Mammographic Breast Density as a Predictive Factor of Local Recurrence in Female Patients with Invasive Breast Cancer

Emad Sadaka¹, Walid Almorsy², Amr Albadry³ and Alsiagy Ali Salama³ ¹Clinical Oncology Department, Faculty of Medicine, KaferElsheikh University, Egypt ²Clinical Oncology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Tanta University, Egypt ³Radiology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Tanta University, Egypt <u>e sadaka@hotmail.com</u>

<u>c_sadaka(@notman.com</u>

Abstract: Purpose: Mammographic breast density (MBD) is one of the strongest breast cancer risk factors. Dense breast tissue was demonstrated increase the risk of local recurrence after modified radical mastectomy. The aim of this study was to evaluate MBD as a predictive factor for local recurrence in female patients with invasive breast cancer. **Methods**: Eighty sevenfemale patients with local recurrence after mastectomy forinvasive breast cancer were included in this study. Patient's data were recorded concerning mammographic density, age, menopausal status and tumor features (histological type, grade, size, nodal status, LVI, hormonal receptors status, Ki67 and Her-2/neu). **Results**: Among all patients, 23 (26.44%) patients had low dense breasts (<25%) while 64 (73.66%) patients had high dense breasts ($\geq 25\%$). Analysis of risk factors associated with local recurrence according to the mean time (in months) showed a significant association between early local relapse (LR) andhigh MBD (p<0.001), age <50 (p=0.006), LVI (p=0.044), positive axillary nodes (p=0.014) and high Ki67 expression (p=0.007). In multivariate analysis, MBD was an independent risk factor for LR (p<0.001). Age and nodal status was near significant (p=0.07). **Conclusion:** mammographic breast densityhas a significant impact on local recurrence in female patients with invasive breast cancer. Further studies with large number of patients still needed to confirm the predictive value of MBD in the incidence of local recurrence in female patients with invasive breast cancer.

[Emad Sadaka, Walid Almorsy, Amr Albadry and Alsiagy Ali Salama.**Mammographic Breast Density as a Predictive Factor of Local Recurrence in Female Patients with Invasive Breast Cancer**. *Cancer Biology* 2018;8(2):97-101]. ISSN: 2150-1041 (print); ISSN: 2150-105X (online). <u>http://www.cancerbio.net</u>. 13. doi:<u>10.7537/marscbj080218.13</u>.

Keywords: Mammographic Breast density, local recurrence, prediction.

1. Introduction

Breast cancer the most common leading cause of cancer related death and cancer in women^[1] Mammography one of the tools in the diagnosis of breast cancer and is currently considered to be the primary investigative modality.Mammographic breast density changedby time and is affected by genetic factors.It decreases with age, and by menopause and multiparity.^[2,3]

Breast density, refers to the appearance ofradiographsof breast. ^[5,6]Radiolucent fat appears dark on a mammogram. Epithelial and fibrous stromal tissues, on the other hand, appear white or radio dense and are collectively referred to as mammographic density. High mammographic density is inversely associated with age and body weight and can be measured inquantitative and qualitative manners.^[4].

Patients with very low density were associated with a poor prognosis.^[7-9]Density has many mechanisms that could affect prognosis. The MBD has consistently been associated with breast stromal composition, which is involved in tumor progression.^[10-13]

The primary treatment for local breast cancer is modified radical mastectomy.^[14,15]Nearly 10% of patients had MRM are at risk of locoregional recurrence (LRR), and a 25% of patients are at risk of developing distant metastases during follow up.^[16] Huang et al evaluated MBD as a predictive for LRR in patients with invasive breast cancer andfound that dense breast tissue increased the risk of locoregional recurrence after MRM.^[17]

2. Material and Methods

Eighty seven (87) patients with invasive breast were included out of diagnosed patients in clinical oncology department, Tanta university hospital in the period from December 2012 to December 2017. Patients with invasive breast carcinoma who experienced local relapse (LR) after modified radical mastectomy were included. Patients with unavailable pretreatment mammography were excluded. Information's were recorded concerning mammographic density, age, menopausal status and tumor features (histological type, grade, size, nodal status, LVI, hormonal receptors status. Ki67 and Her-2/neu).Mammographic density was calculated visually using the craniocaudal projections of the original diagnostic mammograms. To minimize error, tow radiologists share in the analysis. were classified according toWolfe Patients classification of mammographic.^[10] they were classified as low (<25% density)and high (>25% density).

Statistical analysis:

Descriptive characteristics were compared using the chi-squared test. The multivariate analysis was assessed using logistic regression model. Mann- Whitney test used to evaluate the potential risk factors for LR. Overall, a p value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. SPSS program version 21 was used.

3. Results

Among all patients, 23 (26.44%) patients had low dense breasts (<25%) while 64 (73.66%) patients had high dense breasts (>25%). Age < 50 (p=0.002), premenopausal women (p=0.013), tumor size >5cm (p=0.003), LVI (p=0.001), high Ki67 expression (p<0.001) and patients who received adjuvant radiotherapy (p<0.001) were significantly associated with more frequent high breast density.

Table 1 showed the correlation betweenpatient'scharacteristicsandMBD.

Table (1): Correlation betwee	en mammographic breast dens	ity and patients characteristics.

	Total (n = 87)	Low (n = 23)	High (64)	Р	
Age					
≤50	39(44.8%)	4(17.4%)	35(54.7%)	0.002^{*}	
>50	48(55.2%)	19(82.6%)	29(45.3%)	0.002	
Pathology					
Ductal	76(87.4%)	19(82.6%)	57(89.1%)	0.42	
Lobular	11(12.6%)	4(17.4%)	7(10.9%)	0.42	
Menopause					
Pre	38(43.7%)	5(21.7%)	33(51.6%)	0.012*	
Post	49(56.3%)	18(78.3%)	31(48.4%)	0.013*	
Ν	× ,		· · · · ·		
NO	26(29.9%)	10(43.5%)	16(25%)		
N1	22 (25.3%)	6(26.1%)	16(25%)	0.17	
N2	26(29.9%)	3(13%)	23(35.9)	J. 1 /	
N3	13(14.9%)	4(17.4%)	9(14.1)		
Grade					
G1&2	59(67.8%)	16(69.6%)	43(67.2%)	0.02	
G3	28(32.2%)	7(30.4%)	21(32.8%)	0.83	
LVI			()		
Non	47(54%)	19(82.6%)	28(43.8%)	0.001*	
Yes	40(46%)	4(17.4%)	36(56.2%)	0.001^{*}	
radiotherapy					
Yes	68(78.2%)	12(52.2%)	56(87.5%)		
No	19(21.8%)	11(47.8%)	8(12.5%)	< 0.001	
Ki67		(
Low	32(36.8%)	15(65.2%)	17(26.6%)	· · · · *	
High	55(63.2%)	8(34.8%)	47(73.4%)	0.001^{*}	
Her-2	55(05.270)	0(31.070)	17(13.770)		
Positive	14(16.1%)	2(8.7)	12(18.8%)		
Negative	73(83.9%)	21(91.3%)	52(81.2%)	0.26	
Tumor size	, , ((, , , , ,)	(>)			
<=5					
>5	53(60.9)	20(87)	33(51.6)	0.002*	
-	34(39.1)	3(13)	34(39.1)	0.003*	
Hormonal status					
+ve		14/20.00			
-ve	64(73.6)	14(60.8)	50(78.1)	0.11	
	23(26.4)	9(39.1)	14(21.9)		

Table 2 showed analysis of risk factors associated with local recurrence according to the

mean time (months) to local relapse. There were a significant association between early local relapse

(LR) and high MBD (p<0.001), age <50 (p=0.006), LVI (p=0.044), positive axillary nodes (p=0.014) and high Ki67 expression (p=0.007). In

multivariate analysis (table3), MBD was an independent risk factor for LR (p<0.001). Age and nodal status was near significant (p=0.07).

Table	(2)	Univariate	analysis	for	factors	affectingLR	2

Age 35.74 0.006 >50 years 35.74 0.006 >50 years 50.71 0.147 Pathology 0.147 Ductal Ca. 42.51 0.147 Lobular Ca. 54.32 0.014 N stage 39.66 0.014 Nenopause 9.66 0.090 Pre- 38.79 0.090 Positive 38.13 0.004 LVI -ve 49.00 0.044 +ve 38.13 0.055 +ve 38.13 0.0155 Tumor size 45.10 0.125 <5 38.29 0.355 25 38.82 0.125 State 0.125 0.125 State 3 40.84 0.900 HR 9 0.900 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 0.900 MBD 10 10 10 10 Low 67.59 <0.001 10 High 35.52 10 10 </th <th></th> <th>Mean time to local</th> <th></th>		Mean time to local	
≤ 50 years 35.74 0.006 > 50 years 50.71 0 Pathology 0 0.147 Ductal Ca. 54.32 0.147 N stage 54.32 0.004 N stage 0.004 0.004 Positive 38.79 0.090 Post- 48.04 $0.044 $ LVI $0.044 $ $0.044 $ +ve 38.13 $0.044 $ Her-2 45.10 0.355 +v 38.82 0.125 Grade $0.044 $ 0.014 1-2 38.82 0.125 Grade 0.090 0.421 HR 0.900 0.900 negative 43.80 0.900 MBD 0.900 0.900 Itigh 35.52 0.001 High 35.52 0.0001	Factor	recurrence	Р
>50 years 50.71 -14 Pathology 42.51 0.147 Ductal Ca. 54.32 -147 N stage -147 0.014 Negative 54.32 0.014 Positive 39.66 0.014 Menopause -166 0.090 Post- 48.04 -1600 LVI -16000 $0.044 $ +ve 38.13 $0.004 $ Her-2 $+38.13$ 0.355 +ve 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 0.125 25 38.82 0.125 25 38.82 0.125 Grade $1-2$ 45.50 0.421 $1-2$ 43.80 0.900 120 44.57 0.900 112 45.50 0.421 120 45.50 0.900 120 45.50 0.900 120 45.50 0.001			
>50 years 50.71 -14 Pathology 42.51 0.147 Ductal Ca. 54.32 -147 N stage -147 0.014 Negative 54.32 0.014 Positive 39.66 0.014 Menopause -166 0.090 Post- 48.04 -1600 LVI -16000 $0.044 $ +ve 38.13 $0.004 $ Her-2 $+38.13$ 0.355 +ve 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 0.125 25 38.82 0.125 25 38.82 0.125 Grade $1-2$ 45.50 0.421 $1-2$ 43.80 0.900 120 44.57 0.900 112 45.50 0.421 120 45.50 0.900 120 45.50 0.900 120 45.50 0.001	≤50 years		0.006
Ductal Ca. 42.51 0.147 Lobular Ca. 54.32 0.014 N stage 39.66 0.014 Negative 39.66 0.090 Menopause 20.090 0.090 Positive 48.04 0 LVI 48.04 0 +ve 49.00 0.044 +ve 38.13 0 Her-2 49.00 0.044 +ve 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 0 Tumor size 0.125 0 <5	>50 years	50.71	
Lobular Ca. 54.32 N stage 0.014 Negative 39.66 Menopause 0.014 Pre- 38.79 0.090 Post- 48.04 0 LVI 0.044 0 -ve 49.00 0.044 +ve 38.13 0 Her-2 49.00 0.055 +v 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 0 Tumor size 0.125 0 ≤5 38.82 0 Grade 0.40.84 0 1-2 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0 HR 0.900 0.900 negative 44.57 0 MBD 0.900 0 Low 67.59 <0.001	Pathology		
N stage 54.17 0.014 Positive 39.66 0.090 Menopause 38.79 0.090 Post- 48.04 0 LVI -ve 49.00 0.044 +ve 38.13 0 0.044 Her-2 49.00 0.044 0 +ve 38.13 0.355 0.355 -ve 45.10 0.125 0.125 ≥5 38.82 0.125 0.125 Grade 1-2 45.50 0.421 1-2 45.50 0.421 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 0.900 HR 0.900 0.900 0.900 0.900 negative 43.80 0.900 0.900 negative 44.57 0.100 0.900 MBD 100 0.900 0.900 Itigh 35.52 0.001 0.900 MBD 100 55.52 0.001 High 35.53 0.007 0.900 <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.147</td>			0.147
Negative 54.17 0.014 Positive 39.66	Lobular Ca.	54.32	
Positive 39.66 Menopause 0.090 Pre- 38.79 0.090 Post- 48.04 - LVI 0.044 - -ve 49.00 0.044 +ve 38.13 0.355 Her-2 38.29 0.355 +v 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 - Tumor size 0.125 - <5	N stage		
Menopause Pre- Post-38.79 48.040.090LVI -ve +ve49.00 38.130.044 +ve38.130.044 +ve38.29 45.100.355-ve +v45.100.125S538.82Grade 1-2 340.840.421HR Positive negative0.900HR Positive hegative0.900MBD Low67.59 35.52<0.001	Negative	54.17	0.014
Pre- 38.79 0.090 Post- 48.04 -1000 LVI $-ve$ 49.00 $0.044 $ +ve 38.13 $-1000000000000000000000000000000000000$	Positive	39.66	
Pre- 38.79 0.090 Post- 48.04 -1000 LVI $-ve$ 49.00 $0.044 $ +ve 38.13 $-1000000000000000000000000000000000000$	Menopause		
LVI 49.00 0.044 -ve 49.00 0.044 +ve 38.13 0.355 Her-2 45.10 0.355 +v 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 0.125 Z 47.32 0.125 ≥ 5 38.82 0.125 Grade 0.421 0.421 1-2 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 10000 0.900 Low 67.59 <0.001		38.79	0.090
-ve 49.00 38.13 0.044 $+ve$ 38.13 0.355 $+v$ 38.29 45.10 0.355 $-ve$ 45.10 0.125 25 47.32 38.82 0.125 25 38.82 0.125 $Grade$ $1-2$ 3 45.50 40.84 0.421 HR Positive negative 0.900 HR Positive negative 43.80 44.57 0.900 HR Positive negative 67.59 35.52 0.001 $Ki67$ Low 67.59 35.53 0.007	Post-	48.04	
+ve 38.13 IHer-2 38.29 0.355 +v 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 0.125 Tumor size 47.32 0.125 ≤ 5 47.32 0.125 ≥ 5 38.20 0.421 Grade 45.50 0.421 $1-2$ 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 4.57 0.900 Low 67.59 <0.001 High 35.52 0.007	LVI		
Her-2 +v38.29 38.29 0.355-ve45.100.125Tumor size < 5	-ve	49.00	0.044
+v 38.29 0.355 -ve 45.10 0.125 Tumor size 47.32 0.125 ≥ 5 38.82 0.421 Grade 0.421 0.421 1-2 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0.900 HR 0.900 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 0.900 0.900 Low 67.59 <0.001 High 35.52 0.007	+ve	38.13	
-ve 45.10 Tumor size 47.32 0.125 ≥ 5 38.82 0.125 Grade 45.50 0.421 1-2 45.50 0.421 HR 0.900 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 0.900 0.900 Low 67.59 -0.001 Ki67 53.53 0.007	Her-2		
Tumor size47.32 0.125 ≥ 5 38.82 0.125 $\subseteq 5$ 38.82 0.421 Grade 45.50 0.421 $1-2$ 40.84 0.900 3 40.84 0.900 HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0.001 MBD 0.001 0.001 Low 67.59 0.001 High 35.52 0.007	+v	38.29	0.355
Tumor size47.32 0.125 ≥ 5 38.82 0.125 Grade 38.82 0.421 $1-2$ 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0.900 HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0.001 MBD 67.59 -0.001 Low 67.59 -0.001 High 35.52 0.007	-ve	45.10	
< 5 47.32 0.125 ≥ 5 38.82 0.421 $1-2$ 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0.900 HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0.401 MBD 45.50 0.900 Low 67.59 <0.001 High 35.52 0.007			
Grade 45.50 0.421 1-2 40.84 0.421 3 40.84 0.900 HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 67.59 <0.001		47.32	0.125
Grade 45.50 0.421 1-2 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0.900 HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 67.59 -<0.001	≥5	38.82	
1-2 45.50 0.421 3 40.84 0 HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0 MBD 67.59 -<0.001			
HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 67.59 <0.001 Low 67.52 <0.001		45.50	0.421
HR 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57 0.900 MBD 67.59 <0.001	3	40.84	
Positive 43.80 0.900 negative 44.57			
negative 44.57 MBD 67.59 <0.001 Low 67.59 <0.001		43.80	0.900
MBD 67.59 <0.001 Low 35.52 High 35.52 Ki67 0.007			
Low 67.59 <0.001 High 35.52 Control Co			
High 35.52 Ki67 53.53 Low 53.53		67.59	<0.001
Ki67 53.53 0.007			
Low 53.53 0.007			
		53.53	0.007
	high	38.45	

Table (3) multivariate analysis for factor affecting
--

factor	HR (95% CI)	p-value
Age	0.623(0.372-1.042)	0.071
Nodal stage	1.640 (.960 – 2.800)	0.070
LVI	1.064(0.658-1.721)	0.800
MBD	1.687 (1.273 – 2.236)	<0.001
Ki67	1.042(0.630-1.724)	0.872

4. Discussion

Mammographic density is one of the risk factors for breast cancerandloco regional recurrence in patients withinvasive breast cancer.^[20]in the present study there was correlation between patient's characteristics and MBD. Among

87 patients, 23 (26.44%) patients had low dense breasts (<25%) while 64 (73.66%) patients had high dense breasts (\geq 25%). Age < 50 (p=0.002), premenopausal women (p=0.013), tumor size \geq 5cm (p=0.003), LVI (p=0.001), high Ki67 expression (p<0.001) and patients who received adjuvant

radiotherapy (p < 0.001) were significantly associated with more frequent high breast density.

The analysis of risk factors associated with local recurrence according to the mean time (months) to local relapse showed a significant association between early local relapse (LR) andhigh MBD (p<0.001), age <50 (p=0.006), LVI (p=0.044), positive axillary nodes (p=0.014) and high Ki67 expression (p=0.007). In multivariate analysis (table2), MBD was an independent risk factor for LR (p<0,001). Age and nodal status was near significant (p=0.07).

Tulin et al $2009^{[19]}$ evaluated the role of mammographic density as a risk factor for the development of local recurrence and found that patients with high mammographic density had a greater risk of local recurrence compared with the low dense breasts. Women who did not receive radiotherapy had a disease recurrence rate at 10 years of40% for patients with >50% density versus 0% for women <25% density (P < .0001). They concluded that mammographic breast density is an important risk factor for local breast cancer recurrence especially among women not receiving breast irradiation.

Louise et al $2013^{[20]}$ found that (PD) was associated withlocal(p = 0.039) and locoregional recurrence (p = 0.033)for women with PD \geq 25%. They suggested that high mammographic density is an independent risk factor of both local and LRR.

Yu-Sen et al ^[17] evaluated patients with dense (50–75% density) and extremely dense (>75% density) breasts and found that those patients had an increased risk of locoregional recurrence. They also demonstrate that dense breast tissue (>50% density) increased the risk of LRR after modified radical mastectomy in patients with invasive breast cancer.

In a study carried out by Chengshuai et al^[21], 814 patients with invasive breast cancer were evaluated on univariate and multivariate analysis. The tumor size and subtype show statistical significance with LN metastases. Luminal B type shows significant higher incidence of axillary lymph nodes involvement. So, they conclude that LN involvement is an intrinsic characteristic for molecular subtype of breast cancer. And triple positive patientshad the least and most incidence of LN metastases.

References

- 1. Jemal A, Bray F, Center MM, Ferlay J et al.: Global cancer statistics. CA Cancer J Clin 61:69–90,2011.
- 2. Martin LJ, Boyd NF: Mammographic density. Potential mechanisms of breast cancer risk associated with mammographic density: hypotheses based on epidemiological evidence. Breast Cancer Res 200810,2008.

- 3. Martin LJ, Melnichouk O, Guo H et al.: Family history, mammographic density, and risk of breast cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 19:456–463,2010
- McCormack VA, dos Santos Silva I :Breast density and parenchymal patterns as markers of breast cancer risk: a meta-analysis. CancerEpidemiol Biomarkers Prev15(6):1159– 1169,2006.
- 5. Thurfjell E.: Breast density and the risk of breast cancer. N Engl J Med 347(12):866,2002.
- 6. Boyd NF, Rommens JM, Vogt K, et al. Mammographic breast density as an intermediate phenotype for breast cancer. Lancet Oncol6 (10):798–808, 2005.
- Masarwah A, Auvinen P, Sudah M, et al.: Very low mammographic breast density predictspoorer outcome in patients with invasive breast cancer. EurRadiol. 25(7):1875– 82, 2015.
- 8. Masarwah A, Tammi M, Sudah M, et al.: The reciprocal association between mammographicbreast density, hyaluronan synthesis and patient outcome. Breast CancerRes Treat. 153(3):625–34,2015.
- Allred DC, Medina D.: The relevance of mouse models to understanding the development and progression of human breast cancer. J Mammary Gland BiolNeoplasia.13(3):279– 88,2008
- 10. Alowami S, Troup S, Al-Haddad S, et al.: Mammographic density is related to stroma and stromal proteoglycan expression. Breast Cancer Res. 5(5):R129–35,2003.
- 11. Hawes D, Downey S, Pearce CL, et al.: Dense breast stromal tissue shows greatly increased concentration of breast epithelium but no increase in its proliferative activity. Breast Cancer Res. 8(2):R24,2006.
- Lahlou H, Muller WJ.: Beta1-integrins signaling and mammary tumor progression in transgenic mouse models: implications for human breast cancer. Breast Cancer Res. 13(6):229,2011.
- 13. vanDongen JA, Voogd AC, Fentiman IS, et al.: Long-term results of a randomized trial comparing breast-conserving therapy with mastectomy: European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer 10801 trial. J Natl Cancer Inst. 92(14):1143–50,2000.
- 14. Poggi MM, Danforth DN, Sciuto LC, et al.: Eighteen-year results in the treatment of early breast carcinoma with mastectomy versus breast conservation therapy: the National Cancer Institute Randomized Trial. Cancer.98(4):697– 702,2003.
- 15. Fisher B, Anderson S, Bryant J, et al.: Twentyyear follow-up of a randomized trial comparing total mastectomy, lumpectomy, and lumpectomy plus irradiation for the treatmentof

invasive breast cancer. N Engl J Med. 347(16):1233-41,2002.

- 16. Yu-Sen Huang, Jenny Ling-Yu Chen, Chiun-Sheng Huang, et al: High mammographic breast density predicts locoregional recurrence after modified radical mastectomy for invasive breast cancer: a case-control study. Breast Cancer Research 18:120,2016
- 17. Wolfe JN.: Risk for breast cancer development determined by mammographic parenchymal pattern. Cancer. 1976; 37: 2486-2492,1976.
- 18. TulinCil; Eve Fishell; Wedad Hanna et al: Mammographic Density and the Riskof Breast

6/25/2018

ancer Recurrence After Breast-Conserving Surgery. Cancer December 15,: 5780-86,2009.

- 19. Louise Eriksson, KamilaCzene, Lena Rosenberg et al: Possible influence of mammographic density on local and locoregional recurrence of breast cancer. Breast Cancer Research 15:R56,2013.
- 20. Chengshuai Si, Yiting Jin, Hongying Wang, et al.: Association betweenmolecular subtypes and lymph node status in invasive breast cancer.Int J ClinExp Pathol;7(10):6800-6806,2014.