



Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy for Locally Advanced Gastric Cancer: Where Are We at?

Jen-Hao Yeh ^{1,2,3,4}, Yung-Sung Yeh ^{5,6,7}, Hsiang-Lin Tsai ^{8,9}, Ching-Wen Huang ^{8,9}, Tsung-Kun Chang ^{1,8,10}, Wei-Chih Su ^{1,8} and Jaw-Yuan Wang ^{1,8,9,11,12,13,*}

- ¹ Graduate Institute of Clinical Medicine, College of Medicine, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan; ed109486@edah.org.tw (J.-H.Y.); tsungkunchang@gmail.com (T.-K.C.); lake0126@yahoo.com.tw (W.-C.S.)
- ² Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Internal Medicine, E-DA Dachang Hospital, Kaohsiung 82445, Taiwan
- ³ Department of Medical technology, College of Medicine, I-Shou University, Kaohsiung 82445, Taiwan
- ⁴ Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Department of Internal Medicine, E-DA Hospital, Kaohsiung 82445, Taiwan
- ⁵ Division of Trauma and Surgical Critical Care, Department of Surgery, Kaohsiung Medical University Hospital, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan; 920055@gmail.com
- ⁶ Department of Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Post-Baccalaureate Medicine, College of Medicine, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan
- ⁷ Graduate Institute of Injury Prevention and Control, College of Public Health, Taipei Medical University, Taipei 11031, Taiwan
- ⁸ Division of Colorectal Surgery, Department of Surgery, Kaohsiung Medical University Hospital, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan; chunpin870132@yahoo.com.tw (H.-L.T.); 1000131@ms.kmuh.org.tw (C.-W.H.)
- ⁹ Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, College of Medicine, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan
- ¹ Department of Surgery, Faculty of Post-Baccalaureate Medicine, College of Medicine, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan
- ¹¹ Center for Cancer Research, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan
- ¹² Cohort Research Center, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung 80708, Taiwan
- ¹³ Pingtung Hospital, Ministry of Health and Welfare, Pingtung 90054, Taiwan
- Correspondence: cy614112@ms14.hinet.net; Tel.: +886-7-3122805; Fax: +886-7-3114679

Simple Summary: More than 50% of gastric cancer are at least locally advanced at presentation. For such patients, a multimodal approach rather than mere surgical resection leads to better long-term prognosis. Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy is one of the common treatment strategies for local advanced gastric cancer. Based on the experience and evidence from esophago-gastric cancers, the incorporation of systemic and locoregional therapy has shown superior disease control and reduced local recurrence. However, the optimal chemotherapy regimen, patient selection, technical consideration and potential biomarkers are still under investigation. Furthermore, the comparison of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy with neoadjuvant/perioperative chemotherapy is also an important issue to be answered. In the review article, we addressed the current available evidence to provide a comprehensive understanding and the use of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced gastric cancer. Future studies and ongoing trials will be necessary to determine the best candidate and the role of newer systemic and radiation therapies in such patients. NCRT is a feasible treatment option for LAGC, with the ability to achieve favorable disease control and enable higher radical resection rates over those afforded by perioperative chemotherapy or surgery alone. Large clinical trials examining the comparative efficacy of NCRT and NCT are underway. The discrepancy between the satisfactory pCR rates associated with NCRT and the nonsignificant association between NCRT and survival warrants further exploration. Furthermore, newer therapies such as immunotherapy and adaptive radiotherapy may be implemented in con-junction with NCRT, and the development of useful biomarkers may ultimately lead to the de-velopment of personalized treatments for LAGC. These research directions may lead to the dis-covery of the optimal approach to administering NCRT to patients with LAGC. They may also aid in the determination of the optimal candidates for undergoing NCRT.



Citation: Yeh, J.-H.; Yeh, Y.-S.; Tsai, H.-L.; Huang, C.-W.; Chang, T.-K.; Su, W.-C.; Wang, J.-Y. Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy for Locally Advanced Gastric Cancer: Where Are We at? *Cancers* 2022, *14*, 3026. https://doi.org/10.3390/ cancers14123026

Academic Editor: Alain P. Gobert

Received: 15 May 2022 Accepted: 17 June 2022 Published: 20 June 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/). Abstract: Locally advanced gastric cancer (LAGC) has a poor prognosis with surgical resection alone, and neoadjuvant treatment has been recommended to improve surgical and oncological outcomes. Although neoadjuvant chemotherapy has been established to be effective for LAGC, the role of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT) remains under investigation. Clinical experience and research evidence on esophagogastric junction adenocarcinoma (e.g., cardia gastric cancers) indicate that the likelihood of achieving sustainable local control is higher through NCRT than through resection alone. Furthermore, NCRT also has an acceptable treatment-related toxicity and adverse event profile. In particular, it increases the likelihood of achieving an R0 resection and a pathological complete response (pCR). Moreover, NCRT results in higher overall and recurrencefree survival rates than surgery alone; however, evidence on the survival benefits of NCRT versus neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NCT) remains conflicting. For noncardia gastric cancer, the efficacy of NCRT has mostly been reported in retrospective studies, and several large clinical trials are ongoing. Consequently, NCRT might play a more essential role in unresectable LAGC, for which NCT alone may not be adequate to attain disease control. The continual improvements in systemic treatments, radiotherapy techniques, and emerging biomarkers can also lead to improved personalized therapy for NCRT. To elucidate the contributions of NCRT to gastric cancer treatment in the future, the efficacy, potential toxicity, predictive biomarkers, and clinical considerations for implementing NCRT in different types of LAGC were reviewed.

Keywords: locally advanced gastric cancer; neoadjuvant treatment; chemoradiation therapy

1. Introduction

One of the most common cancers, gastric cancer, constitutes a leading cause of cancerrelated death despite improvements in treatment and the widespread eradication of *Helicobacter pylori* [1–3]. The suboptimal prognosis of this disease is likely attributable to its aggressive biological behavior and to its frequently advanced stage at diagnosis (in more than 50% of cases) [4]. Although surgical resection provides the highest chance of recovery, it is usually insufficient or inapplicable for locally advanced gastric cancer (LAGC). A multimodal strategy includes systemic and local therapies that are based on the tumor characteristics [5,6]; it can induce disease control, facilitate complete resection, and improve survival outcomes [7]. This principle applies not only to initially resectable disease but also unresectable LAGC [8].

LAGC is typically defined as a tumor of the stomach or esophagogastric junction (EGJ); it is a type of histologically confirmed adenocarcinoma staged under the clinical tumor, node, and metastasis (TNM) staging system as cT3–cT4b, lymph node metastasis (N1–N3) without distant metastases (M0) [9]. In this context, tumors exhibiting mesenteric root invasion, para-aortic lymphadenopathy, or major vessel encasement are considered unresectable. For resectable disease, neoadjuvant chemotherapy (NCT) has demonstrated clear survival benefits over those of initial surgery, regardless of whether adjuvant chemotherapy was implemented [10–12]. Moreover, NCT might result in the downstaging of LAGC, facilitating subsequent resection [13–15]. Little information is available on the addition of radiotherapy, namely, neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT), to LAGC treatment programs.

A network meta-analysis concluded that combining radiotherapy and chemotherapy leads to more favorable local control relative to modality alone [16]. According to clinical trials on esophageal or EGJ adenocarcinomas, NCRT is associated with a significantly lower local failure rate and higher pathological complete response (pCR) and R0 resection rates in subsequent surgery [17–19]. Furthermore, NCRT results in a more satisfactory clinical response than NCT, suggesting its viability as a treatment modality. Prognostic data for LAGC are less abundant than those for esophageal and EGJ cancers. Notably, several clinical trials exploring the efficacy and safety of NCRT in LAGC are ongoing [20–23]. This paper presents a narrative review of studies on NCRT for LAGC, examining its efficacy, adverse effects, technical aspects, and perioperative and oncological outcomes. Furthermore, we discuss recommendations for the implementation of NCRT in this context.

2. Material and Methods

We searched the PubMed and Cochrane Library databases in February 2022 for Englishlanguage articles. The search strategy is described in Appendix A. In brief, the titles and abstracts of the publications retrieved from the aforementioned databases were screened. Subsequently, relevant articles were manually reviewed to identify other potentially eligible studies.

3. NCRT for EGJ and Gastric Cardia Cancers

3.1. NCRT versus Surgery Alone

Multimodal treatment has been advocated for locally advanced EGJ and esophageal cancer because of the poor survival rate afforded by radical surgery alone [24–26]. Specifically, NCRT or perioperative chemotherapy is recommended for EGJ adenocarcinoma [27]. EGJ adenocarcinoma can be further classified as esophageal or gastric cancer, with a distinct staging system for each type of cancer under a staging system slightly different from the TNM staging system. In general, EGJ tumors are staged as gastric cancer if they extend more than 2 cm to the proximal stomach; otherwise, they are staged as esophageal cancer [28,29]. Under the Siewert classification, which is widely applied to the classification of EGJ cancers, type I and type II/III tumors are more appropriately staged as esophageal and gastric cancer, respectively [30]. However, gastric cardia cancers are frequently included with EGJ adenocarcinoma in clinical studies, and their management is largely the same.

The superior survival benefits conferred by NCRT over surgery alone for locally advanced esophageal cancer and EGJ cancer were first demonstrated in an Irish clinical trial in which 113 patients with esophageal adenocarcinoma were randomly assigned to receive either NCRT or surgery alone. The 3 year overall survival (OS) rate achieved through NCRT was significantly higher than that achieved through surgery (32% vs. 6%, p = 0.01) [31]. In another trial, CALGB 9781, in which patients with esophageal adenocarcinoma constituted the majority, NCRT also resulted in more favorable survival over surgery alone (median OS, 4.48 vs. 1.79 years, p = 0.02) [32]. Moreover, in the phase III CROSS trial [33], NCRT was associated with a higher R0 resection rate (92% vs. 69%, p < 0.001) and OS (hazard ratio [HR] 0.65, 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.49–0.87) than surgery alone. The rate of major adverse events associated with NCRT was acceptable (6% leukopenia and 5% anorexia), and inhospital mortality did not differ between the two groups. Furthermore, the survival benefits afforded by NCRT persisted over 10 years in the long-term follow-up [34]. Although both squamous cell cancer and adenocarcinoma were considered in the trial, 75% of the patients had adenocarcinoma, and NCRT led to survival benefits in both types of cancer.

Other trials have reported negative results for NCRT. Aside from two studies that were underpowered due to the low number of cases [35,36], the FFCD 9901 trial, which included patients with stage I and II esophageal cancer, found that NCRT did not provide any survival benefits over surgery alone. Instead, it reported a significantly higher postoperative mortality rate of 11.1% of NCRT versus 3.4% of NCT (p = 0.049) [37]. These discrepant findings may be explained by between-study differences in patient characteristics; only 29.2% of the patients had adenocarcinoma, and most tumors were located at the middle-third of the esophagus. Although subgroup analysis for stage I and II tumors was not performed, the present study indicated that NCRT should be considered with caution for earlier stage disease. On the other hand, meta-analyses have consistently indicated that NCRT confers greater survival benefits than surgery alone for locally advanced esophageal and EGJ adenocarcinoma [38–40], and that these benefits may be more pronounced in younger patients (patients aged \leq 55 years) [39]. The clinical studies discussed thus far are summarized in Table 1.

Author	Trial Name	Patients	Group	Chemotherapy	Radiotherapy	R0 Resection of NCRT (%)	pCR of NCRT (%)	Survival Outcomes
Walsh et al., 1996 [31]		113 EGJ AC	NCRT vs. surgery	$PF \times 2$ 4-weekly	40 Gy, 2D/3D EBRT	92.9	25	3 year OS rate was higher under NCRT vs. surgery alone (32% vs. 6%, p = 0.01).
Tepper et al., 2008 [32]	CALGB- 9781	56 EC (75% EGJ AC)	NCRT vs. surgery	$PF \times 2$ monthly	50.4 Gy, EBRT	NA	40	Median OS was 4.48 years vs. 1.79 years, favoring NCRT (p = 0.002).
van Hagen et al., 2012 [33]	CROSS	366 EC (75% EGJ AC)	NCRT vs. surgery	$CP \times 5$ every week	41.4 Gy, 3D EBRT	92	29	Median OS was 49.4 months vs. 24.0 months, favoring NCRT (p = 0.003).
Urba et al., 2001 [35]		100 EC (75% EGJ AC)	NCRT vs. surgery	$PF \times 2$ + vinblastine	45 Gy, 3D EBRT	NA	28	Median OS was 17.6 months with surgery alone vs. 16.9 months with NCRT. ($p = 0.15$).
Burmeister et al., 2005 [36]		128 EC (62% EGJ AC)	NCRT vs. surgery	$PF \times 1$	35 Gy, 2D EBRT	80	NA	Similar OS (HR: 0.89, 95% CI: 0.67–1.19) and RFS (HR 0.82, 95% CI 0.61–1.10) were observed between NCRT and surgery.
Mariette et al., 2014 [37]	FFCD-9901	195 EC (28% EGJ AC) Stage I-II	NCRT vs. surgery	PF × 2 biweekly	45 Gy, 3D EBRT	93.8	33.3	NCRT had a similar 3 year OS rate (47.5% vs. 53.0%, p = 0.94) but a higher postoperative mortality rate (11.1% vs. 3.4%, $p = 0.049$).
Stahl et al., 2017 [19,41]	POET	126 Pts (EGJ AC/GCC)	NCRT vs. NCT	NCRT: Induction PLF × 2 then PE NCT: PLF × 2.5	30 Gy, 3D EBRT	69.5	15.6	NCRT had a similar 5 year OS rate (39.5% vs. 24.4%, <i>p</i> = 0.055) but higher local RFS (HR: 0.37, 95% CI 0.16–0.85) vs. NCT.
Reynold et al., 2021 [42]	Neo- AEGIS	377 Pts (EGJ or Esophageal AC)	NCRT vs. NCT	NCRT: CP × 5 every week NCT: FLOT	41.4 Gy 3D/4D EBRT	95	16	3 year OS rate was similar (56% with NCRT vs. 57% with NCT, HR: 1.02, 95% CI: 0.74–1.42, <i>p</i> -value was not available).
Tsai et al., 2020 [43]		5,371 GCC	NCRT vs. NCT	NA (US national database)	NA	91.4	NA	Multivariable analysis revealed similar OS (HR 0.95, 95% CI 0.86–1.05).
Klevebro et al., 2016 [18]		181 Pts (72% EGJ/28% Esophageal AC)	NCRT vs. NCT	NCRT: PF × 3 every 3 week NCT: PF × 3	40 Gy, 3D EBRT	87	28	3 year OS rate was similar (47% with NCRT vs. 49% with NCT, $p = 0.77$). RFS was 44% in both groups.

Table 1. Studies examining neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT) for esophagogastric junction

 (EGJ) cancer or gastric cardia cancer (GCC).

AC: adenocarcinoma; EC: esophageal cancer; pCR: pathological complete response; OS: overall survival; RFS: recurrence-free survival; PF: cisplatin plus fluorouracil; CP: carboplatin plus paclitaxel; EBRT: external beam radiation therapy; PLF: cisplatin, leucovorin, and fluorouracil; PE: cisplatin and etoposide; FLOT: fluorouracil plus leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval; US: United States; NCT: neoadjuvant chemotherapy; NA: not available.

3.2. NCRT versus NCT for EGJ and Gastric Cardia Cancers

Since the MAGIC trial reported that perioperative chemotherapy with ECF regimen (i.e., epirubicin, cisplatin, and fluorouracil) resulted in a significantly more favorable clinical response and significantly higher OS over surgery alone for distal esophageal and gastric cardia adenocarcinoma [10], researchers have devoted efforts to determining whether NCRT or NCT is more suitable for gastric cardia cancers. The German POET trial is the only randomized controlled Phase III trial designed for EGJ cancer that compares NCRT and NCT [19,41]. Patients undergoing NCRT had a higher rate of local recurrence-free survival (RFS; HR 0.37, 95% CI 0.16–0.85) as well as a higher rate of pCR (14.3% vs. 1.9%, p = 0.03) and a trend toward higher 5 year OS (39.5% vs. 24.4%, HR 0.65, 95% CI 0.42–1.01). Notably, the subgroup analysis suggested that patients with cardia cancers (Siewert type II) gained more benefits from NCRT relative to patients with Siewert type I cancers.

Conversely, the phase III NEO-AEGIS trial [42] and a Swedish trial [18] indicated that NCRT did not confer greater benefits in terms of OS and RFS than NCT, despite the association of NRT with higher pCR and R0 resection rates. Moreover, a meta-analysis suggested that NCRT is associated with higher postoperative mortality rates than is NCT (relative risk (RR) 1.58, 95% CI 1.00–2.49) [16]. In summary, evidence from locally advanced EGJ cancer indicates that NCRT is the modality of choice in terms of local control, although whether it affords greater survival benefits over NCT remains unclear. Until more evidence from clinical trials is presented, the implementation of NCRT in cases of gastric cardia cancer can be considered [19,42,43].

Recently, the results of the recent phase II/III FLOT4 trial [44] suggest a new standard for perioperative chemotherapy for EGJ cancers and LAGC. The perioperative FLOT regimen, which comprises fluorouracil plus leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel, provided superior OS (median, 50 vs. 35 months, HR: 0.77, 95% CI 0.63–0.94) relative to the ECF or ECX (i.e., epirubicin, cisplatin, and capecitabine) regimens. Although numerous patients may benefit from perioperative FLOT, whether it can be a substitute for NCRT remains unclear [44], and a clearer answer may emerge after the completion of the ESOPEC trial, which directly compares the perioperative FLOT and CROSS regimens.

4. NCRT for Locally Advanced, Resectable Noncardia Gastric Cancer

Based on the experience of and evidence from research on EGJ and cardia cancers, the main advantage of NCRT is that it achieves a higher rate of local control to enable subsequent curative surgery. Compared with its use in EGJ and cardia cancers, the use of NCRT for noncardia gastric cancer is less validated due to the lack of phase III randomized controlled trials. Evidence from mostly uncontrolled studies [13,45–52] indicates that NCRT led to R0 resection and pCR rates of approximately 70–80% and approximately 20–25%, respectively. A review of the performances of NCRT and other modalities is presented as follows.

4.1. NCRT versus Adjuvant Therapy for Resectable LAGC

A small trial found that NCRT afforded no clinical benefits over adjuvant chemoradiotherapy [53]. However, two recent studies with propensity score matching suggested that NCRT is preferred over adjuvant chemotherapy [54] or chemoradiotherapy [55]. In a Chinese cohort, NCRT was associated with a significantly higher pCR rate (17.0% vs. 4.0%, p = 0.001), RFS (HR, 0.63; 95% CI 0.43–0.92, p = 0.014), and local-recurrence-free survival rates (HR, 0.40; 95% CI 0.23–0.69, p = 0.0019) but a significantly higher proportion of grade 3/4 adverse events (52% vs. 34%, p = 0.01). The OS did not differ significantly between treatments (HR, 0.45; 95% CI 0.51–1.11, p = 0.15) [54]. In contrast, in a Korean cohort, NCRT was associated with significantly improved OS (HR 0.57, 95% CI 0.36–0.91, p = 0.020) and R0 resection rates (HR 0.50, 95% CI 0.27–0.90, p = 0.021) as well as lower grade 3/4 toxicity (10% vs. 54%, p < 0.001) than adjuvant chemoradiotherapy [55].

A recent randomized controlled trial examined adjuvant XELOX chemotherapy administered to 60 patients with LAGC and compared the outcomes of adjuvant XELOX chemotherapy with and without NCRT [56]. NCRT resulted in a significantly higher RFS rate (60.0% vs. 33.3%, p = 0.019) and a significantly lower local recurrence rate (11.5% vs. 36.7%, p = 0.039) for up to 3 years, without an increase in perioperative complications (23.1% vs. 30.0%, p = 0.560). No significant difference in OS was observed (63.3% vs. 50.0%, p = 0.215). These findings, which are summarized in Table 2, indicate that NCRT is more effective than adjuvant treatments in achieving and maintaining local control. To determine whether long-term OS can be improved under NCRT, further investigations are warranted.

Table 2. Studies examining neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT) for locally advanced gastric cancers (LAGC) in comparison with surgery alone or adjuvant therapies.

Author	Trial Name	Patients	Group	Chemotherapy	Radiotherapy	R0 Resection of NCRT (%)	pCR of NCRT (%)	Survival Outcomes
Ajani et al., 2006 [13]	RTOG- 9904	43 NCGC	NCRT	Induction PF × 1 then cisplatin + paclitaxel	45 Gy, 3D EBRT	77	26	Median OS was 23.2 months. R0 resection and pCR were associated with improved outcomes (<i>p</i> -value not shown).
Ajani et al., 2004 [45]		33 NCGC (all resectable)	NCRT	Induction PF \times 1 then fluorouracil	45 Gy, 2D EBRT	70	30	Median OS was 33.7 months.
Pepek et al., 2013 [47]		48 GC (73% proximal)	NCRT	Various	45 Gy, 3D EBRT	86	19	3 year OS and RFS rates were 50% and 41%, respectively.
Rostom et al., 2013 [48]		41 GC/EGJ AC (68% NCGC)	NCRT	Induction PF \times 2 then fluorouracil	45 Gy, 3D EBRT	70.7	24	3 year OS rate was 47.3%. R0 resection (p = 0.027) and pCR (p = 0.01) were associated with improved outcomes.
Trip et al., 2014 [49]		24 NCGC	NCRT	Carboplatin plus paclitaxel × 5	45 Gy, 3D IMRT	72	16	Median OS was 15 months.
Badgwell et al., 2015 [50]		192 (74% GC)	NCRT	NA	NA	93	20	5 year OS was 56% (median OS: 5.8 years).
Saedi et al., 2014 [53]		25 NCGC	NCRT vs. Surgery	$PF \times 1$ then Adjuvant ECX	45 Gy, 2D EBRT	NA	NA	5 year OS rates were similar (38.5% with NCRT vs. 16.7% with surgery, <i>p</i> = 0.169).
Kim et al., 2022 [55]		152 GC/EGJ AC (42% NCGC)	NCRT vs. ACRT	Various	50.4 Gy, IMRT	95	26	NCRT was independently associated with improved OS (HR: 0.57, 95% CI: 0.36-0.91).
Wang et al., 2021 [56]		60 NCGC	NCRT vs. ACT	XELOX \times 2	50.4 Gy, 3D EBRT	84.6	NA	3 year OS rates were similar (60% with NCRT vs. 50% with ACT, $p = 0.215$).

NCGC: noncardia gastric cancer; EGJ: esophagogastric junction; AC: adenocarcinoma; pCR: pathological complete response; OS: overall survival; RFS: recurrence-free survival; PF: cisplatin plus fluorouracil; EBRT: external beam radiation therapy; IMRT: intensity modulated radiation therapy; ECX: epirubicin, cisplatin, and capecitabin; XELOX: oxaliplatin plus capecitabine; NCT: neoadjuvant chemotherapy; ACT: adjuvant chemotherapy; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval.

4.2. NCRT versus NCT for Resectable LAGC

NCT has demonstrated survival benefits over upfront surgery [10,57], and this approach is embraced under current treatment guidelines [8]. Nonrandomized studies have compared NCRT and NCT (Table 3) [46,51,52,54,58,59]. In general, NCRT is more likely to achieve a pCR and enable R0 resection than is NCT. However, the advantage of more favorable local control does not confer OS benefits. Trumbull et al. [59] observed greater survival benefits in terms of pCR under NCT than under NCRT in patients with LAGC. Another study found that NCRT was beneficial in patients with initial lymph node metastasis, as indicated by the association of a complete nodal response with significantly improved survival. Martin-Romano et al. reported that compared with patients receiving NCT, patients receiving NCRT had a higher likelihood of achieving a better local response (Becker Ia-b response, 58 vs. 32%, p = 0.001), exhibiting a grade D nodal regression (30% vs. 6%, p = 0.009), and attaining a favorable pathological response (23% vs. 3%; p = 0.019). However,

Trial pCR of **R0** Resection Patients Group Radiotherapy Survival Outcomes Author Chemotherapy NCRT (%) of NCRT (%) Name OS was similar An et al. 87.8 74 NCGC NCRT vs 45 Gy mode between NCRT and 201 Má Roma 201 Zhar 201 Wan 202 Alle 202 Trumb 202 Barz 202 Leor 201

> ıl; SOX: S-1 and oxaliplatin; EBRT: external beam radiation therapy; IMRT: intensity modulated radiation therapy; NCT: neoadjuvant chemotherapy; PCT: perioperative chemotherapy; ECF: epirubicin, cisplatin, and 5-fluorouracil; HR: hazard ratio; US: United States; CI: confidence interval.

> Reasons explaining why more favorable disease control does not necessarily translate to longer survival include insufficient follow-up durations, differences in chemotherapeutics, selection bias ascribable to a retrospective design, and potential toxicity attributable to radiotherapy. Furthermore, whether the NCRT outcomes vary with the location of the tumor remains unclear. A study based on the US National Cancer Database found that NCRT resulted in less favorable outcomes than perioperative chemotherapy (HR 1.10, 95% CI 1.00–1.20) in proximal gastric cancer. Corresponding data for distal gastric cancer are lacking [60]. Notably, NCRT remains recommended as an alternative to NCT in the guidelines of the US National Comprehensive Cancer Network. At least two large randomized controlled trials (i.e., TOPGEAR and CRITICS-II) evaluating the feasibility of NCRT for resectable LAGC are ongoing [20,61].

no between-group difference in survival in patients with no cancerous lymph nodes at baseline was detected [51].

Table 3. Studies examining neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT) for locally advanced gastric cancer (LAGC).

74 NCGC (all resected)	NCRT vs. NCT	Various	45 Gy, mode not shown	87.8 (combined)	NA	between NCRT and NCT (<i>p</i> -value not shown).
80 NCGC	NCRT vs. NCT	NA	45 Gy, 3D EBRT	95.3	23.3	Median OS was similar (71 months with NCRT vs. 51 months with NCR, $p = 0.24$).
126 GC	NCRT vs. NCT	NCRT: NA NCT: docetaxel and S-1	NA	89.7	15.5	3 year OS rates were similar (46.6% vs. 37.0%, <i>p</i> -value not shown).
2779 GC	NC(R)T vs. ACT	NCRT: SOX × 2-4 NCT/ACT: various	45 Gy, IMRT	86	17	NCRT was associated with longer OS relative to ACT (52 months vs. 26 months, p < 0.001). OS results for NCRT/NCT were similar.
440 GC	NCRT vs. NCT	Induction: various, then fluorouracil for NCRT	45 Gy, IMRT	NA	27.7	Median OS was borderline longer with NCRT (122.1 vs. 70.7 months, p = 0.21).
413 GC	NCRT vs. NCT	NA (US national database)	NA	NA	100%	Only patients with PCR were enrolled. NCRT had worse 5 year OS rates relative to NCT (60% vs. 94% , p < 0.001).
35,882 GC	NCRT vs. NCT vs. others	NA (US national database)	NA	NA	NA	For proximal GC, NCRT was inferior to PCT (HR: 1.1, 95% CI: 1.00–1.20). No data were reported for distal GC with NCRT.
NR 120 GC	NCRT vs. PCT	NCRT: ECF induction, then fluorouracil PCT: ECF × 3	45 Gy, IMRT	NA	NA	An interim analysis indicated that 90% and 85% of patients receiving PCT and NCRT, respectively, proceeded to surgery. Grade 3+ toxicity was 22% in both groups.
	(all resected) 80 NCGC 126 GC 2779 GC 440 GC 413 GC 35,882 GC	(all resected)NCT80 NCGCNCRT vs. NCT126 GCNCRT vs. NCT2779 GCNC(R)T vs. ACT440 GCNCRT vs. NCT413 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. others	(all resected)NCTVarious80 NCGCNCRT vs. NCTNA126 GCNCRT vs. NCTNCRT: NA NCT: docetaxel and S-12779 GCNC(R)T vs. ACTNCRT: SOX × 2-4 NCT/ACT: various440 GCNCRT vs. NCTInduction: various, then fluorouracil for NCRT413 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs.NA (US national database)35,882 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. othersNA (US national database)AR120 GCNCRT vs. PCTNCRT: ECF induction, then fluorouracil	(all resected)NCTVariousnot shown80 NCGCNCRT vs. NCTNA45 Gy, 3D EBRT126 GCNCRT vs. NCTNCRT: NA NCT: docetaxel and S-1NA2779 GCNC(R)T vs. ACTNCRT: SOX × 2-4 NCT/ACT: various45 Gy, IMRT440 GCNCRT vs. NCTInduction: various, then fluorouracil for NCRT45 Gy, IMRT413 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs. NCT stational database)NA35,882 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. othersNA (US national database)NA420 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. OthersNA (US national database)NA	(all resected)NCTVariousnot shown(combined)80 NCGCNCRT vs. NCTNA $\frac{45}{3D}$ Gy. GO EBRT95.3126 GCNCRT vs. NCTNCRT: NA NCTNA89.72779 GCNC(R)T vs. ACTNCRT: SOX × 2-4 NCT/ACT: variousNA89.7440 GCNCRT vs. NCTInduction: various, then fluorouracil for NCRT45 Gy. IMRTNA413 GCNCRT vs. NCTNA (US national database)NANA35,882 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs. othersNA (US national database)NANAR120 GCNCRT vs. RCTNA (US national database)NANA	(all resected)NCTVariousnot shown(combined)NA80 NCGCNCRT vs. NCTNA $\frac{45}{3D}$ EBRT95.323.3126 GCNCRT vs. NCTNCRT: NA NCTNA89.715.52779 GCNC(R)T vs. ACTNCRT: NCTNA89.715.52779 GCNC(R)T vs. ACTNCRT: NCT/ACT: various45 Gy, IMRT8617440 GCNCRT vs. NCTInduction: various, then fluorouracil for NCRT45 Gy, IMRTNA27.7413 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. NCT vs.NA (US national database)NANA100%35,882 GCNCRT vs. NCT vs. PCTNA (US national database)NANANANR120 GCNCRT vs. NCRT vs. PCTNCRT: ECF induction; then fluorouracil MRT45 Gy, MRTNANA

4.3. NCRT versus NCT for Unresectable LAGC

Less uncertainty surrounds the optimal approach for unresectable LAGC. In general, treatment should be administered to improve survival rates and quality of life and to palliate symptoms. For medically fit patients, systemic therapies are frequently recommended. Among various modalities, NCRT has been reported to result in a wide-ranging response rate (33–83%, Table 4) [62–66], and under the exclusion of metastatic disease, a clinical complete response was observed in 23–36% of patients [63,64]. In a phase II study including 29 patients, the initial NCRT response rate was 55%, and no clinical complete response was achieved. However, R0 resection was attained in 10 patients undergoing subsequent surgical resection, and pCR was achieved in 4 of those individuals [62].

Table 4. Studies examining neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy (NCRT) for unresectable gastric cancer (GC).

Author	Trial Name	Patients	Group	Chemotherapy	Radiotherapy	R0 Resection of NCRT (%)	pCR of NCRT (%)	Survival Outcomes
Saikawa et al., 2008 [62]		30 GC	NCRT	S-1 with low dose cisplatin	40 Gy, 2D EBRT	100 (33.3% received surgery)	13	Median OS was 25 (range: 10–50) months.
Liu et al., 2017 [63]		36 GC	NCRT	Modified DCF before and after RT; docetaxel with RT	50.4 Gy, IMRT	NA	NA	Median survival time was 25.8 months (95% CI: 7.1–44.5 months).
Taki et al., 2017 [64]		21 GC	NCRT	Various	50 Gy, 3D EBRT	NA	NA	Clinical complete response rate was 16.6%, and the mean OS was 19.8 (range: 3–51) months.
Yeh et al., 2020 [65]		65 GC (46% NCRT)	NCRT vs. NCT	mFOLFOX-4	45-50 Gy, 3D EBRT and IMRT	36.7	NA	NCRT had higher median OS (14 vs. 10 months, p = 0.011) and RFS (9 vs. 8 months, $p = 0.008$) relative to NCT.
Li et al., 2018 [66]		4795 GC	NCRT vs. NCT	NA (US national database)	45 Gy (median)	NA	NA	Multivariable analysis and propensity score matching revealed that NCRT was associated with improved OS (HR: 0.82, 95% CI: 0.77–0.89) relative to NCT.

GC: gastric cancer; pCR: pathological complete response; OS: overall survival; RFS: recurrence-free survival; RT: radiation therapy; EBRT: external beam radiation therapy; IMRT: intensity modulated radiation therapy; NCT: neoadjuvant chemotherapy; PCT: perioperative chemotherapy; DCF: doxorubicin, cisplatin, and 5-fluorouracil; FOLFOX: fluorouracil, leucovorin, and oxaliplatin; US: United States; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval.

An observational study was conducted to compare NCRT and NCT in unresectable and metastatic LAGC. Compared with NCT, NCRT resulted in significantly longer OS (median 14 months vs. 10 months, p = 0.011) and RFS (median 9 months vs. 8 months, p = 0.008). The occurrence of grade 3/4 toxicity did not differ significantly between the two groups [65]. A recent retrospective study determined that in patients with LAGC, compared with NCT, neoadjuvant chemotherapy was associated with a more favorable pathologic response, with no increase in serious postoperative complications [67]. Furthermore, an investigation based on the US National Cancer Database found that in cases of in unresectable LAGC, NCRT was associated with higher survival rates relative to chemotherapy alone. Only 30.8% of patients received NCRT in that study, suggesting the potential underutilization of this modality [66].

Taken together, the evidence indicates that NCRT is a viable option for patients with unresectable LAGC with favorable performance status. However, further randomized controlled trials are warranted to explore the optimal approach to treating this patient population.

5. Selection of Chemotherapy Regimen of NCRT for LAGC

The optimal chemotherapy regimen for NCRT has yet to established. The primary regimen used in clinical trials is doublet chemotherapy; the types of doublet chemotherapy

include cisplatin plus 5-fluorouracil [32], capecitabine plus oxaliplatin [68], and the CROSS regimen, which comprises low-dose carboplatin plus paclitaxel [33] and is recommended by the latest NCCN guidelines [8]. Although a direct comparison of the aforementioned treatments has yet to be conducted, the CROSS regimen is suggested by various experts because of its ease of administration (single weekly dose) and favorable safe profile, especially for mucositis. Furthermore, a recent network meta-analysis of esophageal cancer also suggested that the CROSS regimen is preferred over a 5-fluorouracil-based regimen [69]. In addition, whether induction chemotherapy followed by chemoradiation can improve the efficacy of NCRT remains unclear [58,70], and this topic may be further clarified by the ongoing CRITICS-II trial [61].

6. Toxicity, Therapeutical Considerations, and Biomarkers of NCRT

NCRT is generally considered well tolerated, and overall complication rates have been noted to be comparable to those of NCT [46,65,67,71] and surgery alone [71–73]. However, a study based on a US national database suggested that NCRT is associated with significantly higher 30 day postoperative mortality rates (2.91% vs. 1.68% and 0.04%, p < 0.001) and significantly higher 90 day postoperative mortality rates (7.09% vs. 4.63% and 0.39%, p < 0.001) than perioperative chemotherapy or adjuvant chemoradiotherapy. In that study, NCRT was primarily administered to patients with proximal LAGC. This finding may partly explain why NCRT did not produce significant survival benefits despite providing more favorable local disease control in other studies [46,51,52,54,58,59]. However, this supposition necessitates validation through further large-scale clinical trials. In addition, Fujitani et al. suggested that an age of >60 years (RR: 11.3, 95% CI: 2.50–50.6) and a body mass index of \geq 26 (RR: 4.08, 95% CI: 1.08–15.4) are significant risk factors for postoperative complications in patients who underwent NCRT following induction chemotherapy [74].

Radiotherapy, which is a crucial component of NCRT, has evolved as a medical treatment [75]. In clinical practice, radiotherapy is administered on the basis of tumor location and node metastasis status. For proximal gastric cancer, the field must cover the splenic hilum and paraesophageal lymph nodes; as for distal gastric cancer, coverage should encompass the porta hepatis, the distal superior mesenteric artery, and the duode-nal stump [76]. The use of radiotherapy was evaluated because the earlier INT0116 trial suggested successful local control and a potential survival benefit with adjuvant chemoradiotherapy compared with surgery alone, even when old parallel-opposed anterior and posterior field arrangements were implemented [77]. Subsequently, a study demonstrated that the newer three-dimensional confocal radiotherapy can be safely administered with the more effective ECF chemotherapy regimen [78], and it has become the backbone of the TOPGEAR trial [20]. Notably, the role of adjuvant chemoradiotherapy has decreased because of its lack of advantages versus perioperative chemotherapy [21,79], and ongoing studies are focusing on the role of NCRT.

Modern radiotherapy includes dynamic planning techniques (e.g., image-guided radiotherapy, adaptive radiotherapy [80], and four-dimensional computed tomography [81]) because of the mobility of the stomach. Furthermore, intensity-modulated radiotherapy (IMRT) may reduce extra-organ damage to healthy tissues adjacent to the treatment site better than conventional three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy [82,83]. The combination of newer planning and therapeutic modalities can minimize the radiation dose and associated toxicity. Adaptive radiotherapy, which uses deformation models to adapt to individual gastric shapes, has been validated, and a population-based model is available [84]. The progress achieved can improve the safety and effectiveness of the treatment in a personalized manner.

Several biomarkers have been associated with the outcomes of NCRT-treated LAGC, including overexpressed ERCC1 and ERCC2 [4], LAG-3 [85], microRNAs (miRs) 338-3p and miR-142-3p [86], T-cell density, and 5-fluorouracil-related enzymes [87,88]. Before these biomarkers are applied to clinical practice, further validation of these findings is required. Notably, the presence of signet ring cell carcinoma and a higher histologic grade may be

associated with chemoradiation resistance and poorer prognosis [89]. Shared decision making and participation in clinical trials should thus be considered for such patients whenever possible.

7. Conclusions and Future Perspectives

NCRT is a feasible treatment option for LAGC, with the ability to achieve favorable disease control and enable higher radical resection rates over those afforded by perioperative chemotherapy or surgery alone. Large clinical trials examining the comparative efficacy of NCRT and NCT are underway. The discrepancy between the satisfactory pCR rates associated with NCRT and the nonsignificant association between NCRT and survival warrants further exploration. Furthermore, newer therapies such as immunotherapy and adaptive radiotherapy may be implemented in conjunction with NCRT, and the development of useful biomarkers may ultimately lead to the development of personalized treatments for LAGC. These research directions may lead to the discovery of the optimal approach to administering NCRT to patients with LAGC. They may also aid in the determination of the optimal candidates for undergoing NCRT.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, J.-H.Y. and J.-Y.W.; Methodology, H.-L.T.; Validation, C.-W.H. and T.-K.C.; Formal Analysis and Investigation, Y.-S.Y. and W.-C.S.; Data Curation, J.-H.Y. and H.-L.T.; Writing—Original Draft Preparation, J.-H.Y.; Writing—Review and Editing, Y.-S.Y. and J.-Y.W.; Supervision, J.-Y.W.; Funding Acquisition, J.-Y.W. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This work was supported by grants through funding from the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST 109-2314-B-037-035, MOST 109-2314-B-037-040, MOST 109-2314-B-037-046-MY3, MOST110-2314-B-037-097) and the Ministry of Health and Welfare (MOHW109-TDU-B-212-134026, MOHW109-TDU-B-212-114006, MOHW110-TDU-B-212-1140026) and funded by the Health and Welfare Surcharge of on Tobacco Products, and the Kaohsiung Medical University Hospital (KMUH110-0R37, KMUH110-0R38, KMUH110-0M34, KMUH110-0M35, KMUH110-0M36, KMUHSA11013, KMUH-DK(C)110010, KMUH-DK(B)110004-3) and KMU Center for Cancer Research (KMU-TC111A04-1) and KMU Office for Industry-Academic Collaboration (S109036), Kaohsiung Medical University. This work was also supported by E-DA hospital (EDAHP111012).

Data Availability Statement: All data were directly extracted or appropriately calculated based on the cited articles.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declared no potential conflict of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Appendix A

Steps	Terms and Strategy					
#1	Gastric cancer					
#2	Stomach cancer					
#3	Gastroesophageal cancer					
#4	Esophagogastric junction cancer					
#5	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4					
#6	neoadjuvant chemotherapy					
#7	neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy					
#8	#6 OR #7					
#9	#5 AND #8					
#10	Filtered by "English articles"					

Table A1. The search strategy by *advanced search* on PubMed and other databases.

References

- 1. Bray, F.; Ferlay, J.; Soerjomataram, I.; Siegel, R.L.; Torre, L.A.; Jemal, A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J. Clin.* **2018**, *68*, 394–424. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Sitarz, R.; Skierucha, M.; Mielko, J.; Offerhaus, G.J.A.; Maciejewski, R.; Polkowski, W.P. Gastric cancer: Epidemiology, prevention, classification, and treatment. *Cancer Manag. Res.* 2018, 10, 239–248. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Torre, L.A.; Siegel, R.L.; Ward, E.M.; Jemal, A. Global Cancer Incidence and Mortality Rates and Trends—An Update. *Cancer Epidemiol. Biomark. Prev.* 2016, 25, 16–27. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Yeh, Y.S.; Chen, Y.T.; Tsai, H.L.; Huang, C.W.; Ma, C.J.; Su, W.C.; Huang, C.M.; Huang, M.Y.; Hu, H.M.; Lu, C.Y.; et al. Predictive Value of ERCC1, ERCC2, and XRCC Expression for Patients with Locally Advanced or Metastatic Gastric Cancer Treated with Neoadjuvant mFOLFOX-4 Chemotherapy. *Pathol. Oncol. Res. POR* 2020, 26, 1105–1116. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 5. Ricci, A.D.; Rizzo, A.; Rojas Llimpe, F.L.; Di Fabio, F.; De Biase, D.; Rihawi, K. Novel HER2-Directed Treatments in Advanced Gastric Carcinoma: AnotHER Paradigm Shift? *Cancers* 2021, *13*, 1664. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Rihawi, K.; Ricci, A.D.; Rizzo, A.; Brocchi, S.; Marasco, G.; Pastore, L.V.; Llimpe, F.L.R.; Golfieri, R.; Renzulli, M. Tumor-Associated Macrophages and Inflammatory Microenvironment in Gastric Cancer: Novel Translational Implications. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2021, 22, 3805. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Rizzo, A.; Mollica, V.; Ricci, A.D.; Maggio, I.; Massucci, M.; Rojas Limpe, F.L.; Fabio, F.D.; Ardizzoni, A. Third- and later-line treatment in advanced or metastatic gastric cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Future Oncol.* 2020, *16*, 4409–4418. [CrossRef]
- Ajani, J.A.; D'Amico, T.A.; Bentrem, D.J.; Chao, J.; Cooke, D.; Corvera, C.; Das, P.; Enzinger, P.C.; Enzler, T.; Fanta, P.; et al. Gastric Cancer, Version 2.2022, NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology. J. Natl. Compr. Cancer Netw. 2022, 20, 167–192. [CrossRef]
- 9. Sah, B.K.; Zhang, B.; Zhang, H.; Li, J.; Yuan, F.; Ma, T.; Shi, M.; Xu, W.; Zhu, Z.; Liu, W.; et al. Neoadjuvant FLOT versus SOX phase II randomized clinical trial for patients with locally advanced gastric cancer. *Nat. Commun.* **2020**, *11*, 6093. [CrossRef]
- Cunningham, D.; Allum, W.H.; Stenning, S.P.; Thompson, J.N.; Van de Velde, C.J.; Nicolson, M.; Scarffe, J.H.; Lofts, F.J.; Falk, S.J.; Iveson, T.J.; et al. Perioperative chemotherapy versus surgery alone for resectable gastroesophageal cancer. N. Engl. J. Med. 2006, 355, 11–20. [CrossRef]
- Kang, Y.K.; Yook, J.H.; Park, Y.K.; Lee, J.S.; Kim, Y.W.; Kim, J.Y.; Ryu, M.H.; Rha, S.Y.; Chung, I.J.; Kim, I.H.; et al. PRODIGY: A Phase III Study of Neoadjuvant Docetaxel, Oxaliplatin, and S-1 Plus Surgery and Adjuvant S-1 Versus Surgery and Adjuvant S-1 for Resectable Advanced Gastric Cancer. J. Clin. Oncol. 2021, 39, 2903–2913. [CrossRef]
- 12. Wu, F.; Hong, J.; Du, N.; Wang, Y.; Chen, J.; He, Y.; Chen, P. Long-Term Outcomes of Neoadjuvant Chemotherapy in Locally Advanced Gastric Cancer/Esophagogastric Junction Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Anti-Cancer Agents Med. Chem.* **2022**, *22*, 143–151. [CrossRef]
- Ajani, J.A.; Winter, K.; Okawara, G.S.; Donohue, J.H.; Pisters, P.W.; Crane, C.H.; Greskovich, J.F.; Anne, P.R.; Bradley, J.D.; Willett, C.; et al. Phase II trial of preoperative chemoradiation in patients with localized gastric adenocarcinoma (RTOG 9904): Quality of combined modality therapy and pathologic response. J. Clin. Oncol. 2006, 24, 3953–3958. [CrossRef]
- 14. Yoshikawa, T.; Sasako, M.; Yamamoto, S.; Sano, T.; Imamura, H.; Fujitani, K.; Oshita, H.; Ito, S.; Kawashima, Y.; Fukushima, N. Phase II study of neoadjuvant chemotherapy and extended surgery for locally advanced gastric cancer. *Br. J. Surg.* 2009, *96*, 1015–1022. [CrossRef]
- 15. Li, Y.; Chen, J.; He, Q.; Ji, X.; Wang, X.; Fan, C.; Li, G. Clinical efficacy of neoadjuvant chemotherapy regimens FLEEOX vs. XELOX in patients with initially unresectable advanced gastric cancer: A propensity score analysis. *Oncotarget* **2017**, *8*, 86886–86896. [CrossRef]
- 16. Chan, K.K.W.; Saluja, R.; Delos Santos, K.; Lien, K.; Shah, K.; Cramarossa, G.; Zhu, X.; Wong, R.K.S. Neoadjuvant treatments for locally advanced, resectable esophageal cancer: A network meta-analysis. *Int. J. Cancer* **2018**, *143*, 430–437. [CrossRef]
- Burmeister, B.H.; Thomas, J.M.; Burmeister, E.A.; Walpole, E.T.; Harvey, J.A.; Thomson, D.B.; Barbour, A.P.; Gotley, D.C.; Smithers, B.M. Is concurrent radiation therapy required in patients receiving preoperative chemotherapy for adenocarcinoma of the oesophagus? A randomised phase II trial. *Eur. J. Cancer* 2011, *47*, 354–360. [CrossRef]
- Klevebro, F.; Alexandersson von Döbeln, G.; Wang, N.; Johnsen, G.; Jacobsen, A.B.; Friesland, S.; Hatlevoll, I.; Glenjen, N.I.; Lind, P.; Tsai, J.A.; et al. A randomized clinical trial of neoadjuvant chemotherapy versus neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for cancer of the oesophagus or gastro-oesophageal junction. *Ann. Oncol. Off. J. Eur. Soc. Med. Oncol.* 2016, 27, 660–667. [CrossRef]
- 19. Stahl, M.; Walz, M.K.; Riera-Knorrenschild, J.; Stuschke, M.; Sandermann, A.; Bitzer, M.; Wilke, H.; Budach, W. Preoperative chemotherapy versus chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced adenocarcinomas of the oesophagogastric junction (POET): Long-term results of a controlled randomised trial. *Eur. J. Cancer* **2017**, *81*, 183–190. [CrossRef]
- Leong, T.; Smithers, B.M.; Haustermans, K.; Michael, M.; Gebski, V.; Miller, D.; Zalcberg, J.; Boussioutas, A.; Findlay, M.; O'Connell, R.L.; et al. TOPGEAR: A Randomized, Phase III Trial of Perioperative ECF Chemotherapy with or Without Preoperative Chemoradiation for Resectable Gastric Cancer: Interim Results from an International, Intergroup Trial of the AGITG, TROG, EORTC and CCTG. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 2017, 24, 2252–2258. [CrossRef]
- Cats, A.; Jansen, E.P.M.; van Grieken, N.C.T.; Sikorska, K.; Lind, P.; Nordsmark, M.; Meershoek-Klein Kranenbarg, E.; Boot, H.; Trip, A.K.; Swellengrebel, H.A.M.; et al. Chemotherapy versus chemoradiotherapy after surgery and preoperative chemotherapy for resectable gastric cancer (CRITICS): An international, open-label, randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2018, 19, 616–628. [CrossRef]

- Liu, X.; Jin, J.; Cai, H.; Huang, H.; Zhao, G.; Zhou, Y.; Wu, J.; Du, C.; Long, Z.; Fang, Y.; et al. Study protocol of a randomized phase III trial of comparing preoperative chemoradiation with preoperative chemotherapy in patients with locally advanced gastric cancer or esophagogastric junction adenocarcinoma: PREACT. *BMC Cancer* 2019, *19*, 606. [CrossRef]
- Skoropad, V.Y.; Afanasyev, S.G.; Gamayunov, S.V.; Silantyev, N.K.; Agababyan, T.A.; Sokolov, P.V.; Ivanov, S.A.; Kaprin, A.D. Phase 2 multicenter randomized clinical trial: Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy followed by D2 gastrectomy and adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with locally advanced gastric cancer. *Sib. J. Oncol.* 2020, *19*, 5–14. [CrossRef]
- 24. Hagen, J.A.; DeMeester, S.R.; Peters, J.H.; Chandrasoma, P.; DeMeester, T.R. Curative resection for esophageal adenocarcinoma: Analysis of 100 en bloc esophagectomies. *Ann. Surg.* **2001**, *234*, 520–530; discussion 530–521. [CrossRef]
- 25. Portale, G.; Hagen, J.A.; Peters, J.H.; Chan, L.S.; DeMeester, S.R.; Gandamihardja, T.A.; DeMeester, T.R. Modern 5-year survival of resectable esophageal adenocarcinoma: Single institution experience with 263 patients. *J. Am. Coll. Surg.* 2006, 202, 588–596; discussion 596–588. [CrossRef]
- Altorki, N.; Kent, M.; Ferrara, C.; Port, J. Three-field lymph node dissection for squamous cell and adenocarcinoma of the esophagus. *Ann. Surg.* 2002, 236, 177–183. [CrossRef]
- Shah, M.A.; Kennedy, E.B.; Catenacci, D.V.; Deighton, D.C.; Goodman, K.A.; Malhotra, N.K.; Willett, C.; Stiles, B.; Sharma, P.; Tang, L.; et al. Treatment of Locally Advanced Esophageal Carcinoma: ASCO Guideline. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2020, 38, 2677–2694. [CrossRef]
- Warneke, V.S.; Behrens, H.M.; Hartmann, J.T.; Held, H.; Becker, T.; Schwarz, N.T.; Röcken, C. Cohort study based on the seventh edition of the TNM classification for gastric cancer: Proposal of a new staging system. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2011, 29, 2364–2371. [CrossRef]
- Amin, M.B.; Greene, F.L.; Edge, S.B.; Compton, C.C.; Gershenwald, J.E.; Brookland, R.K.; Meyer, L.; Gress, D.M.; Byrd, D.R.; Winchester, D.P. The Eighth Edition AJCC Cancer Staging Manual: Continuing to build a bridge from a population-based to a more "personalized" approach to cancer staging. *CA Cancer J. Clin.* 2017, 67, 93–99. [CrossRef]
- Hasegawa, S.; Yoshikawa, T.; Aoyama, T.; Hayashi, T.; Yamada, T.; Tsuchida, K.; Cho, H.; Oshima, T.; Yukawa, N.; Rino, Y.; et al. Esophagus or stomach? The seventh TNM classification for Siewert type II/III junctional adenocarcinoma. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 2013, 20, 773–779. [CrossRef]
- Walsh, T.N.; Noonan, N.; Hollywood, D.; Kelly, A.; Keeling, N.; Hennessy, T.P. A comparison of multimodal therapy and surgery for esophageal adenocarcinoma. N. Engl. J. Med. 1996, 335, 462–467. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Tepper, J.; Krasna, M.J.; Niedzwiecki, D.; Hollis, D.; Reed, C.E.; Goldberg, R.; Kiel, K.; Willett, C.; Sugarbaker, D.; Mayer, R. Phase III trial of trimodality therapy with cisplatin, fluorouracil, radiotherapy, and surgery compared with surgery alone for esophageal cancer: CALGB 9781. J. Clin. Oncol. 2008, 26, 1086–1092. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- van Hagen, P.; Hulshof, M.C.C.M.; van Lanschot, J.J.B.; Steyerberg, E.W.; Henegouwen, M.I.v.B.; Wijnhoven, B.P.L.; Richel, D.J.; Nieuwenhuijzen, G.A.P.; Hospers, G.A.P.; Bonenkamp, J.J.; et al. Preoperative Chemoradiotherapy for Esophageal or Junctional Cancer. N. Engl. J. Med. 2012, 366, 2074–2084. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 34. Eyck, B.M.; van Lanschot, J.J.B.; Hulshof, M.; van der Wilk, B.J.; Shapiro, J.; van Hagen, P.; van Berge Henegouwen, M.I.; Wijnhoven, B.P.L.; van Laarhoven, H.W.M.; Nieuwenhuijzen, G.A.P.; et al. Ten-Year Outcome of Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy Plus Surgery for Esophageal Cancer: The Randomized Controlled CROSS Trial. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2021, *39*, 1995–2004. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Urba, S.G.; Orringer, M.B.; Turrisi, A.; Iannettoni, M.; Forastiere, A.; Strawderman, M. Randomized trial of preoperative chemoradiation versus surgery alone in patients with locoregional esophageal carcinoma. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2001, 19, 305–313. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 36. Burmeister, B.H.; Smithers, B.M.; Gebski, V.; Fitzgerald, L.; Simes, R.J.; Devitt, P.; Ackland, S.; Gotley, D.C.; Joseph, D.; Millar, J.; et al. Surgery alone versus chemoradiotherapy followed by surgery for resectable cancer of the oesophagus: A randomised controlled phase III trial. *Lancet Oncol.* **2005**, *6*, 659–668. [CrossRef]
- Mariette, C.; Dahan, L.; Mornex, F.; Maillard, E.; Thomas, P.A.; Meunier, B.; Boige, V.; Pezet, D.; Robb, W.B.; Le Brun-Ly, V.; et al. Surgery alone versus chemoradiotherapy followed by surgery for stage I and II esophageal cancer: Final analysis of randomized controlled phase III trial FFCD 9901. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2014, *32*, 2416–2422. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Sjoquist, K.M.; Burmeister, B.H.; Smithers, B.M.; Zalcberg, J.R.; Simes, R.J.; Barbour, A.; Gebski, V. Survival after neoadjuvant chemotherapy or chemoradiotherapy for resectable oesophageal carcinoma: An updated meta-analysis. *Lancet Oncol.* 2011, 12, 681–692. [CrossRef]
- Ronellenfitsch, U.; Schwarzbach, M.; Hofheinz, R.; Kienle, P.; Kieser, M.; Slanger, T.E.; Jensen, K. Perioperative chemo(radio)therapy versus primary surgery for resectable adenocarcinoma of the stomach, gastroesophageal junction, and lower esophagus. *Cochrane Database Syst. Rev.* 2013, Cd008107. [CrossRef]
- Pasquali, S.; Yim, G.; Vohra, R.S.; Mocellin, S.; Nyanhongo, D.; Marriott, P.; Geh, J.I.; Griffiths, E.A. Survival After Neoadjuvant and Adjuvant Treatments Compared to Surgery Alone for Resectable Esophageal Carcinoma: A Network Meta-analysis. *Ann. Surg.* 2017, 265, 481–491. [CrossRef]
- Stahl, M.; Walz, M.K.; Stuschke, M.; Lehmann, N.; Meyer, H.J.; Riera-Knorrenschild, J.; Langer, P.; Engenhart-Cabillic, R.; Bitzer, M.; Königsrainer, A.; et al. Phase III comparison of preoperative chemotherapy compared with chemoradiotherapy in patients with locally advanced adenocarcinoma of the esophagogastric junction. J. Clin. Oncol. 2009, 27, 851–856. [CrossRef]

- Reynolds, J.V.; Preston, S.R.; O'Neill, B.; Lowery, M.A.; Baeksgaard, L.; Crosby, T.; Cunningham, M.; Cuffe, S.; Griffiths, G.O.; Roy, R.; et al. Neo-AEGIS (Neoadjuvant trial in Adenocarcinoma of the Esophagus and Esophago-Gastric Junction International Study): Preliminary results of phase III RCT of CROSS versus perioperative chemotherapy (Modified MAGIC or FLOT protocol). (NCT01726452). J. Clin. Oncol. 2021, 39, 4004. [CrossRef]
- 43. Tsai, C.; Mueller, A.; Maubach, J.; Warschkow, R.; Nussbaum, D.P.; Schmied, B.M.; Blazer, D.; Gloor, B.; Worni, M. No Difference in Survival between Neo-Adjuvant Chemotherapy and Neo-Adjuvant Chemoradiation Therapy in Gastric Cardia Cancer Patients: A Contemporary View from the National Cancer Database. *Dig. Surg.* 2020, *37*, 249–257. [CrossRef]
- 44. Al-Batran, S.-E.; Homann, N.; Pauligk, C.; Goetze, T.O.; Meiler, J.; Kasper, S.; Kopp, H.-G.; Mayer, F.; Haag, G.M.; Luley, K.; et al. Perioperative chemotherapy with fluorouracil plus leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and docetaxel versus fluorouracil or capecitabine plus cisplatin and epirubicin for locally advanced, resectable gastric or gastro-oesophageal junction adenocarcinoma (FLOT4): A randomised, phase 2/3 trial. *Lancet* 2019, 393, 1948–1957. [CrossRef]
- Ajani, J.A.; Mansfield, P.F.; Janjan, N.; Morris, J.; Pisters, P.W.; Lynch, P.M.; Feig, B.; Myerson, R.; Nivers, R.; Cohen, D.S.; et al. Multi-institutional trial of preoperative chemoradiotherapy in patients with potentially resectable gastric carcinoma. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2004, 22, 2774–2780. [CrossRef]
- An, J.Y.; Kim, H.I.; Cheong, J.H.; Hyung, W.J.; Kim, C.B.; Noh, S.H. Pathologic and oncologic outcomes in locally advanced gastric cancer with neoadjuvant chemotherapy or chemoradiotherapy. *Yonsei Med. J.* 2013, 54, 888–894. [CrossRef]
- 47. Pepek, J.M.; Chino, J.P.; Willett, C.G.; Palta, M.; Blazer Iii, D.G.; Tyler, D.S.; Uronis, H.E.; Czito, B.G. Preoperative chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced gastric cancer. *Radiat. Oncol.* **2013**, *8*, 6. [CrossRef]
- Rostom, Y.; Zaghloul, H.; Khedr, G.; El-Shazly, W.; Abd-Allah, D. Docetaxel-based preoperative chemoradiation in localized gastric cancer: Impact of pathological complete response on patient outcome. J. Gastrointest. Cancer 2013, 44, 162–169. [CrossRef]
- Trip, A.K.; Poppema, B.J.; van Berge Henegouwen, M.I.; Siemerink, E.; Beukema, J.C.; Verheij, M.; Plukker, J.T.; Richel, D.J.; Hulshof, M.C.; van Sandick, J.W.; et al. Preoperative chemoradiotherapy in locally advanced gastric cancer, a phase I/II feasibility and efficacy study. *Radiother. Oncol. J. Eur. Soc. Ther. Radiol. Oncol.* 2014, 112, 284–288. [CrossRef]
- Badgwell, B.; Blum, M.; Estrella, J.; Chiang, Y.J.; Das, P.; Matamoros, A.; Fournier, K.; Mansfield, P.; Ajani, J. Predictors of Survival in Patients with Resectable Gastric Cancer Treated with Preoperative Chemoradiation Therapy and Gastrectomy. J. Am. Coll. Surg. 2015, 221, 83–90. [CrossRef]
- 51. Martin-Romano, P.; Sola, J.J.; Diaz-Gonzalez, J.A.; Chopitea, A.; Iragorri, Y.; Martínez-Regueira, F.; Ponz-Sarvise, M.; Arbea, L.; Subtil, J.C.; Cano, D.; et al. Role of histological regression grade after two neoadjuvant approaches with or without radiotherapy in locally advanced gastric cancer. *Br. J. Cancer* 2016, 115, 655–663. [CrossRef]
- 52. Zhang, X.T.; Zhang, Z.; Liu, L.; Xin, Y.N.; Xuan, S.Y. Comparative study of different neoadjuvant therapy regimen in locally advanced gastric cancer. *Chin. J. Cancer Prev. Treat.* **2016**, *23*, 739–743.
- 53. Saedi, H.S.; Mansour-Ghanaei, F.; Joukar, F.; Shafaghi, A.; Shahidsales, S.; Atrkar-Roushan, Z. Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy in non-cardia gastric cancer patients–does it improve survival? *Asian Pac. J. Cancer Prev. APJCP* **2014**, *15*, 8667–8671. [CrossRef]
- Wang, T.; Chen, Y.; Zhao, L.; Zhou, H.; Wu, C.; Zhang, X.; Zhou, A.; Jin, J.; Zhao, D. The Effect of Neoadjuvant Therapies for Patients with Locally Advanced Gastric Cancer: A Propensity Score Matching Study. J. Cancer 2021, 12, 379–386. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 55. Kim, D.W.; Lee, G.; Hong, T.S.; Li, G.; Horick, N.K.; Roeland, E.; Keane, F.K.; Eyler, C.; Drapek, L.C.; Ryan, D.P.; et al. Neoadjuvant versus Postoperative Chemoradiotherapy is Associated with Improved Survival for Patients with Resectable Gastric and Gastroesophageal Cancer. Ann. Surg. Oncol. 2022, 29, 242–252. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Wang, F.; Qu, A.; Sun, Y.; Zhang, J.; Wei, B.; Cui, Y.; Liu, X.; Tian, W.; Li, Y. Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy plus postoperative adjuvant XELOX chemotherapy versus postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy with XELOX regimen for local advanced gastric cancer-A randomized, controlled study. *Br. J. Radiol.* 2021, 94, 1124. [CrossRef]
- 57. Xiong, B.H.; Cheng, Y.; Ma, L.; Zhang, C.Q. An updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trial assessing the effect of neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced gastric cancer. *Cancer Investig.* **2014**, *32*, 272–284. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- 58. Allen, C.J.; Blumenthaler, A.N.; Smith, G.L.; Das, P.; Minsky, B.D.; Blum, M.; Ajani, J.; Mansfield, P.F.; Ikoma, N.; Badgwell, B.D. Chemotherapy Versus Chemotherapy Plus Chemoradiation as Preoperative Therapy for Resectable Gastric Adenocarcinoma: A Propensity Score-Matched Analysis of a Large, Single-Institution Experience. Ann. Surg. Oncol. 2021, 28, 758–765. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Trumbull, D.A.; Lemini, R.; Díaz Vico, T.; Jorgensen, M.S.; Attwood, K.; Ji, W.; Brady, M.; Gabriel, E.; Kukar, M. Prognostic Significance of Complete Pathologic Response Obtained with Chemotherapy Versus Chemoradiotherapy in Gastric Cancer. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 2021, *28*, 766–773. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Barzi, A.; Yang, D.; Kim, A.W.; Shah, M.A.; Sadeghi, S. Comparative effectiveness of treatment modalities in non-metastatic gastric adenocarcinoma: A propensity score matching analysis of the National Cancer Database. *BMJ Open Gastroenterol.* 2020, 7, e000483. [CrossRef]
- 61. Slagter, A.E.; Jansen, E.P.M.; van Laarhoven, H.W.M.; van Sandick, J.W.; van Grieken, N.C.T.; Sikorska, K.; Cats, A.; Muller-Timmermans, P.; Hulshof, M.C.C.M.; Boot, H.; et al. CRITICS-II: A multicentre randomised phase II trial of neo-adjuvant chemotherapy followed by surgery versus neo-adjuvant chemotherapy and subsequent chemoradiotherapy followed by surgery versus neo-adjuvant chemotherapy in resectable gastric cancer. *BMC Cancer* **2018**, *18*, 877. [CrossRef]

- Saikawa, Y.; Kubota, T.; Kumagai, K.; Nakamura, R.; Kumai, K.; Shigematsu, N.; Kubo, A.; Kitajima, M.; Kitagawa, Y. Phase II study of chemoradiotherapy with S-1 and low-dose cisplatin for inoperable advanced gastric cancer. *Int. J. Radiat. Oncol. Biol. Phys.* 2008, 71, 173–179. [CrossRef]
- Liu, Y.; Zhao, G.; Xu, Y.; He, X.; Li, X.; Chen, H.; Wu, Q.; Yao, S.; Yan, G.; Chen, T. Multicenter phase 2 study of peri-irradiation chemotherapy plus intensity modulated radiation therapy with concurrent weekly docetaxel for inoperable or medically unresectable nonmetastatic gastric cancer. *Int. J. Radiat. Oncol. Biol. Phys.* 2017, *98*, 1096–1105. [CrossRef]
- 64. Taki, T.; Hoya, Y.; Watanabe, A.; Nakayoshi, T.; Okamoto, T.; Sekine, H.; Mitsumori, N.; Yanaga, K. Usefulness of chemoradiotherapy for inoperable gastric cancer. *Ann. R. Coll. Surg. Engl.* **2017**, *99*, 332–336. [CrossRef]
- Yeh, Y.S.; Huang, M.Y.; Ma, C.J.; Huang, C.W.; Tsai, H.L.; Chen, Y.C.; Li, C.C.; Yu, F.J.; Shih, H.Y.; Wang, J.Y. Observational Study Comparing Efficacy and Safety between Neoadjuvant Concurrent Chemoradiotherapy and Chemotherapy for Patients with Unresectable Locally Advanced or Metastatic Gastric Cancer. J. Oncol. 2020, 2020, 6931317. [CrossRef]
- 66. Li, R.; Hou, W.-H.; Chao, J.; Woo, Y.; Glaser, S.; Amini, A.; Nelson, R.A.; Chen, Y.-J. Chemoradiation improves survival compared with chemotherapy alone in unresected nonmetastatic gastric cancer. J. Natl. Compr. Cancer Netw. **2018**, 16, 950–958. [CrossRef]
- Li, C.C.; Yeh, Y.S.; Chen, Y.C.; Su, W.C.; Chang, T.K.; Tsai, H.L.; Huang, C.W.; Ma, C.J.; Yin, T.C.; Chen, P.J.; et al. Surgical Efficacy and Safety of Patients with Locally Advanced Gastric Cancer following Neoadjuvant Concurrent Chemoradiotherapy and Chemotherapy. J. Oncol. 2022, 2022, 3719241. [CrossRef]
- Javle, M.M.; Yang, G.; Nwogu, C.E.; Wilding, G.E.; O'Malley, L.; Vinjamaram, S.; Schiff, M.D.; Nava, H.R.; LeVea, C.; Clark, K.R.; et al. Capecitabine, oxaliplatin and radiotherapy: A phase IB neoadjuvant study for esophageal cancer with gene expression analysis. *Cancer Investig.* 2009, 27, 193–200. [CrossRef]
- 69. Huang, T.C.; Hsu, C.H.; Lin, C.C.; Tu, Y.K. Systematic review and network meta-analysis: Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for locoregional esophageal cancer. *Jpn. J. Clin. Oncol.* **2015**, *45*, 1023–1028. [CrossRef]
- Mizrak Kaya, D.; Nogueras González, G.M.; Harada, K.; Blum Murphy, M.A.; Lee, J.H.; Bhutani, M.S.; Weston, B.; Thomas, I.; Rogers, J.E.; Das, P.; et al. Efficacy of Three-Drug Induction Chemotherapy Followed by Preoperative Chemoradiation in Patients with Localized Gastric Adenocarcinoma. *Oncology* 2020, *98*, 542–548. [CrossRef]
- Badgwell, B.; Ajani, J.; Blum, M.; Ho, L.; Fournier, K.; Chiang, Y.J.; Matamoros, A.; Das, P.; Mansfield, P. Postoperative Morbidity and Mortality Rates are Not Increased for Patients with Gastric and Gastroesophageal Cancer Who Undergo Preoperative Chemoradiation Therapy. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 2016, 23, 156–162. [CrossRef]
- Haskins, I.N.; Kroh, M.D.; Amdur, R.L.; Ponksy, J.L.; Rodriguez, J.H.; Vaziri, K. The Effect of Neoadjuvant Chemoradiation on Anastomotic Leak and Additional 30-Day Morbidity and Mortality in Patients Undergoing Total Gastrectomy for Gastric Cancer. J. Gastrointest. Surg. Off. J. Soc. Surg. Aliment. Tract 2017, 21, 1577–1583. [CrossRef]
- 73. Ychou, M.; Boige, V.; Pignon, J.P.; Conroy, T.; Bouché, O.; Lebreton, G.; Ducourtieux, M.; Bedenne, L.; Fabre, J.M.; Saint-Aubert, B.; et al. Perioperative chemotherapy compared with surgery alone for resectable gastroesophageal adenocarcinoma: An FNCLCC and FFCD multicenter phase III trial. J. Clin. Oncol. 2011, 29, 1715–1721. [CrossRef]
- 74. Fujitani, K.; Ajani, J.A.; Crane, C.H.; Feig, B.W.; Pisters, P.W.; Janjan, N.; Walsh, G.L.; Swisher, S.G.; Vaporciyan, A.A.; Rice, D.; et al. Impact of induction chemotherapy and preoperative chemoradiotherapy on operative morbidity and mortality in patients with locoregional adenocarcinoma of the stomach or gastroesophageal junction. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* 2007, 14, 2010–2017. [CrossRef]
- 75. Ng, S.P.; Leong, T. Role of Radiation Therapy in Gastric Cancer. Ann. Surg. Oncol. 2021, 28, 4151–4157. [CrossRef]
- Shinde, A.; Novak, J.; Amini, A.; Chen, Y.J. The evolving role of radiation therapy for resectable and unresectable gastric cancer. *Transl. Gastroenterol. Hepatol.* 2019, 4, 64. [CrossRef]
- 77. Macdonald, J.S.; Smalley, S.R.; Benedetti, J.; Hundahl, S.A.; Estes, N.C.; Stemmermann, G.N.; Haller, D.G.; Ajani, J.A.; Gunderson, L.L.; Jessup, J.M.; et al. Chemoradiotherapy after Surgery Compared with Surgery Alone for Adenocarcinoma of the Stomach or Gastroesophageal Junction. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2001, 345, 725–730. [CrossRef]
- Leong, T.; Joon, D.L.; Willis, D.; Jayamoham, J.; Spry, N.; Harvey, J.; Di Iulio, J.; Milner, A.; Mann, G.B.; Michael, M. Adjuvant chemoradiation for gastric cancer using epirubicin, cisplatin, and 5-fluorouracil before and after three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy with concurrent infusional 5-fluorouracil: A multicenter study of the Trans-Tasman Radiation Oncology Group. *Int. J. Radiat. Oncol. Biol. Phys.* 2011, 79, 690–695. [CrossRef]
- 79. Lordick, F.; Nilsson, M.; Leong, T. Adjuvant radiotherapy for gastric cancer-end of the road? *Ann. Oncol. Off. J. Eur. Soc. Med. Oncol.* 2021, 32, 287–289. [CrossRef]
- Henke, L.E.; Contreras, J.; Green, O.; Cai, B.; Kim, H.; Roach, M.; Olsen, J.; Fischer-Valuck, B.; Mullen, D.; Kashani, R. Magnetic resonance image-guided radiotherapy (MRIgRT): A 4.5-year clinical experience. *Clin. Oncol.* 2018, 30, 720–727. [CrossRef]
- Peng, J.; Gong, J.; Wang, X.; Mou, J.; Xu, H.; Dai, J.; Zhou, F.; Zhou, Y. 4-Dimensional computed tomography analysis of clinical target volume displacement in adjuvant radiation of patients with gastric cancer and its implication on radiotherapy. *Oncol. Lett.* 2019, 17, 3641–3648. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Hawrylewicz, L.; Leszczyński, W.; Namysł-Kaletka, A.; Bronclik, I.; Wydmański, J. Protection of organs at risk during neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy for gastric cancer based on a comparison between conformal and intensity-modulated radiation therapy. *Oncol. Lett.* 2016, 12, 692–698. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
- Moningi, S.; Ajani, J.A.; Badgwell, B.D.; Murphy, M.B.; Ikoma, N.; Mansfield, P.F.; Ho, J.C.; Suh, Y.; Crane, C.; Herman, J.M.; et al. IMRT Reduces Acute Toxicity in Patients Treated with Preoperative Chemoradiation for Gastric Cancer. *Adv. Radiat. Oncol.* 2020, 5, 369–376. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

- 84. Bleeker, M.; Hulshof, M.C.C.M.; Bel, A.; Sonke, J.-J.; van der Horst, A. Gastric deformation models for adaptive radiotherapy: Personalized vs population-based strategy. *Radiother. Oncol.* **2022**, *166*, 126–132. [CrossRef]
- Siesing, C.; Svensson, M.C.; Hedner, C.; Nodin, B.; Borg, D.; Jirstrom, K. Prognostic significance of lymphocyte-activation gene-3 expression in chemoradiotherapy-naïve esophageal and gastric adenocarcinoma. *Ann. Oncol.* 2018, 29, viii220. [CrossRef]
- Liu, X.; Cai, H.; Sheng, W.; Huang, H.; Long, Z.; Wang, Y. microRNAs expression profile related with response to preoperative radiochemotherapy in patients with locally advanced gastric cancer. *BMC Cancer* 2018, 18, 1048. [CrossRef]
- Hashiguchi, K.; Kitajima, Y.; Kai, K.; Hiraki, M.; Nakamura, J.; Tokunaga, O.; Noshiro, H.; Miyazaki, K. A quantitative evaluation of the determinant proteins for S-1 responsiveness in a biopsy specimen assists in patient selection to neoadjuvant therapy in cases of advanced gastric cancer. *Int. J. Oncol.* 2010, *37*, 257–264. [CrossRef]
- Huang, D.; Yang, Y.; Zhang, S.; Su, Z.; Peng, T.; Wang, X.; Zhao, Y.; Li, S. Regulatory T-cell density and cytotoxic T lymphocyte density are associated with complete response to neoadjuvant paclitaxel and carboplatin chemoradiotherapy in gastric cancer. *Exp. Ther. Med.* 2018, *16*, 3813–3820. [CrossRef]
- Charalampakis, N.; Nogueras González, G.M.; Elimova, E.; Wadhwa, R.; Shiozaki, H.; Shimodaira, Y.; Blum, M.A.; Rogers, J.E.; Harada, K.; Matamoros, A., Jr.; et al. The Proportion of Signet Ring Cell Component in Patients with Localized Gastric Adenocarcinoma Correlates with the Degree of Response to Pre-Operative Chemoradiation. *Oncology* 2016, *90*, 239–247. [CrossRef]