TITLE: Role of Intraperitoneal Intraoperative Chemotherapy with Paclitaxel in the Surgical Treatment of Peritoneal Carcinomatosis from Ovarian Cancer. Hyperthermia versus Normothermia. A randomized controlled trial.

AUTHORS: Casado-Adam A^{1*}, Rodríguez-Ortiz L¹, Rufián-Peña S¹, Muñoz-Casares F.C¹, Caro Cuenca T², Ortega Salas R², Fernández-Peralbo M.A³, Luque de Castro M.D³, Sánchez-Hidalgo J.M¹, Hervás-Martínez C⁴, Romero-Ruiz A⁵, Briceño-Delgado J¹, Arjona-Sánchez A¹.

AUTHORS AFFILIATIONS:

- Angela Casado-Adam (* manuscript corresponding author)

Mail address: angeti@hotmail.com

Degree: MD, PhD

Institution: Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain; CIBERehd, Maimonides Biomedical Research Institute of Cordoba (IMIBIC), University Hospital Reina Sofia, Córdoba, Spain.

Mailing address: Avda Menéndez Pidal s/n, 14004 Córdoba, Spain.

Phone: 0034 957 010439, Fax: 0034 957 010447

- Lidia Rodríguez Ortiz

Mail address: lidiaortiz1@gmail.com

Degree: MD

Institution: Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain; CIBERehd, IMIBIC, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain.

- Sebastián Rufián-Peña

Mail address: sebastian.rufian.sspa@juntadeandalucia.es

Degree: MD, PhD

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Institution: Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit, University Hospital Reina Sofia,
Cordoba, Spain; CIBERehd, IMIBIC, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain.

- Francisco Cristobal Muñoz-Casares

Mail address: fcocris@telefonica.net

Degree: MD, PhD

Institution: Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit, University Hospital Reina Sofia,
Córdoba, Spain; CIBERehd, IMIBIC, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Córdoba, Spain.

- Teresa Caro-Cuenca

Mail address: caromariateresa@yahoo.es

Degree: MD

Institution: Department of Pathology, Reina Sofia University Hospital, Córdoba, Spain.
Maimónides Biomedical Research Institute of Córdoba (IMIBIC), Córdoba, Spain.

- Rosa Ortega-Salas

Mail address: rosam.ortega.sspa@juntadeandalucia.es

Degree: MD, PhD

Institution: Department of Pathology, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Córdoba, Spain.
Maimónides Biomedical Research Institute of Córdoba (IMIBIC), Córdoba, Spain.

- María Auxiliadora Fernández-Peralbo

Mail address: q32fepem@uco.es

Institution: Department of Analytical Chemistry. University of Córdoba, Spain.

Mailing Address: Annex Marie Curie Building. Campus of Rabanales, 14071, Córdoba,
Spain.

- María Dolores Luque de Castro

Mail address: galucam@uco.es

Degree: PhD

Institution: Department of Analytical Chemistry. University of Córdoba, Spain.

- Juan Manuel Sánchez-Hidalgo

Mail address: juanmanuel Sanchezhidalgo@hotmail.com

Degree: MD, PhD

Institution: Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain; CIBERehd, IMIBIC, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain.

- César Hervás-Martínez

Mail address: chervas@uco.es

Degree: PhD

Institution: Department of Computer Science and Numerical Analysis, University of Córdoba, Spain.

- Antonio Romero Ruiz

Mail address: antonioromeroruiz@gmail.com

Degree: PhD

Institution: CIBERehd, Maimonides Biomedical Research Institute of Cordoba (IMIBIC), University Hospital Reina Sofia, Córdoba, Spain.

- Javier Briceño-Delgado

Mail address: javibriceno@hotmail.com

Degree: MD, PhD

Institution: Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain; CIBERehd, IMIBIC, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Cordoba, Spain.

- Alvaro Arjona-Sanchez

Mail address: alvaroarjona@hotmail.com

Degree: MD, PhD

Institution: Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Córdoba, Spain; CIBERehd, IMIBIC, University Hospital Reina Sofia, Córdoba, Spain.

SHORT TITLE: Hyperthermia vs Normothermia. Treatment of Ovarian Peritoneal Carcinomatosis.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: There are no conflicts of interest in the work submitted or participating authors.

This research was supported by “ Aid Biomedical Research and Health Sciences in Andalucía” and by The Public Foundation Progress and Health Andalusian, Health Counseling, Junta de Andalucía. PI 0678-10. N° EudraCT: 2011-004373-89.
ClinicalTrial.gov Identifier: NCT02739698.

ABSTRACT:

- Background

The treatment of ovarian carcinomatosis with cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC is still controversial. The effect and pharmacokinetics of the chemotherapeutics used (specially taxanes) are under consideration at present.

-Methods

A phase II, simple blind and randomized controlled trial (NCT02739698) was performed. Thirty-two patients with primary or recurrent ovarian carcinomatosis undergoing cytoreductive surgery (CRS) and intraoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy with paclitaxel (PTX) were included; 16 in hyperthermic and 16 in normothermic conditions. Tissue, serum and plasma samples were taken in every patient before and after intraperitoneal chemotherapy to measure the concentration of PTX. To analyze the immunohistochemical profile of p53, p27, p21, ki67, PCNA, caspasa-3 and the

pathological response a scale of intensity and percentage of expression and a grouped Miller and Payne system were used, respectively. Perioperative characteristics and morbidity-mortality were also analyzed.

-Results

Main characteristics of patients, surgical morbidity, haematotoxicity and nephrotoxicity were similar in both groups. The concentration of paclitaxel in the tissue was higher than that observed in plasma and serum, although no statistically significant differences were found between the two groups. No statistically significant association regarding pathological response and apoptosis (caspase-3) between both groups was proved. Intraperitoneal PTX reduced the expression of p53, p27, p21, ki67 and PCNA more in hyperthermia group, but not significantly.

-Conclusion

The use of intraperitoneal PTX has proven an adequate pharmacokinetics with reduction of cell cycle and proliferation markers globally without finding differences between its administration in hyperthermia versus normothermia conditions.

MANUSCRIPT:

INTRODUCTION

Standard treatment of advanced epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC), either primary or recurrent, is the complete cytoreductive surgery (CRS) with no residual tumor followed by adjuvant chemotherapy based on taxanes and platinum compounds^{1,2}.

Due to its natural history, EOC remains to a great extent localized in the abdominal cavity. Intraperitoneal (IP) chemotherapy allows higher concentrations of chemotherapeutics in the peritoneal cavity than systemic chemotherapy because of its direct administration, improving cytotoxicity while minimizing systemic adverse effects^{3,4} and the survival of the

patients. Nevertheless, this type of chemotherapy has not been fully accepted because it is not free from complications⁵.

To overcome the IP chemotherapy inconveniences, an intraoperative IP chemotherapy under hyperthermia conditions (HIPEC) arised. Its main objective was to treat residual microscopic disease after CRS, before the formation of adhesions through physical (heat) and chemical (chemotherapeutic) methods⁶. The mechanisms by which HIPEC results in increase tumour response to cytostatics, besides the direct effect of heat⁷ “per se” are multiple⁸; potentiates the cytotoxic effect of some chemotherapeutic agents⁹⁻¹³ and increases their tissue penetration^{14,15}.

There is a great heterogeneity in fundamental aspects of the administration of HIPEC such as the clinical setting in which it is indicated, the definition of optimal surgery (CC1 vs R1), the cytostatic and its dose, the temperature (37-46°C) or the perfusion time¹⁶.

The reasons why some authors¹⁷⁻²⁵ (our group among them) use taxanes for HIPEC in the treatment of ovarian carcinomatosis are its high efficacy observed in the systemic treatment of EOC and its favorable pharmacokinetics after IP administration due to its high molecular weight²⁶ and hepatic metabolism. The theory about an increase in the efficacy of taxanes in their IP administration is supported on different clinical²⁷⁻³⁰ and experimental studies^{31,32}.

In an update published by Sugarbaker³³ it was observed that hyperthermia increases the cytotoxic activity of most citostatics. However, this synergy is not clear in taxanes. Contradictory results have been obtained with respect to the interaction of heat with taxanes³⁴, even though they are heat stable and hyperthermia seems to increase the intracelular accumulation of these citostatics.

For all the above, the aim of this study was to analyze the effect of intraoperative IP administration of paclitaxel (PTX) under hyperthermia vs normothermia conditions on

antitumor activity, proliferation and cell cycle markers and its pharmacokinetics.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

A phase II, simple blind, randomized controlled trial (RCT), NTC02739698 was performed.

All steps, including selection of patients, sampling and storage were developed according to the guidelines dictated by the World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki in 2004. The ethical review board of Reina Sofía Hospital (Córdoba, Spain) approved and supervised the clinical study.

Inclusion criteria:

Age ranging between 18–75 years; histopathologic confirmation of peritoneal carcinomatosis from primary or recurrent EOC (stage IIIb-IIIc FIGO); Karnofsky index >70 o Gynecologic Oncology Group performance status ≤ 2 and informed consent form filled by all patients.

Exclusion criteria:

Unfulfillment of inclusion criteria; extra-abdominal metastasis or stage IV FIGO; concomitance of other malignant neoplasm; renal, hepatic or cardiovascular dysfunction; intolerance during treatment or and refusal to participate.

Sample size calculation

Based on an expected 40% of G3 tumor-regression in experimental arm vs a 1% of G3 tumor-regression in control arm with an α error of 0.05 and β error of 0.20, the sample

size was 32 (16 patients per group).

Treatment

All patients (except one) received a neoadjuvant chemotherapy regime consisting of 4–6 cycles of carbo-taxol. After confirming the stabilization or regression of disease, the patients underwent optimal CRS followed by intraoperative IP chemotherapy with 60 mg/m² PTX per 2 l of 1.5% dextrose at continuous perfusion for 60 minutes. They were randomized in two groups: the experimental arm (H-group) in which the IP chemotherapy was administered in hyperthermia conditions (41–42°C) and the control arm (N-group) where this IP chemotherapy was administered in normothermia conditions (36–37°C). After surgery most patients received adjuvant carbo-taxol chemotherapy to complete the 8 cycles.

Variables

Main characteristics of patients, situation of ovarian cancer, previous surgical score (PSS)³⁵, response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy (complete response: normalization of Ca 125 and disappearance of signs of disease in radiology tests, partial response: decrease of the value of Ca 125 and decrease of signs of disease in radiology tests according to RECIST criteria³⁶) and data of surgery such as peritoneal carcinomatosis index (PCI)³⁷ or Completeness of Cytoreduction (CC) Score³⁸ were noted.

Dindo-Clavien scale³⁹ and CTCAE⁴⁰ v 4.0 were used to describe surgical morbidity and haematological and renal toxicities, respectively. Mortality occurring during the postoperative hospital stay or within 30 days since operation was collected prospectively. Grade 3–4 complications and toxicities were considered as major morbidity.

Sampling and storage

Two types of peritoneal biopsies (with and without tumor) were taken before and after IP chemotherapy (PRE-chemo and POST-chemo, respectively). Those who have a small and well-perfused area of infiltrated peritoneum were sent to Pathology Department in fresh. The other tumor-free peritoneal biopsies and the blood samples (taken before, immediately after and 1 hour after IP chemotherapy: PRE-chemo, POST-chemo and 1 h POST-chemo, respectively), the latter after centrifugation, were introduced in Eppendorf tubes and preserved at -80°C to analyze the concentration of PTX in peritoneal tissue by liquid chromatography–tandem mass spectrometry (LC–MS/MS), as reported before⁴¹.

Anatomopathologic study

The specimens were fixed in 10% neutral formalin, routinely processed and embedded in paraffin blocks, from which 3 micrometer (μm) thick serial sections were cut and stained with HE, PAS and Masson's trichome.

The immunohistochemical study was performed using the prediluted antibodies; p53 (clone DO.7. Dako Corporation), p27^{kip1} (clone DSC-72. Génova Scientific SL), p21^{waf1} (clone polyclonal. Génova Scientific SL), ki67 (clone MIB.1. Dako Corporation), PCNA (clone PC10. Genova Scientific SL) and CASPASA-3 (clone polyclonal. Master Diagnostica SL). For the immunostaining, the Dako EnVision Flex Plus visualization system was used. The sections were examined by two blinded expert pathologists and evaluated by the grouped Miller and Payne (MP) system⁴² for pathological response: G1 (minimal changes that includes MP G1-G2), G3 (microscopic foci, that includes MP G3-G4) and G5 (no residual tumor), according to the percentage of total area involved in the biopsy specimen. Immunohistochemical expression was assessed by percentage of nuclei stained of tumor cells.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were expressed as means and standard deviation (SD), and categorical variables as frequency and percentages. Association between categorical variables was tested with the Pearson's chi-squared test (χ^2). The difference between means of continuous variables was tested by independent *t*-test. A second set of dependent *t*-test (paired-samples *t*-test) was carried out to compare the means of two related groups to determine if a statistically significant difference exists between these means of anatomopathological results. P values ≤ 0.05 were defined as statistically significant.

RESULTS

Patients main characteristics

The patient main characteristics are presented in Table 1. No statistically significant differences in preoperative variables were found between the two groups, except BMI, (24.68 ± 2.55 H-group vs 29.00 ± 4.84 N-group, $p < 0.004$).

Treatment and morbidity

The mean PCI was similar in both groups and although microscopically complete cytoreduction (CC0) was achieved in 81.2% in H-group and 62.5% in N-group, no significant differences were found (Table 2).

There were no treatment-related death. All patients in this study had at least one grade II surgical complication since they all received total parenteral nutrition (TPN) and most of patients required blood transfusion.

Major surgical morbidity ($\geq$ IIIa) was 25% in H-group and 12.5% in N-group. In H-group, two patients had wound infection that needed surgical debridement, one patient had low-grade colorectal fistula treated with conservative treatment and percutaneous drainage and other patient required reintervention due to hemoperitoneum. In N-group, one patient required reoperation due to hemoperitoneum and other patient had septic shock with reintervention and renal and global respiratory failure.

Grade 3–4 hemotoxicity was seen in 18.8% (12.5% H-group vs 6.3% N-group). Grade 3–4 nephrotoxicity was seen in 12.5% of H-group and in 25% of N-group (Table 2).

Pharmacokinetic

PRE-chemo serum, plasma and tissue samples had PTX values below the detection limit. In H-group the mean PTX concentration in serum POST-chemo and 1 h POST-chemo was 16.61 ± 5.34 ng/ml and 12.18 ± 5.52 ng/ml, respectively, in plasma POST-chemo and 1 h POST-chemo was 17.24 ± 6.14 ng/ml and 11.23 ± 5.15 ng/ml, respectively, and in tissue POST-chemo was 1382 ± 1407.18 ng/ml. In N-group the mean PTX concentration in serum POST-chemo and 1 h POST-chemo was 14.98 ± 4.79 ng/ml and 13.37 ± 4.87 ng/ml, respectively, in plasma POST-chemo and 1 h POST-chemo was 15.14 ± 6.18 ng/ml and 12.36 ± 4.87 ng/ml, respectively and in tissue POST-chemo was 2093.19 ± 1777.92 ng/ml. No significant differences were found between the two groups in any measurement. It was observed that the concentration of PTX obtained at local level (tissue) was much higher than the systemic (plasma and serum) in both groups (Figure 1).

Anatomopathologic

Regarding to the pathological response according to MP grouped system, no significant differences were observed in both groups. It was observed that in 87.5% of H-group and

81.3% of N-group, IP chemotherapy produced a marked reduction of tumor cellularity. No significant differences in relation to apoptosis (caspase-3) were found either.

The analysis of the results of the cell cycle markers (p53, p27 and p21) shows that there was a significant reduction in the expression of the three markers after IP chemotherapy in the 32 patients ($p=0.021$, $p=0.000$ and $p=0.000$ respectively), but when both groups were compared, this reduction was not statistically significant. Similarly occurred with cell proliferation markers (ki67 and PCNA). After comparing PRE and POST-chemo samples globally, the differences were statistically significant ($p=0.012$ and $p=0.000$), but not when PRE and POST-chemo samples from both groups were compared (Table 3). Although no statistically significant, our results suggest that there is a tendency to decrease the cell cycle and proliferation markers in H-group (Figure 2).

DISCUSSION

CRS with peritonectomy procedures associated to HIPEC has been worldwide incorporated by numerous medical centers, making this technique the standard of treatment in colon carcinomatosis^{43,44}, pseudomyxoma peritonei^{45,46}, and mesothelioma⁴⁷. Although the standard treatment of ovarian carcinomatosis is not CRS+HIPEC^{1,2}, evidence of its use is growing after recent publications of the first phase III RCT⁴⁸ and a meta-analysis⁴⁹. Spiliotis et al⁴⁸ demonstrated an improvement in survival in the treatment of recurrent EOC with CRS+HIPEC vs CRS alone, where the mean overall survival was 26.7 vs 13.4 months, respectively. The meta-analysis⁴⁹ concludes that CRS+HIPEC improves overall survival rates for both, primary and recurrent EOC vs isolated CRS.

Our group has been carrying out these CRS+HIPEC with PTX in the treatment of ovarian carcinomatosis since 1997⁵⁰. At the beginning it was not always possible to use the perfusion machine that allowed to reach hyperthermia, and IP chemotherapy was administered in normothermia conditions observing how these patients reached similar numbers of survival. This behaviour, added to the contradictory results obtained with respect the interaction of heat with taxanes³³, led us decide this study.

The analysis of the results shows two homogeneous groups according to pre- and perioperatives variables, except BMI that was significantly higher in N-group. In spite of it, this difference did not affect the ability to achieve optimal CRS that was similar in both groups, which is consistent with the literature as well^{51,52}.

The morbidity and mortality outcomes of CRS+HIPEC are similar to a major gastrointestinal surgery, with a surgical morbidity rates ranging from 12% to 52% and a mortality rates ranging from 0.9% to 5.8%⁵³. In our experience, the total major surgery morbidity was 25% in H-group and 12.5% in N-group, although twice as much, no significant differences were found between the two groups. These values are within the range of publications of this type of procedure.

Major systemic chemotherapy-related complications as hematological and renal toxicity in CRS + HIPEC ranged from 0% to 28 % and 0% to 18.6%, respectively^{53,54}. Hematological and renal major toxicities related to IP PTX administration ranged from 10.5% to 84.2% and 0% to 7%, respectively^{5,55}. And for HIPEC PTX administration, major hematological toxicity is reported from 0 % to 13%^{20,56} and renal toxicity above 11,6%⁵⁷. In our study we observed global mayor hematological complications in 12.5% of H-group and 6.3% of N-group and a mayor renal toxicity in 12.5 % of H-group and

25% of N-group.

In our study the maximal tissue concentration was average 84.54 and 178.01 time longer than the maximal plasma concentration (H and N-group, respectively), a fact that supports that PTX is a chemotherapist suitable to IP administration and is in keeping with previous reports of intraperitoneal use of PTX^{20,58}. Although PTX concentration in the N-group was almost twice that of H-group, this fact may be related to the contradictory results of the effect of hyperthermia on the pharmacokinetics of taxanes³⁴, no significant differences were observed in both groups.

To assess the effect of IP administration of PTX on the pathological response (reduction in tumor cellularity) we have used the grouped Miller and Payne system, widely studied in the effect of neoadjuvancia on locally advanced breast cancer⁵⁹, but not used previously in the treatment of ovarian cancer with HIPEC. In our study, although we did not find significant differences in both groups, it was observed that in 87.5% of H-group and 81.3% of N-group, IP chemotherapy produced a marked reduction of tumor cellularity.

Proliferation and cell cycle control are central processes in the biology of cancer⁶⁰ and our study has shown for the first time the behavior of these biomarkers to IP chemotherapy. As p53 mutation seems to be related to the development of chemoresistance and recurrence^{61,62}, findings regarding the predictive and prognostic relevance of expression of p21 and p27 in EOC are inconsistent⁶³⁻⁶⁶.

In our study we observed a statistically significant difference when comparing the PRE-chemo samples with the POST-chemo of the 32 patients in both cell cycle and proliferation markers; but comparing the differences between the PRE-chemo with the

POST-chemo samples of each group, the results were not statistically significant. Although no significant, our results suggest that there is a greater decrease in these tumor markers in H-group: a fact that could be related to the cytotoxic effect "per se" of hyperthermia.

The main limitation of the study is the small sample size, even though our hospital is a reference for the treatment of ovarian carcinomatosis in our country, so it will be necessary additional studies with a larger sample size to validate the impact of the temperature in IP administration of PTX on pharmacokinetics, pathological response and cell cycle markers. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, this is the first study in ovarian carcinomatosis where the IP chemotherapy is compared with taxanes in hyperthermia vs normothermia conditions.

In conclusion, in this clinical trial PTX has proven to have an adequate pharmacokinetics to treat ovarian carcinomatosis, reaching optimal concentrations in tissue and minimal in serum and plasma as well as a reduction of cell cycle and proliferation markers globally when administered in the peritoneal cavity during CRS. Although no significant differences were found between the two groups, it seems that hyperthermia may have a negative effect on the pharmacokinetics of PTX, but could enhance its cytotoxic effect, making this combination an effective treatment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS^{[1][2]}_[SEP]

All staff who have participated directly or indirectly in the realization of this study, specially the Department of Analytical Chemistry of the University of Córdoba, the Department of Pathology and the Oncologic and Pancreatic Surgery Unit of Reina Sofia Hospital is thanked.

REFERENCES

1. National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Ovarian Cancer including Fallopian Tube Cancer and Primary Peritoneal Cancer. V. 1.2016. Available: <https://www.tri-kobe.org/nccn/guideline/gynecological/english/ovarian.pdf>.
2. Gonzalez-Martín A, Bover I, Del Campo JM, Redondo A, Vidal L. SEOM guideline in ovarian cancer 2014. Clin Transl Oncol 2014; 16:1067–71.
3. Dedrick RL, Myers CE, Bungay PM, DeVita VT Jr. Pharmacokinetic rationale for peritoneal drug administration in the treatment of ovarian cancer. Cancer Treat Rep 1978; 62:1–11.
4. Markman M. Intraperitoneal chemotherapy. Semin Oncol 1991; 18:248–54.
5. Armstrong DK, Bundy B, Wenzel L, et al. Intraperitoneal cisplatin and paclitaxel in ovarian cancer. N Engl J Med 2006; 354: 34–43.
6. Sugarbaker PH. “It’s what the surgeon doesn’t see that kills the patient”. J Nippon Med Sch 2000; 67:5–8.
7. de Bree E, Romanos J, Tsiftsis DD. Hyperthermia in anticancer treatment. Eur J Surg Oncol 2002; 28:95.
8. Barrasa A, Van de Speeten K, Anthony Stuart O, Hendrick Sugarbaker P, Zappa L. Rationale for perioperative chemotherapy treatment in peritoneal carcinomatosis. Cir Esp 2009; 85:3–13.
9. Hahn GM, Braun J, Har-Kedar I. Thermochemotherapy: synergism between hyperthermia (42-43 degrees) and adriamycin (of bleomycin) in mammalian cell inactivation. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 1975; 72:937–40.
10. van Ruth S, Mathot RA, Sparidans RW, Beijnen JH, Verwaal VJ, Zoetmulder FA. Population pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of mitomycin during

- intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2004; 43:131–43.
11. Kusumoto T, Holden SA, Ara G, Teicher BA. Hyperthermia and platinum complexes: time between treatments and synergy in vitro and in vivo. *Int J Hyperthermia* 1995; 11:575–86.
 12. Urano M, Ling CC. Thermal enhancement of melphalan and oxaliplatin cytotoxicity in vitro. *Int J Hyperthermia* 2002;18:307–15.
 13. Mohamed F, Marchettini P, Stuart OA, Urano M, Sugarbaker PH. Thermal enhancement of new chemotherapeutic agents at moderate hyperthermia. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2003; 10:463–8.
 14. Benoit L, Duvillard C, Rat P, Chauffert B. Effects de la température intra-abdominale sur la diffusion tissulaire et tumorale du cisplatine intrapéritonéal dans un modèle de carcinose péritonéale chez le rat. *Chirurgie* 1999; 124:375–9.
 15. Jacquet P, Averbach A, Stuart OA, Chang D, Sugarbaker PH. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal doxorubicin: pharmacokinetics, metabolism, and tissue distribution in a rat model. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 1998; 41:147–54.
 16. Cascales PA, Gil J, Galindo PJ, Machado F, Frutos IM, Paricio PP. Heterogeneity in patients and methods. A problem for hyperthermic intraoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in ovarian carcinoma. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2011; 158:361–2.
 17. de Bree E, Romanos J, Michalakis J, Relakis K, Georgoulas V, Melissas J, Tsiftsis DD. Intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy with docetaxel as second-line treatment for peritoneal carcinomatosis of gynaecological origin. *Anticancer Res* 2003; 23:3019–27.

18. Rufian S, Muñoz-Casares FC, Briceño J, et al. Radical surgery-peritonectomy and intraoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis in recurrent or primary ovarian cancer. *J Surg Oncol* 2006;94:316–24.
19. Bae JH, Lee JM, Ryu KS, et al. Treatment of ovarian cancer with paclitaxel or carboplatin based intraperitoneal hyperthermic chemotherapy during secondary surgery. *Gynecol Oncol* 2007; 106:193–200.
20. de Bree E, Rosing H, Filis D, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and intraoperative hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy with paclitaxel: a clinical and pharmacokinetic study. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2008; 15:83–92.
21. Muñoz-Casares FC, Rufián S, Rubio MJ, et al. The role of hyperthermic intraoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis in recurrent ovarian cancer. *Clin Transl Oncol* 2009; 11:753–9.
22. Kim JH, Lee JM, Ryu KS, et al. Consolidation hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy using paclitaxel in patients with epithelial ovarian cancer. *J Surg Oncol* 2010; 101:149–55.
23. Ansaloni L, Agnoletti V, Amadori A, et al. Evaluation of extensive cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in patients with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2012 Jun; 22:778–85.
24. Cascales-Campos PA, Gil J, Gil E, Feliciangeli E, González-Gil A, Parrilla JJ, Parrilla P. Treatment of microscopic disease with hyperthermic intraoperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy after complete cytoreduction improves disease-free survival in patients with stage IIIC/IV ovarian cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2014 Jul; 21:2383–9.

25. Muñoz-Casares FC, Medina-Fernandez FJ, Arjona-Sánchez A, et al. Peritonectomy procedures and HIPEC in the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis from ovarian cancer: Long-term outcomes and perspectives from a high-volume center. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2016 ; 42:224–33.
26. Sugarbaker PH. An Overview of Peritonectomy, Visceral Resections, and Perioperative Chemotherapy for Peritoneal Surface Malignancy: Textbook and Video Atlas. Canada. Ciné-Med Publishing. 2013. ISBN: 978-0-9846171-5-9.
27. Kohn EC, Sarosy G, Bicher A, et al. Dose-intense taxol: high response rate in patients with platinum-resistant recurrent ovarian cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1994 ;86:18–24.
28. Omura GA, Brady MF, Look KY, et al. Phase III trial of paclitaxel at two dose levels, the higher dose accompanied by filgrastim at two dose levels in platinum pretreated epithelial ovarian cancer: an intergroup study. *J Clin Oncol* 2003 ; 21:2843–8.
29. Reed E, Bitton R, Sarosy G. Paclitaxel dose intensity. *J Infus Chemother* 1996 ;6:59–63.
30. Takimoto CH, Rowinsky EK. Dose-intense paclitaxel: déjà vu all over again?. *J Clin Oncol* 2003 ;21:2810–4.
31. Michalakis J, Georgatos SD, de Bree E, et al. Short term exposure of cancer cells to micromolar doses of paclitaxel, with or without hyperthermia, induces long term inhibition of cell proliferation and cell death in vitro. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2007 ;14:1220–8.
32. Michalakis J, Georgatos SD, Romanos J, Koutala H, Georgoulas V, Tsifsis D, Theodoropoulos PA. Micromolar taxol, with or without hyperthermia, induces

- mitotic catastrophe and cell necrosis in HeLa cells. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2005 ;56:615–22.
33. Sugarbaker PH, Mora JT, Carmignani P, Stuart OA, Yoo D. Update on chemotherapeutic agents utilized for perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *Oncologist* 2005 ;10:112–22.
 34. de Bree E, Theodoropoulos PA, Rosing H, Michalakis J, Romanos J, Beijnen JH, Tsiftsis DD. Treatment of ovarian cancer using intraperitoneal chemotherapy with taxanes: from laboratory bench to bedside. *Cancer Treat Rev* 2006 ;32:471–82.
 35. Jacquet P, Sugarbaker PH. Current methodologies for clinical assessment of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 1996; 15:46–58.
 36. Therasse P, Arbuck SG, Eisenhauer EA, et al. New guidelines to evaluate the response to treatment in solid tumors. European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer, National Cancer Institute of the United States, National Cancer Institute of Canada. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2000;92:205-16.
 37. Jacquet P, Sugarbaker PH. Clinical research methodologies in diagnosis and staging of patients with peritoneal carcinomatosis. *Cancer Treat Res* 1996; 82:359–74.
 38. Sugarbaker PH. Peritonectomy procedure. *Ann Surg* 1995; 221:29–42.
 39. Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Clasification of surgical complications. A new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. *Ann Surg.* 2004; 240(2):205-13.
 40. National Cancer Institute (NCI) / National Institutes of Health (NIH). Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE). Version 4.0 Published: May 28, 2009 (v4.03: June 14, 2010) Available: https://evs.nci.nih.gov/ftp1/CTCAE/CTCAE_4.03_2010-06-

[14_QuickReference_5x7.pdf](#).

41. Fernández-Peralbo MA, Priego-Capote F, Luque de Castro MD, Casado-Adam A, Arjona-Sánchez A, Muñoz-Casares FC. LC–MS/MS quantitative analysis of paclitaxel and its major metabolites in serum, plasma and tissue from women with ovarian cancer after intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *J Pharm Biomed Anal* 2014; 91:131–7.
42. Ogston KN, Miller D, Payne S, et al. A new histological grading system to assess response of breast cancers to primary chemotherapy: prognostic significance and survival. *Breast* 2003; 12: 320–7.
43. Yan TD, Black D, Savady R, Sugarbaker PH. Systematic review on the efficacy of cytoreductive surgery combined with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2006; 24:4011–9.
44. Cao C, Yan TD, Black D, Morris DL. A systematic review and meta-analysis of cytoreductive surgery with perioperative intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal origin. *Ann Sur Oncol*. 2009; 16:2152–62.
45. Moran B, Baratti D, Yan TD, Kusamura S, Deraco M. Consensus statement on the loco-regional treatment of appendiceal mucinous neoplasms with peritoneal dissemination (pseudomyxoma peritonei). *J Surg Oncol* 2008; 98:277–82.
46. Chua TC, Moran BJ, Sugarbaker PH, et al. Early and long-term outcome data of 2298 patients with pseudomyxoma peritonei of appendiceal origin treated by a strategy of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *J Clin Oncol* 2012; 30:2449–56.

47. Yan TD, Deraco M, Baratti D, et al. Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for malignant peritoneal mesothelioma: multi-institutional experience. *J Surg Oncol* 2009; 27:6237–42.
48. Spiliotis J, Halkia E, Lianos E, Kalantzi N, Grivas A, Efstathiou E, Giassas S. Cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC in recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer: a prospective randomized phase III study. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015; 22:1570–5.
49. Huo YR, Richards A, Liauw W, Morris DL. Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) and cytoreductive surgery (CRS) in ovarian cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2015; 41:1578–89.
50. Arjona-Sánchez A, Rufián-Peña S. *Progress in the management of primary and recurrent ovarian carcinomatosis with peritonectomy procedures and HIPEC in a high volumen center*. *Int J Hyperthermia* (2017) DOI:10.1080/02656736.2017.1278631.
51. Fotopoulou C, Richter R, Braicu EI, et al. Impact of obesity on operative morbidity and clinical outcome in primary epithelial ovarian cancer after optimal primary tumor debulking. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2011; 18:2629–37.
52. Backes FJ, Nagel CI, Bussewitz, Donner J, Hade E, Salani R. The impact of body weight on ovarian cancer outcomes. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2011; 21:1601–5.
53. Chua TC, Yan TD, Saxena A, Morris DL. Should the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis by cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy still be regarded as a highly morbid procedure?: a systematic review of morbidity and mortality. *Ann Surg* 2009; 249:900–7.
54. Canda AE, Sokmen S, Terzi C et al. Complications and toxicities after cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013; 20:1082–7.

55. Kim SW, Paek J, Nam EJ, Kim SH, Kim JH, Kim YT. The feasibility of carboplatin-based intraperitoneal chemotherapy in ovarian cancer. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 2010; 152:195–9.
56. Cascales Campos P, Gil J, Parrilla P. Morbidity and mortality outcomes of cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy in patients with primary and recurrent advanced ovarian cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2014; 40:970–5.
57. Arjona-Sánchez A, Cadenas-Febres A, Cabrera-Bermon J, et al. “Assesment of RIFLE and AKIN criteria to define acute renal disease for HIPEC procedures for ovarian and non ovarian peritoneal malignances”. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2016; 42:869–76.
58. Ansaloni L, Coccolini F, Morosi L et al. Pharmacokinetics of concomitant cisplatin and paclitaxel administered by hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy top atientes with peritoneal cacinomatosis from epithelial ovarian cancer. *Br J Cancer* 2015; 112:306–12.
59. Shintia C, Endang H, Diani K. Assessment of pathological response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in locally advanced breast cancer using the Miller-Payne system and TUNEL. *Malaysian J Pathol* 2016; 38:25–32.
60. Belt EJ, Brosens RP, Delis-van Diemen PM et al. Cell cycle proteins predict recurrence in stage II and III colon cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2012; 19 Suppl 3:S682–92.
61. Vang R, Levine DA, Soslow RA, Zaloudek C, Shih IeM, Kurman RJ. Molecular alterations of PT53 are a defining feature of ovarian high-grade serous carcinoma: a rereview of cases lacking TP53 mutations in the Cancer Genome Atlas ovarian study. *Int J Gynecol Pathol* 2016; 35:48–55.

62. Zhang M, Zhuang G, Sun X, Shen Y, Wang W, Li Q, Di W. TP53 mutation-mediated genomic instability induces the evolution of chemoresistance and recurrence in epithelial ovarian cancer. *Diagn Pathol* 2017; 12:16.
63. Skirnisdottir I, Seidal T. Association of p21, p21 p27 and p21 p53 status to histological subtypes and prognosis in low-stage epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cancer Genomics Proteomics* 2013; 10:27–34.
64. Geisler HE, Geisler JP, Miller GA, Geisler MJ, Wiemann MC, Zhou Z, Crabtree W. p21 and p53 in ovarian carcinoma: their combined staining is more valuable than their alone. *Cancer* 2001; 92:781–6.
65. Schmider-Ross A, Pirsig O, Gottschalk E, Denkert C, Lichtenegger W, Reles A. Cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitors CIP1(p21) and KIP1 (p27) in ovarian cancer. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 2006; 132:163–71.
66. Plisiecka-Halasa J. P21 WAF1, P27 KIP1 TP53 and C-MYC analysis in 204 ovarian carcinomas treated with platinum-based regimens. *Ann Oncol* 2003; 14:1078–85.

Table 1: Patients main characteristics

	H-group (n=16)	N-group (n=16)	<i>p</i>
Age (years)	57.06±12.60	58.13±9.38	0.789
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.68±2.55	29.00±4.84	0.004
Prior abdominal surgery			
No	13 (81.2%)	9 (56.2%)	0.253
Yes	3 (18.8%)	7 (43.8%)	
Prior comorbidity			
No	8 (50.0%)	9 (56.3%)	1.000
Yes	8 (50.0%)	7 (43.8%)	

Ovarian cancer situation			
Primary	15 (93.8%)	12 (75.0%)	0.330
Recurrent	1 (6.3%)	4 (25.0%)	
Prior cancer surgery			
No	10 (62.5%)	4 (25.0%)	0.075
Yes	6 (37.5%)	12 (75.0%)	
Prior Surgical Score (PSS)			
0	10 (62.5%)	4 (25.0%)	0.164
1	4 (25.0%)	8 (50.0%)	
2	2 (12.5%)	3 (28.8%)	
3	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy			
No	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0.310
Yes	15 (93.8%)	16 (100%)	
Response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy			
Complete	2 (12.5%)	4 (25.0%)	0.714
Partial	13 (81.2%)	12 (75.0%)	

H-group: Hyperthermia group, N-group: Normothermia group, BMI: Body Mass Index

Table 2: Treatment and morbidity

	H-group (n=16)	N-group (n=16)	<i>p</i>
Ureteral catheterization			
No	2 (12.5%)	1 (6.3%)	0.544
Yes	14 (87.5%)	15 (93.8%)	
PCI	19.25±6.78	21.50±7.81	0.391
Peritonectomy procedure			
Total	11 (68.8%)	12 (75.0%)	0.462
Extensive	5 (31.3%)	3 (18.8%)	
Pelvic	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	
CC Score			
CC0	13 (81.2%)	10 (62.5%)	0.432
CC1	3 (18.8%)	6 (37.5%)	
Splenectomy			
No	12 (75.0%)	10 (62.5%)	0.703
Yes	4 (25.0%)	6 (37.5%)	
Number of anastomosis			
0	5 (31.3%)	8 (50.0%)	0.363
1	10 (62.5%)	6 (37.5%)	
2	1 (6.3%)	2 (12.5%)	
Number of procedures			
1-2	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	0.665

3-4	11 (68.8%)	10 (62.5%)	
5	5 (31.3%)	5 (31.3%)	
Intraoperative blood transfusion			
No	5 (31.3%)	9 (56.3%)	0.154
Yes	11 (68.8%)	7 (43.8%)	
Duration of surgery (minutes)	492.53±95.81	538.06±112.91	0.237
Postoperative blood transfusion (units)			
0	4 (25.0%)	1 (6.3%)	0.688
1-2	7 (43.8%)	7 (43.8%)	
3-4	3 (18.8%)	5 (31.3%)	
>4	2 (12.5%)	2 (12.5%)	
Postoperative stay (days)	12.38±6.63	13.33±6.65	0.691
Surgical Morbidity (Clavien)			
I-II	12 (75.0%)	14 (87.5%)	0.245
IIIa	3 (18.8%)	0 (0.0%)	
IIIb	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)	
IVa	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	
IVb	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
V	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Leukopenia (CTCAE 4.0)			
No	14 (87.5%)	15 (93.8%)	1.000
1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0%)	
2	0 (0.0%)	0 (0%)	
3	2 (12.5%)	1 (6.3%)	
4	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
5	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Neutropenia (CTCAE 4.0)			
No	14 (87.5%)	15 (93.8%)	0.491
1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
2	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
3	1 (6.3%)	1 (6.3%)	
4	1 (6.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
5	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Thombocytopenia (CTCAE 4.0)			
No	15 (93.8%)	13 (81.2%)	0.478
1	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	
2	1 (6.3%)	2 (12.5%)	
3	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
4	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
5	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Acute kidney injury (CTCAE 4.0)			
No	11 (68.8%)	6 (37.5%)	0.346
1	2 (12.5%)	2 (12.5%)	
2	1 (6.3%)	4 (25.0%)	

3	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8%)	
4	0 (0.0%)	1 (6.3%)	
5	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Hematuria (CTCAE 4.0)			
No	8 (50.0%)	7 (43.5%)	
1	2 (12.5%)	2 (12.5%)	
2	6 (37.5%)	7 (43.8%)	
3	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
4	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
5	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0.931

H-group: Hyperthermia group, N-group: Normothermia group, PCI: Peritoneal Carcinomatosis Index, CC score: Completeness of Cytoreduction Score, CTCAE: Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse

Table 3: Anatomopathologic results

	H (n=16)	N (n=16)	H + N (n=32)	P
Pathological response				
GR1 (minimal changes)	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8%)		
GR3 (microscopic foci)	10 (62.5%)	10 (62.5%)		0.842
GR5 (no residual tumor)	4 (25%)	3 (18.8%)		
p53				
ΔPre-Post H+N			16.66±38.64	0.021
ΔPre-Post H vs Pre-Post N	21.56±39.99	11.75±37.89		0.482
p27				
ΔPre-Post H+N			51.88±34.47	0.000
ΔPre-Post H vs Pre-Post N	59.38±38.55	44.38±29.15		0.224
p21				
ΔPre-Post H+N			29.78±6.22	0.000
ΔPre-Post H vs Pre-Post N	36.25±38.28	23.31±34.02		0.320
Ki67				
ΔPre-Post H+N			10.03±21.36	0.012
ΔPre-Post H vs Pre-Post N	11.19±24.32	8.88±18.68		0.765
PCNA				
ΔPre-Post H+N			35.31±42.13	0.000
ΔPre-Post H vs Pre-Post N	47.38±44.18	23.25±37.49		0.106
Caspasa-3				
ΔPre-Post H+N			10.31±43.38	0.188
ΔPre-Post H vs Pre-Post N	23.44±49.35	-2.81±32.96		0.089

H: hyperthermia, N:normothermia

Figure 1: Pharmacokinetics of intraperitoneal PTX administration in our study.

Figure 2: Immunohistochemical nuclear expression of cell cycle regulatory proteins in 1 H-group patient.

A: p53 PRE-chemo, B: p53 POST-chemo, C: p27 PRE-chemo, D: p27 POST-chemo, E: p21 PRE-chemo, F: p21 POST-chemo.