Original article

Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy with Fluorouracil plus Leucovorin, Oxaliplatin, and Docetaxel (FLOT) for Gastric Cancer Patients in China

*Sah BK, Zhang Ben Yan, Zhang H, Yan C, *Li C, Yan M, *Zhu ZG

Running title: FLOT regimen for gastric cancer patients in China

Authors

*Birendra Kumar Sah, MD/Ph D

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Postal add: 197 Ruijin Er Road, Shanghai-200025, China

Contact no. : Ph: 0086-21-64370045 ext 671302

Email: rjsurgeon@hotmail.com

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7415-960X

Zhang Ben Yan, MD

Department of Pathology

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Zhang Huan, MD

Department of Radiology

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Yan Chao, MD/Ph D

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

*Li Chen, MD/Ph D

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit,

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Shanghai, China.

Yan Min, MD

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit,

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Shanghai, China.

*Prof. Zhu Zheng Gang, MD/Ph.D., FACS

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit,

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Shanghai Key Laboratory of Gastric Neoplasms

Shanghai Institute of Digestive Surgery

Shanghai, China.

*Corresponding authors

Abstract

Background: Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with fluorouracil plus leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel (FLOT) has shown significant benefits for gastric cancer patients. However, it has not been well accepted in Asian countries, so we conducted a prospective study on the safety and feasibility of this regimen in Chinese patients.

Methods: Patients with adenocarcinoma of the stomach or esophagogastric received 4 cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) and 4 cycles of adjuvant chemotherapy (AC) with the FLOT regimen. The completion status of chemotherapy, adverse events, postoperative morbidities and pathological tumor regression were analyzed. The two-year overall survival (OS) and relapse-free survival are presented. The trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (number NCT03646591).

Results: Altogether, 10 patients were enrolled, and all patients completed 4 cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy. There were no severe hematological adverse events (grade 3 or above), except for a case of grade 3 anemia. Four patients had grade 3 or 4 vomiting, and all other non-hematological adverse events were grade 2 or below. All 10 patients underwent radical gastrectomy. There was no anastomotic leakage, reoperation or death due to surgical complications. Nine patients had R0 resection, and 3 patients had complete or subtotal pathological tumor regression. Nine patients completed 4 cycles of adjuvant chemotherapy, but only one patient completed the full dose of

adjuvant chemotherapy. The dose of adjuvant chemotherapy was reduced by 25% or less in the other patients. The median follow-up time was 23.13 months, 8 patients achieved the overall survival endpoint, and 7 patients had relapse-free survival for this period. Two patients died of disease progression. Conclusions: Our study demonstrates that neoadjuvant chemotherapy with FLOT regimen is safe and effective for Chinese patients. Dose adjustment is necessary for adjuvant chemotherapy. The pathological regression and survival rates need reevaluation in a larger cohort.

Keywords: gastric cancer; neoadjuvant chemotherapy; FLOT regimen

Background

Neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) for gastric cancer gained attention after the publication of the MAGIC trial in the New England Journal of Medicine in 2006, which advocated for perioperative chemotherapy with triplet chemotherapy consisting of epirubicin, cisplatin, and infused fluorouracil [1]. However, NAC has been debated for a long time among various centers around the world. It was interesting that most of the chemotherapy- or chemoradiotherapy-related trials came from Western countries despite the higher prevalence of gastric cancer in Eastern countries [1, 2]. Japanese researchers conducted most of the trials for the last few decades, but there have been no large-scale phase 3 trials on NAC for resectable locally advanced gastric cancer (LAGC) patients, and NAC was only tested in Japan for gastric cancer patients with bulky metastatic lymph nodes, para-aortic lymph node (PAN)-positive patients, or those with large ulcero-invasive type (Bormann type 3) or linitis plastic (Borrmann type 4) gastric cancer [3, 4, 5, 6]. Even if NAC was safe in Japanese patients, its effect on survival was questionable or contradictory [7, 8]. In addition, the chemotherapy regimens were relatively conservative in Japan compared to the chemotherapy regimens used in Western countries, and these regimens were mainly based on cisplatin and fluorouracil or S1 [3, 4, 5, 6, 9]. The addition of taxane-based chemotherapy failed to show benefits for gastric cancer patients in Japan [9]. Adjuvant chemotherapy was suggested to be beneficial for gastric cancer patients, and a review was long before

published on JAMA by French researchers [10]. In general, for patients with resectable LAGC, standard gastrectomy with adjuvant chemotherapy is well accepted in Asian countries, especially after the publication of the milestone articles of the CLASSIC and ARTIST trials from South Korea [11, 12, 13]. Adjuvant chemotherapy was mainly dominated by platinum-based doublet chemotherapy. Oral capecitabine and cisplatin or oxaliplatin are common adjuvant chemotherapies in Eastern countries [11, 13]. On the other hand, German scientists published a series of clinical studies on neoadjuvant chemotherapy with taxane-based chemotherapy [14, 15, 16]. The German studies even advocated for taxane-based triplet chemotherapy [16, 17].The groundbreaking results comparing ECF or ECX with FLOT showed that FLOT was associated with significantly higher proportions of patients achieving pathological complete regression than ECF/ECX [17]. NAC with taxane-based chemotherapy was later supported by Italian researchers [18, 19].

The FLOT regimen is a taxane-based triplet chemotherapy regimen that is generally considered more toxic and prescribed as second-line chemotherapy for recurrent gastric cancer in the East. In addition, there have been no published papers on well-controlled RCT studies of NAC from China despite many reviews and articles in the past that confirmed the beneficial effects of NAC [20, 21, 22]. The results of two large-scale multicenter trials (RESOLVE and RESONANCE) from China were only recently presented at academic conference trials, and the chemotherapy regimens were also based on doublet

combinations of XELOX or SOX [23, 24]. Zhou et al. investigated and recommended a modified FLOT regimen; however, this study lacks the evidence to support this modified regimen [25]. Furthermore, initial studies of FLOT, which were also published by Lancet, showed that it was well tolerated in gastric cancer patients with promising results in terms of pathological regression and survival in Germany [16, 17]. Therefore, there is a scientific basis for conducting a prospective study to evaluate the safety and feasibility of a standard FLOT regimen for Chinese patients. In our study, we strictly adhered to the FLOT regimen as described by the original investigators [16].

Methods

Nature of the study

This is an investigator-initiated, phase I, open-label study. We assessed the FLOT regimen for safety and feasibility in Chinese gastric cancer patients. Patients were enrolled between November 2017 and August 2018 from Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiaotong University School of Medicine, a high volume center for gastric cancer in China. The trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT03646591.

Inclusion criteria

Age: 18-80 years old.

Sex: all.

Diagnosis: histology-confirmed adenocarcinoma of the stomach or esophagogastric junction.

Clinical stage: stage III or above (CT3-4bN1-3M0, AJCC/UICC 8th cTNM staging system).

Performance status: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) ≤ 2 (normal to symptomatic but in bed less than half the day).

Clinically fit for systemic chemotherapy and gastric cancer surgery, i.e., adequate renal, hepatic, hematologic, and pulmonary function.

Written informed consent provided.

Exclusion criteria

Clinically unfit for systemic chemotherapy and gastric cancer surgery, i.e. uncontrolled cardiac disease or other clinically significant uncontrolled comorbidities.

Unable to undergo general anesthesia

Distant metastases (including retroperitoneal lymph node)

Locally advanced inoperable disease (clinical assessment)

Relapse of gastric cancer.

Malignant secondary disease

Prior chemotherapy or radiotherapy

Inclusion in another clinical trial

Known contraindications or hypersensitivity to planned chemotherapy

Pretreatment assessment

All patients underwent a full clinical assessment before the commencement of the treatment, which included a full medical history, physical examination,

complete blood count, clotting analysis, serum liver function, renal function test, 24-hour urinary clearance, and blood tumor markers for gastrointestinal diseases. Electrocardiography, echocardiography, chest radiography, and computed tomography of the chest, abdomen and pelvis, and upper gastrointestinal endoscopy were performed. The specially designed protocol was used for staging the CT scans of gastric cancer, consisting of arterial, venous, and portal phase transverse section images and reconstruction images of the sagittal and coronary sections. Ultrasonography and magnetic resonance (MR) were used if clinically necessary to rule out suspicious distant metastases or retroperitoneal lymph nodes. Positron emission tomography (PET) or whole-body bone scintigraphy was required in suspected cases. Diagnostic laparoscopy was routinely performed to rule out peritoneal metastases. Clinical staging was performed according to the AJCC/UICC tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) eighth edition staging system.

Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy

A standard dose of FLOT chemotherapy was prescribed [16]. Preventive antiemetic and dexamethasone were allowed before chemotherapy, and growth factor or other supportive medicines were allowed for treatment only.

FLOT chemotherapy regimen

A cycle consists of the following:

Day 1: 5-FU 2600 mg/m^2 intravenously

via peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) for 24 hours

Day 1: Leucovorin 200 mg/m^2 intravenously

Day 1: Oxaliplatin 85 mg/m^2 intravenously

Day 1: Docetaxel 50 mg/m^2 intravenously

Repeated every 15th day

Dose alteration or stop

The National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE, 4.0) was followed for the evaluation of adverse effects. The postponement or dose adjustment of treatment was allowed after discussion with oncologists and was carefully documented.

Restaging

Two specialized radiologists independently evaluated the overall response rate. Any conflicting results were settled after discussion among both radiologists and investigators. The response to treatment was evaluated according to the Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST, version 1.1) guidelines [25]. Complete response (CR) was defined as the disappearance of all target lesions. Any pathological lymph nodes (whether target or nontarget) must have a reduction in the short axis to <10 mm. Partial response (PR) was defined as at least a 30% decrease in the sum of the diameters of the target lesions, taking the baseline sum diameters as the reference. Progressive disease (PD) was defined as at least a 20% increase in the sum of the diameters of the target lesions, taking the smallest sum of diameters in the study as the reference (this includes the baseline sum if that

was the smallest in the study). In addition to the relative increase of 20%, the sum must also demonstrate an absolute increase of at least 5 mm (note: the appearance of one or more new lesions is also considered progression). Stable disease (SD) was defined as neither sufficient shrinkage to qualify for PR nor sufficient increase to qualify for PD, taking the smallest sum of diameters while in the study as the reference.

Surgery

Surgery was scheduled between two to four weeks after the completion of the planned chemotherapy. The patients underwent an exploratory laparoscopic examination to rule out peritoneal or distant metastases. Surgery was terminated if there was peritoneal or distant metastasis. The Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines 2018 (5th Edition) were observed for surgical treatment. Standard gastrectomy with curative intent was the principal surgical procedure. It involves resection of at least two-thirds of the stomach with D2 lymph node dissection. Regarding the resection margin, a sufficient resection margin was ensured when determining the resection line in gastrectomy.

Pathological assessment

After formalin fixation and paraffin embedding, all specimens underwent immunohistochemical examination. The pathological assessment was made according to local clinical guidelines that observed the tumor–node–metastasis (TNM) classification version 8. It included tumor type, depth of invasion, involvement of lymph nodes, resection margins, vessels, and nerve invasion.

The presence or absence of residual tumor after surgery is described as the R status; R0 represents curative resection with negative resection margins, and R1 or R2 represents a microscopic or macroscopic presence of residual tumor, respectively. Pathologists carefully examined residual vital tumor cells and the remnant of the previous tumor as necrosis, fibrosis, or scar. The tumor regression grading (TRG) with the Becker criteria was used for the evaluation of pathological response in the resected specimens [26]. Two specialized pathologists independently rated the TRG grading. Any conflicting results were settled after re-examination and discussion among both pathologists and investigators.

The tumor regression grades (TRGs) according to the Becker criteria [26] were as follows:

Grade 1a: Complete tumor regression: 0% residual tumor per tumor bed

Grade 1b: Subtotal tumor regression: <10% residual tumor per tumor bed

Grade 2: Partial tumor regression: 10-50% residual tumor per tumor bed

Grade 3: Minimal or no tumor regression: >50% residual tumor per tumor bed

Endpoints

Primary Outcome Measure:

Completion rate of the preoperative FLOT regimen

Secondary Outcome Measures:

Adverse events

Pathological response rate: According to tumor regression grading (TRG)

Postoperative morbidity: Postoperative complications

Postoperative mortality: Death due to surgical complications

Overall survival (OS): Time from randomization to death from tumor recurrence

Relapse-free survival: Time from randomization to relapse

Statistical analysis

The following were analyzed: the completion rates of neoadjuvant and adjuvant chemotherapy; the nonsurgical adverse events and serious adverse events before surgery; the overall response rate (radiological) and pathological response rate (TRG); and the postoperative morbidity and 30-day mortality rates. The statistical analysis was performed with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22.0 for Windows (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois). The continuous data are expressed as the median and range.

Results

Altogether, 10 patients were enrolled in this study (Table 1). All patients completed 4 cycles of FLOT chemotherapy before curative gastrectomy. The median time interval between two cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy was 15 days for all three intervals. Eight patients received a full dose of the standard preoperative FLOT chemotherapy regimen. The chemotherapy dose was reduced by 25 percent or less in two patients (Table 2).All 10 patients underwent surgery at the same hospital. One patient refused adjuvant chemotherapy. Nine patients completed 4 cycles of adjuvant chemotherapy.

Eight patients received adjuvant chemotherapy at the same hospital, and one patient received adjuvant chemotherapy at a different hospital. The median time to the first chemotherapy cycle after surgery was 36 days, and it was approximately three weeks for the remaining three intervals. There were no severe hematological adverse events (grade 3 or above), except for a case with grade 3 anemia. Four patients had grade 3 or 4 vomiting, and all other non-hematological adverse events were grade 2 or below (Table 3).

CT results

The prechemotherapy clinical TNM staging showed that all patients had advanced-stage tumors. Four patients had a partial response, and six patients had stable disease comparing the prechemotherapy and postchemotherapy radiological results according to the RECIST 1.1 criteria (Table 4).

Postoperative complications

Standard curative gastrectomy (gastrectomy+ D2 lymphadenectomy) was performed in all 10 patients. Among them, 3 patients underwent total gastrectomy, and 7 patients underwent distal gastrectomy. The median postoperative hospital stay was 9 days, and five patients had minor or moderate scale postoperative complications. There were no cases of anastomotic leakage, reoperation, or death due to surgical complications (Table 5).

Postoperative pathology

Nine patients underwent R0 resection. The median number of examined lymph

nodes was 28, and eight patients were classified as stage III according to the ypTNM classification. One patient had complete tumor regression (TRG 1a), and two patients had subtotal tumor regression (Table 6).

Adjuvant chemotherapy

Nine patients completed 4 cycles of postoperative chemotherapy. One patient refused adjuvant chemotherapy. Only one patient completed the full dose of all four cycles of postoperative chemotherapy. The dose of adjuvant chemotherapy was reduced by 25% or less in the other patients (Table 7).

Follow up

All 10 patients had timely follow-up; the median follow-up time was 23.13 months. Eight patients were still alive; among them, seven patients were without any signs of relapse at the last follow-up visit. One patient had a relapse of peritoneal and ovary metastases after eight months of the first chemotherapy cycle and was still undergoing chemotherapy treatment. Thus, 8 patients achieved overall survival (OS), and 7 patients achieved relapse-free survival (RFS) during this follow-up time. Two patients died, one of whom died of retroperitoneal metastases. The OS time was 26 months, and the RFS time was 6 months for this patient. Another patient died of peritoneal metastases and Krukenberg tumor. The OS time was 10.6 months, and the RFS time was approximately 6 months for this patient (Table 8).

Discussion

Despite many presumptions about the toxic adverse effects, our study shows

that the FLOT regimen is safe and effective in Chinese patients, as most of the patients tolerated the standard dose of the FLOT regimen, which may be due to the well-balanced dose combination of this regimen, which is different from other combinations [9, 16]. All 4 cycles with a full dose of neoadjuvant chemotherapy were completed in 8 patients. Even for 2 patients, for whom the dose was adjusted, it was solely the decision of a clinical doctor; there was no concrete rationale for reducing the dose in those two cases. Most of the hematological adverse effects and symptomatic adverse effects were acceptable for triplet chemotherapy. None of the patients discontinued chemotherapy due to adverse events.

The postoperative morbidities were acceptable for radical gastrectomy compared to previously reported results [27, 28]. There were no deaths, anastomotic leakages or reoperations due to postoperative complications, which are the main concerns of surgeons, especially for patients who received neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

The postoperative pathological findings confirmed that the majority of patients had advanced-stage adenocarcinoma; eight patients were pathologically confirmed as stage III in ypTNM staging. In previewing the prechemotherapy clinical stage, we found that all the tumors were T4a or T4b, and lymph nodes were positive on CT diagnosis. After chemotherapy, restaging showed that there was down staging in four cases by the RECIST criteria. There was no progressive disease. This finding indicates that all patients achieved disease

control. The pathological results showed that 9 of 10 patients achieved R0 resection, and pathological tumor regression was observed in 6 patients, including one patient who had a complete response. The TRG results were comparable with those reported in FLOT-4[16]; however, this is a relatively small number of patients, and this result needs to be re-evaluated in a larger cohort.

The completion rate of full-dose neoadjuvant chemotherapy was comparable with that in the FLOT-4 study [16], but the only concern was the feasibility of the full dose of adjuvant chemotherapy, as the data showed that most of the patients were administered a reduced dose of the FLOT regimen despite completing all four adjuvant chemotherapy cycles. Even in the FLOT-4 study, less than half of the patients completed all 8 cycles of chemotherapy [16]. However, this was again a very conservative approach for the chemotherapy dose by the local oncologists. Perhaps the previous assumptions for taxane-based triplet chemotherapy and clinical experience might have prejudiced the final decision on dose adjustment. Furthermore, the reduction of the dose was below 25 percent, which was considered acceptable for postoperative patients. We also presented preliminary reports on OS and DFS. Though the two-year duration was not long enough to perform any comparisons with previous reports, the present survival results were not poor for this cohort because the majority of patients (8 patients) had very late stage disease on postoperative pathological findings (ypTNM stage III).

Conclusion

Our findings suggest that neoadjuvant chemotherapy with the FLOT regimen is safe and effective for gastric cancer patients in China. The drug dose of chemotherapy and time interval between two chemotherapy cycles need to be adjusted for adjuvant chemotherapy. The pathological regression and survival rates were comparable but it should be reevaluated in a larger cohort. The results of this phase 1 study pave the way for further studies in Asian countries.

References

1. Cunningham D, Allum WH, Stenning SP, Thompson JN, Van de Velde CJ, et al. Perioperative Chemotherapy versus Surgery Alone for Resectable Gastroesophageal Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2006; 355:11-20.

2. Christoph Schuhmacher, Stephan Gretschel, Florian Lordick, Peter Reichardt, Werner Hohenberger, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy compared with surgery alone for locally advanced cancer of the stomach and cardia: European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Randomized Trial 40954. J Clin Oncol. 2010 Dec 10; 28(35):5210-8.

3. Yoshikawa T, Sasako M, Yamamoto S, Sano T, Imamura H, et al. Phase II study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy and extended surgery for locally advanced gastric cancer. Br J Surg. 2009 Sep; 96(9):1015-22.

4. Iwasaki Y, Sasako M, Yamamoto S, Nakamura K, Sano T, et al. Phase II study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy with S-1 and cisplatin followed by gastrectomy for clinically resectable type 4 and large type 3 gastric cancers (JCOG0210). J Surg Oncol. 2013 Jun; 107(7):741-5.

5. Katayama H, Tsuburaya A, Mizusawa J, Nakamura K, Katai H, et al. An Integrated Analysis of Two Phase II Trials (JCOG0001 and JCOG0405) of Preoperative Chemotherapy Followed by D3 Gastrectomy for Gastric Cancer With Extensive Lymph Node Metastasis. Gastric Cancer. 2019 Nov;22 (6):1301-1307.

6. Terashima M, Iwasaki Y, Mizusawa J, Katayama H, Nakamura K, et al.

Randomized phase III trial of gastrectomy with or without neoadjuvant S-1 plus cisplatin for type 4 or large type 3 gastric cancer, the short-term safety and surgical results: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study Gastric Cancer. 2019 Sep;22 (5):1044-1052.

7. Okabe H, Hata H, Ueda S, Zaima M, Tokuka A, et al. A phase II study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy with S-1 and cisplatin for stage III gastric cancer: KUGC03. J Surg Oncol. 2016 Jan; 113(1):36-41.

8. Eto K, Hiki N, Kumagai K, Shoji Y, Tsuda Y, et al. Prophylactic effect of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in gastric cancer patients with postoperative complications. Gastric Cancer. 2018 Jul; 21(4):703-709.

9. Ito S, Sano T, Mizusawa J, Takahari D, Katayama H, et al. A phase II study of preoperative chemotherapy with docetaxel, cisplatin, and S-1 followed by gastrectomy with D2 plus paraaortic lymph node dissection for gastric cancer with extensive lymph node metastasis: JCOG1002. Gastric Cancer. 2017 Mar;20 (2):322-331.

10. GASTRIC (Global Advanced/Adjuvant Stomach Tumor Research International Collaboration) Group, Paoletti X, Oba K, Burzykowski T, Michiels S, et al. Benefit of adjuvant chemotherapy for resectable gastric cancer a meta-analysis. JAMA. 2010 May 5; 303(17):1729-37.

11. Bang YJ, Kim YW, Yang HK, Chung HC, Park YK, et al. Adjuvant capecitabine and oxaliplatin for gastric cancer after D2 gastrectomy (CLASSIC): a phase 3 open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2012

Jan 28;379(9813):315-21.

12. Lee J, Lim HD, Kim S, Park HS, Park OJ, et al. Phase III trial comparing capecitabine plus cisplatin versus capecitabine plus cisplatin with concurrent capecitabine radiotherapy in completely resected gastric cancer with D2 lymph node dissection: The ARTIST Trial. J Clin Oncol. 2012 Jan 20;30(3):268-73.

13. Noh SH, Park SR, Yang HK, Chung HC, Chung IJ, et al. Adjuvant Capecitabine Plus Oxaliplatin for Gastric Cancer After D2 Gastrectomy (CLASSIC): 5-year Follow-Up of an Open-Label, Randomised Phase 3 Trial. Lancet Oncol. 2014 Nov; 15(12):1389-96

14. Lorenzen S, Thuss-Patience P, Al-Batran SE, Lordick F, Haller B, et al. Impact of pathologic complete response on disease-free survival in patients with esophagogastric adenocarcinoma receiving preoperative docetaxel-based chemotherapy. Ann Oncol. 2013 Aug; 24(8):2068-73.

15. Ronellenfitsch U, Schwarzbach M, Hofheinz R, Kienle P, Kieser M, et al. Perioperative chemo(radio)therapy versus primary surgery for resectable adenocarcinoma of the stomach, gastroesophageal junction, and lower esophagus. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2013 May 31;(5):CD008107.

16 Al-Batran SE, Hofheinz RD, Pauligk C, Kopp HG, Haag GM, et al. Histopathological regression after neoadjuvant docetaxel, oxaliplatin, fluorouracil, and leucovorin versus epirubicin, cisplatin, and fluorouracil or

capecitabine in patients with resectable gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction adenocarcinoma (FLOT4-AIO). Lancet Oncol. 2016 Dec; 17(12):1697-1708

17. Al-Batran SE, Homann N, Pauligk C, Goetze TO, Meiler J, et al. Perioperative chemotherapy with fluorouracil plus leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel versus fluorouracil or capecitabine plus cisplatin and epirubicin for locally advanced, resectable gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction adeno carcinoma (FLOT4): a randomised, phase 2/3 trial. Lancet. 2019 May 11; 393(10184):1948-1957.

18. Coccolini F, Nardi M, Montori G, Ceresoli M, Celotti A, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced gastric and esophago-gastric ca ncer. Meta-analysis of randomized trials.Int J Surg. 2018 Mar;51:120-127.

19. Fazio N, Biffi R, Maibach R, Hayoz S, Thierstein S, et al. Preoperative Versus Postoperative Docetaxel-Cisplatin-Fluorouracil (TCF) Chemotherapy in Locally Advanced Resectable Gastric Carcinoma: 10-year Follow-Up of the SAKK 43/99 Phase III Trial. Ann Oncol. 2016 Apr; 27(4):668-73.

20. Yang YN, Yin X, Sheng L, Xu S, Dong LL, et al. Perioperative Chemotherapy More of a Benefit for Overall Survival Than Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Operable Gastric Cancer: An Updated Meta-analysis. Sci Rep. 2015 Aug 5;5: 12850.

21. Jiang L, Yang KH, Guan QL, Chen Y, Zhao P, et al. Survival Benefit of Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy for Resectable Cancer of the Gastric and Gastroesophageal Junction: A Meta-Analysis. J Clin Gastroenterol. May-Jun

2015;49 (5):387-94.

22. Zhao JH, Gao P, Song YX, Sun JX, Chen XW, et al. Which is better for gastric cancer patients, perioperative or adjuvant chemotherapy: a meta-analysis. BMC Cancer. 2016 Aug 12; 16:631.

23. Jl. Ji J, Shen L, Li Z, et al. LBA42 Perioperative chemotherapy of oxaliplatin combined with S-1 (SOX) versus postoperative chemotherapy of SOX or oxaliplatin with capecitabine (XELOX) in locally advanced gastric adenocarcinoma with D2 gastrectomy: a randomized phase III trial (RESOLVE trial), Ann Oncol 2019,26 Suppl 4:S29-S30

24. L Chen, Z Xu, J Ji, et al. The randomized,multicenter, controlled evaluation of S-1 and oxaliplatin (SOX) as neoadjuvant chemotherapy for Chinese advanced gastric cancer patients (RESONANCE trial) . J clin Oncol , 2020 ASCO Annual Meeting

25. Zhou CF , Ma T, Shi M , Xi WQ, Wu JW, Yang C et al. Dose-finding study of modified FLOT (mFLOT) regimen as first-line treatment in Chinese patients with metastatic adenocarcinoma of stomach. Cancer Chemotherapy and Pharmacology (2020) 85:113–119

26. Eisenhauer EA, Therasse P, Bogaerts J, Schwartz LH, Sargent D, et al. New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1). Eur J Cancer. 2009 Jan;45(2):228-47.

27 Becker K, Mueller JD, Schulmacher C, Ott K, Fink U, et al. Histomorphology and Grading of Regression in Gastric Carcinoma Treated

With Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy. Cancer. 2003 Oct 1;98(7):1521-30.

28. Sah BK, Chen MM, Yan M, Zhu ZG. Gastric cancer surgery: Billroth I or Billroth II for distal gastrectomy? BMC Cancer. 2009 Dec 9;9:428.

29. Sah BK, Chen MM, Yan M, Zhu ZG. Reoperation for early postoperative complications after gastric cancer surgery in a Chinese hospital. World J Gastroenterol. 2010 Jan 7; 16(1):98-103.

Table 1 Demographic data

Parameter		Number
Gender	Male	7
	Female	3
Age (Years)	Median	59.50
	Range	26 (43-69)
Body mass index	Median	22.95
	Range	17.29(16.30-33.59)
Site of tumor	Body	4
	Distal	6
Type of resection	Partial	7
	Total	3
Pre-chemo interval time(days)	1st-2nd chemo	15(14-18)
Median (Range)	2nd-3rd chemo	15(14-20)
	3rd-4th chemo	15(11-17)
Post-chemo interval time(days)	Surgery-1st chemo	36(26-50)
Median (Range)	1st-2nd chemo	22(14-46)
	2nd-3rd chemo	21(14-28)
	3rd-4th chemo	22(14-40)

Table 2 Preoperative chemo dose alteration

Case	1st Chemo	2nd chemo	3rd Chemo	4th Chemo
1	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
2	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
3	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
4	F: DRB 10-25%	F: DRB 10-25%	F: DRB 10-25%	F: DRB 10-25%
	L: Full	L: Full	L: Full	L: Full
	O: DRB 25%	O: DRB 25%	O: DRB 25%	O: DRB 25%
	T: DRB 25%	T: DRB 25%	T: DRB 25%	T: DRB 25%
5	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
6	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
7	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.
	L: Full	L: Full	L: Full	L: Full
	O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.
	T: Full	T: Full	T: Full	T: Full
8	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
9	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
10	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.
			L: Full	L: Full
			O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.
			T: DRB 10-25%.	T: DRB 10-25%.

DRB: Dose reduced by

Table 3 Adverse effects

Parameter		Number
WBC decreased	Grade 0	5
	Grade 1	4
	Grade 2	1
Neutrophil count decreased	Grade 0	4
	Grade 1	1
	Grade 2	5
Febrile neutropenia	Grade 0	10
Anemia	Grade 0	2
	Grade 1	4
	Grade 2	3
	Grade 3	1
Platelet count decreased	Grade 0	10
AST increased	Grade 0	4
	Grade 1	6
ALT increased	Grade 0	7
	Grade 1	3
Nausea	Grade 0	5
	Grade 1	5
Vomiting	Grade 0	6
	Grade 3,4	4

Diarrhea	Grade 0	10
Peripheral neuropathy	Grade 0	10
Fatigue	Grade 0	10
Anorexia	Grade 0	9
	Grade 2	1
Oral mucositis	Grade 0	9
	Grade 1	1

Table 4 Computed tomography (CT) results

Parameter		Number
Pre chemo tumor(T)	T4A	7
	T4B	3
Pre-chemo lymph node(N)	N1	5
	N2	5
Post-chemo tumor(T)	T3	2
	T4A	7
	T4B	1
Post-chemo lymph node(N)	N0	2
	N1	5
	N2	3
Response	Partial response(PR)	4
	Stable disease(SD)	6

Table 5 Postoperative complications

Complication		Number
Overall complications		5
Abdominal complication		3
Intrabdominal hemorrhage		1
Infection	Pulmonary	2
	Abdominal	1
	Abdominal(Suspicious)	2
Anastomotic leakage		0
Pancreatic fistula		1
Readmission		0
Reoperation		0
Death		0

Table 6 Postoperative pathology

Parameter		Number
Resection	R0	9
	R1	1
Lauren's classification	Intestinal	3
	Diffuse	5
	Mixed	1
	Unclassifiable	1
Nerve invasion	Negative	7
	Positive	3
Vessels invasion	Negative	8
	Positive	2
Tumor	Unclassifiable	1
	T3	5
	T4A	4
Lymph node	N0	2
	N1	2
	N2	2
	N3A	3
YpTNM	I	1
	II	1
	III	8

TRG	1A	1
	1B	2
	2	3
	3	4

Table 7 Postoperative chemo dose alteration

Case	1st Chemo	2nd chemo	3rd Chemo	4th Chemo
1	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full	FLOT: Full
2	FLOT: CAC	CAC	CAC	CAC
3	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.
4	No chemotherapy	No chemotherapy	No chemotherapy	No chemotherapy
5	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.
6	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.
		L: Full	L: Full	L: Full
		O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.	O: Full
		T: Full	T: Full	T: Full
7	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.	F: DRB 10-25%.
	L: Full	L: Full	L: Full	L: Full
	O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.	O: DRB 10-25%.
	T: Full	T: Full	T: Full	T: Full
8	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: Full	FLOT: DRB 10-25%.
9	F: DRB 10-25%.	FLOT: DRB 25%.	CAC	CAC
	L: DRB 10-25%.			
	O: DRB 25%			
	T: DRB 10-25%.			
10	FLOT: DRB 25%.	FLOT: DRB 25%.	FLOT: DRB 25%.	FLOT: DRB 25%.

DRB: Dose reduced by, CAC: Chemotherapy at another center

Table 8 Survival analysis

Case	Status	Cause	Follow up days	RFS(days)	OS(days)
1	Dead/Relapse	Retroperitoneal metastases	780	180	780
2	Alive	No sign of relapse	727	NA	NA
3	Alive	No sign of relapse	705	NA	NA
4	Alive	No sign of relapse	677	NA	NA
5	Dead/Relapse	Peritoneal metastases/ Ovary	319	184	319
6	Alive	No sign of relapse	684	NA	NA
7	Alive	No sign of relapse	908	NA	NA
8	Alive	No sign of relapse	635	NA	NA
9	Alive	No sign of relapse	785	NA	NA
10	Alive / Relapse	Peritoneal metastases/ Ovary	635	244	NA

NA: Not applicable