

A Modern Multidisciplinary
Approach

 Springer

Editor
Adam I. Riker
Louisiana State University
New Orleans
Louisiana
USA

ISBN 978-3-319-78309-3 ISBN 978-3-319-78310-9 (eBook)
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-78310-9>

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018944122

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: Gewerbstrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Preface

This book has been a labor of love, really beginning with my surgical oncology fellowship at the National Cancer Institute, Surgery Branch, under the leadership of Dr. Steven Rosenberg. During this time, we learned just about every aspect of treating melanoma, from the treatment of the primary and locoregional recurrence to the treatment of widespread metastatic disease with various forms of immunotherapy. I have been interested in this formidable cancer ever since this time, incorporating the management of melanoma into my clinical practice for almost two decades now. I remain an “immunotherapist” at heart, still asking basic questions about our immune system and how we can maximize our own bodies potential to fight cancer.

My impetus for writing this book has been the rapidity of progress and change in how we currently manage melanoma, further highlighted by the impressive recent advances in our treatment paradigm for treating metastatic melanoma with immunotherapy. Many of you have likely participated as an investigator of basic science and translational research, clinical trials, and the immunotherapy of melanoma. Others may find this book useful as a nice overview of melanoma and its current overall management. I believe it will be useful for almost anyone with an interest in melanoma.

I have done my best to include what I feel are the essentials of melanoma, ranging from the early detection and prevention of melanoma through the surgical and medical management of this disease. We have included several chapters focused upon complex wound reconstruction options. Other chapters are focused upon more common, non-melanoma skin cancers and rare tumors, such as Merkel cell carcinoma.

I have gathered together a phenomenal group of internationally renowned authors, all of whom are highly respected, committed, and experienced individuals in their areas of expertise. It has been an honor and a privilege to be able to collaborate with such a fine group of individuals, many of whom I have known for years, while others I have come to appreciate as respected colleagues throughout this process.

Finally, I would like to thank all of the folks at Springer, especially Tracy Marton, for providing the support and direction to keep this project on track and on time.

New Orleans, LA, USA

Adam I. Riker

Contents

1	History of Melanoma	1
	John F. Thompson, Richard Kefford, Graham Stevens, and Richard Scolyer	
2	Anatomy and Physiology of the Skin	15
	Amir Dehdashtian, Thomas P. Stringer, Abby Joan Warren, Euphemia W. Mu, Bardia Amirlak, and Ladan Shahabi	
3	Melanoma Epidemiology and Prevention.	27
	Sowmiya Murali†, Mary E. Logue†, Yvonne Talamantes, and Marianne Berwick	
4	Methods of Melanoma Detection.	39
	Clara Curiel-Lewandrowski, Clara Stemwedel, Mihaela Balu, Suephy C. Chen, Laura K. Ferris, Pedram Gerami, Adele C. Green, Mariah M. Johnson, Lois J. Loescher, Josep Malveyh, Ashfaq A. Marghoob, Kathryn Martires, Giovanni Pellacani, Tracy Petrie, Susana Puig, Inga Saknite, Susan M. Swetter, Per Svedenhag, Eric R. Tkaczyk, Oliver J. Wisco, and Sancy A. Leachman	
5	Staging and Classification of Melanoma.	87
	Michael E. Egger and Jeffrey E. Gershenwald	
6	The Genetic Evolution of Melanoma.	105
	Katja Harbst and Göran Jönsson	
7	Epigenetics in Melanoma	115
	Marjan E. Askarian-Amiri, Euan J. Rodger, Aniruddha Chatterjee, Graeme Finlay, and Bruce C. Baguley	
8	Immunobiology of the Melanoma Microenvironment.	133
	Yutaka Kawakami and Adam I. Riker	
9	Dermoscopy of Melanocytic Lesions	143
	Zachary J. Wolner, Oriol Yélamos, Konstantinos Liopyris, and Ashfaq A. Marghoob	
10	International Models of Melanoma Management (Australia)	159
	Paul Elmslie	

11	Pigmented Lesions: Biopsy Methods and Emerging Non-invasive Imaging Techniques	177
	Cindy Wassef, Lea J. Bellomo, and David I. Silverstein	
12	The Pathology of Melanoma	193
	Jane L. Messina and Rahel A. John	
13	Pediatric Melanoma and Atypical Melanocytic Neoplasms	213
	Radhika Sreeraman Kumar, Jane L. Messina, Damon R. Reed, and Vernon K. Sondak	
14	Melanoma in Pregnancy	239
	Joanna L. Walker, Annie Wang, George Kroumpouzou, and Martin A. Weinstock	
15	Mucosal Melanoma	253
	Lauge Hjorth Mikkelsen and Steffen Heegaard	
16	Uveal Melanoma	273
	Ronald W. Milam Jr. and Anthony B. Daniels	
17	Current Surgical Management of Primary Cutaneous Melanoma	313
	Adam I. Riker, Marco Antonio Rajo, Stephen L. Lambert, and Jonathan S. Lam	
18	Mohs Surgery for Melanoma In Situ	323
	Joy Kunishige and John Zitelli	
19	Surgical Management of Head and Neck Melanoma	337
	Joseph Zenga, Kevin Emerick, and Shaun Desai	
20	Management of Melanoma Locoregional Recurrence	351
	Clara R. Farley and Keith A. Delman	
21	Reconstructive Options for Head and Neck Melanoma	361
	Ian R. Wisecarver, Charles L. Dupin, and Julian D’Achille	
22	Reconstruction Options for Ear and Nose Melanoma	363
	Charles L. Dupin, Julian D’Achille, and Ian R. Wisecarver	
23	Reconstruction Options for Lip, Cheek, Forehead, and Scalp Melanoma	389
	Charles L. Dupin, Julian D’Achille, Ian R. Wisecarver, and Taylor Smith	
24	Reconstruction Options for Trunk and Extremity Melanoma	411
	Oren Tessler, Alex M. Lin, Shukan Patel, and Charles L. Dupin	
25	Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy for Melanoma	425
	Ann Y. Chung, Catalina Mosquera, and Jan H. Wong	

26	Operative Techniques for Melanoma	437
	Soraya A. Voigt, Catalina Mosquera, and Nasreen A. Vohra	
27	Isolated Limb Infusion for Recurrent and Locally Metastatic Limb Melanoma	451
	Hidde M. Kroon, Anna M. Huisman, Brendon J. Coventry, and John F. Thompson	
28	Surgery for Stage IV Metastatic Melanoma	467
	David W. Ollila, Shachar Laks, and Eddy C. Hsueh	
29	Adjuvant Therapy of Melanoma	483
	Elisabeth Eapen Paul and Sanjiv S. Agarwala	
30	Radiation Therapy for Melanoma	499
	Noelle L. Williams, Brittany A. Simone, Pramila R. Anné, and Wenyin Shi	
31	Immuno-Oncolytic Virotherapy for Melanoma	515
	Helene Woyczesczyk and Karim Essani	
32	Chemotherapy and Biochemotherapy for Melanoma	525
	Chia-Yen Hung and John Wen-Cheng Chang	
33	Therapeutic Cancer Vaccines for Melanoma	533
	Kaitlin M. Peace, Garth S. Herbert, Timothy J. Vreeland, G. Travis Clifton, and George E. Peoples	
34	Adoptive Cell Therapy for Melanoma	549
	Jane Mills, Phillip Darcy, and David E. Gyorki	
35	Current Immunotherapy of Melanoma	567
	Kimberly Loo, Clinton Wu, and Adil Daud	
36	Immune-Related Adverse Toxicities and Clinical Management	577
	Michael Constantin Kirchberger and Lucie Heinzerling	
37	Management of Non-melanoma Skin Cancers: Basal Cell Carcinoma, Squamous Cell Carcinoma	591
	Sheila Jalalat, Corin Agoris, Neil Alan Fenske, and Basil Cherpelis	
38	Management of Non-melanoma Skin Cancers: Rare Subtypes	605
	Michael Saco, Neil Alan Fenske, and Basil Cherpelis	
39	Management of Non-melanoma Skin Cancers: Merkel Cell Carcinoma	623
	Isabel Prieto, Teresa Pérez-de-la-Fuente, M Susana Medina, Beatriz Castelo, Fernando Cassinello, David Esteban, and Nuria Rodriguez-Salas	
	Index	637

Contributors

Sanjiv S. Agarwala Department of Hematology and Oncology, St. Luke's University Health Network, Bethlehem, PA, USA

Corin Agoris Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Bardia Amirlak Department of Plastic Surgery, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA

Pramila R. Anne Department of Radiation Oncology, Sidney Kimmel Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Marjan E. Askarian-Amiri Auckland Cancer Society Research Centre, University of Auckland, Grafton, Auckland, New Zealand

Department of Molecular Medicine and Pathology, School of Medical Sciences, University of Auckland, Grafton, Auckland, New Zealand

Bruce C. Baguley Auckland Cancer Society Research Centre, University of Auckland, Grafton, Auckland, New Zealand

Mihaela Balu Department of Surgery, Beckman Laser Institute and Medical Clinic, University of California, Irvine, CA, USA

Lea J. Bellomo Department of Dermatology, Stony Brook Medicine, Stony Brook, NY, USA

Marianne Berwick Department of Internal Medicine and Dermatology, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

Fernando Cassinello Department of Anesthesiology, Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain

John Wen-Cheng Chang Division of Hematology and Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital at Linkou, Taoyuan, Taoyuan, Taiwan

Aniruddha Chatterjee Department of Pathology, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

Maurice Wilkins Centre for Molecular Biodiscovery, Auckland, New Zealand

Suephy C. Chen Department of Dermatology, Emory University and Atlanta VA Medical Center, Atlanta, GA, USA

Basil Cherpelis Department of Dermatology and Cutaneous Surgery, Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Ann Y. Chung Division of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, East Carolina University Brody School of Medicine, Greenville, NC, USA

G. Travis Clifton Department of General Surgery, San Antonio Military Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, USA

Brendon J. Coventry Department of Surgery, Royal Adelaide Hospital, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Clara Curiel-Lewandrowski Department of Medicine and Dermatology, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Department of Dermatology, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
Cutaneous Oncology Program, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA
Skin Cancer Institute, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, USA

Julian D'Achille Division of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Surgery, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, LA, USA

Anthony B. Daniels Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Department of Radiation Oncology, Vanderbilt-Ingram Cancer Center, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, TN, USA

Program in Cancer Biology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN, USA

Phillip Darcy Research Division, Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Adil Daud Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

Amir Dehdashtian Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, School of Public Health, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Keith A. Delman Department of Surgical Oncology, Emory University Hospital, Atlanta, GA, USA

Shaun Desai Division of Facial Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery, Johns Hopkins Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA

Charles L. Dupin Division of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Surgery, Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, LA, USA

Michael E. Egger Department of Surgical Oncology, University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA

Department of Surgery, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY, USA

Paul Elmslie Healthcert International, Singapore, Singapore

National Skin Cancer Centres, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Kevin Emerick Department of Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery, Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Karim Essani Laboratory of Virology, Department of Biological Sciences, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, USA

Clara R. Farley Department of Surgical Oncology, Emory University Hospital, Atlanta, GA, USA

Neil Alan Fenske Department of Dermatology and Cutaneous Surgery, Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Beatriz Castelo Department of Medical Oncology, Hospital Universitario La Paz, Madrid, Spain

Laura K. Ferris Department of Dermatology, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Graeme Finlay Auckland Cancer Society Research Centre, University of Auckland, Grafton, Auckland, New Zealand

Department of Molecular Medicine and Pathology, School of Medical Sciences, University of Auckland, Grafton, Auckland, New Zealand

Pedram Gerami Skin Cancer Institute of Northwestern Medicine (SCIN-Med), Chicago, IL, USA

Melanoma Program of SCIN-Med, Department of Dermatology, Northwestern Hospital, Chicago, IL, USA

Jeffrey E. Gershenwald Department of Surgical Oncology, University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA

Department of Cancer Biology, University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA

Melanoma and Skin Center, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, USA

Adele C. Green Population Health, Herston, QLD, Australia

QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute and CRUK Manchester Institute, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

David E. Gyorki Division of Cancer Surgery, Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Department of Surgery, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, Australia

Katja Harbst Faculty of Medicine, Department of Clinical Sciences Lund, Oncology and Pathology, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Steffen Heegaard Eye Pathology Section, Department of Pathology and Department of Ophthalmology, Rigshospitalet, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Lucie Heinzerling Department of Dermatology, University Hospital Erlangen, Erlangen, Germany

Garth S. Herbert Department of General Surgery, San Antonio Military Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, USA

Eddy C. Hsueh Department of surgery, Saint Louis University, St. Louis, MO, USA

Anna M. Huismans Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Chia-Yen Hung Hematology and Oncology Division, Internal Medicine Department, Mackay Memorial Hospital, Taipei, New Taipei, Taiwan

Division of Hematology and Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital at Linkou, Taoyuan, Taoyuan, Taiwan

Sheila Jalalat Department of Dermatology and Cutaneous Surgery, Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Rahel A. John Department of Pathology, Lutheran General Hospital, Park Ridge, IL, USA

Mariah M. Johnson Department of Dermatology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA

Göran Jönsson Faculty of Medicine, Department of Clinical Sciences Lund, Oncology and Pathology, Lund University, Lund, Sweden

Yutaka Kawakami Division of Cellular Signaling, Institute for Advanced Medical Research, Keio University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

Richard Kefford Westmead Hospital, Westmead, NSW, Australia

Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Macquarie University, North Ryde, NSW, Australia

Michael Constantin Kirchberger Department of Dermatology, University Hospital Erlangen, Erlangen, Bavaria, Germany

Hidde M. Kroon Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Department of General Surgery, Flinders Medical Centre, Adelaide, SA, Australia

Department of Surgery, Royal Adelaide Hospital, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA, Australia

George Kroumpouzou Department of Dermatology, The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

Department of Dermatology, Medical School of Jundiai, Sao Paulo, Brazil

Division of Dermatology, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Providence, RI, USA

Radhika Sreeraman Kumar Radiation Oncology Services, Riverdale, GA, USA

Joy Kunishige Department of Plastic Surgery, Zitelli & Brodland Skin Cancer Center, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Shachar Laks Department of Surgery, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Jonathan S. Lam Section of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, Louisiana State University, New Orleans, LA, USA

Stephen L. Lambert Department of Family Medicine, Health Science Center, Louisiana State University, New Orleans, LA, USA

Sancy A. Leachman Department of Dermatology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA

Alex M. Lin Frank H. Netter MD School of Medicine at Quinnipiac University, Hamden, CT, USA

Konstantinos Liopyris Department of Medicine, Dermatology Service, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

Lois J. Loescher The University of Arizona, College of Nursing, Tucson, AZ, USA

Mary E. Logue School of Medicine, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

Kimberly Loo Department of Hematology/Oncology, Melanoma, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

Josep Malvehy Department of Dermatology, Hospital Clinic of Barcelona, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

Ashfaq A. Marghoob Division of Dermatology, Department of Medicine, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

Kathryn Martires Stanford University School of Medicine, Department of Dermatology, Palo Alto, CA, USA

M. Susana Medina Department of Dermatology, Príncipe de Asturias University Hospital, Madrid, Spain

Jane L. Messina Departments of Anatomic Pathology and Cutaneous Oncology, Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL, USA

Departments of Pathology and Cell Biology and Dermatology, University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine, Tampa, FL, USA

Lauge Hjorth Mikkelsen Eye Pathology Section, Department of Pathology and Department of Ophthalmology, Rigshospitalet, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

Ronald W. Milam Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Vanderbilt Eye Institute, Nashville, TN, USA

Jane Mills Division of Cancer Surgery, Peter MacCallum Cancer Center, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

David Esteban Moreno Department of Radiation Oncology, Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain

Catalina Mosquera Division of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, East Carolina University Brody School of Medicine, Greenville, NC, USA

Euphemia W. Mu Ronald O. Perelman Department of Dermatology, NYU, New York, NY, USA

Sowmiya Murali University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, USA

David W. Ollila Department of Surgery, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

Shukan Patel Department of Plastics and Reconstructive Surgery, Louisiana State University Health Science Center—New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, USA

Elisabeth Eapen Paul Department of Hematology and Oncology, St. Luke's University Health Network, Bethlehem, PA, USA

Kaitlin M. Peace Department of General Surgery, San Antonio Military Medical Center, Fort Sam Houston, TX, USA

Giovanni Pellacani Department of Dermatology, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy

George E. Peoples Cancer Insight, LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA

Teresa Pérez-de-la-Fuente Department of Plastic Surgery, Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain

Tracy Petrie Department of Dermatology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA

Isabel Prieto Department of Radiation Oncology, Fundación Jiménez Díaz, Madrid, Spain

Susana Puig Department of Dermatology, Hospital Clinic Barcelona, Barcelona, Catalonia, Spain

Marco Antonio Rajo Section of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, Louisiana State University, New Orleans, LA, USA

Damon R. Reed Departments of Cutaneous Oncology and Sarcoma Oncology, Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL, USA

Pediatric Cancer and Blood Disorders Institute, Johns Hopkins All Children's Hospital, St Petersburg, FL, USA

Adam I. Riker Section of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, Louisiana State University, School of Medicine, LSU Health-New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, USA

Euan J. Rodger Department of Pathology, Dunedin School of Medicine, University of Otago, Dunedin, Dunedin, New Zealand

Maurice Wilkins Centre for Molecular Biodiscovery, Auckland, New Zealand

Michael Saco Department of Dermatology and Cutaneous Surgery, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA

Inga Saknite Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt Health, One Hundred Oaks, Nashville, TN, USA

Nuria Rodriguez Salas Department of Medical Oncology, Hospital Universitario La Paz, Madrid, Spain

Richard Scolyer Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Sydney Medical School, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia
Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Camperdown, NSW, Australia

Ladan Shahabi The Ronald O. Perleman Department of Dermatology, NYU Langone Medical Center, New York, NY, USA

Wenyin Shi Department of Radiation Oncology, Sidney Kimmel Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

David I. Silverstein Department of Dermatology, Stony Brook Medicine, Stony Brook, NY, USA

Brittany Simone Department of Radiation Oncology, Sidney Kimmel Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Taylor Smith Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, LA, USA

Vernon K. Sondak Department of Cutaneous Oncology, Moffitt Cancer Center, Tampa, FL, USA

Departments of Oncologic Sciences and Surgery, University of South Florida Morsani College of Medicine, Tampa, FL, USA

Clara Stemwedel Department of Dermatology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA

Graham Stevens Western Sydney University, Bathurst Clinical School, Orange, NSW, Australia

Orange Hospital, Bathurst, NSW, Australia

Thomas P. Stringer Department of Dermatology, NYU Langone School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA

Per Svedenhag SciBase, Stockholm, Sweden

Susan M. Swetter Stanford University Medical Center and Cancer Institute, Stanford, CA, USA

VA Palo Alto Health Care System, Palo Alto, CA, USA

Department of Dermatology/Cutaneous Oncology, Stanford Dermatology/Cutaneous Oncology, Stanford, CA, USA

Yvonne Talamantes CRTC Population Science Academic Unit, Albuquerque, NM, USA

Oren Tessler Department of Surgery, University Medical Center, New Orleans, New Orleans, LA, USA

John F. Thompson Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Sydney Medical School, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, Camperdown, NSW, Australia

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Macquarie University, North Ryde, NSW, Australia

Eric R. Tkaczyk Cutaneous Imaging Clinic, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Department of Medicine, One Hundred Oaks—Dermatology, Nashville, TN, USA

Nasreen A. Vohra Division of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, Brody School of Medicine, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA

Soraya A. Voigt Division of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, Brody School of Medicine, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA

Timothy J. Vreeland Department of General Surgery, Womack Army Medical Center, Fort Bragg, NC, USA

Joanna L. Walker Department of Dermatology, The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

Division of Dermatology, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Providence, RI, USA

Annie Wang Department of Dermatology, Hawaii Permanente Medical Group, Honolulu, HI, USA

Abby Joan Warren Department of Plastic Surgery, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX, USA

Cindy Wassef Department of Dermatology, Stony Brook Medicine, Stony Brook, NY, USA

Martin A. Weinstock Department of Dermatology, The Warren Alpert Medical School of Brown University, Providence, RI, USA

Division of Dermatology, Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Providence, RI, USA

Noelle Williams Department of Radiation Oncology, Sidney Kimmel Medical College, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Oliver J. Wisco Department of Dermatology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR, USA

Ian R. Wisecarver Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, New Orleans, LA, USA

Zachary J. Wolner Department of Medicine, Dermatology Service, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

Jan H. Wong Division of Surgical Oncology, Department of Surgery, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC, USA

Helene Woyczesczyk Laboratory of Virology, Department of Biological Sciences, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI, USA

Clinton Wu Department of Melanoma Oncology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

Oriol Yélamos Department of Medicine, Dermatology Service, Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY, USA

Joseph Zenga Department of Otolaryngology—Head & Neck Surgery, Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

John Zitelli Departments of ENT and Plastic Surgery, Zitelli & Brodland Skin Cancer Center, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center, Pittsburgh, PA, USA



History of Melanoma

1

John F. Thompson, Richard Kefford,
Graham Stevens, and Richard Scolyer

Melanoma in Antiquity and Through the Ages

Melanoma classically occurs in fair-skinned individuals of European origin. It is therefore surprising that the earliest evidence of melanoma has been found in the skeletons and skin of pre-Columbian, non-European mummies discovered in the foothills of the Peruvian Andes [1]. As well as widespread metastases in bone, rounded melanotic masses were identified in the skin of these mummies. Carbon dating has indicated that these individuals died around 2400 years ago.

At about the same time in Europe, in the fifth century BC, the Greek physician Hippocrates described a condition that he referred to as the

“fatal black tumor,” almost certainly melanoma. This condition was subsequently reported in the writings of Rufus of Ephesus in the first century AD, but there was no further mention of it until references were made to “fatal black tumor,” and “black fluid in the body” in European reports from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including the writings of Highmore in 1651 [1], Bartholin in 1677 [2], Bonet in 1679, and Henrici and Nothnagel in 1757 [2]. In 1804, René Laennec, inventor of the stethoscope, used the term “melanose” to describe a distinct disease entity [3]. Laennec’s mentor in Paris was an anatomist and surgeon Baron Guillaume Dupuytren, and in 1812 they published detailed descriptions of “la melanose”. Jean Cruveilhier, author of the

J. F. Thompson, M.D. (✉)
Melanoma Institute Australia, The University
of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Sydney Medical School, The University of Sydney,
Sydney, NSW, Australia

Royal Prince Alfred Hospital,
Camperdown, NSW, Australia

Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences,
Macquarie University, North Ryde,
NSW, Australia
e-mail: john.thompson@melanoma.org.au

R. Kefford
Westmead Hospital, Westmead, NSW, Australia

Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of
Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia
e-mail: richard.kefford@mq.edu.au

G. Stevens
Western Sydney University, Bathurst Clinical School,
Bathurst, NSW, Australia

Orange Hospital, Orange, NSW, Australia
e-mail: graham.stevens@health.nsw.gov.au

R. Scolyer
Melanoma Institute Australia, The University of
Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia

Sydney Medical School, The University of Sydney,
Sydney, NSW, Australia

Royal Prince Alfred Hospital,
Camperdown, NSW, Australia
e-mail: richard.scolyer@sswahs.nsw.gov.au

famous treatise *Anatomie pathologique du corps humain*, was another student of Dupuytren, and published the earliest descriptions of melanoma of the hand, foot, and vulva [2].

In 1858, Oliver Pemberton, a surgeon from Birmingham, England, reported a series of 60 patients with metastatic melanoma treated over a 37-year period, describing their clinical features and the sites to which metastasis occurred. Based on Greek words “melas” (dark) and “oma” (tumor), the English word “melanoma” is believed to have been first introduced by a Scottish pathologist, Robert Carswell, in 1838 [4, 5]. Carswell produced a monograph entitled *Illustrations of the Elementary Forms of Disease*, in which he depicted examples of melanomas. However, in the mid-1900s, this disease was often referred to as “melanoblastoma” [6], presumably because it was observed to behave more like a sarcoma than a skin cancer [4, 5].

Melanoma Pathology: Classical and Modern

The first illustrated descriptions of both primary and metastatic melanomas, notably those of Cruveilhier in 1829, were derived from autopsies. In 1853, a surgeon at St Bartholomew’s Hospital in London, James Paget, published a report documenting 25 cases of melanoma, and he appears to have been the first to point out that melanoma can progress from a radial growth phase to a vertical growth phase [7]. In 1894, one of the first pathological descriptions of an excised melanoma was published by the British surgeon, Jonathan Hutchinson. He described a case of lentigo maligna melanoma in which an excised amelanotic nodule was examined pathologically by his son (Jonathan Hutchinson, Jr.), who identified a malignant tumor composed of spindle-shaped cells resembling a sarcoma and which he therefore called “melanotic sarcoma.”

It was not until the 1900s that detailed descriptions of the histopathological features of melanoma were published. In 1948, a monograph entitled *Biology of Melanomas* was published by the New York Academy of Sciences detailing the

state of knowledge at the time. In early 1967 a committee of Australian pathologists, led by the eminent melanoma researcher Vincent McGovern, published recommendations for melanoma classification and terminology [8]. Additionally, in 1967, the US pathologist, Dr. Wallace Clark, published his landmark paper on the histogenetic classification of melanoma that became the basis of previous and current versions of the *WHO Classification of Melanoma* [9]. He described three types of melanoma (lentigo maligna melanoma, superficial spreading melanoma, and nodular melanoma), and also suggested that they had differing prognoses. Subsequent studies provided some evidence in support of this assertion [10–12]. However, in their 1969 publication, Clark et al. showed that the prognosis of melanoma was primarily related to the depth of invasion, which they categorized according to five levels of the skin (now known as Clark-McGovern levels, reflecting the contributions that both these pathology doyens made to establishing level of invasion as an important prognostic factor for patients with primary melanomas) [10–12].

Although it had been documented as early as 1953 that the depth of invasion appeared to be associated with prognosis [13], it was not until the publication in 1970 of Alexander Breslow’s landmark paper on the prognostic significance of tumor thickness that the vertical (Breslow’s) tumor thickness was established as a very strong prognostic factor [14]. Breslow defined tumor thickness as the vertical depth from the top of the granular layer of the epidermis to the deepest invasive cell. Melanomas <0.76 mm thick and Clark level II tumors were noted to be associated with a more favorable prognosis. The pioneering work of Breslow remains relevant today, with tumor thickness now confirmed in multiple studies to be the strongest predictor of outcome in patients with clinically localized primary melanomas. It has been, and remains, an important factor in successive versions of the internationally accepted American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) Melanoma Staging System [15].

At the International Pigment Cell Conference and the International Cancer Conference held

concurrently in Sydney in 1972, an international group of pathologists, chaired by Vincent McGovern, met to develop a consensus on the classification and histopathological reporting of melanoma. The classification, published in 1973 [16], was based on Clark's original proposal and listed two forms of noninvasive "in situ" melanoma (Hutchinson's melanotic freckle and superficial spreading melanoma), and three forms of invasive melanoma (invasive melanoma with adjacent intraepidermal component of Hutchinson's melanotic freckle type, invasive melanoma with an adjacent intraepidermal component of superficial spreading type, and invasive melanoma without an adjacent intraepidermal component).

In 1977 Arrington, Reed et al. described the features of melanomas involving acral skin as a distinct subtype of melanoma that has subsequently become known as acral lentiginous melanoma [17].

The 1972 Sydney classification was revised at an international workshop held in Sydney in 1982 [18]. The original categories were retained (albeit with some slightly different terminologies) but new categories were added: melanoma with an adjacent component of acral lentiginous type, melanoma with an adjacent component of mucosal lentiginous type, and melanoma of unclassifiable histogenetic type.

In the 1960s, and for the next 25–30 years, the disease was usually referred to as "malignant" melanoma, but use of this adjective is now strongly discouraged because it is confusing to patients and to many physicians because there is no nonmalignant form of invasive melanoma. In 2013, Bahmer and Bahmer referred to melanoma in more dramatic terms, describing it as "the black death of modern times"! [19].

In the early years of the twenty-first century, great technological advances facilitated a new understanding of the molecular pathogenesis of a wide variety of diseases, including melanoma [20]. In 2005, Boris Bastian and colleagues published their landmark study showing the presence of common oncogenic somatic gene mutations in BRAF, NRAS, and CKIT in many melanomas. They also showed associations of these mutations

with the anatomical site of the primary tumor and the degree of chronic sun damage [21]. These discoveries paved the way for the development of a molecular classification of melanoma that was subsequently expanded into four major melanoma molecular subclasses by The Cancer Genome Atlas Melanoma Project: BRAF mutant, NRAS mutant, NF1 mutant, and triple-wild-type tumors [22]. These advances also led to the development of new therapies that targeted specific gene mutations in melanoma patients, resulting in new treatment options for those with advanced-stage disease.

Recognition of Genetic and Environmental Factors Predisposing to Melanoma

Hereditary Predisposition to Melanoma

In 1820, William Norris, a British general practitioner, noted that satellite lesions frequently occurred around a primary cutaneous melanoma (which he referred to as "fungoid disease"), and observed that spread could occur to distant sites including the lungs, liver, brain, and bone [23]. Norris also appears to have been the first to point out that patients with melanoma sometimes have a family history of melanoma, suggesting that there was an inherited predisposition [24]. Norris later commented on the fact that most of his patients with the condition had a fair complexion and light hair. He based this observation on his clinical experience that a father of one of his melanoma patients later died of an apparently similar disease. Furthermore, the patient's children had multiple nevi on their bodies, as did the patient himself. (It seems likely that they had the atypical multiple mole syndrome, now a well-recognized entity partially attributed to germline CDKN2A mutations; we now know that melanoma occurs by 80 years of age in 58–92% of individuals with these mutations [25]). Thus, Norris appears to have been the first to propose that melanomas could develop from preexisting nevi. Although Norris had suggested that melanomas typically

occurred in individuals with fair skin and light hair, a rare case of what we now know as melanoma occurring in a patient with dark skin, a native of Madagascar, was reported by Pemberton in 1858 [26].

The Role of Exposure to Sunshine in Melanoma Development

Sun worshippers have existed for millennia [27]. In some ancient civilizations, sun gods were regarded as the source of all goodness and life, and “Sunday” was designated the special day to worship the sun. For the Greeks, Apollo was the god of the sun and his son Asclepius the god of medicine. It is therefore not surprising that sun bathing was widely practiced in the Asclepian health clinics in the first century BC.

It was not until the late nineteenth century that there was any suggestion that sunshine might not always be beneficial to health. The first documented proposal that sunshine could be harmful is attributed to Unna [28], who in 1893 described severe damage to the skin of sailors caused by prolonged and intense solar exposure. In the early twentieth century, it was specifically noted that skin cancer was more common in geographical areas where there was much sunshine, particularly in outdoor workers.

In 1956, a landmark report was published by the Australian researcher H.O. Lancaster [29], containing data supporting the concept that sunshine was involved in the initiation of cutaneous melanoma. Lancaster indicated that his studies had been undertaken to test the earlier proposal by AGS Cooper, director of the Queensland Radium Institute in Brisbane, that sunlight was an important predisposing factor for all forms of skin cancer. He had observed that skin cancer was far more common in northern Queensland than southern Queensland. Cooper did not publish his results until 1959 [30]. In this article, he noted that a similar observation about latitude and skin cancer incidence had been made in the United States, in the southern cities of New Orleans and Dallas, respectively, and published by Sarnat and Schour in 1950 [31].

A subsequent paper by Lancaster and Nelson, published in 1957 [32], explored in more detail the concept as it applied specifically to melanoma. They noted that those most commonly affected by melanoma in Australia had a fair complexion and did not tan readily, but instead sunburned easily and developed freckles. Lancaster and Nelson clearly documented the fact that melanoma, as well as other types of skin cancer, developed more often in white Australians who lived in the northern state of Queensland than in the southern states of New South Wales and Victoria, with a remarkable latitudinal gradient correlation with melanoma incidence rates. Population-based incidence data for cutaneous melanoma have been collected in Australia and most other developed countries since the 1960s, with a steady increase in observed incidence worldwide. This is attributed mainly to increased UV exposure, mainly from sunshine but also from artificial sources of UV including skin tanning equipment.

Recognition of Melanoma as a Treatable Entity in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

In 1844 Samuel Cooper, a London surgeon, recommended early surgical removal of malignant pigmented tumors, but as Norris had done previously he emphasized the apparently untreatable situation of patients with locally advanced and metastatic disease [1, 2, 33]. Subsequently, Norris discussed treatment options in more detail, recommending wide excision of the skin and subcutaneous tissue around a primary melanoma to minimize the risk of recurrence [23].

The first known surgical resection of metastatic melanoma appears to have been undertaken in 1787 [4] by a British surgeon, John Hunter, in London [2]. He reported resection of a recurrent tumor mass behind the angle of the mandible of a 35-year-old man, and described it as a “cancerous fungus excrescence” [34]. It is not clear whether Hunter knew what condition he was dealing with, but the preserved tumor is still on

display in the Hunterian Museum of the Royal College of Surgeons in London, subsequently confirmed to be melanoma [35]. The fate of the patient is unknown. The first reported groin dissection for melanoma was in 1851 by Ferguson [36]. Shortly afterwards, in 1857, Jonathan Hutchinson provided the first definite description of subungual melanoma, and stated that early amputation was required [37].

Establishment of Surgical Treatment Paradigms for Melanoma in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

Herbert Snow, of the Marsden Hospital in London, was the first to propose surgical clearance of the regional lymph nodes as part of the initial management of patients with primary cutaneous melanoma (which he called “melanotic cancerous disease”). Snow suggested that the regional lymph nodes functioned as “traps” (filters) to prevent the spread of cancer cells into the bloodstream. What is today referred to as an elective lymph node dissection (ELND) was described by Snow as “anticipatory gland dissection” in 1892 [38]. In 1903 Frederick Eve [39] also recommended excision of regional lymph nodes as well as wide excision of the primary melanoma site, whether or not there was any clinical evidence of metastatic disease in the nodes. In 1907, William Sampson Handley emphasized that generous wide excision of primary melanomas (which he referred to as “melanotic growths”) was required for effective treatment, in combination with surgical clearance of the regional lymph nodes, and amputation in selected cases [40]. Handley noticed the lymphatic spread of melanoma at the time of autopsy in the leg of a woman who had apparently died of advanced metastatic melanoma. Based on this single case, he recommended not only removal of two inches of skin around the primary melanoma site, with an even wider excision of subcutaneous tissue down to the level of muscle fascia, but also removal of the regional lymph nodes. This treatment plan went unchallenged for the subsequent 50 years.

Pringle, in 1908, extended Handley’s concept of lymphatic spread of melanoma, and proposed wide excision of the primary melanoma site and in continuity excision of a generous strip of skin, subcutaneous tissue, and fascia between the primary site and involved regional lymph nodes, all as a single operative specimen [41].

ELND, as part of the primary definitive treatment of melanomas more than 1.5 mm in Breslow’s thickness, continued to be performed at many major melanoma treatment centers worldwide. This did not come under debate until the mid-1980s, when its value had become a matter of ongoing controversy. Those who advocated ELND based their recommendation mainly on retrospective studies that may have been subject to selection bias. Prospective clinical trials had not been performed at this point, with little evidence of a true benefit. There were two large, randomized, multicenter clinical trials led by Charles Balch in the United States and Pino Cascinelli in Italy (the Intergroup Melanoma Surgical Trial [42] and the WHO Melanoma Group Trial Number 14 [43]), both failing to demonstrate a statistically significant overall survival benefit. However, both studies showed a nonsignificant trend in favor of ELND.

The History of Radiation Therapy for Melanoma

The use of radiation therapy in the treatment of melanoma has a checkered history, with periods of enthusiasm alternating with bouts of skepticism. Following the discovery of radiation and radioactivity by Roentgen [44], Becquerel [45], and the Curies [46] in 1895–1896, radiation was applied enthusiastically to a wide range of medical conditions, including cancers [47]. However, its inappropriate use and the occurrence of late complications led to disrepute. Early reports of radiation treatment for melanoma were particularly disappointing, leading to the conclusion that melanomas responded poorly to radiation. In retrospect, many of these early treatments were for advanced, incurable melanomas for which meaningful responses would have been unlikely.

The concept that melanoma was a radioresistant tumor was strengthened by *in vitro* studies of the response of melanoma cell lines by Dewey and Barranco [48, 49]. Both reported that fewer melanoma cells than non-melanoma cells were killed by low doses of radiation. However, enhanced cell killing occurred for higher radiation doses than the usual daily amounts administered. This response to radiation was viewed as an intrinsic characteristic of melanoma cells, which had a high capacity for repair of radiation damage, but which could be overcome by delivering higher daily doses of radiation. A large number of *in vivo* studies ensued, indicating that high response rates resulted from a hypofractionated treatment schedule (a small number of large fractions of radiation). This became the prevailing methodology for both therapeutic and adjuvant radiation therapy in the late twentieth century [50].

There was, however, growing evidence of a marked heterogeneity in melanoma response to radiation therapy from both *in vitro* and *in vivo* studies. *In vitro* cell line and xenograft studies showed that melanomas had a wide range of radiation sensitivities, from highly sensitive to highly resistant types. A randomized clinical trial failed to show an improvement for an extreme hypofractionated treatment schedule (8 Gray \times 4 fractions) compared with a mildly hypofractionated schedule (2.5 Gray \times 20 fractions). It has now become clear that most melanomas are somewhat less sensitive to radiation than other common cancer types, such that mildly hypofractionated schedules are appropriate. These have become the most common treatment schedules for adjuvant radiation therapy following resection of primary melanomas with desmoplastic features or positive margins, and following regional lymph node dissection. A Phase III clinical trial clearly showed evidence of substantially lower node field recurrence rates (18% vs. 31%) in patients at high risk of regional recurrence [51].

Novel strategies to improve the response of melanomas have included the combination of radiation with hyperthermia [52]; however, uniform and selective heating of deeply placed tumors was difficult. This was complicated by the lack of specialized equipment being readily avail-

able except for a few institutions. Other methods have included selective targeting of melanoma cells using boron neutron capture therapy (BNCT) [53] or alpha-emitting isotopes attached to melanoma-selective probes (TAT-targeted alpha therapy) [54]. None of these approaches has become widely available for clinical practice. By contrast, proton therapy has been used with great success for uveal melanomas for several decades in selected institutions [55, 56].

The modern era of radiation therapy is dominated by continued improvements in the delivery of radiation from linear accelerators. Dose rates have increased, reducing concerns regarding tumor and organ motion; multileaf collimators (MLCs) have replaced single-square apertures, allowing greater conformality of tumor shape from different angles; “onboard” imaging devices (plain X-ray, CT, or MRI scans) allow real-time imaging of tumors and normal anatomy. Inverse treatment planning allows dose sculpting around critical normal tissues, and dynamic motion of all moving components permits safety margins around tumors to be reduced. This allows for higher radiation doses to be delivered to the tumors without causing unacceptable complications.

The availability of these advances has led to the development of “stereotactic” radiation therapy, in which very high radiation doses, delivered as single treatments, or as a highly hypofractionated schedule with great precision, are used to ablate tumors. This technology was used initially for the treatment of intracranial metastases, called stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS), and is delivered using linear accelerators, the Gamma Knife or the CyberKnife. Studies indicated that the differing radiosensitivities observed for conventionally fractionated treatments did not persist following ablative therapy, with high response rates for all tumor types, including melanoma [57]. This technology is increasingly applied to tumors throughout the body, called “stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT).”

With the recent availability of effective systemic therapies for locally recurrent and metastatic melanoma, a new role for radiation therapy is emerging. The success of immuno-

therapy depends on the activation of cytotoxic T lymphocytes. Priming doses of radiation are used to disrupt melanoma cells, releasing melanoma antigens and thereby facilitating the anti-tumor immune response to immunotherapy or as an abscopal radiation response at distant sites [58].

The Evolution of Locoregional Techniques for Treating Melanoma Metastases: Isolated Limb Perfusion, Isolated Limb Infusion, Intralesional and Topical Therapies

Until the mid-twentieth century, patients with locally advanced or extensive metastatic melanoma involving a limb were usually treated by amputation. This dramatic and disabling surgery was able to be avoided in most cases after the introduction, in 1958, of the isolated limb perfusion (ILP) technique by Creech and Kremenz et al. in Louisiana [59]. This procedure involved temporary isolation of the limb vasculature from the general circulation, and then perfusion of the “isolated” limb with cytotoxic drugs via large-bore catheters inserted surgically into the major vessels of the groin or axilla and connected to a modified heart-lung external circuit. Overall response rates of around 80% were achieved with ILP, and use of the technique meant that limb amputation was able to be avoided in most patients [60].

The ILP technique was complex and technically challenging. Consequently, it was only performed in a few specialized centers. In 1994, Thompson et al. in Sydney described a similar but much simpler technique that they called isolated limb infusion (ILI) [61]. Percutaneously inserted arterial and venous catheters were used, and after inflating a pneumatic tourniquet around the proximal limb the infused drug was circulated using a syringe and a three-way tap via a simple external circuit containing a heating device without an oxygenator. The results obtained by ILI were similar to those achieved by ILP, and ILI is now being used at many melanoma treatment centers around the world [62].

Another form of treatment that has been used to treat melanoma in transit metastases is intratumoral injection. A wide variety of agents have been injected. Reports dating as far back as 1896 [63] have documented intratumoral injection of bacillus prodigiosus, BCG, and the cytotoxic drug thiotepa [64–67]. In the 1980s, there were reports of intralesional injection of interleukin-2 [68], and more recently of Rose Bengal (PV-10) [69] and talimogene laherparepvec (TVEC, “Imlygic”) [70]. Good local control of injected lesions has been reported for each of the latter three agents. Involution of nearby, non-injected lesions can also occur, and occasionally there is an abscopal effect on distant metastatic disease. These effects on non-injected tumor deposits are attributed to an antitumoral immune response enhanced by the release of antigens from tumor cells damaged or killed by the intratumoral injection.

Another local therapy technique for melanoma recurrences is electrochemotherapy (electroporation) [71–75]. First reported in 1987 [76], this technique involves intratumoral or systemic administration of a cytotoxic drug (usually bleomycin), and then application of an electrical field to tumor deposits using an array of needle electrodes. Transient permeability of the tumor cell membrane to the drug occurs, resulting in cell death [72]. Yet another form of local therapy for recurrent melanoma involves the topical application of diphencyprone. This was first reported by Damian and Thompson in 2007 [77] and is often effective in controlling or eliminating extensive but superficial melanoma recurrences, sometimes with an abscopal effect on metastases at remote sites.

Early Studies of Lymphatic Anatomy and Physiology Leading to Understanding of the Sentinel Node Concept

In 280 BC, the existence of the lymphatic system was first noted by Erasistratus, who described vessels that contained milky fluid and terminated in mesenteric lymph nodes, and considered them to be a form of blood vessel. Nearly two centuries later, lymphatic vessels in the mesentery were

rediscovered by Gasparo Aselli in Italy. He too proposed that they were lacteal “veins.” In the early part of the seventeenth century, several investigators including Vessling, Folius, Tulp, Wallee, and Pecquet confirmed the existence of lymphatic vessels [78]. The Danish polymath Thomas Bartholin reported the existence of the thoracic duct in 1652, and appears to have been the first to clearly state that the lymphatic system was separate from the vascular system [79]. He proposed (correctly) that lymph originated from the blood by filtration. He was also the first to introduce the term “lymphatic”, referring to the lymph vessels that he observed as “*vasa lymphatica*.” Subsequently, a number of investigators attempted to map the lymphatic system, including Nuck (1650–1692), a professor of anatomy in the Netherlands, who injected mercury mixed with tin and lead into lymphatics to demonstrate their course towards lymph nodes [80].

The function of lymphatics and lymph nodes was essentially unknown until the studies of the famous German pathologist, Rudolf Ludwig Carl Virchow, in the mid-nineteenth century. In 1863, he proposed that lymph from any particular body site drained through lymphatics to specific lymph nodes, and then onwards to other lymph nodes [81]. This proposal was based on autopsy findings in a sailor who had a tattoo on the skin of his arm and was found to have obvious carbon pigment in a single axillary lymph node. The sentinel node concept is thus at least 150 years old!

Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy: A New Gold Standard for Melanoma Staging

As previously discussed, “elective” lymph node dissection was widely practiced in patients with melanomas >1.5 mm in thickness until the 1980s. It was known that only about 20% of patients could possibly benefit, because only this percentage had metastatic disease in their regional nodes, but there was no way of identifying them. In 1992, Morton and Cochran et al. published a landmark article [82] describing the technique of sentinel node biopsy (SNB). This was practice-

changing, and allowed the 20% of node-positive patients to be identified and offered a completion lymph node dissection. In 1994, a large international study, the first Multicenter Selective Lymphadenectomy Trial (MSLT-I), was commenced [83], and 2001 patients were randomized. The final results, published in 2014 [84] with 10 years minimum follow-up, showed no overall survival benefit for SN biopsy. However, there was a substantial survival benefit (compared with patients who were simply observed) in the subgroup of patients who had a positive SN followed by an immediate completion lymph node dissection (CLND). The great advantage of SN biopsy for all patients, however, was that it provided much better staging than had been possible previously, and allowed more accurate estimates of prognosis to be made. Consequently, SN status has become an essential part of the AJCC/UICC Melanoma Staging System. Whether CLND is necessary in all patients found to be SN positive is being assessed in another trial designed by Morton, the Second Multicenter Selective Lymphadenectomy Trial (MSLT-II). Initial results indicate that routine CLND in SN-positive patients does not improve survival outcome [85].

Reliable SN identification requires careful lymphatic mapping, and although Morton’s initial studies were with blue dye only, the importance of high-quality lymphoscintigraphy soon became apparent. Detailed lymphoscintigraphic studies by Uren, Thompson et al. in the 1990s, undertaken in the course of SN mapping for melanoma and breast cancer, provided important new insights into lymphatic anatomy that had major implications for melanoma surgery [86, 87].

Treatment of Metastatic Melanoma with Conventional Systemic Therapies: 1960 to 2010

Chemotherapy

For half a century, following the introduction of cytotoxic chemotherapy for solid human cancers in the 1950s, efforts in treating metastatic melanoma focused largely on attempts to use this