



## Evidence-based Series 7-16 version 2 - IN REVIEW

A Quality Initiative of the  
Program in Evidence-Based Care (PEBC), Cancer Care Ontario (CCO)

### The Role of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in the Palliation of Symptoms in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer

*Y Ung, E Yu, C Falkson, A Haynes, WK Evans, and the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group*

An assessment conducted in December 2016 placed Evidence-based Series (EBS) 7-16 version 2 IN REVIEW. This means that it is undergoing review for currency and relevance. The Lung Cancer Disease Site Group has determined that it is still appropriate for this document to continue to be available while this updating process unfolds. The PEBC has a formal and standardized process to ensure the currency of each document.

[\(PEBC Assessment & Review Protocol\)](#)

EBS 7-16 Version 2 reviewed EBS report, which is available on the [CCO website](#), consists of the following four sections:

- Section 1: Clinical Practice Guideline (ENDORSED)
- Section 2: Systematic Review
- Section 3: Guideline Development and External Review
- Section 4: Guideline Review Summary and Tool

**Release Date: May 16, 2013**

For information about this document, the PEBC and/or the most current version of all reports, please visit the CCO Web site at <http://www.cancercare.on.ca/> or contact the PEBC office at:

Phone: 905-527-4322 ext. 42822 Fax: 905-526-6775 E-mail: [ccopgi@mcmaster.ca](mailto:ccopgi@mcmaster.ca)

**PEBC Report Citation (Vancouver Style):** Ung Y, Yu E, Falkson C, Haynes A, Evans WK; Lung Cancer Disease Site Group. The role of high dose rate brachytherapy in the palliation of symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Toronto (ON): Cancer Care Ontario; [ENDORSED 2013 Sep. In review 2016 Dec]. Program in Evidence-based Care Evidence-based Series No.: 7-16 version 2. IN REVIEW

**Journal Citation (Vancouver Style):** Ung YC, Yu E, Falkson C, Haynes AE, Stys-Norman D, Evans WK, et al. The role of high-dose-rate brachytherapy in the palliation of symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review. *Brachytherapy*. 2006;5(3):189-202.

IN REVIEW

## Guideline Report History

GUIDELINE VERSION	SYSTEMATIC REVIEW		PUBLICATIONS	NOTES AND KEY CHANGES
	Search Dates	Data		
Original version October 2005	1966 - 2005	Full Report	Web publication	NA
Version 2 May 2013	2005-2012	New data found in section 4: <a href="#">Document Review Tool</a>	Updated Web publication	2005 recommendations are <a href="#">ENDORSED</a>

## Table of Contents

Section 1: Clinical Practice Guideline .....	1
Section 2: Evidentiary Base .....	5
Section 3: Guideline Development and External Review .....	35
Section 4: Document Review and Summary Tool .....	44

Evidence-based Series #7-16: Section 1

**The Role of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in the Palliation of  
Symptoms in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer:  
A Clinical Practice Guideline**

*Y Ung, E Yu, C Falkson, A Haynes, WK Evans, and the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group*

A Quality Initiative of the  
Program in Evidence-based Care (PEBC), Cancer Care Ontario (CCO)

These guideline recommendations have been **ENDORSED**, which means that the recommendations are still current and relevant for decision making. Please see [Section 4: Document Review Summary and Tool](#) for a summary of updated evidence published between 2002 and 2012, and for details on how this Clinical Practice Guideline was **ENDORSED**.

Report Date: May 16, 2013

**Guideline Question**

1. Is there a role for high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy (HDREB) in the palliation of respiratory symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer?
2. If so, what is the optimal dose of HDREB in this setting?

**Target Population**

The recommendations apply to adult patients with symptomatic endobronchial disease in non-small cell lung cancer.

**Recommendations**

- For patients with previously untreated, symptomatic, endobronchial non-small cell lung cancer:
  - External beam radiation therapy (EBRT) alone is more effective for palliation than HDREB alone.
  - The evidence does not provide conclusive results to suggest that HDREB and EBRT would provide improved symptom relief over EBRT alone.
  - For patients with complete collapse of the lung due to endobronchial obstruction, a surgical core out procedure may be needed before EBRT or EBRT with HDREB

- For patients previously treated by EBRT who are symptomatic with endobronchial obstruction due to recurrent disease, HDREB is recommended, providing that endobronchial brachytherapy is technically feasible.
- 

### Qualifying Statements

- This guideline addresses only the use of HDREB for the palliation of symptomatic endobronchial disease and not its use as a radical or adjuvant treatment.
- The occurrence of fatal hemoptysis because of HDREB is a significant risk with that therapy, and occurrence rates as high as 32% of patients have been reported. However, the majority of studies report rates between 4% and 18% of patients.
- Improvement of hemoptysis as a result of HDREB ranges from 19% to 100% of patients, with most studies reporting rates of 69% and higher.
- HDREB should be provided by a team of experts that includes radiation oncologists, thoracic surgeons (or physicians with expertise in bronchoscopy), and medical physicists.
- HDREB is only possible if afterloading catheters can be inserted bronchoscopically. Patients with complete endobronchial obstruction are not suitable for HDREB.
- Treatment alternatives to HDREB include EBRT (if not previously irradiated), Nd-YAG laser therapy, photodynamic therapy (PDT), and surgical core-out procedure.
- The optimal dose and fractionation for HDREB for the palliation of symptoms of airway obstruction has not yet been determined. However, commonly used doses include 1000 cGy at 1cm in a single fraction or 750 cGy at 1cm in one or two fractions.
- HDREB may be effectively combined with other endobronchial treatment modalities such as neodymium-yttrium-aluminum-garnet (Nd-YAG) laser therapy.

### Key Evidence

- A total of six small randomized trials were identified. One trial compared EBR with HDREB, each as primary palliative treatments. Three studies randomized patients to either EBR alone or EBR with HDREB, one trial randomized patients to Nd-YAG laser therapy with or without HDREB, and one trial compared two different schedules of HDREB. Sample sizes ranged from 29 and 108 patients.
- One randomized trial compared two different doses and schedules of HDREB (four fractions of 3.8 Gy administered weekly versus two fractions of 7.2 Gy administered every 3 weeks) and obtained similar response rates (36% versus 37%), survival (median, 4.2 versus 4.4 months; one-year, 11% versus 20%), and rates of fatal hemoptysis (22% versus 21%), respectively.
- One randomized trial involving 99 previously untreated patients obtained better overall palliation with EBRT alone compared with HDREB alone (physician preference ratings for EBRT,  $p=0.09$ ; patient preference ratings for EBRT,  $p=0.029$ ). The incidence of fatal hemoptysis was comparable in both groups (6% to 8%). Although survival was not a specified endpoint of that study, a significant survival advantage for EBRT alone over HDREB alone ( $p=0.04$ ) was found (median, 9.4 versus 8.2 months, one-year, 38% versus 22%).
- One randomized trial evaluated HDREB in combination with EBRT to EBRT alone using biologically equivalent doses for both arms. Symptom control for cough was better in patients who were treated with EBRT alone compared to HDREB and EBRT, and survival at one year was the same in each group.
- Two trials obtained comparable median survival (6.2 versus 6.5 months and 7.0 versus 8.5 months) and incidence of fatal hemoptysis (14% versus 20% and 13% versus 15%) for

patients treated with EBRT alone or EBRT with HDREB. Combined treatment improved mean dyspnea scores over time ( $p=0.02$ ) and atelectasis improved for a significantly greater proportion of patients with prior atelectasis in the combined group (57% versus 35%,  $p=0.009$ ), although individual symptom scale scores were comparable for both treatments. The other trial reported a tendency toward improved local control with combined therapy ( $p=0.052$ ), but symptom control was not evaluated.

- Median survival (7.4 versus 10.3 months) and incidence of fatal hemoptysis (0 versus 1 patient) were similar for Nd-YAG laser therapy alone or combined with HDREB. The symptom-free period was significantly longer with the combined treatment (8.5 versus 2.8 months,  $p<0.05$ ), although toxicity and symptom palliation were not reported by treatment group.
- Eighteen non-comparative prospective studies evaluated HDREB in doses ranging from 4 Gy at 2 cm from the source axis twice daily over two days to a single fraction of 20 Gy at 1cm from the source axis. Response rates varied between 20% and 98%, median survival between three and 28 months, and one-year survival between 7% and 78%. Hemoptysis improved for most patients, although fatal hemoptysis occurred in between 4% and 32% of patients.
- Five retrospective studies, involving more than 100 patients, reviewed the role of HDREB alone or in combination with EBRT. Treatment intent varied from palliation to radical, using single dose or fractionated treatments. Symptom improvement ranged from 74% to 94%. The risk of fatal hemoptysis ranged from 3.6% to 8%.

### Treatment Alternatives

High dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy can only be given when there is an adequate lumen to allow for insertion of the treatment catheter. If there is complete endobronchial obstruction, then initial therapy could include other treatment modalities such as surgical core out, endobronchial stent for more proximal tumours, Nd-YAG laser therapy, or PDT. Those modalities of therapy could then be followed by HDREB.

### Future Research

Future research on the role of HDREB should focus on two objectives:

1. Defining the optimal dose and fractionation as well as defining the physical aspects of radiation delivery (e.g., dose prescription, optimal length, and the effects of catheter curvature on dose).
2. Evaluating the role of combination therapies (e.g., Nd-YAG laser therapy and PDT).

### Related Evidence Summary

- Evidence Summary Report #7-15: *The Role of Photodynamic Therapy (PDT) in Patients with Non-small Cell Lung Cancer.*

#### *Funding*

The PEBC is supported by Cancer Care Ontario (CCO) and the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. All work produced by the PEBC is editorially independent from its funding agencies.

#### *Copyright*

This guideline is copyrighted by Cancer Care Ontario; the guideline and the illustrations herein may not be reproduced without the express written permission of Cancer Care Ontario. Cancer Care Ontario reserves the right at any time, and at its sole discretion, to change or revoke this authorization.

*Disclaimer*

Care has been taken in the preparation of the information contained in this document. Nonetheless, any person seeking to apply or consult the practice guideline is expected to use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances or seek out the supervision of a qualified clinician. Cancer Care Ontario makes no representation or guarantees of any kind whatsoever regarding their content or use or application and disclaims any responsibility for their application or use in any way.

*Contact Information*

For further information about this practice guideline report, please contact  
**Dr. William K. Evans**, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group, McMaster University and Juravinski  
Cancer Centre, 699 Concession Street, Hamilton ON L8V 5C2;  
TEL (905) 387-9711 ext. 63001; FAX (905) 575-6323

or

**Dr. Yee C. Ung**, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group, Toronto-Sunnybrook Regional Cancer  
Centre, 2075 Bayview Avenue, Toronto, ON, M4N 3M5;  
TEL (416) 480-4951; FAX (416) 480-6002.

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports,  
please visit the CCO website at <http://www.cancercare.on.ca/>

or contact the PEBC office at:

Phone: 905-527-4322 ext. 42822 Fax: 905-526-6775 E-mail: [ccopgi@mcmaster.ca](mailto:ccopgi@mcmaster.ca)

Evidence-based Series #7-16: Section 2

**The Role of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in the Palliation of Symptoms in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: A Systematic Review**

*Y Ung, E Yu, C Falkson, AE Haynes, WK Evans, and the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group*

A Quality Initiative of the  
Program in Evidence-based Care (PEBC), Cancer Care Ontario (CCO)

These guideline recommendations have been **ENDORSED**, which means that the recommendations are still current and relevant for decision making. Please see [Section 4: Document Review Summary and Tool](#) for a summary of updated evidence published between 2002 and 2012, and for details on how this Clinical Practice Guideline was **ENDORSED**.

Report Date: October 25, 2005

## QUESTIONS

1. Is there a role for high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy (HDREB) in the palliation of symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)?
2. If so, what is the optimal dose of HDREB in this setting?

## INTRODUCTION

Brachytherapy is not a new treatment modality, but the development of remote afterloading high dose rate equipment has resulted in the increased use of this treatment option (1,2). High dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy (HDREB) has been defined as brachytherapy capable of delivering greater than 12 Gy/h (>0.2 Gy/min) (3).

A flexible bronchoscope is used to place an intraluminal treatment applicator at the location of the tumour. The applicator is then connected to a high dose rate, remote, afterloading device, which is programmed to advance the radiation source to specific locations within the applicator. That process provides a higher radiation dose at the centre of the tumour than at the periphery, thereby reducing the effect of the radiation on surrounding tissue (1,2).

The treatment can be conducted on an outpatient basis and be both convenient for patients and cost effective for institutions. HDREB has been used as an alternative to, and in combination with, external beam radiation therapy (EBRT) for the palliation of advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Given the potential for HDREB to provide fast, effective, and convenient relief of symptoms associated with endobronchial disease, the authors felt that an evaluation of this technique for the palliation of symptoms in patients with NSCLC was warranted. This systematic review addresses the role of HDREB in the palliation of symptoms in patients with NSCLC and the optimal dose of HDREB in that setting.

## **METHODS**

This systematic review was developed by Cancer Care Ontario's Program in Evidence-based Care (PEBC), using the methods of the Practice Guidelines Development Cycle (4). Evidence was selected and reviewed by three members of the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group (Lung DSG).

This systematic review is a convenient and up-to-date source of the best available evidence on HDREB for the palliation of advanced NSCLC. The body of evidence in this review is primarily comprised of mature randomized controlled trial data. That evidence forms the basis of a clinical practice guideline developed by the Lung DSG. The systematic review and companion practice guideline are intended to promote evidence-based practice in Ontario, Canada. The PEBC is editorially independent of Cancer Care Ontario and the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care.

### **Literature Search Strategy**

MEDLINE (1966 through July 2005), EMBASE (1980 through July 2005), CANCELIT (1975 through March 2002), and the Cochrane Library (2005, Issue 4) databases were searched for evidence relevant to this practice guideline report. "Carcinoma, non-small-cell lung" (Medical subject heading (MeSH)), "Lung Neoplasms" (MeSH), and the phrase "non small cell lung" used as a text word were combined with "brachytherapy" (MeSH), "radiotherapy dosage" (MeSH) and each of the following phrases used as text words: "brachytherapy", "interstitial radiotherapy", "seed implant", "high dose", or "HDR". The initial search did not include restrictions on study design as the literature was expected to be limited. However, subsequent searches included the search terms for the following study designs and publication types: practice guidelines, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, reviews, randomized controlled trials, controlled clinical trials, clinical trials, comparative studies, follow-up studies, prospective studies, and retrospective studies.

In addition, conference proceedings of the American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) (1995-2005) and the American Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology (ASTRO) (2000-2005) were searched for abstracts of relevant trials. The Canadian Medical Association Infobase (<http://mdm.ca/cpgsnew/cpgs/index.asp>) and the Web site of the National Guidelines Clearinghouse (<http://www.guideline.gov/index.asp>) were also searched for existing evidence-based practice guidelines.

Relevant articles and abstracts were selected and reviewed by three reviewers, and the reference lists from those sources were searched for additional trials, as were the reference lists from relevant review articles.

### **Inclusion Criteria**

Articles published as full reports were selected for inclusion in this systematic review of the evidence if they were the following:

1. Randomized clinical trials (RCTs), non-comparative prospective studies, or large retrospective studies involving more than 100 patients evaluating treatment for symptomatic endobronchial disease in patients presenting with primary NSCLC.
2. At least one group in the study had to receive HDREB, either alone or in combination with EBRT, laser therapy, or photodynamic therapy (PDT).
3. Reported data on symptom control, response, survival, or toxicity.

### Exclusion Criteria

Articles were excluded if they were:

1. Published in a language other than English.
2. Published in abstract form only.
3. Letters, comments, or editorials.
4. Case studies.

### Synthesizing the Evidence

As only three of the six randomized trials compared similar treatments, and all three administered different doses of HDREB, the data were not pooled.

## RESULTS

### Literature Search Results

Six randomized trials (5-11), 18 non-comparative prospective studies (12-30), and five large retrospective studies (31-36) of HDREB alone or in combination with EBR, neodymium-yttrium-aluminium-garnet (Nd-YAG) laser therapy, or PDT met the eligibility criteria (Table 1). One guideline published by the American Brachytherapy Society in 2001 was identified. A trial by Moghissi et al (37) focused on the treatment of endotracheal or endobronchial obstruction using EBR versus HDREB endobronchial treatment. This trial was excluded as the results were pooled and not reported by treatment arm.

Since it was often difficult to identify if case series reports were based on data collected prospectively or retrospectively, those studies were considered retrospective unless there were clear indications that a study protocol or patient eligibility criteria was pre-specified. Although prospective studies, in particular RCTs, provide the best evidence for the evaluation of different treatments, the view was that large retrospective studies could also provide valuable information relating to treatment toxicity, dosing, and scheduling. Retrospective studies involving more than 100 patients were, therefore, included in the development of this practice guideline.

**Table 1. Studies included in this practice guideline report.**

Study Type	Number of studies	Reference numbers	Further information found in table
Randomized trials	6	(5-11)	2a and 2b
Non-controlled, prospective studies	18	(12-30)	3a and 3b
Retrospective studies with >100 patients	5	(31-36)	4a and 4b

### Outcomes

#### *Practice Guideline*

One practice guideline on the role of brachytherapy was found. The recommendations developed by ABS panel members and published by the ABS were based on a literature review, clinical experience, and biomathematical modelling and were reviewed by external

experts (2). The guideline included a review of studies involving both low and high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy, either alone or in combination with EBRT, and focused primarily on indications for treatment and suggested doses for palliative, curative, or interstitial brachytherapy. The guideline also reviewed the treatment technique of brachytherapy and provided recommendations regarding standardized reporting for symptoms, bronchoscopic response, and radiation bronchitis.

The ABS guideline concluded that palliative brachytherapy should be considered for defined patient populations, particularly those with endobronchial tumours within the lumen that cannot be adequately resected or subjected to further EBRT, and that cause symptoms such as hemoptysis, shortness of breath, or persistent cough. The use of endobronchial brachytherapy as a curative treatment, either alone or as a boost to EBRT, was considered an option for patients with inoperable, occult tumours. A broad range of literature was referenced in the ABS guideline, and although the literature search and selection strategy were not reported, a number of additional studies, including three RCTs, were identified during the development of the current guideline.

### ***Randomized Trials***

The six randomized trials involving HDREB are summarized in Tables 2a and 2b (5-11). One trial compared EBR with HDREB, each as primary palliative treatments (9). Three studies randomized patients to either EBR alone or EBR with HDREB (5-7,10), one trial randomized patients to neodymium-yttrium-aluminium-garnet (Nd-YAG) laser therapy with or without HDREB (8), and one trial compared two different schedules of HDREB (11). Across these trials, a total of 491 eligible patients were randomized, with the number of randomized patients per RCT ranging from 29 to 108. None of the trials reported blinding of treatment assignment for researchers or patients, and only one trial described the method of randomization (5). One trial stratified patients by institution, stage and external fractionation schedule (5). Statistical power to detect a significant difference between groups was reported in three trials (5,8,9), although one trial did not meet the target sample size (5). Primary outcomes varied between the trials, and included survival time, response rate of dyspnea, symptom relief, and disease-free progression. Three trials reported that statistical analyses were performed according to intent-to-treat (5,10,11).

The preliminary trial results reported by Sur et al (6) were updated at ASTRO 2004 (7). The trial by Langendijk et al was stopped prematurely due to insufficient patient accrual (5). Stout et al (9) randomized 108 patients with tumours confined to the thorax but reported results only for the 99 patients who were previously untreated. All patients in the study by Chella et al (8) were previously treated with surgery, EBR, or chemotherapy and were not eligible for further conventional treatment. Seven patients receiving EBR alone in the study by Huber et al (10) were treated at other hospitals and were not evaluable. Huber et al (11) also reported interim results for a trial of 93 patients that compared two different schedules of HDREB. The total brachytherapy dose varied from 14.4 Gy to 15.2 Gy, administered in two to four fractions over four to six weeks. The two trials reported by Huber et al (10,11) were not completely independent. Patients in the study involving EBR who had advanced disease and were ineligible for other treatment options (10) were also included in the HDREB scheduling trial (11).

**Table 2a. Randomized trials of HDREB: descriptions.**

Author, Year (Reference)	Disease Description	No. of Pts Randomized/Evaluable	Treatment	Follow-up	Comments
Langendijk, 2001 (5)	Inoperable, biopsy proven NSCLC with tumour in main or lobar bronchus.	NR/47 NR/48 Total: 98/95	Radical EBRT: 2.25 Gy/fx x 4 q1w to 45 Gy + 15 Gy boost, or palliative EBRT: 3 Gy/fx x 4 q1w to 30 Gy Radical or palliative EBRT + HDREB of 7.5 Gy @ 1cm q1w x 2	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: WHO 0-3</li> <li>• Stage: I-IIIb (IIIb=55%)</li> <li>• EBRT + HDREB not given on the same day</li> <li>• Previously untreated: 100%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Sur, 2001 (6) Sur, 2004 (7) [abstract]	Inoperable, biopsy proven NSCLC, luminal disease, no prior treatment.	Total: 65 NR NR	All patients: EBRT: 30 Gy in 10 fx; or 36 Gy in 18 fx; or 40 Gy in 20 fx followed by either: EBRT: 20 Gy in 10 fx over 2w; or HDREB: 12 Gy in 2 fx over 2w @ 1cm	Minimum, 12Mo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Karnofsky &gt;=60</li> <li>• Stage: III (IIIb=46%)</li> <li>• Previously untreated: 100%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> <li>• Preliminary results from first 26 pts to reach 1 year follow-up</li> </ul>
Chella, 2000 (8)	NSCLC involving central airway, SCC 72%.	15/15 14/14	Nd-YAG: 25-45W @ pulses up to 1.2s to a mean total of 1850J Nd-YAG + HDREB of 5 Gy @ 0.5cm q1w x 3	Median, 17.8Mo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: WHO 0-2</li> <li>• Stage: NR</li> <li>• HDREB given 15-18 days after Nd-YAG in group 2</li> <li>• Previously untreated: 0%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Stout, 2000 (9)	Inoperable, histologically proven NSCLC, SCC 82%.	50/NR 49/NR	EBRT: 30 Gy in 8 fx over 10-12 days HDREB: 15 Gy @ 1cm	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS &amp; Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previously untreated: 100%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Huber, 1997 (10)	Inoperable, histologically proven NSCLC, SCC 69%.	NR/42 NR/56	EBRT alone: 2-2.5 Gy/day with 4-5fx per week to 50 Gy + 10 Gy booster EBRT + HDREB of 4.8 Gy @ 1cm 1w pre-EBRT and 3w post-EBRT	Median, 30Mo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Karnofsky &gt; 50</li> <li>• Stage: I-IV (IIIb/IV=77%)</li> <li>• Previously untreated: 68%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: 7.44 ± 2.6 Gy</li> </ul>
Huber, 1995 (11)	Histologically proven lung cancer, SCC 49%.	44/44 (37 <sup>1</sup> ) 49/49 (36 <sup>1</sup> )	HDREB(4): 3.8 Gy @ 1cm q1w x 4 HDREB(2): 7.2 Gy @ 1cm q3w x 2	Median, 30Mo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: NR</li> <li>• Stage: I-IV (IIIb/IV=80%)</li> <li>• Previously untreated: 10%</li> <li>• Previous HDREB: HDREB(4)/(2), 11% / 17%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: HDREB(4)/(2), 13.4 ± 5.2 Gy / 13.7 ± 4.4 Gy</li> </ul>

Notes: EBRT - external beam radiation therapy, EBT - Endobronchial treatment, fx - fraction(s), Gy - Gray, HDREB - high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy, J - joules(s), Mo - month(s), Nd-YAG - neodymium-yttrium-aluminum-garnet laser therapy, No - number, NR - not reported, NSCLC - non-small cell lung cancer, PS - performance status, pts - patients, q - every, s - second(s), SCC - squamous cell carcinoma, w - week(s), W - Watts, WHO - World Health Organization.

<sup>1</sup> Evaluable for response.

<sup>a</sup> Patients that received allocated treatment (Moghissi 1999) (5).

**Table 2b. Randomized trials of HDREB: results.**

Author, Year (Reference)	Response CR/PR (%)	Survival	Toxicity	Symptom Control
Langendijk, 2001 (5)	EBRT: NR EBRT + HDREB: NR	<u>Median</u> 8.5Mo (CI: 5.4-11.6)  7.0Mo (CI: 5.3-8.9)  Overall, p=0.21	<u>EBRT vs. EBRT + HDREB</u> Fhem: 13% vs. 15% (p=ns) Unknown cause of death: 2% vs. 13% Bronchopleural fistula: 0% vs. 2% (9Mo post-EBRT)	<u>EBRT vs. EBRT + HDREB</u> Rate of radiological re-expansion for pts with prior atelectasis, 35% vs. 57% (p=0.009) Mean group dyspnea rating over time better for HDREB group (p=0.02)
Sur, 2001 (6) Sur, 2004 (7) [abstract]	EBRT: NR EBRT + HDREB: NR	<u>One-year</u> 29.4%  29.7%  p>0.05	No complications in either group	<u>EBRT vs. EBRT + HDREB</u> <u>Median event-free survivals:</u> Any symptoms: 129d vs. 77d, p=0.0090 Dyspnea: 336d vs. 311d, p=0.9158 Cough: 141d vs. 133d, p=0.0464 Hemoptysis: not reached, p=0.2994 Chest pain: 113d vs. 127d, p=0.2768
Chella, 2000 (8)	Nd-YAG: NR Nd-YAG + HDREB: NR	<u>Median</u> 7.4Mo  10.3Mo  p=ns	<u>Nd-YAG vs. Nd-YAG + HDREB</u> Fhem: 0% vs. 7% (1pt at 12Mo post-treatment)  Reported no morbidity or mortality related to treatment although 6 pts experienced grade 2 or 3 actinic bronchitis	<u>Nd-YAG vs. Nd-YAG + HDREB</u> Symptom-free period in responsive pts, 2.8Mo vs. 8.5Mo (p<0.05) For both treatment arms, Nd-YAG improved stridor in 100% of 9 pts, hemoptysis in 100% of 11 pts, dyspnea in 76% of 21 pts, and cough in 48% of 29 pts. Transient increase in cough in 6 pts.
Stout, 2000 (9)	EBRT: NR HDREB: NR	<u>Median / 1-yr</u> 9.4Mo / 38%  8.2Mo / 22%  Overall, p=0.04	<u>EBRT vs. HDREB</u> Fhem: 6% vs. 8%  No serious late morbidity occurred	<u>EBRT vs. HDREB (at 8 weeks)</u> Patient-rated symptoms (43 vs. 40 pts, % improved or maintained): Chest pain, 77% vs. 43% (p=0.003) Anorexia, 77% vs. 43% (p=0.003) Tiredness, 65% vs. 30% (p=0.0029) Nausea, 81% vs. 58% (p=0.033) EBRT achieved more re-inflation than HDREB, 60% vs. 18%
Huber, 1997 (10)	EBRT: NR EBRT + HDREB: NR  Overall: p=0.052 in favour of combination	<u>Median / 1-yr</u> 6.5Mo / 19%  6.2Mo / 25%  Overall, p=0.42	<u>EBRT vs. EBRT + HDREB</u> Fhem: 14% vs. 20% (p=ns)	NR
Huber, 1995 (11)	HDREB(4): 1/15 (ITT: 36) HDREB(2): 0/18 (ITT: 37)	<u>Median / 1-yr</u> 4.2Mo / 11.4%  4.4Mo / 20.4%  p=ns	<u>HDREB(4) vs. HDREB(2)</u> Fhem: 22% vs. 21%	NR

Notes: CI - 95% confidence interval, CR - complete response, d - day(s), EBRT - external beam radiation therapy, Fhem - fatal hemoptysis, HDREB - high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy, ITT - intention to treat, Mo - month(s), NCI-CTC - National Cancer, Institute-Common Toxicity Criteria, Nd-YAG - neodymium-yttrium-aluminum-garnet laser therapy, NR - not reported, ns - not statistically significant, PR - partial response, pt(s) - patient(s), vs. - versus, yr - year(s).

### *Response*

Langendijk et al (5), Sur et al (6,7), and Stout et al (9) did not report treatment response rates. Although Chella et al (8) did not report response rate by treatment group, the Speiser index of obstruction, an alternative measure of response, improved to a similar extent in both treatment groups (from 6.4 to 3.0 for single treatment and from 6.9 to 2.7 for combined treatment). For local control over time, Huber et al (10) found a non-significant difference in favour of EBR combined with HDREB over EBR alone ( $p=0.052$  log rank for 90 evaluable patients). For a subgroup of 62 patients with squamous cell carcinoma, that difference was significant ( $p=0.007$  log rank). In the study by Huber et al (11), response was assessed bronchoscopically and by X-ray for the 73 patients evaluable at three months post-treatment. Response was similar for the two different schedules of HDREB of 2 and 4 fractions, complete response 0% vs 1%, partial response, 18% versus 15%, respectively. The two studies by Huber et al defined partial response differently, with the former study including tumours with more than 50% reduction (10) and the latter study requiring only a 25% reduction in tumour size (11).

### *Survival*

Median survival was similar for patients receiving EBRT with or without HDREB in the study by Langendijk et al (5), although the study did not reach target accrual and may have been underpowered for that comparison. The percentage of patients that reached one year survival was similar in both arms in the Sur et al trial. (7,8) Similarly, in the study by Chella et al (8), median survival was comparable for patients receiving Nd-YAG laser therapy with or without HDREB. Evaluating survival was not one of the aims of the study by Stout et al (9); however, a post-hoc analysis revealed a survival advantage for EBRT alone over HDREB alone (overall,  $p=0.04$ ). Huber et al (10) reported no significant difference in either median or overall survival for patients receiving EBRT with or without HDREB. A subgroup analysis in the same study for patients with squamous cell carcinomas obtained a non-significant, longer median survival for the combined treatment group (9.2 versus [vs.] 7.6 months for 39 and 29 patients, respectively,  $p=0.09$  log rank). An analysis of the patients that were treated according to protocol found a longer median survival for the combined treatment group (9.9 vs. 6.9 months,  $p=0.08$ , number of patients not reported). Two schedules of HDREB, reported by Huber et al (11), evidenced comparable median and one-year survival. For the subgroup of 46 patients with squamous cell carcinoma, median survival was longer for weekly compared with three-weekly treatment (4.4 vs. 2.1 months), although that difference was not significant.

### *Toxicity*

Sur et al (6,7) reported no complications due to treatment for either trial arm. The incidence of fatal hemoptysis was comparable across treatment groups in the five remaining randomized trials, with the lowest rate (0%) obtained for Nd-YAG laser therapy alone (8). The incidence for HDREB varied from 7% of 14 patients when combined with Nd-YAG laser therapy (8) to 20% of 44 patients when administered alone at 3.8 Gy weekly for four fractions (11). Few other toxicities were reported; however, Langendijk et al (5) reported more bronchopleural fistula in the combined treatment group nine months post-EBR (2% vs. 0%), and there were a higher proportion of patients with cause of death unknown in the combined treatment group (13% vs. 2%). Chella et al (8) reported no morbidity or mortality related to treatment although six patients experienced grade 2 or 3 actinic bronchitis.

### *Symptom control*

Four of the six randomized trials assessed symptomatic change (5-9). Langendijk et al (5) assessed palliation with chest X-rays, CT scans, and changes in inspiratory vital capacity. Quality of life (QOL) was evaluated using the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) general questionnaire, QLQ-C30, and lung cancer module, QLQ-LC13. Comparable responses were obtained for EBR plus HDREB and EBR alone with respect to dyspnea and other respiratory symptoms, including cough, hemoptysis, chest pain, and pain in the arm/shoulder. The results of other QOL dimensions were not reported. A significant difference in favour of the combined treatment group was observed for the mean group dyspnea scores over time ( $p=0.02$ ). That difference was largely due to the improvement in symptoms experienced by the combined group at two to six weeks post-treatment and was most evident for patients with tumours in the main versus lobar bronchus. By three to six months, the difference had dissipated, and both treatment groups experienced increased dyspnea. Atelectasis improved for a significantly greater proportion of patients in the combined versus single treatment group (57% of 30 patients vs. 35% of 26 patients,  $p=0.009$  for patients with prior atelectasis).

Sur et al (6,7) used the National Cancer Institute Common Toxicity Criteria to rate improvements in dyspnea, cough, hemoptysis, and chest pain. An improvement was defined as the relief of symptomatology by at least one grade from the presenting score and was measured monthly from the time of treatment through each follow-up appointment. The median overall symptom-free survival was significantly longer in the EBR-boost arm compared to the HDREB-boost arm (129 days vs. 77 days, respectively,  $p=0.0090$ ). Each individual symptom was examined separately, with only median cough-free survival significantly improved for patients that received the EBR boost compared to the HDREB boost (141 days vs. 133 days, respectively,  $p=0.0464$ ).

Chella et al (8) obtained a significantly longer symptom-free period for patients initially responding to combined Nd-YAG laser therapy and HDREB compared to those responding to Nd-YAG laser therapy alone (8.5 vs. 2.8 months,  $p<0.05$ ), and fewer additional endoscopic treatments were required by the combined treatment group (3 vs.15,  $p<0.05$ ). Across both treatment arms, 76% of patients with dyspnea, 48% of patients with cough and all patients with hemoptysis and stridor had symptom improvement after Nd-YAG. Improvements in lung function tests, including measures of forced expiratory volume in the first second and forced vital capacity, were comparable for both treatment groups.

Patients in the study by Stout et al completed QOL questionnaires (Rotterdam Symptom Checklist and the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale), and the physicians rated patient symptoms as none, mild, moderate, or severe (9). Nine key symptoms were combined to provide a measure of overall palliation: cough, hemoptysis, breathlessness, chest pain, dysphagia, anorexia, tiredness, nausea, and hoarseness. Overall palliation was higher with EBR for both physician ratings (91% vs. 76% of patients,  $p=0.09$ ) and patient ratings (83% vs. 59% of patients,  $p=0.029$ ). HDREB resulted in more frequent improvement or stability of physician-assessed dysphagia at four weeks (85% vs. 45%,  $p=0.00085$ ), although there was a higher proportion of missing data in the EBR group (42% vs. 16%). At eight weeks, improvement or stability of symptoms was more frequent with EBR than HDREB, and the difference was significant for the patient-assessed symptoms of chest pain (77% vs. 43%,  $p=0.003$ ), anorexia (77% vs. 43%,  $p=0.003$ ), tiredness (65% vs. 30%,  $p=0.0029$ ), and nausea (81% vs. 58%,  $p=0.033$ ). However, with the exception of patient-assessed tiredness ( $p=0.01$ ), those differences had disappeared by the 16-week follow-up. There was a significant difference between physician-rated and patient-rated symptom assessments at eight weeks for breathlessness ( $p=0.0002$ ), anorexia ( $p=0.02$ ), tiredness ( $p=0.003$ ), and nausea ( $p=0.013$ ), with patients rating symptoms more negatively than physicians. Anxiety and depression were comparable for both treatment groups at eight weeks post-treatment.

### ***Non-controlled, Prospective Studies***

Eighteen non-comparative prospective studies were identified (Tables 3a and 3b). Across these trials, a total of 1069 patients were enrolled, with the number per trial ranging from 15 to 117. The percentage of patients evaluated out of those enrolled, ranged from 80% to 100%. The patient inclusion and exclusion criteria differed for each trial. Patients included generally had recurrent, primary symptomatic bronchogenic carcinoma, although disease stage, tumour histology, and performance status varied among trials. Some trials also included a small number of patients with metastatic lung tumours. Two studies focused on patients with malignant airway occlusion, although 77% (27) and 80% (14), respectively, of patients had a primary lung tumour. Studies varied in the percentage of patients that had received previous EBR, ranging from no previous EBR (15,18) to all patients having received previous EBR (16,19,20,25,26,28,30). Seven studies reported Nd-YAG laser therapy prior to HDREB for 2% to 45% of patients (17,20,22-25,28,29). The criteria used to assess symptom control differed across trials and the reliability and validity of the methods used is not clear. The methods used for symptom assessment included asking the patient to rate improvement, using questionnaires, and using a numerical scale developed by Speiser and Spratling (24). However, five trials did not report how symptoms were assessed (14,15,21,26,30). Non-comparative trials are more susceptible to bias and the subjective outcomes used in these trials should be interpreted with the limitations of this study design in mind.

Anacak et al (15) enrolled 30 previously-untreated NSCLC patients in a trial of combination HDREB and EBRT. In the study reported by Gejerman et al (14), 41 patients with locally advanced lung cancer or metastatic cancer with endobronchial obstruction or extrabronchial tumour were treated with combination HDREB and EBRT. Three studies treated patients with a single application of HDREB (17,22,29). In the study by Burt et al (29), only patients whose symptoms were likely to respond to brachytherapy were enrolled (e.g., those with hemoptysis, dyspnea or cough), and a majority were previously untreated (94%).

In two studies that included patients with recurrent carcinoma, HDREB applications were administered to tumours confined to the bronchial lumen (19,26). In both studies, the majority of patients were treated according to the protocol (67% and 88% of 81 and 24 patients, respectively). Freitag et al (12) treated inoperable patients with PDT 2mg/kg six weeks prior to five fractions of 4Gy at weekly intervals.

Ofiara et al (16) reported results separately for the 20 patients with endoluminal tumours and the 10 patients with submucosal infiltration or extrinsic compression. Six of the patients in that study were also included in the report by Hernandez et al (20) (personal communication, May 2002). Perol et al (18) treated 19 patients with endobronchial lesions of  $\leq 1$ cm. In the study by Trédaniel et al (21), the six planned fractions of HDREB were received by 90% of the 29 patients with endoluminal tumours and 41% of the 22 patients with extraluminal tumour extension.

In a case series, Speiser et al (23,24) treated patients on one of three protocols based on patient characteristics and prior treatment: curative (20% patients), palliative (48% patients) and recurrent (32% patients). However, treatment results were not presented by treatment protocol within brachytherapy dose. All of the patients in the curative protocol received concurrent EBRT, as did 43% of the 164 patients in the palliative protocol. Most patients received the scheduled three fractions of treatment (83%), although 6% received more than three treatments.

In the trial by Bedwinek et al (25), the scheduled three fractions were repeated for four patients between four and 10 months after initial brachytherapy. Mehta et al (27) compared data obtained from an earlier study of low dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy with that obtained from a recent study using a hyperfractionated high dose rate schema.

Only the data from the high dose rate study is included in Tables 3a and 3b. In a phase II study, Suttedja et al (28) treated intraluminal tumours.

**Table 3a. Non-controlled prospective studies of HDREB: descriptions.**

Author, Year (Reference)	Disease Description	No. of Pts Enrolled/ Evaluable	HDREB Treatment	Follow-up	Comments
Freitag 2004 (12)	Inoperable or recurrent bronchogenic carcinoma limited to the bronchial wall, SCC 97%	32/32	PDT iv 2mg/kg and HDREB 4 Gy @ 1cm q1w x 5 (HDREB 6w after PDT)	24 Mo (3-46 mos)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treatment: 6 w apart and 2<sup>nd</sup> round of PDT &amp; HDREB if required</li> <li>• PS: NR</li> <li>• Stage: NR</li> </ul>
Escobar-Sacristan 2004 (13)	Malignant endobronchial tumour (SCLC 9%), SCC 59%, primary 94%	81/81	5 Gy @ 0.5-1 cm q1w x 4	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focuses on CR of symptoms in pts</li> <li>• PS: Karnofsky &gt; 60</li> <li>• Stage: Advanced</li> </ul>
Gejerman, 2002 (14)	Endobronchial obstruction and extrabronchial tumours >2.5 cm, SCLC 15%, primary 80%	41/41	5 Gy/w @ 1cm x 3w + EBRT 2.5 Gy/d x 3.5w	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HDREB and EBRT not given on same day</li> <li>• PS: Median Karnofsky, 70 (range, 40-90)</li> <li>• Lung cancer - 33 pts</li> <li>• Lung metastases - 8 pts (colorectal [4], breast, ovary, renal cell carcinoma, sarcoma)</li> <li>• 83% of pts had stage IV disease</li> </ul>
Anacak 2001 (15)	Endobronchial tumour with biopsy proven stage III NSCLC	30/30	5 Gy @ 1cm x 3 (frequency NR) + EBRT 60 Gy	Median, 45Mo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Karnofsky &gt; 60</li> <li>• Stage: IIIa-b</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 0%</li> <li>• Mean HDRB dose: NR</li> <li>• HDREB and EBRT not given on same day</li> </ul>
Ofiara 1997 (16)	Inoperable, bronchogenic carcinoma with recurrent or persistent symptoms (SCLC 10%), SCC 67%	30/24	8 Gy @ 1cm q2w x 3	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: NR</li> <li>• Stage: IIIa-IV</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 100%, mean dose 43 Gy</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Ornadel 1997 (17)	Recurrent, inoperable bronchogenic carcinoma (SCLC 2%), SCC 70%	117/102	15 Gy @ 1cm	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS &amp; Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 79%, median dose 30 Gy</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> <li>• Nd-YAG - 44%*</li> </ul>
Perol 1997 (18)	Histologically proven, localized, bronchogenic NSCLC, lesion <1 cm, SCC 84%	19/18	7 Gy @ 1cm q1w x 3-5	Mean, 28Mo (range, 7-49)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Mean Karnofsky, 78.4 ± 8.9</li> <li>• Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 0%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Delclos 1996 (19)	Recurrent, endobronchial carcinoma (SCLC 6%), SCC 46%	81/81	Intracavity: 15 Gy @ 6mm or 7.5mm q2w x 2	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Karnofsky, 40-90</li> <li>• Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 100%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Hernandez 1996 (20)	Histologically proven, residual or recurrent bronchogenic carcinoma (SCLC 14%), SCC 72%	29/26	7.5 to 10 Gy @ 1cm q2w x 3	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Mean ECOG, 1.9</li> <li>• Stage (NSCLC): IIIa-IV</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 100%, mean dose 44 Gy</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: 8.05 Gy/session</li> <li>• Nd-YAG - 10%*</li> </ul>
Trédaniel 1994 (21)	Endobronchial disease (G1) with extraluminal extension (G2), SCC > 80%	G1: 29/25 G2: 22/21	7 Gy @ 1cm in 2 fx over 2d q15d x 3	Range, 4-23Mo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Karnofsky &gt; 50, mean 72 to 85.9</li> <li>• Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 63%, median dose &gt;55 Gy</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Goldman 1993 (22)	Inoperable, bronchogenic carcinoma with major airway occlusion (SCLC 5%), SCC 80%	20/19	15 Gy @ 1cm	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: WHO 0-2</li> <li>• Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 20%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> <li>• Nd-YAG - 5%*</li> </ul>

Speiser 1993 (23) and (24)	Endobronchial carcinoma, inoperable or primary or recurrent, SCC 49%	G1: 47/NR G2: 144/NR G3: 151/NR	MDREB: 10 Gy @ 5mm x 3 HDREB: 10 Gy @ 1cm x 3 HDREB: 7.5 Gy @ 1cm x 3	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: Host 0-4</li> <li>• Stage: T1-3N0-3M0, T4±M1</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: curative, 0%, palliative, NR, recurrent, 100%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> <li>• Nd-YAG - 24%*</li> </ul>
Bedwinek 1992 (25)	Biopsy proven, recurrent endobronchial carcinoma	38/27	6 Gy @ 1cm q1w x 3	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS &amp; Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 100%, dose ≥ 50 Gy</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> <li>• Nd-YAG - 24%*</li> </ul>
Gauwitz 1992 (26)	Recurrent, primary, bronchogenic carcinoma (SCLC 4%), SCC 54%	24/24	15 Gy @ 6mm (equivalent to 9 Gy at 1 cm) q2w x 2	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: ECOG 0-2</li> <li>• Stage: III (96%)</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 100%, dose ≥ 55 Gy</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>
Mehta 1992 (27) Pilot study	Malignant airway occlusion (primary lung tumour, 77%)	31/31	4 Gy @ 2cm BID x 2d	Median, 4.5Mo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: ECOG 0-4</li> <li>• Stage: NR</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 30%, median dose 50 Gy</li> <li>• Median HDREB dose: 32 Gy @ 1cm</li> </ul>
Sutedja 1992 (28)	Recurrent, endobronchial NSCLC	31/31	10 Gy @ 1cm q2w x 3 maximum	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: NR</li> <li>• Stage: III</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 100%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> <li>• Nd-YAG - 45%*</li> </ul>
Burt 1990 (29)	Inoperable, advanced symptomatic endobronchial carcinoma (SCLC, 6%), SCC 72%	50/46	15-20 Gy @ 1cm	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: NR</li> <li>• Stage: Advanced</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 2%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> <li>• Nd-YAG - 2%*</li> </ul>
Fass 1990 (30) Pilot study	Tracheal or bronchial recurrence of advanced NSCLC, prior treatment with EBRT	15/15	5-6 Gy @ 1cm q7-10d x 6 maximum	NR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PS: NR</li> <li>• Stage: Advanced</li> <li>• Previous EBRT: 100%</li> <li>• Mean HDREB dose: NR</li> </ul>

Notes: BID - twice daily, d - day(s), EBRT - external beam radiation therapy, ECOG - Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group, fx - fractions, Gy - Gray, HDREB - high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy, LC - Lung Cancer, Mo - month(s), MDREB - medium dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy, Nd-YAG - neodymium-yttrium-aluminum-garnet laser therapy, No - number, NR - not reported, NSCLC - non-small cell lung cancer, PDT - Photodynamic therapy, bw - body weight, PS - performance status, pt(s) - patient(s), q - every, SCC - squamous cell carcinoma, SCLC - small cell lung cancer, w - week(s), WHO - World Health Organization.

\* Percentage of all patients in the study who were pretreated with Nd-YAG laser therapy.

**Table 3b. Non-controlled prospective studies of HDREB: results.**

Author, Year, Reference	Response CR/PR (%)	Survival	Toxicity % pts (No. of pts)	Symptom Control % pts (No. of pts)
Freitag 2004 (12)	24/NR (75%) post PDT 31/NR (97%) post combine tx	Mean 24mos 100% survival 26 pts RTLRF	No severe complications reported	NR
Escobar-Sacristan 2004 (13)	46/33 (98%) at 1 mo post treatment	NR	Bronchospasm, 1% (1/81pts) Post tx bronchial stenosis 1% (1/81pts) Pneumonitis 1% (1/81pts) Bronchial Fistula 1% (1/81pts)	Overall, CR for 85% of symptoms analysed Haemoptysis, 96% (23/24) Cough, 88% (30/34) Dyspnea, 75% (18/24) Expectoration 50% (4/8) Stridor 100% (7/7)
Gejerman, 2002 (14)	NR/NR (ITT: 54%)	Median, 5.2Mo	Odynophagia, 64%	No specific symptom improvements noted. However, 72% of pts reported clinically significant alleviation of their chief complaint with 67% of pts free of their presenting symptom at time of last follow-up or death.
Anacak 2001 (15)	16/7 (ITT: 77%) at 4-6w after EBRT	Median, 11Mo 5-yr, 10% actuarial	<u>Early:</u> Cough and laryngotracheal irritation; Grade I-III radiation bronchitis, 70% (21/30 pts); Grade III acute esophagitis, 7% (2/30 pts) <u>Late:</u> Fhem, 10% (2/19 pts); Bronchial stenosis, 25% (4/16 pts); Esophageal stenosis, 12% (2/16 pts)	Palliation of symptoms at 4-6w post EBRT: Cough, 43% (12/28 pts); Hemoptysis, 95% (20/21 pts); Chest pain, 88% (15/17 pts); Dyspnea, 80% (12/15 pts)
Ofiara 1997 (16)	NR	NR	NR	Symptom improvement at 4w: Hemoptysis, 79% (11/14 pts), p<0.01; Cough, 46% (11/24 pts), p<0.01; Dyspnea, 33% (8/24 pts); Pneumonitis, 20% (1/5 pts); Atelectasis, 43% (9/21 pts)
Ornadel 1997 (17)	NR	Median, 12Mo	Fhem, 9% (11/117 pts) in total with actuarial risk of 11% at 1 yr and 20% at 2 yrs	No/mild symptoms, pre- vs. 3Mo post tx (includes 102 evaluable patients): Cough, 62% vs. 77%; Dyspnea, 32% vs. 56%; Hemoptysis, 78% vs. 97%; PS, 65% vs. 84%
Perol 1997 (18) Pilot study	Total, 15 (ITT: 79% <sup>1</sup> ) at 2Mo	Median, 28Mo 1-yr, 78% 2-yr, 58%	<u>Early:</u> Pneumothorax, 5% (1/19 pts); Bronchial infection, 5% (1/19 pts) <u>Late:</u> Fhem, 11% (2/19 pts); Major necrosis of bronchial wall, 11% (2/19 pts, one also with Fhem); Cause of death unknown, 21% (4/19 pts)	NR
Delclos 1996 (19)	NR	Median, 5Mo	Fatal, 2% (2/81 pts, fistula and tracheal malacia); Pneumothorax, 4% (3/81 pts); Tumour necrosis, 1% (1/81 pt); Tracheal stenosis, 2% (2/81 pts); Hemorrhage, 1% (1/81 pts); Total 11% (9/81 pts)	Symptom improvement (for all patients): Excellent, 32%; Moderate, 31%; Minimal, 21%; Worsening symptoms, 9%

Hernandez 1996 (20)	NR	NR	Nonfatal massive hemoptysis, 3% (1/29 pts); Minor hemoptysis, 21% (6/29 pts); Pneumothorax, 3% (1/29 pts)	Symptom improvement/worsening at 1Mo: Atelectasis, 28% (5/18 pts) / 28% (5 pts); Hemoptysis, 69% (11/16 pts) / 19% (3 pts); Pneumonitis, 25% (3/12 pts) / 59% (7 pts); Dyspnea, 24% (7/29 pts) / 28% (8 pts); Cough, 24% (7/29 pts) / 21% (6 pts); PS, 24% (7/29 pts) / 34% (10 pts)
Trédaniel 1994 (21)	G1: 18/2 (ITT: 69% <sup>1</sup> )  G2: 2/8 (ITT: 45% <sup>1</sup> ) at 2Mo <sup>2</sup>	Median, G1, NYR  G2, 5Mo	<u>Early:</u> Temporary pleuritic pain (no. of pts NR); Bronchial secretions, 6% (3/51 pts); Transient fever/chills, 4% (2/51 pts) <u>Late (G1/G2 of 51 pts):</u> Fhem, 3%/18% (1/4 pts); Fatal massive bronchorrhea, 7%/0% (2/0 pts); Pulmonary abscess, 4% (2pts) total; Mild radiation bronchitis, 10%/18% (3/4 pts)	Complete/partial relief of symptoms: 70% (21/30 pts)
Goldman 1993 (22)	NR	1-yr, 15%	No serious complications reported	Symptom improvement at 6w: Overall, 89% (17/19 pts); Re-expansion of lung, 69% (9/13 pts)
Speiser 1993 (23) and (24)	NR	Mean, Curative, 9.5Mo Palliative, 5.6Mo Recurrent, 6.2Mo	Fhem, G1, 4.2% (2/47 pts), G2, 7.0% (10/144 pts), G3, 8.6% (13/151 pts), overall, 7.3%; Radiation bronchitis/stenosis, G1, 9% (4/47 pts), G2, 12% (17/144 pts), G3, 13% (20/151 pts), overall, 12% <sup>3</sup>	Symptom improvement at 4-8w (based on symptom index, no. of pts not reported): Hemoptysis, >99%; Pneumonia, > 99%; Dyspnea, 86%; Cough, 85%
Bedwinek 1992 (25)	11/11 (ITT: 58% <sup>1</sup> ) at 3Mo	Median, 6.5Mo	Fhem, 32% (12/38 pts)	Complete/partial symptom relief Overall, 76% (29/38 pts) Where the major symptom was cough or hemoptysis, 80%, and fever or SOB, 71%
Gauwitz 1992 (26)	NR	Median, 7.4Mo Symptom-free median, 6.0Mo (range, 1.6-9.2)	<u>Early:</u> Bronchospasm, 4% (1/24 pts); Blood-tinged sputum, 12.5% (3/24 pts) <u>Late:</u> Chronic mucosal sloughing, 4% (1/24 pts); Fhem, 4% (1/24 pts)	Symptom improvement: Overall, 88% (21/24 pts); Reaeration of lung, 83% (15/18 pts)
Mehta 1992 (27) Pilot study	NR	Median, 4.0Mo 1-yr, 7% (actuarial)	Tracheovascular fistula, 3% (1/31 pts) No reported cases of fatal hemoptysis	Symptom improvement: Overall, 79% of 203 symptoms; Cough, 73% (19/26 pts); Dyspnea, 75% (18/24 pts); Pneumonia, 71% (10/14 pts); Hemoptysis, 100% (10/10 pts); Chest pain, 75% (6/8 pts); Reaeration of lung, 85% (12/14 pts); ECOG PS mean improved from 2.1 to 1.6
Sutedja 1992 (28)	0/22 (ITT: 71%) at 6w	Median, 7Mo/3Mo for pts with response / no response	Fhem, 32% (10/31 pts); Fistula, 10% (3/31 pts) including 1 fatal and 2 resulting in Fhem	Symptom improvement: Dyspnea for 82% of patients with PR (18/22 pts)

Burt 1990 (29)	NR	Median, 3.5Mo	<u>Early:</u> Transient tracheal stridor, 2% (1/50 pts); Asymptomatic pneumothorax, 2% (1/50 pts). No acute radiation esophagitis or late morbidity reported Fhem, 4% (2/50 pts)	Symptom improvement at 6w: Hemoptysis, 86% (24/28 pts); Dyspnea, 64% (21/33 pts); Cough, 50% (9/18 pts); Lung collapse, 46% (11/24 pts)
Fass 1990 (30) Pilot study	3/NR (ITT: 20%)	NR	Obliterative bronchial fibrosis, 7% (1/15pts) Radiation pneumonitis, 7% (1/15pts) Tracheal perforation, 7% (1/15pts)	Palliation of symptoms: Overall, 71% (10/14 pts) Cough, 67% (4/6 pts); Hemoptysis, 71% (5/7 pts); Atelectasis, 33% (1/3 pts); Dyspnea, 60% (3/5 pts)

Notes: CR - complete response, EBRT - external beam radiation therapy, ECOG - Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group, Fhem - fatal hemoptysis, ITT - intention to treat, Mo - month(s), No. - number, NR - not reported, NYR - not yet reached, PR - partial response, PS - performance status, pt(s) - patient(s), RTLRF - residual tumour and local recurrence free, SOB - shortness of breath, tx - treatment, vs. - versus, w - week(s), yr - year(s)..

<sup>1</sup> Intention to treat response rate calculated by reviewer.

<sup>2</sup> Macroscopic CR reported as 21 and 6 patients for group 1 and 2, respectively.

<sup>3</sup> Radiation bronchitis/stenosis reported as 11% for group 3 in the second report of this study (19).

### Response

Nine of the 18 prospective studies (12-15,18,21,25,28,30) reported response rates. Complete response was defined as the complete disappearance of the tumour assessed bronchoscopically or by biopsy, and partial response was defined as, at a minimum, definite but not complete tumour regression, or >50% tumour regression. The lowest reported rate, 20%, was obtained for tracheal or bronchial recurrence of NSCLC treated to a total HDREB dose of 5 or 6 Gy every seven to ten days for a maximum of 6 rounds (21). Patients in that study had received previous EBRT. In both of the latter studies, response was assessed macroscopically and histologically two months after HDREB. The highest rates were 97% and 98%. 98% was obtained with 81 patients with malignant endobronchial tumours treated with HDREB alone (13). 97% was obtained in a study of 32 patients with non-small cell bronchogenic tumours who were treated with a PDT and then with HDREB in weekly intervals at five fractions of 4Gy (12). Perol et al (18) reported that tumour control was maintained for 12 of 16 evaluable patients (75%) at one year. Bedwinek et al (25) obtained a significantly higher complete response rate for tumours <5cm compared with those ≥5cm at three months post-treatment (67% of 12 tumours vs. 0% of five tumours, respectively, p=0.048). The difference was not significant when partial response was taken into account (100% of 12 tumours vs. 60% of 5 tumours, p=0.225). At six weeks post-treatment, Sutedja et al (28) reported a partial response, defined as ≥50% improvement in airway lumen diameter, in all 10 T3N2 tumours and in 12 of 21 T4N3 tumours. The remaining T4N3 tumours were considered non-responsive. All of the patients in the latter two studies had received previous EBRT.

Six additional studies provided an alternative measure of response (16,20,22-24,29). Both Ofiara et al (16) and Hernandez et al (20) included a blinded review of response assessment and defined improvement as ≥25% reduction in endobronchial obstruction assessed bronchoscopically. Ofiara et al reported improvement from baseline in 62% of 24 patients at four weeks post-treatment (16), particularly for peripherally located tumours (71% of 14 patients, p<0.01). In the study by Hernandez et al (20), 42% of 26 patients showed improvement at eight weeks post-treatment. Goldman et al (22) obtained complete or partial clearing of bronchial obstruction, assessed bronchoscopically, for eight and nine of 20 patients (40% and 45%, respectively). In the same study, the mean obstruction index, based on the degree of major airway obstruction weighted according to tumour size, improved post-treatment (6.2 vs. 2.8, p<0.001). Speiser et al (23,24) treated patients on one of three different protocols: curative, palliative or recurrent. The post-treatment reduction in

obstruction scores, as a percentage of the initial obstruction scores, were 13%, 16%, and 30% for the curative, palliative, and recurrent protocols, respectively. Response was assessed at six weeks post-treatment as worse, better, or the same by Burt et al (29), with improvement observed bronchoscopically in 88% of 17 patients and radiographically in 39% of 41 patients.

### *Survival*

Eleven studies reported the median survival, which varied between 3.5 and 28 months following the first HDREB treatment (14,15,17-19,21,25-29). The shortest overall median survival occurred in a study of patients with advanced, symptomatic, bronchogenic carcinoma, 94% of whom were previously untreated (29). The longest median survival was reported in a small study of 19 patients with localized bronchogenic carcinoma, none of whom had received previous EBRT (18). In the study reported by Gejerman et al (14) overall median survival was 5.2 months. The authors also reported longer median survival for the 22 partial and complete responders compared to the 19 non-responders (11 vs. 4.2 months, respectively;  $p=0.01$ ). Sutedja et al (28) did not report overall median survival but did provide median survival separately for 22 treatment responders (seven months) and nine non-responders (three months). In a similar comparison, Anacak et al (15) observed a longer median survival for patients who attained a complete response compared to those who did not (19 vs. 7 months, respectively;  $p=0.019$ ). Although not part of the main study conducted by Gauwitz et al (26), all five patients with Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status  $>2$  who were treated on the study protocol died within one month of treatment, while the 24 patients in the main study, with  $ECOG \leq 2$ , had a median survival of 7.4 months. All of the patients in the latter two studies received previous EBRT. Speiser et al (23,24) reported a mean survival of 9.5 months, 5.6 months, and 6.2 months for patients treated according to a curative, palliative, or recurrent protocol, respectively. However, since the mean is more directly affected by extreme values than the median, it is difficult to compare this data with that obtained in the other studies reported.

The one-year survival rate was reported in three studies. The highest rate, 78% of 19 patients, was obtained by Perol et al (18). In the same study, the two-year survival rate was reported as 58%. The lowest one-year survival rate, 7% of 31 patients, was obtained by Mehta et al (27) who administered a unique schedule of HDREB. Seventy-seven percent of the patients had lung tumours, and 74% had metastatic disease. Freitag et al (12) had 100% survival at a mean of 24 months, with 26 (84%) of patients remaining free from residual tumour and local recurrence.

### *Toxicity*

Toxicity was reported to varying degrees in 17 of the 18 prospective studies. Some reported only serious complications (12-14,17,22-25,27,28,30) while others reported minor and early complications as well as late complications (15,18-21,26,29).

Of the serious complications reported, fatal hemoptysis was most common, occurring in nine studies (15,17,18,21,23-26,28,29). The lowest rate was 3% (one of 29 patients with endobronchial disease) following local relapse 11 months after treatment (21). The highest rate was 32% at two to fifty-six weeks post-treatment for 38 patients (25) and at two to twenty-four weeks post-treatment for 31 patients (28). Bedwinek et al (25) found fatal hemoptysis to be more common for left upper lobe tumours (75% of eight tumours) than right upper lobe (28% of eight tumours) or right main stem tumours (30% of 10 tumours). In the study by Sutedja et al (28), seven of the 10 patients with fatal hemoptysis had previously been treated with Nd-YAG laser therapy. The four patients with extraluminal disease who died from hemoptysis between one week and 12 months post-treatment in the study by Trédaniel et al (21) also had previous EBR at a dose  $>55$  Gy. None of those patients had

previous laser therapy or cryotherapy. Seven studies reported no cases of fatal hemoptysis (12-14,19,20,22,27), although Hernandez et al (20) reported massive, non-fatal hemoptysis and minor hemoptysis in 3% and 21%, respectively, of 29 patients.

Other fatal complications included fistula in one of 81 and 31 patients (19,28), tracheal malacia in one of 81 patients (19), and bronchorrhea in two of 51 patients (21). Four deaths among the 19 patients in the study by Perol et al (18) were of unknown cause; therefore, the rate of complications may have been underestimated in that study.

The proportions of patients with serious but non-fatal complications are reported in Appendix 1.

### *Symptom control*

Sixteen studies provided some form of symptom assessment (Table 3b), before and after treatment, although the timing and method of assessment was not always clearly stated (13-17,19-30). With respect to specific symptoms, some level of improvement was generally obtained following brachytherapy for dyspnea, hemoptysis, cough and pneumonia. Improvement in dyspnea ranged from 24% to 89% (13,15-17,20-24,27-30). Cough improvement ranged from 24% to 88% and hemoptysis from 69% to 100% (13,15-17,20-24,27,29,30). Improvement of pneumonitis varied from 20% to 25% (16,20), atelectasis from 28% to 43% (16,20,30) and re-aeration of the lung from 69% to 85% (22,26,27,29). Only two studies reported improvement in chest pain, and ranged from 75% of 8 patients (27) to 88% of 17 patients (15). Two studies also reported improvement in pneumonia, ranging from 71% to >99% (23,24,27). Ofiara et al (16) assessed symptoms using scales developed by Speiser and Spratling (24). At four weeks post treatment, patients with submucosal and endoluminal tumours had a significant improvement for hemoptysis ( $p<0.05$ ), and patients with submucosal disease also had significant improvement in cough ( $p<0.05$ ). In addition, significant improvement was observed in cough and hemoptysis for peripherally located tumours, but not for centrally tumours.

General symptom improvement was also reported. Gejerman et al (14) reported that 72% of patients had a clinically significant improvement of their main symptom, with two-thirds of patients free of their presenting symptoms at the time of their last follow-up or death, although the method of assessment was not reported. Delclos et al (19) obtained moderate to excellent symptom improvement in 63% of 81 patients whose initial symptoms included shortness of breath, cough, hemoptysis, chest pain, and pneumonitis, however, 9% of patients indicated that their symptoms worsened. Complete or partial relief of symptoms such as cough, hemoptysis, and dyspnea was reported at four weeks post-treatment in 70% of 30 patients in the study by Trédaniel et al (21). Goldman et al (22) reported that overall symptom improvement was obtained in 89% of 19 patients at six weeks post-treatment, with improvement more frequent for hemoptysis (100%) and dyspnea (89%) than cough (37%). Bedwinek et al (25) recorded the maximum symptom relief reported by patients over a three-month period following their final treatment. Improvement was obtained in 76% of 38 patients with a median duration of symptom relief of five months. Symptom relief was more likely when the major symptom was cough or hemoptysis (80%) compared with fever or shortness of breath (71%). In the study by Gauwitz et al (26), patients were asked specific questions about the severity of symptoms and change in symptomatology following brachytherapy and at every three months thereafter. Overall improvement was obtained for 88% of 24 patients, with a median symptom-free survival of six months. Of the 82 symptoms identified prior to treatment, Mehta et al (27) reported an improvement in 79% following treatment, and Bedwinek et al (25) reported more frequent symptom relief for tumours with diameter <5cm (100% for 15 tumours <5cm compared with 25% for eight tumours with

diameter  $\geq 5\text{cm}$ ,  $p=0.0007$ ). Escobar-Sacristan et al (13) observed a complete clinical response in 85% of symptoms analysed (hemoptysis, cough, dyspnea, expectoration, and stridor).

Using a self-report questionnaire scored according to an adaptation of the Rotterdam scoring system, Ornelas et al (17) obtained an improvement of at least one grade from baseline, at three months post-treatment, in cough (43% of patients with pre-treatment symptoms), dyspnea (50%,  $p=0.0063$ ), and performance status (54%,  $p=0.0417$ ). Hernandez et al (20) scored symptoms based on the Speiser index and reported a significant reduction from baseline at four weeks post-treatment in hemoptysis scores ( $p<0.01$ ). Although improvements were obtained in hemoptysis, pneumonitis, dyspnea, cough, and ECOG performance status, a comparable or greater proportion of patients experienced worsening symptoms for pneumonitis, dyspnea, cough and performance status.

Speiser et al (23,24) reported symptom change as a percentage of the pre-treatment weighted composite symptom score. At baseline, approximately 339 patients had a cough, 325 reported dyspnea, 226 had hemoptysis, and 164 presented with obstructive pneumonia. At four to eight weeks post-treatment, reductions in the symptom index score of  $>85\%$  were reported for hemoptysis, pneumonia, cough and dyspnea. Using Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG) criteria, Mehta et al (27) reported post-treatment improvements in cough, dyspnea, pneumonia, hemoptysis, and chest pain. Mean performance status, as measured on the ECOG scale, also improved from 2.1 to 1.6. In the study by Sutedja et al (28), dyspnea improved by at least two grades in 82% of patients following treatment. Burt et al (29) asked patients to rate symptoms as worse, the same or better at six weeks post-treatment and patients reported improvements in hemoptysis, dyspnea, and cough.

Pre-treatment atelectasis was reported in seven studies (16,20,22,26,27,29,30). Hernandez et al (20) assessed atelectasis radiographically and obtained improvement and worsening of that condition in the same proportion of patients, 28%, at one month post-treatment. Complete or partial re-aeration of the lung occurred in a higher proportion of patients, between 33% of 24 patients and 85% of 14 patients (22,26,27,29).

### ***Retrospective Studies***

Five retrospective studies, each involving more than 100 patients, were reported (31-36) (Tables 4a and 4b). The reports by Gollins et al describe results for the same group of 406 patients (34,35). Two studies primarily involved administration of HDREB alone (33,36), and three involved a combination of EBRT with HDREB (31,32,34,35). The majority of tumours treated were squamous cell (65% to 88%), and the main aim of most retrospective studies was to assess symptom palliation and rate of complications associated with HDREB, alone or in combination with EBRT.

These studies did not yield information suggestive of different outcomes or complications compared to those documented in prospective studies. However, they do suggest that the two most significant complications with HDREB are radiation bronchitis (8.7%-40%) and fatal hemoptysis (3.6%-8%).

**Table 4a. Retrospective studies primarily involving HDREB alone or in combination with EBRT: study descriptions.**

Author, Year (Ref)	Disease Description	Number of Pts	HDREB/EBRT Treatment	Follow-up	Comments
Muto 2000 (31)	Biopsy proven NSCLC	320 pts treated with EBRT/HDREB  G1: 84 G2: 47 G3: 189	G1: 10Gy @ 1cm (75 pts single cath; 9 pts two cath), then EBRT G2: 7Gy x2 @ 1cm (41 single cath; 6 dbl cath), EBRT, HDREB G3: 5Gy x3 @ 0.5-1cm (170 single cath; 19 dbl cath) + EBRT q15fx of HDRB	Range 5-36Mo	PS: KPS>60  Stage: IIIA-IIIB
Hennequin 1998 (32)	Biopsy proven bronchial malignancies (SCLC 2%), SCC 88%	149 total (75% prior EBRT)  G1: Palliative HDREB for distant metastases, 47 G2: Radical HDREB for tumours <2cm diameter, 73 G3: EBRT/HDREB for primary, localized tumours, 29	Mostly @ 1cm (range 0.5 to 1.5)  G1: 5-7Gy x 4 over 3w + 2 additional fx G2: 7Gy x 5-6 over 5w  G3: 5-7Gy x 2 following EBRT 60Gy +/- CT	NR	PS: NR  Stage: NR  No prior EBRT: 25%  Mean HDREB dose: NR
Taulelle 1998 (33)	Stage I-IV lung cancer, 90% with symptoms of endobronchial disease (SCLC 6%), SCC 84%	189 total, (62% prior EBRT)  G1: No previous treatment, 22 G2: Acute respiratory distress, 36 G3: Previously treated; residual tumour, 33 G4: Previously treated; recurrent, 87	6-10Gy @ 1 cm q1w x 2-6	Median 32Mo	PS: WHO≥2 (53%) Stage: I-IV (22% IIIB/IV) No prior treatment: 30.7% Mean HDRB dose: NR
Gollins 1996,1994 (34,35)	Inoperable, primary endobronchial or endotracheal SCC 87% NSCLC 6.5%	406 total (same pts reported in both studies) (20% prior EBRT)  G1: No previous radiation, 324 G2: Recurrent after EBRT, 65 G3: EBRT + HDREB, 17	15Gy @ 1cm (range 10-20Gy)  G3: EBRT dose NR	1.5, 4, and 12Mo	PS: NR Stage: II-IV (81% IV) No prior EBRT: 80% 7 pts previous Nd-YAG laser treatment
Macha 1995 (36)	Recurrent bronchial carcinoma SCC 65% SCLC 9%	365 total (majority had prior EBRT; number NR)  G1: Palliative HDREB, 124 G2: Radical HDREB, 241	5Gy @ 1cm x3 (G1) or x4 (G2) q2w G1: HDREB + EBRT, laser, cytotoxic therapy or palliative surgery G2: HDREB alone	NR	PS: NR  Stage: NR

Notes: cath - catheter(s), CT - chemotherapy, dbl - double, EBRT - external beam radiation therapy, fx - fraction, G - group, Gy - Gray, HDR(EB) - high dose rate (endobronchial brachytherapy), KPS - Karnofsky performance status, Mo - month(s), Nd-YAG - neodymium-yttrium-aluminum-garnet laser therapy, NR - not reported, NSCLC - non-small cell lung cancer, PS - performance status, pts - patients, q - every, Ref - reference, SCC - squamous cell carcinoma, SCLC - small-cell lung cancer, w - week(s), WHO - World Health Organization.

**Table 4b. Retrospective studies primarily involving HDREB alone or in combination with EBRT: study results.**

Author, Year (Ref)	Response CR/PR (%)	Survival	Toxicity	Symptom Control
Muto 2000 (31)	PR: 45% (defined as reduction of >1/3 tumour volume 1Mo post-treatment)	Mean from diagnosis 11.1Mo; from last HDREB 9.7Mo (median NR)	40% radiation bronchitis @ 6m (18% G3/4) (highest incidence in G1(80% of pts, p<0.01) 3.6% Fhem (no sig diff between G, p>0.05)	Improvement in dyspnea 90%, cough 82%, hemoptysis 94%, OP 90%
Hennequin 1998 (32)	Overall RR: 79% (133 assessable pts at 4-6 weeks post-HDR). CR: 48% PR: 31%	Median / 2-yr survival: G1, 4.2Mo/ 0% G2, 14.4Mo/ 45% G3, 24.6Mo/ 52%	<u>Early:</u> transient hypoxia, 4% bronchial infection, 5% esophagitis, 2% hypoglycemia, angina, pneumothorax, and bacteremia, all <1%. <u>Late:</u> Fhem, 6.7% (10 pts) + 0.7% non-fatal hemoptysis RB, 8.7% (13 pts, including 1.3% fatal)	Improvement in 60% (44/73 pts) with initial respiratory symptoms
Taulelle 1998 (33)	Overall RR: 79% CR: 54% (n=103) (at 1Mo post-HDR) PR: 24% CR (p=0.0005) and survival (p<0.0001) better for G1	Overall median / 2-yr survival: 7Mo / 10%	<u>Early:</u> not reported in detail <u>Late:</u> overall significant grade 3-4 toxicity, 17% massive hemoptysis, 7% bronchial stenosis, 6% soft tissue necrosis, 4% fistula, 2% pneumothorax, <1% Overall, 22% with asymptomatic RB	Complete symptom relief for: hemoptysis, 74%, dyspnea, 54%, cough, 54%  No. of pts with initial symptoms, NR
Gollins 1996,1994 (34,35)	CR in 80% of 25 pts with bronchoscopy at 3m post-tx	Overall: median 5.7Mo/ 2-yr 7.2% G1: 6.5Mo/8.8% G2: 4.3Mo/1.5% (p<0.0001) G3: 6.5Mo/0%	<u>Early:</u> Transient cough common and pain occurred in 1% (5 pts)  Fhem, 7.9%	Symptom improvement in G1 pts: stridor 92%, hemoptysis 88%, cough 62%, dyspnea 60%, pain 50%, pulmonary collapse 46%
Macha 1995 (36)	NR	G1: mean 9Mo (limited disease, i.e. confined to thorax); extensive disease 5m G2: mean 23Mo (limited disease) (median NR)	G1: 21% fatal hemorrhage; 2% deaths due to tracheo-esophageal fistula; 5% brain mets; 13% resp failure due to pneumonia  G2: NR	Effective palliation in 67% of pts G1: 32% improvement in forced expiratory volume and vital capacity, p<0.001 G2: NR

Notes: CR - complete response, diff - difference, EBRT - external beam radiation therapy, Fhem - fatal hemoptysis, G - group(s), HDR(EB) - high dose rate (endobronchial Brachytherapy), Mo - month(s), No. - number, NR - not reported, OP- obstructive pneumonia, PR - partial response, pts - patients, RB - radiation bronchitis, ref - reference, resp - respiratory, RR - response rate, sig - significant, tx - treatment, yr - year.  
1 CR = more than 80% of normal lumen reopened; PR = more than 50% of normal lumen reopened (minimal residual tumour).

## DISCUSSION

EBR alone is preferable to HDREB alone as a palliative treatment in previously untreated patients, because EBR provided better overall symptom palliation and fewer patients required retreatment in the one RCT (9) that examined this issue. The primary endpoint of this RCT was palliation and quality of life, but results did demonstrate a significant survival benefit in favour of palliative EBR alone compared to HDREB alone.

One RCT (5) showed that the combination of EBR and HDREB provided superior symptom relief of short duration for the mean scores of dyspnea over time compared with

EBR alone in treatment-naïve patients. Patients with prior atelectasis had significantly improved radiological re-expansion with combined EBR and HDREB compared with EBR alone (57% vs. 35%, respectively,  $p=0.009$ ). Another RCT by Sur et al (6,7) reported that median symptom-free survival was better for patients that received an EBR boost following EBR compared to patients that received a HDREB boost following EBR (129 days vs. 77 days, respectively,  $p=0.0090$ ). In addition, cough-free survival was better for the EBR-boost arm. A RCT involving both previously treated and untreated patients showed a trend towards improved local control with the addition of brachytherapy to EBR (10). However, that study did not report on symptom control. Median survival and toxicity were similar for Nd-YAG laser therapy with or without HDREB, although the combined treatment significantly prolonged the symptom-free period and resulted in fewer additional endoscopic treatments (8). The dosages of brachytherapy for those six randomized studies ranged from 3.8 to 15 Gy at 0.5cm to 1cm from the source.

The only reported randomized trial evaluating different dosages and frequency of administration of HDREB alone did not report any differences in either median survival or the incidence of fatal hemoptysis (11). However, the two-dose schedules in that trial may not have been that different (3.8 Gy X 4 = 15.2 Gy vs. 7.2 Gy X 2 = 14.4 Gy). The available evidence makes identifying the optimal dose of HDREB for palliation of endobronchial symptoms impossible, since all RCTs to date have been small, involving less than 100 patients, and each trial has used a different dose/schedule combination.

We reviewed 18 non-comparative, prospective studies to define dose and assess complications. The reported administration schedules varied, with the most common (all prescribed at 1cm from the source) being 24 Gy in three fractions (one of 16 studies), 15-20 Gy in a single fraction (one study), 18 Gy in three fractions (one study), 15 Gy in a single fraction (two studies) or three fractions (two studies), 10 Gy in three fractions (three studies), or 7 Gy in three to five fractions (two studies). Two studies reported a dose of 15 Gy given in two fractions at 6 to 7.5 mm from the source. One study reported a dose of 5-6 Gy at 1cm from the centre of the source given every seven to 10 days to a maximum of six fractions. Another study reported a dose of 4 Gy at 2cm from the central axis of the source given twice daily for two days. The various dose and fractionation schedules used in those prospective studies do not clearly define an optimal dose. The main toxicities reported in the trials (shown in Appendix 1) include radiation bronchitis (17%), fatal hemoptysis (10%), bronchial or tracheal stenosis (4%), bronchial necrosis or fistula formation (3%), pneumothorax (3%), and bronchial/tracheal spasm (2%).

The occurrence of fatal hemoptysis is a significant risk with HDREB. The incidence of fatal hemoptysis in randomized trials ranged from 6% to 14% for EBR alone (5,9,10), 15% to 20% for EBR combined with HDREB (5,10) and 8% to 22% for HDREB alone (9,11). The incidence of fatal hemoptysis was higher for EBR combined with HDREB than EBR alone, although the two studies that reported a statistical comparison did not find a significant difference (5,10). It is not apparent whether fatal hemoptysis is related to tumour progression into pulmonary vessels or the irradiation dose and fractionation scheme administered, since the available evidence does not clearly make the distinction. Two retrospective studies conducted analyses to identify factors related to fatal hemoptysis. In a multivariate analysis by Hennequin et al (32), palliative treatment with four to six fractions of HDREB at 5Gy to 7Gy in patients with distant metastases resulted in a higher rate of fatal hemoptysis than treatment in patients with small tumours of < 2cm or those with localized tumours receiving both EBRT and HDR brachytherapy ( $p=0.02$ ). Endobronchial tumour length ( $p=0.004$ ) and therapeutic group ( $p=0.009$ ) were associated with hemoptysis in a univariate analysis, although age, gender, performance status, histology and tumour location were not significantly associated with fatal hemoptysis. Gollins et al found that repeat HDR brachytherapy in the same location as the

first treatment (hazard ratio, 4.38, 95% confidence interval, 1.45 to 13.23) and primary treatment with a combination of EBR and HDR brachytherapy (hazard ratio, 3.83, 95% confidence interval, 1.05 to 13.93) were both significantly associated with occurrence of fatal hemoptysis. However, the number of patients with fatal hemoptysis and repeat brachytherapy or combination treatment was very small (four and three patients, respectively). Prospective future research will need to clarify the causes of hemoptysis and should attempt to minimize this toxicity.

The optimal dose and fractionation for HDREB for palliation of symptoms has not yet been determined in well designed randomized clinical trials. A reasonable recommendation is to use 1000 cGy at 1cm from the central axis given in a single fraction. Technical factors that may influence dose reduction and the fractionation scheme include the extent of curvature causing overlap and “hot spots” of radiation dose, length of treatment, and previous external beam radiation exposure in the treatment volume. If the distal margin can be evaluated, proximal and distal margins should be 2cm.

Patients that may benefit from HDREB include those who have an endobronchial tumour causing symptoms of dyspnea, hemoptysis, post-obstructive pneumonitis, or intractable cough; minimal extrinsic compression of the bronchi; visible endoluminal disease but not complete endobronchial obstruction; failed previous EBR or are not candidates for further EBR; and have good performance status (i.e., ECOG  $\leq$  2). Patients with poorer performance status caused directly by the endobronchial disease may still be suitable for HDREB.

HDREB can only be given if it is technically feasible. While the catheters can be placed in the main bronchi, lobar bronchi or segmental bronchi, there must be an adequate lumen to allow for afterloading catheters to be inserted bronchoscopically into the endobronchial lesion. Adequate bronchoscopic visualization beyond the segmental bronchi may be limited and preclude accurate catheter placement, making HDREB not feasible. Patients are not suitable for HDREB if there is complete endobronchial obstruction and a surgical core-out procedure is not possible. Initial therapy could then include other treatment modalities such as Nd-YAG laser therapy or PDT. These modalities of therapy could be followed by HDREB. HDREB may not be appropriate if the patient previously received the maximal tolerated doses of EBR.

This review is limited by the lack of high quality evidence on the role of combination therapies, the optimal dose and fractionation scheme for HDREB, as well the physical aspects of radiation delivery (e.g., dose prescription, optimal length, and the effects of catheter curvature on dose). Randomized controlled trials are needed to address these questions and should be the focus of future clinical research.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

For patients with previously untreated, symptomatic, endobronchial NSCLC, EBR alone is more effective for palliation than HDREB alone. The evidence does not provide conclusive results that HDREB and EBR provide improved relief over EBR alone. Furthermore, for patients with complete collapse of the lung due to endobronchial obstruction, a surgical core-out procedure may be needed before EBR or EBR with HDREB. In addition, for those patients previously treated by EBR who are symptomatic from recurrent disease due to endobronchial obstruction, HDREB is recommended, providing that endobronchial brachytherapy is technically feasible.

Fatal hemoptysis is a significant risk of HDREB, and the majority of studies reported rates between 4% and 18%, with rates as high as 32%. Conversely, the same studies reported improvement of hemoptysis in 19% to 100% of patients, while most studies reported improvement in at least 69% of patients. HDREB demonstrates a significant improvement in hemoptysis in patients with disease amenable to HDREB and the potential risk of fatal

hemoptysis should not be regarded as a contraindication in these patients. Clinicians may offer patients HDREB for relief of hemoptysis following a full discussion with the patient of the treatment options, goals of therapy, and potential adverse effects.

### ONGOING TRIALS

The National Cancer Institute's clinical trials database on the Internet ([http://www.cancer.gov/search/clinical\\_trials/](http://www.cancer.gov/search/clinical_trials/)) was searched for reports of new or ongoing trials that involved HDREB for patients with NSCLC.

Protocol ID(s)	Title and details of trial
2003 ASCO Annual Meeting Abstract No: 3630	High dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy in the management of primary and recurrent bronchogenic malignancies. Vatteemi E et al (38)
CCT: ISRCTN76769573	A randomized trial comparing external beam radiotherapy alone with external beam radiotherapy plus intraterminal irradiation for palliation of endobronchial symptoms in advanced lung cancer. Posted August 2002.
CCT: ISRCTN66281665	A phase II randomized trial to assess external beam radiotherapy and intraluminal bronchial brachytherapy as re-treatment in patients with lung cancer who have received primary palliative external beam therapy. Posted August 2002.
2000 ASCO Annual Meeting Abstract No: 2002	High dose-rate endobronchial brachytherapy for roentgenographically negative bronchogenic carcinoma. Hayakawa K et al (39) (no study to date has been published)
Int J Rad Oncol Biol Phys. 2001; 51(3 Suppl 1)	Fatal hemoptysis and high dose-rate endobronchial brachytherapy: is there a relationship with clinical or technical parameters. Carvelho HA et al (40) (no study to date has been published)
Int J Rad Oncol Biol Phys. 2000; 48(3 Suppl 1)	High-dose rate brachytherapy (HDT-BT): A prospective randomized trial of two fractionation schedules in the palliative treatment of central lung tumours. Poellinger B et al (41) (no study to date has been published)

### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The members of the Lung DSG disclosed potential conflicts of interest relating to the topic of this evidence-based series. No potential conflicts were declared.

### JOURNAL REFERENCES

Ung YC, Yu E, Falkson C, Haynes AE, Stys-Norman D, Evans WK, et al. The role of high-dose-rate brachytherapy in the palliation of symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review. *Brachytherapy*. 2006;5(3):189-202.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Lung DSG would like to thank Dr. Yee Chung Ung, Dr. Edward Yu, Dr. Conrad Falkson, and Dr. William K. Evans, as well as Mr. Adam Haynes, Mrs. Nancy Lloyd, Ms Jean Mackay, and Mrs Denise Stys-Norman for taking the lead in drafting and revising this evidence-based series.

#### *Funding*

The PEBC is supported by Cancer Care Ontario (CCO) and the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. All work produced by the PEBC is editorially independent from its funding agencies.

#### *Copyright*

This series is copyrighted by Cancer Care Ontario; the guideline and the illustrations herein may not be reproduced without the express written permission of Cancer Care Ontario. Cancer Care Ontario reserves the right at any time, and at its sole discretion, to change or revoke this authorization.

#### *Disclaimer*

Care has been taken in the preparation of the information contained in this document. Nonetheless, any person seeking to apply or consult the evidence-based series is expected to use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances or seek out the supervision of a qualified clinician. Cancer Care Ontario makes no representation or guarantees of any kind whatsoever regarding their content or use or application and disclaims any responsibility for their application or use in any way.

#### *Contact Information*

For a complete list of the Lung DSG members and the Practice Guidelines Coordinating Committee group members, please visit the CCO Web site at <http://www.cancercare.on.ca/>

For further information about this evidence-based series, please contact  
**Dr. William K. Evans**, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group, McMaster University and Juravinski Cancer Centre, 699 Concession Street, Hamilton ON L8V 5C2;  
TEL (905) 387-9711 ext. 63001; FAX (905) 575-6323

or

**Dr. Yee C. Ung**, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group, Toronto-Sunnybrook Regional Cancer Centre, 2075 Bayview Avenue, Toronto, ON, M4N 3M5;  
TEL (416) 480-4951; FAX (416) 480-6002.

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports,  
please visit the CCO website at <http://www.cancercare.on.ca/>

or contact the PEBC office at:

Phone: 905-527-4322 ext. 42822 Fax: 905-526-6775 E-mail: [ccopgi@mcmaster.ca](mailto:ccopgi@mcmaster.ca)

## REFERENCES

1. Gaspar LE. Brachytherapy in lung cancer. *J Surg Oncol*. 1998;67(1):60-70.
2. Nag S, Kelly JF, Horton JL, Komaki R, Nori D. Brachytherapy for carcinoma of the lung. Recommendations from the American Brachytherapy Society. *Oncology (Huntingt)*. 2001;15(3):371-81.
3. Hall EJ. Radiobiology for the radiologist. 5th ed. Philadelphia (PA): Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2000.
4. Browman GP, Levine MN, Mohide EA, Hayward RSA, Pritchard KI, Gafni A, et al. The practice guidelines development cycle: a conceptual tool for practice guidelines development and implementation. *J Clin Oncol*. 1995;13(2):502-12.
5. Langendijk H, de Jong J, Tjwa M, Muller M, ten Velde G, Aaronson N, et al. External irradiation versus external irradiation plus endobronchial brachytherapy in inoperable non-small cell lung cancer: a prospective randomized study. *Radiother Oncol*. 2001;58(3):257-68.
6. Sur R, Ahmed SN, Donde B, Morar R, Mohamed G, Sur M, et al. Brachytherapy boost vs teletherapy boost in palliation of symptomatic, locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer: Preliminary analysis of a randomized, prospective study. *J Brachyther Int*. 2001;17(4):309-15.
7. Sur R, Donde B, Mohuiddin M, Ahmed N, Pacella J, Mohamed G, et al. Randomized prospective study on the role of high dose rate intraluminal brachytherapy (HDRILBT) in palliation of symptoms in advanced non small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) treated with radiation alone [abstract]. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2004;60(1 Suppl 1):A127.
8. Chella A, Ambrogi MC, Ribechini A, Mussi A, Fabrini MG, Silvano G, et al. Combined Nd-YAG laser/HDR brachytherapy versus Nd-YAG laser only in malignant central airway involvement: a prospective randomized study. *Lung Cancer*. 2000;27(3):169-75.
9. Stout R, Barber P, Burt P, Hopwood P, Swindell R, Hodgetts J, et al. Clinical and quality of life outcomes in the first United Kingdom randomized trial of endobronchial brachytherapy (intraluminal radiotherapy) vs. external beam radiotherapy in the palliative treatment of inoperable non-small cell lung cancer. *Radiother Oncol*. 2000;56(3):323-7.
10. Huber RM, Fischer R, Hautmann H, Pollinger B, Haussinger K, Wendt T. Does additional brachytherapy improve the effect of external irradiation? A prospective, randomized study in central lung tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1997;38(3):533-40.
11. Huber RM, Fischer R, Hautmann H, Pollinger B, Wendt T, Muller-Wening D, et al. Palliative endobronchial brachytherapy for central lung tumors. A prospective, randomized comparison of two fractionation schedules. *Chest*. 1995;107(2):463-70.
12. Freitag L, Ernst A, Thomas M, Prenzel R, Wahlers B, Macha HN. Sequential photodynamic therapy (PDT) and high dose brachytherapy for endobronchial tumour control in patients with limited bronchogenic carcinoma. *Thorax* 59(9):790-3. 2004;
13. Escobar-Sacristan JA, Granda-Orive JI, Gutierrez JT, Delgado JM, Rodero BA, Saez VR. Endobronchial brachytherapy in the treatment of malignant lung tumours. *Eur Resp J*. 2004;24(3):348-52.
14. Gejerman G, Mullokandov EA, Bagiella E, Blaivas A, Beitler JJ. Endobronchial brachytherapy and external-beam radiotherapy in patients with endobronchial obstruction and extrabronchial extension. *Brachytherapy*. 2002;1(4):204-10.
15. Anacak Y, Mogulkoc N, Ozkok S, Goksel T, Haydaroglu A, Bayindir U. High dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy in combination with external beam radiotherapy for stage III non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer*. 2001;34(2):253-9.

16. Ofiara L, Roman T, Schwartzman K, Levy RD. Local determinants of response to endobronchial high-dose rate brachytherapy in bronchogenic carcinoma. *Chest*. 1997;112(4):946-53.
17. Ornadell D, Duchesne G, Wall P, Ng A, Hetzel M. Defining the roles of high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy and laser resection for recurrent bronchial malignancy. *Lung Cancer*. 1997;16(2-3):203-13.
18. Perol M, Caliendo R, Pommier P, Malet C, Montbarbon X, Carrie C, et al. Curative irradiation of limited endobronchial carcinomas with high-dose rate brachytherapy. Results of a pilot study. *Chest*. 1997;111(5):1417-23.
19. Delclos ME, Komaki R, Morice RC, Allen PK, Davis M, Garden A. Endobronchial brachytherapy with high-dose-rate remote afterloading for recurrent endobronchial lesions. *Radiology*. 1996;201(1):279-82.
20. Hernandez P, Gursahaney A, Roman T, Schwartzman K, Donath D, Cosio MG, et al. High dose rate brachytherapy for the local control of endobronchial carcinoma following external irradiation. *Thorax*. 1996;51(4):354-8.
21. Tredaniel J, Hennequin C, Zalcman G, Walter S, Homasson JP, Maylin C, et al. Prolonged survival after high-dose rate endobronchial radiation for malignant airway obstruction. *Chest*. 1994;105(3):767-72.
22. Goldman JM, Bulman AS, Rathmell AJ, Carey BM, Muers MF, Joslin CAF. Physiological effect of endobronchial radiotherapy in patients with major airway occlusion by carcinoma. *Thorax*. 1993;48(2):110-4.
23. Speiser BL, Spratling L. Radiation bronchitis and stenosis secondary to high dose rate endobronchial irradiation. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1993;25(4):589-97.
24. Speiser BL, Spratling L. Remote afterloading brachytherapy for the local control of endobronchial carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1993;25(4):579-87.
25. Bedwinek J, Petty A, Bruton C, Sofield J, Lee L. The use of high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy to palliate symptomatic endobronchial recurrence of previously irradiated bronchogenic carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1992;22(1):23-30.
26. Gauwitz M, Ellerbroek N, Komaki R, Putnam JBJr, Ryan MB, DeCaro L, et al. High dose endobronchial irradiation in recurrent bronchogenic carcinoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1992;23(2):397-400.
27. Mehta M, Petereit D, Chosy L, Harmon M, Fowler J, Shahabi S, et al. Sequential comparison of low dose rate and hyperfractionated high dose rate endobronchial radiation for malignant airway occlusion. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1992;23(1):133-9.
28. Sutedja G, Baris G, Schaake-Koning C, van Zandwijk N. High dose rate brachytherapy in patients with local recurrences after radiotherapy of non-small cell lung cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1992;24(3):551-3.
29. Burt PA, O'Driscoll BR, Notley HM, Barber PV, Stout R. Intraluminal irradiation for the palliation of lung cancer with the high dose rate micro-Selectron. *Thorax*. 1990;45(10):765-8.
30. Fass DE, Armstrong J, Harrison LB. Fractionated high dose rate endobronchial treatment for recurrent lung cancer. *Endocrine Hyperther Oncol*. 1990;6:211-5.
31. Muto P, Ravo V, Panelli G, Liguori G, Fraioli G. High-dose rate brachytherapy of bronchial cancer: treatment optimization using three schemes of therapy. *Oncologist*. 2000;5(3):209-14.
32. Hennequin C, Tredaniel J, Chevret S, Durdux C, Dray M, Manoux D, et al. Predictive factors for late toxicity after endobronchial brachytherapy: a multivariate analysis. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 1998;42(1):21-7.

33. Taulelle M, Chauvet B, Vincent P, Felix-Faure C, Buciarelli B, Garcia R, et al. High dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy: results and complications in 189 patients. *Eur Respir J*. 1998;11(1):162-8.
34. Gollins SW, Ryder WD, Burt PA, Barber PV, Stout R. Massive haemoptysis death and other morbidity associated with high dose rate intraluminal radiotherapy for carcinoma of the bronchus. *Radiother Oncol*. 1996;39(2):105-16.
35. Gollins SW, Burt PA, Barber PV, Stout R. High dose rate intraluminal radiotherapy for carcinoma of the bronchus: outcome of treatment of 406 patients. *Radiother Oncol*. 1994;33(1):31-40.
36. Macha HN, Wahlers B, Reichle C, von Zwehl D. Endobronchial radiation therapy for obstructing malignancies: ten years' experience with iridium-192 high-dose radiation brachytherapy afterloading technique in 365 patients. *Lung*. 1995;173(5):271-80.
37. Moghissi K, Bond MG, Sambrook RJ, Stephens RJ, Hopwood P, Girling DJ. Treatment of endotracheal or endobronchial obstruction by non-small cell lung cancer: lack of patients in an MRC randomized trial leaves key questions unanswered. *Clin Oncol*. 2004;11(3):179-83.
38. Vattemi E, Binato S, Zovato S, Fantoni U, Zuin R, Mazzarotto R, et al. High dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy in the management of primary and recurrent bronchogenic malignancies [abstract]. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol*. 2003;22:903, Abstract 3630.
39. Hayakawa K, Sakurai H, Nakayama Y, Saito Y, Nasu S, Kurosaki H, et al. High dose-rate endobronchial brachytherapy for roentgenographically negative bronchogenic carcinoma [abstract]. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol*. 2000;19:511a, Abstract 2002.
40. Carvalho HA, Aisen S, Goncalves SV, Pedreira WL, Gregorio MG, Tucci MR, et al. Fatal hemoptysis and high dose-rate endobronchial brachytherapy: is there any relationship with clinical or technical parameters [abstract]. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2001;51(3 Suppl 1):349, Abstract 2238.
41. Poellinger B, Huber RM, Fischer R, Hautmann H, Siefert A, Duehmke E. High-dose rate brachytherapy (HDR-BT): a prospective randomized trial of two fractionation schedules in the palliative treatment of central lung tumours [abstract]. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*. 2000;48(3 Suppl 1):233-4, Abstract 244.

**Appendix 1. Summary of complications reported in non-comparative, prospective studies.**

Complication	Pooled % (total number of patients)	Number of studies (References)
<b>Complications reported in more than one study</b>		
radiation bronchitis (includes grade I-III and mild)	17% (69/418)	3 (15,21,23,24)
fatal hemoptysis	10% (70/691)	9 (15,17,18,21,23-26,28,29)
bronchial/tracheal stenosis	4% (7/178)	3 (13,15,19)
bronchial necrosis/ulceration/fistula formation	3% (8/243)	5 (13,18,19,27,28)
pneumothorax	3% (6/179)	4 (18-20,29)
bronchial/tracheal spasm	2% (2/105)	2 (13,26)
<b>Complications reported in a single study</b>		
odynophagia	65% (26/41)	1 (14)
blood-tinged sputum	13% (3/24)	1 (26)
esophageal stenosis	12% (2/16)	1 (15)
esophagitis (grade III)	7% (2/30)	1 (15)
obliterative bronchial fibrosis	7% (1/15)	1 (30)
radiation pneumonitis	7% (1/15)	1 (30)
tracheal perforation	7% (1/15)	1 (30)
bronchial secretions	6% (3/51)	1 (21)
bronchial infection	5% (1/19)	1 (18)
fever/chills	4% (2/51)	1 (21)
massive bronchorrhea	4% (2/51)	1 (21)
pulmonary abscess	4% (2/51)	1 (21)
chronic mucosal sloughing	4% (1/24)	1 (26)
tracheal stridor	2% (1/50)	1 (29)
tracheal malacia	2% (1/81)	1 (19)
tumour necrosis	2% (1/81)	1 (19)
hemorrhage	1% (1/81)	1 (19)
pneumonitis	1% (1/81)	1 (13)

## Appendix 2. Summary of fatal hemoptysis and symptom improvement for all trials.

Study (Reference)	Fatal hemoptysis (% of patients)	Symptom improvement (% of patients)
<b>Randomized controlled trials</b>		
Langendijk, 2001 (5)	15%	NR
Sur, 2001 (6)	NR	NR
Chella, 2000 (8)	7%	symptom free period significantly greater in HDREB arm (HDREB, 8.5mo vs. no HDREB, 2.8mo)
Stout, 2000 (9)	8%	symptom improvement better for EBRT
Huber, 1997 (10)	20%	NR
Huber, 1995 (11)	(G1, 22%;G2, 21%	NR
<b>Non-controlled prospective studies</b>		
Freitag, 2004 (12)	0%	NR
Escobar-Sacristan, 2004 (13)	0%	hemoptysis, 96%
Gejerman, 2002 (14)	0%	Main symptom was alleviated in 72%
Anacak, 2001 (15)	10%	hemoptysis, 95%
Ofiara, 1997 (16)	NR	hemoptysis, 79%
Ornadel, 1997 (17)	9%	hemoptysis, 19%
Perol, 1997 (18)	11%	NR
Delclos, 1996 (19)	0%	overall: minimal, 21%; moderate, 31%; excellent, 32%
Hernandez, 1996 (20)	0%	hemoptysis, 69%
Trédaniel, 1994 (21)	HDREB, 3% EBRT+HDREB, 18%	70% complete/partial relief of symptoms
Goldman, 1993 (22)	0%	overall, 89%
Speiser, 1993 (23,24)	7.3% (G1, 4.2%; G2, 7.0%; G3, 8.6%)	hemoptysis, >99%
Bedwinek, 1992 (25)	32%	hemoptysis, 80%; overall, 76%
Gauwitz, 1992 (26)	4%	overall, 88%
Mehta, 1992 (27)	0%	hemoptysis, 100%; overall, 79%
Sutedja, 1992 (28)	32%	dyspnea, 82% of patients with PR
Burt, 1990 (29)	4%	hemoptysis, 86%
Fass, 1990 (30)	NR	hemoptysis, 71%; overall, 71%
<b>Retrospective studies</b>		
Muto, 2000 (31)	3.6%	hemoptysis, 94%
Hennequin, 1998 (32)	6.7%	overall, 60%
Taulelle, 1998 (33)	NR (massive hemoptysis, 7%)	hemoptysis, 74%
Gollins, 1994 & 1996 (34,35)	7.9%	hemoptysis, 88%
Macha, 1995 (36)	G1, 21% massive hemorrhage G2, NR	effective palliation in 67% of patients

Notes: EBRT - external beam radiation therapy, G - group, HDREB - high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy, mo - months, NR - not reported, PR - partial response, vs. - versus.



cancer care  
ontario

program in  
evidence-based care

action cancer  
ontario

programme de soins  
fondé sur des preuves

### Evidence-based Series #7-16: Section 3

## The Role of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in the Palliation of Symptoms in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: Guideline Development and External Review - Methods and Results

*Y Ung, E Yu, C Falkson, AE Haynes, WK Evans, and the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group*

A Quality Initiative of the  
Program in Evidence-based Care (PEBC), Cancer Care Ontario (CCO)

These guideline recommendations have been **ENDORSED**, which means that the recommendations are still current and relevant for decision making. Please see [Section 4: Document Review Summary and Tool](#) for a summary of updated evidence published between 2002 and 2012, and for details on how this Clinical Practice Guideline was **ENDORSED**.

Report Date: October 25, 2005

### THE PROGRAM IN EVIDENCE-BASED CARE

The Program in Evidence-based Care (PEBC) is an initiative of the Ontario provincial cancer system, Cancer Care Ontario (CCO) (1). The PEBC mandate is to improve the lives of Ontarians affected by cancer, through the development, dissemination, implementation, and evaluation of evidence-based products designed to facilitate clinical, planning, and policy decisions about cancer care.

The PEBC supports a network of disease-specific panels, called Disease Site Groups (DSGs) and Guideline Development Groups (GDGs), mandated to develop the PEBC products. These panels are comprised of clinicians, methodologists, and community representatives from across the province.

The PEBC is well known for producing evidence-based practice guideline reports, using the methods of the Practice Guidelines Development Cycle (1,2). The PEBC reports consist of a comprehensive systematic review of the clinical evidence on a specific cancer care topic, an interpretation of and consensus agreement on that evidence by our DSGs and GDGs, the resulting clinical recommendations, and an external review by Ontario clinicians in the province for whom the topic is relevant. The PEBC has a formal standardized process to ensure the currency of each clinical practice guideline report, through the routine periodic review and evaluation of the scientific literature and, where appropriate, the integration of that literature with the original clinical practice guideline information.

## The Evidence-based Series: A New Look to the PEBC Practice Guidelines

Each Evidence-based Series is comprised of three sections.

- *Section 1: Clinical Practice Guideline.* This section contains the clinical recommendations derived from a systematic review of the clinical and scientific literature and its interpretation by the DSG or GDG involved and a formalized external review by Ontario practitioners.
- *Section 2: Systematic Review.* This section presents the comprehensive systematic review of the clinical and scientific research on the topic and the conclusions reached by the DSG or GDG.
- *Section 3: Guideline Development and External Review: Methods and Results.* This section summarizes the guideline development process and the results of the formal external review by Ontario practitioners of the draft version of the clinical practice guideline and systematic review.

## DEVELOPMENT OF THIS EVIDENCE-BASED SERIES

### Development and Internal Review

This evidence-based series was developed by the Lung DSG of Cancer Care Ontario's PEBC. The series is a convenient and up-to-date source of the best available evidence on HDREB for the palliation of advanced NSCLC, developed through systematic review, evidence synthesis, and input from practitioners in Ontario.

### Disease Site Group Consensus

The application of HDREB for lung cancer requires an adequately trained and experienced team that includes radiation oncologists, thoracic surgeons (or physicians with expertise in bronchoscopy), and medical physicists. While the aim of this evidence-based series was not to review the many technical aspects of the delivery of HDREB, the Lung Cancer DSG recommends that rigorous quality assurance programs be in effect to ensure safety and to provide consistency in reporting dose prescriptions to facilitate comparisons of treatment results.

The analysis of the available evidence does not permit the recommendation of a standard dose or optimal fractionation for HDREB. However, a survey of the provincial cancer centres in Ontario was conducted by one of the guideline authors (Ung) to determine common practice among centres doing HDREB. The consensus recommendation for palliation is to use a prescribed dose of 1000 cGy at 1cm from the central axis given in a single fraction. Technical factors that may influence dose reduction and the fractionation scheme include the extent of curvature causing overlap and "hot spots" of radiation dose, length of treatment, and previous external beam radiation exposure in the treatment volume.

The group of patients that may benefit from HDREB may be defined as those who have:

1. Endobronchial tumour causing symptoms of dyspnea, hemoptysis, post-obstructive pneumonitis, or intractable cough;
2. Minimal extrinsic compression of the bronchi;
3. Visible endoluminal disease but not complete endobronchial obstruction;
4. Failed previous EBRT or those who are not candidates for further external beam radiation;
5. Good performance status (i.e., ECOG  $\leq$  2). Patients with poorer performance status caused directly by the endobronchial disease may still be suitable for HDR brachytherapy.

### **External Review by Ontario Clinicians**

Following the review and discussion of Sections 1 and 2 of this evidence-based series, the Lung DSG circulated the clinical practice guideline and systematic review to clinicians in Ontario for review and feedback. Box 1 summarizes the draft clinical recommendations and supporting evidence developed by the panel.

IN REVIEW

**BOX 1:****DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS** (approved for external review May 4 2004)***Target Population***

- This practice guideline applies to adult patients with symptomatic endobronchial disease in NSCLC.

***Recommendations***

- For patients with previously untreated, symptomatic, endobronchial NSCLC:
  - EBRT, alone, is more effective for palliation than HDREB, alone.
  - HDREB in combination with EBRT provides more effective palliation for symptoms of hemoptysis, cough, and chest pain than EBRT alone.
    - In patients with significant extrinsic compression of the airways, EBRT is often administered prior to HDREB.
    - In patients with respiratory symptoms caused by endobronchial lesions, HDREB can be administered prior to EBRT.
- For patients who have persistent or recurrent symptomatic airway obstruction due to endobronchial disease after previous EBRT, HDREB provides prompt palliation of obstructive symptoms.
- The occurrence of fatal hemoptysis as a result of HDREB is a significant risk of this therapy and may occur in up to 32% of treated patients.
- The optimal dose and fractionation for HDREB for the palliation of symptoms of airway obstruction has not yet been determined. However, commonly used doses include 1000 cGy at 1cm in a single fraction or 750 cGy at 1cm in one or two fractions.
- HDREB may be effectively combined with other endobronchial treatment modalities such as Nd-YAG laser therapy.

***Qualifying Statements***

- This guideline only addresses the use of HDREB for palliation of symptomatic endobronchial disease and does not apply to its use as a radical or adjuvant treatment.
- HDREB should be provided by a team of experts that include radiation oncologists, thoracic surgeons (or physicians with expertise in bronchoscopy) and medical physicists.
- HDREB is only possible if afterloading catheters can be inserted bronchoscopically. Patients with complete endobronchial obstruction are not suitable for HDREB.
- Treatment alternatives to HDREB include EBRT (if not previously irradiated), ND-YAG laser therapy, PDT, and surgical core out procedure.

***Treatment Alternatives***

- HDREB can only be given when there is an adequate lumen to allow for insertion of the treatment catheter. If there is complete endobronchial obstruction, then initial therapy could include other treatment modalities such as surgical core out, endobronchial stent for more proximal tumours, ND-YAG laser, or PDT. These modalities of therapy are usually followed by HDREB.

## Methods

Feedback was obtained through a mailed survey of 117 practitioners in Ontario and included 35 medical oncologists, 22 radiation oncologists, 27 surgeons, 32 respirologists, and a hematologist. The survey consisted of items evaluating the methods, results, and interpretive summary used to inform the draft recommendations and whether the draft recommendations above should be approved as a practice guideline. Written comments were invited. The practitioner feedback survey was mailed out on May 7, 2004. Follow-up reminders were sent at two weeks (post card) and four weeks (complete package mailed again). The Lung DSG reviewed the results of the survey.

## Results

Fifty-three responses were received out of the 117 surveys sent (45.3% response rate). Responses include returned completed surveys as well as phone, fax, and email responses. Of the practitioners who responded, 33 indicated that the report was relevant to their clinical practice, and they completed the survey. Two respondents left that question blank but completed the survey. Key results of the practitioner feedback survey are summarized in Table 5.

**Table 5. Practitioner responses to eight items on the practitioner feedback survey.**

Item	Number (%)		
	Strongly agree or agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Strongly disagree or disagree
The rationale for developing a clinical practice guideline, as stated in the "Choice of Topic" section of this report, is clear. <sup>1</sup>	30 (88)	3 (9)	1 (3)
There is a need for a clinical practice guideline on this topic. <sup>2</sup>	22 (67)	11 (33)	0
The literature search is relevant and complete. <sup>2</sup>	28 (85)	4 (12)	1 (3)
The results of the trials described in the report are interpreted according to my understanding of the data. <sup>1</sup>	32 (94)	2 (6)	0
The draft recommendations in this report are clear. <sup>1</sup>	32 (94)	2 (6)	0
I agree with the draft recommendations as stated. <sup>1</sup>	31 (91)	2 (6)	1 (3)
This report should be approved as a practice guideline. <sup>1</sup>	29 (85)	3 (9)	2 (6)
If this report were to become a practice guideline, how likely would you be to make use of it in your own practice? <sup>1</sup>	Very likely or likely	Unsure	Not at all likely or unlikely
	17 (50)	6 (18)	11 (32)

<sup>1</sup> One practitioner did not respond to these questions.

<sup>2</sup> Two practitioners did not respond to these questions.

## Summary of Written Comments

Nine respondents (26%) provided written comments. The main points contained in the written comments were:

1. One practitioner was concerned that the need for a team approach limits the applicability to some extent.
2. Three practitioners responded that this practice guideline was an informative review of HDREB for NSCLC and provides useful guidance. However, two of these commented that although they see patients with NSCLC, the recommendations apply only to radiation oncologists and thoracic surgeons and not medical oncologists, as the latter are not directly involved in the procedure.

3. One practitioner stated that a study on endobronchial brachytherapy has just been completed, and that the complication rates, including hemoptysis, are much lower than reported in the current guideline. This respondent also indicated that patient selection was the key and that the results of the study will be published in the future.
4. One practitioner was concerned that the practice guideline is based on a small amount of data and that each study used different doses of brachytherapy.
5. One practitioner stated that surgical core-out procedures are a useful adjunct to all forms of endobronchial therapy, whether it is HDREB, PDT, or Nd-YAG laser therapy. This practitioner also stated that they can be helpful even when obstruction is not complete.
6. One practitioner noted that assessment of symptoms using validated tools is essential in the application of new therapies as symptom control is as important an outcome as survival. A guideline should be developed on the assessment and quantification of symptoms.
7. One practitioner was concerned that the guideline was unclear on which patients with previously untreated symptomatic endobronchial NSCLC should get HDREB in addition to EBRT. The practitioner stated that the guideline needs recommendations regarding patient selection for HDREB.

#### ***Modifications/Actions***

1. The Lung DSG feels that centres that perform HDREB should have a multidisciplinary team to do the procedure, and therefore not all cancer centres will be able to offer HDREB.
2. The Lung DSG agrees that the recommendations are intended to aid radiation oncologists and thoracic surgeons; however, it was important to include in the survey sample all practitioners that see NSCLC patients so that they are aware of HDREB as a treatment option.
3. The Lung DSG acknowledges there are studies that have not been published as of yet; however, only published reports have been included in this practice guideline, and, as a result, the recommendations reflect this. The guideline development process necessitates that updates be done on a consistent basis; therefore, when additional trials are identified they will be incorporated into the existing guideline.
4. The Lung DSG acknowledges that the studies included in the guideline used differing doses of HDREB; however, the recommendations are based on the available evidence as well as expert consensus among centres in Ontario doing HDREB.
5. The Lung DSG states, under “Treatment Alternatives,” that surgical core-out is an acceptable treatment option when there is complete endobronchial obstruction.
6. The Lung DSG acknowledges that symptom control is an important outcome especially for NSCLC, and the Group feels that this issue was adequately discussed in the “Results” and “Interpretive Summary” sections.
7. The Lung DSG acknowledges that the recommendations should be clear regarding patient selection. Therefore, the recommendations regarding previously untreated patients were reworded in order to clarify which patients should receive HDREB as palliative treatment.

#### **Practice Guidelines Coordinating Committee Approval Process**

This evidence-based series reflects the integration of the draft recommendations with feedback obtained from the external review process. After being approved by the Lung DSG, the series was submitted to the Practice Guidelines Coordinating Committee.

Of the 15 panel members, eight members returned ballots of the reviewed document. However, one panel member is a member of the Lung DSG and was not eligible to review the document. Six panel members approved the document and one member approved the

document on condition that changes to one of the recommendations are changed due to the weak evidence supporting it.

### ***Modifications/Actions***

Rewording of the recommendations was made to provide a clear and concise interpretation. During the course of revisions the group was made aware that a new abstract had been published which met the inclusion criteria of the guideline. The group was unsure whether the new abstract had been an update of a previous study or a new study. Clarification was required from the author of the study and one of the author's of the guideline made contact. The delay in addressing the PGCC comments was due to the wait in response from the lead author of the published abstract. The most recent abstract was in fact an update of a previous study that had been included in the systematic review. The results were updated in the guideline and the outcomes of the current abstract had changed from the initial publication that in fact there was no significant difference in symptom control in patients when they were treated with high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy in combination with external beam radiation therapy oppose to external beam radiation therapy alone. This resulted in a change in one of the recommendations.

### ***Final Recommendations***

For previously untreated patients with NSCLC, the evidence does not provide conclusive results to suggest that HDREB and EBRT would provide improved relief over EBRT alone.

For patients with complete collapse of the lung due to endobronchial obstruction, a surgical core out procedure may be needed before EBRT or EBRT with HDREB

For patients previously treated by EBRT who are symptomatic from recurrent disease due to endobronchial obstruction, high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy is recommended providing that endobronchial brachytherapy is technically feasible.

### **RELATED PRINT AND ELECTRONIC PUBLICATIONS**

Ung YC, Yu E, Falkson C, Haynes AE, Stys-Norman D, Evans WK, et al. The role of high-dose-rate brachytherapy in the palliation of symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a systematic review. *Brachytherapy*. 2006;5(3):189-202.

#### ***Funding***

The PEBC is supported by Cancer Care Ontario (CCO) and the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. All work produced by the PEBC is editorially independent from its funding agencies.

#### ***Copyright***

This series is copyrighted by Cancer Care Ontario; the guideline and the illustrations herein may not be reproduced without the express written permission of Cancer Care Ontario. Cancer Care Ontario reserves the right at any time, and at its sole discretion, to change or revoke this authorization.

#### ***Disclaimer***

Care has been taken in the preparation of the information contained in this document. Nonetheless, any person seeking to apply or consult the evidence-based series is expected to use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances or seek out the supervision of a qualified clinician. Cancer Care Ontario makes no representation or guarantees of any kind whatsoever regarding their content or use or application and disclaims any responsibility for their application or use in any way.

*Contact Information*

For a complete list of the Lung DSG members and the Practice Guidelines Coordinating Committee group members, please visit the CCO Web site at <http://www.cancercare.on.ca/>

For further information about this evidence-based series, please contact  
**Dr. William K. Evans**, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group, McMaster University and Juravinski Cancer Centre, 699 Concession Street, Hamilton ON L8V 5C2;  
TEL (905) 387-9711 ext. 63001; FAX (905) 575-6323

or

**Dr. Yee C. Ung**, Co-Chair, Lung Cancer Disease Site Group, Toronto-Sunnybrook Regional Cancer Centre, 2075 Bayview Avenue, Toronto, ON, M4N 3M5;  
TEL (416) 480-4951; FAX (416) 480-6002.

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports,  
please visit the CCO website at <http://www.cancercare.on.ca/>

or contact the PEBC office at:

Phone: 905-527-4322 ext. 42822 Fax: 905-526-6775 E-mail: [ccopgi@mcmaster.ca](mailto:ccopgi@mcmaster.ca)

## REFERENCES

1. Browman GP, Levine MN, Mohide EA, Hayward RSA, Pritchard KI, Gafni A, et al. The practice guidelines development cycle: a conceptual tool for practice guidelines development and implementation. *J Clin Oncol.* 1995;13:502-12.
2. Browman GP, Newman TE, Mohide EA, Graham ID, Levine MN, Pritchard KI, et al. Progress of clinical oncology guidelines development using the practice guidelines development cycle: the role of practitioner feedback. *J Clin Oncol.* 1998;16(3):1226-31.

Evidence-based Series #17- 6: Section 4

The Role of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in the Palliation of Symptoms in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer

**Guideline Review Summary**

Review Date: December 11, 2012

*The 2002 guideline recommendations are*

**ENDORSED**

*This means that the recommendations are still current and relevant for decision making.*

**OVERVIEW**

**Evidence-based Series History**

The original version of this guidance document was released by Cancer Care Ontario's Program in Evidence-based Care in 2005.

In September 2011, this document was assessed in accordance with the PEBC Document Assessment and Review Protocol and was determined to require a review. As part of the review, a PEBC methodologist conducted an updated search of the literature. A clinical expert (EY) reviewed and interpreted the new eligible evidence and proposed the existing recommendations could be endorsed. In December 2012, the Lung Cancer Disease Site Group (DSG) endorsed the recommendations found in Section 1 (Clinical Practice Guideline).

**DOCUMENT ASSESSMENT AND REVIEW RESULTS**

**Questions Considered**

1. Is there a role for high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy (HDREB) in the palliation of respiratory symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer?
2. If so, what is the optimal dose of HDREB in this setting?

### **Literature Search and New Evidence**

The new search (October 2005 to September 2012) yielded 8 relevant new publications in the following categories: One Randomized Control Trial, one prospective non-comparative trial, five large retrospective trials, one meta-analysis (abstract) and 2 existing guidelines. Brief results of these publications are shown in the Document Assessment and Review Tool at the end of this report.

### **Impact on Guidelines and Its Recommendations**

The new data supports existing recommendations. Hence, the Lung Cancer DSG ENDORSED the 2005 recommendations on the role of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in the Palliation of Symptom in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer.

## Document Review Tool

<b>Number and title of document under review</b>	<b>7-16</b> The Role of High Dose Rate Brachytherapy in the Palliation of Symptoms in Patients with Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer
<b>Current Report Date</b>	October 25, 2005
<b>Clinical Expert</b>	Dr. Edward Yu
<b>Research Coordinator</b>	Robert Mackenzie
<b>Date Assessed</b>	September 2012
<b>Approval Date and Review Outcome (once completed)</b>	December 11, 2012 (ENDORSED)
<p><b>Original Question(s):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is there a role for high dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy (HDREB) in the palliation of symptoms in patients with non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)?</li> <li>2. If so, what is the optimal dose of HDREB in this setting?</li> </ol> <p><b>Target Population:</b> The recommendations apply to adult patients with symptomatic endobronchial disease in non-small cell lung cancer.</p> <p><b>Study Selection Criteria:</b></p> <p><b>Inclusion Criteria</b> Articles published as full reports were selected for inclusion in this systematic review of the evidence if they were the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Randomized clinical trials (RCTs), non-comparative prospective studies, or large retrospective studies involving more than 100 patients evaluating treatment for symptomatic endobronchial disease in patients presenting with primary NSCLC.</li> <li>2. At least one group in the study had to receive HDREB, either alone or in combination with EBRT, laser therapy, or photodynamic therapy (PDT).</li> <li>3. Reported data on symptom control, response, survival, or toxicity.</li> </ol> <p><b>Exclusion Criteria</b> Articles were excluded if they were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Published in a language other than English.</li> <li>2. Published in abstract form only.</li> <li>3. Letters, comments, or editorials.</li> <li>4. Case studies.</li> </ol> <p><b>Search Details:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• July 2005 to September 2012 (Medline and Embase, Cochrane Library, ASCO Annual Meeting, and Clinicaltrials.gov)</li> <li>• ASCO - ("brachytherapy" AND ("non small cell lung cancer" OR "nsclc"))</li> <li>• Clinicaltrials.gov - "Brachytherapy" AND "Lung"</li> </ul>	

**Brief Summary/Discussion of New Evidence:**

RANDOMIZED CONTROL TRIALS					
Interventions	Name of RCT (med F/U)	Population (n)	Outcomes	Brief results	References
<p>EBBT vs EBBT &amp; XRT  <b>Arm A:</b> XRT 30 gy/10fr/2 weeks &amp; 2 sessions EBBT @ 8 Gy.  <b>Arm B:</b> XRT 30 gy/10fr/2 weeks &amp; 1 session EBBT @ 10 Gy  <b>Arm C:</b> EBBT @ single fraction 15gy</p>	<p>Optimal Dose &amp; Fractionation EBBT</p>	<p>n=45</p>	<p>Response rates, duration of symptom palliation, obstruction scores, Qol</p>	<p>Response rates: No sig. difference between arms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dyspnea(91%)</li> <li>• cough(84%)</li> <li>• hemoptysis(94%)</li> <li>• Obs. Pneumonia(83%)</li> <li>• Median time to symptom relapse: 4-8 months(all)</li> <li>• Median time to symptom progression 6-11 months(all).</li> <li>• Hemoptysis: shorter palliation arm c (p&lt;0.01)</li> </ul>	<p>Mallick I. et al 2006</p>
NON COMPARATIVE PROSPECTIVE TRIALS					
Interventions	Name of RCT (med F/U)	Population (n)	Outcomes	Brief results	References
<p>Weekly HDREB sessions intervals (500-1000 cGy per session) with prior Diodi-laser resection in some cases</p>	<p>Outpatient HDREB</p>	<p>n=35</p>	<p>Response was assessed bronchoscopically, clinically and functionally at the end of treatment and one month after the last HDREB session</p>	<p>Following 2000 cGy HDREB therapy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• dyspnoea decreased (Wilcoxon test, p=0.049), and remained significantly improved (p=0.049) after 1 month.</li> <li>• Haemoptysis completely disappeared after one month(x2 Mc-Nemar=4.9; p=0.027).</li> <li>• Cough decreased significantly (Wilcoxon test, p=0.019) after one month.</li> </ul>	<p>Scarda A. et al. 2007</p>

Single dose of at least 20 Gy from a 192Ir source in HDR technique	CT-guided interstitial brachytherapy	n=30	Adverse effects, respiratory effect, tumor control	<p>Adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nausea (n = 3, 6%)</li> <li>• minor (n = 6, 12%) and one major pneumothorax (2%)</li> <li>• no changes of vital capacity and forced expiratory volume could be detected</li> <li>• Median follow-up period was 9 months with a local tumor control of 91% at 12 months</li> </ul>	Peters N. et al. 2008
single fraction of 20 Gy in percutaneous brachytherapy & hypofractionated from 5 × 5 Gy to 2 × 12.5 Gy in transbronchial brachytherapy.	High-Dose-Rate Brachytherapy for Small-Sized Peripherally Located Lung Cancer	n=12	Adverse effects, recurrence, tumor control, survival	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal radiation pneumonitis was observed in most patients</li> <li>• Primary recurrence occurred in three patients</li> <li>• local control rate is 88.9%</li> <li>• estimated 5-year survival rate is between 60% and 70%</li> </ul>	Imamura F., et al. 2006
<b>LARGE RETROSPECTIVE STUDIES</b>					
<b>Interventions</b>	<b>Name of RCT (med F/U)</b>	<b>Population (n)</b>	<b>Outcomes</b>	<b>Brief results</b>	<b>References</b>
EBBT with or without palliative external radiation (XRT)	Palliation of endobronchial symptoms in advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)	n=95	Symptomatic response rates, duration of symptom palliation, obstruction scores, complications and quality of life outcomes	<p>Improvements Symptomatic response rates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 93% for dyspnea, 57% complete response</li> <li>• 81% for cough, 19% complete response</li> <li>• 97% haemoptysis, 95% complete response</li> <li>• 91% for obstructive pneumonia, 78%</li> </ul>	Mallick I. et al 2007

				<p>complete response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improvement in the obstruction score: 95.8% cases</li> <li>• Median time to symptom relapse: 4–8 months all symptoms</li> <li>• Median time to symptom progression: 6–11 months.</li> <li>• Quality of life improvement for symptom scores, functional scales, overall</li> </ul>	
HDR-EBBT as a part of multimodality therapy	<p>Risk factors, early complication rates (occurring within 3 weeks after the application of brachytherapy) following HDR Brachytherapy in Palliative treatment Lung Cancer</p>	n=761	<p>Early Complications included severe hypoxemia, global respiratory failure, cardiac arrhythmia requiring additional treatment, hemoptysis, pneumothorax, pneumomediastinum, pulmonary edema, tracheoesophageal fistulae, and death. Risk factors included myocardial infarction occurring ≥ 6 months previously, stable hypertension, stable arrhythmias, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), stabilized cardiomyopathy, previous external beam radiation therapy (EBRT), previous chemotherapy, and previous interventional pulmonology procedures</p>	<p>(Statistical significance <math>p=0.001</math>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistically significant correlation between number of clinical risk factors and complications.</li> <li>• statistically significant correlation between age and complications</li> <li>• No statistically significant correlations were evident between the rate of complications and sex, smoking status, type of lung cancer, and localization of the tumor.</li> <li>• Multivariate analysis identified stable hypertension,</li> </ul>	Zarick B. et al. 2010

				controlled arrhythmia, COPD, and stabilized cardiomyopathy as statistically significant risk factors	
Stage III lung cancer patients (ERT in combination with HDR-EB), not treated previously with RT, previously irradiated with full dose curative radiotherapy	HDREB response and toxicity evaluation	n=43 NSCLC (158 total)	symptomatic and endoscopic responses as well as related toxicities	<p>KPS and obstruction scores after the completion of treatments were statistically significant (p = 0.0001 for both)</p> <p>Endoscopic response rate was 86%, including 67% of patients who achieved a complete endoscopic response rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 58% for cough (30% complete response), 77% for dyspnea (76% complete response)</li> <li>• 100% for hemoptysis (92% complete response)</li> <li>• Median survival was 11 months</li> <li>• 2 and 5 year survival rates 25.5% and 9.5%</li> </ul>	Ozkok S. et al. 2008
Six fractions of 5 or 7 Gy, usually delivered 1 cm from the source	Long-term results of endobronchial brachytherapy	n=106	complete histologic response rate, local control, overall survival, and cause-specific survival rates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 63 with a complete histologic response (59.4%)</li> <li>• 23 with a complete macroscopic response (21.8%)</li> <li>• 9 with a partial response (8.5%)</li> <li>• 7 with local progression or no change (7.5%)</li> <li>• Patients with complete macroscopic response had a significantly</li> </ul>	Hennequin C. et al. 2007

				<p>shorter mean endobronchial tumor length (1.6cm vs. 2.5 cm, p = 0.006) and less severe bronchial obstruction (19% vs. 35%, p= 0.02)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patients whose tumors were visible on CT achieved complete remission less frequently than others (30.8% [4 of 13] vs. 65.6% [59 of 90], p= 0.01)</li> <li>• Local control rate was 60.3% at 24 months and 51.6% at 60 months</li> <li>• The median interval between HDR-EBBT and local failure was 14 months; 6 patients developed local relapse more than 2 years after HDR-EBBT</li> <li>• Median overall survival time - 21.4 months</li> <li>• 2- yr overall survival rate - 47.4%, 5yr overall survival - 24%</li> <li>• 36 deaths (48%) were attributed to the treated lung cancers</li> <li>• Massive hemoptysis occurred 3 months after the procedure in 2 patients</li> <li>• 3 patients</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				developed necrosis of the bronchial wall	
total dose:= 30 Gy vs less, dose per fraction:= 5 Gy vs more, number of catheter(s):1 vs = 2. (ASCO Absrtact)	Retrospective review high dose rate brachytherapy (HDR-BT) for early stage non-small cell lung carcinoma	n=226	impact on survival and complications	<p><b>SURVIVAL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two and 5-year survival: overall: 57%, 29%</li> <li>local- relapse free (LRF) 68%</li> <li>LRF survival was better in patients treated with = 2 catheters (p=0.007)</li> </ul> <p><b>TOXICITY</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pneumothorax 1.3%</li> <li>hemoptysis 6.6% (5% fatal)</li> <li>bronchitis 20%.</li> </ul>	Aumont M. et al, 2007
<b>SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS</b>					
Diverse fractionation schedules of palliative HDR EBB, EBRT versus HDR EBB, Combined Nd-YAG laser plus HDR EBB versus Nd-YAG laser alone	Palliative endobronchial brachytherapy for non-small cell lung cancer (Review)	n=577	Symptom response, recurrence, survival.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Variety o HDR EB fractionation schedules had similar effectiveness in overall survival</li> <li>A schedule of 7.4 Gy in two fractions appeared to be significantly superior to 3.8 Gy in four fractions per week for local control</li> <li>Fatal hemoptysis was significantly less frequent with the 7.4 Gy in two fractions schedule group, in one trial; no significant difference was found in the other one</li> <li>The comparison between EBRT</li> </ul>	Cardona et al., 2008

				<p>and HDR EBB in patients with untreated advanced NSCLC favors the use of EBRT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings from one trial suggest that a schedule of two fractions of 7.4 Gy EBB is more effective than one of 3.8 Gy per week four times in prolonging the mean time of local control and reducing the rate of fatal hemoptysis.</li> <li>• For patients previously treated by EBRT and who are symptomatic from recurrent disease because of endobronchial central obstruction, EBB should be considered in selected cases</li> <li>• Conclusion: EBRT alone is more effective for palliation than EBB alone. Not enough conclusive evidence to recommend EBB combination with EBRT, chemotherapy or Nd-YAG laser.</li> <li>• Study comparing YAG laser with HDR EBB may be underpowered.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

**ON-GOING CLINICAL TRIALS (Retrieved from clinicaltrial.gov database)**

Interventions	Official title	Status	Protocol ID & URL	Last Updated
External Beam Radiation vs. External Beam Radiation (EBR) plus High Dose Rate Intraluminal brachytherapy (HDRIB)	A Phase III, Multi-centre, randomized Trial to Evaluate the Symptomatic and Quality of Life Improvements in Lung Cancer Patients Receiving External Beam Radiation With or Without High Dose Rate Intraluminal Brachytherapy	recruiting	NCT01351116	June 11, 2012

**Existing Guidelines**

Publishing Group	Recommendation	source
American Society for Radiation Oncology 2011	No defined role for EBB in the routine initial palliative treatment of chest disease has been demonstrated; however, EBB can be a reasonable option for the palliation of endobronchial lesions causing obstructive symptomatology including lung collapse, or for hemoptysis after EBRT failure.	
Guidelines Subcommittee of the Clinical Affairs and Quality Committee of the American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO)	No defined role for endobronchial brachytherapy for the routine initial palliative treatment of chest disease has been demonstrated; however, endobronchial brachytherapy remains an option for the palliation of endobronchial lesions causing obstructive symptomatology in the EBRT failure scenario or in locally advanced nonmetastatic cancer patients with endobronchial disease who require lung re-expansion before or in conjunction with radical RT.	

1. Does any of the newly identified evidence, on initial review, contradict the current recommendations, such that the current recommendations may cause harm or lead to unnecessary or improper treatment if followed? Answer Yes or No, and explain if necessary, citing newly identified references:	1. No
	If Yes, the document will be immediately removed from the PEBC website, and a note as to its status put in its place. Go to 2.

<p>2. On initial review,</p> <p>a. Does the newly identified evidence support the existing recommendations?</p> <p>b. Do the current recommendations cover all relevant subjects addressed by the evidence, such that no new recommendations are necessary?</p> <p>Answer Yes or No to each, and explain if necessary:</p>	<p>2a. Yes a,</p> <p>2b. Yes</p>
	<p>If both are Yes, the document can be <b>ENDORSED</b>. If either is No, go to 3.</p>
<p>3. Is there a good reason (e.g., new stronger evidence will be published soon, changes to current recommendations are trivial or address very limited situations) to postpone updating the guideline? Answer Yes or No, and explain if necessary:</p>	<p>3. Not Applicable</p> <p>If Yes, a final decision can be <b>DELAYED</b> up to one year. If No, go to 4.</p>
<p>4. Do the PEBC and the DSG/GDG responsible for this document have the resources available to write a full update of this document within the next year?</p>	<p>4. Not Applicable</p> <p>If Yes, the document needs an <b>UPDATE</b>. It can be listed on the website as IN REVIEW for one year. If a full update is not started within the year, it will be automatically <b>ARCHIVED</b>. If NO, go to 5.</p>
<p>5. If Q2, Q3, and Q4 were all answered NO, this document should be <b>ARCHIVED</b> with no further action.</p>	
<p><b>Review Outcome</b></p>	<p>ENDORSE</p>
<p><b>DSG/GDG Approval Date</b></p>	<p>December 11, 2012</p>
<p><b>DSG/GDG Commentary</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Due to limited amount of evidence, it is noted that patient selection may help determine who would be best treated by EBRT, HDREB or both.</li> <li>• Although not found in this review of literature it is noted that EBRT re-treatment is another intervention used for palliation of symptoms in NSCLC.</li> </ul>

### New References Identified:

1. Mallick I, Sharma SC, Behera D, Ghoshal S, Oinam AS. Optimization of dose and fractionation of endobronchial brachytherapy with or without external radiation in the palliative management of non-small cell lung cancer: a prospective randomized study. *Journal of Cancer Research & Therapeutics*. 2006;2(3):119-25.
2. Mallick I, Sharma SC, Behera D. Endobronchial brachytherapy for symptom palliation in non-small cell lung cancer--analysis of symptom response, endoscopic improvement and quality of life. *Lung Cancer*. 2007;55(3):313-8.
3. Zaric B, Perin B, Jovelic A, Lalic N, Secen N, Kopitovic I, et al. Clinical risk factors for early complications after high-dose-rate endobronchial brachytherapy in the palliative treatment of lung cancer. *Clinical Lung Cancer*. 2010;11(3):182-6.
4. Scarda A, Confalonieri M, Baghiris C, Binato S, Mazzarotto R, Palamidese A, et al. Out-patient high-dose-rate endobronchial brachytherapy for palliation of lung cancer: an observational study. *Monaldi Archives for Chest Disease*. 2007;67(3):128-34.
5. Ozkok S, Karakoyun-Celik O, Goksel T, Mogulkoc N, Yalman D, Gok G, et al. High dose rate endobronchial brachytherapy in the management of lung cancer: response and toxicity evaluation in 158 patients. *Lung Cancer*. 2008;62(3):326-33.
6. Peters N, Wieners G, Pech M, Hengst S, Ruhl R, Streitparth F, et al. CT-guided interstitial brachytherapy of primary and secondary lung malignancies: results of a prospective phase II trial. *Strahlentherapie und Onkologie*. 2008;184(6):296-301.
7. Hennequin C, Bleichner O, Tredaniel J, Quero L, Sergent G, Zalcman G, et al. Long-term results of endobronchial brachytherapy: A curative treatment? *International Journal of Radiation Oncology Biology Physics*. 2007;67(2):425-30
8. Cardona AF, Reveiz L, Ospina EG, Ospina V, Yepes A. Palliative endobronchial brachytherapy for non-small cell lung cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2008;(2)(CD004284).
9. Imamura F, Ueno K, Kusunoki Y, Uchida J, Yoshimura M, Koizumi M, et al. High-dose-rate brachytherapy for small-sized peripherally located lung cancer. *Strahlentherapie und Onkologie*. 2006;182(12):703-7.
10. Aumont M, Mahe M, Prevost B, Sunyach M, Peiffert D, Maingon P, Thomas L, Begue M, Willaume D, Lerouge D, Champion L. Exclusive high dose rate brachytherapy (HDR-BT) for early stage non-small cell lung carcinoma: Results of a retrospective study in 226 patients. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 2007 ASCO Annual Meeting Proceedings Part I. Vol 25, No. 18S (June 20 Supplement), 2007: 7688.
11. Rodrigues, George, Gregory M. Videtic, Ranjan Sur, Andrea Bezjak, Jeffrey Bradley, Carol A. Hahn, Corey Langer, Keith L. Miller, Benjamin J. Moeller, Kenneth Rosenzweig, and Benjamin Movsas. "Palliative Thoracic Radiotherapy in Lung Cancer: An American Society for Radiation Oncology Evidence-based Clinical Practice Guideline." *Practical Radiation Oncology* 1 (2011): 60-71.
12. Mazon JJ, Ardiet JM, Haie-Meder C, Kovacs G, Levendag P, Peiffert D, et al. GEC-ESTRO recommendations for brachytherapy for head and neck squamous cell carcinomas. *Radiotherapy and Oncology*. 2009;91(2):150-6.
13. Peters S., Adjei A.A., Gridelli C., Reck M., Kerr K., Felip E., and on behalf of the ESMO Guidelines Working Group. Metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC): ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up *Ann Oncol* (2012) 23(suppl 7): vii56-vii64 doi:10.1093/annonc/mds226.
14. Alberta Health Services., Alberta Health Services clinical practice guideline LU-003, Non-small cell lung cancer - stage III. Date Accessed: Oct 4, 2012.

## Literature Search Strategy:

### MEDLINE

1. meta-Analysis as topic.mp.
2. meta analysis.pt.
3. (meta analy\$ or metaanaly\$).tw.
4. (systematic review\$ or pooled analy\$ or statistical pooling or mathematical pooling or statistical summar\$ or mathematical summar\$ or Quantitative syntheses or quantitative overview?).tw.
5. (systematic adj (review\$ or overview?)).tw.
6. (exp Review Literature as topic/ or review.pt. or exp review/) and systematic.tw.
7. or/1-6
8. (cochrane or embase or psychlit or psyclit or psychinfo or psycinfo or cinahl or cinhal or science citation index or scisearch or bids or sigle or cancerlit).ab.
9. (reference list\$ or bibliograph\$ or hand-search\$ or relevant journals or manual search\$).ab.
10. (selection criteria or data extraction or quality assessment or jadam scale or methodological quality).ab.
11. (study adj selection).ab.
12. 10 or 11
13. review.pt.
14. 12 and 13
15. exp randomized controlled trials as topic/ or exp clinical trials, phase III as topic/ or exp clinical trials, phase IV as topic/
16. (randomized controlled trial or clinical trial, phase III or clinical trial, phase IV).pt.
17. random allocation/ or double blind method/ or single blind method/
18. (randomi\$ control\$ trial? or rct or phase III or phase IV or phase 3 or phase 4).tw.
19. or/15-18
20. (phase II or phase 2).tw. or exp clinical trial/ or exp clinical trial as topic/
21. (clinical trial or clinical trial, phase II or controlled clinical trial).pt.
22. (20 or 21) and random\$.tw.
23. (clinic\$ adj trial\$1).tw.
24. ((singl\$ or doubl\$ or treb\$ or tripl\$) adj (blind\$3 or mask\$3 or dummy)).tw.
25. placebos/
26. (placebo? or random allocation or randomly allocated or allocated randomly).tw.
27. (allocated adj2 random).tw.
28. or/23-27
29. practice guidelines/
30. practice guideline?.tw.
31. practice guideline.pt.
32. or/29-31
33. 7 or 8 or 9 or 14 or 19 or 22 or 28 or 32
34. (comment or letter or editorial or note or erratum or short survey or news or newspaper article or patient education handout or case report or historical article).pt.
35. 33 not 34
36. limit 35 to english
37. Animal/
38. Human/
39. 37 not 38
40. 36 not 39
41. carcinoma, non-small-cell lung/
42. non-small cell lung.tw.
43. or/41-42
44. (brachytherapy or (radiotherapy adj dosage)).tw.
45. ((interstitial adj radiotherapy) or brachytherp\$ HDR or (seed adj implant) or (high adj dose)).tw.
46. or/44-45
47. 43 and 46
48. (200507: or 2006: or 2007: or 2008: or 2009: or 2010: or 2011: or 2012).ed.
49. 47 and 48
50. remove duplicates from 49

### EMBASE

1. exp meta analysis/ or exp systematic review/
2. (meta analy\$ or metaanaly\$).tw.

3. (systematic review\$ or pooled analy\$ or statistical pooling or mathematical pooling or statistical summar\$ or mathematical summar\$ or Quantitative syntheses or quantitative overview?).tw.
4. (systematic adj (review\$1 or overview\$1)).tw.
5. exp review/ or review.pt.
6. (systematic or selection criteria or data extraction or quality assessment or jasad scale or methodological quality).ab.
7. (study adj selection).ab.
8. 5 and (6 or 7)
9. or/1-4,8
10. (cochrane or embase or psychlit or psyclit or psychinfo or psycinfo or cinahl or cinhal or science citation index or scisearch or bids or sigle or cancerlit).ab.
11. (reference list\$ or bibliograph\$ or hand-search\$ or relevant journals or manual search\$).ab.
12. exp randomized controlled trial/ or exp phase 3 clinical trial/ or exp phase 4 clinical trial/
13. randomization/ or single blind procedure/ or double blind procedure/
14. (randomi\$ control\$ trial? or rct or phase III or phase IV or phase 3 or phase 4).tw.
15. or/12-14
16. (phase II or phase 2).tw. or exp clinical trial/ or exp prospective study/ or exp controlled clinical trial/
17. 16 and random\$.tw.
18. (clinic\$ adj trial\$1).tw.
19. ((singl\$ or doubl\$ or treb\$ or tripl\$) adj (blind\$3 or mask\$3 or dummy)).tw.
20. placebo/
21. (placebo? or random allocation or randomly allocated or allocated randomly).tw.
22. (allocated adj2 random).tw.
23. or/18-22
24. practice guidelines/
25. practice guideline?.tw.
26. practice guideline.pt.
27. or/24-26
28. 9 or 10 or 11 or 15 or 17 or 23 or 27
29. (editorial or note or letter or erratum or short survey).pt. or letter/ or case study/
30. 28 not 29
31. limit 30 to english
32. Animal/
33. Human/
34. 32 not 33
35. 31 not 34
36. carcinoma, non-small cell lung/
37. non small cell lung.tw.
38. or/36-37
39. (brachytherapy or (radiotherapy adj dosage)).tw.
40. ((((((interstitial adj radiotherapy) or brachytherp\$ or seed) adj implant) or high) adj dose) or HDR).tw.
41. or/39-40
42. 38 and 41
43. (200507: or 2006: or 2007: or 2008: or 2009: or 2010: or 2011:or 2012).ew.
44. 42 and 43
45. remove duplicates from 44

ASCO

1. ("brachytherapy" AND ("non small cell lung cancer" OR "nslc"))

CLINICALTRIALS.gov

1. "Brachytherapy" AND "Lung"

## OUTCOMES DEFINITIONS

1. **ARCHIVED** - An archived document is a document that will no longer be tracked or updated but may still be useful for academic or other informational purposes. The

document is moved to a separate section of the Web site and each page is watermarked with the phrase “ARCHIVED”.

2. **ENDORSED** - An endorsed document is a document that the DSG/GDG has reviewed for currency and relevance and determined to be still useful as guidance for clinical decision making. A document may be endorsed because the DSG/GDG feels the current recommendations and evidence are sufficient, or it may be endorsed after a literature search uncovers no evidence that would alter the recommendations in any important way.
3. **DELAY** - A Delay means that there is reason to believe new, important evidence will be released within the next year that should be considered before taking further action.
4. **UPDATE** - An Update means that the DSG/GDG recognizes that there is new evidence that makes changes to the existing recommendations in the guideline necessary but these changes are more involved and significant than can be accomplished through the Document Assessment and Review process. The DSG/GDG will rewrite the guideline at the earliest opportunity to reflect this new evidence. Until that time, the document will still be available as its existing recommendations are still of some use in clinical decision making.