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local control rate was 82% (95% CI: 76-91%). Complete toxicity data were available for 143 patients: 22% of them presented a G3+ acute toxicity, mainly as moist desquamation (n = 25) or diarrhea (n = 10). Three patients presented a late grade 3 gastrointestinal toxicity (anal incontinence). No grade 4 acute or late toxicity was recorded. Patients treated with standard dynamic IMRT presented a significantly higher risk of acute grade 3 or more toxicity compared to those treated with VMAT or HT (38.5% vs 15.3%, p = 0.049).

Conclusion
Modern IMRT (VMAT or HT) with daily IGRT are effective and safe in treating AC patients, and should be considered the standard of care in this clinical setting.
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Purpose or Objective
Helical Tomotherapy (HT) has only been recently introduced in the neoadjuvant treatment of locally advanced rectal cancer (LARC) patients (pts). Aim of this retrospective study is to report the results in terms of toxicity and local control of the largest population treated with neoadjuvant HT and chemotherapy (CRT) with daily image guidance (IGRT) followed by surgery.

Material and Methods
Data of 117 patients LARC pts treated in 2 Swiss Radiotherapy departments were collected and analyzed. Radiotherapy (RT) consisted of 45 Gy (1.8 Gy/fraction, 5 days/week for 5 weeks) to the regional lymph nodes. Seventy pts also received a simultaneous-integrated boost (SIB) up to a total dose of 50 Gy to the tumor (2 Gy/fraction, 5 days/week for 5 weeks). Chemotherapy consisted of capecitabine 850 mg/m2, twice daily, during the RT days. Following a mean interval after completion of CRT of 53 days (range, 13-142), all pts underwent surgery. Ninety-four patients (80.3%) received a low anterior resection (LAR), while 23 pts (19.7%) received an abdomino-perineal resection (APR). The resection status was classified as R0 in 107 patients, and R1 in 3 patients (not reported in 7 patients).

Results
The overall rate of G2 or more toxicity was 22% (22/117 patients). Only 3 patients (2.5%) presented a G3 toxicity, as dermatitis (n = 1) or diarrhea (n = 2). None of the patients presented a G4 or more non-hematologic toxicity and/or G4 non-hematologic toxicity. After a median follow-up time of 23.3 months (range, 4.8 - 66.8), only 2 pts (1.7%) presented a G3-4 late toxicity. The 3-year local control rate was 96.9% (95% confidence interval: 96.4 - 97.3%).

Conclusion
CRT delivered with HT and daily IGRT shows excellent rates of local control with few acute toxicity. Longer follow-up is needed to confirm these encouraging results.
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Purpose or Objective
Hypofractionated radiotherapy (HRT) preoperatively improves locoregional control (LRC) for resectable rectal cancer. In addition chemoradiotherapy alone provides complete response rates of 10-20%. For patients with localised disease, unfit for surgery or with metastatic disease, the efficacy of HRT regimens is less clear. We report a single centre study of HRT for non-surgically treated rectal cancer.

Material and Methods
We retrospectively reviewed all patients who received HRT between 2007 and 2015. Patients had histologically proven rectal cancer with localised or metastatic disease and were ineligible for surgery. The primary endpoint was overall survival (OS). Secondary endpoints were LRC, toxicity and objective symptom control.

Results
Between March 2007 and December 2015 48 patients received pelvic HRT for inoperable rectal cancer, 24 (50%) had locoregional disease. The median (range) age was 78 years (44-93), 17 (35%) patients had performance status 3. Dose/fractionation delivered was 27 Gy/6# in 3 weeks, 31 (64.6%) patients and 25 Gy/5# in 1 week, 12 patients, BED=88 Gy for both regimens. Median (range) time from diagnosis to RT was 2.5 months (0.5-74 months). RT was delivered with a 3D conformal technique in 81% of cases. Two (4%) patients were re-treated with 8 Gy/14/ and 16 Gy/4#, after receiving 27 Gy/6# and 25Gy/5# respectively. At a median (range) follow up of 12 months (0.5-76), symptomatic improvement was documented in 19 (39.5%) patients. All patients completed the prescribed regimen. Two (4%) patients died within 30 days of treatment. The 1 and 2 year survival rates for all patients were 45.8% and 16.7% respectively. Median (IQR) OS for patients with localised and metastatic disease were 13.4 months (10.3-25) and 6.2 months (2.5-10.3) respectively. Of the 16 patients alive, 12 (75%) had localised disease with median (IQR) OS in this subgroup of 17.2 months (12.7-27.3).

Conclusion
Hypofractionated radiotherapy is efficacious and tolerable for patients with rectal cancer, ineligible for surgery. Long term control of localised disease control can be achieved in a minority. A prospective randomised study would further quantify the benefit of HRT for this poor prognosis rectal cancer subgroup.
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Purpose or Objective
TME surgery is the mainstay of treatment for rectal cancer. For those who are either medically unfit or refuse the operation, radiotherapy is frequently recommended but rarely leads to cure. There is recently some evidence suggesting dose escalation by adding HDRBT after EBRT is a feasible and promising strategy for this population. However, optimal dose fractionation regime remains
unclear on how to balance to tumor control and toxicity. Herein we reported our early experience on using EBRT and HDBRT in rectal cancer patients who are either unfit or refuse surgery.

Material and Methods
During the period of Jan-2015 to Sep-2016, total 12 consecutive patients treated with EBRT and HDBRT were analyzed; seven patients were because of medical inoperability, while five due to the refusal of surgery. Treatment consisted of EBRT with the regime (1.85 Gy x 28, n=2; 5Gy x 5, n=4; 3Gy x 13, n=6) were at the discretion of physicians, followed by HDBRT boost given 8 weeks afterward. The starting dose level was 10Gy weekly x 1 fraction, with escalation to maximum 3 fractions if acute toxicity was acceptable. The primary endpoint was acute toxicity. Secondary endpoints were tumor response, local control, and survival. Tumor responses were assessed based on endoscopy and MRI findings and classified as responding disease (CR + PR), static disease (SD) or progression (PD).

Results
At the time of current analysis 9 patients were still alive and, median follow-up time was 13.6 months (range: 5.7-19.2 months). Median age 79 years (range: 70-88), ECOG 2/3 (n=7/5), Charlson co-morbidity score <3 or ≥ 3 (n=6/6); CT3/cT4 (n=11/1), Node positive/ negative (n=6/6), MRI predicted mesorectal fascia threatened (<1mm) or not (n=7/3.5). Planned dose of HDBRT 10Gy x 1 / 10Gy x 2/ 10Gy x 3 (n=6/3/3). One patient developed grade 3 toxicity (8.3%). Tumor response was observed in 10 patients (83%). The local control rate at 1 year and 2 years was 100% and 50% respectively. No patients received ≥2 fractions HDBRT boost developed local progression. At 1 year, the cancer specific survival was 81.5%, and the overall survival was 71.3%. Outcome related to dose level was reported in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tumor Response</th>
<th>10Gy x 1</th>
<th>10Gy x 2</th>
<th>10Gy x 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3 acute toxicity</td>
<td>0/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local progression</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>0/3</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion
In our early experience, the combination of EBRT and HDBRT achieves promising tumor response of 83% and 1-year local control rate of 100% with acceptable acute toxicity. Longer follow-up is ongoing. Randomized trials are warranted to determine the optimal dose level of HDBRT.

Material and Methods
16 patients were eligible for this study, 6 women and 10 men in age 50-78 years at the time of treatment. All of them were M1I based stage with 3 patients cT3N1, 5 cT4N2, 2 T4N1, 4 T3N2, 2 T2N2 and 1 to 3 liver Mets. We excluded of our study patients with more than 3 Mets because indication for surgery was ruled at diagnosis and only offered radiotherapy as palliation. Hypofractionated scheme radiotherapy was administered with a total dose of 25Gy and surgery was delayed for 7 days from the start of radiation therapy or at least 4 weeks as literature recommended. Chemotherapy used after surgery of the primary tumour was Folfox or Folfiri scheme with 3 or 6 cycles depending number of liver Mets and patient characteristics.

Results
After radiotherapy completion, 5 patients were into surgical resection in one week, and only 2 had synchronous surgery. Pathological findings showed 12 partial response, 1 complete response and 2 stabilization of rectal tumour. Only 1 patient had a complete liver response after chemotherapy so he was considered as responder.

Purpose or Objective
We evaluated the significance of both metabolic response using fluorodeoxyglucose-pet-positron emission tomography/computed tomography (PET/CT) and change in CEA level before and after preoperative chemoradiotherapy (CRT) as prognosticators for survival in patients with rectal cancer.

Material and Methods
We retrospectively analyzed T3/T4 or N+ rectal cancer 196 patients who underwent preoperative CRT from October 2008 to June 2013. All patients received a median of 50.4 Gy in 28 fractions with 5-fluorouracil or capetibeinate. The metabolic response was assessed by determining the maximal standardized uptake value (SUVmax), absolute difference (ΔSUVmax), and SUV reduction ratio (SRR) on pre- and post-CRT PET/CT scans. The serum CEA (pre-CRT and post-CRT), absolute difference for Liver Surgery (ΔCEA), CEA reduction ratio (CRR), and post-operative CEA (post-op CEA) were also determined. Multivariate analysis was performed using above parameters to determine any prognosticator for survival.

Results
Median follow-up period was 59 months. 5-year locoregional failure-free survival (LRFS), disease-free survival (DFS), and overall survival (OS) was 80.9 %, 66.0 %, and 86.8 %, respectively. Median pre-CRT SUVmax, ΔSUVmax, and SRR were 13.5, 4.9, 11.5, and 0.85, respectively. Median pre-CRT CEA, post-CRT CEA, ΔCEA, CRR, and post-op CEA were 4.42 ng/ml, 2.62 ng/ml, 1.38 ng/ml, 0.34, and 1.55 ng/ml, respectively. On