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ABSTRACT

Purpose: Routine physical examination is recommended in follow up guidelines for women with a history of breast cancer. The objective of this paper is to assess the contribution of routine physical examination in addition to mammography in the early diagnosis of breast cancer recurrences.

Patients and methods: The medical follow-up documents of 669 patients were reviewed. 127 contra-lateral breast cancers (CBCs) and 58 loco-regional recurrences (LRRs) in 163 patients were included. The additional contribution of routine physical examination over mammography was evaluated with the proportions of CBCs or LRRs detected by physical examination alone. χ² tests were used to compare the difference of contribution of physical examination among subgroups.

Results: Seven (6%) out of 127 CBCs and 13 (22%) out of 58 LRRs were detected by routine physical examination alone. Six LRRs (17%; 6/35) were in patients after breast conserving surgery and seven LRRs (30%; 7/23) in patients after mastectomy. There was a trend that the contribution of physical examination is higher in women under 60 years of age in the detection of CBCs (9%; 5/57) and LRRs (28%, 8/29) than in women over 60 years of age (CBCs:3%; 2/70 and LRRs:17%, 5/29; χ² = 3.090, P = 0.079).

Conclusions: Twenty-two percent of loco regional breast cancer recurrences would have been detected later without physical examination. Routine physical examination may be most valuable for women with a history of breast cancer younger than 60 years at follow-up visit.

© 2010 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

A combination of high incidence and good survival makes breast cancer the most prevalent cancer in women. This puts an increasing burden on follow-up oncology clinics. It is predicted that there will be a 48% increased need for cancer services by 2020. Specialists are facing an ever-increasing workload of providing long-term follow-up care for women...
Patients with breast cancer were selected from the files of the
these LRRs and CBCs early.5–7 The value of mammography for
guidelines for women with a history of breast cancer to detect
physical examination are recommended in the follow up
examination. since primary diagnosis on the diagnostic value of physical
the contribution of physical examination in addition to mam-
primary treatment. The aim of the current study is to evaluate
be more LRRs and CBCs detected by routine physical exami-
for early detection of CBC has been confirmed in several stud-
ies.8–10 In addition, LRR in the conserved breast can often be
detected early by mammography.11,12 However, the contribu-
tion of routine physical examination to the early detection
of a recurrence is debatable and estimates for the proportion
of recurrences detected by physical examination alone vary
from 6% to 40%.13 It is known that the performance of
physical examination is at least influenced by age and
previous surgical treatment (breast conserving surgery versus
mastectomy).14,15 In addition, a higher frequency physical
examination in the first 5 year after primary treatment has
been recommended.16 It was hypothesised that there might
be more LRRs and CBCs detected by routine physical exami-
dation due to the intensive follow-up in the first 5 years after
primary treatment. The aim of the current study is to evaluate
the contribution of physical examination in addition to mam-
mography during following up of women with a history of
breast cancer, and to assess the influence of patient’s age at
follow-up visit, previous surgical treatment and the time
since primary diagnosis on the diagnostic value of physical
examination.

2. Patients and methods

2.1. Settings and subjects

Patients with breast cancer were selected from the files of the
regional cancer registry of the former Comprehensive Cancer
Centre North-Netherlands (CCCN, merged into the Compre-
hensive Cancer Centre Northeast-Netherlands in 2009). This
cancer registry contains data on diagnosis, stage and treat-
ment actively abstracted from the medical records of all hos-
pitals within the CCCN catchment area using a national
registration and coding manual of the Dutch Association of
Comprehensive Cancer Centres.

For 5589 consecutive women, breast cancer was the first
primary cancer diagnosed in four hospitals in the Northern
part of the Netherlands (an academic hospital, a large teach-
ing hospital and two non-teaching hospitals) from January
1989 to January 2003. A new primary tumour was defined as
any new tumour that was not a recurrence or direct extension
of the known tumour. All these women were without
evidence of distant metastasis at the moment of primary
diagnosis. Of these 5589 women a total of 139 patients devel-
oped CBC at least six months after the first tumour and those
CBCs were registered in the database. Because the informa-
tion on follow-up and LRRs is not available in the cancer reg-
istry, this additional follow-up information was retrieved
from the medical documents in the four participating hospi-
tals. Follow-up information was collected for all 139 patients
with a CBC and for a sample of the patients (n = 597) without
a CBC. To minimise bias, patients without a CBC were strati-
fied on hospital of diagnosis, age at first primary tumour
and duration of follow-up before sampling.

For these 736 patients, follow-up information was re-
trieved from medical documents in the four participating hospi-
tals (Fig. 1). Follow up documents were unavailable for
67 patients (9%) of whom 12 patients had CBCs. Of the
remaining 669 women included in this cohort, 51 patients
were found to have developed a total of 58 LRRs (recurrences
in the conserved breast, chest wall, axilla or supraclavicular
nodes at the same side of the primary tumour). Recurrences
that were detected in the same patient within a six months
period were considered as one recurrence.

Therefore, a total of 127 CBCs and 58 LRRs in 163 patients
were reported in this cohort. In the other 506 patients there
was no evidence of LRRs or CBCs. Patients who developed dis-
tant metastases before or at the time of CBC or LRR were not
included.

2.2. Data abstraction

For all patients included in our study cohort, the information
regarding appointments and tests were retrieved, including
date of appointment, symptoms reported by the patients dur-
ing or pending the appointment (yes or no; and kind of symp-
toms if applicable), findings of routine physical examination
(mass, abnormality in scar, abnormality in axilla or supra-cla-
vicular) and mammography. For these analyses, all follow-up
visits were regrouped into episodes, which were defined as
45-d periods. It was assumed that follow-up appointments
that happened within these episodes were related to each
other, so the information was combined.

2.3. Definitions

Routine physical examination was defined as the physical
examination undertaken by a physician during the routine
follow-up visits with or without mammography. Routine
mammography was defined as a mammography that was
undertaken during routine follow-up visits with or without
physical breast examination.

The mode of detection of CBCs and LRRs was classified as
mammography alone (in case of normal findings on physical
examination and abnormal mammograms in asymptomatic
patients); physical examination alone (in case of abnormal
findings on physical examination and normal mammograms
in asymptomatic patients); both mammography and physical
examination (in case of abnormal findings of physical exam-
ination and abnormal mammograms in asymptomatic pa-
tients) and symptoms (reported by patients at interval visits
between two scheduled follow-up visits or presented at
scheduled follow-up visits).

The contribution of routine physical examination was
evaluated by assessing the proportion of recurrences detected
by routine physical examination alone. The analysis of the
contribution of physical examination was based on the number of recurrences.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Comparisons of the contribution of physical examination were performed by \( \chi^2 \) tests among subgroups with respect to the type of recurrences, the surgical treatment of the first tumour, age of the patient at the time of recurrence and the time from the first tumour. For all the patients included in this sample, the information on follow-up and LRR was collected from the documents in hospital including the follow-up appointments and the follow-up procedures. The number of mammographies and physical examinations performed during the follow-up of each patient was analysed aiming to give a profile of the burden of follow-up in case of a LRR. Because CBC events were oversampled, the burden of follow-up to detect CBCs early could not be assessed. The number of routine physical examinations undertaken for the early detection of one additional loco-regional recurrence in addition to routine mammography was calculated in subgroups with respect to surgical treatment modality, patients’ age and the time from the first tumour.

3. Results

3.1. Characteristics of patients and the primary breast cancer

Of the 669 included patients, 56% (\( n = 375 \)) were younger than 60 years of age when the primary breast cancer was diagnosed (Table 1). 32% (\( n = 214 \)) of patients received breast conserving surgery as primary treatment, 57% (\( n = 383 \)) of the patients received radiotherapy, 15% (\( n = 101 \)) chemotherapy and 21% (\( n = 139 \)) hormonal therapy, respectively. The median follow-up time was 11.0 years (1.6–18.1).

3.2. Characteristics of CBCs and LRRs

Out of 127 CBCs, 45% (\( n = 57 \)) were diagnosed in patients under the age of 60 (Table 1). Seventy-five percent (\( n = 84 \)) out of 112 CBCs with specified pathological T stage were detected at stage T1 or Tis. Of all CBCs, 70% (80/114) were detected without lymph nodes involved. 31% (\( n = 39 \)) of 127 patients with CBC received radiotherapy for the CBC, 13% (\( n = 16 \)) received chemotherapy and 26% (33) received hormonal therapy. Thirty-four percent of CBCs (\( n = 43 \)) were diagnosed more than 5 years after primary treatment.

Out of the 58 isolated LRRs, 50% (29) were diagnosed in patients under the age of 60 (Table 1). Forty-nine percent of the LRRs (\( n = 25 \)) were treated with mastectomy, where 51% of LRRs (\( n = 26 \)) were treated with local excision. Five LRRs were detected in women who had breast conserving surgery previously and 21 LRRs were detected in women who had mastectomy previously. For seven LRRs the type of surgical treatment was unknown.

For 34% of LRRs (\( n = 20 \)), patients received radiotherapy, for 85% of LRRs (\( n = 49 \)), patients received chemotherapy and for 33% of LRRs (\( n = 19 \)) patients received hormonal therapy. Thirty-one (53%) out of 58 LRRs developed more than 5 years after the primary treatment.

3.3. Detection of contra-lateral breast cancers

Of 127 CBCs, seven (6%) were detected by routine physical examination alone, 42 (33%) were detected by mammography
alone and 26 (21%) were detected by both follow-up modalities (Table 2). Of the 75 asymptomatic patients with CBCs, 33 (44%; 95% CI: 32–56%) were palpable by the physician at routine follow-up visits. Out of 52 patients (41%) who reported symptoms leading to the diagnosis of a CBC, 11 (9%) presented at scheduled follow-up visits and 41 (32%) presented as interval cases.

In total, 86 patients (67.7%) with CBCs were detected during routine follow-up visits and 41 (33.3%) presented as interval cases. Out of 86 patients detected during routine follow-up visits, 33 patients (38.4%) with CBCs were palpable in routine physical examinations.

### 3.4. Detection of loco-regional recurrences

In 214 patients who received breast conserving surgery for the primary tumour, 16% (n = 35) of LRRs were diagnosed. Eleven LRRs after BCS were diagnosed because of symptoms reported by the patient (31%) between two scheduled follow-up visits and none at the moment of a scheduled visit. Of the 24 asymptomatic LRRs, 17 (71%; 95% CI: 51–91%) were palpable by the physician at routine follow-up visits. Six of the LRRs (17%) were diagnosed by routine physical examination alone, 20% (n = 7) by routine mammography alone and 31% (n = 11) by both (Table 2).

### Table 1 – Characteristics of patients and their tumours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Primary tumour N = 669</th>
<th>CBC N = 127</th>
<th>LRR N = 58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age group at diagnosis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;60</td>
<td>375 (56)</td>
<td>57 (45)</td>
<td>29 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>294 (44)</td>
<td>70 (55)</td>
<td>29 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathologic T stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pTis</td>
<td>57 (9)</td>
<td>14 (12)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT1</td>
<td>321 (49)</td>
<td>70 (63)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pT2/3/4</td>
<td>281 (42)</td>
<td>28 (25)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pathologic N stage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N0</td>
<td>439 (67)</td>
<td>80 (70)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N+</td>
<td>215 (33)</td>
<td>34 (30)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surgery</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumpectomy/local excision</td>
<td>214 (33)</td>
<td>35 (34)</td>
<td>26 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastectomy</td>
<td>429 (67)</td>
<td>68 (66)</td>
<td>25 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radiation therapy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>383 (57)</td>
<td>39 (31)</td>
<td>20 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>286 (43)</td>
<td>88 (69)</td>
<td>38 (66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chemotherapy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>101 (15)</td>
<td>16 (13)</td>
<td>49 (85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>568 (85)</td>
<td>111 (87)</td>
<td>9 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hormonal therapy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>139 (21)</td>
<td>33 (26)</td>
<td>19 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>530 (79)</td>
<td>94 (74)</td>
<td>39 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time of follow up (median (range) years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.8 (0.6–11.9)</td>
<td>5.0 (0.6–15.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>84 (66)</td>
<td>27 (47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 – Contribution of physical examination to mammography in follow-up of patients with breast cancer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of detection</th>
<th>CBC (n = 127)</th>
<th>LRR_BCS (n = 35)</th>
<th>LRR_Mastectomy (n = 23)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine physical examination alone</td>
<td>7 (6)</td>
<td>6 (17)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine mammography alone</td>
<td>42 (33)</td>
<td>7 (20)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>26 (20)</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptoms reported by patients</td>
<td>52 (41)</td>
<td>11 (31)</td>
<td>16 (70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Recurrences-based analysis.

b LRR_BCS: Loco regional recurrence in patients after breast conserving surgery.

LRR_Mastectomy: LRR in patients after mastectomy.
Seventeen percent (6%) of 127 CBCs and 13 (22%) out of 58 LRRs were detected during routine physical examination alone (Table 2). Seventy percent (n = 16) presented with symptoms in which 40% (n = 9) presented at scheduled follow-up visits and 30% (n = 7) presented as interval cases.

In total, 40 patients (69.0%) with LRRs were detected during routine follow-up visits and 18 (31.0%) presented as interval cases. Out of 40 patients detected during routine follow-up visits, 24 patients (60.0%) with LRRs were palpable in routine physical examinations.

When considering only the first recurrence in each patient, it was found that seven (6%) out of 120 CBCs and six (14.0%) out of 43 LRRs (four LRRs after breast conserving surgery and two LRRs after mastectomy) were detected by routine physical examination alone.

### 3.5. Contribution of physical examination

Seven (6%) out of 127 CBCs and 13 (22%) out of 58 LRRs in which six LRRs (17%; 6/35) in patients after breast conserving surgery and seven LRRs (30%; 7/23) in patients after mastectomy were detected by routine physical examination alone. The incremental contribution of physical examination was higher in detecting LRRs than in detecting CBCs ($\chi^2 = 11.797$, $P = 0.001$).

Seventeen percent (n = 6) of 35 LRRs after breast conserving surgery and 30% (n = 7) of 23 LRRs after mastectomy would have been detected later, if there was no routine physical examination. The difference in the contribution of physical examination in the detection of LRRs after BCT or after mastectomy was not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 1.410$, $P = 0.235$).

There was a trend that the proportion of recurrences detected by physical examination alone was higher in women under 60 years of age at follow-up visit than in those over 60 years ($\chi^2 = 3.090$, $P = 0.079$). In women under 60 years of age at follow-up visit, 9% (n = 5) of 57 CBCs and 28% (n = 8) of 29 LRRs would have been missed, if there was no routine physical examination. For women over 60, 3% (n = 2) of 70 CBCs and 17% (n = 5) of 29 LRRs would have been detected later if there was no routine physical examination, respectively.

Of the recurrences occurring within 5 years after the primary tumour, 4% (n = 3) of 84 CBCs and 26% (n = 7) of 27 LRRs were detected with routine physical examination alone. For recurrences occurring after 5 years from the first tumour, 9% (n = 4) of 43 CBCs and 19% (n = 6) of 31 LRRs were detected with routine physical examination. There is no significant association between the proportions of recurrences detected by physical examination alone and time from the first tumour ($\chi^2 = 0.934$, $P = 0.334$).

Eight hundred and one (10,411/13) physical examinations were done to detect one additional LRR. In patients after breast conserving surgery, 716 (4298/6) physical examinations were done to detect one additional LRR. In patients after mastectomy, 873 (6113/7) physical examinations were done to detect one additional LRR. For patients younger than 60 years, 644 (5152/8) physical examinations were done to detect one additional LRR, whereas the number was 1052 (5259/5) for patients older than 60. In the first 5 years, 1041 (7286/7) physical examinations were done to detect one additional LRR, whereas this number was 521 (3125/6) more than 5 years after primary treatment (Fig. 2).

### 4. Discussion

If there was no routine physical examination, 22% of 58 LRRs and 6% of 127 CBCs would have been detected later. There was a trend towards a higher contribution of physical examination in detecting LRR in younger (<60) patients than in older (≥60) patients. For patients younger than 60 years at follow-up visit, 644 physical examinations were performed to detect one additional LRR, whereas, for patients older than 60 years at follow-up visit, the number was 1052.

Regular mammography has proven its benefit in the early detection of CBC. There are only a few studies to evaluate the contribution of physical examination in early detection of CBC. In this study the number of CBCs was enriched to evaluate the contribution of physical examination on detecting CBCs by including all available patients with CBCs of 5589 patients with a history of breast cancer. The overall detection rate of CBC by routine physical examination alone is low in this study, which is consistent with results from a recent
The contribution of physical examination was larger in detecting CBCs and LRRs among women younger than 60 at follow-up visit. This finding was in line with that of another study which evaluated the incremental contribution of physical examination over mammography in a breast cancer screening programme. Age has been reported to have an important influence on the sensitivity of mammography and the value of physical examination. Tumour characteristics are different across ages that might influence the performance of routine physical examination. In addition, it is possible that physicians might pay more attention when they examine younger patients due to the debatable performance of mammography. To our knowledge, the age of the patient has not been taken into account specifically yet during the follow-up visit. This finding was in line with that of another study (6%).
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