



**HAL**  
open science

# Trends in Response Rate and Survival in Small-Cell Lung Cancer Patients Between 1997 and 2017

Mickaël Lattuca Truc

► **To cite this version:**

Mickaël Lattuca Truc. Trends in Response Rate and Survival in Small-Cell Lung Cancer Patients Between 1997 and 2017. Human health and pathology. 2019. dumas-02188372

**HAL Id: dumas-02188372**

**<https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-02188372>**

Submitted on 18 Jul 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



## AVERTISSEMENT

Ce document est le fruit d'un long travail approuvé par le jury de soutenance et mis à disposition de l'ensemble de la communauté universitaire élargie.

Il n'a pas été réévalué depuis la date de soutenance.

Il est soumis à la propriété intellectuelle de l'auteur. Ceci implique une obligation de citation et de référencement lors de l'utilisation de ce document.

D'autre part, toute contrefaçon, plagiat, reproduction illicite encourt une poursuite pénale.

Contact au SID de Grenoble :  
[bump-theses@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr](mailto:bump-theses@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr)

## LIENS

Code de la Propriété Intellectuelle. articles L 122. 4  
Code de la Propriété Intellectuelle. articles L 335.2- L 335.10

<http://www.cfcopies.com/juridique/droit-auteur>

<http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/infos-pratiques/droits/protection.htm>

Année : 2019

**Trends in Response Rate and Survival in Small-Cell Lung Cancer Patients  
Between 1997 and 2017**

THÈSE  
PRÉSENTÉE POUR L'OBTENTION DU TITRE DE DOCTEUR EN MÉDECINE  
DIPLOME D'ÉTAT

Mickaël LATTUCA TRUC

[Données à caractère personnel]

THÈSE SOUTENUE PUBLIQUEMENT À LA FACULTÉ DE MÉDECINE DE GRENOBLE

Le : 05/07/2019

DEVANT LE JURY COMPOSÉ DE

Président du jury :

Monsieur le Professeur MORO-SIBILOT Denis

Membres :

Monsieur le Professeur DEGANO Bruno

Madame le Docteur DELAFOSSE Patricia

Madame le Docteur TOFFART Anne-Claire (directrice de thèse)

*L'UFR de Médecine de Grenoble n'entend donner aucune approbation ni improbation aux opinions émises dans les thèses ; ces opinions sont considérées comme propres à leurs auteurs.*

Doyen de la Faculté : Pr. Patrice MORAND

Année 2018-2019

ENSEIGNANTS DE L'UFR DE MEDECINE

CORPS	NOM-PRENUM	Discipline universitaire
PU-PH	ALBALADEJO Pierre	Anesthésiologie réanimation
PU-PH	APTEL Florent	Ophthalmologie
PU-PH	ARVIEUX-BARTHELEMY Catherine	Chirurgie générale
PU-PH	BAILLET Athan	Rhumatologie
PU-PH	BARONE-ROCHETTE Gilles	Cardiologie
PU-PH	BAYAT Sam	Physiologie
PU-PH	BENHAMOU Pierre Yves	Endocrinologie, diabète et maladies métaboliques
PU-PH	BERGER François	Biologie cellulaire
MCU-PH	BIDART-COUTTON Marie	Biologie cellulaire
MCU-PH	BOISSET Sandrine	Agents infectieux
PU-PH	BOLLA Michel	Cancérologie-Radiothérapie
PU-PH	BONAZ Bruno	Gastro-entérologie, hépatologie, addictologie
PU-PH	BONNETERRE Vincent	Médecine et santé au travail
PU-PH	BOREL Anne-Laure	Endocrinologie, diabète et maladies métaboliques
PU-PH	BOSSON Jean-Luc	Biostatistiques, informatique médicale et technologies de communication
MCU-PH	BOTTARI Serge	Biologie cellulaire
PU-PH	BOUGEROL Thierry	Psychiatrie d'adultes
PU-PH	BOUILLET Laurence	Médecine interne
PU-PH	BOUZAT Pierre	Réanimation
PU-PH	BRAMBILLA Christian	Pneumologie
PU-PH	BRAMBILLA Elisabeth	Anatomie et de Pathologie Cytologiques
MCU-PH	BRENIER-PINCHART Marie Pierre	Parasitologie et mycologie
PU-PH	BRICAULT Ivan	Radiologie et imagerie médicale
PU-PH	BRICHON Pierre-Yves	Chirurgie thoracique et cardio- vasculaire
MCU-PH	BRIOT Raphaël	Thérapeutique, médecine d'urgence
MCU-PH	BROUILLET Sophie	Biologie et médecine du développement et de la reproduction
PU-PH	CAHN Jean-Yves	Hématologie
PU-PH	CANALI-SCHWEBEL Carole	Réanimation médicale
PU-PH	CARPENTIER Françoise	Thérapeutique, médecine d'urgence
PU-PH	CARPENTIER Patrick	Chirurgie vasculaire, médecine vasculaire
PU-PH	CESBRON Jean-Yves	Immunologie
PU-PH	CHABARDES Stephan	Neurochirurgie
PU-PH	CHABRE Olivier	Endocrinologie, diabète et maladies métaboliques
PU-PH	CHAFFANJON Philippe	Anatomie
PU-PH	CHARLES Julie	Dermatologie
PU-PH	CHAVANON Olivier	Chirurgie thoracique et cardio- vasculaire
PU-PH	CHIQUET Christophe	Ophthalmologie

CORPS	NOM-PRENOM	Discipline universitaire
PU-PH	CHIRICA Mircea	Chirurgie générale
PU-PH	CINQUIN Philippe	Biostatistiques, informatique médicale et technologies de communication
MCU-PH	CLAVARINO Giovanna	Immunologie
PU-PH	COHEN Olivier	Biostatistiques, informatique médicale et technologies de communication
PU-PH	COURVOISIER Aurélien	Chirurgie infantile
PU-PH	COUTTON Charles	Génétique
PU-PH	COUTURIER Pascal	Gériatrie et biologie du vieillissement
PU-PH	CRACOWSKI Jean-Luc	Pharmacologie fondamentale, pharmacologie clinique
PU-PH	CURE Hervé	Oncologie
PU-PH	DEBATY Guillaume	Médecine d'Urgence
PU-PH	DEBILLON Thierry	Pédiatrie
PU-PH	DECAENS Thomas	Gastro-entérologie, Hépatologie
PU-PH	DEMATTEIS Maurice	Addictologie
PU-PH	DEMONGEOT Jacques	Biostatistiques, informatique médicale et technologies de communication
MCU-PH	DERANSART Colin	Physiologie
PU-PH	DESCOTES Jean-Luc	Urologie
PU-PH	DETANTE Olivier	Neurologie
MCU-PH	DIETERICH Klaus	Génétique et procréation
MCU-PH	DOUTRELEAU Stéphane	Physiologie
MCU-PH	DUMESTRE-PERARD Chantal	Immunologie
PU-PH	EPAULARD Olivier	Maladies Infectieuses et Tropicales
PU-PH	ESTEVE François	Biophysique et médecine nucléaire
MCU-PH	EYSSERIC Hélène	Médecine légale et droit de la santé
PU-PH	FAGRET Daniel	Biophysique et médecine nucléaire
PU-PH	FAUCHERON Jean-Luc	Chirurgie générale
MCU-PH	FAURE Julien	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
PU-PH	FERRETTI Gilbert	Radiologie et imagerie médicale
PU-PH	FEUERSTEIN Claude	Physiologie
PU-PH	FONTAINE Éric	Nutrition
PU-PH	FRANCOIS Patrice	Epidémiologie, économie de la santé et prévention
MCU-MG	GABOREAU Yoann	Médecine Générale
PU-PH	GARBAN Frédéric	Hématologie, transfusion
PU-PH	GAUDIN Philippe	Rhumatologie
PU-PH	GAVAZZI Gaétan	Gériatrie et biologie du vieillissement
PU-PH	GAY Emmanuel	Neurochirurgie
MCU-PH	GILLOIS Pierre	Biostatistiques, informatique médicale et technologies de communication
PU-PH	GIOT Jean-Philippe	Chirurgie plastique, reconstructrice et esthétique
MCU-PH	GRAND Sylvie	Radiologie et imagerie médicale
PU-PH	GRIFFET Jacques	Chirurgie infantile
MCU-PH	GUZUN Rita	Endocrinologie, diabétologie, nutrition, éducation thérapeutique
PU-PH	HAINAUT Pierre	Biochimie, biologie moléculaire
PU-PH	HALIMI Serge	Nutrition
PU-PH	HENNEBICQ Sylviane	Génétique et procréation
PU-PH	HOFFMANN Pascale	Gynécologie obstétrique
PU-PH	HOMMEL Marc	Neurologie
PU-MG	IMBERT Patrick	Médecine Générale
PU-PH	JOUK Pierre-Simon	Génétique

CORPS	NOM-PRENO	Discipline universitaire
PU-PH	JUVIN Robert	Rhumatologie
PU-PH	KAHANE Philippe	Physiologie
MCU-PH	KASTLER Adrian	Radiologie et imagerie médicale
PU-PH	KRAINIK Alexandre	Radiologie et imagerie médicale
PU-PH	LABARERE José	Epidémiologie ; Eco. de la Santé
MCU-PH	LABLANCHE Sandrine	Endocrinologie, diabète et maladies métaboliques
MCU-PH	LANDELLE Caroline	Bactériologie - virologie
MCU-PH	LARDY Bernard	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
MCU - PH	LE PISSART Audrey	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
PU-PH	LECCIA Marie-Thérèse	Dermato-vénéréologie
PU-PH	LEROUX Dominique	Génétique
PU-PH	LEROY Vincent	Gastro-entérologie, hépatologie, addictologie
PU-PH	LETOUBLON Christian	Chirurgie digestive et viscérale
PU-PH	LEVY Patrick	Physiologie
PU-PH	LONG Jean-Alexandre	Urologie
MCU-PH	LUPO Julien	Virologie
PU-PH	MAGNE Jean-Luc	Chirurgie vasculaire
MCU-PH	MAIGNAN Maxime	Médecine d'urgence
PU-PH	MAITRE Anne	Médecine et santé au travail
MCU-PH	MALLARET Marie-Reine	Epidémiologie, économie de la santé et prévention
PU-PH	MALLION Jean-Michel	Cardiologie
MCU-PH	MARLU Raphaël	Hématologie, transfusion
MCU-PH	MAUBON Danièle	Parasitologie et mycologie
PU-PH	MAURIN Max	Bactériologie - virologie
MCU-PH	MC LEER Anne	Cytologie et histologie
PU-PH	MORAND Patrice	Bactériologie - virologie
PU-PH	MOREAU-GAUDRY Alexandre	Biostatistiques, informatique médicale et technologies de communication
PU-PH	MORO Elena	Neurologie
PU-PH	MORO-SIBILOT Denis	Pneumologie
PU-PH	MOUSSEAU Mireille	Cancérologie
PU-PH	MOUTET François	Chirurgie plastique, reconstructrice et esthétique ; brûlologie
MCU-PH	PACLET Marie-Hélène	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
PU-PH	PALOMBI Olivier	Anatomie
PU-PH	PARK Sophie	Hémato - transfusion
PU-PH	PASSAGLIA Jean-Guy	Anatomie
PU-PH	PAYEN DE LA GARANDERIE Jean-François	Anesthésiologie réanimation
MCU-PH	PAYSANT François	Médecine légale et droit de la santé
MCU-PH	PELLETIER Laurent	Biologie cellulaire
PU-PH	PELLOUX Hervé	Parasitologie et mycologie
PU-PH	PEPIN Jean-Louis	Physiologie
PU-PH	PERENNOU Dominique	Médecine physique et de réadaptation
PU-PH	PERNOD Gilles	Médecine vasculaire
PU-PH	PIOLAT Christian	Chirurgie infantile
PU-PH	PISON Christophe	Pneumologie
PU-PH	PLANTAZ Dominique	Pédiatrie
PU-PH	POIGNARD Pascal	Virologie
PU-PH	POLACK Benoît	Hématologie

CORPS	NOM-PRENOM	Discipline universitaire
PU-PH	POLOSAN Mircea	Psychiatrie d'adultes
PU-PH	PONS Jean-Claude	Gynécologie obstétrique
PU-PH	RAMBEAUD Jean-Jacques	Urologie
PU-PH	RAY Pierre	Biologie et médecine du développement et de la reproduction
MCU-PH	RENDU John	Biochimie et Biologie Moléculaire
MCU-PH	RIALLE Vincent	Biostatistiques, informatique médicale et technologies de communication
PU-PH	RIGHINI Christian	Oto-rhino-laryngologie
PU-PH	ROMANET Jean Paul	Ophthalmologie
PU-PH	ROSTAING Lionel	Néphrologie
MCU-PH	ROUSTIT Matthieu	Pharmacologie fondamentale, pharmaco clinique, addictologie
MCU-PH	ROUX-BUISSON Nathalie	Biochimie, toxicologie et pharmacologie
MCU-PH	RUBIO Amandine	Pédiatrie
PU-PH	SARAGAGLIA Dominique	Chirurgie orthopédique et traumatologie
MCU-PH	SATRE Véronique	Génétique
PU-PH	SAUDOU Frédéric	Biologie Cellulaire
PU-PH	SCHMERBER Sébastien	Oto-rhino-laryngologie
PU-PH	SCOLAN Virginie	Médecine légale et droit de la santé
MCU-PH	SEIGNEURIN Arnaud	Epidémiologie, économie de la santé et prévention
PU-PH	STAHL Jean-Paul	Maladies infectieuses, maladies tropicales
PU-PH	STANKE Françoise	Pharmacologie fondamentale
MCU-PH	STASIA Marie-José	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
PU-PH	STURM Nathalie	Anatomie et cytologie pathologiques
PU-PH	TAMISIER Renaud	Physiologie
PU-PH	TERZI Nicolas	Réanimation
MCU-PH	TOFFART Anne-Claire	Pneumologie
PU-PH	TONETTI Jérôme	Chirurgie orthopédique et traumatologie
PU-PH	TOUSSAINT Bertrand	Biochimie et biologie moléculaire
PU-PH	VANZETTO Gérald	Cardiologie
PU-PH	VUILLEZ Jean-Philippe	Biophysique et médecine nucléaire
PU-PH	WEIL Georges	Epidémiologie, économie de la santé et prévention
PU-PH	ZAOUI Philippe	Néphrologie
PU-PH	ZARSKI Jean-Pierre	Gastro-entérologie, hépatologie, addictologie

PU-PH : Professeur des Universités et Praticiens Hospitaliers

MCU-PH : Maître de Conférences des Universités et Praticiens Hospitaliers

PU-MG : Professeur des Universités de Médecine Générale

MCU-MG : Maître de Conférences des Universités de Médecine Générale

# Remerciements

J'aimerais tout d'abord remercier les membres du jury, c'est un honneur pour moi de vous présenter le fruit de mon travail.

Au Pr MORO SIBILOT, c'est une grande fierté de vous avoir en tant que président du jury, j'aimerais vous remercier de m'avoir transmis cette passion de l'oncologie thoracique avant même le début de mon internat dans votre service, c'est une vraie chance d'avoir pu travailler et apprendre à vos côtés !

Au Pr DEGANO, merci pour votre présence dans ce jury. Je n'ai malheureusement pas eu l'occasion de travailler avec vous mais j'ai pu assister à plusieurs de vos cours de pneumologie, c'était très intéressant et instructif, j'admire vos qualités d'orateur certaines.

Au Dr DELAFOSSE, merci d'avoir répondu présente. C'est un plaisir de vous présenter ce travail, qui j'espère vous aura intéressée !

Au Dr TOFFART, merci d'avoir accepté d'encadrer ce travail de thèse. J'ai pris beaucoup de plaisir à relever ce challenge avec toi, c'était très enrichissant. Merci pour ta disponibilité, ton aide précieuse et ton professionnalisme. Très fier d'avoir pu partager cette aventure avec toi.

A toute l'équipe de pneumologie du CHU Grenoble Alpes.

Pr PISON, merci pour toutes ces années passées avec vous. Je vous suis très reconnaissant de m'avoir permis d'effectuer mon internat dans les meilleures conditions, aux côtés de personnes remarquables au quotidien. Merci pour votre bienveillance et votre transmission de savoir.

Merci à Anne Laure, Boubou, Christel, François, Johanna, Julian, Marie, Matteo, Rebecca, Sébastien. J'ai appris énormément grâce à vous, vous êtes une chouette équipe qui a su me donner goût à la pneumologie sous toutes ces formes, le tout dans une ambiance conviviale, ce que j'ai beaucoup appréciée. J'espère qu'on aura l'occasion de collaborer à nouveau ensemble à l'avenir !

A mes cointernes de pneumologie, que de bons souvenirs avec vous ! une vraie cohésion de groupe et des soirées inoubliables ! Je vous souhaite tout le meilleur pour la suite.

A toute l'équipe de l'Institut Daniel Hollard, avec qui j'ai partagé un semestre agréable, et surtout Linda, merci pour tout ce que tu as pu m'apporter dès mes premiers pas dans le monde de l'oncologie thoracique. Merci pour ta confiance, ton écoute, ta bienveillance.

A toute l'équipe de médecine interne du 3C, avec des infs au top !!! Lulu et Aurélie, très heureux d'avoir partagé ce semestre avec vous, qui nous a permis de créer de beaux liens d'amitiés.



A toute l'équipe de pneumologie du CH de Chambéry, Eric, Marie, Anne, Julie, Philippe, Violaine, Laetitia, que de bons moments passés avec vous, merci de m'avoir accordé votre confiance pour les années à venir. J'ai hâte de poursuivre cette belle aventure avec vous.

A toute l'équipe de radiothérapie du CH de Chambéry, Philippe, Emmanuel, Joanne et Ngoc hanh merci pour votre accueil et votre sympathie. Je ne suis toujours pas radiothérapeute mais j'ai vraiment apprécié ce semestre avec vous, qui m'a permis de mieux connaître votre belle spécialité.

A tous mes amis, qui m'ont soutenu dans ce long parcours, vous êtes indispensables à ma vie.

A Clemmy, beaucoup de souvenirs de ces années médecine ensemble... on a vécu les pires comme les meilleurs, j'ai toujours pu compter sur toi. Je repense à nos trajets dans le bus en P1, nos soirées médecine, notre première garde aux urgences, les après-midi révisions/potins sur le balcon... Merci d'avoir été là pour moi. Malgré la distance on restera toujours aussi proches.

Aux moulasses, Noélia, Sophie, Roxanne et Lisa, les inséparables... (c'est pas extensible) je suis vraiment fier de vous connaître et que vous fassiez parti de ma vie, même si le temps passe nos liens sont d'autant plus forts et notre amitié plus belle encore.

A toute ma famille, mon socle qui m'a permis d'être ce que je suis aujourd'hui. Maman, Mamie, Méliss et Jéjé, ça n'a pas toujours été facile de me supporter je sais (et ça n'a pas changé), mais vous m'avez donné le courage de me battre et de tenir bon pendant les moments les plus difficiles. C'est une vraie chance de vous avoir au quotidien, je vous aime fort. Merci pour tout. A mes fées clochette, qui me manquent tellement.... Vous serez toujours dans mon cœur. A Romain, qui me supporte aussi au quotidien, merci pour ton soutien précieux, ton grain de folie et ta bonne humeur qui me permet de garder cet équilibre dans ma vie. Merci aussi pour ton aide dans ce travail, tes compétences linguistiques incontestables et surtout ton ordinateur professionnel !

Merci à toutes les personnes qui ont contribué à ma formation de près ou de loin, à celles qui m'ont permis d'enrichir mes connaissances, Alix et Christine, Linda, Elodie, merci pour votre sympathie en plus de votre professionnalisme.

# Sommaire

Résumé.....	p.9
Abstract .....	p.11
Abréviations .....	p.13
Article.....	p.14
Introduction .....	p.15
Material and methods .....	p.16
Results .....	p.18
Discussion .....	p.20
Conclusions .....	p.23
Figures .....	p.24
Tables .....	p.27
References .....	p.33
Serment d'Hippocrate .....	p.36
Conclusion .....	

## **Evolution du taux de réponse à la chimiothérapie et de la survie des patients atteints d'un cancer bronchique à petites cellules au CHU Grenoble Alpes entre 1997 et 2017**

### **RÉSUMÉ :**

**Introduction :** La médiane de survie globale des patients atteints d'un cancer bronchique à petites cellules (CBPC) est d'environ 1 an. Le développement de nouveaux traitements peut avoir amélioré leur pronostic. L'objectif de ce travail est d'évaluer l'évolution de la réponse à la chimiothérapie et de la survie des patients atteints d'un CBPC sur les dernières années.

**Méthodes :** Tous les patients avec un CBPC du CHU Grenoble-Alpes ont été inclus. Leurs caractéristiques, la réponse à la chimiothérapie et la survie ont été comparées entre 1997–2009 (période 1) et 2010–2017 (période 2).

**Résultats :** Parmi les 529 patients inclus, 498 ont reçu une 1ère ligne de chimiothérapie et 279 patients une 2ème ligne. La majorité (n=290, 58 %) avait une maladie avancée. Le taux de réponse à la 1ère ligne de chimiothérapie chez les patients métastatiques était de 63 % pour la période 1 et 62 % pour la période 2 ; pour la 2ème ligne de traitement il était respectivement de 39 % et 29 %. La médiane de survie globale depuis l'initiation de la chimiothérapie était de 13.2 mois [IQ 25 %–75 %, 7.4–24.4] pour la période 1 et de 11.2 mois [IQ 25 %–75 %, 7.1–21.2] pour la période 2. La mortalité dans ces deux périodes ne différait pas de façon significative, même après ajustement sur les facteurs pronostiques (HR=0.82, [IC à 95 %, 0.66–1.00]).

Les facteurs indépendamment associés au décès étaient la présence de comorbidités cardiovasculaires (HR=1.28 [IC 95 %, 1.05–1.55]), hépatiques (HR=1.31 [IC 95 %, 1.03–1.65]), un performance status élevé (3–4 vs 0–1 (HR=2.45 [IC 95 %, 1.83–3.30]) et une maladie métastatique (HR=2.69 [IC 95 %, 2.18–3.33]).

**Conclusions** : Depuis 1997, il n’y a eu aucune amélioration ni de la réponse à la chimiothérapie ni de la survie des patients atteints d’un CBPC. Il existe un réel besoin de nouvelles thérapeutiques pour augmenter la survie de ces patients.

**MOTS CLÉS** : Carcinome bronchique à petites cellules ; Chimiothérapie ; Réponse ; Survie

**FILIÈRE** : Oncologie Thoracique, CHU Grenoble Alpes, France

## **Trends in response rate and survival in small-cell lung cancer patients between 1997 and 2017**

### **ABSTRACT :**

**Introduction :** Median survival of small-cell lung cancer (SCLC) patients is usually around 1 year. The advent of new drugs may have slightly improved their prognosis. We aimed to assess whether SCLC response to chemotherapy and survival had changed over time.

**Methods :** Consecutive SCLC patients were included at Grenoble University Hospital, France. We compared the patients' characteristics, response to chemotherapy and survival between 1997-2009 (Period 1) and 2010-2017 (Period 2).

**Results :** A total of 529 patients were identified, of whom 498 received a first line of chemotherapy and 279 a second line. The majority (n=290, 58%) had extensive disease. The objective response rate (ORR) to first-line chemotherapy in metastatic patients was 63% in period 1 and 62% in period 2; the ORRs to second-line chemotherapy were 39% and 29%, respectively. Median overall survival from first-line chemotherapy was 13.2 months (interquartile range [IQR]: 7.4–24.4) in period 1 and 11.2 months (IQR: 7.1–21.2) in period 2. Mortality in these two periods did not differ significantly even after adjustment for prognostic factors (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.82, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.66–1.00). The factors independently associated with death were cardiovascular comorbidities (HR=1.28 [95%CI 1.05–1.55]), liver comorbidities (HR=1.31 [95%CI 1.03–1.65]), poor ECOG performance status (3–4 vs. 0–1, HR=2.45 [95%CI 1.83–3.30]) and extensive disease (HR=2.69 [95%CI 2.18–3.33]).

**Conclusions :** Since 1997, there has been no improvement in the survival or response rate to chemotherapy of SCLC patients. There is a desperate need for new approaches in this setting.

**KEYWORDS :** Small-cell lung cancer; Chemotherapy; Response; Survival

## **ABBREVIATIONS:**

CAV: Cyclophosphamide, Doxorubicin and Vincristine

CI: Confidence Interval

CT: Chemotherapy

DCRs: Disease Control Rates

ECOG: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group

FDA: Food Drug and Administration

HR: Hazard Ratio

IQR: Interquartile Range

ORRs: Objective Response Rates

PCI: Prophylactic Cranial Irradiation

PET: Positron Emission Tomography

PS: Performance Status

SCLC: Small-Cell Lung Cancer

# *Article*





## Trends in response rate and survival in small-cell lung cancer patients between 1997 and 2017



Mickaël Lattuca-Truc<sup>a</sup>, Jean-François Timsit<sup>b</sup>, Matteo Gaj Levra<sup>a</sup>, Stéphane Ruckly<sup>b</sup>, Julie Villa<sup>c</sup>, Isabelle Dumas<sup>d</sup>, Julian Pinsolle<sup>a</sup>, Léonie Ferrer<sup>a</sup>, Pascale Guillem<sup>d</sup>, Denis Moro-Sibilot<sup>a</sup>, Anne-Claire Toffart<sup>a,e,\*</sup>, for the Multidisciplinary Thoracic Oncology Group Grenoble University Hospital France

<sup>a</sup>Thoracic Oncology Unit, Grenoble-Alpes University Hospital, Grenoble, France

<sup>b</sup>Department of Biostatistics, OUTCOMEREA<sup>™</sup>, Bobigny, France

<sup>c</sup>Radiotherapy Unit, Grenoble-Alpes University Hospital, Grenoble, France

<sup>d</sup>Cancer Coordination Center, Grenoble-Alpes University Hospital, Grenoble, France

<sup>e</sup>Institute for Advanced Biosciences, Grenoble, France

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Small-cell lung cancer  
Chemotherapy  
Response  
Survival

### ABSTRACT

**Introduction:** Median survival of small-cell lung cancer (SCLC) patients is usually around 1 year. The advent of new drugs may have slightly improved their prognosis. We aimed to assess whether SCLC response to chemotherapy and survival had changed over time.

**Methods:** Consecutive SCLC patients were included at Grenoble University Hospital, France. We compared the patients' characteristics, response to chemotherapy and survival between 1997–2009 (period 1) and 2010–2017 (period 2).

**Results:** A total of 529 patients were identified, of whom 498 received a first line of chemotherapy and 279 a second line. The majority (n = 290, 58%) had extensive disease. The objective response rate (ORR) to first-line chemotherapy in metastatic patients was 63% in period 1 and 62% in period 2; the ORRs to second-line chemotherapy were 39% and 29%, respectively. Median overall survival from first-line chemotherapy was 13.2 months (interquartile range [IQR] 7.4–24.4) in period 1 and 11.2 months (IQR 7.1–21.2) in period 2. Mortality in these two periods did not differ significantly even after adjustment for prognostic factors (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.82, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.66–1.00). The factors independently associated with death were cardiovascular comorbidities (HR = 1.28 [95%CI 1.05–1.55]), liver comorbidities (HR = 1.31 [95%CI 1.03–1.65]), poor ECOG performance status (3–4 vs. 0–1, HR = 2.45 [95%CI 1.83–3.30]) and extensive disease (HR = 2.69 [95%CI 2.18–3.33]).

**Conclusions:** Since 1997, there has been no improvement in the survival or response rate to chemotherapy of SCLC patients. There is a desperate need for new approaches in this setting.

\* Corresponding author at: UM Oncologie Thoracique, Pôle Thorax et Vaisseaux, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire A Michallon, BP217, 38043 Grenoble Cedex 9, France.

E-mail address: [AToffart@chu-grenoble.fr](mailto:AToffart@chu-grenoble.fr) (A.-C. Toffart).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lungcan.2019.03.028>

Received 14 January 2019; Received in revised form 14 March 2019; Accepted 25 March 2019

0169-5002/ © 2019 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

## **Introduction**

Small-cell lung cancer (SCLC) represents 13 to 20% of lung cancer [1, 3]. Tobacco consumption is the main risk factor for this disease. While the proportion diagnosed with SCLC has declined from approximately 20 to 13% in Europe [3], it has remained stable in the United States of America (USA) [2, 3]. SCLC is often considered an incurable disease, with median survival being shorter than non-small cell lung cancer and less than 12 months at any stage [3]. In the last two decades, there has been no dramatic breakthrough in the clinical care of SCLC and survival has remained poor [3]. Schabath *et al.* [4] identified an increase in the median survival time of treated SCLC from 11.3 to 15.2 months. These two studies included patients up to 2010 and no data is available for subsequent patients with SCLC.

Two forms of the disease are distinguished in the TNM classification, namely extensive and limited SCLC [5]. The improvement of imaging, particularly with positron emission tomography (PET) [6], has made a better approach to the disease possible because all tumor sites can be characterized. This has caused a decrease in the proportion of cases with limited SCLC [7]. Treatment is adapted to each patient depending on whether they have extensive or limited disease. Platinum-based chemotherapy (CT) remains the cornerstone of first-line treatment [8], and it is combined with thoracic radiotherapy in limited disease [9]. All limited cases should be considered for prophylactic cranial irradiation (PCI) [10] if they respond to initial treatment. For extensive cases, PCI should be discussed if there is disease stability or a disease response at the end of treatment, since it could prevent the development of brain metastases and improve patient survival [10].

Most patients relapse and second-line treatment depends on sensitivity to the first-line CT. Patients with sensitive relapse may derive benefit from a re-initiation of the first-line regimen [9]. Only topotecan is recommended in the second line [11]. Cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin and vincristine (CAV) is another option.

However, the advent of new regimens and the impact of supportive treatments may have slightly improved the prognosis of these patients. The aim of this study was to compare response to CT in two distinct periods between 1997 and 2017.

## **Material and Methods**

### **Study Design and Patients**

All SCLC patients discussed during weekly thoracic oncology multidisciplinary team meetings at Grenoble Alpes university hospital, France, were selected. Any who required multidisciplinary expertise were presented. Metastatic cases have to be treated according to the guidelines only. This data has been entered into a database since 1980. This paper followed on from an initial analysis of 300 SCLC patients discussed between 1997 and 2009 [12]. We added patients discussed during our team meetings between 2010 and 2017. All patients who received at least one line of CT were included, those receiving supportive care only at diagnosis were excluded from the analysis.

The study obtained ethical approval on September 12, 2018 (CECIC Rhône-Alpes-Auvergne, Clermont-Ferrand, IRB 5891). An information letter was sent to each living patient, while we obtained an exemption from the obligation to inform deceased patients (from the CNIL, the French data protection agency).

Our primary objective was to identify the factors associated with a response to first- and second-line CT. The secondary objectives were to compare survival between period 1 (1997–2009) and period 2 (2010–2017) and to identify prognostic factors at the beginning of first- and second-line treatment.

### **Data Collection**

The following clinical data were collected at the time of diagnosis: sex, age, weight loss, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status (PS) [13], smoking history and cancer characteristics (histology, stage, and related paraneoplastic syndromes). Each antineoplastic treatment (CT, radiotherapy, and surgery) and the response to each treatment line were reported.

Follow-up was completed for all patients in December 2017 using our hospital medical records or a call to the place of birth.

Using the response to treatment (RECIST criteria [14]) at 3 months after the end of the first CT, we classified patients into three categories: “sensitive” if an objective response (a partial or complete response) was observed at 3 months, “resistant” if an initial objective response was observed but relapse occurred before 3 months, and “refractory” if no response was observed or progression occurred during treatment [15].

### **Statistical Analysis**

Data were expressed as number (and percentage) for qualitative variables and median (and interquartile range [IQR]) for quantitative variables and were compared between the two period groups using chi-squared or Mann-Whitney tests, as appropriate.

The potential risk factors associated with survival from the beginning of first- and second-line treatment were estimated using univariate Cox models. Multivariate Cox models adjusted for significant variables were computed with stepwise selection. We decided to stop the analyses after the second line because of limited patient numbers. For the multivariate models, missing data was imputed into the model.

All tests were two-sided, and  $P$  values  $< 0.05$  were considered statistically significant. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

## **Results**

### **Patient Characteristics and Anticancer Treatment**

A total number of 529 patients were identified (Fig. 1). Of these, 498 received a first line of treatment (477 [96%] with etoposide and platinum CT), 279 a second line (126 [45%] with etoposide and platinum CT and 122 [44%] with taxane-based CT), and 121 a third line.

The patients' characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Median age was 64 years (IQR: 56–71), 116 (23%) were women, and 208 (42%) had limited-stage disease. The proportion of patients with weight loss of  $\geq 10\%$  at diagnosis was higher in period 2 (n=50, 28%) compared to period 1 (n=50, 18%) ( $p<0.01$ ). Concomitant or sequential mediastinal radiotherapy was performed in 96/148 (65%) limited SCLC patients in period 1 and in 41/60 (68%) in period 2. In period 1, 81 (26%) patients received PCI, as did 59 (33%) in period 2. Some 28 patients underwent surgery, in most cases (n=16/18, 89%) before the diagnosis of SCLC. In the 10 remaining patients, the date of surgical resection was not available.

### **Objective Response Rates According to the Line of Chemotherapy**

In metastatic patients, the objective response rates (ORRs) to first-line chemotherapy were 63% and 62% during periods 1 and 2, respectively (Table 1). Most patients (n=226, 45%) were sensitive to first-line treatment, 121 (24%) were resistant, and 109 (22%) refractory. This response pattern was similar across the two periods. The ORRs to second-line treatment were 39% and 29% in periods 1 and 2, respectively, and those to third-line treatment were 19% and 20%.

Among those patients sensitive to first-line treatment, 144 (64%) were able to receive a second line with an ORR of 52% (n=75), and 21 (9%) were still responding at the time of data analyses. Among resistant patients, 81 (67%) were able to receive a second line with an ORR of 20% (n=16). Among refractory patients, 53 (49%) were able to receive a second line with an ORR of 13% (n=37).

### **Factors Associated with Survival**

Median overall survival from the beginning of treatment was 12.2 months (IQR: 7.2–22.5), 13.2 months in period 1 (IQR: 7.4–24.4) and 11.2 months in period 2 (IQR: 7.1–21.2) (Supplemental Table 1).

Univariate and multivariate survival analyses from the beginning of first-line CT are reported in Table 2. Mortality did not differ significantly across the two periods, even after adjustment for prognostic factors (hazard ratio (HR) = 0.82; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.66–1.00).

Factors independently associated with mortality were cardiovascular comorbidity (HR=1.28 [95%CI 1.06–1.55]), liver comorbidity (HR=1.29 [95%CI 1.02–1.63]), ECOG PS (2 vs. 0–1, HR=1.35 [95%CI 1.08–1.68]; 3–4 vs. 0–1, HR=2.45 [95%CI 1.83–3.30]), and extensive disease (HR=2.67 [95%CI 2.17–3.29]). Figure 2 represents this Cox adjusted survival curve.

From the beginning of second-line CT (Supplemental Table 1), the factors independently associated with mortality were extensive disease at diagnosis (HR=1.52 [95%CI 1.17–1.99]), sensitivity to first-line CT (HR=1.74 [95%CI 1.17–2.61] and HR=1.67 [95%CI 1.19–2.35] for refractory vs. sensitive and resistant vs. sensitive, respectively), ECOG PS  $\geq 2$  at the beginning of second-line treatment (HR=2.6 [95%CI 2–3.4]), and the CT agents used in the second line (HR=1.55 [95%CI 1.11–2.17] and HR=1.1 [95%CI 0.68–1.77] for taxane vs. etoposide CT and other vs. etoposide CT, respectively). Figure 3 represents this Cox adjusted survival curve according to sensitivity to first-line CT.

### **Impact of Tobacco Use**

In this study, 448 patients were smokers, of whom 158 (34%) were former smokers and 290 (62%) were active smokers. Never-smokers had poorer survival (Supplemental Table 1) with their median survival being 8.3 months (IQR: 3.0–12.2), as against 12.3 months (6.5–24) for former smokers and 12.2 months (7.4–22.4) for active smokers.

### **Discussion**

This study highlights the lack of improvement in response to CT and survival over the last two decades. No change in the CT agents used was observed. Etoposide and platinum remain the standard CT. In our center, we often used taxane CT in the second line even though this drug has never been registered for this setting.

The strength of this study was the variety of data recorded in a large number of patients, such as the ECOG PS at the beginning of each line of CT as well as the response thereto.

But only the data of patients discussed at our weekly thoracic oncology multidisciplinary team meetings were reported. That explains why a large majority of patients received CT. Furthermore, this study was conducted in real life conditions, and so disease response was evaluated by the physicians in charge of the patients without external control. We were not able to specify which patients were staged by 18-fluoro-deoxyglucose (FDG)-PET, nor were we able to provide progression-free survival data for each line of CT.

Our patients had similar characteristics to those reported in the study by the French College of General Hospital Respiratory Physicians (KBP-2010-CPHG [16]). Namely, 23% were women, median age was 65 years, the proportions of never, former, and active smokers were the same, 55 to 60% had an ECOG PS of 0–1, and 70% had extensive disease. In other countries, some of these characteristics differ. In the United Kingdom [17] and the USA [4], women made up half of SCLC patients, and age at diagnosis was older (68 years). Interestingly, in the study by Schabath *et al.*, half of patients had limited-stage disease in the 2000–8 period. Two patients' characteristics significantly differed between the 2 studied periods. We observed more patients with weight loss of  $\geq 10\%$  at diagnosis in the period 2, it could be due to a better nutritional evaluation over the last decade. Advances in imaging, as the systematic use of the 18-FDG-PET to confirm the absence of metastasis could explain that fewer patients had a localized disease in period 2.

Comorbidity among patients with SCLC is very common and has been increasing [18]. As in our study, Aarts *et al.* identified heart disease as having a negative prognostic effect on SCLC patients [18]. We also identify liver comorbidity as prognostic factor, but, to our knowledge, it is not describe in the literature. These results encourage identifying and stabilizing cardiac and liver comorbidities when starting chemotherapy in order to avoid more toxicity during the treatment. SCLC in never-smokers is an uncommon but highly aggressive disease. Never-smokers had clearly shorter survival (8.3 months *vs.* 12.3 months in former smokers and 12.2 months in active smokers). This survival data were similar to other studies, even in limited-stage disease [19].

In the SEER database, nearly half of SCLC patients were treated. Additional therapy beyond platinum CT was associated with survival benefit [20]. These results are consistent with ours. Khakwani *et al.* [17] observed an increase in the proportion of patients receiving both CT and radiotherapy each year (from 19 to 40% in limited disease and 9 to 21% in extensive disease between 2004 and 2011). As explained above, we are not able to provide this information.

In our study, the ORR to first-line CT (mostly etoposide and platinum) was 73%. It was 67% in patients treated with cisplatin and 66% in those treated with carboplatin in the Rossi study [8]. Regarding sensitivity, 45% of our patients were platinum-sensitive, as in a previous study [21], and the ORRs to second- and third-line treatment were 36 and 19%, respectively, without significant changes over time, while the disease control rates (DCRs) with second- and third-line treatment were 55 and 39%, respectively. In a retrospective study [22] reporting disease response among 193 patients treated in the second line with platinum-based CT (mainly irinotecan or topotecan) or a single-agent therapy, the ORR was 25% in the combination group and 9% in the single-agent group, while in that study the DCRs were 65 and 35%, respectively. In the second-line setting, the ORR to topotecan has been 24%, and that to CAV 18% [11]. In the study by Aktas *et al.* [21], the DCRs at first, second, and third-line CT were 92, 68, and 44%, respectively. In contrast to our study, only 14% of primary-resistant patients were able to receive second-line CT.

From the beginning of second-line CT, we identified extensive disease at diagnosis, first-line sensitivity, a poor ECOG PS, and the second-line drugs used as being associated with mortality. These results are consistent with the study published by Song *et al.* [22] in which PS, recurrence type and further treatment were independently associated with survival on second-line treatment. An anti-PD1 (Nivolumab) was granted FDA approval in 2018 for the treatment of patients with SCLC with disease progression following platinum-based CT and one other line of therapy. Rovalpituzumab (in the first, second and third lines) [23] and Alisertib in combination with Nab-paclitaxel (in the second line) are new drugs being developed in SCLC.




## **Conclusions**

Since 1997, there has not been any improvement in response rates to CT or survival in SCLC patients.


There is a desperate need for new approaches in this setting. Various ongoing clinical trials and the recent FDA approval of Nivolumab in SCLC are encouraging signs.

**Figure 1.** Flow chart of study patients.




**Figure 2.** Cox adjusted survival curve from the beginning of first-line chemotherapy.

Adjustment was performed with variables associated with survival (Table 3): ECOG performance status, extensive *versus* limited disease, cardiovascular comorbidities, and liver comorbidities.



**Figure 3.** Cox adjusted survival curve from the beginning of second-line chemotherapy.

Adjustment was performed with variables associated with survival (Table 3): ECOG performance status, extensive *versus* limited disease, cardiovascular comorbidities, and liver comorbidities



**Table 1.** Characteristics of Patients and Response to Chemotherapy according to Treatment Line

<b>Variable</b>	<b>All patients N=498</b>	<b>Diagnosis &lt; 2010 N=317</b>	<b>Diagnosis ≥ 2010 N=181</b>	<b>P value</b>
<b>Patient characteristics</b>				
<b>Female</b>	116 (23)	73 (23)	43 (24)	0.85
<b>Age (years)</b>	64 [56-71]	63 [55-71]	65 [58-72]	0.03
<b>Smoking status (MD, n=33)</b>				
- <b>Non-smoker</b>	17 (4)	10 (4)	7 (4)	0.23
- <b>Former smoker</b>	158 (34)	89 (31)	69 (39)	
- <b>Active smoker</b>	290 (62)	187 (65)	103 (58)	
<b>Comorbidities</b>				
- <b>Cardiovascular</b>	245 (49)	151 (48)	94 (52)	0.36
- <b>Respiratory</b>	156 (31)	104 (33)	52 (29)	0.35
- <b>Renal</b>	62 (12)	45 (14)	17 (9)	0.12
- <b>Hepatic</b>	100 (20)	68 (22)	32 (18)	0.31
<b>ECOG-PS (MD, n=2)</b>				
- <b>0-1</b>	278 (56)	181 (58)	97 (54)	0.15
- <b>2</b>	150 (30)	98 (31)	52 (29)	
- <b>3-4</b>	68 (14)	36 (11)	32 (18)	
<b>Weight loss ≥ 10% (MD, n=35)</b>	100 (22)	50 (18)	50 (28)	9.10 <sup>-3</sup>
<b>Cancer characteristics</b>				
<b>Extensive disease</b>	290 (58)	169 (53)	121 (67)	3.10 <sup>-3</sup>
<b>Histology</b>				
- <b>Pure SCLC</b>	453 (91)	289 (91)	164 (91)	0.83
- <b>Combined SCLC</b>	45 (9)	28 (9)	17 (9)	
<b>Paraneoplastic syndrome</b>				
- <b>None</b>	424 (85)	270 (85)	154 (85)	0.70
- <b>Endocrinologic</b>	8 (2)	4 (1)	4 (2)	
- <b>Other</b>	66 (13)	43 (14)	23 (13)	
<b>1<sup>st</sup> line concurrent treatment</b>				
<b>Surgery</b>	28 (6)	24 (8)	4 (2)	0.01
<b>Radiotherapy</b>				
- <b>Mediastinal</b>	141 (28)	99 (31)	42 (23)	0.06
- <b>ED/LD</b>	4/137	3/96	1/41	
- <b>Cranial prophylaxis</b>	140 (28)	81 (26)	59 (33)	0.09
- <b>Palliative</b>	65 (13)	42 (13)	23 (13)	0.86
<b>Response to 1<sup>st</sup> line CT</b>				
<b>ORR (MD, n=13)</b>	352 (73)	228 (74)	124 (71)	0.52
<b>ORR in LD (MD, n=4)</b>	176/208 (86)	124/148 (86)	52/60 (88)	0.62
<b>ORR in ED (MD, n=9)</b>	176/290 (63)	104/169 (63)	72/121 (62)	0.87
<b>Sensitivity (MD, n=42)</b>				
- <b>Sensitive</b>	226 (45)	150 (47)	76 (42)	0.70
- <b>Resistant</b>	121 (24)	74 (24)	47 (26)	
- <b>Refractory</b>	109 (22)	68 (22)	41 (23)	
<b>Response to 2<sup>nd</sup> line CT</b>				
<b>ECOG-PS of 0-1 at the beginning of 2<sup>nd</sup> line (MD, n=23)</b>	136 (53)	88 (56)	48 (48)	0.19
<b>Time between the beginning of 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> lines (MD, n=1)</b>	9 [7-13]	10 [7-13]	9 [7-12]	0.18

<b>ORR</b>	99 (36)	70 (39)	29 (29)	0.09
<b>DCR</b>	154 (55)	99 (55)	55 (55)	0.96
<b>Response to 3<sup>rd</sup> line CT</b>	<b>N=121</b>	<b>N=81</b>	<b>N=40</b>	
<b>ECOG-PS of 0-1 at the beginning of 3<sup>rd</sup> line (MD, n=11)</b>	51 (46)	34 (49)	17 (43)	0.54
<b>ORR</b>	23 (19)	15 (19)	8 (20)	0.85
<b>DCR</b>	47 (39)	28 (35)	19 (48)	0.17

Data are expressed as median [IQR] for quantitative variables and as number (percentage) for qualitative variables.

DCR, disease control rate; ED, extensive disease; LD, limited disease; MD, missing data; ORR, objective response rate; PS, performance status; SCLC, small-cell lung cancer.

**Table 2.** Univariate and Multivariate Analyses of Factors Associated with Mortality from First-Line Chemotherapy

Variable	Univariate analysis HR [95%CI]	Multivariate analysis HR [95%CI]
<b>2010-2017 vs. 1997-2009</b>	1.03 [0.84-1.25]	0.82 [0.66-1.00]
<b>Baseline patient characteristics</b>		
Female vs. male	0.80 [0.64-1]	...
Age ≥ 60 years	1.21 [1-1.48]	...
Cardiovascular comorbidity	1.33 [1.1-1.6]	1.28 [1.05-1.55]
Respiratory comorbidity	1.19 [0.97-1.45]	...
Renal comorbidity	1.30 [0.98-1.72]	...
Hepatic comorbidity	1.66 [1.32-2.08]	1.31 [1.03-1.65]
<b>ECOG-PS (MD, n=2)</b>		
- 0-1	1	1
- 2	1.81 [1.47-2.23]	1.35 [1.08-1.68]
- 3-4	3.40 [2.57-4.50]	2.45 [1.83-3.30]
<b>Weight loss ≥ 10% (MD, n=35)</b>	1.70 [1.34-2.15]	...
<b>Baseline cancer characteristics</b>		
<b>ED vs. LD</b>	2.99 [2.44-3.67]	2.69 [2.18-3.33]
<b>Paraneoplastic syndrome</b>		
- None	1	...
- Endocrine	1.57 [1.20-2.06]	...
- Other	0.74 [0.33-1.65]	...
<b>Etoposide-based CT vs. other CT</b>	1.27 [0.68-2.39]	...

CT, chemotherapy; ED, extensive disease; LD, limited disease; MD, missing data.

**Table 3.** Univariate and Multivariate Analyses of Factors Associated with Mortality from Second-Line Chemotherapy (n=278)\*

Variable	Univariate analysis	Multivariate analysis
	HR [95%CI]	HR [95%CI]
<b>2010-2017 vs. 1997-2009</b>	0.82 [0.64-1.07]	0.97 [0.73-1.27]
<b>Baseline patient characteristics</b>		
Female vs. male	0.80 [0.60-1.05]	...
Age > 60 years	1.01 [0.79-1.29]	...
Cardiovascular comorbidity	1.08 [0.84-1.38]	...
Respiratory comorbidity	1.30 [0.99-1.71]	...
Renal comorbidity	1.12 [0.74-1.70]	...
Hepatic comorbidity	1.23 [0.89-1.69]	...
<b>Baseline cancer characteristics</b>		
ED vs. LD	1.81 [1.4-2.33]	1.53 [1.17-2.01]
<b>Paraneoplastic syndrome</b>		
- None	1	...
- Endocrine	1.54 [1.08-2.2]	...
- Other	2.74 [0.87-8.62]	...
<b>1<sup>st</sup> line characteristics</b>		
Mediastinal radiotherapy	0.53 [0.4-0.71]	
Prophylactic cranial irradiation	0.59 [0.45-0.77]	
Palliative irradiation	1.67 [1.16-2.41]	
<b>Sensitivity (MD, n=2)</b>		
- Sensitive	1	1
- Resistant	2.14 [1.6-2.86]	1.67 [1.19-2.35]
- Refractory	2.77 [1.99-3.85]	1.74 [1.17-2.61]
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> line characteristics</b>		
ECOG-PS $\geq$ 2 (MD, n=22)	3.06 [2.33-4.01]	2.61 [2.00-3.41]
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> line CT</b>		
- Etoposide	1	1
- Taxane	2.61 [2.00-3.41]	1.54 [1.10-2.16]
- Other	1.69 [1.20-2.56]	1.09 [0.67-1.76]

\*One patient with unknown date of second line start was excluded.

CT, chemotherapy; ED, extensive disease; LD, limited disease; MD, missing data.



**Supplemental Table 1.** Summary of Survival (from the Beginning of Chemotherapy)

	N	Median [IQR] (months)	KM estimate <sup>b</sup> 1-year survival	KM estimate <sup>b</sup> 3-year survival
<b>All patients</b>	498	12.2 [7.2-22.5]	0.53 [0.49-0.58]	0.13 [0.10-0.16]
<b>Male</b>	382	11.4 [7-21.4]	0.50 [0.45-0.56]	0.12 [0.09-0.15]
<b>Female</b>	116	14.5 [8.1-25.7]	0.62 [0.53-0.71]	0.16 [0.10-0.23]
<b>Smoking status (MD, n=33)</b>				
- <b>Non-smoker</b>	17	8.3 [3-12.2]	0.34 [0.13-0.58]	
- <b>Former smoker</b>	158	12.3 [6.5-24]	0.55 [0.47-0.63]	0.13 [0.08-0.19]
- <b>Active smoker</b>	290	12.2 [7.4-22.4]	0.52 [0.46-0.58]	0.13 [0.10-0.18]
<b>Limited disease</b>	208	21.2 [11.6-33.9]	0.77 [0.71-0.86]	0.27 [0.21-0.33]
<b>Extensive disease</b>	290	8.7 [5.2-15.0]	0.36 [0.31-0.42]	0.03 [0.01-0.05]
<b>Endocrine paraneoplastic syndrome</b>	66	9.0 [5.2-13]	0.37 [0.26-0.49]	0.06 [0.02-0.14]
<b>Non-endocrine paraneoplastic syndrome</b>	432	13.0 [7.7-23.7]	0.56 [0.51-0.60]	0.14 [0.11-0.17]
<b>Treatment &lt; 2010</b>	317	13.2 [7.4-24.4]	0.55 [0.49-0.60]	0.14 [0.10-0.18]
<b>Treatment ≥ 2010</b>	181	11.2 [7.1-21.2]	0.50 [0.42-0.57]	0.11 [0.06-0.17]
<b>LD treatment &lt; 2010</b>	148	21.3 [12.2-36.6]	0.76 [0.69-0.83]	0.26 [0.20-0.34]
<b>LD treatment ≥ 2010</b>	60	21.0 [10.9-27.2]	0.79 [0.67-0.88]	0.27 [0.15-0.41]
<b>ED treatment &lt; 2010</b>	169	8.6 [5.2-15.6]	0.36 [0.29-0.44]	0.02 [0.01-0.05]
<b>ED treatment ≥ 2010</b>	121	8.9 [6.2-14.1]	0.36 [0.28-0.45]	0.03 [0.01-0.08]
<b>Survival from <sup>a</sup> :</b>				
<b>Line 1</b>	498	12.2 [7.2-22.5]	0.53 [0.49-0.58]	
<b>Line 2</b>	278	6.6 [3.5-11]	0.22 [0.17-0.27]	
<b>Line 3</b>	121	5.1 [3-7.2]	0.14 [0.08-0.21]	
<b>Line 4</b>	37	3.7 [2.2-5]	0.16 [0.03-0.24]	

<b>Survival from 1<sup>st</sup> line</b>				
<b>Sensitive</b>	226	22.5 [14.8-34.2]	0.87 [0.83-0.91]	0.27 [0.21-0.33]
<b>Resistant</b>	121	10.0 [7.2-14.0]	0.36 [0.27-0.44]	0.01 [0-0.04]
<b>Refractory</b>	109	6.5 [3.2-9.1]	0.15 [0.09-0.22]	
<b>From 1<sup>st</sup> line</b>				
- <b>If line 2</b>	279	15.2 [10.4-23.1]	0.67 [0.61-0.72]	0.08 [0.05-0.11]
- <b>If censored after 1st line</b>	219	7.9 [3.2-20.7]	0.35 [0.29-0.42]	0.2 [0.15-0.26]
<b>alive</b>	36	58.8 [11-92.7]		
<b>deceased</b>	183	7.0 [2.9-11.7]	0.25 [0.19-0.31]	0.08 [0.05-0.13]
<b>From 2<sup>nd</sup> line</b>				
- <b>If line 3</b>	121	9.9 [7.5-14.7]	0.40 [0.38-0.50]	0.05 [0.02-0.10]
- <b>If censored after 2<sup>nd</sup> line</b>	157	4.3 [2.3-7.2]	0.07 [0.03-0.12]	0.03 [0.01-0.06]
<b>alive</b>	8	7.9 [1.5-76.7]		
<b>deceased</b>	149	4.2 [2.3-6.8]	0.05 [0.02-0.09]	0.01 [0.00-0.03]
<b>From 1<sup>st</sup> line according to 1<sup>st</sup> line CT</b>				
- <b>Platinum and etoposide</b>	477	12.2 [7.2-22.7]	0.53 [0.49-0.58]	0.13 [0.10-0.16]
- <b>Other</b>	21	13.4 [7.9-20.7]	0.57 [0.35-0.77]	0.23 [0.05-0.50]
<b>From 2<sup>nd</sup> line according to 2<sup>nd</sup> line CT</b>				
- <b>Platinum and etoposide</b>	126	9.7 [6-14.6]	0.38 [0.29-0.47]	0.07 [0.03-0.12]
- <b>Taxane</b>	121	5.0 [2.5-7.4]	0.06 [0.02-0.11]	0.01 [0.00-0.03]
- <b>Other</b>	31	4.7 [2.1-9.5]	0.20 [0.08-0.36]	0.04 [0.00-0.15]

<sup>a</sup>One patient with unknown date for 2<sup>nd</sup> line start and one with unknown date for 4<sup>th</sup> line start.

<sup>b</sup>Kaplan Meier estimate with confidence interval using arcsine-square root.


CT, chemotherapy; ED, extensive disease; IQR, interquartile range; LD, limited disease; MD, missing data.

## References

- [1] Y. Nilssen, T.E. Strand, L. Fjellbirkeland, K. Bartnes, B. Møller, Lung cancer survival in Norway, 1997-2011: from nihilism to optimism, *Eur. Respir. J.* 47 (2016) 275–287. doi:10.1183/13993003.00650-2015.
- [2] R. Meza, C. Meernik, J. Jeon, M.L. Cote, Lung Cancer Incidence Trends by Gender, Race and Histology in the United States, 1973–2010, *PLOS ONE*. 10 (2015) e0121323. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0121323.
- [3] M. Grivaux, B. Duvert, P. Ferrer-Lopez, S. Hominal, E. Goarant, A. Brichet-Martin, P. Romand, E. Fournier, B. Asselain, D. Debieuvre, [One-year survival improvement in lung cancer in France. Results of the prospective real life studies KBP-2000-CPHG and KBP-2010-CPHG], *Rev Pneumol Clin.* 72 (2016) 163–170. doi:10.1016/j.pneumo.2016.02.002.
- [4] M.B. Schabath, A. Nguyen, P. Wilson, K.R. Sommerer, Z.J. Thompson, A.A. Chiappori, Temporal trends from 1986 to 2008 in overall survival of small cell lung cancer patients, *Lung Cancer.* 86 (2014) 14–21. doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2014.07.014.
- [5] P. Goldstraw, K. Chansky, J. Crowley et al. The IASLC Lung Cancer Staging Project: Proposals for Revision of the TNM Stage Groupings in the Forthcoming (Eighth) Edition of the TNM Classification for Lung Cancer, *Journal of Thoracic Oncology.* 11 (2016) 39–51. doi:10.1016/j.jtho.2015.09.009.
- [6] B.M. Fischer, J. Mortensen, The Future in Diagnosis and Staging of Lung Cancer: Positron Emission Tomography, *Respiration.* 73 (2006) 267–276. doi:10.1159/000092080.
- [7] S. Bishnoi, K. Pittman, M. Colbeck, A. Townsend, J. Hardingham, S. Sukumaran, B. Hooper, M. Tuck, D. Roder, C. Luke, T. Price, Small cell lung cancer: patterns of care and their influence on survival - 25 years experience of a single Australian oncology unit, *Asia Pac J Clin Oncol.* 7 (2011) 252–257. doi:10.1111/j.1743-7563.2011.01426.x.
- [8] A. Rossi, M. Di Maio, P. Chiodini, R.M. Rudd, H. Okamoto, D.V. Skarlos, M. Früh, W. Qian, T. Tamura, E. Samantas, T. Shibata, F. Perrone, C. Gallo, C. Gridelli, O. Martelli, S.-M. Lee, Carboplatin- or Cisplatin-Based Chemotherapy in First-Line Treatment of Small-Cell Lung Cancer: The COCIS Meta-Analysis of Individual Patient Data, *Journal of Clinical Oncology.* 30 (2012) 1692–1698. doi:10.1200/JCO.2011.40.4905.
- [9] M. Früh, D. De Ruyscher, S. Popat, L. Crinò, S. Peters, E. Felip, ESMO Guidelines Working Group, Small-cell lung cancer (SCLC): ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up, *Ann. Oncol.* 24 Suppl 6 (2013) vi99-105. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdt178.
- [10] B. Slotman, C. Faivre-Finn, G. Kramer, E. Rankin, M. Snee, M. Hatton, P. Postmus, L. Collette, E. Musat, S. Senan, Prophylactic Cranial Irradiation in Extensive Small-Cell Lung Cancer, *New England Journal of Medicine.* 357 (2007) 664–672. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa071780.

- [11] J. von Pawel, J.H. Schiller, F.A. Shepherd, S.Z. Fields, J.P. Kleisbauer, N.G. Chrysson, D.J. Stewart, P.I. Clark, M.C. Palmer, A. Depierre, J. Carmichael, J.B. Krebs, G. Ross, S.R. Lane, R. Gralla, Topotecan versus cyclophosphamide, doxorubicin, and vincristine for the treatment of recurrent small-cell lung cancer, *J. Clin. Oncol.* 17 (1999) 658–667. doi:10.1200/JCO.1999.17.2.658.
- [12] H. Nagy-Mignotte, P. Guillem, L. Vignoud, M. Coudurier, A. Vesin, V. Bonnetterre, A.-C. Toffart, L. Sakhri, C. Brambilla, E. Brambilla, J.-F. Timsit, D. Moro-Sibilot, Outcomes in recurrent small-cell lung cancer after one to four chemotherapy lines: A retrospective study of 300 patients, *Lung Cancer.* 78 (2012) 112–120. doi:10.1016/j.lungcan.2012.06.006.
- [13] M.M. Oken, R.H. Creech, D.C. Tormey, J. Horton, T.E. Davis, E.T. McFadden, P.P. Carbone, Toxicity and response criteria of the Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group, *Am. J. Clin. Oncol.* 5 (1982) 649–655.
- [14] E.A. Eisenhauer, P. Therasse, J. Bogaerts, L.H. Schwartz, D. Sargent, R. Ford, J. Dancey, S. Arbuck, S. Gwyther, M. Mooney, L. Rubinstein, L. Shankar, L. Dodd, R. Kaplan, D. Lacombe, J. Verweij, New response evaluation criteria in solid tumours: Revised RECIST guideline (version 1.1), *European Journal of Cancer.* 45 (2009) 228–247. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2008.10.026.
- [15] A. Kurup, N.H. Hanna, Treatment of small cell lung cancer, *Critical Reviews in Oncology/Hematology.* 52 (2004) 117–126. doi:10.1016/j.critrevonc.2004.08.005.
- [16] C. Dayen, D. Debieuvre, O. Molinier, O. Raffy, F. Paganin, J. Virally, S. Larive, B. Desurmont-Salasc, M. Perrichon, F. Martin, M. Grivaux, New insights into stage and prognosis in small cell lung cancer: an analysis of 968 cases, *Journal of Thoracic Disease.* 9 (2017) 5101–5111. doi:10.21037/jtd.2017.11.52.
- [17] A. Khakwani, A.L. Rich, L.J. Tata, H.A. Powell, R.A. Stanley, D.R. Baldwin, R.B. Hubbard, Small-Cell Lung Cancer in England: Trends in Survival and Chemotherapy Using the National Lung Cancer Audit, *PLoS ONE.* 9 (2014) e89426. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0089426.
- [18] M.J. Aarts, J.G. Aerts, B.E. van den Borne, B. Biesma, V.E.P.P. Lemmens, J.S. Kloover, Comorbidity in Patients With Small-Cell Lung Cancer: Trends and Prognostic Impact, *Clinical Lung Cancer.* 16 (2015) 282–291. doi:10.1016/j.clc.2014.12.003.
- [19] M. Torres-Durán, A. Ruano-Ravina, K.T. Kelsey, I. Parente-Lamelas, M. Provencio, V. Leiro-Fernández, J. Abal-Arca, C. Montero-Martínez, I. Vidal-García, C. Pena, O. Castro-Añón, A. Golpe-Gómez, C. Martínez, R. Guzmán-Taveras, M.J. Mejuto-Martí, A. Fernández-Villar, J.M. Barros-Dios, Small cell lung cancer in never-smokers, *European Respiratory Journal.* 47 (2016) 947–953. doi:10.1183/13993003.01524-2015.
- [20] M. Behera, C. Ragin, S. Kim, R.N. Pillai, Z. Chen, C.E. Steuer, N.F. Saba, C.P. Belani, F.R. Khuri, S.S. Ramalingam, T.K. Owonikoko, Trends, predictors, and impact of systemic chemotherapy in small cell lung cancer patients between 1985 and 2005: Small Cell Lung Cancer in SEER-Medicare, *Cancer.* 122 (2016) 50–60. doi:10.1002/cncr.29674.

- [21] gokmen aktas, K. Tulay, mehmet emin kalender, alper sevinc, celaletdin camci, seval kul, Survival analysis in second-line and third-line chemotherapy with irinotecan followed by topotecan or topotecan followed by irinotecan for extensive-stage small-cell lung cancer patients: a single-center retrospective study, *OncoTargets and Therapy*. (2016) 1921. doi:10.2147/OTT.S101390.
- [22] Z. Song, L. Shao, B. Lin, Y. Zhang, Single-agent chemotherapy compared with combination chemotherapy as second-line treatment in extensive-stage small cell lung cancer: a retrospective analysis, *Clinical and Translational Oncology*. 15 (2013) 843–848. doi:10.1007/s12094-013-1013-5.
- [23] David Paul Carbone et al., Efficacy and safety of rovalpituzumab tesirine in patients With DLL3-expressing,  $\geq$  3rd line small cell lung cancer: Results from the phase 2 TRINITY study., (n.d.).



## **SERMENT D'HIPPOCRATE**

*En présence des Maîtres de cette Faculté, de mes chers condisciples et devant l'effigie d'HIPPOCRATE,*

*Je promets et je jure d'être fidèle aux lois de l'honneur et de la probité dans l'exercice de la Médecine.*

*Je donnerai mes soins gratuitement à l'indigent et n'exigerai jamais un salaire au dessus de mon travail. Je ne participerai à aucun partage clandestin d'honoraires.*

*Admis dans l'intimité des maisons, mes yeux n'y verront pas ce qui s'y passe ; ma langue taira les secrets qui me seront confiés et mon état ne servira pas à corrompre les mœurs, ni à favoriser le crime.*

*Je ne permettrai pas que des considérations de religion, de nation, de race, de parti ou de classe sociale viennent s'interposer entre mon devoir et mon patient.*

*Je garderai le respect absolu de la vie humaine.*

*Même sous la menace, je n'admettrai pas de faire usage de mes connaissances médicales contre les lois de l'humanité.*

*Respectueux et reconnaissant envers mes Maîtres, je rendrai à leurs enfants l'instruction que j'ai reçue de leurs pères.*

*Que les hommes m'accordent leur estime si je suis fidèle à mes promesses.*

*Que je sois couvert d'opprobre et méprisé de mes confrères si j'y manque.*

**THÈSE SOUTENUE PAR : Mickaël LATTUCA TRUC**

**TITRE :**

**Evolution du taux de réponse à la chimiothérapie et de la survie des patients atteints d'un cancer bronchique à petites cellules au CHU Grenoble Alpes entre 1997 et 2017**

**CONCLUSION :**

Entre 1997-2009 et 2010-2017, il n'y a pas eu d'amélioration ni de la réponse à la chimiothérapie ni de la survie des patients atteints d'un cancer bronchique à petites cellules


Les facteurs associés à une moins bonne survie à partir de la 1ère ligne de chimiothérapie sont les comorbidités cardiovasculaire et hépatique, un performance status  $\geq 2$  et une maladie étendue au diagnostic

Les facteurs associés à une moins bonne survie à partir de la 2ème ligne de chimiothérapie sont une maladie étendue au diagnostic, les patients avec une maladie résistante ou réfractaire à la 1ère ligne de chimiothérapie, un performance status  $\geq 2$ , un traitement de 2ème ligne autre que sels de platine/VP16

Ce travail a permis la constitution d'une cohorte de référence pour les molécules en cours de développement dans le cancer bronchique à petites cellules.

VU ET PERMIS D'IMPRIMER  
Grenoble, le : *Mari 2019*

LE DOYEN



Pr. Patrice MORAND

LE PRÉSIDENT DE LA THÈSE



Pr. Denis MORO SIBILOT

pour le Président  
et par délégation  
Le Doyen de Médecine  
Pr. Patrice MORAND

CHU de Grenoble  
Département  
Médical - Urgences  
Pr. MORO-SIBILOT  
Pr. Patrice MORAND  
N° Adeli : 33111938