

Locoregional recurrence in patients with node negative early breast cancer who received adjuvant hypofractionated radiotherapy regimen vs. conventional fractionation regimen after breast conservative surgery retrospective study

Thesis

Submitted for Partial Fulfillment of Master Degree in
Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine

By

Engy Salah Ramzy Todary

M.B.B.C.H

Under Supervision of

Prof.Dr.Hany Mohammed Abd Elaziz

Professor of clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine
Faculty of Medicine -Ain-Shams University

Prof. Dr. Dina Ahmed Salem

Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine
Faculty of Medicine -Ain-Shams University

Dr. Amr Shafik Tawfik

Assistant Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine
Faculty of Medicine Ain-Shams University

Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University

2019



Acknowledgment

*First, and foremost, I feel always indebted to **Allah**, the Most Kind and the Most Merciful.*

*Words can never express my hearty thanks and indebtedness to **Prof. Dr. Hany Mohammed Abd Elaziz**, Professor of clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine , Faculty of Medicine -Ain-Shams University, for his great support and continuous encouragement and guidance to complete this work. It was a great honor to work under his guidance and supervision.*

*I wish also to express my gratitude to **Prof. Dr. Dina Ahmed Salem**, Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine, Faculty of Medicine -Ain-Shams University, for her great efforts, kind advice, support and encouragement throughout the whole work.*

*My deepest appreciation and grateful thanks to **Dr. Amr Shafik Tawfik**, Assistant Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine Faculty of Medicine Ain-Shams University, for his meticulous supervision, continuous guidance, and constructive criticism.*

*Last but not least, I can't forget to thank all members of my Family, specially my **Parents**, and my **Friends**, for their great support and pushing me forward in every step of my life.*

 **Engy Salah Ramzy Todary**

List of Contents

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page No.</i>
List of Abbreviations	i
List of Tables.....	iii
List of Figures	v
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work.....	4
Review of Literature	
Epidemiology and Etiology	5
Pathology.....	13
Management.....	31
Patients and Methods.....	104
Results.....	108
Discussion	153
Conclusion.....	159
Recommendations	160
Summary	161
References	163
Arabic Summary	—

List of Abbreviations

Abbrev.	Full-term
ABUS	: Automated Breast Ultrasound System
AIs	: Aromatase Inhibitors
ALN	: Axillary Lymph Node
AR	: Axillary Recurrence
ASTRO	: American Society of Radiation Oncology
BCS	: Breast Conservative Surgery
BCT	: Breast Conservative Therapy
BSGI	: Breast Specific Gamma Imaging
CEDM	: Contrast Enhanced Digital Mammography
CESM	: Contrast Enhanced Spectral Mammography
CFRT	: Conventional Fractionation Radiotherapy
CMF	: Cyclophosphamide, Methotrexate and Fluorouracil
DCIS	: Ductal Carcinoma In Situ
DFS	: Disease Free Survival
DWI	: Diffusion-Weighted Image
EBCTCG	: Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group
EQD2	: Equivalent Dose Delivered in 2 Gy fractions
ER	: ER receptor
F	: Fraction
G	: Grade
HER2	: Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2
HFRT	: Hypofractionated Radiotherapy
HHUS	: Hand-Held US
HP	: Herceptin/Perjeta
IHC	: Immunohistochemistry

ILC	: Invasive Lobular Carcinoma
IMRT	: Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy
IORT	: Intra-Operative Radiotherapy
LCIS	: Lobular Carcinoma In-Situ
LRR	: Locoregional Recurrence
LVI	: lymphovascular Invasion
MRI	: Magnetic Resonance Imaging
NCCN	: National Comprehensive Cancer Network
NICE	: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
OS	: Overall Survival
PEM	: Positron Emission Mammography
PR	: Progesterone Receptor
ROR	: Risk Of Recurrence
RS	: Recurrence Score
SD	: Standard deviation
SLN	: Sentinel Lymph Node
SLNB	: Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy
SPSS	: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences
TNBC	: Triple Negative Breast Cancer
US	: Ultrasound
WBI	: Whole Breast Irradiation

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	The Van Nuys Prognostic Index (VNPI) Scoring System	14
Table (2):	AJCC anatomic stage groups	49
Table (3):	Estimate of biologically effective dose late effects in lungs for four fractionation regimen	72
Table (4):	Normal tissue effects by fractionation schedule in START-A.....	79
Table (5):	Normal tissue effects by fractionation in START-B.....	80
Table (6):	Number of normal tissue events reported in START-A and B trials.	81
Table (7):	Meta-analysis of randomized trials comparing hypofractionated radiotherapy to conventionally fractionated radiotherapy	84
Table (8):	Patient assessed moderate/marked normal tissue effects in the arm or shoulder following lymphatic irradiation in START-A and START-B and START-pilot	89
Table (9):	Physician assessed moderate/marked normal tissue effects in the arm or shoulder following lymphatic irradiation in START-A and START-B and START-pilot	90
Table (10):	Epidemiological characters' distribution between CFRT and HFRT groups.....	109
Table (11):	Histopathological characters distribution between CFRT and HFRT groups.....	113

Table (12): Treatment characteristics distribution in both arms of treatment:	126
Table (13): Radiotherapy pulmonary toxicity between CFRT & HFRT:	132
Table (14): Locoregional recurrence in the whole cohort.....	132
Table (15): Distant metastasis in the whole cohort:	133
Table (16): Comparison between patients who received CFRT vs. HFRT regarding TLC failure:	134
Table (17): Comparison between patients who received CFRT vs. HFRT regarding disease free survival:	135
Table (18): Comparison between patients who received CFRT vs. HFRT regarding overall survival: .	137
Table (19): Correlation between TLC failure (TLC) and other factors.....	139
Table (20): Correlation between ER receptor status and TLC failure.....	141
Table (21): Correlation between HER 2 neu receptor status and TLC failure:.....	142
Table (22): Correlation between radiotherapy delay and TLC failure:.....	143
Table (23): Case processing summary of correlation between Ki 67 and TLC failure:	147

List of Figures

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Invasive papillary carcinoma and benign intraductal papilloma	18
Figure (2):	Forest plot comparing Hypofractionated vs. standard fractionation for Grade 2/3 acute skin reactions	86
Figure (3):	Forest plot comparing hypofractionated vs. conventional fractionation for symptomatic radiation pneumonitis	91
Figure (4):	Forest plot comparing hypofractionated vs. standard fractionation in symptomatic rib fracture	93
Figure (5):	Forest plot comparing hypofractionated vs. standard fractionation in symptomatic rib fracture	93
Figure (6):	Forest plot of comparison: HFRT vs CFRT regarding OS.....	100
Figure (7):	Forest plot of comparison: HFRT vs CFRT regarding DFS.	101
Figure (8):	Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding age.....	110
Figure (9):	Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding menopausal state.	111
Figure (10):	Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding FH.	112

Figure (11): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding histopathological subtype.	115
Figure (12): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding histopathological grade.	116
Figure (13): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding T staging.	117
Figure (14): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding N staging.	118
Figure (15): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding ER receptor status.	119
Figure (16): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding PR status.	120
Figure (17): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding Her2 neu receptor status.	121
Figure (18): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding Ki-67 %.	122
Figure (19): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding PNI.	123
Figure (20): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding LVI.	124

Figure (21): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding carcinoma in situ.	125
Figure (22): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding surgical margin status.	127
Figure (23): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding radiotherapy OTT delay.....	128
Figure (24): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding surgery/radiotherapy interval.	129
Figure (25): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding chemotherapy.	130
Figure (26): Comparison between patients received CFRT and patients received HFRT regarding radiotherapy Herceptin.	131
Figure (27): Survival curves of TLC between patients received CFRT vs. HFRT	135
Figure (28): Survival curves of DFS between patients received CFRT vs. HFRT	136
Figure (29): Survival curves of OS between patients received CFRT vs. HFRT	138
Figure (30): Survival curves of TLC failure between patients with +ve ER receptors vs. –ve ER receptors	141
Figure (31): Survival curves of TLC failure between patients with +ve Her2-neu receptors vs. –ve Her2-neu receptors	142

Figure (32): Survival curves of TLC between patients with no delay or 7 days delay vs. OTT delay of > 7-14 delay vs. OTT > 2 weeks (orange).....	143
Figure (33): Survival curves of TLC between premenopausal & postmenopausal patients	144
Figure (34): Survival curves of TLC failure between patients < 45 years old vs. patients ≥ 45 years old	145
Figure (35): Survival curves of TLC failure between patients with -ve FH vs. patients with +ve FH	145
Figure (36): Survival curves of patients with +ve PR receptors vs. -ve PR receptors	147
Figure (37): Survival curves of patients with T1 tumor stage vs. T2& T3 tumor stage	148
Figure (38): Survival curves TLC failure between patients with less than 10 excised LNs vs. patients ≥ 10 excised LNs	148
Figure (39): Survival curves of TLC failure between patients with histopathological grade (G) I & II vs. patients with G III	149
Figure (40): Survival curves TLC failure between patients with LVI vs. patients without LVI ...	149
Figure (41): survival curves of TLC failure between patients with CIS vs. patients with negative CIS	150

- Figure (42):** Survival curves of TLC failure between patients who received adjuvant RTH ≤ 6 months after BCS vs. patients who received it > 6 months..... 151
- Figure (43):** Survival curves of TLC failure between patients who received CTH vs. patients who didn't receive CTH 151
- Figure (44):** Survival curves of patients who received Herceptin vs. patients who didn't receive it in patients with Her 2neu +ve receptors 152

Introduction

Worldwide, breast cancer is the most frequently diagnosed cancer accounting for more than a million cases each year (**Globocan, 2012**), including low and middle income countries (**WHO 2013**), incidence rates are higher in north America, Australia, western and northern Europe, and lowest in Asia and sub-Saharan Africa (**Torre et al., 2015**), these international variation is likely attributed to societal changes as a consequence of industrialization such as changes in fat intake, body weight, age at menarche, reproductive patterns of fewer pregnancies and later age at first birth (**Siegel et al., 2018**). Breast cancer mortality rates have been decreasing since the 1970s which is likely attributed to improved screening modalities and adjuvant therapies (**Kohler et al., 2015**).

Breast cancer is treated with a multidisciplinary approach that involves surgical oncology, radiotherapy and medical oncology; these combined modalities have been associated with a reduction in breast cancer mortality (**Kesson et al., 2012**).

patients with early-stage breast cancer undergo primary surgery (lumpectomy or mastectomy) with or without radiation therapy (RT), followed by adjuvant systemic therapy based on primary tumor characteristics, such as tumor size, grade, number of involved lymph nodes,

the status of estrogen (ER) and progesterone receptors (PR), and expression of the human epidermal growth factor 2 receptor (HER2) **(Taghian et al., 2019)**.

Breast conserving therapy (BCT) is comprised of breast-conserving surgery (BCS) plus radiation therapy, randomized trials have demonstrated equivalent disease-free and overall survival (OS) between mastectomy and BCT **(Litière et al., 2012)**.

The objective of adjuvant radiotherapy is the eradication of any tumor deposits remaining after surgery which reduces the risk of Locoregional recurrence (LRR) and improves breast cancer specific and overall survival **(Darby et al., 2011)**.

Conventional Whole-Breast Irradiation (WBI) delivers 1.8 to 2 Gy daily fractions (F) over 4.5 to 5 weeks to a total dose of 45 to 50 Gy with or without a 10 to 16 Gy boost to the tumor bed over 5 to 8 fractions for a total dose of 60 to 66 Gy delivered over 6 to 7.5 weeks, while hypofractionated schedule, delivers more radiation per dose, but the overall treatment duration is shorter (40 to 42.5 Gy in approximately three to five weeks with or without a boost. The American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) strongly encourage the use of hypofractionated regimen in women with invasive breast cancer receiving WBI with or without

inclusion of the low axilla, the preferred dose-fractionation scheme is hypofractionated WBI to a dose of 4000 cGy in 15 fractions or 4250 cGy in 16 fractions (**Benjamin et al., 2018**). Cosmetic and disease outcomes have been found to be equivalent between both hypofractionated and conventional schedules as demonstrated in a meta-analysis of four randomized trials, in which 7095 patients were enrolled (**James et al., 2010**).

A boost to the tumor bed is recommended for patients with invasive breast cancer with any of the following criteria: age ≤ 50 years with any histopathological grade, or if AGE 51 to 70 years with high grade or a positive margin (**Benjamin et al., 2018**).

WBI is associated with acute toxicities that involve the area treated such as skin, muscle, and internal organs. Also it may cause long-term complications, including cardiotoxicity, lung injury, and second malignancies (**Taylor et al., 2017**).