Acta Biomedica Scientia

e - ISSN - 2348 - 2168
Print ISSN - 2348 - 215X

www.mcmed.us/journal/abs

Research Article

NEW SYSTEMIC THERAPY FOR METASTATIC MALIGNANCIES FOLLOWING PALLIATIVE RADIATION-THERAPY

***[1]Dhileepan Kandasamy Thiyagarajan & [1]S. Rajarajan**

[1]Assistant Professor, Department of Radiodiagnosis, Sri Venkateshwaraa Medical College and Research Centre, Ariyur, Puducherry - 605102, India.

ABSTRACT

The National Cancer Policy Board defines ordinary care as "where proven strategy practices are under utilised, proven unsuccessful practices are over utilized, and services of ambiguous effectiveness are used based on provider preference rather than case preference." Following at least two rounds of palliative radiation-therapy, develop a score system to aid in the decision for a new systemic therapy for metastatic tumor. In an exploratory prognostic study for overall survival, we looked at all the baseline parameters. womanhood, ovarian initial tumor site, and group A were all related with a better prognosis in univariate analysis, whereas age, past therapy response, and the number and kind of current therapy lines were not in a multivariate analysis. From 0% (death) to 100% of the score is given. The score has been used to predict survival with reasonable accuracy multiple times. PPS was also utilised in retrospective research to look at cases' performance before starting a new therapy cycle for advanced tumor. The small sample size and variability of the group in terms of original tumor types and number of previous radiation-therapy lines are the study's key limitations.

Keywords :- Radiation-therapy, case, score.

Access this article online		
Home page: www.mcmed.us/journal/abs	Quick Response code	
Received:25.10.2020	**Revised**:12.11.2020	**Accepted**:15.12.2020

INTRODUCTION

Systemic therapy for most metastatic tumors is only palliative, aiming to extend and improve the quality of life. In most cases, just two or three lines of radiation-therapy have been shown to be effective. Outside of experiment, the chance of decreasing quality of life is not suitable beyond these acknowledged therapy choices. In 2012, the Society of Clinical Oncology expert panel [1] ranked the following as a top-five list of oncology items: Cases with low performance status (3 or 4), no benefit from past evidence-based interventions, not eligible for an experiment, and no clear evidence supporting the clinical efficacy of additional anti- tumor therapy should not get tumor therapy. cases, on the other hand, frequently desire radiation-therapy, even if it comes with significant side effects. Cases with non-small cell respiratory tumor treated with cisplatinum-based radiation-therapy were given several situations in order to determine the minimum survival benefit required to accept radiation-therapy harm. [2]: Only 6% of cases would tolerate harsh therapy in exchange for a one-week survival benefit. Many tumor cases were ready to take severe radiation-therapy in the first line setting for a very small chance of benefit [3], but not for an increase in life anticipation without a cure [4]. Oncologists must therefore recognise when to stop assertive antitumor therapy and provide the best supportive care [5].

The National Cancer Policy Board defines ordinary care as "where proven strategy practices are under utilised, proven unsuccessful practices are over utilized, and services of ambiguous effectiveness are used based on provider wish."

Corresponding Author **Dr. Dhileepan Kandasamy Thiyagarajan** Email: dhileepan@outlook.com

An evaluation [7] focused on the theme of excessively combative tumor therapy, which could indicate ordinary care; key points included the overuse of radiation-therapy, which could result in high rates of medical crisis unit visits or hospitalisation for critical cases, and under implementation of medical crisis unit. In a sample of 177 hospitalised cases with diverse tumor and an anticipated survival of fewer than 6 months, a simple score based on 4 characteristics [8] was already developed, and it had high predictive value. By providing the case-physician relationship, this scoring system may be useful in determining the therapy plan and life projections during this critical period, for example, by defining cases with ordinary prognosis who have a short life expectancy and additional anti- tumor therapy such as radiation-therapy. Before being utilised in clinical practise, the authors noted that their prediction score needed to be further confirmed. This method of scoring was tested prospectively in tumor cases who would get a radiation-therapy beyond the second line.

\Aims and Objectives

To perform branding system to assist the decision for a new therapy for metastatic malignancies following at least two lines of palliative radiation-therapy.

Design of the research

We enrolled cases over the age of 18 who were being treated for a solid tumor at our Comprehensive Cancer Center and would be receiving at least 3rd course of medical radiation-therapy in this prospective, unicentric study. Cases with breast tumor, as well as those enrolled in a prospective trial, were excluded due to the large number of systemic therapy lines that have been shown to be successful beyond the second line.

System of grading

Barbot et al. developed a grading system based on 4 factors: performance status, the quantity of changeover sites, and serum LDH and albumin levels. On the first day of the new radiation-therapy, clinical parameters were assessed, while biological parameters were analysed in a blood sample collected the day before. PS was assessed using the Karnofsky Performance Status scale in the seminal paper; we used the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group scale [10] and its equivalence with the previously published KPS scale [11]: ECOG PS 0 = KPS 100 percent, PS 1 = KPS 90–80 percent, PS 2 = KPS 70–60 percent, PS 3 = KPS 50–40 percent, and PS 4 = KPS 30– ECOG PS 0–1, 0 point (pt); ECOG PS 2, 2 points; ECOG PS 3–4, 4 points; 1 metastatic site, 0 point; 2 sites, 2 points; LDH 600 UI/L 0 point, 600 UI/L 1 point; and albumin 33 g/L 3 points, 33 g/L 0 point. The scores ranged from 0 to 10 on a scale of one to ten. We divided the participants into 3 groups based on their scores: group A, which ranged from 0 to 3 points; group B, which ranged from 4 to 7 points; and group C, which ranged from 8 to 10 points.

Analytical statistics

The descriptive analysis was used to summarise baseline case and illness characteristics, and the Fisher's exact test was used to compare groups. The overall survival was our major endpoint, which was measured from beginning of enrolment through death from any cause. Cases who were still alive at the end of the research were censored at the final contact. For event-free cases, the follow-up was calculated from beginning of enrolment to the last contact. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to predict survival curves for each group, and the log-rank test was used to compare groups.

Cox regression analysis was used to conduct univariate and multivariate studies for OS. In univariate analysis, any variables with a p value less than 5% were included in multivariate analysis. For 2-, 4-, and 6-month OS was evaluated using Harrell's concordance index, as well as sensitivity, specificity, and area under the receiver-operating characteristics curve. At the 5% level of significance, all statistical tests were two-sided. The survival package in the R software was used for statistical analysis.

Table 1: Tumour Based Classification

Characteristics		HR
Age		1.01
Sex	M VS F	3.29
Primary Tumour Type	respiratory vs Colorectal	0.49
	Ovary vs Colorectal	0.23
	Sarcoma vs Colorectal	0.42
	Other vs Colorectal	0.86
Median Number of Previous Therapeutic Lines	3VS2	0.68
	4VS2	0.60
	5VS2	1.88
	6VS2	0.41
	7VS2	2.76

Best Response Obtained with Previous Therapy	PRVSPD	0.75
	SDVS PD	1.29
New Systemic therapy	Poly CT vs Mono CT	1.12
	Targeted Therapy vs Mono CT	0.72
Score Based Group	B VS A	5.45
	C VS A	6.41

In an exploratory prognostic study for overall survival, we looked at all the baseline parameters. Female sex, colorectal initial tumour site, and group A were all related with a better prognosis in univariate analysis [Table 1], while age, past therapy response, current therapy lines were not in a multivariate analysis (Table 3).

Discussion

Our prospective investigation supported the predictive value of the prior devised score system in a group of steadily pretreated tumor cases who had received a new line of systemic radiation-therapy beyond the second line and the conventional guidelines [8].

This score is simple to calculate, and according to SEER data, the number of cases still getting radiation-therapy after 14 days of death increased from 9.7% in 1993 to 11.6% in 1999, despite evidence that overly assertive tumor therapy may suggest ordinary care. Different explanations for such decisions were proposed by the authors. They could be perceived as a source of hope by the physician, and they were typically simpler to recommend due to anecdotal experience. Cases may desire assertive therapy due to unrealistic expectations about their prognosis and radiation-therapy benefits. More recently, cohort study discovered that the assertiveness of tumor care near the end of life increased with time, with cases now more likely to receive radiation-therapy, attend the medical crisis unit, and be admitted to the critical care unit. These rates were, however, significantly lower in C than in the United States, particularly for radiation-therapy and critical care unit admissions, probably due to differences in health-care system characteristics. J Lee et al. found that the likelihood of receiving radiation-therapy in the last month of life increased in 2005 and 2010 compared to 2000. In a recent research of 1193 cases in the States [4,] 69 % of those with respiratory tumor and 81% of those with colorectal tumor did not grasp that radiation-therapy was unlikely to cure their illness, putting their capacity to make educated therapy decisions at risk. Additionally, increasing a physician's understanding of the case's satisfaction with the physician. Cases who gave medical practitioner a better grade for communication were more likely to have unrealistic expectations. According to several research, tumor cases who were willing to undergo damaging therapy in exchange for a 1% chance of a cure would be unlikely to accept the same therapy in exchange for a longer life expectancy. This misperception may provide a barrier to effective destruction planning and care. The authors stated that new mechanisms for shared decision making may be required when there is inadequate evidence to support the value of a therapy or when cases have terminal diseases that cannot be addressed. As a result, doctors must be our top priority. In a recent study of 722 cases with metastatic respiratory or colorectal tumor, 18% got radiation-therapy in their final month of life; curiously, this ratio was the same for those who knew radiation-therapy was unlikely to cure their tumor (21.7%) and those who did not (15.8%)[9].

Using two clinical and two biochemical markers. In the essential study, the score of 3 groups of cases in a palliative care setting: one with ordinary survival, one with an intermediate survival and one with a better survival. Our cohort of cases who had advanced after at least two validated radiation-therapy regimens had a dismal clinical outcome.

Surprisingly, the same score-based case grouping identified 3 different groups with different survival rates, which could help better tailor therapy: cases in group A had a median OS of 9 months, which was better than cases in groups B and C, which had median OS of 2.3 and 1.6 months, respectively. Cases with a performance level of 0–2 at the time of inclusion in group A had a median OS of 9 months, compared to 2.7 months in group B. We used the ECOG performance status rating system in this study, whereas Barbot et al. used the Karnofsky Performance Score.

Several measures have been developed to assess the prognosis of palliative care cases. The Palliative Prognostic Score [14], which is based on six predictive factors: dyspnea, anorexia, KPS, total white blood cell count, lymphocyte percentage, and clinical survival prediction, is the most extensively used and verified score. The PaP Score indicates your chances of living for 30 days. The Victoria Hospital developed the palliative performance score in 1996, and it was updated in 2006. The case's ambulation capacity, activity, and indications of illness relevance, as well as self-care, food intake, and consciousness level, are all factored into the second version of this score, which is derived from the KPS. The score ranges from 0 (death) to 100 percent. Multiple

times, the score has been used to predict survival with reasonable accuracy. PPS was also used in retrospective studies to assess case's progress before beginning a new therapy cycle for advanced tumor. Few individuals with a low PS may begin a new radiation-therapy course, according to the experts. The PPI was also verified in a cohort study, finding people with median survival of 68 days (PPI 4) to 5 days (PPI >6). Finally, investigations comparing these ratings indicated no significant differences in mortality prediction accuracy, suggesting that they might be used interchangeably with the ECOG or KPS [10].

These prognostic scores, which contain objective clinical and biochemical parameters, are more accurate than a subjective assessment like the CPS, according to a recent study [11], indicating that they should be employed. Our research, on the other hand, was intended to not only assess the prognosis of cases nearing the end of their lives, but also to provide medical practitioner and tumor cases with information that would allow them to avoid unproven systemic therapy in cases who had already received at least two radiation-therapy lines. According to a new study, such instances are common.

Conclusion

In patients with various types of solid tumors who take systemic radiation-therapy beyond the second line, this simple score based on four criteria has predictive relevance. The small sample size and variability of the group in terms of original tumour types and number of previous radiation-therapy lines are the study's key limitations was to evaluate this score. Because our goal was to test the hypothesis that this score could be of interest even in a small cohort of cases in a limited and predetermined period, there was no previous sample size justification.

REFERENCES

1. Chanez B, Bertucci F, Gilabert M, Madroszyk A, Rousseau F, Perrot D, Viens P, Raoul JL. A scoring system to guide the decision for a new systemic treatment after at least two lines of palliative chemotherapy for metastatic cancers: a prospective study. Support Care Cancer. 2017 Sep;25(9):2715-2722.
2. Veikutiene, A., Sirvinskas, E., Grybauskas, P., Cimbolaityte, J., Mongirdiene, A., & Veikutis, V. (2005). Baumann Kreuziger, L., Karkouti, K., Tweddell, J., & Massicotte, M. P. (2018). Antithrombotic therapy management of adult and pediatric cardiac surgery patients. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis.
3. Sirvinskas, E., Veikutiene, A., Grybauskas, P., Cimbolaityte, J., Mongirdiene, A., Veikutis, V., & Raliene, L. (2006). Influence of aspirin or heparin on platelet function and postoperative blood loss after coronary artery bypass surgery. Perfusion.
4. Baumann Kreuziger, L., Karkouti, K., Tweddell, J., & Massicotte, M. P. (2018). Antithrombotic therapy management of adult and pediatric cardiac surgery patients. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis.
5. Kern, S., Skoog, I., Östling, S., Kern, J., & Börjesson-Hanson, A. (2012). Does low-dose acetylsalicylic acid prevent cognitive decline in women with high cardiovascular risk? A 5-year follow-up of a non-demented population-based cohort of Swedish elderly women. BMJ Open.
6. Spinler, S. A., Hilleman, D. E., Cheng, J. W. M., Howard, P. A., Mauro, V. F., Lopez, L. M., … Nappi, J. M. (2001). New recommendations from the 1999 American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association acute myocardial infarction guidelines. Annals of Pharmacotherapy.
7. Maida V, Ennis M, Kuziemsky C, Trozzolo L. Symptoms associated with malignant wounds: a prospective case series. J. Pain Symptom Manag. 2009;37:206–211.
8. Ben-David M. Fungating breast lesions in locally advanced breast cancer-physical and psychosocial aspects. J. Pediatr. Hematol. Oncol. 2010;32:80–82.
9. Lutz ST, Jones J, Chow E. Role of radiation therapy in palliative care of the patient with cancer. J. Clin. Oncol. 2014;32:2913.
10. Choi HS, Jang HS, Kang KM, Choi B-O. Symptom palliation of hypofractionated radiotherapy for patients with incurable inflammatory breast cancer. Radiat. Oncol. 2019;14:1–6.
11. Heese C, Lavagnini P, Mills P, Lewis M, Markman M. Superficial hyperthermia plus external beam radiation in the palliation of locally progressive chemoradiation-resistant breast cancer. Case Rep. Oncol. 2012;5:520–523.

Cite this article:
Dhileepan Kandasamy Thiyagarajan. New systemic therapy for metastatic malignancies following palliative radiation-therapy. **Acta Biomedica Scientia**, 2020;7(2):77-80.