incidence and epidemiology

Almost one million (951 600) new cases of gastric cancer were diagnosed globally in 2012, resulting in ∼723 100 deaths [1]. Of these ∼140 000 cases and ∼107 000 deaths occurred in Europe [2]. Gastric cancer displays significant global variation in incidence; the highest rates are seen in Eastern Asia, Eastern Europe and South America, with lower rates in North America and Western Europe. A gradual decline in the incidence of gastric cancer has been observed in Western Europe and North America over the past 60 years and more recent declines in high-prevalence countries have also become apparent. This is epidemiologically distinct from the relative increase in tumours of the gastroesophageal junction, which are discussed in a separate guideline document.

Risk factors for gastric cancer include male gender (incidence is twice as high), Helicobacter pylori infection, tobacco use, atrophic gastritis, partial gastrectomy and Ménétrier’s disease [3]. Regional variation in gastric cancer risk factors influences the most common anatomical subsites of disease. Distal or antral gastric cancers that are associated with H. pylori infection, alcohol use, high-salt diet, processed meat and low fruit and vegetable intake are more common in East Asia. Tumours of the proximal stomach (cardia) are associated with obesity, and tumours of the gastroesophageal junction are associated with reflux and Barrett’s oesophagus and are more common in non-Asian countries [4]. Gastric cancer demonstrates familial aggregation in ∼10% of cases, and an inherited genetic predisposition is found in a small proportion of cases (∼1%–3%); relevant syndromes include hereditary non-polyposis colorectal cancer, familial adenomatous polyposis colorectal cancer, hereditary diffuse gastric cancer (HDGC), gastric adenocarcinoma and proximal polyposis of the stomach (GAPPS) and Peutz Jegher’s syndrome [5, 6]. If a familial cancer syndrome such as HDGC is suspected, referral to a geneticist for assessment is recommended based on international clinical guidelines [V, B] [7].

diagnosis and pathology

Recommendation: Diagnosis should be made from a gastroscopic or surgical biopsy reviewed by an experienced pathologist, and histology should be reported according to the World Health Organisation (WHO) criteria [IV, C].

Patients in Asian countries are frequently diagnosed with gastric cancer at an earlier stage than in non-Asian countries. In Japan and Korea, where the incidence of gastric cancer is much higher than in Western countries, screening for gastric cancer is routine. In patients who develop symptoms from an underlying gastric cancer, these commonly include weight loss, dysphagia, dyspepsia, vomiting, early satiety and/or iron deficiency anaemia.

Ninety per cent of gastric cancers are adenocarcinomas (ACs), and these are subdivided according to histological appearances into diffuse (undifferentiated) and intestinal (well-differentiated) types (Lauren classification). Recent large-scale studies in molecular subtyping have defined four subtypes of gastric cancer across genomic, transcriptomic and proteomic levels; however, these subtypes do not yet have any impact on treatment [8]. These Clinical Practice Guidelines do not apply to rarer gastric malignancies such as gastrointestinal stromal tumours (GISTs), lymphomas and neuroendocrine tumours.

If a diagnosis of gastric cancer is suspected, diagnosis should be made from a gastroscopic or surgical biopsy reviewed by an experienced pathologist, and histology should be reported according to the WHO criteria [IV, C].

staging and risk assessment

Recommendation: Initial staging and risk assessment should include physical examination, blood count and differential, liver and renal function tests, endoscopy and contrast-enhanced computed tomography (CT) scan of the thorax, abdomen ± pelvis (Table 1) [V, A]. Laparoscopy is recommended for patients with
Table 1. Diagnostic and staging investigations in gastric cancer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full blood count</td>
<td>Assess for iron deficiency anaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal and liver function</td>
<td>Assess renal and liver function to determine appropriate therapeutic options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endoscopy and biopsy</td>
<td>Obtain tissue for diagnosis, histological classification and molecular biomarkers, e.g. HER2 status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT thorax + abdomen ± pelvis</td>
<td>Staging of tumour—to detect local/distant lymphadenopathy and metastatic disease or ascites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUS</td>
<td>Accurate assessment of T and N stage in potentially operable tumours Determine the proximal and distal extent of tumour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laparoscopy ± washings</td>
<td>Exclude occult metastatic disease involving peritoneum/diaphragm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET, if available</td>
<td>May improve detection of occult metastatic disease in some cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CT, computed tomography; EUS, endoscopic ultrasound; PET, positron emission tomography

Resectable gastric cancer [III, B]. Multidisciplinary treatment planning before any treatment is mandatory [IV, C]. Careful tumour staging is essential to ensure that patients are appropriately selected for treatment interventions. The recommended initial staging investigations are detailed in Table 1.

Identification of malignant lymph nodes on CT: The following characteristics are frequently demonstrated in malignant lymph nodes detected on CT:
1) Short-axis diameter 6–8 mm in perigastric lymph nodes;
2) round shape;
3) central necrosis and
4) heterogeneous or high enhancement [9–11].

However, the sensitivity of CT for lymph node staging is variable (62.5%–91.9% on systematic review), and global consensus is lacking on specific diagnostic criteria [12].

Endoscopic ultrasound (EUS) is helpful in determining the proximal and distal extent of the tumour and provides further assessment of the T and N stage; however, it is less useful in antral tumours [III, B]. EUS is more consistently accurate than CT for the diagnosis of malignant lymph nodes: patterns associated with malignancy on EUS include hypoechochogenicity, round shape, smooth, distinct margin and size >1 cm [13, 14]. Positron emission tomography (PET)-CT imaging may improve staging by detecting involved lymph nodes or metastatic disease. However, PET may not be informative in patients with mucinous or diffuse tumours [III, B].

Laparoscopy ± peritoneal washings for malignant cells is recommended in all stage IB–III gastric cancers which are considered potentially resectable, to exclude radiologically occult metastatic disease; the benefit may be greater for patients with T3/T4 disease [III, B] [15, 16].

The TNM stage should be recorded according to the latest edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC)/Union for International Cancer Control (UICC) guidelines and staging manual [17, 18] (Tables 2 and 3).

Treatment Planning
Multidisciplinary treatment planning before any treatment decision is mandatory. The core membership of the multidisciplinary team should include surgeons, medical and radiation oncologists, radiologists and pathologists, with other members as available [IV, C].

Management of Local/Locoregional Disease

Recommendation: Endoscopic resection is appropriate for selected very early tumours [III, B]. For stage IB–III gastric cancer, radical gastrectomy is indicated and perioperative therapy is recommended for these patients [I, A]. Medically fit patients should undergo D2 resections in high-volume surgical centres [I, B].

Surgery
Surgical resection of gastric cancer, specifically at early stages, is potentially curative. However, the majority of patients still relapse following resection, and therefore, combined modality therapies are standard for ≥ Stage IB disease.

The extent of resection is determined by the preoperative stage.

Endoscopic resection may be carried out for very early gastric cancers (T1a) if they are clearly confined to the mucosa, well-differentiated, ≤2 cm and non-ulcerated [III, B]. The associated lymph node metastatic risk in this group is virtually zero. Two forms of endoscopic resection are practised: endoscopic mucosal resection (EMR) is acceptable for lesions smaller than 10–15 mm with a very low probability of advanced histology (Paris 0–Ia) [19]. However, European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Guidelines recommend endoscopic submucosal dissection (ESD) as the treatment of choice for most gastric superficial neoplastic lesions [IV, B] [19].

T1 tumours that do not meet the above mentioned criteria for endoscopic resection require surgery, although less extensive surgery than other gastric cancers (see below). Lymph node dissection for T1 tumours may be confined to perigastric lymph nodes and include local N2 nodes (D1+, with variation in nodal groups dissected according to the site of cancer). Sentinel lymph node mapping may further modify these approaches.

For stage IB–III gastric cancer, radical gastrectomy is indicated. Subtotal gastrectomy may be carried out if a macroscopic proximal margin of 5 cm can be achieved between the tumour and the gastroesophageal junction. For diffuse cancers, a margin of 8 cm is advocated. Otherwise, a total gastrectomy is indicated [III, A]. Perioperative therapy is recommended for these patients.

The extent of nodal dissection accompanying radical gastrectomy has been extensively debated. D1 resection implies the removal of the perigastric lymph nodes and D2 implies removal of perigastric lymph nodes plus those along the left gastric, common hepatic and splenic arteries and the coeliac axis (see...
The current UICC/AJCC TNM (seventh edition) classification recommends excision of a minimum of 15 lymph nodes to allow reliable staging. In Asian countries, experience from observational and randomised trials demonstrates that D2 dissection leads to superior outcomes compared with D1 resection [II, B]. In Western countries, a Dutch [21], an MRC [22] and a recent Italian [23] trial failed to demonstrate any initial survival advantage with D2 resection, although the Italian study suggested a trend towards a benefit in disease-specific survival for patients with T2–T4 lymph node-positive cancers treated with D2 resection [23]. Long-term (15-year) follow-up from the Dutch trial demonstrated fewer locoregional recurrences and gastric cancer-related deaths with D2 resection; however, this was offset slightly by an increase in postoperative mortality and morbidity [24]. A recent review of the quality of lymph node dissection in the same study also suggests that non-compliance in the D2 resection group may have obscured a significant difference in survival between the randomised groups; this has also been suggested for the recent Italian study [23].

Consensus opinion is that, in Western countries, medically fit patients should undergo D2 dissection that is carried out in specialised, high-volume centres with appropriate surgical expertise and postoperative care [I, B] [25–27]. As a result, perioperative outcome has become standardised with morbidity and mortality rates of 15% and 3.0%, respectively [23, 28]. The concept of ‘enhanced recovery’ encompasses all aspects of optimal perioperative care for the patient undergoing gastrectomy; guidance is provided by relevant Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS®) Society guidelines on this topic [29].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage grouping</th>
<th>T stage</th>
<th>N stage</th>
<th>M stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 0</td>
<td>Tis</td>
<td>N0</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IA</td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>N0</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IB</td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>N0</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IIA</td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>N0</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IIB</td>
<td>T4a</td>
<td>N0</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T1</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IIIA</td>
<td>T4a</td>
<td>N1</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T2</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IIIB</td>
<td>T4b</td>
<td>N0–1</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T4a</td>
<td>N2</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T3a</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IIIC</td>
<td>T4b</td>
<td>N2–3</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T4a</td>
<td>N3</td>
<td>M0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td>Any T</td>
<td>Any N</td>
<td>M1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Anatomic stage/prognostic groups as per AJCC, 7th edition [17, 18]
Laparoscopic surgery has the potential benefit of decreased postoperative morbidity and reduced recovery time. Although concerns existed regarding the possibility of a reduced nodal harvest with a laparoscopic approach, a recent meta-analysis suggests that lymph node yields are comparable for both approaches [30]. Trials from the Far East have reported equivalent results to open surgery for distal gastrectomy, but there remain some technical issues particularly for anastomosis for total gastrectomy [31, 32]. Laparoscopic surgery is becoming one of the recommended options for patients with early gastric cancer; however, it remains to be shown whether laparoscopic surgery can achieve the same results as open surgery in gastric cancers requiring D2 lymphadenectomy. It may be that as techniques predicting lymph node involvement develop, those with negative nodes should be operated laparoscopically, whereas those with predicted positive nodes would require open surgery.

**perioperative chemotherapy**

**Recommendation: Perioperative (pre- and postoperative) chemotherapy with a platinum/fluoropyrimidine combination is recommended for patients with ≥ Stage IB resectable gastric cancer [I, A].**

The UK MRC MAGIC trial demonstrated an improvement in 5-year survival from 23% to 36% for patients with resectable stage II and III gastric cancers treated with six cycles (three pre- and three postoperative) of perioperative ECF chemotherapy [epirubicin, cisplatin and 5-fluorouracil (5-FU)] compared with surgery alone [33]. A subsequent French trial has reported similar results with the use of a 28-day regimen of perioperative cisplatin and 5-FU [34]. The MAGIC trial recruited predominantly patients with gastric cancers, whereas the French study was composed of a majority of patients with proximal tumours. Therefore, a perioperative treatment approach may be considered evidence-based for both tumour subsites. An EORTC study in which patients were randomised to surgery plus or minus bi-weekly cisplatin (50 mg/m²) and 5-FU in the de Gramont style also increased R0 resection rates in chemotherapy-treated patients but closed early due to poor accrual and is not powered to show a survival benefit [35]. Perioperative chemotherapy has therefore been widely adopted as a standard of care throughout many parts of Europe [I, A]. Since capcitabine avoids the need for an indwelling central venous access device and is non-inferior to 5-FU in the advanced disease setting [36], capcitabine-containing regimens can also be suggested in the perioperative setting (as ECX: epirubicin, cisplatin, capcitabine, in preference to ECF) [IV, C]. Also, other platinum/fluoropyrimidine doublets or triplets may be considered; in particular, oxaliplatin may replace cisplatin [as EOX (epirubicin, oxaliplatin, capcitabine)] and is non-inferior to ECX in the metastatic setting [36].

The effect of dose intensification (e.g. with taxanes) of perioperative chemotherapy in gastric cancer remains unclear. In oesophageal and gastrooaeophageal junctional AC, intensification of preoperative chemotherapy from two cycles of cisplatin and capcitabine (CX) to four cycles of ECX resulted in improved pathological response rates (secondary end point), but this did not translate into an improvement in overall survival (OS) [37]. However, as this trial did not include gastric cancer patients or a postoperative chemotherapy component, direct cross-trial comparisons are challenging. A study of the German AIO study group investigating a perioperative FLOT regimen (fluorouracil, leucovorin, oxaliplatin, docetaxel) versus ECF/X demonstrated higher rates of pathological response for FLOT (15.6% versus 5.8%); however, correlation with survival outcomes is awaited [38].

Based on these studies, it may be reasonable to use any fluoropyrimidine–platinum doublet or triplet before surgery, although the strongest evidence is for cisplatin/fluorouracil ± epirubicin.
combinations. Recommended treatment duration is 2–3 months. There is no current evidence to support the use of perioperative trastuzumab therapy or any other biologically targeted drug, including anti-angiogenic compounds.

adjuvant treatment

**Recommendation:** For patients with Stage IB gastric cancer who have undergone surgery without administration of preoperative chemotherapy (e.g. due to understaging before the initial decision for upfront surgery), postoperative chemoradiotherapy (CRT) or adjuvant chemotherapy is recommended [I, A]. For patients having undergone preoperative chemotherapy, the addition of postoperative radiotherapy (RT) has no added benefit.

chemoradiotherapy. The North American Intergroup-0116 trial demonstrated that adjuvant therapy with 5-FU/leucovorin (Q28) plus conventionally fractionated RT (45 Gy in 25 fractions) resulted in improved OS years compared with surgery alone, (50% 3-year survival for patients treated with CRT versus 41% for those treated with surgery alone [39]). After 10 years of follow-up, this OS improvement remains significant [I, A] [40]. Therefore, this treatment approach is currently considered as standard therapy in the USA, though it has not gained wide acceptance in Europe due to concerns about potential late toxic effects and the quality of surgery within the trial. Moreover, >50% of patients underwent inadequate (less than D1) lymphadenectomy, suggesting that postoperative CRT may be (mainly) compensating for suboptimal surgery [II, B]. This is supported by retrospective data from the Dutch D1D2 trial, demonstrating that CRT reduces local recurrence rates following D1 resection, but provides no benefit in patients who have undergone D2 resection [41]. However, other randomised and non-randomised data suggest potential benefits from postoperative CRT even after optimal D2 dissection [I, B] [42–45], and this is the subject of ongoing randomised trials.

Regarding patients who have had a microscopically incomplete resection, a retrospective comparison of the Dutch D1D2 trial has suggested significant improvements in OS and local recurrence rates with use of CRT after an R1 resection, a finding that has been confirmed by other retrospective series [IV, B] [41, 46].

In current postoperative CRT regimens, RT should preferably be given as a concomitant regimen of fluoropyrimidine-based CRT to a total dose of 45 Gy in 25 fractions of 1.8 Gy, 5 fractions/week by intensity-modulated RT techniques [IV, A] [47]. The clinical target volume encompasses the gastric bed (with stomach remnant when present), anastomoses and draining regional lymph nodes [I, B] [44, 45].

adjuvant chemotherapy. The ACTS-GC trial evaluating adjuvant chemotherapy with S-1 following D2 resection in Asian patients demonstrated an OS benefit for patients treated with adjuvant chemotherapy [I, A] [48, 49]. The CLASSIC trial evaluated a capecitabine–oxaliplatin doublet in a similar population and this was associated with significantly improved OS and disease-free survival (DFS) [50, 51] compared with surgery alone.

However, none of sequential S1-paclitaxel, sequential tegafur and uracil (UFT)-paclitaxel or UFT alone resulted in a superior outcome (DFS as the primary end point) when compared with single-agent, adjuvant S1 in a two by two randomised factorial trial [52].

Historically, a greater benefit has been noted with adjuvant chemotherapy in Asian studies, and uptake of adjuvant chemotherapy in Europe for patients with resected gastric cancer remains limited due to a perceived lack of benefit and routine use of perioperative chemotherapy. However, a large individual patient-level meta-analysis of adjuvant chemotherapy in gastric cancer has confirmed a 6% absolute benefit for 5-FU-based chemotherapy, compared with surgery alone [hazard ratio (HR) 0.82, 95% confidence interval (CI) 0.76–0.90; P < 0.001] in all subgroups tested [I, A] [53]. However, as adjuvant chemotherapy is also less well tolerated than neoadjuvant chemotherapy, a perioperative approach is preferred if possible, so that more patients can benefit from systemic treatment even if the postoperative component of treatment is unable to be delivered.

For adjuvant treatment following preoperative chemotherapy, the preoperatively chosen regimen should be completed after resection for patients who are fit for treatment, independent from pathohistological findings and considerations. The addition of postoperative RT has been shown to not improve survival in patients receiving chemotherapy before and after curative-intent surgery. Recently, the randomised, phase III CRITICS trial concluded that patients undergoing chemotherapy followed by surgery with curative intent had similar OS and progression-free survival (PFS) regardless of whether they received chemotherapy or CRT after surgery [54].

management of advanced/metastatic disease

first-line treatment

**Recommendation:** Doublet or triplet platinum/fluoropyrimidine combinations are recommended for fit patients with advanced gastric cancer [I, A].

Patients with inoperable locally advanced and/or metastatic (stage IV) disease should be considered for systemic treatment (chemotherapy), which has shown improved survival and quality of life compared with best supportive care alone [I, A] [55–57]. However, co-morbidities, organ function and performance status (PS) must always be taken into consideration [II, B].

In general, resection of the primary tumour is not recommended in the palliative setting; however, a small number of patients with initially unresectable locally advanced disease may be deemed operable following a good response to systemic therapy.

Response to systemic treatments should normally be assessed with interval imaging of the chest, abdomen and pelvis, mostly with CT, although alternative imaging techniques may be used if required to monitor known sites of disease (e.g. magnetic resonance imaging for bone lesions).

Doublet combinations of platinum and fluoropyrimidines are generally used, and there remains controversy regarding the utility of triplet regimens. However, a meta-analysis has demonstrated significant benefit from the addition of an anthracycline to a platinum and fluoropyrimidine doublet [58]. For anthracycline-based triplets, the UK REAL-2 trial demonstrated non-inferiority between ECF, ECX, EOF (epirubicin, oxaliplatin, 5-FU) and EOX. The EOX regimen was associated with numerically longer median OS (11.2 versus 9.9 months, HR 0.80, 95% CI 0.66–0.97; P = 0.02)
than ECF, without the need for an indwelling catheter and with reduced rates of thromboembolism [59]. Additionally, a combined analysis has demonstrated that capecitabine is associated with improved OS, compared with infused 5-FU within doublet and triplet regimens [I, A] [58].

Triplets containing taxanes are also an evidence-based treatment choice for first-line chemotherapy [60, 61]. In a phase III randomised trial, the addition of docetaxel to 5-FU/cisplatin in a 3-weekly regimen (DCF) was associated with improved OS, but also added significant toxic effects including increased rates of febrile neutropaenia [I, C] [61]. A phase II randomised control trial of a modified 2-weekly DCF regimen compared with original DCF (with growth factor support) halted recruitment in the original DCF arm due to excessive toxicity; however, the study suggested that a substantially modified DCF regimen was tolerable and effective [II, B] [62]. Several other studies have examined the efficacy of docetaxel, fluoropyrimidine and oxaliplatin-containing regimens. The FLOT regimen (fluorouracil, leucovorin, oxaliplatin and docetaxel) resulted in a median PFS of 5.1 months and a median OS of 11 months in a small non-randomised study [63]. An almost identical regimen used in a randomised phase II trial resulted in encouraging median PFS and OS of 7.7 and 14.6 months, respectively [II, B] [64]. As an alternative to platinum-based therapy, irinotecan plus leucovorin and infusional 5-FU (FOLFIIRI) has been studied in both phase II trials and one phase III randomised trial in the first-line setting, and may be considered for selected patients [60, 65].

See the metastasectomy section for surgery in stage IV gastric cancer.

elderly patients with gastric cancer

Elderly patients with gastric cancer are under-represented in clinical trials, and there are few randomised data in this setting. Regimens that have been specifically addressed in phase II trials in elderly patients with comparable survival results include capecitabine and oxaliplatin, FOLFIRI (leucovorin, 5-FU and oxaliplatin), single-agent capecitabine and S1 (in Asian patients) [III, B] [66–68]. A phase II trial investigated the miniDOX (docetaxel, oxaliplatin and capcitabine) regimen in primarily older patients and also recruited patients with other poor prognostic markers (PS2, weight loss 10–25%). This regimen was associated with survival comparable to good prognostic groups; however, toxicity was also prominent [69]. In addition, a meta-analysis of three phase III trials comparing patients ≥70 years with younger patients demonstrated no differences in response rates or OS between the two patient groups [II, B] [70]. In the perioperative setting, a German study compared the doublet FLO (infusional 5-FU, leucovorin and oxaliplatin) and the FLOT regimens in 44 elderly gastric cancer patients [71]. Although the FLOT regimen was associated with a trend towards improved PFS, it was also associated with increased toxicity [II, B]. Furthermore, in the MAGIC trial, there was no evidence of heterogeneity of treatment effect for patients over the age of 70 [33]. However, it must be considered that all patients included in these analyses were clinical trial participants, which may not reflect patients treated in a community setting. When making a decision regarding chemotherapy, the functional age of the patient must also be considered, as co-morbidities and PS may have an equal effect on tolerance of chemotherapy as age. Geriatric assessment may be helpful before initiating treatment of older patients.

second- and further-line treatment

Recommendation: Second-line chemotherapy with a taxane (docetaxel, paclitaxel), or irinotecan, or ramucirumab as single agent or in combination with paclitaxel is recommended for patients who are of PS 0–1 [I, A].

In patients of adequate PS, second-line treatment is associated with proven improvements in OS and quality of life compared with best supportive care, with treatment options including irinotecan, docetaxel or paclitaxel, if not used before [I, A] [72–75]. A randomised phase III trial directly comparing weekly paclitaxel with irinotecan has demonstrated similar efficacy for both regimens [I, A] [76].

The anti-VEGFR-2 monoclonal antibody ramucirumab has shown activity in two randomised phase III trials. As a single agent it is associated with a survival benefit comparable to cytotoxic chemotherapy in the second-line setting [I, A], whereas ramucirumab in addition to paclitaxel is associated with a survival benefit compared with paclitaxel alone [I, A] [77, 78].

Alternatively, in patients with disease progression ≥3 months following first-line chemotherapy, it may be appropriate to consider a rechallenge with the same drug combination as an additional treatment option [IV, C] [79]. In patients with symptomatic, locally advanced or recurrent disease, hypo-fractioned RT is an effective and well-tolerated treatment modality that may palliate bleeding, obstructive symptoms or pain [III, B] [80]. Treatment options may be used sequentially in second and third line, but there is no clear evidence for a benefit beyond second line treatment.

personalised medicine and targeted therapy

Recommendation: Trastuzumab is recommended in conjunction with platinum and fluoropyrimidine-based chemotherapy for patients with HER2-positive advanced gastric cancer [I, A].

Gastric cancers have been demonstrated to be highly molecularly diverse and may be driven by a number of different genetic and epigenetic abnormalities. Four subtypes of gastric cancer have recently been described in The Cancer Genome Atlas; these are the Epstein Barr Virus, microsatellite instability (MSI) high, genomically stable and chromosomal instability (CIN) subtypes [8]. Each subtype is enriched for selected molecular abnormalities, with some overlap. In particular, the CIN subtype is enriched for copy number changes in key receptor tyrosine kinase oncogenes such as HER2, EGFR, FGFR2 and MET. These findings have potentially important therapeutic implications as oncologists attempt to target the key pathways driving the tumour in each individual patient.

In HER2-positive gastric cancer (10%–15% of cases), the phase III ToGA trial demonstrated clinically and statistically significant improvements in response rate, PFS and OS with the addition of trastuzumab to a cisplatin/fluoropyrimidine doublet (median OS 13.8 versus 11.1 months, HR 0.74, 95% CI 0.60–0.91; P = 0.0048) [I, A] [81]. The benefits of trastuzumab were even more marked in the traditionally defined HER2-positive野生染色体。
subgroup with immunohistochemistry (IHC) 2+/FISH+ tumours, or IHC 3+ tumours. In these patients, the median OS was improved from 11.8 to 16.0 months (HR 0.65, 95% CI 0.51–0.83). Following the ToGA trial results, trastuzumab was licensed in Europe for use in HER2-positive disease (IHC3+ or 2+/FISH+) in combination with capecitabine or 5-FU and cisplatin. This regimen now represents the standard of care for these patients [I, A]. However, recent phase III randomised trials targeting the EGFR and MET-HGF axes have not demonstrated improvements in OS for anti-EGFR and anti-MET/HGF therapies [82–85]. In contrast, emerging data from early phase trials suggests that use of immunotherapies such as the PD-1 inhibitors pembrolizumab and nivolumab may result in durable remissions for a proportion of patients with advanced gastric cancer [86, 87]. The interaction between immunotherapy for gastric cancer and other known biomarkers in gastric cancer such as MSI requires further investigation.

A personalised medicine synopsis table is presented in Table 4.

**specific situations**

**metastasectomy**

In general, patients with metastatic cancer do not benefit from resection of metastases. Uncontrolled case series have demonstrated prolonged survival for selected patients undergoing liver and lung metastasectomy and surgical removal of Krukenberg tumours [V, C] [88–90]. The randomised REGATTA trial established (in an Asian patient population) that gastrectomy in patients with limited metastatic disease does not improve survival [I, A] [91]. Until further evidence is presented, both gastrectomy and metastasectomy should be considered experimental for patients with gastric cancer.

**peritoneal metastases**

Several small randomised trials in Asian patients have demonstrated a significant survival benefit for adjuvant hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in high-risk curatively resected gastric cancer patients; however, these results have not been validated in non-Asian patients [92, 93]. For patients with advanced peritoneal metastases, data from randomised trials in Asia also exist to support the use of cytoreductive surgery plus HIPEC in selected patients [94]. However, randomised data are lacking for non-Asian patients. A large French series demonstrated a median survival of surgery plus HIPEC of 9.2 months, with a 5-year survival rate of 13% for all patients and 23% for those who had complete cytoreductive surgery [IV, C] [95]. Currently, this approach cannot be recommended outside the context of clinical research.

**signet cell tumours**

Gastric AC associated with signet ring cells is associated with a poor prognosis. Retrospective case series suggest that this gastric cancer subtype may be less sensitive to chemotherapy and CRT [IV] [96, 97]. However, evidence is insufficient to support not adopting standard chemotherapy or surgical approaches for these patients.

**follow-up, long-term implications and survivorship**

In the setting of operable gastric cancer, the complexity of treatment frequently induces symptoms that adversely affect health-related quality of life. A regular follow-up may allow investigation and treatment of symptoms, psychological support and early detection of recurrence, though there is no evidence that it improves survival outcomes [III, B] [98, 99].

Follow-up should be tailored to the individual patient and the stage of the disease [V, B] [100]. Dietary support is recommended for patients on either a radical or a palliative pathway with reference to vitamin and mineral deficiencies [V, B] [101, 102].

New strategies for patient follow-up are currently undergoing evaluation, including patient-led self-referral and services led by clinical nurse specialists [103].

In the advanced disease setting, identification of patients for second-line chemotherapy and clinical trials requires regular follow-up to detect symptoms of disease progression before significant clinical deterioration [IV, B].

If relapse/disease progression is suspected, then a clinical history, physical examination and directed blood tests should be carried out. Radiological investigations should be carried out in patients who are candidates for further chemotherapy or RT [IV, B].

The aggressive nature of gastric cancer and historically poor outcomes even in the setting of operable disease mean that the concept of survivorship is only now beginning to evolve. Long-term implications, late effects of therapy and psychosocial implications of treatment have been poorly studied to date.

**methodology**

These clinical practice guidelines were developed in accordance with the ESMO standard operating procedures for clinical practice guidelines development, http://www.esmo.org/Guidelines/ESMO-Guidelines-Methodology. The relevant literature has been selected by the expert authors. A summary of recommendations is given in Table 1. Levels of evidence and grades of

| Table 4. Personalised medicine synopsis table for lower oesophageal and gastric cancer |
|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| **Biomarker** | **Method** | **Use** | **LOE, GOR** |
| HER2 | Immunohistochemistry for HER2 protein expression or ISH for HER2 gene amplification | Used to select patients with metastatic disease for treatment with a trastuzumab-containing regimen | I, A |

LOE, level of evidence; GOR, grade of recommendation; HER2, human receptor growth factor receptor 2; ISH, in situ hybridisation.
Table 5. Summary of recommendations

Incidence and epidemiology
- If a familial cancer syndrome such as HDGC is suspected, referral to a geneticist for assessment is recommended based on international clinical guidelines [V, B]

Diagnosis and pathology
- Diagnosis should be made from a gastroscopic or surgical biopsy reviewed by an experienced pathologist, and histology should be reported according to the WHO criteria [IV, C]

Staging and risk assessment
- Initial staging and risk assessment should include physical examination, blood count and differential, liver and renal function tests, endoscopy and contrast-enhanced CT scan of the thorax, abdomen ± pelvis [V, A]
- Laparoscopy is recommended for patients with resectable gastric cancer [III, B]
- Multidisciplinary treatment planning before any treatment is mandatory [IV, C]
- EUS is helpful in determining the proximal and distal extent of the tumour and provides further assessment of the T and N stage; however, it is less useful in antral tumours [III, B]
- PET-CT imaging may improve staging by detecting involved lymph nodes or metastatic disease. However, PET may not be informative in patients with mucinous or diffuse tumours [III, B]
- Laparoscopy ± peritoneal washings for malignant cells are recommended in all stage IB–III gastric cancers that are considered potentially resectable, to exclude radiologically occult metastatic disease; the benefit may be greater for patients with T3/T4 disease [III, B]

Treatment planning
- Multidisciplinary treatment planning before any treatment decision is mandatory. The core membership of the multidisciplinary team should include surgeons, medical and radiation oncologists, radiologists and pathologists, with other members as available [IV, C]

Management of local/locoregional disease
- Endoscopic resection is appropriate for selected early tumours [III, B]
- For stage IB–III gastric cancer, radical gastrectomy is indicated; perioperative therapy is recommended for these patients [I, A]
- Medically fit patients should undergo D2 resections in high-volume surgical centres [I, B]

Surgery
- Endoscopic resection may be carried out for very early gastric cancers (T1a) if they are clearly confined to the mucosa, well-differentiated, ≤2 cm and non-ulcerated [III, B]
- European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy Guidelines recommend ESD as the treatment of choice for most gastric superficial neoplastic lesions [IV, B]
- For stage IB–III gastric cancer, radical gastrectomy is indicated. Subtotal gastrectomy may be carried out if a macroscopic proximal margin of 5 cm can be achieved between the tumour and the gastroesophageal junction. For diffuse cancers, a margin of 8 cm is advocated. Otherwise, a total gastrectomy is indicated [III, A]. Perioperative therapy is recommended for these patients
- In Asian countries, experience from observational and randomised trials demonstrates that dissection leads to superior outcomes compared with D1 resection [II, B]
- Consensus opinion is that, in Western countries, medically fit patients should undergo D2 dissection that is carried out in specialised, high-volume centres with appropriate surgical expertise and postoperative care [I, B]

Perioperative chemotherapy
- Perioperative (pre- and postoperative) chemotherapy with a platinum and fluoropyrimidine combination is recommended for patients with ≥stage IB resectable gastric cancer [I, A]
- Since capecitabine avoids the need for an indwelling central venous access device, and is non-inferior to 5-FU in the advanced disease setting, capecitabine-containing regimens can also be suggested in the perioperative setting [IV, C]

Adjuvant treatment
- For patients with ≥stage IB gastric cancer who have undergone surgery without administration of preoperative chemotherapy, postoperative CRT or adjuvant chemotherapy is recommended [I, A]
- Adjuvant therapy with 5-FU/leucovorin plus conventionally fractionated RT resulted in improved OS years compared with surgery alone. After 10 years of follow-up, this OS improvement remains significant [I, A]
- Postoperative CRT may (mainly) be compensating for suboptimal surgery [II, B]. However, some data suggest potential benefits from postoperative CRT event after optimal D2 dissection [I, B]
- In patients who have had a microscopically incomplete resection, significant improvements in OS and local recurrence rates with the use of CRT after an R1 resection have been seen [IV, B]
- RT should preferably be given as a concomitant regimen of fluoropyrimidine-based CRT to a total dose of 45 Gy in 25 fractions of 1.8 Gy, 5 fractions/week by intensity-modulated RT techniques [IV, A]. The clinical target volume encompasses the gastric bed, anastomoses and draining regional lymph nodes [I, B]

Continued
recommendation have been applied using the system given in Table 6. Statements without grading were considered justified standard clinical practice by the experts and the ESMO faculty. This manuscript has been subjected to an anonymous peer-review process.

**Table 5. Continued**

| **OS benefit has been demonstrated for patients treated with adjuvant chemotherapy [I, A]** |
| **The benefit of 5-FU-based chemotherapy has been confirmed compared with surgery alone [I, A]** |

**Management of advanced/metastatic disease**

**First-line treatment**

- Doublet or triplet platinum/fluoropyrimidine combinations are recommended for fit patients with advanced gastric cancer [I, A]
- Patients with inoperable locally advanced and/or metastatic (stage IV) disease should be considered for systemic treatment (chemotherapy), which has shown improved survival and quality of life compared with best supportive care alone [I, A]. However, comorbidities, organ function and PS must always be taken into consideration [II, B]
- Capecitabine is associated with improved OS compared with infused 5-FU within doublet and triplet regimens [I, A]
- DCF in a 3-weekly regimen was associated with improved OS, but also added significant toxic effects including increased rates of febrile neutropaenia [I, C]

**Elderly patients with gastric cancer**

- Regimens that have been specifically addressed in phase II trials in elderly patients with comparable survival results include capecitabine and oxaliplatin, FOLFOX, single-agent capecitabine and S1 (in Asian patients) [III, B]
- The FLOT regimen is associated with a trend towards improved PFS but also with increased toxicity [II, B]

**Second- and further-line treatment**

- Second-line chemotherapy with a taxane (docetaxel, paclitaxel), or irinotecan, or ramucirumab as a single agent or in combination with paclitaxel is recommended for patients who are of PS 0–1 [I, A]
- Similar efficacy has been demonstrated for weekly paclitaxel and irinotecan [I, A]
- In patients with disease progression >3 months following first-line chemotherapy, it may be appropriate to consider a rechallenge with the same drug combination [IV, C]
- In patients with symptomatic locally advanced or recurrent disease, hypofractionated RT is an effective and well-tolerated treatment modality that may palliate bleeding, obstructive symptoms or pain [III, B]

**Personalised medicine and targeted therapy**

- Trastuzumab is recommended in conjunction with platinum- and fluoropyrimidine-based chemotherapy for patients with HER2-positive advanced gastric cancer [I, A]

**Specific situations**

**Metastasectomy**

- Gastrectomy in patients with limited metastatic disease does not improve survival [I, A]

**Peritoneal metastases**

- In patients with peritoneal metastases, the use of cytoreductive surgery plus HIPEC has been studied, but this approach cannot yet be recommended outside the context of clinical research.

**Follow-up, long-term implications and survivorship**

- A regular follow-up may allow investigation and treatment of symptoms, psychological support and early detection of recurrence, though there is no evidence that it improves survival outcomes [III, B]
- Follow-up should be tailored to the individual patient and the stage of the disease [V, B]
- Dietary support is recommended for patients on either a radical or a palliative pathway, with reference to vitamin and mineral deficiencies [V, B]
- In the advanced disease setting, identification of patients for second-line chemotherapy and clinical trials requires regular follow-up to detect symptoms of disease progression before significant clinical deterioration [IV, B]
- If relapse/disease progression is suspected, then a clinical history, physical examination and directed blood tests should be carried out. Radiological investigations should be carried out in patients who are candidates for further chemotherapy or RT [IV, B]
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Table 6. Levels of evidence and grades of recommendation (adapted from the Infectious Diseases Society of America–United States Public Health Service Grading System) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of evidence</th>
<th>Grades of recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Strong evidence for efficacy with a substantial clinical benefit, strongly recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Strong or moderate evidence for efficacy but with a limited clinical benefit, generally recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Insufficient evidence for efficacy or benefit does not outweigh the risk or the disadvantages (adverse events, costs, ...), optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Moderate evidence against efficacy or for adverse outcome, generally not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Strong evidence against efficacy or for adverse outcome, never recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By permission of the Infectious Diseases Society of America [104].
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