Table 4. Results of meta-analyses for neoadjuvant chemotherapy-setting treatment.

	[illegible]	[illegible]
Major selection criteria:	– Stage III/IV>90% – NAC regimen included CDDP or CBDCA – NAC was administered before cytoreductive surgery	
Target period for Medline search	1 January 1989–30 September 2005	1 January 1989–30 June 2008
Studies (n)	21	21
[illegible]		
MST	24.5 months	27.5 months
Taxane use (%)	47.7	48.2
Optimal cytoreduction (%)	65.0	70.0
Stage IV (%)	27.4	28.9
Age (years)	61.1	60.4
[illegible]		
Year of publication	p = 0.004 (1.1 months/year)	p = 0.002
Rate of taxane use	p < 0.0005 (1.6 months/10%)	p = 0.007
Rate of optimal cytoreduction	p = 0.012 (1.9 months/10%)	p = 0.012
Rate of stage IV patients	p = 0.002 (-2.3 months/10%)	p = 0.101 (NS)
NAC cycles (n)	p = 0.046 (-4.1 months/cycle)	p = 0.701 (NS)
Age	p = 0.448 (NS)	NA
Statistical method	Simple linear regression model	Random-effects model

CBDCA: Carboplatin; CDDP: Cisplatin; MST: Median survival time; NA: Not assessed; NAC: Neoadjuvant chemotherapy; NS: Not significant.

the tumor marker criterion (CA125/CEA ratio >25) could be used. After enrollment, patients assigned to NACT required laparoscopic biopsy, image-guided biopsy or fine-needle biopsy. Although the rate of benign disease or the rate of other malignancy may be revealed by the study, at present we cannot recommend starting NACT by using only diagnoses based on imaging tests and serum tumor marker results.

Schwartz *et al.* evaluated the role of cytology in the pretreatment diagnosis of advanced-stage ovarian cancer [30]. They performed NACT for patients with advanced-stage ovarian cancer diagnosed based on clinical findings. Pretreatment cytology slides of ascitic fluid were reviewed and categorized as consistent with ovarian cancer, not consistent with ovarian cancer, or insufficient. Pathological diagnosis at IDS and cytological diagnosis were compared in 47 patients. In total, 42 out of 43 patients with cytology consistent with ovarian cancer had ovarian cancer and one had no pathologic evidence of disease. Two out of three patients with cytology not consistent with ovarian cancer had ovarian cancer, and one had a mesonephric adenocarcinoma. The authors conclude that cytology has proven to be extremely helpful in supporting clinical impressions of apparently advanced-stage ovarian cancer.

Freedman *et al.* compared diagnostic strategies for predicting final pathology of ovarian cancer among 149 patients who underwent NACT [31]. The initial diagnosis was based on cytology in 108 patients, histology in 26 patients and only clinical factors (imaging studies and CA125) in 15 patients. Pathological diagnoses of disease in four patients who obtained complete pathological responses were determined to be consistent with ovarian cancer. The diagnostic accuracy of the cytology, histology and clinical factors alone was 98, 96 and 87%, respectively (p = 0.04). The authors conclude that diagnosis of epithelial ovarian cancer based on cytology and histology are superior to clinical factors alone.

The JCOG0206 study assessed the accuracy of clinical diagnosis based on imaging tests, cytology from ascites, pleural effusion or tumor, and tumor markers (CA125 >200 U/ml and CEA <20 ng/ml) [27]. All enrolled patients underwent diagnostic laparoscopy in order to determine accurate diagnoses. The disease was ovarian, tubal or peritoneal cancer in 100% (56 out of 56 patients), and stage III/IV in 95% (53 out of 56 patients). As for the stage of the disease, laparotomy performed immediately after the diagnostic laparoscopy revealed stage IIIb disease in one out of the aforementioned three patients. The results suggest that appropriate target diseases for NACT can be diagnosed with >90% accuracy by clinical diagnoses based on findings including cytology, according to the Bayesian statistical methods.

From these studies, it can be concluded that cytological examination of ascites, pleural effusion or tumor in addition to imaging diagnosis and tumor markers may be necessary before NACT for accurate diagnosis of advanced-stage ovarian, tubal or peritoneal cancer, unless we select diagnostic laparotomy or laparoscopy.

Table 5. Phase III randomized studies comparing neoadjuvant chemotherapy-setting treatment and primary debulking surgery followed by chemotherapy.

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Study name or ID	EORTC55971	CHORUS	JCOG0602	ID I473
Principal Investigator	Vergote IB	Kehoe S	Yoshikawa H	Kumar L
Country or area	Europe	UK	Japan	India
Target disease origin	Ovary, tube and peritoneum	Ovary, tube and peritoneum	Ovary, tube and peritoneum	Ovary
Stage	Stage IIIC/IV	Stage III/IV	Stage III/IV	Stage IIIC + IV (pleural effusion)
Phase of the study	III	II/III	III	III
[illegible]				
Necessity for biopsy/ cytology	Biopsy is preferentially necessary FNA cytology is allowed	Neither biopsy nor cytology is necessary	Cytology is necessary biopsy is allowed	Either biopsy or cytology is allowed
Tumor marker	CA125/CEA ratio >25†	CA125/CEA ratio >25‡	CA125 >200 U/ml; CEA <20 ng/ml	Normal CEA
Regimen	Platinum (CDDP or CBDCA) + taxane (PTX or DTX)	CBDCA or CBDCA based	PTX + CBDCA	PTX + CBDCA
Chemotherapy cycles (n)	NAC: 3/total: 6	NAC: 3/total: 6	NAC: 4/total: 8	NAC: 3/total: 6
Planned number of patients	704	150 (Phase II) + 400 (Phase III)	300	180
Start date	21 September 1998	March 2004 (Phase III part)	17 November 2006	November 2001
Accrual period	4 years	4 years	3 years	5 years
Status of the study	Closed on 6 December 2006	Closed on 31 August 2010	Open	Open
Design of the study	Noninferiority	Noninferiority (combined with EORTC patients)	Noninferiority	Noninferiority (probably)
Database registration ID	NCT00003636	NCT00075712	UMIN000000523	NCT00715286
Registered day	1 November 1999	9 January 2004	17 November 2006	14 July 2008

†Supplementary criterion to omit investigations for gastrointestinal or colon cancer in whom cytology was used for the confirmation of malignancy.
‡Supplementary criterion to omit investigations for gastrointestinal cancer.
CBDCA: Carboplatin; CDDP: Cisplatin; CEA: Carcinoembryonic antigen; CHORUS: Chemotherapy or Upfront Surgery; CTU-MRC: Medical Research Council Clinical Trials Unit; DTX: Docetaxel; EORTC: European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer; FNA: Fine-needle aspiration; JCOG: Japan Clinical Oncology Group; NAC: Neoadjuvant chemotherapy; PTX: Paclitaxel.

When should we perform IDS?

In earlier studies of NACT, the number of cycles of NAC was sometimes based on the response to NAC. Occasionally, the number of cycles of NAC reached more than six cycles in each patient base [7,32,33], while in more recent studies, the number of cycles of NAC usually settled at three or four cycles. However, the optimal number of cycles of NAC has not yet been determined. Some reports paid attention to the number of NAC cycles.

Lim and Green administered NAC to 30 patients with stage III/IV ovarian cancer [34]. The NAC regimen consisted of CBDCA, ifosfamide, and mesna for a median of three cycles. Objective responses were observed in 13 patients, including five patients who achieved a complete response after three cycles. This study showed that more than three cycles of NAC did not increase the number of complete responses, but were associated with greater toxicity. The use of three cycles was optimal in terms of the response rate, feasibility of beneficial surgery, and so on.

In a retrospective study by Loizzi *et al.*, 30 women were treated with NACT [11]. The mean number of NAC cycles was 4.1, and the NAC regimen consisted of CDDP and cyclophosphamide in 12 patients and PTX and CBDCA in 18 patients. In this study, the outcome of patients who underwent ≤three cycles of NAC were compared with those who received >three cycles. No statistically significant difference between the two groups was observed

Table 6. Summary of interval debulking surgery outcomes following neoadjuvant chemotherapy composed of platinum and taxane combination.

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Kuhn *et al.* (2001)	31	3	CBDCA + PTX	97 (30/31)	84 (26/31)†	NR	32 (10/31)†	Prospective	[18]
Chan *et al.* (2003)	17	3	Platinum + PTX	76 (13/17)	59 (10/17)†	NR	29 (5/17)†	Retrospective	[52]
Morice *et al.* (2003)	57	3	Platinum + PTX	100 (57/57)	84 (48/57)	NR	51 (29/57)	Retrospective	[17]
Le *et al.* (2005)	61	3	CBDCA + PTX	100 (61/61)	80 (49/61)	54 (33/61)	26 (16/61)	Retrospective	[50]
Le *et al.* (2006)	58	3	CBDCA + PTX	100 (58/58)	79 (46/58)	55 (32/58)	28 (16/58)	Retrospective	[51]
Lee *et al.* (2006)	18	3	CDDP + PTX	100 (18/18)	78 (14/18)	NR	NR	Prospective	[20]
Tiersten *et al.* (2009)	58	3	CBDCA + PTX	62 (36/58)	NR	45 (26/58)†	NR	Prospective	[53]
Pölcher *et al.* (2009)	44	2	CBDCA + DTX	98 (43/44)	NR	73 (32/44)†	43 (19/44)†	Prospective	[35]
Pölcher *et al.* (2009)	44	3	CBDCA + DTX	91 (40/44)	NR	68 (30/44)†	27 (12/44)†	Prospective	[35]
Onda *et al.* (2009)	53	4	CBDCA + PTX	89 (47/53)	NR	72 (38/53)	55 (29/53)	Prospective	[27]
Vergote *et al.* (2010)	322	3	Platinum + taxane	91 (292/322)‡	NR	74 (239/322)‡	47 (152/322)‡	Prospective	[4]
Total Number	763			91 (695/763)	80 (193/242)	67 (430/640)	42 (288/687)		
Range	17–322	NAC 2–4 cycles		62–100	59–84	45–74	26–55%		

†Frequencies are recalculated to include all patients into denominators.
‡Frequencies are calculated from the number of patients in per-protocol analysis.
CBDCA: Carboplatin; CDDP: Cisplatin; DTX: Docetaxel; IDS: Interval debulking surgery; NAC: Neoadjuvant chemotherapy; NR: Not recorded; PTX: Paclitaxel; RD: Residual disease.

with respect to the response to NAC (p = 0.82) and median survival (p = 0.74). The issue of whether women who received ≤three cycles of NACT benefited more than those who had >three cycles could not be answered in their study.

Colombo *et al.* analyzed prognostic factors in 61 patients treated with NACT in a retrospective study [16]. IDS was performed after three to six cycles of NAC consisting of platinum and PTX in 39 patients, and platinum and another agent in 22 patients. In addition to the response to NAC (p = 0.04), the range of mesenteric involvement (p = 0.025), performance of digestive resection (p = 0.01), residual tumor after IDS (p = 0.014) and number of NAC cycles (three or four vs >four; p = 0.04) were identified as statistically significant prognostic factors in univariate analysis. Median survival of patients treated with three or four cycles of NAC was much better than that of patients treated with >four cycles of NAC (31 vs 20 months, respectively).

Pölcher *et al.* prospectively compared two and three cycles of NAC in NACT, consisting of IDS and six cycles of combination regimen of CBDCA and docetaxel in total [35]. A total of 44 patients were each allocated to two or three cycles of the NAC arm. There were no significant differences in PFS (12.5 vs 12.2 months; p = 0.77) and OS (28.4 vs 24.1 months; p = 0.87). The authors concluded that a treatment schedule with two preoperative cycles is a reasonable option for NACT.

Bristow *et al.* demonstrated in their meta-analysis that each incremental increase in NAC cycles was associated with a 4.1-month decrease in MST (p = 0.046), and one of their important conclusions was that definitive operative intervention should be undertaken as early as possible in the treatment program [22]. On the contrary, Kang *et al.* demonstrated in their meta-analysis that the between-study variation of the number of NAC cycles did not influence survival (p = 0.701) [23]. The difference between the two studies probably results from differences in both selection of studies and statistical methods. In any case, we cannot draw a definitive conclusion from these meta-analyses.

From these aforementioned studies, it seems that three or four cycles may be the most likely optimal amount, and two cycles may be a reasonable option for the optimal number of NAC cycles. To decide the number of NAC cycles, individual evaluation of tumor resectability discussing in the following section may be of use. However, further evaluation is still necessary.

How can we predict successful debulking at primary or interval surgery?

In the early studies of NACT, selection of patients was based on the resectability of the tumors or patients characteristics at PDS, such as age, PS and medical conditions. Some investigators proposed criteria to predict successful or unsuccessful debulking. These methods may be also applicable in the setting of NACT to determine an indication or timing of IDS.

Nelson *et al.* defined several CT findings as unresectable disease and the results were compared with surgical outcome in 42 patients [36]. Successful cytoreduction (<2 cm residual disease) was accomplished in 23 out of 24 who fulfilled CT criteria for cytoreduction and six out of 18 with CT criteria predictive of inability to perform cytoreduction. They concluded that CT scan is an accurate method for predicting successful surgical cytoreduction. Dowdy *et al.* selected 17 CT findings and correlated with the possibility of optimal cytoreductive surgery (residual tumor <1 cm) in 87 patients [37]. A combination of diffuse peritoneal thickening and ascites was a most useful predictor of suboptimal cytoreduction and associated with a very low rate of optimal cytoreduction (32%). Qayyum *et al.* defined several imaging criteria for inoperable tumors and compared with operability at surgery in 137 patients [38]. Sensitivity and specificity for the prediction of suboptimal debulking were 76% (16 out of 21 patients) and 99% (115 out of 116 patients), respectively. They also found that CT and MRI were equally effective in the detection of inoperable tumor.

On the other hand, Vergote *et al.* utilized laparoscopic diagnosis to evaluate an operability in 77 patients [39]. In total, 79% of 28 patients, those supposed to be operable, were cytoreduced to <0.5 cm residual tumor. Deffieux *et al.* evaluated the role of laparoscopy in selecting candidates for complete cytoreduction surgery in 15 patients [40]. Among the 11 patients considered to have resectable tumors by laparoscopy, ten women had no macroscopic residual tumor after surgery. Fagotti *et al.* developed a scoring system based on laparoscopic evaluation of metastases in seven regions [41]. They demonstrated that this scoring system predicts suboptimal surgery with 100% sensitivity, 100% positive-predictive value and 74% accuracy.

Although these methods may be useful during the evaluation of resectability from the viewpoints of tumor spread, Aletti *et al.* pointed out the importance of patients' conditions and surgeons' expertise to achieve successful cytoreduction [42]. They found that patients' performance and surgeons' aggressive tendency are independently associated with optimal surgery in multivariate analysis. In another study, they identified a group of high-risk patients characterized by high tumor dissemination or stage IV, poor performance or nutritional status and age ≥75 years [43]. Aggressive debulking surgery was associated with morbidity of 63.6% and limited survival benefit in these patients.

Indication or timing of IDS should be evaluated, taking into account the patient's condition and the surgeon's expertise in addition to imaging diagnoses in clinical practice.

What is the optimal goal of IDS?

Most studies emphasized that the greatest advantage of NACT is a higher rate of optimal surgery in IDS. These studies uniformly used the same definition of optimal surgery in IDS as that in PDS. The meaning of residual disease after PDS and IDS is naturally different because chemoresistance may be altered by NAC and the planned number of postsurgical chemotherapy may be different. Thus, the definition of optimal surgery in IDS should be stricter than in PDS to indicate similar good survival from viewpoints of chemoresistance and remaining chemotherapy. In many retrospective studies and some prospective studies, a high proportion of optimal surgeries in IDS, based on the same definition, did not influence the survival of patients treated with NACT [4–6,9,12,15,16,20]. For example, Vrščaj *et al.* demonstrated higher optimal debulking in the IDS group compared with the PDS group (60 vs 22%, respectively; p = 0.001) but not improved survival (25 vs 26 months, respectively; p = not significant) [9]. Everett *et al.* reported similar observations of a higher proportion of optimal debulking in the IDS group than the PDS group (86 vs 54%, respectively; p < 0.001), but comparable survival (33 vs 42 months, respectively; p = not significant) [12]. Lee *et al.* presented an improved rate of optimal surgery (78% for IDS vs 46% for PDS; p = 0.04) without improving survival (53 months for IDS vs 55 months for PDS; p = not significant) [20]. These results support our idea.

As far as we know, there have been few studies addressing the definition of optimal surgery for IDS during NACT. Although it was not a direct analysis, we related the size of the residual tumor and survival after interval look or debulking surgery during PDS-CT based on the assumption that chemotherapy after interval surgery is identical between NACT and PDS-CT [48]. Interval look and debulking surgeries were performed after three or four cycles of chemotherapy for patients with optimal and suboptimal PDS, respectively. The 5-year survival of patients with no residual tumor after interval surgery was comparable with that of patients with minimal residual tumor (<2 cm) after PDS (47 vs 40%, respectively), while the 5-year survival of patients with minimal residual tumor after interval surgery is much worse (0%). Colombo *et al.* analyzed the prognostic factors in patients treated with NACT. They found that the size of the residual tumor is a significant prognostic factor (p = 0.014), and the 5-year survival of patients with no residual tumor, <1 cm tumor or >1 cm tumor was 33, 11 or 0%, respectively [16]. Mazzeo *et al.* reported similar results among patients treated with NACT [49]. The median survival of patients with no residual tumor at IDS is significantly better than that of patients with any residual tumor (41 vs 23 months, respectively; p = 0.0062). Almost 50% of patients with no residual tumor survived for 4 years, whereas no patients with residual tumor survived longer than 4 years. For long-term survival, surgery leaving even minimal residual tumor is not optimal.

Pölcher *et al.* addressed the definition of optimal surgery at IDS [35]. They performed a multivariate analysis of prognostic factors and found that no residual tumor was independently associated with good survival (hazard ratio: 0.33; p < 0.001).

They stated that optimal debulking after NAC should be defined as no gross residual disease. Although this suggestion may be based on a somewhat aggressive standpoint, it also supports our opinion. Without addressing the definition of optimal debulking, Kuhn *et al.* also demonstrated by multivariate analysis (relative risk: 14.3; p = 0.02) [18] and Schwartz *et al.* demonstrated by univariate analysis (p < 0.001) that macroscopic residual tumor is a significantly worse prognostic factor for OS [7]. Le *et al.* [50] and Le *et al.* [51] demonstrated a significant association between macroscopic residual tumor and PFS by multivariate analysis (p = 0.003 and 0.04, respectively). All of these studies support our opinion from an aggressive standpoint.

On the basis of these studies, we can say that the definition of optimal debulking in IDS should be stricter than in PDS and that the definition should be no residual tumor in IDS, even though the definition of optimal surgery in PDS remains <1-cm residual tumors.

How frequently can we achieve optimal IDS following NAC with platinum and taxane?

Bristow *et al.* [22] and Kang *et al.* [23] reported that the weighted mean rate of optimal debulking was 65.0 and 70.0%, respectively, in their meta-analyses. Regrettably, these results may not be in accordance with current clinical practice. For example, these studies used the definition of optimal surgery as defined for each cohort, which is, in the majority of cases, residual tumors of <2 cm. In addition, these studies include cohorts treated with NAC regimens other than platinum–taxane combinations. Table 6 summarizes the performance rate and results of IDS among cohorts treated with a NAC regimen composed of platinum and taxane [4,17,18,20,27,35,50–53].

The median performance rate of IDS after three or four cycles of NAC ranged from 62 to 100% in each cohort base, and the average performance rate was 91% (695 out of 763). IDS resulted in residual disease with <2 cm residual tumors (i.e., the older definition of optimal surgery) in 80% (193 out of 242) of patients (range: 59–84% in each cohort base). Similarly, IDS resulted in residual disease with <1 cm residual tumors (i.e., present definition of optimal surgery) in 67% (430 out of 640) of patients (range: 45–74% in each cohort base). Finally, complete resection of all tumors (i.e., recommended definition of optimal surgery) was achieved in 42% (288 out of 687) of patients (range: 26–55% in each cohort base). Although these cohorts still include various selection criteria for NACT, different decision criteria for performing IDS and different target goals for surgery, as well as include retrospective studies, this information may be useful in order to predict an ordinary course of treatment.

As an average course of NACT for advanced-stage ovarian cancer by using a standard platinum–taxane combination regimen, IDS is possible in approximately 91% of patients, optimal debulking according to the present definition (<1 cm residual tumor) is possible in approximately 67% of patients, and complete resection can be achieved in approximately 42% of patients.

Should we exclude patients with clear-cell or mucinous histology from NACT?

One of the important questions is whether we should avoid performing NACT for advanced-stage ovarian cancer with chemoresistant histology, such as clear-cell or mucinous adenocarcinoma. In principle, NACT does not seem beneficial for patients with chemoresistant histology. Current publications seldom discuss differences in histology.

Inciura *et al.* reported on a retrospective, comparative study between NACT (n = 213) and PDS-CT (n = 361) [13]. The number of patients with serous, mucinous, endometrioid, and other types were 84, 48, 49 and 32, respectively, in the NACT group and 135, 67, 118 and 41, respectively, in the PDS-CT group. There was no statistical difference in OS between NACT and PDS-CT in serous (p = 0.396), endometrioid (p = 0.197) and mucinous (p = 0.256) histology. We can find no apparent demerits of NACT for patients with mucinous adenocarcinoma in this study.

Ongoing Phase III studies [24,25] and a recently published EORTC study [4] set the criteria for tumor marker CA125 and CEA in eligibility. These criteria may work not only to exclude the malignancy of digestive tracts but also to decrease the enrollment of patients with clear-cell adenocarcinoma or mucinous histology. Actually, patients with clear-cell adenocarcinoma or mucinous adenocarcinoma enrolled in the EORTC study was only 4.3% (29 out of 670).

Accumulation of data may be necessary in order to determine whether we should avoid selecting NACT for patients with clear-cell adenocarcinoma or mucinous adenocarcinoma, although, in principle, NACT would not seem beneficial for patients with such chemoresistant histology.

Expert commentary

When NACT was an alternative treatment for patients with advanced ovarian, tubal, or peritoneal cancer, selection of patients with primarily unresectable tumors was one of most important issues before initiating treatment. For this purpose, some investigators proposed the criteria of unresectablity using CT or MRI results [36–38], while others used or recommended diagnostic laparoscopy [39–41] to select such patients, as previously mentioned. Now that NACT is a standard treatment option, the roles of these criteria may change. How to diagnose ovarian, tubal or peritoneal malignancy and diagnose the advanced stage of these diseases (i.e., diagnose as adequate disease for NACT) without wasting time is a very important issue before starting NACT. As discussed previously, cytology may be a useful tool for this purpose. Although we cannot diagnose all patients with ovarian, tubal or peritoneal cancer correctly by cytological diagnosis alone, we can correctly select patients with these diseases by cytology in combination with imaging diagnosis and serum tumor markers. However, it is noteworthy that malignancies of other origins, such as breast and digestive tract, were carefully ruled out by some other criteria in the setting of clinical study. Similar careful diagnosis is necessary to use cytological diagnosis at clinical practice.

Once again, when NACT was an alternative treatment for patients with more advanced-stage ovarian, tubal or peritoneal cancer with primarily unresectable tumors, achievement of optimal surgery with <1 cm residual tumors in IDS might have been very positive because the prognoses of these patients were deemed to be poor. Now that NACT is a standard treatment option for all patients with stage III/IV, NACT should be selected with the expectation of the best outcomes for patients. We should perform IDS in NACT with the aim of complete resection of all macroscopic tumors, taking into consideration that leaving even minimal residual disease makes prognoses of the patients poor.

Along with the change in the role of NACT, we should also change the management of patients regarding diagnosis before treatment and IDS.

Five-year view

Mature, long-term, follow-up results from all or most of the ongoing Phase III studies will probably be available in order to help establish a role for NACT. The role of NACT itself and new strategies of chemotherapy in NACT will be a focus of research. In the setting of PDS-CT, the strategies of intraperitoneal (IP) chemotherapy; a combination regimen of CBDCA and dose-dense, weekly PTX; and a combination of molecular-target therapy, are candidates for replacing an intravenous, tri-weekly combination of platinum and taxane based on the results of Phase III studies [54–56]. All of these strategies can be combined with NACT, and several studies of these treatments have been performed or are in progress.

The Southwest Oncology Group (SWOG) performed a Phase II study of NAC and IDS followed by intravenous/IP chemotherapy in women with stage III/IV ovarian, tubal or peritoneal cancer with bulky disease [53]. NAC consisted of three cycles of intravenous CBDCA and PTX. Postsurgical chemotherapy for optimally cytoreduced patients consisted of six cycles of intravenous and IP PTX and IP CBDCA. In total, 26 out of 58 enrolled patients underwent optimal IDS and received postsurgical intravenous/IP chemotherapy. PFS and OS for 26 patients who received intravenous/IP chemotherapy is 29 and 34 months, respectively. They concluded that these results compare favorably with other studies of suboptimally debulked patients and that randomized comparisons are necessary to make conclusions regarding the toxicity and efficacy of their intravenous/IP regimen. The University Health Network in Canada started a Phase I/II study of NAC and IDS followed by IP CDDP and intravenous PTX in February 2007 (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT00889733 [101]). The Clinical Trial Group of the National Cancer Institute of Canada also started a randomized Phase II/III study in September 2009 to compare three post-IDS chemotherapy arms, including an intravenous PTX and intravenous CBDCA arm, intravenous/IP PTX and IP CDDP arm, and intravenous/IP PTX and IP CBDCA arm (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT00993655 [101]).

Pölcher *et al.* performed a Phase II study of NACT using a molecular target agent to assess activity and tolerability [57]. The regimen was a combination therapy of tri-weekly CBDCA and PTX with the multi-target, tyrosine kinase inhibitor, sorafenib (400 mg twice daily). The planned protocol treatment was two cycles of NAC and IDS followed by four cycles of postsurgical chemotherapy and maintenance, single-agent oral sorafenib through 1 year. Unfortunately, the study was terminated early because all four enrolled patients suffered severe toxicities after NAC and IDS. Although the regimen was not feasible, the authors conclude that further evaluations of sorafenib are warranted. Wright *et al.* initiated a Phase II study of neoadjuvant CBDCA, PTX and bevacizumab in May 2010 (ClinicalTrials.gov identifier: NCT01146795 [101]). The treatment schedule includes three cycles of NAC and IDS followed by six cycles of postsurgical chemotherapy.

The new strategies of NACT using a wide variety of schedules or agents will be assessed for efficacy and toxicity with great enthusiasm. It is expected that such strategies will contribute to further improvements in the outcome of patients with advanced ovarian, tubal or peritoneal cancer.

Key issues

- Retrospective or nonrandomized prospective studies demonstrated that neoadjuvant chemotherapy-setting treatment (NACT) seemed to greatly reduce surgical invasiveness without compromising the survival of patients with advanced ovarian, tubal or peritoneal cancer.
- NACT is expected to become a standard treatment for unselected patients with advanced ovarian cancer when favorable results are confirmed by Phase III studies and several problems are resolved.
- Cytological examination of ascites, pleural effusion or tumor, in addition to imaging diagnosis and tumor markers, may be necessary before NACT can be used for accurate diagnosis of target diseases, unless we select diagnostic laparotomy or laparoscopy.
- Although further evaluation is necessary, three or four cycles may be the most likely optimal amount, and two cycles may be a reasonable option for the optimal number of neoadjuvant chemotherapy cycles.
- The definition of optimal debulking in interval debulking surgery should be stricter than in primary debulking surgery and it should mean no residual tumor, even though the definition in primary debulking surgery remains <1-cm residual tumors.
- As an average course of NACT for advanced ovarian cancer by using a standard platinum–taxane combination regimen, interval debulking surgery is possible in approximately 91% of patients, optimal debulking (<1-cm residual tumor) is possible in approximately 67% of patients, and complete resection can be achieved in approximately 42% of patients.
- Accumulation of data may be necessary in order to determine whether we should avoid selecting NACT for patients with chemoresistant histology, such as clear-cell adenocarcinoma or mucinous adenocarcinoma.

Financial & competing interests disclosure

The authors have no relevant affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity with a financial interest in or financial conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. This includes employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, or royalties.

No writing assistance was utilized in the production of this manuscript.

References

Papers of special note have been highlighted as:
- • of interest
- •• of considerable interest

1 Griffiths CT. Surgical resection of tumor bulk in the primary treatment of ovarian carcinoma. *Natl Cancer Inst. Monogr.* 42, 101–104 (1975).

2 Covens AL. A critique of surgical cytoreduction in advanced ovarian cancer. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 78(3 Pt 1), 269–274 (2000).

3 Dauplat J, Le Bouedec G, Pomel C, Scherer C. Cytoreductive surgery for advanced stages of ovarian cancer. *Semin. Surg. Oncol.* 19(1), 42–48 (2000).

4 Vergote I, Tropé CG, Amant F *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy or primary surgery in stage IIIC or IV ovarian cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 363(10), 943–953 (2010).

•• **First Phase III study comparing neoadjuvant chemotherapy-setting treatment (NACT) and primary debulking surgery followed by chemotherapy (PDS-CT). NACT was not inferior to PDS-CT in survival and tended to be less toxic.**

5 Jacob JH, Gershenson DM, Morris M, Copeland LJ, Burke TW, Wharton JT. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy and interval debulking for advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 42(2), 146–150 (1991).

6 Onnis A, Marchetti M, Padovan P, Castellan L. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced ovarian cancer. *Eur. J. Gynaecol. Oncol.* 17(5), 393–396 (1996).

7 Schwartz PE, Rutherford TJ, Chambers JT, Kohorn EI, Thiel RP. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for advanced ovarian cancer: long-term survival. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 72(1), 93–99 (1999).

8 Kayikçioğlu F, Köse MF, Boran N, Çalişkan E, Tulunay G. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy or primary surgery in advanced epithelial ovarian carcinoma. *Int. J. Gynecol. Cancer* 11(6), 466–470 (2001).

9 Vrščaj MU, Rakar S. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for advanced epithelial ovarian carcinoma: a retrospective case–control study. *Eur. J. Gynaecol. Oncol.* 23(5), 405–410 (2002).

10 Morice P, Brehier-Ollive D, Rey A *et al.* Results of interval debulking surgery in advanced stage ovarian cancer: an exposed-non-exposed study. *Ann. Oncol.* 14(1), 74–77 (2003).

11 Loizzi V, Cormio G, Resta L *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced ovarian cancer: a case–control study. *Int. J. Gynecol. Cancer* 15(2), 217–223 (2005).

12 Everett EN, French AE, Stone RL *et al.* Initial chemotherapy followed by surgical cytoreduction for the treatment of stage III/IV epithelial ovarian cancer. *Am. J. Obstet. Gynecol.* 195(2), 568–574; discussion 574–576 (2006).

13 Inciura A, Simavicius A, Juozaityte E *et al.* Comparison of adjuvant and neoadjuvant chemotherapy in the management of advanced ovarian cancer: a retrospective study of 574 patients. *BMC Cancer* 6, 153 (2006).

14 Steed H, Oza AM, Murphy J *et al.* A retrospective analysis of neoadjuvant platinum-based chemotherapy versus up-front surgery in advanced ovarian cancer. *Int. J. Gynecol. Cancer* 16(Suppl. 1), 47–53 (2006).

15 Hou JY, Kelly MG, Yu H *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy lessens surgical morbidity in advanced ovarian cancer and leads to improved survival in stage IV disease. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 105(1), 211–217 (2007).

16 Colombo PE, Mourregot A, Fabbro M *et al.* Aggressive surgical strategies in advanced ovarian cancer: a monocentric study of 203 stage IIIC and IV patients. *Eur. J. Surg. Oncol.* 35(2), 135–143 (2009).

17 Morice P, Dubernard G, Rey A *et al.* Results of interval debulking surgery compared with primary debulking surgery in advanced stage ovarian cancer. *J. Am. Coll. Surg.* 197(6), 955–963 (2003).

18 Kuhn W, Rutke S, Späthe K *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by tumor debulking prolongs survival for patients with poor prognosis in International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics stage IIIC ovarian carcinoma. *Cancer* 92(10), 2585–2591 (2001).

• **Nonrandomized Phase II study comparing NACT and PDS-CT. Higher tumor resection rate and longer median survival time in the NACT group were demonstrated.**

19 Hegazy MA, Hegazi RA, Elshafei MA *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy versus primary surgery in advanced ovarian carcinoma. *World J. Surg. Oncol.* 3, 57 (2005).

20 Lee SJ, Kim BG, Lee JW, Park CS, Lee JH, Bae DS. Preliminary results of neoadjuvant chemotherapy with paclitaxel and cisplatin in patients with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer who are inadequate for optimum primary surgery. *J. Obstet. Gynaecol. Res.* 32(1), 99–106 (2006).

21 Giannopoulos T, Butler-Manuel S, Taylor A, Ngeh N, Thomas H. Clinical outcomes of neoadjuvant chemotherapy and primary debulking surgery in advanced ovarian carcinoma. *Eur. J. Gynaecol. Oncol.* 27(1), 25–28 (2006).

22 Bristow RE, Chi DS. Platinum-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy and interval surgical cytoreduction for advanced ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 103(3), 1070–1076 (2006).

• **Meta-analysis of the results of NACT in 22 cohorts from 21 studies. NACT was associated with inferior overall survival compared with PDS-CT.**

23 Kang S, Nam BH. Does neoadjuvant chemotherapy increase optimal cytoreduction rate in advanced ovarian cancer? Meta-analysis of 21 studies. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 16(8), 2315–2320 (2009).

• **Meta-analysis of the results of NACT in 21 studies. A rate of optimal cytoreduction was increased in interval debulking surgery compared to PDS.**

24 Kehoe S. Treatments for gynaecological cancers. *Best Pract. Res. Clin. Obstet. Gynaecol.* 20(6), 985–1000 (2006).

25 Onda T, Matsumoto K, Shibata T *et al.* Phase III trial of upfront debulking surgery versus neoadjuvant chemotherapy for stage III/IV ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG0602. *Jpn J. Clin. Oncol.* 38(1), 74–77 (2008).

•• **Presenting the outline of ongoing Phase III study comparing NACT and PDS-CT.**

26 Onda T, Kamura T, Ishizuka N, Katsumata N, Fukuda H, Yoshikawa H. Feasibility study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by interval

cytoreductive surgery for stage III/IV ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG0206. *Jpn J. Clin. Oncol.* 34(1), 43–45 (2004).

27 Onda T, Kobayashi H, Nakanishi T *et al.* Feasibility study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by interval debulking surgery for stage III/IV ovarian, tubal, and peritoneal cancers: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG0206. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 113(1), 57–62 (2009).

- **Results of feasibility study of NACT. In addition to the safety and efficacy of NACT, reliability of clinical diagnosis without surgical procedures were assessed.**

28 Kumar L, Hariprasad R, Kumar S *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced epithelial ovarian oancer (EOC): a Phase III randomized study. *J. Clin. Oncol. (Meeting Abstracts)* 24(18 Suppl.), 15000 (2006).

29 Kumar L, Hariprasad R, Kumar S *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NACT) followed by interval debulking surgery versus upfront surgery followed by chemotherapy (CT) in advanced epithelial ovarian carcinoma (EOC): a prospective randomized study – interim results. *J. Clin. Oncol. (Meeting Abstracts)* 25(18 Suppl.), 5531 (2007).

30 Schwartz PE, Zheng W. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for advanced ovarian cancer: the role of cytology in pretreatment diagnosis. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 90(3), 644–650 (2003).

31 Freedman OC, Dodge J, Shaw P *et al.* Diagnosis of epithelial ovarian carcinoma prior to neoadjuvant chemotherapy. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 119(1), 22–25 (2010).

32 Donadio M, Bonardi G, Iberti V *et al.* The role of induction chemotherapy in inoperable ovarian cancer. *Tumori* 75(6), 609–614 (1989).

33 Chambers JT, Chambers SK, Voynick IM, Schwartz PE. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy in stage X ovarian carcinoma. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 37(3), 327–331 (1990).

34 Lim JT, Green JA. Neoadjuvant carboplatin and ifosfamide chemotherapy for inoperable FIGO stage III and IV ovarian carcinoma. *Clin. Oncol. (R. Coll. Radiol.)* 5(4), 198–202 (1993).

35 Pölcher M, Mahner S, Ortmann O *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy with carboplatin and docetaxel in advanced ovarian cancer – a prospective multicenter Phase II trial (PRIMOVAR). *Oncol. Rep.* 22(3), 605–613 (2009).

- **Randomized Phase II study of NACT comparing two and three cycles of neoadjuvant chemotherapy out of six cycles of carboplatin–docetaxel chemotherapy in total.**

36 Nelson BE, Rosenfield AT, Schwartz PE. Preoperative abdominopelvic computed tomographic prediction of optimal cytoreduction in epithelial ovarian carcinoma. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 11(1), 166–172 (1993).

37 Dowdy SC, Mullany SA, Brandt KR, Huppert BJ, Cliby WA. The utility of computed tomography scans in predicting suboptimal cytoreductive surgery in women with advanced ovarian carcinoma. *Cancer* 101(2), 346–352 (2004).

38 Qayyum A, Coakley FV, Westphalen AC, Hricak H, Okuno WT, Powell B. Role of CT and MR imaging in predicting optimal cytoreduction of newly diagnosed primary epithelial ovarian cancer. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 96(2), 301–306 (2005).

39 Vergote I, De Wever I, Tjalma W, van Gramberen M, Decloedt J, van Dam P. Neoadjuvant chemotherapy or primary debulking surgery in advanced ovarian carcinoma: a retrospective analysis of 285 patients. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 71(3), 431–436 (1998).

40 Deffieux X, Castaigne D, Pomel C. Role of laparoscopy to evaluate candidates for complete cytoreduction in advanced stages of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Int. J. Gynecol. Cancer* 16(Suppl. 1), 35–40 (2006).

41 Fagotti A, Ferrandina G, Fanfani F *et al.* A laparoscopy-based score to predict surgical outcome in patients with advanced ovarian carcinoma: a pilot study. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 13(8), 1156–1161 (2006).

42 Aletti GD, Gostout BS, Podratz KC, Cliby WA. Ovarian cancer surgical resectability: relative impact of disease, patient status, and surgeon. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 100(1), 33–37 (2006).

43 Aletti GD, Eisenhauer EL, Santillan A *et al.* Identification of patient groups at highest risk from traditional approach to ovarian cancer treatment. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 120(1), 23–28 (2011).

44 Chi DS, Eisenhauer EL, Lang J *et al.* What is the optimal goal of primary cytoreductive surgery for bulky stage IIIC epithelial ovarian carcinoma (EOC)? *Gynecol. Oncol.* 103(2), 559–564 (2006).

45 Eisenkop SM, Spirtos NM, Lin WC. 'Optimal' cytoreduction for advanced epithelial ovarian cancer: a commentary. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 103(1), 329–335 (2006).

46 du Bois A, Reuss A, Pujade-Lauraine E, Harter P, Ray-Coquard I, Pfisterer J. Role of surgical outcome as prognostic factor in advanced epithelial ovarian cancer: a combined exploratory analysis of 3 prospectively randomized Phase 3 multicenter trials: by the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Gynaekologische Onkologie Studiengruppe Ovarialkarzinom (AGO-OVAR) and the Groupe d'Investigateurs Nationaux Pour les Etudes des Cancers de l'Ovaire (GINECO). *Cancer* 115(6), 1234–1244 (2009).

47 Aletti GD, Dowdy SC, Gostout BS *et al.* Aggressive surgical effort and improved survival in advanced-stage ovarian cancer. *Obstet. Gynecol.* 107(1), 77–85 (2006).

48 Onda T, Yoshikawa H, Yasugi T, Matsumoto K, Taketani Y. The optimal debulking after neoadjuvant chemotherapy in ovarian cancer: proposal based on interval look during upfront surgery setting treatment. *Jpn J. Clin. Oncol.* 40(1), 36–41 (2010).

49 Mazzeo F, Berlierè M, Kerger J *et al.* Neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by surgery and adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with primarily unresectable, advanced-stage ovarian cancer. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 90(1), 163–169 (2003).

50 Le T, Faught W, Hopkins L, Fung Kee Fung M. Primary chemotherapy and adjuvant tumor debulking in the management of advanced-stage epithelial ovarian cancer. *Int. J. Gynecol. Cancer* 15(5), 770–775 (2005).

51 Le T, Alshaikh G, Hopkins L, Faught W, Fung MF. Prognostic significance of postoperative morbidities in patients with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy and delayed primary surgical debulking. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 13(12), 1711–1716 (2006).

52 Chan YM, Ng TY, Ngan HY, Wong LC. Quality of life in women treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy for advanced ovarian cancer: a prospective longitudinal study. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 88(1), 9–16 (2003).

53 Tiersten AD, Liu PY, Smith HO *et al.* Phase II evaluation of neoadjuvant chemotherapy and debulking followed by intraperitoneal chemotherapy in women with stage III and IV epithelial ovarian, Fallopian tube or primary peritoneal cancer: Southwest Oncology Group Study S0009. *Gynecol. Oncol.* 112(3), 444–449 (2009).

54 Elit L, Oliver TK, Covens A *et al.* Intraperitoneal chemotherapy in the first-line treatment of women with stage III epithelial ovarian cancer: a systematic review with metaanalyses. *Cancer* 109(4), 692–702 (2007).

55 Katsumata N, Yasuda M, Takahashi F *et al.* Dose-dense paclitaxel once a week in combination with carboplatin every 3 weeks for advanced ovarian cancer: a Phase 3, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 374(9698), 1331–1338 (2009).

56 Burger RA, Brady MF, Bookman MA *et al.* Phase III trial of bevacizumab (BEV) in the primary treatment of advanced epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC), primary peritoneal cancer (PPC), or Fallopian tube cancer (FTC): a Gynecologic Oncology Group study. *J. Clin. Oncol. (Meeting Abstracts)* 28(18 Suppl.), LBA1 (2010).

57 Pölcher M, Eckhardt M, Coch C *et al.* Sorafenib in combination with carboplatin and paclitaxel as neoadjuvant chemotherapy in patients with advanced ovarian cancer. *Cancer Chemother. Pharmacol.* 66(1), 203–207 (2010).

Website

101 ClinicalTrials.gov http://clinicaltrial.gov

JJCO Japanese Journal of Clinical Oncology

Review Article: Study Group

Jpn J Clin Oncol 2011;41(10)1156–1161
doi:10.1093/jjco/hyr111
Advance Access Publication 2 September 2011

The History of the Gynecologic Cancer Study Group (GCSG) of the Japan Clinical Oncology Group (JCOG)

Takashi Onda[1,*], Ikuo Konishi[2], Hiroyuki Yoshikawa[3] and Toshiharu Kamura[4]

[1]Division of Gynecologic Oncology, National Cancer Center Hospital, Tokyo, [2]Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto, [3]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba and [4]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Kurume University School of Medicine, Kurume, Japan

*For reprints and all correspondence: Takashi Onda, Division of Gynecologic Oncology, National Cancer Center Hospital, 5-1-1 Tsukiji, Chuo-ku, Tokyo 104-0045, Japan. E-mail: takashi-tky@umin.ac.jp

Received May 17, 2011; accepted July 8, 2011

The Gynecologic Cancer Study Group (GCSG) of the Japan Clinical Oncology Group (JCOG) was organized in 1994. The GCSG has developed under the leadership of three successive group representatives, five principal study investigators, the cooperation of group members and the support of several public research funds. At present, 38 institutions are participating as active members of the GCSG of the JCOG. In addition to gynecologic oncologists, medical oncologists, pathologists and radiotherapists are participating in our group. Our group manages female genital malignancies including uterine cervical, endometrial, ovarian, tubal and vulvar cancers. Because the incidences of uterine cervical (in younger women), endometrial and ovarian cancer have increased in Japan in recent years, we are developing new standard treatments especially for these malignancies. As of 31 May 2011, our group has conducted six JCOG clinical trials (three completed and three ongoing) and completed one JCOG accompanying study, which is now in preparation for publication. Our group has also conducted several retrospective studies, and Phase I and II trials independent of the JCOG Data Center. Our aim is to conduct unique and high-quality clinical trials which we can appeal to the world. In this review, we present the organization and achievements of our group, along with a list of participating institutions, as the history of the GCSG of the JCOG.

Key words: gynecologic cancer – treatment – clinical trial

ORGANIZATION OF THE GYNECOLOGIC CANCER STUDY GROUP OF THE JAPAN CLINICAL ONCOLOGY GROUP

The Gynecologic Cancer Study Group (GCSG) of the Japan Clinical Oncology Group (JCOG) was organized in 1994 with Dr Ryuichiro Tsunematsu as the first group representative. The original members of the GCSG were also members of a study group called 'A Study for the efficacy of dose-intensive chemotherapy for advanced ovarian cancer', which was organized by Dr Tsunematsu as the principal investigator with the support of Grants-in-Aid for Cancer Research from the Ministry of Health and Welfare during the 1994–97 fiscal years. This group was taken over by a study group organized by Dr Hiroyuki Yoshikawa entitled 'A study for the development of new treatment methods for gynecologic malignancy', which was supported by Grants-in-Aid for Cancer Research from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) during the 1998–2001 fiscal years. In 1998, the group representative of the GCSG of JCOG was handed over to Dr Yoshikawa from Dr Tsunematsu. In 2001, a new study group called 'A study for the multidisciplinary treatment aiming to improve the prognosis of advanced ovarian cancer' was organized by Dr Yoshikawa with the support of Health Sciences Research Grants for Clinical Research from the MHLW during the 2001–03 fiscal years. After 2004, this study group headed by Dr Yoshikawa was renamed 'A study for the multidisciplinary treatment for advanced ovarian cancer' for the

2004–06 fiscal years, followed by 'A study for the establishment of the treatment starting with neoadjuvant chemotherapy for advanced ovarian cancer' for the 2007–09 fiscal years, and is now called 'A study to prove the treatment starting with neoadjuvant chemotherapy as standard treatment for advanced ovarian cancer'. Going back to 2002, the study group supported by Grants-in-Aid for Cancer Research was taken over by Dr Toshiharu Kamura with the same study name for the fiscal years 2002–05. Subsequently in 2003, a new study group called 'A study for the establishment of standard chemotherapy in the multidisciplinary treatment aiming to improve the prognosis of uterine cervical cancer' was organized by Dr Kamura with the support of Health Sciences Research Grants for Clinical Research from the MHLW during the 2003–05 fiscal years. Dr Kamura took over as the group representative of GCSG of JCOG from Dr Yoshikawa in 2005 and is still in charge. The chief investigator of the study group supported by Grants-in-Aid for Cancer Research was changed to Dr Ikuo Konishi from Dr Kamura while retaining the same study name for the 2006–09 fiscal years, and the study group organized by Dr Kamura supported by Health Sciences Research Grants for Clinical Research was renewed as a study group called 'A study for the establishment of standard treatment for advanced or recurrent uterine cervical cancer' for the 2006–08 fiscal years. Both study groups completed their respective studies at the ends of their planned periods. In 2010, Dr Takahiro Kasamatsu organized a study group called 'A study for the establishment of the standard treatment for rare cancers among gynecological malignancy' supported by Grants-in-Aid for Cancer Research and Development from the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare for the 2010 fiscal year. Meanwhile, some members of the GCSG participated in the study called 'A multi institutional cooperative study for the establishment of the standard treatment for hyper responsive malignancy' organized by Dr Tomomitsu Hotta for the 2005–07 fiscal years and by Dr Kensei Tobinai for the 2008–11 fiscal years; both these were supported by Grants-in-Aid for Cancer Research for the 2005–09 fiscal years or by Grants-in Aid for Cancer Research and Development for the 2010–11 fiscal years from the MHLW.

At present, the GCSG of the JCOG consists of 38 institutions, mainly university hospitals and cancer center hospitals. In addition to gynecologic oncologists, medical oncologists, pathologists and radiotherapists are also participating in the GCSG.

TREATMENT MODALITIES FOR GYNECOLOGICAL MALIGNANCIES AND TARGET DISEASES FOR CLINICAL TRIALS

In contrast to other malignancies, surgery and radiotherapy used to be the gold standards for the treatment of gynecological malignancies. However, since the late 1970s, many anticancer drugs have been developed; some of which are effective on gynecological malignancies. Therefore, at present, in addition to surgery and radiotherapy, chemotherapy has occupied an important position in treatment. Although the prognosis of those who have gynecologic malignancies has recently been substantially improved by combining these modalities, it is still not satisfactory for some diseases. Therefore, the GCSG has conducted clinical trials to develop more effective standard treatments. Our group covers female genital malignancies including uterine cervical, endometrial, ovarian, tubal and vulvar cancers. Because the incidences of uterine cervical (in younger women), endometrial and ovarian cancer have increased rapidly in Japan in recent years, we have continued developing new standard treatments especially for these malignancies.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE GCSG OF THE JCOG

As of 31 May 2011, the GCSG has conducted six JCOG clinical trials (three completed and three ongoing) and completed one JCOG accompanying study, which is now in preparation for publication. Our group also conducted several retrospective studies as well as Phase I and II trials independent of the JCOG Data Center. Here, we present the main findings of our studies.

Ovarian Cancer

JCOG9412: Phase II Study of Dose-intensive Cyclophosphamide, Doxorubicin and Cisplatin with Granulocyte Colony-stimulating Factor in Patients with Advanced Epithelial Ovarian Cancer (1)

We conducted a Phase II study of dose-intensive cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin and cisplatin (CAP; 750 mg/m^2 cyclophosphamide, 55 mg/m^2 doxorubicin and 75 mg/m^2 cisplatin) for patients with Stage III–IV suboptimally debulked ovarian cancer. The aim of this study was to assess the safety and evaluate the antitumor activity (i.e. pathological complete response) of this regimen by using second-look laparotomy. After the primary surgery, patients with residual disease ($\geq$1 cm) were treated with dose-intensive CAP every 3 weeks for six courses. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factor was administered from day 3 at 2 μg/kg. A pathological complete response (CR) rate at the time of planned interim analysis was observed in more than 4 (the lower cut-off point) of 28 patients. In December 1996, the projected accrual was closed in order to enroll 70 patients totally. Major toxicity was Grade 4 neutropenia (76.5%) accompanied by Grade 3 neutropenic fever (8.3%) at the latest monitoring. No treatment-related deaths occurred, and no Grade 3 or 4 neurological toxicity was observed. The toxicity of this treatment was considered to be tolerable.

This study is our first JCOG study, which was started in 1994. The results were presented at the 6th Biennial Meeting of the International Gynecologic Cancer Society held in Fukuoka, Japan, in 1997.

JCOG0206: Feasibility Study of Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy Followed by Interval Debulking Surgery for Stage III/IV Ovarian, Tubal and Peritoneal Cancers (2,3)

We performed this feasibility study to assess the safety and efficacy of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) followed by interval debulking surgery (IDS) for müllerian carcinomas such as ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers to determine whether we can omit diagnostic surgical procedures before the initiation of treatment. Eligible patients were presumed to have Stage III/IV müllerian carcinomas clinically diagnosed by imaging studies, cytology and tumor markers. All patients underwent diagnostic laparoscopy to confirm the clinical diagnosis. Four cycles of paclitaxel and carboplatin were administered as NAC followed by IDS and an additional four cycles of chemotherapy. The primary endpoint was the proportion of clinical complete remission (cCR) among Stage III/IV müllerian carcinomas. The major secondary endpoint was the positive predictive value (PPV) of clinical diagnosis. Fifty-six patients were enrolled into the study between January 2003 and February 2004. The PPV of overall clinical diagnosis for the tumor origin, histology and stage was 95% (53/56). Fifty-three patients received the protocol treatment and 22 (42%) achieved cCR. The median overall and progression-free survival (PFS) was 45 and 14 months, respectively. NAC without diagnostic laparoscopy for advanced müllerian carcinomas seemed to hold sufficient promise to be compared with upfront surgery in a Phase III trial. We proceeded to Phase III studies, which are presented later (JCOG0602).

JCOG0503: Phase II Trial of Oral Etoposide and Intravenous Irinotecan for Patients with Platinum-resistant and Taxane-pre-treated Ovarian Cancer (4)

We started this study because effective chemotherapy for patients with platinum-resistant ovarian cancer is currently an unmet medical need. Oral etoposide and intravenous irinotecan as monotherapies have demonstrated some efficacy for platinum-resistant ovarian cancer. Thus, combining these two topoisomerase inhibitors is an intriguing idea. After Phase I and feasibility studies, we began a nationwide Phase II study to evaluate the safety and efficacy of this regimen for patients with platinum-resistant and taxane-pre-treated ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers. Eligible patients were given etoposide at 50 mg/m^2 p.o. from days 1–21 and irinotecan 70 mg/m^2 i.v. at days 1 and 15; this was repeated every 28 days for up to six cycles. The primary endpoint was response rate; the secondary endpoints were adverse events, PFS and overall survival (OS). The expected and threshold values for the primary endpoint were set at 35 and 20%, respectively. Sixty patients are to be registered from April 2009 to March 2011 in the initial plan. The study period was extended, and 42 patients were registered as of 16 May 2011. This study is currently ongoing.

JCOG0602: Phase III Trial of Upfront Debulking Surgery Versus NAC for Stage III/IV Ovarian, Tubal and Peritoneal Cancers (5)

Based on the promising results of NAC in our previous study (JCOG0206), we have been performing a Phase III study of treatment starting with NAC versus standard treatment starting with primary debulking surgery (PDS) for Stage III/IV müllerian carcinomas since November 2006. The purposes of this study are to prove the non-inferiority of the efficacy of treatment starting with NAC and to demonstrate the decrease in adverse effects and reduced invasiveness. Three hundred patients will be randomized over 3 years according to the initial plan. NAC arm patients undergo four cycles of NAC with paclitaxel plus carboplatin followed by IDS and an additional four cycles of post-surgical chemotherapy. Standard arm patients undergo PDS and eight cycles of post-surgical chemotherapy with or without IDS. The primary endpoint is OS. The major secondary endpoints are the incidence of adverse events and parameters representing surgical invasiveness. The study period was extended, and 285 patients were registered as of 16 May 2011. The study is currently ongoing.

Multicenter Retrospective Study for Prognostic Factors of Stage IV Epithelial Ovarian Cancer (6)

We conducted a multicenter retrospective analysis to elucidate the prognostic factors of Stage IV epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC). The data for all patients with Stage IV EOC that was surgically confirmed and initially treated in each institution between January 1990 and December 1997 were collected from 24 member institutions of the GCSG in November 1999. In total, 275 patients with Stage IV ovarian cancer were identified. The most common site of the extraperitoneal disease was malignant pleural effusion (39.6%). Of the 225 patients who underwent an attempt at surgical debulking, 70 (31.1%) were optimally cytoreduced. Most patients received platinum-based combination chemotherapy for primary chemotherapy. In multivariate analysis, performance status, histology and residual disease after cytoreductive surgery were independent prognostic predictors of outcomes. The overall median survival for optimally debulked patients was 32 months compared with 16 months for suboptimally debulked patients ($P < 0.0001$; hazard ratio, 0.415). Optimal surgical debulking, performance status and histology appeared to be important prognostic factors of survival in patients with Stage IV EOC.

Multicenter Phase I Study of Chemotherapy Consisting of Cisplatin, Paclitaxel and Escalating Doses of Doxorubicin in Advanced Ovarian Cancer (7)

We designed a Phase I/II study in patients with advanced ovarian cancer (AOC) for first-line chemotherapy using a combination of a fixed dose of cisplatin and paclitaxel, which was the standard regimen at that time, with escalating doses of

doxorubicin, which has been shown to have favorable effects on AOC according to a meta-analysis, given at every 3 weeks. Eligible patients had Stage III or IV ovarian cancer. Dose-limiting toxicity (DLT) was defined as prolonged Grade 4 neutropenia, febrile neutropenia or non-hematologic toxicity ≥Grade 3. Four different dose levels were planned. The dose of doxorubicin was escalated from 20 to 50 mg/m^2 in sequential cohorts, and fixed doses of 75 mg/m^2 cisplatin and 110 mg/m^2 paclitaxel in a 24 h infusion were tested. Between December 1998 and December 2000, 28 patients entered the study. The patients received a mean of 5.4 courses. Non-hematologic toxicity was generally mild, except for Grade 3 vomiting. No Grade 3 neurotoxicity was observed. Hematologic toxicities were Grade 3–4 neutropenia in all patients and Grade 3 anemia in 44% patients. At Level IV, two of six patients developed DLT that manifested as febrile neutropenia in two and diarrhea in one. Clinical response was observed in 17 of evaluable patients (89%). The recommended dose was at Level IV with 50 mg/m^2 doxorubicin. Further studies including anthracyclines for first-line chemotherapy of ovarian cancer are warranted because of its favorable antitumor activity.

Multicenter Retrospective Study for Fertility-sparing Surgery for Stage I EOC (8)

The objective of this study was to assess the clinical outcomes and fertility in patients treated conservatively for unilateral Stage I invasive EOC. A multi-institutional retrospective investigation was undertaken to identify patients with unilateral Stage I EOC treated with fertility-sparing surgery. Favorable histology was defined as Grade 1 or 2 adenocarcinoma excluding clear cell histology. A total of 211 patients treated between 1985 and 2004 were identified from 30 institutions. The median follow-up duration was 78 months. Five-year OS and recurrence-free survival were 10 and 97.8%, respectively, for Stage IA and favorable histology (n = 108); 100 and 100%, respectively, for Stage IA and clear cell histology (n = 15); 100 and 33.3%, respectively, for Stage IA and Grade 3 (n = 3); 96.9 and 92.1%, respectively, for Stage IC and favorable histology (n = 67); 93.3 and 66.0%, respectively, for Stage IC and clear cell histology (n = 15); and 66.7 and 66.7%, respectively, for Stage IC and Grade 3 (n = 3). Forty-five (53.6%) of 84 patients who were nulliparous at surgery and married at the time of investigation gave birth to 56 healthy children. Our data confirm that fertility-sparing surgery is a safe treatment for Stage IA patients with favorable histology and suggest that Stage IA patients with clear cell histology and Stage IC patients with favorable histology could be candidates for fertility-sparing surgery followed by adjuvant chemotherapy.

Cervical Cancer

JCOG0102: Phase III Randomized Trial of NAC Followed by Radical Hysterectomy Versus Radical Hysterectomy for Bulky Stage I/II Cervical Cancer (9,10)

We compared NAC followed by radical hysterectomy (RH) with RH for bulky Stage I/II cervical cancer. Patients with Stage IB2, IIA (>4 cm), or IIB squamous cell carcinoma of the uterine cervix were randomly assigned to receive either BOMP (7 mg bleomycin from days 1 to 5, 0.7 mg/m^2 vincristine on day 5, 7 mg/m^2 mitomycin on day 5 and 14 mg/m^2 cisplatin from days 1 to 5) q21 days for two to four cycles followed by RH (NAC arm) or undergo RH (RH arm). Patients with positive surgical margins, metastatic nodes, parametrial involvement and/or deep stromal invasion received post-operative irradiation. The primary endpoint was OS. Totally, 134 patients (67 NAC and 67 RH) were randomized between December 2001 and August 2005. The first planned interim analysis was performed in July 2005 using data from 108 patients registered as of November 2004. We are now preparing to publish the results of the interim analysis and the final analysis.

JCOG0505: Phase III Trial of Paclitaxel plus Carboplatin Versus Paclitaxel plus Cisplatin in Stage IVB, Persistent or Recurrent Cervical Cancer (11)

Paclitaxel and cisplatin is the standard regimen for treating patients with Stage IVB, persistent or recurrent cervical cancer who are not amenable to curative treatment with local therapy. However, carboplatin is expected to be more feasible than cisplatin in terms of effectiveness and toxicity management. Therefore, the aim of this randomized trial was to compare the efficacy of paclitaxel and carboplatin (TC) with that of paclitaxel and cisplatin (TP) as a control. This trial was designed to evaluate the non-inferiority of TC compared with TP. The primary endpoint is OS. The secondary endpoints are PFS, response rates, adverse events, severe adverse events and the proportion of non-hospitalization periods compared with planned treatment periods served as an indicator of quality of life. Planned accrual was completed in November 2011. Follow-up data are now being accumulated.

JCOG0806A: Multicenter Retrospective Study for Clinical and Pathological Analyses for Stage IB1 Small (<2 cm) Uterine Cervical Cancer

This study has been performed as JCOG accompanying study since 2008. The study was designed to reveal clinical outcomes and pathological findings of Stage IB1 uterine cervical cancer. Final reports of the results were issued by the data center of JCOG in August 2010. We are now preparing to publish the results as well as for a prospective study to prove the efficacy of less-invasive surgery for patients with Stage IB1 small (<2 cm) uterine cervical cancer.

Multicenter Retrospective Study for Pulmonary Metastasectomy for Uterine Cervical Cancer (12)

This study evaluated the results of the resection of pulmonary metastases from cervical cancer. Among 7748 patients with primary Stage IB or II cervical cancer who underwent curative initial treatment consisting of radical hysterectomy

or radiotherapy in 22 hospitals, pulmonary metastases detected after a disease-free period were resected from 29 (0.37%) patients with the intention to cure by 30 June 1998. The 5-year disease-free survival rate (DFS) after pulmonary metastasectomy for all patients was 32.9%. Patients with one or two pulmonary metastases had a 5-year DFS of 42.2% compared with 0% for patients with three or four metastases ($P = 0.0003$). Patients with squamous cell cancers (SCC) had a 5-year DFS of 47.4% compared with 0% for patients with adenosquamous cell cancers or adenocarcinoma ($P = 0.0141$). In multivariate analysis, the significant prognostic variables for DFS were less than or equal to two metastases ($P = 0.0232$) and SCC ($P = 0.0168$). Cervical cancer patients with pulmonary metastases after successful initial treatment can be expected to achieve long-term DFS by pulmonary metastasectomy when there are less than or equal to two metastases and the histology is SCC.

Endometrial cancer

Multicenter Retrospective Study for Conservative Therapy for Endometrioid Adenocarcinoma and Atypical Endometrial Hyperplasia of the Endometrium in Young Women (13)

Thirty-nine patients with endometrioid adenocarcinoma (EA) and atypical endometrial hyperplasia (AH) of the endometrium who received conservative treatment to preserve fertility were collected from member institutions of the GCSG. The institutional diagnosis of EA in 29 patients was changed to AH in 10, complex hyperplasia in 3 and atypical polypoid adenomyoma in 3; the diagnosis of AH in 10 patients was changed to EA in 1 and simple hyperplasia in 1 by a central pathological review. Nine of 12 women (75%) with EA and 15 of 18 women (83%) with AH had initially responded to medroxyprogesterone acetate (MPA) treatment. Two of nine responders with EA later developed relapse and one of them had a lymph node metastasis. Two became pregnant and one delivered one full-term infant. One of the responders with AH had a relapse in the endometrium. Five became pregnant and four delivered four normal infants. Young women with EA localized in the endometrium who wish to preserve their fertility may be treated as successfully with MPA as those with AH. Based on the results, we conducted the Phase II study presented below.

Multicenter Phase II Study of Fertility-sparing Treatment with MPA for EA and AH in Young Women (14)

This multicenter prospective study was carried out at 16 institutions to assess the efficacy of fertility-sparing treatment using MPA for EA and AH in young women. Twenty-eight patients presumed to have Stage IA EA and 17 patients with AH who were <40 years of age were enrolled. All patients were given a daily oral dose of 600 mg MPA with low-dose aspirin. This treatment continued for 26 weeks as long as the patients responded. Either estrogen–progestin therapy or fertility treatment was provided for the responders after MPA therapy. The primary endpoint was a pathological CR rate. Toxicity, pregnancy rate and PFS were the secondary endpoints. CR was found in 55% of EA cases and 82% of AH cases; the overall CR rate was 67%. Neither therapeutic death nor irreversible toxicities were observed. During the 3-year follow-up period, 12 pregnancies and 7 normal deliveries were achieved after MPA therapy. Fourteen recurrences were found in 30 patients (47%) between 7 and 36 months. The efficacy of fertility-sparing treatment with a high dose of MPA for EA and AH was proven by this prospective trial. However, even in responders, close follow-up is required because of the substantial rate of recurrence.

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES OF THE GCSG OF THE JCOG

We are now planning to conduct several studies such as less invasive surgery for Stage IB1 uterine cervical cancer, maintenance chemotherapy following concurrent chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced uterine cervical cancer and chemotherapy for uterine leiomyosarcoma. So far, we have not had an opportunity to collaborate with foreign societies. However, in the future, we would like to make a protocol that interests foreign societies. We hope that the GCSG will develop better treatments for women who suffer from gynecologic cancer via unique and high-quality clinical trials.

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS (AS OF 31 MAY 2011)

Hokkaido University, Sapporo Medical University, Iwate Medical University, Tohoku University, University of Tsukuba, National Defense Medical College, Saitama Cancer Center, Saitama Medical Center, The Jikei University Kashiwa Hospital, National Cancer Center Hospital, Tokyo Metropolitan Cancer and Infectious diseases Center Komagome Hospital, The Jikei University School of Medicine, Cancer Institute Hospital, The University of Tokyo, Juntendo University, NTT Medical Center Tokyo, Kitasato University, Niigata Cancer Center Hospital, Shinshu University, Aichi Cancer Center, Nagoya University, Kyoto University, Osaka City University, Kinki University, Osaka Medical Center for Cancer and Cardiovascular Diseases, Osaka City General Hospital, Sakai Hospital Kinki University Faculty of medicine, Hyogo Cancer Center, Tottori University, National Hospital Organization Kure Medical Center, National Hospital Organization Shikoku Cancer Center, National Hospital Organization Kyushu Cancer Center, Kurume University, Kyushu University, Saga University, Kumamoto University, Kagoshima City Hospital and University of the Ryukyus.

Funding

This study was supported by the Health and Labour Sciences Research Grants for Clinical Cancer Research (h22-020).

Conflict of interest statement

None declared.

References

1. Tsunematsu R, Yoshikawa H, Yakushiji M, Fujii T, Nishimura T, Shimizu T. Phase II study of dose-intensive cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin and cisplatin (CAP) with G-CSF in patients with advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 1997;7(Suppl 2, Meeting Abstract):P125.
2. Onda T, Kamura T, Ishizuka N, Katsumata N, Fukuda H, Yoshikawa H. Feasibility study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by interval cytoreductive surgery for stage III/IV ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG0206. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2004;34:43–5.
3. Onda T, Kobayashi H, Nakanishi T, Hatae M, Iwasaka T, Konishi I, et al. Feasibility study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy followed by interval debulking surgery for stage III/IV ovarian, tubal, and peritoneal cancers: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG0206. *Gynecol Oncol* 2009;113:57–62.
4. Matsumoto K, Katsumata N, Saito I, Konishi I, Kamura T, Japan Clinical Oncology Group. A phase II trial of oral etoposide and intravenous irinotecan for patients with platinum-resistant and taxane-pretreated ovarian cancer (JCOG0503). *ASCO Meeting Abstracts* 2010;28(Suppl 15):TPS259.
5. Onda T, Matsumoto K, Shibata T, Sato A, Fukuda H, Konishi I, et al. Phase III trial of upfront debulking surgery versus neoadjuvant chemotherapy for stage III/IV ovarian, tubal and peritoneal cancers: Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study JCOG0602. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2008;38:74–7.
6. Akahira JI, Yoshikawa H, Shimizu Y, Tsunematsu R, Hirakawa T, Kuramoto H, et al. Prognostic factors of stage IV epithelial ovarian cancer: a multicenter retrospective study. *Gynecol Oncol* 2001;81:398–403.
7. Onda T, Katsumata N, Tsunematsu R, Yasugi T, Mushika M, Yamamoto K, et al. Cisplatin, paclitaxel and escalating doses of doxorubicin (TAP) in advanced ovarian cancer: a phase I trial. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2004;34:540–6.
8. Satoh T, Hatae M, Watanabe Y, Yaegashi N, Ishiko O, Kodama S, et al. Outcomes of fertility-sparing surgery for stage I epithelial ovarian cancer: a proposal for patient selection. *J Clin Oncol* 2010;28:1727–32.
9. Katsumata N, Yoshikawa H, Hirakawa T, Saito T, Kuzuya K, Fujii T, et al. Phase III randomized trial of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) followed by radical hysterectomy (RH) versus RH for bulky stage I/II cervical cancer (JCOG 0102). *ASCO Meeting Abstracts* 2006;24(Suppl 18):5013.
10. Katsumata N, Yoshikawa H, Kobayashi H, Saito T, Kuzuya K, Mizunoe T, et al. Phase III randomized trial of neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) followed by radical hysterectomy (RH) versus RH for bulky stage I/II cervical cancer: update of Japan Clinical Oncology Group (JCOG) Protocol 0102. *ASCO Meeting Abstracts* 2010;28(Suppl 15):5047.
11. Saito I, Kitagawa R, Fukuda H, Shibata T, Katsumata N, Konishi I, et al. A phase III trial of paclitaxel plus carboplatin versus paclitaxel plus cisplatin in stage IVB, persistent or recurrent cervical cancer: Gynecologic Cancer Study Group/Japan Clinical Oncology Group Study (JCOG0505). *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2010;40:90–3.
12. Yamamoto K, Yoshikawa H, Shiromizu K, Saito T, Kuzuya K, Tsunematsu R, et al. Pulmonary metastasectomy for uterine cervical cancer: a multivariate analysis. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2004;77:1179–82.
13. Kaku T, Yoshikawa H, Tsuda H, Sakamoto A, Fukunaga M, Kuwabara Y, et al. Conservative therapy for adenocarcinoma and atypical endometrial hyperplasia of the endometrium in young women: central pathologic review and treatment outcome. *Cancer Lett* 2001;167:39–48.
14. Ushijima K, Yahata H, Yoshikawa H, Konishi I, Yasugi T, Saito T, et al. Multicenter phase II study of fertility-sparing treatment with medroxyprogesterone acetate for endometrial carcinoma and atypical hyperplasia in young women. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:2798–803.

JJCO Japanese Journal of Clinical Oncology

Jpn J Clin Oncol 2011;41(2)278–282
doi:10.1093/jjco/hyq182
Advance Access Publication 11 October 2010

A Randomized Phase II/III Trial of 3 Weekly Intraperitoneal versus Intravenous Carboplatin in Combination with Intravenous Weekly Dose-dense Paclitaxel for Newly Diagnosed Ovarian, Fallopian Tube and Primary Peritoneal Cancer

Keiichi Fujiwara[1,*], Eriko Aotani[2], Tetsutaro Hamano[2], Shoji Nagao[1], Hiroyuki Yoshikawa[3], Toru Sugiyama[4], Junzo Kigawa[5], Daisuke Aoki[6], Noriyuki Katsumata[7], Masahiro Takeuchi[2] and Mitsuaki Suzuki[8]

[1]Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Saitama Medical University International Medical Center, Hidaka-City, Saitama, [2]Clinical Trial Coordinating Center, Kitasato University Research Center for Clinical Pharmacology, Tokyo, [3]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Tsukuba University, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, [4]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Iwate Medical University, Iwate, [5]Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Tottori University Cancer Center, Yonago, Tottori, [6]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Keio University, Shinjuku-ku, [7]Division of Medical Oncology, National Cancer Center Hospital, Tokyo and [8]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Jichi Medical University, Shimono, Tochigi, Japan

*For reprints and all correspondence: Keiichi Fujiwara, Department of Gynecologic Oncology, Saitama Medical University International Medical Center, 1397-1 Yamane, Hidaka-City, Saitama 350-1298, Japan. E-mail: fujiwara@saitama-med.ac.jp

Received July 21, 2010; accepted August 29, 2010

Retrospective studies and a Phase II trial demonstrated the promising efficacy and safety of intraperitoneal administration of carboplatin in ovarian, fallopian tube and primary peritoneal cancer. A Japanese Gynecologic Oncology Group 3016 randomized Phase III trial for these cancers showed dose-dense weekly administration of paclitaxel significant improvement of progression-free survival and overall survival over every 3-week administration. From June 2010, we have been conducting a randomized Phase II/III trial of intravenous versus intraperitoneal administration of carboplatin every 3 week in combination with dose-dense weekly administration of paclitaxel. The purpose of this trial is to prove the superiority of intraperitoneal administration of carboplatin over intravenous administration. Primary endpoint is progression-free survival and secondary endpoints include overall survival, quality of life assessment and cost–benefit. The first 120 patients will be evaluated for the feasibility of intraperitoneal arm and a total of 746 patients will be enrolled in a Phase III study.

Key words: ovarian cancer – intraperitoneal chemotherapy – carboplatin – paclitaxel – dose-dense chemotherapy

INTRODUCTION

In Japan, it is estimated that incidence of epithelial ovarian cancer is approximately 8000 per year and almost half of the patients died of this disease. There is no established screening method; therefore, 60–70% of the patients are at Stages III or IV when newly diagnosed. A standard treatment strategy for the advanced ovarian cancer is a maximum debulking surgery followed by chemotherapy. The standard chemotherapy regimen has been a combination of carboplatin at AUC of 5–6 and paclitaxel at 175 mg/m^2 given intravenously every 3 weeks (1). This regimen has been utilized as standard since 1999, yet the prognosis of advanced ovarian cancer is poor. Numerous efforts have been made to improve the survival, and two distinct innovations on the chemotherapy were achieved recently, which are intraperitoneal chemotherapy and weekly dose-dense administration of paclitaxel.

Three large randomized trials have been conducted in the USA and all of them showed improvement of overall survival (OS) and/or progression-free survival (PFS) (2–4). US National Cancer Institute and Gynecology Oncology Group (GOG) conducted a metanalysis and found that

intraperitoneal (IP) chemotherapy improved OS at the hazard ratio of 0.78 (5). In response to this result, US NCI has issued a clinical announcement in 2006 to recommend IP cisplatin-based chemotherapy for optimally debulked Stage III ovarian cancer patients. In spite of these efforts, IP chemotherapy has not been accepted in the gynecologic cancer community, mainly because of the toxicity. It is expected that replacement of cisplatin to carboplatin may reduce the toxicity without sacrificing the efficacy (6).

Another innovation was the application of dose-dense weekly paclitaxel. Japanese Gynecologic Oncology Group (JGOG) has conducted a large-scale randomized trial and demonstrated significant improvement in PFS and OS (7).

Therefore, it is of great expectation that the combination of dose-dense weekly administration of paclitaxel with IP administration of carboplatin will improve the prognosis further.

This protocol was designed by the Protocol Committee of Gynecologic Oncology Trial and Investigation Consortium (GOTIC) and Ovarian Committee member of JGOG. The protocol was approved by Clinical Trial Review Committee of GOTIC as GOTIC-001 on 9 September 2009, and that of JGOG as JGOG-3019 on 26 April 2010. The protocol was submitted for the Evaluation System of Investigational Medical Care of Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, Japan, and was approved to conduct under the Japanese governmental health insurance system on 16 April 2010. This trial was registered at the UMIN Clinical Trials Registry as UMIN000003670 (http://www.umin.ac.jp/ctr/index.htm).

PROTOCOL DIGEST OF GOTIC-001/JGOG-3019

Purpose

This study was designed to prove superiority of IP administration of carboplatin over IV administration in newly diagnosed carcinoma of the ovary, fallopian tube and primary peritoneum. The combination of paclitaxel is the dose-dense weekly fashion based on the JGOG-3016 trial result.

Study Setting

This is a multi-institutional randomized Phase II/III trial.

Resource

Grants-in Aid for Cancer Research (H21--014), from the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare, Japan. Gynecologic Oncology Trial and Investigation Consortium and JGOG support this trial.

Endpoints

The primary endpoint of this study is PFS. Secondary endpoints are OS, response rate in patients with measurable disease, quality of life assessment and cost–benefit.

Eligibility Criteria

(i) The patient must be planned to undergo laparotomy surgery for formal registration. Since this trial includes patents with both optimal and suboptimal residual disease, the patients with exploratory laparotomy are also eligible.
(ii) Patient who is preoperatively anticipated to be FIGO II to IV epithelial ovarian, fallopian tube or primary peritoneal cancer is eligible for pre-registration. And the patient must be clinically at Stages II–IV at the time of formal registration.
(iii) Patient who signed the consent for the placement of IP port system when she is assigned to the IP arm.
(iv) The patients who are planned to receive chemotherapy within 8 weeks after initial surgery.
(v) ECOG performance status must be 0–2.
(vi) Patient must have adequate organ functions.
(vii) Survival can be expected 3 month or more.
(viii) Age 20 or older.

Written informed consent must be obtained from the patient or legal guardian.

Exclusion Criteria

(i) Patients with borderline malignancies.
(ii) Patients who have received chemotherapy or radiation therapy for the current disease before enrolment.
(iii) Patients with any of the active concurrent malignancies or past history of malignancies of which the follow-up is within 5 years.
(iv) Patients with severe complications: patients with severe heart disease or cerebrovascular disease, or uncontrolled diabetes or hypertension, pulmonary fibrosis, interstitial pneumonitis, active bleeding, active gastrointestinal ulcer or sever neuropathy.
(v) Patients with history of hypersensitivity polyoxyethylene castor oil.
(vi) Patients with pleural effusion that need continuous drainage.
(vii) Patients with active infectious disease.
(viii) Patients with possibility of pregnancy or under breast-feeding.
(ix) Patients with symptomatic brain metastasis.
(x) Patients whose circumstances at the time of entry onto the study would not permit completion of study or required follow-up.

Study Flow

The patient who is anticipated to have Stage II, III or IV carcinoma of the ovary, fallopian tube or primary peritoneum will be pre-registered through Web Registration System of Kitasato University Clinical Trial Coordinating Center (CTCC), after written informed consent was obtained. At the time of surgery, the physician will call to the Kitasato CTCC

before closure of the abdominal wall. The coordinator will ask the stratification factors, clinical stages and the size of residual disease, then randomization result will be informed. This is considered as a formal registration. When the patient is randomized to IP arm, the Bard IP Port (#14 Fr) will be placed according to the surgical manual. For patient who randomized to the IV arm, IP port will not be placed. The protocol chemotherapy will be started within 8 weeks after confirmation of histology as epithelial cancer.

Control Arm Treatment

For patients randomized to IV arm will receive paclitaxel at 80 mg/m^2 as 1 h intravenous (IV) infusion followed by carboplatin at AUC 6 as a 30–120 min IV infusion on Day 1. IV administration of paclitaxel will be repeated at 80 mg/m^2 on days 8 and 15. This regimen is considered as one cycle.

Experimental Arm Treatment

For patients randomized to IP arm will receive paclitaxel at 80 mg/m^2 as 1 h IV infusion. During the paclitaxel infusion, 1000–1500 ml physiological saline or 5% glucose will be administered through IP port. This will allow the confirmation that IP port is not obstructed and dense adhesion does not occur surrounding the catheter. After completion of the hydroperitoneum, carboplatin at AUC 6 will be infused. To confirm that the hypersensitivity of carboplatin does not occur, 10 ml will be administered and after waiting for 10 min, the rest of the amount will be infused. These procedures will be done on day 1. IV administration of paclitaxel will be repeated at 80 mg/m^2 on days 8 and 15. This regimen is considered as one cycle.

Number of Cycles

The protocol treatment will be repeated for six cycles for patients with chemotherapy only after primary surgery. However, in patient, who will undergo interval debulking surgery after response to the suboptimal residual disease, they may receive up to eight cycles. Interval debulking surgery can be performed after three to five cycles of protocol chemotherapy, and then patient can receive three more cycles of chemotherapy.

Study Design and Statistical Considerations

This study was designed as a randomized Phase II/III trial.

Target sample sizes and event were as follows.

Phase A: 60 patients/arm
Phase B: 510 events (target sample size: 746 patients, including Phase A patients)

Planned patient accrual duration is 3 year and planned follow-up duration will be either 3 year or until the time when the 510 events are observed, whichever it comes first.

Sample sizes were determined based on the following considerations.

Phase II Part (Phase A)

In the previous JGOG-3016 study, treatment completion rate for dose-dense pacliaxel plus carboplatin (dd-TC) was 47.0%, and hematologic adverse event (more than or equal to grade 3) rate for dd-TC was the following, neutropenia: 91.7%, leukocytes: 80.4%, hemoglobin: 68.6%, platelets: 43.6%. Furthermore, the response rate for dd-TC was 55.8%. According to above evidence, we performed statistical simulations for these factors to find a sample size which would be necessary to obtain 95% confidence intervals of these estimates with 15% precisions in the IV arm, and we calculated that 46 patients is needed. We also assumed that treatment completion rate in the IP arm is expected to be lower than the IV arm and hematologic adverse event rates defined above are expected to be higher, thereby the required sample size in the IP arm would be larger than those of the IV arm. Furthermore, we also assumed that some patients would not have a measurable site. Thus, we plan the sample size of 120 patients (60 patients for each arm) to be targeted. Phase II patients will be included in the Phase III analysis.

Phase III Part (Phase A + Phase B)

The primary endpoint of this study is PFS. In the previous JGOG3016 study, the median PFS was approximately 28 months for dd-TC. Furthermore, in a meta-analysis conducted by the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and the Gynecologic Oncology Group, the hazard ratio for PFS in the IP as compared with the IV was 0.784, indicating the 21.6% hazard reduction in the IP treatment).

According to above evidence, we assumed that the median PFS was 28 months for the IV arm and the hazard ratio for PFS in the IP arm as compared with the IV arm was 0.78. The 22% hazard reduction would be acceptable as a new standard treatment regimen. With an accrual period of 3 years and a minimum follow-up period of 3 years, 746 patients (373 patients for each arm) and 510 events (239 in IP arm) are required in order to detect this hazard ratio using the log-rank test with an overall two-sided type I error of 0.05 and a power of 80%. The final analysis will be performed either after the required events will be observed or after the minimum follow-up period will be completed, whichever comes first. If the required events will not be observed after the minimum follow-up period will be completed, extension of the follow-up duration will be considered.

Randomization and Stratifications

Patients will be centrally randomized. A minimization technique will be used for random treatment allocation stratifying by the enrolling institutions, initial FIGO stage of disease (II, III or IV) and the size of residual disease (complete, less than 1 cm, between 1 and 2 cm and more than 2 cm).

Analysis Method

Phase III part: analysis set. Efficacy analyses will be performed on all randomly assigned patients based on the intent-to-treat principle. Patients receiving at least one partial infusion of the study drug will be qualified for safety analysis.

Primary efficacy analysis. The PFS curves will be estimated using Kaplan–Meier method. Non-parametric 95% confidence intervals will be calculated for the median PFS, and the curves will be compared in the two treatment groups based on the two-sided log-rank test with an overall significance level of 5%. Multiplicity adjustments in regard to interim analysis will be noted in the section of the interim analysis.

Secondary efficacy analysis. The OS curves will be also estimated using Kaplan–Meier technique and compared using log-rank test. The response rates in the case with measurable site, and the treatment completion rates will be estimated by arms. We define the treatment completion case as the patient who receives treatment to the sixth cycle. Exact 95% confidence intervals will be calculated for each response rate and treatment completion rate. The rates for the two treatment groups will be compared using Fisher's exact test and a normally approximated 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio.

Interim analysis. Under the proportional hazard assumption, alternative hypothesis and uniformly patients' enrollment, the half of the required events (255 events) would be observed when approximately 3.2 years go by from a starting point of this trial. One interim analysis will be carried out either when 3.5 years go by from a starting point of this trial or when the required events will be observed, whichever comes first. In order to maintain an overall significance level of 5%, the PFS curves would be compared with Type I error of 0.3% in the interim analysis and of 4.7% in the final analysis calculated by the O'Brien and Fleming-type alpha spending function.

Subgroup analysis. In order to support analyses of primary and secondary endpoints, all comparisons and estimates will be stratified by randomization factors and other demographic data.

Exploratory analysis. Statistical models (e.g. Cox's proportional hazard model and logistic regression model) will be used for further explorations.

Safety analysis. The number of patients for each adverse event will be summarized for each treatment group. The rates of adverse events will be estimated for each group and compared using an approximate 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio.

Quality of life and Cost-effectiveness analyses. Quality of life (QOL) and cost-effectiveness (CE) of IP arm and IV arm will be analyzed when 2 years go by from a starting point of this trial, assuming that 300 qualified patients would be observed at that time. CE data are also analyzed at the same time of QOL analysis. These endpoints will also be analyzed after the study completion (or study termination) with efficacy endpoints. Baseline QOL score will be analyzed using linear model adjusting for age and baseline ECOG performance status (PS). Other QOL scores will be analyzed using linear mixed model with age, PS and baseline QOL scores. Further details of QOL and CE analysis will be specified in the statistical analysis plan.

Analysis results of QOL evaluation will be published after 2 years go by from a starting point of this trial, assuming that 300 qualified patients would be observed at that time. For CE analysis, we define the analysis set of all patients who will be registered and agreed with informed consents of CE analysis. Analysis and report of cost-effectiveness with primary endpoints will be reviewed.

Feasibility Analysis. In the Phase II period, the feasibility of combination of IV dose-dense paclitaxel and IP carboplatin will be evaluated. The number of patients for treatment completion, hematologic and non-hematologic toxic effects will be summarized for each treatment group. The rates of toxic effects will be estimated for each group. Furthermore, the rates at the end of the treatment will be estimated for each treatment group. Exact 95% confidence intervals will be calculated for each rate. These rates for the two treatment groups will be compared using Fisher's exact test and an approximate 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio to aid the IDMC in reaching decisions about study continuation.

Study Monitoring

Study monitoring will be performed by the Kitasato University Clinical Trial Coordinating Center, to ensure data submission, patient eligibility, protocol compliance, safety and on-schedule study progress. On-site monitoring on the selective institution will be performed once a year. The monitoring reports will be submitted to the Independent Data and Safety Monitoring Committee every 6 months.

Participating Institutions

Leading institution as the study under the Evaluation System of Investigational Medical Care (ESIMeC) is Saitama Medical University International Medical Center. Other institutions waiting for the governmental approval for the ESIMeC as of 15 July 2010 are as follows. Iwate University, Jichi Medical University, Keio University, National Cancer Center Hospital, Tottori University, Tsukuba University, Gunma University and Saitama Medical University Medical Center. Other institutions are under the process of ESIMeC submission.

Funding

Supported by Grant-in-Aid from Ministry of Heath, Welfare, and Labor, H21-Cancer Clinical-General-014. Investigational Drugs are supplied by Bristol-Meyers, Nippon Kayaku, Sawai, and Sandoz.

Conflict of interest statement

None declared.

References

1. du Bois A, Quinn M, Thigpen T, Vermorken J, Avall-Lundqvist E, Bookman M, et al. 2004 consensus statements on the management of ovarian cancer: final document of the 3rd International Gynecologic Cancer Intergroup Ovarian Cancer Consensus Conference (GCIG OCCC 2004). *Ann Oncol* 2005;16(Suppl. 8):viii7–viii12.
2. Alberts DS, Liu PY, Hannigan EV, O'Toole R, Williams SD, Young JA, et al. Intraperitoneal cisplatin plus intravenous cyclophosphamide versus intravenous cisplatin plus intravenous cyclophosphamide for stage III ovarian cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1996;335:1950–5.
3. Markman M, Bundy BN, Alberts DS, Fowler JM, Clark-Pearson DL, Carson LF, et al. Phase III trial of standard-dose intravenous cisplatin plus paclitaxel versus moderately high-dose carboplatin followed by intravenous paclitaxel and intraperitoneal cisplatin in small-volume stage III ovarian carcinoma: an intergroup study of the Gynecologic Oncology Group, Southwestern Oncology Group, and Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:1001–7.
4. Armstrong DK, Bundy B, Wenzel L, Huang HQ, Baergen R, Lele S, et al. Intraperitoneal cisplatin and paclitaxel in ovarian cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:34–43.
5. NCI clinical announcement. intraperitoneal chemotherapy, 2006. http://ctep.cancer.gov/highlights/docs/clin_annc_010506.pdf.
6. Fujiwara K, Markman M, Morgan M, Coleman RL. Intraperitoneal carboplatin-based chemotherapy for epithelial ovarian cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* 2005;97:10–5.
7. Katsumata N, Yasuda M, Takahashi F, Isonishi S, Jobo T, Aoki D, et al. Dose-dense paclitaxel once a week in combination with carboplatin every 3 weeks for advanced ovarian cancer: a phase 3, open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2009;374:1331–8.