

gastrointestinal (non-colorectal) cancers

B20 Second-line chemotherapy in advanced pancreatic cancer patients before nab-paclitaxel introduction. Retrospective study in Reggio Emilia Clinical Cancer Centre

L. Baldi¹, M. Panebianco¹, P. Giorgi Rossi², E. Di Felice², T. Cassetti³, R. Sassatelli³, E. Rondini¹, C. Boni¹, C. Pinto¹

¹Medical Oncology Unit, Clinical Cancer Centre, Arcispedale Santa Maria Nuova-IRCCS, REGGIO EMILIA

²Servizio iteraziendale epidemiologia e comunicazione rischio, AUSL, REGGIO EMILIA

³Gastroenterologia ed Endoscopia digestiva, Arcispedale Santa Maria Nuova-IRCCS, REGGIO EMILIA

Background: Only 1-2% of patients with advanced pancreatic survive at 5 years. FOLFIRINOX and nab-paclitaxel/gemcitabine regimens improved first-line treatment outcomes. There is no consensus on second-line setting. The aim of this study is to evaluate the second-line therapy impact in two time periods before nab-paclitaxel introduction.

Material and methods: A retrospective observational single-center study was performed in Medical Oncology, Clinical Cancer Centre, IRCCS-Arcispedale S. Maria Nuova of Reggio Emilia. From 1/01/2009 to 31/12/2014, 204 consecutive patients received a first-line chemotherapy. Patients treated with second-line were evaluated in the two different time periods: before and after 2012 related to the introduction of FOLFIRINOX.

Results: In two periods, 98 (48.5%) patients received a second-line. The main regimens used in first-line were gemcitabine in the first period (2009-2011) and FOLFIRINOX in

the second period (2012-2014) (from 2012 to 2014 17 patients were treated with nab-paclitaxel/gemcitabine). We observed an increasing use of gemcitabine in the second period due to the reduction in use on the front line (52% patients post 2012 vs 21.4% before 2012); in the two periods there was no difference between oxaliplatin-based regimens (19 vs 21 patients).

Table: B20

First-line	HR	Std. Err.	Z	P > z	95% C.I.
Nab-Paclitaxel/Gem vs Gem/Cape or GEMOX	0.99	0.33	0	0.99	0.51-1.92
FOLFIRINOX vs Gem/Cape or GEMOX	0.87	0.21	-0.53	0.59	0.54-1.42
FOLFOX or XELOX vs Gem/Cape or GEMOX	2.06	0.97	1.54	0.12	0.81-5.21
Gem or Cape vs Gem/Cape or GEMOX	0.96	0.27	-0.13	0.89	0.59-1.56
Second-line	HR	Std. Err.	z	P > z	95% C.I.
Nab-Paclitaxel/Gem vs FOLFOX or XELOX	1.53	0.61	1.07	0.28	0.69-3.38
FOLFIRINOX vs FOLFOX or XELOX	0.69	0.24	-1.04	0.29	0.34-1.38
Gem or Cape vs FOLFOX or XELOX	0.46	0.21	-1.66	0.09	0.18-1.14
Gem/Cape or GEMOX vs FOLFOX or XELOX	0.73	0.22	-1.02	0.30	0.40-1.33

In the two periods (2012-2014 vs 2009-2011) it was not observed a statistically significant improvement in overall survival (HR 1.05; P = 0.33) and an increase of second-line chemotherapy treatment (HR 0.6; p = 1.24).

Conclusions: We observed an increased of treatment with gemcitabine as second line after the introduction of FOLFIRINOX regimen, without an absolute increase of second-line chemotherapy use. With limits of a retrospective analysis, our data showed the same efficacy of second-line chemotherapy regardless of the first-line regimen employed. It will be interesting to compare our analysis with future data after the introduction of nab-paclitaxel in the first-line clinical practice.