



**HAL**  
open science

## **FOLFIRINEC: a randomized phase II trial of mFOLFIRINOX vs platinum-etoposide for metastatic neuroendocrine carcinoma of gastroenteropancreatic or unknown origin**

Julien Hadoux, Pauline Afchain, Thomas Walter, David Tougeron, Vincent Hautefeuille, Carole Monteryuard, Véronique Lorgis, Frédéric Thuillier, Eric Baudin, Jean Yves Scoazec, et al.

### ► **To cite this version:**

Julien Hadoux, Pauline Afchain, Thomas Walter, David Tougeron, Vincent Hautefeuille, et al.. FOLFIRINEC: a randomized phase II trial of mFOLFIRINOX vs platinum-etoposide for metastatic neuroendocrine carcinoma of gastroenteropancreatic or unknown origin. *Digestive and Liver Disease*, 2021, 53 (7), pp.824-829. 10.1016/j.dld.2021.04.016 . hal-03333521

**HAL Id: hal-03333521**

**<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-03333521>**

Submitted on 3 Sep 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **FOLFIRINEC: randomized phase II trial of mFOLFIRINOX vs platinum-etoposide for**  
2 **metastatic neuroendocrine carcinoma of gastroenteropancreatic or unknown origin.**

3

4 Authors:

5 Julien Hadoux<sup>a\*</sup>, Pauline Afchain<sup>b</sup>, Thomas Walter<sup>c</sup>, David Tougeron<sup>d</sup>, Vincent Hautefeuille<sup>e</sup>,  
6 Carole Montereymard<sup>f</sup>, Véronique Lorgis<sup>g</sup>, Frédéric Thuillier<sup>h</sup>, Eric Baudin<sup>a</sup>, Jean Yves Scoazec<sup>i</sup>,  
7 Côme Lepage,<sup>f,j</sup> and Romain Desgrippes<sup>k</sup>

8

9 Affiliations:

10 a – Endocrine oncology, Imaging department, Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, F-94805 Villejuif

11 b - Department of Oncology, Saint Antoine Hospital, Paris, France

12 c - Department of Oncology, ENETS Centre of Excellence, Hospices Civils de Lyon and Lyon  
13 University, Lyon, France

14 d - Department of Hepato-gastroenterology, Poitiers University Hospital; University of Poitiers,  
15 Poitiers, France

16 e - Department of Hepato-gastroenterology, Amiens University Hospital, Amiens, France

17 f - FFCD EPICAD INSERM LNC-UMR 1231, University of Burgundy and Franche-Comté,  
18 Dijon, France

19 g - Department of Oncology, Cancerology institut of Bourgogne GRReCC, Dijon, France

20 h - Department of Oncology, Limoges University Hospital, Limoges, France

21 i - Pathology, Biopathology department, Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, F-94805 Villejuif

22 j - Department of digestive oncology University hospital Dijon; University of Burgundy and  
23 Franche Comté, Dijon, France

24 k – Hepato-gastroenterology department, Centre Hospitalier de Saint-Malo, F-35403 Saint-  
25 Malo

26

27 \* Corresponding author:

28 Dr Julien Hadoux

29 Gustave Roussy, 114 rue Edouard Vaillant, 94805 Villejuif

30 [Julien.hadoux@gustaveroussy.fr](mailto:Julien.hadoux@gustaveroussy.fr)

31 +33 1 42 11 63 61

32

33 **Keywords**

34 Neuroendocrine carcinoma

35 Gastroenteropancreatic

36 Chemotherapy

37 FOLFIRINOX

38 **ABSTRACT**

39

40 **Background**

41 Poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinomas (NEC) are rare diseases with a poor  
42 prognosis. Platinum-etoposide (PE) has been the recommended first-line treatment for  
43 decades. FOLFIRINEC (NCT04325425) is a national multicenter randomized phase II study  
44 which aims to challenge this standard regimen.

45 **Methods**

46 The primary objective is to compare the median progression-free survival (PFS) under  
47 mFOLFIRINOX versus PE. The secondary objectives are to evaluate the objective response  
48 rates (ORR), median overall survival (OS), safety and quality of life. The associated real-time  
49 translational study will establish a molecular profile for each patient enrolled.

50 Main inclusion criteria are: NEC of gastroenteropancreatic (GEP) or unknown origin, metastatic  
51 and RECIST 1.1 evaluable disease, tumor sample available and no contraindication to  
52 chemotherapy. Patients will be randomized 1:1 between PE every 21 days for 6-8 cycles and  
53 mFOLFIRINOX every 14 days for up to 12 cycles and stratified according to center,  
54 performance status, Ki67 and pathological subtype.

55 This trial will randomize 218 patients (24 months of follow-up) to have 80% power to detect an  
56 improvement of the median PFS from 5 months under PE to 7.5 months under mFOLFIRINOX  
57 (HR of 0.67,  $\alpha$  =5%, two-sided). An intermediate analysis is planned at 50% of events.

58 Recruitment started on October 20, 2020.

## 59 1. Rational and aims

60 Poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinomas (NEC) of gastroenteropancreatic  
61 (GEP) and unknown origins are rare and heterogeneous diseases. The diagnosis is often done  
62 at the metastatic stage and the prognosis is poor. The standard first-line (L1) treatment is  
63 platinum-etoposide (PE) combination chemotherapy, mostly based on retrospective studies  
64 [1,2]. With this regimen, RR is 40 to 70% but the median PFS is short, between 4 and 9 months  
65 [3,4]. Disease progression almost always occurs during or just after treatment and median  
66 overall survival (OS) is only about 12-15 months for GEP NEC with similar efficacy of either  
67 cisplatin or carboplatin [3,4] and of either oral or intravenous etoposide [5,6]. After progression,  
68 only 40 to 45% of patients will receive a second-line (L2) chemotherapy which will include 5-  
69 fluoro-uracil (5FU) or capecitabine and irinotecan (FOLFIRI [7]) or oxaliplatin (XELOX,  
70 FOLFOX [8]) or dacarbazine/temozolomide [9]. This second-line treatment can provide about  
71 30% of RR and a median PFS of 4 months [4,7,8]. Taken together, these data indicate a major  
72 medical need for improving NEC treatments.

73 Since the first description, thirty years ago, of the PE combination efficacy for what was  
74 called “anaplastic neuroendocrine carcinomas” and referred nowadays to NEC by Moertel and  
75 collaborators, no change has been made to this standard of care [10]. Only one randomized  
76 phase II trial have compared the efficacy of the cisplatin - irinotecan (PI) combination to the  
77 standard PE regimen. This phase II enrolled 66 patients and was terminated prematurely  
78 following interim analysis showing equivalent efficacy. Indeed, the objective RR were similar  
79 in both arm (42.4%), the median PFS was 6.4 months in the PE arm and 5.8 months in the PI  
80 arm, respectively ( $p=0.81$ ), and the median OS was 11.3 months and 10.2 months,  
81 respectively, ( $p=0.37$ ) [11]. A single arm phase II study evaluated PE intensification with the  
82 addition of paclitaxel and found an objective RR of 53%, a median PFS of 7.5 months and a  
83 median OS of 14.5 months which led the authors to conclude to the absence of higher efficacy  
84 as compared to the standard PE regimen [12]. Other studies are almost all retrospective and  
85 have reported equivalent efficacies of either PE or PI, except the Yamaguchi *et al.* study

86 suggesting higher efficacy of PI regimen but this study was not randomized, the studies of first-  
87 line chemotherapy in NEC are summarized in Table 1.

88 Although all studies on second-line treatment of metastatic NEC of GEP or unknown  
89 origin were retrospective, they have suggested that both irinotecan and oxaliplatin, in  
90 combination with 5FU can have anti-tumor effect in NEC [7,8]. In the last decade, the  
91 FOLFIRINOX triplet chemotherapy regimen, combining 5FU, oxaliplatin and irinotecan, has  
92 shown significant efficacy in several digestive cancers such as pancreas [13] or colorectal  
93 adenocarcinoma [14]. Tolerance of this regimen has improved over the years with better  
94 tolerability that has led to the development of the mFOLFIRINOX regimen [15]. mFOLFIRINOX  
95 could be a good L1 treatment in metastatic GEP NEC because: (i) Oxaliplatin, irinotecan and  
96 5FU have anti-tumor effect in metastatic GEP NEC [4,7,8]; (ii) triplet with a potential high RR  
97 could be efficient in these chemosensitive cancers; (iii) the degradation of PS following tumor  
98 progression during/after L1 treatment makes access to a second-line uncertain which argue  
99 for the use of an aggressive L1 treatment; (iiii) administration on a one-day outpatient basis  
100 (day hospital), as well as acceptable adverse events, could have an impact on quality of life in  
101 these patients with a poor prognosis. With the PRODIGE 69-FOLFIRINEC trial hypothesize  
102 that the mFOLFIRINOX triplet may improve the prognosis of patients with metastatic NEC from  
103 GEP or unknown primary.

104 Few data are available on predictive factors of L1 chemotherapy efficacy in metastatic  
105 NEC which are subdivided in 2 main pathological subtypes; eg. small cell NEC (SCNEC) and  
106 large cell NEC (LCNEC). These two subtypes are treated with the same PE regimen, whatever  
107 the primary tumour site, although overall response rate (ORR) seem to differ between SCNEC  
108 (about 50 to 70%) and LCNEC (about 30-50%) in lung and pancreas NEC retrospective series  
109 [16–19]. These data have led to the choice of stratifying the FOLFIRINEC trial according to  
110 pathological subtypes. Few studies have reported molecular profiles of NEC with a perspective  
111 of personalized treatment. Previous studies have mainly focused on *BRAF* mutation in colon  
112 NEC and the efficacy of the dabrafenib-trametinib combination [20–22], contrary to what is  
113 observed in colon adenocarcinoma, which has been suggested to be related to an epigenetic

114 silencing of the epidermal growth factor receptor in colon NEC [21]. Moreover, little is known  
115 on the putative predictive biomarkers to immunotherapy efficacy in NEC of GEP and unknown  
116 origin. Tumour mutational burden (TMB) is between 8.6 and 10.5 mutations/megabase in NEC  
117 of the lung [23,24] but no data exist for GEP and unknown origin NEC. In addition MLH1 and  
118 PMS2 loss of expression by immunohistochemistry mostly due to *MLH1* promoter methylation  
119 (dMMR phenotype) have been reported in 12.4% tumoral samples of a series of 89 GEP NEC  
120 and mixed neuroendocrine neoplasms [25]. In an attempt to expand knowledge on molecular  
121 alterations in NEC of GEP and unknown origin, the FOLFIRINEC-PRODIGE 69 phase II trial  
122 is associated with a “real time” translational study which will establish the tumor molecular  
123 profile of each participating patients for whom tumoral sample is available.

## 124 2. Study design

125 The PRODIGE 69-FOLFIRINEC study is a national, multicentre, prospective, open-  
126 label, randomized and trial comparing the efficacy of mFOLFIRINOX versus PE regimen for  
127 the treatment of patients with metastatic NEC of GEP and unknown origin associated with a  
128 molecular profiling for therapeutic targets and biomarkers identification (Figure 1).

129 Eligible patients will be stratified according to ECOG PS (0 vs 1), Ki67 (<55% vs ≥55%)  
130 and pathological subtype (small cell vs large cell or unknown) and then randomly assigned  
131 (1:1) to either standard regimen arm with platinum (cisplatin 100 mg/m<sup>2</sup> day 1 or carboplatin  
132 AUC 5 day 1, according to physician's choice) and etoposide (100 mg/m<sup>2</sup> intravenous (IV), day  
133 1, 2 and 3) administered every 21 days for 6 to 8 cycles (24 weeks maximum) or experimental  
134 treatment arm with mFOLFIRINOX (oxaliplatin 85 mg/m<sup>2</sup> IV + irinotecan 180 mg/m<sup>2</sup> IV +  
135 LV5FU2 2400 mg/m<sup>2</sup> without 5 FU bolus) administered every 14 days for 12 cycles (24 weeks  
136 maximum).

137 Main inclusion criteria in the PRODIGE 69-FOLFIRINEC trial are patients over 18  
138 years, ECOG PS 0 or 1, with a metastatic NEC or high grade MiNEN with a NEC component  
139 ≥ 30%, of GEP or unknown origin, whatever the pathological subtype (small cell or large cell  
140 or non-small cell or unknown/indetermined) (Table 2). Grade 3 well-differentiated  
141 neuroendocrine tumors according to WHO 2017 classification are not eligible. Patient must not  
142 have received any prior therapy for metastatic disease. Patient with asymptomatic brain  
143 metastases or under stable corticosteroid doses for at least 2 weeks before randomization can  
144 be included; otherwise, radiation therapy prior to inclusion is required in case of symptomatic  
145 brain metastases. Patient must have adequate haematology parameters (neutrophil count ≥  
146  $1.5 \times 10^9/L$ , platelet ≥  $100 \times 10^9/L$  and hemoglobin > 8 g/dL), a creatinine clearance above 30  
147 ml/min (Cockroft & Gault formula) and adequate liver function (total bilirubin ≤ 1.5N, AST/ALT  
148 ≤ 2.5N, or AST/ALT ≤ 5N in case of liver metastases). All patients must undergo  
149 dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase (DPD) deficiency screening and cannot be included in case  
150 of uracilemia ≥ 16 ng/mL. Other standard exclusion criteria are applied: pregnancy, history of



151 recent malignancy, active HIV or viral hepatitis and any active or suspected acute or chronic  
152 uncontrolled disease that would impair study participation.

153 The radiological assessment will be performed at baseline (within a maximum of 3  
154 weeks before inclusion) using a TAP computed tomography (CT) scan (or magnetic resonance  
155 imaging (MRI) of the abdomen plus chest CT-scan in case of contrast medium allergy), and  
156 the same procedure (CT and/or MRI) will be repeated every 8 weeks until tumor progression  
157 or death. Radiological tumor assessment will be performed according to the RECIST v1.1  
158 criteria. Brain imaging is required at baseline either by CT-scan and/or MRI. Imaging of brain  
159 lesions by CT-scan and/or MRI is required every 8 weeks (+/- 1 week) during treatment and  
160 follow-up if present at baseline.

161

## 162 **2.1. Study endpoints**

163 The primary endpoint is the median PFS. PFS is defined as the time interval between  
164 date of randomization and date of the first radiological progression (according to RECIST 1.1)  
165 or death due to any cause, whichever occurs first, according to the investigator. Patient alive  
166 without progression will be censored at date of last follow-up visit.

167 The secondary endpoints are:

- 168 - centralized PFS by independent reviewed
- 169 - OS which is defined as the time between date of randomization and date of death (whatever  
170 the cause). Patients alive will be censored at date of last news.
- 171 - Best objective RR which is defined as the proportion of patients with an objective response  
172 (complete response (CR) + partial response (PR)) at any evaluation during the treatment,  
173 according to RECIST 1.1 and centralized review.
- 174 - Safety which is defined as the percentage of patients who experienced toxicities and  
175 grading of these toxicities according to NCI-CTC V4. Toxicities will be presented as the  
176 number of patients presenting at least one toxicity by maximum grade.
- 177 - Dose reductions and dose intensity which are defined as the number of treatment cycles,  
178 the dose received and the percentages of actual dose received as compared to the

179 theoretical dose will be described, as well as the percentage of patients with at least one  
180 dose modification/reduction or at least one postponement of chemotherapy.

- 181 - Quality of life assessed by the EORTC QLQ-C30 and EQ-5D-5L questionnaires.
- 182 - Exploratory analyses (see “biomarkers analyses”). The predictive value of each molecular  
183 alterations will be evaluated using correlation with objective RR, PFS and OS, in both arms.

184

## 185 **2.2. Ethical considerations**

186 This study is sponsored by the *Fédération Francophone de Cancérologie Digestive*  
187 (FFCD) and Dijon University hospital. PRODIGE 69-FOLFIRINEC has been authorized by the  
188 French medicines agency (*Agence Nationale de Sécurité du Médicament et des produits de*  
189 *santé*, ANSM) on March 23, 2020. It was submitted and approved (July 20, 2020) by the ethics  
190 committee (*Comité de protection des personnes*, CPP). This trial is registered on the European  
191 Union Clinical Trials Register (EudraCT no. 2019-001013-16) and on the clinicaltrials.gov  
192 website (NCT04325425). The study complies with the Declaration of Helsinki and the  
193 principles of Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

194

## 195 **2.3 Statistical methods**

196 For the primary endpoint, the median PFS will be calculated among patients who have  
197 received at least one dose of chemotherapy, whatever the dose and the treatment (modified  
198 intent-to-treat). Median PFS will be given for each treatment arm with their two-sided 95%  
199 confidence interval. The Kaplan-Meier method (Kaplan and Meier, 1958) will be used to  
200 estimate median and curves will be plotted. Log-rank test will be used to compare the 2  
201 treatment arms. Hazard ratios will be calculated using Cox proportional model (Cox, 1984).  
202 Proportionality (Schoenfeld residual methods) and linearity (Martingale residuals) hypotheses  
203 will be checked.

204 The hypothesis of the PRODIGE 69-FOLFIRINEC trial is that mFOLFIRINOX could  
205 increase median PFS from 5 months in the control arm (PE) to 7.5 months in the experimental  
206 arm (H1).

207 With a two-sided risk alpha of 5% and a power of 80%, 203 events (radiographic  
208 progression or death) are required to demonstrate a median PFS difference of 2.5 months  
209 (HR=0.67). With 24 months of follow-up, an inclusion rate of 5 patients/month and a lost-to-  
210 follow-up rate of 5%, 218 patients will be randomized.

211 An intermediate analysis is planned at 50% of events (102 radiographic progression or  
212 death). The intermediate analysis is planned in order to show efficacy at an early stage  
213 (rejection of H0) or futility (accept H0). The p-values will be calculated using the O'Brien-  
214 Fleming function based on the real number of events.

215 As G3 NEC is a rare disease, 48 centers will be open to recruitment throughout France.

216

## 217 **2.4 Biomarker analysis**

218 This study includes a real-time, centralized molecular profiling of the tumor consisting  
219 of immunohistochemistry (IHC) markers (PD-L1 (Programmed death-ligand 1), Rb  
220 (retinoblastoma protein), TP53, MLH1 (MutL Homolog 1)) and a targeted next generation  
221 sequencing (NGS) panel of 161 genes (Oncomine Comprehensive assay V3, ThermoFisher®,  
222 Waltham, Massachusetts, US) associated with the determination of mutational tumor burden  
223 (TMB) and microsatellite instability status (MSI). This molecular profile will be reviewed by a  
224 molecular tumor board and the report will be sent to the investigator, together with the  
225 molecular profile results, within 2 months of tumor sample submission for informing further line  
226 treatment-decision making in the case of targetable alterations.

227

## 228 **Conclusion**

229 PRODIGE 69 - FOLFIRINEC is designed to challenge the standard platinum-etoposide  
230 combination chemotherapy with mFOLFIRINOX for the treatment of patients with NEC of GEP  
231 and unknown origin. The associated translational study aims at identifying biomarkers of  
232 responses in these patients and to draw the mutational landscape of these tumors with the  
233 goal to find targets for personalized medicine. The first patient was included on October 20,  
234 2020, the end of inclusion is scheduled for the end of 2024.

235

236 **Acknowledgment**

237 Lila Gaba, Marie Moreau, Sascha Moccozet, Laethicia Ndong, Caroline Choine, Jaïque Cario,  
238 Charlène Barreaux, and all the clinical research associate and staff from CHU de Dijon &  
239 Fédération Francophone de Cancérologie Digestive (FFCD)

240 Ludovic Lacroix, Corinne Brandy, Leslie Girard, Zsofia Balogh, Malika Abdi and all the Gustave  
241 Roussy personalized medicine and biopathology staff for the translational study:

242 We thank all the research and clinical networks involved: GERCOR, UNICANCER, FFCD,  
243 ENDOCAN-RENATEN.

244 We thank all the participating centers research and clinical teams and the patients.

245

246 **Conflict of interests:**

247 None

248

249 **Funding**

250 The study is funded by the French National Cancer Institute (PHRC-K18 139).

251

252 **Source of support**

253 Supported by Clinical Research Hospital Program grants (PHRC-K 2018) from the French  
254 ministry of health (PHRC-K18 139).

255

256 References

- 257 [1] Pavel M, Öberg K, Falconi M, Krenning EP, Sundin A, Perren A, et al.  
258 Gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for  
259 diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. *Ann Oncol* 2020;31:844–60.  
260 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2020.03.304>.
- 261 [2] de Mestier L, Lepage C, Baudin E, Coriat R, Courbon F, Couvelard A, et al. Digestive  
262 Neuroendocrine Neoplasms (NEN): French Intergroup clinical practice guidelines for  
263 diagnosis, treatment and follow-up (SNFGE, GTE, RENATEN, TENPATH, FFCD, GERCOR,  
264 UNICANCER, SFCD, SFED, SFRO, SFR). *Dig Liver Dis* 2020;52:473–92.  
265 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dld.2020.02.011>.
- 266 [3] Sorbye H, Welin S, Langer SW, Vestermark LW, Holt N, Osterlund P, et al. Predictive  
267 and prognostic factors for treatment and survival in 305 patients with advanced gastrointestinal  
268 neuroendocrine carcinoma (WHO G3): The NORDIC NEC study. *Ann Oncol* 2012.  
269 <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mds276>.
- 270 [4] Walter T, Tougeron D, Baudin E, Le Malicot K, Lecomte T, Malka D, et al. Poorly  
271 differentiated gastro-entero-pancreatic neuroendocrine carcinomas: Are they really  
272 heterogeneous? Insights from the FFCD-GTE national cohort. *Eur J Cancer* 2017;79:158–65.  
273 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2017.04.009>.
- 274 [5] Frizziero M, Spada F, Lamarca A, Kordatou Z, Barriuso J, Nuttall C, et al. Carboplatin  
275 in Combination with Oral or Intravenous Etoposide for Extra-Pulmonary, Poorly-Differentiated  
276 Neuroendocrine Carcinomas. *Neuroendocrinology* 2019;109:100–12.  
277 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000497336>.
- 278 [6] Ali AS, Grönberg M, Langer SW, Ladekarl M, Hjortland GO, Vestermark LW, et al.  
279 Intravenous versus oral etoposide: efficacy and correlation to clinical outcome in patients with  
280 high-grade metastatic gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine neoplasms (WHO G3). *Med*  
281 *Oncol* 2018;35:47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12032-018-1103-x>.
- 282 [7] Hentic O, Hammel P, Couvelard A, Rebours V, Zappa M, Palazzo M, et al. FOLFIRI  
283 regimen: an effective second-line chemotherapy after failure of etoposide-platinum

284 combination in patients with neuroendocrine carcinomas grade 3. *Endocr Relat Cancer*  
285 2012;19:751–7. <https://doi.org/10.1530/ERC-12-0002>.

286 [8] Hadoux J, Malka D, Planchard D, Scoazec JY, Caramella C, Guigay J, et al. Post-first-  
287 line FOLFOX chemotherapy for grade 3 neuroendocrine carcinoma. *Endocr Relat Cancer*  
288 2015;22:289–98. <https://doi.org/10.1530/ERC-15-0075>.

289 [9] Couronne T, Girot P, Hadoux J, Lecomte T, Durand A, Fine C, et al. Post first-line  
290 dacarbazine or temozolomide in neuroendocrine carcinoma. *Endocrine Connections*  
291 2020;9:498–505. <https://doi.org/10.1530/EC-20-0192>.

292 [10] Moertel CG, Kvols LK, O’Connell MJ, Rubin J. Treatment of neuroendocrine  
293 carcinomas with combined etoposide and cisplatin. Evidence of major therapeutic activity in  
294 the anaplastic variants of these neoplasms. *Cancer* 1991;68:227–32.

295 [11] Zhang P, Li J, Li J, Zhang X, Zhou J, Wang X, et al. Etoposide and cisplatin versus  
296 irinotecan and cisplatin as the first-line therapy for patients with advanced, poorly differentiated  
297 gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine carcinoma: A randomized phase 2 study. *Cancer*  
298 2020;126 Suppl 9:2086–92. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.32750>.

299 [12] Hainsworth JD, Spigel DR, Litchy S, Greco FA. Phase II trial of paclitaxel, carboplatin,  
300 and etoposide in advanced poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma: a Minnie Pearl  
301 Cancer Research Network Study. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:3548–54.  
302 <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2005.05.0575>.

303 [13] Conroy T, Desseigne F, Ychou M, Bouché O, Guimbaud R, Bécouarn Y, et al.  
304 FOLFIRINOX versus gemcitabine for metastatic pancreatic cancer. *N Engl J Med*  
305 2011;364:1817–25. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1011923>.

306 [14] Ychou M, Rivoire M, Thezenas S, Quenet F, Delpero J-R, Rebischung C, et al. A  
307 randomized phase II trial of three intensified chemotherapy regimens in first-line treatment of  
308 colorectal cancer patients with initially unresectable or not optimally resectable liver  
309 metastases. The METHEP trial. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013;20:4289–97.  
310 <https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-013-3217-x>.

- 311 [15] Lambert A, Gavaille C, Conroy T. Current status on the place of FOLFIRINOX in  
312 metastatic pancreatic cancer and future directions. *Therap Adv Gastroenterol* 2017;10:631–  
313 45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1756283X17713879>.
- 314 [16] Zhuo M, Guan Y, Yang X, Hong L, Wang Y, Li Z, et al. The Prognostic and Therapeutic  
315 Role of Genomic Subtyping by Sequencing Tumor or Cell-Free DNA in Pulmonary Large-Cell  
316 Neuroendocrine Carcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res* 2020;26:892–901. [https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-  
317 0432.CCR-19-0556](https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-0556).
- 318 [17] Derks J, Leblay N, van Suylen RJ, Thunnissen E, den Bakker M, Groen HJM, et al.  
319 Genetic subtypes of large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma (LCNEC) to predict response to  
320 chemotherapy. *JCO* 2017;35:9061–9061.  
321 [https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.35.15\\_suppl.9061](https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2017.35.15_suppl.9061).
- 322 [18] Tanaka H, Hijioka S, Hosoda W, Ueno M, Kobayashi N, Ikeda M, et al. Pancreatic  
323 neuroendocrine carcinoma G3 may be heterogeneous and could be classified into two distinct  
324 groups. *Pancreatology* 2020;20:1421–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pan.2020.07.400>.
- 325 [19] Le Treut J, Sault MC, Lena H, Souquet PJ, Vergnenegre A, Le Caer H, et al. Multicentre  
326 phase II study of cisplatin-etoposide chemotherapy for advanced large-cell neuroendocrine  
327 lung carcinoma: the GFPC 0302 study. *Ann Oncol* 2013;24:1548–52.  
328 <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdt009>.
- 329 [20] Dizdar L, Werner TA, Drusenheimer JC, Möhlendick B, Raba K, Boeck I, et al.  
330 BRAFV600E mutation: A promising target in colorectal neuroendocrine carcinoma. *Int J*  
331 *Cancer* 2019;144:1379–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijc.31828>.
- 332 [21] Capdevila J, Arqués O, Hernández Mora JR, Matito J, Caratù G, Mancuso FM, et al.  
333 Epigenetic EGFR Gene Repression Confers Sensitivity to Therapeutic BRAFV600E Blockade  
334 in Colon Neuroendocrine Carcinomas. *Clin Cancer Res* 2020;26:902–9.  
335 <https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-19-1266>.
- 336 [22] Klempner SJ, Gershenhorn B, Tran P, Lee TK, Erlander MG, Gowen K, et al.  
337 BRAFV600E Mutations in High-Grade Colorectal Neuroendocrine Tumors May Predict

338 Responsiveness to BRAF-MEK Combination Therapy. *Cancer Discov* 2016;6:594–600.  
339 <https://doi.org/10.1158/2159-8290.CD-15-1192>.

340 [23] George J, Lim JS, Jang SJ, Cun Y, Ozretić L, Kong G, et al. Comprehensive genomic  
341 profiles of small cell lung cancer. *Nature* 2015;524:47–53.  
342 <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14664>.

343 [24] Rekhtman N, Pietanza MC, Hellmann MD, Naidoo J, Arora A, Won H, et al. Next-  
344 Generation Sequencing of Pulmonary Large Cell Neuroendocrine Carcinoma Reveals Small  
345 Cell Carcinoma-like and Non-Small Cell Carcinoma-like Subsets. *Clin Cancer Res*  
346 2016;22:3618–29. <https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-15-2946>.

347 [25] Sahnane N, Furlan D, Monti M, Romualdi C, Vanoli A, Vicari E, et al. Microsatellite  
348 unstable gastrointestinal neuroendocrine carcinomas: a new clinicopathologic entity. *Endocr*  
349 *Relat Cancer* 2015;22:35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1530/ERC-14-0410>.

350 [26] Kulke MH, Wu B, Ryan DP, Enzinger PC, Zhu AX, Clark JW, et al. A phase II trial of  
351 irinotecan and cisplatin in patients with metastatic neuroendocrine tumors. *Dig Dis Sci*  
352 2006;51:1033–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10620-006-8001-3>.

353 [27] Yamaguchi T, Machida N, Morizane C, Kasuga A, Takahashi H, Sudo K, et al.  
354 Multicenter retrospective analysis of systemic chemotherapy for advanced neuroendocrine  
355 carcinoma of the digestive system. *Cancer Sci* 2014;105:1176–81.  
356 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cas.12473>.

357 [28] Ramella Munhoz R, de Mendonça Rego JF, de Celis Ferrari AR, Ignez Braghiroli M,  
358 Mendonça Bariani G, Marcelo Hoff P, et al. Combination of irinotecan and a platinum agent for  
359 poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinomas. *Rare Tumors* 2013;5:e39.  
360 <https://doi.org/10.4081/rt.2013.e39>.

361 [29] Lokesh KN, Anand A, Lakshmaiah KC, Babu KG, Lokanatha D, Jacob LA, et al. Clinical  
362 profile and treatment outcomes of metastatic neuroendocrine carcinoma: A single institution  
363 experience. *South Asian J Cancer* 2018;7:207–9. [https://doi.org/10.4103/sajc.sajc\\_176\\_17](https://doi.org/10.4103/sajc.sajc_176_17).



364 [30] Yoon SE, Kim JH, Lee SJ, Lee J, Park SH, Park JO, et al. The impact of primary tumor  
365 site on outcomes of treatment with etoposide and cisplatin in grade 3 gastroenteropancreatic  
366 neuroendocrine carcinoma. *J Cancer* 2019;10:3140–4. <https://doi.org/10.7150/jca.30355>.

367 [31] Bukhari MH, Coppola D, Nasir A. Clinicopathologic analysis of primary  
368 gastroenteropancreatic poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma; A ten year  
369 retrospective study of 68 cases at Moffit Cancer Center. *Pak J Med Sci* 2020;36:265–70.  
370 <https://doi.org/10.12669/pjms.36.2.1336>.

371 [32] Mitry E, Baudin E, Ducreux M, Sabourin JC, Rufié P, Aparicio T, et al. Treatment of  
372 poorly differentiated neuroendocrine tumours with etoposide and cisplatin. *Br J Cancer*  
373 1999;81:1351–5. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6690325>.

374 [33] Iwasa S, Morizane C, Okusaka T, Ueno H, Ikeda M, Kondo S, et al. Cisplatin and  
375 etoposide as first-line chemotherapy for poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma of the  
376 hepatobiliary tract and pancreas. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2010;40:313–8.  
377 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jjco/hyp173>.

378 [34] Deutschbein T, Unger N, Yucec A, Eberhardt W, Gauler T, Lahner H, et al.  
379 Chemotherapy in patients with progressive, undifferentiated neuroendocrine tumors: a single-  
380 center experience. *Horm Metab Res* 2011;43:838–43. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0031-1284354>.

381

382 [35] Patta A, Fakih M. First-line cisplatin plus etoposide in high-grade metastatic  
383 neuroendocrine tumors of colon and rectum (MCRC NET): review of 8 cases. *Anticancer Res*  
384 2011;31:975–8.

385 [36] Nakano K, Takahashi S, Yuasa T, Nishimura N, Mishima Y, Sakajiri S, et al. Feasibility  
386 and efficacy of combined cisplatin and irinotecan chemotherapy for poorly differentiated  
387 neuroendocrine carcinomas. *Jpn J Clin Oncol* 2012;42:697–703.  
388 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jjco/hys085>.

389 [37] Lu ZH, Li J, Lu M, Zhang XT, Li J, Zhou J, et al. Feasibility and efficacy of combined  
390 cisplatin plus irinotecan chemotherapy for gastroenteropancreatic neuroendocrine  
391 carcinomas. *Med Oncol* 2013;30:664. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12032-013-0664-y>.

- 392 [38] Okita NT, Kato K, Takahari D, Hirashima Y, Nakajima TE, Matsubara J, et al.  
393 Neuroendocrine tumors of the stomach: chemotherapy with cisplatin plus irinotecan is effective  
394 for gastric poorly-differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma. *Gastric Cancer* 2011;14:161–5.  
395 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10120-011-0025-5>.
- 396 [39] Okuma HS, Iwasa S, Shoji H, Takashima A, Okita N, Honma Y, et al. Irinotecan plus  
397 cisplatin in patients with extensive-disease poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma of  
398 the esophagus. *Anticancer Res* 2014;34:5037–41.
- 399

**Table 1: First-line chemotherapy results in gastroenteropancreatic poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma**

Authors	n patients	Study design	Primary	Chemotherapy regimen	response rate (%)	median PFS (months)	median OS (months)
Zhang et al [11]	66	Monocentric randomized phase II	GEP(88%), UK(12%)	Etoposide/cisplatin	44	6.4	11.3
	33			Irinotecan/cisplatin	44	5.8	10.2
Hainsworth et al [12]	78	Multicentric monoarm Phase II	UK(62%), GEP(19%), lung(9%)	Etoposide/carboplatin/paclitaxel	53	7.5	14.5
Kulke et al [26]	4	Monocentric phase II	GEP (84%), UK (11%), lung (5%)	Irinotecan/cisplatin	25	4.5	11.4
Sørbye et al & ali et al [3,6]	252	Multicentric retrospective	GEP (69%), UK (31%)	Etoposide/cisplatin	31	4	12
	129			Etoposide/carboplatin	30	4	11
	67						
Yamaguchi et al [27]	258	Multicentric retrospective	GEP (100%)	Irinotecan/cisplatin	50	5.2	13
	160			Etoposide/cisplatin	28	4	7
	46						
Walter et al [4]	253	Multicentric retrospective	GEP (80%) UK (20%)	Etoposide/platinum	50	6.2	11.6
Frizziero et al [5]	98	Bicentric retrospective	GEP (54%), UK (23%), GU (21%)	Etoposide/carboplatin	48	5.8	11.6
Ramella et al [28]	27	Bicentric retrospective	GEP(64%), UK(21%)	Irinotecan/cisplatin	46.4	3.7	11.7
Lokesh et al [29]	114	Monocentric retrospective	GEP (33%), lung(26%), GU (15%), HN (14%), UK(9%)	Etoposide/platinum	24	NR	11
Yoon et al [30]	64	Monocentric retrospective	GEP (87,5%), UK(12,5%)	Etoposide/cisplatin	28	3.5	NR

Bukhari et al [31]	58	Monocentric retrospective	GEP (100%)	Etoposide/platinum	NR	NR	85% at 1 year
Mitry et al [32]	41	Monocentric retrospective	GEP (20), lung (10), HN (4), UK (7)	Etoposide/cisplatin	41.5	8.9	15
Iwasa et al [33]	21	Monocentric retrospective	Pancreas & biliary (100%)	Etoposide/cisplatin	14	1.8	5.8
Moertel et al [10]	18	Monocentric retrospective	GEP (14), lung (1), UK (3)	Etoposide/cisplatin	67	11	19
Deutschbein et al [34]	18	Monocentric retrospective	GEP (60%), UK (30%), other (10%)	Etoposide/cisplatin or carboplatin	17	6.3	NR
Patta et al [35]	8	Monocentric retrospective	Colo-rectal (100%)	Etoposide/cisplatin	62.5	4.5	9.5
Nakano et al [36]	30	Monocentric retrospective	HN (41%), UK (28%), GEP (20%), GU (9%)	Irinotecan/cisplatin	46	4.5	14.3
Lu et al [37]	16	Monocentric retrospective	GEP (94%), UK (6%)	Irinotecan/cisplatin	57	5.5	10.6
Okita et al [38]	12	Monocentric retrospective	stomach (100%)	Irinotecan/cisplatin	75	7	10.4
Okuma et al [39]	12	Monocentric retrospective	oesophagus (100%)	Irinotecan/cisplatin	50	4	12.6

Legend: GEP = gastroenteropancreatic, UK = unknown primary, HN = Head and neck primary, GU = Genitourinary primary, PFS = progression-free survival, OS = overall survival, NR = Not reported

**Table 2: Main inclusion and exclusion criteria**

---

<b>Inclusion criteria</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Poorly differentiated neuroendocrine carcinoma or high grade MiNEN with a NEC component <math>\geq 30\%</math></li><li>• Small cell or large cell or non-small cell or unknown/undetermined subtype</li><li>• gastro-entero-pancreatic or unknown origin</li><li>• Metastatic disease</li><li>• First-line treatment</li><li>• At least one measurable lesion according to RECIST 1.1 guidelines (CT-scan)</li><li>• Age <math>\geq 18</math> years</li><li>• ECOG Performance Status <math>\leq 1</math> (Appendix 4)</li><li>• Available tumor block</li><li>• Absolute neutrophil count <math>\geq 1.5 \times 10^9/l</math>, platelet <math>\geq 100 \times 10^9/l</math> and hemoglobin <math>&gt; 8</math> g/dl</li><li>• Total bilirubin <math>\leq 1.5N</math>, AST <math>\leq 2.5N</math>, ALT <math>\leq 2.5N</math> or AST and ALT <math>\leq 5N</math> in case of liver metastases.</li></ul>
<b>Exclusion criteria</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Grade 3 well differentiated neuroendocrine tumor according to WHO 2017 classification</li><li>• Symptomatic brain metastases*.</li><li>• Previously treated by chemotherapy or targeted therapy</li><li>• History or know hypersensitivity to any of the study chemotherapy agents, or their excipients.</li><li>• Known or historical active infection with HIV, or known active viral hepatitis</li><li>• Pre-existing permanent neuropathy (NCI CTC V4.0 grade <math>\geq 2</math>)</li><li>• Known Gilbert's syndrome</li><li>• Pregnant women or breastfeeding mother</li><li>• History of prior malignancy, in the three years before randomization except for cured non-melanoma skin cancer and cured in situ cervical carcinoma</li><li>• Active or suspected acute or chronic uncontrolled disease that would induce excess risk associated with study participation.</li><li>• Patient under guardianship and/or deprived of his/her freedom</li><li>• Partial or complete Dihydropyrimidine Dehydrogenase deficiency (uracilemia <math>\geq 16</math> ng/mL)</li><li>• Severe renal impairment (creatinine clearance less than 30 mL/min, according to Cockcroft and Gault Formula)</li><li>• QTc interval <math>&gt; 450</math> msec for male and <math>&gt; 470</math> msec for female at EKG.</li><li>• <math>K^+</math> <math>&lt;</math> lower limit of normal (LLN), <math>Mg^{2+}</math> <math>&lt;</math> LLN, <math>Ca^{2+}</math> <math>&lt;</math> LLN</li></ul>

---

*\*Patient with asymptomatic brain metastases or under stable corticosteroid doses for at least 2 weeks before randomization can be included.*

**Figure 1: FOLFIRINEC study design**

