



Centralized multidisciplinary team assessment of metastasis resectability in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: A fundamental necessity

Thierry André

► To cite this version:

Thierry André. Centralized multidisciplinary team assessment of metastasis resectability in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: A fundamental necessity. The Lancet Regional Health - Europe, 2021, 3, pp.100058. 10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100049 . hal-03355261

HAL Id: hal-03355261

<https://hal.sorbonne-universite.fr/hal-03355261>

Submitted on 27 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.



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Lancet Regional Health - Europe

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/lanep

Commentary

Centralized multidisciplinary team assessment of metastasis resectability in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: A fundamental necessity

Thierry André

Department of Medical Oncology, Saint-Antoine Hospital, 184 Rue du Faubourg, 75012 Paris, France

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 10 February 2021

Accepted 11 February 2021

Available online 26 February 2021

In patients with colorectal cancer (CRC), visceral metastases are observed in 40%–60% of cases and 25% of them are synchronous. Despite the progress achieved with chemotherapy and targeted therapies, surgical resection or destruction of lesions by focal treatment can lead to complete remission and sometimes cure and therefore these should always be debated and discussed in a multidisciplinary tumour board (MDT) as treatment options. An ideal MDT for CRC should include access to both a colorectal surgeon (preferably with expertise in peritoneal approaches) and a hepatobiliary surgeon, and/or a thoracic surgeon as necessary, with the obligatory inclusion of a pathologist and a diagnostic radiologist, as well as radiation and medical oncologists [1]. An interventional radiologist may also be included if appropriate, given that the role of ablative treatments is gaining increasing importance. The CRC experts' discussion evaluates the benefit-risk balance of local treatments. For hepatic or pulmonary metastases, the benefit/risk criteria of surgery are, no contraindications to surgery and anaesthesia (performance status <2 , no severe comorbidity), the R0 resection feasibility of all metastases, prediction of $>25\%$ to 40% of "non-tumoral" residual liver, and the absence of progression under neoadjuvant chemotherapy if administered [1]. The European Society of Medical Oncology (ESMO) guidelines recommended that patients should be treated in either specialist cancers or, alternatively, if this is not possible, as part of a network of individuals dedicated to the management of CRC with an established referral route between their centre and a specialist cancer centre (virtual MDTs) [1]. Although several retrospective population based studies underlined the importance of MDT meetings for face-to-face discussions amongst the experts involved with the patient management and for improved metastatic CRC resectability assessment, limited prospective data are evaluable on this topic [2,3].

In this issue of the *The Lancet Regional Health Europe*, Österlund et al., present the results of a prospective repeated centralized MDT

resectability assessment on line in real-world Finnish population with metastatic CRC [4]. The local oncologists organized the systemic therapy and oversaw repeated referrals to organ-specific CRC MDTs at Helsinki University Hospital tertiary referral center and resections performed at high-volume centres. This is a well-conducted study with reliable prospective clinical database on resections of CRC metastases, owing to high coverage of the Finnish population. This report is of the utmost importance for the gastrointestinal oncologists and surgeons community. Despite the prospective nature of the study, it was not population-based and may be prone to selection bias. The resectability and resection rates of 40% and 36%, respectively, are impressive. The study population most likely included patients with questionable resectability. In Finland, like in all over Europe and across the world, most of metastasis resection or ablations are performed in expert centres and not in lower-volume hospitals. The RAXO study highlights the interest to present all metastatic CRC patient in MDTs, at the beginning of their treatment, but also imperatively after neoadjuvant treatment, with the opportunity to have access in high-volumes centres for resection/destruction. It is also important for patients with initially unresectable metastases, where conversion of resectability is sometimes feasible [4].

Many questions remain. Considerable inconsistencies exist amongst expert surgeons when choosing a therapeutic strategy for resection of CRC metastases [5,6]. This may confuse both patients and referring physicians and points out the need for an international high-level consensual statement and widely accepted guidelines [7]. While adjuvant chemotherapy improves OS for stage III CRC [8], peri-operative chemotherapy significantly increases disease-free survival (DFS), but not OS, for resectable metastatic CRC [9]. Improvements in both DFS and OS rates after CRC metastases resection are awaited. For the small proportion (5%) of microsatellite-instability-high CRC patients, immune-checkpoint inhibitors revolutionized the therapeutic management and survival of this population. Moreover, immune-checkpoint inhibitors may change the rules concerning surgery in this rare group of patients with CRC metastases, stressing the importance of MDTs with specialists with the expertise in new therapeutic options [10].

To conclude, the RAXO trial is an example of how to organize the management of patients with CRC metastases. Repeated MDT assessments including virtual MDTs for CRC metastases, adapted to the size and the specific constraints of each country, with the possibility to refer patients to high-volume centres for surgical resection of metastatic disease, must be organised.

DOI of original article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.lanep.2021.100049>.E-mail address: thierry.andre@aphp.fr<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lanep.2021.100058>2666-7762/© 2021 The Author. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

Declaration of Competing Interest

Dr André reports personal fees from Amgen, Astra-Zeneca, Bristol Myers Squibb, Clovis Oncology, GlaxoSmithKline, Gritstone Oncology, HalioDx, Pierre Fabre, Ventana, Sanofi, Servier, Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp and Roche, outside the submitted work.

References

- [1] Van Cutsem E, Cervantes A, Adam R, Sobrero A, Van Krieken JH, Aderka D, et al. ESMO consensus guidelines for the management of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2016;27:1386–422.
- [2] Prades J, Remue E, van Hoof E, Boras JM. Is it worth reorganising cancer services on the basis of multidisciplinary teams (MDTs)? A systematic review of the objectives and organisation of MDTs and their impact on patient outcomes. *Health Policy (New York)* 2015;119:464–74.
- [3] Hamers PAH, Elferink MAG, Stellato RK, Punt CJA, May AM, Koopman M, et al. Informing metastatic colorectal cancer patients by quantifying multiple scenarios for survival time based on real-life data. *Int J Cancer* 2021;148:296–306.
- [4] Österlund P, Salminen T, Soveri LM, Kallio K, Kellokumpu I, Lamminmäki A, et al. Repeated centralized multidisciplinary team assessment of resectability, clinical behaviour, and outcomes in 1086 Finnish metastatic colorectal cancer patients (RAXO): a nationwide prospective intervention study. *The Lancet Regional Health – Europe* 2021. doi: 10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100049.
- [5] Ignatavicius P, Oberkofler CE, Chapman WC, DeMatteo RP, Clary BM, D'Angelica MI, et al. Choices of therapeutic strategies for colorectal liver metastases among expert liver surgeons: a throw of the dice? *Ann Surg* 2020;272:715–22.
- [6] Adam R, Kitano Y, Abdelrafee A, Allard MA, Baba H. Debulking surgery for colorectal liver metastases: foolish or chance? *Surg Oncol* 2020;33:266–9.
- [7] Ren L, Zhu D, Benson 3rd AB, Nordlinger B, Koehne CH, Delaney CP, et al. Shanghai international consensus on diagnosis and comprehensive treatment of colorectal liver metastases (version 2019). SINCE (Shanghai International Consensus Expert Group on Colorectal Liver Metastases). *Group Eur J Surg Oncol* 2020;46:955–66.
- [8] Taieb J, André T, Auclin E. Refining adjuvant therapy for non-metastatic colon cancer, new standards and perspectives. *Cancer Treat Rev* 2019;75:1–11.
- [9] Nordlinger B, Sorbye H, Glimelius B, Poston GJ, Schlag PM, Rougier P, et al. Perioperative FOLFOX4 chemotherapy and surgery versus surgery alone for resectable liver metastases from colorectal cancer (EORTC 40983): long-term results of a randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol* 2013;14:1208–15.
- [10] Andre T, Shiu K-K, Kim TW, Jensen BV, Jensen LH, Punt CJA, et al. Pembrolizumab in microsatellite instability high advanced colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:2207–18.