

exclusion of fit elderly patients from clinical studies and also to the total lack of studies in unfit elderly, who represent at least 50% of the geriatric population presenting into major hospitals.

Methods: We analysed a database of 3825 patients treated within different European trials for the prognosis of elderly (> 70 years, n=711) and non-elderly patients (<= 70 years, n=3114).

Results: There was a difference in the percentage of elderly patients included in the different European countries: the highest rate in Austria (38%) and lowest in the UK (3%). Germany had 13% and overall 19% of patients were above 70 years of age. The distribution of age groups was as follows: 70-75 years 370 pts, 75-80 years 116 pts, > 80 years 20 pts (only 1 patient above 85 years). Elderly patients had a higher incidence of rectal primary (p=0.01), more frequent weight loss (p=0.03) and more prior adjuvant chemotherapy (p<0.0001). Significant prognostic factors (Köhne et al. ASCO 2000) like WBC, thrombocytosis, alkaline phosphatase and LDH all were in favour of elderly patients, however the distribution into good (52% vs. 73%), intermediate (27% vs. 26%) or poor risk (21% vs. 21%) of non-elderly and elderly patients did not differ significantly. Objective responses were more likely to occur in elderly patients (26% vs. 21%, p=0.005). Relapse free survival (5.3 vs. 5.8 months, p<0.0001) and overall survival (11.1 vs. 12.0 months, p<0.001) were all in favour of elderly patients with insignificant clinical albeit statistical significance. Survival of elderly vs. non-elderly patients in the three previously defined risk groups did not differ. Older age was also not an independent prognostic parameter.

Conclusions: Fit elderly patients should not be excluded from clinical trials and studies in unfit elderly patients are warranted and currently discussed by The International Society of Geriatric Oncology (SIOG) and DGHO elderly group. Elderly patients need more attention regarding their functional, social and mental status.

303

POSTER

Capecitabine plus oxaliplatin (XELOX): findings from a human colon cancer xenograft model and a phase II clinical trial in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer (MCRC)

N. Sawada¹, Y. Tanaka¹, C. Twelves², J. Tabernero³, E. Díaz-Rubio⁴, E. Van Cutsem⁵. ¹ Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd, Product Research, Kamakura, Japan; ² Cancer Research UK, Glasgow, UK; ³ Vall d'Hebron University Hospital, Barcelona, Spain; ⁴ Hospital San Carlos, Madrid, Spain; ⁵ University Hospital, Leuven, Belgium

Background: Capecitabine (Xeloda®), an oral tumoractivated fluoropyrimidine, is replacing i.v. 5-FU as first-line therapy in MCRC based on its high single-agent activity (response rate [RR] 26%) and improved safety compared with bolus 5-FU/LV. With other advantages in terms of convenience and patient preference for oral therapy, capecitabine could also replace i.v. 5-FU in combination regimens. Adding oxaliplatin (single agent RR approx. 10%) to infused 5-FU/LV improves efficacy in patients with MCRC. Since capecitabine and oxaliplatin have key toxicities that do not overlap, capecitabine is an attractive combination partner for oxaliplatin.

Preclinical Study: The antitumor activity of XELOX was evaluated in mice with CFX280 human colon cancer xenograft. Capecitabine was administered p.o. on days 1-14 plus oxaliplatin i.v. on day 1, every 21 days. Combining capecitabine and oxaliplatin produced at least additive antitumor activity. XELOX at two-thirds of the maximum tolerated dose (MTD) for each agent was more potent than either single agent at their MTD. Furthermore, oxaliplatin upregulated the tumor level of thymidine phosphorylase (TP), the final enzyme in the conversion of capecitabine to 5-FU. This upregulation of TP by oxaliplatin was not observed in two further colon cancer xenograft models that were unresponsive to oxaliplatin.

Phase II Clinical Study: 96 patients (61 men, 35 women) received i.v. oxaliplatin (130 mg/m², day 1) plus oral capecitabine (1000 mg/m², twice daily on days 1-14) every 21 days as first-line treatment for MCRC. Median age was 64; colon cancer (63%)/rectal cancer (33%)/both (4%); 54% had >1 metastatic site; 77%, 39% and 32% had liver, lymph node or lung metastases, respectively; 28% had received adjuvant fluoropyrimidines. All patients were evaluable for efficacy and safety. RR was 55% (95% CI, 45-65%) and 31% of patients had SD >3 months. Median TTP was 7.6 months (95% CI, 6.4-8.6 months) and median overall survival was 19.5 months. Grade 3/4 toxicities were sensory neuropathy (16%), diarrhea (16%), nausea/vomiting (13%), asthenia (9%), neuropathic pain (6%), neutropenia (7%), and thrombocytopenia (4%). Grade 3 hand-foot syndrome affected only 3% of patients and 60-day all cause mortality was 2.1%.

Conclusions: The clinical findings (RR 55% and good tolerability) confirm the preclinical observations in human colon cancer xenografts and indicate that XELOX is a highly active and appropriate first-line treatment for MCRC.

304

POSTER

Capecitabine plus irinotecan (XELIRI) in first line metastatic colorectal cancer (MCRC): update on a phase II trial

Y.Z. Patt¹, J. Leibmann², D. Diamandidis³, S.G. Eckhardt⁴, M. Javle⁵, G.R. Justice⁶, W. Keiser⁷, F.-C. Lee⁸, W. Miller⁹, E. Lin¹. ¹ University of Texas, M. D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, USA; ² New Mexico Oncology/Hematology Consultants, Albuquerque, USA; ³ Nevada Cancer Center, Las Vegas, USA; ⁴ University of Colorado, Denver, USA; ⁵ Roswell Park Cancer Center, Buffalo, USA; ⁶ Pacific Coast Hematology and Oncology, Fountain Valley, USA; ⁷ Redwood Regional Oncology Center, Santa Rosa, USA; ⁸ New Mexico Cancer Research and Treatment Center, Albuquerque, USA; ⁹ Scripps Clinic, La Jolla, USA

Background: Capecitabine (Xeloda®), a tumor-activated oral fluoropyrimidine, has superior activity and an improved safety profile compared to 5-FU/LV in 1st line MCRC. Adding irinotecan (CPT) to bolus or infused 5-FU/LV improves efficacy, but safety appears better with infused 5-FU. However, infused combinations are burdensome and time-consuming for patients and healthcare providers alike. Mimicking infusion with twice-daily oral administration, capecitabine can replace infused 5-FU in combination therapy. The combination of capecitabine (X) and CPT should be an effective, safe, and more convenient 1st line option.

Materials and methods: Recommended doses were identified in 2 independent phase I trials [1]: intravenous CPT (250 mg/m² d1) followed by intermittent oral X (1000 mg/m² twice-daily for 14 days) every 3 weeks, from evening day 1 to morning day 15. To improve safety and permit treatment of older patients (pts), those ≥ 65 years old received lower doses of both agents (200/750). Objectives were to evaluate efficacy and safety in 1st line MCRC pts.

Results: Accrual is complete (n=52). 51 patients are evaluable for safety and 43 for response: 29 men (56%), 23 women (44%); median Karnofsky PS 90 (70-100), median age 57.5 (30-79). 44 pts (85%) had colon cancer, 6 rectal (11%) and 2 both (4%). Tumor differentiation was 15% poor, 64% moderate, 11% well and 10% unknown. 41 pts (79%) had liver metastases and 31 (60%) had stage IV disease at initial diagnosis. 10 pts (19%) received prior adjuvant 5-FU. Median number of treatment cycles is currently 5 (70% ≥ 4 cycles, 44% ≥ 6, 14% = maximum of 12 cycles) with a median follow-up of 39 weeks (range, 11 to 68 weeks). Most common (>5%) AEs (all grade 3) were diarrhea 22%, nausea/vomiting 12%, dehydration 12% (1 pt with grade 4), hand-foot syndrome 6%. Grade 3 or 4 neutropenia was seen in 18%. There were no treatment-related deaths. Response rate was 18/43 (42%) with another 17 stabilizations (39%), including 8 unconfirmed responses, giving tumor control in 8/10 patients). In one center, 8 patients were able to undergo potentially-curative resection following their chemotherapy. Median time to progression (TTP) is currently 6.4 months (range, 1-13).

Conclusion: X should replace 5-FU in combination with CPT to create an effective, safe, and less burdensome treatment option in 1st line MCRC. XELIRI compares favorably with standard CPT/5-FU/LV combination regimens in terms of response rate and TTP. Updated results will be presented.

Reference

[1] Kerr et al, Delord et al. ASCO 02 abstracts 643 & 397

305

POSTER

Twelve weeks of neoadjuvant capecitabine and oxaliplatin followed by synchronous chemoradiation (CRT) and total mesorectal excision (TME) in MRI defined poor risk locally advanced rectal cancer resulted in promising tumour regression and rapid symptomatic relief

I. Chau¹, D. Cunningham¹, D. Tait², G. Brown³, N. Tebbutt¹, M. Hill¹, A. Wotherspoon⁴, A.R. Norman⁵, A. Massey¹, J. Oates¹. ¹ Royal Marsden Hospital, Department of Medicine, London and Surrey, United Kingdom; ² Royal Marsden Hospital, Department of Radiotherapy, London and Surrey, United Kingdom; ³ Royal Marsden Hospital, Department of Diagnostic Imaging, London and Surrey, United Kingdom; ⁴ Royal Marsden Hospital, Department of Histopathology, London and Surrey, United Kingdom; ⁵ Royal Marsden Hospital, Department of Computing and Information, London and Surrey, United Kingdom

Purpose: To evaluate neoadjuvant capecitabine/oxaliplatin prior to CRT and TME in newly diagnosed patients with MRI defined poor risk/locally advanced rectal cancer. **Patients and Methods:** MRI criteria for poor risk rectal cancer were: tumours within 2mm of mesorectal fascia i.e. circumferential resection margin (CRM) threatened; T3 tumours at/below levators; tumours extending more than or equal to 5mm into peri-rectal fat;