Original article

Dragon III: Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy FLOT versus SOX for Gastric Cancer

*[1]Birendra Kumar Sah, [2] Benyan Zhang, [3]Huan Zhang , [4]Jian Li, [1] Wei Xu, [5]Tao Ma, [5]Min Shi, [3]Lan Wang, [1]Zhenglun Zhu, [1]Yanan Zheng, [1]Zhongyin Yang, [1]Wentao Liu, [1]Runhua Feng, [2]Fei Yuan, *[1]Chen Li, [1]Bingya Liu, [1]Min Yan, *[1] Zhenggang Zhu

***Corresponding authors**

1 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

2 Department of Pathology

Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

3 Department of Radiology

Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

4 Clinical Research Center

Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

5 Department of Medical Oncology

Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine

Running title: Neoadjuvant FLOT versus SOX for Gastric Cancer

Abstract

Background: Despite of growing trends there is no consensus on types of drug for neoadjuvant chemotherapy in gastric cancer, especially between East and West. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with docetaxel, oxaliplatin, fluorouracil and Leucovorin (FLOT) regimen has showed promising results in terms of pathological response and survival rate. However, S1 or TGO plus oxaliplatin (SOX) is more favorable chemotherapy regimen in eastern countries. We conducted this study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of both regimens.

Methods: This is a prospective, open label, randomized controlled trial. Patients with locally advanced gastric cancer were 1 :1 randomized to FLOT or SOX group. Patients in FLOT group received 4 cycles of FLOT chemotherapy and the patients in SOX group received 3 cycles of TGO plus oxaliplatin prior to curative gastrectomy. The primary endpoint was the comparison of complete or sub-total tumor regression grading (TRG1a+ TRG1b) in the primary tumour.

Results: Altogether 74 cases enrolled between August 2018 and March 2020, all 74 randomly assigned cases were considered as intention-to-treat (ITT) population and the 55 patients who completed the planned chemotherapy and surgery were considered as per protocol (PP) population. There was no significant difference in pre-treatment clinical parameters between two groups ($p>0.05$). There was no significant difference of adverse effects or postoperative morbidity and mortality between two groups ($p>0.05$). Similarly,

there was no significant difference in proportion of tumor regression grading between two groups ($p>0.05$). In ITT population, complete or sub-total TRG was 20.0 percent in FLOT versus 32.4 percent in SOX group ($p>0.05$).

Conclusions: Our study demonstrates that FLOT and SOX regimens were safe in terms of toxicity and postoperative morbidity. Both regimens were similarly effective for gastric cancer patients in terms of pathological response. A large scale phase 3 randomized controlled trial is necessary for the validation of this result.

Key words: Gastric cancer, neoadjuvant chemotherapy, FLOT, SOX

Background

In the field of gastric cancer, probably the most debatable issue is the treatment of locally advanced gastric cancer. There are considerable contagious issues that were not addressed in the past and probably very difficult to have common consensus due to the highly heterogeneous nature of this disease. Several trials have been done for different treatment modalities, e.g., whether surgery alone or adjuvant chemotherapy followed by surgery or neoadjuvant chemotherapy (1, 2,). Similarly, there have been good trials on the role of chemoradiotherapy for advanced stage gastric cancer (3,4, 5).However, despite disagreements, there are growing trends for neoadjuvant chemotherapy after the milestone publication of MAGIC trial in 2006, and recently it was even supported in Asian countries (1,6,7,8,9). And recent studies have shown that neoadjuvant chemotherapy is well tolerated and did not influence postoperative morbidity or mortality in gastric cancer patients even in Japan (10).

Recent large scale German studies clearly showed the superiority of neoadjuvant docetaxel, oxaliplatin, fluorouracil and Leucovorin (FLOT) over epirubicin, cisplatin, and fluorouracil or capecitabine (ECF or ECX) in terms of pathological response and overall survival (11, 12). FLOT regimen is not a common chemotherapy in China, however, there were published study which clearly shows that the modified or standard FLOT regimen is safe and effective in Chinese patients (13,14). Probably taxane based triplet chemotherapy was

considered more toxic in past, therefore doublet chemotherapy with the S1 or TGO is a mainstream adjuvant chemotherapy in Asian countries and few studies suggested S1 plus platinum-based chemotherapy as neoadjuvant chemotherapy for locally advanced gastric cancer, especially with bulky lymph nodes (15, 16,17). In recent years, several studies on perioperative chemotherapy for patients with locally advanced gastric cancer (LAGC) have been carried out in East Asian countries, among them, preliminary results of two large scale 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 (18,19). We found no previous study that comapred the efficacy of doublet chemo regimen SOX with triplet chemo regimen FLOT. For patients undergoing neoadjuvant chemotherapy, the pathological response rate or tumor regression grading is considered as one of the major factors which influence the overall survival (20, 21). Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to compare the tumor regression after neoadjuvant chemotherapy between two groups.

Methods

Dragon III trial is an investigator-initiated, phase II, open-label, randomized controlled trial. All the patients were enrolled between August 2018 and March 2020 at Ruijin Hospital Shanghai Jiaotong University School of medicine. The trial is prospectively registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, number NCT03636893

Inclusion criteria

A written informed consent from patient

Sex: Any

Age: 18-80 years old

Histology confirmed adenocarcinoma

Non-obstructive tumor of the stomach or esophagogastric junction

Clinical stage: cTNM: cT3-4bN1-3M0

Performance status: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG ≤ 2)

Adequate hematological function, liver function, renal function

Adequate heart and pulmonary function

Exclusion criteria

Acute infectious diseases

Uncontrolled systemic disease or comorbidities

Confirmed or highly suspicious distant metastases

Confirmed or highly suspicious retroperitoneal lymph node metastases

Locally invaded irresectable tumors

Recurrent gastric cancer

Malignant secondary disease

Prior chemo or radiotherapy

Inclusion in another clinical trial

Known contraindications or hypersensitivity to drugs used for FLOT or SOX chemotherapy

Drop out

Protocol violation

Unable to complete planned chemotherapy or surgery for any reason

Refusal to perform surgery at the same hospital

Withdrawn by the participant for any reason

Ethics

The study was done according to the Declaration of Helsinki and Good Clinical Practice Guidelines as defined by the International Conference on Harmonisation. The institutional review board of the Ruijin Hospital approved the study protocol and patients gave written informed consent for planned treatment. The study was conducted and analyzed by Unit III of the Gastrointestinal department at the Ruijin Hospital. This study was monitored by the Clinical Research Center of the Ruijin hospital (Official body responsible to guide and monitor all types of research in the hospital), a timely meeting was performed to check the implementation of protocol guidelines.

Randomization

Patients were 1:1 randomized to FLOT or SOX group. A masked statistician at the Clinical Research Center of the hospital was responsible for randomization. The randomization sequence was generated with SPSS software and labeled with random names for two groups. The assignment was made by telephone contact or text messages after the patient met the inclusion criteria and signed the informed consent.

Pre-treatment assessment

We reviewed all clinical results before assignmemt of randomized allocation.All Patients completed all the routine tests included but not limited to following:

1. complete blood count, liver and renal function test, clotting analysis, serum tumor markers.
2. Electrocardiography, echocardiography, plain chest film.
3. upper gastrointestinal endoscopy.
4. Enhanced computed tomography of the chest, abdomen and pelvis. CT examination included arterial, venous, and portal phase. CT images consisted transverse sagittal and coronary section.
5. For suspicious distant metastases, supraclavicular lymh node or retroperitoneal lymph nodes on CT, we performed ultrasound test or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI)
6. Patients underwent bone scintigraphy or positron emission tomography (PET) in suspicious lesions on CT examination.
7. Finally, the diagnosis of peritoneal metastases was done by exploratory laparoscopy .
8. For clinical staging of the disease, we followed eighth edition of tumor–node–metastasis (TNM) classification, issued by International Union against Cancer (UICC)

Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy

After randomization patients were transferred to the department of medical oncology for chemotherapy, a standard protocol for chemotherapy was

circulated and timely inspection was performed by investigators and Clinical Research Center to evaluate the implementation of the protocol. Antiemetic drugs with dexamethasone were administered intravenously before chemotherapy. Other supportive drugs including granulocyte colony stimulating factor were given for treatment purpose only. Surgical intervention was allowed for emergency situation, e.g. acute upper gastrointestinal bleeding or perforation.

Patients in the FLOT group received at least four cycles of the standard dose of FLOT chemotherapy and the patients in the SOX group received at least three cycles of a standard dose of TGO plus oxaliplatin before curative gastrectomy.

A cycle of Neoadjuvant FLOT

Day 1: Intravenous 5-FU 2600mg/M2

Via peripherally inserted central catheter (PICC) continued for 24 hour

Day 1:Intravenous leucovorin 200mg/M2

Day 1:Intravenous oxaliplatin 85mg/ M2

Day 1: Intravenous docetaxel 50mg/M2

Next chemotherapy was repeated on 15th day

A cycle of Neoadjuvant SOX

Day 1: Intravenous oxaliplatin 130mg/M2

Day 1-14: Oral tegafur gimeracil oteracil potassium capsule(TGO) 80mg/M2 twice/day

Next chemotherapy was repeated on 21st day.

Evaluation of adverse effects

Adverse effects were recorded according to National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE 4.0). In the events of grade three and above adeverse effects, dose adjustment or timing was extended for next chemotherapy. Patients with progressive disease were allowed for alteration of treatment. Patients were allowed for withdrawal due to any reason.

Restaging

We followed the Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST version 1.1) guidelines for comparison of radiological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy between two groups (22). Criteria for response were as follow:

“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."

Evaluated of the response rate was evaluated by two specialized radiologists independently.

Surgery

Patients undersent surgical resection between two to four weeks after completion of the neoadjuvant chemotherapy in any group. An exploratory laparoscopic was performed to rule out peritoneal or distant metastases. Experienced surgeons for gastric cancer were trained for implementation of study protocol. Surgeons followed Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines, in general partial or total gastrectomy with D2 lymphadenectomy was performed. Patients with adjacent involved organ underwent combined resection along with gastrectomy if deemed necessary for R0 resection and these patients were documented separately. Proximal Distal gastrectomy with Billroth I gastroduodenostomy or Billroth II gastrojejunostomy with Braun anastomosis or Uncut Roux-Y gastrojejunostomy or Roux-Y gastrojejunostomy was performed for the tumors located at antrum or lower part of the stomach body. Total gastrectomy with Roux-en-Y esophagojejunostomy was performed for the proximal tumors. The extent of the surgery was documented to state whether the procedure was curative or

non-curative intent according to the definition stated in Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines.

Pathological assessment

Pathologists were masked for the allocation types of neoadjuvant chemotherapy. After formalin fixation and paraffin embedding, pathologists performed immunohistochemical examination of all resected specimens. Routine examination included for types of tumor, depth of tumor invasion, involved lymph nodes, resection margins, invasion of nerve, lympathetic or blood vessel. Resection or R status nominated for curative(R0)resection or non curative (R1 andR2) resection. Pathological examinations also included following: measurement of the macroscopically identifiable residual tumor and/or scarring indicating the site of the previous tumor bed. Two specialized pathologists followed the Becker criteria for the tumor regression grading (TRG) (20). Any conflicting results were settled after re-examination and discussion among both pathologists and investigators.

Tumor regression grade (TRG), Becker criteria

"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

Total percentage of patients with pathological complete tumor regression (TRG1a) and sub-total tumor regression (TRG1b) in the primary tumor

Secondary Outcome Measures:

Overall survival (OS): Time from randomization to death from any cause.

Relapse-free survival (RFS): Time from randomization to relapse of the tumor.

Sample size

This is an exploratory study. The sample size was estimated empirically.

Data analysis and cut off time

Data analysis cut off time was set after completion of surgery of the 55th patient who met the criteria for per-protocol (PP) analysis.

Statistical analysis

The primary endpoint was analyzed in the intention- to- treat (ITT) population, defined as the patients who were randomly assigned to a treatment. Postoperative morbidity and mortality were analyzed in the per-protocol (PP) population, that is the number of patients who had surgery after completion of neoadjuvant chemotherapy. Comparisons of other factors except primary endpoint were posthoc analyses. The statistical analysis was performed with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22.0 for Windows (SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois). Nonparametric methods were used to test the data with an abnormal distribution. The continuous data are described as median and range. The categorical data are expressed as frequency and rate. A chi-square test or Fisher's exact test was used to compare the differences in

rate between the two groups. All p-values presented are two-sided， a *p*-value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant. This study is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov, Identifier: NCT03636893.

Results

Altogether 74 patients (40 patients in the FLOT group and 34 patients in the SOX group) were enrolled in the Dragon III research. 9 cases in the FLOT group and 10 cases in SOX were dropped out for different reasons (Fig.1). Finally, 55 cases completed the planned chemotherapy and underwent surgical resection. All 74 randomly assigned cases were considered as the ITT population and 55 patients who had surgery were considered as PP population.

Clinical demographic

Clinical demographic of the ITT populations are described in Table 2, no significant difference was observed in all clinical parameters between two groups including age, sex, BMI (Table 1, $p>0.05$). In the PP population, there was no significant difference in terms of site of the tumor, types of resection. Approximately one-third of patients in each group had tumors at the proximal part of the stomach, all patients underwent D2 lymphadenectomy, and approximately 60 percent of patients in each group underwent total gastrectomy. One patient in each group underwent pancreatoduodenectomy due to local invasion.

Adverse effects

All patients completed three cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in the SOX group. Three cases (9.7%) of the FLOT group had more than four cycles of chemotherapy (5, 6, 8 cycles respectively); the remaining 90.3 percent of patients had four cycles of chemotherapy before surgery. Both the FLOT and SOX regimens were well tolerated. There was no significant difference in chemotherapy-related hematological or non-hematological adverse effects between the two groups (Table 2, $p>0.05$). Most of the patients had decreased WBC or decreased neutrophil count below grade 3. Rare cases of grade 3 or 4 hematological disorders were observed in both groups. Similarly, most of the non-hematological adverse events were below grade 3.

Radiological response

The pre-treatment clinical stage was approximately similar in both groups (Table 3). There was no difference in the cTNM stage between two groups, 41.9 percent versus 37.5 percent cases were diagnosed as stage IVA for FLOT and SOX group respectively. There was no significant difference concerning the radiological response rate between the two groups. In ITT population, the disease control rate (PR+SD) rate was comparable between FLOT group (75.0%) and SOX group(67.6%) , Overall response rate (ORR) was 55.0% in FLOT group versus 41.2% in SOX group (Table 3, $p>0.05$).

Pathological response

Among the PP population, there was no significant difference in any pathological factors (Table 4, $p>0.05$). Patients in both groups had favorable

margin free resection, 87.1 percent in FLOT group, and 100.0 percent in the SOX group. Lauren's classification shows that 58.1 percent in the FLOT group and 54.2 percent in the SOX group were Intestinal types. The proportion of T4a tumor and N2 lymph node was relatively higher in FLOT group comparing to SOX group, a greater portion of stage III postoperative tumor (ypTNM) was observed in FLOT group than SOX group (54.8 percent versus 45.8 percent) but there was no significant difference between two groups. Overall pathological response (TRG grade 1a+1b+2) rate was 67.7 percent in FLOT versus 75 percent in the SOX group (Table 4, $p>0.05$). In the ITT population, the complete or sub-total TRG was 20 percent in the FLOT group and 32.4 percent in the SOX group, yet there was no significant difference between the two groups ($p>0.05$).

Postoperative morbidity

There was no significant difference in the postoperative stay at the hospital between two groups, the median length of stay was approximately 9 days in both groups. There was no significant difference in overall postoperative morbidity between the two groups (Table 5, $p>0.05$). Two (6.5 percent) anastomotic leakage was observed in the FLOT group and 1(4.2 percent) in the SOX group. One patient underwent reoperation for intrabdominal hemorrhage in the SOX group. There was no death due to postoperative complications in any group.

Discussion

We did not calculate the sample number because there was no good quality paper on tumor regression grading of SOX regimen, we only had the results of FLOT4 (11). Probably this was the most important demerit of this study. The number of participants was empirically estimated to obtain preliminary results, and initially, 60 patients were expected to get enrolled for the analysis but there were a substantial number of drop-out cases. Because the primary endpoint of our study was to compare the pathological regression, the cut off time was set after the surgery of the 55th patient; cut-off time was set after discussion among investigators and statisticians, without knowing pathological results. Finally, 74 patients were enrolled.

There was no difference in both group in terms of adverse effects and postoperative morbidity.Thus, this study further validated our previous study that the neoadjuvant chemotherapy with FLOT regimen is safe in Chinese patients (14). Despite less number of patients in the study, the demographic data shows that patients in both groups were well balanced by randomized assignment. The univariate analysis of the whole data suggested that TRG was associated with sex, nerve invasion, vessel invasion, and postoperative pathological stage. But there was no difference between any of these factors between the two groups (Table 6). These data suggest that these known factors which might have a role for a pathological response did not influence the result of this study.

There was a conflicting result of the radiological response rate with that of pathological results, which shows that a greater proportion of ORR was seen in the FLOT group comparing to the SOX group. Though there was no significant difference in terms of statistics, the result demands further clarification. We therefore further analyzed the data according to the stratification of pretreatment clinical staging and postoperative pathological TNM staging. Still, there was no significant difference in terms of TRG, and the proportion of complete or sub-total TRG was still higher in the SOX group.

The result of this study with no way challenges the results of the milestone study in the field of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for gastric cancer, the FLOT4 trial(11), but it perhaps gives some insights for further trials because as per our knowledge there was no previous study which compares the famous SOX regimen with the FLOT regimen. The higher proportion of complete or sub-total TRG in the SOX group cannot claim superiority over the FLOT group because there was no significant difference in terms of statistical calculation. This might have simply caused by the inadequate sample numbers or biased by the significant number of drop-out patients. However, at the very least the result of this study urges for the need for further large scale multicenter randomized trials. We may assume hypothetically that the heterogeneity was caused by the racial difference, and maybe FLOT was not that effective in Chinese patients as it reported in German patients because the proportion of complete or sub-total TRG in our study was less than the result of FLOT 4 trial.

Approximately 16 percent of patients achieved complete pathological response and 37 percent of patients achieved complete or sub-total TRG in FLOT, but we only have 20% of complete or sub-total TRG. Even if we do not compare the result with the SOX group, this result was almost half of that was observed in FLOT 4 study. In contrary to that the complete or sub-total TRG of SOX group was 32.4 percent and it was comparable to the result of FLOT 4.

Conclusion

Our study demonstrates that neoadjuvant chemotherapy with FLOT and SOX regimens were safe and similarly effective for gastric cancer patients in terms of pathological response. The result for disease-free survival and overall survival are still awaited. Due to a lack of an adequate number of samples this study failed to obtain a definitive answer on the superiority of any regime. A large scale phase 3 multicenter randomized controlled trial is necessary for the validation of this result.

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. 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

3. van Hagen P, Hulshof MC, van Lanschot JJ, Steyerberg EW, van Berge Henegouwen MI, et al. Preoperative Chemoradiotherapy for Esophageal or Junctional Cancer. N Engl J Med. 2012 May 31;366(22):2074-84.

4. Se Hoon Park, Tae Sung Sohn, Jeeyun Lee, Do Hoon Lim, Min Eui Hong, et al. Phase III Trial to Compare Adjuvant Chemotherapy With Capecitabine and Cisplatin Versus Concurrent Chemoradiotherapy in Gastric Cancer: Final Report of the Adjuvant Chemoradiotherapy in Stomach Tumors Trial, Including Survival and Subset Analyses. J Clin Oncol. 2015 Oct 1;33(28):3130-6

5. Fuchs CS, Niedzwiecki D, Mamon HJ, Tepper JE, Ye X, et al. Adjuvant Chemoradiotherapy With Epirubicin, Cisplatin, and Fluorouracil Compared With Adjuvant Chemoradiotherapy With Fluorouracil and Leucovorin After Curative Resection of Gastric Cancer: Results From CALGB 80101 (Alliance).

J Clin Oncol. 2017 Nov 10;35(32):3671-3677.

6. Li W, Qin J, Sun YH, Liu TS. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for advanced gastric cancer: a meta-analysis. World J Gastroenterol. 2010 Nov 28;16(44):5621-8.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. Hiroshi Katayama, Akira Tsuburaya , Junki Mizusawa , Kenichi Nakamura , Hitoshi Katai, 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

11. 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

12. 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.

13. 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

14. Sah BK, Zhang BY, Zhang H, Yan C, Li C ,et.al. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with fluorouracil plus leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel (FLOT) for gastric cancer patients in China. medRxiv 2020.05.22.20110668; doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.05.22.20110668

15. Gun Min Kim , Hei-Cheul Jeung, Sun Young Rha, Hyo Song Kim, Inkyung Jung, et al. A Randomized Phase II Trial of S-1-oxaliplatin Versus Capecitabine-Oxaliplatin in Advanced Gastric Cancer. Eur J Cancer. 2012 Mar;48(4):518-26.

16. Y Yamada , K Higuchi , K Nishikawa , M Gotoh, N Fuse, et al. Phase III Study Comparing Oxaliplatin Plus S-1 With Cisplatin Plus S-1 in chemotherapy-naïve Patients With Advanced Gastric Cancer. Ann Oncol. 2015 Jan; 26(1):141-8.

17. Hironaga Satake, Akira Miki , Masato Kondo, Takeshi Kotake , Yoshihiro Okita, et al. Phase I study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy with S-1 and oxaliplatin for locally advanced gastric cancer (Neo G-SOX PI). ESMO Open. 2017 Mar 9;2(1):e000130

18. 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

19. 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

20. 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.

21. G Tomasello [1], F Petrelli [2], M Ghidini [1], E Pezzica [3], R Passalacqua, et al. Tumor Regression Grade and Survival After Neoadjuvant Treatment in

Gastro-Esophageal Cancer: A Meta-Analysis of 17 Published Studies. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2017 Sep;43(9):1607-1616.

22. 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.

23. Japanese Gastric Cancer Association.Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines 2014 (ver. 4). Gastric Cancer (2017) 20:1–19

Table 1 Demographic data

Parameter		FLOT	SOX	P-Value
Sex	Male	29(72.5)	21(61.8)	0.326
	Female	11(27.5)	13(38.2)	
Age (Years)	Median	67	61	0.155
	Range	27-76	34-80	
Body mass index	Median	23.41	23.18	0.888
	Range	15.69-29.48	17.31-27.82	
Tumor site (PP)	Proximal	7(22.6)	7(29.2)	0.528
	Proximal-body	3(9.7)	1(4.2)	
	Body	7(22.6)	3(12.5)	
	Distal-body	6(19.4)	5(20.8)	
	Distal	8(25.8)	6(25.0)	
	Total	0	2(8.3)	
Resection type (PP)	Partial	13(41.9)	9(37.5)	0.739
	Total	18(58.1)	15(62.5)	

Analysis of intention to treat (ITT) population except otherwise indicated

2. Adverse effects

Parameter		FLOT	SOX
WBC decreased	Grade 0,1,2	30(96.8)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	1(3.2)	0
Neutrophil count decreased	Grade 0,1,2	29(93.5)	22(91.7)
	Grade 3,4	2(6.5)	2(8.3)
Febrile neutropenia	Grade 0,1,2	31(100.0)	23(95.8)
	Grade 3,4	0	1(4.2)
Anemia	Grade 0,1,2	27(87.1)	22(91.7)
	Grade 3,4	4(12.9)	2(8.3)
Platelet count decreased	Grade 0,1,2	30(96.8)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	1(3.2)	0
Aminotrasferase increased	Grade 0,1,2	30(96.8)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	1(3.2)	0
Nausea	Grade 0,1,2	30(96.8)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	1(3.2)	0
Vomiting	Grade 0,1,2	30(96.8)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	1(3.2)	0
Diarrhea	Grade 0,1,2	31(100.0)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	0	0
Peripheral neuropathy	Grade 0,1,2	31(100.0)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	0	0

Fatigue	Grade 0,1,2	31(100.0)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	0	0
Anorexia	Grade 0,1,2	30(96.8)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	1(3.2)	0
Oral mucositis	Grade 0,1,2	31(100.0)	24(100.0)
	Grade 3,4	0	0

Analysis of PP population except otherwise indicated

3. Comparison of CT results between Pre-NAC and Post-NAC

Parameter		FLOT	SOX	P-value
Depth of invasion (Pre-NAC)	T4A	18(58.1)	15(62.5)	0.739
	T4B	13(41.9)	9(37.5)	
Lymph node (Pre-NAC)	N0	1(3.2)	3(12.5)	0.169
	N1	4(12.9)	5(20.8)	
	N2	23(74.2)	11(45.8)	
	N3	3(9.7)	5(20.8)	
TNM stage (Pre-NAC)	IIB	1(3.2)	3(12.5)	0.422
	III	17(54.8)	12(50.0)	
	IVA	13(41.9)	9(37.5)	
Depth of invasion (Post-NAC)	T1	1(3.2)	1(4.2)	0.430
	T2	9(29.0)	10(41.7)	
	T3	13(41.9)	5(20.8)	
	T4A	8(25.8)	8(33.3)	
Lymph node (Post-NAC)	N0	4(12.9)	7(29.2)	0.227
	N1	12(38.7)	9(37.5)	
	N2	15(48.4)	7(29.2)	
	N3	0	1(4.2)	
TNM stage (Post-NAC)	I	3(9.7)	5(20.8)	0.444

	IIA	7(22.6)	6(25.0)	
	IIB	1(3.2)	2(8.3)	
	III	20(64.5)	11(45.8)	
Response rate	PR	22(71.0)	14(58.3)	0.618
	SD	8(25.8)	9(37.5)	
	PD	1(3.2)	1(4.2)	
Overall response rate (ITT population)		22(55.0)	14(41.2)	0.236
Disease control rate (ITT population)		30(75.0)	23(67.6)	0.484

Analysis of PP population except otherwise indicated

4. Comparison of postoperative pathological results between two groups

Parameter		FLOT	SOX	P-value
Lauren's classification	Intestinal	18 (58.1)	13(54.2)	0.314
	Diffuse	7 (22.6)	6 (25.0)	
	Mixed	3 (9.7)	5 (20.8)	
	Unclassifiable	3 (9.7)	0	
Resection	R0	27(87.1)	24(100.0)	0.123
	R1	4(12.9)	0	
Nerve invasion	Negative	16(51.6)	14(58.3)	0.620
	Positive	15(48.4)	10(41.7)	
Vessels invasion	Negative	25(80.6)	17(70.8)	0.396
	Positive	6(19.4)	7(29.2)	
Tumor	Unclassifiable	1(3.2)	0	0.856
	T1A	1(3.2)	1(4.2)	
	T1B	1(3.2)	1(4.2)	
	T2	2(6.5)	3(12.5)	
	T3	19(61.3)	16(66.7)	
	T4A	6(19.4)	2(8.3)	
	T4B	1(3.2)	1(4.2)	
Lymph node	N0	10(32.3)	9(37.5)	0.661
	N1	4(12.9)	3(12.5)	

	N2	10(32.3)	5(20.8)	
	N3A	6(19.4)	4(16.7)	
	N3B	1(3.2)	3(12.5)	
YpTNM	I	3(9.7)	3(12.5)	0.799
	II	11(35.5)	10(41.7)	
	III	17(54.8)	11(45.8)	
TRG	1A	1(3.2)	0	0.277
	1B	7(22.6)	11(45.8)	
	2	13(41.9)	7(29.2)	
	3	10(32.3)	6(25.0)	
Pathological regression in ITT	Complete or sub-total	8(20)	11(32.4)	0.225

Analysis of PP population except otherwise indicated

5. Table Postoperative complications PP population

Complication	Number of patients		p value
	FLOT	SOX	
Overall complications	9(29.0)	8(33.3)	0.732
Abdominal complication	7(22.6)	5(20.8)	0.876
Intra-abdominal hemorrhage	0	1(4.2)	0.436
Superficial wound dehiscence	0	1(4.2)	0.436
Pulmonary Infection	2(6.5)	1(4.2)	1.000
Abdominal Infection	4(12.9)	2(8.3)	0.686
Anastomotic leakage	2(6.5)	1(4.2)	1.000
Pancreatic fistula	0	1(4.2)	0.436
Impaired renal function	1(3.2)	0	1.000
Cardiac/respiratory failure	0	1(4.2)	0.436
Readmission	1(3.2)	1(4.2)	1.000
Reoperation	0	1(4.2)	0.436
Death	0	0	NA

Analysis of PP population except otherwise indicated

Table 6 Complete or sub-total tumor regression

		Complete or sub-total tumor regression		
Stage type	Stage	FLOT	SOX	P VALUE
cTNM	IIB	1/1(100.0)	1/3(33.3)	NS
	III	5/17(29.0)	6/12(50.0)	NS
	IVA	2/13(15.4)	4/9(44.4)	NS
ypTNM	I	3/3(100.0)	3/3(100.0)	NS
	II	5/11(45.5)	6/10 (60.0)	NS
	III	0/17	2/11(18.2)	NS

Analysis of PP population except otherwise indicated

cTNM: Pre-treatment clinical TNM stage;

ypTNM: Postoperative pathological TNM stage