

Supplemental Online Content

Factors associated with fatal stroke in glioma patients: a population analysis

Kai Jin, PhD^{1,2}, Paul M Brennan, PhD^{2,3}, Michael TC Poon, MSc^{1,2,3}, Cathie LM Sudlow, PhD^{1,2*},
Jonine D Figueroa, PhD^{1,2*}

*Contributed equally

¹Usher Institute, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

²Brain Tumour Centre of Excellence, Cancer Research UK Edinburgh Centre, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

³Translational Neurosurgery, Centre for Clinical Brain Sciences, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

eMethods: expanded methods

eTable 1. Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients having surgery and by age group between 2000-2008

eTable 2. Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients stratified by sex and ethnicity/race between 2000-2008

eTable 3. Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients and by age group after 2015

eTable 4. Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients having surgery and by age group after 2015

eMethods

Study design

We conducted a retrospective, observational cohort study using Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) according to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines. We examined the association of brain tumour grades, tumour size and cancer treatment with stroke mortality in patients with glioma using SEER.

Data sources

SEER have been previously described¹. SEER is a registry of population-based incident tumor registries from geographically distinct regions in the USA, covering 28% of the US population, including incidence, survival, and surgical treatment data. The SEER registry does not code comorbidities, performance status, surgical pathology, margin status, doses, or agents. The SEER database is representative of the population of the USA, and this has been validated by external studies²⁻⁵. Mortality data are coded using ICD classification scheme and are derived from death certificate data. There could be some misclassification due to the coding of cause of death due to the index-cancer may not be perfect⁶.

Study population and grading of gliomas

We identified adult patients (≥ 18 years) with primary malignant gliomas between 2005 and 2018 from SEER 18 registries database. We classified patients with glioma using the following International Classification of Diseases 10th revision (ICD-10) codes: C700-C729. We used the International Classification of Diseases for Oncology third edition (ICD-O-3) codes to group glioma following the definitions from the Central Brain Tumour Registry of the United States (CBTRUS) described previously⁷. Gliomas is classified based on histological and molecular type⁸. Based on WHO criteria, glioma is classified into four grades and higher grade indicates increasing tumour aggressiveness⁹: Grade I includes pilocytic astrocytoma, Grade II includes low grade diffuse astrocytoma, Grade III includes anaplastic astrocytoma and Grade IV includes the most aggressive and malignant glioblastoma multiforme (GBM). Histology codes were following the definitions from the Central Brain Tumour Registry of the United States (CBTRUS) described previously¹. Although pilocytic astrocytoma (Grade I) classified as a non-malignant tumour by WHO, this histology has been historically classified as malignant for mandatory US cancer registry reporting¹⁰.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive analyses of baseline characteristics in glioma and by grades were performed using the Pearson χ^2 test for categorical variables (summarized as frequencies/percentages). Continuous variables were compared across subgroups using analysis of variance for normal distribution data presented as mean, 95% confidence interval (CI), or Kruskal–Wallis (summarized as medians and interquartile range) for non-normal distribution.

The primary outcome of interest was death from cerebrovascular disease using ICD 10 code described previously¹, exposures of interest were tumour grades, tumour size and treatment status. Survival analysis was performed and assessed by Kaplan-Meier methods and compared by the log-rank test to access cerebrovascular-cause specific mortality. Deaths from other causes were censored at the time of death. We computed survival time from the date of diagnosis until date of death or last contact (December 31, 2018) and proportional hazards assumption was tested with the Schoenfeld residuals. Due to small numbers of cerebrovascular death in Grade 1 (N=6) we restricted analysis to grades II-IV in the final analysis. Cause-specific cox regression models were used to estimate adjusted hazard ratios (HRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) to determine factors associated with cerebrovascular mortality among glioma patients including tumour grades, tumour size (≤ 3 cm, 3-6 cm, 6-9 cm, ≥ 9 cm), treatment status (surgery yes vs no, radiation therapy yes vs no, chemotherapy yes vs no), adjusted by sociodemographic factors (age, sex, races/ethnicity, marital status) and calendar years.

Subgroup analyses were performed to check for potential bias and subgroup effects including: 1) age (18- 65 years, >65 years); 2) having surgery. This was to test the assumption that cerebrovascular mortality were not affected by older age that often accompanied by comorbidities and/or risk for stroke⁶ while younger age was usually healthy with less comorbidities⁷; having surgery may be a proxy for healthier patients generally well enough to receive the surgery⁸, thus representing a relative healthy cohort.¹¹ We also conducted subgroup analyses by sex (male and female) and ethnicity/race (White, Black, not performed in Hispanic and other ethnics due to small number of cases). Sensitivity analysis were performed by 1) limiting the study period after 2005 to test the assumption that introduction of adjuvant chemotherapy treatment in 2005 did not influence the probability of occurrence of outcome¹²; 2) for age group of 18-60 years and >60 years old; 3) landmark analyses to those with follow-up commencing 1 month after cancer diagnoses to reduce the chance of reverse causality thereby excluding patients with an event (death or cerebrovascular disease event) within 1 months of cancer diagnosis¹³. All analyses were performed in R version 4.0. An association was considered statistically significant for a two-sided P value < 0.05 .

eTable 1. Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients having surgery

Characteristics	Overall having surgery	By age group	
	Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	Age<65 with surgery Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	Age> 65 with surgery Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)
Grades			
Grade 2	Reference	Reference	Reference
Grade3	1.30 (0.86 1.96)	1.04 (0.63 1.71)	1.05 (0.50 2.19)
Grade 4	2.87 (1.80 4.56)***	2.27 (1.29 4.00)**	1.05 (0.50 2.21)
Tumour size			
<=3 cm	Reference	Reference	Reference
3-6 cm	2.04 (1.17 3.54)*	2.09 (0.96 4.54)	2.42 (1.08 5.42)*
6-9cm	1.22 (0.55 2.70)	2.11 (0.81 5.49)	0.36 (0.04 2.87)
>9 cm	2.29 (1.28 4.10)***	2.94 (1.34 6.46)**	1.65 (0.68 3.99)
Receiving radiation			
No	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.81 (0.58 1.14)	1.05 (0.67 1.64)	0.55 (0.32 0.95)*
Receiving chemotherapy			
No	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.36 (0.24 0.52)***	0.43 (0.27 0.70)***	0.25 (0.13 0.50)***

The hazard ratios were calculated using a cause-specific Cox proportional hazards regression model and adjusted by age, sex, ethnicity/race, marital status, calendar year. Signif. codes: ‘****’ 0.001, ‘***’ 0.01, ‘*’ 0.05 ‘

eTable 2 Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients stratified by sex and ethnicity/race

Characteristics	By sex		By race	
	Female Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	Male Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	White Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	Black Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)
Grades				
Grade 2	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Grade3	1.27 (0.82 1.97)	1.09 (0.72 1.67)	1.25 (0.86 1.80)	0.72 (0.31 1.70)
Grade 4	1.40 (0.84 2.33)	2.45 (1.57 3.82)***	2.09 (1.39 3.13)***	1.59 (0.63 4.01)
Tumour size				
<=3 cm	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
3-6 cm	2.05 (1.15 3.67)*	1.81 (1.07 3.05)*	1.57 (1.01 2.45)*	1.94 (0.59 6.32)
6-9cm	0.73 (0.24 2.21)	1.12 (0.53 2.37)	0.57 (0.25 1.30)	NA

>9 cm	2.25 (1.26 4.01)**	1.90 (1.12 3.24)*	1.84 (1.19 2.85)**	2.71 (0.88 8.41)
Receiving surgery				
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.65 (0.43 0.98)*	0.66 (0.46 0.95)*	0.69 (0.50 0.96)*	0.48 (0.22 1.05)
Receiving radiation				
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.79 (0.53 1.18)	0.57 (0.39 0.82)**	0.58 (0.42 0.81)**	0.57 (0.25 1.30)
Receiving chemotherapy				
No	Reference	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.55 (0.35 0.88)*	0.45 (0.30 0.68)***	0.48 (0.33 0.70)***	0.58 (0.21 1.60)

The hazard ratios were calculated using a cause-specific Cox proportional hazards regression model and adjusted by age, sex, ethnicity/race, marital status, calendar year. Significance codes: '****' 0.001, '***' 0.01, '*' 0.05

eTable 3 Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients and by age group after 2005

Characteristics	Overall	<65 years	>65 years
	Adjusted HR ^a	Adjusted HR ^a	Adjusted HR ^a
	(95% CI)	(95% CI)	(95% CI)
Grades			
Grade 2	Reference	Reference	Reference
Grade 3	1.15 (0.78 1.70)	1.15 (0.67 1.97)	0.79 (0.45 1.38)
Grade 4	1.72 (1.12 2.63)*	2.33 (1.30 4.17)**	0.64 (0.36 1.16)
Tumour size			
≤3 cm	Reference	Reference	Reference
3-6 cm	1.95 (1.30 2.92)**	1.58 (0.90 2.77)	2.51 (1.38 4.57)**
6-9cm	1.00 (0.53 1.89)	1.27 (0.58 2.79)	0.72 (0.23 2.20)
>9 cm	2.05 (1.37 3.08)***	1.75 (1.00 3.06)*	2.40 (1.33 4.35)**
Receiving surgery			
No	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.58 (0.41 0.82)**	0.48 (0.30 0.76)**	0.88 (0.51 1.52)
Receiving radiation			
No	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.66 (0.46 0.96)*	0.73 (0.44 1.21)	0.55 (0.31 0.98)*
Receiving chemotherapy			
No	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.49 (0.33 0.74)***	0.49 (0.29 0.85)*	0.41 (0.21 0.79)**

eTable 4. Cause-specific Cox proportional hazard regression model HRs for association between tumour grades, tumour size, cancer treatment and stroke mortality in gliomas patients having surgery and by age group after 2005

Characteristics	Overall having surgery	By age groups	
	Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	Age<65 with surgery Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)	Age> 65 with surgery Adjusted HR ^a (95% CI)
Grades			
Grade 2	Reference	Reference	Reference
Grade3	1.01 (0.59 1.72)	0.73 (0.36 1.46)	0.91 (0.38 2.19)
Grade 4	2.25 (1.25 4.06)**	2.32 (1.11 4.86)*	0.72 (0.29 1.79)
Tumour size			
<=3 cm	Reference	Reference	Reference
3-6 cm	1.82 (1.03 3.19)*	1.68 (0.76 3.71)	2.37 (1.04 5.38)*
6-9cm	1.07 (0.47 2.44)	1.77 (0.66 4.76)	0.35 (0.04 2.83)
>9 cm	2.11 (1.17 3.80)*	2.71 (1.22 6.03)*	1.35 (0.54 3.35)
Receiving radiation			
No	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.82 (0.51 1.31)	0.78 (0.41 1.48)	0.77 (0.39 1.54)
Receiving chemotherapy			
No	Reference	Reference	Reference
Yes	0.33 (0.20 0.54)***	0.42 (0.21 0.81)**	0.20 (0.09 0.45)***

The hazard ratios were calculated using a cause-specific Cox proportional hazards regression model and adjusted by age, sex, ethnicity/race, marital status, calendar year. Signif. codes: '***' 0.001, '**' 0.01, '*' 0.05

References

- Jin K, Brennan PM, Poon MTC, Sudlow CLM, Figueroa JD. Raised cardiovascular disease mortality after central nervous system tumor diagnosis: analysis of 171,926 patients from UK and USA. *Neuro-Oncology Advances*. 2021;3(1).
- Park HS, Lloyd S, Decker RH, Wilson LD, Yu JB. Overview of the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database: evolution, data variables, and quality assurance. *Current problems in cancer*. 2012;36(4):183-190.
- National Cancer Institute. Population characteristics. <http://seer.cancer.gov/registries/characteristics.html>. Published 2016. Accessed August, 2016.
- National Cancer Institute. About the SEER program. <http://seer.cancer.gov/about>. Published 2016. Accessed August, 2016.
- Surveillance Research Program, National Cancer Institute SEER*Stat software version 8.2.1. www.seer.cancer.gov/seerstat. Published 2016. Accessed.
- Zaorsky NG, Zhang Y, Tchelebi LT, Mackley HB, Chinchilli VM, Zacharia BE. Stroke among cancer patients. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1):5172.
- Ostrom QT, Gittleman H, Truitt G, Boscia A, Kruchko C, Barnholtz-Sloan JS. CBTRUS Statistical Report: Primary Brain and Other Central Nervous System Tumors Diagnosed in the United States in 2011-2015. *Neuro-oncology*. 2018;20(suppl_4):iv1-iv86.
- Perry A, Wesseling P. Chapter 5 - Histologic classification of gliomas. In: Berger MS, Weller M, eds. *Handbook of Clinical Neurology*. Vol 134. Elsevier; 2016:71-95.
- Marquet G, Dameron O, Saikali S, Mosser J, Burgun A. Grading glioma tumors using OWL-DL and NCI Thesaurus. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*. 2007;2007:508-512.

10. Forjaz G, Barnholtz-Sloan JS, Kruchko C, et al. An updated histology recode for the analysis of primary malignant and nonmalignant brain and other central nervous system tumors in the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program. *Neuro-Oncology Advances*. 2020;3(1).
11. Weller M, van den Bent M, Preusser M, et al. EANO guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of diffuse gliomas of adulthood. *Nature reviews Clinical oncology*. 2021;18(3):170-186.
12. Stupp R, Mason WP, van den Bent MJ, et al. Radiotherapy plus concomitant and adjuvant temozolomide for glioblastoma. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;352(10):987-996.
13. Anderson JR, Cain KC, Gelber RD. Analysis of survival by tumor response. *J Clin Oncol*. 1983;1(11):710-719.