

THE ROLE OF CONTRALATERAL SUBMANDIBULAR SPARING IN HEAD AND NECK INTENSITY MODULATED RADIOTHERAPY (IMRT): A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Jacinto, JC Kennetth M.¹; Co, Jayson L.¹; Mejia, Michael Benedict A.¹ ¹Department of Radiation Oncology, Benavides Cancer Institute, University of Santo Tomas Hospital, Manila Philippines Email address: jc_kenneth_jacinto@yahoo.com

Introduction

- Xerostomia is one of the most concerning side effects of radiotherapy affecting mastication, dentition, deglutition, speaking and nutrition.
- · Numerous studies showed improvement in physician-graded xerostomia scores and stimulated salivary flow rates in patients treated with parotid-sparing IMRT.
- · However, these have poor correlation on patientreported xerostomia.
- · Submandibular glands are the primary source of unstimulated salivary flow in about 60% and are responsible for mucin production that retains water for moisture.
- Sparing the submandibular gland may improve patient-reported xerostomia.

Objective

The aim of this review is to synthesize present available evidences on the effectiveness of contralateral submandibular (cSMG) sparing IMRT in patients with head and neck squamous cell carcinoma

Methods

- · Search of relevant articles was done from 2001 to December 2016.
- Search terms: "SUBMANDIBULAR SPARING" AND "RADIOTHERAPY" in MEDLINE Complete, CINAHL Plus, Proquest Health and Medical Complete, Academic Search Complete, Biomedical Reference Collection Basic, PubMed and HERDIN database
- Critical appraisal and meta-analysis of the eligible studies were undertaken to assess effectiveness of cSMG sparing versus non-cSMG sparing IMRT in head and neck cancer treated with parotid sparing IMRT.
- Critical appraisal using McMaster Critical Review form for Quantitative Studies
- Statistical pooling using Review Manager Software 5.3



Results

- 4 studies eligible for analysis:
 - 1 prospective study: narrative analysis 3 restrospective studies: pooled anaysis

Only one prospective study (Wang et al, 2011)

Variable	cSMG-sparing group	cSMG-unspared group	
cSMG Volume, cm ³ \pm SD (range) Mean dose, Gy \pm SD (range) Mean V30, % \pm SD (range)	$n = 26 \text{ patients} 7.0 \pm 2.2 (3.1-11.6) 20.4 \pm 7.8 (1.9-29.7) 14.7 \pm 16.6 (0-46.6)$	$n = 26 \text{ patients} 6.2 \pm 1.8 (3.0-10.0) 57.4 \pm 3.8 (49.8-63.6) 99.8 \pm 0.6 (97.6-100)$	

Assessment of Xerostomia and Salivary Flow

- At 2 and 6 months post-IMRT: lower among at cSMG-sparing group, but not significant at 12 and 18 months
- cSMG-sparing group had better mean unstimulated salivary flow rates at each time point post-IMRT and better mean stimulated salivary flow rates at 2 months post-IMRT



 Comparison 100 (%) of recovery 80 percentage 60 SWS 12 mc

Time after treatment

Oncologic Outcomes

• At 25 months median follow-up: Locoregional recurrence, distant metastasis and overall survival were the same (p values >0.05)

Pooled Analysis (Retrospective studies)

Physician-Graded Xerostomia at 12 months

	cSMG Sp	pared	cSMG Not S	pared		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Gensheimer 2014	3	54	11	27	51.9%	0.14 [0.04, 0.45]	
Saarilahti 2006	4	18	2	18	48.1%	2.00 [0.42, 9.58]	
Total (95% CI)		72		45	100.0%	0.50 [0.04, 6.89]	
Total events	7		13				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	3.10; Chi	$i^2 = 7.1$	6, df = 1 (P	= 0.007); l ² = 86	%	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.52	(P = 0.	50)				Favours [cSMG Spared] Favours [cSMG Not Spared]

Figure 1. Physician-graded xerostomia at 12 months

Locoregional recurrence at 24 months

	cSMG S	pared	cSMG Not S	pared		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Gensheimer 2014	12	76	7	38	60.3%	0.86 [0.37, 2.00]	
Tam 2015	1	60	6	57	39.7%	0.16 [0.02, 1.27]	
Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	13 2.31, df Z = 1.41	136 = 1 (P = (P = 0.	13 0.13); I ² = 1 16)	95 57%	100.0%	0.58 [0.27, 1.24]	0.01 01 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100

Figure 2. Locoregional recurrence at 24 months

Conclusion

Current evidences suggest better patient-reported xerostomia without compromising oncologic outcomes with cSMG sparing IMRT. More RCTs are warranted to provide higher level of evidence to verify its benefits.

References

Wang, Z.H., et al., Impact of salivary gland dosimetry on post-IMRT recovery of saliva output and xerostomia grade for head-and-neck cancer patients treated with or without contralateral submandibular gland sparing: a longitudinal study. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2011. 81(5): p. 1479-87.
Tam, M., et al., Sparing bilateral neck level IB in oropharyngeal carcinoma and xerostomia outcomes. Am J Clin Oncol. 2015. 38(4): p. 343-7.
Gensheimer, M.F., et al., Submandibular gland-sparing radiation therapy for locally advanced oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma: patterns of failure and xerostomia outcomes. Radiat Oncol. 2014. 9: p. 255.
Saarilahti, K., et al., Sparing of the submandibular glands by intensity modulated radiotherapy in the treatment of head and neck cancer. Radiother Oncol, 2006. 78(3): p. 270-5.