The Toxicity Profile and Side Effects of Capecitabine vs. Fluorouracil with Radiotherapy in Rectal Cancer

Thesis

Submitted for Fulfillment of Master Degree in Clinical Oncology & Nuclear Medicine

Bγ **Gawhara Effat Tawfic Rashwan** *M.B.B.ch.*

Supervised by

Prof. Dr. Amr Lotfy

Professor of Clinical Oncology & Nuclear Medicine Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohmed Yassin

Assistant Professor of Clinical Oncology & Nuclear Medicine Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Dr. Mohmed Essam Saleh

Lecturer of Clinical Oncology & Nuclear Medicine Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University

Faculty of Medicine - Ain Shams University
2017



سورة البقرة الآية: ٣٢

Acknowledgment

First and foremost my deepest gratitude goes to AUAH the most merciful

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thankfulness to **Dr. Amr Lotfy** Professor of Medical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine, Ain Shams University for his close

Supervision, valuable instructions, continuous help, patience, advices, and guidance. He generously devoted much of his time and effort in reading and revising this study.

I would like to express my great thanks and gratitude to **Dr. Mohmed Yassin** Assistant Professor of Clinical Oncology & Nuclear Medicine Ain Shams University & **Dr. Mohmed Essam Saleh** Lecturer of Clinical Oncology & Nuclear Medicine Ain Shams University for their great help, their patience in reading and revising the manuscript, and valuable ideas throughout the work.

I have been honored and gratified working under their supervision.

I would like to thank my professors and colleagues in Nasser Institute for their help and cooperation.

Last but not least, it gives me a great pleasure to thank my family and my friends for their support, assistance and belief in my work and in me.

Gawhara Effat Rashwan

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	5
List of Figures	10
List of Abbreviations	14
Introduction	1
Aim of the Work	6
Review of Literature	
Colorectal Cancer	7
• Evolution of the Treatment of Rectal Cancer	30
 Toxicity Profile and Side Effects of Chemotherapeutic Agents 	89
Patients and Methods	155
Results	160
Discussion	208
Summary and Conclusion	228
Health related quality of life in colorectal cancer patie	
References	
Arabic summary	

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	Factors associated with an increased decreased risk of colorectal cancer	
Table (2):	Primary tumour (T) staging of primary	
	cancer.	27
Table (3):	Regional lymph nodes (N) staging of cancer	rectal 28
Table (4):	Distant metastasis (M) staging of cancer.	rectal
Table (5):	Anatomic stage/prognostic groups	
Table (6):	The National Cancer Institute Co. Terminology Criteria for (NCI CT	mmon
	diarrhea grades	
Table (7):	National Cancer Institute Cor Terminology Criteria for mucositis se	
	version 4.	
Table (8):	NCI Common Terminology Criteria Adverse Events (CTCAE) grading of h	epatic
Л-1-1- (0)	toxicity, v4.0.	
Table (9):	Grading scale for palmar perythrodysesthesia syndrome	
Table (10):	•	to the
	Adverse Events v4.0	
Table (11):	Comparison between group I (patients rectal cancer treated with fluorouracing group II (patients with rectal cancer to	l) and
	with capecitabine) regarding sex o	
	patients.	
Table (12):	Comparison between group I (patients rectal cancer treated with fluorouracing group II (patients with rectal cancer to	l) and
	with capecitabine) regarding smoking.	

Table No.	Title	Page	No.
Table (13):	Comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorourac group II (patients with rectal cancer twith capecitabine) regarding histofeatures of the disease	il) and reated ological	
Table (14):	Comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorourac group II (patients with rectal cancer t with capecitabine) regarding resection	il) and created of the	
Table (15):	comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorourace group II (patients with rectal cancer to with capecitabine) regarding the patients.	s with il) and created	
Table (16):	who received neoadjuvant treatment Comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorourace group II (patients with rectal cancer to with capecitabine) regarding the patients with received adjuvant treatment	s with il) and created atients	
Table (17):	Comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorourace group II (patients with rectal cancer twith capecitabine) regarding anemia side effect.	s with il) and created	
Table (18):	Comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorourace group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding neutropen side effect.	il) and treated	

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (19):	Comparison between group I (patirectal cancer treated with fluorous group II (patients with rectal cancer)	racil) and
	with capecitabine) thrombocytopenia as a side effect	regarding 176
Table (20):	Comparison between group I (patirectal cancer treated with fluorous group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding hepa	racil) and er treated
Table (21):	as a side effect. Comparison between group I (pati	178 ents with
	rectal cancer treated with fluorous group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding impairment as a side effect	er treated renal
Table (22):	Comparison between group I (patirectal cancer treated with fluorous group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding diarrance.	ents with racil) and er treated hea as a
Table (23):	side effect. Comparison between group I (patirectal cancer treated with fluorous group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding emesis effect.	ents with racil) and er treated s as a side
Table (24):	Comparison between group I (patirectal cancer treated with fluorous group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding muco side effect.	ents with racil) and er treated sitis as a

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (25):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluoroura group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding alterataste and smell as a side effect	cil) and treated tions in
Table (26):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluoroura group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding xeroston side effect.	nts with cil) and treated
Table (27):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluoroura group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding bleeding as a side effect.	nts with cil) and treated gingival
Table (28):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluoroura group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) rehypersensitivity reactions as a side effects.	nts with cil) and treated egarding
Table (29):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluoroura group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding pigrichanges as a side effect.	cil) and treated mentary
Table (30):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluoroura group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding aloped side effect.	cil) and treated ia as a

Table No.	Title Pag	e No.
Table (31):	Comparison between group I (patients wirectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) as group II (patients with rectal cancer treat with capecitabine) regarding nail disorders as a side effect.	nd ed
Table (32):	Comparison between group I (patients wirectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) as group II (patients with rectal cancer treat with capecitabine) regarding the acretythema as a side effect	nd ed
Table (33):	Comparison between group I (patients wirectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) argroup II (patients with rectal cancer treat with capecitabine) regarding cardiotoxici as a side effect.	nd ed
Table (34):	Comparison between group I (patients wirectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) as group II (patients with rectal cancer treat with capecitabine) regarding neurotoxicity	th nd ed as
Table (35):	a side effect. Comparison between our study and oth studies regarding the different toxicities capecitabine <i>vs.</i> 5Fu in rectal cancer.	of

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title Page	No.
Figure (1):	Globocan 2012 Egypt fact sheet: estimated cancer incidence in both sex.	
Figure (2):	Globocan 2012 Egypt fact sheet: estimated	
Figure (2).	cancer incidence in both sex.	
Figure (3): Figure (4):	Histologic types of rectal adenocarcinoma	
rigure (4):	tomography slices	
Figure (5):	Comparison between group I (patients with rectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) and group II (patients with rectal cancer treated with capecitabine) regarding sex of the	L
	patients.	
Figure (6):	Comparison between group I (patients with rectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) and group II (patients with rectal cancer treated	<u>l</u>
	with capecitabine) regarding smoking	163
Figure (7):	Comparison between group I (patients with rectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) and group II (patients with rectal cancer treated with capecitabine) regarding histological	l l
		165
Figure (8):	Comparison between group I (patients with rectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) and group II (patients with rectal cancer treated with capecitabine) regarding resection of the	l
71 (0)	1 0	167
Figure (9):	Comparison between group I (patients with rectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) and group II (patients with rectal cancer treated with capecitabine) regarding the patients who	l
	received neoadjuvant treatment.	
Figure (10):	Comparison between group I (patients with rectal cancer treated with fluorouracil) and group II (patients with rectal cancer treated	[[
	with capecitabine) regarding the patients who	
	received adjuvant treatment	171

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (11):	Comparison between group I (parectal cancer treated with fluore group II (patients with rectal car with capecitabine) regarding anem effect.	ouracil) and ncer treated nia as a side 173
Figure (12):	Comparison between group I (parectal cancer treated with fluorogroup II (patients with rectal car with capecitabine) regarding neutroside effect	ouracil) and ncer treated copenia as a
Figure (13):	Comparison between group I (parectal cancer treated with fluorogroup II (patients with rectal car with capecitabine) regarding throm	ouracil) and ncer treated nbocytopenia
Figure (14):	as a side effect	ntients with ouracil) and ncer treated totoxicity as
Figure (15):	a side effect. Comparison between group I (parectal cancer treated with fluorogroup II (patients with rectal can with capecitabine) regarding renal as a side effect.	ntients with ouracil) and ncer treated impairment
Figure (16):	Comparison between group I (parectal cancer treated with fluore group II (patients with rectal can with capecitabine) regarding diarrheffect.	ntients with ouracil) and ncer treated nea as a side
Figure (17):	Comparison between group I (parectal cancer treated with fluorogroup II (patients with rectal can with capecitabine) regarding emes effect.	ouracil) and ncer treated is as a side

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (18):	Comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding mucos side effect	racil) and er treated citis as a
Figure (19):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding alterates and smell as a side effect.	racil) and er treated ations in
Figure (20):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding xerosto	racil) and er treated omia as a
Figure (21):	comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding gingival as a side effect.	ents with racil) and er treated l bleeding
Figure (22):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding hypers reactions as a side effect.	ents with racil) and er treated sensitivity
Figure (23):	Comparison between group I (patient rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding pichanges as a side effect.	ents with racil) and er treated gmentary
Figure (24):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding alopecia effect	racil) and er treated as a side

List of Figures (Cont...)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (25):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding nail disorside effect	acil) and r treated ders as a
Figure (26):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cance with capecitabine) regarding acral ery a side effect.	ents with acil) and r treated
Figure (27):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) regarding cardiotox side effect.	ents with acil) and r treated
Figure (28):	Comparison between group I (patier rectal cancer treated with fluorour group II (patients with rectal cancer with capecitabine) neurotoxicity as effect	acil) and r treated s a side

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
3DCRT	Three dimensional conformal radiotherapy
	5-fluorouracil
	Activities of daily living
	American joint committee on cancer
	Alanine transaminase
ANC	Absolute neutrophil count
	Adenomatous polyposis coli
APPA	Anteroposterior-posteroanterior
	Abdominoperineal resection
	Cytosine arabinoside
ASCO	The american society of clinical oncology
ASR	Age-standardized rate
AST	Aspartate transaminase
<i>BM</i>	Bone marrow
<i>BNP</i>	B-type natriuretic peptide
c CR	complete clinical response
CA 19-9	Cancer antigen 19-9
<i>CAD</i>	Coronary artery disease
<i>CAPOX</i>	Capecitabine & Oxaloplatin
<i>CDC</i>	Centers for disease control and prevention.
<i>CEA</i>	Carcinoembryonic antigen
<i>CI</i>	Confidence interval
<i>CID</i>	Chemotherapy-induced diarrhea
<i>CINV</i>	Chemotherapy-induced nausea and vomiting
<i>CK</i>	Cytokeratin
<i>CRC</i>	Colorectal cancer
<i>CRM</i>	Circumferential resection margin
<i>CT</i>	Computed tomography
<i>CTV</i>	Clinical target volume

List of Abbreviations (cont...)

Abb.	Full term
CTX	. Cyclophosphamide
<i>DCBE</i>	. Double-contrast barium enema
<i>DNA</i>	. Deoxyribonucleic acid
<i>DPD</i>	. Dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase
<i>DPYD</i>	. Dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase
DRE	. Digital rectal examination
<i>DUMP</i>	. Deoxyuridine monophosphate
<i>ECG.</i>	$. \ Electrocardiographic$
EORTC	• European organization for research and treatment of cancer
<i>EUS</i>	. Endoscopic ultra sound
FACT-G	Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy- General version
<i>FAP</i>	. Familial adenomatous polyposis
<i>FBAL</i>	. Alpha-fluoro-beta-alanine
<i>FDUMP</i>	$oldsymbol{.}$ 5 -fluorode oxyuridine monophosphate
<i>FEP</i>	. Fixed erythrodysesthesia plaque
<i>FIT</i>	. Fecal immunochemical tests
FOBTs	. Fecal Occult Blood Tests
FOLFOX	. Oxaloplatin, Leucovorin &5-fluorouracil
Gfobt	. Guaiac fecal occult blood test
<i>GGT</i>	. Gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase
<i>GI</i>	$. \ Gastroint estinal$
<i>GVHD</i>	. Graft-versus-host disease
<i>Hgb</i>	. Hemoglobin
<i>HNPCC</i>	. Hereditary non-polyposis colon cancer
HR	. Hazard ratio
HRQoL	. Health related quality of life
<i>HSC</i>	. Hematopoietic stem cell