

早期左乳腺癌保乳术后仰卧位和俯卧位照射的剂量学及放射损伤的比较

《现代肿瘤医学》[ISSN:1672-4992/CN:61-1415/R] 期数: 2019年04期 页码: 650-653 栏目: 论著(放射治疗) 出版日期: 2019-01-08

Title: Comparison of dosimetry and radiation injury of the supine position and prone position in early left-breast cancer after breast conserving surgery

作者: 黄维; 马珺; 于大海; 宋威; 黄腾

江苏省中医院放疗科, 江苏南京 210000

Author(s): Huang Wei; Ma Jun; Yu Dahai; Song Wei; Huang Teng

Radiotherapy Department of Jiangsu Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Jiangsu Nanjing 210000, China.

关键词: 乳腺癌; 保乳术; 仰卧位; 俯卧位; 放射损伤

Keywords: breast cancer; breast conserving surgery; supine position; prone position; radiation injury

分类号: R737.9

DOI: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-4992.2019.04.027

文献标识码: A

摘要: 目的: 通过比较早期左乳腺癌保乳术后仰卧位和俯卧位两种不同体位的调强治疗计划中危及器官的剂量学及急性放射损伤方面的差异性, 为临床选择合适的体位固定方式提供依据。方法: 选取2015年01月至2017年12月江苏省中医院收治的36例早期左乳腺癌保乳术后的患者, 其中18例进行俯卧位固定方式的调强放疗, 18例进行仰卧位固定方式的调强放疗, 全乳房剂量为50 Gy/25 f, 2 Gy/f, 5 f/w。后对疤痕周围2 cm给予6 MeV电子线加量10 Gy/2.0 Gy/5次, 5次/周。分别评估仰卧位及俯卧位两种治疗体位的计划中危及器官的剂量及急性放射性损伤的差异性, 并对两组进行随访评估生存。结果: 俯卧位组左肺Dmean (721.5 ± 11.6) cGy, V5 (20.4 ± 1.4) %, V20 (15.3 ± 6.5) %, 心脏平均剂量Dmean (468.6 ± 60.4) cGy, V30 (7.4 ± 5.6) %; 仰卧位组左肺Dmean (632.4 ± 38.6) cGy, V5 (35.5 ± 1.3) %, V20 (21.2 ± 7.9) %, 心脏平均剂量Dmean (532.2 ± 17.9) cGy, V30 (9.1 ± 2.3) %。两组比较有统计学差异 ($P < 0.05$), 且俯卧位组左肺 Dmean、V5、V20, 心脏平均剂量Dmean、V30优于仰卧位组。仰卧位及俯卧位组的术后2年局部复发率分别为5.6% (1/18), 0% (0/18), 无一例出现远处转移, 无瘤生存率分别为94.4%、100%, 2年生存率都为100%。两组无明显统计学差异 ($P > 0.05$)。放射损伤方面, 两组均未出现肺及心脏的急性放射性损伤, 皮肤反应方面, 均为1级皮肤反应, 无一例出现2级及2级以上的皮肤损伤。俯卧位组及仰卧位组的皮肤损伤无明显差异。结论: 相比于仰卧位放疗, 在不减低生存的情况下, 俯卧位放疗对肺及心脏保护得更好, 且对皮肤的保护不劣于仰卧位组。

Abstract: Objective: By comparing the differences in the dosimetry and radiation injuries of two different positions in the treatment plan of supine position and prone position in the early left-breast (L-breast) cancer after breast conserving surgery, to provide the basis for the clinical selection of suitable postural fixation. Methods: A total of 36 patients with early left breast cancer receiving breast conserving surgery, were selected, including 18 patients with supine radiotherapy and 18 patients with prone radiotherapy. The radiotherapy plans were all breast doses 50 Gy/25 f, 2 Gy/f, 5 f/w, and the sequential boost doses 10 Gy/5 f, 2 Gy/f, 5 f/w. To assess the difference between the dose of organs at risk and the radiation injury with different position. Results: The following indicators compared the two groups were statistically significant ($P < 0.05$): Left lung Dmean, V5, V20, heart Dmean, V30. Left lung Dmean (721.5 ± 11.6) cGy, V5 (20.4 ± 1.4) %, V20 (15.3 ± 6.5) %, heart Dmean (468.6 ± 60.4) cGy, V30 (7.4 ± 5.6) % in prone group. Left lung Dmean (632.4 ± 38.6) cGy, V5 (35.5 ± 1.3) %, V20 (21.2 ± 7.9) %, heart Dmean (532.2 ± 17.9) cGy, V30 (9.1 ± 2.3) % in supine group. In the two groups, 2-year local recurrence rates were 5.6% (1/18) and 0% (0/18) respectively, no distant metastasis was found. The local control rate were 94.4% and 100%, the 2-year survival rate was 100%. There was no statistically significant difference between the two groups ($P > 0.05$). In the aspect of radiation injury, in both groups there was no acute radiation injury of the lung and heart, and the skin reaction was all 1 stage skin

reaction, there was no skin reaction of level 2 or above. There was no significant difference between the skin reaction of the prone and supine groups. Conclusion: Compared to the supine radiotherapy, prone position radiotherapy is better for the protection of left lung and heart, and the skin damage is not inferior to the supine group in the absence of reduced survival.

参考文献/REFERENCES

- [1] Chen Wanqing, Zheng Rongshou, Baade Peter D, et al. Cancer statistic in China, 2015 [J]. CA Cancer J Clin, 2016, 2(66):115-132.
- [2] Darby S, McGale P, Correa C, et al. Effect of radiotherapy after breast-conserving surgery on 10-year recurrence and 15-year breast cancer death: meta-analysis of individual patient data for 10,801 women in 17 randomised trials [J]. Lancet, 2011, 378(9804):1707-1716.
- [3] Chen WJ, Di XX, Wang BB, et al. Dosimetric comparison of two common inverse intensity modulated radiotherapy of breast cancer [J]. Chinese J Med Physics, 2010, 27(5):2100-2104.
- [4] Bergom C, Currey A, Desai N, et al. Deep inspiration breath hold: Techniques and advantages for cardiac sparing during breast cancer irradiation [J]. Frontiers Oncol, 2018, 8:87.
- [5] Mahe MA, Classe JM, Dravet F, et al. Preliminary results for prone position breast irradiation [J]. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2002, 52(1):156 - 160.
- [6] Bert Boute, Wilfried De Neve, Bruno Speleers, et al. Potential benefits of crawl position for prone radiation therapy in breast cancer [J]. J Applied Clin Med Physics, 2017(4):200-205.
- [7] Bartlett FR, Colgan RM, Donovan EM, et al. The UK HeartSpare Study (Stage Ib): Randomised comparison of a voluntary breath-hold technique and prone radiotherapy after breast conserving surgery [J]. Radiother Oncol, 2015, 114(1):66-72.
- [8] Lakosi F, Gulyban A, Janvary L, et al. Respiratory motion, anterior heart displacement and heart dosimetry: Comparison between prone (Pr) and supine (Su) whole breast irradiation [J]. Pathol Oncol Res, 2015, 21(4):1051-1058.
- [9] Chen JL, Cheng JC, Kuo SH, et al. Prone breast forward intensity-modulated radiotherapy for Asian women with early left breast cancer: factors for cardiac sparing and clinical outcomes [J]. J Radiat Res, 2013, 54(5):899-908.
- [10] Liu Xuhong, Chen Xiao, Ai Yiqin, et al. Dosimetric comparison and analysis of supine position and prone position in intensity-modulated radiotherapy plan for early left-breast cancer after breast conserving surgery [J]. Chinese J Med Physics, 2015, 32(5):737-741. [刘旭红, 陈晓, 艾毅钦, 等. 早期左乳腺癌保乳术后仰卧位和俯卧位照射剂量学比较与分析 [J]. 中国医学物理学杂志, 2015, 32 (5) :737-741.]
- [11] Ng J, Shuryak I, Xu Y, et al. Predicting the risk of secondary lung malignancies associated with whole-breast radiation therapy [J]. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2012, 83(4):1101-1106.
- [12] De Langhe S, Mulliez T, Veldeman L, et al. Factors modifying the risk for developing acute skin toxicity after whole-breast intensity modulated radiotherapy [J]. BMC Cancer, 2014, 25(14):711-717.
- [13] Osa EO, DeWynghaert K, Roses D, et al. Prone breast intensity modulated radiation therapy: 5-year results [J]. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2014, 89(4):899-906.
- [14] Min C, Connolly E, Chen T, et al. Hypofractionated radiation therapy for early stage breast cancer: outcomes, toxicities, and cost analysis [J]. Breast J, 2014, 20(3):267-273.
- [15] Veldeman L, Schiettecatte K, De Sutter C, et al. The 2-year cosmetic outcome of a randomized trial comparing prone and supine whole breast irradiation in large-breasted women [J]. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2016, 95(4):1210-1217.
- [16] Kirby AM, Evans PM, Donovan EM, et al. Prone versus supine positioning for whole and partial-breast radiotherapy: a comparison of non-target tissue dosimetry [J]. Radiother Oncol, 2010, 96(2):178-184.

备注/Memo: National Natural Science Foundation of China(No.81703758);国家自然科学基金 (编号: 81703758)

更新日期/Last Update: 1900-01-01