



# Postoperative Loss of Skeletal Muscle Mass Predicts Poor Survival After Gastric Cancer Surgery

Shanjun Tan<sup>†</sup>, Qiulin Zhuang<sup>†</sup>, Zhige Zhang<sup>†</sup>, Shuhao Li, Jiahao Xu, Junjie Wang, Yanni Zhang, Qiulei Xi, Qingyang Meng, Yi Jiang and Guohao Wu<sup>\*</sup>

Department of General Surgery/Shanghai Clinical Nutrition Research Center, Zhongshan Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

#### Edited by:

Kalliopi-Anna Poulia, Agricultural University of Athens, Greece

#### Reviewed by:

Gerasimos Terzis, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece Xinying Wang, Medical School of Nanjing University, China

#### \*Correspondence:

Guohao Wu prowugh@163.com

<sup>†</sup>These authors have contributed equally to this work

#### Specialty section:

This article was submitted to Clinical Nutrition, a section of the journal Frontiers in Nutrition

Received: 13 October 2021 Accepted: 10 January 2022 Published: 01 February 2022

#### Citation:

Tan S, Zhuang Q, Zhang Z, Li S, Xu J, Wang J, Zhang Y, Xi Q, Meng Q, Jiang Y and Wu G (2022) Postoperative Loss of Skeletal Muscle Mass Predicts Poor Survival After Gastric Cancer Surgery. Front. Nutr. 9:794576. doi: 10.3389/fnut.2022.794576 **Background:** Skeletal muscle mass deterioration is common in gastric cancer (GC) patients and is linked to poor prognosis. However, information regarding the effect of skeletal muscle mass changes in the postoperative period is scarce. This study was to investigate the link between postoperative loss of skeletal muscle mass and survival following GC surgery.

# **Methods:** Patients who underwent GC surgery between January 2015 and December 2016 were recruited into the study. Computed tomography at L3 vertebral level was used to examine skeletal muscle index prior to surgery and about 6 months after surgery. Skeletal muscle index changes were categorized as presence or absence of $\geq$ 5% loss. Overall survival (OS) and disease-free survival (DFS) were analyzed, and Cox proportional hazard models used to identify their predictors.

**Results:** The study comprised of 318 gastric cancer patients of which 63.5% were male. The group's mean age was  $58.14 \pm 10.77$  years. Sixty-five patients experienced postoperative skeletal muscle index loss  $\geq 5\%$  and had poorer OS (P = 0.004) and DFS (P = 0.020). We find that postoperative skeletal muscle index loss  $\geq 5\%$  predicts OS [hazard ratio (HR): 2.769, 95% confidence interval (CI): 1.865–4.111; P < 0.001] and DFS (HR: 2.533, 95% CI: 1.753–3.659; P < 0.001).

**Conclusions:** Loss of skeletal muscle mass postoperatively is linked to poor survival following GC surgery. Further studies are needed to determine whether stabilizing or enhancing skeletal muscle mass after surgery improves survival.

Keywords: muscle loss, gastric cancer, surgery, survival, prognosis

# INTRODUCTION

While its incidence rate continues to decrease in most parts of the world, gastric cancer (GC) accounts for the fifth common cancer and become the third leading cause of cancer-related death worldwide (1, 2). GC is mostly diagnosed after it has progressed to an advanced stage, and as such, has a low 5-year survival (3). Surgical resection is the most effective therapeutic intervention against GC (4). However, despite advances in operative techniques and perioperative care, GC prognosis after surgery remains poor (5). Numerous studies have shown that cancer prognosis is

1

conditioned not only by non-modifiable tumor-specific factors such as histology and stage but also modifiable patientindividual factors such as performance status (i.e., patients' physical functioning associated with activities of daily life) and body composition (6–8). Thus, timely identification of these modifiable factors is needed for effective targeted interventions and improved prognosis.

Examination of body composition and its influence on cancer outcomes has drawn growing interest in surgical oncology. Notably, loss of skeletal muscle mass has cancer prognostic value (6-8). Preoperative reduction in skeletal muscle mass is related to poor prognosis after surgical treatment of various cancers, including GC (9-11). Identifying skeletal muscle mass preoperative loss is prognostic and may allow timely therapeutic intervention for better GC outcomes. However, GC patients are often malnourished before surgery, and their malnutrition is often worsened by various factors like postoperative chemotherapy and reduced stomach volume (12). Significant postoperative weight loss has been reported after GC surgery (13, 14), suggesting that muscle wasting might occur in the postoperative period. We have recently reported that after GC surgery, reduced skeletal muscle mass occurs in 3 months after hospital discharge (15). Postoperative skeletal muscle mass has also been reported to negatively impact survival after digestive tract cancer surgeries, including pancreatic, colorectal, and esophageal cancer (7, 16, 17). However, as far as we know, earlier studies mainly concentrated on the influence of preoperative skeletal muscle mass loss on postsurgical GC prognosis. Thus, it is unclear whether the loss of skeletal muscle postoperatively is a risk factor for poor GC prognosis after surgery. If this were the case, then serial assessment of skeletal muscle mass postoperatively may guide efficient interventions.

Here, we aimed to assess postoperative changes in skeletal muscle mass using computed tomography (CT) after GC surgery and to determine whether these changes affect overall and disease-free survival.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

# **Study Population**

Patients aged > 18 years, who underwent GC surgery between January 2015 and December 2016 at the Department of General Surgery/Shanghai Clinical Nutrition Research Center, Zhongshan Hospital, Fudan University, China, were recruited into the study from our prospective clinical database. Patients under palliative or emergency surgery were excluded from the study. Our institutional ethics committee provided ethical approval for the study, which was conducted based on the Declaration of Helsinki ethical standards.

# Assessment of Skeletal Muscle Mass

We utilized routine patient abdominal CT scans to examine skeletal muscle mass, as we previously described (18). The CT images used were either contrast-enhanced or unenhanced multiphase acquisitions, 5 mm thick. Two adjacent CT images

at L3 vertebral levels in the same series were chosen in the non-contrast phase. Next, total skeletal muscle area (SMA) was quantified using ImageJ2 software (The National Institutes of Health, Washington, MD, USA) between -29 to +150Hounsfield units (HU) for skeletal muscle on both slices, and the average SMA reported. Skeletal muscle index (SMI) was computed using the formula:  $SMI = SMA/height^2$ , expressed in cm<sup>2</sup>/m<sup>2</sup>. Anonymized CT images were analyzed by an experienced study evaluator who was not aware of the order of images. All included patients underwent abdominal CT scans within 7 days before surgery and about 6 months after surgery, and SMI changes were calculated. Because skeletal muscle losses  $\geq$  5% have previously been associated with poor clinical outcomes, including short survival in cancer treatment (19), we used this cutoff threshold to define the postoperative loss of skeletal muscle mass by grouping patients as SMI loss  $\geq$  5% or SMI loss < 5%.

# **Data Collection**

The clinical data collected included demographics, preoperative characteristics [including BMI (body mass index), ECOG (eastern cooperative oncology group) performance status, serum hemoglobin and albumin level, and comorbidities], operative and pathologic features [including tumor location, type of resection, type of reconstruction, histology, and cancer stage based on the 8th AJCC (American joint committee on cancer) edition], postoperative characteristics (postoperative hospital stay, postoperative complications examined based on the Dindo and Clavien classification), number of patients needing chemotherapy, and chemotherapy tolerance (defined as chemotherapy modification including dose reduction, delay, or termination, and evaluated using a dichotomous scale of absent vs. present) (20). Data on overall survival (OS) and disease-free survival (DFS) were collected. In our prospective clinical database, the follow-up period for all patients was 1<sup>st</sup>-month post-surgery and after every 3 months, until June 2020.

# **Statistical Analysis**

Statistical analysis was done on SPSS 23.0 software (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). Continuous data are expressed as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation (SD), whereas categorical data are shown as percentages and numbers. Independent-samples t-test or Mann-Whitney U test was employed to analyze continuous variables.  $\chi^2$  test or the Fisher exact test was used to compare categorical data. Kaplan-Meier analyses were used to generate OS and DFS curves. Variations in survival were analyzed using the log-rank test. The impact of postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss on survival was investigated using Cox proportional hazard models. First, univariate analyses were performed respectively for all potential variables that were chosen based on clinical information. Multivariate analysis was then done using Cox proportional backward stepwise procedure, including all variables with P < 0.05 in the univariate analysis. P < 0.05 indicates statistical significance.

#### TABLE 1 | Patient demographic and clinical characteristics according to postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss.

Characteristics	Total ( <i>n</i> = 318)	SMI loss ≥ 5% (n = 65)	SMI loss < 5% (n = 253)	P-value
Gender				0.284
Male Female	202 (63.5) 116 (36.5)	45 (69.2) 20 (30.8)	157 (62.1) 96 (37.9)	
Age (years), mean $\pm$ SD	$58.14 \pm 10.77$	$60.86 \pm 10.73$	$57.45 \pm 10.68$	0.022
Diabetes	21 (6.6)	6 (9.2)	15 (5.9)	0.399
Respiratory comorbidity	17 (5.3)	3 (4.6)	14 (5.5)	1.000
Cardiovascular comorbidity	58 (18.2)	13 (20)	45 (17.8)	0.680
Serum albumin (g/L), mean $\pm$ SD	$38.46 \pm 4.79$	$37.54 \pm 4.47$	$38.69 \pm 4.85$	0.083
Serum hemoglobin (g/L), mean $\pm$ SD	$122.72 \pm 23.58$	$119.46 \pm 21.77$	$123.56 \pm 23.99$	0.212
Preoperative BMI (kg/m <sup>2</sup> ), mean $\pm$ SD	$22.29 \pm 3.38$	$21.61 \pm 3.29$	$22.47 \pm 3.38$	0.067
Preoperative SMI (cm²/m²), mean $\pm$ SD	$42.60 \pm 5.23$	$41.71 \pm 5.34$	$42.82 \pm 5.18$	0.124
Preoperative ECOG performance status				0.549
0 1	261 (82.1) 57 (17.9)	55 (84.6) 10 (15.4)	206 (81.4) 47 (18.6)	
Tumor location				0.816
Upper Not upper	70 (22.0) 248 (78.0)	15 (23.1) 50 (76.9)	55 (21.7) 198 (78.3)	
Type of resection				0.596
Total gastrectomy Subtotal gastrectomy	99 (31.1) 219 (68.9)	22 (33.8) 43 (66.2)	77 (30.4) 176 (69.6)	
Type of reconstruction				0.741
Billroth I Billroth II Roux-en-Y Other	121 (38.1) 69 (21.7) 117 (36.8) 11 (3.5)	26 (40.0) 11 (16.9) 26 (40.0) 2 (3.1)	95 (37.5) 58 (22.9) 91 (36.0) 9 (3.6)	
Histology				0.793
Undifferentiated Differentiated	113 (35.5) 205 (64.5)	24 (36.9) 41 (63.1)	89 (35.2) 164 (64.8)	
AJCC stage				0.010
I II III	79 (24.8) 115 (36.2) 124 (39.0)	12 (18.5) 17 (26.2) 36 (55.4)	67 (26.5) 98 (38.7) 88 (34.8)	
Postoperative any complication	56 (17.6)	17 (26.2)	39 (15.4)	0.043
Postoperative hospital stay (days), mean $\pm$ SD	9.48 ± 2.17	$9.72\pm2.50$	$9.42 \pm 2.08$	0.314
Postoperative chemotherapy	216 (67.9)	51 (78.5)	165 (65.2)	0.041
Chemotherapy modification	73 (23.0)	23 (35.4)	50 (19.8)	0.008

Values are presented as n (%) unless otherwise stated. Bold values indicate statistical significant.

SD, standard deviation; BMI, body mass index; SMI, skeletal muscle index; AJCC, American Joint Committee on Cancer; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group.

# RESULTS

# **Patient Characteristics**

Of the 363 patients who consecutively underwent curative GC surgery from January 2015 to December 2016, 318 patients (63.5% male, mean age 58.14 years) met the inclusion criteria. 65 patients exhibited SMI losses  $\geq$  5%, while 253 had SMI losses < 5%. Participant characteristics are shown on **Table 1**. The groups with  $\geq$  5% SMI loss and the one with < 5% SMI loss were similar with regards to gender, diabetes, respiratory and cardiovascular comorbidity, serum albumin and hemoglobin, preoperative BMI, preoperative

SMI, preoperative ECOG performance status, tumor location, type of resection, type of reconstruction, histology, and postoperative hospital stay (P > 0.05). However,  $\geq 5\%$  loss significantly correlated with advanced age ( $60.86 \pm 10.73$  vs. 57.45  $\pm 10.68$  years, P = 0.022), higher incidence of postoperative complications (26.2 vs. 15.4%; P = 0.043), higher rates of postoperative chemotherapy (78.5 vs. 65.2%; P = 0.041), and chemotherapy modification including dose reduction, delay, or termination (35.4 vs. 19.8%; P = 0.008). Moreover, AJCC stage differed significantly between the two groups (P = 0.010).





# Effects of Postoperative Skeletal Muscle Mass Loss on Overall Survival

During follow-up, patients who exhibited  $\geq$  5% SMI loss showed significantly lower OS relative to those with < 5% SMI loss (40.0 vs. 56.1%; P = 0.004) (Figure 1). Univariate and multivariate analyses were used to identify factors influencing OS following GC curative surgery (Table 2). Univariate analysis revealed the following factor as significantly-associated with poor OS: age > 65 years [hazard ratio (HR) = 1.638, 95% confidence interval (CI) = 1.160-2.314; P = 0.005], hypoproteinemia (HR = 1.501, P)95% CI = 1.035-2.328; P = 0.043), preoperative SMI (HR = 2.546, 95% CI = 1.774–3.653; *P* < 0.001), histology (HR = 1.500, 95% CI = 1.083-2.078; P = 0.015), AJCC stage (II vs. I: HR = 6.355, 95% CI = 3.719–10.859; P < 0.001; III vs. I: HR = 6.930, 95% CI = 4.200–11.435; P < 0.001), postoperative any complication (HR = 1.494, 95% CI = 1.011-2.209; P = 0.044), postoperative chemotherapy (HR = 1.619, 95% CI = 1.117-2.348; P = 0.011), chemotherapy modification (HR = 1.545, 95% CI = 1.081–2.207; P = 0.017), and SMI loss  $\ge$  5% (HR = 1.693, 95% CI = 1.175-2.439; P = 0.005). Multivariate analysis identified the following factors as independently correlating with poor OS: age >65 years (HR = 1.616, 95% CI = 1.130-2.311; P = 0.009), preoperative SMI (HR = 2.187, 95% CI = 1.491 - 3.208; P < 0.001), AJCC stage (II vs. I: HR = 6.106, 95% CI = 3.504-10.641; *P* < 0.001; III vs. I: HR = 8.840, 95% CI = 5.231–14.938; P < 0.001), chemotherapy modification (HR = 1.498, 95% CI = 1.079–2.325; P = 0.032), and SMI loss  $\geq 5\%$  (HR = 2.769, 95%) CI = 1.865 - 4.111; P < 0.001).

# Effects of Postoperative Loss of Skeletal Muscle Mass on Disease-Free Survival

In the course of follow-up, patients who exhibited  $\geq$  5% SMI loss showed considerably lower DFS rates relative to those with < 5%

SMI loss (33.8 vs. 46.2%; P = 0.020) (Figure 2). Univariate and multivariate analyses were used to identify factors influencing DFS following GC curative surgery (Table 3). Univariate analysis revealed the following factors as significantly correlating with poor DFS: hypoproteinemia (HR = 1.401, 95% CI = 1.022-1.922; P = 0.036), preoperative SMI (HR = 2.348, 95% CI = 1.675-3.290; *P* < 0.001), histology (HR = 1.774, 95% CI = 1.319–2.388; P < 0.001), AJCC stage (II vs. I: HR = 12.511, 95% CI = 7.524-20.804); P < 0.001; III vs. I: HR = 8.525, 95% CI = 5.237-13.878; P < 0.001), postoperative any complication (HR = 1.854, 95% CI = 1.307-2.629; P = 0.001), chemotherapy modification (HR = 1.513, 95% CI = 1.032–1.975; P = 0.019), and  $\geq$  5% SMI loss (HR = 1.492, 95% CI = 1.058–2.102; *P* = 0.022). Multivariate analysis identified preoperative SMI (HR = 1.953, 95% CI = 1.369-2.786; *P* < 0.001), AJCC stage (II vs. I: HR = 11.726, 95% CI = 6.983-19.690; *P* < 0.001; III vs. I: HR = 10.096, 95% CI = 6.091–16.735; P < 0.001), chemotherapy modification (HR = 1.403, 95% CI = 1.006–1.879; P = 0.041), and SMI loss  $\geq 5\%$  (HR = 2.533, 95%) CI = 1.753 - 3.659; P < 0.001) as independently correlated with poor DFS.

# DISCUSSION

To our best knowledge, this study was the first report suggesting that postoperative loss of skeletal muscle mass negatively influences OS and DFS in patients following GC surgery. These findings may guide clinicians on the optimal use of prophylactic strategies to reduce postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss, aiming to improve GC outcomes after surgery.

Even though there has been a significant advancement in nutritional support therapy, surgical techniques, and increased recovery rates following surgery, GC surgery is still associated with high malnutrition risk as a result of gastrointestinal complications and reduced food intake. These problems are exacerbated by chronic comorbidities, unintentional weight loss prior to surgery, and postoperative chemotherapy (12). Poor nutrition is linked to poor clinical outcomes, which mainly include increased morbidity and mortality, as well as decreased survival (21-23). Thus, the management of malnutrition is critical for GC treatment and prognosis. Recently, loss of skeletal muscle mass emerged as a prognostic indicator in various cancers during surgery (6-11). However, studies conducted previously primarily focused on the effects of preoperative skeletal muscle mass loss after gastric cancer surgery, and it is unclear whether postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss affects post-GC surgery prognosis. Additionally, postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss negatively impacts survival after digestive tract surgery due to the pancreatic, colorectal, and esophagus cancers (7, 16, 17). Here, we sought to examine skeletal muscle mass postoperative changes after GC surgery and to determine whether these changes affect OS and DFS.

A standard technique for measuring skeletal muscle mass is lacking. Different methods like dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry and CT scanning, are applied to quantitatively measure skeletal muscle mass in clinical practice and research (24). Of the widely used techniques, CT scan has emerged TABLE 2 | Univariate and multivariate analyses of prognostic factors for overall survival.

	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
	HR (95% CI)	P-value	HR (95% CI)	P-value
Gender				
Male vs. female	1.118 (0.763–1.639)	0.567		
Age, years				
≥ 65 vs. < 65	1.638 (1.160–2.314)	0.005	1.616 (1.130–2.311)	0.009
Diabetes				
Yes vs. no	1.572 (0.890–2.777)	0.120		
Respiratory comorbidity				
Yes vs. no	1.329 (0.587–3.008)	0.495		
Cardiovascular comorbidity				
Yes vs. no	1.066 (0.714–1.591)	0.754		
Hypoproteinemia				
Yes vs. no	1.501 (1.035–2.328)	0.043	1.432 (0.975–1.072)	0.097
Anemia				
Yes vs. no	1.188 (0.783–1.802)	0.417		
Preoperative BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>				
< 18.5 vs. 18.5–25	1.138 (0.704–1.839)	0.598		
> 25 vs. 18.5–25	1.052 (0.700–1.582)	0.808		
Preoperative SMI, cm <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup>				
< 43.13 for men or < 37.81 for women vs. $\ge$ 43.13 for men or $\ge$ 37.81 for women <sup>a</sup>	2.546 (1.774–3.653)	< 0.001	2.187 (1.491–3.208)	< 0.001
Preoperative ECOG performance status				
1 vs. 0	1.223 (0.887-1.687)	0.220		
Tumor location				
Upper vs. not upper	1.066 (0.721–1.575)	0.750		
Type of resection				
Total vs. subtotal	1.230 (0.874–1.730)	0.235		
Histology				
Undifferentiated vs. differentiated	1.500 (1.083–2.078)	0.015	1.098 (0.773–1.559)	0.601
AJCC stage				
ll vs. l	6.355 (3.719–10.859)	< 0.001	6.106 (3.504–10.641)	< 0.001
III vs. I	6.930 (4.200–11.435)	< 0.001	8.840 (5.231–14.938)	< 0.001
Postoperative any complication				
Yes vs. no	1.494 (1.011–2.209)	0.044	1.193 (0.797–1.786)	0.390
Postoperative chemotherapy				
Yes vs. no	1.619 (1.117–2.348)	0.011	1.229 (0.823–1.836)	0.314
Chemotherapy modification				
Yes vs. no	1.545 (1.081–2.207)	0.017	1.498 (1.079–2.325)	0.032
SMI loss				
$\geq 5\%$ vs. $< 5\%$	1.693 (1.175–2.439)	0.005	2.769 (1.865–4.111)	< 0.001

Bold values indicate statistical significant.

HR, hazard ratio; Cl, confidence interval; BMI, body mass index; SMI, skeletal muscle index; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group.

<sup>a</sup> This cut point was based on the recent study showing that SMI <  $43.13 \text{ cm}^2/m^2$  for men or <  $37.81 \text{ cm}^2/m^2$  for women was associated with poor surgical and oncologic outcomes after gastrointestinal cancer surgery (18).

as a reliable method of skeletal muscle mass measurement (25–27). Cross-sectional areas of skeletal muscle tissue on single CT slices at L3 vertebral levels have been shown to strongly correlate with total body skeletal muscle tissue. CT images provide objective quantitative measures of skeletal muscle mass via SMI calculation (28–30). Thus, the assessment of skeletal muscle mass using CT scan at L3 vertebral levels

combined with SMI calculation is increasingly used to examine the impact of preoperative skeletal muscle mass changes on clinical outcomes after digestive tract cancer surgery (18, 31, 32). Here, we used CT scan to measure skeletal muscle mass before and approximately 6 months after surgery and calculated SMI changes. We considered  $\geq$  5% skeletal muscle loss indicative of significant postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss, since



it has been previously associated with poor clinical outcomes, including short survival with cancer treatment. Our data revealed 65 of 318 patients as having > 5% SMI loss in the 6 months after GC surgery.  $\geq$  5% SMI loss significantly correlated with older age, higher incidence of postoperative complications, and higher postoperative chemotherapy and chemotherapy modification (like dose reduction, delay/termination). There was a significant difference in AJCC stage between the two groups. However, the  $\geq$  5% SMI loss group was comparable to the < 5% SMI loss group with regards to gender, diabetes, respiratory and cardiovascular comorbidity, serum albumin and hemoglobin, preoperative BMI, preoperative SMI, preoperative ECOG performance status, tumor location, type of resection, type of reconstruction, histology, and postoperative hospital stay. These indicate that the  $\geq$  5% SMI loss criteria used in this study represents significant postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss after GC surgery. Moreover, skeletal muscle mass measurement using abdominal CT scans can be employed to postoperatively evaluate patients, as abdominal CT scans are regularly used, inexpensive, and easy to execute during follow up after GC surgery.

Regarding the survival following cancer surgery, it always receives a significant concern for the prognostic gain following oncologic surgery. Studies have mainly evaluated the association between skeletal muscle mass loss and survival postoperatively. Here, we primarily assessed the effect of postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss on OS and DFS after GC surgery. Our data show that postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss significantly correlates with lower OS and DFS following GC surgery. Multivariate analyses reveal that it is an unfavorable prognostic indicator of disease-free survival. These findings are consistent with previous reports on surgical treatment of other gastrointestinal cancers (7, 16, 17, 33, 34), indicating

independent relationship between skeletal muscle mass loss postoperatively and cancer endpoints. Although we did not examine the reasons underlying the strong link between postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss and survival, we speculate that it may be due to multiple factors, including poor tolerability of systemic chemotherapy. Previous studies, including our recent one on digestive cancer surgery, show that loss of skeletal muscle mass may reduce the ability to tolerate systemic chemotherapy. Thus, patients exhibiting low skeletal muscle mass are more likely to experience extreme treatmentassociated toxicities, leading to fewer completed chemotherapy cycles (18, 26, 35). Here, postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss was related to more chemotherapy modifications, like dose reduction, delay/termination, and was identified as a risk factor for poor OS and DFS following GC surgery. This could lead to poorer disease control and low survival. Nevertheless, these findings highlight the importance of identifying skeletal muscle mass loss after surgery because it allows prophylactic strategies including the use of proper nutritional support therapy and physical exercise aiming to reduce postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss.

We acknowledge the following limitations in our study. First, our analysis did not examine nutritional intake and physical activity, which are linked to skeletal muscle mass and may affect survival (36). The inclusion of these data would more comprehensively highlight the causal link between skeletal muscle mass loss and poor survival. Secondly, being a singlecenter study, it may exaggerate the impact of postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss on survival. Thus, there is a need to conduct international multicenter studies to verify these findings. Thirdly, recent evidence indicates that both low skeletal muscle mass and decreased skeletal muscle function influence clinical outcomes (37, 38). However, our study did not capture data on skeletal muscle functions like grip strength/walking speed because of the retrospective design of the study cohort. Further research should evaluate both skeletal muscle mass and function, to evidently reveal the effect of skeletal muscle changes on cancer patients post-surgery. Finally, there were apparent differences in participant characteristics between the two groups, such as AJCC stage, which may affect OS and DFS. The Propensity Score Matching will be conducted to comprehensively answer the question regarding the impact of postoperative loss of skeletal muscle mass on survival after GC surgery. In addition, the univariate and multivariate analyses of risk factors affecting OS and DFS in our study are of great significance, and due to the confounding factors, the significance of OS and DFS in patients with different skeletal muscles is unclear and unreliable. Thus, we will include the related analysis in our future studies in this field of research.

In this study, our data show that postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss negatively affects survival and that it has a strong, independent, prognostic value after GC surgery. Identification of postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss by abdominal CT imaging after GC surgery and targeted approaches to reduce postoperative skeletal muscle mass loss may improve GC outcomes. TABLE 3 | Univariate and multivariate analyses of prognostic factors for disease-free survival.

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline HR (95% C) & P-value & HR (95% C) & P-value \\ \hline HR (95% C) & P-value \\ \hline HR (95% C) & P-value \\ \hline Ma (vs. female A, series $		Univariate anal	ysis	Multivariate analysis	
Gender         Gender           Male vs. female         1.217 (0.861–1.721)         0.265           Åge, years         265 vs. < 65         1.327 (0.679–1.875)         0.158           Diabetes         9         9         0.067           Respiratory comorbidity         1481 (0.967–2.786)         0.067           Respiratory comorbidity         0.048         0.067           Viso vs. no         1.358 (0.717–2.570)         0.348           Catchowsacute comorbidity         0.049         0.036           Viso vs. no         1.045 (0.722–1.512)         0.816           Hypoproteinemia         1.401 (1.022–1.922)         0.036         1.225 (0.879–1.709)         0.231           Anemia         1.401 (0.622–1.612)         0.115         1.225 (0.879–1.709)         0.231           Yes vs. no         1.401 (0.624–1.609)         0.928         2.55 v. 13.5–25         0.994 (0.685–1.442)         0.975           Preoperative BMI, m/m²         -         4.313 for men or $\leq$ 37.81 for women         2.348 (1.675–3.290)         < 0.001         1.953 (1.369–2.786)         < 0.001           Viso 0         1.511 (0.827–1.499)         0.485         -         -         0.001           Viso 0         1.963 (0.745–1.516)         0.735         -		HR (95% CI)	P-value	HR (95% CI)	P-value
Mak vs. simale         1.217 (0.861-1.721)         0.265           Age, vers         2         5% x< 65	Gender				
Age, gars. $\geq 65$ vs. < 65	Male vs. female	1.217 (0.861–1.721)	0.265		
≥ 65 x. < 65	Age, years				
Diabetes           Yes vs. no         0.461 (0.967–2.765)         0.067           Respiratory comorbidity         New vs. no         0.358 (0.717–2.570)         0.348           Cardiovascular comorbidity         0.816 (0.727–1.512)         0.816         0.817           Yes vs. no         1.040 (1.022–1.922)         0.816         0.827           Hypoproteinemia         0.898 (0.717–2.570)         0.368         0.827           Yes vs. no         1.040 (1.022–1.922)         0.816         0.828           Anemia         1.859 (0.879–1.709)         0.231           Yes vs. no         1.021 (0.648–1.609)         0.928           > 25 vs. 18.5–25         1.021 (0.648–1.609)         0.001           No Contaction         1.111 (0.827–1.493)         0.405           Tumor location         1.111 (0.827–1.493)         0.	≥ 65 vs. < 65	1.327 (0.679–1.875)	0.158		
Yes vs. no         1.641 (0.967–2.78)         0.067           Respiratory comorbidity	Diabetes				
Respiratory comorbidity         Na58 (0.717–2.570)         0.348           Yes vs. no         1.045 (0.722–1.512)         0.816           Hypoproteinemia             Yes vs. no         1.040 (0.722–1.512)         0.036         1.225 (0.879–1.709)         0.231           Anemia             0.231           Aremia             0.231           Yes vs. no         1.371 (0.928–2.0292)         0.15              Yes vs. no         1.371 (0.928–2.0292)         0.928                 0.921               0.001   <	Yes vs. no	1.641 (0.967–2.785)	0.067		
Yes vs. no         1.358 (0.717–2.570)         0.348           Cardiovascular comorbidity         0.405 (0.722–1.512)         0.816           Hypoproteinemia         0.936         1.225 (0.879–1.709)         0.231           Anemia         0.936         1.225 (0.879–1.709)         0.231           Yes vs. no         1.371 (0.926–2.0292)         0.115         0.236           Preoparative BMI, Kg/m <sup>2</sup> 0.936         0.928         0.936           > 25 vs. 18.5~25         0.994 (0.835–1.442)         0.975         0.901           Preoparative SMI, eng/m <sup>2</sup> 0.994 (0.835–1.442)         0.975         0.901           < 4.31 5 for men or ~ 37.81 for women <sup>4</sup> 0.995         0.901         1.953 (1.369–2.786)         < 0.001	Respiratory comorbidity				
Cardiovascular comorbidity           Yea vs. no         1.045 (0.722-1.512)         0.816           Hypoproteinemia	Yes vs. no	1.358 (0.717–2.570)	0.348		
Yes vs. no         1.045 (0.722-1.512)         0.816           Hyportelinemia	Cardiovascular comorbidity				
Hypoproteinemia         Ves vs. no         1.401 (1.022-1.92)         0.036         1.225 (0.879-1.709)         0.231           Amemia         Ves vs. no         1.371 (0.926-2.0292)         0.115         0.928         0.928         0.928         0.928         0.928         0.928         0.927         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.928         0.929         0.929         0.929         0.929         0.929         0.929         0.929         0.929         0.928         0.929 <td>Yes vs. no</td> <td>1.045 (0.722–1.512)</td> <td>0.816</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Yes vs. no	1.045 (0.722–1.512)	0.816		
Yes vs. no         1.401 (1.022–1.922)         0.036         1.225 (0.879–1.709)         0.231           Anemia	Hypoproteinemia				
Anemia           Yes vs. no         1.371 (0.926-2.0292)         0.115           Preoperative BM, kg/m <sup>2</sup> .         .           <18.5 vs. 18.5-25	Yes vs. no	1.401 (1.022–1.922)	0.036	1.225 (0.879–1.709)	0.231
Yes vs. no         1.371 (0.926-2.0292)         0.115           Preoperative BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>	Anemia				
Preoperative BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup> 1.021 (0.648–1.609)         0.928           > 25 vs. 18.5–25         0.994 (0.685-1.442)         0.975           Preoperative SMI, em <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup> < 43.13 for men or < 37.81 for women	Yes vs. no	1.371 (0.926–2.0292)	0.115		
< 18.5 vs. 18.5-25	Preoperative BMI, kg/m <sup>2</sup>				
> 25 vs. 18.5–25         0.994 (0.685–1.442)         0.975           Preoperative SMI, cm²/m²             < 4.3.13 for men or < 37.81 for women °	< 18.5 vs. 18.5–25	1.021 (0.648-1.609)	0.928		
Preoperative SMI, cm²/m²         <           <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <         <	> 25 vs. 18.5–25	0.994 (0.685–1.442)	0.975		
< 43.13 for men or < 37.81 for women <sup>a</sup> 2.348 (1.675–3.290)       < 0.001	Preoperative SMI, cm <sup>2</sup> /m <sup>2</sup>				
Preoperative ECOG performance status           1 vs. 0         1.111 (0.827-1.493)         0.485           Tumor location         Upper vs. not upper         1.063 (0.745-1.516)         0.735           Type of resection         0.010         0.003           Total vs. subtotal         1.316 (0.964-1.794)         0.083           Histology         0.001         1.307 (0.962-1.776)         0.087           AJCC stage         0.001         1.0726 (6.983-19.690)         < 0.001	< 43.13 for men or < 37.81 for women vs. $\ge$ 43.13 for men or $\ge$ 37.81 for women <sup>a</sup>	2.348 (1.675–3.290)	< 0.001	1.953 (1.369–2.786)	< 0.001
1 vs. 01.111 (0.827-1.493)0.485Tumor locationUpper vs. not upper1.063 (0.745-1.516)0.735Type of resectionTotal vs. subtotal1.316 (0.964-1.794)0.083HistologyUndifferentiated vs. differentiated1.774 (1.319-2.388)< 0.001	Preoperative ECOG performance status				
Tumor location       Upper vs. not upper $1.063 (0.745-1.516)$ $0.735$ Type of resection $0.735$ $0.735$ Total vs. subtotal $1.316 (0.964-1.794)$ $0.063$ Histology $0.001$ $1.307 (0.962-1.776)$ $0.087$ AJCC stage $0.001$ $1.307 (0.962-1.776)$ $0.087$ Il vs. I $12.511 (7.524-20.804)$ $< 0.001$ $11.726 (6.983-19.690)$ $< 0.001$ MUS I $8.525 (5.237-13.878)$ $< 0.001$ $11.026 (6.091-16.735)$ $< 0.001$ Postoperative any complication $0.852 (5.237-13.878)$ $< 0.001$ $10.096 (6.091-16.735)$ $< 0.001$ Postoperative chemotherapy $ves vs. no$ $1.854 (1.307-2.629)$ $0.001$ $1.371 (0.954-1.970)$ $0.088$ Postoperative chemotherapy $ves vs. no$ $1.314 (0.948-1.822)$ $0.101$ $0.954-1.970$ $0.088$ Postoperative chemotherapy $ves vs. no$ $1.513 (1.032-1.975)$ $0.019$ $1.403 (1.006-1.879)$ $0.041$ Sthloss $ves vs. co$ $1.492 (1.058-2.102)$ $0.022$ $2.533 (1.753-3.659)$ $< 0.001$	1 vs. 0	1.111 (0.827–1.493)	0.485		
Upper vs. not upper         1.063 (0.745-1.516)         0.735           Type of resection         0.083           Total vs. subtotal         1.316 (0.964-1.794)         0.083           Histology         0.001         1.307 (0.962-1.776)         0.087           AJCC stage         0.001         1.0096 (6.091-16.735)         < 0.001           Il vs. 1         12.511 (7.524-20.804)         < 0.001         11.726 (6.983-19.690)         < 0.001           Il vs. 1         12.551 (5.237-13.878)         < 0.001         10.096 (6.091-16.735)         < 0.001           Postoperative any complication         8.525 (5.237-13.878)         < 0.001         1.371 (0.954-1.970)         0.088           Postoperative chemotherapy         Yes vs. no         1.854 (1.307-2.629)         0.001         1.371 (0.954-1.970)         0.088           Postoperative chemotherapy         Yes vs. no         1.314 (0.948-1.822)         0.101         0.011         0.041           Stell vs. s. no         1.513 (1.032-1.975)         0.019         1.403 (1.006-1.879)         0.041           Stell vs. s. no         1.513 (1.032-1.975)         0.019         2.533 (1.753-3.659)         <0.041           Stell vs. s. no         1.402 (1.058-2.102)         0.022         2.533 (1.753-3.659)         <0.041	Tumor location				
Type of resection       1.316 (0.964-1.794)       0.083         Histology       Undifferentiated vs. differentiated       1.774 (1.319-2.388)       < 0.001	Upper vs. not upper	1.063 (0.745–1.516)	0.735		
Total vs. subtotal1.316 (0.964–1.794)0.083HistologyUndifferentiated vs. differentiated1.774 (1.319–2.388)< 0.001	Type of resection				
Histology       Undifferentiated vs. differentiated       1.774 (1.319–2.388)       < 0.001	Total vs. subtotal	1.316 (0.964–1.794)	0.083		
Undifferentiated vs. differentiated         1.774 (1.319–2.388)         < 0.001         1.307 (0.962–1.776)         0.087           AJCC stage         I vs. I         12.511 (7.524–20.804)         < 0.001         11.726 (6.983–19.690)         < 0.001           II vs. I         12.511 (7.524–20.804)         < 0.001         11.726 (6.983–19.690)         < 0.001           Postoperative any complication         < 0.001         10.096 (6.091–16.735)         < 0.001           Postoperative chemotherapy         No         0.001         1.371 (0.954–1.970)         0.088           Postoperative chemotherapy         No         0.1314 (0.948–1.822)         0.101            Yes vs. no         1.513 (1.032–1.975)         0.019         1.403 (1.006–1.879)         0.041           SMI loss                 ≥ 5% vs. < 5%         1.492 (1.058–2.102)         0.022         2.533 (1.753–3.659)         <0.001	Histology				
AJCC stage         II vs. I       12.511 (7.524–20.804)       < 0.001	Undifferentiated vs. differentiated	1.774 (1.319–2.388)	< 0.001	1.307 (0.962–1.776)	0.087
II vs. I12.511 (7.524–20.804) 8.525 (5.237–13.878)< 0.00111.726 (6.983–19.690) 10.096 (6.091–16.735)< 0.001Postoperative any complication< 0.001	AJCC stage				
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $1$ $$	ll vs. l	12.511 (7.524–20.804)	< 0.001	11.726 (6.983–19.690)	< 0.001
Postoperative any complication         Yes vs. no         1.854 (1.307–2.629)         0.001         1.371 (0.954–1.970)         0.088           Postoperative chemotherapy         Yes vs. no         1.314 (0.948–1.822)         0.101         Chemotherapy         0.101         Chemotherapy         1.513 (1.032–1.975)         0.019         1.403 (1.006–1.879)         0.041         SMI loss         SMI loss         1.492 (1.058–2.102)         0.022         2.533 (1.753–3.659)         < 0.001	III vs. I	8.525 (5.237–13.878)	< 0.001	10.096 (6.091–16.735)	< 0.001
Yes vs. no         1.854 (1.307–2.629)         0.001         1.371 (0.954–1.970)         0.088           Postoperative chemotherapy         1.314 (0.948–1.822)         0.101	Postoperative any complication				
Postoperative chemotherapy         Yes vs. no         1.314 (0.948–1.822)         0.101           Chemotherapy modification         Ves vs. no         1.513 (1.032–1.975)         0.019         1.403 (1.006–1.879)         0.041           SMI loss         2<5% vs. < 5%         1.492 (1.058–2.102)         0.022         2.533 (1.753–3.659)         < 0.001	Yes vs. no	1.854 (1.307–2.629)	0.001	1.371 (0.954–1.970)	0.088
Yes vs. no         1.314 (0.948–1.822)         0.101           Chemotherapy modification             Yes vs. no         1.513 (1.032–1.975)         0.019         1.403 (1.006–1.879)         0.041           SMI loss <td>Postoperative chemotherapy</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Postoperative chemotherapy				
Chemotherapy modification         Yes vs. no         1.513 (1.032–1.975)         0.019         1.403 (1.006–1.879)         0.041           SMI loss         2 5% vs. < 5%         1.492 (1.058–2.102)         0.022         2.533 (1.753–3.659)         < 0.001	Yes vs. no	1.314 (0.948-1.822)	0.101		
Yes vs. no       1.513 (1.032−1.975)       0.019       1.403 (1.006−1.879)       0.041         SMI loss       2 5% vs. < 5%       1.492 (1.058−2.102)       0.022       2.533 (1.753−3.659)       < 0.001	Chemotherapy modification				
SMI loss         ≥ 5% vs. < 5%         1.492 (1.058-2.102)         0.022         2.533 (1.753-3.659)         < 0.001	Yes vs. no	1.513 (1.032–1.975)	0.019	1.403 (1.006–1.879)	0.041
$\geq 5\%$ vs. < 5% 1.492 (1.058–2.102) 0.022 2.533 (1.753–3.659) < 0.001	SMI loss				
	$\geq 5\%$ vs. $< 5\%$	1.492 (1.058–2.102)	0.022	2.533 (1.753–3.659)	< 0.001

Bold values indicate statistical significant.

HR, hazard ratio; Cl, confidence interval; BMI, body mass index; SMI, skeletal muscle index; ECOG, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group.

<sup>a</sup> This cut point was based on the recent study showing that SMI <  $43.13 \text{ cm}^2/m^2$  for men or <  $37.81 \text{ cm}^2/m^2$  for women was associated with poor surgical and oncologic outcomes after gastrointestinal cancer surgery (18).

# DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The raw data supporting the conclusions of this article will be made available by the authors, without undue reservation.

# **ETHICS STATEMENT**

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by Zhongshan Hospital Fudan University. The

patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

# **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

GW supervised the entire project and ST designed the study. QZ, ZZ, SL, JX, JW, YZ, QX, QM, and YJ performed data collection. QZ and ZZ conducted data analyses. ST wrote and revised the

manuscript. All authors critically reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

### FUNDING

This study was sponsored by Clinical Research Special Fund of Zhongshan Hospital, Fudan University (2020ZSLC17) and Construction Program of Key but

# REFERENCES

- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* (2018) 68:394–424. doi: 10.3322/caac.21492
- Arnold M, Park JY, Camargo MC, Lunet N, Forman D, Soerjomataram I. Is gastric cancer becoming a rare disease? a global assessment of predicted incidence trends to 2035. *Gut.* (2020) 69:823–9. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2019-320234
- Thrift AP, El-Serag HB. Burden of gastric cancer. Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol. (2020) 18:534–42. doi: 10.1016/j.cgh.2019.07.045
- Yu J, Huang C, Sun Y, Su X, Cao H, Hu J, et al. Effect of laparoscopic vs open distal gastrectomy on 3-year disease-free survival in patients with locally advanced gastric cancer: the CLASS-01 randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. (2019) 321:1983–92. doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.5359
- Petrillo A, Pompella L, Tirino G, Pappalardo A, Laterza MM, Caterino M, et al. Perioperative Treatment in Resectable Gastric Cancer: Current Perspectives and Future Directions. *Cancers*. (2019) 11:399. doi: 10.3390/cancers11030399
- Dolan RD, Almasaudi AS, Dieu LB, Horgan PG, McSorley ST, McMillan DC. The relationship between computed tomography-derived body composition, systemic inflammatory response, and survival in patients undergoing surgery for colorectal cancer. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. (2019) 10:111–22. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12357
- Basile D, Parnofiello A, Vitale MG, Cortiula F, Gerratana L, Fanotto V, et al. The IMPACT study: early loss of skeletal muscle mass in advanced pancreatic cancer patients. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. (2019) 10:368–77. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12368
- Huang CY, Yang YC, Chen TC, Chen JR, Chen YJ, Wu MH, et al. Muscle loss during primary debulking surgery and chemotherapy predicts poor survival in advanced-stage ovarian cancer. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. (2020) 11:534– 46. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12524
- Choi MH, Yoon SB, Lee K, Song M, Lee IS, Lee MA, et al. Preoperative sarcopenia and post-operative accelerated muscle loss negatively impact survival after resection of pancreatic cancer. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. (2018) 9:326–34. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12274
- Lu J, Zheng ZF Li P, Xie JW, Wang JB, Lin JX, et al. A novel preoperative skeletal muscle measure as a predictor of postoperative complications, long-term survival and tumor recurrence for patients with gastric cancer after radical gastrectomy. *Ann Surg Oncol.* (2018) 25:439–48. doi: 10.1245/s10434-017-6269-5
- 11. Shichinohe T, Uemura S, Hirano S, Hosokawa M. Impact of preoperative skeletal muscle mass and nutritional status on short-and long-term outcomes after esophagectomy for esophageal cancer: a retrospective observational study: impact of psoas muscle mass and body mass on esophagectomy. *Ann Surg Oncol.* (2019) 26:1301–10. doi: 10.1245/s10434-019-07188-z
- Oh SE, Choi MG, Seo JM, An JY, Lee JH, Sohn TS, et al. Prognostic significance of perioperative nutritional parameters in patients with gastric cancer. *Clin Nutr.* (2019) 38:870–6. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2018.02.015
- Hatao F, Chen KY, Wu JM, Wang MY, Aikou S, Onoyama H, et al. Randomized controlled clinical trial assessing the effects of oral nutritional supplements in postoperative gastric cancer patients. *Langenbecks Arch Surg.* (2017) 402:203–11. doi: 10.1007/s00423-016-1527-8
- 14. Kong SH, Lee HJ, Na JR, Kim WG, Han DS, Park SH, et al. Effect of perioperative oral nutritional supplementation in malnourished patients

Weak Disciplines of Shanghai Health Commission-Clinical Nutrition (2019ZB0105).

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ST expresses his deepest love, sincerest gratitude and endless miss to his father, Mr. Weilong Tan, for his cultivating parenting and always encouraging during his life and work.

who undergo gastrectomy: a prospective randomized trial. *Surgery.* (2018) 164:1263–70. doi: 10.1016/j.surg.2018.05.017

- Meng Q, Tan S, Jiang Y, Han J, Xi Q, Zhuang Q, et al. Post-discharge oral nutritional supplements with dietary advice in patients at nutritional risk after surgery for gastric cancer: a randomized clinical trial. *Clin Nutr.* (2020) 40:40–6. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2020.04.043
- Brown JC, Caan BJ, Meyerhardt JA, Weltzien E, Xiao J, Cespedes Feliciano EM, et al. The deterioration of muscle mass and radiodensity is prognostic of poor survival in stage I-III colorectal cancer: a population-based cohort study (C-SCANS). J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. (2018) 9:664–72. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12305
- Takahashi K, Watanabe M, Kozuki R, Toihata T, Okamura A, Imamura Y, et al. Prognostic significance of skeletal muscle loss during early postoperative period in elderly patients with esophageal cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol.* (2019) 26:3727–35. doi: 10.1245/s10434-019-07616-0
- Zhang S, Tan S, Jiang Y, Xi Q, Meng Q, Zhuang Q, et al. Sarcopenia as a predictor of poor surgical and oncologic outcomes after abdominal surgery for digestive tract cancer: A prospective cohort study. *Clin Nutr.* (2019) 38:2881–8. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2018.12.025
- Lee J, Lin JB, Wu MH, Jan YT, Chang CL, Huang CY, et al. Muscle radiodensity loss during cancer therapy is predictive for poor survival in advanced endometrial cancer. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. (2019) 10:814– 26. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12440
- Blauwhoff-Buskermolen S, Versteeg KS. de van der Schueren MA, den Braver NR, Berkhof J, Langius JA, et al. Loss of Muscle Mass During Chemotherapy Is Predictive for Poor Survival of Patients With Metastatic Colorectal Cancer. J Clin Oncol. (2016) 34:1339–44. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2015. 63.6043
- Fujiya K, Kawamura T, Omae K, Makuuchi R, Irino T, Tokunaga M, et al. Impact of malnutrition after gastrectomy for gastric cancer on long-term survival. *Ann Surg Oncol.* (2018) 25:974–83. doi: 10.1245/s10434-018-6342-8
- Li YF, Nie RC, Wu T, Li SM, Chen S, Wang W, et al. Prognostic value of the nutritional risk screening 2002 scale in metastatic gastric cancer: a large-scale cohort study. J Cancer. (2019) 10:112–9. doi: 10.7150/jca.27729
- 23. Yang Y, Gao P, Song Y, Sun J, Chen X, Zhao J, et al. The prognostic nutritional index is a predictive indicator of prognosis and postoperative complications in gastric cancer: A meta-analysis. *Eur J Surg Oncol.* (2016) 42:1176–82. doi: 10.1016/j.ejso.2016.05.029
- Buckinx F, Landi F, Cesari M, Fielding RA, Visser M, Engelke K, et al. Pitfalls in the measurement of muscle mass: a need for a reference standard. *J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle*. (2018) 9:269–78. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12268
- Poltronieri TS, de Paula NS, Chaves GV. Assessing skeletal muscle radiodensity by computed tomography: an integrative review of the applied methodologies. *Clin Physiol Funct Imaging*. (2020) 40:207–23. doi: 10.1111/cpf.12629
- Duan K, Gao X, Zhu D. The clinical relevance and mechanism of skeletal muscle wasting. *Clin Nutr.* (2020) 40:27–37. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2020.07.029
- 27. Borggreve AS, den Boer RB, van Boxel GI, de Jong PA, Veldhuis WB, Steenhagen E, et al. The predictive value of low muscle mass as measured on ct scans for postoperative complications and mortality in gastric cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Med.* (2020) 9:199. doi: 10.3390/jcm9010199
- 28. Viertel M, Bock C, Reich M, Löser S, Plauth M. Performance of CTbased low skeletal muscle index, low mean muscle attenuation, and bioelectric impedance derived low phase angle in the detection of an

increased risk of nutrition related mortality. Clin Nutr. (2019) 38:2375-80. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2018.10.018

- Nakashima Y, Saeki H, Nakanishi R, Sugiyama M, Kurashige J, Oki E, et al. Assessment of sarcopenia as a predictor of poor outcomes after esophagectomy in elderly patients with esophageal cancer. *Ann Surg.* (2018) 267:1100–4. doi: 10.1097/SLA.00000000002252
- 30. Zwart AT, van der Hoorn A, van Ooijen PMA, Steenbakkers R, de Bock GH, Halmos GB. CT-measured skeletal muscle mass used to assess frailty in patients with head and neck cancer. J Cachexia Sarcopenia Muscle. (2019) 10:1060–9. doi: 10.1002/jcsm.12443
- Rinninella E, Cintoni M, Raoul P, Pozzo C, Strippoli A, Bria E, et al. Muscle mass, assessed at diagnosis by L3-CT scan as a prognostic marker of clinical outcomes in patients with gastric cancer: a systematic review and metaanalysis. *Clin Nutr.* (2020) 39:2045–54. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2019.10.021
- Tan S, Meng Q, Jiang Y, Zhuang Q, Xi Q, Xu J, et al. Impact of oral nutritional supplements in post-discharge patients at nutritional risk following colorectal cancer surgery: A randomised clinical trial. *Clin Nutr.* (2020) 40:47–53. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2020.05.038
- Kudou K, Saeki H, Nakashima Y, Kimura K, Ando K, Oki E, et al. Postoperative skeletal muscle loss predicts poor prognosis of adenocarcinoma of upper stomach and esophagogastric junction. *World J Surg.* (2019) 43:1068– 75. doi: 10.1007/s00268-018-4873-6
- 34. Kudou K, Saeki H, Nakashima Y, Sasaki S, Jogo T, Hirose K, et al. Postoperative development of sarcopenia is a strong predictor of a poor prognosis in patients with adenocarcinoma of the esophagogastric junction and upper gastric cancer. *Am J Surg.* (2019) 217:757–63. doi: 10.1016/j.amjsurg.2018.07.003
- 35. Sealy MJ, Dechaphunkul T, van der Schans CP, Krijnen WP, Roodenburg JLN, Walker J, et al. Low muscle mass is associated with early termination of chemotherapy related to toxicity in patients with head and neck cancer. *Clin Nutr.* (2020) 39:501–9. doi: 10.1016/j.clnu.2019.02.029

- Abiri B, Vafa M. Nutrition and sarcopenia: a review of the evidence of nutritional influences. Crit Rev Food Sci Nutr. (2019) 59:1456–66. doi: 10.1080/10408398.2017.1412940
- Chen L-K, Woo J, Assantachai P, Auyeung T-W, Chou M-Y, Iijima K, et al. Asian working group for sarcopenia: 2019 consensus update on sarcopenia diagnosis and treatment. J Am Med Dir Assoc. (2020) 21:300–7.e2. doi: 10.1016/j.jamda.2019.12.012
- Cruz-Jentoft AJ, Bahat G, Bauer J, Boirie Y, Bruyère O, Cederholm T, et al. Sarcopenia: revised European consensus on definition and diagnosis. Age Ageing. (2019) 48:16–31. doi: 10.1093/ageing/ afy169

**Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

**Publisher's Note:** All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

Copyright © 2022 Tan, Zhuang, Zhang, Li, Xu, Wang, Zhang, Xi, Meng, Jiang and Wu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.