

Does Nutritional Status Affect Treatment Tolerability, Response and Survival in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer Patients? Results of a Prospective Multicenter Study

Karabulut Senem

Istanbul Universitesi Istanbul Tip Fakultesi

Dogan Izzet

Istanbul Universitesi Istanbul Tip Fakultesi

Cigdem Usul Afsar (✉ cigdemusul@yahoo.com)

Acibadem Bakirkoy Hospital <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3764-7639>

Karabulut Mehmet

Bakirkoy Dr Sadi Konuk Egitim ve Arastirma Hastanesi

Sule Kahraman

Istanbul Universitesi Istanbul Tip Fakultesi

Ferhat Ferhatoglu

Istanbul Universitesi Istanbul Tip Fakultesi

Tastekin Didem

Istanbul Universitesi Istanbul Tip Fakultesi

Research

Keywords: Colorectal ancer, malnutrition, toxicity, survival

Posted Date: January 31st, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.22409/v1>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Background: The efficacy and tolerability of modern cytotoxic chemotherapy regimens used in malnourished metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC) patients is uncertain. The aim of this study was to investigate the effect of malnutrition on efficacy and tolerability of cytotoxic chemotherapy and overall survival in mCRC patients.

Methods: In this multicenter study, demographic, oncologic and nutritional data were collected prospectively from mCRC patients. Nutritional status of the patients were evaluated on the basis of NRI, BMI and WL before the first chemotherapy, after the first and second chemotherapy during 2 cycles of chemotherapy every 15 days. To determine the inter-treatment weight loss toxicity assessment was included to these parameters after each chemotherapy. NRI calculation was performed as $[1.51 \times \text{serum albumin level (g/L)} + 41.7 \times \text{current weight/basic weight}]$. NRIs were examined in 3 categories as 'no malnutrition' (NRI >97.5), 'moderate malnutrition' ($97.5 \geq \text{NRI} \geq 83.5$) or 'severe malnutrition' (NRI <83.5). Response to treatment and drug-induced toxicities were assessed based on Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST) 1.1 and National Cancer Institute CTCAE version 4.0 respectively.

Results: One-hundred and thirty-seven mCRC patients were prospectively included. Median age was 48 (range 18-83). Primary location was colon in 66% of patients and 84% of their primary source was left colon. Malnutrition was detected in 39% of the cases. Response rate to treatment was twenty four percent. While there was no significant relationship between chemotherapy response and moderate/severe malnutrition ($p=0.24$), moderate/severe malnutrition was associated with multiple site of metastases, WHO PS of 1, over the median value of CEA/CA 19-9 levels ($p=0.003$, $p=0.03$, $p<0.001$, and $p=0.02$; respectively). Hypoalbuminemia and moderate/severe malnutrition were associated with all types of toxicity ($p<0.001$ and $p<0.001$). Moderate/severe malnutrition was associated with thrombocytopenia, and diarrhea following chemotherapy predominately, ($p=0.02$ and $p=0.04$; respectively). In moderate/severe malnutrition group median overall survival was prominently shorter than those with no malnutrition [6.6 months (95%CI, 5.6-7.6) vs 11.9 months (95% CI, 11.1-12.7) respectively, $p<0.001$].

Conclusions: Our study showed that moderate/severe malnutrition in mCRC patients was associated with decreased overall survival and increased chemotherapy toxicity.

Introduction

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is a common and lethal disease (1). Although CRC mortality has been progressively declining since 1990, at a current rate of approximately 1.7 to 1.9 percent per year (2), it still remains the third most common cause of cancer death in the United States in women, and the second leading cause of death in men. Current literature suggests that over 86 percent of those diagnosed under the age of 50 are symptomatic at diagnosis, and this is associated with more advanced stage at diagnosis and poorer outcomes (3).

In patients with gastrointestinal malignancies, i.e. cancers of the stomach, colon, liver, biliary tract or pancreas, progressive malnutrition can be regularly observed during the course of illness and it significantly affects the patients' quality of life, morbidity and survival (4, 5). The impact of body mass index (BMI) on the survival of patients with CRC is controversial. Increased BMI has been associated by some authors with short survival in CRC (6). In contrast, other studies have shown lower mortality among overweight or moderately obese patients with CRC (7, 8). However, the combination of several nutritional scores, such as the use of BMI, bioelectrical impedance analysis, Nutritional Risk Assessment (NRI), and the subjective Patient-Produced Subjective Nutritional Assessment (PG-SGA), have demonstrated more conclusive responses in predicting survival in patients with CRC (7–9). Clear evidence suggests that the nutritional status in peri- and postdiagnosis periods of CRC patients also influences the prognosis related to the disease (10).

Malnutrition has become more important as a prognostic indicator and it is predictive of CT toxicity. Although, survival and nutrition are matched together, there is limited data about the relationship of nutrition and chemotherapy. In a new study; malnutrition according to PG-SGA was significantly associated with chemotherapy-related grade ≥ 2 clinical toxicities in CRC patients (5). Furthermore, malnutrition risk according to different nutritional assessment tools and whey protein intake were found to be significantly predictive of chemotherapy toxicity in patients with CRC receiving CT (11). Even one course of CT worsens the nutritional status of the patients in geriatric GI malignancies (12). Impact of nutritional status in the era of FOLFOX/FIRI-based chemotherapy was also studied and it was found that the well-nourished patients at first 6 months may predict a good response to therapy and fewer adverse events in FOLFOX/FIRI chemotherapy (13).

In this study, we aimed to investigate the effect of malnutrition on efficacy and tolerability of cytotoxic chemotherapy and overall survival in mCRC patients.

Materials And Methods

a) Patients' Characteristics

Between March 2019 and February 2018 the nutritional status of patients receiving chemotherapy for their metastatic colorectal cancer were screened in outpatient services of three gastrointestinal medical oncology and surgery departments in Turkey. Nutritional status of the patients were evaluated on the basis of NRI, BMI and WL before the first chemotherapy, after the first and second chemotherapy during 2 cycles of chemotherapy every 15 days. Age > 18 years, mCRC currently being treated with first line chemotherapy (Fluoropyrimidine derivate + oxaliplatin or irinotecan + targeted treatments) and not receiving nutritional support were determined as inclusion criteria. Patients with a follow-up of less than 2 months were excluded because of compromising the treatment tolerability assessment and insufficient data. The study was approved by our institutional ethics committee and also informed consent was obtained from each patient included. Nutritional and oncological data were recorded prospectively and anonymously on standardized and computerized case report forms.

b) Nutritional Assessment and Oncological Data

Age, sex, overall weight (6 months before diagnosis) and current weight, height, WHO PS, biochemical parameters including albumin, carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA) and carbohydrate antigen 19-9 (CA 19-9) levels were recorded to determine nutritional status.

BMI ($\text{weight}/\text{height}^2$), WL percentage [$100 - (\text{current weight}/\text{basic weight} \times 100)$] and NRI [$1.51 \times \text{serum albumin level (g/L)} + 41.7 \times \text{current weight}/\text{basic weight}$] were also calculated at each visit. NRIs were examined in 3 categories 'no malnutrition' ($\text{NRI} > 97.5$), 'moderate malnutrition' ($97.5 \geq \text{NRI} \geq 83.5$) or 'severe malnutrition' ($\text{NRI} < 83.5$) in accordance with what was previously defined (14).

Primary tumor location, number of metastases and sites, complete biochemistry including CA 19-9 and CEA levels and hemogram parameters were recorded as oncologic data. Complete biochemistry values were recorded after the first and second chemotherapy and toxicity was assessed by grading according to CTCAE 4.0 (15). In the event of grade 3 hematological toxicity, treatment was discontinued until either toxicity decreased to grade 2 or the blood count reached the lower limit of the laboratory and then the original dose of the drug was administered. In hematologic grade 4 and nonhematologic grade 3-4 toxicities, treatment was interrupted until ameliorated to grade 2 and grade 1 respectively. Nutritional evaluation was carried out before treatment and after the completion of the second chemotherapy. Response to treatment was assessed together with recording all potentially chemotherapy-related adverse events after 2 months of the completion of first nutritional evaluation. Response assessment was evaluated based on Criteria in Solid Tumors (RECIST) 1.1 after two months of treatment.

c) Statistical Analysis

SPSS for Windows version 21.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL., USA) was used to calculate the data. Follow-up times were calculated by subtracting the date of the first chemotherapy from the date of death or last follow-up visit. The overall survival (OS) was defined as the time between the first treatment date and death or the last date the patient-patient relative was contacted. Quantitative data were expressed with mean value, standard deviation, median value including minimum and maximum values. Qualitative analyzes were expressed as frequency and percentage. Pearson chi-square test was used to analyze the relationships and comparisons between clinical and laboratory variables. Fisher's exact test was used if Pearson chi-square test could not be performed. Kaplan-Meier method was used for the probability of survival function and the log-rank statistics was used in order to calculate the differences in OS. All statistical analyses were two-sided; comparisons were made as p value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results

One-hundred and thirty-seven mCRC patients were prospectively included in the study from 3 Turkish hospitals. Median age was 48 (range 18-83) and sixty-one percent of the patients were men. Primary location was colon in 66% of patients, 84% of their primary source was left colon and 42% had primary

tumor resection. Thirty-four % of patients' WHO PS was 0 and 52% had at least two metastatic sites. Liver and lung were the most common sites of metastasis. There were 68% of patients receiving first-line chemotherapy. While 10% of the patients received fluoropyrimidine chemotherapy alone, 61% received anti-VEGFR treatment. According to RECIST 1.1 4 patients had complete response, 29 had partial response, 21 had stable disease and 53 had progressive disease. When the treatment response was accepted as partial response and complete response 24% of patients were found to respond to treatment. The characteristics of the patients are summarized in Table 1.

Malnutrition was detected in 39% of the cases, of which 38% were moderate and 0.9% severe. WL>10% was 25% and BMI<18.5 was 0.4% of the patients. Additionally, 49% of the patients were overweight/obesity according to the BMI. Patients with moderate/severe malnutrition values did not decrease significantly after the second chemotherapy ($p=0.72$). Nutritional values are described in Table 2.

When the relationship between sex, age, primary location of tumor, resected primary tumor, WHO PS, number of metastatic sites, CEA, CA 19-9 and moderate/severe malnutrition was evaluated four clinic parameters were found associated with moderate/severe malnutrition; multiple site of metastases, WHO PS of 1, over the median value of CEA/CA 19-9 levels ($p=0.003$, $p=0.03$, $p<0.001$, and $p=0.02$; respectively). There was no significant relationship between chemotherapy response and moderate / severe malnutrition. ($p=0.24$).

Chemotherapy-related adverse events are listed in tables 3a and 3b. Hypoalbuminemia and moderate/severe malnutrition were associated with all types of toxicity ($p<0.001$ and $p<0.001$). Moderate/severe malnutrition was associated with thrombocytopenia, nausea/vomiting, and diarrhea following chemotherapy predominantly, ($p=0.02$, $p=0.05$, and $p=0.04$; respectively). Worse moderate/severe malnutrition values were found related to \geq grade 2 hematologic/non-hematological chemotherapy toxicities. ($p <0.001$ and $p = 0.05$). Furthermore all hematological/non-hematological toxicity, anemia and grade 1 elevation of transaminases was also more frequent in patients with hypoalbuminemia, ($p<0.001$, $p<0.001$, $p=0.04$, and $p=0.03$; respectively). Both thrombocytopenia and all \geq grade 2 non-hematological toxicity were also more frequent in patients with BMI<25, ($p=0.02$ and $p=0.01$). >10% WL was significantly associated with \geq grade 2 leukopenia following chemotherapy, ($p=0.02$).

Median follow-up period from the date of nutritional evaluation was 4 months [95% confidence interval (CI), 1-13]. Forty of 137 patients died during study period. Median overall survival was 9.4 months (95% CI, 8.5-10.2). In moderate/severe malnutrition group median overall survival was prominently shorter than those with no malnutrition [6.6 months (95 %CI, 5.6-7.6) vs 11.9 months (95 % CI, 11.1-12.7) respectively, $p<0.001$] (Figure 1). Other clinicopathological parameters linked to overall survival are detailed in Table 4.

Discussion

Malnutrition is a serious problem in patients who receive anticancer therapy. Cancer-related malnutrition is multifactorial and reflects the balance between disease course and its treatment (16–18).

In our study, hypoalbuminemia and moderate/severe malnutrition were associated with all types of toxicity and moderate/severe malnutrition was associated with thrombocytopenia, and diarrhea following chemotherapy predominately and median OS was prominently shorter in moderate/severe malnutrition group than those without malnutrition. Nutritional status might be very important to continue chemotherapy without severe adverse events. Therefore, maintaining patients well-nourished during chemotherapy might have a key role in the outcomes of treatment and it is crucial for survival benefit.

Four clinic parameters were found associated with moderate/severe malnutrition; multipl site of metastases, WHO PS of 1, over the median value of CEA and CA 19 – 9 levels. All these parameters are the predictors of survival, too.

Evaluation of the baseline nutritional status of patients with CRC should be a part of routine clinical practice because maintaining a well-nourished situation during CT might contribute to higher response to cancer and fewer adverse events for patients. A nutritional support should be one of the options for the patients in bad-nourished ones (18, 19).

Malnutrition and frailty were strongly associated with an increased mortality risk in patients who underwent palliative chemotherapy in older CRC patients receiving CT. Furthermore, a poor score on Mini Nutritional Assessment (MNA) was predictive for less tolerance of chemotherapy (20).

In the light of the literature; we can suggest that malnutrition is a prognostic tool for survival and it is also related with treatment toxicity.

Conclusion

Prospective documentation of the nutritional status of patients with GI cancer, especially for CRC patients, is essential for predicting toxicities and the survival of patients.

Declarations

Ethical Approval and Consent to participate: Ethical approval was taken before the study from Istanbul University Medical Faculty, Institute of Oncology's local ethical committee. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant.

Consent for publication: All authors consent the submission of the manuscript as it is.

Availability of supporting data: Not applicable.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Author's contributions: Conceptualization, S.K. and C.U.A; Methodology, C.U.A and Ş.K.; Software, M.K. and Ş.K.; Validation, F.F.; Formal Analysis, M.K.; Investigation, D.T.; Resources, I.D.; Data Curation, M.K. and F.F.; Writing—Original Draft Preparation, C.U.A.; Writing—Review & Editing, C.U.A. and S.K.; Visualization, F.F.; Supervision, D.T.; Project Administration, M.K. and I.D.; Funding Acquisition, S.K.

Acknowledgements: Not applicable.

Author's information:

Affiliations: ¹Department of Medical Oncology, Institute of Oncology, Istanbul University Istanbul Medical Faculty, ²Balıkesir University, Research and Practice Hospital, Department of Internal Medicine and Medical Oncology, ³Department of General Surgery, Bakırkoy Dr Sadi Konuk Education and Research Hospital, Health Sciences University, ⁴Department of Radiation Oncology, Istanbul University Istanbul Medical Faculty.

References

1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2019. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2019; 69:7.
2. Cronin KA, Lake AJ, Scott S, et al. Annual Report to the Nation on the Status of Cancer, part I: National cancer statistics. *Cancer* 2018; 124:2785.
3. Dozois EJ, Boardman LA, Suwanthanma W, et al. Young-onset colorectal cancer in patients with no known genetic predisposition: can we increase early recognition and improve outcome? *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2008; 87:259.
4. Oneda E, Zaniboni A. Considerations about the importance of nutritional status in the treatment of advanced colorectal cancer. *Recenti Prog Med* 2019; 110(10): 476-9.
5. Gallois C, Artru P, Lièvre A, Auclin E, Lecomte T, Locher C, et al. Evaluation of two nutritional scores' association with systemic treatment toxicity and survival in metastatic colorectal cancer: an AGEO prospective multicentre study. *Eur J Cancer* 2019; 119: 35-43.
6. Vrieling A, Kampman E. The role of body mass index, physical activity, and diet in colorectal cancer recurrence and survival: a review of the literature. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2010; 92: 471–90.
7. Schlesinger S, Siegert S, Koch M, Walter J, Heits N, Hinz S, et al. Postdiagnosis body mass index and risk of mortality in colorectal cancer survivors: a prospective study and meta-analysis. *Cancer Causes Control* 2014; 25: 1407–18.
8. Choe EK, Park KJ, Ryoo SB, Moon SH, Oh HK, Han EC. Prognostic impact of changes in adipose tissue areas after colectomy in colorectal cancer patients. *J Korean Med Sci* 2016; 31: 1571–8.
9. Campbell PT, Newton CC, Dehal AN, Jacobs EJ, Patel AV, Gapstur SM. Impact of body mass index on survival after colorectal cancer diagnosis: the Cancer prevention study-II nutrition cohort. *J Clin Oncol* 2012; 30: 42–52.

10. Parsons HA, Baracos VE, Dhillon N, Hong DS, Kurzrock R. Body composition, symptoms, and survival in advanced cancer patients referred to a phase I service. *PLoS One* 2012; 7(1): e29330.
11. Mazzuca F, Roberto M, Arrivi G, Sarfati E, Schipilliti FM, Crimini E, et al. Clinical Impact of Highly Purified, Whey Proteins in Patients Affected With Colorectal Cancer Undergoing Chemotherapy: Preliminary Results of a Placebo-Controlled Study. *Integr Cancer Ther* 2019 Jan-Dec;18:1534735419866920. doi: 10.1177/1534735419866920.
12. Bicakli DH, Ozveren A, Uslu R, Dalak RM, Cehreli R, Uyar M, et al. The effect of chemotherapy on nutritional status and weakness in geriatric gastrointestinal system cancer patients. *Nutrition* 2018; 47: 39-42.
13. Okada S, Yamazaki S, Kaiga T, Funada T, Kochi M, Takayama T. Impact of nutritional status in the era of FOLFOX/FIRI-based chemotherapy. *World J Surg Oncol* 2017; 15(1): 162.
14. Perioperative total parenteral nutrition in surgical patients. The Veterans Affairs Total Parenteral Nutrition Cooperative Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1991; 325: 525-32.
15. National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events and Common Toxicity Criteria. http://ctep.cancer.gov/protocol_Development/electronic_applications/ctc.htm.
16. Marik PE, Zaloga GP. Early enteral nutrition in acutely ill patients: a systematic review. *Crit Care Med* 2001; 29: 2264–70.
17. Montejo JC, Zarazaga A, López-Martínez J. Immunonutrition in the intensive care unit. A systematic review and consensus statement. *Clin Nutr* 2003; 22: 221–33.
18. Elia M, Van Bokhorst-De Van Der Schueren MAE II, Garvey J, et al. Enteral (oral or tube administration) nutritional support and eicosapentaenoic acid in patients with cancer: a systematic review. *Int J Oncol* 2006; 28: 5–23.
19. Ziętańska M, Krawczyk-Lipiec J, Kraj L, Zaucha R, Małgorzewicz S. Nutritional status assessment in colorectal cancer patients qualified to systemic treatment. *Contemp Oncol (Pozn)* 2017; 21(2): 157-61.
20. Aaldriks AA, van der Geest LG, Giltay EJ, le Cessie S, Portielje JE, Tanis BC, et al. Frailty and malnutrition predictive of mortality risk in older patients with advanced colorectal cancer receiving chemotherapy. *J Geriatr Oncol* 2013; 4(3): 218-26.

Tables

Table 1. Patients and laboratory characteristics

Variables		n (%)
Age, years	Median (range) years: 62 (18-83) <Median /Median	66 (48)/71 (52)
Gender	Male/Female	54 (39)/83 (61)
WHO performance status	0/1	47 (34)/90 (64)
Primary tumor	Right colon/Left colon Colon /Rectum	22 (16)/115 (84) 91 (66)/46 (37)
Primary tumor resection	Yes/No	58 (42)/79 (58)
Metastasis site	Liver/Lung Abdominal implant-lymphadenopathy/Bone Others&	105 (77)/42 (31) 40 (29)/13 (1) 24 (18)
Number of metastases	Single/Multipl site	66 (48)/77 (52)
Chemotherapy	1 line 2 lines > 2 lines	93 (68) 31 (23) 13 (10)
Chemotherapy protocol	FP*+oxaliplatin /FP+Irinotecan FP+oxaliplatin+irinotecan FP alone	75 (58)/34 (26) 13 (10) 14 (10)
Targeted therapy	Anti- VEGF monoclonal antibody Anti- EGFR monoclonal antibody	84 (61) 38 (28)
Response to chemotherapy**	Yes/No	33 (24)/74 (54)
CEA (ng/mL)	Median (range): 23.12 (0.20-7966.00) <Median />Median	61 (45)/59 (43)
CA-19-9 (U/mL)	Median (range): 50.41 (0.60-14835.00) <Median />Median	63 (46)/61 (45)

&Mediastinal LAP, adnex, pancreas, spleen, adrenal gland

* FP: Fluoropyrimidine

**Stable disease wasn't accepted responsive

Table 2. Nutritional characteristics of patients

Variables	n (%)
Weight loss (WL)	
Former body WL% median (range): 8.5 (1.3-27.7)	
>10% WL	34 (25)
<10% WL	55 (40)
Body mass index (BMI)	
Underweight (<18.5)	5 (0.4)
Normal weight (18.5–25)	60 (44)
Overweight (25–30)	36 (26)
Obesity (>30)	32 (23)
Albumin (g/L)	
Median (range): 37.5 (24-45)	
Nutritional status based on the NRI	
<83.5	12 (0.9)
83.5-97.5	52 (38)
>97.5	73 (53)

Table 3a. Nutritional characteristics and chemotherapy-related hematologic toxicity (G1 vs ≥G2).

	Leucopenia	Anemia	Thrombocytopenia	All Toxicity
10% WL				
>10%	2/8	19/13	9/2	17/15
<10%	4/0	31/18	19/0	34/18
<i>p</i>	0.02	0.72	0.42	0.27
BMI				
<25	10/9	39/21	24/8	41/22
>25	12/5	44/19	15/0	41/24
<i>p</i>	0.36	0.57	0.02	0.81
Albumin				
<35	2/2	77/24	4/2	78/28
>35	21/12	10/16	35/2	8/18
<i>p</i>	0.69	<0.001	0.29	<0.001
NRI				
≤97.5	6/10	32/30	21/8	30/34
>97.5	17/4	55/10	18/0	56/11
<i>p</i>	0.36	0.57	0.02	<0.001

Thickened in $p \leq 0.05$.

Table 3b. Nutritional characteristics and chemotherapy-related non-hematologic toxicity (G1 vs ≥G2)

	Kreatin	Transam.	Nausea Vomiting	Mucosit	Diarrhea	Constipation	Neuropathy	All toxicity
10% WL								
>10%	6/4	10/4	1/5	0/6	0/0	2/0	5/5	16/18
<10%	1/0	24/3	4/3	1/6	3/9	2/0	11/3	26/18
<i>p</i>	0.73	0.38	0.23	0.73	NC	1.0	0.26	0.29
BMI								
<25	7/4	29/6	4/8	1/11	4/7	5/0	16/7	28/31
>25	3/0	21/1	5/1	1/4	2/2	3/0	11/2	36/15
<i>p</i>	0.37	0.16	0.10	0.72	0.75	1.0	0.47	0.01
Albumin								
<35	0/0	41/4	0/0	0/2	0/0	2/0	4/0	56/14
>35	10/4	10/3	10/9	6/7	10/9	6/0	23/9	8/33
<i>p</i>	NC	0.03	NC	0.84	0.38	1.0	0.39	0.03
NRI								
≤97.5	4/4	28/6	10/4	0/10	0/9	2/0	16/4	26/28
>97.5	6/0	23/1	0/5	2/6	0/3	6/0	11/5	38/6
<i>p</i>	0.14	0.12	0.05	0.41	0.04	1.0	0.58	0.05

Thickened in $p \leq 0.05$, NC= No istatistics are computed.

Table 4. Univariate analyses of overall survival

Variables	Survival (months) Median (\pm SD)	p
Age, years		
<60/>60	11.7 (0.4)/6.9 (0.5)	<0.001
Gender		
Male/Female	10.8 (0.7)/8.4 (0.5)	0.05
WHO performance status		
0/1	11.9 (0.5)/8.1 (0.5)	0.002
Primary tumor localization		
Colon/Rectum	9.5 (0.5)/8.1 (0.7)	0.04
Primary tumor localization		
Right colon/Left colon	8.8 (0.9)/9.3 (0.5)	0.31
Number of metastases		
Single/Multipl site	10.6 (0.6)/7.9 (0.6)	0.03
Response to chemotherapy*		
Yes /No	12.7 (0.3)/8.6 (0.5)	<0.001
CEA		
<Median />Median	11.2 (0.4)/6.9 (0.6)	<0.001
CA-19-9		
<Median />Median	10.5 (0.4)/7.1 (0.5)	<0.001
Albumin		
<35/>35	5.6 (0.6)/9.8 (0.5)	0.004
10% WL		
>10% /<10%	8.4 (0.7)/9.0 (0.7)	0.83
BMI		
<25/>25	7.7 (0.5)/10.3 (0.6)	0.04
NRI		
>97.5/83.5-97.5/<83.5	11.9 (0.4)/6.4 (0.5)/5.3 (0.4)	<0.001
NRI		
\leq 97.5/>97.5	6.6 (0.5)/11.9 (0.4)	<0.001
NRI		
<83.5/ \geq 83.5	5.3 (0.4)/9.4 (0.5)	0.85

Thickened in $p \leq 0.05$. *Stable disease wasn't accepted responsive.

Figures




Figure 2

Overall survival and nutritional status in two patient groups (Malnourished patients and non-malnourished patients) ($p < 0.001$).