surgery and standard radiotherapy to the whole breast, in order to evaluate the differences in terms of accuracy.

Materials and Methods: In our study we retrospectively analyzed a group of patients who received an advance boost on the tumor with LDFRT, for a total dose of 10 Gy by photon technique, and associated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy, to the simulated boost to the tumor bed of the same patients, after surgery and standard radiotherapy, for a total dose of 10 Gy by electron technique. The plans were analyzed for dosimetric coverage of the CT-delineated irradiated volume. The minimal dose received by 95% of the target volume (D95), the minimal dose received by 90% of the target volume (D90), and geografic miss were evaluated. A geografic miss was defined as any portion of the tumor bed receiving <50% of the prescribed dose.

Results: twelve patients, recruited from 2008 to 2011, were evaluated. We observed 3 patients with stage IIA, 8 patients with stage IIB and 1 patients with stage IIIA. Two patients had lobular cancer and 10 ductal cancer. The grading was G3 in 7 patients and G2 in 5 patients. Median age was 55 years (range 37−70). The standard sequential boost technique resulted in inferior target volume coverage compared with the advance boost technique, with a median D95 of 68.8%, a median D90 of 75.4% and a geografic miss in 25% of patients. The results of the advance boost technique were significantly better: 96% and 96.8% for median D90 and median D95 respectively, and no geografic miss was observed.

Results: the results of our study have shown that an advance boost using photon beam technique allows for optimal target volume coverage compared with sequential boost after whole breast irradiation using electron beam technique. A better localization of the target volume, represented by the tumor, could allow a smaller irradiation volume.

Friday, 23 March 2012 12:45–14:00

POSTER SESSION

Surgical Management (Including Reconstructive Surgery and Sentinel Node)

489 Poster discussion

Outcomes of Axillary Dissection Following a Positive Sentinel Node or Node Sample − Retrospective Study of Two Years Practise in a Large Breast Unit

S. Aitken[1], D.A. Cameron[2], J.M. Dixon[3], P. Mitchell[4], J.S. Thomas[5]. *[1]Lothian University Hospitals Trust, Pathology, Edinburgh, United Kingdom; [2]Lothian University Hospitals Trust, Medical Oncology, Edinburgh, United Kingdom; [3]Lothian University Hospitals Trust, Edinburgh Breast Unit, Edinburgh, United Kingdom; [4]University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh Cancer Centre, Edinburgh, United Kingdom; [5]Lothian University Hospitals NHS Trust, Pathology, Edinburgh, United Kingdom*

Background: The Edinburgh Breast Unit (EBU) initially stages the axilla in breast cancer patients by axillary ultrasound followed by fine needle aspiration (FNA) cytology of suspicious nodes. FNA negative patients are managed by sentinel node biopsy (SNB) usually supplemented by limited node sampling (ANS). If this group of patients are found to be positive on histology they are advised to go on to either axillary dissection (AND) or axillary radiotherapy. We examined the outcome in a two year cohort of patients who had undergone both SNB and ANS from EBU in 2009–2010 to guide future practice.

Materials and Methods: Case records of all patients undergoing SNB and simultaneous ANS were reviewed. Data included tumour grade and size, ER & Her-2 status, node status and results of axillary dissection. There were 529 patients in the cohort.

Results: 112 patients were SNB/ANS positive. 41 patients received axillary radiotherapy and 54 received AND of which 23 were positive. In the positive ANDs 19 cases showed replacement type (>2 mm) metastases, 1 showed a micrometastasis and 3 were not specified. 17 patients were not treated, the most common reason being comorbidity. Results are summarised in Table 1.

In the patients who were SNB positive there were no differences in tumour characteristics in those patients that were ANS positive and ANS negative. Furthermore there no differences in tumour characteristics or nodal (ANS and SNB) characteristics (number and size of nodal metastases) in those patients who did and did not have positive ANDs.

Conclusions: Additional positive nodes are identified in 36% of cases when SNB is supplemented by ANS. There are no indicators of subsequent AND status from the standard tumour or nodal dataset.

Table 1

Node status	Number	% of Total	% of Positives	AND + (Numbers)	AND − (Numbers)
SNB + ANS +	40	8	36	13	15
SNB + ANS −	61	12	54	8	14
SNB − ANS +	11	2	10	2	2
SNB − ANS −	417	79			
Total	529				

490 Poster discussion

Nipple-sparing Mastectomy for Breast Cancer at a Japanese Institution − Risk of Nipple-areola Recurrence in a Series of 806 Cases

T. Sakurai[1], T. Sakurai[2], E. Jinta[1], T. Suzuma[3], T. Umemura[4]. *[1]Wakayama Medical University Kihoku Hospital, Surgery, Ito Wakayama, Japan; [2]Sakurai Breast Clinic, Surgery, Wakayama, Japan; [3]Kushimoto Arida Hospital, Surgery, Wakayama, Japan; [4]Kiwa Hospital, Surgery, Wakayama, Japan*

Background: Cosmetic outcome is one of the most important aspects of surgical treatment of breast cancer. Most patients undergo mastectomy when breast conservation is inapplicable. Recent reports have suggested that nipple-sparing mastectomy (NSM) is as oncologically safe as mastectomy and provides a better cosmetic outcome than does mastectomy. However, NSM is controversial in terms of the risk of local recurrence behind the nipple areola complex (NAC). We herein provide a review of safety in NSM surgical technique involving the NAC and a discussion of nipple-areola recurrence and prognosis of nipple-areola recurrent cases.

Material and Methods: We retrospectively analyzed 806 patients with primary breast cancer who underwent NSM from 1985 to 2004. No patient received radiotherapy. Our surgical notes for NSM included the following information: (1) Tissue thickness under the NAC was left at 5 mm, but the major ducts were removed from within its lumen. (2) A skin flap preparation was created based on a thick flap (>1-cm-thick subcutaneous adipose tissue) created >2 cm away from the tumor, but a thin flap was placed close to the tumor.

Results: During 106 months of follow-up in an average in 806 cases of NSM, no nipple necrosis was recorded. The nipple-areola recurrence rate was 3.6% (0.4% per year). The prognosis of nipple-areola recurrence was good with a 60-month overall survival of 93% and a 100-month survival of 84%. A total of 45% of nipple-areola recurrence cases were Paget's type recurrences. All cases of nipple-areola recurrence were able to undergo salvage surgery. The nipple-areola recurrence rate was significantly high when the smallest areola-tumor distance was <1 cm.

Conclusions: The nipple-areola recurrence rate after NSM was low, and its prognosis was good. Our long-term follow-up data show that NSM may be considered to be an alternative option for mastectomy in patients with breast cancer in whom breast-conserving surgery is inapplicable.

491 Poster discussion

Medical and Personal Reasons of No Breast Reconstruction After Mastectomy − Results in 1937 Breast Cancer Patients with 70% of No Reconstruction in a Single Cancer Institute

D. Hequet[1], K. Zarca[2], S. Dolbeault[3], B. Couturaud[1], F. Reyal[1], A. De La Rochefordière[4], B. Sigal[5], B. Asselain[2], D. Hajage[2], S. Alran[1]. *[1]Institut Curie, Surgery, Paris Cedex 05, France; [2]Institut Curie, Biostatistics, Paris Cedex 05, France; [3]Institut Curie, Psycho-oncology, Paris Cedex 05, France; [4]Institut Curie, Radiotherapy, Paris Cedex 05, France; [5]Institut Curie, Pathology, Paris Cedex 05, France*

Backgrounds: The aim of this study was to determinate clinico-biologic factors associated to no breast reconstruction and to evaluate personal reasons of no reconstruction and information quality.

Materiel and Methods: This study is divided into two parts. First part consisted in a retrospective study on 1937 mastectomies done in Institute Curie between January 2004 and February 2007. We compared clinico-biologic factors of patients who had a reconstruction to them who didn't have. Second part consisted in a questionnaire sent to a representative sample of patients with no reconstruction (10% of our population, n = 132).

Results: In situ cancer represented 17% of the 1937 mastectomies (n = 335) and invasive cancer 83% (n = 1602). The total rate of no reconstruction was 68% (n = 1315). No reconstruction rates were respectively 35% (n = 116/335) and 75% (n = 1200/1602) for in situ and invasive cancer.

After multivariate analysis, patients with professional activity are more reconstructed than patients without professional activity (OR = 4.05; IC = 2.05−8, $p < 0.005$) in the group with in situ cancer. For invasive