# Oncologist<sup>®</sup>

# Computed Tomography-Based Body Composition Is Not Consistently Associated with Outcome in Older Patients with Colorectal Cancer

Stéphanie M.L.M. Looijaard,<sup>a</sup> Carel G.M. Meskers,<sup>b</sup> Monique S. Slee-Valentijn,<sup>c</sup> Donald E. Bouman,<sup>d</sup> A.N. Machteld Wymenga,<sup>e</sup> Joost M. Klaase,<sup>f,g</sup> Andrea B. Maier D<sup>a,h</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Human Movement Sciences, @AgeAmsterdam, Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; <sup>b</sup>Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Amsterdam University Medical Center, VU Medical Center, Amsterdam Movement Sciences, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; <sup>c</sup>Center of Excellence in Geriatric Rehabilitation, Cordaan, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Departments of <sup>d</sup>Radiology, <sup>e</sup>Medical Oncology, and <sup>f</sup>Surgery, Medical Spectrum Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands; <sup>g</sup>Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery and Liver Transplantation, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands; <sup>h</sup>Department of Medicine and Aged Care, @AgeMelbourne, The Royal Melbourne Hospital, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

Disclosures of potential conflicts of interest may be found at the end of this article.

Key Words. Body composition • Computed tomography • Colorectal neoplasms • Aged • Surgery • Adjuvant chemotherapy

#### Abstract \_

**Background.** Current literature is inconsistent in the associations between computed tomography (CT)-based body composition measures and adverse outcomes in older patients with colorectal cancer (CRC). Moreover, the associations with consecutive treatment modalities have not been studied. This study compared the associations of CT-based body composition measures with surgery- and chemotherapy-related complications and survival in older patients with CRC.

Materials and Methods. A retrospective single-center cohort study was conducted in patients with CRC aged ≥65 years who underwent elective surgery between 2010 and 2014. Gender-specific standardized scores of preoperative CT-based skeletal muscle (SM), muscle density, intermuscular adipose tissue (IMAT), visceral adipose tissue (VAT), subcutaneous adipose tissue, IMAT percentage, SM/VAT, and body mass index (BMI) were tested for their associations with severe postoperative complications, prolonged length of stay (LOS), readmission, and dose-limiting toxicity using logistic regression and 1-year

and long-term survival (range 3.7–6.6 years) using Cox regression. Bonferroni correction was applied to account for multiple testing.

**Results.** The study population consisted of 378 patients with CRC with a median age of 73.4 (interquartile range 69.5–78.4) years. Severe postoperative complications occurred in 13.0%, and 39.4% of patients died during follow-up. Dose-limiting toxicity occurred in 77.4% of patients receiving chemotherapy (*n* = 53). SM, muscle density, VAT, SM/VAT, and BMI were associated with surgery-related complications, and muscle density, IMAT, IMAT percentage, and SM/VAT were associated with long-term survival. After Bonferroni correction, no CT-based body composition measure was significantly associated with adverse outcomes. Higher BMI was associated with prolonged LOS. *Conclusion.* The associations between CT-based body composition measures and adverse outcomes of consecutive treatment modalities in older patients with CRC were not consistent or statistically significant. *The Oncologist* 2020;25:e492–e501

**Implications for Practice:** Computed tomography (CT)-based body composition, including muscle mass, muscle density, and intermuscular, visceral, and subcutaneous adipose tissue, showed inconsistent and nonsignificant associations with surgery-related complications, dose-limiting toxicity, and overall survival in older adults with colorectal cancer. This study underscores the need to verify whether CT-based body composition measures are worth implementing in clinical practice.

Correspondence: Andrea B. Maier, M.D., Ph.D., The Royal Melbourne Hospital – City Campus, 300 Grattan St., Parkville, Victoria 3050, Melbourne, Australia. Telephone: 61-3-9342-2635; e-mail: andrea.maier@mh.org.au Received July 31, 2019; accepted for publication September 24, 2019; published Online First on November 20, 2019. http://dx.doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2019-0590 This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

 The Oncologist 2020;25:e492-e501
 www.TheOncologist.com
 © 2019 The Authors.

The Oncologist published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc. on behalf of AlphaMed Press.

#### INTRODUCTION \_

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is a highly prevalent disease in older individuals, representing more than 10% of all new cancer cases worldwide [1]. The cornerstone of CRC treatment is surgical resection, potentially preceded by neoadjuvant (chemo) radiation in rectal cancer or followed by adjuvant chemotherapy in patients with high-risk stage II and stage III colon cancer [2]. Older patients with CRC are known to have a higher risk of adverse outcomes such as postoperative complications, prolonged length of stay (LOS), dose reductions and early discontinuation of chemotherapy, and higher overall and cancerrelated mortality compared with younger patients [3–6].

Computed tomography (CT)-based body composition measures, and especially skeletal muscle mass (SM), muscle density, which is a measure of muscle quality determined by fat infiltration [7], and visceral adipose tissue (VAT), have been proposed as predictors of adverse outcomes in older patients with CRC [8-12]. However, although several studies have revealed an association between SM and severe or infectious postoperative complications [11, 13], a lack of association with severe postoperative complications was found in other studies [9, 10, 14]. Muscle density was found to be associated with long-term overall survival [15-17], in contrast to other studies [9-11]. For VAT, the association with prolonged LOS showed both positive and negative results [18]. Therefore, it remains to be proved if CT-based body composition measures show consistent and statistically significant associations with adverse outcomes in older patients with CRC to be clinically relevant. Moreover, the predictive value of CT-based body composition measures on consecutive treatment modalities including both surgery- and chemotherapy-related complications within the same cohort of (older/CRC) cancer patients has not been reported yet.

The aim of this study was to compare CT-based body composition measures regarding their predictive value of adverse outcomes in older patients with CRC, including surgery-related complications, dose-limiting chemotherapy toxicity, and overall survival.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS** 

# **Study Population**

This is a retrospective single-center cohort study evaluating the PREdictive value of MUScle mass in CoLorectal cancer in Elderly (PREMUSCLE), in patients with primary CRC aged 65 years and older who underwent elective surgery between 2010 and 2014 at Medical Spectrum Twente, a large nonacademic teaching hospital in The Netherlands. The study population of 472 older patients with CRC was selected from the Dutch ColoRectal Audit (DCRA), which contains prospectively collected information on patient and tumor characteristics, treatment, and outcomes of CRC surgery. Patients were excluded if (a) there were two or more primary tumors requiring surgery (n = 41); (b) pathology reports concluded the primary tumor was benign or noncolorectal (n = 12); (c) surgery was classified as acute, urgent, or elective after stent placement because of an increased risk of complications (n = 4); (d) data on body height and/or weight were missing (n = 4);

(e) data on outcome measures were missing (n = 1); (f) there was no preoperative CT scan available on the level at the third lumbar vertebra (L3; n = 14); or (g) CT scan was not eligible for analysis because of quality issues such as artifacts or frame selection (n = 18). This led to the inclusion of 378 older patients with CRC, as is shown in Figure 1. Patient data were retrieved from the DCRA and hospital information system and included gender, age, body weight, height, preoperative number of comorbidities and medications (both retrieved by medical record review), Karnosfky Performance Scale score (range 0-100), tumor- and treatment-related characteristics, and predefined outcome measures. Survival data were extracted from the civil registry. The study has been approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of the Amsterdam University Medical Center, location VU Medical Center, with site-specific approval of Medical Spectrum Twente.

#### **CT-Based Body Composition**

Body composition was measured by analyzing single-slice abdominal CT scans at L3 that were obtained preoperatively for staging purposes. Single-slice CT scan analysis was performed because SM area and adipose tissue area at L3 are highly correlated with total body SM and total body adipose tissue volume [19, 20]. CT scans were analyzed using medical imaging software SliceOMatic version 5.0 (TomoVision, Montreal, QC, Canada), which identifies body tissues based on the Hounsfield Units (HU). CT scan analyses were performed by a trained and certified researcher (S.L.). Imaging quality was assessed on the identification of the following muscles: rectus abdominis, transversus abdominis, internal and external oblique, quadratus lumborum, erector spinae, and psoas. In case of unilateral quality issues in a symmetrical image, unilateral body composition area was determined and multiplied by two. CT scans in which total SM could not be determined were excluded. A second assessor was consulted in case of doubt (n = 15) about inclusion or multiplication of body composition area (W.L.). Tissues were identified by HU ranges: SM -29 to +150 HU; intermuscular adipose tissue (IMAT) and subcutaneous adipose tissue (SAT) -190 to -30 HU; VAT -150 to -50 HU [20, 21]. Total cross-sectional surface area in cm<sup>2</sup> of each tissue was computed by multiplying the pixel area with the amount of pixels. Skeletal muscle index (SMI) was calculated by dividing SM ( $cm^2$ ) by height<sup>2</sup> ( $m^2$ ). The percentage of IMAT was calculated as a measure of fattiness of the muscle by IMAT/(IMAT+SM)\*100; the ratio between SM and VAT as a measure of sarcopenic obesity. Muscle density was determined by the mean HU of muscle tissue, lower HU is a sign of more fat infiltration within the muscle [7]. Median tube potential of CT scans was 120 kilovolts (range 100-135 kilovolts), and slice thickness was 3 millimeters (range 1-5 millimeters). All contrast-enhanced CT scans were used. The intra- and interobserver correlation coefficient for variability of body composition measures were calculated using a two-way mixed model with absolute agreement. Intraobserver correlation coefficient for variability was 0.991-1.000 based on a random selection of n = 10, and interindividual correlation coefficient for variability was 0.971-1.000 based on a random selection of n = 24 (A.V.).



Figure 1. Flowchart of selection of patients.

Abbreviations: CRC, colorectal cancer; CT, computed tomography.

# **Adjuvant Chemotherapy**

Based on the Tumor, Node, Metastasis classification, all patients were postoperatively classified into a cancer stage according to the American Joint Committee on Cancer guidelines [22]. Patients with high-risk stage II and stage III colon cancer were considered for adjuvant chemotherapy treatment [2], which consisted of folinic acid, fluorouracil and oxaliplatin, capecitabine and oxaliplatin, capecitabine monotherapy, or folinic acid and fluorouracil according to national guidelines. Equivalent variables were used to identify patients with high-risk stage II colon cancer in that era: (a) T4 tumor; (b) less than 10 lymph nodes found; (c) venous vascular or lymph invasion of the tumor; (d) poorly differentiated tumor; and (e) preoperative obstruction or perforation of the colon or rectum. Dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase deficiency was not taken into consideration because this was not routinely tested in The Netherlands at the time of the study. A multidisciplinary team including a gastroenterologist, gastrointestinal surgeon, radiologist, radiotherapist, and medical oncologist decided whether a patient would be referred to the medical oncology department to discuss adjuvant chemotherapy treatment. If so, patients were directed to the medical oncologist, who decided together with the patient on the initiation of adjuvant chemotherapy treatment.

# **Outcome Measures**

Surgery-related complications included severe postoperative complications, prolonged LOS, and readmission. Severe postoperative complications were defined as any grade 3 (requiring reintervention), grade 4 (requiring intensive care unit admittance), or grade 5 (death) surgical or medical complication according to the Clavien-Dindo Classification of Surgical

Complications, during admission or within 30 days after surgery [23]. Surgical complications included anastomotic leakage, intra-abdominal abscess, wound or fascial dehiscence, stoma-related complications, blood loss >500 milliliters or postoperative hemorrhage, incisional hernia, bowel injury, or injury to another organ. Medical complications included respiratory, cardiac, thromboembolic, infectious, neurological, and other complications. LOS was calculated as the number of days between the day of surgery until the day of discharge after surgery and dichotomized into LOS  $\leq$ 14 days and prolonged LOS of >14 days because prolonged LOS is associated with postoperative complications [24]. Readmissions included readmission to the hospital for any reason within 30 days after discharge.

Chemotherapy-related outcome for the subgroup receiving adjuvant chemotherapy was defined as dose-limiting toxicity, which was chemotherapy toxicity that led to a dose reduction or early discontinuation.

Survival was defined as 1-year and long-term overall survival, with a median follow-up of 5.3 (interquartile range [IQR] 3.7–6.6) years. Survival time was calculated from the day of surgery until the day of death of any cause (died) or the April 23, 2019 (censored).

# Statistical Analyses

Variables are described by number (percentage), mean  $\pm$  SD, or median (IQR). To avoid dichotomization of the determinants by using cutoff points, CT-based body composition measures (SM, SMI, muscle density, IMAT, VAT, SAT, IMAT percentage, and SM/VAT) and body mass index (BMI) were analyzed continuously, using gender-specific standardized Z scores to enable comparison of the body composition measures. Variables that were not normally distributed

The Oncologist published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc. on behalf of AlphaMed Press.



# Table 1. Patient characteristics for all patients and stratified by adjuvant chemotherapy treatment

Characteristics	All patients (n = 378)	Received chemotherapy (n = 53)
Demographics		
Gender, male	228 (60.3)	30 (56.6)
Age, median (IQR), years	73.4 (69.5–78.4)	70.9 (67.5–73.5)
Comorbidity, median (IQR), n	2.0 (1.0–3.0)	1.0 (1.0–2.5)
Medication, median (IQR), n	4.0 (2.0–6.5) <sup>a</sup>	2.0 (1.0–4.0)
Karnofsky score, ≥90	173 (51.2) <sup>b</sup>	39 (75.0) <sup>c</sup>
Tumor characteristics		
Primary tumor, colon	284 (75.1)	53 (100.0)
Tumor stage, colon cancer	284	53
Stage I	56 (19.7)	_
Stage II, low-risk	54 (19.0)	_
Stage II, high-risk	42 (14.8)	1 (1.9)
Stage III	96 (33.8)	52 (98.1)
Stage IV	26 (9.2)	_
Stage T0/unknown	10 (3.6)	_
Tumor stage, rectum cancer	94	
Stage I	34 (36.2)	_
Stage II	22 (23.4)	_
Stage III	20 (21.3)	_
Stage IV	4 (4.3)	_
Stage T0/unknown	14 (14.9)	_
Body composition		
Body weight, mean $\pm$ SD, kg	79.2 $\pm$ 14.4	$\textbf{82.7} \pm \textbf{13.7}$
Height, mean $\pm$ SD, cm	$170.7\pm9.0$	$172.5\pm7.8$
BMI, mean $\pm$ SD, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	$27.1 \pm 4.1$	$27.7 \pm 3.7$
SM. mean $\pm$ SD. cm <sup>2</sup>	$129.1\pm29.7$	$138.7 \pm 33.1$
SMI, mean + SD, $cm^2/m^2$	44.0 + 8.1	46.3 + 8.9
Muscle density, mean $\pm$ SD. HU	$31.2\pm8.0$	$32.4 \pm 7.5$
IMAT. median (IQR). cm <sup>2</sup>	13.2 (9.1–19.7)	14.4 (10.0–18.2)
VAT. mean $\pm$ SD. cm <sup>2</sup>	$193.9 \pm 107.3^{d}$	204.0 + 117.0
SAT, median (IOR), $cm^2$	172.6 (126.9–220.5) <sup>e</sup>	180.6 (133.2–217.0) <sup>f</sup>
IMAT. median (IOR). %	9.3 (6.7–14.4)	9.1 (6.4–12.3)
$SM/VAT$ , median (IOR), $cm^2$	$0.7 (0.5 - 1.1)^d$	0.7 (0.5 - 1.2)
Surgery		
Surgical approach, laparoscopic	217 (57.4)	39 (73.6)
Postoperative complication <30 days	180 (47.6)	21 (39.6)
Severe postoperative complication	49 (13.0)	5 (9.4)
I OS. median (IOR), days	6.5 (5.0-11.0)	5.0 (4.0-7.5)
Prolonged LOS. >14 days	56 (14.8)	5 (9.4)
Readmission <30 days	46 (12 2)	4 (7 5)
Chemotherapy	10 (12.2)	. (7.5)
Chemotherapeutic agent		53
Capecitabine	_	26 (49.1)
CAPOX	_	23 (43.4)
FOLFOX	_	1 (1.9)
5FU/LV	_	3 (5.7)
Toxicity, all grade	_	46 (86.8)
Dose reduction	-	28 (52.8)

© 2019 The Authors. *The Oncologist* published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc. on behalf of AlphaMed Press.

(continued)

# Table 1. (continued)

Characteristics	All patients (n = 378)	Received chemotherapy (n = 53)
Early discontinuation	_	26 (49.1)
Dose-limiting toxicity	_	41 (77.4)
Survival		
One-year overall survival, died	26 (6.9)	2 (3.8)
Long-term overall survival, died	149 (39.4)	18 (34.0)

All variables are presented in *n* (%) unless otherwise indicated. The subgroup of patients undergoing chemotherapy consisted of patients with high-risk stage II and stage III colon cancer.

Data available of <sup>a</sup>n = 373; <sup>b</sup>n = 338; <sup>c</sup>n = 52; <sup>d</sup>n = 376; <sup>e</sup>n = 310; and <sup>f</sup>n = 41.

Abbreviations: 5FU, fluorouracil; BMI, body mass index; CAPOX, capecitabine and oxaliplatin; FOLFOX, folinic acid, fluorouracil, and oxaliplatin; HU, Hounsfield units; IMAT, intermuscular adipose tissue; IQR, interquartile range; LOS, length of stay; LV, leucovorin (folinic acid); SAT, subcutaneous adipose tissue; SM, skeletal muscle; SMI, skeletal muscle index; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

were log-transformed before standardization (IMAT, SAT, IMAT percentage, and SM/VAT). The associations between gender-specific standardized body composition measures and treatment-related adverse outcomes were analyzed using bivariate logistic regression for severe postoperative complications, prolonged LOS, readmission, and dose-limiting toxicity and Cox proportional hazards model for 1-year and long-term overall survival. For survival analyses, survival time in months was used. All analyses were performed using a crude model and an adjusted model for age, stage of disease, and number of medications (model 1) to adjust for possible confounders. Stage of disease was considered because of its association with cachexia [25] and cancer-related outcomes. Number of medications was considered as a reflection of overall health and severity of the number of comorbidities that could influence both body composition and the risk of adverse outcomes [26]. The associations between SM and SMI and adverse outcomes were additionally adjusted for BMI  $\geq$  30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (model 2), to eliminate the potential influence of sarcopenic obesity. The cutoff BMI ≥30 kg/m<sup>2</sup> was chosen because it was identified as an independent predictor of complicated postoperative course in patients with CRC in The Netherlands [27]. Owing to the number of determinant variables (9) and outcome measures (6) that were tested, a Bonferroni correction for 54 tests was applied to avoid type 1 errors. Therefore, p values of <.001 were considered statistically significant. Sensitivity analyses were performed on the possible impact of (a) the time interval between CT scan and surgery, by excluding CT scans made more than 8 weeks before surgery (analyses with n = 304); (b) estimations based on unilaterally determined body composition area, by excluding CT scans in which surface area was multiplied (n = 352); and (c) stratification of colon cancer (n = 284) and rectum cancer (n = 94). Post hoc analyses were performed to clarify associations, by stratifying for Karnofsky Performance Scale score based on the median of the study population,  $\leq 80$  (n = 165) and  $\geq 90$ (n = 173). Statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics version 25 (IBM SPSS Statistics, Feltham, U.K.).

#### RESULTS

#### **Patient Characteristics**

The study population of 378 older patients with CRC consisted of 284 with colon cancer (75.1%) and 94 with rectal cancer (24.9%). The median age of the total cohort was 73.4 (IQR 69.5–78.4) years, and 228 patients were male (60.3%). In total,

13.0% of all patients experienced a severe postoperative complication, prolonged LOS occurred in 14.8%, and 12.2% of patients were readmitted to the hospital within 30 days after discharge. After 1-year and more than 5-years of follow-up, 6.9% and 39.4%, respectively, of patients had died. The subgroup of patients who had an indication for adjuvant chemotherapy consisted of 138 patients with high-risk stage II or stage III colon cancer (36.5%). In 53 of these patients, of whom 1 had high-risk stage II colon cancer, adjuvant chemotherapy was initiated (38.4%). Reasons for not initiating adjuvant chemotherapy were decision by the medical oncologist or multidisciplinary team, patients' preference, or both. Of 53 patients with colon cancer, 41 (77.4%) treated with adjuvant chemotherapy experienced dose-limiting toxicity. Patient characteristics of the total cohort and the subgroup of patients who received adjuvant chemotherapy are shown in Table 1.

# Surgery-Related Complications and Dose-Limiting Toxicity

Table 2 shows the associations between gender-specific standardized body composition measures and severe postoperative complications, prolonged LOS, readmission, and doselimiting toxicity. Higher SM and SMI were associated with a higher risk of readmission, and higher SM was associated with prolonged LOS in the adjusted models. Lower muscle density was associated with severe postoperative complications in the adjusted model. Higher VAT was associated with a higher risk of severe postoperative complications, prolonged LOS, and readmission. Higher SM/VAT was associated with a lower risk of prolonged LOS and readmission. Higher BMI was associated with a higher risk of severe postoperative complications and prolonged LOS. BMI showed the strongest association of all body composition measures with severe postoperative complications and prolonged LOS. VAT was most strongly associated with the risk of readmission. After applying Bonferroni correction, BMI remained statistically significant in its association with prolonged LOS in the crude model. None of the body composition measures showed a significant association with dose-limiting toxicity in crude or adjusted analyses.

#### One-Year and Long-Term Overall Survival

None of the body composition measures were associated with 1-year overall survival. For long-term overall survival, muscle density was associated with a lower mortality risk whereas IMAT and IMAT percentage were associated with a higher mortality



	Surgery-related complications (n = 378)							Chemotherapy (n = 53)		
Z-scores body composition measures	Severe postoperative complications		LOS	LOS > 14 days		Readmission		Dose-limiting toxicity		
	OR	95% CI	OR	95% Cl	OR	95% Cl	OR	95% CI		
Z SM, cm <sup>2</sup>	-		-							
Crude	1.255	0.936-1.681	1.253	0.949–1.654	1.445 <sup>a</sup>	1.071–1.950	0.722	0.405–1.287		
Model 1	1.309	0.942-1.819	1.452 <sup>a</sup>	1.054–2.002	1.532 <sup>a</sup>	1.097–2.140	0.676	0.360-1.270		
Model 2	1.315	0.938-1.844	1.434 <sup>a</sup>	1.033–1.991	1.603 <sup>a</sup>	1.130–2.275	0.604	0.299–1.219		
Z SMI, cm²/m²										
Crude	1.118	0.833-1.502	1.175	0.890–1.550	1.463 <sup>a</sup>	1.089–1.965	0.634	0.350–1.146		
Model 1	1.169	0.851-1.605	1.327	0.980–1.798	1.503 <sup>a</sup>	1.096–2.062	0.603	0.320–1.139		
Model 2	1.171	0.842-1.627	1.308	0.954–1.793	1.602 <sup>a</sup>	1.145–2.242	0.518	0.249–1.076		
Z Muscle density, HU										
Crude	0.740	0.546-1.002	0.759	0.570–1.011	0.850	0.624–1.157	0.669	0.337–1.331		
Model 1	0.684 <sup>a</sup>	0.486-0.962	0.773	0.561-1.066	0.884	0.633–1.235	0.564	0.259–1.229		
Z IMAT, cm <sup>2</sup>										
Crude	1.291	0.949–1.758	1.280	0.956–1.712	1.162	0.850–1.589	1.263	0.578–2.758		
Model 1	1.366	0.980-1.902	1.297	0.947–1.777	1.130	0.817–1.563	1.340	0.586–3.065		
Z VAT, cm <sup>2</sup>										
Crude	1.341 <sup>a</sup>	1.007-1.787	1.458 <sup>a</sup>	1.111–1.914	1.551 <sup>ª</sup>	1.157–2.078	0.968	0.529–1.772		
Model 1	1.355	0.996-1.845	1.465 <sup>a</sup>	1.096–1.960	1.543 <sup>a</sup>	1.137–2.093	1.005	0.539–1.872		
Z SAT, cm <sup>2</sup>										
Crude	0.996	0.711-1.394	1.283	0.914–1.802	1.195	0.839–1.703	1.532	0.597–3.929		
Model 1	1.139	0.768-1.690	1.224	0.851–1.762	1.104	0.762–1.599	1.561	0.624–3.906		
<i>Z</i> IMAT, %										
Crude	1.145	0.843-1.557	1.150	0.860–1.537	1.007	0.739–1.372	1.445	0.699–2.989		
Model 1	1.203	0.861-1.680	1.121	0.816–1.539	0.977	0.705–1.355	1.572	0.722–3.425		
Z SM/VAT, cm <sup>2</sup>										
Crude	0.794	0.564-1.116	0.647 <sup>a</sup>	0.454–0.922	0.605 <sup>a</sup>	0.406–0.902	0.904	0.443–1.842		
Model 1	0.716	0.480-1.069	0.650 <sup>a</sup>	0.440-0.961	0.600 <sup>a</sup>	0.390-0.923	0.831	0.388–1.777		
Z BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>										
Crude	1.343 <sup>a</sup>	1.017-1.774	1.541	1.182-2.010	1.172	0.874-1.572	0.932	0.454–1.913		
Model 1	1.357	0.998-1.845	1.571 <sup>a</sup>	1.174-2.103	1.072	0.781-1.471	0.966	0.468-1.994		

Body composition was analyzed with gender-specific standardized scores. Severe postoperative complications were defined as (0) no or grade 1-2Clavien-Dindo complications; (1) grade 3-5 Clavien-Dindo complications (complications that led to reintervention, intensive care unit admittance, or death). Dose-limiting toxicity was defined as (0) no toxicity or no toxicity that led to dose reduction or early discontinuation of chemotherapy; (1) toxicity that led to dose reduction or early discontinuation of chemotherapy.

Model 1: adjusted for age, stage and number of medications. Dose-limiting toxicity was adjusted for age and number of medications. Model 2: + BMI  $\geq$ 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

Bolded values (p < .001) are considered statistically significant after Bonferroni correction.

<sup>a</sup>p < .05.

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; HU, Hounsfield units; IMAT, intermuscular adipose tissue; LOS, length of stay; OR, odds ratio; SM, skeletal muscle; SMI, skeletal muscle index; SAT, subcutaneous adipose tissue; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

risk. The association was strongest for IMAT compared with other body composition measures. In the subgroup of patients who received adjuvant chemotherapy, SM/VAT was associated with a higher mortality risk during follow-up in the adjusted model. None of the survival analyses remained statistically significant after Bonferroni correction, as is shown in Table 3.

# **Sensitivity Analyses**

The median number of days between CT scan and surgery was 36 days (range 8–209 days), with 80.4% of patients having a

CT scan that was made a maximum of 8 weeks before surgery. Sensitivity analyses excluding CT scans that were made more than 8 weeks before surgery (supplemental online Table 1) and excluding scans in which body composition area was multiplied because of quality issues (supplemental online Table 2) showed results consistent with the total cohort. Stratification for colon and rectum cancer (supplemental online Tables 3, 4) showed similar results for both tumor types. Post hoc analyses stratified by Karnofsky Performance Scale score were performed to clarify the associations between higher SM and SMI

	One-	One-year survival All patients ( <i>n</i> = 378)		Long-term survival					
Z-scores body composition measures	All pat			ents ( <i>n</i> = 378)	Received chemotherapy (n = 53)				
	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI	HR	95% CI			
Z SM, cm <sup>2</sup>									
Crude	0.753	0.498-1.138	0.976	0.834-1.142	0.861	0.561-1.320			
Model 1	0.820	0.518-1.298	1.069	0.897–1.273	0.882	0.563-1.381			
Model 2	0.832	0.523-1.325	1.125	0.936-1.351	0.900	0.566-1.430			
Z SMI, cm²/m²									
Crude	0.706	0.463-1.076	0.953	0.812-1.119	0.861	0.557-1.332			
Model 1	0.780	0.494-1.232	0.998	0.840-1.187	0.879	0.560-1.379			
Model 2	0.793	0.498-1.263	1.054	0.879–1.264	0.898	0.561-1.436			
Z Muscle density, HU									
Crude	0.687	0.470-1.006	0.814 <sup>a</sup>	0.694–0.955	0.948	0.559-1.607			
Model 1	0.786	0.511-1.209	0.918	0.771-1.093	0.957	0.544-1.686			
Z IMAT, cm <sup>2</sup>									
Crude	1.239	0.838-1.833	1.225ª	1.039-1.444	1.161	0.622-2.165			
Model 1	1.074	0.702-1.643	1.087	0.915-1.293	1.177	0.626-2.210			
Z VAT, cm <sup>2</sup>									
Crude	1.060	0.724–1.552	0.998	0.849–1.173	0.618	0.363-1.052			
Model 1	0.984	0.639–1.515	0.941	0.792-1.118	0.593	0.338-1.042			
Z SAT, cm <sup>2</sup>									
Crude	0.997	0.657-1.514	0.934	0.785–1.111	0.789	0.368-1.694			
Model 1	0.902	0.561-1.450	0.902	0.742-1.098	0.764	0.378-1.546			
Z IMAT, %									
Crude	1.317	0.881-1.969	1.205ª	1.021-1.423	1.210	0.690-2.124			
Model 1	1.111	0.719–1.715	1.049	0.879–1.252	1.198	0.679–2.112			
Z SM/VAT, cm <sup>2</sup>									
Crude	0.864	0.564-1.324	0.995	0.844-1.174	1.588	0.951-2.651			
Model 1	1.025	0.647-1.622	1.131	0.951-1.345	1.778 <sup>a</sup>	1.002-3.156			
Z BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>									
Crude	0.951	0.638-1.417	0.988	0.835-1.169	0.834	0.470-1.481			
Model 1	0.836	0.529-1.320	0.899	0.744-1.087	0.840	0.470-1.501			

Table 3. Associations	between computed	tomography-based	body composition	measures and	overall	survival
-----------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	--------------	---------	----------

Body composition was analyzed with gender-specific standardized scores. The hazard ratio for death is given; survival time was calculated in months. Model 1: adjusted for age, stage, and number of medications. Associations with subgroup that received chemotherapy was adjusted for age and number of medications. Model 2: + BMI  $\ge$  30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>a</sup>p < .05.

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; CI, confidence interval; HR, hazard ratio; HU, Hounsfield units; IMAT, intermuscular adipose tissue; SAT, subcutaneous adipose tissue; SM, skeletal muscle; SMI, skeletal muscle index; VAT, visceral adipose tissue.

and higher risk of prolonged LOS and readmission (supplemental online Table 5). The associations between SM and SMI and higher risk of readmission were only present in the group with a Karnofsky Performance Scale score of ≥90.

#### DISCUSSION

In a population of older patients with CRC, preoperative CT-based body composition measures were not consistently or statistically significantly associated with surgery-related complications, dose-limiting toxicity, and overall survival. SM, muscle density, VAT, SM/VAT, and BMI showed associations with surgery-related complications. Muscle density, IMAT, and IMAT percentage showed associations with long-term overall survival in the total cohort and SM/VAT in the subgroup of patients

receiving adjuvant chemotherapy. However, associations of CTbased body composition measures were no longer statistically significant after Bonferroni correction for multiple testing was applied. The only statistically significant association was the association of higher BMI with prolonged LOS. The results of this study underscore the need for a meta-analysis to elucidate the value of CT-based body composition measures to predict adverse outcomes in patients with CRC.

The current body of evidence shows inconsistent associations between body composition measures and adverse outcomes in patients with CRC. Low SM has been shown to be associated with severe postoperative complications [11], LOS [13], dose-limiting toxicity [28–31], and long-term survival [10, 14–17, 32–34]. However, other studies did not show associations between low SM and overall [9–11, 14, 35–37]



or severe postoperative complications [9, 10, 14], readmission [13], and long-term survival [9, 11]. These varying results may have been caused by the use of different cutoff points, limiting comparison of studies. Another explanation for the inconsistency in the literature could be the inclusion of all age groups, as only one study specifically included older patients and found a significant association between low muscle mass and overall survival in patients with rectal cancer receiving chemoradiation [34]. The association between CT-based body composition measures and adverse outcomes is expected to differ between younger and older populations as body composition measures are negatively affected by age [38] but still show inconsistency when only studies with a mean/median age of 65 years and older are considered. In this study, statistically significant associations between higher SM and higher risk of surgery-related complications were found before Bonferroni correction was applied. This was contrary to what was expected. Post hoc analyses revealed that these associations were mainly applicable in patients with a high Karnofsky Performance Scale score. This could indicate that patients with higher SM were treated more aggressively, leading to a higher risk of surgery-related complications. Another possibility is that these patients lost muscle mass prior to the preoperative CT scan, leading to higher risk of complications; however, this could not be proved owing to the design of this study. Potential influences of confounding factors, type of treatment and type of complications, or edema leading to an overestimation of muscle mass have been evaluated but could not further explain the unexpected association between higher SM and higher risk of surgery-related complications. On the contrary, higher SM/VAT was associated with lower risk of surgery-related complications before Bonferroni correction, which might imply that different body composition measures are needed to predict adverse outcomes than absolute muscle mass. After accounting for multiple testing, neither SM nor SM/VAT were significantly associated with surgery-related complications, dose-limiting toxicity, or overall survival.

Besides muscle mass, several CT-based adipose measures were considered, including muscle density, IMAT, and VAT. Based on the negative effects that low muscle density and high IMAT and VAT can impose on the body, associations with adverse outcomes were expected. The negative effect of VAT, in contrast to SAT, is caused by provoked insulin resistance and pro-inflammatory cytokines, which increases the risk of detrimental health outcomes [39, 40]. IMAT, on the other hand, which includes both inter- and intramuscular fat [41], results in a misbalance in pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines, which can lead to a higher risk of adverse health outcomes independent of VAT [42]. IMAT, in its turn, highly correlates with muscle density, which is a measure of fat infiltration in skeletal muscle fibers [7]. Low muscle density has been associated with reduced muscle strength and physical performance, which are determinants of adverse outcomes in older patients [43, 44]. However, although muscle density, IMAT, and VAT appeared to be associated with adverse outcomes in this study, the associations were weak and no longer present after correction for multiple testing. This inconsistency is in line with available literature. Low muscle density has been associated with postoperative complications [9-11, 37] and long-term survival [15-17], although

other studies have found no associations with overall [35] or severe postoperative complications [10] and long-term survival [9-11, 17]. The same counts for VAT or visceral obesity, which was found to be associated with postoperative complications [36, 45-48], LOS [36, 46, 48], readmission [49], and 2-year survival [50] in some studies. However, in other studies, associations with overall postoperative complications [35, 51], LOS [45, 47, 51, 52], readmission [36], dose-limiting toxicity [29], and long-term survival [16, 33, 51, 53] were not found. The use of cutoff points and inclusion of all age groups could have contributed to the inconsistency of these results. BMI was the only body composition measure that remained statistically significant after Bonferroni correction and was associated with prolonged LOS. This can be explained by the higher risk of surgical complications such as fascial dehiscence and surgical incisional site infections and thromboembolic complications in patients with higher BMI [27, 54]. These are complications that could have been classified as mild complications (grade 1 or 2) because they do not necessarily lead to reintervention but can still lead to longer LOS.

Apart from looking at CT-based body composition at one moment in time, changes in body composition over time might be important. A few studies have shown that body composition in patients with CRC is dynamic and loss of muscle and visceral fat tissue can lead to a higher risk of adverse outcomes [55-58]. Furthermore, muscle function might be more relevant than absolute mass, as has been shown in a recent study in older patients with advanced cancer in which higher muscle strength was associated with overall survival whereas SM and muscle density were not [59]. An earlier study showed that a combination of CT-based low SM, handgrip strength, and gait speed was predictive of postoperative complications in patients with CRC [60]. Possibly, CT-based body composition measures need to be combined with functional measures such as handgrip strength and physical performance to predict relevant patient outcomes. Moreover, other domains of the Comprehensive Geriatric Assessment such as nutritional status and cognition have prognostic value and could contribute to the prediction of adverse outcomes in older patients with CRC [61]. Future research needs to clarify the prognostic value of these measures in addition to CT-based body composition measures over time, to predict the risk of adverse outcomes in older patients with CRC. This is also important in the development of preoperative interventions, also known as prehabilitation, which can be effective in older patients with CRC [62, 63].

The strength of this study is the comparison of the associations of various standardized CT-based body composition measures on consecutive treatment modalities in older patients with CRC. By omitting cutoff points and using gender-specific standardized Z scores, body composition measures could be compared with one another. Limitations of this study are that it is a single-center cohort study and may not be representative for other populations. Moreover, because of the retrospective design, other prognostic measures such as nutrition and physical performance could not be taken into account. The subgroup of patients receiving adjuvant chemotherapy was small, resulting in limited power, and only included patients who were considered fit enough for chemotherapy treatment by the multidisciplinary team, and almost half of all patients received capecitabine monotherapy. Concerning the CT scans, the time period between preoperative CT scan and surgery and chemotherapy was not standardized, although sensitivity analyses showed similar results excluding CT scans with a longer time period before surgery. A small proportion of 5% of CT scans was not suitable for body composition measurement because of artifacts or frame selection.

# CONCLUSION

In a cohort of older patients with CRC, associations between preoperative CT-based body composition measures and surgery-related complications, dose-limiting toxicity, and overall survival were not consistent or statistically significant. Associations between CT-based body composition measures and consecutive treatment modalities could not be confirmed. Future research should focus on the change in body composition over time combined with muscle strength, physical performance, and other geriatric domains to predict adverse outcomes in older patients with CRC.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Willem G.P.M. Looijaard for being the second assessor in case of doubt about inclusion or multiplication of surface area in included CT scans. Moreover, we thank Anna F. Voskuilen (A.V.) for analyzing a selection of CT scans to determine the interobserver correlation coefficient. This work was supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under the Marie-Sklodowska-Curie grant agreement 675003 (PANINI program) and by an unrestricted grant of the University of Melbourne, Australia, received by Professor Andrea B. Maier. The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study, data collection and analysis, interpretation of data, or preparation of the manuscript. This study has been performed in accordance with the ethical standards laid down in the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki and its later amendments. The study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of the Amsterdam University Medical Center, location VU Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands (number of approval 2015.166) with site-specific approval of Medical Spectrum Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands. Written informed consent was waived because of the retrospective design of the study.

#### **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

- Conception/design: Stéphanie M.L.M. Looijaard, Carel G.M. Meskers, Monique S. Slee-Valentijn, Donald E. Bouman, A.N. Machteld Wymenga, Joost M. Klaase, Andrea B. Maier
- Provision of study material or patients: Donald E. Bouman, A.N. Machteld Wymenga, Joost M. Klaase
- Collection and/or assembly of data: Stéphanie M.L.M. Looijaard, Monique S. Slee-Valentijn, Donald E. Bouman, Andrea B. Maier
- Data analysis and interpretation: Stéphanie M.L.M. Looijaard, Carel G.M. Meskers, Joost M. Klaase, Andrea B. Maier
- Manuscript writing: Stéphanie M.L.M. Looijaard, Carel G.M. Meskers, Monique S. Slee-Valentijn, Donald E. Bouman, A.N. Machteld Wymenga, Joost M. Klaase, Andrea B. Maier
- Final approval of manuscript: Stéphanie M.L.M. Looijaard, Carel G.M. Meskers, Monique S. Slee-Valentijn, Donald E. Bouman, A.N. Machteld Wymenga, Joost M. Klaase, Andrea B. Maier

#### DISCLOSURES

The authors indicated no financial relationships.

#### **References**

**1.** Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I et al. 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.

**2.** Benson AB, III, Schrag D, Somerfield MR et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology recommendations on adjuvant chemotherapy for stage II colon cancer. J Clin Oncol 2004;22:3408–3419.

**3.** Aquina CT, Mohile SG, Tejani MA et al. The impact of age on complications, survival, and cause of death following colon cancer surgery. Br J Cancer 2017;116:389–397.

**4.** Bastiansen M, Furnes B, Sondenaa K et al. Older colon cancer patients have more co-morbidities, are vulnerable and have a higher risk for complications, longer hospital stay and increased mortality. Eur Geriatr Med 2011;2:S185.

**5.** Sud S, Lai P, Zhang T et al. Chemotherapy in the oldest old: The feasibility of delivering cytotoxic therapy to patients 80 years old and older. J Geriatr Oncol 2015;6:395–400.

**6.** Laurent M, Des Guetz G, Bastuji-Garin S et al. Chronological age and risk of chemotherapy nonfeasibility: A real-life cohort study of 153 stage II or III colorectal cancer patients given adjuvantmodified FOLFOX6. Am J Clin Oncol 2018;41: 73–80.

**7.** Goodpaster BH, Kelley DE, Thaete FL et al. Skeletal muscle attenuation determined by computed tomography is associated with skeletal muscle lipid content. J Appl Physiol 2000;89: 104–110.

**8.** Malietzis G, Aziz O, Bagnall NM et al. The role of body composition evaluation by computerized tomography in determining colorectal cancer treatment outcomes: A systematic review. Eur J Surg Oncol 2015;41:186–196.

**9.** Berkel AEM, Klaase JM, de Graaff F et al. Patient's skeletal muscle radiation attenuation and sarcopenic obesity are associated with postoperative morbidity after neoadjuvant chemoradiation and resection for rectal cancer. Dig Surg 2019;36: 376–383.

**10.** Boer BC, de Graaff F, Brusse-Keizer M et al. Skeletal muscle mass and quality as risk factors for postoperative outcome after open colon resection for cancer. Int J Colorectal Dis 2016;31: 1117–1124.

**11.** van Vugt JLA, Coebergh van den Braak RRJ, Lalmahomed ZS et al. Impact of low skeletal muscle mass and density on short and long-term outcome after resection of stage I-III colorectal cancer. Eur J Surg Oncol 2018;44:1354–1360.

**12.** Brown JC, Cespedes Feliciano EM, Caan BJ. The evolution of body composition in oncology-epidemiology, clinical trials, and the future of patient care: Facts and numbers. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle 2018;9:1200–1208.

**13.** Lieffers JR, Bathe OF, Fassbender K et al. Sarcopenia is associated with postoperative infection and delayed recovery from colorectal cancer resection surgery. Br J Cancer 2012;107:931–936.

**14.** Takeda Y, Akiyoshi T, Matsueda K et al. Skeletal muscle loss is an independent negative prognostic factor in patients with advanced lower rectal cancer treated with neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy. PLoS One 2018;13:e0195406.

**15.** Dolan RD, Almasaudi AS, Dieu LB et al. The relationship between computed tomographyderived body composition, systemic inflammatory response, and survival in patients undergoing surgery for colorectal cancer. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle 2019;10:111–122.

**16.** Hopkins JJ, Reif RL, Bigam DL et al. The impact of muscle and adipose tissue on long-term survival in patients with stage I to III colorectal cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 2019;62:549–560.

**17.** Charette N, Vandeputte C, Ameye L et al. Prognostic value of adipose tissue and muscle mass in advanced colorectal cancer: A post hoc analysis of two non-randomized phase II trials. BMC Cancer 2019;19:134.

**18.** Cakir H, Heus C, van der Ploeg TJ et al. Visceral obesity determined by CT scan and outcomes after colorectal surgery; A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Colorectal Dis 2015;30:875-882.

**19.** Shen W, Punyanitya M, Wang Z et al. Total body skeletal muscle and adipose tissue volumes: Estimation from a single abdominal cross-sectional image. J Appl Physiol 2004;97:2333–2338.

**20.** Mitsiopoulos N, Baumgartner RN, Heymsfield SB et al. Cadaver validation of skeletal muscle measurement by magnetic resonance



imaging and computerized tomography. J Appl Physiol 1998;85:115–122.

**21.** Mourtzakis M, Prado CM, Lieffers JR et al. A practical and precise approach to quantification of body composition in cancer patients using computed tomography images acquired during routine care. Appl Physiol Nutr Metab 2008;33: 997–1006.

**22.** Edge S, Byrd D, Compton C et al. AJCC Cancer Staging Handbook. New York: Springer, 2010.

**23.** Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: A new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. Ann Surg 2004;240:205–213.

**24.** Dekker JW, Gooiker GA, van der Geest LG et al. Use of different comorbidity scores for risk-adjustment in the evaluation of quality of colorectal cancer surgery: Does it matter? Eur J Surg Oncol 2012;38:1071–1078.

**25.** Porporato PE. Understanding cachexia as a cancer metabolism syndrome. Oncogenesis 2016; 5:e200.

**26.** Fried TR, O'Leary J, Towle V et al. Health outcomes associated with polypharmacy in community-dwelling older adults: A systematic review. J Am Geriatr Soc 2014;62:2261–2272.

**27.** Poelemeijer YQM, Lijftogt N, Detering R et al. Obesity as a determinant of perioperative and postoperative outcome in patients following colorectal cancer surgery: A population-based study (2009-2016). Eur J Surg Oncol 2018;44: 1849–1857.

**28.** Prado CMM, Baracos VE, McCargar LJ et al. Body composition as an independent determinant of 5-fluorouracil-based chemotherapy toxicity. Clin Cancer Res 2007;13:3264–3268.

**29.** Barret M, Antoun S, Dalban C et al. Sarcopenia is linked to treatment toxicity in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. Nutr Cancer 2014;66:583–589.

**30.** Cespedes Feliciano EM, Lee VS, Prado CM et al. Muscle mass at the time of diagnosis of nonmetastatic colon cancer and early discontinuation of chemotherapy, delays, and dose reductions on adjuvant FOLFOX: The C-SCANS study. Cancer 2017;123:4868–4877.

**31.** Ali R, Baracos VE, Sawyer MB et al. Lean body mass as an independent determinant of dose-limiting toxicity and neuropathy in patients with colon cancer treated with FOLFOX regimens. Cancer Med 2016;5:607–616.

**32.** Miyamoto Y, Baba Y, Sakamoto Y et al. Sarcopenia is a negative prognostic factor after curative resection of colorectal cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 2015;22:2663–2668.

**33.** van Vledder MG, Levolger S, Ayez N et al. Body composition and outcome in patients undergoing resection of colorectal liver metastases. Br J Surg 2012;99:550–557.

**34.** Park SE, Hwang IG, Choi CH et al. Sarcopenia is poor prognostic factor in older patients with locally advanced rectal cancer who received preoperative or postoperative chemoradiotherapy. Medicine 2018;97:e13363.

**35.** Almasaudi AS, Dolan RD, McSorley ST et al. Relationship between computed tomographyderived body composition, sex, and post-operative complications in patients with colorectal cancer. Eur J Clin Nutr 2019 [Epub ahead of print].

**36.** Heus C, Bakker N, Verduin WM et al. Impact of body composition on surgical outcome in rectal cancer patients, a retrospective cohort study. World J Surg 2019;43:1370–1376.

**37.** van der Kroft G, Bours D, Janssen-Heijnen DM et al. Value of sarcopenia assessed by computed tomography for the prediction of postoperative morbidity following oncological colorectal resection: A comparison with the malnutrition screening tool. Clinical Nutr ESPEN 2018;24:114–119.

**38.** Johannesdottir F, Allaire B, Anderson DE et al. Population-based study of age- and sex-related differences in muscle density and size in thoracic and lumbar spine: The Framingham study. Osteoporos Int 2018;29:1569–1580.

**39.** Stehno-Bittel L. Intricacies of fat. Phys Ther 2008;88:1265–1278.

**40.** Wronska A, Kmiec Z. Structural and biochemical characteristics of various white adipose tissue depots. Acta Physiol 2012;205:194–208.

**41.** Addison O, Marcus RL, Lastayo PC et al. Intermuscular fat: A review of the consequences and causes. Int J Endocrinol 2014;2014:309570.

**42.** Yim JE, Heshka S, Albu J et al. Intermuscular adipose tissue rivals visceral adipose tissue in independent associations with cardiovascular risk. Int J Obes (Lond) 2007;31:1400–1405.

**43.** Goodpaster BH, Carlson CL, Visser M et al. Attenuation of skeletal muscle and strength in the elderly: The Health ABC study. J Appl Physiol 2001;90:2157–2165.

**44.** Visser M, Kritchevsky SB, Goodpaster BH et al. Leg muscle mass and composition in relation to lower extremity performance in men and women aged 70 to 79: The health, aging and body composition study. J Am Geriatr Soc 2002; 50:897–904.

**45.** Watanabe J, Tatsumi K, Ota M et al. The impact of visceral obesity on surgical outcomes of laparoscopic surgery for colon cancer. Int J Colorectal Dis 2014;29:343–351.

**46.** Tsujinaka S, Konishi F, Kawamura YJ et al. Visceral obesity predicts surgical outcomes after laparoscopic colectomy for sigmoid colon cancer. Dis Colon Rectum 2008;51:1757–1767.

**47.** Ishii Y, Hasegawa H, Nishibori H et al. Impact of visceral obesity on surgical outcome after laparoscopic surgery for rectal cancer. Br J Surg 2005;92:1261–1262.

**48.** Cakir H, Heus C, Verduin WM et al. Visceral obesity, body mass index and risk of complications after colon cancer resection: A retrospective cohort study. Surgery 2015;157:909–915.

**49.** Martin L, Hopkins J, Malietzis G et al. Assessment of computed tomography (CT)defined muscle and adipose tissue features in relation to short-term outcomes after elective surgery for colorectal cancer: A multicenter approach. Ann Surg Oncol 2018;25:2669–2680. **50.** Guiu B, Petit JM, Bonnetain F et al. Visceral fat area is an independent predictive biomarker of outcome after first-line bevacizumab-based treatment in metastatic colorectal cancer. Gut 2010;59:341–347.

**51.** Rickles AS, Iannuzzi JC, Mironov O et al. Visceral obesity and colorectal cancer: Are we missing the boat with BMI? J Gastrointest Surg 2013; 17:133–143.

**52.** Ballian N, Lubner MG, Munoz A et al. Visceral obesity is associated with outcomes of total mesorectal excision for rectal adenocarcinoma. J Surg Oncol 2012;105:365–370.

**53.** Yamamoto N, Fujii S, Sato T et al. Impact of body mass index and visceral adiposity on outcomes in colorectal cancer. Asia Pac J Clin Oncol 2012;8:337–345.

**54.** Merkow RP, Bilimoria KY, McCarter MD et al. Effect of body mass index on short-term outcomes after colectomy for cancer. J Am Coll Surg 2009;208:53–61.

**55.** Kurk S, Peeters P, Stellato R et al. Skeletal muscle mass loss and dose-limiting toxicities in metastatic colorectal cancer patients. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle 2019;10:803–813.

**56.** Blauwhoff-Buskermolen S, Versteeg KS, de van der Schueren MA et al. Loss of muscle mass during chemotherapy is predictive for poor survival of patients with metastatic colorectal cancer. J Clin Oncol 2016;34:1339–1344.

**57.** Miyamoto Y, Baba Y, Sakamoto Y et al. Negative impact of skeletal muscle loss after systemic chemotherapy in patients with unresectable colorectal cancer. PLoS One 2015;10:e0129742.

**58.** Hopkins JJ, Reif R, Bigam D et al. Change in skeletal muscle following resection of stage I-III colorectal cancer is predictive of poor survival: A cohort study. World J Surg 2019;43:2518–2526.

**59.** Versteeg KS, Blauwhoff-Buskermolen S, Buffart LM et al. Higher muscle strength is associated with prolonged survival in older patients with advanced cancer. *The Oncologist* 2018;23: 580–585.

**60.** Huang D, Wang S, Zhuang C et al. Sarcopenia, as defined by low muscle mass, strength and physical performance, predicts complications after colorectal cancer surgery. Colorectal Dis 2015;17:256–264.

**61.** Bruijnen CP, van Harten-Krouwel DG, Koldenhof JJ et al. Predictive value of each geriatric assessment domain for older patients with cancer: A systematic review. J Geriatr Oncol 2019;10:859–873.

**62.** Hijazi Y, Gondal U, Aziz O. A systematic review of prehabilitation programs in abdominal cancer surgery. Int J Surg 2017;39:156–162.

**63.** Looijaard S, Slee-Valentijn MS, Otten RHJ et al. Physical and nutritional prehabilitation in older patients with colorectal carcinoma: A systematic review. J Geriatr Phys Ther 2018;41: 236–244.

See http://www.TheOncologist.com for supplemental material available online.