The Breast 49 (2020) 233-241



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Breast



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/brst

Original article

Should women with early breast cancer under 40 years of age have a routine 21-gene recurrence score testing: A SEER database study



癥

BREAST

Kai-Hua Liu ^{a, 1}, Lei Zhang ^{b, 1}, Jian-Xian Chen ^c, Chen-Lu Lian ^d, Jun Wang ^d, Zhen-Yu He ^{b, **}, San-Gang Wu ^{d, *}

^a Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Cancer Hospital, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xiamen University, Teaching Hospital of Fujian Medical University, Xiamen, 361003, People's Republic of China

^b Department of Radiation Oncology, Sun Yat-sen University Cancer Center, State Key Laboratory of Oncology in South China, Collaborative Innovation

Center of Cancer Medicine, 651 Dongfeng Road East, Guangzhou, 510060, People's Republic of China

^c Department of Medical Oncology, People's Hospital of Baise, Baise, 533000, People's Republic of China

^d Department of Radiation Oncology, Cancer Hospital, The First Affiliated Hospital of Xiamen University, Teaching Hospital of Fujian Medical University, Xiamen, 361003, People's Republic of China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 2 September 2019 Received in revised form 16 December 2019 Accepted 18 December 2019 Available online 26 December 2019

Keywords: Breast cancer Oncotype Age Prognosis Chemotherapy Recurrence score

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To investigate the effect of 21-gene recurrence score (RS) on chemotherapy-decision making and prognosis in breast cancer patients aged <40 years.

Methods: Using the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results program, we included patients aged <40 years with tumor size \leq 5 cm, node negative, and estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer between 2004 and 2015. Correlations among the 21-gene RS, chemotherapy decision-making and prognosis were analyzed.

Results: We included 2721 patients in this study. According to TAILORx cutoffs, 352 (12.9%), 1814 (66.7%), and 555 (20.4%) patients were classified as low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts, respectively. The 21-gene RS categories were associated with the probability of receiving chemotherapy, with 7.1%, 33.4%, and 77.1% of patients in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts treated with chemotherapy, respectively (P < 0.001). Those in the intermediate-risk cohort were significantly less likely to receive chemotherapy over time (P = 0.008), and the trends of chemotherapy receipt were stable in the low-risk and high-risk cohorts over time. Multivariate analysis showed that the 21-gene RS was an independent prognostic indicator for breast cancer specific survival. In the stratified analysis, the receipt of chemotherapy was associated with better breast cancer specific survival in the high-risk cohort (P = 0.028), but not in the intermediate-risk cohort (P = 0.223).

Conclusions: 21-gene RS has clinical implications for young breast cancer patients with respect to optimizing chemotherapy-decisions. Despite increasing rates of chemotherapy receipt in young patients, more studies are needed to determine the definitive effect of chemotherapy in young patients with three RS categories.

© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Breast cancer remains a major public health problem in women worldwide, and studies have been attracted by breast cancer arising in young women [1–4]. Young breast cancer, usually defined as women diagnosed with breast cancer under the age of 40, accounting for approximately 5–7% of new breast cancer cases [1,2]. Although this represents a small proportion of the cancer burden, young breast cancer patients tend to experience more aggressive behavior, which contributes to poor prognosis [3,4]. Young women have several adverse biological factors contributing to poorer outcomes including lower hormone receptor expression, overexpression of human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER-2), higher tumor grade, higher risk of lymphovascular invasion and nodal involvement [4–7]. In hormone receptor-positive breast

0960-9776/© 2019 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

^{*} Corresponding author.

^{**} Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: hezhy@sysucc.org.cn (Z.-Y. He), unowu12345@hotmail.com (S.-G. Wu).

¹ Kai-Hua Liu and Lei Zhang contributed equally to this work.

cancer, patients with younger age were associated with lower survival compared to those with older age [8–10]. Genomic analysis suggests there is a distinct biological entity between young and older breast cancer patients, which may contribute to lower hormone sensitivity in young patients [11–14]. Therefore, age <40 years has itself been demonstrated to be an independently unfavorable prognostic factor.

The 21-gene recurrence score (RS) (Oncotype DxTM, Redwood, CA) is one of the most widely used gene expression profiles to guide the personalized management of breast cancer. The 21-gene RS model was constructed from 16 breast cancer related genes and 5 reference genes to both predict prognosis and estimate the benefits of adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with hormone receptorpositive, HER-2 negative, nodal negative (NO) breast cancer [15,16]. However, most patients in previous studies have been older and data regarding the decision-making process of chemotherapy and prognostic assessment of the 21-gene RS in young breast cancers are limited [17–23]. Due to the longer life expectancy of young women, genomic testing may be more valuable in determining the chemotherapy-decision making and assessing prognosis. Using data from the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project (NSABP) B-14 study, patients aged <40 years had a significantly higher proportion of high-risk RS score (55.9%) compared to patients aged 40-50 years (29.6%), 50-60 years (25.4%), and >60 years (21.3%) (traditional RS cutoffs) [24]. However, only 668 patients were included in this study, which may affect the representativeness of these findings.

The recent trials including Trial Assigning Individualized Options for Treatment (TAILORx) and West German Study Group PlanB (WSG-PlanB) have confirmed both prognosis and the predictive value of chemotherapy by the 21-gene RS assay in NO and hormone receptor-positive breast cancer [25,26]. In addition, the results of 21-gene RS have incorporated into the 8th American Joint Committee on Cancer staging system of breast cancer [27]. In the current National Comprehensive Cancer Network breast cancer clinical practice guidelines, the 21-gene RS assay also have been incorporated into the decision of systemic chemotherapy and adjuvant endocrine therapy in early stage breast cancer [28]. However, only 4.6% of patients were aged \leq 40 years in TAILORx trial and the age distribution was unavailable in WSG-PlanB trial [25,26]. Therefore, more studies are needed to validate the genomic signatures in clinical practice of young patients aged <40 years. In light of this, the aims of the current study were to assess the effect of 21-gene RS on chemotherapy-decision making and survival outcome in breast cancer patients aged <40 years.

2. Materials and methods

Patients We included female patients diagnosed with breast cancer between 2004 and 2015 using the data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program. The National Cancer Institute's SEER database includes de-identified patient information including demographic, clinicopathological factors, and survival outcomes for approximately 28% of the United States population [29]. Patients aged <40 years with tumor size \leq 5 cm (T1-2), N0, and estrogen receptor (ER)-positive invasive breast carcinoma who received surgical treatment and had available 21-gene RS results were included. Patients with no pathological diagnosis and metastatic stage were excluded. Our study was exempted from the Institutional Review Board approval process because of the de-identified patient information in the SEER dataset.

2.1. Variables

We included the following variables of interest: age at diagnosis, race/ethnicity, grade, tumor size, progesterone receptor (PR) status, and histology. The management including surgical procedure, chemotherapy, and radiotherapy were also identified. In addition, two 21-gene RS cutoffs including traditional RS cutoffs and TAILORx RS cutoffs were identified. Traditional RS cutoffs were classified into the following three categories: low-risk (RS < 18), intermediate-risk (RS 18–30), and high-risk (RS > 30) cohorts [15,16]. The optimal cutoffs have changed from traditional cutoffs to TAILORx cutoffs in recent clinical trials, which have been optimized to minimize under-treatment of potential high-risk patients. The TAILORx RS cutoffs were also stratified into three following risk categories: low-risk (RS < 11), intermediate-risk (RS 11-25), and high-risk (RS > 25) cohorts [25].

2.2. Statistical analysis

The categorical variables were compared using the chi-squared test. Binomial logistic regression and receiver operating characteristics (ROC) were used to assess the predictive factors related to chemotherapy administration. Breast cancer specific survival (BCSS) curves were evaluated using the Kaplan-Meier method and compared using the log-rank test. Multivariate Cox proportional analysis was used to determine the independent prognostic indicators related to BCSS. Statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS, version 22.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA), and a P-value < 0.05 was determined to be statistically significant.

3. Results

We included 2721 patients in this study. The majority of patients had invasive ductal carcinoma subtype (89.1%) and PR-positive disease (94.3%). In 1776 patients with available HER-2 status, 97.8% (n = 1737) of them had HER-2 negative disease. In the entire cohort, 53.8% of them received mastectomy, and approximately 40% of patients received radiotherapy and chemotherapy. The median RS was 18 with a range of 0–74. According to traditional RS cutoffs, 1293 (47.5%), 1122 (41.2%), and 306 (11.2%) patients were classified as low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts, respectively. Using TAILORx RS cutoffs, 352 (12.9%), 1814 (66.7%), and 555 (20.4%) patients were classified as low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts, respectively. The patient baseline characteristics are listed in Table 1.

Patients with a higher RS were more likely to receive chemotherapy. In the traditional RS cutoffs, 14.5%, 55.4%, and 81.7% of patients in the low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts were treated with chemotherapy, respectively (P < 0.001). According to the TAILORx RS cutoffs, 7.1%, 33.4%, and 77.1% of patients in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts were treated with chemotherapy, respectively (P < 0.001) (Fig. 1A-B). In the traditional RS cutoffs, 21-gene RS was an independent predictive factor for receipt of chemotherapy. Patients at intermediate-risk (odds ratio [OR] 6.802, 95% confidence interval [CI] 5.570-8.306, P < 0.001) and high-risk (OR 18.930, 95%CI 13.391–26.759, P < 0.001) cohorts were more likely to receive chemotherapy compared to low-risk cohort. Similar trends were found using the TAILORx cutoffs. In addition, age, tumor size, tumor grade, surgical procedure, and radiotherapy were also independent predictors associated with chemotherapy receipt (Table 2). Moreover, the 21-gene RS was also an effective predictor of chemotherapy receipt using ROC analysis (Fig. 2). Using traditional RS cutoffs, there was a significantly decreased percentage of chemotherapy receipt in the low-risk cohort over time (P = 0.003), and the trends of chemotherapy

Table 1

The patient baseline characteristic.

Variables	n (%)
Age (mean \pm SD) (years)	35.5 ± 3.5
Race/ethnicity	
Non-Hispanic White	1664 (61.2)
Non-Hispanic Black	268 (9.8)
Hispanic (All Races)	373 (13.7)
Other	416 (15.3)
Grade	
Well differentiated	640 (23.5)
Moderately differentiated	1443 (53.0)
Poorly/undifferentiated	578 (21.2)
Unknown	60 (2.2)
Histology	
IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma	2425 (89.1)
ILC or mixed with other types of carcinoma	112 (4.1)
Other	184 (6.8)
Tumor stage	
T1	2083 (76.6)
T2	638 (23.4)
PR status	
Negative	145 (5.3)
Positive	2567 (94.3)
Unknown	9 (0.3)
Surgical procedure	
BCS	1257 (46.2)
Mastectomy	1464 (53.8)
Radiotherapy	
No	1611 (59.2)
Yes	1110 (40.8)
Chemotherapy	
No	1662 (61.1)
Yes	1059 (38.9)
Traditional RS cutoffs	
Low-risk	1293 (47.5)
Intermediate-risk	1122 (41.2)
HIgn-risk	306 (11.2)
I AILOKX KS CULOIIS	252 (12.0)
LUW-IISK Intermediate rick	552 (12.9) 1914 (66.7)
IIIter methate-IISK Llieb viele	1014(00.7)
підп-піяк	555 (20.4)

Abbreviations: BCS, breast conserving surgery; IDC, invasive ductal carcinoma; ILC, invasive lobular carcinoma; PR, progesterone receptor; RS, recurrence score; SD, standard deviation; T, tumor; TAILORx, Trial Assigning Individualized Options for Treatment.

receipt were not significantly changed in the intermediate-(P = 0.746) and high-risk (P = 0.573) cohorts over time (Fig. 3A). However, there was a significantly decreased *percentage* of chemotherapy receipt in the intermediate-risk cohort over time (P = 0.008), and the trends of chemotherapy receipt were stable in low- (P = 0.469) and high-risk (P = 0.951) cohorts over time using TAILORx RS cutoffs (Fig. 3B).

With a median follow-up of 50 months, 38 patients died with breast cancer-related disease. The 5-year BCSS was 99.0%. Using the

traditional RS cutoffs, the 5-year BCSS was 99.8%, 99.4%, and 94.2% in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts, respectively (log-rank test, P < 0.001) (Fig. 4A). Using the TAILORx cutoffs, the 5-year BCSS was 100%, 99.6%, and 96.5% in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts, respectively, respectively (log-rank test, P < 0.001) (Fig. 4B). The multivariate prognostic analysis showed that the 21-gene RS was an independent prognostic factor related to BCSS. In the traditional RS cutoffs, the low-risk cohort had comparable BCSS compared to the intermediate-risk cohort (hazard ratio [HR] 0.363, 95% CI 0.131–1.000, P = 0.050), and the high-risk cohort had significantly lower BCSS compared to the intermediate-risk cohort (HR 4.664, 95%CI 2.342–9.288, P < 0.001) (Table 3). Similar trends were also observed for the TAILORx RS cutoffs.

Finally, we analyzed the effect of chemotherapy on survival stratified by 21-gene RS categories. In the TAILORx RS cutoffs, after adjustment of age, race/ethnicity, histology, tumor stage, PR status, and treatment variables, the receipt of chemotherapy was correlated with better BCSS in the high-risk cohort (HR 0.369, 95%CI 0.151–0.897, P = 0.028), but was not associated with better BCSS in the intermediate-risk cohort (HR 1.975, 95%CI 0.660-5.906, P = 0.223). We could not perform multivariate analysis in the lowrisk cohort because no patients died with breast cancer in this patient subset. The survival curves between patients treated with and without chemotherapy in the intermediate- and high-risk cohorts are shown in Fig. 5. The 5-year BCSS was comparable between chemotherapy and non-chemotherapy cohorts in the intermediaterisk cohort (log-rank test, P = 0.134) (Fig. 5A), and was 98.0% and 91.4% in the high-risk cohort, respectively (log-rank test, P = 0.052) (Fig. 5B). However, in the traditional RS cutoffs, the receipt of chemotherapy was not associated with improved BCSS according to the three risk categories in univariate and multivariate prognostic analysis (Fig. 5C-D) (Table 4).

4. Discussion

In this study, we used a population-based cohort to assess the effect of 21-gene RS in chemotherapy-decision making and prognostic assessment in breast cancer patients aged <40 years. Our results showed that a higher RS was independently associated with a higher percentage of chemotherapy administration and lower BCSS.

Although young patients aged <40 years were more likely to experience large tumors, nodal involvement, and hormone receptor negative, approximately 50% of them had T1-2N0 and ERpositive disease [30]. Therefore, RS testing should also be considered for half of young patients. In our previous large cohort study including all patient ages, the distribution of 21-gene RS was 56.7%, 35.7%, and 7.6% in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts using traditional RS categories, respectively [31]. However, in this study, we found that 11.2% of patients <40 years were in the high-risk RS



Fig. 1. The percentage of chemotherapy receipt according to 21-gene RS categories (traditional RS cutoffs, A; TAILORx cutoffs, B).

Table 2

Multivariable logistic regression model for chemotherapy receipt.

Variables	Traditional RS cutoffs			TAILORx RS cutoffs		
	OR	95%CI	Р	OR	95%CI	Р
Age (continuous variable) (years)	0.972	0.947-0.997	0.030	0.972	0.948-0.996	0.023
Race/ethnicity						
Non-Hispanic White	1			1		
Non-Hispanic Black	0.797	0.583-1.088	0.153	0.857	0.632-1.163	0.323
Hispanic (All Races)	0.856	0.647-1.133	0.278	0.859	0.659-1.119	0.259
Other	1.049	0.807-1.361	0.719	1.106	0.860-1.423	0.432
Grade						
Well differentiated	1			1		
Moderately differentiated	1.816	1.424-2.316	< 0.001	1.821	1.443-2.297	< 0.001
Poorly/undifferentiated	2.885	2.152-3.868	< 0.001	2.942	2.211-3.915	< 0.001
Unknown	1.456	0.749-2.831	0.268	1.392	0.741-2.616	0.304
Histology						
IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma	1			1		
ILC or mixed with other types of carcinoma	1.091	0.685-1.736	0.714	1.054	0.681-1.631	0.814
Other	0.725	0.491 - 1.070	0.105	0.758	0.523-1.099	0.144
Tumor stage						
T1	1			1		
T2	1.458	1.179-1.803	0.001	1.471	1.202-1.801	< 0.001
PR status		0				
Negative	1			1		
Positive	0.984	0.657 - 1.474	0.938	0.87	0.584-1.297	0.495
Unknown	2.827	0.535-14.950	0.221	2.065	0.468-9.124	0.339
Surgical procedure						
BCS	1			1		
Mastectomy	1.718	1.287-2.292	< 0.001	1.683	1.269-2.232	< 0.001
Radiotherapy						
No	1			1		
Yes	2.022	1.508-2.713	< 0.001	1.803	1.354-2.400	< 0.001
21-gene recurrence score						
Low-risk	1			1		
Intermediate-risk	6.802	5.570-8.306	< 0.001	5.995	3.933-9.138	< 0.001
High-risk	18.93	13.391-26.759	<0.001	31.231	19.650-49.637	< 0.001

Abbreviations: BCS, breast conserving surgery; CI, confidence interval; IDC, invasive ductal carcinoma; ILC, invasive lobular carcinoma; OR, odds ratio; PR, progesterone receptor; RS, recurrence score; T, tumor; TAILORx, Trial Assigning Individualized Options for Treatment.



Fig. 2. Receiver operating characteristics analyses for prediction of chemotherapy receipt.

cohort, which was similar to the results from the Genomic Health central lab (14.1% vs. 8.8% in women aged <40 vs. \geq 70 years) [23]. The results from NSABP B-14 study also showed significantly higher probability of high-risk RS in patients aged <40 years compared to those aged \geq 40 years (55.9% vs. 24.3%) [24]. Our results showed that young patients were also presented with aggressive behavior in the era of genetic testing. Given that younger women tend to experience less medical comorbidities, it is possible that providers can be more 'aggressive' in their treatment recommendations for younger patients, thus precluding the need for genetic testing.

The optimal cutoffs of RS have changed from traditional cutoffs to TAILORx cutoffs in recent clinical trials, which have been optimized to minimize under-treatment of potential high-risk patients [25]. In the latest American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) guideline, chemoendocrine therapy may be offered for intermediate-risk patients (RS of 16–25) aged \leq 50 years [32]. Using the TAILORx cutoffs, more patients were reclassified into intermediate-risk (25.5%) and high-risk (8.9%) cohorts. With the ASCO clinical practice guideline, approximately half of the low-risk cohort in the traditional RS cutoffs would have been candidates for



Fig. 3. The trends of chemotherapy receipt according to 21-gene RS categories over time (traditional RS cutoffs, A; TAILORx cutoffs, B).



Fig. 4. Breast cancer specific survival curves by 21-gene RS categories (traditional RS cutoffs, A; TAILORx cutoffs, B).

chemotherapy after being reclassified into the intermediate-risk cohort using the TAILORx cutoffs. As listed the study characteristics of our study and previous studies in Supplementary Table 1, there were significantly differences in the percentage of chemotherapy receipt between traditional RS cutoffs and TAILORx RS cutoffs.

In this study, we observed excellent prognosis of young patients in the low- and intermediate-risk cohorts. Recently, a large cohort study also indicated the 5-year disease recurrence rate was 1.5%, 2.9%, and 11.1% of patients aged <50 years with low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohort, respectively (Supplementary Table 1) [33]. Our results showed that the 21-gene RS was a robust prognostic indicator in young patients, while comparable BCSS was found between low- and intermediate-risk cohorts. Therefore, our findings raise questions about the benefit of adjuvant chemotherapy in the intermediate-risk cohort.

21-gene RS is extensively used worldwide to guide chemotherapy decisions for breast cancer with T1-2NO, hormone receptor-positive, and HER-2 negative disease. However, studies in young patients are limited [17–23]. A study by Mutonga et al. showed that 0%, 39%, and 100% of patients aged <50 years received chemotherapy in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts, respectively, which was not significantly different from older patients [34]. However, a recent study from the National Cancer Database showed that the recommendation or receipt of chemotherapy was significantly more likely in patients aged <50 years with low- (16.8% vs. 10.8%, P < 0.001), intermediate- (64.4% vs. 46.3%, P < 0.001), and high-risk (93.1% vs. 88.6%, P < 0.001) cohorts, compared to patients aged >50 years [35]. Another study including intermediate-risk RS patients (RS of 16-25) from the National Cancer Database also showed that 47.8% of patients aged <40 years were treated with chemotherapy, while only 25.3% of patients aged \geq 40 years received chemotherapy [36]. Here, we also showed that 21-gene RS was associated with receipt of chemotherapy, there was 14.5%, 55.4%, and 81.7% of traditional RS cutoffs patients in low-, intermediate-, and high-risk cohorts treated with chemotherapy, respectively, while it was 7.1%, 33.4%, and 77.1% in TAILORx RS cutoffs. The percentage of chemotherapy receipt in the three risk categories were higher than in previous studies in all ages of patients using both traditional RS cutoffs (low-risk RS, 4.5%-7%; intermediate-risk RS, 32.3%-34%; high-risk RS, 72%) and TAILORx RS cutoffs (low-risk RS, 1.7%–5%; intermediated-risk RS, 15%–18%; high-risk RS, 63%-73.4%) [31,37,38]. Therefore, although the 21gene RS assay affects the decision-making of chemotherapy in young patients, the overall rate of chemotherapy receipt in young patients is higher than for other ages. However, our study showed that the percentage of chemotherapy receipt in young patients with lower RS gradually decreased over time.

Table 3

Multivariate prognostic analyses in the entire cohort.

HR95%CIPHR95%CIPAge (continuous variable) (years)0.9780.905-1.0570.5790.9840.909-1.0650.686Race/ethnicity1111111Non-Hispanic Black1.2750.543-2.9960.5771.4740.631-3.4460.370Hispanic (Il Races)0.2420.033-1.7890.1640.2640.036-1.9520.195Other1.0170.348-2.9750.9751.0960.375-3.2010.867Grade111111Medrately differentiated1.1710.343-3.9940.8011.0370.303-3.5480.953Poort/yundifferentiated1.1710.343-3.9940.8011.0370.303-3.5480.953Unknown0.9780.981Histology0.9771.1760.156-8.9000.875Other0.0200.054-3.1040.8770.4240.056-3.1950.405Tumor stage-1-1-1T1111-1-Positive0.7810.320-1.9070.5880.6540.275-1.5550.336Unknown0.9900.992Surgical procedure0.9900.992Surgical procedure0.9900.992Surgical procedure-	Variables	Traditional RS cutoffs			TAILORx RS cutoffs			
Age (continuous variable) (years) 0.978 0.905-1.057 0.579 0.984 0.909-1.065 0.686 Race/ethnicity 1 1 1 0.07-Hispanic White 1 0.370 Non-Hispanic Black 1.275 0.543-2.996 0.577 1.474 0.631-3.446 0.370 Hispanic (Ik Races) 0.242 0.033-1.789 0.164 0.264 0.036-1.952 0.192 Other 1.017 0.348-2.975 0.975 1.096 0.375-3.201 0.867 Grade 1 1 1 1 0.0066 1.078 0.350-3.318 0.895 Poort/yundifferentiated 1.171 0.343-3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303-3.548 0.953 Uhcorn mixed with other types of carcinoma 1		HR	95%CI	Р	HR	95%CI	Р	
Pace/ethnicity I I Non-Hispanic White 1 1 1 Non-Hispanic Black 1.275 0.543–2.996 0.577 1.474 0.631–3.446 0.370 Hispanic (All Races) 0.242 0.033–1.789 0.164 0.264 0.036–1.952 0.192 Other 0.107 0.348–2.975 0.975 1.096 0.375–3.318 0.895 Grade 1 1 0.438–3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303–3.548 0.953 Poorly/undifferentiated 1.171 0.348–3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303–3.548 0.953 Unknown - - 0.978 - - 0.978 Ubc or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1.030 0.137–7.730 0.977 1.177 0.156–8.900 0.875 Other 0.409 0.413–1.04 0.367 0.424 0.056–3.195 0.446 Tumor stage I I I I I I I I <t< td=""><td>Age (continuous variable) (years)</td><td>0.978</td><td>0.905-1.057</td><td>0.579</td><td>0.984</td><td>0.909-1.065</td><td>0.686</td></t<>	Age (continuous variable) (years)	0.978	0.905-1.057	0.579	0.984	0.909-1.065	0.686	
Non-Hispanic White 1 1 Non-Hispanic Black 1275 0.543-2.996 0.577 1.474 0.631-3.466 0.370 Hispanic (All Races) 0.242 0.033-1.789 0.164 0.264 0.036-1.952 0.192 Other 1.017 0.348-2.975 0.975 1.096 0.375-3.201 0.867 Grade 1	Race/ethnicity							
Non-Hispanic Black 1.275 0.543-2.996 0.577 1.474 0.631-3.446 0.370 Hispanic (All Races) 0.242 0.033-1.789 0.164 0.264 0.036-1.952 0.192 Grade 1 1 1 1 1 Moderately differentiated 1 1 1 1 0.348-2.975 0.976 1.096 0.375-3.201 0.857 Poorly/undifferentiated 1.279 0.418-3.915 0.666 1.078 0.330-3.318 0.895 Poorly/undifferentiated 1.171 0.343-3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303-3.548 0.953 Unknown - - 0.978 - - 0.981 Histology 0.317-7.730 0.977 1.177 0.156-8.900 0.875 Unknown - 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Non-Hispanic White	1			1			
Hispanic (All Races) 0.242 0.033-1.789 0.164 0.264 0.036-1.952 0.192 Other 1.07 0.348-2.975 0.975 1.096 0.375-3.201 0.867 Grade Well differentiated 1 1 Moderately differentiated 1.279 0.418-3.915 0.666 1.078 0.303-3.318 0.895 Poorly/undifferentiated 1.171 0.343-3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303-3.548 0.9531 Unknown - - 0.978 - - 0.9381 Histology 1 1 1 UC or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 UL or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 <	Non-Hispanic Black	1.275	0.543-2.996	0.577	1.474	0.631-3.446	0.370	
Other 1.017 0.348–2.975 0.975 1.096 0.375–3.201 0.867 Grade 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0.350–3.318 0.895 0.975 0.978 0.375–3.201 0.867 0.978 0.350–3.318 0.895 0.979 0.978 0.303–3.548 0.953 0.978 0.977 1.177 0.156–8.900 0.875 0.975 0.976 0.177 0.156–8.900 0.875 0.975 0.977 1.177 0.156–8.900 0.875 0.975 0.976 0.424 0.056–3.195 0.405 Tumor stage 1 </td <td>Hispanic (All Races)</td> <td>0.242</td> <td>0.033-1.789</td> <td>0.164</td> <td>0.264</td> <td>0.036-1.952</td> <td>0.192</td>	Hispanic (All Races)	0.242	0.033-1.789	0.164	0.264	0.036-1.952	0.192	
Grade Image: space s	Other	1.017	0.348-2.975	0.975	1.096	0.375-3.201	0.867	
Well differentiated 1 1 1 Moderately differentiated 1.279 0.418–3.915 0.666 1.078 0.303–3.318 0.895 Poorly/undifferentiated 1.171 0.343–3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303–3.548 0.8953 Unknown - - 0.978 - - 0.981 Histology - - 0.977 1.177 0.156–8.900 0.875 Other 0.409 0.054–3.104 0.387 0.424 0.056–3.195 0.405 Other 0.409 0.054–3.104 0.387 0.424 0.56–8.900 0.875 Other 0.409 0.054–3.104 0.387 0.424 0.56–8.900 0.875 Other 1	Grade							
Moderately differentiated 1.279 0.418-3.915 0.666 1.078 0.350-3.318 0.895 Poorly/undifferentiated 1.171 0.343-3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303-3.548 0.953 Unknown - - 0.978 - - 0.981 Histology - 1 - - 0.981 IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1 1 - 1 IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1.0 0.137-7.730 0.977 1.177 0.156-8.900 0.875 Other 0.409 0.054-3.104 0.387 0.424 0.056-3.195 0.405 Turnor stage 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0.002 R status 1 0.320-1.907 0.588 0.654 0.275-1.555 0.336 Unknown 0.781 0.320-1.907 0.588 0.654 0.275-1.555 0.336 Unknown 1 1 1 1 1 1	Well differentiated	1			1			
Poorly/undifferentiated 1.171 0.343-3.994 0.801 1.037 0.303-3.548 0.953 Histology - - 0.978 - - 0.981 Histology - - 0.978 - - 0.981 IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1 - 1 - 0.977 1.177 0.156-8.900 0.875 Other 0.030 0.137-7.730 0.977 1.177 0.156-8.900 0.405 Tumor stage - - 0.424 0.056-3.195 0.405 Tumor stage - - 1 - - - 0.424 0.56-3.915 0.405 Tumor stage - - 1 - - - 0.424 0.56-3.915 0.405 Tumor stage - - 1 - - - 0.902 - - 0.902 - - 0.992 - 0.992 - 0.992 - 0.992 <td>Moderately differentiated</td> <td>1.279</td> <td>0.418-3.915</td> <td>0.666</td> <td>1.078</td> <td>0.350-3.318</td> <td>0.895</td>	Moderately differentiated	1.279	0.418-3.915	0.666	1.078	0.350-3.318	0.895	
Unknown - - 0.978 - - 0.981 Histology - 1 - 0.981 - - 0.981 IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1.030 0.137-7.730 0.977 1.177 0.156-8.900 0.875 Other 0.409 0.054-3.104 0.387 0.424 0.056-3.195 0.405 Tumor stage 1 <td>Poorly/undifferentiated</td> <td>1.171</td> <td>0.343-3.994</td> <td>0.801</td> <td>1.037</td> <td>0.303-3.548</td> <td>0.953</td>	Poorly/undifferentiated	1.171	0.343-3.994	0.801	1.037	0.303-3.548	0.953	
Histology 1 1 IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1.030 0.137-7.730 0.977 1.1424 0.056-3.195 0.875 Other 0.409 0.054-3.104 0.387 0.424 0.056-3.195 0.405 Tumor stage 1 </td <td>Unknown</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>0.978</td> <td>_</td> <td>_</td> <td>0.981</td>	Unknown	_	_	0.978	_	_	0.981	
IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma111ILC or mixed with other types of carcinoma1.0300.137-7.7300.9771.1770.156-8.9000.875Other0.4090.054-3.1040.3870.4240.056-3.1950.405Tumor stage111111T22.6271.376-5.0170.0032.7861.448-5.3610.002PR status111111Negative111111Positive0.7810.320-1.9070.5880.6540.275-1.5550.336Unknown0.990-0.9920.992Surgical procedureE1111Res1110.511-3.6920.5920.592Radiotherapy111111No111111Yes0.8990.317-2.5510.8420.8070.289-2.2560.683Chemotherapy111111Yes0.8900.317-2.5510.8420.8070.387-1.6100.56621-gene recurrence score11111Intermediate-risk11111Low-risk0.3630.131-1.0000.5500.968Hirb-risk111-0.968-0.968 </td <td>Histology</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Histology							
ILC or mixed with other types of carcinoma 1.030 0.137-7.730 0.977 1.177 0.156-8.900 0.875 Other 0.409 0.054-3.104 0.387 0.424 0.056-3.195 0.405 Tumor stage 1 1 1 1 1 0.003 2.786 1.448-5.361 0.002 PR status 1 1 1 1 0.990 - - 0.992 Negative 1 0.781 0.320-1.907 0.588 0.654 0.275-1.555 0.336 Unknown - - 0.990 - - 0.992 Surgical procedure 1 1 1 1 1 1 BCS 1 1.330 0.525-3.890 0.484 1.374 0.511-3.692 0.529 Radiotherapy 1.430 0.525-3.890 0.484 1.374 0.511-3.692 0.529 Radiotherapy 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	IDC or mixed with other types of carcinoma	1			1			
Other0.4090.054-3.1040.3870.4240.056-3.1950.405Tumor stage111	ILC or mixed with other types of carcinoma	1.030	0.137-7.730	0.977	1.177	0.156-8.900	0.875	
Tumor stage 1 1 T1 1 1 T2 2.627 1.376–5.017 0.003 2.786 1.448–5.361 0.002 PR status Negative 1 1 1 1 1 1 Positive 0.781 0.320–1.907 0.588 0.654 0.275–1.555 0.336 Unknown - - 0.990 - - 0.992 Surgical procedure - - 0.990 - - 0.992 Surgical procedure - - 0.990 - - 0.992 Surgical procedure - - - 0.990 - - 0.992 Surgical procedure - - - 0.990 - - 0.992 Surgical procedure - - - - - 0.992 - - 0.992 - - - 0.525 - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	Other	0.409	0.054-3.104	0.387	0.424	0.056-3.195	0.405	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Tumor stage							
T22.6271.376-5.0170.0032.7861.448-5.3610.002PR status I I I I I I Negative1 I I I I I Positive0.7810.320-1.9070.5880.6540.275-1.5550.336Unknown $ -$ 0.990 $ -$ 0.992Surgical procedure I I I I I I BCS1 I I I I I I I Mastectomy1.4300.525-3.8900.484 $I.374$ $0.511-3.692$ 0.529 Radiotherapy I I I I I I I No1 I I I I I I I Yes0.8990.317-2.5510.8420.8070.289-2.2560.683Chemotherapy I I I I I I No1 I I I I I Yes0.8440.414-1.7170.6390.7900.387-1.6100.51621-gene recurrence score I I I I I I Intermediate-risk I I I I I I Low-risk0.3630.131-1.0000.050 $ 0.968$ Hipbrink27641.048-7.2950.0404.682.102-10.419 < 0.001	T1	1			1			
PR status 1 1 Positive 0.781 0.320–1.907 0.588 0.654 0.275–1.555 0.336 Unknown – – 0.990 – – 0.992 Surgical procedure – – 0.990 – 0.992 0.992 Surgical procedure – – 0.990 – – 0.992 Surgical procedure – – 1 – – 0.992 Surgical procedure – – 1 – – 0.992 Surgical procedure – – 1 – – 0.992 0.992 0.992 0.992 0.992 0.992 0.529 0.992 0.529 0.526 0.5683<	T2	2.627	1.376-5.017	0.003	2.786	1.448-5.361	0.002	
Negative111Positive0.7810.320–1.9070.5880.6540.275–1.5550.336Unknown––0.990––0.992Surgical procedure––0.990––0.992Surgical procedure––1–1–BCS11–1–5020.529Radiotherapy1.4300.525–3.8900.4841.3740.511–3.6920.529Radiotherapy––1–––No1–1––6.883Chemotherapy––1––6.883Chemotherapy––1––6.883Chemotherapy––1–––No1–1–––6.883Chemotherapy––1––––No1–1–––––––6.833––– <td>PR status</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	PR status							
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Negative	1			1			
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c } Unknown & - & - & 0.990 & - & - & 0.992 \\ \hline Surgical procedure & & & & & & & \\ BCS & 1 & & & 1 & & & & \\ Mastectomy & 1.430 & 0.525-3.890 & 0.484 & 1.374 & 0.511-3.692 & 0.529 \\ \hline Radiotherapy & & & & & & & & \\ No & 1 & & & 1 & & & & \\ Yes & 0.899 & 0.317-2.551 & 0.842 & 0.807 & 0.289-2.256 & 0.683 \\ \hline Chemotherapy & & & & & & & \\ No & 1 & & & 1 & & & & \\ Yes & 0.844 & 0.414-1.717 & 0.639 & 0.790 & 0.387-1.610 & 0.516 \\ \hline 21-gene recurrence score & & & & & & \\ Intermediate-risk & 1 & & & 1 & & \\ Low-risk & 0.363 & 0.131-1.000 & 0.050 & - & & & & 0.968 \\ \hline Hieb-risk & 0.363 & 0.131-1.000 & 0.050 & - & & & & 0.968 \\ \hline Hieb-risk & 0.363 & 0.131-1.000 & 0.050 & - & & & & & 0.968 \\ \hline \end{array}$	Positive	0.781	0.320-1.907	0.588	0.654	0.275-1.555	0.336	
Surgical procedure BCS 1 1 Mastectomy 1.430 0.525–3.890 0.484 1.374 0.511–3.692 0.529 Radiotherapy No 1 1 1 Yes 0.899 0.317–2.551 0.842 0.807 0.289–2.256 0.683 Chemotherapy No 1 1 1 Yes 0.844 0.414–1.717 0.639 0.790 0.387–1.610 0.516 21-gene recurrence score 1 Intermediate-risk 1 1 Low-risk 0.363 0.131–1.000 0.050 - - 0.9688 High-risk 2.764 1.048–7.295 0.0404 4.68 2.102–10.419 <0.001	Unknown	_	-	0.990	_	_	0.992	
BCS111Mastectomy1.4300.525–3.8900.4841.3740.511–3.6920.529Radiotherapy V V V V V V No1 V V V V V Yes0.8990.317–2.5510.8420.8070.289–2.2560.683Chemotherapy V V V V V V No1 V V V V V Yes0.8440.414–1.7170.6390.7900.387–1.6100.51621-gene recurrence score V V V V V V Intermediate-risk1 V V V V V Low-risk0.3630.131–1.0000.050 $ V$ V High-risk2.7641.048–7.2950.04004.682.102–10.419 < 0.001	Surgical procedure							
Mastectomy 1.430 0.525–3.890 0.484 1.374 0.511–3.692 0.529 Radiotherapy	BCS	1			1			
Radiotherapy No 1 1 Yes 0.899 0.317–2.551 0.842 0.807 0.289–2.256 0.683 Chemotherapy I No 1 1 1 5 Yes 0.844 0.414–1.717 0.639 0.790 0.387–1.610 0.516 21-gene recurrence score I Intermediate-risk 1 1 1 Low-risk 0.363 0.131–1.000 0.050 - - 0.968 High-risk 2.764 1.048–7.295 0.0400 4.68 2.102–10.419 <0.001	Mastectomy	1.430	0.525-3.890	0.484	1.374	0.511-3.692	0.529	
No11Yes 0.899 $0.317-2.551$ 0.842 0.807 $0.289-2.256$ 0.683 Chemotherapy 1 1 1 Yes 0.844 $0.414-1.717$ 0.639 0.790 $0.387-1.610$ 0.516 21-gene recurrence score 1 1 1 1 Intermediate-risk 1 1 1 1 Low-risk 0.363 $0.131-1.000$ 0.050 $ 0.968$ Hieb-risk 2.764 $1.048-7.295$ 0.040 4.68 $2.102-10.419$ <0.001	Radiotherapy							
Yes 0.899 0.317–2.551 0.842 0.807 0.289–2.256 0.683 Chemotherapy No 1 <	No	1			1			
Chemotherapy 1 1 No 1 0.00000000000000000000000000000000000	Yes	0.899	0.317-2.551	0.842	0.807	0.289-2.256	0.683	
No 1 1 Yes 0.844 0.414–1.717 0.639 0.790 0.387–1.610 0.516 21-gene recurrence score I I I I 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.00000 0.0000 0.968 High-risk 2.764 1.048–7.295 0.0400 4.68 2.102–10.419 <0.0010	Chemotherapy							
Yes 0.844 0.414–1.717 0.639 0.790 0.387–1.610 0.516 21-gene recurrence score	No	1			1			
21-gene recurrence score Intermediate-risk 1 1 Low-risk 0.363 0.131−1.000 0.050 - - 0.968 High-risk 2.764 1.048−7.295 0.040 4.68 2.102−10.419 <0.001	Yes	0.844	0.414-1.717	0.639	0.790	0.387-1.610	0.516	
Intermediate-risk 1 1 Low-risk 0.363 0.131–1.000 0.050 - - 0.968 High-risk 2.764 1.048–7.295 0.040 4.68 2.102–10.419 <0.001	21-gene recurrence score							
Low-risk 0.363 0.131–1.000 0.050 – – 0.968	Intermediate-risk	1			1			
High-rick 2 764 1 048–7 295 0 040 4 68 2 102–10 419 <0 001	Low-risk	0.363	0.131-1.000	0.050	_	-	0.968	
1.510 1.510 1.255 0.040 4.00 2.102 10.415 (0.001	High-risk	2.764	1.048-7.295	0.040	4.68	2.102-10.419	< 0.001	

Abbreviations: BCS, breast conserving surgery; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; IDC, invasive ductal carcinoma; ILC, invasive lobular carcinoma; PR, progesterone receptor; RS, recurrence score; T, tumor; TAILORx, Trial Assigning Individualized Options for Treatment.

The survival benefit of adjuvant chemotherapy for intermediate-risk patients remains unclear. Our results showed that the TAILORx RS cutoffs may be more optimal to select young patients for chemotherapy. The recent results of the TAILORx trial showed that endocrine therapy was non-inferior to chemoendocrine therapy in patients with intermediate-risk (RS of 16–25) (HR 1.08, 95% CI 0.94–1.24, P = 0.262) [25]. However, in an exploratory subgroup analysis among patients aged \leq 50 years, a lower rate of distant recurrence was observed in patients who received chemotherapy. Notably, only one-third of patients in the TAILORx study were aged <50 years, which may be underrepresentative of those affected. In addition, several studies also failed to observe survival benefit in the intermediate-risk cohort (TAILORx RS cutoffs). However, only 2.6%-6.8% of patients were aged <40 years [33,36,37]. Owing to potential long-term chemotherapy toxicities including cardiovascular toxicity, cognitive change, secondary cancers, and irreversible ovarian failure, which may occur in young women with longer life expectancy. Moreover, approximately two-thirds of patients were diagnosed as intermediate-risk RS. Therefore, more studies are needed to investigate the potential effect of chemotherapy in this patient subset.

The results from moxifen and Exemestane Trial/Suppression of Ovarian Function Trial trials have indicated that the addition of ovarian function suppression to endocrine therapy could improve survival outcomes in high risk premenopausal patients with hormone receptor-positive/HER2-negative breast cancer, including patients aged <40 years and node negative disease [39]. In the TAILORx trial, there were also 13% of premenopausal women treated with ovarian function suppression [25]. Younger patients have a lower incidence of chemotherapy-induced amenorrhea (52%, 70.8%, and 95.1% in aged <40, 40–45, and >45 years, P < 0.0001), which may contribute to worse survival outcomes in hormone receptor-positive breast cancer [40]. However, there were currently no studies assessing the role of ovarian function suppression in intermediate- and high-risk RS cohorts, and it is not known if an escalated adjuvant endocrine treatment will reduce the impact of adjuvant chemotherapy or not. We should underline that the data of ovarian function suppression and endocrine therapy were not include in the SEER database. More studies are needed to assess the effect of ovarian function suppression on prognosis in intermediate- and high-risk RS cohorts.

Several inherent limitations should be considered in our study. First, there was potential selective bias using a retrospective database. However, our study reflects the real-world outcomes for young breast cancer patients using a population-based national registry. Secondly, the functional status, socioeconomic status, and comorbidities of patients were not recorded in the SEER database, which may likely influence the treatment decisions for patients. However, similar to our results, younger patients might be treated more aggressively because of fewer comorbidities compared to older patients. Third, HER-2 status was not included in the analysis of our study. However, only 2.2% of patients had HER-2 positive disease in patients with available HER-2 status. We believe that this



Fig. 5. Breast cancer specific survival curves in patients treated with and without chemotherapy by 21-gene RS categories (TAILORx cutoffs: intermediate-risk, A, high-risk, B; traditional RS cutoffs: intermediate-risk, C, high-risk, D).

Table 4

Multivariate prognostic analyses by 21-gene RS stratifications.

Variables	Low-risk		Intermediate-risk	Intermediate-risk		High-risk	
	HR (95%CI)	Р	HR (95%CI)	Р	HR (95%CI)	Р	
Traditional RS cutoffs No chemotherapy Chemotherapy TAILORx RS cutoffs No chemotherapy	1 2.155 (0.324–14.326) –	0.427	1 0.877 (0.297–2.592)	0.812	1 0.337 (0.113–1.003) 1	0.051	
Chemotherapy	-	_	1.907 (0.641-5.673)	0.246	0.368 (0.151-0.897)	0.025	

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; RS, recurrence score; TAILORx, Trial Assigning Individualized Options for Treatment.

would have limited impact on our results. In addition, the treatment information including types of chemotherapy regimen, completion of chemotherapy, and endocrine therapy were also not recorded in the SEER program. Moreover, the median follow-up time was only 50 months and only 38 events have been recorded in our study, therefore long-term follow-up with additional events are necessary to draw definitive conclusions regarding 21-gene RS testing in decision-making of chemotherapy and prognostic assessment of young women.

In conclusion, our study suggests that 21-gene RS has clinical implications for young breast cancer patients with respect to optimizing chemotherapy-decisions. Despite increasing rates of chemotherapy receipt in young patients, future studies are needed to obtain more evidence-based management strategies in young patients with three RS categories.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Acknowledgments

This work was partly supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81872459), the Commission Young and Middle-aged Talents Training Project of Fujian Health Commission (No. 2019-ZQNB-25), the Science and Technology Planning Projects of Xiamen Science & Technology Bureau (No. 3502Z20174070), and the Baise City Scientific Research and Technology Development Plan (No. 20183008).

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.breast.2019.12.013.

References

- Reyna C, Lee MC. Breast cancer in young women: special considerations in multidisciplinary care. J Multidiscip Healthc 2014;7:419–29.
- [2] Liu P, Li X, Mittendorf EA, Li J, Du XL, He J, et al. Comparison of clinicopathologic features and survival in young American women aged 18-39 years in different ethnic groups with breast cancer. Br J Canc 2013;109:1302–9.
- [3] Lee HB, Han W. Unique features of young age breast cancer and its management. J Breast Cancer 2014;17:301–7.
- [4] Anastasiadi Z, Lianos GD, Ignatiadou E, Harissis HV, Mitsis M. Breast cancer in young women: an overview. Updates Surg 2017;69:313–37.
- [5] Gnerlich JL, Deshpande AD, Jeffe DB, Sweet A, White N, Margenthaler JA. Elevated breast cancer mortality in women younger than age 40 years compared with older women is attributed to poorer survival in early-stage disease. J Am Coll Surg 2009;208:341–7.
- [6] Kheirelseid EH, Boggs JM, Curran C, Glynn RW, Dooley C, Sweeney KJ, et al. Younger age as a prognostic indicator in breast cancer: a cohort study. BMC Canc 2011;11:383.
- [7] Lin NU, Vanderplas A, Hughes ME, Theriault RL, Edge SB, Wong YN, et al. Clinicopathologic features, patterns of recurrence, and survival among women with triple-negative breast cancer in the National Comprehensive Cancer Network. Cancer 2012;118:5463–72.
- [8] Sheridan W, Scott T, Caroline S, Yvonne Z, Vanessa B, David V, et al. Breast cancer in young women: have the prognostic implications of breast cancer subtypes changed over time? Breast Canc Res Treat 2014;147:617–29.
- [9] Liu Z, Sahli Z, Wang Y, Wolff AC, Cope LM, Umbricht CB. Young age at diagnosis is associated with worse prognosis in the Luminal A breast cancersubtype: a retrospective institutional cohort study. Breast Canc Res Treat 2018;172:689–702.
- [10] Lian W, Fu F, Lin Y, Lu M, Chen B, Yang P, et al. The impact of young age for prognosis by subtype in women with early breast cancer. Sci Rep 2017;7: 11625.
- [11] Anders CK, Hsu DS, Broadwater G, Acharya CR, Foekens JA, Zhang Y, et al. Young age at diagnosis correlates with worse prognosis and defines a subset of breast cancers with shared patterns of gene expression. J Clin Oncol 2008;26:3324–30.
- [12] Azim Jr HA, Michiels S, Bedard PL, Singhal SK, Criscitiello C, Ignatiadis M, et al. Elucidating prognosis and biology of breast cancer arising in young women using gene expression profiling. Clin Cancer Res 2012;18:1341–51.
- [13] Anders CK, Acharya CR, Hsu DS, Broadwater G, Garman K, Foekens JA, et al. Age-specific differences in oncogenic pathway deregulation seen in human breast tumors. PLoS One 2008;3:e1373.
- [14] Dobi Á, Kelemen G, Kaizer L, Weiczner R, Thurzó L, Kahán Z. Breast cancer under 40 years of age: increasing number and worse prognosis. Pathol Oncol

Res 2011;17:425-8.

- [15] Paik S, Shak S, Tang G, Kim C, Baker J, Cronin M, et al. A multigene assay to predict recurrence of tamoxifen-treated, node-negative breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2004;351:2817–26.
- [16] Paik S. Development and clinical utility of a 21-gene recurrence score prognostic assay in patients with early breast cancer treated with tamoxifen. Oncologist 2007;12:631–5.
- [17] Gage MM, Rosman M, Mylander WC, Giblin E, Kim HS, Cope L, et al. A validated model for identifying patients unlikely to benefit from the 21gene recurrence score assay. Clin Breast Canc 2015;15:467–72.
- [18] Kim HS, Umbricht CB, Illei PB, Cimino-Mathews A, Cho S, Chowdhury N, et al. Optimizing the use of gene expression profiling in early-stage breast cancer. J Clin Oncol 2016;34:4390–7.
- [19] Hanna MG, Bleiweiss IJ, Nayak A, Jaffer S. Correlation of oncotype DX recurrence score with histomorphology and immunohistochemistry in over 500 patients. Int J Breast Cancer 2017;2017:1257078.
- [20] Bomeisl PE, Thompson CL, Harris LN, Gilmore HL. Comparison of oncotype DX recurrence score by histologic types of breast carcinoma. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2015;139:1546–9.
- [21] Clark BZ, Dabbs DJ, Cooper KL, Bhargava R. Impact of progesterone receptor semiquantitative immunohistochemical result on Oncotype DXrecurrence score: a quality assurance study of 1074 cases. Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol 2013;21:287–91.
- [22] Auerbach J, Kim M, Fineberg S. Can features evaluated in the routine pathologic assessment of lymph node-negative estrogen receptor-positive stage I or II invasive breast cancer be used to predict the Oncotype DX recurrence score? Arch Pathol Lab Med 2010;134:1697–701.
- [23] Swain SM, Nunes R, Yoshizawa C, Rothney M, Sing AP. Quantitative gene expression by recurrence score in ER-positive breast cancer, by age. Adv Ther 2015;32:1222–36.
- [24] Paik S, Shak S, Tang G, Kim C, Baker J, Cronin M, et al. A multigene assay to predict recurrence of tamoxifen-treated, node-negative breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2004;351:2817–26.
- [25] Sparano JA, Gray RJ, Makower DF, Pritchard KI, Albain KS, Hayes DF, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy guided by a 21-gene expression assay in breast cancer. N Engl J Med 2018;379:111–21.
- [26] Nitz U, Gluz O, Christgen M, Kates RE, Clemens M, Malter W, et al. Reducing chemotherapy use in clinically high-risk, genomically low-risk pN0 and pN1 earlybreast cancer patients: five-year data from the prospective, randomised phase 3 West GermanStudy Group (WSG) PlanB trial. Breast Canc Res Treat 2017;165(3):573–83.
- [27] Giuliano AE, Edge SB, Hortobagyi GN. Eighth edition of the AJCC cancer staging manual: breast cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2018;25(7):1783–5.
- [28] NCCN. NCCN clinical Practice guidelines in oncology V.2.2019. Breast Cancer. Available online at: https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/ breast.pdf. [Accessed 10 December 2019].
- [29] SEER*Stat Database: Incidence SEER 18 Regs (Excl AK) Custom Data Malignant Breast (with Oncotype DX and Additional Treatment Fields) Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End results (SEER) program. National Cancer Institute, DCCPS, Surveillance Research Program; Nov 2017. Sub (2004-2015) - Linked To County Attributes - Total U.S., 1969-2016 Counties, www.seer.cancer.gov. released April 2018, based on the November 2017 submission.
- [30] Fu J, Wu L, Fu W, Tan Y, Xu T, Hong Z, et al. How young is too young in breast cancer?-young breast cancer is not a unique biological subtype. Clin Breast Canc 2018;18:e25–39.
- [31] Wang J, He ZY, Dong Y, Sun JY, Zhang WW, Wu SG. The distribution and outcomes of the 21-gene recurrence score in T1-T2N0 estrogen receptorpositive breast cancer with different histologic subtypes. Front Genet 2018;9:638.
- [32] Andre F, Ismaila N, Henry NL, Somerfield MR, Bast RC, Barlow W, et al. Use of biomarkers to guide decisions on adjuvant systemic therapy for women with early-stage invasive breast cancer: ASCO clinical practice guideline updateintegration of results from TAILORx. J Clin Oncol 2019;37:1956–64.
- [33] Stemmer SM, Steiner M, Rizel S, Soussan-Gutman L, Ben-Baruch N, Bareket-Samish A, et al. Clinical outcomes in patients with node-negative breast cancer treated based on the recurrence score results: evidence from a large prospectively designed registry. NPJ Breast Cancer 2017;3:33.
- [34] Mutonga M, Speedy S, Rademaker A, Liu D, Uthe R, Jain S, et al. Relationship of pathological features and a 21 gene expression assay in younger versus older women with node-negative endocrine receptor-positive breast cancer. Breast Canc Res Treat 2019;176:95–100.
- [35] Williams AD, Reyes SA, Arlow RL, Tchou J, De La Cruz LM. Is age trumping genetic profiling in clinical practice? Relationship of chemotherapy recommendation and oncotype DX recurrence score in patients aged <50 Years versus \geq 50 Years, and trends over time. Ann Surg Oncol 2018;25:2875–83.
- [36] Chen J, Wu X, Christos PJ, Formenti S, Nagar H. Practice patterns and outcomes for patients with node-negative hormone receptor-positive breast cancer and intermediate 21-gene Recurrence Scores. Breast Cancer Res 2018;20:26.
- [37] Barcenas CH, Raghavendra A, Sinha AK, Syed MP, Hsu L, Patangan Jr MG, et al. Outcomes in patients with early-stage breast cancer who underwent a 21-

- gene expression assay. Cancer 2017;123:2422–31. [38] Kizy S, Huang JL, Marmor S, Blaes A, Yuan J, Beckwith H, et al. Distribution of 21-gene recurrence scores among breast cancer histologic subtypes. Arch Pathol Lab Med 2018;142:735–41.
- [39] Francis PA, Fleming GF, Walley BA, Viale G, Colleoni MG, Láng I, et al. Absolute improvements in freedom from distant recurrence to tailor adjuvant EndocrineTherapies for premenopausal women: results from TEXT and SOFT. Oct

16:JCO1801967 J Clin Oncol 2019. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.18.01967 [Epub ahead of print].
[40] Perez-Fidalgo JA, Rosello S, Garcia-Garre E, Jorda E, MartinMartorell P, Bermejo B, et al. Incidence of chemotherapy-induced amenorrhea in hormonesensitive breast cancer patients: the impact of addition of taxanes to anthracycline-based regimens. Breast Canc Res Treat 2010;120:245–51.