medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Original article

Dragon III- Phase 1: Feasibility and safety of neoadjuvant chemotherapy with fluorouracil plus leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel (FLOT) for locally-advanced gastric cancer patients in China

*Sah Birendra Kumar, Xu Wei, Zhang Benyan, Zhang Huan, Yuan Fei, Li Jian, Liu Wentao, Chao Yan, *Li Chen, Yan Min, *Zhu Zhenggang

Running title: Neoadjuvant FLOT 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NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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 July 30, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

Xu Wei, MD/Ph D (Co-first author)

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Zhang Benyan, MD

Department of Pathology

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Zhang Huan, MD/Ph D

Department of Radiology

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Yuan Fei, MD/Ph D

Department of Pathology

Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Liu Wentao, MD/Ph D

Department of General Surgery, Gastrointestinal Surgery Unit

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 Jian, MD/Ph D

Clinical Research Center

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 Zhenggang, 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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Neoadjuvant 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 FLOT regimen in Chinese patients.

Methods: Patients with adenocarcinoma of the stomach or esophagogastric junction 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.

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. All 10 patients underwent radical gastrectomy. 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

endpoint, and 7 patients had relapse-free survival for this period. Two patients died of disease progression.

Conclusions: Our study demonstrates that the neoadjuvant 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.

The trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (number NCT03646591).

Keywords: gastric cancer; neoadjuvant chemotherapy; FLOT regimen

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 infusional 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(3-6). Even if NAC was safe in Japanese patients, its effect on survival was not clearly justified (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(3-6, 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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(11-13). Adjuvant chemotherapy was mainly dominated by platinum-based doublet chemotherapy. Oral capecitabine and cisplatin or oxaliplatin are common adjuvant chemotherapy agents in Eastern countries (11, 13). On the other hand, German scientists published a series of clinical studies on neoadjuvant chemotherapy with taxane-based chemotherapy (14-16). 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. Zhou et al. investigated and recommended a modified FLOT regimen; however, this study lacks the evidence to support this modified regimen (20). 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

regimen for Chinese patients. In our study, we strictly adhered to the FLOT regimen as described by the original investigators (16).

Methods

This is a phase I, open-label, single-arm prospective 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. The trial is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT03646591.

Inclusion criteria

Age: 18-80 years old.

Sex: all.

Diagnosis: histologically-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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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.

Second malignant 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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(21).

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. 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.

Pathological assessment

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(22). Two specialized pathologists independently rated the TRG grading.

Endpoints

Primary Outcome Measure:

Completion rate of the preoperative FLOT regimen

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 any cause

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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. The median time was approximately 21 days between two chemotherapies. 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).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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, 8 patients were still alive; among them, 7 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) at the median follow up time of 23.13 months.. 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).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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(23, 24). 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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Cunningham D, Allum WH, Stenning SP, Thompson JN, Van de Velde CJ, Nicolson M, et al. Perioperative chemotherapy versus surgery alone for resectable gastroesophageal cancer. N Engl J Med. 2006;355(1):11-20.

2. Schuhmacher C, Gretschel S, Lordick F, Reichardt P, Hohenberger W, Eisenberger CF, 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;28(35):5210-8.

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

4. Iwasaki Y, Sasako M, Yamamoto S, Nakamura K, Sano T, Katai H, et al. Phase II study of preoperative 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;107(7):741-5.

5. Katayama H, Tsuburaya A, Mizusawa J, Nakamura K, Katai H, Imamura 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;22(6):1301-7.

6. Terashima M, Iwasaki Y, Mizusawa J, Katayama H, Nakamura K, Katai H, et al. Randomized phase III trial of gastrectomy with or without neoadjuvant

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 (JCOG0501). Gastric Cancer. 2019;22(5):1044-52.

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

8. Eto K, Hiki N, Kumagai K, Shoji Y, Tsuda Y, Kano Y, et al. Prophylactic effect of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in gastric cancer patients with postoperative complications. Gastric Cancer. 2018;21(4):703-9.

9. Ito S, Sano T, Mizusawa J, Takahari D, Katayama H, Katai H, et al. A phase II study of preoperative chemotherapy with docetaxel, cisplatin, and S-1 followed by gastrectomy with D2 plus para-aortic lymph node dissection for gastric cancer with extensive lymph node metastasis: JCOG1002. Gastric Cancer. 2017;20(2):322-31.

10. Group G, Paoletti X, Oba K, Burzykowski T, Michiels S, Ohashi Y, et al. Benefit of adjuvant chemotherapy for resectable gastric cancer: a meta-analysis. JAMA. 2010;303(17):1729-37.

11. Bang YJ, Kim YW, Yang HK, Chung HC, Park YK, Lee KH, et al. Adjuvant capecitabine and oxaliplatin for gastric cancer after D2 gastrectomy (CLASSIC): a phase 3 open-label, randomised controlled trial. Lancet. 2012;379(9813):315-21.

12. Lee J, Lim DH, Kim S, Park SH, Park JO, Park YS, et al. Phase III trial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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;30(3):268-73.

13. Noh SH, Park SR, Yang HK, Chung HC, Chung IJ, Kim SW, 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;15(12):1389-96.

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

15. Ronellenfitsch U, Schwarzbach M, Hofheinz R, Kienle P, Kieser M, Slanger TE, 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(5):CD008107.

16. Al-Batran SE, Hofheinz RD, Pauligk C, Kopp HG, Haag GM, Luley KB, 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): results from the phase 2 part of a multicentre, open-label, randomised phase 2/3 trial. Lancet Oncol. 2016;17(12):1697-708.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

17. Al-Batran SE, Homann N, Pauligk C, Goetze TO, Meiler J, Kasper S, 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 adenocarcinoma (FLOT4): a randomised, phase 2/3 trial. Lancet. 2019;393(10184):1948-57.

18. Coccolini F, Nardi M, Montori G, Ceresoli M, Celotti A, Cascinu S, et al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced gastric and esophago-gastric cancer. Meta-analysis of randomized trials. Int J Surg. 2018;51:120-7.

19. Fazio N, Biffi R, Maibach R, Hayoz S, Thierstein S, Brauchli P, 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;27(4):668-73.

20. Zhou C, Ma T, Shi M, Xi W, Wu J, 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 Chemother Pharmacol. 2020;85(1):113-9.

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

22. Becker K, Mueller JD, Schulmacher C, Ott K, Fink U, Busch R, et al. Histomorphology and grading of regression in gastric carcinoma treated with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Cancer. 2003;98(7):1521-30.

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

24. 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;16(1):98-103.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 1 Demographic data

Parameter		Number
Sex	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
Prechemotherapy time interval (days)	1st-2nd chemo	15(14-18)
Median (range)	2nd-3rd chemo	15(14-20)
	3rd-4th chemo	15(11-17)
Postchemotherapy time interval (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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2 Preoperative chemotherapy 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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 4 Computed tomography (CT) results

Parameter		Number
Prechemotherapy tumor(T)	T4A	7
	T4B	3
Prechemotherapy lymph node(N)	N1	5
	N2	5
Postchemotherapy tumor(T)	T3	2
	T4A	7
	T4B	1
Postchemotherapy 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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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
Vessel 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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

TRG	1A	1
	1B	2
	2	3
	3	4

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668; this version posted July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 7 Postoperative chemotherapy dose alteration

Case	1st Chemo	2ndChemo	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 July 30, 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. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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