



저작자표시-비영리-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



비영리. 귀하는 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 없습니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#)

Early Treatment Volume Reduction Rate as a Prognostic Factor in Patients Treated with Chemoradiotherapy for Limited Stage Small Cell Lung Cancer



Joohwan Lee

Department of Medicine

The Graduate School, Yonsei University

Early Treatment Volume Reduction Rate as a Prognostic Factor in Patients Treated with Chemoradiotherapy for Limited Stage Small Cell Lung Cancer

Directed by Professor Chang Geol Lee

The Master's Thesis

Submitted to the Department of Medicine,
the Graduate School of Yonsei University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Medical Science

Joohwan Lee

June 2015

This certifies that the Master's Thesis
of Joohwan Lee is approved.

Thesis Supervisor: Chang Geol Lee

Thesis Committee Member #1: Jaeho Cho

Thesis Committee Member #2: Se Kyu Kim

The Graduate School
Yonsei University

June 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Chang Geol Lee for supervising for this thesis. Also I would like to express my appreciation to Professor Jaeho Cho and Se Kyu Kim for giving me a plenty of advice for completing for this article. I would like to appreciate to professor Chang-Ok Suh, Jinsil Seong, Ki Chang Keum, Jaeho Cho, Yong Bae Kim, Ik Jae Lee, Woong Sub Koom, and Jun Won Kim for always offering the great instructions with endless concern and endurance.

Joohwan Lee

<TABLE OF CONTENTS>

ABSTRACT	1
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. MATERIALS AND METHODS	6
1. Patients	6
2. Pretreatment evaluation and follow-up	7
3. Treatment	7
A. Chemotherapy	7
B. Radiotherapy	8
4. Volumetric parameters	9
5. Statistical analysis	10
III. RESULTS	12
1. Patient characteristics	12
2. Treatment response and pattern of failure	14
3. Volumetric parameters related to survival outcomes	16
IV. DISCUSSION	23
V. CONCLUSION	27
REFERENCES	28
ABSTRACT (IN KOREAN)	32

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier survival curves (A) Overall survival, (B) Progression-free survival, (C) Loco-regional progression-free survival, and (D) Distant metastasis-free survival.....	15
Figure 2. Results based on early treatment volume reduction rate (A) Overall survival and (B) Loco-regional progression-free survival	18

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Patient and treatment characteristics	13
Table 2. Volumetric parameters (Gross tumor volume and volume reduction rate)	17
Table 3. Univariate analysis of prognostic factors	19
Table 4. Multivariate logistical regression analyses of prognostic factors	22

<Abstract>

**Early Treatment Volume Reduction Rate as a Prognostic Factor in
Patients Treated with Chemoradiotherapy for Limited Stage Small Cell
Lung Cancer**

Joohwan Lee

Department of Medicine

The Graduate School, Yonsei University

(Directed by Professor Chang Geol Lee)

Purpose: To investigate the relationship between early treatment response to definitive chemoradiotherapy (CRT) and survival outcome in patients with limited stage small cell lung cancer (LS-SCLC)

Materials and Methods: We retrospectively reviewed 47 patients with LS-SCLC who received definitive CRT between January 2009 and December 2012. Patients were treated with systemic chemotherapy regimen of etoposide/carboplatin (n = 15) or

etoposide/cisplatin (n = 32) and concurrent thoracic radiotherapy at a median dose of 54 Gy (range, 46-64 Gy). Early treatment volume reduction rate (ETVRR) was defined as the percentage change in gross tumor volume between diagnostic computed tomography (CT) and simulation CT for adaptive RT planning and was used as a parameter for early treatment response. The median dose at adaptive RT planning was 36 Gy (range, 30-43 Gy), and adaptive CT was performed in 30 patients (63.8%).

Results: With a median follow-up of 27.7 months (range, 5.9-75.8 months), the two-year loco-regional progression-free survival (LRPFS) and overall survival (OS) rates were 74.2% and 56.5%, respectively. The mean diagnostic and adaptive gross tumor volumes were 117.9 cc (range, 5.9-447 cc) and 36.8 cc (range, 0.3-230.6 cc), respectively. The median ETVRR was 71.4% (range, 30-97.6%) and the ETVRR >45% group showed significantly better OS ($p < 0.0001$) and LRPFS ($p = 0.009$) than the other group.

Conclusions: ETVRR as a parameter for early treatment response may be a useful prognostic factor to predict treatment outcome in LS-SCLC patients treated with CRT.

Key words: small cell lung carcinoma, gross tumor volume, early treatment response, volume reduction rate

**Early Treatment Volume Reduction Rate as a Prognostic Factor in
Patients Treated with Chemoradiotherapy for Limited Stage Small Cell
Lung Cancer**

Joohwan Lee

Department of Medicine

The Graduate School, Yonsei University

(Directed by Professor Chang Geol Lee)



I. INTRODUCTION

Small cell lung cancer (SCLC) is a well-known subtype of lung cancer that is diagnosed almost exclusively in patients with a smoking history.¹ SCLC comprised 13% of new lung cancer diagnoses in 2011, and limited stage (LS)-SCLC accounts for approximately 30% to 40% of these cases in the USA.² The current standard treatment for SCLC is systemic chemotherapy with concurrent thoracic radiotherapy (RT) for consolidation. While this cancer shows favorable response to treatment, it still has poor survival outcome.^{3,4}

Prognostic factors for survival in SCLC include stage, age, sex, the World Health Organization performance score (WHO-PS), serum lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) level, N3 nodal status, and time from the start of any treatment to the end of radiation therapy (SER).⁵ The T stage is a significant prognostic factor for lung cancer, but it contains only bi-dimensional measurements of gross tumor. The International Commission on Radiation Units & Measurements (ICRU) 50 report⁶ defines gross tumor volume (GTV) as the gross palpable or visible/demonstrable extent and location of malignant growth and is the basic concept of three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy (3DCRT). Initial GTV is a prognostic factor for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients treated with chemoradiotherapy (CRT)⁷ and has been studied as an independent prognostic factor for survival in SCLC.⁸

The volume reduction rate (VRR) during RT is a possible indicator of biological tumor radiosensitivity and serves as a clinical marker of treatment outcome. In advanced rectal cancer patients treated with neoadjuvant CRT, Kim et al.⁹ revealed a difference in tumor VRR between patients who were down-staged by neoadjuvant treatment and those who were not. Among head and neck (oropharyngeal or hypopharyngeal) cancer patients treated with definitive CRT using intensity-modulated RT (IMRT), VRR was a significant indicator of local control rate.¹⁰ Werner-Wasik et al.¹¹ investigated the volumetric response of 22 locally-advanced NSCLC patients treated with non-surgical therapy including thoracic RT. VRR was one of the most effective tools for evaluating treatment response.

However, no studies investigate the prognostic effect of tumor volume change between initial presentation and adaptive RT planning on SCLC survival outcome. The aim of the current study is to investigate the relationship between treatment response and outcome in patients with LS-SCLC.



II. MATERIALS AND METHODS

1. Patients

We retrospectively reviewed the medical records of 106 patients with SCLC who underwent CRT with definitive aim between January 2009 and December 2012. A diagnosis of SCLC was confirmed histologically in all patients. SCLC is staged by the Veterans Administration Lung Study Group (VALSG) staging system,¹² according to which patients are classified as having limited disease (LD) or extensive disease (ED). Patients with LD have tumor confined to the ipsilateral hemithorax, without any malignant effusion, with disease that may be incorporated in a single radiation beam field. Disease that does not fulfill these criteria is defined as ED. Limited/extensive staging was determined based on imaging studies, including both diagnostic CT and positron emission tomography (PET)-CT. All eligible patients were also staged according to the 7th American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) TNM staging system.¹³

Exclusion criteria included extensive-stage disease (n = 19), more than one primary cancer that could affect survival outcome (n = 6), loss of follow-up after completion of treatment (n = 4), incomplete RT less than 45 Gy (n = 3), incomplete chemotherapy less than four cycles (n = 13), and chemotherapy regimen other than etoposide/cisplatin (EP) or etoposide/carboplatin (EC) (n = 14). Finally, 47 patients were enrolled in the study.

2. Pretreatment evaluation and follow-up

Pretreatment evaluation included 1) complete history and physical examination, 2) biopsy for histological diagnosis, 3) laboratory studies, including complete blood cell counts and hepatic/renal functions, and 4) imaging studies for staging such as chest X-ray, chest CT, brain magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), and PET-CT. Patients were followed with chest CT and/or PET-CT one month after radiotherapy, every three months within the first year, every six months in the second year, and once a year thereafter. Treatment response was evaluated with follow-up CT performed one and three months after RT using the Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST) guidelines, version 1.1.¹⁴

3. Treatment

A. Chemotherapy

To evaluate changes of tumor volume in response to RT evenly, we limited the concurrent chemotherapy regimen to only EP (n = 15) or EC (n = 32). The treatment schedule was consisted of cisplatin or carboplatin on day 1 with etoposide on days 1 to 3 for four to six cycles (average 4.3 cycles), and repeated every three weeks. The standard chemotherapy dose was 120mg/m² etoposide with 60mg/m² cisplatin for the EP regimen and 100mg/m² etoposide for the EC regimen. Carboplatin in the EC regimen dose was calculated based on the target area under the curve (AUC) as (5 mg/ml/h x (glomerular filtration rate [GFR] + 25)). GFR was calculated with the

Cockcroft-Gault formula.¹⁵ During treatment, six patients required a dose reduction due to hematologic toxicities more severe than RTOG grade 1. There was a difference in volume between diagnostic CT and planning CT because RT started with the second cycle of chemotherapy in most patients (n = 35).

B. Radiotherapy

All patients were treated with 3DCRT. Planning CT was performed with contrast and a 3-mm thickness for each scan slice. For respiration-dependent organ motion, fluoroscopy (Simulix EvolutionTM, Nucletron, Veenendal, Netherlands) was used in 18 patients prior to July 2010, and a four-dimensional CT system (Anzai Medical, Tokyo, Japan) that acquired images in 12 phases was used in 29 patients afterward that date.

For patients undergoing 2D fluoroscopy, GTV was defined as primary tumor and involved regional lymph nodes (LN) identified in the planning chest CT. The PET-CT was fused with the planning CT for target delineation in all but one patient (97.9%). Clinical target volume (CTV) was defined as GTV plus a 10 to 15 mm margin in order to include microscopic tumor extension. Planning target volume (PTV), for adapting errors which could occur through set-up variation and respiratory motion, was defined as CTV plus an additional 5 to 15 mm margin, depending on 2D fluoroscopy results. For patients undergoing 4DCT, GTV was contoured on the mid-ventilation, maximum inhalation and exhalation phases in order to reflect respiration.

CTV was defined as GTV plus a 10 to 15 mm margin expansion, and PTV was defined as an additional 5 mm margin beyond the CTV.

One patient was treated with IMRT, and 46 patients were treated with 3DCRT. Three to five coplanar isocentric fields were designed for the initial 3DCRT plan, which used PinnacleTM radiotherapy treatment planning (RTP) systems (Philips Radiation Oncology Systems, Milpitas, CA, USA) or MIMTM software version 6.3.7 (MIM Software, Cleveland, OH, USA). An additional simulation CT was performed to evaluate GTV shrinkage during RT, and adaptive planning focused on accurate tumor targeting and preservation of adjacent normal organs (i.e., normal lung volume, esophagus). For this adaptive planning, we used a larger number of coplanar isocentric beams. In the patient treated with IMRT, the RT plan was designed to deliver 56 Gy to 95% of the PTV using six coplanar MV beams through a helical tomotherapy planning system. Definitive CRT was followed by prophylactic cranial irradiation (PCI) in patients showing complete or partial response.

4. Volumetric parameters

For each patient, we contoured GTVs in four sets of CT images: diagnostic, planning, adaptive, and follow-up CT images. ‘Diagnostic CT’ was defined as the first chest CT that contains a malignant lung mass confirmed by a chest radiologist. Chest CTs performed at other hospitals were also registered in our PACS (Picture Archiving and Communication System) (GE Healthcare, Milwaukee, WI, USA) and fused with

the ‘planning CT’ for target contouring. ‘Adaptive CT’ was defined as a chest simulation CT performed at the time of adaptive RT planning, using the same setting as the planning CT. ‘Follow-up CT’ was conducted for evaluation of the best treatment response between one and three months after completion of RT.

When contouring each GTV, we used MIM software version 6.3.7 and homogenized window settings for CT density in order to reduce errors. We defined a lung setting with a window of 1324 and a level of -362 for contouring GTV localized at the lung parenchyme and a mediastinum setting with a window of 500 and a level of 39 for regional LNs.

We proposed overall volume reduction rate (OVR) as a parameter for overall treatment response that appeared as percentage change in GTV between diagnostic CT and follow-up CT. To evaluate early treatment response, we calculated early treatment volume reduction rate (ETVRR) as an indication of the percentage change in GTV obtained when comparing diagnostic CT with adaptive CT. Additionally, we measured early chemotherapy volume reduction rate (ECVRR) for pure evaluation of first cycle chemotherapy response defined as the percentage change in GTV between diagnostic CT and planning CT.

5. Statistical analysis

LRPFS, distant metastasis-free survival (DMFS), PFS, and OS were calculated from the date of diagnosis to the event and were plotted using the Kaplan-Meier method. We dichotomized patients upon VRR with every 5% interval around

median to find out most effective cut-off value. For analyzing the relationship between the time interval from first chemotherapy to first RT and ETVRR, we used the Kruskal-Wallis test.

Univariate survival analyses for several prognostic factors were also processed with the Kaplan-Meier method. To create multivariate model, we used stepwise logistic regression with variables entry at $p < 0.15$ and removed if the p value was ≥ 0.15 . Patient survival status was confirmed in February 2013. In our study, all statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 20.0.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). A p -value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.



III. RESULTS

1. Patient characteristics

The median patient age was 68 (range, 40 to 84), and 42 patients (89.4 %) were male. At the time of diagnosis, 41 patients (87.2%) had the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status (ECOG PS) of 0 (n = 12) to 1 (n = 29). According to the AJCC 7th TNM staging system,¹³ five patients were Stage I (10.6%), four patients were Stage II (8.5%) and 38 patients were Stage III (80.9%). The median thoracic RT dose was 54 Gy (range, 46 to 64 Gy), with a median daily dose of 2 Gy (range, 1.8 to 2.5 Gy). The median time interval between diagnostic and planning CT was 32 days (range, 9 to 123 days). The date of first chemotherapy was a median of 22 days (range, 0 to 161 days) earlier than the date of first RT. Most patients started RT concurrently with 1st (n = 8) or 2nd (n = 35) cycle chemotherapy and other four patients received delayed RT because of poor general condition status (n = 2) or neutropenia caused by initial chemotherapy (n = 2).

Adaptive CT was conducted at a median RT dose of 36 Gy (range, 28.8 to 43 Gy) and was performed in 30 patients (63.9%). After completion of CRT, 38 patients (80.9%) underwent prophylactic cranial irradiation (PCI). Patient characteristics are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Patient and treatment characteristics

Variables	No. of Patients	(%)
Age, years		
Median	68	
Range	40-84	
Sex		
Male	42	(89.4)
Female	5	(10.6)
ECOG Performance status		
0	12	(25.5)
1	29	(61.7)
2	6	(12.8)
T Stage		
1-2	22	(46.8)
3-4	25	(53.2)
N Stage		
0-2	32	(68.1)
3	15	(31.9)
AJCC Stage		
IA	3	(6.4)
IB	2	(4.3)
IIA	3	(6.4)
IIB	1	(2.1)
IIIA	15	(31.9)
IIIB	23	(48.9)
Chemotherapy		
Regimen		
Etoposide/carboplatin	15	(31.9)
Etoposide/cisplatin	32	(68.1)
Cycle		
4	39	(83.0)

Variables	No. of Patients	(%)
5	1	(2.1)
6	7	(14.9)
Radiotherapy		
Modality		
3DCRT	46	(97.9)
Tomotherapy	1	(2.1)
Dose, Gy		
Median	54	
Range	46-64	
Prophylactic cranial irradiation		
Yes	38	(80.9)
No	9	(19.1)
SER, days		
Median	64	
Range	36-203	

Abbreviations: ECOG = Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; AJCC = American Joint Committee on Cancer; 3DCRT = three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy; SER = start of any treatment to the end of radiation therapy.

2. Treatment response and pattern of failure

Five patients (10.6%) achieved a complete response (CR), 40 patients achieved a partial response (PR) (85.1%), and two patients had stable disease (SD) (4.3%). With a median follow-up time of 27.4 months (range, 6.2 to 66.4 months), the two-year LRPFS and DMFS rates were 74.2% and 70.1%, respectively. Two-year PFS and OS rates were 50.6% and 56.5%, respectively (Figure 1). Of the total patients, 17 (36.2%) experienced loco-regional failure, 17 (36.2%) had distant failure,

and seven (14.9%) had both. Sites of distant failure included brain (n = 9), bone (n = 2), adrenal gland (n = 2), liver (n = 2), and intra-abdominal LNs including the para-aortic area (n = 1). One patient had multifocal sites, including the brain, left seventh rib, and LN around the celiac trunk.




Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier survival curves (A) Overall survival, (B) Progression-free survival, (C) Loco-regional progression-free survival, and (D) Distant metastasis-free survival

3. Volumetric parameters related to survival outcomes

The volumetric parameters measured in this study are described in Table 2. The mean GTV of diagnostic, planning, adaptive, and follow-up CT were 117.9 cc (range, 5.9 to 447 cc), 68.7 cc (range, 2.5 to 391 cc), 36.8 cc (range, 0.3 to 230.6 cc), and 20.6 cc (range, 0.1 to 102.1 cc), respectively. Every patient experienced volume reduction in each CT when treated with CRT. The median OVRR was 81.6% (range, 44.2 to 99%), median ECVRR was 53.5% (range, 0 to 82.3%) and the median ETVRR of 30 patients with adaptive CT was 71.4% (range, 30 to 97.6%).


ETVRR was a statistically effective prognostic factor for OS ($p = 0.012$) and PFS ($p = 0.015$). In the univariate analysis with median cut-off value, initial GTV, OVRR, ECVRR, and ETVRR showed no prognostic impact on survival outcome (all $p > 0.05$). To reveal most effective cut-off value of VRR, we assessed every 5% interval around median. By this process, we concluded that ETVRR with 45% cut-off value correlated significantly with OS ($p < 0.0001$) and LRPFS ($p = 0.009$) (Table 3). The median OS and LRPFS were 31.3 and 47.5 months for patients with greater than 45% ETVRR, respectively, compared with 8.3 and 6.3 months for those with a lower than 45% value (Figure 2). Nodal status was a statistically significant prognostic factor of DMFS when comparing the N3 group versus N0-2 group ($p = 0.049$). Other factors of age, sex, ECOG PS, stage except for nodal status, RT dose, SER, PCI did not show statistically significant difference with regard to survival outcomes.

Table 2. Volumetric parameters (Gross tumor volume and volume reduction rate)

Image	Gross tumor volume (cc)
Diagnostic CT (n = 47)	
Mean	117.9
Range	5.9-447
Planning CT (n = 47)	
Mean	68.7
Range	2.5-391
Adaptive CT (n = 30)	
Mean	36.8
Range	0.3-230.6
Follow-up CT (n = 47)	
Mean	20.6
Range	0.1-102.1
Response	Volume reduction rate (%)
Overall	
Median	81.6 (± 13.5)
Range	44.2-99
Early Chemotherapy	
Median	53.5 (± 25.9)
Range	0-82.3
Early Treatment	
Median	71.4 (± 16.6)
Range	30-97.6

Abbreviations: CT = computed tomography

(A) OS



(B) LRPFS




Figure 2. Results based on early treatment volume reduction rate (A) Overall survival and (B) Loco-regional progression-free survival



Table 3. Univariate analysis of prognostic factors

Variable		n	2yr OS (%)	<i>p</i>	2yr PFS (%)	<i>p</i>	2yr LRPFS (%)	<i>p</i>	2yr DMFS (%)	<i>p</i>
Age	≤70	29	46.5	0.274	30.4	0.232	64.7	0.048	69.3	0.279
	>70	18	72.2		44		88.1		70.5	
Sex	Male	42	57.1	0.484	50.1	0.911	73.6	0.748	70.1	0.725
	Female	5	50		53.3		80		66.7	
ECOG PS	<2	41	60	0.083	52.8	0.669	76.4	0.72	69.6	0.786
	≥2	6	33.3		25		50		66.7	
T Stage	1-2	22	57.3	0.483	55.2	0.999	70.6	0.311	76.7	0.389
	3-4	25	56		46.7		77.8		64.3	
N Stage	0-2	32	64.6	0.203	55.5	0.548	73.4	0.625	77.8	0.049
	3	15	40		39.1		73.3		53.9	
Stage	I-III A	24	65.3	0.539	57.6	0.732	72.4	0.479	84.2	0.135
	IIIB	23	47.8		43.7		75.8		56.3	
RT dose, Gy	≤54	32	61.3	0.195	47.4	0.825	73.4	0.82	65	0.968
	>54	15	46.7		61.8		76.6		84	
SER, days	≤64	24	56.5	0.754	54	0.614	72.2	0.58	71.8	0.846
	>64	23	56.5		46.6		71		68.8	
PCI	Yes	38	54.1	0.317	52.8	0.22	75.7	0.446	74.4	0.168
	No	9	66.7		40		85.7		53.3	
Initial GTV, cc	≤90	24	61	0.73	46.6	0.225	74	0.686	62.3	0.077

Variable		n	2yr OS (%)	p	2yr PFS (%)	p	2yr LRPFS (%)	p	2yr DMFS (%)	p
OVR, %	>90	23	52.2	0.667	54.9	0.439	74.2	0.564	77.6	0.87
	≤80	20	50		38.8		62.2		64.9	
ECV, %	>80	27	61.5	0.161	59.1	0.551	82.7	0.842	74.2	0.243
	≤50	25	44		38.2		67.3		60.6	
ETV, %	>50	22	71.4	<0.0001	62.2	0.138	81.3	0.009	79.4	0.556
	≤45	3	0		0		0		0	
	>45	27	61.5		44.7		70.3		73.9	

Abbreviations: ECOG PS = Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance score; RT = radiotherapy; SER = start of any treatment to the end of radiation therapy; PCI = prophylactic cranial irradiation; GTV = gross tumor volume, OVR = overall volume reduction rate; ECV = early chemotherapy volume reduction rate; ETV = early treatment volume reduction rate; yr = year; OS = overall survival; PFS = progression-free survival; LRPFS = loco-regional progression-free survival; DMFS = distant metastasis-free survival

Because ETVRR was the only significant prognostic factor in the univariate analysis, we assessed the backward stepwise multivariate analysis and ETVRR was also shown as the only statistically significant factor for OS (HR, 0.117; 95% CI, 0.026-0.530, $p = 0.005$) and LRPFS (HR, 0.064; 95% CI, 0.007-0.601, $p = 0.016$) (Table 4).

We additionally analyzed the relationship between the time interval from first chemotherapy to first RT and ETVRR. Patients were divided into three groups depend on the timing of RT start. Group 1 ($n = 8$) and group 2 ($n = 35$) started RT with 1st and 2nd cycle of chemotherapy, and group 3 ($n = 4$) started RT with 3rd or thereafter. Median ETVRR of each group was 70.5%, 76.9%, and 66.7%, respectively, and there was no statistical difference between the time interval and ETVRR ($p = 0.619$).

Table 4. Multivariate logistical regression analyses of prognostic factors

Variable	OS			LRPFS		
	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>	HR	95% CI	<i>p</i>
Age, >70yr vs. ≤70yr				0.226	0.048-1.072	0.061
Sex, Male vs. Female	0.27	0.034-2.126	0.214	6.009	0.502	71.951
N Stage, 0-2 vs. 3				0.207	0.023-1.86	0.16
ETVRR, >45% vs. ≤45%	0.117	0.026-0.530	0.005	0.064	0.007-0.601	0.016

Abbreviations: yr = year; OS = overall survival; LRPFS = loco-regional progression-

free survival; HR = hazard ratio; CI = confidence interval; ETVRR = early treatment

volume reduction rate



IV. DISCUSSION

This aim of this study was to determine prognostic factors influencing CRT outcome for LS-SCLC, including tumor volume parameters such as OVRR, ECVRR and ETVRR. We hypothesized that initial GTV and VRR of gross tumor are prognostic factors related to patient survival. The median OVRR was 81.6%, showing substantial GTV reduction within three months after RT; however, an OVRR >80% was not a statistically significant prognostic factor of any survival outcome. The median ETVRR was 71.4% (range, 30 to 97.6%), which showed a substantial degree of GTV reduction during early CRT, reflecting the radiosensitivity of SCLC. An ETVRR >45% was a significant prognostic factor of OS ($p < 0.0001$) and LRPFS ($p = 0.009$).

Tumor volume defined in CT images is a main concept of 3DCRT. Before the CT era, the largest longitudinal diameter was the only detectable prognostic factor related to tumor size. In RTOG 73-01,¹⁶ tumor diameter measurement was based on posterior-anterior and lateral chest radiography. With this two-dimensional assessment, 91% of patients treated with 60 Gy showed CR, PR or SD status and only 9% had a progressive response. Such favorable outcomes differ considerably from the outcomes of more recent studies of lung cancer treatment. To compensate for this over-estimation, the definition of CR was changed to include radiographic, clinical, and bronchoscopic results.^{17,18} However, these methods are still less objective than image-only method due to inter-observer variation. The AJCC TNM staging system,¹³ one of

most widely accepted prognostic factors of lung cancer, also uses greatest tumor dimension based on CT images for T staging.

After the introduction of 3DCRT for cancer treatment, physicians began to contour the tumor shape on each planning CT slice. Tumor volume was considered as a possible prognostic factor based on clinical experiences. Volumetric tumor measurement was also considered more objective and accurate than clinical evaluation of tumor response.

There have been several studies regarding initial tumor volume as a prognostic factor in lung cancer. Bradley et al.¹⁹ demonstrated that GTV was a prognostic factor for OS and cause-specific survival in NSCLC treated with 3DCRT planning. In that study, T, N, and overall stage were not statistically significant prognostic factors. Werner-Wasik et al.²⁰ investigated the efficacy of initial GTV for NSCLC patients in the RTOG 93-11 phase I-II trial. In their dose-escalation study, patients with tumor volume smaller than 45cm^3 achieved better median survival time and PFS compared to those of patients with larger tumors. Basaki et al.²¹ also showed that primary tumor volume had an impact on OS in 71 NSCLC stage III patients treated with definitive CRT ($n = 45$) or RT alone ($n = 26$). In that study, gross tumor volume and total tumor volume were statistically meaningful, but nodal volume alone was not. Koo et al.²² conducted a single-institution study that retrospectively reviewed 191 patients with stage III NSCLC who underwent CRT. They concluded that smaller pre-treatment GTV is an independent prognostic factor of better OS, PFS, and LRPFS (all $p < 0.05$). They also studied the impact of VRR as a prognostic factor of survival

outcome; however, it showed only a trend of OS ($p = 0.075$). Reymen et al.⁸ revealed total GTV, including gross tumor with selective LNs to be irradiated, as an independent prognostic factor of overall survival in stage I to III SCLC. This was the first study to show the prognostic significance of total GTV in SCLC. Initial GTV was not a prognostic factor in this study, and OVRR was also not statistically significant. We hypothesize that these results are due to the small number of patients and the fact that SCLC has a favorable treatment response, as reported in previous studies,²³ so almost every patient experienced substantial volume reduction at follow-up CT.

A limited number of studies have concentrated on the rate of 3D volume reduction. VRR was studied in head and neck cancer by Yang et al.¹⁰ and was an effective predictor of local control in oropharynx and hypopharynx cancer patients treated with IMRT. Therefore, it was recommended that patients who showed a less than 50% volume reduction should be considered for other treatment options like salvage surgery or escalated dose prescription. In 2001, Werner-Wasik et al.¹¹ reported that VRR was an effective prognostic factor of response evaluation in locally-advanced NSCLC patients. Since then, however, no studies have produced meaningful results regarding volume changes in lung cancer. This study was the first attempt to reveal the prognostic importance of VRR in SCLC.

The ETVRR $\leq 45\%$ group patients showed poor OS and LRPFS (8.3 and 6.3 months, respectively) and this was relatively poor survival outcome than previous

studies. The reason was because of early loco-regional failure in ipsilateral lung parenchyme (n = 2) and brain metastasis (n = 1).

This study has some limitations. Established prognostic factors in SCLC (age, sex, ECOG PS, SER, initial GTV, and overall treatment response) were not significantly correlated with survival outcome in this study, which may have been influenced by the relatively small number of patients included in analysis. Not all patients were subjected to adaptive planning, and ETVRR was determined in only 30 of 47 patients. Currently, most SCLC patients treated with CRT at our institution undergo adaptive planning; a longer follow-up with a larger number of patients will reveal the validity of these results.



V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, overall and early treatment responses to chemo-radiation in LS-SCLC as measured by volume reduction were favorable. Patients who showed an early treatment response (ETVRR >45%) had better treatment outcome in terms of PFS and OS than those who did not. ETVRR as a parameter for early treatment response may be a useful prognostic factor of treatment outcome in LS-SCLC patients treated with CRT.



REFERENCES

1. Adjei AA, Marks RS, Bonner JA. Current guidelines for the management of small cell lung cancer. *Mayo Clin Proc* 1999;74:809-16.
2. Siegel R, Ward E, Brawley O, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2011: the impact of eliminating socioeconomic and racial disparities on premature cancer deaths. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2011;61:212-36.
3. Warde P, Payne D. Does thoracic irradiation improve survival and local control in limited-stage small-cell carcinoma of the lung? A meta-analysis. *J Clin Oncol* 1992;10:890-5.
4. Pignon JP, Arriagada R, Ihde DC, Johnson DH, Perry MC, Souhami RL, et al. A meta-analysis of thoracic radiotherapy for small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1992;327:1618-24.
5. van Meerbeeck JP, Fennell DA, De Ruyscher DK. Small-cell lung cancer. *Lancet* 2011;378:1741-55.
6. ICRU. Prescribing, Recording, and Reporting Photon Beam Therapy. ICRU Report 50. Washington, DC; 1993.
7. Dehing-Oberije C, Yu S, De Ruyscher D, Meersschout S, Van Beek K, Lievens Y, et al. Development and external validation of prognostic model for 2-year survival of non-small-cell lung cancer patients treated with chemoradiotherapy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2009;74:355-62.
8. Reymen B, Van Loon J, van Baardwijk A, Wanders R, Borger J, Dingemans

- AM, et al. Total gross tumor volume is an independent prognostic factor in patients treated with selective nodal irradiation for stage I to III small cell lung cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2013;85:1319-24.
9. Kim YH, Kim DY, Kim TH, Jung KH, Chang HJ, Jeong SY, et al. Usefulness of magnetic resonance volumetric evaluation in predicting response to preoperative concurrent chemoradiotherapy in patients with resectable rectal cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2005;62:761-8.
 10. Yang SN, Liao CY, Chen SW, Liang JA, Tsai MH, Hua CH, et al. Clinical implications of the tumor volume reduction rate in head-and-neck cancer during definitive intensity-modulated radiotherapy for organ preservation. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2011;79:1096-103.
 11. Werner-Wasik M, Xiao Y, Pequignot E, Curran WJ, Hauck W. Assessment of lung cancer response after nonoperative therapy: tumor diameter, bidimensional product, and volume. A serial CT scan-based study. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2001;51:56-61.
 12. Micke P, Faldum A, Metz T, Beeh KM, Bittinger F, Hengstler JG, et al. Staging small cell lung cancer: Veterans Administration Lung Study Group versus International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer--what limits limited disease? *Lung Cancer* 2002;37:271-6.
 13. Sobin LH, Compton CC. TNM seventh edition: what's new, what's changed: communication from the International Union Against Cancer and the American Joint Committee on Cancer. *Cancer* 2010;116:5336-9.

14. Eisenhauer EA, Therasse P, Bogaerts J, Schwartz LH, Sargent D, Ford R, et al. New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1). *Eur J Cancer* 2009;45:228-47.
15. Cockcroft DW, Gault MH. Prediction of creatinine clearance from serum creatinine. *Nephron* 1976;16:31-41.
16. Perez CA, Stanley K, Rubin P, Kramer S, Brady L, Perez-Tamayo R, et al. A prospective randomized study of various irradiation doses and fractionation schedules in the treatment of inoperable non-oat-cell carcinoma of the lung. Preliminary report by the Radiation Therapy Oncology Group. *Cancer* 1980;45:2744-53.
17. Le Chevalier T, Arriagada R, Quoix E, Ruffie P, Martin M, Tarayre M, et al. Radiotherapy alone versus combined chemotherapy and radiotherapy in nonresectable non-small-cell lung cancer: first analysis of a randomized trial in 353 patients. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1991;83:417-23.
18. Le Chevalier T, Arriagada R, Tarayre M, Lacombe-Terrier MJ, Laplanche A, Quoix E, et al. Significant effect of adjuvant chemotherapy on survival in locally advanced non-small-cell lung carcinoma. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1992;84:58.
19. Bradley JD, Ieumwananonthachai N, Purdy JA, Wasserman TH, Lockett MA, Graham MV, et al. Gross tumor volume, critical prognostic factor in patients treated with three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy for non-small-cell lung carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2002;52:49-57.

20. Werner-Wasik M, Swann RS, Bradley J, Graham M, Emami B, Purdy J, et al. Increasing tumor volume is predictive of poor overall and progression-free survival: secondary analysis of the Radiation Therapy Oncology Group 93-11 phase I-II radiation dose-escalation study in patients with inoperable non-small-cell lung cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;70:385-90.
21. Basaki K, Abe Y, Aoki M, Kondo H, Hatayama Y, Nakaji S. Prognostic factors for survival in stage III non-small-cell lung cancer treated with definitive radiation therapy: impact of tumor volume. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2006;64:449-54.
22. Koo TR, Moon SH, Lim YJ, Kim JY, Kim Y, Kim TH, et al. The effect of tumor volume and its change on survival in stage III non-small cell lung cancer treated with definitive concurrent chemoradiotherapy. *Radiat Oncol* 2014;9:283.
23. Ha IB, Jeong BK, Jeong H, Choi HS, Chai GY, Kang MH, et al. Effect of early chemoradiotherapy in patients with limited stage small cell lung cancer. *Radiat Oncol J* 2013;31:185-90.

<ABSTRACT (IN KOREAN)>

항암방사선치료를 받은 제한기 소세포성 폐암 환자에서
예후인자로서의 초기치료 체적감소율

<지도교수 이 창 겐>

연세대학교 대학원 의학과

이 주 환

목적: 근치적 목적의 항암방사선치료를 받은 제한기 소세포성 폐암 환자에서의 초기 치료반응이 향후 치료성적을 예측할 수 있는 예후 인자로서 의미가 있는지를 밝히고자 한다.

재료 및 방법: 2009년 1월부터 2012년 12월까지 본원에서 근치적 항암방사선치료를 받은 47명의 제한기 소세포성 폐암 환자에 대해서 후향적 분석을 시행하였다. 환자들은 중앙값 54 Gy (범위, 46-64 Gy)의 흉부 방사선치료 및 동시 항암 치료를 시행 받았으며, 항암치료는 15명 (31.9%)의 환자에서 etoposide/cisplatin, 32명 (68.1%)의 환자에서 etoposide/carboplatin 요법을 진행하였다. 초기 치료반응

을 나타내는 지표로서 초기치료 체적감소율 (Early treatment volume reduction rate)을 제안하였으며, 이는 진단에 사용된 컴퓨터 단층 촬영 (Computed Tomography, CT)과 방사선 치료 도중 치료 적응을 위해 시행한 설계용 컴퓨터 단층 촬영 간의 육안적 종양 체적의 백분율 감소 정도로 정의하였다. 치료 적응시의 중앙 방사선치료 선량은 36 Gy (범위, 30-43 Gy) 였으며, 치료 적응을 위한 컴퓨터 단층 촬영은 30명 (63.8%)의 환자에서 시행되었다.

결과: 대상환자의 중앙추적관찰기간은 27.7 개월 (범위, 5.9-75.8 개월) 이었다. 추적관찰 결과 2년 생존률, 무병 생존률, 국소 무병생존률, 원격전이 무병생존률은 각각 56.5%, 50.6%, 74.2%, 70.1% 였다. 진단용 컴퓨터 단층 촬영에서의 평균 육안적 종양 체적은 117.9cc (범위, 5.9-447cc) 였고 적응용 CT 상에서의 육안적 종양 체적은 36.8cc (범위, 0.3-230.6cc) 였다. 초기치료 체적감소율의 중앙값은 71.4% (범위, 30-97.6%) 였고 45%를 기준으로 보다 많이 감소한 군에서 2년 생존률 ($p < 0.0001$) 및 국소 무병 생존률 ($p = 0.009$)에서 유의한 예후 인자로 확인되었다.

결론: 초기치료체적감소율 (ETVRR)은 항암방사선치료를 받은 제한기 소세포성 폐암 환자에서 치료 결과를 예측하기 위한 유용한 예후인자로 사용될 수 있다.



핵심되는 말: 소세포성 폐암, 육안적 종양체적, 초기 치료반응, 체적 감소율