

Appraisal of Long-time Outcomes After Curative Surgery in Elderly Patients with Gastric Cancer: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis

Tomoyuki Matunaga (✉ matut0m0@tottori-u.ac.jp)

Tottori University Hospital: Tottori Daigaku Igakubu Fuzoku Byoin

Ryo Ishiguro

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Wataru Miyauchi

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Yuji Shishido

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Kozo Miyatani

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Manabu Yamamoto

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Naruo Tokuyasu

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Shuichi Takano

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Teruhisa Sakamoto

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Soichiro Honjo

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Hiroaki Saito

Tottori Red Cross Hospital: Tottori Sekijuji Byoin

Yoshiyuki Fujiwara

Tottori University: Tottori Daigaku

Research article

Keywords: elderly patient, gastric cancer, prognosis

Posted Date: September 24th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-75500/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 January 9th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12893-021-01046-0>.

Abstract

Background: This study was conducted to assess the long-term outcomes of elderly patients among propensity-score-matched gastric cancer patients after curative gastrectomy and to propose the proper management of elderly gastric cancer patients.

Methods: We enrolled 626 patients with gastric cancer who underwent curative gastrectomy at our institution between January 2004 and December 2015. To minimize selection bias among 2 groups, propensity score matching was performed.

Results: Patients were divided into an elderly group over 75 years old (EP group; n=186) and a non-elderly group (NEP group; n=440). After propensity score matching, patients were divided into EP group (n=186) and NEP group (n=186). Five-year overall survival was significantly lower in the EP group than in the NEP group, consistent with a subgroup analysis of each stage. However, the 5-year disease-specific survival among all enrolled patients and those with stage I and II disease did not differ significantly. Moreover, in the subgroup of stage III patients, 5-year disease-specific survival was significantly lower in the EP group (23.0%) than in the NEP group (59.4%; $P=0.004$). Because elderly patients with stage III disease had an extremely poor prognosis, we decided to compare the two groups with stage III. The EP group contained significantly fewer patients with D2 lymphadenectomy ($P=0.002$) and adjuvant chemotherapy ($P<0.001$) than the NEP group. Multivariate analysis revealed that older age and lymphatic invasion were independent prognostic factors. C-reactive protein to albumin ratio was significantly higher in patients in the EP group than in the NEP group ($P=0.046$), and the prognostic nutritional index was significantly lower in EP group patients than NEP group patients ($P=0.045$).

Conclusions: Elderly gastric cancer patients with stage III disease showed poorer disease-specific survival compared with non-elderly patients, which may be due to fewer D2 lymphadenectomies, a lack of adjuvant chemotherapy, and a poorer nutritional and inflammatory background. The safe induction of standard lymphadenectomy and adjuvant chemotherapy with perioperative aggressive nutritional support may improve the prognosis of elderly gastric cancer patients with stage III disease.

Introduction

Gastric cancer is the fourth most common cancer in the world and the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths, while the number of elderly gastric cancer patients is reported to be increasing [1] [2]. Advances in surgery, anesthesia, and pre- and post-operative management have led to an increase in gastrectomies conducted on elderly patients. Surgeons sometimes have difficulties in deciding upon the surgery of elderly patients because elderly patients are poorly nourished and have a variety of comorbidities [3]. For these reasons, although curative surgery with standard lymph node dissection is important in gastrectomy, surgeons often refrain from lymph node dissection because elderly patients might experience serious postoperative complications. [4] [5]. However, there are few studies evaluated

outcomes after operation of gastric cancer in elderly patients, and whether lymph node dissection is associated with poor cancer prognosis is unclear.

Adjuvant chemotherapy is necessary to improve survival in advanced gastric cancer patients after curative surgery [6]. The efficacy of adjuvant chemotherapy in gastric cancer has been demonstrated by various randomized control trials [6] [7] [8]. Chemotherapy is toxic and can cause serious side effects, while age is associated with increased toxicity and is considered a risk factor for reduced tolerance to chemotherapy. Despite the increase in elderly gastric cancer patient populations, there are few reports that indicate the efficacy of chemotherapy for elderly patients. Various clinical trials often enroll fewer elderly patients or exclude them altogether. The efficacy of limited lymph node dissection and adjuvant chemotherapy is unclear in patients with stage III disease where recurrence risk is high.

This study was conducted to assess the long-term outcomes of elderly patients among propensity-score-matched gastric cancer patients after curative gastrectomy and to propose the proper management of elderly gastric cancer patients.

Patients And Methods

Patients

This retrospective study was performed at Tottori University Hospital from January 2004 to December 2015, during which 626 gastric cancer patients underwent curative gastrectomy. The Japanese Gastric Cancer Treatment Guidelines were used to determine tumor status and the degree of lymph node dissection [9]. Patients with other primary cancers, distant metastases, and neoadjuvant chemotherapy were excluded from this study. Patients over 75 years old were defined as the elderly patient (EP) group, and patients under 75 years old were defined as the non-elderly patient (NEP) group. To minimize selection bias among 2 groups, propensity score matching was performed with a logistic regression model and a 1:1 nearest neighbor-matching using MatchIt package on R version 3.6.3 software. The following variables were selected and matched as matching variables because these variables were determined to have a significant survival impact: sex (male, female), depth of tumor invasion (T1, T2, T3, T4), lymph node metastasis (N0, N1, N2, N3), lymphatic invasion (positive, negative), venous invasion (positive, negative), histologic type (differentiated, undifferentiated), type of gastrectomy (partial gastrectomy, total gastrectomy, proximal gastrectomy), and pathological stage (I, II, III).

Surgical procedures and postoperative management

Gastrectomy was performed with D2 lymph node dissection for advanced cancer and D1+ lymph node dissection for early gastric cancer according to the Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines [9]. However, the refrain of lymph node dissection for surgery in the elderly or high-risk patients was determined by physician. The indication for adjuvant chemotherapy is patients with pathological stage II and stage III disease excluding T3N0 [9]. The adjuvant chemotherapy was based on oral 5-fluorouracil

derivatives without the combination of other agents. Indications for adjuvant chemotherapy, including elderly patients, were those with preserved organ function, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Performance Status 0 or 1, and adequate oral intake, and consent was obtained from each patient. Patients were periodically checked for recurrence via physical examination and blood tests every 3 months after discharge from the hospital. Computed tomography (CT) was performed at least every 6 months after surgery. The recurrence patterns and causes of death were examined from clinical records, CT, and positron emission tomography CT. In patients who were difficult to follow, we made direct enquires with their families.

Definition of inflammation-based factors

The findings of peripheral blood tests, such as serum albumin level, total white blood cell count, total platelet count (PC), lymphocyte count (LC), and neutrophil count (NC) were collected from patients' records. Preoperative blood tests were performed within 5 days before surgery. The platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR) and neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR) and were obtained by dividing the peripheral PC and NC by the peripheral LC, respectively [10]. The prognostic nutritional index (PNI) was calculated as follows: $10 \times \text{ALB concentration} + 0.005 \times \text{total LC}$ [11]. The CRP/ALB ratio (CAR) was calculated by dividing the CRP level by the ALB level (CRP measured in mg/L and albumin measured in g/L) [12].

The definition of complications

The Clavien–Dindo (CD) system was used to determine postoperative complications[13]. In this study, postoperative complications were defined as those of CD classification grade II or more occurring within 30 days after surgery. If multiple complications occurred, a higher CD classification was used in the present study.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables were compared via χ^2 test or Fisher's exact tests. Mann–Whitney U test was used to compare continuous data, which was expressed as mean \pm standard deviation. The time from the date of surgery until death from any cause, including death resulting from another disease, was defined as overall survival (OS). Survival curves were calculated using the Kaplan-Meier method, and differences between survival curves were examined using the log-rank test. Cox's proportional hazards model was used for univariate and multivariate analyses of factors considered prognostic for disease-specific survival (DSS). $P < 0.05$ was considered significant. All reported statistical analyses were performed using JMP v9.0.1 software (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Patient characteristics

Overall, there were 450 (71.9%) male and 176 (28.1%) female patients, and their median age was 67.8 ± 11.5 years (range, 27–93). The pathological disease stages were I, II, and III in 432, 115, and 79 patients, respectively. Patients were divided into an elderly group over 75 years old (EP group; $n = 186$) and a non-elderly group (NEP group; $n = 440$). The relationships between the age and clinicopathological variables of the patients are shown in Table 1. As for histology, the EP group included more patients with differentiated-type carcinoma compared with the NEP group ($P = 0.005$). Positive venous invasion was significantly higher in patients in the EP group than in those in the NEP group ($P = 0.004$). Death from other disease was significantly higher in patients in the EP group than in those in the NEP group ($P < 0.001$). No significant differences were observed regarding sex, tumor size, type of gastrectomy, approach, depth of tumor invasion, lymph node metastasis, lymphatic invasion, pathological stage, and death from primary disease. After propensity score matching, no significant differences were observed between the two groups except for age and death from another disease (Table 1). Finally, 372 patients were selected for analysis.

Table 1
Clinicopathological features of patients in the EP group and NEP group before and after propensity score matching

Characteristics	Before matching			After matching		
	EP group(n = 186)	NEP group(n = 440)	p value	EP group(n = 186)	NEP group(n = 186)	p value
Age (years)	80.0 ± 4.1	62.6 ± 9.5	< 0.001	80.0 ± 4.1	63.6 ± 8.9	< 0.001
Sex			0.206			0.497
Male	127 (68.3)	323 (73.4)		127 (68.3)	134 (72.0)	
Female	59 (31.7)	117 (26.6)		59 (31.7)	52 (28.0)	
Tumor size (mm)	40.4 ± 25.9	38.9 ± 25.6	0.470	40.4 ± 25.9	40.5 ± 26.4	0.693
Depth of tumor invasion			0.479			0.928
T1	115 (61.8)	288 (65.5)		115 (61.8)	119 (64.0)	
T2	26 (14.0)	49		26 (14.0)	22 (11.8)	
T3	33 (17.7)	84 (19.1)		33 (17.7)	34 (18.3)	
T4	12 (6.5)	19		12 (6.5)	11 (5.9)	
Lymph node metastasis			0.765			0.911
Positive	51 (27.4)	112 (25.5)		51 (27.4)	48 (25.8)	
Negative	135 (72.6)	328 (74.5)		135 (72.6)	138 (74.2)	
Histologic type			0.005			0.448
Differentiated	116 (62.4)	220 (50.0)		116 (62.4)	124 (66.7)	
Undifferentiated	70 (37.6)	220 (50.0)		70 (37.6)	62 (33.3)	
Lymphatic invasion			0.136			1.000
Positive	110 (59.1)	231 (52.5)		110 (59.1)	110 (59.1)	
Negative	76 (40.9)	209 (47.5)		76 (40.9)	76 (40.9)	
Venous invasion			0.004			0.917

Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation or number (percentage) of patients.

EP elderly patient, *NEP* non-elderly patient

Characteristics	Before matching		After matching	
Positive	102 (54.8)	184 (41.8)	102 (54.8)	100 (53.8)
Negative	84 (45.2)	256 (58.2)	84 (45.2)	86 (46.2)
Stage of disease			0.550	0.616
□	124 (66.7)	308 (70.0)	124 (66.7)	130 (69.9)
□	39 (21.0)	76 (17.2)	39 (21.0)	31 (16.7)
□	23 (11.3)	56 (12.8)	23 (11.3)	25 (13.4)
Type of gastrectomy			0.508	0.943
Distal	131 (70.4)	325 (73.9)	131 (70.4)	132 (71.0)
Total	34 (18.3)	64 (14.5)	34 (18.3)	35 (18.8)
Proximal	21 (11.3)	51 (11.6)	21 (11.3)	19 (10.2)
Approach			0.476	0.201
Open	71 (38.2)	183 (41.6)	71 (38.2)	80 (43.0)
Laparoscopy	115 (61.8)	257 (58.4)	115 (61.8)	106 (57.0)
Death from other disease			< 0.001	0.034
Present	33 (17.7)	37 (8.4)	33 (17.7)	18 (9.7)
Absent	153 (82.3)	403 (91.6)	153 (82.3)	168 (90.3)
Death from primary disease			0.189	0.403
Present	23 (12.4)	39 (8.9)	23 (12.4)	17 (9.1)
Absent	163 (87.6)	401 (91.1)	163 (87.6)	169 (90.9)
Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation or number (percentage) of patients.				
<i>EP</i> elderly patient, <i>NEP</i> non-elderly patient				

Postoperative long-term outcomes

The 5-year OS rate was significantly lower in the EP group (68.5%) than in the NEP group (81.0%; $P < 0.001$; Fig. 1a) in all patients enrolled in this study. The significantly worse OS in the EP group was also observed in subgroups with stage I (Fig. 1b), stage II (Fig. 1c), and stage III (Fig. 1d) disease. However, the 5-year DSS among all enrolled patients and those with stage I and II disease did not differ significantly

(all stage, $P=0.094$, Fig. 2a; stage I, $P=0.823$, Fig. 2b; stage II, $P=0.684$, Fig. 2c). Moreover, in the subgroup of stage III patients, 5-year DSS was significantly lower in the EP group (23.0%) than in the NEP group (59.4%; $P=0.004$, Fig. 2d).

Patient characteristics in stage III disease

Because elderly patients with stage III disease had an extremely poor prognosis, we decided to compare the two groups with stage III. The clinicopathological characteristics of stage III patients are summarized in Table 2. No marked differences were observed in sex, tumor size, depth of tumor invasion, lymph node metastasis, histological type, lymphatic invasion, and venous invasion. The surgical procedure and short-term outcome in patients with stage III disease are shown in Table 3. The EP group contained significantly fewer patients who underwent D2 lymphadectomy ($P=0.015$) and adjuvant chemotherapy ($P<0.001$) than the NEP group. Death of primary disease was significantly higher in patients in the EP group than in those in the NEP group ($P=0.043$). No marked differences were observed in the type of gastrectomy, approach, death from other disease or in the frequency of postoperative complications.

Table 2
Clinicopathological characteristics of stage III patients

	EP group(n = 23)	NEP group(n = 25)	p value
Age (years)	80.5 ± 4.9	62.2 ± 8.92	< 0.001
Sex			0.075
Male	21 (91.3)	17 (68.0)	
Female	2 (8.7)	8 (32.0)	
Tumor size (mm)	64.1 ± 27.5	69.9 ± 31.2	0.174
Depth of tumor invasion			0.548
T1	0	0	
T2	2 (8.7)	2 (8.0)	
T3	10 (43.5)	14 (56.0)	
T4	11 (47.8)	9 (36.0)	
Lymph node metastasis			0.845
N0	0	0	
N1	2 (8.7)	3 (12.0)	
N2	11 (47.8)	9 (36.0)	
N3	10 (43.5)	13 (52.0)	
Histologic type			1.000
Differentiated	8 (34.8)	8 (32.0)	
Undifferentiated	15 (65.2)	17 (68.0)	
Lymphatic invasion			0.214
ly0	0	0	
ly1	4 (17.4)	3 (12.0)	
ly2	8 (34.8)	15 (60.0)	
ly3	11 (47.8)	7 (28.0)	
Venous invasion			0.907

Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation or number (percentage) of patients.

EP elderly patient, NEP non-elderly patient

	EP group(n = 23)	NEP group(n = 25)	p value
v0	2 (8.7)	3 (12.0)	
v1	9 (39.1)	10 (40.0)	
v2	9 (39.1)	10 (40.0)	
v3	3 (13.1)	2 (8.0)	
Data are presented as the mean \pm standard deviation or number (percentage) of patients.			
<i>EP</i> elderly patient, <i>NEP</i> non-elderly patient			

Table 3
Surgical procedures and short-term outcomes of stage III disease

	EP group(n = 23)	NEP group(n = 25)	p value
Type of gastrectomy			0.246
Distal	11 (47.8)	12 (48.0)	
Total	10 (43.5)	13 (52.0)	
Proximal	2 (8.7)	0	
Approach			0.308
Laparoscopic	5 (21.7)	6 (24.0)	
Open	18 (78.3)	19 (76.0)	
Lymphadectomy			0.002
<D2	13 (56.5)	3 (12.0)	
D2	10 (43.5)	22 (88.0)	
Adjuvant chemotherapy			< 0.001
Present	7 (30.4)	20 (80.0)	
Absent	16 (69.6)	5 (20.0)	
Postoperative complication (CD \geq 2)			0.529
Present	8 (34.8)	6 (24.0)	
Absent	15 (65.2)	19 (76.0)	
Postoperative complication (CD \geq 3)			1.000
Present	5 (21.7)	5 (20.0)	
Absent	18 (78.3)	20 (80.0)	
Death from other disease			1.000
Present	4 (17.4)	5 (20.0)	
Absent	19 (82.6)	20 (80.0)	
Death from primary disease			0.043
Present	15 (65.2)	9 (36.0)	
Data are presented as number (percentage) of patients.			
CD Clavien–Dindo, EP elderly patient, NEP non-elderly patient			

	EP group(n = 23)	NEP group(n = 25)	p value
Absent	8 (34.8)	16 (64.0)	
Data are presented as number (percentage) of patients.			
<i>CD</i> Clavien–Dindo, <i>EP</i> elderly patient, <i>NEP</i> non-elderly patient			

Univariate and multivariate analyses of patients with stage III disease

We performed univariate analysis of clinicopathological factors considered prognostic for DSS in patients with stage III disease. Univariate analysis identified age, lymphatic invasion, and adjuvant chemotherapy as prognostic indicators (Table 4). Then, in the multivariate analysis, we included parameters significant at $P < 0.05$ in the univariate analysis. Multivariate analysis revealed that age and lymphatic invasion were independent prognostic factors (Table 4).

Table 4

Univariate and multivariate analyses of prognostic factors for disease-specific survival in patients with stage III disease

	Univariate analysis			Multivariate analysis		
	Hazard ratio	95% CI	P value	Hazard ratio	95% CI	P value
Age (≥ 75 vs <75)	3.200	1.377–7.437	0.007	2.755	1.135–6.690	0.025
Gender (Female vs Male)	0.728	0.268–1.978	0.534			
Lymphatic invasion (3 vs 0,1,2)	3.608	1.584–8.214	0.002	3.300	1.436–7.583	0.005
Venous invasion (2,3 vs 0,1)	1.241	0.555–2.773	0.599			
pT(4 vs 1,2,3)	2.229	0.992–5.010	0.052			
pN (2,3 vs 0,1)	1.683	0.741–3.820	0.213			
Histologic type (Differentiated vs Undifferentiated)	0.448	0.177–1.134	0.090			
Approach (Laparoscopic vs Open)	1.513	0.625–3.662	0.359			
Type of gastrectomy (TG vs DG/PG)	1.525	0.674–3.450	0.311			
Lymphadectomy ($\geq D2$ vs $< D2$)	0.501	0.221–1.136	0.098			
Adjuvant chemotherapy (Present vs Absent)	0.469	0.211–0.963	0.048	0.706	0.303–1.646	0.420
Infectious complication (CD2 \geq vs < 2)	1.577	0.588–4.234	0.366			
Infectious complication (CD3 \geq vs < 3)	1.984	0.589–6.689	0.269			
<i>CD</i> Clavien–Dindo, <i>CI</i> confidence interval, <i>DG</i> distal gastrectomy, <i>EP</i> elderly patient, <i>NEP</i> non-elderly patient, <i>PG</i> proximal gastrectomy, <i>pT</i> pathological depth of invasion, <i>pN</i> pathological lymph node metastasis, <i>TG</i> total gastrectomy						

Systemic inflammatory response in patients with Stage III

Clinical features including systemic inflammatory response in patients with stage III disease are shown in Table 5. CAR was significantly higher in patients in the EP group than in those in the NEP group ($P=0.046$). Albumin and PNI were significantly lower in the EP group than in those in the NEP group ($P=0.036$ and $P=0.045$, respectively). No significant differences were observed regarding WBC, CRP, PC, NLR, and PLR.

Table 5
Systemic inflammatory response in patients with stage III disease

	EP group (n = 23)	NEP group (n = 25)	P-value
WBC	6796 ± 2069	6564 ± 2098	0.505
CRP	0.75 ± 1.51	0.43 ± 0.65	0.055
Albumin	3.73 ± 0.49	3.96 ± 0.44	0.036
PC	23.1 ± 7.2	26.3 ± 7.8	0.053
CAR	0.274 ± 0.683	0.115 ± 0.187	0.046
NLR	3.412 ± 2.074	2.902 ± 1.440	0.760
PLR	161.9 ± 64.9	181.9 ± 90.7	0.124
PNI	44.8 ± 5.5	48.0 ± 5.4	0.045
Data are presented as the mean ± standard deviation of patients.			
<i>CRP</i> C-reactive protein, <i>CAR</i> C-reactive protein-to-albumin ratio, <i>NLR</i> neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, <i>PC</i> platelet count, <i>PLR</i> platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio, <i>PNI</i> prognostic nutritional index			

Site of recurrence in patients with stage III disease

The site of recurrence was reviewed in patients with stage III disease, and hematogenous metastasis was significantly more frequent in the EP group than in the NEP group ($P=0.020$; Table 6). No significant differences were observed regarding peritoneal metastasis, lymph node metastasis, and local recurrence ($P=0.703$, $P=1.000$, and $P=0.479$, respectively; Table 6).

Table 6
Site of recurrence in patients with stage III disease

	EP group (n = 23)	NEP group (n = 25)	P-value
Peritoneal metastasis			0.703
Present	3 (13.0)	5 (20)	
Absent	20 (87.0)	20 (80)	
Hematogenous metastasis			0.020
Present	7 (30.4)	1 (4)	
Absent	16 (69.6)	24 (96)	
Lymph node metastasis			1.000
Present	5 (21.7)	5 (20)	
Absent	18 (78.3)	20 (80)	
Local recurrence			0.479
Present	1 (4.3)	0 (0)	
Absent	22 (95.7)	25 (100)	
Data are presented as number (percentage) of patients.			
<i>EP</i> elderly patient, <i>NEP</i> non-elderly patient			

Discussion

In the present study, the 5-year OS rate was significantly lower in the EP group than in that in the NEP group. The 5-year DSS rates were significantly lower in stage III patients in the EP group than in those in the NEP group. Multivariate analysis revealed that age and lymphatic invasion were independent prognostic factors in patients with stage III disease. The EP group contained significantly fewer patients with D2 lymphadectomy and adjuvant chemotherapy than the NEP group. CAR was significantly higher in the EP group than in the NEP group, and PNI was significantly lower in EP group patients than in NEP group patients.

In this study, the 5-year OS rate was significantly poor in the EP group. This result was similar with recent reports that elderly patients have poor physical or nutritional statuses and some degree of frailty, and are likely to die from other diseases even if gastric cancer can be cured by gastrectomy [14] [15]. In this study, the 5-year DSS rate was significantly poor only in stage III EP group patients. However, the reason for the poor prognosis in elderly stage III gastric cancer patients has not been sufficiently elucidated, but one possible explanation is the low rate of adjuvant chemotherapy in this population. Surgery is the mainstay in patients with gastric cancer, but the prognosis is still poor in patients with far-advanced gastric cancer

such as stage III disease [6]. Therefore, adjuvant therapy may contribute to the improved survival of patients with curative gastrectomy[16]. However, side effects can result from chemotherapy and can sometimes be severe. Furthermore, age is considered a risk factor for increased toxicity and poorer tolerance to chemotherapy. Ying et al. reported the survival benefits of adjuvant fluoropyrimidine-based chemotherapy among elderly patients with non-metastatic gastric cancer after D2 gastrectomy[17]. They reviewed the prognosis of 360 gastric cancer patients aged 65 years or older with non-metastatic gastric cancer who had undergone D2 gastrectomy, and showed that significant survival benefits were achieved with adjuvant chemotherapy in stage III patients but not in stage I or stage II patients. Mustafa et al. also reported that the addition of adjuvant chemotherapy after gastrectomy influenced survival in gastric cancer patients of ≥ 65 years of age [18]. Based on these reports, aggressive adjuvant chemotherapy may be required even in elderly gastric cancer patients with stage III disease.

Another possible explanation of the poor prognosis is the elevated inflammatory markers and poor nutrition in stage III EP group patients. The systemic inflammatory response plays an important role in cancer development and progression [19], and several studies have reported that the CAR is significantly related to prognosis in various types of cancers including gastric cancer [12] [20] [21]. A recent retrospective study indicates that high CAR predicts early recurrence and poor prognosis in patients with gastric cancer [22]. They reviewed the prognosis of 384 gastric cancer patients who underwent gastrectomy and showed CAR to independently affect OS and disease-free survival. However, recent reports indicated that preoperative nutritional status impacts short- and long-term outcomes of patients with gastric cancer [23] [24]. In addition, Sakurai et al. reviewed the prognosis of 147 elderly gastric cancer patients who underwent curative gastrectomy and showed that low preoperative PNI predicts the poor survival of patients with gastric cancer. These findings suggest that elevated inflammatory markers and low nutritional status may be associated with poor prognosis in elderly patients with stage III disease.

In this study, patients in the EP group underwent significantly fewer D2 lymphadenectomies than the NEP group. The limited lymph node dissection in the elderly patients is another potential explanation of the poor prognosis. Complete tumor resection is essential to treat gastric cancer, and D2 gastrectomy is the standard surgical procedure for patients with advanced gastric cancer in Japan [9]. Some studies reported that elderly patients with gastric cancer experienced a higher incidence of postoperative complications than non-elderly patients [25] [15]. Recent data have also suggested that patients who suffer from complications have poorer long-term survival outcomes in gastric cancer [26] [27]. Because of the concern that postoperative complications may be more severe in elderly patients with fewer functional reserves and more comorbidities, surgeons tend to limit the extent of lymph node dissection. However, limiting the extent of lymph node dissection in elderly patients may be acceptable because postoperative complications did not differ, and lymph node recurrence did not differ between the two groups in this study. The acceptance of limited lymph node resection could be suggested by the results of Yoshikawa et al. [28]. They retrospectively reviewed 402 gastric cancer patients who underwent gastrectomy and showed that limited lymph node dissection did not affect cancer-specific survival in elderly patients.

This study had several limitations. First, this was a retrospective study that used patients' records from a single institution. Propensity score matching was used to balance the two groups, but the results must be interpreted carefully. Second, there are various definitions of the elderly patient [14] [29]. Currently, the Japanese Geriatrics Society has proposed to redefine the elderly as 75 years of age or older, and thus we adopted a threshold of 75 years [30]. Further well-designed multicenter prospective studies with larger populations are needed to confirm these findings.

Conclusion

In conclusion, elderly gastric cancer patients with stage III disease showed poorer DSS compared with non-elderly patients, which may be due to fewer D2 lymphadenectomies, a lack of adjuvant chemotherapy, and a poorer nutritional and inflammatory background. The safe induction of standard lymphadenectomy and adjuvant chemotherapy with perioperative aggressive nutritional support may improve the prognosis of elderly gastric cancer patients.

Abbreviations

CAR: C-reactive protein-to-albumin ratio; CD: Clavien–Dindo; CRP: C-reactive protein; CT: Computed tomography; DSS: disease-specific survival; EP: elderly patient; NEP: non-elderly patient; NLR: neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio; PC: platelet count; PLR: platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio; OS: overall survival; PNI: prognostic nutritional index

Declarations

Acknowledgments

We thank H. Nikki March, PhD, from Edanz Group (<https://en-author-services.edanzgroup.com/>) for editing a draft of this manuscript.

Authors' contributions

Study conception: TM; Study design: TM; Data acquisition: RI,WM,YS,KM, and MY;; Quality control of data and algorithms: NT; Data analysis and interpretation: ST and TS; Statistical analysis: TM; Manuscript preparation: TM; Manuscript editing: HS; Manuscript review: YF; Final approval of the article: all authors.

Funding

The authors have no financial support to declare.

Availability of data and materials

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

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All procedures performed in this study involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional review board of ethics committee and national research committee with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments. The institutional review board of our institution approved the study (#18A154). The informed consent requirement was waived.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1. Bray F, Jemal A, Grey N, Ferlay J, Forman D: **Global cancer transitions according to the Human Development Index (2008-2030): a population-based study.** *Lancet Oncol* 2012, **13**(8):790-801.
2. Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, Eser S, Mathers C, Rebelo M, Parkin DM, Forman D, Bray F: **Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012.** *Int J Cancer* 2015, **136**(5):E359-386.
3. Orsenigo E, Tomajer V, Palo SD, Carlucci M, Vignali A, Tamburini A, Staudacher C: **Impact of age on postoperative outcomes in 1118 gastric cancer patients undergoing surgical treatment.** *Gastric Cancer* 2007, **10**(1):39-44.
4. Hayashi T, Yoshikawa T, Aoyama T, Ogata T, Cho H, Tsuburaya A: **Severity of complications after gastrectomy in elderly patients with gastric cancer.** *World J Surg* 2012, **36**(9):2139-2145.
5. Hamel MB, Henderson WG, Khuri SF, Daley J: **Surgical outcomes for patients aged 80 and older: morbidity and mortality from major noncardiac surgery.** *J Am Geriatr Soc* 2005, **53**(3):424-429.
6. Sasako M, Sakuramoto S, Katai H, Kinoshita T, Furukawa H, Yamaguchi T, Nashimoto A, Fujii M, Nakajima T, Ohashi Y: **Five-year outcomes of a randomized phase III trial comparing adjuvant chemotherapy with S-1 versus surgery alone in stage II or III gastric cancer.** *J Clin Oncol* 2011, **29**(33):4387-4393.
7. Bang YJ, Kim YW, Yang HK, Chung HC, Park YK, Lee KH, Lee KW, Kim YH, Noh SI, Cho JY *et al*: **Adjuvant capecitabine and oxaliplatin for gastric cancer after D2 gastrectomy (CLASSIC): a phase 3**

- open-label, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2012, **379**(9813):315-321.
8. Yamada Y, Higuchi K, Nishikawa K, Gotoh M, Fuse N, Sugimoto N, Nishina T, Amagai K, Chin K, Niwa Y *et al*: **Phase III study comparing oxaliplatin plus S-1 with cisplatin plus S-1 in chemotherapy-naïve patients with advanced gastric cancer.** *Ann Oncol* 2015, **26**(1):141-148.
 9. **Japanese gastric cancer treatment guidelines 2014 (ver. 4).** *Gastric Cancer* 2017, **20**(1):1-19.
 10. Yodying H, Matsuda A, Miyashita M, Matsumoto S, Sakurazawa N, Yamada M, Uchida E: **Prognostic Significance of Neutrophil-to-Lymphocyte Ratio and Platelet-to-Lymphocyte Ratio in Oncologic Outcomes of Esophageal Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis.** *Ann Surg Oncol* 2016, **23**(2):646-654.
 11. Onodera T, Goseki N, Kosaki G: **[Prognostic nutritional index in gastrointestinal surgery of malnourished cancer patients].** *Nihon Geka Gakkai Zasshi* 1984, **85**(9):1001-1005.
 12. Saito H, Kono Y, Murakami Y, Shishido Y, Kuroda H, Matsunaga T, Fukumoto Y, Osaki T, Ashida K, Fujiwara Y: **Prognostic Significance of the Preoperative Ratio of C-Reactive Protein to Albumin and Neutrophil-Lymphocyte Ratio in Gastric Cancer Patients.** *World J Surg* 2018, **42**(6):1819-1825.
 13. Katayama H, Kurokawa Y, Nakamura K, Ito H, Kanemitsu Y, Masuda N, Tsubosa Y, Satoh T, Yokomizo A, Fukuda H *et al*: **Extended Clavien-Dindo classification of surgical complications: Japan Clinical Oncology Group postoperative complications criteria.** *Surg Today* 2016, **46**(6):668-685.
 14. Hashimoto T, Kurokawa Y, Mikami J, Takahashi T, Miyazaki Y, Tanaka K, Makino T, Yamasaki M, Motoori M, Kimura Y *et al*: **Postoperative Long-Term Outcomes in Elderly Patients with Gastric Cancer and Risk Factors for Death from Other Diseases.** *World J Surg* 2019, **43**(11):2885-2893.
 15. Yang JY, Lee HJ, Kim TH, Huh YJ, Son YG, Park JH, Ahn HS, Suh YS, Kong SH, Yang HK: **Short- and Long-Term Outcomes After Gastrectomy in Elderly Gastric Cancer Patients.** *Ann Surg Oncol* 2017, **24**(2):469-477.
 16. Yamada Y, Boku N, Mizusawa J, Iwasa S, Kadowaki S, Nakayama N, Azuma M, Sakamoto T, Shitara K, Tamura T *et al*: **Docetaxel plus cisplatin and S-1 versus cisplatin and S-1 in patients with advanced gastric cancer (JCOG1013): an open-label, phase 3, randomised controlled trial.** *Lancet Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2019, **4**(7):501-510.
 17. Jin Y, Qiu MZ, Wang DS, Zhang DS, Ren C, Bai L, Luo HY, Wang ZQ, Wang FH, Li YH *et al*: **Adjuvant chemotherapy for elderly patients with gastric cancer after D2 gastrectomy.** *PLoS One* 2013, **8**(1):e53149.
 18. Kucukoner M, Arpaci E, Isikdogan A, Bilici M, Uncu D, Cetin B, Dane F, Inanc M, Ekinci AS, Inal A *et al*: **Prognostic analysis of patients with operable gastric cancer and tolerability to adjuvant radio-chemotherapy.** *Neoplasma* 2013, **60**(1):19-25.
 19. Coussens LM, Werb Z: **Inflammation and cancer.** *Nature* 2002, **420**(6917):860-867.
 20. Allen G: **Evidence appraisal of Zhang L, Liao Q, Zhang T, Dai M, Zhao Y. Blood transfusion is an independent risk factor for postoperative serious infectious complications after pancreaticoduodenectomy.:** *World J Surg.* 2016;**40**(10):2507-2512. *Aorn j* 2016, **104**(5):465-470.

21. Kinoshita A, Onoda H, Imai N, Iwaku A, Oishi M, Tanaka K, Fushiya N, Koike K, Nishino H, Matsushima M: **The C-reactive protein/albumin ratio, a novel inflammation-based prognostic score, predicts outcomes in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma.** *Ann Surg Oncol* 2015, **22**(3):803-810.
22. Toiyama Y, Shimura T, Yasuda H, Fujikawa H, Okita Y, Kobayashi M, Ohi M, Yoshiyama S, Hiro J, Araki T *et al*: **Clinical Burden of C-Reactive Protein/Albumin Ratio Before Curative Surgery for Patients with Gastric Cancer.** *Anticancer Res* 2016, **36**(12):6491-6498.
23. Sakurai K, Ohira M, Tamura T, Toyokawa T, Amano R, Kubo N, Tanaka H, Muguruma K, Yashiro M, Maeda K *et al*: **Predictive Potential of Preoperative Nutritional Status in Long-Term Outcome Projections for Patients with Gastric Cancer.** *Ann Surg Oncol* 2016, **23**(2):525-533.
24. Sakurai K, Tamura T, Toyokawa T, Amano R, Kubo N, Tanaka H, Muguruma K, Yashiro M, Maeda K, Ohira M *et al*: **Low Preoperative Prognostic Nutritional Index Predicts Poor Survival Post-gastrectomy in Elderly Patients with Gastric Cancer.** *Ann Surg Oncol* 2016, **23**(11):3669-3676.
25. Takeuchi D, Koide N, Suzuki A, Ishizone S, Shimizu F, Tsuchiya T, Kumeda S, Miyagawa S: **Postoperative complications in elderly patients with gastric cancer.** *J Surg Res* 2015, **198**(2):317-326.
26. Yuan P, Wu Z, Li Z, Bu Z, Wu A, Wu X, Zhang L, Shi J, Ji J: **Impact of postoperative major complications on long-term survival after radical resection of gastric cancer.** *BMC Cancer* 2019, **19**(1):833.
27. Shimizu S, Saito H, Kono Y, Murakami Y, Shishido Y, Miyatani K, Matsunaga T, Fukumoto Y, Fujiwara Y: **The prognostic significance of the comprehensive complication index in patients with gastric cancer.** *Surg Today* 2019, **49**(11):913-920.
28. Yoshikawa K, Shimada M, Higashijima J, Nakao T, Nishi M, Kashihara H, Takasu C: **Limited lymph node dissection in elderly patients with gastric cancer.** *J Med Invest* 2016, **63**(1-2):91-95.
29. Ohkura Y, Haruta S, Tanaka T, Ueno M, Udagawa H: **Effectiveness of postoperative elemental diet (Elental®) in elderly patients after gastrectomy.** *World J Surg Oncol* 2016, **14**(1):268.
30. Ouchi Y, Rakugi H, Arai H, Akishita M, Ito H, Toba K, Kai I: **Redefining the elderly as aged 75 years and older. Proposal from the Joint Committee of Japan Gerontological Society and the Japan Geriatrics Society.** *Geriatr Gerontol Int* 2017, **17**(7):1045-1047.

Figures




Figure 1

Overall survival curves of all patients (a), and those classified as stage I (b), stage II (c), and stage III (d). EP, elderly patient; NEP, non-elderly patient.




Figure 2

Disease-specific survival curves of all patients (a), and those classified as stage I (b), stage II (c), and stage III (d). EP, elderly patient; NEP, non-elderly patient.