World Journal of *Clinical Oncology*

World J Clin Oncol 2022 January 24; 13(1): 1-70





Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

WJC0

World Journal of Woriu journe Clinical Oncology

Contents

1

Monthly Volume 13 Number 1 January 24, 2022

EDITORIAL

Update on the treatment of metastatic renal cell carcinoma Medina López RA, Rivero Belenchon I, Mazuecos-Quirós J, Congregado-Ruíz CB, Couñago F

REVIEW

9 New approaches for patients with advanced radioiodine-refractory thyroid cancer Pitoia F, Jerkovich F, Trimboli P, Smulever A

MINIREVIEWS

- 28 Immunotherapy: A new standard in the treatment of metastatic clear cell renal cell carcinoma Popovic M, Matovina-Brko G, Jovic M, Popovic LS
- 39 Role of radiotherapy in oligometastatic breast cancer: Review of the literature Beduk Esen CS, Gultekin M, Yildiz F

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Retrospective Study

49 Association of cancer with comorbid inflammatory conditions and treatment in patients with Lynch syndrome

Faisal MS, Burke CA, Liska D, Lightner AL, Leach B, O'Malley M, LaGuardia L, Click B, Achkar J, Kalady M, Church J, Mankaney G

CASE REPORT

62 Late recurrence of localized pure seminoma in prostate gland: A case report

Baweja A, Mar N, Rezazadeh Kalebasty A



Contents

Monthly Volume 13 Number 1 January 24, 2022

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of World Journal of Clinical Oncology, Manoj K Kashyap, MS, PhD, Associate Professor, Amity Stem Cell Institute, Amity Medical School, Amity University Haryana Amity Education Valley Panchgaon (Manesar), Gurugram, Haryana 122413, India. mkkashyap@ggn.amity.edu

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of World Journal of Clinical Oncology (WJCO, World J Clin Oncol) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of oncology with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJCO mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of oncology and covering a wide range of topics including art of oncology, biology of neoplasia, breast cancer, cancer prevention and control, cancer-related complications, diagnosis in oncology, gastrointestinal cancer, genetic testing for cancer, gynecologic cancer, head and neck cancer, hematologic malignancy, lung cancer, melanoma, molecular oncology, neurooncology, palliative and supportive care, pediatric oncology, surgical oncology, translational oncology, and urologic oncology.

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The WJCO is now abstracted and indexed in PubMed, PubMed Central, Emerging Sources Citation Index (Web of Science), China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), China Science and Technology Journal Database (CSTJ), and Superstar Journals Database. The 2021 edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2020 Journal Citation Indicator (JCI) for WJCO as 0.48.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: Ying-Yi Yuan; Production Department Director: Xu Guo; Editorial Office Director: Ze-Mao Gong.

| NAME OF JOURNAL World Journal of Clinical Oncology | INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204 |
|---|---|
| ISSN | GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS |
| ISSN 2218-4333 (online) | https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287 |
| LAUNCH DATE | GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH |
| November 10, 2010 | https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240 |
| FREQUENCY | PUBLICATION ETHICS |
| Monthly | https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288 |
| EDITORS-IN-CHIEF | PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT |
| Hiten RH Patel, Stephen Safe, Jian-Hua Mao, Ken H Young | https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208 |
| EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS | ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE |
| https://www.wjgnet.com/2218-4333/editorialboard.htm | https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242 |
| PUBLICATION DATE | STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS |
| January 24, 2022 | https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239 |
| COPYRIGHT | ONLINE SUBMISSION |
| © 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc | https://www.f6publishing.com |

© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved. 7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com



World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Submit a Manuscript: https://www.f6publishing.com

World J Clin Oncol 2022 January 24; 13(1): 39-48

DOI: 10.5306/wico.v13.i1.39

ISSN 2218-4333 (online)

MINIREVIEWS

Role of radiotherapy in oligometastatic breast cancer: Review of the literature

Caglayan Selenge Beduk Esen, Melis Gultekin, Ferah Yildiz

ORCID number: Caglayan Selenge Beduk Esen 0000-0001-9967-8177; Melis Gultekin 0000-0002-1806-2619; Ferah Yildiz 0000-0002-2557-8103.

Author contributions: Beduk Esen CS wrote the main body of the manuscript; Gultekin M and Yildiz F provided guidance in the structure of the manuscript and reviewed the manuscript.

Conflict-of-interest statement: The authors have no conflict of interests to declare.

Country/Territory of origin: Turkey

Specialty type: Oncology

Provenance and peer review: Invited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

Peer-review report's scientific quality classification

Grade A (Excellent): 0 Grade B (Very good): 0 Grade C (Good): C, C Grade D (Fair): 0 Grade E (Poor): 0

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative

Caglayan Selenge Beduk Esen, Melis Gultekin, Ferah Yildiz, Department of Radiation Oncology, Hacettepe University Faculty of Medicine, Ankara 06100, Turkey

Corresponding author: Caglayan Selenge Beduk Esen, MD, Research Scientist, Department of Radiation Oncology, Hacettepe University Faculty of Medicine, Sıhhiye, Ankara 06100, Turkey. selengebedk@gmail.com

Abstract

Metastatic breast cancer has been historically considered as an incurable disease. Radiotherapy (RT) has been traditionally used for only palliation of the symptoms caused by metastatic lesions. However, in recent years the concept of oligometastatic disease has been introduced in Cancer Medicine as a clinical scenario with a limited number of metastases (\leq 5) and involved organs (\leq 2) with controlled primary tumor. The main hypothesis in oligometastatic disease is that locoregional treatment of primary tumor site and metastasis-directed therapies with surgery and/or RT may improve outcomes. Recent studies have shown that not all metastatic breast cancer patients have the same prognosis, and selected patients with good prognostic features as those younger than 55 years, hormone receptor-positive, limited bone or liver metastases, a low-grade tumor, good performance status, long disease-free interval (> 12 mo), and good response to systemic therapy may provide maximum benefit from definitive treatment procedures to all disease sites. While retrospective and prospective studies on locoregional treatment in oligometastatic breast cancer demonstrated conflicting results, there is an increasing trend in favor of locoregional treatment. Currently, available data also demonstrated the improvements in survival with metastasisdirected therapy in oligometastatic breast cancer. The current review will discuss the concept of oligometastases and provide up-to-date information about the role of RT in oligometastatic breast cancer.

Key Words: Breast cancer; Oligometastatic; Radiotherapy; Locoregional treatment; Ablative therapy; Metastasis-directed therapy

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: Radiotherapy (RT) has been traditionally used for only palliation of the



Commons Attribution

NonCommercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: htt ps://creativecommons.org/Licens es/by-nc/4.0/

Received: February 28, 2021 Peer-review started: February 28, 2021 First decision: April 27, 2021 Revised: May 5, 2021 Accepted: December 22, 2021 Article in press: December 22, 2021 Published online: January 24, 2022

P-Reviewer: Al-Afandi N, Huo Q S-Editor: Gong ZM L-Editor: Filipodia P-Editor: Gong ZM



symptoms caused by metastatic lesions. However, in recent years the concept of oligometastatic disease has been introduced in Cancer Medicine as a clinical scenario with a limited number of metastases (\leq 5) and involved organs (\leq 2) with controlled primary tumor. The main hypothesis in oligometastatic disease is that locoregional treatment of primary tumor site and metastasis-directed therapies with surgery and/or RT may improve outcomes. The current review will provide up-to-date information about the role of RT in oligometastatic breast cancer.

Citation: Beduk Esen CS, Gultekin M, Yildiz F. Role of radiotherapy in oligometastatic breast cancer: Review of the literature. World J Clin Oncol 2022; 13(1): 39-48 URL: https://www.wjgnet.com/2218-4333/full/v13/i1/39.htm DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.5306/wjco.v13.i1.39

INTRODUCTION

Breast cancer is the most common cancer in females worldwide, with an estimated 276480 new cases, and the second most common cause of cancer death with an estimated 42170 deaths in 2020[1]. Metastasis at the time of diagnosis has been observed in 3%-10% of breast cancer patients and has been considered in the past unlikely to be cured^[2]. However, the metastatic disease has a broad spectrum ranging from a single metastasis to widespread dissemination, and it has been observed that not all metastatic patients have the same prognosis.

The concept of oligometastases was first described by Hellman and Weichselbaum [3] in 1995, and they hypothesized that patients with oligometastases should be considered as candidates for curative therapeutic strategies. Oligometastases was described as a clinical scenario with a limited number of metastases (1 to 5) and involved organs (≤ 2) with controlled primary tumors[3]. The exact number of metastasis for the concept of oligometastases has not been clearly defined yet; however, most studies evaluating oligometastatic disease included patients with five or less metastasis[4,5].

While the standard treatment for metastatic disease includes systemic therapy with or without palliative radiotherapy (RT), recent studies are evaluating the role of ablative therapies to metastases and locoregional treatment to the primary tumor site in oligometastatic breast cancer [6-9]. In recent years, the prognosis of breast cancer has improved with the introduction of novel systemic therapies, even in patients with metastatic disease[10,11]. Some patients with good prognostic features may achieve complete response for more than 5 years after systemic therapy[12]. Several factors affect the prognosis in breast cancer patients with oligometastatic disease as the disease-free interval between primary cancer and metastasis formation, number of metastatic lesions, metastatic sites, hormone receptor status, human epidermal growth factor 2 (Her2) status, and pN stage[13-15]. Systemic therapy and local treatment to both primary and metastatic lesions may improve outcomes in such selected patients with metastatic breast cancer. Herein, we will review the impact of RT in oligometastatic breast cancer for both metastatic and primary tumor sites.

SHOULD WE PERFORM LOCOREGIONAL TREATMENT IN **OLIGOMETASTATIC BREAST CANCER PATIENTS?**

In the past, the locoregional treatment in metastatic breast cancer was believed to have a role only for palliation of the symptoms caused by the local progression of the tumor. However, beginning from the early 2000s, with the advent of novel systemic therapies as new chemotherapeutic agents, anti-HER2 agents, hormonal therapies, immunotherapies, and cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitors, the destiny of patients with metastatic breast cancer have changed. A significant number of patients showed at least good partial response both in the primary and metastatic sites, which led to questioning the idea of treating these patients with some form of locoregional treatment based on the idea that the primary tumor could be a source of reseeding of cancer outside the breast. The National Cancer Database study revealed that surgery



to the primary site when added to systemic therapy in patients with stage IV breast cancer significantly improved survival^[16]. A similar retrospective study using the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database also showed that median survival was longer in metastatic breast cancer patients who had surgery to the primary site than patients who did not (36 mo vs 21 mo, P < 0.001)[17]. However, the prospective phase III ABCSG-28 POSYTIVE trial that randomized metastatic breast cancer patients to surgery followed by systemic therapy or systemic therapy alone could not demonstrate an overall survival (OS) benefit for the surgery arm[18]. Another study from India randomized 350 patients with de novo metastatic breast cancer who had an objective tumor response after 6-8 courses of chemotherapy to locoregional treatment to primary or no locoregional treatment arms[19]. At a median follow-up of 23 mo, no statistically significant difference in OS was observed between treatment arms (19.2 mo vs 20.5 mo, P = 0.79). However, locoregional treatment was associated with improved locoregional progression-free survival (PFS) but shorter distant PFS[19]. In another study by Soran et al[20], 274 treatment naïve metastatic breast cancer patients were randomized to receive locoregional treatment followed by systemic therapy vs systemic therapy alone. With a median follow-up of 55 mo, median survival was significantly longer in the locoregional treatment arm compared to patients with systemic therapy alone arm (46 mo vs 37 mo, P = 0.005). Unplanned subgroup analysis of this study showed that improvement in survival was observed in patients with estrogen receptor/progesterone receptor positive, Her2 negative disease, younger than 55 years, and with solitary bone-only metastasis[20].

Several ongoing trials are evaluating the impact of locoregional treatment on survival in metastatic breast cancer. Early results of the ECOG E2108 trial that randomized 256 patients whose disease responded to initial systemic therapy, or stayed stable, to systemic therapy plus locoregional treatment or systemic therapy alone, showed that there was no significant difference in 3-year OS (68.4% vs 67.9%, P = 0.63); however, the locoregional recurrence or progression was significantly higher in the systemic therapy alone arm (3-year rate 25.6% vs 10.2%, Gray test P = 0.003)[21]. Preliminary results of another multicentric prospective ongoing trial (TBCRC 013) evaluating the impact of surgery on OS in metastatic breast cancer patients who responded to first-line systemic therapy showed that the addition of surgery to systemic therapy had no impact on OS even in responders to first-line systemic therapy^[22]. JCOG1017 PRIM-BC trial comparing surgery to primary plus systemic therapy with systemic therapy alone has completed accrual, and results of this trial are being expected[23]. Ongoing SUBMIT (NCT01392586) trial is also investigating whether upfront surgery in patients with metastatic breast cancer will result in an improvement of the 2-year survival compared to the survival achieved by systemic therapy and delayed local treatment or systemic therapy alone^[24]. The details of prospective randomized trials investigating the role of locoregional treatment in metastatic breast cancer are given in Table 1. The final results of these prospective randomized studies will hopefully clarify the exact role of locoregional treatment in metastatic breast cancer patients.

There is no prospective randomized study comparing surgery with surgery plus RT or RT alone as a locoregional treatment in metastatic breast cancer. A retrospective study by Gultekin et al^[7] evaluating the impact of locoregional treatment in 227 oligometastatic breast cancer patients showed that locoregional treatment per se did not affect OS and PFS, however, surgery and RT when used together improved OS and PFS. The authors also observed that patients with solitary metastasis had longer PFS than patients with multiple metastases. In another retrospective study, Le Scodan et al[8] compared 320 metastatic breast cancer patients who received exclusive locoregional RT with or without surgery with 261 metastatic breast cancer patients who did not receive locoregional treatment. In this study, 78% of patients had exclusive locoregional RT, and patients with locoregional treatment had longer 3-year OS rates (43.4% vs 26.7%, P < 0.001). Although there was no statistically significant difference in locoregional treatment modalities regarding survival outcomes, multifactorial analysis in the Le Scodan et al[8] study showed that age at diagnosis, visceral metastases, involvement of multiple sites, endocrine treatment, and locoregional treatment were independent prognostic factors for OS[8]. Retrospective studies published within the last decade investigating the impact of locoregional treatment on primary tumor sites are detailed in Table 2.

There is still no consensus about the efficacy of locoregional treatment in metastatic breast cancer. There is again no consensus about the optimal treatment strategy as surgery alone or surgery plus RT or RT alone when locoregional treatment is indicated. Based on the available data, locoregional treatment may be offered to patients who have a long-life expectancy, such as those younger than 55 years, have



Table 1 Prospective randomized phase III trials investigating the role of locoregional treatment in de novo metastatic breast cancer

| Ref. | n | Treatment | Patients | Median follow-up (mo) | Outcomes |
|---|-----|---|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Khan <i>et al</i> [21] (ECOG- ACRIN E2108) | 256 | Primary systemic therapy: LRT (<i>n</i> = 125); No LRT (<i>n</i> = 131) | NR | 59 | 3-yr OS: 68.4% <i>vs</i> 67.9%, <i>P</i> = 0.63 3-yr locoregional recurrence/progression: 10.2% <i>vs</i> 25.6%, <i>P</i> = 0.003 |
| Fitzal <i>et al</i> [18] (ABCSG-28 | 90 | Arm A: Primary surgery + systemic therapy (<i>n</i> = 45) | Arm A: More cT3 and cN2 tumors | 37.5 | Stopped early |
| POSYTIVE) | | | | | Median OS (mo): 34.6 vs 54.8, P = 0.267 |
| | | Arm B: Primary systemic therapy (<i>n</i> = 45) | | | Time to distant progression (mo): 13.9 vs 29.0, $P = 0.0668$ |
| Soran <i>et al</i> [20] (MF07- 01) | 274 | LRT + systemic therapy ($n = 138$) | LRT arm: More ER/PR (+), less triple negative tumors | 54.5 vs 55 | Median OS (mo): 46 vs 37, P = 0.005 |
| | | Systemic therapy (n = 136) | tunois | | Unplanned subgroup analysis: Improvement in survival: ER/PR (+), HER2 (-), < 55 yr, solitary bone- only metastasis |
| Badwe <i>et al</i> [<mark>19</mark>] (NCT00193778) | 350 | Primary systemic therapy: LRT (n = 173); No LRT (n = 177) | Similar patient and tumor characteristics | 23 | Median OS (mo): 19.2 vs 20.5, P = 0.79 |
| (11010193776) | | | | | Median LR-PFS (mo): not attained vs 18.2, $P < 0.0001$ |
| | | | | | Median distant-PFS (mo): 11.3 vs 19.8, P = 0.012 |

NR: Not reported; LRT: Locoregional treatment; c: Clinic; T: Tumor; N: Node; ER: Estrogen receptor; PR: Progesterone receptor; OS: Overall survival; HER2: Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; LR: Locoregional; PFS: Progression-free survival.

> hormone receptor-positive, HER2 positive, bone or limited liver metastases, presence of a low-grade tumor, good performance status, good response to systemic therapy, and a limited number of metastases[8,25].

SHOULD WE TREAT METASTASES IN OLIGOMETASTATIC BREAST CANCER PATIENTS?

Traditionally, the standard treatment is systemic therapy for metastatic breast cancer patients; however, long-term complete response with systemic therapy alone is rare [12]. Given that progression in metastatic breast cancer patients frequently occurs at sites of known metastases rather than new metastatic lesions, local ablative therapies to metastatic sites may provide therapeutic benefit [9,26]. In addition to surgery and radiofrequency ablation, stereotactic body RT (SBRT) or stereotactic ablative RT (SABR), which allows highly conformal dose distribution using high dose per fraction with a low number of fractions, may be used as local ablative therapies to metastases to prevent progression[26,27].

Response to systemic therapy is a significant prognostic factor in metastatic breast cancer^[4]. In a retrospective study by Weykamp *et al*^[28], the 2-year local control and OS rates were reported as 89% and 62%, respectively, in patients with oligometastatic disease. The authors also observed that solitary metastasis and young age were independent factors for PFS and OS, respectively [28]. In another study by Kobayashi et al[29], 75 oligometastatic breast cancer patients who had a complete or partial response after systemic therapy and treated with local therapy were retrospectively evaluated, and it was demonstrated that complete response or no evidence of disease rates were significantly better in patients with a single organ metastasis than with two organ metastases (P = 0.002)[29]. In this retrospective study, the multidisciplinary treatment improved OS compared to systemic therapy alone[29].

Few studies have investigated the role of SBRT as a local treatment of metastases in oligometastatic disease including metastatic breast cancer patients (Table 3)[4-6,9,26, 28,30,31]. Studies in the literature showed that the maximum benefit from SBRT to all metastatic sites was provided in young patients whose primary breast cancer was controlled, with a limited number of metastases, low tumor volume, only bone metastases, good response to systemic therapy, long disease-free interval (> 12 mo), and hormone receptor-positivity [4,29,30].



Table 2 Retrospective studies published within the last decade investigating the impact of locoregional treatment to the primary tumor site in de novo metastatic breast cancer

| Ref. | n | Treatment | Patient | Median follow- up (mo) | Outcomes |
|--|-------|--|--|---------------------------|--|
| Ma et al[35] 987 | 987 | Surgery ($n = 463$) No surgery ($n = 524$) | Surgery arm: More T1-2, HR- positive, solitary metastasis, bone | NR | Median survival (mo): 45 <i>vs</i> 28, <i>P</i> < 0.001 |
| | | No surgery (<i>n</i> – 524) | only metastasis | | Better survival in surgery after systemic therapy than primary surgery |
| | | | | | Triple negative, brain metastases: No benefit of surgery |
| Lane <i>et al</i> [<mark>16</mark>] (NCDB) | 24015 | Systemic therapy alone (<i>n</i> = 13505) | Surgery after systemic therapy arm: Younger, more T3-4 and HR- | NR | Median OS (mo): 37.5 vs 49.4 vs 52.8, P < 0.001 |
| | | Surgery before systemic therapy ($n = 4552$) | negative | | RT: No impact on OS |
| | | Systemic therapy before surgery (<i>n</i> = 5958) | | | |
| Li <i>et al</i> [<mark>36</mark>] (SEER database) | 20870 | Surgery (<i>n</i> = 5779) | Surgery arm: Younger, more T1-3, N+, Gr III, and less HR+ More chemo and RT received | NR | Surgery arm (\pm RT): Improved BCSS and OS ($P < 0.001$) |
| | | No surgery ($n = 15091$) | | | |
| Pons-Tostivint <i>et al</i> [37] | 4276 | LRT (<i>n</i> = 1706): Surgery, RT or both | LRT arm: Younger, more solitary or bone-only metastases | 45.3 | Median OS (mo): HR-positive, HER2- negative: 61.6 <i>vs</i> 45.9, <i>P</i> < 0.001 |
| | | No LRT (<i>n</i> = 2570) | | | HR-positive, HER2-positive: 77.2 <i>vs</i> 52.6, <i>P</i> = 0.008 |
| | | | | | Triple negative: 19 <i>vs</i> 18.6, <i>P</i> = 0.54 |
| | | | | | Bone only metastases: 70.4 vs 62, $P < 0.001$ |
| | | | | | Visceral metastases: 83 vs 52.7, P < 0.001 |
| Choi et al[<mark>38</mark>] | 245 | LRT ($n = 82$): Surgery, RT or both | LRT arm: < T4, no liver or brain metastasis, and < 5 metastatic sites | 40 | 5-yr LRFS: 62% <i>vs</i> 20%, <i>P</i> < 0.001 |
| | | No LRT (<i>n</i> = 163) | | | 5-yr OS:73% vs 45%, $P = 0.02$ |
| Gultekin et al[7] | 227 | LRT (<i>n</i> = 188): Surgery, RT or both | LRT arm: Less T3-4 and more solitary metastases | 35 | 5-yr OS: 56% <i>vs</i> 24%, <i>P</i> < 0.001 |
| | | No LRT $(n = 39)$ | | | 5-yr PFS: 27% vs 7%, $P < 0.0001$ |
| Nguyen et al[39] | 733 | LRT (<i>n</i> = 378): Surgery, RT or both | LRT arm: Younger, more T1-2, N0-1, limited M1 disease | 21 | 5-yr OS: 21% <i>vs</i> 14%, <i>P</i> < 0.001 |
| | | No LRT ($n = 355$) | No-1, innited wit disease | | 5-yr PFS 72% vs 46%, $P < 0.001$ |
| Neuman <i>et al</i> [25] | 186 | Surgery (<i>n</i> = 69): 13% RT | Surgery arm: More HER2- | 52 | No difference in OS ($P = 0.10$) |
| | | No surgery ($n = 117$) | negative, smaller tumors, more solitary metastasis | | |

NCDB: National Cancer Database; SEER: Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results, RT: Radiotherapy; LRT: Locoregional treatment; T: Tumor; HR: Hormone receptor; HER2: Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; N: Node, Gr: Grade; M: Metastasis; NR: Not reported; OS: Overall survival; PFS: Progression-free survival; BCSS: Breast cancer-specific survival; LRFS: Local recurrence-free survival.

> The prospective studies exploring the role of SBRT to metastatic sites in oligometastatic breast cancer are limited (Table 4)[5,6,9,26,30,31]. Milano et al[9] performed hypofractionated stereotactic radiation (50 Gy in 10 fractions) to all sites of disease in 48 breast cancer patients with 1-5 extracranial metastases. The authors observed that some patients who have only bone metastases rather than visceral metastases and with low tumor burden (volume and number of lesions) survived longer than 10 years[9]. Five- and ten-year OS rates after hypofractionated stereotactic radiation was 83% and 75%, for patients with only bone metastases vs 31% and 17%, respectively, for patients with not only bone metastases[9]. Trovo et al[6] in a prospective phase II trial



Table 3 Retrospective studies investigating the role of radiotherapy as a local treatment of metastases in oligometastatic disease

| Ref. | n | Treatment | Patients | Median follow-up (mo) | Outcomes |
|--------------------------------------|-----|--|--|-----------------------------|---|
| Weykamp et al [<mark>28</mark>] | 46 | SBRT: Bone, lung, liver, adrenal gland Median 3 frx (1-10)/28 Gy (24-60 Gy) | Inclusion criteria: breast cancer, oligometastatic (≤ 3) or oligoprogressive (1) disease 58 lesions | 21 | 2-yr LC, DC, PFS and OS: 89%, 44%, 17%, and 62%, respectivelySolitary metastasis: Poor prognostic factor for DC and PFSHigher age: Poor prognostic factor for OS |
| Kobayashi <i>et al</i> [29] | 75 | Primary systemic chemotherapy: CR/PR Surgery or RT | Inclusion criteria: breast cancer, ≤ 2 metastatic organs, < 5 metastases, < 5 cm lesions | 103 | 10-yr and 20-yr OS: 59.2% and 34.1%, respectively 10-yr and 20-yr RFS: 27.4% Single organ metastasis, local treatment and shorter DFI: Better RFS |
| Hong <i>et al</i> [4] | 361 | SBRT 10 frx/50-60 Gy or 3 frx/24-48 Gy | Extracranial oligometastases (≤ 5) Breast cancer (16%) | 26.2 | 3-yr OS, PFS and TMC were 56%, 24%, and 72%, respectively Primary tumor type, interval to metastasis, number of treated metastasis, and mediastinal/hilar LN, liver, or adrenal metastases: Associated with OS All breast cancer patients: RPA class 1 (3-yr OS 75%) |
| Cha et al[40] | 49 | LRT (<i>n</i> = 33) 82% RT: Bone, LN | Inclusion criteria: HR-positive, HER2-negative | 101.6 vs 105.6 | Median OS (mo): 72.3 vs 91, $P = 0.272$ |
| | | Endocrine therapy alone ($n = 16$) | Similar patient and tumor characteristics | | Median PFS (mo): 30 vs 18, P = 0.049 |

SBRT: Stereotactic body radiation therapy; frx: Fraction, Gy: Gray, CR: Complete response; PR: Partial response; RT: Radiotherapy; LN: Lymph node; LRT: Locoregional treatment; HR: Hormone receptor; HER2: Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; LC: Local control; DC: Distant control; OS: Overall survival; PFS: Progression-free survival; DFI: Disease-free interval; TMC: Treated metastasis control; RPA: Recursive partitioning analysis.

administered SBRT (30-45 Gy in 3 fractions) or intensity-modulated RT (60 Gy in 25 fractions) to all metastatic sites in 54 oligometastatic breast cancer patients whose primary tumor was controlled. The authors reported that 2-year local control, OS, and PFS rates with a median follow-up of 30 mo were 97%, 95%, and 53%, respectively, and no \geq grade 3 toxicity was documented[6]. The first randomized phase II study in metastatic cancer is the SABR-COMET study in which 99 patients with the oligometastatic disease were randomized to receive systemic therapy plus palliative RT (8 Gy in 1 fraction or 30 Gy in 10 fractions) or systemic therapy plus SABR to all metastatic sites. Only 18% of the patients were with breast cancer in this study. There was a significant improvement in terms of 5-year OS (17.7% vs 42.3%, P = 0.006), 4-year PFS (3.2% vs 21.6%, P = 0.001), and local control rates (46% vs 63%, P = 0.039) in patients treated with SABR without any significant adverse events[5]. Results of three ongoing prospective randomized studies (SABR-COMET 10, STEREO-SEIN, and NRG-BR002) are being expected to clarify the role of SBRT to all metastatic sites in oligometastatic breast cancer[32-34].

CONCLUSION

Metastatic breast cancer includes a wide spectrum of disease ranging from oligometastatic to disseminated disease. There has been growing interest during the last 20 years in the curative treatment of oligometastatic breast cancer with the advances in systemic therapy. Aggressive local treatment of primary tumor and metastasesdirected therapies may improve survival in selected patients, and should especially be suggested to young patients with limited number of metastases. The results of ongoing trials specific to breast cancer will be more helpful in the future.

Zaisbideng® WJCO | https://www.wjgnet.com

Table 4 Prospective studies exploring the role of radiotherapy to metastatic sites in oligometastatic disease including primary breast cancer

| Ref. | n | Treatment | Patients | Median follow-up (mo) | Outcomes |
|---|---------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| Palma <i>et al</i> [5] 99 (SABR- COMET) | Palliative RT \pm systemic | Inclusion criteria: 1-5 metastases, life expectancy ≥ 6 mo, controlled primary | 51 | 5-yr OS: 17.7% <i>vs</i> 42.3%, <i>P</i> = 0.006 | |
| | therapy $(n = 33)$ | tumor | | 4-yr PFS 3.2% vs 21.6%, $P = 0.001$ | |
| | 1 frx/8 Gy or 1 Gy | | | | LC 46% vs 63%, $P = 0.039$ |
| | | SABR \pm systemic therapy ($n = 66$) | Primary breast cancer (<i>n</i>): 5 <i>vs</i> 13 | | \geq Gr 2 toxicity: 9% vs 29%, $P=0.026$ |
| | | Different regimens according to tumor size and location | | | SABR: Gr 5 toxicity ($n = 3$) |
| Milano et al[9] | 48 | HSRT: ≥ 50 Gy in 10 frx | Inclusion criteria: breast cancer, 1-5 extracranial metastases, primary controlled | 52 | 5- and 10-yr OS: |
| | | | | | Bone-only oligometastases: 83% and 75% |
| | | | | | Non-bone-only oligometastases: 31% and 17% ($P = 0.002$) |
| | | | | | GTV > 25 cc: Poor prognostic factor for LC |
| Trovo et al[<mark>6</mark>] | 54 | SBRT: 3 frx/30-45 Gy (<i>n</i> = 44) | Inclusion criteria: breast cancer, ≤ 5 extracranial metastases, primary controlled | 30 | 2-y LC: 97% |
| | | | | | 2-y OS: 95% |
| | | IMRT: 25 frx/60 Gy (<i>n</i> = 10) | | | 1- and 2-yr PFS: 75% and 53%, respectively |
| | | | 92 lesions | | No≥Gr 3 toxicity |
| Salama et al [<mark>26</mark>] | 61 | SBRT: Lung, LN, liver, bone, adrenal, soft tissue, pancreas | Inclusion criteria: 1-5 metastatic sites, life expectancy > 3 mo | 20.9 | 1-yr and 2-yr OS: 81.5% and 56.7%, respectively |
| | | 3 frx/24-48 Gy | | | 1-yr and 2-yr PFS: 33.3% and 22.0%, respectively |
| Scorsetti <i>et al</i> | 33 | SBRT: 3-4 frx/48-75 Gy | Inclusion criteria: breast cancer, < 5 lung or liver metastases, other metastatic sites stable or responding after chemotherapy | 24 | 1- and 2-yr LC: 98% and 90%, respectively |
| [51] | [31] | | | | 1- and 2-yr OS: 93% and 66%, respectively |
| | | | | | 1- and 2-yr PFS: 48% and 27%, respectively |
| | | | 43 lesions | | No grade 3-4 toxicities |
| Milano <i>et al</i> | | SBRT doses and | Inclusion criteria: breast cancer, ≤ 5 | NR | 4-yr OS: 59% |
| [30] | fractionation was not mentioned | metastases | | 4-yr PFS: 38% | |
| | | | | | 4-yr LC: 89% |
| | | | | | Favorable prognosis: Solitary metastasis, smaller tumor volume, bone-only disease, and stable or regressing lesions |

RT: Radiotherapy; frx: Fraction; Gy: Gray; SBRT: Stereotactic body radiation therapy; HSRT: Hypofractionated stereotactic radiotherapy; IMRT: Intensitymodulated radiation therapy; NR: Not reported; OS: Overall survival; PFS: Progression-free survival; LC: Local control; LN: Lymph node; Gr: Grade; GTV: Gross tumor volume.

REFERENCES

- 1 Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2020. CA Cancer J Clin 2020; 70: 7-30 [PMID: 31912902 DOI: 10.3322/caac.21590]
- Sant M, Allemani C, Berrino F, Coleman MP, Aareleid T, Chaplain G, Coebergh JW, Colonna M, 2 Crosignani P, Danzon A, Federico M, Gafà L, Grosclaude P, Hédelin G, Macè-Lesech J, Garcia CM, Møller H, Paci E, Raverdy N, Tretarre B, Williams EM; European Concerted Action on Survival and Care of Cancer Patients (EUROCARE) Working Group. Breast carcinoma survival in Europe and the United States. Cancer 2004; 100: 715-722 [PMID: 14770426 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.20038]
- Hellman S, Weichselbaum RR. Oligometastases. J Clin Oncol 1995; 13: 8-10 [PMID: 7799047 DOI: 3 10.1200/JCO.1995.13.1.8]
- Hong JC, Ayala-Peacock DN, Lee J, Blackstock AW, Okunieff P, Sung MW, Weichselbaum RR, 4 Kao J, Urbanic JJ, Milano MT, Chmura SJ, Salama JK. Classification for long-term survival in



oligometastatic patients treated with ablative radiotherapy: A multi-institutional pooled analysis. PLoS One 2018; 13: e0195149 [PMID: 29649281 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195149]

- 5 Palma DA, Olson R, Harrow S, Gaede S, Louie AV, Haasbeek C, Mulroy L, Lock M, Rodrigues GB, Yaremko BP, Schellenberg D, Ahmad B, Senthi S, Swaminath A, Kopek N, Liu M, Moore K, Currie S, Schlijper R, Bauman GS, Laba J, Qu XM, Warner A, Senan S. Stereotactic Ablative Radiotherapy for the Comprehensive Treatment of Oligometastatic Cancers: Long-Term Results of the SABR-COMET Phase II Randomized Trial. J Clin Oncol 2020; 38: 2830-2838 [PMID: 32484754 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.20.00818]
- 6 Trovo M, Furlan C, Polesel J, Fiorica F, Arcangeli S, Giaj-Levra N, Alongi F, Del Conte A, Militello L, Muraro E, Martorelli D, Spazzapan S, Berretta M. Radical radiation therapy for oligometastatic breast cancer: Results of a prospective phase II trial. Radiother Oncol 2018; 126: 177-180 [PMID: 28943046 DOI: 10.1016/j.radonc.2017.08.032]
- Gultekin M, Yazici O, Eren G, Yuce D, Aksoy S, Ozisik Y, Guler N, Yazici G, Hurmuz P, Yildiz F, 7 Altundag K, Gurkaynak M. Impact of locoregional treatment on survival in patients presented with metastatic breast carcinoma. Breast 2014; 23: 775-783 [PMID: 25201554 DOI: 10.1016/i.breast.2014.08.008]
- Le Scodan R, Stevens D, Brain E, Floiras JL, Cohen-Solal C, De La Lande B, Tubiana-Hulin M, 8 Yacoub S, Gutierrez M, Ali D, Gardner M, Moisson P, Villette S, Lerebours F, Munck JN, Labib A. Breast cancer with synchronous metastases: survival impact of exclusive locoregional radiotherapy. J Clin Oncol 2009; 27: 1375-1381 [PMID: 19204198 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2008.19.5396]
- 9 Milano MT, Katz AW, Zhang H, Huggins CF, Aujla KS, Okunieff P. Oligometastatic breast cancer treated with hypofractionated stereotactic radiotherapy: Some patients survive longer than a decade. Radiother Oncol 2019; 131: 45-51 [PMID: 30773186 DOI: 10.1016/j.radonc.2018.11.022]
- 10 Chia SK, Speers CH, D'yachkova Y, Kang A, Malfair-Taylor S, Barnett J, Coldman A, Gelmon KA, O'reilly SE, Olivotto IA. The impact of new chemotherapeutic and hormone agents on survival in a population-based cohort of women with metastatic breast cancer. Cancer 2007; 110: 973-979 [PMID: 17647245 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.22867]
- Elliott F, Barrett JH, Timothy Bishop D, Newton-Bishop JA. Response to P. Autier and M. Boniol 11 regarding our article--Relationship between sunbed use and melanoma risk in a large case-control study in the United Kingdom. Int J Cancer 2013; 132: 1960-1961 [PMID: 22987533 DOI: 10.1002/iic.27847]
- Greenberg PA, Hortobagyi GN, Smith TL, Ziegler LD, Frye DK, Buzdar AU. Long-term follow-up 12 of patients with complete remission following combination chemotherapy for metastatic breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 1996; 14: 2197-2205 [PMID: 8708708 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.1996.14.8.2197]
- 13 Lobbezoo DJ, van Kampen RJ, Voogd AC, Dercksen MW, van den Berkmortel F, Smilde TJ, van de Wouw AJ, Peters FP, van Riel JM, Peters NA, de Boer M, Peer PG, Tjan-Heijnen VC. Prognosis of metastatic breast cancer: are there differences between patients with de novo and recurrent metastatic breast cancer? Br J Cancer 2015; 112: 1445-1451 [PMID: 25880008 DOI: 10.1038/bjc.2015.127]
- Regierer AC, Wolters R, Ufen MP, Weigel A, Novopashenny I, Köhne CH, Samonigg H, Eucker J, 14 Possinger K, Wischnewsky MB. An internally and externally validated prognostic score for metastatic breast cancer: analysis of 2269 patients. Ann Oncol 2014; 25: 633-638 [PMID: 24368402 DOI: 10.1093/annonc.mdt539]
- 15 van Ommen-Nijhof A, Steenbruggen TG, Schats W, Wiersma T, Horlings HM, Mann R, Koppert L, van Werkhoven E, Sonke GS, Jager A. Prognostic factors in patients with oligometastatic breast cancer - A systematic review. Cancer Treat Rev 2020; 91: 102114 [PMID: 33161237 DOI: 10.1016/j.ctrv.2020.102114]
- 16 Lane WO, Thomas SM, Blitzblau RC, Plichta JK, Rosenberger LH, Fayanju OM, Hyslop T, Hwang ES, Greenup RA. Surgical Resection of the Primary Tumor in Women With De Novo Stage IV Breast Cancer: Contemporary Practice Patterns and Survival Analysis. Ann Surg 2019; 269: 537-544 [PMID: 29227346 DOI: 10.1097/SLA.00000000002621]
- Gnerlich J, Jeffe DB, Deshpande AD, Beers C, Zander C, Margenthaler JA. Surgical removal of the 17 primary tumor increases overall survival in patients with metastatic breast cancer: analysis of the 1988-2003 SEER data. Ann Surg Oncol 2007; 14: 2187-2194 [PMID: 17522944 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-007-9438-01
- Fitzal F, Bjelic-Radisic V, Knauer M, Steger G, Hubalek M, Balic M, Singer C, Bartsch R, Schrenk 18 P, Soelkner L, Greil R, Gnant M; ABCSG. Impact of Breast Surgery in Primary Metastasized Breast Cancer: Outcomes of the Prospective Randomized Phase III ABCSG-28 POSYTIVE Trial. Ann Surg 2019; 269: 1163-1169 [PMID: 31082916 DOI: 10.1097/SLA.00000000002771]
- 19 Badwe R, Hawaldar R, Nair N, Kaushik R, Parmar V, Siddique S, Budrukkar A, Mittra I, Gupta S. Locoregional treatment versus no treatment of the primary tumour in metastatic breast cancer: an open-label randomised controlled trial. Lancet Oncol 2015; 16: 1380-1388 [PMID: 26363985 DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00135-7
- 20 Soran A, Ozmen V, Ozbas S, Karanlik H, Muslumanoglu M, Igci A, Canturk Z, Utkan Z, Ozaslan C, Evrensel T, Uras C, Aksaz E, Soyder A, Ugurlu U, Col C, Cabioglu N, Bozkurt B, Uzunkoy A, Koksal N, Gulluoglu BM, Unal B, Atalay C, Yıldırım E, Erdem E, Salimoglu S, Sezer A, Koyuncu A, Gurleyik G, Alagol H, Ulufi N, Berberoglu U, Dulger M, Cengiz O, Sezgin E, Johnson R. Randomized Trial Comparing Resection of Primary Tumor with No Surgery in Stage IV Breast Cancer at Presentation: Protocol MF07-01. Ann Surg Oncol 2018; 25: 3141-3149 [PMID: 29777404 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-018-6494-6]



- Khan SA, Solin LJ, Goldstein LJ, Cella D, Basik M, Golshan M, Julian TB, Pockaj BA, Lee CA, 21 Razaq W, Sparano JA, Babiera GV, Dy IA, Jain S, Silverman P, Fisher C, Tevaarwerk AJ, Wagner LI, Sledge GW. A randomized phase III trial of systemic therapy plus early local therapy vs systemic therapy alone in women with de novo stage IV breast cancer: A trial of the ECOG-ACRIN Research Group (E2108). J Clin Oncol 2020; 38: no. 18_suppl [DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2020.38.18_suppl.LBA2]
- 22 King TA, Lyman J, Gonen M, Reyes S, Hwang ESS, Rugo HS, Liu MC, Boughey JC, Jacobs LK, McGuire KP, Storniolo AM, Isaacs C, Meszoely IM, Van Poznak CH, Babiera G, Norton L, Morrow M, Wolff AC, Winer EP, Hudis CA. A prospective analysis of surgery and survival in stage IV breast cancer (TBCRC 013). J Clin Oncol 2016; 34: 1006-1006 [DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2016.34.15_suppl.1006]
- 23 Shien T, Nakamura K, Shibata T, Kinoshita T, Aogi K, Fujisawa T, Masuda N, Inoue K, Fukuda H, Iwata H. A randomized controlled trial comparing primary tumour resection plus systemic therapy with systemic therapy alone in metastatic breast cancer (PRIM-BC): Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG1017. Jpn J Clin Oncol 2012; 42: 970-973 [PMID: 22833684 DOI: 10.1093/jjco/hys120]
- 24 Ruiterkamp J, Voogd AC, Tjan-Heijnen VC, Bosscha K, van der Linden YM, Rutgers EJ, Boven E, van der Sangen MJ, Ernst MF; Dutch Breast Cancer Trialists' Group (BOOG). SUBMIT: Systemic therapy with or without up front surgery of the primary tumor in breast cancer patients with distant metastases at initial presentation. BMC Surg 2012; 12: 5 [PMID: 22469291 DOI: 10.1186/1471-2482-12-5
- Neuman HB, Morrogh M, Gonen M, Van Zee KJ, Morrow M, King TA. Stage IV breast cancer in 25 the era of targeted therapy: does surgery of the primary tumor matter? Cancer 2010; 116: 1226-1233 [PMID: 20101736 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.24873]
- Salama JK, Hasselle MD, Chmura SJ, Malik R, Mehta N, Yenice KM, Villaflor VM, Stadler WM, 26 Hoffman PC, Cohen EE, Connell PP, Haraf DJ, Vokes EE, Hellman S, Weichselbaum RR. Stereotactic body radiotherapy for multisite extracranial oligometastases: final report of a dose escalation trial in patients with 1 to 5 sites of metastatic disease. Cancer 2012; 118: 2962-2970 [PMID: 22020702 DOI: 10.1002/cncr.26611]
- 27 Potters L, Kavanagh B, Galvin JM, Hevezi JM, Janjan NA, Larson DA, Mehta MP, Ryu S, Steinberg M, Timmerman R, Welsh JS, Rosenthal SA; American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology; American College of Radiology. American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology (ASTRO) and American College of Radiology (ACR) practice guideline for the performance of stereotactic body radiation therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2010; 76: 326-332 [PMID: 20117285 DOI: 10.1016/j.irobp.2009.09.042]
- 28 Weykamp F, König L, Seidensaal K, Forster T, Hoegen P, Akbaba S, Mende S, Welte SE, Deutsch TM. Schneeweiss A. Debus J. Hörner-Rieber J. Extracranial Stereotactic Body Radiotherapy in Oligometastatic or Oligoprogressive Breast Cancer. Front Oncol 2020; 10: 987 [PMID: 32676455 DOI: 10.3389/fonc.2020.009871
- 29 Kobayashi T, Ichiba T, Sakuyama T, Arakawa Y, Nagasaki E, Aiba K, Nogi H, Kawase K, Takeyama H, Toriumi Y, Uchida K, Kobayashi M, Kanehira C, Suzuki M, Ando N, Natori K, Kuraishi Y. Possible clinical cure of metastatic breast cancer: lessons from our 30-year experience with oligometastatic breast cancer patients and literature review. Breast Cancer 2012; 19: 218-237 [PMID: 22532161 DOI: 10.1007/s12282-012-0347-0]
- Milano MT, Zhang H, Metcalfe SK, Muhs AG, Okunieff P. Oligometastatic breast cancer treated 30 with curative-intent stereotactic body radiation therapy. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2009; 115: 601-608 [PMID: 18719992 DOI: 10.1007/s10549-008-0157-4]
- Scorsetti M, Franceschini D, De Rose F, Comito T, Villa E, Iftode C, Navarria P, D'Agostino GR, 31 Masci G, Torrisi R, Testori A, Tinterri C, Santoro A. Stereotactic body radiation therapy: A promising chance for oligometastatic breast cancer. Breast 2016; 26: 11-17 [PMID: 27017237 DOI: 10.1016/j.breast.2015.12.002]
- Palma DA, Olson R, Harrow S, Correa RJM, Schneiders F, Haasbeek CJA, Rodrigues GB, Lock M, 32 Yaremko BP, Bauman GS, Ahmad B, Schellenberg D, Liu M, Gaede S, Laba J, Mulroy L, Senthi S, Louie AV, Swaminath A, Chalmers A, Warner A, Slotman BJ, de Gruijl TD, Allan A, Senan S. Stereotactic ablative radiotherapy for the comprehensive treatment of 4-10 oligometastatic tumors (SABR-COMET-10): study protocol for a randomized phase III trial. BMC Cancer 2019; 19: 816 [PMID: 31426760 DOI: 10.1186/s12885-019-5977-6]
- Chmura SJ, Al-Hallaq HA, Borges VF, Jaskowiak NT, Matuszak M, Milano MT, Salama JK, 33 Woodward WA, White JR. NRG-BR002: A phase IIR/III trial of standard of care therapy with or without stereotactic body radiotherapy (SBRT) and/or surgical ablation for newly oligometastatic breast cancer (NCT02364557). J Clin Oncol 2019; 37: no. 15_suppl [DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2019.37.15_suppl.TPS1117]
- Bourgier C. Trial of Superiority of Stereotactic Body Radiation Therapy in Patients With Breast 34 Cancer (STEREO-SEIN). accessed 28 Feb 2021]. In: ClinicalTrials.gov [Internet]. ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: N02089100. Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02089100
- 35 Li X, Huang R, Ma L, Liu S, Zong X. Locoregional surgical treatment improves the prognosis in primary metastatic breast cancer patients with a single distant metastasis except for brain metastasis. Breast 2019; 45: 104-112 [PMID: 30928762 DOI: 10.1016/j.breast.2019.03.006]
- Pons-Tostivint E, Kirova Y, Lusque A, Campone M, Geffrelot J, Mazouni C, Mailliez A, Pasquier D, 36 Madranges N, Firmin N, Crouzet A, Gonçalves A, Jankowski C, De La Motte Rouge T, Pouget N, de La Lande B, Mouttet-Boizat D, Ferrero JM, Uwer L, Eymard JC, Mouret-Reynier MA, Petit T, Robain M, Filleron T, Cailliot C, Dalenc F. Survival Impact of Locoregional Treatment of the



Primary Tumor in De Novo Metastatic Breast Cancers in a Large Multicentric Cohort Study: A Propensity Score-Matched Analysis. Ann Surg Oncol 2019; 26: 356-365 [PMID: 30539492 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-018-6831-9]

- 37 Choi SH, Kim JW, Choi J, Sohn J, Kim SI, Park S, Park HS, Jeong J, Suh CO, Keum KC, Kim YB, Lee IJ. Locoregional Treatment of the Primary Tumor in Patients With De Novo Stage IV Breast Cancer: A Radiation Oncologist's Perspective. Clin Breast Cancer 2018; 18: e167-e178 [PMID: 28689012 DOI: 10.1016/j.clbc.2017.06.002]
- Nguyen DH, Truong PT, Alexander C, Walter CV, Hayashi E, Christie J, Lesperance M. Can 38 locoregional treatment of the primary tumor improve outcomes for women with stage IV breast cancer at diagnosis? Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2012; 84: 39-45 [PMID: 22330986 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2011.11.046]
- 39 Cha C, Ahn SG, Yoo TK, Kim KM, Bae SJ, Yoon C, Park S, Sohn J, Jeong J. Local Treatment in Addition to Endocrine Therapy in Hormone Receptor-Positive and HER2-Negative Oligometastatic Breast Cancer Patients: A Retrospective Multicenter Analysis. Breast Care (Basel) 2020; 15: 408-414 [PMID: 32982652 DOI: 10.1159/000503847]





Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc 7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-3991568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com Help Desk: https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk https://www.wjgnet.com

