Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Heliyon



journal homepage: www.cell.com/heliyon

Research article

5<sup>2</sup>CelPress

# Enhancing clinical decision-making: A novel nomogram for stratifying cancer-specific survival in middle-aged individuals with follicular thyroid carcinoma utilizing SEER data

# Chenghao Zhanghuang <sup>a,b,c,1</sup>, Jinkui Wang <sup>b,1</sup>, Fengming Ji<sup>a</sup>, Zhigang Yao<sup>a</sup>, Jing Ma<sup>c</sup>, Yu Hang<sup>a</sup>, Jinrong Li<sup>a</sup>, Zipeng Hao<sup>a</sup>, Yongqi Zhou<sup>b</sup>, Bing Yan<sup>a,c,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Urology, Kunming Children's Hospital(Children's Hospital Affiliated to Kunming Medical University), Yunnan Province Clinical Research Center for Children's Health and Disease, Kunming, 650228, China

<sup>b</sup> Department of Urology, Chongqing Key Laboratory of Children Urogenital Development and Tissue Engineering, Chongqing Key Laboratory of Pediatrics, Ministry of Education Key Laboratory of Child Development and Disorders, National Clinical Research Center for Child Health and Disorders, China International Science and Technology Cooperation base of Child development and Critical Disorders, Children's Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, 400015, China

<sup>c</sup> Yunnan Key Laboratory of Children's Major Disease Research, Kunming Children's Hospital(Children's Hospital Affiliated to Kunming Medical University), Yunnan Clinical Medical Center for Pediatric Diseases, Kunming Children's Solid Tumor Diagnosis and Treatment Center, Kunming, 650228, China

# ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Nomogram Risk stratification system Cancer-specific survival Follicular thyroid carcinoma SEER

## ABSTRACT

*Background:* Thyroid cancer (TC) is the most common malignant tumor in the endocrine system, is also one of the head and neck tumor. Follicular Thyroid Carcinoma (FTC) plays an important role in the pathological classification of thyroid cancer. This study aimed to develop an innovative predictive tool, a nomogram, for predicting cancer specific survival (CSS) in middle-aged FTC patients.

*Methods:* We collected patient data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database. The data from patients between 2004 and 2015 were used as the training set, and the data from patients between 2016 and 2018 were used as the validation set. To identify independent risk factors affecting patient survival, univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses were performed. Based on this, we developed a nomogram model aimed at predicting CSS in middle-aged patients with FTC. The consistency index (C-index), the area under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve (AUC), and the calibration curve were used to evaluate the accuracy and confidence of the model.

*Results*: A total of 2470 patients were enrolled in this study, in which patients from 2004 to 2015 were randomly assigned to the training cohort (N = 1437) and validation cohort (N = 598), and patients from 2016 to 2018 were assigned to the external validation cohort (N = 435) in terms of time. Univariate and multivariate Cox regression analysis showed that marriage, histological grade and TNM stage were independent risk factors for survival. The C-index for the training cohort was 0.866 (95 % CI: 0.805–0.927), for the validation cohort it was 0.944 (95 % CI:

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e31876

Received 1 June 2023; Received in revised form 18 May 2024; Accepted 23 May 2024

Available online 25 May 2024

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Department of Urology, Kunming Children's Hospital(Children's Hospital affiliated to Kunming Medical University); 288 Qianxing Road, Kunming, 650228, Yunnan, China.

E-mail addresses: 736564145@qq.com (C. Zhanghuang), ybwcy@163.com (B. Yan).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Chenghao Zhanghuang and Jinkui Wang contributed equally to this work and should be considered co-first authors.

<sup>2405-8440/© 2024</sup> Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

0.903–0.985), and for the external validation cohort, it reached 0.999 (95 % CI: 0.997–1.001). Calibration curves and AUC suggest that the model has good accuracy.

*Conclusions:* We developed an innovative nomogram to predict CSS in middle-aged patients with FTC. Our model after a rigorous internal validation and external validation process, based on the time proved that the high level of accuracy and reliability. This tool helps healthcare professionals and patients make informed clinical decisions.

# 1. Background

Thyroid cancer (TC) is the most common clinical endocrine tumour and the most common malignant solid tumour of the head and neck [1]. Unlike other cancers, TC is more likely to occur in middle-aged patients. In 2020, there were 586,000 diagnosed patients of TC worldwide, ranking ninth among malignant tumours. The incidence of TC in developed countries is higher than that in developing countries [2], and it is also one of the tumours with the fastest growing incidence of cancer in the United States [3]. The aetiology of TC is unknown, and the incidence of TC is mainly in women, and the proportion of diagnosed TC in women is about three times that in men. One in 20 women is diagnosed with TC [2]. Well-differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC) is the essential thyroid malignant tumour, accounting for more than 90 % of TC [4]. According to histological classification, DTC can be divided into papillary thyroid carcinoma (PTC) and follicular thyroid carcinoma (FTC) [5]. Papillary and follicular TCs are well differentiated, and there are abundant thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH) receptors in tumour cells, which greatly depend on TSH receptors secreted by the pituitary gland. Therefore, inhibition of TSH secretion can inhibit the occurrence and development of PTC and FTC. However, TC is also one of the most heterogeneous malignant tumours. Mutation analysis has shown that mutations in different, mutually exclusive genes can cause different types of TCs [6,7].

FTC accounts for 15 % of TC and is more aggressive than PTC. It is also considered an important reason for the increasing incidence of TC year by year [8]. Unlike PTC, which relies on lymphatic diffusion for metastasis, FTC mainly depends on hematogenous metastasis, so PTC mainly metastases to lymph nodes in the neck region. At the same time, PTC is more prone to distant metastasis [9, 10]. This is also one of the important reasons for the high malignant degree of FTC. Although it is also in the DTC category, FTC patients have significantly worse overall survival (OS) and cancer-specific survival (CSS) than PTC patients with a good prognosis [11]. In addition, radiation exposure in childhood is considered the only external factor to induce TC [2]. Radiation exposure is significantly correlated with PTC, but studies have shown that this inducing factor does not connect with FTC [12].

Moreover, given the considerable side effects of radioactive iodine, it is routinely used in patients with a poor prognosis of TC. Using I131 for postoperative adjuvant therapy has been highly controversial [13]. In addition, most DTC patients are overdiagnosed and treated. Authoritative reports have found that between 2008 and 2012, 80%-95 % of TC patients in South Korea, Belarus, China, Italy, Croatia, Slovakia and France were overdiagnosed. In countries and regions such as Denmark, the UK and Japan, the ratio is also between 50 % and 70 % [14,15]. Therefore, understanding which patients are at risk for poor prognosis is key to implementing appropriate treatment plans and long-term monitoring. Thus, improving the knowledge of the prediction of FTC and accurately judging the prognosis of FTC patients has become an important topic and has excellent research significance.

The low mortality rate of TC patients makes it difficult to assess the importance of survival-related and other relevant factors using single-center studies [16]. Traditionally, TNM staging has been considered the most important criterion for determining the prognosis of various malignancies. However, it is not sufficient to encompass the biology of various malignancies and control for their survival outcomes [17]. Some essential clinical variables that may significantly impact cancer were not included. More importantly, these critical clinical variables, such as active and passive treatment patterns, sex and age, are still controversial in the predictive value evaluation of TC [18,19]. In addition, no predictive model has been developed for middle-aged PTC patients.

FTC is a relatively rare type of thyroid cancer, which tends to metastasize through vascular invasion and has a relatively poor prognosis compared with papillary thyroid cancer (PTC). Middle-aged patients may exhibit different disease progression and treatment responses due to changes in physiological and psychological status, such as changes in hormone levels and increased life stress [20]. In addition, family and social responsibilities of middle-aged patients may affect their adherence to treatment and continuity of follow-up [21]. Therefore, the need to study FTC in middle-aged adults is to provide more accurate diagnosis, treatment, and follow-up strategies for this population.

In light of the above, we collected information on middle-aged patients with FTC from the US National Cancer Institute's Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) database. Based on these characteristics, we developed and validated a nomogram for the prognosis of CSS in middle-aged patients with FTC.

#### 2. Methods

#### 2.1. Dataset description

The patient data were downloaded from the SEER database and included all middle-aged patients with FTC. At present, there is no clear consensus on the definition of the age range for middle-aged people. In this study, patients aged 40–65 years old were included according to the conclusions of previous studies [22]. The SEER database contains 18 cancer registries, covering approximately 30 % of the US population. This study did not require ethical approval or informed consent from patients because patient records are publicly

available and patients' personal data are not identifiable. Our study methods conform to the study criteria published in the SEER database.

We downloaded basic information about the patient such as age, gender, race, year of diagnosis, and marital status. Also available were the patient's intraoperative status and chemoradiotherapy status. Patient follow-up information, including survival status, cause of death, and survival time, was also collected equally.

Inclusion criteria:(1) age 40-65; (2) the pathologic diagnosis was FTC; (3) patients diagnosed between 2004 and 2018.

Exclusion criteria:(1) tumour size and TNM staging is unknown; (2) unknown surgical method; (3) patients had no (<1 month) or unknown survival time at follow-up. A detailed screening algorithm is shown in Fig. 1.

Patients are classified as white, black, or other (American Indian/British Indian, Asian/Pacific Islander). Histologic classification is grade I (well-differentiated), grade II (moderately differentiated), grade III (poorly differentiated), and grade IV (undifferentiated). To ensure the consistency of data, TNM staging was unified as (Derived AJCC 6th ed) TNM staging. Surgical procedures included intraoperative thyroid lobectomy, subtotal thyroidectomy, total thyroidectomy, and near total thyroidectomy.

#### 2.2. Nomogram construction and validation

Patients from the SEER database from 2004 to 2015 were randomly assigned to the training and validation cohorts in a 7:3 ratio, while patients from 2016 to 2018 were included in a time-based external validation cohort. We used univariate and multifactorial Cox regression models to identify independent risk factors affecting CSS in patients with FTC. Column plots predicting CSS in middle-aged FTC patients were constructed based on the screened independent risk factors. We used a validation cohort from 2004 to 2015 for cross-validation and a time-based external validation cohort from 2016 to 2018 to test the accuracy and reliability of the nomogram. The accuracy of the model was tested using calibration curves, and the discriminatory power of the model was tested using C-index and AUC.

## 2.3. Clinical application

We used the decision curve analysis (DCA) algorithm to calculate the benefits of the model. At the same time, we compared the constructed nomogram with the conventional TNM staging to test the clinical utility value of the nomogram. Next, we calculate the risk value of each patient based on the constructed nomogram and select the optimal cut-off value by subject operating characteristic curve (ROC). Patients were divided into high-risk and low-risk groups based on the cutoff values. Finally, the Log-rank test and Kaplan-Meier (K-M) curves were used to compare the survival differences between patients in the low-risk and high-risk groups.

# 2.4. Statistical analysis

In the statistical analysis, for categorical data, we used frequency to represent. When comparisons between groups were needed, we



Fig. 1. Flow chart for inclusion and exclusion of all patients with PTC screening.

used the chi-square test. For continuous data, after passing the normal distribution test, we describe them by means and standard deviations. When making comparisons between groups, we used the nonparametric *U* test or the chi-square test. To explore the factors affecting patient survival, Cox regression models were used. Differences in survival between groups were assessed by means of the Logrank test. We used R software, version 4.1.0, and SPSS software, version 26.0, to perform these statistical analyses. A P value of less than 0.05 was considered to indicate statistical significance.

# 3. Results

# 3.1. Clinical features

A total of 2470 patients with FTC were included in this study. Of these, patients from 2004 to 2015 were randomly assigned to the training (N = 1437) and validation (N = 598) groups in a 7:3 ratio, and patients from 2016 to 2018 were included in the external validation group (N = 435) as temporal external validation. The mean age of the patients included in this study was ( $52.6 \pm 7.26$ ) years. Of these, 1575 cases (77.4 %) were Caucasian. In the gender classification, there were fewer males, 664 cases (32.6 %). Among the marital status, married accounted for the majority, with 1321 cases (64.9 %). There were 375 (18.4 %) patients with grade I, 93 (4.57 %) patients with grade II, 62 (3.05 %) patients with grade III, and 9 (0.44 %) patients with grade IV. There were 508 (25.0 %) patients in T1, 777 (38.2 %) patients in T2, 681 (33.5 %) patients in T3, and 69 (3.39 %) patients in T4. 1960 (96.3 %) patients had

# Table 1 Clinicopathological characteristics of middle-age patients with FTC.

| $\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline N &= 2035 & N &= 1437 & N &= 598 & p \\ \hline Age & S2.6 (7.26) & S2.6 (7.28) & S2.6 (7.23) & 0.797 \\ \hline Race & & 0.122 \\ \hline white & 1575 (77.4 \%) & 1097 (76.3 \%) & 478 (79.9 \%) \\ \hline black & 268 (13.2 \%) & 203 (14.1 \%) & 65 (10.9 \%) \\ \hline other & 192 (9.43 \%) & 137 (9.53 \%) & 55 (9.20 \%) \\ \hline Sex & & & 0.508 \\ \hline Male & 664 (32.6 \%) & 462 (32.2 \%) & 202 (33.8 \%) \\ \hline Fenale & 1371 (67.4 \%) & 975 (67.8 \%) & 396 (66.2 \%) \\ \hline Marited & 1321 (64.9 \%) & 945 (65.8 \%) & 376 (62.9 \%) \\ \hline Marited & 1321 (64.9 \%) & 945 (65.8 \%) & 376 (62.9 \%) \\ \hline Year of diagnosis & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & $   |
|---|
| Age52.6 (7.26)52.6 (7.28)52.6 (7.23)0.79Race0.125white1575 (77.4 %)1097 (76.3 %)478 (79.9 %)black268 (13.2 %)203 (14.1 %)65 (10.9 %)other192 (9.43 %)137 (9.53 %)55 (9.20 %)Sex0.500Male664 (32.6 %)462 (32.2 %)202 (33.8 %)Female1371 (67.4 %)975 (67.8 %)396 (66.2 %)Marital0.2330.795No714 (35.1 %)492 (34.2 %)222 (37.1 %)Marited0.233No714 (35.1 %)945 (65.8 %)376 (62.9 %)Year of diagnosis0.9672004-2009990 (48.6 %)700 (48.7 %)290 (48.5 %)2010-20151045 (51.4 %)737 (51.3 %)308 (51.5 %)Grade0.333I375 (18.4 %)255 (17.7 %)120 (20.1 %)II93 (4.57 %)71 (4.94 %)22 (3.68 %)III93 (4.57 %)71 (4.94 %)22 (3.68 %)IV9 (0.44 %)5 (0.35 %)4 (0.67 %)Unknown1496 (73.5 %)1059 (73.7 %)437 (73.1 %)TT777 (38.2 %)547 (38.1 %)230 (38.5 %)T3681 (33.5 %)48 (33.6 %)198 (33.1 %)T469 (3.39 %)47 (3.27 %)22 (3.68 %)NN100 (0.06 0 %)100 (0.06 0 %)100 (0.07 %)  |
| Race       0.124         white       1575 (77.4 %)       1097 (76.3 %)       478 (79.9 %)       0.124         black       268 (13.2 %)       203 (14.1 %)       65 (10.9 %)       0.50         other       192 (9.43 %)       137 (9.53 %)       55 (9.20 %)       0.50         Sex        0.62 (32.2 %)       202 (33.8 %)       0.50         Male       664 (32.6 %)       975 (67.8 %)       396 (66.2 %)       0.23         Marital        0.714 (35.1 %)       492 (34.2 %)       222 (37.1 %)       0.23         Married       1321 (64.9 %)       945 (65.8 %)       376 (62.9 %)       0.96         2004-2009       990 (48.6 %)       700 (48.7 %)       290 (48.5 %)       0.96         2010-2015       1045 (51.4 %)       755 (17.7 %)       120 (20.1 %)       0.33         Grade         0.33       0.308 (51.5 %)       0.33         I       375 (18.4 %)       255 (17.7 %)       120 (20.1 %)       0.40       0.40       0.40       0.40       0.40       0.40       0.40       0.33       0.33       0.33       0.34       0.35       0.34       0.35       0.34       0.33       0.34       0.35       0.34       0.33                      |
| white1575 (77.4 %)1097 (76.3 %)478 (79.9 %)black268 (13.2 %)203 (14.1 %)65 (10.9 %)other192 (9.43 %)137 (9.53 %)55 (9.2 %)Sex   |
| black<br>other268 (13.2 %)203 (14.1 %)65 (10.9 %)other192 (9.43 %)137 (9.53 %)55 (9.20 %)Sex  |
| other192 (9.43 %)137 (9.53 %)55 (9.20 %)Sex   |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |
| Male $664 (32.6 \%)$ $462 (32.2 \%)$ $202 (33.8 \%)$ Female $1371 (67.4 \%)$ $975 (67.8 \%)$ $396 (66.2 \%)$ Marital  |
| Female         1371 (67.4 %)         975 (67.8 %)         396 (66.2 %)           Marital  |
| Marital0.233No714 (35.1 %)492 (34.2 %)222 (37.1 %)Married1321 (64.9 %)945 (65.8 %)376 (62.9 %)Year of diagnosis0.00 (48.7 %)290 (48.5 %)0.00 (48.7 %)2004-2009900 (48.6 %)700 (48.7 %)290 (48.5 %)2010-20151045 (51.4 %)770 (51.3 %)290 (48.5 %)Grade $0.333$ $0.355 (15.7 \%)$ 120 (20.1 %)I93 (45.7 %)71 (4.94 %)22 (3.68 %)III93 (45.7 %)71 (4.94 %)22 (3.68 %)IV9 (0.44 %)5 (0.35 %)4 (0.67 %)VN9 (0.44 %)5 (0.35 %)4 (0.67 %)TT $0.96 (25.1 \%)$ 148 (24.7 %)T508 (25.0 %)360 (25.1 %)148 (24.7 %)T3681 (33.5 %)483 (33.6 %)198 (33.1 %)T469 (3.99 %)47 (3.27 %)22 (3.68 %)N $0.016 (0.01 \%)$ $0.016 (0.01 \%)$ $0.016 (0.01 \%)$   |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |
| Married         1321 (64.9 %)         945 (65.8 %)         376 (62.9 %)           Year of diagnosis         0.900         9.900 (48.6 %)         700 (48.7 %)         290 (48.5 %)           2004-2009         9.900 (48.6 %)         700 (48.7 %)         290 (48.5 %)         200           2010-2015         1.900 (48.6 %)         700 (48.7 %)         290 (48.5 %)         200           Grade         700 (48.7 %)         290 (48.5 %)         0.333           I         375 (18.4 %)         255 (17.7 %)         120 (20.1 %)           II         93 (4.57 %)         71 (4.94 %)         22 (3.68 %)           III         62 (3.05 %)         47 (3.27 %)         15 (2.51 %)           IV         9 (0.44 %)         5 (0.35 %)         4 (0.67 %)           Unknown         1496 (73.5 %)         1059 (73.7 %)         437 (73.1 %)           T         777 (38.2 %)         560 (25.1 %)         436 (24.7 %)           T2         777 (38.2 %)         547 (38.1 %)         230 (38.5 %)           T3         681 (33.5 %)         483 (33.6 %)         198 (33.1 %)           T4         69 (3.39 %)         47 (32.7 %)         22 (3.68 %) |
| Year of diagnosis       0.967         2004-2009       990 (48.6 %)       700 (48.7 %)       290 (48.5 %)         2010-2015       1045 (51.4 %)       737 (51.3 %)       308 (51.5 %)         Grade       0.333         I       375 (18.4 %)       255 (17.7 %)       120 (20.1 %)         III       93 (4.57 %)       71 (4.94 %)       22 (3.68 %)         IV       9 (0.44 %)       5 (0.35 %)       4 (0.67 %)         Unknown       1496 (73.5 %)       1059 (73.7 %)       437 (73.1 %)         T  |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$  |
| 2010-2015       1045 (51.4 %)       737 (51.3 %)       308 (51.5 %)         Grade       0.333         I       375 (18.4 %)       255 (17.7 %)       120 (20.1 %)         II       93 (4.57 %)       71 (4.94 %)       22 (3.68 %)         III       62 (3.05 %)       47 (3.27 %)       15 (2.51 %)         IV       9 (0.44 %)       5 (0.35 %)       4 (0.67 %)         Unknown       196 (73.5 %)       509 (73.7 %)       430 (73.1 %)         T       777 (38.2 %)       360 (25.1 %)       148 (24.7 %)         T2       777 (38.2 %)       547 (38.1 %)       230 (38.5 %)         T3       681 (33.5 %)       483 (33.6 %)       198 (33.1 %)         T4       69 (3.39 %)       47 (3.27 %)       22 (3.68 %)  |
| Grade       0.33         I       375 (18.4 %)       255 (17.7 %)       120 (20.1 %)         II       93 (4.57 %)       71 (4.94 %)       22 (3.68 %)         III       62 (3.05 %)       47 (3.27 %)       15 (2.51 %)         IV       9 (0.44 %)       5 (0.35 %)       4 (0.67 %)         Unknown       1496 (73.5 %)       1059 (73.7 %)       437 (73.1 %)         T       777 (38.2 %)       360 (25.1 %)       148 (24.7 %)         T2       777 (38.2 %)       547 (38.1 %)       230 (38.5 %)         T3       681 (33.5 %)       483 (33.6 %)       198 (33.1 %)         T4       69 (3.39 %)       47 (3.27 %)       22 (3.68 %)   |
| I       375 (18.4 %)       255 (17.7 %)       120 (20.1 %)         II       93 (4.57 %)       71 (4.94 %)       22 (3.68 %)         III       62 (3.05 %)       47 (3.27 %)       15 (2.51 %)         IV       9 (0.44 %)       5 (0.35 %)       4 (0.67 %)         Unknown       1096 (73.5 %)       1059 (73.7 %)       437 (73.1 %)         T       508 (25.0 %)       360 (25.1 %)       148 (24.7 %)         T2       777 (38.2 %)       547 (38.1 %)       230 (38.5 %)         T3       681 (33.5 %)       483 (33.6 %)       198 (33.1 %)         T4       69 (3.39 %)       47 (32.7 %)       22 (3.68 %)  |
| II       93 (4.57 %)       71 (4.94 %)       22 (3.68 %)         III       62 (3.05 %)       47 (3.27 %)       15 (2.51 %)         IV       9 (0.44 %)       5 (0.35 %)       4 (0.67 %)         Unknown       1496 (73.5 %)       1059 (73.7 %)       437 (73.1 %)         T       0.965         T1       508 (25.0 %)       360 (25.1 %)       148 (24.7 %)         T2       777 (38.2 %)       547 (38.1 %)       230 (38.5 %)         T3       681 (33.5 %)       483 (33.6 %)       198 (33.1 %)         T4       69 (3.39 %)       47 (32.7 %)       22 (3.68 %)  |
| III       62 (3.05 %)       47 (3.27 %)       15 (2.51 %)         IV       9 (0.44 %)       5 (0.35 %)       4 (0.67 %)         Unknown       1496 (73.5 %)       1059 (73.7 %)       437 (73.1 %)         T       0.965         T1       508 (25.0 %)       360 (25.1 %)       148 (24.7 %)         T2       777 (38.2 %)       547 (38.1 %)       230 (38.5 %)         T3       681 (33.5 %)       483 (33.6 %)       198 (33.1 %)         T4       69 (3.39 %)       47 (32.7 %)       22 (3.68 %)   |
| IV         9 (0.44 %)         5 (0.35 %)         4 (0.67 %)           Unknown         1496 (73.5 %)         1059 (73.7 %)         437 (73.1 %)           T         0.965           T1         508 (25.0 %)         360 (25.1 %)         148 (24.7 %)           T2         777 (38.2 %)         547 (38.1 %)         230 (38.5 %)           T3         681 (33.5 %)         483 (33.6 %)         198 (33.1 %)           T4         69 (3.39 %)         47 (3.27 %)         22 (3.68 %)   |
| Unknown         1496 (73.5 %)         1059 (73.7 %)         437 (73.1 %)           T         0.965           T1         508 (25.0 %)         360 (25.1 %)         148 (24.7 %)           T2         777 (38.2 %)         547 (38.1 %)         230 (38.5 %)           T3         681 (33.5 %)         483 (33.6 %)         198 (33.1 %)           T4         69 (3.39 %)         47 (3.27 %)         22 (3.68 %)   |
| T       0.965         T1       508 (25.0 %)       360 (25.1 %)       148 (24.7 %)         T2       777 (38.2 %)       547 (38.1 %)       230 (38.5 %)         T3       681 (33.5 %)       483 (33.6 %)       198 (33.1 %)         T4       69 (3.39 %)       47 (3.27 %)       22 (3.68 %)         N       0.018  |
| T1     508 (25.0 %)     360 (25.1 %)     148 (24.7 %)       T2     777 (38.2 %)     547 (38.1 %)     230 (38.5 %)       T3     681 (33.5 %)     483 (33.6 %)     198 (33.1 %)       T4     69 (3.39 %)     47 (3.27 %)     22 (3.68 %)  |
| T2     777 (38.2 %)     547 (38.1 %)     230 (38.5 %)       T3     681 (33.5 %)     483 (33.6 %)     198 (33.1 %)       T4     69 (3.39 %)     47 (3.27 %)     22 (3.68 %)       N     0.018  |
| T3     681 (33.5 %)     483 (33.6 %)     198 (33.1 %)       T4     69 (3.39 %)     47 (3.27 %)     22 (3.68 %)       N     0.018  |
| T4         69 (3.39 %)         47 (3.27 %)         22 (3.68 %)           N         0.018  |
| N 0.018   |
|   |
| NU 1960 (96.3 %) 1395 (97.1 %) 565 (94.5 %)   |
| N1a 42 (2.06 %) 23 (1.60 %) 19 (3.18 %)   |
| N1b 33 (1.62 %) 19 (1.32 %) 14 (2.34 %)   |
| M 0.746   |
| M0 1954 (96.0 %) 1378 (95.9 %) 576 (96.3 %)   |
| M1 81 (3.98 %) 59 (4.11 %) 22 (3.68 %)  |
| Tumor size 35.9 (24.8) 35.9 (23.0) 35.8 (28.8) 0.965  |
| Surgery 0.290   |
| No 28 (1.38 %) 20 (1.39 %) 8 (1.34 %)   |
| Lobectomy 392 (19.3 %) 262 (18.2 %) 130 (21.7 %)  |
| Subtotal or near total thyroidectomy 99 (4.86 %) 68 (4.73 %) 31 (5.18 %)  |
| Total thyroidectomy 1516 (74.5 %) 1087 (75.6 %) 429 (71.7 %)  |
| Chemotherapy 1.000  |
| No/Unknown 2019 (99.2 %) 1425 (99.2 %) 594 (99.3 %)   |
| Yes 16 (0.79 %) 12 (0.84 %) 4 (0.67 %)  |
| Radiation 0.84  |
| No/Unknown 791 (38.9 %) 561 (39.0 %) 230 (38.5 %)   |
| Yes 1244 (61.1 %) 876 (61.0 %) 368 (61.5 %)   |
| Survival months 96.2 (44.9) 96.0 (45.3) 96.7 (43.8) 0.744   |

stage N0 and 1954 (96.0 %) patients had stage M0. 392 (19.3 %) patients received lobectomy, 99 (4.86 %) received subtotal or neartotal thyroidectomy, and 1516 (74.5 %) received total thyroidectomy. Sixteen (0.79 %) patients received chemotherapy, and 1244 (61.1 %) received radiotherapy. There was no significant difference in patients in the training and validation cohorts(Table 1).

#### 3.2. Univariate and multivariate cox regression analysis

In the training set, initial evaluation using univariate Cox regression indicated that several variables -age, race, marital status, Grade grade, tumor size, TNM stage, and treatment including radiation and chemotherapy -were significantly associated with patient survival outcomes. Subsequently, we performed a multivariate Cox regression analysis incorporating factors that showed prognostic significance in the early univariate assessment. This refined analysis identified marital status, Grade grade, and TNM stage as independent predictors of survival. The combined results of univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses are presented in Table 2.

#### 3.3. Nomogram construction

Then, a new nomogram was constructed for predicting CSS in middle-aged FTC patients based on multifactorial Cox regression analysis with selected independent risk factors (Fig. 2). TNM stage was the most important factor affecting patient survival. Secondly, the histological grade of the tumor was also considered as an important prognostic factor in our analysis. Finally, our nomogram showed that marital status also had some impact on patient survival.

#### Table 2

Univariate and multivariate analyses of CSS in training set.

|                                      | Univariate |              |         | Multivariate |               |         |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------------|---------|
|                                      | HR         | 95%CI        | Р       | HR           | 95%CI         | Р       |
| Age                                  | 1.06       | 1.02–1.1     | 0.004   |              |               |         |
| Race                                 |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| white                                |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| black                                | 1.95       | 1.01-3.74    | 0.046   |              |               |         |
| other                                | 1.96       | 0.91-4.22    | 0.085   |              |               |         |
| Sex                                  |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| Male                                 | 0.6        | 0.25 1.01    | 0.055   |              |               |         |
| Feiliale                             | 0.6        | 0.35-1.01    | 0.055   |              |               |         |
| No                                   |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| Married                              | 0.38       | 0.23-0.65    | <0.001  | 0.436        | 0 247_0 772   | 0.004   |
| Vear of diagnosis                    | 0.50       | 0.23-0.05    | <0.001  | 0.430        | 0.247-0.772   | 0.004   |
| 2004-2009                            |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| 2010–2015                            | 0.81       | 0.45-1.46    | 0.478   |              |               |         |
| Grade                                |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| Ι                                    |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| II                                   | 1.78       | 0.33-9.69    | 0.507   | 0.716        | 0.124-4.138   | 0.709   |
| III                                  | 15.67      | 4.91-49.99   | < 0.001 | 3.725        | 1.09-12.729   | 0.036   |
| IV                                   | 139.68     | 34.64-563.24 | < 0.001 | 23.987       | 4.502-127.791 | < 0.001 |
| Unknown                              | 2.06       | 0.73-5.8     | 0.169   | 1.401        | 0.49-4.007    | 0.529   |
| Т                                    |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| T1                                   |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| T2                                   | 2.91       | 0.63-13.46   | 0.172   | 2.969        | 0.641-13.755  | 0.164   |
| T3                                   | 10.75      | 2.56-45.19   | 0.001   | 8.747        | 2.07-36.968   | 0.003   |
| T4                                   | 90.31      | 20.94–389.38 | < 0.001 | 18.063       | 3.878-84.13   | < 0.001 |
| N                                    |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| NO                                   | 11.00      | 101 06 60    | 0.001   | 6.064        | 0.000 15 504  | 0.001   |
| NIA                                  | 11.33      | 4.81-26.69   | <0.001  | 6.064        | 2.339–15.724  | < 0.001 |
| NID                                  | 13.39      | 5.7-31.44    | <0.001  | 0.732        | 0.26-2.057    | 0.554   |
| MO                                   |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| M0<br>M1                             | 25 57      | 14 00 43 63  | <0.001  | 12 423       | 6 437 33 074  | <0.001  |
| Tumor size                           | 1.01       | 1 01_1 02    | < 0.001 | 12.425       | 0.437-23.974  | <0.001  |
| Surgery                              | 1.01       | 1.01-1.02    | <0.001  |              |               |         |
| No                                   |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| Lobectomy                            | 0.22       | 0.02-1.97    | 0.176   |              |               |         |
| Subtotal or near total thyroidectomy | 0.4        | 0.04-4.4     | 0.452   |              |               |         |
| Total thyroidectomy                  | 0.67       | 0.09-4.86    | 0.692   |              |               |         |
| Chemotherapy                         |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| No/Unknown                           |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| Yes                                  | 18.48      | 6.59-51.76   | < 0.001 |              |               |         |
| Radiation                            |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| No/Unknown                           |            |              |         |              |               |         |
| Yes                                  | 2.36       | 1.25-4.47    | 0.008   |              |               |         |

#### 3.4. Validation

We used the C-index to test the discrimination of the prediction model in the training cohort and validated it in the validation cohort. The results showed that the C-index was 0.866 (95 % CI: 0.805–0.927) and 0.944 (95 % CI: 0.903–0.985) for the training cohort and the validation cohort, respectively. Meanwhile, the C-index of the external validation cohort was 0.999 (95 % CI:0.997–1.001), indicating the good predictive ability of the model by the time-based external validation cohort. The calibration curves in the training and validation cohorts show that the observed and predicted values of our constructed prediction model are consistent (Fig. 3). In the training cohort, the 3-, 5-, and 10-year AUCs of the nomogram are 85.4, 86.0, and 87.6. In the validation cohort, they are 97.2, 95.8, and 94.9, respectively; this indicates that the prediction model we constructed has good identification ability (Fig. 4).

#### 3.5. Clinical application

Moving forward, we conducted a Decision Curve Analysis (DCA) across both the training and validation cohorts, which confirmed the robust clinical applicability of our developed nomogram. The predictive accuracy of this nomogram was notably higher compared to the standard TNM staging system (Fig. 5). Furthermore, individual patient risk scores were determined utilizing the nomogram, and the most effective cut-off point was identified through Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) analysis. Utilizing this threshold, the patient population was categorized into high-risk (scores  $\geq$ 89.2) and low-risk (scores <89.2) categories. Kaplan-Meier (K-M) survival analysis for the stratified middle-aged FTC patients revealed that those in the low-risk category exhibited markedly improved survival rates when contrasted with the high-risk group (Fig. 6). The 3-, 5-, and 10-year survival rates of FTC patients in the low-risk group were 99.6 %, 99.4 %, and 99.4 %, respectively. In contrast, the 3-, 5-, and 10-year survival rates for FTC patients in the high-risk group were significantly lower, at 96.7 %, 95.4 %, and 90.5 %, respectively. Finally, in the comparison of surgical modalities, we found that most patients underwent lobectomy and total thyroidectomy, and patients had the highest survival rate after lobectomy (Fig. 7).

#### 4. Discussion

TC is one of the most common endocrine tumours [1] and one of the top ten common malignant tumours in the United States [23]. In 2020, the incidence of TC ranked ninth in the world [2]. Although most TC patients have a good prognosis, some FTC patients have a poor prognosis due to distant metastasis, and the results are heterogeneous [16]. The overall incidence ratio for TC in women/men was approximately 3:1. One plausible explanation is that women are screened for TC earlier and more widely than men. In FTC, the incidence ratio of females to males is 2:1, and the prognosis of male TC patients is generally worse than that of females. Therefore, understanding the changes in the incidence of FTC based on demographic and tumour characteristics can provide information for future analysis and intervention strategies [24].



Fig. 2. Nomogram predicting CSS in middle-aged patients with FTC.



Fig. 3. The calibration curves of the Nomogram constructed in this study were in the training cohort (A) and the validation cohort (B).



Fig. 4. AUC curves predicting CSS in middle-aged FTC patients in the training cohort (A) and validation cohort (B).

Whether sex can be used as an independent risk factor to predict the prognosis of TC has been controversial. Existing data are from single-centre retrospective or population-based studies, without specific analysis of the role of sex in TC [22]. According to histological classification, Studies have shown that sex hormones regulate growth and modulate the function of the thyroid gland [25]. This difference also exists in cancer and adjacent tissues of TC patients [26]. This may be related to the fact that estrogen can promote TSH release from the pituitary, while TSH can inhibit the development of TC. Studies on TC tumour tissues also found that TC tissues contain many estrogen receptors, but there is still a lack of precise mechanisms [27].

Whether marital status is one of the important factors influencing tumor survival is controversial. Merrill RM et al. conducted a large sample population survival analysis after collecting data on 779,978 men and 1,032,868 women diagnosed with one of the 13 cancers between 2000 and 2008. It was found that for less fatal cancers, such as thyroid cancer, married status significantly prolonged the survival time of patients with these cancers [28]. The results of an Italian study, however, showed no substantial association between marital status and cancer risk [29]. In a study related to thyroid cancer, Shi RL et al. evaluated the impact of marriage on survival outcomes in patients with DTC through a retrospective analysis, and they found that being unmarried and especially widowed increased the risk of cancer death in patients with DTC [30]. Not coincidentally, Tang J et al. also found that unmarried and widowed patients tended to predict a poor prognosis compared to married middle-aged PTC patients [31]. The underlying rationale for this phenomenon may be that married people have better mood and receive more social support, including practical support and financial resources, so that they can focus on therapy [30]. Studies have shown that married status can even enable patients to obtain higher



Fig. 5. The DCA of Nomogram constructed in this study is in the training cohort (A) and the validation cohort (B).



Fig. 6. Kaplan-Meier curves for middle-aged FTC patients in the low-risk and high-risk groups in the training cohort (A) and the validation cohort (B).

benefits than chemotherapy [32]. In the present study, we found that married middle-aged FTC patients reflected a longer survival time and better prognosis, consistent with previous studies related to thyroid cancer. Exploring the underlying reasons, in terms of psychosocial, economic or treatment adherence, we found that married patients may have a better prognosis due to better social support and mental health status [33]. Unmarried or divorced patients may face more psychological stress and less social support, which may affect their adherence to treatment and, thus, overall health [34]. In addition, marital status may also be associated with patient's economic status, health insurance coverage, and access to health information, all of which may indirectly influence the prognosis of FTC as mediated by marital status [31].

Age is positively correlated with many types of cancer. Studies have shown that the OS of TC starts to decline steadily from age 40 [35]. A population study in Germany found that when comparing the all-cause mortality of well-differentiated TC patients with the general population, there was a moderate decline in survival in patients aged >45 years and a significant decrease in patients aged over 60 years [36]. Yang et al. conducted a population-based study that evaluated and predicted the probability of death due to TC and other causes in patients with TC and found a continuous positive correlation between age and TC survival [37]. Age was not an independent risk factor for CSS in FTC patients aged 40–65 years in this study. This may be related to FTC maintaining a lower mortality rate in this age group.

Our study also found that TNM staging remains the primary prognostic criterion for middle-aged FTC, although it is insufficient to cover all critical clinical factors. This study found that the prognosis of middle-aged FTC patients with tumours> 4 cm and minimal invasion (stage T3-4) was worse, while confined within the thyroid capsule and tumour < 4 cm suggested an excellent prognosis was



Fig. 7. Kaplan-Meier curves for different surgical approaches in middle-aged FTC patients: low-risk group (A); high-risk group (B).

consistent with relevant reports. It is worth noting that Aschebrook et al. analyzed the incidence of FTC in the United States from 1980 to 2009 and found that patients newly diagnosed with FTC had larger tumour volume accompanied by more regional lymph node metastasis [11]. That means the 4 cm threshold may need to be updated. We believe that traditional TNM staging in FTC patients may need to be updated by the latest trends. Onitilo et al. developed a new simplified and quantified TNM staging system (QTNM) after updating the TNM system. The comparison with the traditional TNM system revealed better discrimination of QTNM, which was maintained when such risk stratification was applied to external validation [38].

Surgery is the primary way to treat DTC. The critical factor in deciding whether or not to operate and the scope of the operation is the results of a fine needle aspiration biopsy (FNAB) combined with an intraoperative frozen section. However, whether to use I-131 for postoperative treatment and the specific dosage are the most significant controversies in diagnosing and treating TC. Although as a single therapeutic effect, I-131 can kill residual tumour tissue and effectively prevent tumour recurrence. However, from the overall perspective of adjuvant therapy, I-131 will also affect the normal thyroid tissue remaining after injury [13]. For high-risk TC, such as undifferentiated thyroid carcinoma (ATC) and medullary thyroid carcinoma (MTC), the benefits of adjuvant therapy with I-131 have been demonstrated in patients with TC [39]. However, in the low-risk group of patients represented by PTC and FTC, I-131 adjuvant therapy did not benefit patients. In a systematic review of multivariable correction analysis of low-risk TC patients, Lamartina et al. did not find that I-131 use significantly impacted patients' CSS [40]. I-131 has been infrequently used in low-risk FTC in recent years because of its effects on pregnancy, young children in the family, and potential risk of secondary malignancies [41]. In contrast, thermal ablation (TA), including radiofrequency ablation (RFA), laser thermal ablation (LTA), microwave ablation (MWA), and high-intensity frequency ultrasound (HIFU), involves the delivery of energy to target lesions and destruction of their constituent cells. This treatment does not cause hypothyroidism and does not cause significant maternal and child toxic side effects. It has gradually become the mainstream trend of non-surgical treatment [42]. The latest joint statement of thyroid associations and Societies of Nuclear Medicine in the United States and Europe believes that there is probably no "right" treatment for DTC, and individual assessment and treatment are needed for the specific situation of each patient [13]. Our study can provide a basis for evaluating CSS in middle-aged FTC patients.

The application of the nomogram constructed in this study in clinical practice is mainly to help doctors and patients predict treatment outcome and disease progression based on specific clinical parameters. In the treatment of midlife FTC, first, physicians can use nomograms to assess the expected effects of different treatment options, such as surgery, radioiodine therapy, or targeted therapy. Second, the nomogram can also help to develop a personalized follow-up strategy to adjust the frequency of follow-up and examination items according to the patient's prognostic risk. Avoid situations that result in delay or overtreatment. In addition, the nomogram can be used as a communication tool in patient counseling to help patients understand their disease status and treatment options so that they can better participate in the decision-making process and improve patient adherence to treatment according to their specific situation.

In recent years, molecular markers also play an essential role in predicting the prognosis of FTC patients. Studies have found that there are a variety of gene mutations and rearrangements in FTC, and these molecular events are closely related to the pathogenesis, clinical manifestations, and prognosis of tumours. PAX8-PPAR $\gamma$  rearrangement is the most common in FTC, with an incidence between 30 and 35 %, and has also been reported in benign adenomas of FTC. This rearrangement results in the fusion of the paired domain transcription factor of the PAX8 gene with the PPAR $\gamma$  gene, producing a fusion protein whose overexpression has been implicated in the occurrence of FTC [43]. In addition, RAS gene family mutations are also relatively common in FTC, especially in follicular adenoma and follicular carcinoma; the incidence of RAS mutations is about 20 %. These mutations usually affect the GTPase activity of the RAS

gene, leading to the continuous activation of the RAS protein, which in turn promotes the proliferation and survival of FTC tumor cells through MAPK and PI3K/AKT signaling pathways [44]. At the same time, other gene changes have been found in FTC, such as PIK3CA gene mutation and amplification, which activate the PI3K/AKT signaling pathway and have an important impact on the development and prognosis of FTC [45]. In addition,  $\beta$ -catenin mutations are also common in FTC. These mutations usually occur in exon 3 of the CTNNB1 gene, leading to abnormal nuclear expression of  $\beta$ -catenin, which is associated with tumor aggressiveness and poor prognosis [46]. By studying these molecular markers, physicians may be able to assess patients' prognostic risk more accurately and provide patients with more personalized treatment recommendations. Through the study of these molecular markers, more accurate diagnostic tools and therapeutic targets may be developed in the future.

However, there are some deficiencies in this study. First of all, middle-aged patients with FTC were included in the SEER database for analysis. Considering that the clinical information in the SEER database is all previous information, this study is a retrospective study, and selection bias may be unavoidable. Secondly, the SEER database did not include some clinical variables, such as smoking, alcohol consumption, BMI and other factors that might affect the CSS of middle-aged FTC patients, and also lacked follow-up information. This missing information may have influenced the results. Third, the SEER database includes patients from the United States. Therefore, after considering the influence of different factors such as race and region, the reference value of the conclusions of this study for clinicians in Europe, Africa, Oceania, and Asia may be limited. But we included vital elements such as age, surgery, radiation and chemotherapy, so the results were not significantly different. Finally, although we separately screened patients updated from 2016 to 2018 for external validation in terms of time, the results were more convincing. However, external validation of the nomogram in different populations does need to be considered when conducting prognostic studies in middle-aged FTC patients. Although external time-based validation was performed with data from the SEER database, other cohorts are warranted because thyroid cancer incidence, treatment, race and ethnicity, and patient survival may vary substantially across regions and health systems. Future studies should focus on validating the generalizations of the nomogram in a diverse patient population to provide more accurate prognostic assessment and personalized treatment recommendations for thyroid cancer patients worldwide.

#### 5. Conclusion

In summary, in this study we discovered that marital standing, tumor grade, and TNM staging are predictors of CSS in middle-aged patients with FTC. We have formulated a novel predictive tool, a nomogram, specifically designed for this patient demographic. This prediction model underwent internal validation and external validation based on time, demonstrating commendable precision and dependability. It serves to assist middle-aged individuals with FTC in selecting the most appropriate clinical treatment strategy and offers valuable insights and substantiation for medical professionals in their diagnostic and therapeutic processes.

#### Funding

This study was supported by Yunnan Education Department of Science Research Fund (No. 2023 J0295), Department of Science and Technology of Yunnan Province Kunming Medicine Joint Special Program (No. 202301AY070001-108), Kunming City Health Science and Technology Talent "1000" training Project (No. 2020-SW (Reserve)-112), Open Research Fund of Clinical Research Center for Children's Health and Diseases of Yunnan Province (No. 2022-ETYY-YJ-03), and Kunming Medical Joint Project of Yunnan Science and Technology Department (No. 202001AY070001-271). The funding bodies played no role in the study's design and collection, analysis and interpretation of data, and writing the manuscript.

#### Ethics approval and consent to participate

The data of this study is obtained from the SEER database. The patients' data is public and anonymous, so this study does not require ethical approval and informed consent.

#### Methods

The methods used in this study comply with the regulations and guidelines of the SEER database.

# **Consent for publication**

None.

## Data availability statement

The SEER data analyzed in this study is available at https://seer.Cancer.gov/.

# CRediT authorship contribution statement

**Chenghao Zhanghuang:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Resources, Project administration, Methodology, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Jinkui Wang:** Writing – original draft, Formal

analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Fengming Ji:** Methodology, Investigation, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Zhigang Yao:** Data curation, Conceptualization. **Jing Ma:** Project administration, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation. **Yu Hang:** Methodology, Investigation, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Jinrong Li:** Validation, Supervision, Formal analysis. **Zipeng Hao:** Validation, Methodology. **Yongqi Zhou:** Validation, Data curation, Conceptualization. **Bing Yan:** Writing – review & editing, Investigation, Funding acquisition, Formal analysis, Data curation, Conceptualization.

#### 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.

#### Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

## References

- H. Lim, S.S. Devesa, J.A. Sosa, D. Check, C.M. Kitahara, Trends in thyroid cancer incidence and mortality in the United States, 1974-2013, JAMA 317 (13) (2017 Apr 4) 1338–1348, https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.2719. PMID: 28362912; PMCID: PMC8216772.
- [2] H. Sung, J. Ferlay, R.L. Siegel, M. Laversanne, I. Soerjomataram, A. Jemal, F. Bray, Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries, CA Cancer J Clin 71 (3) (2021 May) 209–249, https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21660. Epub 2021 Feb 4. PMID: 33538338.
- [3] J. Ferlay, M. Colombet, I. Soerjomataram, T. Dyba, G. Randi, M. Bettio, A. Gavin, O. Visser, F. Bray, Cancer incidence and mortality patterns in Europe: estimates for 40 countries and 25 major cancers in 2018, Eur. J. Cancer 103 (2018 Nov) 356–387, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2018.07.005. Epub 2018 Aug 9. PMID: 30100160.
- [4] T. Carling, R. Udelsman, Thyroid cancer. Annu Rev Med 65 (2014) 125–137, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-med-061512-105739. Epub 2013 Nov 20. PMID: 24274180.
- [5] M.E. Cabanillas, D.G. McFadden, C. Durante, Thyroid cancer. Lancet. 388 (10061) (2016 Dec 3) 2783–2795, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30172-6.
   Epub 2016 May 27. PMID: 27240885.
- [6] A. Prete, P. Borges de Souza, S. Censi, M. Muzza, N. Nucci, M. Sponziello, Update on fundamental mechanisms of thyroid cancer, Front. Endocrinol. 11 (2020 Mar 13) 102, https://doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2020.00102. PMID: 32231639; PMCID: PMC7082927.
- [7] R.H. Grogan, E.J. Mitmaker, O.H. Clark, The evolution of biomarkers in thyroid cancer-from mass screening to a personalized biosignature, Cancers 2 (2) (2010 May 20) 885–912, https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers2020885. PMID: 24281099; PMCID: PMC3835110.
- [8] J. Kim, J.E. Gosnell, S.A. Roman, Geographic influences in the global rise of thyroid cancer, Nat. Rev. Endocrinol. 16 (1) (2020 Jan) 17–29, https://doi.org/ 10.1038/s41574-019-0263-x. Epub 2019 Oct 15. PMID: 31616074.
- [9] E. Aliyev, M.J. Ladra-González, M. Sánchez-Ares, I. Abdulkader-Nallib, M. Piso-Neira, G. Rodríguez-Carnero, P. Vieiro-Balo, R. Pérez-Becerra, F. Gude-Sampedro, F. Barreiro-Morandeira, C.V. Alvarez, J.M. Cameselle-Teijeiro, Thyroid papillary microtumor: validation of the (updated) porto proposal assessing sex hormone receptor expression and mutational BRAF gene status, Am. J. Surg. Pathol. 44 (9) (2020 Sep) 1161–1172, https://doi.org/10.1097/PAS.00000000001522, PMID: 32804453.
- [10] C. Durante, N. Haddy, E. Baudin, S. Leboulleux, D. Hartl, J.P. Travagli, B. Caillou, M. Ricard, J.D. Lumbroso, F. De Vathaire, M. Schlumberger, Long-term outcome of 444 patients with distant metastases from papillary and follicular thyroid carcinoma: benefits and limits of radioiodine therapy, J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 91 (8) (2006 Aug) 2892–2899, https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2005-2838. Epub 2006 May 9. PMID: 16684830.
- B. Aschebrook-Kilfoy, R.H. Grogan, M.H. Ward, E. Kaplan, S.S. Devesa, Follicular thyroid cancer incidence patterns in the United States, 1980-2009, Thyroid 23 (8) (2013 Aug) 1015–1021, https://doi.org/10.1089/thy.2012.0356. Epub 2013 Jul 20. PMID: 23360496; PMCID: PMC3752506.
- [12] S. Haq, S. Ali, R. Mohammad, F.H. Sarkar, The complexities of epidemiology and prevention of gastrointestinal cancers, Int. J. Mol. Sci. 13 (10) (2012 Oct 1) 12556–12572, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms131012556. PMID: 23202913; PMCID: PMC3497287.
- [13] R.M. Tuttle, S. Ahuja, A.M. Avram, V.J. Bernet, P. Bourguet, G.H. Daniels, G. Dillehay, C. Draganescu, G. Flux, D. Führer, L. Giovanella, B. Greenspan, M. Luster, K. Muylle, J.W.A. Smit, D. Van Nostrand, F.A. Verburg, L. Hegedüs, Controversies, consensus, and collaboration in the use of 1311 therapy in differentiated thyroid cancer: a joint statement from the American thyroid association, the European association of nuclear medicine, the society of nuclear medicine and molecular imaging, and the European thyroid association, Thyroid 29 (4) (2019 Apr) 461–470, https://doi.org/10.1089/thy.2018.0597. PMID: 30900516.
- [14] H.S. Ahn, H.G. Welch, South Korea's thyroid-cancer "Epidemic"-Turning the tide, N. Engl. J. Med. 373 (24) (2015 Dec 10) 2389–2390, https://doi.org/ 10.1056/NEJMc1507622. PMID: 26650173.
- [15] L. Furuya-Kanamori, K.J.L. Bell, J. Clark, P. Glasziou, S.A.R. Doi, Prevalence of differentiated thyroid cancer in autopsy studies over six decades: a meta-analysis, J. Clin. Oncol. 34 (30) (2016 Oct 20) 3672–3679, https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2016.67.7419. PMID: 27601555.
- [16] M. Banerjee, D.G. Muenz, J.T. Chang, M. Papaleontiou, M.R. Haymart, Tree-based model for thyroid cancer prognostication, J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 99 (10) (2014 Oct) 3737–3745, https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2014-2197. Epub 2014 Jul 17. PMID: 25033070; PMCID: PMC4184064.
- [17] Y.H. Park, S.J. Lee, E.Y. Cho, Y. La Choi, J.E. Lee, S.J. Nam, J.H. Yang, J.H. Shin, E.Y. Ko, B.K. Han, J.S. Ahn, Y.H. Im, Clinical relevance of TNM staging system according to breast cancer subtypes, Ann. Oncol. 30 (12) (2019 Dec 1) 2011, https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdz223. Erratum for: Ann Oncol. 2011 Jul;22 (7):1554-1560. PMID: 31408085.
- [18] T. Fullmer, M.E. Cabanillas, M. Zafereo, Novel therapeutics in radioactive iodine-resistant thyroid cancer, Front. Endocrinol. 12 (2021 Jul 15) 720723, https:// doi.org/10.3389/fendo.2021.720723. PMID: 34335481; PMCID: PMC8321684.
- [19] S.L. Oyer, V.A. Smith, E.J. Lentsch, Sex is not an independent risk factor for survival in differentiated thyroid cancer, Laryngoscope 123 (11) (2013 Nov) 2913–2919, https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.24018. Epub 2013 Apr 5. PMID: 23564257.
- [20] A. Miranda-Filho, J. Lortet-Tieulent, F. Bray, B. Cao, S. Franceschi, S. Vaccarella, L. Dal Maso, Thyroid cancer incidence trends by histology in 25 countries: a population-based study, Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 9 (4) (2021 Apr) 225–234, https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(21)00027-9. Epub 2021 Mar 1. PMID: 33662333.
- [21] N. Casellas-Cabrera, Y. Díaz-Algorri, V.J. Carlo-Chévere, M. González-Pons, N. Rodríguez-Mañón, J. Pérez-Mayoral, C. Bertrán-Rodríguez, M. Soto-Salgado, F. M. Giardiello, S. Rodríguez-Quilichini, M. Cruz-Correa, Risk of thyroid cancer among Caribbean Hispanic patients with familial adenomatous polyposis, Fam. Cancer 15 (2) (2016 Apr) 267–274, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10689-015-9862-4. PMID: 26690363; PMCID: PMC4803522.
- [22] M. Miller, Y. Mojica-Perez, M. Livingston, E. Kuntsche, C.J.C. Wright, S. Kuntsche, The who and what of women's drinking: examining risky drinking and associated socio-demographic factors among women aged 40-65 years in Australia, Drug Alcohol Rev. 41 (4) (2022 May) 724–731, https://doi.org/10.1111/ dar.13428. Epub 2022 Jan 26. PMID: 35081266.

- [23] H.A. Mascohortt, S.L. Hampp, J.L. Goldberg, M. Mooney, L.K. Parreco, L. Minasian, M. Montello, G.E. Mishkin, C. Davis, J.S. Abrams, Meeting the challenge: the national cancer Institute's central institutional review board for multi-site research, J. Clin. Oncol. 36 (8) (2018 Mar 10) 819–824, https://doi.org/10.1200/ JCO.2017.76.9836. Epub 2018 Jan 31. PMID: 29384720; PMCID: PMC5844669.
- [24] B. Aschebrook-Kilfoy, M.H. Ward, M.M. Sabra, S.S. Devesa, Thyroid cancer incidence patterns in the United States by histologic type, 1992-2006, Thyroid 21 (2) (2011 Feb) 125–134, https://doi.org/10.1089/thy.2010.0021. Epub 2010 Dec 27. PMID: 21186939; PMCID: PMC3025182.
- [25] Q. Zeng, G.G. Chen, A.C. Vlantis, C.A. van Hasselt, Oestrogen mediates the growth of human thyroid carcinoma cells via an oestrogen receptor-ERK pathway, Cell Prolif. 40 (6) (2007 Dec) 921–935, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2184.2007.00471.x. PMID: 18021179; PMCID: PMC6495898.
- [26] M.L. Lee, G.G. Chen, A.C. Vlantis, G.M. Tse, B.C. Leung, C.A. van Hasselt, Induction of thyroid papillary carcinoma cell proliferation by estrogen is associated with an altered expression of Bcl-xL, Cancer J. 11 (2) (2005 Mar-Apr) 113–121, https://doi.org/10.1097/00130404-200503000-00006. PMID: 15969986.
- [27] K.S. Banu, P. Govindarajulu, M.M. Aruldhas, Testosterone and estradiol have specific differential modulatory effect on the proliferation of human thyroid papillary and follicular carcinoma cell lines independent of TSH action, Fall, Endocr. Pathol. 12 (3) (2001) 315–327, https://doi.org/10.1385/ep:12:3:315. PMID: 11740053.
- [28] R.M. Merrill, E. Johnson, Benefits of marriage on relative and conditional relative cancer survival differ between males and females in the USA, J Cancer Surviv 11 (5) (2017 Oct) 578–589, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11764-017-0627-y. Epub 2017 Aug 2. PMID: 28770444.
- [29] G. Randi, A. Altieri, S. Gallus, L. Chatenoud, M. Montella, S. Franceschi, E. Negri, R. Talamini, C. La Vecchia, Marital status and cancer risk in Italy, Prev. Med. 38 (5) (2004 May) 523–528, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2003.12.004. PMID: 15066354.
- [30] R.L. Shi, N. Qu, Z.W. Lu, T. Liao, Y. Gao, Q.H. Ji, The impact of marital status at diagnosis on cancer survival in patients with differentiated thyroid cancer, Cancer Med. 5 (8) (2016 Aug) 2145–2154, https://doi.org/10.1002/cam4.778. Epub 2016 Jun 5. PMID: 27264532; PMCID: PMC4898978.
- [31] J. Tang, C. Zhanghuang, Z. Yao, L. Li, Y. Xie, H. Tang, K. Zhang, C. Wu, Z. Yang, B. Yan, Development and validation of a nomogram to predict cancer-specific survival in middle-aged patients with papillary thyroid cancer: a SEER database study, Heliyon 9 (2) (2023 Feb 10) e13665, https://doi.org/10.1016/j. heliyon.2023.e13665. PMID: 36852028; PMCID: PMC9958280.
- [32] A.A. Aizer, M.H. Chen, E.P. McCarthy, M.L. Mendu, S. Koo, T.J. Wilhite, P.L. Graham, T.K. Choueiri, K.E. Hoffman, N.E. Martin, J.C. Hu, P.L. Nguyen, Marital status and survival in patients with cancer, J. Clin. Oncol. 31 (31) (2013 Nov 1) 3869–3876, https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2013.49.6489. Epub 2013 Sep 23. PMID: 24062405; PMCID: PMC4878087.
- [33] Y. Mao, Y. Huang, L. Xu, J. Liang, W. Lin, H. Huang, L. Li, J. Wen, G. Chen, Surgical methods and social factors are associated with long-term survival in follicular thyroid carcinoma: construction and validation of a prognostic model based on machine learning algorithms, Front. Oncol. 12 (2022 Jun 21) 816427, https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2022.816427. PMID: 35800057; PMCID: PMC9253987.
- [34] J. Wang, C. Zhanghuang, L. Jin, Z. Zhang, X. Tan, T. Mi, J. Liu, M. Li, X. Wu, X. Tian, D. He, Development and validation of a nomogram to predict cancerspecific survival in elderly patients with papillary thyroid carcinoma: a population-based study, BMC Geriatr. 22 (1) (2022 Sep 8) 736, https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12877-022-03430-8. PMID: 36076163; PMCID: PMC9454205.
- [35] A. Konturek, M. Barczyński, W. Nowak, P. Richter, Prognostic factors in differentiated thyroid cancer–a 20-year surgical outcome study, Langenbeck's Arch. Surg. 397 (5) (2012 Jun) 809–815, https://doi.org/10.1007/s00423-011-0899-z. Epub 2012 Feb 15. PMID: 22350610; PMC3349847.
- [36] L. Qi, W. Zhang, X. Ren, R. Xu, C. Liu, C. Tu, Z. Li, Incidence and predictors of synchronous bone metastasis in newly diagnosed differentiated thyroid cancer: a real-world population-based study, Front Surg 9 (2022 Jan 24) 778303, https://doi.org/10.3389/fsurg.2022.778303. PMID: 35141273; PMCID: PMC8819693.
- [37] F.A. Verburg, U. Mäder, K. Tanase, E.D. Thies, S. Diessl, A.K. Buck, M. Luster, C. Reiners, Life expectancy is reduced in differentiated thyroid cancer patients ≥ 45 years old with extensive local tumor invasion, lateral lymph node, or distant metastases at diagnosis and normal in all other DTC patients, J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 98 (1) (2013 Jan) 172–180, https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2012-2458. Epub 2012 Nov 12. PMID: 23150687.
- [38] L. Yang, W. Shen, N. Sakamoto, Population-based study evaluating and predicting the probability of death resulting from thyroid cancer and other causes among patients with thyroid cancer, J. Clin. Oncol. 31 (4) (2013 Feb 1) 468–474, https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2012.42.4457. Epub 2012 Dec 26. PMID: 23270002.
- [39] Y.D. Podnos, D.D. Smith, L.D. Wagman, J.D. Ellenhorn, Survival in patients with papillary thyroid cancer is not affected by the use of radioactive isotope, J. Surg. Oncol. 96 (1) (2007 Jul 1) 3–7, https://doi.org/10.1002/jso.20656. PMID: 17567872.
- [40] L. Lamartina, C. Durante, S. Filetti, D.S. Cooper, Low-risk differentiated thyroid cancer and radioiodine remnant ablation: a systematic review of the literature, J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 100 (5) (2015 May) 1748–1761, https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2014-3882. Epub 2015 Feb 13. PMID: 25679996.
- [41] M.N. Stan, M. Papaleontiou, J.J. Schmitz, M.R. Castro, Nonsurgical management of thyroid nodules: the role of ablative therapies, J. Clin. Endocrinol. Metab. 107 (5) (2022 Apr 19) 1417–1430, https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgab917. PMID: 34953163; PMCID: PMC9016471.
- [42] L. Yan, M. Zhang, Q. Song, Y. Luo, Ultrasound-guided radiofrequency ablation versus thyroid lobectomy for low-risk papillary thyroid microcarcinoma: a propensity-matched cohort study of 884 patients, Thyroid 31 (11) (2021 Nov) 1662–1672, https://doi.org/10.1089/thy.2021.0100. Epub 2021 Sep 17. PMID: 34269611.
- [43] I. Landa, M.E. Cabanillas, Genomic alterations in thyroid cancer: biological and clinical insights, Nat. Rev. Endocrinol. 20 (2) (2024 Feb) 93–110, https://doi. org/10.1038/s41574-023-00920-6. Epub 2023 Dec 4. PMID: 38049644.
- [44] G. García-Rostán, A.M. Costa, I. Pereira-Castro, G. Salvatore, R. Hernandez, M.J. Hermsem, A. Herrero, A. Fusco, J. Cameselle-Teijeiro, M. Santoro, Mutation of the PIK3CA gene in anaplastic thyroid cancer, Cancer Res. 65 (22) (2005 Nov 15) 10199–10207, https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-04-4259. PMID: 16288007.
- [45] H.F. Lai, J.F. Hang, P.C. Kuo, C.S. Kuo, S.F. Yao, J.Y. Chen, C.H. Lee, BRAF V600E mutation lacks association with poorer clinical prognosis in papillary thyroid carcinoma, Ann. Surg Oncol. 1 (2024 Feb), https://doi.org/10.1245/s10434-024-14935-4. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 38300401.
- [46] M. Xing, BRAF mutation in papillary thyroid cancer: pathogenic role, molecular bases, and clinical implications, Endocr. Rev. 28 (7) (2007 Dec) 742–762, https://doi.org/10.1210/er.2007-0007. Epub 2007 Oct 16. PMID: 17940185.