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Evidence-Based Series 2-8 Version 2: Section 1

Management of Squamous Cell Cancer of the Anal Canal: Guideline Recommendations

K Spithoff, B Cummings, D Jonker, J Biagi, and the Gastrointestinal Cancer Disease Site Group

A Quality Initiative of the Program in Evidence-Based Care (PEBC), Cancer Care Ontario (CCO)

Report Date: March 31, 2009

These guideline recommendations have been ENDORSED, which means that the recommendations are still current and relevant for decision making. Please see Section 4: Document Review Summary and Tool for a summary of updated evidence published between 2008 and 2013, and for details on how this Clinical Practice Guideline was ENDORSED.

INTENDED USERS
This guideline is intended for use by clinicians and health care providers involved in the management or referral of adult patients with squamous cell cancer of the anal canal.

QUESTIONS
1. Does the addition of chemotherapy (CT) to radiotherapy (RT) improve outcome for patients with squamous cell cancer of the anal canal?
2. What are the optimal CT drugs for the treatment of patients with squamous cell cancer of the anal canal?
3. Does the use of induction CT before concurrent CT and RT improve outcome for patients with squamous cell cancer of the anal canal?
4. What is the best management for patients with squamous cell cancer of the anal canal who are human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) positive?

Outcomes of interest are colostomy rate, local failure, survival, disease-free survival, acute and late adverse effects, and quality of life.
TARGET POPULATION
These recommendations apply to adult patients (age ≥18 years) with a primary diagnosis of biopsy-proven squamous cell cancer of the anal canal, including basaloid, cloacogenic, and transitional cell tumours. These recommendations do not apply to patients who have previously undergone resection of their tumour. The management of patients who later develop extra-pelvic metastases is not considered in this guideline.

RECOMMENDATIONS
- For all stages of localized squamous cell cancer of the anal canal, concurrent CT and RT is recommended over RT alone to improve local control and decrease colostomy rates.
- The optimal CT drug combination for squamous cell cancer of the anal canal is 5-fluorouracil (5FU) plus mitomycin C (MMC), given concurrently with radiation treatment.
- At this time, induction CT before concurrent CT and RT should be considered an investigational approach.
- It is the expert opinion of the Gastrointestinal Cancer Disease Site Group (GI DSG) that HIV-positive patients with squamous cell cancer of the anal canal should be managed in the same way as patients without known HIV. Treating physicians should be aware that a greater than average risk of toxicity is possible.

QUALIFYING STATEMENTS
- No randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were identified that addressed the management of squamous cell cancer of the anal canal in HIV-positive patients. See the Discussion in Section 2 for a description of non-randomized data available on this topic.
- Only two RCTs included patients with T1 lesions of the anal canal, and results were not reported by disease stage. See the Discussion in Section 2 for further discussion on management of patients with T1N0 disease.
- Two RCTs included patients with squamous cell cancer of the perianal skin. A limited discussion of perianal cancer is included in the Discussion in Section 2.
- James et al. 2013 (ACT II), studied maintenance chemotherapy versus none following chemoradiation and found that maintenance chemotherapy does not improve overall survival or colostomy-free survival. Therefore, maintenance chemotherapy following chemoradiation is not recommended in the management of squamous cell carcinoma of the anal canal. See Section 4 for more details.
- In the trials using MMC in the 5FU-MMC combination regimens, MMC schedules include dose of 12 or 15mg/m2 day 1 only, and a 10mg/m2 Day 1, 29 dosing. There is no comparative data to allow a recommendation of a preferred schedule.

KEY EVIDENCE
- The United Kingdom Coordinating Committee for Cancer Research (UKCCCR) trial (1) and the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) trial (2) demonstrated lower rates of colostomy and local failure in patients who received concurrent RT and CT (5FU plus MMC) compared with patients who received RT alone (Section 2, Table 3). Neither trial demonstrated a significant difference in overall survival between treatment arms.
- The Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG) 87-04 trial (3) demonstrated that the omission of MMC from the standard combination of 5FU plus MMC resulted in a higher colostomy rate (22% versus [vs.] 9%; p=0.002) and local failure rate (34% vs. 16%; p=0.0008) and lower disease-free survival (51% vs. 73%; p=0.0003) at four years, although...
overall survival rates were not significantly different. Acute hematologic toxicity rates were significantly lower in the RT plus 5FU alone arm (3% vs. 18%; p<0.001).

- The RTOG 98-11 trial (4) compared the standard RT plus 5FU and MMC approach with concurrent RT plus 5FU and cisplatin, following two courses of induction CT with 5FU and cisplatin. The 5FU and cisplatin combination was associated with a higher colostomy rate at five years (19% vs. 10%; hazard ratio [HR] 1.68; log-rank p=0.02) compared with the standard 5FU and MMC combination. Local failure, overall survival, and disease-free survival were not significantly different between treatment arms. Severe hematologic toxicity rates were lower in the cisplatin arm compared with the MMC arm (42% vs. 61%; p=0.001), but overall acute adverse effects and severe late adverse effects were similar between arms.

- Updated data on RTOG 98-11 shows OS/PFS advantage for 5FU/MMC (Gunderson et al., 2012). See Section 4 for more details.

CLINICAL CONSIDERATIONS
The following issues are beyond the scope of this guideline but warrant consideration in the management of squamous cell cancer of the anal canal. See the Discussion in Section 2 for further discussion of these issues.

- Optimal doses and schedules of RT and CT have not been studied systematically. Readers should refer to Section 2 (Table 1) for details regarding treatment used in the available randomized trials.

- Once patients have completed definitive treatment, regularly scheduled clinical follow-up over a five-year period by an experienced specialist is essential since incomplete response or local recurrence may be amenable to salvage surgery.

Funding
The PEBC is a provincial initiative of Cancer Care Ontario supported by the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care through Cancer Care Ontario. All work produced by the PEBC is editorially independent from its funding source.

Copyright
This report is copyrighted by Cancer Care Ontario; the report and the illustrations herein may not be reproduced without the express written permission of Cancer Care Ontario. Cancer Care Ontario reserves the right at any time, and at its sole discretion, to change or revoke this authorization.

Disclaimer
Care has been taken in the preparation of the information contained in this report. Nonetheless, any person seeking to apply or consult the report is expected to use independent medical judgment in the context of individual clinical circumstances or seek out the supervision of a qualified clinician. Cancer Care Ontario makes no representation or guarantees of any kind whatsoever regarding the report content or use or application and disclaims any responsibility for its application or use in any way.

Contact Information
For further information about this report, please contact:

Dr. Rebecca Wong, Co-Chair, Gastrointestinal Cancer Disease Site Group
Princess Margaret Hospital, University Health Network, Radiation Medicine Program
610 University Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 2M9
Phone: 416-946-2126; Fax: 416-946-6561,
Dr. Jim Biagi, Co-Chair, Gastrointestinal Cancer Disease Site Group  
Cancer Centre of Southeastern Ontario, Kingston General Hospital  
25 King St W, Kingston, ON, K7L-5P9  
Phone: 613-544-2630 ext. 4502; Fax: 613-546-8209

For information about the PEBC and the most current version of all reports, please visit the CCO website at http://www.cancercare.on.ca/ or contact the PEBC office at:  
Phone: 905-527-4322 ext. 42822  Fax: 905-526-6775  E-mail: ccopgi@mcmaster.ca
REFERENCES