

**Original
Article**

**OXALIPLATIN AND CAPECITABINE IN THE TREATMENT OF METASTATIC
COLORECTAL CARCINOMA (PHASE-II STUDY)**

Mohammad Hassan¹, Hussein Omar², Ehab Alnakory³, Ehab Esmat⁴, and Ehab Hassan⁵

¹Erfan Hospital, ²King Abdulaziz Hospital, ³Saudi German Hospital, ⁴King Faisal Hospital, ⁵King Fahd Hospital, Saudi Arabia

ABSTRACT

Background: Capecitabine and oxaliplatin are two new chemotherapeutic agents with potential synergistic activity, both have demonstrated promising antitumor efficacy in advanced and metastatic colorectal cancer. Capecitabine plus oxaliplatin, established in a previous dose-finding study, have the same efficacy like oxaliplatin with infused FU and leucovorin (FOLFOX) regimens. The present studies further characterize efficacy and safety of capecitabine and oxaliplatin regimen.

Objectives: To evaluate the objective tumor response rate and safety profile of oxaliplatin and capecitabine when administered to patients with previously untreated metastatic colorectal carcinoma (MCRC).

Patients and Methods: A total of 23 patients with MCRC received first-line oxaliplatin plus Capecitabine in three weeks.

Treatment cycles: Intravenous oxaliplatin 130mg/m² (day one) followed by oral capecitabine 1,250mg/m² twice daily (day one, to day 14).

Results: Twelve patients (52%) achieved an objective response and 6 patients (26%) had stable disease for three or more months following treatment. After a minimum follow-up of 21 months, the median time to disease progression (TTP) was 7.5 months and median overall survival was 18 months. Capecitabine plus oxaliplatin safety was predictable; the most common grade three to four toxicities were hand and foot syndrome (17%), diarrhea (13%), neutropenia and neurotoxicities 8.6% and 4%, respectively.

Conclusion: This phase II study provides clear evidence of the efficacy and safety of oxaliplatin and capecitabine as a convenient first-line treatment for patients with previously untreated metastatic colorectal carcinoma.

Key Words: Colorectal carcinoma, oxaliplatin, capecitabine.

Corresponding Author: Ehab Alnakory, German-Saudia Hospital, Sudia Arabia, Tel.: 00966561541037,

INTRODUCTION

Colorectal carcinoma is a leading cause of cancer death worldwide, with nearly 150,000 new cases and 60,000 attributed deaths annually in the United States. Despite these sobering statistics, the 21 century heralds a new era in colorectal cancer treatment. From the late 1950s until very recently, fluorouracil (FU) was the only drug approved for the treatment of colorectal cancer with response rates ranged from 10% to 15% and median survival of 10 months, affording treated patients minimal improvement in survival over supportive care.^{1,2}

This response rate was improved to nearly 25% when leucovorin (LV) was used to modulate FU³. A modest survival benefit came at the cost of a small increase in toxicity, and subsequently FU/LV became standard first-line therapy for metastatic colorectal cancer from the late 1980s to 2002^{4,5}. The recent availability of new active chemotherapeutic agents has doubled the median overall survival for metastatic colorectal cancer from 10 to 20 months, and though the optimal strategy for incorporation

of all drugs is still unclear, current data support the use of chemotherapy doublets in first-line rather than sequential single-agent therapy. Multidrug regimens increase both response rate and the proportion of patients able to undergo potentially curative resection⁶. In addition, as many as 20% to 30% of patients never receive second-line chemotherapy. When used as single agents, bolus and infusional FU/LV and capecitabine are similarly effective but have differing toxicity.⁷

Chemotherapy combinations that incorporate infusion of FU are less toxic and more effective than those using bolus FU dosing⁸. Capecitabine is under study as an alternative dosing method for use in combination regimens; however, the optimal dose has not been defined and final safety and efficacy outcomes are being addressed in ongoing phase II and III investigations^{9,10}. Three combinations have shown excellent first-line efficacy in phase III trials—IFL (Irinotecan, 5FU, and Leucovorine) with bevacizumab, FOLFOX (5FU, Leucovorine and

Oxaliplatin) and FOLFIRI (5FU, Leucovorine and Irinotecan), but neither of these combinations is clearly superior.¹¹⁻¹³

Despite the increased efficacy associated with infused FU/LV plus oxaliplatin, the administration schedules for the FU component are inconvenient for both patients and healthcare professionals. These require two bolus injections plus two 22-hour infusions every two weeks¹⁴ or five days of continuous infusion with chronomodulation equipment every three weeks¹⁵ or weekly 24-hour infusion¹⁰. Because capecitabine has already demonstrated its ability to replace FU/LV as a highly effective and more convenient treatment for colorectal cancer, there is a strong rationale for investigating the efficacy and safety of capecitabine in combination with oxaliplatin.

The current, phase II study was conducted to evaluate further the efficacy and safety of oxaliplatin and capecitabine regimen as first-line therapy for patients with MCRC.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

This was a multicenter phase II study, conducted at Saudi Arabia. The primary end point was overall response rate. Secondary end points included time to disease progression (TTP), one year survival, overall survival, and safety. All patients provided written informed consent.

Patients aged 18 to 75 years with measurable, histologically confirmed metastatic colorectal cancer were eligible for the study. Patients were required to be ambulatory and have a WHO performance status of <2. No prior chemotherapy for advanced disease, but adjuvant or neoadjuvant chemotherapy was allowed, providing it was completed at least 6 months before start of study treatment.

Exclusion criteria included prior therapy with capecitabine, oxaliplatin, or irinotecan, clinically significant cardiac disease, radiotherapy or surgery within four weeks before treatment, neutropenia (<1.5 / μL), thrombocytopenia (<100/ μL), severe renal function impairment (creatinine clearance <30mL/min), or abnormal liver function and pregnant women.

A full medical history and physical examination, hematological and blood chemistry tests were necessary. Tumor assessments were performed by computed tomography scan, and/or magnetic resonance imaging during first assessment, after the first three cycles of treatment, then after every three cycles of treatment until disease progression or withdrawal from the study medication.

In patients whose disease had not progressed when

stopping treatment, tumor assessments were performed every three months until progression. Tumor response was assessed according to WHO criteria¹⁶. TTP was defined as the interval between the first dose of study treatment and the first recording of disease progression or death. Adverse events, including neurosensory toxicity and hand and foot syndrome (HFS), were classified by National Cancer Institute Common Toxicity Criteria version 2.

Treatment protocol:

Oxaliplatin 130mg/m² (diluted in a 5% glucose solution) IV day one then oral capecitabine 1,250mg/m² twice daily from day one to day 14, followed by a 7-days treatment-free interval, in a three weeks cycle. The capecitabine starting dose was reduced to 75% of the standard dose in patients with moderate renal impairment (with creatinine clearance between 30 and 50 mL/min) or grade three hand and foot syndrome (HFS)¹⁷. The dose of oxaliplatin was also reduced to 75% for grade three vomiting, grade three or four thrombocytopenia, or grade four neutropenia, and for paresthesia with pain or functional impairment >7 days, or paresthesia with pain persistent between cycles. For paresthesiae with functional impairment persistent between cycles, oxaliplatin was discontinued.

The planned number of treatment cycles was 6, but patients maintaining a response or stable disease after this time could continue treatment at the same protocol. Patients could also continue capecitabine monotherapy after discontinuation of oxaliplatin irrespective of the number of cycles already received. The primary end point was overall confirmed response rate, TTP and survival were estimated by Kaplan-Meier analysis version 10. Safety was analyzed in all patients who received at least one dose of study medication.

RESULTS

A total of 23 patients were recruited between July 2002 and June 2004. Approximately half of the patients had multiple metastases, with liver, lung, and bone being the most frequent sites of metastases (Table 1). fourteen patients had received prior adjuvant chemotherapy with IV 5FU, and four patients had received prior radiotherapy.

An objective response was observed in 12 patients (52%) with complete response in one patient (4%). All objective responses were confirmed at least four weeks after first observation (Table 2). Disease stabilization was achieved in a further 6% (26%). Notably, disease stabilization lasted longer than three months from start of treatment in all of these patients; one patient of them had increase in the CEA tumor marker but clinically and radiologically had stable disease.

Table 1: Patients characteristics.

Patients character (23 patients)	No.
Age- year	
Range	29- 72
Median	59
Sex M/F	14/9
WHO performance	
0	13
1	8
2	2
Primary tumor site	
Colon	16
Rectum	7
First presentation with mets	4
Mets site	
Liver	14
Lung	4
Bone	2
Others	6
Prior adjuvant treatment:	
Chemotherapy	14
Radiotherapy	4

Table 2: Treatment Response.

Response	No.	%
Objective response (PR+CR)	12	52
Partial response (PR)	11	48
Complete response (CR)	1	4
Stable disease	6	26
Progressive disease	5	22

After a minimum follow-up of 21 months, the median TTP in the intent-to-treat population was 7.5 months. Median overall survival was 18 months. The estimated survival rate was 68% at one year and 27% at two years.

A total of 14 patients (60%) received second-line and 7 (30%) received third-line chemotherapy. The most common second-line chemotherapy was irinotecan (10 patients), either as monotherapy or in combination with 5FU. two patients received bevacizumab. One patient had received cetuximab, three patients (13%) received palliative radiotherapy, and two patients underwent surgery, and one patient underwent radiofrequency for small hepatic metastases.

Toxicities

The most common treatment-related adverse events are shown in table 3. Hand and foot syndrome (HFS), a frequent side effect of capecitabine, was the most common treatment-related adverse event, occurring in 14 patients (60%). The majority of hand and foot syndrome was mild to moderate, with only four patients (17%) experienced grade three or four. Other grade three or four treatment-

related adverse events were diarrhea (13%), and nausea or vomiting (8.6%). Neurotoxicity was experienced by four patients (17%), only one was grade three (4%). Grade three neutropenia (8.6%), thrombocytopenia (4%), and anemia (4%).

Table 3: Treatment toxicity.

Toxicities	Grade 1-2		Grade 3-4		Total	
	NO.	%	NO.	%	NO.	%
H FS	10	43	4	17	14	60
Neurotoxicities	3	13	1	4	4	17
Diarrhea	4	17	3	13	7	30
Stomatitis	13	39	0	0	13	39
Fatigue	7	30	0	0	7	30
Neusea&vomiting	4	17	2	8.6	6	25.6
Neutropenia	5	21	2	8.6	7	29.6
thrombocytopenia	2	8.6	1	4	3	12.6
Anemia	4	17	1	4	5	21

Capecitabine and oxaliplatin demonstrated a similar favorable safety profile among the subgroups of patients aged ≥ 60 years or younger than 60 years. Stomatitis was the only treatment-related adverse event more common in patients ≥ 60 years old than those younger than 60 years (26% v 13%, respectively), but no patients in either age groups experienced grade three or four stomatitis. Overall, there was a similar incidence of grade three or four treatment-related adverse events in the two age groups (15 patients younger than 60 years and 8 patients 60 years or older) with no significant differences in the incidences of any grade three or four treatment-related adverse events.

Seventeen patients received full doses of capecitabine and oxaliplatin throughout the study. Dose reduction was required for capecitabine in 6 patients (26%), for oxaliplatin in two patients (8.6%). Myelosuppression and hand and foot syndrome were the most common adverse events leading to dose reduction. The incidence of dose reduction was similar in the subgroups of male and female patients but more in those age group ≥ 60 years.

DISCUSSION

Until a few years ago, treatment options for patients with advanced colorectal cancer (ACC) were limited to fluorouracil (FU) a therapy plagued by poor response rates and dismal median survival. The introduction of biochemical modulators such as leucovorin (LV) or methotrexate has led to improvements in response rates with minimal effect on survival. Similarly, various modifications of the original FU bolus administration schedule, such as continuous infusion or chemomodulation, have yielded only marginal improvement¹⁸. Within the

last five years, a number of new, promising anticancer agents with unique and different mechanisms of action, synergism with FU, or reduced toxicity have been introduced^{19,20}. Oral FU prodrugs, specifically capecitabine, characterized by high and predictable oral bioavailability, as well as a preferential conversion to FU in neoplastic tissues, are notable examples^{20,21}. In two recently published randomized trials, each comprising about 600 patients, a superior therapeutic index was reported for capecitabine compared with bolus FU/LV. Another promising agent, the third-generation one, 2-diaminocyclohexane-platinum derivate oxaliplatin, was approved for the treatment of ACC in Europe in 1999.^{22,23}

Oxaliplatin and capecitabine combination regimen is a rational combination treatment. The addition of oxaliplatin to infused FU/LV chemotherapy results in higher response rates and TTP in both first- and second-line treatment of advanced colorectal cancer²⁴. Oral capecitabine monotherapy has previously shown superior antitumor activity to bolus FU/LV (Mayo Clinic regimen) in this setting, with higher response rates (26% v 17%, $P < .0002$) and at least equivalent TTP and overall survival in two large randomized studies.^{23,25}

This phase II study was undertaken to further evaluate the combination of oxaliplatin and capecitabine as first-line therapy for MCRC. Oxaliplatin and capecitabine achieved a high response rate of 52%, with an additional 26% of patients maintaining stable disease for at least three months. These results were comparable to the results achieved in recent published study by Jim et al.²⁶ Also, subgroup analysis showed that the response rate remained high irrespective of patient and disease characteristics. These efficacy results compare favorably with the randomized studies of FU/LV with oxaliplatin¹⁴ which demonstrated significant improvements for the combination (FOLFOX) compared with FU/LV alone. Oxaliplatin and capecitabine achieved similar response rates and progression-free and overall survival to most of the regimens combining protracted FU/LV infusion with oxaliplatin.

Capecitabine and oxaliplatin have no overlapping toxicities, and the combination was well tolerated even with long treatment duration. The safety profile of oxaliplatin and capecitabine was similar to that of FU/LV plus oxaliplatin, with a lower incidence of grade three or four neutropenia. In this study 17% showed grade three hand and foot syndrome which was higher comparable to other study²⁶. However in this study the incidence of grade three neurotoxicities was low (4%). The low incidence of grade three neurotoxicities with oxaliplatin and capecitabine regimen may be due to the hot whether in Saudi Arabia in comparison to the higher neurotoxicities in western studies²³. It is also possible that oxaliplatin-induced neurotoxicity may be masked by the symptoms

of HFS. In addition, oxaliplatin and capecitabine demonstrated a similar safety profile in patients younger than or at least 60 years.

The data therefore indicate that three weekly cycles of capecitabine and oxaliplatin is a highly effective regimen as a first-line treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer and that capecitabine has strong potential to replace FU/LV as the optimal combination partner for oxaliplatin. The Capecitabine and oxaliplatin dose schedule of capecitabine 1,250mg/m² twice daily with oxaliplatin 130mg/m² had been previously identified in another phase II trial evaluated the same dose of capecitabine in combination with oxaliplatin in patients with pretreated and previously untreated MCRC²⁵. While a response rate of 49% was obtained in patients receiving the combination as first-line therapy, the incidence of grade three or four diarrhea was 33% in treatment-naïve patients and 50% in pretreated patients. Although the authors recommend the full dose of both agents for treatment of patients with advanced CRC, more than 25% of the chemotherapy-naïve population required a capecitabine dose reduction after the first cycle. A similar incidence of capecitabine dose reduction was noted in our study 26% (6 patients).

A randomized phase II trial has evaluated two schedules of capecitabine plus oxaliplatin as first-line therapy in 89 patients with MCRC²⁷. Patients were randomly assigned to receive a dose-intensified regimen (capecitabine 1,750mg/m² twice daily on days one to 7 and 14 to 21 plus oxaliplatin 85mg/m² on days one and 14, every 28 days) or XELOX (capecitabine 1,000mg/m² twice daily days one to 14 plus oxaliplatin 130mg/m² on day one, every 21 days). No formal prospective comparison of efficacy in the two treatment groups was planned and the study was not powered statistically for such a comparison. Both regimens were active, achieving response rates of 55% and 42%, with median progression-free survival of 10.5 and 6.0 months, respectively. However, in the absence of data from a prospective, randomized, phase III comparison, no conclusions about the efficacy and safety of the dose-intensified regimen relative to XELOX can be drawn. Another phase II study has evaluated a lower dose of capecitabine (750mg/m² twice daily) than used in our study²⁸. This regimen achieved a response rate of only 34% in 35 treated patients which is much lower than our achievement (52%). In summary, the dose of 1,250mg/m² capecitabine twice daily in combination with oxaliplatin, as used in this regimen, achieves high efficacy while maintaining a good safety profile.

The capecitabine and oxaliplatin regimen has demonstrated similar efficacy and safety to FOLFOX. Interestingly, the incidence of grade three or three neutropenia is lower with the capecitabine and oxaliplatin regimen than with the FOLFOX regimen, as is the incidence of febrile neutropenia¹⁴. In addition, Capecitabine and oxaliplatin requires only one clinic

visit per three weeks cycle for a two hours infusion of oxaliplatin. This constitutes a marked advantage over regimens combining infused FU/LV and oxaliplatin in terms of the impact on patients' convenience and the cost. In summary, this study shows that Capecitabine and oxaliplatin is a highly effective therapy for patients with MCRC. Response rates, time to disease progression, and overall survival compare favorably with previous studies of FU/LV/oxaliplatin, and the Capecitabine and oxaliplatin combination offers substantially improved convenience and is less disruptive for patients. In addition, the Capecitabine and oxaliplatin regimen offers a novel, well-tolerated, and active backbone for incorporation of innovative targeted agents such as the EGFR-directed drugs (cetuximab), and the antiangiogenic monoclonal antibody (bevacizumab).

REFERENCES

- Poon MA, O'Connell MJ, Moertel CG, Wieand HS, Cullinan SA, Everson LK, et al. Biochemical modulation of fluorouracil: Evidence of significant improvement of survival and quality of life in patients with advanced colorectal carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 1989 Oct;7(10):1407-18.
- Petrelli N, Douglass HO, Jr, Herrera L, Russell D, Stablein DM, Bruckner HW, et al. The modulation of fluorouracil with leucovorin in metastatic colorectal carcinoma: A prospective randomized phase III trial. *Gastrointestinal Tumor Study Group. J Clin Oncol* 1989 Oct;7(10):1419-26.
- Modulation of fluorouracil by leucovorin in patients with advanced colorectal cancer: Evidence in terms of response rate. *Advanced Colorectal Cancer Meta-Analysis Project. J Clin Oncol* 1992 Jun;10(6):896-903.
- Simmonds PC. Palliative chemotherapy for advanced colorectal cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Colorectal Cancer Collaborative Group. BMJ* 2000 Sep 2;321(7260):531-5.
- Piedbois P, Michiels S. Survival benefit of 5FU/LV over 5FU bolus in patients with advanced colorectal cancer: An updated meta-analysis based on 2.751 patients. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2003;22:294.
- Saltz LB, Cox JV, Blanke C, Rosen LS, Fehrenbacher L, Moore MJ, et al. Irinotecan plus fluorouracil and leucovorin for metastatic colorectal cancer. *Irinotecan Study Group. N Engl J Med* 2000 Sep 28;343(13):905-14.
- Douillard JY, Cunningham D, Roth AD, Navarro M, James RD, Karasek P, et al. Irinotecan combined with fluorouracil compared with fluorouracil alone as first-line treatment for metastatic colorectal cancer: A multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet* 2000 Mar 25;355(9209):1041-7.
- Goldberg RM, Sargent DJ, Morton RF, Fuchs CS, Ramanathan RK, Williamson SK, et al. A randomized controlled trial of fluorouracil plus leucovorin, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin combinations in patients with previously untreated metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2004 Jan 1;22(1):23-30.
- Twelves C. Capecitabine as first-line treatment in colorectal cancer. Pooled data from two large, phase III trials. *Eur J Cancer* 2002 Feb;38(Suppl 2):15-20.
- Grothey A, Deschler B, Kroening H, Ridwelski K, Reichardt P, Kretschmar A, et al. Phase III study of bolus 5- fluorouracil (5-FU)/ folinic acid (FA) (Mayo) vs weekly high-dose 24h 5-FU infusion/ FA+ oxaliplatin (OXA) (FUFOX) in advanced colorectal cancer (ACRC). *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2002;21:129a.
- Hurwitz H, Fehrenbacher L, Novotny W, Cartwright T, Hainsworth J, Heim W, et al. Bevacizumab plus irinotecan, fluorouracil, and leucovorin for metastatic colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004 Jun 3;350(23):2335-42.
- Kabbinavar F, Hurwitz HI, Fehrenbacher L, Meropol NJ, Novotny WF, Lieberman G, et al. Phase II, randomized trial comparing bevacizumab plus fluorouracil (FU)/leucovorin (LV) with FU/LV alone in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2003 Jan 1;21(1):60-5.
- Cunningham D, Humblet Y, Siena S, Khayat D, Bleiberg H, Santoro A, et al. Cetuximab monotherapy and cetuximab plus irinotecan in irinotecan-refractory metastatic colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2004 Jul 22;351(4):337-45.
- De Gramont A, Figer A, Seymour M, Homerin M, Hmissi A, Cassidy J, et al. Leucovorin and fluorouracil with or without oxaliplatin as first-line treatment in advanced colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2000 Aug;18(16):2938-47.
- Giacchetti S, Perpoint B, Zidani R, Le Bail N, Faggiuolo R, Focan C, et al. Phase III multicenter randomized trial of oxaliplatin added to chronomodulated fluorouracil-leucovorin as first-line treatment of metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2000 Jan;18(1):136-47.
- World Health Organization. WHO handbook for reporting results of cancer treatment. Geneva(Switzerland): World Health Organization; 1979.
- Blum JL, Jones SE, Buzdar AU, LoRusso PM, Kuter I, Vogel C, et al. Multicenter phase II study of capecitabine in paclitaxel-refractory metastatic breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1999 Feb;17(2):485-93.
- Schmoll HJ, Buchele T, Grothey A, Dempke W. Where do we stand with 5-fluorouracil? *Semin Oncol* 1999 Dec;26(6):589-605.
- Harstrick A, Vanhoefer U, Seeber S. New drugs in colorectal cancer: A review of antitumor activity and cross-resistance

- patterns of topoisomerase I inhibitors, thymidylate synthetase inhibitors, and oxaliplatin. *Onkologie* 1998;21(2):95-103.
20. Van Cutsem E, Peeters M, Verslype C, Filez L, Haustermans K, Janssens J. The medical treatment of colorectal cancer: Actual status and new developments. *Hepatogastroenterology* 1999 Mar-Apr;46(26):709-16.
 21. Ishikawa T, Fukase Y, Yamamoto T, Sekiguchi F, Ishitsuka H. Antitumor activities of a novel fluoropyrimidine, N4-pentyloxycarbonyl-5'-deoxy-5-fluorocytidine (capecitabine). *Biol Pharm Bull* 1998 Jul;21(7):713-7.
 22. Schuller J, Cassidy J, Dumont E, Roos B, Durston S, Banken L, et al. Preferential activation of capecitabine in tumor following oral administration to colorectal cancer patients. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol* 2000;45(4):291-7.
 23. Hoff PM, Ansari R, Batist G, Cox J, Kocha W, Kuperminc M, et al. Comparison of oral capecitabine versus intravenous fluorouracil plus leucovorin as first-line treatment in 605 patients with metastatic colorectal cancer: Results of a randomized phase III study. *J Clin Oncol* 2001 Apr 15;19(8):2282-92.
 24. Twelves C, Harper P, Van Cutsem E, Thibault A, Shelygin YA, Burger HU, et al. A phase III trial (S014796) of Xeloda[Superscript TM](capecitabine) in previously untreated advanced/Metastatic colorectal cancer. *Proc Am Soc Clin Oncol* 1999;18:263a.
 25. Borner MM, Dietrich D, Stupp R, Morant R, Honegger H, Wernli M, et al. Phase II study of capecitabine and oxaliplatin in first- and second-line treatment of advanced or metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002 Apr 1;20(7):1759-66.
 26. Cassidy J, Taberero J, Twelves C, Brunet R, Butts C, Conroy T, et al. XELOX (capecitabine plus oxaliplatin): Active first-line therapy for patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2004 Jun 1;22(11):2084-91.
 27. Scheithauer W, Kornek GV, Raderer M, Schull B, Schmid K, Kovats E, et al. Randomized multicenter phase II trial of two different schedules of capecitabine plus oxaliplatin as first-line treatment in advanced colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2003 Apr 1;21(7):1307-12.
 28. Shields AF, Zalupski MM, Marshall JL, Meropol NJ. Treatment of advanced colorectal carcinoma with oxaliplatin and capecitabine: A phase II trial. *Cancer* 2004 Feb 1;100(3):531-7.