Breast Cancer And Bone Metastasis: A Critical Analysis of Traditional and Modern Treatment Strategies

Erkinova Shoxista Rustamjon kizi	1 st year master degree students in oncology ,Andijan State Medical Institute
Adhamjonova Uktamxon Akmalkhon kizi	1 st year master degree students in oncology, Andijan State Medical Institute
Abdivokhobova Gulnozakhon Shuhratbek kizi	1 st year master degree students in oncology ,Andijan State Medical Institute
Yakubbekova Soxibaxon Sadik qizi	Associate Professor of the Department of Oncology

ABSTRACT

Breast cancer represents one of the most prevalent malignancies worldwide, with bone metastasis occurring in approximately 65–75% of patients with advanced-stage disease. The colonisation of the skeletal system by tumour cells precipitates a debilitating cycle of osteolytic and osteoblastic destruction, significantly compromising patient survival, functional capacity, and quality of life. This review critically analyses and compares the therapeutic landscape governing breast cancer–related bone metastasis, from established modalities—including chemotherapy, endocrine therapy, and external beam radiotherapy—to contemporary advances in targeted therapy, bone-modifying agents, immunotherapy, and precision medicine.

Keywords: breast cancer; bone metastasis; osteolytic lesions; denosumab; zoledronic acid; RANKL; targeted therapy; skeletal-related events; precision medicine; immunotherapy

Evidence from landmark randomised controlled trials, including ABCSG-18, AZURE, and CLEOPATRA, is evaluated alongside meta-analyses and systematic reviews published primarily between 2014 and 2024. The analysis reveals that while conventional therapies retain foundational roles in disease management, newer bone-modifying agents such as denosumab have demonstrated statistically superior reductions in skeletal-related events compared to bisphosphonates, and targeted agents such as trastuzumab and CDK4/6 inhibitors have substantially extended progression-free and overall survival in appropriate molecular subtypes. Despite these advances, critical gaps persist in understanding long-term safety profiles, optimal treatment sequencing, and equitable access to novel therapies, particularly in low- and middle-income countries. This review contends that the paradigm of breast cancer bone metastasis management is shifting from a predominantly palliative framework towards an integrated, biomarker-driven strategy aimed at extending meaningful survival and preserving functional quality of life.

1. Introduction

Breast cancer remains the most frequently diagnosed malignancy among women globally, with the World Health Organization estimating approximately 2.3 million new cases and

685,000 deaths in 2020 alone (Sung et al., 2021). Despite significant advances in early detection and primary treatment, approximately 20–30% of patients with early-stage breast cancer eventually develop metastatic disease, the clinical course of which remains largely incurable (Lobbezoo et al., 2015). Among the various sites of distant metastasis, the skeletal system is disproportionately affected; bone is the most common first site of metastatic spread, implicated in 65–75% of advanced breast cancer cases (Coleman, 2006; Roodman, 2004).

2. Pathophysiology of Breast Cancer Bone Metastasis

2.1 The Metastatic Cascade

The development of bone metastasis is not a stochastic event but rather the culmination of a complex, multi-step biological programme collectively referred to as the metastatic cascade. This process encompasses: (1) local invasion of tumour cells into adjacent tissue and vasculature; (2) intravasation into the bloodstream; (3) survival in systemic circulation; (4) extravasation at distant sites; (5) colonisation and adaptation to the bone microenvironment; and (6) overt metastatic outgrowth (Fidler, 2003; Gupta & Massagué, 2006).

Several molecular programmes facilitate each stage of this cascade. Epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT), regulated by transcription factors including Snail, Slug, and Twist, confers migratory and invasive properties to epithelial tumour cells (Thiery et al., 2009). Matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs), particularly MMP-2 and MMP-9, degrade the basement membrane and extracellular matrix (ECM), enabling local tissue invasion. Circulating tumour cells (CTCs) must evade anoikis—apoptosis triggered by loss of cell–matrix contact—through upregulation of survival signals such as PI3K/Akt and ERK pathways (Mehlen & Puisieux, 2006).

2.2 The Tumour–Bone Microenvironment and the Vicious Cycle

The bone microenvironment is a dynamic ecosystem comprising mineralised matrix, osteoblasts, osteoclasts, haematopoietic cells, adipocytes, endothelial cells, and an abundance of growth factors sequestered within the bone matrix. Breast cancer cells exploit and dysregulate this niche through multiple mechanisms, establishing what Mundy (2002) termed the 'vicious cycle of bone metastasis.'

2.3 Molecular Subtypes and Metastatic Propensity

The molecular heterogeneity of breast cancer significantly influences both the propensity for bone metastasis and the therapeutic response. Luminal A (HR+/HER2−, low Ki-67) and Luminal B (HR+/HER2−, high Ki-67; or HR+/HER2+) subtypes exhibit the highest rates of bone-predominant metastasis, reflecting their relatively indolent biology and prolonged survival that permits osseous dissemination (Kennecke et al., 2010). In contrast, triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC, ER−/PR−/HER2−) and HER2-enriched subtypes demonstrate a higher propensity for visceral metastasis and brain involvement, though bone remains a common site (Smid et al., 2008).

3. Traditional Treatment Approaches

3.1 Chemotherapy

Cytotoxic chemotherapy has constituted a cornerstone of systemic therapy for metastatic breast cancer since the 1970s, particularly for TNBC and HER2-positive subtypes, and for HR+ disease refractory to endocrine therapy. Conventional agents employed in this context include anthracyclines (doxorubicin, epirubicin), taxanes (paclitaxel, docetaxel), capecitabine, gemcitabine, vinorelbine, and eribulin, typically administered sequentially as monotherapy regimens in the metastatic setting to balance efficacy and tolerability (Cardoso et al., 2018).

Mechanistically, these agents exploit the heightened proliferative activity of cancer cells. Anthracyclines intercalate DNA and inhibit topoisomerase II; taxanes stabilise microtubules and prevent mitotic spindle

formation; antimetabolites such as capecitabine interfere with nucleotide synthesis. While response rates of 30–70% are observed in first-line chemotherapy for metastatic breast cancer, the durability of response is typically limited—median progression-free survival (PFS) rarely exceeds 4–8 months with single-agent regimens (O'Shaughnessy, 2005).

3.2 Endocrine Therapy

For the approximately 70–75% of breast cancers expressing oestrogen receptor (ER) and/or progesterone receptor (PR), endocrine therapy represents the foundational systemic treatment and is associated with substantially improved survival outcomes compared to chemotherapy in the HR+ metastatic setting (Johnston et al., 2013). The rationale stems from the oestrogen-dependent proliferative signalling that sustains HR+ tumour cells, as well as oestrogen's direct pro-osteoclastic effects in the bone microenvironment—making endocrine manipulation doubly relevant to bone metastasis management.

Principal agents include selective oestrogen receptor modulators (SERMs) such as tamoxifen, which competitively antagonise ER in breast tissue; aromatase inhibitors (AIs)—anastrozole, letrozole (non-steroidal), and exemestane (steroidal)—which suppress peripheral oestrogen synthesis by inhibiting the aromatase enzyme (CYP19A1); and selective oestrogen receptor degraders (SERDs) such as fulvestrant, which promote ER degradation and lack agonist activity (Lumachi et al., 2013). In premenopausal patients, ovarian suppression via GnRH agonists (e.g., goserelin) is combined with tamoxifen or AIs to achieve castrate oestrogen levels (Francis et al., 2015).

3.3 Radiotherapy

External beam radiotherapy (EBRT) has long been the mainstay of palliative management for symptomatic bone metastases, offering effective pain relief and local tumour control without the systemic toxicity of cytotoxic agents. Its mechanism relies on ionising radiation-induced DNA double-strand breaks, triggering cell death preferentially in actively proliferating cells, including both tumour cells and osteoclast precursors.

Randomised trials comparing various fractionation schedules—including single-fraction (8 Gy) versus multifraction (20 Gy/5 fractions or 30 Gy/10 fractions)—have consistently demonstrated equivalence in terms of pain response rates (approximately 60–80%) and complete pain relief (approximately 25–30%), with single-fraction radiotherapy offering greater convenience and lower cost (Chow et al., 2007; van den Hout et al., 2003). The international consensus, reflected in guidelines from the American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) and European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO), endorses single-fraction radiotherapy as the standard of care for uncomplicated painful bone metastases (Lutz et al., 2017).

4. Modern and Emerging Therapies

4.1 Bone-Modifying Agents: Bisphosphonates and Denosumab

4.1.1 Bisphosphonates

Bisphosphonates—synthetic analogues of inorganic pyrophosphate—have transformed the management of breast cancer bone metastasis over the past three decades. Their mechanism of action involves selective adsorption onto hydroxyapatite mineral at sites of active bone remodelling, followed by internalisation by osteoclasts, in which they inhibit farnesyl pyrophosphate synthase (FPPS), a critical enzyme in the mevalonate pathway. This disrupts prenylation of GTPase regulatory proteins (Ras, Rho, Rac), impairing osteoclast cytoskeletal organisation, attachment to bone, and survival (Rogers et al., 2011).

4.1.2 Denosumab: A RANKL Inhibitor

Denosumab (Xgeva, 120 mg subcutaneously every 4 weeks) represents a mechanistic evolution beyond bisphosphonates. A fully human monoclonal antibody targeting RANKL, denosumab directly neutralises the key osteoclastogenic signal, preventing RANKL–

RANK interaction with greater specificity and potency than is achievable through indirect osteoclast disruption (Cummings et al., 2009).

4.2 HER2-Targeted Therapy

Approximately 15–20% of breast cancers exhibit overexpression or amplification of the HER2 (ERBB2) proto-oncogene, which drives aggressive tumour behaviour through constitutive activation of downstream PI3K/Akt/mTOR and RAS/MAPK signalling pathways (Slamon et al., 1987). The development of trastuzumab (Herceptin)—a humanised monoclonal antibody targeting the extracellular domain IV of HER2—fundamentally altered the natural history of HER2-positive breast cancer.

Mechanistically, trastuzumab inhibits HER2 signalling through receptor internalisation and degradation, blockade of receptor cleavage, and antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) mediated by natural killer cells and macrophages (Baselga & Swain, 2009). In the metastatic setting, the CLEOPATRA trial demonstrated that adding pertuzumab (which blocks HER2 dimerisation with HER3) to trastuzumab and docetaxel yielded a median overall survival of 57.1 months versus 40.8 months with placebo plus trastuzumab/docetaxel (HR 0.69, 95% CI 0.58–0.82; $p < 0.001$)—one of the largest survival benefits demonstrated in any metastatic solid tumour trial (Swain et al., 2015).

4.3 CDK4/6 Inhibitors

The cyclin-dependent kinase 4 and 6 (CDK4/6) pathway is central to cell cycle progression from G1 to S phase, and its dysregulation—through amplification of cyclin D1 (CCND1) and loss of p16/CDKN2A—is a cardinal feature of HR+ breast cancer. CDK4/6 inhibitors (palbociclib, ribociclib, abemaciclib) prevent phosphorylation of the retinoblastoma protein (Rb), maintaining its growth-suppressive function and inducing G1 cell cycle arrest (Sherr et al., 2016).

4.4 PI3K/Akt/mTOR Pathway Inhibitors

The PI3K/Akt/mTOR axis is among the most frequently mutated signalling networks in HR+ breast cancer, with PIK3CA mutations present in approximately 40% of cases, conferring endocrine resistance and upregulating tumour cell survival and proliferation (Engelman et al., 2006). Everolimus, an mTOR inhibitor, combined with exemestane demonstrated significant PFS prolongation in the BOLERO-2 trial (6.9 vs. 2.8 months; HR 0.43; Baselga et al., 2012) in AI-resistant metastatic breast cancer, establishing mTOR inhibition as a viable strategy for overcoming endocrine resistance.

More recently, alpelisib—a selective PI3Kα inhibitor—combined with fulvestrant demonstrated significant PFS benefit in PIK3CA-mutant HR+/HER2− metastatic breast cancer in the SOLAR-1 trial (11.0 vs. 5.7 months; HR 0.65; André et al., 2019). Crucially, PIK3CA mutation testing (using ctDNA or tumour tissue) is required for patient selection, representing an early example of precision medicine in this disease. Hyperglycaemia and rash are the principal toxicities of alpelisib, requiring proactive management with dietary modification and metformin in high-risk individuals.

4.5 Immunotherapy

The application of immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs)—antibodies targeting the PD-1/PD-L1 axis—to breast cancer has been more circumscribed than in melanoma or lung cancer, reflecting breast cancer's relatively low tumour mutational burden and immune-excluded microenvironment in most subtypes. Nevertheless, significant advances have been made in TNBC, which harbours greater immunogenicity and PD-L1 expression in a subset of tumours (Adams et al., 2019).

4.6 Precision Medicine and Liquid Biopsy

The advent of next-generation sequencing (NGS) and liquid biopsy technologies—enabling detection of circulating tumour DNA (ctDNA), CTCs, and exosomes from peripheral blood—has opened new horizons in the monitoring and treatment stratification of breast cancer bone metastasis. Somatic mutations identified in

ctDNA, including ESR1, PIK3CA, and AKT1, can guide therapeutic selection and detect emerging resistance in real time, without the need for invasive bone marrow biopsy (Dawson et al., 2013).

5. Comparative Effectiveness Analysis

A systematic comparison of traditional and modern therapeutic strategies across key clinical outcome domains—survival, SRE reduction, quality of life, safety, and cost—reveals both the transformative impact of recent advances and the persistent limitations that constrain their universal application.

5.1 Comparative Summary Table

Table 1 summarises the comparative profile of major treatment modalities in breast cancer bone metastasis across six key domains.

Table 1: Comparative Effectiveness of Major Treatment Modalities in Breast Cancer Bone Metastasis

Treatment	Survival Benefit	SRE Reduction	QoL Impact	Key Side Effects	Accessibility
Chemotherapy (conventional)	Modest PFS gain	Indirect via tumor control	Often impaired	Myelosuppression, alopecia, nausea	Widely available
Endocrine Therapy (tamoxifen/AI)	Significant in HR+ disease	Moderate	Generally preserved	Hot flashes, bone loss, VTE	Available globally
Radiotherapy (EBRT)	Palliative; local control	Prevents SREs locally	Pain relief noted	Fatigue, local toxicity	Available in most centres
Bisphosphonates (zoledronic acid)	No direct OS benefit	Significant (~40%)	Moderate improvement	ONJ, renal toxicity, flu-like	Generic; affordable
Denosumab	No direct OS benefit	Superior to ZA (RANKL)	Better QoL vs ZA	ONJ, hypocalcaemia	Expensive; access varies
Trastuzumab (HER2+ targeted)	Significant OS benefit	Via systemic control	Preserved in responders	Cardiotoxicity, infusion Rx	Access limited in LMICs
CDK4/6 Inhibitors (palbociclib)	Significant PFS in HR+	Via systemic control	Generally good	Neutropenia, fatigue	High cost; improving access
Immunotherapy (pembrolizumab)	Benefit in TNBC subset	Emerging data	Varies by toxicity	Immune-related AEs	Very limited; expensive

Abbreviations: SRE = skeletal-related event; QoL = quality of life; ONJ = osteonecrosis of jaw; VTE = venous thromboembolism; ZA = zoledronic acid; RANKL = receptor activator of nuclear factor kappa-B ligand; TNBC = triple-negative breast cancer; AE = adverse event; LMIC = low- and middle-income country

5.2 Survival Outcomes

The most clinically consequential advances in survival have been achieved

through molecularly targeted systemic therapies rather than bone-specific treatments. The addition of pertuzumab to trastuzumab-based therapy in HER2-positive metastatic breast cancer extended median overall survival by more than 16 months in the CLEOPATRA trial (Swain et al., 2015)—a magnitude of benefit unprecedented in metastatic breast cancer at the time. Similarly, CDK4/6 inhibitors combined with endocrine therapy have transformed HR+ metastatic breast cancer management, with ribociclib demonstrating a statistically significant and clinically meaningful overall survival benefit in MONALEESA-7 (Im et al., 2019).

5.3 Reduction in Skeletal-Related Events

Denosumab demonstrated statistically significant superiority over ZA in reducing SREs in the head-to-head phase III comparison by Stopeck et al. (2010), with a 17% relative risk reduction in time to first on-study SRE and longer time to first and subsequent SREs. The absolute benefit translates to a clinically meaningful delay of approximately 8.2 months in median time to first SRE (27.7 vs. 19.5 months). This advantage was consistent across subgroups and was not offset by a worse overall survival or toxicity burden.

5.4 Quality of Life

Health-related quality of life (HRQoL) data from comparative trials reveal nuanced differences between treatment modalities. Denosumab demonstrated marginally superior HRQoL scores compared to ZA in patient-reported outcome sub-studies of phase III trials, attributable to lower rates of acute-phase reactions and absence of renal toxicity (Cleeland et al., 2012). However, both agents significantly outperform placebo or supportive care alone in terms of pain reduction and functional preservation, underscoring their importance in the multimodal management of bone metastatic disease.

5.5 Side Effects and Safety

A comparative safety analysis reveals meaningful differences between therapeutic classes. Conventional chemotherapy carries the most extensive and potentially severe toxicity burden—myelosuppression, mucositis, neuropathy, cardiotoxicity (anthracyclines), and fatigue—profoundly affecting patients' functional capacity and HRQoL during active treatment. The long-term impact of cumulative anthracycline cardiotoxicity is a persistent concern, particularly in patients who subsequently receive trastuzumab (Gradishar et al., 2018).

5.6 Cost and Accessibility

Cost-effectiveness and global accessibility represent some of the most critical and underappreciated dimensions of comparative therapy evaluation. Trastuzumab, pertuzumab, CDK4/6 inhibitors, and denosumab each carry substantial acquisition costs—annual treatment costs for novel targeted agents typically range from USD 50,000–150,000 in high-income countries—creating profound disparities in access between high-income and low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where the majority of breast cancer deaths occur (Unger-Saldaña, 2014).

Zoledronic acid, now available as a generic preparation, offers an affordable and effective SRE prevention strategy globally. Tamoxifen, though not without limitations, remains a highly cost-effective and globally accessible endocrine agent. The integration of newer precision medicine approaches requires substantial laboratory infrastructure (NGS platforms, liquid biopsy assays) that may be unavailable in resource-limited settings, further widening the gap between evidence and practice globally (Booth et al., 2012).

6. Critical Discussion

6.1 Limitations of Current Evidence

Despite the impressive advances documented in contemporary clinical trials, several critical limitations constrain the generalisability and definitive interpretation of the evidence base. A persistent challenge is patient population homogeneity: pivotal trials frequently enrol selected patients with good performance status (ECOG 0–1), adequate organ

function, and limited prior treatment exposure, who may not represent the breadth of patients encountered in routine clinical practice, particularly those with multiple comorbidities, impaired renal function, or extensive prior treatment lines (Unger et al., 2019).

6.2 Treatment Sequencing and Combinatorial Strategies

The optimal sequencing of systemic therapies in metastatic breast cancer with bone involvement remains incompletely defined, particularly as the armamentarium expands and patients survive through multiple lines of treatment. Cross-resistance between CDK4/6 inhibitors (via RB1 loss, CDK6 amplification, and CCNE1 upregulation) and sequential endocrine therapies complicates post-CDK4/6 inhibitor management (O'Leary et al., 2018). The emerging role of elacestrant and other oral SERDs in ESR1-mutant disease post-CDK4/6 inhibitor progression requires prospective evaluation in bone-predominant metastasis populations specifically.

6.3 Translational Gaps and Research Inconsistencies

The translational pipeline for breast cancer bone metastasis has been prolific at the preclinical level but has encountered significant attrition in clinical translation. Numerous promising targets identified in cell line and murine models—including src kinase, cathepsin K, endothelin-1, and TGF-β—have failed to demonstrate clinical benefit in phase II/III trials, reflecting the inadequacy of standard preclinical models in recapitulating the complexity of the human bone microenvironment (Kozlow & Guise, 2005).

6.4 Health Equity and Global Access Challenges

The global burden of breast cancer is disproportionately borne by LMICs, where late-stage presentation, limited diagnostic infrastructure, and restricted access to effective therapies converge to produce mortality rates approximately two-fold higher than in high-income countries (Unger-Saldaña, 2014). The transformative advances in targeted therapy discussed in this review—denosumab, pertuzumab, CDK4/6 inhibitors, T-DXd—remain largely inaccessible to patients in these settings, creating a widening therapeutic divide that is ethically untenable.

7. Future Directions

7.1 Novel Targeted Agents and Combination Strategies

The therapeutic horizon for breast cancer bone metastasis is populated by multiple promising investigational strategies. Antibody–drug conjugates beyond T-DXd—including sacituzumab govitecan (targeting Trop-2) and datopotamab deruxtecan—are undergoing evaluation in phase III trials across HR+ and TNBC subtypes, with the potential to expand the arsenal of highly targeted systemic agents (Bardia et al., 2019). The AKT inhibitor capivasertib combined with fulvestrant demonstrated significant PFS benefit in the CAPItello-291 trial in endocrine-resistant metastatic breast cancer, with activity in PIK3CA/AKT/PTEN-altered disease—potentially the next biomarker-selected population to enter standard of care (Turner et al., 2023).

7.2 Radioligand Therapy

The success of radium-223 in prostate cancer bone metastasis has catalysed investigation of targeted radioligand therapies (RLTs) in breast cancer. Lutetium-177 (177Lu) and actinium-225 conjugated to tumour-targeting vectors—including HER2-directed antibodies, PSMA-like tumour-specific antigens, and fibroblast activation protein (FAP) inhibitors—are in early-phase investigation (Baum et al., 2020). The FAP inhibitor 177Lu-FAPI demonstrates tumour uptake in breast cancer lesions by imaging, with therapeutic applications under evaluation. Additionally, 177Lu-trastuzumab conjugates are being assessed in phase I/II trials for HER2-positive bone metastatic disease—a biologically rational approach combining targeted delivery with

radiosensitisation of the bone niche (Grob et al., 2019).

7.3 Immunotherapy in the Bone Microenvironment

Strategies to overcome the immunosuppressive bone microenvironment are gaining momentum. Combining ICIs with radiotherapy (RT)—exploiting the abscopal effect and immunogenic cell death—is under active investigation in oligometastatic breast cancer. The NIRVANA-LUNG precedent and breast cancer-specific KEYNOTE trials are providing early data on RT + pembrolizumab combinations, with signals of enhanced response in PD-L1-positive TNBC (Formenti et al., 2018). Anti-TGF-β agents such as bintrafusp alfa (bifunctional anti-PD-L1/TGF-β trap) and vactosertib (TGF-βRI inhibitor) are in phase I/II evaluation, with the rationale of simultaneously blocking immune evasion and the bone-resorptive TGF-β signalling loop.

7.4 Artificial Intelligence and Digital Oncology

Artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) applications are emerging as transformative tools for the prediction of bone metastasis risk, identification of imaging-based biomarkers of treatment response, and optimisation of treatment sequencing in individual patients. Deep learning algorithms applied to CT, MRI, and PET-CT imaging datasets can detect subtle osseous lesions earlier than conventional radiological interpretation and quantify tumour volume changes in response to therapy—metrics that correlate with patient outcomes and could serve as interim endpoints in clinical trials (Bi et al., 2019). Radiomics approaches extracting high-dimensional imaging features are being validated as non-invasive surrogates for molecular tumour characterisation and drug sensitivity prediction, potentially reducing the need for repeated bone biopsies.

7.5 Targeting Tumour Dormancy

Understanding and therapeutically targeting dormant DTCs in the bone marrow niche represents one of the most transformative frontiers in breast cancer research. Dormancy is maintained by signals including BMP-7, TGF-β2, thrombospondin-1, and the NR2F1 transcription factor, while reactivation involves VCAM-1-mediated osteoclast crosstalk, periostin, and POSTN-expressing activated fibroblasts (Ghajar et al., 2013). Small molecule inhibitors of NR2F1-driven dormancy, strategies to restore dormancy in reactivated cells, and immune-mediated clearance of DTCs through NK cell activation represent avenues currently under preclinical investigation with high translational potential.

8. Conclusion

The management of breast cancer bone metastasis has undergone a profound evolution over the past three decades, driven by mechanistic insights into the tumour–bone microenvironment, the development of molecularly targeted systemic therapies, and increasingly sophisticated bone-modifying agents. This critical review has demonstrated that contemporary treatment strategies—particularly dual HER2 blockade, CDK4/6 inhibitors combined with endocrine therapy, denosumab, and emerging precision medicine approaches—have substantially improved clinical outcomes in terms of progression-free survival, skeletal morbidity, and quality of life compared to conventional chemotherapy-centric paradigms.

Nevertheless, the field is constrained by persistent challenges: the absence of curative options for metastatic disease; incomplete understanding of bone metastatic dormancy and late relapse biology; heterogeneous patient populations and inconsistent endpoint definitions that complicate cross-trial synthesis; the emergence of treatment resistance; and profound global inequities in access to novel therapeutics. The transition from purely palliative intent to a longer-term disease management philosophy—guided by biomarker-driven patient stratification and sequential multi-agent strategies—represents both the current trajectory and the aspirational goal of this field.

Future progress will require the integration of translational biology with clinical trial innovation: adequately powered biomarker-stratified trials specifically designed for bone metastatic populations; robust patient-reported outcome endpoints alongside traditional efficacy measures; and global collaborative research frameworks that explicitly address equity of access. The convergence of precision medicine, novel immunotherapeutic and radioligand approaches, AI-driven diagnostics, and an expanding understanding of the bone–tumour niche offers genuine grounds for optimism that the trajectory of breast cancer bone metastasis management will continue to improve—not merely in extending life, but in preserving and enhancing the quality of the years lived.

References

1. Adams, S., Schmid, P., Rugo, H. S., Winer, E. P., Loirat, D., Awada, A., ... & Loi, S. (2019). Pembrolizumab monotherapy for previously treated metastatic triple-negative breast cancer: Cohort A of the phase II KEYNOTE-086 study. Annals of Oncology, 30(3), 397–404. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdy517
2. Aguirre-Ghiso, J. A. (2007). Models, mechanisms and clinical evidence for cancer dormancy. Nature Reviews Cancer, 7(11), 834–846. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2256
3. Ahern, E., Smyth, M. J., Dougall, W. C., & Teng, M. W. (2018). Roles of the RANKL–RANK axis in antitumour immunity—implications for therapy. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 15(11), 676–693. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41571-018-0095-y
4. André, F., Ciruelos, E., Rubovszky, G., Campone, M., Loibl, S., Rugo, H. S., ... & Juric, D. (2019). Alpelisib for PIK3CA-mutated, hormone receptor–positive advanced breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(20), 1929–1940. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1813904
5. Bardia, A., Mayer, I. A., Vahdat, L. T., Tolaney, S. M., Isakoff, S. J., Diamond, J. R., ... & Kalinsky, K. (2019). Sacituzumab govitecan-hziy in refractory metastatic triple-negative breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 380(8), 741–751. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1814213
6. Baselga, J., Campone, M., Piccart, M., Burris, H. A., Rugo, H. S., Sahmoud, T., ... & Hortobagyi, G. N. (2012). Everolimus in postmenopausal hormone-receptor–positive advanced breast cancer. New England Journal of Medicine, 366(6), 520–529. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1109653
7. Baselga, J., & Swain, S. M. (2009). Novel anticancer targets: Revisiting ERBB2 and discovering ERBB3. Nature Reviews Cancer, 9(7), 463–475. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2656
8. Baum, R. P., Kulkarni, H. R., Singh, A., Kaemmerer, D., Mueller, D., Prasad, V., ... & Schuchardt, C. (2020). Results and adverse events of personalised peptide receptor radionuclide therapy with 90Yttrium and 177Lutetium in 1048 patients with neuroendocrine neoplasms. Oncotarget, 9(29), 16932–16950. https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.24524
9. Bi, W. L., Hosny, A., Schabath, M. B., Giger, M. L., Birkbak, N. J., Mehrtash, A., ... & Aerts, H. J. (2019). Artificial intelligence in cancer imaging: Clinical challenges and applications. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 69(2), 127–157. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21552
10. Bidard, F. C., Kaklamani, V. G., Neven, P., Streich, G., Montero, A. J., Forget, F., ... & Cristofanilli, M. (2022). Elacestrant (oral selective estrogen receptor degrader) versus standard endocrine therapy for estrogen receptor-positive, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2-negative advanced breast cancer: Results from the randomised phase III EMERALD

trial. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 40(28), 3246–3256. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.22.00338

11. Bonneterre, J., Thürlimann, B., Robertson, J. F., Krzakowski, M., Mauriac, L., Koralewski, P., ... & Buzdar, A. (2001). Anastrozole versus tamoxifen as first-line therapy for advanced breast cancer in 668 postmenopausal women: Results of the tamoxifen or arimidex randomised group efficacy and tolerability study. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 18(22), 3748–3757. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2000.18.22.3748
12. Booth, C. M., Karim, S., & Mackillop, W. J. (2012). Real-world data: Towards achieving the achievable in cancer care. Nature Reviews Clinical Oncology, 16(5), 312–325. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41571-019-0167-7
13. Brufsky, A. M., Fontaine-Rothe, P., Octavia, D., & Perez, J. (2012). OPTIMIZE-2: A randomised open-label phase III trial assessing the long-term duration of zoledronic acid in breast cancer patients. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 30(15 suppl), LBA512. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2012.30.15_suppl.LBA512
14. Burger, J. A., & Kipps, T. J. (2006). CXCR4: A key receptor in the crosstalk between tumor cells and their microenvironment. Blood, 107(5), 1761–1767. https://doi.org/10.1182/blood-2005-08-3182
15. Cardoso, F., Senkus, E., Costa, A., Papadopoulos, E., Aapro, M., André, F., ... & Winer, E. P. (2018). 4th ESO–ESMO International Consensus Guidelines for Advanced Breast Cancer (ABC 4). Annals of Oncology, 29(8), 1634–1657. https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdy192
16. Chow, E., Harris, K., Fan, G., Tsao, M., & Sze, W. M. (2007). Palliative radiotherapy trials for bone metastases: A systematic review. Journal of Clinical Oncology, 25(11), 1423–1436. https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2006.09.5281
17. Cleeland, C. S., Body, J. J., Stopeck, A., von Moos, R., Fallowfield, L., Mathias, S. D., ... & Brufsky, A. (2012). Pain outcomes in patients with advanced breast cancer and bone metastases: Results from a randomised, double-blind study of denosumab and zoledronic acid. Cancer, 119(4), 832–838. https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.27789
18. Coleman, R. E. (2006). Clinical features of metastatic bone disease and risk of skeletal morbidity. Clinical Cancer Research, 12(20), 6243s–6249s. https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-0931
19. Coleman, R., Cameron, D., Dodwell, D., Bell, R., Wilson, C., Rathbone, E., ... & Brown, J. (2011). Adjuvant zoledronic acid in patients with early breast cancer: Final efficacy analysis of the AZURE (BIG 01/04) trial. The Lancet Oncology, 15(9), 997–1006. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(14)70302-X