



Who Needs Systemic Chemotherapy? Tailoring Adjuvant Systemic Therapy

Yoon-Sim YAP (葉 詠心)(엽 영 심) Division of Medical Oncology, National Cancer Centre Singapore



Children's Hospital

Seneral Hospita













PATIENTS, AT THE HE RT OF ALL WE I

Sengkang Health



DISCLOSURE SLIDE

Personal COI:

Consultancy/Honoraria/Travel/Research Support

• Astra Zeneca, Eisai, Lilly, Novartis, Pfizer, Roche

Outline

- Introduction
 - Key Milestones in Adjuvant Chemotherapy
- Who needs chemotherapy?
 - Guidelines
 - Standard Clinicopathological Factors
 - Molecular Assays
- Limitations and Future Directions
- Conclusions

Chemotherapy Evolution Timeline



Verrill, BJC 2009

Stepwise Improvements with Adjuvant Chemotherapy in Breast Cancer

No chemotherapy < CMF < Anthracyclines < Taxanes



Who Needs Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer?

- Who has occult micrometastases?
 - Residual disease after local therapy
 - Tumor burden
 - Tumor biology
- What do the guidelines say?
 - ASCO, St Gallen/ESMO, NCCN etc
- What is the evidence behind the recommendations?
 - Clinicopathological Factors
 - Molecular Assays

Who Needs Adjuvant Chemotherapy?

Treatment effect 2n<0.00001

| | Allocated anthracycline | Allocated control | Log-rank O-E | Variance of O–E | Anthracycline:Cont | rol |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|
| A) Cumulative anthracycline dosage, if dose pe | r cycle is at least A60/E90 | $(\chi_1^2 = 1.5; 2p = 0.2; NS)$ | | | | |
| 4360 (CAF) | 324/1177 (27.5%) | 456/1143 (39.9%) | -35-3 | 80.3 | | 0.64 (SE 0.09 |
| 300 (no trials) | | | | | | |
| 1240/E360 (standard 4AC/EC) | 212/747 (28.4%) | 265/792 (33.5%) | -25.6 | 100.5 - | + | 0.78 (SE 0.09 |
| Dose/cycle <a60 e90<="" td=""><td>880/2830 (31.1%)</td><td>980/2798 (35.0%)</td><td>-79.0</td><td>400-5</td><td>-[]-</td><td>0.82 (SE 0.05</td></a60> | 880/2830 (31.1%) | 980/2798 (35.0%) | -79.0 | 400-5 | -[]- | 0.82 (SE 0.05 |
| B) Anthracycline tested [*] (χ ² =1·9; 2p=0·2; NS) | | | | | | |
| Doxorubicin (A) | 973/2626 (37.1%) | 1185/2570 (46.1%) | -106-1 | 370.4 | . | 0.75 (SE 0.05 |
| pirubicin (E) | 293/1283 (22.8%) | 318/1283 (24.8%) | -20.5 | 138.4 | | 0.86 (SE 0.08 |
| l or E | 150/845 (17-8%) | 198/880 (22.5%) | -13-3 | 72.5 - | | 0-83 (SE 0-11 |
| C) Concurrent endocrine therapy (if ER+)? $(\chi_1^2=0)$ | ·3; 2p=0·6; NS) | | | | | |
| /es | 607/2004 (30-3%) | 693/2014 (34-4%) | -54-4 | 288.0 | | 0.83 (SE 0.05 |
| lo (any endocrine only after chemotherapy ended) | 462/1431 (32-3%) | 514/1398 (36.8%) | -48.2 | 203-8 | - • - | 0.79 (SE 0.06 |
| andom† | 347/1319 (26.3%) | 494/1321 (37.4%) | -37-2 | 89-4 —0 | - | 0.66 (SE 0.09 |
| D) Entry age (trend χ ₁ ² =2·0; 2p=0·2; NS) | | | | | | |
| 45 years | 135/402 (33.6%) | 127/353 (36.0%) | -4.9 | 53.0 - | | 0-91 (SE 0-13 |
| 5-54 years | 338/1115 (30.3%) | 419/1175 (35.7%) | -34.9 | 139.8 – | | 0.78 (SE 0.07 |
| 5–69 years | 899/2995 (30.0%) | 1071/2956 (36-2%) | -88.5 | 377-0 | - | 0.79 (SE 0.05 |
| 70 years | 43/225 (19-1%) | 84/232 (36.2%) | -11.7 | 11.4 🔶 | _ | 0-36 (SE 0-19 |
| Inknown | 1/17 (5·9%) | 0/17 (0.0%) | 0.2 | 0.1 | | |
| E) Nodal status (trend χ ² =0.0; 2p=0.9; NS) | | | | | | |
| 10/N- | 122/789 (15.5%) | 137/761 (18.0%) | -12.0 | 56.9 | - | 0-81 (SE 0-12 |
| √ 1–3 | 513/2257 (22.7%) | 604/2217 (27-2%) | -51.3 | 214.1 | - ė - | 0.79 (SE 0.06 |
| 14+ | 575/1226 (46-9%) | 741/1295 (57-2%) | -53.7 | 222-3 | - ė | 0.79 (SE 0.06 |
|)ther/unknown | 206/482 (42.7%) | 219/460 (47.6%) | -22.8 | 88.0 — | | 0.77 (SE 0.09 |
| F) ER status (χ ² =0·1; 2p=0·7; NS) | | | | | | |
| R-poor | 403/1095 (36.8%) | 464/1043 (44-5%) | -40.5 | 180.4 | - i | 0.80 (SE 0.07 |
| R+ | 831/3100 (26.8%) | 1063/3177 (33.5%) | -84.6 | 328-5 | - mi - | 0.77 (SE 0.05 |
| R unknown | 182/559 (32.6%) | 174/513 (33.9%) | -14.9 | 72.3 — | | 0-81 (SE 0-11 |
| Subsets of ER+ | | | | | | |
| ER+, chemotherapy+endocrine vs endocrine | 659/2622 (25.1%) | 853/2675 (31.9%) | -56.2 | 247.0 | | 0.80 (SE 0.06 |
| ER 10–99 fmol/mg | 416/1371 (30-3%) | 544/1442 (37.7%) | -35-3 | 162-5 | | 0.80 (SE 0.07 |
| ER ≥100 fmol/mg | 274/1146 (23.9%) | 337/1160 (29.1%) | -20.6 | 95.6 – | - i | 0-81 (SE 0-09 |
| ER+, age <55 years | 250/845 (29.6%) | 316/943 (33·5%) | -19.4 | 102-4 - | | 0.83 (SE 0.09 |
| FR+, age 55-60 years | 542/2071 (26.2%) | 677/2055 (22.0%) | -52.0 | 215.2 | <u> </u> | 0.78 (SE 0.06 |
| ER+, poorly differentiated | 100/461 (21.7%) | 120/477 (25-2%) | -12.2 | 45.8 — | | 0.77 (SE 0.13 |
| ER+, moderately/well differentiated | 228/985 (23·1%) | 286/1026 (27.9%) | -27.8 | 112.8 – | - | 0.78 (SE 0.08 |
| Total | 1416/4754 (29·8%) | 1701/4733 (35-9%) | -139.9 | 581-3 | \$ | 0.786 (SE 0. |
| | | | | | | 2p<0.00001 |
| - 99% or <>> 95% Cl | | | | 0.5 | 1.0 | 1.5 |

Reduction in BC mortality by >20-30% (relative). Appears largely independent of

- age,
- nodal status,
- tumor size,
- grade or
- ER status

But absolute risk reduction depends on risk of relapse. EBCTCG Lancet 2012

PATIENTS. AT THE HE RT OF ALL WE DO.

Benefit-Risk Calculators



• These calculators should not, however, be considered a substitute for multigene assays.

ASCO Guidelines (Adaptation of the Cancer Care Ontario Clinical Practice Guideline)

- Decisions regarding adjuvant chemotherapy regimens should take into account baseline recurrence risk, toxicities, likelihood of benefit, and host factors such as comorbidities.
 - In high-risk HER2-negative populations with excellent performance status, anthracycline- and taxane-containing regimens are the standard of care.
 - Docetaxel and cyclophosphamide for four cycles is an acceptable non-anthracycline regimen.

Denduluri et al, JCO 2016

 Patients with early-stage HER2-negative breast cancer with pathologic, invasive residual disease at surgery following standard anthracycline- and taxane-based preoperative therapy may be offered up to 6 to 8 cycles of adjuvant capecitabine.

De-escalating and escalating treatments for early-stage breast cancer: the St. Gallen International Expert Consensus Conference on the Primary Therapy of Early Breast Cancer 2017

Table 5. Adjuvant systemic treatment recommendations for triple negative and HER2 positive early breast cancer

| Subtypes according to clinical-pathologic and genomic risk assessment | Treatment recommendation | De-escalation | Escalation |
|---|---|---|--|
| Ductal triple negative | | | |
| pT1a node negative | | No routine adjuvant chemo- therapy for stage pT1a pN0. | |
| Higher T and N stage | Neoadjuvant therapy for stage II or III is suggested as initial treatment approach. Chemotherapy should include anthracycline and taxanes | Dose-dense adjuvant chemo- therapy preferred by only a minority of the consensus panel | No consensus on post-neoadjuvant treatment in case of residual disease. In <i>BRCA1/2</i> associated cancers, the Panel was evenly split on whether to recommend (neo)adjuvant platinum chemotherapy though agreed that such patients should receive alkylating chemotherapy. |

Curigliano et al, Ann Onc 2017

St Gallen Expert Consensus

Table 4. (Neo)-Adjuvant systemic treatment recommendations for ER positive/HER2 negative early breast cancer

| Subtypes according to clinical-pathologi- cal and genomic risk assessment | Treatment recommendation | De-escalation | Escalation |
|--|---|----------------------|--|
| High/Intermediate degree of ER and PgR expression, intermediate tumour burden pT1c, pT2, pN0 or pN1 (1-3), intermediate or high proliferation or grade, and/or inter- mediate "genomic risk" | Endocrine therapy according to menopausal status plus adjuvant chemotherapy | | |
| Premenopausal Uncertain "clinical risk" (node negative) "intermediate genomic risk" | OFS plus tamoxifen or OFS plus exemestane | | Consider addition of chemother- apy in selected cases Extended adjuvant endocrine therapy with tamoxifen in some cases |
| Premenopausal intermediate/high "clinical risk" (node positive) "intermediate/high genomic risk" | OFS plus exemestane plus adju- vant chemotherapy in many cases | | Chemotherapy Extended adjuvant endocrine therapy with tamoxifen |
| Post-menopausal Uncertain "clinical risk" (node negative) "intermediate genomic risk" | Al up front Chemotherapy in many cases | | Bisphosphonates |
| Postmenopausal "intermediate/high genomic risk" and intermediate/high "clinical risk" (node positive) | Chemotherapy AI as first endocrine therapy for at least 3-5 years | | Extended adjuvant AI according to risk and tolerability Bisphosphonates |
| | | | Denosumab has been shown to reduce bone-health related events in breast cancer patients |

PATIENTS. AT THE HE RT OF ALL WE DO.

St Gallen Expert Consensus

| Subtypes according to clinical-pathologi- cal and genomic risk assessment | Treatment recommendation | De-escalation | Escalation |
|--|---|---------------|--|
| ntermediate to low ER and PR expression Higher tumor burden (typically T3 and/or N2-3) More proliferative / higher Ki67 'Intermediate to high genomic risk markers" | Adjuvant chemotherapy plus endocrine therapy according to menopausal status | | |
| Premenopausal high risk | Adjuvant chemotherapy and OFS + AI (if premenopausal after chemo) | | Extended adjuvant Al accord- ing to risk and tolerability |
| Postmenopausal high risk | Adjuvant chemotherapy and Al | | Extended adjuvant AI accordin to risk and tolerability Bisphosphonates Denosumab has been shown t reduce bone-health related events in breast cancer patien |

Curigliano et al, Ann Onc 2017



SYSTEMIC ADJUVANT TREATMENT: HORMONE RECEPTOR-NEGATIVE - HER2-NEGATIVE DISEASE^{d,v}



<u>See Principles of HER2 Testing (BINV-A).</u>

<u>See Special Considerations for Breast Cancer in Men (BINV-J).</u>

- ² Mixed lobular and ductal carcinoma, should be graded based on the ductal component and treated based on this grading. For metaplastic carcinoma, the prognostic value of the histologic grading is uncertain. However, when a specific histologic subtype of metaplastic carcinoma is present and accounts for more than 10% of the tumor, the subtype is an independent prognostic variable.
- ^{aa} Consider adjuvant bisphosphonate therapy in postmenopausal (natural or induced) patients receiving adjuvant therapy.
- ^{dd} There are limited data to make chemotherapy recommendations for those >70 y of age. <u>See NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines for Older Adult Oncology</u>.
- nn See Preoperative/Adjuvant Therapy Regimens (BINV-L).

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any patient with cancer is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

BINV-9

Version 1.2019, 03/14/19 @ 2019 National Comprehensive Cancer Network* (NCCN*), All rights reserved. NCCN Guidelines* and this illustration may not be reproduced in any form without the express written permission of NCCN.

SYSTEMIC ADJUVANT TREATMENT: NODE-NEGATIVE - HORMONE RECEPTOR-POSITIVE - HER2-NEGATIVE DISEASE^{d,v}



Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any patient with cancer is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

BINV-6

SYSTEMIC ADJUVANT TREATMENT: NODE-POSITIVE - HORMONE RECEPTOR-POSITIVE - HER2-NEGATIVE DISEASE^{d,v}



dSee Principles of HER2 Testing (BINV-A).

NCCN

V See Special Considerations for Breast Cancer in Men (BINV-J).

- ² Mixed lobular and ductal carcinoma should be graded based on the ductal component and treated based on this grading. For metaplastic carcinoma, the prognostic value of the histologic grading is uncertain. However, when a specific histologic subtype of metaplastic carcinoma is present and accounts for more than 10% of the tumor, the subtype is an independent prognostic variable.
- ^{aa} Consider adjuvant bisphosphonate therapy in postmenopausal (natural or induced) patients receiving adjuvant therapy.
- ^{bb} Evidence supports that the magnitude of benefit from surgical or radiation ovarian ablation in premenopausal women with hormone receptor-positive breast cancer is similar to that achieved with CMF alone. <u>See Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy (BINV-K)</u>.
- ^{cc} Chemotherapy and endocrine therapy used as adjuvant therapy should be given sequentially with endocrine therapy following chemotherapy. Available data suggest that sequential or concurrent endocrine therapy with radiation therapy is acceptable. <u>See</u> <u>Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy (BINV-K)</u> and <u>Preoperative/Adjuvant Therapy Regimens</u> (BINV-L).

- ^{dd} There are limited data to make chemotherapy recommendations for those >70 y of age. <u>See NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines for Older Adult Oncology.</u>
- ^{kk} In N1mi and N1, multigene assays are prognostic and not proven to be predictive of chemotherapy benefit but can be used to identify a low-risk population that when treated with proper endocrine therapy may derive little absolute benefit from chemotherapy. Regarding the 21-gene RT-PCR assay, a secondary analysis of a prospective trial suggests that the test is predictive for women with 1–3 involved ipsilateral axillary lymph nodes. Other multigene assays have not proven to be predictive of chemotherapy benefit.
 Il See Multigene Assays for Consideration of Addition of Adjuvant Systemic Chemotherapy to Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy (BINV-N).
- ^{mm} There are few data regarding the role of multigene assays in women with four or more ipsilateral axillary lymph nodes. Decisions to administer adjuvant chemotherapy for this group should be based on clinical factors.

Note: All recommendations are category 2A unless otherwise indicated.

Clinical Trials: NCCN believes that the best management of any patient with cancer is in a clinical trial. Participation in clinical trials is especially encouraged.

BINV-7

Version 1.2019, 03/14/19 @ 2019 National Comprehensive Cancer Network* (NCCN*), All rights reserved. NCCN Guidelines* and this illustration may not be reproduced in any form without the express written permission of NCCN.

Need for Genomic Assays?



Panel of 21 genes in Oncotype

Table 1. Kaplan–Meier Estimates of the Rate of DistantRecurrence at 10 Years, According to Recurrence-ScoreRisk Categories.*

| Risk Category | Percentage of Patients | Rate of Distant Recurrence at 10 Yr (95% CI)† percent |
|---------------|------------------------|--|
| Low | 51 | 6.8 (4.0–9.6) |
| Intermediate | 22 | 14.3 (8.3–20.3) |
| High | 27 | 30.5 (23.6–37.4)‡ |

* A low risk was defined as a recurrence score of less than 18, an intermediate risk as a score of 18 or higher but less than 31, and a high risk as a score of 31 or higher.
† CI denotes confidence interval.

 \pm P<0.001 for the comparison with the low-risk category.

The overall agreement in tumor grade among the 3 pathologists in the study was 43%.

Paik et al, NEJM 2004

Benefit of Adjuvant Chemotherapy is mainly in High risk subgroups (recurrence score ≥31)

Node Negative (NSABP-B20)

Node Positive (SWOG 8814)



Paik et al, JCO 2006

Albain et al, Lancet Onc 2010



TAILORx: Design n = 10,253

For RS ≤10 (n =1,626 (15.9%))

Rate of invasive disease– free survival at 5 years was 93.8%; 5-yr rate of freedom from recurrence of breast cancer at a distant site was 99.3%.



Sparano et al, NEJM 2015

Other prospective studies in node positive patients are ongoing.



RS 11-25



</= 50 years





Effect of chemotherapy induced amenorrhoea?

Sparano et al, NEJM 2018

Who Needs Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer?



Cardoso et al, NEJM 2016



Survival without Distant Metastasis in the Four Risk Groups.



Cardoso et al, NEJM 2016





Cardoso et al, NEJM 2016

ASCO Recommendations re Mammaprint

May be used in those with high clinical risk to identify a good-prognosis population with potentially limited chemotherapy benefit. However, a benefit from chemotherapy cannot be excluded, particularly in patients with >1 node involved. Women in the low clinical risk category did not benefit from chemotherapy regardless of genomic MammaPrint risk group. Therefore, it does not have clinical utility in such patients.

Comparison of 6 Prognostic Signatures for ER+ BC - Secondary Analysis of ATAC Trial



Each signature provided significantly more information than the Clinical Treatment Score. For women with node-negative disease, the ROR (PAM50-based Prosigna risk of recurrence), BCI (Breast Cancer Index), and Epclin (EndoPredict) were significantly more prognostic for overall and late distant recurrence. For women with 1-3+ nodes, limited independent information was available from any test.

Sestak et al, JAMA Oncology 2018

Low risk

High risk

429

162

414

400

145

384

129

356

110

202

60

Low risk

High risk

43

140

43

135

41

125

37

106

32

89

15

48

Genomic Assays for Early BC

- Who needs it?
 - HR+HER2-
 - Mainly node negative
 - If it changes the clinical decision
- Which one is the best?
 - All are prognostic, though ROR, BCI, and EPclin were significantly more prognostic for overall and late distant recurrence.
- Which has the highest level of evidence to support its use?
 - Oncotype currently

Limitations of Current Practice



KM Curve from Paik et al, JCO 2006 (subset of NSABP-B20)

Conclusions and Future Directions

- Improvements continue to be made to refine selection of who needs adjuvant chemotherapy.
 - Prediction Tools using Clinicopathological factors
 - Guidelines
 - Molecular Assays
- However, there are still limitations with truly personalising treatment.
 - Still overtreating substantial proportion of patients
 - Better detection of residual microscopic disease?
 - Need to develop better treatments to reduce risk of relapse further.

Thank you for your attention! 감사합니다





