VOLUME 24 · NUMBER 22 · AUGUST 1 2006

JOURNAL OF CLINICAL ONCOLOGY

ORIGINAL REPORT

Phase III Study of Docetaxel Compared With Vinorelbine in Elderly Patients With Advanced Non–Small-Cell Lung Cancer: Results of the West Japan Thoracic Oncology Group Trial (WJTOG 9904)

Shinzoh Kudoh, Koji Takeda, Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Minoru Takada, Nobuyuki Katakami, Kaoru Matsui, Tetsu Shinkai, Toshiyuki Sawa, Isao Goto, Hiroshi Semba, Takashi Seto, Masahiko Ando, Taroh Satoh, Naruo Yoshimura, Shunichi Negoro, and Masahiro Fukuoka

From the Department of Respiratory Medicine, Osaka City University Medical School; Department of Medical Oncology, Osaka City General Hospital; Department of Medical Oncology, Kinki University Medical School; Department of Respiratory Medicine, Rinku General Medical Center; Department of Thoracic Malignancy, Osaka Prefectural Medical Center for Respiratory and Allergic Diseases; Department of Respiratory Medicine, Osaka Medical College, Osaka; Division of Respiratory Medicine, Kobe City General Hospital, Kobe; Department of Internal Medicine, Shikoku Cancer Center, Ehime; Department of Respiratory Medicine, Gifu Municipal Hospital, Gifu; Department of Internal Medicine, Kumamoto Regional Medical Center, Kumamoto; and the Health Service, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.

Submitted February 11, 2006; accepted June 5, 2006.

Authors' disclosures of potential conflicts of interest and author contributions are found at the end of this article.

Address reprint requests to Shinzoh Kudoh, MD, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Osaka City University Medical School, 1-4-3, Asahimachi, Abeno-ku, Osaka 545-8585, Japan; e-mail: shinzohykudoh@med.osaka-cu.ac.jp.

0732-183X/06/2422-3657/$20.00

DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2006.06.1044

A B S T R A C T

Purpose
Docetaxel has shown activity in elderly patients with advanced non–small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). This randomized phase III trial evaluated the efficacy and safety of docetaxel versus vinorelbine (the current standard treatment) in elderly patients.

Patients and Methods
Chemotherapy-naïve patients age 70 years or older with stage IIIB/IV NSCLC and performance status 2 or lower were eligible. Patients randomly received docetaxel 60 mg/m^2 (day 1) or vinorelbine 25 mg/m^2 (days 1 and 8) every 21 days for four cycles. The primary end point was overall survival. Overall disease-related symptom improvement was assessed using an eight-item questionnaire.

Results
In total, 182 patients were enrolled. Median age was 76 years (range, 70 years to 86 years). There was no statistical difference in median overall survival with docetaxel versus vinorelbine (14.3 months *v* 9.9 months; hazard ratio, 0.780; 95% CI, 0.561 to 1.085; $P = .138$). There was a significant difference in median progression-free survival (5.5 months *v* 3.1 months; $P < .001$). Response rates were also significantly improved with docetaxel versus vinorelbine (22.7% *v* 9.9%; $P = .019$). The most common grade 3 to 4 toxicities were neutropenia (82.9% for docetaxel; 69.2% for vinorelbine; $P = .031$) and leukopenia (58.0% for docetaxel; 51.7% for vinorelbine). Other toxicities were mild and generally well tolerated. Docetaxel improved overall disease-related symptoms over vinorelbine (odds ratio, 1.86; 95% CI, 1.09 to 3.20).

Conclusion
Docetaxel improved progression-free survival, response rate, and disease-related symptoms versus vinorelbine. Overall survival was not statistically significantly improved at this time. Docetaxel monotherapy may be considered as an option in the standard treatment of elderly patients with advanced NSCLC.

J Clin Oncol 24:3657-3663. © 2006 by American Society of Clinical Oncology

Introduction

Due to a general increase in life expectancy in developed countries worldwide, the proportion of the general population in these countries that is elderly is increasing. For example, in 1970 in Japan, 7.9% of the general population was 65 years or older, which increased to 17.3% by 2000, and is estimated to reach 29.6% by 2030.[1] As non–small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) is a common disease in the elderly population, the question of how best to treat elderly NSCLC patients will become increasingly important.[2]

Chemotherapy in patients with advanced NSCLC improves survival, reduces disease-related symptoms, and improves quality of life (QOL) compared with best supportive care.[3] Although platinum-based doublets involving newer agents, such as docetaxel, paclitaxel, gemcitabine, vinorelbine, and irinotecan, are standard first-line chemotherapy for most patients with advanced NSCLC,[4,5] the use of these regimens in elderly patients remains a topic of debate.[2] The main reasons given for withholding standard platinum-based doublet regimens from elderly patients are age-related impairment of organ function, presence of potentially complicating

comorbid conditions, and a lower ability to tolerate the potential toxicity of combination chemotherapy than younger patients.

Three prospective randomized trials have investigated the optimal chemotherapy for elderly (70 years or older) NSCLC patients.[6-8] The Elderly Lung Cancer Vinorelbine Italian Study Group reported significantly superior survival and QOL with single-agent vinorelbine over best supportive care (median survival time, 6.4 months and 4.8 months, respectively; n = 161).[6] Two other studies have attempted to determine whether doublet regimens are optimal over single-agent therapy in elderly patients.[7,8] The conclusive results were reported in the Multicenter Italian Lung Cancer in the Elderly Study (MILES), which enrolled more than 700 patients and reported no significant survival difference between single-agent vinorelbine, single-agent gemcitabine, or a regimen with both agents combined.[8]

Docetaxel has demonstrated activity and acceptable toxicity in the treatment of advanced NSCLC, including elderly patients.[9-12] However, to date, no prospective randomized trials of docetaxel in elderly patients have been published. Two phase II trials of tri-weekly docetaxel 60 mg/m^2 (the recommended dose and schedule in Japan) have been performed in adult patients with NSCLC.[13,14] We conducted an exploratory, combined-subset analysis of the cohorts of patients age 70 years or older from these two trials: in 53 patients with a median age of 74 years (range, 70 years to 80 years), the median survival time was 10.3 months and the response rate was 24.5% (unpublished data). This encouraging retrospective result led us to design a prospective phase III trial to evaluate the efficacy of docetaxel versus vinorelbine in elderly patients with previously untreated advanced NSCLC, the results of which are reported herein.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Eligibility Criteria

Chemotherapy- and radiotherapy-naïve patients with histologically or cytologically proven stage IIIB/IV NSCLC were enrolled. Other inclusion criteria included: age 70 years or older with a life expectancy of 3 months or longer; measurable and assessable disease; Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status 2 or lower; adequate function of the bone marrow (leukocyte count, 4,000/μL or higher; absolute neutrophil count, 2,000/μL or higher; hemoglobin concentration, 9.5 g/dL or higher; platelet count, 100,000/μL or higher), kidney (serum creatinine, 1.2 mg/dL or lower), and liver (total bilirubin, 1.5× the institutional upper limits of normal or lower; AST and ALT 2.5× the institutional upper limits of normal or lower). Exclusion criteria included: presence of symptomatic brain metastasis or apparent dementia; active concomitant malignancy; massive pleural effusion or ascites; active infection; severe heart disease or grade 2 or higher ECG abnormality; uncontrolled diabetes mellitus, ileus, pulmonary fibrosis, diarrhea; bleeding tendency. All patients gave written informed consent and the protocol was approved by the institutional review board at each participating center.

Before treatment, all patients underwent a complete medical history and physical examination, chest radiography, fiberoptic bronchoscopy, chest and abdominal computed tomography (CT) scan, a brain CT or magnetic resonance imaging scan, an ECG, pulmonary function tests, and arterial blood gas analysis. A radionuclide bone scan was also performed to document the extent of the disease. Laboratory tests included a CBC with WBC differential, liver function tests, serum electrolytes, serum creatinine, blood urea nitrogen, and urinalysis.

The physical examination and laboratory tests were performed weekly. Chest radiography and/or CT were repeated every cycle to evaluate tumor response.

Treatment Plan

Patients were randomly assigned to receive a minimum of four cycles of tri-weekly docetaxel 60 mg/m^2 (1-hour intravenous infusion, day 1) or tri-weekly vinorelbine 25 mg/m^2 (intravenous infusion, days 1 and 8; weekly vinorelbine 25 mg/m^2 is the recommended dose in Japan[15]). Random assignment was centralized at the West Japan Thoracic Oncology Group (WJTOG) data center in Osaka, Japan; patients were stratified according to institution, disease stage (IIIB v IV), and performance status (0 to 1 v 2).

Vinorelbine was delayed on day 8 if leukocyte and platelet counts were lower than 2,000/μL and lower than 50,000/μL, respectively, and was withheld until the counts had recovered to 4,000/μL or higher and 100,000/μL or higher, respectively; patients were withdrawn from the study if longer than 5 weeks had elapsed from the time of the last treatment until these criteria were satisfied. The presence of grade 4 leukopenia and/or neutropenia led to reductions in the doses of docetaxel and vinorelbine by 10 mg/m^2 and 5 mg/m^2, respectively, in the subsequent cycle. Patients were withdrawn from the study in the event of progressive disease, consent withdrawal or grade 3 or higher nonhematologic toxicity without myelosuppression, nausea, vomiting, or alopecia. Second-line treatment was given at the physician's discretion.

Patients were evaluated for objective response before every cycle using WHO criteria.[16] A minimum duration of 4 weeks was required to document a response and the best response was recorded for each patient. Drug-induced toxicity was assessed before every cycle and was classified in accordance with National Cancer Institute Common Toxicity Criteria, version 2.0.[17] The worst data for each patient across all chemotherapy cycles were used in the toxicity analysis.

QOL Assessment

QOL was assessed using a self-administered questionnaire, which included a visual face scale for global QOL[18] (primary QOL analysis) and eight separate measures for assessing disease-related symptoms (secondary QOL analysis; Fig 1). The eight disease-related symptom items were derived from two sources: the disease-specific symptoms score for the first four items of the Lung Cancer Working Party, Medical Research Council[19] and the treatment-related symptoms for the last four items of the Functional Living Index, Cancer.[20] Patients completed the questionnaires at enrollment and at 3 weeks, 9 weeks, and 12 weeks. QOL was considered to have improved if the difference in score between any survey point and baseline was positive and to have worsened if the difference was negative.

Statistical Analysis

The primary objective was to determine whether docetaxel improved survival compared with vinorelbine. The study was designed with an 80% power using a two-sided log-rank test at a level of .05 to detect a 60% improvement in median survival time from 6.4 months with vinorelbine to 10.3 months with docetaxel; this required 90 patients per treatment arm. An interim analysis was performed after 120 patients were accrued; after the data had been reviewed, a decision was made to continue the study.

Survival analyses were conducted on the intent-to-treat population using follow-up data available at March 28, 2005. Overall survival was calculated from the start of therapy to the date of death from any cause or last follow-up. Progression-free survival was calculated from the start of therapy to the date of disease progression, recurrence, or death from any cause. Survival curves were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method. A Cox proportional hazards regression model adjusted by the stratification factors (performance status, stage) was applied.

The χ^2 test was used in the response rate comparison and the toxicity analysis. For the QOL analyses, the comparison between the arms was conducted using generalized estimating equation regression models by GENMOD procedure in SAS (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).[21] An odds ratio of higher than 1 indicated that QOL was better with docetaxel than vinorelbine, achieving statistical significance if the 95% CI excluded 1.

A



B

Symptom	Not at all	A little	Moderately	Very much
1 Cough	0	1	2	3
2 Pain	0	1	2	3
3 Anorexia	0	1	2	3
4 Shortness of breath	0	1	2	3
5 Fatigue	0	1	2	3
6 Nausea	0	1	2	3
7 Bowel disorder	0	1	2	3
8 Sleep disturbance	0	1	2	3

Fig 1. (A) An illustration of the visual face scale for global quality of life and (B) the disease-related symptoms questionnaire.

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

A total of 182 patients were enrolled and randomly assigned (90 to docetaxel, 92 to vinorelbine) between May 2000 and September 2003 from 32 institutions in WJTOG (Fig 2). Two patients were subsequently considered ineligible due to being entered twice in the study (n = 1, vinorelbine arm) and consent withdrawal immediately after random assignment (n = 1, docetaxel arm). Therefore, the intent-to-treat population comprised 180 patients: 89 assigned to docetaxel and 91 assigned to vinorelbine. One patient assigned to docetaxel developed disease progression before starting chemotherapy and was therefore not treated. Thus, toxicity and response were evaluated in 88 docetaxel patients and 91 vinorelbine patients.

Patients' baseline characteristics were well balanced between the treatment arms (Table 1). Although more patients receiving vinorelbine than docetaxel had a performance status of 2, the difference was not significant ($P = .057$).

The median number of treatment cycles was four in the docetaxel arm and three in the vinorelbine arm, which was significantly different ($P = .050$). Overall, 45 (51.1%) of 88 docetaxel patients and 37 (40.7%) of 91 vinorelbine patients completed four cycles of chemotherapy. The major reasons for treatment withdrawal in the docetaxel versus vinorelbine arms were disease progression (19.3% *v* 35.2%), adverse events (12.5% *v* 9.9%), physician's decision to withdraw patient (6.8% *v* 5.5%), protocol violation (3.4% *v* 3.3%), and consent withdrawal (2.3% *v* 3.3%). The relative dose intensities were 90.7% and 83.1% for docetaxel



Fig 2. Flow diagram for the study. QoL, quality of life.

Table 1. Patient Characteristics

Characteristic	Docetaxel (n = 89) No. of Patients	%	Vinorelbine (n = 91) No. of Patients	%
Age, years				
Median	76		76	
Range	70-86		70-84	
Sex				
Male	69	77.5	68	74.7
Female	20	22.5	23	25.3
Performance status				
0-1	88	98.9	85	93.4
2	1	1.1	6	6.6
Stage				
IIIB	33	37.1	33	36.3
IV	56	62.9	58	63.7
Histology				
Adenocarcinoma	57	64.0	51	56.0
Squamous cell carcinoma	26	29.2	31	34.1
Other	6	6.7	9	9.9
Weight loss*				
> 10%	12	13.5	12	13.1
≤ 10%	77	86.5	78	85.7
Comorbid illness	38	42.6	36	39.6
None	51	57.3	55	60.4
Smoker	18	20.2	23	25.2
Never	71	79.8	68	74.7

*A data was not obtained from one vinorelbine patient.

and vinorelbine, respectively; most patients received the projected dose of chemotherapy in both treatment arms.

Second-line chemotherapy was administered to 85 patients (47.5%; 45 docetaxel patients and 40 vinorelbine patients). Among patients initially treated with docetaxel, five patients received second-line vinorelbine, while nine patients enrolled in the vinorelbine arm received crossover treatment with docetaxel. Fifty-two patients (29.0%) received second-line gefitinib: 33 patients (37.5%) in the docetaxel arm and 19 patients (20.9%) in the vinorelbine arm.

Response and Survival

Overall response rates significantly favored docetaxel over vinorelbine (22.7% *v* 9.9%; $P = .019$; Table 2). Progressive disease during treatment occurred in 37.4% of vinorelbine-treated patients and in 20.5% of docetaxel-treated patients; the difference between arms was significant ($P = .012$).

By March 28, 2005, 143 (79.4%) of 180 patients had died (docetaxel, 68; vinorelbine, 75). Median follow-up for survivors was 11.6 months. The median progression-free survival time with docetaxel was significantly longer than with vinorelbine (5.5 months *v* 3.1 months; hazard ratio, 0.606; 95% CI, 0.450 to 0.816; $P < .001$; Fig 3). Median survival time was 14.3 months and 9.9 months with docetaxel and vinorelbine, respectively. Although docetaxel prolonged median survival time by 4.4 months, the overall survival distributions were not statistically significant (hazard ratio, 0.780; 95% CI, 0.561 to 1.085; log-rank $P = .138$ and generalized Wilcoxon test $P = .065$; Fig 4). One-year survival rates were 58.6% and 36.7% for docetaxel and vinorelbine, respectively.

Table 2. Response to Treatment

Response	Docetaxel (n = 88) No. of Patients	%	Vinorelbine (n = 91) No. of Patients	%
Complete response	0		0	
Partial response	20	22.7	9	9.9
Stable disease	47	53.4	45	49.5
Progressive disease	18	20.5	34	37.4
Not assessable	3	3.4	3	3.3
Overall response rate	22.7		9.9	
95% CI	13.9 to 31.5		3.8 to 16.0	

NOTE. $P = .019$.

Toxicity

Overall, 179 patients were assessable for toxicity. Table 3 summarizes the major toxicities. Grade 3 to 4 neutropenia occurred in more patients in the docetaxel arm than in the vinorelbine arm ($P = .031$). However, there were no significant differences between the docetaxel and vinorelbine arms in the occurrence of grade 3 to 4 febrile neutropenia and infection. The incidence of grade 3 to 4 anemia was relatively low and there was no grade 2 or higher thrombocytopenia in either arm (Table 3). Alopecia (any grade) occurred significantly more frequently in the docetaxel arm than the vinorelbine arm ($P < .0001$). Overall toxicity in both treatment arms was generally mild and well tolerated in elderly patients with NSCLC.

One patient (age 76 years with stage IV disease and a performance status of 1) developed treatment-related interstitial pneumonia after three cycles of docetaxel; despite steroid pulse treatment, the patient died from this toxicity on day 65 after the start of the third treatment cycle.

QOL

Baseline QOL data were available for all patients except one vinorelbine patient (for whom data were not collected due to human error; Fig 2). Thus, 179 patients completed baseline questionnaires; questionnaire completion rates were 92.2% at 3 weeks, 83.2% at 9 weeks, and 69.8% at 12 weeks. Compliance rates were not significantly different between the arms ($P = .311$). QOL data were missing in 28 surveys due to death or severe impairment of the patient's general condition; this accounted for 3.9% of the total number of surveys scheduled. The proportions of data missing at baseline and at 3 weeks, 9 weeks, and 12 weeks were 0%, 1.1%, 2.3%, and 6.7% in the docetaxel



Fig 3. Progression-free survival curves for patients treated with docetaxel (n = 89) or vinorelbine (n = 91).



Fig 4. Overall survival curves for patients treated with docetaxel (n = 89) or vinorelbine (n = 91).



Fig 5. Forest plot of odds ratio for global quality of life (QoL) and disease-related symptoms analyses.

arm compared with 0%, 1.1%, 6.6%, and 13.2% in the vinorelbine arm. The distribution of the missing data was not significantly different between the treatment arms ($P = .150$). In terms of global QOL, no significant difference was observed between the two arms (odds ratio, 1.30; 95% CI, 0.80 to 2.11; Fig 5). Docetaxel was associated with significantly better improvement in the overall symptom score than vinorelbine (odds ratio, 1.86; 95% CI, 1.09 to 3.20; Fig 5). When the eight-symptom scores were analyzed separately, the docetaxel arm showed significantly better improvement in anorexia and fatigue than the vinorelbine arm. These results did not change when the QOL data were reanalyzed with the missing information from the 28 surveys assigned as unimproved.

DISCUSSION

This phase III trial showed that docetaxel provided significantly longer progression-free survival (5.5 months *v* 3.1 months; $P < .001$), a significantly higher overall response rate (22.7% *v* 9.9%; $P = .019$), a more favorable 1-year survival rate (58.6% *v* 36.7%) and significantly better disease-related symptom improvement than vinorelbine in elderly patients with advanced NSCLC. However, although docetaxel-treated patients also experienced a longer median survival time (14.3 months *v* 9.9 months) than vinorelbine-treated patients, the primary end point of improved overall survival with docetaxel was not achieved. Possible reasons for failing to detect a significant difference between the docetaxel and vinorelbine survival curves may include an

Table 3. Toxicities

	Docetaxel (n = 88)				Vinorelbine (n = 91)			
	Grade (%)				Grade (%)			
Toxicity	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Leukopenia	10.2	27.3	52.3	5.7	6.6	30.8	35.2	16.5
Neutropenia	0	6.8	26.1*	56.8*	2.2	9.9	30.8*	38.5*
Anemia (Hb)	59.1	36.4	2.3	1.1	41.8	42.9	8.8	1.1
Thrombocytopenia	13.6	0	0	0	26.4	0	0	0
AST	22.7	2.3	1.1	0	24.2	4.4	3.3	0
ALT	27.3	3.4	1.1	0	19.8	5.5	2.2	0
Creatinine	11.4	0	0	1.1	9.9	0	0	3.3
Nausea	25.0	17.0	10.2	0	20.9	14.3	8.8	0
Vomiting†	9.1	3.4	0	0	0	1.1	1.1	0
Febrile neutropenia	—	—	12.5	0	—	—	11.0	0
Infection	4.5	15.9	11.4	0	5.5	7.7	13.2	0
Constipation	26.1	14.8	2.3	0	18.7	20.9	5.5	1.1
Diarrhea	15.9	5.7	4.5	0	14.3	3.3	1.1	0
Mucositis‡	10.2	5.7	0	0	3.3	0	0	0
Alopecia§	45.5	28.4	—	—	30.8	0	—	—
Peripheral neuropathy	12.5	1.1	0	0	7.7	0	0	0

NOTE. *P* values ware obtained by χ^2 test.
Abbreviation: Hb, hemoglobin.
*Indicates grade 3 to 4 neutropenia; $P = .031$.
†Indicates grade 1 to 4 vomiting; $P = .007$.
‡Indicates grade 1 to 4 mucositis; $P = .004$.
§Indicates grade 1 to 2 alopecia; $P < .001$.

insufficient occurrence of documented events as a result of the study population comprising patients with relatively good prognosis, in addition to a high proportion of patients (47.5%) subsequently receiving second-line therapy. Another reason may have been the small sample size and the prespecified aim of detecting an improvement in survival from 6.4 months to 10.3 months. The selection of a median survival in the reference arm of 6.4 months for the sample size calculation was based on the results of the Elderly Lung Cancer Vinorelbine Italian Study Group study.[6] However, more recent survival data from the MILES study[8] reporting a median survival of 8.3 months with vinorelbine may have been more appropriate. Had this value been used in the sample size calculation a larger study population would have been required which would likely have allowed the present analysis to detect statistically significant differences between the treatment arms.

The survival findings with vinorelbine in this study were similar to or slightly better than those reported in other studies; vinorelbine monotherapy in elderly NSCLC patients has previously shown median survival times of 4.5 months to 8.3 months and 1-year survival rates of 13% to 38%.[6-8] One reason for a slightly longer median survival time in our study may be the relatively better prognosis of the enrolled patients. Interestingly, the median survival time of 14.3 months with docetaxel in this study appears to be similar to that reported for platinum-doublet chemotherapies assessed in a recent Japanese randomized trial in chemotherapy-naïve NSCLC patients, which reported median survival times of 11.4 months to 14.8 months.[5] The improved overall survival time in the docetaxel arm may be attributed to gefitinib treatment as a second-line treatment. Japanese patients are sensitive to gefitinib, and 37% of patients who were treated with docetaxel also received gefitinib, compared with 20.9% of vinorelbine treated patients although this difference may be attributable to the numerically greater number of patients alive after initial docetaxel treatment. Crossover to second-line chemotherapy was permitted in this protocol and could have also influenced outcomes. However, as only a small number of patients in either treatment arm were treated with alternative chemotherapy as salvage (five patients from the docetaxel arm and nine patients from the vinorelbine arm), outcomes for these patients were not felt to significantly alter the overall results of the study.

Age should still be taken into consideration when selecting appropriate chemotherapy in the clinical setting given the likelihood of metabolic changes with advancing age, the increased likelihood of comorbidities, and general lack of clinical trial data specifically in older patients.

The toxicity profiles for both treatment arms were generally mild and tolerable in this study. Although severe neutropenia occurred significantly more often with docetaxel, there were no differences in the incidence of febrile neutropenia or other hematologic toxicities between the two arms. The incidence of grade 3 to 4 neutropenia (69.3%) with vinorelbine treatment in our study was somewhat higher than that reported in the MILES (25%).[8] The reason for these differences is unclear. In our study, patients treated with docetaxel experienced a relatively higher incidence of severe neutropenia compared with patients treated with vinorelbine, although the incidence with docetaxel was similar to that seen in Japanese phase II studies of docetaxel in patients with advanced NSCLC (87%, grade 3-4 neutropenia).[13] However, the incidences of grade 3 febrile neutropenia and grade 3 infection were relatively low and similar between the treatment arms in our study. Importantly, there was no difference in global QOL between the treatment arms. Furthermore, docetaxel significantly improved QOL in terms of disease-related symptoms compared with vinorelbine.

The WJTOG 9904 study is the first prospective, randomized, phase III trial of taxane monotherapy for elderly patients with advanced NSCLC, and has shown encouraging efficacy with single-agent docetaxel. To further improve outcomes, we would suggest that the next step for treating elderly patients might be to prospectively investigate platinum-doublet regimens, particularly docetaxel with carboplatin, in phase III trials. Retrospective analyses suggest that platinum doublets are effective and tolerable in fit, elderly patients.[2,22-24] For further future studies in elderly patients, it would be of interest to investigate regimens involving docetaxel combined with a molecular-targeted agent (such as gefitinib, erlotinib,[25] or bevacizumab), as molecular-targeted agents are associated with relatively mild toxicity profiles compared with cytotoxic agents.

In conclusion, docetaxel improved response rate, progression-free survival, and overall disease-related symptoms compared with vinorelbine in elderly patients with advanced NSCLC; overall survival was not significantly improved. Based on these results, docetaxel monotherapy may be considered as an option in the standard treatment of elderly patients with advanced NSCLC.

REFERENCES

1. National Institute of Population and Social Security Research: Population Projections for Japan: 2001-2050, 2005. http://www.ipss.go.jp

2. Gridelli C, Shepherd FA: Chemotherapy for elderly patients with non-small cell lung cancer: A review of the evidence. Chest 128:947-957, 2005

3. Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Co-operative Group: Chemotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: A meta-analysis using updated data on individual patients from 52 randomized clinical trials. BMJ 311:899-909, 1995

4. Schiller JH, Harrington D, Belani CP, et al: Comparison of four chemotherapy regimens for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med 346:92-98, 2002

5. Kubota K, Nishiwaki Y, Ohashi Y, et al: The Four-Arm Cooperative Study (FACS) for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 22:14S, 2004 (abstr 7006)

6. The Elderly Lung Cancer Vinorelbine Italian Study Group: Effects of vinorelbine on quality of life and survival of elderly patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 91:66-72, 1999

7. Frasci G, Lorusso V, Panza N, et al: Gemcitabine plus vinorelbine versus vinorelbine alone in elderly patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 18:2529-2536, 2000

8. Gridelli C, Perrone F, Gallo C, et al: Chemotherapy for elderly patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: The Multicenter Italian Lung Cancer in the Elderly Study (MILES) phase III randomized trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 95:362-372, 2003

9. Takigawa N, Segawa Y, Kishino D, et al: Clinical and pharmacokinetic study of docetaxel in elderly non-small-cell lung cancer patients. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol 54:230-236, 2004

10. Ohe Y, Niho S, Kakinuma R, et al: A phase II study of cisplatin and docetaxel administered as three consecutive weekly infusions for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer in elderly patients. Ann Oncol 15:45-50, 2004

11. Yoshimura N, Kudoh S, Negoro S, et al: A phase II study of docetaxel in elderly patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 19:532a, 2000 (abstr 2093)

12. Hainsworth JD, Burris HA 3rd, Litchy S, et al: Weekly docetaxel in the treatment of elderly patients with advanced nonsmall cell lung carcinoma: A Minnie Pearl Cancer Res Network Phase II Trial. Cancer 89:328-333, 2000

13. Kunitoh H, Watanabe K, Onoshi T, et al: Phase II trial of docetaxel in previously untreated advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: A Japanese cooperative study. J Clin Oncol 14:1649-1655, 1996

14. Kudo S, Hino M, Fujita A, et al: Late phase II clinical study of RP56976 (docetaxel) in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Gan To Kagaku Ryoho21:2617-2623, 1994 (Japanese)

15. Furuse K, Kubota K, Kawahara M, et al: A phase II study of vinorelbine, a new derivative of vinca alkaloid, for previously untreated advanced non-small cell lung cancer: Japan Vinorelbine Lung Cancer Study Group. Lung Cancer 11:385-391, 1994

16. Miller AB, Hoogstraten B, Staquet M, et al: Reporting results of cancer treatment. Cancer 47: 207-214, 1981

17. National Cancer Institute: Common Toxicity Criteria, version 2. Bethesda, MD, Division of Cancer Treatment and Diagnosis, National Cancer Institute, 1999 http://www.fda.gov/cder/cancer/toxicityframe.htm

18. Kurihara M, Shimizu H, Tsuboi K, et al: Development of quality of life questionnaire in Japan: Quality of life assessment of cancer patients receiving chemotherapy. Psychol Oncol 8:355-363, 1999

19. Stephens RJ, Hopwood P, Girling DJ: Defining and analysing symptom palliation in cancer clinical trials: A deceptively difficult exercise. Br J Cancer 79:538-544, 1999

20. Schipper H, Clinch J, McMurray A, et al: Measuring the quality of life of cancer patients: The Functional Living Index – Cancer: Development and validation. J Clin Oncol 2:472-483, 1984

21. Kianifard F, Gallo PP: Poisson regression analysis in clinical research. J Biopharm Stat 5:115-129, 1995

22. Langer CJ, Manola J, Bernardo P, et al: Cisplatin-based therapy for elderly patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: Implications of Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group 5592, a randomized trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 94:173-181, 2002

23. Belani CP, Fossella F.: Elderly subgroup analysis of a randomized phase III study of docetaxel plus platinum combinations versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin for first-line treatment of advanced non small cell lung carcinoma (TAX 326).Cancer 104: 2766-2774, 2005

24. Fossella F, Pereira JR, von Pawel J, et al: Randomized, multinational, phase III study of docetaxel plus platinum combinations versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: The TAX 326 study group. J Clin Oncol 21:3016-3024, 2003

25. Davies AM, Lara PN, Lau DH, et al: Intermittent erlotinib in combination with docetaxel (DOC): Phase I schedules designed to achieve pharmacodynamic separation. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 23: 630s, 2005 (abstr 7038)

Acknowledgment

We wish to thank the patients who participated in the West Japan Thoracic Oncology Group 9904 clinical trial. We also thank Yuki Inoue and Kazumi Kubota, from the West Japan Thoracic Oncology Group Data Center, for their help with data collection and analysis.

Appendix

The Appendix is included in the full-text version of this article, available online at www.jco.org. It is not included in the PDF version (via Adobe® Reader®).

Authors' Disclosures of Potential Conflicts of Interest

The authors indicated no potential conflicts of interest.

Author Contributions

Conception and design: Shinzoh Kudoh, Koji Takeda, Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Shunichi Negoro, Masahiro Fukuoka
Administrative support: Shinzoh Kudoh, Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Minoru Takada, Taroh Satoh, Shunichi Negoro, Masahiro Fukuoka
Provision of study materials or patients: Shinzoh Kudoh, Koji Takeda, Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Minoru Takada, Nobuyuki Katakami, Kaoru Matsui, Tetsu Shinkai, Toshiyuki Sawa, Isao Goto, Hiroshi Semba, Takashi Seto, Taroh Satoh, Naruo Yoshimura
Collection and assembly of data: Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Takashi Seto, Masahiko Ando, Taroh Satoh, Naruo Yoshimura
Data analysis and interpretation: Shinzoh Kudoh, Koji Takeda, Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Minoru Takada, Nobuyuki Katakami, Kaoru Matsui, Tetsu Shinkai, Toshiyuki Sawa, Isao Goto, Hiroshi Semba, Takashi Seto, Masahiko Ando, Taroh Satoh, Naruo Yoshimura
Manuscript writing: Shinzoh Kudoh, Masahiko Ando
Final approval of manuscript: Shunichi Negoro, Masahiro Fukuoka

Cancer Chemother Pharmacol (2006) 58: 285–291
DOI 10.1007/s00280-005-0176-3

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Nobuyuki Yamamoto · Yasumasa Nishimura
Kazuhiko Nakagawa · Kaoru Matsui
Masahiro Fukuoka

Phase I/II study of weekly docetaxel dose escalation in combination with fixed weekly cisplatin and concurrent thoracic radiotherapy in locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer

Received: 22 May 2005 / Accepted: 19 September 2005 / Published online: 17 January 2006

Abstract *Purpose*: We conducted a phase I study to determine the maximum-tolerated dose (MTD) and dose-limiting toxicities (DLT) of weekly docetaxel and cisplatin (DOC/CDDP) with concurrent thoracic radiotherapy (TRT) in patients with unresectable stage III non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *Materials and methods*: The DOC/CDDP administration schedules consisted of a split schedule (SS) with administration in 3 out of every 4 weeks, and a continuous schedule (CS) with administration every week. TRT was given to a total dose of 60 Gy at 2 Gy per fraction over 6 weeks. *Results*: Twenty-one patients entered the study. The patient characteristics were: PS 0/1/2, 6/13/2; Sq/Ad, 16/5; stage IIIA/IIIB, 4/17. The principal DLT was grade3 esophagitis. The MTD of DOC on the SS and CS in combination with CDDP (25 mg/m2/week) was 25 and 20 mg/m^2/week, respectively. We determined the RD and schedule of DOC/CDDP on the SS to be 20/25 mg/m^2/week. The serum α-1-acid glycoprotein (AAG) concentration values were found to be negatively correlated with the grade of esophagitis. The median survival time was 23.1 months. *Conclusion*: The chemoradiation regimen tested in this study has promising activity and manageable toxicity. The continuous schedule could not be recommended due to excessive toxicity. The main DLT was esophagitis, and it significantly correlated with the plasma AAG concentration.

Keywords Docetaxel · Cisplatin · Chemoradiation · AAG

Conflicts of interest: The authors indicated no potential conflicts of interest

N. Yamamoto (✉) · K. Nakagawa · M. Fukuoka
Medical Oncology, Kinki University School of Medicine, Osaka, Japan
E-mail: n.yamamoto@scchr.jp
Tel.: +81-55-9895222
Fax: +81-55-9895634

Y. Nishimura
Radiology, Kinki University School of Medicine, Osaka, Japan

N. Yamamoto
Thoracic Oncology Division, Shizuoka Cancer Center, 1007 Naga-izumicho Shimonagakubo, Sunto-gun, 411-8777 Shizuoka, Japan

K. Matsui
Department of Thoracic Oncology, Osaka Prefectural Hospital for Pulmonary and Allergic Disease, Osaka, Japan

Introduction

Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) accounts for approximately 80% of all lung cancers, and although surgery offers the best chance of cure and long-term survival, only a small percentage of patients present with resectable disease. In fact, 25–30% of patients with NSCLC present with locally or regionally advanced unresectable tumors. Chest irradiation with modern megavoltage equipment plays a critical role in the treatment of these patients, since it assures good local control of the tumor in most patients. However, the development of distant metastases also affects their prognosis, and the addition of chemotherapy to thoracic radiation therapy (TRT) has been proposed in an attempt to reduce the risk of distant metastases.

Recent studies support the benefit of combined modality therapy in stage III NSCLC. The results of randomized studies that used sequential or concomitant chemotherapy for unresectable non-small cell lung cancer have shown significant differences in survival, local control rates, and distant metastasis rates for chemoradiotherapy over radiotherapy alone [1–5], and a recent meta-analysis of all randomized trials that compared TRT alone with the combined approach showed an unequivocal, although modest, survival advantage when cisplatin-based chemotherapy was added to TRT [6]. Concomitant chemoradiotherapy offers the potential advantage of synergistic interactions for local control

and the added possibility of direct antitumor activity [4, 5]. More recently, there has been accumulating phase III evidence that concomitant chemoradiotherapy probably yields higher response rates and survival in patients with stage III disease [7, 8].

Several novel agents with remarkable radiosensitizing properties have recently been introduced in clinical practice. In preclinical studies the taxanes were found to be potent radiation-enhancers by virtue of their ability to cause cell cycle arrest in the radiosensitive G2/M phase [9, 10]. Preclinical studies further illustrated the taxanes' radiosensitizing effect in tumor-cell lines, with docetaxel exhibiting an effect ten times that of paclitaxel at equimolar concentrations [11]. Four phase I trials of docetaxel and concurrent radiation have been reported [12–15]. Mauer et al. [12] and Koukourakis et al. [14] conducted phase I trials of weekly docetaxel with concurrent thoracic radiotherapy and determined that the maximum-tolerated dose (MTD) of weekly docetaxel was 20–30 mg/m^2 with thoracic radiation. The dose-limiting toxicities (DLTs) were esophagitis and neutropenia. The phase II studies of docetaxel [16, 17] and thoracic radiotherapy have shown an encouraging, high response, but an increased incidence of esophagitis and asthenia was observed.

The use of low daily doses of cisplatin concomitantly with RT seems to be of particular interest, since clear synergism has been demonstrated in vitro [18]. In a European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) study, daily administration of cisplatin proved to be more effective than a weekly schedule in potentiating the local tumor control achievable with RT alone, although the difference between the two schedules were not statistically significant [4].

In view of these considerations, we planned this phase I study. The objectives of this study were to determine the MTD, recommended dose (RD) and DLT of cisplatin and docetaxel when given weekly concomitantly with conventional TRT, and evaluate the efficacy of this regimen.

Moreover, since it has reported that serum α-1-acid glycoprotein (AAG) combined with docetaxel extensively [19] and that the AAG levels were significantly associated with time to progression in NSCLC patients and febrile neutropenia [20]. The AAG levels were significantly associated with the toxicity of docetaxel because AAG strongly binds docetaxel in serum. Thus, we examined the relationship between serum AAG level and major toxicities in this regimen.

Patients and methods

Patient eligibility

Previously untreated patients with histologically or cytologically documented inoperable stage IIIA or IIIB NSCLC were eligible for this study. Patients with malignant pleural effusion or any disease that required irradiation of more than half of the hemithorax were ineligible. Other eligibility criteria included: (1) age less than 75, (2) Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status equal to or less than 2, (3) evaluable or measurable disease, (4) no prior therapy, (5) adequate bone marrow function (leukocyte count ≥4,000/mm^3, platelet count ≥100,000/mm^3, hemoglobin ≥9.5 g/dl), renal function (serum creatinine ≤ 2.0 mg/dl), hepatic function (AST/ALT ≤ 2.5 times upper limit of normal, serum bilirubin ≤ 1.5 mg/dl), and pulmonary function (arterial blood gases PaO2 ≥70 mmHg), (6) absence of active infection, heart failure, or acute myocardial infarction within 3 months before study entry, no serious medical or psychiatric illness. All patients signed an informed consent form that was approved by each of the institutional review boards. Before entry into the study, all patients underwent an evaluation that consisted of a complete history and physical examination, chest X-ray, chest and upper abdomen (to include the liver and adrenals) computed tomography (CT) scan, brain CT or MRI, and a bone scan.

Chemotherapy

The treatment regimens are outlined in Fig. 1. The study was designed to fix the cisplatin dose at 25 mg/m^2/week and escalate docetaxel dose. The docetaxel and cisplatin administration schedules were: split schedule (SS), 3 out of every 4 weeks (day 1, 8, 15, 29, 36, and 43), continuous schedule (CS), weekly (day 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, 36). Docetaxel was administered as an intravenous (IV) infusion over 30 min and followed by cisplatin given as an IV infusion over 30 min. The participating investigators at each institution were allowed to decide the volume of fluid replacement and the antiemetic therapy to be administered, but adequate amounts of parenteral fluid and diuretics were given in order to prevent the renal toxicity of cisplatin. The patients did not receive steroids due to prevention of a hypersensitivity reaction. The starting dose of docetaxel was 20 mg/m^2/week, and the docetaxel dose was increased by 5 mg/m^2/week. There was no dose escalation in individual patients, and administration of cisplatin and docetaxel was cancelled if the leukocyte count fell below 2,000/mm^3 or any DLTs occurred.

At first, we planed only sequential schedule. However, as we thought that continuous schedule had a stronger radiosensitizing effect compared with sequential schedule, we amended protocol and added continuous schedule. After the MTD and RD of SS had been determined, we treated with CS using the RD of SS.

Thoracic radiation

Thoracic radiation therapy of 60 Gy in 2.0 Gy fractions was given concurrently with weekly docetaxel and



Fig. 1 Treatment regimens for weekly docetaxel and cisplatin concomitant with TRT

cisplatin infusion for 6 weeks. A 6- or 10-MV linear accelerator was used. Two-dimensional treatment planning of TRT was performed by conventional X-ray simulators. Inhomogeneity correction for lung tissues was not done. The initial planning target volume (PTV) consisted of the primary tumor, ipsilateral hilar nodes, and superior mediastinal nodes with 1–1.5 cm margin. If metastasis to supraclavicular nodes were found, they were also included in the initial PTV. This initial large field was treated by parallel-opposed anterior and posterior fields to 40 Gy in 20 fractions. The widths and lengths of the initial fields with appropriate trimming ranged from 10.5 to 16 cm (median; 14 cm) and 10.5–20 cm (median; 16 cm), respectively. After 40 Gy, oblique parallel-opposed fields were used to exclude the spinal cord. The angles of the oblique fields ranged from 15° to 45° with a median of 40°. In the boost fields, the primary tumors and the involved nodes were included with a margin of 0.5–1.5 cm. The total dose to the boost field was 60 Gy in 30 fractions. In the present study, patients were excluded if the initial radiation field exceeded half of the ipsilateral lung. However, no dose constraints on the normal tissues including the percentage of pulmonary volume irradiated to >20 Gy (V20) or esophageal length was determined, as three-dimensional treatment planning using a CT-simulator was not available.

If grade 4 hematologic toxicity occurred during the course of TRT, it was suspended and restarted after recovery to grade 3 or less. If grade 3 or greater esophagitis occurred and the physician decided that the TRT could not be continued, it was suspended and restarted after recovery to grade 2 or less. If PaO_2 fell to 10 torr and a patient had a fever of 38°C or higher, both TRT and chemotherapy were suspended and restarted immediately after recovery.

Definition of MTD, RD and DLT

Maximum-tolerated dose was defined as the dose level at which DLT occurs in more than 50% of the patients treated, and the preceding dose level was defined as RD. At least six patients were entered at each dose level. DLT was defined as grade 4 leukopenia or neutropenia lasting 3 days or more, a platelet count of ≤ 20,000/mm^3, febrile neutropenia and grade 3 or greater non-hematologic toxicities other than nausea and vomiting. Suspension of docetaxel and cisplatin two or more times was also considered as a DLT.

Response evaluation and survival analysis

The criteria for assessing the response to treatment were as follows. Complete response (CR) was defined as total disappearance of all clinically detectable lesions for at least 4 weeks. Partial response (PR) was defined as a reduction of 50% or more in the sum of the products of the cross-sectional diameters of all measurable lesions for at least 4 weeks, without the development of new lesions. Stable disease (SD) was defined as a reduction of less than 50% or an increase of less than 25% in the sum of the products of the cross-sectional diameters of all measurable lesions, with no clear evidence of either regression or progression for at least 6 weeks. Progressive disease (PD) was defined as an increase of 25% or more 25% in the sum of the products of the cross-sectional diameters of all measurable lesions, together with an increase of assessable disease or the appearance of new lesions. Survival time was defined as the interval between the date of the start of treatment and the date of death due to any cause or the most recent follow-up evaluation. The survival curves were estimated by the Kaplan–Meier method.

Statistical analysis

The *T*-test was used to examine the relationship between serum AAG values and the categorical endpoints of major toxicities, such as grade of esophagitis. A *P*-value of 0.05 or less was considered statistically significant.

Results

Patient characteristics

Between April 1999 and April 2000, 21 patients were enrolled in the study, and their characteristics are listed in Table 1. All patients were eligible for evaluation of efficacy, but one who enrolled at a docetaxel dose of 20 mg/m^2/week in SS was excluded from the evaluation of toxicity because chemotherapy was suspended due to exacerbation of a gastric ulcer. That patient experienced no DLT. The 19 men and 2 women enrolled in the study had a median age of 65 (range: 51–75). Most patients had squamous cell carcinoma ($n=16$: 76%) and stage IIIB disease (n = 17: 81%). Median performance status was 1 (range: 0–2), while only two patients had a performance status of 2.

Dose escalation

The DLTs encountered at each dose level are listed in Table 2. On the SS, six and seven patients were evaluable for toxicity at docetaxel doses of 20 and 25 mg/m^2/week, respectively. Two of the six patients at the 20 mg/m^2/week dose experienced DLTs consisting of grade 3 esophagitis in one patient and cancellation of chemotherapy twice because of grade 3 leukopenia in the other. At the 25 mg/m^2/week dose, four of the seven patients developed DLTs consisting of grade 3 esophagitis in two patients, grade 3 fatigue in one, and febrile neutropenia in one. Accordingly, the MTD and RD on the SS were concluded to be a dose of docetaxel 25 and 20 mg/m^2/week, respectively. The next cohort of patients was treated with a docetaxel dose of 20 mg/m^2/week in CS. However, four of the seven patients developed DLTs, consisting of grade 3 esophagitis in two patients, grade 3 fatigue in one patient, and cancellation of chemotherapy twice because of grade 3 neutropenia in one patient. Finally, we concluded that the dose level 1 in SS was the recommended dose for further study of this therapy.

Table 1 Patient characteristics

Characteristic	Number of patients
Total number of patients	21
Assessable for toxicity	20
Assessable for survival and response	21
Age, years	
Median (range)	65 (51–75)
Sex	
Male	19
Female	2
Performance status	
0	6
1	13
2	2
Histology	
Squamous cell carcinoma	16
Adenocarcinoma	5
Stage	
IIIA	4
IIIB	17

Toxicity

Hematologic and non-hematologic toxicities are summarized in Table. 3 and 4. Twenty patients could be assessed for toxicities. The hematologic toxicities were mild, and there were no grade 4 hematologic toxicities. Grade 3 neutropenia, decrease in hemoglobin, and thrombocytopenia were observed in 6 patients (30%), 6 patients (30%), and 1 patient (5%), respectively. Febrile neutropenia developed in only one patient, and it occurred at the 25 mg/m^2/week dose of docetaxel.

The principal toxicity on this regimen was esophagitis. Grade 2 or higher esophagitis occurred in 12 of the 20 (60%) patients enrolled, and in 5 cases (25%) it was of grade 3 and caused suspension of treatment in 2 patients and permanent discontinuation of treatment in one patient at 52 Gy. Another dose-limiting non-hematologic toxicity was grade 3 fatigue which occurred in one patient each at 25 mg/m^2/week dose of docetaxel on the SS and at the 20 mg/m^2/week dose of docetaxel on the CS. Other non-hematologic toxicities were mild and never greater than grade 2. Grade 2 nausea and pneumonitis occurred in five patients and two patients, respectively. No hypersensitivity reactions occurred. There were no treatment related deaths.

Treatment delivery

A total of 110 chemotherapy cycles were administered to 20 patients at three dose levels. Ten (9%) of the planned doses were omitted. The ratio of actual dose intensity to planned dose intensity of docetaxel and cisplatin at 20 and 25 mg/m^2/week docetaxel dose levels on the SS and at the 20 mg/m^2/week docetaxel dose level on the CS was 0.95, 0.93, and 0.88, respectively. A TRT dose of 60 Gy was administered to 18 of 20 (90 %) patients. TRT at the 25 mg/m^2/week dose of docetaxel on the SS and the 20 mg/m^2/week of docetaxel on the CS each one patient was discontinued at 58 and 52 Gy, respectively, because of grade 3 esophagitis.

Response and survival

Table 5 shows the responses observed at each dose level. All 21 patients enrolled were evaluable for response. CR was observed in 5 of the 21 (24%) patients, PR in 14 (67%) and SD in 1 (5%). The overall response rate was 90% (95% confidence interval: 69.6–98.8%). No significant differences in response were observed between the three dose levels of docetaxel.

Table 2 Dose limiting toxicity

Dose of docetaxel	Assessable patients	Dose limiting toxicitiy	
Split schedule			
20 mg/m^2	6	2	1: Grade 3 esophagitis1: 2 times cancellation of chemotherapy due to grade 3 leukopenia
25 mg/m^2	7	4	2: Grade 3 esophagitis1: Grade 3 fatigue1: Febrile neutropenia
Continuous schedule			
20 mg/m^2	7	4	2: Grade 3 esophagitis1: Grade 3 fatigue1: 2 times cancellation of chemotherapy due to grade 3 neutropenia

Table 3 Hematologic toxicity

Dose level of docetaxel	No. of patients	ANC		Febrile neutropenia	Hb		Platelet	
		Grade			Grade		Grade	
		3	4		2	3	2	3
Split schedule								
20 mg/m^2	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
25 mg/m^2	7	2	0	1	3	2	1	1
Continuous schedule								
20 mg/m^2	7	4	0	0	2	2	0	0

ANC absolute neutrophil count, *Hb* hemoglobin

Figure 2 shows the overall survival for all 21 patients enrolled in the study; 16 patients (76%) had died at the time of the analysis. All survivors had a follow-up time of 30 months. Based on the Kaplan–Meier method, the 1-, 2-, and 3-year overall estimated survival rates were 71.4, 42.9, and 32.7%, respectively. The median overall survival time was 23.1 months.

Relationship between esophagitis and plasma AAG levels

The principle toxicity on this regimen was esophagitis. Another DLT, grade 3 fatigue occurred in only two patients, and hematologic toxicity was mild. We, therefore, examined the relationship between plasma AAG levels and grade of esophagitis. Plasma AAG was measured in 12 patients prior to the start of the treatment, and the baseline AAG level of the patients who experienced grade 2 or 3 esophagitis was significantly higher ($P=0.04$) than that of the patients who experienced grade 0 or 1 esophagitis (grade 0/1, mean AAG level = 168 pg/ml vs. grade 2/3, mean AAG level = 83 pg/ml: Fig. 3).

Discussion

We conducted a phase I study of cisplatin and docetaxel administered in weekly infusions concomitant with conventional TRT in patients with unresectable stage IIIA/IIIB NSCLC. This is the first study that examined schedule and dose of weekly docetaxel in combination fixed dose of cisplatin 25 mg/m^2 concomitant with TRT. The recommended dose and schedule were determined to be cisplatin 25 mg/m^2 and docetaxel 20 mg/m^2 on days 1, 8, 15 of every 4 weeks, respectively. Esophagitis and neutropenia were by far the severest toxicities in this

Table 4 Non-hematologic toxicity

Dose level of docetaxel	No. of patients	Esophagitis		Fatigue		Nausea		Pneumonitis	
		Grade		Grade		Grade		Grade	
		2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3
Split schedule									
20 mg/m^2	6	3	1	0	0	2	0	1	0
25 mg/m^2	7	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	0
Continuous schedule									
20 mg/m^2	7	3	2	1	1	2	0	0	0

Table 5 Response at each dose level

Dose level of docetaxel	No. of patients	Response				Response rate
		CR	PR	SD	PD	
Split schedule						
20 mg/m^2	7	2	5	0	0	7/7100%
25 mg/m^2	7	2	5	0	0	7/7100%
Continuous schedule						
20 mg/m^2	7	1	4	1	0	5/771%
Total	21	5	14	1	1	19/2190%

study, while pulmonary toxicity was almost nonexistent. The pulmonary toxicity associated with concurrent chemoradiotherapy using third generation anticancer agents is frequently serious and fatal. When cisplatin and paclitaxel were combined with concurrent TRT, grade 3 or more late lung toxicity in 20%, including grade 5 in 8% was reported [21]. The incidence of grade 3 or more pulmonary toxicity in the studies of cisplatin and docetaxel concomitant with TRT has been low. Grade 3 pneumonitis occurred in 4.8% of patients in the study by Kiura et al. [22], and no grade 3 or more pulmonary toxicity was reported by Wu et al. [23].

Wu et al. [23] conducted a phase I study of weekly docetaxel and cisplatin concomitant with thoracic radiotherapy in stage III NSCLC and reported that the recommended dose was docetaxel 20 mg/m^2 plus cisplatin 20 mg/m^2 weekly. This dose is almost the same as in our study, but the dose intensity of docetaxel at the recommended dose was slightly lower in our study (docetaxel: 14 mg/m^2/week) than in the Wu study (docetaxel: 20 mg/m^2/week). The reason for this difference may be the dose of cisplatin.

Unfortunately, three-dimensional treatment planning and conformal radiotherapy were not available in the present study. Therefore, it was not possible to analyze a relationship between degree and frequency of toxicities and various dose-volume parameters including V20 or the maximum esophageal point dose. The acute toxicities are closely related to the dose-volume parameters of the normal tissues [24–26]. The degree and frequency of toxicities could be reduced by three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy, which can restrict the dose and volume of the normal tissues compared with conventional two-dimensional technique.

The response rate of 90%, median survival time of 23.1 months, and 2-year survival time of 42.9% obtained in our study are very encouraging. One reason for these favorable results may be that the weekly docetaxel and cisplatin not has only radiosensitizing activity but systemic chemotherapeutic activity. Ohe et al. [27] are currently evaluating docetaxel and cisplatin administered in three consecutive weekly infusions as systemic chemotherapy for advanced NSCLC. Thirty-three elderly patients with advanced NSCLC were enrolled in their phase II study of docetaxel 20 mg/m^2 and cisplatin 25 mg/m^2 on days 1, 8, and 15, doses which are similar to the recommended doses and schedule in our study. The overall response rate was 52%, the complete response rate was 6% and the median survival time was 12.4 months. Both response rate and median survival time in their study are promising and the results suggest that a docetaxel dose of 20 mg/m^2/week plus cisplatin dose of 25 mg/m^2/week has an antitumor effect as systemic chemotherapy.

The correlation with AAG was not a primary objective and this was not essential in this study. Thus, we could collect only 12 samples. The baseline AAG



Fig. 2 Overall survival of patients treated with weekly docetaxel and cisplatin concomitant with TRT



Fig. 3 Relationship between toxicity grade of esophagitis and serum AAG level

levels correlated significantly with the intensity of esophagitis in this study. The plasma AAG level was shown to be a significant predictor of pharmacodynamics in docetaxel treatment of NSCLC by Bruno et al. [20]. Since AAG strongly binds docetaxel, high AAG levels result in a lower free docetaxel fraction, and, therefore, decreased toxicity. The finding that high AAG decreased the grade of esophagitis was not unexpected.

In conclusion, the weekly combination of cisplatin and docetaxel concurrently with TRT is well tolerated and the recommended dose and schedule were determined to be cisplatin 25 mg/m^2 and docetaxel 20 mg/m^2 on days 1, 8, 15 of every 4 weeks, respectively. Because of favorable survival and acceptable toxicity profile, we consider this chemoradiotherapy as a warrant for further evaluation in phase II trials.

References

1. Dillman RO, Herndon J, Seagren SL et al (1996) Improved survival in stage III non-small-cell lung cancer: seven-year follow-up of cancer and leukemia group B (CALGB) 8433 trial. J Natl Cancer Inst 88:1210–1215
2. Le Chevalier T, Arriagada R, Quiox E et al (1991) Radiotherapy alone versus combined chemotherapy and radiotherapy in nonresectable non-small-cell lung cancer: first analysis of randomized trial in 353 patients. J Natl Cancer Inst 83:417–423
3. Sause W, Kolesar P, Taylor S et al (2000) Final results of phase III trial in regionally advanced unresectable non-small cell lung cancer. Chest 117:358–364
4. Schaake-Koning C, van den Bogaert W, Dalesio M et al (1992) Effects of concurrent cisplatin and radiotherapy on inoperable non-small-cell lung cancer. N Engl J Med 326:524–530
5. Jeremic B, Shibamoto Y, Acimovic L et al (1996) Hyperfractionated radiation therapy with or without concurrent low-dose daily carboplatin/etoposide for stage III non-small-cell lung cancer: a randomized study. J Clin Oncol 14:1065–1070
6. Non-small Cell Lung Cancer Collaborative Group (1995) Chemotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: a meta-analysis using updated data on individual patients from 52 randomized clinical trials. Br Med J 311:899–909
7. Furuse K, Fukuoka M, Kawahara M et al (1999) Phase III study of concurrent versus sequential thoracic radiotherapy in combination with mitomycin, vindesine, and cisplatin in unresectable stage III non-small-cell lung caner. J Clin Oncol 17:2692–2699
8. Curran WJ Jr, Scott C, Langer C et al (2000) Phase III comparison of sequential vs concurrent chemoradiation for PTS with unresected stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): Initial report of Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG) 9410. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 19:484a
9. Hei TK, Piao CQ, Geard CR et al (1994) Taxol and ionizing radiation: interaction and mechanisms. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Pys 29(2):267–271
10. Hennequim C, Giocanti N, Favaudon V (1996) Interaction of ionizing radiation with paclitaxel (Taxol) and docetaxel (Taxotere) in HeLa and SQ20B cells. Cancer Res 56(8):1842–1850
11. Choy H, Rodriguez F, Koester S et al (1992) Synergistic effects of toxol/taxotere on radiation sensitivity on human cell lines. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 24(suppl):274–275
12. Mauer AM, Masters GA, Haraf DJ et al (1998) Phase I study of docetaxel with concomitant thoracic radiation therapy. J Clin Oncol 16:159–164
13. Aamdal S, Wibe E, Hallen MN et al (1997) Phase I study of concomitant docetaxel (Taxotere) and radiation in locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 16:460a
14. Koukourakis MI, Kourousis C, Kamilaki M et al (1998) Weekly docetaxel and concomitant boost radiotherapy for non-small cell lung cancer. A phase I/II dose escalation trial. Eur J Cancer 34:838–844
15. Koukourakis MI, Giatromanolaki A, Schiza S et al (1999) Concurrent twice-a-week docetaxel and radiotherapy: a dose escalation trial with immunological toxicity evaluation. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 43:107–113
16. Aamdal S, Hagen I, Avril I et al (1999) Docetaxel (D, Taxotere) with concurrent radiation in locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Proc Am Clin Oncol 18:479a
17. Koukourakis MI, Bahlitzanakis N, Froudarakis M et al (1999) Concurrent conventionally fractionated radiotherapy and weekly docetaxel in the treatment of stage IIIb non-small-cell lung carcinoma. Br J Cancer 80:1792–1796
18. Dewitt L (1987) Combined treatment of radiation and cisdiamminedichloroplatinum (II): a review of experimental and clinical data. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 13:403–426
19. Urien S, Barre J, Morin C et al (1996) Docetaxel serum protein binding with high affinity to alpha1-acid gylcoprotein. Invest New Drug 14:147–151
20. Bruno R, Hille D, Riva A et al (1998) Population pharmacokinetics/pharmacodynamics of docetaxel in phase II studies in patients with cancer. J Clin Oncol 16:187–196
21. Robert F, Spencer SA, Childs HA III et al (2002) Concurrent chemoradiation therapy with cisplatin and paclitaxel for locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer: long-term follow-up of a phase I study. Lung Cancer 37(2):189–199
22. Kiura K, Ueoka H, Segawa Y et al (2003) Phase I/II study of docetaxel and cisplatin with concurrent thoracic radiation therapy for locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. Br J Cancer 89:795–802
23. Wu HG, Bang YJ, Choi EK et al (2002) Phase I study of weekly docetaxel and cisplatin concurrent with thoracic radiotherapy in stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. Int J Rad Oncol Biol Phys 52(1):75–80
24. Werner-Wasik M, Pequignot E, Leeper D et al (2000) Predictors of severe esophagitis include use of concurrent chemotherapy, but not the length of irradiated esophagus: a multivariate analysis of patients with lung cancer treated with nonoperative therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 48(3):689–696
25. Tsujino K, Hirota S, Endo M et al (2003) Predictive value of dose-volume histogram parameters for predicting radiation pneumonitis after concurrent chemoradiation for lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 55(1):110–115
26. Singh AK, Lockett MA, Bradley JD (2003) Predictors of radiation-induced esophageal toxicity in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer treated with three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 55(2):337–341
27. Niho S, Ohe Y, Yokoyama A et al (2003) A phase II study of docetaxel (D) and cisplatin (C) (DC) administered as three consecutive weekly infusions in elderly patients (pts) with advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol 22:679

Phase II Study of 3-Week Scheduling of Irinotecan in Combination With Cisplatin in Patients With Advanced Nonsmall-Cell Lung Cancer

Hiroshi Saito, MD, Shinzoh Kudoh, MD,† Kazuhiko Nakagawa, MD,‡ Shunichi Negoro, MD,§ Kaoru Matsui, MD,¶ Hiroshi Semba, MD,‖ and Minoru Takada, MD***

Objectives: The combination of irinotecan and cisplatin given every 4 weeks is one of the standard treatments for advanced nonsmall-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in Japan. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the efficacy, safety and dose-intensity as a measure of the feasibility of 3-week scheduling of irinotecan and cisplatin in patients with advanced NSCLC in phase II study.

Methods: Previously untreated patients with stage IIIB and IV NSCLC were treated intravenously with irinotecan (60 mg/m^2) on days 1 and 8 and cisplatin (60 mg/m^2) on day 1 of a 3-week cycle.

Results: Of the 28 patients enrolled, 27 were evaluable for response and toxicity. The response rate was 30% (95% confidence interval, 14–50%). The median duration of response was 16 weeks (range, 10–26 weeks). The median survival time for all patients was 52 weeks and the 1-year and 2-year survival rates were 48% and 29%, respectively. The dose-intensity of irinotecan was 34 mg/m^2/wk (range, 19–40). The major toxicities observed were neutropenia (grade 3, 30%; 4, 30%), leukopenia (grade 3, 30%), and diarrhea (grade 3, 22%). Other toxicities were generally mild.

Conclusions: Three-week scheduling of irinotecan and cisplatin is effective and feasible in advanced NSCLC.

Key Words: irinotecan, cisplatin, nonsmall-cell lung cancer

(*Am J Clin Oncol* 2006;29: 503–507)

Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer mortality. Nonsmall-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) accounts for 80% to 85% of patients with lung cancer and approximately two-thirds of them are inoperable at the time of diagnosis. Therefore, chemotherapy is a mainstay of the treatment of advanced nonsmall-cell lung cancer (NSCLC).[1] Recent meta-analyses have shown that cisplatin-based chemotherapy produces improved survival in advanced NSCLC.[2,3] Several new agents including irinotecan, taxanes, vinorelbine, and gemcitabine are active as single agents against NSCLC with the response rate ranging from 20% to 27%.[4] Among these, irinotecan hydrochloride, a camptothecin derivative, is active against NSCLC with a response rate of 32% as a single agent when given on a weekly basis.[5] The combination of irinotecan and cisplatin is considered to be synergistic and is active against advanced NSCLC.[6,7] A phase III study performed in Japan has revealed that a combination therapy with irinotecan and cisplatin given every 4 weeks produced comparable survival to a combination of cisplatin and vindesine in patients with advanced NSCLC.[8] In the subgroup analysis, the combination of irinotecan and cisplatin was also superior to the combination of cisplatin and vindesine in terms of survival prolongation in patients with stage IV disease.[8] Based on these results, the combination of irinotecan and cisplatin given every 4 weeks is one of the standard treatments for advanced NSCLC in Japan. In that study, there were considerable delays in treatment with or dose omissions of irinotecan, mostly on day 15, because of leukopenia and/or diarrhea, and the dose intensity of irinotecan was only 30 mg/m^2/wk (range, 12–46) in contrast to the planned dose intensity of 45 mg/m^2/wk.[8] Therefore, we conducted this phase II study of irinotecan and cisplatin scheduled every 3 weeks to evaluate response rate, safety and dose intensity as a measure of feasibility in patients with advanced NSCLC.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Eligibility Criteria

Patients with histologically or cytologically proven diagnosis of NSCLC were eligible for this study. Other eligibility criteria included the following: stage IIIB with malignant pleural or pericardial effusion or contralateral hilar node metastasis that precluded curative radiotherapy or stage IV; measurable disease; no prior therapy including chemotherapy, radiotherapy or surgery to the primary tumor; age ranging from 20 to 74 years; a life expectancy ≥12 weeks; Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of 0 to 1; an adequate baseline organ function defined

From the *Aichi Cancer Center Aichi Hospital, Okazaki, Japan; †Osaka City University Hospital, Osaka, Japan; ‡Kinki University Hospital, Osakasayama, Japan; §Hyogo Medical Center for Adults, Akashi, Japan; ¶Osaka Prefectural Medical Center for Respiratory and Allergic Diseases, Habikino, Japan; ‖Kumamoto Regional Medical Center, Kumamoto, Japan; and **Kinki-chuo Chest Medical Center, Sakai, Japan.

This study was supported by grants from Yakult Honsha Co., Ltd, Tokyo, Japan, and Daiichi Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd, Tokyo, Japan.

Reprints: Hiroshi Saito, MD, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Aichi Cancer Center Aichi Hospital, 18 Kuriyado Kake-machi, Okazaki Aichi 444-0011, Japan. E-mail: hsaito@sun-inet.or.jp.

ISSN: 0277-3732/06/2905-0503
DOI: 10.1097/01.coc.0000231432.22998.6a

as leukocyte count from 4000 to 12,000/mm^3, platelet count ≥ 100,000/mm^3, hemoglobin ≥9.5 g/dL, aspartate aminotransferase and alanine aminotransferase ≤100 IU/L, total bilirubin ≤1.5 mg/dL, serum creatinine ≤ the institutional upper limit of normal or 24-hour creatinine clearance ≥60 mL/min, and PaO_2 at rest ≥60 mm Hg. Patients were ineligible if they had the following criteria: superior vena caval syndrome; history of serious drug allergy; massive pleural or pericardial effusion or ascites that required drainage; active infection; persistent diarrhea (watery stool); paralytic ileus; interstitial pneumonia or pulmonary fibrosis; symptomatic brain metastasis; other concurrent active malignancy; uncontrolled diabetes mellitus; pregnancy or lactation, other concomitant serious medical conditions. The study protocol was approved by each institutional review board for clinical use. All patients gave written informed consent before enrollment.

Study Evaluations

Pretreatment baseline evaluation included a complete medical history and physical examination, complete blood cell count (CBC), blood chemistry studies, chest radiography, computed tomography (CT) of the chest, CT or ultrasound study of the abdomen, CT or magnetic resonance imaging of the brain, bone scintigraphy and electrocardiography. Complete blood cell count and blood chemistry studies were repeated weekly.

Treatment Schedule

Patients were treated intravenously with irinotecan 60 mg/m^2 on days 1 and 8 and cisplatin 60 mg/m^2 on day 1. Irinotecan was reconstituted in 250 mL of normal saline or 5% dextrose in water and infused over 60 minutes. Cisplatin was administered over 60 minutes with adequate hydration, usually ≥2500 mL infusion. Diuretics and antiemetics were given at the discretion of each treating physician. Therapy was repeated every 3 weeks for at least 4 cycles unless there was evidence of disease progression, unacceptable toxicity or withdrawal of consent.

Dose Modification

Dose modifications were made in response to any myelosuppression and nonhematologic toxicity that occurred. If a leukocyte count of less than 3000/mm^3 or a platelet count of less than 100,000/mm^3 was determined or if the patient had fever (≥38.0°C) or grade ≥1 diarrhea, or other grade ≥3 toxicity on days 8 through 15, irinotecan was withheld. Irinotecan was decreased by 10 mg/m^2 in the subsequent cycle if a leukocyte nadir count of less than 1000/mm^3 or a platelet nadir count less than 50,000/mm^3 or grade ≥2 diarrhea, or other grade ≥3 nonhematologic toxicity (excluding electrolytes imbalance, nausea, appetite loss, fatigue, and hair loss) was observed during the previous course of treatment. Cisplatin was decreased by 10 mg/m^2 in the subsequent cycle if grade ≥2 creatinine or other grade ≥3 nonhematologic toxicity (excluding electrolyte imbalance, nausea, appetite loss, fatigue, and hair loss) was observed during the previous course of treatment.

Evaluation

The Response Evaluation Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST) were used for response assessment.[9] Toxicity was evaluated according to National Cancer Institute-Common Toxicity Criteria (version 2.0). An independent review was conducted to validate the eligibility of the patients, staging, response, and toxicity.

Statistical Analysis

The primary end point of this study was the estimate of the response rate. We assumed that the response rate was 45% from a prior trial reported by Negoro et al[8] and the distance from the point estimate to the 95% confidence interval (CI) was 20%. Thus, 24 evaluable patients were required. If 11 out of 24 evaluable patients have response, the response rate is 46% with the exact 95% CI of 26% to 67%. Durations of response and survival were measured from the first day of the treatment, and the overall survival curve and progression-free survival curve were calculated by the method of Kaplan and Meier.[10]

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

Between January and June 2003, 28 patients were entered in this study. Baseline characteristics of the evaluable patients were listed in Table 1. Twenty patients (74%) had stage IV disease and 11 patients (41%) had ECOG performance status of 0. Adenocarcinoma was the dominant histology (74%).

Treatment Administration

Patients received a median of 4 treatment cycles (range, 1–6 cycles). Seven patients received only 1 cycle of treatment because of adverse events (4 patients) and progressive disease (3 patients). A total of 92 cycles were given. Irinotecan administration on day 8 was withheld in 9 cycles (10%)

TABLE 1. Patients Characteristics

No. patients	27
Age (years)	
Median	63
Range	38–72
Gender (% of patients)	
Male	19 (70)
Female	8 (30)
Performance status (ECOG) (% of patients)	
0	11 (41)
1	16 (59)
Stage (% of patients)	
IIIB	7 (26)
IV	20 (74)
Histology (% of patients)	
Adenocarcinoma	20 (74)
Squamous cell carcinoma	7 (26)

ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group.



FIGURE 1. Kaplan-Meier survival curve of 27 evaluable patients with advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer.

and dose reduction was made in 41 cycles (45%). The dose of cisplatin was reduced in 18 cycles (20%). The dose-intensity of irinotecan was 34 mg/m^2/wk (85% of the planned dose) and cisplatin 19 mg/m^2/wk (95% of the planned dose).

Response and Survival

Three of 7 patients (43%) with stage IIIB disease achieved partial response while 5 of 20 patients (25%) with stage IV disease showed partial response, with an overall response rate of 30% (95% CI, 14–50%). The response rate for adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma were 20% and 57%, respectively. Thirteen patients showed stable disease and 6 had progressive disease. No complete response was seen. The median duration of response was 16 weeks (range, 10–26 weeks). The median survival time for all patients was 52 weeks and a 1-year and 2-year survival rate was 48% (95% CI, 29–67%) and 29% (95% CI, 11–46%), respectively (Fig. 1).

Toxicity

The major adverse events were shown in Table 2. Hematologic toxicity was the principal toxicity of this regimen. Grade 4 neutropenia and anemia was observed in 8 patients (30%) and 1 patient (4%), respectively. There was no grade 4 leukopenia. Thrombocytopenia was predominantly mild (grade 1–2) and only 1 patient had grade 3 toxicity. Nonhematologic toxicities mainly consisted of diarrhea, nausea and vomiting, and anorexia. Grade 3 diarrhea was observed in 6 patients (22%) but no patient had grade 4 diarrhea. Grade 3 infection was observed in 4 patients (15%) and 1 patient had febrile neutropenia. There were no treatment-related deaths.

TABLE 2. Major Toxicities by Patient and Cycle

	Grade 3/4	
	Patients (%), n = 27	Cycles (%), n = 92
Neutropenia	8/8 (59)	27/8 (38)
Leukopenia	8/0 (30)	10/0 (11)
Anemia	5/1 (22)	7/1 (9)
Thrombocytopenia	1/0 (4)	1/0 (1)
Diarrhea	6/0 (22)	9/0 (10)
Nausea	8/0 (30)	9/0 (10)
Vomiting	2/0 (7)	2/0 (2)
Infection	4/0 (15)	4/0 (4)
Anorexia	9/0 (33)	13/0 (14)

DISCUSSION

In this phase II study, we have explored the potential advantages of 3-week schedule of irinotecan and cisplatin in patients with advanced NSCLC and have achieved a 30% response rate. In the chemotherapy of advanced lung cancer, irinotecan is usually given weekly on days 1, 8, and 15 in a combination with cisplatin and the treatment cycle is repeated every 4 weeks. Masuda et al reported a 48% response rate in 4-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin in a phase II study.[7] Based on this result, 2 randomized phase III studies have been conducted in Japan. Negoro et al[8] compared a combination of irinotecan and cisplatin with a combination of cisplatin and vindesine and irinotecan alone while Niho et al[11] compared a combination of irinotecan and cisplatin with a combination of cisplatin and vindesine. The response rates of irinotecan and cisplatin were 44% and 29%,

respectively. Despite the difference of the response rates between the 2 phase III studies, the median survival times (50 versus 45 weeks) and the 1-year survival rates (47 versus 43%) were comparable between the 2 studies. These 2 studies have revealed that a combination therapy with irinotecan and cisplatin given every 4 weeks produced comparable survival to a combination of cisplatin and vindesine in patients with advanced NSCLC.[8,11] Furthermore, Negoro et al reported that in the subgroup analysis, the combination of irinotecan and cisplatin was superior to the combination of cisplatin and vindesine in survival prolongation in patients with stage IV disease.[8] The response rate of 30% in our study is between those of the 2 phase III studies evaluating 4-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin. This, plus the median survival time of 52 weeks and the 1-year survival of 48% in our study are encouraging.

Two groups evaluated 3-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin in patients with advanced NSCLC in the phase II studies.[12,13] Takeda et al administered irinotecan (75 mg/m^2) and cisplatin with antilate-diarrheal program and reported the response rate of 63%.[12] Han et al evaluated 2 sequences of 3-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan (80 mg/m^2) and cisplatin without any antidiarrheal measures and reported the overall response rate of 47%.[13] These studies including our own suggest that 3-week cycle of irinotecan and cisplatin is effective in patients with advanced NSCLC. Recently, another randomized phase III study conducted in Japan has compared the 4-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin as the control arm with 3 platinum-based doublets with new agents (carboplatin plus paclitaxel, cisplatin plus gemcitabine, and cisplatin plus vinorelbine).[14] This study has shown that 4-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin was comparable to other platinum doublet therapy with new agents in terms of response rate and survival with different toxic profiles. Further evaluation will be necessary to clarify whether 3-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin is superior in terms of survival and toxicity to 4-week scheduled therapy as well as other platinum doublet therapy with new agents in the treatment of advanced NSCLC.

Neutropenia was the most prominent toxicity in this study and grade 4 neutropenia was observed in 8 patients (30%). This incidence was lower than in other studies evaluating the 4-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin, in which the incidence of grade 4 neutropenia was 37% to 38%.[7,8] The incidence of grade 4 neutropenia in the 4-week scheduled therapy for irinotecan and cisplatin was lower than in the platinum-based doublet in a combination with a new agent such as paclitaxel, gemcitabine, vinorelbine, and docetaxel.[15–18] In 3-week scheduled therapy, the incidence of grade 4 neutropenia is further reduced. Leukopenia was usually less severe than neutropenia. In our study, grade 3 leukopenia was observed in 30% of the patients and there was no grade 4 leukopenia observed. Anemia and thrombocytopenia were relatively mild with this regimen. Diarrhea was the most troublesome nonhematologic toxicity in irinotecan-containing regimens.[5,19] We observed grade 3 diarrhea in 22% of our patients and no patient experienced grade 4 diarrhea. Antilate-diarrheal program may be beneficial to further reduce moderate to severe diarrhea.[12]

Another aim of this study was to evaluate dose-intensity as a measure of the feasibility of a 3-week schedule of irinotecan and cisplatin. In the previous phase III study, the dose intensity of irinotecan was only 30 mg/m^2/wk (67% of the planned dose).[8] We planned to administer irinotecan at a dose of 60 mg/m^2 on days 1 and 8, giving the planned dose-intensity of irinotecan of 40 mg/m^2/wk. The actual dose-intensity of irinotecan administered was 34 mg/m^2/wk (85% of the planned dose). In contrast, the actual dose intensities of irinotecan in the studies of Takeda et al and Han et al were 48.5 mg/m^2/wk and 44 mg/m^2/wk, respectively.[12,13] One explanation for this difference is that we reduced the dose of irinotecan based on the toxicity in the previous cycle while they did not reduce the dose of irinotecan based on the toxicity in the previous cycle. Despite this difference, these data suggest that 3-week cycle of irinotecan and cisplatin is better tolerated than the 4-week scheduling of irinotecan and cisplatin with greater irinotecan dose-intensity.

In summary, this study suggests that therapy with a 3-week cycle of irinotecan and cisplatin is effective and feasible in the treatment of advanced NSCLC. Further evaluation of the combination of irinotecan and cisplatin, at the doses and schedule used in this study, is warranted in advanced NSCLC.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Yukitoshi Yasuzawa and Akiko Hayakawa for their assistance in data collection and analysis.

REFERENCES

1. Marino P, Pampallona S, Preatoni A, et al. Chemotherapy vs supportive care in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. Results of a meta-analysis of the literature. *Chest.* 1994;106:861–865.
2. Grilli R, Oxman AD, Julian JA. Chemotherapy for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: how much benefit is enough? *J Clin Oncol.* 1993;11:1866–1872.
3. Non-small Cell Lung Cancer Collaborative Group. Chemotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: a meta-analysis using updated data on individual patients from 52 randomized clinical trials. *BMJ.* 1995;311:899–909.
4. Bunn PA Jr, Kelly K. New chemotherapeutic agents prolong survival and improve quality of life in non-small cell lung cancer: a review of the literature and future directions. *Clin Cancer Res.* 1998;5:1087–1100.
5. Fukuoka M, Niitani H, Suzuki A, et al. A phase II study of CPT-11, a new derivative of camptothecin, for previously untreated non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 1992;10:16–20.
6. Masuda N, Fukuoka M, Takada M, et al. CPT-11 in combination with cisplatin for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol.* 1992;10:1775–1780.
7. Masuda N, Fukuoka M, Fujita A, et al. A phase II trial of combination of CPT-11 and cisplatin for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. CPT-11 Lung Cancer Study Group. *Br J Cancer.* 1998;78:251–256.
8. Negoro S, Masuda N, Takada Y, et al. Randomised phase III trial of irinotecan combined with cisplatin for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Br J Cancer.* 2003;88:335–341.
9. 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;92:205–216.

10. Kaplan EL, Meier P. Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *J Am Stat Assoc.* 1958;53:457–481.
11. Niho S, Nagao K, Nisiwaki Y, et al. Randomized multicenter phase III trial of irinotecan (CPT-11) and cisplatin (CDDP) versus CDDP and vindesine (VDS) in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) (Abstract). *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol.* 1999;18:492a. Abstract 1897.
12. Takeda Y, Tsuduki E, Izumi S, et al. A phase I/II trial of irinotecan-cisplatin combined with an anti-late-diarrhoeal programme to evaluate the safety and antitumour response of this combination therapy in patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Br J Cancer.* 2005; 93:1341–1349.
13. Han JY, Lim HS, Lee DH, et al. Randomized phase II study of two opposite administration sequences of irinotecan and cisplatin in patients with advanced nonsmall cell lung carcinoma. *Cancer.* 2006;106:873–880.
14. Kubota K, Nishiwaki Y, Ohashi Y, et al. The Four-Arm Cooperative Study (FACS) for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC). *J Clin Oncol, 2004 ASCO Annual Meeting Proceedings (Post-Meeting Edition).* 2004;22:618s. Abstract 7006.
15. Kelly K, Crowley J, Bunn PA Jr, et al. Randomized phase III trial of paclitaxel plus carboplatin versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin in the treatment of patients with advanced non–small-cell lung cancer: a Southwest Oncology Group trial. *J Clin Oncol.* 2001;19:3210–3218.
16. Schiller JH, Harrington D, Belani CP, et al. Comparison of four chemotherapy regimens for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2002;346:92–98.
17. Smit EF, van Meerbeeck JP, Lianes P, et al. Three-arm randomized study of two cisplatin-based regimens and paclitaxel plus gemcitabine in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a phase III trial of the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer Lung Cancer Group–EORTC 08975. *J Clin Oncol.* 2003;21:3909–3917.
18. Fossella F, Pereira JR, von Pawel J, et al. Randomized, multinational, phase III study of docetaxel plus platinum combinations versus vinorelbine plus cisplatin for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: the TAX 326 study group. *J Clin Oncol.* 2003;21:3016–3024.
19. Abigerges D, Armand JP, Chabot GG, et al. Irinotecan (CPT-11) high-dose escalation using intensive high-dose loperamide to control diarrhea. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1994;86:446–449.

Lung Cancer (2006) 54, 241–242

available at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/lungcan

CASE REPORT

Pemetrexed-induced edema of the eyelid

Takayasu Kurata*, Kenji Tamura, Isamu Okamoto, Taroh Satoh, Kazuhiko Nakagawa, Masahiro Fukuoka

Department of Medical Oncology, Kinki University School of Medicine, 377-2 Ohno-Higashi Osaka-Sayama, Osaka 589-8511, Japan

Received 28 April 2006; received in revised form 8 August 2006; accepted 14 August 2006

KEYWORDS
Chemotherapy;
Eyelid edema;
Lung cancer;
Supportive care

Summary Pemetrexed is a novel antimetabolite that targets multiple enzymes in the folate pathway, and has exhibited clear antitumor activities in the treatment of malignant pleural mesothelioma and non-small cell lung cancer. Although many adverse events of pemetrexed, such as bone marrow suppression, have been reported, edema of the eyelid has been previously reported in only one case (0.2%, $n=519$), according to the Pemetrexed Clinical Investigator's Brochure, April 2005 version. We experienced a patient who developed the valuable edema of the eyelid. We believe that medical oncologists should be aware of this rare adverse event, although the mechanism responsible for it is not yet known.

1. Introduction

Pemetrexed is a novel antimetabolite that targets multiple enzymes in the folate pathway, and has exhibited clear antitumor activities in the treatment of malignant pleural mesothelioma and non-small cell lung cancer [1,2]. In early-phase pemetrexed studies, severe unpredictable toxicities were observed. Recently, Niyikiza et al reported that pemetrexed-based toxicities were associated with elevated serum homocysteine levels at baseline [3], and that to avoid pemetrexed-based severe toxicities, patients have received folic acid and vitamin B_{12} supplements. In the Japanese protocol, prophylactic steroids need not be administered, since the incidence of severe rash is very low in Japanese patients [4].

2. Case description

A 56-year-old Japanese man was diagnosed with adenocarcinoma of the lung with brain and pulmonary metastases in April, 2004 (cT4N3M1; stage IV). He received three courses of cisplatin/gemcitabine and subsequently received gefitinib as maintenance therapy from April to August, 2004, with a best response of partial response. After radiation therapy to the brain metastasis, which had exhibited aggravation, he was enrolled in a clinical trial of pemetrexed (Alimta®) in December, 2004 and received 1000 mg/m^2 of pemetrexed on day 1 of a 21-day cycle according to the trial design using randomized assignment (500 or 1000 mg/m^2 arm). He developed edema of the eyelid, which appeared on day 8 of the second course of pemetrexed (cumulative

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +81 72 366 0221; fax: +81 72 360 5000.
E-mail address: ctc002@poh.osaka-med.ac.jp (T. Kurata).

0169-5002/$ – see front matter © 2006 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2006.08.002