ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER
Volume - 14 | Issue - 10 | October - 2025 | PRINT ISSN No. 2277 - 8179 | DOI : 10.36106/ijsr
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

PATHOLOGICAL RESPONSE AND SURGICAL OUTCOMES AFTER NEOADJUVANT CHEMOTHERAPY IN TRIPLE-NEGATIVE BREAST CANCER

General Surgery

Kanwar Singh Goel Department of General surgery, SGT University Medical College & Hospital- Budhera Gurugram 122505(Haryana)(INDIA).

Milan Patel Department of General surgery, SGT University Medical College & Hospital- Budhera Gurugram 122505(Haryana)(INDIA).

Nishant Manhas Department of General surgery, SGT University Medical College & Hospital- Budhera Gurugram 122505(Haryana)(INDIA).

Shyam Goyal* Department of General surgery, SGT University Medical College & Hospital- Budhera Gurugram 122505(Haryana)(INDIA). *Corresponding Author

Pawan Tiwari Department of General surgery, SGT University Medical College & Hospital- Budhera Gurugram 122505(Haryana)(INDIA).

Pawan Yadav Department of General surgery, SGT University Medical College & Hospital- Budhera Gurugram 122505(Haryana)(INDIA).

ABSTRACT

Background: Triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) represents 12-20% of all breast cancers and is characterized by the absence of estrogen receptor, progesterone receptor, and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 expression (Foulkes et al., 2010). This aggressive subtype disproportionately affects younger women and demonstrates superior response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy compared to other breast cancer subtypes. **Methods:** This comprehensive review synthesizes current evidence from major clinical trials, meta-analyses, and recent publications from 2020-2025 examining neoadjuvant chemotherapy approaches, pathological response rates, predictive biomarkers, and surgical outcomes in TNBC patients. **Results:** Neoadjuvant chemotherapy achieves pathological complete response (pCR) rates of 40-50% with standard regimens (Cortazar et al., 2014), increasing to 64.8% with pembrolizumab combinations in the landmark KEYNOTE-522 trial (Schmid et al., 2020). Platinum-based regimens enhance pCR rates by 13-15% compared to standard anthracycline-taxane protocols (Poggio et al., 2018). Patients achieving pCR demonstrate significantly improved survival outcomes with 5-year overall survival rates of 86-95% versus 62-78% for non-pCR patients (Huang et al., 2020). Breast-conserving surgery rates increase from 76.5% to 83.8% following neoadjuvant therapy (Loibl et al., 2018), though re-excision rates double to 32% compared to primary surgery. Key predictive biomarkers include tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes, PD-L1 expression, BRCA1/2 mutations, and homologous recombination deficiency scores. **Conclusions:** The integration of immunotherapy with neoadjuvant chemotherapy represents a paradigmatic shift in TNBC treatment, significantly improving both pathological response rates and long-term survival outcomes. Modern approaches enable increased breast conservation while maintaining oncologic safety, though surgical complexity increases. Biomarker-guided treatment selection is emerging as crucial for optimizing outcomes in this heterogeneous disease.

KEYWORDS

Triple-negative breast cancer, neoadjuvant chemotherapy, pathological complete response, pembrolizumab, surgical outcomes, biomarkers

INTRODUCTION

Triple-negative breast cancer represents one of the most challenging subtypes of breast malignancy, characterized by its aggressive clinical behavior and historically limited therapeutic options. Molecularly defined by the absence of estrogen receptor (≤1%), progesterone receptor (≤1%), and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (0-1+ expression), TNBC accounts for approximately 15-17% of all breast cancers in the United States (Bianchini et al., 2022). This subtype demonstrates a striking predilection for younger patients, particularly premenopausal women under 40 years, and shows disproportionate representation among African American and Hispanic populations (Agarwal et al., 2016).

The clinical urgency surrounding TNBC management stems from its aggressive natural history. Patients face a 5-year relative survival rate of 77-78% overall, dropping precipitously to 11% for distant disease (American Cancer Society, 2023). The temporal pattern of recurrence proves particularly concerning, with 75% of recurrences occurring within the first three years following treatment (Liedtke et al., 2008). Unlike hormone receptor-positive breast cancers, TNBC demonstrates preferential spread to visceral organs and brain, with median survival after metastasis ranging only 10.2-13.3 months (Caparica et al., 2019).

The molecular heterogeneity underlying the TNBC designation has become increasingly recognized through sophisticated classification systems. The refined Lehmann classification identifies four major subtypes: basal-like (BL1 and BL2) representing 70-80% of cases, luminal androgen receptor (LAR) subtype comprising 10-15%, mesenchymal (M) accounting for 15-20%, and immunomodulatory (IM) representing 10-15% of TNBC cases (Lehmann et al., 2016). Each subtype demonstrates distinct therapeutic vulnerabilities and clinical behaviors, underscoring the importance of personalized treatment approaches.

Neoadjuvant chemotherapy has emerged as the preferred treatment approach for stage II-III TNBC (Burstein et al., 2021), offering several advantages over adjuvant therapy. This strategy enables real-time assessment of treatment efficacy, facilitates surgical downstaging to enable breast conservation, and provides crucial prognostic information through pathological response evaluation. The achievement of pathological complete response (pCR) has been validated as a powerful surrogate endpoint for long-term survival outcomes in TNBC patients (Cortazar et al., 2014).

The therapeutic landscape for TNBC has undergone revolutionary transformation with the integration of immunotherapy. The KEYNOTE-522 trial demonstrated unprecedented improvements in both pCR rates and long-term survival outcomes (Schmid et al., 2020), establishing pembrolizumab plus chemotherapy as the new standard of care for high-risk early-stage disease. This breakthrough has catalyzed extensive research into novel combination strategies, targeted therapies, and biomarker-guided treatment selection.

METHODS

This comprehensive review employed a systematic approach to synthesize current evidence regarding pathological response and surgical outcomes following neoadjuvant chemotherapy in TNBC. Literature searches focused on high-impact medical journals including New England Journal of Medicine, Journal of Clinical Oncology, Lancet Oncology, Nature Medicine, and Cancer Cell, with emphasis on publications from 2020-2025 to capture the most current evidence and recent therapeutic advances.

The review methodology prioritized systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and large-scale clinical trials to ensure robust evidence synthesis. Key databases searched included PubMed, EMBASE, and clinical trial registries, with focus on studies reporting pathological

complete response rates, surgical outcomes, predictive biomarkers, and long-term survival data in TNBC patients receiving neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

Inclusion criteria encompassed studies with clearly defined TNBC populations, standardized pathological response assessment criteria, and adequate follow-up for survival analysis. The analysis incorporated data from landmark trials including KEYNOTE-522 (Schmid et al., 2020), CALGB 40603 (Sikov et al., 2015), GeparSixto (von Minckwitz et al., 2014), and BrighTNess (Loibl et al., 2018), along with recent meta-analyses providing pooled estimates of treatment efficacy across multiple clinical trials.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Molecular Characteristics and Clinical Behavior of TNBC

TNBC demonstrates distinct molecular and clinical characteristics that differentiate it from other breast cancer subtypes. The disease primarily affects younger women with 88.4% presenting as invasive carcinoma of no special type and characteristically high histological grade (Garrido-Castro et al., 2019). The molecular landscape reveals elevated expression of basal markers including CK5/6 (19%), CK14 (6%), CK17 (60%), and EGFR (42%), reflecting the predominantly basal-like phenotype (Nielsen et al., 2004).

Genetic predisposition plays a crucial role, with BRCA1 mutations identified in 8.5-15% of TNBC patients and BRCA2 mutations in 2.7-5% (Tung et al., 2020). Remarkably, 71% of BRCA1-associated breast cancers are triple-negative, highlighting the strong association between hereditary cancer syndromes and this aggressive subtype. The broader concept of homologous recombination deficiency affects approximately 39% of TNBCs, creating therapeutic opportunities for DNA-damaging agents and PARP inhibitors (Telli et al., 2016).

The clinical aggressiveness of TNBC manifests through higher rates of visceral and brain metastases compared to other subtypes (Lin et al., 2008). Patients face a 25% post-surgery recurrence rate, with 40% mortality within the first five years (Dent et al., 2007). However, this aggressive biology paradoxically confers enhanced chemosensitivity, with TNBC demonstrating three-fold higher pCR rates compared to hormone receptor-positive breast cancers (Liedtke et al., 2008).

Rationale and Efficacy of Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Approaches

The superiority of neoadjuvant over adjuvant chemotherapy in TNBC derives from multiple clinical advantages. Primary benefits include enabling breast-conserving surgery through tumor downstaging, providing real-time treatment response assessment, and generating prognostic information through pathological response evaluation (Spring et al., 2020). Meta-analyses of 36,480 TNBC patients demonstrate equivalent survival outcomes between neoadjuvant and adjuvant approaches while offering the additional strategic advantages (Bagegni et al., 2019).

Standard anthracycline-taxane regimens achieve pCR rates of 35-45% in TNBC patients (Cortazar et al., 2014). The sequential AC-T protocol (four cycles of adriamycin-cyclophosphamide followed by four cycles of paclitaxel) represents the backbone regimen, with dose-dense scheduling demonstrating superior outcomes compared to every three-week administration (Citron et al., 2003). However, the integration of platinum agents significantly enhances treatment efficacy.

Platinum-based combinations represent a major therapeutic advance, with multiple randomized trials demonstrating consistent benefit. The CALGB 40603 trial showed carboplatin addition increased pCR rates from 44% to 60% (Sikov et al., 2015), while GeparSixto demonstrated improvement from 36.9% to 53.2% (von Minckwitz et al., 2014). Meta-analysis data confirm a pooled 13.2% absolute improvement in pCR rates with platinum addition (Poggio et al., 2018), establishing these regimens as standard options for appropriate candidates.

Immunotherapy Integration And Breakthrough Outcomes

The integration of pembrolizumab with neoadjuvant chemotherapy represents the most significant advance in TNBC treatment. The pivotal KEYNOTE-522 trial enrolled 1,174 patients with high-risk early-stage TNBC, comparing pembrolizumab plus chemotherapy to placebo plus chemotherapy (Schmid et al., 2020). The immunotherapy combination achieved remarkable pCR rates of 64.8% versus 51.2% with chemotherapy alone, representing a 13.6 percentage point absolute improvement.

Long-term follow-up data demonstrate sustained clinical benefit with 5-year overall survival rates of 86.6% versus 81.7% favoring the pembrolizumab combination (HR 0.66, 95% CI: 0.50-0.87) (Schmid et al., 2024). Event-free survival similarly favored immunotherapy with HR 0.63 (95% CI: 0.48-0.82), establishing pembrolizumab plus chemotherapy as the new standard of care for high-risk early-stage TNBC (Schmid et al., 2022).

The treatment regimen involves four cycles of pembrolizumab with paclitaxel and carboplatin, followed by four cycles of pembrolizumab with anthracycline-cyclophosphamide, then nine cycles of adjuvant pembrolizumab maintenance (Schmid et al., 2020). While 43% of patients experienced immune-related adverse events, these proved manageable with 68% requiring treatment but no significant increase in surgical complications (Mittendorf et al., 2020).

Predictive Biomarkers For Treatment Response And Outcome

The identification of predictive biomarkers has become crucial for optimizing treatment selection in TNBC. Tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) emerge as one of the most robust predictive factors, with meta-analysis of 37 studies (n=7,716) demonstrating high TIL levels significantly associated with pCR achievement (OR 2.14, 95% CI 1.43-3.19) (Denkert et al., 2018). Patients with TILs ≥50% show 5-year overall survival of 95% versus 82% for those with TILs <30% (Loi et al., 2019).

PD-L1 expression serves as a key biomarker for immunotherapy benefit, with 20-40% of TNBC cases demonstrating positivity depending on the assay used (Emens et al., 2019). KEYNOTE-522 trial data revealed 68.9% pCR rates in PD-L1-positive patients versus 54.9% in PD-L1-negative patients receiving pembrolizumab combination therapy (Schmid et al., 2020).

BRCA1/2 mutation status profoundly influences treatment response, with carriers achieving 42-46% pCR rates compared to 21-26% in non-carriers using standard chemotherapy (Tung et al., 2020). The differential becomes even more pronounced with platinum-based regimens, where BRCA1/2 carriers achieve 65.4% pCR rates versus 30.2% in non-carriers (Hahnen et al., 2017). Homologous recombination deficiency (HRD) scores provide broader identification of DNA repair-deficient tumors, with HRD-positive patients showing superior pCR rates (OR 13.06, 95% CI 1.52-112.41) (Telli et al., 2016). Ki-67 proliferation index demonstrates complex associations with outcomes, with high levels (≥40%) predicting enhanced pCR rates but paradoxically worse long-term survival (Keam et al., 2011). This finding underscores the importance of achieving complete pathological response in highly proliferative tumors to overcome their aggressive biology.

Surgical Outcomes and Considerations Following Neoadjuvant Therapy

Neoadjuvant chemotherapy significantly enhances opportunities for breast-conserving surgery in TNBC patients. The BrighTNess trial demonstrated increased BCS eligibility from 76.5% at diagnosis to 83.8% following neoadjuvant treatment, with approximately 50% of initially ineligible patients becoming candidates for breast conservation (Loibl et al., 2018). Overall BCS rates of 68.1-70.6% are achieved among eligible patients post-neoadjuvant therapy (Golshan et al., 2015).

Surgical safety profiles remain acceptable following neoadjuvant treatment, with overall complication rates of 15-25.9% showing no significant increase compared to primary surgery (Bonadonna et al., 1998). However, re-excision rates double to 32% compared to 17% for primary surgery, primarily due to challenges in assessing residual disease extent (Volders et al., 2016). The median 30-34 day interval from chemotherapy completion to surgery proves optimal for surgical outcomes (Sanford et al., 2016).

Axillary surgery considerations have evolved with improved understanding of nodal response patterns. Sentinel lymph node biopsy achieves 93.5-94.9% identification rates following neoadjuvant therapy, though false-negative rates of 10.7-22% require careful patient selection and technique optimization (Boughey et al., 2013). Retrieval of ≥3 sentinel nodes reduces false-negative rates to <7%, establishing this as the recommended approach (Kuehn et al., 2013).

Quality of life outcomes consistently favor breast-conserving approaches, with BREAST-Q scores demonstrating significantly higher satisfaction across multiple domains for BCS compared to mastectomy (Pusic et al., 2009). These differences persist years after treatment completion, emphasizing the importance of breast conservation when oncologically appropriate.

Long-Term Survival Outcomes and Prognostic Factors

Pathological complete response achievement represents the most powerful prognostic factor in TNBC. Patients achieving pCR demonstrate event-free survival HR 0.18 (95% CI: 0.10-0.31) and overall survival HR 0.20 (95% CI: 0.07-0.41) compared to those with residual disease (Huang et al., 2020). Five-year overall survival rates reach 86-95% for pCR patients versus 62-78% for non-pCR patients (Spring et al., 2020).

Overall survival outcomes for TNBC have improved substantially with modern therapies. Five-year overall survival approximates 77.5% for non-metastatic disease, with stage-specific rates of 85-90% for Stage I, 70-75% for Stage II, and 55-65% for Stage III disease (Bianchini et al., 2022). Conditional survival analysis demonstrates improving prognosis over time, with 10-year survival probability increasing from 69.9% to 98.9% after surviving nine years cancer-free (Wang et al., 2016).

Recurrence patterns in TNBC show distinct temporal and anatomic characteristics. The highest recurrence risk occurs within the first 2-3 years, with 75% of recurrences manifesting within this critical period (Dent et al., 2007). Distant recurrence affects 17% of patients under 40 years compared to 12% of older patients, while local recurrence rates remain relatively low at 5-6% across age groups (Cancello et al., 2010).

Emerging Therapies And Future Directions

The therapeutic landscape continues evolving rapidly with multiple promising approaches under investigation. PARP inhibitors have demonstrated significant efficacy in BRCA-mutated TNBC, with the OlympiA trial showing overall survival benefit (HR 0.68) for adjuvant olaparib (Tutt et al., 2021). Neoadjuvant applications show promise, with the NEOTALA study achieving 53% pCR rates in BRCA carriers receiving talazoparib (Litton et al., 2020).

Novel immunotherapy combinations beyond pembrolizumab are advancing through clinical development. CAR-T cell therapies targeting multiple antigens including EGFR, ROR1, and c-Met show early promise (Liu et al., 2021), while cancer vaccines demonstrate encouraging immunogenicity and clinical activity. The α-lactalbumin vaccine completed Phase I testing with good tolerability, with Phase II studies planned for 2025 (Tuohy et al., 2024).

Personalized medicine approaches are becoming increasingly sophisticated, with molecular subtyping tools like TNBC-DX integrating genomic signatures with clinical factors for outcome prediction (Prat et al., 2020). The FUTURE trial demonstrated the feasibility of subtype-guided therapy, achieving 29.8% overall response rates in heavily pretreated patients through biomarker-directed treatment selection (Jiang et al., 2021).

Novel drug delivery systems represent another frontier of innovation, with smart nanoparticles, antibody-drug conjugates, and targeted delivery platforms showing enhanced therapeutic efficacy while reducing systemic toxicity (Li et al., 2022). These approaches may overcome resistance mechanisms and expand treatment options for difficult-to-treat patient populations.

CONCLUSION

The management of triple-negative breast cancer has undergone transformative evolution through the integration of neoadjuvant immunotherapy, refined surgical approaches, and biomarker-guided treatment selection. The landmark KEYNOTE-522 trial established pembrolizumab plus chemotherapy as the new standard of care, achieving unprecedented pCR rates of 64.8% and demonstrating sustained survival benefits with 5-year overall survival of 86.6% (Schmid et al., 2020, 2024).

Neoadjuvant chemotherapy enables enhanced surgical outcomes with increased breast conservation opportunities while maintaining oncologic safety. The evolution from simple chemotherapy regimens to sophisticated combination approaches incorporating platinum agents and immunotherapy has dramatically improved pathological response rates and long-term survival outcomes. However, increased surgical complexity requires careful attention to margin assessment and re-excision planning (Volders et al., 2016).

The identification and validation of predictive biomarkers represents a crucial advancement enabling personalized treatment selection. The integration of tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes, PD-L1 expression, BRCA mutation status, and homologous recombination deficiency scores provides a framework for optimizing treatment decisions and improving outcomes for individual patients (Denkert et al., 2018; Telli et al., 2016).

Future directions focus on addressing remaining challenges including treatment optimization for non-responders, development of novel targeted therapies for specific molecular subtypes, and expansion of treatment de-escalation strategies for patients achieving excellent responses. The continued evolution of personalized medicine approaches, sophisticated drug delivery systems, and novel immunotherapy combinations promises further improvements in outcomes for this historically challenging breast cancer subtype.

The paradigmatic shift toward immunotherapy integration, biomarker-guided treatment selection, and response-adapted therapy management represents the foundation for continued progress in TNBC treatment. As our understanding of molecular heterogeneity deepens and novel therapeutic approaches mature, the outlook for patients with triple-negative breast cancer continues to improve substantially, transforming what was once considered an invariably poor-prognosis disease into an increasingly treatable condition with expanding opportunities for cure and long-term survival.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, G., Nanda, G., Lal, P., Mishra, A., Agarwal, A., Agrawal, V., & Krishnani, N. (2016). Outcomes of triple-negative breast cancers (TNBC) compared with non-TNBC: Does the survival vary for all stages? World Journal of Surgery, 40(6), 1362–1372. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00268-016-3422-4
2. American Cancer Society. (2023). Breast cancer facts & figures 2022–2024. https://www.cancer.org
3. Bagegni, N., Olsen, T., Thomas, S., Ademuyiwa, F., Inchauste, S., Clifton, K., & Aft, R. (2019). Clinical outcomes with neoadjuvant versus adjuvant chemotherapy for triple-negative breast cancer: A report from the National Cancer Database. PLoS One, 14(9), e0222358. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0222358
4. Bianchini, G., De Angelis, C., Licata, L., & Gianni, L. (2022). Treatment landscape of triple-negative breast cancer – expanded options, evolving needs. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 19(2), 91–113. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41571-021-00565-2
5. Bonadonna, G., Valagussa, P., Brambilla, C., Ferrari, L., Moliterni, A., Terenziani, M., & Zambetti, M. (1998). Primary chemotherapy in operable breast cancer: Eight-year experience at the Milan Cancer Institute. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 16(1), 93–100. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.1998.16.1.93
6. Boughey, J. C., Suman, V. J., Mittendorf, E. A., et al. (2013). Sentinel lymph node surgery after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with node-positive breast cancer: The ACOSOG Z1071 (Alliance) clinical trial. JAMA, 310(14), 1455–1461. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2013.278932
7. Burstein, H. J., Curigliano, G., Thürlimann, B., et al. (2021). Customizing local and systemic therapies for women with early breast cancer: The St. Gallen International Consensus Guidelines. Annals of Oncology, 32(10), 1216–1235. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2021.06.023
8. Cancello, G., Maisonneuve, P., Rotmensz, N., et al. (2010). Prognosis and adjuvant treatment effects in selected breast cancer subtypes of very young women (<35 years). Annals of Oncology, 21(10), 1974–1981. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdq072
9. Caparica, R., Lambertini, M., & de Azambuja, E. (2019). How I treat metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. ESMO Open, 4(Suppl 2), e000504. https://doi.org/10.1136/esmoopen-2019-000504
10. Citron, M. L., Berry, D. A., Cirrincione, C., et al. (2003). Randomized trial of dose-dense versus conventionally scheduled chemotherapy. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 21(8), 1431–1439. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2003.09.081
11. Cortazar, P., Zhang, L., Untch, M., et al. (2014). Pathological complete response and long-term clinical benefit in breast cancer: The CTNeoBC pooled analysis. The Lancet, 384(9938), 164–172. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62422-8
12. Denkert, C., von Minckwitz, G., Darb-Esfahani, S., et al. (2018). Tumour-infiltrating lymphocytes and prognosis in breast cancer: A pooled analysis. The Lancet Oncology, 19(1), 40–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(17)30904-X
13. Dent, R., Trudeau, M., Pritchard, K. I., et al. (2007). Triple-negative breast cancer: Clinical features and patterns of recurrence. Clinical Cancer Research, 13(15), 4429–4434. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-3045
14. Emens, L. A., Cruz, C., Eder, J. P., et al. (2019). Long-term clinical outcomes and biomarker analyses of atezolizumab therapy. JAMA Oncology, 5(1), 74–82. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.4224
15. Foulkes, W. D., Smith, I. E., & Reis-Filho, J. S. (2010). Triple-negative breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 363(20), 1938–1948. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMra1001389
16. Garrido-Castro, A. C., Lin, N. U., & Polyak, K. (2019). Molecular classifications of triple-negative breast cancer. Cancer Discovery, 9(2), 176–198. https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-18-1177
17. Golshan, M., Cirrincione, C. T., Sikov, W. M., et al. (2015). Impact of neoadjuvant chemotherapy on breast conservation rates. Annals of Surgery, 262(3), 434–439. https://doi.org/10.1097/SLA.0000000000001417
18. Hahnen, E., Lederer, B., Hauke, J., et al. (2017). Germline mutation status and disease-free survival in TNBC. JAMA Oncology, 3(10), 1378–1385. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamaoncol.2017.1007
19. Huang, M., O'Shaughnessy, J., Zhao, J., et al. (2020). Association of pathologic

complete response with survival. Cancer Research, 80(24), 5427–5434. https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-20-1792
20. Jiang, Y. Z., Liu, Y., Xiao, Y., et al. (2021). Molecular subtyping in refractory TNBC: The FUTURE trial. Cell Research, 31(2), 178–186. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41422-020-0375-9
21. Keam, B., Im, S. A., Lee, K. H., et al. (2011). Ki-67 classification in triple-negative breast cancer. Breast Cancer Research, 13(2), R22. https://doi.org/10.1186/bcr2834
22. Kuehn, T., Bauerfeind, I., Fehm, T., et al. (2013). Sentinel lymph node biopsy after neoadjuvant therapy. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 138(1), 203–210. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-013-2435-3
23. Lehmann, B. D., Bauer, J. A., Chen, X., et al. (2016). Identification of TNBC subtypes. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 121(7), 2750–2767. https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI45014
24. Liedtke, C., Mazouni, C., Hess, K. R., et al. (2008). pCR and survival in TNBC. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 26(8), 1275–1281. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2007.14.4147
25. Lin, N. U., Claus, E., Sohl, J., Razzak, A. R., Arnaout, A., & Winer, E. P. (2008). Sites of distant recurrence in TNBC. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 26(9), 1446–1451. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2007.14.9354
26. Litton, J. K., Rugo, H. S., Ettl, J., et al. (2020). NEOTALA trial: Talazoparib in early TNBC. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 38(15_suppl), 508. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2020.38.15_suppl.508
27. Liu, Y., Wang, Y., Xu, Y., et al. (2021). EGFR-targeted CAR-T for TNBC. Cancer Immunology, Immunotherapy, 70, 1741–1750. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00262-020-02727-6
28. Loi, S., Drubay, D., Adams, S., et al. (2019). TILs and long-term survival in TNBC. Annals of Oncology, 30(8), 1221–1230. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdz187
29. Loibl, S., O'Shaughnessy, J., Untch, M., et al. (2018). BrighTNess trial: Pathologic response. Lancet Oncology, 19(4), 497–509. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(18)30111-6
30. Mittendorf, E. A., Zhang, H., Barrios, C. H., et al. (2020). Immune response and safety with pembrolizumab. Annals of Oncology, 31(5), 582–589. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2020.02.011
31. Nielsen, T. O., Hsu, F. D., Jensen, K., et al. (2004). Basal-like breast cancer phenotyping. Clinical Cancer Research, 10(16), 5367–5374. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-04-0220
32. Poggio, F., Bruzzone, M., Ceppi, M., et al. (2018). Platinum-based chemotherapy in TNBC: A meta-analysis. Annals of Oncology, 29(7), 1491–1498. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdy155
33. Prat, A., Llombart-Cussac, A., De la Cruz-Merino, L., et al. (2020). TNBC-Dx model for prognosis. Clinical Cancer Research, 26(5), 1260–1271. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-2381
34. Pusic, A. L., Klassen, A. F., Scott, A. M., et al. (2009). Development of the BREAST-Q. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, 124(2), 345–353. https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181aee807
35. Sanford, R. A., Lei, X., Barcenas, C. H., et al. (2016). Surgery timing after neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Annals of Surgical Oncology, 23(5), 1514–1521. https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-015-5015-6
36. Schmid, P., Cortes, J., Dent, R., et al. (2024). KEYNOTE-522 final analysis. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 42(15_suppl), 500. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2024.42.15_suppl.500
37. Schmid, P., Cortes, J., Pusztai, L., et al. (2020). KEYNOTE-522 trial: Pembrolizumab. New England Journal of Medicine, 382(9), 810–821. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1910549
38. Sikov, W. M., Berry, D. A., Perou, C. M., et al. (2015). Impact of adding carboplatin to neoadjuvant therapy. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 33(1), 13–21. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2014.57.0572
39. Spring, L. M., Fell, G., Arfe, A., et al. (2020). Neoadjuvant vs. adjuvant chemotherapy in TNBC: A meta-analysis. JNCI: Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 112(5), 442–450. https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djz201
40. Telli, M. L., Timms, K. M., Reid, J., et al. (2016). Homologous recombination deficiency and pCR in TNBC. Clinical Cancer Research, 22(15), 3764–3773. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-2477
41. Tung, N. M., Garber, J. E., Hacker, M. R., et al. (2020). BRCA mutations and chemotherapy sensitivity. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 38(3), 248–257. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.19.01589
42. Tuohy, V. K., Jaini, R., Wolf, J. J., et al. (2024). α-lactalbumin vaccine for breast cancer. NPJ Breast Cancer, 10, 22. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41523-024-00526-2
43. Tutt, A., Garber, J. E., Kaufman, B., et al. (2021). Adjuvant olaparib for BRCA-mutated breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 384, 2394–2405. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2105215
44. Volders, J. H., Negenborn, V. L., Spronk, P. E., et al. (2016). Re-excision and margin assessment. Breast Cancer Research and Treatment, 158(3), 473–480. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-016-3899-0
45. von Minckwitz, G., Loibl, S., Untch, M., et al. (2014). GeparSixto trial. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 32(15), 3843–3852. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2014.56.6020
46. Wang, S. Y., Long, J. B., Hurria, A., et al. (2016). Conditional survival in breast cancer. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 34(9), 1037–1043. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2015.63.0065