



Radiological simultaneous portohepatic vein embolization (RASPE) and major hepatectomy with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)

Georgios K. Glantzounis, Anastasia Karampa, Dimitra Peristeri

HPB Unit, Department of Surgery, University Hospital of Ioannina and School of Medicine, University of Ioannina, Ioannina, Greece

Correspondence to: Georgios K. Glantzounis, MD, PhD, FEBS. Professor of Surgery and Transplantation, Head of HPB Unit, Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, University of Ioannina, 45 110, Ioannina, Greece. Email: ggglantzounis@uoi.gr; ggglantzounis@gmail.com.

Comment on: Laurent C, Fernandez B, Marichez A, *et al.* Radiological Simultaneous Portohepatic Vein Embolization (RASPE) Before Major Hepatectomy A Better Way to Optimize Liver Hypertrophy Compared to Portal Vein Embolization. *Ann Surg* 2020;272:199-205.

Submitted Dec 30, 2020. Accepted for publication Feb 02, 2021.

doi: 10.21037/hbsn-20-865

View this article at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/hbsn-20-865>

1 Radiological simultaneous portohepatic vein
2 embolization (RASPE) is a relatively new technique, which
3 aims to rapidly increase the future liver remnant (FLR) in
4 patients with very small FLR in order to undergo major
5 hepatectomy.

6 It was initially described by Hwang *et al.* as a two stages
7 procedure, which, included portal vein embolization (PVE)
8 first, followed by embolization of right hepatic vein (HVE)
9 after several days (1). They concluded that sequential
10 application of PVE and HVE is safe and leads to a stronger
11 compensatory regeneration of the FLR than does PVE
12 alone. Recently, the process of simultaneous portohepatic
13 vein embolization has been reported by Guiu *et al.* (2).
14 Briefly the procedure was done under general anesthesia.
15 The right HV (and accessory right HV when present) were
16 accessed first. Then the distal part of the right HV was
17 punctured under US and the right PV branch was assessed
18 with US-guided technique. Embolization was conducted
19 using a mixture of iodized oil and n-butyl-cyanoacrylate. It
20 was concluded that simultaneous PVE and HVE induces
21 safe and rapid hypertrophy of the FLR before right
22 hepatectomy (2).

23 Furthermore, two very recent studies by Laurent
24 *et al.* (3) and Guiu *et al.* (4), mainly with patients with liver
25 metastases and inadequate FLR, showed that RASPE or
26 liver venous deprivation (LVD) which is a similar term,
27 is safe and induces faster and greater FLR, with better
28 functional capacity in comparison to PVE, with less risk of
29 post-operative liver failure. For this reason RASPE could
30 be considered a safer “radiological associating liver partition

and portal vein ligation” (ALPPS) for staged hepatectomy. 31

It would certainly be interesting to explore the potential 32
applications of RASPE in patients with hepatocellular 33
carcinoma (HCC). 34

HCC is the 5th most common cancer worldwide and the 35
3rd most common cause of death. Despite the vaccination 36
for hepatitis B and the effective anti-viral treatment for 37
hepatitis B and C the world incidence is increasing. This 38
is mainly due to the increase in non-alcoholic fatty liver 39
disease (NAFLD) and steatohepatitis which are the hepatic 40
components of metabolic syndrome (5). 41

HCC is mainly developed in chronic liver disease, 42
where there is hepatic steatosis, fibrosis or cirrhosis. 43
Liver resection and liver transplantation are the main 44
treatment options in order to achieve long term survival 45
or cure. Liver transplantation offers very good results, but 46
has many limitations, as it is usually applied in selected 47
patients which mainly fulfil the Milano criteria (single 48
tumor <5 cm, 3 tumors <3 cm each). Liver resection is the 49
treatment of choice for large HCCs with preserved liver 50
function. Recent evidence suggests that liver resection can 51
expand its indications as it can be applied even in advanced 52
stages of the disease (multinodular HCCs, HCCs with 53
limited macrovascular invasion) with satisfactory long- 54
term results (6,7). Furthermore, anatomic resections with 55
broad surgical margins (>1 cm) provide better results, as 56
HCC has a tendency to invade the small branches of portal 57
vein, and to cause intrahepatic dissemination. However, 58
major liver surgery is prohibited by the presence of chronic 59
liver disease, which can have a significant impact on portal 60

61 venous pressure and significantly decreases the capacity for
62 liver regeneration.

63 The gold standard for patients with HCC and inadequate
64 FLR is PVE. The main indications for PVE, in patients
65 with HCC and presence of liver fibrosis or cirrhosis, are
66 FLR <40% when liver function is good (ICGR15 <10%)
67 and FLR <50% when liver function is affected (ICGR15:
68 10–20%) (8). However, PVE has limitations: it can not
69 be applied effectively when FLR is very small (<25%) and
70 a long waiting period (>4 weeks) is required before liver
71 resection, in order that adequate hypertrophy of FLR can
72 be achieved. Furthermore, segment IV embolization
73 is technically very demanding, when an extended right
74 hepatectomy is required.

75 In order to increase the regeneration of the FLR, the
76 ideal method should be safe, induce rapid liver regeneration
77 with good FLR functionality and be associated with low
78 postoperative mortality.

79 ALPPS, which is the alternative of PVE in patients with
80 small FLR, provides rapid liver regeneration but not with
81 good functionality. A recent systematic review assessed the
82 role of ALPPS in 176 patients with HCC and inadequate
83 FLR. They concluded that ALPPS is safe and feasible to
84 treat selected patients with initially unresectable HCC but
85 with high 90-day mortality (17.6%) and, as yet unclear
86 oncological outcomes (9).

87 RASPE has the potential to overcome the disadvantages
88 of PVE and ALPPS: it increases the FLR rapidly and
89 effectively, with preservation of liver function (FLR-F) as
90 expressed by the use of Technetium (99mTc) mebrofenin
91 scintigraphy (4), is safe and with low post-operative
92 mortality. Furthermore, embolization of middle HVE
93 facilitates the performance of extended right hepatectomy.

94 The increase in regeneration rate *vs.* PVE could be due
95 to several factors: embolization of the HVE could prevent
96 persistent portal inflow and could reduce porto-portal
97 collaterals. Furthermore, RASPE can increase liver injury
98 since occlusion of HVE out-flow and simultaneous PVE
99 could reduce the flow in the hepatic artery through the
100 hepatic arterial buffer response.

101 There are, of course, several questions which have to be
102 answered: what will be the effect of RASPE in patients with
103 liver fibrosis or cirrhosis, where liver regeneration capacity
104 is reduced? The majority of patients, where RASPE has
105 been done, are patients with colorectal metastases, where
106 liver is not fibrotic. Also, as the combination of TACE
107 and PVE seems to be more effective in patients with large
108 HCCs or satellite lesions (8), what will be the risks for the

liver after sequential application of TACE and RASPE? 109

RASPE is also a technically demanding procedure and it
still has to be shown if it is easily reproducible. 110 111

The randomized trial which is running for the effect of
RASPE *vs.* PVE in patients with colo-rectal liver metastases
should provide several answers, on the FLR changes at
3 weeks after the procedure (10). However, a similar trial
should be conducted with patients with HCC, as the
regeneration process is different in diseased liver. 112 113 114 115 116 117

Overall, RASPE has the potential to become the
procedure of choice in patients with HCC and small FLR
(<25%). 118 119 120

Acknowledgments 121 122

Funding: None. 123 124

Footnote 125 126

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned
by the editorial office of *Hepatobiliary Surgery and Nutrition*.
The article did not undergo external peer review. 127 128 129 130 131

Conflicts of Interest: All authors have completed the ICMJE
uniform disclosure form (available at <https://hbsn.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/hbsn-20-865/coif>).
The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare. 132 133 134 135 136

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. 137 138 139 140 141

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/>. 142 143 144 145 146 147 148 149 150 151

References 152

1. Hwang S, Lee SG, Ko GY, et al. Sequential preoperative
ipsilateral hepatic vein embolization after portal vein
embolization to induce further liver regeneration in 153 154 155 156

- 157 patients with hepatobiliary malignancy. *Ann Surg*
 158 2009;249:608-616.
- 159 2. Guiu B, Chevallier P, Denys A, et al. Simultaneous trans-
 160 hepatic portal and hepatic vein embolization before major
 161 hepatectomy: the liver venous deprivation technique. *Eur*
 162 *Radiol* 2016;26:4259-67.
- 163 3. Laurent C, Fernandez B, Marichez A, et al. Radiological
 164 Simultaneous Portohepatic Vein Embolization
 165 (RASPE) Before Major Hepatectomy A Better Way to
 166 Optimize Liver Hypertrophy Compared to Portal Vein
 167 Embolization. *Ann Surg* 2020;272:199-205.
- 168 4. Guiu B, Quenete F, Panaro Q, et al. Liver venous deprivation
 169 versus portal vein embolization before major hepatectomy:
 170 future liver remnant volumetric and functional changes.
 171 *Hepatobiliary Surg Nutr* 2020;9:564-76.
- 172 5. Anastasopoulos N-A, Lianos G, Tatsi V, et al. Clinical
 173 heterogeneity in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver
 174 disease associated with hepatocellular carcinoma. *Expert*
 175 *Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2020;14:1025-33.
- 176 6. Glantzounis K, Paliouras A, Stylianidi MC, et al. The role
 177 of liver resection in the management of intermediate and
 178 advanced stage hepatocellular carcinoma. A systematic
 179 review. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2018;44:195-208.
7. Chen LT, Martinelli E, Cheng AL, et al. Pan-Asian
 adapted ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for the
 management of patients with intermediate and advanced/
 relapsed hepatocellular carcinoma: a TOSeESMO
 initiative endorsed by CSCO, ISMPO, JSMO, KSMO,
 MOS and SSO. *Ann Oncol* 2020;31:334-51.
8. Glantzounis GK, Tokidis E, Basourakos SP, et al. The role
 of portal vein embolization in the surgical management of
 primary hepatobiliary cancers. A systematic review. *Eur J*
Surg Oncol 2017;43:32-41.
9. Zhang J, Huang H, Bian J, et al. Safety, feasibility, and
 efficacy of associating liver partition and portal vein
 ligation for staged hepatectomy in treating hepatocellular
 carcinoma: a systematic review. *Ann Transl Med*
 2020;8:1246.
10. Deshayes E, Piron L, Bouvier A et al. Study protocol
 of the HYPER-LIV01 trial: a multicenter phase
 II, prospective and randomized study comparing
 simultaneous portal and hepatic vein embolization to
 portal vein mobilization for hypertrophy of the future
 liver remnant before major hepatectomy for colo-rectal
 liver metastases. *BMC Cancer* 2020;20:574.

Cite this article as: Glantzounis GK, Karampa A, Peristeri D. Radiological simultaneous portohepatic vein embolization (RASPE) and major hepatectomy with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). *HepatoBiliary Surg Nutr* 2021;10(2):267-269. doi: 10.21037/hbsn-20-865