

Updated Clinical and Dosimetric Recommendations for Yttrium-90 Glass Microspheres in Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC)

Riad Salem,¹ Siddharth A Padia,² Marnix Lam,³ Carlo Chiesa,⁴ Paul Haste,⁵ Bruno Sangro,⁶ Beau Toskich,⁷ Kirk Fowers,⁸ Joseph M. Herman,⁹ S. Cheenu Kappadath,¹⁰ Thomas Leung,¹¹ Daniel Y. Sze,¹² Edward Kim,¹³ Etienne Garin¹⁴

¹Northwestern Feinberg School of Medicine, USA ²University of California-Los Angeles, USA, ³University Medical Center Utrecht, The Netherlands, ⁴Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale Tumori, Italy, ⁵Indiana University School of Medicine, USA, ⁶Clinica Universidad de Navarra and CIBEREHD, Spain, ⁷Mayo Clinic, USA, ⁸Boston Scientific Corporation, USA, ⁹Northwell Health, USA, ¹⁰University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, USA, Hong Kong Sanatorium and Hospital, Hong Kong, ¹²Stanford University School of Medicine, USA, ¹³Mount Sinai, USA, ¹⁴Cancer

Eugène Marquis, France

Purpose	Materials and Methods	Results																					
Rationale		Curative Intent		Palliative Intent																			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TheraSphere Global Clinical and Dosimetry Steering Committee(DSC) reconvened to update the clinical and dosimetric recommendations for the treatment of unresectable HCC with Y-90 glass microspheres. Recommendations for treatment standardization under various clinical presentations are presented; considering treatment planning and delivery, patient selection, dosing and follow-up 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TheraSphere Global DSC is comprised of health care providers across multiple disciplines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hepatology Interventional Radiology Medical Oncology Medical Physics Nuclear Medicine Radiation Oncology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committee discussion and consensus led to the expansion of recommendations from four to five common clinical scenarios in patients with HCC to support more individualized treatment with Y-90 glass microspheres. Existing clinical scenarios were updated to reflect recent developments in dosimetry approaches and broader treatment paradigms evolving for patients presenting with HCC. Scenarios were divided into <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curative Intent Palliative Intent 	<p>Radiation Segmentectomy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridge to transplant or definitive treatment, i.e., ablative radioembolization Child-Pugh A and select B7 Segmental or subsegmental (angiosome) CBCT defined perfused volume Target absorbed dose \geq400 Gy, higher absorbed dose increased CPN rate Strength of recommendation A; Degree of consensus strong <p>Radiation Lobectomy/Modified Radiation Lobectomy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bridge to resection, contralateral lobe hypertrophy in cases of small FLR, biologic test of time, tumor retraction from hepatic vein and/or IVC or definitive treatment Child-Pugh A, unilobar treatment CBCT defined tumor/normal tissue Dosimetry: lobar 140-150 Gy, segmental tumor \geq400 Gy + lobar 100 Gy or tumor \geq205 Gy with normal tissue $>$88 Gy Strength of recommendation B; Degree of consensus strong 	<p>Multifocal unilobar without MVI/PVT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child-Pugh A, MDTB for B7 Delay progression prior to initiation of systemic Tx Conversion to resection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multicompartment dosimetry preferred: tumor dose \geq205 Gy ($>$250 Gy if possible), normal tissue dose \leq120 Gy with \geq30% hepatic reserve Strength of recommendation B; Degree of consensus strong <p>Multifocal bilobar without MVI/PVT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child-Pugh A, \geq30% hepatic reserve is ideal Preservation of liver function Staged sequential lobar treatment preferred <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multicompartment dosimetry preferred: tumor dose \geq205 Gy ($>$250 Gy if possible), normal tissue dose \leq120 Gy Strength of recommendation B; Degree of consensus Strong 	<p>HCC with MVI/PVT:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Child-Pugh A, \geq30% hepatic reserve is ideal Unilobar: combine/bridge to systemic Tx; bilobar consider systemic upfront Conversion to resection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multicompartment dosimetry preferred: tumor dose \geq205 Gy ($>$250 Gy if possible), normal tissue dose \leq120 Gy Strength of recommendation A; Degree of consensus Strong 																		
<p>Key Definitions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single Compartment: A MIRD dosimetry model that assumes the ^{90}Y microspheres (and therefore absorbed dose) are distributed uniformly within the VOI. Multi Compartment: A MIRD-based dosimetry approach where absorbed dose (AD) is determined in more than one VOI, such as the tumor VOI and the normal parenchyma VOI. MCTB: Multidisciplinary tumor board 	<p>Table 1. Degree of Recommendation</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Degree</th><th>Meaning</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td><td>Strongly recommended (good evidence)</td></tr> <tr> <td>B</td><td>Recommended (moderate evidence)</td></tr> <tr> <td>C</td><td>No recommendation for or against</td></tr> <tr> <td>D</td><td>Recommendation against</td></tr> <tr> <td>E</td><td>Insufficient, low quality or contradictory evidence</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Table 2. Strength of Consensus</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Strength of Consensus</th><th>Definition</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Strong</td><td>\geq 80% consensus</td></tr> <tr> <td>Moderate</td><td>50-70% consensus</td></tr> <tr> <td>Weak</td><td>\leq 49% consensus</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Degree	Meaning	A	Strongly recommended (good evidence)	B	Recommended (moderate evidence)	C	No recommendation for or against	D	Recommendation against	E	Insufficient, low quality or contradictory evidence	Strength of Consensus	Definition	Strong	\geq 80% consensus	Moderate	50-70% consensus	Weak	\leq 49% consensus	<p>Conclusions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated consensus recommendations are provided to guide clinical and dosimetric approaches for the use of Y-90 glass microsphere TARE in HCC, accounting for disease presentation, tumor biology, and treatment intent. 	<p>Acknowledgements</p> <p>We thank Evelyn Schnuerer, MSc. (Boston Scientific Corporation), Alexandra J. Greenberg-Worisek, PhD, MPH (Boston Scientific Corporation) and Paginae Incorporated, funded by Boston Scientific for medical writing assistance.</p>
Degree	Meaning																						
A	Strongly recommended (good evidence)																						
B	Recommended (moderate evidence)																						
C	No recommendation for or against																						
D	Recommendation against																						
E	Insufficient, low quality or contradictory evidence																						
Strength of Consensus	Definition																						
Strong	\geq 80% consensus																						
Moderate	50-70% consensus																						
Weak	\leq 49% consensus																						