Reduced duration for Breast Cancer Radiotherapy

Poompis Pattaranutaporn, MD.

Breast Cancer

Role of Radiation

- After Mastectomy
 - T3 or T4
 - N+>3 (N2)
- After Breast Conservative Surgery

Radiation would eradicate the microscopic diseases and prevent local recurrence



Typical breast radiation

Conventional scheme

Surgery

Chemotherapy (if any)

Radiation 5-6 wks



Typical breast radiation



Reduced radiotherapy

- Hypofractionation
- Partial breast irradiation
- Omitted RT

Objective of HypoFx

- Iso-effective to conventional fraction
 - Locoregional control
 - Cosmetic outcome
 - Same late toxicities
- Shorten treatment time
- Decrease work load and cost

Radiosensitivity of tumor

Therapeutic ratio (TR)

= Normal tissue tolerance radiation dose

Tumor lethal radiation dose

	Interm	ediate	Desistant	
40Gy	Relatively 60-70Gy	Relatively 70-80Gy	>80Gy	
Lymphoma			Sarcoma	
Germ cell	Squamous	Adeno CA	Melanoma	
Small cell CA			Renal cell CA GBM	

Standard dose and fractionation

Table 1 Normal tissue tolerance-linear quadratic model. What										
are the α/β-values (GY)?										
Tissue	End point	α/β (Gy)	Range*	Reference						
Early responding tissue/organ										
Skin	Erythema	8.8	6.9-11.6	(3)						
	Erythema	12.3	1.8-22.8	(4)						
	Desquamation		9.4-21	(5)						
	Desquamation	11.2	8.5-17.6	(3)						
Jejunal	Clones	13	7-13	(6)						
mucosa										
Late respondin	g tissue/organ									
Spinal cord	Paresis/	<3	1.6-5	(5)						
	myelopathy									
Lung	Pneumonitis	4.0	2.2-5.8	(7)						
	Pneumonitis		1.6-4.5	(5)						
	Fibrosis	2.3		(5)						
	Fibrosis	3.1	-0.2-8.5	(8)						
Bladder	Contraction		5.8-11	(5)						
Cartilage	Organ function	3.5	1-4.9	(5)						
Most human	Tumors		6-25	(5)						
*, 90% confide	nce limit (Gy) (for	r some of	the data).							



	Hôpital Necker (24)	Canada (18, 19, 21)	RMH/GOC (17, 20)	START A (10)	START B (16)
Intention to treat analysis?	_	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Stratification variables	None	Age Tumor size Systemic therapy	Treatment center Margin status	Treatment center Type of surgery Intention to boost	Treatment center Type of surgery Intention to boost
Equal distribution of potential confounders	No*	Yes	_	Yes	Yes
Power	_	90% power to exclude	_	80% power to detect a	95% power to exclude
				difference of 5% in the absolute risk of IBTR between the control and either of the experimental arms.	Non inferiority recurrence in the experimental compared with control arm.
Percent attrition	_	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Percent crossover	_	1.0%	0.1%	0.8%	0.5%
Percent non-adherentnonadherent	_	0.3%	0.7%	0.3%	0.2%
Percent lost to follow up	0%	0%	1.3%	0.4%	0.9%
Overall rating [†]	Poor	Good	Fair [‡]	Good	Good

Table 2. Design and quality of randomized clinical trials

 Table 7. Equivalent doses in 2-Gy fractions for local-regional control of subclinical breast cancer and breast appearance for the experimental arms of the Phase III whole-breast irradiation fractionation trials

	Total dose (Gy)	Dose per fraction (Gy)	# No. fractions	Overall treatment time (days)	NTD—breast cancer (Gy)*	NTD—breast appearance (Gy)*
Conventional	50	2	25	35	50	50
Canada (18, 19, 21)	42.5	2.66	16	22	46.7^{\dagger}	47.7
RMH/GOC high [‡] (17, 20)	12.0	2.2	10	35	51.4	53.2
START A high ^{\ddagger} (10)	2.66-3	3.3G/F x 13	-16F	35	49.2	50.8
START A $low^{\ddagger}(10)$				35	44.9	46.2
START B (16)	40	2.67	15	21	44.0^{\dagger}	44.9

Outcome of HypoFx trials

Table 5. Oncologic outcomes for randomized clinical trials comparing hypofractionated whole breast irradiation with conventionally fractionated whole breast irradiation

			Arm		Arm		Arm		1	BTR	Local- recu	regional rrence	Dise su	ase-free rvival	Ov sur	erall vival
Trial	Median Follow- up (years)	Time point for outcome reporting (years)	Dose (Gy)	# Fr	# Days	N	%	р	%	р	%	р	%	р		
Canada	12	10	50	25	35	612	7.5						84.4			
(18, 19, 21)			42.5	16	22	622	7.4	<.001*					84.6	0.79		
RMH/GOC (17, 20)	9.7	10	50	25	35	470	12	†								
			42.9	13	35	466	9.6	†								
			39	13	35	474	15	†								
START A (10)	5.1	5	50	25	35	749	3.2		3.6^{\ddagger}		86		89			
			41.6	13	35	750	3.2	0.74	3.5 [‡]	$0.86^{\$}$	88	0.33 [§]	89	$0.81^{\$}$		
			39	13	35	737	4.6	0.40	5.2^{\ddagger}	0.35 [§]	85	0.33 [§]	89	0.99 [§]		
START B (16)	6.0	5	50	25	35	1105	3.3		3.3 [‡]		86		89			
			40	15	21	1110	2.0	0.21	2.2^{\ddagger}	0.35	89	0.02	92	0.03		

Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2011 Sep 1;81(1):59-68.

RT Technique in HypoFx trials

Table 3. Radiotherapy parameters for randomized clinical trials comparing hypofractionated whole breast irradiation to conventionally fractionated whole breast irradiation

	Canada (18, 19, 21)	RMH/GOC (17, 20)	START A (10)	START B (16)
Energy	Co-60, 4 MV or 6 MV	6 MV*	6 MV*	6 MV*
Wedges	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Inhomogeneity cCorrections	_	GOC only	Variable	Variable
Planning	2D	2D—RMH	2D or 3D	2D or 3D
		3D—GOC		
Central Axis Dose Homogeneity	-7% to $+7%$	-5% to +7%	-5% to +5%	5% to +5%
Separation	$\leq 25 \text{ cm}$	_	_	_
Percent receiving boost	0%	75%	61%	39%
Boost dose	_	14 Gy, 7 fr	10 Gy, 5 fr	10 Gy, 5 fr
Boost modality		Electrons	Electrons	Electrons
Percent receiving regional nodal irradiation				
Target for nodal irradiation	Due to concern	i about toxicities	, triais limit n	naximum
Use of PAS	hreast senarati	on or homogene	ity	
Dose to regional nodes		on of nonlogene	TLY	

Effect of Inhomogeneity in HypoFx



Concerned toxicities

- Cosmetic outcome
- Subcutaneous fibrosis
- Ischemic heart disease
- Pneumonitis
- Rib fractures

At 5-10 years F/U, No significant difference in toxicities

Some toxicities may need longer F/U to access



Dosimetric comparison IMRT vs 2D/3D

- IMRT significantly reduce mean volumes receiving
 - Dose >107% (10.5 vs 44.5)
 - Dose <95%(132.7 vs 180.8)
 (p<0.00005)
- IMRT also can reduce dose to other OARs (Heart, Lung)



J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol. 2009 Feb;53(1):92-9. Radiother Oncol. 2009 Jul;92(1):34-41. Hypofractionated breast radiotherapy 3 weeks (FAST-Forward): 5-year efficac tissue effects results from a multicentu randomised, phase 3 trial



	Number of moderate or marked events/total number of assessments over follow-up	Odds ratio for schedule (95% CI)	p value for comparison with 40 Gy	p value for comparison between 27 Gy and 26 Gy	Odds ratio for years of follow-up (95% CI); p value
Any adverse event in the breast or chest wall*					0.98 (0.96–1.00); 0.055
40 Gy	651/6121 (10-6%)	1 (ref)			
27 Gy	1004/6303 (15.9%)	1.55 (1.32-1.83)	<0.0001		
26 Gy	774/6327 (12-2%)	1.12 (0.94–1.34)	0.20	0.0001	
Breast distortion†					0-99 (0-95-1-02); 0-38
40 Gy	232/5724 (4-0%)	1 (ref)			
27 Gy	363/5953 (6.1%)	1.51 (1.15-1.97)	0.0028		
26 Gy	299/5945 (5.0%)	1.20 (0.91-1.60)	0.19	0.083	
Breast shrinkage†					1.03 (1.00–1.06); 0.023
40 Gy	330/5728 (5.8%)	1 (ref)			
27 Gy	503/5944 (8·5%)	1.50 (1.20-1.88)	0.0004		
26 Gy	369/5943 (6-2%)	1.05 (0.82-1.33)	0.71	0.0018	
Breast induration (tumour bed)†					1.00 (0.96–1.04); 0.95
40 Gy	185/5713 (3-2%)	1 (ref)			
27 Gy	304/5948 (5.1%)	1.56 (1.19-2.05)	0.0013		
26 Gy	236/5937 (4-0%)	1.19 (0.90–1.59)	0.23	0.047	
Breast induration (outside tumour bed)†					0.96 (0.90–1.02); 0.17
40 Gy	45/5712 (0-8%)	1 (ref)			
27 Gy	137/5943 (2.3%)	2.79 (1.74-4.50)	<0.0001		
26 Gy	97/5930 (1-6%)	1.90 (1.15-3.14)	0.013	0.059	
Telangiectasia					1.21 (1.14–1.29); <0.0001
40 Gy	63/6087 (1.0%)	1 (ref)			**
27 Gy	100/6272 (1.6%)	1.68 (1.07-2.65)	0.025		
26 Gy	102/6300 (1-6%)	1.53 (0.96-2.43)	0.070	0.65	
Breast or chest wall oedema					0.73 (0.69–0.78); <0.0001
40 Gy	89/6097 (1.5%)	1 (ref)			
27 Gy	217/6287 (3.4%)	2.18 (1.57-3.03)	<0.0001		
26 Gy	155/6318 (2.4%)	1.47 (1.03-2.09)	0.032	0.0097	
Breast or chest wall discomfort					0-93 (0-89-0-97); 0-0003
40 Gy	234/6086 (3·8%)	1 (ref)			
27 Gy	269/6285 (4-3%)	1.10 (0.86-1.40)	0-44		
26 Gy	250/6309 (4.0%)	0.98 (0.76-1.26)	0-86	0.35	

Results for years of follow-up show trend in normal tissue effects over follow-up across all fractionation schedules. p values are calculated by Wald test; odds ratios are estimated from the generalised estimating equations model including all follow-up data and show relative odds of moderate or marked adverse event (vs none or mild) for each pairwise comparison of fractionation schedules across all follow-up assessments. *Includes shrinkage, induration, telangiectasia, or oederna. †Patients who had breast conservation surgery or mastectomy with reconstruction.

Figure 2: Cumulative risk of ipsilateral breast tumour relapse by fractionation schedule

Table 4: Longitudinal analysis of moderate or marked clinician-assessed late normal tissue effects for patients with at least one annual clinical assessment (n=3975)

Breast RT Fractionation

Duration	Dose (Gy)	Dose/F	BED (Gy3)	BCS	PMRT	RNI
5 Weeks	50	2	78.5	$\checkmark\checkmark$	$\checkmark\checkmark$	$\checkmark\checkmark$
				- Standard	of care for lo	ong time
3 Weeks	42.5	2.67	74.9	$\checkmark\checkmark$	\checkmark	\checkmark
				 Popular hypofractionation regimen and now accepted as standard of care No difference in outcomes and complications 		
1 Week	26	5.2	64.6	\checkmark	\checkmark	Ongoing
				 Push the boundary for hypofractionation Follow up is quite short (5 Yrs) Slightly worse cosmetic effects 		

Reduced radiotherapy

- Hypofractionation
- Partial breast irradiation
- Omitted RT

For early stage, after breast conserving surgeryDo we really need to irradiate to WHOLE breast?Do we really need to irradiate?

Mastectomy vs BCS vs BCS+RT



NSABP-B06, RCT 2163 pts between 1976-1984

Mastectomy vs BCS vs BCS+RT



- NSABP-B06 results
 - No OS difference
 - Lumpectomy alone has higher recurrence than lumpectomy + RT
 - 20yrs incidence of ipsilateral recurrence were 14.3 vs 39.2%

Radiation after BCS

 Meta-analysis showed that adjuvant RT reduced recurrence around 16% at 10 years and avoid breast cancer death by 4% at 15 years (4 : 1)



Figure 1: Effect of radiotherapy (RT) after breast-conserving surgery (BCS) on 10-year risk of any (locoregional or distant) first recurrence and on 15-year risks of breast cancer death and death from any cause in 10 801 women (67% with pathologically node-negative disease) in 17 trials Further details are in webappendix p 5. RR=rate ratio. Rate ratios in this figure include all available years of follow-up.

EBCTCG, Lancet 2011

Rationales for APBI

- Clinicopathological paradox
 - Two-thirds of specimens of mastectomies harbor occult cancer foci distributed throughout the breast
 - Most local recurrences in the conserved breast appear in the original tumor bed



Comparison of APBI technique

Table 5

Comparison of PBI techniques

	3D CRT		Interstitial brachytherapy HDR, LDR, PDR	MammoSite		Targit, 5	0 kV X-rays	IORT, electrons	
Coverage of target Thickness of cavity wall irradiated	Best PTV = tum 25 mm. O field edge	nor bed + 20–)ften 5 mm to e from PTV	Variable 1–2 cm	Good Dose prescribed to 1 surface of applicator	cm from	Good Dose pro from sur 5–7 Gy 1 applicate	escribed to 1 mm rface of applicator. 10 mm from or	Good Dose prescribed to isodose line. 80% is 13 mm (3 MeV)–24 (9 MeV)	90% odose a I mm
Dose homogeneity	Best		Fair	Fair		Fair		Fair	
Sparing of normal breast / other organs	Least		Good	Good		Best		Varies with location	n
Skin dose	Least	Frac	tionated, after	surgery		Least (1 Fx, at time	of surgery	
Technical feasibility for various size, shape or location of cavity	Suitable f all cases	Usually	34-38.5Gy/10F	the breast	/irregular iphery of	Not su irregu peripher	Usually 2	0-21Gy or skin	ors /axilla
Expertise required	Average		High	Average		High		Very high	
Potential for wide spread use	Very good	t	Fair	Very good		Fair		Limited	
Main drawback	Relatively higher dose to normal tissue and breathing motionAdequacy of target coverage in some cases and wider applicabilityCavity sh Although be high		Cavity shape and size Although easy to use QA is required. Skin be high	e. , stringent dose may	Very lim irradiate size. His	nited depth ed; cavity shape and tology not available	Wider applicability Histology not availa Based on quadrante	able. ectomy	

Modified from Sarin [113].

Radiotherapy and Oncology 90 (2009) 1–13

External Beam Radiation (3D)



Figure 3: Three-Dimensional Conformal Radiation Therapy—This noninvasive method of delivering accelerated partial-breast irradiation provides increased dose homogeneity, leading to the theoretical potential for better cosmetic outcomes compared to other techniques.

Brachytherapy – MammoSite



Figure 2: MammoSite Balloon Brachytherapy—External (left) and sagittal (right) views of balloon with dosimetric target coverage. Photographs courtesy of Douglas Arthur, with permission from the *Journal of Clinical Oncology*.

INTRABEAM :: TARGIT

- TARGIT (TARGeted Intra-operative radioTherapy)
- Mobile X-ray source which emits low energy X-ray radiation (max. 50 kV) in isotropic distribution







Conventional vs IORT



- IORT (with TARGIT in selected patients) showed ,at least, non inferior to whole breast radiation in term of local control and survival
- There still have some doubts to be answer
 - Complication of IORT and what if IORT+EBRT
 - Can we do a wider surgery to avoid IORT
 - Can patients suitable for IORT be safely omit radiation

Omitted RT in elderly

- May consider to omit RT in low-risk elderly group
 - Low recurrence rate
 - Avoid long 5-6 weeks of radiotherapy
- Data mainly from
 - CALGB C9343 (>70 yrs, T1N0, ER+)
 - PRIME II (>65 yrs, T1-2(<3cm)N0, ER+)
- RT improve LRR 4% -> 1%, but no different in OS

IORT vs Omitted RT

- No published direct comparison between IORT and omitted RT
- Overall survival was not difference in low or very low risk patients
- RT still has local control benefit but absolute is small enough to omit
 - However, LRR rate were usually >= 10%
 - Except those age >70 and ER+

RT options for early breast cancer



Whole breast radiation WBRT+/- LN

APBI/IORT

Omit RT

Breast RT Fractionation

Duration	Dose (Gy)	Dose/F	BED (Gy3)	BCS	PMRT	RNI	
5 Weeks	50	2	78.5	$\checkmark\checkmark$	$\checkmark\checkmark$	$\checkmark\checkmark$	
				- Standard	of care for lo	ong time	
3 Weeks	42.5	2.67	74.9	$\checkmark\checkmark$	\checkmark	\checkmark	
				 Popular hypofractionation regimen and now accepted as standard of care No difference in outcomes and complications 			
1 Week	26	5.2	64.6	\checkmark	\checkmark	Ongoing	
				 Push the boundary for hypofractionation Follow up is quite short Slightly worse cosmetic 			