World Journal of *Gastrointestinal Oncology*

World J Gastrointest Oncol 2022 February 15; 14(2): 369-546





Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

WU

Governation of Gastrointestinal Oncolor

Contents

Monthly Volume 14 Number 2 February 15, 2022

EDITORIAL

369 Anal human papilloma viral infection and squamous cell carcinoma: Need objective biomarkers for risk assessment and surveillance guidelines

Shenoy S

REVIEW

Microbiome and colorectal carcinogenesis: Linked mechanisms and racial differences 375 Tortora SC, Bodiwala VM, Quinn A, Martello LA, Vignesh S

396 Gastric epithelial histology and precancerous conditions Yang H, Yang WJ, Hu B

MINIREVIEWS

- Small bowel adenocarcinoma: An overview 413 Khosla D, Dey T, Madan R, Gupta R, Goyal S, Kumar N, Kapoor R
- 423 Relation between skeletal muscle volume and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy

De Nardi P, Giani A, Maggi G, Braga M

434 Multimodal treatment in oligometastatic gastric cancer Chevallay M, Wassmer CH, Iranmanesh P, Jung MK, Mönig SP

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Basic Study

450 Frankincense myrrh attenuates hepatocellular carcinoma by regulating tumor blood vessel development through multiple epidermal growth factor receptor-mediated signaling pathways

Zheng P, Huang Z, Tong DC, Zhou Q, Tian S, Chen BW, Ning DM, Guo YM, Zhu WH, Long Y, Xiao W, Deng Z, Lei YC, Tian XF

478 Comprehensive molecular characterization and identification of prognostic signature in stomach adenocarcinoma on the basis of energy-metabolism-related genes

Chang JJ, Wang XY, Zhang W, Tan C, Sheng WQ, Xu MD

Clinical and Translational Research

498 Association and prognostic significance of alpha-L-fucosidase-1 and matrix metalloproteinase 9 expression in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma

Yu XY, Lin SC, Zhang MQ, Guo XT, Ma K, Wang LX, Huang WT, Wang Z, Yu X, Wang CG, Zhang LJ, Yu ZT



Contents

World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology

Monthly Volume 14 Number 2 February 15, 2022

Retrospective Study

511 Chemotherapy predictors and a time-dependent chemotherapy effect in metastatic esophageal cancer

Midthun L, Kim S, Hendifar A, Osipov A, Klempner SJ, Chao J, Cho M, Guan M, Placencio-Hickok VR, Gangi A, Burch M, Lin DC, Waters K, Atkins K, Kamrava M, Gong J

525 Predictive value of serum alpha-fetoprotein for tumor regression after preoperative chemotherapy for rectal cancer

Zhang DK, Qiao J, Chen SX, Hou ZY, Jie JZ

SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

533 Endoscopic ultrasound-guided ablation of solid pancreatic lesions: A systematic review of early outcomes with pooled analysis

Spadaccini M, Di Leo M, Iannone A, von den Hoff D, Fugazza A, Galtieri PA, Pellegatta G, Maselli R, Anderloni A, Colombo M, Siersema PD, Carrara S, Repici A

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

543 Prevention of late complications of endoscopic resection of colorectal lesions with a coverage agent: Current status of gastrointestinal endoscopy

Miao YD, Tang XL, Wang JT, Mi DH



Contents

Monthly Volume 14 Number 2 February 15, 2022

ABOUT COVER

Editorial Board Member of World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology, Filippo Lococo, MD, PhD, Assistant Professor, Department of Thoracic Surgery, Catholic University, Rome 00168, Italy. filippo_lococo@yahoo.it

AIMS AND SCOPE

The primary aim of World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology (WJGO, World J Gastrointest Oncol) is to provide scholars and readers from various fields of gastrointestinal oncology with a platform to publish high-quality basic and clinical research articles and communicate their research findings online.

WJGO mainly publishes articles reporting research results and findings obtained in the field of gastrointestinal oncology and covering a wide range of topics including liver cell adenoma, gastric neoplasms, appendiceal neoplasms, biliary tract neoplasms, hepatocellular carcinoma, pancreatic carcinoma, cecal neoplasms, colonic neoplasms, colorectal neoplasms, duodenal neoplasms, esophageal neoplasms, gallbladder neoplasms, etc.

INDEXING/ABSTRACTING

The WJGO is now indexed in Science Citation Index Expanded (also known as SciSearch®), PubMed, PubMed Central, and Scopus. The 2021 edition of Journal Citation Reports® cites the 2020 impact factor (IF) for WJGO as 3.393; IF without journal self cites: 3.333; 5-year IF: 3.519; Journal Citation Indicator: 0.5; Ranking: 163 among 242 journals in oncology; Quartile category: Q3; Ranking: 60 among 92 journals in gastroenterology and hepatology; and Quartile category: Q3. The WJGO's CiteScore for 2020 is 3.3 and Scopus CiteScore rank 2020: Gastroenterology is 70/136.

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS FOR THIS ISSUE

Production Editor: Ying-Yi Yuan; Production Department Director: Xiang Li; Editorial Office Director: Ya-Juan Ma.

NAME OF JOURNAL	INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS
World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/204
ISSN	GUIDELINES FOR ETHICS DOCUMENTS
ISSN 1948-5204 (online)	https://www.wignet.com/bpg/GerInfo/287
LAUNCH DATE	GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH
February 15, 2009	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240
FREQUENCY	PUBLICATION ETHICS
Monthly	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/288
EDITORS-IN-CHIEF	PUBLICATION MISCONDUCT
Monjur Ahmed, Florin Burada	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/208
EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS	ARTICLE PROCESSING CHARGE
https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-5204/editorialboard.htm	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/242
PUBLICATION DATE	STEPS FOR SUBMITTING MANUSCRIPTS
February 15, 2022	https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/GerInfo/239
COPYRIGHT	ONLINE SUBMISSION
© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc	https://www.f6publishing.com

© 2022 Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved. 7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com https://www.wjgnet.com



G O WJ

World Journal of **Gastrointestinal** Oncology

Submit a Manuscript: https://www.f6publishing.com

World J Gastrointest Oncol 2022 February 15; 14(2): 423-433

DOI: 10.4251/wjgo.v14.i2.423

ISSN 1948-5204 (online)

MINIREVIEWS

Relation between skeletal muscle volume and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy

Paola De Nardi, Alessandro Giani, Giulia Maggi, Marco Braga

ORCID number: Paola De Nardi 0000-0002-9337-6765; Alessandro Giani 0000-0003-0718-2321; Giulia Maggi 0000-0001-5774-6020; Marco Braga 0000-0002-5009-9710.

Author contributions: De Nardi P designed the study, drafted the manuscript, participated in the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data and approved the final version; Giani A and Maggi G participated in the acquisition, analysis and interpretation of the data, drafted the manuscript and approved the final version; Braga M participated in the analysis and interpretation of the data, revised the article critically for important intellectual content and approved the final version.

Conflict-of-interest statement: Authors declare no conflict of interest for this article.

Country/Territory of origin: Italy

Specialty type: Oncology

Provenance and peer review: Invited article; Externally peer reviewed.

Peer-review model: Single blind

Peer-review report's scientific quality classification Grade A (Excellent): 0

Paola De Nardi, Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milano 20132, Italy

Alessandro Giani, Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan Italy, Monza 20900, Italy

Giulia Maggi, Department of Oncologic Surgery, Policlinico Casilino, Rome 00169, Italy

Marco Braga, Department of Surgery, San Gerardo Hospital, University Milano Bicocca, Monza 20900, Italy

Corresponding author: Paola De Nardi, FASCRS, Staff Physician, Surgeon, Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Via Olgettina 60, Milano 20132, Italy. denardi.paola@hsr.it

Abstract

The prognostic role of body composition indexes, and specifically sarcopenia, has recently been explored in different cancer types. However, conflicting results have been reported. Heterogeneity in cancer type, cancer stage or oncological treatments, as well as different methodology and definition of sarcopenia, could be accounted for different conclusions retrieved from literature. When focusing on colorectal cancer, it clearly appears that colon and rectal cancers are often treated as a single entity though they have different behaviors and treatments. Particularly, patients with advanced rectal cancer represent a peculiar group of patients that according to current guidelines are treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy and radiotherapy followed by radical surgery. This review was restricted to a homogeneous group of patients with advanced lower rectal cancer and the aim of exploring whether there is a correlation between skeletal muscle depletion and prognosis. Literature was searched for articles related to patients with advanced rectal cancer undergoing neoadjuvant chemo-radiotherapy (NCRT) followed by radical surgery, in whom muscle mass and/or change in muscle mass during neoadjuvant treatment were measured. Eight full-text articles were selected and included in the present review. The main findings of our review were: (1) The majority of the studies defined sarcopenia as muscle mass alone over muscle strength or physical performance; (2) There was a great deal of heterogeneity in the definition and measures of sarcopenia, in the definition of cut-off values, and in the method to measure change in muscle mass; (3) There was not full agreement on the association between sarcopenia at baseline and/or after chemoradiotherapy and prognosis, and only few studies found a significance in the



Grade B (Very good): 0 Grade C (Good): C, C Grade D (Fair): 0 Grade E (Poor): 0

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article that was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: htt p://creativecommons.org/License s/by-nc/4.0/

Received: March 18, 2021 Peer-review started: March 18, 2021 First decision: July 16, 2021 Revised: August 1, 2021 Accepted: January 6, 2022 Article in press: January 6, 2022 Published online: February 15, 2022

P-Reviewer: El-Hussuna A, Yoshimatsu K S-Editor: Fan JR L-Editor: Filipodia P-Editor: Fan JR



multivariate analysis; and (4) It seems that a loss in skeletal muscle mass during NCRT is associated with the worst outcomes in terms of disease-free survival. In conclusion, analysis of muscle mass might provide prognostic information on patients with rectal cancer, however more robust evidence is needed to define the role of muscle depletion and/or muscle change during neoadjuvant treatments, related to this specific group of patients. If a prognostic role would be confirmed by future studies, the role of preoperative intervention aimed at modifying muscle mass could be explored in order to improve outcomes.

Key Words: Advanced rectal cancer; Sarcopenia; Neoadjuvant treatment; Chemoradiotherapy; Surgery; Muscle mass change; Prognosis; Survival; Review

©The Author(s) 2022. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core Tip: Rectal cancer is one of the most common cancers worldwide. The present review explores the potential prognostic role of muscle depletion in patients undergoing curative surgery for rectal cancer after neoadjuvant treatment. Evidence supports the hypothesis that sarcopenic patients, and patients in whom a decrement in muscle mass is detected during neoadjuvant treatment, are considered at greater risk of tumor recurrence and tumor death. Despite this observation, assessment of muscle mass is mostly neglected while it could inform on prognosis as well as guide in optimal treatment.

Citation: De Nardi P, Giani A, Maggi G, Braga M. Relation between skeletal muscle volume and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy. World J Gastrointest Oncol 2022; 14(2): 423-433

URL: https://www.wjgnet.com/1948-5204/full/v14/i2/423.htm DOI: https://dx.doi.org/10.4251/wjgo.v14.i2.423

INTRODUCTION

Recently, the influence of anthropometry on treatment outcome has been a matter of research in several fields of surgical oncology. Several reports identified a significant association between specific profiles of the fat and muscular compartments and shortand long-term prognosis in cancer patients.

The most investigated hallmark sign of anthropometric frailty is sarcopenia, which has been identified as a predictor of poor outcome in different gastrointestinal cancers [1-3]. Sarcopenia, initially defined as an age-related reduction in muscle mass and strength, has been otherwise associated with various chronic diseases, including cancer-related malnutrition and cachexia[4-6]. It has been suggested that it may reflect a state of increased metabolic activity of tumor biology leading to host immune functional impairment, deficient response to systemic inflammation, nutritional changes, and altered endocrine function [4,7]. These conditions enhance patient vulnerability towards stressors and lead to an increased risk of developing adverse health outcomes. Actually, skeletal muscle depletion, that is the central feature of sarcopenia, has been negatively associated with chemotherapy toxicity, complications following surgery, and impaired survival in cancer patients[8-11].

The prognostic role of body composition indexes, and specifically sarcopenia, has been broadly explored also in patients undergoing colorectal cancer resection[12-14]. Nevertheless, colonic and rectal cancers are often appraised as a single entity despite their substantial differences in surgical management, oncological strategies, and prognosis. Rectal surgery accounts for a considerably greater number of postoperative complications[15,16] and rectal tumors have a higher recurrence rate and a shorter survival than colonic ones[17-19]. In addition, preoperative neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT) is the standard care for patients with advanced lower rectal cancer because of the relatively high risk of local recurrence[20]. Accordingly, it would be worthwhile to study more homogeneous patient cohorts.



The identification of patients with skeletal muscle wasting might be critical for early and tailored nutritional interventional planning that may improve long-term outcomes and treatment tolerance as reported in cases of advanced rectal cancer^[21]. Thus, we conducted a review to assess whether sarcopenia could be used to predict recurrence and survival among patients with advanced lower rectal cancers who are treated with NCRT followed by surgery.

LITERATURE SEARCH AND STUDIES SELECTION

A literature review was performed through Medline/PubMed, Embase, Scopus, Web of Science, and Cochrane library databases until January 2021. Searched terms were: "Rectal cancer" OR "rectal neoplasm" and "sarcopenia" OR "muscle mass" and "neoadjuvant therapy" as term and related Medical Subject Headings. Reference lists of the selected publications were searched for identifying additional studies. Only articles in English language were included.

Studies were selected if they were related to adult patients with advanced non metastatic rectal cancer at diagnosis who underwent NCRT (any scheme) and surgery with curative intent, and if muscle mass was measured (either preoperatively and/or before and/or after NCRT) and/or change in muscle mass during NCRT was measured, and related to survival.

Through databases and reference lists searching, 27 articles were identified. After excluding reviews, abstracts, duplicates, and studies not providing the selected outcome measures, 8 full-text articles were selected and included in the present review [22-29].

A PRISMA flowchart reporting the studies selection process is shown in Figure 1.

STUDY CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1 summarizes the studies included in this review along with the main outcome measures. All the studies were retrospective, with sample sizes ranging from 30 to 188; all were published between 2017 and 2019 with a median follow-up between 24.1 and 98.2 mo.

DEFINITION OF SARCOPENIA

Irwin Rosenberg defined sarcopenia (from Greek 'sarx' or flesh + 'penia' or loss) for the first time in 1989 as an age associated decline in skeletal muscle mass[30]. However, it was not until 2010 that a Sarcopenia Working Group (SWG) developed a broadly accepted clinical definition and diagnostic criteria that would be used both in clinical practice and in research studies[31]. According to the SWG, sarcopenia was defined as a "syndrome characterized by progressive and generalized loss of skeletal muscle mass and strength with a risk of adverse outcomes". The working group also categorized sarcopenia into primary, in which aging is the only apparent cause and secondary, among which different diseases, such as malignancy, play an important role.

The original definition was updated 10 years later as "a progressive and generalized skeletal muscle disorder that is associated with increased likelihood of adverse outcomes" [32]. One of the main insights of the revision was the prominent role of muscle strength over muscle mass as a measure that better predicts adverse outcomes. This revision also defined these two criteria: (1) Low muscle mass; and (2) Low muscle strength.

These two criteria are requested to define sarcopenia and help to resolve several questions concerning diagnostic measures and cut-off points important to clinical practice.

As a matter of fact, the majority of the studies evaluating the association of sarcopenia and clinical outcome defined sarcopenia as muscle mass alone over muscle strength or physical performance, possibly because it is based on more objective parameters that can be evaluated retrospectively in studies and rely on imaging tools that are widely used in clinical practice. On the contrary, other tests are more subjective, based on patient's perception, or too long to be administered and thus less suited for research. All the eight studies selected for the present review used muscle



Table Tincluded studies with the main outcome measures											
Ref.	Type of study	Measure of muscle mass	Definition of sarcopenia	СТ	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Pts age	Mean outcome	Follow-up (mo)	Results	
Berkel <i>et al</i> [22], 2019	Retrospective	TPA and TAMA at L3 and both the superior and inferior border of L4 (+ measurement of skeletal muscle radiation attenuation)	Normalized TPA or TAMA at each level below the median (males and females)	After NCRT	cT3 or cT4 (CRM < 1 mm) and/or cN2 rectal cancer undergoing NCRT	No preoperative CT scan or of poor quality	99; 66 (40-81)	Correlation between TAMA radiation attenuation and OS	Median: 32.9 (range: 19.4-51.1)	Sarcopenia (at TAMA L4 inferior) correlated to OS	
Choi <i>et al</i> [<mark>23</mark>], 2018	Retrospective	Skeletal muscle index at L3 level	SMI < 52.4 cm^2/m^2 for male and 38.5 cm^2 $/\text{m}^2$ for female	Before NCRT	cT≥3 or cN≥1 rectal cancer undergoing NCRT	Metastasis/recurrence. No CT at initial diagnosis	188; 61.3 (27-84)	Correlation between SMI and OS and DFS	Median: 52 (range: 5- 91)	Worse OS in sarcopenic patients	
Chung et al[24], 2020	Retrospective	Skeletal muscle index at L3 level	SMI < 52.4 cm ² /m ² for male and < 38.5 cm ² /m ² for female	Before and after NCRT	Locally advanced non metastatic rectal cancer undergoing NCRT	Not reported	93	Correlation between SMI and skeletal muscle loss during NCRT and OS and DFS	Not found	Worse 5-yr OS in sarcopenic pts after NCRT. Worse OS in pts with severe muscle loss during NCRT. CT4 independent risk factor for severe muscle loss	
De Nardi et al[<mark>25</mark>], 2020	Retrospective	Skeletal muscle index at L3 level	SMI < 52 cm ² /m ² for male and < 42 cm ² /m ² for female	Before and after NCRT	cT ≥ 3 and N+ cancers undergoing NCRT	Not reported	52; 63 (32-79)	Correlation between skeletal muscle change during NCRT and OS and DFS	Median: 56 (range: 32- 8)	Worse DFS in pts with SML > 2%. In stage II subgroup, worse DFS in SML > 2% or > 5%	
Fukuoka <i>et al</i> [<mark>26</mark>], 2019	Retrospective	Psoas muscle index at the level of the navel	No definition	Before and after NCRT or NAC	cT3N+ rectal cancer undergoing NCRT or NAC	Distant metastasis. History of other malignancies	47; 66 (27-88)	Correlation between change in PMI during neoadjuvant treatment and OS and DFS	Median: 24.1	Worse OS and DFS in patients with PMI decrease > 10%	
Levolger <i>et al</i> [27], 2018	Retrospective	Skeletal muscle index at L3 level	SMI < 52 cm ² /m ² for male and < 39.5 cm ² /m ² for female	Before and after NCRT	cT3 and cT4 rectal cancer and/or cN+ undergoing NCRT	Not reported	12261 (53-66.3)	Correlation between change in skeletal muscle mass during NCRT and OS, DFS, metastases	Median: 41 (range: 26- 62)	Lower SMI in patients with cT4 tumors than cT3. SMI variation associated to worse DFS and metastases	
Park <i>et al</i> [28], 2018	Retrospective	Skeletal muscle index at L3 level	SMI < 55 cm ² /m ² for male and < 39 cm ² /m ² for female	Before NCRT	> 65-yr-old pts with rectal cancer undergoing NCRT	RT or CT alone	30; 72 (66-87)	Correlation between sarcopenia and OS and DFS	Median: 98.2 (range 73.5-122.8)	Worse OS and DFS in sarcopenic patients	
Takeda <i>et</i> al[<mark>29</mark>], 2018	Retrospective	Skeletal muscle index at L3 level	SMI < $45 \text{ cm}^2/\text{m}^2$ for male and 33.8 cm ² /m ² for female	Before NCRT	cII or cIII advanced rectal cancer undergoing NCRT	Lack of baseline CT scan	144. Sarcopenic: 65 (42-81). Not sarcopenic: 60 (32-65)	Correlation between sarcopenia and OS and DFS	Median: 67 (range: 5.7- 137.1)	Worse OS and DFS in sarcopenic patients	

TPA: Total psoas area; TAMA: Total abdominal muscle area; c: Clinical; NCRT: Neoadjuvant chemo-radiotherapy; NAC: Neoadjuvant chemotherapy; SMI: Skeletal muscle index (cross sectional skeletal muscle area normalized by the square of the height); PMI: Psoas muscle index; L3: Third lumbar vertebra; L4: Fourth lumbar vertebra; OS: Overall survival; DFS: Disease free survival; SML: Skeletal muscle loss; CT: Computed tomography.

mass alone as the diagnostic criterion to define sarcopenia and none employed muscle strength or physical performance.

MEASURE OF MUSCLE MASS

Body muscle mass can be assessed by different techniques including imaging techniques, bio impedance analysis, anthropometric measure, or body potassium evaluation. Body imaging techniques comprise computed tomography (CT) scan, magnetic resonance imaging, and dual energy X-ray absorptiometry; CT is the most frequently used in clinical practice for its high accuracy and reproducibility[33]. The problem of the radiation exposure is bypassed in cancer patients because this exam is routinely performed for cancer staging and follow-up. As a substitute of muscle mass, the abdominal wall musculature is the most commonly assessed: Skeletal muscle cross sectional area (cm²) is generally measured with CT images at the level of the 3rd lumbar vertebra (L3). L3 vertebra level is the site most commonly used because it correlates significantly with whole-body muscle[34]. However, there could be differences depending on the exact site of measurement such as the upper, mid, or lower vertebral body. The parameter is then normalized for patient stature and designated as skeletal muscle index, skeletal muscle index (SMI) (cm²/m²). There was a substantial agreement for the choice of L3 as a reference site and only one study^[22] evaluated three levels: The third lumbar vertebra and both the superior and inferior border of the fourth lumbar vertebra. Differently, Fukuoka et al[26] measured the psoas muscle index (PMI) at the level of the navel as an indicator of skeletal muscle mass; however, this approach is less standardized and since psoas is a minor muscle, it is questioned if it is representative of the overall lean body mass. The threshold of skeletal muscle radiation attenuation, to discriminate between skeletal muscle and other tissues, (mean Hounsfield Units, HU) was -29 to +150 HU[35]. The most common definition of sarcopenia in the studies considered in the present review takes into consideration gender specific cut off values, however these values vary considerably: Cut-off points of 43 cm²/m², 52.4 cm²/m², 52 cm²/m², 49 cm²/m² for men, and 41 cm²/m², 38.5 cm²/ m^2 , 42 cm²/m², 31 cm²/m² for women are reported. Other authors [29] stratified by quartiles according to the SMI values for men and women and defined low skeletal muscle mass as the lowest quartile. A recent review found 12 different diagnostic thresholds for sarcopenia, the most common being 52.4 cm²/m² for men and 38.5 cm² $/m^{2}$ for women[36], therefore the need for further standardization is highlighted. The cut-off values may differ for different reasons: First for the reference population since, for instance, the Eastern population may have different body size with respect to the Western one[37]. The different threshold may lead to different prevalence of sarcopenia and thus to different results; moreover, it makes it difficult to compare the results of different studies. Interestingly, only one author[22] evaluated the quality of muscle assessing the skeletal muscle radiation attenuation (as mean HU of Total Abdominal Muscle Area, TAMA); according to previous studies, a lower HU corresponded to fatty infiltration of muscle myosteatosis.

The studies examining the rate of change in muscle mass during NCRT also employed different methods; De Nardi et al[25] established a 2% and 5% variation threshold[25]. Fukuoka et al[26] employed a 10% threshold, after subtracting the pre-PMI from the post-PMI and then dividing the results by the pre-PMI multiplied by 100. Chung et al[24] initially calculated (SMI_post-SMI_pre)/SMI_pre × 100 and then dichotomized the patients based on cut-off values of 4.2%/100 d; this process accounted for differences in the time elapsed between the 2 CT scans[24].

In conclusion, although the majority of the authors agreed on the tool and site to measure muscle mass, more research is needed to provide reference values in order to increase the comparability of the results.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SARCOPENIA AND OTHER DEMOGRAPHIC AND/OR PROGNOSTIC FACTORS BEFORE AND AFTER NCRT

Sarcopenia has multiple contributing factors such as age, heritability, diet, nutritional status, lifestyle, chronic diseases, hormonal changes and drug treatments. Low skeletal muscle mass is common among cancer patients. Cancer is a main cause of secondary sarcopenia because of the catabolic state caused by inflammatory reaction, possibly associated with poor nutritional status. As underlined by a recent systematic review,





Figure 1 PRISMA flowchart of included studies.

sarcopenia prevalence ranges from 15% to 74% in oncologic patients before cancer treatment[38]. This wide range in prevalence is partly due to different characteristics of tumor; albeit a variation in the definition of sarcopenia, as already stated, may also play a role. Among patients with colorectal cancer, a study on 3262 patients examining medical and demographic characteristics associated with sarcopenia found a prevalence of 42% with a strong correlation to older age, Caucasian race, and advanced disease stage^[39]. Several other authors tried to identify patients' characteristics or tumor factors that could be associated with sarcopenia. As expected, a relationship with older age was found since cancer and aging recognize a similar pathophysiologic mechanism^[40]. In patients with colorectal cancer, sarcopenia was associated with body mass index (BMI), serum carcinoembryonic antigen level and mean number of metastatic lymph nodes[10] while in patients with colorectal liver metastasis with female sex, low BMI and a lower amount of intra-abdominal fat[41].

Several of the studies examined in the present review did not explore these correlations[22,25,28] while others[26,27] found no differences in patient demographic and clinical characteristics between sarcopenic and non-sarcopenic patients. On the other hand, an association with BMI was described by 3 studies[23,24,29] and with older age by 2[23,29]. Black et al[42] reported the data on 86 patients with colorectal cancer and although the results pertaining to rectal cancer patients only cannot be extrapolated, they described an association between sarcopenia and older age and elevated neutrophil count^[42]. This last parameter reflects the systemic inflammatory response specific of cancer patients. This association has been demonstrated to be also strongly related to survival in colorectal cancer patients[43]. Interestingly, few studies recognized a relationship between sarcopenia and disease stage[44]; a possible explanation relies in the small sample size of the majority of the studies. In the studies examined here, this difference could not be found due to the homogeneity of tumor stage (only II and III stage rectal cancer). In the study by Levolger et al[27] no association was found at baseline while, after NCRT, patients with cT4 tumors had a lower SMI when compared to patients with cT3 tumors. Finally, De Nardi et al[25] examined a subgroup of patients with stage II cancer and found that poor differentiated tumors (G3) were associated with skeletal muscle loss during NCRT^[25].

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SARCOPENIA AND SURVIVAL AND DISEASE-FREE SURVIVAL

Body composition and functional status in cancer patients have been acknowledged as prominent factors associated with prognosis in different tumors such as liver, rectum, esophagus, stomach and kidney^[38]. In patients undergoing surgery, pre-operative



sarcopenia has been shown to be an independent unfavorable predicting factor for several cancers and it has been associated with worse clinical outcomes in terms of post-operative complications, hospital stay, morbidity, mortality and a lower tolerance of chemo radiation therapy[45].

The role of sarcopenia in colorectal cancer patients' postoperative outcomes have been the topic of several works. Sarcopenia independently predicted mortality adjusted for age, sex, and previous abdominal surgery in a study on 310 patients[7]. In another study, Lieffers et al^[8] reported that sarcopenic patients had significantly longer hospitalization and a higher wound infection rate[8]. A systematic review of 12 studies, including 5337 patients with non-metastatic colorectal cancer undergoing surgery, confirmed that sarcopenia was not only an independent predictor of postoperative complications, but it was also related to overall, relapse-free and progression-free survival^[46]. More recently, another systematic review^[47] included 44 randomized and observational studies comprising 18891 patients, to assess the prognostic value of sarcopenia on postoperative outcomes and survival rates of patients with colorectal cancer; studies involving treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer were excluded. Among the 44 studies, twenty-five, with a total of 15446 patients, reported overall survival (OS) as an outcome; the meta-analysis demonstrated an association between sarcopenia and shorter OS; furthermore, sarcopenia was negatively related to disease free survival (DFS) and cancer specific survival. However, when patients with rectal cancer were retrieved from the whole population, the authors could not find a worse survival in sarcopenic patients. Overall, 6511 patients had rectal cancer, among them a large proportion had stage I or II and the minority with advanced or metastatic disease, accordingly, only a small proportion of them underwent NCRT.

In order to analyze a more homogeneous group of patients in terms of tumor location, stage, and treatments, we restricted our review to patients with advanced rectal cancer who underwent neoadjuvant NRCT and curative surgery. In the studies analyzing the relation between skeletal muscle depletion and prognosis, we focused on two issues. Firstly, related to single time point measurement of sarcopenia and secondly to the changes in muscle mass during cancer treatment.

In univariate analysis, the majority of the authors reported an association between pre-or post-NCRT sarcopenia and OS[22-24], or both OS and DSF[28,29].

In the multivariate model, sarcopenia pre-NCRT[23,28,29], or post-NCRT[22,24], was associated with OS. Additionally, in the study by Park *et al*[28], sarcopenia was the only independent poor prognostic factor for OS. The DFS was also affected, in the studies by Park *et al*[28] and Takeda *et al*[29], by sarcopenia before NCRT. Takeda *et al* [29] identified that pathological tumor stage and sarcopenia were independently associated with poor OS and DFS in multivariate analysis. Chung *et al*[24] identified 51 pts (54.8%) with sarcopenia after the completion of NCRT, while they did not report the absolute number of patients with sarcopenia pre-NCRT. While there was no significant difference in OS or DFS between patients with and without sarcopenia pre-NCRT, in the patients with sarcopenia.

In summary, a paucity of studies has examined, up to now, the relation between muscle depletion and prognosis in the group of patients with rectal cancer undergoing NCRT and surgery. Although several of them reported a correlation, particularly with OS, the results are inconsistent so far. The discrepancy among the studies could be due to different definitions of sarcopenia, different time points for performing CT scan, or insufficient power calculation for the analysis. Nevertheless, some interesting reports should encourage clinicians to undertake clinical trials to obtain more robust evidence.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SKELETAL MUSCLE MASS CHANGE DURING NRCT AND SURVIVAL AND DISEASE-FREE SURVIVAL

The existing literature on sarcopenia and prognosis in cancer patients is mainly connected to evaluation of muscle mass at a single time point, while temporal changes of body composition during treatment and their impact on survival have been scarcely studied. Actually, anthropometry is generally assessed only before starting surgical or oncological programs, while a proper appraisal of changes in fat and lean body mass during therapies may be another critical prognostic tool and add value to existing literature.

Zaishideng® WJGO | https://www.wjgnet.com

Some studies demonstrated the negative impact of muscle loss during oncological treatments on prognosis of colorectal cancer patients. Nonetheless, most of those studies occurred in patients with metastatic diseases undergoing palliative chemotherapy. Miyamoto et al[48] evaluated the association between progressive skeletal muscle loss and prognosis in patients with unresectable colorectal cancer undergoing systemic first-line chemotherapy. It was found that patients who had a loss greater than 5% during chemotherapy experienced significantly shorter progression-free survival than those in the non-skeletal-muscle loss group. Similarly, a decrease in muscle area during chemotherapy of 9% or more was significantly associated with worse OS rates in metastatic colorectal cancer patients in a study by Blauwhoff-Buskermolen et al[49]. Interestingly, the static pre-treatment evaluation of skeletal muscle depletion was not a risk factor for survival in both cohorts. These results confirmed the value of depletion of skeletal muscle during chemotherapy as a prognostic factor already observed in other diseases[50,51].

Heus et al[52] measured an overall increase in skeletal muscle during neoadjuvant therapy as if chemo-radiation could lessen the inflammatory tumor state and consequently increase muscle mass.

From a biological point of view, the available data suggest that sarcopenia may reflect the increased metabolic activity of a more aggressive tumor leading to systemic inflammation and causing muscle loss. In this perspective, it might be speculated that the modification in body composition could be an expression of a different biologic response to antineoplastic therapy; thus, achieving tumor control with effective chemotherapy has the potential to reverse the catabolic processes causing cachexia. On the contrary, a significant loss of skeletal muscle during treatment suggests a more aggressive disease and potential ineffectiveness of chemotherapy.

Less evidence is available regarding changes in lean body mass specifically during neoadjuvant therapies for rectal cancer. Levolger et al[27] found that skeletal muscle loss during NCRT was associated with poor DFS and a higher risk of developing distant metastasis; however, muscle depletion did not impair OS. In addition, in their population, single time point assessment of sarcopenia, a widely adopted method was not predictive of survival. In an analogous study[25], NCRT was associated with loss of skeletal muscle in 36.5% of patients, while no variation or increased muscle mass was found in 63.5%. Muscle loss after NCRT was related to worse DFS. Additionally, even if not statistically significant, patients that experienced muscle mass depletion were more likely to have none or a poor response to neoadjuvant treatment. This last evidence, if confirmed, may support the above-mentioned theory of a relationship between treatment failure and muscle depletion. Chung et al[24] reported that 24.7% of the patients had severe muscle loss after NCRT; they found no difference in survival in sarcopenic patients, before or after NCRT, however patients with severe muscle loss during NCRT showed significant worse OS with respect to the control group. The authors also tried to identify variables that could predict severe muscle loss and found that cT4 tumors were the only risk factor. Finally, Fukuoka *et al*[26] reported that a > 10% decrease of muscle mass during NCRT was associated with a shorter OS and DFS [26].

Based on the little available evidence, it is not clear if an aggressive tumor biology rather than NCRT per se is more likely to be the causative factor inducing a critical catabolic state in certain patients. Further studies are needed to define the potential prognostic role of body composition changes during neoadjuvant treatments on pathological tumor response and long-term outcomes. Additionally, despite mounting evidence demonstrating a sarcopenia relationship with poor survival, it is still undefined whether targeted physical and nutritional interventions, aimed at halting or reversing cancer related muscle wasting, may improve the outcomes. Whether these regimens are effective remains to be answered, however, eventually the interval between NCRT and surgery might display a perfect opportunity to enhance the overall condition of locally advanced rectal cancer patients.

CONCLUSION

Only a few studies have been published so far on the relationship between muscle mass and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing NCRT followed by surgery. Overall, these studies demonstrated an association between sarcopenia and OS; in addition, the evaluation of temporal changes in muscle mass during NCRT also showed that muscle loss during treatment was associated with a worse prognosis. Consequently, it is of paramount importance to identify patients with skeletal muscle



wasting in order to plan an early and tailored intervention that may improve longterm outcomes.

Besides implementing studies examining the relationship between muscle wasting and prognosis, it would be desirable to lead studies evaluating the relationship between sarcopenia and other prognostic factors such as tumor downstaging or complete pathological response.

REFERENCES

- Parkin E, Plumb AA, O'Reilly D, Renehan AG. Body composition and outcome in patients undergoing resection of colorectal liver metastases (Br J Surg 2012; 99: 550-557). Br J Surg 2012; 99: 1021-1022; author reply 1022 [PMID: 22648645 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.8826]
- Prado CM, Lieffers JR, McCargar LJ, Reiman T, Sawyer MB, Martin L, Baracos VE. Prevalence 2 and clinical implications of sarcopenic obesity in patients with solid tumours of the respiratory and gastrointestinal tracts: a population-based study. Lancet Oncol 2008; 9: 629-635 [PMID: 18539529 DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(08)70153-0]
- 3 Martin L, Birdsell L, Macdonald N, Reiman T, Clandinin MT, McCargar LJ, Murphy R, Ghosh S, Sawyer MB, Baracos VE. Cancer cachexia in the age of obesity: skeletal muscle depletion is a powerful prognostic factor, independent of body mass index. J Clin Oncol 2013; 31: 1539-1547 [PMID: 23530101 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2012.45.2722]
- Dodson S, Baracos VE, Jatoi A, Evans WJ, Cella D, Dalton JT, Steiner MS. Muscle wasting in cancer cachexia: clinical implications, diagnosis, and emerging treatment strategies. Annu Rev Med 2011; 62: 265-279 [PMID: 20731602 DOI: 10.1146/annurev-med-061509-131248]
- Rosenberg IH. Sarcopenia: origins and clinical relevance. J Nutr 1997; 127: 990S-991S [PMID: 5 9164280 DOI: 10.1093/in/127.5.99081
- 6 Fearon K, Strasser F, Anker SD, Bosaeus I, Bruera E, Fainsinger RL, Jatoi A, Loprinzi C, MacDonald N, Mantovani G, Davis M, Muscaritoli M, Ottery F, Radbruch L, Ravasco P, Walsh D, Wilcock A, Kaasa S, Baracos VE. Definition and classification of cancer cachexia: an international consensus. Lancet Oncol 2011; 12: 489-495 [PMID: 21296615 DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(10)70218-7
- 7 Reisinger KW, van Vugt JL, Tegels JJ, Snijders C, Hulsewé KW, Hoofwijk AG, Stoot JH, Von Meyenfeldt MF, Beets GL, Derikx JP, Poeze M. Functional compromise reflected by sarcopenia, frailty, and nutritional depletion predicts adverse postoperative outcome after colorectal cancer surgery. Ann Surg 2015; 261: 345-352 [PMID: 24651133 DOI: 10.1097/SLA.00000000000628]
- Lieffers JR, Bathe OF, Fassbender K, Winget M, Baracos VE. Sarcopenia is associated with 8 postoperative infection and delayed recovery from colorectal cancer resection surgery. Br J Cancer 2012; 107: 931-936 [PMID: 22871883 DOI: 10.1038/bjc.2012.350]
- Giani A, Famularo S, Riva L, Tamini N, Ippolito D, Nespoli L, Conconi P, Sironi S, Braga M, Gianotti L. Association between specific presurgical anthropometric indexes and morbidity in patients undergoing rectal cancer resection. Nutrition 2020; 75-76: 110779 [PMID: 32268263 DOI: 10.1016/j.nut.2020.110779
- Miyamoto Y, Baba Y, Sakamoto Y, Ohuchi M, Tokunaga R, Kurashige J, Hiyoshi Y, Iwagami S, 10 Yoshida N, Yoshida M, Watanabe M, Baba H. Sarcopenia is a Negative Prognostic Factor After Curative Resection of Colorectal Cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2015; 22: 2663-2668 [PMID: 25564158 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-014-4281-6]
- 11 Chemama S, Bayar MA, Lanoy E, Ammari S, Stoclin A, Goéré D, Elias D, Raynard B, Antoun S. Sarcopenia is Associated with Chemotherapy Toxicity in Patients Undergoing Cytoreductive Surgery with Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Peritoneal Carcinomatosis from Colorectal Cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2016; 23: 3891-3898 [PMID: 27352205 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-016-5360-7]
- 12 Malietzis G, Currie AC, Athanasiou T, Johns N, Anyamene N, Glynne-Jones R, Kennedy RH, Fearon KC, Jenkins JT. Influence of body composition profile on outcomes following colorectal cancer surgery. Br J Surg 2016; 103: 572-580 [PMID: 26994716 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.10075]
- 13 Hopkins JJ, Reif RL, Bigam DL, Baracos VE, Eurich DT, Sawyer MB. The Impact of Muscle and Adipose Tissue on Long-term Survival in Patients With Stage I to III Colorectal Cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 2019; 62: 549-560 [PMID: 30789442 DOI: 10.1097/DCR.00000000001352]
- Brown JC, Caan BJ, Prado CM, Cespedes Feliciano EM, Xiao J, Kroenke CH, Meyerhardt JA. The 14 Association of Abdominal Adiposity With Mortality in Patients With Stage I-III Colorectal Cancer. J Natl Cancer Inst 2020; 112: 377-383 [PMID: 31355882 DOI: 10.1093/jnci/djz150]
- 15 Leijssen LGJ, Dinaux AM, Kunitake H, Bordeianou LG, Berger DL. The impact of postoperative morbidity on survival in patients with metastatic colon and rectal cancer. J Surg Oncol 2019; 120: 460-472 [PMID: 31276213 DOI: 10.1002/jso.25610]
- 16 Alves A, Panis Y, Mathieu P, Mantion G, Kwiatkowski F, Slim K; Association Française de Chirurgie. Postoperative mortality and morbidity in French patients undergoing colorectal surgery: results of a prospective multicenter study. Arch Surg 2005; 140: 278-283, discussion 284 [PMID: 15781793 DOI: 10.1001/archsurg.140.3.278]
- 17 McDermott FT, Hughes ES, Pihl E, Milne BJ, Price AB. Comparative results of surgical management of single carcinomas of the colon and rectum: a series of 1939 patients managed by one



surgeon. Br J Surg 1981; 68: 850-855 [PMID: 6172174 DOI: 10.1002/bjs.1800681207]

- Lee YC, Lee YL, Chuang JP, Lee JC. Differences in survival between colon and rectal cancer from 18 SEER data. PLoS One 2013; 8: e78709 [PMID: 24265711 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0078709]
- 19 Li M, Li JY, Zhao AL, Gu J. Colorectal cancer or colon and rectal cancer? Oncology 2007; 73: 52-57 [PMID: 18334831 DOI: 10.1159/000120628]
- 20 Iqbal A, George TJ. Randomized Clinical Trials in Colon and Rectal Cancer. Surg Oncol Clin N Am 2017; 26: 689-704 [PMID: 28923225 DOI: 10.1016/j.soc.2017.05.008]
- Malietzis G, Aziz O, Bagnall NM, Johns N, Fearon KC, Jenkins JT. The role of body composition 21 evaluation by computerized tomography in determining colorectal cancer treatment outcomes: a systematic review. Eur J Surg Oncol 2015; 41: 186-196 [PMID: 25468746 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejso.2014.10.056]
- 22 Berkel AEM, Klaase JM, de Graaff F, Brusse-Keizer MGJ, Bongers BC, van Meeteren NLU. Patient's Skeletal Muscle Radiation Attenuation and Sarcopenic Obesity are Associated with Postoperative Morbidity after Neoadjuvant Chemoradiation and Resection for Rectal Cancer. Dig Surg 2019; 36: 376-383 [PMID: 29898443 DOI: 10.1159/000490069]
- 23 Choi MH, Oh SN, Lee IK, Oh ST, Won DD. Sarcopenia is negatively associated with long-term outcomes in locally advanced rectal cancer. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle 2018; 9: 53-59 [PMID: 28849630 DOI: 10.1002/jcsm.12234]
- 24 Chung E, Lee HS, Cho ES, Park EJ, Baik SH, Lee KY, Kang J. Prognostic significance of sarcopenia and skeletal muscle mass change during preoperative chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced rectal cancer. Clin Nutr 2020; 39: 820-828 [PMID: 30928250 DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2019.03.014]
- De Nardi P, Salandini M, Chiari D, Pecorelli N, Cristel G, Damascelli A, Ronzoni M, Massimino L, 25 De Cobelli F, Braga M. Changes in body composition during neoadjuvant therapy can affect prognosis in rectal cancer patients: An exploratory study. Curr Probl Cancer 2020; 44: 100510 [PMID: 31703987 DOI: 10.1016/j.currproblcancer.2019.100510]
- Fukuoka T, Maeda K, Nagahara H, Shibutani M, Iseki Y, Matsutani S, Hirakawa K, Ohira M. 26 Change in PMI During Neoadjuvant Therapy Is a Predictive Prognostic Marker in Rectal Cancer. Anticancer Res 2019; 39: 5157-5163 [PMID: 31519628 DOI: 10.21873/anticanres.13711]
- Levolger S, van Vledder MG, Alberda WJ, Verhoef C, de Bruin RWF, IJzermans JNM, Burger JW. 27 Muscle wasting and survival following pre-operative chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced rectal carcinoma. Clin Nutr 2018; 37: 1728-1735 [PMID: 28756039 DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2017.06.028]
- Park SE, Hwang IG, Choi CH, Kang H, Kim BG, Park BK, Cha SJ, Jang JS, Choi JH. Sarcopenia is 28 poor prognostic factor in older patients with locally advanced rectal cancer who received preoperative or postoperative chemoradiotherapy. Medicine (Baltimore) 2018; 97: e13363 [PMID: 30508928 DOI: 10.1097/MD.000000000013363]
- Takeda Y, Akiyoshi T, Matsueda K, Fukuoka H, Ogura A, Miki H, Hiyoshi Y, Nagasaki T, Konishi 29 T, Fujimoto Y, Fukunaga Y, Ueno M. Skeletal muscle loss is an independent negative prognostic factor in patients with advanced lower rectal cancer treated with neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy. PLoS One 2018; 13: e0195406 [PMID: 29630652 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0195406]
- Rosenberg IH. Summary Comments in: Epidemiologic and Methodologic problems in Determining 30 Nutritional Status of Older Patients. Am J Clin Nutr 1989; 50: 1231-1233 [DOI: 10.1093/ajcn/50.5.1231]
- 31 Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Baeyens JP, Bauer JM, Boirie Y, Cederholm T, Landi F, Martin FC, Michel JP, Rolland Y, Schneider SM, Topinková E, Vandewoude M, Zamboni M; European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. Sarcopenia: European consensus on definition and diagnosis: Report of the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People. Age Ageing 2010; 39: 412-423 [PMID: 20392703 DOI: 10.1093/ageing/afq034]
- 32 Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, Boirie Y, Bruyère O, Cederholm T, Cooper C, Landi F, Rolland Y, Sayer AA, Schneider SM, Sieber CC, Topinkova E, Vandewoude M, Visser M, Zamboni M; Writing Group for the European Working Group on Sarcopenia in Older People 2 (EWGSOP2), and the Extended Group for EWGSOP2. Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing 2019; 48: 16-31 [PMID: 30312372 DOI: 10.1093/ageing/afy169]
- 33 Albano D, Messina C, Vitale J, Sconfienza LM. Imaging of sarcopenia: old evidence and new insights. Eur Radiol 2020; 30: 2199-2208 [PMID: 31834509 DOI: 10.1007/s00330-019-06573-2]
- 34 Amini B, Boyle SP, Boutin RD, Lenchik L. Approaches to Assessment of Muscle Mass and Myosteatosis on Computed Tomography: A Systematic Review. J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci 2019; 74: 1671-1678 [PMID: 30726878 DOI: 10.1093/gerona/glz034]
- Ceniccola GD, Castro MG, Piovacari SMF, Horie LM, Corrêa FG, Barrere APN, Toledo DO. Current 35 technologies in body composition assessment: advantages and disadvantages. Nutrition 2019; 62: 25-31 [PMID: 30826596 DOI: 10.1016/j.nut.2018.11.028]
- Daly LE, Prado CM, Ryan AM. A window beneath the skin: how computed tomography assessment 36 of body composition can assist in the identification of hidden wasting conditions in oncology that profoundly impact outcomes. Proc Nutr Soc 2018; 77: 135-151 [PMID: 29745361 DOI: 10.1017/S0029665118000046
- Chen LK, Liu LK, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung TW, Bahyah KS, Chou MY, Chen LY, Hsu PS, 37 Krairit O, Lee JS, Lee WJ, Lee Y, Liang CK, Limpawattana P, Lin CS, Peng LN, Satake S, Suzuki T, Won CW, Wu CH, Wu SN, Zhang T, Zeng P, Akishita M, Arai H. Sarcopenia in Asia: consensus report of the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia. J Am Med Dir Assoc 2014; 15: 95-101 [PMID: 24461239 DOI: 10.1016/j.jamda.2013.11.025]



- Shachar SS, Williams GR, Muss HB, Nishijima TF. Prognostic value of sarcopenia in adults with 38 solid tumours: A meta-analysis and systematic review. Eur J Cancer 2016; 57: 58-67 [PMID: 26882087 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejca.2015.12.030]
- 39 Xiao J, Caan BJ, Cespedes Feliciano EM, Meyerhardt JA, Kroenke CH, Baracos VE, Weltzien E, Kwan ML, Alexeeff SE, Castillo AL, Prado CM. The association of medical and demographic characteristics with sarcopenia and low muscle radiodensity in patients with nonmetastatic colorectal cancer. Am J Clin Nutr 2019; 109: 615-625 [PMID: 30850836 DOI: 10.1093/ajcn/nqy328]
- Dolin TG, Mikkelsen M, Jakobsen HL, Nordentoft T, Pedersen TS, Vinther A, Zerahn B, Vistisen 40 KK, Suetta C, Nielsen D, Johansen JS, Lund CM. Geriatric assessment and intervention in older vulnerable patients undergoing surgery for colorectal cancer: a protocol for a randomised controlled trial (GEPOC trial). BMC Geriatr 2021; 21: 88 [PMID: 33516195 DOI: 10.1186/s12877-021-02045-9]
- van Vledder MG, Levolger S, Ayez N, Verhoef C, Tran TC, Ijzermans JN. Body composition and 41 outcome in patients undergoing resection of colorectal liver metastases. Br J Surg 2012; 99: 550-557 [DOI: 10.1002/bjs.7823]
- Black D, Mackay C, Ramsay G, Hamoodi Z, Nanthakumaran S, Park KGM, Loudon MA, Richards 42 CH. Prognostic Value of Computed Tomography: Measured Parameters of Body Composition in Primary Operable Gastrointestinal Cancers. Ann Surg Oncol 2017; 24: 2241-2251 [PMID: 28324283 DOI: 10.1245/s10434-017-5829-z]
- Watt DG, Martin JC, Park JH, Horgan PG, McMillan DC. Neutrophil count is the most important 43 prognostic component of the differential white cell count in patients undergoing elective surgery for colorectal cancer. Am J Surg 2015; 210: 24-30 [PMID: 25842358 DOI: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2014.12.031]
- Carrara G, Pecorelli N, De Cobelli F, Cristel G, Damascelli A, Beretta L, Braga M. Preoperative sarcopenia determinants in pancreatic cancer patients. Clin Nutr 2017; 36: 1649-1653 [PMID: 27789123 DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2016.10.014]
- Zhang S, Tan S, Jiang Y, Xi Q, Meng Q, Zhuang Q, Han Y, Sui X, Wu G. Sarcopenia as a predictor 45 of poor surgical and oncologic outcomes after abdominal surgery for digestive tract cancer: A prospective cohort study. Clin Nutr 2019; 38: 2881-2888 [DOI: 10.1016/j.clnu.2018.12.025]
- 46 Vergara-Fernandez O, Trejo-Avila M, Salgado-Nesme N. Sarcopenia in patients with colorectal cancer: A comprehensive review. World J Clin Cases 2020; 8: 1188-1202 [PMID: 32337193 DOI: 10.12998/wicc.v8.i7.1188]
- Trejo-Avila M, Bozada-Gutiérrez K, Valenzuela-Salazar C, Herrera-Esquivel J, Moreno-Portillo M. 47 Sarcopenia predicts worse postoperative outcomes and decreased survival rates in patients with colorectal cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Colorectal Dis 2021; 36: 1077-1096 [PMID: 33481108 DOI: 10.1007/s00384-021-03839-4]
- Miyamoto Y, Baba Y, Sakamoto Y, Ohuchi M, Tokunaga R, Kurashige J, Hiyoshi Y, Iwagami S, 48 Yoshida N, Watanabe M, Baba H. Negative Impact of Skeletal Muscle Loss after Systemic Chemotherapy in Patients with Unresectable Colorectal Cancer. PLoS One 2015; 10: e0129742 [PMID: 26069972 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0129742]
- Blauwhoff-Buskermolen S, Versteeg KS, de van der Schueren MA, den Braver NR, Berkhof J, 49 Langius JA, Verheul HM. Loss of Muscle Mass During Chemotherapy Is Predictive for Poor Survival of Patients With Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. J Clin Oncol 2016; 34: 1339-1344 [PMID: 26903572 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2015.63.6043]
- Stene GB, Helbostad JL, Amundsen T, Sørhaug S, Hjelde H, Kaasa S, Grønberg BH. Changes in 50 skeletal muscle mass during palliative chemotherapy in patients with advanced lung cancer. Acta Oncol 2015; 54: 340-348 [PMID: 25225010 DOI: 10.3109/0284186X.2014.953259]
- 51 Yip C, Goh V, Davies A, Gossage J, Mitchell-Hay R, Hynes O, Maisey N, Ross P, Gaya A, Landau DB, Cook GJ, Griffin N, Mason R. Assessment of sarcopenia and changes in body composition after neoadjuvant chemotherapy and associations with clinical outcomes in oesophageal cancer. Eur Radiol 2014; 24: 998-1005 [PMID: 24535076 DOI: 10.1007/s00330-014-3110-4]
- 52 Heus C, Cakir H, Lak A, Doodeman HJ, Houdijk AP. Visceral obesity, muscle mass and outcome in rectal cancer surgery after neo-adjuvant chemo-radiation. Int J Surg 2016; 29: 159-164 [PMID: 27063857 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2016.03.066]





Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc 7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA Telephone: +1-925-3991568 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com Help Desk: https://www.f6publishing.com/helpdesk https://www.wjgnet.com

