

NON-SMALL CELL LUNG CANCER: FOCUS ON OLIGOMETASTATIC DISEASE AND 2017 UPDATE March **31** - April **01**, 20**17** PADOVA

## Update on locally advanced disease:

## **Radiation Oncology**

#### Filippo Alongi, MD

Chair of Radiation Oncology Department Sacro Cuore Don Calabria Cancer Care Center, Negrar-Verona, Italy





## LOCALLY ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: background

Staging of NCSLC

"Stage III represents a very heterogeneus group."

Stage IIIA	T1 <i>,</i> T2	N2
	Т3	N1, <b>N2</b>
	T4	N0, N1
Stage IIIB	ogni T	N3
	Τ4	N2

*Objectives:* Stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) describes a heterogeneous population with disease presentation ranging from apparently resectable tumors with occult microscopic nodal metastases to unresectable, bulky nodal disease.







#### LOCALLY ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: **Treatment options**



#### **Treatment of Stage III Non-small Cell** Lung Cancer

**Diagnosis and Management of Lung Cancer, 3rd ed: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines** 







Clinically occult N2

Schematic of types of patients included in studies using different treatment approaches





CHEST 2013; 143(5)(Suppl):e314S-e340S



#### LOCALLY ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: Radiotherapy

CANCER INVESTIGATION 2016, VOL. 0, NO. 0, 1–14

## What is changing in radiotherapy for the treatment of locally advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer patients? a review

Niccoló Giaj-Levra, Francesco Ricchetti, and Filippo Alongi

Radiation Oncology, Sacro Cuore-Don Calabria Hospital, Negrar-Verona, Italy

#### ABSTRACT

Radiotherapy treatment continues to have a relevant impact in the treatment of nonsmall cell cancer (NSCLC). Use of concurrent chemotherapy and radiotherapy is considered the gold standard in the treatment of locally advanced NSCLC but clinical outcomes are not satisfactory. Introduction of new radiotherapy technology and chemotherapy regimens are under investigation in this setting with the goal to improve unsatisfactory results. We report how radiotherapy is changing in the treatment of locally advanced NSCLC.





#### LOCALLY ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: Radiotherapy



# From chemotherapy to target therapies associated with radiation in the treatment of NSCLC: a durable marriage?

Filippo Alongi, Stefano Arcangeli, Sara Ramella, Niccolò Giaj-Levra, Paolo Borghetti, Rolando D'Angelillo, Francesco Ricchetti, Marta Maddalo, Rosario Mazzola, Marco Trovò, Elvio Russi & Stefano Maria Magrinion the behalf of Associazione Italiana Radioterapia Oncologica (AIRO)

- To date the addition of target therapies to chemo-radiotherapy did not demonstrate any robust advantage in this stage of disease.
- Chemo-radiotherapy still represents the standard of choice in locally advanced NSCLC





### LOCALLY ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: Radio(chemo)therapy



- 1. Timing with Chemotherapy (concurrent, sequential)
- 2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant





#### LOCALLY ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: Radio(chemo)therapy

#### 1. Timing with Chemotherapy (concurrent, sequential)

#### Analysis 6.1. Comparison 6 concurrent versus sequential, Outcome 1 overall survival.

Review: Concurrent chemoradiotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer

Comparison: 6 concurr	ent versus sequential					
Outcome: I overall sur	vival					
Study or subgroup	Concurrent n/N	Sequential n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Random,95% Cl	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Random,95% Cl	
Curran 2003	127/201	139/201		49.7 %	0.91 [ 0.79, 1.05 ]	
Fournel 2001	67/103	80/104		31.4 %	0.85 [ 0.71, 1.01 ]	
Zatloukal 2003	34/52	43/50		18.9 %	0.76 [ 0.61, 0.95 ]	
Total (95% CI) Total events: 228 (Concur Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0 Test for overall effect: Z =	356 rrent), 262 (Sequential) ); Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.90, df = 2 (P : 296 (P = 0.0031)	355 = 0.39); 1 <sup>2</sup> =0.0%	$\bigcirc$	100.0 %	0.86 [ 0.78, 0.95 ]	RT-CHT increases
Analysis 6.2. Co	omparison 6 concu	fa urrent versus seq	0.5 0.7 I I.5 2 wours concurrent favours sequential uen tial, Outcome 2 locoreg	ional progression	-free survival.	OS and PFS

Review: Concurrent chemoradiotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer

Comparison: 6 concurrent versus sequential

Outcome: 2 locoregional progression-free survival

Study or subgroup	Concurrent n/N	Sequential n/N	1	F M-H,Ran	iisk Ratio dom,95% C	1	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Random,95% Cl
Curran 2003	64/201	76/201		-	-		100.0 %	0.84 [ 0.64, 1.10 ]
Total (95% CI)	201	201		(-			100.0 %	0.84 [ 0.64, 1.10 ]
Total events: 64 (Concurr	ent), 76 (Sequential)							
Heterogeneity: not applic	able							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.25 (P = 0.21)							
			0.2	0.5	2	5		
			favours conc	urrent	favours se	quential		









#### ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: Radio(chemo)therapy

1. Timing with Chemotherapy (concurrent, sequential)

Study or subgroup	Concurrent n/N	Sequential n/N		Ris M-H,Rando	k Ratío m,95% C	1	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Random,95% Cl
Curran 2003	127/201	139/201					49.7 %	0.91 [ 0.79, 1.05 ]
Fournel 2001	67/103	80/104					31.4 %	0.85 [ 0.71, 1.01 ]
Zatloukal 2003	34/52	43/50					18.9 %	0.76 [ 0.61, 0.95 ]
Total (95% CI)	356	355		+			100.0 %	0.86 [ 0.78, 0.95 ]
Total events: 228 (Concur	rent), 262 (Sequential)							
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.0	; Chi² = 1.90, df = 2 (F	P = 0.39);  2 = 0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	2.96 (P = 0.0031)							
			0.5	0.7 I	1.5	2		
			favours co	ncurrent	favours s	equential		

### RTCHT: 2-y Risk of Death Reduction 14%

O'Rourke N. Clin Oncol 2010

Meta-Analysis of Concomitant Versus Sequential Radiochemotherapy in Locally Advanced Non–Small-Lung Cancer

#### **RTCHT:**

### Increase 3 and 5-y OS of **5.7% and 4.5%,** *respectively*



Α	No. Deaths / I	No. Entered						
Trial	RT + Conc CT	RT + Seq CT	0-E	Variance	Hazard Ratio	HR (95% CI)		
CALGB 8831	45/46	39/45	2.4	20.9	÷ <b>-</b>	1.12 (0.73 to 1.72)		
WJLCG	131/156	142/158	-16.8	67.3	-	0.78 (0.61 to 0.99)		
RTOG 9410	180/204	189/203	-20.5	91.1		0.80 (0.65 to 0.98)		
GMMA Ankara 95	15/15	15/15	-1.0	7.0		0.87 (0.41 to 1.82)		
GLOT-GFPC NPC	87/102	96/103	-9.9	45.0		0.80 (0.60 to 1.07)		
EORTC 0897	2 63/80	66/78	-0.5	31.9		0.98 (0.69 to 1.39)		
Total	521/603	547/602	-46.4	263.1	•	0.84 (0.74 to 0.95)		
Test for hete $\chi^2_5$ = 3.24, <i>P</i> =	rogeneity: : .66, l² = 0%		R	0.25 F + Conc C	r, o F Better RT + Se	4.00 eq CT Better		
RT + conc CT effect: Log-rank test = $8.19$ . $P = .004$								



THE COCHRANE COLLABORATION®

### ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: Radio(chemo)therapy

trial	deaths	acute oesophagitis	acute pneumonitis	late oesophagitis	lung fibrosis	neutropenia	anaemia
	num- ber of deaths / number as- sessable; con- current v se- quential	num- ber of cases / number as- sessable; con- current v se- quential	num- ber of cases / number as- sessable; con- current v se- quential	num- ber of cases / number as- sessable; con- current v se- quential	num- ber of cases / number as- sessable; con- current v se- quential	num- ber of cases / number as- sessable; con- current v se- quential	num- ber of cases / number as- sessable; con- current v se- quential
Curran 2003	6/201 v 4/201	50/201 v 8/201	8/201 v 14/201	not reported	22/201 v 26/201	117/201 v 113/201	not reported
Fournel 2001	10/89 v 6/89	0/89 v 23/89	not reported	not reported	not reported	67/89 v 78/89	not reported
Zatloukal 2002, 2003	0/52 v 0/50	9/52 v 2/50	2/52 v 1/50	not reported	not reported	34/52 v 20/50	not reported
total	16/342 v 10/340 (4.7% v 2.9%)	59/342 v 33/340 (17.3% v 9.7%)	10/253 v 15/251 (4.0% v 6.0%)		22/201 v 26/201 (10.9% v 12.9%)	217/342 v 210/340 (63.4% v 61.8%)	-
relative risk (P; Fisher's Exact Test)	1.59 (NS)	1.78 P=0.004	0.66 (NS)	-	0.85 (NS)	1.03 (NS)	-

Table 5. Concurrent versus sequential chemoradiotherapy : toxicity (grade 3 to 5)





#### ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: ADVANCEMENTS IN RADIATION ONCOLOGY

#### THE ISSUE OF MOTION MANAGEMENT







#### ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: ADVANCEMENTS IN RADIATION ONCOLOGY



#### **4D CT AND MOTION MANAGEMENT**







#### A CONTINUOUS CHANGING: IMAGING ON BOARD (IGRT)

Int J Clin Oncol (2009) 14:568-569 DOI 10.1007/s10147-009-0896-1 © The Japan Society of Clinical Oncology 2009

#### LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Filippo Alongi · Nadia Di Muzio

#### Image-guided radiation therapy: a new era for the radiation oncologist?

dimensional customized targets, after tumor targeting and organ contouring on each CT scan.

In the modern era of radiotherapy the term "imageguided radiation therapy (IGRT)" has encompassed the use of various types of images to control patient position in order to correct possible setup errors. IGRT uses weekly or

F. Alongi







#### ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: IMRT/VMAT as Treatment options for chemo-RT

Scorsetti et al. Radiation Oncology 2010, 5:94 http://www.ro-journal.com/content/5/1/94

RESEARCH



#### Open Access

#### Large volume unresectable locally advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer: acute toxicity and initial outcome results with rapid arc

Marta Scorsetti<sup>1</sup>, Pierina Navarria<sup>1</sup>, Pietro Mancosu<sup>1\*</sup>, Filippo Alongi<sup>1</sup>, Simona Castiglioni<sup>1</sup>, Raffaele Cavina<sup>2</sup>, Luca Cozzi<sup>3</sup>, Antonella Fogliata<sup>3</sup>, Sara Pentimalli<sup>1</sup>, Angelo Tozzi<sup>1</sup>, Armando Santoro<sup>3</sup>

Acute toxicities at 3 months showed: -91% with grade 1 -9% with grade2 -no Grade3 esophageal toxicity







#### **ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC:**

IMRT as new standard Treatment option for chemo-RT

Impact of Intensity-Modulated Radiation Therapy Technique for Locally Advanced Non–Small-Cell Lung Cancer: A Secondary Analysis of the NRG Oncology RTOG 0617 Randomized Clinical Trial

#### Purpose

Although intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) is increasingly used to treat locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC), IMRT and three-dimensional conformal external beam radiation therapy (3D-CRT) have not been compared prospectively. This study compares 3D-CRT and IMRT outcomes for locally advanced NSCLC in a large prospective clinical trial.

#### **Patients and Methods**

A secondary analysis was performed to compare IMRT with 3D-CRT in NRG Oncology clinical trial RTOG 0617, in which patients received concurrent chemotherapy of carboplatin and paclitaxel with or without cetuximab, and 60- versus 74-Gy radiation doses. Comparisons included 2-year overall survival (OS), progression-free survival, local failure, distant metastasis, and selected Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (version 3)  $\geq$  grade 3 toxicities.

#### Results

The median follow-up was 21.3 months. Of 482 patients, 53% were treated with 3D-CRT and 47% with IMRT. The IMRT group had larger planning treatment volumes (median, 427 v486 mL; P = .005); a larger planning treatment volume/volume of lung ratio (median, 0.13 v 0.15; P = .013); and more stage IIIB disease (30.3% v38.6%, P = .056). Two-year OS, progression-free survival, local failure, and distant metastasis–free survival were not different between IMRT and 3D-CRT. IMRT was associated with less  $\geq$  grade 3 pneumonitis (7.9% v3.5%, P = .039) and a reduced risk in adjusted analyses (odds ratio, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.171 to 0.986; P = .046). IMRT also produced lower heart doses (P < .05), and the volume of heart receiving 40 Gy (V40) was significantly associated with OS on adjusted analysis (P < .05). The lung V5 was not associated with any  $\geq$  grade 3 toxicity, whereas the lung V20 was associated with increased  $\geq$  grade 3 pneumonitis risk on multivariable analysis (P = .026).

#### Conclusion

IMRT was associated with lower rates of severe pneumonitis and cardiac doses in NRG Oncology clinical trial RTOG 0617, which supports routine use of IMRT for locally advanced NSCLC.





**ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC:** 

IMRT as new standard Treatment option for chemo-RT

#### Treatment for Locally Advanced NSCLC



PET before RT

60 Gy/30 fr. with VMAT

PET after RT





### ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: RT-CT final remarks



Timing with Chemotherapy (concurrent, sequential)

**Final remarks** 

**Concurrent** chemoradiation increased overall survival and progression free survival compared to sequential treatment.

New intensity modulated and image guided RT techniques are suggested







### PDTA ROV



#### •17) RADIOTERAPIA + CHEMIOTERAPIA

•Stadio IIIA (T3 N1 - T4 per estensione N0-1) se non candidabili a chirurgia devono essere sottoposti a trattamento concomitante chemio-radioterapico. Il trattamento chemioterapico e radioterapico sequenziale o radioterapico esclusivo deve essere considerato nei pazienti fragili non in grado di tollerare concomitanza.





ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: SURGERY? WHEN?

- 1. Timing with Chemotherapy (concurrent, sequential)
- 2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant







#### ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: SURGERY? WHEN?



Clinical N2 (cN2) Neoadjuvant therapy

## $_{2.}$ 3 RANDOMIZED TRIALS:

✓ INT 0139 (Albain Lancet 2009)

✓ GERMAN study (Thomas Lancet Oncology 2008)

✓ EORTC (Van Meerbeeck J Natl Cancer Inst 2007)





2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant

✓ INT 0139 (Albain Lancet 2009)

**Methods**—Patients with stage T1-3pN2M0 NSCLC were randomized before induction chemoRT (2 cycles of cisplatin and etoposide [PE] concurrent with 45 Gy RT). If no progression, arm 1 underwent resection, and arm 2 continued RT uninterrupted to 61 Gy. Two additional cycles of PE were given. The primary endpoint was overall survival (OS).

100 Dead/Total/Median CT/RT/S 145/202/23.6 months 75 ······ CT/RT 155/194/22.2 months % Alive 50 25 Logrank p = 0.24Hazard ratio = 0.87 (0.70, 1.10) 0 12 24 36 48 0 60

**Interpretation**—There was no significant survival advantage to surgery after chemoRT, despite improved PFS. Both chemoRT with definitive RT and chemoRT followed by resection (preferably lobectomy) are options for patients with stage IIIA(N2) NSCLC.





#### 2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant

## ✓ GERMAN study (Thomas Lancet Oncology 2008)

## Effect of preoperative chemoradiation in addition to preoperative chemotherapy: a randomised trial in stage III non-small-cell lung cancer

Michael Thomas, Christian Rübe, Petra Hoffknecht, Hans N Macha, Lutz Freitag, Albert Linder, Norman Willich, Michael Hamm, Gerhard W Sybrecht, Dieter Ukena, Karl-Matthias Deppermann, Cornelia Dröge, Dorothea Riesenbeck, Achim Heinecke, Cristina Sauerland, Klaus Junker, Wolfgang E Berdel\*, Michael Semik\*, for the German Lung Cancer Cooperative Group\*\*



INTERPRETATION: In patients with stage III NSCLC amenable to surgery, preoperative chemoradiation in addition to chemotherapy increases pathological response and mediastinal downstaging, but does not improve survival. After induction with chemoradiation, pneumonectomy should be avoided.





2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant

## ✓ EORTC (Van Meerbeeck J Natl Cancer Inst 2007)

#### Randomized Controlled Trial of Resection Versus Radiotherapy After Induction Chemotherapy in Stage IIIA-N2 Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer

Jan P. van Meerbeeck, Gijs W. P. M. Kramer, Paul E. Y. Van Schil, Catherine Legrand, Egbert F. Smit, Franz Schramel, Vivianne C. Tjan-Heijnen, Bonne Biesma, Channa Debruyne, Nico van Zandwijk, Ted A. W. Splinter, Giuseppe Giaccone



#### Conclusion

In selected patients with pathologically proven stage IIIA-N2 NSCLC and a response to induction chemotherapy, surgical resection did not improve overall or progression-free survival compared with radiotherapy. In view of its low morbidity and mortality, radiotherapy should be considered the preferred locoregional treatment for these patients.





2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant

#### **Final remarks**

3.5.2. In patients with discrete N2 involvement by NSCLC identified preoperatively (IIIA), either definitive chemoradiation therapy or induction therapy followed by surgery is recommended over either surgery or radiation alone (Grade 1A).

3.5.3. In patients with discrete N2 involvement by NSCLC identified preoperatively (IIIA), pri-<u>mary surgical resection followed by adjuvant</u> therapy is not recommended (except as part of a clinical trial) (Grade 1C).





2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant

Postoperative radiotherapy in non-small-cell lung cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis of individual patient data from nine randomised controlled trials



PORT Meta-analysis Trialists Group\*

#### Critical points of trials

- 1. Recruitment
- 2. Dose and fractionation
- 3. Volume
- 4. Technique
- 5. Technology



THE LANCET • Vol 352 • July 25, 1998



#### 2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant

95% Cl	
1 45 5 1 1 4 1 75 5	
1.42 [ 1.16, 1.75 ]	
1.26 [ 1.04, 1.52 ]	
0.97 [ 0.82, 1.14 ]	
Peto Odds Rat	io
95% CI	
1.41 [ 1.09, 1.83	]
1.21 [ 1.02, 1.44	]
0.96 [ 0.79, 1.17	]
रा	
u in non-small coll lung ca	
e Collaboration. Publishe	d
	y in non-small cell lung ca se Collaboration. Publishe



Adjuvan

herapy in non-small cell lung cancer (Review) Copyright © 2009 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.



Comparison Surgery + PORT versus surgery alone – Nodal status







#### Comparison Surgery + PORT versus surgery alone – Overall survival

Total (95% CI)				•	0			100.0 %	1.18 [ 1.07, 1.31 ]
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 16.65, df = 10 (P = 0.08); l <sup>2</sup> =40%									
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.20$ (P = 0.0014)									
Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable									
		3				ß	ĩ		
	0.1	0.2	0.5	T	2	5	10		
	Fa	vours	PORT		Favou	irs no	PORT		

#### AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS Implications for practice

Although the radiotherapy used in most of the included trials is now considered suboptimal, this update still provides the best evidence that postoperative radiotherapy (PORT) has an adverse effect on survival. There is now less compelling evidence that the effect of PORT varies by stage, and in particular nodal status, but PORT should not be used routinely unless supporting evidence can be obtained from an ongoing trial of modern PORT techniques (Lung ART-IGR 2006/1202).





#### PORT in N2 positive lymph node

	Local Tumor Control	Disease-Free Survival	Cancer-Specific Survival		
	Odds ratio 3.991	Odds ratio 3.29	Odds ratio 4.619		
Single/ Multiple pN2	Std. Err. 1.96	Std. Err. 2.02	Std. Err. 3.55		
	z 2.16	z 1.94	z 1.99		
	P.05	<i>P</i> .04	P.04		
	95% Cl 0.98-9.44	95% CI 0.98-10.96	95% CI 1.02-20.86		
	Odds ratio 1.203	Odds ratio 1.051	Odds ratio 0.992		
Histologic Type	Std. Err. 0.76	Std. Err. 0.41	Std. Err. 0.49		
	z 0.29	z0.13	z-0.02		
	P.77	P.89	P.98		
	95% CI 0.34-4.21	95% CI 0.49-2.24	95% CI 0.37-2.62		
	Odds ratio 0.559	Odds ratio 1.223	Odds ratio 1.126		
	Std. Err. 0.33	Std. Err. 0.41	Std. Err. 0.45		
Chemotherap	y z – 0.97	z 0.59	z 0.30		
	P 0.33	P .55	P.76		
	95% CI 0.17-1.81	95% CI 0.62-2.38	95% CI 0.51-2.47		
	Odds ratio 1.023	Odds ratio 1.008	Odds ratio 1.011		
2 0.00	Std. Err. 0.07	Std. Err. 0.02	Std. Err. 0.03		
Radiation Dose	z 0.32	z 0.33	z 0.35		
	P.75	P.73	P.72		
	95% CI 0.88-1.18	95% CI 0.96-1.05	95% CI 0.95-1.07		

This retrospective study evaluates adjuvant thoracic radiotherapy in pathologic N2 non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Sixty-six patients received postoperative radiotherapy (PORT). Actuarial local control was 80% at 12 months, 77.2% at both 24 and 36 months, and 72.1% at 60 months. Overall survival at 12 months and 60 months was 77% and 37%, respectively.

The number of metastastic lymph nodes was a prognostic factor for local control and survival. Background: Adjuvant radiotherapy in non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is still controversial. The purpose of this retrospective study was to evaluate the role of postoperative radiotherapy (PORT) in terms of local control and survival in pathologic N2 NSCLC. Patients and Methods: From January 2003 to December 2008, 66 patients with pathologic N2 NSCLC received PORT. Mediastinal lymph node metastases were classified into single (12 patients) or multiple (54 patients) stations. All patients received conformal radiation therapy, with a median total dose of 50.4 Gy. Target volumes included the bronchial stump, ipsilateral hilum, all pathologically involved lymph node regions, and all the lymph nodes between 2 noncontiguous pathologic nodal stations. The pattern of failure was considered as locoregional or systemic, or a combination of both. Locoregional failure was defined as in field or out of field. Results: Median follow-up time was 34.9 months (range 3.5-62.8 months), Local control was 80% at 12 months, 77.2% at both 24 and 36 months, and 72.1% at 60 months. The pattern of failure was locoregional in 3 patients (1 out of field and 2 in field) and systemic in 25 patients, with 12 patients presenting both locoregional and distant disease. Overall survival at 12, 36, and 60 months was 77%, 44%, and 37%, respectively. Median survival time was 34 months. The number of pathologically involved lymph node stations was a prognostic factor for local control (P = .05), cancerspecific survival (CSS) (P = .04), and disease-free survival (DFS) (P = .04). Conclusion: Despite the limitations of the present study, mainly represented by its retrospective nature, our data support the role of PORT in terms of locoregional control and overall survival benefit; the number of involved mediastinal lymph nodes represents a significant prognostic factor in patients with pathologic N2 NSCLC.





#### Postoperative Radiotherapy is Associated with Better Survival in Non–Small Cell Lung Cancer with Involved N2 Lymph Nodes

Results of an Analysis of the National Cancer Data Base



Introduction: Use of postoperative radiotherapy (PORT) in nonsmall-cell lung cancer remains controversial. Limited data indicate that PORT may benefit patients with involved N2 nodes. This study evaluates this hypothesis in a large retrospective cohort treated with chemotherapy and contemporary radiation techniques.

Methods: The National Cancer Data Base was queried for patients diagnosed 2004–2006 with resected non–small-cell lung cancer and pathologically involved N2 (pN2) nodes also treated with chemotherapy. Multivariable Cox proportional hazards model was used to assess factors associated with overall survival (OS). Inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW) using the propensity score was used to reduce selection bias. OS was compared between patients treated with versus without PORT using the adjusted Kaplan–Meier estimator and weighted log-rank test based on IPTW.

**Results:** Two thousand and one hundred and fifteen patients were eligible for analysis. 918 (43.4%) received PORT, 1197 (56.6%) did not. PORT was associated with better OS (median survival time 42 months with PORT versus 38 months without, p = 0.048). This effect was significant in multivariable and IPTW Cox models (hazard ratio: 0.87, 95% confidence interval: 0.78–0.98, p = 0.026, and hazard ratio: 0.89, 95% confidence interval: 0.79–1.00, p = 0.046, respectively). No interaction was seen between the effects of PORT and number of involved lymph nodes (p = 0.615).

Conclusions: <u>PORT was associated with better survival for patients</u> with pN2 nodes also treated with chemotherapy. No interaction was seen between benefit of PORT and number of involved nodes. These findings reinforce the benefit of PORT for N2 disease in modern practice using the largest, most recent cohort of chemotherapytreated pN2 patients to date.





#### 2. Timing with Surgery: neoadjuvant versus adjuvant

#### **Final remark**

4.5.5. In patients with NSCLC who were found to have incidental (occult) N2 disease (IIIA) despite thorough preoperative staging and were incompletely resected (R1,2), combined postoperative concurrent chemotherapy and radiotherapy is suggested (Grade 2C).

*Remark:* Incomplete resection (R1,2) does not appear to confer a survival benefit over no resection.

4.5.4. In patients with R0 resected NSCLC who were found to have incidental (occult) N2 disease (IIIA) despite thorough preoperative staging, sequential adjuvant radiotherapy is suggested when concern for a local recurrence is high (Grade 2C).

*Remark*: Adjuvant postoperative radiotherapy reduces the incidence of local recurrence, but it is unclear whether it improves survival.





#### LUNG OLIGOMETASTASES: .. THE ROLE OF SABR



Radiation Oncology

Review and Uses of Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy for Oligometastases

FILIPPO ALONGI,<sup>a</sup> Stefano Arcangeli,<sup>a</sup> Andrea Riccardo Filippi,<sup>b</sup> Umberto Ricardi,<sup>b</sup> Marta Scorsetti<sup>a</sup>



Seminars in RADIATION ONCOLOGY



To SABR or Not to SABR? Indications and Contraindications for Stereotactic Ablative Radiotherapy in the Treatment of Early-Stage, Oligometastatic, or Oligoprogressive Non–Small Cell Lung Cancer

David Benjamin Shultz, MD, PhD,<sup>\*,†</sup> Maximilian Diehn, MD, PhD,<sup>\*,†,‡</sup> and Billv W. Loo Jr. MD. PhD<sup>\*,†</sup>

H. Badakhshi · A. Grün · C. Stromberger · V. Budach · D. Boehmer Department for Radiation Oncology, Charité University Medicine, Berlin

# Oligometastases: the new paradigm and options for radiotherapy

A critical review

> The concept of Oligomestastatic disease was proposed nearly 20 years ago.

SABR is quite effective than surgery for controlling pulmunary metastases





#### STEREOTACTIC BODY RT(SBRT): LUNG OLIGOMTS

TRUEBEAM treatment for colon lung Peripheric metastasis







#### SBRT and... "OLIGOPROGRESSIVE"







### **CONCLUSIONS AND TAKE HOME MESSAGE**

#### IIIA-B:

- Radiochemotherapy is the standard
- New technology allow us to perform with safety RT-CT
- Adjuvant approach is to discuss in case of N2

#### Stage IV :

• SABR for oligometastatic and oligoprogressive disease is an open issue..





ADVANCED STAGE LUNG NSCLC: CONCLUSIONS

## THANK YOU

