Is sentinel lymph node biopsy alone accurate for breast cancer mastectomy? Results of a cohort study of 2423 patients.

Gilles HOUVENAEGHEL (✉ houvenaeghelg@ipc.unicancer.fr)

Institut Paoli-Calmettes <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4384-6255>

J.M. Classe

Institut de Cancerologie de l'Ouest

G. Blache

Institut Paoli-Calmettes

C. Mazouni

Gustave Roussy

F. Reyat

Institut Curie

P. Gimbergues

Centre Jean Perrin

E. Daraï

Hopital Tenon

A.S. Azuar

Centre Hospitalier de Grasse

P.E. Colombo

Institut du Cancer de Montpellier

M. Bannier

Institut Paoli-Calmettes

E. Lambaudie

Institut Paoli-Calmettes

M. Cohen

Institut Paoli-Calmettes

Research article

Keywords: Sentinel node ; breast cancer ; mastectomy

Posted Date: September 12th, 2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.14318/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background : Few patients with mastectomy and only with pN0(i+) or pN1mi sentinel node (SN) were included in randomized trial. To demonstrate SN biopsy accuracy for mastectomy. Methods: We examined results of SN among a multi-institutional cohort of patients, $\leq$ cT2-N0, who required total mastectomy, according to SN status and complementary axillary lymph-node dissection (cALND) or not. We have analyzed involved non-sentinel node (NSN) rate at cALND, overall (OS) and disease-free survival (DFS). Results: Among 2423 patients we reported 1307 pN0(i-)SN, 120 pN0(i+)SN, 273 pN1miSN and 723 pN1macro-metastases SN with cALND respectively in 24.5, 73.3, 82.4 and 93.1%. Median follow-up was 42.72 months. Among 320 patients with pN0(i-)SN we observed 35 NSN macro-metastases (10.9%) and among 723 patients with SN macro-metastases, cALND was omitted in 50 patients (6.9%): in multivariate analysis, OS and DFS were not significantly different according to cALND or not. Among 120 patients with pN0(i+)SN and 273 with pN1miSN, cALND were respectively omitted in 32 and 48 patients: age, pT-size and SN-status were predictive of NSN involvement. In multivariate analysis, post-mastectomy radiotherapy, regional nodal irradiation and adjuvant chemotherapy were significantly correlated to cALND and a significant lesser DFS rate was reported for patients without cALND (HR: 3.861, $p=0.002$). Conclusion: SN biopsy appeared as an accurate procedure for axillary staging of breast cancer mastectomy for pN0 SN status. For pN1-macro-metastases it is not possible to propose to avoid cALND. When SN was involved by ITC or micro-metastases, omission of cALND is still controversial and should have a negative prognosis impact in relation with a down staging and under treatment.

Background

A decrease of axillary lymph node dissection (ALND) rate since the development and validation of sentinel lymph node biopsy (SLNB) for non-involved sentinel node (SN)¹ has been observed. More recently, since results of ACOSOG Z0011, IBCSG 23-01 and AATRM trials^{2,3,4}, complementary ALND (cALND) was questioned in some situations for involved-SN. However, few studies were reported about SLNB accuracy for patients who need total mastectomy.

In Z0011 trial² patients undergoing upfront conservative surgery followed by systemic adjuvant therapy for unifocal breast cancer (BC) with 1 or 2 SN involved by micro or macro-metastases, without capsular rupture, were included. Results were discussed concerning the limits and the biases of this study^{5,6}. Omission of cALND was held in some teams and recommendations^{7,8}, underlining the strict conditions of possible omission of cALND. An evaluation in selected patients considered at high-risk was reported⁹. But some points remains unclear, particularly for patients who required total mastectomy. The possibility of cALND avoidance for patients who required total mastectomy is a timely topic. Very few patients with mastectomy were included in randomized trial^{3,4} and only for patients with pN0(i+) or pN1mi SN (86 patients in IBCSG 23-01 trial and 18 in AATRM trial). For this reason we designed the SERC trial to compare outcomes in patients with SN-involvement treated with cALND or no further treatment to the axilla with larger inclusion criteria^{10,11}.

The aim of this study was to examine involved non-sentinel node (NSN) rate, axillary recurrence (AR) rate and mainly survival according to SN status among a multi-institutional cohort of patients who required total mastectomy.

Methods

We conducted a retrospective analysis of 2423 consecutive patients managed between March 1999 and December 2012 in 9 specialized breast centers, referred for mastectomy and SLNB (not included in SERC trial) among a breast cancer data base of 23145 patients. Total mastectomy was usually proposed to manage multi focal tumors, small invasive BC with a large in situ component, patients with a very small breast volume and patient's choice for total mastectomy.

All patients included in this study have been managed for early BC $\leq$ cT2-N0, without pre-operative treatment before SLNB and total mastectomy. We excluded patients with axillary cN1 or T3-4. SLNB was performed using combined isotopic and

colorimetric detection or isotopic detection alone with peri-tumoral and/or sub areolar injection¹¹. Although the methods used for SN histological examination were not standardized in the protocol, all sites proceeded similarly: serial sections were performed every 200 microns and stained with standard HE. The number of sections was six to ten, or pursued until node exhaustion in case of large SN. Additional IHC analysis was done in case of negative results at standard examination. For lymph nodes (LN) identified by cALND, routine HE analysis was performed^{10, 11}.

For data analysis, we used:

Five tumor subtypes were defined according to immunohistochemistry (IHC) analysis of endocrine receptors (ER) and Her2: Luminal-A (ER+ Her2- Grade 1-2, Her2 (Her2+ ER-), Triple negative (ER- Her2-: negative estrogen and progesterone receptors), Luminal-B Her2- Grade 3, Luminal-B Her2+ ER+^{8, 9}. ERs (Estrogen receptor and/or progesterone receptor expression) were considered as positive if they were expressed in at least 10% of the tumor specimen. HER2 status was determined according to French guidelines by IHC +/- fluorescent in situ hybridization.

Statistical analysis: Four categories of SN-status were defined: negative-SN (pN0i-), isolated tumor cells (ITC: pN0(i+) £0.2mm), detected either by hematoxylin and eosin (HE) staining or by cytokeratin IHC, micro-metastases (pN1mi >0.2mm and £2mm), and macro-metastases (>2mm)¹⁰⁻¹².

We have analyzed involved non-sentinel node (NSN) rate at cALND and predictive factors of NSN involvement. Then we have evaluated axillary recurrence (AR) rate, overall survival (OS) and disease-free survival (DFS) according to cALND or not. We used standard descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation [SD], median and range for quantitative variables, count and frequency for categorical variables) to describe patients and tumors characteristics. In univariate analyses, comparisons were performed using Chi Square. Multivariable analysis was performed using binary logistic regression. Survival analysis was performed using Log Rank test for univariate analysis and Cox model for multivariate analysis. Overall survival was defined as the time elapsed between surgery and death from any cause. Disease-free survival was calculated from the date of surgery to the first date of loco-regional recurrence, distant recurrence or death from any cause, whichever occurred first.

All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS 16.0. All statistical tests were two-sided. The level of statistical significance was set at a p value of 0.05.

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were done in accordance with the French ethical standards and with the 2008 Helsinki declaration. This work was approved by our institutional review board (IPC Comité d'Orientation Stratégique).

Results

Population

Among 2423 patients with SLNB for BC mastectomy we reported 1307 pN0(i-)SN, 120 pN0(i+)SN, 273 pN1miSN and 723 pN1macroSN. cALND has been performed for 1306 patients (53.9%), in 24.5, 73.3, 82.4 and 93.1% for SN pN0(i-), pN0(i+), pN1mi and pN1macro, respectively. Factors associated with pN final status with or without cALND are reported in **Table 1**.

Median follow-up was 42.72 months (mean: 51.33, CI95%: 49.9-52.8, range: 0.26-211). We reported 120 death and 213 recurrences including 152 metastases and 21 axillary recurrences and 40 local breast recurrence or unknown as first event.

pN0(i-) SN status

Among 1307 patients with pN0(i-)SN, 320 underwent an additional ALND, mainly before publication of NSABP B-32 trial results¹. We observed 35 LN macro metastases at cALND (10.9%) and false negative rate (FNR) was 3.63% among 964

patients with LN involvement (35/964) at cALND with pathologic results known or at SN.

In binary logistic regression, cALND was significantly associated with grade, LVI, ER, tumor size and periods of treatment. Adjuvant chemotherapy (AC), post-mastectomy radiotherapy (PMRT) and regional nodal irradiation (RNI) were delivered more frequently for patients with cALND, including 95.4% (21/22) of AC and 97.1% (34/35) of PMRT for patients with involved NSN at cALND. (**Table 2**).

In Cox regression analysis, OS and DFS were not significantly different according to cALND or not (**Table 3, 4**). AR rates were 1.4% for patients without cALND (14/987) and 0.3% with cALND (1/320) (p: 0.086): 2.8% (9/323) and 0.8% (5/660) for patients without cALND respectively with and without PMRT, 0.4% (1/225) and 0% (0/95) for patients with cALND respectively with and without PMRT (p: 0.039: cALND or not for patients with PMRT).

pN1 macro metastases SN status

Among 723 patients with SN macro-metastases, cALND was omitted in only 50 patients (6.9%). Among patients with involved-SN number known, only one SN macro-metastases was observed in 372 patients and more than one in 257 patients: 124 patients with only one SN macro-metastases had one or more NSN-involved at cALND (124/332: 37.3%). AC and PMRT were delivered more frequently for patients with cALND (**Table 2**). In Cox regression analysis, OS and DFS were not significantly different according to cALND or not (**Table 3, 4**). AR rates were 1.0 and 0% respectively for patients with and without cALND (7/673 vs 0/50), 0.9% and 2.5% respectively for patients with and without PMRT (6/683 vs 1/40: p=0.330).

pN0(i+) and pN1mi SN status

Among 120 patients with pN0(i+) SN and 273 patients with pN1mi SN, cALND were respectively omitted in 32 patients (26.7%) and 48 patients (17.6%) (**Table 2**).

One or several macro-metastases in NSN at cALND was observed in 6 patients with pN0(i+) SN (6/88: 6.8%, 1 NSN positive for 4 patients, 2 and 6 NSN positive for 2 others) and 30 patients with pN1mi (30/225: 13.3%, 1 NSN positive for 21 patients, 2 NSN positive for 7 patients, 3 and 6 NSN positive for 2 others).

In univariate analysis, age, pT size and SN status were significantly predictive of NSN involvement among patients with pN0(i+) or pN1mi SN and cALND (**Table 5**). These factors remained significant in binary logistic regression (**Table 5**).

Four groups were determined according to pT tumor size < or >= 20mm and age > or <= 40 years-old with NSN involvement rate for pN0(i+) and pN1mi from 0 to 65%. In binary logistic regression cALND was not significantly associated to these 4 sub-groups and SN status (**Table 6**).

For pN0(i+) and for pN1mi, AC and PMRT was delivered more frequently for patients with cALND, including for patients with involved NSN at cALND 100% (5/5) and 92.3% (24/26) of AC, 83.3% (5/6) and 100% (30/30) of PMRT for pN0(i+) and pN1mi respectively (**Table 2**).

For pN0(i+) and pN1mi according to cALND or not, PMRT rate was significantly different only for patients with pT<20mm/age>40 years-old, RNI rate was significantly different for patients with pT<20mm/age>40 years-old and pT<20mm/age<=40 years-old, AC rate was significantly different for patients with pT<20mm/age>40 years-old and pT>=20mm/age>40 years-old (**Supplementary Table 1**).

In binary logistic regression, PMRT, RNI and AC were significantly associated with cALND but also to SN status and pT/age sub-groups (**Table 6**).

In univariate analysis (Log Rank), OS and DFS was lesser and significantly different for patients with pN0(i+) SN without cALND (respectively, p: 0.012 and <0.0001), but without difference for pN1mi SN (respectively, p: 0.985 and 0.180). In Cox regression analysis (Tables 3-4), OS were not significantly different according to cALND or not for patients with pN0(i+) or pN1mi (HR: 2.063, CI95%: 0.439-9.693, p: 0.359) and a significant difference was observed for DFS with lesser survival rate for patients without cALND (HR: 3.861, CI95%: 1.660-8.982, p: 0.002) without other significant criteria (ET, AC, LVI, age, SN status, PMRT and RNI) (*Fig. 1*).

In Cox regression analysis adjusted on endocrine therapy (ET), SN status and pT/age (< or >=20mm/<= or >40 years-old), omission of cALND was negatively associated to DFS (HR: 4.023, CI95%: 1.896-8.534, p<0.001) and no ET had also a borderline negative association (HR: 2.755, CI95%: 0.988-7.684, p: 0.053). Omission of cALND and no ET were negatively associated to RFS (respectively, HR: 3.187, CI95%: 1.379-7.363, p: 0.007 and HR: 3.968, CI95%: 1.399-11.25, p: 0.010). On OS adjusted on ET, SN status, pT/age (< or >=20mm/<= or >40 years-old), LVI, only no ET was negatively associated to OS (HR: 7.985, CI95%: 1.346-47.37, p: 0.022) without significant difference for cALND or not (HR: 2.904, CI95%: 0.733-11.51, p: 0.129).

AR rates were no significantly different according to cALND or not and PMRT or not, 0% (0/31) and 0% (0/49) for patients without cALND, 0.8% (2/246) and 1.5% (1/67) for patients with cALND respectively with and without PMRT.

Conclusions

We reported from a large retrospective cohort of mastectomy, no OS and DFS significant difference between cALND or not for patients with pN0(i-) SN status and for patients with pN1 macro metastases SN status. However, few patients with pN1 macro metastases SN had no cALND. For patients with pN0(i+) or pN1mi SN, lesser DFS was reported for patients without cALND in comparison with patients with cALND in multivariable analysis (HR: 3.861, p: 0.002) but without significant difference for OS.

For patients with pN0(i-) SN, we reported analysis of 1307 patients without cALND in 75.5% of patients. In Veronesi et al trial¹³, randomization of cALND was proposed for patients cN0 with tumor diameter of 2cm or less and breast conserving surgery: 8 positive NSN at cALND were reported (8/257: 3.1%) with 8.8% FNR (8/91). In NSABP-B32 trial¹, randomization of cALND was proposed for patients cN0 with unifocal tumor, mainly <=20mm (83.8%: 3344/3989) with conservative treatment (87.5%) or mastectomy (n= 499, 12.5%). In cALND arm, 75 patients (75/1975: 3.8%) had positive NSN with a FNR > 8.3% (75 among 904 patients with SN positive or unknown). FNR was lower in our study (3.63%). A lower rate of FNR should be attributed to more extensive SN pathologic analysis in our study with serial sections and IHC for negative HE analysis. After more extensive pathologic analysis, it was reported that 15.9% (CI95%: 14.7-17.1%) of SN (616/3884) presented occult metastases (69.8% among ITC: 430/616 and 27.9% among micro-metastases: 172/616) and in some cases macro-metastases (2.3% of macro-metastases: 14/616)¹⁴. It had been reported that SLNB was accurate for large tumors (1101 with tumors > 20 and <30mm and 748 tumors >=30mm)¹⁵ and for multi-focal multi-centric tumors¹⁶ even if LN involvement rate was higher for these patients.

For patients who had a macro-metastases SN, the only reported trial with cALND randomization versus only SLNB² had included macro and micro-metastases only for conservative treatment. In AMAROS trial¹⁷, with randomization between cALND versus axillary radiotherapy, patients with tumors up to 5cm diameter, cN0, unifocal or multifocal and breast-conserving treatment or mastectomy were eligible: 19.4% of patients had tumors more than 2cm (276/1425), 17.4% had mastectomy (248/1425), 60.4% had macro-metastases SN (861/1425), 28.8% had micro-metastases SN (410/1425) and 10.8% had ITC SN (154/1425). In the cALND arm, involved NSN rate was 32.8% (220/671). In NSABP B-04 trial with randomization between ALND or no axillary surgery for patients with total mastectomy, no survival impact was observed with a long follow-up¹⁸. However, patients included in this trial had large tumors, which were very different with patients for

whom SLNB is indicated, and any systemic treatment was administered with low survival rates in two arms. Omission of regional treatment with ALND had in consequence no survival impact.

In OTOASOR trial¹⁹, with randomization between cALND versus axillary radiotherapy, patients with tumors up to 3cm diameter, cN0, unifocal or multifocal and breast-conserving treatment or mastectomy were eligible: 48.7% of patients had tumors more than 2cm (231/474) with 11.1% of multifocal tumors (53/474), 15.6% had mastectomy (74/474), 60.4% had macro-metastases SN (139/230), 33.5% had micro-metastases SN (77/230) and 6.1% had ITC SN (14/230) in the radiotherapy arm. In the cALND arm, involved NSN rate was 38.5% (94/244).

Several trials are ongoing with randomization of cALND: INSEMA trial with only 1 or 2 SN macro-metastases and conservative treatment²⁰, POSNOC trial with only 1 or 2 SN macro-metastases and conservative treatment or mastectomy with cALND or radiotherapy versus no other axillary treatment²¹, SERC trial^{10, 11} and BOOG 2013–07 trial for mastectomy and 1 to 3 involved SN by micro or macro-metastases with only mastectomies²², SENOMAC trial for patients with 1 or 2 SN macro-metastases including mastectomies²³.

In SERC trial^{10, 11}, 1897 patients are actually included with randomization between cALND or no other treatment for involved SN by ITC or micro-metastases or macro-metastases with conservative treatment or mastectomy. In the first 963 patients included in the first analysis (170 mastectomies and 793 conservative treatment), the overall rate of positive NSN was 19% (84/442) for patients with cALND, and crude rates of positive NSN according to SN status were 4.5% for patients with ITC (1/22), 9.5% for SN micro-metastases (13/137), 23.9% for SN macro-metastases (61/255).

For patients with pN0(i+) or pN1mi SN, two trials were reported with randomization of cALND^{3, 4} with 86 mastectomies in IBCSG 23-01 trial (86/931: 9.2%) and the rate of involved NSN in cALND arm was 13%. In AATRM trial only 18 patients had had mastectomy⁴. In the study published by Tvedskov et al., these rates of involved NSN were 9.2% for ITC and 17.9% for Mic²⁴ and in a previous study we had reported positive-NSN rates of 13.9% (40/287) for ITC and 14.1% (93/658) for pN1mi SN with a predictive nomogram based on tumor size, ratio of positive-SN/analyzed-SN, LVI, tumor histologic type^{15, 25}.

AC rate was not higher for patients without cALND for pN0(i+) and pN1mi in comparison with patients with ALND in our study, respectively 59.4% and 39.6% versus 34.1% and 21.3%.

In the AMAROS trial¹⁷, ALND realization had no impact on the decision of adjuvant treatment. In a study in 172 patients with pN1mi SN who underwent cALND, Mazouni et al.²⁶ showed the low impact of SN status in the therapeutic decision for AC, except in case of low grade or HER2-negative tumors. However, in the study by Aigner et al.²⁷, indication of AC was modified in 18.2% of cases. In the Multicenter Clinical Trial AATRM⁴, 247 patients with Mic were randomized between cALND and no cALND and AC rate was higher in those who underwent cALND (40.2%) compared to those without cALND (36.8%). Finally, in the study by Savolt et al. with randomization between cALND and regional node RT, AC was more frequently administered in case of cALND (78 versus 69%)¹⁹. In IBCSG trial AC was not different between cALND and no cALND: 32.1% (149/464) and 29.1% (136/467)³. Indications of AC depended of tumor phenotype and molecular tumor subtypes but also of presence or no of axillary lymph node macro-metastases. Under evaluation of axillary LN status with omission of cALND could resulted in AC under indication, particularly for Luminal-A or Luminal-B Her2-negative tumors.

PMRT rate was not lower in our study for pN0(i+) and pN1mi for patients with cALND versus cALND (respectively, 34.1% and 21.3% versus 59.4% and 39.6%). In IBCSG 23-01 trial, no PMRT was realized in all patients with mastectomy. The role of RT in the absence of cALND in patients with invaded SN has been extensively discussed²⁸. In the ACOSOG Z0011 trial, adjuvant treatments associated with whole breast irradiation (WBI) using axillary tangential fields, likely contributed to the low rate of node recurrence (1% in the group without ALND). However, WBI with tangential fields and regional RT were specified in only one third of cases²⁹. Most series evaluating the SN technique showed that tangential fields include the

majority of levels I and II but others reported that standard tangential fields of breast RT include the axillary only to a limited extent^{30,31}.

AR is a rare event corresponding to a strong survival pejorative factor³².

In Gentilini et al. study, AR rates were significantly different between patients who received WBI or partial breast irradiation after conservative treatment³³. At 10-years, AR rate were in IBCSG 23-01 trial 1.2% and 1.2% for 86 mastectomies respectively in arm with ALND (1/44) and without cALND (1/42) but AR rates for patients with conservative treatment with IORT without WBI were 0% (0/79) in arm with cALND and 6.25% (5/80) in arm without cALND. In our study, AR rates were no significantly different according to cALND or not and PMRT or not. PMRT is usually indicated for patients with lymph node macro-metastases³⁴. Two trials explored omission of cALND for patients with positive-SN treated by mastectomy with determination of tangential fields: BOOG 2013–07 and SERC trials^{10,11,22}.

Abbreviations

AC : Adjuvant chemotherapy

ALND : axillary lymph node dissection

AR : axillary recurrence

BC : breast cancer

cALND : complementary axillary lymph node dissection

DFS : disease-free survival

ER : endocrine receptors

ET : endocrine therapy

FNR : false negative rate

HE : hematoxylin and eosin

HR : hazard ratio

IHC : immunohistochemistry

IORT : intra operative radiotherapy

ITC : isolated tumor cells

LN : lymph nodes

LVI : lympho vascular invasion

NSN : non-sentinel node

OS : overall survival

PMRT : post-mastectomy radiotherapy

RNI : regional nodal irradiation

RT : radiotherapy

SD : standard deviation

SLNB : sentinel lymph node biopsy

SN : sentinel node

WBI : whole breast irradiation

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate :

This work was approved by our institutional review board (IPC - Comité d'Orientation Stratégique).

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were done in accordance with the French ethical standards and with the 2008 Helsinki declaration.

All included patients provided written informed consent before surgery, including the use of their data for research.

Availability of data and material :

Administrative data and clinical data are compiled in a common database and are available to editors and peer reviewers.

Competing interests :

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Source of funding : This work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Authors' contributions :

GH, JMC, GB, CM, FR, PG, ED, ASA, PEC, MB, EL, MC supervised or participated in the data collection

GH and MC conducted data analyses and interpreted the results.

GH and MC drafted the manuscript.

GH, JMC, GB, CM, FR, PG, ED, ASA, PEC, MB, EL, MC participated in revisions of the manuscript.

GH, JMC, GB, CM, FR, PG, ED, ASA, PEC, MB, EL, MC have read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements : Not applicable.

References

1. Krag DN, Anderson SJ, Julian TB, Brown AM, Harlow SP, Costantino JP, et al. Sentinel-lymph-node resection compared with conventional axillary-lymph-node dissection in clinically node-negative patients with breast cancer: overall survival findings from the NSABP B-32 randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2010;11:927-33.
2. Giuliano AE, Hunt KK, Ballman KV, Beitsch PD, Whitworth PW, Blumencranz PW, et al. Axillary dissection vs no axillary dissection in women with invasive breast cancer and sentinel node metastasis: a randomized clinical trial. *AM, Saha S,*

McCall LM, Morrow M. JAMA. 2011 Feb 9;305(6):569-75.

3. Galimberti V, Cole BF, Zurrada S, Viale G, Luini A, Veronesi P, et al. Axillary dissection versus no axillary dissection in patients with sentinel-node micrometastases (IBCSG 23-01): a phase 3 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2013 Apr;14(4):297-305.
4. Sola M, Alberro JA, Fraile M, Santesteban P, Ramos M, Fabregas R, et al. Complete axillary lymph node dissection versus clinical follow-up in breast cancer patients with sentinel node micrometastasis: final results from the multicenter clinical trial AATRM 048/13/2000. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013; 20(1): 120-7.
5. Caudle AS, Hunt KK, Kuerer HM, Meric-Bernstam F, Lucci A, Bedrosian I, et al. Multidisciplinary Considerations in the Implementation of the Findings from the American College of Surgeons Oncology Group (ACOSOG) Z0011 Study: A Practice-Changing Trial. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2011; 18(9): 2407–2412.
6. Tsai-Wei Huang , Ken N. Kuo , Kee-Hsin Chen, Chieh-feng Chen, Wen-Hsuan Hou, Wei-Hwa Lee, et al. Recommendation for axillary lymph node dissection in women with early breast cancer and sentinel node metastasis: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials using the GRADE system. *Int J Surg* 2016, 34 (2016) 73-80.
7. Lyman GH, Temin S, Edge SB, Newman LA, Turner RR, Weaver DL, Benson AB 3rd, et al. [Sentinel lymph node biopsy for patients with early-stage breast cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline update](#). *J Clin Oncol*. 2014 May 1;32(13):1365-83.
8. Coates AS, Winer EP, Goldhirsch A, Gelber RD, Gnant M, Piccart-Gebhart M, et al. [Tailoring therapies—improving the management of early breast cancer: St Gallen International Expert Consensus on the Primary Therapy of Early Breast Cancer 2015](#). *Ann Oncol*. 2015 Aug;26(8):1533-46.
9. Chung A, Gangi A, Mirocha J, Giuliano A. Applicability of the ACOSOG Z0011 Criteria in Women with High-Risk Node-Positive Breast Cancer Undergoing Breast Conserving Surgery *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015 ; 22:1128–1132.
10. Houvenaeghel G, Resbeut M, Boher JM. Sentinel node invasion: is it necessary to perform axillary lymph node dissection? Randomized trial SERC. *Bull Cancer*. 2014 Apr;101(4):358-63.
11. Houvenaeghel G, Cohen M, Raro P, De Troyer J, de Lara CT, Gimbergues P, Gauthier T, Faure-Virelizier C, Vaini-Cowen V, Lantheaume S, Regis C, Darai E, Ceccato V, D'Halluin G, Del Piano F, Villet R, Jouve E, Beedassy B, Theret P, Gabelle P, Zinzindohoue C, Opinel P, Marsollier-Ferrer C, Dhainaut-Speyer C, Colombo PE, Lambaudie E, Tallet A, Boher JM; Others investigators (SERC trial group). [Overview of the pathological results and treatment characteristics in the first 1000 patients randomized in the SERC trial: axillary dissection versus no axillary dissection in patients with involved sentinel node](#). *BMC Cancer*. 2018 Nov 21;18(1):1153.
12. Houvenaeghel G, Nos C, Mignotte H, Classe JM, Giard S, Rouanet P, et al. Micrometastases in sentinel lymph node in a multicentric study: predictive factors of nonsentinel lymph node involvement—Groupe des Chirurgiens de la Federation des Centres de Lutte Contre le Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2006 ; 24 : 1814-22.
13. Veronesi U, Paganelli G, Viale G, Luini A, Zurrada S, Galimberti V, et al. A randomized comparison of sentinel-node biopsy with routine axillary dissection in breast cancer. *New Engl J Med* 2003;349:546e53.
14. Weaver DL, Ashikaga T, Krag DN, Skelly JM, Anderson SJ, Harlow SP, et al. [Effect of occult metastases on survival in node-negative breast cancer](#). *N Engl J Med*. 2011 Feb 3;364(5):412-21.
15. Houvenaeghel G, Quilichini O, Cohen M, Reyat F, Classe JM, Mazouni C, et al. [Sentinel lymph node biopsy validation for large tumors](#). *Int J Surg*. 2017 Dec;48:275-280.
16. Houvenaeghel G, Tallet A, Jalaguier-Coudray A, Cohen M, Bannier M, Jauffret-Fara C, Lambaudie E. [Is breast conservative surgery a reasonable option in multifocal or multicentric tumors?](#) *World J Clin Oncol*. 2016 Apr 10;7(2):234-42.
17. Donker M, van Tienhoven G, Straver ME, Meijnen P, van de Velde CJ, Mansel RE, et al. [Radiotherapy or surgery of the axilla after a positive sentinel node in breast cancer \(EORTC 10981-22023 AMAROS\): a randomised, multicentre, open-label, phase 3 non-inferiority trial](#). *Lancet Oncol*. 2014 Nov;15(12):1303-10.

18. Fisher B, Jeong JH, Anderson S, et al. Twenty-five-year followup of a randomized trial comparing radical mastectomy, total mastectomy and total mastectomy followed by irradiation. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:567–75.
19. Savolt A, Peley G, Polgar C, Udvarhelyi N, Rubovszky G, Kovacs E, et al. Eight-year follow up result of the OTOASOR trial: The Optimal Treatment Of the Axilla - Surgery Or Radiotherapy after positive sentinel lymph node biopsy in early-stage breast cancer: A randomized, single centre, phase III, non-inferiority trial. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2017;43(4):672-9.
20. Reimer T, Stachs A, Nekljudova V, Loibl S, Hartmann S, Wolter K, et al. [Restricted Axillary Staging in Clinically and Sonographically Node-Negative Early Invasive Breast Cancer \(c/IT1-2\) in the Context of Breast Conserving Therapy: First Results Following Commencement of the Intergroup-Sentinel-Mamma \(INSEMA\) Trial](#). *Geburtshilfe Frauenheilkd*. 2017 Feb;77(2):149-157.
21. Goyal A, Dodwell D. [POSNO: A Randomised Trial Looking at Axillary Treatment in Women with One or Two Sentinel Nodes with Macrometastases](#). *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. 2015 Dec;27(12):692-5.
22. van Roozendaal LM, de Wilt JH, van Dalen T, van der Hage JA, Strobbe LJ, Boersma LJ, et al. [The value of completion axillary treatment in sentinel node positive breast cancer patients undergoing a mastectomy: a Dutch randomized controlled multicentre trial \(BOOG 2013-07\)](#). *BMC Cancer*. 2015 Sep 3;15:610.
23. de Boniface J, [Frisell J](#), Andersson Y, [Bergkvist L](#), [Ahlgren J](#), [Rydén L](#), [Olofsson Bagge R](#), [Sund M](#), [Johansson H](#), [Lundstedt D](#) & [SENOMACTrialists' Group](#). Survival and axillary recurrence following sentinel node-positive breast cancer without completion axillary lymph node dissection: the randomized controlled SENOMAC *BMC Cancer*. 2017 May 26;17(1):379.
24. Tvedskov TF, Meretoja TJ, Jensen MB, Leidenius M, Kroman N. Cross-validation of three predictive tools for non-sentinel node metastases in breast cancer patients with micrometastases or isolated tumor cells in the sentinel node. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2014; 40(4):435-41.
25. Houvenaeghel G, Nos C, Giard S, Mignotte H, Esterni B, Jacquemier J, et al. A nomogram predictive of non-sentinel lymph node involvement in breast cancer patients with a sentinel lymph node micrometastasis. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2009;35(7):690-
26. Mazouni C, Reitsamer R, Rimareix F, Stranzl H, Uzan C, Garbay JR, et al. The positive non-sentinel status is not the main decisional factor for chemotherapy assignment in breast cancer with micrometastatic disease in the sentinel lymph node. *J Surg Oncol* 2012;106(6):703-7.
27. Aigner J, Smetanay K, Hof H, Sinn HP, Sohn C, Schneeweiss A, et al. Omission of axillary dissection according to ACOSOG Z0011: impact on adjuvant treatment recommendations. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013;20(5):1538-44.
28. Haffty BG, Hunt KK, Harris JR, Buchholz TA. Positive sentinel nodes without axillary dissection: implications for the radiation oncologist. *J Clin Oncol* 2011;29(34):4479-81.
29. Jagsi R, Chadha M, Moni J, Ballman K, Laurie F, Buchholz TA, et al. Radiation field design in the ACOSOG Z0011 (Alliance) trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2014;32(32):3600-6.
30. Belkacemi Y, Allab-Pan Q, Bigorie V, Khodari W, Beaussart P, Totobenazara JL, et al. The standard tangential fields used for breast irradiation do not allow optimal coverage and dose distribution in axillary levels I-II and the sentinel node area. *Ann Oncol* 2013;24(8):2023-8.
31. Belkacemi Y, Bigorie V, Pan Q, Bouaita R, Pigneur F, Itti E, et al. Breast radiotherapy (RT) using tangential fields (TgF): a prospective evaluation of the dose distribution in the sentinel lymph node (SLN) area as determined intraoperatively by clip placement. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2014;21(12):3758e65.
32. Houvenaeghel G, Classe JM, Garbay JR, Giard S, Cohen M, Faure C, et al. [Survival impact and predictive factors of axillary recurrence after sentinel biopsy](#). *Eur J Cancer*. 2016 May;58:73-82.
33. Gentilini O, Botteri E, Leonardi MC, Rotmensz N, Vila J, Peradze N, et al. [Ipsilateral axillary recurrence after breast conservative surgery: The protective effect of whole breast radiotherapy](#). *Radiother Oncol*. 2017 Jan;122(1):37-44. doi: 10.1016/j.radonc.2016.12.021.

34. Forissier V, Tallet A, Cohen M, Classe JM, Reyat F, Chopin N, Mazouni C, Gimbergues P, Daraï E, Colombo PE, Azuar P, Lambaudie E, Houvenaeghel G. [Is post-mastectomy radiation therapy contributive in pN0-1mi breast cancer patients? Results of a French multi-centric cohort.](#) Eur J Cancer. 2017 Nov 3;87:47-57.

Tables

Table 1: Characteristics of patients according to pN status.

	pN final status	pN0		pN0(i+)		pN1mi		pN1 macro		Total		Chi 2
		Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%	Nb	%	p
Total		1272	52.5	114	4.7	243	10.0	794	32.8	2423		
SN alone		987	88.4	32	2.9	48	4.3	50	4.5	1117		
SN+ALND	pN0(i-) sn	285	89.1	0		0		35	10.9	320	24.5	
	pN0(i+) sn	0		82	93.2	0		6	6.8	88	6.7	
	pN1 mi sn	0		0		195	86.7	30	13.3	225	17.2	
	pN1 macro sn	0		0		0		673	100	673	51.5	
age	≤ 40	101	7.9	23	20.2	32	13.2	82	10.3	238	9.8	< 0.001
	40.1-50	317	24.9	29	25.4	60	24.7	262	33.0	668	27.6	
	50.1-74.9	718	56.4	56	49.1	125	51.4	393	49.5	1292	53.3	
	≥ 75	136	10.7	6	5.3	26	10.7	57	7.2	225	9.3	
pT mm	0-5	176	14.3	9	8.0	18	7.5	33	4.3	236	10.0	< 0.001
	>5-10	260	21.2	19	17.0	30	12.4	53	6.8	362	15.4	
	>10-20	387	31.5	27	24.1	79	32.8	159	20.5	652	27.7	
	21-50	344	28.0	43	38.4	80	33.2	401	51.7	868	36.8	
	> 50	61	5.0	14	12.5	34	14.1	130	16.8	239	10.1	
Grade	1	351	27.6	20	17.5	70	28.8	147	18.5	588	24.3	< 0.001
	2	618	48.6	65	57.0	116	47.7	427	53.8	1226	50.6	
	3	246	19.3	24	21.1	51	21.0	213	26.8	534	22.0	
	unknown	57	4.5	5	4.4	6	2.4	7	0.9	75	3.1	
LVI	No	950	86.8	69	63.9	135	63.7	350	51.3	1504	71.8	< 0.001
	Yes	144	13.2	39	36.1	77	36.3	332	48.7	592	28.2	
	unknown									327		
ER	positive	1072	84.3	102	89.5	225	92.6	677	85.3	2076	85.7	< 0.001
	negative	171	13.4	9	7.9	16	6.5	114	14.4	310	12.8	
	unknown	29	2.3	3	2.6	2	0.8	3	0.4	37	1.5	
Her2	positive	160	13.7	17	17.5	26	12.7	130	17.8	333	15.1	0.003
	negative	955	81.8	71	73.2	171	83.8	584	79.9	1781	81.0	
	unknown	52	4.5	9	9.3	7	3.4	17	2.3	85	3.9	
Histology	Ductal	925	72.7	76	66.7	176	72.4	576	72.5	1753	72.3	0.001
	Lobular	225	17.7	26	22.8	38	15.6	161	20.3	450	18.6	
	Mixt	26	2.0	6	5.3	7	2.9	30	3.8	69	2.8	
	Others	96	7.5	6	5.3	22	9.1	27	3.4	151	6.2	
T subtypes	Lum A	775	69.8	54	61.4	134	68.0	436	61.2	1399	66.3	< 0.001
	Lum B HER-	96	8.6	15	17.0	31	15.7	101	14.2	243	11.5	
	Lum B HER+	90	8.1	10	11.4	18	9.1	69	9.7	187	8.9	
	HER2	70	6.3	7	8.0	8	4.1	61	8.6	146	6.9	
	TN	80	7.2	2	2.3	6	3.0	46	6.5	134	6.4	
Chemotherapy	No	762	59.9	49	43.0	65	26.7	64	8.1	940	38.8	< 0.001
	Yes adjuvant	493	38.8	63	55.3	167	68.7	663	83.5	1386	57.2	
	Yes Neo adjuvant	12	0.9	2	1.8	10	4.1	66	8.3	90	3.7	
	unknown	5	0.4	0		1	0.4	1	0.1	7	0.3	
Endocrine Therapy	No	281	22.2	18	15.8	26	10.8	135	17.1	460	19.1	< 0.001
	Yes	985	77.8	95	84.2	214	89.2	654	82.9	1949	80.9	
	unknown									14		
Trastuzumab	No	1048	90.1	101	88.6	219	90.1	680	86.6	2048	88.9	0.102
	Yes	115	9.9	13	11.4	24	9.9	105	13.4	257	11.1	
	unknown											
PMRT	No	754	59.4	39	34.2	58	23.9	42	5.3	893	36.9	< 0.001
	Yes	514	40.5	75	65.8	185	76.1	752	94.7	1526	63.1	
	unknown	1	0.1	0		0		0		1		
RNI	No	1000	84.8	57	58.8	104	48.8	77	11.2	1238	56.9	< 0.001
	Yes	179	15.2	40	4.3	109	51.2	611	88.8	939	43.1	
	unknown									246		

Deviation : SN : sentinel node ; ALND : axillary lymph node dissection ; ER : endocrine receptor ; LVI : lympho vascular invasion ;
 RT : post-mastectomy radiotherapy ; RNI : regional nodal irradiation;

Table 2: Characteristics of patients according to sentinel node status and cALND or not.

	SN status	pN0			pN0(i+)			pN1mi			pN1macro		
		SN+ALND Nb	SN Nb	Chi2 p	SN+ALND Nb	SN Nb	Chi2 p	SN+ALND Nb	SN Nb	Chi2 p	SN+ALND Nb	SN Nb	Chi2 p
pN final	pN0	285	987										
	pN0(i+)				82	32							
	pN1mi							195	48				
	pN1macro	35	0		6	0		30	0				
age	<= 40	20	82	0.218	16	8	0.546	33	5	<0.0001	71	3	<0.0001
	40.1-50	89	239		22	8		62	7		231	10	
	50.1-74.9	184	555		46	13		118	22		328	26	
	>= 75	27	111		4	3		12	14		43	11	
T size	<=5mm	25	154	<0.0001	7	3	0.238	15	4	0.930	24	4	0.418
	5.1-10	43	219		11	8		27	5		45	4	
	10.1-19.9	87	309		20	7		69	17		135	8	
	20-50	122	239		35	12		81	17		334	28	
	>50mm	36	29		14	1		31	5		117	6	
Grade	1	66	287	0.001	18	3	0.325	63	10	0.103	131	10	0.935
	2	179	460		47	22		115	23		352	28	
	3	69	189		20	5		43	13		183	12	
	unknown	6	18		3	2		4	2		7	0	
LVI	No	185	781	<0.0001	48	26	0.017	123	24	0.305	289	28	0.187
	Yes	55	103		34	6		73	18		283	20	
Endocrine Therapy	Yes	56	233	0.013	12	6	0.334	23	5	0.581	117	8	0.537
	No	262	750		76	26		199	43		553	40	
Her2/ER	ER+	215	676	0.941	53	21	0.701	148	35	0.436	456	38	0.904
	Her2-												
	ER- Her2-	20	63		2	0		6	1		40	2	
	ER- Her2+	16	57		5	2		10	0		52	4	
	ER+ Her2+	21	75		6	4		19	3		54	5	
Chemotherapy	No	140	623	<0.0001	30	19	0.034	48	19	0.025	51	10	0.006
	Yes	160	354		55	13		162	29		573	40	
	adjuvant												
	Neo	19	6		3	0		14	0		48	0	
	adjuvant												
	unknown	1	4					1	0		0	0	
PMRT	No	95	660	<0.0001	25	15	0.048	42	16	0.023	34	6	0.050
	Yes	225	323		63	17		183	32		639	44	
RNI	No	211	794	<0.0001	41	18	0.128	79	28	0.001	61	6	0.132
	Yes	101	107		35	8		118	14		529	27	

Table 3: Overall Survival according to sentinel node status: multivariable analysis.

Overall Survival		pN0 SN			pN0(i+) & pN1mi SN			pN1 macro SN		
		HR	CI95%	p	HR	CI95%	p	HR	CI95%	p
ALND	Yes	1			1			1		
	No	1.472	0.614-3.526	0.386	2.063	0.439-9.693	0.359	1.171	0.417-3.287	0.764
Grade	1	1						1		
	2	0.551	0.225-1.350	0.192				4.637	1.421-15.13	0.011
	3	1.238	0.501-3.057	0.644				7.826	2.293-26.71	0.001
LVI	No	1			1					
	Yes	2.293	1.010-5.205	0.047	0.775	0.181-3.314	0.731			
Endocrine therapy	Yes	1			1			1		
	No	3.044	1.484-6.247	0.002	6.924	1.087-44.09	0.040	1.706	0.960-3.032	0.069
age	<= 40	1			1			1		
	40.1-50	0.280	0.069-1.140	0.076	0.628	0.037-10.58	0.747	0.895	0.337-2.375	0.823
	50.1-74.9	0.610	0.205-1.813	0.374	1.521	0.164-14.14	0.712	1.994	0.833-4.775	0.121
	>= 75	2.499	0.730-8.558	0.145	1.957	0.136-28.14	0.622	6.985	1.973-24.73	0.003
pN final	pN0	1								
	pN1macro	7.180	2.031-25.38	0.002						
Chemotherapy	No				1			1		
	Yes				0.347	0.074-1.619	0.178	0.484	0.121-1.930	0.304
	NAC							0.654	0.257-1.666	0.374
PMRT	No				1					
	Yes				0.289	0.024-3.486	0.328			
RNI	No				1					
	Yes				5.095	0.350-74.16	0.233			

Legend: Significant univariate variables were included in each model.

tions : HR : hazard ratio; ALND : axillary lymph node dissection; LVI : lympho vascular invasion; PMRT : post-mastectomy rapy ; RNI : regional nodal irradiation;

Table 4: Disease Free Survival according to sentinel node status: multivariable analysis.

DFS		pN0 SN			pN0(i+) & pN1mi SN			pN1 macro SN		
		HR	CI95%	p	HR	CI95%	p	HR	CI95%	p
ALND	Yes	1			1			1		
	No	1.446	0.752-2.782	0.269	3.861	1.660-8.982	0.002	1.322	0.636-2.750	0.455
Grade	1	1								
	2	0.883	0.453-1.722	0.715						
	3	1.893	0.858-4.178	0.114						
LVI	No	1			1					
	Yes	2.031	1.050-3.928	0.035	1.136	0.508-2.542	0.756			
Endocrine therapy	Yes	1			1			1		
	No	3.190	1.785-5.703	<0.0001	2.450	0.770-7.799	0.129	2.522	1.658-3.835	<0.0001
SN status	pN0(i-)									
	pN0(i+)				1					
	pN1mi				0.708	0.315-1.592	0.404			
	pN1 macro									
T size	<=5mm	1						1		
	5.1-10	3.016	0.826-11.01	0.095				1.718	0.344-8.590	0.510
	10.1-19.9	4.087	1.153-14.48	0.029				1.198	0.267-5.381	0.814
	20-50	4.874	1.356-17.52	0.015				2.248	0.547-9.245	0.262
	>50mm	6.537	1.583-26.99	0.009				4.356	1.044-18.17	0.043
age	<= 40	1			1			1		
	40.1-50	0.886	0.276-2.846	0.839	0.773	0.245-2.442	0.661	0.794	0.424-1.485	0.470
	50.1-74.9	0.967	0.335-2.791	0.950	0.689	0.240-1.976	0.489	1.075	0.607-1.905	0.804
	>= 75	1.821	0.532-6.233	0.340	0.578	0.125-2.686	0.485	1.521	0.613-3.774	0.365
Chemotherapy	No	1			1			1		
	Yes	0.446	0.221-0.901	0.024	1.164	0.413-3.280	0.774	0.960	0.450-2.048	0.915
	NAC	0.000	0.0-8.4E256	0.971	2.841	0.280-28.87	0.377	1.447	0.548-3.825	0.456
PMRT	No				1			1		
	Yes				0.472	0.145-1.538	0.213	2.125	1.053-4.287	0.035
RNI	No				1					
	Yes				1.015	0.345-2.985	0.978			

Significant univariate variables were included in each model.

ation : DFS : Disease Free Survival ; : HR : hazard ratio SN: sentinel node; ALND : axillary lymph node dissection; LVI : lympho invasion; PMRT : post-mastectomy radiotherapy ; RNI : regional nodal irradiation

Table 5: Binary logistic regression predictive of positive NSN.

		pN0(i+) & pN1mi with ALND			
		univariate	Regression		
		p	OR	CI95%	p
age	> 40	0.013	1		
	<= 40		2.306	1.078-4.932	0.031
pT size	< 20mm	0.003	1		
	>= 20mm		2.603	1.426-4.751	0.002
SN status	pN0(i+)	<0.0001	1		
	pN1mi		4.825	1.930-12.06	0.001
Grade	1 vs 2 vs 3	0.617			
LVI	No vs Yes	0.430			
ER	No vs Yes	0.340			
Periods	P1 vs P2 vs P3	0.170			
Her2/ER	ER+ Her2-	0.255			

Abréviation : ALND : axillary lymph node dissection; SN : sentinel node; LVI : lympho vascular invasion ; ER : endocrine receptor;

6: PMRT, RNI and AC realization: binary logistic regression.

		PMRT			RNI			AC		
		OR	CI95%	p	OR	CI95%	p	OR	CI95%	p
no	SN+cALND	1			1			1		
	SN	0.477	0.273-0.833	0.009	0.436	0.244-0.779	0.005	0.398	0.226-0.700	0.001
	pN0(i+)	1			1			1		
	pN1mi	1.905	1.134-3.201	0.015	1.629	0.991-2.678	0.055	2.477	1.465-4.188	0.001
s	pT < 20mm	1			1			1		
	pT >=20mm	3.019	1.774-5.137	<0.0001	2.155	1.322-3.513	0.002	4.098	2.421-6.937	<0.0001
rs	pT < 20mm	2.168	0.885-5.312	0.090	1.222	0.541-2.761	0.630	5.402	1.970-14.81	0.001
	pT >=20mm	17.82	2.330-136.3	0.006	4.545	1.692-12.21	0.003	28.89	3.681-226.7	0.001

itions: PMRT : post-mastectomy radiotherapy ; RNI : regional nodal irradiation ; AC : adjuvant chemotherapy; cALND :
mentary axillary lymph node dissection ; SN : sentinel node;

Figures

Figure 1

DFS for pN0(i+) and pN1mi according to cALND or not, adjusted in multivariable analysis.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [SupplementaryTable1.docx](#)