medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

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,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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, we conducted a prospective study on the safety and feasibility of this regimen.

Methods: Patients with adenocarcinoma of the stomach or esophagogastric junction were enrolled. Patients received 4 cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy and 4 cycles of adjuvant chemotherapy according to the FLOT regimen. Completion status of chemotherapy, adverse events, postoperative morbidities and pathological tumor regression were analyzed. We also presented the two years Overall survival and Relapse-free survival.

Results: Altogether 10 patients enrolled, all of them completed 4 cycles of the neoadjuvant chemotherapy and underwent radical gastrectomy. There was no anastomotic leak, reoperation and death due to surgical complications. Nine patients had R0 resection, 3 patients achieved complete or sub-total pathological tumor regression. Nine patients completed four cycles of adjuvant chemotherapy, but only one patient completed the full dose of adjuvant chemotherapy. There were no severe hematological adverse events (Grade 3or above), except a case with grade 3 anemia. Four patients had grade 3 or 4 vomitings, all other non-hematological adverse events were grade 2 or below. The median follow up time was 23.13 months, two patients died of disease progression. Thus, 8 patients achieved overall survival and 7 patients had

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

relapse-free survival for this period.

Conclusions: The neoadjuvant chemotherapy with FLOT regimen is safe for Chinese patients. Dose adjustment is necessary for adjuvant chemotherapy. The pathological regression and survival rate needs further evaluation in a larger cohort. The results of this study pave the way for further studies in Asian countries.

Keywords: gastric cancer; Neoadjuvant chemotherapy; FLOT regimen

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Background

Neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) for gastric cancer came to limelight after the publication of MAGIC trial in New England Journal of Medicine in 2006, which advocated for the perioperative chemotherapy with triplet chemotherapy, consisting of epirubicin, cisplatin, and infused fluorouracil [1]. However, the NAC was debated for a long time, among various centers around the world. It was interesting that most of the chemotherapy or chemo-radiotherapy 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 was no large scale phase 3 trial on NAC for resectable locally advanced gastric cancer (LAGC) patients, and the NAC was only tested in Japan for gastric cancer patients with the bulky metastatic lymph nodes or para-aortic lymph node (PAN) positive cases, or with large ulcero-invasive type (Bormann type 3) or linitis plastic (Borrmann type 4)gastric cancer [3,4,5, 6]. And even if the NAC was safe in Japanese patients but its effect on survival was questioned or contradicting [7, 8]. Besides, the chemotherapy regimens were relatively conservative in Japan comparing to chemotherapy regimens of western countries, and these regimens were mainly grounded on cisplatin and fluorouracil or S1 [3, 4, 5, 6, 9], adding of taxane-based chemotherapy failed to show beneficial for gastric cancer patients in Japan [9]. Adjuvant chemotherapy was proved to be beneficial for gastric cancer patients and a review was long before published

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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 milestone articles of CLASSIC and ARTIST trials from South Korea [11, 12, 13]. And the adjuvant chemotherapy was mainly dominated by platinum-based doublet chemotherapy. Oral capecitabine and cisplatin or oxaliplatin were common adjuvant chemotherapy in eastern countries[11 , 13]. On the other hand, German scientists published a series of clinical research on neoadjuvant chemotherapy with taxane-based chemotherapy [14, 15, 16]. German researches even advocated for taxane-based triplet chemotherapy [16, 17]. The groundbreaking results on comparing ECF or ECX with FLOT showed that the FLOT was associated with significantly higher proportions of patients achieving pathological complete regression than was ECF/ECX [17]. NAC with taxane-based chemotherapy was later supported by Italian researchers [18, 19].

Though the FLOT regimen is taxane-based triplet chemotherapy, which is generally considered more toxic and prescribed as second-line chemotherapy for recurrent gastric cancer in the East. But the studies from the original researchers of FLOT showed that the FLOT was well tolerated in gastric cancer patients in Germany and produced a promising result on pathological regression and survival [16, 17]. Besides, there were no published papers on well-controlled RCT studies for NAC from China despite many reviews- articles

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

in the past which confirmed the beneficial effects of NAC [20, 21, 22]. The results of two large scale multi-center 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]. Therefore, the author conducted a prospective exploratory study on the safety and feasibility of this taxane-based triplet neoadjuvant chemotherapy on Chinese patients.

Methods

Nature of the study

This is an investigator-initiated, phase I, open-label study. Investigators assessed the FLOT regimen for safety and feasibility in Chinese gastric cancer patients. Patients were enrolled between November 2017 and August 2018 at a high volume center for gastric cancer in China.

Inclusion criteria

Age: 18-80 years old

Sex: all

Histology confirmed adenocarcinoma of the stomach or esophagogastric junction.

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

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Written informed consent

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 chemo or radiotherapy

Inclusion in another clinical trial

Known contraindications or hypersensitivity for planned chemotherapy

Pre-treatment assessment

All patients underwent full clinical assessment before commencement of the treatment, which included a full medical history, physical examination, a complete blood count, clotting analysis, serum liver function, and renal function test, 24-hour urinary clearance, blood tumor markers for gastrointestinal diseases. Electrocardiography, echocardiography, chest radiography, and computed tomography of the chest, abdomen and pelvis, upper gastrointestinal endoscopy. The specially designed protocol was used for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

staging CT of gastric cancer, consisting of arterial, venous, and portal phase of transverse section images and reconstruction images of the sagittal and coronary section). 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.

Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy

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

FLOT Chemotherapy regimen

A cycle consists of

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

via a peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) for 24 hour

Day 1: Leucovorin 200mg/m^2 intravenous

Day 1: Oxaliplatin 85mg/ m^2 intravenous

Day 1: Docetaxel 50mg/m^2 intravenous

Repeated every 15th day

Dose alteration or stop

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Restaging

Two specialized radiologists independently evaluated the overall response rate. Any conflicting results were settled after discussion among both radiologists and investigators. Response to treatment was evaluated according to the Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST version 1.1) guidelines [25]. Complete Response (CR): Disappearance of all target lesions. Any pathological lymph nodes (whether target or non-target) must have a reduction in short axis to <10 mm. Partial Response (PR): At least a 30% decrease in the sum of diameters of target lesions, taking as reference the baseline sum diameters. Progressive Disease (PD): At least a 20% increase in the sum of diameters of target lesions, taking as reference the smallest sum on study (this includes the baseline sum if that is the smallest on 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): Neither sufficient shrinkage to qualify for PR nor sufficient increase to qualify for PD, taking as reference the smallest sum diameters while on the study.

Surgery

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Surgery was scheduled between two to four weeks after completion of the planned chemotherapy. The patient underwent an exploratory laparoscopic examination to rule out peritoneal or distant metastases. Surgery would be terminated if there was peritoneal or distant metastasis. 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 a D2 lymph node dissection. 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 which observed Tumor–Node–Metastasis (TNM) classification version 8. It included tumor type, depth of invasion, the 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 is a curative resection with negative resection margins; 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) withBecker criteria were used for the evaluation of pathological response in the resected specimens [26]. Two specialized

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

pathologists independently rated the TRG grading. Any conflicting results were settled after re-examination and discussion among both pathologists and investigators.

Tumor regression grade (TRG), Becker criteria[26]

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 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 complication

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

Relapse-free survival: Time from randomization to relapse.

Statistical analysis

The completion rate of neoadjuvant and adjuvant chemotherapy was analyzed. Non-surgical adverse events and serious adverse events before surgery were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

analyzed. The overall response rate (radiological) and pathological response rate (TRG) were analyzed. Postoperative morbidity and 30-day mortality rate were analyzed. The statistical analysis was performed with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22.0 for Windows (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois). The continuous data were expressed as median and range.

Results

Altogether 10 patients enrolled in this study (Table 1). All patients completed 4 cycles of the FLOT chemotherapy before curative gastrectomy. The median interval time of neoadjuvant chemotherapy between two cycles was 15 days in all three intervals. Eight patients received a full dose of the standard preoperative FLOT chemotherapy. The chemotherapy dose was reduced by 25 percent or less in two patients (Table 2). All 10 patients had surgery at the same hospital. One patient refused to have 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 for the first chemo after surgery was 36 days, and about three weeks in the rest of three intervals. There were no severe hematological adverse events (Grade 3or above), except a case with grade 3 anemia. Four patients had grade 3 or 4 vomitings, all other non-hematological adverse events were grade 2 or below (Table 3).

CT results

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

Postoperative complication

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

Postoperative pathology

Nine patients had R0 resection. The median number of examined lymph nodes was 28 , eight patients were classified as stage III according to ypTNM. One patient had complete tumor regression (TRG 1a), two patients had sub-total tumor regression (Table 6).

Adjuvant chemotherapy

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Follow up

All the 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 sign of relapse at the last follow-up time. One patient had a relapse of peritoneal and ovary metastases after eight months of first chemotherapy and still undergoing chemotherapy treatment. Thus, 8 patients achieved overall survival (OS) and 7 patients achieved relapse-free survival (RFS) for this follow-up time. Two patients died, one of them died of retroperitoneal metastases, OS time was 26 months and RFS time was 6 months for this case. Another patient died of peritoneal metastases and Krukenberg Tumor, OS time was 10.6 months and RFS time was about 6 months (table 8).

Discussion

The preliminary results of two RCT trials (RESOLVE, RESONANCE) in China suggest that perioperative SOX regimen can benefit patients in terms of R0 resectability, TRG, ypTNM, pCR, and 3y-DFS compared with the control group [23, 24] FLOT-4 study recently reports that in patients with gastric cancer, perioperative chemotherapy with 5-fluorouracil, leucovorin, oxaliplatin and docetaxel (FLOT regimen) increases survival over standard ECF/ECX regimen (epirubicin, cisplatin, and 5-fluorouracil [or capecitabine]). But as for our knowledge, there was no study comparing the doublet chemotherapy SOX with the triplet chemotherapy FLOTDespite many presumptions on the toxic adverse effects, the FLOT regimen was feasible in this cohort as most of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

patients tolerated the standard dose of the FLOT regimen, it may be due to the well-balanced dose combination of the FLOT regimen which is different from other combinations [9, 16]. All the 4 cycles with a full dose of neoadjuvant chemotherapy were completed in 8 patients. And 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 quite acceptable for triplet chemotherapy. None of the patients discontinued chemotherapy for adverse events.

The postoperative morbidities were acceptable for a radical gastrectomy comparing to previously reported results [27, 28]. There was no death and anastomotic leak or reoperation due to postoperative complications, which are the main concerns of the surgeons, especially for the patients who had neoadjuvant chemotherapy.

The postoperative pathology findings confirmed that the majority of cases were quite an advanced-stage adenocarcinoma; eight patients were pathologically confirmed as stage III on ypTNM staging. Previewing the pre-chemotherapy clinical stage, we found that all the tumors were T4a or T4b, and lymph nodes were positive on CT diagnosis. After chemotherapy, the restaging showed that there was down-staging in four cases, by the RECIST criteria. And there was no progressive disease. Which means all patients achieved the disease control. Pathological results showed that 9 of 10 patients achieved R0

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

resection and the pathological tumor regression was observed in 6 patients, including one patient who had a complete response. TRG results were comparable with that reported in FLOT 4[16], however, this is a quite small number of patients, and this result needs to be re-evaluated on a larger cohort. The completion rate of full-dose neoadjuvant chemotherapy was comparable with FLOT 4 research [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 FLOT regimen despite completing all four adjuvant chemotherapy cycles. Even in FLOT 4 study, less than half of the patients completed all 8 cycles of chemotherapies[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 the preliminary reports on the OS and DFS. Though two years' duration was not long enough to have any comparison with the previous reports, nonetheless the present survival result was not poor for this cohort, because the majority of cases(8 cases) were very late stage on postoperative pathological findings(ypTNM stage III).

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that neoadjuvant chemotherapy with the FLOT

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

regimen is safe for gastric cancer patients in China. Chemotherapy dose and interval time between two chemotherapies need to be adjusted for postoperative treatment. The pathological regression and survival rate were comparable but it should be further evaluated in a larger cohort. The results of this study pave the way for further studies in Asian countries.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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. 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.

26. 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.

27. 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.

28. Sah BK, Chen MM, Yan M, Zhu ZG. Reoperation for early postoperative

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

complications after gastric cancer surgery in a Chinese hospital. World J Gastroenterol. 2010 Jan 7; 16(1):98-103.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

TRG	1A	1
	1B	2
	2	3
	3	4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted June 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

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