

Online Submissions: http://www.wjgnet.com/esps/ wjg@wjgnet.com doi:10.3748/wjg.v19.i38.6315 World J Gastroenterol 2013 October 14; 19(38): 6315-6318 ISSN 1007-9327 (print) ISSN 2219-2840 (online) © 2013 Baishideng. All rights reserved.

EDITORIAL

# Epidermal growth factor receptor and metastatic colorectal cancer: Insights into target therapies

Ramon Andrade de Mello, Andrea Marin Marques, António Araújo

Ramon Andrade de Mello, António Araújo, Department of Medical Oncology, Portuguese Oncology Institute, 4200-072 Porto, Portugal

Ramon Andrade de Mello, Department of Medicine, FMUP-Faculty of Medicine, University of Porto, 4200-319 Porto, Portugal

Andrea Marin Marques, Department of Medicine, Centro Hospitalar Médio Ave, 4780 Porto, Portugal

Author contributions: All authors contributed as the same for this manuscript preparation.

Correspondence to: Ramon Andrade de Mello, MD, PhD, Department of Medical Oncology, Portuguese Oncology Institute, Rua Dr. António Bernardino de Almeida, 4200-072 Porto, Portugal. ramondemello@gmail.com

 Telephone:
 +351-22-584000
 Fax:
 +351-22-584010

 Received:
 May 18, 2013
 Revised:
 August 4, 2013

 Accepted:
 September 4, 2013
 Published online:
 October 14, 2013

# Abstract

Colorectal cancer (CRC) has high incidence and mortality worldwide. In 2012, CRC was the second most prevalent cancer among males (9%) and the third among females (8%). In recent decades, standard chemotherapies protocols combining 5-fluorouracil, leucovorin, irinotecan and oxaliplatin were important for improve survival in this set of patients. Further, biological drugs throughout epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) pathways showed interesting results in metastatic disease (mCRC) control when in association to standard chemotherapy regimens. Cetuximab and panitumumab are two cornerstones for mCRC treatment and are both approved in Europe and United States based on previous results phase III trials. This paper will briefly summarize those anti-EGFR therapies framework in mCRC and discusses some issues in this regard.

© 2013 Baishideng. All rights reserved.

Key words: Colorectal cancer; Epidermal growth factor receptor; *KRAS* mutation; Chemotherapy; Cetuximab;

#### Panitumumab

**Core tip:** Metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC) remains a challenge for oncologists worldwide. Despite a very aggressive disease profile, mCRC's outcomes are improving toward last decades. Target drugs, such as cetuximab and panitumumab, acquired a main role in this scenario whether phase III trials showed interesting results in overall survival and disease control. Thus, we will briefly in this paper discuss some issues and pitfalls concerning this framework.

de Mello RA, Marques AM, Araújo A. Epidermal growth factor receptor and metastatic colorectal cancer: Insights into target therapies. *World J Gastroenterol* 2013; 19(38): 6315-6318 Available from: URL: http://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/full/v19/ i38/6315.htm DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v19.i38.6315

## INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) has high incidence and mortality worldwide. In 2012, CRC was the second most prevalent cancer among males (9%) and the third among females (8%)<sup>[1]</sup>. The survival rates, in advanced CRC remain low; therefore, the development of new therapeutic weapons becomes a real need. Targets therapies through epidermal growth factor (EGF) and its receptor (EGFR) and also KRAS pathways modulation acquired a main role whether in association with standard chemotherapy<sup>[2]</sup>. Since its discovery, EGFR has been considered a good candidate for targeted cancer therapy<sup>[3,4]</sup>. It is over expressed in many types of cancers, especially CRC<sup>[5]</sup>.

# EPIDERMAL GROWTH FACTOR RECEPTOR

Although EGFR remains a controversial prognostic fac-



#### de Mello RA et al. EGFR therapies and mCRC

Table 1       Mainly clinical trial and target therapies						
Study	Design	Median PFS (mo)	Median OS (mo)	Toxicity (grade 3/4)	Genetic analyses	Response rate
PACCE trial <sup>[18]</sup>	PMAB + Bev/Ox-CT +	10	19.4	Skin rash, diarrhea, infections and pulmonary	<i>KRAS</i> status was determined in 82% tumor samples. Mutations	46%
	PMAB + Bev/Iri-CT			embolism	were found in 40%	
	Bev/Ox-CT	11.4	24.5			48%
	+					
[22]	Bev/Iri-CT		1			
Peeters <i>et al</i> <sup>[22]</sup>	Panitumumab-FOLFIRI	5.9	14.5	Toxicities associated with	KRAS status was available for 91%	Improved to
	(in the WT KRAS			anti-EGFR therapy	of patients: 597 (55%) with wild-	35% <i>vs</i> 10% with
	subpopulation)	2.0	10 F <sup>1</sup>		type KRAS tumors, and 486 (45%)	the addition of
	FOLFIRI (in the WT KRAS	3.9	12.5		with mutant KRAS tumors	panitumumab
PRIME study <sup>[28]</sup>	Wild type KRAS stratum	9.6	<b>23</b> 0 <sup>1</sup>			55%
I KINE Study	Panitumumah +	9.0	23.9			5570
	FOLFOX (4)					
	FOLFOX(4)	8.0	$19.7^{1}$	Toxicities associated with	KRAS results were available for	
	Mutant KRAS stratum			anti-EGFR therapy	1100 ( 93%)patients	48%
	Panitumumab +	7.3	15.5 <sup>1</sup>			40%
	FOLFOX (4)					
	FOLFOX (4)	8.8	19.3 <sup>1</sup>			40%
COIN trial <sup>[29]</sup>	Ox and 5FU (arm A) in	$8.6^{1}$	$17.9^{1}$	NA	565 (43%) had KRAS mutations	57%
	KRAS wild-type tumours					
	Ox and 5FU plus	8.61	17.0 <sup>1</sup>	Skin rash and		64%
	cetuximab (arm B) in			gastrointestinal toxic		
	KRAS wild-type tumours	<b>z</b> ol	20. 1	effects		11.0/
NORDIC-VII <sup>LOJ</sup>	Standard Nordic FLOX	7.9	20.4	The regimens were well	KRAS and BRAF mutation analyses	41%
	(arm A)	e 2 <sup>1</sup>	$10.7^{1}$	tolerated	were obtained in 498 (88%) and 457	40%
	(arm B)	8.5	19.7		patients (81%) respectively	49%
	(arm b) Cetuvimah combined with	$7.3^{1}$	$20.3^{1}$			47%
	intermittent FLOX (arm C)	7.5	20.5			47 /0
	internation r Loss (affir C)					

<sup>1</sup>Without statistical significance. PFS: Progression-free survival; OS: Overall survival; PMAB: Panitumumab; Bev: Bevacizumab; Ox:CT: Oxaliplatin: based chemotherapy; Iri-CT: Irinotecan-based chemotherapy; 5FU: 5-fluorouracil; FOLFOX/FLOX: Fluorouracil, leucovorin and oxaliplatin; FOLFIRI: Fluorouracil, leucovorin and irinotecan; NA: Not applicable.

tor, this expression-stage association may play a crucial role in the decision to initiate an adjuvant treatment toward KRAS mutation assessment<sup>[6]</sup> as it will be discussed below.

However, not all patients have a good response to anti-EGFR monoclonal antibodies, and given the risks for adverse effects associated with their use and their substantial cost, there is particular interest in identifying predictors of treatment benefit or lack thereof<sup>[2]</sup>. Genetic alterations may explain the resistance to anti-EGFR therapies<sup>[7]</sup>. In current clinical practice, *KRAS* mutation (codon 12 and 13) is mainly responsible for primary resistance to the EGFR target drugs, particularly cetuximab and panitumumab<sup>[8]</sup>. Thus the advantages of anti-EGFR monoclonal antibody treatment of colorectal cancer may be limited to *KRAS* wild-type patients<sup>[9]</sup>.

# METASTATIC COLORECTAL CANCER

Currently, we know that many monoclonal antibodies has been approved by Food and Drugs Administration (FDA) and European Medicine Agency for the treatment of mCRC: cetuximab and panitumumab in KRAS wild-type patients<sup>[5,9]</sup> and bevacizumab for those harbor codon 12 or 13 mutation<sup>[10,11]</sup>. These drugs are used in association with chemotherapy in patients with mCRC or maintenance therapies in chemorefractory tumors (Table 1). In overall, current guidelines advocate the use of the following regimens as initial standard chemotherapy for mCRC: fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy (FOLFOX), fluorouracil, leucovorin, and irinotecanbased chemotherapy (FOLFIRI), capecitabine plus oxaliplatin (CapeOx or XELOX)<sup>[12,13]</sup>, and fluorouracil, leucovorin, oxaliplatin and irinotecan-based chemotherapy (FOLFOXIRI)<sup>[14]</sup>. The addition of a biological agent, such as anti-vascular endothelial growth factor (bevacizumab)<sup>[15]</sup> or anti-EGFR (cetuximab or panitumumab), in KRAS wild-type, will depends on patients KRAS profile, fitness and related- clinical co-morbidities.

However, we should be aware for the toxicity profile. Most common anti-EGFR adverse events<sup>[16]</sup> are the skin acneiform rash, xeroderma, hypomagnesemia, diarrhea and nausea<sup>[17]</sup>. Hecht *et al*<sup>[18]</sup> assessed panitumumab plus bevacizumab versus regular chemotherapy (oxaliplatin and irinotecan-based) as first line treatment for mCRC and showed no outcomes benefit, but only increase in toxicity profile, particularly diarrhea, infections and pulmonary embolism<sup>[19]</sup>. The increased in the toxicity can be explicated by dual-pathway inhibition in combination with chemotherapy<sup>[18]</sup>. In this study the patients were enrolled onto one of two cohorts per investigator arm: a fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin-based chemotherapy (FOLFOX) cohort or a fluorouracil, leucovorin, and irinotecan-based chemotherapy (FOLFIRI) cohort, each with bevacizumab. Anyway, panitumumab given with FOLFOX or with FOLFIRI in the absence of bevacizumab appears to be well tolerated in other studies.

Tveit *et al*<sup>20]</sup> evaluated in mCRC patiens the efficacy of cetuximab plus bolus fluorouracil/folinic acid and oxaliplatin, administered continuously or intermittently as first line regimen. This study did not show significant benefit compared with the FOLFOX regime. For another hand in third-line treatment of patients with chemotherapy-refractory mCRC, cetuximab provides a substantial prolongation of progression-free-survival (PFS) and overall survival<sup>[21]</sup>. Similarly, panitumumab plus FOLFIRI has shown significantly improved in PFS and was welltolerated as second-line treatment in patients with wildtype *KRAS* mCRC<sup>[22]</sup>.

Plus, the combination of cetuximab plus FOLFIRI as first-line chemotherapy in wild-type KRAS tumors also can reduce the risk of progression of mCRC as compared with FOLFIRI alone<sup>[23]</sup>. Moreover, we should note that the toxicity of FOLFIRI plus cetuximab combination was superior to FOLFIRI regimen alone (notably skin reactions). Notwithstanding, patients with KRAS wild-type locally advanced rectal cancer with the addition of cetuximab to chemoradiation regimen based on irinotecan plus capecitabine showed no benefit compared to the use of chemoradiation alone<sup>[24]</sup>. Further, in spite of we have focused our attention to KRAS mutations; there are others biomarkers that are also implicated in colorectal cancer outcomes, such as BRAF mutation. BRAF-mutant tumors have worse prognosis<sup>[25]</sup>. Recently BRAF inhibitor, vemurafenib, was approved by the FDA for treatment of patients with BRAF-mutant metastatic melanoma<sup>[26]</sup>. It is expected that in the near future other BRAF inhibitors are developed and maybe directed to mCRC.

## CONCLUSION

In summary, the most recent studies aim to demonstrate not only the efficacy and safety of the target molecules discussed above, in particular cetuximab and panitumumab, but also how these new agents act in conjunction with conventional chemotherapy. Currently, mCRC molecular profile assessments acquired a main role for oncologists worldwide due to the possibility of personalizing treatments approaches for mCRC patients and thus improve survival outcomes as well as quality of life<sup>[27-29]</sup>. In addition, the choice to use bevacizumab, cetuximab or panitumumab in association with standard chemotherapy (FOLFOX or FOLFIRI) for mCRC framework run toward patients fitness, acceptable toxicities profiles, survival outcome and mainly pharmaco-economic evaluation of those drugs in this setting.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Authors would like to acknowledge Luis F Moreira, PhD, Post-Doc fellow at School of Sciences, Department of Chemistry, University of Porto, Portugal, for his help in language review.

#### REFERENCES

- Siegel R, DeSantis C, Virgo K, Stein K, Mariotto A, Smith T, Cooper D, Gansler T, Lerro C, Fedewa S, Lin C, Leach C, Cannady RS, Cho H, Scoppa S, Hachey M, Kirch R, Jemal A, Ward E. Cancer treatment and survivorship statistics, 2012. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2012; 62: 220-241 [PMID: 22700443 DOI: 10.3322/caac.21149]
- 2 Dahabreh IJ, Terasawa T, Castaldi PJ, Trikalinos TA. Systematic review: Anti-epidermal growth factor receptor treatment effect modification by KRAS mutations in advanced colorectal cancer. Ann Intern Med 2011; 154: 37-49 [PMID: 21200037 DOI: 10.7326/0003-4819-154-1-201101040-00006]
- 3 **Baselga J**. Why the epidermal growth factor receptor? The rationale for cancer therapy. *Oncologist* 2002; 7 Suppl 4: 2-8 [PMID: 12202782 DOI: 10.1634/theoncologist.7-suppl\_4-2]
- 4 de Mello RA, Marques DS, Medeiros R, Araújo AM. Epidermal growth factor receptor and K-Ras in non-small cell lung cancer-molecular pathways involved and targeted therapies. *World J Clin Oncol* 2011; 2: 367-376 [PMID: 22087435 DOI: 10.5306/wjco.v2.i11.367]
- 5 Gschwind A, Fischer OM, Ullrich A. The discovery of receptor tyrosine kinases: targets for cancer therapy. Nat Rev Cancer 2004; 4: 361-370 [PMID: 15122207]
- 6 Spano JP, Lagorce C, Atlan D, Milano G, Domont J, Benamouzig R, Attar A, Benichou J, Martin A, Morere JF, Raphael M, Penault-Llorca F, Breau JL, Fagard R, Khayat D, Wind P. Impact of EGFR expression on colorectal cancer patient prognosis and survival. *Ann Oncol* 2005; 16: 102-108 [PMID: 15598946 DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdi006]
- 7 Shackelford RE, Whitling NA, McNab P, Japa S, Coppola D. KRAS Testing: A Tool for the Implementation of Personalized Medicine. *Genes Cancer* 2012; 3: 459-466 [PMID: 23264846 DOI: 10.1177/1947601912460547]
- 8 Misale S, Yaeger R, Hobor S, Scala E, Janakiraman M, Liska D, Valtorta E, Schiavo R, Buscarino M, Siravegna G, Bencardino K, Cercek A, Chen CT, Veronese S, Zanon C, Sartore-Bianchi A, Gambacorta M, Gallicchio M, Vakiani E, Boscaro V, Medico E, Weiser M, Siena S, Di Nicolantonio F, Solit D, Bardelli A. Emergence of KRAS mutations and acquired resistance to anti-EGFR therapy in colorectal cancer. *Nature* 2012; **486**: 532-536 [PMID: 22722830 DOI: 10.1038/nature 11156]
- 9 Cartwright TH. Treatment decisions after diagnosis of metastatic colorectal cancer. *Clin Colorectal Cancer* 2012; 11: 155-166 [PMID: 22192364 DOI: 10.1016/j.clcc.2011.11.001]
- 10 Hurwitz H, Fehrenbacher L, Novotny W, Cartwright T, Hainsworth J, Heim W, Berlin J, Baron A, Griffing S, Holmgren E, Ferrara N, Fyfe G, Rogers B, Ross R, Kabbinavar F. Bevacizumab plus irinotecan, fluorouracil, and leucovorin for metastatic colorectal cancer. N Engl J Med 2004; 350: 2335-2342 [PMID: 15175435 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa032691]
- 11 Kabbinavar FF, Schulz J, McCleod M, Patel T, Hamm JT, Hecht JR, Mass R, Perrou B, Nelson B, Novotny WF. Addition of bevacizumab to bolus fluorouracil and leucovorin in first-line metastatic colorectal cancer: results of a randomized phase II trial. *J Clin Oncol* 2005; 23: 3697-3705 [PMID: 15738537 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2005.05.112]
- 12 Cunningham D, Atkin W, Lenz HJ, Lynch HT, Minsky B, Nordlinger B, Starling N. Colorectal cancer. *Lancet* 2010; 375: 1030-1047 [PMID: 20304247 DOI: 10.1016/SO140-6736(10)60353-4]

T # & Raishideng®

WJG www.wjgnet.com

- 13 Cassidy J, Clarke S, Díaz-Rubio E, Scheithauer W, Figer A, Wong R, Koski S, Lichinitser M, Yang TS, Rivera F, Couture F, Sirzén F, Saltz L. Randomized phase III study of capecitabine plus oxaliplatin compared with fluorouracil/folinic acid plus oxaliplatin as first-line therapy for metastatic colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol 2008; 26: 2006-2012 [PMID: 18421053 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2007.14.9898]
- 14 Falcone A, Ricci S, Brunetti I, Pfanner E, Allegrini G, Barbara C, Crinò L, Benedetti G, Evangelista W, Fanchini L, Cortesi E, Picone V, Vitello S, Chiara S, Granetto C, Porcile G, Fioretto L, Orlandini C, Andreuccetti M, Masi G. Phase III trial of infusional fluorouracil, leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and irinotecan (FOLFOXIRI) compared with infusional fluorouracil, leucovorin, and irinotecan (FOLFIRI) as first-line treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer: the Gruppo Oncologico Nord Ovest. J Clin Oncol 2007; 25: 1670-1676 [PMID: 17470860 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2006.09.0928]
- 15 Saif MW. Is there a benefit from addiction to anti-VEGF therapy in patients with colorectal cancer? *Anticancer Res* 2013; 33: 2377-2380 [PMID: 23749885]
- 16 Maier S, Peltz G, Penrod JR, Sugarman KP. Retrospective evaluation of cetuximab-related adverse events from claims databases--methodological concerns. *Ann Oncol* 2010; 21: 1731-1732; author reply 1731-1732 [PMID: 20605932 DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdq327]
- 17 Monti M, Motta S. Clinical management of cutaneous toxicity of anti-EGFR agents. *Int J Biol Markers* 2007; 22: S53-S61 [PMID: 17520582]
- 18 Hecht JR, Mitchell E, Chidiac T, Scroggin C, Hagenstad C, Spigel D, Marshall J, Cohn A, McCollum D, Stella P, Deeter R, Shahin S, Amado RG. A randomized phase IIIB trial of chemotherapy, bevacizumab, and panitumumab compared with chemotherapy and bevacizumab alone for metastatic colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol 2009; 27: 672-680 [PMID: 19114685 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2008.19.8135]
- 19 Hoag JB, Azizi A, Doherty TJ, Lu J, Willis RE, Lund ME. Association of cetuximab with adverse pulmonary events in cancer patients: a comprehensive review. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res* 2009; 28: 113 [PMID: 19682368 DOI: 10.1186/1756-9966-2 8-113]
- 20 Tveit KM, Guren T, Glimelius B, Pfeiffer P, Sorbye H, Pyrhonen S, Sigurdsson F, Kure E, Ikdahl T, Skovlund E, Fokstuen T, Hansen F, Hofsli E, Birkemeyer E, Johnsson A, Starkhammar H, Yilmaz MK, Keldsen N, Erdal AB, Dajani O, Dahl O, Christoffersen T. Phase III trial of cetuximab with continuous or intermittent fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin (Nordic FLOX) versus FLOX alone in first-line treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer: the NORDIC-VII study. J Clin Oncol 2012; 30: 1755-1762 [PMID: 22473155 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2011.38.0915]
- 21 Jonker DJ, O'Callaghan CJ, Karapetis CS, Zalcberg JR, Tu D, Au HJ, Berry SR, Krahn M, Price T, Simes RJ, Tebbutt NC, van Hazel G, Wierzbicki R, Langer C, Moore MJ. Cetuximab for the treatment of colorectal cancer. N Engl J Med 2007; 357: 2040-2048 [PMID: 18003960]
- 22 **Peeters M**, Price TJ, Cervantes A, Sobrero AF, Ducreux M, Hotko Y, André T, Chan E, Lordick F, Punt CJ, Strickland

AH, Wilson G, Ciuleanu TE, Roman L, Van Cutsem E, Tzekova V, Collins S, Oliner KS, Rong A, Gansert J. Randomized phase III study of panitumumab with fluorouracil, leucovorin, and irinotecan (FOLFIRI) compared with FOLFIRI alone as second-line treatment in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2010; **28**: 4706-4713 [PMID: 20921462 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2009.27.6055]

- 23 Van Cutsem E, Köhne CH, Hitre E, Zaluski J, Chang Chien CR, Makhson A, D'Haens G, Pintér T, Lim R, Bodoky G, Roh JK, Folprecht G, Ruff P, Stroh C, Tejpar S, Schlichting M, Nippgen J, Rougier P. Cetuximab and chemotherapy as initial treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer. N Engl J Med 2009; 360: 1408-1417 [PMID: 19339720 DOI: 10.1056/NEJ-Moa0805019]
- 24 Kim SY, Shim EK, Yeo HY, Baek JY, Hong YS, Kim DY, Kim TW, Kim JH, Im SA, Jung KH, Chang HJ. KRAS mutation status and clinical outcome of preoperative chemoradiation with cetuximab in locally advanced rectal cancer: a pooled analysis of 2 phase II trials. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys* 2013; 85: 201-207 [PMID: 22672749 DOI: 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2012.03.048]
- 25 Van Cutsem E, Köhne CH, Láng I, Folprecht G, Nowacki MP, Cascinu S, Shchepotin I, Maurel J, Cunningham D, Tejpar S, Schlichting M, Zubel A, Celik I, Rougier P, Ciardiello F. Cetuximab plus irinotecan, fluorouracil, and leucovorin as first-line treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer: updated analysis of overall survival according to tumor KRAS and BRAF mutation status. *J Clin Oncol* 2011; **29**: 2011-2019 [PMID: 21502544 DOI: 10.1200/jco.2010.33.5091]
- 26 **De Mello RA**. Metastatic melanoma and vemurafenib: novel approaches. *Rare Tumors* 2012; **4**: e31 [PMID: 22826788 DOI: 10.4081/rt.2012.e31]
- 27 Láng I, Köhne CH, Folprecht G, Rougier P, Curran D, Hitre E, Sartorius U, Griebsch I, Van Cutsem E. Quality of life analysis in patients with KRAS wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer treated first-line with cetuximab plus irinotecan, fluorouracil and leucovorin. *Eur J Cancer* 2013; **49**: 439-448 [PMID: 23116683 DOI: 1016/j.ejca.2012.08.023]
- 28 Douillard JY, Siena S, Cassidy J, Tabernero J, Burkes R, Barugel M, Humblet Y, Bodoky G, Cunningham D, Jassem J, Rivera F, Kocákova I, Ruff P, Błasińska-Morawiec M, Šmakal M, Canon JL, Rother M, Oliner KS, Wolf M, Gansert J. Randomized, phase III trial of panitumumab with infusional fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin (FOLFOX4) versus FOLFOX4 alone as first-line treatment in patients with previously untreated metastatic colorectal cancer: the PRIME study. J Clin Oncol 2010; 28: 4697-4705 [PMID: 20921465 DOI: 10.1200/JCO.2009.27.4860]
- 29 Maughan TS, Adams RA, Smith CG, Meade AM, Seymour MT, Wilson RH, Idziaszczyk S, Harris R, Fisher D, Kenny SL, Kay E, Mitchell JK, Madi A, Jasani B, James MD, Bridgewater J, Kennedy MJ, Claes B, Lambrechts D, Kaplan R, Cheadle JP; MRC COIN Trial Investigators. Addition of cetuximab to oxaliplatin-based first-line combination chemotherapy for treatment of advanced colorectal cancer: results of the randomised phase 3 MRC COIN trial. *Lancet* 2011; 377: 2103-2114 [PMID: 21641636 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736]

P-Reviewers Hard PD, Wang S S-Editor Gou SX L-Editor A E-Editor Zhang DN





WJG www.wjgnet.com