# States to the state of the stat

L'IMPORTANZA DELLA RICERCA IN ONCOLOGIA

20 - 21 APRILE 2023 ROMA THE HIVE HOTEL Via Torino 6

## THE OXFORD DEBATE EDITION

## Le terapie locoregionali dovrebbero essere sempre associate alla terapia sistemica nella malattia oligometastatica

### PRO

#### Carlotta Becherini, MD

Radiation Oncology Unit - Oncology Department, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Careggi Florence, Italy



## Oligometastases – Recent studies on breast cancer

- 50% of breast cancer patients with metastatic disease present with a limited number of metastases

Salama JK, et al Semin Oncol 2014

- Breast cancer is potentially well-suited for metastasis-directed therapy in selected patients

Pockaj BA, et al. Ann Surg Oncol 2010 Di Lascio S, et al. Breast Care 2014 Drazer MV, et al. Expert Rev Anticancer Ther 2016 Ricardi U, et al. J Radiat Res 2016

 In retrospective studies on oligometastatic breast cancer patients metastasis-directed surgery or radiation therapy was associated with significantly long-term survival outcomes

> Kobayashi T, et al. Breast Cancer 2012 Milano, et al. Radiother Oncol 2019

## Intracranial Metastasis

- Surgery:
  - Single BMs should be considered for surgical resection [EANO: I, A; ESMO: II, A].
  - Multiple resectable BMs may be considered for surgical resection [EANO: IV, C; ESMO: V, C].
- Radiotherapy:
  - SRS is recommended for patients with a limited number
  - (1-4) of BMs [EANO: I, A; ESMO: I, A].
  - SRS may be considered for patients with a higher number
  - of BMs (5-10) with a cumulative tumour volume <15 ml
  - [EANO: II, B; ESMO: II, B].

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

THE

EDITION

reas

 SRS to the resection cavity is recommended after complete or incomplete resection of BMs [EANO: I, A;ESMO: I, A].



20 - 21 APRILE

## Extracranial metastases

#### Published SBRT studies focused on:

- 1. Variety of primary tumors and metastasis's location
- 2. Single metastatic site
- 3. Single primary tumor

#### Heterogeneity

- SBRT technique, dose, fractionation
- Size of metastases
- Few data on oligometastatic breast cancer

#### Selection bias

- Unfavorable prognosis, heavily pre-treated

#### Salama JK, et al. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2012



## Oligometastases – various entities





**ESO-ESMO**: ≤5 M+, potentielly amenable for local treatment, aiming at complete remission

<u>ATRO-ESTRO</u>: ≤5 M+, all tumour locations safely treatable with curative intent

Cardoso, The Breast 2017 Lievens, Radiother Oncol 2020 Guckenberger, Lancet Oncol 2020

breast Journal Club REERCA WONCOLOCIA THE **OXFORD DEBATE** EDITION



Stereotactic ablative radiotherapy versus standard of care palliative treatment in patients with oligometastatic cancers (SABR-COMET): a randomised, phase 2, open-label trial

David A Palma, Robert Olson, Stephen Harrow, Stewart Gaede, Alexander V Louie, Cornelis Haasbeek, Liam Mulroy, Michael Lock, George B Rodrigues, Brian P Yaremko, Devin Schellenberg, Belal Ahmad, Gwendolyn Griffioen, Sashendra Senthi, Anand Swaminath, Neil Kopek, Mitchell Liu, Karen Moore, Suzanne Currie, Glenn S Bauman, Andrew Warner, Suresh Senan

- 99 patients  $\rightarrow$  randomization (1:2) to receive either palliative standard of care treatments alone (control group), or standard of care plus SBRT to all metastatic lesions (SBRT group)
- Controlled primary tumor and up to 5 metastatic lesions
- Stratification by number of metastases (1-3 vs 4-5)
- Primary endpoint  $\rightarrow$  OS
- 18 breast cancer patients enrolled (13 in SBRT group)

	Control group (n=33)	SABR group (n=66)
Age	69 (64–75)	67 (59–74)
Sex		
Men	19 (58%)	40 (61%)
Women	14 (42%)	26 (39%)
Site of original primary turr	our	
Breast	5 (15%)	13 (20%)
Colorectal	9 (27%)	9 (14%)
Lung	6 (18%)	12 (18%)
Prostate	2 (6 %)	14 (21%)
Other	11 (33%)	18 (27%)
Time from diagnosis of primary tumour to randomisation (years)	2·3 (1·3-4·5)	2.4 (1.6–5.3)
Number of metastases		
1	12 (36 %)	30 (46%)
2	13 (40%)	19 (29%)
3	6 (18%)	12 (18%)
4	2 (6%)	2 (3%)
5	0 (0%)	3 (5%)
Location of metastases		
Adrenal	2/64 (3%)	7/127 (6%)
Bone	20/64 (31%)	45/127 (35%)
Liver	3/64 (5%)	16/127 (13%)
Lung	34/64 (53%)	55/127 (43%)
Other*	5/64 (8%)	4/127 (3%)

Data are n (%), n/N (%), or median (IQR). SABR=stereotactic ablative radiotherapy. \*Other comprises brain (n=3 lesions in control group; n=1 lesion in SABR group), lymph nodes (n=1 lesion in control group; n=3 lesions in SABR group), and para-renal (n=1 lesion in control group).

Table 1: Baseline characteristics

Palma DA, et al. Lancet 2019



Median follow-up 25.5 months

THE

EDITION

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

Median OS was 28 months (95% CI 19–33) in the control group vs 41 months (26–not reached) in the SABR group

(HR 0.57, 95% CI 0.30–1.10; p=0.090 with p<0.20 as positive trial)



Palma DA, et al. Lancet 2019

*Figure 2:* Overall survival (A) and progression-free survival (B) SABR=stereotactic ablative radiotherapy. HR=hazard ratio.

- Adverse events of grade 2 or worse occurred in three (9%) of
  33 controls and 19 (29%) of 66 patients in the SABR group (p=0.026), an absolute increase of 20%
- 4.5% of patients in the SABR group died as a result of toxicity, despite stringent dose constraints and a requirement for peer review of all radiation plans
- SBRT should continue to focus on **minimization of toxicity** and that the use of SABR in patients with more than five lesions should be done **in the context of a clinical trial**
- Phase 3 trials are needed to confirm an OS benefit and to determine the maximum number of metastatic lesions wherein SABR provides a benefit

RD DEBATE

	All patients (n=99)	Control group (n=33)	Stereotactic ablative radiotherapy group (n=66)	p value
Adverse event grade ≥2	55 (56%)	15 (46%)	40 (61%)	0.15
Related adverse event grade ≥2	22 (22%)	3 (9%)	19 (29%)	0.026
Adverse event associated with death (grade 5)	3 (3%)	0	3 (5%)	0.55
Fatigue*				0.45
Grade 2	6 (6%)	2 (6%)	4 (6%)	
Grade 3	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	0	
Dyspnoea*				1.00
Grade 2	1 (1%)	0	1 (2%)	
Grade 3	1 (1%)	0	1 (2%)	
Pain (any type)*				0.14
Grade 2	5 (5%)	0	5 (8%)	
Grade 3	3 (3%)	0	3 (5%)	
Data are n (%). *Treatment rela	ated.			
Table 2: Summary of adverse events				

#### Palma DA, et al. Lancet 2019

www.redjournal.org

## Predictable toxicity

#### **CLINICAL INVESTIGATION**

#### Determining Planning Priorities for SABR for Oligometastatic Disease: A Secondary Analysis of the SABR-COMET Phase II Randomized Trial

Matthew Van Oirschot,\* Alanah Bergman, PhD,<sup>†</sup> Wilko F.A.R. Verbakel, PhD,<sup>†</sup> Lucy Ward, BSc,<sup>§</sup> Isabelle Gagne, PhD,<sup>∥</sup> Vicky Huang, MSc, <sup>#</sup> Nick Chng, PhD,\*\* Peter Houston, MSc,<sup>††</sup> Kerry Symes, BSc,<sup>†</sup> Christopher G. Thomas, PhD,<sup>§</sup> Parminder Basran, PhD,<sup>‡‡</sup> David Bowes, MD,<sup>§</sup> Stephen Harrow, MBChB, PhD,<sup>††</sup> Robert Olson, MD, MSc,\*\* Suresh Senan, MBBS, PhD,<sup>‡</sup> Andrew Warner, MSc,\* David A. Palma, MD, PhD,\* and Stewart Gaede, PhD\*

- Because **oligometastases occur at multiple different sites**, relevant OARs will vary, and trade-offs will depend on the exact location of the tumor and other physiological considerations.
- For example, a lesion adjacent to the trachea may warrant a more conservative approach than a lesion against a less-critical structure, such as the chest wall.
- It is also unclear whether it is preferable to prescribe higher dose that requires PTV coverage compromise versus lowering the prescription dose and covering them PTV fully.
- PTV compromise was required for approximately one-third of lesions, but was not associated with OS, PFS, or lesional control.



Median follow-up 51 months

THE

EDITION

**OXFORD DEBATE** 



Kaplan-Meier plots for (A) overall survival and (B) progression-free survival

Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy: General

The 5-year OS rate was 17.7% in arm 1 versus 42.3% in arm 2 The 5-year PFS rate was not reached in arm 1 (3.2%) and 17.3% in arm 2 There were no new grade 2-5 adverse events and no differences in QOL between arms

Palma DA, et al. 2020, JCO; 38:2830-2838

For Breast cancer patients (only 18 pts): OS HR (95% CI) 0.77 (0.21, 2.88) and PFS HR (95% CI) 0.53 (0.18, 1.59) Lower rate of chemotherapy use in the SABR arm (33%) vs. the control arm (55%, p=0.043)

Courtesy from D. Palma ESTRO 2022

20 - 21 ADDII I

**Methods:** OMBC pts with  $\leq$  4 extracranial mets on standard imaging with controlled primary disease were eligible if on first line SOC ST for  $\leq$  12 months without progression

#### Median age 54 years

**79% ER+ or PR+/HER2-**, 13% HER2+, 8% triple negative **60% with 1 metastasis** and 20% presented synchronously with primary disease

The median follow-up 30 months

New mets*inside*index area (SOC) /RT field (SOC+A): Fewer for SOC+A: 7% vs. 29%

**Conclusions:** The addition of MDT to SOC ST did not show signal for improved PFS, nor OS difference in patients with OMBC, so the trial will not proceed to the Phase III component

Meeting Abstract | 2022 ASCO Annual Meeting I

#### BREAST CANCER-METASTATIC

NRG-BR002: A phase IIR/III trial of standard of care systemic therapy with or without stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) and/or surgical resection (SR) for newly oligometastatic breast cancer (NCT02364557).

Check for updates

<u>Steven J. Chmura, Kathryn A. Winter, Wendy A. Woodward, Virginia F. Borges, Joseph Kamel</u> <u>Salama, Hania A Al-Hallaq, ...</u>

	ST (n=65)	ST+MDT (n=60)
mPFS	23 months	19.5 months
24-mo PFS	45.7%	46.8%
36-mo PFS	32.8%	38.1%
36-mo OS	71.8%	68.9%

## Oligometastases- Real Life



JNCI Cancer Spectrum (2021) 5(3): pkab010

doi: 10.1093/jncics/pkab010 First published online 4 February 2021 Article

Characterization of Oligometastatic Disease in a Real-World Nationwide Cohort of 3447 Patients With de Novo Metastatic Breast Cancer

Tessa G. Steenbruggen (), MD,<sup>1</sup> Michael Schaapveld (), PhD,<sup>2</sup> Hugo M. Horlings (), MD, PhD,<sup>3</sup> Joyce Sanders (), MD, PhD,<sup>3</sup> Sander J. Hogewoning (), MSc,<sup>4</sup> Esther H. Lips (), PhD,<sup>5</sup> Marie-Jeanne T. Vrancken Peeters, MD, PhD,<sup>6</sup> Niels F. Kok, MD, PhD,<sup>6</sup> Terry Wiersma (), MD,<sup>7</sup> Laura Esserman (), MD, PhD<sup>8</sup> Laura J. van 't Veer, PhD,<sup>9</sup> Sabine C. Linn (), MD, PhD,<sup>1,10</sup> Sabine Siesling (), PhD,<sup>4,11</sup>

Table 3. Multivariable model of associations with overall survival in a weighed cohort of patients with oligometastatic breast cancer ( $\leq$ 3 metastases)

Characteristic	Adjusted hazard ratio (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	Р	
Local therap <mark>y primary tumor<sup>c</sup></mark> Yes	0.58 (0.37 to 0.89)	.01 —	
No	Referent		
Yes	0.57 (0.36 to 0.90)	.02	
No	Referent		

In multivariable analyses, premenopausal and perimenopausal status, absence of lung metastases, and local therapy of metastases (surgery and/or radiotherapy) added to systemic therapy were statistically significantly associated with better OS and progression-free survival in OMBC, independent of local therapy of the primary tumor



#### NCCN Guidelines Breast Cancer Version 2.2023

*"consideration of surgery after initial systemic treatment for those requiring palliation of symptoms or with impending complications, such as skin ulceration, bleeding, fungation, and pain"* 

#### **ESMO Clinical Practice Guideline**

Surgery of the primary tumour may be considered for patients with bone-only metastasis, HR-positive tumours, HER2-negative tumours, patients <55 years, patients with Oligometastatic Diseas and those with a good response to initial systemic therapy [II, B]

Annals of Oncology, 2021



#### **ABCSG-28 POSYTIVE Trial**



Inclusion criteria:

- age > 18 years
- Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) Performance Status Grade 0 to 2
- operable breast cancer of any size
- de novo metastatic breast cancer

#### Exclusion criteria:

- inflammatory cancer
- brain metastases
- patient not eligible for general anesthesia and surgery







THE

EDITION

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

Results:

- Median follow-up of 37.5 months
- Median OS: 42 months34.6 months in the surgery group and 54.8 in the nonsurgery group (HR for nonsurgery 0.691; 95% CI 0.358–1.333;P= 0.267)
- Time to distant progression (TTDP): 13.9 months in the surgery arm and 29.0 in the nonsurgery arm (HR 0.598; 95% CI 0.343–1.043; P= 0.0668; Fig. 3)
- Time to loco-regional progression (TTLP) was similar between the 2 arms, with a trend toward a lower number of patients with local progression in surgery Arm A (8.9% vs 17.8%; P=0.2148)
- cT3 and cN2 tumors were more represented in the surgery arm (22.2% vs 6.7% and 15.6% vs 4.4% respectively)
- This study was underpowered as it was stopped early due to poor recruitment



20 - 21 ADDII I

Locoregional treatment versus no treatment of the primary tumour in metastatic breast cancer: an open-label randomised controlled trial

Rajendra Badwe, Rohini Hawaldar, Nita Nair, Rucha Kaushik, Vani Parmar, Shabina Siddique, Ashwini Budrukkar, Indraneel Mittra, Sudeep Gupta

- Feb 7, 2005 Jan 18, 2013
- Inclusion criteria:
  - ≤65 years of age

THE

EDITION

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

)ceos

- an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 1 year)
- de-novo metastatic breast cancer (with measurable and non-measureable disease)
- fit to receive anthracycline chemotherapy (adequate cardiac and liver functions)



#### Badwe, Lancet Oncol, 2015

20 - 21 APRILE

2023 ROMA

Via Torino, 6

THE

**EDITION** 

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

Dreas: Iourna Locoregional treatment versus no treatment of the primary tumour in metastatic breast cancer: an open-label randomised controlled trial

Rajendra Badwe, Rohini Hawaldar, Nita Nair, Rucha Kaushik, Vani Parmar, Shabina Siddique, Ashwini Budrukkar, Indraneel Mittra, Sudeep Gupta



Badwe, Lancet Oncol, 2015

20 - 21 APRILE

2023 ROMA

Via Torino, 6

## Primary Tumour treatment – **Turkish Trial, MF07-01**

- N=274
- Primary endpoint = OS
- Assumed local therapy would  $\uparrow$  3-yr OS 18% (17% $\rightarrow$ 35%)
- All patients received chemotherapy

THE

EDITION

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

• HR+ and HER2+ patients received targeted therapy





Median f/u 18 mo: No difference in OS

• HR=0.76 (0.49-1.16) p=0.20

Median f/u 40 mos: Difference in OS

• HR=0.66 (0.49-0.88) p=.005

Soran A et al. Ann Surg Oncol 2018

20 - 21 APRILE

## Primary Tumour treatment – Turkish Trial, MF07-01

#### Unplanned, exploratory subgroup analyses



THE

EDITION

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

Dreas:

Soran A et al. Ann Surg Oncol 2018

20 - 21 APRILE

2023 ROMA

Via Torino, 6

## Primary Tumour treatment – BOMET MF 14-01

#### • Prospective Multicenter Registry

THE

**EDITION** 

**OXFORD DEBATE** 

Dreas

#### •N=505

	ST n:240 (%)	LRT n:265 (%)	Р
	54.0±13.8	51.1±12.9	0.02
)	$28.3 \pm 4.5$	$27.8 \pm 4.5$	0.21
s)	33 (25–41)	34.9(24-45)	0.66
T1	28 (12)	48 (18)	0.0006
T2	192 (80)	172 (65)	
Т3	20 (8)	45 (17)	
I	38 (16)	27 (10)	0.02
П	95 (40)	135 (51)	
III	107 (45)	103 (39)	
IDC	195 (81)	218 (82)	0.94
ILC	20 (8)	20 (8)	
Other	25 (10)	27 (10)	
	206 (86)	224 (85)	0.67
	68 (28)	76 (29)	0.93
	20 (8)	16 (6)	0.32
Solitary	76 (32)	138 (52)	< 0.0001
Oligometastases (< 4 metastases)	128 (53)	201 (76)	< 0.0001
Multiple ( $\geq$ 4 metastases)	111 (46)	64 (24)	0.003
> 5 metastases	64 (27)	41 (15)	0.002
	s) T1 T2 T3 I II III IDC ILC Other Solitary Oligometastases (< 4 metastases) Multiple (≥ 4 metastases) > 5 metastases	ST n:240 (%) ST n:240 (%) 54.0±13.8 28.3±4.5 s) 33 (25–41) T1 28 (12) T2 192 (80) T3 20 (8) I 38 (16) II 38 (16) II 95 (40) III 107 (45) IDC 195 (81) ILC 20 (8) Other 25 (10) 206 (86) 68 (28) 20 (8) Solitary 76 (32) Oligometastases (< 4 metastases) 128 (53) Multiple (≥ 4 metastases) 111 (46) > 5 metastases 64 (27)	ST n:240 (%)LRT n:265 (%) $54.0\pm13.8$ $51.1\pm12.9$ $28.3\pm4.5$ $27.8\pm4.5$ $s)$ $33 (25-41)$ $34.9(24-45)$ $T1$ $28 (12)$ $48 (18)$ $T2$ $192 (80)$ $172 (65)$ $T3$ $20 (8)$ $45 (17)$ $I$ $38 (16)$ $27 (10)$ $I$ $95 (40)$ $135 (51)$ $II$ $107 (45)$ $103 (39)$ $IDC$ $195 (81)$ $218 (82)$ $ILC$ $20 (8)$ $20 (8)$ $Other$ $25 (10)$ $27 (10)$ $206 (86)$ $224 (85)$ $68 (28)$ $76 (29)$ $20 (8)$ $16 (6)$ Solitary $76 (32)$ $138 (52)$ $Oligometastases (< 4 metastase)$ $128 (53)$ $201 (76)$ $Multiple (≥ 4 metastase)$ $111 (46)$ $64 (24)$ $> 5$ metastases $64 (27)$ $41 (15)$



Prolonged survival in the median 3-year follow-up in favor of LRT

of the primary (HR 0.40, p<0.0001)

Soran A et al. Ann Surg Oncol 2021

20 - 21 APRILE

2023 ROMA

**HE HIVE HOTEL** 

Via Torino, 6

## **Oligometastatic Disease - Conclusions**



**Increasing Effectiveness of Systemic Therapy** 

Contribution of improved locoregional control to survival depends on the effectiveness of systemic treatment

In this model the component of metastatic risk of the primary tumor is missing

Punglia RS, et al. N Engl J Med 2007



## **Oligometastatic Disease - Conclusions**



The influence of **both the effectiveness of systemic therapy and metastatic risk of the primary tumor** can be used to estimate the contribution of improved locoregional treatment to the final outcome

Poortmans P, et al. lancet 2014



## **Oligometastatic Disease - Conclusions**

Aims to locoregional treatment

- To prolong local control
- To postpone further systemic therapy



- To improve DFS/PFS/OS
- To treat symptomatic critical sites







## Oligometastatic Disease – Who? When? What?

#### Identification of metastatic patients suitable for *curative* treatment

- prognostic/predictive models for patients selection

#### Improvement of *diagnostic* accuracy

- metabolic imaging? CTC's? detection of minimal drug-resistant residual disease?

#### Combining SRT with *drugs* to investigate interactions

- high-dose radiotherapy, systemic immune cascade, regression of distant non-irradiated lesions

Tharmalingham H, et al. Tech Inn Pat Sup Radi Onc 2017



Le terapie locoregionali dovrebbero essere sempre associate alla terapia sistemica nella malattia oligometastatica

#### Carlotta Becherini, MD

Radiation Oncology Unit - Oncology Department, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Careggi Florence, Italy

Contact at <a href="mailto:becherini.carlotta@gmail.com">becherini.carlotta@gmail.com</a>

Twitter Account @CarlottaB



ORD DEBATE

