# **Decreasing Trend in Contralateral Prophylactic Mastectomy Rate** in Average-Risk Women with Unilateral Breast Cancer (787740)

Hannah Kapur BSc, Rebecca Warburton MD, Jin-Si Pao MD, Urve Kuusk MD, Carol Dingee MD, Leo Chen MSc, Amy Bazzarelli MD, Elaine McKevitt MD University of British Columbia Faculty of Medicine, Department of Surgery, Division of General Surgery, Mount Saint Joseph Hospital

# Introduction

- Despite lack of evidence for survival benefit, recent studies have demonstrated increasing rates of contralateral prophylactic mastectomy (CPM) among women with unilateral breast cancer (1).
- For average-risk women with unilateral breast cancer, the risk of contralateral breast cancer (CBC) at 10 years is low (2).
- CPMs are not recommended for average-risk patients with unilateral cancer because they do not provide a survival benefit compared to a unilateral procedure. CPMs are reserved for a select patients with genetic mutations, such as BRCA1/2, at high risk for CBC (3).
- This increasing trend is largely attributable to patient factors, such as fear of recurrence and peace of mind.
- In order to prevent overtreatment of unilateral breast cancer, there is consensus to counsel the average risk patient about the risks of recurrent or metachronous breast cancer, and the limited benefit compared to risks of CPMs.

# **Objectives**

- 1. Assess the rate of detecting occult malignancy or high-risk lesions in CPM specimens at our institution.
- 2. Evaluate trends in CPM rates between 2013 to 2017.

### Methods

- All patients receiving a total mastectomy for unilateral breast cancer between 2013 to 2017 were identified with our institution's database. Patient and tumour characteristics were verified by chart review.
- Inclusion: Patients with unilateral breast cancer treated with unilateral mastectomy or total mastectomy plus a CPM (average-risk patients).
- **Exclusion:** Patients with BRCA or other genetic predispositions (high-risk patients).
- CPM rate was calculated based on prospectively-collected data.
- Pathology data was investigated among patients undergoing total mastectomy plus a CPM for occult malignancy detection.

### Results



## **Table 1: Patient Characteristics**

Patient Age (continuous)	Mean
	Median
	Range
Patient Age (Categorical)	< 40
	40 to 74
	75 +
<b>Bilateral Cancer</b>	Rate
Reconstruction	Rate
Reason for Mastectomy	Medically Necessary
	Patient Preference
Indication for Surgery	Primary Treatment
	Completio TM after BCS
	Locally Recurrent
	Second Primary
	±

**Unilateral TM** TM and CPM p-value (N=998) (N=355) 59.3 52.0 < 0.001 58 < 0.001 51 26 to 96 27 to 81 NA 64 (6.4%) 44 (12.4%) 779 (78.1%) 304 (85.6%) < 0.001 7 (2.0%) 155 (15.5%) 0.689 7 (0.7%) 1 (0.3%) 436 (43.7%) 255 (71.8%) < 0.001 755 (76.5%) 233 (68.7%) 0.006 106 (31.3%) 232 (23.5%) 240 (71.6%) 771 (77.3%) 143 (14.3%) 65 (19.4%) 0.124 51 (5.1%) 16 (4.8%) 13 (3.9%) 26 (2.6%)

2015

Table 2: Tumour Characteristics					
		Unilateral TM (N=998)	TM and CPM (N=355)	p-value	
Tumour Size (mm)	Mean Pre- Operative Size	30.8	26.0	0.003	
	Mean Post- Operative Size	23.9	18.5	< 0.001	
Tumour Morphology	IDC	718 (73.9%)	254 (78.4%)	0.132	
	DCIS	205 (21.1%)	61 (18.8%)		
	Other (LCIS, Paget's ILC)	49 (5.0%)	9 (2.8%)		
Lymph Node Status	Positive	168 (19.9%)	71 (26.4%)	0.031	
Presenting Problem	Mass	542 (59.0%)	184 (63.9%)	0.534	
	Abnormal Imaging	336 (36.6%)	96 (33.3%)		
	Nipple Discharge	19 (2.1%)	3 (1.0%)		
	Breast Pain	3 (0.3%)	1 (0.3%)		
Neoadjuvant Therapy	Yes	140 (14.0%)	77 (21.7%)	0.001	
<b>Receptor Status</b>	ER Positive	314 (78.9%)	79 (79.8%)	0.952	
	PR Positive	262 (71.4%)	64 (67.4%)	0.522	
	<b>HER Positive</b>	79 (22.7%)	20 (23.0%)	1.000	

2016

2017

# Conclusion

### Summary

- make informed decisions.

## **Contact Information**

Hannah Kapur • Email: hannah.kapur@alumni.ubc.ca

Dr. Elaine McKevitt • Email: emckevitt@providencehealth.bc.ca

# References



• Our institution had an occult malignancy detection rate of 5.6% in CPM tissue between 2013 to 2017. Our results support findings in the literature that there is a low risk of malignancy in CPM tissue, and thus warrants continued advocacy and patient education to reduce the number of CPMs performed in average-risk patients with unilateral cancer (Figure 1).

• After identifying a high CPM rate in 2012, our institution demonstrated a decreasing trend in CPM rate between 2013 to 2017 from 31.6% to 17.3% (p<0.001) with no significant change in the occult malignancy detection rate (p=0.8126) (Figure 1).

• Among average-risk patients with unilateral cancer, those that underwent a CPM have significantly higher reconstruction rates (Table 1), although there was no significant change in the reconstruction rate over 5 years.

• As often reported in the literature, patient choosing a CPM tended to be younger, but they did not have a significantly higher rate of completion mastectomies (Table 1).

• We did not find a statistical difference in the bilateral cancer rate, reason for mastectomy, pre-operative tumour size, lymph node status, presenting problem, or receptor status, although post-operative sizes were statistically smaller in patients who had a CPM (Table 1 and 2).

• Our institution's data confirms that there is a low risk of malignancy in CPM specimens in patients with average-risk unilateral breast cancer. This data can be used to counsel patients at our institution who may ask about CPMs and empower them to

• CPM rates provide an actionable measure and opportunity to de-escalate surgery for average-risk unilateral breast cancer, and thus could potentially serve as a quality indicator for institutions to monitor breast cancer care.

• The findings of younger age and high reconstruction rates in patients receiving a CPM highlights potential patient decision-making factors and may serve as an opportunity to identify select patients and offer individualized counselling and risk-profiling, as well as potential to collaborate with plastic surgeons.

• We suggest that to prevent overtreatment of breast cancer, CPM rates could be used in conjunction with other published quality indicators, such as breast conserving surgery rates, re-excision rates, and single-operation rates.

1. Yao K, Stewart AK, Winchester DJ, Winchester DP. Trends in contralateral prophylactic mastectomy for unilateral cancer: A report from the national cancer data base, 1998-2007. Ann Surg Oncol. 2010 Oct 12;17(10):2554–62.

2. Reiner AS, John EM, Brooks JD, Lynch CF, Bernstein L, Mellemkjær L, et al. Risk of asynchronous contralateral breast cancer in noncarriers of BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutations with a family history of breast cancer: A report from the women's environmental cancer and radiation epidemiology study. J Clin Oncol. 2013 Feb 1;31(4):433–9.

Wright FC, Look Hong NJ, Quan ML, Beyfuss K, Temple S, Covelli A, et al. Indications for Contralateral Prophylactic Mastectomy: A Consensus Statement Using Modified Delphi Methodology. In: Annals of Surgery. Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2018. p. 271–9.