

REVIEWS IN BASIC AND CLINICAL GASTROENTEROLOGY

Wafik El-Diery and David Metz, Section Editors

Systemic Treatment of Colorectal Cancer

BRIAN M. WOLPIN^{*,‡} and ROBERT J. MAYER^{*,‡,§}

^{*}Department of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts; and the [‡]Department of Medical Oncology, [§]Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, Massachusetts

Colorectal cancer is the fourth most common noncutaneous malignancy in the United States and the second most frequent cause of cancer-related death. Over the past 12 years, significant progress has been made in the systemic treatment of this malignant condition. Six new chemotherapeutic agents have been introduced, increasing median overall survival for patients with metastatic colorectal cancer from less than 9 months with no treatment to approximately 24 months. For patients with stage III (lymph node positive) colon cancer, an overall survival benefit for fluorouracil-based chemotherapy has been firmly established, and recent data have shown further efficacy for the inclusion of oxaliplatin in such adjuvant treatment programs. For patients with stage II colon cancer, the use of adjuvant chemotherapy remains controversial, but may be appropriate in a subset of individuals at higher risk for disease recurrence. Ongoing randomized clinical trials are evaluating how best to combine currently available therapies, while smaller studies are evaluating new agents, with the goal of continued progress in prolonging life among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer and increasing cure rates among those with resectable disease.

Colorectal cancer is the fourth most common noncutaneous malignancy in the United States and the second most frequent cause of cancer-related death. In 2008, an estimated 148,810 cases of colorectal cancer will be diagnosed and 49,960 people will die from this disease.¹ Significant progress in the treatment of colorectal cancer has been achieved over the past 12 years, with the approval of 6 new therapeutic agents in the United States (Table 1). These compounds have greatly improved the outlook for patients diagnosed with resectable and metastatic disease. The current review focuses on advances in the systemic therapy of colorectal cancer.

Staging and Prognosis

Pathologic stage represents the most important prognostic factor for patients with colorectal cancer. The

tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) system, as defined by the American Joint Committee on Cancer, is the most commonly used staging system and is based on depth of invasion of the bowel wall, extent of regional lymph node involvement, and presence of distant sites of disease (Table 2).²⁻⁴ The depth of tumor invasion defines the T stage and increases from T1 (invasion of the submucosa) to T4 (invasion into the serosa or adjacent structures). As the depth of tumor invasion increases, the risk for nodal and distant spread also grows. Pathologic review of surrounding lymph nodes defines the 3 N categories: N0 (no lymph nodes involved), N1 (1-3 lymph nodes involved), and N2 (>3 lymph nodes involved). Current guidelines recommend the identification of 12 or more lymph nodes in the resected specimen^{2,5} because the examination of fewer regional lymph nodes has been linked with poorer outcome in patients with node-negative and node-positive disease.⁶⁻¹⁰ The examination of fewer lymph nodes may reflect a less complete surgical procedure or an inadequate inspection of the pathologic specimen, mistakenly leading to understaging of the tumor and the subsequent omission of beneficial adjuvant therapy.

In patients with resectable colorectal cancer, several other pathologic and clinical features have been identified that are associated with an increased risk for tumor recurrence. These include poorly differentiated histology, lymphovascular invasion, perineural invasion, T4 tumor penetration, bowel perforation, clinical bowel obstruction, and an increased preoperative plasma level of carcinoembryonic antigen.¹¹⁻¹⁵ In contrast, hospitals and surgeons with higher patient volume have been associated with improved outcomes for resectable colorectal cancer.¹⁶⁻¹⁸

Abbreviations used in this paper: ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group; EGFR, epidermal growth factor receptor; FOLFIRI, infusional fluorouracil, leucovorin, and irinotecan; FOLFOX, infusional fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin; IFL, irinotecan, bolus fluorouracil, and leucovorin.

© 2008 by the AGA Institute
0016-5085/08/\$34.00
doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2008.02.098

Table 1. New Chemotherapeutic Agents in the Systemic Treatment of Colon Cancer

Drug	Current indications ^a			
	Metastatic disease	FDA-approval date	Adjuvant therapy	FDA-approval date
Irinotecan (Camptosar)	Yes	June 1996	No	—
Capecitabine (Xeloda)	Yes	April 2001	Yes	June 2005
Oxaliplatin (Eloxatin)	Yes	August 2002	Yes	November 2004
Cetuximab (Erbix) ^b	Yes	February 2004	No	—
Bevacizumab (Avastin)	Yes	February 2004	No	—
Panitumumab (Vectibix) ^b	Yes	September 2006	No	—

^aUS Food and Drug Administration (FDA) data accessed at www.accessdata.fda.gov.

^bApproved for use in patients with tumors that express the EGFR.

Microsatellite instability and loss of heterozygosity at chromosome 18q are the 2 best-defined molecular prognostic markers.¹⁹ Microsatellite instability results from mutations or promoter hypermethylation of DNA mismatch repair genes leading to errors in DNA replication and changes in short, repeated sequences of DNA. It is present in the vast majority of tumors from patients with hereditary nonpolyposis colon cancer, but also is found in 15% to 20% of patients with sporadic colon cancer.^{20,21} Patients with tumors possessing a high degree of microsatellite instability have a more favorable prognosis than those patients whose tumors are microsatellite stable.^{20,22} Loss of heterozygosity at chromosome 18q has been reported in approximately 50% of colon cancers and has been associated with a worse prognosis.^{23,24} Although these factors provide prognostic information on the risk of tumor recurrence after primary resection, they have not been prospectively validated as predictive markers for altered outcome with administration of specific chemotherapeutic regimens.

The rectum is located within the pelvis and extends from the transitional mucosa of the anal dentate line to the sigmoid colon, which measures between 10 and 15 cm from the anal verge by rigid sigmoidoscopy. The bony constraints of the pelvis limit surgical access to the rectum, leading to a lower likelihood of achieving widely negative margins and a higher risk of local recurrence. Because of the increased risk of local recurrence, the local management of rectal cancer varies somewhat from that of colon cancer. Surgical resection of rectal cancer with sharp dissection of the mesorectum en bloc with the rectum, as part of a total mesorectal excision, has resulted in a lower likelihood of local recurrence.^{25,26} The mesorectum is the rectal mesentery that contains the rectum's vascular supply and lymphatic drainage and is the initial site of spread for rectal cancer. In addition, radiotherapy administered preoperatively or postoperatively has been associated with a lower risk of local recurrence when compared with surgery alone, even when a total mesorectal excision has been performed.^{26,27}

Spread of tumor beyond the colorectum and regional lymph nodes defines the M stage of the American Joint

Committee on Cancer classification system, with M1 indicating the presence of tumor metastases to distant sites. Approximately 20% of patients present with metastatic disease and 30% to 40% of patients with localized disease ultimately develop metastases. The liver reflects the most common initial site of disease spread, but metastases to other organs during the course of the disease are common, including to the lungs, peritoneum, and intra-abdominal lymph nodes. Patients with a small number of isolated, organ-confined metastases may be cured of their disease by surgical resection²⁸; decisions regarding metastasectomy should be made by a medical oncologist working in close conjunction with an experi-

Table 2. TNM Staging System for Colorectal Cancer

Primary tumor (T)		
T _x	Primary tumor cannot be assessed	
T _{is}	Carcinoma in situ	
T ₁	Tumor invades submucosa	
T ₂	Tumor invades muscularis propria	
T ₃	Tumor invades through the muscularis propria into the subserosa	
T ₄	Tumor directly invades other organs or structures, or perforates visceral peritoneum	
Regional lymph nodes (N)		
N _x	Regional lymph nodes cannot be assessed	
N ₀	No regional lymph node metastases	
N ₁	Metastases in 1–3 regional lymph nodes	
N ₂	Metastases in ≥4 regional lymph nodes	
Distant metastases (M)		
M _x	Presence or absence of distant metastases cannot be determined	
M ₀	No distant metastases detected	
M ₁	Distant metastases detected	
Stage grouping and 5-year survival		
Stage	TNM classification	5-year survival
I	T ₁₋₂ , N ₀ , M ₀	>90%
IIA	T ₃ , N ₀ , M ₀	80%–85%
IIB	T ₄ , N ₀ , M ₀	70%–80%
IIIA	T ₁₋₂ , N ₁ , M ₀	65%–80%
IIIB	T ₃₋₄ , N ₁ , M ₀	50%–65%
IIIC	T ₁₋₄ , N ₂ , M ₀	25%–50%
IV	T ₁₋₄ , N ₀₋₂ , M ₁	5%–8%

NOTE. Data from Greene et al,³⁻⁵ O'Connell et al,³⁰ and Meyerhardt and Mayer.³¹

enced surgeon. Most patients with metastatic disease are candidates for systemic chemotherapy to palliate symptoms and prolong life. As the American Joint Committee on Cancer stage increases from stage I to stage IV, the 5-year overall survival rates decline dramatically: stage I, greater than 90%; stage II, 70%–85%; stage III, 25%–80%; and stage IV, less than 10% (Table 2).^{2,29,30}

Fluoropyrimidines

Intravenous Fluorouracil

Fluorouracil remains the cornerstone of systemic treatment for colorectal cancer. It is a fluorinated pyrimidine that acts primarily through inhibition of thymidylate synthetase, the rate-limiting enzyme in pyrimidine nucleotide synthesis³¹ and is commonly administered with leucovorin, a reduced folate that is thought to stabilize fluorouracil's interaction with this enzyme.^{32–35} A meta-analysis of 3300 patients from 19 randomized trials found that the likelihood of a greater than 50% tumor shrinkage by bidimensional product measurement doubles when fluorouracil is administered with leucovorin in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, with a modest but statistically significant improvement in overall survival when compared with fluorouracil alone.³⁶ Among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer receiving fluorouracil and leucovorin, approximately 20% will have a reduction in tumor size by 50% or more, and median survival is increased from approximately 6 months to about 12 months.^{36,37}

Fluorouracil can be administered by a variety of different schedules, with differing toxicity profiles. Neutropenia and stomatitis are the most frequent side effects when bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin are administered daily for 5 days every 4 to 5 weeks (the Mayo Clinic regimen). Higher rates of diarrhea are noted when bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin are administered weekly for 6 of 8 weeks (the Roswell Park regimen). Schedules that administer fluorouracil as a continuous infusion are associated with less hematologic and gastrointestinal toxicity, but have a greater incidence of hand-foot syndrome, a tender, erythematous rash involving the palms and soles.

Although treatment programs that involve infusional fluorouracil were initially thought to be less convenient and more expensive than bolus regimens, little difference has been noted in quality of life or cost between these 2 types of regimens.^{38–40} In addition, a meta-analysis of 6 randomized trials has shown a modest improvement in response rate and median overall survival among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer who received infusional fluorouracil when compared with patients who received a more rapid, bolus approach.³⁷

Oral Fluoropyrimidines

Initial attempts to administer fluoropyrimidines orally were unsuccessful. A randomized comparison of

oral vs intravenous fluorouracil in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer favored the intravenous route in terms of tumor response rate and mean duration of tumor response.⁴¹ These differences in response were thought to result from erratic intestinal absorption of fluorouracil, owing to differing mucosal concentrations of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase, a major catabolic enzyme of the drug. Two strategies have been used to circumvent this problem: the administration of an absorbable fluorouracil prodrug that is not catabolized by dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase⁴² and the co-administration of an inhibitor of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase with oral fluorouracil.⁴³

Capecitabine (Xeloda; Roche, Nutley, NJ) is an oral prodrug of fluorouracil that is absorbed intact through the gastrointestinal mucosa and undergoes a 3-step enzymatic conversion to fluorouracil.⁴² The side-effect profile of this drug is similar to that seen with continuous infusion fluorouracil, with the hand-foot syndrome being most prominent. Studies have shown capecitabine to be equivalent therapeutically to bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin (Mayo Clinic schedule) as initial therapy in metastatic colorectal cancer, with no significant differences in median time to tumor progression or median overall survival.^{44,45}

Tegafur uracil (Orzel; Bristol-Myers Squibb, New York, NY) circumvents the erratic intestinal absorption of fluorouracil by the co-administration of an oral fluoropyrimidine (tegafur) with an inhibitor of dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase (uracil), thereby allowing for a more uniform absorption and bioavailability of tegafur.⁴⁶ In 2 randomized studies of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, treatment with tegafur uracil and oral leucovorin resulted in similar rates of response and median survival as parental fluorouracil and leucovorin.^{47,48} Although available in Europe and Asia, tegafur uracil is not available in the United States.

Although capecitabine, at the recommended dose of 1250 mg/m² twice daily, appears therapeutically similar to monthly bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin with a somewhat less severe toxicity profile, it is uncertain whether the differences in toxicity profile would remain if capecitabine were compared with a more tolerable schedule of parenteral fluorouracil (ie, Roswell Park or infusional schedule). In addition, results from recent studies of capecitabine administered with other intravenous chemotherapies, such as oxaliplatin and irinotecan, call into question the more favorable convenience and cost-effectiveness profile that have been reported with single-agent capecitabine.^{49–51}

Adjuvant Therapy With Fluoropyrimidines for Stage III Colon Cancer

Fluorouracil was thought for many years to be ineffective as adjuvant treatment for colon cancer^{52–55}; a meta-analysis of randomized trials published before 1987

showed only a small, statistically insignificant benefit for such treatment.⁵⁶ In retrospect, these randomized trials suffered from heterogeneous patient populations, inadequate sample size, and poor compliance with therapy. Two subsequent approaches to adjuvant therapy for colon cancer revived interest in fluorouracil.

In an attempt to reduce the incidence of subsequent liver metastases, several clinical trials evaluated the administration of fluorouracil into the portal circulation during the immediate postoperative period.⁵⁷⁻⁶² Although these studies failed to reduce tumor spread to the liver, a meta-analysis of 10 such trials did show a modest overall survival benefit, supporting the value of a short exposure to adjuvant fluorouracil when compliantly administered.⁶³

In addition, the merits of adjuvant treatment with fluorouracil were reassessed when levamisole, an antihelminthic, was examined as a putative immunomodulating agent.⁶⁴⁻⁶⁶ Because levamisole eventually was shown to be inactive, these studies actually represented a reassessment of the adjuvant administration of fluorouracil. A large trial of 1296 patients conducted by the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) showed that adjuvant fluorouracil (and levamisole) reduced the risk of recurrence by 41% and the risk of death by 33% compared with surgery alone in patients with stage III disease.⁶⁷ After a median follow-up period of 6.5 years, overall survival was increased from 47% to 60% by the addition of postoperative fluorouracil (and levamisole).⁶⁸

Because the antitumor activity of fluorouracil was enhanced in the metastatic setting when administered with leucovorin,³⁶ the combination of fluorouracil and leucovorin was evaluated in the adjuvant setting, where it was found to improve disease-free and overall survival.⁶⁹⁻⁷² A pooled analysis of 7 randomized trials of postoperative fluorouracil-based therapy vs surgery alone showed an increase in 5-year disease-free survival from 42% to 58% and a 5-year overall survival from 51% to 61% in patients with stage III disease.⁷³ Subsequent studies showed that adjuvant fluorouracil and leucovorin administered for 6 months was equivalent to fluorouracil and levamisole administered for 12 months, and that the addition of levamisole to fluorouracil and leucovorin did not provide added benefit.^{72,74,75} Furthermore, none of the various administration schedules of fluorouracil was found to be superior to any other in the adjuvant setting,⁷⁶⁻⁷⁹ although different side-effect profiles were noted, similar to those observed in patients treated for metastatic disease.

Oral fluoropyrimidines also have been evaluated in the adjuvant therapy of colon cancer. In the Xeloda in Adjuvant Colon Cancer Trial, capecitabine (1250 mg/m² administered twice daily on days 1-14 every 3 weeks) was shown to be equally effective when compared with the Mayo Clinic regimen of bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin in a cohort of patients with stage III colon cancer.⁸⁰

A large randomized trial comparing tegafur uracil and leucovorin with intravenous fluorouracil and leucovorin as adjuvant therapy also showed similar rates of disease-free survival and overall survival between the 2 treatment arms.⁸¹

Although nearly 75% of patients diagnosed with colon cancer are 65 years of age or older,⁸² such patients have been underrepresented in clinical trials and are less likely to receive adjuvant therapy.^{83,84} Pooled data analyses and population-based studies have repeatedly shown a consistent and equivalent survival benefit for adjuvant therapy in all age groups,⁸⁵⁻⁸⁹ without an increase in treatment-related toxicity among older patients.^{86,89-92} When disease outcomes have been analyzed by ethnicity, higher colorectal cancer-specific mortality has been noted in African American than in Caucasian patients.⁹³ Differences in comorbid disease, sociodemographic factors, stage at presentation, tumor biology, and receipt of treatment have been investigated as underlying reasons for the discrepancy in outcomes.^{87,94-97} Subset analyses of randomized treatment trials have shown similar disease-free survival among African American and Caucasian patients,^{98,99} suggesting that African Americans derive a similar degree of benefit from appropriately administered therapy as do Caucasians.

Adjuvant Therapy With Fluoropyrimidines for Stage II Colon Cancer

The benefit of adjuvant fluorouracil-based therapy in patients with stage II colon cancer is less clear. Subset analyses of trials that have included patients with stage II and III disease have repeatedly failed to show a statistically significant survival benefit for stage II patients receiving adjuvant therapy. A pooled analysis of 7 studies showed a 5-year overall survival of 81% in patients who received fluorouracil-based adjuvant therapy and 80% in patients who underwent surgery alone ($P = .11$).⁷³

Two studies have been cited in favor of the use of adjuvant therapy in patients with stage II disease. A retrospective subset analysis of 4 consecutive National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project trials noted a similar proportional survival benefit for patients with stage II and stage III disease who received fluorouracil-based therapy,¹⁰⁰ although the statistical approach taken in this analysis has been questioned.¹⁰¹ The Quick and Simple and Reliable study, a complex comparison of 4 different fluorouracil-based regimens with observation alone, showed a statistically significant 3.7% improvement in overall survival (80.8% vs 77.1%) among patients with predominantly stage II colon and rectal cancer who received adjuvant treatment.¹⁰² Interpretation of these data is clouded by the lack of central pathologic review to verify tumor stage; a heterogeneous patient population with inclusion of patients with both colon (71%) and rectal (29%) cancers, patients with stage III disease (8%), and patients who also received radiotherapy or portal

vein infusion; multiple different chemotherapy regimens in the treatment arm; and a somewhat lower than expected survival in the 2 arms, when compared with other recently published adjuvant studies.¹⁰³

After systematically reviewing the available literature, the Cancer Care Ontario Program in Evidence-Based Care,¹⁰⁴ an expert panel convened by the American Society of Clinical Oncology,¹⁰⁵ and the National Comprehensive Cancer Network¹⁰⁶ independently recommended against the routine administration of adjuvant therapy in patients with stage II disease. In addition, the American Society of Clinical Oncology panel determined that a sample size of 9680 patients per group would be required to detect a 2% survival difference between treatment and control arms, with 90% power and a significance level of 0.05.¹⁰⁵

It has been proposed that adjuvant chemotherapy may provide benefit to those patients with stage II disease and adverse clinical characteristics, such as T4 tumor penetration, bowel perforation, or clinical bowel obstruction.¹⁰⁵ Although this hypothesis has not yet been validated in a prospective, randomized clinical trial, a retrospective subset analysis of patients with stage II disease enrolled in the previously noted ECOG study that examined the adjuvant value of fluorouracil and levamisole suggested a survival benefit for postoperative therapy in these high-risk patient subgroups.¹⁴ Although other high-risk features, such as inadequate lymph node sampling, lymphovascular or perineural invasion, poorly differentiated histology, microsatellite stability, and loss of heterozygosity at chromosome 18q also are known to carry a higher risk of recurrence,¹¹ the potential benefit of chemotherapy has not been examined prospectively in patients with these risk factors.

Adjuvant Therapy With Fluoropyrimidines for Stage II and Stage III Rectal Cancer

Several clinical trials performed in the 1980s showed that the addition of systemic chemotherapy to postoperative radiation reduced the risk of local recurrence and improved overall survival after the resection of stage II and stage III rectal cancers.¹⁰⁷⁻¹⁰⁹ In a subsequent study, the administration of infusional fluorouracil with radiotherapy was noted to be more effective than similar radiotherapy with concurrent bolus fluorouracil.¹¹⁰ More recently, the German Rectal Cancer Study Group showed that preoperative combined chemoradiation therapy improved local control, decreased toxicity, and reduced the need for a colostomy when compared with postoperative chemotherapy and radiation among patients assessed by preoperative endoscopic ultrasound and thought to have stage II and stage III rectal cancer.¹¹¹ No differences in disease-free or overall survival were observed between the preoperative and postoperative treatment arms. Therefore, the standard of care for stages II and III rectal cancer generally is considered to be preoperative combined mo-

dality therapy with radiation and chemotherapy, followed by surgical resection with total mesorectal excision. Perhaps to parallel the 6 months of adjuvant therapy used among patients with resected colon cancer, an additional 4 months of postoperative fluorouracil-based chemotherapy typically is administered to patients with stage II or III rectal cancer.

Irinotecan

Irinotecan (Camptosar; Pfizer, New York, NY) is a semisynthetic derivative of the natural alkaloid camptothecin that is converted by carboxylesterases to SN-38.¹¹² By inhibiting topoisomerase I, an enzyme that catalyzes breakage and rejoining of DNA strands during DNA replication, SN-38 causes DNA fragmentation and programmed cell death.¹¹³ Metabolism of SN-38 occurs predominantly in the liver, where it is inactivated by glucuronidation and excreted through the biliary system. A polymorphism in the uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase isoform 1A1 (UGTA1A) gene, which is responsible for glucuronidation of SN-38, has been identified and leads to decreased inactivation of SN-38 with resultant increases in treatment-related toxicity.¹¹⁴ A diagnostic test for this genetic polymorphism is available, although not widely used in the clinic. Increased serum bilirubin levels also have been associated with excess irinotecan-mediated toxicity and this drug is not typically administered to patients with hyperbilirubinemia.¹¹⁵ The most commonly observed toxicities associated with irinotecan are diarrhea, myelosuppression, and alopecia.^{116,117}

Randomized trials have shown improvements in progression-free and overall survival when irinotecan has been added to either infusional (FOLFIRI)¹¹⁸ or bolus (IFL)¹¹⁹ fluorouracil and leucovorin in the initial treatment of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. More recently, a randomized trial comparing FOLFIRI, IFL, and irinotecan plus capecitabine showed that those patients receiving FOLFIRI experienced longer progression-free and overall survival times, supporting the superiority of the infusional approach.¹²⁰ In addition, irinotecan plus capecitabine was associated with approximately twice the rates of serious vomiting, diarrhea, and dehydration when compared with the 2 regimens that included intravenous fluorouracil.

Based on the encouraging results with irinotecan in patients with metastatic disease, it was anticipated that irinotecan would be an effective addition to adjuvant treatment programs for colon cancer. Three randomized trials of adjuvant irinotecan with either bolus or infusional fluorouracil and leucovorin have examined this premise.¹²¹⁻¹²³ Surprisingly, each of these studies showed increased toxicity without a meaningful improvement in outcome among patients receiving irinotecan. This unanticipated failure of irinotecan to prove beneficial in the adjuvant setting has not been well explained, but under-

scores the importance of conducting rigorous, randomized clinical trials before making changes in clinical practice.¹²⁴

Oxaliplatin

Oxaliplatin (Eloxatin; Sanofi-Aventis, Bridgewater, NJ) is a diaminocyclohexane platinum compound that forms DNA adducts, leading to impaired DNA replication and cellular apoptosis.^{125,126} In patients with metastatic colon cancer, single-agent oxaliplatin has limited efficacy, but clinical benefit has been observed when it is administered with fluorouracil and leucovorin,¹²⁷⁻¹³² possibly as a result of oxaliplatin-induced down-regulation of thymidylate synthetase.¹³³ A cumulative sensory neuropathy, characterized by paresthesias of the hands and feet, is the primary toxicity associated with oxaliplatin.

In 2 randomized clinical trials in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, the addition of oxaliplatin to infusional fluorouracil and leucovorin (FOLFOX) increased tumor response rates and disease-free survival, with a trend towards an improvement in overall survival.^{129,130} Further studies have compared the efficacy of oxaliplatin-containing and irinotecan-containing combinations. In one such trial of patients with newly diagnosed metastatic disease, FOLFOX was associated with prolongations of progression-free and overall survival when compared with IFL or a combination of irinotecan and oxaliplatin.¹³⁴ Because this outcome may have been influenced by the superiority of infusional fluorouracil (as included in FOLFOX) over bolus fluorouracil (as included in IFL),^{37,120} 2 further studies have compared oxaliplatin and irinotecan in combination with an infusional fluorouracil schedule.^{132,135} In both of these studies, tumor response rate, progression-free survival, and overall survival were statistically indistinguishable among patients receiving FOLFOX or FOLFIRI as first-line therapy. Importantly, patients receiving all 3 of these drugs—fluorouracil, oxaliplatin, and irinotecan—were noted to have a median overall survival of approximately 20 months.^{132,135,136} Recent randomized studies have examined whether capecitabine can replace fluorouracil and leucovorin in combination with oxaliplatin as initial therapy among patients with metastatic disease.¹³⁷⁻¹³⁹ These trials have shown the 2 combinations to have similar therapeutic benefit and toxicity, but the capecitabine-containing regimens to be more expensive because of the high cost of capecitabine.⁵¹

In contrast to the experience with irinotecan, 2 randomized trials have shown an improvement in disease-free survival when oxaliplatin has been added to fluorouracil and leucovorin in the adjuvant setting.^{140,141} Both the Multicenter International Study of Oxaliplatin/Fluorouracil/Leucovorin in the Adjuvant Treatment of Colon Cancer study and the C-07 study of the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project have shown a 20% reduction in the rate of colon cancer

recurrence with the addition of oxaliplatin. With 6 years of follow-up evaluation, the Multicenter International Study of Oxaliplatin/Fluorouracil/Leucovorin in the Adjuvant Treatment of Colon Cancer study also has shown a statistically significant 4.4% improvement in overall survival for those patients with stage III disease (73.0% vs 68.6%).¹⁰³ No such survival benefit was observed in patients with stage II colon cancer, for whom the likelihood of survival after 6 years was 87% in both treatment arms. However, a nonsignificant 26% reduction in disease recurrence with the addition of oxaliplatin was observed in patients with high-risk stage II disease, defined as the presence of T4 tumor stage, bowel obstruction, perforation, poorly differentiated histology, venous invasion, or examination of less than 10 lymph nodes in the resected specimen. The addition of oxaliplatin to fluorouracil and leucovorin in these trials did result in increased rates of neutropenia and neurotoxicity. Of note, approximately 10% of patients who received oxaliplatin continued to have symptomatic neuropathy 2 years after completing treatment on these clinical trials.^{103,142}

Angiogenesis Inhibitors

A more recently recognized strategy to control malignant proliferation and spread involves the inhibition of neoangiogenesis, or new blood vessel formation.¹⁴³ Currently, the most successful anti-angiogenic strategy has focused on inhibiting the vascular endothelial growth factor, a soluble protein that stimulates blood vessel proliferation.¹⁴⁴ Bevacizumab (Avastin; Genetech, South San Francisco, CA) is a humanized monoclonal antibody directed against vascular endothelial growth factor that has been examined in combination with chemotherapy in patients with advanced colorectal cancer (Table 3). In these patients, bevacizumab has been relatively well tolerated, with reversible hypertension and proteinuria representing 2 of the most common toxicities. Nonetheless, rare, yet serious side effects have been observed with bevacizumab, including a 1%–2% risk of bowel perforation, a 3% risk of serious bleeding events, a 2%–3% risk of arterial embolic events, and a less than 1% risk of reversible posterior leukoencephalopathy syndrome.¹⁴⁵⁻¹⁴⁷

Initial studies of bevacizumab showed improvements in tumor response rate and progression-free survival among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer when bevacizumab was added to fluorouracil and leucovorin.^{148,149} In subsequent randomized trials, bevacizumab was shown to prolong median overall survival (20.3 vs 15.6 mo) in combination with IFL¹⁴⁵ as initial treatment, and FOLFOX¹⁵⁰ after the failure of a prior irinotecan-containing regimen (12.9 vs 10.8 mo). Further studies have confirmed improved response rates and progression-free survival times with the addition of bevacizumab to FOLFIRI

Table 3. Trials of Targeted Therapies in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer

Study	Study type	No. of patients	Response rate, %	Median DFS, mo	Median OS, mo
Cetuximab					
Cunningham et al ¹⁶⁰	Phase II ^a				
Cetuximab		111	11	1.5	6.9
Cetuximab + irinotecan		218	23	4.1	8.6
NCIC CO.17¹⁵⁹					
Best supportive care	Phase III ^b	285	0	—	4.6
Cetuximab		287	8	—	6.1
CRYSTAL¹⁶⁷					
FOLFIRI	Phase III ^c	609	39	8.0	—
FOLFIRI + cetuximab		608	47	8.9	—
Panitumumab					
Van Cutsem et al ¹⁶⁸	Phase III ^b				
Best supportive care		232	0	1.8	—
Panitumumab		231	10	2.0	—
Bevacizumab					
Hurwitz et al ¹⁴⁵	Phase III ^c				
IFL		402	35	6.2	15.6
IFL + bevacizumab		411	45	10.6	20.3
ECOG E3200¹⁵⁰					
FOLFOX	Phase III ^d	291	9	4.7	10.8
FOLFOX + bevacizumab		286	23	7.3	12.9
Bevacizumab + anti-EGFR					
BOND-2¹²³					
Cetuximab + bevacizumab	Phase II ^a	40	20	4.9	11.4
Irinotecan + cetuximab + bevacizumab		43	37	7.3	14.5
Panitumumab Advanced Colorectal Cancer Evaluation¹⁷⁷					
FOLFOX + bevacizumab	Phase III ^c	410	46	11.0	20.6
FOLFOX + bevacizumab + panitumumab		413	45	9.5	19.3

DFS, disease-free survival; OS, overall survival.

^aSecond- or third-line therapy after progressive disease on an irinotecan-containing regimen.

^bAfter progressive disease on a fluoropyrimidine, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin.

^cFirst-line therapy in previously untreated patients.

^dSecond-line therapy after progressive disease on an irinotecan-containing regimen.

or FOLFOX in patients with untreated, metastatic colorectal cancer.^{120,151}

Given the efficacy of bevacizumab in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, the role of bevacizumab in adjuvant therapy currently is being examined in several randomized trials (Table 4). In the United States, the

C-08 study of the National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project is randomizing patients with stage II or III colon cancer to FOLFOX with or without bevacizumab, and a similar study of oxaliplatin-containing regimens with or without bevacizumab is ongoing in Europe. In addition, investigators of the ECOG have incorporated

Table 4. Ongoing Trials of Targeted Therapies in Resected Colon Cancer

Clinical trial	American Joint Committee on Cancer stage	Randomization
National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project C-08	II, III	FOLFOX ± bevacizumab
AVANT	II, III	FOLFOX vs FOLFOX + bevacizumab vs capecitabine + oxaliplatin + bevacizumab
ECOG E5202	II	Molecular high risk (MSS or MSI-L and 18q LOH): FOLFOX ± bevacizumab Standard risk: observation
North Central Cancer Treatment Group N0147	III	FOLFOX ± cetuximab
PETACC-8	III	FOLFOX ± cetuximab

MSS, microsatellite stable; MSI-L, microsatellite instability—low; 18q LOH, loss of heterozygosity at chromosome 18q.

molecular markers into a large, randomized study of FOLFOX vs FOLFOX and bevacizumab in patients with high-risk stage II colon cancer. Until the results of these trials are available, it is premature to recommend the incorporation of bevacizumab into adjuvant treatment programs for colon cancer.

Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor Inhibitors

The epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) is a transmembrane glycoprotein that interacts with signaling pathways affecting cellular growth, proliferation, and programmed cell death,¹⁵² and is expressed in malignancies of multiple tissues, including those of the colon, lung, breast, and head and neck.¹⁵³ In colorectal cancer, EGFR expression on the tumor cell surface has been shown in up to 80% of tumors^{154,155} and tumors that express EGFR carry a poorer prognosis.¹⁵⁶ Antibodies directed against the extracellular domain of EGFR and small molecular inhibitors of the intracellular tyrosine kinase domain have been developed to inhibit the function of this transmembrane receptor. Thus far, only the anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies, cetuximab (Erbix; ImClone Systems, Brachburg, NJ) and panitumumab (Vectibix; Amgen, Thousand Oaks, CA), have definitively shown efficacy in colorectal cancer (Table 3).¹⁵⁷ Although small molecule inhibitors of the intracellular tyrosine kinase domain of EGFR, such as erlotinib (Tarceva; Genentech), are effective in other solid tumors, they appear to be inactive in patients with colorectal cancer.¹⁵⁸

In a study of patients whose disease had progressed on a fluoropyrimidine, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin, weekly cetuximab showed improvements in progression-free and overall survival (6.1 vs 4.6 mo) when compared with those treated with best supportive care alone.¹⁵⁹ Other studies of cetuximab in patients with irinotecan-refractory, metastatic colorectal cancer have confirmed tumor response rates of approximately 10% with cetuximab alone and 20% with cetuximab and irinotecan,¹⁶⁰⁻¹⁶² indicating an ability of cetuximab to overcome irinotecan resistance in tumor cells. The main side effects of treatment with cetuximab are acneiform rash, hypomagnesemia, and infusion reactions, with approximately 3% of patients experiencing serious hypersensitivity reactions to cetuximab infusion. The presence of an acneiform rash has been associated positively with an improved response to cetuximab, among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer.¹⁶³ Although initial studies mandated the immunohistochemical detection EGFR on the surface of tumor cells as a prerequisite for enrollment, the degree of surface EGFR expression has been found to correlate poorly with tumor response, and responses to cetuximab have been noted among patients without detectable EGFR by immunohistochemistry.^{164,165}

Two further studies have evaluated the addition of cetuximab to first-line regimens in patients with previ-

ously untreated metastatic colorectal cancer.^{166,167} Initial results from a trial conducted by the Cancer and Leukemia Group B (CALGB) have shown an improvement in tumor response rate (RR) with the addition of cetuximab to FOLFIRI or FOLFOX (RR, 52% vs 38%).¹⁶⁶ The CRYSTAL trial, a randomized evaluation of FOLFIRI with or without cetuximab, has shown improvements in tumor response rate (RR, 47% vs 39%) and progression-free survival (PFS) (median, 8.9 vs 8.0 mo) among those patients receiving cetuximab.¹⁶⁷ Although these results do support the efficacy of including cetuximab in first-line treatment programs, how these regimens compare with bevacizumab-containing regimens is currently unknown. Several ongoing studies, described later, have been designed to investigate this question.

The role of cetuximab in the adjuvant therapy of colon cancer has not yet been defined. The North Central Cancer Treatment Group and the European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer are each registering more than 2000 patients with resected stage III colon cancer and randomizing them to receive FOLFOX alone or FOLFOX with cetuximab (Table 4). Until the results of these trials become available, the inclusion of cetuximab in adjuvant treatment programs cannot be recommended outside of a clinical trial.

Panitumumab is a humanized monoclonal antibody to EGFR that has shown similar single-agent activity as cetuximab in metastatic colorectal cancer, but with a biweekly (rather than weekly) administration schedule.^{157,168} In an initial study, 9% of patients whose cancers had progressed after treatment with fluorouracil and either irinotecan or oxaliplatin experienced a tumor response to panitumumab.¹⁶⁹ In a randomized trial of 463 patients previously treated with a fluoropyrimidine, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin, single-agent panitumumab improved progression-free survival when compared with best supportive care (median PFS, 8.0 vs 7.3 wk),¹⁶⁸ similar to the previously described experience with cetuximab.¹⁵⁹ Two ongoing studies are evaluating the addition of panitumumab to FOLFOX and FOLFIRI in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. Panitumumab has not yet been tested in adjuvant treatment programs among patients with colon cancer, and cannot be recommended in this setting.

Because only a subset of patients' tumors treated with cetuximab or panitumumab will respond to this drug, the identification and characterization of molecular markers to predict tumor response is an area of active investigation. Two such tumor characteristics have emerged from initial studies: EGFR copy number as determined by fluorescence in situ hybridization and *K-ras* gene mutation status. Among patients treated with cetuximab or panitumumab, high EGFR gene copy number by fluorescence in situ hybridization has been associated with higher tumor response rates and prolongation of disease-free and overall survival.

Two further studies have evaluated the addition of cetuximab to first-line regimens in patients with previ-

Trends in median survival among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer

Reference	Treatment status	Median survival
Scheithauer <i>et al.</i> ¹⁸¹	Before any active chemotherapy	6 mo
Cochrane Database ¹⁸²	Fluoropyrimidine only	10-12 mo
Saltz <i>et al.</i> ¹¹⁹ and de Gramont <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁰	Fluoropyrimidine and one other active cytotoxic chemotherapeutic agent (irinotecan or oxaliplatin)	14-16 mo
Goldberg <i>et al.</i> ¹³⁴ and Fuchs <i>et al.</i> ¹²⁰ or Hurwitz <i>et al.</i> ¹⁴⁵	Fluoropyrimidine, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin (in combination or as sequential therapy) or Cytotoxic chemotherapy and targeted therapy	>20 mo

Adapted with permission from Meyerhardt and Mayer³¹

Figure 1. Trends in median survival among patients with metastatic colorectal cancer.^{119,120,130,134,145,181,182} Adapted with permission from Meyerhardt and Mayer.³⁰

al.^{170,171} In contrast, patients with tumors having mutations in *K-ras* appear to be relatively resistant to treatment with cetuximab¹⁷²⁻¹⁷⁴ or panitumumab,¹⁷⁵ with lower response rates and poorer survival. These and other molecular features may help define a subset of patients who will derive benefit from treatment with an inhibitor of EGFR.

Combined Targeted Therapy

Several ongoing studies are assessing the efficacy of combined treatment with monoclonal antibodies to vascular endothelial growth factor and EGFR in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer (Table 3). Initial data supporting this treatment approach arose from 2 studies in which patients received combinations of irinotecan, cetuximab, and bevacizumab.^{160,176} Those patients receiving both cetuximab and bevacizumab had improvements in tumor response rate and progression-free survival.

In the Panitumumab Advanced Colorectal Cancer Evaluation trial, patients with previously untreated, metastatic colorectal cancer received FOLFOX and bevacizumab with or without panitumumab.¹⁷⁷ Surprisingly, the first planned efficacy interim analysis showed an inferior outcome for those patients receiving panitumumab, with shorter survival times and increased side effects. Because patients receiving panitumumab experienced greater treatment-related toxicity, it remains uncertain whether the combination is therapeutically inferior or whether the toxic effects resulted in less exposure to active drugs. This question should be answered by an ongoing randomized trial coordinated by the National Cancer Institute (CALGB/SWOG 80405), in which patients with previously untreated, metastatic colorectal cancer are receiving FOLFOX or FOLFIRI with the addition of cetuximab; bevacizumab; or cetuximab and bevacizumab.

Summary and Future Directions

Currently available data in 2008 support the use of a fluoropyrimidine, irinotecan, oxaliplatin, bevacizumab, and either cetuximab or panitumumab, in the treatment of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. The optimal sequence of administration of these drugs remains under investigation, but patients who receive all of these available therapies can now expect a median overall survival of approximately 2 years (Figure 1). The success of chemotherapy in prolonging survival in the metastatic setting also is translating to improved cure rates among patients with stage III disease. The goal of ongoing adjuvant trials evaluating bevacizumab and cetuximab is to increase even further the improved rates of survival provided by fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin (Table 5).

Over the past 15 years, deaths from colorectal cancer in the United States have decreased by approximately

Table 5. Postoperative Treatment of Patients With Resected Stage II and Stage III Colon Cancer

Stage III disease	Randomized clinical trials support 6 months of postoperative fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin Capecitabine and intravenous bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin appear to have similar efficacy, if a fluoropyrimidine is to be used alone as postoperative therapy Current data do not support the use of irinotecan, cetuximab, or bevacizumab in postoperative treatment programs
Stage II disease	Randomized clinical trials have not shown a clear survival benefit to postoperative therapy in patients with standard risk stage II disease Although certain features can predict an increased risk for disease recurrence, the benefit of postoperative therapy in patients with high-risk stage II disease has not been validated prospectively in clinical trials

Table 6. Costs of Systemic Treatments for Colorectal Cancer

Regimen	Cost per 6 mo, \$ ^a
Bolus fluorouracil/leucovorin (Mayo Clinic schedule)	96
Infusional fluorouracil/leucovorin	352
Capecitabine	11,648
Irinotecan (every 3 weeks)	30,100
FOLFIRI	23,572
FOLFOX	29,989
Bevacizumab	23,897
Cetuximab	52,131
Panitumumab	44,720

NOTE. Adapted with permission from Meropol and Schulman.¹⁸⁰

^aOnly drug costs included. Costs based on average sales price for a 70-kg patient with a body-surface area of 1.7 m². Wholesale acquisition costs provided for panitumumab.

13%.^{1,178} This decline in mortality highlights the advances made in screening, prevention, and treatment for colorectal cancer, brought about by the collaboration of gastroenterologists, medical oncologists, pathologists, primary care physicians, and surgeons. Although this progress has occurred relatively rapidly, such cancer care and new chemotherapeutic agents, in particular, have not come without a significant cost to the health care system (Table 6).^{179,180} In the near future, physicians and society may be faced with difficult decisions regarding resource allocation and innovative cancer treatment, as we work to maintain our current trajectory of progress.¹⁸⁰

Supplementary Data

Note: To access the supplementary data accompanying this article, visit the online version of *Gastroenterology* at www.gastrojournal.org, and at doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2008.02.098.

References

- Jemal A, Siegel R, Ward E, et al. Cancer statistics, 2008. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2008;58:71–96.
- Greene F, Page DL, Fleming ID, et al, eds. *AJCC cancer staging handbook*. 6th ed. New York: Springer, 2002.
- Greene FL, Stewart AK, Norton HJ. A new TNM staging strategy for node-positive (stage III) colon cancer: an analysis of 50,042 patients. *Ann Surg* 2002;236:416–421.
- Greene FL, Stewart AK, Norton HJ. New tumor-node-metastasis staging strategy for node-positive (stage III) rectal cancer: an analysis. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:1778–1784.
- Compton CC, Greene FL. The staging of colorectal cancer: 2004 and beyond. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2004;54:295–308.
- Swanson RS, Compton CC, Stewart AK, et al. The prognosis of T3NO colon cancer is dependent on the number of lymph nodes examined. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2003;10:65–71.
- Le Voyer TE, Sigurdson ER, Hanlon AL, et al. Colon cancer survival is associated with increasing number of lymph nodes analyzed: a secondary survey of intergroup trial INT-0089. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:2912–2919.
- Berger AC, Sigurdson ER, LeVoyer T, et al. Colon cancer survival is associated with decreasing ratio of metastatic to examined lymph nodes. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:8706–8712.
- Stocchi L, Nelson H, Sargent DJ, et al. Impact of surgical and pathologic variables in rectal cancer: a United States community and cooperative group report. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:3895–3902.
- Tepper JE, O'Connell MJ, Niedzwiecki D, et al. Impact of number of nodes retrieved on outcome in patients with rectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:157–163.
- Compton C, Fenoglio-Preiser CM, Pettigrew N, et al. American Joint Committee on Cancer Prognostic Factors Consensus Conference: Colorectal Working Group. *Cancer* 2000;88:1739–1757.
- Wanebo HJ, Rao B, Pinsky CM, et al. Preoperative carcinoembryonic antigen level as a prognostic indicator in colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1978;299:448–451.
- Wolmark N, Fisher B, Wieand HS, et al. The prognostic significance of preoperative carcinoembryonic antigen levels in colorectal cancer. Results from NSABP (National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project) clinical trials. *Ann Surg* 1984;199:375–382.
- Moertel CG, Fleming TR, Macdonald JS, et al. Intergroup study of fluorouracil plus levamisole as adjuvant therapy for stage II/Dukes' B2 colon cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1995;13:2936–2943.
- Krasna MJ, Flancbaum L, Cody RP, et al. Vascular and neural invasion in colorectal carcinoma. Incidence and prognostic significance. *Cancer* 1988;61:1018–1023.
- Hodgson DC, Zhang W, Zaslavsky AM, et al. Relation of hospital volume to colostomy rates and survival for patients with rectal cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2003;95:708–716.
- Schrag D, Cramer LD, Bach PB, et al. Influence of hospital procedure volume on outcomes following surgery for colon cancer. *JAMA* 2000;284:3028–3035.
- Meyerhardt JA, Tepper JE, Niedzwiecki D, et al. Impact of hospital procedure volume on surgical operation and long-term outcomes in high-risk curatively resected rectal cancer: findings from the Intergroup 0114 Study. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:166–174.
- Lurje G, Zhang W, Lenz HJ. Molecular prognostic markers in locally advanced colon cancer. *Clin Colorectal Cancer* 2007;6:683–690.
- Gryfe R, Kim H, Hsieh ET, et al. Tumor microsatellite instability and clinical outcome in young patients with colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2000;342:69–77.
- Hampel H, Frankel WL, Martin E, et al. Screening for the Lynch syndrome (hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer). *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:1851–60.
- Watanabe T, Wu TT, Catalano PJ, et al. Molecular predictors of survival after adjuvant chemotherapy for colon cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2001;344:1196–1206.
- Popat S, Houlston RS. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the relationship between chromosome 18q genotype, DCC status and colorectal cancer prognosis. *Eur J Cancer* 2005;41:2060–2070.
- Locker GY, Hamilton S, Harris J, et al. ASCO 2006 update of recommendations for the use of tumor markers in gastrointestinal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:5313–5327.
- Heald RJ, Moran BJ, Ryall RD, et al. Rectal cancer: the Basingstoke experience of total mesorectal excision, 1978–1997. *Arch Surg* 1998;133:894–899.
- Kapiteijn E, Marijnen CA, Nagtegaal ID, et al. Preoperative radiotherapy combined with total mesorectal excision for resectable rectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:638–646.
- Colorectal Cancer Collaborative Group. Adjuvant radiotherapy for rectal cancer: a systematic overview of 8,507 patients from 22 randomised trials. *Lancet* 2001;358:1291–1304.
- Tomlinson JS, Jarnagin WR, DeMatteo RP, et al. Actual 10-year survival after resection of colorectal liver metastases defines cure. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4575–4580.

29. O'Connell JB, Maggard MA, Ko CY. Colon cancer survival rates with the new American Joint Committee on Cancer sixth edition staging. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2004;96:1420–1425.
30. Meyerhardt JA, Mayer RJ. Systemic therapy for colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352:476–487.
31. Sobrero A, Guglielmi A, Grossi F, et al. Mechanism of action of fluoropyrimidines: relevance to the new developments in colorectal cancer chemotherapy. *Semin Oncol* 2000;27:72–77.
32. Zhang ZG, Harstrick A, Rustum YM. Modulation of fluoropyrimidines: role of dose and schedule of leucovorin administration. *Semin Oncol* 1992;19:10–15.
33. de Gramont A, Bosset JF, Milan C, et al. Randomized trial comparing monthly low-dose leucovorin and fluorouracil bolus with bimonthly high-dose leucovorin and fluorouracil bolus plus continuous infusion for advanced colorectal cancer: a French intergroup study. *J Clin Oncol* 1997;15:808–815.
34. Petrelli N, Douglass HO Jr, Herrera L, et al. The modulation of fluorouracil with leucovorin in metastatic colorectal carcinoma: a prospective randomized phase III trial. *Gastrointestinal Tumor Study Group. J Clin Oncol* 1989;7:1419–1426.
35. Poon MA, O'Connell MJ, Moertel CG, et al. Biochemical modulation of fluorouracil: evidence of significant improvement of survival and quality of life in patients with advanced colorectal carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 1989;7:1407–1418.
36. Thirion P, Michiels S, Pignon JP, et al. Modulation of fluorouracil by leucovorin in patients with advanced colorectal cancer: an updated meta-analysis. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:3766–3775.
37. Efficacy of intravenous continuous infusion of fluorouracil compared with bolus administration in advanced colorectal cancer. Meta-analysis Group In Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1998;16:301–308.
38. Lokich JJ, Moore CL, Anderson NR. Comparison of costs for infusion versus bolus chemotherapy administration: analysis of five standard chemotherapy regimens in three common tumors—part one. Model projections for cost based on charges. *Cancer* 1996;78:294–299.
39. Lokich JJ, Moore CL, Anderson NR. Comparison of costs for infusion versus bolus chemotherapy administration—part two. Use of charges versus reimbursement for cost basis. *Cancer* 1996;78:300–303.
40. Kohne CH, Wils J, Lorenz M, et al. Randomized phase III study of high-dose fluorouracil given as a weekly 24-hour infusion with or without leucovorin versus bolus fluorouracil plus leucovorin in advanced colorectal cancer: European organization of Research and Treatment of Cancer Gastrointestinal Group Study 40952. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:3721–3728.
41. Hahn RG, Moertel CG, Schutt AJ, et al. A double-blind comparison of intensive course 5-fluorouracil by oral vs. intravenous route in the treatment of colorectal carcinoma. *Cancer* 1975;35:1031–1035.
42. Pentheroudakis G, Twelves C. The rational development of capecitabine from the laboratory to the clinic. *Anticancer Res* 2002;22:3589–3596.
43. Meropol NJ. Oral fluoropyrimidines in the treatment of colorectal cancer. *Eur J Cancer* 1998;34:1509–1513.
44. Hoff PM, Ansari R, Batist G, et al. Comparison of oral capecitabine versus intravenous fluorouracil plus leucovorin as first-line treatment in 605 patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: results of a randomized phase III study. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:2282–2292.
45. Van Cutsem E, Twelves C, Cassidy J, et al. Oral capecitabine compared with intravenous fluorouracil plus leucovorin in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: results of a large phase III study. *J Clin Oncol* 2001;19:4097–4106.
46. Sulkes A, Benner SE, Canetta RM. Uracil-ftorafur: an oral fluoropyrimidine active in colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1998;16:3461–3475.
47. Carmichael J, Popiela T, Radstone D, et al. Randomized comparative study of tegafur/uracil and oral leucovorin versus parenteral fluorouracil and leucovorin in patients with previously untreated metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:3617–3627.
48. Douillard JY, Hoff PM, Skillings JR, et al. Multicenter phase III study of uracil/tegafur and oral leucovorin versus fluorouracil and leucovorin in patients with previously untreated metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:3605–3616.
49. Ward S, Kaltenthaler E, Cowan J, et al. Clinical and cost-effectiveness of capecitabine and tegafur with uracil for the treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer: systematic review and economic evaluation. *Health Technol Assess* 2003;7:1–93.
50. Twelves C, Gollins S, Grieve R, et al. A randomised cross-over trial comparing patient preference for oral capecitabine and 5-fluorouracil/leucovorin regimens in patients with advanced colorectal cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2006;17:239–245.
51. Mayer RJ. Should capecitabine replace infusional fluorouracil and leucovorin when combined with oxaliplatin in metastatic colorectal cancer? *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4165–4167.
52. Higgins GA, Humphrey E, Juler G, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy in the surgical treatment of large bowel cancer. *Cancer* 1976;38:1461–1467.
53. Higgins GA, Donaldson RC, Humphrey EW, et al. Adjuvant therapy for large bowel cancer: update of Veterans Administration Surgical Oncology Group Trials. *Surg Clin North Am* 1981;61:1311–1320.
54. Grossi CE, Wolff WI, Nealon TF Jr, et al. Intraluminal fluorouracil chemotherapy adjunct to surgical procedures for respectable carcinoma of the colon and rectum. *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 1977;145:549–554.
55. Grage TB, Moss SE. Adjuvant chemotherapy in cancer of the colon and rectum: demonstration of effectiveness of prolonged 5-FU chemotherapy in a prospectively controlled, randomized trial. *Surg Clin North Am* 1981;61:1321–1329.
56. Buyse M, Zeleniuch-Jacquotte A, Chalmers TC. Adjuvant therapy of colorectal cancer. Why we still don't know. *JAMA* 1988;259:3571–3578.
57. Taylor I, Machin D, Mullee M, et al. A randomized controlled trial of adjuvant portal vein cytotoxic perfusion in colorectal cancer. *Br J Surg* 1985;72:359–363.
58. Wereldsma JC, Bruggink ED, Meijer WS, et al. Adjuvant portal liver infusion in colorectal cancer with 5-fluorouracil/heparin versus urokinase versus control. Results of a prospective randomized clinical trial (colorectal adenocarcinoma trial I). *Cancer* 1990;65:425–432.
59. Beart RW Jr, Moertel CG, Wieand HS, et al. Adjuvant therapy for resectable colorectal carcinoma with fluorouracil administered by portal vein infusion. A study of the Mayo Clinic and the North Central Cancer Treatment Group. *Arch Surg* 1990;125:897–901.
60. Wolmark N, Rockette H, Wickerham DL, et al. Adjuvant therapy of Dukes' A, B, and C adenocarcinoma of the colon with portal-vein fluorouracil hepatic infusion: preliminary results of National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project Protocol C-02. *J Clin Oncol* 1990;8:1466–1475.
61. Fielding LP, Hittinger R, Grace RH, et al. Randomised controlled trial of adjuvant chemotherapy by portal-vein perfusion after curative resection for colorectal adenocarcinoma. *Lancet* 1992;340:502–506.
62. Long-term results of single course of adjuvant intraportal chemotherapy for colorectal cancer. Swiss Group for Clinical Cancer Research (SAKK). *Lancet* 1995;345:349–353.
63. Portal vein chemotherapy for colorectal cancer: a meta-analysis of 4000 patients in 10 studies. Liver Infusion Meta-analysis Group. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1997;89:497–505.

64. Bedikian AY, Valdivieso M, Mavligit GM, et al. Sequential chemimmunotherapy of colorectal cancer: evaluation of methotrexate, Baker's Antifol and levamisole. *Cancer* 1978; 42:2169–2176.
65. Buroker TR, Moertel CG, Fleming TR, et al. A controlled evaluation of recent approaches to biochemical modulation or enhancement of 5-fluorouracil therapy in colorectal carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 1985;3:1624–1631.
66. Windle R, Bell PR, Shaw D. Five year results of a randomized trial of adjuvant 5-fluorouracil and levamisole in colorectal cancer. *Br J Surg* 1987;74:569–572.
67. Moertel CG, Fleming TR, Macdonald JS, et al. Levamisole and fluorouracil for adjuvant therapy of resected colon carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 1990;322:352–358.
68. Moertel CG, Fleming TR, Macdonald JS, et al. Fluorouracil plus levamisole as effective adjuvant therapy after resection of stage III colon carcinoma: a final report. *Ann Intern Med* 1995;122: 321–326.
69. Wolmark N, Rockette H, Fisher B, et al. The benefit of leucovorin-modulated fluorouracil as postoperative adjuvant therapy for primary colon cancer: results from National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project protocol C-03. *J Clin Oncol* 1993;11: 1879–1887.
70. Francini G, Petrioli R, Lorenzini L, et al. Folinic acid and 5-fluorouracil as adjuvant chemotherapy in colon cancer. *Gastroenterology* 1994;106:899–906.
71. O'Connell MJ, Mailliard JA, Kahn MJ, et al. Controlled trial of fluorouracil and low-dose leucovorin given for 6 months as postoperative adjuvant therapy for colon cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1997;15:246–250.
72. Wolmark N, Rockette H, Mamounas E, et al. Clinical trial to assess the relative efficacy of fluorouracil and leucovorin, fluorouracil and levamisole, and fluorouracil, leucovorin, and levamisole in patients with Dukes' B and C carcinoma of the colon: results from National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project C-04. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:3553–3559.
73. Gill S, Loprinzi CL, Sargent DJ, et al. Pooled analysis of fluorouracil-based adjuvant therapy for stage II and III colon cancer: who benefits and by how much? *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:1797–1806.
74. O'Connell MJ, Laurie JA, Kahn M, et al. Prospectively randomized trial of postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with high-risk colon cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1998;16:295–300.
75. Haller DG, Catalano PJ, MacDonald JS, et al. Fluorouracil (FU), leucovorin (LV), and levamisole (LEV) adjuvant therapy for colon cancer: five year report of INT-0089 (abstr). *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 1998;17:256a.
76. Haller DG, Catalano PJ, Macdonald JS, et al. Phase III study of fluorouracil, leucovorin, and levamisole in high-risk stage II and III colon cancer: final report of Intergroup 0089. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:8671–8678.
77. Andre T, Colin P, Louvet C, et al. Semimonthly versus monthly regimen of fluorouracil and leucovorin administered for 24 or 36 weeks as adjuvant therapy in stage II and III colon cancer: results of a randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:2896–2903.
78. Chau I, Norman AR, Cunningham D, et al. A randomised comparison between 6 months of bolus fluorouracil/leucovorin and 12 weeks of protracted venous infusion fluorouracil as adjuvant treatment in colorectal cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2005;16:549–557.
79. Poplin EA, Benedetti JK, Estes NC, et al. Phase III Southwest Oncology Group 9415/Intergroup 0153 randomized trial of fluorouracil, leucovorin, and levamisole versus fluorouracil continuous infusion and levamisole for adjuvant treatment of stage III and high-risk stage II colon cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:1819–1825.
80. Twelves C, Wong A, Nowacki MP, et al. Capecitabine as adjuvant treatment for stage III colon cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2005;352: 2696–2704.
81. Lembersky BC, Wieand HS, Petrelli NJ, et al. Oral uracil and tegafur plus leucovorin compared with intravenous fluorouracil and leucovorin in stage II and III carcinoma of the colon: results from National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project Protocol C-06. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:2059–2064.
82. Yancik R, Ries LA. Aging and cancer in America. Demographic and epidemiologic perspectives. *Hematol Oncol Clin North Am* 2000;14:17–23.
83. Hutchins LF, Unger JM, Crowley JJ, et al. Underrepresentation of patients 65 years of age or older in cancer-treatment trials. *N Engl J Med* 1999;341:2061–2067.
84. Schrag D, Cramer LD, Bach PB, et al. Age and adjuvant chemotherapy use after surgery for stage III colon cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2001;93:850–857.
85. Sundararajan V, Mitra N, Jacobson JS, et al. Survival associated with 5-fluorouracil-based adjuvant chemotherapy among elderly patients with node-positive colon cancer. *Ann Intern Med* 2002; 136:349–357.
86. Sargent DJ, Goldberg RM, Jacobson SD, et al. A pooled analysis of adjuvant chemotherapy for resected colon cancer in elderly patients. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:1091–1097.
87. Jessup JM, Stewart A, Greene FL, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy for stage III colon cancer: implications of race/ethnicity, age, and differentiation. *JAMA* 2005;294:2703–2711.
88. Iwashyna TJ, Lamont EB. Effectiveness of adjuvant fluorouracil in clinical practice: a population-based cohort study of elderly patients with stage III colon cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20: 3992–3998.
89. Popescu RA, Norman A, Ross PJ, et al. Adjuvant or palliative chemotherapy for colorectal cancer in patients 70 years or older. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:2412–2418.
90. Ayanian JZ, Zaslavsky AM, Fuchs CS, et al. Use of adjuvant chemotherapy and radiation therapy for colorectal cancer in a population-based cohort. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:1293–1300.
91. Aschele C, Guglielmi A, Tixi LM, et al. Adjuvant treatment of colorectal cancer in the elderly. *Cancer Control* 1995;2:36–38.
92. Sargent D, Goldberg RM, Bleiberg H, et al. A pooled safety and efficacy analysis of the FOLFOX4 regimen (bi-monthly oxaliplatin plus fluorouracil/leucovorin) in elderly compared to younger patients with colorectal cancer (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24: 3517.
93. Polite BN, Dignam JJ, Olopade OI. Colorectal cancer and race: understanding the differences in outcomes between African Americans and whites. *Med Clin North Am* 2005;89:771–793.
94. Marcella S, Miller JE. Racial differences in colorectal cancer mortality. The importance of stage and socioeconomic status. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2001;54:359–366.
95. Mayberry RM, Coates RJ, Hill HA, et al. Determinants of black/white differences in colon cancer survival. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1995;87:1686–1693.
96. Bach PB, Schrag D, Brawley OW, et al. Survival of blacks and whites after a cancer diagnosis. *JAMA* 2002;287:2106–2113.
97. Baldwin LM, Dobie SA, Billingsley K, et al. Explaining black-white differences in receipt of recommended colon cancer treatment. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005;97:1211–1220.
98. McCollum AD, Catalano PJ, Haller DG, et al. Outcomes and toxicity in African-American and Caucasian patients in a randomized adjuvant chemotherapy trial for colon cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2002;94:1160–1167.
99. Dignam JJ, Ye Y, Colangelo L, et al. Prognosis after rectal cancer in blacks and whites participating in adjuvant therapy randomized trials. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:413–420.
100. Mamounas E, Wieand S, Wolmark N, et al. Comparative efficacy of adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with Dukes' B versus

- Dukes' C colon cancer: results from four National Surgical Adjuvant Breast and Bowel Project adjuvant studies (C-01, C-02, C-03, and C-04). *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:1349-1355.
101. Harrington DP. The tea leaves of small trials. *J Clin Oncol* 1999;17:1336-1338.
 102. Quasar Collaborative G, Gray R, Barnwell J, et al. Adjuvant chemotherapy versus observation in patients with colorectal cancer: a randomised study. *Lancet* 2007;370:2020-2029.
 103. de Gramont A, Boni C, Navarro M, et al. Oxaliplatin/5-FU/LV in adjuvant colon cancer: updated efficacy results of the MOSAIC trial, including survival, with a median follow-up of six years (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:165s.
 104. Figueredo A, Charette ML, Maroun J, et al. Adjuvant therapy for stage II colon cancer: a systematic review from the Cancer Care Ontario Program in evidence-based care's gastrointestinal cancer disease site group. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:3395-3407.
 105. Benson AB 3rd, Schrag D, Somerfield MR, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology recommendations on adjuvant chemotherapy for stage II colon cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:3408-3419.
 106. Winn R, McClure J. The NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology. *J Natl Compr Cancer Network* 2003;1:9.
 107. Prolongation of the disease-free interval in surgically treated rectal carcinoma. Gastrointestinal Tumor Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1985;312:1465-1472.
 108. Douglass HO Jr, Moertel CG, Mayer RJ, et al. Survival after postoperative combination treatment of rectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1986;315:1294-1295.
 109. Krook JE, Moertel CG, Gunderson LL, et al. Effective surgical adjuvant therapy for high-risk rectal carcinoma. *N Engl J Med* 1991;324:709-715.
 110. O'Connell MJ, Martenson JA, Wieand HS, et al. Improving adjuvant therapy for rectal cancer by combining protracted-infusion fluorouracil with radiation therapy after curative surgery. *N Engl J Med* 1994;331:502-507.
 111. Sauer R, Becker H, Hohenberger W, et al. Preoperative versus postoperative chemoradiotherapy for rectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:1731-1740.
 112. Mathijssen RH, van Alphen RJ, Verweij J, et al. Clinical pharmacokinetics and metabolism of irinotecan (CPT-11). *Clin Cancer Res* 2001;7:2182-2194.
 113. Garcia-Carbonero R, Supko JG. Current perspectives on the clinical experience, pharmacology, and continued development of the camptothecins. *Clin Cancer Res* 2002;8:641-661.
 114. Ando M, Hasegawa Y, Ando Y. Pharmacogenetics of irinotecan: a promoter polymorphism of UGT1A1 gene and severe adverse reactions to irinotecan. *Invest New Drugs* 2005;23:539-545.
 115. Wasserman E, Myara A, Lokiec F, et al. Severe CPT-11 toxicity in patients with Gilbert's syndrome: two case reports. *Ann Oncol* 1997;8:1049-1051.
 116. Rougier P, Van Cutsem E, Bajetta E, et al. Randomised trial of irinotecan versus fluorouracil by continuous infusion after fluorouracil failure in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *Lancet* 1998;352:1407-1412.
 117. Cunningham D, Pyrhonen S, James RD, et al. Randomised trial of irinotecan plus supportive care versus supportive care alone after fluorouracil failure for patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *Lancet* 1998;352:1413-1418.
 118. Douillard JY, Cunningham D, Roth AD, et al. Irinotecan combined with fluorouracil compared with fluorouracil alone as first-line treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer: a multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet* 2000;355:1041-1047.
 119. Saltz LB, Cox JV, Blanke C, et al. Irinotecan plus fluorouracil and leucovorin for metastatic colorectal cancer. *Irinotecan Study Group. N Engl J Med* 2000;343:905-914.
 120. Fuchs CS, Marshall J, Mitchell E, et al. Randomized, controlled trial of irinotecan plus infusional, bolus, or oral fluoropyrimidines in first-line treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer: results from the BICC-C study. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4779-4786.
 121. Van Cutsem ELR, Hossfel D, Bodoky G, et al. Randomized phase III trial comparing infused irinotecan/5-fluorouracil (5-FU)/folinic acid (IF) versus 5-FU/FA (F) in stage III colon cancer patients (PETACC 3) (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23(Suppl)8.
 122. Ychou MRJ, Douillard J, Bugat R, et al. A phase III randomized trial of LV5FU2+CPT-11 vs. LV5FU2 alone in adjuvant high risk colon cancer (FNCLCC Accord02/FFCD9802) (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23(Suppl)3502.
 123. Saltz LB, Niedzwiecki D, Hollis D, et al. Irinotecan fluorouracil plus leucovorin is not superior to fluorouracil plus leucovorin alone as adjuvant treatment for stage III colon cancer: results of CALGB 89803. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:3456-3461.
 124. Meropol NJ. A renewed call for equipoise. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:3392-3394.
 125. Raymond E, Chaney SG, Taamma A, et al. Oxaliplatin: a review of preclinical and clinical studies. *Ann Oncol* 1998;9:1053-1071.
 126. Raymond E, Faivre S, Woynarowski JM, et al. Oxaliplatin: mechanism of action and antineoplastic activity. *Semin Oncol* 1998;25:4-12.
 127. Becouarn Y, Ychou M, Ducreux M, et al. Phase II trial of oxaliplatin as first-line chemotherapy in metastatic colorectal cancer patients. Digestive Group of French Federation of Cancer Centers. *J Clin Oncol* 1998;16:2739-2744.
 128. Diaz-Rubio E, Sastre J, Zaniboni A, et al. Oxaliplatin as single agent in previously untreated colorectal carcinoma patients: a phase II multicentric study. *Ann Oncol* 1998;9:105-108.
 129. Giacchetti S, Perpoint B, Zidani R, et al. Phase III multicenter randomized trial of oxaliplatin added to chromomodulated fluorouracil-leucovorin as first-line treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2000;18:136-147.
 130. de Gramont A, Figuer A, Seymour M, et al. Leucovorin and fluorouracil with or without oxaliplatin as first-line treatment in advanced colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2000;18:2938-2947.
 131. Rothenberg ML, Oza AM, Bigelow RH, et al. Superiority of oxaliplatin and fluorouracil-leucovorin compared with either therapy alone in patients with progressive colorectal cancer after irinotecan and fluorouracil-leucovorin: interim results of a phase III trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:2059-2069.
 132. Tournigand C, Andre T, Achille E, et al. FOLFIRI followed by FOLFOX6 or the reverse sequence in advanced colorectal cancer: a randomized GERCOR study. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:229-237.
 133. Raymond E, Faivre S, Chaney S, et al. Cellular and molecular pharmacology of oxaliplatin. *Mol Cancer Ther* 2002;1:227-235.
 134. Goldberg RM, Sargent DJ, Morton RF, et al. A randomized controlled trial of fluorouracil plus leucovorin, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin combinations in patients with previously untreated metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:23-30.
 135. Colucci G, Gebbia V, Paoletti G, et al. Phase III randomized trial of FOLFIRI versus FOLFOX4 in the treatment of advanced colorectal cancer: a multicenter study of the Gruppo Oncologico Dell'Italia Meridionale. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:4866-4875.
 136. Grothey A, Sargent D, Goldberg RM, et al. Survival of patients with advanced colorectal cancer improves with the availability of fluorouracil-leucovorin, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin in the course of treatment. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:1209-1214.
 137. Porschen R, Arkenau HT, Kubicka S, et al. Phase III study of capecitabine plus oxaliplatin compared with fluorouracil and leucovorin plus oxaliplatin in metastatic colorectal cancer: a final report of the AIO Colorectal Study Group. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4217-4223.
 138. Diaz-Rubio E, Tabernero J, Gomez-Espana A, et al. Phase III study of capecitabine plus oxaliplatin compared with continuous-infusion fluorouracil plus oxaliplatin as first-line therapy in metastatic colorectal cancer: final report of the Spanish Cooperative Group for the

- Treatment of Digestive Tumors Trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4224–4230.
139. Cassidy J, Clarke S, Diaz-Rubio E, et al. XELOX vs. FOLFOX 4: efficacy results from XELOX-1/NO16966, a randomized phase III trial in first-line metastatic colorectal cancer (MCRC) (abstr). *Gastrointest Cancer Symp* 2007;219:270.
 140. Andre T, Boni C, Mounedji-Boudiaf L, et al. Oxaliplatin, fluorouracil, and leucovorin as adjuvant treatment for colon cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2343–2351.
 141. Kuebler JP, Wieand HS, O'Connell MJ, et al. Oxaliplatin combined with weekly bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin as surgical adjuvant chemotherapy for stage II and III colon cancer: results from NSABP C-07. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:2198–2204.
 142. Land SR, Kopec JA, Cecchini RS, et al. Neurotoxicity from oxaliplatin combined with weekly bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin as surgical adjuvant chemotherapy for stage II and III colon cancer: NSABP C-07. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:2205–2211.
 143. Folkman J. Tumor angiogenesis: therapeutic implications. *N Engl J Med* 1971;285:1182–1186.
 144. Ferrara N, Gerber HP, LeCouter J. The biology of VEGF and its receptors. *Nat Med* 2003;9:669–676.
 145. Hurwitz H, Fehrenbacher L, Novotny W, et al. Bevacizumab plus irinotecan, fluorouracil, and leucovorin for metastatic colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:2335–2342.
 146. Hurwitz H, Fehrenbacher L, Hainsworth JD, et al. Bevacizumab in combination with fluorouracil and leucovorin: an active regimen for first-line metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:3502–3508.
 147. Glusker P, Recht L, Lane B. Reversible posterior leukoencephalopathy syndrome and bevacizumab. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354:980–982.
 148. Kabbinavar F, Hurwitz H, Fehrenbacher L, et al. Phase II, randomized trial comparing bevacizumab plus fluorouracil (FU)/leucovorin (LV) with FU/LV alone in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2003;21:60–65.
 149. Kabbinavar FF, Hambleton J, Mass RD, et al. Combined analysis of efficacy: the addition of bevacizumab to fluorouracil/leucovorin improves survival for patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:3706–3712.
 150. Giantonio BJ, Catalano PJ, Meropol NJ, et al. Bevacizumab in combination with oxaliplatin, fluorouracil, and leucovorin (FOLFOX4) for previously treated metastatic colorectal cancer: results from the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Study E3200. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:1539–1544.
 151. Saltz L, Clarke S, Diaz-Rubio E, et al. Bevacizumab (Bev) in combination with XELOX or FOLFOX4: updated efficacy results from XELOX-1/NO16966, a randomized phase III trial in first-line metastatic colorectal cancer (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:18S.
 152. Baselga J. Why the epidermal growth factor receptor? The rationale for cancer therapy. *Oncologist* 2002;7(Suppl 4):2–8.
 153. Spaulding DC, Spaulding BO. Epidermal growth factor receptor expression and measurement in solid tumors. *Semin Oncol* 2002;29:45–54.
 154. Messa C, Russo F, Caruso MG, et al. EGF, TGF- α , and EGFR in human colorectal adenocarcinoma. *Acta Oncol* 1998;37:285–289.
 155. Porebska I, Harlozinska A, Bojarowski T. Expression of the tyrosine kinase activity growth factor receptors (EGFR, ERB B2, ERB B3) in colorectal adenocarcinomas and adenomas. *Tumour Biol* 2000;21:105–115.
 156. Mayer A, Takimoto M, Fritz E, et al. The prognostic significance of proliferating cell nuclear antigen, epidermal growth factor receptor, and *mdr* gene expression in colorectal cancer. *Cancer* 1993;71:2454–2460.
 157. Messersmith WA, Hidalgo M. Panitumumab, a monoclonal anti epidermal growth factor receptor antibody in colorectal cancer: another one or the one? *Clin Cancer Res* 2007;13:4664–4666.
 158. Venook AP. Epidermal growth factor receptor-targeted treatment for advanced colorectal carcinoma. *Cancer* 2005;103:2435–2446.
 159. Jonker DJ, O'Callaghan CJ, Karapetis CS, et al. Cetuximab for the treatment of colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:2040–2048.
 160. Cunningham D, Humblet Y, Siena S, et al. Cetuximab monotherapy and cetuximab plus irinotecan in irinotecan-refractory metastatic colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:337–345.
 161. Saltz L, Rubin M, Hochster H, et al. Cetuximab (IMC-C225) plus irinotecan (CPT-11) is active in CPT-11-refractory colorectal cancer (CRC) that expresses epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR). *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2001;20:3a.
 162. Saltz LB, Meropol NJ, Loehrer PJ Sr, et al. Phase II trial of cetuximab in patients with refractory colorectal cancer that expresses the epidermal growth factor receptor. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22:1201–1208.
 163. Perez-Soler R, Saltz L. Cutaneous adverse effects with HER1/EGFR-targeted agents: is there a silver lining? *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:5235–5246.
 164. Chung KY, Shia J, Kemeny NE, et al. Cetuximab shows activity in colorectal cancer patients with tumors that do not express the epidermal growth factor receptor by immunohistochemistry. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23:1803–1810.
 165. Hebbbar M, Wacrenier A, Desauw C, et al. Lack of usefulness of epidermal growth factor receptor expression determination for cetuximab therapy in patients with colorectal cancer. *Anticancer Drugs* 2006;17:855–857.
 166. Venook A, Niedzwiecki D, Hollis D, et al. Phase III trial of irinotecan/5FU/LV (FOLFIRI) or oxaliplatin/5FU/LV (FOLFOX) +/- cetuximab for patients (pts) with untreated metastatic adenocarcinoma of the colon or rectum (MCRC): CALGB 80203 preliminary results (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24:148s.
 167. Van Cutsem E, Nowacki M, Lang I, et al. Randomized phase III study of irinotecan and 5-FU/LV with or without cetuximab in the first line treatment of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:164s.
 168. Van Cutsem E, Peeters M, Siena S, et al. Open-label phase III trial of panitumumab plus best supportive care compared with best supportive care alone in patients with chemotherapy-refractory metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:1658–1664.
 169. Malik I, Hecht JR, BoPatnaikige A, et al. Safety and efficacy of panitumumab monotherapy in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2005;2005:3520.
 170. Sartore-Bianchi A, Moroni M, Veronese S, et al. Epidermal growth factor receptor gene copy number and clinical outcome of metastatic colorectal cancer treated with panitumumab. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:3238–3245.
 171. Cappuzzo F, Finocchiaro G, Rossi E, et al. EGFR FISH assay predicts for response to cetuximab in chemotherapy refractory colorectal cancer patients. *Ann Oncol* 2008;19:717–723.
 172. Finocchiaro G, Cappuzzo F, Janne PA, et al. EGFR, HER2, Kras as predictive factors for cetuximab sensitivity in colorectal cancer (abstr). *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:18S.
 173. Khambata-Ford S, Garrett CR, Meropol NJ, et al. Expression of epiregulin and amphiregulin and K-ras mutation status predict disease control in metastatic colorectal cancer patients treated with cetuximab. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:3230–3237.
 174. Lievre A, Bachet JB, Boige V, et al. KRAS mutations as an independent prognostic factor in patients with advanced colorectal cancer treated with cetuximab. *J Clin Oncol* 2008;26:374–379.
 175. Amado R, Wolf M, Freeman D, et al. Panitumumab (pmab) efficacy and patient-reported outcomes (PRO) in metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC) patients (pts) with wild-type (WT) KRAS tumor status. Presented at: the 2008 American Society

of Clinical Oncology Gastrointestinal Cancers Symposium; January 25–27, 2008; Orlando, FL; abstract 278

176. Saltz LB, Lenz HJ, Kindler HL, et al. Randomized phase II trial of cetuximab, bevacizumab, and irinotecan compared with cetuximab and bevacizumab alone in irinotecan-refractory colorectal cancer: the BOND-2 study. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:4557–4561.
177. Hecht J, Mitchell EP, Chidiac T, et al. An updated analysis of safety and efficacy of oxaliplatin (Ox)/bevacizumab (bev) +/- panitumumab (pmab) for first-line treatment (tx) of metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC) from a randomized controlled trial (PACCE). Presented at: the 2008 American Society of Clinical Oncology Gastrointestinal Cancers Symposium; January 25–27, 2008; Orlando, FL; abstract 273.
178. Boring CC, Squires TS, Tong T. Cancer statistics, 1992. *CA Cancer J Clin* 1992;42:19–38.
179. Schrag D. The price tag on progress—chemotherapy for colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:317–319.
180. Meropol NJ, Schulman KA. Cost of cancer care: issues and implications. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:180–186.
181. Scheithauer W, Rosen H, Kornek GV, et al. Randomised comparison of combination chemotherapy plus supportive care with supportive care alone in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *BMJ* 1993;306:752–755.
182. Palliative chemotherapy for advanced or metastatic colorectal cancer: Colorectal Meta-analysis Collaboration. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2000;(2):CD001545.

Received January 31, 2008. Accepted February 27, 2008

Address requests for reprints to: Robert J. Mayer, MD, Center for Gastrointestinal Oncology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, 44 Binney Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02115. e-mail: robert_mayer@dfci.harvard.edu; fax: (617) 632-2260.

The authors wish to cite NIH support from grant numbers T32CA09001 and IP50CA127003-01.

Supplemental Table. Glossary of Relevant Terms

Term	Definition
AJCC TNM system	American Joint Committee on Cancer, Tumor-Node-Metastasis Cancer Staging System
Adjuvant treatment	Treatment delivered after resection of the primary tumor, with the goal of reducing the risk of tumor recurrence by eliminating micrometastatic disease
IFL	Irinotecan, bolus Fluorouracil (5-FU), and Leucovorin (LV)
FOLFIRI	Infusional 5-FU, LV, and Irinotecan
CAPIRI	Capecitabine and Irinotecan
FOLFOX	Infusional 5-FU, LV, and Oxaliplatin
XELOX	Capecitabine (Xeloda®) and Oxaliplatin
Targeted therapy	Therapeutic agents designed to perturb specific molecular pathways critical for tumor cell growth and survival
EGFR	Epidermal growth factor receptor – a transmembrane protein on the surface of tumor cells, targeted by cetuximab and panitumumab
VEGF	Vascular endothelial growth factor – a serum protein involved in stimulating new blood vessel formation, targeted by bevacizumab