Published in final edited form as:

Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 2013 June 1; 86(2): . doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2012.09.001.

Second solid cancers after radiotherapy: a systematic review of the epidemiological studies of the radiation dose-response relationship

Amy Berrington de Gonzalez, DPhil^{1,*}, Ethel Gilbert, PhD¹, Rochelle Curtis, MA¹, Peter Inskip, ScD¹, Ruth Kleinerman, MPH¹, Lindsay Morton, PhD¹, Preetha Rajaraman, PhD¹, and Mark P Little, DPhil¹

¹Radiation Epidemiology Branch, Division of Cancer Epidemiology & Genetics, NCI, NIH, Bethesda, MD, USA

Abstract

Rapid innovation in radiotherapy techniques has resulted in an urgent need for risk projection models for second cancer risks from high-dose radiation exposure, since direct observation of the late-effects of newer treatments will require patient follow-up for a decade or more. However, the patterns of cancer risk after fractionated high-dose radiation are much less well understood than those after lower-dose exposures (0.1–5 gray (Gy)). In particular, there is uncertainty about the shape of the dose-response curve at high doses, and the magnitude of the second cancer risk per unit dose. We reviewed the available evidence from epidemiologic studies of second solid cancers in organs that received high-dose exposure (>5Gy) from radiotherapy where dose-response curves were estimated from individual organ-specific doses. We included 28 eligible studies with 3,434 second cancer patients across 11 second solid cancers. Overall, there was little evidence that the dose-response curve was non-linear in the direction of a down-turn in risk, even at organ doses of 60Gy. Thyroid cancer was the only exception with evidence of a downturn after 20Gy. Generally the excess relative risk per Gy, taking account of age and sex, was 5–10 times lower than the risk from acute exposures of <2Gy among the Japanese atomic bomb survivors. However, the magnitude of the reduction in risk varied according to second cancer. The results from our review provide insights into radiation carcinogenesis from fractionated high-dose exposures, and are generally consistent with current theoretical models. The results can be used to refine the development of second solid cancer risk projection models for novel radiotherapy techniques.

Introduction

Rapid innovation in radiotherapy in the last decade, including the widespread introduction of intensity modulated radiotherapy treatment (IMRT) and the proliferation of proton therapy centers, has resulted in an urgent need for robust methods to project second cancer risks from radiotherapy. Risk projection models are a critical first step because direct observation of the potential solid cancer risks will require patient follow-up for many years since most radiation-related cancers do not develop until at least a decade after exposure. These newer

*Corresponding author: Amy Berrington de Gonzalez, DPhil, Senior Investigator, Radiation Epidemiology Branch, DCEG, NCI, 6120 Executive Boulevard, Bethesda, MD 20892, Tel: 301-594-7201 Fax: 301-402-0207, berringtona@mail.nih.gov.

Conflicts of interest: None to declare (all authors)

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

treatments aim to reduce the amount of healthy tissue exposed to high-doses of radiation (>5 Gy (gray)), but this may be at the expense of increasing the amount of normal tissue exposed to lower-doses (1). Thus, risk projection models for novel radiotherapy techniques need to be able to model the cancer risks from a wide-spectrum of radiation doses. Compared to the cancer risks from lower dose radiation exposures (<5 Gy), the patterns of risk after fractionated high-dose exposure (>5 Gy) are less well understood. In particular, there is uncertainty about the shape of the dose-response curve at high doses, and the magnitude of the reduction in cancer risk due to fractionation and cell killing (1). Although theoretical models have been developed to predict the dose-response at these high dose levels (2,3), until the last decade there have been relatively few direct human studies and no systematic evaluation of these studies has been conducted to date.

We conducted a systematic review of the epidemiological studies that have evaluated the dose-response relationship for second solid cancer risks after high-dose fractionated radiotherapy. Firstly, we reviewed the shape of the dose-response relationship for each second cancer site to assess whether the data support a linear relationship, a plateau or a downturn in risk at high doses. Secondly, we compared the magnitude of the risk per unit dose from the high-dose fractionated exposures with age and sex matched risk estimates from the Japanese atomic bomb survivors, who received an acute lower-dose radiation exposure (<2 Gy) (4). It is well known that fractionation and cell killing will reduce the risk per unit dose, however, uncertainty remains about the magnitude of the reduction and whether the reduction is similar for all cancer sites. This comparison provides direct estimates of this reduction based on the available human data.. In 2001 Little (5) assessed cancer risks after radiotherapy for benign and malignant conditions and compared them with risks in age and sex matched subsets of the Japanese atomic bomb survivor data. The current review is the first to specifically focus on higher dose (>5 Gy) studies that estimated the shape and magnitude of the dose-response relationship. Most of the eligible studies were published since 2001 and, therefore, were not included in the earlier review. The results from our review provide insights into radiation carcinogenesis at high-doses and can be used to refine the development of models for projecting second solid cancer risks from fractionated high-dose exposure, and can also be used to assess the validity of the theoretical models. The implications of the findings for the assessment of second cancer risks following newer radiotherapy techniques are also discussed.

Methods

Epidemiological studies with an outcome of a second (or subsequent) solid cancer that had collected detailed data on radiotherapy, specifically the estimated dose delivered to the second cancer site for each patient, were eligible for inclusion in this review. Potentially eligible studies were identified from searching PubMed (search terms “radiotherapy”, “dose”, “subsequent malignancy”), from review articles and from references in identified studies. The search was limited to human studies and to peer-reviewed articles. No language or date restrictions were applied.

Studies were required to have published age-adjusted odds ratios or relative risks for at least three categories of estimated absorbed radiation dose to the second cancer site. Because we were evaluating the risks from high-dose radiation, we excluded studies with maximum absorbed organ doses of <5 Gy to the second cancer site of interest. Studies of high-dose radiation exposure for the treatment of non-malignant conditions (e.g. peptic ulcers) were not included because the fractionation patterns of the treatment are often quite different from those used to treat cancer.

For each eligible study, we extracted the following data: number of cases and controls (or cohort size), average (mean or median) and range of age at first cancer diagnosis, average (mean or median) age at second cancer diagnosis, average (mean or median) and range of estimated absorbed dose to the second cancer site in the controls (or the cohort), the relative risk (or odds ratio) and 95% confidence interval for the second cancer in relation to each category of radiation dose, and the estimated continuous dose-response relationship usually expressed as the excess relative risk per Gray (ERR/Gy) and its 95% confidence interval. We also recorded whether there had been an evaluation of the consistency of the dose-response relationship with non-linear dose-response curves such as linear-exponential or linear-quadratic, and any associated tests of statistical significance. If the specific value for a variable (e.g. mean absorbed dose) was not available then we attempted, wherever possible, to derive it from other values available in the publication.

To estimate the magnitude of the impacts of cell killing at high doses and fractionation on the second solid cancer risk, we compared the dose-response estimates from these radiotherapy studies with estimates from acute lower-dose radiation exposure using the risk models developed by the National Academy of Science Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR) VII committee (4). Although developed originally for low-dose radiation exposures (<0.1 Gy) the BEIR VII risk models have been used to compare lifetime cancer risk estimates for high-dose exposures from radiotherapy in a number of studies (see for example references 6–8). The standard summary statistic for a linear dose-response relationship in studies of radiation-related cancer is the ERR/Gy. To maximize the comparability of the risk estimates we estimated the ERR/Gy from the BEIR VII models for the average age at exposure and average attained age of the patients in each radiotherapy study. For studies that included men and women we calculated the average of the sex-specific BEIR VII estimates. We then calculated the ratio of the ERR/Gy from the high-dose fractionated exposure to the low-dose exposure ERR/Gy estimate. The comparison was restricted to the ERR/Gy because most of the second cancer studies eligible for the current review are of case-control design and therefore estimates of the excess absolute risk (EAR)/Gy were not available. The BEIR VII report included risk models for ten solid cancer sites. We used additional risk models for brain tumors (including benign and malignant tumors) and esophageal cancer that we previously developed following the BEIR VII methodology (9). For all cancer sites, except breast and thyroid, the BEIR VII models are based on the Japanese atomic bomb survivors who received a single acute exposure (97% were exposed to <2 Gy). The BEIR VII breast and thyroid cancer models, however, were developed from pooled analyses that included fractionated low-dose exposures to medically exposed cohorts. As the BEIR VII models are aimed primarily at exposures <0.1 Gy the committee recommended that risk coefficients be divided by a dose and dose rate reduction effectiveness factor (DDREF) of 1.5 to account for a potential curvilinear dose-response curve in the very low-dose range (<0.1 Gy). For the current analysis we did not apply the low-dose and low dose-rate correction factor because we were interested in a direct comparison between the ERR/Gy from fractionated exposures >5 Gy with a lower acute exposure (<2 Gy).

Results

Our search identified 28 eligible studies (10–30) that included 3,434 patients who developed a second cancer with average absorbed organ doses in the non-cases ranging from 5–165Gy (Table 1). The majority of the studies were case-control studies (n=25), many of which were nested case-control studies within a cohort such as the Childhood Cancer Survivor Study (12,13,20,28). More than half (n=16) of the studies were of childhood cancers. The study results are reviewed according to the eleven different second solid cancer sites, and common patterns across different second cancer sites are then evaluated.

Breast cancer

Three studies evaluated second breast cancers after radiotherapy with average age at exposure between 6 years and 22 years and maximum absorbed organ doses of 60–80 Gy to the breast (10–12). All three studies found approximately linear dose-response relationships with breast cancer risk and no evidence of a downturn in risk even at doses of 30 Gy or more (Figure 1). The ERR/Gy varied from 0.13 to 0.27, 5–16 fold lower than the risk estimates observed in the pooled analysis of lower dose studies by Preston et al (31) for similar age at exposure and attained age (Table 1). An important effect modifier was radiotherapy to the ovary of at least 5 Gy, which significantly reduced the risk of radiation-related breast cancer in both studies where such treatment was common (10,12), most likely because the ablation of ovarian function suppresses the hormonal stimulation of the breast tissue. The use of alkylating agents also had a similar effect in reducing the risk of breast cancer following Hodgkin's lymphoma (10).

Brain cancer

All three studies of brain cancer or benign brain tumors (largely composed of meningioma) were in childhood cancer survivors with an average age of exposure <10 years (13–15). In two of the three studies, results were reported separately for glioma and meningioma (13,14). There was no evidence of significant curvature in the dose-response relationship in any of the studies even at doses of 50 Gy or higher (Figure 2). The ERR/Gy was higher for meningioma than glioma (Table 1) (13,14). Detailed dose-response relationships for the LSS have been estimated only for all brain cancers combined (9). The ERR/Gy for all brain cancers combined in the LSS was about 5–10 fold-higher than the estimate from the high-dose studies of glioma (13,14) and the study of all brain cancers after childhood cancer (15). The ERR/Gy in the two studies of meningioma was of similar to or even greater than the risk for all brain cancers combined in the LSS. However, an analysis of the risks in the LSS by histology has also been conducted which showed that the high ERR/Gy is driven by the risk of schwannomas rather than the meningiomas. The ERR/Gy for meningiomas and gliomas in the LSS was similar and about half the overall ERR/Gy (32).

Lung cancer

Two studies of second lung cancer were identified with similar average age at exposure (49–50 yrs) (16,17). In the study of lung cancer after breast cancer (n=61) there was some evidence of an increasing risk with increasing dose, and the ERR/Gy was 0.2 at an average attained age of 68 years (16) (Figure 3). In the larger study of 227 lung cancer cases after Hodgkin's lymphoma the ERR/Gy was similar in magnitude (0.15). Maximum doses were more than 60 Gy but there was no evidence of departure from a linear dose-response relationship ($p>0.5$) (17). Overall the ERR/Gy was 5–10 times smaller than in the LSS with a similar age at exposure and attained age (4). There was evidence that the joint effect of chemotherapy and radiotherapy was approximately additive, whereas smoking and radiotherapy acted multiplicatively with respect to lung cancer risk (17).

Thyroid cancer

In the three studies of second thyroid cancer after various childhood cancers the maximum dose to the thyroid was up to 75 Gy (18–20). In the largest study (20) there was clear evidence of a downturn in risk at doses above 20 Gy (Figure 4), and a linear-exponential dose-response model fitted significantly better than the purely linear model ($p<0.05$) (Figure 4). The number of cases was small in the other two studies (n=22 and 14), but one also found evidence that a linear-exponential model fit better than the purely linear model ($p=0.04$) (19), whereas in the third study, there was no evidence of significant curvature ($p=0.09$) (20). The linear term of the dose-response models for thyroid cancer for the ERR/

Gy varied from 1.4–4.5, which was similar to the ERR/Gy of 3–4 in the pooled analysis of thyroid cancer studies that was the basis for the BEIR VII model for similar age at exposure and attained age (33). As noted above some of the studies in that pooled analysis involved fractionated exposure, and there was some evidence that the ERR/Gy after fractionated exposure was about 1.5 times lower than after a single acute exposure, but this difference was not statistically significant ($p=0.18$) (33). The estimated ERR/Gy for thyroid cancer after acute childhood exposure in the Japanese atomic bomb survivors was 4.2 (34).

Sarcoma

Second bone cancers have been evaluated after childhood cancer and cervical cancer (21–24). In the studies of childhood cancer, there was clear evidence of increasing risks with increasing doses and no evidence of a downturn even at doses of >60 Gy (21,23,24) (Figure 5). In the one small study of exposure in adulthood (cervical cancer, $n=15$) there was no clear relationship with dose (22). The number of bone sarcomas in the LSS is currently too small to develop a detailed dose-response model for this outcome (34). After childhood cancer there was a significant dose-response relationship also for soft tissue sarcoma, but the ERR/Gy was lower than for bone sarcoma (25,26), and there was no clear association with dose among the cervical cancer patients (22) (Figure e1). In a small study of sarcomas after breast cancer ($n=14$) there was an increased risk with increasing dose (27). The largest study to date examined all sarcomas combined after childhood cancer (28). About 40% of the cases in that study were bone sarcomas and there was no evidence of a differential dose-response from soft tissue sarcomas. The ERR/Gy was higher than observed in the other soft tissue and bone sarcoma studies (1.38 (95%CI: 0.44–4.22)). Heterogeneity in risk according to the primary cancer was suggested as a possible explanation for this higher risk (28).

Other sites

A number of other second cancer sites were studied after radiotherapy for cervical cancer (22). Risks were generally linear with dose but with a much lower ERR/Gy than expected based on the Japanese atomic bomb survivors (5–30 fold) (Figure e2). Two recent studies also found clear dose-response relationships for second esophageal and stomach cancer in adulthood cancer survivors (29,30). In the large study of esophageal cancer after breast cancer, risk increased consistently over the range 20–60 Gy. Although there was modest evidence that a linear-quadratic dose-response function fitted the data better than a linear one ($p = 0.08$), the coefficient for the quadratic term was positive, that is, in the opposite direction of a downturn in risk at very high doses. The ERR/Gy was nearly 10 times smaller than in the Japanese atomic bomb survivors (9). The analysis of stomach cancer after testicular cancer and Hodgkin lymphoma also did not find evidence of curvature (30). Although the ERR/Gy was similar in magnitude to the estimate from the LSS the confidence intervals were very wide due to the small number of cases ($n=42$).

Results summary

Overall, when all second solid cancer sites were considered there was no clear evidence of non-linearity in the dose-response in the direction of a reduction in risk at high doses even at doses of 60 Gy or higher. The exception was thyroid cancer, for which there was a plateau in risk in one study (20) and a clear downturn in another above 20 Gy (18). The ERR/Gy was generally considerably lower after fractionated high-dose radiotherapy than after the acute lower-dose exposure experienced by the Japanese atomic bomb survivors, in the range of 5–10 fold lower for most second solid cancer sites. Confidence intervals for the ERR/Gy in the second cancer studies were often wide, and the lower-bound was, on average, consistent with risks that were about two-fold lower than the acute low-dose estimate. Although there were a couple of sites for which the ERR/Gy from the high-dose radiotherapy was nearly equivalent to the acute low-dose estimate, there are qualifications or possible alternative

explanations. For example, the stomach cancer finding was based on only one small study (n=42), and the BEIR VII thyroid cancer risk model included several studies of fractionated exposure (33). Although the results for meningioma were also consistent with the risk model for all brain tumors combined in the LSS, as noted above the high ERR/Gy for brain tumors in the LSS is driven by schwannomas not by meningiomas (32). For most cancer sites, the relative risk at 40 Gy of developing a second solid cancer was typically in the region of 5–10 times higher than the risk in the patients who did not receive radiotherapy or those who received very low doses.

Discussion

The rapid evolution of current radiotherapy techniques requires appropriate methods to estimate the potential risk of second solid cancers without having to wait a decade or more to study the risks directly. To date most dose-response modeling efforts for IMRT and other newer therapies have assumed that, for all cancer sites, either a) the BEIR VII risk models can be applied directly or b) the BEIR VII risk models can be applied but adjusted with a plateau or a downturn above some dose level (see for example Fontenot et al (2009) (6)). Although this approach allows for rough comparisons of different treatments, or treatment plans, it could give misleading results if the shape of the dose-response curve varies by cancer site and/or the reduction in risk due to fractionation and cell killing varies by cancer site. In this paper, we conducted a systematic review of the available human dose-response data and found that, in general, there is little support for a plateau or a downturn in solid cancer risk at high doses with the exception of second thyroid cancer. As expected, the ERR/Gy is lower than from acute lower-dose exposures in the Japanese atomic bomb survivors or other lower-dose studies; often as much as 5–10 times lower. However, the exact magnitude of the reduction in risk varied according to second cancer, and even by cancer sub-type (eg meningioma, glioma), although some of this variation may be due to chance. This suggests that uniform adjustment factors for cell killing and fractionation effects for all solid cancer sites may result in misleading risk projections and comparisons for second cancer risks from high-dose fractionated radiotherapy.

Little (2001) previously conducted an extensive review of all studies of cancer after medical radiation exposure, including studies of radiotherapy for benign conditions (5). This previous review focused on the impact of fractionation and did not evaluate the shape of the dose-response curve at high doses. This was largely because there were few studies published at that time that included individual dosimetry; indeed, only five of the 28 studies in the current review were included in that previous review. The finding by Little (2001) that the magnitude of the dose-response was generally lower in the studies of high-dose radiotherapy than after the acute lower-dose exposure to the Japanese atomic bomb survivors was similar to the finding in the current review, and this is consistent with theoretical predictions.

Suit et al (2007) also conducted a broad review of second cancer risks from radiotherapy that assessed both animal and human data (35). The human data were largely composed of several registry-based cohort studies that had very limited data on radiotherapy exposure (typically yes/no and external beam therapy/brachytherapy). Dose-response relationships were therefore constructed by combining different summary results from various studies with each study contributing a single point estimate to the dose-response curve based on a typical organ dose. This approach is prone to many additional biases, since there will likely be wide-variation in doses within each study and many differences between the studies that limit comparability in this manner. Dose-response assessment within a single study with accurate dose-reconstruction to the tumor site is a much more powerful, less biased approach, for assessing the shape of the dose-response relationship. Doi et al (2011)

conducted a meta-analysis combining the estimated ERR/Gy for any second cancer after radiotherapy for benign or malignant disease (36). Unsurprisingly, given the variation in second cancer sites, age at exposure and sex, they found significant heterogeneity between studies. Overall, they found that the ERR/Gy for all cancers combined was about three-fold lower than in the Japanese atomic bomb survivors. Our study shows that this ratio is likely to vary by cancer site and, therefore, that combining all cancer sites may conceal important differences in the radiosensitivity of different tissues.

There are a number of additional factors other than the effect of cell killing and fractionation that could affect the magnitude or the shape of the dose-response curve after high-dose radiotherapy, which could not always be taken into account, and may have affected our results. Baseline cancer risks differ between the general population in the US and Japan, and the BEIR VII committee recommended that radiation risks be transferred from the Japanese to the US population using a weighted average of the ERR and the excess absolute risk (EAR) models (4). For breast cancer, BEIR VII recommended use of the EAR model, since this model has been found to vary less between the US and Japan than the ERR model (31). Unfortunately, for most of the second cancer studies here, only ERR models are available because they are estimated from case-control studies. Furthermore, baseline cancer risks differ between cancer survivors and the general population, likely due to genetics and lifestyle factors. In addition, few studies provided a formal assessment of the potential interaction between radiotherapy and concomitant therapies. In those few studies where there was an individual and high quality assessment of chemotherapy the joint effect was generally additive (13,17,29), but data are limited on this issue. Furthermore, these effects are tissue specific as chemotherapy can also reduce second cancer risks, as has been shown for breast cancer (10,12). The risk of radiation-related cancer also varies strongly with age at exposure (4). A limitation of the current available evidence on the dose-response relationship for second cancer risks after high-dose fractionated radiotherapy is that for brain, thyroid and bone cancers the studies are exclusively of childhood radiotherapy and for lung cancer only adulthood radiotherapy exposures. Therefore, some of the results may not be generalizable to other age-groups.

Although the data reviewed here provide little indication of departure from a linear dose-response over the full dose range, statistical power for detecting such departures and for estimating the ERR/Gy was likely limited in many of the studies as can be seen from the wide confidence intervals in Figures 1–5, e1–e2 and Table 1, where these intervals often cover more than an order of magnitude. Some studies had few subjects who did not receive radiotherapy and/or lacked adequate data over the full dose range. Furthermore, dose estimates used in these studies are subject to several uncertainties including misspecification of the tumor location in relation to the treatment fields (37). Dose errors, which have not been taken into account in analyses of data from these studies, can further reduce power, potentially bias estimated risk coefficients, and distort the shape of the dose-response (38). The problem of random errors in the Japanese A-bomb dosimetry and their impact on inferences with respect to the cancer dose-response has been comprehensively investigated by many researchers (39–41). In general, the errors in individual dose estimates for the atomic bomb survivors are of classical form; upward corrections of 15–20% in the unadjusted risk coefficients are required (39–42). It is probable that the magnitude of dosimetric errors for the relevant organ doses in the various medical series considered here would be somewhat larger than those in the LSS, because doses are extremely heterogeneous within an organ (particularly when the organ is on the margins of the treatment field or when organ blocks are used), so that very slight uncertainties in estimated position of the beam can result in large errors in organ dose. Set against that, dose reconstruction is often based on individual treatment records. To the best of our knowledge, there has been no detailed evaluation of such errors in the datasets considered here. In

summary, much work remains to be done to evaluate dosimetric uncertainty in second cancer studies, accounting for heterogeneity in dose within an organ, and assessing the effect on regression risk estimates. The majority of the studies reviewed here evaluated the risk in relation to the dose to the tumor site and these models do not take account of dose inhomogeneity across the organs and more research is warranted on this important question. For risk projection models developed from human data it will be necessary to consider the average dose to the organ until a better understanding of the impact of dose inhomogeneity is available from the human data.

The results from these human data do not support the traditional cell killing/inactivation model or the animal data, which predicts a down-turn in the dose-response relationship at doses as low as 5 Gy (43). Although the confidence intervals were often wide in the studies we reviewed, especially for the highest dose categories, additional strength for this conclusion can be drawn from the fact that across 26 of the 28 studies there was no clear evidence of a downturn or plateau in the risk even at doses of 40 Gy or more. Although for thyroid cancer there was such a downturn, this was not evident until at least 20 Gy, vastly in excess of the level suggested by *in vitro* measures of cell killing, which imply that about half of the irradiated cells would be inactivated by a dose of 1 Gy (4). Lack of a downturn in the dose-response is consistent with theoretical models that incorporate repopulation as well as cell killing after high dose radiotherapy (see for example 2,3, 45). Formal statistical comparison of the theoretical models with the entirety of the human data presented here would be an important next step. These comparisons should take account of the various additional uncertainties in the human data that may influence the shape of the dose-response curve that were described above. Hybrid risk prediction modeling that incorporates radiobiological (linear-quadratic cell-repopulation) models and human data (see for example 46) is also an interesting approach that warrants further evaluation, but also requires a formal assessment of the fit of the models to all relevant human data. For leukemia there is a clear downturn in the dose-response relationship after moderate and high dose radiation exposure in most studies at levels above 3–5 Gy (47,48), and the review by Little (2001) suggested that second leukemia excess risk was generally much lower than would be expected from the LSS (5). Theoretical mechanisms have been suggested that account for these observations, taking account of the known transfer of hematopoietic stem cells between bone marrow compartments (49,50). Detailed dosimetry to the bone marrow is more complex than for solid cancer and therefore, these studies will be reviewed separately.

To date, no observational studies have directly assessed the second cancer risks after IMRT or proton therapy. Until sufficient follow-up is available to conduct such studies assessment of the risks relies upon risk projection studies or theoretical models. The results from our review, which are consistent with current theoretical models that combine cell killing and repopulation, can be used to refine the development of the second solid cancer risk projection models for evaluating novel radiotherapy techniques. We also highlight the limitations of the human data, in particular the large uncertainties at the high-dose levels. Pooled analyses of individual patient data are an important next step for a more robust assessment of the shape of the dose-response relationship and the impact of cell killing and fractionation for each second cancer site. Efforts for thyroid and brain cancer are already underway or planned.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Funding: This study was supported by the Intramural research program of the NIH

References

1. Hall EJ, Wu C-S. Radiation-induced second cancers: the impact of 3D-CRT and IMRT. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2003; 56:83–88. [PubMed: 12694826]
2. Shuryak I, Hahnfeldt P, Hlatky L, Sachs RK, Brenner DJ. A new view of radiation-induced cancer: integrating short- and long-term processes. Part II: second cancer risk estimation. *Radiat Environ Biophys.* 2009 Aug; 48(3):275–86. [PubMed: 19499238]
3. Wheldon EG, Lindsay KA, Wheldon TE. The dose-response relationship for cancer incidence in a two-stage radiation carcinogenesis model incorporating cellular repopulation. *Int J Radiat Biol.* 2000; 76:699–710. [PubMed: 10866293]
4. NRC. Sciences NAS. Health Risks From Exposure To Low Levels Of Ionizing Radiation BEIR VII Phase 2. Washington, DC: 2005. Committee to Assess Health Risks from Exposure to Low Levels of Ionizing Radiation.
5. Little MP. Comparison of the risks of cancer incidence and mortality following radiation therapy for benign and malignant disease with the cancer risks observed in the Japanese A-bomb survivors. *Int J Radiat Biol.* 2001; 77:431–464. [PubMed: 11304437]
6. Fontenot JD, Lee AK, Newhauser WD. Risk of secondary malignant neoplasms from proton therapy and intensity-modulated x-ray therapy for early-stage prostate cancer. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2009; 74:616–22. [PubMed: 19427561]
7. Taddei PJ, Howell RM, Krishnan S, et al. Risk of second malignant neoplasm following proton versus intensity-modulated photon radiotherapies for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Phys Med Biol.* 2010; 55:7055–65. [PubMed: 21076199]
8. Kry SF, Salehpour M, Titt U, et al. Monte Carlo study shows no significant difference in second cancer risk between 6- and 18-MV intensity-modulated radiation therapy. *Radiother Oncol.* 2009; 91:132–7. [PubMed: 19147246]
9. Berrington de González A, Apostoaei AI, Veiga LHS, Rajaraman P, Thomas BA, Hoffman FO, Gilbert E, Land C. RADRAT: A Radiation Risk Assessment Tool for Lifetime Cancer Risk Projection. *J Radiol Prot.* (in press).
10. Travis LB, Hill DA, Dores GM, et al. Breast cancer following radiotherapy and chemotherapy among young women with Hodgkin disease. *JAMA.* 2003; 290:465–75. [PubMed: 12876089]
11. Guibout C, Adjadj E, Rubino C, et al. Malignant breast tumors after radiotherapy for a first cancer during childhood. *J Clin Oncol.* 2005; 23:197–204. [PubMed: 15625374]
12. Inskip PD, Robison LL, Stovall M, et al. Radiation dose and breast cancer risk in the childhood cancer survivor study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2009; 27:3901–7. [PubMed: 19620485]
13. Neglia JP, Robison LL, Stovall M, et al. New primary neoplasms of the central nervous system in survivors of childhood cancer: a report from the Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2006; 98:1528–37. [PubMed: 17077355]
14. Taylor AJ, Little MP, Winter DL, et al. Population-based risks of CNS tumors in survivors of childhood cancer: the British Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2010; 28:5287–93. [PubMed: 21079138]
15. Little MP, de Vathaire F, Shamsaldin A, et al. Risks of brain tumour following treatment for cancer in childhood: modification by genetic factors, radiotherapy and chemotherapy. *Int J Cancer.* 1998; 78:269–75. [PubMed: 9766556]
16. Inskip PD, Stovall M, Flannery JT. Lung cancer risk and radiation dose among women treated for breast cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1994; 86:983–8. [PubMed: 8007020]
17. Gilbert ES, Stovall M, Gospodarowicz M, et al. Lung cancer after treatment for Hodgkin's lymphoma: focus on radiation effects. *Radiat Res.* 2003; 159:161–73. [PubMed: 12537521]
18. Tucker MA, Jones PH, Boice JD Jr, et al. Therapeutic radiation at a young age is linked to secondary thyroid cancer. The Late Effects Study Group. *Cancer Res.* 1991; 51:2885–8. [PubMed: 1851664]

19. de Vathaire F, Hardiman C, Shamsaldin A, et al. Thyroid carcinomas after irradiation for a first cancer during childhood. *Arch Intern Med.* 1999; 159:2713–9. [PubMed: 10597762]
20. Bhatti P, Veiga LH, Ronckers CM, et al. Risk of second primary thyroid cancer after radiotherapy for a childhood cancer in a large cohort study: an update from the childhood cancer survivor study. *Radiat Res.* 2010; 174:741–52. [PubMed: 21128798]
21. Tucker MA, D'Angio GJ, Boice JD Jr, et al. Bone sarcomas linked to radiotherapy and chemotherapy in children. *N Engl J Med.* 1987; 317:588–93. [PubMed: 3475572]
22. Boice JD Jr, Engholm G, Kleinerman RA, et al. Radiation dose and second cancer risk in patients treated for cancer of the cervix. *Radiat Res.* 1988; 116:3–55. [PubMed: 3186929]
23. Hawkins MM, Wilson LM, Burton HS, et al. Radiotherapy, alkylating agents, and risk of bone cancer after childhood cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1996; 88:270–8. [PubMed: 8614005]
24. Le Vu B, de Vathaire F, Shamsaldin A, et al. Radiation dose, chemotherapy and risk of osteosarcoma after solid tumours during childhood. *Int J Cancer.* 1998; 77:370–7. [PubMed: 9663598]
25. Wong FL, Boice JD Jr, Abramson DH, et al. Cancer incidence after retinoblastoma. Radiation dose and sarcoma risk. *JAMA.* 1997; 278:1262–7. [PubMed: 9333268]
26. Menu-Branthomme A, Rubino C, Shamsaldin A, et al. Radiation dose, chemotherapy and risk of soft tissue sarcoma after solid tumours during childhood. *Int J Cancer.* 2004; 110:87–93. [PubMed: 15054872]
27. Rubino C, Shamsaldin A, Lê MG, et al. Radiation dose and risk of soft tissue and bone sarcoma after breast cancer treatment. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.* 2005; 89:277–88. [PubMed: 15754127]
28. Henderson T, Rajaraman P, Stovall M, et al. New primary sarcomas in childhood cancer survivors: a childhood cancer survivor study report. *Int J Radiat Oncol.* (in press).
29. Morton LM, Gilbert ES, Hall P, et al. Risk of Treatment-Related Esophageal Cancer Among Breast Cancer Survivors. *Annals of Oncology.* (in press).
30. van den Belt-Dusebout AW, Aleman BM, Besseling G, et al. Roles of radiation dose and chemotherapy in the etiology of stomach cancer as a second malignancy. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2009; 75:1420–9. [PubMed: 19931732]
31. Preston DL, Mattsson A, Holmberg E, et al. Radiation effects on breast cancer risk: a pooled analysis of eight cohorts. *Radiat Res.* 2002; 158:220–35. [PubMed: 12105993]
32. Preston DL, Ron E, Yonehara S, et al. Tumors of the nervous system and pituitary gland associated with atomic bomb radiation exposure. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2002; 94:1555–63. [PubMed: 12381708]
33. Ron E, Lubin JH, Shore RE, et al. Thyroid cancer after exposure to external radiation: a pooled analysis of seven studies. *Radiat Res.* 1995; 141:259–77. [PubMed: 7871153]
34. Preston DL, Ron E, Tokuoka S, et al. Solid cancer incidence in atomic bomb survivors: 1958–1998. *Radiat Res.* 2007; 168:1–64. [PubMed: 17722996]
35. Suit H, Goldberg S, Niemierko A, et al. Secondary carcinogenesis in patients treated with radiation: a review of data on radiation-induced cancers in human, non-human primate, canine and rodent subjects. *Radiat Res.* 2007; 167:12–42. [PubMed: 17214511]
36. Doi K, Mieno MN, Shimada Y, et al. Meta-analysis of second cancer risk after radiotherapy among childhood cancer survivors. *Radiat Prot Dosimetry.* 2011; 146:263–7. [PubMed: 21561937]
37. Stovall M, Weathers R, Kasper C, et al. Dose reconstruction for therapeutic and diagnostic radiation exposures: use in epidemiological studies. *Radiat Res.* 2006; 166:141–57. [PubMed: 16808603]
38. Schafer DW, Gilbert ES. Some statistical implications of dose uncertainty in radiation dose-response analyses. *Radiat Res.* 2006; 166:303–12. [PubMed: 16808615]
39. Pierce DA, Stram DO, Vaeth M. Allowing for random errors in radiation dose estimates for the atomic bomb survivor data. *Radiat Res.* 1990; 123:275–284. [PubMed: 2217725]
40. Little MP, Muirhead CR. Evidence for curvilinearity in the cancer incidence dose-response in the Japanese atomic bomb survivors. *Int J Radiat Biol.* 1996; 70:83–94. [PubMed: 8691040]
41. Little MP, Deltour I, Richardson S. Projection of cancer risks from the Japanese atomic bomb survivors to the England and Wales population taking into account uncertainty in risk parameters. *Radiat Environ Biophys.* 2000; 39:241–252. [PubMed: 11200968]

42. Little MP, Hoel DG, Molitor J, et al. New models for evaluation of radiation-induced lifetime cancer risk and its uncertainty employed in the UNSCEAR 2006 report. *Radiat Res.* 2008; 169:660–676. [PubMed: 18494541]
43. Gray, LH. Radiation biology and cancer. *Proc. of the XVIII Ann. Symp. on Fundamental Cancer Res*; Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins; 1965.
44. Deschavanne PJ, Fertil B. A review of human cell radiosensitivity in vitro. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 1996; 34:251–266. [PubMed: 12118559]
45. Schneider U. Mechanistic model of radiation-induced cancer after fractionated radiotherapy using the linear-quadratic formula. *Med Phys.* 2009; 36:1138–43. [PubMed: 19472619]
46. Schneider U, Sumila M, Robotka J. Site-specific dose-response relationships for cancer induction from the combined Japanese A-bomb and Hodgkin cohorts for doses relevant to radiotherapy. *Theor Biol Med Model.* 2011 Jul 26;8:27. [PubMed: 21791103]
47. Little MP, Weiss HA, Boice JD Jr, et al. Risks of leukemia in Japanese atomic bomb survivors, in women treated for cervical cancer, and in patients treated for ankylosing spondylitis. *Radiat Res.* 1999; 152:280–292. [PubMed: 10453089]
48. Boice JD Jr, Blettner M, Kleinerman RA, et al. Radiation dose and leukemia risk in patients treated for cancer of the cervix. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1987; 79:1295–311. [PubMed: 3480381]
49. Shuryak I, Sachs RK, Hlatky L, et al. Radiation-induced leukemia at doses relevant to radiation therapy: Modeling mechanisms and estimating risks. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute.* 2006; 98:1794–1806. [PubMed: 17179481]
50. Little MP. A multi-compartment cell repopulation model allowing for inter-compartmental migration following radiation exposure, applied to leukaemia. *J Theor Biol.* 2007; 245:83–97. [PubMed: 17092522]
51. United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation (UNSCEAR). Volume I: Report to the General Assembly, Scientific Annexes A and B. 2008.

Summary

We reviewed 28 epidemiologic studies of second solid cancers after radiotherapy that had estimated dose-response curves using individual patient organ-doses. Except for second thyroid cancer, there was little evidence for a down-turn or flattening in the dose-response curve for radiation-related second solid cancers, even for organ doses of 60+Gy. For most cancers the magnitude of the radiation-related cancer risk from fractionated high-dose exposure was about 5–10 times smaller than the risk following acute lower-dose exposures in the Japanese atomic bomb survivors.

Figure 1.

Relative risk (& 95% CI) for subsequent breast cancer according to the estimated absorbed radiation dose (Gy)

Dotted black line indicates fitted linear dose-response for that study. Dashed grey line indicates the RR for similar age at exposure and attained age based on the pooled ERR model from Preston et al (31). *Travis et al (2003) the reference dose category was 0–3Gy, and the fitted linear dose-response was for women who did not receive alkylating agents or ovarian radiation (5+Gy).

Figure 2.

Relative risk (& 95% CI) for subsequent brain cancer according to the estimated absorbed radiation dose (Gy)

Dotted black line indicates fitted linear dose-response for that study. Dashed grey line indicates the RR for similar age at exposure and attained age based on the BEIR VII risk models (4,9). *Reference categories for Neglia et al (2006) were <1Gy rather than 0Gy, which is used for the fitted dose-response, and this accounts for any apparent discrepancy between the categorical estimates and fitted line.

Figure 3.

Relative risk (& 95% CI) for subsequent lung cancer according to the estimated absorbed radiation dose (Gy)

Dotted black line indicates fitted linear dose-response for that study. Dashed grey line indicates the RR for similar age at exposure and attained age based on the BEIR VII risk models (4).

Figure 4.

Relative risk (& 95% CI) for subsequent thyroid cancer according to the estimated absorbed radiation dose (Gy)

Dotted black line indicates fitted linear dose-response for that study. Dashed grey line indicates the RR for similar age at exposure and attained age based on the BEIR VII risk models (4). *For Tucker et al (1991) the reference category was <2Gy rather than 0Gy, which is used for the fitted dose-response, and this accounts for any apparent discrepancy between the categorical estimates and fitted line. The fitted linear dose-response model for Bhatti et al (2010) is based on the linear term from the linear-quadratic model.

Figure 5.

Relative risk (& 95% CI) for subsequent bone sarcoma according to the estimated absorbed radiation dose (Gy)

Dotted black line indicates fitted linear dose-response for that study. BEIR VII risk models not available. *No confidence intervals were available for Tucker et al. **Reference category for Le Vu et al (1998) and Boice et al (1988) was <1Gy rather than 0Gy, which is used for the fitted dose-response, and this accounts for any apparent discrepancy between the categorical estimates and fitted line. RR for Le Vu et al 40Gy dose category=184.

Ref												ERR/Gy				
no.	Reference	2nd cancer	1st cancer		Cases	Controls	Age 1st cancer		Age 2nd cancer		Dose (controls)		Study (& 95% CI)		BEIR VII	Ratio
22	Boice 1988	Colon	Cervix		409	759	45–54 yrs	(Range) (<45–65+ yrs)	Average 68 yrs	Average 24 Gy	Max 40+ Gy	0.00	(–0.01–0.02)*	0.36	-	
22	Boice 1988	Rectum	Cervix		488	901	45–54 yrs	(<45–65+ yrs)	68 yrs	30–60 Gy	60+ Gy	0.02	(0–0.04)*	0.10	5.04	
22	Boice 1988	Uterus Corpus	Cervix		313	469	45–54 yrs	(<45–65+ yrs)	68 yrs	165	200+ Gy	na	na	na	-	
22	Boice 1988	Ovary	Cervix		309	560	45–54 yrs	(<45–65+ yrs)	68 yrs	32	60+ Gy	0.01	(–0.02–0.14)*	0.32	31.89	
22	Boice 1988	Bladder	Cervix		273	520	45–54 yrs	(<45–65+ yrs)	68 yrs	30–60 Gy	60+ Gy	0.07	(0.02–0.17)*	1.38	19.78	

na – not available. Dose = Estimated absorbed dose to the tumor site (except for Inskip et al, 1994 and Boice et al,1988 where average absorbed dose to the whole organ was estimated). ERR/Gy – Excess Relative Risk per Gray. NS- not significant. na- not available.

#ERR/Gy from Travis et al (2003) excludes patients who received alkylating agents or radiation of 5Gy or more delivered to the ovaries.

* ERR/Gy for these studies was taken from UNSCEAR (51).

** For Bhatti et al the fitted dose-response is based on the linear term of the linear-quadratic regression model.