Multicenter Analysis of Survival and Prognostic Factors in Pathologic Stage I Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer According to the New 2009 TNM Classification
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Abstract

Introduction: The new 2009 TNM classification introduced important modifications in lung cancer staging. The aim of this study is to validate our series of patients with pathologic stage I non-small-cell lung cancer according to the 7th edition of the TNM classification of malignant tumors and to the factors related with prognosis.

Patients and methods: A multicenter retrospective study was performed. Survival rates were calculated by the Kaplan–Meier method, and for multivariate analyses, Cox proportional hazards regression model was used. The following variables were analyzed: age, sex, pathologic stage, T category, histology, type of resection and tumor size.

Results: A total of 402 patients were included. Mean follow-up was 70.18 months. Overall 5-year survival was 68%. Males and patients over 70 had lower survival. Prognosis worsened with increasing pathologic stage, T category and tumor size. We found no statistically significant differences in prognosis for histology or type of resection. Multivariate analysis showed age, sex and pathologic stage to be independent prognostic factors.

Conclusions: Survival results and the analysis of prognostic factors in our series are similar to those published in the new 2009 TNM classification. The most important prognostic factor is pathologic stage. Other adverse prognostic factors include male sex and age over 70.
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tumoral. No encontramos diferencias pronósticas estadísticamente significativas en relación con el tipo histológico y el tipo de resección practicada. El análisis multivariable mostró que la edad, el sexo y el estadío patológico son factores pronósticos independientes.

Conclusions: Los resultados de supervivencia y el análisis de factores pronósticos de nuestra serie se ajustan a los publicados en la nueva clasificación TNM de 2009. El factor pronóstico más importante es el estadío patológico. Otros factores pronósticos desfavorables son el sexo masculino y la edad mayor de 70 años.

© 2011 SEPAR. Publicado por Elsevier España, S.L. Todos los derechos reservados.

Introduction
Lung cancer, due to its incidence and mortality, is a public health problem in developed Western countries.1,2 In 2009, the UICC and the AJCC published the seventh edition of the TNM classification for malignant tumors, in effect since January 2010. In this edition, the lung cancer classification, which has incorporated important modifications, was updated by the International Staging Committee of the IASLC, presided by Dr. P. Goldstraw, President.3,4

Approximately 80% of all lung cancers belong to the group of non-small-cell carcinomas. In this histologic type, complete surgical resection is the treatment of choice in the initial stages, although surgical approaches and techniques are evolving.5

Despite recent medical advances, survival of patients with lung cancer is low. If we center on non-small-cell carcinomas, which is the aim of this study, overall five-year survival in Europe does not surpass 15% in any of the European countries.6,7 Approximately 30% of patients with non-small-cell lung cancer in stage I who undergo complete resection relapse and die within 5 years, fundamentally due to the presence of micrometastasis at the time of resection.8 It is not known, however, what mechanisms produce these recurrences or in which patients they will occur.

The identification of prognostic factors in lung cancer is very useful for assessing the individual patient prognosis, selecting the best treatment, defining new criteria to classify patients according to risk groups and helping design and direct future research.9

In recent years, more than 150 variables have been identified that have been described as prognostic factors in lung cancer and may implicate the tumor, the patient or the setting.10

Therefore, the objectives of this study are to validate our surgical series of patients with pathologic stage I non-small-cell pulmonary carcinoma according to the seventh edition of the TNM classification for malignant tumors and to identify the factors that may be related with prognosis.

Patients and Methods
Patients
Patients who underwent surgical treatment for pathologic stage I non-small-cell lung cancer by the Thoracic Surgery Departments at the Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón (between 1991 and 2005), the Complejo Hospitalario Xeral-Cies in Vigo (between 2000 and 2004) and the Complejo Hospitalario Universitario in Albacete (between 2001 and 2006) with complete lung resection. The patients had not received either adjuvant or induction treatment.

Methods
We performed a multi-center, retrospective study, analyzing survival and determining prognostic factors.

The clinical data of the patients were compiled in a protocol that was common for the three health centers that participated in the study and were later introduced into a Microsoft Access® database designed for their analysis.

This database included clinical variables as well as those from imaging studies, surgical intervention protocol and pathological anatomy reports, as well as data from the outpatient consultation follow-up (Table 1).

In all patients, complete surgical resection was performed. Lobectomy was considered the standard lung resection. Pneumonectomy was carried out when required due to technical or oncological reasons. Atypical lung resection was done in patient with high surgical risk or poor cardiorespiratory reserve. Usually, lymphadenectomy was performed systematically after lung resection, including the nodes of the hilar and mediastinal regions.

For the survival analysis and prognostic factors, the following variables were selected: age, sex, pathologic stage, T category (TNM), histologic type, resection type and tumor size.

The statistical analysis was done with SPSS 15.0 software package for Windows. In order to compare the independent quantitative variables, we used the Student’s t test, the Kruskal–Wallis test and the Mann–Whitney U test. Correlations between two categorical variables were studied with the $\chi^2$ test. The survival analysis was calculated with the Kaplan–Meier product-limit method. Log-rank was used to evaluate whether the differences observed on two survival curves could be explained by chance. For the multivariable analysis, we constructed a Cox proportional hazard model (“enter” method) including the following variables: age, sex, histologic type, type of surgical resection and stage. A $P$ value <.05 was considered statistically significant.

Results
The sample selected for the study was composed of 402 patients: 180 from the Hospital General Universitario Gregorio Marañón, 49 of which had been included in the SEPAR study by
Table 2
Clinical and Surgical Data (n=402).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients, n (%)</th>
<th>Patients, n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|Age
<70| 290 (72)
>70| 122 (28)
|Sex
Male | 350 (87)
Female | 52 (13)
|Affected hemithorax
Right | 245 (61)
Left | 157 (39)
|Tobacco habit
Active smoker | 205 (51)
Ex-smoker | 161 (40)
Never smoker | 36 (9)
|Pre-op diagnosis
Yes | 173 (43)
|Tumor location
Upper lobe | 277 (69)
Middle lobe | 20 (5)
Lower lobe | 105 (26)
|Type of resection
Atypical resection | 71 (18)
Lobectomy | 269 (67)
Bi-lobectomy | 18 (4)
Pneumonectomy | 44 (11)
|the Bronchogenic Carcinoma Workgroup (in Spanish, GCCB-S); 135 from the Complejo Hospitalario Xeral-Cies; and 87 from the Complejo Hospitalario Universitario in Albacete.

At the time of the surgical intervention, the patients were between 35 and 83 years of age, with a mean age of 64 (SD 9). 87% were males and the right hemithorax was the most frequently affected. As for tobacco habit, 51% were active smokers at the time of the diagnosis, 40% were ex-smokers and only 9% had never smoked. The most frequent histologic type was epidermoid carcinoma, which is being a predominantly poorly and moderately defined tumor. The average tumor size was 2.5 cm and 38% of the tumors were stage IA. The most relevant clinical surgical data are shown in Table 2 and the pathological data are shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Pathological Data (n=402).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients, n (%)</th>
<th>Patients, n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|Histology
Epidermoid carcinoma | 196 (49)
Adenocarcinoma | 186 (46)
Large-cell carcinoma | 18 (4.5)
Adenosquamous carcinoma | 2 (0.5)
|Degree of differentiation
Good | 64 (16)
Moderate | 185 (46)
Poor | 153 (38)
|T. TNM
T1a | 93 (23)
T1b | 62 (15)
T2a | 247 (62)
|Size, cm
0–2 | 144 (36)
2.1–3 | 126 (31)
3.1–5 | 132 (33)

Table 4
Five-Year Survival Analysis According to the Kaplan–Meier Method (n=402).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients, n (%)</th>
<th>Patients, n (%)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Sv</td>
<td>– (68)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|Sv/age
<70 | 290 (71)
>70 | 122 (62)
|Sv/sex
Male | 350 (66)
Female | 52 (72)
|Sv/histology
Epidermoid carcinoma | 196 (69)
Adenocarcinoma | 186 (66)
Large-cell carcinoma | 20 (70)
|Sv/type of resection
Atypical resection | 71 (65)
Lobectomy | 287 (68)
Pneumonectomy | 44 (68)
|Sv/stage
IA | 155 (76)
IB | 247 (62)
|Sv/T category
T1a | 93 (73)
T1b | 62 (69)
T2a | 247 (62)
|Sv/tumor size
0–2 cm | 144 (73)
2.1–3 cm | 126 (70)
3.1–5 cm | 132 (59)

After a mean patient follow-up time of 70.18 months with a standard deviation of 45.15 months (range, 1.8–218.07), 186 patients (46%) were alive and disease-free, 18 (4%) were alive but with metastatic disease, 135 (34%) had died as a direct consequence of the relapse of the tumor disease and 63 (16%) had died due to causes other than lung cancer.

Overall survival was analyzed, as were the different variables described in “Patients and Methods” section that could affect survival. The two adenosquamous carcinomas were grouped together with the large-cell carcinomas for the survival analysis depending on the histological type. The 18 bi-lobectomies were grouped with the 269 lobectomies when survival was analyzed according to type of resection. Survival was also analyzed solely depending on tumor size, grouping the tumors into 3 groups: tumors between 0 and 2 cm, tumors between 2.1 and 3 cm and tumors between 3.1 and 5 cm.

Table 4 summarizes the findings of the statistical analysis for total survival depending on the variables described. The overall 5-year survival rate of the series was 68%. Being male and being over the age of 70 were factors that both had a negative prognostic influence. In addition, the prognosis worsened as the stage, T category and tumor size increased. We found no statistically significant differences when comparing survival according to histologic type or resection type.

Figs. 1 and 2 show the survival curves of the patients depending on the variables previously analyzed and show the statistical differences found.

The multivariable analysis done with the Cox proportional hazards model (Table 5) showed that age, sex and tumor stage are independent prognostic factors. The analysis, adjusted for the rest of the variables that were entered into the model, showed that the patients in stage IB have a risk for death that is 1.81 greater than the patients in stage IA. The analysis also showed that males are 2.15 times more likely to die than women, while patients over the age of 70 have a risk for death 1.02 times greater than younger patients.
Fig. 1. Survival curves of the patients according to the Kaplan–Meier method, and the statistical difference found: (A) according to age; (B) according to sex; (C) according to histologic type; (D) according to resection type.

Fig. 2. (A) survival curves of the patients by the Kaplan–Meier method according to pathologic stage and the statistical difference found. (B) Survival curves of the patients by the Kaplan–Meier method according to T category; statistically significant differences were found between the survival curves for T1a and T2a (P=0.005), and between the survival curves of T1b and T2a (P=0.049); statistical significance was not met between the curves of T1a and T1b (P=0.68). (C) Survival curves of the patients by the Kaplan–Meier method according to tumor size; statistically significant differences were found between the survival curves for 0–2 cm and 3.1–5 cm (P=0.01); statistical significance was not reached between the survival curves for 0–2 cm and 2.1–3 cm (P=0.13), or between the survival curves for 2.1–3 cm and 3.1–5 cm (P=0.28).
However, as our research obtained better also found that sex and age are important prognostic factors. We therefore also analyzed the survival of the patients in our series, classifying them by size alone (without contemplating invasion of the visceral pleura, involvement of the main bronchus at more than 2 cm from the carina or obstructive pneumonitis that does not affect the entire lung) and we found that there were also statistically significant differences in the global analysis of this descriptor ($P=0.027$). However, in the comparative analysis between the different curves, we only found statistically significant differences between the survival curves for 0–2 cm and 3.1–5 cm ($P=0.01$); although statistical significance was not reached, a relevant clinical influence was observed between the survival curves for 0–2 cm and 2.1–3 cm ($P=0.13$), and between the survival curves for 2.1–3 cm and 3.1–5 cm ($P=0.28$). The differences between the survival curves of the T category and the size descriptor are due to the influence on survival of some of the descriptors of the T category mentioned previously, which were not able to be validated in the current TNM classification, $P=0.03$ and therefore have not been aims of this study.

Chansky et al. also found that sex and age are important prognostic factors in surgically resected non-small-cell lung cancer. Likewise, our series confirms that male sex and age over 70 are unfavorable prognostic factors.

In the survival study according to histologic type, we found no statistically significant differences. Chansky et al. obtained better survival of patients with bronchioloalveolar carcinoma, as already published by other authors. In our series, however, this relationship was not studied as the few cases of bronchioloalveolar carcinoma were included in the adenocarcinoma group for the statistical analysis.

Currently, lobectomy is considered the best oncological resection for the treatment of lung cancer as there is a greater percentage of relapse in atypical resections and segmentectomies. Nevertheless, recent studies have reported results comparable to those of lobectomy in small-sized peripheral tumors, basically bronchioloalveolar carcinomas. Thus, in the current recommendations, minor resections of a lobe are reserved only for this type of tumors under the right conditions. In our series, we also did not find differences in survival according to surgical resection type.

In conclusion, the analysis of the survival and prognostic factors in our series conforms to the results of the new TNM lung cancer classification. The most important prognostic factor is pathologic stage. Other unfavorable prognostic factors are being male and being over the age of 70.
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