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Background

• Hypofractionated (HF) radiation therapy (RT), which is a shorter course of RT with a larger dose at each treatment, was found to be similar in disease free survival compared to longer course of RT.
  • In 1092 analyzable men with low-risk PrCa, 70 Gy in 28 fxs over 5.6 wks is non-inferior to 73.8 Gy in 41 fxs over 8.2 wks (DFS HR=0.85, 95% CI: 0.64, 1.14)

• However, there was some concern that HF arm had slight increase over the conventional fraction (CF) arm in late grade 2 (mild) clinician reported adverse events
  • GI adverse events  HF arm  18%  vs  CF arm 11%    p=0.002
  • GU adverse events  HF arm  26%  vs  CF arm 20.5%   p=0.06
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• The purpose of this study was to assess difference in patient reported outcomes between arms
Method

Expanded Prostate Index Composite (EPIC) used to measure health related quality of life and symptoms

• 50 item patient reported outcomes (PRO) questionnaire measured on a Likert scale (e.g. 0- no problem up to 4- big problem):
  • Responses transformed to 0-100
  • Higher scores indicating better HRQoL

• EPIC has 4 domains:
  • bowel
  • sexual
  • urinary
  • hormonal

• Measured at baseline, 6 and 12 months
Results: EPIC PRO at 1 year

- Hormonal scores had no change from baseline in either arm.
- Sexual function had a large similar decline on both arms of about 15 points on the CF arm and 11 points on the HF arm but these changes were not significantly different.
- Urinary scores exhibited almost no decline from baseline in both arms: 0 points for CF and 2 points for HF and these changes were not significantly different between arms.
- Bowel scores exhibited a small decline from baseline in both arms: 0 points for CF and 2 points for HF and these changes were not significantly different between arms.
- As compared with CF, pts treated with HF had a statistically larger decline in bowel scores, however this change was not deemed clinically significant – meaning the patients could not tell the difference in bowel changes between the shorter HF arm and the longer CF arm.
Our findings are similar to studies of bowel and bladder function in men without cancer and me treated with even shorter courses of RT.
Conclusions

• Patient reported outcomes are comparable between arms, supporting value based care with HF for low risk prostate cancer

• There is now a significant body of evidence showing that men can safely be treated with shorter course radiation for low risk prostate cancer, which can save men 2 and one half weeks of treatment (from 8.2 weeks to 5.6 weeks)

• These 2½ weeks of treatment that are no longer needed save on cost, inconvenience, time lost from work or time having to get a ride to treatment

• These results are now ready for consideration for changing RT practice guidelines for men with low risk prostate cancer
Question – is this data practice changing?

**Strategies for the mgmt of low risk prostate cancer**

- **Active surveillance / watchful waiting**
- **3-D/IMRT external beam radiation 74–78 Gy**
  - Note: This is the preferred treatment method.
  - The use of $^{60}$Co for EBRT in this setting is not recommended
- **LDR brachytherapy**
  - Note: Not preferred due to difficulties with source procurement
- **Investigational:**
  - HDR brachytherapy monotherapy
  - Hypofractionated EBRT