A meta-analysis of clinical trials over regimens with or without cetuximab for advanced gastric cancer patients
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Summary

\textbf{Purpose:} To evaluate the efficiency and toxicity of treatment with or without cetuximab in patients with advanced gastric cancer (AGC).

\textbf{Methods:} Randomized phase III clinical trials (RCTs) on chemotherapy with or without cetuximab for AGC were searched in PUBMED and CNKI. A total of 874 patients were analyzed for their overall survival (OS), disease control rate (DCR), and toxicity. Reported hazard ratio (HR) with 95\% CI from each study were used as the primary outcome measure.

\textbf{Results:} Three RCTs were detected on chemotherapy with or without cetuximab regimens for AGC. Chemotherapy plus cetuximab was not significantly advantageous over chemotherapy alone for OS rate and DCR odds ratio (OR) (OS: OR=0.89, 95\% CI=0.50-1.56; DCR: OR=1.11, 95\% CI=0.78-1.59). However, haematological toxicity and neutropenia were lower in the experimental group (chemotherapy plus cetuximab) than in the control group (chemotherapy alone) (OR=0.65, 95\% CI=0.50-0.84). No evidence of publication bias was found in this study.

\textbf{Conclusion:} Adding cetuximab to chemotherapy does not improve OS or DCR compared with chemotherapy alone. Cetuximab-containing combination chemotherapy can reduce the risk of neutropenia.
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Introduction

The morbidity and mortality of gastric cancer continues to decline in recent years [1]. However, gastric cancer is still the third common cancer in the world [2]. It is one of the leading causes of cancer-related death globally. There are several kinds of gastric cancer treatments such as surgery, radiotherapy and chemotherapy [3]. Resection of disease has been accepted as one of the most important and effective treatments. However, most patients are diagnosed as AGC, which bears poor prognosis with only 30-50\% of 5-year survival [4]. Therefore, treatment of AGC remains challenging. In order to improve survival outcomes of patients with AGC, several studies were conducted to compare chemotherapy with or without cetuximab [5-10].

Cetuximab is a recombinant chimeric monoclonal antibody directed against the human epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR). Increased levels of EGFR have been associated with poor prognosis in gastric cancer [11]. Overexpression of EGFR has been reported in AGC and gastric cancer seems to be a good candidate for chemotherapy combined with anti-EGFR drugs [12]. Based on the above research results, we can infer that both chemotherapy with or without cetuximab are effective treatment methods to improve the survival of patients with gastric cancer. But patients subjected to chemotherapy combined with cetuximab suffer of higher toxicity and higher treatment cost than when receiving chemotherapy alone.
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The efficiency of the two kinds of therapies is still unclear. To choose the best treatment plan for patients diagnosed with AGC, we performed a meta-analysis of all available published RCTs and evaluated the efficacy of the two treatment methods and the safety of cetuximab.

Methods

Literature search

All published studies were searched in PUBMED and CNKI up to January 2016. Reference articles and previous systematic evaluations were also looked for other relevant trials (Table 1). The following key words were included in the search strategy, which combined gastric, cancer, cetuximab, randomized, trials. The RCTs included in the meta-analysis should meet the following criteria: (i) patients were pathological diagnosed with AGC; (ii) studies comparing chemotherapy plus cetuximab to that without cetuximab: mono and combined chemotherapy with cetuximab vs mono and combined chemotherapy without cetuximab; (iii) RCTs, and review or prospective controlled research. A standardized form was used by two reviewers for independent evaluation in the research contained in this study. Comprehensive review was done for each article to eliminate repetitions.

Table 1. Trials comparing cetuximab containing and non-cetuximab containing chemotherapies, treatment schedules and quality of each trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Regimen</th>
<th>Patients, n</th>
<th>DCR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lordick et al.</td>
<td>Cetuximab + capcitabine and cisplatin</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capcitabine and cisplatin 23 (65.7)</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang et al.</td>
<td>Cetuximab + S-1 and oxaliplatin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-1 and oxaliplatin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meng et al.</td>
<td>Cetuximab + 5-Fu + irinotecan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 FU+irinotecan</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

OS was used as the main outcome measurement. Secondary outcome measurements evaluated were DCR and toxicities. HR and 95% CI from given data, directly or indirectly, estimated the effect of related measures. Appropriate data were extracted for the estimation of the log HR and its variance as previously described [15,14]. Standard techniques for meta-analysis were used to calculate the pooled estimates [15]. The meta-analysis was performed via a fixed-effects model or a random-effects model. Heterogeneity was tested using the Cochrane Q statistic test and was quantified with the I² score [16]. Heterogeneity was considered statistically significant when p<0.05. Begg’s and Egger’s tests were used to evaluate the publication bias of the studies [15,17,18]. All tests were two-sided, and the analyses were conducted using the Stata 8.2 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX).

Results

There were 3 randomized phase III trials in this meta-analysis, including one European [19] and two Chinese [20,21]. These trials included 874 patients with AGC, of which 452 received chemotherapy containing cetuximab. We evaluated the treatment schedule and quality of each trial (Table 1).

Overall survival

The OS rate was reported in two trials [19,20], during which 452 patients received chemotherapy with cetuximab while 422 patients received chemotherapy alone. However, only one trial (EXPAND) [19] reported the HR of outcome. The other two trials [20,21] showed that the median OS of the experimental and control group was 14.0 and 12.2 months, without significant difference (p=0.698, I²=0.0%; Figure 1).

Disease control rate

The DCR ranged between 79-87.1% in patients treated with chemotherapy with cetuximab and 57.9-83.9% in those with chemotherapy alone. Meta-analysis of the pooled data demonstrated that the DCR was not significantly different between the two therapies (OR=1.11, 95% CI=0.78 -1.59, p=0.548; Figure 2). Also, no significant heterogeneity was found in all trials (p=0.222, I²=33.5%).

Figure 1. Overall survival of patients with advanced gastric cancer after chemotherapy containing cetuximab and chemotherapy alone. HR: hazard ratio.
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Toxicity

Toxicity was analyzed in all trials. Neutropenia was lower in patients after chemotherapy with cetuximab than those after chemotherapy alone (OR=0.65, 95% CI=0.50-0.84, p=0.001; Figure 3). Other toxicities such as thrombocytopenia was similar in patients after chemotherapy with cetuximab and chemotherapy without cetuximab (OR=0.86, 95% CI=0.62-1.18, p=0.3444; Figure 4). No significant differences in toxicity was found except for diarrhea.

Publication bias

Publication bias was studied by plotting Begg’s funnel graph of OR. From the shape of the funnel figure, no publication bias was found (Figure 5) concerning the three endpoints (OS rate, DCR, and toxicity).

Discussion

In this meta-analysis, we estimated the relative efficacy and safety of chemotherapy with or without cetuximab for treating AGC. It was found that chemotherapy with cetuximab did not prolong the OS and DCR rates of patients with AGC. However, the toxicity between the two groups showed more neutropenia in the control group.

The present systematic review poses the question whether chemotherapy with cetuximab is better than chemotherapy alone for AGC patients. EGFR is expressed in gastric cancer and is associated with poor prognosis. Cetuximab is an anti-EGFR monoclonal antibody and adding cetuximab to first-line chemotherapy can improve the clinical outcome of patients with wild-type KRAS metastatic colorectal cancer [22,23], advanced non-small-cell lung cancer [24], and recurrent or metastatic squamous-cell carcinoma of the head and neck [25]. There are several phase II studies [5-10] of cetuximab plus various first-line chemotherapy regimens with response rates of 41–65%. There were also several phase III RCTs [19-21] aiming to assess the efficacy and safety of cetuximab in first-line chemotherapy in patients with unresectable advanced or metastatic gastric
adeno-carcinoma. The findings of a European RCT [19] showed that adding cetuximab to capecitabine and cisplatin did not improve PFS compared with chemotherapy alone. However, Meng et al. [21] performed a randomized phase III trial of cetuximab combined with 5-FU and irinotecan for patients with HER2 positive AGC, and reported that the response rate and DCR of patients in the chemotherapy plus cetuximab group was higher than those in the chemotherapy alone group.

Factors such as limited number of trials, the different standards, methods or evaluation criteria used could lead to inconsistent results. To comprehensively evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of chemotherapy combined with cetuximab or not for patients with AGC, we conducted a meta-analysis of published data of related researches. However, this study has a number of limitations. First, there were only 3 RCTs meeting the inclusion criteria, thus reducing the reliability of the analysis. Second, in these 3 included articles, the chemotherapy options to combine with cetuximab were different from each other. In these 3 articles cetuximab was combined with capecitabine and cisplatin, S-1 and oxaliplatin, 5-FU and irinotecan, which may be potentially heterogeneous. Finally, one RCT included Asian patients and the sample size was small, showing the need for more high-quality and large-sample RCTs to confirm the results of this meta-analysis.
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