IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

- 1 <u>TITLE</u>: Radiation sensitivity and efficacy in aggressive and non-aggressive basal cell carcinoma (BCC) of the
- 2 skin: Image Guided Superficial Radiation Therapy achieves high rate of local control in sclerosing,
- 3 infiltrative, morpheaform and micronodular BCC subtypes as well as in non high risk BCCs, an analysis of
- 4 **7994 BCC lesions.**
- 5 Word Count: 2766; Figure Count:6; Table Count: 8
- 6 Lio Yu, MD, DABR^a, Michael Kaczmarski^b, Clay Cockerell, MD, MBA, JD^c.
- 7 Affiliations:
- 8 a. Chief of Radiation Oncology, Laserderm Dermatology., Smithtown, NY
- 9 Research Chair, Dermatology Association of Radiation Therapy
- 10 b. New York Institute of Technology
- 11 c. Clinical Professor of Dermatology and Pathology
- 12 UT Southwestern Medical Center
- 13 Chair, DFW/Lake Granbury Dermatology Residency Program
- 14 Dallas, Texas
- 15 <u>Corresponding Author:</u> Lio Yu, MD (<u>lio.yu@protonmail.com</u>)
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 17
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24

- 26
- -
- 27

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

28

ABSTRACT

29 Background

- 30 High risk (HR) basal cell carcinoma (BCC) subtypes have been associated with high recurrence rates that is felt to
- 31 be better managed surgically. Specifically, Mohs Micrographic Surgery (MMS) is considered most effective for
- 32 aggressive HR BCCs and superior to traditional nonsurgical techniques, including radiation. Recently, superficial
- 33 radiation therapy with high resolution ultrasound image guidance called Image Guided Superficial Radiation
- 34 Therapy (IGSRT) displayed high local control (LC) rates and is an emerging non-surgical alternative to MMS for
- 35 non-melanoma skin cancer (NMSC).

36 **Objectives**

- 37 We present the largest experience in the USA on treatment of BCCs using IGSRT and specifically evaluate if there
- 38 are differences in LC between HR BCC versus non-HR subtypes using this technology.
- 39 Methods
- 40 A retrospective analysis was conducted on 7,994 BCC lesions treated with IGSRT in the continental United States.
- 41 We compared the results of BCCs treated with IGSRT separated by HR vs non HR groups including 339 HR BCC
- 42 lesions and 7655 non HR BCC lesions. High risk was defined as infiltrative, micronodular, morpheaform, and
- 43 sclerosing subtypes. Non-HR BCC included superficial, nodular, and not otherwise specified (NOS) subtypes. Local
- 44 control (LC) rates at two and five years were calculated with actuarial life-table and Kaplan-Meier methods and
- 45 statistically compared using log rank tests.
- 46 **Results**
- 47 IGSRT treatment of the HR BCC group showed no recurrences with two and five-year actuarial and KM LC rates
- 48 all at 100%. In comparison, the non-HR BCC cohort achieved similar two and five-year actuarial LC rates of
- 49 99.71% and 99.24% (KM LC at 99.5% and 99.23%), respectively. No statistical differences in LC rates between the
- 50 two cohorts (p=0.278 each) resulted. Patients tolerated treatment well with little or rare high grade RTOG toxicity
- 51 reported in both cohorts.
- 52 Conclusion
- 53 HR BCC may be treated just as effectively as low risk BCC using IGSRT and presents a viable alternative to MMS.
- 54 The targeted approach using IGSRT, incorporating high resolution dermal ultrasound (HRDUS), appear to enhance
- treatment accuracy and effectiveness demonstrating high LC rates in all subtypes of BCC comparable to MMS and
- 56 is a viable non-surgical option.
- 57
- 58
- 59 60
- 61
- ~
- 62
- 63

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

- 64 <u>Plain language summary:</u>
- 65 Effectiveness of a non-surgical skin cancer treatment using an image guided form of radiation modality on all
- 66 subtypes of basal cell skin cancer.
- 67 Recent studies using a non-surgical treatment combining low penetrance radiation with ultrasound called Image
- 68 Guided Superficial Radiation Therapy (IGSRT) showed promise in curing Basal Cell Cancer (BCC) of the skin,
- 69 which is the most common skin cancer worldwide afflicting millions annually. Recent studies on early stage (I, II)
- 70 BCCs treated with IGSRT (estimated combined total of ~1900 BCC cases) appear to rival the best surgical treatment
- 71 available called Mohs Micrographic Surgery ("Mohs" or MMS). Furthermore, certain subtypes of BCC appear to
- behave more aggressively with worse outcomes even with surgery and is generally felt inappropriate for radiation
- 73 treatment. However, BCC subtypes were not specified in previous IGSRT studies.
- 74
- 75 This study presents the largest experience (using medical chart review) in approximately 8000 BCC cases treated by
- 76 IGSRT across the continental United States separated by aggressive vs non-aggressive subtypes for early stages (I,
- II) as well as more advanced (stage III) BCC cases to evaluate the efficacy and safety.
- 78
- 79 This study confirms the high cure/control rate and safety of IGSRT for all subtypes of BCC which appear equivalent
- 80 with Mohs (although the study was not meant to be a head to head comparison of the 2 different modalities).
- 81 Moreover, the aggressive types of BCC showed similar (if not marginally better) cure rates than the more common
- 82 non-aggressive BCC subtypes.
- 83 The potential benefits to patients from this study show there is now a clinically proven non-surgical treatment with
- 84 the same effectiveness as surgery for the most common cancer on the planet.
- 85

86 Key Points

- This study provides evidence that backs up using IGSRT as a viable treatment option to MMS for both high
 risk and non-high risk BCC cases, achieving similar local control rates for both groups.
- It highlights that high risk BCC is more sensitive to radiation therapies such as IGSRT than previously
- 90 believed, challenging the conventional practice of surgical treatment.

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

91 **1 Introduction**

- 92 Skin cancer is the most common form of cancer globally and presents a significant health challenge with various
- 93 subtypes and varying prognoses. Among the many kinds of cancers, basal cell carcinoma (BCC) emerges as e most
- 94 common type, accounting for nearly 80% of non-melanoma skin cancers [1]. As the incidence of non-melanoma
- 95 skin cancers (NMSC) continues to rise with an estimation of 3.5 million patients with 5.4 million lesions each year
- 96 diagnosed in the United States as of 2012 and continues to rise, the need for developing effective strategies to
- 97 manage the disease becomes more imperative, particularly in the context of BCC [2].
- 98
- 99 For early stage BCC, which is the most common skin cancer amongst patients, several approaches are available for
- 100 these cases including surgical excision, radiotherapy, topical imiquimod, photodynamic therapy [3,4] and Mohs
- 101 Micrographic Surgery (MMS). Nevertheless, after BCC treatments (surgical or non-surgical) there is an increased
- 102 risk of future BCC developing with up to a 16% chance of the development of new BCCs within the first year after
- 103 initial treatment and an expected 5 year incidence for BCC developing of 45% as compared to the general US white
- 104 population [5] which demonstrates the scope of the problem.
- 105
- 106 Although basal cell carcinoma has a characteristic of slow progression, local invasiveness, and low metastatic

107 potential, there exist histological subtypes that are considered "high risk" that have been observed to have a more

aggressive nature and ability to recur [6] Certain histologies such as morphemic, sclerosing, infiltrative, and micro

109 nodular subtype present a challenge to typical treatment practices that have led to favoring surgical interventions

- 110 over alternative modalities [7].
- 111

According to the American Academy of Dermatology (AAD), surgical interventions with Mohs micrographic surgery are widely recognized as the gold standard of care for patients with morpheaform and sclerosing BCCs due to their ability to conserve healthy tissue and retain high cure rates [8]. Conventional wisdom in dermatological oncology has a long held the belief that high risk BCCs are less responsive to radiation therapy and less prone to recur with surgery. This belief has been rooted by the inherent biological aggressiveness of these histologies backed by prior observational data [10] Surgical management of high risk cases such as morpheaform BCC on the nose was

118	observed to have an incomplete excision rate of 61.5% and at the ear of 50% [11]. Coupled with various concerns
119	about the efficacy and safety aspects of radiation therapies, this has led to vigilant or cautionary approaches in
120	treating these high risk BCC histologies. However, this established approach may not be suitable for all patients.
121	Several factors such as disfigurement, the overall health of the patient, or the ability to tolerate surgery treatments
122	may have an influence on treatment decisions. Thus, it is crucial to consider alternative and less invasive treatments
123	in selected cases [9].
124	
125	As radiation therapy techniques have advanced recently, the introduction of image-guided superficial radiation
126	therapy (IGSRT) which is a combination of HRDUS with SRT has allowed for the reconsideration of methods
127	employed on treating skin cancer. Specifically, with regard to early stage NMSC (including high risk BCCs),
128	IGSRT, which is regarded as precision and targeted medicine, potentially mitigates limitations associated with
129	conventional non image-guided traditional radiation therapy (such a external/electron beam radiotherapy [XRT] and
130	superficial radiation therapy [SRT]) and has been shown to statistically improve outcomes on treatment of all major
131	histologies of NMSC, such as BCC, SCC and SCCIS [12-15]. On this basis, it stands to reason that re-assessment of
132	the previous notion of bypassing the option of radiotherapy in high risk subtypes of BCCs should be evaluated using
133	this more modern method of radiotherapy incorporating image guidance intrinsically to assess to see if the
134	prevailing sentiment of non-radiation approach still holds true.
135	
136	We set out to evaluate the differences, if any, in the local control rate of aggressive high risk BCC subtypes in
137	comparison to the non-aggressive BCC subtypes treated with the use of this newer technology of IGSRT.
138	
139	2 Methods and methods
140	From 2016-2023, pathologic proven BCCs of stage I, II,III (AJCC 8 TH edition cancer staging with tumor stage T1,
141	T2, and T3) treated w IGSRT at multiple institutions throughout the continental United States were retrospectively
142	reviewed and analyzed. Only pure BCCs without combined or collision histologic components (ie, without any
143	squamous cell carcinoma (SCC), squamous cell carcinoma in situ (SCCIS), keratoacanthoma (KA), other non BCC
144	histologies) were selected. We separated the high risk (HR) BCC histology cohort from the non-HR BCCs, gathered

145	the lesion characteristics, treatment parameters and analyzed the rate of recurrence deriving the lesion local control
146	post IGSRT treatment. Lesion and patient characteristics were summarized descriptively. Actuarial (life-table)
147	local control (LC) rate and Kaplan-Meier (KM) LC were calculated and plotted graphically. Comparison of the
148	actuarial LC and KMLC between the HR BCC vs non-HR BCC cohorts were performed using log-rank statistical
149	methods.
150	
151	High risk histology are defined as Infiltrative, Micronodular, Morpheaform, and Sclerosing subtype of BCCs. Non-
152	HR BCC histology included superficial, nodular, or not otherwise specified (NOS) subtypes.
153	
154	This study has been determined to be exempt by WCG-IRB under 45 CFR § 46.104(d)(4), because the research
155	involves the use of identifiable information which is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity
156	of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, the
157	investigator does not contact the subjects, and the investigator will not re-identify subjects.
158	
159	3 Results
160	Patient/Lesion characteristics:
161	
162	Between 2016-2023, 339 high risk (HR) BCC and 7655 non-HR BCC lesions were treated with IGSRT.
163	Table 1 summarizes the patient age and gender revealing a slight predominance of males (55.8%) overall however,
164	there were slightly more females proportionally in the HR group. Mean age of patients was 72.5 ranging from 19.7
165	to 104.5.
166	
167	Table 2 demonstrates the anatomic distributions of NMSC lesions separated by risk groups. As expected, the most
168	common sites of BCC lesions were on the head and neck(H&N). There were more HR BCCs occurring in the H&N
169	region in comparison to the non-HR BCC cohort (90% vs 80%).
170	

171	Table 3 summarizes the different pathologic subtypes of high risk and non high risk BCC cohorts. Infiltrative
172	(57.2%) and sclerosing (22.4%) were the most common subtypes for the high risk BCC group. The most common
173	pathology subtypes for the non high risk BCC group were nodular (62.0%) and not otherwise specified (26.5%)
174	histology.
175	
176	Table 4 summarizes high risk and non-high risk BCC lesion diameter and depth. The mean diameter and depths of
177	HR vs non-HR BCCs were similar with mean diameter slightly higher for the HR group(1.40cm) vs the non HR
178	BCC subset (1.27cm). Mean depths recorded by high resolution dermal ultrasound (HRDUS) for both groups were
179	equal(1.4mm each), however the median depth for non-HR cohort was lower (1.0 mm) vs the non HR cohort
180	(1.35mm).
181	
182	Table 5 illustrates the tumor stage (based on AJCC 8 th edition applied to all body locations rather than just the H&N
183	region to be consistent) separated by high risk and non high risk BCC lesions. The HR BCC cohort had slightly
184	higher proportion of stage II and III lesions whereas the non-HR cohort had a slightly higher proportion of stage I
185	lesions (74% vs 80%).
186	
187	Table 6 summarizes the total fractions of treatments, total treatment dose, duration of treatment, and duration of
188	follow up separated by the HR vs non-HR cohort. The total treatment fractions were the same amongst the 2 groups
189	with a slightly higher total doses given to the HR BCC group (5502.4 cGy) vs the non-HR BCC group (5386.5
190	cGy). High risk lesions were treated for an average of 7.2 weeks and had an average follow up interval of 80.6
191	weeks. Non high risk lesions were treated for an average of 6.7 weeks with an average follow up interval of 101.17
192	weeks.
193	
194	Table 7 summarizes the energies that the lesions were treated with (50kV, 70kV, or 100 kV exclusively, or mixed)
195	Lesions that were treated with more than one energy during the treatment course were termed as "mixed".
196	Approximately 3.5% of high risk lesions and 11.2% of non-high risk lesions were treated with a mix of two or more
197	energies.

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

- 198
- 199 Table 8 highlights the safety profile of IGSRT treatment for both groups. Overall, in both groups combined
- 200 approximately 4% (3.97%) of lesions had RTOG grade 3 or 4 toxicities showing the IGSRT treatment appeared safe
- and well tolerated and similar in both groups.
- 202

203 **3.1 Lesion Local Control**

- 204 With a mean follow up of over 1.5 years in the HR cohort and almost 2 years in the non-HR group (going well past
- 205 5 years in a substantial number of lesions), there were no failures/recurrences in the HR BCC cohort w 100% local
- 206 control. In the non-HR BCC cohort there were 31 failures.
- 207

208 Actuarial Local Control at 2 and 5 years:

- An actuarial 2 yr LC of 99.7% and 5 yr actuarial LC of 99.2% was achieved (Figure 1) in the non-HR group. The
- 210 actuarial LC rates for the HR group were 100% at both 2 and 5 years (Figure 2). There was no statistical difference

between the 2 cohorts' actuarial LC rates on log-rank testing (p= 0.278) (Figure 3).

212

213 Kaplan-Meier Local Control at 2 and 5 Years:

214 The non-high risk 2 yr LC rate was 99.6%, and the 5 yr LC rate was 99.2% (Figure 4). The Kaplan-Meier analysis

shows 2 and 5 yr LC of 100% (Figure 5) for the high risk subtypes. Statistical analysis using the log-rank test

216 revealed no significant difference (p = 0.278) in local control rates between the two cohorts (Figure 6).

217

218 4 Discussion

219 This paper presents a comprehensive analysis of superficial radiotherapy (ultrasound guided) treatment on the

220 largest reported series of BCC patients in the United States, with one cohort pathologically diagnosed with high risk

BCC subtypes consisting of 339 lesions of infiltrative, morpheaform, micronodular and sclerosing subtypes and the

- 222 other non-high risk BCC cohort (nodular, superficial and NOS subtypes) comprising of 7655 lesions. Both cohorts
- 223 underwent a similar treatment regimen with doses and energies using HRDUS guided superficial radiation therapy

224 (commercially and commonly referred to as IGSRT) using a previously published regimen (Ladd-Yu protocol) [12].

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

- 225 The HR BCC cohort showed 100% KMLC which was minimally (and non statistically) higher than the non-HR
- BCC subgroup (99.6% and 99.2% KM LC) at 2 and 5 years, respectively.
- 227 Both HR and non HR groups had low toxicity of treatment with the regimen used showing RTOG toxicity generally
- limited to grades of 1 and 2, and rare instances of RTOG 3 and 4 toxicity.
- 229
- 230 These results shows that high risk histology subtypes of BCC are indeed radiosensitive using SRT combined w
- HRDUS guidance. In fact, these aggressive BCC subtypes may actually be paradoxically more radiosensitive when
- 232 compared to standard/non-aggressive BCC subtypes. Although the number of HR cases are lower than the non-HR
- BCC group, the authors feel that there are substantially sufficient number to justify the validity the results and
- 234 conclusions. This observation may actually be consistent with certain other higher grade cancers subtype radiation
- response showing a similar paradoxically higher radiosensitivity and initial complete response rate than lower grade
- cells such as in Bladder CA and lymphomas, etc [16]. Albeit in these other decidedly more life threatening cancers
- with their tendency for distant or nodal metastases, the initial response may not translate to better outcome. We feel
- that for the typically local only behavior of BCCs, that the radiosensitivity and complete response rate does indeed
- translate to ultimate long term local control or "cure" (a term many dermatologists like to use for BCCs and other
- early stage NMSC) of the target lesion.
- 241
- 242 The LC differences between the 2 groups are small(<1%) by log rank analyses with both cohorts showing
- 243 outstanding LC out past 5 years and no statistically significant difference in lesion local control rates by log rank

analysis. This improved LC in all subtypes of BCCs establishes that the relatively new modality of IGSRT is

appropriate for all BCCs regardless of subtype.

246

247 Debunking Myths of radioresistence of HR BCC

These results contribute to debunking the myth that radiation therapy is ineffective or less effective for high risk
BCCs. Our analysis shows an equivalent or actually lower failure rate (of 0%) compared to the non-high risk cohort
(at 0.5-0.8% failure).

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

252	The most obvious explanation for this improvement is the new ability of IGSRT over tradiational non-image guided
253	radiotherapy modalities. In 2 recent studies using logistic-regression analysis and meta-analysis, LC in the treatment
254	of NMSC using IGSRT in comparison to non-image guided external radiation modalities (superficial radiation
255	therapy (SRT) or external beam radiation therapy (XRT including electron beam or photon beam radiotherapy) have
256	been shown to be superior and achieving statistically improved LC [14,15] and were attributed to the image
257	guidance factor. Whereas previously, the use of RT may not have been recommended for high risk BCCs due to
258	potentially higher recurrence rates, the advent of HRDUS in combination with SRT allow more precision to be
259	directed to the full depth of the tumor and ushers in an era of modern more exacting targeting of radiation beams that
260	appears to be associated with higher success rates rivaling that of surgical interventions such as MMS and present a
261	valuable treatment option especially for those who are not ideal candidates for surgical management. This paradigm
262	shifting development uses the HRUS which has high correlation with depth of tumor involvement [17] and is useful
263	not only in pre-treatment planning but also in evaluation during the midst of treatment as well as for following the
264	lesion post treatment at the post therapy area in both scenarios of surgical and non-surgical (including definitive
265	radiotherapeutic) treatment approaches. The imaging can give information to help in treatment
266	modification/adaptation and direct potential salvage therapy selection post therapy. HRDUS may also be helpful to
267	help differentiate the aggressive subtypes of BCC versus non-aggressive subtypes based on the echogenicity of the
268	ultrasound findings [17]. Further discussion of the use of HRUS is beyond the scope of this paper and may be a good
269	subject for future publications. The utility of HRDUS in surgical NMSC scenarios may benefit from further
270	research endeavors.
271	
272	Based on the results of this study, IGSRT may indeed be a good option in these HR subtypes and in select situations
273	may be preferred over surgical excision/MMS in situations for patients with surgical fatigue, lesions in

cosmetically/functionally sensitive locations, poor performance status subjects on anticoagulation, or those who
 cannot tolerate a prolonged surgical procedures requiring patient to remain still for extended periods of time, or

those who decline surgery.

278	By examining the outcomes of these cases, this paper challenges the prevailing notions about the management of
279	high risk and non-risk BCCs and provides evidence that may change treatment perspectives and future guidelines.
280	A paradigm shift may be advocated for how high risk BCC is approached, moving away from previous notions of
281	surgical only treatments to a more customized evidence-based approach that is also non-surgical.
282	
283	As the prevalence of skin cancer continues to expand, such advancements are critical in the evolving landscape of
284	cancer care ensuring that patients, in consultation with their dermatology and/or radiation/ oncology providers, make
285	the best decision with regard to selection of the treatment modalities best suited for the patients' specific situation to
286	maximize optimal outcomes as well as assuring safety minimizing short term and long term toxicity and
287	subsequently achieving the best quality of life, both functionally and cosmetically.
288	
289	4.1 Limitations
290	A number of practices may have excluded these high risk BCCs categorically and steered these patients to Mohs
291	after discussion. Others did not exclude any histological subtypes. The category of not otherwise specified BCCs
292	may have certain BCCs that may have elements of high risk features that were simply not reported and perhaps
293	might have accounted for some of its failures.
294	
295	Competing risks of death was not accounted for however, we feel that BCC typically does not affect mortality, thus
296	we felt exclusions based on this was not necessary and thus was not done in this paper.
297	
298	5 Conclusion
299	IGSRT achieves high success rates in all subtypes of BCC in retrospective review on almost 8,000 cases in the USA.
300	
301	HR BCC subtypes may actually be paradoxically more radiosensitive than or at least equivalent to other more
302	common "non-aggressive" BCC subtypes.
303	

304	There is no contraindications to using RT in the form of SRT combined w HRDUS (commonly called IGSRT) for
305	high risk subtypes of BCCs. In fact, in certain patients with any subtype of BCC, IGSRT may be preferential over
306	excision/MMS if the patient is a poor surgical candidate, has lesions in cosmetically/functionally sensitive locations
307	or if the patient prefers a non-surgical approach.
308	
309	
310	
311	
312	
313	
314	
315	
316	
317	
318	
319	
320	
321	
322	
323	
324	
325	
326	
327	
328	
329	
330	

References:
1 Katalinic A, Kunze U, Schäfer T. Epidemiology of cutaneous melanoma and non-melanoma skin cancer in
Schleswig-Holstein, Germany: incidence, clinical subtypes, tumour stages and localization (epidemiology of skin
cancer). Br J Dermatol. 2003 Dec;149(6):1200-6.
2 Rogers HW, Weinstock MA, Harris AR, Hinckley MR, Feldman SR, Fleischer AB, et al. Incidence estimate of
nonmelanoma skin cancer in the United States, 2006. Arch Dermatol. 2010 Mar;146(3):283-7.
3 Puig S, Berrocal A. Management of high-risk and advanced basal cell carcinoma. Clin Transl Oncol. 2015 Jul
1;17(7):497–503.
4 Rubin Adam I., Chen Elbert H., Ratner Désirée. Basal-Cell Carcinoma. New England Journal of Medicine.
2005;353(21):2262–9.
5 Marghoob A, Kopf AW, Bart RS, Sanfilippo L, Silverman MK, Lee P, et al. Risk of another basal cell carcinoma
developing after treatment of a basal cell carcinoma. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 1993 Jan
1;28(1):22–8.
6 Tanese K. Diagnosis and Management of Basal Cell Carcinoma. Curr Treat Options Oncol. 2019 Feb 11;20(2):13.
7 Paolino G, Donati M, Didona D, Mercuri SR, Cantisani C. Histology of Non-Melanoma Skin Cancers: An Update.
Biomedicines. 2017 Dec 20;5(4):71.
8 Bichakjian C, Armstrong A, Baum C, Bordeaux JS, Brown M, Busam KJ, et al. Guidelines of care for the
management of basal cell carcinoma. Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology. 2018 Mar 1;78(3):540-59.

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

2	5	Q
J	J	o

359 9 Durmus Ucar AN, Durmus Kocaaslan FN, Salman A, Demirkesen C, Erdem Bayram F, Bayramicli M. Margin-360 Controlled, Staged Surgical Excision in the Treatment of High-Risk Basal Cell Carcinomas of the Head and Neck 361 Region. J Cutan Med Surg. 2019 May;23(3):258-64. 362 363 10 Nguyen TH, Ho DQD. Nonmelanoma skin cancer. Curr Treat Options in Oncol. 2002 Jun 1;3(3):193–203. 364 365 11 Kappelin J, Nielsen K, Nilsson F, Bjellerup M, Ahnlide I. Surgical treatment of basal cell carcinoma: a case 366 series on factors influencing the risk of an incomplete primary excision. Journal of the European Academy of 367 Dermatology and Venereology. 2020 Mar 2; 34(11):2518-25. 368 369 12 Yu L, Oh C, Shea CR. The Treatment of Non-Melanoma Skin Cancer with Image-Guided Superficial Radiation 370 Therapy: An Analysis of 2917 Invasive and In Situ Keratinocytic Carcinoma Lesions. Oncol Ther. 2021 Feb 5; 371 9(1):153-66. 372 373 13 Tran A, Moloney M, Kaczmarski P, Zheng S, Desai A, Desai T, et al. Analysis of image-guided superficial 374 radiation therapy (IGSRT) on the treatment of early-stage non-melanoma skin cancer (NMSC) in the outpatient 375 dermatology setting. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol. 2023; 149(9):6283-91. 376 377 14 Yu L, Moloney M, Tran A, Zheng S, Rogers J. Local control comparison of early-stage non-melanoma skin 378 Cancer (NMSC) treated by superficial radiotherapy (SRT) and external beam radiotherapy (XRT) with and without 379 dermal image guidance: a meta-analysis. Discov Oncol. 2022 Nov 21;13(1):129. 380 381 15 Yu L, Moloney M, Zheng S, Rogers J. High resolution dermal ultrasound (US) combined with superficial 382 radiation therapy (SRT) versus non-image guided SRT or external beam radiotherapy (XRT) in early-stage epithelial 383 cancer: a comparison of studies. BMC Cancer. 2023 Jan 28;23(1):98. 384

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

385	16 Kimball AS, Webb TJ. The Roles of Radiotherapy and Immunotherapy for the Treatment of Lymphoma. Mol
386	Cell Pharmacol. 2013 Jan 1;5(1):27–38.
387	
388	17 Laverde-Saad A, Simard A, Nassim D, Jfri A, Alajmi A, O'Brien E, et al. Performance of Ultrasound for
389	Identifying Morphological Characteristics and Thickness of Cutaneous Basal Cell Carcinoma: A Systematic
390	Review. Dermatology. 2022;238(4):692-710.
391	
392	
393	
394	
395	
396	
397	
571	
398	
399	
400	
401	
402	

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

AGE AT FIRST TREATMENT							
	ALL	(min-max)	HR	(min-max)	non HR	(min-max)	
	n =5758		n = 339		n =5419		
Mean Age	72.5	(19.7-104.5)	72.8	(40.0-97.5)	72.1	(19.7-104.5)	
GENDER							
	ALL		HR		non HR		
Male	3208		166		3042		
Female	2545		173		2372		
Total	5753		339		5414		

Table 1 Patient Characteristics Tables *

lot all patient genders and ages were available

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

Table 2 Anatomic distribution of NMSC lesions

	HR BCC	NON-HR BCC
Head and neck (H&N)	289/321 (90.03%)	5662/7106 (79.68%)
H&N sublocation		
Ear	55/321 (17.13%)	627/7106 (8.82%)
Cheek	38/321 (11.84%)	1143/7106 (16.08%)
Nose	135/321 (42.06%)	2145/7106 (30.19%)
Cutaneous lip	9/321 (2.80%)	249/7106 (3.50%)
Mucosal lip Forehead Temple Scalp	1/321 (0.31%) 26/321 (8.09%) 8/321 (2.49%) 11/321 (3.43%)	12/7106 (0.17%) 702/7106 (9.88%) 233/7106 (3.28%) 209/7106 (2.94%)
Neck	6/321 (1.87%)	342/7106 (4.81%)
Extremities	18/321 (5.60%)	799/7106 (11.24%)
Extremities sublocation* Hand Trunk	4/321 (1.18%) 11/321 (3.43%)	60/7106 (0.84%) 402/7106 (5 66%)
Trunk sublocation	11/0#1 (0/70 /0)	
Chest Back Shoulder	4/321 (1.25%) 9/321 (2.80%) 3/321 (0.93%)	211/7106 (2.97%) 445/7106 (6.26%) 243/7106 (3.42%)

Table 3 Pathology Subtypes^a of HR BCC and non-HR BCC

HR BCC				NON-HR BCC				
MN	SCL	INF	MOR	Total	NOS	SUP	NOD	Total
59/339 (17.4%)	76/339 (22.4%)	194/339 (57.2%)	10/339 (3.00%)	339	2025/7655 (26.5%)	887/7655 (11.5%)	4743/7655 (62.0%)	7655

^aMN = Micronodular; SCL = Sclerosing; INF = Infiltrating; MOR = Morpheaform; NOS = Not otherwise
 specified; SUP = Superficial; NOD = Nodular.

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

Table 4 BCC initial lesion sizes

BCC Subcategories	HR BCC	NON-HR BCC	
Lesion diameter (cm) at start	N□=□399	N□=□7655	
$Mean \Box \pm \Box SD$	$1.4 \pm \Box 1.00$	1.27 ±□0.84	
Range	0.3–8.0	0.0–10.5	
Median	1.0	1.0	
BCC lesion depth (mm) at start	<i>n</i> \square = \square 339	<i>n</i> □=□7655	
$Mean \Box \pm \Box SD$	$1.4 \pm \Box 1.00$	1.4 ±□0.53	
Range	0.3–8.0	0.0-4.82	
Median	1.0	1.35	

Table 5 Stage of NMSC lesions

	HR BCC	NON-HR BCC
Stage	n (%)	n (%)
l (0 to <2 cm)	252 (74.34)	6157 (80.43)
ll (2 to <4 cm)	74 (21.83)	1295 (16.92)
III (≥ 4 cm)	11 (3.24)	96 (1.25)
Unspecified	2 (0.59)	107 (1.40)
Total	339(100)	7655 (100)

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

Characteristic	Statistic	HR BCC	NON-HR BCC
Total number of fractions	Ν	339	7655
	$Mean \Box \pm \Box SD$	$20.3 \Box \pm \Box 0.94$	20.0 ± 1.24
	Range	13.0 to 25.0	12.0 to 32.0
	Median	20.0	20.0
	Ν	339	7655
Total tractment dage (cCv)	$Mean \Box \pm \Box SD$	5502.4 ± 228.60	5386.5 ± 234.08
Total treatment dose (cGy)	Range	4453.4 to 6595.88	3716.0 to 7363.7
	Median	5491.2	5420.3
	Ν	339	7655
Duration of treatment (weeks)	$Mean \Box \pm \Box SD$	$7.2\Box \pm \Box 2.13$	6.7 ± 4.17
	Range	0.14-24.29	0.14 to 61.71
	Median	6.86	6.57
	Ν	339	7655
Duration of follow-up	$Mean \square \pm \square SD$	$80.6 \square \pm \square 70.92$	101.17 ± 89.17
(weeks)	Range	0.14-362.86	0.0 to 391.0
	Median	58.9	77.14

Table 6 Total number of treatment fractions, dose, duration, and follow-up interval

Table 7 Hurse resion treatment by energy			
	HR BCC	Non-HR BCC	
Energy (kV)	N = 339	N = 7642	
50	21 (6.2%)	1410 (18.5%)	
70	167 (49.3%)	4059 (53.1%)	
100	139 (41.0%)	1322 (17.3%)	
Mixed	12 (3.5%)	851 (11.1%)	
Total*	339 (100%)	7642 (100%)	

Table 7 NMSC lesion treatment by energy

450 *Some lesions did not have any lesion energy recorded
451
452
453

Characteristic Grade Description (n == 229) (n == 4552) Follicular, faint, or dull erythema; 1 epilation; dry desquamation; decreased 117/229 (51.1%) 2797/4552 (61.4%) Highest RTOG toxicity grade 2 Tender or bright erythema, patchy moist desquamation; moderate edema 108/229 (47.2%) 1569/4552 (34.5%) 3 Confluent, moist desquamation other 4/229 (1.7%) 183/4552 (4 4 Ulceration, hemorrhage, necrosis 0/229 (0.0%) 3/4552 (0.07) <i>RTOG</i> (Radiation Treatment Oncology Group) (Not all lesions have documented scores) RTOG	Table 8 Safety— BCC	-by le	esion based on RTOG criteria	HR BCC	NON I
Follicular, faint, or dull erythema; 1 epilation; dry desquamation; decreased 117/229 (51.1%) (61.4%) Highest RTOG toxicity grade 2 Tender or bright erythema, patchy moist desquamation; moderate edema 4/229 (47.2%) (34.5%) 3 Confluent, moist desquamation other than skin folds; pitting edema 4/229 (1.7%) 183/4552 (0.07 <i>RTOG</i> (Radiation Treatment Oncology Group) (Not all lesions have documented scores) <i>RTOG</i> (Radiation Treatment Oncology Group) (Not all lesions have documented scores)	Characteristic (Frad	eDescription	(<i>n</i> □=□229)	(<i>n</i> □=□4552)
Highest RTOG toxicity grade 2 Tender or bright erythema, patchy moist toxicity grade 108/229 (47.2%) 1569/4552 (34.5%) 3 Confluent, moist desquamation other than skin folds; pitting edema 4/229 (1.7%) 183/4552 (0.07) 4 Ulceration, hemorrhage, necrosis 0/229 (0.0%) 3/4552 (0.07) RTOG (Radiation Treatment Oncology Group) (Not all lesions have documented scores) RTOG		1	Follicular, faint, or dull erythema; epilation; dry desquamation; decreased sweating	117/229 (51.1%)	2797/4552 (61.4%)
3 Confluent, moist desquamation other 4/229 (1.7%) 183/4552 (4 4 Ulceration, hemorrhage, necrosis 0/229 (0.0%) 3/4552 (0.07) <i>RTOG</i> (Radiation Treatment Oncology Group) (Not all lesions have documented scores)	Highest RTOG toxicity grade	2	Tender or bright erythema, patchy moist desquamation; moderate edema	108/229 (47.2%)	1569/4552 (34.5%)
4 Ulceration, hemorrhage, necrosis 0/229 (0.0%) 3/4552 (0.07) <i>RTOG</i> (Radiation Treatment Oncology Group) (Not all lesions have documented scores)		3	Confluent, moist desquamation other than skin folds; pitting edema	4/229 (1.7%)	183/4552 (4.02
<i>RTOG</i> (Radiation Treatment Oncology Group) (Not all lesions have documented scores)		4	Ulceration, hemorrhage, necrosis	0/229 (0.0%)	3/4552 (0.07%

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

483 ACTURARIAL LOCAL CONTROL CURVES:

484







IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

500

501 KAPLAN-MEIER LOCAL CONTROL CURVES:







IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

5	0	n
J	7	υ

521 **FIGURE LEGENDS**:

- 522 Figure 1: Actuarial Local Control at 2 and 5 Years for non-High Risk BCC. The graph demonstrates high rates of
- 523 local control with actuarial 2 year local control of 99.71% and 5 year actuarial local control of 99.24%.
- 524 Figure 2: Actuarial Local Control at 2 and 5 Years for High Risk BCC. The graph demonstrates high rates of local
- 525 control with actuarial 2 and 5 year local control of 100% and 100%.

526

- 527 Figure 3: Actuarial Local Control Curve comparing High Risk and non-High Risk BCC groups. The blue line
- 528 represents High Risk BCCs, and the red line represents non High Risk BCCs. The log rank test revealed a p value of
- 529 0.278 indicating no statistical difference in local control rates between the two groups.

530

531 Figure 4: Kaplan-Meier Local Control at 2 and 5 Years for non-High Risk BCC. Kaplan-Meier local control curves

for the non-High Risk BCC cohort at 2 and 5 years treated with IGSRT is 99.55% and 99.23%, respectively.

533

Figure 5: Kaplan-Meier Local Control Curve for High Risk BCC. The 2 year and 5 year KM local control rate
using IGSRT are both 100%.

536

Figure 6: Kaplan-Meier (KM) Local Control (LC) at 2 and 5 years: KM Local Control Curves comparing High
Risk and non-High Risk BCC groups. The blue line represents High Risk BCCs, and the red line represents non
High Risk BCCs. The log rank test revealed a p value of 0.278 indicating no statistical difference in local control
rates between the two groups.

- 541
- 542 543
- --
- 544
- 545

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

546 **Declarations**

- 547 I. <u>Funding</u>:
- 548 A commercial company provided funding for the first author's time as an independent contractor for independent
- 549 researching and writing of this paper. The sponsor of the study was <u>not</u> involved in the study design, collection,
- analysis, interpretation of data, or writing of the report. Writing of this paper and the submission process was solely
- that of the first author and co-authors.
- 552 II. <u>Conflict of Interest:</u>
- 553 The first author has received research, speaking and/or consulting support from a commercial company. He has
- served on an advisory board for another commercial company previously unrelated to this research. The other
- authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.
- 556 III. Availability of data and material:
- 557 The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.
- 558
- 559 IV. Ethic approvals/IRB:
- 560 This study has been determined to be exempt by WCG-IRB under 45 CFR § 46.104(d)(4), because the research
- involves the use of identifiable information which is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the identity
- 562 of the human subjects cannot readily be ascertained directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects, the
- 563 investigator does not contact the subjects, and the investigator will not re-identify subjects.
- 564
- 565 V. <u>Consent to participate:</u>
- 566 Not applicable
- 567 VI. Consent for publication:
- 568 Not applicable
- 569 VII. <u>Code availability:</u>
- 570 Not applicable
- 571
- 572

IGSRT sensitivity and efficacy in High Risk vs Non High Risk Basal Cell Carcinoma

573 VIII. <u>Author contributions:</u>

574 All authors have contributed to the manuscript and approved the final submitted version of the manuscript. Lio Yu-575 Conceptualization, methodology, data collection and curation, supervision, data and statistics verification, writing-576 original draft, review and editing. Michael Kaczmarski- data collection, data and statistics verification, tables and 577 figures, writing- original draft, review and editing. Clay J. Cockerell- concept refinement, supervision, review and 578 editing. 579 580 Acknowledgements: The authors would like to acknowledge the following people who were instrumental in 581 collecting and extracting data from various different locations, without whom this study would not be 582 possible: ☐ Amanda Boatner, Berta Benzschawel, Beth Ann Marogi, Brianna Moore, Carolyn Mahoot, Charles 583 Bingner, Cherie Hoppe, Diane Krause, Lio Yu, Eric Hill, Erica Kovaluskie, Isabella Moore, Jacob Britt, Jacqueline 584 Contino, Jennilee Kovaluskie, Jenny Folden, JoAnne Porta, Karen McKenna, Katie Curtiss, Kim McLaugherty, 585 Kimberly Wilke-Zuma, Krupal Patel, Lacy Smith, Leslie Walker, Lisa Gonzalez, Lisha Kelly, Macie Najera, 586 Mairead Moloney, Mandi Brown, Michael Kaczmarski, Michelle Smith, Nick Natalizio, Olivia Desalvo, Paula 587 Wright, Peter Kaczmarski, Prithvi Narasimhan, Rachel Lindley, Rachelle Moore, Samantha Sheehan, Sarah Moss, 588 Soham More, Stacey Robinson, Tonya Johnson, and Yancy Boatner. Special thanks to Soham Moore and Prithi

589 Narasimhan from Sympto Health for data scraping of data from EMR's. We are indebted to Songzhu for statistical

590 calculations and LC curve generation.

591

592

593

594

595