Date of origin: 1996
Last review date: 2014

# American College of Radiology
# ACR Appropriateness Criteria®

## NON-SPINE BONE METASTASES

Expert Panel on Radiation Oncology–Bone Metastases: Edward Y. Kim, MD[1]; Tobias R. Chapman, MD[2]; Samuel Ryu, MD[3]; Eric L. Chang, MD[4]; Nicholas Galanopoulos, MD[5]; Joshua Jones, MD[6]; Charlotte D. Kubicky, MD, PhD[7]; Charles P. Lee, MD[8]; Bin S. Teh, MD[9]; Bryan J. Traughber, MD[10]; Catherine Van Poznak, MD[11]; Andrew D. Vassil, MD[12]; Kristy Weber, MD[13]; Simon Shek-Man Lo, MB, ChB.[14]

## Summary of Literature Review

### Introduction/Background

Bone is a common site of metastasis, affecting patients with a wide variety of malignancies including breast, prostate, lung, colorectal, bladder, endometrial, thyroid, kidney, myeloma, and melanoma. The presence of tumor in bone can cause significant morbidity including pain, neurologic dysfunction, hypercalcemia, and pathologic fracture leading to significant functional loss. The optimal treatment of a patient with bone metastases depends on many factors, including evaluation of the patient's goals of care, performance status, mechanical stability of the affected bone, life expectancy, and overall extent of disease. Both osteolytic and osteoblastic lesions may be associated with pain and risk of fracture. Management decisions frequently involve collaboration among several types of specialists, including diagnostic radiologists, radiation oncologists, medical oncologists, surgeons, pain medicine specialists, physiatrists, and palliative care professionals. Similar to the approaches used for patients treated with curative intent, optimal management of patients with bone metastases requires multidisciplinary consideration of localized therapies such as surgery and external beam radiation therapy (EBRT) with systemic therapies including pain medications, chemotherapy, hormonal therapy (HT), osteoclast inhibitors (OI), and radiopharmaceuticals [1-5].

Oftentimes, patients who present with multifocal bone metastases are treated first with medical therapies including narcotics, chemotherapy, HT, bisphosphonates, radiopharmaceuticals, and RANK ligand inhibitors. EBRT is usually reserved for when a specific metastatic lesion causes significant local symptoms such as pain or creates a risk for pathological fracture or neurologic injury. Surgical stabilization can treat or prevent the morbidity of a pathologic fracture, particularly in weight-bearing bones. In addition, the alpha-emitting radiopharmaceutical therapy, radium 223 dichloride, has a place in the management of patients with castration-resistant prostate cancer, symptomatic bone metastases, and no known visceral metastatic disease [6,7].

*Variant 1: 52-year-old man with a history of a T1N0M0 non–small-cell lung cancer. Two years after lobectomy, he is found to have a painful metastasis in the right femoral neck. The lesion is 3.5 cm in size with greater than 50% erosion of the medial bone cortex. Karnofsky performance status (KPS) 90. No other metastatic disease is found. He has had no previous therapy other than lobectomy.*

This patient has newly diagnosed metastatic disease at a single site (femur), an excellent performance status, and has not previously received systemic therapy. Systemic therapy (including biologic agents, chemotherapy, and OI) will be critical for systemic disease control. However, he is at elevated risk of developing pathologic fracture in the near future and would benefit from immediate attention to the femoral lesion.

The most useful means of predicting the risk for pathologic fracture includes evaluation by a published scoring system based on anatomic site, degree of pain, type of lesion (blastic, mixed, lytic), and tumor size [8]. Another

[1]Principal Author, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. [2]Research Author, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington. [3]Panel Vice-chair, Stony Brook University School of Medicine, Stony Brook, New York. [4]University of Southern California-Keck School of Medicine, Los Angeles, California. [5]University Hospitals of Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio. [6]University of Pennsylvania Perelman Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. [7]Oregon Health & Science University, Portland Oregon. [8]The Cancer Institute of Dallas, Duncanville, Texas. [9]The Methodist Hospital, Houston, Texas. [10]University Hospitals Seidman Cancer Center, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. [11]University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center, Ann Arbor, Michigan, American Society of Clinical Oncology. [12]Cleveland Clinic, Strongsville, Ohio. [13]University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. [14]Panel Chair, University Hospitals, Seidman Cancer Center, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

The American College of Radiology seeks and encourages collaboration with other organizations on the development of the ACR Appropriateness Criteria through society representation on expert panels. Participation by representatives from collaborating societies on the expert panel does not necessarily imply individual or society endorsement of the final document.

Reprint requests to: publications@acr.org.

simplified method of predicting pathologic fracture in the femur describes an elevated risk in lesions with >3 cm cortical involvement [9].

This patient should be evaluated by an orthopedic surgeon for consideration of surgical stabilization of the femur. If he undergoes surgical stabilization, postoperative radiotherapy should be considered. If he does not undergo surgical stabilization, then immediate radiotherapy is indicated. The goals of therapy would be to control pain as well as preserve ambulatory function.

Radiation can be delivered to this site most efficiently through parallel opposed anterior and posterior fields. A strip of skin and soft tissue, as large as possible, should be spared to reduce the risk of long-term lower-extremity lymphedema, which can be associated with full-circumference extremity radiation.

This patient also has oligometastatic disease. The optimal management of oligometastases is an active area of research. Investigations comparing site-specific localized therapy to a more systemic approach with or without localized therapy are ongoing. Some have argued that patients with minimal sites of bone-only metastatic disease (deemed "oligometastatic") from certain disease may be treated with curative intent, though the data to confirm that stance are still to be accrued [10].

Single fraction radiotherapy (8 Gy × 1), when compared to higher-dose multifraction regimens, has been associated with a higher risk of postradiation pathologic fracture in femoral metastases. If this patient does not undergo surgical stabilization, then a higher-dose multifraction regimen would be reasonable [9]. Local therapy should be followed by systemic therapy including consideration of OI. In light of the slight risk of jaw osteonecrosis associated with OI administration, a pretreatment dental evaluation to assess dentition and potential risk prior to OI use might be warranted (see Variant 1).

*Variant 2: 62-year-old woman with estrogen-receptor positive/progesterone-receptor positive breast cancer, Her-2/neu nonamplified. She develops a painful lytic bone metastasis in the right humerus after 4 years of a single-line of adjuvant hormonal therapy. There is minimal invasion of bone cortex, and the lesion is thought to have a low fracture risk per orthopedic surgery consult. KPS is 90. Bone scan demonstrates a few other asymptomatic bone metastases.*

This patient has a good performance status and multiple sites of metastatic disease, but has a symptomatic lesion in a non–weight-bearing bone. This patient has a life expectancy that may be measured in years. This patient (as all patients) should receive appropriate analgesic therapy as a first-line treatment to provide rapid relief.

In general, the setup and prescription points for treatment should follow those outlined by the International Consensus on Palliative Radiotherapy Endpoints for future clinical trials, which were updated recently [11]. Fluoroscopic simulation, computed tomography (CT) simulation, and clinical simulation are all acceptable methods for planning radiation fields. There are no data to suggest that highly conformal therapy with intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT), stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT), proton therapy, or brachytherapy would improve the outcome for this patient.

EBRT provides at least partial pain relief in 50%–80% of patients, and most series suggest a rate of complete pain relief in about one-third of patients [12]. Although a recent international survey showed 101 different dose schedules in common use for treating painful bone metastases with EBRT, the rates of pain relief are equivalent for fractionation schemes including 30 Gy in 10 fractions, 24 Gy in 6 fractions, 20 Gy in 5 fractions, and a single 8 Gy fraction [2,13]. Single-fraction treatment optimizes patient convenience and reduces acute side effects but is associated with an approximate 20% rate of retreatment to the same site compared to an 8% retreatment rate with the more prolonged courses [12-14].

Due to the presence of multifocal disease, systemic therapy options should be explored, and current practice patterns also should include consideration of the use of OI. If both palliative radiotherapy and palliative systemic chemotherapy are to be delivered to this patient, they should be given sequentially rather than concurrently. OI have the ability to decrease the risk of skeletal-related events (fracture, need for surgery or radiation to bone, spinal cord compression, and hypercalcemia of malignancy) as well as the ability to decrease pain from bone metastases and improve quality of life in patients with certain disease histologies [15]. OI therapy is an adjunctive therapy to radiation. In addition, it may alleviate metastatic bone pain, and it is routinely administered indefinitely [16]. Inhibiting osteoclast activity does not appear to impart a survival advantage. Recognized effects of the toxicities of potent OI include renal dysfunction (with intravenous bisphosphonates), hypocalcemia, and osteonecrosis of the jaw (see Variant 2).

*Variant 3: 65-year-old woman with metastatic hormone-receptor positive breast cancer currently on hormonal and bisphosphonate therapy for skeletal-dominant metastatic disease. She received palliative radiation (30 Gy/10 fractions) to a painful lesion in the right humerus 3 years ago with good pain relief but now has recurrent pain at this site. Radiographs show a lytic lesion with no radiographic evidence of impending fracture. She has several other asymptomatic skeletal lesions and a new 1.5-cm lung metastasis.*

This patient has pain at a site that has been previously irradiated. She had initial pain relief with treatment. Available data from multiple smaller, retrospective studies suggest that retreatment with EBRT may provide a reasonable chance of pain relief in 33%–84% of patients [17,18]. A recent meta-analysis of 10 studies, including data from 2,694 patients, estimated pain response in 58% of patients who received reirradiation for painful bone metastases [19]. A recently completed international randomized prospective phase III trial compared a single-fraction (8 Gy x 1) reirradiation schedule to a multiple-fraction regimen (20 Gy in 5-8 fractions) in 850 patients with previously irradiated bone metastases. The majority of patients had prostate, breast, or lung cancers. The single-fraction regimen was not inferior to the multiple-fraction regimen with respect to pain control assessment at 2 months. Acute toxicities were worse in the multiple-fraction arm [20,21].

As in any case of reirradiation, care should be taken to avoid combined doses greater than the normal tissue tolerances of structures within the retreated volumes. The recurrence of pain in any long bone necessitates a reassessment of pathologic fracture risk before delivering reirradiation. Treatment should be planned to spare a skin and soft-tissue strip to minimize the risk of developing late chronic upper extremity lymphedema. Fluoroscopic simulation, CT simulation, and clinical simulation are all acceptable methods for planning radiation fields. There are no data to suggest that highly conformal therapy with IMRT, SBRT, brachytherapy, or proton therapy would improve the outcome for this patient.

Systemic chemotherapy can be considered depending on the patient's previous exposure to chemotherapy and her tolerance of further therapy. This patient's disease has progressed on bisphosphonates, and RANK ligand inhibitors may be of use. If cytotoxic therapy is considered, it should be delivered sequentially with palliative radiotherapy rather than concurrently. Duration of radiation therapy should be weighed against the urgency of initiating a new line of systemic therapy. A shorter course of palliative reirradiation would potentially delay chemotherapy less than a longer treatment course.

The American Society of Clinical Oncology Guidelines for the use of bone modifying agents in metastatic breast cancer recommend the use of OI, bisphosphonate or denosumab, be continued until there is evidence of substantial decline in the patient's clinical status [16]. These drugs may reduce the risk of subsequent skeletal-related events and may aid in controlling bone pain. It is of note that in the pooled analysis of the phase III studies of denosumab versus zoledronic acid, denosumab demonstrated superiority in delaying the time to subsequent skeletal-related events with a relative risk of 0.82 (95% confidence interval [CI], 0.75 to 0.90) $P<0.001$ [22] (see Variant 3).

*Variant 4: 66-year-old man with metastatic hormone-refractory prostate cancer. He has widespread osteoblastic skeletal disease with increasingly painful lesions in the lumbar spine, hips, and extremities. Prior therapy has included hormonal therapy, bisphosphonates, docetaxel chemotherapy, and EBRT to one of his painful hip lesions.*

This patient has been heavily pretreated for metastatic prostate cancer and now has hormone-refractory disease. The patient may consider additional systemic therapy. As his bone metastases appear relatively symptomatic, Sipuleucel-T is not a likely next step. Abiraterone/prednisone and enzalutamide may be considered options if not used already [23-25]. Note that enzalutamide is FDA approved for disease progression after docetaxel therapy. In addition, a clinical trial, cabozantinib, or mitoxantrone may be options for this individual depending on his goals of care, marrow reserve, and performance status [25,26].

Although it may be technically possible to deliver EBRT to multiple symptomatic lesions, his burden of disease suggests he may be a favorable candidate for radiopharmaceutical therapy. Multiple series have reported pain responses rates ranging from 45% to 80% with samarium-153 or strontium-89 [27-29]. An international prospective randomized trial of radium-223 versus placebo showed improvements in quality of life scores, decreased skeletal events, and improved overall survival with administration of radium-223 [7].

The use of radiopharmaceuticals does not preclude the delivery of palliative EBRT. If this patient were to receive focused EBRT to painful lesions, it would be prudent to consider the volume of bone marrow within the treatment

field given the potential for diffuse bone marrow suppression that has previously been reported with radiopharmaceuticals (see Variant 4).

*Variant 5: 47-year-old man with a history of malignant melanoma, now with a painful metastatic lesion in the left scapula. KPS is 70. He has had no prior therapy for metastatic disease. Staging scans show an asymptomatic 3-cm liver metastasis.*

This patient has severe pain from a single site of bone metastases with a functional performance status. This patient (as with all patients) should receive appropriate analgesic therapy as first-line treatment to provide rapid symptom relief. Systemic therapy for melanoma is an evolving field, but overall prognosis remains poor. Melanoma is traditionally considered less sensitive to conventionally fractionated radiotherapy [30,31]. The majority of studies evaluating radiotherapy for skeletal metastases consist of prostate, breast, and lung cancer patients [20]. There is inadequate data available to determine whether tumor histologies traditionally thought of as "radioresistant" respond equally well to palliative radiotherapy as other more traditionally "radiosensitive" histologies. The ability of melanoma cell lines to repair sublethal DNA damage suggests melanoma may be more sensitive to large doses per fraction or a hypofractionated course of therapy.

Skin and soft-tissue sparing techniques should be utilized. A single treatment would minimize his time commitment, transportation requirements, and discomfort from being transferred on and off the treatment table [32]. Fluoroscopic simulation, CT simulation, and clinical simulation are all acceptable methods for planning radiation fields. Treatment with large fractions might be more likely to cause a temporary pain flare, but anti-inflammatory medications are capable of minimizing this effect [33]. There are no data to suggest that highly conformal therapy with IMRT, SBRT, brachytherapy, or proton therapy would improve the outcome for this patient (see Variant 5).

**Summary of Recommendations**

- EBRT successfully provides rapid palliative relief from painful bone metastases in most cases.
- The acute side effects of palliative EBRT are usually minimal and self-limiting, whereas long-term side effects are uncommon and may not be clinically relevant in a patient group with limited life expectancy.
- Radiotherapy is not commonly recommended for asymptomatic bone metastases that are not associated with a risk of pathologic fracture as the primary goals of therapy are pain relief and functional preservation.
- Prospective randomized trials have proven equivalent pain relief with varied fractionation schemes, including 8 Gy in 1 fraction, 20 Gy in 5 fractions, 24 Gy in 6 fractions, or 30 Gy in 10 fractions. Prolonged courses are associated with a lower incidence of retreatment, although shorter courses maximize patient and caregiver convenience by reducing the number of trips to the radiation department.
- Patients who undergo surgical stabilization for impending or completed pathologic fracture of a long bone may be treated with postoperative radiotherapy to 30 Gy in 10 fractions, 24 Gy in 6 fractions, 20 Gy in 5 fractions, or 8 Gy in a single fraction.
- Reirradiation with EBRT may be feasible and effective, though retreatment to sites including radiation-sensitive critical structures should include careful consideration of the cumulative radiation doses that may exceed normal tissue tolerance. Reirradiation with a single 8 Gy fraction is not inferior to multiple-fraction radiation and has less acute toxicity.
- Management of metastatic bone disease is palliative. A multidisciplinary team of care providers, including the palliative care team, should be available to the patient. Goals of care should be defined with the patient. Hospice referral should be considered if the life expectancy is 6 months or less, but this does not preclude the use of radiation for pain control.

**Summary of Evidence**

Of the 33 references cited in the *ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Non-Spine Bone Metastases* document, all of them are categorized as therapeutic references including 10 well-designed studies. There are 23 references that may not be useful as primary evidence.

The 33 references cited in the *ACR Appropriateness Criteria® Non-Spine Bone Metastases* document were published between 1989–2014.

While there are references that report on studies with design limitations, 10 well-designed studies provide good evidence.

**Supporting Documents**

For additional information on the Appropriateness Criteria methodology and other supporting documents go to www.acr.org/ac.

## References


1. Janjan N, Lutz ST, Bedwinek JM, et al. Therapeutic guidelines for the treatment of bone metastasis: a report from the American College of Radiology Appropriateness Criteria Expert Panel on Radiation Oncology. *J Palliat Med.* 2009;12(5):417-426.
2. Lutz S, Berk L, Chang E, et al. Palliative radiotherapy for bone metastases: an ASTRO evidence-based guideline. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2011;79(4):965-976.
3. Wu JS, Wong RK, Lloyd NS, Johnston M, Bezjak A, Whelan T. Radiotherapy fractionation for the palliation of uncomplicated painful bone metastases - an evidence-based practice guideline. *BMC Cancer.* 2004;4:71.
4. Lo SS, Lutz ST, Chang EL, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria (R) spinal bone metastases. *J Palliat Med.* 2013;16(1):9-19.
5. Lutz ST, Lo SS, Chang EL, et al. ACR Appropriateness Criteria(R) non-spine bone metastases. *J Palliat Med.* 2012;15(5):521-526.
6. Cancer Care Ontario Guideline on Radiopharmaceuticals for the Palliation of Painful Bone Metastases. http://www.cancercare.on.ca/common/pages/UserFile.aspx?fileId=34803. Accessed October 28, 2013.
7. Parker C, Nilsson S, Heinrich D, et al. Alpha emitter radium-223 and survival in metastatic prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;369(3):213-223.
8. Mirels H. Metastatic disease in long bones. A proposed scoring system for diagnosing impending pathologic fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1989(249):256-264.
9. van der Linden YM, Kroon HM, Dijkstra SP, et al. Simple radiographic parameter predicts fracturing in metastatic femoral bone lesions: results from a randomised trial. *Radiother Oncol.* 2003;69(1):21-31.
10. Lo SS, Teh BS, Mayr NA, et al. Stereotactic body radiation therapy for oligometastases. *Discov Med.* 2010;10(52):247-254.
11. Chow E, Hoskin P, Mitera G, et al. Update of the international consensus on palliative radiotherapy endpoints for future clinical trials in bone metastases. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2012;82(5):1730-1737.
12. Chow E, Harris K, Fan G, Tsao M, Sze WM. Palliative radiotherapy trials for bone metastases: a systematic review. *J Clin Oncol.* 2007;25(11):1423-1436.
13. Fairchild A, Barnes E, Ghosh S, et al. International patterns of practice in palliative radiotherapy for painful bone metastases: evidence-based practice? *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2009;75(5):1501-1510.
14. Hartsell WF, Scott CB, Bruner DW, et al. Randomized trial of short- versus long-course radiotherapy for palliation of painful bone metastases. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2005;97(11):798-804.
15. Wong MH, Stockler MR, Pavlakis N. Bisphosphonates and other bone agents for breast cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2012;2:CD003474.
16. Van Poznak CH, Temin S, Yee GC, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology executive summary of the clinical practice guideline update on the role of bone-modifying agents in metastatic breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 2011;29(9):1221-1227.
17. Chow E, Hoskin PJ, Wu J, et al. A phase III international randomised trial comparing single with multiple fractions for re-irradiation of painful bone metastases: National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group (NCIC CTG) SC 20. *Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol).* 2006;18(2):125-128.
18. van der Linden YM, Lok JJ, Steenland E, et al. Single fraction radiotherapy is efficacious: a further analysis of the Dutch Bone Metastasis Study controlling for the influence of retreatment. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2004;59(2):528-537.
19. Huisman M, van den Bosch MA, Wijlemans JW, van Vulpen M, van der Linden YM, Verkooijen HM. Effectiveness of reirradiation for painful bone metastases: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2012;84(1):8-14.
20. Chow E, Van Der Linden Y, Roos D, et al. Response and Quality of Life (QOL) Outcomes in a Randomized Trial of Single Versus Multiple Fractions (Fx) for Re-irradiation (RE-RT) of Painful Bone Metastases (PBM): NCIC CTG SC.20. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2013;87(2):S6.
21. Chow E, van der Linden YM, Roos D, et al. Single versus multiple fractions of repeat radiation for painful bone metastases: a randomised, controlled, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2014;15(2):164-171.

22. Lipton A, Fizazi K, Stopeck AT, et al. Superiority of denosumab to zoledronic acid for prevention of skeletal-related events: a combined analysis of 3 pivotal, randomised, phase 3 trials. *Eur J Cancer.* 2012;48(16):3082-3092.
23. Bishr M, Saad F. Overview of the latest treatments for castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Nat Rev Urol.* 2013;10(9):522-528.
24. Ryan CJ, Smith MR, de Bono JS, et al. Abiraterone in metastatic prostate cancer without previous chemotherapy. *N Engl J Med.* 2013;368(2):138-148.
25. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. Prostate Cancer. Version 1.2014. 2014; Available at: http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/prostate.pdf. Accessed February 28, 2014.
26. Pinto A. Cabozantinib: a novel agent with a dual mechanism of action for castration-resistant prostate carcinoma. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol.* 2014;73(2):219-222.
27. Baczyk M, Czepczynski R, Milecki P, Pisarek M, Oleksa R, Sowinski J. 89Sr versus 153Sm-EDTMP: comparison of treatment efficacy of painful bone metastases in prostate and breast carcinoma. *Nucl Med Commun.* 2007;28(4):245-250.
28. Dolezal J, Vizda J, Odrazka K. Prospective evaluation of samarium-153-EDTMP radionuclide treatment for bone metastases in patients with hormone-refractory prostate cancer. *Urol Int.* 2007;78(1):50-57.
29. Sartor O, Reid RH, Hoskin PJ, et al. Samarium-153-Lexidronam complex for treatment of painful bone metastases in hormone-refractory prostate cancer. *Urology.* 2004;63(5):940-945.
30. Schild SE. Role of radiation therapy in the treatment of melanoma. *Expert Rev Anticancer Ther.* 2009;9(5):583-586.
31. Strojan P. Role of radiotherapy in melanoma management. *Radiol Oncol.* 2010;44(1):1-12.
32. Lutz S, Spence C, Chow E, Janjan N, Connor S. Survey on use of palliative radiotherapy in hospice care. *J Clin Oncol.* 2004;22(17):3581-3586.
33. Hird A, Chow E, Zhang L, et al. Determining the incidence of pain flare following palliative radiotherapy for symptomatic bone metastases: results from three canadian cancer centers. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys.* 2009;75(1):193-197.

The ACR Committee on Appropriateness Criteria and its expert panels have developed criteria for determining appropriate imaging examinations for diagnosis and treatment of specified medical condition(s). These criteria are intended to guide radiologists, radiation oncologists and referring physicians in making decisions regarding radiologic imaging and treatment. Generally, the complexity and severity of a patient's clinical condition should dictate the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Only those examinations generally used for evaluation of the patient's condition are ranked. Other imaging studies necessary to evaluate other co-existent diseases or other medical consequences of this condition are not considered in this document. The availability of equipment or personnel may influence the selection of appropriate imaging procedures or treatments. Imaging techniques classified as investigational by the FDA have not been considered in developing these criteria; however, study of new equipment and applications should be encouraged. The ultimate decision regarding the appropriateness of any specific radiologic examination or treatment must be made by the referring physician and radiologist in light of all the circumstances presented in an individual examination.

**Clinical Condition:** **Non-Spine Bone Metastases**

**Variant 1:** **52-year-old man with a history of a T1N0M0 non–small-cell lung cancer. Two years after lobectomy, he is found to have a painful metastasis in the right femoral neck. The lesion is 3.5 cm in size with greater than 50% erosion of the medial bone cortex. Karnofsky performance status (KPS) 90. No other metastatic disease is found. He has had no previous therapy other than lobectomy.**

| Treatment | Rating | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Surgical intervention followed by EBRT, then systemic therapy | 9 | |
| Surgical intervention followed by systemic therapy alone | 5 | |
| EBRT alone | 3 | This treatment is associated with a high risk of pathologic fracture without prophylactic internal fixation, as evaluated by certain criteria [8]. |
| EBRT followed by systemic therapy | 3 | This treatment is associated with a high risk of pathologic fracture without prophylactic internal fixation, as evaluated by certain criteria [8]. |
| Surgical intervention alone | 3 | |
| Hospice after treatment of the femur | 2 | |
| Systemic therapy alone (may include biologic agents, bisphosphonates, and/or chemotherapy) | 2 | |
| Observation | 1 | |
| Direct hospice placement | 1 | |
| **Radiation Therapy Dose** | | |
| 8 Gy/1 fraction | 4 | |
| 20 Gy/5 fractions | 5 | |
| 24 Gy/6 fractions | 6 | A high biologically effective dose of radiation may be beneficial for this patient with an excellent KPS and oligometastatic disease. |
| 30 Gy/10 fractions | 8 | |
| 35 Gy/14 fractions | 4 | |
| 40 Gy/20 fractions | 4 | |
| **Treatment Technique** | | |
| Clinical simulation | 5 | |
| Fluoroscopic simulation or 2-D RT | 7 | |
| CT simulation | 8 | |
| AP/PA | 8 | |
| 3-D CRT | 8 | |
| IMRT | 3 | |
| SBRT | 2 | |
| Proton therapy to the bone metastasis | 2 | |

**Rating Scale:** **1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate**

**Clinical Condition:** **Non-Spine Bone Metastases**

**Variant 2:** **62-year-old woman with estrogen-receptor positive/progesterone-receptor positive breast cancer, Her-2/neu nonamplified. She develops a painful lytic bone metastasis in the right humerus after 4 years of a single-line of adjuvant hormonal therapy. There is minimal invasion of bone cortex, and the lesion is thought to have a low fracture risk per orthopedic surgery consult. KPS is 90. Bone scan demonstrates a few other asymptomatic bone metastases.**

| Treatment | Rating | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| EBRT followed by systemic therapy | 8 | |
| Systemic therapy alone (hormonal therapy and bisphosphonates or RANK ligand inhibitor) | 4 | |
| EBRT alone | 3 | |
| Radiopharmaceuticals | 2 | |
| Surgical intervention | 2 | |
| Direct hospice placement | 1 | |
| Hospice after treatment of the humerus | 1 | |
| **Radiation Therapy Dose** | | |
| 8 Gy/1 fraction | 8 | |
| 20 Gy/5 fractions | 8 | |
| 24 Gy/6 fractions | 8 | |
| 30 Gy/10 fractions | 8 | |
| 35 Gy/14 fractions | 5 | |
| 40 Gy/20 fractions | 3 | |
| **Treatment Technique** | | |
| Clinical simulation | 5 | |
| Fluoroscopic simulation or 2-D RT | 7 | |
| CT simulation | 8 | |
| AP/PA | 8 | |
| 3-D CRT | 8 | |
| IMRT | 2 | |
| SBRT | 2 | |
| Proton therapy to the bone metastasis | 2 | |

**Rating Scale:** **1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate**

**Clinical Condition:** **Non-Spine Bone Metastases**

**Variant 3:** **65-year-old woman with metastatic hormone-receptor positive breast cancer currently on hormonal and bisphosphonate therapy for skeletal-dominant metastatic disease. She received palliative radiation (30 Gy/10 fractions) to a painful lesion in the right humerus 3 years ago with good pain relief but now has recurrent pain at this site. Radiographs show a lytic lesion with no radiographic evidence of impending fracture. She has several other asymptomatic skeletal lesions and a new 1.5-cm lung metastasis.**

| Treatment | Rating | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| EBRT reirradiation to symptomatic lesion | 8 | |
| Consider changes to systemic therapy only | 5 | |
| Radiopharmaceuticals | 3 | |
| Surgical intervention | 3 | |
| Direct hospice placement | 2 | |
| Hospice after treatment of the humerus | 2 | |
| **Radiation Therapy Dose** | | |
| 8 Gy/1 fraction | 8 | |
| 20 Gy/5 fractions | 8 | |
| 24 Gy/6 fractions | 8 | |
| 30 Gy/10 fractions | 7 | |
| 35 Gy/14 fractions | 5 | |
| 40 Gy/20 fractions | 3 | |
| **Treatment Technique** | | |
| Clinical simulation | 5 | |
| 3-D CRT | 8 | |
| Fluoroscopic simulation or 2-D RT | 8 | |
| CT simulation | 9 | |
| AP/PA | 8 | |
| IMRT | 2 | |
| SBRT | 2 | |
| Proton therapy to the bone metastasis | 2 | |
| **Rating Scale:** 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate | | |

**Clinical Condition:** **Non-Spine Bone Metastases**

**Variant 4:** **66-year-old man with metastatic hormone-refractory prostate cancer. He has widespread osteoblastic skeletal disease with increasingly painful lesions in the lumbar spine, hips, and extremities. Prior therapy has included hormonal therapy, bisphosphonates, docetaxel chemotherapy, and EBRT to one of his painful hip lesions.**

| Treatment | Rating | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| Radiopharmaceuticals and EBRT to symptomatic lesions | 8 | |
| Radiopharmaceuticals | 8 | |
| EBRT to most symptomatic lesions | 7 | EBRT is an effective modality for pain relief of selected lesions, but the amount of bone marrow treated should be minimized to prevent compromising the patient's remaining systemic therapy options. |
| Direct hospice placement | 5 | |
| Consider changes to systemic therapy only | 4 | |
| Medical pain management only | 4 | |
| **Radiation Therapy Dose (If EBRT used)** | | |
| 8 Gy/1 fraction | 8 | |
| 20 Gy/5 fractions | 7 | |
| 24 Gy/6 fractions | 7 | |
| 30 Gy/10 fractions | 7 | |
| 35 Gy/14 fractions | 4 | |
| 40 Gy/20 fractions | 3 | |
| **Treatment Technique (If EBRT used)** | | |
| Clinical simulation | 5 | |
| Fluoroscopic simulation or 2-D RT | 7 | |
| CT simulation | 8 | |
| 3-D CRT | 8 | |
| IMRT | 2 | |
| SBRT | 2 | |
| Proton therapy to the bone metastasis | 2 | |

**Rating Scale:** **1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate**

**Clinical Condition:** **Non-Spine Bone Metastases**

**Variant 5:** **47-year-old man with a history of malignant melanoma, now with a painful metastatic lesion in the left scapula. KPS is 70. He has had no prior therapy for metastatic disease. Staging scans show an asymptomatic 3-cm liver metastasis.**

| Treatment | Rating | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| EBRT and consideration of systemic therapy | 8 | |
| Systemic therapy alone | 4 | This patient may be a candidate for targeted therapies, but radiation offers rapid palliation of pain. |
| EBRT alone | 3 | |
| Hospice after treatment of the scapula metastasis | 2 | |
| Direct hospice placement | 2 | |
| Radiopharmaceuticals | 2 | |
| **Radiation Therapy Dose** | | |
| 8 Gy/1 fraction | 8 | |
| 20 Gy/5 fractions | 7 | |
| 24 Gy/6 fractions | 8 | |
| 30 Gy/10 fractions | 8 | |
| 30 Gy/5 fractions | 8 | |
| 35 Gy/14 fractions | 6 | |
| 40 Gy/20 fractions | 3 | |
| **Treatment Technique** | | |
| Clinical simulation | 5 | |
| Fluoroscopic simulation or 2-D RT | 7 | |
| CT simulation | 8 | |
| 3-D CRT | 8 | |
| IMRT | 2 | |
| SBRT | 2 | |
| Proton therapy to the bone metastasis | 2 | |
| **Rating Scale: 1,2,3 Usually not appropriate; 4,5,6 May be appropriate; 7,8,9 Usually appropriate** | | |