Conclusions: D demonstrates a significant improvement in objective RR at the doses used in routine clinical practice compared with N-P at the licensed dose. Overall the activity and toxicity profile in this retrospective analysis favour the use of D with GCSF over N-P as single agent therapy. Updated PFS data will be presented at the meeting.

252 Poster

Comparison of True Recurrence Versus New Primary: an Analysis of Ipsilateral Breast Tumor Recurrences After Breast-Conserving Therapy

S.H. Hwang[1], J.W. Lee[2], B.H. Son[2], J. Jeong[1], S.H. Ahn[2], S.G. Ahn[1], H.M. Lee[1], H.D. Lee[1]. [1]*Gangnam Severance Hospital Yonsei University College of Medicine, Surgery, Seoul, Korea;* [2]*Asan Medical Center University of Ulsan College of Medicine, Surgery, Seoul, Korea*

Background: Ipsilateral breast tumor recurrence (IBTR) may develop in 5−20% of early breast cancer treated with breast-conserving therapy. Some prospective and retrospective studies had propounded that two classification of IBTR, true recurrence (TR), new primary (NP), would have a different features and outcomes. This study compared survival outcomes between two patient cohorts divided clinically as either TR or NP.

Materials and Methods: Between April 1991 and December 2009, a total of 5,888 patients who diagnosed breast malignancy were treated with breast-conserving therapy in the Gangnam Severance Hospital and the Asan Medical Center. Of 5,185 patients, after excluding ductal carcinoma in situ and no available data, 74 (15 in the Gangnam, 59 in the Asan) patients (1.4 %) had pathologically confirmed IBTR. If either within the same quadrant as index tumor or below 3cm distance between index tumor and IBTR lesion and the same estrogen receptor (ER) status and the same histologic type, that was defined as TR, and the others were defined as NP. According to the this criteria, of 74 patients, 45 (60.8 %) were classified as having TR and 29 (39.2 %) as having NP.

Results: The median follow up period after initial operation was 5.8 years, 5.8 years for TR and 5.9 years for NP. The median follow up period after IBTR was 2.3 years, 2.3 years for TR and 1.6 years for NP. There were no differences in the clinicopathologic features of initial tumor between TP and NP groups except location of initial tumor, more lateral in TR (88.9 %) than in NP (62.1 %) ($p = 0.023$), more negativity of ER in TR (70.5 %) than in NP (30.8 %) ($p = 0.002$), more triple negative breast cancer (TNBC) type in TR (44.7 %) than in NP (18.2 %) ($p = 0.007$). The median time to recurrence were shorter in TR group than in NP group, but no statistically significant (2.4 years vs. 3.1 years, $p = 0.132$). There was no difference for adjuvant treatment between the two groups, but in hormonal therapy, there was a trend for the difference between NP (64.3 %) and TR (42.2 %) ($p = 0.067$). In the TR and NP cohorts, breast cancer-specific survival was 78.3 % vs. 90.4 % ($p = 0.478$), and overall survival was 75.2 % vs. 84.7 % ($p = 0.655$), respectively.

Conclusions: With the limitation of patients number, the biologic behavior of NP seems to be different with that of TR. So when we consider the treatment of IBTR, the type of recurrence should be preferentially evaluated.

253 Poster

Everolimus (EVE) for Postmenopausal Women with Advanced Breast Cancer (ABC) Refractory to Letrozole or Anastrozole: Long-term Efficacy and Safety Results of the BOLERO-2 Trial

H. Rugo[1], K.I. Pritchard[2], M. Gnant[3], S. Noguchi[4], M. Piccart[5], G.N. Hortobagyi[6], H.A. Burris[7], H. Bauly[8], T. Sahmoud[9], J. Baselga[10]. [1]*University of California San Francisco, Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, San Francisco, USA;* [2]*Sunnybrook Odette Cancer Centre and the University of Toronto, Department of Medicine, Toronto, Canada;* [3]*Medical University of Vienna, Department of Surgery, Vienna, Austria;* [4]*Osaka University, Department of Breast and Endocrine Surgery, Osaka, Japan;* [5]*Jules Bordet Institute, Department of Medicine, Brussels, Belgium;* [6]*University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Department of Breast Medical Oncology, Houston, USA;* [7]*Sarah Cannon Research Institute, Drug Development Program, Nashville, USA;* [8]*Novartis Pharma AG, Biostatistics, Basel, Switzerland;* [9]*Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, Global Oncology Development, Florham Park, USA;* [10]*Massachusetts General Hospital Cancer Center, Division of Hematology/Oncology, Boston, USA*

Background: Patients with hormone-resistant ABC show constitutive activation of the PI3K/Akt/mTOR pathway. In phase II studies, the oral mTOR inhibitor EVE has shown promising efficacy when used in combination with endocrine therapy in estrogen receptor-positive (ER+) ABC progressing during treatment with nonsteroidal aromatase inhibitors. BOLERO-2 is a multinational, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase III study comparing EVE in combination with exemestane (EXE) with EXE alone in postmenopausal women with ER+ ABC refractory to letrozole or anastrozole.

Methods: Eligible patients were randomized (2:1) to EVE 10 mg/d or placebo (PBO) in combination with EXE 25 mg/d. Stratification criteria included sensitivity to prior hormonal therapy and the presence of visceral metastases. Study drugs were continued until disease progression or unacceptable toxicity. Primary outcome was investigator assessed progression-free survival (PFS). Adverse events (AEs) were monitored continuously.

Results: 724 patients were administered EVE+EXE (n = 485) or EXE (n = 239). Median age was 62 years; 56% had visceral involvement, and 84% were sensitive to prior hormone therapy. Current analysis is based on 457 events and a median follow-up of 12.5 months. Median investigator-assessed PFS was significantly longer at 7.4 months with EVE+EXE vs 3.2 months with EXE (HR=0.44; $P < 1 \times 10^{-16}$), and by central review at 11.0 vs 4.1 months, respectively (HR=0.36; $P < 1 \times 10^{-16}$). Response rates (RR) were also improved with EVE+EXE vs EXE (12.0% vs 1.3%; $P < 0.0001$) as well as clinical benefit rate (CBR) (50.5% vs 25.5%, respectively; $P < 0.0001$). Serious AEs occurred in 26.8% in the EVE+EXE arm and 13.9% in the EXE arm, including 11.2% (EVE+EXE) and 1.7% (EXE) attributed to study treatment. The most common grade 3/4 AEs (EVE+EXE vs EXE) were stomatitis (8% vs 1%), anemia (7% vs 1%), hyperglycemia (5% vs <1%), dyspnea (4% vs 1%), fatigue (4% vs 1%), and pneumonitis (3% vs 0%). At the current time, the overall survival is still immature because of the low number of events with 17.3% for the EVE+EXE arm and 22.6% for the EXE arm.

Conclusion: EVE+EXE significantly improved PFS, RR, and CBR compared with EXE. Side effects were manageable and consistent with previous reports of EVE in this patient population. These data support the use of EVE in combination with an aromatase inhibitor as a new therapeutic option for women with hormone therapy-refractory ABC.

254 Poster

Oral Combination Chemotherapy with Capecitabine and Cyclophosphamide Showed Good Efficacy and Quality of Life for Metastatic Breast Cancer Patient

H. Kameshima[1], T. Ohmura[1], G. Kutomi[1], H. Shima[1], T. Takamaru[1], F. Satomi[1], Y. Suzuki[1], K. Hirata[1], S. Otokozawa[2]. [1]*Sapporo Medical University School of Medicine, 1st department of Surgery, Sapporo, Japan;* [2]*Sapporo Medical University School of Medicine, Department of Public Health Research, Sapporo, Japan*

Background: Anthracyclin and taxan-containing regimens are standard for first-line chemotherapy in metastatic breast cancer (MBC). However, increasing numbers of MBC patients have experienced the use of these agents with diminishing results, leading to the need for new regimens in treating MBC.

The combination of therapy with capecitabine (Xeroda®, X) and cyclophosphamide (C) which can be given orally and which have synergic effects with no cross-resistance to anthracycline and taxans was explored. As a complete cure is difficult for MBC, it is desirable that the treatment be continued while keeping the disease stable over a long period and simultaneously promoting a high quality of life (QOL).

We estimated efficacy and QOL as affected by treatment with the XC therapy.

Material and Methods: A phase II study of the XC combination therapy was conducted in patients with MBC. Twenty-four patients with the median age 54 (range 29−77 years) were registered. A dose of 1657 mg/m^2/day of capecitabine and 65 mg/m^2/day of cyclophosphamide were given orally for 2 weeks at 3-week intervals. We evaluated the effect of treatment, adverse events and the QOL after each cycle. The QOL was evaluated by QOL-ACD, QOL-ACD-B questionnaire surveys. The full score of the questionnaire is 5.0. The primary endpoint was the response rate. Progression-free survival, adverse events and the evaluation of QOL were investigated as secondary endpoints. Remission rates were compared using the χ^2 test.

Results: The metastatic sites of these patients were the lung, liver and bone. Fourteen patients (40%) had a single metastatic site, while 10 patients had multiple sites. The median dosing period was 16.8 (4−64) cycles. A complete response (CR) was obtained in four of 24 patients (17%), partial response (PR) in 5 (21%), stable disease (SD) in 11(45%) and progress disease (PD) in 4 (17%) resulting in a clinical benefit rate of 83%. The median progression-free-survival was 12.1 months. Adverse events occurred in 85% of these patients, but all of them were grade 2 or less. The QOL survey showed 4.0 in pre-treatment and 3.4 in 4 subsequent cycles; the QOL showed no significant statistical change pre- and post-treatment.