Northwestern Medicine[®]



Charles D. Logan, MD^{1,2}; Ryan J. Ellis, MD MS^{1,2}; Joe Feinglass, PhD³; Amy L. Halverson¹; Kalvin Lung, MD²; Ryan P. Merkow, MD MS¹, David J. Bentrem, MD MS¹ and David D. Odell, MD MS^{1,2} 1 Surgical Outcomes and Quality Improvement Center, Department of Surgery, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL 2 Canning Thoracic Institute, Department of Surgery, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL 3 Department of Medicine, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL

Objectives

Regionalization of surgery for non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) to high-volume centers (HVCs) improves perioperative outcomes but increases travel distance for patients who receive care at these centers. Increased distance may decrease rates of adjuvant chemotherapy (AC). However, the relationship of travel distance, surgical volume, and receipt of AC with outcomes is unknown. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the association of distance, volume, and receipt of AC with overall survival among patients with NSCLC.

Methods

Patients with stage II-IIIA (NO-N1) NSCLC were identified between 2004-2018 using the National Cancer Database. Patient travel distance to their surgical facility was categorized into quartiles (<6.4, 6.4 to <14.7, 14.7 to <35.1, and \geq 35.1 miles), and HVCs were defined in accordance with LeapFrog criteria as those performing ≥40 annual resections. Patient characteristics and odds of receiving AC at any center were determined. Survival analysis was performed using Kaplan-Meier curves and adjusted Cox Proportional Hazards models.

Results

Overall, 48,226 patients with surgically resected stage II-IIIA (N0-N1) NSCLC met criteria for inclusion. Of the cohort, 51.7% received AC, 16.7% traveled <6.4mi to LVCs, and 15.2% traveled ≥35.1mi to HVCs (p<0.001). Among stage II-IIIA patients who traveled ≥35.1mi to HVCs, 46.0% received AC vs 54.1% who traveled <6.4mi to LVCs (aOR 0.66, 95% CI 0.58-0.74; p<0.001; reference). Patients with Stage II-IIIA NSCLC who traveled ≥35.1mi were more likely than patients who traveled <6.4 miles to be male (57.2% vs 49.5%), from rural areas (40.6% vs 1.6%). For patients who traveled <6.4 miles and received treatment at an LVC, the median time to initiation of adjuvant chemotherapy was 45 (IQR 35-60) Patients with Stage II-IIIA NSCLC who traveled days. ≥35.1mi to HVCs and did not receive AC had higher mortality than those who traveled <6.4mi to LVCs and received AC (aHR for mortality 1.31, 95% CI 1.21-1.42). Median overall survival was lower for patients who traveled long distances (35.1 to 250 miles) for surgical treatment at HVCs and did not receive AC (median OS 38.8 months) compared with patients who traveled short distances (<6.4 miles) and were surgically treated at LVCs and received AC (median OS 54.6 months, reference).



Subgroup

SF = Survivor

Figure 1: Forest Plot Evaluating the Association of Increasing Travel Distance and Odds of Receipt of Adjuvant Chemotherapy for Patients with Resected Stage II-IIIA (NO-N1) NSCLC

Distance (miles)

<6.4

6.4 to <14.7

14.7 to <35.1

35.1 to 250

* p <0.001

Association of Travel Distance, Surgical Volume, and Receipt of Adjuvant Chemotherapy with Survival among Patients with Resectable Lung Cancer



Figure 2: Kaplan-Meier Curves Evaluating the Association of Travel Distance, Surgical Volume, Receipt of Adjuvant Chemotherapy, and Survival. (A) Stage I, (B) Stage II, and (C) Stage IIIA (NO-N1)



Table 2: Kaplan-Meier Survival Estimates Evaluating the Association of Travel Distance, Surgical Volume, and Receipt of Adjuvant Chemotherapy Subgroups with Survival for Resected Pathological Stage II-IIIA (NO-N1) NSCLC

	12 months		36 months		60 months		
)	Ν	SF (95% CI)	N	SF (95% CI)	Ν	SF (95% CI)	
.C	3792	0.88 (0.87-0.89)	2300	0.61 (0.60-0.63)	1362	0.47 (0.46-0.49)	
N	2900	0.75 (0.74-0.77)	1629	0.51 (0.50-0.53)	917	0.39 (0.37-0.41)	
Sunction $CI =$	Confidence Interval 11C - shor	t distance (<6.4 miles), low-volume (<40 annu	al resections) successfully received	٨٢			

interval, LTC = Short distance (<0.4 miles), iow-volume (<40 annual resections), successibility received A , H4N = long distance (35.1 to 250 miles), high-volume (≥40 annual resections), failed to receive AC

Table 1: Association ofVolume, and Odds of Rewith Resected Stage II-II	Increasing eceipt of Ac IA (N0-N1)	Travel Dist djuvant Che NSCLC	ance, Hos emothera	Table 3: Cox Proportional Hazards Models Evaluating the Association of Travel Distance, Surgical Volume, and Receipt of Adjuvant Chemotherapy Subgroups with				
	Total	Received AC	No AC		NSCLC	NSCLC		
Parameter	48,226 (100%) N	24,953 (51.7%) %	23,273 (48.3%) %	aOR (95% CI)		Cox Proportional	Hazards Models	
Hospital Surgical Volume / Travel Distance (miles)				Subgroup	Unadjusted	Adjusted		
LVC / <6.4	8,055	54.1	45.9	Reference				
LVC / 6.4 to <14.7	5,309	52.7	47.3	0.87 (0.81-0.94)		HR (95% CI)	aHR (95% CI)	
LVC / 14.7 to <35.1	4,039	51.3	48.7	0.82 (0.75-0.90)				
LVC / ≥35.1 to 250	2,772	46.4	53.6	0.67 (0.60-0.76)	L1C	Reference	Reference	
HVC / <6.4	6,766	53.4	46.6	0.93 (0.85-1.02)	H4N			
HVC / 6.4 to <14.7	6,754	54.6	45.4	0.93 (0.84-1.02)		1.39 (1.30-1.49)	1.31 (1.21-1.42)	
HVC / 14.7 to <35.1	7,175	52.3	47.7	0.83 (0.75-0.92)	L1C = short distance (<6.4 miles), low-volume (<40 annual resections), successfully received AC H4N = long distance (35.1 to 250 miles), high-volume (≥40 annual resections), failed		nnual resections), successfully	
HVC / ≥35.1 to 250	7,356	46.0	54.0	0.66 (0.58-0.74)			e (≥40 annual resections), failed	
AC = Adjuvant Chemotherapy;	aOR = adjuste	ed Odds Ratio	to receive AC					
= Low-Volume Center; HVC = H	ligh-Volume C	Center		HR = Hazard Ratio; CI = Confidence Interval; aHR = adjusted Hazard Ratio				

M Northwestern Medicine* Feinberg School of Medicine

Conclusions

Longer travel distance is associated with decreased odds of receiving adjuvant chemotherapy. Furthermore, patients with stage II-IIIA (NO-N1) NSCLC who traveled ≥35.1mi to high-volume centers for surgery and did not receive adjuvant chemotherapy had lower overall survival compared to patients who traveled <6.4mi to low-volume centers for surgery but received adjuvant chemotherapy. Understanding the reason for lack of receipt of adjuvant chemotherapy is necessary to improve delivery and maximize the benefit of travel to high-volume centers for surgery.

References

- 1. Begg CB, Cramer LD, Hoskins WJ, Brennan MF. Impact of hospital volume on operative mortality for major cancer surgery. JAMA 1998;280(20):1747-1751.
- 2. Bach PB, Cramer LD, Schrag D, Downey RJ, Gelfand SE, Begg CB. The influence of hospital volume on survival after resection for lung cancer. N Engl J Med 2001;345(3):181-188.
- B. Birkmeyer JD, Warshaw AL, Finlayson SR, Grove MR, Tosteson AN. Relationship between hospital volume and late survival after pancreaticoduodenectomy. Surgery 1999;126(2):178-183.
- 4. Herb JN, Dunham LN, Mody G, Long JM, Stitzenberg KB. Lung cancer surgical regionalization disproportionately worsens travel distance for rural patients. J Rural Health 2020;36(4):496-505.

