# OPEN

# Recurrence Risk Factors Analysis for Stage I Non-small Cell Lung Cancer

Ching-Feng Wu, Jui-Ying Fu, Chi-Ju Yeh, Yun-Hen Liu, Ming-Ju Hsieh, Yi-Cheng Wu, Ching-Yang Wu, Ying-Huang Tsai, and Wen-Chi Chou

**Abstract:** Lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer-related death worldwide. Even early-stage patients might encounter disease recurrence with relative high risk. Effective postoperative therapy is based on an accurate assessment of treatment failure after surgery. The aim of this study is to construct a disease-free survival (DFS) prediction model and stratify patients into different risk score groups.

A total of 356 pathological stage I patients (7th American Joint Committee on Cancer) who underwent lung resection from January 2005 through June 2011 were retrospectively reviewed. Of these patients, 63 patients were eliminated for this study. A total of 293 p-stage I patients were included for further univariate and multivariate analysis. Clinical, surgical, and pathological factors associated with high risk of recurrence were analyzed, including age, gender, smoking status, additional primary malignancy (APM), operation method, histology, visceral pleural invasion, angiolymphatic invasion, tumor necrosis, and tumor size.

Of the 293 p-stage I non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients examined, 143 were female and 150 were male, with a mean age of 62.8years old (range: 25–83-years old). The 5-year DFS and overall survival rates after surgery were 58.9% and 75.3%, respectively. On multivariate analysis, current smoker (hazards ratio [HR]: 1.63), APM (HR: 1.86), tumor size (HR: 1.54, 2.03), nonanatomic resections (HR: 1.81), adenocarcinoma histology (HR: 2.07), visceral pleural invasion (HR: 1.54), and angiolymphatic invasion (HR: 1.53) were found to be associated with a higher risk of tumor recurrence. The final model showed a fair discrimination ability (C-statistic = 0.68). According to the difference risk group, we found patients with intermediate or higher risk group had a higher distal relapse tendency as compared with low risk group (P = 0.016, odds ratio: 3.31, 95% confidence interval: 1.21–9.03).

Greater than 30% of disease recurrences occurred after surgery for stage I NSCLC patients. That is why we try to establish an effective DFS predicting model based on clinical, pathological, and surgical covariates. However, our initial results still need to be validated and refined into greater population for better application in clinical use.

Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

(*Medicine* 94(32):e1337)

**Abbreviations**: APM = additional primary malignancy, CT = computed tomography, DFS = disease-free survival, NSCLC = non-small cell lung cancer, PET = positron emission tomography, UFT = uracil-tegafur.

#### INTRODUCTION

ung cancer is the main cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide.<sup>1</sup> Surgery constitutes the primary therapeutic option for the management of early-stage non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC).<sup>2</sup> Even early-stage patients might encounter disease recurrence with relative high risk.3,4 Effective postoperative therapy is based on an accurate assessment of treatment failure after surgery. Recently, adjuvant cisplatin-based regimens have demonstrated survival benefits in early-stage NSCLC patients.<sup>5,6</sup> In addition, it has been reported that oral administration of the combination drug uracil-tegafur (UFT) or S-1 improved overall survival and disease-free survival (DFS) of patients who underwent complete resection for stage I NSCLC adenocarcinoma.<sup>7-9</sup> However, the risk factors of treatment failure after surgery have not been well described, and clinical pathologic features placing patients at particularly high risk of tumor recurrence have been inadequately studied. Only when a complete prediction model can be imposed on stage I NSCLC patients, can each patient receive adequate adjuvant therapy and follow-up program. The aim of this study is to construct a DFS prediction model and stratify patients into different risk groups.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### Patients

This study was approved by the institutional review board of the Chang Gung Memorial Hospital (IRB No: 103-5631B). Because this was a retrospective study, the need to obtain written informed consent from each patient was waived.

We performed a retrospective review of 356 patients who underwent lung resection for pathological stage I NSCLC (7th American Joint Committee on Cancer) in our prospective lung cancer database from January 2005 through June 2011. Sixty three patients were eliminated from this study, whereby exclusion criteria included an incomplete medical record, loss of patients to follow-up, surgical margin positive patients, or patients' receiving neoadjuvant therapy or scheduled adjuvant therapy. Medical records and pertinent radiologic imaging were reviewed to characterize each patient's demographic information, obtain surgical and pathologic details, and record patterns of failure after surgery. The preoperative workup included chest radiography, bronchoscopy, chest computed tomography (CT), spirometry, bone scan, and a thorough search

Editor: Raffaele Pezzilli.

Received: April 16, 2015; revised: July 15, 2015; accepted: July 16, 2015. From the Division of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery (C-FW, Y-HL, M-JH, Y-CW, C-YW); Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care, Department of Internal Medicine (J-YF); Division of Pathology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan (C-JY); Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care, Department of Internal Medicine, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Chiayi (Y-HT); and Division of Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan, Taiwan (W-CC).

Correspondence: Ching-Yang Wu, Division of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery, Department of Surgery, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, IRB No 103-5631B, Taoyuan, Taiwan (e-mail: wu.chingyang@gmail. com).

The authors have no funding and conflicts of interest to disclose.

This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. ISSN: 0025-7974

DOI: 10.1097/MD.000000000001337

for distant metastases, such as positron emission tomography (PET) imaging and brain CT.

# Surgical Technique

Lobectomy, bilobectomy or pneumonectomy, and wedge resection with systemic lymphadenectomy were performed according to the patient's preoperative physiological condition and tumor location. At least 3 mediastinal nodes are excised as a minimum requirement. All of the resected lymph nodes were labeled separately. All pulmonary resections were performed by open thoracotomy (open) or video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery. Surgical resections included 2 pneumonectomies, 3 bilobectomies, 263 lobectomies, and 25 wedge resections.

#### **Pathological Evaluation**

According to the TNM classification of the 7th American Joint Committee for Cancer Staging, all patients were staged as final pathologic stage I. The recorded pathological variables included tumor size, tumor differential grade, visceral pleural invasion,<sup>10–12</sup> angiolymphatic invasion,<sup>12–14</sup> tumor necrosis,<sup>15</sup> tumor histology, and lymph node dissection numbers.<sup>16</sup>

#### Follow-Up

After surgery, patients were examined on an outpatient basis at 3 to 6-month intervals. Chest radiography or chest CT was utilized for surveillance imaging. If disease relapse was suspected, brain magnetic resonance imaging or 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose PET was arranged. The main purpose of this study was to assess the risk of disease recurrence after surgery and to identify clinical, surgical, and pathological features which were associated with high recurrence risk. Local recurrence was defined as disease recurrence at the surgical resection margin, ipsilateral hilum, and/or mediastinum. All other sites of failure were considered distant recurrences.

### **Statistical Analysis**

SPSS (V17.0, SPSS, Inc, Chicago, IL) and STATA (version 12.1) were used for statistical analysis. DFS period was calculated from the date of surgery to the date of treatment failure (defined as local and/or distant recurrence). DFS curves were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier method. Significance was assessed using the log rank test. A P value of <0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance. Possible predictors of DFS were investigated using Cox multivariate proportional hazards. The discriminative ability of prognostic models was evaluated by Harrell concordance index (C-index), which is a natural extension of the receiver-operating characteristic curve area to survival analysis and ranges from 0.5 (no discrimination) to 1 (perfect discrimination). The additive risk score was derived from regression model coefficients of the significant predictor: the smallest coefficient was given a value of 1 and the other values were assigned by the reason of proportional increasing.

#### RESULTS

Of the 293 p-stage I NSCLC patients examined, 143 were female and 150 were male, with a mean age of 62.83-years old (range: 25–83-years old). The mean follow-up time was 46 months. The majority of patients had stage Ib disease (38.6% with stage Ia and 61.4% with stage Ib). The average number of hilar lymph nodes retrieved was 7.45, and the average total number of lymph nodes dissected was 17.67. Surgical margins

were all negative in 293 patients. Angiolymphatic invasion was seen in 66 patients (22.5%), and visceral pleural invasion was noted in 130 patients (44.3%). The characteristics of patients' profiles are shown in Table 1. For all patients, the 5-year DFS and overall survival rates after surgery were 58.9% and 75.3%, respectively. When evaluated by T stage, patients with T1a tumors had 78% DFS, whereas patients with T1b and T2a tumors had an estimated 68.2% and 50.7% 5-year DFS rate (P < 0.001 Figure 1).

TABLE 1. Patient Demographics and (	Characteristics
-------------------------------------	-----------------

Former smoker64 (21.8%)Current smoker55 (18.8%)Additional primary malignancy (prior to primary lung cancer)Yes35 (11.9%)No258 (88.1%)Cell type	Age	62.83 (25-83)
Female       143         Smoking status       174 (59.4%)         Former smoker       64 (21.8%)         Current smoker       55 (18.8%)         Additional primary malignancy (prior to primary lung cancer)       Yes         Yes       35 (11.9%)         No       258 (88.1%)         Cell type       Adenocarcinoma       225 (76.8%)         Squamous cell carcinoma       50 (17.1%)         Others       18 (7.1%)         Surgical approach       VATS       132 (45.1%)         Open       161 (54.9%)         Surgical procedure       Wedge resection       25 (8.5%)         Lobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       2 (0.7%)         Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Surgical procedure $(20.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Surgical sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Varse       66 (22.5%)         No       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       Yes         Yes       130 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.	Gender	
Smoking status174 (59.4%)Nonsmoker174 (59.4%)Former smoker64 (21.8%)Current smoker55 (18.8%)Additional primary malignancy (prior to primary lung cancer)Yes35 (11.9%)No258 (88.1%)Cell typeAdenocarcinoma225 (76.8%)Squamous cell carcinoma50 (17.1%)Others18 (7.1%)Surgical approach132 (45.1%)VATS132 (45.1%)Open161 (54.9%)Surgical procedure263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy2 (0.7%)Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTumor size2 $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $< 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $< 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis130 (44.4%)No163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis144 (49.1%)Yes144 (49.1%)No149 (50.9%)pT status51 (18.8%)T1a60 (20.5%)T1b55 (18.8%)T2a178 (60.8%)Pathological stage176 (60.8%)	Male	150
Nonsmoker       174 (59.4%)         Former smoker       64 (21.8%)         Current smoker       55 (18.8%)         Additional primary malignancy (prior to primary lung cancer)       Yes         Yes       35 (11.9%)         No       258 (88.1%)         Cell type       Adenocarcinoma         Adenocarcinoma       225 (76.8%)         Squamous cell carcinoma       50 (17.1%)         Others       18 (7.1%)         Surgical approach       VATS         VATS       132 (45.1%)         Open       161 (54.9%)         Surgical procedure       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       2 (0.7%)         Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         N1 sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Vars       66 (22.5%)         No       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       130 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis       144 (49	Female	143
Former smoker $64$ (21.8%)Current smoker $55$ (18.8%)Additional primary malignancy (prior to primary lung cancer)YesYes $35$ (11.9%)No $258$ (88.1%)Cell typeAdenocarcinoma $225$ (76.8%)Squamous cell carcinoma $20$ (17.1%)Others18 (7.1%)Surgical approachVATS132 (45.1%)Open161 (54.9%)Surgical procedure263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy2 (0.7%)Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (average Total sampling numbersN1 sampling numbers17.67 (average Total sampling numbers $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $< 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $< 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion Yes66 (22.5%)No227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion Yes130 (44.4%)No163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis Yes144 (49.1%)No149 (50.9%)pT status11aT1a60 (20.5%)T1b55 (18.8%)T2a178 (60.8%)Pathological stage176	Smoking status	
Current smoker55 (18.8%)Additional primary malignancy (prior to primary lung cancer)Yes35 (11.9%)No258 (88.1%)Cell typeAdenocarcinoma225 (76.8%)Squamous cell carcinoma50 (17.1%)Others18 (7.1%)Surgical approachVATSVATS132 (45.1%)Open161 (54.9%)Surgical procedureWedge resectionWedge resection25 (8.5%)Lobectomy263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy2 (0.7%)Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTumor size2 $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $< 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $< 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion149 (50.9%)Yes144 (49.1%)No149 (50.9%)T1a60 (20.5%)T1b55 (18.8%)T2a178 (60.8%)	Nonsmoker	174 (59.4%)
Additional primary malignancy (prior to primary lung cancer)Yes $35 (11.9\%)$ No $258 (88.1\%)$ Cell type $258 (88.1\%)$ Adenocarcinoma $225 (76.8\%)$ Squamous cell carcinoma $50 (17.1\%)$ Others $18 (7.1\%)$ Surgical approach $VATS$ VATS $132 (45.1\%)$ Open $161 (54.9\%)$ Surgical procedure $25 (8.5\%)$ Lobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $2 (0.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers $7.45 (average Total sampling numbersN1 sampling numbers17.67 (average Total sampling numbersNo22-394 (32.1\%)Angiolymphatic invasion227 (77.5\%)Visceral pleural invasion272 (77.5\%)Visceral pleural invasion44 (49.1\%)No149 (50.9\%)T1a60 (20.5\%)T1b55 (18.8\%)T2a178 (60.8\%)$	Former smoker	64 (21.8%)
Yes       35 (11.9%)         No       258 (88.1%)         Cell type       225 (76.8%)         Squamous cell carcinoma       50 (17.1%)         Others       18 (7.1%)         Surgical approach       VATS         VATS       132 (45.1%)         Open       161 (54.9%)         Surgical procedure       25 (8.5%)         Lobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       2 (0.7%)         Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         N1 sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Surgical pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       130 (44.4%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       118         T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)	Current smoker	55 (18.8%)
Yes       35 (11.9%)         No       258 (88.1%)         Cell type       225 (76.8%)         Squamous cell carcinoma       50 (17.1%)         Others       18 (7.1%)         Surgical approach       VATS         VATS       132 (45.1%)         Open       161 (54.9%)         Surgical procedure       25 (8.5%)         Lobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       2 (0.7%)         Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         N1 sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Surgical pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       130 (44.4%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       118         T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)	Additional primary malignancy (prior to prin	nary lung cancer)
Cell type $225 (76.8\%)$ Squamous cell carcinoma $50 (17.1\%)$ Others $18 (7.1\%)$ Surgical approach $132 (45.1\%)$ VATS $132 (45.1\%)$ Open $161 (54.9\%)$ Surgical procedure $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $2 (0.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers $7.45 (average Total sampling numbers         N1 sampling numbers       7.45 (average Total sampling numbers         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average Total sampling numbers)         2^2 - 3 108 (36.9\%) < 2^{-3} 94 (32.1\%)         Angiolymphatic invasion       227 (77.5\%)         Visceral pleural invasion       Yes         Yes       130 (44.4\%)         No       163 (55.6\%)         Tumor necrosis       Yes         Yes       144 (49.1\%)         No       149 (50.9\%)         pT status       71a 60 (20.5\%)         T1b       55 (18.8\%) 72a         Pathological stage       178 (60.8\%) $		
Adenocarcinoma225 (76.8%)Squamous cell carcinoma50 (17.1%)Others18 (7.1%)Surgical approach132 (45.1%)VATS132 (45.1%)Open161 (54.9%)Surgical procedure25 (8.5%)Lobectomy263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy2 (0.7%)Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (averageN1 sampling numbers7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageSurgiolymphatic invasion94 (32.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion130 (44.4%)No163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis144 (49.1%)No149 (50.9%)PT status178 (60.8%)Pathological stage178 (60.8%)	No	258 (88.1%)
Squamous cell carcinoma $50 (17.1\%)$ Others $18 (7.1\%)$ Surgical approach $132 (45.1\%)$ VATS $132 (45.1\%)$ Open $161 (54.9\%)$ Surgical procedure $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $2 (0.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers $7.45 (average Total sampling numbers         Total sampling numbers       7.45 (average Total sampling numbers         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average Total sampling numbers)         Varse       66 (22.5\%)         Angiolymphatic invasion       227 (77.5\%)         Visceral pleural invasion       243 (55.6\%)         Yes       130 (44.4\%)         No       163 (55.6\%)         Tumor necrosis       144 (49.1\%)         No       149 (50.9\%)         pT status       71a (60 (20.5\%)         T1b 55 (18.8\%) 72a (77.5\%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8\%) $	Cell type	. ,
Squamous cell carcinoma $50 (17.1\%)$ Others $18 (7.1\%)$ Surgical approach $12 (45.1\%)$ VATS $132 (45.1\%)$ Open $161 (54.9\%)$ Surgical procedure $25 (8.5\%)$ Lobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $2 (0.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers $7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageSquamous size22\leq 291 (31.0\%)< 2-3108 (36.9\%)< 3-594 (32.1\%)Angiolymphatic invasion466 (22.5\%)Yes66 (22.5\%)No227 (77.5\%)Visceral pleural invasion130 (44.4\%)No149 (50.9\%)pT status114 (49.1\%)No149 (50.9\%)T1b55 (18.8\%)T2a178 (60.8\%)Pathological stage178 (60.8\%)$	Adenocarcinoma	225 (76.8%)
Others $18 (7.1\%)$ Surgical approach $132 (45.1\%)$ VATS $132 (45.1\%)$ Open $161 (54.9\%)$ Surgical procedure $25 (8.5\%)$ Lobectomy $263 (89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy $2 (0.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers $1.4\%$ N1 sampling numbers $7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (average)Total sampling numbers17.67 (average)Total sampling numbers17.67 (average)Angiolymphatic invasion4 (32.1\%)Yes66 (22.5\%)No227 (77.5\%)Visceral pleural invasion43 (55.6\%)Tumor necrosis144 (49.1\%)No149 (50.9\%)T1a60 (20.5\%)T1b55 (18.8\%)T2a178 (60.8\%)$	Squamous cell carcinoma	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Surgical approach       132 (45.1%)         Open       161 (54.9%)         Surgical procedure       25 (8.5%)         Lobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       2 (0.7%)         Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Support       2.3 - 5       94 (32.1%)         Angiolymphatic invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       30 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis       130 (44.4%)         Yes       130 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       114         T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)	1	
VATS       132 (45.1%)         Open       161 (54.9%)         Surgical procedure       25 (8.5%)         Lobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       2 (0.7%)         Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Tumor size       91 (31.0%) $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $<2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $<3-5$ 94 (32.1%)         Angiolymphatic invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       130 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis       130 (44.4%)         Yes       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       11a         T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)	Surgical approach	
Open161 $(54.9\%)$ Surgical procedure25 $(8.5\%)$ Lobectomy263 $(89.8\%)$ Bilobectomy3 $(1\%)$ Pneumonectomy2 $(0.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (averageN1 sampling numbers7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (average291 $(31.0\%)$ $<2-3$ 108 $(36.9\%)$ $<3-5$ 94 $(32.1\%)$ Angiolymphatic invasion227 $(77.5\%)$ Visceral pleural invasion30 $(44.4\%)$ No163 $(55.6\%)$ Tumor necrosis144 $(49.1\%)$ No149 $(50.9\%)$ pT status118T1a60 $(20.5\%)$ T1b55 $(18.8\%)$ T2a178 $(60.8\%)$		132 (45.1%)
Surgical procedure25 (8.5%)Wedge resection25 (8.5%)Lobectomy263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy3 (1%)Pneumonectomy2 (0.7%)Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (average $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $< 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $< 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion130 (44.4%)No163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis144 (49.1%)No149 (50.9%)pT status118T1a60 (20.5%)T1b55 (18.8%)T2a178 (60.8%)Pathological stage178 (60.8%)	Open	· · · · ·
Wedge resection       25 (8.5%)         Lobectomy       263 (89.8%)         Bilobectomy       3 (1%)         Pneumonectomy       2 (0.7%)         Lymph node sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Tumor size $\leq 2$ $\leq 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $< 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)         Angiolymphatic invasion $27$ (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion $27$ (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion $130$ (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis $28$ Yes       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status $71a$ 60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%) $72a$ Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)	1	× /
Lobectomy263 (89.8%)Bilobectomy3 (1%)Pneumonectomy2 (0.7%)Lymph node sampling numbers2 (0.7%)N1 sampling numbers7.45 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTumor size $\leq 2$ $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $< 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $< 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion130 (44.4%)Yes130 (44.4%)No163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis144 (49.1%)No149 (50.9%)pT status118T1a60 (20.5%)T1b55 (18.8%)T2a178 (60.8%)Pathological stage178 (60.8%)	<b>e</b>	25 (8.5%)
Bilobectomy3 (1%)Pneumonectomy2 (0.7%)Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (averageN1 sampling numbers17.67 (averageTotal sampling numbers17.67 (averageTumor size $\leq 2$ $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $< 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $< 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion130 (44.4%)No163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis144 (49.1%)No149 (50.9%)pT status118T1a60 (20.5%)T1b55 (18.8%)T2a178 (60.8%)Pathological stage178 (60.8%)	e	
Pneumonectomy $2 (0.7\%)$ Lymph node sampling numbers $7.45$ (averageN1 sampling numbers $17.67$ (averageTumor size $22$ $\leq 2$ $91$ ( $31.0\%$ ) $<2-3$ $108$ ( $36.9\%$ ) $<3-5$ $94$ ( $32.1\%$ )Angiolymphatic invasion $227$ ( $77.5\%$ )Visceral pleural invasion $227$ ( $77.5\%$ )Visceral pleural invasion $130$ ( $44.4\%$ )No $163$ ( $55.6\%$ )Tumor necrosis $144$ ( $49.1\%$ )No $149$ ( $50.9\%$ )pT status $118$ T1a $60$ ( $20.5\%$ )T1b $55$ ( $18.8\%$ )T2a $178$ ( $60.8\%$ )Pathological stage		
Lymph node sampling numbers7.45 (average Total sampling numbersN1 sampling numbers17.67 (average Total sampling numbersTumor size $\leq 2$ $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) (3.0%) $<2-3$ 108 (36.9%) (3.2.1%)Angiolymphatic invasion Yes66 (22.5%) NoNo227 (77.5%)Visceral pleural invasion Yes130 (44.4%) NoNo163 (55.6%)Tumor necrosis Yes144 (49.1%) NoNo149 (50.9%) PT statusT1a60 (20.5%) T1bT2a178 (60.8%) Pathological stage	•	
N1 sampling numbers       7.45 (average         Total sampling numbers       17.67 (average         Tumor size $(2-3)$ $(2-3)$ 108 (36.9%) $(3-5)$ 94 (32.1%)         Angiolymphatic invasion $(22.5\%)$ No       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion $(44.4\%)$ Yes       130 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis $(20.5\%)$ Yes       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status $(20.5\%)$ T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage $(20.5\%)$		- ()
Total sampling numbers $17.67$ (averagTumor size $\leq 2$ $91$ ( $31.0\%$ ) $<2-3$ $108$ ( $36.9\%$ ) $<3-5$ $94$ ( $32.1\%$ )Angiolymphatic invasion $227$ ( $77.5\%$ )Yes $66$ ( $22.5\%$ )No $227$ ( $77.5\%$ )Visceral pleural invasion $227$ ( $77.5\%$ )Yes $130$ ( $44.4\%$ )No $163$ ( $55.6\%$ )Tumor necrosis $244$ ( $49.1\%$ )Yes $144$ ( $49.1\%$ )No $149$ ( $50.9\%$ )pT status $116$ T1a $60$ ( $20.5\%$ )T1b $55$ ( $18.8\%$ )T2a $178$ ( $60.8\%$ )Pathological stage $1167$ ( $1100$		7.45 (average)
Tumor size $\leq 2$ 91 (31.0%) $\leq 2-3$ 108 (36.9%) $\leq 3-5$ 94 (32.1%)         Angiolymphatic invasion $(32.1\%)$ Yes       66 (22.5%)         No       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion $(30.44.4\%)$ No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis $(44.4\%)$ Yes       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status $(149.1\%)$ T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage $(46.8\%)$		
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		
<2-3       108 (36.9%) $<3-5$ 94 (32.1%)         Angiolymphatic invasion       94 (32.1%)         Yes       66 (22.5%)         No       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       130 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       11b         T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)		91 (31.0%)
<3-5	—	
Angiolymphatic invasion       Yes       66 (22.5%)         No       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       130 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       11a         T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)		· · · · · ·
Yes       66 (22.5%)         No       227 (77.5%)         Visceral pleural invasion       70 (44.4%)         No       163 (55.6%)         Tumor necrosis       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)		) I ( <u>52.1</u> 70)
No         227 (77.5%)           Visceral pleural invasion         130 (44.4%)           No         163 (55.6%)           Tumor necrosis         144 (49.1%)           No         149 (50.9%)           pT status         110           T1a         60 (20.5%)           T1b         55 (18.8%)           T2a         178 (60.8%)           Pathological stage         178 (60.8%)		66 (22 5%)
Visceral pleural invasion     130 (44.4%)       No     163 (55.6%)       Tumor necrosis     144 (49.1%)       No     149 (50.9%)       pT status     114       T1a     60 (20.5%)       T1b     55 (18.8%)       T2a     178 (60.8%)       Pathological stage     178 (60.8%)		
Yes     130 (44.4%)       No     163 (55.6%)       Tumor necrosis     144 (49.1%)       Yes     144 (49.1%)       No     149 (50.9%)       pT status     149 (50.9%)       T1a     60 (20.5%)       T1b     55 (18.8%)       T2a     178 (60.8%)       Pathological stage     178 (60.8%)		227 (11.370)
No         163 (55.6%)           Tumor necrosis         163 (55.6%)           Yes         144 (49.1%)           No         149 (50.9%)           pT status         149 (50.9%)           T1a         60 (20.5%)           T1b         55 (18.8%)           T2a         178 (60.8%)           Pathological stage         178 (60.8%)		130 (44 4%)
Tumor necrosis       144 (49.1%)         No       149 (50.9%)         pT status       149 (50.9%)         T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)		· · · · · ·
Yes     144 (49.1%)       No     149 (50.9%)       pT status     149 (50.9%)       T1a     60 (20.5%)       T1b     55 (18.8%)       T2a     178 (60.8%)       Pathological stage     178 (60.8%)		105 (55.070)
No         149 (50.9%)           pT status         60 (20.5%)           T1a         60 (20.5%)           T1b         55 (18.8%)           T2a         178 (60.8%)           Pathological stage         178 (60.8%)		144 (49 1%)
pT status T1a 60 (20.5%) T1b 55 (18.8%) T2a 178 (60.8%) Pathological stage		· · · · · ·
T1a       60 (20.5%)         T1b       55 (18.8%)         T2a       178 (60.8%)         Pathological stage       178 (60.8%)		149 (30.970)
T1b         55 (18.8%)           T2a         178 (60.8%)           Pathological stage         178 (60.8%)	*	60 (20 5%)
T2a 178 (60.8%) Pathological stage		
Pathological stage		
6 6		170 (00.070)
113 (38.070)	6 6	113 (38 60/)
		113 (38.0%) 180 (61.4%)



**FIGURE 1.** Disease-free survival rates of stage I patients with different pT status (P < 0.001).

Patients with previous history of malignancy have a poor DFS rate (P = 0.002). The 5-year DFS rates for adenocarcinoma and nonadenocarcinoma were 55.4% and 65.1%, respectively (P = 0.144). The 5-year DFS rates of patients with and without angiolymphatic invasion were 45% and 62.1%, respectively (P = 0.001). DFS was shown to be significantly longer in patients without visceral pleural invasion. These patients had an average 5-year DFS rate of 69.8%, in contrast to 46% in those with visceral pleural invasion (P < 0.001).

Disease recurrence was identified in 115 patients. Disease recurrence was confirmed by means of biopsy in 47% of patients, while the remaining 53% of patients were confirmed by means of CT or PET scan. If patients had previous history of malignancy, biopsy was conducted. Local recurrence was noted in 50 patients and distal recurrence in 65 patients. The median time from surgery to recurrence was 16 months for those patients with local recurrence and 18 months for those with distal recurrence.

Variables associated with a higher rate of treatment failure on univariate analysis were wedge resection, previous history of malignancy, current smoker, tumor size, angiolymphatic invasion, and visceral pleural invasion. Detailed univariate analysis is listed in Table 2. For the multivariate analysis, possible prognostic factors associated with DFS were considered in a multivariable Cox proportional hazard regression analysis and presented in Table 3. Predictors of DFS associated with  $P \le 0.05$  on multivariate analysis were included in the final score model. The additive risk score was designed from the hazard ratio of significant predictor estimates (Table 4). The resulting additive risk score identifies 3 groups, each presenting a different DFS curve (P < 0.001, Figure 2). We further analyzed the relationship between the relapse pattern and the risk group. We found patients with intermediate or higher risk group had a higher distal relapse tendency as compared with low risk group (P = 0.016, odds ratio: 3.31, 95% confidence interval: 1.21–9.03) (Figure 3).

#### DISCUSSION

This study represents an attempt to create a prognostic model for clinical and pathological DFS in surgically resected stage I NSCLC patients. Correct prediction for patients with

TABLE 2.	Clinical-Pathological Risk Factors Univariate Analys	sis
----------	--	-----

	Univariate		
Patient Characteristics	5-year DFS Rate	P Value	
Age		0.680	
≤65	56.6		
	59.2		
Gender		0.565	
Male	57.6		
Female	57.4		
Smoking status		0.002	
Current	45.6		
Never and former	61.2		
Additional primary malignancy	0112	0.002	
Yes	34.8	0.002	
No	60.7		
Operative approach	00.7	0.778	
VATS	54.1	0.770	
Open	59		
Resection	57	0.009	
Anatomatic resection	60.9	0.007	
Wedge resection	31.6		
Histology	51.0		
Adenocarcinoma	55.4	0.144	
Nonadenocarcinoma	65.1	0.144	
Tumor size	05.1	0.010	
<2	70.6	0.010	
$\frac{\geq 2}{2-3}$	57.7		
2-3 3-5	÷		
	46.2	0.050	
Tumor necrosis	(2.1	0.050	
Yes	63.4		
No	52.8	0.004	
Angiolymphatic invasion		0.001	
Yes	45		
No	62.1		
Visceral pleural invasion		< 0.001	
Yes	46		
No	68.5		

DFS = disease-free survival, VATS = video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery.

NSCLC is clinically essential but complex to define. The TNMstaging system has been the only validated prognostic indicator for survival,<sup>1</sup> but there are reports of large variations, ranging from 55% to 85%.<sup>17–19</sup> A more refined estimate of outcome in early-stage NSCLC is DFS. In order to clarify and stratify patients into different risk groups, we give each risk factor its own score by regression model coefficient and stratify them into 3 groups. We found that if patients belong to the low risk group, longer DFS could be expected (Figure 2). Moreover, in the lower risk score group (score: 0-3) there was a higher tendency of local recurrence compared with intermediate or higher risk group (Figure 3). Different follow-up program may be considered for low or intermediate and high risk group. Routinely chest X-ray may be insufficient for intermediate and high risk group patients. Further prospective study is needed.

Our study suggests that a history of additional primary malignancy (APM), current smoker, tumor size, angiolymphatic invasion, visceral pleural invasion, and nonanatomic resection (wedge resection) were all independent risk factors. Due to

	Multivariate			
Patient Characteristics	HR	95% CI	<i>P</i> Value	
Malignancy history			0.015	
No	Reference group			
Yes	1.86	1.12 - 3.08		
Smoking status			0.037	
Non or former	Reference group			
Current	1.63	1.03 - 2.58		
Resection method			0.031	
Anatomatic resection	Reference group			
Wedge resection	1.81	1.05 - 3.10		
Histology			0.007	
Nonadenocarcinoma	Reference group			
Adenocarcinoma	2.07	1.23-3.51		
Tumor size			0.031	
$\leq 2$	Reference group			
2-3	1.55	0.94-2.53		
3-5	2.03	1.19-3.45		
Tumor necrosis			0.307	
No	Reference group			
Yes	1.23	0.82 - 1.87		
Angiolymphatic invasion			0.048	
No	Reference group			
Yes	1.54	1.01 - 2.35		
Visceral pleural invasion			0.028	
No	Reference group			
Yes	1.54	1.05 - 2.27		

 TABLE
 3. Clinical-Pathological
 Risk
 Factors
 Multivariate

 Analysis
 Analysis

TABLE 4. Risk Factor Calculation and Risk Group Stratification

Parameter	Score	
Smoking status		
Non or former	0	
Current	2	
Malignancy history		
No	0	
Yes	2	
Resection method		
Anatomatic resection	0	
Wedge resection	2	
Histology		
Nonadenocarcinoma	0	
Adenocarcinoma	2	
Tumor size		
$\leq 2$	0	
2-3	1	
3-5	2	
Angiolymphatic invasion		
No	0	
Yes	1	
Visceral pleural invasion		
No	0	
Yes	1	
Risk group	Risk score	5-years DFS
Low risk group	0-3	79%
Intermediate risk group	4-7	46%
High risk group	8-12	22%
DFS = disease-free survival.		

adenocarcinoma and 31% belongs to nonadenocarcinoma patients. Owing to limited numbers of patients, we did not put smoking habits and different histology-type lung cancer into further evaluation. In addition, although patients with squamous cell carcinoma constitute majority of nonadenocarcinoma population, different cell types of pulmonary malignancy, such as carcinoid tumor, mucoepidermoid tumor, were also included in this group. This might affect result in our analysis. In future, we



**FIGURE 2.** Disease-free survival rates for different risk group (P < 0.001).

medical and surgical improvements, the detection of APM is not uncommon in NSCLC patients.<sup>20</sup> The incidence rate of APM ranges from 8% to 12.8% in reports.<sup>21</sup> Cho et al<sup>22</sup> showed APM was a poor prognostic factor in stage I gastric cancer.<sup>23</sup> Our study revealed similar findings in stage I NSCLC; however, due to the limited case numbers, the effect of APM warrants further investigation. DFS deteriorated with different smoking habits. Current smoker was a poor prognostic factor for DFS compared with nonsmoker and ex-smoker (P = 0.002). In addition, nonadenocarcinoma patients were found to have a better DFS rate in the multivariate analysis. Our result showed some discrepancy with several reports, in which showed that adenocarcinoma is at least equal or do better than squamous histology in patients with early-stage lung cancer.3,4 However, smoking habits might affect the survival result of different histology type of lung cancer. Michael et al<sup>23</sup> reported that squamous histology was a significant beneficial factor compared with adenocarcinoma, with regard to survival.<sup>24</sup> In his study, smoking status at time of surgery does not affect long-term survival in patients with squamous cell carcinoma, but make a significant difference to the long-term outcomes of patients with adenocarcinoma.<sup>24</sup> Besides, from view of actual pharmacologic effect, quitting smoking showed different effect among different cell type of pulmonary malignancy.<sup>25</sup> In our study, 55 current smokers were identified. A 75% belongs to adenocarcinoma patients and 25% belongs to nonadenocarcinoma patients. With regard to ex-smoker, 69% belongs to



**FIGURE 3.** Relapse site analysis with risk score (P=0.016, odds ratio: 3.31, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.21–9.03).

may enroll more patients to validate the role of different histologies in terms of DFS and further analyze the survival impact of smoking habits on different cell type.

As with any retrospective analysis, the current study has limitations. Although nearly 50% of local recurrences were confirmed with biopsy, the remaining was scored using imaging studies that can lead to overestimation. In addition, our 5-year DFS rate is inferior to that of a Japanese report, especially with regard to pIb patients.<sup>26,27</sup> This could be explained in part by the routine use of UFT or S-1 as adjuvant therapy for stage I adenocarcinoma patients in Japan<sup>7-9</sup> and the fact that plb patients constitute the majority of stage I patients in our study (61.4%). Our national health insurance began to cover UFT usage in pIb adenocarcinoma patients in 2010. In the current study, we excluded patients who received UFT therapy as scheduled adjuvant therapy. In future, we may further confirm UFT's role in early-stage lung cancer. Furthermore, wedge resection was done for older patients or patients with poor pulmonary function, and in these patients, hilar lymph nodes were not adequately sampled. Occult metastasis may have occurred in these patients. Despite these shortcomings, this study may serve as a cornerstone regarding failure patterns and risk factor analysis in stage I NSCLC patients.

# CONCLUSION

Curative surgery remains the major treatment for stage I patients according to the current National Comprehensive Cancer Network guidelines.<sup>2</sup> However, with recurrence rates of 20% to 50% among resected early-stage NSCLC patients.<sup>18,19,26–29</sup> That is why we designed an effective prognostic model based on clinical, pathological, and surgical covariates. Further investigation might be necessary to define if higher risk groups may benefit from a different follow-up schedule or image study protocol and adjuvant treatment options.

#### REFERENCES

- American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) cancer staging handbook. In: Edge SB, Byrd DR, Compton CC, et al, eds. AJCC Cancer Staging Manual. 7th ed. Chicago: Springer; 2010:299–323.
- 2. National comprehensive cancer network guideline version 2. 2013.
- Copyright © 2015 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

- Kelsey CR, Marks LB, Hollis D, et al. Local recurrence after surgery for early stage lung. *Cancer*. 2009;115:5218–5227.
- Guerreraa F, Erricob L, Evangelistac A, et al. Exploring stage I nonsmall-cell lung cancer: development of a prognostic model predicting 5-year survival after surgical resection. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2014;6:1037–1043.
- Pignon JP, Tribodet H, Scagliotti GV, et al. Lung adjuvant cisplatin evaluation: a pooled by the LACE Collaborative Group. J Clin Oncol. 2008;26:3552–3559.
- Tsutani Y, Miyata Y, Kushitani K, et al. Propensity score-matched analysis of adjuvant chemotherapy for stage I non-small cell lung cancer. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2014;148:1179–1185.
- Kato H, Ichinose Y, Ohta M, et al. Japan Lung Cancer Research Group on Postsurgical Adjuvant Chemotherapy. A randomized trial of adjuvant chemotherapy with uracil–tegafur for adenocarcinoma of the lung. N Engl J Med. 2004;350:1713–1721.
- Hamada C, Tsuboi M, Ohta M, et al. Effect of postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy with tegafur-uracil on survival in patients with stage IA nonsmall cell lung cancer: an exploratory analysis from a meta-analysis of six randomized controlled trials. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2009;4:1511–1516.
- Tanaka F, Wada H, Fukushima M. UFT and S-1 for treatment of primary lung cancer. *Gen Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2010;58:3–13.
- Travis WD, Brambilla E, Rami-Porta R, et al. International Staging Committee. Visceral pleural invasion: pathologic criteria and use of elastic stains. Proposal for the 7th edition of the TNM classification for lung cancer. J Thorac Oncol. 2008;3:1384–1390.
- Shimizu K, Yoshida J, Nagai K, et al. Visceral pleural invasion is an invasive and aggressive indicator of non-small cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2005;130:160–165.
- Schuchert MJ, Schumacher L, Kilic A, et al. Impact of angiolymphatic and pleural invasion on surgical outcomes for stage I nonsmall cell lung cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2011;91:1059–1065.
- Kato T, Ishikawa K, Aragaki M, et al. Angiolymphatic invasion exerts a strong impact on surgical outcomes for stage I lung adenocarcinoma, but not non-adenocarcinoma. *Lung Cancer*. 2012;77:394–400.
- Arame A, Mordant P, Cazes A, et al. Characteristics and prognostic value of lymphatic and blood vascular microinvasion in lung cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2012;94:1673–1679.10.
- Park SY, Lee HS, Jang HJ, et al. Tumor necrosis as a prognostic factor for stage IA non-small cell lung cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2011;91:1668–1673.
- Riquet M, Legras A, Mordant P, et al. Number of mediastinal lymph nodes in non-small cell lung cancer: a gaussian curve, not a prognostic factor. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2014;98:224–231.
- Chang MY, Mentzer J, Colson YL, et al. Factors predicting poor survival after resection of stage IA non-small cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2007;134:850–856.
- Asamura H, Goya T, Koshiishi Y, et al. A Japanese Lung Cancer Registry study: prognosis of 13,010 resected lung cancers. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2008;3:46–52.
- Peters S, Weder W, Dafni U, et al. Lungscape: resected non-smallcell lung cancer outcome by clinical and pathological parameters. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2014;9:1675–1684.
- Son C, Lee SK, Choi PJ, et al. Characteristics of additional primary malignancies in Korean patients with non-small cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Dis.* 2013;5:737–744.
- Brock MV, Alberg AJ, Hooker CM, et al. Risk of subsequent primary neoplasms developing in lung cancer patients with prior malignancies. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2004;127:1119–1125.
- Cho I, An JY, Kwon IG, et al. Risk factors for double primary malignancies and their clinical implications in patients with sporadic gastric cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol.* 2014;40:338–344.

- Poullis M, Shackcloth M, Page R, et al. Metastatic index of nonsmall-cell lung cancer and long-term survival. *Asian Cardiovasc Thorac Ann.* 2015:185–190.
- Poullis M, McShane J, Shaw M, et al. Smoking status at diagnosis and histology type as determinants of long-term outcomes of lung cancer patients. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2013;43:919–924.
- 25. Fry JS, Lee PN, Forey BA, et al. Is the shape of the decline in risk following quitting smoking similar for squamous cell carcinoma and adenocarcinoma of the lung? A quantitative review using the negative exponential model. *Regul Toxicol Pharmacol.* 2015;72:49–57.
- Koike T, Koike T, Yoshiya K, et al. Risk factor analysis of locoregional recurrence after sublobar resection in patients with clinical stage IA nonsmall cell lung cancer. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2013;146:372–378.
- Yamamoto K, Ohsumi A, Kojima F, et al. Long-term survival after video-assisted thoracic surgery lobectomy for primary lung cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2010;89:353–359.
- Higuchi M, Yaginuma H, Yonechi A, et al. Long-term outcomes after video-assisted thoracic surgery (VATS) lobectomy versus lobectomy via open thoracotomy for clinical stage IA non-small cell lung cancer. *J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2014; 9:88.
- 29. Vallières E, Shepherd FA, Crowley J, et al. The IASLC Lung Cancer Staging Project: proposals regarding the relevance of TNM in the pathologic staging of small cell lung cancer in the forthcoming (seventh) edition of the TNM classification for lung cancer. *J Thorac Oncol.* 2009;4:1049–1059.