

League of Nations.

---

1937-39. III. 2.2.3.

21065

C O N T E N T S .

1. Annual Report on the Results of Radiotherapy  
in Cancer of the Uterine Cervix. Vol.I.  
Statements of Results obtained in 1930  
and previous years (collated in 1936)  
Ed. by J. Heyman. (1937.III.2.) 74pp.
2. dto Vol. II. Results obtained in 1931  
(collated in 1937.) (1938.III.2.) 94pp.
3. dto Vol.III. Results obtained in 1932  
(collated in 1938)(1939.III.3.) 148pp.

-----

Official No. : C. H. 1225

Geneva, July 1937.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

HEALTH ORGANISATION

---

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF  
RADIOTHERAPY IN CANCER OF THE  
UTERINE CERVIX

---

First Volume

STATEMENTS OF  
RESULTS OBTAINED IN 1930 AND  
PREVIOUS YEARS  
(collated in 1936)

*Edited by :*  
J. HEYMAN, M.D.  
Stockholm

Series of League of Nations Publications

---

III. HEALTH  
1937. III. 2.

## PREFACE

---

The radiological treatment of cancer of the uterine cervix has formed the subject of a study by the Radiological Sub-Commission of the Cancer Commission of the Health Committee, which initiated an enquiry, some of the results of which appear in the following report.

The Health Organisation desires to record its gratitude to all those who have undertaken the laborious work of collecting the detailed clinical and other data necessary for the compilation of tabular matter of the kind here presented, including, not only those whose statements appear in the report, but also many others who, by adopting the methods of recording advocated by the Sub-Commission, have facilitated the acquisition of more exact knowledge of the results obtained in radiation therapy of cervical cancer.

The Health Organisation wishes also to acknowledge its indebtedness to the Advisory Committee (Dr. J. HEYMAN, Radiumhemmet, Stockholm; Dr. A. LACASSAGNE, the Radium Institute of the University, Paris; and Lt.-Col. A. B. SMALLMAN, Ministry of Health, London) for the care bestowed upon the preparation of this report, the first of a series devoted to this important subject.

*(Health Section, League of Nations.)*

---

# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY .....	7
II. COLLABORATION IN PROVISION OF MATERIAL FOR ANNUAL REPORTS .....	9
III. SOURCES OF ERROR IN STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF TREATMENT .....	11
IV. ANNUAL REPORT.	
The first annual report comprises:	
1. Notes for the Guidance of Collaborators .....	15
2. Specimens of the Tables used for Cases treated in 1930 .....	17
3. Specimens of the Tables used for Cases treated in Previous Years .....	21
4. Definition of the Different Varieties of Utero-vaginal Carcinoma .....	23
5. Definition of the Stages of Cancer of the <i>Cervix uteri</i> .	25
6. Statements :	
(a) The Centre des Tumeurs de l'Université de Bruxelles, Belgium .....	27
(Contributed by Professor J. MURDOCH.)	
(b) The Liverpool Radium Institute, England ....	34
(Contributed by Dr. P. MALPAS.)	
(c) The Marie Curie Hospital, London, England ...	41
(Contributed by Dr. Elizabeth HURDON.)	

	PAGE
<i>(d)</i> Radium Centre for Carcinoma of the Uterus, London County Council, England . . . . . (Contributed by Sir Comyns BERKELEY.)	48
<i>(e)</i> The Institut du Radium de l'Université de Paris, France . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. A. LACASSAGNE.)	55
<i>(f)</i> The Radiumhemmet, Stockholm, Sweden . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. J. HEYMAN.)	65

---

## I. INTRODUCTORY.

---

In 1928, the Radiological Sub-Commission of the Cancer Commission of the Health Committee was invited to report, among other things, upon the possibility of presenting uniform statistical statements on the results obtained by radio-therapeutic methods in the treatment of cancer of the uterine cervix.

The Sub-Commission recognised that reliable information regarding the results obtained by different methods could be procured only if those results were recorded in a uniform way, and the task of formulating rules designed to facilitate the presentation of exact and comparable statistics was entrusted to Dr. J. HEYMAN, Stockholm, Dr. A. LACASSAGNE, Paris, and Professor F. VOLTZ, Munich. The four matters which the experts considered to be particularly important were :

- (1) The classification of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma;
- (2) The grouping of carcinomata of the *cervix uteri* into different stages according to the extent of the growth;
- (3) The data which are essential in a report dealing statistically with the results of radiation treatment of cancer of the cervix together with the method which should be employed in calculating results obtained by treatment;
- (4) A scheme for setting out the details of the technique employed.

The experts' suggestions were adopted in a slightly modified form by the Sub-Commission, and published in April 1929 (document C.H.788; Ser. L.o.N. P. 1929.III.5).

The recommendations made by the Radiological Sub-Commission for recording, collecting and analysing material for the purpose in view were adopted in several countries. In July 1934, the Health Organisation convened at Zurich a Conference of former members of the Sub-Commission and other experts to advise as to the lines on which further action should be pursued.

The Conference recommended that analyses of the results of treatment by radio-therapy in cancer of the uterine cervix estimated after a period of observation of five, six, seven or more years should be issued annually by the Health Organisation in the form of reports. It was affirmed that "the primary object of the proposed annual statistical reports" should be "to provide a convenient work of reference for those who need to know what can be said statistically in regard to the results obtained by the application of radiotherapy to patients suffering from cancer of the *cervix uteri* when the agreed rules for the setting-up of statistics have been observed". The Conference also recommended that the preparation for issue of the annual reports should be entrusted to a small body of experts, an advisory committee.

The recommendations of the Zurich Conference were adopted by the Health Committee in 1935 and in October of the same year the following Advisory Committee was appointed :

*Chairman :*

Dr. J. HEYMAN, Radiumhemmet, Stockholm.

*Members :*

Dr. A. LACASSAGNE, Radium Institute of the University, Paris.

Lt.-Col. A. B. SMALLMAN, Ministry of Health, London.

*Secretary :*

Dr. M. D. MACKENZIE, replaced in July 1936, by

Dr. J. WASSERBERG, of the Health Section of the League of Nations Secretariat, Geneva.

---



## II. COLLABORATION IN PROVISION OF MATERIAL FOR ANNUAL REPORTS.

---

The Advisory Committee recognises that its first annual report must necessarily be of an experimental nature to serve as a guide to its future work; consequently, the statements of results obtained in treatment and included in this report are limited in the main to those clinics and countries which were associated with the earlier work of the Radiological Sub-Commission. A notable exception is that, to the great regret of the Committee, the Universitäts Frauenklinik, Munich, has not been in a position to contribute a statement.

The Committee also recognises that a number of clinics and individual clinicians in certain countries, particularly Great Britain, have for several years past recorded and observed their cases in the way recommended by the Radiological Sub-Commission. Although their series of cases for a single year may not be large enough for statistically reliable findings to be derived from them, the Committee trusts they will continue their valuable work, so that by accumulation, suitably large series will be obtained.

The Committee is empowered to invite the collaboration of institutes or individuals throughout the world, provided their statements are considered suitable for inclusion in the annual reports.

The Chairman,<sup>1</sup> in his capacity as editor of the reports, will undertake all correspondence with collaborators including the collection of annual statements.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. J. HEYMAN, Radiumhemmet, Stockholm.

The Committee has adopted certain rules (see page 15 *et seq.*) for the presentation of data, which collaborators are expected to observe.

It is also expected that the clinical or other relevant records and histological preparations relating to cases included in statistical statements will be available if required for inspection by the Committee or by an authorised representative.

The typewritten statements should reach the Chairman before May 1st each year.

For the present, annual reports will be concerned only with cancer of the *cervix uteri*; the question of widening the scope of future reports to include, for example, analyses of material relating to the *corpus uteri* and the vagina is under consideration.

It is hoped that the annual reports, the first of which is here presented, in the official languages of the League of Nations, will promote the extension and development of the League's previous work on this subject. Organised international collaboration in providing statements for the annual report may be expected to lead to a clearer conception of the problems involved and to provide the experience which is necessary for their solution.

The Committee would like to take this opportunity to invite directors of clinics and others who are interested in this subject to communicate with the Chairman with a view to participation in future reports.

The Committee wishes to add that it would be happy to receive suggestions for improving the annual reports and for promoting the further development of the work to which they relate.

---

### III. SOURCES OF ERROR IN STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF TREATMENT.

---

In spite of many efforts to obtain uniform and comparable statistics on the results of radiation treatment of uterine cancer, some difficulties still remain to be surmounted. The essential ones are due to (1) smallness of the samples for analysis and (2) lack of comparability between the samples of clinical material analysed at the co-operating clinics. These are two sources of error which must be reduced to a minimum before it can be asserted that differences between the results at different clinics are due to differences in the methods of treatment employed.

#### 1. *Smallness of the Samples.*

The degree of variation due to chance depends upon the size of the samples under examination, and, in order to meet this difficulty, the following procedure has been adopted in the present report :

In samples relating to 100 or more cases, although differences due to chance may be considerable, the percentages calculated have a reasonable degree of reliability and are printed in heavy type.

In samples containing from 15 to 100 cases, chance variations are so great that statistically significant differences occur only exceptionally; in these samples, the probable degree of error is stated as determined by a generally agreed formula. The figures are printed in ordinary type.

For samples containing less than 15 cases, percentages are not calculated.

## 2: *Lack of Comparability.*

Comparability, though an essential condition, is inherently difficult to secure, the principal reason for this being the following. Different radio-therapeutic clinics receive for treatment clinical material of unlike composition inasmuch as it contains different proportions of early or of late cases. Broadly speaking, the cause of these differences lies in the fact that, for some clinics, the material is not selected, for others a varying degree of intentional or unintentional selection takes place.

In countries where hospital treatment is provided by the State, clinics are responsible for the treatment of almost every patient from a defined area. There is practically no selection, the only patients not treated being those found unsuitable for treatment owing to the extent of the disease, general condition, etc. This involves nothing more than small differences which, moreover, can be easily estimated, provided all patients are included in the analysis whether treated or not.

Clinics of this type may be assumed to have non-selected and consequently comparable material. Such clinics may appropriately state the result of treatment by using the absolute cure rate—*i.e.*, the proportion the number of patients alive without recurrence forms of the total number examined, stated as a percentage. The absolute cure rate, in one clinic is comparable with that of other clinics similarly circumstanced, but not with that of clinics in which selection necessarily takes place.

In other clinics, a varying degree of selection may occur owing to such factors as inadequacy of facilities for treatment or of bed accommodation for all patients who present themselves, or preference of the physician who first examines the patient for operative or radiation treatment (often depending upon the degree to which radio-therapy has developed) and probably others. In clinics of this type, the composition of the clinical material may differ considerably and the results calculated from the total number of patients would be comparable only in exceptional instances. A comparison between

such clinics is justifiable only when selection similar in kind and degree takes place. To estimate that similarity in selection would, however, be difficult and is hardly possible unless detailed knowledge of the organisation of the different clinics in this respect is available.

When such knowledge is available an over-all relative cure rate (calculated on the total number of patients treated) may have a certain value. It is clear, however, that over-all relative cure rates should be compared only with discrimination.

In order, so far as possible, to meet the difficulty of non-comparability between clinics dealing with selected material, cases have been divided into different groups according to the anatomical spread of the growth. The definitions of these groups—the four stages—are reproduced on page 25. The samples included at different clinics in one and the same "stage" should provide uniform material suitable for comparison. This device for assessing comparability is, however, accompanied by a disadvantage in that different collaborators may interpret the arbitrary rules adopted for allotting cases to the various stages in a different way, thereby defeating to some extent the effort to assess the comparability of the sample. Consequently, cure rates for the different stages of the disease are unreliable unless close similarity of interpretation of the rules for "staging" can be secured in the different clinics under comparison.

The Advisory Committee is aware that different clinicians have interpreted the rules for "staging" differently and is taking steps in association with the Health Organisation of the League of Nations to devise some means whereby these differences of interpretation may be reduced.

Lack of general comparability between the clinical material at different clinics entails also lack of comparability between the cure rates calculated from such material. The Committee realised that such differences would probably exist among the material to which the statements of the collaborators applied and recognised that they would preclude comparison of the different cure rates presented. Nevertheless, those

invited to collaborate in this report were asked to submit all the different rates mentioned—*i.e.*, “absolute” (for clinics where an absolute cure rate is applicable), “relative” and “stage”. Possible rearrangements regarding the procedure thus recommended must be based on further experience which the collaboration in the annual reports will undoubtedly provide.

Two other, although less important problems which may affect the comparability of the clinical material in different clinics have also engaged the attention of the Committee *viz.* :—

(a) Limiting the analysis to cases examined at the clinic, thus excluding those referred to the clinic but not examined;

(b) The need for agreement regarding the classification of certain cases of cancer of the uterus which are difficult to classify as either cancer of the corpus or of the cervix.

It is intended to defer any further examination of these points until consideration has been given to the question of extending the enquiry to include cancer of the corpus and perhaps of the vagina.

---

#### IV. FIRST ANNUAL REPORT.

---

##### 1. NOTES FOR THE GUIDANCE OF COLLABORATORS.

1. The statement should include cases of cancer of the *cervix uteri* only (including carcinoma of the stump).

(a) The statement will be confined to cases where the treatment planned was entirely radiological (radium and Roentgen rays);

(b) Patients operated upon after failure of radiological treatment and alive five years after the beginning of the treatment should appear in Table 4, column 4.

2. The following clinical types of cases should be excluded :

(a) Cancer of the corpus uteri and vagina;<sup>1</sup>

(b) Recurrences after radical operation;

(c) Patients radiologically treated elsewhere;

(d) Patients primarily submitted to combined operative and radiological treatment.

3. Only those series of cases in which all clinical diagnoses have been microscopically confirmed can, as a rule, be accepted.

4. The following histological types of cases should be excluded :

(a) Precancerous conditions;

(b) Chorio-epithelioma, sarcoma, malignant mixed tumours.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is intended to revise, in the future, the definitions of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma. Pending the results of that revision, the definitions used will be those in the Report of the Radiological Sub-Commission (document C.H.788; Ser. L.o.N. P. 1929. III. 5), reprinted on page 23.

5. The statement should relate to the total number of patients whose radiological treatment was begun during the year to which the statement refers as well as all patients examined with a view to treatment but not treated.

6. The statement should not be completed until a period of observation of at least five years from the beginning of the treatment has expired in all cases included.

7. Tables 1 to 6 are intended for the annual statements beginning with 1935 (*i.e.*, cases treated in 1930); tables 7 to 10 have been provided for those institutes which are able to furnish data for an earlier period on a basis corresponding to that being adopted in the present series of annual reports.

---



2. SPECIMENS OF THE TABLES USED FOR  
CASES TREATED IN 1930.

Cancer of the Cervix uteri.

(Institute)

Statement of results in 19.....

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment .....	
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ... ..	
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the Clinic but not treated.<sup>1</sup>*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves. ....	
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	
(d) Operation advised .....	
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	
(h) Some other specified reason .....	
Total... ..	

<sup>1</sup> Patients referred to the clinic by means (*e.g.*, letter, telephone, etc.) which do not allow of their being examined at the clinic are excluded.

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate (see Table 5, footnote 1) omitted because of .....

.....  
.....

**Table 3.**

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).<sup>1</sup>*

	Stages <sup>3</sup> I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated .....									
With microscopical verification .....									
Without microscopical verification <sup>2</sup> .....									

<sup>1</sup> Total number of patients treated, incompletely treated patients included.

<sup>2</sup> A detailed description should be given for each case in which the patient is alive without recurrence five years from the beginning of treatment, and in which no microscopical verification has been made (see below).

<sup>3</sup> It is intended to revise, in the future, the definitions of the stages of cervical carcinoma. Pending the results of that revision, the definitions used will be those in the Report of the Radiological Sub-Commission (document C.H.788; Ser. L.o.N. P. 1929.III.5), reprinted on page 25.

Detailed description of cases alive without recurrence five years after treatment in which no microscopical verification has been made.

(The reason why histological confirmation was not obtained should be stated.)

.....  
 .....  
 .....

Table 4.

*Results of Treatment estimated after a Period of Observation of Five Years, dating from the Beginning of Treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radio-therapy	5. Died of cancer <sup>1</sup>	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of inter-current disease
I.....							
II.....							
III.....							
IV.....							
I-IV.....							

<sup>1</sup> Patients dying during or as a result of treatment should be included in this column.

CALCULATION OF RESULTS.

Table 5.

*Absolute Cure Rate.*<sup>1</sup>

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	.....
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV).....	.....
Absolute cure rate <sup>2</sup> .....	.....

<sup>1</sup> For certain clinics conditions are such, *e.g.*, when they are responsible for the treatment of almost every patient who seeks it from a defined area, that the calculation of an absolute cure rate has value for comparison with clinics similarly organised. When this is the case, the rate should be calculated as above. In other clinics the calculation may be omitted, the reason being given in a footnote to Table 2. In all clinics "Patients examined at the clinic but not treated" will be distributed, in Table 2, among the groups there set out.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.*, the proportion the above number of patients alive without recurrence forms of the total number examined, stated as a percentage.

Table 6.

*Relative Cure Rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage <sup>1</sup>
Stage I .....	.....	.....	.....
Stage II .....	.....	.....	.....
Stage III.....	.....	.....	.....
Stage IV .....	.....	.....	.....
Stages I-IV .....	.....	.....	.....

<sup>1</sup> The cure rate calculated in this way obviously understates the results of treatment since a proportion of patients will have died of a cause unrelated to cancer of the cervix, whilst the fate of a further proportion may be unknown.

ANS OF THE TABLES USED FOR CASES TREATED IN PREVIOUS YEARS.

Cancer of the Cervix uteri.

Statement for 19.....-19.....inclusive.

(date)

Table 7.<sup>1</sup>

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>2</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
19.....							
19.....							
19.....							
19.....							
etc.							

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1 to 6 for a period prior to 1930.

<sup>2</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.<sup>1</sup>

Results of Treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of					4. <sup>2</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of								
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9
		years					years					years					years					years								
19.....																														
19.....																														
19.....																														
19.....																														
etc.																														

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1 to 6 for a period prior to 1930.

<sup>2</sup> To include patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9<sup>1</sup>, Stages I-IV.—*Evaluation of Results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4.						5.						6.					
			Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>2</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						Absolute cure rate <sup>3</sup> at the end of						Relative cure rate <sup>4</sup> at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
years						years						years								
19.....																				
19.....																				
19.....																				
19.....																				
etc.																				

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1 to 6 for a period prior to 1930.  
<sup>2</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained should be entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4.  
<sup>3</sup> See Table 5, footnote 1.  
<sup>4</sup> See Table 6.

Table 10,<sup>1</sup> Stage I.—*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
19.....													
19.....													
19.....													
19.....													
etc.													

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1 to 6 for a period prior to 1930.

Note.—Similar tables for stages II, III and IV.

#### 4. DEFINITION OF THE DIFFERENT VARIETIES OF UTERO-VAGINAL CARCINOMA.

1. Cases should be reckoned as carcinoma of the vagina when the site of the growth is in the vagina; when clinical examination shows that the cervix is intact; and when there is no ground for supposing that the carcinoma is other than a primary growth in the vagina. In cases in which the carcinoma involves the cervix, the case must be regarded as one of carcinoma of the cervix.

It would, however, be advisable to classify as vaginal carcinoma those cases in which a small lesion previously noticeable on the cervix has rapidly disappeared after radiological treatment, while the main part of the tumour is still present in the vagina.

In those cases in which the cervix could not be examined at the beginning of the treatment, and therefore no decision could be made as to whether it was involved or not, the final diagnosis must be postponed until the situation has been clarified as a result of treatment. When, even after radiological treatment, no differentiation can be made owing to the impossibility of examining the cervix, the case should be classified as cancer of the vagina if the cervix and parametria appear to be clinically free from growth on rectal examination.

2. Cases should be classified as carcinoma of the body when the site of the disease is in the body, whereas the cervix appears to be healthy.

The clinical distinction between carcinoma of the cervix and of the body of the uterus may offer difficulties in a small number of cases, such as the following :

(a) The uterus is not enlarged and clinical examination does not give sufficient indications for determining the point of origin or the direction of spread of the growth.

In the majority of these cases, it should be possible, without too great risk of error, to classify them on the

basis of the microscopical report; for instance, pure squamous-celled carcinoma and adeno-carcinoma with mucous secretion are both types of cervical epithelioma.

In the remaining cases, which certainly form a very small fraction of the total in which it is not possible to make a definite classification on either clinical or microscopical evidence, the classification may be left to individual discretion.

(b) The cavity of the uterus is enlarged. It is not possible to determine by clinical examination whether the case is an endo-cervical carcinoma of the cervix with extension to the body or a carcinoma of the body extending to the cervix. Such cases generally spread like carcinoma of the body and it is more of theoretical than of practical interest to ascertain the point of origin of the disease. They behave essentially as carcinoma of the body and should be so classified unless the microscopical picture contra-indicates such a classification as in the case of a pure squamous-celled carcinoma or an adeno-carcinoma with mucous secretion.

Cases presenting difficulty in diagnosis due to complications such as myomata, pyometra, etc., should be classified in the same manner.

\* \* \*

*Note.*—It is intended to revise, in the future, the definitions of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma.

---



5. DEFINITION OF THE STAGES OF CANCER  
OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

Stage I.

The growth is strictly limited to the *cervix uteri*. Uterus mobile.

Stage II.

Lesion spreading into one or more fornices with or without infiltration of the parametrium adjacent to the uterus, the uterus retaining some degree of mobility.

Stage III.

- (a) Nodular infiltration of the parametria on one or both sides extending to the wall of the pelvis, with limited mobility of the uterus or massive infiltration of one parametrium with fixation of the uterus;
- (b) More or less superficial infiltration of a large part of the vagina, with a mobile uterus;
- (c) Isolated metastases in the pelvic glands, with a relatively small primary growth;
- (d) Isolated metastases in the lower part of the vagina.

Generally speaking, all cases not falling into Stages II or IV will be placed under Stage III.

Stage IV.

- (a) Cases with massive infiltration of both parametria extending to the walls of the pelvis;
- (b) Carcinoma involving the bladder or rectum;
- (c) The whole vagina infiltrated (rigid vaginal passage), or one vaginal wall infiltrated along its whole length with fixation of the primary growth;
- (d) Remote metastases.

*Note.*—The Advisory Committee is aware that different clinicians have interpreted the rules for “ staging ” differently and is taking steps in association with the Health Organisation of the League of Nations to devise some means whereby these differences of interpretation may be reduced.

---

6. STATEMENTS.

(a) THE CENTRE DES TUMEURS DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE BRUXELLES,  
BELGIUM

(Contributed by Professor J. MURDOCH).

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1930.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	94
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	11
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	83

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the Clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	2
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	1
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	6
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	2
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	11

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage
Total number of patients treated .....	83	9	10.8	27	32.5	35	42.2	12	14.5
With microscopical verification .....	81	9		26		35		11	
Without microscopical verification .....	2 <sup>1</sup>	0		1		0		1	

<sup>1</sup> Both patients died before the end of the five-year period.

Table 4.

*Results of Treatment estimated after a Period of Observation of Five Years, dating from the Beginning of Treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I .....	9	4	0	0	4	0	1
II .....	27	3	1	0	21	0	2
III .....	35	7	1	0	26	0	1
IV .....	12	0	0	0	12	0	0
I-IV .....	83	14	2	0	63	0	4

**Table 5.**

*Absolute Cure Rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	94
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV).....	14
Absolute cure rate .....	14.9 $\frac{0}{10}$

**Table 6.**

*Relative Cure Rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	9	4	
Stage II .....	27	3	11.1
Stage III .....	35	7	20.0
Stage IV .....	12	0	
Stages I-IV .....	83	14	16.9

STATEMENT FOR 1920-1929 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1926	75	15	60	14	15	23	8
1927	59	9	50	11	13	19	7
1928	76	8	68 <sup>2</sup>	20	18	21	8
1929	80	6	74 <sup>2</sup>	20	11	39	3
Total...	290	38	252	65	57	102	26

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> One case not classified because of insufficient clinical information is included in Tables 7, 8 and 9. As the patient died before the end of the five-year period, the case will not appear in Table 10.

Table 8.

Results of Treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. Alive <sup>1</sup> with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of											
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10			
1926	60	16	16	15	11	10			0	0	0	1	0			42	42	42	42	43			0	0	0	0	0			2	2	3	6	7
1927	50	14	14	13	12				0	0	1	0				31	31	31	32			0	0	0	0				5	5	5	6		
1928	68	17	14	13					2	0	0					47	49	50				0	0	0					2	5	5			
1929	74	21	20						0	0						52	52					0	0						1	2				
Total	252	68	64						2	0						172	174					0	0						10	14				

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.  
*Evaluation of Results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			years						years						years					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1926	75	60	16(1)	16(1)	15(1)	11(1)	10(1)	21.3	21.3	20.0	14.7	13.3	26.7	26.7	25.0	18.3	16.7			
1927	59	50	14	14	13	12	23.7	23.7	22.0	20.3	28.0	28.0	26.0	24.0						
1928	76	68	17	14	13	22.4	18.4	17.1	25.0	20.6	19.1									
1929	80	74	21	20	26.3	25.0	28.4	27.0												
Total	290	252	68	64	23.4	22.1	27.0	25.4												

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4.

Table 10, Stage I.  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1926	14	6	6	6	5	5								
1927	11	6	6	6	6									
1928	20	6	6	6				30.0	30.0	30.0				
1929	20	13	12					65.0	60.0					
Total ...	65	31	30					47.7	46.2					

Table 10, Stage II.  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1926	15	6	6	6	3	3		40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0		
1927	13	5	5	5	5									
1928	18	5	5	5				27.8	27.8	27.8				
1929	11	2	2											
Total ...	57	18	18					31.6	31.6					



**Table 10, Stage III.**  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	23	4	4	3	3	2		17.4	17.4	13.0	13.0	8.7	
1927	19	3	3	2	1			15.8	15.8	10.5	5.3		
1928	21	6	3	2				28.6	14.3	9.5			
1929	39	6	6					15.4	15.4				
Total . . .	102	19	16					18.6	15.7				

**Table 10, Stage IV.**  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	8	0	0	0	0	0							
1927	7	0	0	0	0								
1928	8	0	0	0									
1929	3	0	0										
Total . . .	26	0	0					0.0	0.0				

(b) THE LIVERPOOL RADIUM INSTITUTE, ENGLAND  
(Contributed by Doctor P. MALPAS).

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.  
STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1930.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	92
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	3
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	89

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the Clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	1
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	2
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	3

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table I, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated .....	80	13	14.6	26	29.2	29	32.6	21	23.6
With microscopical verification .....	84	13		26		29		16	
Without microscopical verification.....	5	0		0		0		5 <sup>1</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> Five patients died from cancer before the end of the five-year period.

Table 4.

*Results of Treatment estimated after a Period of Observation of Five Years, dating from the Beginning of Treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of inter-current disease
I .....	13	9	0	1	0	1	2
II .....	26	12	0	1	13	0	0
III .....	29	4	0	0	25	0	0
IV .....	21	0	0	0	20	1	0
I-IV .....	80	25	0	2	58	2	2

Table 5.

*Absolute Cure Rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the clinic was not solely responsible for the treatment of cervical carcinoma in the area, which was not a homogeneous unit from the standpoint of hospital administrative arrangements.

Table 6.

*Relative Cure Rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	13	9	
Stage II .....	26	12	46.2
Stage III .....	29	4	13.8
Stage IV .....	21	0	0.0
Stages I-IV .....	89	25	28.1

STATEMENT FOR 1929.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1929	36	2	34	0	17	11	6

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of Treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive and free from disease after a period of observation of					4. Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from intercurrent disease during a period of observation of									
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years					years					years					years					years									
1929	34	8	8					0	0					24	24					2	2					0	0				

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of Results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of								
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10			
			years						years						years								
1929	36	34	8	8												23.5	23.5						

Table 10, Stage I.

*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1929	0	0	0											

Table 10, Stage II.

*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1929	17	5	5					29.4	29.4					





(c) THE MARIE CURIE HOSPITAL, LONDON, ENGLAND  
(Contributed by Doctor Elizabeth HURDON).

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.  
STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1930.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	142
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	6
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	136

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the Clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	1
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	5
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	6

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage
Total number of patients treated .....	136	6	4.4	32	23.5	81	59.6	17	12.5
With microscopical verification .....	135	6		32		80		17	
Without microscopical verification.....	1			0		1 <sup>1</sup>		0	

<sup>1</sup> Patient alive without recurrence five years after treatment.

Age 33 years. Hæmorrhage 9 months. Enlarged cervix, fungating, hæmorrhagic growth involving cervix, all fornices and upper part posterior vaginal wall. Cervix fixed. Stage III. Case treated during my absence on holiday and no reason given. The rule is that histological confirmation must be obtained before second treatment.

Table 4.

*Results of Treatment estimated after a Period of Observation of Five Years, dating from the Beginning of Treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of inter-current disease
I .....	6	5	0	0	1	0	0
II .....	32	21	0	0	11	0	0
III .....	81	27	1	0	52	1	0
IV .....	17	3	0	0	14	0	0
I-IV .....	136	56	1	0	78	1	0

**Table 5.**  
*Absolute Cure Rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	142
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV).....	56
Absolute cure rate .....	39.4%

**Table 6.**  
*Relative Cure Rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	6	5	
Stage II .....	32	21	65.6
Stage III .....	81	27	33.3
Stage IV .....	17	3	17.6
Stages I-IV .....	136	56	41.2

## STATEMENT FOR OCTOBER 1925-1929 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1925 / 1926 )	74	1	73 <sup>2</sup>	2	10	50	11
1927	59	2	57	1	9	28	19
1928	88	2	86	7	18	46	15
1929	110	0	110	4	16	70	20
Total ...	331	5	326	14	53	194	65

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925-January 1st, 1926 : 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926-January 1st, 1927 : 59.

Table 8.

*Results of Treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of					4. Alive <sup>1</sup> with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of									
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years					years					years					years					years									
1925 / 1926 )	73 <sup>2</sup>	22	18	17	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	54	54	54	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	2					
1927	57	15	15	15	14	1	0	0	0	41	42	42	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1928	86	36	32	31	1	0	0	49	53	54	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0												
1929	110	38	34	0	1	72	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																
Total	326	111	99	2	1	213	224	0	2	0	0																				

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925-January 1st, 1926 : 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926-January 1st, 1927 : 59.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of Results.*

*The Marie Curie Hospital, London*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			years						years						years					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1925 / 1926 }	74	73 <sup>2</sup>	22	18	17	16	16	29.7	24.3	23.0	21.6	21.6	30.1	24.7	23.3	21.9	21.9			
1927	59	57	15	15	15	14	25.4	25.4	25.4	23.7	26.3	26.3	26.3	24.6						
1928	88	86	36(1)	32(1)	31(1)	40.9	36.4	35.2	41.9	37.2	36.0									
1929	110	110	38(1)	34(1)	34.5	30.9	34.5	30.9												
Total	331	326	111	99	33.5	29.9	34.0	30.4												

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4.

<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925-January 1st, 1926 : 14.

Cases treated January 1st, 1926-January 1st, 1927 : 59.

Table 10, Stage I.  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7 col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of							
		5	6	7 years		8	9	10	5	6	7 years		8	9	10
1925 } 1926 }	2	2	2	2	2	2									
1927	1	1	1	1	1										
1928	7	6	5	5											
1929	4	4	4												
Total...	14	13	12												

Table 10, Stage II. .  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of							
		5	6	7 years		8	9	10	5	6	7 years		8	9	10
1925 } 1926 }	10	6	5	4	4	4									
1927	9	5	5	5	5										
1928	18	11	9	9				61.1	50.0	50.0					
1929	16	12	10					75.0	62.5						
Total...	53	34	29					64.2	54.7						

*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1925 / 1926	50	14	11	11	10	10		28.0	22.0	22.0	20.0	20.0	
1927	28	9	9	9	8			32.1	32.1	32.1	28.6		
1928	46	16	15	15				34.8	32.6	32.6			
1929	70	20	18					28.6	25.7				
Total ...	194	59	53					30.4	27.3				

Table 10, Stage IV.  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1925 / 1926	11	0	0	0	0	0							
1927	19	0	0	0	0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
1928	15	3	3	2				20.0	20.0	13.3			
1929	20	2	2					10.0	10.0				
Total ...	65	5	5					7.7	7.7				

(c) RADIUM CENTRE FOR CARCINOMA OF THE UTERUS,  
LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL, ENGLAND

(Contributed by Sir Comyns BERKELEY).

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1930.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	66
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	9
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	57

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the Clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	9
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	9



Table 3.

Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated .....	57	3	5.3	24	42.1	18	31.6	12	21.1
With microscopical verification .....	56	3		24		17		12	
Without microscopical verification.....	1	0		0		1 <sup>1</sup>		0	

<sup>1</sup> Patient lost sight of.

Table 4.

Results of Treatment estimated after a Period of Observation of Five Years, dating from the Beginning of Treatment.

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I .....	3	2	0	0	1	0	0
II .....	24	5	0	0	19	0	0
III .....	18	1	0	0	16	1 <sup>1</sup>	0
IV .....	12	2	0	0	10	0	0
I-IV .....	57	10	0	0	46	1	0

<sup>1</sup> Without microscopical verification.

Table 5.

*Absolute Cure Rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	66
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV).....	10
Absolute cure rate .....	15.2%

Table 6.

*Relative Cure Rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	3	2	
Stage II .....	24	5	20.8
Stage III .....	18	1	5.6
Stage IV .....	12	2	
Stages I-IV .....	57	10	17.5

STATEMENT FOR 1928-1929 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1928	21	1	20	1	6	9	4
1929	83	10	73	6	12	30	25
Total...	104	11	93	7	18	39	29

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of Treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from intercurrent disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1928	20	2	2	2				0	0	0				18	18	18				0	0	0				0	0	0			
1929	73	12	9					0	0					59	61					2	3					0	0				
Total	93	14	11					0	0					77	79					2	3					0	0				



**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years												
1928	1	1	1	1										
1929	6	2	2											
Total ...	7	3	3											

**Table 10, Stage II.**  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years												
1928	6	0	0	0										
1929	12	3	2											
Total ...	18	3	2					16.7	11.1					

Table 10, Stage III.  
Evaluation of Results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1928	9	1	1	1										
1929	30	6	4					20.0	13.3					
Total ...	39	7	5					17.9	12.8					

Table 10, Stage IV.  
Evaluation of Results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1928	4	0	0	0										
1929	25	1	1					4.0	4.0					
Total ...	29	1	1					3.5	3.5					

(d) THE INSTITUT DU RADIUM DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS,  
FRANCE

(Contributed by Doctor A. LACASSAGNE).

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1930.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	158
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	47
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	111

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the Clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	1
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	4
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	25
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	2
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	14
(h) Advanced pulmonary tuberculosis .....	1
Total...	47

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treat- ed .....	111	16	14.4	34	30.6	47	42.3	14	12.6
With microscopical verification .....	111	16		34		47		14	
Without micro- scopical verifi- cation .....	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of Treatment estimated after a Period of Observation  
of Five Years, dating from the Beginning of Treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radio- therapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter- current disease
I .....	16	12	0	0	3	0	1
II .....	34	19	1	0	14	0	0
III .....	47	16	2	0	28	0	1
IV .....	14	5	0	0	9	0	0
I-IV .....	111	52	3	0	54	0	2



Table 5.

*Absolute Cure Rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the available facilities at the Institut du Radium are not sufficient for treatment of all patients presenting themselves, a number of patients being referred to other anti-cancer centres of Paris.

Table 6.

*Relative Cure Rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I . . . . .	16	12	75.0
Stage II . . . . .	34	19	55.9
Stage III . . . . .	47	16	34.0
Stage IV . . . . .	14	5	
Stages I-IV . . . . .	111	52	46.8

## STATEMENT FOR 1919-1929 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4.				
			Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1919	81	6	75	1	25	35	14
1920	169	79	90	13	38	33	6
1921	139	98	41	7	23	9	2
1922	91	34	57	7	22	24	4
1923	107	32	75	8	27	33	7
1924	98	29	69	4	20	35	10
1925	104	18	86	9	26	35	16
1926	108	20	88	4	29	41	14
1927	113	19	94	11	33	36	14
1928	118	24	94	6	47	37	4
1929	135	33	102	11	38	46	7
Total...	1,263	392	871	81	328	364	98

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.  
Results of Treatment.

1.	2.	3.						4.						5.						6.						7.					
		Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						Died of cancer during a period of observation of						Lost sight of during a period of observation of						Died from intercurrent disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
years						years						years						years						years							
1919	75	5	5	4	4	4	4	5	4	3	2	2	1 <sup>1</sup>	64	65	66	67	67	68	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
1920	90	15	14	13	12	12	12	2	2	2	1	0	0	71	72	72	73	74	74	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	2
1921	41	7	6	6	6	6	6	2	1	1	1	1 <sup>1</sup>	1 <sup>1</sup>	31	32	32	32	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	2
1922	57	15	15	15	13	13	13	2	1	1	2	0	0	39	40	40	41	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1923	75	23	22	22	21	21	21	1	0	0	1	1	0	49	50	50	50	50	51	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
1924	69	25	25	25	25	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	41	41	41	41	41	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
1925	86	28	28	27	26	23	23	5	3	3	2	1	1	51	53	54	55	57	57	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	4	4
1926	88	30	29	25	25	25		4	2	0	0	0		50	53	56	56	56		1	1	1	1	1		3	3	6	6	6	
1927	94	27	27	24	23			5	2	4	1 <sup>1</sup>			59	62	62	65			2	2	2	2			1	1	2	3		
1928	94	42	42	39				2	0	1				43	45	45				4	4	4				3	3	5			
1929	102	43	41					2	4					49	49					1	1					7	7				
Total	871	260	254					30	19					547	562					13	13					21	23				

<sup>1</sup> Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.  
Evaluation of Results.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
			years							years						years					
1919	81	75	5	5	4	4	4	4							6.7	6.7	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	
1920	169	90	15	14	13	12	12	12							16.7	15.6	14.4	13.3	13.3	13.3	
1921	139	41	7	6	6	6	6	6							17.1	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	14.6	
1922	91	57	15	15	15	13	13	13							26.8	26.8	26.8	22.8	22.8	22.8	
1923	107	75	23	22	22	21	21	21							30.7	29.3	29.3	28.0	28.0	28.0	
1924	98	60	25	25	25	25	24	24							36.2	36.2	36.2	36.2	34.8	34.8	
1925	104	86	28	28	27	26	23	23							32.6	32.6	31.4	30.2	26.7	26.7	
1926	108	88	30	29	25	25	25								34.1	33.0	28.4	28.4	28.4		
1927	113	94	27	27	24	23									28.7	28.7	25.5	24.5			
1928	118	94	42	42	39										44.7	44.7	41.5				
1929	135	102	43	41											42.2	40.2					
Total	1,263	871	260	254											29.9	29.2					

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. ↓)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1919	1	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1920	13	4	4	4	4	4	4							
1921	7	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1922	7	4	4	4	4	4	4							
1923	8	6	6	6	6	6	6							
1924	4	4	4	4	4	4	4							
1925	9	6	6	6	6	6	6							
1926	4	4	4	4	4	4	4							
1927	11	7	7	7	7	7	7							
1928	6	4	4	2										
1929	11	8	8											
Total ...	81	48	48					59.3	59.3					

Table 10, Stage II.  
Evaluation of Results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919	25	4	4	3	3	3	3	16.0	16.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
1920	38	10	9	9	8	8	8	26.3	23.7	23.7	21.1	21.1	21.1
1921	23	6	5	5	5	5	5	26.1	21.7	21.7	21.7	21.7	21.7
1922	22	8	8	8	7	7	7	36.4	36.4	36.4	31.8	31.8	31.8
1923	27	10	10	10	9	9	9	37.0	37.0	37.0	33.3	33.3	33.3
1924	20	9	9	9	9	9	9	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
1925	26	8	8	8	7	7	7	30.8	30.8	30.8	26.9	26.9	26.9
1926	29	15	15	13	13	13		51.7	51.7	44.8	44.8	44.8	
1927	33	12	12	11	11			36.4	36.4	33.3	33.3		
1928	47	24	24	23				51.1	51.1	48.9			
1929	38	20	20					52.6	52.6				
Total ...	328	126	124					38.4	37.8				

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919	35	1	1	1	1	1	1	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9
1920	33	1	1	0	0	0	0	3.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1921	9	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1922	24	3	3	3	2	2	2	12.5	12.5	12.5	8.3	8.3	8.3
1923	33	7	6	6	6	6	6	21.2	18.2	18.2	18.2	18.2	18.2
1924	35	12	12	12	12	11	11	34.3	34.3	34.3	34.3	31.4	31.4
1925	35	13	13	12	12	10	10	37.1	37.1	34.3	34.3	28.6	28.6
1926	41	11	10	8	8	8		26.8	24.4	19.5	19.5	19.5	
1927	36	8	8	6	5			22.2	22.2	16.7	13.9		
1928	37	14	14	14				37.8	37.8	37.8			
1929	46	15	13					32.6	28.3				
Total ...	364	85	81					23.4	22.3				

Table 10, Stage IV.  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1919	14	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1920	6	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1921	2	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1922	4	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1923	7	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1924	10	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	16	1	1	1	1	0	0	6.3	6.3	6.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	
1926	14	0	0	0	0	0								
1927	14	0	0	0	0									
1928	4	0	0	0										
1929	7	0	0											
Total ...	98	1	1					1.0	1.0					



(f) THE RADIUMHEMMET, STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN  
(Contributed by Doctor J. HEYMAN).

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1930.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	205
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2)...	7
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	198

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the Clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	7
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	7

Table 3.

Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage
Total number of patients treated .....	198	12	6.1	60	30.3	93	47.0	33	16.7
With microscopical verification .....	196	12		60		93		31	
Without microscopical verification .....	2	0		0		0		2 <sup>1</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> One patient died from cancer within a year.

The second patient is alive without recurrence five years after treatment. *Radiumhemmet Journ.*, 5587/30. G. H. aged 35. Suffering for the last four months from backache and fetid discharge. In a bad general condition on admission, thin and anæmic. The vaginal portion is replaced by an ulcerated disc-shaped tumour, 4 x 4 cm., involving the anterior and left vaults. In the anterior vaginal wall, a submucous involvement reaching the vaginal orifice. On rectal examination, a nodulous tumour mass, the size of a goose egg. Cystoscopy: in the right wall of the bladder a protruding nodule of tumour-like appearance the size of a pea. A biopsy was taken with a pair of scissors from the margin of the tumour. Clinical diagnosis, which was cancer of the cervix, stage IV, could not be histologically verified. The biopsy had apparently been taken from the connective tissue surrounding the cancer.

Table 4.

Results of Treatment estimated after a Period of Observation of Five Years, dating from the Beginning of Treatment.

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radio-therapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I .....	12	5	0	1	5	0	1
II .....	60	26	1	4	27	0	2
III .....	93	16	2	0	74	0	1
IV .....	33	3	0	0	30	0	0
I-IV .....	198	50	3	5	136	0	4

Table 5.

*Absolute Cure Rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	205
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV).....	50
Absolute cure rate .....	24.4%

Table 6.

*Relative Cure Rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	12	5	
Stage II .....	60	26	43.3
Stage III .....	93	16	17.2
Stage IV .....	33	3	9.1
Stages I-IV .....	198	50	25.3

## STATEMENT FOR 1914-1929 INCLUSIVE.

68

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1914	31	5	26	0	6	12	8
1915	44	3	41	1	6	23	11
1916	53	6	47	1	8	28	10
1917	69	5	64	3	9	30	22
1918	45	4	41	1	7	20	13
1919	85	8	77	6	18	34	19
1920	100	4	96	12	26	36	22
1921	121	6	115	16	31	39	29
1922	134	4	130	13	36	51	30
1923	111	6	105	19	30	31	25
1924	153	4	149	16	53	56	24
1925	140	6	134	14	33	45	42
1926	150	7	143	16	48	51	28
1927	149	6	143	9	55	53	26
1928	135	7	128	14	37	48	29
1929	160	8	152	22	38	66	26
Total...	1,680	89	1,591	163	441	623	364

The Radiumhemmet, Stockholm

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.  
Results of Treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. Alive with recurrence <sup>1</sup> after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						years						years						years						
1914	26	7	5	5	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	19	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	3
1915	41	12	11	9	9	9	8	1	1	1	1	1	1	28	29	29	29	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	3
1916	47	4	3	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	43	44	44	44	46	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1917	64	9	8	8	7	7	6	1	1	1	1	1	2	54	55	55	55	55	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	
1918	41	10	9	9	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	31	31	31	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	
1919	77	21	21	18	18	17	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	54	55	55	55	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	5	
1920	96	24	23	22	20	18	18	3	3	2	3	2	2	68	69	71	71	73	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	5
1921	115	27	27	25	24	22	20	1	0	1	1	1	0	85	86	86	87	88	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	4	5
1922	130	25	24	24	23	23	20	3	4	2	2	1	1	99	99	101	101	102	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4	4	7
1923	105	23	22	20	18	18	18	3	4	3	3	2	2	78	78	81	82	83	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2
1924	149	35	34	32	30	30	29	3	1	2	2	0	0	108	110	111	113	115	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4	4	4
1925	134	19	19	19	18	18	18	3	2	0	0	0	0	108	109	111	112	112	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	4
1926	143	35	30	27	27	27		3	2	2	1	1		103	103	110	111	111		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	4	
1927	143	36	34	34	34			4	2	1	1			100	104	105	105			0	0	0	0			3	3	3	3			
1928	128	29	26	25				1	3	1				95	96	99				0	0	0				3	3	3				
1929	152	46	44					2	0					98	102					0	0					6	6					
Total	1,591	362	340					28	23					1,170	1,193					0	0					31	35					

<sup>1</sup> Includes patients operated upon after failure of radiotherapy, alive without recurrence :

1915, 1917 and 1922 respectively, one patient for 10 years;  
1920 and 1923 respectively, two patients for 10 years;

1926, one patient for 5 years and one for 9 years;  
1928, one patient for 7 years.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.  
Evaluation of Results.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of <sup>1</sup>						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			years							years						years					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1914	31	26	7 (2)	5 (2)	5 (2)	5 (2)	5 (2)	4 (1)	22.6	16.1	16.1	16.1	16.1	12.9	26.9	19.2	19.2	19.2	19.2	15.4	
1915	44	41	12	11	9	9	9	8	27.3	25.0	20.5	20.5	20.5	18.2	29.3	26.8	22.0	22.0	22.0	19.5	
1916	53	47	4	3	3	1	1	1	7.5	5.7	5.7	1.9	1.9	1.9	8.5	6.4	6.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	
1917	69	64	9 (1)	8 (1)	8 (1)	7 (1)	7 (1)	6 (1)	13.0	11.6	11.6	10.1	10.1	8.7	14.1	12.5	12.5	10.9	10.9	9.4	
1918	45	41	10	9	9	9	9	9	22.2	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	24.4	22.0	22.0	22.0	22.0	22.0	
1919	85	77	21	21	18	18	17	16	24.7	24.7	21.2	21.2	20.0	18.8	27.3	27.3	23.4	23.4	22.1	20.8	
1920	100	96	24 (2)	23 (2)	22 (2)	20 (2)	18 (2)	18 (2)	24.0	23.0	22.0	20.0	18.0	18.0	25.0	24.0	22.9	20.8	18.8	18.8	
1921	121	115	27 (2)	27 (2)	25 (2)	24 (2)	22 (2)	20 (2)	22.3	22.3	20.7	19.8	18.2	16.5	23.5	23.5	21.7	20.9	19.1	17.4	
1922	134	130	25	24	24	23	23	20	18.7	17.9	17.9	17.2	17.2	14.9	19.2	18.5	18.5	17.7	17.7	15.4	
1923	111	105	23	22	20	18	18	18	20.7	19.8	18.0	16.2	16.2	16.2	21.9	21.0	19.0	17.1	17.1	17.1	
1924	153	149	35	34	32	30	30	29	22.9	22.2	20.9	19.6	19.6	19.0	23.5	22.8	21.5	20.1	20.1	19.5	
1925	140	134	19	19	19	18	18	18	13.6	13.6	13.6	12.9	12.9	12.9	14.2	14.2	14.2	13.4	13.4	13.4	
1926	150	143	35	30	27	27	27		23.3	20.0	18.0	18.0	18.0		24.5	21.0	18.9	18.9	18.9		
1927	149	143	36 (1)	34 (1)	34 (1)	34 (1)			24.2	22.8	22.8	22.8			25.2	23.8	23.8	23.8			
1928	135	128	29	26	25				21.5	19.3	18.5				22.7	20.3	19.5				
1929	160	152	46	44					28.8	27.5					30.3	28.9					
Total	1,680	1,591	362	340					21.5	20.2					22.8	21.4					

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4. A detailed description of these cases is published in *Acta Radiologica*, Vol. VIII, 363, 1927.

Table 10, Stage I.

*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1914	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1915	1	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1916	1	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1917	3	1	1	1	0	0	0							
1918	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1919	6	3	3	3	3	3	3							
1920	12	7	7	7	7	6	6							
1921	16	8	8	8	8	8	8	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	
1922	13	9	9	9	8	8	8							
1923	19	10	10	10	9	9	9	52.6	52.6	52.6	47.4	47.4	47.4	
1924	16	10	10	9	8	8	7	62.5	62.5	56.3	50.0	50.0	43.8	
1925	14	3	3	3	3	3	3							
1926	16	10	8	8	8	8		62.5	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0		
1927	9	5	5	4	4									
1928	14	8	7	7										
1929	22	13	13					59.1	59.1					
Total ...	163	88	85					54.0	52.1					

*The Radiumhemmet, Stockholm*

Table 10, Stage II.  
*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1914	6	3	3	3	3	3	3							
1915	6	4	4	3	3	3	3							
1916	8	2	1	1	1	1	1							
1917	9	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1918	7	3	3	3	3	3	3							
1919	18	8	8	8	8	7	7	44.4	44.4	44.4	44.4	38.9	38.9	
1920	26	13	12	11	10	9	9	50.0	46.2	42.3	38.5	34.6	34.6	
1921	31	11	11	10	9	8	7	35.5	35.5	32.3	29.0	25.8	22.6	
1922	36	9	8	8	8	8	6	25.0	22.2	22.2	22.2	22.2	16.7	
1923	30	9	8	7	6	6	6	30.0	26.7	23.3	20.0	20.0	20.0	
1924	53	16	16	15	15	15	15	30.2	30.2	28.3	28.3	28.3	28.3	
1925	33	10	10	10	10	10	10	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3	30.3	
1926	48	13	13	11	11	11		27.1	27.1	22.9	22.9	22.9		
1927	55	18	16	17 <sup>1</sup>	17			32.7	29.1	30.9	30.9			
1928	37	13	12	11				35.1	32.4	29.7				
1929	38	20	19					52.6	50.0					
Total ...	441	153	145					34.7	32.9					

*The Radiumhemmet, Stockholm*

<sup>1</sup> One patient considered hopeless after six years recovered.



Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1914	12	3	1	1	1	1	0							
1915	23	7	6	5	5	5	4	30.4	26.1	21.7	21.7	21.7	17.4	
1916	28	2	2	2	0	0	0	7.1	7.1	7.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	
1917	30	6	5	5	5	5	4	20.0	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	13.3	
1918	20	5	4	4	4	4	4	25.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	
1919	34	8	8	6	6	6	5	23.5	23.5	17.6	17.6	17.6	14.7	
1920	36	3	3	3	2	2	2	8.3	8.3	8.3	5.6	5.6	5.6	
1921	39	7	7	6	6	6	5	17.9	17.9	15.4	15.4	15.4	12.8	
1922	51	6	6	6	6	6	6	11.8	11.8	11.8	11.8	11.8	11.8	
1923	31	3	3	3	3	3	3	9.7	9.7	9.7	9.7	9.7	9.7	
1924	56	8	7	7	7	7	7	14.3	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	
1925	45	3	3	3	3	3	3	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7	
1926	51	11	8	7	7	7		21.6	15.7	13.7	13.7	13.7		
1927	53	13	13	13	13			24.5	24.5	24.5	24.5			
1928	48	5	5	5				10.4	10.4	10.4				
1929	66	11	10					16.7	15.2					
Total . . .	623	101	91					16.2	14.6					

*The Radiumhemmet, Stockholm*

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of Results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1914	8	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1915	11	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1916	10	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1917	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	
1918	13	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1919	19	2	2	1	1	1	1	10.5	10.5	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	
1920	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5	
1921	29	1	1	1	1	0	0	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	0.0	0.0	
1922	30	1	1	1	1	1	0	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	0.0	
1923	25	1	1	0	0	0	0	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
1924	24	1	1	1	0	0	0	4.2	4.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	
1925	42	3	3	3	2	2	2	7.1	7.1	7.1	4.8	4.8	4.8	
1926	28	1	1	1	1	1		3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6		
1927	26	0	0	0	0			0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0			
1928	29	3	2	2				10.3	6.9	6.9				
1929	26	2	2					7.7	7.7					
Total ...	364	20	19					5.5	5.2					

*Official No.: C. H. 1336*

LEAGUE OF NATIONS  
HEALTH ORGANISATION

---

**ANNUAL REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF  
RADIOTHERAPY IN CANCER OF  
THE UTERINE CERVIX**

---

Second Volume

STATEMENTS OF  
RESULTS OBTAINED IN 1931 AND  
PREVIOUS YEARS

(collated in 1937)

*Edited by:*  
J. HEYMAN, M.D.  
Stockholm

Series of League of Nations Publications

III. HEALTH  
1938. III. 2.

## P R E F A C E

The Health Organisation desires to record its gratitude to all those who have undertaken the laborious work of collecting the detailed clinical and other data necessary for the compilation of tabular matter of the kind here presented.

The Health Organisation wishes also to acknowledge its indebtedness to the Advisory Committee (Prof. J. HEYMAN, Radiumhemmet, Stockholm; Dr. A. LACASSAGNE, the Radium Institute of the University, Paris; and Lt.-Col. A. B. SMALLMAN, Ministry of Health, London) for the care bestowed upon the preparation of this report.

*(Health Section, League of Nations.)*

---

## CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTORY.....	7
II. SOURCES OF ERROR IN STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF TREATMENT.....	9
III. ALLOCATION OF CASES TO THEIR APPROPRIATE STAGES, AND DEFINITIONS OF THE STAGES; STEPS TAKEN TO PROMOTE GREATER UNIFORMITY.....	11
IV. SECOND ANNUAL REPORT.....	15
1. Notes for the guidance of collaborators.....	15
2. Specimens of the tables used for cases treated in 1931.....	17
3. Specimens of the tables used for cases treated in previous years.....	21
4. Definition of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma.....	23
5. Definitions of the four stages of cancer of the cervix uteri.....	25
(A) Definitions approved in 1929.....	25
(B) Definitions approved in 1937.....	26
6. Statements: <sup>1</sup>	
(a) Memorial Hospital for the Treatment of Cancer and Allied Diseases, New York, United States of America.....	28
(Contributed by Dr. William P. HEALY.)	
(b) Woman's Hospital in the State of New York, United States of America.....	31
(Contributed by Dr. George G. WARD.)	
(c) The Centre des Tumeurs de l'Université de Bruxelles, Belgium.....	41
(Contributed by Prof. J. MURDOCH.)	
(d) The Liverpool Radium Institute, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	48
(Contributed by Dr. P. MALPAS.)	

---

<sup>1</sup> Countries are given in alphabetical order, in French, in accordance with the practice of the League of Nations.

	Page
(e) The Marie Curie Hospital, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland..... (Contributed by Dr. Elisabeth HURDON.)	55
(f) Radium Centre for Carcinoma of the Uterus, London County Council, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland..... (Contributed by Sir Comyns BERKELEY.)	62
(g) The Institut du Cancer, Paris, France..... (Contributed by Dr. Simone LABORDE.)	69
(h) The Institut du Radium de l'Université de Paris. France..... (Contributed by Dr. A. LACASSAGNE.)	79
(i) The Radiumhemmet, Stockholm, Sweden..... (Contributed by Prof. J. HEYMAN.)	86
7. Summary.....	93

---

## I. INTRODUCTORY.

The First Annual Report,<sup>1</sup> published in 1937, referred to cases treated in 1930 and previous years. The Second Annual Report, which is here presented, includes statements referring to cases treated in 1931.

The Report is still concerned only with cancer of the cervix uteri. The preliminary work for widening the scope of future reports to include analyses of material relating to the corpus uteri and the vagina has not yet been completed.

There has been no modification of the rules or of the Tables recommended in the First Annual Report for the presentation of the data.

In Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 of the present report, the figures relating to cases treated prior to 1926 are not reproduced by individual years, but are summarized for the whole of the period prior to and including 1925; data for individual years therefore start, in this report, with 1926. A similar procedure will be adopted in future reports. Statements presented by new collaborators whose data have not previously appeared in this series of reports will, on the first occasion, relate to individual years.

The Advisory Committee invites attention to a further effort (see Chapter III) to secure greater comparability among the statements furnished by co-operating clinics. It will be seen that the definitions of the four stages have been slightly modified and given more precision.

All collaborators in the First Annual Report have submitted statements for the present report. The Committee has great pleasure in including statements from three additional collaborators, viz.:

---

<sup>1</sup> C. H. 1225; League of Nations Publications, Health 1937, III, 2.

Dr. Simone Laborde, Institut du Cancer, Paris;  
Dr. William P. Healy, Memorial Hospital for the Treatment  
of Cancer and Allied Diseases, New York;  
Dr. George G. Ward, Woman's Hospital in the State of  
New York.

Several other clinicians have expressed their wish to collaborate in future reports.

The Advisory Committee on the results of radiological treatment of uterine cancer consists of the same members as previously, namely:

*Chairman:*

Prof. J. HEYMAN, Radiumhemmet, Stockholm.

*Members:*

Dr. A. LACASSAGNE, Radium Institute of the University,  
Paris;

Lt.-Col. A. B. SMALLMAN, Ministry of Health, London.

*Secretary:*

Dr. I. WASSERBERG, replaced in January 1938 by

Dr. M. D. MACKENZIE, of the Health Section of the League  
of Nations Secretariat, Geneva.

The Committee wishes to renew the invitation given in the First Annual Report (page 10) to directors of clinics, and others who are interested in this subject, to communicate with the Chairman with a view to participation in future reports.

---



## II. SOURCES OF ERROR IN STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF TREATMENT.

Some consideration was given to this subject in the First Annual Report, particularly in regard to samples of cases which were numerically small and to lack of comparability between the clinical material at the different clinics, owing to differences of hospital organisation in the countries concerned.

Two other sources of lack of comparability were also mentioned in the First Report, viz., the differentiation of cancer of the corpus from cancer of the cervix, and the limitation of the analyses to patients actually examined at the clinic.

The Committee is aware that, apart from the sources of error mentioned above, there are several other problems which must be duly considered with a view to securing comparability between the statements submitted by different clinics. The Committee intends to study these problems successively, and hopes that collaborators will facilitate this work by placing their experience at the Committee's disposal when required.

Since the preparation of the First Annual Report, the Committee has devoted its principal attention to the means of securing greater uniformity in the allocation to stages of cervical cancers and to the definitions of the four stages. The steps taken by the Committee in this respect are referred to in greater detail later (see Chapter III).

Hitherto no reference has been made to the possibility that such differences as exist between the cure-rates of co-operating clinics may be related to the methods of treatment used in those clinics. The Committee is convinced that consideration

of such matters is of small value at present and that it is not yet practicable to assign to differences in methods of treatment, differences in the cure-rates obtained. Work of this kind must be postponed until there is greater certainty that factors, other than the actual treatment used, which are liable to vitiate the reliability of cure-rates stated numerically, have as far as practicable been eliminated. The elimination of such other possible causes of differences in cure-rates constitutes the primary object of the Committee's work in its present phase.

The Committee has noticed with great satisfaction that most reviewers of the First Report have followed the Committee's practice in not drawing conclusions from the results submitted, as to the value of the different methods of treatment employed.

The rules adopted for use in this series of reports are intended to serve as a means of securing a reasonable degree of comparability between the statements furnished by the co-operating clinics. The Committee realises that its system of preparing and presenting the data can be still further improved.

---

### III. ALLOCATION OF CASES TO THEIR APPROPRIATE STAGES, AND DEFINITIONS OF THE STAGES: STEPS TAKEN TO PROMOTE GREATER UNIFORMITY.

In 1929, certain rules for the allocation to stages of carcinomata of the cervix according to the anatomico-clinical extent of the growth were adopted by the Radiological Sub-Commission of the Cancer Commission of the League of Nations.<sup>1</sup> As noted in the First Annual Report, the Advisory Committee was aware that these rules have been somewhat differently interpreted. Variations due to this cause tend to defeat efforts to secure comparability in the results presented by different clinics.

With the object of endeavouring to promote more uniform "staging", a proposal was made to the Health Organisation of the League of Nations that the Committee should be entrusted with the preparation of a volume illustrating, by appropriate diagrams, examples of the cases to be allocated to each of the four stages.

This proposal was accepted by the Health Organisation, and the work on the preparation of the Atlas was entrusted to Prof. J. Heyman in collaboration with Dr. M. Strandquist, both of the Radiumhemmet, Stockholm. The Atlas, which contains 38 diagrams drawn by Dr. Strandquist, was published in March 1938. It may be had on application to the Publications Department of the League of Nations, Geneva, Switzerland.\*

The Committee wishes particularly to express its gratitude to Prof. L. Adler, Vienna; Sir Comyns Berkeley, London;

<sup>1</sup> C. H. 788; League of Nations Publications, Health 1929, III 5

\* Price: Swiss fr. 7.50.

Prof. J. Ducuing, Toulouse; and Dr. W. Healy, New York, for their kind collaboration in the work on the Atlas.

The preparation of the volume has provided the opportunity of slightly modifying the definitions of the four stages adopted in 1929 (see page 25). The proposed modifications, which derive from experience gained during recent years and which aim at a simpler and more precise differentiation between the four stages, were finally approved by the Committee in December 1937.

It is hoped that those interested in this subject will approve to utilize the modified definitions. Collaborators in these reports are requested to adopt them from 1938 onwards (see note page 25).

The following extract from the Atlas, which discusses the above subject in greater detail, is printed for the use of those interested.

*"2. Comments on definitions and on allocation of cases to their appropriate stages.*

According to the Committee's experience, differences in interpretation of the rules for grouping, which affect materially the comparability of different statistics, occur particularly in differentiating between stages II and III and in those cases where the degree of involvement of the parametrium should be the deciding factor. In the 1929 definitions estimation of the extent of involvement of the parametrium was based mainly on the degree of fixation of the uterus. In the revised definitions (see page 26) the distinction between stage II and stage III has been based solely on what can be established, on rectal and vaginal examination, in regard to the relationship between the growth and the pelvic wall and seems likely to reduce differences due to subjective interpretation. The pelvic wall is understood to consist of the pelvic bone, its muscles, fasciae, vessels and lymph-nodes as indicated in the diagrams of the Atlas, that is the pelvic wall as appreciated by the exploring finger.

The definitions have been much simplified in those cases

where allocation to a stage is governed by the vaginal extent of the growth.

The definitions of 1929 were drawn up on an anatomical basis and, as regards stage IV, to counteract a previously generally accepted idea that hopeless cases should be included in that stage. It does not appear, however, that the result has been entirely satisfactory. There are numerous cases which are hopeless owing to the patients' general condition but which, judged by the extent of the growth, should be classified as stage III; on the other hand there are a certain number of cases which are not hopeless, but which, following the 1929 definitions of stage IV, paragraph (a) and (c), belong to that stage. The Committee therefore suggests including in stage IV those cases only in which the bladder or the rectum is involved or in which spread outside the true pelvis has occurred. The proposed modifications will undoubtedly reduce comparability between the results obtained before and after 1938 at the same clinic, but this is of minor importance, because it will not affect the comparability of the results obtained in the same year at different clinics.

A case should be allocated to its stage by the condition found on inspection, on bimanual examination, vaginal and rectal, and on cystoscopy when there is a question of involvement of the bladder.

It is to be expected that the simplified definitions and illustrative diagrams will permit of experienced clinicians staging in a reasonably uniform manner those cases in which thorough examination enables the extent of the growth to be precisely determined. Nevertheless there will remain, for various reasons, a number of cases in which even the most expert examiner may have doubt as to the appropriate stage.

Difficulties may occur for instance:

- in determining whether an individual case should be considered as an advanced example of a certain stage or an early example of the succeeding one. In such instances it should be made a general rule to allocate cases to the

- prognostically more favourable stages in order not to raise unduly the rates for earlier stages;
- in differentiating between an inflammatory and a carcinomatous infiltration of the parametrium. Uniformity in grouping would be promoted if doubtful infiltrations with consequent fixation of the uterus were consistently recorded as inflammatory;
  - in differentiating between a metastasis and a nodule of some other origin, *e. g.*, a lymphadenitis of non-carcinomatous origin, a remnant of a pelvic peritonitis or a phlebitis. In many instances, particularly of nodules in the vagina and of superficial lymph-nodes, it is easy to confirm the diagnosis by microscopical examination. When this is impracticable it may be justifiable to postpone the final classification and to let the further development of the disease decide. Such a procedure should be adopted only quite exceptionally. As a rule each case should be staged at the examination previous to treatment and should remain in that stage;
  - in cystoscopic diagnosis of carcinomatous involvement of the bladder. Further investigation of this subject is necessary before it can be said with certainty what cystoscopic appearances denote carcinomatous involvement of the bladder and consequent allocation to stage IV."
-

## IV. SECOND ANNUAL REPORT.

### 1. NOTES FOR THE GUIDANCE OF COLLABORATORS.

1. The statement should include cases of cancer of the cervix uteri only (including carcinoma of the stump).

(a) The statement will be confined to cases where the treatment planned was entirely radiological (radium and Roentgen rays).

(b) Patients operated upon after failure of radiological treatment and alive five years after the beginning of the treatment should appear in Table 4, col. 4.

2. The following clinical types of cases should be excluded:

(a) Cancer of the corpus uteri and vagina.<sup>1</sup>

(b) Recurrences after radical operation.

(c) Patients radiologically treated elsewhere.

(d) Patients primarily submitted to combined operative and radiological treatment.

3. Only those series of cases in which all clinical diagnoses have been microscopically confirmed can, as a rule, be accepted.

4. The following histological types of cases should be excluded:

(a) Precancerous conditions.

(b) Chorio-epithelioma, sarcoma, malignant mixed tumours.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is intended to revise, in the future, the definitions of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma. Pending the results of that revision, the definitions used will be those in the Report of the Radiological Sub-Commission (Series of League of Nations Publications C. H. 788), reprinted on page 23.

5. The statement should relate to the total number of patients whose radiological treatment was begun during the year to which the statement refers, as well as all patients examined with a view to treatment but not treated.

6. The statement should not be completed until a period of observation of at least 5 years from the beginning of the treatment has expired in all cases included.

7. Tables 1—6 are intended for the annual statement relating to cases treated in 1931; tables 7—10 have been provided for those institutes which are able to furnish data for an earlier period on a basis corresponding to that now being adopted in the present series of annual reports.

---



2. SPECIMENS OF THE TABLES USED FOR  
CASES TREATED IN 1931.

.....  
(Institute) **Cancer of the Cervix uteri.**  
*Statement of results in 19.....*

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment .....	
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ... ..	
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.<sup>1</sup>*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves .....	
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	
(d) Operation advised .....	
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	
(h) Some other specified reason .....	
Total .....	

<sup>1</sup> Patients referred to the clinic by means (*e. g.*, letter, telephone etc.) which do not allow of their being examined at the clinic are excluded.

*Note:* Calculation of absolute cure rate (see Table 5, footnote 1) omitted because of .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

**Table 3.**

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages <sup>3</sup> I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated.									
With microscopical verification . . . . .									
Without microscopical verification <sup>2</sup>									

<sup>1</sup> Total number of patients treated, incompletely treated patients included.

<sup>2</sup> A detailed description should be given for each case in which the patient is alive without recurrence five years from the beginning of treatment, and in which no microscopical verification has been made.

<sup>3</sup> See footnote page 25.

Detailed description of cases alive without recurrence five years after treatment in which no microscopical verification has been made.

(The reason why histological confirmation was not obtained should be stated.)

.....

.....

.....

.....

**Table 4.**

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer <sup>1</sup>	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I .....							
II .....							
III .....							
IV .....							
I—IV .....							

<sup>1</sup> Patients dying during or as a result of treatment should be included in this column.

CALCULATION OF RESULTS.

**Table 5.**

*Absolute cure rate.*<sup>1</sup>

Total number of cases (see Table 1. I) .....	
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV).....	
Absolute cure rate <sup>2</sup> .....	

<sup>1</sup> For certain clinics conditions are such *e. g.*, when they are responsible for the treatment of almost every patient who seeks it from a defined area, that the calculation of an absolute cure rate has value for comparison with clinics similarly organised. When this is the case, the rate should be calculated as above. In other clinics the calculation may be omitted, the reason being given in a footnote to Table 2. In all clinics 'Patients examined at the clinic but not treated' will be distributed, in Table 2, among the groups there set out.

<sup>2</sup> *I. e.* the proportion the above number of patients alive without recurrence form of the total number examined, stated as a percentage.

**Table 6.**

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage <sup>1</sup>
Stage I .....			
Stage II .....			
Stage III .....			
Stage IV .....			
Stages I—IV .....			

<sup>1</sup> The cure rate calculated in this way obviously understates the results of treatment, since a proportion of patients will have died of a cause unrelated to cancer of the cervix, whilst the fate of a further proportion may be unknown.

3. SPECIMENS OF THE TABLES USED FOR CASES TREATED IN PREVIOUS YEARS.

Cancer of the Cervix uteri.

(Institute)

Table 7.<sup>1</sup>

Statement for 19.....—19.....inclusive.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>2</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I—IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
19.....							
19.....							
etc.							

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1—6 for a period prior to 1931. — <sup>2</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.<sup>1</sup>

Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of					4. <sup>2</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of								
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9
19.....																														
19.....																														
etc.																														

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1—6 for a period prior to 1931. — <sup>2</sup> To include patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

**Table 9<sup>1</sup>, Stages I—IV.**

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4.						5.						6.					
			Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>2</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						Absolute cure rate <sup>3</sup> at the end of						Relative cure rate <sup>4</sup> at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
years						years						years								
19.....																				
19.....																				
etc.																				

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1—6 for a period prior to 1931. — <sup>2</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained should be entered in brackets after the principal figures in col. 4. — <sup>3</sup> See Table 5, footnote 1. — <sup>4</sup> See Table 6.

— 22 —

**Table 10<sup>1</sup>, Stage I.**

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
19.....													
19.....													
etc.													

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1—6 for a period prior to 1931.

*Note: Similar tables for stages II, III and IV.*

#### 4. DEFINITION OF THE DIFFERENT VARIETIES OF UTERO-VAGINAL CARCINOMA.

1. Cases should be reckoned as carcinoma of the vagina when the site of the growth is in the vagina; when clinical examination shows that the cervix is intact; and when there is no ground for supposing that the carcinoma is other than a primary growth in the vagina. In cases in which the carcinoma involves the cervix, the case must be regarded as one of carcinoma of the cervix.

It would, however, be advisable to classify as vaginal carcinoma those cases in which a small lesion previously noticeable on the cervix has rapidly disappeared after radiological treatment, while the main part of the tumour is still present in the vagina.

In those cases in which the cervix could not be examined at the beginning of the treatment, and therefore no decision could be made as to whether it was involved or not, the final diagnosis must be postponed until the situation has been clarified as a result of treatment. When, even after radiological treatment, no differentiation can be made, owing to the impossibility of examining the cervix, the case should be classified as cancer of the vagina if the cervix and parametria appear to be clinically free from growth on rectal examination.

2. Cases should be classified as carcinoma of the body when the site of the disease is in the body, whereas the cervix appears to be healthy.

The clinical distinction between carcinoma of the cervix and of the body of the uterus may offer difficulties in a small number of cases, such as the following:

(a) The uterus is not enlarged, and clinical examination does not give sufficient indications for determining

the point of origin or the direction of spread of the growth.

In the majority of these cases it should be possible, without too great risk of error, to classify them on the basis of the microscopical report; for instance, pure squamous-celled carcinoma and adeno-carcinoma with mucous secretion are both types of cervical epithelioma.

In the remaining cases, which certainly form a very small fraction of the total in which it is not possible to make a definite classification on either clinical or microscopical evidence, the classification may be left to individual discretion.

(b) The cavity of the uterus is enlarged. It is not possible to determine by clinical examination whether the case is an endo-cervical carcinoma of the cervix with extension to the body or a carcinoma of the body extending to the cervix. Such cases generally spread like carcinoma of the body, and it is more of theoretical than of practical interest to ascertain the point of origin of the disease. They behave essentially as carcinoma of the body, and should be so classified unless the microscopical picture contra-indicates such a classification, as in the case of a pure squamous-celled carcinoma or an adeno-carcinoma with mucous secretion.

Cases presenting difficulty in diagnosis, owing to complications such as myomata, pyometra, etc., should be classified in the same manner.

*Note:* It is intended to revise, in the future, the definitions of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma.

---



5. DEFINITIONS OF THE FOUR STAGES OF CANCER  
OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

*A. Definitions approved in 1929.*

*Stage I.*

The growth is strictly limited to the cervix uteri. Uterus mobile.

*Stage II.*

Lesion spreading into one or more fornices, with or without infiltration of the parametrium adjacent to the uterus, the uterus retaining some degree of mobility.

*Stage III.*

(a) Nodular infiltration of the parametria on one or both sides extending to the wall of the pelvis, with limited mobility of the uterus or massive infiltration of one parametrium with fixation of the uterus.

(b) More or less superficial infiltration of a large part of the vagina, with a mobile uterus.

(c) Isolated metastases in the pelvic glands, with a relatively small primary growth.

(d) Isolated metastases in the lower part of the vagina.

Generally speaking, all cases not falling into Stages II or IV will be placed under Stage III.

*Stage IV.*

(a) Cases with massive infiltration of both parametria extending to the walls of the pelvis.

(b) Carcinoma involving the bladder or rectum.

(c) The whole vagina infiltrated (rigid vaginal passage), or one vaginal wall infiltrated along its whole length, with fixation of the primary growth.

(d) Remote metastases.

*Note:* Collaborators are requested to be good enough to use the definitions of 1937 (see page 26) for the grouping of cases treated in 1938 and consecutive years.

*B. Definitions approved in 1937.*

*Stage I.*

- The carcinoma is strictly confined to the cervix.

*Stage II.*

- The carcinoma infiltrates the parametrium on one or both sides, but has not invaded the pelvic wall. *Stage II, parametrium.*
- The carcinoma infiltrates the vagina, but does not involve its lower third. *Stage II, vagina.*
- Endocervical carcinoma which has spread to the corpus. *Stage II, corpus.*

*Stage III.*

- The carcinomatous infiltration of the parametrium has invaded the pelvic wall on one or both sides. On rectal examination no cancer-free space is found between the tumour and the pelvic wall. *Stage III, parametrium.*
- The carcinoma involves the lower third of the vagina. *Stage III, vagina.*
- Isolated carcinomatous metastases are palpable on the pelvic wall, (irrespective of the extent of the primary cervical growth). *Stage III, isolated pelvic metastases.*

*Stage IV.*

- The carcinoma involves the bladder as determined by cystoscopic examination or by the presence of a vesico-vaginal fistula. *Stage IV, bladder.*
- The carcinoma involves the rectum. *Stage IV, rectum.*
- The carcinoma has spread outside the true pelvis (below the vaginal inlet, above the pelvic brim, distant metastases). *Stage IV, distant spread.*

*General rules to be observed:*

- When allocating a case to a stage, nothing but facts revealed by examination should be taken into account.
  - The stage of each case should be decided at examination prior to treatment, and this classification should remain. The classification may be postponed quite exceptionally and the reasons stated.
  - When it is doubtful to which stage a given case is to be allocated, the earlier stage should be chosen.
  - The fact that a single case presents two or more of the conditions which characterise a particular stage does not affect the staging.
-

6. STATEMENTS.

(a) MEMORIAL HOSPITAL FOR THE TREATMENT OF CANCER AND ALLIED DISEASES, NEW YORK, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

(Contributed by Dr. WILLIAM P. HEALY.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	137
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2)...	1
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	136

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	1
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	1

**Table 3.**  
*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated.	136	17	12.5	15	11.0	74	54.4	30	22.1
With microscopic verification . . . . .	135	17		15		74		29	
Without microscopical verification	1	0		0		0		1 <sup>1</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> This patient died before the five year observation period was over.

**Table 4.**  
*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	17	9	0	0	8	0	0
II . . . . .	15	7	0	0	8	0	0
III . . . . .	74	14	0	0	56	2	2
IV . . . . .	30	3	0	0	23	4	0
I—IV . . . . .	136	33	0	0	95	6	2

**Table 5.**  
*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	137
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV).....	33
Absolute cure rate.....	24.1

**Table 6.**  
*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	17	9	52.9
Stage II .....	15	7	46.7
Stage III .....	74	14	18.9
Stage IV.....	30	3	10.0
Stages I—IV .....	136	33	24.3

Data from Memorial Hospital relating to the years previous to 1931 will appear in the Third Annual Report.

(b) WOMAN'S HOSPITAL IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

(Contributed by Dr. GEORGE G. WARD.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.\*

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	51
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ...	0
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	51

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised.....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	0

\* The statistical year ends May 15, 1931.

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated.	51	9	17.6	24	47.1	18	35.3	0	0.0
With microscopical verification . . . . .	51	9		24		18		0	
Without microscopical verification	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
Stage	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	9	5	0	0	2	1	1
II . . . . .	24	6	2	0	15	0	1
III . . . . .	18	3	0	0	15	0	0
IV . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I—IV . . . . .	51	14	2	0	32	1	2



**Table 5.**  
*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	51
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV) .....	14
Absolute cure rate.....	27.5

**Table 6.**  
*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	9	5	
Stage II .....	24	6	25.0
Stage III .....	18	3	16.7
Stage IV.....	0	0	
Stages I—IV .....	51	14	27.5

## STATEMENT FOR 1920—1930 INCLUSIVE.\*

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I—IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1920	40	2	38	9	11	18	0
1921	34	2	32	8	9	14	1
1922	34	1	33	12	8	13	0
1923	40	0	40	11	16	12	1
1924	39	2	37	7	20	7	3
1925	47	1	46	7	18	17	4
1926	45	1	44	5	24	11	4
1927	51	5	46	7	18	19	2
1928	46	3	43	8	25	4	6
1929	53	0	53	8	23	19	3
1930	37	1	36	6	13	17	0
Total	466	18	448	88	185	151	24

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

\* Each statistical year ends May 15th of that year.

**Table S.**  
*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1920	38	6	6	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	28	28	28	28	3	3	4	4	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1
1921	32	9	8	8	8	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	22	22	22	22	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
1922	33	6	5	5	4	4	4	1	1	1	2	2	1	23	24	24	24	24	25	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
1923	40	11	11	11	11	11	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	29	29	29	29	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
1924	37	7	7	6	6	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	25	25	25	25	25	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	3	3
1925	46	10	9	8	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	35	35	35	35	35	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3	3
1926	44	9	9	9	8	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	34	34	34	34	34	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	2
1927	46	11	11	10	9	9		0	0	0	0	0		32	32	32	32	32		1	1	1	1	1		2	2	3	4	4	
1928	43	13	11	11	11			0	0	0	0			28	28	28	28			1	2	2	2			1	2	2	2		
1929	53	14	13	12				0	0	1				38	38	38				0	1	1				1	1	1			
1930	36	14	13					1	0					19	20					0	0					2	3				
Total	448	110						9						306						12						11					

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

Evaluation of results.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observ- ation of (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
			years							years						years					
1920	40	38	6	6	5	5	5	5	15.0	15.0	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	15.8	15.8	13.2	13.2	13.2	13.2	
1921	34	32	9	8	8	8	8	8	26.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5	28.1	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	
1922	34	33	6	5	5	4	4	4	17.6	14.7	14.7	11.8	11.8	11.8	18.2	15.2	15.2	12.1	12.1	12.1	
1923	40	40	11	11	11	11	11	9	27.5	27.5	27.5	27.5	27.5	22.5	27.5	27.5	27.5	27.5	27.5	22.5	
1924	39	37	7	7	6	6	6	6	17.9	17.9	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.4	18.9	18.9	16.2	16.2	16.2	16.2	
1925	47	46	10	9	8	7	7	7	21.3	19.1	17.0	14.9	14.9	14.9	21.7	19.6	17.4	15.2	15.2	15.2	
1926	45	44	9	9	9	8	7	7	20.0	20.0	20.0	17.8	15.6	15.6	20.5	20.5	20.5	18.2	15.9	15.9	
1927	51	46	11	11	10	9	9		21.6	21.6	19.6	17.6	17.6	23.9	23.9	21.7	19.6	19.6			
1928	46	43	13	11	11	11			28.3	24.0	24.0	24.0		30.2	25.6	25.6	25.6				
1929	53	53	14	13	12				26.4	24.5	22.6			26.4	24.5	22.6					
1930	37	36	14	13					37.8	35.1				38.9	36.1						
Total	466	448	110						23.6						24.6						

Table 10, Stage I.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1920	9	3	3	3	3	3	3							
1921	8	6	5	5	5	5	5							
1922	12	5	4	4	3	3	3							
1923	11	6	6	6	6	6	6							
1924	7	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1925	7	4	3	2	2	2	2							
1926	5	4	4	4	3	2	2							
1927	7	1	1	1	1	1								
1928	8	6	6	6	6									
1929	8	5	4	4										
1930	6	5	4											
Total	88	47						53.4						

Table 10, Stage II.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1920	11	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1921	9	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1922	8	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1923	16	3	3	3	3	3	2	18.8	18.8	18.8	18.8	18.8	12.5	
1924	20	4	4	4	4	4	4	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	
1925	18	6	6	6	5	5	5	33.3	33.3	33.3	27.8	27.8	27.8	
1926	24	4	4	4	4	4	4	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.7	
1927	18	6	6	5	5	5		33.3	33.3	27.8	27.8	27.8		
1928	25	7	5	5	5			28.0	20.0	20.0	20.0			
1929	23	6	6	6				26.1	26.1	26.1				
1930	13	6	6											
Total	185	46						24.9						

**Table 10, Stage III.**

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1920	18	2	2	1	1	1	1	11.1	11.1	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6
1921	14	1	1	1	1	1	1						
1922	13	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1923	12	2	2	2	2	2	1						
1924	7	1	1	0	0	0	0						
1925	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1926	11	1	1	1	1	1	1						
1927	19	4	4	4	3	3		21.1	21.1	21.1	15.8	15.8	
1928	4	0	0	0	0								
1929	19	3	3	2				15.8	15.8	10.5			
1930	17	3	3					17.6	17.6				
Total	151	17						11.3					

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1921	1	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1922	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1923	1	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1924	3	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	4	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1926	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1927	2	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1928	6	0	0	0	0									
1929	3	0	0	0										
1930	0	0	0											
Total	34	0							0.0					



(c) THE CENTRE DES TUMEURS DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE  
BRUXELLES, BELGIUM.

(Contributed by Prof. J. MURDOCH.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	73
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2)....	10
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	63

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	3
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	1
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	6
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	10

**Table 3.**

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated.	63	6	9.5	20	31.7	28	44.4	9	14.3
With microscopical verification. ....	58	5		20		26		7	
Without microscopical verification..	5 <sup>1</sup>	1		0		2		2	

<sup>1</sup> These five patients died before the end of the five year period.

**Table 4.**

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I .....	6	2	0	0	3	0	1
II .....	20	8	0	0	11	0	1
III .....	28	4	0	0	23	0	1
IV .....	9	0	0	0	9	0	0
I—IV .....	63	14	0	0	46	0	3

**Table 5.**

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	73
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV).....	14
Absolute cure rate .....	19.2 %

**Table 6.**

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	6	2	
Stage II .....	20	8	40.0
Stage III .....	28	4	14.3
Stage IV .....	9	0	
Stages I—IV .....	63	14	22.2

STATEMENT FOR 1926—1930 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I—IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
			1926	75	15	60	14
1927	59	9	50	11	13	19	7
1928	76	8	68 <sup>2</sup>	20	18	21	8
1929	80	6	74 <sup>2</sup>	20	11	39	3
1930	94	11	83	9	27	35	12
Total	384	49	335	74	84	137	38

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2. — <sup>2</sup> One case not classified because of insufficient clinical information is included in Tables 7, 8 and 9. As the patient died before the end of the five-year period, the case will not appear in Table 10.

Table 8.

Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of							4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of							5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of							6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of							7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of						
		5   6   7   8   9   10 years							5   6   7   8   9   10 years							5   6   7   8   9   10 years							5   6   7   8   9   10 years							5   6   7   8   9   10 years						
		1926	60	16	16	15	11	10	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	42	42	42	42	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	7	7			
1927	50	14	14	13	12	12	0	0	1	0	0	31	31	31	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	6	6										
1928	68	17	14	13	13	2	0	0	0	47	49	50	50	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	5															
1929	74	21	20	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	52	53	0	0	0	1	2	2																	
1930	83	14	13	2	1	63	64	0	0	4	5																									
Total	335	82					4					235					0					14														

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9, Stages I—IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observa- tion of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
			years							years						years					
1926	75	60	16(1)	16(1)	15(1)	11(1)	10(1)	10(1)	21.3	21.3	20.0	14.7	13.3	13.3	26.7	26.7	25.0	18.3	16.7	16.7	
1927	59	50	14	14	13	12	12		23.7	23.7	22.0	20.3	20.3		28.0	28.0	26.0	24.0	24.0		
1928	76	68	17	14	13	13			22.4	18.4	17.1	17.1			25.0	20.6	19.1	19.1			
1929	80	74	21	20	19				26.3	25.0	23.8				28.4	27.0	25.7				
1930	94	83	14	13					14.9	13.8					16.9	15.7					
Total	384	335	82						21.4						24.5						

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4.

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		y e a r s						y e a r s						
1926	14	6	6	6	5	5	5							
1927	11	6	6	6	6	6								
1928	20	6	6	6	6			30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0			
1929	20	13	12	11				65.0	60.0	55.0				
1930	9	4	3											
Total	74	35						47.3						

**Table 10, Stage II.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		y e a r s						y e a r s						
1926	15	6	6	6	3	3	3	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	
1927	13	5	5	5	5	5								
1928	18	5	5	5	5			27.8	27.8	27.8	27.8			
1929	11	2	2	2										
1930	27	3	3					11.1	11.1					
Total	84	21						25.0						

**Table 10, Stage III.**

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	23	4	4	3	3	2	2	17.4	17.4	13.0	13.0	8.7	8.7
1927	19	3	3	2	1	1		15.8	15.8	10.5	5.3	5.3	
1928	21	6	3	2	2			28.6	14.3	9.5	9.5		
1929	39	6	6	6				15.4	15.4	15.4			
1930	35	7	7					20.0	20.0				
Total	137	26						19.0					

**Table 10, Stage IV.**

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	8	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1927	7	0	0	0	0	0							
1928	8	0	0	0	0								
1929	3	0	0	0									
1930	12	0	0										
Total	38	0						0.0					

(d) THE LIVERPOOL RADIUM INSTITUTE, UNITED KINGDOM  
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

(Contributed by Dr. P. MALPAS.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	94
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	0
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	94

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities.....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications.....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	0



**Table 3.**  
*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated	94	8	8.5	28	29.8	43	45.7	15	16.0
With microscopical verification . . . .	87	8		27		41		11	
Without microscopical verification	7	0		1 <sup>1</sup>		2 <sup>2</sup>		4 <sup>3</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> No 203. Malignant ulcer destroying the posterior lip of cervix and extending on to the posterior fornix. Mobility of the uterus limited. Ulcer friable and bleeds on examination. Clinical diagnosis confirmed by Dr. A. A. Gemmell and Mr. Malpas. Pathological report lost.

<sup>2</sup> No 242. Cauliflower growth springing from the anterior lip of cervix and the uterus completely fixed. Glands to be felt along right brim of pelvis. Both parametria show diffuse infiltration not extending out to the lateral pelvic wall. Pathological report has been lost.

No 223. Malignant ulcer with irregular bossed edges replacing vaginal cervix and extending on to the posterior vaginal wall for 3 cms. The uterus is completely fixed. There was an isolated superficial malignant ulcer 1 cm. x 1/2 cm. situated on the middle of the anterior vaginal wall. Both parametria presented an ill-defined diffuse injection. Pathological report has been mislaid.

<sup>3</sup> These four patients died before the end of the five year period.

**Table 4.**

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radio-therapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	8	5	0	0	2	0	1
II . . . . .	28	7	1	0	18	2	0
III . . . . .	43	6	0	0	37	0	0
IV . . . . .	15	0	0	0	15	0	0
I—IV . . . . .	94	18	1	0	72	2	1

**Table 5.***Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the clinic was not solely responsible for the treatment of cervical carcinoma in the area, which was not a homogeneous unit from the standpoint of hospital administrative arrangements.

**Table 6.***Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	8	5	
Stage II .....	28	7	25.0
Stage III .....	43	6	14.0
Stage IV.....	15	0	0.0
Stages I—IV.....	94	18	19.1



Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of								
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10			
			years						years						years								
1929	36	31	8	8	8													23.5	23.5	23.5			
1930	92	89	25	24														28.1	27.0				
Total	128	123	33															26.8					

**Table 10, Stage I.**

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1929	0	0	0	0									
1930	13	9	9										
Total	13	9											

**Table 10, Stage II.**

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1929	17	5	5	5				29.4	29.4	29.4			
1930	26	12	12					46.2	46.2				
Total	43	17						39.5					

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1929	11	3	3	3										
1930	29	4	3					13.8	10.3					
Total	40	7						17.5						

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1929	6	0	0	0										
1930	21	0	0					0.0	0.0					
Total	27	0						0.0						

(e) THE MARIE CURIE HOSPITAL, LONDON, UNITED  
KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

(Contributed by Dr. Elizabeth HURDON.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	130
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2)....	4
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	126

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised.....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or thera- peutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	4
(h) Some other specified reason.....	0
Total	4

**Table 3.***Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated	126	9	7.1	20	15.9	75	59.5	22	17.5
With microscopical verification . . . .	126	9		20		75		22	
Without microscopical verification	0	0		0		0		0	

**Table 4.***Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	9	6	0	0	2	0	1
II . . . . .	20	12	0	0	7	0	1
III . . . . .	75	23	1	0	51	0	0
IV . . . . .	22	1	0	0	20	0	1
I-IV . . . . .	126	42	1	0	80	0	3



**Table 5.**

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	130
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV) .....	42
Absolute cure rate .....	<b>32.3 %</b>

**Table 6.**

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	9	6	
Stage II .....	20	12	60.0
Stage III .....	75	23	30.7
Stage IV .....	22	1	4.5
Stages I—IV .....	126	42	<b>33.3</b>

STATEMENT FOR OCTOBER 1925—1930 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I—IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1925 } 1926 }	74	1	73 <sup>2</sup>	2	10	50	11
1927	59	2	57	1	9	28	19
1928	88	2	86	7	18	46	15
1929	110	0	110	4	16	70	20
1930	142	6	136	6	32	81	17
Total	473	11	462	20	85	275	82

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925—January 1st, 1926: 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926—January 1st, 1927: 59.

Table 8.

Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1925 } 1926 }	73 <sup>2</sup>	22	18	17	16	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	54	54	54	54	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	3
1927	57	15	15	15	14	14	1	0	0	0	0	41	42	42	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1928	86	36	32	31	28	1	0	0	0	49	53	54	55	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1929	110	38	34	32	0	1	0	72	75	76	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1			
1930	136	56	51	1	0	78	80	1	4	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1						
Total	462	167					3					291					1						0								

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925—January 1st, 1926: 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926—January 1st, 1927: 59.

Table 9, Stages I—IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
			years							years						years					
1925 } 1926 }	74	73 <sup>2</sup>	22	18	17	16	16	15	29.7	24.3	23.0	21.6	21.6	20.3	30.1	24.7	23.3	21.9	21.9	20.5	
1927	59	57	15	15	15	14	14	25.4	25.4	25.4	23.7	23.7	26.3	26.3	26.3	24.6	24.6				
1928	88	86	36(1)	32(1)	31(1)	28(1)	40.9	36.4	35.2	31.8	41.9	37.2	36.0	32.6							
1929	110	110	38(1)	34(1)	32(1)	34.5	30.9	29.1	34.5	30.9	29.1										
1930	142	136	56(1)	51(1)	39.4	35.9	41.2	37.5													
Total	473	462	167						35.3						36.1						

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4. From and including 1930 a detailed description of such cases will be found in previous annual reports.

<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925—January 1st, 1926: 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926—January 1st, 1927: 59.

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		y e a r s						y e a r s					
1925 } 1926 }	2	2	2	2	2	2	2						
1927	1	1	1	1	1	1	1						
1928	7	6	5	5	5								
1929	4	4	4	4									
1930	6	5	4										
Total	20	18						90.0					

**Table 10, Stage II.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		y e a r s						y e a r s					
1925 } 1926 }	10	6	5	4	4	4	4						
1927	9	5	5	5	5	5							
1928	18	11	9	9	8			61.1	50.0	50.0	44.4		
1929	16	12	10	10				75.0	62.5	62.5			
1930	32	21	20					65.6	62.5				
Total	85	55						64.7					

**Table 10, Stage III.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1925 } 1926 }	50	14	11	11	10	10	9	28.0	22.0	22.0	20.0	20.0	18.0
1927	28	9	9	9	8	8		32.1	32.1	32.1	28.6	28.6	
1928	46	16	15	15	13			34.8	32.6	32.6	28.3		
1929	70	20	18	16				28.6	25.7	22.9			
1930	81	27	24					33.3	29.6				
Total	275	86						31.3					

**Table 10, Stage IV.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1925 } 1926 }	11	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1927	19	0	0	0	0	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
1928	15	3	3	2	2			20.0	20.0	13.3	13.3		
1929	20	2	2	2				10.0	10.0	10.0			
1930	17	3	3					17.6	17.6				
Total	82	8						9.8					

(f) RADIUM CENTRE FOR CARCINOMA OF THE UTERUS,  
LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL, UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT  
BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND.

(Contributed by Sir Comyns BERKELEY.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	96
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	9
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	87

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves ..	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	1
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	1
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	7
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	9

**Table 3.**

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated	87	4	4.6	27	31.0	37	42.5	19	21.8
With microscopical verification . . . .	86	4		27		36		19	
Without microscopical verification .	1 <sup>1</sup>	0		0		1		0	

<sup>1</sup> This patient died before the end of the five year period.

**Table 4.**

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	4	1	0	0	2	1	0
II . . . . .	27	3	0	0	23	1	0
III . . . . .	37	7	0	0	30	0	0
IV . . . . .	19	0	0	0	19	0	0
I—IV . . . . .	87	11	0	0	74	2	0

**Table 5.***Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, 1) .....	96
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV) .....	11
Absolute cure rate .....	11.5 %

**Table 6.***Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	4	1	
Stage II .....	27	3	11.1
Stage III.....	37	7	18.9
Stage IV.....	19	0	0.0
Stages I—IV .....	87	11	12.6



STATEMENT FOR 1928—1930 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I—IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
			1928	21	1	20	1
1929	88	10	73	6	12	30	25
1930	66	9	57	3	24	18	12
Total	170	20	150	10	42	57	41

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years					
		1928	20	2	2	2	2			0	0	0	0			18	18	18	18			0	0	0	0			0	0	0	0
1929	73	12	9	7				0	0	0				59	61	63				2	3	3				0	0	0			
1930	57	10	10					0	0					46	46					1	1					0	0				
Total	150	24						0	0					123						3						0					

Table 9, Stages 1-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observ- ation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years						years					
1928	21	20	2	2	2	2			9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5			10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		
1929	83	73	12	9	7			14.5	10.8	8.4				16.4	12.3	9.6				
1930	66	57	10	10				15.2	15.2					17.5	17.5					
Total	170	150	24					14.1						16.0						

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1928	1	1	1	1	1								
1929	6	2	2	2									
1930	3	2	2										
Total	10	5											

**Table 10, Stage II.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1928	6	0	0	0	0								
1929	12	3	2	2									
1930	24	5	5				20.8	20.8					
Total	42	8					19.0						

**Table 10, Stage III.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1928	9	1	1	1	1									
1929	30	6	4	3				20.0	13.3	10.0				
1930	18	1	1					5.6	5.6					
Total	57	8						14.0						

**Table 10, Stage IV.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1928	4	0	0	0	0									
1929	25	1	1	0				4.0	4.0	0.0				
1930	12	2	2											
Total	41	3						7.3						

(g) THE INSTITUT DU CANCER, PARIS, FRANCE.

(Contributed by Dr. SIMONE LABORDE.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	111
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprises in Table 2) ..	28
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	83

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	3
(d) Operation advised .....	1
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	24
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	28

**Table 3.***Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated..	83	9	10.8	15	18.1	40	48.2	19	22.9
With microscopical verification ....	83	9		15		40		19	
Without microscop- ical verification .	0	0		0		0		0	

**Table 4.***Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years,  
dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recur- rence	Alive with recur- rence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radio- therapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter- current disease
I .....	9	4	0	0	3	1	1
II .....	15	8	0	0	7	0	0
III .....	40	14	1	0	22	3	0
IV .....	19	2	0	0	16	1	0
I—IV .....	83	28	1	0	48	5	1

**Table 5.**

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, 1) .....	111
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV) .....	28
Absolute cure rate.....	<b>25.2</b>

**Table 6.**

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	9	4	
Stage II .....	15	8	53.3
Stage III .....	40	14	35.0
Stage IV.....	19	2	10.5
Stages I—IV .....	83	28	33.7

## STATEMENT FOR 1921—1930 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I—IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1921	15	4	11	0	1	6	4
1922	38	13	25	2	2	12	9
1923	32	7	25	1	2	12	10
1924	44	12	32	0	2	23	7
1925	38	8	30	0	6	14	10
1926	59	8	51	0	9	24	18
1927	78	23	55	6	10	22	17
1928	85	24	61	7	10	32	12
1929	99	39	60	1	9	27	23
1930	87	7	80	8	13	38	21
Total	575	145	430	25	64	210	131

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.



**Table 8.**  
*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of					4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of									
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1921	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1922	25	7	5	5	5	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	18	18	18	19	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
1923	25	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	21	21	21	21	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
1924	32	7	6	6	5	5	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	24	25	25	26	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
1925	30	10	10	10	8	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	21	21	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1926	51	9	8	8	7	7	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	41	42	42	43	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
1927	55	15	12	12	12	12		0	0	0	0	0		38	40	40	40	40		1	2	2	2	2		1	1	1	1	1	
1928	61	16	13	12	11			1	2	1	0			38	39	40	41			4	5	5	5			2	2	3	4		
1929	60	18	17	16				0	1	0			34	34	35				7	7	7				1	1	2				
1930	80	22	22					1	1				53	53					2	2					2	2					
Total	430	109						4					296						15						6						

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observ- ation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years						years					
1921	15	11	2	2	2	2	2	2	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3						
1922	38	25	7	5	5	5	5	4	18.4	13.2	13.2	13.2	13.2	10.5	28.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	16.0
1923	32	25	3	3	3	3	3	3	9.4	9.4	9.4	9.4	9.4	9.4	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0
1924	44	32	7	6	6	5	5	4	15.9	13.6	13.6	11.4	11.4	9.1	21.9	18.8	18.8	15.6	15.6	12.5
1925	38	30	10	10	10	8	8	7	26.3	26.3	26.3	21.1	21.1	18.4	33.3	33.3	33.3	26.7	26.7	23.3
1926	59	51	9	8	8	7	7	6	15.3	13.6	13.6	11.9	11.9	10.2	17.6	15.7	15.7	13.7	13.7	11.8
1927	78	55	15	12	12	12	12		19.2	15.4	15.4	15.4	15.4		27.3	21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	
1928	85	61	16	13	12	11			18.8	15.3	14.1	12.9			26.2	21.3	20.0	18.0		
1929	99	60	18	17	16				18.2	17.2	16.2				30.0	28.3	26.7			
1930	57	80	22	22					25.3	25.3					27.5	27.5				
Total	575	430	109						19.0						25.3					

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1921	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1922	2	2	1	1	1	1	1							
1923	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1924	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1926	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1927	6	6	5	5	5	5	5							
1928	7	2	1	1	1									
1929	1	0	0	0										
1930	8	2	2											
Total	25	13						52.0						

Table 10, Stage II.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1921	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1922	2	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1923	2	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1924	2	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1925	6	6	6	6	5	5	4							
1926	9	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1927	10	3	3	3	3	3								
1928	10	3	2	1	1									
1929	9	7	7	6										
1930	13	6	6											
Total	64	31						48.4						

**Table 10, Stage III.**

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1921	6	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1922	12	4	3	3	3	3	2							
1923	12	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1924	23	6	5	5	4	4	3	26.1	21.7	21.7	17.4	17.4	13.0	
1925	14	4	4	4	3	3	3							
1926	24	7	6	6	5	5	4	29.2	25.0	25.0	20.8	20.8	16.7	
1927	22	6	4	4	4	4		27.3	18.2	18.2	18.2	18.2		
1928	32	11	10	10	9			34.4	31.3	31.3	28.1			
1929	27	10	9	9				37.0	33.3	33.3				
1930	38	12	12					31.6	31.6					
Total	210	62						29.5						

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1921	4	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1922	9	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1923	10	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1924	7	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	10	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1926	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1927	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		
1928	12	0	0	0	0									
1929	23	1	1	1				4.3	4.3	4.3				
1930	21	2	2					9.5	9.5					
Total	131	3						23						

(h) THE INSTITUT DU RADIUM DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS,  
FRANCE.

(Contributed by Dr. A. LACASSAGNE.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	157
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2)....	55
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	102

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	5
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	5
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	26
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	19
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	55

**Table 3.***Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated	102	12	11.8	44	43.1	34	33.3	12	11.8
With microscopical verification . . . .	102	12		44		34		12	
Without microscopical verification	0	0		0		0		0	

**Table 4.***Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	12	8	0	0	3	0	1
II . . . . .	44	19	1	0	20	1	3
III . . . . .	34	11	0	0	21	0	2
IV . . . . .	12	1	0	0	11	0	0
I—IV . . . . .	102	39	1	0	55	1	6



**Table 5.***Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the available facilities at the Institut du Radium are not sufficient for treatment of all patients presenting themselves, a number of patients being referred to other anti-cancer centres of Paris.

**Table 6.***Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	12	8	
Stage II .....	44	19	43.2
Stage III .....	34	11	32.3
Stage IV .....	12	1	
Stages I—IV .....	102	39	38.2

STATEMENT FOR 1919—1930 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I—IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1919—25 <sup>2</sup>	789	296	493	49	181	204	59
1926	108	20	88	4	29	41	14
1927	113	19	94	11	33	36	14
1928	118	24	94	6	47	37	4
1929	135	33	102	11	38	46	7
1930	158	47	111	16	34	47	14
Total	1,421	439	982	97	362	411	112

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2. — <sup>2</sup> The figures of the individual years from which these totals are derived may be found on reference to the First Annual Report.

Table 8.  
*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		years						years						years						years						years					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1919—25 <sup>2</sup>	493	118	115	112	107	103	103	17	11	10	9	5	3	346	353	355	359	364	366	5	5	5	5	7	7	7	9	11	13	14	14
1926	88	30	29	25	25	24	4	2	0	0	0	0	50	53	56	56	56	56	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	6	6	6	7	
1927	94	27	27	24	23	21	5	2	4	1	0	59	62	62	65	67	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	4					
1928	94	42	42	39	36	2	0	1	3	43	45	45	45	4	4	4	5	3	3	5	5										
1929	102	43	41	39	2	4	2	49	49	51	1	1	2	7	7	8															
1930	111	52	49	3	1	54	58	0	0	2	3																				
Total	982	312					33					601					13						23								

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy. — <sup>2</sup> See note 2, Table 7.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			years							years						years					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1919-25 <sup>1</sup>	789	493	118	115	112	107	103	103								23.9	23.3	22.7	21.7	20.9	20.9
1926	108	88	30	29	25	25	25	24								34.1	33.0	28.4	28.4	28.4	27.3
1927	113	94	27	27	24	23	21									28.7	28.7	25.5	24.5	22.3	
1928	118	94	42	42	39	36										44.7	44.7	41.5	38.3		
1929	135	102	43	41	39											42.2	40.2	38.2			
1930	158	111	52	49												46.8	44.1				
Total	1,421	982	312													31.8					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 82, Table 7.

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919—25 <sup>1</sup>	49	25	25	25	25	25	25	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0	51.0
1926	4	4	4	4	4	4	4						
1927	11	7	7	7	7	6							
1928	6	4	4	2	2								
1929	11	8	8	7									
1930	16	12	12					75.0	75.0				
Total	97	60						61.9					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 82, Table 7.

**Table 10, Stage II.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919—25 <sup>1</sup>	181	55	53	52	48	48	48	30.4	29.3	28.7	26.5	26.5	26.5
1926	29	15	15	13	13	13	12	51.7	51.7	44.8	44.8	44.8	41.4
1927	33	12	12	11	11	10		36.4	36.4	33.3	33.3	30.3	
1928	47	24	24	23	21			51.1	51.1	48.9	44.7		
1929	38	20	20	20				52.6	52.6	52.6			
1930	34	19	19					55.9	55.9				
Total	362	145						40.1					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 82, Table 7.

**Table 10, Stage III.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919—25 <sup>1</sup>	204	37	36	34	33	30	30	18.1	17.6	16.7	16.2	14.7	14.7
1926	41	11	10	8	8	8	8	26.8	24.4	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5
1927	36	8	8	6	5	5		22.2	22.2	16.7	13.9	13.9	
1928	37	14	14	14	13			37.8	37.8	37.8	35.1		
1929	46	15	13	12				32.6	28.3	26.1			
1930	47	16	15					34.0	31.9				
Total	411	101						24.6					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 82, Table 7.

**Table 10, Stage IV.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919—25 <sup>1</sup>	59	1	1	1	1	0	0	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0
1926	14	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1927	14	0	0	0	0	0							
1928	4	0	0	0	0								
1929	7	0	0	0									
1930	14	5	3										
Total	112	6						5.4					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 82, Table 7.

(2) THE RADIUMHEMMET, STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN.

(Contributed by Prof. J. HEYMAN.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*.

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1931.

**Table 1.**

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	219
II. Of those:	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) ..	8
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	211

**Table 2.**

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation of therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	8
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total	8

Table 3.

Patients radiologically treated (Table I, II, 2).

	Stages I—IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage	Number of cases	Per- centage
Total number of patients treated	211	31	14.7	67	31.8	71	33.6	42	19.9
With microscopical verification . . . .	211	31		67		71		42	
Without microscopical verification	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	31	15	1	0	15	0	0
II . . . . .	67	18	2	1	42	0	4
III . . . . .	71	6	1	0	64	0	0
IV . . . . .	42	4	0	0	38	0	0
I—IV . . . . .	211	43	4	1	159	0	4

**Table 5.***Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, 1) .....	219
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I—IV) .....	43
Absolute cure rate .....	19.6%

**Table 6.***Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I—IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I—IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	31	15	48.4
Stage II .....	67	18	26.9
Stage III .....	71	6	8.5
Stage IV .....	42	4	9.5
Stages I—IV .....	211	43	20.4



STATEMENT FOR 1914—1930 INCLUSIVE.

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1914—25 <sup>2</sup>	1,086	61	1,025	102	263	405	255
1926	150	7	143	16	48	51	28
1927	149	6	143	9	55	53	26
1928	135	7	128	14	37	48	29
1929	160	8	152	22	38	66	26
1930	205	7	198	12	60	93	33
Total	1,885	96	1,789	175	501	716	397

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2. — <sup>2</sup> The figures of the individual years from which these totals are derived may be found on reference to the First Annual Report.

Table 8.  
Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		years						years						years						years						years					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1914—25 <sup>2</sup>	1,025	216	206	194	182	177	167	18	16	12	15	8	8	774	783	794	799	808	812	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	20	25	29	32	38
1926	143	35	30	27	27	27	26	3	2	2	1	1	1	103	108	110	111	111	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	4	4
1927	143	36	34	34	34	33	4	2	1	1	1	100	104	105	105	106	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3					
1928	128	29	26	25	24	1	3	1	2	95	96	99	99	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3										
1929	152	46	44	43	2	0	0	98	102	103	0	0	0	6	6	6															
1930	198	50	47	8	6	136	140	0	0	4	5																				
Total	1,789	412					36					1,306					0						35								

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy. — <sup>2</sup> See note 2, Table 7.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years						years					
1914-25 <sup>2</sup>	1,086	1,025	216(7)	206(7)	194(7)	182(7)	177(7)	167(6)	19.9	19.0	17.9	16.8	16.3	15.4	21.1	20.9	18.9	17.8	17.3	16.3
1926	150	143	35	30	27	27	27	26	23.3	20.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	17.3	24.5	21.0	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.2
1927	149	143	36(1)	34(1)	34(1)	34(1)	33(1)		24.2	22.8	22.8	22.8	22.1		25.2	23.8	23.8	23.8	23.1	
1928	135	128	29	26	25	24			21.5	19.3	18.5	17.8			22.7	20.3	19.5	18.8		
1929	160	152	46	44	43				28.8	27.5	26.9				30.3	28.9	28.3			
1930	205	198	50(1)	47(1)					24.4	22.9					25.3	23.7				
Total	1,885	1,789	412						21.9						23.0					

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4. A detailed description of these cases will be found in Acta Radiologica, Vol. VIII, 363, 1937, and in the First Annual Report. — <sup>2</sup> See note 2, page 89, Table 7.

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914-25 <sup>1</sup>	102	52	52	51	47	46	45	51.0	51.0	50.0	46.1	45.1	44.1
1926	16	10	8	8	8	8	7	62.5	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	43.8
1927	9	5	5	4	4	4							
1928	14	8	7	7	7								
1929	22	13	13	13				59.1	59.1	59.1			
1930	12	5	5										
Total	175	93						53.1					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 89, Table 7.

**Table 10, Stage II.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914-25 <sup>1</sup>	263	89	85	80	77	74	71	33.8	32.3	30.4	29.3	28.1	27.0
1926	48	13	13	11	11	11	11	27.1	27.1	22.9	22.9	22.9	22.9
1927	55	18	16	17 <sup>2</sup>	17	17		32.7	29.1	30.9	30.9	30.9	
1928	37	13	12	11	11			35.1	32.4	29.7	29.7		
1929	38	20	19	18				52.6	50.0	47.4			
1930	60	26	26					43.3	43.3				
Total	501	179						35.7					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 89, Table 7. — <sup>2</sup> One patient considered hopeless at six years recovered at seven.

**Table 10, Stage III.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914—25 <sup>1</sup>	405	61	55	51	48	48	43	15.1	13.6	12.6	11.9	11.9	10.6
1926	51	11	8	7	7	7	7	21.6	13.7	13.7	13.7	13.7	13.7
1927	53	13	13	13	13	12		24.5	24.5	24.5	24.5	22.6	
1928	48	5	5	5	4			10.4	10.4	10.4	8.3		
1929	66	11	10	10				16.7	15.2	15.2			
1930	93	16	13					17.2	14.0				
Total	716	117						16.3					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 89, Table 7.

**Table 10, Stage IV.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914—25 <sup>1</sup>	255	14	14	12	10	9	8	5.5	5.5	4.7	3.9	3.5	3.1
1926	28	1	1	1	1	1	1	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
1927	26	0	0	0	0	0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
1928	29	3	2	2	2			10.3	6.9	6.9	6.9		
1929	26	2	2	2				7.7	7.7	7.7			
1930	33	3	3					9.1	9.1				
Total	397	23						5.8					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 89, Table 7.

## 7. SUMMARY.

This Annual Report, the second of the series, includes statements from nine radiotherapeutic centres.

The statements provided by these centres vary considerably in respect of the number of years to which they relate and of the number of patients treated yearly in each centre. When all the data included in them are combined, they furnish information concerning 6,570 patients suffering from cancer of the uterine cervix who were examined with a view to treatment; 5,672 (86.3 per cent.) of them were submitted to radiological treatment.

The following tabular statement shows the results obtained after the lapse of five years from the date of treatment:

Alive without recurrence . . . . .	1,491 <sup>1</sup>	26.3 %
Alive with recurrence (including those operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.) . . . . .	102	1.8 %
Died of cancer . . . . .	3,901	68.8 %
Died of intercurrent disease . . . . .	113	2.0 %
Lost sight of . . . . .	65	1.1 %
	5,672	100.0 %

The 5,672 patients treated were allocated to stages as follows:

Stage I . . . . .	607	10.7 %
Stage II . . . . .	1,626	28.7 %
Stage III . . . . .	2,417	42.6 %
Stage IV . . . . .	1,020	18.0 %
Unclassified . . . . .	2	0.04 %
	5,672	100.0 %

Results of treatment calculated for each of the four stages:

	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Relative cure rate
Stage I . . . . .	607	335	55.2 %
Stage II . . . . .	1,626	590	36.3 %
Stage III . . . . .	2,417	512	21.2 %
Stage IV . . . . .	1,020	54	5.3 %
Unclassified . . . . .	2	0	0.0 %
	Grand total 5,672	1,491	26.3 %

<sup>1</sup> Includes 17 patients without microscopical verification.

The inverse relationship between the proportions of patients allocated to, and cured in the different stages will be noted.

Patients examined with a view to treatment, but not treated may be considered in two classes, viz:—

- (a) Not treated owing to some condition of the patient such as extent of the disease, general health, or other complication.
- (b) Not treated owing to some other reason such as lack of hospital accommodation, etc.

The data needed to divide the whole sample of untreated cases (898 in number) into these two classes have not been recorded; they are available, however, for 198 cases untreated during the years 1930 and 1931 and show that 29 (14.6 %) fell into group (a), 169 (85.4 %) fell into group (b).

---

*Official No. : C.H. 1427.*

Geneva, August 1939.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS  
HEALTH ORGANISATION

---

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF  
RADIOTHERAPY IN CANCER OF THE  
UTERINE CERVIX

---

Third Volume

STATEMENTS OF  
RESULTS OBTAINED IN 1932 AND  
PREVIOUS YEARS

(collated in 1938)

*Edited by :*

J. HEYMAN, M.D.

Stockholm

Series of League of Nations Publications

III. HEALTH

1939. III. 3.

## PREFACE

The Health Organisation, in again recording its gratitude to all those whose co-operation has made it possible to present the third volume in this series of reports, desires to invite attention to the rapid and welcome growth of that co-operation. The first volume contained statements prepared by six collaborators representing the practice of three countries, the second volume contained nine statements emanating from five countries, while the present volume contains sixteen statements contributed from seven countries. Wide extension of a uniform system of recording and analysing data can hardly fail to promote more precise assessment of the value of the methods employed in treatment.

The Health Organisation wishes also to acknowledge its indebtedness to the Advisory Committee (Professor J. HEYMAN, Radiumhemmet, Stockholm; Dr. A. LACASSAGNE, the Radium Institute of the University, Paris; and Lt.-Col. A. B. SMALLMAN, Ministry of Health, London) for the care and labour bestowed upon the preparation of this report; both increase in direct proportion to the growth of co-operation.

*(Health Section, League of Nations.)*

---



## CONTENTS

---

	Page
I. INTRODUCTORY.....	7
II. SOURCES OF ERROR IN STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF TREATMENT :	
A. Difficulties connected with recording the Data .....	10
B. Comparability in stating, arithmetically, the Results of Treatment.....	15
III. THIRD ANNUAL REPORT :	
1. Notes for the Guidance of Collaborators.....	21
2. Specimens of the Tables used for Cases treated in 1932....	23
3. Specimens of the Tables used for Cases treated in Previous Years .....	27
4. Definition of the Different Varieties of Utero-vaginal Carcinoma .....	29
5. Definitions of the Four Stages of Cancer of the <i>Cervix Uteri</i> .	31
A. Definitions approved in 1929 .....	31
B. Definitions approved in 1937 .....	32
6. Statements : <sup>1</sup>	
(a) Memorial Hospital for the Treatment of Cancer and Allied Diseases, New York, United States of America. (Contributed by Dr. William P. HEALY.)	34
(b) Woman's Hospital in the State of New York, United States of America .....	37
(Contributed by Dr. George G. WARD.)	
(c) Centre des Tumeurs de l'Université de Bruxelles, Belgium .....	44
(Contributed by Professor J. MURDOCH.)	

---

<sup>1</sup> Countries are given in the alphabetical order of the French, in accordance with the practice of the Secretariat of the League of Nations.

	Page
(d) Institut du Cancer de l'Université de Louvain, Belgium . . . . . (Contributed by Professor J. MAISIN.)	51
(e) The General Infirmary at Leeds, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. A. A. DIGGES LA TOUCHE.)	61
(f) The Liverpool Radium Institute, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. P. MALPAS.)	68
(g) The Marie Curie Hospital, London, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. Elizabeth HURDON.)	75
(h) Radium Centre for Carcinoma of the Uterus, London County Council, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . . (Contributed by Sir Comyns BERKELEY.)	82
(i) The Sheffield Radium Centre, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. F. ELLIS.)	89
(j) Radiumstationen, Copenhagen, Denmark . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. O. CHLEWITZ.)	96
(k) Radiumstationen for Jylland, Aarhus, Denmark . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. C. KREBS.)	99
(l) Institut du Cancer, Paris, France . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. SIMONE LABORDE.)	106
(m) Institut du Radium de l'Université de Paris, France . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. A. LACASSAGNE.)	113
(n) Antoni van Leeuwenhoek-Huis, Amsterdam, The Netherlands . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. D. DEN HOED.)	120
(o) Radiologiska Kliniken, Sahlgrenska Sjukhuset, Gothenburg, Sweden . . . . . (Contributed by Dr. F. VON BERGEN.)	130
(p) Radiumhemmet, Stockholm, Sweden . . . . . (Contributed by Professor J. HEYMAN.)	140
7. SUMMARY . . . . .	148

## I. INTRODUCTORY

---

The Third Annual Report, which is here presented, includes statements referring to cases treated in 1932 and previous years.

The report is still concerned only with cancer of the cervix uteri. The preliminary work for widening the scope of future reports to include analyses of material relating to the corpus uteri and vagina has not yet been completed.

There has been no modification of the rules or of the Tables for the presentation of data, which were recommended in the First Annual Report.

A total of twenty-five statements have been submitted for this report. Apart from the nine statements from previous collaborators, the Committee has great pleasure in including statements from seven additional collaborators, viz. :

Dr. F. VON BERGEN, Radiologiska Kliniken, Sahlgrenska Sjukhuset, Gothenburg, Sweden;

Dr. O. CHIEWITZ, Radiumstationen, Copenhagen, Denmark;

Dr. F. ELLIS, The Sheffield Radium Centre, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

Dr. A. DEN HOED, Antoni van Leeuwenhoek-Huis, Amsterdam, the Netherlands;

Dr. C. KREBS, Radiumstationen for Jylland, Aarhus, Denmark;

Dr. A. A. DIGGES LA TOUCHE, The General Infirmary at Leeds, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland;

Dr. J. MAISON, Institut du Cancer de l'Université de Louvain, Belgium.

Statements have also been received from other clinicians, but were found on examination to be unsuitable for inclusion in the report, on various grounds which are referred to later (see page 147).

The Advisory Committee on the Results of Radiological Treatment of Uterine Cancer consists of the same members as previously, namely :

*Chairman :*

Prof. J. HEYMAN, Radiumhemmet, Stockholm.

*Members :*

Dr. A. LACASSAGNE, Radium Institute of the University,  
Paris;

Lt.-Col. A. B. SMALLMAN, Ministry of Health, London.

*Secretary :*

Dr. M. D. MACKENZIE, of the Health Section of the League  
of Nations Secretariat, Geneva.

The Committee wishes to renew the invitation, given in the First Annual Report (page 10) to directors of clinics and others who are interested in this subject, to communicate with the Chairman with a view to participation in future reports.

It may be opportune to emphasise at this point that the immediate object of the Committee's work is to promote the greatest possible uniformity in the statistical ascertainment of the results of radiotherapy in uterine cancer, in order that an opportunity may be provided for estimating the value of the different methods of treatment employed. Such an estimation is practicable only if the figures presented by different clinics are, in fact, comparable.

Comparability necessitates compiling all the data concerning clinical material in an identical manner and adopting suitable methods for calculating results.

As regards the former, elimination of all factors which are liable to vitiate the comparability of statements constitutes the primary object of the work in its present phase. In the following chapter (II, A) the Committee calls attention to a number of such factors. As regards the latter, calculation of results is clearly of small value unless the material is reliable.

Comparability is so difficult to secure that it is essential for it to be attempted in the first instance on a simple basis, avoiding consideration of a number of problems which, although of great interest, have no direct bearing on the subject.

Perusal of the report will indicate the difficulties encountered even on the simplified basis adopted. Nevertheless, the Committee ventures to hope that the method of assessment of results of treatment utilised in these reports may secure general adoption. The collaboration which the Committee has so far been fortunate enough to secure already endows the work with an international character; it is hoped that this collaboration will be continued and extended.

Some other problems, material for the solution of which is in process of collection and to which the Committee hopes in due course to devote its attention in this series of reports, include the following :

Comparison of the five-year with the ten-year cure rate with a view to ascertaining the permanency of cure;

The question of the relative advantages of "survival" and "cure" rates.

---

## II. SOURCES OF ERROR IN STATISTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE RESULTS OF TREATMENT

---

### A. DIFFICULTIES CONNECTED WITH RECORDING THE DATA

In the Second Annual Report, the Committee mentioned that several problems connected with the effort to secure proper comparability between the data of different clinics would need further consideration and expressed its intention of studying these problems in succession. Among those to which the Committee has so far devoted its attention are the following :

#### (1) *Interpretation of the Term " Cancer "*<sup>1</sup>

Some collaborators think it desirable to include in the statements only those cases which would be regarded by all pathologists as true carcinomata; others may wish to include cases manifesting a " pre-cancerous " condition. The Committee thinks it essential, in order to promote comparability, to include only the former for the present. Whether the work can be extended at a later stage to include pre-cancerous conditions depends upon further investigation.

#### (2) *Interpretation of the Term " Cervix "*<sup>1</sup>

Some collaborators may wish to include among the cervical carcinomata all cases in which the cervix is involved, even those in which it is impossible to be certain of the origin of the growth, for example :

- (a) Coincident involvement of cervix and corpus;
- (b) Coincident involvement of uterus and ovaries;
- (c) Wide involvement of several pelvic genital organs.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purpose of these reports.

The definitions of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma adopted by the Radiological Sub-Commission in 1929 do not permit of a reliable classification of such types of case. This is one reason why the Committee has considered it desirable, as mentioned in both previous reports (see Notes for the Guidance of Collaborators, paragraph 2(a)), to revise the definitions. This revision should preferably take place simultaneously with the widening of the scope of the Annual Reports to include cancer of the corpus and of the vagina.

The Committee is inclined to think that the above-mentioned types of case should form specialised groups, but wishes to postpone further discussion of this matter until the preparatory work for widening the field covered by the Report has been completed. The Committee thinks it desirable, at the present stage, not to include among the cervical carcinomata cases in which the origin of the growth cannot be safely determined.

(3) *Untreated Patients to be included in the Statements.*

In Table 2, certain categories into which untreated patients may fall are defined. The footnote to Table 2 relates to a category of untreated patients which is at present excluded from the statements. The Committee believes that such exclusion may lead to certain forms of selection, thus interfering with the comparability of absolute cure rates, and is contemplating further investigation of this point with a view to including all such cases.

(4) *Classification of Treated Patients according to the Extent of the Growth.*

The procedure by which this is effected is termed "staging",<sup>1</sup> the principal object of which is to obtain comparable material for the purpose of assessing the results of treatment statistically, in the absence of comparable over-all cure rates. It is effected by

---

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of brevity the word staging is used in these reports to indicate the process of dividing cases of cervical carcinoma into stages.

dividing the whole group of treated cases into a number of smaller groups, each of which contains cases of approximately the same anatomic-clinical extent, and provides the only means at present available for the purpose. With this object, among others, the present four stages have been adopted.<sup>1</sup>

Staging, to be of value, depends upon uniform application by clinicians of the rules for allocating cases to their appropriate stages. Uniform application of those rules, however, tends to be prevented by :

- (a) Lack of uniformity in their interpretation;
- (b) Varying degrees of skill and experience among examining clinicians;
- (c) Differences among examining clinicians, independently of their skill and experience, in interpreting the findings.

It is obvious, therefore, that staging is open to legitimate criticism and it is probable that *complete* uniformity is unattainable. On the other hand, it seems quite certain that greater uniformity than now exists can be secured.

As regards the first of the difficulties mentioned, there was published at the instance of the Committee, during 1938, an Atlas in which the four stages were slightly modified, and illustrative diagrams given of the stages to which cases should be allocated. The Atlas was intended as a step towards promoting greater uniformity in staging, and was taken only after its need had been demonstrated by experiment and after prolonged and careful consideration supported by the views of a number of experienced clinicians. The Committee is hopeful that the guidance thus given will prove of value to collaborators.

Criticisms which have been made of the present method of staging have led to, among others, the following suggestions :

- (i) That Stage I should be subdivided;

---

<sup>1</sup> See page 32.



(ii) That Stage IV should not be limited to cases with involvement of the bladder and rectum and those with distant metastases, but should be extended to include cases with extensive parametrial involvement.

(i) An advantage claimed for subdividing Stage I is that it provides an opportunity for demonstrating the favourable therapeutic results in the earliest cases and consequently for advocating early diagnosis and treatment. The Committee considers that this aspect, important as it is, has no bearing on its immediate aim (see page 8). It is claimed as a disadvantage of Stage I that it includes cases in which the prognosis differs too widely. In the Committee's view, such a criticism arises from a misunderstanding of the purpose of staging which is as stated at page 11; although staging is useful in a prognostic sense, that is not its primary purpose.

Further, adequate definition of the suggested subdivisions of Stage I would be attended with considerable difficulty, while the numbers of cases in them might, in many clinics, be so small as to be statistically valueless. It may be added that the case for subdivision of Stages II and III is stronger than it is for Stage I, since those stages generally contain much larger numbers of cases.

In view of the difficulty in securing uniformity with the present number of stages, the question of further subdivision may be safely omitted at all events for the present.

(ii) On this subject, the Committee would like to invite attention to the remarks on page 7 of the Atlas. It is true that some cases with extensive involvement of the parametria are more advanced than are some of these with involvement of the bladder or the rectum. On the other hand, the Committee is not aware of any method of subdividing those cases in which the carcinoma has invaded the pelvic wall without at the same time disturbing uniformity in staging; consequently, it seems preferable to allocate all such cases to one stage, the most appropriate for the purpose being Stage III.

In the Committee's view, the stages at different clinics can become comparable only by adopting the guiding principle that a given stage at one clinic contains the same average type of case as does the corresponding stage at other clinics; division of cases in an attempt to allocate to given stages only those cases which have approximately the same prognosis is relatively unimportant.

The Committee would like to take this opportunity of emphasising the desirability of clinicians making a practice, where serious doubt arises as to which of two stages is the more appropriate for a particular case, of allocating the case to the earlier stage.

Finally, the Committee would urge that a free use of the Atlas, which sets out the simplified definitions of the stages with illustrative diagrams, is calculated to promote greater comparability between the statements of different observers.

(5) *Definition of Certain Categories into which Treated Patients fall.*

(a) *Alive without recurrence five years after treatment* (Table 4, column 2).—This may be interpreted by some as freedom from disease following treatment and persisting throughout the five-year period; by others it is taken to include also those who have had recurrence followed by further radiological treatment within the five years, but are free from signs of the disease at the end of that period. The Committee considers the latter procedure appropriate; to regard such cases as radiotherapeutic failures would be inequitable.

It is clearly desirable that those patients only should be entered in the statistics who have been examined at the reporting clinic at or after the expiration of five years from the beginning of treatment. It is well recognised, however, that an examination may not furnish conclusive evidence as to freedom from disease; some ill-defined pain may prove eventually to be due to a distant metastasis. It is also recognised that practical difficulties

may prevent examination at the reporting clinics of all patients and that collaborators may feel impelled to accept the opinion of a physician not attached to the clinic or even the written statement of the patient or a relative.

The Committee being anxious to know to what extent such circumstances occur and tend to invalidate comparability between the results of different centres, decided to ask collaborators to be kind enough to complete a form of tabular statement \* designed to secure the desired information. The results of this enquiry are intended for the information of the Committee, not for publication.

(b) *Died of cancer* (Table 4, column 5) is intended to be limited to those cases in which death was due to the cancer for which treatment was given or to metastases arising therefrom.

(c) *Lost sight of* (Table 4, column 6).—This category should include those cases only the histories of which prove impossible to ascertain, in spite of all reasonable endeavour, within the limits imposed by the “follow-up” system adopted in the clinic. It may be remarked that the proportion of patients “lost sight of” constitutes one of the indications as to the reliability or otherwise of statements of results.

\* Report on . . . patients treated in 1932 and included as alive without recurrence in the Statement from . . . Table 4, column 2, of the Third Report.

The patient's condition after a period of observation of five years was ascertained :

(1) By examination in . . . . . cases		(2) By letter, telephone, etc., in . . . . cases				
At the clinic	By physician outside the clinic	Last examination at the clinic was made after a period of observation of				
		more than 4 years	3 to 4 years	2 to 3 years	1 to 2 years	less than 1 year

(d) *Died of intercurrent disease* (Table 4, column 7).—Cases included in this category should be limited to those which at the last examination did not show any signs of the treated cancer and who have died from accident, infectious disease, or some other condition which can safely be regarded as unconnected with cancer of the cervix. A case in which death is considered to be due to cancer of some other organ, for example on the evidence of histological examination, should be included.

From the above discussion of the difficulties connected with recording the data, it is obvious that there are a number of factors which have to be considered before the statements from different clinics can be regarded as comparable.

The Committee wishes to emphasise that a slightly varying interpretation applied to one single factor may not seriously affect comparability. On the other hand, by consciously varying, now in one direction, now in another, the interpretation applied to all the different factors, one can obtain results which differ seriously for the same material; clearly, a similar effect may be the outcome of unconscious variations in interpretation. Such effects are particularly serious in small groups of cases.

#### B. COMPARABILITY IN STATING, ARITHMETICALLY, THE RESULTS OF TREATMENT

Results of treatment may be expressed either as the proportion of patients who have recovered at the end of a defined period after treatment, or as the proportion of patients who are alive, irrespective of whether the disease is still present or not, at the end of the period.

Two factors are therefore concerned: (*a*) the condition of the patients and (*b*) the period at which the results of treatment are assessed. As regards (*a*) the Committee believes it to be of importance that the condition of the patients, in regard to their freedom or otherwise from disease, should be ascertained with as much accuracy as is practicable (*cf.* page 14 (5) a); as regards (*b*) the Committee has chosen, in accordance with general practice, a period of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment,

as the interval after which the results of treatment may be safely assessed.

At the same time, it seemed desirable to the Committee to ascertain the fate of treated patients at intervals longer than five years. It will be appreciated, however, that the problems connected with the natural increase in the number of patients dying of causes other than cancer will then also need to be considered.

### *Calculation of Results.*

The next point for consideration is the number of patients on which the proportion of recoveries should be calculated in order to arrive at the different cure rates in a comparable manner.

The varieties of rate generally used are as follows :

- (a) The “ absolute ” cure rate, which is the proportion of cured patients expressed as a percentage of the total number examined with a view to treatment, whether they are treated or not.
  
- (b) The “ relative ” cure rates :
  - (1) The “ over-all relative ” rate, which is the proportion of cured patients expressed as a percentage of the total number actually treated ;
  - (2) The “ stage ” rate, which is the proportion of cured patients expressed as a percentage of the total number in that stage actually treated.

For the purpose of this report, any of these rates is suitable if comparable with the corresponding rate at other clinics. Comparability, however, necessitates that the samples of patients for which any individual rate is utilised are of equal clinical quality.

The absolute cure rate is suitable for comparing results at those clinics only in which the sample of patients to which the statement relates can be regarded as random and unselected.

Circumstances are particularly favourable in the case of clinics responsible for the treatment and accommodation of all patients

within a geographically defined area and where consequently the clinic, being perhaps the only one available, is required to care for all patients who seek advice. The Committee considers it desirable that clinics organised in this way should state an absolute cure rate which may be considered to give the most reliable figure for the purpose of comparability.

There are, however, clinics which do not serve a geographically defined area but whose samples of patients may nevertheless be considered as random and unselected and hence suitable for the stating of an absolute cure rate. Such conditions obtain at a clinic which forms the natural, though not necessarily the only, place at which the population of the area seeks treatment provided it cares for all patients who seek advice. Under such conditions, the larger the population served the more likely it is to provide a random sample of patients.

Patients may also form a random sample in other circumstances when, for example, their choice of hospital is determined by financial arrangements, by nationality, by religion or perhaps other reasons.

In any instance where precise information as to the organisation of the clinic is not available to the Committee, it reserves the right to discuss the suitability of stating an absolute cure rate.

Many clinics do not receive random, unselected samples of patients. This is particularly true in those localities, for example, where several radio-therapeutic institutes are active, where an individual clinic accepts that number of patients only which can be suitably accommodated, or where a clinic, by not being under an obligation to provide treatment for all patients who are capable of it whatever their condition, is able to select for treatment those patients who for one reason or another are suited to the conditions obtaining in the clinic. An absolute cure rate calculated upon such selected material is unsuitable for comparative purposes and therefore not acceptable.

The over-all "relative" rate is of value for ascertaining the result of treatment for all cases treated in an individual clinic. A comparison of over-all "relative" rates necessitates, however,

a detailed examination of the sample of treated cases to ascertain whether the quality is similar in the clinics to be compared. It may be that, in a number of clinics, the quality of the material is so similar that a reliable comparison of over-all rates is possible. However, this will probably occur only very exceptionally.

It is obvious from what is said above that, in a considerable proportion of clinics, direct comparisons of the results of treatment (*i.e.*, by the use of "absolute" and over-all "relative" rates) is not practicable. It then becomes necessary to fall back upon "stage" rates.

But, as already pointed out, division of cases into stages is as yet by no means uniformly practised. Further, staging has the inherent defect that each stage contains, in common with the whole of the clinical material, more advanced and less advanced cases. In this connection, it is to be observed that selection of cases for treatment within each stage is liable to occur owing, for example, to lack of hospital accommodation, to a desire to study particular problems of scientific interest, and perhaps to other reasons.

It should also be emphasised that, since staging is based solely on the anatomo-clinical extent of the growth, other factors which may affect prognosis and thus vitiate comparability are neglected. In this connection may be mentioned severe infection, serious disease of other organs, age, pregnancy and other complications, any of which may prevent completion of treatment or cause the death of the patient before the five-year period has elapsed. There is probably a marked difference in the frequency of such complicated cases at different clinics, particularly those in which selection of patients occurs compared with those responsible for the treatment of all patients seeking treatment.

Hence "stage" rates have a degree of unreliability which should lead to great caution in drawing conclusions. This attitude is even more essential when other causes of incomparability, such as have been mentioned in this and previous reports, are borne in mind.

---

### III. THIRD ANNUAL REPORT

---

#### 1. NOTES FOR THE GUIDANCE OF COLLABORATORS

1. The statement should include cases of cancer of the cervix uteri only (including carcinoma of the stump).

(a) The statement will be confined to cases where the treatment planned was entirely radiological (radium and Roentgen rays);

(b) Patients operated upon after failure of radiological treatment and alive five years after the beginning of the treatment should appear in Table 4, column 4.

2. The following clinical types of cases should be excluded :

(a) Cancer of the corpus uteri and vagina;<sup>1</sup>

(b) Recurrences after radical operation;

(c) Patients radiologically treated elsewhere;

(d) Patients primarily submitted to combined operative and radiological treatment.

3. Only those series of cases in which all clinical diagnoses have been microscopically confirmed can, as a rule, be accepted.

4. The following histological types of cases should be excluded :

(a) Pre-cancerous conditions;

(b) Chorio-epithelioma, sarcoma, malignant mixed tumours.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is intended to revise, in the future, the definitions of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma. Pending the results of that revision, the definitions used will be those in the Report of the Radiological Sub-Commission (Series of League of Nations Publications C.H. 788), reprinted on page 29.



5. The statement should relate to the total number of patients whose radiological treatment was begun during the year to which the statement refers, as well as all patients examined with a view to treatment but not treated.

6. The statement should not be completed until a period of observation of at least five years from the beginning of the treatment has expired in all cases included.

7. Tables 1-6 are intended for the annual statement relating to cases treated in 1932; Tables 7-10 have been provided for those institutes which are able to furnish data for an earlier period on a basis corresponding to that now being adopted in the present series of annual reports.

2. SPECIMENS OF THE TABLES USED FOR  
CASES TREATED IN 1932

Cancer of the Cervix uteri.

(Institute)

Statement of results in 19.....

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment .....	
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*<sup>1</sup>

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.....	
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere.....	
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	
(d) Operation advised .....	
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	
(h) Some other specified reason .....	
Total...	

<sup>1</sup> Patients referred to the clinic by means (e.g., letter, telephone, etc.) which do not allow of their being examined at the clinic are excluded.

Note : Calculation of absolute cure rate (see Table 5, footnote 1) omitted because of .....

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).<sup>1</sup>*

	Stages <sup>2</sup> I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated.									
With microscopical verification . . . .									
Without microscopical verification <sup>2</sup> . . . . .									

<sup>1</sup> Total number of patients treated, incompletely treated patients included.

<sup>2</sup> A detailed description should be given for each case in which the patient is alive without recurrence five years from the beginning of treatment, and in which no microscopical verification has been made.

<sup>3</sup> See note, page 31.

Detailed description of cases alive without recurrence five years after treatment in which no microscopical verification has been made.

(The reason why histological confirmation was not obtained should be stated.)

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer <sup>1</sup>	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .							
II . . . . .							
III . . . . .							
IV . . . . .							
I-IV . . . . .							

<sup>1</sup> Patients dying during or as a result of treatment should be included in this column.

CALCULATION OF RESULTS

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.<sup>1</sup>*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) . . . . .	
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) . . . . .	
Absolute cure rate <sup>2</sup> . . . . .	

<sup>1</sup> For certain clinics conditions are such—*e.g.*, when they are responsible for the treatment of almost every patient who seeks it from a defined area—that the calculation of an absolute cure rate has value for comparison with clinics similarly organised. When this is the case, the rate should be calculated as above. In other clinics the calculation may be omitted, the reason being given in a footnote to Table 2. In all clinics "Patients examined at the clinic but not treated" will be distributed, in Table 2, among the groups there set out.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.*, the proportion the above number of patients alive without recurrence form of the total number examined, stated as a percentage.

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage <sup>1</sup>
Stage I.....			
Stage II .....			
Stage III .....			
Stage IV ,.....			
Stages I-IV .....			

<sup>1</sup> The cure rate calculated in this way obviously understates the results of treatment, since a proportion of patients will have died of a cause unrelated to cancer of the cervix, whilst the fate of a further proportion may be unknown.



Table 9,<sup>1</sup> Stages I-IV.  
Evaluation of results.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment. (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>2</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate <sup>2</sup> at the end of					6. Relative cure rate <sup>3</sup> at the end of						
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years					years						
19.....																				
19.....																				
etc.																				

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1-6 for a period prior to 1932.  
<sup>2</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained should be entered in brackets after the principal figures in col. 4.  
<sup>3</sup> See Table 5, footnote 1.  
<sup>4</sup> See Table 6.

13

Table 10,<sup>1</sup> Stage I.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
19.....													
19.....													
etc.													

<sup>1</sup> Intended for the use of those clinics which are able and willing to furnish data on the bases of Tables 1-6 for a period prior to 1932.

Note : Similar tables for stages II, III and IV.

#### 4. DEFINITION OF THE DIFFERENT VARIETIES OF UTERO-VAGINAL CARCINOMA

1. Cases should be reckoned as carcinoma of the vagina when the site of the growth is in the vagina; when clinical examination shows that the cervix is intact; and when there is no ground for supposing that the carcinoma is other than a primary growth in the vagina. In cases in which the carcinoma involves the cervix, the case must be regarded as one of carcinoma of the cervix.

It would, however, be advisable to classify as vaginal carcinoma those cases in which a small lesion previously noticeable on the cervix has rapidly disappeared after radiological treatment, while the main part of the tumour is still present in the vagina.

In those cases in which the cervix could not be examined at the beginning of the treatment, and therefore no decision could be made as to whether it was involved or not, the final diagnosis must be postponed until the situation has been clarified as a result of treatment. When, even after radiological treatment, no differentiation can be made owing to the impossibility of examining the cervix, the case should be classified as cancer of the vagina if the cervix and parametria appear to be clinically free from growth on rectal examination.

2. Cases should be classified as carcinoma of the body when the site of the disease is in the body, whereas the cervix appears to be healthy.

The clinical distinction between carcinoma of the cervix and of the body of the uterus may offer difficulties in a small number of cases, such as the following :

(a) The uterus is not enlarged and clinical examination does not give sufficient indications for determining the point of origin or the direction of spread of the growth.

In the majority of these cases it should be possible, without too great risk of error, to classify them on the basis



of the microscopical report; for instance, pure squamous-celled carcinoma and adeno-carcinoma with mucous secretion are both types of cervical epithelioma.

In the remaining cases, which certainly form a very small fraction of the total, in which it is not possible to make a definite classification on either clinical or microscopical evidence, the classification may be left to individual discretion.

(*b*) The cavity of the uterus is enlarged. It is not possible to determine by clinical examination whether the case is an endo-cervical carcinoma of the cervix with extension to the body or a carcinoma of the body extending to the cervix. Such cases generally spread like carcinoma of the body and it is more of theoretical than of practical interest to ascertain the point of origin of the disease. They behave essentially as carcinoma of the body and should be so classified unless the microscopical picture contra-indicates such a classification as in the case of a pure squamous-celled carcinoma or an adeno-carcinoma with mucous secretion.

Cases presenting difficulty in diagnosis due to complications such as myomata, pyometra, etc., should be classified in the same manner.

*Note* : It is intended to revise, in the future, the definitions of the different varieties of utero-vaginal carcinoma.

5. DEFINITIONS OF THE FOUR STAGES OF CANCER  
OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

A. *Definitions approved in 1929.*

*Stage I.*

The growth is strictly limited to the *cervix uteri*.  
Uterus mobile.

*Stage II.*

Lesion spreading into one or more fornices, with or without infiltration of the parametrium adjacent to the uterus, the uterus retaining some degree of mobility.

*Stage III.*

(a) Nodular infiltration of the parametria on one or both sides extending to the wall of the pelvis, with limited mobility of the uterus or massive infiltration of one parametrium with fixation of the uterus.

(b) More or less superficial infiltration of a large part of the vagina, with a mobile uterus.

(c) Isolated metastases in the pelvic glands, with a relatively small primary growth.

(d) Isolated metastases in the lower part of the vagina.

Generally speaking, all cases not falling into Stages II or IV will be placed under Stage III.

*Stage IV.*

(a) Cases with massive infiltration of both parametria extending to the walls of the pelvis.

(b) Carcinoma involving the bladder or rectum.

(c) The whole vagina infiltrated (rigid vaginal passage), or one vaginal wall infiltrated along its whole length, with fixation of the primary growth.

(d) Remote metastases.

*Note :* Collaborators are requested to be good enough to use the definitions of 1937 (see page 32) for the grouping of cases treated in 1938 and consecutive years.

B. *Definitions approved in 1937.*

*Stage I.*

- The carcinoma is strictly confined to the cervix.

*Stage II.*

- The carcinoma infiltrates the parametrium on one or both sides, but has not invaded the pelvic wall. *Stage II, parametrium.*
- The carcinoma infiltrates the vagina, but does not involve its lower third. *Stage II, vagina.*
- Endocervical carcinoma which has spread to the corpus. *Stage II, corpus.*

*Stage III.*

- The carcinomatous infiltration of the parametrium has invaded the pelvic wall on one or both sides. On rectal examination, no cancer-free space is found between the tumour and the pelvic wall. *Stage III, parametrium.*
- The carcinoma involves the lower third of the vagina. *Stage III, vagina.*
- Isolated carcinomatous metastases are palpable on the pelvic wall (irrespective of the extent of the primary cervical growth). *Stage III, isolated pelvic metastases.*

*Stage IV.*

- The carcinoma involves the bladder as determined by cystoscopic examination or by the presence of a vesicovaginal fistula. *Stage IV, bladder.*
- The carcinoma involves the rectum. *Stage IV, rectum.*
- The carcinoma has spread outside the true pelvis (below the vaginal inlet, above the pelvic brim, distant metastases). *Stage IV, distant spread.*

*General rules to be observed :*

- When allocating a case to a stage, nothing but facts revealed by examination should be taken into account.
  - The stage of each case should be decided at examination prior to treatment, and this classification should remain. The classification may be postponed quite exceptionally and the reasons stated.
  - When it is doubtful to which stage a given case is to be allocated, the earlier stage should be chosen.
  - The fact that a single case presents two or more of the conditions which characterise a particular stage does not affect the staging.
-

6. STATEMENTS

(a) MEMORIAL HOSPITAL FOR THE TREATMENT OF CANCER AND ALLIED DISEASES, NEW YORK, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Contributed by Dr. WILLIAM P. HEALY.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	159
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	18
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	141

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	1
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	3
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	3
(d) Operation advised .....	2
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	1
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	8
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	18

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	141	21	14.9	14	9.9	68	48.2	38	27.0
With microscopical verification . . . .	139	21		14		67		37	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	2 <sup>1</sup>	0		0		1		1	

<sup>1</sup> These two patients died before the five-year observation period was over.

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	21	16	0	0	4	1	0
II . . . . .	14	6	1	0	5	1	1
III . . . . .	68	18	1	0	47	0	2
IV . . . . .	38	0	1	0	37	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	141	40	3	0	93	2	3

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	159
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	40
Absolute cure rate .....	25.2%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	21	16	76.2
Stage II .....	14	6	
Stage III .....	68	18	26.5
Stage IV .....	38	0	0.0
Stages I-IV.....	141	40	28.4

Data from Memorial Hospital relating to the years previous to 1932 will appear in the Fourth Annual Report.

(b) WOMAN'S HOSPITAL IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK,  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Contributed by Dr. GEORGE G. WARD.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENTS OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932 \*

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	42
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	1
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	41

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	1
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	1

\* The statistical year ends May 15, 1932.



Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age
Total number of patients treated	41	11	26.8	26	63.4	4	9.8	0	0.0
With microscopical verification . . . .	41	11		26		4		0	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	11	8	1	0	2	0	0
II . . . . .	26	10	0	0	15	0	1
III . . . . .	4	1	0	0	3	0	0
IV . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	41	19	1	0	20	0	1

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I).....	42
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	19
Absolute cure rate .....	45.2%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	11	8	
Stage II .....	26	10	38.5
Stage III .....	4	1	
Stage IV .....	0	0	
Stages I-IV.....	41	19	46.3

STATEMENT FOR 1920-1931 INCLUSIVE \*

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1920-26 <sup>2</sup>	279	9	270	59	106	92	18
1927	51	5	46	7	18	19	2
1928	46	3	43	8	25	4	6
1929	53	0	53	8	23	19	3
1930	37	1	36	6	13	17	0
1931	51	0	51	9	24	18	0
Total...	517	18	499	97	209	169	24

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> The figures of the individual years from which these totals are derived may be found on reference to the Second Annual Report.

Table 8.

Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1920-26 <sup>2</sup>	270	58	55	52	49	48	46	8	1	1	2	2	1	189	197	197	197	197	199	10	11	12	12	12	12	5	6	8	10	11	12
1927	46	11	11	10	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	32	32	32	32	32	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	4	4	4
1928	43	13	11	11	11	11		0	0	0	0	0		28	28	28	28	28		1	2	2	2	2		1	2	2	2	2	
1929	53	14	13	12	12			0	0	1	0			38	38	38	39			0	1	1	1			1	1	1	1		
1930	36	14	13	12				1	0	0				19	20	21				0	0	0				2	3	3			
1931	51	14	13					2	0					32	34					1	1					2	3				
Total...	499	124						11						338						13						13					

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

<sup>2</sup> See note 2, Table 7.

\* Each statistical year ends May 15th of that year.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years						years					
1920-26 <sup>2</sup>	279	270	58(6)	55(6)	52(6)	49(6)	48(6)	46(6)	20.8	19.7	18.6	17.6	17.2	16.5	21.5	20.4	19.3	18.1	17.8	17.0
1927	51	46	11	11	10	9	9	9	21.6	21.6	19.6	17.6	17.6	17.6	23.9	23.9	21.7	19.6	19.6	19.6
1928	46	43	13	11	11	11	11		28.3	23.9	23.9	23.9	23.9		30.2	25.6	25.6	25.6	25.6	
1929	53	53	14	13	12	12			26.4	24.5	22.6	22.6			26.4	24.5	22.6	22.6		
1930	37	36	14	13	12				37.8	35.1	32.4				38.9	36.1	33.3			
1931	51	51	14	13					27.5	25.5					27.5	25.5				
Total...	517	499	124(6)						24.0						24.8					

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4.

<sup>2</sup> See note 2, page 10, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage I.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1920-26 <sup>1</sup>	59	30	27	26	24	23	23	50.8	45.8	44.1	40.7	39.0	39.0
1927	7	1	1	1	1	1	1						
1928	8	6	6	6	6	6							
1929	8	5	4	4	4								
1930	6	5	4	4									
1931	9	5	4										
Total...	97	52						53.6					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 40, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage II.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1920-26 <sup>1</sup>	106	21	21	21	20	20	19	19.8	19.8	19.8	18.9	18.9	17.9
1927	18	6	6	5	5	5	5	33.3	33.3	27.8	27.8	27.8	27.8
1928	25	7	5	5	5	5		28.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	
1929	23	6	6	6	6			26.1	26.1	26.1	26.1		
1930	13	6	6	6									
1931	24	6	6					25.0	25.0				
Total...	209	52						24.9					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 40, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage III.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1920-26 <sup>1</sup>	92	7	7	5	5	5	4	7.6	7.6	5.4	5.4	5.4	4.3
1927	19	4	4	4	3	3	3	21.1	21.1	21.1	15.8	15.8	15.8
1928	4	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	19	3	3	2	2			15.8	15.8	10.5	10.5		
1930	17	3	3	2				17.6	17.6	11.8			
1931	18	3	3					16.7	16.7				
Total...	169	20						11.8					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 40, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage IV.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1920-26 <sup>1</sup>	13	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1927	2	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1928	6	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	3	0	0	0	0								
1930	0	0	0	0									
1931	0	0	0										
Total...	24	0						0.0					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 40, Table 7.

(c) CENTRE DES TUMEURS DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE BRUXELLES,  
BELGIUM

(Contributed by Professor J. MURDOCH.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	93
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	10
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	83

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	1
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	9
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	10

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	83	18	21.7	24	28.9	38	45.8	3	3.6
With microscopical verification . . . .	80	18		23		36		3	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	3 <sup>1</sup>	0		1		2		0	

<sup>1</sup> These three patients died before the end of the five-year period.

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of intercurrent disease
I . . . . .	18	9	1	0	8	0	0
II . . . . .	24	6	0	0	16	0	2
III . . . . .	38	6	0	0	31	0	1
IV . . . . .	3	0	0	1	2	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	83	21	1	1	57	0	3



**Table 5.**  
*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I).....	93
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	21
Absolute cure rate .....	22.6%

**Table 6.**  
*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	18	9	50.0
Stage II .....	24	6	25.0
Stage III .....	38	6	15.8
Stage IV .....	3	0	
Stages I-IV.....	83	21	25.3

STATEMENT FOR 1926-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
			1926	75	15	60	14
1927	59	9	50	11	13	19	7
1928	76	8	68 <sup>2</sup>	20	18	21	8
1929	80	6	74 <sup>2</sup>	20	11	39	3
1930	94	11	83	9	27	35	12
1931	73	10	63	6	20	28	9
Total...	457	59	398	80	104	165	47

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> One case not classified because of insufficient clinical information is included in Tables 7, 8 and 9. As the patient died before the end of the five-year period, the case will not appear in Tables 10.

Table 8.

Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		5   6   7   8   9   10						5   6   7   8   9   10						5   6   7   8   9   10						5   6   7   8   9   10											
		years						years						years						years											
1926	60	16	16	15	11	10	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	42	42	42	42	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	7	7
1927	50	14	14	13	12	12	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	31	31	31	32	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	6	6	6
1928	68	17	14	13	13	13		2	0	0	0	0		47	49	50	50	50		0	0	0	0	0		2	5	5	5	5	
1929	74	21	20	19	18			0	0	0	0			52	52	53	53			0	0	0	0			1	2	2	3		
1930	83	14	13	13				2	1	1				63	64	64				0	0	0				4	5	5			
1931	63	14	13					0	0					46	46					0	0					3	4				
Total...	398	96						4						281						0					17						

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment. (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5   6   7   8   9   10 years							5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1926	75	60	16(1)	16(1)	15(1)	11(1)	10(1)	10(1)	21.3	21.3	20.0	14.7	13.3	13.3	26.7	26.7	25.0	18.3	16.7	16.7	
1927	59	50	14	14	13	12	12	12	23.7	23.7	22.0	20.3	20.3	20.3	28.0	28.0	26.0	24.0	24.0	24.0	
1928	76	68	17	14	13	13	13		22.4	18.4	17.1	17.1	17.1		25.0	20.6	19.1	19.1	19.1		
1929	80	74	21	20	19	18			26.3	25.0	23.8	22.5			28.4	27.0	25.7	24.3			
1930	94	83	14	13	13				14.9	13.8	13.8				16.9	15.7	15.7				
1931	73	63	14	13					19.2	17.8					22.2	20.6					
Total...	457	398	96(1)						21.0						24.1						

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4.

Table 10, Stage I.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	14	6	6	6	5	5	5						
1927	11	6	6	6	6	6	6						
1928	20	6	6	6	6	6		30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	
1929	20	13	12	11	11			65.0	60.0	55.0	55.0		
1930	9	4	3	3									
1931	6	2	2										
Total...	80	37						46.3					

Table 10, Stage II.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	15	6	6	6	3	3	3	40.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
1927	13	5	5	5	5	5	5						
1928	18	5	5	5	5	5		27.8	27.8	27.8	27.8	27.8	
1929	11	2	2	2	2								
1930	27	3	3	3				11.1	11.1	11.1			
1931	20	8	7					40.0	35.0				
Total...	104	29						27.9					

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	23	4	4	3	3	2	2	17.4	17.4	13.0	13.0	8.7	8.7
1927	19	3	3	2	1	1	1	15.8	15.8	10.5	5.3	5.3	5.3
1928	21	6	3	2	2	2		28.6	14.3	9.5	9.5	9.5	
1929	39	6	6	6	5			15.4	15.4	15.4	12.8		
1930	35	7	7	7				20.0	20.0	20.0			
1931	28	4	4					14.3	14.3				
Total...	165	30						18.2					

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1926	8	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1927	7	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1928	8	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	3	0	0	0	0								
1930	12	0	0	0									
1931	9	0	0										
Total...	47	0						0.0					

(d) INSTITUT DU CANCER DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE LOUVAIN,  
BELGIUM

(Contributed by Professor J. MAISIN.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	62
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) . . . . .	1
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) . . . . .	61

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere . . . . .	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons . . . . .	0
(d) Operation advised . . . . .	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities . . . . .	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient . . . . .	1
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications . . . . .	0
(h) Some other specified reason . . . . .	0
Total . . .	1

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	61	0	0.0	18	29.5	39	63.9	4	6.6
With microscopical verification . . . .	59	0		17		38		4	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	2 <sup>1</sup>	0		1		1		0	

<sup>1</sup> These two patients died before the end of the five-year period.

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
II . . . . .	18	11	0	0	5	1	1
III . . . . .	39	11	1	0	25	1	1
IV . . . . .	4	1	0	0	3	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	61	23	1	0	33	2	2

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	62
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	23
Absolute cure rate .....	37.1%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	0	0	
Stage II .....	18	11	61.1
Stage III .....	39	11	28.2
Stage IV .....	4	1	
Stages I-IV .....	61	23	37.7



## STATEMENT FOR 1924-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1924	10	0	10	0	5	4	1
1925	21	1	20	0	7	12	1
1926	27	1	26	0	7	19	0
1927	39	0	39	0	7	31	1
1928	44	0	44	0	14	29	1
1929	47	0	47	0	19	26	2
1930	76	0	76	3	26	45	2
1931	58	0	58	1	19	35	3
Total...	322	2	320	4	104	201	11

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of treatment.*

Institut du Cancer de l'Université de Louvain

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 1)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of									
		5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years						5   6   7   8   9   10 years									
1924	10	3	3	3	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	6	6	6	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0				
1925	20	6	6	6	6	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	13	13	14	14	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1				
1926	26	10	9	9	8	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	12	13	13	13	5	5	5	5	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0				
1927	39	11	11	11	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	25	25	25	25	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0				
1928	44	14	13	13	13	13		0	0	0	0	0	25	26	26	26	26		4	4	4	4	4		1	1	1	1	1						
1929	47	11	11	11	10			0	0	0	0		32	32	32	33			4	4	4	4			0	0	0	0							
1930	76	37	32	31				0	0	0			36	39	40				3	5	5				0	0	0								
1931	58	30	28					0	0				27	28					1	1					0	1									
Total...	320	122						0					174						23						1										

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of							
			years						years						years							
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10		
1924	10	10	3	3	3	2	2	2														
1925	21	20	6	6	6	6	5	4	28.6	28.6	28.6	28.6	23.8	19.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	25.0	20.0		
1926	27	26	10	9	9	8	8	7	37.0	33.3	33.3	29.6	29.6	25.9	38.5	34.6	34.6	30.8	30.8	26.9		
1927	39	39	11	11	11	11	11	11	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2	28.2		
1928	44	44	14	13	13	13	13		31.8	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5		31.8	29.5	29.5	29.5	29.5			
1929	47	47	11	11	11	10			23.4	23.4	23.4	21.3			23.4	23.4	23.4	21.3				
1930	76	76	37	32	31				48.7	42.1	40.8				48.7	42.1	40.8					
1931	58	58	30	28					51.7	48.3					51.7	48.3						
Total...	322	320	122						37.9						38.1							

Table 10, Stage I.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1924	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1926	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1927	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1928	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1930	3	3	3	3										
1931	1	1	1											
Total...	4	4												

Table 10, Stage II.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 1)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1924	5	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1925	7	3	3	3	3	3	2							
1926	7	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1927	7	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1928	14	5	5	5	5	5								
1929	19	4	4	4	3			21.1	21.1	21.1	15.8			
1930	26	15	11	11				57.7	42.3	42.3				
1931	19	10	10					52.6	52.6					
Total...	104	43						41.3						

Table 10, Stage III.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1924	4	1	1	1	0	0	0							
1925	12	3	3	3	3	2	2							
1926	19	8	7	7	6	6	5	42.1	36.8	36.8	31.6	31.6	26.3	
1927	31	9	9	9	9	9	9	29.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	29.0	
1928	29	9	8	8	8	8		31.0	27.6	27.6	27.6	27.6		
1929	26	7	7	7	7			26.9	26.9	26.9	26.9			
1930	45	18	18	17				40.0	40.0	37.8				
1931	35	18	17					51.4	48.6					
Total...	201	73						36.3						



(e) THE GENERAL INFIRMARY AT LEEDS, UNITED KINGDOM  
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

(Contributed by Dr. A. A. DIGGES LA TOUCHE.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	57
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	3
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	54

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	3
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	3



Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	54	6	11.1	15*	27.8	26	48.1	7	13.0
With microscopical verification . . . .	52	6		15		25		6	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	2 <sup>1</sup>	0		0		1		1	

<sup>1</sup> These two patients died before the end of the five-year period.

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	6	1	0	0	4	0	1
II . . . . .	15	6	0	0	7	2	0
III . . . . .	26	6	0	0	19	1	0
IV . . . . .	7	0	0	0	7	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	54	13	0	0	37	3	1

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the clinic was not solely responsible for the treatment of cervical carcinoma in the area.

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	6	1	
Stage II .....	15	6	40.0
Stage III .....	26	6	23.1
Stage IV .....	7	0	
Stages I-IV.....	54	13	24.1

## STATEMENT FOR 1931

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4.				
			Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1931	55	1	54	3	14	17	20

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of					4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of							
		years					years					years					years					years							
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8
1931	54	11	11				0	0				43	43				0	0				0	0						





Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1931	17	2	2					11.8	11.8				

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1931	20	1	1					5.0	5.0				

(f) THE LIVERPOOL RADIUM INSTITUTE, UNITED KINGDOM  
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

(Contributed by Dr. P. MALPAS.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENTS OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	77
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	4
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	73

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	4
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	4

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	73	6	8.2	28	38.4	23	31.5	16	21.9
With microscopical verification . . . .	62	6		26		21		9	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	11 <sup>1</sup>	0		2 <sup>2</sup>		2		7	

<sup>1</sup> Ten of these eleven patients died before the end of the five-year period.

<sup>2</sup> One of these two patients was alive and free from recurrence five years after treatment. No. 368. History of severe irregular bleeding for three months and a continuous profuse and offensive discharge. The growth consisted of an ulcer replacing the posterior lip of the cervix and extending from the external os to the summit of the posterior fornix. The ulcer has raised, irregular edge and an indurated base. There is a submucous nodule present in the right fornix. Pathological examination not performed owing to an oversight.

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	6	4	0	0	1	0	1
II . . . . .	28	11	0	0	16	1	0
III . . . . .	23	5	0	0	17	1	0
IV . . . . .	16	0	0	0	16	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	73	20	0	0	50	2	1



Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the clinic was not solely responsible for the treatment of cervical carcinoma in the area, which was not a homogeneous unit from the standpoint of hospital administrative arrangements.

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	6	4	
Stage II .....	28	11	39.3
Stage III .....	23	5	21.7
Stage IV .....	16	0	0.0
Stages I-IV.....	73	20	27.4

STATEMENT FOR 1929-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4.				
			Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1929	36	2	34	0	17	11	6
1930	92	3	89	13	26	29	21
1931	94	0	94	8	28	43	15
Total...	222	5	217	21	71	83	42

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of																																	
		years						years						years						years						years																																	
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10																												
1929	34	8	8	8	8							0	0	0	0									24	24	24	24									2	2	2	2									0	0	0	0								
1930	89	25	24	24								2	2	2										58	58	58										2	2	2										2	3	3									
1931	94	18	16									1	1											72	74											2	2											1	1										
Total...	217	51										3												154												6												3											

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

The Liverpool Radium Institute

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of									
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10				
			years						years						years									
1929	36	34	8	8	8	8											23.5	23.5	23.5	23.5				
1930	92	89	25	24	24												28.1	27.0	27.0					
1931	94	94	18(3)	16(3)													19.1	17.0						
Total...	222	217	51(3)														23.5							

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4. A detailed description of these cases will be found in the Second Annual Report.

**Table 10, Stage I.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1929	0	0	0	0	0								
1930	13	9	9	9									
1931	8	5	5										
Total...	21	14						66.7					

**Table 10, Stage II.**  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1929	17	5	5	5	5			29.4	29.4	29.4	29.4		
1930	26	12	12	12				46.2	46.2	46.2			
1931	28	7	5					25.0	17.9				
Total...	71	24						33.8					

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1929	11	3	3	3	3								
1930	29	4	3	3				13.8	10.3	10.3			
1931	43	6	6					14.0	14.0				
Total...	83	13						15.7					

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1929	6	0	0	0	0								
1930	21	0	0	0				0.0	0.0	0.0			
1931	15	0	0					0.0	0.0				
Total...	42	0						0.0					

(g) THE MARIE CURIE HOSPITAL, LONDON, UNITED  
KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

(Contributed by Dr. ELIZABETH HURDON.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	119
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) . . . . .	6
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) . . . . .	113

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere . . . . .	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons . . . . .	0
(d) Operation advised . . . . .	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities . . . . .	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient . . . . .	1
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications . . . . .	5
(h) Some other specified reason . . . . .	0
Total . . .	6

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age
Total number of patients treated	113	7	6.2	34	30.1	59	52.2	13	11.5
With microscopical verification . . . .	113	7		34		59		13	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	7	6	1	0	0	0	0
II . . . . .	34	17	2	0	15	0	0
III . . . . .	59	18	1	0	39	0	1
IV . . . . .	13	1	0	0	12	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	113	42	4	0	66	0	1

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the clinic was not solely responsible for the treatment of cervical carcinoma in the area, which was not a homogeneous unit from the standpoint of hospital administrative arrangements.

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 1, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 1, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	7	6	
Stage II .....	34	17	50.0
Stage III .....	59	18	30.5
Stage IV .....	13	1	
Stages I-IV.....	113	42	37.2



STATEMENT FOR OCTOBER 1925-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

78

The Marie Curie Hospital, London

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
			1925-1926	74	1	73 <sup>2</sup>	2
1927	59	2	57	1	9	28	19
1928	88	2	86	7	18	46	15
1929	110	0	110	4	16	70	20
1930	142	6	136	6	32	81	17
1931	130	4	126	9	20	75	22
Total...	603	15	588	29	105	350	104

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925-January 1st, 1926 : 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926-January 1st, 1927 : 59.

Table 8. — Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		years						years						years						years						years					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1925-1926	73 <sup>2</sup>	22	18	17	16	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	54	54	54	54	54	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	3
1927	57	15	15	15	14	14	11	1	0	0	0	0	0	41	42	42	43	43	43	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
1928	86	36	32	31	28	25		1	0	0	0	0	49	53	54	55	55		0	1	1	3	5		0	0	0	0	1		
1929	110	38	34	32	28			0	1	0	0		72	75	76	76			0	0	1	3			0	0	1	3			
1930	136	56	51	45				1	0	2			78	80	80				1	4	8				0	1	1				
1931	126	42	40					1	0				80	81					0	0					3	5					
Total...	588	209						4					371						1						3						

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925-January 1st, 1926 : 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926-January 1st, 1927 : 59.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
			years							years						years					
1925-26	74	73 <sup>2</sup>	22	18	17	16	16	15								30.1	24.7	23.3	21.9	21.9	20.5
1927	59	57	15	15	15	14	14	11								26.3	26.3	26.3	24.6	24.6	19.3
1928	88	86	36(1)	32(1)	31(1)	28(1)	25(1)								41.9	37.2	36.0	32.6	29.1		
1929	110	110	38(1)	34(1)	32(1)	28(1)									34.5	30.9	29.1	25.5			
1930	142	136	56(1)	51(1)	45(1)										41.2	37.5	33.1				
1931	130	126	42	40											33.3	31.7					
Total...	603	588	209(3)													35.5					

The Marie Curie Hospital, London

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4. From and including 1930, a detailed description of such cases will be found in previous annual reports.

<sup>2</sup> Cases treated October 1st, 1925-January 1st, 1926 : 14. Cases treated January 1st, 1926-January 1st, 1927 : 59.

Table 10, Stage I.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1925-1926	2	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1927	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1928	7	6	5	5	5	5	5							
1929	4	4	4	4	4	4	4							
1930	6	5	4	4	4	4	4							
1931	9	6	6	6	6	6	6							
Total...	29	24						82.8						

Table 10, Stage II.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1925-1926	10	6	5	4	4	4	4							
1927	9	5	5	5	5	5	4							
1928	18	11	9	9	8	7	7	61.1	50.0	50.0	44.4	38.9		
1929	16	12	10	10	9	9	9	75.0	62.5	62.5	56.3			
1930	32	21	20	17	17	17	17	65.6	62.5	53.1				
1931	20	12	11	11	11	11	11	60.0	55.0					
Total...	105	67						63.8						

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1925-26	50	14	11	11	10	10	9	28.0	22.0	22.0	20.0	20.0	18.0
1927	28	9	9	9	8	8	6	32.1	32.1	32.1	28.6	28.6	21.4
1928	46	16	15	15	13	12		34.8	32.6	32.6	28.3	26.1	
1929	70	20	18	16	13			28.6	25.7	22.9	18.6		
1930	81	27	24	22				33.3	29.6	27.2			
1931	75	23	22					30.7	29.3				
Total...	350	109						31.1					

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1925-26	11	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1927	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1928	15	3	3	2	2	1		20.0	20.0	13.3	13.3	6.7	
1929	20	2	2	2	2			10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0		
1930	17	3	3	2				17.6	17.6	11.8			
1931	22	1	1					4.5	4.5				
Total...	104	9						8.7					

(h) RADIUM CENTRE FOR CARCINOMA OF THE UTERUS,  
LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL, UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT  
BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

(Contributed by Sir COMYNS BERKELEY.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	73
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	6
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	67

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	6
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	6

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage	Number of cases	Per-centage
Total number of patients treated	67	2	3.0	23	34.3	28	41.8	14	20.9
With microscopical verification . . . .	65	2		22		28		13	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	2 <sup>1</sup>	0		1		0		1	

<sup>1</sup> These two patients died before the end of the five-year period.

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
II . . . . .	23	5	0	0	18	0	0
III . . . . .	28	3	0	0	25	0	0
IV . . . . .	14	1	0	0	13	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	67	10	0	0	57	0	0

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	73
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	10
Absolute cure rate .....	13.7%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	2	1	
Stage II .....	23	5	21.7
Stage III .....	28	3	10.7
Stage IV .....	14	1	
Stages I-IV .....	67	10	14.9

STATEMENT FOR 1928-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1928	21	1	20	1	6	9	4
1929	83	10	73	6	12	30	25
1930	66	9	57	3	24	18	12
1931	96	9	87	4	27	37	19
Total...	266	29	237	14	69	94	60

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of					4. Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of							
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8
1928	20	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	18	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
1929	73	12	9	7	8	1	0	0	0	0	59	61	63	63	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	0							
1930	57	10	10	8	0	0	0	46	46	47	1	1	1	0	0	1													
1931	87	11	10	0	0	74	75	2	2	0	0																		
Total...	237	35					0	197					5	0															

<sup>1</sup> One patient lost sight of was found alive and well.



Table 9, Stages I-IV.  
*Evaluation of results.*

1.	2.	3.	4.						5.						6.							
			Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						Absolute cure rate at the end of						Relative cure rate at the end of					
					5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
Year			years						years						years							
1928	21	20	2	2	2	2	2	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	9.5	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0					
1929	83	73	12	9	7	8 <sup>1</sup>	14.5	10.8	8.4	9.6	16.4	12.3	9.6	11.0								
1930	66	57	10	10	8	15.2	15.2	12.1	17.5	17.5	14.0											
1931	96	87	11	10	11.5	10.4	12.6	11.5														
Total..	266	237	35					13.2					14.8									

<sup>1</sup> See note 1, page 85, Table 8.

Table 10, Stage I.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1928	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1929	6	2	2	2	2								
1930	3	2	2	2									
1931	4	1	1										
Total...	14	6											

Table 10, Stage II.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1928	6	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	12	3	2	2	2								
1930	24	5	5	4			20.8	20.8	16.7				
1931	27	3	3				11.1	11.1					
Total...	69	11					15.9						

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1928	9	1	1	1	1	1		20.0	13.3	10.0	13.3		
1929	30	6	4	3	4 <sup>1</sup>			5.6	5.6	5.6			
1930	18	1	1	1				18.9	16.2				
1931	37	7	6										
Total...	94	15						16.0					

<sup>1</sup> See note 1, page 85, Table 8.

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1928	4	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	25	1	1	0	0			4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0		
1930	12	2	2	1				0.0	0.0				
1931	19	0	0										
Total...	60	3						5.0					

(i) THE SHEFFIELD RADIUM CENTRE, UNITED KINGDOM  
OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

(Contributed by Dr. F. ELLIS.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment.	64
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	1
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	63

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	1
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	1

**Table 3.**  
*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	63	5	7.9	11	17.5	22	34.9	25	39.7
With microscopical verification . . . .	58	5		10		22		21	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	5	0		1 <sup>1</sup>		0		4 <sup>2</sup>	

<sup>1</sup> No. 1. Nine months vaginal discharge, foul smell, bleeding with clots and pain. Cervix movable, os patulous, canal inside friable and bleeds easily. Irregularity in posterior fornix. Microscopic examination had been performed at the hospital from which the patient was referred. The report could not be traced later.

<sup>2</sup> These four patients died before the end of the five-year period.

**Table 4.**  
*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	5	4	0	0	1	0	0
II . . . . .	11	9	0	0	1	0	1
III . . . . .	22	5	0	0	15	0	2
IV . . . . .	25	2	0	0	22	1	0
I-IV . . . . .	63	20	0	0	39	1	3

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	64
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	20
Absolute cure rate .....	31.3%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	5	4	
Stage II .....	11	9	
Stage III .....	22	5	22.7
Stage IV .....	25	2	8.0
Stages I-IV .....	63	20	31.7



Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1.	2.	3.	4.						5.						6.					
Year	Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						Absolute cure rate at the end of						Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years						years					
1931	66	66	9	9					13.6	13.6					13.6	13.6				





Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1931	31	4	4					12.9	12.9				

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1931	22	2	2					9.1	9.1				

(j) RADIUMSTATIONEN, COPENHAGEN, DENMARK

(Contributed by Dr. O. CHEWITZ.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	180
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	0
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	180

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons .....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	0

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age	Number of cases	Per- cent- age
Total number of patients treated	180	13	7.2	34	18.9	94	52.2	39	21.7
With microscopical verification . . . .	180	13		34		94		39	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recur- rence	Alive with recur- rence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radio- therapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter- current disease
I . . . . .	13	9	0	0	4	0	0
II . . . . .	34	16	1	0	13	0	4
III . . . . .	94	17	1	0	72	0	4
IV . . . . .	39	2	0	0	36	0	1
I-IV . . . . .	180	44	2	0	125	0	9

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I).....	180
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	44
Absolute cure rate .....	24.4%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	13	9	
Stage II .....	34	16	47.1
Stage III .....	94	17	18.1
Stage IV .....	39	2	5.1
Stages I-IV.....	180	44	24.4

Data from Radiumstationen, relating to the years previous to 1932 will appear in the Fourth Annual Report.

(k) RADIUMSTATIONEN FOR JYLLAND, AARHUS, DENMARK

(Contributed by Dr. C. KREBS.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	78
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	0
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	78

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	0

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	78	19	24.4	14	17.9	28	35.9	17	21.8
With microscopical verification . . . .	78	19		14		28		17	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of intercurrent disease
I . . . . .	19	10	0	0	9	0	0
II . . . . .	14	8	0	0	6	0	0
III . . . . .	28	4	0	0	24	0	0
IV . . . . .	17	2	0	0	14	1	0
I-IV . . . . .	78	24	0	0	53	1	0

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I).....	78
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	24
Absolute cure rate .....	30.8%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	19	10	52.6
Stage II .....	14	8	
Stage III .....	28	4	14.3
Stage IV .....	17	2	11.8
Stages I-IV.....	78	24	30.8



Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	78	19	24.4	14	17.9	28	35.9	17	21.8
With microscopical verification . . . .	78	19		14		28		17	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	19	10	0	0	9	0	0
II . . . . .	14	8	0	0	6	0	0
III . . . . .	28	4	0	0	24	0	0
IV . . . . .	17	2	0	0	14	1	0
I-IV . . . . .	78	24	0	0	53	1	0

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I).....	78
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV) .....	24
Absolute cure rate .....	30.8%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	19	10	52.6
Stage II .....	14	8	
Stage III .....	28	4	14.3
Stage IV .....	17	2	11.8
Stages I-IV.....	78	24	30.8

## STATEMENT FOR 1931

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1931	92	0	92	33	18	28	13

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

Table 8.

*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1931	92	20	19					0	0					70	70					1	1					1	2				



Table 10, Stage I.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1931	33	10	10					30.3	30.3					

Table 10, Stage II.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1931	18	8	7					44.4	38.9					

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1931	28	0	0					0.0	0.0					

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1931	13	2	2											

(1) INSTITUT DU CANCER, PARIS, FRANCE

(Contributed by Dr. SIMONE LABORDE.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	127
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2) . . . . .	48
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) . . . . .	79

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere . . . . .	3
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons . . . . .	8
(d) Operation advised . . . . .	3
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities . . . . .	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient . . . . .	3
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications . . . . .	31
(h) Some other specified reason . . . . .	0
Total . . . . .	48

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	79	6	7.6	13	16.5	34	43.0	26	32.9
With microscopical verification . . . .	79	6		13		34		26	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
II . . . . .	13	6	0	0	5	2	0
III . . . . .	34	15	1	0	16	2	0
IV . . . . .	26	3	0	0	18	5	0
I-IV . . . . .	79	30	1	0	39	9	0



**Table 5.***Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the clinic was not solely responsible for the treatment of cervical carcinoma in the area, which was not a homogeneous unit from the standpoint of hospital administrative arrangements.

**Table 6.***Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	6	6	
Stage II .....	13	6	
Stage III .....	34	15	44.1
Stage IV .....	26	3	11.5
Stages I-IV.....	79	30	38.0

STATEMENT FOR 1921-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1921-26 <sup>2</sup>	226	52	174	3	22	91	58
1927	78	23	55	6	10	22	17
1928	85	24	61	7	10	32	12
1929	99	39	60	1	9	27	23
1930	87	7	80	8	13	38	21
1931	111	28	83	9	15	40	19
Total...	686	173	513	34	79	250	150

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> The figures of the individual years from which these totals are derived may be found on reference to the Second Annual Report.

Table 8.—Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1921-26 <sup>2</sup>	174	38	34	34	30	30	26	2	1	1	0	0	0	133	135	135	138	138	140	1	2	2	2	2	4	0	2	2	4	4	4
1927	55	15	12	12	12	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	40	40	40	40	40	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
1928	61	16	13	12	11	11		1	2	1	0	0		38	39	40	41	41		4	5	5	5	5		2	2	3	4	4	
1929	60	18	17	16	15			0	1	0	0			34	34	35	35			7	7	7	7			1	1	2	3		
1930	80	22	22	21				1	1	0				53	53	55				2	2	2				2	2	2			
1931	83	28	27					1	2					49	49					4	4					1	1				
Total...	513	137						5						345						19						7					

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

<sup>2</sup> See note 2, Table 7.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1.	2.	3.	4.						5.						6.							
			Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						Absolute cure rate at the end of						Relative cure rate at the end of					
					5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
Year			years						years						years							
1921-26 <sup>1</sup>	226	174	38	34	34	30	30	26								21.8	19.5	19.5	17.2	17.2	14.9	
1927	78	55	15	12	12	12	12	12								27.3	21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	21.8	
1928	85	61	16	13	12	11	11									26.2	21.3	19.7	18.0	18.0		
1929	99	60	18	17	16	15										30.0	28.3	26.7	25.0			
1930	87	80	22	22	21											27.5	27.5	26.3				
1931	111	83	28	27												33.7	32.5					
Total...	686	513	137													26.7						

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 109, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage I.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1921-26 <sup>1</sup>	3	3	2	2	2	2	2						
1927	6	6	5	5	5	5	5						
1928	7	2	1	1	1	1							
1929	1	0	0	0	0								
1930	8	2	2	2									
1931	9	4	4										
Total...	34	17						50.0					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 109, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage II.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1921-26 <sup>1</sup>	22	12	12	12	11	11	10	54.5	54.5	54.5	50.0	50.0	45.5
1927	10	3	3	3	3	3	3						
1928	10	3	2	1	1	1							
1929	9	7	7	6	6								
1930	13	6	6	6									
1931	15	8	7					53.3	46.7				
Total...	79	39						49.4					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 109, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1921-26 <sup>1</sup>	91	23	20	20	17	17	14	25.3	22.0	22.0	18.7	18.7	15.4
1927	22	6	4	4	4	4	4	27.3	18.2	18.2	18.2	18.2	18.2
1928	32	11	10	10	9	9		34.4	31.3	31.3	28.1	28.1	
1929	27	10	9	9	8			37.0	33.3	33.3	29.6		
1930	38	12	12	11				31.6	31.6	28.9			
1931	40	14	14					35.0	35.0				
Total...	250	76						30.4					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 109, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1921-26 <sup>1</sup>	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1927	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1928	12	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	23	1	1	1	1			4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3		
1930	21	2	2	2				9.5	9.5	9.5			
1931	19	2	2					10.5	10.5				
Total...	150	5						3.3					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 109, Table 7.

(*m*) INSTITUT DU RADIUM DE L'UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS,  
FRANCE

(Contributed by Dr. A. LACASSAGNE.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment.	181
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	80
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	101

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

( <i>a</i> ) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
( <i>b</i> ) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	1
( <i>c</i> ) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	4
( <i>d</i> ) Operation advised .....	1
( <i>e</i> ) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	47
( <i>f</i> ) Treatment refused by the patient .....	1
( <i>g</i> ) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	26
( <i>h</i> ) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	80

**Table 3.**

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated	101	18	17.8	43	42.6	34	33.7	6	5.9
With microscopical verification . . . .	101	18		43		34		6	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

**Table 4.**

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of intercurrent disease
I . . . . .	18	14	0	0	3	0	1
II . . . . .	43	23	1	0	19	0	0
III . . . . .	34	14	0	0	20	0	0
IV . . . . .	6	1	0	0	5	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	101	52	1	0	47	0	1

**Table 5.**

*Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the available facilities at the Institut du Radium are not sufficient for treatment of all patients presenting themselves, a number of patients being referred to other anti-cancer centres of Paris.

**Table 6.**

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	18	14	77.8
Stage II .....	43	23	53.5
Stage III .....	34	14	41.2
Stage IV .....	6	1	
Stages I-IV.....	101	52	51.5



STATEMENT FOR 1919-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1919-26 <sup>2</sup>	897	316	581	53	210	245	73
1927	113	19	94	11	33	36	14
1928	118	24	94	6	47	37	4
1929	135	33	102	11	38	46	7
1930	158	47	111	16	34	47	14
1931	157	55	102	12	44	34	12
Total...	1,578	494	1,084	109	406	445	124

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> The figures of the individual years from which these totals are derived may be found on reference to the previous Annual Reports.

Table 8.

Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of						
		years						years						years						years						years						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1919-26 <sup>2</sup>	581	148	144	137	132	128	127	21	13	10	9	5	3	396	406	411	415	420	422	6	6	6	6	8	8	10	12	17	19	20	21	
1927	94	27	27	24	23	21	19	5	2	4	1	0	0	59	62	62	65	67	68	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	4	6	
1928	94	42	42	39	36	36	2	0	1	3	0	43	45	45	45	48	4	4	4	5	5	3	3	5	5	5						
1929	102	43	41	39	37	2	4	2	2	49	49	51	55	1	1	2	0	7	7	8	8											
1930	111	52	49	46	3	1	1	54	58	58	0	0	1	2	3	5																
1931	102	39	38	1	0	55	57	1	0	6	7																					
Total...	1,084	351						34						656						14						29						

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

<sup>2</sup> See note 2, Table 7

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years						years					
1919-26 <sup>1</sup>	897	581	148	144	137	132	128	127							25.5	24.8	23.6	22.7	22.0	21.9
1927	113	94	27	27	24	23	21	19							28.7	28.7	25.5	24.5	22.3	20.2
1928	118	94	42	42	39	36	36							44.7	44.7	41.5	38.3	38.3		
1929	135	102	43	41	39	37							42.2	40.2	38.2	36.3				
1930	158	111	52	49	46									46.8	44.1	41.4				
1931	157	102	39	38									38.2	37.3						
Total...	1,578	1,084	351											32.4						

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 116, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage I.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919-26 <sup>1</sup>	53	29	29	29	29	29	29	54.7	54.7	54.7	54.7	54.7	54.7
1927	11	7	7	7	7	6	5						
1928	6	4	4	2	2	2							
1929	11	8	8	7	7								
1930	16	12	12	12				75.0	75.0	75.0			
1931	12	8	8										
Total...	109	68						62.4					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 116, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage II.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919-26 <sup>1</sup>	210	70	68	65	61	61	60	33.3	32.4	31.0	29.0	29.0	28.6
1927	33	12	12	11	11	10	10	36.4	36.4	33.3	33.3	30.3	30.3
1928	47	24	24	23	21	21		51.1	51.1	48.9	44.7	44.7	
1929	38	20	20	20	18			52.6	52.6	52.6	47.4		
1930	34	19	19	17				55.9	55.9	50.0			
1931	44	19	19					43.2	43.2				
Total...	406	164						40.4					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 116, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage III.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919-26 <sup>1</sup>	245	48	46	42	41	38	38	19.6	18.7	17.1	16.7	15.5	15.5
1927	36	8	8	6	5	5	4	22.2	22.2	16.7	13.9	13.9	11.1
1928	37	14	14	14	13	13		37.8	37.8	37.8	35.1	35.1	
1929	46	15	13	12	12			32.6	28.3	26.1	26.1		
1930	47	16	15	14				34.0	31.9	29.8			
1931	34	11	10					32.4	29.4				
Total...	445	112						25.2					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 116, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage IV.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1919-26 <sup>1</sup>	73	1	1	1	1	0	0	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	0.0	0.0
1927	14	0	0	0	0	0	0						
1928	4	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	7	0	0	0	0								
1930	14	5	3	3									
1931	12	1	1										
Total...	124	7						5.6					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 116, Table 7.

(n) ANTONI VAN LEEUWENHOEK-HUIS, AMSTERDAM,  
THE NETHERLANDS

(Contributed by Dr. D. DEN HOED.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	41
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	0
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	41

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient .....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	0
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	0

**Table 3.**

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated.	41	6	14.6	12	29.3	18	43.9	5	12.2
With microscopical verification . . . .	41	6		12		18		5	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

**Table 4.**

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1. Number of patients treated	2. Alive without recurrence	3. Alive with recurrence	4. Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	5. Died of cancer	6. Lost sight of	7. Died of intercurrent disease
I . . . . .	6	6	0	0	0	0	0
II . . . . .	12	8	0	0	4	0	0
III . . . . .	18	2	1	0	14	0	1
IV . . . . .	5	1	0	0	4	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	41	17	1	0	22	0	1

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

*Note.*—Calculation of absolute cure rate omitted because the clinic was not solely responsible for the treatment of cervical carcinoma in the area, which was not a homogeneous unit from the standpoint of hospital administrative arrangements.

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I . . . . .	6	6	
Stage II . . . . .	12	8	
Stage III . . . . .	18	2	11.1
Stage IV . . . . .	5	1	
Stages I-IV . . . . .	41	17	41.5

STATEMENT FOR 1924-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1.	2.	3.	4.				
Year	Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1924	7	0	7	1	2	2	2
1925	10	0	10	0	2	6	2
1926	12	0	12	0	2	7	3
1927	19	0	19	2	3	10	4
1928	12	0	12	2	3	5	2
1929	15	0	15	1	5	9	0
1930	23	0	23	4	8	7	4
1931	31	0	31	4	10	15	2
Total...	129	0	129	14	35	61	19

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.



Table 8.

*Results of treatment.*

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of						5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of						6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of						7. Died from inter- current disease during a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1924	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1925	10	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1926	12	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1927	19	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	16	16	16	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
1928	12	5	5	5	5	5		0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0				
1929	15	6	6	6	6			0	0	0	0	8	8	8	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				
1930	23	10	10	10				1	0	0			9	10	10			1	1	1			2	2	2						
1931	31	10	10					0	0				15	15				0	0				6	6							
Total...	129	36						2					78					2					11								

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			years						years						years					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
1924	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0												
1925	10	10	1	1	1	1	1	1												
1926	12	12	2	2	2	2	2	2												
1927	19	19	2	2	2	2	2	2							10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5
1928	12	12	5	5	5	5	5													
1929	15	15	6	6	6	6									40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0		
1930	23	23	10	10	10										43.5	43.5	43.5			
1931	31	31	10	10											32.3	32.3				
Total ...	129	129	36												27.9					



Table 10, Stage II.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1924	2	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	2	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1926	2	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1927	3	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1928	3	3	3	3	3	3	3							
1929	5	3	3	3	3									
1930	8	5	5	5										
1931	10	5	5											
Total...	35	19						54.3						

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1924	2	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	6	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1926	7	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1927	10	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1928	5	1	1	1	1	1								
1929	9	2	2	2	2									
1930	7	2	2	2										
1931	15	4	4					26.7	26.7					
Total...	61	11						18.0						

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1924	2	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	2	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1926	3	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1927	4	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1928	2	0	0	0	0	0								
1929	0	0	0	0	0									
1930	4	0	0	0										
1931	2	0	0											
Total...	19	0						0.0						

*Antoni van Leeuwenhoek-Huis, Amsterdam*

(o) RADIOLOGISKA KLINIKEN, SAHLGRENSKA SJUKHUSET,  
GOTHENBURG, SWEDEN

(Contributed by Dr. F. VON BERGEN.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENTS OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment.	36
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	3
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3) .....	33

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	3
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total...	3

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage	Number of cases	Percentage
Total number of patients treated.	33	11	33.3	8	24.2	11	33.3	3	9.1
With microscopical verification . . . .	33	11		8		11		3	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	11	7	0	0	3	0	1
II . . . . .	8	3	0	0	5	0	0
III . . . . .	11	5	0	0	6	0	0
IV . . . . .	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	33	15	0	0	17	0	1



Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	36
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV).....	15
Absolute cure rate .....	41.7%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	11	7	
Stage II .....	8	3	
Stage III.....	11	5	
Stage IV .....	3	0	
Stages I-IV .....	33	15	45.5

## STATEMENT FOR 1920-1931 INCLUSIVE

Table 7.

1.	2.	3.	4.				
Year	Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
1920	22	1	21	2	11	8	0
1921	28	1	27	4	6	16	1
1922	27	0	27	1	7	15	4
1923	23	0	23	2	8	13	0
1924	20	0	20	2	7	6	5
1925	22	0	22	2	10	10	0
1926	37	0	37	11	10	12	4
1927	44	1	43	13	10	17	3
1928	27	0	27	2	9	13	3
1929	19	0	19	5	3	8	3
1930	41	2	39	9	13	15	2
1931	26	1	25	5	10	10	0
Total...	336	6	330	58	104	143	25

<sup>1</sup> According to indications in Table 2.



Table 9, Stages I—IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of 1 (see Table 8, col. 3)							5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
			years							years						years					
1920	22	21	5(3)	5(3)	5(3)	4(2)	4(2)	4(2)	22.7	22.7	22.7	18.2	18.2	18.2	23.8	23.8	23.8	19.0	19.0	19.0	
1921	28	27	9(1)	9(1)	9(1)	8	8	8	32.1	32.1	32.1	28.6	28.6	28.6	33.3	33.3	33.3	29.6	29.6	29.6	
1922	27	27	5	4	4	4	4	4	18.5	14.8	14.8	14.8	14.8	14.8	18.5	14.8	14.8	14.8	14.8	14.8	
1923	23	23	6	4	3	3	3	3	26.1	17.4	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	26.1	17.4	13.0	13.0	13.0	13.0	
1924	20	20	2	2	2	2	2	2	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
1925	22	22	4	4	3	3	2	2	18.2	18.2	13.6	13.6	9.1	9.1	18.2	18.2	13.6	13.6	9.1	9.1	
1926	37	37	11(2)	11(2)	10(2)	10(2)	8(1)	8(1)	29.7	29.7	27.0	27.0	21.6	21.6	29.7	29.7	27.0	27.0	21.6	21.6	
1927	44	43	12	12	10	9	8	8	27.3	27.3	22.7	20.5	18.2	18.2	27.9	27.9	23.3	20.9	18.6	18.6	
1928	27	27	4	3	3	3	3		14.8	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1		14.8	11.1	11.1	11.1	11.1		
1929	19	19	6	6	6	6			31.6	31.6	31.6	31.6			31.6	31.6	31.6	31.6			
1930	41	39	15	15	14				36.6	36.6	34.1				38.5	38.5	35.9				
1931	26	25	5	4					19.2	15.4					20.0	16.0					
Total...	336	330	84(6)						25.0						25.5						

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4.

Table 10, Stage I.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1920	2	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1921	4	4	4	4	3	3	3							
1922	1	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1923	2	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1924	2	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1925	2	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1926	11	7	7	6	6	4	4							
1927	13	4	4	4	4	4	4							
1928	2	2	2	2	2	2	2							
1929	5	4	4	4	4									
1930	9	6	6	6										
1931	5	2	2											
Total...	58	36						62.1						

Table 10, Stage II.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1920	11	3	3	3	2	2	2						
1921	6	3	3	3	3	3	3						
1922	7	2	1	1	1	1	1						
1923	8	2	1	0	0	0	0						
1924	7	1	1	1	1	1	1						
1925	10	2	2	2	2	1	1						
1926	10	3	3	3	3	3	3						
1927	10	3	3	1	1	1	1						
1928	9	2	1	1	1	1							
1929	3	1	1	1	1								
1930	13	4	4	4									
1931	10	0	0										
Total...	104	26						25.0					

Table 10, Stage III.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1920	8	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1921	16	2	2	2	2	2	2	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5
1922	15	2	2	2	2	2	2	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3	13.3
1923	13	2	1	1	1	1	1							
1924	6	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	10	1	1	0	0	0	0							
1926	12	1	1	1	1	1	1							
1927	17	5	5	5	4	3	3	29.4	29.4	29.4	23.5	17.6	17.6	
1928	13	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	8	1	1	1	1									
1930	15	5	5	4				33.3	33.3	26.7				
1931	10	3	2											
Total...	143	22						15.4						

Table 10, Stage IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of						
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	
		years						years						
1920	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1921	1	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1922	4	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1923	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1924	5	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1925	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1926	4	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1927	3	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1928	3	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1929	3	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1930	2	0	0	0										
1931	0	0	0											
Total...	25	0						0.0						



(p) RADIUMHEMMET, STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

(Contributed by Prof. J. HEYMAN.)

CANCER OF THE *CERVIX UTERI*

STATEMENT OF RESULTS OF TREATMENT IN 1932

Table 1.

I. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment.	239
II. Of those :	
1. Not treated (Total of cases comprised in Table 2).....	16
2. Radiologically treated (Total of cases included in Table 3).....	223

Table 2.

*Patients examined at the clinic but not treated.*

(a) Prevented by disease or death from presenting themselves.	0
(b) Seeking treatment elsewhere .....	0
(c) Not presenting themselves for unknown reasons.....	0
(d) Operation advised .....	0
(e) Not accepted owing to lack of accommodation or therapeutic facilities .....	0
(f) Treatment refused by the patient.....	0
(g) Treatment considered unsuitable owing to the patient's general condition, to the extent of the disease or to other complications .....	16
(h) Some other specified reason .....	0
Total....	16

Table 3.

*Patients radiologically treated (Table 1, II, 2).*

	Stages I-IV	Stage I		Stage II		Stage III		Stage IV	
		Number of cases	Per-cent-age	Number of cases	Per-cent-age	Number of cases	Per-cent-age	Number of cases	Per-cent-age
Total number of patients treated.	223	18	8.1	91	40.8	70	31.4	44	19.7
With microscopical verification . . . .	223	18		91		70		44	
Without microscopical verification . . . . .	0	0		0		0		0	

Table 4.

*Results of treatment estimated after a period of observation of five years, dating from the beginning of treatment.*

Stage	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Alive with recurrence	Patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy	Died of cancer	Lost sight of	Died of inter-current disease
I . . . . .	18	12	0	2	4	0	0
II . . . . .	91	35	0	1	53	0	2
III . . . . .	70	14	0	0	54	0	2
IV . . . . .	44	3	1	0	40	0	0
I-IV . . . . .	223	64	1	3	151	0	4

Table 5.

*Absolute cure rate.*

Total number of cases (see Table 1, I) .....	239
Alive without recurrence five years after the beginning of treatment (see Table 4, col. 2, stages I-IV).....	64
Absolute cure rate .....	26.8%

Table 6.

*Relative cure rate.*

	Number of patients treated (see Table 4, col. 1, I-IV)	Alive without recurrence (see Table 4, col. 2, I-IV)	Percentage
Stage I .....	18	12	66.7
Stage II .....	91	35	38.5
Stage III.....	70	14	20.0
Stage IV .....	44	3	6.8
Stages I-IV .....	223	64	28.7

Table 7.

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment	3. Patients examined but not treated <sup>1</sup>	4. Radiologically treated				
			Stages I-IV	Stage I	Stage II	Stage III	Stage IV
			1914-26 <sup>2</sup>	1,236	68	1,168	118
1927	149	6	143	9	55	53	26
1928	135	7	128	14	37	48	29
1929	160	8	152	22	38	66	26
1930	205	7	198	12	60	93	33
1931	219	8	211	31	67	71	42
Total...	2,104	104	2,000	206	568	787	439

<sup>1</sup> According to indications given in Table 2.

<sup>2</sup> The figures of the individual years from which these totals are derived may be found on reference to the previous Annual Reports.

Table 8.—Results of treatment.

1. Year	2. Number of patients treated (see Table 7, col. 4)	3. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of							4. <sup>1</sup> Alive with recurrence after a period of observation of					5. Died of cancer during a period of observation of					6. Lost sight of during a period of observation of					7. Died from inter-current disease during a period of observation of							
		years							years					years					years					years							
		5	6	7	8	9	10		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9
1914-26 <sup>2</sup>	1,168	251	236	221	209	204	193	21	18	14	16	9	9	877	891	904	910	919	924	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	29	33	36	42
1927	143	36	34	34	34	33	31	4	2	1	1	1	1	100	104	105	105	106	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	4
1928	128	29	26	25	24	24		1	3	1	2	2		95	96	99	99	99		0	0	0	0	0		3	3	3	3	3	
1929	152	46	44	43	43			2	0	0	0			98	102	103	103			0	0	0	0			6	6	6	6		
1930	198	50	47	43				8	6	5				136	140	143				0	0	0				4	5	7			
1931	211	43	41					5	3					159	162					0	0					4	5				
Total...	2,000	455						41						1,465						0						39					

<sup>1</sup> Including patients alive operated upon after failure of radiotherapy.

<sup>2</sup> See note 2, Table 7.

Table 9, Stages I-IV.

*Evaluation of results.*

1. Year	2. Total number of patients examined with a view to treatment (see Table 7, col. 2)	3. Number of patients treated (see T. 7, col. 4)	4. Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of <sup>1</sup> (see Table 8, col. 3)						5. Absolute cure rate at the end of						6. Relative cure rate at the end of					
			5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
			years						years						years					
1914-26 <sup>2</sup>	1,236	1,168	251(7)	236(7)	221(7)	209(7)	204(7)	193(6)	20.3	19.1	17.9	16.9	16.5	15.6	21.5	20.2	18.9	17.9	17.5	16.5
1927	149	143	36(1)	34(1)	34(1)	34(1)	33(1)	31(1)	24.2	22.8	22.8	22.8	22.1	20.8	25.2	23.8	23.8	23.8	23.1	21.7
1928	135	128	29	26	25	24	24		21.5	19.3	18.5	17.8	17.8		22.7	20.3	19.5	18.8	18.8	
1929	160	152	46	44	43	43			28.8	27.5	26.9	26.9			30.3	28.9	28.3	28.3		
1930	205	198	50(1)	47(1)	43(1)				24.4	22.9	21.0				25.3	23.7	21.7			
1931	219	211	43	41					19.6	18.7					20.4	19.4				
Total...	2,104	2,000	455(9)						21.6						22.8					

<sup>1</sup> The number of cases in which microscopical verification was not obtained is entered in brackets after the principal figures in column 4. A detailed description of these cases will be found in *Acta Radiologica*, Vol. VIII, 363, 1927, and in the First Annual Report.

<sup>2</sup> See note 2, page 143, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage I.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage I (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914-26 <sup>1</sup>	118	62	60	59	55	54	52	52.5	50.8	50.0	46.6	45.8	44.1
1927	9	5	5	4	4	4	3						
1928	14	8	7	7	7	7							
1929	22	13	13	13	13			59.1	59.1	59.1	59.1		
1930	12	5	5	5									
1931	31	15	14					48.4	45.2				
Total...	206	108						52.4					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 143, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage II.  
Evaluation of results.

Year	Number of patients treated in stage II (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914-26 <sup>1</sup>	311	102	98	91	88	85	82	32.8	31.5	29.3	28.3	27.3	26.4
1927	55	18	16	17 <sup>2</sup>	17	17	16	32.7	29.1	30.9	30.9	30.9	30.9
1928	37	13	12	11	11	11		35.1	32.4	29.7	29.7	29.7	
1929	38	20	19	18	18			52.6	50.0	47.4	47.4		
1930	60	26	26	24				43.3	43.3	40.0			
1931	67	18	18					26.9	26.9				
Total...	568	197						34.7					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 143, Table 7.

<sup>2</sup> One patient considered hopeless at six years recovered at seven.

Radiumhemmet, Stockholm

145

Table 10, Stage III.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage III (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914-26 <sup>1</sup>	456	72	63	58	55	55	50	15.8	13.8	12.7	12.1	12.1	11.0
1927	53	13	13	13	13	12	12	24.5	24.5	24.5	24.5	22.6	22.6
1928	48	5	5	5	4	4		10.4	10.4	10.4	8.3	8.3	
1929	66	11	10	10	10			16.7	15.2	15.2	15.2		
1930	93	16	13	11				17.2	14.0	11.8			
1931	71	6	5					8.5	7.0				
Total...	787	123						15.6					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 143, Table 7.

Table 10, Stage IV.  
*Evaluation of results.*

Year	Number of patients treated in stage IV (see Table 7, col. 4)	Alive without recurrence after a period of observation of						Relative cure rate after a period of observation of					
		5	6	7	8	9	10	5	6	7	8	9	10
		years						years					
1914-26 <sup>1</sup>	283	15	15	13	11	10	9	5.3	5.3	4.6	3.9	3.5	3.2
1927	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1928	29	3	2	2	2	2		10.3	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.9	
1929	26	2	2	2	2			7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7		
1930	33	3	3	3				9.1	9.1	9.1			
1931	42	4	4					9.5	9.5				
Total...	439	27						6.2					

<sup>1</sup> See note 2, page 143, Table 7.

The Committee decided not to accept nine statements submitted for this report. Four of these statements relate to less than 100 treated cases, which is the minimum regarded as essential. The addition to each of these statements of the group of patients treated in 1933 will make them suitable, in this respect, for inclusion in the Fourth Annual Report.

One statement which presented a part only of the necessary data was considered unacceptable.

Lastly, the Committee refused the remaining four statements mainly on account of the lack of microscopical verification in a high proportion of patients, particularly those reported as alive and free from recurrence five years after treatment.

In the following table is shown, for three of the statements, the number of cases of those "alive without recurrence", both with and without microscopical verification. In the first line of each example, the cases without microscopical verification are included with those alive. In the second line, they are excluded from the total number of cases examined and from those alive without recurrence.

Total number of patients examined	Alive without recurrence	Microscopical verification lacking	"	Absolute cure rate %	Differences in cure rates %
(a) 203 188	53 38	15 —	28.3 —	26.1 20.2	5.9
(b) 119 117	11 9	2 —	18.2 —	9.2 7.7	1.5
(c) 650 637	104 91	13 —	12.5 —	16.0 14.3	1.7

This demonstrates the range of possible variation in cure rates when the proportion of cases without microscopical verification is high.



## 7. SUMMARY

This annual report, the third of the series, includes statements from sixteen radiotherapeutic centres.

The statements provided by these centres vary considerably in respect of the number of years to which they relate and of the number of patients treated yearly in each centre. When all the data in them are combined, they furnish information concerning 9,061 patients suffering from cancer of the uterine cervix examined with a view to treatment, of whom 7,958 (87.8%) were submitted to radiological treatment.

The following tabular statement shows the results obtained after the lapse of five years from the date of treatment :

		%
Alive without recurrence .....	2,194 <sup>1</sup>	27.6
Alive with recurrence (including those operated upon after failure of radiotherapy) .....	128	1.6
Died of cancer .....	5,368	67.5
Died of intercurrent disease .....	163	2.0
Lost sight of .....	105	1.3
	7,958	100.0

The 7,958 patients treated were allocated to stages as follows :

		%
Stage I .....	871	10.9
Stage II .....	2,305	29.0
Stage III .....	3,420	43.0
Stage IV .....	1,360	17.1
Unclassified .....	2	0.03
	7,958	100.0

Results of treatment calculated for each of the four stages :

	Number of patients treated	Alive without recurrence	Relative cure rate %
Stage I .....	871	498	57.2
Stage II .....	2,305	867	37.6
Stage III .....	3,420	754	22.0
Stage IV .....	1,360	75	5.5
Unclassified .....	2	0	0.0
Grand total. . .	7,958	2,194	27.6

<sup>1</sup> Includes thirty-one patients without microscopical verification.