Radiation Therapy for Gastro-esophageal Cancer

Joel Tepper, MD Dept of Radiation Oncology UNC/Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center University of North Carolina School of Medicine Chapel Hill, NC



DISCLOSURES

NONE

Terminology

- Substantial confusion as to biology related to site of origin of tumors in the stomach and esophagus
- Epidemiology of classical esophageal, gastric and GE junction cancers are distinct
- Clinical trials have been designed for gastric or esophageal cancers with variable numbers of patients with GE junction tumors included

Terminology

- Unclear relevance of many published studies to true GE junction tumors
 - Recent gastric trials have generally included primarily classical gastric cancers, with about 20-25% of GE junction cancers
 - Recent esophageal trials from the US have included a majority of patients with GE junction adenocarcinomas
 - These trials may be more reflective of appropriate management strategies

C	ASTRIC CARCIN	IOMA - MGH
STAGE	TOTAL LOCAL- REGIONAL FAILU	LOCAL-REGIONAL JRE FAILURE ALONE
۵	0	0
B1	3/16 (19%)) 1/16 (6%)
B2	6/12 (50%)) 1/12 (8%)
B3	2 / 5	0
C1	4/17 (24%)) 2/17 (12%)
C ₂	16/44 (36%) 10/44 (23%)
C3	18/32 (56%) 7/32 (22%)

Re-operation Series			
Stage	Number failed	Local- regional failure	Local-regional failure alone
В	10/12 (83%)	9/12 (75%)	4/12 (33%)
С	68/89 (76%)	59/89 (66%)	17/89 (19%)







Gastric Recu	c Cancer- Sites of rrence- MSKCC	
Local Regional- 19	9 patients	
 Lymph nodes 	48%	
Anastomosis	32%	
Gastric bed	20%	
Distant - 188 pati	ents	
Liver	37%	
 Lung 	16%	
• Bone	16%	
 Lymph nodes 	14%	
• Brain	6%	
	D' Angelica- Ann Surg, 20	004

Gastric Cardia

- Surgery vs preoperative radiation therapy
- Limited radiation fields
- 5- year survival- 20% vs 30%
- Local failure- 52% vs 39%
- Distant metastases- no difference

Zhang- IJROBP- 1998





SWOG 9	9008/IN ⁻	T 0116
BASELINE DISEA	SE CHARACTERI	STICS
	<u>OBS(275)</u>	<u>RX(281)</u>
I-STAGE	• • • •	
%T1-T2	31%	31%
% T3	61%	62%
% T 4	8%	6%
NO. + NODES		
% None	16%	14%
% 1-3	41%	42%
,		



SWOG 9008/INT 0116

BASELINE DISEASE CHARACTERISTICS		
	<u>OBS(275)</u>	<u>RX(281)</u>

LOCATION OF		
PRIMARY		
Antrum	56%	53%
Corpus	25%	24%
Cardia	18%	21%
Multicentric	0.4%	2%









SWOG	9008/INT	0116
------	----------	------

Sites of recurrence

local	51	21
regional	126	76
distant	32	36

MAGIC Trial

- 3 cycles ECF preoperatively
 Surgical resection
 3 cycles ECF postoperatively
- ECF
 - ECF Epirubicin- 50 mg/m2/d, d1 Cisplatin- 60 mg/m2/d, d1 5-FU- 200 mg/m2/d x 21 d
- Approximately 25% of patients with GE junction or esophageal cancer No obvious difference in outcome on site of primary





Patt	erns of Fa	ilure
	Local Recurrence	Distant metastases
Control	20.6%	36.8%
Peri-operative chemotherapy	14.4%	24.4%



Esophageal Cancer

- Squamous or adeno, no mets
- RT alone- 6400 cGy
- RT + chemo
 - 5-FU 1000 mg/m2 x 4 d, d 1-4 x 4 cycles
 - Cis-platin- 75 mg/m2, d 1 x 4 cycles
 - RT- 5000 cGy

Herskovic, NEJM, 1992





First Failure	RT Only (%)	RT + CT- randomized (%)	RT + CT- non- randommized (%)
None	11	36	26
Local Persistence	37	25	28
Local- Regional Only	18	15	20
Local/Reg/ Distant	13	5	6
Total Local Regional	68%	45%	54%



CALGB 9781-Chemo/RT + Surg vs Surg aloneSTAGE I, II, III esophageal cancerSFU-1000mg/m2 x 4 dcisplatin- 100 mg/m2Chemo weeks 1 and 5Surgery aloneRadiation therapy (50.4 Gy)concurrent with

Surgery-3-8 wks later

chemotherapy





































FDG PET- treatment planning

- PET very useful to determine the sites of primary disease and nodal spread- staging
- PET should be used cautiously to determine the exact extent of disease
 - Can be difficult to determine length of primary tumor in esophagus from imaging studies

Radiation Therapy Technique

- Treat celiac axis nodes if this does not require a large field extension
- Proximal and distal margins on esophageal lesion are arbitrary
 Generally recommend 3-5 cm
- Generally recommend 3-5 cm
 Treat para-esophageal nodes in the primary
- fieldMinimize cardiac and pulmonary irradiation
- Minimize cardiac and pulmonary irradiati
 Keep spinal cord dose to ≤45 Gy
- Reep spinal cord dose to <a>45 Gy
 Concurrent chemotherapy based on
 - FU
 - Irinotecan
 - Platinum

Radiation Therapy Technique

- Fields should be primarily AP-PA to minimize pulmonary dose
 - IMRT should be used with caution, especially in preoperative setting
- Off cord for a small percentage of dose
 Laterals
 - Obliques
- Emphasis should be on the likely surgical margins in para-esophageal soft tissue

Radiation Therapy Technique

- 45 Gy/180 cGy/fx to initial field
- 5.4 Gy cone down
- Liver- Mean dose < 25 Gy
 60% of liver < 30 Gy
- Heart- Entire heart < 30 Gy
 50% of heart < 40 Gy
- Lung- <20% of lung receiving 30 Gy</p>

Radiation Therapy Technique-Problems

- Cervical esophageal cancers
 - IMRT is often useful
 - Difficult to meet constraints with standard fields
- Postoperative radiation therapy
 - (especially transhiatal esophagectomy) • Difficult to treat entire field without
 - excessive morbidity
 Often need to treat highest risk area, which may be the tumor bed, not the anastomosis
- Strongly prefer preoperative RT

GE Junction cancers

- Local control remains a clinical issue in both gastric and esophageal cancer patients
- Radiation therapy, with concurrent chemotherapy, decreases local failure in both gastric and esophageal cancer
- Treatment regimens with radiation therapy improve survival in both gastric and esophageal cancer
- Radiation therapy remains an important component of the management of GE junction carcinomas

GE Junction Cancers

- The value of chemotherapy in gastric cancer in no way minimizes the value of radiation therapy
- Clinical trials are needed to optimize the combination of the therapeutic modalities
- Need to define which patients are at highest risk for local and systemic failure
- We must improve our understanding of the biology of GE junction tumors

