11

Breast cancer: Emerging principles of metastasis, adjuvant and neoadjuvant treatment from cancer

registry data

Jutta Engel[1,2], Renate Eckel[1], Simone Schrodi[2], Kathrin Halfter[1], Gabriele Schubert-Fritschle[1,2],
Dieter Hölzel[1]

[1]Munich Cancer Registry (MCR), Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry and
Epidemiology (IBE), Ludwig-Maximilians-University (LMU), D-81377 Munich, Germany
[2]Munich Cancer Registry (MCR), Bavarian Cancer Registry - Regional Centre Munich (LGL)
at the University Hospital of Munich
20
Corresponding author:
Prof. Dr. Dieter Hölzel
Munich Cancer Registry
D-81377 München, Germany
hoe@ibe.med.uni-muenchen.de
Tel: ++49-89-8414875

Abbreviations

AT   neo-adjuvant systemic therapy
BC   breast cancer
HR   hormone receptor
(s)MET   (secondary) metastases
MET-P   metastasization process
LR   local recurrence
(p)LN   positive lymph node
(1st/2nd)PT   (first/second) primary tumor/breast cancer
(d/c)TC   (disseminated/circulating) tumor cell
TD   tumor diameter
VD(T)   volume doubling (time)

Keywords:
breast cancer, tumor initiation, tumor growth, local recurrence, lymph node, metastasis, adjuvant
treatment, survival
43
44   Body text: 6437 words
45   Abstract: 333 words
46   References: 104
47   Figures: 3 (and 16 individual Figures)

Abstract

Background: A growing primary breast cancer (PT) can initiate local (LR), regional (pLN), and distant metastases (MET). Characteristics of these progressions such as initiation, frequency and duration of PT and MET growth describe principles of the MET process. They are bottlenecks through which molecular hypotheses and scientific terms for prediction and prognosis have to go.

Methods: Population-based data from the Munich Cancer Registry over 4 time periods since 1978 with the most important prognostic factors and a follow-up up to this day are analyzed. With n= 66.818 patients, reliable data are obtained on initiation on METs, growth times und survival even in small subgroups. Together with results of clinical trials on prevention and adjuvant treatment (AT) principles of tumor growth, MET process and AT are summarized.

Results: The median growth periods for PT/ MET/LR/pLN result in 12,5/8,8/5/3,5 years. Even if 30% of METs only appear after 10 years of MET-free time, a delayed initiation or cascade like initiation of METs, e.g. from pLNs cannot be derived from the data. That is an immediate MET initiation principle by PT. The growth rate of the PT can vary by a factor of 10 or more and can be transferred to the MET. The coupling of the growth rates of PT/MET results in the principle of a nearly constant relation of about 1.4. Principles of AT are the 50% eradication of 1st and 2ndPT, the selective and partial eradication of bone and lung METs with successful ATs, which cannot be improved by extending the duration of ATs. These principles reveal that there is no convincing rationale for the currently accepted early risk of breast cancer by hormone replacement therapies, for long term endocrine ATs or cascade like initiation of METs.

Conclusion: A paradigm with nine principles for the MET process and ATs can be derived from real world data and clinical trials. The principles suggest alternative interpretations of well-known clinical trials and changes in treatments. The outlined MET process should be generalizable to all solid tumors.

Introduction

Biomedical research regularly increases the complexity of cancer. More and more details are emerging on the association with risk factors, the steps involved in carcinogenesis, and processes such as clonal evolution that ultimately result in genetically heterogeneous PTs.[1-3] Also the steps leading to metastasis, the MET-process (MET-P), are becoming increasingly differentiated.[4,5] By definition secondary metastases (sMET) are referred to as local recurrences (LRs), positive lymph nodes (pLNs), and distant METs. Primary and secondary BCs (1stPT/2ndPT) are also included because these may also be prevented and have the similar risk of initiating comparable sMETs.

Even though the molecular processes involved in the disease course of PTs and sMETs may be highly complex, these can nevertheless be described using only a few parameters and defined principles of METs and their treatment. The aim of this article is to elucidate initiation, growth, survival, and treatment effects of BC and sMET with real world data from the Munich Cancer Registry (MCR) which are basic conditions, the bottleneck through which molecular hypotheses and scientific terms for prediction and prognosis have to go.

Methods

The Munich Cancer registry (MCR) has data starting from 1978, it has been population-based for the currently underlying 4.9 million population since 1998, and is included in Cancer Incidence of Five Continents. Reliable data on changing adjuvant treatments (AT) and on locoregional disease manifestations from pathology reports such as hormone receptor status, tumor diameter (TD), number of pLN, Ki67 - since 2010 - and contralateral PT are available. All death certificates from the region have been incorporated and result in a follow-up to this day.

In the case of cancer-related death, approximately 70% of METs were recorded. Four time intervals have been distinguished since 1978 and the time trends of the successful ATs and the changing pogressions are evaluated. Despite missing values, it is robust data with n=66.818 patients for the analysis of even small subgroups.

The relative survival is an estimate for tumor-specific survival and is calculated by dividing the overall survival after diagnosis by the survival observed in the general population with comparable age distribution.

Kaplan-Meier curves for the relative survival from diagnosis, for survival up to and after MET and with distributions of the MET-free survival time describe the relationships with prognostic and predictive factors. The relative survival is an estimate for tumor-specific survival and is calculated by dividing the overall survival after diagnosis by the survival observed in the general population with comparable age distribution.

METs account for the great majority of cancer-associated deaths, why this complex process needs to be better understood. With every millimeter of PT growth, further METs are initiated. Three growth phases are to be estimated, the time from occult MET growth to PT diagnosis, the MET-free time up to MET detection and survival afterwards. The distribution of the MET-free survival times is the shift of the distribution of the MET initiations before PT diagnosis if the same growth duration is assumed. The median time is an estimate of the growth duration of the METs.

So far, modeling has seldom been used in medicine to elucidate relationships. Processes are modeled with the distribution functions for the incidence of PTs and METs, the growth times and eradication rates. The effect of HRT with growth acceleration of prevalent PTs and a risk of new PTs or the long-term endocrine AT with a preventive and adjuvant effect are examples. Statistical analyses were performed by using SAS V 9.4 and R V 3.1.3.

Results

Initiation of primary tumors and secondary foci

Growing and evolutionarily developing PTs may have already disseminated circulating tumor cells (TC) and DNA (ctDNA) to form local or distant small foci through alterations in the tumor microenvironment.[6,7] Several cell types and signaling molecules are involved in promoting the epithelial-mesenchymal transition that allow TCs to disseminate. PTs can achieve MET-competence starting from about 1 mm TD[4] and initially a first MET-competent TC appears among many disseminated TCs.[8] They may remain local or may spread through lymphatic or hematogenous dissemination and initiate LRs, pLNs, and METs. Temporal aspects of initiation and growth of these sMETs are shown in Fig.1. In Fig.2A, possible sources and pathways of the initiating TCs are outlined and some results for pT1c- and pT2-PTs are arranged in Fig.2B. Growing PTs are associated with poor prognoses (Fig.2C). Until R0-resection, all TCs that can initiate sMETs are disseminated. Only dormancy could delay the onset. In the form of a liquid biopsy, circulating TCs and ctDNA can be detected when diagnosing a BC, although they are very rare and the sensitivity and specificity of the procedure is moderate.[9,10]

Initiation of local recurrences

When TCs migrate but remain close to the PT, they are able to initiate true LRs. These usually occur within 3 centimeter (Fig.2A), the range of migrating TCs and the target area of the boost irradiation. The shared microenvironment of the PT and the LR forms a supporting niche providing particularly favorable growth conditions. This was shown in historical data from the NSABP-B-06 study with 39.2% LR after breast conserving surgery without irradiation.[11] However, the term LR is inaccurate because LR like METs or pLNs can occur synchronously with PTs in about 18% and then are referred to as multifocal PTs.

In total, four types of LR can be distinguished: growing residual tumors from positive margins, true

PT-near LRs, and independently initiated ipsilateral 2ndPT or multicentric PTs (Fig.1).[12,13] A fourth

type may be foci that emerge through self-seeding.[14,15] Since these are initiated by TCs, which find

their way back through circulation, they likely exhibit similar characteristics as true LRs but without

the proximity to the PT (Fig.2A). In addition, this form of self-seeding can initiate contralateral foci. It

can be assumed that tumor cell dissemination from PTs must have already been taking place for

some time if LRs appear simultaneous to PTs. In parallel, as data from the MCR shows, initiation of

pLNs becomes more likely with about 15% more pN+ findings for pT1-2m (multiple) PTs.[16]

Initiation of positive lymph nodes

TCs can infiltrate LNs through lymphatic dissemination. This LN infiltration is also a stochastic process

over time, with the number of pLNs representing discrete successive steps.[17] This process can be

described by a simple Markov model with transition probabilities for each status with n pLN to reach

the (n +1)pLN status by one millimeter growth. Fig.2B shows LN infiltration depending on pT-

categories. In pT2-PTs more than half (26.2%) of the 46.5% pLNs are likely to have been infiltrated by

TCs during growth up to pT1c. In the subgroup of hormone receptor (HR) positive non-advanced PTs,

the percentage of patients with more than n pLNs can be described by Gompertz functions with 3

parameters. Cumulated and complementary to 100%, Fig. 2E shows observed and fitted data for 0 to

> 10pLN. For 0pLN results: y (≥0pLN,%) = 100 – 75.4*exp(-2.82*exp(-0.063*TD) (TD: 2 – 90mm).

In addition, large PTs can develop the required driver mutations at a later point in time but the

infiltration process is not significantly affected. As the TD increases, the fraction with >10 pLNs

increases at the expense of 0pLNs, the proportion of which varies between 0.05% and 1.75% per

millimeter. However, the proportion with 1, 2 or 3 positive nodes is largely independent of the TD for

larger PTs. In the 0pLN status, some of the PTs have begun to disseminate MET-competent TCs

(Fig.2D). In PTs with negative sentinel LNs approximately 15.9% of isolated TC or micro-MET are

detected, which corresponds to the proportion of 0pLN* in Fig. 2E.[18] The risk of a MET for a patient

with 0pLN status increases with the TD of the PT.

The sum of all pLNs that initiate growing and continuously disseminating PTs in 100 patients can also

be described with a Gompertz function: Sum (pLNs /TD) = 646 * exp (-3.91 * exp (-0.041 * TD)) (2

<TD <90mm).[17] The asymptote of 646 pLNs is a biological characteristic, resulting from the

proportion of subgroups 0pLN up to >10pLN in large tumors. Because of the maximum of about 30

LNs the mean value for >10pLNs is 17, and is largely independent of the TD.

Initiation of metastases

When are METs initiated? As described above, clinical findings on the effect of pT-category show that

for pT1-PTs about 13% metastasize and two years after diagnosis tumor-related deaths are to be

expected after 15 years (Fig.2G). When comparing such results, the time reference of the cohort and

therefore the ATs of the 2000s should be taken into account because progress has been made with

successful innovations. If PTs are diagnosed at a later time point as pT2-PTs with a mean TD of

28mm, the METs already initiated up to a tumor size of pT1c continued to grow and 25% new no

longer eradicable METs are initiated after pT1c size (Fig.2B).[19]

In the pT2 category the proportion of advanced PTs has already reached 4.2% and the MET-free

interval shortens to 4.2 years. The time scale of the MET-P in pT2-PTs illustrates that expediting the

PT diagnosis avoids METs and results in a longer MET-free interval of 5.1 years. This constitutes a

lead time effect for the subgroup with unavoidable METs, which are initiated up to a tumor size

equivalent to pT1.

The initiation of MET is similar to that of LNs. At some point a TC succeeds in infiltrating a distant

organ site, perhaps cooperatively as a homogeneous cluster or with other heterogeneous circulating

TCs (polyclonal origin). Therefore, MET may have already been initiated in the pN0* phase (Fig.2E).

Indeed this can be seen in the 1pLN status as the doubling of the mortality. Thereafter, additional

METs can be initiated sequentially by a PT, which can acquire further mutations in the meantime

(Fig.1). Therefore, multiple METs in one or more organs and also in different pLNs can be genetically

different.[3,20] In addition, different areas of a PT can already be assigned as source of TCs.[21]

Combinations of initiated sMETs

If a PT disseminates MET-competent TCs in principle all three sMETs can be initiated. LR are more

common than pLNs, which in turn are more common than METs, as TCs have to overcome additional

lymphatic and hematogenous barriers, extravasation and colonization into organs.[1] All combinations

of sMETs in any order are possible. In the absence of a variant, not only chance but also necessity

may play a role, which may be related to MET organ-specific properties of TCs. [22-24] The competing

initiation is illustrated in the 15-year relative survival which is 88.1/93.8/87.9/84.7% for pT1c and

all / pN0 / 1pLN / 2pLNs respectively. The corresponding values for pT2 are 67.4 / 80.7 / 72.9 / 64.6%

and demonstrate the high proportion of simultaneously initiated pLNs and METs.

Initiation of primary tumors

The age-dependent incidence also reveals the initiation of 1stPTs[19,25], which occurs years earlier

according to the PTs growth durations. About 2% of patients have bilateral PTs which must be

initiated nearly at the same time and then grew in parallel. The incidence of contralateral 2ndPT and

PTs in prevention studies [26] show that year after year these PTs are diagnosed and must have been

prevalent in the patient cohort according to the duration of the growth of PTs (Fig.2H). In high-risk

groups[27] the incidence is increased, with a BRCA positive proportion of 60-80%, compared to

approximately life-long 12.4% of 1stPT in the normal population.[25] BC patients, in particular, are at

least 3-5 times more likely to get a 2ndPT than the normal population.[28]

Source and time of late MET initiations

Dormant TCs

DTCs could be an inexhaustible source to initiate MET after PT removal.[29-31] The only argument for

their existence is the detection of vital TCs in the bone marrow.[32] Such TCs exist and are a prognostic

factor but probably not a relevant cause of METs. Improved diagnostics reveal more synchronous LR

and advanced PTs. More elaborate preparation of sentinel LN detects isolated tumor cells. Occult

METs of all sizes are also present in organs as the distributions of MET-free survival show (Fig.3B).

Late METs were usually initiated shortly before PTs were diagnosed and 10 or more years MET-free

time does not need to be bridged with dormancy. Successful ATs have been shortened to few

months from years ago.[33] This implies that even in large studies no relevant risk by METs could be

demonstrated that would have been initiated by dTCs in the previously longer treatment phase.

Therefore, also an ectopic evolution of TCs in niches should not be a relevant step in the MET-P. [6,34]

Thus, only the risk of MET initiation by TCs of the three sMETs has to be considered (Fig.2A).

True local recurrences

True LRs are not considered a source of MET because 39.2% LR after breast conserving surgery did

not result in a higher mortality in the seminal NSABP-B-06 study[11]. The high 4:1 risk found in meta-

analyzes has meanwhile been reduced to the subset of pN+ findings.[35,36] Such a constraint is not

plausible because survival curves show a continuously increasing MET-risk that starts at 0pLN*

(Fig.2E). This can be also shown by data of the MCR: in the subgroup of non-irradiated patients

where 38.7% of LRs occur without any effect on survival, which reproduces the results of the NSABP-

B-06 study.

Positive lymph nodes

Synchronous pLNs are not involved in MET seeding[37] , nor they have yielded convincing evidence of

cascade-like infiltration.[38,39] Long-growing PTs can infiltrate 10 or more LNs. If after a sentinel

extirpation a LN recurrence is diagnosed it is often a singular pLN, which does not infiltrate the

subsequent LN network like PTs. As mentioned above METs are also initiated when no LNs are

involved (Fig.2D). In none of any solid tumor radical LN dissection has resulted in a survival benefit.

This has been demonstrated for BC and more than 10 other tumor types and can also be logically

deduced from Fig.2D.[17,40,41] The more than a century old hypothesis of cascade-like spread cannot be

sustained.[42,43] Survival curves in Fig.2D-E show that the additional MET-risk decreases with each

additional pLN. Therefore, pLNs are dead ends within the MET process.[4]

Metastases

METs disseminate TCs with prognostic and predictive relevance.[44] However, cascade-like initiation is clinically difficult to detect because, due to growth periods, patients would generally not experience MET initiated by METs. However, there are studies which claim that each sMET can initiate tertiary METs. Estimates of initiation and growth of METs are usually not considered. In addition, any study must concede that "we cannot formally exclude an alternative explanation for the observed patterns, that each of these METs has seeded from an undetected subclone in the PT".[45] This risk can also be largely ruled out because multiple MET in different organs and their segments are often genetically different.[21,46] MET surgery data also points against this argument because, after R0-MET resections, no new proximal METs limit the successful local resection as in 60% LR (inclusive multifocal LR) of the PT without irradiation.[47] Taken together, this data supports the hypothesis that LRs, pLNs, and METs themselves most likely cannot initiate clinically relevant new METs themselves. Therefore, all sMETs and also 2ndPTs are already prevalent during the primary diagnosis (Fig.1), which are targeted by primary systemic ATs and/or radiotherapy.

Growth duration

The mechanisms of tumor growth remain largely unknown. From the smallest clusters of cells to angiogenesis in the more advanced disease phase and thereafter, tumor growth varies due to differential cell divisions inherent to the molecular subtypes and unknown apoptotic rates. In addition, there are dependencies for extravasation and colonization on the tumor microenvironment[24]. Nevertheless, growth duration can be estimated based on the initiation period (Fig.2B), prevalence, PT- and MET-free durations, and can be transformed in volume doubling times (VDT). The growth of tumor foci can be described by growth trajectories[48] that show the increase in the cell number over time (Fig.2H). For a cohort, the age distribution of occult METs at the time of diagnosis and their occurrence during the course of the disease can be elucidated.

The growth of PTs

The growth of PTs can lead to METs during the course of the disease. If there are about 1.3% M1 in pT1a but already 12.3% for pT3 and varying MET-free intervals depending on TD, then the growth of the PT is also a chronometer for simultaneously growing MET (Fig.2B). There are three approaches to this process: Estimates from screening data showed a median VDT for women aged 60-69 years between 10 to 20mm within 143 days.[49] If these growth rates also apply starting from a diameter of 2.5 mm (pT1a) the variability of the VDT with 25%/50% /75% percentiles of 65/143/308 days results in a growth time between 2.5 to 15 mm (pT1c) in 1.4/3.0/6.5 years (Fig.3A). The 25% percentile at 1.4 years is consistent with the approximately 25% that occur as interval cases in a biennial screening.[50] The growth time of HR+ preclinical BC, which can be influenced by hormone replacement therapy, are correspondingly longer. The mean age at diagnosis 60.9 / 61.7 / 64.6 for

pT1a-b / pT1c / pT2 also largely reflects PT growth. The great variability of VDT is also apparent for

molecular subtyping.[51] Since sMETs are rare in pT1a-PTs, it follows that all sMETs usually grow faster

than PTs.

The second approach is provided by prevention studies. From the first TC, with the above VDTs of

65/143/308 days after 32 VD, a median pT1c-PT would be achieved equivalent to 5.7/12.5/27.0 years

for PT growth. In keeping with this, prevention studies show a continued reduction in incidence even

15 years after the end of a 5 year endocrine chemoprevention.[26,52] Fifteen years of PT growth

corresponds to 171 days of VDs for 32 cell divisions. If the above 143 days are assumed this would

result in a median growth of 12.5 years. That means that at PT diagnosis most of contralateral

2ndPTs for the next 12.5 years are already prevalent. In about 2% of cases synchronous PTs are

detected. At the beginning of the mammography screening recommended for people aged 50 and

over, 4% PTs are not yet detectable but already prevalent, and will occur in the next 12.5 years. The

short-term increase of incidence by postmenopausal estrogen plus progestin therapy and its decline

after weaning can also be explained by the prevalence and growth stimulation of PTs.[53-55] The third

approach is provided by the estimation of MET growth from MET initiation to PT diagnosis.

The growth of METs

The growth of METs can be estimated using 4 vertices (Fig.2B): a lower limit for initiation starting at

about 1mm tumor size, the time points of PT and MET diagnosis, as well as tumor-related death. The

growth period for METs consists of the growth up to PT diagnosis and the MET-free time afterwards.

In the special case of primary MET the MET has grown parallel to the PT (Fig.2H). If METs were

initiated at 2.5mm, they would grow a median of 3.0/4.1 years parallel to the pT1c/pT2-PTs and

therefore must have more genomic differences to the PT than late-initiated METs.[56] In tumors of the

size pT2/pT3/pT4 about 4/12/27% are primarily metastasized. In the case of a primary M0 diagnosis

the distribution function of the MET-free time with a follow-up of more than 20 years results in

about 30% METs >10 years and a median of 6 years (Fig.3B).[57]

If T-N-M1 cases are also included, the distribution begins with a step corresponding to the proportion

of M1 in all courses of disease with MET (Fig.3B). A perfect regression results with the Gompertz

function y(%) = 98.9*exp(-1.82*exp(-0.19*t)) (-10 - t(years) - 20, MET with HR pos PTs, 1988-97). The

median MET-free times with T-N-M1 result in 2.0/4.8 years for HR neg/pos PTs or together 4.4. years.

The double is 8.8 years or 100 days for 1 VD and a plausible estimate for a median MET growth. The

MET growth varies similar to PT growth. The MET-free time and the time after MET already differ by

a factor of more than 2.4 solely based on the PT HR status (Fig.3B-C). But there is also a great

variability within these subgroups. If the MET-free time is divided into quintiles, then the 5-year

survival after MET is 10%/40% for the outer 20% limit values of approx. <1.5 and > 11 years

(Fig.3D).[58] The longer the MET-free time the more favorable the prognostic factors of the PTs are.

This also contradicts a continuous MET initiation from dTCs after R0 removal. METs that would not

be initiated until 5 or 10 years after PT diagnosis would have to grow very fast and most of them

would have to originate from triple negative PTs, which is not observed. Growth rate variability

reflects the distribution of event-free times, which are positively skewed with a long upper tail for

METs that occur without dormancy phases after 15 years or more. Despite the increase in MET

frequency with TD, MET is an autonomous process within molecular subgroups. Larger PTs do not

initiate more aggressive METs. According to this principle METs initiated early or later on grow

comparably fast (Figs.2H, 3C), therefore MET-competence of TCs is a qualitative not a quantitative

characteristic. METs can acquire additional mutations (Fig.1)[3] and become a moving target for

precision oncology, which does not seem to affect growth rates.

The growth of LRs

The growth of LRs can be read from two time durations: Late initiations of true LR occur immediately

before PT removal and are likely to have the longest LR-free times. This growth period of true LRs can

be read from the breast conserving surgery studies with and without radiation[35] and is about 6 years

(Fig.3E) because thereafter the slope of the cumulative incidence of LRs is the same in both groups.

The earliest initiations of true LRs results in 18% multifocal findings and without them the median LR-

free time is approximately 2.5 years and independent of follow-up (Fig.3E), while median ipsilateral

2ndPT-free time increases to half the follow-up time due to continuous initiation of PTs (Fig.2H).[59,60]

Six years of growth results in a VDT of about 68 days and 32 VDs, almost 2.1 as fast as that of the PTs.

The growth of pLNs

The growth of pLNs cannot be easily estimated because valid vertices in the form of pLN-free

intervals are lacking. In addition, LN dissections are frequent in pLNs and LN recurrences are rare.

According to data of the MCR in 100 patients with pT1b-BC (7.5 mm), 13% pN+ and a total of about

36 pLNs are to be expected. If PTs reach a diameter of 15mm after about 14 months, 42 more LNs

are infiltrated, in total 25% pLNs. In today's serial sentinel preparation, small PTs have about 12%

macro-METs and almost as many isolated TCs and micro-METs.[61,62] If the 12% newly infiltrated LNs

had a size of 0.2mm at 7.5mm (border between ITC and micro-MET) and then grew to a size of 2mm,

this results in a VDT of 43 days, 3.3 times that of PTs.[39]

MET-free and post-MET survival

338   The survival of a MET-related death is composed of three periods of MET growth (Fig. 2B), the time

339   to PT diagnosis, the MET-free time, and the post-MET survival. If PTs from 1mm TD can initiate MET,

340   then this will become even more likely with an increasing size of the PT. The longer a PT

341   disseminates, i.e. the larger the PT, the longer the occult MET growth and the shorter the MET-free

342   survival time. This also applies to pLNs. Of all METs 35% occur with 0pLNs. The MET-risk increases

when micro-METs are already detectable in LNs and it doubles when the first LN is positive (Fig. 2D).[39,61,62] If more LNs become positive these occult METs continue to grow, the MET-free intervals become increasingly shorter, with more than 15 pLNs PT and MET are diagnosed together in 20% of cases. The number of pLNs is the most important clinical prognostic factor, it may even be considered a chronometer for METs but not a cause thereof.[39,40] Nevertheless, extended LN dissections for MET-risk reduction unfortunately are still found in the literature.

True LRs are caused by disseminating PTs, which can also initiate METs in parallel to LNs and organs. As in the NSABP-B06 trial there is no MET-risk in MCR data. The group without radiation has an overall less favorable prognosis (Fig. 2F). In addition, the growth times of the MET do not match the 4:1 survival effect [35] that should occur without irradiation due to the not avoided LRs and their caused METs. The lack of MET-risk is also supported for synchronous true LR, i.e. multifocal findings, for which no increased MET-risk could be detected.[63,64] Progression data in Fig. 3B-D are easier to interpret if the progression-free times are not considered from diagnosis but from the initiation of the progressions, which occur about twice the median time before the progression detection (Fig.3D). Differences in growth are clearly recognizable in the long follow-up by the median of the MET-free periods of the subgroups.

The diagnosis of MET has no influence on MET growth. For this reason, all courses of the disease are synchronized with this point in time and the temporary post-MET survival reveals the influence of the various growth factors. Median post-MET survival varies e.g. at Ki67 between 0.7-3 years and is linearly correlated with the MET-free survival (Fig.3C). Since growth also varies by a factor of 10 or more with a qualitative characteristic such as HR status, there must be a quantitative molecular biomarker for the growth rate that correlates higher than the combination HR and Ki67.

A rare MET in pT1b-c is usually not a particularly aggressive tumor. Rather, the correlations show that larger PTs that later initiate MET, grow faster and pass on these growth characteristics to the MET. Therefore, the duration of the MET-free time is an important prognostic factor for survival after MET (Fig.3E). However, this variability is limited by the extent of the MET and the MET localization because e.g. median survival after bone and CNS-MET differ by the factor 3.1.[65]

Hypotheses about tumor growth and the MET process

Available evidence from well-known data about PT findings and the course of disease provide a plethora of facts and hypotheses about initiating, growth and effects of today's successful neo- and ATs. Neither initiation of METs by secondary foci nor a long-term delay through dormancy has been demonstrated. This could be summarized in an ***immediate MET initiation principle by the primary tumor,*** *e.g. without delay by dormant TCs*.

Growing PTs continuously initiate life-threatening METs. Derived from tumor-specific mortality, the
cumulative incidence of MET as a function of TD is also nonlinear and follows a Gompertz function.
This is a *growth dependent metastasis principle*: With every millimeter of a growing PT the
proportion of METs increases, with early and late MET being less frequent compared to the
maximum at the inflection point of the Gompertz function at 21mm. This random process leads to a
variability in the age of the MET at diagnosis and the MET-free time, which together give a mean
duration for MET growth of about 8,8 years (Fig.2H).

Growth rates of PTs and their METs can each differ by a factor of 10 and more with a long upper tail
(Fig.3A). Despite the great variability and molecular heterogeneity, the dissemination of TCs and
initiation of pLNs and METs, depending on TD, are likely comparable. The processes only take place
with varying speeds which can be considered a relativity principle, in other words *a time lapse*
principle. Therefore, the properties of 25% interval PTs are comparable to populations without
biennial screening despite their rapid growth[50], or early advanced PTs are not predominantly triple
negative PTs.

Triple negative or luminal A-PTs usually do not initiate contrary METs. That is, the relationship of the
growth rates of PTs and their METs varies only slightly (Fig.3F). The relationship must be greater than
1 because there are M1-PTs and it cannot be 10 or more because then there would be mostly M1-
PTs. The estimate of about 8.8 years of growth for MET and 12.5 years for PT results in the factor 1.4.
This growth relation can be seen as a relativity principle of the MET process, *a constant MET-PT*
growth relation principle.

Dissemination, acquisition of MET-competence, MET initiation, and growth rates are likely to be
independent principles. HR-status causes different growth rates and is the first target for treatment
but not a driver of the MET-P. The comparable tumor-specific long-term survival supports these
principles and is a challenge for gene expression tests (Fig.3G).[66]

Effect of adjuvant and neoadjuvant treatments

The principles of MET-P can explain successes, limitations, and opportunities of ATs and conversely
successful ATs can confirm MET-P principles. All secondary foci are already prevalent at primary
therapy because LRs, pLNs, and METs cannot be initiated after removal of the 1stPT. There are three
questions that remain about successful ATs: 1. From and up to what size are METs eradicated? 2.
How many METs are eradicated? 3. How long do ATs have to last? The same questions also apply to
occult contralateral and ipsilateral 2ndPTs, the latter due to the current practice of predominantly
breast conserving surgery.

Eradication of primary tumors

Complete pathological remissions of over 50% can be achieved with neo-ATs in a few weeks.[67-69] Endocrine therapies achieve a less complete remission, but downsizing and prolonged localized control of the PT are possible.[70-73] The lower efficacy of endocrine neo-ATs depends on the size of PTs, because the reduction of the incidence by chemoprevention starts after a short delay.[26,74] The delay is less than 3 VDs and can be interpreted as a lead time effect via the inclusion criteria of a negative mammography exam. Thus, prevention also works in the short term, especially under aromatase inhibitor treatment.[75] Since further 1stPTs are initiated during the 5 years in the prevention studies, the eradication of these smallest clusters becomes apparent 15 years later. This means that the prevention successfully eradicates about 50% PTs of all sizes up to a threshold of almost detectable 1stPTs. This is exactly how endocrine ATs act on 2ndPTs, and this has been confirmed many times on the contralateral 2ndPTs.[76] In both situations 1st and 2ndPTs of the next 12.5 years are prevalent at the beginning of prevention. There is no rationale for 5 years of prevention. On the contrary, the incidence curves suggest that shorter chemopreventions are possible.

Eradication of metastases

Overt METs have not been eradicable until today. This also applies to nearly detectable MET, because in clinical trials with (neo-) ATs the survival curves of MET-free time do not separate in the first months.[77-79] Thus, there is a size-dependent upper threshold for effectiveness comparable to chemoprevention. A lower limit is not recognizable from our historical data because successful ATs have achieved a uniform eradication of even the smallest METs (Fig.3H).

This is shown by the distribution of the number of pLNs: the fraction with 0pLN* and 1-3 pLNs is largely independent of the TD (Fig. 2E), but the mortality increases with each additional pLN (Fig.2D). In these subgroups, there are a similar number of small METs which can be destroyed by ATs. This explains the more than 10% improvement in survival seen in the past decades, independent of the PT size.[58,80] With a favorable prognosis (0pLN, pT1) the relative 5-year survival now reaches 99% (Fig:2C,D,G). [25]

Alternatives such as the selective eradication of early-initiated MET with few mutations or late-onset MET due to smaller foci are not recognizable (Fig.3H). However, the already mentioned successful ATs of the past few decades provide a selective eradication of METs: Nowadays, METs in bone and lung are about 50% and 30% less common, whereas there is no evidence of clinically relevant eradication in the liver and CNS METs until now. Such successful ATs produce a paradoxical effect. If the early bone METs become less frequent and the progression begins with the later CNS METs, then MET-free survival becomes longer and post-progression survival becomes shorter.[58,81] In contrast, the

MET pattern in T-N-M1 (at diagnosis) has not changed in the last decades because it is untreated and

mirrors the biology of BC.[65] A rationale for the duration of the therapies is not known.

The process is also explained when the effects of delayed treatments are considered.[82] If surgery is

postponed by a few weeks, further METs and pLNs are initiated with every additional millimeter of

TD. This is the contrary of the logic of screening to shorten the duration of the dissemination of the

PTs and thereby prevent METs (Fig. 2B-C). If ATs are started with a delay, there is initially the same

effect as if they were started immediately.[83] However, as all prevalent METs continued to grow

during the delay, there are fewer eradicable METs and some have exceeded the eradicability

threshold (Fig.2H).[83,84] That also suggests the effectiveness of short treatment durations and justifies

the AT question of "how short is short enough".

Eradication of LR and pLNs

Control of true LR is nearly perfect through irradiation. Radiation therapies even made breast

conserving surgery possible due to its exceptional efficacy in faster growing LRs compared to PTs

which are also prevalent in the form of ipsilateral 2ndPTs (Fig.3E).[11] Therefore, ATs may improve local

control of multifocal and multicenter LRs, the different origins of which should be shown by their

clonality.[85]

Regional control of pLNs is also achieved with today's surgical and neo-ATs making a LN relapse in

<5% of cases during a time span of 15 years a rare event. Survival is optimal if no residual tumor

remains after neo-AT primary and in the LNs.[67,69] Thus, ATs also contribute to regional control

because in the absence of an axillary dissection they act as neo-ATs on not removed LNs with isolated

TCs and micro-METs.[40,86]

Hypotheses about neo- and adjuvant treatments

Treatment cohorts of MCR and clinical studies suggest five most likely principles of treatment: First,

chemopreventions of 1stPT and 2ndPTs show that about 50% can be eradicated, regardless of

whether the PT develops during the therapy, is already prevalent and very small or almost

detectable. Secondly, with neo-AT a complete pathological remission is possible in 50%. Thirdly,

successful neo- and adjuvant therapies can also eradicate METs of all sizes until just before

detectability. In addition, an organ-specific effectiveness must be considered. Forthly, the eradication

of PTs and METs is achieved quickly, which can be derived from opening of survival curves and is

supported by successful shortening or unsuccessful extension of the treatment periods. Fifthly, this

data suggests the hypothesis that the rapid efficacy makes intrinsic resistance in PTs and METs more

likely than a therapy-induced resistance.[87]

Discussion of possible improvements

These principles of today's treatments are evident. However, they also illustrate the limits of treatment and an inadequate quantification of treatment-associated factors. These circumstances should motivate innovative steps in the optimization of treatment for PTs and METs. The first question concerns the required duration of successful treatments. If there is no rationale for the duration of a treatment regimen there will be both an under- and overtreatment. Longer treatment periods are more likely to be tested.[88] Optimization studies are problematic in terms of research ethics and not scientifically attractive. But there are also trials with shorter duration of ATs, e.g. also in colorectal cancers.[89,90] Real world data could help to fill this gap in knowledge. Considering personalized medicine targets in BC are already the standard of care. If PT growth can vary by a factor of 10 or more associating the duration of treatment to a biomarker for cell division could be a step to a more personalized treatment. A specific example is extended endocrine AT.[91-93] Although improved outcome is evident and also logical (Fig.2H), there is no rationale for long-term therapies. Therefore, the interpretation of the trial is questionable and the applicable principle from our data suggest a possible 70% reduction of overtreatment through intermittent therapies.[94] Further implications concern LN dissections and after-care. Despite many studies, pLNs are not a cause of MET and therefore extended LN dissections cannot be justified and the efficiency of expensive diagnostics in aftercare has not been shown, which can actually be explained with the principles presented.

Second, the long periods of growth lead to the issue of which occult foci are eradicated. MET-free times show that M1 or almost M1 are an upper limit of effectiveness. This also applies to chemoprevention, in which new PTs are also eradicated during therapy. This results in a de-escalation principle for ATs in the sense of "how short is short enough" instead of an overtreatment impulse with "how long is long enough".[95,96] Chemoprevention requires intermittent treatment because new PTs are created throughout a lifetime.

Third, the rapid and selective efficacy of therapies requires focus. At MET, efficacy is first coupled to the microenvironment. MET in bone and lung are reduced by successful ATs, CNS and liver are inaccessible and pharmacokinetic causes and molecular mechanism are discussed.[97] From prevention trials[26] we know that about 50% of HR+ PTs of all sizes may become resistant. The rapid eradication of PTs[67,79] and METs[98] within 1-2 VDs suggests that a non-responsive tumor is more of a consequence of intrinsic resistance mechanisms than of acquired ones.[99,100] This is also supported by the fact that there are many gene expression signatures that are predictive of poor outcome and whose genes influence estrogen receptors, apoptosis, or MET.[101] Meticulous observations, laboratory and mathematical models can further clarify the statements and shorten the path to innovation, especially because the described relationships are highly likely.

Conclusions

Clinical trials and real-world data with lifelong follow-up and progression-free and the post-progression survival elucidate dissemination of TCs, initiation and growth of sMET as well as PTs. Four principles describe tumor growth and the MET-P and form a framework for scientific terms, molecular hypotheses, and treatments. Dormancy and stepwise MET initiations by sMETs are not supported by data. Also, principles about neo- and ATs can be derived from data about successes and limits of preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic interventions. Tumor growth and successful changed MET patterns question the duration of preventive and ATs.

Primarily, real world cancer registry data should clarify how findings, treatments, or MET pattern change and which medical advances have a relevant impact on a population. With quantitative models[102] and comparative effectiveness analyzes [103,104] hypotheses about tumor growth and therapies can be derived and validated from the data. Feedback from this data analyzes can support delivery of care and improve its quality, especially when many outcome parameters are compared. Impulses for health care-relevant translational research can be given. Linking cancer registry data to biomaterial and sequencing data could accelerate interdisciplinary knowledge acquisition for innovation. Such expansions of the systematic use of available data can become a vast source of knowledge.

Appendices:

Disclosure: The authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgment

We thank the clinics, doctors and teams of the general practitioners, the departments of pathology

and radiation oncology for the systematic transfer of their findings and treatments. In particular, we

would like to thank the staff of the Munich Cancer Registry for their meticulous and systematic

recording and maintenance of the data. The Project Group Breast Cancer of our Comprehensive

Cancer Centers has regularly discussed questions and results with the MCR. Thank you very much.

Figures

Figure 1 Initiation and growth of a PT and secondary foci

Growing PTs can initiate LRs, pLNs and METs with different gene signature. They can be diagnosed synchronously with PTs (filled symbols), remain occult, will be eradicated by ATs or occur in the course of disease. (The article and this figure were inspired by LR Yates et al (2017).[3])

Figure 2: 2A – 2H combined

Legends Figure 2

(A) Tumor cell dissemination and initiation of LRs, pLNs, METs. (B) Tumor size dependent MET and pLN initiation and survival. I: METs can be initiated until the removal of a PT. II: PTs will initiate up to pT1c about 10% METs, 1.5% are already T-N-M1. III: During growth up to pT2, 4.5% become T-N-M1, 25% METs and 20.3% pLNs are additionally initiated which can be avoided by early detection at pT1. Equal rapid MET growth is outlined. Because of successful ATs, the percentages depend on the reference period and can therefore vary. (C)Relative* survival depending on tumor diameter for T-N-M0 PTs. (D) Relative* survival depending on the number of pLNs. The arrows are the same length. The length corresponds to the mortality of 20% in 0pLNs after 20 years. The arrows show the decreasing risk of the increasing number of pLNs. (E) Lymph node infiltration. Distribution of the number of pLNs in dependence on tumor diameter (n=30,170). Cumulative observed data (dotted lines) and fitted Gompertz functions (Gf) (solid lines) show for each TD the percentages with >npLNs. The dotted black line estimates the proportion of patients (0pLN*) with METs initiated during 0pLN-status. The length corresponds to the MET-risk of 0pLNs and 1pLN in Fig. 2D. The black line is the fitted Gf for the observed tumor specific 15-year mortality (diamonds) depending on TD. The stacked barplot visualizes the distribution of pLNs at 22.5mm TD. (F) Overall survival for patients with pT1-2 PTs, breast conserving surgery and irradiation. The blue dotted and dashed subgroups are samples with the same distribution of age, pT and LNs as the subgroup without radiation (brown curve), which is further divided according to the occurrence of LRs. (G) Relative* survival for pT1c and pT2 PTs and 4 time periods from 1978. The improvement after 15 years is about 10% absolute in both subgroups. (H) Growth trajectories for MET and 2ndPTs. Each trajectory describes the number of TCs (log scale) as a function of a median growth time (8 MET or 12 PT years) relative to the PT. The age of a MET or 2ndPT at the time of diagnosis of the 1stPT indicate the age scales. The sum of age and event-free survival is on average constant. Blue trajectories represent synchronous events, black ones for 2nPTs, which are initiated after PT diagnosis. The age distributions of METs are snapshots at the time of PT diagnosis and a delayed time afterwards. Since no new METs are initiated, there are no small METs for delayed ATs and the larger ones have already been discovered.

*The relative survival is an estimate for tumor-specific survival and is calculated by dividing the overall survival after diagnosis by the survival observed in the general population with comparable age distribution.

577 **Figure 3:** 3A – 3H combined

Legends Figure 3

(A) Volume doubling and tumor growth. Growth durations of PTs from 2.5mm depending on estimates of the 25% / 50% / 75% percentiles VDTs according to H. Weedon-Fekjaer 49 The variability is illustrated by the growth times from 2.5 mm up to pT1c or pT2-PT. **(B)** Hormone receptor dependent MET-free survival. Distribution functions of the MET-free times for T-N-M0 and HR positive (red) and HR negative (blue) PTs from the time periods 1988-97 and 1998-2007. Because of the observation period of 20 years the distributions from 1998-2007 reach almost 100% at 20 years. About 30% of the MET appear after 10 years. The dashed lines also show the fraction of T-N-M1 for 1988-97 **(C)** Cumulative incidence of METs and survival after MET depending on KI67. The median survival at T-N-M0 in the event of tumor-related death for the two outer subgroups is approximately 3.1 and 1.5 years. The post MET survival curves are covered at 22%. **(D)** Cumulative incidence of LRs after breast conserving surgery with and without irradiation. Black dotted lines are parallels and show that late LRs increases in both groups comparable to the incidence of contralateral 2ndPT. The dotted blue curve is similar to those for LRs without irradiation and is the fictive initiation of true LR after forwarding the twofold LR-free time of about 26 months. **(E)** Overall survival from MET of HR+ PTs as a function of MET-free time. PTs are diagnosed between 1988-2006 with > 20 years follow-up and n=8,127 METs observed. The differences of PTs of the 1st and 5th Quintile (<1.5, ≥11 ys) are 12.4/36.9% for 5 years survival, 23.9%/45.7% for pT1 and 18.3 / 42.4% for pN0. **(F)** MET-PT growth relation principle. Relation of tumor growth of PTs and METs (pT1,pT2), MET-free survival and post MET-survival (red) at different growth rates.[49] **(G)** Relative survival of HR positive and negative PTs. **(H)** Time trend of bone MET-free survival. Cumulative incidence of bone METs as a function of 4 time periods since 1978. (Kaplan-Meier method without concurrent risks) The black lines sketch fictitious selective eradication of early (dashed) or late (dottet) initiated METs alternative to green line.

 Supplement: 16 Figures 2A-3H shown individually with a higher resolution

604 **Figure 2A** Tumor cell dissemination and initiation of LRs, pLNs, METs
605

Figure 2B Tumor size dependent MET and pLN initiation and survival
I: METs can be initiated until the removal of a PT. **II**: PTs will initiate up to pT1c about 10% METs,
1.5% are already T-N-M1. **III**: During growth up to pT2, 4.5% become T-N-M1, 25% METs and 20.3%
pLNs are additionally initiated which can be avoided by early detection at pT1. Equal rapid MET
growth is outlined. Because of successful ATs, the percentages depend on the reference period and
can therefore vary.

Figure 2C Tumor diameter

Relative* survival depending on tumor diameter for T-N-M0 PTs.

*The relative survival is an estimate for tumor-specific survival and is calculated by dividing the overall survival
after diagnosis by the survival observed in the general population with comparable age distribution.

Figure 2D positive LNs
Relative survival depending on the number of pLNs. The arrows are the same length. The length
corresponds to the mortality of 20% in 0pLNs after 20 years. The arrows show the decreasing risk of
the increasing number of pLNs.

Figure 2E Lymph node infiltration
Distribution of the number of pLNs in dependence on tumor diameter (n=30,170). Cumulative
observed data (dotted lines) and fitted Gompertz functions (Gf) (solid lines) show for each TD the
percentages with >npLNs. The dotted black line estimates the proportion of patients (0pLN*) with
METs initiated during 0pLN-status. The length corresponds to the MET-risk of 0pLNs and 1pLN in Fig.
2D. The black line is the fitted Gf for the observed tumor specific 15-year mortality (diamonds)
depending on TD. The stacked barplot visualizes the distribution of pLNs at 22.5mm TD.
631

633 **Figure 2F** Overall survival after breast conserving surgery and irradiation
634 Overall survival for patients with pT1-2 PTs, breast conserving surgery and irradiation. The blue
635 dotted and dashed subgroups are samples with the same distribution of age, pT and LNs as the
636 subgroup without radiation (brown curve), which is further divided according to the occurrence of
637 LRs.

 Figure 2G Trend: relative Survival depending on pT1-2

Relative survival for pT1c and pT2 PTs and 4 time periods from 1978. The improvement after 15 years

is about 10% absolute in both subgroups

Figure 2H Growth trajectories

Growth trajectories for MET and 2ndPTs. Each trajectory describes the number of TCs (log scale) as a

function of a median growth time (8 MET or 12 PT years) relative to the PT. The age of a MET or

2ndPT at the time of diagnosis of the 1stPT indicate the age scales. The sum of age and event-free

survival is on average constant. Blue trajectories represent synchronous events, black ones for 2nPTs,

which are initiated after PT diagnosis. The age distributions of METs are snapshots at the time of PT

diagnosis and a delayed time afterwards. Since no new METs are initiated, there are no small METs

for delayed ATs and the larger ones have already been discovered.

Figure 3A Volume doubling and tumor growth

Growth durations of PTs from 2.5mm depending on estimates of the 25% / 50% / 75% percentiles

VDTs according to H. Weedon-Fekjaer [49] The variability is illustrated by the growth times from 2.5

mm up to pT1c or pT2-PT.

Figure 3B Hormone receptor dependent MET-free survival

Distribution functions of the MET-free times for T-N-M0 and HR positive (red) and HR negative (blue)

PTs from the time periods 1988-97 and 1998-2007. Because of the observation period of 20 years the

distributions from 1998-2007 reach almost 100% at 20 years. About 30% of the MET appear after 10

years. The dashed lines also show the fraction of T-N-M1 for 1988-97.

Figure 3C Cumulative incidence of METs and survival after MET depending on KI67.
The median survival at T-N-M0 in the event of tumor-related death for the two outer subgroups is
approximately 3.1 and 1.5 years. The post MET survival curves are covered at 22%.

Figure 3D Cumulative incidence of LRs after breast conserving surgery with and without irradiation.
Black dotted lines are parallels and show that late LRs increases in both groups comparable to the
incidence of contralateral 2ndPT. The dotted blue curve is similar to those for LRs without irradiation
and is the fictive initiation of true LR after forwarding the twofold LR-free time of about 26 months.

Figure 3E Overall survival from MET of HR+ PTs as a function of MET-free time
PTs are diagnosed between 1988-2006 with > 20 years follow-up and n=8,127 METs observed. The
differences of PTs of the 1st and 5th Quintile (<1.5, ≥11 ys) are 12.4/36.9% for 5 years survival,
23.9%/45.7% for pT1 and 18.3 / 42.4% for pN0.

Figure 3F MET-PT growth relation principle
Relation of tumor growth of PTs and METs (pT1,pT2), MET-free survival and post MET-survival (red)
at different growth rates [49]

Figure 3G Relative survival of HR positive and negative PTs.

Figure 3H Time trend of bone-MET-free survival
Cumulative incidence of bone METs as a function of 4 time periods since 1978. (Kaplan-Meier
method without concurrent risks) The black lines sketch fictitious selective eradication of early
(dashed) or late (dottet) initiated METs alternative to green line.

References:

1. Valastyan S, Weinberg RA: Tumor metastasis: molecular insights and evolving paradigms. Cell 147:275-92, 2011

2. Hanahan D, Weinberg RA: Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. Cell 144:646-74, 2011

3. Yates LR, Knappskog S, Wedge D, et al: Genomic Evolution of Breast Cancer Metastasis and Relapse. Cancer Cell 32:169-184.e7, 2017

4. Lambert AW, Pattabiraman DR, Weinberg RA: Emerging Biological Principles of Metastasis. Cell 168:670-691, 2017

5. Peinado H, Zhang H, Matei IR, et al: Pre-metastatic niches: organ-specific homes for metastases. Nat Rev Cancer 17:302-317, 2017

6. Husemann Y, Geigl JB, Schubert F, et al: Systemic spread is an early step in breast cancer. Cancer Cell 13:58-68, 2008

7. Narod SA, Sopik V: Is invasion a necessary step for metastases in breast cancer? Breast Cancer Res Treat 169:9-23, 2018

8. Butler TP, Gullino PM: Quantitation of cell shedding into efferent blood of mammary adenocarcinoma. Cancer Res 35:512-6, 1975

9. Menyailo ME, Tretyakova MS, Denisov EV: Heterogeneity of Circulating Tumor Cells in Breast Cancer: Identifying Metastatic Seeds. Int J Mol Sci 21, 2020

10. Cresswell GD, Nichol D, Spiteri I, et al: Mapping the breast cancer metastatic cascade onto ctDNA using genetic and epigenetic clonal tracking. Nat Commun 11, 2020

11. Fisher B, Anderson S, Bryant J, et al: Twenty-year follow-up of a randomized trial comparing total mastectomy, lumpectomy, and lumpectomy plus irradiation for the treatment of invasive breast cancer. N Engl J Med 347:1233-41, 2002

12. Panet-Raymond V, Truong PT, McDonald RE, et al: True recurrence versus new primary: an analysis of ipsilateral breast tumor recurrences after breast-conserving therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 81:409-17, 2011

13. Whipp E, Beresford M, Sawyer E, et al: True local recurrence rate in the conserved breast after magnetic resonance imaging-targeted radiotherapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 76:984-90, 2010

14. Comen E, Norton L: Self-seeding in cancer. Recent Results Cancer Res 195:13-23, 2012

15. Kim MY, Oskarsson T, Acharyya S, et al: Tumor self-seeding by circulating cancer cells. Cell 139:1315-26, 2009

16. Brierley JD, Gospodarowicz MK, Wittekind C, et al: The TNM Classification of Malignant Tumours 8th ed. Wiley & Sons, 2016

17. Engel J, Weichert W, Jung A, et al: Lymph node infiltration, parallel metastasis and treatment success in breast cancer. Breast 48:1-6, 2019

18. Mamounas EP, Kuehn T, Rutgers EJT, et al: Current approach of the axilla in patients with early-stage breast cancer. Lancet, 2017

19. Munich Cancer Registry: http://www.tumorregister-muenchen.de/en/ (accessed March 20, 2020).

20. Turajlic S, Swanton C: Metastasis as an evolutionary process. Science 352:169-75, 2016

21. Yachida S, Jones S, Bozic I, et al: Distant metastasis occurs late during the genetic evolution of pancreatic cancer. Nature 467:1114-7, 2010

22. Zhang XH, Jin X, Malladi S, et al: Selection of bone metastasis seeds by mesenchymal signals in the primary tumor stroma. Cell 154:1060-73, 2013

23. Bos PD, Zhang XH, Nadal C, et al: Genes that mediate breast cancer metastasis to the brain. Nature 459:1005-9, 2009

24. Weiss L: Comments on hematogenous metastatic patterns in humans as revealed by autopsy. Clin Exp Metastasis 10:191-9, 1992

25. Noone A, Howlader N, Krapcho M, et al: SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2015 National Cancer Institute. Bethesda, MD,: http://seer.cancer.gov/ (accessed March 20, 2020).

26.   Cuzick J, Sestak I, Cawthorn S, et al: Tamoxifen for prevention of breast cancer:
extended long-term follow-up of the IBIS-I breast cancer prevention trial. Lancet Oncol 16:67-75,
2015
27.   Gail MH, Brinton LA, Byar DP, et al: Projecting individualized probabilities of
developing breast cancer for white females who are being examined annually. J Natl Cancer Inst
81:1879-86, 1989
28.   Chaudary MA, Millis RR, Hoskins EO, et al: Bilateral primary breast cancer: a
prospective study of disease incidence. Br J Surg 71:711-4, 1984
29.   Aguirre-Ghiso JA, Bragado P, Sosa MS: Metastasis Awakening: Targeting dormant
cancer. Nat Med 19:276-7, 2013
30.   Oskarsson T, Batlle E, Massague J: Metastatic stem cells: sources, niches, and vital
pathways. Cell Stem Cell 14:306-21, 2014
31.   Meng S, Tripathy D, Frenkel EP, et al: Circulating tumor cells in patients with breast
cancer dormancy. Clin Cancer Res 10:8152-62, 2004
32.   Janni W, Vogl FD, Wiedswang G, et al: Persistence of disseminated tumor cells in the
bone marrow of breast cancer patients predicts increased risk for relapse--a European pooled
analysis. Clin Cancer Res 17:2967-76, 2011
33.   Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group: Systemic treatment of early breast
cancer by hormonal, cytotoxic, or immune therapy. 133 randomised trials involving 31,000
recurrences and 24,000 deaths among 75,000 women. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative
Group. Lancet 339:71-85, 1992
34.   Hunter KW, Amin R, Deasy S, et al: Genetic insights into the morass of metastatic
heterogeneity. Nat Rev Cancer 18:211-223, 2018
35.   Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group: Effects of radiotherapy and of
differences in the extent of surgery for early breast cancer on local recurrence and 15-year survival:
an overview of the randomised trials. Lancet 366:2087-106, 2005
36.   Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group: Effect of radiotherapy after breast-
conserving surgery on 10-year recurrence and 15-year breast cancer death: meta-analysis of
individual patient data for 10 801 women in 17 randomised trials. Lancet 378:1707-16, 2011
37.   Ullah I, Karthik GM, Alkodsi A, et al: Evolutionary history of metastatic breast cancer
reveals minimal seeding from axillary lymph nodes. J Clin Invest 128:1355-1370, 2018
38.   Cady B: Lymph node metastases. Indicators, but not governors of survival. Arch Surg
119:1067-72, 1984
39.   Engel J, Emeny RT, Holzel D: Positive lymph nodes do not metastasize. Cancer
Metastasis Rev 31:235-246, 2012
40.   Giuliano AE, Ballman KV, McCall L, et al: Effect of Axillary Dissection vs No Axillary
Dissection on 10-Year Overall Survival Among Women With Invasive Breast Cancer and Sentinel Node
Metastasis: The ACOSOG Z0011 (Alliance) Randomized Clinical Trial. Jama 318:918-926, 2017
41.   Engel J, Lebeau A, Sauer H, et al: Are we wasting our time with the sentinel
technique? Fifteen reasons to stop axilla dissection. Breast 15:452-5, 2006
42.   Halsted W: The results of operations for the cure of the cancer of the breast
performed at the Johns Hopkins Hospital from June 1889 to January 1894. Arch Surgery 20:497, 1894
43.   Crile G: Excision of cancer of the head and neck. JAMA 47:1780-1786, 1906
44.   Cristofanilli M, Budd GT, Ellis MJ, et al: Circulating tumor cells, disease progression,
and survival in metastatic breast cancer. N Engl J Med 351:781-91, 2004
45.   Gundem G, Van Loo P, Kremeyer B, et al: The evolutionary history of lethal
metastatic prostate cancer. Nature 520:353-357, 2015
46.   Ramaswamy S, Ross KN, Lander ES, et al: A molecular signature of metastasis in
primary solid tumors. Nat Genet 33:49-54, 2003
47.   Hölzel D, Eckel R, Emeny R, et al: Distant metastases do not metastasize. Cancer
Metastasis Rev 29:737-750, 2010
48.   Spratt JA, von Fournier D, Spratt JS, et al: Decelerating growth and human breast
cancer. Cancer 71:2013-9, 1993

49.   Weedon-Fekjaer H, Lindqvist BH, Vatten LJ, et al: Breast cancer tumor growth
estimated through mammography screening data. Breast Cancer Res 10:R41, 2008
50.   Houssami N, Hunter K: The epidemiology, radiology and biological characteristics of
interval breast cancers in population mammography screening. NPJ Breast Cancer 3:12, 2017
51.   Zhang S, Ding Y, Zhou Q, et al: Correlation Factors Analysis of Breast Cancer Tumor
Volume Doubling Time Measured by 3D-Ultrasound. Med Sci Monit 23:3147-3153, 2017
52.   Cuzick J: Preventive therapy for cancer. Lancet Oncol 18:e472-e482, 2017
53.   Chlebowski RT, Kuller LH, Prentice RL, et al: Breast cancer after use of estrogen plus
progestin in postmenopausal women. N Engl J Med 360:573-87, 2009
54.   Chlebowski RT, Hendrix SL, Langer RD, et al: Influence of estrogen plus progestin on
breast cancer and mammography in healthy postmenopausal women: the Women's Health Initiative
Randomized Trial. JAMA 289:3243-53, 2003
55.   Engel J, Schubert-Fritschle G, Hölzel D: Hormone replacement therapy and elevated
breast cancer risk: An artifact of growth acceleration? MEDRXIV/2020/050708, 2020
56.   Bertucci F, Ng CKY, Patsouris A, et al: Genomic characterization of metastatic breast
cancers. Nature 569:560-564, 2019
57.   Pan H, Gray R, Braybrooke J, et al: 20-Year Risks of Breast-Cancer Recurrence after
Stopping Endocrine Therapy at 5 Years. N Engl J Med 377:1836-1846, 2017
58.   Hölzel D, Eckel R, Bauerfeind I, et al: Improved systemic treatment for early breast
cancer improves cure rates, modifies metastatic pattern and shortens post-metastatic survival: 35-
year results from the Munich Cancer Registry. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 143:1701-12, 2017
59.   McGrath S, Antonucci J, Goldstein N, et al: Long-term patterns of in-breast failure in
patients with early stage breast cancer treated with breast-conserving therapy: a molecular based
clonality evaluation. Am J Clin Oncol 33:17-22, 2010
60.   Smith TE, Lee D, Turner BC, et al: True recurrence vs. new primary ipsilateral breast
tumor relapse: an analysis of clinical and pathologic differences and their implications in natural
history, prognoses, and therapeutic management. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 48:1281-9, 2000
61.   Colleoni M, Rotmensz N, Peruzzotti G, et al: Size of breast cancer metastases in
axillary lymph nodes: clinical relevance of minimal lymph node involvement. J Clin Oncol 23:1379-89,
2005
62.   de Boer M, van Deurzen CH, van Dijck JA, et al: Micrometastases or isolated tumor
cells and the outcome of breast cancer. N Engl J Med 361:653-63, 2009
63.   Pedersen L, Gunnarsdottir KA, Rasmussen BB, et al: The prognostic influence of
multifocality in breast cancer patients. Breast 13:188-93, 2004
64.   O'Daly BJ, Sweeney KJ, Ridgway PF, et al: The accuracy of combined versus largest
diameter in staging multifocal breast cancer. J Am Coll Surg 204:282-5, 2007
65.   Hölzel D, Eckel R, Bauerfeind I, et al: Survival of de novo stage IV breast cancer
patients over three decades. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 143:509-19, 2017
66.   Colleoni M, Sun Z, Price KN, et al: Annual Hazard Rates of Recurrence for Breast
Cancer During 24 Years of Follow-Up: Results From the International Breast Cancer Study Group
Trials I to V. J Clin Oncol 34:927-35, 2016
67.   Cortazar P, Zhang L, Untch M, et al: Pathological complete response and long-term
clinical benefit in breast cancer: the CTNeoBC pooled analysis. Lancet 384:164-72, 2014
68.   Robidoux A, Tang G, Rastogi P, et al: Lapatinib as a component of neoadjuvant
therapy for HER2-positive operable breast cancer (NSABP protocol B-41): an open-label, randomised
phase 3 trial. Lancet Oncol 14:1183-92, 2013
69.   von Minckwitz G, Untch M, Blohmer JU, et al: Definition and impact of pathologic
complete response on prognosis after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in various intrinsic breast cancer
subtypes. J Clin Oncol 30:1796-804, 2012
70.   Fontein DB, Charehbili A, Nortier JW, et al: Efficacy of six month neoadjuvant
endocrine therapy in postmenopausal, hormone receptor-positive breast cancer patients--a phase II
trial. Eur J Cancer 50:2190-200, 2014

71.   Fentiman IS, Christiaens MR, Paridaens R, et al: Treatment of operable breast cancer
in the elderly: a randomised clinical trial EORTC 10851 comparing tamoxifen alone with modified
radical mastectomy. Eur J Cancer 39:309-16, 2003

72.   Spring LM, Gupta A, Reynolds KL, et al: Neoadjuvant Endocrine Therapy for Estrogen
Receptor-Positive Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA Oncol 2:1477-1486,
2016

73.   Ellis MJ, Suman VJ, Hoog J, et al: Ki67 Proliferation Index as a Tool for Chemotherapy
Decisions During and After Neoadjuvant Aromatase Inhibitor Treatment of Breast Cancer: Results
From the American College of Surgeons Oncology Group Z1031 Trial (Alliance). J Clin Oncol 35:1061-
1069, 2017

74.   Fisher B, Costantino JP, Wickerham DL, et al: Tamoxifen for the prevention of breast
cancer: current status of the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project P-1 study. J Natl
Cancer Inst 97:1652-62, 2005

75.   Cuzick J, Sestak I, Forbes JF, et al: Use of anastrozole for breast cancer prevention
(IBIS-II): long-term results of a randomised controlled trial. Lancet 395:117-22, 2020

76.   Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group: Tamoxifen for early breast cancer:
an overview of the randomised trials. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group. Lancet
351:1451-67, 1998

77.   Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group: Relevance of breast cancer
hormone receptors and other factors to the efficacy of adjuvant tamoxifen: patient-level meta-
analysis of randomised trials. Lancet 378:771-84, 2011

78.   Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group: Comparisons between different
polychemotherapy regimens for early breast cancer: meta-analyses of long-term outcome among
100,000 women in 123 randomised trials. Lancet 379:432-44, 2012

79.   Cameron D, Piccart-Gebhart MJ, Gelber RD, et al: 11 years' follow-up of trastuzumab
after adjuvant chemotherapy in HER2-positive early breast cancer: final analysis of the HERceptin
Adjuvant (HERA) trial. Lancet 389:1195-1205, 2017

80.   Welch HG, Prorok PC, O'Malley AJ, et al: Breast-Cancer Tumor Size, Overdiagnosis,
and Mammography Screening Effectiveness. N Engl J Med 375:1438-1447, 2016

81.   Jurrius P, Green T, Garmo H, et al: Invasive breast cancer over four decades reveals
persisting poor metastatic outcomes in treatment resistant subgroup - the "ATRESS" phenomenon.
Breast 50:39-48, 2020

82.   Hanna TP, King WD, Thibodeau S, et al: Mortality due to cancer treatment delay:
systematic review and meta-analysis. Bmj 371:m4087, 2020

83.   Delozier T, Switsers O, Genot JY, et al: Delayed adjuvant tamoxifen: ten-year results
of a collaborative randomized controlled trial in early breast cancer (TAM-02 trial). Ann Oncol
11:515-9, 2000

84.   Veronesi A, Miolo G, Magri MD, et al: Late tamoxifen in patients previously operated
for breast cancer without postoperative tamoxifen: 5-year results of a single institution randomised
study. BMC Cancer 10:205, 2010

85.   Kim H, Kim CY, Park KH, et al: Clonality analysis of multifocal ipsilateral breast
carcinomas using X-chromosome inactivation patterns. Hum Pathol 78:106-114, 2018

86.   Mamtani A, Patil S, Stempel M, et al: Axillary Micrometastases and Isolated Tumor
Cells Are Not an Indication for Post-Mastectomy Radiotherapy in Stage 1 and 2 Breast Cancer. Ann
Surg Oncol 24:2182-8, 2017

87.   Razavi P, Chang MT, Xu G, et al: The Genomic Landscape of Endocrine-Resistant
Advanced Breast Cancers. Cancer Cell 34:427-438.e6, 2018

88.   Goldhirsch A, Gelber RD, Piccart-Gebhart MJ, et al: 2 years versus 1 year of adjuvant
trastuzumab for HER2-positive breast cancer (HERA): an open-label, randomised controlled trial.
Lancet 382:1021-8, 2013

89.   Pivot X, Romieu G, Debled M, et al: 6 months versus 12 months of adjuvant
trastuzumab for patients with HER2-positive early breast cancer (PHARE): a randomised phase 3 trial.
Lancet Oncol 14:741-8, 2013

90.   Petrelli F, Rulli E, Labianca R, et al: Overall survival with 3 or 6 months of adjuvant
chemotherapy in Italian TOSCA Phase 3 Randomized Trial. Ann Oncol, 2020
91.   Davies C, Pan H, Godwin J, et al: Long-term effects of continuing adjuvant tamoxifen
to 10 years versus stopping at 5 years after diagnosis of oestrogen receptor-positive breast cancer:
ATLAS, a randomised trial. Lancet 381:805-16, 2013
92.   Curigliano G, Burstein HJ, E PW, et al: De-escalating and escalating treatments for
early-stage breast cancer: the St. Gallen International Expert Consensus Conference on the Primary
Therapy of Early Breast Cancer 2017. Ann Oncol 28:1700-1712, 2017
93.   Burstein HJ, Lacchetti C, Anderson H, et al: Adjuvant Endocrine Therapy for Women
With Hormone Receptor-Positive Breast Cancer: ASCO Clinical Practice Guideline Focused Update. J
Clin Oncol 37:423-438, 2019
94.   Engel J, Schubert-Fritschle G, Emeny R, et al: Breast cancer: Are long-term and
intermittent endocrine therapies equally effective? J Cancer Res Clin Oncol, 2020
95.   Smith IE, Yeo B, Schiavon G: The optimal duration and selection of adjuvant
endocrine therapy for breast cancer: how long is enough? Am Soc Clin Oncol Educ Book:e16-24, 2014
96.   Peto R: Five years of tamoxifen--or more? J Natl Cancer Inst 88:1791-3, 1996
97.   Minchinton AI, Tannock IF: Drug penetration in solid tumours. Nat Rev Cancer 6:583-
92, 2006
98.   Conte P, Frassoldati A, Bisagni G, et al: 9 weeks vs 1 year adjuvant trastuzumab in
combination with chemotherapy: final results of the phase III randomized Short-HER study. Ann
Oncol, 2018
99.   Holohan C, Van Schaeybroeck S, Longley DB, et al: Cancer drug resistance: an
evolving paradigm. Nat Rev Cancer 13:714-26, 2013
100.   Jeselsohn R, Buchwalter G, De Angelis C, et al: ESR1 mutations-a mechanism for
acquired endocrine resistance in breast cancer. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 12:573-83, 2015
101.   Musgrove EA, Sutherland RL: Biological determinants of endocrine resistance in
breast cancer. Nat Rev Cancer 9:631-43, 2009
102.   Altrock PM, Liu LL, Michor F: The mathematics of cancer: integrating quantitative
models. Nat Rev Cancer 15:730-45, 2015
103.   Hershman DL, Wright JD: Comparative effectiveness research in oncology
methodology: observational data. J Clin Oncol 30:4215-22, 2012
104.   Concato J, Lawler EV, Lew RA, et al: Observational methods in comparative
effectiveness research. Am J Med 123:e16-23, 2010