

# Efficacy of Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy (HIPEC) in the Management of Malignant Ascites

**Jie Jiao**

Jinan Central Hospital

**Chengzhen Li**

PLA 960th Hospital

**Guanying Yu**

Jinan Central Hospital

**Lei Zhang**

Jinan Central Hospital

**Xiaoyan Shi**

Jinan Central Hospital

**Jingdu Yan**

PLA 960th Hospital

**Houjun Zhang**

PLA 960th Hospital

**Peiming Guo** (✉ [guopeiming\\_dd@163.com](mailto:guopeiming_dd@163.com))

---

## Research

**Keywords:** efficacy, malignant ascites, intraperitoneal hyperthermic chemotherapy

**Posted Date:** February 19th, 2020

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.23958/v1>

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

[Read Full License](#)

---

**Version of Record:** A version of this preprint was published on July 22nd, 2020. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12957-020-01956-y>.

# Abstract

**Objective:** The purpose of this study is to compare the difference of clinical efficacy between conventional intraperitoneal chemotherapy and HIPEC, so as to explore the clinical application value and advantages of HIPEC.

**Design:** A retrospective analysis was conducted on 80 patients with malignant ascites admitted to our hospital from June 2017 to June 2019. The general clinical data and qualitative data of the treatment results of 80 patients with malignant ascites were processed by SPSS19.0 using  $\chi^2$  test and quantitative data were processed by t test.  $P < 0.05$ , statistical data can be considered statistically significant.

**Results:** 1. There was no significant change in vital signs and temperature in the observation group during the treatment, and the difference was not statistically significant 2. The short-term total effective rate of patients in the observation group was 91.11%, and the short-term total effective rate of the patients in the control group was 40%. 3. There was no significant difference in the incidence of adverse reactions between the two groups of patients.

**Conclusion:** Intraperitoneal hyperthermic chemotherapy combined with intravenous chemotherapy can significantly control malignant ascites, and has small adverse reactions, which is worthy of clinical promotion and application.

**Key words:** efficacy; malignant ascites; intraperitoneal hyperthermic chemotherapy.

## Introduction

Abdominal or systemic malignant tumors can easily induce diffuse lesion of the abdominal visceral wall and further lead to abnormal increase of peritoneal effusion, which is called malignant ascites clinically[1]. Clinical studies have found that malignant ascites develops rapidly, and patients without effective intervention may experience symptoms such as abdominal distention, abdominal pain, and even breathing difficulties[2]. Some studies have pointed out that the prognosis of patients with malignant ascites is very poor, the survival period of patients is short, the 5-year survival rate is less than 35%[3]. In recent years, hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) is an effective method for auxiliary abdominal malignant tumor treatment, than traditional chemotherapy agents, in the treatment and prevention of malignant tumors of peritoneal planting has extremely obvious clinical advantages[4]. Therefore, a retrospective study was conducted on 80 patients with malignant ascites treated in our hospital to compare the difference of clinical efficacy between conventional intraperitoneal chemotherapy and HIPEC, so as to explore the clinical application value and advantages of HIPEC.

## 1 Material Methods

### 1.1 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria: (1)  $16 \leq \text{age} \leq 85$  years (2) CT, MRI, exploratory laparotomy and/or intraperitoneal free cancer cells confirmed diffuse intraperitoneal implantation metastasis of tumor;(3)Ultrasonography confirmed the abdominal volume of  $> 3\ 000$  mL.

Exclusion criteria: (1)No malignant ascites or abdominal volume  $< 1500$  mL;(2)Extensive adhesion in the abdominal cavity;(3) Inclusional peritoneal effusion;(4)Total intestinal obstruction;(5) Severe coagulation dysfunction;(6)Too old and obviously poor physical function.

## 1.2 General case information

The 80 patients admitted to our hospital from June 2017 to June 2019 were divided into an observation group and control group according to different treatment methods. Among the 45 patients in the observation group, 25 were male

and 20 were female. The mean age was  $57.87 \pm 9.733$  years. Mean abdominal volume was  $4353.3 \pm 685.180$  ml; There were 8 cases of primary appendiceal, 12 cases of primary gastric cancer, 20 cases of colon cancer, 2 cases of mesothelioma and 3 cases of ovarian cancer. Among the 35 patients in the control group, there were 18 males and 17 females. The mean age was  $58.0 \pm 8.570$  years. The mean abdominal volume was  $4170.0 \pm 646.55$  ml. There were 6cases of primary appendiceal, 10 cases of primary gastric cancer, 18 cases of colon cancer, none of mesothelioma and 1 case of ovarian cancer. There were no statistically significant differences in gender, age, abdominal volume, and primary disease between the two groups ( $P > 0.05$ ). (Table 1).

Characteristic	Observation group	Control group	P value
gender			
Male	25	18	0.822
female	20	17	
Age (years)	$57.87 \pm 9.733$	$58.0 \pm 8.570$	0.760
Ascites volume(ml)	$4353.3 \pm 685.180$	$4170.0 \pm 646.55$	0.960
Type of primary disease			
Appendiceal	8	6	0.670
Colorectal	20	18	
Gastric	12	10	
Mesothelioma	2	0	
Ovarian	3	1	

Table 1 Patient and procedure characteristics

## 1.3 Methods

In the observation group, 45 patients were first treated with HIPEC for 5 times, followed by 6 ~ 8 courses of intravenous chemotherapy. The intravenous chemotherapy regimen was selected according to the primary disease[5]. The HIPEC drugs for gastric and colon cancer were loperlatin, cisplatin, irinotecan and 5-fu, while for ovarian cancer were paclitaxel, loperlatin, cisplatin and 5-fu, and the drug dosage was referred to intravenous chemotherapy[6]. Four special HIPEC tubes were placed under laparoscopy to connect to the HIPEC therapeutic apparatus, and chemotherapy drugs were added to 4000 ml normal saline[7]. The perfusion flow rate was 400–600 ml /min, the perfusion time was 60 min, and the treatment temperature was set as  $43 \pm 0.2^{\circ}\text{C}$ [7]. Each treatment interval was  $\geq 24$  hours[8]. The HIPEC therapy instrument used in this treatment was BR-TRG-2 peritoneal thermal perfusion therapy system.

In the control group, 35 patients were treated with intravenous chemotherapy and abdominal puncture pumping. The chemotherapy regimen was selected based on the primary disease, and 6–8 courses of chemotherapy were selected. 1,000 mL of fluid was initially dispensed, and then no more than 500 mL of fluid was removed from the abdominal cavity every day[9]. All patients were evaluated for efficacy one month after the end of treatment, and then followed up every month for six months.

## 1.4 Efficacy Evaluation Criteria

According to WHO standards, in evaluating the clinical efficacy of patients, the patients were divided into complete remission (CR), partial remission (PR), disease stability (SD), and disease progression (PD). CR: Ascites disappeared for more than 4 weeks; PR: Ascites decreased by more than 50% and lasted more than 4 weeks; SD: No significant ascites, changes in ascites are less than 50%; PD: Increased ascites[10]. Total effective rate =  $(\text{CR} + \text{PR}) / \text{total number of cases} \times 100\%$ . Adverse reactions were classified into  $\text{I} \sim \text{IV}$  degrees according to WHO anti-cancer drug adverse reaction scale[11].

## 1.5 Statistical Analysis

The general clinical data and qualitative data of the treatment results of 80 patients with malignant ascites were processed by SPSS19.0 using  $\chi^2$  test and quantitative data were processed by t test.  $P < 0.05$ , statistical data can be considered statistically significant.

## 2 Result

### 2.1 Vital signs and temperature of patients in the observation group during treatment

There was no significant change in vital signs and temperature in the observation group during the treatment, and the difference was not statistically significant.(Table 2)

Table 2 Vital signs and temperature in observation group during treatment

	Treatment 0 min	Treatment 30 min	Treatment 60 min	P value
Heart rate (times / min)	69±7	80±8	94±6	∞0.05
Diastolic blood pressure (mmHg)	82±8	81±8	94±5	∞0.05
Systolic pressure (mmHg)	122±6	116±7	128±5	∞0.05
Blood oxygen saturation (%)	98±2	97±2	98±1	∞0.05
Respiration (times / min)	14±2	16±1	18±1	∞0.05
Body surface temperature (°C)	36.2±0.2	36.9±0.3	37.7±0.4	∞0.05

Table 3

Comparison of short-term efficacy between observation group and control group

Group	Total cases	CR	PR	SD	PD	Total effective rate
Observation group	45	13	28	2	2	91.11%
Control group	35	2	12	16	5	40.00%
χ <sup>2</sup>						25.79
P value						P<0.01

## 2.2 Recent efficacy observations

The short-term total effective rate of patients in the observation group was 91.11%, and the short-term total effective rate of the patients in the control group was 40%. The difference between the two groups in the total effective rate shortly was statistically significant ( $P < 0.01$ )

## 2.3 Adverse reactions

Both groups had varying degrees of gastrointestinal reactions, mainly vomiting, hiccups, decreased appetite, constipation, and diarrhea. Both groups had different degrees of myelosuppression, and no myelosuppression above ∞ was found. There were no serious complications such as intestinal obstruction, intestinal adhesions, peritonitis, and abdominal infection in both groups. There was no significant difference in the incidence of adverse reactions between the two groups of patients ( $P > 0.05$ ). (Table 4)

Table 4  
Comparison of adverse reactions between observation group and control group

Group	Gastrointestinal reaction			Myelosuppression	
	Grade I	Grade II	Grade III	Grade I	Grade II
Observation group	20	18	5	9	3
Control group	14	13	5	8	1
$\chi^2$	0.257			0.643	
P value	0.879			0.422	

### 3 Discussion

Malignant ascites is a common complication of advanced abdominal and pelvic malignancies[12]. Abdominal puncture and fluid diuresis alone are not only ineffective, but also increase in ascites responsiveness[13]. Repeated pumping treatment is likely to lead to complications such as electrolyte disturbance and hypoproteinemia[14]. Therefore, effectively controlling the growth of malignant ascites can significantly improve the quality of life of patients and prolong the survival of patients, which is of great significance for the treatment of advanced tumors[15]. Some scholars have pointed out that the use of hyperthermia can effectively kill tumor cells, destroy the vascular structure in the lesion area, reduce blood supply to tumor tissues, and effectively inhibit tumor proliferation[16]. In addition, hyperthermia can also effectively enhance cell membrane permeability, inhibit tumor cell self-repair, increase the permeability of drug lesions, and improve efficacy[17]. Studies have found that if the temperature of hyperthermia is lower than 41°C, it cannot be effectively treated, but when the temperature is higher than 45°C, normal tissues and organs will be damaged, and the critical death temperature of most tumor cells is 43°C[18]. The temperature is controlled at 41–45°C[19]. In this study, hyperthermia combined with HIPEC was used to intervene in the patients. Now the perfusion chemotherapy drugs are preheated, which effectively shortens the endogenous field temperature to reach the plateau period and makes the perfusion temperature stable and stable[20]. The results showed that the clinical efficacy of the observation group was significantly better than that of the control group, and suggesting that the use of HIPEC in the treatment of malignant ascites has excellent clinical advantages.

The main purpose of treating malignant ascites is to improve the quality of life of the patient, relieve the patient's pain, and thereby extend the patient's survival. HIPEC is an auxiliary method used in the treatment of malignant tumors in the abdominal cavity in recent years[21]. A large number of warm chemotherapy infusion fluids can allow the chemotherapeutic drugs to fully contact the small intra-abdominal metastases. During the treatment process, the chemotherapy infusion fluid can mechanically remove free abdominal cancer cells[22]. After the chemotherapeutic drugs are infused into the abdominal

cavity, there can be a constant, high and durable concentration in the abdominal cavity, but less chemotherapy enters the systemic circulation, and the systemic adverse reactions are small, which makes HIPEC have a significant therapeutic advantage in treating malignant ascites[23].

## **Conclusion**

In short, intraperitoneal hyperthermic chemotherapy combined with intravenous chemotherapy can significantly control malignant ascites, and has small adverse reactions, which is worthy of clinical promotion and application.

## **Declarations**

### **Acknowledgements**

Not applicable.

### **Authors' contributions**

Data collection and analysis were performed by Jie Jiao, Jingdu Yan, and Houjun Zhang. Others authors contributed to the literature studies analysis for discussion and participation to surgical procedures. All authors read and approved the final manuscript in its present form.

### **Funding**

This work was supported by Science and Technology Plan Project of Jinan Municipal Health and Family Planning Commission (Grants No. 2018-1-07).

### **Availability of data and materials**

The datasets during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

### **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

The study was done after an agreement from the local ethics committee (Jinan Central Hospital ethics committee) and with the patients' informed consent.

### **Competing interests**

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

### **Author details**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Gastrointestinal surgery, Jinan Central Hospital Affiliated to Shandong University, Jinan, Shandong 250013, China.

Written informed consent for publication of their clinical details and/or clinical images was obtained from the patient/parent/guardian/ relative of the patient.

## References

1. Kalogeraki, A., et al., *Cytopathologic interpretation of ascites due to malignancy*. J buon, 2012. 17(3): p. 446-51.
2. Hodge, C. and B.D. Badgwell, *Palliation of malignant ascites*. 2019. 120(1): p. 67-73.
3. Maeda, H., M. Kobayashi, and J. Sakamoto, *Evaluation and treatment of malignant ascites secondary to gastric cancer*. World J Gastroenterol, 2015. 21(39): p. 10936-47.
4. Robella, M., et al., *Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy: morbidity and postoperative outcomes*. Minerva Chir, 2019. 74(3): p. 195-202.
5. Loggie, B.W. and P. Thomas, *Gastrointestinal Cancers With Peritoneal Carcinomatosis: Surgery and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy*. Oncology (Williston Park), 2015. 29(7): p. 515-21.
6. de Bree, E., *Optimal drugs for HIPEC in different tumors*. J buon, 2015. 20 Suppl 1: p. S40-6.
7. Bartos, A., et al., *Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC). Mechanisms of action and the role of HIPEC in the treatment of peritoneal carcinomatosis*. Ann Ital Chir, 2018. 89: p. 513-527.
8. Leebmann, H. and P. Piso, *[Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy]*. Chirurg, 2019. 90(7): p. 593-604.
9. Binyamin, S., et al., *[INTRAVENOUS CHEMOTHERAPY VERSUS INTRAPERITONEAL CHEMOTHERAPY IN ADVANCED OVARIAN CANCER: UPDATE ON THE SITUATION WORLDWIDE AND IN ISRAEL]*. Harefuah, 2015. 154(9): p. 594-8, 607, 606.
10. Dever, J.B. and M.Y. Sheikh, *Review article: spontaneous bacterial peritonitis—bacteriology, diagnosis, treatment, risk factors and prevention*. Aliment Pharmacol Ther, 2015. 41(11): p. 1116-31.
11. Rapoport, B.L., et al., *Supportive care for patients undergoing immunotherapy*. Support Care Cancer, 2017. 25(10): p. 3017-3030.
12. Saif, M.W., I.A. Siddiqui, and M.A. Sohail, *Management of ascites due to gastrointestinal malignancy*. Ann Saudi Med, 2009. 29(5): p. 369-77.
13. Denis, B. and D. Elias, *[Diagnosis and treatment of peritoneal carcinoma]*. Gastroenterol Clin Biol, 2004. 28(5 Suppl): p. D17-25.
14. Aziz, O., et al., *Predicting Survival After Cytoreductive Surgery and Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Appendix Adenocarcinoma*. Dis Colon Rectum, 2018. 61(7): p. 795-802.
15. Mikula-Pietrasik, J., et al., *Biochemical composition of malignant ascites determines high aggressiveness of undifferentiated ovarian tumors*. Med Oncol, 2016. 33(8): p. 94.
16. Degett, T.H., H.C. Pommergaard, and I. Gogenur, *[Hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy at the primary gastrointestinal cancer operation]*. Ugeskr Laeger, 2017. 179(12).

17. Rajeev, R. and K.K. Turaga, *Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy and Cytoreductive Surgery in the Management of Peritoneal Carcinomatosis*. *Cancer Control*, 2016. 23(1): p. 36-46.
18. Rihuete Caro, C., et al., *Cytoreductive surgery combined with hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy (HIPEC) in patients with gastric cancer and peritoneal carcinomatosis*. *Eur J Surg Oncol*, 2018. 44(11): p. 1805-1810.
19. Oseledchyk, A. and O. Zivanovic, *Intraoperative Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy in Patients With Advanced Ovarian Cancer*. *Oncology (Williston Park)*, 2015. 29(9): p. 695-701.
20. Kok, N.F. and I.H. de Hingh, *Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal metastases of colorectal origin*. *Br J Surg*, 2017. 104(4): p. 313-315.
21. Polom, K., et al., *Cytoreductive surgery and hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy for treatment of ovarian cancer*. *Int J Hyperthermia*, 2016. 32(3): p. 298-310.
22. Scholer, A.J., et al., *Abdominal wall reconstruction after cytoreduction surgery-hyperthermic intraperitoneal chemotherapy*. *J Surg Res*, 2018. 221: p. 266-274.
23. Eveno, C., T. Voron, and G. Piessen, *Laparoscopic Hyperthermic Intraperitoneal Chemotherapy for Patients with Gastric Peritoneal Metastases: Limitations and Perspectives*. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2019. 26(9): p. 3009-3010.

## Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [Consentforpublication.jpg](#)