CURRENT CONCEPTS IN THE DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF

Neoplastic Meningitis

AN EDUCATIONAL VIRTUAL LECTURE FOR PHYSICIANS, PHARMACISTS AND REGISTERED NURSES

Activity Workbook

Jointly sponsored by Robert Michael Educational Institute LLC and Postgraduate Institute for Medicine





Postgraduate Institute for Medicine Supported by an educational grant from Enzon Pharmaceuticals, Inc.



CONTENTS

tivity Overview
culty Biography
creditation & Credit
sclosures & Disclaimer
esentation
ferences
otes

Target Audience

This virtual lecture has been designated to meet the educational needs of physicians, pharmacists and registered nurses involved in the care of patients with neoplastic meningitis.

Activity Purpose

This virtual lecture is intended to assist clinicians in understanding how to treat and manage patients with neoplastic meningitis.

Statement of Need

Today, more patients are living longer because of effective treatments for cancer. As a result, more patients are at risk for neoplastic meningitis (NM), which occurs when malignant cells enter the cerebrospinal fluid.¹⁻³ NM is a devastating and ultimately fatal disease.⁴ Although treatment remains palliative, it often affords stabilization and protection against further neurological deterioration.⁵ When NM is left undiagnosed or untreated, rapid neurological deterioration can occur.¹ Therefore, healthcare professionals should carefully evaluate patients in order to diagnose NM and plan treatment to maximize its effects while minimizing treatment-associated toxicities.¹

Educational Objectives

After completing this virtual lecture, the participant should be better able to:

- Describe the epidemiology and pathogenesis of metastatic malignant disease involving the meninges
- · Identify signs and symptoms associated with neoplastic meningitis
- · Explain methods of diagnosing neoplastic meningitis
- Review existing and emerging treatment options, including intrathecal chemotherapy, systemic chemotherapy and radiation therapy

¹Armstrong TS, Gilbert MR. The treatment of neoplastic meningitis. *Expert Opin Pharmacother*. 2004;5:1929-1935. ²Chamberlain MC, Nolan C, Abrey LE. Leukemic and lymphomatous meningitis: incidence, prognosis and treatment. *J Neurooncol*.

^{2005;75:71-83.}

³Chowdhary S, Chamberlain M. Leptomeningeal metastases: current concepts and management guidelines. J Natl Compt Cancer Netw. 2005;3:693-703.

⁴Glantz MJ, Jaeckle KA, Chamberlain MC, et al. A randomized controlled trial comparing intrathecal sustained-release cytarabine (DepoCyt) to intrathecal methotrexate in patients with neoplastic meningitis from solid tumors. *Clin Cancer Res.* 1999;5:3394-3402. ⁵Chamberlain MC. Neoplastic meningitis. *Neurologist.* 2006;12:179-187.

FACULTY BIOGRAPHY

Marc C. Chamberlain, MD

Professor of Neurology Department of Neurology University of Washington

Affiliate Investigator Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center Seattle, Washington



Marc C. Chamberlain, MD, is Professor of Neurology in the Department of Neurology at the University of Washington and Affiliate Investigator at Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center in Seattle, Washington. He is board-certified in both pediatrics and neurology.

After receiving a Bachelor of Arts degree in zoology and a Bachelor of Science degree in biochemistry from the University of California at Berkeley, Dr. Chamberlain earned a medical degree from Columbia University in New York. Subsequently, he completed both an internship and a residency in pediatrics at the Bronx Municipal Hospital Center and a residency in pediatrics at Harbor–UCLA Medical Center in Los Angeles, California. He also completed a fellowship in pediatric neurology at UCLA and an American Cancer Society fellowship.

Dr. Chamberlain is on the editorial boards of CNS Drugs and the American Journal of Cancer and is a reviewer for numerous journals, including Cancer, Journal of Clinical Oncology, Journal of Neuro-Oncology, Neurology, Archives of Neurology, and Lancet Neurology. He has authored more that 160 articles and 22 book chapters and has presented 200 invited lectures.

Over the years, Dr. Chamberlain developed many of the methods in use today to evaluate and manage neoplastic meningitis. Since 1996, his research has focused increasingly on clinical trials in patients with primary brain tumors.

Physician Continuing Education

Accreditation Statement

This activity has been planned and implemented in accordance with the Essential Areas and Policies of the Accreditation Council for Continuing Medical Education (ACCME) through the joint sponsorship of Robert Michael Educational Institute LLC (RMEI) and Postgraduate Institute for Medicine (PIM). PIM is accredited by the ACCME to provide continuing medical education for physicians.

Credit Designation

Postgraduate Institute for Medicine designates this educational activity for a maximum of I AMA PRA Category I CreditTM. Physicians should only claim credit commensurate with the extent of their participation in the activity.

Pharmacist Continuing Education

Accreditation Statement

Postgraduate Institute for Medicine is accredited by the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education as a provider of continuing pharmacy education.

Credit Designation

Postgraduate Institute for Medicine designates this continuing education activity for 1.0 contact hour (0.10 CEU) of the Accreditation Council for Pharmacy Education. (Universal Program Number 809-999-07-047-H01-P)

A statement of credit will be issued only upon receipt of a completed activity Evaluation form and will be mailed to participants within 4 to 6 weeks.

ACPE Release Date: April 25, 2007

Nursing Continuing Education

CNA/ANCC

This educational activity for 1.0 contact hour is provided by Postgraduate Institute for Medicine (PIM).

PIM is an approved provider of continuing nursing education by the Colorado Nurses Association, an accredited approver by the American Nurses Credentialing Center's Commission on Accreditation.

California Board of Registered Nursing

Postgraduate Institute for Medicine is approved by the California Board of Registered Nursing, Provider Number 13485 for 1.2 contact hours.

Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

Postgraduate Institute for Medicine (PIM) assesses conflict of interest with its instructors, planners, managers, and other individuals who are in a position to control the content of CME activities. All relevant conflicts of interest that are identified are thoroughly vetted by PIM for fair balance, scientific objectivity of studies utilized in this activity, and patient care recommendations. PIM is committed to providing its learners with high-quality CME activities and related materials that promote improvements or quality in healthcare and not a specific proprietary business interest of a commercial interest.

The following faculty reported a real or apparent conflict of interest:

Dr. Marc C. Chamberlain has asked that we advise participants in this activity that he has an affiliation with Enzon Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Mundipharma International Limited (*Consultant*).

The following planners and managers have the following to disclose:

ROBERT MICHAEL EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE LLC

- Sherri Kramer, MD, has no affiliations with commercial interests to disclose.
- Patricia C. Walter has no affiliations with commercial interests to disclose.
- Marie Bialek, PharmD, has asked that we advise participants in this activity that she has an affiliation with AstraZeneca (Salary) and McNeil Consumer & Specialty Pharmaceuticals (Contractor).

POSTGRADUATE INSTITUTE FOR MEDICINE

- Jan Hixon, RN, has no affiliations with commercial interests to disclose.
- Linda Graham, RN, has no affiliations with commercial interests to disclose.
- Trace Hutchison, PharmD, has no affiliations with commercial interests to disclose.

Disclosure of Unlabeled Use

This educational activity may contain discussion of published and/or investigational uses of agents that are not indicated by the FDA. Postgraduate Institute for Medicine (PIM), Robert Michael Educational Institute LLC and Enzon Pharmaceuticals do not recommend the use of any agent outside of the labeled indications.

The opinions expressed in the educational activity are those of the faculty and do not necessarily represent the views of PIM, Robert Michael Educational Institute LLC and Enzon Pharmaceuticals. Please refer to the official prescribing information for each product for discussion of approved indications, contraindications and warnings.

Disclaimer

Participants have an implied responsibility to use the newly acquired information to enhance patient outcomes and their own professional development. The information presented in this activity is not meant to serve as a guideline for patient management. Any procedures, medications or other courses of diagnosis or treatment discussed or suggested in this activity should not be used by clinicians without the evaluation of their patient's conditions and possible contraindications on dangers in use, review of any applicable manufacturer's product information and comparison with recommendations of other authorities.



1

Objectives

- Describe the epidemiology and pathogenesis of neoplastic meningitis (NM)
- Identify the signs and symptoms of NM
- Explain methods of diagnosing NM
- Review existing and emerging treatment options for NM

Background

- A central nervous system (CNS) metastatic complication in patients with late-stage cancer^{1,2}
- Also called leptomeningeal metastasis
 - Carcinomatous meningitis (from solid tumor)^{2,3}
 - Lymphomatous meningitis (from systemic lymphoma)^{2,3}
 - Leukemic meningitis (from systemic leukemia)
- Malignant cells spread to the leptomeninges and subarachnoid space1
- · Tumor cells are disseminated within the cerebrospinal fluid (CSF)1
- · Early diagnosis and treatment are important¹
- Gleissner B, Chamberlain MC. *Lancet Neurol.* 2006;5:443-452. Jaeckle KA. *Semin Oncol.* 2006;33:312-323. NCCN Guidelines. V.2.2006. Accessed February 5, 2007.

Incidence of Neoplastic Meningitis

- NM is diagnosed clinically in 3% to 5% of patients with cancer
- Autopsy studies suggest a higher incidence
 - 4%-15% of solid tumors
 - 5%-15% of leukemia and lymphoma
 - 1%-2% of primary brain tumors

Chamberlain MC. Neurologist. 2006;12:179-187.

3

Risk Factors

Liquid tumors^{1,2}

- Raised lactate dehydrogenase; low serum albumin; <60 years of age
- Involvement of the testis, breast, or bone marrow
- More than 2 extranodal sites
- Brain metastases?

• Solid tumors³

- No risk factors identified
- HER2-positive breast cancer?
- Brain metastases?
- Chamberlain MC. *J Clin Oncol*, 2005;23:3605-3613. Gleissner B, Chamberlain MC. *Lancet Neurol*, 2006;5:443-452. Gabos Z, et al. *J Clin Oncol*, 2006;24:5658-5663.



Pathophysiology: Entry of Cancer Cells into the CSF Compartment

- Hematogenous dissemination^{1,2}
- Centripetal migration from systemic tumors along perineural or perivascular spaces^{1,2}
- Direct extension from contiguous tumor deposits¹⁻³
 - Epidural- or dural-based disease
 - Brain parenchyma
- NCCN Guidelines. V.2.2006. Accessed February 5, 2007.
 Chamberlain MC. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23:3605-3613.
 Gleissner B, Chamberlain MC. Lancet Neurol. 2006;5:443-452.





Neoplastic Meningitis in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: Spine



9

	Symptoms	Signs	
erebral	Headache	Cognitive defects	
	Alteration of mentation	Seizures	
	Difficulty walking	Gait disturbances	
	Nausea and vomiting	Sensory disturbances	
	Loss of consciousness	Papilledema	
anial nerves	Diplopia Hearing loss	Oculomotor paresis III, IV, VI; hypoglossal neuropathy XII	
	Visual loss Facial numbness Dysphagia	Trigeminal neuropathy V; diminishe gag reflex IX, X; acoustic neuropath VIII; optic neuropathy II Facial paresis VII	
pinal	Focal weakness	Reflex asymmetry	
	Paresthesias	Sensory loss	
	Back pain	Upper or lower motor neuron weak	
	Radicular pain	Decreased rectal tone	
	Bladder and bowel	Straight leg raising	
	dysfunction	Nuchal rigidity	

10

С

S



- Injury to nerves that traverse the subarachnoid space
- Direct tumor invasion of the brain or spinal cord
- Alteration in the local blood supply
- Obstruction of normal CSF flow pathways

NCCN Guidelines. V.2.2006; Accessed February 5, 2007.



12



Findings on CSF Examination

	Initial	Total
CSF Findings	Examination	Examinations
	(%)	(%)
Opening pressure >150 mm H ₂ O	30-57	61-72
White blood cells >4 mm ³	57-64	72-79
Protein >50 mg/dL	73-86	79-91
Glucose <60 mg/dL	31-55	41-77
Positive cytology	45-73	77-100

A composite from 5 studies in more than 300 patients.

Kaplan JG, et al. *J Neurol Oncol.* 1990:9:225-229. Wasserstrom WR, et al. *Cancer.* 1982;49:759-772. Balm M, Hammack L. *Arch Neurol.* 1996;53:626-632. Theodore WH, Gendelman S. *Arch Neurol.* 1981;38:696-699. Olson ME, et al. *Arch Neurol.* 1974;30:122-137. 13

14

Sensitivity of CSF Analysis

- False-negative results are common (40% to 60%)
- Prospective evaluation of 39 patients with NM suggests sample size of at least 10.5 mL required to ensure a 3% false-negative rate

Glantz MJ, et al. Cancer. 1998;82:733-739.

CSF Analysis in Liquid Tumors

- Another analytic method is flow cytometry together with 2 to 4 fluorescence markers (FACS)¹
- Polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification of IgH genes is useful for lymphomatous meningitis²
 - Each clonal lymphoma cell is characterized by a unique rearranged cell surface heavy chain immunoglobulin (IgH) or T-cell receptor

Gleissner B, Chamberlain M. J Neurooncol. 2007; Feb 28 [Epub ahead of print].
 Gleissner B, et al. Neurology. 2002;58:390-396.

Use of Magnetic Resonance Imaging

- Gadolinium (Gd)-enhanced MRI imaging is the technique of choice
- Imaging of the entire CNS axis (brain and spine) is required
- T1-weighted with contrast and T2-weighted images with fat suppression

Chamberlain MC. *Neurologist*. 2006;12:179-187. Glass JP, et al. *Neurology*. 1979;29:1369-1375. 16

	Cranial	MRI	Finding	s in	NN
--	---------	-----	---------	------	----

Neuroimaging Abnormality	Chamberlain, 1990 (N=14) (%)	Balm, 1996 (N=126) (%)
Parenchymal volume loss	93	
Focal or diffuse enhancement of		
Sulci or convexity	57	
Cisterns	28	
Tentorium	21	
Ependymal	21	
Nodules		
Subarachnoid	36	
Parenchymal	43	
Hydrocephalus	7	16
Communicating		14
Obstructive		2
Parenchymal metastases	43	24
Single		18
Multiple		6

17

Neuroradiographic Differential Diagnosis

- Inflammatory disease
- Infectious disease
- Granulomatous disease (ie, sarcoid)
- latrogenic disease (ie, chemical meningitis)
- Stroke (ie, cortical thrombosis, subarachnoid hemorrhage)
- Intracranial surgery
- Low-pressure syndromes
- Trauma

Gleissner B, Chamberlain MC. Lancet Neurol. 2006;5:443-452.

Radioisotope CSF Flow Studies (1)

- CSF flow obstruction is common in NM¹⁻⁴
- Approximately one third of patients with solid tumor NM
 - No data on incidence in liquid tumor NM
- Blocks are most common at base of skull, spinal canal, and over the cerebral convexities
- · CSF flow studies are performed in most nuclear medicine departments
- Technique of choice^{4,5}
 - Indium 111-DTPA (only FDA-approved method)
 - ^{99m}Technetium macroaggregated albumin
- Chamberlain MC. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23:3605-3613. Chamberlain MC. J Neurooncol. 1995;23:233-238. Glantz MJ, et al. Cancer. 1995;75:2919-2931. Trump DL, et al. Arch Intern Med. 1982;142:583-586. Chamberlain MC. J Neurooncol. 1998;38:135-140.

Radioisotope CSF Flow Studies (2)

- Used as an adjunct to treatment planning
- Enable detection of flow abnormalities in patients considered for treatment
 - Risk for toxicity increases in patients with ventricular outlet obstruction
 - Obstruction of CSF flow prevents drug dissemination

Chamberlain MC. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23:3605-3613.

19



21

22

Treatment of CSF Flow Obstruction

- Radiation therapy to sites of obstructions
 - One third of CSF obstructions are in the brain
 50% resolve after radiotherapy¹
 - Two thirds of CSF obstructions are in the spine
 - 35% resolve after radiotherapy¹
- May obviate need for CSF shunting

Gleissner B, Chamberlain MC. Lancet Neurol. 2006;5:443-452.

Treatment Goals

- Maintain neurological quality of life¹
- Stabilize or improve neurological symptoms¹⁻³
- Extend survival¹⁻³
- Chamberlain MC. Neurologist. 2006;12:179-187. Gleissner B, Chamberlain MC. Lancet Neurol. 2006;5:443-452. NCCN Guidelines. V.2.2006. Accessed February 5, 2007.

Stratification for Treatment

Poor Risk Group

- Low KPS
- Multiple, serious, or major neurological deficits No major neurological deficits
- Extensive systemic disease with few
- treatment options
- Bulky CNS disease
- NM-related
- encephalopathy
- CSF block

Good Risk Group High KPS

- deficits
- Minimal systemic disease Reasonable systemic
- treatment options
- No CSF block

KPS = Karnofsky Performance Status. NCCN Guidelines. V.2.2006. Accessed February 5, 2007.

23



26

Radiotherapy for NM

- Palliate symptoms
- Treat bulky disease
- Correct CSF flow abnormalities
- Therapy type
 - Involved-field irradiation
 - Craniospinal irradiation

Chamberlain MC. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23:3605-3613.

Surgery for NM

- Placement of port for intraventricular therapy
- CSF diversion for patients with symptomatic hydrocephalus¹
- Meningeal biopsy

1. Omuro AM, et al. Neurology. 2005;64:1625-1627.

Treatment Options for NM

- Regional or intra-CSF chemotherapy
- High-dose systemic chemotherapy
- Craniospinal irradiation

27

Treatment: Intra-CSF Chemotherapy

- Three agents used most often
 - Methotrexate
 - Cytarabine (including the liposomal form)
 - Thiotepa
- Toxicity and complications of treatment
 - Primary toxicity of intra-CSF chemotherapy is transient chemical meningitis
 - May last for 4 to 5 days
 - May be associated with confusion, seizures, fever, stiff neck, photophobia, nausea, vomiting, and headache
 - Device- or port-related complications
 - Failure
 - Infection
 - Chamberlain MC. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23:3605-3613.

	INDUCTION		CONSOLID	CONSOLIDATION		MAINTENANCE	
	Bolus	CxT	Bolus	CxT	Bolus	СхТ	
Methotrexate	10-15 mg 2 x wk x 4wk	2 mg/d x 5d QOW x 8wk	10-15 mg 1 x wk x 4wk	2 mg/d x 5d QOW x 4wk	10-15 mg Qmo	2 mg/d x 5d Qmo	
Cytarabine	25-100 mg 2 or 3 x wk x 4wk	25 mg/d x 3d/wk x 4wk	25-100 mg 1 x wk x 4wk	25 mg/d x 3d QOW x 4wk	25-100 mg Qmo	25 mg/d x 3d Qmo	
DepoCyt ^{® ∗}	50 mg Q14d for 2 doses		50 mg Q14d for 3 doses plus 1 dose at 13wk		50 mg Q28d for 4 doses		
Thiotepa	10 mg 2 or 3 x wk x 4wk	10 mg/d x 3d/wk x 4wk	10 mg 1 x wk x 4wk	10 mg/d x 3d QOW x 4wk	10 mg Qmo	10 mg/d x 3d Qmo	
Alpha- Interferon	1 x 10 ⁶ U 3 x wk x 4wk		1 x 10 ⁶ U 3 x wk QOW x 4wk		1 x 10 ⁶ U 3 x wk x 1wk/mo		
Etoposide		0.5 mg/d x 5d QOW x 8wk				0.5 mg/d x 5 d Qmo	
Topotecan	0.4 mg 2 x wk x 4wk		0.4 mg 2 x wk QOW x 4 wk		0.4 mg 2 x wk Qmo		
*Administer conco CxT = Concentratio Chamberlain MC. /	mitantly with dexan on x time; QOW = ev <i>leurologist</i> . 2006;12	nethasone 4 mg very other week 2:179-187. Chan	bid PO or IV for 5 day ; Qmo = every month. berlain MC, et al. <i>Can</i>	ys beginning or ocer. 2006;106:2	n first day of Depo 2021-2027.	Cyt injection.	

29









Study	Design	Response	Toxicity
Glantz et al. <i>Clin Cancer Res.</i> 1999;5:3394- 3402	N=61 Solid tumors (eg, breast, SCLC, NSCLC in 52%) DepoCyt vs MTX	DepoCyt vs MTX: RR* 26% vs 20% OS* 105 vs 78 d TTP 58 vs 30 d	DepoCyt vs MTX: Sensory/motor: 4% vs 10%; altered mental status: 5% vs 2%; headache: 4% vs 2%
Grossman et al. <i>J Clin Oncol.</i> 1993;11:561- 569	N=59 Nonleukemic malignancy (breast, lung, lymphatic in 90%) IT MTX vs thiotepa	IT MTX vs thiotepa: Neurological improvements: none Median survival: 15.9 vs 14.1 wk	IT MTX vs thiotepa: Serious toxicities similar betweer groups. Mucositis and neurological complications more common in MTX group
Hitchins et al. <i>J Clin Oncol.</i> 1987;5:1655- 1662	N=44 Nonleukemic malignancy (eg, SCLC, breast cancer, adenocarcinoma unknown primary in 70%) IT MTX vs MTX + Ara-C	IT MTX vs MTX + Ara-C: RR*: 61% vs 45% Median survival*: 12 vs 7 wk	IT MTX vs MTX + Ara-C: NV: 36% vs 50%; septicemia, neutropenia: 9% vs 15%; mucositis: 14% vs 10%; pancytopenia: 9% vs 10%. AEs related to reservoir: blocked port 17% vs 0%; intracranial hemorrhage: 11% vs 0%

33

34

Novel Intra-CSF Chemotherapy

- Etoposide in adults with solid or liquid NM¹
 - RR of 26% (7/27); reversible arachnoiditis (4/27)
- Topotecan in children and adults with solid or liquid NM
 - RR of 26% (6/23); arachnoiditis DLT (phase I)²
 - RR/no change in 16% (5/30); mild toxicity (phase II)³
- Mafosfamide in children with brain tumors⁴
 - RR of 42% (11/26) (median follow-up, 26.5 mo)
 - Immediate toxicities manageable
- 1. Chamberlain MC, et al. Cancer. 2006;106:2021-2027.
- 2. Blaney SM , et al. J Clin Oncol. 2003;21:143-147.
- 3. Groves MD, et al. Neurology. 2004;62:475 [Abstract].
- 4. Slavc I, et al. *J Neurooncol.* 2003;64:239-247.

Intra-CSF Biological Agents

- Alpha-interferon¹
- Rituximab²
 - Maximum tolerated dose in one recent, small, Phase I study: 25 mg twice weekly by Ommaya reservoir for a maximum of 9 doses
- Trastuzumab³
- Preclinical studies of nonradioactive antibodies⁴ or immunoconjugates⁵
- 1. Chamberlain MC. Cancer. 2002;15:2675-2680.
- 2. Rubenstein JL, et al. J Clin Oncol. 2007;25:1350-1356.
- 3. Laufman LR, Foprsthoefel KF. Clin Breast Cancer. 2002;2:316.
- Bergman I, et al. *Int J Cancer.* 1999;112:538-548.
 Bigner DD, et al. *Clin Cancer Res.* 1995;1:1545-1555.
- 5. Bigner DD, et al. Clin Cancer Res. 1995;1:1545-1555.

35

36

Radioisotopes and Radioimmunoconjugates

- Unconjugated iodine 131¹
- Low toxicity with transient improvements (n=31)
- ¹³¹I-radiolabeled monoclonal antibodies
 - Case study reported complete response²
 - In neuroectodermal tumors, RR was 53%³
- I-conjugated antibody to chondroitin proteoglycan sulfate and tenascin⁴
 - CSF or radiographic response achieved; prolonged survival

Wong F, et al. Neurology. 2006;66 [Abstract EV6.002]. Cokgor I, et al. Cancer. 2001;91:1809-1813. Bigner DD, et al. J Neurooncol. 1995;24:109-122. Coakham HB, Kemshead JT. J Neurooncol. 1998;38:225-232.

Supportive Care

- Radiation to symptomatic and bulky sites
- Anticonvulsants for seizure control
- Adequate analgesia
- Antidepressants, anxiolytics
- Corticosteroids (of limited use)
- Antiemetics
- Psychostimulants

Chamberlain MC. *J Clin Oncol.* 2005;23:3605-3613. Chamberlain MC. *Neurologist.* 2006;12:179-187. Chamberlain MC. *Arch Neurol.* 1997;54:16-17.

Challenges and Complications (1)

- Does intra-CSF chemotherapy contribute to outcome?
- Does site of drug administration matter (ie, intraventricular vs intralumbar)?
- Does positive CSF cytology have clinical relevance?
- Is extent and progression of neurological disease the most relevant outcome measure?
- Can clinicians reliably distinguish between deaths due to NM compared with systemic disease?

37

Challenges and Complications (2)

- What is the role for intra-CSF chemoprophylaxis aside from ALL?
- Do CSF-negative patients differ from CSF-positive patients?
- What is the role of radioisotope CSF flow studies?
- Is there a preferred intra-CSF drug and schedule?
- What characteristics define a patient for which intra-CSF chemotherapy is reasonable?
- Is there a role for systemic chemotherapy in improving outcomes independent of intra-CSF chemotherapy?

Conclusions

- Intra-CSF chemotherapy is the primary therapy for neoplastic meningitis
- Most patients require a combination of intra-CSF chemotherapy and radiotherapy
- Treatment may prolong survival and improve QOL
 No significant survival advantages at this time
- Recommend treatment only for a subset of patients
- Further studies are needed to improve outcomes

39

REFERENCES

Balm M, Hammack J. Leptomeningeal carcinomatosis. Presenting features and prognostic factors. *Arch Neurol*. 1996;53:626-632.

Bergman I, Barmada MA, Heller G, Griffin JA, Cheung N-K. Treatment of neoplastic meningeal xenografts by intraventricular administration of an antiganglioside monoclonal antibody, 3F8. *Int J Cancer.* 1999;82:538-548.

Bigner DD, Archer GE, McLendon RE, Friedman HS, Fuchs HE, Pai LH, Herndon JE II, Pastan IH. Efficacy of compartmental administration of immunotoxin LMB-1 (B3-LysPE38) in a rat model of carcinomatous meningitis. *Clin Cancer Res.* 1995;1:1545-1555.

Bigner DD, Brown M, Coleman RE, Friedman AH, Friedman HS, McLendon RE, Bigner SH, Zhao X-G, Wikstrand CJ, Pegram CN, Kerby T, Zalutsky MR. Phase I studies of treatment of malignant gliomas and neoplastic meningitis with (131)I-radiolabeled monoclonal antibodies anti-tenascin 81C6 and anti-chondroitin proteoglycan sulfate Mel-14 F (ab'),: a preliminary report. J Neurooncol. 1995;24:109-122.

Blaney SM, Heideman R, Berg S, Adamson P, Gillespie A, Geyer JR, Packer R, Matthay K, Jaeckle K, Cole D, Kuttesch N, Poplack DG, Balis FM. Phase I clinical trial of intrathecal topotecan in patients with neoplastic meningitis. *J Clin Oncol*. 2003;21:143-147.

Boogerd W, van den Bent MJ, Koehler PJ, Heimans JJ, van der Sande JJ, Aaronson NK, Hart AA, Benraadt J, Vecht ChJ. The relevance of intraventricular chemotherapy for leptomeningeal metastasis in breast cancer: a randomized study. *Eur J Cancer*. 2004;40:2726-2733.

Chamberlain MC. A phase II trial of intra-cerebrospinal fluid alpha interferon in the treatment of neoplastic meningitis. *Cancer.* 2002;94:2675-2680.

Chamberlain MC. Carcinomatous meningitis. Arch Neurol. 1997;54:16-17.

Chamberlain MC. Comparative spine imaging in leptomeningeal metastases. J Neurooncol. 1995;23:233-238.

Chamberlain MC. Neoplastic meningitis. J Clin Oncol. 2005;23:3605-3613.

Chamberlain MC. Neoplastic meningitis. *Neurologist*. 2006;12:179-187.

Chamberlain MC. Radioisotope CSF flow studies in leptomeningeal metastases. J Neurooncol. 1998;38:135-140.

Chamberlain MC, Sandy AD, Press GA. Leptomeningeal metastasis: a comparison of gadolinium-enhanced MR and contrast-enhanced CT of the brain. *Neurology*. 1990; 40:435-438.

Chamberlain MC, Tsao-Wei DD, Groshen S. Phase II trial of intracerebrospinal fluid etoposide in the treatment of neoplastic meningitis. *Cancer*. 2006;106:2021-2027.

Coakham HB, Kemshead JT. Treatment of neoplastic meningitis by targeted radiation using (131)I-radiolabelled monoclonal antibodies. Results of responses and long term follow-up in forty patients. *J Neurooncol*. 1998;38:225-232.

Cokgor I, Akabani G, Friedman HS, Friedman AH, Zalutsky MR, Zehngebot LM, Provenzale JM, Guy CD, Wikstrand CJ, Bigner DD. Long term response in a patient with neoplastic meningitis secondary to melanoma treated with (131)I-radiolabeled antichondroitin proteoglycan sulfate Mel-14 F(ab¹); a case study. *Cancer*. 2001;91:1809-1813.

Gabos Z, Sinha R, Hanson J, Chauhan N, Hugh J, Mackey JR, Abdulkarim B. Prognostic significance of human epidermal growth factor receptor positivity for the development of brain metastasis after newly diagnosed breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2006;24:5658-5663.

Glantz MJ, Cole BF, Glantz LK, Cobb J, Mills P, Lekos A, Walters BC, Recht LD. Cerebrospinal fluid cytology in patients with cancer: minimizing false-negative results. *Cancer.* 1998;82:733-739.

Glantz MJ, Hall WA, Cole BF, Chozick BS, Shannon CM, Wahlberg L, Akerley W, Marin L, Choy H. Diagnosis, management, and survival of patients with leptomeningeal cancer based on cerebrospinal fluid-flow status. *Cancer*. 1995;75:2919-2931.

Glantz MJ, Jaeckle KA, Chamberlain MC, Phuphanich S, Recht L, Swinnen LJ, Maria B, LaFollette S, Schumann GB, Cole BF, Howell SB. A randomized controlled trial comparing intrathecal sustained-release cytarabine (DepoCyt) to intrathecal methotrexate in patients with neoplastic meningitis from solid tumors. *Clin Cancer Res.* 1999; 5:3394-3402.

Glantz MJ, LaFollette S, Jaeckle KA, Shapiro W, Swinnen L, Rozental JR, Phuphanich S, Rogers LR, Gutheil JC, Batchelor T, Lyter D, Chamberlain M, Maria BL, Schiffer C, Bashir R, Thomas D, Cowens W, Howell SB. Randomized trial of a slow-release versus a standard formulation of cytarabine for the intrathecal treatment of lymphomatous meningitis. *J Clin Oncol.* 1999;17:3110-3116.

Glass JP, Melamed M, Chernik NL, Posner JB. Malignant cells in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF): the meaning of a positive CSF cytology. *Neurology*. 1979;29:1369-1375.

Gleissner B, Chamberlain M. Treatment of CNS dissemination in systemic lymphoma. *J Neurooncol*. 2007; 84:107-117.

REFERENCES

Gleissner B, Chamberlain MC. Neoplastic meningitis. *Lancet Neurol.* 2006;5:443-452.

Gleissner B, Siehl J, Korfel A, Reinhardt R, Thiel E. CSF evaluation in primary CNS lymphoma patients by PCR of the CDR III IgH genes. *Neurology*. 2002;58:390-396.

Grossman SA, Finkelstein DM, Ruckdeschel JC, Trump DL, Moynihan T, Ettinger DS. Randomized prospective comparison of intraventricular methotrexate and thiotepa in patients with previously untreated neoplastic meningitis. Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. *J Clin Oncol.* 1993; 11:561-569.

Groves MD, Baumgartner KE, Conrad CA, Chamberlain M, Hsu S, Glantz M, Gilbert M, Forman A, Puduvalli V, Colman H, Yung A. A phase II study of intrathecal topotecan in patients with meningeal malignancies. *Neurology*. 2004; 62:475 [Abstract].

Hitchins RN, Bell DR, Woods RL, Levi JA. A prospective randomized trial of single-agent versus combination chemotherapy in meningeal carcinomatosis. *J Clin Oncol.* 1987;5:1655-1662.

Jaeckle KA. Neoplastic meningitis from systemic malignancies: diagnosis, prognosis and treatment. Semin Oncol. 2006;33:312-323.

Kaplan JG, DeSouza TG, Farkash A, Shafran B, Pack D, Rehman F, Fuks J, Portenoy R. Leptomeningeal metastases: comparison of clinical features and laboratory data of solid tumors, lymphomas and leukemias. *J Neurol Oncol*. 1990; 9:225-229.

Laufman LR, Forsthoefel KF. Use of intrathecal trastuzumab in a patient with carcinomatous meningitis. *Clin Breast Cancer*. 2001;2:235.

NCCN Guidelines. Central and nervous system cancers. V.2.2006; Available at:

http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/PDF/cns.pdf Accessed February 5, 2007.

Olson ME, Chernik, NL, Posner JB. Infiltration of the leptomeninges by systemic cancer: a clinical and pathologic study. *Arch Neurol.* 1974;30:122-137.

Omuro AM, Lallana EC, Bilsky MH, DeAngelis LM. Ventriculoperitoneal shunt in patients with leptomeningeal metastasis. *Neurology*. 2005;64:1625-1627.

Rubenstein JL, Fridlyand J, Abrey L, Shen A, Karch J, Wang E, Issa S, Damon L, Prados M, McDermott M, O'Brien J, Haqq C, Shuman M. Phase I study of intraventricular administration of rituximab in patients with recurrent CNS and intraocular lymphoma. *J Clin Oncol.* 2007;25:1350-1356.

Shapiro WR, Schmid M, Glantz M, Miller JJ. A randomized phase III/IV study to determine benefit and safety of cytarabine liposome injection for treatment of neoplastic meningitis. 2006 ASCO Annual Meeting Proceedings Part I. *J Clin Oncol.* 2006;24 (June 6 Suppl):1528.

Slavc I, Schuller E, Falger J, Günes M, Pillwein K, Czech T, Dietrich W, Rössler K, Dieckmann K, Prayer D, Hainfellner J. Feasibility of long-term intraventricular therapy with mafosfamide (n=26) and etoposide (n=11): experience in 26 children with disseminated malignant brain tumors. J Neurooncol. 2003;64:239-247.

Theodore WH, Gendelman S. Meningeal carcinomatosis. *Arch Neurol.* 1981;38:696-699.

Trump DL, Grossman SA, Thompson G, Murray K. CSF infections complicating the management of neoplastic meningitis: clinical features and results of therapy. *Arch Intern Med.* 1982;142:583-586.

Wasserstrom WR, Glass JP, Posner, JB. Diagnosis and treatment of leptomeningeal metastases from solid tumors: experience with 90 patients. *Cancer.* 1982;49:759-772.

Wong F, Groves M, Conrad C, et al. A phase I study of intraventricular injection of I-131 sodium iodide in patients with leptomeningeal metastases. *Neurology*. 2006;66 [Abstract EV 6.002].

NOTES