

Surgical versus Non-Surgical Treatment for Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma in Patients Older than 70 years: A Propensity Score Matching Analysis

Running title: ESCC treatment options older than 70 years

Authors: Kexun Li, MD^{1,2†}, Changding Li, MD^{1†}, Xin Nie, MD^{1†}, Wemwu He, MD¹, Kunyi Du, MD¹, Kun Liu, MD¹, Chenghao Wang, PhD, MD¹, Jialong Li, PhD, MD¹, Kunhan Ni, MD¹, Yongtao Han, FRCS, MD¹, Lin Peng, MD¹, [Qifeng Wang, PhD, MD^{3,4*}](#), [Xuefeng Leng, PhD, MD^{1*}](#)

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

¹Department of Thoracic Surgery, Sichuan Cancer Hospital & Institute, Sichuan Cancer Center, School of Medicine, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

²Department of Thoracic Surgery I, Key Laboratory of Lung Cancer of Yunnan Province, Yunnan Cancer Hospital, The Third Affiliated Hospital of Kunming Medical University, Cancer Center of Yunnan Province, Kunming, China

³Department of Radiation Oncology, Sichuan Cancer Hospital & Institute, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China (UESTC), Chengdu, China

⁴Radiation Oncology Key Laboratory of Sichuan Province, Chengdu, China

***Correspondence:**

Sichuan Cancer Hospital, No. 55, Section 4, South Renmin Road, Chengdu 610041, China

Qifeng Wang (littlecancer@163.com Tel:+8618227667667 Fax:86-028-85420156)

Xuefeng Leng (doc.leng@uestc.edu.cn Tel:+8618908178797 Fax:86-028-85420156)

ABSTRACT

Background: With the rising life expectancy and an ageing population, it has become increasingly important to investigate treatments suitable for older adult patients with esophageal cancer. This study investigated whether older adult patients who underwent esophagectomy had better clinical outcomes than those who were non-surgically treated.

Materials and methods: We retrospectively analyzed patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) who were 70 years or older and underwent esophagectomy, radiotherapy (RT), and/or chemotherapy (CT) from January 2018 to December 2019. Patients were divided into two groups: the surgery group (S group) and non-surgery group (NS group). Then compared the clinical outcomes of the two groups.

Results: After a median follow-up duration of 36.6 months, the S group showed better OS. The 3-year OS was 59% in the S group and 27% in the NS group (HR, 0.397; 95% CI, 0.278–0.549; $P < 0.0001$). In the S group, the median progression free survival was 38.3 months (95% CI, 30.6–46.1) compared to 12.3 months in the NS group (HR, 0.511; 95% CI, 0.376–0.695; $P < 0.0001$). In addition, the number of adverse events in the NS group was higher than that in the S group ($P < 0.001$).

Conclusion: Overall, patients with ESCC ≥ 70 years who underwent esophagectomy had significantly better clinical outcomes than those who underwent non-surgical treatment with RT and/or CT.

KEYWORDS: esophagectomy; chemotherapy; esophageal squamous cell carcinoma; older adults; overall survival; radiotherapy

- **What is already known on this topic** – *There was a lack of comprehensive research specifically focusing on older adult patients with ESCC and comparing the outcomes of*

surgical and non-surgical treatments. Given the rising life expectancy and aging population, it became increasingly important to investigate appropriate treatment options for older adult patients with esophageal cancer. This study aimed to fill the gap in knowledge by retrospectively analyzing patients with ESCC who were 70 years or older and underwent different treatment modalities such as esophagectomy, radiotherapy (RT), and/or chemotherapy (CT). By conducting this study, the researchers aimed to provide valuable insights into the optimal treatment approach for older adult patients with ESCC. Understanding the comparative effectiveness and safety of surgical versus non-surgical treatments would help clinicians make informed decisions when managing and treating this specific patient population.

- **What this study adds** – *In addition to the research discussion on OS and DFS, this study also increased the comparison of Adverse events of different treatments in elderly ESCC patients.*
- **How this study might affect research, practice or policy** – *In the treatment practice of elderly patients with ESCC, it is suggested that surgical treatment is possible.*

1 1. INTRODUCTION

2 According to the Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence
3 and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries, the incidence of esophageal
4 cancer ranked seventh among the 36 human cancers and was the sixth primary cause of
5 cancer-related death in the world, with the highest incidence rates for both men and women
6 seen in Eastern Asia, particularly China [1]. Esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) is
7 a significant disease impacting the Chinese population's health and overall survival (OS). In
8 recent years, given the increase in the number of studies on ESCC, comprehensive treatment
9 modalities based on esophagectomy have gradually improved [2-5].

10 Based on the analysis of lifetime death probability from major causes of death among
11 Chinese residents, heart diseases, cerebrovascular diseases, malignant tumors, respiratory
12 diseases, and injuries from poisoning are the five major causes of death in the Chinese
13 population [6]. Among the aforementioned conditions, cancer is the most high-risk cause of
14 death in people aged 40–45 years, while death in older adult patients is mostly related to
15 cardiovascular and cerebrovascular diseases [1]. The median age of diagnosis for esophageal
16 cancer is 68, and more than 40 percent of patients are over 70 years [7,8]. With the rising life
17 expectancy and an ageing population, it has become increasingly important to investigate
18 treatments suitable for older patients with esophageal cancer. In China, the number of
19 patients with ESCC aged 70 years or older who visited the Sichuan Cancer Hospital has
20 increased yearly, from only 18 cases in 2010 to 139 cases in 2016.

21 Esophagectomy is performed through a right transthoracic procedure with two or three-
22 field lymph node dissections [9-12]. This procedure, known as McKeown or Ivor-Lewis
23 esophagectomy, has been the main surgical approach used in patients with ESCC. However,
24 elderly patients may be more susceptible to postoperative complications such as infections,
25 delirium, and cognitive dysfunction, which can lead to longer hospital stays, increased

26 healthcare costs, and decreased quality of life [13-15]. In addition, studies have shown that
27 elderly patients with ESCC have higher short-term mortality and lower long-term survival
28 after esophagectomy [16]. Currently, there remains a lack of high-quality clinical evidence
29 that compares surgical versus non-surgical treatment modalities for patients with ESCC in
30 China, especially for the older adult population aged 70 or older. In this study, we aimed to
31 assess whether older adult patients aged 70 or above are suitable for comprehensive
32 treatment, that includes a surgical intervention, through prospective verification.

33

34 **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

35 **2.1. Study design**

36 We collected data from a retrospective database (Sichuan Cancer Hospital & Institute
37 Esophageal Cancer Case Management Database (SCH-ECCM Database)) on 284 patients
38 with ESCC from a cancer hospital between January 2018 to December 2019. The patients
39 were divided into two groups: the surgery group (S group) and the non-surgery group (NS
40 group). We then measured the patients' clinical outcomes. Furthermore, patients' records
41 were reviewed for clinicopathologic findings and outcomes. Esophagectomy was performed
42 through a right transthoracic procedure with a two-field or three-field lymphadenectomy. The
43 surgical approach used depended on the characteristics of the patient and the surgeon's
44 preferences. Disease staging was adjusted to the American Joint Committee on Cancer/Union
45 for International Cancer Control 8th edition tumor–node–metastasis (TNM) system. There
46 were three inclusion criteria: (1) patients with pathologically confirmed diagnosis of ESCC,
47 (2) patients who underwent esophagectomy, RT, and/or CT, and (3) patient's age was ≥ 70
48 years. There were two exclusion criteria: (1) the presence of other malignant tumors and (2)
49 missing required data. Patients were then assigned to the S or NS group (Figure 1). From
50 2018 to 2019, paclitaxel in combination with platinum was the primary regimen, with a small

51 number of patients receiving Tegafur or docetaxel in combination with platinum. If a patient
52 was placed into the NS group but salvage esophagectomy was later performed, that patient's
53 outcomes were excluded. The patients' records were prospectively collected along with data
54 regarding clinicopathologic findings and outcomes. Patients were followed up once every 3
55 months for the first 2 years, and once every 6 months after that. OS was calculated from the
56 month and year of initial diagnosis till death or last follow-up, while progression-free survival
57 (PFS) was recorded from the date of treatment/surgery until detection of recurrence,
58 progression, or metastasis. The last follow-up was in April 2022. All procedures performed in
59 this study were in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in 2013). This
60 study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Sichuan Cancer Hospital (No.
61 NCC2014ZC-01) and Sichuan Science and Technology Project (No. 2021YJ0118) and this
62 retrospective study was reviewed by the Ethics Committee (EC) for Medical Research and
63 New Medical Technology of Sichuan Cancer Hospital (SCCHEC-02-2022-050). The data are
64 anonymous, and the requirement for informed consent was therefore waived. The work has
65 been reported in line with the STROBE criteria [17].

66

67 **2.2. Criteria and characteristics of the adverse events**

68 Based on relevant reports and international standards from the World Health
69 Organization (WHO), body mass index (BMI) was divided into three levels [18,19].
70 According to the recommendation of the International Consensus on Standardization of Data
71 Collection for Complications Associated with Esophagectomy [20], the Clavien–Dindo
72 classification was used as a reference guide to standardize the classification of surgical
73 complications [21-23]. Toxicities after CT, RT, and chemoradiotherapy (CRT) were
74 evaluated using the common terminology criteria, Common Terminology Criteria for
75 Adverse Events (CTCAE), for adverse events [24,25].

76

77 **2.3. Statistical analysis**

78 OS and PFS curves were calculated using the Kaplan–Meier method and compared
79 using the unstratified log-rank test. A Cox regression model with stepwise selection was used
80 for multivariate analyses, and the results are reported as hazard ratios (HRs) with 95%
81 confidence intervals (CIs). P-values of <0.05 were considered statistically significant. All
82 analyses were performed using SPSS version 23.0 (SPSS Inc. Chicago, IL, USA).
83 Furthermore, unbalanced covariates were adjusted by performing propensity score matching
84 (PSM) to create two comparable groups of patients: Group S and Group NS. A logit model
85 was used to estimate patient propensity scores that included age, sex, Karnofsky Performance
86 Status (KPS) scores, cT stage, cN stage, TNM stage, tumor location, BMI, and comorbidity
87 incorporation for the cohort of PSM. Nearest neighbor matching (1:1) was performed without
88 replacement based on a prespecified caliper width (0.02) to match patients in the NS and S
89 groups. Patients with TNM stage I and patients with a missing tumor location during PSM
90 were excluded.

91

92 **3. RESULTS**

93 **3.1. Patient characteristics**

94 We enrolled 284 patients in this study, 148 of whom (52.1%) underwent surgery while
95 136 (47.9%) underwent non-surgical treatment. Approximately 85.6% (243/284) of the
96 patients were between 70–79 years of age, and 14.4% (41/284) were 80 years old or above;
97 79.9% (227/284) were men, while 20.1% (57/284) were women. Patients with clinical stage
98 III accounted for 49.3%. The proportion of patients with clinical stage N0 was 13.7%
99 (39/284) versus 86.3% (245/284) of those with clinical N+ stage. Of the patients, 85.4%
100 (243/284) had a BMI below 18.5, and 40.5% had other comorbidities: 27.5% had high blood

101 pressure (HBP), 8.5% had diabetes mellitus (DM), 3.9% had coronary heart disease (CHD),
 102 and 9.2% had chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) (Table 1). The incidence of
 103 non-R0 resection was 3.4% (5/148).

104

105 **Table 1.** Demographic characteristics of the patients

Characteristic	Patients before PSM (n=284)		P value	Patients after PSM (n=140)		P value
	Surgical (n=148)	Non-surgical (n=136)		Surgical (n=70)	Non-surgical (n=70)	
Age, years			0.005			0.830
<80	135 -91.20%	108 -79.40%		60 -85.70%	61 -87.10%	
≥80	13 -8.80%	28 -20.60%		10 -14.30%	9 -12.90%	
Sex			0.047			0.805
Male	125 -84.50%	102 -75.00%		57 -81.40%	56 -80.00%	
Female	23 -15.50%	34 -25.00%		13 -18.60%	14 -20.00%	
KPS			0.605			0.353
≥90	118 -79.70%	105 -77.20%		61 -87.10%	57 -81.40%	
≤80	30 -20.30%	31 -22.80%		9 -12.90%	13 -18.60%	
BMI			0.020			0.854
Low-BMI	11 -7.40%	30 -22.10%		6 -8.60%	5 -7.10%	
Normal-BMI	109 -73.6%	85 -62.5%		48 -68.6%	51 -72.9%	
High-BMI	28 -18.9%	21 -15.4%		16 -22.9%	14 -20.0%	
Tumor location			0.005			0.284
Upper	18 -12.20%	34 -25.00%		16 -22.90%	11 -15.70%	
Lower	130 -87.80%	102 -75.00%		54 -77.10%	59 -84.30%	
Unknown	0 0.00%	0 0.00%		0 0.00%	0 0.00%	
Clinical T stage			<0.001			0.698
T1	18 -12.20%	1 -0.70%		1 -1.40%	0 0.00%	
T2	26 -17.60%	13 -9.60%		9 -12.90%	9 -12.90%	
T3	91 -61.50%	78 -57.30%		50 -71.40%	48 -68.60%	
T4	13 -8.80%	44 -32.40%		10 -14.30%	13 -18.60%	
Clinical N stage			<0.001			0.771
N0	32 -21.60%	7 -5.10%		7 -10.00%	6 -8.60%	
N+	116 -78.40%	129 -94.90%		63 -90.00%	64 -91.40%	

8th cTNM Sstage			<0.001			0.445
I	16	1		0	0	
	-10.80%	-0.70%		0.00%	0.00%	
□	33	13		12	12	
	-22.30%	-9.60%		-17.10%	-17.10%	
□	84	56		46	40	
	-56.80%	-41.20%		-65.70%	-57.10%	
□	15	66		12	18	
	-10.10%	-48.50%		-17.10%	-25.70%	
Basic disease	56	59	0.342	30	29	0.864
	-37.80%	-43.40%		-42.90%	-41.40%	
HBP	40	38	0.863	20	19	0.850
	-27.00%	-27.90%		-28.60%	-27.10%	
DM	15	9	0.287	10	3	0.042
	-10.10%	-6.60%		-14.30%	-4.30%	
CHD	4	7	0.286	2	4	0.676
	-2.70%	-5.10%		-2.90%	-5.70%	
COPD	14	12	0.909	10	5	0.172
	-9.50%	-8.80%		-14.30%	-7.10%	

106

107 Abbreviations: BMI=Body Mass Index; Low-BMI < 18.5 kg/m², 18.5 kg/m² ≤ Normal-BMI < 25.0 kg/m², 25.0
 108 kg/m² < High-BMI; HBP= high blood pressure; DM= diabetes mellitus; COPD= chronic obstructive pulmonary
 109 disease; CHD= coronary heart disease; KPS= Karnofsky Performance Status; PSM= propensity score matching.

110

111 3.2. Survival outcomes

112 After 36.6 months of median follow-up time, the median OS is 24.4 months in 284
 113 patients (95% CI, 17.3–31.6). In the S group, OS did not reach the median overall survival
 114 time, with the average OS being 35.1 months (95% CI, 32.0–38.2), while the median OS of
 115 the NS group was only 15.4 months (95% CI, 9.2–21.6). The OS at 1, 2, and 3 years was
 116 80%, 66%, and 59% in the S group, respectively. In the NS group, the OS rates at 1, 2, and 3
 117 years were 54%, 34%, and 27%, respectively (HR, 0.397; 95% CI, 0.278–0.549; P<0.0001;
 118 Figure 2A). In the S group, the median PFS was 38.3 months (95% CI, 30.6–46.1) compared
 119 to 12.3 months in the NS group (HR, 0.511; 95% CI, 0.376–0.695; P<0.0001; Figure 2B).
 120 After excluding patients who died within 90 days of treatment, the OS of the S group was
 121 significantly higher than that of the NS group (HR, 0.681; 95% CI, 0.550–0.843; P=0.0001;
 122 Supplementary Figure 4A).

123

124 **3.3. Subgroup analysis according to patient characteristics**

125 The univariate analysis indicated that substantial factors influenced the 3-year OS after
 126 treatment, such as age (P=0.031), KPS (P=0.005), treatment method (P<0.001). Further
 127 analysis using multivariate methods indicated that the significant factors that affected the 3-
 128 year OS after treatment were the KPS (P=0.004), cTNM staging (P<0.001), and treatment
 129 method (P=0.005) (Table 2).

130

131 **Table 2.** Univariate and multivariate Cox regression analysis factors affecting survival among patients.

Variables	Patients over 70 years (n=284)			
	Univariate		Multivariate	
	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	P-value	Hazard ratio (95% CI)	P-value
Age (<80 years)	1.571 (1.042–2.37)	0.031	1.172 (0.764-1.796)	0.467
Sex (male)	1.077 (0.73–1.59)	0.707		
KPS (≥90)	1.663 (1.164–2.377)	0.005	1.711 (1.182-2.475)	0.004
BMI		0.129		
Normal-BMI	Ref.	0.162		
Low-BMI	1.359 (0.884–2.089)	0.238		
High-BMI	0.763 (0.486–1.197)	0.129		
8th cTNM stage		<0.001		<0.001
I	Ref.		Ref.	
□	2.577 (0.762–8.716)	0.128	2.595 (0.764-8.817)	0.127
□	3.773 (1.187–11.989)	0.024	3.474 (1.082-11.157)	0.036
□	9.138 (2.862–29.177)	<0.001	6.508 (1.963-21.578)	0.002
Treatment method	2.514 (1.818–3.478)	<0.001	1.711 (1.181-2.48)	0.005
(S group)				
Tumor location	1.04 (0.686–1.575)	0.854		
(upper)				
Basic disease	1.132 (0.824–1.553)	0.445		

HBP	1.02 (0.72–1.447)	0.910
DM	1.325 (0.777–2.259)	0.301
CHD	1.201 (0.589–2.449)	0.614
COPD	0.541 (0.222–1.319)	0.177

132

133 Abbreviations: BMI= Body Mass Index; Low-BMI < 18.5 kg/m², 18.5 kg/m² ≤ Normal-BMI < 25.0 kg/m², 25.0
134 kg/m² ≤ High-BMI; HBP= high blood pressure; DM= diabetes mellitus; COPD= chronic obstructive pulmonary
135 disease; CHD= coronary heart disease; HR= hazard ratio; CI= confidence interval

136

137 There was a significant difference in OS between patients with cStage II and cStage III.
138 Among the 46 patients with cStage II, the 3-year survival rate of the S group was 72%, while
139 that of the NS group was 42% (HR, 0.351; 95%CI, 0.122–1.005; P=0.014; Figure 3A).
140 Among the cStage III patients, the 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year OS rates of 84 patients in the S
141 group were 79%, 62%, and 56%, respectively. The 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year OS rates of 56
142 patients in the NS group were 58%, 39%, and 36%, respectively (HR, 0.557; 95%CI, 0.333–
143 0.886; P=0.009; Figure 3B). No significant difference between the two groups was observed
144 in cStage IV (Figure 3C).

145 In addition, patients with or without comorbidities were analyzed in the subgroups. For
146 the patients with comorbidities, the 3-year survival rate was 58% for the S group and 19% for
147 the NS group (HR, 0.312; 95%CI, 0.192–0.508; P<0.001; Figure 4A). In patients without
148 comorbidities, the OS of the S group was significantly better than that of the NS group (HR,
149 0.521; 95%CI, 0.337–0.807; P=0.002; Figure 4B).

150 To examine whether patients undergoing esophagectomy need a sufficient number of
151 lymph node (LN) dissections, patients were divided into two subgroups: those who had ≥20
152 and <20 LNs dissected; the median number of resected LNs in the surgery group was 19. The
153 OS was highest in the subgroup with ≥20 LN dissections, followed by the subgroups with
154 <20 LN dissections and the NS group. The OS of patients in the subgroup with ≥20 LNs

155 dissected was significantly better than that in the NS group ($P < 0.001$). The OS of patients in
156 the subgroup with < 20 LNs dissected was still better than that in the NS group ($P = 0.020$;
157 Supplementary Figure 2A), The OS curve between the subgroups LNs ≥ 20 and LNs < 20
158 dissected after PSM was calculated ($P = 0.060$; Figure 5).

159

160 **3.4. Adverse events of surgery, chemotherapy, and radiotherapy**

161 The majority of adverse events were recorded one week after surgery, while anastomotic
162 stenosis and delayed anastomotic fistula were generally recorded approximately one month
163 after surgery. Adverse events in the S group mainly included pleural effusion in 55 patients
164 (37.2%) and pulmonary infection in 31 patients (21.1%). In the NS group, gastrointestinal
165 reactions (anorexia in 100 patients [73.5%], esophagitis in 51 patients [37.5%], and emesis in
166 37 patients [27.2%]) and hematologic toxicity (anemia [93 cases], leukocytopenia [84 cases],
167 neutropenia [38 cases], and thrombocytopenia [37 cases]) were the most common adverse
168 events. The number of adverse events in the NS group was higher than that in the S group
169 ($P < 0.001$), and they occurred mainly in patients with grades I–II ($P < 0.001$). There was no
170 significant difference in the number of patients with grades III–IV ($P = 0.679$) and in those
171 who died within 90 days of treatment ($P = 0.668$) (Table 3). In terms of adverse events
172 between the ≥ 20 and < 20 LNs dissected subgroups of the S group (Table 3), which was based
173 on the Clavien–Dindo classification (15–17), there were no significant differences between
174 the two subgroups, whether in grades I–II ($P = 0.853$), grade III ($P = 0.297$), grade IV
175 ($P = 0.470$), or in total ($P = 0.139$). In the S and NS groups, the mortality rate at 30 days was 1.4%
176 and 1.5%, at 90 days was 4.7% and 5.9%, and at 6 months was 10.14% and 26.47%,
177 respectively (Supplementary Table 1).

8 **Table 3.** Adverse events in the surgical and non-surgery groups.

Adverse events	S group (n=148) (Clavien–Dindo, 2009)															NS group (n=136) (CTCAE 5.0, 2017)					
	Total (n=148)					Ln<20 (n=77)					Ln≥20 (n=71)					Any	1–2	3	4	5	
	Any	1–2	3	4	5	Any	1–2	3	4	5	Any	1–2	3	4	5						
Fever	28 (18.9%)	28 (18.9%)				10 (13%)	10 (13%)				18 (25.4%)	18 (25.4%)				Anemia	93 (68.4%)	87 (64.0%)	5 (3.7%)		1 (0.7%)
Anastomotic stenosis	26 (17.6%)		26 (17.6%)			12 (15.6%)		12 (15.6%)			14 (19.7%)		14 (19.7%)			Leukocytopenia	84 (61.8%)	65 (47.9%)	15 (11.0%)	4 (2.9%)	
Anastomotic leakage	22 (14.9%)	11 (7.5%)	7 (4.7%)	4 (2.7%)		9 (11.7%)	4 (5.2%)	3 (3.9%)	2 (2.6%)		13 (18.3%)	7 (9.9%)	4 (5.6%)	2 (2.8%)	Neutropenia	38 (27.9%)	25 (18.3%)	8 (5.9%)	5 (3.7%)		
Suspected Anastomotic leakage	12 (8.1%)	9 (6.1%)	3 (2.0%)			6 (7.8%)	4 (5.2%)	2 (2.6%)			6 (8.4%)	5 (7.0%)	1 (1.4%)		Thrombocytopenia	37 (27.2%)	34 (25.0%)	2 (1.5%)	1 (0.7%)		
Injury of recurrent nerve	6 (4.1%)	5 (3.4%)		1 (0.7%)		1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)				5 (7.0%)	4 (5.6%)		1 (1.4%)	Esophageal fistula	6 (4.4%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.5%)	1 (0.7%)	2 (1.5%)	
Chylothorax	10 (6.8%)	7 (4.7%)	2 (1.4%)	1 (0.7%)		6 (7.8%)	4 (5.2%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)		4 (5.6%)	3 (4.2%)	1 (1.4%)		Esophageal hemorrhage	5 (3.7%)	2 (1.5%)	1 (0.7%)		2 (1.5%)	
Pulmonary infection	31 (21.1%)	15 (10.2%)	5 (3.4%)	10 (6.8%)	1 (0.7%)	13 (16.9%)	6 (7.8%)	2 (2.6%)	4 (5.2%)	1 (1.3%)	18 (25.4%)	9 (12.7%)	3 (4.2%)	6 (8.4%)	Esophagitis	51 (37.5%)	51 (37.5%)				
Pleural effusion	55 (37.2%)	55 (37.2%)				26 (33.8%)	26 (33.8%)				29 (40.8%)	29 (40.8%)			Pneumonitis	23 (16.9%)		20 (14.7%)	2 (1.5%)	1 (0.7%)	
Pneumothorax	12 (8.2%)	2 (1.4%)	10 (6.8%)			2 (2.6%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)			10 (14.1%)	1 (1.4%)	9 (12.7%)		Radiation pneumonitis	5 (3.7%)	4 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)			
Hemorrhage	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (0.7%)		1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)				2 (2.8%)		1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)	Dermatitis	5 (3.7%)	5 (3.7%)				
Empyema	1 (0.7%)		1 (0.7%)			1 (1.3%)		1 (1.3%)			0 (0.0%)				Constipation	36 (26.3%)	35 (25.6%)	1 (0.7%)			
Arrhythmia	23 (15.6%)	21 (14.2%)		2 (1.4%)		12 (15.6%)	11 (14.3%)		1 (1.3%)		11 (15.5%)	10 (14.1%)		1 (1.4%)	Diarrhea	7 (5.1%)	7 (5.1%)				

Respiratory failure	11 (7.5%)		10 (6.8%)	1 (0.7%)	4 (5.2%)				3 (3.9%)	1 (1.3%)	7 (9.9%)			7 (9.9%)		Anorexia	100 (73.5%)	95 (69.8%)	5 (3.7%)		
Pulmonary embolism	1 (0.7%)			1 (0.7%)	1 (1.3%)					1 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)					Emesis	37 (27.2%)	34 (25.0%)	3 (2.2%)		
Fat necrosis of incision	2 (1.4%)	2 (1.4%)			1 (1.3%)	1 (1.3%)					1 (1.4%)	1 (1.4%)				Suicide					1 (0.7%)
Total	104 (70.3%)	51 (34.5%)	38 (25.7%)	14 (9.5%)	1 (0.7%)	50 (64.9%)	26 (33.8%)	17 (22.1%)	6 (7.8%)	1 (1.3%)	54 (76.1%)	25 (35.2%)	21 (29.6%)	8 (11.3%)	0 (0%)	Total	128 (94.1%)	77 (56.6%)	39 (28.7%)	12 (8.8%)	4 (2.9%)
Died in 30 days				2 (1.4%)						1 (1.3%)				1 (1.4%)							2 (1.5%)
Died in 30–90 days				7 (4.7%)						6 (7.8%)				1 (1.4%)							8 (5.9%)
Died within half a year				15 (10.2%)						11 (14.3%)				4 (5.6%)							36 (26.3%)

Abbreviations: LN=lymph node.

182 **3.5. Outcomes after PSM**

183 After PSM, we found no significant difference in the basic characteristics of patients
184 between the S group and NS group (Table 1). The median OS of the 140 patients was 23.8
185 months (95%CI, 11.3–36.3). The OS of the S group did not reach the median OS, and the
186 average OS was 29.8 months (95%CI, 26.1–33.7). In contrast, the median OS in the NS
187 group was only 16.8 months (95%CI, 8.8–24.7). The 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year OS rates in
188 the S group were 76%, 61%, and 56%, respectively. In the NS group, the 1-year, 2-year, and
189 3-year OS rates were 56%, 38%, and 34%, respectively. The 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year OS
190 rates were significantly lower in the NS group (HR, 0.553; 95%CI, 0.354–0.863; P=0.008;
191 Figure 2C). Similarly, after excluding patients who died within 90 days of treatment, there
192 were still significant differences in OS between the two groups (HR, 0.517; 95%CI, 0.323–
193 0.827; P=0.005; Supplementary Figure 4B). The 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year PFS rates in the S
194 group and NS group were 73%, 54%, and 50%, and 52%, 34%, and 29%, respectively (HR,
195 0.629; 95%CI, 0.417–0.951; P=0.024; Figure 2D).

196 As for clinical staging of the 24 cStage II patients, the OS of the N group was better than
197 that of the NS group. The 3-year OS rates in the S and NS groups were 83% and 36%
198 respectively (HR, 0.206; 95%CI, 0.063–0.671; P=0.014; Figure 3D). There were 94 patients
199 in cStage III; 46 in the S group and 40 in the NS group. The 1-year, 2-year, and 3-year OS
200 rates in the S group were 83%, 63%, and 57%, respectively. In the NS group, the 1-year, 2-
201 year, and 3-year OS rates were 58%, 39%, and 36%, respectively (HR, 0.583; 95%CI, 0.298–
202 0.971; P=0.033; Figure 3E). No significant difference in OS was observed between the N and
203 NS groups among patients with cStage IV (HR, 0.793; 95%CI, 0.377–1.861; P=0.583; Figure
204 3F).

205 In patients with comorbidities, the 3-year OS rates of the S and NS groups were 60%
206 and 25%, respectively (HR, 0.406; 95%CI, 0.206–0.800; P=0.008; Figure 4C). However, the

207 difference between the two groups of patients without comorbidities was not obvious after
208 PSM (HR, 0.682; 95%CI, 0.378–1.233; P=0.196; Figure 4D). Survival differences were only
209 observed between the subgroup with LNs ≥ 20 and the NS group (P=0.004; Figure 5).

210 Adverse events in the S group mainly included pleural effusion in 30 (42.6%) patients
211 and pulmonary infection in 14 (20.0%) patients. Mainly grade 1 to 3 adverse events occurred,
212 of which grade 1 to 2 adverse events accounted for 41.4%, of the events and grade 3 adverse
213 events accounted for 22.9%. In the NS group, 65 patients had adverse reactions. Anemia
214 occurred in 47 (67.1%), leukopenia in 41 (58.6%), and anorexia in 48 cases (68.6%). Grade 1
215 to 2 adverse events accounted for 57.1% of the events and grade 3 adverse events accounted
216 for 25.7%. The number of adverse events in the NS group was higher than that in the S group
217 (P=0.002) (Table 3).

218

219 **4. DISCUSSION**

220 In this study, we discussed various treatments for older adult patients aged 70 years or
221 older with ESCC and compared esophagectomy and conservative treatment in terms of OS,
222 PFS, and complications after treatment. Patients with ESCC older than 70 years who
223 underwent esophagectomy had significantly better OS and PFS than those who underwent
224 non-surgical treatment based on RT and/or CT.

225 In a Japan Clinical Oncology Group phase III trial (JCOG 9907) to determine the
226 optimal timing for CT, the overall frequency of adverse events was 34%. Recurrent nerve
227 palsy (18%) and pneumonia (13%) were the main adverse events. In the JCOG 1109 NExT
228 study, the frequency of pneumonia was 10.3%, 9.8%, and 12.9% and the frequency of
229 recurrent nerve palsy was 15.1%, 8.7%, and 12.4% in the Neo CF, Neo DCF, and Neo
230 CF+RT groups, respectively [26,27]. However, in our study, the frequency of adverse events
231 was 70.3% in the S group and 94.1% in the NS group, the frequency of pulmonary infection

232 was 21.1% in the S group, and the frequency of pneumonitis was 16.9% in the NS group.
233 Recurrent nerve injury occurred in 4.1% of cases, which was similar to results from the
234 NEOCRTEC5010 study [2]. Furthermore, adverse events did not significantly differ between
235 the S group and the NS group, when the patients had grade III–IV ESCC. However, patients
236 experienced less adverse events when they exhibited grades I–II ESCC. The results after
237 PSM were similar to those before PSM. To explore the reasons for the different OS outcomes
238 after PSM, we conducted a subgroup analysis. Patients with TNM stages II, III, or IV had the
239 same results after PSM; in TNM stage II or III, the patients’ OS was better in the surgical
240 treatment group. Nevertheless, OS did not differ significantly between the S and NS groups
241 when patients had ESCC stage IV. The results indicate that accurate staging and appropriate
242 adjustment of the treatment plan for different patients are critical.

243 The study findings suggest that the ideal treatment strategy for patients with ESCC aged
244 70 years or older should be esophagectomy. However, older adults are prone to surgical
245 complications, and adverse events due to RT or CT are also prominent. Older adult patients
246 have more complications in the peri-chemoradiotherapy period, a lower long-term OS rate,
247 and poor tolerance to this treatment modality, which was also confirmed in the 2010 study at
248 the Massachusetts General Hospital and the 2020 study at the Acharya Tulsi Regional Cancer
249 Treatment and Research Institute [28,29]. Despite adverse events during therapy, radical
250 treatment remains a necessity according to a 2017 study by the Affiliated Hospital of
251 Guizhou Medical University. In patients aged >75 years with esophageal cancer, CT
252 combined with RT was more advantageous than RT alone [30]. In a study from the Changhua
253 Christian Hospital, in patients with early esophageal squamous cell carcinoma,
254 esophagectomy alone had a significant advantage in terms of survival over definitive CRT.
255 However, among patients with locally advanced disease, the overall survival was similar
256 between the two treatment modalities [31]. However, lymphadenectomy might be considered

257 as an important factor vital to OS, according to recent studies and the present data [32-33]. A
258 Turkish study compared the OS of patients who underwent surgery as opposed to CRT and
259 showed no significant differences in patients with locally advanced esophageal cancer [34].
260 However, a Japanese study which used PSM showed the opposite outcome [35]. Our study
261 showed that surgical treatment brought significant improvements in the OS of patients.

262 In the well-known phase III study, FFCD 9102, the 2-year survival rate of patients
263 treated with neoadjuvant CRT combined with surgery and CRT alone was approximately
264 30% [36]. As models of esophageal cancer treatments continue to evolve, differences in
265 treatment patterns are emerging. Therefore, we collected data from prospective databases
266 from January 2018 to September 2019 and found through subgroup analysis that among
267 patients with comorbidities, there were no significant differences between the S and NS
268 groups after PSM. Therefore, the comorbidities of patients should also be considered before
269 surgical treatment. Furthermore, patients with no less than 20 resected LNs had better OS
270 than those with less than 20 resected and the same results were obtained after PSM.

271 In the current treatment models of ESCC, comprehensive treatment based on surgery is
272 still predominant [2–5,26,27]. Neoadjuvant treatment modalities also are advantageous for
273 patients, as shown by a meta-analysis from Germany which compared neoadjuvant treatment
274 modalities and definitive non-surgical therapy based on radiation or CT for ESCC.
275 Neoadjuvant treatment modalities significantly improved OS without increasing morbidity in
276 patients with resectable ESCC. Definitive non-surgical therapy did not show any survival
277 benefit compared to the neoadjuvant mode [37]. Regarding the optimal treatment for older
278 adult patients with ESCC, further international multicenter studies with a large sample size
279 are needed to establish the optimal therapy in future.

280 This study has some limitations. First, this is a retrospective study; hence, the required
281 data were often missing and difficult to verify, while the results were biased. Second, as there

282 were many different models of conservative treatment used, therapeutic effects on the OS of
283 patients were heterogeneous; thus, bias was unavoidable in the results. Third, data were
284 collected from a single-center database, and lack of 5-year OS and PFS. With the
285 development of immunotherapy in ESCC, multicenter prospective phase III clinical trials
286 employing the advanced non-surgical treatment options are required to further clarify the
287 treatment of patients aged >70 years.

288

289 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

290 Patients with ESCC older than 70 years who underwent esophagectomy had
291 significantly better OS and PSF than those who underwent non-surgical treatment based on
292 RT and/or CT. Regarding adverse events, patients who underwent esophagectomy had
293 advantages in the reduced number of adverse events compared to patients who underwent
294 non-surgical treatments based on RT and/or CT.

295

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We appreciate Yongtao Han, Xuefeng Leng, Qifeng Wang, and Chenghao Wang for their financial support and everyone who contributed to the data collection.

Declaration of interest: None.

DISCLOSURES

Ethics information

All procedures performed in this study were in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (as revised in 2013). This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Sichuan Cancer Hospital (No. NCC2014ZC-01) and Sichuan Science and Technology Project

(No. 2021YJ0118) and this retrospective study was reviewed by the Ethics Committee (EC) for Medical Research and New Medical Technology of Sichuan Cancer Hospital (SCCHEC-02-2022-050). The data are anonymous, and the requirement for informed consent was therefore waived.

Previous communication

Partial preliminary results of this article were poster presented by the first author of this article at 31th European Conference on General Thoracic Surgery (ESTS 2023) which will held virtually from 4-6 June 2023.

Funding

This work was supported by grants from the National Key Research and Development Program (2022YFC2403400), International Cooperation Projects of Science and Technology Department of Sichuan Province (Grant No. 2020YFH0169), the Sichuan Key Research and Development Project from Science and Technology Department of Sichuan Province (Grant No. 2023YFS0044, 2023YFQ0056, 2023YFS0488 and 2023YFQ0055), the Wu Jieping Clinical Research Projects (Grant No. 320.6750.2020-15-3), and Sichuan Province Clinical Key Specialty Construction Project.

Author contributions

Study concept and design: All authors. Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors. Drafting of the article: Kexun Li. Revising the article critically for important intellectual content: All authors. Final approval of the version to be published: All authors. Statistical analysis: Changding Li. Obtained funding: Lin Peng. Administrative, technical, or material support: Yongtao Han, Xuefeng Leng and Lin Peng. Study supervision: Xuefeng

Leng and Qifeng Wang, Kexun Li, Changding Li, and Xin Nie had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. The work reported in the paper has been performed by the authors, unless clearly specified in the text.

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned, externally peer-reviewed.

REFERENCES

- 1 Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA A Cancer J Clin* 2021;71:209–49. doi:10.3322/caac.21660
- 2 Yang H, Liu H, Chen Y, et al. Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy Followed by Surgery Versus Surgery Alone for Locally Advanced Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Esophagus (NEOCRTEC5010): A Phase III Multicenter, Randomized, Open-Label Clinical Trial. *JCO* 2018;36:2796–803. doi:10.1200/JCO.2018.79.1483
- 3 Kelly RJ, Ajani JA, Kuzdzal J, et al. Adjuvant Nivolumab in Resected Esophageal or Gastroesophageal Junction Cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2021;384:1191–203. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2032125
- 4 Shapiro J, Van Lanschot JJB, Hulshof MCCM, et al. Neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy plus surgery versus surgery alone for oesophageal or junctional cancer (CROSS): long-term results of a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Oncology* 2015;16:1090–8. doi:10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00040-6

- 5 Li C, Zhao S, Zheng Y, et al. Preoperative pembrolizumab combined with chemoradiotherapy for oesophageal squamous cell carcinoma (PALACE-1). *European Journal of Cancer* 2021;144:232–41. doi:10.1016/j.ejca.2020.11.039
- 6 Yuan P, Xiang J, Borg M, et al. Analysis of lifetime death probability for major causes of death among residents in China. *BMC Public Health* 2020;20:1090. doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09201-7
- 7 National Cancer Institute: SEER cancer stat facts: esophageal cancer [online]. 2021. <https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/esoph.html>. (accessed 20 January 2021).
- 8 Vlacich G, Samson PP, Perkins SM, et al. Treatment utilization and outcomes in elderly patients with locally advanced esophageal carcinoma: a review of the National Cancer Database. *Cancer Med* 2017;6:2886–96. doi:10.1002/cam4.1250
- 9 Wright CD. Esophageal cancer surgery in 2005. *Minerva Chir* 2005;60:431–44.
- 10 Rentz J, Bull D, Harpole D, et al. Transthoracic versus transhiatal esophagectomy: A prospective study of 945 patients. *The Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery* 2003;125:1114–20. doi:10.1067/mtc.2003.315
- 11 Ozawa S, Ito E, Kazuno A, et al. Thoracoscopic esophagectomy while in a prone position for esophageal cancer: a preceding anterior approach method. *Surg Endosc* 2013;27:40–7. doi:10.1007/s00464-012-2404-3
- 12 Li K, Du K, Liu K, et al. Impact of two-field or three-field lymphadenectomy on overall survival in middle and lower thoracic esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: A single-center retrospective analysis. *Oncol Lett* 2023;25:189. doi:10.3892/ol.2023.13774
- 13 Motoori M, Ito Y, Miyashiro I, et al. Impact of Age on Long-Term Survival in Patients with Esophageal Cancer Who Underwent Transthoracic Esophagectomy. *Oncology* 2019;97:149–54. doi:10.1159/000500604

- 14 Motoyama S, Maeda E, Iijima K, et al. Does Esophagectomy Provide a Survival Advantage to Patients Aged 80 Years or Older? Analyzing 5066 Patients in the National Database of Hospital-based Cancer Registries in Japan. *Annals of Surgery* 2022;276:e16–23. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000004437
- 15 Van Deudekom FJ, Klop HG, Hartgrink HH, et al. Functional and cognitive impairment, social functioning, frailty and adverse health outcomes in older patients with esophageal cancer, a systematic review. *Journal of Geriatric Oncology* 2018;9:560–8. doi:10.1016/j.jgo.2018.03.019
- 16 Lagergren J, Bottai M, Santoni G. Patient Age and Survival After Surgery for Esophageal Cancer. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2021;28:159–66. doi:10.1245/s10434-020-08653-w
- 17 Da Costa BR, Cevallos M, Altman DG, et al. Uses and misuses of the STROBE statement: bibliographic study. *BMJ Open* 2011;1:e48. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2010-000048.
- 18 Stokes A, Collins JM, Grant BF, et al. Obesity Progression Between Young Adulthood and Midlife and Incident Diabetes: A Retrospective Cohort Study of U.S. Adults. *Diabetes Care* 2018;41:1025–31. doi:10.2337/dc17-2336
- 19 Reeves GK, Pirie K, Beral V, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality in relation to body mass index in the Million Women Study: cohort study. *BMJ* 2007;335:1134. doi:10.1136/bmj.39367.495995.AE
- 20 Low DE, Alderson D, Cecconello I, et al. International Consensus on Standardization of Data Collection for Complications Associated With Esophagectomy: Esophagectomy Complications Consensus Group (ECCG). *Annals of Surgery* 2015;262:286–94. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000001098
- 21 Rammelt Veen, Jan-Willem H. P. Lard M. Recording and Classification of Complications in a Surgical Practice. *The European Journal of Surgery* 1999;165:421–4. doi:10.1080/110241599750006622

- 22 Clavien PA, Sanabria JR, Strasberg SM. Proposed classification of complications of surgery with examples of utility in cholecystectomy. *Surgery* 1992;111:518–26.
- 23 Cunningham SC, Kavic SM. What Is a Surgical Complication? *World J Surg* 2009;33:1099–100. doi:10.1007/s00268-008-9881-5
- 24 Bruner DW, Hanisch LJ, Reeve BB, et al. Stakeholder perspectives on implementing the National Cancer Institute’s patient-reported outcomes version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE). *Behav Med Pract Policy Res* 2011;1:110–22. doi:10.1007/s13142-011-0025-3
- 25 Ji Y, Du X, Zhu W, et al. Efficacy of Concurrent Chemoradiotherapy With S-1 vs Radiotherapy Alone for Older Patients With Esophageal Cancer: A Multicenter Randomized Phase 3 Clinical Trial. *JAMA Oncol* 2021;7:1459. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2021.2705
- 26 Kataoka K, Takeuchi H, Mizusawa J, et al. Prognostic Impact of Postoperative Morbidity After Esophagectomy for Esophageal Cancer: Exploratory Analysis of JCOG9907. *Annals of Surgery* 2017;265:1152–7. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000001828
- 27 Kato K, Ito Y, Daiko H, et al. A randomized controlled phase III trial comparing two chemotherapy regimen and chemoradiotherapy regimen as neoadjuvant treatment for locally advanced esophageal cancer, JCOG1109 NExT study. *JCO* 2022;40:238–238. doi:10.1200/JCO.2022.40.4_suppl.238
- 28 Mak RH, Mamon HJ, Ryan DP, et al. Toxicity and outcomes after chemoradiation for esophageal cancer in patients age 75 or older: ChemoRT, esophageal cancer in the elderly. *Diseases of the Esophagus* 2009;23:316–23. doi:10.1111/j.1442-2050.2009.01014.x
- 29 Mohata S, Kumar H, Sharma N, et al. Acute treatment-related toxicity in elderly patients with good performance status compared to young patients in locally advanced esophageal

- carcinoma treated by definitive chemoradiation: A retrospective comparative study. *J Can Res Ther* 2020;16:116. doi:10.4103/jcrt.JCRT_878_18
- 30 Zhao Q, Hu G, Xiao W, et al. Comparison of definitive chemoradiotherapy and radiotherapy alone in patients older than 75 years with locally advanced esophageal carcinoma: A retrospective cohort study. *Medicine* 2017;96:e7920. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000000007920
- 31 Wang B-Y, Hung W-H, Wu S-C, et al. Comparison Between Esophagectomy and Definitive Chemoradiotherapy in Patients With Esophageal Cancer. *The Annals of Thoracic Surgery* 2019;107:1060–7. doi:10.1016/j.athoracsur.2018.11.036
- 32 Li K, Leng X, He W, et al. Resected lymph nodes and survival of patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: an observational study. *International Journal of Surgery* 2023; Publish Ahead of Print. doi:10.1097/JS9.0000000000000436
- 33 Li K, Nie X, Li C, et al. Mapping of Lymph Node Metastasis and Efficacy Index in Thoracic Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma: A Large-Scale Retrospective Analysis. *Ann Surg Oncol* Published Online First: 25 May 2023. doi:10.1245/s10434-023-13655-5
- 34 Sakin A, Sahin S, Aldemir MN, et al. Chemoradiotherapy followed by surgery versus observation in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. *J BUON* 2021;26:1509–16.
- 35 Nomura M, Oze I, Kodaira T, et al. Comparison between surgery and definitive chemoradiotherapy for patients with resectable esophageal squamous cell carcinoma: a propensity score analysis. *Int J Clin Oncol* 2016;21:890–8. doi:10.1007/s10147-016-0963-3
- 36 Bedenne L, Michel P, Bouché O, et al. Chemoradiation Followed by Surgery Compared With Chemoradiation Alone in Squamous Cancer of the Esophagus: FFCD 9102. *JCO* 2007;25:1160–8. doi:10.1200/JCO.2005.04.7118

37 Kranzfelder M, Schuster T, Geinitz H, et al. Meta-analysis of neoadjuvant treatment modalities and definitive non-surgical therapy for oesophageal squamous cell cancer.

British Journal of Surgery 2011;98:768–83. doi:10.1002/bjs.7455

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram showing patient selection. ESCC, esophageal squamous cell carcinoma.

Figure 2. Overall survival curves before and after PSM. (A) The overall survival curves for the S group and NS group; (B) The progression-free survival curves for the S group and NS group; (C) The overall survival curve for the S group and NS group after PSM; (D) The progression-free survival curve for the S group and NS group after PSM. PSM, propensity score matching.

Figure 3. Overall survival curves according to staging. (A) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group(stage II); (B) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group(stage III); (C) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group (stage IV); (D) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group after PSM (stage II); (E) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group after PSM in stage III; (F) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group after PSM (stage IV). PSM, propensity score matching.

Figure 4. Overall survival curves for patients with and without comorbidities. (A) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group for patients with a comorbidity; (B) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group for patients without a comorbidity; (C) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group for patients with a comorbidity after PSM; (D) The overall survival curve between the S group and NS group for patients without a comorbidity after PSM. PSM, propensity score matching.

Figure 5. Overall survival curves. (A) The overall survival curve between the S subgroups and NS group. (B) The overall survival curve between the S subgroups and NS group after propensity score matching.