Stereotactic radiation treatment for recurrent nonbenign meningiomas
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Object. The authors analyzed the results of stereotactic radiosurgery (SRS) and stereotactic radiotherapy (SRT) for the treatment of recurrent meningiomas that were described at initial resection as showing aggressive, atypical, or malignant features (nonbenign).

Methods. Twenty-five patients who underwent SRS and/or SRT for nonbenign meningiomas between December 1992 and August 2004 were included. Thirteen of these patients underwent treatment for multiple primary or recurrent lesions. In all, 52 tumors were treated. All histological sections were reviewed and reclassified according to World Health Organization (WHO) 2000 guidelines as benign (Grade I), atypical (Grade II), or anaplastic (Grade III) meningiomas. The median follow-up period was 42 months.

Seventeen (68%) of the cases were reclassified as follows: WHO Grade I (five cases), Grade II (11 cases), and Grade III (one case). Malignant progression occurred in eight cases (32%) during the follow-up period; these cases were considered as a separate group. The 3-year progression-free survival (PFS) rates for the Grades I, II, and III, and malignant progression groups were 100, 83, 0, and 11%, respectively (p < 0.001). In the Grade II group, the 3-year PFS rates for patients treated with SRS and SRT were 100 and 33%, respectively (p = 0.1). After initial treatment, 22 new tumors required treatment using SRS or SRT; 17 (77%) of them occurred inside the original resection cavity. Symptomatic edema developed in one patient (4%).

Conclusions. Stereotactic radiation treatment provided effective local control of “aggressive” Grade I and Grade II meningiomas, whereas Grade III lesions were associated with poor outcome. The outcome of cases in the malignant progression group was intermediate between that of the Grade II and Grade III groups, with the lesions showing a tendency toward malignancy.
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Abbreviations used in this paper: EBRT = external-beam radiation therapy; GKS = Gamma Knife surgery; MR = magnetic resonance; PFS = progression-free survival; SRS = stereotactic radiosurgery; SRT = stereotactic radiotherapy; WHO = World Health Organization.
Stereotactic radiation for recurrent nonbenign meningiomas

and malignant meningiomas were treated with either of these modalities.\textsuperscript{9,15,16,17,33,36,45}

In this retrospective study we assessed the results of SRS and SRT in a selected group of patients with recurrent meningiomas not considered benign at initial resection. The data were analyzed after a histological reassessment of the tumors according to the WHO 2000 classification system.

Clinical Material and Methods

Patient Population

The radiosurgery database of the University of California at Los Angeles was retrospectively reviewed. Between December 1992 and August 2004, 395 patients underwent SRS or SRT for treatment of meningiomas. We selected a group of 31 patients who had a history of meningioma resection and recurrence before stereotactic radiation treatment. The majority of tumors were originally classified as atypical or malignant. Tumors described with less defined terms, such as “meningioma with cytological atypia,” “focally aggressive,” or “atypical/malignant features,” were also included. Three patients were excluded because of inadequate follow up. The microscopic slides or blocks from the remaining cases were collected for review, including those from patients who underwent surgery at another facility. Three other patients were excluded for the following reasons: no slide available (one patient), suboptimal specimen (one patient), and diagnosis of a melanoma (one patient).

The histological sections from tumors resected in the 25 remaining patients were analyzed without reference to the previous diagnosis or outcome and were reclassified according to WHO 2000 criteria as benign (Grade I), atypical (Grade II), or anaplastic (Grade III) meningiomas.\textsuperscript{9} In cases involving patients who underwent multiple surgeries, we performed a careful analysis of all microscopic slides searching for evidence of malignant progression during the follow-up period. The clinical records were closely examined to identify treatment plan details and complications. Only patients who were followed up for at least 2 years or who were found to have evidence of progression on neuroimages obtained earlier than 2 years after the initial tumor resection were included in this study.

The patient characteristics are summarized in Table 1. Fourteen women and 11 men were included in the study. Their mean age at the time of their first stereotactic radiation treatment was 53 years (range 27–79 years). In the majority of the cases (17 of 25), treatment was indicated on the basis of postsurgical follow-up imaging examinations. Eight patients presented for evaluation as a result of primary complaints as follows: headaches (two patients), cognitive dysfunction (two patients), sixth cranial nerve palsy (two patients), seizure (one patient), and sensory/motor deficit (one patient). All patients in the study group had previously undergone resections (median one resection, range one–three resections). Two patients had undergone EBRT and one patient had undergone proton-beam radiation therapy before undergoing stereotactic radiation treatment in our institution. Two other patients had radiation-induced meningiomas due to previously treated leukemia and nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Three patients received chemotherapy during the follow-up period as part of a clinical trial.

Stereotactic Radiation Treatment

The stereotactic radiation treatment technique used in the management of meningiomas at our institution has been described elsewhere.\textsuperscript{7,42,46} For the SRS treatments, a BRW (Radinics) or a BrainLAB (BrainLAB AG) stereotactic frame was placed after administration of a local anesthetic. A custom-fitted thermoplastic mask (U-PLAST, BrainLAB AG) was used for immobilization during the SRT procedures.

The tumors were localized using previously acquired 3-mm-slice MR images, which were fused with the computed tomography scans obtained on the treatment day. Three-dimensional treatment plans were generated using commercially available software (BrainLAB).

The radiation was delivered using a Clinac 18 linear accelerator (Varian, Inc.) in five patients treated during the period from 1990 to 1996. Two patients were treated with a dedicated Varian 600 SR linear accelerator (Varian, Inc.) between 1996 and 1998. The Novalis (BrainLAB AG) dedicated system with miniature multileaf collimator capability has been used since 1997 in our institution, and that unit was used to treat 18 patients in this series.

During the follow-up period, 13 patients (52%) underwent treatment for multiple tumors due to the development of new tumors (nine patients), the presence of multiple tumors at presentation (two patients), or both (two patients). A total of 52 tumors were treated in 25 patients. Tumor locations were as follows: convexity (22 tumors), skull base (17 tumors), and parasagittal region (13 tumors). In all, 40 treatment sessions were performed. Thirty-eight tumors were treated in 26 sessions of SRS, and the remaining 14 tumors were treated with SRT. The median treatment volumes were 2.2 cm\textsuperscript{3} (range 0.11–65.2 cm\textsuperscript{3}) for SRS and 21.3 cm\textsuperscript{3} (range 1.3–57.1 cm\textsuperscript{3}) for SRT. The peripheral doses ranged from 12 to 18 Gy (median 15.5 Gy) for SRS and 25 to 54 Gy (median 49.3 Gy) for SRT, delivered in 25 to 28 daily fractions (Table 2). One patient received five fractions of 5 Gy for each of two lesions.

Follow-Up Imaging

Follow-up imaging consisted of Gd-enhanced MR imaging examinations performed within 3 months of the procedure and then every 6 months thereafter or sooner if indicated. After the second postoperative year, MR imaging studies were performed annually. The median duration of clinical and imaging follow up was 42 months (range 3–119 months). The MR images were reviewed to determine success or failure of local control and identify any radiation-induced changes. Treatment was considered to have failed when an increase in lesion size was observed in any follow-up image.

Statistical Analysis

The PFS rate was determined on the basis of the length of time from stereotactic radiation treatment to the appearance of evidence of local recurrence. Survival was measured as the time from the end of a patient’s first radiation treatment to the date of his or her death. The Kaplan–Meier method was used to plot PFS for each histological grade and radiation modality (SRS or SRT). Analyses were conducted using the survival library of R statistical software version 2.1.1 (2005; http://www.r-project.org).

J. Neurosurg. / Volume 106 / May, 2007
Results

Histological Analysis

The histological analysis of lesions from patients who underwent multiple surgeries in this series revealed that eight patients (32%) had malignant progression during the follow-up period (Table 3). Four patients had initially benign tumors that evolved to atypical (in two cases) or malignant (in two cases). Three additional patients had documented malignant progression following the diagnosis of atypical meningioma. In one patient the histological characteristics of recurrences progressed from benign to atypical and from atypical to malignant. Overall, 18 tumors were treated in the patients who underwent multiple surgeries. Grouping these tumors according to the grade established at the time of stereotactic radiation treatment yields the following distribution: Grade I, nine lesions; Grade II, four lesions; and Grade III, five lesions. The rates of local control of these lesions at 2-year follow up were: Grade I, 33%; Grade II, 25%; and Grade III, 20%. Since we could not provide a plausible biological rationale for this response to treatment, we decided to group all lesions in which malignant progression occurred as a separate category. Therefore, the patients in this study were ultimately categorized as follows: patients with Grade I tumors, five (20%); patients with Grade II lesions, 11 (44%); patient with a Grade III tumor, 1 (4%); and patients with lesions that showed malignant progression, eight (32%). Additionally, the individual lesions were distributed as follows: Grade I, five lesions; Grade II, 24 lesions; Grade III, five lesions; and malignant progression, 18 lesions (Table 4).

Tumor Control

Grade I Meningiomas. In all five patients in the Grade I group, harboring one lesion each, local control was achieved, with no other lesions developing after treatment with SRS (three patients) or SRT (two patients) (Table 4). The 3-year PFS was 100% for patients with tumors of this grade. The histopathological features of these tumors are summarized in Table 5.

Grade II Meningiomas. Among the 11 patients with Grade II meningiomas, five (45%) underwent additional stereotactic radiation treatment for nine new lesions arising inside (eight lesions) or outside (one lesion) the original resection cavity and outside the original radiation field (Fig. 1). Of the 24 lesions treated, four (17%) recurred within the field. Treatment failure was observed in two of 19 lesions treated using SRS and in two of five lesions treated using SRT. The 3-year PFS rates for patients with SRS- and SRT-treated Grade II lesions were 100 and 33%, respectively (Table 4). The combined 3-year PFS rate for the two treatment modalities was 83%.

Grade III Meningiomas. One patient with Grade III lesions treated with SRS without previous EBRT had poor tumor control. Eight months after SRS, he presented with a local recurrence of a convexity lesion and underwent SRS treatment for three new lesions outside the original surgical cavity and one lesion involving the previously irradiated tumor. Treatment failure was evident in all of these lesions 4 to 7 months after treatment. Thus, the 1-year PFS was 0% for Grade III meningiomas (Table 4).

Meningiomas Characterized by Malignant Progression. Among the eight patients presenting with meningiomas with malignant progression, five (63%) underwent treatment for nine new lesions arising outside (one lesion) or

TABLE 1
Characteristics of 25 patients*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>median follow up (mos)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age (yrs)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>27-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>14 (56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior radiation treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBRT</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proton-beam radiation therapy</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imaging follow up</td>
<td>17 (68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>headaches</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognitive dysfunction</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN VI palsy</td>
<td>2 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seizure</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensory/motor deficit</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Values represent the number of patients unless otherwise indicated. Abbreviation: CN VI = sixth cranial nerve.

TABLE 2
Treatment characteristics for 52 tumors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>location (no. of tumors [%])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convexity</td>
<td>22 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skull base</td>
<td>17 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parasagittal region</td>
<td>13 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatment modality (no. of tumors [%])</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>38 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT</td>
<td>14 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS treatment vol (cm³)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>0.11–65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS peripheral dose (Gy)</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>12–18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT treatment vol (cm³)</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>1.3–57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT peripheral dose (Gy)</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>range</td>
<td>25–54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Tumor grades according to WHO 2000 reclassification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>No. of Cases (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td>5 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td>11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malignant progression</td>
<td>8 (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade I to Grade II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade I to Grade III</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II to Grade III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade I to Grade II &amp; Grade II to Grade III</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inside (eight lesions) the original resection cavity. Three of these lesions involved a tumor previously irradiated by SRS (two lesions) or SRT (one lesion). Of the 18 lesions treated, 16 (89%) recurred. Treatment failure was observed in all 11 lesions treated with SRS, whereas treatment failure was observed in only five of the seven lesions treated with SRT (Fig. 2). Additionally, local treatment failure was observed in all three lesions retreated for growth inside the field originally treated by means of SRS. The 3-year PFS rates for patients with SRS- and SRT-treated lesions were estimated at 9 and 14%, respectively (Table 4). The 1- and 3-year PFS rates for the two treatment modalities combined were 61 and 11%, respectively.

In summary, 11 of the 25 patients developed 22 new tumors, 17 inside and five outside the original surgical resection cavity, after initial stereotactic radiation treatment. The PFS curves for the four groups—the three WHO 2000 grades and the cases involving lesions that showed evidence of malignant progression—considering SRS and SRT combined, are shown in Fig. 3. The difference between these curves was statistically significant (p < 0.001).

### Clinical Response

Twenty patients (80%) were clinically stable after treatment. Two patients (8%) had symptomatic improvement of a sixth cranial nerve palsy (one patient) and seizures (one patient). Symptom progression was observed in three patients (12%); in all three cases it was associated with tumor progression as seen in imaging studies. One patient who underwent SRT for treatment of a Grade II cavernous sinus and Meckel’s cave meningioma experienced an increase in facial numbness 14 months after treatment. One patient who underwent SRT for treatment of what was initially a Grade I lesion, a sphenoid wing meningioma that extended into the orbit and cavernous sinus, had loss of vision as well as ophthalmoplegia in the left eye associated with tumor progression 19 months after treatment. Histological examination was performed after a new resection, and the lesion was found to have the characteristics of a Grade II meningioma. Another patient, who underwent SRS for treatment of a recurrent tentorial Grade III meningioma, experienced vision worsening due to perilesional edema and local mass effect caused by tumor progression in the area of the occipital pole.

In total, six patients had died by the last follow up. In three cases, the cause of death was related to tumor progression, including one case in which the patient developed an intraparenchymal hematoma. In two other patients the specific cause of death was not determined, although tumor progression was documented at the last follow-up examination. One patient died of Fournier gangrene. The 3-year survival rates for patients in the Grade I, Grade II, and malignant progression groups were 100, 100, and 57%, respectively. The patient treated for a Grade III meningioma died 17 months after treatment.

### Complications of Treatment

One patient who had undergone whole-brain radiation therapy as a child because of leukemia underwent multiple resections and stereotactic radiation treatment for a radiation-induced meningioma. Malignant transformation was also documented in this case (Fig. 2). The patient was a 29-year-old woman who developed radiation-induced edema and experienced an increase in epileptic activity after undergoing SRT for treatment of a large meningioma. Although the patient experienced clinical improvement after steroid therapy, the lesion was resected due to an increase in mass effect. Another patient developed asymptomatic radiation-induced edema after undergoing SRT for a mar-

---

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of lesions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS failure</td>
<td>0/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT failure</td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr PFS for SRS</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr PFS for SRT</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of lesions</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS failure</td>
<td>2/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT failure</td>
<td>2/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr PFS for SRS</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr PFS for SRT</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of lesions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS failure</td>
<td>5/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT failure</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malignant progression</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS failure</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRT failure</td>
<td>5/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr PFS for SRS</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-yr PFS for SRT</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLE 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen No.</th>
<th>Initial Abnormal Cellularity</th>
<th>Nuclear Pleomorphism</th>
<th>Nucleoli</th>
<th>Other Pathological Findings</th>
<th>Mitotic Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cytopathological atypia</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>pronounced</td>
<td>prominent</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>focally high proliferation rate</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>Ki 67: 15–20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>atypical features</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>pronounced</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>atypical features</td>
<td>focally increased</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>bone invasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>focally aggressive features</td>
<td>focally increased</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>prominent</td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NP = not present.
ginal recurrence of a meningioma that had been treated previously by means of SRS and that had progressed from Grade II to Grade III.

Discussion

The unpredictable behavior of a subset of meningiomas was recognized by Horsley in 1883, Krause in 1910, and Cushing in 1938. Although atypical meningioma was recognized by the WHO classification in 1993, the delineation between the three grades was considered by many to be ill defined. Several previously adopted classification schemes failed to predict behavior of borderline cases. Given the retrospective method of the present report, doubt existed about which histological grade should be considered for the cases demonstrating malignant progression during follow up. The pathology report represents an assessment of the tumor at the time of a given resection and, considering that malignant transformation is a dynamic process, it is impossible to estimate what histological characteristics the tumor had at the exact time of treatment. The data from the present study demonstrate that patients who experienced malignant progression had clinically very aggressive tumors, even when they were considered to be Grade I meningiomas based on their histological characteristics. The finding of 67% local treatment failure at the 2-year follow up in this group of meningiomas after stereotactic radiation treatment suggests that local failure of stereotactic radiation treatment was a predictor of propensity for malignant progression in this series. Furthermore, considering tumors demonstrating malignant progression as a separate group, regardless of histological grade, allowed a distinct, statistically significant clinical correlation for the remaining groups of tumors (WHO Grades I, II, and III). Unfortunately, we could not identify histological features to differentiate this group from others, and including

Malignant Progression Cases

Malignant progression in meningiomas is associated with aggressive behavior of the tumors, and its mechanism is still unclear. The pattern of genetic alterations in these lesions has been shown to include changes in the short arm of chromosome 1 and in the long arms of chromosomes 10 and 14. The incidence rate of 32% in the present study is slightly higher than the rates (range 18–27%) that have been reported in previously published series of cases of atypical and malignant meningiomas. The higher incidence in our study could be related to the selection criteria we used, including only recurrent tumors, as well as the high degree of complexity of the cases referred to our clinic.

Given the retrospective method of the present report, doubt existed about which histological grade should be considered for the cases demonstrating malignant progression during follow up. The pathology report represents an assessment of the tumor at the time of a given resection and, considering that malignant transformation is a dynamic process, it is impossible to estimate what histological characteristics the tumor had at the exact time of treatment.

The data from the present study demonstrate that patients who experienced malignant progression had clinically very aggressive tumors, even when they were considered to be Grade I meningiomas based on their histological characteristics. The finding of 67% local treatment failure at the 2-year follow up in this group of meningiomas after stereotactic radiation treatment suggests that local failure of stereotactic radiation treatment was a predictor of propensity for malignant progression in this series. Furthermore, considering tumors demonstrating malignant progression as a separate group, regardless of histological grade, allowed a distinct, statistically significant clinical correlation for the remaining groups of tumors (WHO Grades I, II, and III). Unfortunately, we could not identify histological features to differentiate this group from others, and including

Fig. 1. Axial MR images obtained in a 78-year-old man who had undergone surgery for a Grade II meningioma 5 years earlier and developed a recurrent lesion (A and B), which was treated using SRS. This lesion was under control 18 months after treatment (C), although 6 months after the first SRS session another lesion was found to have developed inside the original tumor resection cavity (D). A second session of SRS was required for this new lesion (E), which was under control after 1 year of follow up (F).
this subgroup of tumors in the Grade I, II, and III groups would have biased our series. Interestingly, the combination of the relatively high 3-year survival rate of 57% that was observed for patients in the malignant progression group and the low local control rate of 11% at 3 years indicates an intermediate behavior between Grades II and III for these tumors that demonstrated dedifferentiation on histopathological examination.

Al-Mefty et al. recently used fluorescence in situ hybridization to study four cases of meningioma with malignant progression. They found that a complex karyotype involving deletion of 1p and 14q was present “ab initio” in lower-grade tumors that subsequently demonstrated malignant progression, apparently contradicting the stepwise clonal evolution model for dedifferentiated tumors. This finding seems to support our suggestion of classifying those meningiomas as a separate group having its own characteristics. A detailed description of our cases in which malignant progression was present will be reported in a separate study.

The Role of Radiation Treatment in the Management of Nonbenign Meningiomas

External-Beam Radiation Therapy. Surgery is the first-line therapy for nonbenign meningiomas. Although limited by small numbers of patients, the results of retrospective studies have suggested that EBRT might improve outcome in patients with atypical or malignant meningiomas. Nevertheless, the application of different radiation schemes and the variety of classification criteria adopted in the definition of histological malignancy make analysis of the literature difficult. The 5-year local control rates reported by authors of studies on atypical and malignant meningiomas range from 38 to 56% and from 44 to 52%, respectively. Dziuk et al. reported that adjuvant radiation therapy following initial resection of malignant meningiomas increased the 5-year PFS rates from 15 to 80%.

Traditionally, EBRT has been recommended for atypical meningiomas after microsurgery or only for residual tumors. For malignant meningiomas, patients are referred to radiation therapy regardless of the extent of resection. Some authors recommend starting the radiation treatment immediately after surgery.

Higher doses of radiation were reported to achieve better local control rates for atypical and malignant meningiomas, although Katz et al. recently reported a lack of benefit from accelerated hyperfractionated radiotherapy with 60 Gy plus a radiosurgery boost. This treatment scheme was unacceptably toxic and yielded no improvement in local control.

Stereotactic Radiation Treatment. Benign meningiomas have been effectively controlled with SRS or SRT. Five-year local control rates greater than 90%...
have been reported for both techniques.\(^{27,33,45}\) In the present study, we obtained a 3-year PFS rate of 100% for the Grade II tumors. One should note that this group was made up of meningiomas with some aggressive features, which did not, however, fulfill the criteria for WHO Grade II tumors. Some of their histomorphological features have been described as suspicious in the literature: prominent nucleoli,\(^{6,35,38,41}\) nuclear pleomorphism,\(^{5,6,21,26,31,37,41}\) increased cellularity,\(^{10,21,23,29,31,37,38,41}\) and high proliferation rate.\(^{1,10,17,26,35}\)

Few reports that focus on the application of SRS and SRT for treatment of Grades II and III meningiomas provide a clear description of the histological classification system applied. Previously published studies and their various classification systems are summarized in Table 6.

Harris et al.\(^{16}\) obtained 5-year local control rates of 83 and 72% for atypical and malignant meningiomas, respectively, using GKS. Surprisingly, the 5-year survival rate was the same (59%) for both histological types. These results may be due in part to the classification system the authors applied. The great majority of the tumors in their case series were classified with brain invasion considered as a criterion for atypical meningioma.\(^{38}\) Furthermore, malignant progression could play a role in local control rate. We have demonstrated in the current study that better survival rates can be expected in cases with malignant progression, so the fact that progression from lower grades was present in 27% of the cases in the series reported by Harris et al. could explain the high survival rate that they observed in their patients with malignant meningiomas. Similarly, in our previously published series about stereotactic radiation treatment of benign and atypical meningiomas without histological review, a low local control rate of only 38% was found for atypical tumors.\(^{46}\) Therefore, it seems reasonable to identify and exclude these cases when performing analysis of local control and survival for Grades I, II, and III meningiomas.

Huffmann et al.\(^{19}\) used the WHO 2000 classification system in their study of Grade II meningiomas treated by SRS. They reported survival and local control rates of 93 and 95%, respectively, at a median follow up of 35 months and observed that their smallest dose of radiation (15 Gy) was related to local relapse. In the present case series, we obtained local control in all eight Grade II meningiomas treated with doses lower than 15 Gy (range 12–14 Gy). The only two Grade II tumors in which there was local treatment failure were treated with a 16-Gy dose (the mean dose applied for tumors of Grade II histological characteristics). Considering the 3-year PFS rate of 100% that we obtained for Grade II lesions, it seems that higher doses of radiation are not required for treatment of atypical meningiomas.

Ojemann et al.\(^{36}\) reported on 22 patients treated by SRS for malignant meningioma after EBRT. They used the WHO 1993 classification or Jääskeläinen\(^{22}\) classification and obtained a 5-year survival rate of 40% and a PFS rate of 26%. The high rate of radiation necrosis observed in their series (23%) is probably related to the previous EBRT received by all patients. Conversely, only 12% of our patients had previously received EBRT or proton-beam radiation therapy, which could explain our smaller rate of side effects. Moreover, we had a 1-year PFS rate of 0% and a relatively short survival period in our single case of malig-

**TABLE 6**

Reported rates of tumor control and patient survival in cases of Grades II and III meningiomas treated using SRS or SRT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors &amp; Year</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Classification System</th>
<th>Histological Findings</th>
<th>% Cases w/ Tumor Control</th>
<th>% Patients Surviving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hakim et al., 1998</td>
<td>SRS, LINAC</td>
<td>WHO 1993</td>
<td>atypical malignant</td>
<td>67†</td>
<td>22 at 4 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81†</td>
<td>83 at 4 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojemann et al., 2000</td>
<td>SRS, GKS</td>
<td>WHO 1993 or Jääskeläinen, 1986</td>
<td>malignant</td>
<td>26 at 5 yrs</td>
<td>40 at 5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debou et al., 2001</td>
<td>SRT, LINAC</td>
<td>WHO‡</td>
<td>atypical</td>
<td>78 at 3 yrs</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford et al., 2001</td>
<td>SRS, GKS</td>
<td>WHO‡</td>
<td>atypical malignant</td>
<td>0 at 5 yrs</td>
<td>0 at 5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68 at 5 yrs</td>
<td>76 at 5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris et al., 2003</td>
<td>SRS, GKS</td>
<td>Perry et al., 1999</td>
<td>atypical malignant</td>
<td>72 at 5 yrs</td>
<td>59 at 5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83 at 5 yrs</td>
<td>59 at 5 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huffmann et al., 2005</td>
<td>SRS, GKS</td>
<td>WHO 2000</td>
<td>atypical</td>
<td>95 at 3 yrs</td>
<td>93 at 3 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milker-Zabel et al., 2005</td>
<td>SRT, LINAC</td>
<td>WHO‡</td>
<td>atypical</td>
<td>89 at 5 yrs</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* LINAC = linear accelerator; — = data not provided.
† Time frame not specified.
‡ Edition not specified.
Stereotactic radiation for recurrent nonbenign meningiomas

nant meningioma. Similar results were obtained by Staff-
ford et al.\textsuperscript{46} using GKS.

The low control rate achieved with SRT in Grade II me-
ningiomas in the present study is in disagreement with the
5-year PFS rate of 89\% reported by the University of Heid-
elberg group, although they do not specify which WHO
version they used.\textsuperscript{9,33}

The main challenge in the treatment of nonbenign me-
ningiomas is their capability to develop consecutive mul-
tiple local recurrences, usually at the borders or in the vi-
cinity of the first operation.\textsuperscript{4,8,40,44} Thus, the application of
focused stereotactically guided radiation for each new nod-
ule arising in this way seems to be of limited efficacy. This
pattern is demonstrated in the present study, in which 55\%
of the patients with nonbenign meningiomas developed
new lesions after the initial radiation treatment for relapse,
the majority (77\%) of them inside the original tumor bed.
Huffmann et al.\textsuperscript{19} reported that 40\% of patients treated by
SRS for atypical meningiomas developed marginally or
distant recurrent tumors during follow up.

On the basis of the results of the present study, we sug-
gest that at relapse of previously resected atypical or malig-
nant meningiomas the whole cavity should be treated with
stereotactic radiation treatment to reduce the incidence of
further tumor bed relapses, with a radiosurgery boost to the
recurrent nodule if desired. By extrapolation it may be ap-
propriate to treat the tumor cavity right away after initial
surgery to reduce the risk of any relapse. In cases of ex-
tensive tumors, EBRT may be necessary. After tumor bed
irradiation, any recurrent nodules should be approached with
SRS.

The reliability of any classification system has a particu-
lar impact on the study of Grade II meningiomas, consid-
ering that these lesions could be erroneously classified as
Grade I or III by the inclusion or withdrawal of histological
criteria. Given the variety of classifications adopted histor-
ically in the literature and the relatively small number of
series in which the WHO 2000 classification has been ap-
plied, it is difficult to compare the data in the literature. We
believe that the behavior and treatment response of menin-
giomas will only be understood when an accurate classifi-
cation system is universally adopted.

Conclusions

Both SRS and SRT were associated with acceptable
local control and survival rates in “aggressive” Grade I and
Grade II meningiomas in our study, whereas our patient
with Grade III lesions had poor local control and survival.

Once a nonbenign meningioma has recurred, further re-
currence, mainly inside the original tumor resection cavity,
is relatively common. This finding suggests that at recur-
rence the whole cavity should receive radiation therapy.

The behavior of lesions demonstrating malignant pro-
gression was intermediate between that of Grade II and
Grade III lesions; the success of local control of these
lesions tended to be more like that of malignant lesions than
that of atypical lesions, but the survival rate for patients
with lesions demonstrating malignant potential was rela-
tively high. When we considered those lesions as a separate
grade, the WHO 2000 classification provided good clinical
correlation in Grades I, II, and III meningiomas.

Failure of stereotactic radiation treatment in Grade I me-
ningiomas was a predictor of malignant transformation in
this case series.

Disclosure

Dr. De Salles is a member of the BrainLAB speakers bureau. Dr.
Gorgulho is supported in part by a fellowship from BrainLAB.

References

1. Abramovich CM, Prayson RA: MIB-1 labeling indices in benign,
aggressive, and malignant meningiomas: a study of 90 tumors. 
Hum Pathol 29:1420–1427, 1998
2. Al-Mefty O, Kadri PA, Pravdenkova S, Sawyer JR, Stangeby C,
Husain M: Malignant progression in meningioma: documentation
of a series and analysis of cytogenetic findings. J Neurosurg 101:
210–218, 2004
M, Kim SM, et al: Fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy for the
treatment of optic nerve sheath meningiomas: preliminary obser-
vations of 33 optic nerves in 30 patients with historical compari-
son to observation with or without prior surgery. Neurosurgery
51(8):900–904, 2002
4. Borovich B, Doron Y, Braun J, Guilbund JN, Zaaroor M, Goldshe-
der D, et al: Recurrence of intracranial meningiomas: the role played
by regional multicentricity. Part 2: Clinical and radiological as-
5. Cerda-Nicolas M, Lopez-Gines C, Perez-Bacete M, Barcia-Salor-
io JL, Llombart-Bosch A: Histopathological and cytogenetic find-
ings in benign, atypical and anaplastic human meningiomas: a
6. de la Monte SM, Flickinger J, Linggood RM: Histopathologic fea-
tures predicting recurrence of meningiomas following subtotal re-
7. De Salles AA, Frighetto L, Grande CV, Solberg TD, Cabatan-
Awang C, Selch MT, et al: Radiosurgery and stereotactic radia-
tion therapy of skull base meningiomas: proposal of a grading sys-
8. de Vries J, Wakhloo AK: Repeated multifocal recurrence of grade
I, grade II, and grade III meningiomas: regional multicentricity
(primary new growth) or metastases? Surg Neurol 41:299–305,
1994
et al: High efficacy of fractionated stereotactic radiotherapy of
19:3547–3553, 2001
10. Devaprasath A, Chacko G: Diagnostic validity of the Ki-67 label-
ing index using the MIB-1 monoclonal antibody in the grading of
al: Factors predicting local tumor control after gamma knife ste-
reotactic radiotherapy for benign intracranial meningiomas. Int J
Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 60:1515–1519, 2004
WS, et al: Malignant meningioma: an indication for initial ag-
gressive surgery and adjuvant radiotherapy. J Neurooncol 37:
177–188, 1998
irradiation for subtotally resected meningiomas. A retrospective
analysis of 140 patients treated from 1967 to 1990. J Neurosurg
80:195–201, 1994
Local control and overall survival in atypical meningioma: a ret-
MP, et al: Results of linear accelerator-based radiosurgery for in-

J. Neurosurg. / Volume 106 / May, 2007
853