

The Prognostic Value of the Prechemotherapy Neutrophil - Lymphocyte Ratio in Gastric Cancer

Thesis

*Submitted for partial fulfillment of Master Degree in
Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine*

By

Monika Magdy Youssef
(M.B.B.C.H)

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Tarek Hussein Kamel

*Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Ass. Prof. Dr. Ahmed Ezzat Eissa

*Assistant Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Gaballah

*Lecturer of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine
Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University*

*Faculty of Medicine
Ain Shams University
2017*

Acknowledgment

*First and foremost, I feel always indebted to **GOD**, the Most Kind and Most Merciful.*

*I'd like to express my respectful thanks and profound gratitude to **Prof. Tarek Hussein**, Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University for his keen guidance, kind supervision, valuable advice and continuous encouragement, which made possible the completion of this work.*

*I am also delighted to express my deepest gratitude and thanks to **Ass. Prof. Dr. Ahmed Ezzat**, Assistant Professor of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his kind care, continuous supervision, valuable instructions, constant help and great assistance through out this work.*

*I am deeply thankful to **Dr. Ahmed Gaballah**, Lecturer of Clinical Oncology and Nuclear Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Ain Shams University, for his great help, active participation and guidance.*

I would like to express my hearty thanks to all my family for their support till this work was completed.

Last but not least my sincere thanks and appreciation to all patients participated in this study.

Monika Magdy Youssef

List of Contents

Title	Page No.
List of Tables	4
List of Figures	6
List of Abbreviations.....	9
Introduction.....	1
Aim of the Work.....	17
<i>Review of literutura</i>	
- Epidemiology and Risk Factors	18
- Diagnosis and Staging.....	36
- Treatment of Gastric Cancer	71
- Prognostic Factors of Gastric Cancer	141
Subjects and Methods	212
Results	216
Discussion	238
Summary	249
Conclusion	252
Recommendation	253
References.....	254
Arabic Summary	-

List of Tables

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (1):	The Paris Endoscopic Classification.....	44
Table (2):	Gastric adenocarcinoma classification systems	53
Table (3):	Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) scoring criteria for gastric cancer	57
Table (4):	Nodal Compartments to be removed for each type of lymph node dissection as defined by the Japanese Research Society for Gastric Cancer.....	81
Table (5):	Patient characteristics and survival in GEJ carcinoma trials	93
Table (6):	Summary of phase I and II trials investigation impact of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced gastric cancer.....	94
Table (7):	Patient characteristics, side effects and survival in different gastric cancer trials.....	99
Table (8):	Trials about palliative chemotherapy.....	105
Table (9):	Trials about targeted therapy.....	122
Table (10):	Checkpoint inhibitors in gastric cancer immunotherapy.....	127
Table (11):	List of clinical trials in gastric cancer using immune checkpoint inhibitors	130
Table (12):	Summary of the DVH parameters examined	137
Table (13):	Correlation Between Tumor Size and Clinicopathologic Factors.....	143
Table (14):	Patient and tumor characteristics of patients included.....	149
Table (15):	Patient and tumor characteristics of patients included.....	151
Table (16):	Correlation between preoperative serum tumor makers and major clinic pathological traits in the validation cohort.....	159
Table (17):	Clinicopathologic characteristics and PD-LI and APEI expression in gastric cancer patients	177
Table (18):	Results of Jin et al.	197
Table (19):	Patient demographic characteristics	216
Table (20):	Tumor site in upper GI Endoscopy	217
Table (21):	Gross morphology in Upper GI endoscopy	218
Table (22):	Lauren's Classification	218
Table (23):	Tumor's grade	218
Table (24):	Lymphovascular invasion and perineural invasion.....	219

List of Tables (Cont.)

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table (25):	Ascites at diagnosis	219
Table (26):	Tumor stage.....	220
Table (27):	Metastasis at diagnosis	220
Table (28):	Number of sites of metastasis	221
Table (29):	Site of metastasis.....	221
Table (30):	Prechemotherapy neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio	223
Table (31):	Correlation between age and NLR.....	223
Table (32):	Correlation between sex and NLR	224
Table (33):	Correlation between smoking and NLR.....	225
Table (34):	Correlation between DM and NLR	226
Table (35):	Correlation between tumor site and NLR	227
Table (36):	Correlation between tumor gross morphology and NLR.....	228
Table (37):	Correlation between Lauren's classification and NLR.....	229
Table (38):	Correlation between tumor's grade and NLR	230
Table (39):	Correlation between LVI and NLR.....	230
Table (40):	Correlation between PNI and NLR.....	231
Table (41):	Correlation between ascites and NLR.....	232
Table (42):	Correlation between stage and NLR	233
Table (43):	Correlation between response to treatment and NLR	234
Table (44):	Correlation between response to chemotherapy and NLR in metastatic patients	235
Table (45):	Correlation between event free survival (EFS) and NLR.....	235
Table (46):	Correlation between overall survival (OS) and NLR.....	236

List of Figures

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (1):	Troisier's sign	40
Figure (2):	Sister Joseph's nodule	40
Figure (3):	Trousseau's sign.....	41
Figure (4):	Acanthosis nigricans	42
Figure (5):	Blumer shelf	43
Figure (6):	The Paris Endoscopic Classification.....	45
Figure (7):	Endoscopic findings of superficial elevated (0 IIa) type early gastric cancer in the gastric antrum.....	45
Figure (8):	Endoscopic findings of superficial depressed (0 IIc) type early gastric cancer in the gastric cardia	46
Figure (9):	Endoscopic findings of superficial depressed (0 IIc) type early gastric cancer in the gastric body	46
Figure (10):	Borrmann Classification of advanced gastric cancer	47
Figure (11):	Papillary adenocarcinoma	49
Figure (12):	Tubular adenocarcinoma.....	50
Figure (13):	Mucinous adenocarcinoma.....	51
Figure (14):	Signet-ring cell adenocarcinoma.....	52
Figure (15):	Micropapillary carcinoma	56
Figure (16):	Carcinoma of the lesser curve	60
Figure (17):	Enlarged porta hepatis lymph nodes, ascites and omental involvement.....	61
Figure (18):	Celiac-axis nodes and irregular liver metastasis	62
Figure (19):	The gastric wall as visualized by EUS	64
Figure (20):	Treatment algorithm of Gastric cancer	71
Figure (21):	The extent of lymphadenectomy after total gastrectomy	73
Figure (22):	The extent of lymphadenectomy after distal gastrectomy	73
Figure (23):	Types of reconstruction pocedures.....	75
Figure (24):	The extent of lymphadenectomy after pylorus- preserving gastrectomy	77
Figure (25):	The extent of lymphadenectomy after proximal gastrectomy	77
Figure (26):	Location of gastric lymph node stations according to Japanese research society for Gastric Cancer (JRSSC)	81

List of Figures (Cont.)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (27):	Pathways that represent potential targets for the treatment of advanced stage GC	121
Figure (28):	Immune checkpoint targeting.....	126
Figure (29):	Mean dose volume histograms for PTV, CTV, OAR and healthy tissue for global analysis according to treatment plan.....	136
Figure (30):	3D, IMRT, Proton therapy	138
Figure (31):	Conventional radiation.....	139
Figure (32):	IMRT radiation.....	139
Figure (33):	Comparative accuracies of survival analysis. A, Survival curve of patients according to subgroups of T stage. B, Survival curve of patients according to subgroups of Ts stage. C, Survival curve of patients according to subgroups of TNM stage. D, Survival curve of patients according to subgroups of TsNM stage.....	145
Figure (34):	Representative gastroendoscopy images of advanced gastric cancer by macroscopic classification	146
Figure (35):	Kaplan-Meier curves showing difference in relapse-free survival and overall survival between macroscopic high-risk group and average-risk group	147
Figure (36):	Kaplan-Meier curves showing difference in cumulative survival between well, moderately and poorly differentiated gastric cancer.....	150
Figure (37):	Curves showing probability of death due to gastric cancer in different stages with respect to pathological subtypes included in Bamboat et al.....	153
Figure (38):	Kaplan-Meier curves showing difference in cumulative overall survival between tumor marker (CA 125 or CA 19.9 or CEA) -positive and tumor marker- negative population in Wang et al	160
Figure (39):	Relation between inflammation and carcinogenesis.....	163
Figure (40):	Pre-metastatic niche formation	166
Figure (41):	Immunosurveillance in cancer	171
Figure (42):	Relationship Between PD-LI Expression And Survival Time	175

List of Figures (Cont.)

Fig. No.	Title	Page No.
Figure (43):	Kaplan-Meier analysis of the relationship between APEI immunoassaying and survival time	176
Figure (44):	Relationship between APEI and PD-LI Coexpression and survival time	178
Figure (45):	Kaplan-Meier curves showing the difference in DFS and OS between patients with high PNI and patients with low PNI.....	181
Figure (46):	Kaplan-Meier curves showing the difference in 5 years overall survival between patients with high fibrinogen and patients with low fibrinogen	183
Figure (47):	Th1 cytokine response Vs. Th2 cytokine response.....	187
Figure (48):	Role of neutrophils in carcinogenesis and tumor progression	191
Figure (49):	Role of neutrophils in carcinogenesis and tumor progression	192
Figure (50):	Kaplan-Meier curves showing difference in OS between high NLR group and low NLR group in Jin et al.....	195
Figure (51):	Progression Free Survival (PFS) Curves in Musri et al. ...	198
Figure (52):	Overall Survival (OS) Curves in Musri et al.....	199
Figure (53):	Relation between CD3 density, CD4 density, CD8 density and NLR	202
Figure (54):	Kaplan-Meier curves showing difference in DFS and OS between high NLR group and low NLR group in Choi et al	203
Figure (55):	RIGHT Kaplan-Meier curves showing difference in OS high NLR group and low NLR group in both localized and advanced gastric cancer. LEFT Kaplan-Meier curves showing difference in OS between high PLR group and low PLR group in both localized and advanced gastric cancer	207
Figure (56):	Kaplan-Meier curve showing difference in OS between groups with different COA-NLR scores	209
Figure (57):	Role of PSK in cancer	210
Figure (58):	Kaplan-Meier curve showing difference in EFS between high NLR group and low NLR group	236
Figure (59):	Kaplan-Meier curve showing difference in OS between high NLR group and low NLR group	237

List of Abbreviations

Abb.	Full term
AGC	Advanced gastric cancer
AID.....	Activation induced deaminase
APCs	Antigen-presenting cells
APE1.....	Apurinic/aprimidinic endonuclease 1
ASIR	Age-standardized incidence rate
BMDCs	Bone marrow-derived cells
BSC	Best supportive care
CO	carbon monoxide
CRP	C-reactive protein
CRT.....	Chemoradiotherapy
CTCAE.....	Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events
DC	Dendritic cells
DCR	Disease control rate
DFS.....	Disease-free survival
EBV.....	Epstein-Barr virus
ECOG.....	Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group
EFS	Event-free survival
EGFR.....	Epidermal growth factor receptor
EMR.....	Endoscopic mucosal resection
ESD.....	Endoscopic submucosal dissection
FAP	Familial adenomatous polyposis
FFQ.....	Food frequency questionnaire
GC	Gastric cancer

List of Abbreviations (Cont.)

Abb.	Full term
GEJ	Gastro-esophageal junction
HDGC	Hereditary diffuse gastric cancer
HER2	Human epithelial growth factor receptor 2
HIPEC	Hyperthermia intraperitoneal chemotherapy
JGCA	Japanese Gastric Cancer Association
JPS.....	Juvenile polyposis syndrome
LRRFS	Loco-regional recurrence free survival
LVI.....	Lympho-vascular invasion
MAPK	Mitogen-activated kinase
mGC	metastatic gastric cancer
mGPS.....	Modified Glasgow Prognostic Score
MHC	Major histocompatibility complex
MMP-9	Matrix metalloproteinase
NK.....	Natural killer cells
NKT	Natural killer T cells
NLR	Neutrophil to Lymphocyte ratio
NOC	N-nitroso compounds
OAR	Organs at risk
ORR	Objective response rate
OS	Overall survival
PAH	Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
pCR	pathological complete response
PDGFR	Platelet derived growth factor receptor
PFS	Progression-free survival

List of Abbreviations (Cont.)

Abb.	Full term
PI3K.....	Phosphoinositide 3-kinase
PJS.....	Peutz-Jeghers syndrome
PLR.....	Platelet to lymphocyte ratio
PNI.....	Perineural invasion
PTEN	Phosphatas and Tensin homolog
RECIST.....	Response Evaluation Criteria In Solid Tumors
<i>RFS</i>	Relapse free survival
ROS.....	Reactive oxygen species
RR	Response rate
STAT3.....	Signal transducers and activators of transcription
TAMs	Tumor-associated macrophages
TDSFs.....	Tumor-derived secreted factors
TGF- α	Transforming growth factor alpha
TGF- α	Transforming growth factor- α
TKI.....	Tyrosine kinase inhibitor
TNF α	Tumor necrosis factor alpha
TTP	Time to progression
VEGF	Vascular endothelial gross factor
WPT	Water pipe tobacco

INTRODUCTION

Gastric cancer is the fifth most common cancer worldwide, with about one million (952,000) new cases diagnosed annually (*Chen et al., 2015*).

More than 70% of gastric cancers occur in developing countries, particularly in Eastern Asia. The peak age for gastric cancer is 60-80 years (*Zeeneldin et al., 2014*).

According to the GLOBOCAN database, gastric adenocarcinoma (GC) is the third leading cause of cancer-related death worldwide, after lung and liver malignancies, resulting in around 723,000 deaths in 2012 (*Ferlay et al., 2015*).

Although there have been advances in diagnosis and management, most GC patients present with locally advanced or metastatic disease, with a 5-year survival rate of <10% (*Wang et al., 2015*).

In Egypt, gastric cancer is the 12th most common cancer in both sexes, representing 1.6 % of total cancers. It's the 12th leading cause of cancer death, representing 2.2 % of total cancer mortality. Median age of gastric cancer in Egypt is 56 years (*Zeeneldin et al., 2014*).

Environmental risk factors include *Helicobacter pylori* (*H. pylori*) infection, smoking, high salt intake and other

dietary factors. Though most gastric cancers are considered sporadic, it is estimated that 5 % to 10 % have a familial component; and 3 % to 5 % are associated with inherited cancer predisposition syndromes. The most common hereditary cancer predisposition syndromes are: - Hereditary Diffuse Gastric cancer, Lynch Syndrome, Juvenile Polyposis Syndrome, Peutz-Jeghers Syndrome and Familial Adenomatous Polyposis (*NCCN Guidelines Version 1.2017*).

Treatment strategies are determined by TNM staging system. However, many patients of the same TNM stage have different prognoses (*Jingxu Sun et al., 2015*).

Gastric Cancer exhibits diverse prognoses according to various intrinsic characteristics. Therefore, the development of efficient treatment strategies for the various prognostic groups within GC is important. With this, we can more readily understand the underlying biological mechanisms of each subtype of GC, to effectively individualize each treatment strategy (*Chan-Young et al., 2017*).

Several prognostic factors in GC have been reported: - performance status, tumor burden, tumor markers such as carbohydrate antigen 19-9 (CA-19-9), the high metabolic landscape of the tumor and weight loss during chemotherapy. They have been independently correlated with a poor prognosis (*Ock et al., 2016*).

It is increasingly recognised that variations within clinical outcomes in cancer patients are influenced; by not only the oncological characteristics of the tumor, but also the host-response factors. The possibility of combining multiple clinically available host- and tumor related factors is of great interest; as it might serve as an excellent basis for clinical decision-making, treatment planning and establishing follow-up schedules (*Chen et al., 2015*).

A number of studies have focused on tumor microenvironment, which is associated with the systemic inflammatory response; and may play an important role in cancer tumorigenesis and progression (*Jingxu Sun et al., 2015*). This inflammatory response reflects a non-specific response to tumor hypoxia tissue injury and necrosis (*Chua et al., 2012*).

Systemic inflammatory response to tumors increases metastasis through the inhibition of apoptosis, augmentation of angiogenesis and DNA damage (*Aldemir et al., 2015*).

Many markers of systemic inflammation response to tumors have been investigated as prognostic and predictive biomarkers, such as C-reactive protein (CRP) and erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) (*Nozoe et al., 2011*).

Inflammatory cytokines and chemokines can be produced by both the tumor and associated host cells, such as leukocytes, and contribute to malignant progression.

Neutrophilia, as an inflammatory response, inhibits the immune system by suppressing the cytolytic activity of immune cells such as lymphocytes, activated T cells and natural killer cells.

Neutrophils and other cells, such as macrophages, have been reported to secrete tumor growth promoting factors, including: - vascular endothelial growth factor, hepatocyte growth factor, IL-6, IL-8, matrix metalloproteinases and elastases. Thus, they likely contribute to a stimulating tumor microenvironment (*Templeton et al., 2014*).

The importance of lymphocytes has been highlighted in several studies; in which increasing infiltration of tumors with lymphocytes has been associated with better response to cytotoxic treatment and prognosis in cancer patients (*Loi et al., 2013*).

The neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio (NLR), which is suggested as the balance between pro-tumor inflammatory status and anti-tumor immune status, has been shown to be associated with outcomes in patients with various types of malignancies (*Pistelli et al., 2015*) such as Renal cell carcinoma, Hepatocellular carcinoma and colorectal cancer (*Pichler et al., 2013*).