Published in final edited form as:

Semin Oncol. 2020 October ; 47(5): 278–292. doi:10.1053/j.seminoncol.2020.08.001.

Landmark Trials in the Medical Oncology Management of Early Stage Breast Cancer

Whitney Hensing, MD MSCR¹, Cesar A. Santa-Maria, MD MSCI², Lindsay L. Peterson, MD MSCR¹, Jennifer Y. Sheng, MD²

¹Siteman Cancer Center, Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, MO

²Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore MD

Abstract

With the advent of breast cancer screening programs, the majority of patients with newly diagnosed breast cancer are diagnosed with early stage disease and are likely to experience cure with proper treatment. Significant advances have been made in the management of early-stage breast cancer to personalize treatment according to disease biology. This progress has led to improvement in survival outcomes and quality of life for our patients. In this review, we discuss landmark clinical trials in medical oncology that have shaped the current standard of care for early stage ER-positive, HER2-positive and triple negative breast cancer.

Keywords

breast cancer; clinical trials; hormone receptor; HER-2; triple negative; adjuvant; neoadjuvant trastuzumab; pertuzumab; T-DM1; trastuzumab emtansine

Introduction

Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in women worldwide and the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths among women in the United States. There will be an estimated 276,000 new cases of breast cancer and 63,000 deaths due to breast cancer in the United States in 2020 [1]. Fortunately, the majority of patients with newly diagnosed breast cancer have early stage disease and thus have a high chance of cure [2]. Early stage breast

Corresponding author: Women's Malignancies Disease Group, The Sidney Kimmel Comprehensive Cancer Center at Johns Hopkins, The Bunting-Blaustein Cancer Research Building CRB1-142, 1650 Orleans St, Baltimore, MD 21287-0013. jsheng7@jhmi.edu (J. Sheng).

Author contributions: JS, CS: Conceptualization. All authors: Writing of original draft, review and editing.

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 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.

Declaration of competing interest

Dr Whitney Hensing has no disclosures. Dr Cesar Santa-Maria has research funding from Pfizer, AstraZeneca, Novartis, Bristol Meyers Squibb and has served on advisory boards for Bristol Meyers Squibb, Genomic Health, Seattle Genetics, Athenex, Halozyme and Polyphor. Dr Lindsay L. Peterson has no disclosures. Dr Jennifer Sheng has no disclosures.

cancer consists of stage I-III disease as determined by the eight edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) staging manual and clinical subtype is determined by estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) status [3]. A multidisciplinary approach to early stage breast cancer typically involving surgical, radiation and medical oncology is a standard of care and associated with optimal outcomes [4]. Treatment approach depends on extent of disease and clinical subtype. Significant advances in breast cancer research over the past five decades have resulted not only in improvement in survival, but also enhanced patients' quality of life [5]. Here we review the landmark trials in early-stage breast cancer which have established the current standard of care in medical oncology.

Principles of chemotherapy for early stage breast cancer

Adjuvant chemotherapy

Adjuvant chemotherapy after primary breast surgery has demonstrated improvement in survival outcomes, and through decades has morphed into current standard regimens [6]. In the mid 1970's, the first adjuvant polychemotherapy consisted of cyclophosphamide plus methotrexate and fluorouracil (CMF) [7]. In the 1990's, use of anthracycline-based chemotherapy regimens were found to be superior to non-anthracycline containing regimens with better tolerance [8–12]. In an Early Breast Cancer Trialists Collaborative Group (EBCTCG) meta-analysis, use of anthracycline-containing regimens compared with no treatment resulted in 8% reduction in 10-year risk of breast cancer recurrence (39.4 vs 47.4%, RR 0.73, 95% CI 0.68–0.79), 6.5% reduction in breast cancer mortality (29.3% vs 35.8%, RR 0.79, 95% CI 0.72–0.85) and 5% reduction in overall mortality (34.6 vs 39.6%, RR 0.84, 95% CI 0.78–0.91) [13]. Additionally, the addition of a taxane to an anthracycline-based chemotherapy regimen further reduced breast cancer mortality by 4.6% (30.2 vs 34.8%, RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.79–0.93). Benefits of taxane incorporation were independent of age, nodal status, tumor size, tumor grade and ER status [13].

Increased dose-intensity and sequential administration of anthracycline and taxane chemotherapy were found to reduce the risk of recurrence and death from breast cancer without increasing mortality from other causes, particularly in women with hormone receptor negative (HR-negative) breast cancer [14, 15]. Compared to standard schedule chemotherapy, dose-intense administration (otherwise known as dose-dense) reduced 10-year risk of breast cancer recurrence by 3.4% (28.0 vs 31.4%, RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.82–0.89), breast cancer mortality by 2.4% (18.9 vs 21.3%, RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.783–0.92) and all-cause mortality by 5.9% (22.1 vs 24.8%, RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.83–0.91). Sequential anthracycline plus taxane chemotherapy was associated with reduction in 10-year risk of disease recurrence by 3.2% (28.1 vs 31.3%, RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.80–0.94) [14]. While the improvement in disease recurrence rates with dose-intense chemotherapy were significant in both ER-positive and ER-negative disease, subsequent studies show that the likely benefit is in luminal B-like (PR <20% and/or Ki67 ≥ 20%) breast cancers compared to luminal A-like (PR ≥ 20% and Ki67 <20%) breast cancers [16–19].

An anthracycline is often used for HER2-negative, lymph node (LN) positive or high-risk LN-negative breast cancer. The Anthracyclines in Early Breast Cancer (ABC) trials were a

series of adjuvant trials that compared taxane-based regimens to anthracycline-taxane-based regimens. The primary endpoint of the analysis (n=4,242) was to determine if a non-anthracycline based regimen was non-inferior to an anthracycline-based regimen with respect to invasive disease-free survival (IDFS) [20]. While the trials failed to demonstrate non-inferiority (4-year IDFS 88.2% vs 90.7%, HR 1.23, 95% CI 1.01–1.50), planned exploratory analyses suggested that the magnitude of benefit for anthracycline-taxane-based regimens was greatest among patients with HR-negative tumors irrespective of nodal status, and those who are both HR-positive with lymph node (LN)-positive disease [20].

In summary, these data demonstrate that anthracycline and taxane based chemotherapy are the standard of care for early stage breast cancer. However, in patients with hormone receptor positive (HR-positive), human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2)-negative, LN-negative disease for whom chemotherapy is recommended, a taxane-based regimen such as docetaxel plus cyclophosphamide (TC) is preferred given the shorter duration of treatment and the lack of cardiac toxicity and secondary acute leukemia associated with anthracyclines [20, 21]. In patients with a significant lymph node burden, an anthracycline-taxane-based regimen such as dose-dense doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide followed by paclitaxel administered weekly or in a dose-dense fashion (dose-dense doxorubicin plus cyclophosphamide followed by paclitaxel, ddAC-T) should be considered if there are no contraindications. In patients with HR-positive, HER2-negative disease and low volume lymph node burden (0–3 LN-positive), either ddAC-T or TC may be considered based on patient preference, comorbidities, and the expected benefit from chemotherapy [6]. Furthermore, the advent of anti-HER2 therapy resulted in different systemic strategies for HER2-positive disease.

Role of neoadjuvant therapy

No significant difference in long-term outcomes has been reported with neoadjuvant vs adjuvant systemic chemotherapy [22, 23]. In an EBCTCG meta-analysis, no difference was seen in distant recurrence rate (38.2% vs 38%, RR 1.02, 0.92–1.14) or breast cancer mortality (34.4% vs 33.7%, RR 1.06, 0.95–1.18) in patients treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT) compared to adjuvant chemotherapy at 15-year follow-up. [24]. Historically, the primary indication of pre-operative systemic therapy has been to improve surgical outcomes by rendering inoperable tumors resectable, down-staging patients with operable cancers desiring breast conservation, and more recently de-escalation of axillary surgery in those with clinically positive nodes [25, 26].

Response to neoadjuvant therapy also provides important prognostic information and may inform adjuvant therapy recommendations for patients with triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) and HER2-positive disease. Achieving a pathologic complete response (pCR) to neoadjuvant therapy has been associated with favorable outcomes in patients with TNBC and HER2-positive breast cancer [27–29]. In a pooled analysis of nearly 12,000 patients who received NACT, pCR was associated with significant improvement in EFS for patients with TNBC (HR 0.24, 95% CI 0.18–0.33) and patients with HER2-positive, HR-negative disease who received trastuzumab (HR 0.15, 95% CI 0.09–0.27) [28]. Based on findings from the Capecitabine for Residual Cancer as Adjuvant Therapy (CREATE-X) and

KATHERINE randomized trials, patients with TNBC who do not achieve pCR following NACT may benefit from adjuvant capecitabine and patients with HER2-positive breast cancer who do not achieve pCR following NACT benefit from adjuvant trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1, KADCYLA), respectively [30, 31].

Management of HR-positive early stage breast cancer

Role for adjuvant chemotherapy

With few exceptions, all patients with HR-positive breast cancers should be considered candidates for adjuvant endocrine therapy. The decision to proceed with adjuvant chemotherapy depends on the predicted risk of disease recurrence and estimated benefit from chemotherapy. Validated risk calculators have been developed to estimate a specific patient's risk of breast cancer recurrence and mortality (e.g. PREDICT) [32]. These include tumor factors such as lymph node status, grade, size and patient factors such as age and menopausal status. However, these calculators do not consider the individual biologic characteristics of the patient's tumor and may lead to over- or under-treatment. Thus, genomic assays were developed to provide additional prognostic information and predict benefit from chemotherapy.

There are various gene expression assays to provide prognostic and therapy-predictive information that complements staging and biomarker information (Table 1), and the 21-gene assay is preferred by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) Breast Cancer Panel for node-negative breast cancer [6]. Other assays can provide additional prognostic information in patients with 1–3 positive lymph nodes but are unknown if predictive of chemotherapy benefit in 1–2 positive lymph nodes.

If a patient is a candidate for chemotherapy, current guidelines recommend obtaining a 21-gene Recurrence Score (RS) for patients with HR-positive, HER2-negative, LN-negative breast cancer with tumors >0.5-cm [6]. In all patients with high RS (RS >25 or RS ≥ 31) chemotherapy should be considered [33]. The Trial Assigning Individualized Options for Treatment (TAILORx) study was designed to determine if the addition of chemotherapy to endocrine therapy provided any benefit for patients with HR-positive, HER2-negative and LN-negative tumors with mid-range RS (RS 11–25) who otherwise met criteria for adjuvant chemotherapy based on tumor characteristics. There was no difference in outcomes between the two groups and 9-year overall survival (OS) was approximately 94% for the intention to treat (ITT) population. In an exploratory analysis, some chemotherapy benefit was shown for women age <50 years with RS 16–25 [34]. Thus, current guidelines recommend endocrine therapy alone for patients with a low RS score (RS <25) [6]. As some chemotherapy benefit was shown for women age <50 years with RS 16–25, chemotherapy may be considered for these patients [34].

The prognostic value of the RS has also been evaluated for patients with HR-positive, HER2-negative, LN-positive breast cancers [35–37]. Secondary analysis of a prospective registry of women with HR-positive, LN-positive tumors demonstrated a 5-year risk of recurrence of 2.7% in patients with an RS <18 treated with endocrine monotherapy [38]. In the West German Study Group PlanB (PlanB) study, women with HR-positive and LN-

negative tumors and an RS <11 had a 5-year disease-free survival (DFS) of 94.4% with endocrine monotherapy [36]. Patients with HR-positive, 1–3 LN-positive and RS ≥18 should be considered for adjuvant chemotherapy due to increased risk of recurrence. However, the optimal RS cut-off to predict chemotherapy benefit in LN-positive disease remains unknown. The randomized phase 3 Treatment for Positive Node, Endocrine Responsive Breast Cancer (RxPONDER) trial is currently ongoing ([NCT01272037](#)) and aims to answer this question [39].

The 70-gene signature test is prognostic and classifies tumors as high or low genomic risk based on risk of recurrence at 5-years and 10-years. In the MINDACT study, this 70-gene signature predicted benefit from adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with LN-negative or 1–3 LN-positive disease who were deemed high clinical risk according to anatomical and pathologic characteristics. Women with discordant clinical and genomic risk results were randomized to chemotherapy versus no chemotherapy. After 5 years of follow-up, among patients with high clinical risk and low genomic risk breast cancers there was no significant difference with respect to distant disease-free survival (DDFS) and OS with chemotherapy versus no chemotherapy (5-year DDFS 93.3% vs 90.3%; 5-year OS 98.8% vs 97.3%) [40]. In updated analysis presented at ASCO 2020, 8-year DDFS and OS were not significantly different with chemotherapy versus no chemotherapy [41]. However, of these women with high clinical risk and low genomic risk, a small percentage still benefited from chemotherapy.

Adjuvant endocrine therapy

Tamoxifen—Adjuvant endocrine therapy (ET) significantly improves outcomes for patients with early stage HR-positive breast cancer. Tamoxifen is a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM) and was historically the standard adjuvant treatment for all patients with HR-positive breast cancers until the introduction of aromatase inhibitors (AI), which were developed for postmenopausal women and are also currently used in premenopausal women receiving ovarian suppression. Tamoxifen remains among the primary adjuvant ET options for premenopausal women and a secondary option for postmenopausal women who are intolerant of an AI. EBCTCG analyses have demonstrated that 5-years of adjuvant tamoxifen reduces local, contralateral, and distant breast cancer recurrence by 30–50% for the first 10-years after diagnosis. In addition, breast cancer mortality is reduced by about one-third for the first 15 years after diagnosis irrespective of tumor features, use of adjuvant chemotherapy and age [42, 43].

While 5-years of adjuvant tamoxifen is the historical standard, studies show benefit to extending therapy to 10-years. In the Adjuvant Tamoxifen, Longer Against Shorter (ATLAS) trial, patients treated with tamoxifen for 10 years had a reduction in the cumulative risk of breast cancer recurrence by 3.7% and breast cancer mortality by 2.8%, in years 5–14 of follow-up compared to those treated for 5 years [44]. Similarly, in the Adjuvant Tamoxifen - To Offer More? (aTTom) study, 10 years of tamoxifen was associated with 2.6% reduction in breast cancer recurrence, which was most notable beyond year 7 and 1.4% reduction in breast cancer mortality [45, 46]. In both studies, there was a small increased risk of endometrial cancer and thromboembolic events. However, meta-analysis shows that

endometrial cancer risk with tamoxifen is correlated with age; there was little absolute risk for patients younger than 54, but for entry age 55–69 years the 15-year incidence of endometrial cancer was 2.6% greater for the tamoxifen groups compared to the control group (3.8% vs 1.1%, 95% CI 1.4–3.8) [43]. These studies are summarized in Table 1.

Aromatase inhibitors—AIs are preferred over tamoxifen for most postmenopausal women with HR-positive breast cancer. A meta-analysis from the EBCTCG of postmenopausal women with ER-positive breast cancer compared AIs to tamoxifen in three cohorts: 1) 5-years of AI versus 5-years of tamoxifen, 2) Tamoxifen alone versus short course of tamoxifen followed by AI for 5-years total of ET, and 3) AI alone versus short course of tamoxifen followed by AI for 5 total years of ET. Treatment with AI in each cohort resulted in reduced risk of breast cancer recurrence during the treatment period compared with tamoxifen with no further impact beyond the 5-year treatment period, and 20% reduction in breast cancer mortality [47]. Evidence suggests comparable outcomes and tolerability between different AIs thus all are appropriate options for those warranting treatment. In the MA.17 study, 5-years of letrozole after completion of 5-years of tamoxifen was associated with improved DFS and OS compared to placebo [48]. Likewise, in the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP) B33 trial which included only patients with LN-positive breast cancer, 5-years of exemestane following 5-years of tamoxifen improved relapse-free survival (RFS) [49]. These studies support sequential strategy for extended endocrine therapy incorporating tamoxifen for 2–3 years or 5 years followed by AI for up to 5 years.

Studies evaluating the role of extended AI beyond 5-years have yielded mixed results. Both the MA.17R and NSABP B42 trial reported improvement in DFS and reduction in contralateral breast cancer (CLBC) [50–52]. Conversely, both the DATA and IDEAL trials failed to confirm benefit in DFS with extended AI [53, 54]. Overall, the data suggest that extended adjuvant AI provides modest DFS benefit, driven mainly by reduction in CLBC. Benefits of extended AI therapy should also be weighed with higher rates of cardiovascular risk factors and osteoporotic fractures [55]. These studies are summarized in Table 1.

Ovarian suppression in premenopausal women—Ovarian functional suppression (OFS) by surgical or pharmacologic means may be considered for high-risk premenopausal women to reduce risk of recurrence (Table 1). The International Breast Study Group (IBCSG) commenced the SOFT and TEXT trials to evaluate OFS in addition to adjuvant endocrine therapy for premenopausal women. In combined analysis of both trials, DFS was compared for three groups, exemestane-OFS vs tamoxifen-OFS vs tamoxifen alone. Results demonstrated that the addition of OFS to tamoxifen improved both DFS and OS compared to tamoxifen alone. Exemestane-OFS resulted in further improvement in DFS, but not OS, compared to tamoxifen-OFS. However, the largest magnitude of benefit was seen with use of OFS in patients with high risk of recurrence. Since OFS is associated with increased toxicity, it should be considered primarily for women who have received chemotherapy (should include large tumors, LN-positive, high genomic risk) and younger women [56, 57].

Adjuvant bisphosphonate—In addition to the effects on bone-mineral density, some studies have suggested that use of bisphosphonates may be associated with improved breast

cancer survival in postmenopausal women. An EBCTCG meta-analysis (Table 1), which included a number of heterogeneous studies using different bisphosphonates and different schedules, demonstrated that the use of bisphosphonate reduced the risk of bone-only breast cancer recurrence in all patients and reduced the risk of breast cancer recurrence, distant metastases and breast cancer related deaths in postmenopausal women irrespective of HR status, tumor grade, nodal involvement or chemotherapy use [58]. Updated American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) guidelines recommend consideration of adjuvant bisphosphonate, with either zoledronic acid for 3–5 years or clodronate for 2–3 years duration, for postmenopausal patients who are deemed candidates for adjuvant systemic therapy [59].

Targeted agents—Given the progression-free survival (PFS) and OS benefits seen with cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK) 4/6 inhibitors in advanced HR-positive breast cancer, these agents are currently being evaluated in the (neo) adjuvant setting in an attempt to reduce the rate of recurrence after definitive treatment for early stage HR-positive breast cancer. The Palbociclib Collaborative Adjuvant Study (PALLAS) study is an ongoing ([NCT02513394](#)) phase III trial assessing the addition of 2 years of palbociclib to 5 years of standard endocrine therapy in stage II-III breast cancer [60]. Following a preplanned efficacy analysis, the investigators announced that this study is unlikely to show statistically significant improvement in IDFS. The New Adjuvant Trial with LEE (NATALEE) study is an ongoing ([NCT03701334](#)) phase III trial of 3-years of ribociclib added to 5 years of standard endocrine therapy [61].

Management of HER2-positive early-stage breast cancer

Patients with HER2-positive early stage breast cancer generally warrant treatment with chemotherapy in addition to anti-HER2 agents. Patients with stage II or III HER2-positive breast cancers are offered NACT for risk stratification by pCR, and consideration of adjuvant TDM1 with residual disease [31]. For patients with pCR following HER2-directed therapy, adjuvant trastuzumab ($\pm$ pertuzumab) is recommended to complete 1 year of anti-HER2 therapy [6]. Patients with smaller, node-negative tumors may proceed with surgery as the initial treatment since they may be candidates for deescalated chemotherapy regimen with paclitaxel plus trastuzumab for 12 weeks follow by trastuzumab to complete 1 year of adjuvant anti-HER2 therapy [6, 62, 63]. The landmark trials for HER2-positive early stage disease are discussed below.

HER2-targeted therapy

Trastuzumab—Trastuzumab is a monoclonal antibody that binds the extracellular domain of HER2. The benefits of adding trastuzumab to adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with HER2-positive tumors have been demonstrated in several studies as summarized in Table 2. A 2012 meta-analysis showed improvement in DFS regardless of trastuzumab treatment duration or schedule [64]. Improvement in OS was seen only in patients treated for 12 months (HR 0.67, 95% CI 0.57–0.80) and concurrent administration of trastuzumab with chemotherapy (HR 0.64, 95% CI 0.53–0.76) [62]. Subsequent data has confirmed that the addition of trastuzumab to chemotherapy results in durable survival benefit in HER2-

positive breast cancer. In combined analysis of North Central Cancer Treatment Group (NCCTG) N9831 and NSABP B31 trials, the addition of trastuzumab to chemotherapy (doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide followed by paclitaxel with trastuzumab) resulted in 37% improvement in OS (HR 0.63, 95% CI 0.54–0.73) and 40% improvement in DFS (HR 0.60, 95% CI 0.53–0.68) compared to chemotherapy alone [65].

Various durations of adjuvant trastuzumab have been investigated and the current standard is one year. The HERA trial demonstrated no additional benefit with extension of trastuzumab to two years [66]. Results of 6-months versus 12 months of adjuvant trastuzumab are discordant. In the PHARE trial, 6-months of trastuzumab did not meet criteria for non-inferiority; however, significantly more patients in the 12-month group experienced a cardiac event (5.7% vs 1.9%, $p < 0.001$) [67]. Similarly, in the Hellenic Oncology Research Group (HORG) trial, 6-months of adjuvant trastuzumab failed to demonstrate non-inferiority [68]. By contrast, in the PERSEPHONE trial, adjuvant trastuzumab for 6-months was found to be non-inferior to 12-months. Furthermore, 6-months of therapy reduced cardiac events by 3% and reduced discontinuation rates by 5% [69]. The different outcomes of these trials may be attributed to variability in the prespecified non-inferiority criteria. Moreover, in the subset of the PERSEPHONE trial that mirrors contemporary practice with concurrent chemotherapy and trastuzumab, there was benefit for the 12-months versus 6-months duration (4-year DFS 93% vs 89%, HR 1.53, 95% CI 1.16–2.01) [69]. Studies of trastuzumab for 9 weeks also failed to demonstrate non-inferiority [70, 71].

Randomized controlled trials establishing the benefit of trastuzumab in HER2-positive early stage breast cancer limited eligibility to women with node-positive or high-risk node-negative breast cancer. Limited information is available regarding low-risk node-negative cases (tumors < 1 -cm). In a recent meta-analysis of 7 studies involving 1181 patients with T1a-bN0 HER2-positive breast cancer, patients treated with trastuzumab were less likely to experience disease recurrence than controls (OR 0.201, 95% CI 0.1–0.404). There was a trend towards reduction in distant recurrence, although results were not statistically significant (OR 0.328, 95% CI 0.082–1.311) [72]. Current NCCN guidelines recommend considering use of adjuvant trastuzumab with chemotherapy in these patients after balancing risk of toxicities (such as cardiotoxicity) [6].

Pertuzumab—Pertuzumab is a monoclonal antibody that binds the extracellular dimerization domain of HER2 and prevents it from binding to itself or other members of the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) family. It is administered in combination with trastuzumab in patients with high-risk HER-2 positive breast cancer. Neoadjuvant dual anti-HER blockade with pertuzumab and trastuzumab was found to improve pCR rate by 16.8% (45.8 vs 29%, $p = 0.01$) compared with single-agent trastuzumab combined with chemotherapy in the NeoSphere trial. However, there was no difference in DFS or PFS after 3-years of follow-up [73, 74]. The TRYPHAENA study was designed to assess the cardiac safety of dual anti-HER2 blockade with chemotherapy. In secondary efficacy analysis, 3-year DFS and OS was comparable between chemotherapy regimens and significant improvement in DFS was seen for patients who had pCR to NACT (HR 0.27, 95% CI 0.11–0.64) [75, 76]. Among patients with LN-positive breast cancer in the APHINITY trial, those randomized to receive adjuvant pertuzumab with trastuzumab for 1 year following

chemotherapy had improved 3-year IDFS by 1.8% (92 vs 90.2%, HR 0.77, 95% CI 0.62–0.96) [77]. Both the APHINITY and TRYPHAENA studies demonstrated no increase in rates of cardiac events with the addition of pertuzumab. Overall, non-anthracycline containing regimens had lower rates of decline in left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF) function and no patients developed symptomatic left ventricular systolic dysfunction (LVSD) [75–77]. These studies are summarized in Table 2.

Trastuzumab emtansine—Trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1, KADCYLA®) is an antibody-drug conjugate of trastuzumab and emtansine, a microtubule inhibitor. T-DM1 retains trastuzumab activity while providing intracellular delivery of DM1 into HER2-expressing cells. The risk of recurrence or death is higher among patients with residual disease at surgery than among patients with a pCR following NACT for HER2-positive breast cancer [27–29]. In the KATHERINE trial (Table 2), adjuvant treatment with T-DM1 improved 3-year IDFS by 11.3% (88.3 vs 77%, HR 0.50, 95% CI 0.39–0.64) and reduced 3-year cumulative risk of distant recurrence by 5.8% (10.5% vs 16.3%, HR 0.60, 0.45–0.79) among patients with residual disease following NACT compared to adjuvant trastuzumab [31]. Thus, switching adjuvant anti-HER2 therapy to T-DM1 is recommended for patients with residual disease after NACT [6].

T-DM1 has been explored in the adjuvant setting for stage I breast cancer, but there are concerns over tolerability and limited follow-up data. In the phase II ATEMPT trial, patients were randomized to adjuvant T-DM1 or paclitaxel + trastuzumab (TH). The study was not powered to compare DFS between treatment groups, but 3-year DFS was 97.7% (95% CI 96.2–99.3) for patients treated with T-DM1 and 92.8% (95% CI 87.7–98.1) for patients treated with TH. However, T-DM1 was not associated with fewer toxicities and 17% of patients receiving T-DM1 discontinued treatment because of toxicity, compared to 6% receiving TH [78].

Other anti-HER2 therapy—The role of dual blockage with agents other than pertuzumab remain unclear. Neoadjuvant dual anti-HER2 blockade with trastuzumab and lapatinib also improved pCR rate by 17% (44 vs 27%) compared to single-agent trastuzumab plus chemotherapy in the NeoALTTO trial. However, only those with pCR had significantly improved 3-year EFS (HR 0.38, 95% CI 0.22–0.63) and OS (HR 0.35, 95% CI 0.15–0.70) [79]. In ALTTO, the addition of lapatinib to adjuvant trastuzumab did not yield additional benefit in 4-year DFS or OS [80]. Neratinib has been shown to decrease recurrence rates when used in the adjuvant setting following treatment with single-agent trastuzumab, particularly in patients with large tumors that are also ER positive. In the ExteNET study, women randomized to neratinib after completing a year of adjuvant trastuzumab had improved 5-year IDFS by 2.5% (90.2 versus 87.7%, HR 0.73, 95% CI 0.57–0.92). There was a trend toward greater improvements for those with HR-positive disease compared with HR-negative disease. However, many patients ended treatment early due to diarrhea. The frequency of grade 3 to 4 diarrhea with neratinib was 40% without diarrhea prophylaxis versus 2% among those receiving placebo [81]. There are no data on the safety or efficacy of neratinib in patients whose adjuvant therapy included pertuzumab, further limiting its clinical utility. These studies are summarized in Table 2.

Choice of chemotherapy—Data regarding the combination of anthracycline-based chemotherapy plus trastuzumab come largely from NSABP B31 and N9831. In combined analysis at 8.4 years of median follow-up, the addition of adjuvant trastuzumab (concurrent with taxane) to anthracycline-taxane based chemotherapy resulted in significantly improved 10-year DFS by 11.5% (73.7 vs 62.2%, HR 0.60, 95% CI 0.53–0.68) and 10-year OS by 8.8% (84% vs 75.2%, HR 0.63, 95% CI 0.54–0.73) [82]. However, the cumulative incidence of cardiac toxicities were 4.0% in B31 and 3.4% in N9831 for patients receiving both trastuzumab and anthracycline [83–85].

Due to cardiotoxicity with anthracyclines and trastuzumab, non-anthracycline-based regimens were investigated. In the BCIRG-006 trial of women with LN-positive or high-risk LN-negative disease, adriamycin + cyclophosphamide + paclitaxel + trastuzumab (ACTH) demonstrated a trend towards improved DFS and OS but was associated with higher rates of heart failure compared with docetaxel + carboplatin + trastuzumab (TCH) (2% vs 0.4%, $p < 0.001$) [86]. However, this study was not powered to compare outcomes between ACTH and TCH. The TRAIN-2 study showed similar pCR rates for patients with stage II-III breast cancer receiving trastuzumab and pertuzumab concurrently with chemotherapy whether they were randomized to receive anthracycline-containing or non-anthracycline-containing regimens (67% vs 68%, $p = 0.95$) [87]. These data suggest that anthracyclines may be avoided in favor of the TCH regimen, particularly for patients with risk factors for cardiotoxicity (i.e. older age, hypertension). For patients with stage II-III breast cancer, EA1181 is an ongoing trial ([NCT04266249](#)) to determine if pCR with taxane-based chemotherapy regimen (THP) allows deescalation of adjuvant therapy without compromising 3-year RFS. Patients with pCR will complete 1-year of dual anti-HER2 blockade (HP) while patients with residual disease may receive AC or TDM1 per investigator's choice [88].

In the WSG-ADAPT phase II study, neoadjuvant therapy with trastuzumab + pertuzumab (HP) was compared with combination anti-HER2 therapy plus paclitaxel for 12 weeks (docetaxel + trastuzumab + pertuzumab, THP). The study failed to demonstrate non-inferiority in pCR rates with dual anti-HER2 blockade alone compared to combination with chemotherapy, especially because of the very high pCR rate in patients treated with the THP regimen at 90.5% (95% CI 77.4–97.3). Exploratory results suggested poor pCR (8.3%) in patients failing to achieve response after one cycle of dual blockade, which was much lower than in others (early responders: 44.7%, unclassifiable: 42.9%). This study suggests a role for further de-escalation of chemotherapy in patients with HER2-positive and ER-negative disease [89]. For patients with smaller LN-negative tumors, TH is usually preferred over TCH or ACTH although the regimens have never been directly compared. A single-arm phase II trial evaluated trastuzumab plus weekly paclitaxel in patients with LN-negative tumors ≤ 3 cm (majority were less than 1-cm). Overall toxicity was minimal and long-term outcomes were excellent with 7-year DFS of 93% (95% CI 90.4–96.2) and 7-year OS of 95% (95% CI 95.9–99.1) [62, 63].

Management of Triple-negative early-stage breast cancer

Triple negative breast cancer (TNBC) lacks expression of hormone receptors and HER2. As these patients have a higher risk of relapse compared to other breast cancer subtypes and are not candidates for targeted agents, chemotherapy is typically recommended. Chemotherapy regimens including anthracyclines and taxanes remain the standard regimens for TNBC. As pCR is associated with improvement in DFS [27–29], NACT is the preferred approach in most patients with tumors >2-cm or LN-positive disease because of available adjuvant regimens for those with residual disease [6, 30]. Ongoing studies are evaluating the benefit of incorporating carboplatin and immunotherapy as (neo) adjuvant therapy patients with early-stage TNBC and have demonstrated some promising early results, however, the benefit has yet to be confirmed. These studies are summarized in Table 3.

Chemotherapy

Carboplatin—In high-risk patients with TNBC, the addition of carboplatin to paclitaxel and anthracycline-containing NACT improves pCR rates. Multicenter trials show pCR rates of 22–39% for anthracycline-taxane-containing regimens without carboplatin and 53–60% for similar regimens with the addition of carboplatin. In the GeparSixto, Cancer and Leukemia Group B (CALGB) 40603, and BrighTNess trials, the addition of carboplatin to standard chemotherapy increased the pCR rate by 16.6, 14, and 27%, respectively [90–95]. However, none of the studies were designed to determine definitively whether the addition of carboplatin to NACT improves DFS or OS. GeparSixto did report a significant improvement in DFS by 10% with the addition of weekly carboplatin to standard chemotherapy after a median follow-up of 47.3 (range 1.7–62.8) months (86 vs 76%; HR 0.56, 95% CI 0.34–0.93), and a trend towards improvement in three-year OS (92 vs 86%; HR 0.60, 95% CI 0.32–1.12) [90–92]. By contrast, the CALGB 40603 study did not demonstrate improved 5-year EFS or OS for the addition of carboplatin to standard NACT [93–94]. Survival outcomes from BrighTNess have not been reported.

Although platinum-based therapy may be beneficial in women with hereditary BRCA1/2 mutations given defects in DNA damage repair, trials report that patients without a germline BRCA mutation exhibit a greater increase in pCR rate than those whose tumors harbor BRCA-mutations [91, 92, 95]. In BrighTNess, the addition of carboplatin increased the pCR rate in patients whose tumors were found to be wild type for BRCA-(29% to 59%) more than in patients whose tumors harbored BRCA mutations (41% to 50%) [95]. Similarly, in GeparSixto, 3-year DFS was greater with the addition of carboplatin in patients whose tumors were found to be wild type for BRCA (74% to 85%) compared to those whose tumors had BRCA mutations (82% to 86%) [91, 92].

Capecitabine—Meta-analysis show that substitution of standard chemotherapy with capecitabine has not improved OS [96]. However, in patients with residual disease after NACT, adjuvant capecitabine has been shown to improve both DFS and OS. In the CREATE-X trial, patients with HER2-negative breast cancer (including 32% with TNBC) and residual disease after NACT were randomized to 6–8 cycles of capecitabine or no further chemotherapy. Patients receiving capecitabine had improved 5-year IDFS by 6%

(74% vs 68%, HR 0.70, 95% CI 0.53–0.92) and 5-year OS by 5% (89% vs 84%, HR 0.59, 95% CI 0.39–0.90), and in subgroup analysis this effect was driven by patients with TNBC [26]. However, subsequent studies (SYSUCC-001 and GEICAM/2003–11_CIBOMA/2004–01) incorporating maintenance capecitabine following standard local and systemic treatments have not shown any significant improvements in OS [97,98].

Immunotherapy—Immunotherapy is not yet approved in early stage TNBC, and recent studies (GeparNuevo and I-SPY2) evaluating the addition of immunotherapy to NACT demonstrate effects on pCR [99, 100]. In KEYNOTE-522, the addition of pembrolizumab to NACT regimens (taxane-platinum and anthracycline-combination) improved pCR rates by 13.6% (64.8% vs 51.2%, $p < 0.001$) and event-free survival (EFS) by 6% (91.3% vs 85.3%, HR 0.63, 95% CI 0.43–0.93) after 15.5 months of median follow up regardless of programmed cell death ligand 1 (PD-L1) status [101]. There are major limitations in this study including the lack of dose dense AC and use of carboplatin — both of which have been proven to improve OS; with the use of carboplatin also controversial as it is not known if this is beneficial to all patients with TNBC. Indeed, this five-drug regimen was extremely toxic with 77% grade 3 or higher adverse events and fatalities seen in both arms. Further follow up is needed, and identifying those who truly require this aggressive regimen is critical to prevent overtreatment.

Healthy lifestyle

Lifestyle modifications can improve mental and physical health in patients with early breast cancer. Observational data suggests that exercise, weight management and minimization of alcohol intake are also associated with decreased risk of disease recurrence and death in breast cancer survivors.

Diet

The impact of dietary modification alone on breast cancer outcomes are unclear. After 5-years of follow-up in the Women's Intervention Nutrition Study (WINS) study, relapse events were 24% lower in women randomized to a low-fat dietary intervention compared to the control group (96/975 vs 181/1462, HR 0.76, 95% CI 0.60–0.98) with greater effect among the subgroup with ER-negative cancers (28/205 vs 59/273, HR 0.58, 95% CI 0.37–0.91)[102]. After 15 years of follow-up, death rates were numerically but not statistically lower in the intervention group compared with control group (13.6% vs 17%, respectively). However, in the subgroup with ER-negative cancers, there was a 36% reduction in mortality in the intervention group compared to the control group [103]. After 7-years of follow-up in the Women's Healthy Eating and Living (WHEL) study, there was no difference in breast cancer recurrence or overall mortality between women randomized to the diet intervention (low in fats and high in fruits, vegetables and fiber) compared to the control group [104]. The differences in outcomes between these studies may be in part attributed to the weight loss experienced by participants in WINS and the longer enrollment period and inclusion of higher-risk patients in WHEL.

Weight loss

Weight control and physical activity have also been showed to improve quality of life and reduce common symptoms among cancer survivors including sexual dysfunction, neuropathy, cardiotoxicity, chronic fatigue and lymphedema [105]. Some trials have evaluated the feasibility and benefits of weight loss in women with breast cancer. In the Lifestyle Intervention in Adjuvant Treatment of Early Breast Cancer (LISA) study, postmenopausal women with HR-positive breast cancer randomized to a two-year telephone-based weight loss intervention had greater weight loss from baseline compared to usual care (−5.4% vs −0.7% at 6 months; − 3.7% vs −0.4% at 2 years, $p<0.001$) [106]. In the Exercise and Nutrition to Enhance Recovery and Good Health for You (ENERGY) trial, women with a history of breast cancer randomized to a group-based weight loss program lost more weight than the control group who received dietitian counseling and print materials (−6.0% vs −1.5% at 1-year; −3.7% vs −1.3% at 2-years, $p<0.001$) [107]. However, studies are needed to determine if weight loss improves survival outcomes. The Breast Cancer Weight Loss (BWEL) trial ([NCT02750826](#)) is ongoing and will assess the impact of a 2-year telephone-based weight loss intervention on IDFS women with stage II-III breast cancer who are overweight or obese [108].

Physical activity

Observational studies suggest that breast cancer survivors who participate in moderate physical activity have improved outcomes compared with survivors who are less active. In a meta-analysis of 16 studies, a 48% reduction in overall mortality (RR 0.52, 95% CI 0.42–0.64) and 28% reduction in breast cancer mortality (RR 0.72, 95% CI 0.60–0.85) was seen for the highest versus lowest level of post-diagnosis physical activity. There was a 24% (95% CI 11–36%) reduction in overall mortality for each 10 metabolic equivalent task-hour/week increase in post-diagnosis physical activity (equivalent to 150 minutes/week of at least moderate intensity activity) [109]. Breast cancer survivors who increased their activity by any level pre- to post-diagnosis had a lower risk of overall mortality (RR 0.61, 95% CI 0.42–0.80) compared with survivors who did not change their activity level [109].

Conclusions

Decades of breast cancer research have led to significant advances in the management of patients with early stage breast cancer with systemic therapy. Treatment planning should consider tumor characteristics, particularly hormone receptor and HER2 status. Patients with HR-positive disease require individualized therapy recommendations incorporating tumor characteristics, prognostic and predictive genomic assays and estimated benefit of therapies. Patients with HER2-positive and TNBC generally have more aggressive disease and neoadjuvant therapies can be used to risk stratify and maximize the opportunity for cure. We have presented the landmark trials which have shaped the current standard of care for patients with early stage breast cancer, including some ongoing studies which will likely change the future treatment paradigm for this disease.

Abbreviations

ABC	Anthracyclines in Early Breast Cancer
AC	adriamycin + cyclophosphamide
ACTH	adriamycin + cyclophosphamide + paclitaxel + trastuzumab
AI	aromatase inhibitor
AJCC	American Joint Committee on Cancer
ALTERNATE	Alternate approaches for clinical stage II-II estrogen receptor positive breast cancer neoadjuvant treatment
ASCO	American Society of Clinical Oncology
ATLAS	Adjuvant Tamoxifen, Longer Against Shorter
aTTOM	Adjuvant Tamoxifen - To Offer More?
BRCA	b reast c ancer gene
BWEL	The Breast Cancer Weight Loss
CI	confidence interval
CALGB	Cancer and Leukemia Group B
CLBC	contralateral breast cancers
CMF	cyclophosphamide + methotrexate + 5-fluorouracil
CREATE-X	Capecitabine for Residual Cancer as Adjuvant Therapy
CDK	cyclin-dependent kinase
ddAC-T	dose-dense doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide followed by paclitaxel
DDFS	distant disease-free survival
DFS	disease-free survival
EBCTCG	Early Breast Cancer Trialists Collaborative Group
EFS	event free survival
EGFR	epidermal growth factor receptor
ENERGY	Exercise and Nutrition to Enhance Recovery and Good Health for You
ER	estrogen receptor

ET	endocrine therapy
HER2	human epidermal growth factor receptor 2
HORG	Hellenic Oncology Research Group
HP	trastuzumab + pertuzumab
HR	hazard ratio
HR negative	hormone receptor negative
HR positive	hormone receptor positive
IBCSG	International Breast Study Group
IDFS	invasive disease-free survival
ITT	intention-to-treat
LISA	Lifestyle Intervention in Adjuvant Treatment of Early Breast Cancer
LN	lymph node
LVEF	left ventricular ejection fraction
LVSD	left ventricular systolic dysfunction
MINDACT	Genetic Testing or Clinical Assessment in Determining the Need for Chemotherapy in Women With Breast Cancer That Involves No More Than 3 Lymph Nodes
NACT	neoadjuvant chemotherapy
NATALEE	New Adjuvant Trial with LEE
NCCTG	North Central Cancer Treatment Group
NET	neoadjuvant endocrine therapy
OFS	Ovarian Function Suppression
OS	overall survival
NCCN	National Comprehensive Cancer Network
NSABP	National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project
PALLAS	Palbociclib Collaborative Adjuvant Study
pCR	pathologic complete response
PFS	progression-free survival
PlanB	West German Study Group PlanB

PR	progesterone receptor
RFS	relapse-free survival
RR	relative risk
RS	21-gene recurrence score
RxPONDER	Treatment for Positive Node, Endocrine Responsive Breast Cancer
SERM	selective estrogen receptor modulator
TAILORx	The Trial Assigning Individualized Options for Treatment
TC	docetaxel + cyclophosphamide
TCH	docetaxel + carboplatin + trastuzumab
T-DM1	trastuzumab emtansine, KADCYLA®
TH	paclitaxel + trastuzumab
THP	docetaxel + trastuzumab + pertuzumab
TNBC	triple-negative breast cancer
WHEL	Women's Healthy Eating and Living
WINS	Women's Intervention Nutrition Study

References

1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2020. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2020 1;70(1):7–30. [PubMed: 31912902]
2. SEER. Cancer of the Breast (Female) - Cancer Stat Facts, <https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/breast.html> [accessed 2020 Jul 25].
3. AJCC (American Joint Committee on Cancer) Cancer Staging Manual; 8th edition, 3rd printing, Amin MB, Edge SB, Greene FL, et al. (Eds), Springer, Chicago 2018.
4. Kesson EM, Allardice GM, George WD, Burns HJG, Morrison DS. Effects of multidisciplinary team working on breast cancer survival: retrospective, comparative, interventional cohort study of 13 722 women. *BMJ*. 2012 4 26;344:e2718. [PubMed: 22539013]
5. Hortobagyi GN. Breast Cancer: 45 Years of Research and Progress. *J Clin Oncol*. 2020 4 7;38(21):2454–62. [PubMed: 32255711]
6. Gradishar WJ, Anderson BO, Abraham J, et al. Breast Cancer, Version 3.2020, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw*. 2020;18(4):452–478. [PubMed: 32259783]
7. Bonadonna G, Valagussa P, Moliterni A, Zambetti M, Brambilla C. Adjuvant cyclophosphamide, methotrexate, and fluorouracil in node-positive breast cancer: the results of 20 years of follow-up. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;332(14):901–906. [PubMed: 7877646]
8. Harlan LC, Abrams J, Warren JL, Clegg L, Stevens J, Ballard-Barbash R. Adjuvant therapy for breast cancer: practice patterns of community physicians. *J Clin Oncol*. 2002;20(7):1809–1817. [PubMed: 11919238]
9. Du X, Goodwin JS. Increase of chemotherapy use in older women with breast carcinoma from 1991 to 1996. *Cancer*. 2001;92(4):730–737. [PubMed: 11550141]

10. Giordano SH, Duan Z, Kuo YF, Hortobagyi GN, Goodwin JS. Use and outcomes of adjuvant chemotherapy in older women with breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2006;24(18):2750–2756. [PubMed: 16782915]
11. Martin M, Villar A, Sole-Calvo A, et al. Doxorubicin in combination with fluorouracil and cyclophosphamide (i.v. FAC regimen, day 1, 21) versus methotrexate in combination with fluorouracil and cyclophosphamide (i.v. CMF regimen, day 1, 21) as adjuvant chemotherapy for operable breast cancer: a study by the GEICAM group. *Ann Oncol*. 2003;14(6):833–842. [PubMed: 12796019]
12. Levine MN, Bramwell VH, Pritchard KI, et al. Randomized trial of intensive cyclophosphamide, epirubicin, and fluorouracil chemotherapy compared with cyclophosphamide, methotrexate, and fluorouracil in premenopausal women with node-positive breast cancer. National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group. *J Clin Oncol*. 1998;16(8):2651–2658. [PubMed: 9704715]
13. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG). Comparisons between different polychemotherapy regimens for early breast cancer: meta-analyses of long-term outcome among 100 000 women in 123 randomized trials. *The Lancet*. 2012 2 4;379(9814):432–44.
14. Bonilla L, Ben-Aharon I, Vidal L, Gafer-Gvili A, Leibovici L, Stemmer SM. Dose-dense chemotherapy in nonmetastatic breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2010;102(24):1845–1854. [PubMed: 21098761]
15. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG). Increasing the dose intensity of chemotherapy by more frequent administration or sequential scheduling: a patient-level meta-analysis of 37 298 women with early breast cancer in 26 randomized trials. *Lancet*. 2019 4 6;393(10179):1440–52. [PubMed: 30739743]
16. Conte B, Bruzzone M, Lambertini M, et al. Effect of dose-dense adjuvant chemotherapy in hormone receptor positive/HER2-negative early breast cancer patients according to immunohistochemically defined luminal subtype: an exploratory analysis of the GIM2 trial [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 4]. *Eur J Cancer*. 2020;136:43–51. [PubMed: 32634760]
17. Herr D, Wischnowsky M, Joukadar R, et al. Does chemotherapy improve survival in patients with nodal positive luminal A breast cancer? A retrospective Multicenter Study. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(7):e0218434 Published 2019 Jul 8. [PubMed: 31283775]
18. Bonte B, Bruzzone M, Lambertini M, et al. Effect of dose-dense adjuvant chemotherapy in hormone receptor positive/HER2-negative early breast cancer patients according to immunohistochemically defined luminal subtype: an exploratory analysis of the GIM2 trial [published online ahead of print, 2020 Jul 4]. *Eur J Cancer*. 2020;136:43–51. [PubMed: 32634760]
19. Martin M, Villar A, Sole-Calvo A, et al. Doxorubicin in combination with fluorouracil and cyclophosphamide (i.v. FAC regimen, day 1, 21) versus methotrexate in combination with fluorouracil and cyclophosphamide (i.v. CMF regimen, day 1, 21) as adjuvant chemotherapy for operable breast cancer: a study by the GEICAM group. *Ann Oncol*. 2003;14(6):833–842 [PubMed: 12796019]
20. Blum JL, Flynn PJ, Yothers G, et al. Anthracyclines in Early Breast Cancer: The ABC Trials—USOR 06–090, NSABP B-46-I/USOR 07132, and NSABP B-49 (NRG Oncology). *J Clin Oncol* 2017 4 11;35(23):2647–55. [PubMed: 28398846]
21. Jones SE, Savin MA, Holmes FA, et al. Phase III trial comparing doxorubicin plus cyclophosphamide with docetaxel plus cyclophosphamide as adjuvant therapy for operable breast cancer [published correction appears in *J Clin Oncol*. 2007 May 1;25(13):1819]. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24(34):5381–5387. [PubMed: 17135639]
22. Rastogi P, Anderson SJ, Bear HD, et al. Preoperative chemotherapy: updates of National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project Protocols B-18 and B-27. *J Clin Oncol* 2008 2 10;26(5):778–85. [PubMed: 18258986]
23. Mauri D, Pavlidis N, Ioannidis JPA. Neoadjuvant Versus Adjuvant Systemic Treatment in Breast Cancer: A Meta-Analysis. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2005 2 2;97(3):188–94. [PubMed: 15687361]
24. Asselain B, Barlow W, Bartlett J, et al. Long-term outcomes for neoadjuvant versus adjuvant chemotherapy in early breast cancer: meta-analysis of individual patient data from ten randomized trials. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2018 1 1;19(1):27–39. [PubMed: 29242041]

25. Gralow JR, Burstein HJ, Wood W, et al. Preoperative Therapy in Invasive Breast Cancer: Pathologic Assessment and Systemic Therapy Issues in Operable Disease. *J Clin Oncol* 2008 26;26(5):814–9. [PubMed: 18258991]
26. Killelea BK, Yang VQ, Mougalian S, et al. Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer Increases the Rate of Breast Conservation: Results from the National Cancer Database. *Journal of the American College of Surgeons*. 2015 6 1;220(6):1063–9. [PubMed: 25868410]
27. Liedtke C, Mazouni C, Hess KR, et al. Response to Neoadjuvant Therapy and Long-Term Survival in Patients with Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2008 3 10;26(8):1275–81. [PubMed: 18250347]
28. Cortazar P, Zhang L, Untch M, et al. Pathological complete response and long-term clinical benefit in breast cancer: the CTNeoBC pooled analysis. *The Lancet*. 2014 7 12;384(9938):164–72.
29. von Minckwitz G, Untch M, Blohmer J-U, et al. Definition and Impact of Pathologic Complete Response on Prognosis After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Various Intrinsic Breast Cancer Subtypes. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012 4 16;30(15):1796–804. [PubMed: 22508812]
30. Masuda N, Lee S-J, Ohtani S, et al. Adjuvant Capecitabine for Breast Cancer after Preoperative Chemotherapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2017 01;376(22):2147–59. [PubMed: 28564564]
31. von Minckwitz G, Huang C-S, Mano MS, et al. Trastuzumab Emtansine for Residual Invasive HER2Positive Breast Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2019 14;380(7):617–28. [PubMed: 30516102]
32. Gray E, Marti J, Brewster DH, Wyatt JC, Hall PS; SATURNE Advisory Group. Independent validation of the PREDICT breast cancer prognosis prediction tool in 45,789 patients using Scottish Cancer Registry data. *Br J Cancer*. 2018;119(7):808–814. [PubMed: 30220705]
33. Sparano JA. TAILORx: trial assigning individualized options for treatment (Rx). *Clin Breast Cancer*. 2006 10;7(4):347–50. [PubMed: 17092406]
34. Sparano JA, Gray RJ, Makower DF, et al. Adjuvant Chemotherapy Guided by a 21-Gene Expression Assay in Breast Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(2):111–121. [PubMed: 29860917]
35. Albain KS, Barlow WE, Shak S, et al. Prognostic and predictive value of the 21-gene recurrence score assay in postmenopausal women with node-positive, oestrogen-receptor-positive breast cancer on chemotherapy: a retrospective analysis of a randomized trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2010 1;11(1):55–65. [PubMed: 20005174]
36. Nitz U, Gluz O, Christgen M, et al. Reducing chemotherapy use in clinically high-risk, genomically lowrisk pN0 and pN1 early breast cancer patients: five-year data from the prospective, randomized phase 3 West German Study Group (WSG) PlanB trial. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2017 10;165(3):573–83. [PubMed: 28664507]
37. Roberts MC, Miller DP, Shak S, Petkov VI. Breast cancer-specific survival in patients with lymph nodepositive hormone receptor-positive invasive breast cancer and Oncotype DX Recurrence Score results in the SEER database. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2017 6;163(2):303–10. [PubMed: 28243896]
38. Stemmer SM, Steiner M, Rizel S, Geffen DB, Nisenbaum B, Peretz T, et al. Clinical outcomes in ER+ HER2 -node-positive breast cancer patients who were treated according to the Recurrence Score results: evidence from a large prospectively designed registry. *NPJ Breast Cancer*. 2017;3:32. [PubMed: 28900632]
39. Clinicaltrials.gov. RxPONDER: A Clinical Trial Rx for Positive Node, Endocrine Responsive Breast Cancer, <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01272037> [accessed 2020 Jul 24].
40. Cardoso F, van Veer LJ, Bogaerts J, et al. 70-Gene Signature as an Aid to Treatment Decisions in Early-Stage Breast Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(8):717–729. [PubMed: 27557300]
41. Cardoso F, van 't Veer L, Poncet C, et al. MINDACT: Long-term results of the large prospective trial testing the 70-gene signature MammaPrint as guidance for adjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer patients. *J Clin Oncol*. 2020 5 20;38(15_suppl):506–506.
42. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG). Effects of chemotherapy and hormonal therapy for early breast cancer on recurrence and 15-year survival: an overview of the randomised trials. *Lancet*. 2005;365(9472):1687–1717. [PubMed: 15894097]
43. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG). Relevance of breast cancer hormone receptors and other factors to the efficacy of adjuvant tamoxifen: patient-level meta-analysis of randomized trials. *The Lancet*. 2011 8 27;378(9793):771–84.

44. Davies C, Pan H, Godwin J, et al. Long-term effects of continuing adjuvant tamoxifen to 10 years versus stopping at 5 years after diagnosis of oestrogen receptor-positive breast cancer: ATLAS, a randomized trial. *Lancet*. 2013 3 9;381(9869):805–16. [PubMed: 23219286]
45. Earl H, Gray R, Kerr D, Lee M. The optimal duration of adjuvant tamoxifen treatment for breast cancer remains uncertain: randomize into aTTom. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. 1997;9(3):141–3. [PubMed: 9269542]
46. Gray RG, Rea D, Handley K, et al. aTTom: Long-term effects of continuing adjuvant tamoxifen to 10 years versus stopping at 5 years in 6,953 women with early breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2013 6 20;31(18_suppl):5–5. [PubMed: 23169505]
47. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG). Aromatase inhibitors versus tamoxifen in early breast cancer: patient-level meta-analysis of the randomised trials. *Lancet*. 2015;386(10001):1341–1352. [PubMed: 26211827]
48. Ingle JN, Tu D, Pater JL, et al. Intent-to-treat analysis of the placebo-controlled trial of letrozole for extended adjuvant therapy in early breast cancer: NCIC CTG MA.17. *Ann Oncol*. 2008;19(5):877–882. [PubMed: 18332043]
49. Mamounas EP, Jeong J-H, Wickerham DL, et al. Benefit from exemestane as extended adjuvant therapy after 5 years of adjuvant tamoxifen: intention-to-treat analysis of the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast And Bowel Project B-33 trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2008 4 20;26(12):1965–71. [PubMed: 18332472]
50. Mamounas EP, Bandos H, Lembersky BC, et al. Use of letrozole after aromatase inhibitor-based therapy in postmenopausal breast cancer (NRG Oncology/NSABP B-42): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2019 1 1;20(1):88–99. [PubMed: 30509771]
51. Mamounas EP, Bandos H, Lembersky BC, et al. Ten-year results from NRG Oncology/NSABP B-42: A randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled clinical trial of extended adjuvant endocrine therapy with letrozole in postmenopausal women with hormone-receptor+ breast cancer who have completed previous adjuvant therapy with an aromatase inhibitor. 2019 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium Abstract GS4–01. Presented December 12, 2019
52. Goss PE, Ingle JN, Pritchard KI, et al. Extending Aromatase-Inhibitor Adjuvant Therapy to 10 Years. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(3):209–219. [PubMed: 27264120]
53. Blok EJ, Kroep JR, Meershoek-Klein Kranenbarg E, et al. Optimal Duration of Extended Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy for Early Breast Cancer; Results of the IDEAL Trial (BOOG 2006–05). *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2018 01;110(1) 40–48.
54. Tjan-Heijnen VCG, van Hellemond IEG, Peer PGM, et al. Extended adjuvant aromatase inhibition after sequential endocrine therapy (DATA): a randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2017;18(11):1502–11. [PubMed: 29031778]
55. Goldvaser H, Barnes TA, Šeruga B, Cescon DW, Ocaña A, Ribnikar D, et al. Toxicity of Extended Adjuvant Therapy With Aromatase Inhibitors in Early Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2018 1 1;110(1):31–9.
56. Francis PA, Pagani O, Fleming GF, et al. Tailoring Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy for Premenopausal Breast Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2018 7 12;379(2):122–37. [PubMed: 29863451]
57. Pagani O, Francis PA, Fleming GF, et al. Absolute Improvements in Freedom From Distant Recurrence to Tailor Adjuvant Endocrine Therapies for Premenopausal Women: Results From TEXT and SOFT. *J Clin Oncol*. 2020 4 20;38(12):1293–303. [PubMed: 31618131]
58. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG). Adjuvant bisphosphonate treatment in early breast cancer: meta-analyses of individual patient data from randomized trials. *The Lancet*. 2015 10 3;386(10001):1353–61.
59. Dhesy-Thind S, Fletcher GG, Blanchette PS, et al. Use of Adjuvant Bisphosphonates and Other BoneModifying Agents in Breast Cancer: A Cancer Care Ontario and American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline. *J Clin Oncol*. 2017;35(18):2062–2081. [PubMed: 28618241]
60. Clinicaltrials.gov. PALbociclib CoLaborative Adjuvant Study, <https://ClinicalTrials.gov/show/NCT02513394> [accessed 2020 July 25].

61. Slamon DJ, Fasching PA, Patel R, et al. NATALEE: Phase III study of ribociclib (RIBO) + endocrine therapy (ET) as adjuvant treatment in hormone receptor-positive (HR+), human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-negative (HER2-) early breast cancer (EBC). *J Clin Oncol* 2019 37:15_suppl, TPS597
62. Tolane SM, Barry WT, Dang CT, et al. Adjuvant paclitaxel and trastuzumab for node-negative, HER2-positive breast cancer [published correction appears in *N Engl J Med*. 2015 Nov 12;373(20):1989]. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372(2):134–141. [PubMed: 25564897]
63. Tolane SM, Guo H, Pernas S, et al. Seven-Year Follow-Up Analysis of Adjuvant Paclitaxel and Trastuzumab Trial for Node-Negative, Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2-Positive Breast Cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2019 01;37(22):1868–75. [PubMed: 30939096]
64. Moja L, Tagliabue L, Balduzzi S, et al. Trastuzumab containing regimens for early breast cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2012 4 18;2012(4):CD006243.
65. Perez EA, Romond EH, Suman VJ, et al. Trastuzumab plus adjuvant chemotherapy for human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive breast cancer: planned joint analysis of overall survival from NSABP B-31 and NCCTG N9831. *J Clin Oncol* 2014 11 20;32(33):3744–52. [PubMed: 25332249]
66. Cameron D, Piccart-Gebhart MJ, Gelber RD, et al. 11 years' follow-up of trastuzumab after adjuvant chemotherapy in HER2-positive early breast cancer: final analysis of the HERceptin Adjuvant (HERA) trial. *Lancet*. 2017 25;389(10075):1195–205. [PubMed: 28215665]
67. Pivot X, Romieu G, Debled M, et al. 6 months versus 12 months of adjuvant trastuzumab for patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer (PHARE): a randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2013 7;14(8):741–8. [PubMed: 23764181]
68. Mavroudis D, Saloustros E, Malamos N, et al. Six versus 12 months of adjuvant trastuzumab in combination with dose-dense chemotherapy for women with HER2-positive breast cancer: a multicenter randomized study by the Hellenic Oncology Research Group (HORG). *Ann Oncol* 2015 7;26(7):1333–40. [PubMed: 25935793]
69. Earl HM, Hiller L, Vallier AL, et al. 6 versus 12 months of adjuvant trastuzumab for HER2-positive early breast cancer (PERSEPHONE): 4-year disease-free survival results of a randomised phase 3 non-inferiority trial. *The Lancet*. 2019 6 29;393(10191):2599–612.
70. Joensuu H, Fraser J, Wildiers H, et al. Effect of Adjuvant Trastuzumab for a Duration of 9 Weeks vs 1 Year With Concomitant Chemotherapy for Early Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2-Positive Breast Cancer: The SOLD Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Oncol*. 2018 01;4(9):1199–206. [PubMed: 29852043]
71. Conte P, Frassoldati A, Bisagni G, et al. Nine weeks versus 1 year adjuvant trastuzumab in combination with chemotherapy: final results of the phase III randomized Short-HER study. *Ann Oncol*. 2018 01;29(12):2328–33. [PubMed: 30219886]
72. Lee HY, Shin IS, Rim CH. Benefits of adjuvant treatment including trastuzumab in HER2-positive pT1abN0M0 breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Transl Med* 2020;8(5):187. [PubMed: 32309334]
73. Gianni L, Pienkowski T, Im Y-H, et al. Five-year analysis of the phase II NeoSphere trial evaluating four cycles of neoadjuvant docetaxel (D) and/or trastuzumab (T) and/or pertuzumab (P). *J Clin Oncol*. 2015 5 20;33(15_suppl):505–505.
74. Gianni L, Pienkowski T, Im YH, et al. Efficacy and safety of neoadjuvant pertuzumab and trastuzumab in women with locally advanced, inflammatory, or early HER2-positive breast cancer (NeoSphere): a randomized multicenter, open-label, phase 2 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2012;13(1):25–32. [PubMed: 22153890]
75. Schneeweiss A, Chia S, Hickish T, et al. Pertuzumab plus trastuzumab in combination with standard neoadjuvant anthracycline-containing and anthracycline-free chemotherapy regimens in patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer: a randomized phase II cardiac safety study (TRYPHAENA). *Ann Oncol*. 2013 9;24(9):2278–84. [PubMed: 23704196]
76. Schneeweiss A, Chia S, Hickish T, et al. Long-term efficacy analysis of the randomised, phase II TRYPHAENA cardiac safety study: Evaluating pertuzumab and trastuzumab plus standard neoadjuvant anthracycline-containing and anthracycline-free chemotherapy regimens in patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer. *Eur J Cancer*. 2018;89:27–35. [PubMed: 29223479]

77. von Minckwitz G, Procter M, de Azambuja E, et al. Adjuvant Pertuzumab and Trastuzumab in Early HER2-Positive Breast Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2017 7 13;377(2):122–31. [PubMed: 28581356]
78. Tolaney SM, Hu J, Dang C, et al. TBCRC 033: A randomized phase II study of adjuvant trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1) vs paclitaxel (T) in combination with trastuzumab (H) for stage I HER2-positive breast cancer (BC) (ATEMPT). Presented at: 2019 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium; December 10–14; San Antonio, TX Abstract GS1–05.
79. de Azambuja E, Holmes AP, Piccart-Gebhart M, et al. Lapatinib with trastuzumab for HER2-positive early breast cancer (NeoALTTO): survival outcomes of a randomised, open-label, multicentre, phase 3 trial and their association with pathological complete response. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2014 9 1;15(10):1137–46. [PubMed: 25130998]
80. Piccart-Gebhart M, Holmes E, Baselga J, et al. Adjuvant Lapatinib and Trastuzumab for Early Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2-Positive Breast Cancer: Results From the Randomized Phase III Adjuvant Lapatinib and/or Trastuzumab Treatment Optimization Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015 11 23;34(10):1034–42. [PubMed: 26598744]
81. Martin M, Holmes FA, Ejlersen B, et al. Neratinib after trastuzumab-based adjuvant therapy in HER2-positive breast cancer (ExteNET): 5-year analysis of a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2017;18(12):1688–1700. [PubMed: 29146401]
82. Perez EA, Romond EH, Suman VJ, et al. Trastuzumab plus adjuvant chemotherapy for human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive breast cancer: planned joint analysis of overall survival from NSABP B-31 and NCCTG N9831. *J Clin Oncol*. 2014;32(33):3744–3752. [PubMed: 25332249]
83. Ganz PA, Romond EH, Cecchini RS, et al. Long-Term Follow-Up of Cardiac Function and Quality of Life for Patients in NSABP Protocol B-31/NRG Oncology: A Randomized Trial Comparing the Safety and Efficacy of Doxorubicin and Cyclophosphamide (AC) Followed by Paclitaxel With AC Followed by Paclitaxel and Trastuzumab in Patients With Node-Positive Breast Cancer With Tumors Overexpressing Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2. *J Clin Oncol*. 2017 10 26;35(35):3942–8. [PubMed: 29072977]
84. Romond EH, Jeong J-H, Rastogi P, et al. Seven-year follow-up assessment of cardiac function in NSABP B-31, a randomized trial comparing doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide followed by paclitaxel (ACP) with ACP plus trastuzumab as adjuvant therapy for patients with node-positive, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-positive breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012 11 1;30(31):3792–9. [PubMed: 22987084]
85. Advani PP, Ballman KV, Dockett TJ, Colon-Otero G, Perez EA. Long-Term Cardiac Safety Analysis of NCCTG N9831 (Alliance) Adjuvant Trastuzumab Trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2016 2 20;34(6):581–7. [PubMed: 26392097]
86. Slamon D, Eiermann W, Robert N, et al. Adjuvant trastuzumab in HER2-positive breast cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(14):1273–1283. [PubMed: 21991949]
87. van Ramshorst MS, van der Voort A, van Werkhoven ED, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with or without anthracyclines in the presence of dual HER2 blockade for HER2-positive breast cancer (TRAIN-2): a multicentre, open-label, randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. 2018;19(12):1630–1640. [PubMed: 30413379]
88. ClinicalTrials.gov. CompassHER2-pCR: Decreasing Chemotherapy for Breast Cancer Patients After Pre-surgery Chemo and Targeted Therapy, <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04266249> [accessed 2020 Jul 5].
89. Nitz UA, Gluz O, Christgen M, et al. De-escalation strategies in HER2-positive early breast cancer (EBC): final analysis of the WSG-ADAPT HER2+/HR- phase II trial: efficacy, safety, and predictive markers for 12 weeks of neoadjuvant dual blockade with trastuzumab and pertuzumab ± weekly paclitaxel. *Ann Oncol*. 2017;28(11):2768–2772. [PubMed: 28945833]
90. Martín M, Rodríguez-Lescure Á, Ruiz A, et al. Molecular predictors of efficacy of adjuvant weekly paclitaxel in early breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2010 8 1;123(1):149–57. [PubMed: 20037779]
91. Hahnen E, Lederer B, Hauke J, et al. Germline Mutation Status, Pathological Complete Response, and Disease-Free Survival in Triple-Negative Breast Cancer: Secondary Analysis of the

- GeparSixto Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Oncol.* 2017 10 1;3(10):1378–85. [PubMed: 28715532]
92. Loibl S, Weber KE, Timms KM, Elkin EP, Hahnen E, Fasching PA, et al. Survival analysis of carboplatin added to an anthracycline/taxane-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy and HRD score as predictor of response final results from GeparSixto. *Ann Oncol.* 2018 01;29(12):2341–7. [PubMed: 30335131]
 93. Sikov WM, Berry DA, Perou CM, et al. Impact of the addition of carboplatin and/or bevacizumab to neoadjuvant once-per-week paclitaxel followed by dose-dense doxorubicin and cyclophosphamide on pathologic complete response rates in stage II to III triple-negative breast cancer: CALGB 40603 (Alliance). *J Clin Oncol* 2015 1 1;33(1):13–21. [PubMed: 25092775]
 94. Sikov WM, Polley M-Y, Twohy E, et al. CALGB (Alliance) 40603: Long-term outcomes (LTOs) after neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT) +/- carboplatin (Cb) and bevacizumab (Bev) in triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC). *J Clin Oncol.* 2019 5 20;37(15_suppl):591–591.
 95. Loibl S, O'Shaughnessy J, Untch M, et al. Addition of the PARP inhibitor veliparib plus carboplatin or carboplatin alone to standard neoadjuvant chemotherapy in triple-negative breast cancer (BrighTNess): a randomised, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2018;19(4):497–509. [PubMed: 29501363]
 96. van Mackelenbergh M, Seither F, Möbus V, et al.: Effects of capecitabine as part of neo-/adjuvant chemotherapy: A meta-analysis of individual patient data from 12 randomized trials including 15,457 patients. 2019 San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium Abstract GS1–07. Presented December 11, 2019.
 97. Lluch A, Barrios CH, Torrecillas L, et al. Phase III Trial of Adjuvant Capecitabine After Standard Neo/Adjuvant Chemotherapy in Patients With Early Triple-Negative Breast Cancer (GEICAM/200311_CIBOMA/2004–01). *J Clin Oncol.* 2020 20;38(3):203–13. [PubMed: 31804894]
 98. Wang X, Wang S-S, Huang H, et al. Phase III trial of metronomic capecitabine maintenance after standard treatment in operable triple-negative breast cancer (SYSUCC-001). *J Clin Oncol.* 2020 5 20;38(15_suppl):507–507.
 99. Loibl S, Untch M, Burchardi N, et al. A randomised phase II study investigating durvalumab in addition to an anthracycline taxane-based neoadjuvant therapy in early triple-negative breast cancer: clinical results and biomarker analysis of GeparNuevo study. *Ann Oncol.* 2019;30(8):1279–1288. [PubMed: 31095287]
 100. Nanda R, Liu MC, Yau C, et al. Effect of Pembrolizumab Plus Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy on Pathologic Complete Response in Women With Early-Stage Breast Cancer: An Analysis of the Ongoing Phase 2 Adaptively Randomized I-SPY2 Trial [published online ahead of print, 2020 Feb 13]. *JAMA Oncol.* 2020;6(5):1–9.
 101. Schmid P, Cortes J, Pusztai L, et al. Pembrolizumab for Early Triple-Negative Breast Cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 27;382(9):810–21. [PubMed: 32101663]
 102. Chlebowski RT, Blackburn GL, Thomson CA, et al. Dietary fat reduction and breast cancer outcome: interim efficacy results from the Women's Intervention Nutrition Study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2006;98(24):1767–1776. [PubMed: 17179478]
 103. Chlebowski Rowan T, Blackburn George L. Final survival analysis from the randomized Women's Intervention Nutrition Study (WINS) evaluating dietary intervention as adjuvant breast cancer therapy [abstract]. In: Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual CTRC-AACR San Antonio Breast Cancer Symposium: 2014 Dec 9–13; San Antonio, TX Philadelphia (PA): AACR; Cancer Res 2015;75(9 Suppl):Abstract nr S5–08.
 104. Pierce JP, Natarajan L, Caan BJ, et al. Influence of a Diet Very High in Vegetables, Fruit, and Fiber and Low in Fat on Prognosis Following Treatment for Breast Cancer: The Women's Healthy Eating and Living (WHEL) Randomized Trial. *JAMA.* 2007 7 18;298(3):289–98. [PubMed: 17635889]
 105. Sheng JY, Sharma D, Jerome G, Santa-Maria CA. Obese Breast Cancer Patients and Survivors: Management Considerations. *Oncology (Williston Park).* 2018;32(8):410–417. [PubMed: 30153321]
 106. Goodwin PJ, Segal RJ, Vallis M, et al. Randomized Trial of a Telephone-Based Weight Loss Intervention in Postmenopausal Women With Breast Cancer Receiving Letrozole: The LISA Trial. *J Clin Oncol.* 2014 6 16;32(21):2231–9. [PubMed: 24934783]

107. Rock CL, Flatt SW, Byers TE, et al. Results of the Exercise and Nutrition to Enhance Recovery and Good Health for You (ENERGY) Trial: A Behavioral Weight Loss Intervention in Overweight or Obese Breast Cancer Survivors. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33(28):3169–3176. [PubMed: 26282657]
108. ClinicalTrials.gov. Breast Cancer WEight Loss Study (BWEL Study), <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02750826> [accessed 2020 Jul 25].
109. Schmid D, Leitzmann MF. Association between physical activity and mortality among breast cancer and colorectal cancer survivors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Oncol*. 2014;25(7):1293–1311. [PubMed: 24644304]

Table 1.

Landmark Trials in HR-positive breast cancer

Study	Number	Population	Study Design	Outcomes
Gene expression assays for consideration of adjuvant chemotherapy				
NSABP B20 [33]	N=651	• LN-negative	• Tamoxifen vs Tamoxifen plus chemotherapy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RS <11: 10-year DDFS: 98% vs 95% • RS 11–25: 10-year DDFS: 95% vs 94% • RS >25: 10-year DDFS: 63% vs 88%, HR 0.285 (0.15–0.55); P<0.0001
TAILORx [34]	N=6711	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HER2-negative • LN-negative • Tumors >1-cm (or >0.5-cm with unfavorable histology) 	• ET vs ET plus chemotherapy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RS 11–25 • 9-year DFS: 83% vs 84% Age 50, RS 16–20: HR 1.9 (1.27–2.84); P=0.0016 Age 50, RS 21–25: HR 1.7 (1.03–2.90); P=0.035 • 9-year DDFS: 94.5% vs 95% • 9-year OS: 94% vs 94%
MINDACT [40, 41]	N=1550	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority HR(+) and HER2(–) • LN-negative or 1–3 LN-positive (48%) 	• Chemotherapy vs no chemotherapy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High clinical risk and low genomic risk: • 5-year DDFS: 94% vs 96% • 5-year DFS: 90% vs 93%, HR 0.64 (0.43–0.95); P=0.03 • 5-year OS: 97% vs 98%
Adjuvant endocrine therapy				
aTTom, [45, 46]	N=6953	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40% ER-positive (60% ER-unknown) • 31% LN-positive • Completed 5 years of adjuvant tamoxifen 	• Continue tamoxifen for additional 5 years (10 years) vs stop tamoxifen (5 years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recurrence rate: 17% vs 19%; P=0.003 Years 7–9: RR 0.84 (0.73–0.95) Years 10: RR 0.75 (0.66–0.86) • Breast cancer mortality: 392 vs 443 deaths; P=0.05 Years 10: RR 0.77 (0.64–0.92) • Overall mortality: 849 vs 910 deaths; P=0.1 Years 10: RR 0.86 (0.75–0.97)
ATLAS [44]	N=6846	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 90% postmenopausal • 46% LN-positive • Completed 5 years of adjuvant tamoxifen 	• Continue tamoxifen for additional 5 years (10 years) vs stop tamoxifen (5 years)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of recurrence: 21% vs 25%; P=0.002 Years 10: RR 0.75 (0.62–0.90) • Breast cancer mortality: 12% vs 15%; P=0.01 Years 10 years: RR 0.71 (0.58–0.88) • Overall mortality: 639 vs 722 deaths; P=0.01 All years: RR 0.87 (0.78–0.97)
MA.17 [48]	N=5187	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postmenopausal • 45% LN-positive • Completed 5 years of adjuvant tamoxifen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letrozole for additional 5 years vs placebo • Allowed for cross-over 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-year DFS: 94% vs 91%, HR 0.68 (0.55–0.83); P<0.001 LN-negative: HR 0.51 (0.35–0.75); P=0.0005 LN+: HR 0.74 (0.58–0.94); P=0.01 • Annual rate of CLBC: 0.3% vs 0.5%, HR 0.61 (0.39–0.97); P=0.003 • No significant difference in DDFS or OS
NASBP B33 [49]	N=1598	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postmenopausal • 100% LN-positive • Completed 5 years of adjuvant tamoxifen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exemestane for additional 5 years vs placebo • Allowed for cross-over 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-year DFS: 91% vs 89%; RR 0.68; P=0.07 • 4-year RFS: 96% vs 94%; RR 0.44; P=0.004 • 4-year incidence of CLBC: 2 vs 8 events; P=0.05 • No significant difference in DDFS or OS
MA.17R [52]	N=1918	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postmenopausal • 53% LN-positive • Completed 5 years of AI and/or tamoxifen 	• Letrozole for additional 5 years vs placebo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-year DFS: 95% vs 91%, HR 0.66 (0.48–0.91); P=0.01 • 5-year OS: 93% vs 94% • Annual rate CLBC: 0.21% vs 0.49%; HR 0.42 (0.22–0.81); P=0.007
NSABP B42 [49–51]	N=3923	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postmenopausal • 57% LN-positive • Completed 5 years of AI and/or tamoxifen 	• Letrozole for additional 5 years vs placebo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10-year DFS: 76% vs 72%; HR=0.84 (0.74–0.96); P=0.01 T≤2 tumors: HR 0.63 (0.49–0.82) T >2 tumors: HR 0.93 (0.80–1.09) (interaction P=0.013) • 10-year OS: 86% vs 85.5% • 10-year BCFI: HR 0.74 (0.61–0.91); P=0.003 • 10-year incidence of DDR: 6% vs 7.5%; HR 0.71 (0.55–0.93); P=0.01
DATA [54]	N=1860	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Postmenopausal • 67% LN-positive 	• Anastrozole for 3 additional years vs 6 additional years	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-year DFS: 83% vs 79% LN+: 84% vs 76%; HR 0.64 (0.46–0.89); P=0.007 T >2 tumors: 82% vs 69%; HR 0.53 (0.53–0.82);

Study	Number	Population	Study Design	Outcomes
		• Completed 2–3 years of tamoxifen		P=0.003 • 5-year OS: 91% vs 90% • 5-year incidence of CLBC: 1.5% vs 3.3%
IDEAL [53]	N=1824	• Postmenopausal • 75% LN-positive • Completed 5 years of ET	• Letrozole for 2.5 additional years vs 5 additional years	• 5-year DFS: 152 vs 163 events • 5-year OS: 104 vs 96 events • 5-year incidence of CLBC: 3.1% vs 1.1%; HR 0.39 (0.19–0.81); P=0.01
Ovarian function suppression				
SOFT [56]	N=3047	• Premenopausal • 85% HER2-negative • 35% LN-positive	• Tamoxifen vs • Tamoxifen-OFS vs • Exemestane-OFS	• 8-year DFS: 79% (T) vs 83% (T-OFS) vs 86% (E-OFS); HR 0.76 (0.62–0.93); P=0.009 <u>HER2-negative, prior chemotherapy</u> : 72% vs 74% vs 83%; HR 0.62 (0.46–0.83) <u><35 years</u> : 64% vs 73% vs 77%; HR 0.52 (0.31–0.87) • 8-year OS: 91.5% (T) vs 93% (T-OFS) vs 92% (E-OFS); HR 0.67 (0.48–0.92); P=0.01
SOFT/TEXT [57]	N=4690	• Premenopausal • 86% HER2-negative • 42% LN-positive	• Exemestane-OFS vs • Tamoxifen-OFS	• 8-year DFS: 87% vs 83%; HR 0.77 (0.67–0.9); P<0.001 • 8-year OS: 93% vs 93% • 8-year DDFS: 92% vs 90%; HR 0.80 (0.66–0.96); P=0.02 <u>HER2-negative, prior chemotherapy</u> : SOFT: 79% vs 87%; HR 0.68 (0.48–0.95) TEXT: 85% vs 89%; HR 0.69 (0.5–0.93)
Adjuvant bisphosphonates				
EBCTCG meta-analysis [58]	N=18766	• 63% postmenopausal • 54% LN-positive • Most patients (97%) received 2–5 years of bisphosphonate	• Bisphosphonate vs control (either open-label or placebo)	• 10-year cumulative risk of recurrence: 26% vs 25% <u>Postmenopausal</u> : RR 0.86 (0.78–0.94); P=0.002 • 10-year cum risk of DDR: 22% vs 20%; RR 0.92 (0.85–0.99), P=0.02 <u>Postmenopausal</u> : RR 0.82 (0.74–0.92); P=0.0003 • 10-year cum risk of bone recurrence: 9% vs. 8%; RR 0.83 (0.73–0.94); P=0.004 <u>Postmenopausal</u> : RR 0.72 (0.60–0.86); P=0.002 • 10-year breast cancer mortality: 18% vs 17%; RR 0.91 (0.83–0.99); P=0.04 <u>Postmenopausal</u> : RR 0.82 (0.73–0.93); P=0.002 • 10-year cum risk of bone fractures: 10% vs 9%, RR 0.85 (0.75–0.97); P=0.02

ABBREVIATIONS:

BCFI, breast-cancer free interval; CLBC, contralateral breast cancer; DDFS, distant disease-free survival; DDR, distant disease recurrence; DFS, disease-free survival; EBCTCG, Early Breast Cancer Trialists Collaborative Group; ER, estrogen-receptor; ET, endocrine therapy; HER2, human epidermal growth-factor receptor 2; HR+, hormone receptor positive; HR, hazard ratio (95% confidence interval); LN, lymph node; RS, Oncotype-Dx 21-gene Recurrence Score; OFS, ovarian function suppression; OS, overall survival; RFS, recurrence free survival; RR, relative risk (95% confidence interval);

CLINICAL TRIALS

NSABP B20 [33] — [NCT01446185](#) — Treatment Decision Impact of OncotypeDX™ in HR+, N- Breast Cancer Patients (SWITCH)

TAILORx [34] — [NCT00310180](#) — Hormone Therapy With or Without Combination Chemotherapy in Treating Women Who Have Undergone Surgery for Node-Negative Breast Cancer (The TAILORx Trial)

MINDACT[40, 41] — [NCT00433589](#) — Genetic Testing or Clinical Assessment in Determining the Need for Chemotherapy in Women With Breast Cancer That Involves No More Than 3 Lymph Nodes (MINDACT)

aTTom [45, 46] — [NCT00003678](#) — Tamoxifen in Treating Women With Breast Cancer

ATLAS [44] — Cancer Research UK, UK Medical Research Council, SRCTN19652633. — Adjuvant Tamoxifen: Longer Against Shorter (ATLAS)

MA.17 [48] — [NCT00897065](#) — Biomarkers in Predicting Response to Tamoxifen and Letrozole in Postmenopausal Women With Primary Breast Cancer Treated on Clinical Trial CAN-NCIC-MA17

NASBP B33 [49] — [NCT00016432](#) — Exemestane in Treating Postmenopausal Women With Resected Stage I, Stage II, or Stage IIIA Breast Cancer Who Have Completed 5 Years of Tamoxifen

MA.17R [52] — [NCT00754845](#) —, Letrozole in Breast Cancer Who Have Received 5 Years of Aromatase Inhibitor Therapy;

NSABP B42 [49–51] — [NCT00382070](#) — Letrozole in Treating Postmenopausal Women Who Have Received Hormone Therapy for Hormone Receptor-Positive Breast Cancer

DATA [54] — [NCT00301457](#) — Different Durations of Adjuvant Anastrozole Therapy After 2 to 3 Years Tamoxifen Therapy in Breast Cancer (DATA)

IDEAL [53] — [NCT01249456](#) — Safety and Efficacy Study of Femara(Letrozole) as an Extended Adjuvant Treatment in Breast Cancer Patients

SOFT [56] — [NCT00066690](#) — Suppression of Ovarian Function With Either Tamoxifen or Exemestane Compared With Tamoxifen Alone in Treating Premenopausal Women With Hormone-Responsive Breast Cancer (SOFT)

SOFT/TEXT [57] — [NCT00066690](#) and [NCT00066703](#) — Suppression of Ovarian Function With Either Tamoxifen or Exemestane Compared With Tamoxifen Alone in Treating Premenopausal Women With Hormone-Responsive Breast Cancer (SOFT) and Triptorelin With Either Exemestane or Tamoxifen in Treating Premenopausal Women With Hormone-Responsive Breast Cancer (TEXT)

EBCTCG, Early Breast Cancer Trialists Collaborative Group

Note: HR, 95%CI and p-values reported only if statistically significant

Table 2.

Landmark Trials in HER2-positive early-stage breast cancer

Study	Number	Population	Study Design	Outcomes
Trastuzumab				
HERA [66]	N=5099	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 57% LN-positive 50% HR+ Completed chemotherapy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation (A) vs trastuzumab for 1-year (B) vs 2-years (C) (Cross-over allowed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10-year DFS: 63% (A) vs 69% (B) vs 69% (C), HR, 0.76 (0.68–0.86); P<0.0001 (A vs B) 10-year OS: 73% vs 79% vs 80%, HR 0.74 (0.64–0.86); P<0.0001 (A vs B) 10-year incidence of cardiac events: 1% vs 5.4% v 8.3%
PHARE [67]	N=3380	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 44.5% LN-positive 58.1% HR+ Completed at least 4 cycles of chemotherapy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trastuzumab for 1-year vs 6-months (Non-inferiority margin 1.15) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-year DFS: 94% vs 91%, HR 1.28 (1.05–1.56); P=0.29 2-year OS: 96% vs 95% 2-year incidence of cardiac events: 5.7% vs 1.9%, P<0.001
HORG [68]	N=481	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 79% LN-positive 67% HR+ Completed ddFEC followed by ddT for 4 cycles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trastuzumab concurrent with docetaxel for 1-year vs 6-months (Non-inferiority margin 1.53) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-year DFS: 96% vs 93%, HR 1.57 (0.86–2.10); P=0.137 No difference in OS No difference in cardiotoxicity
PERSEPHONE [69]	N=4089	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 62% LN-positive 69% HR+ Completed chemotherapy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trastuzumab for 6-months vs 1-year (Non-inferiority margin 3%) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-year DFS: 89% vs 90%, HR 1.07 (0.93–1.24); P=0.011 4-year OS: 95% vs 94%, HR 1.14 (0.95–1.37); P=0.001 4-year incidence of clinical cardiac dysfunction: 8% vs 11%; P=0.00014
Short-HER [71]	N=1254	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 56% LN-positive 68% HR+ Completed anthracycline-taxane chemotherapy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trastuzumab for 1-year vs 9-weeks (Non-inferiority margin 1.29) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5-year DFS: 88% vs 85% 5-year OS: 95% vs 95% 5-year risk of cardiac events: 4% vs 13%, HR 0.32 (0.21–0.5); P<0.0001
SOLD [70]	N=2174	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 60% LN-negative 66% ER-positive Completed docetaxel plus trastuzumab (9 weeks) followed by FEC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No additional trastuzumab vs 1-year (Non-inferiority margin 1.3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5-year DFS: 88% vs 90.5% 5-year OS: 95% vs 96% 5-year cum incidence of cardiac events: 2% vs 4%; P=0.01
Pertuzumab				
NEOSPHERE [73, 74]	N=417	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 70% LN-positive 47% ER-positive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neoadjuvant TH vs THP vs HP vs Pertuzumab plus docetaxel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pCR rate: 46% (THP) vs 29% (TH), P=0.141 3-year DFS : 85% vs 92% 3-year PFS : 86% vs 90%
TRYPHAENA [75, 76]	N=225	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tumors >2-cm LVEF 55% at baseline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FEC+HP, THP (A) vs FEC, THP (B) vs TCHP (C) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incidence of symptomatic LVSD: 0% (A) vs 2.7% (B) vs 0% (C) Incidence of LVEF decline 10% from baseline: 5.6% (A) vs 5.3% (B) vs 3.9% (C)
APHINITY [77]	N=4805	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 63% LN-positive 36% HR+ Receiving adjuvant chemotherapy plus trastuzumab for 1-year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combination with pertuzumab vs placebo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-year IDFS: 94% vs 93%, HR 0.81 (0.66–1.00); P=0.045 LN+: 92% vs 90%; HR 0.77 (0.62–0.96); P=0.02 LN-negative: 97.5% vs 98% 3-year OS: 96% vs 96% Low overall incidence of cardiac events
Trastuzumab emtansine (T-DM1)				
KATHERINE [31]	N=1486	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tumors 1-cm 72% HR+ Residual disease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T-DM1 vs Trastuzumab 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-year IDFS: 88% vs 77%, HR 0.5 (0.39–0.64); P<0.001 3-year DDFS: 90% vs 83%, HR 0.6 (0.45–0.79) 3-year OS: 56 vs 42 deaths
Other anti-HER2 therapy				
NeoALTTO [79]	N=455	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neoadjuvant anti-HER2 in combination with paclitaxel 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neoadjuvant Lapatinib (A) vs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pCR rate: 20% vs 27% vs 44% 3-year EFS: 78% vs 76% vs 84%

Study	Number	Population	Study Design	Outcomes
		followed by adjuvant FEC followed by anti-HER2 to complete 1-year	Trastuzumab (B) vs Lapatinib plus trastuzumab (C)	Pts with pCR: HR 0.38 (0.22–0.63); P=0.0003 • 3-year OS: 93% vs 90% vs 95% Pts with pCR: HR 0.35 (0.15–0.70); P=0.005
ALTTO [80]	N=8381	• 40% LN-negative • 57% HR+ • Completed anthracycline and receiving paclitaxel with anti-HER2 therapy	• Adjuvant Lapatinib plus trastuzumab (L+T) vs Trastuzumab (T)	• 4-year DFS: 88% (L+T) vs 86% (T) • 4-year OS: 95% (L+T) vs 94% (T) • Serious AE: 21% (L+T) vs 14% (T) • Treatment discontinued due to AE: 23% (L+T) vs 8% (T)
ExteNET [81]	N=2840	• 77% LN-positive • 57% HR+ • Completed neoadjuvant or adjuvant chemotherapy plus trastuzumab (T)	• Oral neratinib vs placebo	• 5-year IDFS: 90% vs 88%, HR 0.73 (0.57–0.92); P=0.008 HR+: HR 0.6 (0.43–0.83) HR-negative: HR 0.95 (0.66–1.35) Completion of T 1 year: HR 0.70 (0.54–0.90) Completion of T >1 year: HR 1.00 (0.5–0.94) • Grade 3 diarrhea: 40% vs 2% • Treatment discontinued due to AE: 28% vs 5%

ABBREVIATIONS:

AE, adverse events; AC, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide; ACT, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, taxane; ACTH, doxorubicin, cyclophosphamide, taxane plus trastuzumab; DDFS, distant disease-free survival; ddT, dose-dense docetaxel; ddFEC, dose-dense FEC, dose-dense 5-fluorouracil + epirubicin + cyclophosphamide; DFS, disease-free survival; EFS, event-free survival; FEC, 5-fluorouracil + epirubicin + cyclophosphamide; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2; HP, trastuzumab + pertuzumab; HR+, hormone receptor positive; HR, hazard ratio (95% confidence interval); IDFS, invasive disease-free survival; LN, lymph node; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; LVSD, left ventricular systolic dysfunction; OS, overall survival; pCR, pathologic complete response; PFS, progression-free survival; TCH, taxane, carboplatin, trastuzumab; TCH(P), taxane, carboplatin, trastuzumab (pertuzumab); T-DM1, trastuzumab emtansine; TH, taxane, trastuzumab; THP, taxane, trastuzumab and pertuzumab

CLINICAL TRIALS:

HERA [66] — [NCT00045032](#) — Herceptin (Trastuzumab) in Treating Women With Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor (HER) 2-Positive Primary Breast Cancer

PHARE [67] — [NCT00381901](#) — Trastuzumab for 6 Months or 1 Year in Treating Women With Nonmetastatic Breast Cancer That Can Be Removed By Surgery

HORG [68] — [NCT00615602](#) — Six versus 12 months of adjuvant trastuzumab in combination with dose-dense chemotherapy for women with HER2-positive breast cancer: a multicenter randomized study by the Hellenic Oncology Research Group (HORG)

PERSEPHONE [69] — [NCT00712140](#) — Trastuzumab in Treating Women With HER2-Positive Early Breast Cancer

Short-HER [71] — [NCT00629278](#) — Combination Chemotherapy and Trastuzumab in Treating Women With Stage I, Stage II, or Stage III HER2-Positive Breast Cancer

SOLD [70] — [NCT00593697](#) — The Synergism Or Long Duration (SOLD) Study

NEOSPHERE [73, 74] — [NCT00545688](#) — A Study of Pertuzumab in Combination With Herceptin in Patients With HER2 Positive Breast Cancer.

TRYPHAENA [75, 76] — [NCT00976989](#) — A Study of Pertuzumab in Combination With Herceptin and Chemotherapy in Participants With HER2-Positive Breast Cancer

APHINITY [77] — [NCT01358877](#) — A Study of Pertuzumab in Addition to Chemotherapy and Trastuzumab as Adjuvant Therapy in Participants With Human Epidermal Growth Receptor 2 (HER2)-Positive Primary Breast Cancer (APHINITY)

KATHERINE [31] — [NCT01772472](#) — A Study of Trastuzumab Emtansine Versus Trastuzumab as Adjuvant Therapy in Patients With HER2-Positive Breast Cancer Who Have Residual Tumor in the Breast or Axillary Lymph Nodes Following Preoperative Therapy (KATHERINE)

NeoALTTO [79] — [NCT00553358](#) — Neo ALTTO (Neoadjuvant Lapatinib and/or Trastuzumab Treatment Optimisation) Study

ALTTO [80] — [NCT00490139](#) — ALTTO (Adjuvant Lapatinib And/Or Trastuzumab Treatment Optimisation) Study; BIG 2–06/N063D

ExteNET [81] — [NCT00878709](#) — Study Evaluating The Effects Of Neratinib After Adjuvant Trastuzumab In Women With Early Stage Breast Cancer (ExteNET)

Table 3.**Landmark Trials in Triple Negative early-stage breast cancer**

Study	Number	Population	Study Design	Outcomes
Neoadjuvant carboplatin				
GeparSixto (GBG 66) [91, 92]	N=315	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage II-III • Receiving paclitaxel, non-pegylated doxorubicin, and bevacizumab 	• Carboplatin vs No Carboplatin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pCR rate: 53.5% vs 37%, OR 1.94 (1.24–3.04); P=0.005 • <u>Without gBRCA1/2 mutation</u>: 55% vs 36%, OR 2.14 (1.28–3.58); P=0.004 • 3-year DFS: HR 0.55 (0.32–0.95); P=0.03 • <u>Without gBRCA1/2 mutation</u>: 85% vs 73.5%, HR 0.53 (0.29–0.96); P=0.04
CALGB 40603 [93, 94]	N=454	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage II-III • 58% LN-positive • Receiving Paclitaxel plus study agents, then ddAC 	• Carboplatin and/or bevacizumab	• pCR rate: 60% vs 46%; OR 1.76; P=0.002
BrighTNess [95]	N=634	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage II-III • 42% LN-positive • Receiving paclitaxel plus study agents, then AC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carboplatin plus veliparib (A), Carboplatin plus placebo (B), Veliparib plus placebo (C), Both placebo (D) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pCR rate: 58% (B) vs 31% (D); P<0.0001 • <u>gBRCA1/2 mutation</u>: 50% vs 41% • <u>Without gBRCA1/2 mutation</u>: 59% vs 29%
Adjuvant capecitabine				
CREATE-X [30]	N=910	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage I-IIIB • 61% LN-positive • Residual disease • 32% TNBC 	• Adjuvant capecitabine for 8 cycles vs control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-year DFS: 83% vs 74%; HR 0.7 (0.53–0.92), P=0.01 • <u>TNBC</u>: 70% vs 56%; HR 0.58 (0.39–0.87) • 3-year OS: 94% vs 89%; HR 0.59 (0.39–0.90), P=0.01 • <u>TNBC</u>: 79% vs 70%; HR 0.52 (0.30–0.90)
SYSUCC-001 [98]	N=434	• Completed standard therapy	• Adjuvant capecitabine for 1-year vs observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-year DFS: 83% vs 73%; HR 0.63 (0.42–0.96); P=0.027 • 5-year DDFS: 85% vs 76%; HR 0.56 (0.37–0.90); P=0.016 • 5-year OS: 85% vs. 81%
GEICAM/2003–11_CIBOMA/2004–01 [97]	N=876	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LN-positive or node-negative with tumor >1cm • 44% LN-positive • Completed anthracycline or taxane-based therapy 	• Adjuvant capecitabine for 8 cycles vs observation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5-year DFS: 80% vs 77% • <u>Non-basal phenotype</u>: 83% vs 73%, HR 0.53 (0.31–0.91); P=0.022 • 5-year OS: 87% vs 87.6% • <u>Non-basal phenotype</u>: 89.5% vs 80%, HR 0.42 (0.21–0.81); P=0.0095
Immunotherapy				
KEYNOTE-522 [101]	N=602	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage II-III • 51% LN-positive • Receiving study agent with NACT; adjuvant study agent (up to 9 cycles) • 82% PDL1-positive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neoadjuvant and adjuvant • Pembrolizumab vs placebo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pCR rate: 65% vs 51%; P<0.001 • <u>PDL1-positive</u>: 69% vs 55% • <u>LN-positive</u>: 65% vs 44% • 18-month EFS: 91% vs 85%; HR 0.63 (0.43–0.93)

ABBREVIATIONS: AC, doxorubicin + cyclophosphamide; DFS, disease-free survival; ddAC, dose-dense doxorubicin + cyclophosphamide; DDFS, distant disease-free survival; EFS, event-free survival; gBRCA1/2, germline mutation in BRCA1 or BRCA2 tumor suppressor genes; HR, hazard ratio (95% confidence interval); LN, lymph node; NACT, neoadjuvant chemotherapy; OR, odds ratio (95% confidence interval); OS, overall survival; pCR, pathologic complete response; PDL1, programmed death-ligand 1; TNBC, triple negative breast cancer;

CLINICAL TRIALS:

GeparSixto (GBG 66) [91, 92] — [NCT01426880](#) — Addition of Carboplatin to Neoadjuvant Therapy for Triple-negative and HER2-positive Early Breast Cancer (GeparSixto)

CALGB 40603 [93, 94] — [NCT00861705](#) — Paclitaxel With or Without Carboplatin and/or Bevacizumab Followed by Doxorubicin and Cyclophosphamide in Treating Patients With Breast Cancer That Can Be Removed by Surgery

BrighTNess [95] — [NCT02032277](#) — A Study Evaluating Safety and Efficacy of the Addition of ABT-888 Plus Carboplatin Versus the Addition of Carboplatin to Standard Chemotherapy Versus Standard Chemotherapy in Subjects With Early Stage Triple Negative Breast Cancer

CREATE-X [30] — UMIN Clinical Trials Registry number, UMIN000000843 — Capecitabine for Residual Cancer as Adjuvant Therapy

SYSUCC-001 [98] — [NCT01112826](#) — Efficacy of Capecitabine Metronomic Chemotherapy to Triple-negative Breast Cancer (SYSUCC-001)

GEICAM/2003–11_CIBOMA/2004–01 [97] — [NCT00130533](#) — Maintenance Treatment With Capecitabine Versus Observation in Breast Cancer Patients

KEYNOTE-522 [101] — [NCT03036488](#) — Study of Pembrolizumab (MK-3475) Plus Chemotherapy vs Placebo Plus Chemotherapy as Neoadjuvant Therapy and Pembrolizumab vs Placebo as Adjuvant Therapy in Participants With Triple Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC) (MK-3475–522/KEYNOTE-522)

Note: HRs and associated 95% confidence intervals and p-value only reported if statistically significant