



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *UK national cohort of anal cancer treated with intensity-modulated radiotherapy: One-year oncological and patient-reported outcomes*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/157392/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Gilbert, A, Drinkwater, K, McParland, L et al. (7 more authors) (2020) UK national cohort of anal cancer treated with intensity-modulated radiotherapy: One-year oncological and patient-reported outcomes. *European Journal of Cancer*, 128. pp. 7-16. ISSN 0959-8049

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2019.12.022>

© 2020, Elsevier Ltd. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 UK National cohort of anal cancer treated
2 with intensity modulated radiotherapy:
3 One-year oncological and patient
4 reported outcomes
5

6 A Gilbert¹, K. Drinkwater², L. McParland³, R. Adams⁴, R. Glynne-Jones⁵, M. Harrison⁵, M.A.
7 Hawkins⁶, D. Sebag-Montefiore¹, *D.C. Gilbert⁷, *R. Muirhead⁸

8
9 ¹University of Leeds, Leeds Cancer Centre, St. James's University Hospital, Leeds, UK

10 ²The Royal College of Radiologists, London, UK

11 ³Leeds Clinical Trials Research Unit, Worsley Building, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

12 ⁴Cardiff University - Centre for Trials Research and Velindre Cancer Centre, Cardiff, UK

13 ⁵Mount Vernon Centre for Cancer Treatment, Mount Vernon Hospital, Rickmansworth Road,
14 Northwood, UK

15 ⁶CRUK MRC Oxford Institute for Radiation Oncology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

16 ⁷Sussex Cancer Centre, Royal Sussex County Hospital, Eastern Road, Brighton, UK

17 ⁸Oxford University Hospitals NHS Trust, Department of Oncology, Churchill Hospital, Oxford,
18 UK

19
20 *Joint last authors

21
22 Author for correspondence:

23 Dr A Gilbert,

24 University of Leeds,

25 Leeds Cancer Centre,

26 St. James's University Hospital,

27 Leeds, UK

28 Email: a.gilbert@leeds.ac.uk

1 Abstract

2 Background

3 Concurrent chemoradiotherapy is standard treatment for anal cancer. Following national UK
4 implementation of intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) this prospective, national
5 cohort evaluates the 1-year oncological outcomes and patient-reported toxicity outcomes
6 (PRO) after treatment.

7 Materials and Methods

8 A national cohort of UK cancer centres implementing IMRT was carried out between
9 February to July 2015. Cancer centres provided data on oncological outcomes including
10 survival, and disease and colostomy status at 1-year. EORTC-QLQ core (C30) and colorectal
11 (CR29) questionnaires were completed at baseline and 1-year follow-up. The PRO scores at
12 baseline and 1-year were compared.

13 Results

14 40 UK Cancer Centres returned data with a total of 187 patients included in the analysis.
15 92% received mitomycin with 5-fluorouracil or capecitabine. 1-year overall survival was 94%;
16 84% were disease-free and 86% colostomy-free at 1-year follow up. At 1-year, PRO results
17 found significant improvements in buttock pain, blood and mucous in stools, pain,
18 constipation, appetite loss, and health anxiety compared to baseline. No significant
19 deteriorations were reported in diarrhoea, bowel frequency, and flatulence. Urinary
20 symptom scores were low at 1-year. Moderate impotence symptoms at baseline remained
21 at 1-year and a moderate deterioration in dyspareunia reported.

1 Conclusions

2 With national anal cancer IMRT implementation, at this early pre-defined time point, 1-year
3 oncological outcomes were reassuring and result in good disease-related symptom control.
4 1-year symptomatic complications following CRT for anal cancer using IMRT techniques
5 appear to be relatively mild. These PRO results provide a basis to benchmark future studies.

6

7 Introduction

8 Concurrent chemoradiotherapy is the standard of care for anal cancer treatment[1, 2]. In
9 2012, the UK department of health recommended implementation of intensity modulated
10 radiotherapy (IMRT) (including volumetric modulated arc therapy (VMAT) and tomotherapy)
11 with the aim of reducing toxicity from radiotherapy through sculpting of the beams and
12 dose[3]. Within clinical trials, radiotherapy protocol deviations are known to impact on
13 treatment failure and oncological outcomes[4]. Therefore, to optimise implementation of
14 IMRT in a rare cancer, the Royal College of Radiologists supported the development of a
15 national protocol and implementation strategy[5]. This national cohort was carried out with
16 the aim of collecting prospective data to investigate IMRT delivery[6], to assess early
17 toxicity[7], oncological outcomes and health-related quality of life (HRQOL).

18

19 A small number of studies in anal cancer, including prospective phase II trials, have reported
20 on improved disease outcomes and treatment-related acute toxicity with the introduction
21 of IMRT techniques[8-11]. Cross-sectional studies using patient-reported outcomes (PROs)
22 have found patients report long-term toxicity related to bowel, urinary and sexual
23 dysfunction post-treatment[12, 13]. However, there is a lack of prospectively collected PROs

1 measuring toxicity and HRQOL following anal cancer chemoradiotherapy from both IMRT
2 and conformal techniques[13]. Baseline PRO data is important to be able to establish the
3 true symptomatic benefit of treatment and to distinguish between toxicity and pre-morbid
4 symptoms. In addition, there is also a lack of data outside of single-centre series. This paper
5 presents the prospective evaluation of the impact of IMRT on patient-reported toxicity
6 including HRQOL at 1-year in a national anal cancer cohort supplemented with oncological
7 outcomes.

8

9 [Materials and Methods](#)

10 Prospective data collection from all UK National Health Service (NHS) cancer centres (n=56)
11 in patients with a diagnosis of anal cancer starting IMRT over a 6-month period from 9
12 February to 27 July 2015 was requested. Full details are reported elsewhere[6]. Data
13 collection was performed by the RCR as part of a national prospective cohort program in
14 which approval was obtained by each NHS institution's research and governance board with
15 a pre-planned 1-year follow-up schedule.

16

17 Patient demographic data at baseline included age, gender, stoma status, HIV and smoking
18 status. Tumour and treatment information included TNM staging, radiotherapy dose and
19 fractionation and concurrent chemotherapy schedule. Acute toxicity data was collected
20 weekly during treatment using CTCAEv4[14] and reported grade 3/4 toxicity in any category
21 used in the analysis. Full details of demographics and acute toxicity have been reported
22 previously[6].

23

1 Patients were invited to complete the validated European Organisation for Research and
2 Treatment of Cancer QOL questionnaires (EORTC-QLQ) core module (C30) and colorectal
3 cancer module (CR29)[15, 16]. An anal cancer-specific module was not available at the time
4 of recruitment[17]. The C30 is a generic questionnaire including items on overall HRQOL,
5 physical, role, social, emotional and cognitive function as well as generic symptoms affecting
6 cancer patients including fatigue, diarrhoea and pain. CR29 addresses disease-specific
7 concerns including bowel, urinary and sexual symptoms.

8

9 PRO collection was coordinated by clinical teams at each cancer centre and patients were
10 invited to complete paper questionnaires at two timepoints – baseline (prior to or on day 1
11 of starting radiotherapy) and at 1-year. Invitations to report 1-year follow up data were sent
12 between 14 July 2016 and 18 November 2016 via three email reminders to clinical teams
13 (Range 353-648days). Paper questionnaires were either handed out at clinic appointments
14 for completion or sent to patients in the post with a return (stamped) envelope at the
15 discretion of the clinical team. Resources for this national program were restricted.

16

17 Descriptive and regression analyses were performed using Stata v13.1[18]. Descriptive
18 statistics were used to describe patient, clinical and tumour characteristics. Descriptive
19 analysis was performed on 1-year oncological outcomes as event rates were too low to
20 carry out more extensive analyses. Disease-free status was defined as disease that had
21 achieved a complete response and not demonstrated recurrence[19] and missing data
22 explored using logistic regression.

23

1 Exploratory analyses of EORTC QLQs and handling of missing data were performed
2 according to EORTC guidelines, using a process of imputing missing values in scaled
3 responses[20]. All item responses from the PROs were converted from a four-point Likert-
4 type scale through a linear transformation onto a 0-100 scale. Higher scores for symptom
5 items reflect more severe symptoms (i.e. 'not at all'=0; 'a little'=33.3; 'quite a bit'=66.6;
6 'very much'=100); higher scores for function items reflect a better level of functioning[20]. A
7 minimum important difference (MID) was classified as a small change in scores from 5 to 10
8 points, moderate differences as a change up to 20 points and large differences as a change
9 in scores of >20[21].

10

11 Mean and paired differences between baseline PRO scores and 1-year follow-up were
12 evaluated. A two-sided t-test was used to evaluate statistical significance with a p-value
13 <0.01 deemed to be significant, after Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.

14 Multivariable linear regression analysis was performed to evaluate the impact of age,
15 gender, acute (any) grade 3/4 toxicity, tumour stage and nodal stage on PRO items (p<0.01).

16 Reasons for missing PRO data at baseline and 1-year follow up were explored using
17 multivariable logistic regression, including age, gender, disease status, cancer centre, T
18 stage and baseline PRO completion rates as confounders. An exploratory analysis compared
19 mean PRO scores (for pre-defined PRO items taken from CORMAC core outcome set) at
20 baseline and 1-year by risk groups; early stage T1/2N0 versus locally advanced T3/4 and/or
21 N+[19, 22].

1 Results

2 Patient characteristics

3 1-year follow up data was collected in 40 UK Cancer Centres (71%), with numbers of
4 participants included from each centre ranging from 1-13 participants (Median 4 per
5 centre). Patient and tumour characteristics are summarised in Table 1 and 2 respectively. All
6 187 patients who received radical (curative intent) IMRT were included in this analysis,
7 including patients who received full dose IMRT adherent to UK guidance (n=157)[6], those
8 who received full dose IMRT not strictly adherent to UK guidance (n=23) and those receiving
9 reduced dose IMRT (n=7) (see supplementary figure). Median radiotherapy dose received
10 was 53.2Gy in 28 fractions(F) (Range 30-53.2Gy in 10-30F); T1/2 received median dose
11 50.4Gy in 28F (Range 30-54Gy in 10-30F) and T3/4 received median dose 53.2Gy in 28F
12 (Range 40-54Gy in 15-30F). The majority of patients (n=153) completed full dose
13 chemotherapy (n=27 dose reduced/omitted secondary to toxicity; n=7 no chemotherapy
14 given) (see [6] for more details).

15

16 1-year survival data was available for 109 (58.2%) patients during follow-up. At 3-months no
17 patients were known to have died. At 6-months 2 deaths were known to have occurred -
18 both patients had residual local disease at 3-months. At 1-year, 6 patients in total had died -
19 94% 1-year overall survival. All 6 patients had evidence of local or distant disease, with 4
20 patients with residual local disease reported at 3-months. Disease-free survival status was
21 available on 107 patients (57.2%) (2 patients were alive with unknown disease status). At 1-
22 year, 84 were disease-free (78.5%), and 13 had local disease failure reported (5 underwent
23 salvage surgery; 5 local regional failure; 3 LRR and metastatic disease) (12.1%). Table 3

1 presents 1-year oncological outcomes by patient, treatment and disease characteristics. The
2 event rate (6 deaths) was too low to comment on any trends in the data. 86% of patients
3 were colostomy-free at 1-year (n=97/113). In regards missing data, centres either returned
4 oncological outcome data or did not return any.

5

6 Exploratory PRO and HRQOL analysis

7 A total of 121 (65%) of patients reported some PRO data at either time-point, with 115
8 (61%) completing at least one PRO item at baseline and 57 (30%) at 1-year. 103 (55%) had
9 complete data across all subscales at baseline and 54 (29%) at 1-year follow up. 43 (23%) of
10 patients have complete subscale data at both time-points. No patient, clinical or tumour
11 characteristics predicted missing PRO data. At baseline, only cancer centre appeared to
12 predict missing questionnaires reflecting the administration approach to PRO data collection
13 (p=0.02). At 1-year, there were no significant predictors of missing questionnaire data.

14

15 Table 4 describes the PRO mean scores at baseline and 1-year follow-up and mean and
16 paired differences. Pain, constipation, appetite loss, anxiety, blood and mucous in stools,
17 and buttock pain were all significantly improved at 1-year (mean differences). On review of
18 MID between scores at baseline and 1-year, only dyspareunia showed a moderate clinical
19 deterioration in mean scores (14.5 to 29.5). Otherwise moderate improvements were noted
20 for role and emotional functioning and symptom scores: pain, constipation, appetite loss,
21 anxiety, blood and mucous in stools. A large improvement in buttock pain from baseline was
22 reported.

23

1 In terms of 1-year toxicity, it is reassuring that there was no clinically significant
2 deteriorations reported with PRO items on diarrhoea, bowel frequency, flatulence, urinary
3 frequency or impotence. Mean scores at 1-year for all bowel items ranged between 19.1 to
4 38.8 correlating to a patient reporting a 'mild' symptom[23]. Stoma scores are not included
5 due to low numbers of patients reporting (n=13 at baseline and n=6 at 1-year).

6

7 The sample size for sexual toxicity items was small as only 34% of women reported on
8 symptoms (n=46) and 50% of men (n=26). However, impotence scores for men remained
9 relatively poor (mean score 46.6 – moderate symptoms) at 1-year but did not significantly
10 deteriorate after treatment. For women, dyspareunia showed a moderate deterioration in
11 mean scores but overall the 1-year mean score (29.4) relates to 'mild' symptoms.

12

13 The items with the most severe symptom mean scores at 1-year were flatulence,
14 impotence, libido (for both men and women), and health anxiety. Although, both health
15 anxiety and female libido showed a moderate and small improvement, respectively, from
16 baseline scores. All other changes were minor. In regards HRQOL and function, moderate
17 improvements at 1-year were noted for role and emotional functioning.

18

19 Regression analysis on predictors of significant PRO change between baseline and 1-year
20 found change in pain scores was predicted by gender, with women reporting less of an
21 improvement in pain scores over time ($p=0.004$); and acute G3/4 toxicity, with patients
22 reporting a greater improvement in pain scores if they had reported any G3/4 toxicity
23 during treatment or if this data was unknown as compared to patients with no G3/4 toxicity

1 (p=0.007). Similarly, change in buttock pain scores found women reporting less
2 improvement in pain over time (p=0.01).

3
4 The exploratory analysis by risk groups (supplementary file), found locally advanced
5 tumours have poorer baseline scores but report relatively greater improvements in function
6 and cancer symptoms. In comparison, patients with early stage tumours are less
7 compromised by cancer-related issues at baseline but have a proportionally greater change
8 in scores by 1-year representing more toxicity-related issues.

9

10 Discussion

11 To our knowledge this is the largest, multicentre prospective cohort of 1-year oncological
12 outcomes including PRO assessment of anal cancer patients treated with curative intent
13 IMRT. The results provide a comprehensive evaluation of patients treated in routine
14 practice in the UK.

15

16 The 1-year oncological outcomes found patients to have reassuringly high overall (94%),
17 disease-free (84%) and colostomy-free (86%) survival in line other prospective studies of
18 IMRT and randomised studies of conformal radiotherapy in anal cancer[2, 9, 24].

19

20 The toxicity rates for all symptoms are generally low and improvements in disease-related
21 symptoms, such as buttock pain and per rectal bleeding, significant. Importantly at 1-year,
22 there were no significant deteriorations seen in bowel toxicity items including diarrhoea,
23 bowel frequency, and flatulence, although flatulence symptom scores remained moderately

1 severe (40.2). Urinary symptoms also did not significantly deteriorate at 1-year, although
2 studies of pelvic radiotherapy with longer follow up have found that whilst bowel symptoms
3 may improve after 1-year, urinary symptoms may deteriorate over a longer timeframe[26].
4 Whilst the sample for patients reporting on sexual function is small, it is important to note
5 that dyspareunia deteriorated moderately at 1-year; and impotence symptom scores
6 remained moderately severe, with a relatively greater deterioration seen in earlier cancers.
7
8 The 1-year PRO toxicity scores are similar to those reported in single-centre series of
9 patients treated with IMRT[9, 27]. Although the use of different questionnaires and quality
10 of reporting can make it challenging to directly compare results with other studies, the rates
11 of late toxicity for bowel and erectile function using IMRT appear to be lower than cross-
12 sectional series of patients treated with conformal techniques[28-31]. These findings are
13 likely to reflect the sculpted dose around bowel and penile bulb structures resulting in
14 reduced dose anteriorly[32]. For example, within the current study at 1-year patients
15 reported mild diarrhoea symptoms (mean 16.4; SD22.0). Similarly, contemporary studies of
16 patients treated with IMRT report mild symptoms with mean scores ranging from 12-22.8[9,
17 27]. In comparison, older studies have reported moderate diarrhoea symptom scores with
18 mean scores between 27-34.6[28, 30, 31, 33]. Similarly, large to moderate improvements
19 using IMRT are observed with symptoms of flatulence, faecal incontinence and
20 impotence[27, 30, 31]. Our rates of dyspareunia, urinary frequency and incontinence were
21 similar to results from previous conformal and IMRT studies. Vaginal doses remain high as
22 the structure is directly adjacent to the high dose tumour volume, whilst bladder symptoms
23 may be more reflective of pre-morbid symptoms as minimal change was observed from
24 baseline[34, 35].

1

2 The exploratory analysis lends credence to the need to improve symptoms with a significant
3 impact on QOL, such as flatulence, dyspareunia and impotence, and this should be a target
4 for future studies de-escalating dose in patients with low-risk anal cancer[22]. Indeed, these
5 data provide a benchmark to test improvements in PRO from reduced dose IMRT in early
6 stage disease and to assess any potential 'cost' in PRO from efforts to improve locoregional
7 control in advanced disease with increasing radiotherapy doses, as is being tested in the
8 ongoing platform trial, PLATO (personalizing anal cancer radiotherapy dose; registry no.
9 ISRCTN88455282)[22].

10

11 Due to the restricted resources available for national programs, there are missing data for
12 both PRO and oncological outcomes, more so at 1-year follow-up. The event rate therefore
13 could be underestimated although PRO scores and oncological event rates were similar to
14 expected. This demonstrates the limitations of unfunded multi-centre national audit
15 programs. However, it is reassuring that no patient, clinical or tumour characteristics
16 appeared to predict missing data. Only centres failing to return data appears to be in effect,
17 which provides a strong argument in support of the reliability of these results. The authors
18 also acknowledge that 1-year is an early timepoint in follow-up. A further limitation is
19 standardised quality assurance for IMRT implementation and delivery. At the time of patient
20 recruitment, no validated anal cancer specific PRO existed and therefore as in other studies,
21 the EORTC-QLQ CR29 was used for evaluation. Whilst this provides good quality data, a
22 number of important long-term toxicity issues are missing; of particular note, symptoms
23 related to bowel urgency, toilet dependency, and vaginal symptoms such as vaginal dryness
24 and stenosis. These issues are present in the newly developed EORTC-QLQ ANL27, which is

1 currently under phase IV international validation testing and included in the PLATO trial[17,
2 36]. Future studies should use the EORTC-QLQ ANL27 to provide an accurate understanding
3 of patient disease and toxicity burden [37] and prioritise a priori selection of key PRO items
4 highlighted in CORMAC, the anal cancer core outcome set, for hypothesis testing[19].
5

6 Conclusions

7 In comparison to other studies reporting PRO and HRQOL in anal cancer, our study provides
8 PRO data in a multicentre prospective setting. The effective implementation of IMRT in a
9 national setting was reported previously[6]. At 1-year, early oncological outcomes were
10 reassuring and result in good disease-related symptom control measured with PROs. In
11 comparison to historical series of conformal radiotherapy, these results also suggest
12 benefits in the reduction of bowel and male sexual dysfunction at 1-year. These findings, as
13 well as providing prospective PRO toxicity data to better understand patient experience,
14 may also provide the basis for benchmarking future studies.
15

16 Conflict of Interest statement

17 None declared
18

19 Acknowledgements

20 Funding acknowledgements: MAH is funded by UK Medical Research Council grant
21 MC_UU_00001/2

1 References

- 2 1. Northover J, Glynne-Jones R, Sebag-Montefiore D, James R, Meadows H, Wan S, et
3 al. Chemoradiation for the treatment of epidermoid anal cancer: 13-year follow-up of the
4 first randomised UKCCCR Anal Cancer Trial (ACT I). *British journal of cancer*.
5 2010;102(7):1123-8.
- 6 2. James RD, Glynne-Jones R, Meadows HM, Cunningham D, Myint AS, Saunders MP, et
7 al. Mitomycin or cisplatin chemoradiation with or without maintenance chemotherapy for
8 treatment of squamous-cell carcinoma of the anus (ACT II): a randomised, phase 3, open-
9 label, 2 x 2 factorial trial. *The lancet oncology*. 2013;14(6):516-24.
- 10 3. Department of Health Cancer Policy Team. Radiotherapy in England, 2012. Available
11 at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/radiotherapy-services-in-england-2012>
12 (accessed 6 March 2019).
- 13 4. Ohri N, Shen X, Dicker AP, Doyle LA, Harrison AS, Showalter TN. Radiotherapy
14 protocol deviations and clinical outcomes: a meta-analysis of cooperative group clinical
15 trials. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute*. 2013;105(6):387-93.
- 16 5. Muirhead R, Adams RA, Gilbert DC, Glynne-Jones R, Harrison M, Sebag-Montefiore
17 D, et al. Anal cancer: developing an intensity-modulated radiotherapy solution for ACT2
18 fractionation. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. 2014;26(11):720-1.
- 19 6. Muirhead R, Drinkwater K, O'Cathail SM, Adams R, Glynne-Jones R, Harrison M, et al.
20 Initial Results from the Royal College of Radiologists' UK National Audit of Anal Cancer
21 Radiotherapy 2015. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. 2017;29(3):188-97.
- 22 7. Jones CM, Adams R, Downing A, Glynne-Jones R, Harrison M, Hawkins M, et al.
23 Toxicity, Tolerability, and Compliance of Concurrent Capecitabine or 5-Fluorouracil in
24 Radical Management of Anal Cancer With Single-dose Mitomycin-C and Intensity Modulated
25 Radiation Therapy: Evaluation of a National Cohort. *International journal of radiation*
26 *oncology, biology, physics*. 2018;101(5):1202-11.
- 27 8. Kachnic LA, Winter K, Myerson RJ, Goodyear MD, Willins J, Esthappan J, et al. RTOG
28 0529: a phase 2 evaluation of dose-painted intensity modulated radiation therapy in
29 combination with 5-fluorouracil and mitomycin-C for the reduction of acute morbidity in
30 carcinoma of the anal canal. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics*.
31 2013;86(1):27-33.
- 32 9. Han K, Cummings BJ, Lindsay P, Skliarenko J, Craig T, Le LW, et al. Prospective
33 evaluation of acute toxicity and quality of life after IMRT and concurrent chemotherapy for
34 anal canal and perianal cancer. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics*.
35 2014;90(3):587-94.
- 36 10. Joseph K, Nijjar Y, Warkentin H, Schiller D, Tankel K, Usmani N, et al. Prospective
37 phase II study of tomotherapy based chemoradiation treatment for locally advanced anal
38 cancer. *Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic*
39 *Radiology and Oncology*. 2015;117(2):234-9.
- 40 11. Salama JK, Mell LK, Schomas DA, Miller RC, Devisetty K, Jani AB, et al. Concurrent
41 chemotherapy and intensity-modulated radiation therapy for anal canal cancer patients: a
42 multicenter experience. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society*
43 *of Clinical Oncology*. 2007;25(29):4581-6.
- 44 12. Das P, Cantor SB, Parker CL, Zampieri JB, Baschnagel A, Eng C, et al. Long-term
45 quality of life after radiotherapy for the treatment of anal cancer. *Cancer*. 2010;116(4):822-
46 9.

- 1 13. Sodergren SC, Vassiliou V, Dennis K, Tomaszewski KA, Gilbert A, Glynne-Jones R, et al. Systematic review of the quality of life issues associated with anal cancer and its
2 treatment with radiochemotherapy. Supportive care in cancer : official journal of the
3 Multinational Association of Supportive Care in Cancer. 2015.
- 5 14. CTCAE. Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE). US Department of
6 Health and Human Services. National Institutes of Health National Cancer Institute Version
7 4.0. 2009;May 28 2009 (v4.03):June 14 2010.
- 8 15. Whistance RN, Conroy T, Chie W, Costantini A, Sezer O, Koller M, et al. Clinical and
9 psychometric validation of the EORTC QLQ-CR29 questionnaire module to assess health-
10 related quality of life in patients with colorectal cancer. Eur J Cancer. 2009;45(17):3017-26.
- 11 16. Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, Bullinger M, Cull A, Duez NJ, et al. The
12 European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: a quality-of-life
13 instrument for use in international clinical trials in oncology. Journal of the National Cancer
14 Institute. 1993;85(5):365-76.
- 15 17. Sodergren SC, Johnson CD, Gilbert A, Tomaszewski KA, Chu W, Chung HT, et al. Phase
16 I-III development of the EORTC QLQ-ANL27, a health-related quality of life questionnaire for
17 anal cancer. Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic
18 Radiology and Oncology. 2018;126(2):222-8.
- 19 18. StataCorp. 2013. Stata Statistical Software: Release 13.1. College Station, TX:
20 StataCorp LP.
- 21 19. Fish R, Sanders C, Adams R, Brewer J, Brookes ST, DeNardo J, et al. A core outcome
22 set for clinical trials of chemoradiotherapy interventions for anal cancer (CORMAC): a
23 patient and health-care professional consensus. Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol.
24 2018;3(12):865-73.
- 25 20. Fayers P, Aaronson NK, Bjordal K, Groenvold M, Curran D, Bottomley A. EORTC QLQ-
26 C30 scoring manual. Brussels, Belgium: European Organisation for Research and Treatment
27 of Cancer; 1999.
- 28 21. Osoba D, Rodrigues G, Myles J, Zee B, Pater J. Interpreting the significance of
29 changes in health-related quality-of-life scores. Journal of clinical oncology : official journal
30 of the American Society of Clinical Oncology. 1998;16(1):139-44.
- 31 22. Sebag-Montefiore D, Adams R, Bell S, Berkman L, Gilbert DC, Glynne-Jones R, et al.
32 The Development of an Umbrella Trial (PLATO) to Address Radiation Therapy Dose
33 Questions in the Locoregional Management of Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Anus.
34 International Journal of Radiation Oncology • Biology • Physics. 2016;96(2):E164-E5.
- 35 23. Snyder C, Smith K, Holzner B, Rivera YM, Bantug E, Brundage M, et al. Making a
36 picture worth a thousand numbers: recommendations for graphically displaying patient-
37 reported outcomes data. Quality of life research : an international journal of quality of life
38 aspects of treatment, care and rehabilitation. 2019;28(2):345-56.
- 39 24. Kachnic LA, Tsai HK, Coen JJ, Blaszkowsky LS, Hartshorn K, Kwak EL, et al. Dose-
40 painted intensity-modulated radiation therapy for anal cancer: a multi-institutional report of
41 acute toxicity and response to therapy. International journal of radiation oncology, biology,
42 physics. 2012;82(1):153-8.
- 43 25. Glynne-Jones R, Sebag-Montefiore D, Meadows HM, Cunningham D, Begum R, Adab
44 F, et al. Best time to assess complete clinical response after chemoradiotherapy in
45 squamous cell carcinoma of the anus (ACT II): a post-hoc analysis of randomised controlled
46 phase 3 trial. The lancet oncology. 2017;18(3):347-56.

- 1 26. Barraclough LH, Routledge JA, Farnell DJ, Burns MP, Swindell R, Livsey JE, et al.
2 Prospective analysis of patient-reported late toxicity following pelvic radiotherapy for
3 gynaecological cancer. *Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for*
4 *Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology*. 2012;103(3):327-32.
- 5 27. Joseph K, Vos LJ, Warkentin H, Paulson K, Polkosnik LA, Usmani N, et al. Patient
6 reported quality of life after helical IMRT based concurrent chemoradiation of locally
7 advanced anal cancer. *Radiotherapy and oncology : journal of the European Society for*
8 *Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology*. 2016;120(2):228-33.
- 9 28. Jephcott CR, Paltiel C, Hay J. Quality of life after non-surgical treatment of anal
10 carcinoma: a case control study of long-term survivors. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*.
11 2004;16(8):530-5.
- 12 29. Welzel G, Hagele V, Wenz F, Mai SK. Quality of life outcomes in patients with anal
13 cancer after combined radiochemotherapy. *Strahlentherapie und Onkologie*.
14 2011;187(3):175-82.
- 15 30. Bentzen AG, Balteskard L, Wanderas EH, Frykholm G, Wilsgaard T, Dahl O, et al.
16 Impaired health-related quality of life after chemoradiotherapy for anal cancer: late effects
17 in a national cohort of 128 survivors. *Acta Oncol*. 2013;52(4):736-44.
- 18 31. Provencher S, Oehler C, Lavertu S, Jolicoeur M, Fortin B, Donath D. Quality of life and
19 tumor control after short split-course chemoradiation for anal canal carcinoma. *Radiat*.
20 2010;5:41.
- 21 32. Olsen JR, Moughan J, Myerson R, Abitbol A, Doncals DE, Johnson D, et al. Predictors
22 of Radiation Therapy-Related Gastrointestinal Toxicity From Anal Cancer Dose-Painted
23 Intensity Modulated Radiation Therapy: Secondary Analysis of NRG Oncology RTOG 0529.
24 *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics*. 2017;98(2):400-8.
- 25 33. Welzel G, Hagele V, Wenz F, Mai SK. Quality of life outcomes in patients with anal
26 cancer after combined radiochemotherapy. *Strahlentherapie und Onkologie : Organ der*
27 *Deutschen Röntgengesellschaft [et al]*. 2011;187(3):175-82.
- 28 34. Son CH, Law E, Oh JH, Apte AP, Yang TJ, Riedel E, et al. Dosimetric Predictors of
29 Radiation-Induced Vaginal Stenosis After Pelvic Radiation Therapy for Rectal and Anal
30 Cancer. *International journal of radiation oncology, biology, physics*. 2015;92(3):548-54.
- 31 35. Yahya N, Ebert MA, Bulsara M, Haworth A, Kennedy A, Joseph DJ, et al. Dosimetry,
32 clinical factors and medication intake influencing urinary symptoms after prostate
33 radiotherapy: An analysis of data from the RADAR prostate radiotherapy trial. *Radiotherapy*
34 *and oncology : journal of the European Society for Therapeutic Radiology and Oncology*.
35 2015;116(1):112-8.
- 36 36. ISRCTN Registry. PLATO - Personalising anal cancer radiotherapy dose.
37 ISRCTN88455282 <https://doi.org/10.1186/ISRCTN88455282>. (Accessed 13 March 2019 at
38 <http://www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN88455282q=&filters=conditionCategory:Cancer&sort=&offset=9&totalResults=1850&page=1&pageSize=10&searchType=basic-search>).
- 40 37. Sodergren SC, Gilbert A, Darlington AS, Vassiliou V, Group EQoL. Anal Cancer: Putting
41 Health-Related Quality of Life at the Forefront. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol)*. 2019;31(2):69-71.
42