

The impact of multimodal prehabilitation in colorectal cancer patients on postoperative lean body mass

MICHAEL HULL, M.S.(c), CISSN, PN <u>SUPERVISORS</u>: DR. FRANCO CARLI, DR. HUGUES PLOURDE <u>COMMITTEE MEMBER</u>: DR. CELENA SCHEEDE-BERGDAHL

FIGURE 1.2 Percent distribution of estimated new cancer cases, by sex, Canada, 2016



Canadian Cancer Statistics 2016. (2016). Retrieved from cancer.ca/Canadian-Cancer-Statistics-2016-EN.pdf

Complications of Surgery

Postoperative complication rate of 21.1% to 30%

| Associated | Rick | Factors |
|------------|-------------|---------|
| Associated | NISN | ractors |

| Functional capacity | Age |
|---------------------|-----|
| | |

| Lean mass | Poor nutrition status |
|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Muscle strength | Over- or underweight |

Lucas, D. J. and T. M. Pawlik (2014). "Quality improvement in gastrointestinal surgical oncology with ACS National Surgical Quality Improvement Program." <u>Surgery</u> **155**(4): 593-601. Ragg, J. L., D. A. Watters and G. D. Guest (2009). "Preoperative risk stratification for mortality and major morbidity in major colorectal surgery." <u>Dis Colon Rectum</u> **52**(7): 1296-1303.

Complications of Surgery

Focus on modifiable risk factors

| Associated Risk Factors | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| Functional capacity | Age | | |
| Lean mass | Poor nutrition status | | |
| Muscle strength | Over- or underweight | | |

Lucas, D. J. and T. M. Pawlik (2014). "Quality improvement in gastrointestinal surgical oncology with ACS National Surgical Quality Improvement Program." <u>Surgery</u> **155**(4): 593-601. Ragg, J. L., D. A. Watters and G. D. Guest (2009). "Preoperative risk stratification for mortality and major morbidity in major colorectal surgery." <u>Dis Colon Rectum</u> **52**(7): 1296-1303.

Categories (n=163)



Carli, F. (2017). Database of preoperative colorectal patients (unpublished data), Montreal General Hospital.

Categories (n=163)



Carli, F. (2017). Database of preoperative colorectal patients (unpublished data), Montreal General Hospital.



Functional Capacity By Nutritional Status at Baseline

Carli, F. (2017). Database of preoperative colorectal patients (unpublished data), Montreal General Hospital.



Functional Capacity By SGA Status: Baseline vs Preop

Carli, F. (2017). Database of preoperative colorectal patients (unpublished data), Montreal General Hospital.



One Month Post-Op

| Study | n | Measure | Outcome |
|--------------------|----|----------------------------------|---|
| Christensen et al. | 32 | Fatigue (Visual analog scale) | 33% had increased fatigue compared to baseline |

Christensen, T. and H. Kehlet (1993). "Postoperative fatigue." <u>World J Surg</u> **17**(2): 220-225. Jensen et al. (2011). "Postoperative changes in fatigue, physical function and body composition:" <u>Colorectal Dis</u> **13**(5): 588-593. Lawrence, V. A., et al. (2004). "Functional independence after major abdominal surgery in the elderly." <u>J Am Coll Surg</u> **199**(5): 762-772.

One Month Post-Op

| Study | n | Measure | Outcome |
|--------------------|-----|----------------------------------|---|
| Christensen et al. | 32 | Fatigue (Visual analog scale) | 33% had increased fatigue compared to baseline |
| Lawrence et al. | 372 | Activities of daily living | 28% below baseline |
| | | Time up and go | 60% below baseline |
| | | Grip strength | 68% below baseline |
| | | Functional reach | 61% below baseline |

Christensen, T. and H. Kehlet (1993). "Postoperative fatigue." <u>World J Surg</u> 17(2): 220-225.

Jensen et al. (2011). "Postoperative changes in fatigue, physical function and body composition:" Colorectal Dis 13(5): 588-593.

Lawrence, V. A., et al. (2004). "Functional independence after major abdominal surgery in the elderly." J Am Coll Surg 199(5): 762-772.

One Month Post-Op

| Study | n | Measure | Outcome | |
|--------------------|-----|--|---|--|
| Christensen et al. | 32 | Fatigue (Visual analog scale) | 33% had increased fatigue compared to baseline | |
| | 372 | Activities of daily living | 28% below baseline | |
| Lawrence et al. | | Time up and go | 60% below baseline | |
| | | Grip strength | 68% below baseline | |
| | | Functional reach | 61% below baseline | |
| | 385 | Body composition (DXA/BIA) | Total/lean/fat mass all decreased | |
| Jensen et al. | | Fatigue (vertical numerical rating scale) | 30% reported high fatigue | |
| | | Grip strength | 37% below baseline | |

Christensen, T. and H. Kehlet (1993). "Postoperative fatigue." <u>World J Surg</u> 17(2): 220-225.

Jensen et al. (2011). "Postoperative changes in fatigue, physical function and body composition:" Colorectal Dis 13(5): 588-593.

Lawrence, V. A., et al. (2004). "Functional independence after major abdominal surgery in the elderly." J Am Coll Surg 199(5): 762-772.



Non-Prehabilitation

Santa Mina, D., C. Scheede-Bergdahl, C. Gillis and F. Carli (2015). "Optimization of surgical outcomes with prehabilitation." <u>Appl Physiol Nutr Metab</u> **40**(9): 966-969.



Legend

Non-Prehabilitation

Santa Mina, D., C. Scheede-Bergdahl, C. Gillis and F. Carli (2015). "Optimization of surgical outcomes with prehabilitation." <u>Appl Physiol Nutr Metab</u> **40**(9): 966-969.

Traditional Approach Rehabilitation

- Efforts at accelerating recovery have focused on the postoperative period
- An inopportune time to alter nutrition and exercise
 - Patients are fatigued
 - Worried about exacerbating recovery
 - Stress/anxiety over additional treatments
- New approach: <u>Pre</u>habilitation before surgery

What Is Prehabilitation?

The process of augmenting a patient's functional capacity to **optimize physiologic reserves** so that they might withstand the stressor of inactivity associated with a surgical insult.

Components of Multimodal Prehab





Non-Prehabilitation

Santa Mina, D., C. Scheede-Bergdahl, C. Gillis and F. Carli (2015). "Optimization of surgical outcomes with prehabilitation." <u>Appl Physiol Nutr Metab</u> **40**(9): 966-969.



The Importance of Lean Mass

Low lean body mass in CRC patients is correlated with:

- Increased postoperative complications
- Slowed recovery of bowel functions
- Extended hospital stays
- Higher re-admission rates and costs
- Higher levels of fatigue
- Reduced quality of life

Braunschweig, C., et al. (2000). "Impact of declines in nutritional status on outcomes in adult patients hospitalized for more than 7 days." J Am Diet Assoc **100**(11): 1316-1322; quiz 1323-1314. Garth, A. K., et al. (2010). "Nutritional status, nutrition practices and post-operative complications in patients with gastrointestinal cancer." J Hum Nutr Diet **23**(4): 393-401.

The PREHAB Study

Study Design: International multicenter, prospective, randomized controlled trial (n=708). Our center is responsible for n=100.

Study Population: Adult (≥18) patients undergoing elective surgery for colorectal cancer at the Montréal General Hospital

The PREHAB Study

- Intervention:
 - Intervention group: Receives 4 weeks prehabilitation
 - Control group: Receiving no prehabilitation
 - Both groups: 8 weeks rehabilitation post-op (Enhanced Recovery After Surgery (ERAS) guidelines, which is standard care)

Study Questions & Objectives

- 1. What is the effect of a multimodal prehab program on lean mass accrual? Is the intervention providing a big enough stimulus to slow the loss of lean mass loss compared to control (standard care)?
- 2. Are patients consuming enough protein in the postoperative period? Is there a carry-over effect in the intervention group? Is more intensive dietary counseling needed in the post-op window?

Study Schedule INTERVENTION GROUP

| | | Weeks | Pre-Op | Operation | Weeks P | ost-Op | |
|----------|----------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Week | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +4 | +8 |
| | Test Day | | | Test Day | | Test Day | Test Day |
| Schedule | Exercise | Exercise | Exercise | Exercise | | | |
| | • | $\leftarrow \leftarrow$ Ongoing: | Exercise/diet, | protein suppler | nent, smoking | cessation $\rightarrow \rightarrow$ | |

CONTROL GROUP

| | | Weeks | Pre-Op | Operation | Weeks P | ost-Op | | |
|----------|---|-------|--------|-----------|---------|----------|----------|--|
| Week | -4 | -3 | -2 | -1 | 0 | +4 | +8 | |
| Schodulo | Test Day | | | Test Day | | Test Day | Test Day | |
| Scheuule | \leftarrow \leftarrow Ongoing: Exercise/diet, smoking cessation \rightarrow \rightarrow | | | | | | | |

X Exercise Intervention

CONTROL

INTERVENTION

• Standard care

Exercise

- Unsupervised at home exercise like walks, stretching
- Practice some deep breathing occasionally

• Supervised high intensity

training (HIT) and resistance training 3x/week

- At home training 4x/week
 - 60 minutes of low to moderate intensity exercise



Exercise Dose (FITT)

- Frequency how often is the exercise performed
- Intensity how hard you exercise
- Time total duration
- Type the kind of exercise undertaken

Reference and a servention

Participants will undergo a cardiopulmonary exercise test (CPET) and the exercise intensity will be individualized based on the CPET values.

- HIT = High-intensity interval training
- Performed for 28 minutes total on cycle ergometer
 - 4 intervals of moderate intensity (4 minutes @ x>90% of VO2peak)
 - 4 intervals of high intensity (3 minutes @ 90% of VO2 anaerobic threshold)
- Rate Perceived Exertion (RPE) of 15-17 on Borg scale of 6-20



Reference Antervention

- **Resistance training based on 1 repetition maximum (1RM) estimation**
- 2 sets of 10 repetitions of 6 exercises:
 - Leg press performed on NuStep with resistance on
 - **Chest press** on a flat bench with dumbbells
 - Abdominal crunch seated or, if possible, supine on the floor
 - Lat pull down using resistance bands attached to elevated hook
 - Low row seated, with resistance bands
 - **Step up** performed on 18.5 cm platform

Reference And American Science And American American Science And American Science And American Science And American America

- Volume will be progressively increased week over week
 - In week 1 using 65% of calculated 1RM (baseline)
 - In week 2 using 70% of calculated 1RM (baseline)
 - In week 3 using 65% of calculated 1RM (at 3 weeks)
 - In week 4 using 70% of calculated 1RM (at 3 weeks)
- Progress will be tracked via total volume per week
 - Volume load = sets * repetitions * weight used



Nutrition Intervention

CONTROL

INTERVENTION

Increase protein to 1.5-1.8 g/kg/day

DIET

- Try to eat well throughout the day
- Follow the recommendations given to you by your dietitian

- Consume protein before bed
 Balance out protein intake between
- Balance out protein intake between meals
- Consume protein drink within 30 minutes of in-hospital workouts
- Provide whey protein isolate supplement as needed

Nutrition Intervention

- Nutritional status will be tracked using the PG-SGA
 - Four screenings at -4, -1, +4, and +8
 - Appropriate nutritional advise will be given regardless of group
- Intake will be tracked using 3-day food diaries and 24-hour recall
 - Four 3-day food diaries at -4, -1, +4, and +8
 - Three 24-hour recalls take postoperatively at +1, +2, and 3+ weeks

Lean Mass Assessment

- Body composition assessment via DXA scan at -4, -1, +4, and +8
- Standardized testing procedures
 - Same or similar clothing
 - In the morning after overnight fast, if possible.
 - No exercise prior
 - Hydrated (but not over- or dehydrated)
 - No recent major dietary changes in the 3 days prior
 - Same equipment, software, technician, and body position

CONTROL & INTERVENTION



Patients receive 1.5 hours of instruction in the first session and more sessions during the 4 weeks of prehabilitation if necessary.
The goal is to provide anxiety reduction and avoid depression.

Intensive counseling and nicotine replacement therapy (NRT) will be offered to all patients during the 4 weeks prior to the surgery.

Statistical Analysis

The sample size calculation is based on the primary outcome of differences in lean body mass. An α of 0.05, β of 0.2, and power of 0.80 (two-sided test) will be used with an expected dropout rate of 10%. Sample size needed would be 36 participants, 18 per group.

A one-way repeated measures ANOVA will be used to determine the effect of treatment on lean body mass and protein intake differences between groups. Statistical significance is defined as p < 0.05.

Significance

Results will provide data that may be useful to examine if current PREHAB approaches are resulting in sufficient lean mass accretion and preservation.

Additionally, we can examine patient protein intake post-op to see if future approaches may need to be altered to increase odds of favorable outcomes.