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ABSTRACT
**Purpose/Objective**

As part of the AIRC IG-13218 (NCT01913717), we analyzed data from patients with low and intermediate risk prostate cancer treated with extreme hypofractionated radiotherapy (RT) and simultaneous boost on the intraprostatic legion. The aim of the study is to identify clinically meaningful information through the analysis of validated questionnaires testing gastrointestinal (GI) and genitourinary (GU) RT related toxicity and their impact on quality of life (QoL).

**Material/methods**

At the end of RT treatment, clinical assessment and prostate-specific antigen (PSA) measurements were performed every 3 months for at least 2 years and GI and GU toxicities were evaluated contextually. QoL of enrolled patients was assessed by International Prostatic Symptoms Score (IPSS), Quality Life Questionnaire - Core 30 (QLQ-C30), QLQ prostate specific (QLQ-PR25) and sexual activity by International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF-5). Patients score changes were calculated at the end of RT, at one month after RT and at 12 and 24 months.

**Results**

Sixty-five prospectively enrolled patients were analyzed. Extensive analysis of different QoL assessments showed that patients' tolerance was satisfactory across all the considered time points, with no statistically significant change of QoL from baseline compared to that before RT. Overall survival and biochemical progression-free survival at 2-years were of 98% and 97%, respectively.

**Conclusion**

Although the low toxicity of extreme hypofractionation and the encouraging tumor outcome, a longer follow up is necessary to confirm these findings. The increasing dose to the dominant intraprostatic lesion does not worsen the RT toxicity and consequently does not affect patients' QoL, thus questioning the possibility of an even more escalated treatment.
1. INTRODUCTION

Radiation therapy (RT) represents a curative-intent treatment option in the management of localized prostate cancer (PCa), with disease progression and cancer-specific death rates comparable to radical surgery [1,2]. In the last three decades, starting from the radiobiological rationale of a low α/β ratio in PCa [3] and the technological advancement in treatment delivery (image-guidance RT, IGRT, intensity-modulated RT, IMRT, and stereotactic body RT, SBRT), multiple clinical trials on moderate hypofractionation have shown the effectiveness and the safety of this treatment [4-11], both in terms of oncological outcomes and toxicity profile [5,12-15].

Recent evidence suggest that at least non-inferior outcomes would be achievable also with extremely hypofractionated regimens, defined as the delivery of 5-10 Gy/fraction in 4-7 fractions [11,16-19].

Based on these encouraging results, three extremely hypofractionated schedules (36.25 Gy at 7.25 Gy/fraction, 37 Gy at 7.4 Gy/fraction and 40 Gy at 8.0 Gy/fraction) have been included in the last versions of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) guidelines as Level 2A treatment options for PCa patients staged from very low to favorable intermediate risk group [20]. In this setting, new schedules include simultaneous integrated boost (SIB) to the dominant intraprostatic lesion (DIL) [21]. However, with the aim of insuring precise and safe treatment, this option require steep dose gradients and the use of multiparametric resonance (mpMRI) imaging [22].

Increasing focus to patients’ reported outcomes (PROs) is reserved to several medical fields [23]. In the current setting, the availability of multiple treatment options, as well as the slow-progressive course of the disease, suggest that PROs may be useful for the decisional process. Although patients’ satisfaction is generally high at the end of treatment [24,25], multiple psychological and physical long-term side effects are emerging, ranging from treatment-related symptoms to fatigue and major depressive disorders [26,27]. Furthermore, a consistent underestimation of side effects severity by physician has been recognized [27,28], highlighting the need for a more comprehensive assessment in every-day clinical practice. The systematic use of validated questionnaires for quality of life (QoL) would allow to improve personalized treatments and therapeutic index for PCa.
This is specifically true for the recently introduced extreme hypofractionation: accurate side effects evaluation and longer follow-up periods are warranted in order to fully assess chronic treatment-related comorbidities and endorse its safety in clinical practice.

Based on these premises, in the context of the prospective phase II study “Short-term high precision radiotherapy for early prostate cancer with concomitant boost to the dominant lesion, AIRC-IG-13218” we analyzed data of a cohort of PCa patients treated with extreme hypofractionation, aiming to evaluate gastrointestinal (GI) and genitourinary (GU) RT related toxicity and its impact on QoL.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Patient cohort

Between October 2014 and January 2018, a prospective series of patients diagnosed with low and intermediate risk PCa were enrolled in this study and treated with extreme hypofractionated RT at the Division of Radiation Oncology in European Institute of Oncology (IEO). The inclusion and exclusion criteria along RT treatment details and study design of this phase II prospective trial are described in the previously published protocol [29], registered at ClinicalTrials.gov as NCT01913717, and first results have already been reported [30].

This trial had been approved by the Ethics Committee of the IEO and Centro Cardiologico Monzino of Milan IEOS768/113. All patients signed a dedicated Informed Consent before admission.

For each patient, baseline information, clinical characteristics, pre-treatment mpMRI and uroflowmetry data were collected.

2.2 Radiation therapy treatment planning and delivery

Computed tomography (CT) simulation, volume of interest contouring, and treatment delivery were performed following the previously described methodology [29].

Briefly, to assure an accurate image registration, a pelvic multiparametric magnetic resonance (mpMRI) was performed before CT treatment simulation for each patient in the same treatment position [31,32].

The clinical target volume (CTV) was represented by the whole prostate. A margin of 3 mm posteriorly and 5 mm in all other directions was added to create the prostate planning target volume (PTV) and 3
mm in all directions for the DIL. We delineated as Organ at Risk (OARs) the following structures: urinary bladder, rectum, posterior rectal wall, anal canal, urethra, peritoneal cavity/bowel bag, penile bulb, penis, testis, femoral heads and necks, and cauda equina.

The whole prostate received a dose of 36.25 Gy in 5 fractions (7.25 Gy/fraction), corresponding to 90.6 Gy in 45 fractions according to the linear quadratic model, assuming $\alpha/\beta = 1.5$ Gy for PCa. The DIL received a SIB of 37.5 Gy in 5 fractions (7.5 Gy/fraction), equivalent to 96.4 Gy with conventional fractionation. The treatment was delivered every other day.

Patients were trained to present for access to RT with an empty rectum and full bladder and the IGRT was used to localize the target volume. The use of $\alpha$-1 blockers and low doses of steroids were recommended to lower the risk of urinary obstruction and minimize inflammatory effects.

### 2.3 Treatment assessment of QoL and follow-up

Clinical assessment and prostate-specific antigen (PSA) measurements were performed at the end of RT treatment and afterwards every 3 months for at least 2 years.

GI and GU toxicities were scored according to Radiation Therapy Oncology Group and European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (RTOG/EORTC) scoring criteria [33] and registered as the maximum toxicity observed during the follow-up.

QoL of enrolled patients was assessed by the IPSS, Quality Life Questionnaire - Core 30 (QLQ-C30), QLQ prostate specific (QLQ-PR25) and sexual activity by the International Index of Erectile Function (IIEF-5).

The IPSS is based on seven questions about urinary symptoms and one question concerning QoL. Each question can be answered with a 0 to 5 score. The total score can therefore range from 0 to 35 (asymptomatic to very symptomatic).

The QLQ-C30 contains scales and items addressing functional aspects, symptoms and QoL evaluations of cancer patients.

The QLQ-PR25 is a questionnaire regarding urinary, gastrointestinal, sexual, treatment-related symptoms to be used in conjunction with the QLQ-C30 for assessing the QoL of PCa patients varying in disease stage and treatment modality (i.e. surgery, chemotherapy, RT, etc.).
The IIEF-5 is a 5-item questionnaire, developed to diagnose the severity of erectile dysfunction. It ranges from 0 to 25, with higher scores describing better sexual functioning.

IPSS, QLQ-C30, QLQ-PR25 and the IIEF-5 questionnaires were administered following these time points: at baseline, at the end of RT, at one month after RT and at 12 ad 24 months. IPSS at 6 month and at 24 months were not considered during the analysis due to the large amount of missing values.

2.4 Oncological outcomes

Oncological outcomes were evaluated in terms of biochemical response, time to biochemical failure and overall survival (OS). Biochemical response was assessed through trimestral PSA evaluation. OS was defined as the time interval between the date of RT beginning and death from any cause. For patients lost to follow-up, information on vital status was obtained through municipal vital statistics offices. Time to biochemical failure was defined according to the Phoenix criterion (nadir PSA + 2 ng/mL).

2.5. Statistical analysis

Categorical variables were reported as frequencies (percentages), whereas continuous variables were summarized with the median value and interquartile range (25th-75th percentiles). We evaluated time trends of (i) acute GI toxicity and GU toxicity; and (ii) IPSS, QLQ-C30, QLQ-PR25 and the IIEF-5 questionnaires.

The missing IPSS scores at baseline were replaced by those obtained after RT (where available) and vice versa.

Multivariate logistic regression models with generalized estimation method (GEE) were used to test the association between bladder volume and GU toxicity ≥ Grade (G) 1 over time. Predicted values of toxicity were plotted against rectum volume and bladder volume for each time point.

Assuming that missing IPSS values were missing at random (MAR), a multivariate linear mixed effects model for repeated measures was adopted to study the trend of change of IPSS from baseline. Residuals from full models were checked to assess normal distribution.

All scales of QLQ-C30 (functioning scales: Physical Functioning, Role Functioning, Emotional Functioning, Cognitive Functioning, Social Functioning; general health status scale: Global health status / QoL; symptom scales: Fatigue, Nausea/Vomiting, Pain, Dyspnea, Insomnia, Appetite loss, Constipation,
Diarrhea, Financial Problems) were built according to the EORTC manual and transformed to 0-100 scales, with higher scores reflecting either more symptoms or higher levels of functioning or QoL.

Four multi-item scales (Urinary symptoms, Bowel symptoms, Hormonal treatment-related symptoms, Sexual activity), a single-item scale (Bother due to the use of incontinence aid) and a conditional multi-item scale were obtained from the questionnaire QLQ-PR25. All scales were built following the EORTC guidelines, except for the Sexual activity and the Sexual functioning scales: Question 50, 51 and 52 were reversed so that higher scores identify better sexual conditions. All raw QLQ-PR25 scores were transformed to 0-100 scales.

For both QLQ-C30 and QLQ-PR25 imputation of missing answers was performed as following: if a patient answered less than half the questions in a scale, the scale was considered to be missing; if a patient answered at least half of the questions in a scale, the average score of the answered questions was calculated and imputed as the response to questions which had not been answered.

Within-patient score changes of IPSS, and every scale of QLQ-C30, QLQ-PR25 and IIEF-5 questionnaires were calculated at each time point from baseline. Linear mixed models for repeated measures were used to detect a trend in the changes. The same analyses were repeated stratifying the patients according to the median value of the bladder volume (<341 cm³ vs. ≥341 cm³). All estimates were adjusted for the baseline score. Residuals from full models were checked to assess normal distribution.

A two-sided p-value <0.05 was considered significant for all statistical analyses.

The analyses were performed using SAS software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, USA), version 9.4 and R software (http://www.Rproject.org), version 3.5.2.

3. RESULTS

3.1 Study population

Sixty-five patients were consecutively enrolled in this trial. Their characteristics at baseline are summarized in Table S1 - Supplementary Materials. Patients’ response rates are reported from Table S2 to Table S8 – Supplementary Materials.

3.2 Toxicity assessment
Physician-rated GU and GI toxicities at the end of treatment, at 1 months and over 6 months after the end of RT are reported in Table 1. Overall, patients' tolerance was assessed as satisfactory across all the considered time points, with no residual toxicity exceeding G2 at 6 months after the end of treatment, except for one patient who developed G3 GI symptoms during the course of follow-up. Urinary function as assessed by IPSS showed a statistically significant variation from baseline (p=.002), despite missing data during the follow-up. Specifically, 63/65 (97%) patients fulfilled the IPSS questionnaire at baseline and at the end of RT, 59/65 (91%) at 1 month and 48/65 (74%) at 12 months. The most relevant deterioration in IPSS from baseline was reported after 1 month from the end of treatment, although a sizable recovery towards baseline value was assessed at 12 months (p=0.05). Boxplots reporting IPSS modification are shown in Figure 1.

The QLQ-PR25 Urinary Symptoms score was also analyzed to evaluate the urinary function. A deterioration of symptoms from baseline was observed already at the end of RT and maintained at one month after, with a recovery towards baseline value at 12 months (Figure S1 – Supplementary Materials). Although statistical significance was not reached (p=0.51), these results are consistent with those obtained from IPSS analysis. Interestingly, different trends of urinary symptoms can be found if patients are stratified according to the median bladder volume (341 cm³): patients with a volume < median showed a worsening of symptoms after RT that was kept changeless throughout the entire follow-up (p=0.42). On the contrary, patients with volume ≥ than the median reported a significant decreasing trend of deterioration of symptoms with a median complete recovery at 12 months (Figure S2 – Supplementary Materials).

**3.3 Bladder and Rectal volumes correlation with GU and GI Toxicity**

Genitourinary Toxicity. There was no evidence that bladder volume and physician-rated GU toxicity ≥G1 are associated (p=.60, Figure S2 – Supplementary Materials). Conversely, significant decreasing probability of toxicity (G>1) along time points (P=.02) were found.

Figure 2 shows that patients with a bladder volume greater than its median value (341 cm³) experienced a more relevant deterioration in IPSS score as compared to baseline at 1 month following
the end of RT (median IPSS = 1.5, IQR (-1, 8)) Nevertheless, bladder volume seems not to affect IPSS at 12-months follow-up (p=.24).

**Gastro-intestinal Toxicity.** Patients' probability of experiencing a GI physician-rated toxicity ≥ G1 was found to be correlated with rectal volume measured on planning CT scan (p=.05). Predicted value of rectal volume was more relevant at 1-month after the end of treatment and significantly decreases over 6 months after treatment completion (p=.03) (Figure 3).

### 3.4 Quality of Life

Although there was no statistical evidence of changes in Quality of life along time, a trend towards amelioration of QLQ-C30 Global Health Status/QoL was however found, with minimum values being recorded at the end of treatment and at 1 month from its completion, and a recovery to pre-RT values at one year (Figure 4). Again, although no significant, an improvement from baseline of QLQ-C30 Emotional Functioning Score was noted already one month after RT and was maintained at the 12-months follow-up (p=.85), whereas the change of QLQ-C30 Fatigue score showed a trend towards deterioration over time (p=.11) (Figure 4).

### 3.5 Sexual function assessment

According to the QLQ-PR25 questionnaire, sexual activity changed over time after RT (p=.05). Although no change in sexual activity was found right after RT, a median worsening of condition from baseline occurred in patients after 1 month, followed by a trend of improvement that led to a considerate recovery at the 12-months follow-up (Figure 5a). Conversely, a trend of deterioration of Sexual Functioning was found in patients sexually active patients, which started 1 month after the end of RT and was maintained at the 12-months evaluation (Figure 5b).

The analysis of IIEF-5 did not show any significant change of erectile function from baseline (p=.46), although a slight worsening of function was assessed after 1 month from the end of RT, as reported in Figure 5c.

### 3.5 Oncological outcomes

Because at present follow-up is insufficient to investigate primary endpoint, the current study reports findings about treatment-related toxicity within 2 years.
The median PSA before the beginning of treatment was 6.07 ng/ml and quickly decreased within the first 3 months after RT, reaching a median value of 2.20 ng/ml. After 3 months, the PSA kept steadily decreasing, with a median PSA of 0.49 ng/ml at 21-24 months after treatment (Figure S3 – Supplementary Materials). Although patients with intermediate risk had higher median PSA at baseline (6.07 ng/ml) than patients with low risk (5.30 ng/ml), they had a faster decrease of PSA within the first 6 months after RT that led to smaller median values of PSA throughout the follow-up (Figure S3 – Supplementary Materials).

Only one patients out of the 65 ones died (for a cause not related to the disease ), leading to an OS of 98% at 2-years.

Biochemical progression-free survival (b-PFS) at 2-years was of 97%. Since 2014, only 2 patients experienced biochemical and clinical relapse. Subsequently to primary RT PSA decreased , but after 3 years a progressive increase was noted until trespassing the biochemical relapse. As a result, both patients underwent a Choline PET and a prostate MRI, which showed a clinical relapse on DIL treated with RT. Considering the local relapse of PCa, patients underwent partial prostate re-irradiation with a schedule of 35 Gy in 5 fractions. Treatment was well tolerated and patients are actually in follow up.

4. DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to evaluate gastrointestinal (GI) and genitourinary (GU) RT related toxicity, and its impact on QoL, of a RT scheme comprehensive of a dose escalation to the DIL using mpMRI. We observed only a single case of acute G2 GU toxicity and another one of G2 GI late toxicity, three cases (5%) of late G2 toxicity, while we did not observe G3 toxicity.

In the phase III FLAME trial [22], patients with diagnosed intermediate- and high-risk PCa were randomized to receive either standard treatment (77 Gy in 35 fractions) or experimental (standard with a SIB on DIL of 95 Gy in 35 fractions). No increase in GU and GI toxicity in patients treated with escalated dose were reported at two years of follow up. Late cumulative GI toxicity rates were 11.1% and 10.2% for the standard and dose-escalated group, respectively and 22.6% and 27.1% for GU toxicity [34].

Our results are also supported by the analysis of acute toxicity of the phase III PACE-B trial, in which 858 patients affected by low or intermediate PCa were randomized to receive standard RT (78 Gy in 39
fractions or 62 Gy in 20 fractions) or SBRT (36.35 Gy in 5 fractions). G2 or worse toxicity was not significantly different for GI events (12.1% in the standard arm vs 10.1% in the SBRT arm), nor GU events (27.2% in the standard arm vs 23.2% in the SBRT arm). In addition, in this case, there was no difference between the two groups of patients and less than 1% of patients developed G3 toxicity [35]. The phase III trial HYPO-RT-PC demonstrated the non-inferiority of ultra-hypofractionated RT [36]. Patients affected by intermediate/high risk PCa were randomized to receive either 78 Gy in 39 fractions/daily or 42.7 Gy in 7 fractions every other day. Both arms showed similar late adverse events, except higher GU at 1 year in the experimental arm (32 [6%] of 528 patients vs 13 [2%] of 529 patients).

At 5 years-follow-up the frequency of G2 or worse toxicity was 5% in both arms.

Regarding PROs, it is well known that, preserving QoL is of high importance for many patients; for instance, previous studies have demonstrated that >50% of men consider the preservation of sexual function to be important [36-39]. QoL and toxicities outcomes are widely taken in considerations by many trials [36, 41-43] and studies [44-46] in the context of hypofractionation, including MR-linac approach, showed results comparable to the ones of the present study. Our results showed no statistical worsening with respect to the initial condition assessing the safety of such ultra-hypofractionated treatments.

Regarding our data, we have acquired pre-treatment data for all IPSS, QLQ-C30 and QLQ-PR25 questionnaires. This allowed us to analyze changes since from baseline. Similar findings were reported from the previously mentioned studies [36,40], in which physician-recorded and patient-reported treatment-related late side-effects of ultra-hypofractionation are similar to those of conventional fractionation.

Despite the promising results, our prospective study showed intrinsic limitations. The low number of subjects prevented us from finding significant differences between the groups compared. It is worth to mention that we tried to moderate the effects of missing questionnaire scores by replacing them with other from different time points. In addition, the short median follow-up makes the results for tumor outcome less reliable compared with those for toxicity.
3. CONCLUSIONS

Our data showed that QoL of patients treated with extreme hypofractionation with a dose escalation to the DIL remains acceptable mainly because the related GI and GU toxicities were really low. The toxicity is in line with historical cohorts, therefore SBRT+DIL vs standard of care in a randomised trial should be considered. In addition, although tumor outcomes are encouraging, longer follow up is warranted to confirm these findings.
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PRECIS

The hypofractionation with the boost is feasible and could offer good clinical outcome. The related GI and GU toxicity do not significantly affect quality of life of the patients at 2-years of follow up.
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<td>Prostate Advances in Comparative Evidence-B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCa</td>
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<tr>
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<td>Patient Reported Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLQ-C30</td>
<td>Quality Life Questionnaire - Core 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLQ-PR25</td>
<td>Quality Life Questionnaire prostate specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QoL</td>
<td>Quality of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RT</td>
<td>Radiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBRT</td>
<td>Stereotactic Beam Radiotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMAT</td>
<td>Volumetric Modulated Arc Therapy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend: p-values are from linear mixed models for repeated measures evaluating, respectively, the effect of time on IPSS score and on IPSS change from baseline.
Figure 2 – Change of IPSS score from Baseline grouped by Bladder Volume.

Legend: p-values are from linear mixed models for repeated measures evaluating the effect of time on the change of IPSS score from baseline stratified by median bladder volume.
Figure 3 - Predicted toxicity G≥ from multivariate logistic models by rectum volumes.

Legend: p-value is from a GEE model testing the association between rectum volume and GU toxicity ≥ Grade (G) 1.
Legend: p-values are from linear mixed models for repeated measures evaluating, respectively, the effect of time on the change of QoL score, Emotional Functioning score and Fatigue score from baseline.
Figure 5 – PR25 and IIEF-5 sexual activity and functions scores.

Legend: p-values are from linear mixed models for repeated measures evaluating, respectively, the effect of time on the change of Sexual Activity score, Sexual Functioning score and IIEF-5 score from baseline.
**Table 1 – Descriptive statistics of toxicity by grade and time.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GU toxicity, n. (%)</th>
<th>After RT</th>
<th>At 1 month</th>
<th>Over 6 months after RT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 0</td>
<td>38 (58.46)</td>
<td>42 (64.62)</td>
<td>48 (75.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>26 (40.00)</td>
<td>18 (27.69)</td>
<td>13 (20.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>1 (1.54)</td>
<td>4 (6.15)</td>
<td>3 (4.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (1.54)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GI toxicity, n. (%)</th>
<th>After RT</th>
<th>At 1 month</th>
<th>Over 6 months after RT*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 0</td>
<td>56 (86.15)</td>
<td>54 (83.08)</td>
<td>59 (92.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>7 (10.77)</td>
<td>11 (16.92)</td>
<td>3 (4.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>2 (3.08)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>0 (0.00)</td>
<td>1 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One patient has both late toxicities missing*
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