

The Prognostic Factors and Outcome of Adult Medulloblastoma: Where We Stand

Kamuran Ibis¹, Ahmet Karadeniz¹, Rasim Meral¹, Murat Guveli¹, Mert Basaran², Sevil Bavbek², Meltem Ekenel², Fulya Agaoglu¹, Emin Darendeliler¹, Musa Altun¹

¹Department of Radiation Oncology, Institute of Oncology, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

²Department of Medical Oncology, Institute of Oncology, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

We designed our study to analyze the prognostic factors and treatment outcomes of adult medulloblastoma patients who received postoperative craniospinal irradiation. Fourtythree patients who were treated due to medulloblastoma at Istanbul University, Institute of Oncology between 1990 and 2013 were retrospectively analyzed. All of the patients were older than 18 years, with a median age of 27 years (range, 18–51 years). In 40 (93%) patients, total resection of the tumor was achieved, and 3 (7%) patients had undergone a subtotal tumoral resection. Risk assessment revealed 7 high-risk and 36 standard-risk patients. All patients received postoperative craniospinal irradiation, delivering a median craniospinal dose of 36 Gy, with an additional boost to the posterior fossa up to 54 Gy. Fifteen patients received chemotherapy. The median follow-up was 62 months (range, 3-213 months). The 5-year, 10-year, overall, and disease-free survival rates were 63%, 51%, 66%, and 55%, respectively. Univariate analysis revealed that hydrocephalus, initial local recurrence, subtotal resection in primary surgery, initial Karnofsky performance status <70, duration of symptoms shorter than 30 days, and primary site dose < 54 Gy were found to be negative prognostic factors. Toxicity was moderate. The main therapy in adult medulloblatoms is craniospinal irradiation following surgery. The prognostic factors and outcomes of the patients in our study are concordant with previous reports in the literature.

Key words: Chemotherapy, adjuvant – Medulloblastoma – Radiotherapy, adjuvant – Treatment outcome

Corresponding author: Kamuran Ibis, Department of Radiation Oncology, Institute of Oncology, Istanbul University, 34104 Fatih, Istanbul, Turkey.

Tel.: +90 212 414 24 34; Fax: +90 212 531 31 03; E-mail: kamuranibis@gmail.com

edulloblastoma (MB) is an embryonal brain tumor. MB is a common type of pediatric tumor and accounts for 25% of all pediatric brain tumors and 40% of posterior fossa tumors. The median age at diagnosis is 5 years, and 80% of cases are diagnosed in the first 15 years. Nevertheless, MB constitutes only 1% of all brain tumors in adults.^{1,2} MB is seen more between the ages of 20 and 34 years in the adult population.² In contrast to the pediatric type, MB in adults is encountered with more desmoplastic histology and lateral localization.³ Due to the high risk of leptomeningeal spread of MB of the pediatric type, craniospinal irradiation (CSI) with or without chemotherapy after maximal tumoral resection became the standard treatment.⁴ Pediatric protocols are generally used for the treatment of adult MB. Prognostic factors and treatment results are not very well described because of the rarity of adult MB. We analyzed adult MB patients treated in the last 24 years at our institution in terms of prognostic factors and treatment results.

Materials and Methods

The clinical data of 43 patients who were treated at Istanbul University, Institute of Oncology between 1990 and 2013 were retrospectively analyzed. All of the patients were aged 18 years or older in our series.

Patients characteristics

The median age of our study population was 27 years (range, 18-51 years). The median follow-up was 62 months (range, 3-213 months; Table 1). The symptoms and signs of the patients before surgery are listed in Table 2. Preoperative Karnofsky Performance Status (KPS) was <70 in 7 patients (16.3%), and KPS was >70 in the remaning 36 patients (83.7%). The degree of the spread of MB was evaluated in 6 patients (14%) with craniospinal computed tomography scanning and in 37 patients (86%) with magnetic resonance imaging. Cytologic evaluation of the cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) was determined to be positive in 1 patient (2.3%) and was determined to be negative in 40 patients (93%). In the remaining 2 patients (4.7%), no cytologic examination of CSF was made. Hydrocephalus was detected in 4 patients (13%) with laterally located tumors and in 5 patients (38%) with centrally located tumors. In 5 patients (11%), total excision was performed through a secondary surgery following the primary surgery due to local recurrences before adjuvant therapy. The median interval between the primary surgery and local recurrence was 3 months (range, 2–7 months) in this group of patients. We describe this group as initial locally recurrent disease.

Surgery, histopathology, and risk groups

Whereas the tumor was located centrally in 13 of 43 patients (30.2%), the tumor was found laterally in the remaining 30 patients (69.8%). In 40 patients (93%), total resection of the tumor was achieved; however, the rest of the group (3 patients; 7%) underwent subtotal tumoral resection. In the latter group, the residual tumor size ranged between 1 and 2 cm. Histopathologic examination revealed 26 (60.5%) desmoplastic tumors, 16 (37.2%) classic type of MB, and 1 (2.3%) large cell/anaplastic tumor. Four (15%) of the desmoplastic tumors were located centrally. T status were found to be T1 in 1 (2.3%) patient, T2 in 41 (95.3%) patients, and T4 in 1 (2.3%) patient. M stages were as follows: M0 in 38 patients (88.4%), M1 in 1 patient (2.3%), M2 in 1 patient (2.3%), M3 in 2 patients (4.7%), and M4 in 1 patient (2.3%). Risk assessment revealed 7 high-risk patients (16.3%), and 36 standard-risk patients (83.7%).

Radiotherapy

All of the 43 patients received postoperative CSI through a ⁶⁰Co teletherapy machine or 6-MV linear accelerator. Thirty-eight (88.3%) patients received CSI immediately following surgery, and the remaining 5 (11.3%) patients were irradiated with CSI after receiving chemotherapy following the surgical intervention. The median whole cranial dose was 36 Gy (range, 23.4-48 Gy); the median posterior fossa dose was 16 Gy (range, 5.4-30.6 Gy); the median total posterior fossa dose was 54 Gy (range, 41.4–57.6 Gy); the median primary site boost dose was 10 Gy (range, 8-14 Gy); and the median total primary site dose was 54 Gy (range, 42-59.4 Gy). Eleven (25.6%) patients received a median dose of 5.4 Gy (range, 3.6–8 Gy) to the lamina cribrosa and 36 Gy (range, 12.6-32.8 Gy) of the median spinal dose (Table 3).

Chemotherapy

Fifteen (34.9%) of 43 patients received chemotherapy [1 T2M0 patient with subtotal resection; 1 T2M4 patient, 1 T4M3 patient, 1 T2M2 patient, 1 T2M1

Table 1Patient characteristics

Variable	Patients (%)
Sex	
Female	18 (41.9%)
Male	25 (58.1%)
Age (years)	
18–25	18 (41.9%)
26–35	17 (39.5%)
36–45	6 (14.0%)
>45	2 (4.7%)
Period	
1990–1999	13 (30.2%)
2000-2009	21 (48.8%)
2010-2013	9 (20.9%)
Tumor location	()
Central	13 (30.2%)
Lateral	30 (69.8%)
Hydrocephalus	
Present	9 (20.9%)
Absent	34 (79.1%)
Duration of symptoms (days)	
<30	17 (39%)
>30	26 (61%)
Initial recurrence	
Yes	5 (11.6%)
No	38 (88.4%)
T stage	
T1–2	42 (97.7%)
T3-4	1 (2.3%)
M Stage	- (
MO	38 (88.4%)
M1-4	5 (11.6%)
Initial KPS	0 (11070)
<70	7 (16.3%)
>70	36 (83.7%)
Surgical resection	
Total	40 (93%)
Subtotal	3 (7%)
Histology type	
Desmoplastic	26 (60.5%)
Classic	16 (37.2%)
Large cell/anaplastic	1 (2.3%)
Tumor size (cm)	
<4	15 (34.9%)
>4	28 (65.1%)
Risk group	
Standard risk	36 (83.7%)
High risk	7 (16.3%)
Primary chemotherapy	()
Yes	15 (34.9%)
No	28 (65.1%)
Chemotherapy regimen	(*****)
Packer	7 (16.3%)
OPEC	7 (16.3%)
Karmustin-vincristine	1 (2.3%)
Postoperative residual tumor	1 (2.570)
Yes	3 (7%)
No	40 (93%)
Duration of RT (days)	10 (2070)
<48	19 (44 2%)
>48	24(55.8%)
<u>~</u> 10	24 (00.070)

Variable	Patients (%)			
Interval between surgery and start of RT (weeks)				
≤6	21 (49%)			
	22 (51%)			
RT technique				
2D-RT	38 (88.4%)			
3D-CRT	3 (7%)			
IMRT	2 (4.7%)			

3D-CRT, 3-dimensional conformal radiotherapy.

patient, 1 T2M3 patient, and 2 T2M0 patients after secondary surgery due to early recurrence; 2 T2M0 patients with lowered irradiation doses (28.8 Gy/16 fractions, 23.4 Gy/13 fractions); 1 T2M0 patient with anaplastic/large cell histology; and 4 T2M0 patients with standard risk]. Seven patients received the Packer regimen (*i.e.*, vincristine, siklofosfamid, and cisplatin), 6 patients received the OPEC regimen (*i.e.*, cisplatin, etoposid, vinkristin, and cyclophosphamide) prior to irradiation, 1 patient received the OPEC regimen after irradiation, and 1 patient received carmustine plus vincristine after irradiation (Table 4).

Statistical analysis

Disease-free survival (DFS) and overall survival (OS) were measured from the date of surgery to the date of newly occured disease (local recurrence, seeding, or distant metastasis), the last follow-up, or death from any cause. DFS and OS rates were calculated with the Kaplan-Meier method and compared among subpopulations of patients using the log-rank test. Sex, tumor location, hydrocephalus, duration of symptoms, initial local recurrence, initial KPS, operation type, histologic subtype, M

Table 2Symptoms and neurologic signs

Symptoms and signs	n (%)
Headache	34 (79.1%)
Nausea/vomiting	29 (67.4%)
Diplopia	8 (18.6%)
Unsteady gait	21 (48.8%)
Dizziness	17 (39.5%)
Speech disturbance	3 (7%)
Ataxia	23 (53.5%)
Nystagmus	36 (83.7%)
Rhomberg	7 (16.3%)
Dysmetria	11 (25.6%)
Sixth cranial nerve palsy	3 (7%)
Dysdiadocokinesia	6 (14%)

Table 3 RT treatment fields and doses

Treatment field and dose	Median (range)
Cranial irradiation dose (Gy)	36 (23.4–48)
Fractions	20 (13-17)
Posterior fossa boost irradiation dose (Gy)	16 (5.4-30.6)
Fractions	8 (3–17)
Total posterior fossa irradiation dose (Gy)	54 (41.4-57.6)
Fractions	30 (21–33)
Primary site boost irradiation dose (Gy)	10 (8–14)
Fractions	5 (4-7)
Total primary site boost irradiation dose (Gy)	54 (42-59.5)
Fractions	30 (22–33)
Lamina cribrosa irradiation dose (Gy)	5.4 (3.6-8)
Fractions	3 (2-4)
Spinal irradiation dose (Gy)	36 (12.6-37.8)
Fractions	20 (7-24)

stage, tumor size, risk group, chemotherapy, radiotherapy (RT) duration, interval between surgery and RT, cranial RT dose, posterior fossa RT dose, primary site RT dose, and spinal RT dose were all taken as prognostic factors in univariate analysis.

Results

Survival and patterns of recurrence

OS for 2-year, 5-year, 8-year, and 10-year survival was 86%, 63%, 51%, and 51%, respectively (Fig. 1a). DFS for 2-year, 5-year, 8-year, and 10-year survival was 83%, 66%, 59%, and 55%, respectively (Fig. 1b). There were 16 patients (6 women and 10 men) with recurrences during a median follow-up of 62 months (range, 3-231 months). In 13 of 16 patients with recurrences, the tumor diameter was greater than 4 cm. Fifteen patients died from recurrent disease, and only 1 patient is alive with recurrent disease. The median DFS among this group of 16 patients was 29 months (range, 5-99 months), and the median OS was 41 months (range, 14-99 months). Ten of 16 patients developed isolated local recurrence, 1 patient had local recurrence and spinal seeding metastasis, and 1 patient developed local recurrence and bone metastasis. The median interval between surgical intervention and local recurrence was 40 months (range, 14-99 months). One patient received only supportive treatment among the recurrent group, 4 patients underwent surgical resection, 5 patients received chemotherapy after surgery, 1 patient received chemotherapy and RT after surgery, and 1 patient underwent stereotactic radiosurgery due to recurrent disease. Four of 16 patients with local recurrences developed distant

Chemotherapy type	Patients (n)
Packer regimen	7
OPEC regimen	7
BCNU-vincristine	1
Total	15

BCNU, carmustine.

metastasis, and all of them received chemotherapy (Table 5).

Prognostic factors

Univariate analysis revealed that hydrocephalus, initial locally recurrence, subtotal resection in primary surgery, initial KPS of \leq 70, duration of symptoms shorter than 30 days, and primary site dose <54 Gy were negative prognostic factors (Table 6).

Toxicity

Alopesia, nausea, and hematologic disturbances were observed due to irradiation. In 6 patients, mild memory problems were detected. Three patients developed pancytopenia, and 1 of them died of sepsis. We also detected grade 2 neuropathy in 1 patient, grade 3 neuropathy in another patient, thrombocytopenia of grade 2 in 4 patients, and thrombocytopenia of grade 3 in 1 patient. In a total of 10 patients with hematologic toxicity, 8 of them received chemotherapy (4 OPEC regimen and 4 Packer regimen).

Discussion

We retrospectively analyzed the prognostic factors and outcome of adult patients with MB located in the posterior fossa of the cranium treated at a single center. MB is obviously seen more rarely in adults than in the pediatric population. Basically, more lateral localization and desmoplastic hystology are encountered. In fact, a previous series of adult MB reported about 29%–71% of lateral localization incidence and 25%–50% of desmoplastic hystology.^{2,5–10} In our study, we found similar localizations and hystologic types to previous reports in the literature (69.8% lateral localization and 60.5% desmoplastic hystology).

Late recurrences of MB are more frequent in adults compared with pediatric patients. Whereas pediatric relapses are usually seen in the first 2 years, the median time of MB recurrences in adults

IBIS

Downloaded from https://prime-pdf-watermark.prime-prod.pubfactory.com/ at 2025-07-07 via free access



Fig. 1 Kaplan-Meier curves: (a) OS and (b) DFS.

is 26 months. Twenty-nine percent of the remaining patients with MB recurrences are detected later than 5 years.² The posterior cranial fossa remains the most frequent site of relapse in both age groups.^{2,11–13} There were 16 patients with recurrences (10 of them with only local recurrence) in our series, with a median DFS of 29 months and a median OS of 41 months. Jereb *et al* showed 40 recurrences in 53 patients with MB (13 patients were older than 16

years). The most frequent site of relaps was the posterior fossa (53%), and the second most frequent site was cribriform plate area (15%).¹⁴ After this study, they also modified their treatment field and suggested a new irradiation treatment field including the cribriform plate area after completing a new study with 15 patients with MB who were irradiated according to the new target area covering the cribriform plate.¹⁵

Table 5 Recurrence pattern

Site of recurrence	Patients (n)
Only posterior fossa	10
+ Spinal seeding	1
+ Bone	1
Cerebellar + spinal seeding	1
Cerebral seeding + bone	1
Bone	1
Bone + bone marrow	1
Total	16

Donahue et al evaluated the quality of RT in the Children's Cancer Group/Pediatric Oncology Group 9961 and analyzed associations of RT deviations with outcome. The cribriform plate region was the most common deviation in 79 (25.6%) of 308 patients, and the posterior fossa was the second most common site of deviation (27 of 308 patients; 8.8%). These deviations in the posterior fossa resulted from treating less than the whole posterior fossa. No significant differences in DFS and OS were detected between patients with RT deviations and those without.¹⁶ In our study, 11 patients received boost irradiation to the lamina cribrosa (median dose, 5.4 Gy; range, 3.6-8 Gy). None of the 43 patients developed recurrences in the lamina cribrosa region, and no differences according to OS and DFS were seen among patients in our series.

Chang *et al* showed in their retrospective single center study that the complete resection of adult MB has a positive effect on OS and DFS.² Whereas we were able to show that the complete surgical resection has a positive effect on DFS for 5 years (68% versus 33%; P = 0.02), no statistically significant effect was found for OS.

The treatment strategy of MB in children, which includes CSI, boost irradiation to the posterior fossa, and chemotherapy following maximal possible tumor resection, is very well described. DFS in children with MB is reported as 75% to 85% in previous studies.^{17,18} Retrospective series of adult MB has had significant lower 5-year OS rates (40%–84%) and lower DFS rates (32%–63%) in comparison to pediatric patients with MB.^{2,6,8,9,12,19–22} This was similar to the population-based study of Lai *et al*, which included 454 adult MB patients with 2-, 5-, and 10-year OS rates of 79.9%, 64.9%, and 52.1%, respectively.²³ We found OS rates of 86%, 63%, and 51% for 2, 5, and 10 years, respectively.

Successful results were achieved after lowering the traditional neuroaxis RT dose of 36 to 23.4 Gy by adding chemotherapy in pediatric patients with

standard risk.^{17,24} In the course of conventional RT of anatomic posterior fossa, 35% of the entire brain and 60% of each of 2 temporal lobes received irradiation.²⁵ Merchant *et al* were successful in decreasing the toxicity as a consequence of whole posterior fossa irradiation by lowering the CSI dose to 23.4 Gy, conformal posterior fossa dose to 36 Gy, and conformal primary site dose to 55.8 Gy, followed by 4 cycles of high-dose chemotherapy in 86 patients with standard risk between 3 and 21 years.²⁶ With these modification of the previous technique, the estimated 5-year event-free survival and the cumulative incidance of posterior fossa failure rates were changed to $83 \pm 5.3\%$ and $4.9 \pm 2.4\%$ (\pm SE), respectively. They were able to show in their study that the median volume of posterior fossa receiving a RT dose more than 55 Gy was decreased by 13%, and they also showed a significant decrease in RT dose received by the temporal lobe, cochleae, and hypothalamus during irradiation. Posterior fossa RT dose was determined to be a significant prognostic factor.^{7,8,20} In our series, 12 patients received primary site boost irradiation following posterior fossa irradiation and CSI. However, neither spinal nor cranial RT dose reduction was made. In this subgroup of 12 patients, median spinal, median

subgroup of 12 patients, median spinal, median cranial, median posterior fossa boost, and median primary site boost doses and dose ranges were 36 (range, 36–37.8), 36 (range, 36–38), 9.75 (range, 5.4–14), and 10 Gy (range, 8–14 Gy), respectively. The median primary site dose was 54 Gy (range, 42–59.4 Gy) in our study. The retrospective evaluation of our series revealed that median primary site doses lower than 54 Gy seem to be associated with a negative effect on 5-year OS (25% versus 67%; P = 0.04).

Wong *et al* reported 21 months as the median OS in *de novo* patients with high risk and 15 months as the median OS in patients with recurrent disease (3 recurrent cases; maximal tumor resection; but 1 patient with a residual tumor greater than 1.5 cm in size).²⁷ We have seen that there was no residual tumor after secondary maximal tumor resection for initial recurrence. Despite that, it has a negative effect on OS (P = 0.01).

Kocakaya *et al* recently published a meta-analysis including 227 publications covering 907 adult MB patients between 1969 and 2013, and they found that the median survival was 65 months and 5-year OS was 50.9%. The meta-analysis revelaed that the patients receiving first-line chemotherapy lived significantly longer [median OS, 108 months; 95% confidence interval (CI), 68.6–148.4] than patients treated with RT alone (median OS, 57 months; 95%

Variable Patients (n) $\overline{5}$ -year OS (%) l value $\overline{5}$ -year DFS (%) l value $\overline{5}$ -year DFS (%) l value Sex Female 18 61 54 0.62 67 63 0.69 Male 25 65 50 67 50 0.69 Central 13 59 49 0.77 77 62 0.36 Lateral 30 66 53 61 53 61 53 -0.01 Absent 34 66 60 74 66 0.07 -0.01		OS			DFS			
	Variable	Patients (n)	5-year OS (%)	10-year OS (%)	P value	5-year DFS (%)	10-year DFS (%)	P value
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Sex							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Female	18	61	54	0.82	63	63	0.69
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Male	25	65	50	0.02	67	50	0.07
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Tumor location	20	00	00		07	00	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Central	13	59	49	0.77	77	62	0.36
Horization Horiz	Lateral	30	66	53	0	61	53	0.00
	Hydrocenhalus	00	00	00		01	66	
Absent 94 68 60 74 66 74 Quration of symptomys (days)	Present	9	44	22	0.01	30	15	< 0.01
	Absent	34	68	60	0.01	74	66	-0.01
	Duration of symp	tomps (days)	00	00		71	00	
So D <thd< th=""> D D D</thd<>	< 30	17	45	32	0.03	48	40	0.07
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	>30	26	75	65	0.00	75	63	0.07
mean from from from from from from from from	Initial local recur	ence	75	00		75	00	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Voc	5	20	20	0.01	37	NE	0.16
Initial KTS S0 B0 B0 B0 $≤70$ 7 28 14 0.01 18 NE <0.01	No	38	20 69	20 58	0.01	68	1NE 60	0.10
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Initial KDS	50	09	50		00	00	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	11111111 KF5	7	20	14	0.01	10	NE	<0.01
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	≤ 70	26	20	14	0.01	18 75	INE 60	<0.01
	>/U	50	70	60		75	62	
Complete 40 63 56 0.14 66 60 0.02 Subtota 3 33 NE 33 NE 33 NE Classic 16 66 59 0.54 70 53 0.62 Desmoplastic 26 55 45 61 55 0.69 M14 5 50 50 60 60 60 Tumor size	Operation	40	()	FC	0.14	(0	(0	0.02
Suboral 3 33 NE 33 NE 33 NE Histology type Classic 16 66 59 0.54 70 53 0.62 Desmoplastic 26 55 45 61 55 0.62 Mo 38 64 51 0.88 67 55 0.69 M1-4 5 50 50 60 60 60 71 77 0.11 ≥4 cm 28 60 42 60 44 71 29 0.09 High 7 50 33 0.19 77 77 0.11 ≥4 cm 28 60 42 60 44 70 71 59 0.09 High 7 50 33 0.20 66 52 0.73 No 28 70 57 0.32 77 57 0.54 Oburation of RT (days) 1 58 50 70 57 0.54 Se6 21 54 54 </td <td>Complete</td> <td>40</td> <td>63</td> <td>00 NIE</td> <td>0.14</td> <td>68</td> <td>60 NJF</td> <td>0.02</td>	Complete	40	63	00 NIE	0.14	68	60 NJF	0.02
Flastology typeClassic1666590.5470530.62Desmoplastic26554561550.69M1364510.8867550.69M1-45505060606050Tumor size	Subtotal	3	33	INE		33	INE	
$\begin{array}{c clastic lib bb 59 0.94 70 53 0.53 0.54 70 53 0.54 16 55 16 155 17 155 17 15 15$	Histology type	17		50	0.54	70	50	0.40
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Classic	16	66	59	0.54	70	53	0.62
	Desmoplastic	26	55	45		61	55	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	M stage	20	(1	-1	0.00			0.40
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	MO	38	64	51	0.88	67	55	0.69
Turnor size 4^{4} cm 15 70 53 0.19 77 77 0.11 4^{4} cm 28 60 42 60 44 Risk Standard 36 65 54 0.51 71 59 0.09 High 7 50 33 38 38 Chemotherapy Yes 15 51 38 0.20 66 52 0.73 No 28 70 57 65 56 Duration of RT (days) ≤ 48 19 71 57 0.32 77 57 0.54 >48 24 58 48 57 52 Interval between surgery and start of RT (weeks) ≤ 6 21 54 54 0.52 50 45 0.38 >6 22 78 55 76 57 Kranyal RT dose Kranyal RT dose < 54 Gy 11 62 53 0.92 65 60 0.71 >36 Gy 12 67 50 67 Primary site dose < 54 Gy 15 55 44 0.57 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 15 0.55 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 25 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 25 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 05 55 0.59 50 Primary site dose < 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≥ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≤ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≤ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≤ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≤ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≤ 54 Gy 5 0.57 NE 0.04 81 68 0.27 ≤ 54 Gy 8 67 55 0.59 50 0 ≤ 66 Gy 8 5 0.07 50 0 ≤ 66 Gy 8 6 50 0 ≤ 66 Gy 8 6 50 50 0 ≤ 66 Gy 8 6 50 0 ≤ 66 Gy 8 6 50 0	M1-4	5	50	50		60	60	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Tumor size							
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	<4 cm	15	70	53	0.19	77	77	0.11
Risk Standard 36 65 54 0.51 71 59 0.09 High 7 50 33 38 38 38 Chemotherapy ves 15 51 38 0.20 66 52 0.73 No 28 70 57 0.32 77 57 0.54 Duration of RT (days) $=$	$\geq 4 \text{ cm}$	28	60	42		60	44	
Standard 36 65 54 0.51 71 59 0.09 High7 50 33 38 38 Chemotherapy	Risk							
High750333838ChemotherapyYes1551380.2066520.73No28705765560Duration of RT (days) ≤ 48 1971570.3277570.54>4824584857520150.38>62154540.5250450.38>622785576570.32S6 Gy3162530.9265600.71>36 Gy12675067460PF dose540.5781680.27 < 254 Gy	Standard	36	65	54	0.51	71	59	0.09
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	High	7	50	33		38	38	
Yes1551380.2066520.73No2870576556Duration of RT (days) ≤ 48 1971570.3277570.54>48245848575216Interval between surgery and start of RT (weeks) ≤ 6 2154540.5250450.38>622785576577657Kranyal RT dose ≤ 36 Gy3162530.9265600.71>36 Gy12675067467676PF dose < 54 Gy286754595076Primary site dose < 54 Gy386755595050Spinal dose < 36 Gy850500.4451510.48	Chemotherapy							
No2870576556Duration of RT (days) ≤ 48 1971570.3277570.54>48245848575252Interval between surgery and start of RT (weeks) ≤ 6 2154540.5250450.38>622785576577657Kranyal RT dose ≤ 36 Gy3162530.9265600.71>36 Gy12675067467676PF dose < 54 Gy1555440.5781680.27 ≥ 54 Gy525NE0.0481680.27 ≥ 54 Gy38675559505050Spinal dose < 36 Gy850500.4451510.48	Yes	15	51	38	0.20	66	52	0.73
Duration of RT (days) ≤ 48 1971570.3277570.54>48245848575252Interval between surgery and start of RT (weeks) ≤ 6 2154540.5250450.38 ≤ 6 2278557657570.38>622785576570.52Kranyal RT dose ≤ 36 Gy3162530.9265600.71 ≤ 36 Gy12675067460.57460.57PF dose < 54 Gy1555440.5781680.27 ≥ 54 Gy525NE0.0481680.27 ≥ 54 Gy38675559505051Spinal dose < 36 Gy85050510.4451510.48	No	28	70	57		65	56	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Duration of RT (d	lays)						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≤ 48	19	71	57	0.32	77	57	0.54
Interval between surgery and start of RT (weeks) ≤ 6 2154540.5250450.38>62278557657Kranyal RT dose ≤ 36 Gy3162530.9265600.71>36 Gy12675067467676PF dose ≤ 55 440.5781680.27 ≥ 54 Gy1555440.5781680.27 ≥ 54 Gy286754595076Primary site dose ≤ 54 Gy525NE0.0481680.27 ≥ 54 Gy386755595050555950Spinal dose ≤ 36 Gy850500.4451510.48	> 48	24	58	48		57	52	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Interval between	surgery and sta	rt of RT (weeks)					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≤ 6	21	54	54	0.52	50	45	0.38
Kranyal RT dose $\leq 36 \text{ Gy}$ 3162530.9265600.71 $> 36 \text{ Gy}$ 1267506746PF dose </td <td>>6</td> <td>22</td> <td>78</td> <td>55</td> <td></td> <td>76</td> <td>57</td> <td></td>	>6	22	78	55		76	57	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Kranyal RT dose							
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	≤36 Gy	31	62	53	0.92	65	60	0.71
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	>36 Gy	12	67	50		67	46	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	PF dose							
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<54 Gy	15	55	44	0.57	81	68	0.27
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	\geq 54 Gy	28	67	54		59	50	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Primary site dose							
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<54 Gy	5	25	NE	0.04	81	68	0.27
Spinal dose	\geq 54 Gy	38	67	55		59	50	
<36 Gy 8 50 50 0.44 51 51 0.48	Spinal dose							
	- <36 Gv	8	50	50	0.44	51	51	0.48
>36 Gy 35 66 53 68 56	>36 Gv	35	66	53		68	56	

Table 6 Univariate analysis of risk factors for OS and DFS

NE, not evaluated; PF, posterior fossa.

CI, 39.6–74.4) or patients who received chemotherapy at the time of tumor recurrence.²⁸ We could not show any significance in OS between patients who received chemotherapy (35% of patients; median OS, 83 months; 95% CI, 3.18–162.8) or did not (median OS, 124 months; 95% CI, 9.7–238.3).

Effectivity and toxicity of different treatment strategies in pediatric and adult MB patients with new treatment modalities, such as intensity modulated RT (IMRT), proton therapy, or carbon ion irradiation, which give us the chance to decrease the radiation doses delivered to the organs at risk, have been studied.^{29–32} Yock et al recently reported their phase II prospective clinical study related to the long-term toxic effects of proton RT including 59 pediatric MB patients, acceptable toxicity rates, and similar survival outcomes.³³ Brown et al treated 19 adult MB patients with proton CSI and the remaining 21 patients with photon CSI.33 The patients treated with proton CSI experienced less weight loss that was greater than 5%, less grade II nausea and vomiting, less esophagitis, and less reduction in peripheral white blood cells, hemoglobin level, and platelets compared with the patients treated with photon CSI. Therefore, this was the first report revealing that proton beam CSI significantly reduces gastrointestinal and hematologic toxicities.

The prognostic factors and outcomes of the patients in our study are concordant with previous reports in the literature. However, we need multiinstitutional studies with randomized patients to assess the optimal RT strategy and the timing of chemotherapy for adult MB with minimal toxicity.

In conclusion, the main therapy in adult MB is CSI following surgery. The presence of hydrocephalus, initial local recurrence, initial KPS \leq 70, subtotal surgical resection, shortness of duration of symptoms, and primary site dose <54 Gy are negative prognostic factors. There was no randomized trial about chemotherapy use in adult MB. Nevertheless, an actual meta-analysis showed survival benefits with chemotherapy use for adult MB. Previous data about the RT strategies for adult MB collected from studies which used 2-dimensional (2D) or 3D conformal RT. Nowadays, IMRT, proton, and carbon ion RT or molecular variants for the treatment of MB in adults are promising technologies.

Acknowledgments

Author contributions are as follows: K.I. and M.A. designed the study; K.I., A.K., R.M., M.G., M.B., S.B.,

E.D., and M.A. collected data; K.I. analyzed the data; K.I., A.K., R.M., M.B., S.B., M.E., F.A., E.D., and M.A. interpreted the data; K.I., A.K., R.M., S.B., F.A., E.D., and M.A. prepared the manuscript; and K.I., M.G., and M.E. searched the literature. The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- CBTRUS. 1995–1999 Statistical Report: Primary Brain Tumors in the United States. Chicago, IL: Central Brain Tumor Registry of the United States, 2002
- Chan AW, Tarbell NJ, Black PM, Louis DN, Frosch MP, Ancukiewicz M *et al.* Adult medullolastoma: prognostic factors and patterns of relapse. *Neurosurgery* 200;47(3):623–631
- Aragones MP, Magallon R, Pigueras C, Ley L, Vaguero J, Bravo G. Medulloblastoma in adulthood: prognostic factors influencing survival and recurrence. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 1994; 127(1):65–68
- Packer RJ, Gajjar A, Vezina G, Rorke-Adams L, Burger PC, Robertson PL *et al.* Phase III study of craniospinal radiation therapy followed by adjuvant chemotherapy for newly diagnosed average-risk medulloblastoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24(25):4202–4208
- Frost PJ, Laperpierre NJ, Wong CS, Milosevic MF, Simpson WJ, Pintilie M. Medulloblastoma in adults. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1995;32(4):951–957
- Carrie C, Lasset C, Alapetite C, Haie-Meder C, Hoffstetter S, Demaille MC *et al.* Multivariate analysis of prognostic factors in adult patients with medulloblastoma. *Cancer* 1994;74(8): 2352–2360
- Bloom HJG, Bessell EM. Medulloblastoma in adults: a review of 47 patients treated between 1952 and 1981. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 1990;18(4):763–772
- Skolyszewski J, Glinski B. Results of postoperative irradiation of medulloblastoma in adults. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1989; 16(2):479–482
- Boiardi A, Silvani A, Eoli M, Lamperti E, Salmaggi A, Gaviani P et al. Embryonal tumors in the adult population: implications in therapeutic planning. *Neurol Sci* 2000;21(1):23–30
- Carrie C, Lasset C, Blay JY,Négrier S, Bouffet E, Barbet N, Montbarbon X *et al*. Medulloblastoma in adults: survival and prognostic factors. *Radiother Oncol* 1993;**29**(3):301–307
- Bloom HJ. Medulloblastoma: prognosis and prospects. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 1977;2(9-10):1031–1033
- Kunschner LJ, Kuttesch J, Hess K, Yung WK. Survival and recurrence factors in adult medulloblastoma: the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center experience from 1978 to 1998. *Neuro Oncol* 2001;3(3):167–173
- Prados MD, Warnick RE, Wara WM, Larson DA, Lamborn K, Wilson CB. Medullobalastoma in adults. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1995;32(4):1145–1152

- Jereb B, Reid A, Ahuja R. Patterns of failure with patients with medulloblastoma. *Cancer* 1982;50(12):2941–2947
- Jereb B, Krishnaswami S, Reid A, Allen JC. Radiation for medulloblastoma adjusted to prevent recurrence to the cribriform plate region. *Cancer* 1984;54(3):602–604
- 16. Donahue B, Mervmont MA, Kessel S, Iandoli MK, Fitzgerald T, Holmes E *et al.* Radiation therapy quality in CCG/POG intergroup 9961: implications for craniospinal irradiation and the posterior fossa boost in future medulloblastoma trials. *Front Oncol.* 2012;**2**:185
- Packer RJ, Goldwein J, Nicholson HS, Vezina LG, Allen JC, Ris MD *et al.* Treatment of children with medulloblastomas with reduced-dose craniospinal radiation therapy and adjuvant chemotherapy: a children's cancer group study. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17(7):2127–2136
- Warmuth-Metz M, Blashofer S, von Bueren AO, von Hoff K, Bison B, Pohl F *et al.* Recurrence in childhood medulloblastoma. J Neurooncol 2011;103(3):705–711
- Hartsell WF, Montag AG, Lyndon J, Galinsky DL, Sarin P. Treatment of medulloblastoma in adults. *Am J Clin Oncol* 1992; 15(3):207–211
- Hazuka MB, DeBiose DA, Henderson RH, Kinzie JJ. Survival results in adult patients treated for medulloblastoma. *Cancer* 1992;69(8):2143–2148
- Abacioglu U, Uzel O, Sengöz M, Turkan S, Ober A. Medulloblastoma in adults: treatment results and prognostic factors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2002;54(3):855–860
- Selek U, Zorlu F, Hurmuz P, Cengiz M, Turker A, Soylemezoglu F *et al.* Craniospinal radiotherapy in adult medulloblastoma. *Strahlenther Onkol* 2007;**183**(5):236–240
- 23. Lai R. Survival of patients with adult medulloblastoma: a population-based study. *Cancer* 2008;**112**(7):1568–1574.
- 24. Taylor RE, Bailey CC, Robinson K, Weston CL, Ellison D, Ironside J et al. Results of a randomized study of preradiation chemotherapy versus radiotherapy alone for nonmetastatic medulloblastoma: the International Society of Paediatric Oncology/United Kingdom Children's Cancer Study Group PNET-3 study. J Clin Oncol 2003;21(8):1581–1591
- 25. Merchant TE, Pritchard DL, Vargo JA, Sontag MR. Radiation therapy for the treatment of childhood medulloblastoma: the rationale for current techniques, strategies, and dose-volume considerations. *Electro Medica* 2001;**69**(1):69–71

- 26. Merchant TE, Kun LE, Krasin MJ, Wallace D, Chintagumpala MM, Woo SY *et al.* Multi-institution prospective trial of reduced-dose craniospinal irradiation (23.4Gy) followed by conformal posterior fossa (36 Gy) and primary site irradiation (55.8Gy) and dose-intensive chemotherapy for average-risk meulloblastoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2008;**70**(3):782–787
- 27. Wong SF, Mak G, Rosenthal MA, Cher L, Gan HK. Local perspective on a rare brain tumour: adult medulloblastoma. *Intern Med J* 2013;**43**(5):567–572
- Kocakaya S, Beier CP, Beier D. Chemotherapy increases longterm survival in patients with adult medulloblasto: a literature-based meta-analysis. *Neuro Oncol* 2016;18(3):408–416
- 29. Eaton BR, Esiashvili N, Kim S, Weyman EA, Thornton LT, Mazewski C *et al.* Clinical outcomes among children with standard-risk medulloblastoma treated with proton and photon radiation therapy: a comparison of disease control and overall survival. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2016;94(1): 133–138
- Polkinghorn WR, Dunkel IJ, Souweidane MM, Khakoo Y, Lyden DC, Gilheeney SW *et al.* Disease control and ototoxicity using intensity-modulated radiation therapy tumer-bed boost for medulloblastoma. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2011;81(3):15– 20
- Huang E, Teh BS, Strother DR, Davis QG, Chiu JK, Lu HH et al. Intensity-modulated radiation therapy for pediatric medulloblastoma: early report on the reduction of ototoxicity. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2002;52(3):599–605
- 32. Brown AP, Barney CL, Grosshans DR, McAleer MF, de Groot JF, Puduvalli VK et al. Proton beam craniospinal irradiation reduces acute toxicity for adults with medulloblastoma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2013;86(2):277–284
- Yock TI, Yeap BY, Ebb DH, Weyman E, Eaton BR, Sherry NA et al. Long-term toxic effects of proton radiotherapy for pediatric medulloblastoma: a phase 2 single-arm study. Lancet Oncol 2016;17(3):287–298

© 2016 Ibis et al.; licensee The International College of Surgeons. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial License which permits use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is noncommercial and is otherwise in compliance with the license. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0