



#### The Importance of Prevention and Early Detection

D. Gareth Evans Professor in Medical Genetics & Cancer Epidemiology University of Manchester Theme lead Cancer PED NIHR Manchester BRC Research Director 'Prevent Breast Cancer Unit'



prevent

breast

cancer







# *"Prevention is better than healing because it saves the labour of being sick"*



#### Thomas Adams 17th Century physician



# "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure"



**Bernardino** 

Ramazzini

1633-1714

O. N. Z. S. St. St. and the state of the s

(1) A surface, wantiversi a 22 minute prima restanting antisologicary restantion or performanentries and and a figure and wanting of dataset (figment bett source), whiteway pertone on the state of the source of the

Where good in a gas surgers, or long the resource day allow a flat termina, and now , it planterprass some jointy . It is containing on

(a) Low = p Z(W, (b) Litch, up Z(V, b), indexes (1) on Withing.

and the second

'This marvelous sympathy of the breasts and uterus, those two sources of desire'

Described the high frequency of breast cancer in nuns



"...it is much better to prevent than to cure, and so much easier to foresee future harm and avoid it rather than have to get rid of it after having fallen prey" (XIII Oratio, 1711)

# Prevention Early detection paradigms

- Cervical Cancer
- Screening, HPV vaccination
- Breast cancer
- Screening, Chemoprevention

## Introduction (CC slides courtesy Emma Crosbie)

- Cervical cancer is the second leading cause of cancer-related death among women worldwide
- Cervical cancer is caused by persistent high risk human papillomavirus infection





# Global burden of cervical cancer



**CRUK Cancer Stats** 

- There were 275,000 deaths from cervical cancer worldwide in 2008
- 8% of all female cancer deaths
- 88% of these occurred in developing countries
- Death rates vary 15-fold across the world:
  - 2 per 100,000 in North
    America/ Western Europe
  - 25 per 100,000 in Eastern
    Africa (in 2008)

# Cervical screening is effective at reducing deaths from cervical cancer

#### Figure 2.2: Age standardised (European) mortality rates, cervical cancer, UK, 1971-2008



- Age-standardised incidence has dropped by 44% in 30 years
- Cancer mortality rates are 70% lower

**CRUK Cancer Stats** 

# Age-specific incidence of cervical cancer in screened (UK) and unscreened (Brazil) women



### The success of cervical screening

- It has been estimated that:
  - 1/65 UK women born since 1950
    would have contracted cervical cancer in their lifetime
  - This would equate to approx 6000 deaths per year
  - As a result of screening 80% of these have been prevented
  - This equates to 5000 lives per year being saved



# **Primary screening with HPV**

- Compared to cervical cytology, HPV testing is:
  - 25% more sensitive
  - 6% less specific at detecting borderline smears (or worse)
- Detects more than 90% CIN 2+
- Excellent negative predictive value over two rounds of screening
- Automated to aid throughput & reduce costs
- Primary screening has been tested in 6 'sentinel sites' across the UK and is now being rolled out to whole population



# Primary prevention with HPV Vaccination

- Introduced in 2008
- Excellent coverage and efficacy
- More than ten million doses of HPV vaccine have been given to young women in this country
- Over 80% of women aged 15-24 have received the vaccine
- Will potentially prevent 99% of cervical cancer due to HPV



# Breast cancer cumulative risk UK population and Asia



## Breast cancer age specific risk



### Breast cancer is increasing worldwide

#### nternational Agency for Research on Cancer







http://globocan.iarc.fr







- Screening
- Treatment

\*Mean of annual rates in the seven component 5-year age groups

Source: WHO mortality & UN population estimates

#### FH02 prospective compared to previous studies

| ge at Diagnosis                                | POSH FHpos                   | FH01 40-49      | retrospective FH02 | Prospective FH02 35- |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|
|  | Unscreened 35-40             | Prospective (%) | 33 33 (70)         | (%)                  |
| 1  | 293                          | 136             | 47                 | 50                   |
| ears of diagnosis                              | 2000-2008                    | 2003-2010       | 1990-2008          | 2007-2016            |
| ears follow up                                 | 1-12 years                   | 0-7 years       | 1-12 years         | 0-9 years            |
| listology                                      |                              |                 | ,                  | ,                    |
| nvasive (%)                                    | 293 (100%)                   | 96 (74)         | 35 (74)            | 35 (70)              |
| Grade 1 (% of invasive)                        | 18 (6)                       | 17 (19)         | 3 (8.6)            | 6 (17)               |
| Grade 3 (% of invasive)                        | 177 (60.5)                   | 40 (45)         | 17 (48.6)          | 21 (60)              |
| n-situ (%)                                     | 0 not included in<br>POSH    | 34 (26)         | 12 (26)            | 15 (30)              |
| Jnknown  |                              | 6               | -                  | 0                    |
| value compared to prospective FH02             | N/a as POSH only<br>invasive |                 |                    |                      |
|  |                              |                 |                    |                      |
| ize (in situ excluded)                         |                              |                 |                    |                      |
|  | N=293                        | N=87            | N=35               | N=35                 |
| 2cm  | 138 (47)                     | 61/87 (70)      | 25 (74)            | 28 (80)              |
| -4.9cm   | 122 (41.5)                   |                 | 8 (23)             | 6 (18)               |
| 5cm  | 23 (8)                       |                 | 1 (3)              | 1 (3)                |
| Jnknown  | 10                           | 9               | 1                  | 0                    |
| value for ≤2cm compared to<br>prospective POSH |                              |                 |                    | P<0.0001             |
|  |                              |                 |                    |                      |

#### FH02 prospective compared to previous studies

| Age at Diagnosis                       | POSH FHpos<br>Unscreened<br>35-40 (%) | FH01 40-49<br>Prospective<br>(%) | retrospective<br>FH02 35-39+<br>(%) | Prospective<br>FH02 35-40<br>(%) |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Node Involvement<br>(in situ excluded) | N=293                                 | N=82                             | N=35                                | N=35                             |
| 0                                      | 133 (45)                              | 56 (68)                          | 25 (77)                             | 28 (80)                          |
| 1-4                                    | 110 (38)                              |                                  | 7 (23)                              | 5 (15)                           |
| >4                                     | 48 (16)                               |                                  | -                                   | 2 (6)                            |
| Not sampled/[not known]                | 3 (1)                                 | [14]                             | 3                                   | 0                                |
| P value for LN0 compared to<br>POSH    |                                       |                                  |                                     | P=0.0002                         |
| Stage 1 of invasive                    | 83 (28%)                              | -                                | 21 (60)                             | 24 (68.5%)                       |
| P value POSH ref                       |                                       |                                  |                                     | P<0.0001                         |
| Status                                 | N=289                                 |                                  | N=47                                | N=49*                            |
| Alive (no metastasis)                  | 204 (70)                              | NK                               | 43 (91)                             | 49 (98)                          |
| Alive (with metastasis)                | 23 (8)                                |                                  | 0 (0)                               | 0                                |
| Died (of disease)                      | 63 (21.5)                             |                                  | 4 (9)                               | 1 (2)                            |
| Died (other)                           | 10 (3.5)                              |                                  | 0                                   | 0                                |
| P value compared to POSH               |                                       |                                  |                                     | P=0.0009                         |
| Annual Incidence Rate/ 1000            |                                       |                                  | 4.77                                | 3.7                              |



Years of follow-up



Home > NICE Guidance > Conditions and diseases > Cancer > Breast cancer

# Familial breast cancer: classification, care and managing breast cancer and related risks in people with a family history of breast cancer

Clinical guideline [CG164] Published date: June 2013

Last updated: March 2017

Register as a stakeholder

- Update on chemoprevention stimulated by 2 yearly review process (2015)
- Literature search by NICE didn't identify additional data
- Topic experts identified
  - IBIS-1 long term tamoxifen vs placebo
  - IBIS-2 anastrozole vs placebo



#### Tamoxifen and contralateral breast cancer.

#### Recruitment periods and trial numbers

Cuzick J, Baum M.



Sign in

Familial breast cancer: Classification and care of people at risk of familial breast cancer and management of breast cancer and related risks in people with a family history of breast cancer

NICE guidelines [CG164] Published date: June 2013

| RISK                              | premenopausal   | postmenopausal       |               |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|---------------|
|                                   |                 | Uterus               | No uterus     |
| High<br>(>8% 10 yr)<br>30%+       | Offer TAM*      | Offer TAM* or RAL    | Offer TAM*    |
| Moderate<br>(3%+, 5-8%)<br>17-29% | Consider TAM*   | Consider TAM* or RAL | Consider TAM* |
| Low                               | Do not consider | Do not cons          | ider          |

\* unless they have a past history or may be at increased risk of thromboembolic disease or endometrial cancer.

#### The update question for NICE

What is the effectiveness of chemoprevention for the reduction of the incidence of breast cancer in women with a family history of breast, ovarian or related (prostate/pancreatic) cancer? (More than 70% with FH)

IBIS II

MAP3



MAP3 study of exemestane (steroidal AI) vs placebo

Did not define the proportion of women at risk due to FH –not considered

Cuzick J...Howell A Lancet. 2014 Mar 22;383(9922):1041-8 Goss P et al N Eng J Med 2011 Jun 23;364(25):2381-9

Sign in

Familial breast cancer: Classification and care of people at risk of familial breast cancer and management of breast cancer and related risks in people with a family history of breast cancer

NICE guidelines [CG164] Published date: June 2013

Updated 2017

| RISK                              | premenopausal   | postmenopausal                         |                                    |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|------------------------------------|
|                                   |                 | Uterus                                 | No uterus                          |
| High<br>(>8% 10 yr)<br>30%+       | Offer TAM*      | Offer Anastrozole or Tam*<br>or RAL    | Offer Anastrozole<br>or TAM*       |
| Moderate<br>(3%+, 5-8%)<br>17-29% | Consider TAM*   | Consider Anastrozole or<br>TAM* or RAL | Consider<br>Anastrozole or<br>TAM* |
| Low                               | Do not consider | Do not cons                            | ider                               |

\* unless they have a past history or may be at increased risk of thromboembolic disease or endometrial cancer.

Anastrozole found by NICE HE analysis to be COST SAVING to NHS

University Hospital NHS of South Manchester NHS Foundation Trust

## **Making Choices**

For women at <u>high risk</u> deciding on whether to take <u>tamoxifen</u> for prevention of breast cancer



University Hospital NHS of South Manchester

# **Making Choices**

For women at **moderate risk** deciding whether to take **raloxifene** for prevention of breast cancer











#### Tyrer-Cuzick v8

| Untitled - IBIS Risk Evaluator   |   |
|--|---|
| File Edit View Tools Help  |   |
| D 😅 🖬 🤶 Rill Del Risk Sort Find  |   |
| Personal factors    Measurements      Woman's    40    Menarche:    ?    Height    ?    Measurements      Muliparous:    C    No prior biopsy / no proliferative disease    Premenopausat    C    Age at    Premenopausat    C      Parous:    C    No prior biopsy, result unknown    Premenopausat    C    Age at    Premenopausat    C      Age    ?    Atypical hyperplasia (not atypia)    No information:    C    No information:    ?      Ovarian cancer:    [    Maternal    C    X Valpara® Volumetric Density*    Athkenazi    Show stat      Mother:    Ovarian:    [    Sisters:    Ovarian:    [    Genetic Testing      Blaterat    [    Biaterat    [    Biaterat    [    Maternal    Parian:    [      Paternal    Ovarian:    [    [    Maternal    Ovarian:    [    [    Hail Sisters | Patient<br>st<br>no:<br>1<br>Competing motality<br>Rink Options<br>HRT use<br>Length of<br>use (peers):<br>5 or more<br>user<br>Cancel<br>OK<br>Polygenic SNP risk<br>Hazard rato<br>If incoun, please enter a<br>polygenic SNP score (risk<br>relative to general population).<br>Cancel<br>OK |
| Paternal  Ovarian:  Imaternal  Ovarian:  Imaternal    Gran:  Ovarian:  Imaternal  Ovarian:  Imaternal    Breast cancer:  Imaternal  Ovarian:  Imaternal    Age:  ?  Age:  ?  |   |
| Paternal aunts:  Maternal aunts:  Daughters:    Number:  Ovarian:  I    Number:  Ovarian:  I   | View Family History   |
| Age: 7 7 Age: 7 7 Age: 7 7   | IBIS Risk Evaluator v8.0  |

#### Risk in the screening population



% of women

#### Breast cancer risk in general population



# **Risk Reducing mastectomy**

Manchester experience (update 2018)

- 621 operations
- Age range 21-60 yrs
- 92 carried out on contralateral breast
- 34 simple bilateral mastectomy/modified
- 242 operations on known *BRCA1/2* mutation carriers
- Manchester: 6474 yrs fu: 75.3 cancers expected 4 occurred OR 0.053
- 16/621 (2.5%) occult tumours identified
- One 3mm cancer nipple sparing surgery (BRCA2)10 years post RRM
- One Chest wall 23 mm LN) 6.5 yrs post BRRM BRCA1
- One IDC TNT 15mm in BRCA1 carrier 5 years post RRM
- One IDC 45mm TNT in BRCA1 carrier 7 years post RRM



### Summary

- Huge role for Screening and Prevention in cancer
- Cervical cancer revolutionised
- Huge potential benefits in Breast Cancer
- Many other areas of potential benefit Lung, Colorectal, Endometrial etc etc



The University of Manchester

#### **Programme to predict** risk in the NHSBSP and in the Family History Clinic population (PROCAS)

Paula Stavrinos, Sarah Sampson, Jill Fox, Lynne Fox, Donna Watterson, Helen Ruane, Jake Southworth, Ellie Tinning, Bill Newman, Helen Byers, Elaine Harkness, Iain Buchan, Wendy Watson, Fiona Harrison, Katherine Payne, Michelle Harvie, Mary Wilson, Sue Astley, Alan Hufton, Tony Howell, Gareth Evans. Adam Brentall, Jack Cuzick

#### Mammographic Density and Screening group programme

Mary Wilson, Ursula Beetles, Sue Astley, Alan Hufton, Ruth Warren, Jamie Sergeant, Yit Lim, Anil Jain, Nicky Barr, Sally Bundred, Emma Hurley, Megan Bydder, Soujanya Gadde, Anthony Maxwell, Val Reece, Claire Mercer, Alix He

National Institute for Health Research

#### Acknowledgments

#### Radiographers and Radiographer Assistants

Claire Mercer, Melanie Barker, Amanda Bath, Tina Dunn, Susan Linsky, Jacqui Gallagher, Miriam Griffiths, Elizabeth Harrison, Rachel Hasanaj, Judith Healey, Cathy Hill, Margaret Hornby, Shamayla Iram, Janice Jeffries, Clare Keevil, Allison Kelly, Ann Kelly, Theresa Law, Liz Lord, Jane Nickeas, Simcy Ninan, Julie O'Rourke,

#### Preventive therapy and biomarker programme

Louise Gorman, Rosemary Greenhalgh, Julia Wiseman, Nicola Fisher, Emma Buckley.

#### Asian Breast Cancer Support Group

Anil Jain, Saima Rashid.

#### Ruth Otto, Val Reece. Cathy Rylance, Elaine Randle, Susan Saraji, Geraldine Shires, Frances Showman, Teresa Skwara, Pam Coates, Sandhya Solanki, Laura Starr, Susan Steer, Jeanette Walker, Diana Woodcock, Lyndsay Holt, Katherine Killip, Kimberley Owen, Annette Thomas, Michelle Thomason, Jemila Williams, Julie Penny.

#### **Breast Research Nurses** and team

Sue Grassby, Tracey Platt, Anam Asif, Susan Mbale, Faiza Idries, Deidre Leonard.



**prevent** breast cancer

#### Risk reducing surgery service

Susan Wisely, Stuart Wilson, Lester Barr, Ged Lambe, Richard Johnson, Ashu Ghandi.

#### **Family History Clinic** service

Rosemary Greenhalgh, Julia Wiseman, Jayne Beesley, Helen Morgan, Liz Lee, Lorraine Roberts, Tara Clancy, Fiona Lalloo, Tina Henderson, Gareth Evans, Tony Howell.

#### **Cervical cancer**

Emma Crosbie Cancer PED

Emma Thorpe





**NHS Foundation Trust** 

