

BREAST CANCER- EXPERIMENTAL AND CLINICAL ASPECTS

Editors:

H. T. Mouridsen

T. Palshof

EUROPEAN ORGANIZATION FOR
RESEARCH ON TREATMENT OF
CANCER (EORTC)

BREAST CANCER
Experimental and Clinical Aspects

Proceedings of the Second EORTC Breast Cancer Working Conference
held in Copenhagen, 30 May to 2 June 1979

Guest Editors

T. MOURIDSEN and T. PALSHOF

Finseninstitutet, Copenhagen

Published as a supplement to the
European Journal of Cancer



PERGAMON PRESS

OXFORD · NEW YORK · TORONTO · SYDNEY · PARIS · FRANKFURT

U.K.	Pergamon Press Ltd., Headington Hill Hall, Oxford OX3 0BW, England
U.S.A.	Pergamon Press Inc., Maxwell House, Fairview Park, Elmsford, New York 10523, U.S.A.
CANADA	Pergamon of Canada, Suite 104, 150 Consumers Road, Willowdale, Ontario M2J 1P9, Canada
AUSTRALIA	Pergamon Press (Aust.) Pty. Ltd., P.O. Box 544, Potts Point, N.S.W. 2011, Australia
FRANCE	Pergamon Press SARL, 24 rue des Ecoles, 75240 Paris, Cedex 05, France
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY	Pergamon Press GmbH, 6242 Kronberg-Taunus, Hammerweg 6, Federal Republic of Germany

Copyright © 1980 Pergamon Press Ltd.

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means: electronic, electrostatic, magnetic tape, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from the publishers.

First edition 1980

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
EORTC Breast Cancer Working Conference, 2nd,
Copenhagen, 1979
Breast cancer

1. Breast - Cancer - Congresses

I. Title II. Mouridsen, H T

III. Palshof, T IV. European Organization
for Research on Treatment of Cancer

616.9'94'49 RC280.B8 79-41496

ISBN 0-08-025886-7

Published as Supplement No. 1, 1980, to the *European Journal of Cancer*

In order to make this volume available as economically and as rapidly as possible the authors' typescripts have been reproduced in their original forms. This method has its typographical limitations but it is hoped that they in no way distract the reader.

Introduction

The Second E.O.R.T.C. Breast Cancer Working Conference was held in Copenhagen, May 30 to June 2, 1979.

The conference assembled 375 participants and the subjects which were discussed included aspects concerning statistical planning of trials, diagnostic methods in early and advanced breast cancer, hormone receptors, local and systemic treatment of primary and advanced disease, cell kinetics and psychological and rehabilitation aspects.

This supplement to the *European Journal of Cancer* contains the invited lectures and the free communications presented at the conference.

As reported in these papers progress in the treatment of primary and of advanced disease continues. Among the subjects which in the near future require special efforts are screening methodology and methods of selecting patients for the specific treatment modalities.

The importance of cooperation on an international basis was reemphasized at this conference both in order to ensure rapid arrangement of new progress and to ensure the validity of the conclusions of large cooperative trials.

We are very grateful to the sponsors of the conference, ICI, Pharmaceuticals Division, Danish Cancer Society, Danish Medical Council, Ministry of Education, Handelsbanken and the Finsen Institute.

July 1979

H. T. Mouridsen and T. Palshof
Guest Editors

Contents

Introduction	ix
<i>CLINICAL TRIALS</i>	
K. West Andersen. Exclusions from clinical trials	3
R. Sylvester. On the analysis of response rates in studies of advanced disease	5
<i>DIAGNOSTIC METHODS IN EARLY AND LATE BREAST CANCER</i>	
C. S. B. Galasko. Scintigraphic methods in breast cancer	11
P. Franchimont, P. F. Zangerle, C. Colin, P. Osterrieth, J. C. Hendrick, J. R. van Cauwenberge and J. Hustin. Tumor associated markers in breast cancer	17
D. C. Tormey and T. P. Waalkes. Biological markers as prognostic and clinical evaluation tools	21
R. C. Coombes, T. J. Powles, H. T. Ford, J.-C. Gazet, C. W. Gehrke, J. W. Keyser, P. E. G. Mitchell, S. Patel, W. H. Stimson, K. C. Tsou, M. Worwood and A. M. Neville. The value of sequential marker estimations following mastectomy for breast cancer	25
M. M. Shabot, I. M. Goldberg, P. M. Schick, R. Nieberg, M. R. Coates, J. R. Benfield and Y. H. Pilch. Needle biopsy and aspiration cytology in the diagnosis of malignancy in clinically suspicious breast masses: A rational approach	31
R. D. Bulbrook, D. Y. Wang, R. R. Millis and J. L. Hayward. The possibility of accurate prediction of recurrence rates after mastectomy	35
<i>HORMONE RECEPTORS</i>	
W. L. McGuire. The usefulness of steroid hormone receptors in the management of primary and advanced breast cancer	39
Susan M. Thorpe and J. L. Daehnfeltd. Specific binding of prolactin in human mammary tumors	45
T. Cooke, D. George, R. Schields, P. V. Maynard and K. Griffiths. Estrogen receptors in early breast cancer	53
C. W. Elston, R. W. Blamey, J. Johnson, H. M. Bishop, J. L. Haybittle and K. Griffiths. The relationship of oestradiol receptor (ER) and histological tumour differentiation with prognosis in human primary breast carcinoma	59
A. J. M. Koenders, L. V. M. Beex, J. Geurts-Moespot and T. J. Benraad. Steroid hormone receptors in mammary carcinoma: The effect of tamoxifen	63
A. Lindgren, J. Sällström and H.-O. Adami. Fine needle biopsy in estrogen receptor determination in breast cancer	67
E. Engelsman. Hormone receptors in breast cancer	71

G. Leclercq, A. Tenenbaum and A. Hepburn. Use of blue sepharose for the purification of cytoplasmic estrogen receptors from DMBA-induced rat mammary tumors	73
<i>NEW ASPECTS OF ENDOCRINE TREATMENT OF ADVANCED DISEASE</i>	
B. A. Stoll. Recent developments in the endocrine treatment of breast cancer	79
J. L. Hayward. The changing role of endocrine therapy in the management of advanced breast cancer	81
H. J. Stewart, A. P. M. Forrest, J. M. Gunn, T. Hamilton, A. O. Langlands, I. J. McFadyen, G. Raab and M. M. Roberts. The tamoxifen trial. A double blind comparison with stilboestrol in postmenopausal women with advanced breast cancer	83
J. S. Patterson, R. S. Settatree, H. K. Adam and J. V. Kemp. Serum concentrations of tamoxifen and major metabolite during long-term nolvadex therapy, correlated with clinical response	89
F. Pannuti, A. Martoni, F. Fruet, E. Strocchi and A. R. Di Marco. Hormone therapy in advanced breast cancer: High dose medroxyprogesterone acetate (MAP) vs. tamoxifen (TMX). Preliminary results	93
I. E. Smith, R. C. Coombes, H. T. Ford, J.-C. Gazet, C. Harmer, M. Jones, J. A. McKinna and T. J. Powles. Aminoglutethimide in the management of advanced breast cancer	99
R. Paridaens, C. van Haelen and J. C. Heuson. Medical adrenalectomy with aminoglutethimide-cortisol in the treatment of metastatic breast carcinoma	103
H. T. Mouridsen, Marianne Salimtschik, P. Dombernowsky, Kirsten Gelshøj, T. Palshof, M. Rørth, J. L. Daehnfeldt and C. Rose. Therapeutic effect of tamoxifen versus combined tamoxifen and diethylstilboestrol in advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women	107
<i>NEW ASPECTS OF CHEMOTHERAPY OF ADVANCED DISEASE</i>	
J.-C. Heuson, R. Sylvester and E. Engelsman. Alternating cyclical hormonal-cytotoxic combination chemotherapy in postmenopausal patients with breast cancer. An E.O.R.T.C. trial	113
H. T. Mouridsen, T. Palshof, E. Engelsman and R. Sylvester. CMF versus CMF plus tamoxifen in advanced breast cancer in postmenopausal women. An E.O.R.T.C. trial	119
F. Cavalli, P. Alberto, F. Jungi, K. Brunner and G. Martz. Hormono-chemotherapy versus hormonotherapy followed by chemotherapy in the treatment of disseminated breast cancer	125
P. J. Dady, R. C. Coombes, I. E. Smith, C. A. Parsons, H. T. Ford, J. C. Gazet, J. M. Henk, A. G. Nash and T. J. Powles. Use of an anti-osteolytic agent in treatment of patients with bone metastases from breast cancer	131
M. Rørth, J. Løber, P. Dombernowsky, D. Krusenstjerna-Hofstrøm, W. Mattsson and H. T. Mouridsen. A phase III study of prednimustine (Leo 1031) in advanced breast cancer. A preliminary report	137
R. V. Smalley and A. A. Bartolucci. Variations in responsiveness and survival of clinical subsets of patients with metastatic breast cancer to two chemotherapy combinations	141
<i>ADJUVANT SYSTEMIC TREATMENT</i>	
A. Rossi, G. Bonadonna, G. Tancini, E. Bajetta, S. Marchini, P. Valagussa and U. Veronesi. Trials of adjuvant chemotherapy in breast cancer. The experience of the Istituto Nazionale Tumori of Milan	149

M. Kaufmann, D. V. Fournier, H. Sievers, I. Staib, P. Wöllgens, R. Nedden, H. Lochbühler, W. Queisser, D. Christmann, R. Bühner, P. J. Pfuhl, B. Henningsen, H. Kuttig, S. Wysocki, D. Thüre, C. Köhler and P. Drings. Adjuvant chemotherapy with Chlorambucil and 5-Fluorouracil in primary breast cancer (Cooperative study Heidelberg)	157
T. K. Wheeler on behalf of Multicentre Breast Cancer Chemotherapy Group. Adjuvant chemotherapy with four drugs for stage 2 breast cancer	161
W. Schreml, M. Betzler, M. Lang, H.-P. Lohrman, P. Kubitz, P. Schlag, H.-D. Flad, Ch. Herfarth and H. Heimpel. Adjuvant intermittent chemo-immunotherapy of breast cancer. A prospective study	165
W. F. Jungi, H. J. Senn, R. Amgwerd, E. Hochuli and East Switzerland Cooperative Oncology Group (OSAKO). Divergent effect of adjuvant chemo-immunotherapy on recurrence rates in node-negative and node-positive breast cancer patients	169
M. Rozenzweig, D. D. Von Hoff, J. C. Allegra and F. M. Muggia. Surgical adjuvant trials in the United States	173
J. W. Meakin, W. E. C. Allt, F. A. Beale, R. S. Bush, R. M. Clark, P. J. Fitzpatrick, N. V. Hawkins, R. D. T. Jenkin, J. F. Pringle, J. G. Reid, W. D. Rider, J. L. Hayward and R. D. Bulbrook. Ovarian irradiation and prednisone following surgery and radiotherapy for carcinoma of the breast	179
T. Palshof, H. T. Mouridsen and J. L. Dæhnefeldt. Adjuvant endocrine therapy of primary operable breast cancer. Report on the Copenhagen Breast Cancer Trials	183
C. A. Hubay, O. H. Pearson, J. S. Marshall, R. S. Rhodes, S. M. Debanne, E. G. Mansour, R. E. Hermann, J. C. Jones, W. J. Flynn, C. Eckert, W. L. McGuire and 27 participating investigators. Adjuvant chemotherapy, anti-estrogen therapy and immunotherapy for stage II breast cancer	189
<i>CELL KINETICS</i>	
F. M. Schabel Jr., H. E. Skipper, M. W. Trader, W. Russell Laster Jr., T. H. Corbett and D. P. Griswold Jr. Concepts for controlling drug-resistant tumor cells	199
H. Bush. The relevance of cell kinetics for human cancer	213
<i>PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF BREAST CANCER</i>	
B. A. Stoll. Psycho-physiologic aspects of breast cancer	221
M. Baum, T. Priestman, R. R. West and Eira M. Jones. A comparison of subjective responses in a trial comparing endocrine with cytotoxic treatment in advanced carcinoma of the breast	223
R. G. Wilson, J. R. Farnon and Alison Hutchinson. Quality of survival of patients following mastectomy	227
F. S. A. van Dam, A. C. G. Linssen, E. Engelsman, J. van Benthem and G. J. F. P. Hanewald. Life with cytostatic drugs	229
<i>NEW ASPECTS OF PRIMARY TREATMENT</i>	
A. P. M. Forrest, M. M. Roberts and H. J. Stewart. Selection of local therapy for primary breast cancer by lower axillary node histology	237
M. Tubiana and D. Sarrazin. A reappraisal of radiotherapy in the treatment of operable breast cancer. The new light on the internal mammary chain role	243
D. Sarrazin, M. Tubiana, M. Le, F. Fontaine and R. Arriagada. Conservative treatment of minimal breast cancer	251

A. N. Papaioannou. Chemotherapy before mastectomy may be a more effective therapeutic sequence than its reverse in primary operable breast cancer	255
W. H. Mattheiem and G. Andry. Primary breast cancer treatments: A locoregional recurrence review	259
<i>NEW DRUGS</i>	
S. K. Carter. New cytotoxic drugs for breast cancer and their clinical evaluation	265
I. E. Smith, R. C. Coombes, B. D. Evans, H. T. Ford, J.-C. Gazet, C. Gordon, J. A. McKinna and T. J. Powles. Vindesine as a single agent and in combination with adriamycin in the treatment of metastatic breast carcinoma	271
A. T. van Oosterom, T. J. Powles, E. Hamersma, I. E. Smith and E. Engelsman. A phase II study of Mitomycin C in refractory advanced breast cancer. A multi-centre pilot study	275
P. Juret, Y. Le Talaer, J. E. Couette and T. Delozier. Hydroxy-9-methyl-2-Ellipticinium (NSC 264-137) in 52 cases of osseous metastases from breast cancer	277
B. Arafah, A. Manni and O. H. Pearson. Trioxifene mesylate (LY 133314): A new antiestrogen which inhibits growth hormone secretion in the rat	281
G. Leclercq, N. Devleeschouwer, N. Legros and J. C. Heuson. Estrogen-linked cytotoxic agents of potential value for the treatment of breast cancer	287
R. I. Nicholson, K. J. Walker and P. V. Maynard. Anti-tumour potential of a new luteinizing hormone releasing hormone analogue, ICI 118630	295

Clinical Trials

Exclusions from Clinical Trials

K. West Andersen

The National Health Service, Store Kongensgade 1, 1264 Copenhagen K, Denmark

Correspondence to K. West Andersen

Abstract—It is well-known that in comparing the effect of two treatments it is necessary that the two groups of patients in the trial are "equal". Likewise the results of a clinical trial are not valid for all patients but only for patients "equal" to those included in the trial. To prevent misuse of the results of a trial patients not included should be characterized in relation to all patients and for the purpose one should record patients not fulfilling the entrance criteria and patients fulfilling the entrance criteria, but not included in the trial.

In most clinical trials some patients fulfilling the entrance criteria must be excluded e.g. some doctors may consider one of the treatments in the trial less eligible to low-risk patients and since the randomization has to be respected, such patients cannot be included in the trial. One would get a biased comparison of the treatments in the trial, if e.g. low-risk patients were withdrawn from one of the treatment groups. This means that all such exclusions have to be done before randomization. It is sometimes said that all exclusions which take place before randomization are acceptable (1). This is in some sense correct: a patient who is not included in a clinical trial cannot cause any bias in the comparison of the treatments, but observe that a patient who is randomized to one treatment but does not get that treatment may cause bias in the comparison of the treatments.

Although exclusions from a clinical trial before randomization cannot bias the comparison of the treatments, exclusions before randomization may cause the trial to be of less value. The purpose of a clinical trial is to determine the better treatment and to use that treatment in the future. Even if the better treatment is determined by a proper clinical trial one cannot use that treatment for future patients without knowing something about the excluded patients. It is of very little value to determine the better treatment for a group of patients if one cannot describe these patients.

A hypothetical example may show the bias caused by exclusions before randomization. There are, say, 200 patients who fulfill the entrance criteria in a clinical trial. For some reason a number, say 100, of these patients are excluded before randomization. The reason may be that the patient will not participate in the trial or the patient is not considered eligible although the entrance criteria is fulfilled or some mistake has occurred. The trial is then carried out for

the remaining 100 patients and treatment A and B are compared. The result of the trial may be as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Hypothetical example of results to treatment A and B in selected patients.

Treatment	No. of patients	No. of cured patients
A	50	20 = 40%
B	50	10 = 20%

The result of the trial would probably imply that all patients fulfilling the entrance criteria will be treated by A, and one would forget that half of the patients fulfilling the entrance criteria were not included in the trial. And that would be very easy to forget as probably that fact will not be mentioned in the report of the trial. When applying treatment A to all patients fulfilling the entrance criteria for the original trial one could get the result shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Hypothetical example of results to treatment A in selected and unselected patients.

Patient group	Treatment	No. of patients	No. of cured patients
"Included"	A	100	40 = 40%
"Excluded"	A	100	10 = 10%
Total	A	200	50 = 25%

Patients in the "included" group are patients "equal" to those who were included in the original trial and "excluded" patients are patients "equal" to those excluded from

the original trial although they fulfilled the entrance criteria, e.g. patients who would not participate in a clinical trial, if they were asked, or patients for whom treatment A (or B!) would be considered less eligible so that they could not be included in the original trial. For these patients who are "equal" to the excluded patients the effect of treatment A is not necessarily the same as for patients who were included in the original trial.

Another example where exclusions may cause serious bias is a multicenter trial where a standardized operation is followed by adjuvant chemotherapy. If in case of a slight deviation from the standardized operation the patient is neither included in the trial nor reported to a data collecting centre, one might, without knowing, perform a trial in which only highly selected patients are included (and the selection mechanism may be the same at all the participating hospitals). The report from the trial may recommend the standardized operation followed by the better adjuvant chemotherapy and that may cause damage if one is not aware of the fact that the patients for whom the operation were not completely successful are excluded from the trial.

When applying the result from a clinical trial one must have a patient group "equal" to those who were included in the trial. In order to make it possible to apply the results of a clinical trial in a proper way, the report from the trial should tell how many patients fulfilling the entrance criteria were not included in the trial and the reason why.

When performing a clinical trial it would therefore be of great importance to record all patients suffering from the disease and patients not included in the trial should be specially recorded, and the reason for not being included should be stated for every single patient (1,2).

The fact that the (good) results of many clinical trials are not achieved when applying the better treatment of the trial may be due to a difference between patients included in the clinical trial and patients for whom the result of the trial are applied. In order to make the results of clinical trials more useful one could propose that much effort should be done to characterize, quantitatively and qualitatively, the patients included in the trial in relation to all patients.

Another way to increase the usefulness of a clinical trial might be to include a treatment which is part of another clinical trial since that would make it possible to make a comparison of the results of the trials whatever the results of the two treatments are "equal" or not.

REFERENCES

1. R. Peto, M. C. Pike, P. Armitage, N. E. Breslow, D. R. Cox, S. V. Howard, N. Mantel, K. McPherson, J. Peto, and P. G. Smith, Design and Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials Requiring Prolonged Observation of Each Patient. *Br. J. Cancer*, 34, 585 (1976).
2. Clinical trials of the treatment of breast cancer in Britain and Ireland, *Br. Med. J.* 1, 361 (1977).

On the Analysis of Response Rates in Studies of Advanced Disease*

R. Sylvester

E.O.R.T.C. Data Center, Institut Jules Bordet, 1 rue Héger-Bordet, 1000 Brussels, Belgium

Correspondence to R. Sylvester

Abstract—Instead of simply comparing the percentage of responders in each treatment group in studies of advanced disease, this paper advocates the use of a well known statistic test which takes the ordering of all the response categories into account.

INTRODUCTION

In analyzing the results of studies in advanced patients with measurable disease, it is common to group evaluable patients into different categories according to the degree of tumor response measured after the start of treatment. Hayward et al (1) have for example set forth criteria for the evaluation of treatment response in advanced breast cancer patients. For the purposes of this paper we shall assume that the response to treatment falls into one of the four following categories: complete remission (C.R.), partial remission (P.R.), no change (N.C.) or progression (Prog). Although results are often reported in this manner, it is customary to analyze the data from randomized trials by comparing only the percentage of responders (C.R. or P.R.) in each treatment group. In doing so all of the available information is not used since one ignores the distinction between complete and partial remission and between no change and progression. Important differences may be missed if the treatment differences depend on the inherent ordering of the response categories which reflect the degree of tumor change. In the next section a statistic test is presented which takes this ordering into account.

METHODS

Table 1 presents the results of a hypothetical study comparing the response rates of two treatments A and B in patients with advanced breast cancer. If one compares the percentage of responders (C.R. or P.R.) in each treatment group ($45/75 = 60\%$ on treatment A and $34/75 = 45\%$ on treatment B) using the standard chi-square test with a continuity correction, it is found that the difference is not statistically significant ($P = .10$).

As stated previously the above analysis does not use all the available information. Using all four response categories, one can compute within each response category the percentage of patients who receive treatment A. These percentages are given in Table 1 for the example considered (63%, 55%, 48%, 38%). If there is no difference between the treatments, these proportions should differ from one another only due to random variation. The overall test for the equality of the four proportions is in fact not significant with $P = .22$. This last test does not however take into consideration the ordering of the response categories and lacks the power to detect specific deviations from the hypothesis of no treatment difference.

If the ordering of the categories is now taken into consideration, one would expect the percentage of patients receiving treatment A in each response category to increase as one goes from Prog to N.C. to P.R. to C.R. in that order if in fact treatment A is better than treatment B. One way to test this hypothesis is to assign a score (1, 2, 3, 4 for example) to each response category and then compute the linear regression of the percentage of patients receiving treatment A in each response category on the score in order to determine if there is a linear trend in the proportions as one goes across the table from C.R. to Prog. The overall chi-square statistic previously computed can now be broken down into two additive components, a chi-square which tests for linear trend and a chi-square which tests for departures from linear trend. In the example given, if one assigns the scores 4 for C.R., 3 for P.R., 2 for N.C., and 1 for Prog, the test for linear trend is significant ($P = .04$). This indicates that the percentage of patients receiving treatment A in each response category increases as one goes from Prog to N.C. to P.R. to C.R. It can be shown that the test for trend is equivalent to testing

*This work was supported by Grant Number 2R10 CA11488-10 awarded by the National Cancer Institute, DHEW.

Table 1. Response to treatment.

Treatment	C.R.		P.R.		N.C.		Prog		Total
A	12	63%	33	55%	15	48%	15	38%	75
B	7	37%	27	45%	16	52%	25	62%	75
Total	19	100%	60	100%	31	100%	40	100%	150

*Comparison of treatments A and B**P value*

Percent C.R. or P.R. (A: 60%, B: 45%)
 Overall (63%, 55%, 48%, 38%)
 Trend (63%, 55%, 48%, 38%)

.10
 .22
 .04

whether the average score on treatment A is equal to the average score on treatment B (2). Thus a significant test for trend can be interpreted as indicating that the average response on treatment A is higher than the average response on treatment B.

While the choice of a particular set of scores may be subjective and somewhat arbitrary, one has some leeway in choosing the set of scores to be used. If for example all response categories are considered a priori to be of equal importance then the scores should be chosen to be equally spaced and any set of equally spaced scores will give the same significance level for the test for trend. Examples of such scores might be 1, 2, 3, 4; -3, -1, 1, 3; or 7, 4, 1, -2 for example. Unless a priori one wishes to emphasize a particular response category or set of response categories, the scores should be chosen to be equally spaced.

The (uncorrected) chi-square test for the comparison of the percent responders (C.R. or P.R.) in each treatment group is just a special case of the test for linear trend where now the C.R. and P.R. categories are assigned one score and the N.C. and Prog categories are assigned another score. In practice, however, it is preferable to use the continuity corrected chi-square test when two proportions are being compared. The scores may be similarly modified if a priori one wishes to test other hypotheses.

DISCUSSION

In doing a test for trend one takes into consideration the ordering of the response categories. The test for trend is more powerful than the overall test for the detection of treatment differences if a linear trend is present, which may well be the case if the two treatments differ in efficacy. The decision however concerning choice of scores to be used should be made prior to the start of the study so that the choice of the hypothesis to be tested does not depend on the results of the study.

The formulas used in the above calculations can be found in the appendix which follows.

APPENDIX

The notation used in the appendix follows

that of Armitage (3). Suppose that you have k response categories for each of two treatments with a score X assigned to each category. Then a $2 \times k$ contingency table of the treatment results can be constructed as shown in Table 2.

Where X_i = the score associated with response category i

r_i = the number of patients in response category i receiving treatment A

$n_i - r_i$ = the number of patients in response category i receiving treatment B

n_i = the total number of patients in response category i

$P_i = r_i/n_i$ = the proportion of patients in response category i receiving treatment A

$R = \sum r_i$ = total number of patients receiving treatment A

$N - R = \sum n_i - r_i$ = total number of patients receiving treatment B

$N = \sum n_i$ = total number of patients

$P = R/N$ = overall proportion of patients receiving treatment A

where all summations are from $i = 1$ to k . Then for $k > 2$

$$X_{k-1}^2 = \frac{\sum (r_i^2/n_i) - R^2/N}{P(1-P)}$$

provides an overall test for the equality of the proportions P_i . Under the null hypothesis of no treatment difference, X_{k-1}^2 is approximately distributed as chi-square with $k-1$ degrees of freedom. If one wishes to ask whether there is a significant trend in the proportions P_i from response category 1 to response category k (a trend of P_i with x_i) then the statistic X_{k-1}^2 can be broken down into two additive components:

(1) a test for linear trend

$$X_1^2 = \frac{N(\sum r_i X_i - R \sum n_i X_i)^2}{R(N-R)(\sum n_i X_i^2 - (\sum n_i X_i)^2/N)}$$

which under the null hypothesis of no trend is distributed approximately as chi-square with 1 degree of freedom and

Table 2.

Group	1	2	...	i	...	k	Total
Score	X_1	X_2	...	X_i	...	X_k	
Treatment A	r_1	r_2	...	r_i	...	r_k	R
Treatment B	$n_1 - r_1$	$n_2 - r_2$...	$n_i - r_i$...	$n_k - r_k$	N-R
Total	n_1	n_2	...	n_i	...	n_k	N
Proportion Treatment A	P_1	P_2		P_i		P_k	$P = \frac{R}{N}$

(2) a test for departure from linear trend

$$\chi^2_{k-2} = \chi^2_{k-1} - \chi^2_1$$

which under the null hypothesis of no departure from linear trend is approximately distributed as chi-square with $k-2$ degrees of freedom.

For the case $k = 2$ the test for trend is equivalent to the uncorrected chi-square statistic for the comparison of two percentages. However, in this case it is preferable to use the following continuity corrected statistic:

$$\chi^2_1 = \frac{(|r_1(n_2 - r_2) - r_2(n_1 - r_1)| - N/2)^2 N}{R(N-R)n_1 n_2}$$

which under the null hypothesis of no treatment differences is asymptotically distributed as chi-square with 1 degree of freedom. For further details please consult Armitage (3,4), Cochran (2), Everitt (5), or Fleiss (6).

REFERENCES

1. J. L. Hayward, P. P. Carbone, J. C. Heuson, S. Kumaoka, A. Segaloff and R. D. Rubens, Assessment of response to therapy in advanced breast cancer. *Cancer* 39, 1289 (1977).
2. W. G. Cochran, Some methods for strengthening the common χ^2 tests. *Biometrics* 10, 417 (1954).
3. P. Armitage, *Statistical methods in medical research*, Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford (1971).
4. P. Armitage, Tests for linear trends in proportions and frequencies: *Biometrics* 11, 375 (1955).
5. B. S. Everitt, *The analyses of contingency tables*, Chapman and Hall Ltd., London (1977).
6. J. L. Fleiss, *Statistical methods for rates and proportions*, John Wiley and Sons, New York (1973).

***Diagnostic Methods in Early and
Late Breast Cancer***