NON-SMALL CELL LUNG CANCER
STAGE IV

Effective Date: November, 2013

The recommendations contained in this guideline are a consensus of the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team synthesis of currently accepted approaches to management, derived from a review of relevant scientific literature. Clinicians applying these guidelines should, in consultation with the patient, use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances to direct care.
BACKGROUND

Lung cancer is the overall leading cause of cancer mortality in Canadian men and women. By the end of 2012, an estimated 25,600 new cases of lung cancer were diagnosed in Canada. In addition, an estimated 20,200 Canadian men and women died from their disease, a total higher than the estimated deaths from prostate, breast, and colorectal cancers combined. In 2012, lung cancer was the leading cause of cancer death for both men and women in Alberta. Indeed, while lung cancer death rates are decreasing among Canadian men, they continue to climb among Canadian women. Despite much research and many clinical advances in lung cancer treatments, in 2010 the age-standardized five-year survival rate for all types and stages of lung cancer combined was only 15 percent for Canada overall, and 12 percent for Alberta. The economic impact of lung cancer care is equally as staggering: the mean cost associated with the care of each patient diagnosed with lung cancer in Alberta was reported to be $15,023 for non-small cell lung cancer, and $18,243 for small cell lung cancer, not including end of life care. Smoking remains the largest single risk factor for lung cancer, responsible for 90 percent of lung cancers in men and 80 percent of lung cancers in women in Canada. Exposure to specific industrial and atmospheric pollutants, including second-hand tobacco smoke, also increases an individual’s risk of lung cancer.

GUIDEINE QUESTIONS

- What is the recommended first-line therapy for patients with stage IV non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)?
- What is the role for EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors in first-line treatment of patients with stage IV NSCLC?
- What is the optimal second-line therapy for patients with stage IV NSCLC?
- What is the role of palliative radiotherapy in the management of patients with stage IV NSCLC?

DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION HISTORY

This guideline was reviewed and endorsed by the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team. Members of the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team include medical oncologists, radiation oncologists, surgical oncologists, nurses, pathologists, and pharmacists. Evidence was selected and reviewed by a working group comprised of members from the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team and a Knowledge Management Specialist from the Guideline Utilization Resource Unit. A detailed description of the methodology followed during the guideline development process can be found in the Guideline Utilization Resource Unit Handbook.

This guideline was originally developed in July, 2008. This guideline was revised in September, 2009, June, 2011, January, 2013, March, 2013 and November, 2013.

SEARCH STRATEGY

For the November, 2013 guideline update, the treatment algorithm on page 16 was updated to reflect newly approved provincial coverage of both ALK testing and crizotinib for second line treatment of ALK-positive patients, to describe how this new treatment fits in with overall care for lung cancer patients, and to reflect the specific indications (second line therapy after a failed platinum doublet regimen).
For the January, 2013 guideline update, the working group conducted a search for new or updated practice guidelines published since February 2011 by accessing the websites of the following organizations: Cancer Care Ontario, the British Columbia Cancer Agency, Cancer Care Nova Scotia, the National Comprehensive Cancer Network, the American Society of Clinical Oncology, the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, and the European Society for Medical Oncology.

Medical journal articles were searched using the EMBASE (2011 to January 2013) and PubMed (February 2011 to January 2013) electronic databases; the references and bibliographies of articles identified through these searches were scanned for additional sources. The PubMed search terms were: treatment [MeSH heading] AND stage IV non-small cell lung cancer. The search was limited to the following publication types: humans, adult 19+ years, English, clinical trial, comparative study, controlled clinical trial, guideline, meta-analysis and practice guideline. This search strategy was modified as necessary and repeated in each of the other electronic databases. The working group excluded articles from the final review if they had a non-English abstract, were not available through the library system, or were published prior to 2011.

The working group reviewed the currency and acceptability of all relevant literature and updated published guidelines for the treatment for stage IV non-small cell lung cancer; we then circulated a draft of the updated guideline to the entire provincial tumour team for final feedback and approval.

TARGET POPULATION

The recommendations in this guideline apply to adult patients over the age of 18 years.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Whenever possible, patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) should be considered for eligibility in ongoing clinical trials.

2. Patients with a solitary metastasis as the basis for stage IV disease with good performance status and otherwise resectable and limited thoracic disease may benefit from more aggressive management, including surgical intervention and/or stereotactic radiotherapy.

3. Combination chemotherapy consisting of a platinum-based doublet is the standard of care for first-line treatment of advanced NSCLC (except for EGFR-positive patients; see recommendation 6 below). The combination of three chemotherapeutic agents for the first-line treatment of advanced NSCLC is not routinely recommended based on current evidence.

4. Therapy should be continued for four cycles in most patients, and not more than six cycles in responding patients.

5. Acceptable alternatives to combination chemotherapy include non-platinum doublets or monotherapy:
   - For patients with a borderline performance status (PS=2), single-agent chemotherapy with vinorelbine, gemcitabine, paclitaxel, docetaxel or pemetrexed (for non-squamous cell carcinoma patients only) is recommended over best supportive care alone.
   - For elderly patients who cannot tolerate a platinum-based combination, single-agent chemotherapy with vinorelbine, gemcitabine, docetaxel, or pemetrexed (for non-squamous cell carcinoma patients only) is associated with improved survival and quality of life when compared to best supportive care alone. However, elderly patients with a good performance status (PS=0-1) should receive combination chemotherapy with a platinum-based doublet.
6. First-line monotherapy with the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) tyrosine kinase inhibitor gefitinib is recommended for patients with EGFR mutation-positive NSCLC.

7. Testing for EGFR mutations should take place for all eligible patients with advanced NSCLC and adenocarcinoma (including adenosquamous) histology who are being considered for first-line therapy with gefitinib, irrespective of their gender, ethnicity, and smoking status.

8. Second-line or subsequent chemotherapy options for advanced NSCLC include single-agent docetaxel or erlotinib for patients with squamous cell carcinoma histology, or single agent treatment with a drug that has not been previously used.

9. Crizotinib has been approved for second-line treatment of patients who are positive for ALK-rearrangements from the pan-Canadian Oncology Drug Review (pCODR) and has also been approved for provincial coverage in Alberta.

10. Testing for ALK mutations should take place for all eligible patients with advanced NSCLC and adenocarcinoma (including adenosquamous) histology who are being considered for second line therapy with crizotinib.

11. Palliative radiotherapy is recommended for relief of specific symptoms and prophylactic prevention of symptom development.

DISCUSSION

Diagnosis and Classification

NSCLC accounts for 80 percent of all lung cancer cases, and is categorized using the TNM staging system, which was recently updated by the International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer (IASLC).4 The staging definitions and stage groups for NSCLC are summarized in a supporting document (NSCLC Staging System).

Approximately 40 percent of patients with newly diagnosed NSCLC will have stage IV disease.5 This group includes patients with locally advanced disease with malignant pleural effusion, as well as patients with distant metastases. Decisions regarding the treatment strategy should take into account the patient’s age, performance status (PS), comorbidities, prior therapy, and the presence or absence of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) mutations.6 Patients with a solitary metastasis as the basis for stage IV disease with good performance status and otherwise resectable and limited thoracic disease may benefit from more aggressive management, including surgical intervention and/or stereotactic radiotherapy (recommendation #2).

Chemotherapy

The type and number of chemotherapy drugs used for the treatment of patients with stage IV disease has been evaluated extensively in randomized controlled trials and meta-analyses.

Combination chemotherapy. Two-drug combination chemotherapy with a platinum-based regimen is the standard of care for patients with advanced NSCLC and a PS of 0-1 (recommendation #3). In a large Cochrane meta-analysis involving 13,601 patients with advanced NSCLC, Delbaldo and colleagues compared randomized trials using a doublet regimen with those that used a single-agent regimen and reported that the combination of two chemotherapeutic agents was superior in terms of observed tumour response (OR=0.42; 95% CI 0.37-0.47, p<0.001) and one-year survival (OR=0.80; 95% CI 0.70-0.91, p<0.001).7 Although the authors also reported an increased tumour response rate for trials using triplet regimens compared to single-agent regimens (OR=0.66; 95% CI 0.58-0.75, p<0.001), there was no corresponding improvement in one-year survival associated with triplet therapy, and the triplet regimens
were associated with significantly higher rates of toxicity.\textsuperscript{7} In a recent phase II-III study published after the Cochrane meta-analysis, 324 patients with advanced NSCLC were randomized to receive either carboplatin plus paclitaxel or carboplatin plus paclitaxel plus gemcitabine.\textsuperscript{8} While the investigators reported significant increases in time to progression and median overall survival in favour of the triplet regimen, they also documented significantly higher rates of grade 3-4 toxicity.\textsuperscript{8} Improved response rates in patients treated with a cisplatin-containing triplet regimen were also documented in a recent multicentre phase III trial.\textsuperscript{9} In this study, patients were randomized to receive either gemcitabine plus vinorelbine with or without cisplatin, or gemcitabine plus paclitaxel with or without cisplatin. Progression-free and overall survival rates were similar in all patients, and triplet therapy was associated with significantly more toxic effects.\textsuperscript{9} Based on the high rates of toxicity and conflicting survival outcomes reported in published studies to date, members of the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team do not currently recommend the combination of three chemotherapeutic agents for the first-line treatment of advanced NSCLC (recommendation #3).

Non-platinum-based chemotherapy. A phase III RCT by Flotten \textit{et al} in 2012 examined the efficacy of non-platinum CT combinations for first-line treatment of advanced NSCLC in 444 patients.\textsuperscript{10} In a comparison of vinorelbine and gemcitabine versus vinorelbine and carboplatin the group found no significant difference in OS rates (6.3 months versus 7.0 months, respectively). In addition, the latter, platinum-containing, group had more grade 3-4 AEs and grade 4 neutropenia.

Platinum-based chemotherapy. Several systematic reviews and meta-analyses have concluded that platinum-based combination regimens result in significantly higher response rates than non-platinum regimens;\textsuperscript{11-13} to date, however, there is debate regarding whether any single combination is superior. Comparisons of carboplatin- versus cisplatin-based chemotherapy for advanced NSCLC have reported that cisplatin-based regimens are associated with higher overall response rates and, in certain subgroups such as non-squamous NSCLC, a slightly higher survival rate when combined with a third-generation agent compared to carboplatin-based regimens.\textsuperscript{14-17} However, carboplatin has the advantage of being easier to administer in an outpatient setting, and may also be associated with a more favourable toxicity profile compared to cisplatin.\textsuperscript{18,19}

Cisplatin or carboplatin have been shown to be effective in patients with a good PS (0-1) when combined with any of the following third-generation cytotoxic drugs: gemcitabine, vinorelbine, docetaxel, paclitaxel, and irinotecan. Early phase clinical trials also report limited efficacy with platinum-based combinations that include the following drugs: ipilimumab\textsuperscript{20}, custirsen\textsuperscript{21}, tetrandrine.\textsuperscript{22} In the ECOG 1594 trial, treatment with cisplatin/gemcitabine was associated with longer progression-free survival when compared to cisplatin/docetaxel, cisplatin/docetaxel, or carboplatin/docetaxel.\textsuperscript{23} There were no differences in response rates or median survival among the four regimens, however. This combination was even more effective when combined with rh-endostatin.\textsuperscript{24} Similar results were reported in a Japanese trial comparing cisplatin/irinotecan, carboplatin/ paclitaxel, cisplatin/gemcitabine, and cisplatin/vinorelbine regimens: the four regimens were all associated with similar response and overall survival rates, but all had different toxicity profiles.\textsuperscript{25} Teramoto \textit{et al} examined the efficacy of a docetaxel and nedaplatin combination and found this regimen to be well tolerated and active against NSCLC. Larger phase III clinical trials are warranted.\textsuperscript{26} Stathapoulos \textit{et al} compared the effectiveness of lipoplatin, a liposomal variant of cisplatin, and paclitaxel against regular cisplatin and paclitaxel. The lipoplatin combination was associated with significantly higher partial response rates although overall survival rates were not affected.\textsuperscript{27}

In a 2008 phase III trial, Scagliotti and colleagues randomized chemotherapy-naïve patients with stage IIIB or IV NSCLC to receive either cisplatin/gemcitabine or cisplatin/pemetrexed.\textsuperscript{28} Patients with squamous cell histology had significantly better median survival when treated with cisplatin/gemcitabine versus
cisplatin/pemetrexed therapy (10.8 vs. 9.4 months). However, in patients with adenocarcinoma and large-cell carcinoma histologies, treatment with cisplatin/pemetrexed was associated with significantly better overall survival compared to treatment with cisplatin/gemcitabine (12.6 vs. 10.9 months, adenocarcinoma; 10.4 vs. 6.7 months, large-cell carcinoma). Grade 3 or 4 nausea was more common in patients treated with cisplatin/pemetrexed, but all other rates of grade 3 or 4 toxicities were significantly lower. Based on these results, several published guidelines now recommend the use of cisplatin/pemetrexed as first-line therapy in patients with non-squamous histology.6,29,30 Other published guidelines, however, state that while the Scagliotti et al. trial results are sufficient to recommend that pemetrexed not be used in the first-line treatment of patients with squamous histology, the data are not sufficient to recommend that pemetrexed be used preferentially over other agents such as gemcitabine as part of doublet therapy for first-line treatment of patients with adenocarcinoma histology.31 Pending confirmatory trials, pemetrexed is only approved for second-line use in Alberta at the present time.

Several studies have been recently published in which experimental drugs combined with standard CT show no difference in outcomes when compared to the current standard. These drugs include bevacizumab32, custirsen21, talactoferrin33, vadimezen34 and tetrandrine.22 For many of these studies the authors concluded that additional advanced phase clinical trials are warranted. Until further studies are conducted, however, the current evidence regarding the use of these drugs for advanced NSCLC is limited and, therefore, these drugs are not recommended for use by most clinical practice guidelines.

Socinski et al conducted a phase III RCT with 1,052 patients comparing the efficacy of albumin-bound paclitaxel and carboplatin versus solvent-based paclitaxel and carboplatin. The ORR was significantly greater in the albumin-bound cohort (33% versus 25%; p=0.005, respectively). No significant difference in PFS or OS was observed.35

Clinical trials published in 2011 and 2012 found several novel drugs that were ineffective in platinum-based combinations for the treatment of advanced NSCLC. A phase II trial with 43 subjects found the combination of gemcitabine and oxaliplatin to show modest activity in advanced NSCLC which they believed warranted further investigation.36 However, a phase III RCT by Weissman et al investigating the same combination was terminated prematurely due to unacceptable toxicities and no observable differences in outcomes when compared to paclitaxel and carboplatin.37 Other failed combinations include the addition of sorafenib to gemcitabine and cisplatin in a 2012 phase III RCT of 772 patients38 and the addition of motesanib to carboplatin and paclitaxel in another 2012 phase III RCT of 1090 patients.39 Hida et al published the results of a phase I clinical trial in 2011 assessing the tolerability of vadimezan in combination with paclitaxel and carboplatin.34 In their 15 subject study they found this combination to be tolerable and urged for further clinical trials. In the same year, however, Lara et al published the results of their 1299 subject phase III RCT assessing the clinical activity of vadimezan in combination with the same two chemotherapeutic drugs.40 The trial was prematurely stopped due to futility. Although the vadimezan-paclitaxel-carboplatin combination was tolerable it was deemed clinically ineffective in the treatment of NSCLC.

It is the consensus of the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team that cisplatin combined with either vinorelbine or gemcitabine is the recommended first-line treatment for patients with advanced NSCLC and PS 0 or 1. Therapy should be continued for four cycles in most patients, and not more than six cycles in responding patients.6,18,29,31 The use of carboplatin is an acceptable alternative for patients with a contraindication to cisplatin (recommendation #4). In cases where platinum combinations may be contraindicated, non-platinum combinations are suitable alternatives (recommendation #5).
**Single agent chemotherapy.** With the exception of therapy with EGFR tyrosine-kinase inhibitors in select patients, single agent chemotherapy as first-line treatment is generally limited to elderly patients unable to tolerate combination chemotherapy, as well as patients with a borderline PS (PS=2). In a recent meta-analysis, Baggstrom et al. analyzed five trials comparing monotherapy with the third-generation cytotoxic drugs vinorelbine, gemcitabine, paclitaxel, or docetaxel versus best supportive care (BSC).\(^4\) One-year survival rates favoured the third-generation drugs over BSC, with a 7 percent absolute difference of risk between the two groups, and a one-year survival ranging from 24 to 32 percent. In addition, the authors analyzed four trials comparing monotherapy with a third-generation drug versus platinum-based doublet therapy with a second-generation drug. Monotherapy with the third-generation drugs was associated with a slightly lower response rate, but one-year survival rates were comparable for all trials.\(^4\)

For patients with a borderline PS, single-agent chemotherapy with vinorelbine, gemcitabine, paclitaxel, or docetaxel is recommended over BSC alone; there is no strong evidence to suggest the superiority of one specific third-generation single agent over another (recommendation #5). Docetaxel is currently only approved for second-line therapy in Alberta.

**First line chemotherapy for elderly patients (≥65 years)** Elderly patients (≥65 years) with a PS of 0-1 and no significant comorbidities seem to benefit from combination chemotherapy with a platinum-based doublet.\(^5,42-46\) A phase III RCT by Biesma et al in 2011 found that the addition of paclitaxel or gemcitabine to carboplatin did not significantly affect outcome in elderly patients.\(^4\) Some evidence suggests that bevacizumab-based CT may benefit elderly patients in the same way this combination benefits younger patients.\(^48\) A phase II RCT by Spigel et al assessed TTP in elderly patients treated with two different triplet CT regimens (pemetrexed/gemcitabine/bevacizumab versus pemetrexed/carboplatin/bevacizumab). They found that the latter regimen was associated with improved TTP and OS.\(^46\) Combinations of erlotinib with gemcitabine or gemcitabine and docetaxel have resulted in mixed results.\(^49,50\) For elderly patients who cannot tolerate a platinum-based combination, the single agents vinorelbine, gemcitabine\(^51\), and docetaxel are all viable options that are associated with improved survival and quality of life when compared to BSC alone (recommendation #5).\(^5\)

**EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors.** In 2004, several publications identified that a significant number of patients with NSCLC who achieved an objective response after treatment with the tyrosine kinase inhibitors gefitinib or erlotinib harbored activating somatic mutations in the EGFR gene.\(^52-55\) In addition, in a key 2009 publication, Rosell and colleagues screened 2105 patients with NSCLC and identified 350 (16.6%) with EGFR mutations; mutations were more frequent in women, never-smokers, and patients with adenocarcinoma histology.\(^56\) To date, the results of seven large randomized phase III trials have been conducted comparing either gefitinib or erlotinib to platinum-based chemotherapy as a first-line treatment for patients with advanced NSCLC (Table 1).\(^57-63\) In two of the gefitinib trials, patients were selected on the basis of the clinical characteristics identified in the Rosell et al. study; in the other two gefitinib trials, only patients with confirmed positive EGFR mutational status were included. In all four gefitinib trials, the administration of first-line gefitinib was associated with longer progression-free survival in EGFR-positive patients. In addition, gefitinib therapy was also associated with higher objective response rates, better quality of life, and a more tolerable side-effect profile. Similar results were described in a preliminary report from the OPTIMAL study, in which patients with EGFR mutations were randomized to first-line therapy with either erlotinib or carboplatin-gemcitabine.\(^57\) Preliminary results from the prospective phase III EURTAC trial involving Caucasian patients with a positive EGFR mutational were also recently reported by Rosell and colleagues. Patients treated with erlotinib showed significantly better response and progression-free survival rates when compared to patients treated with platinum-based chemotherapy.\(^58\) The most recent phase III trial by Zhou et al in 2011 compared erlotinib therapy to a gemcitabine and
The authors found a significant increase in median PFS for the erlotinib group compared to the control CT group (13.6 months versus 4.1 months; HR=0.16; p<0.0001). OS rates were not reported.

Studies published in 2011-2012 examining erlotinib have found it to be highly effective in the treatment of EGFR-mutation positive advanced NSCLC. Recent studies examining erlotinib alone, after failure of first-line platinum-based CT and as a combined regimen with the following: sorafenib, gemcitabine, bevacizumab, and apricobrulin, have all shown significant increases in PFS, OS or DCR. A phase II randomized trial by Witta et al in 2012 evaluated erlotinib with and without entinostat, an isoform selective HDACi, and found that it conferred no benefit over erlotinib monotherapy. Miller et al studied the effect of afatinib in patients who had previously failed EGFR-TKIs. This phase II/III double-blind RCT of 585 patients found that although OS rates were not affected, the median PFS of the afatinib group was significantly higher than the placebo group (3.3 months versus 1.1 months; p<0.0001) although it was associated with more AEs. The authors concluded that afatinib could be of use to some patients who fail previous EGFR TKI therapy.

Based on the data published to date, members of the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team recommend the use of gefitinib as a first-line therapy for patients with confirmed EGFR-positive mutational status (recommendation #6). Gefitinib is currently approved by Health Canada for the first-line treatment of EGFR-mutation positive patients with locally advanced or metastatic NSCLC not amenable to curative therapy. Gefitinib therapy is currently approved for first-line treatment of advanced NSCLC in Alberta. Erlotinib therapy is currently approved only for second-line treatment of advanced NSCLC in Alberta.
Table 1. Summary of Phase III Clinical Trials Assessing First-Line Monotherapy with Gefitinib or Erlotinib in Patients with Advanced NSCLC and Positive EGFR Mutational Status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, Year</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Disease Stage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Median PFS (months)</th>
<th>Median OS (months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gefitinib Therapy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsudomi, 2010&lt;sup&gt;61&lt;/sup&gt; (West Japan Oncology Group)</td>
<td>CT-naïve, &lt;75 years, PS 0-1, Japanese, EGFR-positive</td>
<td>IIIB, IV, or post-op recurrence</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>gefitinib 250mg/day q21 days x 3-6 cycles</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>cisplatin 80mg/m² + docetaxel 60mg/m² q21 days x 3-6 cycles</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>HR=0.489; 95% CI 0.336-0.71, p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maemondo, 2010&lt;sup&gt;62&lt;/sup&gt; (North East Japan Study Group)</td>
<td>CT-naïve, &lt;75 years, PS 0-1, EGFR-positive</td>
<td>IIIB, IV, or post-op recurrence</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>gefitinib 250mg/day q21 days</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>carboplatin AUC6 + paclitaxel 200mg/m² q21 days</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>HR=0.30; 95% CI 0.22-0.41, p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mok, 2009&lt;sup&gt;23&lt;/sup&gt; (IPASS)</td>
<td>CT-naïve, adenocarcinoma, non- or former light smoker</td>
<td>IIIB, IV</td>
<td>132*</td>
<td>gefitinib 250mg/day q21 days x 6 cycles</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129*</td>
<td>carboplatin AUC5-6 + paclitaxel 200mg/m² q21 days x 6 cycles</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>HR=0.45; 95% CI 0.36-0.64, p&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, 2009&lt;sup&gt;37&lt;/sup&gt; (First SIGNAL)</td>
<td>CT-naïve, adenocarcinoma, PS 0-2, never-smoker</td>
<td>IIIB, IV</td>
<td>26*</td>
<td>gefitinib 250mg/day q21 days</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>cisplatin 80mg/m² day1, q21 days x 9 cycles + gemcitabine 1250mg/m² days1,8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>HR=0.613; 95% CI 0.308-1.221, p=0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erlotinib Therapy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosell, 2011&lt;sup&gt;38&lt;/sup&gt; (EURTAC)</td>
<td>CT-naïve, PS 0-2, Caucasian, EGFR-positive</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>erlotinib</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>platinum-based chemotherapy</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>HR=0.42; p&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou, 2011&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>CT-naïve, EGFR-positive</td>
<td>IIIB, IV</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>erlotinib (150mg/d)</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhou, 2010&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt; (OPTIMAL)</td>
<td>CT-naïve, PS 0-2, EGFR-positive</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>erlotinib 150mg/day until unacceptable toxicity or PD</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>not reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>carboplatin AUC5 + gemcitabine 1000 mg/m² days1,8 q21 days x 4 cycles</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>HR=0.16; 95% CI 0.10-0.26, p&lt;0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations.** PFS=progression-free survival, OS=overall survival, CT=chemotherapy, PS=performance status, HR=hazard ratio, CI=95% confidence interval, AUC=area under the curve, PD=progressive disease.

* Subset of patients in trial with positive EGFR mutational status; patients not pre-selected for mutational status.

EGFR testing. In addition to the trials outlined in Table 1, multiple retrospective analyses published since 2004 have confirmed that a mutation in the EGFR tyrosine kinase domain is the best predictor of response and progression-free survival to an EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor such as gefitinib or erlotinib for first-line...
treatment of advanced NSCLC. Higher mutation rates have been reported in studies involving Japanese patients, with values ranging from 30 to almost 40 percent.\textsuperscript{53,72-76} In Caucasian populations, the rate of EGFR mutations has been reported to range between 7 and 17 percent.\textsuperscript{53,56,77,78}

As reported by Rosell \textit{et al.},\textsuperscript{56} EGFR mutations are more common in females and never-smokers with adenocarcinoma tumour histology, however a significant proportion of patients with these clinical characteristics do not harbour an EGFR mutation, and would therefore not benefit from therapy with an EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor. In a recently published analysis of 2142 lung adenocarcinoma specimens, D’Angelo and colleagues reported that EGFR mutations in former or current smokers represented 40 percent of all those detected (201/503; 95% CI 36-44%), and that EGFR mutations in men represented 31 percent of all those detected (157/503; 95 CI 27-35%).\textsuperscript{79} The overall survival of men and ever-smokers with EGFR mutations was similar to that seen in women and never-smokers, which led the investigators to conclude that it is the presence of an EGFR mutation and \textbf{not} the clinical characteristic that impacts the outcomes of EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitor treatment. In addition, the investigators reported that 31 percent of all EGFR mutations would be missed if testing were restricted to women only, 40 percent would be missed if testing were restricted to never-smokers only, and 57 percent would be missed if testing were restricted to women who were never-smokers only.\textsuperscript{79} On the basis of this body of literature, and in agreement with recommendations recently made by the American Society of Clinical Oncology,\textsuperscript{80} members of the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team agree that testing for EGFR mutations should take place for all eligible patients with advanced NSCLC and adenocarcinoma (including adenosquamous) histology who are being considered for first-line therapy with gefitinib or erlotinib, irrespective of their gender, ethnicity, and smoking status (recommendation #7).

**Maintenance chemotherapy.** Recent phase III clinical trials have reported a survival benefit associated with maintenance therapy in select patients with stage IIIB or IV NSCLC who have responded to initial chemotherapy and/or who have not progressed after four cycles of platinum-based chemotherapy. In one randomized double-blind study, Ciuleanu and colleagues compared 441 patients treated with maintenance pemetrexed plus BSC to 222 patients who received BSC alone; all patients had stage IIIB or IV disease and had not progressed after four cycles of platinum-based chemotherapy.\textsuperscript{81} Pemetrexed was associated with improved progression-free survival (4.3 vs. 2.6 months; HR=0.50; 95% CI 0.42–0.61, \textit{p}<0.0001) and overall survival (13.4 vs. 10.6 months; HR=0.79; 95% CI 0.65–0.95, \textit{p}=0.012) compared with placebo. The improvements in progression-free and overall survival were recorded mainly in patients with non-squamous histology; more specifically, in a \textit{post hoc} intention-to-treat analysis, median progression-free survival for the 328 patients with adenocarcinoma histology was significantly better for those treated with pemetrexed versus placebo (4.7 vs. 2.6 months; HR=0.45, 95% CI 0.35-0.59; \textit{p}<0.0001). Similarly, in the SATURN trial, patients were randomized to receive maintenance therapy with either erlotinib (n=438) or placebo (n=451) if they did not have progressive disease following four cycles of platinum-based chemotherapy.\textsuperscript{82} The median progression-free survival was significantly longer for patients treated with erlotinib versus placebo (12.3 vs. 11.1 months; HR=0.71; 95% CI 0.62–0.82, \textit{p}<0.0001). For patients with EGFR-positive immunohistochemistry, those who were treated with erlotinib had a significantly longer progression-free survival compared to those treated with placebo. Fidias \textit{et al.} reported the results of a phase III randomized trial involving patients with stage IIIB or IV disease who were treated with first-line gemcitabine and carboplatin.\textsuperscript{83} After four cycles, patients who had not progressed were randomly assigned to immediately receive six cycles of docetaxel or to follow the standard of care, which was defined as no additional therapy until disease progression, at which point they received docetaxel. Treatment with immediate docetaxel was associated with a significantly longer progression-free survival than treatment with delayed docetaxel (5.7 vs. 2.7 months, \textit{p}=0.0001); there was also a non-significant trend toward improved survival with immediate docetaxel compared with delayed docetaxel (12.3 vs. 9.7 months, \textit{p}=0.0032).
p=0.0853). Notably, while 95 percent of patients in the immediate treatment arm received at least one cycle of docetaxel, only 63 percent of patients in the delayed arm actually went on to receive docetaxel at progression. Median survival for the patients in the delayed arm who actually received docetaxel was equivalent to the 12.5 month survival of the patients in the immediate arm, suggesting that the patients in the immediate docetaxel arm trended toward improved overall survival because more patients were able to receive an active drug. A 2012 phase III RCT by Perol et al compared gemcitabine or erlotinib maintenance versus observation in 464 patients. All patients had previously received first-line cisplatin and gemcitabine. Upon completion of first-line treatment patients were randomly assigned to observation, gemcitabine on days 1 and 8 of a 3 week cycle at a dosage of 1250mg/m2 or daily erlotinib at a dosage of 150mg/day. The authors found that although there were no differences in OS between the three groups the PFS rates were significantly greater for gemcitabine versus observation (3.8 months vs 1.9 months) and erlotinib versus observation (2.9 months vs 1.9 months). They concluded that gemcitabine continuation maintenance or erlotinib switch maintenance significant reduced disease progression and were well tolerated.

**Second-line chemotherapy.** The Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team recommends therapy with single-agent docetaxel or erlotinib for patients with squamous cell carcinoma histology, or single-agent pemetrexed for patients with adenocarcinoma tumour histology in the second-line treatment of advanced NSCLC (recommendation #8). All three agents have been reported to produce similar rates of response and overall survival, therefore the choice of which agent to use will depend on the patient’s tumour histology, comorbidities, toxicity from previous treatments, risk for neutropenia, smoking history, and patient convenience and preference.85

When compared to either BSC, vinorelbine, or ifosfamide, two phase III randomized trials, TAX317 and TAX320, have established docetaxel at a dose of 75 mg/m² every three weeks as a standard therapy in the second-line setting.86,87 In the TAX317 trial, treatment with 75 mg/m² docetaxel was associated with longer time to disease progression, longer median survival, and a better one-year survival rate when compared to BSC.86 In a follow-up analysis from the TAX317 trial, Dancey and colleagues reported that patients treated with docetaxel had improved pain control and less deterioration in quality of life compared to those receiving BSC, in whom pain control worsened.88 In the TAX320 trial, overall survival was not significantly different in patients treated with 75 mg/m² docetaxel, 100 mg/m² docetaxel, vinorelbine, or ifosfamide. However, the one-year survival rate was significantly higher for patients treated with 75 mg/m² docetaxel.87 In an effort to minimize toxicity, weekly administration of docetaxel has been compared to the standard three-week schedule in recent phase II and III clinical trials.89-94 In a meta-analysis of individual patient data from five trials, Di Maio et al. reported no difference in the median survival times for patients receiving docetaxel every three weeks versus weekly (27.4 vs. 26.1 weeks; HR=1.09; 95% CI 0.94-1.26, p=0.2449).95 In addition, one-year survival rates were 24.8 and 27.0 percent for patients treated every three weeks versus weekly, respectively. Weekly therapy was associated with a significantly lower rate of both severe and febrile neutropenia, but rates of anemia, thrombocytopenia, and non-hematologic toxicity were similar for both treatment schedules. Weekly docetaxel is an acceptable alternative to the standard schedule, particularly for patients at risk for neutropenia, however, weekly administration may be more inconvenient for the patient, and also requires more frequent use of steroids.

In the first phase III randomized trial of second-line pemetrexed in patients with advanced NSCLC, Hanna and colleagues reported similar median overall survivals (8.3 vs. 7.9 months) and one-year survival rates (29.7%) for patients treated with pemetrexed versus docetaxel.96 Pemetrexed was associated with significantly fewer side effects when compared with docetaxel, particularly grade 3-4 neutropenia, febrile neutropenia, neutropenia with infection, and alopecia.96 Patients treated with pemetrexed in this trial
required supplementation with vitamin B₁₂ (1000 μg every 9 weeks) and folic acid (350–1,000 μg daily). In a subsequent analysis, patients with non-squamous histology (n=302 adenocarcinoma, n=47 large-cell carcinoma, n=50 other histology) had a longer median overall survival when treated with pemetrexed compared to docetaxel (9.3 vs. 8.0 months; HR=0.78; 95% CI 0.61-1.00, p=0.047). In contrast, patients with squamous histology had a shorter median overall survival when treated with pemetrexed compared to docetaxel (6.2 vs. 7.4 months; HR=1.56, 95% CI 1.08 –2.26, p=0.018).³⁷ In a separate retrospective analysis of this trial, Weiss and colleagues reported that the elderly patients treated with pemetrexed had a slightly longer time to progression and median overall survival than elderly patients treated with docetaxel, although the difference was not statistically significant.³⁸ Febrile neutropenia was less frequent in elderly patients treated with pemetrexed compared with docetaxel (2.5 vs. 19%, p=0.025), Because of its good toxicity profile, patients with non-squamous histology, including those who are elderly or have a borderline PS, may benefit from second-line therapy with pemetrexed. A phase I trial published in 2011 examined the feasibility and safety of pemetrexed in combination with everolimus as a second-line treatment for advanced NSCLC.³⁹ They found this regimen to be feasible and acceptably toxic with most frequent grade 3-4 AEs being neutropenia, dyspnea and thrombocytopenia. They recommended an everolimus starting dose of 5 mg/day or 50 mg/week in future clinical trials.

The National Cancer Institute of Canada BR.21 trial compared treatment with erlotinib to BSC in 731 patients who had received one or two prior chemotherapy regimens and who were not eligible for further chemotherapy.¹⁰⁰ Compared to BSC, patients treated with 150 mg daily erlotinib had significantly higher progression-free survival (2.2 vs. 1.8 months; HR=0.61, 95% CI 0.5-0.74; p<0.001) and higher overall survival (6.7 vs. 4.7 months; HR=0.70; 95% CI 0.58-0.85, p<0.001).¹⁰¹ Erlotinib therapy was well-tolerated by the patients; the most common toxic effects were rash and diarrhea. Patients who were never-smokers (p<0.001), female (p=0.006), Asian (p=0.02), had adenocarcinoma histology (p<0.001), and were positive for EGFR expression (p=0.1) were most likely to respond to erlotinib therapy.¹⁰⁰,¹⁰¹ Preliminary findings from the multicentre, open-label phase III TITAN trial were also recently published.¹⁰² In this trial, patients with progressive disease following four cycles of platinum-based doublet therapy were randomized to receive either 150 mg daily of erlotinib (n=203) or a standard regimen of either docetaxel (n=116) or pemetrexed (n=105). There were no significant differences in progression-free survival for patients treated with erlotinib versus docetaxel or pemetrexed (16.3 vs. 8.6 weeks; HR=1.19; 95% CI 0.97-1.46, p=0.09), and overall survival was also similar in both groups of patients (5.3 vs. 5.5 months; HR= 0.96; 95% CI 0.78-1.19, p=0.73). Erlotinib treatment was associated with a higher incidence of treatment-related adverse events compared to standard treatment (58.2% vs. 40.8%), but most of these adverse events were grade 1-2 rash and diarrhea. There was a lower rate of serious adverse events in patients treated with erlotinib versus standard chemotherapy (1% vs. 6.6%), as well as adverse events leading to death (1.5% vs. 5.2%).¹⁰² Recent studies have looked how gemcitabine followed by erlotinib at progression differs from the reverse treatment as a second-line therapy. Although both strategies were feasible the authors found that they had only modest efficacy, with median OS rates of 4.4 months for the former strategy and 3.9 months for the latter (p=NSD).¹⁰³

Other smaller phase I or II studies have examined the roles of talactoferrin (TLF), pralatrexate and mitomycin as second-line treatments. Parikh et al conducted a double-blind RCT with 100 patients to investigate the activity of oral TLF and BSC compared to placebo and BSC.¹⁰⁴ In the experimental group, median OS increased by 65% (3.7 months to 6.1 months). Similar trends appeared to exist for PFS and DCR. Toxicity was generally tolerable. In 2011 Azzoli et al evaluated the safety of pralatrexate and vitamin supplementation in a phase I clinical trial with 39 patients.¹⁰⁵ This combination resulted in a 10% ORR with common grade 3-4 AEs including mucositis and fatigue. Finally, another 2011 study by Stenger et al examined the efficacy of mitomycin in combination with either vinorelbine or cisplatin (depending on
whether cisplatin was used as a first-line treatment) with 14 patients. Mitomycin was prescribed at a dose of 8 mg/m². The authors found that 1 patient had a PR and 6 had SD. The median TTP was 2.3 months and the median OS was 4.6 months. Four patients experienced grade 3-4 leukocytopenia and 4 experienced grade 3-4 neutropenia. The authors concluded that further investigations of mitomycin combinations are warranted.

**Trial data.** Bevacizumab is a monoclonal antibody that binds vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF). Two phase III trials assessing the use of bevacizumab for the treatment of advanced NSCLC have been published to date. In the ECOG 4599 trial, 878 previously untreated patients with non-squamous histology were randomized to treatment with carboplatin-paclitaxel or carboplatin-paclitaxel-bevacizumab. Bevacizumab therapy was associated with significant benefits in overall survival (12.3 vs. 10.3 months; HR for death=0.79; 95% CI 0.67-0.92, p=0.003), progression-free survival (6.2 vs. 4.5 months; HR for disease progression=0.66; 95% CI 0.57-0.77, p<0.001), and response rate (35% vs. 15%, p<0.001). However, treatment-related deaths were more common with bevacizumab therapy (15 vs. 2 deaths, p=0.001); in addition, the rates of hypertension, proteinuria, bleeding, neutropenia, febrile neutropenia, thrombocytopenia, hyponatremia, rash, and headache were all significantly higher in the patients who received bevacizumab (p<0.05). Similar results were reported by Reck and colleagues in the AVAiL trial, in which 1043 previously untreated patients with advanced non-squamous NSCLC were randomized to treatment with cisplatin-gemcitabine plus either low-dose bevacizumab, high-dose bevacizumab, or placebo. Progression-free survival was significantly better in both the low- and high-dose bevacizumab treatment groups compared to placebo, with median progression-free survivals of 6.7, 6.5, and 6.1 months for the low-dose, high-dose, and placebo groups, respectively. When compared to placebo treatment, hazard ratios were 0.75 (p=0.003) in the low-dose group and 0.82 (p=0.03) in the high-dose group. The benefits for progression-free survival were maintained at 13 months, but the addition of bevacizumab did not have a significant effect on overall survival.

Cetuximab is a monoclonal antibody that binds to the EGFR. In the phase III randomized FLEX trial, 1125 previously untreated patients with advanced NSCLC and positive EGFR expression were randomized to receive therapy with either cisplatin-vinorelbine or cisplatin-vinorelbine-cetuximab. The addition of cetuximab was associated with a significant improvement in overall survival (11.3 vs. 10.1 months; HR=0.87; 95% CI 0.762-0.996, p=0.044), but not progression-free survival. Cetuximab therapy was associated with significant increases in toxicity, including rash, febrile neutropenia, diarrhea, and infusion-related reactions. In the phase III BMS-099 trial, Lynch and colleagues randomized chemotherapy-naïve patients with advanced disease to treatment with carboplatin plus a taxane (paclitaxel or docetaxel) or carboplatin-taxane-cetuximab. There were no restrictions by histology or EGFR status in this trial. The addition of cetuximab was not associated with significant improvements in either progression-free survival or overall survival. Ongoing trials examining bevacizumab or cetuximab should help to further define the role of these drugs for the treatment of NSCLC. At the present time, neither cetuximab nor bevacizumab are approved for the treatment of advanced NSCLC in Alberta.

**Treatments for ALK-Positive Rearrangements**

Crizotinib is an anaplastic lymphoma kinase (ALK) inhibitor under study in patients with advanced NSCLC expressing the EML4-ALK fusion gene; this gene is present in approximately two to seven percent of such tumours, and is mutually exclusive with K-Ras and EGFR mutations. ALK translocations have been noted in never-smokers, patients with adenocarcinoma and younger patients. Patients with ALK translocations appear to be less sensitive to EGFR inhibitors and standard CT than those without.
In a recent phase I study, Kwak and colleagues reported a response rate of 57 percent and a stable disease rate of 33 percent in 82 patients with advanced NSCLC who were treated with second-, third-, or fourth-line crizotinib.\textsuperscript{115} Lee \textit{et al.} conducted a retrospective analysis of 1,166 patients to investigate outcome rates of patients with advanced NSCLC who were managed in the pre-ALK inhibitor era.\textsuperscript{116} OS rates were compared across three groups: patients who were ALK-positive, patients who were EGFR-positive and patients who were ALK and EGFR wild types. The median OS rates in these groups were 12.2 months, 29.6 months and 19.3 months, respectively. Median PFS rates were similar in all groups although PFS rates for patients who received EGFR TKIs was shorter in ALK-positive patients compared to other groups. In the pre ALK-inhibitor era, therefore, ALK-positive patients experienced shorter survival on par with wild type patients. In addition, ALK-positive patients were more resistant to EGFR TKI treatment than wild type patients.

Recently, a phase II clinical trial by Kim \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{113} and a phase III clinical trial by Shaw \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{117} investigated the efficacy and safety of crizotinib; building off the results from an earlier phase I, single-arm clinical trial by Camidge \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{118} In the study by Kim \textit{et al.}, published as an abstract at the ASCO 2012 conference, patients with ALK-positive NSCLC were given 250mg BID crizotinib in three-week cycles. An ORR of 53% and 12-week DCR of 85% was observed with a median PFS of 8.5 months. Significant improvements in post-treatment pain, cough, and global QoL were reported. In the phase III clinical trial conducted by Shaw \textit{et al.}, also published as an abstract, this time at the ESMO 2012 conference, crizotinib was compared to standard CT for advanced NSCLC. Like before, 250mg BID crizotinib was administered to 173 patients with another 174 patients receiving either 500mg/m\textsuperscript{2} pemetrexed (57%) or 75mg/m\textsuperscript{2} docetaxel (41%). Crizotinib prolonged PFS to median of 7.7 months from 3 months for those treated with standard CT (HR 0.49, CI 0.37-0.64, p<0.0001). The ORR was significantly higher in those treated with crizotinib (65% versus 20%; p<0.0001). The OS data were still not mature. As there was significant crossover from the standard CT group to the crizotinib group it is possible that OS results may not significantly differ. That said, however, the authors believe crizotinib should be the new standard of care for individuals with ALK-positive advanced NSCLC. As a result of these, and other promising results\textsuperscript{119}, the US FDA have approved crizotinib for patients with ALK-positive advanced or metastatic NSCLC.

The results of these early trials are promising, and, along with other clinical trials currently underway, may strengthen support for the role of prospective genotyping in the selection of therapy for patients with advanced NSCLC. Indeed, guidelines from the National Comprehensive Cancer Network and the European Society for Medical Oncology now recommend ALK gene rearrangement testing to better treat those patients with advanced NSCLC who are ALK-positive.

**Axitinib**

Axitinib is a TKI that inhibits multiple targets including VEGFR-1, VEGFR-2, VEGFR-3, PDGFR and cKIT. Two early phase studies, published in 2009 and 2012, have examined the efficacy and safety of axitinib in the treatment of advanced NSCLC.\textsuperscript{120,121} Schiller \textit{et al.} studied the efficacy and safety of single-agent axitinib in a phase II clinical trial with 32 patients. They observed PR and DCR rates of 9% and 41%, respectively. The median PFS was 4.9 months and median OS was 14.8 months. One-year OS percentages were 57% for those patients who received prior therapy for metastatic disease and 78% for those who had not received prior therapy.\textsuperscript{120} In a 2012 phase I clinical trial, Kozloff \textit{et al.} evaluated the efficacy of axitinib in combination with a paclitaxel-carboplatin combination or gemcitabine-cisplatin combination. Once a maximum tolerated dose was determined an expanded cohort was enrolled to receive an axitinib-paclitaxel-carboplatin regimen. Two patients (of the 49) experienced dose limiting toxicities. The authors concluded that both regimes tested were well tolerated.\textsuperscript{121} Further studies on axitinib are required to determine its role in treating advanced NSCLC.
Palliative Radiotherapy

Palliative radiotherapy plays a significant role in the management of patients with advanced NSCLC who are symptomatic either because they have not responded to chemotherapy, have relapsed, or have contraindications to chemotherapy agents. Palliative radiotherapy should be provided to patients for relief and prevention of symptoms related to advanced NSCLC, including cough, dyspnea, hemoptysis, post-obstructive pneumonia, and pain (recommendation #11).

There is some debate as to which radiotherapy regimen is the most beneficial and least toxic for patients with locally advanced or metastatic NSCLC who are not suitable for curative-intent radical radiotherapy. In a recent Cochrane review, Lester et al. reviewed 14 randomized controlled trials and reported that no single regimen was superior in terms of palliation of symptoms. Although none of the studies reviewed reported a significant increase in survival, higher dose palliative radiotherapy was associated with more frequent reports of toxicity and visits to the hospital. The authors concluded that in patients with a poor PS (3-4), short courses of palliative radiotherapy, such as 10 Gy in one fraction or 16-17 Gy in two fractions, were better tolerated. The most frequently reported and serious adverse effect was radiation myelitis, therefore they stressed that care should be taken to either avoid irradiating or reduce the dose to the spinal cord if the 17 Gy/2 fractions dose was used. In patients with a good PS (0-1), the authors also concluded that higher dose palliative regimens, such as 36 Gy in 12 fractions, could be considered.

There is insufficient published evidence to determine the optimal dose or timing of radiotherapy for patients with advanced NSCLC when the goal of therapy is symptom palliation. Reasonable treatment options may include: 20 Gy in 5 fractions, 30 Gy in 10 fractions, 18 Gy in 3 fractions, or 36-39 Gy in 12-13 fractions. In one multi-centre trial, decreased survival and quality of life were associated with single-fraction 10 Gy radiotherapy compared to 20 Gy in 5 fractions, therefore this regimen is not recommended. However, the Alberta Provincial Thoracic Tumour Team members agree that single fractions of radiotherapy less than 10 Gy may be appropriate in some clinical circumstances, such as poor PS (3-4) or patient travel distance. In a recent systematic review of 13 randomized clinical trials involving 3473 patients, Fairchild et al. described a statistically significantly improved total symptom score (77.1% vs. 65.4%, p=.003) and one-year survival (26.5% vs. 21.7%, p=.002) for high-dose versus low-dose palliative thoracic radiotherapy. The authors recommend that consideration of a schedule of 35 Gy in 10 fractions is warranted in certain clinical scenarios, provided that the patient is informed of the trade-off between advantages (survival improvement, decreased likelihood of re-irradiation) and disadvantages (higher likelihood of esophagitis, longer time investment). For a detailed review and treatment recommendations regarding palliative radiotherapy, please refer to the Palliative Radiotherapy Clinical Practice Guideline.
TREATMENT ALGORITHM

Initial Evaluation and Work-Up
- CT chest/upper abdomen/bone scan or PET
- CT head

Assess for suitability of surgical resection

Advanced Disease (Stage IV) or Stage IIIb Non-Resectable

Squamous Cell Carcinoma

Tumour Histology Testing

Performance Status?

Poor PS (3,4)

Chemotherapy not recommended; provide best supportive care

Platinum-based doublet (4-6 cycles) OR single-agent vinorelbine, gemcitabine, docetaxel, paclitaxel

Disease Progression

Docetaxel OR Erlotinib

Disease Progression

Stable Disease?

Yes

Maintenance therapy with pemetrexed

No

Single-agent treatment with drug that has not been previously used

Disease Progression

Platinum-based doublet (4-6 cycles) OR single-agent vinorelbine, gemcitabine, docetaxel, paclitaxel, pemetrexed

Stable Disease?

Yes

Maintenance therapy with pemetrexed

No

Single-agent treatment with drug that has not been previously used

Disease Progression

Adenocarcinoma, Large Cell Carcinoma, or NOS

Upfront EGFR and ALK Testing

EGFR-positive

Gefitinib

Disease Progression

Platinum-based doublet (4-6 cycles) OR single-agent vinorelbine, gemcitabine, docetaxel, paclitaxel, pemetrexed

Disease Progression

Stable Disease?

Yes

Maintenance therapy with pemetrexed

No

Disease Progression

Platinum-based doublet (4-6 cycles) OR single-agent vinorelbine, gemcitabine, docetaxel, paclitaxel, pemetrexed

Disease Progression

Crizotinib

For patients with ECOG performance status ≤ 2

Disease Progression

EGFR/ALK-negative

Single-agent treatment with drug that has not been previously used

Disease Progression

ALK-positive

Platinum-based doublet (4-6 cycles) OR single-agent vinorelbine, gemcitabine, docetaxel, paclitaxel, pemetrexed

Disease Progression

Stable Disease?

Yes

Maintenance therapy with pemetrexed

No

Disease Progression

Palliative treatments can be administered at any time for symptom control

Consider clinical trials where appropriate
GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALK</td>
<td>Anaplastic Lymphoma Kinase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCO</td>
<td>American Society of Clinical Oncology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAIL</td>
<td>Avastin in Lung Cancer Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>Best Supportive Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Confidence Interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Computed Tomography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCR</td>
<td>Disease Control Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOG</td>
<td>Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EML4</td>
<td>Echinoderm Microtubule-Associated Protein-Like 4 Gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gy</td>
<td>Gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDACi</td>
<td>Histone Deacetylase Inhibitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Hazard Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASLC</td>
<td>International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL</td>
<td>Iressa Dose Evaluation in Advanced Lung Cancer Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEL</td>
<td>Iressa Survival Evaluation in Lung Cancer Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSCLC</td>
<td>Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Overall Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDGFR</td>
<td>Platelet-Derived Growth Factor Receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET</td>
<td>Positron Emission Tomography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFS</td>
<td>Progression Free Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFT</td>
<td>Pulmonary Function Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS</td>
<td>Performance Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATURN</td>
<td>Sequential Tarceva in Unresectable NSCLC Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TITAN</td>
<td>Tarceva in Treatment of Advanced NSCLC Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNM</td>
<td>Tumour-Node-Metastasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTP</td>
<td>Time To Progression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGF</td>
<td>Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEGFR</td>
<td>Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ</td>
<td>Ventilation/Perfusion Scan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISSEMINATION

- Present the guideline at the local and provincial tumour team meetings and weekly rounds.
- Post the guideline on the Alberta Health Services website.
- Send an electronic notification of the new guideline to all members of Alberta Health Services, CancerControl.

MAINTENANCE

A formal review of the guideline will be conducted at the Annual Provincial Meeting in 2015. If critical new evidence is brought forward before that time, however, the guideline working group members will revise and update the document accordingly.
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