



Guest Editorial

Pros and Cons of Alpha versus Beta Bone Seeking Agents in the Treatment of Cancer Pain

Knut Liepe¹¹Department of Nuclear Medicine, Klinikum Frankfurt (Oder), Brandenburg, Germany

World J Nuclear Med 2023;22:255–256.

Skeletal metastases occur in many types of solid malignant tumors, especially in advanced stage of prostate, breast, and lung cancers. The resulting bone pain affects patient's quality of life and requires effective treatment. Only osteoblastic bone metastases are suitable for treatment with bone-seeking agents. Typical tumors are prostate cancer with 65 to 85% of bone metastases, breast cancer with 65 to 75%, and small cell lung cancer with 34 to 50%, respectively.¹ The mechanisms involved in bone pain are poorly understood,² but are likely to be a consequence of osteolysis (bone breakdown).³ Infiltration of the bone trabeculae and matrix by tumor osteolysis is one of the physical factors. Pain may result from instability-based microfractures and stretching of the periosteum by tumor growth.⁴ The pathophysiological mechanisms of pain include stimulation of free nerve endings in the endosteum by a variety of chemical mediators like bradykinin, prostaglandin, histamine, interleukin, and tumor necrosis factor.^{4,5}

Currently, the majority of researchers prefer α emitters, which are highly effective, requiring one to four deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA) hits to evoke cell death, compared with β emitters, which require greater than 1,000 DNA hits.⁶ Alphas have the advantage of high linear energy transfer and a short range, enabling moderate bone marrow toxicity. Alphas have the disadvantage of a short range from 40 to 100 μm . Therefore alphas can interact only with four to six cell lines.⁷ In therapies such as prostate-specific membrane antigen (PSMA) or DOTA-TOC ([DOTA(0)-Phe(1)-Tyr(3)]octreotide) that guide α emitters directly to tumor cells, the short range can be discussed as an advantage.⁸ In therapies like bone pain palliation or microsphere therapy, radionuclides are deposited in the tissue surrounding the tumor. Here, the short range of α emitters is considered a disadvantage and a longer range of β emitters might lead to higher doses of tumor absorbed. A long range leads to higher rates of crossfire and affects cells in greater distance from the source. It can be supposed that the higher the energy of β radiation is, the higher is the bone marrow toxicity.

Interestingly, clinical data show this neither in a direct comparison of ^{188}Re -HEDP (E_{max} 2.12 MeV) and ^{153}Sm -EDTMP (E_{max} 0.81 MeV)⁹ nor in dose calculation.¹⁰ In future, more dosimetric data of radiation-absorbed doses to tumor and surrounding tissue are needed to compare therapeutically relevant α and β emitters.

A possible reason for theoretical and in vivo differences is the bystander effect. Blyth and Sykes defined bystander response as “radiation-induced, signal-mediated effects in un-irradiated cells within an irradiated volume.”¹¹ These signal mediated bystander effects include cell death, DNA damage, chromatid aberrations, genomic instability, transformation, differentiation, proliferation, gene expression, cell cycle, invasion, and radio-adaptive responses.¹² The primary mechanisms involved are release of signaling molecules¹³ and direct intercellular communication via gap junctions.¹⁴ Cell proximity has also been shown to be necessary for proliferative bystander responses.¹⁵ Reactive oxygen species, reactive nitrogen species, calcium, and cytokines have been implicated in bystander signaling.¹⁶ Cell proximity is necessary for proliferative bystander responses.¹⁵

Overall survival is the most important outcome for patients and clinicians. The well-designed randomized Alpharadin in Symptomatic Prostate Cancer Patients (ALSYMPCA) trial showed a survival benefit of 3.6 months for the α emitter ^{223}Ra .¹⁷ Trials aiming in determination of overall survival are limited for β emitters. Biersack et al¹⁸ showed in a small study a prolongation of overall survival from 4.5 to 15.7 months after three cycles of ^{188}Re -HEDP compared with a single treatment.

An interesting therapeutic strategy may be the combination of α and β emitters or the combination of tumor- and bone-guided tracers, for example, ^{223}Ra and ^{177}Lu -PSMA.¹⁹ For nuclear medicine to become a key player in pain palliation and systemic tumor therapy, we need well-designed trials like ALSYMPCA²⁰ or VISION²¹ aimed at determining the overall survival and comparison studies like Therap²² to establish our methods.

Address for correspondence DOI <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0043-1774731>
Prof. Dr. Knut Liepe, MHBA, ISSN 1450-1147.
Department of Nuclear Medicine, Klinikum Frankfurt (Oder),
Klinikum Frankfurt (Oder), Muellroser Chaussee 7, 15236
Frankfurt (Oder), Germany
(e-mail: knut.liepe@klinikumffo.de).

© 2023. The Author(s).

This is an open access article published by Thieme under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction so long as the original work is properly cited. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)
Thieme Medical and Scientific Publishers Pvt. Ltd., A-12, 2nd Floor, Sector 2, Noida-201301 UP, India

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

References

- 1 Juzeniene A, Stenberg VY, Bruland ØS, Revheim ME, Larsen RH. Dual targeting with $^{224}\text{Ra}/^{212}\text{Pb}$ -conjugates for targeted alpha therapy of disseminated cancers: a conceptual approach. *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2023;9:1051825
- 2 Mantyh PW, Clohisy DR, Koltzenburg M, Hunt SP. Molecular mechanisms of cancer pain. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2002;2(03):201–209
- 3 Mundy GR. Metastasis to bone: causes, consequences and therapeutic opportunities. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2002;2(08):584–593
- 4 Serafini AN. Current status of systemic intravenous radiopharmaceuticals for the treatment of painful metastatic bone disease. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 1994;30(05):1187–1194
- 5 Nielsen OS, Munro AJ, Tannock IF. Bone metastases: pathophysiology and management policy. *J Clin Oncol* 1991;9(03):509–524
- 6 Liepe K. Radium-223 chloride in bone pain treatment of prostate cancer. *Der Nuklearmediziner*. 2015;38(02):131–137
- 7 Kassis AI. Therapeutic radionuclides: biophysical and radiobiologic principles. *Semin Nucl Med* 2008;38(05):358–366
- 8 Koh TT, Bezak E, Chan D, Cehic G. Targeted alpha-particle therapy in neuroendocrine neoplasms: a systematic review. *World J Nucl Med* 2021;20(04):329–335
- 9 Liepe K, Kotzerke J. A comparative study of ^{188}Re -HEDP, ^{186}Re -HEDP, ^{153}Sm -EDTMP and ^{89}Sr in the treatment of painful skeletal metastases. *Nucl Med Commun* 2007;28(08):623–630
- 10 Liepe K, Murray I, Flux G. Dosimetry of bone seeking beta emitters for bone pain palliation metastases. *Semin Nucl Med* 2022;52(02):178–190
- 11 Blyth BJ, Sykes PJ. Radiation-induced bystander effects: what are they, and how relevant are they to human radiation exposures? *Radiat Res* 2011;176(02):139–157
- 12 Brady D, O'Sullivan JM, Prise KM. What is the role of the bystander response in radionuclide therapies? *Front Oncol* 2013;3:215
- 13 Mothersill C, Seymour C. Medium from irradiated human epithelial cells but not human fibroblasts reduces the clonogenic survival of unirradiated cells. *Int J Radiat Biol* 1997;71(04):421–427
- 14 Azzam EI, de Toledo SM, Gooding T, Little JB. Intercellular communication is involved in the bystander regulation of gene expression in human cells exposed to very low fluences of alpha particles. *Radiat Res* 1998;150(05):497–504
- 15 Gerashchenko BI, Howell RW. Cell proximity is a prerequisite for the proliferative response of bystander cells co-cultured with cells irradiated with gamma-rays. *Cytometry A* 2003;56(02):71–80
- 16 Prise KM, O'Sullivan JM. Radiation-induced bystander signalling in cancer therapy. *Nat Rev Cancer* 2009;9(05):351–360
- 17 Parker C, Sartor O. Radium-223 in prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2013;369(17):1659–1660
- 18 Biersack HJ, Palmedo H, Andris A, et al. Palliation and survival after repeated $(^{188}\text{Re})\text{HEDP}$ therapy of hormone-refractory bone metastases of prostate cancer: a retrospective analysis. *J Nucl Med* 2011;52(11):1721–1726
- 19 Kostos L, Buteau JP, Yeung T, et al. AlphaBet: combination of radium-223 and $[^{177}\text{Lu}]\text{Lu-PSMA-I\&T}$ in men with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (clinical trial protocol). *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2022;9:1059122
- 20 Parker CC, Pascoe S, Chodacki A, et al. A randomized, double-blind, dose-finding, multicenter, phase 2 study of radium chloride (Ra 223) in patients with bone metastases and castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2013;63(02):189–197
- 21 Sartor O, de Bono J, Chi KN, et al; VISION Investigators. Lutetium-177-PSMA-617 for metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2021;385(12):1091–1103
- 22 Hofman MS, Emmett L, Sandhu S, et al; TheraP Trial Investigators and the Australian and New Zealand Urogenital and Prostate Cancer Trials Group. $[^{177}\text{Lu}]\text{Lu-PSMA-617}$ versus cabazitaxel in patients with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (TheraP): a randomised, open-label, phase 2 trial. *Lancet* 2021;397(10276):797–804