



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Cervical esophageal cancer: a gap in cancer knowledge*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/108780/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Hoeben, A, Polak, J, Van De Voorde, L et al. (3 more authors) (2016) Cervical esophageal cancer: a gap in cancer knowledge. *Annals of Oncology*, 27 (9). pp. 1664-1674. ISSN 0923-7534

<https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdw183>

© The Authors 2016. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the European Society for Medical Oncology. This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in *Annals of Oncology* following peer review. The version of record Hoeben, A, Polak, J, Van De Voorde, L et al. (2016) Cervical esophageal cancer: a gap in cancer knowledge. *Annals of Oncology*, 27 (9). pp. 1664-1674. ISSN 0923-7534 is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdw183>.

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Cervical esophageal cancer: a gap in cancer knowledge

A. Hoeben¹, J. Polak¹, L. Van De Voorde², F. Hoebbers², H.I. Grabsch³, J. de Vos-Geelen¹

¹Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Medical Oncology, GROW School for Oncology and Developmental Biology, Maastricht University Medical Center, Maastricht, The Netherlands

²Department of Radiation Oncology (MAASTRO Clinic), GROW School for Oncology and Developmental Biology, Maastricht University Medical Center, Maastricht, The Netherlands

³Department of Pathology, GROW School for Oncology and Developmental Biology, Maastricht University Medical Center, Maastricht, The Netherlands

Address for correspondence: Mrs. Judith de Vos-Geelen, Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Medical Oncology, Maastricht University Medical Center, P. Debyelaan 25, Maastricht, 6202 AZ, The Netherlands, + 31 43 3877025,
judith.de.vos@mumc.nl

Abstract

Background: The aim of this systematic review is to provide an overview of the diagnosis, treatment options and treatment related complications of cervical esophageal carcinoma (CEC) and subsequently provide recommendations to improve quality of care.

Design: Studies were identified in PubMed, EMBASE and Web of Science. A total of 107 publications fulfilled the inclusion criteria and were included.

Results: CEC is uncommon, accounting for 2-10% of all esophageal carcinomas. These tumors are often locally advanced at presentation and have a poor prognosis, with a 5-year overall survival (OS) of 30%. Tobacco and alcohol consumption seem to be the major risk factors for developing CEC. Surgery is usually not possible due to the very close relationship to other organs such as the larynx, trachea and thyroid gland.

Therefore, the current standard of care is definitive chemoradiation (dCRT) with curative intent. Treatment regimens used to treat CEC are adapted by established regimens in lower esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) and head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC). However, dCRT may be accompanied by severe side effects and complications. Several diagnostic and predictive markers have been studied, but currently there is no other biomarker than clinical stage to determine patient management.

Suggestions to improve patient outcomes are to determine the exact radiation dose needed for adequate locoregional control and to combine radiotherapy (RT) with optimal systemic therapy backbone.

Conclusion: CEC remains uncharted territory for many practising physicians and patient with CEC have a poor prognosis. In order to improve the outcome for CEC

patients, future studies should focus on identification of new diagnostic biomarkers or targets for radiosensitizers, amelioration of radiation schedules, optimal combination of chemotherapeutic agents and/or new therapeutic targets.

Key words: cervical esophageal cancer, chemoradiation, targeted therapy, toxicity, survival, review.

Key Message: "Cervical esophageal squamous cell carcinomas are rare and guidelines are inconclusive regarding treatment of these tumors. Taking survival data and toxicity profiles in consideration, the optimal treatment for cervical esophageal cancer patients is not yet defined."

Introduction

The cervical esophagus is the short part of the esophagus between the lower border of the cricoid cartilage and the thoracic inlet (suprasternal notch), approximately 18 cm from the incisor teeth [1]. Carcinoma of the cervical esophagus (CEC), usually squamous cell carcinoma (SCC), is uncommon, with 5 new cases per 1 million person years in the United States [2] and accounts for 2-10% of all esophageal carcinomas [3]. The highest rates of SCC are found in Eastern Asia and Southern Africa, the lowest rates in Western Africa and Central America [4]. Management of CEC differs from that of cancers of the lower two thirds of the esophagus, because CECs are often locally advanced at time of diagnosis infiltrating nearby anatomical structures including e.g. the cricoid, thyroid cartilage or thyroid gland. Moreover, patients with CEC often present with lymph node metastases [1]. Most CECs are not treatable by surgery, as this would involve mutilating resections including pharyngo-laryngo-esophagectomy (PLE). Therefore, definitive chemoradiation (dCRT) is the standard treatment modality recommended by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) and European Society for Medical Oncology (ESMO) guidelines [5, 6]. Definitive chemoradiation usually consists of 50.4 Gy in 1.8 Gy per fraction per day. Higher doses up to 60-66 Gy may be appropriate if no surgery is planned. Concurrent chemotherapy generally consists of cisplatin and 5-fluorouracil (5-FU), oxaliplatin and 5-FU or carboplatin and paclitaxel [5]. As CEC behaves very aggressive, as they grow in an area of abundant lymphatic drainage and fail to produce early symptoms, and easily and frequently extend towards the hypopharynx, these tumors are sometimes treated with schedules for locally advanced head and neck squamous cell carcinomas (LAHNSCC), which consists of 70

Gy in 35 fractions and cisplatin 100 mg/m² on day 1, 22 and 43 of radiotherapy (RT) (NCCN guidelines for head and neck cancers [7]). dCRT is related to life-threatening adverse events in 5 to 10% of patients [8, 9], thus, further research is needed to define the optimal treatment schedule with adequate survival and acceptable toxicity. In this literature review, we will provide an overview of the current knowledge and controversies surrounding CEC with respect to histopathology, genetic factors, etiology, diagnosis, treatment, toxicity and local disease control rate and survival and we will provide recommendations for future studies regarding potential curative treatment options, based on the current literature.

Methods

Literature search strategy

In May 2015, the PubMed, Web of Science and EMBASE databases were searched for relevant evidence. The literature search strategy is detailed in Supplementary Data section 1. The reference lists from included articles were also searched for additional relevant studies.

Study inclusion and exclusion criteria

Language was restricted to English. Articles published during the last three decades were selected. Studies were included if they comprised a minimum of five patients diagnosed with cancer in the cervical esophagus and treated with curative intent.

Studies were excluded if patients had distant metastasis and were treated with palliative intent. Studies published as abstracts only were excluded.

Literature search results

The initial search in the three databases yielded 639 articles. Based on reading the titles and abstracts, 488 articles were excluded. Using Endnote (Version X6, Thomson Reuters) and manual screening, 63 duplicate articles were excluded. Eighty-eight original articles and reviews were further screened. Thirty articles were excluded based on our predefined exclusion criteria leaving 58 full publications for inclusion in this review. During the manual search of the reference lists of the included articles, a further 49 relevant publications were identified resulting in 107 articles that formed the basis of this review (for details see flowchart in Figure S1).

Histopathology and genetic factors

SCC accounts for 95% of cervical esophageal malignancies [10]. Very little is known about SCC precursor lesions and genetic factors predisposing for CEC in particular. The malignant transformation to SCC involves basal cell hyperplasia, low- and high-grade dysplasia and invasive carcinoma. Squamous dysplasia is a well described histological precursor lesion of esophageal SCC [11-14]. Dysplasia is thought to be caused by molecular alterations [15]. Early detection of molecular alterations, endoscopic and histological features of squamous dysplasia is necessary to identify SCC at an early stage [16-19]. Modern endoscopy techniques, like micro-endoscopy, lugol staining and

the use of biomarkers have the potential to increase early detection [17-19].

Genetic alterations in CEC are currently poorly understood and to the best of our knowledge, there are no studies investigating only genetic alterations in carcinomas located in the cervical esophagus. Several genes have been shown to be down- or upregulated in (pre)malignant lesions of esophageal SCC [11, 20-29]. The most common genetic alterations consist of allelic losses at chromosomes 3p, 5q, 9p, 9q, 3q, 17p, 17q, 18q and mutations of p53, RB1 (retinoblastoma protein), ALDH2 (aldehyde dehydrogenase-2 gene), MTHFR (methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase gene), EGR1 (early growth response gene-1), CCND1 (cyclin D1) and cMYC [30-34]. Recent work by the Cancer Genome Atlas Initiative provides comprehensive molecular profiling data of squamous cancers of the oesophagus which may also facilitate future research for diagnostic and therapeutic molecular targets in CEC [35]. There is an urgent clinical need for further research in order to investigate the potential usefulness of genetic and protein alterations for early diagnosis of CEC.

Etiology and risk factors

Tobacco and alcohol consumption are well known risk factors for CEC [10, 15, 34, 36]. Mutations in ADH (alcohol-dehydrogenase) 1B and ALDH-2, both enzymes involved in alcohol metabolism have been related to the occurrence of neoplasia in the upper aerodigestive tract [10].

The variable geographic incidence of CEC with high-risk regions in Iran, Central Asia, Mongolia, Northern China and Eastern Cape South Africa suggests a potential influence of nutritional and environmental factors. The role of family history has not been clarified

yet [34, 37]. Occupational factors have been difficult to evaluate independently because esophageal carcinomas often occur in unqualified workers in industry and agriculture, who are often also frequent tobacco and/or alcohol consumers. High exposure to polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) has also been associated with a high risk of esophageal cancer [38].

Studies investigating the potential association between human papilloma virus (HPV) infection and CEC incidence have conflicting results. Geographical locations with a high incidence of esophageal SCC tend to also have a higher incidence of HPV infection in patients with esophageal SCC (more than 10% of esophageal SCC cases are related to HPV infection) [39-41]. The main strains involved in esophageal cancer appear to be HPV 16 and 18 [40].

Diagnosis and staging

Endoscopy and biopsy are the first choice of examination if a CEC is suspected. Recommendations regarding the minimum number of biopsies vary between countries, ranging from 1 upto 8 [42]. Endoscopic ultrasonography (EUS) is considered to be the best technique to assess depth of tumor infiltration and lymph node status and can be combined with fine needle aspiration cytology [3, 43, 44]. ¹⁸F-Fluorodeoxyglucose-Positron-Emission-Tomography-Computed-Tomography (¹⁸F-FDG-PET CT) is highly recommended to detect potential tumor invasion into adjacent structures and lymph node or distant metastases [44]. Bronchoscopy, with endobronchial ultrasound and biopsy can be used to assess infiltration in adjacent structures e.g. trachea [45].

Most CECs are locally advanced at time of diagnosis, with approximately 55% being

TNM stage III or IV tumors and 27% stage II tumors [1, 46-49]. An overview of the current TNM staging can be found in Supplementary Data section 2.

Treatment

Historically, surgery has been the standard treatment for CEC. Mostly, a pharyngo-laryngo-esophagectomy (PLE) was performed, a procedure which includes the resection of the larynx and has a huge impact on quality of life [50]. Nonetheless, during the last decades the outcome for patients who underwent surgery for CEC has improved due to newly developed surgical strategies, like minimally invasive surgery and the use of neoadjuvant (chemo)radiotherapy [51]. Furthermore, reconstruction methods like free jejunal graft, gastric pull-up or deltopectoral or pectoralis major myocutaneous flap have been introduced [50, 52-62]. Despite these efforts, surgical treatment still has a great risk of major complications and a high morbidity and mortality rate [57, 63-68].

In order to improve survival and quality of life, noninvasive treatment options like radiotherapy (RT) and dCRT have been explored. The Radiation Therapy Oncology Group (RTOG) compared dCRT versus RT alone for the treatment of patients with thoracic esophageal cancer and found that dCRT significantly increased 5-year overall survival (OS) compared to RT alone, 26% vs 0% [8]. Although this study only included patients with thoracic esophageal cancer, the study results form the basis of the current nonsurgical treatment of patients with esophageal cancer, including CEC. An update of the original RTOG 85-01 trial by Al-Sarraf et al. [69], reports higher survival rates of patients treated with dCRT compared to RT alone in the treatment of locally advanced esophageal cancer. Another study performed in patients with cervical and upper thoracic

esophageal cancer showed less favorable results than the RTOG study, reporting 5-year OS of 18.6% in patients treated with dCRT [70]. Other studies reported a 5-year OS of about 30% for CEC patients treated with dCRT [46, 71] which is comparable to OS after surgery alone (24% to 47%) [56, 58, 63, 66, 72-74]. In comparison to other SCCs in the head- and neck region, 5-year OS of patients with CEC is relatively low [10], while it is comparable to 5-year OS in patients with SCC located in other parts of the esophagus, which is about 26% [8].

dCRT may cause high rates of toxicity in CEC patients. Common toxic effects include dysphagia, dehydration, mucositis, esophagitis, dermatitis and fatigue. An additional side effect of chemotherapy is bone marrow suppression [8, 9, 47-49, 71, 75, 76]. Moreover, late toxic effects like strictures and fistulas may occur [48, 71, 77].

In the next paragraphs we will describe the currently available organ sparing treatment options for locally advanced CEC, which combine RT with chemotherapy.

Systemic therapy used within concurrent treatment regimens for CEC

Several chemotherapeutic regimens are used, adapted by established regimens in lower esophageal SCC and head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC). High-dose cisplatin-based chemotherapy, consisting of 100 mg/m² on day 1, 22 and 43 of RT, is currently considered one of the treatment options for patients with CEC based upon increased cure rates that were observed with high-dose cisplatin in patients with head and neck cancer [7, 46]. However, no difference was seen in OS, disease free survival (DFS) or locoregional recurrence free survival (LRFS) comparing CEC patients treated with high-dose cisplatin with a concurrent RT dose of 70 Gy versus low-dose cisplatin

combined with 5-FU or mitomycin C, concurrently administered with RT schedule of 54 Gy (Table 1) [46].

SCC of the lower esophagus are often treated with a combination of cisplatin and 5-FU [78], a key factor in the treatment of gastroesophageal cancer [79]. In CEC, the combination of cisplatin and 5-FU has shown acceptable cure and survival rates [9, 46-48, 71] (see Table 1), but combination therapy can lead to higher toxicity rates when compared to cisplatin alone. Bleiberg et al. [80] randomized patients with advanced esophageal SCC to either receive cisplatin (100 mg/m²) and continuous 5-FU (1,000 mg/m²/day) from days 1 to 5 or cisplatin alone (100 mg/m²) and found higher 2-year OS rates (18% and 9%, respectively), but also higher toxicity rates in the cisplatin/5-FU group (16% treatment related deaths in the cisplatin/5-FU group versus 0% in the cisplatin alone group).

Other chemotherapeutic regimens have been studied with comparable results [81, 82]. Conroy et al. [81] studied the role of FOLFOX regimen: 5-FU (bolus 400 mg/m², followed by infusional 5-FU 1600 mg/m² over 46h) plus leucovorin (200 mg/m²) and oxaliplatin (85 mg/m²) in patients with adeno-, squamous cell or adenosquamous carcinoma. They compared the FOLFOX regimen with standard cisplatin/5-FU and found more treatment related deaths in the cisplatin/5-FU group (4.5% in the cisplatin/5-FU group versus 0.7% in the FOLFOX group). 3-year OS was 19.9% (95% CI 10.8 - 31.0) in the FOLFOX group and 26.9% (95% CI 16.9 – 37.8) in the cisplatin/5-FU group. Ruppert et al. [82] identified carboplatin/paclitaxel-based chemotherapy, a regimen already used in SCC of the lower esophagus, as a useful alternative to the cisplatin-based regimen. Van Hagen et al. [83] studied the role of neoadjuvant carboplatin AUC 2

and paclitaxel 50 mg/m² for 5 weeks and concurrent RT (41.4 Gy in 23 fractions), followed by surgery in esophageal and esophagogastric junction SCC, adenocarcinoma and large-cell undifferentiated carcinoma and found a pathological complete response (pCR) in 49% of patients with SCC. There was only one treatment-related death among the patients (N = 171) that were treated with neoadjuvant chemoradiation, which indicates the great tolerance of this regimen. 3-year OS in this group was 58%, compared to 44% in the group that received surgery alone. Moreover, Blom et al. [84] found in patients treated with chemoradiation prior to surgery, that the combination of carboplatin/paclitaxel/41.4Gy had a lower percentage of treatment related deaths (1.1% versus 4.1%) and a comparable 3-year OS rate (57% versus 61%) compared to the cisplatin/5-FU/50.4Gy regimen. Hence, low-dose cisplatin, FOLFOX and carboplatin/paclitaxel (especially in combination with a low RT dose of 41.4 Gy) are useful alternatives to a high-dose cisplatin-based chemotherapy.

The role of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR), targeting therapy using cetuximab, an established radiosensitizer in HNSCC [7], seems to be not that prominent in CEC. Based on the results of the SCOPE1 trial, a multicenter phase II/III trial, randomizing 258 patients between standard dCRT and dCRT combined with cetuximab, the use of cetuximab cannot be recommended due to treatment limiting toxicity [85]. Likewise, the randomized phase III RTOG 0436 trial which compared OS between patients treated with dCRT with or without cetuximab [86], and the COG trial, in which esophageal cancer patients who had progressed under chemotherapy were randomly assigned to either gefitinib or placebo [87], did not find an improvement in OS when an anti-EGFR target was added. This is in contrast to the study by Lorenzen et al. [88] , which was

published before the SCOPE1 trial but only included 62 patients. They reported a 75% disease control rate in the group randomized to standard chemotherapy combined with cetuximab (CET-CF), compared to 57% in the group randomized to standard chemotherapy alone (CF). This study also found a difference in survival rates, with a median OS of 9.5 and 5.5 months for CET-CF and CF, respectively, and therefore concluded that the addition of cetuximab to standard chemotherapy might be a useful therapeutic approach in patients with advanced (metastatic) esophageal SCC. Recently, the subsequent phase III REAL3 trial had to be closed early due to a lack of efficacy [89]. These findings seem to indicate that the use of cetuximab is not recommended in patients with CEC.

Radiotherapy used within concurrent treatment regimens for CEC

The standard of care regarding dCRT for patients with esophageal cancer is 50.4 Gy with concurrent chemotherapy. In case of CEC, there exists some tendency to increase the radiation dose to 60-70 Gy to the primary tumor and approximately 40-45 Gy to elective lymph node regions, analogous to the treatment of LAHNSCC [90]. The randomized phase III INT-0123/RTOG 94-05 trial investigated the effect of dose escalation from 50.4 to 64.8 Gy of radiotherapy combined with chemotherapy in esophageal cancer from all anatomical locations [78]. There was no increase in survival or local/regional control for the high-dose arm. In CEC, there has been a tendency to use higher doses of radiation than the standard of 50.4 Gy, upto 66-70 Gy [9, 47, 48, 55, 91, 92]. From retrospective studies, there are some indications that higher dose of radiation might be associated with improved outcome in esophageal cancer; Zhang et al. [93] investigated local disease control and survival rates in patients with stage II-III

esophageal cancer either treated with high-dose RT (> 51 Gy) or with low-dose RT (< 51 Gy) and found a positive correlation between radiation dose and locoregional control rate and survival. Comparable results regarding the association between a higher radiation dose and survival were published by Sun et al. [94]. On the other hand, Huang et al. [46] concluded that when using conventionally fractionated RT (70 Gy) rather than hypofractionated RT (54 Gy), the addition of prophylactic nodal RT and a change to high-dose cisplatin chemotherapy did not result in improved outcome in CEC patients. Currently, the ARTDECO study, in which differences in local tumor control, survival and grade 3 and 4 toxicity are measured between patients with inoperable esophageal cancer treated with a total RT dose of 61.6 Gy in combination with carboplatin/paclitaxel and in patients with similar tumor characteristics treated with a total RT dose of 50.4 Gy with the same concurrent chemotherapy regimen, is ongoing [95].

Administering an adequate RT dose to the tumor is often challenging because of the close proximity of the cervical esophagus to vital structures like the spinal cord and lungs. Modern RT techniques, like intensity modulated radiation therapy (IMRT) and simultaneous integrated boost (SIB), in which the intensity of the radiation can be changed during treatment, enable a higher dose to the tumor and a reduced dose to adjacent structures. Studies suggest that these techniques may be useful in the treatment of CEC [75, 90, 96, 97]. Volume-modulated arc RT (VMAT), a rotational radiation treatment technique, allows to deliver a more conformal dose to the tumor and improved sparing of nearby organs at risk, providing an alternative CEC treatment option [98, 99].

No consensus has been reached so far regarding elective lymph node irradiation (ENI). According to some authors, the omission of ENI did not have a significant effect on the failure rate of non-irradiated lymph nodes and OS, but would delay cervical nodal progression [76, 100, 101], while others do recommended elective irradiation of neck and upper mediastinal lymph node stations [102-105]. Patients who have not been treated with ENI might need salvage treatment more frequently than patients treated with ENI. However, the latter group of patients might experience more frequently and more severe treatment-related toxicity, because of the larger radiation field [76, 106]. There are no guidelines recommending the treatment of paratracheal lymph nodes despite the fact that the lymphatic drainage of the cervical esophagus is primarily to the paratracheal nodes and 43% of CEC patients have paratracheal lymph node metastases [107, 108].

Local disease control rate and survival

The local disease control rate depends mainly on depth of tumour invasion, lymph node status and type of treatment [8, 46, 47, 49, 76, 82]. Locoregional recurrence rates in CEC patients treated with dCRT, range from 13.7% to 42% within 0 to 8.7 years [46, 76, 101] compared to 51% to 74.1% within 0 to 4 years in patients treated with RT alone [47, 100] and 15.6% to 48.6% within 0 to 15 years in surgically treated patients [53, 56, 63, 66].

Local failure is an important prognostic factor for survival. Uno et al. [49] found that after dCRT none of the patients with initial local failure as determined by endoscopic examination, survived more than 20 months compared to 2-year and 5-year survival

rates of 60% and 40%, respectively, in patients with initial local control. Local recurrences can be treated by salvage surgery, which potentially has a high morbidity rate, but is the only chance for relatively long-term survival [109]. Otherwise, palliative treatment options have to be considered.

Survival rates of patients with CEC remain poor, due to a delayed diagnosis, poor performance status of many patients, particular anatomic characteristics of the viscera associated with high malignancy potential, frequent occurrence of locoregional and distant metastases and 12% to 30% increased risk of synchronous or metachronous lesions [9, 46, 110]. Yamada et al. [47] found that performance status and tumor length (< 6 cm or > 6 cm) were factors that were significantly related to survival.

Discussion and recommendations

Cervical esophageal cancer (CEC) is a very rare disease and often locally advanced at time of diagnosis resulting in limited locoregional disease control and poor survival.

Dysplasia is a known precursor lesion of squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) [11-14] and can be diagnosed by endoscopic biopsy improving the detection of patients at high risk of malignant transformation. Detection of genetic changes could also be an effective manner of diagnosing early tumors, but unfortunately the molecular changes in cervical esophageal cancer (CEC) and its precursor lesions remain to be clarified.

Due to the presence of locally advanced disease at time of diagnosis and the cancer being close to vital structures like the larynx, upper airway and spinal cord, non-surgical management seems to be the current preferred therapeutic option. Our review suggests that the best results with respect to locoregional disease control and survival can be

achieved with definitive chemoradiation (dCRT), however, at the costs of higher incidence of toxicity compared to radiotherapy (RT) alone. Despite the introduction of dCRT, survival rates remain relatively low and patients require optimal clinical support to retain food intake and exercise in order to maintain good quality of life and to achieve best patient outcome [111].

Several different chemoradiation schedules and techniques have been investigated in the past, but no consensus has been reached regarding the optimal treatment for CEC patients. High-dose RT (60-70 Gy) and concurrent cisplatin, similar to the established treatment regimen in locally advanced head and neck SCC (HNSCC), could be an option, however there is no level I evidence to support this approach. Although thoracic esophageal SCCs defined by being localized caudal of the suprasternal notch, develop only few centimeters distal from cervical SCC, the commonly used dCRT schedule for thoracic esophageal SCCs consists of a lower radiation dose (50.4 Gy) combined with cisplatin/5-fluorouracil (5-FU), oxaliplatin/5-FU or carboplatin/paclitaxel regimen [6]. A possible rationale for the use of a lower radiation dose is the very close proximity of vital structures in the mediastinum and the lungs. In the CROSS study on preoperative chemoradiation, Van Hagen et al. [83] found a pathological complete response (pCR) of 49% after neoadjuvant chemoradiation (41.4 Gy and concurrent carboplatin/paclitaxel) in esophageal SCC of which 2% were located in the proximal third of the esophagus. The study by Blom et al [84] suggests this regimen is as effective as dCRT consisting of a RT dose of 50.4 Gy and cisplatin/5-FU, and has a more favourable toxicity profile [84]. Therefore, we could hypothesize that the currently used high radiation dose in CEC is potentially unnecessary as it does not seem to result in higher complete response (CR)

rates and outcome in SCC of the lower esophagus [78]. While the use of a high RT dose of 61.6 Gy concurrently with chemotherapy in patients with inoperable/irresectable esophageal cancer is currently studied in the ARTDECO study [95], it could also be of potential interest to study the effect of lower dose RT in CEC alone, which may be accompanied by lower toxicity rates.

However, high toxicity rates in CEC patients [8, 9] might not only be a result of a high radiation dose, but could also be an effect of a relatively large radiation field [106], especially when combined with concurrent chemotherapy. A reduction of toxicity rates may be expected by applying modern state-of-the-art radiation techniques like IMRT, lowering the dose to normal structures. However, the current literature is inconclusive; some studies propose that an irradiation volume covering the gross volume only is appropriate and accompanied with lower toxicity rates [76, 100], while others recommend consideration of ENI, especially in case of nodal stage N1 and higher [5, 101]. Given the reported incidence of metastases in surrounding lymph nodes (approximately 50% of all CECs), especially in the neck (levels II, III and the supraclavicular lymph nodes) and upper mediastinum [104, 107], we recommend that ENI of cervical, supraclavicular and paratracheal lymph nodes should be considered in CEC invading the hypopharynx. In more distally located CEC, which are located close to the suprasternal notch, ENI of mediastinal and paratracheal lymph nodes should be considered [105]. We anticipate that radiation techniques will improve in the near future enabling the discovery and use of newer techniques (e.g. dose painting, in which a non-uniform radiation dose distribution is applied to the target volume based on functional or molecular imaging), where only the radiation dose needed for adequate locoregional disease control is

applied, hopefully minimizing the rate of adverse events.

With respect to systemic therapy, a cisplatin-based schedule is currently often used, since this has shown to be effective in the treatment of HNSCC. Current guidelines are inconclusive regarding the most adequate chemotherapy treatment regimen and cisplatin/5-FU, oxaliplatin/5-FU or carboplatin/paclitaxel are equally recommended [5]. Since the combination of carboplatin and paclitaxel is proven to be effective with acceptable adverse event rates in the (neoadjuvant) treatment of lower esophageal SCC [82, 83], future studies might want to compare the combination of carboplatin/paclitaxel to current cisplatin-based schedules. When molecular profiles of CEC including driver oncogenes and potential therapeutic targets will become apparent, the use of targeted agents, e.g. as radiosensitizers, might become worthwhile to investigate in future clinical trials.

Furthermore, future research should focus on identifying a dCRT design with adequate survival and acceptable toxicity rates. It is of clinical interest to establish whether CECs are best treated with head and neck cancer protocols or regimens established in lower esophageal SCC. As patients with CECs treated according to the head and neck cancer protocol have a worse prognosis compared to patients with HNSCC [72, 74, 108], it could be interesting to study the potential underlying molecular differences between these two types SCCs.

Recommendations

- Future studies that focus on early detection of cervical esophageal carcinoma (CEC) precancerous conditions, molecular changes and on identification of biomarkers for detection of early disease or as targets for radiosensitizers would be desirable for the future. However, since CEC is rare in Western countries, it is improbable that screening will impact on this disease outside high-risk areas.
- Taking the survival data and toxicity profiles of the different dCRT regimens in consideration, the optimal treatment regimen for CEC patients is not yet defined.
- Future studies should focus on whether CEC is best treated according to a head and neck cancer or esophageal cancer protocol.
- We recommend that ENI of cervical, supraclavicular and paratracheal lymph nodes should be considered.
- Finally, one should be aware that patients will need optimal clinical support to retain food intake and exercise in order to optimise patient outcome and quality of life.

Conclusion

Cervical esophageal cancer remains uncharted territory for many practising physicians. Treatment of cancers at this site is often difficult because of the cervical location and most tumors are locally advanced with invasion of surrounding vital structures. To improve survival outcome and reduce morbidity and mortality rates, future studies should focus on earlier detection of these cancers and improving treatment design by investigating innovative radiation schedules and identifying the optimal backbone of systemic therapy.

Funding

No funding was received

Disclosure

The authors have dedated no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Grass, G.D., S.L. Cooper, K. Armeson et al., *Cervical esophageal cancer: A population-based study*. Head Neck, 2014.
2. Davies, L. and H.G. Welch, *Epidemiology of head and neck cancer in the United States*. Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg, 2006. **135**(3): p. 451-7.
3. Lee, D.J., A. Harris, A. Gillette et al., *Carcinoma of the cervical esophagus: diagnosis, management, and results*. South Med J, 1984. **77**(11): p. 1365-7.
4. Torre, L.A., F. Bray, R.L. Siegel et al., *Global cancer statistics, 2012*. CA Cancer J Clin, 2015. **65**(2): p. 87-108.
5. *National Comprehensive Cancer Network: Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines)*, in *Esophageal and Esophagogastric Junction Cancers*2015: NCCN.org.
6. *European Society for Medical Oncology: clinical practice guidelines*, in *Oesophageal cancer: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up*.2013: Annals of Oncology.
7. *National Comprehensive Cancer Network: Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology (NCCN Guidelines)*, in *Head and Neck Cancers*2015: NCCN.org.

8. Cooper, J.S., M.D. Guo, A. Herskovic et al., *Chemoradiotherapy of locally advanced esophageal cancer: long-term follow-up of a prospective randomized trial (RTOG 85-01)*. Radiation Therapy Oncology Group. JAMA, 1999. **281**(17): p. 1623-7.
9. Stuschke, M., M. Stahl, H. Wilke et al., *Induction chemotherapy followed by concurrent chemotherapy and high-dose radiotherapy for locally advanced squamous cell carcinoma of the cervical oesophagus*. Oncology, 1999. **57**(2): p. 99-105.
10. Popescu, C.R., S.V. Bertesteanu, D. Mirea et al., *The epidemiology of hypopharynx and cervical esophagus cancer*. J Med Life, 2010. **3**(4): p. 396-401.
11. Taylor, P.R., C.C. Abnet, and S.M. Dawsey, *Squamous dysplasia--the precursor lesion for esophageal squamous cell carcinoma*. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev, 2013. **22**(4): p. 540-52.
12. Lewin, K.J., *Malignant and premalignant lesions of the esophagus*. Keio J Med, 1992. **41**(3): p. 177-83.
13. Sugimachi, K., K. Sumiyoshi, T. Nozoe et al., *Carcinogenesis and histogenesis of esophageal carcinoma*. Cancer, 1995. **75**(6 Suppl): p. 1440-5.
14. Qiu, S.L. and G.R. Yang, *Precursor lesions of esophageal cancer in high-risk populations in Henan Province, China*. Cancer, 1988. **62**(3): p. 551-7.
15. Popescu, B., C.R. Popescu, R. Grigore et al., *Morphology and morphopathology of hypopharyngo-esophageal cancer*. Rom J Morphol Embryol, 2012. **53**(2): p. 243-8.
16. Dawsey, S.M., G.Q. Wang, W.M. Weinstein et al., *Squamous dysplasia and early esophageal cancer in the Linxian region of China: distinctive endoscopic lesions*. Gastroenterology, 1993. **105**(5): p. 1333-40.

17. Shin, D., M.A. Protano, A.D. Polydorides et al., *Quantitative analysis of high-resolution microendoscopic images for diagnosis of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma*. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2015. **13**(2): p. 272-279 e2.
18. Kaneko, K., A. Katagiri, K. Konishi et al., *Study of p53 gene alteration as a biomarker to evaluate the malignant risk of Lugol-unstained lesion with non-dysplasia in the oesophagus*. Br J Cancer, 2007. **96**(3): p. 492-8.
19. Carvalho, R., M. Areia, D. Brito et al., *Diagnostic accuracy of lugol chromoendoscopy in the oesophagus in patients with head and neck cancer*. Rev Esp Enferm Dig, 2013. **105**(2): p. 79-83.
20. Xue, L.Y., N. Hu, Y.M. Song et al., *Tissue microarray analysis reveals a tight correlation between protein expression pattern and progression of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma*. BMC Cancer, 2006. **6**: p. 296.
21. Wang, L.D., J.Y. Hong, S.L. Qiu et al., *Accumulation of p53 protein in human esophageal precancerous lesions: a possible early biomarker for carcinogenesis*. Cancer Res, 1993. **53**(8): p. 1783-7.
22. Zhou, Q., L. Dong Wang, F. Du et al., *Changes of TGFbeta1 and TGFbetaRII expression in esophageal precancerous and cancerous lesions: a study of a high-risk population in Henan, northern China*. Dis Esophagus, 2002. **15**(1): p. 74-9.
23. Yang, L., L.S. Wang, X.L. Chen et al., *Hedgehog signaling activation in the development of squamous cell carcinoma and adenocarcinoma of esophagus*. Int J Biochem Mol Biol, 2012. **3**(1): p. 46-57.

24. Bai, P., X. Xiao, J. Zou et al., *Expression of p14(ARF), p15(INK4b), p16(INK4a) and skp2 increases during esophageal squamous cell cancer progression*. *Exp Ther Med*, 2012. **3**(6): p. 1026-1032.
25. Chen, H., L.D. Wang, M. Guo et al., *Alterations of p53 and PCNA in cancer and adjacent tissues from concurrent carcinomas of the esophagus and gastric cardia in the same patient in Linzhou, a high incidence area for esophageal cancer in northern China*. *World J Gastroenterol*, 2003. **9**(1): p. 16-21.
26. Kimos, M.C., S. Wang, A. Borkowski et al., *Esophagin and proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA) are biomarkers of human esophageal neoplastic progression*. *Int J Cancer*, 2004. **111**(3): p. 415-7.
27. Roye, G.D., R.B. Myers, D. Brown et al., *CD44 expression in dysplastic epithelium and squamous-cell carcinoma of the esophagus*. *Int J Cancer*, 1996. **69**(4): p. 254-8.
28. Xia, M., M.Q. Zhao, K. Wu et al., *Investigations on the clinical significance of FOXP3 protein expression in cervical oesophageal cancer and the number of FOXP3+ tumour-infiltrating lymphocytes*. *J Int Med Res*, 2013. **41**(4): p. 1002-8.
29. Yang, Y.F., H. Li, X.Q. Xu et al., *An expression of squamous cell carcinoma antigen 2 in peripheral blood within the different stages of esophageal carcinogenesis*. *Dis Esophagus*, 2008. **21**(5): p. 395-401.
30. Wu, M.Y., Y.R. Liang, X.Y. Wu, and C.X. Zhuang, *Relationship between Egr-1 gene expression and apoptosis in esophageal carcinoma and precancerous lesions*. *World J Gastroenterol*, 2002. **8**(6): p. 971-5.

31. Li, Q.D., H. Li, M.S. Wang et al., *Multi-susceptibility genes associated with the risk of the development stages of esophageal squamous cell cancer in Feicheng County*. BMC Gastroenterol, 2011. **11**: p. 74.
32. Yasuda, M., H. Kuwano, M. Watanabe et al., *p53 expression in squamous dysplasia associated with carcinoma of the oesophagus: evidence for field carcinogenesis*. Br J Cancer, 2000. **83**(8): p. 1033-8.
33. Montesano, R., M. Hollstein, and P. Hainaut, *Genetic alterations in esophageal cancer and their relevance to etiology and pathogenesis: a review*. Int J Cancer, 1996. **69**(3): p. 225-35.
34. Morita, M., H. Saeki, M. Mori et al., *Risk factors for esophageal cancer and the multiple occurrence of carcinoma in the upper aerodigestive tract*. Surgery, 2002. **131**(1 Suppl): p. S1-6.
35. Zhan, C., L. Yan, L. Wang et al., *Landscape of expression profiles in esophageal carcinoma by The Cancer Genome Atlas data*. Dis Esophagus, 2015.
36. Pandeya, N., G. Williams, A.C. Green et al., *Alcohol consumption and the risks of adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma of the esophagus*. Gastroenterology, 2009. **136**(4): p. 1215-24, e1-2.
37. Morita, M., H. Kuwano, T. Nakashima et al., *Family aggregation of carcinoma of the hypopharynx and cervical esophagus: special reference to multiplicity of cancer in upper aerodigestive tract*. Int J Cancer, 1998. **76**(4): p. 468-71.
38. van Gijssel, H.E., L.J. Schild, D.L. Watt et al., *Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon-DNA adducts determined by semiquantitative immunohistochemistry in human esophageal biopsies taken in 1985*. Mutat Res, 2004. **547**(1-2): p. 55-62.

39. Guo, F., Y. Liu, X. Wang et al., *Human papillomavirus infection and esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: a case-control study*. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*, 2012. **21**(5): p. 780-5.
40. Ludmir, E.B., M. Palta, X. Zhang et al., *Incidence and prognostic impact of high-risk HPV tumor infection in cervical esophageal carcinoma*. *J Gastrointest Oncol*, 2014. **5**(6): p. 401-7.
41. Syrjanen, K.J., *HPV infections and oesophageal cancer*. *J Clin Pathol*, 2002. **55**(10): p. 721-8.
42. *Nederlandse Vereniging van Maag-Darm-Leverartsen: richtlijn oesofaguscarcinoom*. 2010; Available from: <http://www.oncoline.nl/oesofaguscarcinoom>.
43. Laterza, E., G. de Manzoni, A. Guglielmi et al., *Endoscopic ultrasonography in the staging of esophageal carcinoma after preoperative radiotherapy and chemotherapy*. *Ann Thorac Surg*, 1999. **67**(5): p. 1466-9.
44. Hermans, R., *Imaging of hypopharyngeal and cervical oesophageal cancer*. *Cancer Imaging*, 2004. **4**(1): p. 7-9.
45. Riedel, M., R.W. Hauck, H.J. Stein et al., *Preoperative bronchoscopic assessment of airway invasion by esophageal cancer: a prospective study*. *Chest*, 1998. **113**(3): p. 687-95.
46. Huang, S.H., G. Lockwood, J. Brierley et al., *Effect of concurrent high-dose cisplatin chemotherapy and conformal radiotherapy on cervical esophageal cancer survival*. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*, 2008. **71**(3): p. 735-40.
47. Yamada, K., M. Murakami, Y. Okamoto et al., *Treatment results of radiotherapy for carcinoma of the cervical esophagus*. *Acta Oncol*, 2006. **45**(8): p. 1120-5.

48. Burmeister, B.H., G. Dickie, B.M. Smithers et al., *Thirty-four patients with carcinoma of the cervical esophagus treated with chemoradiation therapy*. Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg, 2000. **126**(2): p. 205-8.
49. Uno, T., K. Isobe, H. Kawakami et al., *Concurrent chemoradiation for patients with squamous cell carcinoma of the cervical esophagus*. Dis Esophagus, 2007. **20**(1): p. 12-8.
50. Archibald, S., J.E. Young, and A. Thoma, *Pharyngo-cervical esophageal reconstruction*. Clin Plast Surg, 2005. **32**(3): p. 339-46, vi.
51. Tepper, J., M.J. Krasna, D. Niedzwiecki et al., *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**(7): p. 1086-92.
52. Bottger, T., P. Bumb, P. Dutkowski et al., *Carcinoma of the hypopharynx and the cervical oesophagus: a surgical challenge*. Eur J Surg, 1999. **165**(10): p. 940-6.
53. Kadota, H., M. Sakuraba, Y. Kimata et al., *Larynx-preserving esophagectomy and jejunal transfer for cervical esophageal carcinoma*. Laryngoscope, 2009. **119**(7): p. 1274-80.
54. Cao, Z., Q. Ye, X. Qian et al., *End-to-end anastomosis after segmental esophagectomy for early stage cervical esophageal carcinoma*. Ann Thorac Surg, 2013. **95**(5): p. 1815-7.
55. Tong, D.K., S. Law, D.L. Kwong et al., *Current management of cervical esophageal cancer*. World J Surg, 2011. **35**(3): p. 600-7.

56. Miyata, H., M. Yamasaki, T. Takahashi et al., *Larynx-preserving limited resection and free jejunal graft for carcinoma of the cervical esophagus*. *World J Surg*, 2013. **37**(3): p. 551-7.
57. Shuangba, H., S. Jingwu, W. Yinfeng et al., *Complication following gastric pull-up reconstruction for advanced hypopharyngeal or cervical esophageal carcinoma: a 20-year review in a Chinese institute*. *Am J Otolaryngol*, 2011. **32**(4): p. 275-8.
58. Sun, F., X. Li, D. Lei et al., *Surgical management of cervical esophageal carcinoma with larynx preservation and reconstruction*. *Int J Clin Exp Med*, 2014. **7**(9): p. 2771-8.
59. Zhao, D., X. Gao, L. Guan et al., *Free jejunal graft for reconstruction of defects in the hypopharynx and cervical esophagus following the cancer resections*. *J Gastrointest Surg*, 2009. **13**(7): p. 1368-72.
60. Cahow, C.E. and C.T. Sasaki, *Gastric pull-up reconstruction for pharyngo-laryngo-esophagectomy*. *Arch Surg*, 1994. **129**(4): p. 425-9; discussion 429-30.
61. Puttawibul, P., C. Pornpatanarak, B. Sangthong et al., *Results of gastric pull-up reconstruction for pharyngolaryngo-oesophagectomy in advanced head and neck cancer and cervical oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma*. *Asian J Surg*, 2004. **27**(3): p. 180-5.
62. Wu, J.X., L. Yu, J.Y. Li et al., *Gasless laparoscopically assisted transhiatal esophagectomy for upper esophageal carcinoma*. *Ann Surg Oncol*, 2015. **22**(3): p. 1015-9.
63. Ott, K., F. Lordick, M. Molls et al., *Limited resection and free jejunal graft interposition for squamous cell carcinoma of the cervical oesophagus*. *Br J Surg*, 2009. **96**(3): p. 258-66.

64. Adelstein, D.J., T.W. Rice, M. Tefft et al., *Aggressive concurrent chemoradiotherapy and surgical resection for proximal esophageal squamous cell carcinoma*. *Cancer*, 1994. **74**(6): p. 1680-5.
65. Chou, S.H., H.P. Li, J.Y. Lee et al., *Radical resection or chemoradiotherapy for cervical esophageal cancer?* *World J Surg*, 2010. **34**(8): p. 1832-9.
66. Daiko, H., R. Hayashi, M. Saikawa et al., *Surgical management of carcinoma of the cervical esophagus*. *J Surg Oncol*, 2007. **96**(2): p. 166-72.
67. Ferahkose, Z., A. Bedirli, M. Kerem et al., *Comparison of free jejunal graft with gastric pull-up reconstruction after resection of hypopharyngeal and cervical esophageal carcinoma*. *Dis Esophagus*, 2008. **21**(4): p. 340-5.
68. Kelley, D.J., R. Wolf, A.R. Shaha et al., *Impact of clinicopathologic parameters on patient survival in carcinoma of the cervical esophagus*. *Am J Surg*, 1995. **170**(5): p. 427-31.
69. al-Sarraf, M., K. Martz, A. Herskovic et al., *Progress report of combined chemoradiotherapy versus radiotherapy alone in patients with esophageal cancer: an intergroup study*. *J Clin Oncol*, 1997. **15**(1): p. 277-84.
70. Wang, S., Z. Liao, Y. Chen et al., *Esophageal cancer located at the neck and upper thorax treated with concurrent chemoradiation: a single-institution experience*. *J Thorac Oncol*, 2006. **1**(3): p. 252-9.
71. Gkika, E., T. Gauler, W. Eberhardt et al., *Long-term results of definitive radiochemotherapy in locally advanced cancers of the cervical esophagus*. *Dis Esophagus*, 2014. **27**(7): p. 678-84.

72. Triboulet, J.P., C. Mariette, D. Chevalier, and H. Amrouni, *Surgical management of carcinoma of the hypopharynx and cervical esophagus: analysis of 209 cases*. Arch Surg, 2001. **136**(10): p. 1164-70.
73. Jiang, M., X. He, D. Wu et al., *Reconstruction techniques for hypopharyngeal and cervical esophageal carcinoma*. J Thorac Dis, 2015. **7**(3): p. 449-54.
74. Wang, H.W., P.Y. Chu, K.T. Kuo et al., *A reappraisal of surgical management for squamous cell carcinoma in the pharyngoesophageal junction*. J Surg Oncol, 2006. **93**(6): p. 468-76.
75. Tu, L., L. Sun, Y. Xu et al., *Paclitaxel and cisplatin combined with intensity-modulated radiotherapy for upper esophageal carcinoma*. Radiat Oncol, 2013. **8**: p. 75.
76. Ma, J.B., Y.P. Song, J.M. Yu et al., *Feasibility of involved-field conformal radiotherapy for cervical and upper-thoracic esophageal cancer*. Onkologie, 2011. **34**(11): p. 599-604.
77. Wang, S.L., Z. Liao, H. Liu et al., *Intensity-modulated radiation therapy with concurrent chemotherapy for locally advanced cervical and upper thoracic esophageal cancer*. World J Gastroenterol, 2006. **12**(34): p. 5501-8.
78. Minsky, B.D., T.F. Pajak, R.J. Ginsberg et al., *INT 0123 (Radiation Therapy Oncology Group 94-05) phase III trial of combined-modality therapy for esophageal cancer: high-dose versus standard-dose radiation therapy*. J Clin Oncol, 2002. **20**(5): p. 1167-74.
79. Cunningham, D., W.H. Allum, S.P. Stenning et al., *Perioperative chemotherapy versus surgery alone for resectable gastroesophageal cancer*. N Engl J Med, 2006. **355**(1): p. 11-20.

80. Bleiberg, H., T. Conroy, B. Paillot et al., *Randomised phase II study of cisplatin and 5-fluorouracil (5-FU) versus cisplatin alone in advanced squamous cell oesophageal cancer*. *Eur J Cancer*, 1997. **33**(8): p. 1216-20.
81. Conroy, T., M.P. Galais, J.L. Raoul et al., *Definitive chemoradiotherapy with FOLFOX versus fluorouracil and cisplatin in patients with oesophageal cancer (PRODIGE5/ACCORD17): final results of a randomised, phase 2/3 trial*. *Lancet Oncol*, 2014. **15**(3): p. 305-14.
82. Ruppert, B.N., J.M. Watkins, K. Shirai et al., *Cisplatin/Irinotecan versus carboplatin/paclitaxel as definitive chemoradiotherapy for locoregionally advanced esophageal cancer*. *Am J Clin Oncol*, 2010. **33**(4): p. 346-52.
83. van Hagen, P., M.C. Hulshof, J.J. van Lanschot et al., *Preoperative chemoradiotherapy for esophageal or junctional cancer*. *N Engl J Med*, 2012. **366**(22): p. 2074-84.
84. Blom, R.L., M.N. Sosef, M. Nap et al., *Comparison of two neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy regimens in patients with potentially curable esophageal carcinoma*. *Dis Esophagus*, 2014. **27**(4): p. 380-7.
85. Crosby, T., C.N. Hurt, S. Falk et al., *Chemoradiotherapy with or without cetuximab in patients with oesophageal cancer (SCOPE1): a multicentre, phase 2/3 randomised trial*. *Lancet Oncol*, 2013. **14**(7): p. 627-37.
86. Ilson, D.H., J. Moughan, M. Suntharalingam et al., *RTOG 0436: A phase III trial evaluating the addition of cetuximab to paclitaxel, cisplatin, and radiation for patients with esophageal cancer treated without surgery*. *J Clin Oncol* 32:5s, 2014 (suppl; abstr 4007), 2014.

87. Dutton, S.J., D.R. Ferry, J.M. Blazeby et al., *Gefitinib for oesophageal cancer progressing after chemotherapy (COG): a phase 3, multicentre, double-blind, placebo-controlled randomised trial*. *Lancet Oncol*, 2014. **15**(8): p. 894-904.
88. Lorenzen, S., T. Schuster, R. Porschen et al., *Cetuximab plus cisplatin-5-fluorouracil versus cisplatin-5-fluorouracil alone in first-line metastatic squamous cell carcinoma of the esophagus: a randomized phase II study of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Internistische Onkologie*. *Ann Oncol*, 2009. **20**(10): p. 1667-73.
89. Waddell, T., I. Chau, D. Cunningham et al., *Epirubicin, oxaliplatin, and capecitabine with or without panitumumab for patients with previously untreated advanced oesophagogastric cancer (REAL3): a randomised, open-label phase 3 trial*. *Lancet Oncol*, 2013. **14**(6): p. 481-9.
90. Fu, W.H., L.H. Wang, Z.M. Zhou et al., *Comparison of conformal and intensity-modulated techniques for simultaneous integrated boost radiotherapy of upper esophageal carcinoma*. *World J Gastroenterol*, 2004. **10**(8): p. 1098-102.
91. Cao, C.N., J.W. Luo, L. Gao et al., *Intensity-modulated radiotherapy for cervical esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: clinical outcomes and patterns of failure*. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol*, 2015.
92. Zhang, P., M. Xi, L. Zhao et al., *Clinical efficacy and failure pattern in patients with cervical esophageal cancer treated with definitive chemoradiotherapy*. *Radiother Oncol*, 2015. **116**(2): p. 257-61.
93. Zhang, Z., Z. Liao, J. Jin et al., *Dose-response relationship in locoregional control for patients with stage II-III esophageal cancer treated with concurrent chemotherapy and radiotherapy*. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*, 2005. **61**(3): p. 656-64.

94. Sun, D.R., *Ten-year follow-up of esophageal cancer treated by radical radiation therapy: analysis of 869 patients*. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 1989. **16**(2): p. 329-34.
95. Hulshof, M.C.C.M., *A randomised trial of dose escalation in definitive chemoradiotherapy for patients with oesophageal cancer.:*
<http://www.trialregister.nl/trialreg/admin/rctview.asp?TC=3532>.
96. Fenkell, L., I. Kaminsky, S. Breen et al., *Dosimetric comparison of IMRT vs. 3D conformal radiotherapy in the treatment of cancer of the cervical esophagus*. Radiother Oncol, 2008. **89**(3): p. 287-91.
97. Zhu, W.G., K. Zhou, C.H. Yu et al., *Efficacy analysis of simplified intensity-modulated radiotherapy with high or conventional dose and concurrent chemotherapy for patients with neck and upper thoracic esophageal carcinoma*. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev, 2012. **13**(3): p. 803-7.
98. Yin, Y., J. Chen, L. Xing et al., *Applications of IMAT in cervical esophageal cancer radiotherapy: a comparison with fixed-field IMRT in dosimetry and implementation*. J Appl Clin Med Phys, 2011. **12**(2): p. 3343.
99. Ma, P., X. Wang, Y. Xu et al., *Applying the technique of volume-modulated arc radiotherapy to upper esophageal carcinoma*. J Appl Clin Med Phys, 2014. **15**(3): p. 4732.
100. Zhao, K.L., J.B. Ma, G. Liu et al., *Three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy for esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: is elective nodal irradiation necessary?* Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys, 2010. **76**(2): p. 446-51.

101. Liu, M., K. Zhao, Y. Chen, and G.L. Jiang, *Evaluation of the value of ENI in radiotherapy for cervical and upper thoracic esophageal cancer: a retrospective analysis*. *Radiat Oncol*, 2014. **9**: p. 232.
102. Li, M., Y. Liu, B. Fan, and J. Yu, *Determining the lymph node clinical target volume of upper esophageal carcinoma with computed tomography*. *Archives of Biological Sciences*, 2013. **65**(3): p. 821-827.
103. Li, M., Y. Liu, L. Xu et al., *Determine the Involved Lymph Node Station for Cervical and Upper Thoracic Esophageal Carcinoma in Nonsurgical patients: A Data Analysis Based on CT*, 2013.
104. Li, M., Y. Liu, L. Xu et al., *Computed tomography-based distribution of involved lymph nodes in patients with upper esophageal cancer*. *Curr Oncol*, 2015. **22**(3): p. e178-82.
105. Van De Voorde, L., R.T. Larue, M. Pijls et al., *A qualitative synthesis of the evidence behind elective lymph node irradiation in oesophageal cancer*. *Radiother Oncol*, 2014. **113**(2): p. 166-74.
106. Fukada, J., N. Shigematsu, T. Ohashi et al., *Pericardial and pleural effusions after definitive radiotherapy for esophageal cancer*. *J Radiat Res*, 2012. **53**(3): p. 447-53.
107. Timon, C.V., M. Toner, and B.J. Conlon, *Paratracheal lymph node involvement in advanced cancer of the larynx, hypopharynx, and cervical esophagus*. *Laryngoscope*, 2003. **113**(9): p. 1595-9.
108. Jones, A.S., N.J. Roland, J. Hamilton et al., *Malignant tumours of the cervical oesophagus*. *Clin Otolaryngol Allied Sci*, 1996. **21**(1): p. 49-53.

109. Schieman, C., D.A. Wigle, C. Deschamps et al., *Salvage resections for recurrent or persistent cancer of the proximal esophagus after chemoradiotherapy*. *Ann Thorac Surg*, 2013. **95**(2): p. 459-63.
110. Mariette, C. and J.P. Triboulet, *Which treatment for squamous cell carcinoma of the pharyngoesophageal junction?* *J Surg Oncol*, 2006. **94**(3): p. 175-7.
111. Fearon, K., F. Strasser, S.D. Anker et al., *Definition and classification of cancer cachexia: an international consensus*. *Lancet Oncol*, 2011. **12**(5): p. 489-95.

Table 1: Included studies using definitive chemoradiation (dCRT) or chemotherapy in patients with esophageal cancer.

Author(s)/ Reference number	Study design	Patients	Treatment	Response rates (%)	Survival (%)
Tepper et al (2008) [51]	RCT phase 3	56 (SCC, AC)	(1) CDDP/5-FU/50.4 Gy + SX (N = 30) (2) SX (N = 26)	(1) CR 33.3 PR 26.7 SD 6.7 PD 6.7 (2) no data	5-YR OS: (1) 39 (95% CI 21-57) (2) 16 (95% CI 5-33)
Cooper et al (1999) [8]	RCT phase 3	123 (SCC, AC)	(1) CDDP/5-FU/50 Gy (N = 61): (2) 64 Gy	(1) PD 26 (2) PD 37	5-YR OS: (1) 26 (95% CI 15-37) (2) 0
Al-Sarraf et al (1997) [69]	RCT phase 3 (update of RTOG 85-01 trial)	123 (SCC)	(1) CDDP/5-FU/50 Gy (N = 61) (2) 64 Gy (N = 62)		5-YR OS: (1) 27 (2) 0
Wang et al (2006) [70]	RS	35 (SCC, AC)	(1) 5-FU/50.4 Gy (N = 35)	CR > 50 Gy: 79.2, < 50 Gy: 27.3 PR 8.6 SD 5.7 PD 5.7	5-YR OS: 18.6 5-YR DFS: 22.4
Uno et al	RS	21 (SCC)	(1) CDDP/5-FU/64 Gy (N = 14):	Initial LCR: 57.9 (including 5	(1) + (2) + (3)

(2007) [49]			(2) CDDP/5-FU/40 Gy + SX (N = 5): (3) 64 Gy (N = 2)	SX patients)	2-YR OS: 41 5-YR OS: 27
Yamada et al (2006) [47]	RS	27 (SCC)	(1) CDDP/5-FU/66 Gy (N = 23): (2) 66 Gy (N = 4)	CR 48.1 PR 40.7 SD 11.1 PD 0	(1) + (2) 5-YR OS: 37.9
Gkika et al (2014) [71]	RS	55 (SCC, AC, undifferentiated carcinoma)	(1) 56-70 Gy/ CDDP/5-FU (RTOG 85-01) ¹ NAT: LV/5-FU/CDDP (N = 25) (2) 56-70 Gy/ CDDP/VP-16 (FLEP) ² NAT: 5-FU/LV/CDDP/VP-16 (N = 22) (3) 56-70 Gy/CDDP-based/irinotecan or taxanes (exact dose is not mentioned) (N = 8)	CR 64 RD 26 PD 14.5 PR 10.9	3-YR OS: (1) 18 (2) 37 (3) 31
Stuschke et al (1999) [9]	RS	17 (SCC)	(1) 60-66 Gy NAT: 5-FU/LV/VP-16 (FLEP) ⁴ CRT: CDDP/VP-16 (FLEP) ⁴ (N = 11) (2) 60-66 Gy NAT: LV/5-FU/CDDP CRT: CDDP/VP-16 (FLEP) ⁴	2-, 3-YR LRR 67 ± 14	(1) + (2) 2- and 3-YR OS: 24

¹ RTOG 85-01: CRT: CDDP 75 mg/m² (first day of week 1, 5, 8 and 11) /5-FU 1 g/m² (first 4 days of week 1, 5, 8 and 11) [7]

² FLEP: NAT: LV 300 mg/m², VP-16 100 mg/m², 5-FU 500 mg/m², CDDP 30 mg/m² on days 1-3. A 2nd and 3rd course were started at day 22 of the last course. CRT started between days 22 and 28 of last NAT course. CRT: CDDP 50 mg/m² days 2 and 8, VP-16 100 mg/m² on days 4, 5 and 6 (60h-infusion) [8]

			(N = 6)		
Burmeister et al (2000) [48]	PCS	34 (SCC, AC)	(1) CDDP 80/5-FU/61.2 Gy (N = 24) (2) CDDP 20/5-FU/61.2 Gy (N = 8) (3) 5-FU/ 61.2 Gy (N = 2)	CR 91.1 PR 5.9 SD 0 PD 2.9	(1) + (2) + (3) 5-YR OS 55 (95% CI 38-74) ³
Huang et al (2008) [46]	RS	50 (CEC)	(1) 5-FU/mitomycin C or CDDP/54 Gy (N = 13) + SX (N = 6) (2) CDDP/70 Gy (N = 22): (3) RT alone (N = 9) (dose unknown)	(1) CR (1-YR) 71 CR (2-YR) 48 (2) CR (1-YR) 64 CR (2-YR) 46	(1) 1-YR OS: 86 (95% CI 62-95) 2-YR OS: 52 (95% CI 30-71) (2) 1-YR OS: 69 (95% CI 49-82) 2-YR OS: 43 (95% CI 24-60)
Conroy et al (2014) [81]	RCT phase 2/3	267 (SCC, AC, ASCC)	(1) oxaliplatin/LV/5-FU (FOLFOX)/50 Gy (N = 134) (2) CDDP/5-FU/50 Gy (N = 133)	(1) CR 44 PR 22 SD 11 PD 9 (2) CR 43 PR 22 SD 8	3-YR OS: (1) 19.9 (95% CI 10.8-31.0) (2) 26.9 (95% CI 16.9-37.8)

³ No significant difference between the two regimens in terms of overall and disease-free survival.

				PD 9	
Crosby et al (2013) [85]	RCT phase 2/3	258 (SCC, AC)	(1) CDDP/capecitabine/50 Gy (2 cycles CDDP/capecitabine NAT) (N = 129) (2) CDDP/capecitabine/50 Gy + cetuximab (2 cycles CDDP/capecitabine NAT) (N = 129)	TFF at 24 weeks: (1) 66.4 (90% CI 58.6 – 73.6) (2) 76.9 (90% CI 69.7-83.0)	mOS ⁴ : (1) 25.4 months (95% CI 20.5-37.9) (2) 22.1 months (95% CI 15.1-24.5)
Ma et al (2011) [76]	RCT	102 (SCC)	(1) paclitaxel/CDDP/59.4 Gy + IFI (N = 51) (2) paclitaxel/CDDP/59.4 Gy + ENI (N = 51)	(1) CR (1-YR) 90.0 CR (2-YR) 80.1 CR (3-YR) 80.1 (2) CR (1-YR) 92.8 CR (2-YR) 92.8 CR (3-YR) 85.7	(1) 1-YR OS: 100 2-YR OS: 87.5 3-YR OS: 32.0 (2) 1-YR OS: 100 2-YR OS: 84.0 3-YR OS: 41.3
Tu et al (2013) [75]	RS	36 (SCC)	(1) paclitaxel/CDDP/60 Gy (IMRT) (N = 36)	CR 16.7 PR 33.3 SD 41.7	1-YR OS: 83.3 2-YR OS: 42.8
Bleiberg et al (1997) [80]	RCT phase 2	88 (SCC)	(1) CTx: CDDP/5-FU (N = 44) prior SX (N = 5) prior radiotherapy (N = 4)	(1) CR 3 PR 32 SD 29 PD 18 early death 15	(1) 1-YR OS: 34 (95% CI 20-48) 2-YR OS: 18 (95% CI 7-29)

⁴ HR: 1.53 (95% CI 1.03-2.27) (P = 0.035)

			(2) CTx: CDDP (N = 44) prior SX (N = 8) prior radiotherapy (N = 6)	not assessable 3 (2) CR 3 PR 16 SD 38 PD 43 early death 0 not assessable 0	(2) 1-YR OS: 27 (95% CI 14-40) 2-YR OS: 9 (95% CI 1-17)
Ruppert et al (2010) [82]	RS	57 (SCC, AC)	(1) CDDP/irinotecan/50.4-61.2 Gy (2 cycles CDDP/irinotecan NAT) (N = 38) (2) carboplatin/paclitaxel/50.4-61.2 Gy (N = 19)	(1) CR 21.1 (2) CR 31.6	(1) ⁵ 2-YR OS: 40.6 (95% CI 26.9 – 61.3) (2) 2-YR OS: 63.2 (95% CI 44.8-89.0)
Ludmir et al (2014) [40]	RS	37 (CEC)	CRT (N = 37) RT: 54 Gy (14.4-71) CTx: CDDP/5-FU (N = 16), CDDP (N = 4), CDDP/VP-16 (N = 6), CDDP/paclitaxel (N = 6), other (N = 7)	CR 5.6	5-YR OS: 34.1
Minsky et al (2002) [78]	RCT phase 3	236 (SCC, AC)	(1) CDDP/5-FU/64.8 Gy (N = 109) (2) CDDP/5-FU/50.4 Gy (N = 109)		2-YR OS: (1) 31 (2) 40

⁵ HR: 2.42 (P = 0.022)

Zhang et al (2015) [92]	RS	102 (CEC)	CRT (N = 102) RT: 60 Gy (50-70) CTx: NAT: CDDP-based (N = 18) CRT: 1. docetaxel/CDDP (N = 13) 2. CDDP/docetaxel (N = 26) 3. CDDP/5-FU (N = 63)		3-YR OS: 39.3
-------------------------	----	-----------	---	--	---------------

RCT: randomized controlled trial, SCC: squamous cell carcinoma, AC: adenocarcinoma, CDDP: cisplatin, 5-FU: 5-fluorouracil, SX: surgery, CR: complete response, PR: partial response, SD: stable disease, PD: progressive disease, -YR OS: -year overall survival, CI: confidence interval, TFF: treatment failure free, RS: retrospective study, -YR DFS: -year disease free survival, LCR: local control rate, CRT: chemoradiation, NAT: neoadjuvant, LV: leucovorin, VP-16: etoposide, LRR: locoregional recurrence rate, PCS: prospective cohort study, CEC: cervical esophageal cancer, ASCC: adenosquamous carcinoma, MOS: median overall survival, HR: hazard ratio, IFI: involved field irradiation, ENI: elective nodal irradiation, IMRT: intensity modulated radiation therapy, CTx: chemotherapy, LRC: locoregional control