

(ILC), 36 (27.7%) invasive pleomorphic lobular carcinoma (IPLC) and 12 (9.2%) showing a mixture of both. Only 11 (8.5%) had pure invasive ductal/no special type carcinoma (IDC). In 36 patients (27.7%) there was either mixed or multifocal/multicentric tumours, the commonest being mixed ILC and IPLC (12 cases), mixed ILC with IDC (10 cases) or IPLC and IDC 10 cases. A high incidence of histological grade 2 (71.1%) and grade 3 (24.5%) invasive cancers was noted with a predominance of ER positive (92%) and HER-2 negative (92.3%) malignancy.

The preoperative diagnosis was known in 87 patients; of these, 22 had pure PLICIS diagnosed preoperatively. On excision 7 of these 22 had evidence of invasive disease (31.8%) and one (4.5%) had associated DCIS. So when PLICIS was the most significant finding on diagnostic biopsy the upgrade to invasive disease on excision was 31.8%, which is higher than pooled data for classical LCIS and DCIS.

Conclusion: The older age at presentation, high rate of upgrade to invasive cancer, common association with higher grade tumours suggest that PLICIS is an aggressive form of *in situ* disease. These findings support the view that PLICIS is a more aggressive form of lobular in situ neoplasia and supports the tendency to treat akin to DCIS.

Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest.

6

INDIVIDUAL ARM LYMPHATIC FLOW PATTERN MAY EXPLAIN SUSCEPTIBILITY TO ARM LYMPHEDEMA AFTER ALND (AXILLARY LYMPHNODE DISSECTION) IN BREAST CANCER SURGERY - AN ANALYSIS BY USING LINF (LYMPHATIC IMAGING WITH NON RADIOACTIVE FLUORESCENT TRACER)

S. Tsunekawa, N. Ogura. *Kansai Electric Power Hospital, Surgery, Osaka, Japan*

Background: Although there are many reports which describe risk factors for ALE (arm lymphedema) after breast cancer surgery, none of them answers a question why some of patients who have the same risk factor, for example ALND, do develop ALE and some do not. We hypothesized that there should be anatomical difference in ALF (arm lymphatic flow) among each individual and the difference could account for susceptibility to ALE after ALND in breast cancer surgery.

Material and methods: LINF (Lymphatic Imaging with Non radioactive Fluorescent tracer) was used for observation of ALF. A fluorescent tracer, ICG (indocyanine green) was injected intradermally in the wrists. ICG got into the lymphatics rapidly and the fluorescent image was obtained by Photo Dynamic Eye (Hamamatsu photonics, Japan). Twenty one post-operative breast cancer patients with ALND were subject to LINF and bilateral (operation side and non-operation side) ALFs of each patient were analyzed. Since bilateral ALF patterns are usually almost identical, the flow pattern of non-operation side arm was regarded as preoperative image of operation side arm. Lymphedema was graded into three categories according to the characteristic LINF images. Those are LS (lymphatic spider), LSW (lymphatic spider web), and DP (diffuse pattern). LS is a very early sign of lymphatic stagnation without symptom. As lymphedema progresses LINF image changes into LSW (slightly symptomatic) and then DP (symptomatic).

Results: LINF of non-operation side arm showed none of these abnormal images but smooth linear normal lymphatic flow toward axilla. By counting the axilla-bound flow, the ALF pattern was categorized into two types, namely, single flow type (n=6) in which just one single lymphatic flow drained into axilla and multiple flow type (n=15) in which multiple lymphatic flows drained into axilla. The background of patients of each type was not significantly different. In the single flow type patients, 33% of the contralateral operation side arm showed DP, 50% showed LS or LSW and 17% showed normal linear lymphatic flow. In the multiple flow type patients, 53% showed normal flow, 47% showed LS or LSW and there was no patient who showed DP. There was a statistical difference (p=0.0241) between the two types when Cochran-Armitage trend test was applied. In other words, patients with just a single axilla-bound flow are more susceptible to arm lymphedema after ALND.

Conclusions; Susceptibility to ALE after ALND was discussed from an anatomical point of view with the aid of LINF. By analyzing individual ALF

pattern, it may be possible to distinguish high risk group for lymphedema to whom some lymphedema preventive procedure such as axillary reverse mapping should be considered.

This study was approved by the hospital ethics committee and the informed consent was appropriately obtained from each patient.

Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest.

Scientific Symposium

Patient Reported Outcomes

7

VALUE BASED LOCOREGIONAL CANCER TREATMENT: THE ECCO VBHC PROJECT

Y. Lievens¹, A. Aggarwal², R.A. Audisio³, I. Banks⁴, L. Collette⁵, E. de Vries⁶, C. Grau⁷, R. Price⁸, O. Kathy⁹. On behalf of the ECCO VBHC project¹ *Ghent University Hospital, Radiation Oncology Department, Ghent, Belgium*; ² *King's College London, Institute of Cancer Policy, London, United Kingdom*; ³ *Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Department of Surgery, Göteborg, Sweden*; ⁴ *European Men's Health Forum, EMHF, Coleraine, United Kingdom*; ⁵ *EORTC, Independent Data Monitoring Committee, Brussels, Belgium*; ⁶ *University Medical Center Groningen, Department of Medical Oncology, Groningen, Netherlands*; ⁷ *Aarhus University Hospital, Department of Oncology, Aarhus, Denmark*; ⁸ *European CanCer Organisation, EU Affairs, Brussels, Belgium*; ⁹ *International Brain Tumour Alliance, IBTa, Tadworth, United Kingdom*

The past decade has witnessed the accelerated emergence of innovative therapeutic strategies for treating patients with cancer. However - given the exponential increase in costs of these new treatment options, together with the significant strain on national budgets to meet growing demands on health care services - the cost of oncological treatments requires careful consideration.

Estimating which extra clinical benefits might be gained from higher costs incurred (economic evaluation) has hitherto been the standard to assess the value for money of new interventions. However, the perceived primary focus on cost-shifting and cost-reduction has not necessarily reflected what matters most to patients.

A much more patient-orientated, value-based approach considers benefit derived from new treatments which focus on the best patient outcomes achieved per monetary unit spent.

This requires a comprehensive appraisal of the impact of new interventions on a whole spectrum of outcomes as valued by the patient which, in addition to survival, toxicity and quality of life, also takes into account the time and sustainability of health recovery (including social endpoints such as return to employment), while considering the costs across the entire cycle of care (financial toxicity).

Several tools, centred on systemic medications, have been developed to assess the value of innovation in oncology treatments including: the ESMO (European Society for Medical Oncology) Magnitude of Clinical Benefit Scale (ESMO-MCBS), NCCN (National Comprehensive Cancer Network) Evidence Blocks and the ASCO (American Society of Clinical Oncology) Value Framework. There is currently far less attention paid to the value of non-pharmaceutical innovations.

Under the umbrella of the European CanCer Organisation (ECCO) and together with other European stakeholders in oncology and patient advocacy organisations, a project has been initiated to address this imbalance - the ECCO Value-Based Health Care Project (VBHC). The purpose is to evaluate ways in which policymakers may consider access and value more broadly across the entire cancer care spectrum. Existing value frameworks are primarily designed for the pharmaceutical market. The ECCO project will specifically consider locoregional treatments (radiotherapy, surgery, interventional radiology). Outcomes will be weighted and the potential to develop a value framework for non-pharmaceutical innovations will be considered.

The current status of the ECCO project will be presented and discussed, with the ultimate aim to come to a harmonized approach to value-based health care across the different oncologic disciplines.

Conflict of interest: No conflict of interest.