# Psychological morbidity in women diagnosed with ductal carcinoma in-situ compared to women with early breast cancer receiving radiotherapy

William Pidduck MD(C), Bo Angela Wan MD(C), Liying Zhang PhD, Eileen Rakovitch MD, Selina Chow BHSc(C), Stephanie Chan BSc(C), Caitlin Yee BSc(C), Leah Drost BSc(C), Philomena Sousa MBA, Donna Lewis MRT(T), Henry Lam MLS, Eric Leung MD, Edward Chow MBBS

Odette Cancer Centre, Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada;





## **Background**

- ❖Ductal carcinoma in-situ (DCIS) is an early-stage noninvasive condition with limited potential for metastatic spread¹-².
- ❖Studies have described similar patient-reported levels of fear regarding breast cancer recurrence and death when comparing women with DCIS to women with early invasive breast cancer (EIBC)³.
- Patient anxiety and depression can have tangible impacts on treatment decisions and preferred intervention

### **Materials and Methods**

- ❖Population: Patients diagnosed with DCIS or EIBC (Stage I or II breast cancer) from 2011-2017 who had >1 Edmonton Symptom Assessment Scale (ESAS) completed pre- and post-radiotherapy (RT)
- ❖Data on systemic treatment, radiation, patient demographics and disease stage were extracted from existing databases. Psychological morbidity was evaluated through measurement of depression, anxiety and overall wellbeing within the ESAS.

**Table 2:** ESAS Scores before and after RT in Group 1 (DCIS), Group 2 (EIBC) and Group 3 (EIBC No Chemotherapy)

	Group 1 (N=137)	Group 2 (N=963)	1 vs 2 p-value	Group 3 (N=518)	1 vs 3 p-value		
ESAS before RT							
Depression							
Mean	1.25	1.65	0.0060	1.61	0.0385		
Anxiety							
Mean	2.20	2.41	0.2574	2.58	0.0969		
Wellbeing							
Mean	2.43	2.63	0.0780	2.46	0.4919		
ESAS after RT							
Depression							
Mean	1.27	1.66	0.1176	1.70	0.2446		
Anxiety							
Mean	1.63	2.10	0.0486	2.14	0.0684		
Wellbeing							
Mean	2.34	2.68	0.1231	2.71	0.1542		

## Results

From a total population of 1224 patients this study included 3 study groups (table 1).

**Table 1:** Characteristics and size of study groups

	Inclusion Criteria	Number (N)	% of total
Group 1:	DCIS	137	11
Group 2:	EIBC (Stage I/II)	963	79
**Group 3:	EIBC (Stage I/II) no Chemotherapy	518	42
Group 4: Excluded	Advanced Disease (Stage III/IV)	124	10

- \*\*Note: Group 3 is a subset of Group 2 not receiving chemotherapy
- ❖ESAS was completed on average 28 days before RT (baseline) and 142 days after RT

#### ❖Group 1 vs. 2

- <u>Baseline:</u> Patient in Group 2 had significantly higher baseline depression scores that those in Group 1 (p=0.006) (Table 2)
- Post RT: Patients in Group 2 had higher anxiety scores after RT compared to those in Group 1 (p=0.049) (Table 2)

#### ❖Group 1 vs. 3

- <u>Baseline</u>: Patients from Group 3 had significantly higher baseline depression scores (more depressive symptoms) compared to Group 1 (p=0.039) (Table 2)
- <u>Post RT:</u> Differences between groups failed to reach statistical significance
- Discrete Changes Pre to Post Therapy
- No differences observed between groups

#### **Discussion/Conclusion**

#### Limitations

- Retrospective design
- No adjustment for comorbidities
- Differences in patient response time post radiation
- Conclusions
- Diagnosis of DCIS seems to carry less psychological impact than a diagnosis of EIBC
- Accurate understanding of breast cancer related risk is essential for women with DCIS to make a rational, informed choice about their treatment options

#### References

- 1. Ernster VL, Ballard-Barbash R, Barlow WE, Zheng Y, Weaver DL, Cutter G et al (2002) Detection of ductal carcinoma in situ in women undergoing screening mammography. J Natl Cancer Inst 94(20):1546–1554
- 2. Siegel R, J MJ, Zou Z, Jemal A (2014) Cancer statistics, 2014. CA Cancer J Clin 64(1):9–29
- 3. Rakovitch, E., Franssen, E., Kim, J., Ackerman, I., Pignol, J., & Paszat, L. et al. (2003). A Comparison of Risk Perception and Psychological Morbidity in Women with Ductal Carcinoma in situ and Early Invasive Breast Cancer. Breast Cancer Research And Treatment, 77(3), 285-293.