

# Current Breast Cancer Reports

## De-Escalating Surgery Among Patients with HER2+ and Triple Negative Breast Cancer --Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	
<b>Full Title:</b>	De-Escalating Surgery Among Patients with HER2+ and Triple Negative Breast Cancer
<b>Article Type:</b>	Review
<b>Section/Category:</b>	Breast Cancer Management During the COVID-19 Pandemic
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Marios Konstantinos Tasoulis, M.D., Ph.D., FEBS, CEBS, MFSTEd, FRCS Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust London, London UNITED KINGDOM
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>	
<b>First Author:</b>	Marios Konstantinos Tasoulis, M.D., Ph.D., FEBS, CEBS, MFSTEd, FRCS
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Marios Konstantinos Tasoulis, M.D., Ph.D., FEBS, CEBS, MFSTEd, FRCS Joerg Heil Henry Kuerer
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>	
<b>Funding Information:</b>	
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Purpose of the review: De-escalation of surgery has been central in the evolution of multidisciplinary management of breast cancer. Advances in oncology and increasing use of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT) have opened opportunities for further surgical de-escalation especially for HER2+ and triple negative (TN) disease. The aim of this review is to discuss the recent data on de-escalation of surgery as well as the future directions.</p> <p>Recent findings: Patients with TN and HER2+ breast cancer with excellent response to NACT would be the ideal candidates for surgical de-escalation. Post-NACT image-guided biopsy, potentially combined with machine learning algorithms, may accurately identify patients achieving pathologic complete response that would be eligible for clinical trials assessing safety of omission of breast and axillary surgery.</p> <p>Summary: Multidisciplinary research is required to further support results of preliminary studies. Current data point towards a future when even less or no surgery may be required for exceptional responders.</p>

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1

1  
2  
3  
4 **Title page**  
5

6  
7 **Title:** De-Escalating Surgery Among Patients with HER2+ and Triple Negative Breast Cancer  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 **Authors**  
15

16  
17 Marios-Konstantinos Tasoulis MD<sup>1,2</sup>, Joerg Heil MD<sup>3</sup>, Henry M Kuerer MD<sup>4</sup>  
18  
19

20  
21 <sup>1</sup> Breast Surgery Unit, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, SW3 6JJ, UK  
22

23 <sup>2</sup> Division of Breast Cancer Research, The Institute of Cancer Research, Old Brompton Road,  
24  
25 London, SW7 3RP, UK  
26  
27

28 <sup>3</sup> University Breast Unit, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Heidelberg University  
29  
30 Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany  
31  
32

33 <sup>4</sup> Department of Breast Surgical Oncology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center,  
34  
35 Houston, Texas, USA  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 **Corresponding author**  
46

47  
48 Mr Marios Konstantinos Tasoulis, MD, PhD, FEBS, CEBS, MFSTEd, FRCS  
49  
50

51  
52 Consultant Breast Surgeon  
53  
54

55 Breast Surgery Unit, The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust  
56  
57

58 Fulham Road, London, SW3 6JJ, UK  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Email: marios.tasoulis@rmh.nhs.uk  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Keywords**  
11

12  
13  
14 Surgical de-escalation; breast surgery; triple negative; HER2 positive; breast cancer  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Abstract

**Purpose of the review:** De-escalation of surgery has been central in the evolution of multidisciplinary management of breast cancer. Advances in oncology and increasing use of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT) have opened opportunities for further surgical de-escalation especially for HER2+ and triple negative (TN) disease. The aim of this review is to discuss the recent data on de-escalation of surgery as well as the future directions.

**Recent findings:** Patients with TN and HER2+ breast cancer with excellent response to NACT would be the ideal candidates for surgical de-escalation. Post-NACT image-guided biopsy, potentially combined with machine learning algorithms, may accurately identify patients achieving pathologic complete response that would be eligible for clinical trials assessing safety of omission of breast and axillary surgery.

**Summary:** Multidisciplinary research is required to further support results of preliminary studies. Current data point towards a future when even less or no surgery may be required for exceptional responders.

## Introduction

Breast cancer management has evolved significantly over the past decades towards less aggressive, tailored treatments. From the seminal clinical trials led by the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP) and the Milan Groups establishing the role of breast conserving surgery (1, 2); to the adoption of sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) for the staging of the axilla (3, 4), and the omission of axillary lymph node dissection (ALND) in selected patients even in the presence of low burden axillary disease (5, 6), de-escalation of surgery has played central role within this paradigm shift.

Multidisciplinary working, advances in radiotherapy and especially in systemic therapy and its use in the neoadjuvant setting, have been pivotal in the successful implementation of surgical de-escalation. Within this context of modern multidisciplinary management of breast cancer, the use of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT) is increasing (7). Historically, NACT was used for advanced disease stage at presentation, to convert inoperable cancers to operable. However, the observed increase in NACT utilization has been greatest in patients with triple negative (TN) and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) positive cancers (8). In these subgroups, NACT is now considered standard of care even in early, operable disease as it may provide significant prognostic information to allow tailored adjuvant treatment decision-making (9, 10). In addition, a significant proportion of patients with these breast cancer subtypes may get an excellent tumor response to NACT. Advances in chemotherapy, targeted therapies and the introduction of immunotherapy have resulted in pathologic complete response (pCR) rates exceeding 60% (11-14). This has created an opportunity for further surgical de-escalation in patients with TN and HER2 positive breast cancer.

## De-escalation of breast surgery

The idea to de-escalate surgery in patients treated with NACT is not new. Historically, there have been attempts to omit surgery, but these led to high rates of loco-regional recurrence (LRR) (15). However, these early studies were performed more than 20 years ago, in an era when multidisciplinary management of breast cancer was not as developed. In addition, the observed LRR for both patients treated with surgery and those who only had radiotherapy would be considered high for modern standards. It is also important to note that in these studies, clinical examination was the only modality used to assess response to NACT and patient selection and treatment was not based on breast cancer subtype.

Despite these caveats and limitations, omission of surgery may not result in worse oncological outcomes. In an early study by Ring et al (16), patients who achieved a complete clinical response to NACT did not have surgery and went straight to radiotherapy. This group had higher LRR compared to patients treated with surgery, although not statistically significant, but there was no difference in disease free survival (DFS) and overall survival (OS). In a more recent study looking into data from the National Cancer Database, there was no difference in OS between patients with complete clinical response who did not have surgery and those who underwent surgery and were found to have pCR. In the same study no OS differences were observed in patients receiving radiotherapy but no surgery and patients undergoing both surgery and radiotherapy (17). Another retrospective study showed that omission of surgery in patients with complete clinical response to NACT was not associated with worse DFS and OS (18). These findings highlight that surgical de-escalation in the breast, may be feasible especially in patients who are most likely to be excellent responders to NACT.

1  
2  
3  
4 In this context, breast cancer subtype is of paramount importance for patient selection. Patients  
5  
6 with TN and HER2 positive disease have been shown to get the highest rates of pCR (11-14, 19).  
7  
8 However, even if pCR is not achieved, a proportion of patients will have low residual disease  
9  
10 burden potentially allowing sufficient local control with radiotherapy only. This approach could  
11  
12 be paralleled to the management of patients with occult breast primary, when surgery has not  
13  
14 been shown to confer OS benefit compared to radiotherapy (20).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 Based on these observations, patients with TN and HER2 positive breast cancers, demonstrating  
21  
22 excellent response to NACT would be the ideal candidates for surgical de-escalation. The  
23  
24 challenge is how these excellent responders can be accurately identified prior to surgery.  
25  
26 Published data has consistently shown that imaging modalities alone cannot reliably predict pCR  
27  
28 (15). However, image-guided breast biopsy has demonstrated promising accuracy to identify  
29  
30 residual disease. Several international groups have been working on the assessment of image-  
31  
32 guided biopsy as a tool to select exceptional responders. However, the reported results are  
33  
34 conflicting.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 The German group in one of the first reports in the field, showed that image-guided vacuum  
42  
43 assisted biopsy (VAB) was associated with a false negative rate (FNR) for residual disease of 28.6%  
44  
45 and 16.7% for TN and HER2 positive cancers respectively. However, when the VAB was  
46  
47 considered representative (presence of tumor or tumor bed in histopathological examination)  
48  
49 the performance of the technique improved with a FNR of 4.8% for the whole cohort (21). Similar  
50  
51 results were reported in the prospective, multi-center RESPONDER trial. Subgroup analysis for  
52  
53 TN and HER2 positive cancers showed a FNR of 17% and 25% respectively. However, when a large  
54  
55 bore VAB needle (7G) was used no residual cancers were missed (FNR 0%) •(22). On recent  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 further analysis of the same data, age and presence of DCIS were found to be associated with the  
5  
6  
7 FNR. In a selected sub-cohort of patients with unicentric disease, not associated with DCIS and a  
8  
9  
10 representative VAB, the FNR was 2.9% (23).

11  
12 The group from South Korea has demonstrated that post-NACT image-guided biopsy was  
13  
14  
15 associated with a FNR ranging from 25% to 40% for core biopsy and VAB respectively. Specifically  
16  
17  
18 in patients with TN or HER2 positive cancer, the negative predictive value (NPV) of image-guided  
19  
20  
21 biopsy ranged between 83.3% and 87.5%. However, in selected patients having at least 5 cores  
22  
23  
24 and very good response on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), the FNR was 0% (24).

25  
26 In the UK, post-NACT image-guided biopsy has been used by groups at Birmingham and The Royal  
27  
28  
29 Marsden Hospital. The NOSTRA PRELIM study using ultrasound-guided core biopsy correctly  
30  
31  
32 identified residual disease in 80% of patients (25). A retrospective analysis from the Royal  
33  
34  
35 Marsden Hospital showed that image-guided VAB was associated with a FNR of 0% for TN and  
36  
37  
38 25% for HER2 positive breast cancer (26). Following these results, a standardized assessment  
39  
40  
41 protocol was adopted. This included patients with TN or HER2 positive, unifocal breast cancer,  
42  
43  
44 with residual imaging abnormality  $\leq 2$  cm who had a VAB to sample at least 90% of the breast  
45  
46  
47 residuum. The preliminary results of this prospective cohort demonstrated a FNR of 9.1% (27)  
48  
49  
50 while further ongoing analysis (anecdotal) has shown a FNR of 5%.

51  
52 The group at MD Anderson Cancer Center assessed the use of image-guided breast biopsy in a  
53  
54  
55 prospective feasibility clinical trial including only patients with TN and HER2 positive disease. The  
56  
57  
58 combination of fine needle aspiration (FNA) and a median of 12, 9G needle VAB cores resulted in  
59  
60  
61 a FNR of 5% (28).

62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 However, there are also studies that have reported negative results. The MICRA study from the  
5  
6 Netherlands used ultrasound-guided core biopsy in patients with MRI radiologic complete  
7  
8 response or residual enhancement measuring up to 2 cm. The patients had a maximum of 8 14G  
9  
10 cores and this was associated with an overall FNR of 37%. Specifically for TN cancers the FNR was  
11  
12 55% and for HER2 positive ranged between 29% and 71% for hormone receptor (HR) positive /  
13  
14 HER2 positive and HR negative / HER2 positive disease respectively (29). It should be noted that  
15  
16 although breast MRI was utilized, the actual biopsy procedure was done in the operating room  
17  
18 directed by intraoperative ultrasound which is not optimal for image-guided biopsy. These  
19  
20 findings may be, to a certain extent, also explained by the use of non-VAB 14G needle for the  
21  
22 core biopsy which yields significantly less tissue and therefore may result in inadequate sampling  
23  
24 of the breast residuum / tumor bed thus missing residual disease.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 Finally, the study from the NRG group in the USA, showed a similarly high FNR of approximately  
34  
35 50%. Specifically for TN cancer the FNR was 63.6% and for HER2 positive disease 40% (30).  
36  
37 However, the full report including the actual selection of patients for unicentric disease, tumor  
38  
39 size, number of VAB cores removed, use of appropriate image-guidance, removal of the initial  
40  
41 biopsy clip, in the study is not yet available. These are critical parameters necessary for super  
42  
43 selectivity in this emerging field of eliminating surgery after NACT.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Careful patient selection and the image-guided biopsy modality used may play important role in  
51  
52 the accuracy of this diagnostic approach. A study from Memorial Sloan Kettering, assessed the  
53  
54 use of MRI-guided VAB in patients with radiologic complete response and showed that 7-12 9 G  
55  
56 vacuum cores resulted in FNR ranging from 14% to 25%. This was depending on the definition  
57  
58 used for pCR. If this was defined as no residual disease including invasive cancer and DCIS the  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 FNR was 25%, while when pCR was defined as no residual invasive disease the FNR was 14.2%  
5  
6  
7 (31). An analysis from MD Anderson Cancer Center showed that stereo-guided compared to  
8  
9 ultrasound-guided VAB was associated with the ability to retrieve more cores and had a higher  
10  
11 positive predictive value for residual disease, therefore recommending this modality as the  
12  
13 preferred method for identification of patients with pCR for trials testing the safety of omission  
14  
15 of surgery (32).  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 A multi-center pooled analysis of patient level data, reported an overall FNR of image-guided  
21  
22 breast biopsy of 18.7% across all tumor subtypes and biopsy techniques. However, exploratory  
23  
24 subgroup analysis showed that use of a standardized protocol to retrieve  $\geq 6$  representative VABs  
25  
26 of a residual imaging abnormality measuring  $\leq 2$  cm, could reliably predict residual TN or HER2  
27  
28 positive cancer with a FNR of 4.2% •(33).  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Recently, the use of a machine learning algorithm to analyze patient, imaging, tumor and VAB  
35  
36 characteristics has shown excellent results to identify pCR with a FNR of 0% •(34, 35) suggesting  
37  
38 that this “intelligent VAB” may be an additional tool in the diagnostic armamentarium to reliably  
39  
40 identify patients with TN and HER2 positive breast cancer that would be suitable for surgical de-  
41  
42 escalation. However, the wider applicability of this modality in the everyday clinical practice is  
43  
44 yet to be determined.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 Although the aforementioned results on the use of post-NACT image-guided breast biopsy are  
51  
52 encouraging, there may be some skepticism around omission of surgery and the potential  
53  
54 implications of missing any residual disease. Especially for patients with TN and HER2 positive  
55  
56 breast cancer, this could potentially affect adjuvant treatment decision making and the use or  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 not of capecitabine (10) or trastuzumab emtansine (9) respectively. It should be noted though,  
5  
6 that low volume residual disease in the breast may still be missed even with surgery. Especially  
7  
8 since modern practice has moved away from removing the original footprint of the disease  
9  
10 towards a more “risk-adapted” approach (36) to resect the area of the residual imaging  
11  
12 abnormality or the area around the pre-NACT inserted marker clip in case of radiologic complete  
13  
14 response. When performing post-NACT image-guided biopsy, appropriate patient selection,  
15  
16 image-guidance, adequate sampling of the breast residuum and meticulous and extensive  
17  
18 processing and histopathological examination of the specimens are of paramount importance to  
19  
20 reduce the risk of not identifying residual disease.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Elimination of surgery in excellent responders, as demonstrated by pCR on post-NACT image-  
29  
30 guided biopsy is currently being tested in a clinical trial at MD Anderson Cancer Center  
31  
32 (NCT02945579) (37). Preliminary analysis of the results, presented at the American Society of  
33  
34 Breast Surgeons 23<sup>rd</sup> Annual Meeting (2022) showed an early ipsilateral breast recurrence-free  
35  
36 survival of 100%. Outside the context of clinical trial, a small cohort of patients at the Royal  
37  
38 Marsden Hospital (n=8) with excellent response to NACT and pCR on post-treatment image-  
39  
40 guided biopsy decided not to undergo surgery and proceed to radiotherapy, while continuing  
41  
42 systemic therapy as indicated as per standard of care. At a median follow-up of 32.5 months the  
43  
44 are no LR recurrences (38).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

### 52 **De-escalation of axillary surgery**

53  
54

55 Axillary surgery has been the topic of extensive research for more than 50 years. Its role as a  
56  
57 therapeutic procedure had already been challenged since the NSABP-B04 trial (39). This showed  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 no difference in oncological outcomes in the group of patients not having axillary surgery leading  
5  
6  
7 to the hypothesis that leaving positive nodes behind might not have an impact on oncological  
8  
9  
10 outcomes, especially in the modern era of multidisciplinary management of breast cancer with  
11  
12 the routine use of systemic therapies with or without radiotherapy.  
13

14  
15 With the increasing use of NACT, especially for TN and HER2 positive breast cancer, further de-  
16  
17  
18 escalation of axillary surgery in these patients should be considered. There is increasing data  
19  
20  
21 supporting de-escalation from ALND to SLNB and targeted axillary dissection (TAD) for clinically  
22  
23  
24 node positive (cN+) patients converting to clinically node negative (cN0) after NACT. Following  
25  
26  
27 the seminal clinical trials showing feasibility of SLNB if  $\geq 3$  lymph nodes are removed, with an  
28  
29  
30 associated FNR  $< 10\%$  (40-43), clipping of the biopsy proven metastatic axillary lymph node and  
31  
32  
33 TAD has further supported the shift away from ALND for these patients. Targeted axillary  
34  
35  
36 dissection has been shown to be associated with a FNR between 2% to 4.3% (44-47) and is now  
37  
38  
39 included as recommendation in the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) and  
40  
41  
42 American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) guidelines (48, 49). If patients are found to have  
43  
44  
45 positive axillary lymph nodes on SLNB / TAD, the standard of care is to proceed with ALND.  
46  
47  
48 However, this might be avoided, depending on the results of the ongoing ALLIANCE A011202  
49  
50  
51 clinical trial (NCT01901094) (50) looking into axillary radiotherapy instead of ALND for the  
52  
53  
54 management of residual disease on SLNB.  
55

56  
57  
58 The next important question is whether there is scope for further surgical de-escalation in  
59  
60  
61 patients who are cN0 at diagnosis and receive NACT. There is data showing that especially in  
62  
63  
64 patients with TN and HER2 positive cancers, which are the subtypes with the highest pCR rates,  
65  
66  
67 those who were cN0 at diagnosis and achieved a pCR in the breast had a very low risk of nodal

1  
2  
3  
4 disease. In the study by Tadros et al, among patients with TN and HER2 positive breast cancer  
5  
6  
7 who achieved a pCR in the breast no disease was identified in the axillary lymph nodes (51).  
8  
9  
10 Similar results, of low risk of nodal positivity have also been shown in other reports (52, 53). In  
11  
12 the largest of these studies by Barron et al, using the National Cancer Database and analyzing  
13  
14 data from over 13,000 patients, the risk of nodal disease in patients with TN and HER2 positive  
15  
16 cancer achieving pCR in the breast was 1.6% (54). This risk is very low, and similar to the FNR of  
17  
18 SLNB. It is therefore important to consider if SLNB can be omitted in patients with these cancer  
19  
20 subtypes if they get breast pCR.  
21  
22  
23  
24

25  
26 A number of studies are being set up to assess the safety of omitting SLNB in patients with TN  
27  
28 and HER2 positive breast cancer treated with NACT. The EUBREAST-01 is a prospective, single-  
29  
30 arm study of patients with complete radiological response on NACT, who will undergo breast  
31  
32 surgery and if pCR is confirmed they will not have axillary surgery (55). Another prospective,  
33  
34 single-arm trial (NCT04225858) is being set up in the Netherlands, omitting SLNB in patients with  
35  
36 TN and HER2 positive breast cancer who achieve complete radiological response on post-NACT  
37  
38 MRI (56). Finally, as mentioned above, utilizing post-NACT image-guided VAB to select  
39  
40 exceptional responders to NACT, an ongoing clinical trial at the MD Anderson Cancer Center is  
41  
42 investigating the safety of elimination of breast and axillary surgery and the preliminary analysis  
43  
44 has shown promising results (NCT02945579) (37).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

## 51 52 **Conclusions**

53  
54  
55 Surgical de-escalation has been central in the multidisciplinary management of breast cancer,  
56  
57  
58 towards tailored, less aggressive treatments. Improved understanding of the importance of  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 tumor biology and increasing use of NACT in combination with advances in medical and radiation  
5  
6  
7 oncology have opened new, exciting opportunities to further de-escalate breast and axillary  
8  
9  
10 surgery in patients with TN and HER2 positive breast cancer. Multidisciplinary research in this  
11  
12 field is pointing towards a future when even less or no surgery may be required for exceptional  
13  
14 responders.  
15  
16  
17

## 18 **Compliance with Ethics Guidelines**

### 20 **Conflict of Interest**

21 Marios-Konstantinos Tasoulis, Joerg Heil, and Henry M. Kuerer declare that they have no  
22 conflict of interest  
23  
24

### 25 **Human and Animal Rights and Informed Consent**

26 This article does not contain any studies with human or animal subjects performed by any of the  
27 authors.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

## 35 **References**

- 36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 1. Veronesi U, Cascinelli N, Mariani L, Greco M, Saccozzi R, Luini A, et al. Twenty-year follow-  
42  
43 up of a randomized study comparing breast-conserving surgery with radical mastectomy for early  
44  
45 breast cancer. The New England journal of medicine. 2002;347(16):1227-32.  
46  
47  
48 2. Fisher B, Anderson S, Bryant J, Margolese RG, Deutsch M, Fisher ER, et al. Twenty-Year  
49  
50 Follow-up of a Randomized Trial Comparing Total Mastectomy, Lumpectomy, and Lumpectomy  
51  
52 plus Irradiation for the Treatment of Invasive Breast Cancer. New England Journal of Medicine.  
53  
54  
55 2002;347(16):1233-41.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 3. Krag DN, Anderson SJ, Julian TB, Brown AM, Harlow SP, Costantino JP, et al. Sentinel-  
5  
6 lymph-node resection compared with conventional axillary-lymph-node dissection in clinically  
7  
8 node-negative patients with breast cancer: overall survival findings from the NSABP B-32  
9  
10 randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2010;11(10):927-33.  
11  
12
- 13  
14 4. Mansel RE, Fallowfield L, Kissin M, Goyal A, Newcombe RG, Dixon JM, et al. Randomized  
15  
16 Multicenter Trial of Sentinel Node Biopsy Versus Standard Axillary Treatment in Operable Breast  
17  
18 Cancer: The ALMANAC Trial. *JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute.* 2006;98(9):599-609.  
19  
20
- 21  
22 5. Giuliano AE, Ballman KV, McCall L, Beitsch PD, Brennan MB, Kelemen PR, et al. Effect of  
23  
24 Axillary Dissection vs No Axillary Dissection on 10-Year Overall Survival Among Women With  
25  
26 Invasive Breast Cancer and Sentinel Node Metastasis: The ACOSOG Z0011 (Alliance) Randomized  
27  
28 Clinical Trial. *JAMA.* 2017;318(10):918-26.  
29  
30
- 31  
32 6. Donker M, van Tienhoven G, Straver ME, Meijnen P, van de Velde CJH, Mansel RE, et al.  
33  
34 Radiotherapy or surgery of the axilla after a positive sentinel node in breast cancer (EORTC  
35  
36 10981-22023 AMAROS): a randomised, multicentre, open-label, phase 3 non-inferiority trial. *The*  
37  
38 *Lancet Oncology.* 2014;15(12):1303-10.  
39  
40
- 41  
42 7. Killelea BK, Yang VQ, Mougalian S, Horowitz NR, Pusztai L, Chagpar AB, et al. Neoadjuvant  
43  
44 chemotherapy for breast cancer increases the rate of breast conservation: results from the  
45  
46 National Cancer Database. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons.* 2015;220(6):1063-9.  
47  
48
- 49  
50 8. Murphy BL, Day CN, Hoskin TL, Habermann EB, Boughey JC. Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy  
51  
52 Use in Breast Cancer is Greatest in Excellent Responders: Triple-Negative and HER2+ Subtypes.  
53  
54  
55  
56 *Annals of surgical oncology.* 2018;25(8):2241-8.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 9. • von Minckwitz G, Huang C-S, Mano MS, Loibl S, Mamounas EP, Untch M, et al.  
5  
6  
7 Trastuzumab Emtansine for Residual Invasive HER2-Positive Breast Cancer. *New England Journal*  
8  
9  
10 of Medicine. 2018;380(7):617-28.
- 11  
12 10. • Masuda N, Lee S-J, Ohtani S, Im Y-H, Lee E-S, Yokota I, et al. Adjuvant Capecitabine for  
13  
14 Breast Cancer after Preoperative Chemotherapy. *New England Journal of Medicine*.  
15  
16  
17 2017;376(22):2147-59.
- 18  
19  
20 11. Sikov WM, Berry DA, Perou CM, Singh B, Cirrincione CT, Tolaney SM, et al. Impact of the  
21  
22 addition of carboplatin and/or bevacizumab to neoadjuvant once-per-week paclitaxel followed  
23  
24 by dose-dense doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide on pathologic complete response rates in  
25  
26 stage II to III triple-negative breast cancer: CALGB 40603 (Alliance). *Journal of clinical oncology :*  
27  
28 official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology. 2015;33(1):13-21.
- 29  
30  
31  
32 12. Schneeweiss A, Chia S, Hickish T, Harvey V, Eniu A, Hegg R, et al. Pertuzumab plus  
33  
34  
35 trastuzumab in combination with standard neoadjuvant anthracycline-containing and  
36  
37 anthracycline-free chemotherapy regimens in patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer: a  
38  
39 randomized phase II cardiac safety study (TRYPHAENA). *Annals of oncology : official journal of*  
40  
41 the European Society for Medical Oncology. 2013;24(9):2278-84.
- 42  
43  
44  
45 13. van Ramshorst MS, van der Voort A, van Werkhoven ED, Mandjes IA, Kemper I, Dezentjé  
46  
47  
48 VO, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with or without anthracyclines in the presence of dual  
49  
50  
51 HER2 blockade for HER2-positive breast cancer (TRAIN-2): a multicentre, open-label, randomised,  
52  
53  
54 phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2018;19(12):1630-40.
- 55  
56  
57 14. Schmid P, Cortes J, Pusztai L, McArthur H, Kümmel S, Bergh J, et al. Pembrolizumab for  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65 Early Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2020;382(9):810-21.



- 1  
2  
3  
4 15. van la Parra RF, Kuerer HM. Selective elimination of breast cancer surgery in exceptional  
5  
6  
7 responders: historical perspective and current trials. *Breast cancer research : BCR*. 2016;18(1):28.  
8
- 9  
10 16. Ring A, Webb A, Ashley S, Allum WH, Ebbs S, Gui G, et al. Is surgery necessary after  
11  
12 complete clinical remission following neoadjuvant chemotherapy for early breast cancer? *Journal*  
13  
14  
15 of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology.  
16  
17 2003;21(24):4540-5.  
18
- 19  
20 17. Özkurt E, Sakai T, Wong SM, Tukenmez M, Golshan M. Survival Outcomes for Patients  
21  
22 With Clinical Complete Response After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy: Is Omitting Surgery an  
23  
24 Option? *Annals of surgical oncology*. 2019;26(10):3260-8.  
25
- 26  
27 18. Apte A, Marsh S, Chandrasekharan S, Chakravorty A. Avoiding breast cancer surgery in a  
28  
29 select cohort of complete responders to neoadjuvant chemotherapy: The long-term outcomes.  
30  
31 *Annals of Medicine and Surgery*. 2021;66:102380.  
32  
33
- 34  
35 19. Cortazar P, Zhang L, Untch M, Mehta K, Costantino JP, Wolmark N, et al. Pathological  
36  
37 complete response and long-term clinical benefit in breast cancer: the CTNeoBC pooled analysis.  
38  
39 *The Lancet*. 2014;384(9938):164-72.  
40  
41
- 42  
43 20. Tsai C, Zhao B, Chan T, Blair SL. Treatment for occult breast cancer: A propensity score  
44  
45 analysis of the National Cancer Database. *The American Journal of Surgery*. 2020;220(1):153-60.  
46  
47
- 48  
49 21. Heil J, Schaeffgen B, Sinn P, Richter H, Harcos A, Gomez C, et al. Can a pathological  
50  
51 complete response of breast cancer after neoadjuvant chemotherapy be diagnosed by minimal  
52  
53 invasive biopsy? *European Journal of Cancer*. 2016;69:142-50.  
54  
55
- 56  
57 22. ● Heil J, Pfob A, Sinn HP, Rauch G, Bach P, Thomas B, et al. Diagnosing Pathologic  
58  
59 Complete Response in the Breast After Neoadjuvant Systemic Treatment of Breast Cancer  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Patients by Minimal Invasive Biopsy: Oral Presentation at the San Antonio Breast Cancer  
5  
6  
7 Symposium on Friday, December 13, 2019, Program Number GS5-03. *Annals of surgery*.  
8  
9  
10 2022;275(3):576-81.

11  
12 23. Koelbel V, Pfob A, Schaefgen B, Sinn P, Feisst M, Golatta M, et al. Vacuum-Assisted Breast  
13  
14 Biopsy After Neoadjuvant Systemic Treatment for Reliable Exclusion of Residual Cancer in Breast  
15  
16  
17 Cancer Patients. *Annals of surgical oncology*. 2022;29(2):1076-84.

18  
19  
20 24. Lee H-B, Han W, Kim S-Y, Cho N, Kim K-E, Park JH, et al. Prediction of pathologic complete  
21  
22 response using image-guided biopsy after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer patients  
23  
24 selected based on MRI findings: a prospective feasibility trial. *Breast Cancer Research and  
25  
26  
27 Treatment*. 2020;182(1):97-105.

28  
29  
30 25. Francis A, Herring K, Molyneux R, Jafri M, Trivedi S, Shaaban A, et al. Abstract P5-16-14:  
31  
32 NOSTRA PRELIM: A non randomised pilot study designed to assess the ability of image guided  
33  
34 core biopsies to detect residual disease in patients with early breast cancer who have received  
35  
36  
37 neoadjuvant chemotherapy to inform the design of a planned trial. *Cancer Research*.  
38  
39  
40 2017;77(4\_Supplement):P5-16-4-P5--4.

41  
42  
43 26. Tasoulis MK, Roche N, Rusby JE, Pope R, Allen S, Downey K, et al. Post neoadjuvant  
44  
45 chemotherapy vacuum assisted biopsy in breast cancer: Can it determine pathologic complete  
46  
47 response before surgery? *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2018;36(15\_suppl):567-.

48  
49  
50  
51 27. Teoh V, MacNeill F, Roche N, Gui G, Pope R, Downey K, et al. Image-guided vacuum-  
52  
53 assisted biopsy to assess pathologic complete response in breast cancer patients with exceptional  
54  
55 response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Journal of Global Oncology*. 2019;5(suppl):39-.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 28. ● Kuerer HM, Rauch GM, Krishnamurthy S, Adrada BE, Caudle AS, DeSnyder SM, et al. A  
5  
6 Clinical Feasibility Trial for Identification of Exceptional Responders in Whom Breast Cancer  
7  
8 Surgery Can Be Eliminated Following Neoadjuvant Systemic Therapy. *Annals of surgery*.  
9  
10 2018;267(5):946-51.  
11  
12  
13  
14 29. van Loevezijn AA, van der Noordaa MEM, van Werkhoven ED, Loo CE, Winter-Warnars  
15  
16 GAO, Wiersma T, et al. Minimally Invasive Complete Response Assessment of the Breast After  
17  
18 Neoadjuvant Systemic Therapy for Early Breast Cancer (MICRA trial): Interim Analysis of a  
19  
20 Multicenter Observational Cohort Study. *Annals of surgical oncology*. 2021;28(6):3243-53.  
21  
22  
23  
24 30. Basik M, Cecchini RS, Santos JFDL, Umphrey HR, Julian TB, Mamounas EP, et al. Abstract  
25  
26 GS5-05: Primary analysis of NRG-BR005, a phase II trial assessing accuracy of tumor bed biopsies  
27  
28 in predicting pathologic complete response (pCR) in patients with clinical/radiological complete  
29  
30 response after neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NCT) to explore the feasibility of breast-conserving  
31  
32 treatment without surgery. *Cancer Research*. 2020;80(4\_Supplement):GS5-05-GS5-  
33  
34  
35  
36 31. Sutton EJ, Braunstein LZ, El-Tamer MB, Brogi E, Hughes M, Bryce Y, et al. Accuracy of  
37  
38 Magnetic Resonance Imaging–Guided Biopsy to Verify Breast Cancer Pathologic Complete  
39  
40 Response After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy: A Nonrandomized Controlled Trial. *JAMA Network*  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Open. 2021;4(1):e2034045-e.  
47  
48 32. Rauch GM, Kuerer HM, Adrada B, Santiago L, Moseley T, Candelaria RP, et al. Biopsy  
49  
50 Feasibility Trial for Breast Cancer Pathologic Complete Response Detection after Neoadjuvant  
51  
52 Chemotherapy: Imaging Assessment and Correlation Endpoints. *Annals of surgical oncology*.  
53  
54  
55  
56 2018;25(7):1953-60.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 33. ● Tasoulis MK, Lee H-B, Yang W, Pope R, Krishnamurthy S, Kim S-Y, et al. Accuracy of Post-  
5  
6 Noadjuvant Chemotherapy Image-Guided Breast Biopsy to Predict Residual Cancer. JAMA  
7  
8 Surgery. 2020;155(12):e204103-e.  
9  
10  
11 34. ● Pfof A, Sidey-Gibbons C, Lee H-B, Tasoulis MK, Koelbel V, Golatta M, et al. Identification  
12  
13 of breast cancer patients with pathologic complete response in the breast after neoadjuvant  
14  
15 systemic treatment by an intelligent vacuum-assisted biopsy. European Journal of Cancer.  
16  
17 2021;143:134-46.  
18  
19  
20 35. ● Pfof A, Sidey-Gibbons C, Rauch G, Thomas B, Schaeffgen B, Kuemmel S, et al. Intelligent  
21  
22 Vacuum-Assisted Biopsy to Identify Breast Cancer Patients With Pathologic Complete Response  
23  
24 (ypT0 and ypN0) After Neoadjuvant Systemic Treatment for Omission of Breast and Axillary  
25  
26 Surgery. Journal of Clinical Oncology.0(0):JCO.21.02439.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 36. Boughey JC, Peintinger F, Meric-Bernstam F, Perry AC, Hunt KK, Babiera GV, et al. Impact  
32  
33 of preoperative versus postoperative chemotherapy on the extent and number of surgical  
34  
35 procedures in patients treated in randomized clinical trials for breast cancer. Annals of surgery.  
36  
37 2006;244(3):464-70.  
38  
39  
40  
41 37. NCT02945579. Eliminating Surgery or Radiotherapy After Systemic Therapy in Treating  
42  
43 Patients With HER2 Positive or Triple Negative Breast Cancer.  
44  
45 <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02945579?term=02945579&draw=2&rank=1>.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 38. Teoh V, Dumitru D, Tasoulis MK, MacNeill F. P088. Breast cancer patients with no surgery  
51  
52 in the breast after an exceptional response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy: a case series.  
53  
54 European Journal of Surgical Oncology. 2019;45(5):908.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 39. Fisher B, Jeong JH, Anderson S, Bryant J, Fisher ER, Wolmark N. Twenty-five-year follow-  
5  
6  
7 up of a randomized trial comparing radical mastectomy, total mastectomy, and total mastectomy  
8  
9 followed by irradiation. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2002;347(8):567-75.  
10  
11  
12 40. Boughey JC, Suman VJ, Mittendorf EA, Ahrendt GM, Wilke LG, Taback B, et al. Sentinel  
13  
14 lymph node surgery after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with node-positive breast  
15  
16 cancer: the ACOSOG Z1071 (Alliance) clinical trial. *Jama*. 2013;310(14):1455-61.  
17  
18  
19 41. Kuehn T, Bauerfeind I, Fehm T, Fleige B, Hausschild M, Helms G, et al. Sentinel-lymph-  
20  
21 node biopsy in patients with breast cancer before and after neoadjuvant chemotherapy  
22  
23 (SENTINA): a prospective, multicentre cohort study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2013;14(7):609-18.  
24  
25  
26 42. Boileau JF, Poirier B, Basik M, Holloway CM, Gaboury L, Sideris L, et al. Sentinel node  
27  
28 biopsy after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in biopsy-proven node-positive breast cancer: the SN  
29  
30 FNAC study. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical*  
31  
32 *Oncology*. 2015;33(3):258-64.  
33  
34  
35 43. Classe JM, Loaec C, Gimbergues P, Alran S, de Lara CT, Dupre PF, et al. Sentinel lymph  
36  
37 node biopsy without axillary lymphadenectomy after neoadjuvant chemotherapy is accurate and  
38  
39 node biopsy without axillary lymphadenectomy after neoadjuvant chemotherapy is accurate and  
40  
41 safe for selected patients: the GANEA 2 study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2019;173(2):343-52.  
42  
43  
44  
45 44. ● Caudle AS, Yang WT, Krishnamurthy S, Mittendorf EA, Black DM, Gilcrease MZ, et al.  
46  
47 Improved Axillary Evaluation Following Neoadjuvant Therapy for Patients With Node-Positive  
48  
49 Breast Cancer Using Selective Evaluation of Clipped Nodes: Implementation of Targeted Axillary  
50  
51 Dissection. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical*  
52  
53 *Oncology*. 2016;34(10):1072-8.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 45. Kuemmel S, Heil J, Rueland A, Seiberling C, Harrach H, Schindowski D, et al. A Prospective,  
5  
6  
7 Multicenter Registry Study to Evaluate the Clinical Feasibility of Targeted Axillary Dissection (TAD)  
8  
9  
10 in Node-Positive Breast Cancer Patients. *Annals of surgery*. 2020.
- 11  
12 46. Simons J, JA v Nijnatten T, Koppert LB, van der Pol CC, v Diest PJ, Jager A, et al. Abstract  
13  
14 GS1-10: Radioactive Iodine Seed placement in the Axilla with Sentinel lymph node biopsy after  
15  
16  
17 neoadjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer: Results of the prospective multicenter RISAS trial.  
18  
19  
20 *Cancer Research*. 2021;81(4\_Supplement):GS1-10-GS1-.
- 21  
22 47. ● Simons JM, van Nijnatten TJA, van der Pol CC, Luiten EJT, Koppert LB, Smidt ML.  
23  
24  
25 Diagnostic Accuracy of Different Surgical Procedures for Axillary Staging After Neoadjuvant  
26  
27  
28 Systemic Therapy in Node-positive Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Annals*  
29  
30  
31 of surgery. 2019;269(3):432-42.
- 32  
33 48. ● National, Comprehensive, Cancer, Network. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in  
34  
35  
36 Oncology. Breast Cancer. v2.2022  
37  
38 [https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician\\_gls/pdf/breast.pdf](https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/breast.pdf). Accessed 15 Mar 2022. 2021.
- 39  
40 49. ● Brackstone M, Baldassarre FG, Perera FE, Cil T, Gregor MCM, Dayes IS, et al.  
41  
42  
43 Management of the Axilla in Early-Stage Breast Cancer: Ontario Health (Cancer Care Ontario) and  
44  
45  
46 ASCO Guideline. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*. 2021;39(27):3056-82.
- 47  
48 50. NCT01901094. Comparison of Axillary Lymph Node Dissection With Axillary Radiation for  
49  
50  
51 Patients With Node-Positive Breast Cancer Treated With Chemotherapy.  
52  
53  
54 <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01901094>.
- 55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 51. Tadros AB, Yang WT, Krishnamurthy S, Rauch GM, Smith BD, Valero V, et al. Identification  
5  
6  
7 of Patients With Documented Pathologic Complete Response in the Breast After Neoadjuvant  
8  
9  
10 Chemotherapy for Omission of Axillary Surgery. *JAMA Surgery*. 2017;152(7):665-70.  
11  
12 52. Samiei S, van Nijnatten TJA, de Munck L, Keymeulen KBMI, Simons JM, Kooreman LFS, et  
13  
14 al. Correlation Between Pathologic Complete Response in the Breast and Absence of Axillary  
15  
16  
17 Lymph Node Metastases After Neoadjuvant Systemic Therapy. *Annals of surgery*.  
18  
19  
20 2020;271(3):574-80.  
21  
22 53. Weiss A, Campbell J, Ballman KV, Sikov WM, Carey LA, Hwang ES, et al. Factors Associated  
23  
24  
25 with Nodal Pathologic Complete Response Among Breast Cancer Patients Treated with  
26  
27  
28 Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy: Results of CALGB 40601 (HER2+) and 40603 (Triple-Negative)  
29  
30  
31 (Alliance). *Annals of surgical oncology*. 2021;28(11):5960-71.  
32  
33 54. ● Barron AU, Hoskin TL, Day CN, Hwang ES, Kuerer HM, Boughey JC. Association of Low  
34  
35  
36 Nodal Positivity Rate Among Patients With ERBB2-Positive or Triple-Negative Breast Cancer and  
37  
38  
39 Breast Pathologic Complete Response to Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy. *JAMA Surgery*.  
40  
41  
42 2018;153(12):1120-6.  
43  
44 55. Reimer T, Glass A, Botteri E, Loibl S, D. Gentilini O. Avoiding Axillary Sentinel Lymph Node  
45  
46  
47 Biopsy after Neoadjuvant Systemic Therapy in Breast Cancer: Rationale for the Prospective,  
48  
49  
50 Multicentric EUBREAST-01 Trial. *Cancers*. 2020;12(12):3698.  
51  
52 56. NCT04225858. Avoiding Sentinel Lymph Node Biopsy in Breast Cancer Patients After  
53  
54  
55 Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy (ASICS). <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04225858>.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65