Clinical and Translational Radiation Oncology 28 (2021) 54-61

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect



Clinical and Translational Radiation Oncology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ctro



Prognosis of severe lymphopenia after postoperative radiotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer: Results of a long-term follow up study



Wang Jing ^{a,b,**}, Yufei Liu ^a, Hui Zhu ^b, James Welsh ^a, Saumil Gandhi ^a, Melenda Jeter ^a, Quynh Nguyen ^a, Aileen B. Chen ^a, Michael O'Reilly ^a, Zhongxing Liao ^a, Joe Y. Chang ^a, Percy Lee ^a, Steven H. Lin ^{a,*}

^a Department of Radiation Oncology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX 77030, USA ^b Department of Radiation Oncology, Shandong Cancer Hospital and Institute, Shandong First Medical University and Shandong Academy of Medical Science, Shandong, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 9 November 2020 Revised 19 February 2021 Accepted 27 February 2021 Available online 12 March 2021

Keywords: Non-small cell lung cancer Lymphopenia Chemoradiation Postoperative radiotherapy Prognosis

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To investigate the incidence and prognosis of severe radiation-induced lymphopenia (sRIL) after postoperative radiotherapy (PORT) for resected NSCLC.

Patients and methods: Between 1998 and 2017, 170 patients treated with PORT for NSCLC were retrospectively reviewed. Lymphopenia was divided into tertiles with severe lymphopenia defined as absolute lymphocyte counts (ALC) < 0.37×10^3 /ul.

Results: sRIL was observed in 32.3% of patients. Multivariable logistic regression analysis indicated sRIL was associated with planning target volume radiation fraction numbers (OR 1.09, p = 0.005) and total lung mean dose (OR 1.12, p = 0.006). With a median follow-up time of 12.2 years, the median progression-free survival and overall survival were 14.8 months and 28.4 months respectively in patients with sRIL, vs. 21.7 months (p = 0.008) and 48.3 months (p = 0.01) respectively in patients without sRIL. Multivariable analyses indicated sRIL significantly decreased OS (HR 1.95, p < 0.01). Since PORT for stage I-II NSCLC was done largely for positive margins, which may confound the contribution of severe RIL, we analyzed stage III separately and found that sRIL also significantly decreased OS (HR 1.88, p = 0.004) in multivariable analysis.

Conclusion: For this long-term outcome study, severe RIL correlated with total lung mean dose and radiation fractionation numbers, and was a strong prognostic factor for poor survival in PORT patients, particularly in patients with stage III NSCLC, highlighting the importance of an intact immune system for post-radiation immunologic disease surveillance.

© 2021 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/ 4.0/).

Introduction

The role of postoperative radiation (PORT) in resectable nonsmall cell lung cancer (NSCLC) remains controversial, particularly in stage III disease [1,2]. The ANITA trial that indicated that patients with pN2 disease could benefit from PORT but patients with pN1 disease did not [3]. However, 95% of patients with clinical stage III-N2 disease receiving PORT were with distant recurrence while only 5% developed an initial isolated local recurrence [2]. Overall survival (OS) was only 43.7% at 5 years, while the locoregional failure-free survival and distant metastasis-free survival were 53.4% and 42.5%, respectively [4].

Radiotherapy was traditionally thought to be solely a local therapy, but the consensus in the era of immunotherapy is that radiation has systemic effects on the host's immune system. Lymphopenia is a common treatment-related toxicity in cancer patients undergoing radiotherapy. Lymphocytes are highly radiosensitive with their numbers decreasing significantly after radiation and remaining at a low level even for months after CRT [5,6]. For patients treated with chemoradiation for NSCLC, approximately 43% of patients developed grade 3 or 4 lymphopenia after radiation [7]. The incidence of grade \geq 3 lymphopenia increased to 87% after concurrent chemoradiation [8]. Furthermore, emerging evidence indicated that lymphopenia was correlated with inferior survival in several solid tumors such as hepatocellular carcinoma, glioma, esophageal cancer, nasopharyngeal carcinoma, as well as lung cancer [9–13]. Grade \geq 3 lymphopenia was found to be a neg-

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctro.2021.02.011

^{*} Corresponding author.

^{**} Corresponding statistical analysis author: Department of Radiation Oncology, Shandong Cancer Hospital and Institute, Shandong First Medical University and Shandong Academy of Medical Science, Jinan, Shandong 250117, China

E-mail addresses: jing12wang@126.com (W. Jing), shlin@mdanderson.org (S.H. Lin).

^{2405-6308/© 2021} The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ative factor for OS (HR 1.5, p = 0.01) in patients receiving definitive chemoradiation for stage III NSCLC [8]. Therefore, determining the effectors of lymphopenia is crucial for further mitigation strategies to protect the host's immune system, which may translate into survival benefits.

Numerous studies have investigated the factors affecting the degree of lymphopenia. In esophageal cancer, proton therapy was superior compared to photon therapy in mitigating lymphopenia [14]. Older age, lower tumor location, greater tumor length, and larger planning target volume (PTV) exacerbated lymphopenia [15]. The nomogram developed in esophageal cancer indicated age, PTV in interaction with body mass index (BMI), radiation technique, and baseline absolute lymphocyte count (ALC) were factors associated with treatment-related lymphopenia [16]. A study in limited-stage small cell lung cancer revealed that patterns of radiation fractionation also affect lymphopenia [17]. In NSCLC patients receiving definitive radiation, larger gross tumor volumes correlated with lower lymphocytes nadirs after radiotherapy [18].

The role of lymphopenia in patients with PORT has not been well studied. Therefore, we conduct a retrospective study to investigate the relationship of patients' characteristics and radiationrelated parameters, as well as baseline ALC, with the risk of severe radiation-induced lymphopenia (sRIL) during CRT in NSCLC patients treated with PORT. The secondary aim was to assess the predictive value of sRIL for clinical outcomes.

Patients and methods

Patients

This is an Institutional Review Board approved cohort study in lung cancer patient treated with radiotherapy. Between 1998 and 2017, the medical records from all consecutive patients who underwent surgery followed by radiation (with or without chemotherapy) for NSCLC were extracted. Inclusion criteria were patients who received radiation after surgery who had availability of complete blood count and follow-up data, Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status ≥ 2 , and no induction chemotherapy. Potential predictors of lymphopenia were recorded, including gender, age, race, BMI, medical complication, smoking status, tumor histology, differentiation grade, tumor location, tumor size, pathological T- and N-stage, pathological stage, and RT-related parameters, such as PTV, radiation modality, total radiation dose (to PTV), fraction number, and lung/heart radiation parameters. Heart or lung V5 was defined as heart or total lung minus-PTV relative percent volumes receiving 5 Gy. All patients were restaged from stage I to III according to the American Joint Committee on Cancer version 7. Patients who underwent interrupted radiotherapy were excluded.

Treatment approaches

All patients treated with PORT by either photon therapy or proton therapy were included. Three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT), intensity-modulated radiation therapy (IMRT), and volumetric-modulated arc therapy (VMAT) were categorized as photon therapy, while intensity-modulated proton therapy and passive scattering proton therapy were categorized as proton therapy. Two-dimensional radiation was not used in this study. Patients received 50–64 Gy in 25–33 fractions with 1.8 Gy– 2.0 Gy per fractionation. In addition, patients who received hyperfractionated radiation twice daily with 1.2 Gy were also eligible. Platinum-based chemotherapy was given peri radiotherapy.

Absolute lymphocyte count assessment

The values of ALC were collected at pre-radiation, during RT, and after 1-month post RT (if applicable). Due to only 16 patients having grade 4 lymphopenia according to the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events version 5.0, lymphopenia was divided into tertiles for the entire population, with sRIL defined as the lower tertile value as absolute lymphocyte counts (ALC) < 0.37×10^3 /ul to minimize the analysis errors.

Statistical analysis

Categorical variables were summarized by frequencies and percentages and compared between the two groups with Chi-square tests or Fisher's exact tests; continuous variables were summarized using means, standard deviations, medians, and ranges and assessed between groups by two-sample t-tests or Wilcoxon rank-sum tests (Kruskal-Wallis tests/ANOVA if appropriate). Generalized linear regressions were used to evaluate the associations between lymphopenia (sRIL versus non-sRIL) and covariates of interest. Unadjusted survival distributions were estimated by the Kaplan-Meier method, and comparisons were made with the logrank test. Cox proportional hazards regression models were used to evaluate the associations between survival outcomes and covariates of interest. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 23.0 (IBM Corp., NY, USA) with 0.05 as a significance level.

Results

Patients

We analyzed a total of 170 patients treated with PORT for NSCLC. The median age for the whole cohort was 62 years (range, 32–89 years). The majority of patients were male (55.3%), white (79.4%), prior/current smoker (83.5%), had adenocarcinoma histology (60.0%), had N2 disease (65.3%) and were clinical stage III (74.1%). Of the 126 patients with stage III disease, 87.3% of patients had N2 disease, while 88.9% were stage IIIA. The median tumor size was 3.9 cm (range, 0.8–14.5 cm). Lobectomy was performed in 79.4% of patients, and 68.8% of patients had a complete resection (R0). 63.5% of patients were given postoperative chemotherapy (POCT) with a median of 4 cycles (range, 1–8). The clinical characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

As shown in Table 1, photon therapy (90.6%) was the dominant RT technique used. The median PTV dose was 54 Gy (range, 48.6–64 Gy) in the whole group, while it was 52 Gy in the sRIL group and 50.4 Gy in the non-sRIL group. For the whole cohort, 36.5% and 22.2% of patients were given 50 Gy and 60 Gy, respectively, while it was 47.0% and 20.9% in non-sRIL, respectively. In sRIL population, 14.5% of patients were given 50 Gy, 50.4 Gy and 63 Gy, respectively. For the dose per fraction in the sRIL group, 70.6% and 22.4% of patients were treated in 2.0 Gy and 1.8 Gy, respectively, while it was 78.3% and 15.7% in the non-sRIL group, respectively.

Lymphopenia during treatment and associated factors

The median interval from the date of surgery to radiation was 1.8 months (IQR, 1.4–2.4), while it was 1.8 months to chemotherapy (IQR, 1.4–3.1). The median interval from surgery to the first time to collect lymphocytes was 1.6 months (IQR, 1.2–2.3). In addition, the median interval between POCT and PORT was 0.8 months (IQR, 0.0–2.5). After surgery but before PORT, the median of ALC for the whole cohort is 1.52×10^3 /ul with ranging from 0.45 – 4.35 $\times 10^3$ /ul. In addition, before PORT, a total of 23 (13.5%)

W. Jing, Y. Liu, H. Zhu et al.

Table 1

Clinical characteristics of patient with severe radiation-induced lymphopenia (sRIL) and non-sRIL.

Characteristics	No. (%) n = 170	s-RIL (%) (n = 55)	Non-sRIL (%) (n = 115)	p value
Gender				
Male	94 (55.3)	36 (65.5)	58 (50.4)	0.07
Female	76 (44.7)	19 (34.5)	57 (49.6)	
Race				
White	135 (79.4)	45 (81.8)	90 (78.3)	0.69
Non-White	35 (20.6)	10 (18.2)	25 (21.7)	
Age (Mean ± SD)				
≥60	107 (62.9)	33 (60.0)	74 (64.3)	0.61
<60	63 (37.1)	22 (40.0)	41(35.7)	
CardioDis				
No	143 (84.1)	49 (89.1)	94 (81.7)	0.27
Yes	27 (15.9)	6 (10.9)	21 (18.3)	
COPD	145 (05.2)	45 (01.0)	100 (07.0)	0.40
NO	145 (85.3)	45 (81.8)	100 (87.0)	0.49
Yes	25 (14.7)	10 (18.2)	15 (13.0)	
Smoking	142 (82 5)	49 (97.2)	04 (81 7)	0.20
Prior/current	142 (83.5)	48 (87.3)	94 (81.7)	0.39
Nevel Dy tymor location	28 (10.3)	7 (12.7)	21 (18.3)	
PX tullior location Right lung	97 (57 1)	27 (49.1)	70 (60 9)	0.18
Left lung	73 (42.9)	28 (50.9)	<i>4</i> 5 (39.1)	0.10
Surgery	75 (42.5)	28 (30.3)	45 (55.1)	
Sublobar resection	10 (11 2)	7 (12 7)	12 (10 4)	0.78
Lobectomy	13(11.2) 135(794)	$A_{2}(76.4)$	93 (80 9)	0.78
Pneumonectomy	16 (94)	6 (10.9)	10 (8 7)	
Pathological type	10 (3.4)	0 (10.5)	10 (0.7)	
ADC	102 (60.0)	31 (56.4)	71 (61 7)	0.78
SCC	50 (29.4)	18 (32.7)	32 (27.8)	0170
NEU	18 (10.6)	6 (10.9)	12 (10.4)	
LVI	()	- ()	()	
Yes	61 (39.6)	16 (31.4)	45 (43.7)	0.16
No	93 (60.4)	35 (68.6)	58 (56.3)	
Differentiation grade				
Well	13 (7.6)	4 (8.2)	9 (8.9)	0.96
Moderate	73 (42.9)	23 (46.9)	50 (49.5)	
Poor	64 (37.6)	22 (44.9)	42 (41.6)	
Surgical margin				
RO	117 (68.8)	30 (54.5)	87 (75.7)	0.01
R1/2	53 (31.2)	25 (45.5)	28 (24.3)	
pT stage				
T1-2	119 (70.0)	35 (63.6)	84 (73.0)	0.28
T3-4	51 (30.0)	20 (36.4)	31 (27.0)	
pN stage				
N0-1	56 (32.9)	23 (41.8)	33 (28.7)	0.12
N2-3	114 (67.1)	32 (58.2)	82 (71.3)	
pStage				
1-11	43 (25.3)	17 (30.9)	26 (22.6)	0.26
III A diamant Channa	127 (74.7)	38 (69.1)	89 (77.4)	
Adjuvant Chemo	100 (62 5)	24 (61.0)	74 (64 2)	0.00
Yes	108 (63.5)	34 (61.8)	/4 (64.3)	0.86
NO PT tochnique	61 (35.9)	21 (38.2)	41 (35.7)	
Photon	154 (00.6)	E1 (02 7)	102 (80.6)	0.50
	100 (64.0)	31 (32.7) 34 (33 1)	66 (A2 9)	0.59
IMRT	100 (04.9) 43 (27 0)	34 (22.1) 17 (11 0)	26 (16 9)	
VMAT	11 (7 1)	0 (0 0)	11 (7 1)	
Proton	16 (9 4)	4 (7 3)	12 (10 4)	
BMI	10 (3.4)	$\frac{1}{2}(7.5)$ 254 + 507	267 + 417	0.34
Tumor size		4 80 + 2 71	4 11 + 2 33	0.09
Baseline ALC		163 + 066	1.65 ± 0.74	0.05
PTV (mean \pm SD, cm ³)		475.6 + 303 3	350.9 + 214.1	0.015
Median PTV dose (range)		58.4 ± 6.9	54.4 ± 5.4	<0.001
Median RTfxNo. (range)		32.2 ± 7.4	28.5 ± 5.7	< 0.001

Abbreviations: CardioDis, Cardiovascular disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; Px, primary; ADC, adenocarcinoma; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma; NEU, neuroendocrine carcinoma; RO/R1/R2: complete resection, microscopic residual tumor, macroscopic residual tumor; LVI, lymphovascular invasion; pT/N stage, pathological tumor/node stage; RT, radiation; ALC, absolute lymphocyte count. 3D-CRT, three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy; IMRT, Intensity-modulated radiation therapy; VMAT, Volumetric modulated arc therapy; BMI, body mass index; PTV, planning targeted volume; RTfxNo., radiation number.

patients experienced lymphopenia, while 11 patients with grade 1, 10 patients with grade 2, and 2 patients with grade 3, but none of them had sRIL as defined by ALC < 0.37×10^3 /ul. Among these 23 patients, 7 patients developed sRIL in the period of RT, while 2

experienced grade 4 lymphopenia. In the whole groups, a total of 55 (32.3%) patients experienced sRIL during RT while 115 patients had non-sRIL. The median of ALC for the 55 patients was 0.26 \times 10³/ul (range, 0.08–0.36 \times 10³/ul). Of the patients with

stage III disease, 29.9% of patients experienced sRIL. Clinical features were well-balanced between the two groups except for surgical margins with significantly more patients with R1/2 (45.5%) in sRIL compared to non-sRIL (24.3%) (p = 0.01).

The dosimetric variables were further investigated between the sRIL and non-sRIL groups. As shown in Table 1, the mean PTV and PTV dose in sRIL were 475.6 cm³ and 58.4 Gy, which were significantly higher than 350.9 cm³ and 54.5 Gy in non-sRIL (p = 0.015, and p < 0.001). Moreover, the median radiation fraction numbers were also higher in patients with sRIL (32.2 vs. 28.5, p < 0.001). In addition, the mean RT dose, V5, V10, and V20 of total lung were also significantly higher in patients with sRIL (Supplementary Table 1).

The correlation between the clinical characteristics, radiationrelated parameters, and lymphopenia was further explored to identify the potential predictors of sRIL. As shown in Table 2, only surgical margin status (HR 2.59, p = 0.01), radiation fractionation (HR 1.09, p < 0.01), fraction size (HR 0.32, p < 0.01), total lung mean RT dose (HR 1.10, p = 0.01), total lung V10 (HR 1.03, p = 0.04), and total lung V20 (HR 1.04, p = 0.03) were correlated with sRIL in univariable logistic regression analysis. In multivariable logistic regression analysis, only gender (HR 2.38, p = 0.036), radiation fractionation numbers (HR 1.09, p = 0.005), and total lung mean dose (HR 1.12, p = 0.006) were associated with sRIL.

Lymphopenia and survival outcomes

The median follow-up for the cohort was 12.2 years (interquartile range, 4.7–14.6 years). 25.9% (44/170) of patients were alive at last follow up. The median PFS and OS for the whole group were 19.8 months and 38.4 months, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 1). For patients with sRIL, the median PFS was 14.9 months, whereas it was 21.7 months in the non-sRIL group (p = 0.008, Fig. 1A). For patients with sRIL, the median OS was 28.4 months, which was significantly worse than the 48.3 months in patients with non-sRIL (p = 0.01, Fig. 1B). The 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival rates in the sRIL group were 69.1%, 42.9%, and 28.0%, respectively, in contrast to 79.3%, 57.6%, and 45.5% in the non-sRIL group, respectively.

Univariable analysis indicated that gender, pathological stage, and lymphopenia were correlated with PFS for the whole cohort (Table 3). Multivariable analysis revealed that pathological stage (HR 1.61, p = 0.019) and sRIL (HR 1.68, p = 0.004) were independent predictors of PFS.

As shown in Table 4, squamous cell histology, adjuvant chemotherapy, and lymphopenia were correlated with OS in the univariable analysis. Multivariable analysis demonstrated that sRIL (HR 1.95, p < 0.01), squamous cell histology (HR 2.39, p = 0.002), pathological stage (HR 2.01, p = 0.002), and adjuvant chemotherapy (HR 0.60, p = 0.006) were independent predictors of OS.

Subgroup analysis in patients with stage III NSCLC

Since PORT given to stage I-II patients is mostly due to close or positive surgical margins which is a competing prognostic risk compared to sRIL, we performed a subgroup analysis only in stage III patients. For patients with sRIL, the median PFS was 11 months vs. 18.4 months in patients with non-sRIL (p = 0.015; Fig. 2A). Similarly, the median OS was worse in the sRIL group (20.4 vs. 46.0 months, p = 0.006; Fig. 2B).

In univariable analysis, smoking status (p = 0.02), squamous cell histology (p = 0.04), pT stage (p = 0.04), and lymphopenia (p = 0.02) were associated with PFS (Supplementary Table 2). Only smoking status (HR 1.79, p = 0.026) and sRIL (HR1.62, p = 0.021) were predictive factors on multivariable analysis. Race (p = 0.04), smoking status (p = 0.01), squamous cell histology (p = 0.01), pN stage (p = 0.01), and lymphopenia (p = 0.01) were associated with OS in univariable analysis (Supplementary Table 3). Multivariable analysis revealed that race (HR 1.78, p = 0.037), squamous cell histology (HR 3.15, p = 0.002), and sRIL (HR 1.88, p = 0.004) were independent predictors of OS.

Discussion

In the present study, we investigated the factors associated with lymphopenia in patients receiving PORT. Lymphopenia occurred in all patients with 32.3% of patients having sRIL. sRIL was associated with gender, radiation fractionation, and total lung mean RT dose. Moreover, sRIL was significantly correlated with decreased PFS and OS. On a subgroup analysis of stage III patients, sRIL was also associated with poorer survival. Therefore, sRIL appears to be strongly prognostic for PFS and OS in patients with PORT. These findings indicate that lymphopenia is very common in this population and has a negative impact on outcomes. These results suggest that modifications in radiation treatment parameters may mitigate lymphopenia and improve clinical outcomes.

Radiation-associated lymphopenia has been investigated in several studies. Huang et al. showed that severe lymphopenia was correlated with female, old age, lower baseline total lymphocyte count, and higher brain volume receiving 25 Gy in high-grade glioma with radiation plus temozolomide [10]. Susannah et al. showed that RT field size, dose per fraction, and fraction number were correlated with lymphopenia [19]. Our study is consistent with the view that the extent of radiation exposure, regardless of context, is lymphocyte depleting. Increased fraction numbers were associated with sRIL (HR 1.09, p = 0.005). 45.5% of patients with sRIL had a positive surgical margin compared to 24.3% in patients with non-sRIL (p = 0.01). Patients with positive margins had larger treatment volumes and total doses (Table 1; Supplementary Table 2), which may have contributed to the sRIL. Prolonged RT duration may contribute to severe lymphopenia. Grade 3 to 4 lymphopenia occurred in 54.8% of patients at a median of the 5th week after RT started [20]. Patients with treatment duration >4 weeks had a 28.9% increase in the risk of grade 3-4 lymphopenia, compared to those with the treatment duration of 4 weeks or less (32.1% vs. 62.1%, p = 0.006). In the present study, the median duration of treatment in patients with sRIL is 6 weeks, while it was only 5.4 weeks in patients with non-sRIL.

Notably, the PTV was also significantly larger in patients with sRIL. Lymphopenia is likely caused by radiation exposure to lymphocytes circulating in the body. Larger PTV leads to a larger volume of organ exposed to radiation. Ellsworth et al. has pointed out that circulating lymphocytes should be considered an organ at risk during RT [19]. In NSCLC patients undergoing definitive RT, larger GTVs were correlated with lower lymphocyte nadirs [18]. Other factors that have been shown to be associated with lymphopenia include RT technique, baseline ALC, radiation of immune organ, as well as dosimetric parameters of lung and heart [14,16,18,21–23]. Proton therapy reduced the risk of severe lymphopenia by 29% compared with photon therapy in esophageal cancer with neoadjuvant CRT (17.6% vs. 40.4%; OR 0.29, p < 0.0001 [24]. However, in the present study, we did not see an advantage using proton therapy, likely due to the small sample size and also patient heterogeneity in tumor location and treatment volumes.

Although we didn't find a correlation of sRIL with heart dose, likely due to the fact that most of the postoperative treatment volumes lie superior to the base of the heart and therefore the relative heart dose was quite low, we did find lung dosimetric parameters to be correlated with severe lymphopenia. Total lung V5, V10, V20, and total lung mean dose were higher in patients with sRIL, with

W. Jing, Y. Liu, H. Zhu et al.

Table 2

Univariate and multivariate analyses for association with severe radiation-induced lymphopenia.

Resp P OR (955 CI) P Cender (Male vs. Rom-white) 1.25 (0.25 - 28.3) 0.39 0.36 Kate (White vs. Rom-white) 1.25 (0.25 - 28.3) 0.39 0.36 Gradio (St. vs. Rom-white) 0.36 (0.87 - 60) 0.36 (0.87 - 60) 0.36 Gradio (St. vs. Rom-white) 1.35 (0.61 - 386) 0.38	Characteristic	Univariate		Multivariate	
ender (Male vs. Female)186 (09-562)0.072.38 (1.06-5.36)0.036Age (260 vs. <00)0.83 (0.43-1.61)0.58Age (260 vs. <00)0.83 (0.43-1.61)0.54Cardiolois0.55 (0.21-1.45)0.22CorDo1.48 (0.62-3.55)0.38Smoking'1.53 (0.61-3.46)0.36Smoking'0.62 (0.22-1.18)0.15Sunder CorteNote (0.77)Right vs. Left0.62 (0.22-1.18)0.62Surgery typeNote (0.77) (0.28-2.11)0.62Partinological TypeNote (0.77)Note (0.77)Partinological TypeNote (0.77)Note (0.77)Partinological TypeNote (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Partinological TypeNote (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Note (0.77)Partinological TypeNote (0.77)Note (0.77)Partinological		OR (95% CI)	р	OR (95% CI)	р
Race (White vis. Non-white)1.25 (0.55-2.83)0.59BMI0.56 (0.87-10.6)0.34CardioDis0.56 (0.21-1.45)0.22COPD1.48 (0.62-3.55)0.38Tumor focation	Gender (Male vs. Female)	1.86 (0.96-3.62)	0.07	2.38 (1.06-5.36)	0.036
Age (250 vs. <60)	Race (White vs. Non-white)	1.25 (0.55-2.83)	0.59		
bM0.96 (0.87-1.05)0.34CordioDis0.55 (0.21-1.45)0.22COPD1.48 (0.82-3.55)0.38Sunoking'1.33 (0.61-3.86)0.36Tumor locationRight v.5. Loft A0.22 (0.22-1.18)0.15Surgery typeSubbar resectionRfLobectmy0.37 (0.28-2.11)0.62Pneumonetomy0.33 (0.26-4.07)0.97Pathodical typeNEUNG0.80SCC0.87 (0.30-2.54)0.80SCC0.87 (0.30-2.54)0.80SCC1.12 (0.36-3.51)0.84Yeng radeNGWellNefModrate1.03 (0.29-3.71)0.96Poor1.18 (0.31-4.26)0.80Surger markeWellNefModrate1.13 (0.39-3.01)0.96Poor1.18 (0.31-4.26)0.80Surger markeWillNenMill A v. TheMill A v. TheMill A v. TheMill A v. TheProor1.55 (0.79-1.00)0.1Tumor sizeMill A v. TheMill A v. TheProor0.90 (0.46-1.74)0.51Produ therapyMill Chen AMill Chen AMill Chen A<	Age (≥60 vs. <60)	0.83 (0.43-1.61)	0.58		
Cardiobis0.55 (0.21-1.45)0.22COPD0.48 (0.02-3.55)0.38Sinoking'1.5 (0.32-1.18)0.5Surgery type	BMI	0.96 (0.87-1.05)	0.34		
COP148 (082–3.5)0.38Smoking"153 (06.1-3.6)0.36Tumor location	CardioDis	0.55 (0.21-1.45)	0.22		
Smoking"15 (0.61-3.86)0.56Right vs. Left0.63Surgery typeSubbota risectionRefSubbota risection0.77 (0.2811)Lobectomy0.77 (0.2811)Pathological typeNEURefNEUNefACC0.87 (0.3025.4)So SC0.82 (0.3025.4)So SC0.82 (0.3025.4)So SC0.82 (0.3025.4)So Co0.82 (0.3025.4)So Co0.82 (0.3025.4)So Co0.82 (0.3025.4)So Co0.30 (0.3025.4)So Co1.03 (0.3025.4)So Co1.03 (0.3025.4)Moderate1.03 (0.3025.4)Moderate1.03 (0.3031.6)Poro1.03 (0.3031.7)Output1.12 (0.9817)Name Size1.12 (0.9817)Surgical margin1.12 (0.9812)Tumor size1.51 (0.78308)Portage1.12 (0.9812)Portage1.12 (0.9812)Na Surgital Margin1.12 (0.9812)Na Surgital Margin1.12 (0.9812)Na Surgital Margin1.12 (0.9117)No Surgital Margin1.12 (0.9117)Motion Margin0.01Motion Margin0.01Motion Margin0.01Margin0.02 (0.1010)Na Surgital Margin0.01Margin0.02 (0.1010)Margin0.02 (0.1010)Margin0.02 (0.1010)Margin0.02 (0.1010)Margin0.01 (0.10-	COPD	1.48 (0.62-3.55)	0.38		
Tumor location support solution support solution <td>Smoking^a</td> <td>1.53 (0.61-3.86)</td> <td>0.36</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Smoking ^a	1.53 (0.61-3.86)	0.36		
Right vs. Left 0.62 (0.321.18) 0.15 Subplohar resection Ref Subplohar resection 0.77 (0.282.1.1) 0.62 Pathological type 0.97 Pathological type 0.97 NEU Ref ADC 0.87 (0.30-2.54) 0.80 SCC 1.12 (0.36-3.51) 0.84 Tumor grade Ref 1.12 (0.36-3.51) 0.84 Yender State 1.33 (0.29-3.71) 0.96 Surgical margin Ref 1.18 (0.33-4.26) 0.80 Surgical margin Ref 1.12 (0.98-1.27) 0.10 Tumor grade 2.59 (1.31-5.11) 0.01 1.01 1.01 Tumor grade 1.12 (0.98-1.27) 0.10 1.01 1.01 1.01 Tumor grade 1.12 (0.98-1.27) 0.10 1.01	Tumor location				
Surgery type subblar rescrion Rf Lobetomy 0.70 (2.8-2.11) 0.62 Preumonetomy 1.03 (0.26-4.07) 0.37 Pathological type NEU Ref ACC 0.87 (0.30-2.54) 0.80 SCC 1.12 (0.36-3.51) 0.84 Tumor grade Well Ref Moderate 1.38 (0.32-4.26) 0.80 Surgial margin R1/2 vs. R0 2.59 (1.31-5.11) 0.10 Tumor size 1.25 (0.78-3.08) 0.21 PA-st rs. T-2 0.56 (0.29-1.09) 0.90 Patholity NS. In 1-2 0.56 (0.29-1.09) 0.91 Patholity NS. In 2 0.56 (0.29-1.09) 0.91 Patholity Poto uschon 0.67 (0.21-2.19) 0.70 RT modality <	Right vs. Left	0.62 (0.32-1.18)	0.15		
Subblar resertionRfLabectony0.77 (0.28-2.11)0.62Pneumonectomy10 (0.28-2.17)0.67Pathological typeNUCRfADC0.87 (0.30-2.54)0.80SCC1.2 (0.36-3.51)0.84Tumor gradeWellRfModerate1.03 (0.29-3.71)0.66Poor1.18 (0.33-4.26)0.80Surgical marginWillSingle and the set of	Surgery type				
Lobectomy 0.77 (0.28-2.11) 0.62 Pneumonectomy 1.03 (0.26-4.07) 0.97 Pathological type NEU NEU NEU Ref NEU ADC 0.87 (0.30-2.54) 0.80 SCC 1.12 (0.36-3.51) 0.84 Tumor grade Well Ref Woldrate 1.03 (0.29-3.71) 0.96 Poor 1.13 (0.32-4.26) 0.80 Surgical margin Ref NEU R1/2 vs. R0 2.59 (1.31-5.11) 0.01 Tumor size 1.12 (0.98-1.27) 0.10 PT-stage Tat vs. R1-2 0.56 (0.29-1.09) 0.21 PN-stage NEU NEU NEU N2-3 vs. N1-2 0.56 (0.29-1.09) 0.30 Ad/Cheno 0.90 (0.46-1.74) 0.75 RT modality NEU NEU NEU NEU NEU NEU 0.67 (0.21-2.19) 0.51 NEU NEU Photon therapy SC SC SC SC SC SC <td>Sublobar resection</td> <td>Ref</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Sublobar resection	Ref			
Pneumonectomy 0.30 (0.26-4.07) 0.97 Pathological type Ref	Lobectomy	0.77 (0.28-2.11)	0.62		
Pathological type Ref NEU 0.87 (0.30–2.54) 0.80 SCC 1.12 (0.36–3.51) 0.84 Tumor grade Well F Moderate 1.03 (0.29–3.71) 0.96 Surgical margin R1/2 vs. R0 2.59 (1.31–5.11) 0.10 D'umor size 1.12 (0.86–1.27) 0.10 PT-stage T3-4 vs. R1-2 1.55 (0.78–3.08) 0.21 PN-stage R12 vs. R1-2 0.55 (0.29–1.09) 0.51 PN-stage R11 vs. I-11 0.69 (0.33–1.40) 0.30 Poton vs. Photon 0.67 (0.21–2.19) 0.51 R11 ws. I-11 0.69 (0.43–1.76) Photon therapy R11 ws. I-11 0.67 (0.21–2.19) 0.51 <td>Pneumonectomy</td> <td>1.03 (0.26-4.07)</td> <td>0.97</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Pneumonectomy	1.03 (0.26-4.07)	0.97		
NEU Ref ADC 0.87 (0.30–2.54) 0.80 SCC 1.12 (0.36–3.51) 0.84 Tumor grade	Pathological type				
ADC 0.87 (0.30 - 2.54) 0.84 SCC 1.12 (0.36 - 3.51) 0.84 Tumor grade	NEU	Ref			
SC 1.12 (0.36-3.51) 0.84 Tumor grade Well Ref Moderate 1.03 (0.29-3.71) 0.96 Poor 1.18 (0.33-4.26) 0.80 Surgical margin	ADC	0.87 (0.30-2.54)	0.80		
Tumor grade Ref Well Ref Moderate 1.03 (0.29-3.71) 0.90 Surgical margin	SCC	1.12 (0.36-3.51)	0.84		
Well Ref Moderate 1.03 (0.29–3.7) 0.96 Poor 1.18 (0.33–4.26) 0.80 Surgical margin	Tumor grade				
Moderate 1.03 (0.29-3.71) 0.96 Poor 1.18 (0.33-4.26) 0.80 Strigical margin	Well	Ref			
Poor 1.8 (0.33-4.26) 0.80 Surgical margin III NI	Moderate	1.03 (0.29–3.71)	0.96		
Surgical margin R1/2 vs. R0 2.59 (1.31-5.11) 0.01 pT-stage	Poor	1.18 (0.33-4.26)	0.80		
R1/2 vs. R0 2.59 (1.31-5.11) 0.01 Tumor size 1.12 (0.38-1.27) 0.10 pT-stage	Surgical margin				
Tumor size 1.12 (0.98–1.27) 0.10 pT-stage	R1/2 vs. R0	2.59 (1.31–5.11)	0.01		
IP-stageT3-4 vs. T1-21.55 (0.78-3.08)0.21pN-stageN2-3 vs. N1-20.56 (0.29-1.09)0.09pStageIll vs. HI0.69 (0.33-1.40)0.30AdjChemo0.90 (0.46-1.74)0.75RT modalityProton vs. Photon0.67 (0.21-2.19)0.51Photon therapy3D-CRTRefIffXN00.99 (1.03-1.15)0.01RTfxN0.1.09 (1.03-1.17)0.005RTfxN50.011.09 (1.03-1.17)0.005RTfxN50.011.09 (1.03-1.17)0.005Ptv1.00 (0.98-1.03)0.011.91Heart V51.00 (0.99-1.02)0.41Heart V51.01 (1.09-1.02)0.20Heart V301.01 (1.09-1.03)0.19Heart V401.01 (0.99-1.03)0.24Heart V501.02 (1.09-1.03)0.24Heart V501.01 (0.99-1.02)0.28Total lung mDose1.01 (0.2-1.18)0.01Total lung v151.03 (1.00-1.06)0.04Total lung V101.03 (1.00-1.06)0.04Total lung V101.03 (1.00-1.06)0.07Total lung V201.04 (1.01-1.08)0.03Abeseline ALC0.94 (0.55-1.50)0.81	Tumor size	1.12 (0.98–1.27)	0.10		
13-4 vs. 11-2 1.50 (7.8-3.08) 0.21 pN-stage	pT-stage				
pN-stage 0.56 (0.29-1.09) 0.09 pStage	13-4 vs. 11-2	1.55 (0.78-3.08)	0.21		
NA=3 vS, N1=2 0.56 (0.29 - 1.09) 0.09 pStage III vs. I-II 0.69 (0.33-1.40) 0.30 AdjChemo 0.90 (0.46-1.74) 0.75 RT modality 0.67 (0.21-2.19) 0.51 Photon vs. Photon 0.67 (0.21-2.19) 0.51 Photon therapy 0.87 (0.43-1.76) 0.70 RTfxNo. 1.09 (1.03-1.15) <0.01	pN-stage	0.56 (0.20, 1.00)	0.00		
pistage III vs. I-II 0.69 (0.33-1.40) 0.30 AdjChemo 0.90 (0.46-1.74) 0.75 RT modality	N2-3 VS. N1-2	0.56 (0.29-1.09)	0.09		
In Ys, I-In 0.69 (0.35-1.40) 0.50 AdjChemo 0.90 (0.46-1.74) 0.75 RT modality	pstage	0.00 (0.22, 1.40)	0.20		
Adjenenio 0.90 (0.40–1.7.4) 0.75 RT modality Proton vs. Photon 0.67 (0.21–2.19) 0.51 Photon therapy 3D-CRT Ref 100 (0.3–1.76) 0.70 RTfxNo. 1.09 (1.03–1.15) <0.01	III VS. I-II	0.09(0.33 - 1.40)	0.30		
N induality Proton vs. Photon 0.67 (0.21-2.19) 0.51 Photon therapy 3D-CRT Ref JNRT* 0.87 (0.43-1.76) 0.70 RTfsXloc. 1.09 (1.03-1.15) <0.01	Aujchemo PT modality	0.90 (0.46-1.74)	0.75		
Photon therapy 0.57 (0.21-2.15) 0.51 3D-CRT Ref IMRT* 0.87 (0.43-1.76) 0.70 RTfxNo. 1.09 (1.03-1.15) <0.01	RI IIIOudilly Proton vs. Photon	0.67(0.21, 2.10)	0.51		
Bit Note the ray of the second sec	Photon therapy	0.07 (0.21-2.19)	0.51		
IMR* 0.87 (0.43-1.76) 0.70 RTfxNo. 1.09 (1.03-1.15) <0.01	3D-CRT	Ref			
Interf 0.09 (1.03 - 1.15) 0.01 1.09 (1.03 - 1.17) 0.005 RTfxNo. 1.09 (0.03 - 1.15) <0.01	IMRT*	0.87(0.43-1.76)	0.70		
RTfxSize (2.0 Gy vs. 1.8 Gy) 0.32 (0.16-0.63) <0.01	RTfxNo	1.09(1.03-1.15)	<0.01	1 09 (1 03-1 17)	0.005
PTV 1.00 (0.98-1.03) 0.01 Heart V5 1.00 (0.99-1.02) 0.41 Heart V10 1.01 (1.00-1.02) 0.20 Heart V20 1.01 (0.99-1.02) 0.27 Heart V30 1.01 (1.00-1.03) 0.19 Heart V40 1.01 (0.99-1.03) 0.24 Heart V50 1.02 (0.99-1.05) 0.16 Heart V50 1.02 (1.09-1.03) 0.28 Total lung mDose 1.01 (1.02-1.18) 0.01 1.12 (1.03-1.21) 0.006 Total lung V5 1.02 (1.00-1.06) 0.04 1.01 (1.00-1.06) 0.07 Total lung V10 1.03 (1.00-1.06) 0.07 1.04 (1.01-1.08) 0.03 Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59-1.50) 0.81 0.81 0.81	RTfxSize (2.0 Gv vs. 1.8 Gv)	0.32 (0.16-0.63)	<0.01	1.05 (1.05 1.17)	0.005
Heart V5 1.00 (0.99–1.02) 0.41 Heart V10 1.01 (1.00–1.02) 0.20 Heart V20 1.01 (0.99–1.02) 0.27 Heart V30 1.01 (1.00–1.03) 0.19 Heart V40 1.01 (0.99–1.03) 0.24 Heart V50 1.02 (0.99–1.05) 0.16 Heart MDose 1.01 (1.02–1.18) 0.01 1.12 (1.03–1.21) 0.006 Total lung MDose 1.02 (1.00–1.04) 0.05 0.04 0.006 0.04 Total lung V10 1.03 (1.00–1.06) 0.04 0.05 0.006 0.04 0.05 0.006 0.04 0.05 0.006 0.07 0.006 0.04 0.05 0.006 0.07 0.01 0.03 <t< td=""><td>PTV</td><td>1.00(0.98-1.03)</td><td>0.01</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	PTV	1.00(0.98-1.03)	0.01		
Heart V10 1.01 (1.00-1.02) 0.20 Heart V20 1.01 (1.00-1.02) 0.27 Heart V30 1.01 (1.00-1.03) 0.19 Heart V40 1.01 (0.99-1.03) 0.24 Heart V50 1.02 (0.99-1.05) 0.16 Heart mDose 1.01 (1.02-1.18) 0.01 Total lung mDose 1.02 (1.00-1.04) 0.05 Total lung V5 1.03 (1.00-1.06) 0.04 Total lung V15 1.03 (1.00-1.06) 0.07 Total lung V20 1.04 (1.01-1.08) 0.03 Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59-1.50) 0.81	Heart V5	1.00(0.99-1.02)	0.41		
Heart V20 1.01 (0.99–1.02) 0.27 Heart V30 1.01 (1.00–1.03) 0.19 Heart V40 1.01 (0.99–1.03) 0.24 Heart V50 1.02 (0.99–1.05) 0.16 Heart mDose 1.01 (1.02–1.18) 0.01 Total lung mDose 1.02 (1.00–1.04) 0.05 Total lung V5 1.03 (1.00–1.06) 0.04 Total lung V15 1.03 (1.00–1.06) 0.07 Total lung V20 1.04 (1.01–1.08) 0.03 Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59–1.50) 0.81	Heart V10	1.01 (1.00–1.02)	0.20		
Heart V30 1.01 (1.00–1.03) 0.19 Heart V40 1.01 (0.99–1.03) 0.24 Heart V50 1.02 (0.99–1.05) 0.16 Heart mDose 1.01 (0.98–1.02) 0.28 Total lung mDose 1.02 (1.00–1.04) 0.05 Total lung V5 1.02 (1.00–1.04) 0.05 Total lung V15 1.03 (1.00–1.06) 0.07 Total lung V20 1.04 (1.01–1.08) 0.03 Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59–1.50) 0.81	Heart V20	1.01 (0.99–1.02)	0.27		
Heart V40 1.01 (0.99–1.03) 0.24 Heart V50 1.02 (0.99–1.05) 0.16 Heart mDose 1.01 (0.98–1.02) 0.28 Total lung mDose 1.10 (1.02–1.18) 0.01 1.12 (1.03–1.21) 0.006 Total lung V5 1.02 (1.00–1.04) 0.05 1.02 (1.00–1.06) 0.04 Total lung V10 1.03 (1.00–1.06) 0.07 1.04 (1.01–1.08) 0.03 Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59–1.50) 0.81 0.81	Heart V30	1.01 (1.00-1.03)	0.19		
Heart V50 1.02 (0.99–1.05) 0.16 Heart mDose 1.01 (0.98–1.02) 0.28 Total lung mDose 1.10 (1.02–1.18) 0.01 1.12 (1.03–1.21) 0.006 Total lung V5 1.02 (1.00–1.04) 0.05 0.04 0.04 0.07 103 (1.00–1.06) 0.07 Total lung V20 1.04 (1.01–1.08) 0.03 0.03 0.04 0.03	Heart V40	1.01 (0.99–1.03)	0.24		
Heart mDose1.01 (0.98-1.02)0.28Total lung mDose1.10 (1.02-1.18)0.011.12 (1.03-1.21)0.006Total lung V51.02 (1.00-1.04)0.050.040.05Total lung V101.03 (1.00-1.06)0.040.070.07Total lung V201.04 (1.01-1.08)0.030.03Baseline ALC0.94 (0.59-1.50)0.81	Heart V50	1.02 (0.99–1.05)	0.16		
Total lung mDose 1.10 (1.02–1.18) 0.01 1.12 (1.03–1.21) 0.006 Total lung V5 1.02 (1.00–1.04) 0.05 0.04 1.01 <t< td=""><td>Heart mDose</td><td>1.01 (0.98–1.02)</td><td>0.28</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Heart mDose	1.01 (0.98–1.02)	0.28		
Total lung V51.02 (1.00-1.04)0.05Total lung V101.03 (1.00-1.06)0.04Total lung V151.03 (1.00-1.06)0.07Total lung V201.04 (1.01-1.08)0.03Baseline ALC0.94 (0.59-1.50)0.81	Total lung mDose	1.10 (1.02–1.18)	0.01	1.12 (1.03-1.21)	0.006
Total lung V101.03 (1.00-1.06)0.04Total lung V151.03 (1.00-1.06)0.07Total lung V201.04 (1.01-1.08)0.03Baseline ALC0.94 (0.59-1.50)0.81	Total lung V5	1.02 (1.00-1.04)	0.05		
Total lung V15 1.03 (1.00–1.06) 0.07 Total lung V20 1.04 (1.01–1.08) 0.03 Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59–1.50) 0.81	Total lung V10	1.03 (1.00-1.06)	0.04		
Total lung V20 1.04 (1.01–1.08) 0.03 Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59–1.50) 0.81	Total lung V15	1.03 (1.00-1.06)	0.07		
Baseline ALC 0.94 (0.59–1.50) 0.81	Total lung V20	1.04 (1.01-1.08)	0.03		
	Baseline ALC	0.94 (0.59–1.50)	0.81		

Abbreviations: BMI, body mass index; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; Smoking^a, prior/current vs. never; pT/N stage, pathological tumor/node stage; AdjChemo, adjuvant chemotherapy; PTV, planning target volume; RT, radiation; 3D-CRT, three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy; IMRT*, Intensity-modulated radiation therapy (including VMAT, Volumetric modulated arc therapy); RTfxNo., radiation fraction number; V5, organ volume receiving 5 Gy; mDose, mean radiation dose; ALC, absolute lymphocyte count.

the latter being significantly correlated with sRIL on univariable and multivariable analyses. As showed in Supplementary Table 4, total lung mean dose was significantly correlated with sRIL (r = 0.212, p = 0.009). Therefore, only total lung mean dose was analyzed, considering lung V5, V10, V20 and total lung mean dose affect each other. This is in contrast to the Tang et al. study, which analyzed 711 patients receiving definitive CRT for NSCLC and found that lung V5 was significantly associated with lymphocyte nadirs [18]. The difference may be due to the variation of patients enrolled.

Another interesting consideration is whether a lower lymphocyte count due to surgery further contributed to the radiationassociated lymphopenia. A previous study demonstrated that reduced mean lymphocyte count was correlated with thoracic surgery (p < 0.0001) [25]. In a study investigating the association between postoperative lymphopenia and postoperative pneumonia, the lymphocyte nadir was $1.0 \pm 0.5 \times 10^9$ /L which occurred on day 1 after the surgery; however, the lymphocytes increased gradually after that. Similarly, lymphocytes decreased to 1.1 ± 0.4 9×10^9 /L 3 days postoperatively but recovered on day 4 in advanced oral cancer treated with surgery. The reduction of lymphocytes caused by surgery is limited and typically recovers fairly quickly afterwards. This is not the same as the lymphopenia caused by radiotherapy. Several studies have indicated that lymphocyte counts decline exponentially during radiation, reaching nadir between 3 and 5 weeks from the start of radiotherapy [20,24]. In



Fig. 1. Progression-free survival (PFS) and Overall survival (OS) of all the patients with or without severe radiation-induced lymphopenia. (A) The median PFS in sRIL is 14.9 months versus 21.7 months in non-sRIL (p = 0.008). (B) The median OS in sRIL is 28.4 months, compared to 48.3 months in non-sRIL (p = 0.01).

Table 3

Univariate and multivariate analyses for progression-free survival in the whole group.

Characteristic	Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
	HR (95%CI)	р	HR (95%CI)	р
Gender				
Male vs. Female	1.49 (1.06-2.10)	0.02		
Race				
White vs. Non-white	1.25 (0.80-1.94)	0.32		
Age (≥60 vs. < 60)	0.95 (0.67-1.34)	0.76		
CardioDis				
COPD	1.26 (0.80-2.00)	0.32		
Smoking ^a	1.43 (0.89-2.27)	0.13		
Tumor site				
Right vs. Left	0.85 (0.61-1.20)	0.37		
Surgery type				
Sublobar resection	Ref			
Lobectomy	1.00 (0.58-1.73)	0.99		
Pneumonectomy	1.40 (0.68-2.87)	0.36		
Pathological type				
NEU	Ref			
ADC	1.08 (0.63-1.86)	0.77		
SCC	1.49 (0.84-2.66)	0.17		
Surgical margin				
R1/2 vs. R0	1.14 (0.79-1.63)	0.49		
LVI	1.27 (0.88-1.83)	0.19		
Tumor grade				
Well	Ref			
Moderate	0.71 (0.37-1.36)	0.30		
Poor	0.86 (0.45-1.65)	0.65		
pT stage				
T3-4 vs. T1-2	1.17 (0.81-1.70)	0.40		
pN stage				
N2-3 vs. N0-1	1.26 (0.88-1.82)	0.21		
pStage (III vs. I–II)	1.52 (1.02-2.26)	0.04	1.61 (1.08-2.40)	0.019
Adjuvant Chemo	0.79 (0.56-1.11)	0.18		
RT technique				
Proton vs. Photon	1.02 (0.56-1.85)	0.94		
Lymphopenia				
sRIL vs. non-sRIL	1.60 (1.13-2.27)	0.01	1.68 (1.18-2.39)	0.004

Abbreviations: CardioDis, Cardiovascular disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; Smoking^a, Prior/Current vs. Never; NEU, neuroendocrine carcinoma; ADC, adenocarcinoma; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma; R0/R1/R2: complete resection, microscopic residual tumor, macroscopic residual tumor; LVI, lymphovascular invasion; pT/N stage, pathological tumor/node stage. sRIL, severe radiation-induced lymphopenia.

addition, the lymphocyte counts are not restored fully for nearly half of the patients even 1–2 months after completing radiation therapy [26]. The difference may be due to different types of lymphocyte damage. The decrease in lymphocytes caused by surgery may be caused by the body's acute stress response, while substantial damage from radiotherapy to lymphocytes contributed to lymphopenia. In our study, 13.5% (23/170) of patients experienced lymphopenia after surgery but before radiation; however, none of them undergone sRIL. Furthermore, only 7 of 23 patients

developed sRIL during RT. Therefore, it seems that the contribution of surgery on lymphopenia is limited.

Previous studies have shown that the severity of lymphopenia is associated with clinical outcomes. Tang et al showed that higher lymphocyte nadirs were associated with prolonged OS (p = 0.01) and event-free survival (p < 0.001) [18]. Ladbury et al. retrospectively reviewed 117 patients with stage III NSCLC treated with definitive CRT and showed that grade \geq 3 lymphopenia was correlated with higher estimated dose of radiation to immune cells

W. Jing, Y. Liu, H. Zhu et al.

Table 4

Univariate and multivariate analyses for overall survival in the whole group.

Characteristic	Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
	HR (95% CI)	р	HR (95% CI)	р
Gender				
Male vs. Female	1.41 (0.85-2.17)	0.06		
Race				
White vs. Non-white	1.36 (0.80-2.17)	0.20		
Age (≥60 vs. <60)	1.28 (0.89-1.84)	0.19		
CardioDis	1.19 (0.74-1.90)	0.47		
COPD	1.35 (0.83-2.18)	0.22		
Smoking ^a	1.63 (0.98-2.73)	0.06		
Tumor site				
Right vs. Left	1.00 (0.70-1.43)	0.99		
Surgery type				
Sublobar resection	Ref			
Lobectomy	1.16 (0.66-2.03)	0.60		
Pneumonectomy	1.09 (0.50-2.36)	0.83		
Pathological type				
Neu	Ref		Ref	
ADC	1.39	0.30	1.75 (0.94-3.25)	0.079
SCC	2.08	0.03	2.93 (1.49-5.76)	0.002
Surgical margin				
R1/2 vs. R0	1.26 (0.88-1.84)	0.22		
LVI	1.10 (0.75-1.62)	0.61		
Tumor grade				
Well	Ref			
Moderate	0.74 (0.37-1.45)	0.37		
Poor	0.88 (0.45-1.74)	0.71		
pT stage				
T3-4 vs. T1-2	1.30 (0.88-1.92)	0.19		
pN stage				
N2-3 vs. N0-1	1.15 (0.79-1.67)	0.47		
pStage (III vs. I–II)	1.41 (0.94-2.13)	0.10	2.01 (1.29-3.13)	0.002
AdjChemo	0.67 (0.47-0.96)	0.03	0.60 (0.42-0.86)	0.006
RT technique				
Proton vs. Photon	0.98 (0.50-1.93)	0.95		
Lymphopenia				
sRIL vs. non-sRIL	1.60 (1.12-2.28)	0.01	1.95 (1.34-2.82)	< 0.01
BMI	1.01 (0.96-1.06)	0.74		
Baseline ALC	1.19 (0.92–1.55)	0.19		

Abbreviations: CardioDis, Cardiovascular disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; Smoking^a, Prior/Current vs. Never; NEU, neuroendocrine carcinoma; ADC, adenocarcinoma; SCC, squamous cell carcinoma; R0/R1/R2: complete resection, microscopic residual tumor, macroscopic residual tumor; LVI, lymphovascular invasion; pT/N stage, pathological tumor/node stage; POCT, postoperative chemotherapy. BMI, body-mass index; ALC, absolute lymphocyte counts.



Fig. 2. Progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) in stage III NSCLC patient with or without sRIL. (A) The median PFS of sRIL was 11 months vs. 18.4 months in non-sRIL (*p* = 0.015); (B) The median OS in sRIL was 20.4 months, compared to 46.0 months in non-sRIL (*p* = 0.006).

(EDRIC, p = 0.004), while EDRIC was independently associated with OS (HR 1.17, p = 0.03) [23]. The results suggested that lymphopenia was correlated with poor survival. Similarly, Yellu et al. reviewed 151 NSCLC stage III treated with curative RT, which was stratified into standard dose (≤ 60 Gy) and high dose (> 66 Gy) [27]. The high dose patients had lower ALC and higher mortality (p < 0.0001).

Consistent with these studies, we also showed that sRIL is a poor prognostic factor for PFS and OS in stage I-III PORT patients.

This study has several limitations as a single-institution retrospective study with a relatively small sample size. We also had to widen the time period for which this data was collected due to the lack of diagnostic lab collections for patients undergoing PORT alone without chemotherapy. This is especially true in more recent years since only 8.8% (15/170) of patients between 2015 and 2017 had their blood drawn for complete blood count analysis. As a consequence, most of the patient data were collected before 2015, when fewer patients received proton radiotherapy. In addition, the inclusion of patients with stage I-II disease increased the rate of patients with positive surgical margins (31.2%) which confounded the relative impact of sRIL. Defining a separate subset analysis in the stage III disease was a way to better study the impact of sRIL after PORT.

In conclusion, we demonstrated that patients with NSCLC receiving PORT were vulnerable to sRIL. Severe radiation-induced lymphopenia was correlated with total lung mean dose and radiation fractionation numbers and associated with poorer survival outcomes. Future studies will need to address the effects of using more hypofractionated course of radiotherapy or advanced radiation delivery techniques like proton therapy to further reduce the risk of sRIL. These approaches are especially relevant in this era of immunotherapies as these agents are increasingly being incorporated sequentially with radiotherapy.

Funding

This study was funded in part by the Shandong Cancer Hospital for WJ and the National Institutes of Health through MD Anderson's Cancer Center Support Grant CA016672.

Patient Consent Statement

This is a retrospective analysis of previous treatment data on IRB approved protocol RCR05-0967 which waives patient consent of chart review for clinical outcomes analysis in thoracic cancer patients.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctro.2021.02.011.

References

- [1] Liu T, Mu Y, Dang J, Li G. The role of postoperative radiotherapy for completely resected pIIIA-N2 non-small cell lung cancer patients with different clinicopathological features: A systemic review and meta-analysis. J Cancer 2019;10(17):3941–9. <u>https://doi.org/10.7150/jca.28680</u>.
- [2] Brandt WS, Yan W, Leeman JE, et al. Postoperative radiotherapy for surgically resected ypN2 non-small cell lung cancer. Ann Thorac Surg 2018;106 (3):848–55. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2018.04.064</u>.
- [3] Douillard JY, Rosell R, De Lena M, Riggi M, Hurteloup P, Mahe MA. Impact of postoperative radiation therapy on survival in patients with complete resection and stage I, II, or IIIA non-small-cell lung cancer treated with adjuvant chemotherapy: The Adjuvant Navelbine International Trialist Association (ANITA) randomized. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2008;72 (3):695–701. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2008.01.044.
- [4] Heo J, Noh OK, Kim HI, et al. Lung dose and the potential risk of death in postoperative radiation therapy for non-small cell lung cancer: A study using the method of stratified grouping. Radiother Oncol 2018;129(1):61–7. <u>https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2018.03.018</u>.
- [5] Stjernswärd J, Vánky F, Jondal M, Wigzell H, Sealy R. Lymphopenia and change in distribution of human B and T lymphocytes in peripheral blood induced by irradiation for mammary carcinoma. Lancet 1972;299(7765):1352–6. <u>https:// doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(72)91091–4</u>.

- [6] Pike LRG, Bang A, Mahal BA, et al. The impact of radiation therapy on lymphocyte count and survival in metastatic cancer patients receiving PD-1 immune checkpoint inhibitors. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2019;103 (1):142–51. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2018.09.010</u>.
- [7] Grossman SA, Ellsworth S, Campian J, et al. Survival in patients with severe lymphopenia following treatment with radiation and chemotherapy for newly diagnosed solid tumors. JNCCN J Natl Compr Cancer Netw 2015;13 (10):1225–31. <u>https://doi.org/10.6004/jnccn.2015.0151</u>.
- [8] Tang C, Lee MS, Gomez D, et al. Effects of chemotherapy regimen and radiation modality on hematologic toxicities in patients receiving definitive platinumbased doublet chemoradiation for non-small cell lung cancer. Am J Clin Oncol Cancer Clin Trials 2017;40(6):625–30. <u>https://doi.org/10.1097/ COC.000000000000206</u>.
- [9] Zhuang Y, Yuan BY, Chen GW, et al. Association between circulating lymphocyte populations and outcome after stereotactic body radiation therapy in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma. Front Oncol 2019;9:896. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2019.00896</u>.
- [10] Huang J, Dewees TA, Badiyan SN, et al. Clinical and dosimetric predictors of acute severe lymphopenia during radiation therapy and concurrent temozolomide for high-grade glioma. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys. 92. Elsevier Inc.; 2015:1000-1007. doi:10.1016/j.ijrobp.2015.04.005.
- [11] Davuluri R, Jiang W, Fang P, et al. Lymphocyte nadir and esophageal cancer survival outcomes after chemoradiation therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2017;99(1):128–35. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2017.05.037</u>.
- [12] Liu LT, Chen QY, Tang LQ, et al. The prognostic value of treatment-related lymphopenia in nasopharyngeal carcinoma patients. Cancer Res Treat 2018;50 (1):19–29. <u>https://doi.org/10.4143/crt.2016.595</u>.
- [13] Campian JL, Ye X, Brock M, Grossman SA. Treatment-related lymphopenia in patients with stage III non-small-cell lung cancer. Cancer Invest 2013;31 (3):183–8. <u>https://doi.org/10.3109/07357907.2013.767342</u>.
- [14] Fang P, Shiraishi Y, Verma V, et al. Lymphocyte-sparing effect of proton therapy in patients with esophageal cancer treated with definitive chemoradiation. Int J Part Ther 2017;4(3):23-32. 10.14338/ijpt-17-00033.1
- [15] Zhou X, Zhu W, Zhu Z, et al. Lymphopenia in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: relationship to malnutrition, various disease parameters, and response to concurrent chemoradiotherapy. Oncologist 2019;24(8):e677–86. https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2018-0723.
- [16] van Rossum PSN, Deng W, Routman DM, et al. Prediction of severe lymphopenia during chemoradiation therapy for esophageal cancer: development and validation of a pretreatment nomogram. Pract Radiat Oncol 2020;10(1):e16-26. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.prro.2019.07.010</u>.
- [17] Wang X, Lu J, Teng F, Yu J. Lymphopenia association with accelerated hyperfractionation and its effects on limited-stage small cell lung cancer patients' clinical outcomes. Ann Transl Med 2019;7(16):385-385. 10.21037/ atm.2019.07.58.
- [18] Tang C, Liao Z, Gomez D, et al. Lymphopenia association with gross tumor volume and lung V5 and its effects on non-small cell lung cancer patient outcomes. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2014;89(5):1084–91. <u>https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.ijrobp.2014.04.025</u>.
- [19] Ellsworth SG. Field size effects on the risk and severity of treatment-induced lymphopenia in patients undergoing radiation therapy for solid tumors. Adv Radiat Oncol 2018;3(4):512–9. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adro.2018.08.014</u>.
- [20] Zhao Q, Chen G, Ye L, et al. Treatment-duration is related to changes in peripheral lymphocyte counts during definitive radiotherapy for unresectable stage III NSCLC. Radiat Oncol 2019;14(1):86. <u>https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-019-1287-z</u>.
- [21] Saito T, Toya R, Yoshida N, et al. Spleen dose-volume parameters as a predictor of treatment-related lymphopenia during definitive chemoradiotherapy for esophageal cancer. In Vivo (Brooklyn) 2018;32(6):1519-1525. 10.21873/ invivo.11409
- [22] Routman DM, Garant A, Lester SC, et al. A comparison of grade 4 lymphopenia with proton versus photon radiation therapy for esophageal cancer. Adv Radiat Oncol 2019;4(1):63–9. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adro.2018.09.004</u>.
- [23] Ladbury CJ, Rusthoven CG, Camidge DR, Kavanagh BD, Nath SK. Impact of radiation dose to the host immune system on tumor control and survival for stage III non-small cell lung cancer treated with definitive radiation therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2019;105(2):346–55. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/i.</u> iirobp.2019.05.064.
- [24] Shiraishi Y, Fang P, Xu C, et al. Severe lymphopenia during neoadjuvant chemoradiation for esophageal cancer: A propensity matched analysis of the relative risk of proton versus photon-based radiation therapy. Radiother Oncol 2018;128(1):154–60. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2017.11.028</u>.
- [25] Lugg S, Agostini P, Kerr A, et al. The role of lymphopenia in the development and severity of postoperative pulmonary complications after lung surgery. Eur Respir J 2017;50(suppl 61):OA3224.
- [26] Deng W, Xu C, Liu A, et al. The relationship of lymphocyte recovery and prognosis of esophageal cancer patients with severe radiation-induced lymphopenia after chemoradiation therapy. Radiother Oncol 2019;133:9–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/i.radonc.2018.12.002.
- [27] Yellu M, Fakhrejahani F, Ying J, et al. Lymphopenia as a predictor of survival in chemoradiation (CRT)-treated stage III non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). J Clin Oncol 2015;33(15_suppl):e18513-e18513. 10.1200/jco.2015.33.15_suppl. e18513