# **Title Page**

- 2 **Construction and Validation of a Nomogram**
- **Based on the Log Odds of Positive Lymph**
- **4** Nodes to Predict the Prognosis of Lung
- **5 Neuroendocrine Tumors**
- 6

1

- 7 **Running title**: LODDS in lung neuroendocrine tumors
- 8

9 Suyu Wang<sup>1†</sup>, Juan Wei<sup>2†</sup>, Yibin Guo<sup>3†</sup>, Qiumeng Xu<sup>4†</sup>, Xin Lv<sup>2</sup>, Yue Yu<sup>1\*</sup>,
10 Meiyun Liu<sup>2\*</sup>

- <sup>1</sup>Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Changzheng Hospital, Naval Medical
   University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China.
- <sup>13</sup> <sup>2</sup>Department of Anesthesiology, Shanghai Pulmonary Hospital, Tongji University
- 14 School of Medicine, Shanghai, People's Republic of China.
- <sup>3</sup>Department of Health Statistics, Naval Medical University, Shanghai, People's
  Republic of China.
- <sup>4</sup>Department of Orthopaedics, Changzheng Hospital, Naval Medical University,
- 18 Shanghai, People's Republic of China.
- 19
- 20 **\*Correspondence to:**

21	Meiyun Liu, MD. Department of Anesthesiology, Shanghai Pulmonary Hospital,
22	Tongji University School of Medicine, Shanghai, People's Republic of China.
23	Address: No.507 Zhengmin Road, Yangpu District, Shanghai, 200433, People's
24	Republic of China. Tel: (86) 18916380529, Email: liumeiyun0@126.com.
25	Yue Yu, MD. Department of Cardiothoracic Surgery, Changzheng Hospital, Naval
26	Medical University, Shanghai, People's Republic of China. Address: No.415
27	Fengyang Road, Huangpu District, Shanghai, 200003, People's Republic of China.
28	Tel: (86) 13601989808, Fax: 021-81885901, Email: 15021567170@153.com.
29	
30	$^{\dagger}$ These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.
31	
32	Abstract
32 33	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of
32 33 34	Abstract Objectives: This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients
32 33 34 35	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs).
32 33 34 35 36	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs). <i>Materials and Methods:</i> We collected 506 eligible patients with resected N1/N2
32 33 34 35 36 37	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs). <i>Materials and Methods:</i> We collected 506 eligible patients with resected N1/N2 classification LNETs from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER)
32 33 34 35 36 37 38	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs). <i>Materials and Methods:</i> We collected 506 eligible patients with resected N1/N2 classification LNETs from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database between 2004 and 2015. First, we applied the Cox proportional-hazards
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs). <i>Materials and Methods:</i> We collected 506 eligible patients with resected N1/N2 classification LNETs from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database between 2004 and 2015. First, we applied the Cox proportional-hazards regression model to evaluate the relationship between LODDS and study endpoints
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs). <i>Materials and Methods:</i> We collected 506 eligible patients with resected N1/N2 classification LNETs from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database between 2004 and 2015. First, we applied the Cox proportional-hazards regression model to evaluate the relationship between LODDS and study endpoints (cancer-specific survival [CSS] and overall survival [OS]) based on the entire cohort.
32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	Abstract <i>Objectives:</i> This study aimed to investigate the prognostic value of Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS) for predicting the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs). <i>Materials and Methods:</i> We collected 506 eligible patients with resected N1/N2 classification LNETs from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database between 2004 and 2015. First, we applied the Cox proportional-hazards regression model to evaluate the relationship between LODDS and study endpoints (cancer-specific survival [CSS] and overall survival [OS]) based on the entire cohort. Second, the study cohort was divided into derivation cohort (n=300) and external

43 constructed and validated based on these two cohorts to predict the 1-, 3- and 5-year
44 survival of patients with LNETs. The accuracy and clinical practicability of
45 nomograms were tested and compared by Harrell's concordance index (C-index),
46 integrated discrimination improvement (IDI), net reclassification improvement (NRI),
47 calibration plots, and decision curve analyses.

*Results:* The Cox proportional-hazards model showed the high LODDS group (-0.33≤ 48 LODDS $\leq$ 1.14) had significantly higher mortality compared to those in the low 49 50 LODDS group (-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33) for both CSS and OS. In addition, besides 51 LODDS, age at diagnosis, histotype, type of surgery, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy were shown as independent predictors in Cox regression analyses and included in the 52 53 nomograms. The values of c-index, NRI, and IDI indicated that the established 54 nomogram performed significantly better than the conventional eighth edition of the 55 TNM staging system alone. The calibration plots for predictions of the 1-, 3-, and 56 5-year OS were in excellent agreement. Decision curve analyses showed that the 57 nomogram had value in terms of clinical application.

58 *Conclusions:* We created visualized nomograms for CSS and OS of LNET patients,

59 facilitating clinicians to provide highly individualized risk assessment and therapy.

Keywords: lung neuroendocrine tumors, log odds of positive lymph nodes,
predictor, survival, nomogram.

62

### 63 **Abbreviations:**

64 LNET: lung neuroendocrine tumor; TC: typical carcinoid; AC: atypical carcinoid;

65	LCNEC: large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma; SCLC: small cell lung carcinoma;
66	NSCLC: non-small cell lung cancer; AJCC: American Joint Committee on Cancer;
67	UICC: Union for International Cancer Control; TNM: tumor-node-metastasis; LN:
68	lymph node; NPLN: number of positive lymph node; LODDS: log odds of positive
69	lymph nodes; SEER: Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results; NDLN: number
70	of dissected lymph node; CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival; SD:
71	standard deviation; IQR: interquartile range; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval;
72	PRCDA: purchased/referred care delivery area; c-index: concordance index; IDI:
73	integrated discrimination improvement; NRI: net reclassification improvement; DCA:
74	decision curve analysis; LNR: lymph node ratio; IASLC: International Association for
75	the Study of Lung Cancer.
76	
77	
78	
79	
80	
81	
82	
83	
84	
85	
86	

### Main Text

# 88 **1. Introduction**

89 Lung neuroendocrine tumors (LNETs) originate from pulmonary neuroendocrine cells, accounting for approximately 25% of primary lung neoplasms [1]. Owing to the 90 increased lung cancer screening, the annual incidence of LNET has substantially 91 92 increased, rising from 0.0003% in 1973 to 0.0014% in 2004 in the United States [2-4]. Currently, the 2015 World Health Organization classification has grouped LNETs into 93 94 four histologic variants based on their histopathologic features: typical carcinoid (TC), 95 atypical carcinoid (AC), large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma (LCNEC), and small cell lung carcinoma (SCLC) [5]. Due to the rarity and morphological heterogeneity of 96 97 these tumors, there have been limited clinical data available regarding LNETs, thus 98 making their diagnosis, staging, risk assessment, and treatment challenging [1]. 99 Although specific to non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), the international American 100 Joint Committee on Cancer/Union for International Cancer Control (AJCC/UICC) 101 tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) staging system has been applied to LNETs [6, 7]. 102 However, several studies have shown an overlapping survival of patients with LNETs, 103 particularly in stages II and III [6-10]. Therefore, further investigation is warranted to 104 optimize the staging system for LNETs.

Lymph node (LN) involvement is a significant prognostic factor for staging and risk stratification. A combination of the number of positive lymph nodes (NPLN), the number of negative lymph nodes, and the anatomic location of LN metastasis have been applied in the staging of many malignancies [11-15]. However, the latest version

109 of AJCC/UICC TNM classification of lung cancer did not take account of any 110 number- or ratio-based LN staging system, which could affect the precision of 111 prognosis evaluation [16, 17]. Log odds of positive lymph nodes (LODDS), defined 112 as the logarithm of the ratio between NPLN and NNLN, is currently being used as a novel prognostic indicator with a strong ability to identify patients with a 113 114 homogeneous prognosis in many malignant tumors, including NSCLC [18-21]. 115 However, no specific study has focused on its prognostic significance in LNETs till 116 now.

The present study aimed to determine whether LODDS could be utilized to predict the long-term prognosis of patients with node-positive (N1/N2 classification) LNET using the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database. To facilitate clinical use, we also constructed a visualized and online nomogram incorporating LODDS for LNETs.

122

### 123 **2. Materials and methods**

#### 124 2.1 Study design, data source, and ethical statement

We conducted a multi-center retrospective cohort study according to the parts of the methods described in our previous studies [20-22]. We use the Transparent Reporting of a multivariate prediction model for Individual Prediction or Diagnosis (TRIPOD) for reporting [23]. The data of this study were extracted from the SEER 18 registries research database, covering approximately 28% of the population of the United States [24]. Data were extracted using the SEER\*Stat version 8.3.5 software. The requirement for informed consent was waived because the study utilized the
anonymous data available in the database. In summary, this study complied with the
Declaration of Helsinki [25].

134

#### 135 **2.2** Population selection

136 Data on the patients with lung cancer were obtained from the SEER database. 137 Inclusion criteria were as followed: (1) diagnosed from 2004 to 2015; (2) site recode 138 "ICD-O-3/WHO 2008" restricted to "Lung and Bronchus"; and (3) pathologically 139 confirmed as TC (ICD-O-3 code: 8240/3), AC (ICD-O-3 code: 8249/3) or LCNEC 140 (ICD-O-3 code: 8013/3). The study period was set from 2004 to 2015, as the TMN 141 classification and Collaborative Stage information was available in the database since 142 2004. Besides, we reclassified the TNM stage according to the eighth edition of 143 AJCC/UICC TNM classification because the TNM system had multiple versions in 144 the SEER database and did not apply to all patients [26]. Furthermore, considering its 145 strong invasion ability and unique pathological characteristics limiting the surgical 146 options, SCLC was not included in the present study [27, 28]. Although LCNEC has 147 been found to harbor subpopulations of tumors with SCLC, surgery should be offered 148 to medically fit patients with both early and locally advanced LCNEC [29-31]. 149 Therefore, we enrolled patients with LCNEC in this study. Patients were excluded 150 who (1) aged < 18 years; (2) had a diagnosis of any other cancer; (3) did not undergo 151 radical surgery with systematic LN dissection; (4) had the diagnosis lacking 152 pathological evidence; (5) were at pN0/pN3 disease; (6) had distant metastasis (M1);

(7) received preoperative radiotherapy; (8) survived less or equal to 30 days after
surgery; (9) had missing data on race, laterality, tumor location, radiotherapy, TNM
staging system, and survival outcomes.

156

#### 157 2.3 Variable extraction, preparation, grouping, and calculation

158 The baseline demographics data including age at diagnosis ( $\leq 62$  and >62), sex (male 159 and female), and race (white, black, and other) were extracted from the SEER 160 database. Data on baseline tumor-related characteristics included primary site (upper 161 lobe, middle lobe, lower lobe, and other), laterality (right and left), histotypes (TC, AC, and LCNEC), tumor differentiation (well/moderately differentiated, poorly 162 163 differentiated /undifferentiated, and unknown), T classification (T1, T2, T3, and T4), 164 and N classification (N1 and N2). In addition, treatment information including 165 surgical intervention (sublobectomy, lobectomy, and pneumonectomy), radiotherapy (yes and no/unknown), chemotherapy (yes and no/unknown), NDLN, and NPLN was 166 167 also extracted from the database. LODDS calculated was as:  $LODDS = \log \frac{NPLN+0.50}{NDLN-NPLN+0.5}$ . To avoid an infinite number, 0.50 was added to both the 168 numerator and denominator. Lung cancer-specific survival (CSS) and overall survival 169 170 (OS) were two of the study endpoints. The period from diagnosis to all-cause death 171 was referred to as OS, while the time from diagnosis to LNET-related death was 172 referred to as CSS. For censored data, the follow-up duration was computed as the 173 number of months between diagnosis and death or the last follow-up (December 31, 174 2016).

#### 176 2.4 Statistical analysis strategy

Baseline characteristics of study cohort stratified by LODDS were compared by using Student *t* test, Mann-Whitney test, Pearson's  $\chi^2$  test, or Fisher's exact test as appropriate. Continuous variables were displayed with the mean (standard deviation [SD]) or the median (interquartile range [IQR]), while categorical variables were reported as count and percentages.

182 First, we analyzed LODDS as a continuous variable. A smooth curve was drawn to 183 estimate the association between LODDS and its hazard ratios (HRs) using restricted 184 cubic spline regression analysis according to the method of Chen et al [32]. Second, 185 we took LODDS as a categorical variable. LODDS was dichotomized via the X-tile 186 software [33]. Survival curves were calculated using the Kaplan-Meier method and 187 compared using the log-rank test. To assess the connection between LODDS and each 188 study outcome, a multivariable Cox proportional-hazards regression model was used, 189 controlling for relevant confounders. These confounders were selected based on their 190 associations with the study endpoints of interest or a change in effect estimate of over 191 10%. The relatively low LODDS group was used as a reference group, and the results 192 are presented as HRs with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). Third, a series of subgroup 193 analyses were performed according to age at diagnosis, sex, primary site, laterality, 194 histotypes, tumor differentiation, T classification, and N classification.

All statistical analyses were performed using R software (version.3.6.14.1.0; The R
Project for Statistical Computing, TX, USA; http://www.r-project.org) and

197 EmpowerStats (version 2.0; http://www.empowerstats.com). Two-tailed P < 0.050198 was deemed as statistical significance.

199

### 200 2.5 Construction and validation of nomograms

Patients with purchased/referred care delivery areas (PRCDA) of East, Northern plains, and Alaska were regarded as the derivation cohort, while the external validation cohort includes patients with PRCDA of Pacific coast and Southwest. StepAIC algorithm was used in multivariable Cox regression analysis to select the predictors for the final models [34]. Using these identified prognostic factors, we constructed two nomograms for predicting 1-, 3-, and 5-year CSS and OS in LNET patients.

208 Several indexes and methods were used to assess the accuracy of our nomograms. 209 First, Harrell's concordance index (c-index) was calculated to quantify the 210 discrimination performance of the nomograms. Second, a calibration curve, which is a 211 diagram presenting the association between predicted probabilities and actual survival 212 rate at 1, 3, and 5 years, along with a bootstrapped sample of the study cohort, was 213 used to assess the calibration. Third, a comparison between our nomogram and the 214 conventional eighth edition of the TNM staging system was conducted by calculating 215 integrated discrimination improvement (IDI) and net reclassification improvement 216 (NRI) [35]. Z test was used to examine the difference. Fourth, the decision curve 217 analysis (DCA) was performed to test the clinical usefulness of the nomograms and 218 TNM classification. Finally, to facilitate researchers' and clinicians' usage of our

219 model, we created two user-friendly webservers for our nomograms.

220

### 221 **3. Results**

#### 222 3.1 Patients characteristics and cutoff value for LOODS

223 The SEER database collected 11,870 patients diagnosed with LNETs from January 224 2004 to December 2015. After employing the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 506 225 patients remained in the final study cohort. The selection process were summarized in 226 Figure 1. Based on the results calculated by the X-tile software, the optimal cutoff 227 value of LODDS was set as -0.33. Therefore, the study cohort was dichotomized into 228 the low LODDS group (-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33; n=334) and the high LODDS group 229 (-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14; n=172). Baseline demographic and clinicopathological features 230 of participants stratified by LODDS were listed in *Table 1*. The median number of 231 NDLN was 12.00 (IQR: 8.00-17.00) in the low LODDS group and 5.00 (IQR: 232 3.00-9.00) in the high LODDS group, whereas the median number of NPLN was 1.00 233 (IQR: 1.00-2.00) in the low LODDS group and 2.00 (IQR: 1.00-4.00) in the high 234 LODDS group. Compared with the low LODDS group (-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33), the 235 patients included in the high LODDS group (-0.33 $\leq$ LODDS $\leq$ 1.14) were more likely 236 to be diagnosed in the N2 classification (P < 0.001), have more positive lymph nodes (P < 0.001) and receive radiotherapy (P=0.045). No difference was observed in age at 237 diagnosis, sex, race, laterality, tumor site, histotype, differentiation, T classification, 238 239 surgery, and chemotherapy between the two cohorts (all *P*-values > 0.050).

#### 241 3.2 Restricted cubic spline analysis

242	We performed a common Cox regression analysis using LODDS as a continuous
243	variable and found the adjusted HRs of LODDS for CSS and OS were 2.21 (95% CI:
244	1.52-3.20, P<0.001) and 1.51 (95%CI: 1.10-2.06, P=0.010). Second, two piece-wise
245	Cox regression analyses were conducted and the inflection points were found (-0.27
246	for CSS, -0.26 for OS, <i>Table S1</i> ). For the LODDS < -0.27, every 1 increase in
247	LODDS was associated with a 321% increase in CSS ( $P$ <0.001), while for the
248	LODDS > -0.27, every 1 increase in LODDS was associated with a 24% increase in
249	CSS ( $P=0.555$ ). For a LODDS < -0.26, every 1 increase in LODDS was associated
250	with a 135% increase in OS ( $P$ <0.001), while for a LODDS > -0.26, every 1 increase
251	in LODDS was associated with a 4% decrease in OS (P=0.906). As shown in the
252	restricted cubic spline analyses (Figure 2), the HRs for LODDS as a continuous
253	variable tends to show a saturation effect.

254

#### 255 3.3 Survival analysis

The median follow-up time for the entire cohort was 42 months (IQR, 19-77 months). A total of 180 (35.57%) patients died from any cause, and 135 (26.68%) patients died from LNET-related death at the end of the study period. The cumulative 1-, 3-, and 5-year CSS and OS rates for patients stratified by LODDS were summarized in *Tables* **S2**. The survival curves showed that patients with the higher values of LODDS (-0.33  $\leq$ LODDS $\leq$ 1.14) were associated with worse prognosis (log-rank test: *P*=0.001 for CSS; *P*=0.005 for OS, *Figures S1*). Based on the entire cohort, the univariable Cox

263	regression model suggested that age at diagnosis, race, site, histotype, differentiation,
264	T classification, N classification, surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, and LODDS
265	were all significant variables for CSS in <i>Table S3</i> . The multivariable Cox regression
266	analysis demonstrated that participants in the high LODDS group (-0.33≤LODDS≤
267	1.14) was related to reducing survival compared to those in the low LODDS group
268	(-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33) (HR=2.06, 95% CI: 1.43-2.97, P<0.001) ( <i>Table 2 and Table</i>
269	S3). The multivariable Cox regression analysis for OS yielded similar results
270	(HR=1.66, 95% CI: 1.22-2.26, P=0.001, Table 2 and Table S4). To eliminate the
271	potential bias caused by the LN fragments, we performed a sensitivity analysis by
272	restricting the resected LN count to fewer than or equal to 20, and found that LODDS
273	remained statistically significant (CSS: HR=2.16, 95% CI: 1.46-3.19, P<0.001; OS:
274	HR=1.75, 95% CI: 1.25-2.43, P=0.001) (Table 2 and Table S5-6). Furthermore, the
275	extent of LN management should be in accordance with the IASLC recommendations,
276	which involves a minimum of 6 nodes/stations, therefore we excluded patients with
277	the examined LN count to fewer than 6. The multivariable Cox regression analysis
278	yielded similar results (CSS: HR=2.84, 95% CI: 1.78-4.50, P<0.001; OS: HR=2.37,
279	95% CI: 1.59-3.54, P<0.001) (Table 2 and Table S7-8).

280

### 281 **3.4 Subgroup analysis**

For CSS, subgroup analyses showed the higher LODDS (-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14) was also associated with deteriorative mortality in most strata (*Table S9*). Even among patients with the same N stage, LODDS still could distinguish and stratify patients into different risk groups. (N1 stage subgroup: HR=1.99, 95% CI: 1.14-3.45, P=0.015; N1 stage subgroup: HR=2.24, 95% CI: 1.27-3.96, P=0.006). For OS, in the N1 stage subgroup, the HR remained the trend of increase despite the results were not statistically significant (HR=1.56, 95% CI: 0.98-2.49, P=0.060).

289

#### 290 3.5 Construction and validation of the nomogram

291 Prognostic nomograms for CSS and OS were established including significant 292 indicators selected by StepAIC algorithm in multivariable Cox regression analysis. 293 For nomogram construction and validation, among the final study cohort including 294 506 patients, 300 of them were assigned to the derivation cohort (PRCDA=East, 295 Northern plains, and Alaska) and 206 of them were assigned to the validation cohort 296 (PRCDA=Pacific coast, Southwest). The comparison of baseline characteristics 297 between the derivation cohort and validation cohort was summarized in *Table S10*. 298 No difference was observed in most variables except sex. The nomogram of CSS 299 showed that histotype contributed the most to the prognosis, followed by age at 300 diagnosis, LODDS, surgery, and chemotherapy (Fig 3 and Table 3). Similarly, the nomogram of OS showed that histotype contributed the most to the prognosis, 301 302 followed by age at diagnosis, chemotherapy, LODDS, and radiotherapy (Fig 3 and 303 *Table 4*). The top point reference scale of the nomograms assigned a score for each 304 category of these predictive variables. After adding up the total score and locating the 305 sum on the total points reference scale, a straight line was drawn to the bottom 306 survival probability scale to find the estimated 1-/3-/5- survival rate.

The nomogram was validated internally in the derivation cohort and externally in the validation cohort. C-indexes of CSS for derivation cohort and validation cohort were 0.845 (0.804-0.886), and 0.821 (0.771-0.871). C-indexes of OS for derivation cohort and validation cohort were 0.821 (0.783-0.858), and 0.811 (0.766-0.856). Additionally, the calibration plots (*Fig 4*) revealed that the points were close to the 45-degree line, indicating a good similarity between the nomogram-predicted and actual survival states.

314

#### 315 3.6 Comparison of the nomogram and the eighth edition TNM staging system

316 The comparisons between the nomograms and the TNM staging system were also 317 performed (*Table S11*). Analysis of accuracy showed that the NRI for the 1-, 3-, and 318 5-year CSS were 0.721 (95% CI: 0.825-0.554, P<0.001), 0.645 (95% CI: 0.743-0.414, 319 P < 0.001) and 0.627 (95% CI: 0.768-0.403, P < 0.001) in the validation cohorts, 320 respectively. Similarly, in the validation set, the IDI for 1-, 3-, and 5-years CSS were 321 0.249 (95% CI: 0.389-0.161, P<0.001), 0.391 (95% CI: 0.519-0.243, P<0.001), and 322 0.42 (95% CI: 0.537-0.265, P<0.001), respectively. Furthermore, the DCA curve was 323 applied to determine the clinical applicability of the nomogram and TNM staging 324 system. The DCA curves showed that our nomograms were better than the TNM 325 staging system, as it added more net benefits compared with the TNM classification 326 for almost all threshold probabilities based on the derivation cohort and validation 327 cohort (Fig S2 and S3).

#### 329 3.7 Development of webservers for convenient clinical use

330 Two dynamic, visualized and publicly accessible online nomograms based on the 331 multivariable Cox regression models were built (CSS: 332 https://drboidedwater.shinyapps.io/DynNom-CSS-lungneuroendocrinecarcinoma/; OS: 333 https://drboidedwater.shinyapps.io/DynNom-OS-lungneuroendocrinecarcinoma/) (Fig 334 S4). The webservers may generate estimated survival probability and Kaplan-Meier 335 curves by entering the covariates.

336

### **4. Discussion**

338 LNETs constitute a unique clinical subgroup of primary pulmonary tumors. Due to 339 their relatively low incidence, no specific staging system exists for LNETs. An exact 340 and reasonable assessment of the lymph node status plays a crucial role in the 341 staging and prognosis evaluation of patients with LNCTs. In this study, we found that 342 LODDS was independently associated with long-term clinical outcomes among 343 patients with resectable LNETs. These results were robust to restricted cubic spline 344 analysis and a series of sensitivity analyses. Second, we constructed a visualized and 345 publicly accessible online nomogram, incorporating LODDS and routinely available 346 demographic, staging and treatment information, to predict the survival probability for 347 individual LNET patients. To our knowledge, the present study is the first to explore 348 the prognostic value of LODDS for LNET based on a multi-center cohort with a 349 relatively large sample size.

350 The involvement of regional lymph nodes in malignancies has been considered as

351 one of the most important prognostic factors. The eighth edition of the AJCC/UICC 352 staging system of NSCLC classified metastasis to ipsilateral peribronchial and/or hilar 353 nodes and intrapulmonary nodes as N1 classification, and metastasis into ipsilateral 354 mediastinal and/or subcarinal nodes into N2 classification, without taking into 355 account numbers of examined and metastatic lymph nodes [36]. LODDS is a new LN 356 ratio-based index and has been identified as an independent predictor in many 357 malignancies such as rectal cancer [37], pancreatic cancer [38], gallbladder cancer 358 [39], gastric cancer [40], and colon cancer [41]. Recently, several studies were attempting to explore the prognostic value of LODDS for NSCLC. In 2020, we did a 359 research and found that the high value of LODDS > -0.37 was independently 360 361 associated with worse survival in patients with node-positive lung squamous cell 362 carcinoma [20]. Dziedzic et al. [19] found that it is possible to discriminate NSCLC 363 patients more effectively by using LODDS compared to conventional N classification. 364 Deng et al. [18] found LODDS and lymph node ratio (LNR) staging schemes 365 outperformed those of NPLN for predicting OS and CSS among patients with 366 node-positive NSCLC. However, most previous studies only focused on NSCLC, and few reports have explored the prognostic value of LODDS in LNETs. 367

In the current study, either as a continuous or as a categorical variable, the high value of LODDS was associated with worse survival for N1/N2 stage patients with LNETs. However, LODDS must be used and calculated with caution, because the value of LODDS is influenced by the number of dissected LN. Therefore, a series of sensitivity analyses were performed. For LNETs, the extent of LN management

373	should conform to the International Association for the Study of Lung Cancer (IASLC)
374	recommendations, which involves a minimum of 6 nodes/stations, 3 of which should
375	be mediastinal including the subcarinal station [42]. Considering that the accurate
376	value of LODDS was dependent on the adequate NDLN, we excluded patients with
377	examined LN count less than 6 and found that LODDS could still serve as an
378	independent predictor for LNETs. In addition, it is quite easy to damage the integrity
379	of the LN during surgery, especially when the LNs are adhesive to each other or
380	difficult to be separated from the dissected tissues [43]. To avoid the potential bias led
381	by fragmented LNs, we excluded patients with examined LN count of more than 20,
382	and the results did not change. Furthermore, in the subgroup stratified by
383	different N stages (N1 and N2 stages), LODDS could still discriminate the high-risk
384	population from the low-risk one. Additionally, to our surprise, N classification was
385	excluded from our nomograms. The possible reason is that the anatomical definition
386	of LN station is more complicated and dependent on surgery quality, which thus
387	might potentially cause misclassification of the stage, and thus be replaced by
388	LODDS [44, 45]. In summary, LODDS is the ratio-based LN staging system that
389	combines NPLN and NNLN, which might be superior to some number-based LN
390	assessment methods. Furthermore, in LODDS, the numerator and denominator are
391	both added with a value of 0.5, eliminating the singularities caused by null data,
392	therefore LODDS might be used to estimate survival of node-negative patients, as
393	opposed to LNR.

394 The LODDS was not the only prognostic factor included in our nomogram.

395 Similar to previous studies [46-48], age at diagnosis, histotype, surgery, radiotherapy, 396 and chemotherapy were independent prognostic factors of CSS or OS. In this study, 397 the nomogram showed that histotype contributed the most to the prognosis, which 398 indicated tumor histotype is a crucial determinant of the clinical behavior of LNETs. 399 Our nomogram indicated that LCNEC showed the worst prognosis followed by AC 400 and TC. Growing evidence also suggests that high-grade LCNEC is biologically 401 distinct from low-grade TC and intermediate-grade AC in view of clinical behavior, 402 pathologic features, molecular alterations as well as possible precursor lesions [49]. 403 All-stage 5-year OS for LCNEC fluctuated between 13% and 57% [50]. Different 404 from LCNEC, TC and AC are more commonly found in younger patients without 405 smoking histories. AC is significantly more aggressive than TC, with a higher 406 frequency of nodal and distant metastases, and 5-year survival of 60%. In this study, 407 we did not include SCLC patients, because a unique feature of SCLC is that it is 408 generally considered a nonsurgical disease [51].

409 The optimal type of surgical treatment for LNETs is controversial. The surgical 410 approach depends on tumor size, location, and preoperative biopsy specimen 411 assessment. Several studies reported that wedge resection may increase the risk of 412 tumor recurrences, especially in node-positive TC or AC [52, 53]. Lobectomy is 413 reported as superior to segmentectomy in terms of OS in some, but not all in 414 pulmonary carcinoids [54-56]. Similar to these studies, our study showed that 415 lobectomy was superior to sublobectomy and pneumonectomy in the nomogram for 416 CSS. Furthermore, there is an absence of high-quality evidence to show whether or

417 not chemotherapy could provide clinical benefits for LNETs. Although our nomogram 418 showed that chemotherapy might be associated with more favorable prognoses. 419 However, the results need to be interpreted with caution. In the SEER database, 420 patients without receiving chemotherapy and those with unknown information about 421 adjuvant therapy were classified into one category, which might lead to potential bias. 422 Until now, for pulmonary carcinoids, routine adjuvant therapy may only be 423 considered in selected fit patients (AC, N2 stage) with a particularly high risk of 424 relapse [57]. Besides, Iyoda et al. [58] suggested that platinum-based adjuvant 425 chemotherapy after surgery could help patients with LCNEC prevent recurrence.

426 Because LNET is a heterogeneous disease, each LNET patient requires an 427 individualized and timely risk assessment, which allows for more precise therapeutic 428 strategies and medical resource allocation decisions. In this study, we developed and 429 validated a nomogram to predict prognosis in patients with LNET. Our nomograms 430 based on LODDS were more accurate and obtained more clinical net benefit than the 431 conventional AJCC/UICC TNM staging system. In summary, the online nomograms, 432 composed of several easily obtained predictors, could be a simpler way to engage 433 clinicians in death risks, patient counseling, and decision-making. To put it another 434 way, LNET patients with poorer clinical results estimated by nomograms may require 435 more aggressive therapy. [28].

436 Several limitations of this study should be noted. First, the SEER database lacks
437 some detailed data, such as smoking history, some promising molecular markers (e.g.
438 Ki-67), imaging techniques used before surgery, histological and morphological data

439 (e.g. mitotic rate), type of resection (R0, R1, or R2), and use of systemic therapies. 440 Therefore they could not be included as covariables in the multivariable Cox models. 441 Second, information about postoperative comorbidities, and tumor recurrence is also 442 not available in the database. Third, although we reclassified the TNM classification 443 according to the eighth edition of AJCC/UICC TNM classification, the TNM staging 444 system, which was derived from the SEER database's collaborative stage system, is a 445 combination of clinical and pathologic stages. Because of the distinction between 446 clinical and pathologic stages, more subgroup analysis is required when using a single 447 clinical or pathologic staging system.

448

# 449 **5.** Conclusions

LODDS was found to be useful in predicting survival outcomes in LNET patients who underwent surgery. Online dynamic nomograms including LODDS to evaluate CSS and OS were constructed. The well-executed nomograms may aid clinicians in providing reasonable, customized therapeutic strategies for LNET patients.

454

# 455 **Funding support**

This study was funded by Development Fund for the Department of Anesthesiology
of Shanghai Pulmonary Hospital. The funders have no role in the study design, data
collection, data analysis and completion of the manuscripts.

459

# 460 **Conflict of interest disclosures**

461 There are no conflicts of interest with any of the authors.

462

# **463 CRediT authorship contribution statement**

- 464 Suyu Wang and Yue Yu: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Investigation,
- 465 Writing-original draft, Writing-review & editing. Juan Wei: Software, Data curation,
- 466 Investigation, Writing-original draft. Yibin Guo and Qiumeng Xu: Visualization,
- 467 Investigation. Xin Lv: Software, Validation. Meiyun Liu: Funding acquisition,
- 468 Writing-review & editing.

469

# 470 **References**

- 471 [1] Hendifar AE, Marchevsky AM and Tuli R. Neuroendocrine Tumors of the Lung: Current
  472 Challenges and Advances in the Diagnosis and Management of Well-Differentiated Disease. J
  473 Thorac Oncol 2017; 12: 425-436.
- 474 [2] Dasari A, Shen C, Halperin D, Zhao B, Zhou S, Xu Y, Shih T and Yao JC. Trends in the Incidence,
  475 Prevalence, and Survival Outcomes in Patients With Neuroendocrine Tumors in the United
  476 States. JAMA Oncol 2017; 3: 1335-1342.
- 477 [3] Hallet J, Law CH, Cukier M, Saskin R, Liu N and Singh S. Exploring the rising incidence of
  478 neuroendocrine tumors: a population-based analysis of epidemiology, metastatic
  479 presentation, and outcomes. Cancer 2015; 121: 589-597.
- 480 [4] Naalsund A, Rostad H, Strøm EH, Lund MB and Strand TE. Carcinoid lung tumors--incidence,
  481 treatment and outcomes: a population-based study. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2011; 39:
  482 565-569.
- Travis WD, Brambilla E, Nicholson AG, Yatabe Y, Austin JHM, Beasley MB, Chirieac LR, Dacic S,
  Duhig E, Flieder DB, Geisinger K, Hirsch FR, Ishikawa Y, Kerr KM, Noguchi M, Pelosi G, Powell
  CA, Tsao MS and Wistuba I. The 2015 World Health Organization Classification of Lung
  Tumors: Impact of Genetic, Clinical and Radiologic Advances Since the 2004 Classification. J
  Thorac Oncol 2015; 10: 1243-1260.
- Yoon JY, Sigel K, Martin J, Jordan R, Beasley MB, Smith C, Kaufman A, Wisnivesky J and Kim
  MK. Evaluation of the Prognostic Significance of TNM Staging Guidelines in Lung Carcinoid
  Tumors. J Thorac Oncol 2019; 14: 184-192.
- Yeh YC and Chou TY. Pulmonary neuroendocrine tumors: study of 90 cases focusing on
  clinicopathological characteristics, immunophenotype, preoperative biopsy, and frozen
  section diagnoses. J Surg Oncol 2014; 109: 280-286.
- 494 [8] Robelin P, Hadoux J, Forestier J, Planchard D, Hervieu V, Berdelou A, Scoazec JY, Valette PJ,

495		Leboulleux S, Ducreux M, Lombard-Bohas C, Baudin E and Walter T. Characterization,
496		Prognosis, and Treatment of Patients With Metastatic Lung Carcinoid Tumors. J Thorac Oncol
497		2019; 14: 993-1002.
498	[9]	Filosso PL, Oliaro A, Ruffini E, Bora G, Lyberis P, Asioli S, Delsedime L, Sandri A and Guerrera F.
499		Outcome and prognostic factors in bronchial carcinoids: a single-center experience. J Thorac
500		Oncol 2013; 8: 1282-1288.
501	[10]	Aydin E, Yazici U, Gulgosteren M, Agackiran Y, Kaya S, Gulhan E, Tastepe I and Karaoglanoglu N.
502		Long-term outcomes and prognostic factors of patients with surgically treated pulmonary
503		carcinoid: our institutional experience with 104 patients. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2011; 39:
504		549-554.
505	[11]	Kodera Y, Yamamura Y, Shimizu Y, Torii A, Hirai T, Yasui K, Morimoto T, Kato T and Kito T. The
506		number of metastatic lymph nodes: a promising prognostic determinant for gastric
507		carcinoma in the latest edition of the TNM classification. J Am Coll Surg 1998; 187: 597-603.
508	[12]	Sinn HP, Helmchen B and Wittekind CH. [TNM classification of breast cancer: changes and
509		comments on the 7th edition]. Pathologe 2010; 31: 361-366.
510	[13]	Gallegos-Hernandez JF, Hernandez-Hernandez DM, Flores-Diaz R, Sierra-Santiesteban I,
511		Pichardo-Romero P, Arias-Ceballos H, Minauro-Munoz G and Alvarado-Cabrero I. The number
512		of sentinel nodes identified as prognostic factor in oral epidermoid cancer. Oral Oncol 2005;
513		41: 947-952.
514	[14]	Yang L, Xiong Z, Xie Q, He W, Liu S, Kong P, Jiang C, Guo G and Xia L. Prognostic value of total
515		number of lymph nodes retrieved differs between left-sided colon cancer and right-sided
516		colon cancer in stage III patients with colon cancer. BMC Cancer 2018; 18: 558.
517	[15]	Chu X and Yang ZF. Impact on survival of the number of lymph nodes resected in patients
518		with lymph node-negative gastric cancer. World J Surg Oncol 2015; 13: 192.
519	[16]	Tsim S, O'Dowd CA, Milroy R and Davidson S. Staging of non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC): a
520		review. Respir Med 2010; 104: 1767-1774.
521	[17]	Lv P, Chen G and Zhang P. Log odds of positive lymph nodes are superior to other measures
522		for evaluating the prognosis of non-small cell lung cancer. Thorac Cancer 2014; 5: 570-575.
523	[18]	Deng W, Xu T, Wang Y, Xu Y, Yang P, Gomez D and Liao Z. Log odds of positive lymph nodes
524		may predict survival benefit in patients with node-positive non-small cell lung cancer. Lung
525		Cancer 2018; 122: 60-66.
526	[19]	Dziedzic D, Piotr R, Langfort R and Orlowski T. Log odds of positive lymph nodes as a novel
527		prognostic indicator in NSCLC staging. Surg Oncol 2017; 26: 80-85.
528	[20]	Yu Y, Zhang P, Yao R, Wang J, Wang P, Xue X, Xiao J and Wang Z. Prognostic value of log odds
529		of positive lymph nodes in node-positive lung squamous cell carcinoma patients after surgery:
530		a SEER population-based study. Transl Lung Cancer Res 2020; 9: 1285-1301.
531	[21]	Wang S, Yu Y, Xu W, Lv X, Zhang Y and Liu M. Dynamic nomograms combining N classification
532		with ratio-based nodal classifications to predict long-term survival for patients with lung
533		adenocarcinoma after surgery: a SEER population-based study. BMC Cancer 2021; 21: 653.
534	[22]	Yu Y, Huang R, Wang P, Wang S, Ling X, Zhang P, Yu J, Wang J, Xiao J and Wang Z.
535		Sublobectomy versus lobectomy for long-term survival outcomes of early-stage non-small cell
536		lung cancer with a tumor size $\leq$ 2 cm accompanied by visceral pleural invasion: a SEER
537		population-based study. J Thorac Dis 2020; 12: 592-604.

538	[23]	Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG and Moons KG. Transparent reporting of a multivariable
539		prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (TRIPOD): the TRIPOD statement. Bmj
540		2015; 350: g7594.
541	[24]	Cronin KA, Ries LA and Edwards BK. The Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER)
542		Program of the National Cancer Institute. Cancer 2014; 120 Suppl 23: 3755-3757.
543	[25]	Goodyear MD, Krleza-Jeric K and Lemmens T. The Declaration of Helsinki. Bmj 2007; 335:
544		624-625.
545	[26]	Detterbeck FC. The eighth edition TNM stage classification for lung cancer: What does it
546		mean on main street? J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2018; 155: 356-359.
547	[27]	Jackson AS, Rosenthal A, Cattoni M, Bograd AJ, Farivar AS, Aye RW, Vallières E and Louie BE.
548		Staging System for Neuroendocrine Tumors of the Lung Needs to Incorporate Histologic
549		Grade. Ann Thorac Surg 2020; 109: 1009-1018.
550	[28]	Yi C, Dai J, Song N, Wu C, Zhang L, Zhu Y, Jiang G, Zhang H and Zhang P. Improvement of
551		pathological staging system for neuroendocrine tumors of the lung. Ann Transl Med 2021; 9:
552		447.
553	[29]	lyoda A, Makino T, Koezuka S, Otsuka H and Hata Y. Treatment options for patients with large
554		cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the lung. Gen Thorac Cardiovasc Surg 2014; 62: 351-356.
555	[30]	lyoda A, Azuma Y and Sano A. Neuroendocrine tumors of the lung: clinicopathological and
556		molecular features. Surg Today 2020; 50: 1578-1584.
557	[31]	Raman V, Jawitz OK, Yang CJ, Voigt SL, Tong BC, D'Amico TA and Harpole DH. Outcomes for
558		Surgery in Large Cell Lung Neuroendocrine Cancer. J Thorac Oncol 2019; 14: 2143-2151.
559	[32]	Chen S, Honda T, Ohara T, Hata J, Hirakawa Y, Yoshida D, Shibata M, Sakata S, Oishi E, Furuta Y,
560		Kitazono T and Ninomiya T. Serum homocysteine and risk of dementia in Japan. J Neuro
561		Neurosurg Psychiatry 2020; 91: 540-546.
562	[33]	Camp RL, Dolled-Filhart M and Rimm DL. X-tile: a new bio-informatics tool for biomarker
563		assessment and outcome-based cut-point optimization. Clin Cancer Res 2004; 10: 7252-7259.
564	[34]	Jungk C, Reinhardt A, Warta R, Capper D, Deimling AV, Herold-Mende C and Unterberg A.
565		Extent of Resection, MGMT Promoter Methylation Status and Tumor Location Independently
566		Predict Progression-Free Survival in Adult Sporadic Pilocytic Astrocytoma. Cancers (Basel)
567		2019; 11:
568	[35]	Vickers AJ and Elkin EB. Decision curve analysis: a novel method for evaluating prediction
569		models. Med Decis Making 2006; 26: 565-574.
570	[36]	Taylor MD, LaPar DJ, Thomas CJ, Persinger M, Stelow EB, Kozower BD, Lau CL and Jones DR.
571		Lymph node ratio predicts recurrence and survival after RO resection for non-small cell lung
572		cancer. Ann Thorac Surg 2013; 96: 1163-1170.
573	[37]	Huang B, Ni M, Chen C, Cai G and Cai S. LODDS is superior to lymph node ratio for the
574		prognosis of node-positive rectal cancer patients treated with preoperative radiotherapy.
575		Tumori 2017; 103: 87-92.
576	[38]	Ramacciato G, Nigri G, Petrucciani N, Pinna AD, Ravaioli M, Jovine E, Minni F, Grazi GL,
577		Chirletti P, Tisone G, Ferla F, Napoli N and Boggi U. Prognostic role of nodal ratio, LODDS, pN
578		in patients with pancreatic cancer with venous involvement. BMC Surg 2017; 17: 109.
579	[39]	Xiao Z, Shi Z, Hu L, Gao Y, Zhao J, Liu Y, Xu Q and Huang D. A new nomogram from the SEER
580		database for predicting the prognosis of gallbladder cancer patients after surgery. Ann Transl
581		Med 2019; 7: 738.

- 582[40]Liu H, Deng J, Zhang R, Hao X, Jiao X and Liang H. The RML of lymph node metastasis was583superior to the LODDS for evaluating the prognosis of gastric cancer. Int J Surg 2013; 11:584419-424.
- 585[41]Fortea-Sanchis C, Martínez-Ramos D and Escrig-Sos J. The lymph node status as a prognostic586factor in colon cancer: comparative population study of classifications using the logarithm of587the ratio between metastatic and nonmetastatic nodes (LODDS) versus the pN-TNM588classification and ganglion ratio systems. BMC Cancer 2018; 18: 1208.
- [42] Caplin ME, Baudin E, Ferolla P, Filosso P, Garcia-Yuste M, Lim E, Oberg K, Pelosi G, Perren A,
  Rossi RE and Travis WD. Pulmonary neuroendocrine (carcinoid) tumors: European
  Neuroendocrine Tumor Society expert consensus and recommendations for best practice for
  typical and atypical pulmonary carcinoids. Ann Oncol 2015; 26: 1604-1620.
- 593 [43] Dai J, Liu M, Yang Y, Li Q, Song N, Rocco G, Sihoe ADL, Gonzalez-Rivas D, Suen HC, He W, Duan
  594 L, Fan J, Zhao D, Wang H, Zhu Y, Chen C, Diasio RB, Jiang G, Yang P and Zhang P. Optimal
  595 Lymph Node Examination and Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Stage | Lung Cancer. J Thorac
  596 Oncol 2019; 14: 1277-1285.
- 597 [44] El-Sherief AH, Lau CT, Obuchowski NA, Mehta AC, Rice TW and Blackstone EH.
  598 Cross-Disciplinary Analysis of Lymph Node Classification in Lung Cancer on CT Scanning. Chest
  599 2017; 151: 776-785.
- 600 [45] Ramirez RA, Wang CG, Miller LE, Adair CA, Berry A, Yu X, O'Brien TF and Osarogiagbon RU.
  601 Incomplete intrapulmonary lymph node retrieval after routine pathologic examination of
  602 resected lung cancer. J Clin Oncol 2012; 30: 2823-2828.
- 603[46]He Y, Zhao F, Han Q, Zhou Y and Zhao S. Prognostic nomogram for predicting long-term604cancer-specific survival in patients with lung carcinoid tumors. BMC Cancer 2021; 21: 141.
- 605[47]Dong S, Liang J, Zhai W and Yu Z. Development and Validation of an Individualized Nomogram606for Predicting Overall Survival in Patients With Typical Lung Carcinoid Tumors. Am J Clin Oncol6072020; 43: 607-614.
- 608 [48] Chen X, Pang Z, Wang Y, Bie F, Zeng Y, Wang G and Du J. The role of surgery for atypical
  609 bronchopulmonary carcinoid tumor: Development and validation of a model based on
  610 Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database. Lung Cancer 2020; 139: 94-102.
- 611 [49] Hiroshima K and Mino-Kenudson M. Update on large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma. Transl
  612 Lung Cancer Res 2017; 6: 530-539.
- 613 [50] Rossi G, Cavazza A, Marchioni A, Longo L, Migaldi M, Sartori G, Bigiani N, Schirosi L, Casali C,
  614 Morandi U, Facciolongo N, Maiorana A, Bavieri M, Fabbri LM and Brambilla E. Role of
  615 chemotherapy and the receptor tyrosine kinases KIT, PDGFRalpha, PDGFRbeta, and Met in
  616 large-cell neuroendocrine carcinoma of the lung. J Clin Oncol 2005; 23: 8774-8785.
- 617 [51] Lim E, Goldstraw P, Nicholson AG, Travis WD, Jett JR, Ferolla P, Bomanji J, Rusch VW, Asamura
  618 H, Skogseid B, Baudin E, Caplin M, Kwekkeboom D, Brambilla E and Crowley J. Proceedings of
  619 the IASLC International Workshop on Advances in Pulmonary Neuroendocrine Tumors 2007. J
  620 Thorac Oncol 2008; 3: 1194-1201.
- 621[52]García-Yuste M, Matilla JM, Cañizares MA, Molins L and Guijarro R. Surgical treatment of low622and intermediate grade lung net. J Thorac Dis 2017; 9: S1435-s1441.
- 623 [53] García-Yuste M, Matilla JM, Cueto A, Paniagua JM, Ramos G, Cañizares MA and Muguruza I.
  624 Typical and atypical carcinoid tumours: analysis of the experience of the Spanish
  625 Multi-centric Study of Neuroendocrine Tumours of the Lung. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2007; 31:

626 192-197.

- Filosso PL, Rena O, Guerrera F, Moreno Casado P, Sagan D, Raveglia F, Brunelli A, Welter S, Gust L, Pompili C, Casadio C, Bora G, Alvarez A, Zaluska W, Baisi A, Roesel C and Thomas PA.
  Clinical management of atypical carcinoid and large-cell neuroendocrine carcinoma: a multicentre study on behalf of the European Association of Thoracic Surgeons (ESTS)
  Neuroendocrine Tumours of the Lung Working Group<sup>†</sup>. Eur J Cardiothorac Surg 2015; 48: 55-64.
- 633[55]Steuer CE, Behera M, Kim S, Chen Z, Saba NF, Pillai RN, Owonikoko TK, Khuri FR and634Ramalingam SS. Atypical carcinoid tumor of the lung: a surveillance, epidemiology, and end635results database analysis. J Thorac Oncol 2015; 10: 479-485.
- 636 [56] Marciello F, Mercier O, Ferolla P, Scoazec JY, Filosso PL, Chapelier A, Guggino G, Monaco R,
  637 Grimaldi F, Pizzolitto S, Guigay J, de Latour BR, Giuffrida D, Longchampt E, de Montpreville VT,
  638 Fadel E, Colao A, Planchard D, Papotti M, Faggiano A and Baudin E. Natural History of
  639 Localized and Locally Advanced Atypical Lung Carcinoids after Complete Resection: A Joined
  640 French-Italian Retrospective Multicenter Study. Neuroendocrinology 2018; 106: 264-273.
- 641 [57] Baudin E, Caplin M, Garcia-Carbonero R, Fazio N, Ferolla P, Filosso PL, Frilling A, de Herder
  642 WW, Hörsch D, Knigge U, Korse CM, Lim E, Lombard-Bohas C, Pavel M, Scoazec JY, Sundin A
  643 and Berruti A. Lung and thymic carcinoids: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis,
- 644 treatment and follow-up(<sup>A</sup>). Ann Oncol 2021; 32: 439-451.
- [58] Iyoda A, Hiroshima K, Moriya Y, Takiguchi Y, Sekine Y, Shibuya K, Iizasa T, Kimura H, Nakatani Y
  and Fujisawa T. Prospective study of adjuvant chemotherapy for pulmonary large cell
  neuroendocrine carcinoma. Ann Thorac Surg 2006; 82: 1802-1807.

# Tables 1-4

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the entire dataset stratified by LODDS

Characteristic	Total	-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33	-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14	P value*
	( <b>n=506</b> )	( <b>n=334</b> )	( <b>n=172</b> )	1 value
Age at diagnosis (year)				0.183
≤62	300 (59.29)	205 (61.38)	95 (55.23)	
>62	206 (40.71)	129 (38.62)	77 (44.77)	
Sex				0.979
Male	232 (45.85)	153 (45.81)	79 (45.93)	
Female	274 (54.15)	181 (54.19)	93 (54.07)	
Race				0.63
White	453 (89.53)	302 (90.42)	151 (87.79)	
Black	29 (5.73)	17 (5.09)	12 (6.98)	
Other	24 (4.74)	15 (4.49)	9 (5.23)	
Laterality				0.639
Right	281 (55.53)	183 (54.79)	98 (56.98)	
Left	225 (44.47)	151 (45.21)	74 (43.02)	
Site				0.767
Upper lobe	194 (38.34)	131 (39.22)	63 (36.63)	
Middle lobe	64 (12.65)	39 (11.68)	25 (14.53)	
Lower lobe	196 (38.74)	131 (39.22)	65 (37.79)	
Other	52 (10.28)	33 (9.88)	19 (11.05)	
Histotype				0.395
Large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma	129 (25.49)	82 (24.55)	47 (27.33)	

Carcinoid tumor	274 (54.15)	188 (56.29)	86 (50.00)	
Atypical carcinoid tumor	103 (20.36)	64 (19.16)	39 (22.67)	
Differentiation				0.710
Well/moderately differentiated	201 (39.72)	136 (40.72)	65 (37.79)	
Poorly differentiated /undifferentiated	97 (19.17)	65 (19.46)	32 (18.60)	
Unknown	208 (41.11)	133 (39.82)	75 (43.60)	
T classification				0.409
T1	209 (41.30)	131 (39.22)	78 (45.35)	
Τ2	190 (37.55)	134 (40.12)	56 (32.56)	
Т3	74 (14.62)	48 (14.37)	26 (15.12)	
T4	33 (6.52)	21 (6.29)	12 (6.98)	
N classification				< 0.001
N1	319 (63.04)	230 (68.86)	89 (51.74)	
N2	187 (36.96)	104 (31.14)	83 (48.26)	
Surgery				0.051
Sublobectomy	44 (8.70)	22 (6.59)	22 (12.79)	
Lobectomy	406 (80.24)	272 (81.44)	134 (77.91)	
Pneumonectomy	56 (11.07)	40 (11.98)	16 (9.30)	
Radiotherapy				0.045
No	439 (86.76)	297 (88.92)	142 (82.56)	
Yes	67 (13.24)	37 (11.08)	30 (17.44)	
Chemotherapy				0.051
No	374 (73.91)	256 (76.65)	118 (68.60)	
Yes	132 (26.09)	78 (23.35)	54 (31.40)	
Number of dissected lymph nodes	9.00 (6.00-14.75)	12.00 (8.00-17.00)	5.00 (3.00-9.00)	< 0.001
Number of positive lymph nodes	2.00 (1.00-3.00)	1.00 (1.00-2.00)	2.00 (1.00-4.00)	< 0.001

LODDS as a continuous variable	-0.49 (-0.790.22)	-0.70 (-0.880.52)	0.00 (-0.22-0.20)	< 0.001
	0 <i>)</i> ( 0 <i>)</i>	0.70 (0.00 0.00)	0.00 ( 0.22 0.20)	

<sup>†</sup>Data are listed as median (IQR) or n (%).\**P* values for Mann-Whitney test or Chi square test by comparing the basic characteristics in the two categorical LODDS groups.

<sup>‡</sup>LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node.

### **Table 2**. HRs for multivariable analysis

	CSS		OS	
Cohort –	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Entire dataset				
Univariable analysis	1.73 (1.23-2.43)	0.002	1.52 (1.13-2.04)	0.006
Multivariable analysis	2.06 (1.43-2.97)	< 0.001	1.66 (1.22-2.26)	0.001
Patients with NDLN≤20				
Univariable analysis	1.89 (1.32-2.72)	0.001	1.65 (1.20-2.26)	0.002
Multivariable analysis	2.16 (1.46-3.19)	< 0.001	1.75 (1.25-2.43)	0.001
Patients with NDLN≥6				
Univariable analysis	2.16 (1.42-3.28)	< 0.001	1.97 (1.37-2.84)	< 0.001
Multivariable analysis	2.84 (1.78-4.50)	<0.001	2.37 (1.59-3.54)	< 0.001

<sup>†</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; OS, overall survival; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; NDLN, number of dissected lymph node.

		Univariable analysis		Stepwise multivariable analysis	
Characteristic	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
≤62	172 (57.33)	1		1	
>62	128 (42.67)	2.92 (1.85-4.61)	< 0.001	2.16 (1.33-3.52)	0.002
Sex					
Male	132 (44.00)	1			
Female	168 (56.00)	0.68 (0.44-1.06)	0.087		
Race					
White	281 (93.67)	1			
Black	15 (5.00)	1.03 (0.38-2.81)	0.958		
Other	4 (1.33)	0 (0.00-Inf)	0.995		
Laterality					
Right	161 (53.67)	1			
Left	139 (46.33)	0.85 (0.54-1.32)	0.467		
Site					
Upper lobe	124 (41.33)	1			
Middle lobe	34 (11.33)	0.25 (0.09-0.71)	0.009		
Lower lobe	113 (37.67)	0.59 (0.36-0.96)	0.033		
Other	29 (9.67)	0.41 (0.16-1.04)	0.061		
Histotype					

**Table 3**. Univariable and stepwise multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for CSS of the derivation dataset

Large cell neuroendocrine	86 (28.67)	1		1	
carcinoma				I	
Carcinoid tumor	152 (50.67)	0.08 (0.04-0.14)	< 0.001	0.06 (0.03-0.13)	< 0.001
Atypical carcinoid tumor	62 (20.67)	0.19 (0.10-0.35)	< 0.001	0.17 (0.09-0.33)	< 0.001
Differentiation					
Well/moderately differentiated	120 (40.00)	1			
Poorly differentiated	64 (21.33)	6.97 (3.87-12.52)	< 0.001		
/undifferentiated					
Unknown	116 (38.67)	1.52 (0.81-2.85)	0.195		
T classification					
T1	128 (42.67)	1			
Τ2	114 (38.00)	0.93 (0.56-1.54)	0.777		
Т3	43 (14.33)	1.54 (0.82-2.88)	0.178		
T4	15 (5.00)	0.95 (0.34-2.68)	0.923		
N classification					
N1	193 (64.33)	1			
N2	107 (35.67)	1.74 (1.12-2.71)	0.014		
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	24 (8.00)	1		1	
Lobectomy	246 (82.00)	0.28 (0.15-0.52)	< 0.001	0.67 (0.34-1.31)	0.242
Pneumonectomy	30 (10.00)	0.45 (0.20-1.00)	0.049	1.27 (0.54-2.96)	0.588
Radiotherapy					
No	259 (86.33)	1			
Yes	41 (13.67)	2.34 (1.40-3.89)	0.001		
Chemotherapy					
No	214 (71.33)	1		1	

Yes LODDS as a categorical	86 (28.67)	2.63 (1.69-4.10)	<0.001	0.68 (0.4-1.15)	0.148
variable -1.44≤LODDS<-0.33	197 (65.67)	1		1	
-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14	103 (34.33)	2.12 (1.36-3.29)	0.001	2.05 (1.28-3.29)	0.003

<sup>†</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

~		Univariable analysis		Stepwise multivariable analysis	
Characteristic	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
≤62	172 (57.33)	1		1	
>62	128 (42.67)	3.5 (2.36-5.20)	< 0.001	2.65 (1.75-4.01)	< 0.001
Sex					
Male	132 (44.00)	1			
Female	168 (56.00)	0.62 (0.43-0.91)	0.014		
Race					
White	281 (93.67)	1			
Black	15 (5.00)	1.11 (0.49-2.53)	0.801		
Other	4 (1.33)	0 (0.00-Inf)	0.994		
Laterality					
Right	161 (53.67)	1			
Left	139 (46.33)	0.87 (0.59-1.26)	0.453		
Site					
Upper lobe	124 (41.33)	1			
Middle lobe	34 (11.33)	0.41 (0.20-0.87)	0.020		
Lower lobe	113 (37.67)	0.74 (0.49-1.12)	0.149		
Other	29 (9.67)	0.69 (0.35-1.36)	0.284		
Histotype					

**Table 4**. Univariable and stepwise multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for OS of the derivation dataset

Large cell neuroendocrine	86 (28.67)	1			
carcinoma					
Carcinoid tumor	152 (50.67)	0.13 (0.08-0.20)	< 0.001	0.09 (0.05-0.16)	< 0.001
Atypical carcinoid tumor	62 (20.67)	0.23 (0.13-0.39)	< 0.001	0.19 (0.11-0.34)	< 0.001
Differentiation					
Well/moderately differentiated	120 (40.00)	1			
Poorly differentiated	64 (21.33)	6.22 (3.70-10.46)	< 0.001		
/undifferentiated					
Unknown	116 (38.67)	1.98 (1.18-3.34)	0.010		
T classification					
T1	128 (42.67)	1			
T2	114 (38.00)	1.12 (0.74-1.70)	0.586		
Т3	43 (14.33)	1.35 (0.76-2.40)	0.301		
T4	15 (5.00)	0.91 (0.36-2.31)	0.849		
N classification					
N1	193 (64.33)	1			
N2	107 (35.67)	1.76 (1.21-2.57)	0.003		
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	24 (8.00)	1			
Lobectomy	246 (82.00)	0.38 (0.21-0.67)	0.001		
Pneumonectomy	30 (10.00)	0.49 (0.23-1.03)	0.058		
Radiotherapy					
No	259 (86.33)	1		1	
Yes	41 (13.67)	1.98 (1.26-3.12)	0.003	1.57 (0.9-2.72)	0.110
Chemotherapy					
No	214 (71.33)	1		1	

Yes LODDS as a categorical	86 (28.67)	1.86 (1.26-2.73)	0.002	0.44 (0.26-0.75)	0.003
-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33	197 (65.67)	1		1	
-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14	103 (34.33)	1.68 (1.15-2.45)	0.007	1.65 (1.12-2.42)	0.011

<sup>†</sup>LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; OS, overall survival; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

### **Tables S1-11**

#### Table S1. HR for LODDS as a continuous variable

Madal	CSS			OS		
Model	Piece-wise LODDS	HR (95%CI)	P value	Piece-wise LODDS	HR (95%CI)	P value
Cox regression model	-	2.21 (1.52-3.20)	< 0.001	-	1.51 (1.10-2.06)	0.010
Two piece-wise Cox regression model	LODDS<-0.27	4.21 (1.95-9.07)	< 0.001	LODDS<-0.26	2.35 (1.27-4.33)	0.006
	LODDS >-0.27	1.24 (0.60-2.55)	0.555	LODDS >-0.26	0.96 (0.51-1.82)	0.906

<sup>†</sup>HR for CSS were evaluated based on multivariable Cox proportional regression model adjusted by age, race, site, histotype, differentiation, T classification, N classification, surgery, radiotherapy and chemotherapy.

<sup>‡</sup>HR for OS were evaluated based on multivariable Cox proportional regression model adjusted by age, sex, site, histotype, differentiation, N classification,

radiotherapy and chemotherapy.

.

§CSS, cancer-specific survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; OS, overall survival; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

Cohort	-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33	-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14
1-year CSS (%)	93.83 (91.25-96.49)	87.52 (82.66-92.66)
3-year CSS (%)	83.92 (79.82-88.23)	70.57 (63.69-78.19)
5-year CSS (%)	76.83 (71.83-82.19)	62.09 (54.37-70.9)

Table S2 1.	3. and 5.	vear CSS	and OS of	different I	ODDS	suborouns
Table 54. 1-	, <b>5-</b> , anu 5-	year Coo	and OS OI	uniterent I		sungruups

1-year OS (%)	90.96 (87.93-94.1)	85.4 (80.28-90.86)
3-year OS (%)	78.7 (74.23-83.44)	66.22 (59.19-74.08)
5-year OS (%)	70.21 (64.94-75.91)	54.2 (46.46-63.23)

<sup>†</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; OS, overall survival.

### Table S3 Univariable and multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for the influence of LODDS on CSS of the entire dataset

		Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
Characteristic	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
$\leq 62$	300 (59.29)	1		1	
>62	206 (40.71)	2.81 (1.99-3.97)	< 0.001	2.25 (1.54-3.30)	< 0.001
Sex					
Male	232 (45.85)	1			
Female	274 (54.15)	0.80 (0.57-1.12)	0.200		
Race					
White	453 (89.53)	1		1	
Black	29 (5.73)	1.68 (0.91-3.12)	0.099	2.00 (1.02-3.92)	0.043
Other	24 (4.74)	0.98 (0.46-2.11)	0.964	0.70 (0.31-1.57)	0.389
Laterality					
Right	281 (55.53)	1			
Left	225 (44.47)	0.84 (0.60-1.18)	0.324		
Site					
Upper lobe	194 (38.34)	1		1	

Middle lobe	64 (12.65)	0.37 (0.19-0.75)	0.006	0.79 (0.37-1.67)	0.532
Lower lobe	196 (38.74)	0.70 (0.48-1.02)	0.062	0.89 (0.59-1.35)	0.594
Other	52 (10.28)	0.73 (0.40-1.33)	0.310	1.13 (0.54-2.35)	0.747
Histotype					
Large cell neuroendocrine	120 (25 40)	1		1	
carcinoma	129 (25.49)				
Carcinoid tumor	274 (54.15)	0.09 (0.06-0.14)	< 0.001	0.07 (0.04-0.14)	< 0.001
Atypical carcinoid tumor	103 (20.36)	0.27 (0.17-0.42)	< 0.001	0.23 (0.13-0.42)	< 0.001
Differentiation					
Grade I-II	201 (39.72)	1		1	
Poorly differentiated	97 (19.17)	7.20 (4.52-11.45)	< 0.001	1.52 (0.76-3.05)	0.235
/undifferentiated					
Unknown	208 (41.11)	1.72 (1.07-2.76)	0.025	1.29 (0.77-2.18)	0.335
T classification					
T1	209 (41.30)	1		1	
T2	190 (37.55)	0.89 (0.60-1.32)	0.555	0.72 (0.48-1.09)	0.117
Т3	74 (14.62)	1.66 (1.04-2.67)	0.035	0.89 (0.53-1.50)	0.673
T4	33 (6.52)	1.41 (0.74-2.70)	0.298	1.19 (0.57-2.50)	0.645
N classification					
N1	319 (63.04)	1		1	
N2	187 (36.96)	1.65 (1.18-2.32)	0.004	1.16 (0.79-1.70)	0.453
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	44 (8.70)	1		1	
Lobectomy	406 (80.24)	0.58 (0.34-0.98)	0.044	1.08 (0.60-1.93)	0.805
Pneumonectomy	56 (11.07)	1.04 (0.55-1.97)	0.894	2.01 (0.99-4.09)	0.054
Radiotherapy					

No	439 (86.76)	1		1	
Yes	67 (13.24)	2.05 (1.36-3.10)	0.001	1.05 (0.65-1.71)	0.847
Chemotherapy					
No	374 (73.91)	1		1	
Yes	132 (26.09)	2.38 (1.69-3.35)	< 0.001	0.50 (0.31-0.81)	0.005
LODDS as a ca	ategorical				
variable					
-1.44 <u>≤</u> LODDS<-0.33	334 (66.01)	1		1	
-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14	172 (33.99)	1.73 (1.23-2.43)	0.002	2.06 (1.43-2.97)	< 0.001

<sup>†</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

### Table S4. Univariable and multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for the influence of LODDS on OS of the entire dataset

Characteristic		Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
≤62	300 (59.29)	1		1	
>62	206 (40.71)	3.46 (2.55-4.70)	< 0.001	2.55 (1.84-3.52)	< 0.0001
Sex					
Male	232 (45.85)	1		1	
Female	274 (54.15)	0.72 (0.54-0.96)	0.026	0.93 (0.69-1.25)	0.625
Race					
White	453 (89.53)	1			
Black	29 (5.73)	1.45 (0.83-2.56)	0.195		

Other	24 (4.74)	0.72 (0.34-1.53)	0.392		
Laterality					
Right	281 (55.53)	1			
Left	225 (44.47)	0.84 (0.62-1.13)	0.242		
Site					
Upper lobe	194 (38.34)	1		1	
Middle lobe	64 (12.65)	0.52 (0.30-0.91)	0.021	1.00 (0.55-1.83)	0.991
Lower lobe	196 (38.74)	0.86 (0.63-1.20)	0.378	1.02 (0.72-1.45)	0.900
Other	52 (10.28)	0.86 (0.52-1.44)	0.579	1.84 (1.05-3.22)	0.033
Histotype					
Large cell neuroendocrine	120 (25 40)	1		1	
carcinoma	129 (23.49)				
Carcinoid tumor	274 (54.15)	0.13 (0.09-0.18)	< 0.001	0.11 (0.07-0.19)	< 0.0001
Atypical carcinoid tumor	103 (20.36)	0.28 (0.18-0.41)	< 0.001	0.27 (0.16-0.45)	< 0.0001
Differentiation					
Well/moderately differentiated	201 (39.72)	1		1	
Poorly differentiated	97 (19.17)	6.61 (4.38-9.97)	< 0.001	1.65 (0.91-2.97)	0.098
/undifferentiated					
Unknown	208 (41.11)	1.92 (1.28-2.88)	0.002	1.45 (0.94-2.23)	0.095
T classification					
T1	209 (41.30)	1			
T2	190 (37.55)	1.00 (0.72-1.40)	0.996		
T3	74 (14.62)	1.43 (0.92-2.21)	0.112		
T4	33 (6.52)	1.28 (0.71-2.32)	0.409		
N classification					
N1	319 (63.04)	1		1	

N2	187 (36.96)	1.71 (1.28-2.29)	< 0.001	1.24 (0.90-1.71)	0.196
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	44 (8.70)	1			
Lobectomy	406 (80.24)	0.68 (0.42-1.09)	0.110		
Pneumonectomy	56 (11.07)	1.00 (0.56-1.80)	0.990		
Radiotherapy					
No	439 (86.76)	1		1	
Yes	67 (13.24)	1.84 (1.27-2.67)	0.001	1.17 (0.75-1.80)	0.491
Chemotherapy					
No	374 (73.91)	1		1	
Yes	132 (26.09)	1.99 (1.47-2.69)	< 0.001	0.45 (0.30-0.69)	0.000
LODDS as a categorical					
variable					
-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33	334 (66.01)	1		1	
-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14	172 (33.99)	1.52 (1.13-2.04)	0.006	1.66 (1.22-2.26)	0.001

<sup>†</sup>OS, overall survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

•

**Table S5**. Univariable and multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for the influence of LODDS on CSS of the patients with number of dissected lymph nodes≤20

		Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
Characteristic	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
<u>≤</u> 62	269 (59.65)	1		1	
>62	182 (40.35)	2.77 (1.91-4.01)	< 0.001	2.20 (1.47-3.31)	< 0.001
Sex					
Male	203 (45.01)	1			
Female	248 (54.99)	0.78 (0.55-1.13)	0.190		
Race					
White	405 (89.80)	1		1	
Black	25 (5.54)	1.86 (0.97-3.56)	0.062	2.22 (1.09-4.52)	0.027
Other	21 (4.66)	1.02 (0.45-2.32)	0.970	0.67 (0.28-1.59)	0.367
Laterality					
Right	246 (54.55)	1			
Left	205 (45.45)	0.80 (0.56-1.16)	0.242		
Site					

Upper lobe	179 (39.69)	1		1	
Middle lobe	59 (13.08)	0.32 (0.15-0.70)	0.004	0.66 (0.28-1.57)	0.351
Lower lobe	179 (39.69)	0.67 (0.45-0.99)	0.043	0.97 (0.62-1.53)	0.912
Other	34 (7.54)	0.66 (0.31-1.37)	0.264	1.41 (0.60-3.31)	0.433
Histotype					
Large cell neuroendocrine	113 (25.06)	1		1	
carcinoma					
Carcinoid tumor	255 (56.54)	0.08 (0.05-0.13)	< 0.001	0.07 (0.03-0.14)	< 0.001
Atypical carcinoid tumor	83 (18.40)	0.21 (0.13-0.36)	< 0.001	0.18 (0.09-0.37)	< 0.001
Differentiation					
Well/moderately differentiated	178 (39.47)	1		1	
Poorly differentiated	84 (18.63)	9.54 (5.65-16.13)	< 0.001	1.76 (0.81-3.81)	0.154
/undifferentiated					
Unknown	189 (41.91)	2.12 (1.24-3.64)	0.006	1.50 (0.82-2.73)	0.187
T classification					
T1	193 (42.79)	1		1	
Τ2	170 (37.69)	0.91 (0.60-1.39)	0.660	0.67 (0.43-1.04)	0.073
Т3	62 (13.75)	1.63 (0.97-2.75)	0.066	0.78 (0.44-1.38)	0.387
T4	26 (5.76)	1.51 (0.74-3.08)	0.256	1.40 (0.64-3.08)	0.402
N classification					
N1	283 (62.75)	1		1	
N2	168 (37.25)	1.56 (1.09-2.25)	0.016	1.07 (0.71-1.62)	0.729
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	43 (9.53)	1		1	
Lobectomy	365 (80.93)	0.62 (0.36-1.07)	0.085	1.17 (0.64-2.13)	0.620
Pneumonectomy	43 (9.53)	0.84 (0.41-1.71)	0.626	1.66 (0.75-3.67)	0.207

Radiotherapy					
No	387 (85.81)	1		1	
Yes	64 (14.19)	2.24 (1.47-3.41)	< 0.001	1.18 (0.71-1.94)	0.520
Chemotherapy					
No	336 (74.50)	1		1	
Yes	115 (25.50)	2.60 (1.80-3.75)	< 0.001	0.46 (0.27-0.77)	0.004
LODDS as a categorical					
variable					
-1.44 <u></u> _LODDS<-0.33	286 (63.41)	1		1	
-0.33 ≤ LODDS ≤ 1.14	165 (36.59)	1.89 (1.32-2.72)	0.001	2.16 (1.46-3.19)	< 0.001

<sup>†</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

Table S6. Univariable and multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for the influence of LODDS on OS of the patients with number of dissected lymph

nodes≤20

		Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
Characteristic	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
<u>≤</u> 62	269 (59.65)	1		1	
>62	182 (40.35)	3.56 (2.56-4.96)	< 0.001	2.48 (1.75-3.51)	< 0.001
Sex					
Male	203 (45.01)	1		1	
Female	248 (54.99)	0.70 (0.51-0.96)	0.027	0.92 (0.66-1.28)	0.634
Race					
White	405 (89.80)	1			
Black	25 (5.54)	1.49 (0.81-2.76)	0.201		
Other	21 (4.66)	0.74 (0.33-1.68)	0.475		
Laterality					
Right	246 (54.55)	1			
Left	205 (45.45)	0.82 (0.60-1.13)	0.232		

Site					
Upper lobe	179 (39.69)	1		1	
Middle lobe	59 (13.08)	0.46 (0.25-0.84)	0.012	0.88 (0.45-1.72)	0.703
Lower lobe	179 (39.69)	0.84 (0.59-1.17)	0.301	1.07 (0.74-1.56)	0.704
Other	34 (7.54)	0.70 (0.36-1.35)	0.283	1.62 (0.80-3.31)	0.183
Histotype					
Large cell neuroendocrine	113 (25.06)	1		1	
carcinoma					
Carcinoid tumor	255 (56.54)	0.12 (0.08-0.17)	< 0.001	0.11 (0.06-0.19)	< 0.001
Atypical carcinoid tumor	83 (18.40)	0.23 (0.15-0.37)	< 0.001	0.23 (0.12-0.41)	< 0.001
Differentiation					
Well/moderately differentiated	178 (39.47)	1		1	
Poorly differentiated	84 (18.63)	8.17 (5.17-12.91)	< 0.001	1.82 (0.94-3.49)	0.074
/undifferentiated					
Unknown	189 (41.91)	2.24 (1.42-3.53)	0.001	1.58 (0.97-2.58)	0.065
T classification					
T1	193 (42.79)	1			
T2	170 (37.69)	1.01 (0.71-1.45)	0.937		
Τ3	62 (13.75)	1.46 (0.90-2.35)	0.123		
T4	26 (5.76)	1.46 (0.77-2.76)	0.251		
N classification					
N1	283 (62.75)	1		1	
N2	168 (37.25)	1.71 (1.25-2.34)	0.001	1.16 (0.82-1.63)	0.413
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	43 (9.53)	1			
Lobectomy	365 (80.93)	0.70 (0.42-1.14)	0.151		

Pneumonectomy	43 (9.53)	0.81 (0.42-1.57)	0.537		
Radiotherapy					
No	387 (85.81)	1		1	
Yes	64 (14.19)	1.94 (1.33-2.84)	0.001	1.20 (0.76-1.89)	0.427
Chemotherapy					
No	336 (74.50)	1		1	
Yes	115 (25.50)	2.14 (1.55-2.96)	< 0.001	0.42 (0.26-0.67)	< 0.001
LODDS as a	categorical				
variable					
-1.44≤LODDS<-0.3	3 286 (63.41)	1		1	
-0.33≤LODDS≤1.14	165 (36.59)	1.65 (1.20-2.26)	0.002	1.75 (1.25-2.43)	0.001

<sup>†</sup>OS, overall survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

.

		Univariable analysis		Multivariable analysis	
Characteristic	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
$\leq 62$	231 (60.16)	1		1	
>62	153 (39.84)	3.00 (2.00-4.50)	< 0.001	2.35 (1.50-3.67)	< 0.001
Sex					
Male	170 (44.27)	1			
Female	214 (55.73)	0.85 (0.57-1.26)	0.409		
Race					
White	342 (89.06)	1		1	
Black	22 (5.73)	1.96 (0.98-3.90)	0.055	2.39 (1.13-5.07)	0.023
Other	20 (5.21)	1.33 (0.62-2.88)	0.468	1.09 (0.47-2.54)	0.833
Laterality					
Right	212 (55.21)	1			
Left	172 (44.79)	0.95 (0.64-1.42)	0.803		
Site					
Upper lobe	137 (35.68)	1		1	
Middle lobe	46 (11.98)	0.34 (0.14-0.79)	0.013	0.70 (0.27-1.79)	0.452
Lower lobe	152 (39.58)	0.65 (0.41-1.01)	0.056	0.97 (0.61-1.56)	0.901
Other	49 (12.76)	0.80 (0.43-1.48)	0.470	0.99 (0.44-2.21)	0.978

**Table S7**. Univariable and multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for the influence of LODDS on CSS of the patients with number of dissected lymph

nodes≥6

)1
)1
4
9
1
9
2
6
7
9
3
4 9 192 6 79

No	284 (73.96)	1		1	
Yes	100 (26.04)	2.46 (1.65-3.67)	< 0.001	0.70 (0.41-1.22)	0.208
LODDS as a categorical					
variable					
-1.44 < LODDS <- 0.33	300 (78.12)	1		1	
-0.33 ≤ LODDS ≤ 1.14	84 (21.88)	2.16 (1.42-3.28)	< 0.001	2.84 (1.78-4.50)	< 0.001

<sup>†</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

•

**Table S8.** Univariable and multivariable Cox proportional regression analysis for the influence of LODDS on OS of the patients with number of dissected lymph $nodes \ge 6$ 

	N (0/)	Univariable analy	vsis	Multivariable analysis		
Characteristic	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value	
Age at diagnosis (year)						
≤62	231 (60.16)	1		1		
>62	153 (39.84)	3.70 (2.60-5.27)	< 0.001	2.63 (1.80-3.83)	< 0.001	
Sex						
Male	170 (44.27)	1		1		
Female	214 (55.73)	0.69 (0.49-0.96)	0.028	0.86 (0.60-1.24)	0.423	
Race						
White	342 (89.06)	1				
Black	22 (5.73)	1.67 (0.90-3.10)	0.104			
Other	20 (5.21)	0.93 (0.43-1.99)	0.844			
Laterality						
Right	212 (55.21)	1				
Left	172 (44.79)	0.88 (0.62-1.23)	0.449			
Site						
Upper lobe	137 (35.68)	1		1		
Middle lobe	46 (11.98)	0.58 (0.31-1.09)	0.089	1.23 (0.61-2.49)	0.563	
Lower lobe	152 (39.58)	0.89 (0.61-1.31)	0.567	1.35 (0.90-2.02)	0.149	
Other	49 (12.76)	0.96 (0.56-1.63)	0.870	2.22 (1.21-4.07)	0.010	

Histotype					
Large cell neuroendocrine	97 (25.26)	1		1	
carcinoma					
Carcinoid tumor	202 (52.60)	0.14 (0.10-0.21)	< 0.001	0.11 (0.06-0.21)	< 0.001
Atypical carcinoid tumor	85 (22.14)	0.27 (0.17-0.43)	< 0.001	0.22 (0.12-0.40)	< 0.001
Differentiation					
Well/moderately differentiated	153 (39.84)	1		1	
Poorly differentiated	74 (19.27)	6.50 (4.01-10.54)	< 0.001	1.78 (0.91-3.47)	0.091
/undifferentiated					
Unknown	157 (40.89)	1.99 (1.23-3.20)	0.005	1.61 (0.97-2.66)	0.066
T classification					
T1	141 (36.72)	1			
Τ2	152 (39.58)	0.91 (0.61-1.35)	0.639		
Т3	62 (16.15)	1.31 (0.80-2.15)	0.283		
T4	29 (7.55)	1.44 (0.78-2.66)	0.241		
N classification					
N1	241 (62.76)	1		1	
N2	143 (37.24)	1.53 (1.09-2.14)	0.014	1.25 (0.86-1.81)	0.247
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	21 (5.47)	1			
Lobectomy	310 (80.73)	0.75 (0.37-1.55)	0.443		
Pneumonectomy	53 (13.80)	1.14 (0.52-2.52)	0.745		
Radiotherapy					
No	336 (87.50)	1		1	
Yes	48 (12.50)	1.61 (1.04-2.50)	0.034	0.88 (0.53-1.48)	0.639
Chemotherapy					
1 V					

No	284 (73.96)	1		1	
Yes	100 (26.04)	1.95 (1.38-2.75)	< 0.001	0.57 (0.35-0.91)	0.020
LODDS as a categorical					
variable					
-1.44 <u></u> _LODDS<-0.33	300 (78.12)	1		1	
-0.33 \( LODDS \( 1.14 \)	84 (21.88)	1.97 (1.37-2.84)	< 0.001	2.37 (1.59-3.54)	< 0.001

<sup>†</sup>OS, overall survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

•

 Table S9. HRs for subgroups

		CSS		OS	
Subgroups	N (%) —	HR (95%CI)	P value	HR (95%CI)	P value
Age at diagnosis (year)					
≤62	300 (59.29)	2.52 (1.42-4.47)	0.002	2.20 (1.34-3.63)	0.002
>62	206 (40.71)	1.63 (0.98-2.69)	0.058	1.21 (0.80-1.82)	0.369
Sex					
Male	232 (45.85)	3.96 (2.15-7.32)	< 0.001	2.06 (1.29-3.27)	0.002
Female	274 (54.15)	1.53 (0.90-2.58)	0.116	1.43 (0.92-2.23)	0.110
Laterality					
Right	281 (55.53)	1.67 (1.04-2.67)	0.035	1.56 (1.04-2.35)	0.033
Left	225 (44.47)	2.88 (1.52-5.45)	0.001	2.00 (1.20-3.32)	0.008
Site					
Pulmonary lobe	454 (89.72)	2.10 (1.44-3.08)	< 0.001	1.67 (1.21-2.31)	0.002
Other	52 (10.28)	4.65 (0.25-87.17)	0.304	1.45 (0.37-5.73)	0.594
Histotype					
Large cell neuroendocrine	129 (25.49)	1.96 (1.19-3.24)	0.009	1.75(1.12(2.74))	0.014
carcinoma				1.73 (1.12-2.74)	0.014
Carcinoid tumor	274 (54.15)	0.75 (0.32-1.73)	0.500	0.79 (0.43-1.43)	0.435
Atypical carcinoid tumor	103 (20.36)	2.67 (0.90-7.90)	0.076	2.40 (1.01-5.74)	0.048
Differentiation					
Well/moderately differentiated	201 (39.72)	0.70 (0.27-1.80)	0.455	0.79 (0.37-1.70)	0.551
Poorly differentiated	97 (19.17)	1.96 (1.06-3.61)	0.031	1.45 (0.85-2.48)	0.174

/undifferentiated					
Unknown	208 (41.11)	3.38 (1.70-6.70)	< 0.001	2.31 (1.40-3.82)	0.001
T classification					
T1	209 (41.30)	2.10 (1.15-3.84)	0.016	1.65 (0.98-2.77)	0.058
T2	190 (37.55)	1.95 (1.00-3.80)	0.048	1.36 (0.81-2.28)	0.243
T3-4	107 (21.15)	1.75 (0.72-4.22)	0.217	1.28 (0.59-2.77)	0.530
N classification					
N1	319 (63.04)	1.99 (1.14-3.45)	0.015	1.56 (0.98-2.49)	0.060
N2	187 (36.96)	2.24 (1.27-3.96)	0.006	1.87 (1.20-2.93)	0.006
Surgery					
Sublobectomy	44 (8.70)	4.64 (0.37-57.53)	0.233	0.57 (0.17-1.92)	0.366
Lobectomy	406 (80.24)	2.53 (1.65-3.89)	< 0.001	2.03 (1.41-2.92)	< 0.001
Pneumonectomy	56 (11.07)	2.19 (0.46-10.51)	0.325	1.67 (0.51-5.53)	0.400

<sup>†</sup>HR for CSS were evaluated based on multivariable Cox proportional regression model adjusted by age, race, site, histotype, differentiation, T classification, N classification, surgery, radiotherapy and chemotherapy.

<sup>‡</sup>HR for OS were evaluated based on multivariable Cox proportional regression model adjusted by age, race, site, histotype, differentiation, N classification, radiotherapy and chemotherapy.

<sup>§</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; OS, overall survival; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval.

	Total	Derivation dataset	External validation dataset	
Characteristic	( <b>n=506</b> )	( <b>n=300</b> )	( <b>n=206</b> )	P value*
Age at diagnosis (year)				0.280
≤62	300 (59.29)	172 (57.33)	128 (62.14)	
>62	206 (40.71)	128 (42.67)	78 (37.86)	
Sex				0.314
Male	232 (45.85)	132 (44.00)	100 (48.54)	
Female	274 (54.15)	168 (56.00)	106 (51.46)	
Race				< 0.001
White	453 (89.53)	281 (93.67)	172 (83.50)	
Black	29 (5.73)	15 (5.00)	14 (6.80)	
Other	24 (4.74)	4 (1.33)	20 (9.71)	
Laterality				0.308
Right	281 (55.53)	161 (53.67)	120 (58.25)	
Left	225 (44.47)	139 (46.33)	86 (41.75)	
Site				0.360
Upper lobe	194 (38.34)	124 (41.33)	70 (33.98)	
Middle lobe	64 (12.65)	34 (11.33)	30 (14.56)	
Lower lobe	196 (38.74)	113 (37.67)	83 (40.29)	
Other	52 (10.28)	29 (9.67)	23 (11.17)	
Histotype				0.100
Large cell neuroendocrine	129 (25.49)	86 (28.67)	43 (20.87)	
Carcinoid tumor	274 (54.15)	152 (50.67)	122 (59.22)	
Atypical carcinoid tumor	103 (20.36)	62 (20.67)	41 (19.90)	

 Table S10. Baseline characteristics of derivation dataset and external validation dataset

Differentiation				0.237
Well/moderately differentiated	d 201 (39 72)	120 (40 00)	81 (39 32)	0.237
Poorly differen	201(37.72)	64 (21 33)	33 (16.02)	
/undifferentiated		0+ (21.55)	33 (10.02)	
Linknown	208 (41 11)	116 (39 67)	02 (44 66)	
Talagification	208 (41.11)	110 (38.07)	92 (44.00)	0 297
	200 (41 20)	128 (42 67)	81 (20.22)	0.387
11 T2	209 (41.30)	128 (42.67)	81 (39.32)	
12	190 (37.55)	114 (38.00)	76 (36.89)	
13	74 (14.62)	43 (14.33)	31 (15.05)	
T4	33 (6.52)	15 (5.00)	18 (8.74)	
N classification				0.468
N1	319 (63.04)	193 (64.33)	126 (61.17)	
N2	187 (36.96)	107 (35.67)	80 (38.83)	
Surgery				0.483
Sublobectomy	44 (8.70)	24 (8.00)	20 (9.71)	
Lobectomy	406 (80.24)	246 (82.00)	160 (77.67)	
Pneumonectomy	56 (11.07)	30 (10.00)	26 (12.62)	
Radiotherapy				0.733
No	439 (86.76)	259 (86.33)	180 (87.38)	
Yes	67 (13.24)	41 (13.67)	26 (12.62)	
Chemotherapy				0.111
No	374 (73.91)	214 (71.33)	160 (77.67)	
Yes	132 (26.09)	86 (28.67)	46 (22.33)	
Number of dissected lymph no	odes 9.00 (6.00-14.75)	9.00 (6.00-14.00)	(6.00-15.00)	0.299
Number of positive lymph nod	les 2.00 (1.00-3.00)	1.00 (1.00-2.00)	(1.00-3.00)	0.350
LODDS as a continuous varial	<b>ble</b> -0.49 (-0.790.22)	-0.50 (-0.770.22)	-0.49 (-0.790.22)	0.916

LODDS as a categorical variable			0.845
-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33	334 (66.01)	197 (65.67)	137 (66.50)
-0.33 <u>&lt;</u> LODDS <u>&lt;</u> 1.14	172 (33.99)	103 (34.33)	69 (33.50)

<sup>†</sup>Data are listed as median (IQR) or n (%). \**P* values for Mann-Whitney test or Chi square test by comparing the basic characteristics in the derivation and external validation datasets.

<sup>‡</sup>LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node.

	IDI		<b>Continuous-NRI</b>			
Endpoint –	95%CI	P value	95%CI	P value		
Derivation dataset						
1-year CSS	0.249 (0.389-0.161)	< 0.001	0.721 (0.825-0.554)	< 0.001		
3-year CSS	0.391 (0.519-0.243)	< 0.001	0.645 (0.743-0.414)	< 0.001		
5-year CSS	0.42 (0.537-0.265)	< 0.001	0.627 (0.768-0.403)	< 0.001		
1-year OS	0.256 (0.368-0.166)	< 0.001	0.649 (0.778-0.453)	< 0.001		
3-year OS	0.349 (0.46-0.208)	< 0.001	0.492 (0.653-0.32)	< 0.001		
5-year OS	0.364 (0.457-0.237)	< 0.001	0.523 (0.662-0.324)	< 0.001		
External validation dataset						
1-year CSS	0.165 (0.356-0.065)	< 0.001	0.46 (0.683-0.178)	< 0.001		
3-year CSS	0.303 (0.427-0.171)	< 0.001	0.539 (0.701-0.308)	< 0.001		
5-year CSS	0.321 (0.442-0.146)	< 0.001	0.496 (0.688-0.283)	< 0.001		
1-year OS	0.121 (0.263-0.057)	< 0.001	0.379 (0.647-0.162)	< 0.001		
3-year OS	0.257 (0.384-0.138)	< 0.001	0.456 (0.653-0.23)	< 0.001		
5-year OS	0.274 (0.382-0.11)	< 0.001	0.451 (0.611-0.24)	< 0.001		

Table S11. The IDI and continuous-NRI comparing nomogram with AJCC 8th TNM staging system

<sup>†</sup>CSS, cancer-specific survival; IDI, integrated discrimination improvement; LODDS, log odds of positive lymph node; NRI, net reclassification improvement; OS, overall survival.

### **Figure legends**

**Figure 1**. Selection of study cohort from the SEER database. AC: atypical carcinoid; LCNEC: large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma; SCLC: small cell lung carcinoma; SEER: Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results; LN: lymph node; TNM: tumor-node-metastasis.

**Figure 2**. Restricted cubic spline fitting for the association between LODDS levels with the HRs of LODDS for CSS (A) and OS (B). LODDS: log odds of positive lymph nodes; CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival; HR: hazard ratio; CI: confidence interval.

**Figure 3**. Nomograms to predict 1-, 3- and 5-year CSS (A) and OS (B) for patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine carcinoma after surgery. CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival; LODDS: log odds of positive lymph nodes.

**Figure 4.** Calibration plots of the nomograms to predict CSS and OS of the derivation dataset (A, B) and external validation dataset (C, D). CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival.

**Figure S1**. Kaplan-Meier estimates of CSS (A) and OS (B) for entire dataset according to LODDS. CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival; LODDS: log odds of positive lymph nodes.

**Figure S2**. Decision curve analysis of AJCC 8th TNM staging system and nomogram for 3-, and 5-year CSS (A, B), OS (C, D) prediction in the derivation dataset. CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival; TNM: tumor-node-metastasis.

**Figure S3**. Decision curve analysis of AJCC 8th TNM staging system and nomogram for 3-, and 5-year CSS (A, B), OS (C, D) prediction in the external validation dataset. CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival; TNM: tumor-node-metastasis.

**Figure S4**. Online nomograms to predict CSS (A) and OS (B) for patients with node-positive lung neuroendocrine carcinoma after surgery. CSS: lung cancer-specific survival; OS: overall survival; LODDS: log odds of positive lymph nodes. Fig 1.







A	0	10	20	20	40	60			70	90	00	100
Points			20		40	50			10		90	
Δ <b>α</b> ρ			2	>62								
Age	\$62			uniont o		h-max						
Histotype	Cominaid hum	~	A	ypical c	arcinoid	tumor		Lara		roonde	aring care	
Curaanu	Carcinold turn	Sublo	bectomy					Large	e cell neu	roenac	ocrine card	inoma
Surgery	Lobectomy		Pneumone	ctomy								
Chemotherapy	Yes		-									
LODDS		0.00	-0.335LO	DDSs1	,14							
-	1.44SLODDS<-	0.33										
Total Points	0	20	40	60	80	10	12	0	140	160	180	200
1-year CSS						o	9 0.8	5 0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5 0.4 0	1.3
3-year CSS				0.9	0.85	0.8	0.7 0.6	0.5	0.4 0.3	0.2	0.1 0.05	
5-year CSS			0.9	0.85	0.8	0.7 0	6 0.5 (	0.4 0	3 0.2	0.1 0.0	05 0.01	
В												
Points	0	10	20	30	40	50	6	•••	70	80	90	100
					>62	2						
Age	≤62		1.120.02.00									
Histotype	Carcinoid tum	or	Atypica	I cardin	oid tumo	x		Larg	e cell ne	uroend	ocrine car	cinoma
Radiotherapy	No	2723	Yes									
Chemotherany	NO			1	No							
Chemotherapy	Yes	-0	2241 0000	c1.14								
LODDS -	1.44sLODDS<-	0.33		31.14								
Total Points	0	20	40	60	80	100	120	140	160	180	200	220
1-year OS						0.0	0.85	1.8	07 0	16.0	5 04 0	1
3-year OS			0	.9 0.	85 0.8	0.9	0.6 (	0.5 0	4 0.3	0.2 (	0.1 0.05	
5-year OS			0.9 0.8	5 0.8	0.7	0.6	0.5 0.4	0.3	0.2 0.1	0.05	0.01	



Fig 4



Fig S1









### Fig S4

### А

Dynamic nomogram for CSS of node-positive lung neuroendocrine carcinoma after surgery

Age		Age
<u>≤</u> 62	•	s62 <b>•</b>
Histotype		Histotype
Large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma	•	Large cell neuroendocrine carcinoma
Surgery		Radiotherapy
Sublobectomy	•	No 👻
Chemotherapy		Chemotherapy
No	•	No
LODDS		LODDS
-1.44sLODDS<-0.33	•	-1.44≤LODDS<-0.33 ▼
Predicted Survival at this Follow Up:		Predicted Survival at this Follow Up:
Survival_months		Survival_months
x 🔯	154	1 60 154
1 17 30 46 55 81 97 113 129	145154	1 17 35 46 63 81 97 113 129 145154
Alpha blending (transparency)		Alpha blending (transparency)
Predict		Predict
Press Quit to exit the application		Press Quit to exit the application
Quit		Quit

В

Dynamic nomogram for OS of node-positive lung neuroendocrine carcinoma after surgery