British Journal of Cancer (2015) 113, 1632 | doi: 10.1038/bjc.2015.219

Comment on: 'Trends in the lifetime risk of developing cancer in great Britain: comparison of risk for those born from 1930 to 1960'—cancer predictions need more context

JL Oke*,1, BD Nicholson1 and B Shinkins1

¹Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford OX2 6GG, UK

Sir

Projections of lifetime risk and cancer incidence for the next 25 years reported by Ahmad *et al* (2015) are alarming but probably realistic. In the last 30 years, the incidence of all cancers in the United Kingdom has risen from 293 cases per 100 000 persons in 1975 to 396 per 100 000 in 2011 (Cancer Research UK, 2012), a rise of 35%. We were, however, surprised to such limited discussion or analysis of cancer mortality trends over the equivalent time period, which has fallen 21% since 1971 (Cancer Research UK, 2012).

There has been a steady and linear increase over time in cancer incidence (Figure 1, solid black line). Extrapolating this trend forward (black dotted line) using simple linear regression produces incidence rates that generate lifetime and cumulative risks that are broadly in line with Ahmad *et al*'s more

500 - Incidence
Mortality
400 - 200
100
100
100
100
Year of diagnosis (incidence) or death (mortality)

Figure 1. All-cancer incidence and mortality in the United Kingdom from 1975 to 2011(solid lines) and projected incidence and mortality (dashed lines).

*Correspondence: Dr J Oke; E-mail: Jason.oke@phc.ox.ac.uk Published online 23 June 2015 © 2015 Cancer Research UK. All rights reserved 0007 – 0920/15 sophisticated approach. Using the same method to extrapolate the trend in all-cancer mortality (solid grey line) suggests that all-cancer mortality will continue to decline (grey dashed line). In short, extrapolating current trends forward sends incidence and mortality in different directions, and this suggests a future in which cancer becomes more common but at the same time more benign.

One explanation for detecting increasing levels of cancer on the scale suggested by Ahmad *et al* without a concomitant increase in mortality is the detection of disease that will not go on to cause symptoms or death: 'overdiagnosis' (Welch and Black, 2010). This was acknowledged as contributory to the increased incidence in prostate cancer in relation to PSA testing, yet similar trends can be seen for thyroid, kidney, melanoma and breast cancer. Although it is methodologically challenging to take into account the impact of over-diagnosis and its underlying causes, diagnostic drift, increasing test sensitivity and changing competing mortality risks, these are important considerations to note when interpreting incidence data (Carter *et al*, 2015).

We call on the authors to publish their projected mortality rates to provide greater context to these worrying figures. The public deserve clear information about the drivers behind them, especially given the cumulative risk of overdiagnosis in an ageing population.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Ahmad AS, Ormiston-Smith N, Sasieni PD (2015) Trends in the lifetime risk of developing cancer in Great Britain: comparison of risk for those born from 1930 to 1960. Br J Cancer 112: 943–947.

Cancer Research UK (2012) Cancer incidence for all cancers combined. Available from http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-info/cancerstats/incidence/ all-cancers-combined/#UK (accessed on 13 February 2015).

Cancer Research UK (2012) Cancer mortality for all cancers combined. Available from http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-info/cancerstats/mortality/all-cancers-combined (accessed on 13 February 2015).

Carter JL, Coletti RJ, Harris RP (2015) Quantifying and monitoring overdiagnosis in cancer screening: a systematic review of methods. BMJ 350: g7773.
 Welch HG, Black WC (2010) Overdiagnosis in cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 102(9):



http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/



BIC

British Journal of Cancer (2015) 113, 1632–1633 | doi: 10.1038/bjc.2015.31

Comment on 'Dexamethasone exerts profound immunologic interference on treatment efficacy for recurrent glioblastoma'

Susannah Ellsworth*,1 and Stuart A Grossman2

¹Department of Radiation Oncology, Indiana University School of Medicine, Indianapolis, IN, USA and ²Department of Oncology, Medicine, & Neurosurgery, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA

Sir,

In this manuscript, Dr Wong and colleagues observed that patients with recurrent glioblastoma who underwent therapy with tumor treating alternating electrical fields and were on higher doses of dexamethasone had lower T-lymphocyte counts and shorter survival (Wong et al, 2015). The investigators attributed these outcomes entirely to 'global immunosuppression by dexamethasone'. In fact, this patient population receives three therapies that are highly toxic to lymphocytes – glucocorticoids, radiation, and temozolomide. Recent studies have demonstrated that 40% of patients with newly diagnosed glioblastoma develop grade III and IV lymphopenia with CD4 counts <200 cells mm⁻³ 2 months after beginning radiation and temozolomide (Grossman et al, 2011). This profound lymphopenia lasts for over 1 year and on multivariate analysis is independently associated with inferior survival. Treatment-induced lymphopenia has also been studied in

other solid tumors that are not treated with dexamethasone or temozolomide; data from these studies strongly point to radiation as the primary causative factor in treatment-induced lymphopenia. These studies reported rates of lymphopenia that were very similar to those seen in glioblastoma and again identified an association between treatment-induced lymphopenia and survival in patients with pancreatic cancer, non-small cell lung cancer, and breast cancer. (Balmanoukian et al, 2012; Campian et al, 2013; Wild et al, 2013; Tang et al, 2014; Afghahi et al, 2015) Two hypotheses have been advanced to explain this phenomenon. The first relates to the inadvertent radiation of circulating lymphocytes (MacLennan and Kay, 1978; Yovino et al, 2013). The second stems from observations that IL-7 levels are inappropriately low in irradiated patients with severe treatment-related lymphopenia (Ellsworth et al, 2014). We agree that immune status is an important prognostic factor in patients with recurrent glioblastoma.

1632 www.bjcancer.com

However, as radiation-associated lymphopenia is common and long-lasting in patients with glioblastoma, as well as in patients with pancreatic, lung, and breast cancer, where dexamethasone is not an integral part of therapy, it is likely that the immunosuppression described by Dr Wong *et al* was due to prior radiation exposure, rather than to dexamethasone treatment. At a minimum, this issue should be formally addressed in this manuscript and in subsequent work regarding this important topic.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Afghahi A, Mathur M, Seto T, Desai M, Kenkare P, Horst KC, Das AK, Thompson CA, Luft HS, Yu PP, Gomez SL, Low Y, Shah NH, Kurian AW, Sledge GW (2015) Lymphopenia after radiotherapy (RT) to predict poor survival in triplenegative breast cancer (TNBC). *J Clin Oncol* 33(Suppl): 1069.

Balmanoukian A, Ye X, Herman J, Laheru D, Grossman SA (2012) The association between treatment-related lymphopenia and survival in newly diagnosed patients with resected adenocarcinoma of the pancreas. *Cancer Invest* 30(8): 571–576

Campian JL, Ye X, Brock M, Grossman SA (2013) Treatment-related lymphopenia in patients with stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. Cancer Invest 31(3): 183–188

Ellsworth S, Balmanoukian A, Kos F, Nirschl C, Nirschl T, Grossman S, Luznik L, Drake CG (2014) Sustained $\mathrm{CD4}+\mathrm{cell}$ driven lymphopenia without a

*Correspondence: Dr S Ellsworth; E-mail: susannah.yovino@gmail.com Published online 8 September 2015

© 2015 Cancer Research UK. All rights reserved 0007 - 0920/15

compensatory IL7/Il15 response among high-grade glioma patients treated with radiation and temozolomide. *Oncoimmunology* **3**(1): e27357.

Grossman SA, Ye X, Lesser G, Sloan A, Carraway H, Desideri S, Piantadosi S. NABTT CNS Consortium (2011) Immunosuppression in patients with highgrade gliomas treated with radiation and temozolomide. Clin Cancer Res 17(16): 5473–5480.

MacLennan IC, Kay HE (1978) Analysis of treatment in childhood leukemia. IV. The critical association between dose fractionation and immunosuppression induced by cranial irradiation. *Cancer* 41(1): 108–111.

Tang C, Liao Z, Gomez D, Levy L, Zhuang Y, Gebremichael RA, Hong DS, Komaki R, Welsh JW (2014) Lymphopenia association with gross tumor volume and lung V5 and its effects on non-small cell lung cancer patient outcomes. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 89(5): 1084–1091.

Wild AT, Ye X, Ellsworth SG, Smith JA, Narang AK, Garg T, Campian J, Laheru DA, Zheng L, Wolfgang CL, Tran PT, Grossman SA, Herman JM (2013) The association between chemoradiation-related lymphopenia and clinical outcomes in patients with locally advanced pancreatic adenocarcinoma. Am J Clin Oncol 38(3): 259–265.

Wong ET, Lok E, Gautam S, Swanson KD (2015) Dexamethasone exerts profound immunologic interference on treatment efficacy for glioblastoma. Br J Cancer 113(2): 232–241.

Yovino S, Kleinberg LR, Grossman SA, Narayanan M, Ford E (2013) The Etiology of treatment-related lymphopenia in patients with malignant gliomas: modeling radiation dose to circulating lymphocytes explains clinical observations and suggests methods of modifying the impact of radiation on immune Cells. Cancer Invest 31(2): 140–144.



http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/



BJC

British Journal of Cancer (2015) 113, 1633–1634 | doi: 10.1038/bjc.2015.320

Response to: Comment on 'Dexamethasone exerts profound immunologic interference on treatment efficacy for recurrent glioblastoma'

Eric T Wong*,1 and Kenneth D Swanson1

¹Brain Tumor Center & Neuro-Oncology Unit, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Sir

We would like to thank you for an opportunity to respond to the comments from Drs Ellsworth and Grossman in their letter to the editor concerning our recent paper, 'Dexamethasone Exerts Profound Immunologic Interference on Treatment Efficacy for Recurrent Glioblastoma', by Wong et al (2015).

Contrary to the assertion by the authors, our paper did not claim that the effects of dexamethasone were mediated via steroid-induced lymphopenia. It is widely accepted that dexamethasone exerts pleotropic effects on the immune system that lead to the suppression of multiple effector systems required for therapy-induced tumor rejection (Fauci, 1976; Benedetti et al, 2003). Within our single institution patient cohort, we aggressively weaned dexamethasone doses and we found that patient outcome correlated with T-cell counts. T-cell count was used as a marker of potential immunological competency to test if it correlated with outcome, as suggested by our initial observation in the phase III trial that high dexamethasone dose was correlated with a poorer survival. As pointed out by Drs Ellsworth and Grossman, the observed lymphocyte counts in our single institution cohort were probably related to patient treatment history, intrinsic immune state or both, but not necessarily to corticosteroid usage. Furthermore, overall survival as a function of the effect of dexamethasone in each of the two arms in the phase III trial was very likely independent of the T-lymphocyte counts of patients entering the trial, as supported by our single institution patient cohort where no correlation was observed between dexamethasone dose and T-lymphocyte count.

The authors also cited their work on the immunosuppressive effect of radiation and temozolomide when given to patients with newly diagnosed glioblastomas (Grossman et al, 2011). They found that 40% of patients had <200 CD4 cells mm⁻³ 2 months after initiation of treatment and this was associated with a poorer survival when compared with those with ≥200 CD4 cells mm $^{-3}$. Given that corticosteroid use was not a controlled variable, it is possible that dexamethasone may have contributed to the poor survival outcome in this study. Regardless, the overall conclusion of their study was also consistent with our utilisation of T-lymphocyte counts as a marker of poor outcome. Furthermore, an earlier study by Hughes et al (2005) investigated the phenomenon of lymphopenia in the pre-temozolomide chemo-irradiation era and found that 24% of the cohort had <200 CD4 cells mm $^{-3}$ whereas 76% had \geq 200 CD4 cells mm $^{-3}$. Therefore, it is possible that the addition of temozolomide to dexamethasone plus radiotherapy increased the proportion of patients who developed poor outcome and low CD4 lymphocyte count (from 24 to 40%). Taken together, it may be important to re-examine the potential role of dexamethasone in these two studies.

Lastly, the authors also cited that treatment-related lymphopenia is a marker of poor outcome in pancreatic and non-small cell lung cancers (Balmanoukian et al, 2012; Campian et al, 2013; Tang et al, 2014; Wild et al, 2015). Our data are consistent with this contention, but do not address the cause of the low T-lymphocyte counts in our patients. It is notable that patients in these studies also received concurrent emetogenic chemotherapies, such as taxol/carboplatin, gemcitabine or gemcitabine/carboplatin, and dexamethasone was likely an important antiemetic in the premedication regimen and may therefore confound the outcome analysis.

Although it is hard to absolutely devolve the contribution of dexamethasone from prior radiation and chemotherapy effects in patients with recurrent glioblastoma, the NovoTTF-100A monotherapy arm in the phase III trial nevertheless offered us a unique opportunity to evaluate the sole effect of dexamethasone dosage because the influence of prior radiation and chemotherapy was randomized and balanced. In contrast to commonly used chemotherapeutic regimens (Grossman *et al*, 2011), NovoTTF-100A does not exert such deleterious effects on the immune system. Given these conditions, we were able to determine that subjects who received a dexamethasone dose of \geqslant 4.1 mg day $^{-1}$ had a significantly shorter survival than those who took <4.1 mg day $^{-1}$. Therefore, one of the obvious implications of our work is that future clinical trials in the glioblastoma population may need to control for the confounding dexamethasone effect in outcome. Furthermore, it may be worthwhile to re-examine treatment outcomes of prior clinical trials based on dexamethasone stratification.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Balmanoukian A, Ye X, Herman J, Laheru D, Grossman SA (2012) The association between treatment-related lymphopenia and survival in newly diagnosed patients with resected adenocarcinoma of the pancreas. *Cancer Invest* 30: 571–576.

Benedetti S, Pirola B, Poliani PL, Cajola L, Pollo B, Bagnati R, Magrassi L, Tunici P (2003) Dexamethasone inhibits the anti-tumor effect of interleukin 4 on rat experimental gliomas. *Gene Ther* **10**: 188–192.

Campian JL, Ye X, Brock M, Grossman SA (2013) Treatment-related lymphopenia in patients with stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. *Cancer Invest* 31: 183–188. Fauci AS (1976) Mechanisms of corticosteroid action on lymphocyte

subpopulations. II. Differential effects of in vivo hydrocortisone, prednisone