General Medicine,ISSN:1311-1817, VOLUME 26 ISSUES 3, Page: 1576-1585
Journal link: https://general-medicine.org
Abstract Link: https://general-medicine.org/abstract-12-12-1576-1585/
december 2024

A Comparative Analysis of Perioperative and Histopathologic Outcomes in Locoregional Gastric Cancer: Neoadjuvant Treatment Strategies Evaluation

[1]Muhammad Daniyal Basheer, [2]Dr Annum Fareed Abbasi, [3]Dr Iqra Hanif, [4]Dr Sajjad Haider awan, [5]Dr Misbah Saddique

[1]Resident Surgery AIMS Hospital Muzaffarabad
[2]Azad Jammu and Kashmir medical college muzaffarbad
[3]Poonch medical college Rawalakot
[4]Medical specialist aims hospital Mzd
[5]Poonch medical college Rawalakot

ABSTRACT:

Background: Locoregional gastric cancer presents a significant clinical challenge, often requiring multimodal treatment approaches. Neoadjuvant therapy has emerged as a promising strategy, but its comparative efficacy concerning perioperative and histopathologic outcomes remains underexplored.

Aim: This study aimed to compare the perioperative and histopathologic outcomes of locoregional gastric cancer patients undergoing different neoadjuvant treatment strategies.

Methods: A retrospective analysis was conducted on locoregional gastric cancer patients who underwent neoadjuvant therapy between May 2023 and April 2024. Patients were categorized into groups based on the type of neoadjuvant treatment received, including chemotherapy alone, chemoradiotherapy, and targeted therapy combined with chemotherapy. Perioperative parameters such as operative time, blood loss, and postoperative complications were recorded. Histopathologic outcomes, including tumor regression grade and lymph node status, were also assessed.

Results: A total of 120 patients met the inclusion criteria, with 56 receiving chemotherapy alone, 24 receiving chemoradiotherapy, and 40 receiving targeted therapy combined with chemotherapy. Perioperative analysis revealed comparable operative times across all groups, with slightly lower blood loss observed in the targeted therapy combined with chemotherapy group. Postoperative complication rates were similar among the groups. Histopathologic evaluation demonstrated varying degrees of tumor regression, with the highest rates observed in the chemoradiotherapy group. Lymph node involvement was significantly reduced in patients receiving chemoradiotherapy compared to other treatment modalities.

Conclusion: Neoadjuvant therapy plays a crucial role in improving perioperative and histopathologic outcomes in locoregional gastric cancer patients. While all treatment strategies showed efficacy, chemoradiotherapy appeared to offer superior tumor regression and lymph node control. These findings underscore the importance of tailored neoadjuvant approaches in optimizing outcomes for patients with locoregional gastric cancer.

Keywords: Locoregional gastric cancer, neoadjuvant therapy, perioperative outcomes, histopathologic outcomes, chemoradiotherapy, targeted therapy, tumor regression grade, lymph node status, comparative analysis.

INTRODUCTION:

Gastric cancer, a formidable adversary in the realm of oncology, has long posed a significant challenge to clinicians worldwide. Its insidious nature, coupled with late-stage diagnoses, often renders curative interventions elusive [1]. In the pursuit of improving patient outcomes, the field has witnessed a fervent exploration of neoadjuvant treatment strategies, aiming to mitigate disease burden and enhance surgical resection feasibility [2]. This comparative analysis delves into the nuanced interplay between perioperative interventions and histopathologic outcomes in locoregional gastric cancer, shedding light on the efficacy and intricacies of various neoadjuvant approaches.

Historically, surgical resection stood as the cornerstone of curative intent for gastric cancer [3]. However, the advent of neoadjuvant therapies has revolutionized treatment paradigms, offering the promise of downstaging tumors, reducing micro-metastatic burden, and enhancing the likelihood of complete resection [4]. Among these strategies, chemotherapy, radiation therapy, and their synergistic combinations have emerged as frontrunners, each wielding unique mechanisms to tackle the heterogeneity of gastric cancer.

Chemotherapy, often employed in multidrug regimens, targets proliferating cancer cells systemically, aiming to shrink primary tumors and eradicate micrometastases [5]. Platinum-based compounds, fluoropyrimidines, and taxanes feature prominently in neoadjuvant chemotherapy protocols, with varying degrees of efficacy and toxicity profiles [6]. Concurrently, radiation therapy harnesses ionizing radiation to induce DNA damage and impede tumor growth, with particular utility in locally advanced disease. The integration of these modalities, either sequentially or concurrently, underscores the tailored approach to neoadjuvant treatment, optimizing therapeutic efficacy while mitigating adverse effects [7].

Central to the evaluation of neoadjuvant strategies is the assessment of perioperative outcomes, encompassing surgical morbidity, mortality, and the feasibility of achieving R0 resections [8]. While neoadjuvant therapies aim to enhance resectability, concerns regarding treatment-related complications and delays in surgical intervention necessitate meticulous evaluation [9]. Notably, studies have underscored the impact of neoadjuvant therapies on postoperative complications, anastomotic integrity, and the overall morbidity burden, highlighting the imperative of a balanced risk-benefit assessment in treatment decision-making [10].

Concomitantly, histopathologic evaluation serves as the linchpin in gauging treatment response and prognostication, offering invaluable insights into tumor regression, lymph node involvement, and residual disease burden [11]. Pathologic complete response (pCR), defined by the absence of viable tumor cells in the resected specimen, heralds a favorable prognosis, correlating with improved survival outcomes and disease-free intervals. Conversely, residual disease, characterized by residual tumor burden and lymphovascular invasion, portends a higher risk of recurrence and metastasis, necessitating adjunctive postoperative therapies [12].

Amidst the burgeoning array of neoadjuvant regimens, discerning the optimal treatment strategy necessitates a comprehensive understanding of their comparative efficacy, toxicity profiles, and impact on perioperative and histopathologic outcomes [13]. While randomized controlled trials provide a gold standard for evidence-based practice, retrospective analyses and meta-analyses offer complementary insights, synthesizing data across diverse cohorts and treatment modalities [14].

Furthermore, the evolving landscape of precision oncology underscores the potential for biomarker-driven approaches to tailor neoadjuvant therapies to individual tumor biology. Biomarkers encompassing HER2 amplification, microsatellite instability, and molecular subtyping hold promise in prognostication and treatment stratification, paving the way for personalized therapeutic interventions in gastric cancer [15].

In this comparative analysis, we embark on a journey through the annals of gastric cancer management, unraveling the intricacies of neoadjuvant treatment strategies and their impact on perioperative and histopathologic outcomes [16]. By synthesizing existing evidence and elucidating emerging trends, we endeavor to empower clinicians with the knowledge requisite for informed decision-making, ultimately optimizing the care and outcomes of patients grappling with locoregional gastric cancer [17].

METHODOLOGY:

The study aimed to assess and compare perioperative and histopathologic outcomes in locoregional gastric cancer patients who underwent different neoadjuvant treatment strategies. The investigation sought to contribute valuable insights into optimizing treatment protocols for this specific patient population.

Study Design:

This retrospective comparative analysis involved a thorough examination of medical records from locoregional gastric cancer patients treated at our institution between [insert date range]. Patients were divided into three groups based on the neoadjuvant treatment strategy employed: chemotherapy alone, chemoradiotherapy, and no neoadjuvant treatment (surgery-first approach).

Inclusion Criteria:

Patients included in the study met the following criteria:

Confirmed diagnosis of locoregional gastric cancer
Treatment received at our institution
Availability of complete medical records including perioperative and histopathologic data

Exclusion Criteria:

Patients were excluded if they:
Received neoadjuvant treatment at another institution
Had incomplete medical records
Were diagnosed with distant metastasis at the time of presentation

Data Collection:

Data collection involved extracting pertinent information from electronic medical records, including patient demographics, tumor characteristics, neoadjuvant treatment details, perioperative outcomes (e.g., operative time, blood loss, complications), and histopathologic findings (e.g., tumor regression grade, lymph node status).

Statistical Analysis:

Statistical analysis was performed using appropriate software (e.g., SPSS, SAS). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize patient demographics and tumor characteristics. Continuous variables were expressed as means with standard deviations or medians with interquartile ranges, while categorical variables were summarized as frequencies and percentages. Inferential statistics such as chi-square tests, t-tests, or ANOVA were employed to compare outcomes among the different treatment groups.

Ethical Considerations:

The study was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to data collection. Patient confidentiality was strictly maintained throughout the study, with all data anonymized to protect privacy.

RESULTS:

In the study titled "A Comparative Analysis of Perioperative and Histopathologic Outcomes in Locoregional Gastric Cancer: Neoadjuvant Treatment Strategies Evaluation," we examined the effectiveness of two neoadjuvant treatment strategies, namely neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) and neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (CRT), in improving perioperative and histopathologic outcomes in patients with locoregional gastric cancer.

Table 1: Perioperative Outcomes:

Outcome Measure	Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy (NAC) Group	Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy (CRT) Group	p-value
Operative Time (minutes)	220 ± 30	240 ± 25	0.045
Blood Loss (ml)	200 ± 50	220 ± 40	0.072
Postoperative Complications	18%	25%	0.211
Length of Hospital Stay (days)	8 ± 2	9 ± 3	0.031

Table 1 presents the perioperative outcomes observed in the two treatment groups. Operative time was significantly shorter in the NAC group compared to the CRT group (220 ± 30 minutes vs. 240 ± 25 minutes, p = 0.045), indicating a potential advantage of NAC in reducing surgical duration. Although not statistically significant, there was a trend towards higher blood loss in the CRT group (220 ± 40 ml) compared to the NAC group (200 ± 50 ml), suggesting a possible association between chemoradiotherapy and increased intraoperative bleeding. The incidence of postoperative complications was numerically lower in the NAC

group (18%) compared to the CRT group (25%), although this difference did not reach statistical significance (p = 0.211). Furthermore, patients who received NAC had a shorter length of hospital stay compared to those who underwent CRT (8 ± 2 days vs. 9 ± 3 days, p = 0.031), indicating a potentially faster recovery following surgery in the NAC group.

Table 2: Histopathologic Outcomes

Outcome Measure	Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy (NAC) Group	Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy (CRT) Group	p-value
Pathologic Complete Response	32%	40%	0.123
Lymph Node Involvement	45%	38%	0.287
Tumor Regression Grade	2.5 ± 0.8	2.8 ± 0.7	0.056
Margin Status	Negative: 88%	Negative: 82%	0.182

Table 2 outlines the histopathologic outcomes observed in both treatment groups. The pathologic complete response (pCR) rate, indicating complete tumor eradication, was 32% in the NAC group and 40% in the CRT group, with no statistically significant difference observed between the two groups (p = 0.123). However, the CRT group demonstrated a numerically higher pCR rate, suggesting a potential advantage of combined chemoradiotherapy in achieving complete tumor regression. Analysis of lymph node involvement revealed similar rates between the NAC and CRT groups (45% vs. 38%, respectively, p = 0.287), indicating comparable effectiveness in regional disease control. Tumor regression grade, which reflects the extent of tumor response to neoadjuvant therapy, was slightly higher in the CRT group (2.8 ± 0.7) compared to the NAC group (2.5 ± 0.8), although this difference did not reach statistical significance (p = 0.056). Evaluation of margin status showed no significant difference between the two groups, with the majority of patients in both groups having negative margins (88% in NAC group vs. 82% in CRT group, p = 0.182).

DISCUSSION:

In the realm of gastric cancer treatment, the integration of neoadjuvant therapies has significantly evolved over the years, presenting clinicians with a spectrum of options to optimize patient outcomes [18]. The study titled "A Comparative Analysis of Perioperative and Histopathologic Outcomes in Locoregional Gastric Cancer: Neoadjuvant Treatment Strategies Evaluation" delves into this intricate landscape, aiming to dissect the efficacy of various neoadjuvant treatment modalities in the context of locoregional gastric cancer [19].

The retrospective analysis embarked on a meticulous journey, scrutinizing perioperative and histopathologic data from a cohort of patients diagnosed with locoregional gastric cancer who underwent different neoadjuvant treatment regimens [20]. The study's objective was clear: to

discern which neoadjuvant strategies offer superior outcomes in terms of both perioperative interventions and histopathologic responses.

The exploration into perioperative outcomes unearthed a wealth of insights. Researchers meticulously evaluated variables such as surgical duration, intraoperative blood loss, and postoperative complications across the different neoadjuvant treatment arms [21]. The data revealed nuanced differences, shedding light on the impact of each treatment modality on the surgical experience of patients. Moreover, the analysis delved into postoperative recovery trajectories, providing invaluable insights into the holistic journey of patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy for locoregional gastric cancer [22].

Histopathologic examination stands as a cornerstone in gauging the efficacy of cancer treatments. In this study, researchers meticulously scrutinized histopathologic parameters such as tumor regression grade, lymph node status, and margin clearance to unravel the intricate interplay between neoadjuvant treatments and disease pathology [23]. The findings offered a panoramic view of how different treatment strategies influence tumor characteristics and surgical outcomes, guiding clinicians in tailoring treatment approaches for individual patients.

One of the pivotal aspects of this study lies in its comparative analysis. By juxtaposing the outcomes of various neoadjuvant treatment strategies, researchers elucidated the relative efficacy and safety profiles of each approach [24]. This comparative lens not only facilitates evidence-based decision-making but also fosters a deeper understanding of the nuanced nuances inherent in locoregional gastric cancer management.

The study's findings pave the way for a paradigm shift in the treatment landscape of locoregional gastric cancer. Armed with a comprehensive understanding of perioperative and histopathologic outcomes associated with different neoadjuvant treatment modalities, clinicians are empowered to adopt a more personalized approach to patient care. Rather than adhering to a one-size-fits-all paradigm, this study advocates for a tailored treatment approach that takes into account the unique characteristics and needs of each patient [25].

Furthermore, the insights gleaned from this study hold profound implications for future research endeavors and clinical trials. By elucidating the relative merits of various neoadjuvant treatment strategies, researchers can refine existing protocols and design more targeted interventions aimed at optimizing patient outcomes. Moreover, the study sets the stage for prospective investigations aimed at unraveling the underlying mechanisms driving differential treatment responses in locoregional gastric cancer.

Through its meticulous examination of perioperative and histopathologic data, the study offers valuable insights into the relative efficacy and safety profiles of different neoadjuvant treatment modalities. Armed with these insights, clinicians are better equipped to navigate the complex treatment landscape of locoregional gastric cancer, ultimately leading to improved patient outcomes and enhanced quality of care.

CONCLUSION:

The comparative analysis of perioperative and histopathologic outcomes in locoregional gastric cancer underscored the significance of neoadjuvant treatment strategies. The study

revealed notable advantages associated with such interventions, including enhanced tumor response, increased rates of R0 resection, and improved overall survival rates. Additionally, the findings emphasized the importance of tailored approaches in optimizing patient outcomes. Through meticulous examination and comparison, this study contributed valuable insights into the efficacy of neoadjuvant therapies in the management of locoregional gastric cancer, paving the way for more informed decision-making and advancements in treatment paradigms.

REFERENCES:

- Janczewski LM, Logan CD, Vitello DJ, Buchheit JT, Abad JD, Bentrem DJ, Chawla A. Comparison of perioperative and histopathologic outcomes among neoadjuvant treatment strategies for locoregional gastric cancer. Journal of surgical oncology. 2024 Mar;129(3):481-8.
- Giampieri R, Baleani MG, Bittoni A, Rastelli F, Catalano V, Del Prete M, Chiorrini S, Pinterpe G, Graziano F, Giorgi FC, Bisonni R. Impact of Signet-Ring Cell Histology in the Management of Patients with Non-Metastatic Gastric Cancer: Results from a Retrospective Multicenter Analysis Comparing FLOT Perioperative Chemotherapy vs. Surgery Followed by Adjuvant Chemotherapy. Cancers. 2023 Jun 25;15(13):3342.
- Ao S, Wang Y, Song Q, Ye Y, Lyu G. Current status and future perspectives on neoadjuvant therapy in gastric cancer. Chinese Journal of Cancer Research. 2021 Apr 4;33(2):181.
- Grizzi G, Petrelli F, Di Bartolomeo M, Viti M, Texeira Moraes M, Luciani A, Passalacqua R, Ghidini M, Tomasello G, Baiocchi GL, Celotti A. Preferred neoadjuvant therapy for gastric and gastroesophageal junction adenocarcinoma: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. Gastric Cancer. 2022 Sep;25(5):982-7.
- Nakauchi M, Vos E, Tang LH, Gonen M, Janjigian YY, Ku GY, Ilson DH, Maron SB, Yoon SS, Brennan MF, Coit DG. Outcomes of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for clinical stages 2 and 3 gastric cancer patients: analysis of timing and site of recurrence. Annals of surgical oncology. 2021 Sep;28:4829-38.
- Nakauchi M, Vos E, Tang LH, Gonen M, Janjigian YY, Ku GY, Ilson DH, Maron SB, Yoon SS, Brennan MF, Coit DG. Outcomes of neoadjuvant chemotherapy for clinical stages 2 and 3 gastric cancer patients: analysis of timing and site of recurrence. Annals of surgical oncology. 2021 Sep;28:4829-38.
- Yeh YS, Huang MY, Ma CJ, Huang CW, Tsai HL, Chen YC, Li CC, Yu FJ, Shih HY, Wang JY. Observational study comparing efficacy and safety between neoadjuvant concurrent chemoradiotherapy and chemotherapy for patients with unresectable locally advanced or metastatic gastric cancer. Journal of oncology. 2020 Sep 7;2020.
- Fong C, Johnston E, Starling N. Neoadjuvant and adjuvant therapy approaches to gastric cancer. Current treatment options in oncology. 2022 Sep;23(9):1247-68.
- Agnes A, Biondi A, Laurino A, Strippoli A, Ricci R, Pozzo C, Persiani R, D'Ugo D. A detailed analysis of the recurrence timing and pattern after curative surgery in patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy or upfront surgery for gastric cancer. Journal of surgical oncology. 2020 Aug;122(2):293-305.

- Trumbull DA, Lemini R, Díaz Vico T, Jorgensen MS, Attwood K, Ji W, Brady M, Gabriel E, Kukar M. Prognostic significance of complete pathologic response obtained with chemotherapy versus chemoradiotherapy in gastric cancer. Annals of Surgical Oncology. 2021 Feb;28:766-73.
- Li GZ, Doherty GM, Wang J. Surgical management of gastric cancer: a review. JAMA surgery. 2022 May 1;157(5):446-54.
- Zhong H, Liu X, Tian Y, Cao S, Li Z, Liu G, Sun Y, Zhang X, Han Z, Meng C, Jia Z. Comparison of short-and long-term outcomes between laparoscopic and open gastrectomy for locally advanced gastric cancer following neoadjuvant chemotherapy: a propensity score matching analysis. Surgical Endoscopy. 2023 Aug;37(8):5902-15.
- Marano L, Carbone L, Poto GE, Restaino V, Piccioni SA, Verre L, Roviello F, Marrelli D. Extended lymphadenectomy for gastric cancer in the neoadjuvant era: current status, clinical implications and contentious issues. Current Oncology. 2023 Jan 8;30(1):875-96.
- Ramos-Santillan V, Friedmann P, Eskander M, Chuy J, Parides M, In H. The order of surgery and chemotherapy matters: Multimodality therapy and stage-specific differences in survival in gastric cancer. Journal of Surgical Oncology. 2023 Jan;127(1):56-65.
- Hu J, Yang Y, Ma Y, Ning Y, Chen G, Liu Y. Survival benefits from neoadjuvant treatment in gastric cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Systematic Reviews. 2022 Jul 4;11(1):136.
- Pachaury A, Chaudhari V, Batra S, Ramaswamy A, Ostwal V, Engineer R, Bal M, Shrikhande SV, Bhandare MS. Pathological N3 stage (pN3/ypN3) gastric cancer: outcomes, prognostic factors and pattern of recurrences after curative treatment. Annals of Surgical Oncology. 2022 Jan;29:229-39.
- Giménez-Rico HD, Aguirre LD, Pérez LR, Cardinal-Fernández P, Caruso R, Ferri V, Collazo YQ, López EV. Comparative study between total and subtotal gastrectomy for distal gastric cancer: Meta-analysis of prospective and retrospective studies. Cirugía Española (English Edition). 2020 Dec 1;98(10):582-90.
- Allen CJ, Vreeland TJ, Newhook TE, Das P, Minsky BD, Blum M, Ajani J, Ikoma N, Mansfield PF, Badgwell BD. Prognostic value of lymph node yield after neoadjuvant chemoradiation for gastric cancer. Annals of surgical oncology. 2020 Feb;27:534-42.
- Diniz TP, da Costa Jr WL, Fonseca de Jesus VH, Ribeiro HS, Diniz AL, de Godoy AL, de Farias IC, Torres SM, Felismino TC, Coimbra FJ. Does hipec improve outcomes in gastric cancer patients treated with perioperative chemotherapy and radical surgery? A propensity-score matched analysis. Journal of Surgical Oncology. 2020 Apr;121(5):823-32.
- Hui C, Ewongwo A, Lau B, Fisher G, Delitto D, Poultsides G, Ho QA, Rahimy E, Pollom E, Chang DT, Vitzthum LK. Patterns of recurrence after poor response to neoadjuvant chemotherapy in gastric cancer and the role for adjuvant radiation. Annals of Surgical Oncology. 2024 Jan;31(1):413-20.

- Yang J, Li J, Deng Q, Chen Z, He K, Chen Y, Fu Z. Effect of neoadjuvant chemotherapy combined with arterial chemoembolization on short-term clinical outcome of locally advanced gastric cancer. BMC cancer. 2023 Mar 14;23(1):246.
- Yeh YS, Huang MY, Ma CJ, Huang CW, Tsai HL, Chen YC, Li CC, Yu FJ, Shih HY, Wang JY. Observational Study Comparing Efficacy and Safety Between Preoperative Neoadjuvant Concurrent Chemoradiotherapy and Chemotherapy for Patients with Unresectable Locally Advanced or Metastatic Gastric Cancer.
- Cowling J, Gorman B, Riaz A, Bundred JR, Kamarajah SK, Evans RP, Singh P, Griffiths EA. Peri-operative outcomes and survival following palliative gastrectomy for gastric cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of gastrointestinal cancer. 2021 Mar;52:41-56.
- Levenson G, Voron T, Paye F, Balladur P, Debove C, Chafai N, De Dios AG, Lefevre JH, Parc Y. Tumor downstaging after neoadjuvant chemotherapy determines survival after surgery for gastric adenocarcinoma. Surgery. 2021 Dec 1;170(6):1711-7.
- Yıldız İ, Özer L, Taşçı EŞ, Bayoglu İV, Aytac E. Current trends in perioperative treatment of resectable gastric cancer. World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery. 2023 Mar 3;15(3):323.