# A multicentre observational study evaluating image-guided radiotherapy for more accurate partial-breast intensity-modulated radiotherapy: comparison with standard imaging technique

Emma J Harris,<sup>1†</sup> Mukesh Mukesh,<sup>2†</sup> Rajesh Jena,<sup>2</sup> Angela Baker,<sup>3</sup> Harry Bartelink,<sup>4</sup> Corrinne Brooks,<sup>1</sup> June Dean,<sup>2</sup> Ellen M Donovan,<sup>1</sup> Sandra Collette,<sup>5</sup> Sally Eagle,<sup>6</sup> John D Fenwick,<sup>7</sup> Peter H Graham,<sup>8</sup> Jo S Haviland,<sup>9</sup> Anna M Kirby,<sup>10</sup> Helen Mayles,<sup>3</sup> Robert A Mitchell,<sup>1</sup> Rosalind Perry,<sup>11</sup> Philip Poortmans,<sup>12</sup> Andrew Poynter,<sup>13</sup> Glyn Shentall,<sup>14</sup> Jenny Titley,<sup>9</sup> Alistair Thompson,<sup>15</sup> John R Yarnold,<sup>10</sup> Charlotte E Coles<sup>2‡</sup> and Philip M Evans<sup>1,16\*‡</sup> on behalf of the IMPORT Trials Management Group

<sup>1</sup>Joint Department of Physics at The Institute of Cancer Research and

The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

<sup>2</sup>Oncology Centre, Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK <sup>3</sup>Department of Radiotherapy and Physics, The Clatterbridge Cancer Centre NHS Foundation Trust, Wirral, UK

- <sup>4</sup>Department of Radiation Oncology, The Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
- <sup>5</sup>Statistics Department, EORTC Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium
- <sup>6</sup>Department of Radiotherapy, Royal Marsden Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK <sup>7</sup>Department of Oncology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
- <sup>8</sup>Cancer Care Centre, St George Hospital, Kogarah, Sydney, NSW, Australia
- <sup>9</sup>ICR-CTSU, Institute of Cancer Research, London, UK
- <sup>10</sup>Breast Unit, Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
- <sup>11</sup>Radiotherapy Department, Ipswich Hospitals NHS Trust, Ipswich, UK

<sup>12</sup>Department of Radiation Oncology, Dr Bernard Verbeeten Instituut, Tilburg, the Netherlands

- <sup>13</sup>Radiotherapy Department, Peterborough City Hospital, Peterborough, UK
- <sup>14</sup>Rosemere Cancer Centre, Lancashire Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Preston, UK
- <sup>15</sup>School of Medicine, University of Dundee, Dundee, UK
- <sup>16</sup>Centre for Vision, Speech and Signal Processing, Faculty of Engineering and Physical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK

\*Corresponding author

†Joint first authors

**‡**Joint principal investigators

**Declared competing interests of authors:** Jenny Titley is employed by the Institute of Cancer Research Clinical Trials and Statistics Unit, which receives some funds from Cancer Research UK.

Published November 2014 DOI: 10.3310/eme01030

## **Plain English summary**

**Image-guided radiotherapy for breast cancer** Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation 2014; Vol. 1: No. 3 DOI: 10.3310/eme01030

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

# **Plain English summary**

Whole-breast radiotherapy (WBRT) is the standard treatment for breast cancer following breast-conserving surgery (lumpectomy). Cancer recurrences are most likely to occur near the original cancer: the tumour bed. A new technique aims to reduce recurrence by delivering a higher dose to the tumour bed ('boost') during WBRT. Currently, X-rays of the rib cage (standard imaging) are used to ensure accurate delivery of breast radiotherapy. Newer imaging using surgical clips within the tumour bed (clip-based imaging) may be preferable for boost radiotherapy.

The main objective was to compare accuracy of radiotherapy boost with standard and clip-based imaging. The bigger 'safety margin' required around the tumour bed was calculated and a mathematical model was constructed to estimate whether or not the extra volume irradiated caused more side effects. Two hundred and eighteen patients receiving breast radiotherapy, within a national breast boost trial, were studied; all had clip-based imaging, but standard images of the rib cage were available for comparison.

Results show that clip-based imaging is more accurate than standard imaging for boost radiotherapy and safety margins are 5 mm and 8 mm, respectively. The volume of breast tissue irradiated decreased by 29 cm<sup>3</sup> (range 11–193 cm<sup>3</sup>) using clip-based imaging, but estimation of side effects was not possible using the model.

In conclusion, margins less than 8 mm cannot be used safely without clip-based imaging for patients receiving boost radiotherapy as the higher-dose boost treatment may 'miss' the tumour bed. Smaller margins may reduce both cancer recurrence and side effects, but long-term results from ongoing trials are needed.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2014. This work was produced by Harris et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

## **Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation**

ISSN 2050-4365 (Print)

ISSN 2050-4373 (Online)

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full EME archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/eme. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

#### Criteria for inclusion in the Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation journal

Reports are published in *Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation* (EME) if (1) they have resulted from work for the EME programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

#### **EME programme**

The Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation (EME) programme was set up in 2008 as part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) and the Medical Research Council (MRC) coordinated strategy for clinical trials. The EME programme is broadly aimed at supporting 'science driven' studies with an expectation of substantial health gain and aims to support excellent clinical science with an ultimate view to improving health or patient care.

Its remit includes evaluations of new treatments, including therapeutics (small molecule and biologic), psychological interventions, public health, diagnostics and medical devices. Treatments or interventions intended to prevent disease are also included.

The EME programme supports laboratory based or similar studies that are embedded within the main study if relevant to the remit of the EME programme. Studies that use validated surrogate markers as indicators of health outcome are also considered.

For more information about the EME programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/eme

#### This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the EME programme as project number 09/150/16. The contractual start date was in March 2011. The final report began editorial review in September 2013 and was accepted for publication in March 2014. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The EME editors and production house have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the final report document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research. The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, MRC, NETSCC, the EME programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the EME programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2014. This work was produced by Harris *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

## Efficacy and Mechanism Evaluation Editor-in-Chief

Professor Raj Thakker May Professor of Medicine, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK

### **NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief**

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the HTA Programme, UK

### **NIHR Journals Library Editors**

**Professor Ken Stein** Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

**Professor Matthias Beck** Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

**Professor Aileen Clarke** Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of NETSCC, HTA, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

**Professor Elaine McColl** Director, Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Faculty of Education, University of Winchester, UK

Professor Jane Norman Professor of Maternal and Fetal Health, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

**Professor James Raftery** Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

**Professor Helen Snooks** Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk