Check for updates

OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY Yuko Ishizaki, Kansai Medical University, Japan

REVIEWED BY

AnnaLynn Williams, University of Rochester Medical Center, United States Chi-kong Li, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

*CORRESPONDENCE Miwa Ozawa mochiwa@luke.ac.jp

SPECIALTY SECTION

This article was submitted to Children and Health, a section of the journal Frontiers in Pediatrics

RECEIVED 19 May 2022 ACCEPTED 09 September 2022 PUBLISHED 06 October 2022

CITATION

Yoshimoto-Suzuki Y, Hasegawa D, Hosoya Y, Saito G, Nagase K, Gunji M, Kobayashi K, Ishida Y, Manabe A and Ozawa M (2022) Significance of active screening for detection of health problems in childhood cancer survivors. *Front. Pediatr.* 10:947646. doi: 10.3389/fped.2022.947646

COPYRIGHT

© 2022 Yoshimoto-Suzuki, Hasegawa, Hosoya, Saito, Nagase, Gunji, Kobayashi, Ishida, Manabe and Ozawa. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

(CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

Significance of active screening for detection of health problems in childhood cancer survivors

Yuri Yoshimoto-Suzuki^{1,2}, Daisuke Hasegawa¹, Yosuke Hosoya¹, Go Saito¹, Kyoko Nagase³, Michiyo Gunji³, Kyoko Kobayashi⁴, Yasushi Ishida⁵, Atsushi Manabe⁶ and Miwa Ozawa^{1*}

¹Department of Pediatrics, St. Luke's International Hospital, Tokyo, Japan, ²Course of Advanced and Specialized Medicine, Graduate School of Medicine, Juntendo University, Tokyo, Japan, ³Department of Nursing, St. Luke's International Hospital, Tokyo, Japan, ⁴Department of Child & Family Health Nursing, St. Luke's International University, Tokyo, Japan, ⁵Pediatric Medical Center, Ehime Prefectural Central Hospital, Ehime, Japan, ⁶Department of Pediatrics, Graduate School of Medicine, Hokkaido University, Hokkaido, Japan

Background: Childhood cancer survivors (CCSs) have a lifelong increased risk of chronic health problems, most of which are associated with the curative therapies. Recent studies have suggested that prospective active screening using comprehensive assessments for CCSs is superior in identifying undiagnosed chronic health problems.

Methods: To assess the significance of active screening using comprehensive medical examinations for detecting chronic health problems in multiple organ systems in CCSs, we retrospectively compared the frequency and severity of health problems between two different cohorts of CCSs in a single institution: 110 CCSs who visited the outpatient clinic for regular follow-ups between December 2010 and December 2015 (regular follow-up group) vs. 58 CCSs who underwent comprehensive medical examinations between February 2016 and September 2019 (active screening group). CCSs were defined as patients aged \geq 18 years who had been diagnosed as having childhood cancer \geq 10 years before and had survived without cancer for \geq 5 years.

Results: Patient characteristics were similar between the two groups except for primary diagnosis (more brain tumors and embryonal tumors in the active screening group) and treatment history (more alkylating agents used and surgical interventions performed in the active screening group). The prevalence and the median number of health problems were significantly higher in the active screening group than in the regular follow-up group: 93% vs. 67% and 1.0 [0.0–8.0] vs. 2.0 [0.0–7.0] respectively. In term of organ-specific health problems, pulmonary dysfunction, neurocognitive impairment, ocular abnormalities, and dental abnormalities were identified more in the active screening group, partly because these problems had not been assessed in the regular follow-up group. Nevertheless, the prevalence of grade 3-5 health problems was similar between the two groups, except for pulmonary dysfunction.

Conclusion: Active screening using comprehensive medical examinations was effective for identifying health problems in CCSs. Although the prevalence of severe problems identified by both approaches was similar, comprehensive medical examinations could detect overlooked problems such as severe pulmonary dysfunction, dental maldevelopment, and borderline intellectual functioning, which might have an impact on quality of life in CCSs.

KEYWORDS

childhood cancer survivor, health problem, late effects, long-term care, screening

Introduction

Progress in the development of therapies for children with cancer has resulted in a >80% survival rate in developed countries, and children who overcome childhood cancer grow up as childhood cancer survivors (CCSs) (1). CCSs have a lifelong increased risk of chronic health problems, most of which are associated with the curative therapies. Chronic health problems in CCSs include cardiac dysfunction, pulmonary dysfunction, renal impairment, endocrine and reproductive disorders, growth impairment, neurocognitive impairment, and subsequent malignant neoplasms (2, 3). These health problems have previously been evaluated using self-report questionnaires or registry data. Recent studies have shown that prospective active screening using comprehensive systematic assessments for all CCSs was superior in identifying a substantial number of undiagnosed chronic health problems (4, 5). In fact, a large study of active screenings for adult CCSs revealed that the estimated cumulative prevalence of chronic health problems and serious/disabling or life-threatening problems at 45 years of age was 95.5 and 80.5%, respectively (6).

At St. Luke's International Hospital, active screening for lateonset health problems among CCSs was started in February 2016. CCSs aged \geq 18 years or older who were diagnosed as having childhood cancer at least 10 years before and remained in remission for \geq 5 years underwent comprehensive medical examinations. Before the active screenings were initiated, patients treated for childhood cancer were evaluated for health problems during regular clinic visits at the discretion of the physician in accordance with the Children's Oncology Group Long-term Follow-Up Guidelines (7) considering cancer type and treatment history.

In the present study, we compared the frequencies and severities of late-onset health problems between different approaches, namely, comprehensive medical examinations and regular clinic-based evaluations. The aim of this study was to assess the utility of active screening using comprehensive medical examinations in detecting chronic health problems of multiple organ systems in CCSs, which might be overlooked at regular clinic visits.

Materials and methods

Study design and participants

All data were obtained through the studies approved by the institutional review board of St. Luke's International Hospital. In the present study, CCSs were defined as patients aged \geq 18 years who were diagnosed with childhood cancer ≥ 10 years before and survived without cancer for \geq 5 years. Data of 58 CCSs who underwent comprehensive medical examinations between February 2016 and September 2019 were prospectively collected (active screening group). We also reviewed the medical records of 147 CCSs who visited the outpatient clinic for regular followups between December 2010 and December 2015, and their medical records were retrospectively analyzed. Of those 147 CCSs, 37 CCSs were excluded because they also underwent a comprehensive medical examination after February 2016, and were thus included in the active screening group in this analysis. Finally, 110 CCSs were assigned to the regular followup group. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants in the active screening group and opt-out consent involving provision of an information leaflet was obtained when the medical records of patients in the regular follow-up group were reviewed.

Data collection

In the active screening group, participants underwent a comprehensive evaluation as follows: medical history, physical examination, resting blood pressure, complete blood cell count, comprehensive metabolic panel, fasting lipid profile, blood sugar, hemoglobin A_1C level, endocrine–reproductive function (thyroid, gonadal, hypothalamic–pituitary axis function), urinalysis, fecal occult blood test, echocardiography, pulmonary function testing, audiological testing, ophthalmologic evaluation, dental evaluation, neurocognitive testing, bone mineral density testing, gynecological examination (female only), thyroid ultrasonography, abdominal ultrasonography,

and brain MRI. These examinations were selected according to the comprehensive medical checkup system administered in healthy adults in Japan (8) and the St. Jude Lifetime Cohort (SJLIFE) study (6). In the regular follow-up group, medical records and the most recent examination results were reviewed, and information about health problems was extracted. Medical assessments for CCSs in the regular follow-up group were performed at the discretion of the pediatric oncologist in accordance with the guidelines (7) considering cancer type and treatment history. The cost of examinations for CCSs in the active screening group and the regular follow-up group was covered by the research grant and public health insurance, respectively. In both groups, cancer-related information, including type of cancer, cumulative doses of chemotherapy, information on hematopoietic cell transplantation, surgical interventions, and the dose and anatomical location of radiological therapy, was extracted from the medical chart for each patient.

Definition of health problems and grading

The criteria for positive screening and the grading are shown in Table 1. Chronic health problems were classified according to the modified National Cancer Institute's Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE) version 4.0, which was also utilized in the SJLIFE study (9). We made additional minor modifications to the SJLIFE-modified CTCAE as follows: obesity was defined as BMI \geq 25 based on Asian criteria; HbA1c and cholesterol level was used in the evaluation of diabetes mellitus and hyperlipidemia, respectively, because the results of fasting tests were not always available in the regular follow-up group; hypothalamic-pituitary axis dysfunction was diagnosed using growth hormone provocation tests or ACTH (adrenocorticotropic hormone) stimulation tests in children in the regular follow-up group who were positive in screening for insulin-like growth factor-1 or morning cortisol level, respectively; hepatitis B or C virus infections were classified as grade 3 if they were serologically positive.

Statistical analysis

Health problems were compared between the active screening group and the regular follow-up group. The significance of the presence and the number of health problems per CCS was tested by Fisher's exact test, a non-parametric test, and one-way analysis of variance. Non-parametric variables were tested using the Mann–Whitney test and Kruskal–Wallis test. Data were analyzed using EZR (Saitama Medical Center, Jichi Medical University), which is a graphical user interface for R (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) (10); more precisely, it is a modified version of R commander, which is designed to perform statistical functions frequently used in biostatistics.

Results

Participant characteristics

The demographic, treatment, and diagnostic characteristics of the 110 CCSs in the regular follow-up group and the 58 CCSs in the active screening group are shown in Table 2. The proportion of males (43.6% vs. 46.6%), median age at diagnosis (6 years vs. 6 years), median age at the last follow-up (27.5 years vs. 25.5 years), and median duration of follow-up from diagnosis (19.0 years vs. 18.0 years) were not statistically different between the regular follow-up group and the active screening group. Hematological malignancies were more prevalent in the regular follow-up group than in the active screening group (81.8% vs. 70.7%), whereas the proportion of CNS tumors and embryonal tumors was higher in the active screening group. All CCSs received chemotherapy, but the proportion of CCSs receiving alkylating agents was higher in the active screening group. Nearly half of the CCSs in both groups received radiotherapy, and the main target organ was the brain. The proportion of CCSs who underwent surgical intervention was higher in the active screening group.

Prevalence of health problems in childhood cancer survivors

The prevalence of any health problems was significantly higher in the active screening group than in the regular follow-up group (93.1% vs. 67.3%; **Table 3**). In addition, the median number of any health problems was also higher in the active screening group than in the regular follow-up group (1.0 [0.0-8.0] vs. 2.0 [0.0-7.0]), and a third of CCSs in the active screening group had 4 or more health problems. In contrast, the prevalence and median number of severe health problems (\geq grade 3) were not significantly different between the two groups. Similar results were obtained from intrapatient comparisons in 37 CCSs who underwent regular follow-up and then active screening (data is not shown).

The median number of health problems was high in CCSs with CNS tumors (4.5 [1.0–8.0]; **Table 4**). Radiotherapy (2.5 vs. 1.0), hematopoietic cell transplantation (3.0 vs. 1.0), and platinum agents (3.0 vs. 1.0) were also associated with a higher number of health problems. The prevalence of severe health problems (\geq grade 3) was also high in these CCSs: 62.5% in CCSs with CNS tumors, 41.2% in CCSs receiving radiotherapy, 51.9% in transplanted CCSs, and 50% in CCSs receiving platinum agents. The age at diagnosis, age at the last follow-up, and

Health problem	Screening test	Criteria for positive screening	Grading rubric (modified CTCAE v4.0)
Cardiovascular			
Cardiomyopathy or Heart valve disorders	Echocardiogram	EF < 50% Detection of presence of valvular sclerosis, stenosis, or calcifications or mild or greater regurgitation	EF 1: Not applicable 2: Resting EF < 50%-40% 3: Resting EF 39%-20% 4: Resting EF < 20%; refractory or poorly controlled heart failure due to drop in EF; on medical management; intervention 5: Death
			 Heart valve disorder 1: Asymptomatic valvular thickening/calcifications with or without mild valvular regurgitation or stenosis by imaging 2: Asymptomatic; moderate regurgitation or stenosis by imaging 3: Symptomatic; severe regurgitation or stenosis by imaging; symptoms controlled with medical intervention 4: Life-threatening consequences; urgent intervention indicated 5: Death
Cardiovascular risk factors			
Hypertension	Blood pressure	$BP \ge 130/80 \text{ mmHg}$	 Systolic BP 130–139 mm Hg or diastolic BP 80–89 mm Hg Systolic BP 140–159 mm Hg or diastolic BP 90–99 mm Hg Systolic BP ≥ 160 mm Hg or diastolic BP ≥ 100 mm Hg Life-threatening consequences; urgent intervention indicated Death
Dyslipidemia	Lipid panel	Total cholesterol \geq 200 mg/dl, or LDL-C \geq 140 mg/dl, or HDL-C < 40 mg/dl	1: Total cholesterol 200–300 mg/dl 2: Total cholesterol 300–400 mg/dl 3: Total cholesterol 400–500 mg/dl 4: Total cholesterol > 500 mg/dl 5: Not applicable
BMI abnormalities			
Obesity	BMI	$BMI \geq 25$	1: Not applicable 2: BMI 25–29.9 kg/m ² 3: BMI 30–39.9 kg/m ² 4: BMI ≥ 40 kg/m ² 5: Not applicable
Underweight	BMI	BMI < 18.5	1: Not applicable 2: BMI < 18.5 kg/m ² 3: Not applicable 4: Not applicable 5: Not applicable
Pulmonary			
Abnormal pulmonary function	Pulmonary function tests	%VC < 80% or FEV1 < 80% predicted	%VC 1:%VC: 79–70% 2:%VC: 69–60% predicted 3:%VC: < 60% predicted 4: Not applicable 5: Not applicable
			FEV1 1: FEV1 (percentages of observed FEV1 related to its predicted value): 79–70% predicted 2: FEV1: 69–50% predicted 3: FEV1: 49–35% predicted 4: FEV1: < 35% predicted 5: Not applicable
Metabolic			
Liver dysfunction	ALT, AST	$\label{eq:altrace} \begin{split} ALT &\geq 40 \; U/I \\ AST &\geq 40 \; U/I \end{split}$	1: AST or ALT > ULN - 3.0 × ULN 2: AST or ALT > 3.0-5.0 × ULN 3: AST or ALT > 5.0-20.0 × ULN 4: AST or ALT > 20.0 × ULN 5: Not applicable

TABLE 1 Definition of health problems, screening tests, criteria for positive screening, and grading rubric.

(Continued)

Health problem	Screening test	Criteria for positive screening	Grading rubric (modified CTCAE v4.0)
Kidney dysfunction	Creatinine, BUN, Urine analysis	eGFR < 60 ml/min/1.73 m ² \pm Abnormal urinalysis	1: eGFR < LLN - 60 ml/min/1.73 m ² 2: eGFR 59-30 ml/min/1.73 m ² 3: eGFR 29-15 ml/min/1.73 m ² 4: eGFR < 15 ml/min/1.73 m ² 5: Death
Endocrine or reproduct	ive		
GH deficiency	GH provocation testing used to establish diagnosis in regular follow-up Active screening: IGF-1	GH dynamic testing: GH peak < criteria value Active screening: IGF-1 < -2SD	 Not applicable Asymptomatic; clinical or diagnostic observations only; intervention not indicated Hormone replacement indicated or initiated Severe symptoms; limiting self-care ADL; hospitalization indicated Not applicable
ACTH deficiency	Low dose ACTH stimulation test used to establish diagnosis in regular follow-up Active screening: Morning cortisol	Low dose ACTH stimulation test: Cortisol < criteria value Active screening: Morning cortisol < 5 mcg/dL	
Diabetes mellitus	Serum glucose, HbA ₁ c	$HbA_1C \geq 6.4\%$	$\label{eq:alpha} \begin{array}{l} 1: HbA_1c \ 6.4-6.9\% \\ 2: HbA_1c \ 7.0-7.9\% \\ 3: HbA_1c > 8.0\% \\ 4: Life threatening consequences, urgent intervention indicated or initiated \\ 5: Death \end{array}$
Primary hypothyroidism	Serum free T4, TSH	Both: Free T₄ below normal range (<1.0 ng/dl) and TSH above normal range (≥4.0 ţIU/ml)	 Not applicable Asymptomatic; clinical or diagnostic observations only; intervention not indicated Hormone replacement indicated or initiated Severe symptoms; limiting self- care ADL; hospitalization indicated Not applicable
Gonadal dysfunction			
Female	FSH, LH, estradiol	Amenorrhea before age 40 or estradiol < 17 pg/ml, FSH \ge 30 mIU/ml	 Not applicable Asymptomatic; clinical or diagnostic observations only; intervention not indicated Hormone replacement indicated or initiated Severe symptoms; limiting self- care ADL; hospitalization indicated Not applicable
Male	FSH, LH, testosterone	Receiving testosterone, and/or FSH > 10 mIU/ml, LH > 0.7 mIU/ml, Testosterone < 1.3 ng/ml	
Neurocognitive			
Neurocognitive impairment	WAIS	FSIQ < 85	1: FSIQ 85–90 2: FSIQ 70–88 3: FSIQ < 70 4: Not applicable 5: Not applicable
Neurosensory			
Ocular abnormalities	Ophthalmology consultation	Cataract, Intraocular pressure ≥ 21 mmHg, clinically significant abnormalities of retinal pigment, integrity, or vasculature, Low vision (corrected to 20/80 or worse)	 Asymptomatic; clinical or diagnostic observations only; intervention not indicated Symptomatic; moderate decrease in visual acuity (20/40 or better) Symptomatic with marked decrease in visual acuity (worse than 20/40 but better than 20/200); operative intervention indicated (e.g., cataract surgery) Blindness (20/200 or worse) in the affected eye Not applicable

(Continued)

Health problem	Screening test	Criteria for positive screening	Grading rubric (modified CTCAE v4.0)
Hearing loss	Pure-tone audiometry	Measurable hearing loss	$\begin{split} 1&:\geq 40 \text{ dB at any frequency } 6-12 \text{ kHz (Chang 1a)}; > 20\\ \text{and } < 40 \text{ dB at } 4\text{ kHz (Chang 1b)}\\ 2&:\geq 40 \text{ dB at } 4 \text{ kHz and above (Chang 2a)}; > 20\\ \text{and } < 40 \text{ dB at any frequency } < 4\text{ kHz (Chang 2b)}\\ 3&:\geq 40 \text{ dB at } 2 \text{ or } 3 \text{ kHz and above}\\ 4&:\geq 40 \text{ dB at } 1 \text{ kHz and above}\\ 5&: \text{ Not applicable} \end{split}$
Skeletal			
Osteoporosis	Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry	BMD t-score \leq -1.0	 Radiologic evidence of osteoporosis or BMD t-score -1 to -2.5 (osteopenia) BMD t-score < -2.5 Loss of height ≥ 2 cm Not applicable Not applicable
Dental abnormalities	Dental consultation	Missing teeth and/or microdontia and/or root change	 Asymptomatic; hypoplasia of tooth or enamel Impairment correctable with oral surgery Maldevelopment with impairment not surgically correctable; disabling Not applicable Not applicable
Infection			
Hepatitis virus infection	Hepatitis B surface antigen and core antibody Hepatitis C antibody	Serologically positive	1: Not applicable 2: Not applicable 3: Present 4: Life-threatening 5: Death
Cancer screening			
Malignant neoplasms		Any malignant neoplasms	1: Not applicable 2: Not applicable 3: Present 4: Life-threatening 5: Death

TABLE1 (Continued)

ACTH, adrenocorticotropic hormone; ADL, activities of daily living; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; BP, blood pressure; BMD, bone mineral density; BMI, body mass index; BUN, blood urine nitrogen; CTCAE, Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; FEV1, forced expiratory volume in the first second, FSH, follicle-stimulating hormone; FSIQ, Full scale intelligence quotient; GH, growth hormone; HbA₁c, hemoglobin A₁c; HDL-C, high-density lipoprotein cholesterol; HPA, hypothalamic-pituitary axis; IGF-1, insulin growth factor 1; LDL-C, low-density lipoprotein cholesterol; LH, luteinizing hormone; LLN, lower limit of normal; SD, standard deviation; TSH, thyroid-stimulating hormone; T4, thyroxine; VC; vital capacity; WAIS; ULN, upper limit of normal; Wechsler adult intelligence scale.

duration of follow-up were not associated with the mean number or severity of health problems.

Organ-specific health problems in childhood cancer survivors

Table 5 summarizes the prevalence of organ-specific health problems and the proportion of CCSs who did not undergo the screening tests for each health problem. Almost all the health problems were systematically evaluated in the active screening group by comprehensive medical examinations, whereas regular clinic-based evaluations failed to assess several organ-specific health problems, for example echocardiograms (the proportion of "not-tested" CCSs was 79.1%), pulmonary function tests (94.5%), neurocognitive evaluations (88.2%), ophthalmologic examinations (80.9%), audiometry (90.9%), bone mineral density tests (93.6%), and dental examinations (100%). These discrepancies in the frequency of organ-specific

evaluations resulted in differences in the prevalence of relevant health problems between the regular follow-up group and the active screening group: pulmonary dysfunction (2.7% vs. 20.7%), neurocognitive impairment (4.5% vs. 22.4%), ocular abnormalities (8.2% vs. 22.4%), and dental abnormalities (unknown vs. 37.9%). However, the prevalence of severe organspecific health problems (\geq grade 3) was the same between the two groups except for pulmonary dysfunction (1.7% vs. 6.9%; P = 0.049). In fact, most of the ocular abnormalities reported in the active screening group were trivial (e.g., optic disk cupping, n = 11), while cataract was found in 2 CCSs. No CCSs in the regular follow-up group had dental examinations, whereas 54 of 58 CCSs (93.1%) in the active screening group underwent dental examinations and dental problems were reported in 22 CCSs: missing teeth in 14, microdontia in 8, and root change in 8. These dental abnormalities detected in the active screening group were not disabling and could be surgically corrected and were thus classified as grade 1-2. Of 12 patients who showed TABLE 2 Demographic, treatment, and diagnostic characteristics of CCSs in the regular follow-up group (n = 110) and the active screening group (n = 58).

Characteristics		Regular follow-up group (n = 110)	Active screening group (n = 58)	P-value
Sex	Male (%)	48 (43.6)	27 (46.6)	0.746
Primary	diagnosis			0.025
	ALL	58 (52.7)	34 (58.6)	
	AML	13 (11.8)	3 (5.2)	
	Other hematological malignancies	10 (9.0)	1 (1.7)	
	Lymphoma	9 (8.2)	3 (5.2)	
	CNS tumors	3 (2.7)	5 (8.6)	
	Sarcoma	9 (8.2)	2 (3.4)	
	Embryonal tumors	6 (5.4)	10 (17.2)	
	Retinoblastoma	2 (1.8)	0 (0.0)	
Median age at diagnosis [years, range]		6 [0–19]	6 [0-16]	0.755
Median a	age at the last follow-up [years, range]	27.5 [18–49]	25.5 [18-42]	0.503
Median	duration of follow-up [years, range]	19 [6-37]	18 [9-39]	0.413
Treatme	nt exposure			
	Chemotherapy	110 (100)	58 (100)	
	Anthracyclines	71 (77.2)	44 (78.6)	1
	Alkylating agents	62 (67.4)	50 (89.3)	0.003
	Platinum	12 (13.0)	12 (21.4)	0.25
	Radiation	53 (48.2)	27 (46.6)	0.872
	Stem cell transplantation	18 (16.4)	9 (15.8)	1
	Surgery	19 (17.3)	20 (34.5)	0.02

ALL, acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML, acute myeloid leukemia, CCSs, childhood cancer survivors; CNS, central nervous system.

 TABLE 3
 Health problems in CCSs in regular follow-ups and active screening.

Health problems	Regular follow-up group $(n = 110)$	Active screening group $(n = 58)$	P-value	
	No. of CCSs (%)	No. of CCSs (%)		
Presence of health problems				
No	36 (32.7)	4 (6.9)	< 0.001	
Yes	74 (67.3)	54 (93.1)		
Median [range] of problems per CCS	1.0 [0.0-8.0]	2.0 [0.0-7.0]	< 0.001	
No. of problems per CCS				
0	36 (32.7)	4 (6.9)		
1	25 (22.7)	16 (27.6)		
2	17 (15.5)	10 (17.2)		
3	15 (13.6)	9 (15.5)		
4	9 (8.2)	10 (17.2)		
≥ 5	8 (7.3)	9 (15.5)		
Presence of \geq grade 3 health problems				
No	82 (74.5)	37 (63.8)	0.157	
Yes	28 (25.5)	21 (36.2)		
No. of \geq grade 3 health problems per CCS				
0	82 (74.5)	37 (63.8)	0.181	
1	19 (17.3)	16 (27.6)		
2	10 (9.1)	5 (8.6)		
≥ 3	0 (0.0)	1 (1.7)		

CCS(s), childhood cancer survivor(s).

Health problems	Regular follow-up group (<i>n</i> = 110)			Active screening group (n = 58)			Regular vs. active all grades	
	Any grades	Grade 3-4 n (%)	Not tested n (%)	Any grade n (%)	Grade 3-4 n (%)	Not tested n (%)	P-value	
	n (%)							
Cardiomyopathy orheart valve disorders	4 (3.6)	0 (0.0)	87 (79.1)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.7)	0.66	
Hypertension	27 (24.5)	3 (2.7)	27 (24.5)	7 (12.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0.069	
Dyslipidemia	40 (36.4)	0 (0.0)	6 (5.5)	25 (43.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0.409	
BMI abnormalities								
Obesity	20 (18.2)	1 (0.9)	4 (3.6)	11 (19.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1	
Underweight	15 (13.6)	0 (0.0)		13 (22.4)	0 (0.0)		0.281	
Abnormal pulmonary function	3 (2.7)	1 (1.7)	104 (94.5)	12 (20.7)	4 (6.9)	0 (0.0)	< 0.001	
Liver dysfunction	9 (8.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	6 (10.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0.777	
Kidney dysfunction	6 (5.5)	3 (2.8)	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0.094	
HPA disorders	15 (13.6)	15 (13.6)	NA	10 (17.2)	5 (8.6)	1 (1.7)	0.649	
Diabetes mellitus	3 (2.7)	0 (0.0)	17 (15.5)	1 (1.7)	1 (1.7)	0 (0.0)	1	
Primary hypothyroidism	6 (6.5)	5 (4.5)	17 (15.5)	3 (5.2)	2 (3.4)	0 (0.0)	1	
Gonadal dysfunction	20 (18.2)	10 (9.1)	20 (18.2)	7 (12.1)	5 (8.6)	0 (0.0)	0.38	
Neurocognitive impairment	5 (4.5)	4 (3.6)	97 (88.2)	13 (22.4)	3 (5.2)	1 (1.7)	0.001	
Ocular abnormalities	9 (8.2)	0 (0.0)	89 (80.9)	13 (22.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.7)	0.015	
Hearing loss	3 (2.7)	0 (0.0)	100 (90.9)	6 (10.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0.065	
Osteoporosis	3 (2.7)	0 (0.0)	103 (93.6)	3 (5.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0.417	
Dental abnormalities	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	110 (100)	22 (37.9)	0 (0.0)	4 (6.8)	< 0.001	
Hepatitis B, Hepatitis C virus infection	7 (6.4)	7 (6.4)	22 (20.0)	5 (8.6)	5 (8.6)	0 (0.0)	0.754	
Malignant neoplasms	5 (4.5)	5 (4.5)	NA	5 (8.6)	5 (8.6)	NA	0.316	

TABLE 4 Prevalence of health problems in CCSs in regular follow-ups and active screening.

BMI, body mass index; CCSs, childhood cancer survivors; HPA, hypothalamic-pituitary axis.

abnormal pulmonary function in active screening group, 11 had restrictive impairment and 4 were classified as grade 3–4.

Discussion

This report delineates the prevalence and severity of health problems across multiple organ systems in adult CCSs, as assessed by comprehensive medical examinations and regular clinic-based evaluations performed at a single center in Japan. Similar to previous reports, the incidence and severity of chronic health problems were associated with specific clinical factors such as CNS tumors, radiotherapy, hematopoietic cell transplantation, and platinum agents.

Active screening successfully identified more health problems compared with regular clinic-based evaluations (93.1% vs. 67.3%). This result might be attributable to efficient screening using comprehensive examinations to evaluate systemic health problems. In fact, several examinations were rarely performed in CCSs at regular follow-ups: echocardiograms, pulmonary function tests, neurocognitive evaluations, ophthalmologic examinations, audiometry, bone mineral density tests, and dental examination. Active screening revealed that pulmonary dysfunction, neurocognitive impairment, ocular abnormalities, and dental abnormalities were more prevalent than previously thought. In the SJLIFE study, prospective and risk-based systematic screening of health problems among CCSs revealed that the prevalence of newly diagnosed neurocognitive and neurosensory deficits, heart valve disorders, and pulmonary dysfunction was particularly increased, which was almost similar to our study. The examinations administered in the active screening group were selected according to the comprehensive medical checkup system administered in healthy adults in Japan (8) and the SJLIFE study (6). Comprehensive medical checkups allow for early detection of diseases in healthy adults and are widely used in Japan. Considering that this medical program is not covered by public health insurance, the cost-effectiveness of comprehensive medical examinations for CCSs needs to be further evaluated.

Most of the problems overlooked in the regular followup group were classified as grade 1–2; however, this may not mean that active screening resulted in overdiagnosis of clinically insignificant health problems in CCSs. For example, grade 1– 2 dental anomalies were found in 40% of CCSs in the active

$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c } \hline Pcular c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Clinical factors		CCSs with any health problems (%)	CCSs with ≥ grade 3 health problems (%)	Sum of health problems		
Primary disease ALL $n = 92$ 72 (78.3) 21 (22.8) 2.0 (0.0-5.0] 0.002 AUL $n = 16$ 11 (68.8) 6 (37.5) 2.0 (0.0-5.0] Other hematological malignancies $n = 11$ 9 (81.8) 3 (27.3) 1.0 (0.0-3.0] Lymphoma $n = 12$ 9 (75.0) 5 (41.7) 1.0 (0.0-6.0] CNS turnors $n = 8$ 8 (100.0) 5 (62.5) 4.5 (1.0-8.0] Embryonal turnors $n = 16$ 13 (84.2) 6 (37.5) 2.5 (0.0-7.0] Embryonal turnors $n = 16$ 13 (84.2) 6 (37.5) 2.5 (0.0-7.0] Retinoblastoma $n = 20$ 2 (100.0) 2 (100.0) 3.5 (3.0-4.0] Age at diagnosis (years) 0-5 $n = 75$ 56 (74.7) 28 (37.3) 2.0 (0.0-6.0] 0.951 5-10 $n = 37$ 28 (75.7) 8 (21.6) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 2 10 $n = 55$ 43 (78.2) 13 (23.6) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 2 10 $n = 55$ 43 (78.2) 13 (23.6) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 2 10 $n = 55$ 43 (78.2) 13 (23.6) 2.0 (0.0-8.0] Age at the last follow-up (years) H = 20 15 (75.0) 4 (20.0) 1.0 (0.0-6.0] 0.403 20-30 $n = 89$ 65 (73.0) 24 (27.0) 20 (0.0-6.0] 2 30 $n = 59$ 48 (81.4) 2.0 (20.00-8.0] 2 30 $n = 50$ 47 (78.3) 24 (40.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 2 10 $n = 60$ 47 (78.3) 24 (40.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 2 20 $n = 60$ 47 (78.3) 24 (40.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 2 30 $n = 60$ 47 (78.3) 24 (40.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 2 30 $n = 19$ 16 (82.0) 7.0 (3.6.8) 2.0 (0.0-6.0] Tratumorf of low-up (years) Tratument exposure Tratument exposure Tratument exposure Tratument exposure Chemotherapy Anthracyclines Yes $n = 115$ 88 (76.5) 31 (27.0) 2.0 (0.0-8.0] 0.074 N_0 $n = 33$ 24 (27.7) 11 (33.3) 1.0 (0.0-8.0] 0.074 N_0 $n = 34$ 29 (25.3) 12 (25.0) 3.0 (0.0-8.0] 0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-5.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.0-6.0] (0.074 N_0 $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 (0.						Median [range]	P-value
ALLn = 9272 (78.3)21 (22.8)20 (00-5.0]0.002ALLn = 1611 (6.8.)6.(37.5)2.0 (0.0-5.0]1Verthernatological malignanciesn = 129.(75.0)3.(27.3)1.0 (0.0-5.0]Lymphoman = 129.(75.0)5.(62.5)4.5 (1.0-8.0]CNS tumorsn = 14.(84.4)1.(9.1)0.0 (0.0-2.0]Sacroman = 1613.(81.2)6.(37.5)2.5 (0.0-7.0)Retino blasman = 202.(00.0)2.5 (0.0-7.0)2.5 (0.0-7.0)Age at dignosis (years)m = 755.6 (74.7)2.6 (37.3)2.0 (0.0-6.0]S-10n = 573.6 (75.2)3.6 (1.6)2.0 (0.0-6.0]2.0 (0.0-8.0)20n = 575.6 (74.7)2.6 (2.0)2.0 (0.0-6.0]2.0 (0.0-8.0)210n = 573.6 (75.5)4.2 (2.0)2.0 (0.0-6.0]2.0 (0.0-8.0)20-50n = 696.5 (73.0)4.2 (2.0)2.0 (0.0-6.0]2.0 (0.0-8.0)20-50n = 696.5 (73.0)2.0 (0.0-10)2.0 (0.0-6.0]2.0 (0.0-6.0]20-50n = 1916.(82.2)7.(36.3)2.0 (0.0-7.0]2.5 (0.0-7.0]20-50n = 1916.(82.2)7.(36.3)2.0 (0.0-7.0]0.57 (0.57)20-50n = 1916.(82.2)7.(36.3)2.0 (0.0-7.0]0.57 (0.57)20-50n = 1916.(82.2)11.(33.3)1.0 (0.0-6.0]0.07 (0.57)20-50n = 192.0 (0.57)3.0 (2.0)0.00 (0.0)0.00 (0.0)20-601.6 (Primary disease						
AML $n = 16$ 11 (68.8) 6 (37.5) 2.0 [0.0-50] Der hernstological malignancies $n = 11$ 9 (81.8) 3 (27.3) 1.0 [0.0-30] Lymphoma $n = 12$ 9 (80.8) 5 (41.7) 1.0 [0.0-60] CNS tumors $n = 8$ 8 (00.0) 5 (62.5) 4.5 [1.0-8.0] Sarcoma $n = 11$ 4 (36.4) 1 (9.1) 0.0 [0.0-2.0] Entinoblastoma $n = 10$ 21 (00.0) 3.5 [3.0-4.0] 0.5 [3.0-4.0] Age at diagnosis (years) $n = 75$ 56 (7.4) 28 (37.3) 2.0 (0.0-7.0] 0.5 [3.0-4.0] Sarcoma $n = 75$ 56 (7.4) 28 (37.3) 2.0 (0.0-8.0] 0.5 [3.0-2.0] 0.5 [3.0-2.0] 0.5 [3.0-2.0] 0.5 [3.0-2.0] 0.5 [3.0-2.0] 0.5 [3.0-2.0] 0.6 [3.0]	ALL		<i>n</i> = 92	72 (78.3)	21 (22.8)	2.0 [0.0-5.0]	0.002
Other hematological malignancies $n = 11$ 9 (81.8) 3 (27.3) 1.0 (0.06) Lymphoma $n = 12$ 9 (75.0) 5 (41.7) 1.0 (0.06) CNS tumors $n = 3$ 8 (10.00) 5 (62.5) 4.5 (1.08.0) Sarcoma $n = 1$ 4 (36.4) 1.9 (1) 0.0 (0.02) Reinoblastoma $n = 0$ 2 (10.00) 2 (20.00) 3.5 [0.060] Age at diagnois (years) $n = 7^{-2}$ 56 (74.7) 28 (37.3) 2.0 (0.060) 0.5 (1.060) S-10 $n = 37$ 28 (75.7) 8 (21.6) 2.0 (0.060) 0.403 Age at the last follow-up (years) $n = 5^{-2}$ 15 (75.0) 4 (20.0) 1.0 (0.0-6.0) 0.403 20-30 $n = 59$ 48 (1.4) 21 (35.6) 2.0 (0.0-8.0) 0.403 20-30 $n = 60$ 47 (78.3) 2.4 (40.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 0.416 20-30 $n = 19$ 16 (8.2) 7 (36.8) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 0.517 2-30 $n = 19$ 16 (8.2) 7 (36.8) 2.0 (0.0-7.0	AML		<i>n</i> = 16	11 (68.8)	6 (37.5)	2.0 [0.0-5.0]	
Lymphoma $n = 12$ 9 (75.0) 5 (41.7) L0 [0.0-6.0] CNS tumors $n = 8$ 8 (100.0) 5 (62.5) 4.5 [1.0-8.0] Sarcoma $n = 11$ 4 (36.4) 1 (91.) 0.0 (0.0-2.0] Embryonal tumors $n = 10$ 13 (81.2) 6 (37.5) 2.5 [0.0-7.0] Retinoblastoma $n = 20$ 2 (100.0) 2.5 [0.0-6.0] 0.951 Age at diagnosis (years) $n = 75$ 5 (67.7) 2.8 (37.3) 2.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.951 $5 - 10$ $n = 75$ 3 (75.7) 8 (13.0) 2.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.951 $2 = 0$ $n = 3^{-7}$ 3 (75.2) 4 (20.0) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.403 $2 = 0$ $n = 2^{-0}$ 15 (75.0) 4 (20.0) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.403 $2 = 0$ $n = 8^{-9}$ 6 (7.7) 2 (3.6) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.403 $2 = 0$ $n = 8^{-9}$ 6 (4 (7.7) 18 (20.5) 1.5 [0.0-8.0] 0.4049 $2 = 0$ $n = 8^{-9}$ 6 (4 (7.7) 18 (20.5) 1.5 [0.0-8.0] 0.57	Other hematological malignancies		n = 11	9 (81.8)	3 (27.3)	1.0 [0.0-3.0]	
CNS tumors $n = 8$ $8(100.0)$ $5(62.5)$ $4.5[1.0-8.0]$ Sarcona $n = 11$ $4(36.4)$ $1(9.1)$ $0.0[0-2.0]$ Betinoblatumors $n = 16$ $13(81.2)$ $6(37.5)$ $25[0.0-7.0]$ Betinoblatumors $n = 0$ $2(100.0)$ 2100.0 $5_13.0-4.0]$ Autinops (years) $n = 75$ $56(74.7)$ $28(37.3)$ $2.0[0.0-6.0]$ 0.951 -5 $n = 75$ $28(75.7)$ $82(1.6)$ $2.0[0.0-6.0]$ 0.951 -10 $n = 37$ $28(75.7)$ $82(1.6)$ $2.0[0.0-6.0]$ 0.951 -20 $n = 75$ $65(73.0)$ $24(2.0)$ $2.0[0.0-6.0]$ 0.403 -20 $n = 80$ $64(72.7)$ $18(20.5)$ $1.5[0.0-8.0]$ 0.492 -20 $n = 88$ $64(72.7)$ $18(20.5)$ $1.5[0.0-8.0]$ 0.492 -20 $n = 18^{-1}$ $16(8.2)$ $76(8)$ $20[0.0-6.0]$ 0.751 -20 $n = 88$ $64(72.7)$ $18(20.5)$ $1.5[0.0-8.0]$ 0.631 -20^{-1} $n = 8^{-1}$ 69	Lymphoma		<i>n</i> = 12	9 (75.0)	5 (41.7)	1.0 [0.0-6.0]	
Sarcoma n = 11 4 (36.4) 1 (9.1) 0.0 [0.0-2.0] Embyronal tumors n = 16 13 (81.2) 6 (37.5) 2.5 [0.0-7.0] Age 20 0.1000 0.21000 0.25 [0.0-7.0] Age m = 75 56 (74.7) 28 (37.3) 0.20 [0.0-6.0] 0.951 5-10 n = 75 36 (74.7) 28 (21.6) 0.20 [0.0-7.0] 0.10 [0.0-6.0] 0.951 Age m = 57 28 (75.2) 8 (21.6) 0.20 [0.0-6.0] 0.01 [0.0-6.0] 0.01 [0.0-6.0] Age m = 50 45 (75.0) 4 (20.0) 0.10 [0.0-6.0] 0.01 [0.0-6.0] 20-30 n = 59 46 (72.7) 48 (81.4) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.40 [0.0.7.0] 2-30 n = 60 47 (78.3) 2.4 (60.0) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.40 [0.0.7.0] 2-30 n = 19 16 (82.2) 7 (36.8) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.40 [0.0.7.0] 2-30 n = 19 16 (82.2) 7 (36.8) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.71 [0.0.8] 2-400 n = 19 16 (82.2) <	CNS tumors		<i>n</i> = 8	8 (100.0)	5 (62.5)	4.5 [1.0-8.0]	
Embryonal tumors $n = 16$ 13 (81.2) 6 (37.5) 2.5 [0.0-7.0] Retinoblastoma $n = 20$ 2 (10.0) 2 (100.0) 3.5 [3.0-4.0] Age trainpoist (years) 3.5 3.6 (4.7.0) 2.8 (37.0) 3.6 (3.0.0 0.0 (0.0-5.0) 0.0 $2 - 10$ $n = 37$ 2.8 (75.7) $8.(21.6)$ 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 0.0 Age at the last follow-up (years) 3.5^{-10} 4.3 (3.2.0) $4.20.0$ 0.0 (0.0-6.0) 0.0 (0.0-6.0) $2 - 30$ $n = 80$ 6.5 (3.0) 2.4 (2.0.0) 2.0 (0.0-6.0) 0.0 (0.0-6.0) $2 - 30$ $n = 80$ 6.5 (3.0) 2.4 (2.0.0) 2.0 (0.0-6.0) 0.0 (0.0-6.0) $2 - 30$ $n = 80$ 6.5 (3.0) 2.4 (2.0.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) $2 - 30$ $n = 88$ 6.6 (3.0) $7.63.0$ 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) $2 - 30$ $n = 18$ $8.7 (5.2)$ 3.0 (2.6.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) 2.0 (0.0-7.0) $2 - 3$	Sarcoma		n = 11	4 (36.4)	1 (9.1)	0.0 [0.0-2.0]	
Retinoblastoma $n = 2^\circ$ $2(100.)$ $2(100.)$ $3.5 [3.0-4.]$ Ageneration (search) $n = 7^\circ$ $56(74.)$ $28(37.)$ $20[0.0-5.]$ 0.951 $5 - 10$ $n = 3^\circ$ $28(75.)$ $28(37.)$ $20[0.0-5.]$ $0.00.6.]$ $2 - 10$ $n = 5^\circ$ $28(75.)$ $3(23.0)$ $20[0.0-5.]$ $0.00.6.]$ $A = 10^\circ$ $n = 5^\circ$ $28(75.)$ $4(20.)$ $1.0[0.0-6.]$ $0.00.6.]$ $A = 10^\circ$ $n = 2^\circ$ $15(75.)$ $4(20.)$ $1.0[0.0-6.]$ $0.00.6.]$ $2^{-3.0}$ $n = 2^\circ$ $15(75.)$ $4(20.)$ $2.0[0.0-5.]$ $0.00.6.]$ $2^{-3.0}$ $n = 5^\circ$ $45(8.)$ $2(10.0)$ $2.0[0.0-5.]$ $0.00.6.]$ $2^{-3.0}$ $n = 6^\circ$ $47(78.)$ $24(40.)$ $2.0[0.0-5.]$ $0.0[0.0-7.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $2^{-3.0}$ $n = 1^\circ$ $16(8.2)$ $7(36.)$ $2.0[0.0-5.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$ $0.0[0.0.0.]$	Embryonal tumors		<i>n</i> = 16	13 (81.2)	6 (37.5)	2.5 [0.0-7.0]	
Appent diagnosis (years) $0-5$ $n = 75$ $56 (74.7)$ $28 (37.3)$ $2.0 (0.0-6.0]$ 0.951 $5-10$ $n = 37$ $2.8 (75.7)$ $8.2 (1.6)$ $2.0 (0.0-8.0]$ 0.951 $2 10$ $n = 37$ $2.8 (75.7)$ $8.2 (1.6)$ $2.0 (0.0-8.0]$ $0.0 (0.0-8.0]$ Age at the last follow-up (years) $1 = 20$ $15 (75.0)$ $4.2 (2.0)$ $2.0 (0.0-6.0]$ $0.0 (0.0-8.0]$ $2 30$ $n = 90$ $65 (73.0)$ $24 (2.7)$ $2.0 (0.0-8.0]$ $0.0 (0.0-8.0]$ $2 - 30$ $n = 90$ $65 (73.0)$ $24 (2.0)$ $2.0 (0.0-8.0]$ $0.0 (0.0-8.0]$ $2 - 30$ $n = 90$ $65 (73.0)$ $24 (2.0)$ $2.0 (0.0-8.0]$ 0.489 $2 - 30$ $n = 90$ $65 (73.0)$ $24 (2.0)$ $2.0 (0.0-8.0]$ 0.489 $2 - 30$ $n = 98$ $64 (72.7)$ $18 (20.5)$ $1.5 (0.0-8.0]$ $0.0 (0.6.0]$ $2 - 30$ $n = 19$ $n = 73$ $24 (72.7)$ $18 (3.0)$ $2.0 (0.0-6.0]$ $0.0 (0.6.0]$ $2 - 0.00 - 10$ $n = 33$ $24 (72.7)$ $11 (3.3)$ $10 (0.0-8.0]$ </td <td>Retinoblastoma</td> <td></td> <td><i>n</i> = 20</td> <td>2 (100.0)</td> <td>2 (100.0)</td> <td>3.5 [3.0-4.0]</td> <td></td>	Retinoblastoma		<i>n</i> = 20	2 (100.0)	2 (100.0)	3.5 [3.0-4.0]	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age at diagnosis (years)						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0–5		<i>n</i> = 75	56 (74.7)	28 (37.3)	2.0 [0.0-6.0]	0.951
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & $	5-10		<i>n</i> = 37	28 (75.7)	8 (21.6)	2.0 [0.0-7.0]	
Age at the last follow-up (years) $18-20$ $n = 20$ $15 (75.0)$ $4 (20.0)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.403 $20-30$ $n = 89$ $65 (73.0)$ $24 (27.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-6.0]$ ≥ 30 $n = 59$ $48 (81.4)$ $21 (35.6)$ $2.0 [0.0-8.0]$ Duration of follow-up (years) < 20 $n = 88$ $64 (72.7)$ $18 (20.5)$ $1.5 [0.0-8.0]$ $20-30$ $n = 60$ $47 (78.3)$ $24 (40.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ $20 -30$ $n = 60$ $47 (78.3)$ $24 (40.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ $20 -30$ $n = 19$ $16 (84.2)$ $7 (36.8)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ $20 -30$ $n = 19$ $16 (82.2)$ $7 (36.8)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ $20 -30$ $n = 19$ $16 (84.2)$ $7 (36.8)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ $20 -30$ $n = 19$ $16 (84.2)$ $7 (36.8)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ $20 -30$ $n = 19$ $88 (76.5)$ $31 (27.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.537 $20 -30$ $n = 33$ $24 (72.7)$ $11 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.07 $20 -30$ $n = 36$ $23 (63.9)$ $12 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.07 $20 -30$ $n = 36$ $23 (63.9)$ $12 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.07 $20 -30$ $n = 124$ $92 (74.2)$ $30 (24.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.07 $20 -30$ $n = 124$ $92 (74.2)$ $30 (41.2)$ $2.5 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.07 $20 -30$ $n = 88$ $59 (67.0)$ $16 (18.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$	≥ 10		<i>n</i> = 55	43 (78.2)	13 (23.6)	2.0 [0.0-8.0]	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Age at the last follow-up (years)						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	18–20		<i>n</i> = 20	15 (75.0)	4 (20.0)	1.0 [0.0-6.0]	0.403
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c } & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & $	20-30		<i>n</i> = 89	65 (73.0)	24 (27.0)	2.0 [0.0-6.0]	
Duration of follow-up (years) < 20 $n = 88$ 64 (72.7) 18 (20.5) 1.5 [0.0-8.0] 0.489 $20-30$ $n = 60$ 47 (78.3) 24 (40.0) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 2.0 ≥ 30 $n = 19$ 16 (84.2) 7 (36.8) 2.0 [0.0-6.0] 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 2.5 Treatment exposure Chemotherapy Anthracyclines Yes $n = 115$ 88 (76.5) 31 (27.0) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.537 Alkylating agents Yes $n = 112$ 89 (79.5) 30 (26.8) 2.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.074 Platinum Yes $n = 24$ 20 (83.3) 12 (23.3) 1.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.077 Radiation Yes $n = 24$ 20 (83.3) 12 (50.0) 3.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.007 Radiation Yes $n = 88$ 59 (67.0) 16 (18.2) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.007 Stem cell transplantation Yes $n = 27$ 24 (88.9) 14 (51.9) 3.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.017 No $n = 140$ 103 (73.6) 34 (24.3)	\geq 30		<i>n</i> = 59	48 (81.4)	21 (35.6)	2.0 [0.0-8.0]	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Duration of follow-up (years)						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<20		<i>n</i> = 88	64 (72.7)	18 (20.5)	1.5 [0.0-8.0]	0.489
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	20-30		n = 60	47 (78.3)	24 (40.0)	2.0 [0.0-7.0]	
Treatment exposure Chemotherapy Anthracyclines Yes $n = 115$ $88 (76.5)$ $31 (27.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.537 No $n = 33$ $24 (72.7)$ $11 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ Alkylating agents Yes $n = 112$ $89 (79.5)$ $30 (26.8)$ $2.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.074 No $n = 36$ $23 (63.9)$ $12 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.007 Platinum Yes $n = 24$ $20 (83.3)$ $12 (50.0)$ $3.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.007 Radiation Yes $n = 24$ $20 (83.3)$ $12 (50.0)$ $3.0 [0.0-5.0]$ < 0.001 No $n = 124$ $92 (74.2)$ $30 (24.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-5.0]$ < 0.001 Radiation Yes $n = 88$ $59 (67.0)$ $16 (18.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ < 0.001 Stem cell transplantation Yes $n = 27$ $24 (88.9)$ $14 (51.9)$ $3.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.017 No $n = 140$ $103 (73.6)$ $34 (24.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.209 No $n = 129$ $97 (75.2$	\geq 30		n = 19	16 (84.2)	7 (36.8)	2.0 [0.0-6.0]	
Chemotherapy Anthracyclines Yes $n = 115$ 88 (76.5) 31 (27.0) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.537 No $n = 33$ 24 (72.7) 11 (33.3) 1.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.074 Alkylating agents Yes $n = 112$ 89 (79.5) 30 (26.8) 2.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.074 No $n = 36$ 23 (63.9) 12 (33.3) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.074 Platinum Yes $n = 24$ 20 (83.3) 12 (50.0) 3.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.007 No $n = 124$ 92 (74.2) 30 (24.2) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] Radiation Yes $n = 80$ 69 (86.2) 33 (41.2) 2.5 [0.0-8.0] <0.007 No $n = 88$ 59 (67.0) 16 (18.2) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] Stem cell transplantation Yes $n = 27$ 24 (88.9) 14 (51.9) 3.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.017 No $n = 140$ 103 (73.6) 34 (24.3) 1.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.209 Surgery Yes $n = 39$ 3.1 (79.5) 16 (41.0) 2.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.209 No <td>Treatment exposure</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Treatment exposure						
AnthracyclinesYes $n = 115$ $88 (76.5)$ $31 (27.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.537 No $n = 33$ $24 (72.7)$ $11 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.074 Alkylating agentsYes $n = 112$ $89 (79.5)$ $30 (26.8)$ $2.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.074 No $n = 36$ $23 (63.9)$ $12 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.007 PlatinumYes $n = 24$ $20 (83.3)$ $12 (50.0)$ $3.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.007 No $n = 124$ $92 (74.2)$ $30 (24.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-5.0]$ 0.001 RadiationYes $n = 88$ $59 (67.0)$ $16 (18.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ Stem cell transplantationYes $n = 27$ $24 (88.9)$ $14 (51.9)$ $3.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.017 No $n = 140$ $103 (73.6)$ $34 (24.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.209 No $n = 129$ $97 (75.2)$ $33 (25.6)$ $2.0 [0.0-6.0]$	Chemotherapy						
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Anthracyclines	Yes	<i>n</i> = 115	88 (76.5)	31 (27.0)	2.0 [0.0-7.0]	0.537
Alkylating agentsYes $n = 112$ $89 (79.5)$ $30 (26.8)$ $2.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.074 No $n = 36$ $23 (63.9)$ $12 (33.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ PlatinumYes $n = 24$ $20 (83.3)$ $12 (50.0)$ $3.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.007 No $n = 124$ $92 (74.2)$ $30 (24.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-5.0]$ 0.001 RadiationYes $n = 80$ $69 (86.2)$ $33 (41.2)$ $2.5 [0.0-8.0]$ < 0.001 No $n = 88$ $59 (67.0)$ $16 (18.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.017 Stem cell transplantationYes $n = 27$ $24 (88.9)$ $14 (51.9)$ $3.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.017 No $n = 140$ $103 (73.6)$ $34 (24.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.209 No $n = 129$ $97 (75.2)$ $33 (25.6)$ $2.0 [0.0-6.0]$		No	<i>n</i> = 33	24 (72.7)	11 (33.3)	1.0 [0.0-8.0]	
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Alkylating agents	Yes	<i>n</i> = 112	89 (79.5)	30 (26.8)	2.0 [0.0-8.0]	0.074
Platinum Yes $n = 24$ 20 (83.3) 12 (50.0) $3.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.007 No $n = 124$ $92 (74.2)$ $30 (24.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-5.0]$ -0.001 Radiation Yes $n = 80$ $69 (86.2)$ $33 (41.2)$ $2.5 [0.0-8.0]$ < 0.001 No $n = 88$ $59 (67.0)$ $16 (18.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ -0.017 Stem cell transplantation Yes $n = 27$ $24 (88.9)$ $14 (51.9)$ $3.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.017 No $n = 140$ $103 (73.6)$ $34 (24.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.209 Surgery Yes $n = 39$ $31 (79.5)$ $16 (41.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.209 No $n = 129$ $97 (75.2)$ $33 (25.6)$ $2.0 [0.0-6.0]$ 0.209		No	<i>n</i> = 36	23 (63.9)	12 (33.3)	1.0 [0.0-6.0]	
No $n = 124$ 92 (74.2)30 (24.2) $1.0 [0.0-5.0]$ RadiationYes $n = 80$ $69 (86.2)$ $33 (41.2)$ $2.5 [0.0-8.0]$ <0.001	Platinum	Yes	<i>n</i> = 24	20 (83.3)	12 (50.0)	3.0 [0.0-8.0]	0.007
RadiationYes $n = 80$ $69 (86.2)$ $33 (41.2)$ $2.5 [0.0-8.0]$ < 0.001 No $n = 88$ $59 (67.0)$ $16 (18.2)$ $1.0 [0.0-6.0]$ Stem cell transplantationYes $n = 27$ $24 (88.9)$ $14 (51.9)$ $3.0 [0.0-7.0]$ 0.017 No $n = 140$ $103 (73.6)$ $34 (24.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ SurgeryYes $n = 39$ $31 (79.5)$ $16 (41.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.209 No $n = 129$ $97 (75.2)$ $33 (25.6)$ $2.0 [0.0-6.0]$		No	<i>n</i> = 124	92 (74.2)	30 (24.2)	1.0 [0.0-5.0]	
No $n = 88$ 59 (67.0) 16 (18.2) 1.0 [0.0-6.0] Stem cell transplantation Yes $n = 27$ 24 (88.9) 14 (51.9) 3.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.017 No $n = 140$ 103 (73.6) 34 (24.3) 1.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.209 Surgery Yes $n = 39$ 31 (79.5) 16 (41.0) 2.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.209 No $n = 129$ 97 (75.2) 33 (25.6) 2.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.209	Radiation	Yes	<i>n</i> = 80	69 (86.2)	33 (41.2)	2.5 [0.0-8.0]	< 0.001
Stem cell transplantation Yes n = 27 24 (88.9) 14 (51.9) 3.0 [0.0-7.0] 0.017 No n = 140 103 (73.6) 34 (24.3) 1.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.019 Surgery Yes n = 39 31 (79.5) 16 (41.0) 2.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.209 No n = 129 97 (75.2) 33 (25.6) 2.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.209		No	<i>n</i> = 88	59 (67.0)	16 (18.2)	1.0 [0.0-6.0]	
No $n = 140$ 103 (73.6) $34 (24.3)$ $1.0 [0.0-8.0]$ SurgeryYes $n = 39$ $31 (79.5)$ $16 (41.0)$ $2.0 [0.0-8.0]$ 0.209 No $n = 129$ $97 (75.2)$ $33 (25.6)$ $2.0 [0.0-6.0]$	Stem cell transplantation	Yes	<i>n</i> = 27	24 (88.9)	14 (51.9)	3.0 [0.0-7.0]	0.017
Surgery Yes n = 39 31 (79.5) 16 (41.0) 2.0 [0.0-8.0] 0.209 No n = 129 97 (75.2) 33 (25.6) 2.0 [0.0-6.0] 0.209	-	No	<i>n</i> = 140	103 (73.6)	34 (24.3)	1.0 [0.0-8.0]	
No $n = 129$ 97 (75.2) 33 (25.6) 2.0 [0.0-6.0]	Surgery	Yes	<i>n</i> = 39	31 (79.5)	16 (41.0)	2.0 [0.0-8.0]	0.209
	·	No	<i>n</i> = 129	97 (75.2)	33 (25.6)	2.0 [0.0-6.0]	

TABLE 5 Health problems by clinical factors.

ALL, acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML, acute myeloid leukemia, CCSs, childhood cancer survivors; CNS, central nervous system.

screening group. Although these dental problems were not disabling and could be surgically corrected, they had potential impact on functional and aesthetic prognoses. Previous studies showed that the prevalence of root abnormalities ranged from 1.3 to 5.6%, and microdontia from 1 to 2% in a population of healthy children (11). The prevalence of hypodontia varies between 4 and 8% depending on the ethnic background (12). Pulmonary dysfunction and neurocognitive impairment were also more prevalent in the active screening group.

Considering that the morbidity rate of pulmonary dysfunction was equivalent to that in the SJLIFE study (6) and that 4 of 12 pulmonary dysfunctions found in the active screening group were classified as \geq grade 3, active screening successfully identified severe underlying pulmonary dysfunctions. Careful follow-up, education, and appropriate intervention such as pneumococcal vaccination should be implemented for CCSs with asymptomatic pulmonary dysfunction to prevent future worsening of pulmonary function. Identification of borderline intellectual functioning in a substantial number of CCSs in the active screening group is also important because of the potential impacts on quality of life. Further investigation is needed to clarify the significance of early interventions in CCSs with borderline intellectual functioning detected by active screening. The significance of ophthalmological abnormalities found in the present study may be controversial. Eleven of the 13 ophthalmological abnormalities in the active screening group were optic disk cupping, which were asymptomatic and concluded to be a non-specific finding by a more detailed follow-up. Because ocular abnormalities affect quality of life in CCSs, further investigation and analysis are needed to determine the importance of early detection of subtle changes in ophthalmological findings.

Because the prevalence of obesity, hypertension, and several laboratory abnormalities such as dyslipidemia and endocrinopathy did not increase by active screening, routine physical examinations and blood tests were adequate to identify these problems. Despite the low examination rate in the regular follow-up group, the similar prevalence of cardiac dysfunction and osteoporosis between the two groups was surprising. One plausible explanation may be that these problems were appropriately evaluated based on treatment history in the regular follow-up group. Another explanation may be that the follow-up duration of the present study was too short to detect subclinical cardiotoxicity among asymptomatic CCSs with normal ejection fractions. Cardiac dysfunction increases markedly with aging, and as many as 1 in 8 of CCSs treated with anthracyclines and chest radiation therapy will have a lifethreatening cardiovascular event within 30 years after treatment (13). Further follow-up using parameters for early detection of subclinical diastolic dysfunction, including strain measurements by speckle tracking, may be required (14).

To our knowledge, this is the first study to prospectively explore systemic health problems in Asian CCSs using comprehensive screening for multiple organs (15). Most previous studies of CCSs in Asian countries have focused on epidemiological research or organ-specific toxicities (15). Health problems in CCSs are affected by a complex of multiple factors. Differences in genetic variations, socioeconomic status, health behaviors, lifestyle, treatment regimens, and clinical practice can be reflected in the prevalence of health problems in CCSs. The relatively low incidence of obesity in our cohort may exemplify the ethnic difference. Differences in genetic variations that influence the incidence of chronic health problems in CCSs between Asian and other populations should be explored in the future.

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this study. The major limitation is the small sample size. Second, the follow-up period was short, and the participants were relatively young. The health problems of CCSs are known to increase with age (16). Although the number and severity of health problems did not increase with age and from the time since diagnosis of pediatric cancer in this study, continuing active screening is expected to contribute to the prompt identification of health problems in CCSs. In addition, generalizability of our findings may be skeptical because most long-term follow-up clinics cannot afford to do the comprehensive medical testing. We believe that one of the significances of our study is that active screening could identify several overlooked problems, which was not regarded as severe based on CTCAE-based criteria but may affect quality of life in CCSs as described above. We are now planning detailed analyses on these subclinical but important health problems and will propose refined risk-based regular follow-up program including pulmonary function tests, neurocognitive evaluations, and dental examination.

Conclusion

Our study revealed that active screening using comprehensive medical examinations can identify health problems in CCSs efficiently. Although the prevalence of severe problems was the same between regular clinic-based evaluations based on follow-up guidelines and comprehensive medical examinations, the latter detected several overlooked problems such as pulmonary dysfunction, dental maldevelopment, and borderline intellectual functioning, which might have an impact on quality of life in CCSs. The cost-effectiveness of active screening should be further addressed in future studies.

Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in this study are included in the article/supplementary material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

Ethics statement

Written informed consent was obtained from all participants in the Active screening group and opt-out consent involving provision of an information leaflet was obtained when the medical records of patients in the Regular follow-up group were reviewed. This study was approved by the Ethics board of St. Luke's International Hospital.

Author contributions

YY-S, DH, YH, KK, YI, AM, and MO conceived and designed the study. GS, KN, and MG collected the clinical information and data. YY-S and DH analyzed the data, interpreted the results, and wrote the manuscript. YH, YI, AM,

and MO contributed to the interpretation of the data and revised the manuscript. All the authors reviewed the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan (2014–2019: 26463429 and 2018-2021: 18H03098), Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare of Japan (2020–2022: 20EA1022), a research grant from Children's Cancer Association of Japan (2020–2021), a research grant from the Gold Ribbon Network (2017 and 2020), Relay For Life Japan: "Project Future" Research Grant (2016–2017), and Heart Link Working Project: Childhood Cancer Follow-up Research Grant (2014–2015).

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the patients and their parents for participating in this study. Sachiko Ohde (Graduate School of

References

1. Armstrong GT, Chen Y, Yasui Y, Leisenring W, Gibson TM, Mertens AC, et al. Reduction in Late Mortality among 5-Year Survivors of Childhood Cancer. *N Engl J Med.* (2016) 374:833–42. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1510795

2. Oeffinger KC, Mertens AC, Sklar CA, Kawashima T, Hudson MM, Meadows AT, et al. Childhood cancer survivor, chronic health conditions in adult survivors of childhood cancer. *N Engl J Med.* (2006) 355:1572–82. doi: 10.1056/NEJMsa060185

3. Landier W, Armenian S, Bhatia S. Late effects of childhood cancer and its treatment. *Pediatr Clin North Am.* (2015) 62:275–300. doi: 10.1016/j.pcl.2014.09. 017

 Geenen MM, Cardous-Ubbink MC, Kremer LC, van den Bos C, van der Pal HJ, Heinen RC, et al. Medical assessment of adverse health outcomes in long-term survivors of childhood cancer. *JAMA*. (2007) 297:2705–15. doi: 10.1001/jama.297. 24.2705

5. Sieswerda E, Mulder RL, van Dijk IW, van Dalen EC, Kniinenburg SL, van der Pal HJH, et al. The EKZ/AMC childhood cancer survivor cohort: methodology, clinical characteristics, and data availability. *J Cancer Surviv.* (2013) 7:439–54. doi: 10.1007/s11764-013-0283-9

6. Hudson MM, Ness KK, Gurney JG, Mulrooney DA, Chemaitilly W, Krull KR, et al. Clinical ascertainment of health outcomes among adults treated for childhood cancer. *JAMA*. (2013) 309:2371–81. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.6296

7. Children's Oncology Group. Long-term follow-up guidelines for survivors of childhood, adolescent, and young adult cancers. Version 5.0. (2018). Available online at: http://www.survivorshipguidelines.org (accessed April 27, 2022).

8. Lu J. Ningen Dock: Japan's unique comprehensive health checkup system for early detection of disease. *Glob Health Med.* (2022) 4:9–13. doi: 10.35772/ghm.2021. 01109

9. Hudson MM, Ehrhardt MJ, Bhakta N, Baassiri M, Eissa H, Chemaitilly W, et al. Approach for classification and severity grading of long-term and late-onset health Public Health, St. Luke's International University) and Seiju Sasaki (Center for Preventive Medicine, St. Luke's International Hospital) for valuable advice regarding the conception and analysis; and all of our colleagues who were involved in the patients' care and assisted with the study.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

events among childhood cancer survivors in the St. Jude Lifetime Cohort. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* (2017) 26:666–74. doi: 10.1158/1055-9965

10. Kanda Y. Investigation of the freely available easy-touse software 'EZR' for medical statistics. *Bone Marrow Transpl.* (2013) 48:452–8. doi: 10.1038/bmt.2012. 244

11. Immonen E, Nikkilä A, Peltomäki T, Aine L, Lohi O. Late adverse effects of childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia treatment on developing dentition. *Pediatric Blood Cancer*. (2021) 68:e29200. doi: 10.1002/pbc.29200

12. Polder BJ, Van't Hof MA, Van der Linden FPGM, Kuijpers-Jagtman AM. A meta-analysis of the prevalence of dental agenesis of permanent teeth. *Commun Dent Oral Epidemiol.* (2004) 32:217–26. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0528.2004.00158.x

13. van der Pal HJ, van Dalen EC, Hauptmann M, Kok WE, Caron HN, van den Bos C, et al. Cardiac function in 5-year survivors of childhood cancer: a long-term follow-up study. *Arch Intern Med.* (2010) 170:1247–55. doi: 10.1001/archinternmed.2010.233

14. Armstrong GT, Joshi VM, Ness KK, Marwick TH, Zhang N, Srivastava D, et al. Comprehensive echocardiographic detection of treatment-related cardiac dysfunction in adult survivors of childhood cancer: results from the St. Jude Lifetime Cohort Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* (2015) 65:2511–22. doi: 10.1016/j.jacc. 2015.04.013

15. Poon LHJ, Yu CP, Peng L, Ewig CL, Zhang H, Li CK, et al. Clinical ascertainment of health outcomes in Asian survivors of childhood cancer: a systematic review. *J Cancer Surviv*. (2019) 13:374–96. doi: 10.1007/s11764-019-00759-9

16. Bhakta N, Liu Q, Ness KK, Baassiri M, Eissa H, Yeo F, et al. The cumulative burden of surviving childhood cancer: an initial report from the St Jude Lifetime Cohort Study (SJLIFE). *Lancet.* (2017) 390:2569–82. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17) 31610-0