Biomedicine & pharmacotherapy
Ulrich Abel Chemotherapy of advanced epithelial cancer - a critical review 1992
46:46 439-452

Biomed & Phamacother (1992) 46,439-452 ©
Elsevier. Paris

Dossier

Chemotherapy of advanced epithelial cancer - a critical review*

U Abel

Tumorzentrum Heidelburg/Mannheim, do Institut fur Epidemiologie und Biometrie, Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum, Im Neuenheimer Feld 280,
D-6900 Heidelberg, Germany

(Received 15 October 1992; accepted 2 November 1992)

Summary - This article is a short version of a report which presents a comprehensive analysis of clinical trials and publications examining the value of cytotoxic chemotherapy in the treatment of advanced epithelial cancer. As a result of the analysis and the comments received from hundreds of oncologists in reply to a request for information, the following facts can be noted. Apart from lung cancer, in particular small-cell lung cancer, there is no direct evidence that chemotherapy prolongs survival in patients with advanced carcinoma. Except for ovarian cancer, available indirect evidence rather supports the absence of a positive effect. In treatment of lung cancer and ovarian cancer, the therapeutical benefit is at best rather small, and a less aggressive treatment seems to be at least as effective as the usual one. It is possible that certain sub-groups of patients benefit from the treatment, yet so far the available results do not allow a sufficiently precise definition of these groups. Many oncologists take it for granted that response to therapy prolongs survival, an opinion which is based on a fallacy and which is not supported by clinical studies. To date, it is unclear whether the treated patients, as a whole, benefit from chemotherapy as to their quality of life. For most cancer sites, urgently required types of studies such as randomized de-escalations of dose or comparisons of immediate *versus* deferred chemotherapy are still lacking. With few exceptions, there is no good scientific basis for the application of chemotherapy in symptom-free patients with advanced epithelial malignancy.

chemotherapy / carcinoa / overview

Resume - La chimiotherapie du cancer epithelial avance. Une revue critique. ***Cet article est une version abregee d'un rapport qui presente une analyse etendue d'etudes cliniques et de publications examinant la valeur de la chimiotherapie dans le traitement du cancer epithelial avance. Comme resultat de Vanalyse et des commentaires supplementaires de la part d'un grand nombre d'oncologistes, nous pouvons retenir les faits suivants: /4 part le cancer du poumon, en particulier du type microcellulaire, il n'y a aucune preuve directe que la chimiotherapie prolonge la survie des patients ayant un carcinome avance. A Vexception du cancer ovarien, les preuves indirectes existantes soutiennent plutot I'absence d'un effet positif. Dans le traitement des cancers du poumon et des ovaires, le benefice therapeutique est au mieux modeste et un traitement moins agressif parait etre aussi efficace que la therapie habituelle. II est possible que certains sous-groupes de patients beneficient du traitement, mais les resultats disponibles ne permettent pas encore une definition suffisamment precise de ces groupes. Beaucoup d'oncologistes sont convaincus que la remission de la tumeur prolonge la survie, opinion basee sur un faux raisonnement, et qui n'est pas mise en evidence par les etudes cliniques. Jusqu'a present, il n'est pas clair que Vensemble des patients doivent beneficier de la chimiotherapie, en ce qui conceme la qualite de leur vie. Pour la plupart des cancers, il y a toujours un manque urgent d'etudes randomisees de certains types, comme par exemple les comparaisons avec des doses moindres ou la comparaison entre une therapie immediate et une therapie reportee. A part quelques exceptions, il n'y a pas de fondement scientifique pour Vapplication de la chimiotherapie chez les patients ne presentant pas de symptdmes.***

chimiotherapie / carcinome / revue

.

Introduction

Epithelial malignancies are responsible for more than 80% of cancer mortality in the world. In the Western industrialized countries they take a toll of over 1 million lives per year. Among others they include nearly all malignant tumors of tra- chea, bronchus, lung, stomach, colon, rectum, esophagus, breast, bladder, pancreas, ovary, cer- vix and corpus uteri, head and neck, and liver. Although reliable data on the treatment of ad- vanced epithelial cancer seem to be unavailable, one can safely assume that the majority of patients receive some form of systemic cytotoxic therapy before death and that in virtually all cases such treatment is taken into consideration.

Ideally, the decision in favor of or against chemotherapy should be influenced only by the following questions. First, does the treatment prolong survival? Second, does it contribute to the patient's well-being, *ie*, to his or her quality of life? Here we will try to answer both questions.

Let us begin with the first. Both laymen and doctors who are not particularly familiar with clinical oncology are likely to regard this question as purely rhetorical and superfluous, for they will take it for granted that if a notoriously toxic and expensive treatment cannot cure, it must at least have a beneficial effect on the patient's prognosis. In fact, this opinion is supported not only by the incontestable, sometimes dramatic, success of chemotherapy achieved in some non-epithelial malignancies such as leukemia, Hodgkin's disease or highly malignant non-Hodgkin lymphoma, but also by assertions of positive results in epithelial cancer made in scientific publications or onco- logical textbooks as well as in communications intended for the public [6, 13, 21, 28, 43, 49, 62, 64, 94, 109, 112, 114, 127, 135]. These claims are largely based on the observation that survival rates have improved since the introduction of chemotherapy into routine practice at the begin- ning of the 1970s. Unfortunately, however, com- parisons with historical controls tend to yield highly biased results, so that in general, they are inadequate for the assessment and quantification of therapeutic advances [14, 29, 39, 40, 102, 117, 126, 139]. Thus, the improvement of diagnostic techniques, the intensification of screening and self-observation, and the refinement of disease monitoring lead to earlier detection of the disease or metastasis, thus prolonging survival even if no real therapeutic progress has been made. Another phenomenon causing bias is stage migration which occurs because increasing diagnostic sen sitivity shifts the distribution of stages to the more advanced ones. Paradoxically, this leads to an im- provement of prognosis both in the early and the advanced stages. While the former ones are dep- leted of patients with advanced disease, the latter ones profit from the addition of patients with a relatively good prognosis. Further reasons for biased results in poorly controlled studies include differences in supportive care or in prognostic factors (due to different inclusion criteria or self- selection), and in methods or quality of observa- tion and follow-up.

In order to render possible an assessment of the vast amount of published studies, it is useful to classify the evidence for or against beneficial treatment effects into direct and indirect ones. Direct evidence permits, within the bounds of statistical and methodological error implied by the study design, the conclusion that the hypothesized effect is present or absent. It always comes from a randomized study. There are three types of stu- dies differing markedly in their intepretability and the strength of positive or negative outcomes:

i) Randomized comparisons of patients treated with the regimen or substance T in question, with controls receiving identical treatment with the omission of T. In particular, comparisons with un- treated controls; ii) randomized comparisons of immediate *versus* deferred therapy, *ie* treatment started on symptoms only; iii) Randomized dose- effect studies.

Indirect evidence is obtained from studies in which differences of survival curves cannot be put down to successful treatment in the superior group. This applies to two classes of investiga- tions:

i) Randomized comparisons of different chemotherapy regimens; ii) non-randomized com- parisons of therapy groups.

See [1] for a discussion of the relative value of evidence from these studies. For what follows it suffices to note that if all pairwise randomized comparisons of different chemotherapy regimens yield null results then this supports the hypothesis that none of them is effective.

The starting point of the present assessment was recent surveys of the state of the art of clini- cal oncology, especially those published by the EORTC on randomized trials in cancer. I at- tempted to gain a comprehensive and up-to-date view of relevant studies yielding direct or indirect evidence. Apart from searches into medical litera-

ture data banks and the inspection of recent proceedings of congresses, this included a personal enquiry addressed to over 350 oncologists and oncological research units all over the world. The aim of the inquiry was two-fold: first, to ask for information on research that was unpublished or unknown to me and, second, to obtain an idea of the rationale and justification of cancer chemotherapy, particularly put forward by those oncologists who were unable or unwilling to quote direct evidence for beneficial effects.

Direct and indirect evidence

Table Ia/b gives a summary of direct and indirect evidence regarding prolongation of survival through cytotoxic therapy in some major epithelial tumors. Note that the symbols + or (+) merely state the existence of evidence. They do not imply that cytotoxic therapy generally prolongs the expectation of survival, but only that this holds true for at least one regimen. Similarly, the negative signs only extend to the regimens that have been investigated, so far.

Table la. **Direct evidence from randomized studies on the question of whether palliative chemotherapy prolongs survival.**

Site	*Type of study*		*Dose-effect-studies*
	Chemotherapy + X vs X alone (X = any treatment)	*Immediate vs deferred therapy*	
Lung, small-cell	+	0	-
Lung, non-small cell	(+)	unclear	0
Colon/rectum	0		0
Stomach	-	0	0
Pancreas	-	0	0
Bladder	0	0	0
Breast	-	(-)	-
Ovary	0	0	unclear
Cervix Uteri	0	0	-
Endometrium	0	0	0

0: There is no evidence of this type; + or The evidence is definitely positive (negative, response); (+) or (-): Unclear evidence; on the whole rather positive (negative, respectively). In case of (+): the effect is, if any, small.

Table lb. **Indirect evidence on the question of whether palliative chemotherapy prolongs survival.**

Site	*Type of study*	
	Randomized comparisons of different regimens	*Non-randomized comparisons of patient cohorts*
Lung, small-cell	+	-
Lung, non-small cell	unclear	-
Colon/Rectum	-	-
Stomach	-	-
Pancreas	-	-
Bladder	-	-
Breast	(-)	-
Ovary	+	-
Cervix uteri	-	-
Endometrium	-	-

For explanatory notes see table la.

For the reasons discussed above, evidence from non-randomized studies (mostly evaluations of secular trends in survival rates) is stated only when negative, *ie*[9] when it suggests that the introduction and development of chemotherapy has not markedly changed the prognosis of cancer patients.

Even more surprising than the large number of negative signs is the high percentage of zeros. This means that, to-date, the corresponding ques- tion has not even been subjected to serious in- vestigation. For a detailed discussion with a substantiation of the statements made in table I for various sites, we refer to the underlying report [1]. Here we will briefly comment on the main evidence, with emphasis on the direct one.

In the case of small-cell lung cancer a prolon- gation of survival by means of chemotherapy (cy- clophosphamide, nitrogen mustard, ifosfamide, or ifosfamide + CCNU) has been established in two randomized trials *versus* no-treatment controls [48, 74]. In addition, a consolidation therapy for responders seems to have a positive effect on sur- vival [36, 65]. Finally, there is considerable and unanimous evidence (see *eg* the eight randomized studies compiled by Malik [84]) that the combi- nation of chemotherapy with radiation therapy is superior to radiation therapy alone. However, the benefit from chemotherapy is by no means strik- ing: the increase in median duration of survival hardly exceeds three months, so that in every single case the side effects of chemotherapy have to be weighed against its rather short-lived success. Two further caveats should be noted. First, no survival advantage was found in three randomized studies [77, 128, 137] comparing chemotherapy with hemibody irradiation. In fact, Laing *et al* [77] even found that for patients having mostly tumors restricted to the thorax and neck region, hemibody irradiation resulted in significantly longer survival than combination chemotherapy with nitrogen mustard + vinblastine + procarbazine + prednisolone. Second, there are not any good indications that high-dose therapy is superior to standard-dose therapy [41, 67, 69, 82, 98]. In an interesting study by Harris *et al* [53], no significant survival difference was ob- served between a mild, oral chemotherapy given at home and an intensive iv in hospital therapy.

For non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), a positive effect of different regimens has been noted in at least eight randomized studies *versus* controls receiving no active treatment [20, 25, 46, 48, 107, 108, 113, 138]. However, the differences in median survival times found in these studies were in the order of only a few weeks and hardly exceed the duration of therapy itself. Moreover, several studies [32, 76, 78] suggest that it may be advantageous to defer treatment in patients without severe symptoms.

Indirect evidence of positive effects of chemotherapy in NSCLC is not more conclusive than direct evidence. While the addition of cisplatinum to standard regimens gave a slight survival improvement in two small studies [38, 45], no advantage was seen in other trials [7, 9]. In addition, in the secular development of survival rates, a distinct improvement over the past 20 years is not perceivable for the entirety of patients [8], let alone for patients in advanced stages who invariably have an extremely poor prognosis with 5-year survival rates of about *2%* [122].

In colorectal cancer, even with the most active regimens, complete remissions are still an excep- tion. No randomized trials including no-treatment or low-treatment controls seem to have been pub- lished. The only studies providing direct evidence are those by Hine and Dykes [59] and The Nordic Gastrointestinal Tumor Adjuvant Therapy Group [123] comparing immediate therapy (5-Fu + CCNU, sequential methotrexate + 5-Fu + folinic acid, respectively) *versus* a deferred cytotoxic therapy given only when required by the symp- toms. (In the study by Hine and Dykes the onset of the treatment was defined not by the detection of metastasis but by the observation of a signif- icant increase in serum CEA). The results of these studies are conflicting. While Hine and Dykes ob- tained almost identical survival curves, the Swedish Study Group found a significant survival advantage for immediate therapy, the median difference being 5 months. Note, however, that 20 months after randomization, the survival rates in the two patient groups dropped to an identical level. There is not any good indirect evidence of beneficial effects of chemotherapy either. No clear survival difference has been found in ran- domized studies of various regimens nor is there any positive trend in survival rates with patients with metastasized colorectal cancer [97, 122]. Note that a retrospective study comparing patients receiving 5-Fu with a low-treatment group of comparable structure yielded very similar survival curves [91].

For advanced gastric cancer, only three ran- domized studies seem to have been published that directly address the problem of whether

chemotherapy extends survival. Essentially, the results of these studies are negative. In an early small study, Moertel *et al* [90] compared the com- bination of radiation therapy with 5-Fu with radia- tion therapy alone. There was significant survival advantage for the combination, possibly due to an enhancement of the effects of radiotherapy, but the difference in median survival was less than three months. In a double-blind controlled trial, Kingston *et al* [73] evaluated the efficacy of 5-Fu + MeCCNU compared with placebo in 193 patients with unresectable gastric carcinoma. The groups were well balanced with respect to age, length of history, and performance status. The sur- vival curves were very similar. Dent *et al* [27] randomly assigned 67 patients with stage T4 or Ml to one of three groups: i) a no-treatment con- trol group, ii) radiation therapy +5-Fu, and iii) iv chemotherapy with thiotepa. Survival of patients was the same in all arms of the trial. None of the numerous randomized trials of quite different chemotherapy regimens demonstrated a marked therapeutic difference [60, 85]. While the re- sponse rates achieved with monotherapy are typi- cally about 20% or less, up to 50% response can be achieved by combination therapy *(eg,* FAM); however, in most cases, the remission is only par- tial. There is no evidence that combination ther- apy is superior to single-agent therapy regarding length of survival.

As for pancreatic cancer, the influence of chemotherapy on survival has been directly assessed in three randomized trials, namely the studies by Mallinson *et al* [87], Frey *et al* [44], and Schnitzler *et al* [111] comparing combination chemotherapy with a no-treatment arm. The re- sults of these trials are unclear. The study by Mal- linson *et al* includes 40 patients, 21 of whom were treated with CMFV. Only 15 patients, however, presented with manifest dissemination of the tumor, and in 14 cases histological confirmation was lacking. The chemotherapy group showed significantly longer survival than the control group. In contrast to this result, the more sizeable study of Frey *et al* in 152 male patients with non- resectable, histologically confirmed carcinoma was completely negative. The group receiving cytotoxic treatment (5-Fu + CCNU) had an even shorter median survival (3.0 months) than the control group (3.9 months). A negative result with multiple crossings of the survival curves was also obtained in the study by Schnitzler *et al* [111] using 5-Fu + ADM + BCNU. Again, this study is of limited value, since it contained only 30 evaluable patients (13 treated, 17 controls). The indirect evidence also produces a negative pic- ture. Never have there been any observations of marked (let alone consistent) differences among chemotherapy regimens when compared in ran- domized trials. This is particularly true for com- parisons of single-agent therapy with combination therapy. Since survival rates are still extremely poor, even in patients without manifest distant metastases, no substantial progress can have been made in the past.

Of particular interest is the case of breast cancer since among all cancer sites it is the one to which falls the greatest share of chemotherapy. Modern therapy using various combinations of cytotoxic drugs, like CMF, CAF, or VAC, achieves response rates of 40-80%, yet the proportion of complete re- sponders is almost always lower than 20%.

There is no direct evidence that chemotherapy prolongs survival of breast cancer patients. Both controlled studies using untreated controls and randomized comparisons of immediate *versus* deferred therapy are lacking. There are, however, some investigations approaching the latter compari- son, namely, trials of combined endocrine/ chemotherapy *versus* either endocrine single-agent therapy or a sequential endocrine-chemotherapy. Unfortunately, the seven studies of endocrine *ver- sus* combined hormone/chemotherapy are very small (see the survey by Macaulay and Smith [83] as well as the publication by Kiang *et al* [72] and they do not yield any clear indications for differ- ences between the treatments. Negative findings also result from the numerous comparisons of sequential *versus* combined applications of en- docrine/chemotherapy. Two recent, fairly large, and well documented cross-over studies (Taylor *et al* [120], The Australian and New Zealand Breast Cancer Trials Group [121]) are worth men- tioning. In the study by Taylor *et al*, 181 patients aged 65+ years received either initial treatment with Tamoxifen or CMF. On progression they were crossed over to the other treatment. In this study, initial hormonal therapy was not only sig- nificantly less toxic but induced a slightly longer survival than CMF, both in ER-positive and ER- negative patients. The three-arm Australia/New Zealand trial compared sequential administration of AC + Tam (starting either with chemo- or hor- mono therapy) with AC + Tam given simul- taneously in 339 post-menopausal patients under 70 years. The survival in all three groups was vir- tually identical.

There are more than 30 randomized trials in which therapy given to the patient groups consists of the same combinations of cytotoxic drugs and differs only in the intensity of the route and timing of administration (for reviews see [58, 83, 103, 119]). In some of these studies survival has not been analysed and others are too small for any meaningful evaluation. Marked or significant differences favoring the more intensive regime have neither been found for single-agents like 5- Fu or doxorubicin nor for combination chemother. apy. Observe that for the reasons discussed above, the dose-intensity analysis presented by Hryniuk and Bush [63] is of little value and cannot ques. tion the results of randomized trials. A comment is warranted on the only two studies that resulted in discernible treatment differences. In the study by Tannock *et al* [119], two different doses of CMF were compared. There was a significant (though small) advantage for the higher dose (me. dian survival = 15.6 vs 12.8 months) but this may be due to the fact that there were highly signifi. cant differences between the treatment groups with respect to prognostic factors. After adjus- ment for this imbalance, the survival differences were no longer statistically significant. Carmo- Pereira *et al* [17] compared identical cumulative doses of doxorubicin given in two regimens of different intensity and length. The shorter and more intensive application was found to yield longer survival. Of course, this does not imply that higher single doses are advantageous as such. In this context, a study by Harris *et al* [52] is noteworthy; a slightly better survival was ob- served for short-term administration of mitoxan- trone compared with a continuous administration of identical doses of the same drug. Furthermore, there is no indirect evidence for beneficial effects of chemotherapy on survival. An enormous num- ber of phase-III studies have been conducted com- paring a variety of quite different regimens, but never (and this is actually surprising in view of the large amount of material) have there been any findings of a distinct, let alone reproducible, sur- vival advantage (see [54, 57, 83, 103]). In par- ticular, this holds true for the comparisons of combination *versus* single-agent chemotherapy. In one study [15], a significant advantage of CMF over L-Pam was observed but the difference was small (median survival = 12 *vs 9* months) and the mean DFS in the CMF-group was 3 months longer than in the L-Pam group, thus favoring CMF somewhat with respect to prognosis. Moreover, the difference was confined to patients with poor initial prognostic status, namely those with liver metastases, or non-ambulatory performance sta- tus. Ahmann *et al* [2] conducted a meta-analysis of three consecutive randomized studies of com- bination chemotherapy *versus* single-agent chemotherapy with methyl-CCNU, ifosfamide, or adriamycin (a total of 131 patients). After pooling the single-agent groups, the median survival for the combination was 3.7 months longer, but ifos- famide alone was even superior to the combina- tion. In addition, the difference found in the meta-analysis was not statistically significant.

An additional comment on the subject of breast cancer is called for. It has been claimed that ag-gressive chemotherapy can prolong survival in certain sub-groups, particularly in patients with a ‘high risk’, *ie,* a poor prognosis. These assertions are based on sub-group analyses of randomized studies comparing regimens of different aggres- siveness *[eg,* 11, 12, 15, 19, 72, 106, 121]. Now, as is well known, analyses of this type tend to produce artefacts [81]. Moreover, an evaluation of the relevant studies shows that the findings are by no means clear and consistent. Thus, in a more recent, extensive well-designed clinical trial com- paring endocrine and cytotoxic therapy given sequentially or in combination [121], no sub- group could be identified that profited from the more aggressive strategy.

As for the secular development of survival rates of breast cancer patients, publications are contradictory, the weight of evidence being rather negative *(eg,* [70, 93, 100, 101, 104, 109, 110, 125, 131, 132, 140]). In this regard, Henderson *et al* [57] correctly state: “Most retrospective stu- dies have failed to show that the survival of patients with advanced breast cancer has changed very much over the past 20-30 years”.

Summarizing, one still has to agree with Mac- aulay and Smith [83], who conclude their com- prehensive survey of randomized studies in advanced breast cancer with the following re- mark: “On this basis there trials argue for a con- servative approach to the management of this disease. There is no evidence that asymptomatic patients need any form of active treatment.”

Ovarian carcinoma is considered to be a tumor that is sensitive to a cytotoxic therapy; most on- cologists are convinced that modern regimens, particularly those containing cisplatinum or its analogon carboplatinum, prolong the survival of patients even in advanced stages (FIGO IV or FIGO III with non-completely resectable tumors),

which are the majority of newly diagnosed cases. This opinion is mainly based on historical com- parisons and on unclear indirect evidence from randomized studies. Strangely enough, there is hardly any direct evidence. Randomized compari- sons with untreated controls or of immediate *ver- sus* postponed therapy are lacking, and today they would probably no longer be accepted since most clinicians consider the use of chemotherapy as un- renouncible. Also, there are no pure dose-effect studies, at least no randomized ones. The dose- intensity analysis published by Levin and Hryniuk [80] is based on a collection of quite incom- parable studies and hence lacks any conclusive- ness. There is, however, one small study by Wiltshaw *et al* [136] which compares high-dose cisplatinum with low-dose cisplatinum + chloram- bucil. The high-dose arm had longer median sur- vival (24 vs 14 months); subgroup analysis indicated that the advantage was confined to patients in stage FIGO III with a residual tumor greater than 2 cm. The positive (indirect) evi- dence for ovarian cancer noted in table lb comes from 13 randomized studies comparing cis-plat- inum-containing combination chemotherapy with non-cis-platinum- containing chemotherapy [5, 16, 23, 26, 35, 50, 79, 96, 99, 116, 118, 130, 134]. Though the results are not quite clear and con- sistent, they tend to give support to the conjec- tured positive effect of cis-platinum (or its less toxic analogue carboplatinum) for patients in stage FIGO III. There is no indication, however, that this also holds true in stage IV which com- prises virtually no 5-year-survivors [75, 136]. And, contrary to the opinion of some oncologists, it is doubtful whether the success in stage III is a durable one justifying a long-term administra- tion of an aggressive therapy. Moreover, it is doubtful if the immediate use of cisplatinum offers an advantage over a sequential strategy starting with a less toxic regimen. Thus, in a large trial comparing sequential chlorambucil + cisplat- inum (the latter given in the case of tumor pro- gression) *versus* combined chlorambucil + cisplatinum, the survival in the two groups was practically identical [50].

The association between response and survival

The induction of a remission, *ie* a measurable decrease of the tumour mass, is the primary goal of palliative chemotherapy. Most clinicians judge the “activity” of the therapy by the response rate. Complete as well as partial responders will often not only experience an alleviation of symptoms but, as clinical trials almost unanimously show, they can expect to survive longer than non-re- sponders [117]. This observation leads a great number of oncologists to the conclusion that a re- sponse to chemotherapy prolongs the survival time of the patient. In fact, this reasoning seems, at first glance, so obvious and logical that its popularity is hardly surprising. The structure of the argument and of its implications deserves a close analysis. First note that the conclusion is neither logically true nor evident from the facts. It would be a logical implication only if patients responding to therapy survived longer than they would without the treatment, a fact which cannot be deduced from their advantage over non-re- sponders. At least three different explanations can be given for the phenomenon, none of them im- plying beneficial therapeutic effects. (They are perhaps the reason why differences in survival time between responders and non-responders are no longer accepted by the FDA as evidence for effective treatment, [68]).

i) Time-to-response bias; ii) Selective bias; iii) Overtreatment of non-responders.

Time-to-response-bias is bias due to the defi- nitions; on average, responders should survive slightly longer than non-responders simply be- cause they must live a minimum interval after the onset of therapy in order to be classifiable as re- sponders. Selection bias arises if responders form a subgroup of patients with a favourable progno- sis who would have lived longer than non-re- sponders whether they had received the treatment or not. This hypothesis, which is perhaps the most frequent objection to the alleged benefit of ther- apy to responders, cannot be tested directly, but there are other ways of corroborating it (see below). As for the third explanation, it is fairly obvious that a toxic treatment can be harmful to those patients whose disease does not respond to it. This applies particularly to progressive cases whose state of health often deteriorates rapidly. In this context, another aspect is worth mention- ing. Let us assume that responders do benefit from their therapy in expected survival. Many on- cologists emphasize that this holds true at least for complete responders. Even then, this effect cannot be used as a self-evident argument in favour of the therapy unless it can be shown that there is a benefit for the entire patient group as otherwise the gain seen in responders must have been compensated for by the loss suffered by non-

responders. In these circumstances the treatment raises a considerable ethical problem.

In what follows we want to analyse more closely the hypothesis of an improvement of prog- nosis in responders, brought about by the therapy. If this hypothesis were true, one would expect and postulate that of two therapies yielding different response rates, the one giving the higher rate should be superior as to survival; this difference must be demonstrable in randomized studies and it must be reproducible. The requirement of re- producibility is important since in a single study the results might be attributed to prognostic fac- tors. If produced repeatedly, however, this argu- ment would fail because it would be inexplicable that the prognostically superior group of patients should always lie in the same arm of the trial.

Let us have a look at the data in the light of these arguments. It is well known from clinical trials, though somewhat enigmatic to the non- oncologist, that, while the response rates of tumours show extreme variations with different chemotherapies, this is not reflected in clear differences in the corresponding survival curves. One has to distinguish between the variability of rates obtained when compiling published trials, and the differences between response rates of two or more regimens compared in the same ran- domized trial. The former can be explained quite naturally by diverging study designs. Note that the response rate found in a patient sample is known to depend on a number of factors such as patient characteristics, treatment, method of data collection, or statistical variability [33, 34, 71, 117, 126, 133]. Nonetheless, the extent of the ranges of rates found in clinical studies is quite surprising. Thus, a recent survey of randomized studies of combination chemotherapy in advanced breast cancer [83] lists 75 groups (arms of differ- ent trials) including more than 40 patients each; the achieved response rate ranges from 25-76%. Similar ranges are found in colorectal and stomach cancer. Still more intriguing are the strik- ing differences in response rates found between the arms of the same randomized trials which are not reflected in differences in survival curves. Not infrequently, even the arms showing lower re- sponse rates do better in their survival.

The lack of any apparent relationship between response and survival is by no means biologically implausible. The reduction of a large tumour mass by 50% may simply by insufficient for a signif- icant change in the course of an advanced disease [37]. It is likely that tumour size is less important for prognosis than the distribution of tumour mass, *ie* the site of metastasis. Also, there are empirical findings indicating an enhancement of malignancy as a result of chemotherapy [88].

Does chemotherapy improve the quality of life?

Many oncologists admit the lack of evidence for positive effects of chemotherapy on the duration of survival in advanced solid cancer; yet, they point out that this is not the primary goal of treat- ment, but that chemotherapy is aimed rather at improving the quality of life (QL) of the patients. This point of view is entirely legitimate. Moreover, if toxic cancer treatment cannot pro- long survival, then the therapist has the duty to furnish proof that it improves QL. New QL is a complex and somewhat hazy notion. It includes tumour-related symptoms as well as the various toxic effects of therapy, and numerous further par- ameters of subjective well-being such as appetite, capability of continuing normal activities, and the degree of anxiety or depression.

The measurement of QL raises many methodo- logical problems concerning the scale, validity, and reliability of the measurement. Several differ- ent instruments have been proposed and used in clinical trials but, as yet, no consensus has been reached on the selection of relevant variables, the method and timing of data collection, the weight- ing and combination of the parameters [30, 47, 89, 129]. In principle, adequate proof of improve- ment of QL due to therapy can be obtained in randomized studies only (unless the definition of QL exhausts itself in a description of toxicity of therapy). Phase-II studies monitoring the param- eters of QL are not very convincing because in these studies therapeutic effects cannot be sepa- rated from the factor “intensity of medical care”.

Palliation in the narrower sense, namely the re- lief of tumour-related complaints, is certainly one aspect of QL which is easier to demonstrate. Often the effects are so evident that there is no need for a verification by clinical trials. Indeed, many oncologists justify their use of chemother- apy with reference to palliation. In clinical prac- tice, however, this justification applies only to a fraction of the patients treated, *eg*, according to Drings [31], to patients suffering from severe pain, pleural or other effusions or paraneoplastic syndromes. A look at the guidelines for stand- ardized tumour therapy [103, 115] shows that at least for some tumour sites an application of

chemotherapy is recommended independently of the patients' symptoms.

There are at least three reasons why in reality cytotoxic treatment is not restricted to sympto- matic patients. First, a large number of oncolo- gists are convinced of the therapeutic effects. They justify the early use of chemotherapy by virtue of its apparent success. Second, the gener- ally accepted demand to treat patients if possible within the scope of clinical studies leads to the result that many patients are treated according to uniform study protocols rather than to individual plans suiting their symptoms and needs. Third, the patients' request for treatment may play a role. Desperate patients will urge the doctor to become active and willingly accept considerable side-ef- fects of treatment, if only to escape the passive-ness of waiting (see the description of the problem by Nagel [95]). It is doubtful, however, whether this natural request can justify a toxic treatment which does not prolong the expected duration of survival and which is applied without an immediate need for palliation.

Also, the aim of palliation of symptoms by chemotherapy conflicts with the maxim followed by some oncologists that the more aggressive cy- totoxic therapy is the more promising it is.

Let us return to the more general concept of QL. It has been noted in several clinical studies [4, 10, 42, 105, 124] that the responders to chemotherapy may benefit from the treatment as to their QL. The benefit can be threefold: First, as already mentioned, the tumour remission can lead to relief from pain. Second, after the induc- tion of a partial or complete remission, the ag- gressive therapy is often stopped so that the responders are spared toxic side-effects. Finally, response has positive effects on the patients' psyche. An improvement in mood as a result of chemotherapy can, despite the side-effects, be in- duced even if the patient is symptom-free at the beginning of the treatment, for the response to therapy and the hope brought about by this re- sponse is, independent of objective justification for it, an important component of QL [55] and thus an essential part of medical care.

It would, however, be a serious, though com- mon error, to assume that the gain in QL seen in responders is an indisputable argument in favour of therapy. The (statistical) proof that treatment leads to an improvement in QL must be furnished for the entirety of the treated patients. Since re- sponders cannot be determined in advance, their possible benefit from chemotherapy must be balanced against the harm done to the other patients.

To date there have been no randomized studies yielding clear evidence for an improvement of QL by means of chemotherapy. This is hardly surpris- ing because the evidence must satisfy the same high methodological standard as in the case of survival. In other words, the same studies which, by their design, are suitable for showing a sur- vival benefit due to a therapy, are also suited for providing evidence of an improvement of QL by treatment. In the case of QL one can expect, *a priori*, to find even less evidence because the measurement of subjective well-being has rarely been part of the clinical trials. Clearly, studies in which the investigation of QL is, as is usual, re-stricted to the treatment-related toxicity cannot yield evidence of an improvement of QL.

To the author's knowledge, the only studies at-tempting to furnish direct evidence are the three trials mentioned above comparing immediate chemotherapy with deferred therapy in non-small cell lung cancer. In these studies, QL in the no immediate treatment group was at least as good as in the immediate treatment group. Indirect evi- dence has been provided in the studies of Baum *et al* [4] and Coates *et al* [22] for patients with breast cancer. While the results of these investiga- tions give some indication that QL may be im- proved by chemotherapy, the study designs have severe methodological flaws which, moreover, are of a kind that might have produced the finding as an artefact. Thus, in the study by Coates *et al*, patient groups differed with respect to the frequency of the visits to the doctor and the hospital. Also, time-dependence of well-being was not ade- quately accounted for. (See [1] for a more detailed discussion of these studies). It is worth mentioning that in a recent matched-pair study comparing chemotherapy with an unconventional cancer treat- ment it was found that the decrease of QL over time was very similar in the two groups [18].

Today, many responsible oncologists are aware of the fact that strong evidence, both for a pro- longation of survival and for an improvement of QL by chemotherapy in advanced solid cancer is lacking, and they draw practical consequences from it. Thus, the "Consensus-Development-Con- ference" [24] gives the following recommendation for the use of chemotherapy in metastasized breast cancer: "For most patients with metasta- sized disease one should start with endocrine ther- apy as a first-line treatment".

It should arouse concern, however, that according to opinion polls, many oncologists would decline to accept cytotoxic therapy in their own case [3, 51, 86, 92]. Also, the observation made by Holli *et al* [61] on 252 patients with advanced breast cancer that the "risk" of receiving cytotoxic therapy was three times as high in the terminal stage as in the remainder of the patients, does not point to a use of therapy which is particularly geared to patients' well-being.

References

1 Abel U (1990) Chemotherapy of advanced epithelial cancer. A critical survey. *Hippokrates* Verlag, Stutt- gart

2 Ahmann DL, Schaid DJ, Bisel HF *et al* (1987) The effect on survival of initial chemotherapy in ad- vanced breast cancer: polychemotherapy *versus* single drug. *J Clin Oncol* 5, 1928

3 Anonymous (1987) Ein gnadenloses Zuviel and Therapie. Teil I. Zweifel an den chemischen Waffen. *Der Spiegel* 26/87, 128

4 Baum M, Priestman T, West RR, Jones EM (1980) A comparison of subjective responses in a trial com- paring endocrine with cytotoxic treatment in ad- vanced cardinoma of the breast. *In: Breast Cancer: Experimental and Clinical Aspects* (Mouridson HT, Palshof T, eds). Proc Sec EORTC Breast Cancer Working Conference, Copenhagen, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 223

5 Bell DR, Woods RL, Levi JA *et al* (1982) Advanced ovarian cancer: A prospective randomised trial of chlorambucil *versus* combined cyclophosphamide and cis-diaminedichloroplatinum. *Aust N Z J Med* 12, 245

6 Berdel WE, Fink U (1984) Intemistische Tumorther- apie. Stand, Probleme, Perspektiven der Chemother- apie. *MUnch Med Wschr* 126/41, 1166

7 Block JB, Chlebowski RT, Richardson B *et al* (1983) Adriamycin, cyclophosphamide, CCNU, and Oncovin with or without cisplatin (ACCO *vs* PACCO) for patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2, 202

8 Boring CC, Squires TS, Tong T (1992) Cancer statis- tics, CA 42, 19

9 Boston B, Getaz EP, Buchanan M, Boston RN (1981) Randomized comparison of vindesine (DVA) *vs* DVA and cisplatin (DDP) in non-small cell lung cancer. Abstract No C-671. *Proc Am Assoc Cancer Res/Am Soc Clin Oncol* 22, 504

10 Brunner KW, Sonntag RW, Martz G *et al* (1975) A controlled study in the use of combined drug therapy for metastatic breast cancer. *Cancer* 36, 1208

11 Brunner KW (1983) Stand der Chemotherapie beim metastasierenden Mammakarzinom. *In: Neue Wege in der Brustkrebsbehandlung. Aktuelle Onkologie 8* (Kubli F, Nagel G, Kadach U, Kaufmann M eds) W. Zuckschwerdt Verlag, Munchen, p 97

12 Brunner KW (1987) Die Problematik randomisierter Studien und ihrer Beurteilungskriterien zur Definition optimaler Chemotherapieprogramme. In: Schmidt CG, Brunner DW, Enghofer E (eds) Onkol- ogisches Kolloquium I, Therapiestrategien beim metastasierenden Mammakarzinom. Walter de Gruy- ter, Berlin - New York, p 1

13 Buzdar AU (1988) Chemotherapeutic approaches to advanced breast cancer. *Sem Oncol* 15 Suppl 4, 65

14 Cairns J (1985) The treatment of diseases and the war against cancer. *Sc Am* 253/5, 31

15 Canellos GP, Pocock S, Taylor S *et al* (1976) Com- bination chemotherapy for metastatic breast carci- noma. *Cancer* 38, 1882

16 Carmo-Pereira J, Costa FO, Henriques E, Ricardo JA (1981) Advanced ovarian cancer: a prospective and randomised clinical trial of cyclophosphamide *versus* combination cytotoxic chemotherapy (Hexa- CAF). *Cancer* 48, 1947

17 Carmo-Pereira J, Costa FO, Henriques E (1987) A comparison of two doses of adriamycin in the pri- mary chemotherapy of disseminated breast carci- noma. *Br J Cancer* 56, 471

18 Cassileth B, Lusk EJ, Guerry DP *et al* (1991) Sur- vival and quality of life among patients receiving unproven as compared with conventional cancer therapy. *N Engl J Med* 324, 1180

19 Cavalli F, Beer M, Martz G *et al* (1982) Gleichzeitige oder sequentielle Hor- mono/Chemotherapie sowie Vergleich verschiedener Polychemotherapien in der Behandlung des metastasierenden Mammakarzinoms. *Schweiz Med Wschr* 112, 774

20 Cellerino R, Tummarello D, Guidi F *et al* (1991) A randomized trial of alternating chemotherapy *versus* best supportive care in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 9, 1453

21 Chabner BA, Fine RL, Allegra CJ *et al* (1984) Cancer chemotherapy - progress and expectations, 1984. *Cancer* 54, 2599

22 Coates A, Gerski V, Stat M *et al* (1987) Improving the quality of life during chemotherapy for advanced breast cancer. *N Engl J Med* 317, 1490

23 Cohen CJ, Goldberg JD, Holland JF *et al* (1983) Improved therapy with cisplatin regimens for patients with ovarian carcinoma (FIGO stages III and IV) as measured by surgical end-staging (sec- ond-look operation). *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 144, 955

24 Consensus Development-Konferenz zur Therapie des metastasierten Mammakarzinoms (1988) Leitlin-

ien zur palliativen Behandlung. *Munch Med Wschr* 130, 93

25 Cormier Y, Bergeron D, LaForge J *et al* (1982) Benefits of polychemotherapy in advanced non- small-cell bronchogenic carcinoma. *Cancer* 50, 845

26 Decker DG, Fleming TR, Malkasian GD *et al* (1982) Cyclophosphamide plus cis-platinum in combina- tion: Treatment program for stage III or IV ovarian carcinoma. *Obstet Gynecol* 60, 481

27 Dent DM, Werner ID, Novis B *et al* (1979) Pro- spective randomized trial of combined oncological therapy for gastric carcinoma. *Cancer* 44, 385

28 DeVita V, Hellmann S, Rosenberg S (1982, 1985) Cancer. Principles and practice of oncology. Vol 1, first ed (1982) and second ed (1985), Ch. 13: Prin- ciples of chemotherapy. JB Lippincott & Co, Philadelphia

28 Doll R, Peto R (1981) The causes of cancer. Oxford University Press, Oxford - New York

30 Donovan K, Sanson-Fisher RW, Redman S (1989) Measuring quality of life in cancer patients. *J Clin Oncol* 7, 959

31 Drings P (1982) Allgemeine Richtlinien zur inter- nistischen Krebsbehandlung. *In: Standardisierte Krebsbehandlung*. (Ott G, Kuttig H, Drings P eds) Springer-Verlag, Berlin, p 43

32 Durrant KR, Berry RJ, Ellis F *et al* (1971) Com- parison of treatment policies in inoperable bronchial carcinoma. *Lancet* i, 715

33 Edler L, Flechtner H (1987) Remission in Phase-II- und Phase-III-Studien: Kriterien und Voraussetzun- gen. *Onkologie* 10, 330

34 Edler L (1988) Remission und Statistik. *In: Bericht des 3. Freiburger onkologischen Kolloquiums* (Lof- fler H, ed). p 13

35 Edwards CL, Herson J, Gershenson DM *et al* (1983) A prospective randomised clinical trial of melphalan and cis-platinum *versus* hexmethylmelamine, adri- amycin and cyclophosphamide in advanced ovarian cancer. *Gynecol Oncol* 15, 261

36 Einhorn L, Greco FA, Cohen H, Birch R (1987) Late consolidation wiht cisplatin plus VP-16 (PVP16) following induction chemotherapy with cyclo- phosphamide, adriamycin and vincristine (CAV) in limited small cell lung cancer (SCLC): A South- eastern Cancer Study Group (SECSG) random pro- spective study. Abstract No 655. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 6, 166

37 Ellenberg S, Hamilton JM (1989) Surrogate end- points in clinical trials: Cancer. *Stat Med* 8, 405

38 Elliott JA, Ahmedzai S, Hole D *et al* (1984) Vin- desine and cisplatin combination chemotherapy compared with vindesine as a single agent in the management of non-small cell lung cancer: A ran- domized study. *Eur J Cancer Clin Oncol* 20, 1025

39 Enstrom JE, Austin DF (1977) Interpreting cancer survival rates. *Science* 195, 847

40 Feinstein A, Sosin DM, Wells CK (1985) The Will Rogers Phenomenon - Stage migration and new diagnostic techniques as a source of misleading statistics for survival in cancer. *N Engl J Med* 312, 1604

41 Figueredo A, Hryniuk WM, Strautmanis I *et al* (1985) Co-trimoxazole prophylaxis during high-dose chemotherapy of small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 3, 54

42 Flechtner H, Holle R, Heim ME (1988) Quality of life (QL) of patients with small cell lung cancer under treatment. Results from a multicentre ran- domized trial. Abstract No. 2/17-M003. Proc 19th Nat Cancer Congr German Cancer Soc. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 114 Suppl, 46

43 Frei III E (1985) Curative cancer therapy. *Cancer Res* 45, 6523

44 Frey Ch, Twomey P, Keehn R *et al* (1981) Ran- domized study of 5-FU and CCNU in pancratic cancer. *Cancer* 47, 27

45 Fuks JZ, Aisner J, van Echo DA *et al* (1983) Ran- domized study of cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and etoposide (VP16-213) with or without cisplat- inum in non-small cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1, 295

46 Ganz PA, Figlin RA, Haskell CM *et al* (1987) Sup- portive care (SC) vs supportive care plus chemother- apy (SCC) in advanced metastatic lung cancer: Response, survival, and quality of life. Abstract No 674. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 6, 171

47 Ganz PA, Bernhard J, Hurny Ch (1991) Quality-of- life and psychosocial oncology research in Europe. *J Psychosoc Oncol* 9, 1

48 Green RA, Humphrey E, Close H, Patno ME (1969) Alkylating agents in bronchgenic carcinoma. *Am J Med* 46, 516

49 Greenfield S, Blanco DM, Elashoff RM, Ganz PA (1987) Patterns of care related to age of breast cancer patients. *J Am Med Assoc* 257, 2766

50 Gynecological Group, Clinical Oncological Society of Australia, and the Sydney Branch, Ludwig Insti- tute for Cancer Research (1986) Chemotherapy of advanced ovarian adenocarcinoma: A randomized comparison of combination *versus* sequential ther- apy using chlorambucil and cisplatin. *Gynecol Oncol* 23, 1

51 Hansen HH (1987) Advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: To treat or not to treat? *J Clin Oncol* 5, 1711

52 Harris AL, Cantwell BMJ, Ghani S (1987a) A ran- domized trial of short course (9 weeks) mitoxan- trone *versus* continuous chemotherapy in advanced breast cancer. Abstract No 258. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 6, 66

53 Harris AL, Cantwell B, Corris P, Bozzino J (1987b) A randomized trial of short courses of intravenous (iv) chemotherapy *versus* oral out-patient chemotherapy for small cell lung cancer (sclc). Ab- stract No. 849. *Proc Am Assoc Cancer Res* 28, 214

54 Henderson IC, Canellos GP (1980) Cancer of the breast. The past decade. *N Engl J Med* 302, 17 and 78

55 Henderson IC (1987a) Stehen Ansprechraten und Dauer des Uberlebens in kausaler Beziehung? *In:* Onkologisches Kolloquium I. Therapiestrategien beim metastasierenden Mammakarzinom (Schmidt CG, Brunner DW, Enghofer E, eds). Walter de Gruy- ter, Berlin - New York, p 15

56 Henderson IC (1987b) Adjuvant systemic therapy for early breast cancer. *Curr Prob Cancer* 11, 125

57 Henderson IC, Hayes DF, Come S *et al* (1987c) New agents and new medical treatments for advanced breast cancer. *Sem Oncol* 14, 34

58 Henderson IC, Hayes DF, Gelman R (1988) Dose- response in the treatment of breast cancer: a critical review. *J Clin Oncol* 6, 1501

59 Hine KR, Dykes PW (1984) Prospective randomized trial of early cytotoxic therapy for recurrent colorectal carcinoma detected by serum CEA. *Gut* 25, 682

60 Hockey MS, Fielding JWL (1986) Gastric cancer. *In: Randomized Trials in Cancer. A Critical Review by Sites* (Slevin ML, Staquet MJ, eds). Raven Press, New York, p 221

61 Holli K, Hakama M (1988) Treatment and diagnos- tic activities during the terminal stage of breast cancer patients

62 Hossfeld DK (1986) Vertretbare Risiken bei der ku- rativen Therapie bosartiger Erkrankungen. *Onko- logie* 9, 215

63 Hryniuk W, Bush H (1984) The importance of dose intensity in chemotherapy of metastatic breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2, 1281

64 Hryniuk WM (1988a) More is better. *J Clin Oncol* 6, 1365

65 Hryniuk WM (1988b) The importance of dose in- tensity in the outcome of chemotherapy. *In: Impor- tant Advances in Oncology* (deVita V *et al* eds). JB Lippincott Co, Philadelphia, p 121

66 Humblet Y, Symann M, Bosly A *et al* (1985) Late intensification (LI) with autologous bone marrow transplantation (ABMT) for small cell lung cancer: A randomized study. Abstract No. C-688. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 4, 174

67 Ihde DC, Johnson BE, Mulshine JL *et al* (1987) Randomized trial of high dose *versus* standard dose etoposide and cisplatin (VP16/PLAT) in extensive stage small cell lung cancer (SCLC). Abstract. No 714. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 6, 181

68 Johnson JR, Temple R (1985) Food and drug ad- ministration requirements for approval of new anti- cancer drugs. *Cancer Treat Rep* 69, 1155

69 Johnson DH, Einhorn LH, Birch R *et al* (1987) A randomized comparison of high-dose *versus* conven- tional-dose cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and vincristine for extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer: A phase III trial of the Southeastern Cancer Study Group. *J Clin Oncol* 5, 1731

70 Kaufman RJ (1981) Advanced breast cancer - addi- tive hormonal therapy. *Cancer* 47, 2398

71 Kearsley JH (1986) Cytotoxic chemotherapy for common adult malignancies: "The emperor's new clothes" revisited? *Br Med J* 293, 871

72 Kiang DT, Gay J, Goldman A, Kennedy BJ (1985) A randomized trial of chemotherapy and hormonal therapy in advanced breast cancer. *N Engl J Med* 313, 1241

73 Kingston RD, Ellis DJ, Powell J *et al* (1978) The West Midlands gastric carcinoma chemotherapy trial: planning and results. *Clin Oncol* 4, 55

74 Kokron O, Miksche M, Titscher R, Wrba H (1982) Ifosphamide *versus* ifosphamide and CCNU in the treatment of inoperable small cell lung cancer. *Onkologie* 5, 56

75 Krag KJ, Parker LM, Canellos GP *et al* (1986) Pre- dictive factors for long-term survival in patients with advanced ovarian cancer. *Abstract. Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 5, 117

76 Lad Th E, Nelson RB, Diekamp U *et al* (1981) Im- mediate *versus* postponed chemotherapy (CAMP) for unresectable non-small cell lung cancer: a ran- domized trial. *Cancer Treat Rep* 65, 973

77 Laing AH, Berry RJ, Newman CR, Smith P (1975a) Treatment of small-cell carcinoma of bronchus. *Lan- cet* i, 129

78 Laing AH, Berry RJ, Newman CR, Peto J (1975b) Treatment of inoperable carcinoma of bronchus. *Lancet* ii, 1161

79 Lambert HE, Berry R (1985) High dose cisplatin compared with high dose cyclophosphamide in the management of advanced epithelial ovarian cancer (FIGO stages III and IV): report from the North Thames Cooperative Group. *Br Med J* 290, 889

80 Levin L, Hryniuk WM (1987) Dose intensity analy- sis of chemotherapy regimens in ovarian carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 5, 756

81 Loprinzi Cl, Ahmann DL (1986) Chemotherapy *ver- sus* hormonal therapy in advanced breast carcinoma. Correspondence. *N Engl J Med* 315, 1092

82 Lowenbraun S, Birch R, Buchanan R *et al* (1984) Combination chemotherapy in small cell lung car- cinoma. *Cancer* 54, 2344

83 Macaulay V, Smith IE (1986) Advanced breast cancer. *In: Randomized Trials in Cancer. A Critical*

Review by Sites (Slevin ML, Staquet MJ, eds). Raven Press, New York, p 273

84 Malik STA (1986) Small cell lung cancer. *In: Ran- domized Trials in Cancer. A Critical Review by Sites* (Slevin ML, Staquet MJ, eds). Raven Press, New York, p 493

85 Macdonald JS, Gohmann JJ (1988) Chemotherapy of advanced gastric cancer: present status, future prospects. *Sem Oncol* 15, Suppl 3, 42

86 Mackillop WJ, Ward GK, O'Sullivan B (1986) The use of expert surrogates to evaluate clinical trials in non-small cell lung cancer. *Br J Cancer* 54, 661

87 Mallinson CN, Rake MO, Cocking JB *et al* (1980) Chemotherapy in pancreatic cancer: Results of a controlled, prospective, randomized, multicentre trial. *Br Med J* 281, 1589

88 McMillan TJ, Hart IR (1987) Can cancer chemother- apy enhance the malignant behavior of tumors? *Cancer Metastasis Rev* 6, 503

89 McMillen Mainpour C, Feigl P, Metch B *et al* (1989) Quality of life end points in cancer clinical trials: review and recommendations. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 81, 485

90 Moertel Ch G, Childs DS, Reitemeier RJ *et al* (1969) Combined 5-FluorouraciI and supervoltage radiation therapy of locally unresectable gastrointestinal cancer. *Lancet* ii, 865

91 Moertel ChG, Thynne GS (1982) Large bowel. *In: Cancer Medicine.* 2. edn (Holland JF, Frei E, eds). Lea & Febiger, Philadelphia, p 1830

92 Moore MJ, Tannock IF (1988) How expert physici- ans would wish to be treated if they developed genito-urinary cancer. Abstract No 455. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 7, 118

93 Myers MH (1973) Breast cancer survival over three decades. *In: Breast Cancer - A Challenging Prob- lem* (Griem ML *et al* eds) Springer-Verlag, Berlin, p 87

94 Nagel GA, Wander HE (1986) Verantwortbare Risiken bei der Wahl der palliativen Chemotherapie. *Onkologie* 9, 225

95 Nagel GA (1988) Begriff und Ursache der Uberbe- handlung in der Onkologie. *Berichte der Dt Krebsges* 2/1988, 4

96 Neijt JP, tenBokkel Huinink WW, van der Burg MEL (1984) Randomised trial comparing two com- bination chemotherapy regimens (Hexa-CAF *vs* CHAP-5) in advanced ovarian cancer. *Lancet* ii, 594

97 Nicholls J (1986) Large bowel cancer. *In: Ran- domized Trials in Cancer. A Critical Review by Sites.* (Slevin ML, Staquet MJ, eds) Raven Press, New York, p 241

98 O'Donnell MR, Ruckdeschel JC, Baxter D *et al* (1985) Intensive induction chemotherapy for small cell anaplastic carcinoma of the lung. *Cancer Treat Rep* 69, 571

99 Omura G, Blessing JA, Ehrlich CE *et al* (1986) A randomized trial of cyclophosphamide and dox- orubicin with or without cisplatin in advanced ovar- ian cancer. *Cancer* 57. 1725

100 Patel JK, Nemoto T, Vezeridis M *et al* (1986) Does more intense palliative treatment improve overall survival in metastatic breast cancer patients? *Cancer* 57, 567

101 Petru E, Schmahl D (1988) No relevant influence an overall survival time in patients with metastatic breast cancer undergoing combination chemother- apy. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 114, 183

102 Pocock SJ (1983) Clinical trials. A practical ap- proach. J Wiley & Sons, Chichester

103 Possinger K, Sauer H-J, Wilmans W (1988) Chemotherapie metastasierter Mammakarzinome. *Dt Med Wschr* 113, 224

104 Powles TJ, Coombes RC, Smith IE *et al* (1980) Failure of chemotherapy to prolong survival in a group of patients with metastatic breast cancer. *Lan- cet* i, 580

105 Priestman T, Baum M (1976) Evaluation of quality of life in patients receiving treatment for advanced breast cancer. *Lancet* i, 899

106 Priestman T, Baum M, Jones V, Forbes J (1977) Comparative trial of endocrine *versus* cytotoxic treatment in advanced breast cancer. *Br Med J* i, 1248

107 Quoix E, Detemann A, Charbonneau J *et al* (1991) La chimiotherapie comportant du cisplatine est-elle utile dans le cancer bronchique non microcellulaire au stade IV? Resultats d'une etude randomisee. *Bull Cancer (Paris)* 78, 341

108 Rapp E, Pater J, Willan A *et al* (1988) Chemother- apy can prolong survival in patients with advanced non-small-cell lung cancer - report of a Canadian multicenter randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 6, 633

109 Ross MB, Buzdar AU, Smith TL *et al* (1985) Im- proved survival of patients with metastatic breast cancer receiving combination chemotherapy. *Cancer* 55, 341

110 Rutqvist LE (1984) Increasing incidence and con- stant mortality rates of breast cancer: Time trends in Stockholm County 1961-73. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* 4, 233

111 Schnitzler G, Queiper W, Heim ME *et al* (1986) Prospektiv randomisierte Prufung von 5- Fluorouracil, Adriamycin, BCNU (FAB) *versus* Beobachtung beim metastasierten Pancreaskarzi- nom. *Tumor Diagnostik & Therapie* 7, 135

112 Schraub S, Bemeheim J (1988) Quackery in the quest of quality. *In:* The *Quality of Life of Cancer Patients* (Aaronson NK, Beckmann J, eds). Raven Press, New York, p 275

113 Selawry O, Krant M, Scotto J *et al* (1977) Methotrexate compared with placebo in lung cancer. *Cancer* 40, 4

114 Senn HJ (1985) Indikationen, Erfolgsaussichten und praktische Durchfuhrung der internistischen Krebstherapie. *In: Internistische Krebstherapie.* (Brunner KW, Nagel GA, eds) Springer-Verlag, Ber- lin, p 92

115 Senn HJ, Drings P, Glaus A *et al* (1988) Checkliste Onkologie. Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart

116 Sessa C, Bolis G, Colombo N *et al* (1985) Hex- methylmelamine, adriamycin and cyclophosphamide (HAC) *versus* cis-dichlorodiammineplatinum, adri- amycin and cyclophosphamide (PAC) in advanced ovarian cancer: A randomized clinical trial. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 14, 222

117 Smith I (1983) Measuring response in incurable cancer. *In: Cancer Treatment: End Point Evaluation*. (Stoll BA, ed) J Wiley & Sons, Chichester, p 23

118 Sturgeon JFG, Fine S, Bean HA *et al* (1982) A ran- domised trial of melphalan alone *versus* combination chemotherapy in advanced ovarian cancer. Abstract No. C-418. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 1, 108

119 Tannock IF, DeBoer G, Erlichman Ch *et al* (1988) A randomized trial of two dose levels of cyclo- phosphamide, methotrexate, and fluorouracil chemotherapy for patients with metastatic breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 6, 1377

120 Taylor SG, Gelman RS, Falkson G *et al* (1986) Combination chemotherapy compared to tamoxifen as initial therapy for stage IV breast cancer in elderly women. *Ann Intern Med* 104, 455

121 The Australian and New Zealand Breast Cancer Trials Group, Clinical Oncological Society of Australia (1986) A randomized trial in post- menopausal patients with advanced breast cancer comparing endocrine and cytotoxic therapy given sequentially or in combination. *J Clin Oncol* 4, 186

122 The Cancer Registry of Norway (1980) Survival of cancer patients. Cases diagnosed in Norway 1968-75. The Norwegian Cancer Registry, Oslo

123 The Nordic Gastrointestinal Tumor Adjuvant Ther- apy Group (1992) Expectancy or primary chemotherapy in patients with advanced asympto- matic colorectal cancer: a randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 10, 904

124 Thompson P, Harvey V (1989) Improved quality of life (QOL) in patients (PTS) with advanced breast cancer responding to treatment with mitoxantrone (MX). Abstract No. 129. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 8, 34

125 Todd M, Shoag M, Cadman E (1983) Survival of women with metastatic breast cancer at Yale from 1920 to 1980. *J Clin Oncol* 1, 406

126 Tonkin K, Tannock I (1988) Evaluation of response and morbidity following treatment of bladder cancer. *In: The Management of Bladder Cancer*. (Raghavan D ed) E Arnold Publ Ltd, London, p 228

127 Ullmann Ch (1988) Krebstherapie - eine Bilanz. Siiddeutsche Zeitung Nr. 279, 13

128 Urtasun RC, Belch AR, McKinnon S *et al* (1982) Small cell lung cancer: initial treatment with sequen- tial hemibody irradiation *vs* 3 drug systemic chemotherapy. *Br J Cancer* 46, 228

129 van Dam FSAM, Linssen CAG, Gouzijn AL (1984) Evaluating "quality of life" in cancer clinical trials. *In: Cancer Clinical Trials — Methods and Practice.* (Buyse M, Staquet MJ, Sylvester RJ, eds) Oxford Univ Press, Oxford, New York, Toronto, p 26

130 Vogl SE, Pagano M, Davies TE *et al* (1983) Plat- inum-based combination chemotherapy *versus* mel- phalan for advanced ovarian cancer. *Proc 13th Int Congress Chemother* 11, 207

131 Von Fournier D (1989) Growth behavior and im- plications for staging and therapy. *In: Breast Diseases.* (Kubli F *et al* eds) Springer-Verlag, Berlin, p 156

132 Wander H-E (1986) Der Einfluss der medika- mentdsen Systemtherapie auf die Uberlebenszeit von Patientinnen mit metastasierendem Mammakarzi- nom. Habilitationsschrift, Universitat Gottingen

133 Warr D, McKinney S, Tannock I (1985) Influence of measurement errors on response rates. *Cancer Treat Rep* 69, 1127

134 Williams CJ, Mead B, McBeth FR *et al* (1985) Cisplatinum combination chemotherapy *versus* chlorambucil in advanced ovarian carcinoma: Ma- ture results of a randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol* 3, 1455

135 Wilmans W (1988) Stellunghahme des Internisten; Bericht 3/88 der Deutschen Krebsgesellschaft, p 10

136 Wiltshaw E, Evans B, Rustin G *et al* (1986) A pro- spective randomized trial comparing high-dose cisplatin with low-dose cisplatin and chlorambucil in advanced ovarian cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 4, 722

137 Woods RL, Tattersall MHN, Rox RH (1981) Hemi- body irradiation in "poor prognosis" small cell lung cancer. Abstract No. C-663. *Proc Am Assoc Cancer Res/Am Soc Clin Oncol* 22, 502

138 Woods RL, Williams CJ, Levi J *et al* (1990) A ran- domized trial of cisplatin and vindesine *versus* sup- portive care only in advanced non-small cell lung cancer. *Br J Cancer* 61, 608

139 Zelen M (1985) The role of statistics in the design and evaluation of trials in cancer medicine. *In: Clini- cal Trials in Cancer Medicine*. (Veronesi U, Bona- donna G, eds) Academic Press Inc, London, p 561

140 Zinser JW, Hortobagyi GN, Buzdar AU *et al* (1987) Clinical course of breast cancer patients with liver metastases. *J Clin Oncol* 5, 77