OPEN

Preoperative lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio (LMR) could independently predict overall survival of resectable gastric cancer patients

Yu-Chen Pan, MM^a, Zhi-Fang Jia, PhD^a, Dong-Hui Cao, PhD^a, Yan-Hua Wu, PhD^a, Jing Jiang, MD, PhD^a, Si-Min Wen, MM^a, Dan Zhao, MM^a, Song-Ling Zhang, MD, PhD^{b,*}, Xue-Yuan Cao, MD, PhD^{c,*}

Abstract

Preoperational hemogram parameters have been reported to be associated with the prognosis of several types of cancers. This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of hematological parameters in gastric cancer in a Chinese population. A total of 870 gastric cancer patients who underwent radical tumorectomy were recruited from January 2008 to December 2012. Preoperative hematological parameters were recorded and dichotomized by time-dependent receiver operating characteristic curves. The survival curves of patients stratified by each hematological parameter were plotted by the Kaplan–Meier method and compared by log-rank test. Multivariate Cox proportional hazards models were used to select parameters independently correlated with prognosis. The median age of the patients was 60 years. The median follow-up time was 59.9 months, and the 5-year survival rate was 56.4%. Results from the univariate analyses showed that low lymphocyte count (< 2.05×10^9 /L), high neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio (LWR < 0.23), low lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio (LMR < 5.43), high neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio (NLR > 1.44), and high platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR > 115) were associated with poor survival of gastric cancer patients. Multivariate analysis showed that low LMR (HR: 1.49, 95% Cl: 1.17–1.89, *P*=.001) was the only hematological factor independently predicting poor survival. These results indicate that preoperational LMR is an independent prognostic factor for patients with resectable gastric cancer.

Abbreviations: FP = false positive, GC = gastric cancer, LMR = lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio, LWR = lymphocyte-to-white blood cell ratio, LYM = lymphocyte count, MONO = monocyte count, MWR = monocyte-to-white blood cell ratio, NEU = neutrophil count, NLR = neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, NWR = neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio, OS = overall survival, PLR = platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio, PLT = platelet count, ROC = receiver operating characteristic, TNM stage = the tumor node metastasis stage, TP = true positive, WBC = white blood cells count.

Keywords: gastric cancer, hemogram parameters, overall survival, prognostic factor

1. Introduction

Gastric cancer (GC) is the fifth most common malignancy in the world and the third most common cause of cancer-related

Editor: Chun Gao.

Yu-Chen PAN and Zhi-Fang JIA contributed equally to this work.

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81673145, 81703293 and 81703286), Science and Technology Development Program of Jilin Province (20180414055GH) and Research fund of Department of Education of Jilin Province (2016487).

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

^a Division of Clinical Research, ^b Department of Gynecological Oncology, ^c Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun, China.

*Correspondence: Xue-Yuan Cao, Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun 130021, Jilin Province, China (e-mail: caoxy@aliyun.com); Song-Ling Zhang, Department of Gynecological Oncology, First Hospital of Jilin University, Changchun 130021, Jilin Province, China (e-mail: slzhang@jlu.edu.cn).

Copyright © 2018 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives License 4.0 (CCBY-NC-ND), where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially without permission from the journal.

Medicine (2018) 97:52(e13896)

Received: 24 February 2018 / Received in final form: 20 June 2018 / Accepted: 6 December 2018

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000013896

mortality.^[1,2] More than two-fifths of the world's gastric cancer cases are from China. In 2015, the incidence and mortality of gastric cancer ranked second among those of all malignant tumors in China.^[3] GC is often asymptomatic at early stages. When diagnosed, almost half of the patients have already progressed to the advanced stage, and the 5-year survival rate is less than 30%.^[2] Clinical stage is frequently used as a prognostic factor for gastric cancer. However, even the patients are diagnosed at the same stage, the clinical outcomes are not the same. Therefore, exploring additional parameters to predict prognosis is necessary.

Accumulating evidence indicates that inflammation is related to tumor development and progression.^[4] It is thought that infection and inflammatory responses are associated with 15% to 20% of deaths from tumors worldwide.^[5] Systemic inflammatory responses can impact tumor development through the inhibition of apoptosis, promotion of angiogenesis, and induction of DNA damage. Abnormalities in peripheral blood cells, such as neutrophilia, lymphopenia, and thrombocytosis, are identified as responses to systemic inflammation.^[6,7] Therefore, immunityrelated components of the blood, such as lymphocytes, neutrophils, monocytes, and platelets, may have prognostic value for cancers. Previous studies reported that the NLR (neutrophil-tolymphocyte ratio), PLR (platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio) and LMR (lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio) were associated with the prognosis of various cancers, such as lung cancer, bladder cancer, nasopharyngeal cancer, and prostate cancer.^[8–12] NWR (neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio), MWR (monocyte-to-white blood cell ratio), and LWR (lymphocyte-to-white blood cell ratio) have also been found to have predictive value in lung cancer and gastrointestinal stromal tumors.^[11,13] For gastric cancer, studies in this field are limited, and studies have focused on only a few hematological parameters.^[14,15] Hence, the purpose of this study was to identify whether hematological parameters (lymphocytes, neutrophils, monocytes, white blood cells, platelets, NLR, PLR, NWR, MWR, and LWR) predict the prognosis of patients with gastric cancer.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Study population

From January 2008 to December 2012, gastric cancer patients were invited to participate in the study at the Department of Gastric and Colorectal Surgery of the First Hospital of Jilin University. Only patients who had undergone radical tumorectomy with D2 lymphadenectomy and were pathologically diagnosed with gastric cancer were included in the study. The average number of dissected lymph nodes was 20.5 ± 13.4 . Patients who

- (1) had a history of other malignant tumors,
- (2) had radiotherapy or neoadjuvant chemotherapy before surgery,
- (3) presented with distant metastasis,
- (4) presented with positive surgical margins, or
- (5) had a history of autoimmune disease or hematopoietic system disease were excluded from analysis.

The seventh edition of the cancer staging manual of the Union for International Cancer Control/American Joint Committee on Cancer (UICC/AJCC) was used for TNM stage. The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee of the First Hospital of Jilin University. Informed consent was obtained from all the participants.

2.2. Data collection

Within 1 week before surgery, venous blood samples were taken into EDTA tubes and mixed thoroughly. Hematological parameters were determined immediately after the blood sample collection using automatic blood analyzer (XE2100, Sysmex, Japan) in the Clinical Laboratory of the First Hospital of Jilin University. Parameters included white blood cell count (WBC), lymphocyte count (LYM), neutrophil count (NEU), monocyte count (MONO) and platelet count (PLT). The day-to-day coefficient of variations (CVs) during the study period were 3.04% for WBC, 1.49% for LYM, 1.03% for NEU, 2.32% for MONO, and 1.97% for PLT, respectively.

2.3. Follow-up

Patients were followed-up periodically after surgery by an experienced follow-up doctor. The follow-up was scheduled 3 months, 6 months, and 12 months after surgery and then every year thereafter. Information on the general status and post-operational therapy were collected during each follow-up. If the patients were dead, the date of death and causes were recorded. Survival time was defined as the duration from the date of surgery to the date of death if the patients were lead or to the date of the last successful follow-up if the patients were living or lost to follow-up.

2.4. Statistical analysis

Continuous variables were described as the median (interguartile range), and categorical variables were described as the frequency (percentage). Optimal cut-off values of each hematological parameter were calculated by time-dependent receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves in the R language, where the difference of the true positive (TP) and false positive (FP) was the maximum in predicting the 5-year survival. Survival curves within each stratification of variables were plotted by the Kaplan-Meier method and compared by log-rank test. The Cox proportional hazard model was used for univariate and multivariate analyses. In the univariate analysis, the Bonferroni correction was used, and variables with P values less than .1 in the univariate analysis were included in the multivariate model and selected by the forward stepwise method. Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS version 18.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL) and the R language (http://www.r-project.org). All P values were 2-tailed, and a P value < .05 indicated statistical significance; in the Bonferroni correction, the P value needed to be less than .004 because 11 hematological parameters were included in the analysis.

3. Result

A total of 870 patients were included in this study (Fig. 1). The baseline characteristics of the patients are shown in Table 1. The median age of the subjects was 60 years (interquartile range, 54-68 years), and 74.5% of them were male (648/870). Nearly half (46.2%) were diagnosed at TNM stage III, 38.2% were at TNM stage II, and only 15.6% were at TNM stage I. The major pathological types were tubular adenocarcinoma (84.9%), followed by signet-ring cell carcinoma (9.0%) and other types (6.1%). Low histological classifications were dominant over moderate or high classification (64.8% vs. 30.2%). Vascular invasion (73.3%) and nerve invasion (55.5%) were observed in most patients. 30.9% of patients received postoperational chemotherapy. The chemotherapy mainly consisted of three regimens: FOLFOX-4 regimen (combination with 5-fluorouracil, leucovorin and oxaliplatin); XELOX regimen (capecitabine and oxaliplatin) and other chemotherapies such as capecitabine or 5fluorouracil alone. Patients would be considered to have postoperative chemotherapy only if they received the therapy for at least 3 cycles.

The patients were followed up until March 1, 2017. The median follow-up time was 59.9 months. During follow-up, 389 patients (44.7%) died, 407 (46.8%) remained alive, and 74 (8.5%) were lost to follow-up. Among the patients who died, 359 died of gastric cancer, and 30 died for other reasons. The estimated 5-year survival rate was 56.4%.

The optimal cut-off values for each parameter to best predict prognosis were obtained by time dependent-ROC, and the results are shown in Table 2. The absolute counts of white blood cells (P=.860) and platelets (P=.990) were not associated with overall survival (OS). However, white blood cells, neutrophils and lymphocytes might be related to GC prognosis. Patients with a lower lymphocyte count (LYM < 2.05 × 10⁹/L) tended to live less time and had a lower 5-year survival rate (P<.001, Fig. 2A). Similar associations were observed for NWR (>0.55, P=.004, Fig. 2B) and LWR (<=.23, P<.001, 2C). Other indices such as LMR, NLR and PLR were found to be associated with patient prognosis in the univariate analysis. Patients tended to have shorter lifespans if their LMR was less than 5.43 (HR: 1.65, 95%)





Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier curves of gastric cancer patient survival (log-rank test). The cutoff values were obtained by time-dependent ROC curve. (a) LYM, lymphocyte counts. (b) NWR, neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio. (c) LWR, lymphocyte- to-white blood cell ratio.(d) LMR, lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio. (e) NLR, neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio. LMR = lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio, LWR = lymphocyte-to-white blood cell ratio, LYM = lymphocyte counts, NLR = neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, NWR = neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio, PLR = lymphocyte ratio.

Table 1

Characteristics of the patients included in the study.

Age (years) 60 (54-68) Depth of invasion 96 (11.0%) T1 96 (11.0%) T2 108 (12.4%) T3 542 (62.3%) T4 124 (14.3%) Lymph node metastasis 124 (14.3%) N0 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 322 (38.2%) III 326 (28.2~4.30) IVM (10 ⁹ L) 3.62 (28.7~4.30) Vest 2.62 (30.0.2%) Vascalar invasion 222 (25.5%) Histological grading	Characteristics	Data (N=870)
Depth of invasion 96 (11.0%) T1 96 (11.0%) T2 108 (12.4%) T3 542 (62.3%) T4 124 (14.3%) Lymph node metastasis 124 (14.3%) N0 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TMM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 136 (15.6%) II 322 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 336 (15.6%) III 336 (15.6%) III 332 (38.2%) IV 362 (2.87-4.80) VBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1-7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38-2.21) MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38-2.21) MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38-2.21) MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 2.34 (197-294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%)	Age (years)	60 (54-68)
T1 96 (11.0%) T2 108 (12.4%) T3 542 (62.3%) T4 124 (14.3%) Lymph node metastasis 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TMM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 136 (15.6%) II 136 (15.6%) II 322 (38.2%) III 322 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1-7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1-7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1-7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30-0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 2.34 (197-294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 223 (197-294) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 222 (25.5%) Neual invasion 222 (26.7%) Neual invasion 279	Depth of invasion	
T2 108 (12.4%) T3 542 (62.3%) T4 124 (14.3%) Lymph node metastasis 242 (27.8%) N0 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (28.7–4.80) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (28.7–4.80) LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (28.7–4.80) MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50) PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 222 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pabitogical type	T1	96 (11.0%)
T3 542 (62.3%) T4 124 (14.3%) Lymph node metastasis 124 (14.3%) N0 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) No 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87-4.80) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87-4.80) LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38-2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 2.34 (197-294) Gender 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 223 (26.7%)	T2	108 (12.4%)
T4 124 (14.3%) Lymph node metastasis 242 (27.8%) N0 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) IV 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 611 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 2.34 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 2.22 (25.5%) Histological grading <	T3	542 (62.3%)
Lymph node metastasis N0 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy No 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.066 (0.5–0.08 LWR	T4	124 (14.3%)
N0 242 (27.8%) N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4) LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ³ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive 483 (55.5%)	Lymph node metastasis	
N1 230 (26.4%) N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1-7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1-7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87-4.80) LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30-0.50) PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 2.34 (197-294) Gender Male Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 222 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%)	NO	242 (27.8%)
N2 184 (21.2%) N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 402 (46.2%) No 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80) LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 2.34 (197–294) Gender 448 (74.5%) Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 224 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 1 Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (64.9%) <t< td=""><td>N1</td><td>230 (26.4%)</td></t<>	N1	230 (26.4%)
N3 214 (24.6%) TNM stage 1 I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 222 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 739 (84.9%) Negative 337 (44.5%) Pathological type 71 Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (64.9%)	N2	184 (21.2%)
TNM stage 1 136 (15.6%) I 132 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 402 (46.2%) No 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80) LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 222 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (73.3%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 337 (44.5%) Pathological type 739 (84.9%) Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) <	N3	214 (24.6%)
I 136 (15.6%) II 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 203 (30.2%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 483 (55.5%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma <	TNM stage	
II 332 (38.2%) III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 203 (30.2%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 73 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–1		136 (15.6%)
III 402 (46.2%) Chemotherapy 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 73 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 </td <td>II</td> <td>332 (38.2%)</td>	II	332 (38.2%)
No 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.66 (0.05–0.08 MWR 0.66 (0.05–0.08	III	402 (46.2%)
No 601 (69.1%) Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.66 (0.05–0.08 MWR 0.66 (0.05–0.	Chemotherapy	
Yes 269 (30.9%) WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 223 (30.2%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.66 (0.05–0.08 MWR 0.66 (0.05–0.08	No	601 (69.1%)
WBC (10 ⁹ /L) 6.1 (5.1–7.4) NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 263 (30.2%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 483 (55.5%) Negative 483 (55.5%) Negative 38 (73.3%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 38 (61.5%) Negative 38 (55.5%) Negative 38 (61.%) Other types 53 (6.1%) <	Yes	269 (30.9%)
NEU (10 ⁹ /L) 3.62 (2.87–4.80 LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender 222 (25.5%) Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 263 (30.2%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Negative 483 (55.5%) Negative 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.66 (0.05–0.08) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) MWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	WBC (10 ⁹ /L)	6.1 (5.1–7.4)
LYM (10 ⁹ /L) 1.75 (1.38–2.21 MONO (10 ⁹ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 73 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08)	NEU (10 ⁹ /L)	3.62 (2.87-4.80)
MONO (10 ⁶ /L) 0.39 (0.30–0.50 PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08)	LYM (10 ⁹ /L)	1.75 (1.38–2.21)
PLT (10 ⁹ /L) 234 (197–294) Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 222 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 235 (55.5%) Negative 483 (55.5%) Negative 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (61.%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	MONO (10 ⁹ /L)	0.39 (0.30–0.50)
Gender Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 222 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 739 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53-2.89) PLR 133 (103-178) NWR 0.61 (0.55-0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05-0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05-0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05-0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05-0.08) WWR 0.029 (0.23-0.35)	PLT (10 ⁹ /L)	234 (197–294)
Male 648 (74.5%) Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading 222 (25.5%) Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 387 (44.5%) Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) WWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08)	Gender	
Female 222 (25.5%) Histological grading	Male	648 (74.5%)
Histological grading 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion 90 Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 387 (44.5%) Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.02 (0.23–0.35)	Female	222 (25.5%)
Low 564 (64.8%) Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Histological grading	
Moderate or High 263 (30.2%) Vascular invasion Positive 638 (73.3%) Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35) 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Low	564 (64.8%)
Vascular invasion 638 (73.3%) Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 387 (44.5%) Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Moderate or High	263 (30.2%)
Positive 638 (73.3%) Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion 232 (26.7%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 387 (44.5%) Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Vascular invasion	· · ·
Negative 232 (26.7%) Neural invasion Positive 483 (55.5%) Positive 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) 0ther types Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR PLR 133 (103–178) NWR NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08 LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35	Positive	638 (73.3%)
Neural invasion 483 (55.5%) Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type 1000000000000000000000000000000000000	Negative	232 (26.7%)
Positive 483 (55.5%) Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Neural invasion	
Negative 387 (44.5%) Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Positive	483 (55.5%)
Pathological type Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Negative	387 (44.5%)
Tubular adenocarcinoma 739 (84.9%) Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Pathological type	
Signet-ring cell carcinoma 78 (9.0%) Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89) PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68) MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08) LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35)	Tubular adenocarcinoma	739 (84.9%)
Other types 53 (6.1%) NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08 LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35	Signet-ring cell carcinoma	78 (9.0%)
NLR 2.05 (1.53–2.89 PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08 LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35	Other types	53 (6.1%)
PLR 133 (103–178) NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08 LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35	NLR	2.05 (1.53–2.89)
NWR 0.61 (0.55–0.68 MWR 0.06 (0.05–0.08 LWR 0.29 (0.23–0.35	PLR	133 (103–178)
MWR 0.06 0.05–0.08	NWR	0.61 (0.55–0.68)
LWB 0.29 (0.23–0.35	MWR	0.06 (0.05–0.08)
	LWR	0.29 (0.23–0.35)
LMR 4.47 (3.31–6.00	LMR	4.47 (3.31–6.00)

Data are presented as the frequency (percentage) or median (interquartile range). The histological grading system applies to tubular and papillary carcinomas (not to other types); data for signet ring carcinoma and other types (mucous adenocarcinoma) that cannot be graded are missing.

 $\label{eq:WBC} WBC = white blood cells; NEU = neutrophil, LYM = lymphocyte, MON0 = monocyte, PLT = platelet, NLR = neutrophil-to- lymphocyte ratio, PLR = platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio, NWR = neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio, LWR = lymphocyte-to-white blood cell ratio.$

CI: 1.29–2.09, P < .001, Fig. 2D). The optimal cutoff value was 1.44 for NLR, and patients with a higher NLR had a worse prognosis (HR: 1.66, 95% CI: 1.24–2.22, P < .001, Fig. 2E). Patients tended to have shorter lifespans if their PLR was higher than 115 (HR: 1.55, 95% CI: 1.24–1.94, P < .001, Fig. 2F).

Results from the multivariate analysis showed that low LMR was an independent risk factor for shorter survival span (HR: 1.49, 95% CI: 1.17–1.89, P=.001), as were old age (HR: 1.33, 95% CI: 1.08–1.65), higher TNM stage (TNM II, HR: 4.36, 95% CI: 2.18–8.75; TNM III, HR: 11.71, 95% CI: 5.85–23.45), positive vascular invasion (HR: 1.78, 95% CI: 1.26–2.52) and no chemotherapy (HR: 1.45, 95% CI: 1.15–1.82) (Table 3).

To further clarify the prognostic value of LMR, stratification analysis of the most important predictive factor, TNM stage, was performed in patients (Fig. 3). A similar association between the LMR and overall survival of GC could be observed in TNM I, TNM II and TNM III patients. However, this trend was more obvious in TNM III patients (Fig. 3).

4. Discussion

Though advances have been achieved in surgical techniques and adjuvant chemotherapy for gastric cancer in the last two decades, the prognosis of GC is still poor; it was estimated that approximately 498,000 Chinese would die from GC in 2015.^[3] Hemogram parameters are readily available and one of the routine laboratory blood tests performed to evaluate the general status of patients before surgery. Previous studies have reported that hemogram parameters could predict the prognosis of various malignancies; however, the results from these studies are controversial. Therefore, the value of hemogram parameters in predicting the prognosis of tumors needs to be further clarified.

Lymphocytes are possibly indicative of tumor suppressor activity. Experimental studies have found that lymphocytes play a considerable role in tumor defense, and tumor-infiltrating lymphocytes can identify tumor cells and induce apoptotic cell death through cytotoxicity. Evidence is accumulating that lymphocytes serve as constituents of the immune complex, represent the cellular basis of cancer immunosurveillance and are involved in the inhibition of tumor cell proliferation and metastasis.^[10,16] Decreased numbers of lymphocytes could induce the release of several inhibitory immunological mediators, particularly IL-10 and transforming growth factor-B.^[17] In our univariate analysis, GC patients with lower lymphocyte counts tended to have shorter survival and an increased risk of death by 55 percent. However, in the multivariate analysis adjusted for other factors, lymphocyte count alone was not an independent prognostic factor. Monocytes are considered pro-tumor cells as they facilitate the progression and dissemination of tumor cells.^[18,19] Monocytes could be recruited to the tumor microenvironment by tumor-derived CCL5 and promote tumor cell growth and survival.^[18] On the other hand, tumor cells induce the differentiation of monocytes into tumor-associated macrophages,^[20] which in turn weaken the antitumor immune response and stimulate the migration and metastatic spread of tumor cells.^[18,19,21] Peripheral monocyte levels were found to be negatively associated with prognosis in patients with various types of cancer.^[22-24] In our study, the results showed that increased monocyte levels were associated with a 40% increased risk of death; however, this finding did not achieve statistical significance (HR: 1.40, 95% CI: 0.93-2.12).

LMR, the ratio of lymphocytes to monocytes, is a comprehensive index that may better predict the long-term prognosis of cancer patients. LMR is reported to have prognostic value in several malignancies.^[25,26] A study by Ni et al demonstrated that elevated LMR (\geq 4.25) was associated with favorable disease-free survival (*P*=.011) in locally advanced breast cancer patients.^[27] Hirahara et al. found that LMR could be used as a predictor of postoperative cancer-specific survival and OS in patients with esophageal cancer and that it may be useful in identifying patients with poor prognosis even after radical esophagectomy (HR: 1.87, 95% CI: 1.09–3.23).^[28] Studies on gastric cancer also found that LMR could be used to predict outcomes of gastric cancer patients undergoing surgery. Lieto et al reported that patients with a low LMR (\leq 3.37) had a higher hazard ratio for both overall survival Table 2

Univariate analysis of the factors associated with the prognosis of gastric cancer.

Variable	Classification	Ν	Death (%)	5-year survival rate	HR (95% CI)
WBC (10 ⁹ /L)	≤7.1	619	257 (41.5%)	56.4%	1.00
	>7.1	251	102 (40.6%)	56.5%	0.98 (0.78-1.23)
NEU (10 ⁹ /L)	<u><</u> 3.27	330	122 (37.0%)	61.3%	1.00
	>3.27	540	237 (43.9%)	53.2%	1.29 (1.04-1.61)
LYM (10 ⁹ /L)	>2.05	276	90 (32.6%)	65.1%	1.00
	≤2.05	594	269 (45.3%)	52.3%	1.55 (1.22-1.97)
MONO (10 ⁹ /L)	≤0.23	74	24 (32.4%)	64.2%	1.00
	>0.23	796	335 (42.1%)	55.6%	1.40 (0.93-2.12)
PLT (10 ⁹ /L)	<u><</u> 252	509	208 (40.9%)	56.6%	1.00
	>252	361	151 (41.8%)	56.0%	0.99 (0.81-1.24)
NWR	≤0.55	225	74 (32.9%)	65.5%	1.00
	>0.55	645	285 (44.2%)	53.1%	1.46 (1.13-1.89)
LWR	>0.23	665	256 (38.5%)	59.9%	1.00
	≤0.23	205	103 (50.2%)	44.6%	1.56 (1.24-1.96)
MWR	≤0.07	530	204 (38.5%)	58.7%	1.00
	>0.07	340	155 (45.6%)	52.7%	1.26 (1.03-1.56)
LMR	>5.43	283	90 (31.8%)	65.7%	1.00
	≤5.43	587	269 (45.8%)	51.8%	1.65 (1.29-2.09)
NLR	≤1.44	179	54 (30.2%)	68.8%	1.00
	>1.44	691	305 (44.1%)	53.1%	1.66 (1.24-2.22)
PLR	≤115	315	106 (33.7%)	64.3%	1.00
	>115	555	253 (45.6%)	51.7%	1.55 (1.24–1.94)

WBC=white blood cells, NEU=neutrophil, LYM=lymphocyte, MONO=monocyte, PLT=platelet, NLR=neutrophil-to- lymphocyte ratio, PLR=platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio, NWR=neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio, MWR=monocyte-to-white blood cell ratio.

(HR: 2.10; P < .001) and disease-free survival (HR: 2.46; P < .001) than high LMR subjects.^[15] Hsu et al found patients with lower LMR (\leq 4.8) had more aggressive tumor behavior, higher surgical mortality rates, and worse long-term survival (HR: 1.36, 95% CI: 1.08–1.69).^[29] In another study, Cong et al found low LMR (\leq 4.34) was associated with poor outcomes in 188 patients with stage II-III gastric cancer.^[30] In this study, we included a relatively large sample size of gastric cancer in TNM

Table 3

Multivariate analysis of the factors associated with gastric cancer prognosis.

Variable	HR (95% CI)	Р
Age (years)		
<65	1.00	
≥65	1.33 (1.08–1.65)	.008
TNM Stage		
	1.00	
	4.36 (2.18-8.75)	<.001
	11.71 (5.85–23.45)	<.001
Vascular invasion		
Negative	1.00	
Positive	1.78 (1.26-2.52)	.001
Chemotherapy		
Yes	1.00	
No	1.45 (1.15–1.82)	.002
LMR		
>5.43	1.00	
≤5.43	1.49 (1.17–1.89)	.001

Cox proportional hazards included age, gender, TNM stage, vascular invasion, chemotherapy, NEU, LYM, NWR, LWR, MWR, LMR, NLR, and PLR.

 $\label{eq:LMR} LMR = lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio, NEU = neutrophil, LYM = lymphocyte, NLR = neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio, PLR = platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio, NWR = neutrophil-to-white blood cell ratio, MWR = monocyte-to-white blood cell ratio, LWR = lymphocyte-to-white blood cell ratio, TNM stage = the tumor node metastasis stage.$

stage I-III (HR: 1.66, 95% CI: 1.04–2.66). Consistent with the previous studies, we also observed that GC patients with lower LMR had worse prognosis. However, the optimal cutoff of LMR was 5.43 and patients with LMR < 5.43 had a shorter lifespan and a lower 5-year survival rate (HR: 1.49, 95% CI: 1.17–1.89). Moreover, subgroup analysis showed similar trends in TNM II and III patients.

Previous studies also suggested that NLR and PLR might be related to cancer patient prognosis. Neutrophils are thought to participate in the process of tumor development by cytokine production.^[31] Platelets play an important role in the process of transendothelial migration, the earliest step in metastasis.^[32] Studies have found that higher NLR and PLR were associated with poor prognosis in patients with endometrioid adenocarcinoma, paranasal sinus cancer, breast cancer and colorectal cancer.^[33-36] In gastric cancer-related studies, NLR and PLR were also found to be independent prognostic factors.^[37,38] In our study, higher NLR and higher PLR were associated with poor survival in the univariate analysis. These associations, however, diminished after adjusting for the influence of TNM stage. We found that NLR and PLR were positively correlated with TNM stage (NLR and TNM, $r_s = 0.141$, P < .001; PLR and TNM, $r_s =$ 0.156, P < .001) and that TNM was the most powerful prognostic predictive factor of GC (AUC for 5-year survival ROC: 0.741). Therefore, NLR and PLR were not independently associated with the prognosis of GC.

Our study had limitations. Although the median follow-up time was 59.40 months, the number of deaths from gastric cancer did not reach half of the total. That may lead to decreased statistical power. Another limitation was that our study only included patients from one center, and the results were not confirmed in other centers. Therefore, generalization of the results should be done cautiously.

In conclusion, we observed that lower LMR was independently associated with poor overall survival of gastric cancer patients



Figure 3. Survival curves of gastric cancer patients stratified by TNM stage. (a) LMR (lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio) levels in patients of TNM I stage. (b) LMR levels in patients of TNM II stage. (c) LMR levels in patients of TNM III stage. LMR = lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio, TNM stage = the tumor node metastasis stage.

undergoing radical tumorectomy. LMR has the potential to be used as a biomarker to predict the prognosis of gastric cancer before surgery, and patients with lower pre-operative LMR should be under more frequent surveillance of gastric cancer and more aggressive chemotherapy. Large cohort studies are needed to confirm our results.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Zhifang Jia.

- Data curation: Yuchen Pan.
- Formal analysis: Yuchen Pan.
- Methodology: Simin Wen, Dan Zhao.
- Project administration: Jing Jiang, Xueyuan Cao.
- Software: Zhifang Jia, Yanhua Wu.
- Supervision: Donghui Cao, Yanhua Wu, Songling Zhang, Xuevuan Cao.
- Validation: Donghui Cao, Xueyuan Cao.
- Visualization: Songling Zhang.
- Writing original draft: Yuchen Pan.
- Writing review & editing: Zhifang Jia.

References

- Fock KM. Review article: the epidemiology and prevention of gastric cancer. Aliment Pharmacol Ther 2014;40:250–60.
- [2] Rugge M, Fassan M, Graham DY. Strong VE. Epidemiology of gastric cancer. Gastric Cancer: Principles and Practice Springer International Publishing, Cham:2015;23–34.
- [3] Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, et al. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. CA: Cancer J Clin 2016;66:115–32.
- [4] Coussens LM, Werb Z. Inflammation and cancer. Nature 2002;420: 860–7.
- [5] Balkwill F, Mantovani A, Balkwill F, et al. Inflammation and cancer: Back to Virchow? Lancet 2001;357:539–45.
- [6] Fu JJ, Baines KJ, Wood LG, et al. Systemic inflammation is associated with differential gene expression and airway neutrophilia in asthma. OMICS 2013;17:187–99.
- [7] Kemp MW, Kannan PS, Saito M, et al. Selective exposure of the fetal lung and skin/amnion (but not gastro-intestinal tract) to LPS elicits acute systemic inflammation in fetal sheep. PloS One 2013;8:e63355.
- [8] Tang L, Li X, Wang B, et al. Prognostic value of neutrophil-tolymphocyte ratio in localized and advanced prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One 2016;11:e0153981.
- [9] Sun W, Zhang L, Luo M, et al. Pretreatment hematologic markers as prognostic factors in patients with nasopharyngeal carcinoma: neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio and platelet-lymphocyte ratio. Head Neck 2016;38: E1332-1340.

- [10] Kang M, Jeong CW, Kwak C, et al. Preoperative neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio can significantly predict mortality outcomes in patients with nonmuscle invasive bladder cancer undergoing transurethral resection of bladder tumor. Oncotarget 2017;8:12891–901.
- [11] Yuan C, Li N, Mao X, et al. Elevated pretreatment neutrophil/white blood cell ratio and monocyte/lymphocyte ratio predict poor survival in patients with curatively resected non-small cell lung cancer: results from a large cohort. Thorac cancer 2017;8:350–8.
- [12] Nishijima TF, Muss HB, Shachar SS, et al. Prognostic value of lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio in patients with solid tumors: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Cancer Treat Rev 2015;41:971–8.
- [13] Feng F, Tian Y, Liu S, et al. Combination of PLR, MLR, MWR, and tumor size could significantly increase the prognostic value for gastrointestinal stromal tumors. Medicine 2016;95:e3248.
- [14] Lin JP, Lin JX, Cao LL, et al. Preoperative lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio as a strong predictor of survival and recurrence for gastric cancer after radical-intent surgery. Oncotarget 2017;8:79234–47.
- [15] Lieto E, Galizia G, Auricchio A, et al. Preoperative neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio and lymphocyte to monocyte ratio are prognostic factors in gastric cancers undergoing surgery. J Gastrointest Surg 2017;21:1764–74.
- [16] Fridman WH, Pagès F, Sautèsfridman C, et al. The immune contexture in human tumours: impact on clinical outcome. Nat Rev Cancer 2012; 12:298–306.
- [17] Salazar-Onfray F, López MN, Mendoza-Naranjo A. Paradoxical effects of cytokines in tumor immune surveillance and tumor immune escape. Cytokine Growth Factor Rev 2007;18:171–82.
- [18] Wilcox RA, Wada DA, Ziesmer SC, et al. Monocytes promote tumor cell survival in T-cell lymphoproliferative disorders and are impaired in their ability to differentiate into mature dendritic cells. Blood 2009;114: 2936–44.
- [19] Peng LS, Zhang JY, Teng YS, et al. Tumor-associated monocytes/ macrophages impair NK-cell function via TGFbeta1 in human gastric cancer. Cancer Immunol Res 2017;5:248–56.
- [20] Mantovani A, Schioppa T, Porta C, et al. Role of tumor-associated macrophages in tumor progression and invasion. Cancer Metastasis Rev 2006;25:315–22.
- [21] Mantovani A, Allavena P, Sica A, et al. Cancer-related inflammation. Nature 2008;454:436–44.
- [22] Wang YQ, Zhu YJ, Pan JH, et al. Peripheral monocyte count: an independent diagnostic and prognostic biomarker for prostate cancer - a large Chinese cohort study. Asian J Androl 2017;19:579–85.
- [23] Valero C, Pardo L, Lopez M, et al. Pretreatment count of peripheral neutrophils, monocytes, and lymphocytes as independent prognostic factor in patients with head and neck cancer. Head Neck 2017;39:219–26.
- [24] Han L, Jia Y, Song Q, et al. Prognostic significance of preoperative absolute peripheral monocyte count in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. Dis Esophagus 2016;29:740–6.

- [25] Toyokawa T, Kubo N, Tamura T, et al. The pretreatment Controlling Nutritional Status (CONUT) score is an independent prognostic factor in patients with resectable thoracic esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: results from a retrospective study. BMC Cancer 2016;16:722–32.
- [26] Chan JCY, Chan DL, Diakos CI, et al. The lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio is a superior predictor of overall survival in comparison to established biomarkers of resectable colorectal cancer. Ann Surg 2017; 265:539–46.
- [27] Ni XJ, Zhang XL, Ou-Yang QW, et al. An elevated peripheral blood lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratio predicts favorable response and prognosis in locally advanced breast cancer following neoadjuvant chemotherapy. PloS One 2014;9:e111886.
- [28] Hirahara N, Matsubara T, Kawahara D, et al. Prognostic significance of preoperative inflammatory response biomarkers in patients undergoing curative thoracoscopic esophagectomy for esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. Eur J Surg Oncol 2017;43:493–501.
- [29] Hsu JT, Wang CC, Le PH, et al. Lymphocyte-to-monocyte ratios predict gastric cancer surgical outcomes. J Surg Res 2016;202:284–90.
- [30] Cong X, Li S, Xue Y. Impact of preoperative lymphocyte to monocyte ratio on the prognosis of the elderly patients with stage II-III gastric cancer. Zhonghua Wei Chang Wai Ke Za Zhi 2016;19:1144–8.
- [31] Tecchio C, Scapini P, Pizzolo G, Cassatella MA. On the cytokines produced by human neutrophils in tumors. Semin Cancer Biol 2013; 23:159–70.
- [32] Goubran HA, Stakiw J, Radosevic M, et al. Platelets effects on tumor growth. Semin Oncol 2014;41:359–69.
- [33] Turri-Zanoni M, Salzano G, Lambertoni A, et al. Prognostic value of pretreatment peripheral blood markers in paranasal sinus cancer: Neutrophil-to-lymphocyte and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio. Head Neck 2017;39:730–6.
- [34] Wang D, Yang JX, Cao DY, et al. Preoperative neutrophil-lymphocyte and platelet-lymphocyte ratios as independent predictors of cervical stromal involvement in surgically treated endometrioid adenocarcinoma. Onco Targets Ther 2013;6:211–6.
- [35] Zhu Y, Si W, Sun Q, et al. Platelet-lymphocyte ratio acts as an indicator of poor prognosis in patients with breast cancer. Oncotarget 2017; 8:1023–30.
- [36] Zou ZY, Liu HL, Ning N, et al. Clinical significance of pre-operative neutrophil lymphocyte ratio and platelet lymphocyte ratio as prognostic factors for patients with colorectal cancer. Oncol Lett 2016;11: 2241–8.
- [37] Li S, Xu X, Liang D, et al. Prognostic value of blood neutrophil-tolymphocyte ratio (NLR) and platelet-to-lymphocyte ratio (PLR) in patients with gastric cancer. Zhonghua Zhong Liu Za Zhi 2014;36: 910–5.
- [38] Xu L, Zhou X, Wang J, et al. The hematologic markers as prognostic factors in patients with resectable gastric cancer. Cancer Biomark 2016;17:359–67.