Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery

The impact of COVID19 on the presentation, diagnosis and management of cutaneous melanoma and squamous cell carcinoma in a single tertiary referral centre --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JPRAS-D-22-00067R1		
Article Type:	Short Communication		
Keywords:	COVID19; melanoma; squamous cell carcinoma; Presentation; Diagnosis; Staging		
Corresponding Author:	Adam McClean, BMBS Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust UNITED KINGDOM		
First Author:	Adam McClean, BMBS, BMedSci, MRCS(ENT)		
Order of Authors:	Adam McClean, BMBS, BMedSci, MRCS(ENT)		
	Paolo Matteucci, MB ChB MRCS FRCS(Plast)		
	Joshua Totty, MBBS, PGCertRes, MRCS, MD, FHEA		

© 2022. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/



Hull York Medical School

Hull University of Hull Hull, HU6 7RX, UK

York University of York York, YO10 5DD, UK

> T 0870 1245500 info@hyms.ac.uk www.hyms.ac.uk

6th January 2022

Dear Editors,

We are pleased to submit our manuscript, "The impact of COVID19 on the presentation, diagnosis and management of cutaneous melanoma and squamous cell carcinoma in a single tertiary referral centre" to JPRAS.

In this retrospective matched cohort study, we have identified significant discrepancies in the presentation and identification of both melanoma and cutaneous SCC, arising as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, which is still ongoing and causing a significant threat to services.

The authors of this manuscript have read and made all reasonable efforts to ensure it is compliant with the JPRAS "Guide for Authors".

All authors have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the paper.

The material in this manuscript is original and has not previously been published elsewhere nor submitted for publication simultaneously.

If accepted, the paper will not be published elsewhere in the same or similar form, in English or any other language, without written consent of the copyright holder.

Adam McClean - Core Surgical Trainee

©≊♥N UNIVERSITY OF HULL





Detailed Response to Reviewers



Hull York Medical School

Hull University of Hull Hull, HU6 7RX, UK

York University of York York, YO10 5DD, UK

> T 0870 1245500 info@hyms.ac.uk www.hyms.ac.uk

22nd April 2022

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your feedback regarding our manuscript "The impact of COVID19 on the presentation, diagnosis and management of cutaneous melanoma and squamous cell carcinoma in a single tertiary referral centre"

This has been reformatted into a short communication comprising of 876 words, 2 tables and 5 references.

Adam McClean - Core Surgical Trainee







- 1 Title: The impact of COVID19 on the presentation, diagnosis and management of cutaneous
- 2 melanoma and squamous cell carcinoma in a single tertiary referral centre
- 3

4 Authors:

- 5 Adam McClean¹
- 6 Paolo Matteucci¹
- 7 Joshua Totty^{1,2}
- 8 Affiliations:
- 9 ¹Department of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Hull University Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust,
- 10 Hull, UK
- 11 ²Centre for Clinical Sciences, Hull York Medical School, Hull, UK
- 12 Corresponding Author and Address:
- 13 Adam McClean
- 14 21 Kingsdale Avenue, Ilkley, LS296QL
- 15 07583848857
- 16 Adam.mcclean1@nhs.net

- 18 Data presented in part at the 10th World Congress of Melanoma 15th-17th April 2021
- 19 Keywords: COVID19; Melanoma; Squamous Cell Carcinoma; Presentation; Diagnosis; Staging
- 20

21 Introduction

22 The SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has had a substantial impact on the provision of surgical services 23 worldwide¹. In the United Kingdom, staff redeployment and reduced staffing due to infection and 24 self-isolation has reduced the availability of clinic slots and theatre lists. Additionally, there has been 25 a substantial reduction in the volume of patients presenting to general practice and hospitals during 26 the height of the pandemic¹. The potential compounded effects of a reduction in referrals along skin 27 cancer pathways and availability of specialist review and intervention has placed patients at risk of delayed investigation, diagnosis, and treatment, and incurred a possibility of adverse outcomes and 28 an increase in morbidity and mortality.^{2,3} The aim of this study was to assess the impact of the 29 30 pandemic upon patients presenting to a speciality skin cancer service.

31 Methods

This was a single-centre retrospective matched cohort study. All patients diagnosed with cutaneous melanoma or squamous cell carcinoma between April and October 2020 were included and compared to those diagnosed in the same time frame in 2019. Disease specific outcomes included Breslow thickness, Clark's level, pT and TNM staging at presentation. Service outcomes included referral source and time to referral, diagnosis, and treatment. Data analysis techniques are described in supplement 1.

38 Results

39 Malignant Melanoma (MM)

There was a 32.1% overall reduction in MM diagnoses in 2020 compared to 2019 (74 vs 109). A
summary of results is shown in table 1.

Time from referral to clinic review was not significantly different between the two cohorts. Time from clinic review to biopsy was significantly shorter in 2020 (17.4 days vs 27.1 days, p = 0.03), as was time from MDT discussion to subsequent treatment (35.2 days vs 47.3 days, p<0.01). Breslow

45	thickness, TNM and pT staging trended towards an increase in 2020, however none of these
46	achieved statistical significance. There was a significant increase in Clark's level in 2020 ($p < 0.01$).
47	Squamous Cell Carcinoma (SCC)
48	There was an overall reduction in SCC diagnoses of 27.7% in 2020 (198 vs 274). A summary of results
49	is shown in table 2.
50	Time from referral to clinic review was equivocal. There was no significant difference in time from
51	clinic to first procedure (37.29 days vs 35.09 days, p=0.562). Time from procedure to MDT discussion
52	was significantly shorter in 2020 (21.60 days vs 26.50 days, p<0.0001). There was a significant
53	increase in MDT recommendations for further treatment in 2020 (19.5% vs 16.0%, p=0.034). There
54	was a significant increase in tumour, nodal, and metastatic stage at presentation in 2020 when
55	compared to 2019.
56	In 2020, the proportion of diagnoses originating from primary care was significantly increased
57	(76.5% vs 67.4% p=0.049) and new lesions identified during secondary care follow up decreased

58 (18.0% vs 27.7%). Routine GP referrals were similar across both groups (5.5% vs 5%).

59 Discussion

60 The findings of this study demonstrate both successes and concerns in the management of skin cancer during the pandemic. Evidence demonstrates that clinic wait times have reached record 61 62 levels⁴, and while the initial expectation is that this would slow progression through the cancer care 63 pathway, this study demonstrates evidence to the contrary. During the pandemic there was no 64 increase in time between GP referral and specialist clinic review for patients with suspected skin 65 cancer, and once within the hospital pathway patients received accelerated care. This may be due to an increased focus on higher risk cancers. A reduction in histological samples due to reduced theatre 66 workload may have also reduced the wait time for samples to be analysed, thus decreasing time 67

between surgery and MDT. Additionally, the implementation of "hot" clinics with same day excisions
likely further reduced wait times.

Fewer patients were seen overall in the 2020 cohort, potentially reducing the strain on the service,
and shortening wait times. This is reflected by a reduction in GP fast track referrals during the
pandemic, estimated to be as high as 60% nationally,⁵ with a more modest reduction of 19.5% seen
in this study. A reduction in primary care referrals suggests the existence of a cohort of patients who
have not yet presented to general practice.

This study found a 53.8% reduction in new lesions diagnosed through secondary care follow up. A significant reduction in SCCs identified during follow up appointments demonstrates a possible explanation for part of this missing cohort of patients, with 'routine' follow-up cancellations likely leading to missed diagnoses. This same effect was not seen with MM, which may be due to clinical prioritisation, a younger cohort and lower risk of second primary lesions.

80 This study shows some evidence that patients are presenting at a later stage of disease. MMs 81 demonstrated an increased Clark's level during the pandemic, with Breslow thickness trending 82 towards an increase. The trend in SCC is more concerning, with significant increases in tumour, 83 nodal, and metastatic stage at presentation. Treatment of metastatic SCC can involve additional 84 surgery, oncology input, and frequent follow up. This, combined with the aforementioned missing cohort of patients, means that the impact of COVID19 on skin cancer services is ongoing, as once 85 86 standard practice is restored, the service is likely to be faced with an increased patient load, 87 requiring more invasive, time-consuming and costly treatment. We therefore suggest that it would 88 be valuable to continue multi-centre prospective data collection to assist in resource planning.

89

90 Conflict of interest statement

91 None

92 Ethical Approval

93 Approval for retrospective data collection obtained via local audit department

94

- 95 Funding
- 96 None

Demographic	2019 (n = 109)	2020 (n = 74)	<i>p</i> =
Age (±SD)	64.3 (±16.5)	63.5 (±17.0)	0.769
Gender			
Female (%)	60 (55%)	42 (57%)	0.819
Male (%)	49 (45%)	32 (43%)	
Location (%)			
Head and Neck	20 (18.7%)	12 (16.2%)	
Upper Limb	28 (26.2%)	18 (24.3%)	0.850
Lower Limb	31 (29%)	26 (35.1%)	
Trunk	18 (26.2%)	18 (24.3%)	
Stage			
T Stage (%)			
Т1	52 (49.1%)	33 (44.6%)	
Т2	26 (24.4%)	13 (17.6%)	0.381
ТЗ	10 (9.4%)	9 (12.2%)	
Т4	18 (17.0%)	19 (25.7%)	

N Stage (%)			
NO	94 (88.7%)	59 (79.7%)	
N1	8 (7.5%)	10 (13.5%)	0.098
N2	3 (2.8%)	3 (4.1%)	
N3	1 (0.9%)	2 (2.7%)	
M Stage (%)			
МО	104 (97.2%)	72 (97.3%)	0.967
М1	3 (2.8%)	2 (2.7%)	
PT Stage (%)			
PT1a	43 (39.4%)	21 (28.4%)	
PT1b	9 (8.3%)	12 (16.2%)	
PT2a	24 (22.0%)	10 (13.5%)	
PT2b	2 (1.8%)	3 (4.1%)	0.168
РТЗа	6 (5.5%)	4 (5.4%)	
PT3b	4 (3.7%)	5 (6.8%)	
PT4a	4 (3.7%)	6 (8.1%)	
PT4b	14 (12.8%)	13 (17.6%)	
Measurement			
Lesion Diameter (mm)	13.33 (± 8.88)	13.35 (±8.44)	0.952
– Mean (±SD)			
Breslow Thickness	2.3 (±4.1)	3.1 (±3.7)	0.205
(mm) – Mean (±SD)			
Clark's Level (%)			

1	l	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
	II	12 (12.2%)	0 (0%)	
		24 (24.5%)	22 (31.0%)	<0.01
	IV	57 (58.2%)	39 (54.9%)	
`	v	5 (5.1%)	10 (14.1%)	

Table 1: Cutaneous melanoma results summary

Demographic	2019 (n=274)	2020 (n=198)	P =
Age (±SD)	80.0 (±9.9)	78.8 (±11.2)	0.234
Gender			
Female (%)	78 (28%)	61 (30%)	0.498
Male (%)	204 (72%)	139 (70%)	0.490
Stage (%)			
T1	112 (40.9%)	137 (69.2%)	
Т2	154 (56.2%)	31 (15.7%)	<0.001
тз	8 (2.9%)	30 (15.2%)	
Τ4	0	0	
NO	274 (100%)	195 (98%)	
N1	0	3 (1.5%)	0.026
N2	0	1 (0.5%)	
M0	274 (100%)	195 (98%)	0.02
M1	0	4 (2%)	0.05
Measurement			

			0.415
(mm) – Mean (±SD)			
Complete Excision	95.8%	94.4%	0.924
(%)			

REFERENCES

105	1. Collaborative C. Elective surgery cancellations due to the COVID-19 pandemic: global predictive
106	modelling to inform surgical recovery plans. The British journal of surgery
107	2020;107(11):1440-49. doi: 10.1002/bjs.11746 [published Online First: 20200613]
108	2. Capitelli-McMahon H, Hurley A, Pinder R, et al. Characterising non-melanoma skin cancer
109	undergoing surgical management during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Plastic,
110	Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery 2020 doi: 10.1016/j.bjps.2020.10.042 [published Online
111	First: 31 Oct 2020]
112	3. Nolan GS, Dunne JA, Kiely AL, et al. The effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on skin cancer surgery in
113	the United Kingdom: a national, multi-centre, prospective cohort study and survey of Plastic
114	Surgeons. BJS (British Journal of Surgery) 2020;n/a(n/a) doi: 10.1002/bjs.12047
115	4. Griffin S. Covid-19: Waiting times in England reach record highs. Bmj 2020;370:m3557. doi:
116	10.1136/bmj.m3557 [published Online First: 20200911]
117	5. Mahase E. Covid-19: Urgent cancer referrals fall by 60%, showing "brutal" impact of pandemic.
118	<i>Bmj</i> 2020;369:m2386. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2386 [published Online First: 20200612]
119	

STROBE Checklist

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material STROBE checklist.doc Supplementary 1 - data analysis

Click here to access/download Supplementary Material Data analysis supplement.docx