

1
2 **Patterns of peritoneal dissemination and response to systemic chemotherapy in common**
3 **and rare peritoneal tumors treated by cytoreductive surgery:**
4 **Study protocol of a prospective, multi-center, observational study**

5
6 **(PRECINCT- Patterns of peritoneal dissemination and REsponse to Chemotherapy IN**
7 **patients undergoing CyToreductive surgery)**
8

9
10 Aditi Bhatt MS, MCh.¹, Pascal Rousset MD, PhD², Dario Baratti MD, PhD³, Daniele Biacchi MD, PhD⁴, Nazim
11 Benzerdjeb MD⁵, PhD³, Ignace de Hingh MD, PhD⁶, Marcello Deraco MD³, Vadim Gushcin MD⁷, Praveen
12 Kammar MS, MCh.⁸, Daniel Labow MD⁹, Edward Levine MD¹⁰, Brendan Moran MD¹¹, Faheez Mohamed MD,
13 FRCS¹¹, David Morris MD PhD¹², Sanket Mehta DNB⁸, Aviram Nissan MD¹³, Mohammad Alyami MD¹⁴,
14 Mohammad Adileh MD¹³, Shoma Barat MD¹², Almog Ben Yacov MD¹³, Kurtis Campbell MD⁷, Kathleen
15 Cummins-Perry MS¹⁰, Delia Cortes-Guiral MD, PhD¹⁴, Noah Cohen MD⁹, Loma Parikh MD¹⁵, Samer
16 Alammari MD¹⁴, Galal Bashanfer MD¹⁶, Anwar Alshukami MD¹⁷, Kaushal Kundalia MD¹¹, Gaurav Goswami
17 DNB¹⁸, Vincent Van de Vlasakker MD⁶, Michelle Sittig RN⁷, Paolo Sammartino MD, PhD⁴, Armando Sardi
18 MD⁷, Laurent Villeneuve MBE, PhD¹⁹, Kiran Turaga MD, MPH²⁰, Yutaka Yonemura MD, PhD²¹, Olivier
19 Glehen MD, PhD.²²
20

21 ¹ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Zydus Hospital, Ahmedabad, India

22 ² Dept. of Radiology, Centre Hospitalier Lyon-sud, Lyon, France

23 ³ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milan, Italy

24 ⁴ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

25 ⁵ Dept. of Pathology, Centre Hospitalier Lyon-sud, Lyon, France

26 ⁶ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Catharina Hospital, Eindhoven, Netherlands

27 ⁷ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Mercy Medical Centre, Baltimore, USA

28 ⁸ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Saifee Hospital, Mumbai, India

29 ⁹ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, USA

30 ¹⁰ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, USA

31 ¹¹ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Peritoneal Malignancy Institute, Basingstoke, UK

32 ¹² Dept. of Surgical Oncology, St. George Hospital, Sydney, Australia

33 ¹³ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Sheba Medical Centre, Telshomer, Israel

34 ¹⁴ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, King Khaled Hospital, Najran, Saudi Arabia

35 ¹⁵ Dept. of Pathology, Zydus Hospital, Ahmedabad, India

36 ¹⁶ Dept. of Pathology, King Khaled Hospital, Najran, Saudi Arabia

37 ¹⁷ Dept. of Radiology, King Khaled Hospital, Najran, Saudi Arabia

38 ¹⁸ Dept. of Radiology, Zydus Hospital, Ahmedabad, India

39 ¹⁹ Dept. of Clinical Research, Centre-hospitalier Lyon-sud, Lyon, France

40 ²⁰ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, University of Chicago Medical Centre, Chicago, USA

41 ²¹ Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Kishiwada Tokashukai Hospital, Osaka, Japan

42 ²² Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Centre Hospitalier Lyon-sud, Lyon, France

43

44

45 **Corresponding author** Dr. Aditi Bhatt MS, MCh.,

46 Department of Surgical oncology, Zydus hospital,

47 Thaltej, Ahmedabad-380054

48 India. Phone- 91 79 6621 0200

49 E-mail- aditimodi31@gmail.com

50

51

52 **Manuscript data**

53 Words- 4000

54 Figures-2

55 Tables -5

56 References-36

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89 **Abstract**

90

91 **Introduction**

92 Despite optimal patient selection and surgical effort, recurrence is seen in over 70% of
93 patients undergoing cytoreductive surgery(CRS) for peritoneal metastases (PM). Apart from
94 the peritoneal cancer index(PCI), completeness of cytoreduction and tumor grade, there are
95 other factors like disease distribution in the peritoneal cavity, pathological response to
96 systemic chemotherapy(SC), lymph node metastases and morphology of PM which may have
97 prognostic value. One reason for the underutilization of these factors is that they are known
98 only after surgery. Identifying clinical predictors, specifically radiological predictors, could
99 lead to better utilization of these factors in clinical decision making and the extent of
100 peritoneal resection performed for different tumors. This study aims to study these factors,
101 their impact on survival and identify clinical and radiological predictors.

102 **Methods and analysis**

103 There is no therapeutic intervention in the study. All patients with biopsy proven PM from
104 colorectal, appendiceal, gastric and ovarian cancer and peritoneal mesothelioma undergoing
105 CRS will be included. The demographic, clinical, radiological, surgical and pathological
106 details will be collected according to a pre-specified format that includes details regarding
107 distribution of disease, morphology of PM, regional node involvement and pathological
108 response to SC. In addition to the absolute value of PCI, the structures bearing the largest
109 tumor nodules and a description of the morphology in each region will be recorded. A
110 correlation between the surgical, radiological and pathological findings will be performed
111 and the impact of these potential prognostic factors on progression-free and overall survival
112 determined. The practices pertaining to radiological and pathological reporting at different
113 centers will be studied.

114

115 **Ethics and dissemination**

116 The study protocol has been approved by the Zydus Hospital ethics committee (27th July,
117 2020) and Lyon-sud ethics committee (A15-128). It is registered with the clinical trials
118 registry of India (CTRI/2020/09/027709).

119 The results will be published in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

120 **Strength and limitations**

- 121 • A prospective correlation between the radiological, surgical and pathological findings
122 in patients undergoing CRS will be performed which has not been done before.
- 123 • Being prospective in nature it will also enable us to evaluate the impact of the current
124 treatment practices on the clinical end-points
- 125 • There is fixed protocol for radiological and pathological evaluation for which there
126 are no specific guidelines
- 127 • The data collection format will capture all the relevant data but this may affect
128 compliance.
- 129 • Despite the large sample size planned for each primary site, the heterogeneity of
130 treatment protocols may be a limiting factor while evaluating the impact on survival.

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139 **1.0 Introduction**

140 A wide variety of primary tumors give rise to peritoneal metastases (PM). Over the last
141 couple of decades, the management of PM has undergone a radical change. Cytoreductive
142 surgery (CRS) with, or without, some form of intraperitoneal chemotherapy has led to a
143 major increase in survival, and cure in some patients. [1] Recurrence after CRS, however, is
144 common and occurs in around 70% of the patients irrespective of the primary tumor site. [2,
145 3, 4] For all types of peritoneal malignancies the peritoneal cancer index (PCI) and the
146 completeness of cytoreduction (CC-score) have emerged as the most important prognostic
147 factors and are used for selecting patients for surgery. [5] The third major factor is disease
148 biology, previously determined mainly by the histological subtype and/or grade and in more
149 recent times using one or more molecular markers (for e.g. KRAS, BRAF and MSI for
150 colorectal PM, BRCA mutations for ovarian cancer). [6] The main role of molecular markers,
151 however, is in selecting patients for systemic therapies. In colorectal PM this is largely
152 because there is limited evidence regarding the benefit of surgery in patients with tumors
153 expressing poor prognostic markers. Apart from the grade of the tumor, pathological factors
154 have been underutilized in selecting patients for surgery. The prognostic impact of the
155 pathological response to systemic chemotherapy (SC) has been demonstrated for both
156 colorectal PM and ovarian cancer. [7, 8] This, however, has not been utilized in clinical
157 decision making. One reason could be that such factors are known only after the surgery has
158 been completed. There are gaps in our knowledge of patterns of disease distribution and
159 morphology of PM and results of experimental studies have not been evaluated in the clinical
160 setting. [9, 10] In our preliminary study, we found a high incidence of regional lymph node
161 involvement related to both the primary tumor and peritoneal disease. [11] All these factors,
162 determined on pathological evaluation, could have a prognostic impact and could influence
163 both patient selection and the extent of surgery performed.

164 Similarly, imaging has been used for determining the disease extent pre-operatively. As
165 expected there is under-prediction of the PCI due to limitations of modern imaging modalities
166 like MRI in detecting tiny peritoneal nodules (<5mm). The other information that can be
167 derived from imaging, such as morphology of PM and disease distribution in the peritoneal
168 cavity, has not been adequately explored for its potential clinical implications. Surgical
169 decision making regarding the extent of resection is made on intra-operative visualization of
170 peritoneal disease which has been reported to be inaccurate in a large proportion of the
171 patients. [12, 13] There is no consensus on the extent of peritoneal resection that should be
172 performed for each primary tumor. [14] And early recurrence could be due to the failure to
173 address all the occult disease effectively with surgery. A better understanding of the disease
174 distribution and mechanisms of peritoneal dissemination may help in standardizing the extent
175 of resection for different primaries.

176 Correlation of the clinical radiological, surgical and pathological findings could provide new
177 insights about peritoneal disease distribution, mechanisms of spread and potential impact of
178 these prognostic factors on the treatment of patients with PM.

179 Hence, this study has been conceived and is being conducted with the following goals

- 180 • To study patterns of peritoneal disease distribution, lymph node metastases,
181 morphology of PM and pathological response to SC in patients undergoing
182 CRS.
- 183 • To study the impact of these factors on survival.
- 184 • To identify clinical and radiological predictors of these factors by performing
185 a correlation between the radiological, surgical and pathological findings.
- 186 • To study the existing practices related to evaluation of disease extent on
187 imaging, intra-operatively and on pathology and the extent of peritoneal
188 resection performed for each tumor.

- 189 • To study the practices related to pathological evaluation of CRS specimens.

190

191 **2.0 Methods**

192 This is a prospective, multi-centre observational study. There is no therapeutic intervention.

193 All the patients with biopsy proven PM from colorectal, appendiceal, gastric and ovarian

194 cancer or with peritoneal mesothelioma undergoing CRS with, or without, intraperitoneal

195 chemotherapy will be included. Informed consent will be taken from all patients. The

196 demographic, clinical, radiological, surgical and pathological details will be collected

197 according to a pre-specified format that includes details regarding the distribution of disease,

198 morphology of PM, regional node involvement and pathological response to SC.

199 There are currently no reporting guidelines for both imaging and pathological evaluation of

200 CRS specimens. The information captured can vary from center to center though the

201 parameters analyzed are the same. The reporting format in this study (**supplement 1**)

202 includes calculation of the radiological PCI and other details like the sites and structures

203 bearing the largest tumor nodules and a description of the morphology in each region.

204 Similarly, the surgical findings will be documented in a systematic pre-specified manner. To

205 ensure uniformity in the morphological description, a list of morphological features has been

206 made for each for the radiological, surgical and pathological evaluations. This description

207 has to be provided with the lesion score for each region of the PCI. The first 6 months of the

208 study comprise a test phase in which teams will see the feasibility and compliance of this

209 form of data capturing. Based on the inputs from the participating centers, if required, some

210 modifications will be made in the format of data collection. During the second phase, there

211 will be an addition to the protocol for pathological evaluation in which pathologists will be

212 required to take additional sections from the ‘normal appearing’ peritoneum adjacent to

213 tumor nodules. Centers in which it is not possible to follow this protocol will continue to
214 follow the protocol of the first phase. The study flow-chart is in **figure 1**.

215 ***2.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria***

- 216 • All patients undergoing CRS for PM from colorectal, ovarian, gastric and appendiceal
217 primary tumors or peritoneal mesothelioma will be included.
- 218 • Only patients with biopsy proven PM will be included (pathological evaluation is not
219 mandatory prior to CRS if imaging or exploration confirms the presence of disease).
- 220 • Patients undergoing second look procedures with no evidence of peritoneal
221 metastases will be excluded.
- 222 • Patient undergoing debulking procedures will be included
- 223 • Patients undergoing palliative procedures that do not involve tumor debulking will be
224 excluded unless the goal of surgery was to obtain a complete cytoreduction i.e.
225 procedures performed with the intention of palliation alone like a diverting stoma will
226 be excluded.
- 227 • For ovarian cancer, only patients with FIGO stage III-C or IV-A will be included.
228 Patients undergoing surgery at first diagnosis, after neoadjuvant chemotherapy
229 (NACT) and those undergoing surgery for recurrent disease will be included. Patients
230 without peritoneal disease will be excluded.

231

232 ***2.2 End points***

233 **Primary end points:** The primary end point is disease distribution in the peritoneal cavity.
234 Disease distribution in the peritoneal cavity will be captured in detail on imaging, during
235 surgery and on pathology. The confirmation of disease on pathology will be considered as
236 confirmatory for presence of disease in each region. If only debulking is performed, for
237 regions which are not addressed during surgery, the surgical evaluation will be considered.

238 The abdominal cavity is divided into 13 regions according to Sugarbaker's PCI and the
239 structures in each region are defined using the PROMISE internet application to ensure
240 uniformity in reporting. [15, 16] Apart from the main data collection spreadsheet, separate
241 forms have been created for the radiological, surgical and pathological evaluation to
242 facilitate capturing of the disease distribution (**supplements 2-4**).

243 **Secondary end points:** The secondary end-point are

244 **1. Pathological response to systemic chemotherapy:** This will be evaluated for all patients
245 receiving NACT for PM. Different scores will be used for different primary tumors as
246 described in the section on pathological evaluation.

247 **2. Regional lymph node involvement:** Both regional nodes in relation to the primary and
248 those in relation to the PM are considered as regional nodes (**Supplement 1**). [11]

249 **3. Morphology of peritoneal metastases:** The morphological description for each region on
250 imaging, during surgery and pathology will be documented (**Table 1**). In phase two, presence
251 of disease in adjacent normal peritoneum will be considered an additional morphological
252 feature.

253 **4. Overall survival:** overall survival (OS) will be calculated from the date of surgery

254 **5. Progression-free survival-** progression-free survival (PFS) will be calculated from the
255 date of surgery

256 **2.3 Recruitment period**

257 • 1st Phase: 15th Sept 2020-14th March 2021

258 • 2nd Phase: 15th March 2021- 14th Sept 2022

259 **2.4 Study duration-** The total duration of the study is 7 years; the first two years for
260 recruitment and another 5 years for follow-up.

261 **2.5 Surgical procedures**

262 All surgical procedures will be performed with the goal of complete cytoreduction. [17]
263 Patients undergoing planned debulking procedures will also be included. According to
264 current surgical standards, only involved regions of the peritoneum or those bearing visible
265 disease will be resected. Some regions like the falciform ligament, umbilical round ligament,
266 lesser and greater omenta may be resected in the absence of visible disease as these structures
267 have a high probability of harboring occult disease. These regions will be considered ‘normal
268 appearing’ regions during surgical and pathological evaluation. At some centers, based on
269 institutional policies and/or as part of an ongoing study, removal of the entire parietal
270 peritoneum is performed for primary tumors such as mesothelioma, appendiceal and ovarian
271 cancer to address occult disease. [18, 19] The peritoneal regions resected thus will be marked
272 as ‘normal appearing’ regions.

273 The peritoneal lesions will be classified as nodules, plaques, confluent deposits, thickening,
274 adhesions or scarring by the surgeon and given a lesion score accordingly (**Table 1**). The
275 largest deposit in each region of the PCI will have to be categorized thus, and the lesion score
276 mentioned. The details of the peritonectomy procedures and visceral resections performed
277 will be recorded.

278 ***2.6 Imaging protocol***

279 CT scan with or without oral and iv contrast, FDG-PET CT scan (with IV contrast) and
280 peritoneal MRI are all acceptable imaging modalities. A combination of the above may be
281 performed. Where the facilities and expertise are available, peritoneal MRI is the preferred
282 modality for evaluating the peritoneal disease. [20] Both T1 and T2, gadolinium enhanced
283 and diffusion weighted images will be used to map the peritoneal disease. The protocol and
284 sequences have been described in detail elsewhere and can be referred to. [20] When used in
285 combination with MRI, oral contrast may be omitted while performing a CT scan. A slice
286 thickness of 0.6-5mm is acceptable. If the whole thorax is not included, at least the lower

287 thorax will be included.

288 Pre-operative imaging will be preferably performed within two to four weeks of the planning
289 surgical procedures. All scans performed will be considered while evaluating both the
290 presence or absence and extent of disease.

291 Imaging features suggestive of peritoneal metastases include peritoneal nodules, thickening,
292 or fat stranding. The morphological classification is listed in Table 1.

293 There are two areas that are elaborated on here.

294 The first is disease related **peritoneal thickening**. Normal peritoneal tissues are relatively
295 thin measuring <3 mm in thickness and typically show only no, or mild, enhancement that is
296 less than or equal to that of the liver parenchyma. Obvious thickening, all the more if
297 irregular or nodular, as well as marked peritoneal enhancement will be considered as
298 peritoneal metastases (in proven cases of peritoneal metastases). Confluent nodules will be
299 given a lesion score of 3 (**Supplement 2**).

300 Infiltration of the adipose tissue (whatever the structure involved-- mesentery –omentum –
301 ligaments -mesocolon) will be reported as “suggestive of peritoneal metastases” if at least
302 confluent or pseudo-nodular in some areas, or nodular or mass-like. In the absence of diffuse
303 mass-like disease scored 3 (e.g. omental cake), the lesion will be scored considering it as
304 focal in the absence of measurable lesions. It will be scored 2 even if >5cm to avoid
305 overestimation due to a misleading effect of resorption. If the maximum length of soft tissue
306 is considered, it will be scored 2 if less than 5cm and 3 if more than 5cm.

307 ***2.7 Pathological evaluation***

308 There are no guidelines or recommendations for evaluation of CRS specimens and each
309 center will follow their existing protocols. [21] The evaluation should involve analysis of

310 each peritoneal region submitted for evaluation separately. Similarly, all viscera should be
311 evaluated individually. Centers where such an evaluation is not performed, or that cannot
312 evaluate the specimens in this manner, were excluded from the study. One important aspect is
313 calculation of the pathological PCI. [22] For the pathological PCI, the pathologist has to
314 specify the size of the largest tumor deposit in the region in millimeters. The presence of
315 disease is confirmed on microscopy. If there is no disease on microscopic examination, the
316 lesion score is zero. The pathological response grade is mentioned for each of the thirteen
317 regions. The method of calculating the pathological PCI is described in **Figure 2**.

318 In the second phase, there will be an intervention in the pathological evaluation. For every
319 region that is submitted to the pathologist, additional sections will be taken from the normal
320 peritoneum at a distance of at least 5mm and preferably 10 mm from the tumor nodule. This
321 evaluation is termed as evaluation of ‘normal peritoneum around tumor nodules’. This part of
322 the study is not mandatory as institutional policies, time constraints and the cost involved
323 may prevent centers performing this part of the study.

324 The following scores for evaluation for pathological response to SC will be used

325 For ovarian cancer, the chemotherapy response score by Bohm et al has been validated in
326 multiple studies and is the preferred score. It is described in **Table 2**. [23]

327 The peritoneal regression grading score by Solass et al was developed for patients undergoing
328 PIPAC and has been externally validated (**Table 3**). [24, 25] It can be used for any of the
329 primary tumors.

330 For colorectal PM, the score developed at Lyon-sud is an alternative as it is specific for
331 colorectal PM but has not been externally validated (**Table 4**). [26] The mean of scores in
332 each region is computed and is the final score. In addition, the type of response is classified
333 as fibrosis, infarct like necrosis or a colloid response. A combination of the three types of
334 response can be present in a given region.

335 Use of scores apart from the above is permitted and the details of the same have to be
336 provided. It would be ideal to have the same score for each primary at all centers but that
337 again may not be possible. Secondly, the main focus will be a pathological complete response
338 which does not have different criteria across the scores. Regional and peritoneal nodes will be
339 evaluated as previously described.[11]

340

341 The reporting of other pathological findings like evaluation of the primary tumor, if present,
342 grade or pathological classification will be according to the existing protocols at each center
343 and will be captured in the data form. Similarly, the molecular markers that have been tested
344 will be recorded with the test results. Performing specific molecular tests is not binding.

345 ***2.8 Follow up***

346 The follow-up of patients will be performed according to the existing protocols at each
347 centers. Centers will be asked to provide a follow-up of their patients at 1, 3 and 5 years after
348 completion of the recruitment. The information will include the disease status, date of
349 detection and site of recurrent disease, subsequent therapies administered, date and cause of
350 death.

351 **3.0 Sample size**

352 The number of patients required was determined based on our preliminary study looking at
353 the disease distribution in relation to the disease extent. We considered involvement of
354 different regions in relation to the surgical PCI as well as different structures in relation to the
355 surgical PCI for each primary tumor. In addition, consideration was given to another end-
356 point, that is pathological response to SC. This was relevant only for colorectal cancer and
357 ovarian cancer. For colorectal cancer, upper regions (1-3 of Sugarbaker's PCI) were involved
358 in 20%. [27] All patients with involvement of these regions had a surgical PCI of more than
359 10. [27] Thus, to confirm this finding in a larger series with 80% predictive power and alpha

360 error of 0.05, we would require 35 patients with a PCI <10 and 35 with a PCI >10.

361 Considering that 70% of the patients have a PCI <10 in those undergoing CRS, we would

362 have to recruit over 100 patients. The incidence of involvement of the umbilical round

363 ligament similarly, was 2% and we would have to recruit around 340 patients to confirm this.

364 [27] For colorectal PM, few studies have evaluated the role of the pathological response to

365 SC. The reported incidence of a pathological complete response (pCR) ranges from 10-15%.

366 [26] In our recent analysis (unpublished data) it was 25%. In the same study, we could not

367 find any factors that had a significant impact on the incidence of pCR except the type of

368 chemotherapy used. To study the impact of 5-7 relevant factors we would need about 70

369 patients with a pCR. If we consider the incidence to be between 15 and 25, around 350

370 patients with colorectal PM receiving NACT will be required. Thus, the number of colorectal

371 cancer patients we need to recruit in the study was set at 500 considering that around 70-80%

372 will receive NACT.

373 For ovarian cancer, the incidence of a near complete/complete response or a Bohm score of 3

374 is around 15% in various published reports. [23] Many studies have explored predictors of a

375 complete response and to date no factor has been found to have a significant impact. To

376 determine the impact of 5 factors, 350 patients undergoing interval CRS alone would be

377 needed. Considering the disease distribution, 120 patients undergoing primary CRS and CRS

378 for recurrence each are required to be recruited. Thus 600 patients with ovarian cancer will be

379 recruited. For peritoneal mesothelioma, 100 patients are required with numbers for gastric

380 cancer being 100 patients and for appendiceal mucinous tumors/pseudomyxoma peritonei

381 (PMP), 300 patients (**Table 5**). These numbers also account for the variable histology,

382 incidence of disease in different structures and regions that are crucial to studying the

383 patterns of peritoneal dissemination.

384 The study will continue for the stipulated time period even if the target numbers are recruited
385 in a shorter period.

386 **4.0 Statistical methods**

387 Categorical data will be described as number (%). Non-normally distributed continuous data
388 will be expressed as the median and range. Categorical data will be compared with the χ^2
389 test. For comparison of parametric data, the student t test and for non-parametric data, the
390 Mann Whitney U test will be used. The impact of various prognostic variables like age, sex,
391 primary tumour site, grade, primary tumour stage, PCI, timing of PM and NACT on the
392 primary and secondary clinical end-points, namely disease distribution, pathological response
393 to SC, morphology of PM and regional lymph node involvement will be studied. Multivariate
394 logistic regression analysis will be performed to test the impact of multiple factors on these
395 end-points. For studying the disease distribution, the peritoneal regions will be divided into
396 four groups- upper regions comprising of regions 1,2,3, middle regions comprising of regions
397 0,4 and 8, lower regions comprising of regions 5, 6, 7 and small bowel regions comprising of
398 regions 9-12 of Sugarbaker's PCI. [16]

399 Previous studies have shown the negative prognostic impact of involvement of some regions
400 like the upper regions and small bowel regions on survival.[28,29] The impact of
401 involvement of these regions on survival will be evaluated as well. In addition, the
402 involvement of some specific structures and regions like the omentum, right upper quadrant
403 or region 1 will be considered separately.

404 Cox proportional hazard regression will be used to describe the association between
405 individual risk factors, including the 4 pathological prognostic variables, on PFS and OS
406 both, in terms of hazard ratio and its 95% confidence interval (CI). Multivariate Cox
407 regression will be used to assess the impact of risk factors on survival. A p-value of <0.05

408 will be considered statistically significant. PFS and OS will be calculated from the date of
409 surgery.

410 For identifying clinical predictors of these pathological prognostic factors, clinical and
411 radiological variables will be considered. One of the important variables is the PCI
412 (radiological and surgical). To test the performance of the radiological and surgical PCI, a
413 comparison will be made with the pathological PCI for each of the two and also between the
414 surgical and radiological PCI. A difference of 0-3 points will be considered as concordance.
415 The comparison will be made between the total value and score in each region. The
416 performance will be expressed in terms of false positives and negatives, true positives and
417 negatives, sensitivity and specificity. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves will be
418 used to determine cut-off values of PCI to predict end-points like a pathological complete
419 response.

420 PCI will also be evaluated as a categorical variable.

421 **5.0 Ethics and dissemination**

422 This study was approved by the Zydus hospital (institution of the first author) ethics
423 committee on the 27th July 2020. At Lyon-sud hospital, this study is being carried out within
424 the framework of the RENAPE observational registry (CNIL-no. DR-2010-297) and the
425 BIG- RENAPE registry (NCT NCT02823860), IRB number A15-128. [30] Subsequently,
426 approval was obtained at other centres according to the existing institutional policies.

427 The proposed analyses will be carried out during the course and after completion of the study
428 and the results published in peer-reviewed scientific journals.

429

430 **6.0 Patient and public involvement**

431 No patient involved

432 **7.0 Registration**

433 The study is registered with the clinical trials registry of India (CTRI/2020/09/027709).

434 **8.0 Discussion**

435 This study includes a prospective correlation between the radiological, surgical and
436 pathological findings in patients undergoing CRS. The main goal is to determine prognostic
437 impact of factors like disease distribution in the peritoneal cavity, pathological response to
438 SC, lymph node metastases and morphology of PM. Correlation with clinical and
439 radiological evaluation will be performed to identify predictors. The results could have a
440 bearing, not just on the patient selection for surgery, but also the extent of peritoneal
441 resection performed. Currently, the same surgical principles are applied to PM arising from
442 different primary tumors, largely based on the surgical principles that were initially
443 developed for pseudomyxoma peritonei (PMP) for which these procedures were first
444 performed [31] It has been proposed that the surgical strategy should differ according to the
445 primary tumor site. [32] The prognostic impact of pathological response to SC, involvement
446 of specific regions of the peritoneal cavity and regional node involvement has been
447 demonstrated previously for some primaries. [23, 33, 34] This study will look at these factors
448 prospectively for all primary sites. This will be the first study to correlate the morphology on
449 imaging and visual inspection with presence, or absence, of disease on pathology. For
450 example, previous studies have looked at the false negative and false positives comparing the
451 surgical lesion score and pathological finding. [35, 36] However, different surgeons will
452 score different morphological appearances differently; some may give a lesion score of 0 to

453 scarring, others may score it 1. The pathological PCI is a potential prognostic marker and is
454 not calculated by many centers. If its prognostic value is demonstrated in this study, a
455 simplified format of calculating it will be needed for other centers to be able to compute it.
456 The results will provide information currently missing in the scientific literature regarding
457 disease distribution in the peritoneal cavity in different primary tumors. It will differ from
458 previous reports as a correlation with the PCI will be performed. Similarly, there is little
459 information available about the regional lymph node involvement in relation to peritoneal
460 disease. Nodal involvement in patients undergoing CRS can be in relation to the primary
461 tumor if the primary is in situ or secondary to peritoneal disease. [11] Pelvic nodes, hepatic
462 hilar nodes, greater and lesser omental nodes are some regional nodes that are involved
463 secondary to peritoneal disease. Whilst regional nodes form part of staging of peritoneal
464 mesothelioma, their involvement has not been studied in other tumors though surgeons often
465 resect these nodes during CRS. Based on the results, the extent of peritoneal resection and
466 regional lymphadenectomy that is performed can be determined for each primary tumor. The
467 participating centers are some of the most experienced centers in treating peritoneal
468 metastases and thus, though different treatment strategies will be employed at each center,
469 their impact can be studied.

470 The format for data collection is exhaustive and designed to capture all relevant information.
471 This may, however, become a limitation of the study as compliance will be a problem. The
472 initial protocol underwent several modifications based on the inputs from each center before
473 being finalized. Another review will be performed during the first phase and alterations made
474 in the format of capturing data if the need arises. Despite the large sample size planned for
475 each primary site, the heterogeneity of treatment protocols may be a limiting factor while
476 evaluating the impact on survival. Nevertheless, the results will provide important insights on
477 disease biology that will in the future influence the way these patients are treated.

478 Future studies could be performed on more homogeneous cohorts to validate the prognostic
479 factors identified in this study.

480

481 **References**

- 482 1. Glehen O, Gilly FN, Boutitie F, Bereder JM, Quenet F, Sideris L, et al. Toward
483 curative treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis from nonovarian origin by
484 cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy.
485 *Cancer*. 2010;116:5608–18.
- 486 2. Braam, H.J., van Oudheusden, T.R., de Hingh, I.H., Nienhuijs, S.W., Boerma, D.,
487 Wiezer, M.J. and van Ramshorst, B. (2014), Patterns of recurrence following
488 complete cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in
489 patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal cancer. *J. Surg. Oncol.*, 109:
490 841-847. doi:10.1002/jso.23597
- 491 3. Mercier, F., Dagbert, F., Pocard, M., Goéré, D., Quenet, F., Wernert, R., Dumont, F.,
492 Brigand, C., Passot, G., Glehen, O. and (2019), Recurrence of pseudomyxoma
493 peritonei after cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy.
494 *BJS Open*, 3: 195-202. doi:10.1002/bjs5.97
- 495 4. Bhatt A, Glehen O. The role of Cytoreductive Surgery and Hyperthermic
496 Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) in Ovarian Cancer: A Review. *Indian J Surg*
497 *Oncol*. 2016 Jun;7(2):188-97. doi: 10.1007/s13193-016-0501-9. Epub 2016 Feb 16.
498 PMID: 27065709; PMCID: PMC4818619.
- 499 5. Mehta SS, Bhatt A, Glehen O. Cytoreductive Surgery and Peritonectomy Procedures.
500 *Indian J Surg Oncol*. 2016 Jun;7(2):139-51. doi: 10.1007/s13193-016-0505-5. Epub
501 2016 Feb 3. PMID: 27065704; PMCID: PMC4818624.

- 502 6. Katdare N., Bhatt A., Glehen O. (2020) Biomarkers in the Management of
503 Peritoneal Metastases. In: Glehen O., Bhatt A. (eds) Pathology of Peritoneal
504 Metastases. Springer, Singapore
- 505 7. Passot G, You B, Boschetti G, Fontaine J, Isaac S, Decullier E, Maurice C, Vaudoier
506 D, Gilly FN, Cotte E, Glehen O (2014) Pathological response to neoadjuvant
507 chemotherapy: a new prognosis tool for the curative management of peritoneal
508 colorectal carcinomatosis. *Ann Surg Oncol* 21(8):2608–2614.
- 509 8. Böhm S, Faruqi A, Said I, Lockley M, Brockbank E, Jeyarajah A et al (2015)
510 Chemotherapy response score: development and validation of a system to quantify
511 histopathologic response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in tubo-ovarian high-grade
512 serous carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 33(22):2457–2463.
- 513 9. Lemoine L, Sugarbaker P, Van der Speeten K. Pathophysiology of colorectal
514 peritoneal carcinomatosis: Role of the peritoneum. *World J Gastroenterol.*
515 2016;22(34):7692–7707. doi:10.3748/wjg.v22.i34.7692
- 516 10. Yonemura Y, Kawamura T, Bandou E, Tsukiyama G, Endou Y, Miura M. The natural
517 history of free cancer cells in the peritoneal cavity. In: Gonzalez-Moreno S, editor.
518 *Advances in Peritoneal Surface Oncology*. Berlin, Germany: Springer- Verlag Berlin
519 Heidelberg, 2007: 11-23
- 520 11. Bhatt A, Yonemura Y, Benzerdjeb N, Mehta S, Mishra S, Parikh L, Kammar P, et al.
521 Pathological assessment of cytoreductive surgery specimens and its unexplored
522 prognostic potential- a prospective multi-centric study. *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2019 July
523 (in press) DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejso.2019.07.019>
- 524 12. Bhatt, A., Kammar, P., Sinukumar, S. *et al*. Total Parietal Peritonectomy Can Be
525 Performed with Acceptable Morbidity for Patients with Advanced Ovarian Cancer

- 526 After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy: Results From a Prospective Multi-centric
527 Study. *Ann Surg Oncol* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-020-08918-4>
- 528 13. Bhatt, A., Rousset, P., Benzerdjeb, N., Kammar, P., Mehta, S., Parikh, L., Goswami,
529 G., Shaikh, S., Kepenekian, V., Passot, G. and Glehen, O. (2020), Prospective
530 correlation of the radiological, surgical and pathological findings in patients
531 undergoing cytoreductive surgery for colorectal peritoneal metastases: implications
532 for the preoperative estimation of the peritoneal cancer index. *Colorectal Dis.*
533 doi:[10.1111/codi.15368](https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.15368)
- 534
- 535 14. Bhatt, A., Glehen, O. ASO Author Reflections: Tailoring the Extent of Peritoneal
536 Resection for Peritoneal Metastases According to the Primary Tumor Site. *Ann Surg*
537 *Oncol* **27**, 1471–1472 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-020-08344-6>
- 538
- 539 15. Jacquet P Sugarbaker PH Current methodologies for clinical assessment of patients
540 with peritoneal carcinomatosis. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res.* 1996; 15: 49-58
- 541 16. Villeneuve L, Thivolet A, Bakrin N, Mohamed F, Isaac S, Valette PJ, Glehen
542 O, Rousset P; BIG-RENAPE and RENAPE Working Groups. A new internet tool to
543 report peritoneal malignancy extent. PeRitOneal Malignancy Stage Evaluation
544 (**PROMISE**) application. *Eur J Surg Oncol.* 2016 Jun;42(6):877-82
- 545 17. Jacquet P, Sugarbaker PH. Clinical research methodologies in diagnosis and staging
546 of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis. In: Sugarbaker PH, editor. *Peritoneal*
547 *carcinomatosis: principles of management.* Boston: Kluwer; 1996. p. 359–74.
- 548 18. Deraco M, Baratti D, Kusamura S, Laterza B, Balestra MR. Surgical technique of
549 parietal and visceral peritonectomy for peritoneal surface malignancies. *J Surg Oncol.*
550 2009;100(4):321–8.

- 551 19. Bhatt, A., Kammar, P., Sinukumar, S. *et al.* Total Parietal Peritonectomy Can Be
552 Performed with Acceptable Morbidity for Patients with Advanced Ovarian Cancer
553 After Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy: Results From a Prospective Multi-centric
554 Study. *Ann Surg Oncol* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-020-08918-4>
- 555 20. Low RN, Barone RM, Rousset P. Peritoneal MRI in patients undergoing
556 cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC: History, clinical applications, and implementation.
557 *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2019 Feb 28. pii: S0748-7983(19)30303-8. doi:
558 10.1016/j.ejso.2019.02.030.
- 559 21. Bhatt, A., Mishra, S., Parikh, L. *et al.* Essentials for Pathological Evaluation of
560 Peritoneal Surface Malignancies and Synoptic Reporting of Cytoreductive Surgery
561 Specimens—A review and evidence-based guide. *Indian J Surg Oncol* **11**, 101–126
562 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13193-019-00897-7>
- 563 22. Bhatt A, Yonemura Y, Mehta S, et al. The Pathologic Peritoneal Cancer Index (PCI)
564 Strongly Differs From the Surgical PCI in Peritoneal Metastases Arising From
565 Various Primary Tumors. *Ann Surg Oncol*. 2020;27(8):2985-2996.
566 doi:10.1245/s10434-020-08234-x
567
- 568 23. Böhm S, Faruqi A, Said I, Lockley M, Brockbank E, Jeyarajah A et al (2015)
569 Chemotherapy response score: development and validation of a system to quantify
570 histopathologic response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in tubo-ovarian high-grade
571 serous carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 33(22):2457–2463. [https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.](https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2014.60.5212)
572 2014.60.5212
- 573 24. Solass W, Sempoux C, Carr NJ, Detlefsen S, Bibeau F. Peritoneal sampling and
574 histological assessment of therapeutic response in peritoneal metastasis: proposal of

- 575 the Peritoneal Regression Grading Score (PRGS). *Pleura Peritoneum*. 2016;1:99–107.
- 576 25. Solass W, Sempoux C, Carr NJ, Bibeau F, Neureiter D, Jäger T, Di Caterino T,
577 Brunel C, Klieser E, Fristrup CW, Mortensen MB, Detlefsen S. Reproducibility of the
578 peritoneal regression grading score for assessment of response to therapy in peritoneal
579 metastasis. *Histopathology*. 2019;74(7):1014–24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/his.13829>.
- 580 26. Passot G, You B, Boschetti G, Fontaine J, Isaac S, Decullier E, Maurice C, Vaudoyer
581 D, Gilly FN, Cotte E, Glehen O (2014) Pathological response to neoadjuvant
582 chemotherapy: a new prognosis tool for the curative management of peritoneal
583 colorectal carcinomatosis. *Ann Surg Oncol* 21(8):2608–2614.
- 584 27. Bhatt A, Yonemura Y, Mehta S, et al. Target region resection in patients undergoing
585 cytoreductive surgery for peritoneal metastases-is it necessary in absence of visible
586 disease? *Eur J Surg Oncol*. 2020;46(4 Pt A):582-589. doi:10.1016/j.ejso.2019.11.495
- 587 28. Bhatt A, Kammar P, Mehta S, Damodaran D, Zaveri S, Patel MD, Sinukumar S, Ray
588 M, Seshadri R. Chasing Rainbows? the Possibility of "Cure" in Patients with
589 Colorectal Peritoneal Metastases Undergoing Cytoreductive Surgery and HIPEC-a
590 Retrospective Study by INDEPSO. *Indian J Surg Oncol*. 2019 Feb;10(Suppl 1):49-56.
591 doi: 10.1007/s13193-019-00879-9. Epub 2019 Jan 30. PMID: 30886494; PMCID:
592 PMC6397129.
- 593 29. Spiliotis J, Kalles V, Kyriazanos I, et al. CRS and HIPEC in patients with peritoneal
594 metastasis secondary to colorectal cancer: The small-bowel PCI score as a predictor
595 of survival. *Pleura Peritoneum*. 2019;4(4):20190018. Published 2019 Oct 30.
596 doi:10.1515/pp-2019-0018
- 597
- 598 30. Villeneuve, L., Passot, G., Glehen, O. *et al*. The RENAPE observational registry:
599 rationale and framework of the rare peritoneal tumors French patient

- 600 registry. *Orphanet J Rare Dis* **12**, 37 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13023-017->
601 0571-y
- 602 31. Sugarbaker PH. Pseudomyxoma peritonei. A cancer whose biology is characterized
603 by a redistribution phenomenon. *Ann Surg.* 1994;219(2):109–11
- 604 32. Bhatt, A., Glehen, O. Extent of Peritoneal Resection for Peritoneal Metastases:
605 Looking Beyond a Complete Cytoreduction. *Ann Surg Oncol* **27**, 1458–1470 (2020).
606 <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-020-08208-z>
- 607 33. Yonemura Y, Canbay E, Ishibashi H. Prognostic factors of peritoneal metastases from
608 colorectal cancer following cytoreductive surgery and perioperative chemotherapy.
609 *Sci World J.* 2013;2013:978394
610
- 611 34. Kammar P, Bhatt A, Anam J, Waghoo S, Pandey J, Mehta S. Correlation between
612 pelvic peritoneal disease and nodal metas- tasis in advanced ovarian cancer: can
613 intraoperative findings define the need for systematic nodal dissection? *Indian J Surg*
614 *Oncol.* 2019;10(Suppl 1):84–90.
- 615 35. Hynninen J, Lavonius M, Oksa S, Grenman S, Carpen O, Aura- nen A. Is
616 perioperative visual estimation of intra-abdominal tumor spread reliable in ovarian
617 cancer surgery after neoadjuvant chemotherapy? *Gynecol Oncol.* 2013;128: 229–32.
- 618 36. Berger Y, Jacoby H, Kaufmann MI, Ben-Yaacov A, Westreich G, Sharon I, et al.
619 Correlation between intraoperative and pathological findings for patients undergoing
620 cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *Ann Surg*
621 *Oncol.* 2019;26(4):1103–9
622

623

Author contributions

624

Study design and conceptualization- Aditi Bhatt, Olivier Glehen

625

Protocol writing- Aditi Bhatt, Olivier Glehen, Pascal Rousset, Nazim Benzerdjeb

626

Data acquisition and analysis- Aditi Bhatt, Pascal Rousset, Dario Baratti, Daniele Biacchi, Nazim Benzerdjeb,

627

Ignace de Hingh, Marcello Deraco, Vadim Gushcin, Praveen Kammar, Daniel Labow, Edward Levine, Brendan

628

Moran, Faheez Mohamed, David Morris, Sanket Mehta, Aviram Nissan, Mohammad Alyami, Mohammad

629

Adileh, Shoma Barat, Almog Ben Yacov, Kurtis Campbell, Kathleen Cummins-Perry, Delia Cortes-Guiral,

630

Noah Cohen, Loma Parikh, Samer Alammari, Galal Bashanfer, Anwar Alshukami, Kaushal Kundalia, Gaurav

631

Goswami, Vincent Van de Vlasakker, Michelle Sittig, Paolo Sammartino, Armando Sardi, Laurent Villeneuve,

632

Kiran Turaga, Yutaka Yonemura, Olivier Glehen

633

Interpretation of data- Aditi Bhatt, Pascal Rousset, Dario Baratti, Daniele Biacchi, Nazim Benzerdjeb, Ignace

634

de Hingh, Marcello Deraco, Vadim Gushcin, Praveen Kammar, Daniel Labow, Edward Levine, Brendan Moran,

635

Faheez Mohamed, David Morris, Sanket Mehta, Aviram Nissan, Mohammad Alyami, Mohammad Adileh,

636

Shoma Barat, Almog Ben Yacov, Kurtis Campbell, Kathleen Cummins-Perry, Delia Cortes-Guiral, Noah

637

Cohen, Loma Parikh, Samer Alammari, Galal Bashanfer, Anwar Alshukami, Kaushal Kundalia, Gaurav

638

Goswami, Vincent Van de Vlasakker, Michelle Sittig, Paolo Sammartino, Armando Sardi, Laurent Villeneuve,

639

Kiran Turaga, Yutaka Yonemura, Olivier Glehen

640

Statistical calculations- Praveen Kammar, Aditi Bhatt and Olivier Glehen

641

Critical review of the protocol and modifications- Dario Baratti, Marcello Deraco, Ignace de Hingh, Daniel

642

Labow, Edward Levine, David Morris, Brendan Moran, Faheez Mohamed, Sanket Mehta, Aviram Nissan,

643

Armando Sardi, Paolo Sammartino, Kiran Turaga, Yutaka Yonemura

644

Ethics and permissions- Aditi Bhatt, Laurent Villeneuve, Faheez Mohamed, Michelle Sittig, Kathleen

645

Cummins Perry, Shoma Barat, Mohammad Alyami

646

Manuscript writing – Aditi Bhatt, Olivier Glehen

647

Manuscript review and editing- Aditi Bhatt, Pascal Rousset, Dario Baratti, Daniele Biacchi, Nazim Benzerdjeb,

648

Ignace de Hingh, Marcello Deraco, Vadim Gushcin, Praveen Kammar, Daniel Labow, Edward Levine, Brendan

649

Moran, Faheez Mohamed, David Morris, Sanket Mehta, Aviram Nissan, Mohammad Alyami, Mohammad

650

Adileh, Shoma Barat, Almog Ben Yacov, Kurtis Campbell, Kathleen Cummins-Perry, Delia Cortes-Guiral,

651

Noah Cohen, Loma Parikh, Samer Alammari, Galal Bashanfer, Anwar Alshukami, Kaushal Kundalia, Gaurav

652

Goswami, Vincent Van de Vlasakker, Michelle Sittig, Paolo Sammartino, Armando Sardi, Laurent Villeneuve,

653

Kiran Turaga, Yutaka Yonemura, Olivier Glehen

654

655

Approval of the final version of the manuscript- Aditi Bhatt, Pascal Rousset, Dario Baratti, Daniele Biacchi,

656

Nazim Benzerdjeb, Ignace de Hingh, Marcello Deraco, Vadim Gushcin, Praveen Kammar, Daniel Labow,

657

Edward Levine, Brendan Moran, Faheez Mohamed, David Morris, Sanket Mehta, Aviram Nissan, Mohammad

658

Alyami, Mohammad Adileh, Shoma Barat, Almog Ben Yacov, Kurtis Campbell, Kathleen Cummins-Perry,

659 Delia Cortes-Guiral, Noah Cohen, Loma Parikh, Samer Alammari, Galal Bashanfer, Anwar Alshukami, Kaushal
660 Kundalia, Gaurav Goswami, Vincent Van de Vlasakker, Michelle Sittig, Paolo Sammartino, Armando Sardi,
661 Laurent Villeneuve, Kiran Turaga, Yutaka Yonemura, Olivier Glehen
662

663 We affirm that all the authors have provided substantial contribution to this manuscript and are in agreement
664 with all aspects of the final version. All the authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in
665 ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated
666 and resolved.

667

668 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
669 commercial or not-for-profit sectors

670 **Disclosures**

671 The authors have no disclosures
672 The authors have no conflicts of interest
673

674 **Figure legends**

675 Figure 1 Study flow-chart and guide to data capturing

676

677

678 Figure 2 Calculation of the pathological PCI (from ref 22 with permission)

679

680

681

682

683

684

685

686

687

688

689

690

Tables

691

692 Table 1 Morphological description of peritoneal lesions on radiological, intraoperative and
693 pathological examination*

Radiological evaluation	Visual inspection	Pathological examination
Normal peritoneum	Normal peritoneum	Normal peritonuem
Tumor nodule/deposit	Tumor nodule	Tumor nodule
Scalloping	Confluent nodules	Clustering of nodules
Calcification	Plaque	Thickening
Thickening	Thickening	Scarring
Confluent disease	Scarring	
Infiltration of adipose tissue	Adhesion	
Retraction		

694

695 *The description/definition of each morphological type is provided at the end of the PCI

696 forms (Supplements 2-4)

697

698

699

700

701

702

703

704

705

706 Table 2 Score categorizing the pathological response to systemic chemotherapy in ovarian
707 cancer [23]

Criteria for chemotherapy response grade (CRG)*	
CRG 1	No or minimal tumor response. Mainly viable tumor with no or minimal regression-associated fibroinflammatory changes, limited to a few foci; cases in which it is difficult to decide between regression and tumor-associated desmoplasia or inflammatory cell infiltration
CRG 2	Appreciable tumor response amid viable tumor that is readily identifiable. Tumor is regularly distributed, ranging from multifocal or diffuse regression-associated fibroinflammatory changes with viable tumor in sheets, streaks, or nodules to extensive regression-associated fibroinflammatory changes with multifocal residual tumor, which is easily identifiable
CRG 3	Complete or near-complete response with no residual tumor or minimal irregularly scattered tumor foci seen as individual cells, cell groups, or nodules, up to 2 mm maximum size. Mainly regression-associated fibroinflammatory changes or, in rare cases, no or very little residual tumor in the complete absence of any inflammatory response. It is advisable to record whether there is no residual tumor or whether there is microscopic residual tumor present

708 *the term chemotherapy response grade is used instead of chemotherapy response score as in
709 the original and subsequent publications to avoid confusion with the term cytoreductive
710 surgery (CRS)

711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726

727 Table 3 The peritoneal regression grading score (PRGS) that can be used for different
 728 primary tumours [24, 25]

Grade	Peritoneal regression grading score (PRGS)	
	Tumor cells	Regression features
PRGS 1–complete response	No tumor cells	Abundant fibrosis and/or acellular mucin pools and/ or infarct-like necrosis
PRGS 2–major response	Regressive changes predominant over tumor cells	Fibrosis and/or acellular mucin pools and/or infarctlike necrosis predominant over tumor cells
PRGS 3 –minor response	Predominance of tumor cells	Tumor cells predominant over fibrosis and/or acellular mucin pools and/or infarct-like necrosis
PRGS 4 –no response	Solid growth of tumor cells (visible at lowest magnification)	No regressive changes

729
 730
 731

732

733 Table 4 The Lyon-sud score for colorectal PM [26]

Grade of response		Type of response
Complete response	No residual tumor cells	Fibrosis
Major response	1-49% residual tumor cells	Infarct-like necrosis
Minor response	>50% residual tumor cells	Colloid response

734
 735
 736

737

738

739

740 Table 5 Sample size for each primary tumor site

Colorectal cancer	500 patients (350 patients who have received NACT)
Ovarian cancer	600 patients (350 undergoing interval CRS)
Appendiceal primary	300 patients
Peritoneal mesothelioma	100 patients
Gastric cancer	100 patients

741

742

743

Patients with peritoneal metastases from colorectal , gastric, ovarian and appendiceal primary and peritoneal mesothelioma



Cytoreductive surgery (goal CC-0)
Debulking surgery



Collection of clinical , radiological
and surgical data (Sheets 1-3)

Phase 1

Pathological evaluation as per institutional
protocol (sheet 4)


Refer to Figure 2 for calculation of path PCI



Follow up of patients at 1, 3 and 5 years
from the date of recruitment
(sheet 5)

Phase 2

Sections from 'normal peritoneum'
at a distance of at least 5mm from
the tumor nodules (sheet 4)



Cytoreductive surgery specimen

Different peritoneal regions marked by the surgeon or sent individually
Areas of doubt marked

Identify of each peritoneal region and viscera and
evaluate the maximum tumor diameter in each region

**GROSS
EXAMINATION**

Group the resected peritoneum and viscera according to Sugarbaker's
PCI (refer to supplement 4 for identifying the structures in each region)

Confirm the presence of disease on microscopy for
each region and viscera (Absence of disease = LS0)

**MICROSCOPIC
EXAMINATION**

Determine the maximum tumor diameter for each of the
13 regions (Lesion score) (Morphological description according to Table 1)

Summation of the score in each region

PATHOLOGICAL PCI