



University of Groningen

Patient Age Is an Independent Risk Factor of Relapse of Differentiated Thyroid Carcinoma and Improves the Performance of the American Thyroid Association Stratification System

Trimboli, Pierpaolo; Piccardo, Arnoldo; Signore, Alberto; Valabrega, Stefano; Barnabei, Agnese; Santolamazza, Giuliano; Di Paolo, Arianna; Stati, Valeria; Chiefari, Alfonsina; Vottari, Sebastiano

Published in: Thyroid

DOI: 10.1089/thy.2019.0688

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date: 2020

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

Citation for published version (APA):

Trimboli, P., Piccardo, A., Signore, A., Valabrega, S., Barnabei, A., Santolamazza, G., Di Paolo, A., Stati, V., Chiefari, A., Vottari, S., Simmaco, M., Ferrarazzo, G., Ceriani, L., Appetecchia, M., & Giovanella, L. (2020). Patient Age Is an Independent Risk Factor of Relapse of Differentiated Thyroid Carcinoma and Improves the Performance of the American Thyroid Association Stratification System. Thyroid, 30(5), 713-719. https://doi.org/10.1089/thy.2019.0688

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverneamendment.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Patient Age Is an Independent Risk Factor of Relapse of Differentiated Thyroid Carcinoma and Improves the Performance of the American Thyroid Association Stratification System

Pierpaolo Trimboli,^{1,*,‡} Arnoldo Piccardo,^{2,*} Alberto Signore,^{3,4} Stefano Valabrega,⁵ Agnese Barnabei,⁶ Giuliano Santolamazza,⁵ Arianna Di Paolo,⁴ Valeria Stati,⁴ Alfonsina Chiefari,⁶ Sebastiano Vottari,⁶ Maurizio Simmaco,⁷ Giulia Ferrarazzo,^{2,8} Luca Ceriani,¹ Marialuisa Appetecchia,^{6,†} and Luca Giovanella^{1,9,†}

Background: The 2015 American Thyroid Association (ATA) guidelines proposed a three-category system for estimating the risk of recurrence of differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC). This system includes several perioperative features, but not age at diagnosis. However, age has traditionally been recognized as a critical factor in the survival of DTC patients, and the eighth edition of TNM stated that patients older than 55 years were at higher risk of death. In this study, we raised the question of whether age at DTC diagnosis impacts on its risk of recurrence. Specifically, the present study aimed to (i) evaluate the association between age at diagnosis and structural recurrence and (ii) investigate whether age at diagnosis could improve the performance of the ATA system.

Methods: During the study period, four institutions selected DTC patients treated with both thyroidectomy and radioiodine and who had follow-up for at least one year. Patients with proven structural evidence of disease during follow-up were identified, and disease-free survival (DFS) was calculated accordingly.

Results: The study involved 1603 DTC patients with a median age of 49 years and DFS of 44 months. Disease recurred in 8%. The shortest DFS was found in the oldest patients. The Kaplan-Meier curves were calculated for each decade of age, and there was a significant association with DFS (p=0.0014). Patients older than 55 years had significantly higher risk (hazard ratio [HR] 1.78, 95% confidence interval [CI 1.23–2.56]). The Kaplan-Meier curves of DFS in high-, intermediate- and low-risk groups showed a significant association only in the high-risk group (p=0.0058). Patients older than 55 years had significantly higher risk of relapse over time only in the high-risk group (HR 2.15 [CI 2.01–4.53]). Cox's proportional analysis showed that the age cutoff of 55 years and the ATA system were significant predictors of relapse. Adding age at diagnosis above 55 years to the ATA system identified a subgroup of patients at highest risk for relapse.

Conclusions: The age threshold adopted in the eighth edition of TNM staging system for DTC patients' prognosis also identifies cases at higher risk of relapse. Applying age at diagnosis, with a cutoff of 55 years, to the ATA risk stratification system identifies cases at highest risk of relapse.

Keywords: thyroid, carcinoma, age, TNM, recurrence, elderly

²Nuclear Medicine Department, Galliera Hospital, Genoa, Italy.

¹Clinic for Nuclear Medicine and Competence Centre for Thyroid Disease, Imaging Institute of Southern Switzerland, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, Bellinzona, Switzerland.

³Medical Imaging Center, Department of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, University of Groningen, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands.

⁴UOC Medicina Nucleare, S. Andrea Hospital, Department of Medical-Surgical Sciences and of Translational Medicine, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy.

Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Ospedale S. Andrea, Sapienza University, Rome, Italy.

⁶Oncological Endocrinology Unit, IRCCS-Regina Elena National Cancer Institute, Rome, Italy.

⁷Analytical Laboratory Unit, S. Andrea Hospital, Department NESMOS, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy. ⁸Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy.

⁹Clinic for Nuclear Medicine, University Hospital and University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

^{*}These authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]These authors share senior co-authorship.

[‡]Current Affiliation: Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI), Lugano, Switzerland.

Introduction

THYROID CANCERS ARE the most prevalent malignant endocrine tumors. Among all thyroid malignancies, differentiated thyroid carcinomas (DTCs) are the most common and are recognized as indolent cancers. Indeed, while 5–20% of DTC patients suffer cancer relapse after the initial treatment, only a small number of patients die from their disease (1).

After diagnosis, DTC patients are staged according to the TNM staging system (2). This staging system is based on the initial histological/imaging information (i.e., size of the primary cancer, invasion of nearby tissues, regional lymph node involvement, and distant metastases). In DTCs, in addition to the above features, age at the time of diagnosis plays a major role in prognosis. Indeed, the most recent edition of the TNM staging manual stated that patients older than 55 years were at higher risk of death (2,3). Although the TNM was originally conceived as a tool for stratifying the risk of disease-specific death in patients affected by malignant tumors, in clinical practice, it has also been frequently used to assess the risk of cancer relapse and to guide follow-up. In the field of thyroid cancer, this is due to two main reasons: the low rate of DTCspecific death and the lack of alternative systems for identifying patients at high risk of recurrence. However, as the TNM system is thought to identify patients at risk of death, this use is debatable.

To fill this gap, the American Thyroid Association (ATA) guidelines published in 2015 proposed a three-category (high risk, intermediate risk, low risk) system for estimating the likelihood of DTC developing a structural recurrence during postoperative follow-up (1). This risk assessment, in addition to some TNM features, includes perioperative data (i.e., aggressive or nonaggressive histological subtype, extension of invasion, completeness of tumor resection, presurgical evidence of suspicious neck lymph nodes, and number and size of neck lymph nodes removed) and further molecular analyses (i.e., BRAF, TERT mutation). In brief, according to the ATA guidelines, DTCs with gross extension are at high risk for recurrence, intrathyroidal DTCs with nonaggressive histology are at low risk, and the remaining DTCs are classified as being at intermediate risk. While age at diagnosis has traditionally been recognized as a critical factor in the survival of DTC patients, some questions arise. Does age at DTC diagnosis actually have an impact on the risk of recurrence after the initial treatment? Moreover, can age at diagnosis improve the predictive model of the ATA risk stratification system?

The present study was undertaken to evaluate the impact of age at diagnosis on DTC relapse in a large retrospective multi-institutional cohort. Specifically, the main outcomes of this study were to (i) evaluate the association between age at diagnosis and structural recurrence in DTCs and (ii) investigate whether age at diagnosis can improve the ATA risk stratification system of these patients.

Materials and Methods

Study design

Four institutions participated in the present multicenter survey: three from Italy (Galliera Hospital in Genoa, S. Andrea Hospital in Rome, and Regina Elena National Cancer Institute in Rome) and one from Switzerland (Ente Ospedalero Cantonale in Bellinzona). At our institutions, DTC patients are seen annually after initial treatment. The study design was a retrospective analysis that included DTC patients treated and followed up at our institutions and evaluated for their annual visit during the period of January to December 2018. The inclusion criteria were patients diagnosed and treated with both thyroidectomy (plus lymph node neck dissection when necessary) and radioiodine (RAI). Patients younger than 18 years at diagnosis, with incidental microcarcinomas, with initially unresectable DTC, with a follow-up period shorter than one year, and/or with incomplete follow-up data were excluded. The cases included were classified according to the ATA guidelines for risk assessment (1). This study was reviewed and approved by all local institutional review and ethical boards.

Reference standards of the study

Patients were classified as alive with no evidence of disease (NED) if there was no clinical, imaging, or cytological/ histological evidence of disease and their measured basal thyroglobulin (Tg) levels were undetectable (i.e., below the functional sensitivity of the locally used assay) or, if detectable, were less than 1 ng/mL and decreased or remained unchanged over time. Patients with structural evidence of disease proven by cytology/histology and/or functional imaging findings with increased Tg were deemed to have structural recurrence (REC). Structural disease-free survival (DFS) was calculated from the date of RAI to the date of the last follow-up examination in NED patients, and from the date of RAI to the date of detection of structural relapse in REC patients.

Statistical analysis

The Mann–Whitney U, Wilcoxon test, and paired or unpaired *t*-test were used to analyze differences between paired or unpaired variables in the two groups of patients. DFS was estimated by means of the Kaplan–Meier method, and differences between curves were analyzed by the log-rank or Mantel–Cox test and expressed as hazard ratios (HRs). Cox's proportional hazards model was performed in univariate and multivariate analyses to evaluate the effect upon time of any potential predictor of cancer relapse (expressed as the HR). Continuous variables are reported in the text as medians and interquartile ranges. Statistical significance was set at p < 0.05. Statistical tests were performed using MedCalc Statistical Software, version 15.8 (MedCalc Software bvba, Ostend, Belgium) or GraphPad Prism version 8 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA).

Results

Demographic data

A total of 1603 DTC patients were finally enrolled, 74% of whom were female. The median age at diagnosis was 49 years. The median DFS was of 44 months. Papillary (papillary thyroid carcinoma) was the most prevalent cancer type, while follicular (follicular thyroid carcinoma) and on-cocytic (oncocytic thyroid carcinoma) carcinomas accounting for $\sim 10\%$ of cases. High-risk cases accounted for 5% of the total cohort. Recurrences occurred in 8.3% of cases. Table 1 summarizes the clinicopathological features of the study cohort.

AGE IN DIFFERENTIATED THYROID CARCINOMA

 TABLE 1. CLINICOPATHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS

 OF THE STUDY COHORT

| Sex 1186 (74) Male 417 (26) Age at diagnosis (years) 49 (39–58) <55 1104 (68.9) >55 499 (31.1) Pathology PTC PTC 1468 (91) FTC 112 (7) OTC 23 (2) TNM classification 738 (46.0) T2 244 (15.2) T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | Variable | 1 | ı (%) |
|--|---------------------------------------|------|----------|
| Female1186 (74) 417 (26)Age at diagnosis (years) 417 (26)Median age at diagnosis49 (39–58) (355)<55 | Sex | | |
| Male $417 (26)$ Age at diagnosis (years) Median age at diagnosis $49 (39-58)$ (355) <55 $1104 (68.9)$ $499 (31.1)$ Pathology PTC $1468 (91)$ $112 (7)$ OTCPTC $1468 (91)$ $112 (7)$ OTCTNM classification $738 (46.0)$ $T2$ $244 (15.2)$ $T3$ T3 $562 (35.1)$ $1204 (75.1)$ N1N0 $1204 (75.1)$ $N1$ $399 (24.5)$ M0N1 $399 (24.5)$ $M1$ N0 $1593 (99.4)$ $M1$ II $1348 (84.1)$ $10 (0.6)$ TNM stage 1 $14 (0.9)$ IVA IVA $R (0.5)$ IVB ATA risk High risk $87 (5.4)$ | Female | 1186 | (74) |
| Age at diagnosis (years) Median age at diagnosis49 (39–58) (39–58) <55 1104 (68.9) 499 (31.1)Pathology PTC1468 (91) 112 (7) OTCPTC1468 (91) 112 (7) OTCTNM classification738 (46.0) T2T1738 (46.0) T2 (244 (15.2)) T3T3562 (35.1) T4T459 (3.7) N0N01204 (75.1) N1 M1N1399 (24.5) M0M01593 (99.4) M1M110 (0.6)TNM stage1 14 (0.9) IVA IVAII1348 (84.1) 14 (0.9) IVAIVB9 (0.6)ATA risk High risk87 (5.4) | Male | 417 | (26) |
| Median age at diagnosis49 $(39-58)$ <55 | Age at diagnosis (years) | | |
| | Median age at diagnosis | 49 | (39-58) |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | <55 | 1104 | (68.9) |
| Pathology PTC 1468 (91) FTC 112 (7) OTC 23 (2) TNM classification 738 (46.0) T2 244 (15.2) T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) | >55 | 499 | (31.1) |
| PTC 1468 (91) FTC 112 (7) OTC 23 (2) TNM classification 738 (46.0) T2 244 (15.2) T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) | Pathology | | |
| FTC 112 (7) OTC 23 (2) TNM classification 738 (46.0) T2 244 (15.2) T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) | PTC | 1468 | (91) |
| OTC 23 (2) TNM classification 738 (46.0) T1 738 (46.0) T2 244 (15.2) T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | FTC | 112 | (7) |
| TNM classification738 (46.0)T1738 (46.0)T2244 (15.2)T3562 (35.1)T459 (3.7)N01204 (75.1)N1399 (24.5)M01593 (99.4)M110 (0.6)TNM stage1I1348 (84.1)II224 (13.9)III14 (0.9)IVA8 (0.5)IVB9 (0.6)ATA risk87 (5.4) | OTC | 23 | (2) |
| T1 738 (46.0) T2 244 (15.2) T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | TNM classification | | |
| T1 130 (16.0) T2 244 (15.2) T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) High risk 87 (5.4) | T1 | 738 | (46.0) |
| T3 562 (35.1) T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | T2 | 244 | (15.0) |
| T4 59 (3.7) N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | T3 | 562 | (35.1) |
| N0 1204 (75.1) N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | T4 | 59 | (3.7) |
| N1 399 (24.5) M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1 I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | NO | 1204 | (75.1) |
| M0 1593 (99.4) M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1348 (84.1) I 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | N1 | 399 | (24.5) |
| M1 10 (0.6) TNM stage 1348 (84.1) I 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) High risk 87 (5.4) | M0 | 1593 | (99.4) |
| TNM stage 1348 (84.1) I 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) High risk 87 (5.4) | M1 | 10 | (0.6) |
| I 1348 (84.1) II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | TNM stage | | |
| II 224 (13.9) III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | I | 1348 | (84.1) |
| III 14 (0.9) IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk 87 (5.4) | II | 224 | (13.9) |
| IVA 8 (0.5) IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk High risk High risk 87 (5.4) | III | 14 | (0.9) |
| IVB 9 (0.6) ATA risk High risk High risk 87 (5.4) | IVA | 8 | (0.5) |
| ATA risk High risk 87 (5.4) | IVB | 9 | (0.6) |
| High risk 87 (5.4) | ATA risk | | |
| | High risk | 87 | (5.4) |
| Intermediate risk 646 (40.3) | Intermediate risk | 646 | (40.3) |
| Low risk 870 (54.3) | Low risk | 870 | (54.3) |
| Long-term outcome | Long-term outcome | | |
| Recurrences 133 (8.3) | Recurrences | 133 | (8.3) |
| Median disease-free survival (months) 44 (12–100) | Median disease-free survival (months) | 44 | (12-100) |

Values in parentheses of median age and disease-free survival represent the interquartile range. All the other parameters are reported as number (percentage).

ATA, American Thyroid Association; FTC, follicular thyroid carcinoma; OTC, oncocytic thyroid carcinoma; PTC, papillary thyroid carcinoma.

Analysis of age as a risk factor for structural recurrence

The median age of patients with REC (52 years, 39–66) was significantly (p = 0.010) higher than that of NED patients (48 years, 39–57). Two-thirds of patients were between 31 and 60 years at diagnosis; 20% of patients were older and 10% were younger. When the overall series was stratified according to age at diagnosis, the median DFS was longest in the youngest subgroup (54 months) and shortest in the oldest subgroup (38 months). The lowest rates of recurrence were found in patients aged 31–50 years, while those older than 70 years had the highest rate. Among patients aged 18–30 years, the rate of REC was 16.87% in the 18- to 25-year-old subgroup (n = 0.089). Table 2 summarizes the details of these subgroups.

When the Kaplan–Meier curves were calculated for each subgroup of age at diagnosis, a significant difference was found (Fig. 1A). The subgroup of patients aged 31–40 years showed a lower risk than that of the subgroup aged 18–30 years. Patients older than 70 years at diagnosis had a shorter DFS than those aged between 61 and 70 years. All other comparisons showed no significant differences. As shown in Figure 1B, patients older than 55 years had a significantly higher risk of relapse than those younger than 55 years, with a median DFS of 41 and 47 months, respectively. No significant difference was found when comparing patients older than or younger than 45 years (Fig. 1C).

Performance of the ATA risk stratification system in predicting relapse

The median age at diagnosis in the three groups was 53 years in the high-risk patients, 49 years in the intermediaterisk patients, and 47 years in the low-risk patients. A significant difference was found only between the low-risk and high-risk groups (p=0.0032). The Kaplan–Meier curves of DFS in the three groups were compared, and a significant difference was found (p<0.0001).

The inclusion of age at diagnosis showed different impacts in the three different ATA risk groups. In the high-risk group, an age at diagnosis >55 was able to further stratify the population, and patients older than 55 years had a significantly higher risk of recurrence than that of the younger (<55 years) patients (Fig. 2). Importantly, the high-risk <55-year-old patients showed no difference in the risk of relapse than the whole group of intermediate-risk patients. No significant

 TABLE 2. ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENTIATED THYROID CARCINOMA PATIENTS BY THE AMERICAN THYROID ASSOCIATION

 Risk Stratification System and Age

| Subgroup | | ATA risk, n (%) | | | | |
|-------------|------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|
| | n | Low | Intermediate | High | Recurrence, n (%) | DFS (months) |
| 18-30 years | 177 | 95 (53.7) | 71 (40.1) | 11 (6.2) | 21 (11.86) | 54 |
| 31–40 years | 304 | 180 (59.2) | 114 (37.5) | 10 (3.3) | 17 (5.59) | 43 |
| 41–50 years | 415 | 241 (58.1) | 158 (38.1) | 16 (3.8) | 22 (5.30) | 46 |
| 51–60 years | 375 | 203 (54.1) | 150 (40.0) | 22 (5.9) | 27 (7.20) | 48 |
| 61–70 years | 215 | 113 (52.6) | 86 (40.0) | 16 (7.4) | 21 (9.77) | 42 |
| >70 years | 117 | 38 (21.5) | 67 (57.3) | 12 (10.2) | 25 (21.37) | 38 |
| <55 years | 1104 | 627 (56.8) | 427 (38.7) | 50 (4.5) | 73 (6.61) | 47 |
| >55 years | 499 | 243 (48.7) | 219 (43.9) | 37 (7.4) | 60 (12.02) | 41 |

DFS, disease-free survival.



FIG. 1. Kaplan–Meier curves for all decades of age at diagnosis (A), an age cutoff of 55 years (B), and an age cutoff of 45 years (C). (A1, A2) Indicate the decades in which a significant difference was found.



FIG. 2. Kaplan–Meier curves for DFS in DTC patients according to their ATA risk category. In the upper panel, patients were divided on the basis of their decade of age at diagnosis. In the lower panel, patients were divided into two groups according to age at diagnosis below or above 55 years. ATA, American Thyroid Association; DFS, disease-free survival; DTC, differentiated thyroid carcinoma.

AGE IN DIFFERENTIATED THYROID CARCINOMA

TABLE 3. UNIVARIATE AND MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

| Variable | HR | CI | р |
|---------------------------|------|--------------------------|--------|
| Univariate analysis | | | |
| Age at diagnosis | 1.02 | 1.00 - 1.03 | 0.0011 |
| (increments of 1 year) | 1.05 | 1 20 2 75 | 0.0002 |
| Age >35 years | 1.95 | 1.39 - 2.73 2.40 3.07 | 0.0002 |
| (increments of one class) | 5.15 | 2.49-3.97 | 0.0001 |
| Multivariate analysis | | | |
| Age >55 years | 1.60 | 1.13-2.26 | 0.0072 |
| ATA risk system | 3.02 | 2.38-3.82 | 0.0000 |

HR, hazard ratio.

differences were found between age subgroups in the other two ATA (low-risk and intermediate-risk) categories.

Cox's proportional hazards model

On univariate analysis, we evaluated age at diagnosis as a continuous variable, age at diagnosis above or below 55 years, and ATA risk classification. The ATA risk classification was the strongest predictor of relapse (Table 3). On multivariate analysis, the model including an age cutoff of 55 years and the ATA system was significant, and both variables were significantly associated with relapse (Table 3).

Adding age at diagnosis to the ATA risk stratification system

Following all the above results, we sought to build a prognostic model including the ATA stratification system with age >55 years old as a new prognostic factor. In this model, we defined four subgroups of risk patients: low-risk, intermediate-risk, and high-risk younger than 55 years, and high-risk older than 55 years. As shown in Figure 3, there was a significant difference for the four Kaplan–Meier curves (log-rank trend test, p < 0.0001). In particular, there was a significant difference between high-risk >55 years cohort and high-risk <55 years (p = 0.043), intermediate-risk (<0.0001), and low-risk (<0.0001) groups, and between intermediate-risk and low-risk groups (p < 0.0001).

Discussion

The present study was conceived to evaluate whether age at diagnosis may be a risk factor for DTC relapse after primary treatment. It is well recognized that old age is associated with poor prognosis in these patients, and the most recent version of the TNM system has changed the age cutoff of risk from 45 to 55 years (2). This decision was mainly supported by findings from a large retrospective study from 10 American institutions (3). In addition, other relevant earlier studies on this topic should be mentioned (4). To date, some studies have attempted to validate the eighth edition of the TNM, and some of the findings have supported the change from the previous edition (5-7), while others have proposed further improvements (8,9). One study specifically analyzed the effect of changing the age cutoff of risk from 45 to 55 years (10) and found that this new threshold was more accurate in staging DTCs. The outcome of all these studies was always disease-specific death, consistent with the aim of using TNM staging system. In 2015, the ATA guidelines proposed a system for stratifying the risk of relapse of DTCs. According to this system, DTCs are classified on the basis of their histology, molecular assessment when available, and preoperative clinical presentation of cancer. However, patient age at diagnosis is not included in the ATA risk classification.

The objective of the present study was to evaluate the role of age at diagnosis as a predictor of structural recurrence, either alone or when combined with the ATA risk stratification system. According to specific selection criteria, we included a large number of DTC patients who were followed at four different institutions after total thyroidectomy and RAI therapy. The main findings of the study were the following. First, age at DTC diagnosis was a significant risk factor of structural cancer relapse. This cutoff performed better than 45 years because an increase in the relapse rate was present only from age 60 years and older (Table 2). Specifically, patients older than 70 years at diagnosis had the highest rate of relapse. Because the ATA risk stratification system already includes several clinical, pathological, molecular, and imaging characteristics, this finding suggests that age at diagnosis should be considered an additional feature for stratifying the initial risk of patients. The patients in our study cohort with an age at diagnosis between 18 and 30 years showed a higher percentage of relapse than those with an age at diagnosis between 31 and 40 years. This finding could probably be influenced by the high rate of REC recorded in the subgroup with age at diagnosis between 18 and 25 years. Even though we did not include patients <18 years old, it is well recognized that young DTC patients have a high risk of recurrence (11). Second, when DTCs were classified as high



FIG. 3. Kaplan–Meier curves of DFS in DTC patients according to their ATA risk category; the high-risk group is divided into two groups of age at diagnosis: below or above 55 years.

risk according to the ATA system and subdivided by age older than or younger than 55 years at diagnosis, a significantly different risk of relapse over time was observed. Patients classified as ATA high risk who were older than 55 years constituted a category at very high risk, while younger high-risk patients had a similar outcome to those of any age in the intermediate-risk group. In contrast, in the ATA low- and intermediate-risk classes, only a trend toward significance was observed between age at diagnosis and DFS. Third, in our multivariate logistic model, both ATA risk assessment and the 55-year age cutoff proved to be reliable and independent risk factors for identifying DTCs with the highest likelihood of structural relapse. This analysis identifies a subgroup of DTC patients at highest risk of relapse in whom adequate staging based on multimodality imaging (12) and molecular assessment (13) has to be considered due to the high likelihood of these patients needing adjuvant RAI (14). Since TNM staging stratifies the risk of disease-specific death, this cluster of patients has to be considered at high risk of death from DTC. These data may also guide the careful management and follow-up of the elderly patients, who are often frail and have comorbidities and are not amenable to an aggressive therapeutic approach after the initial treatment (i.e., surgery and RAI) (1,15). The present results corroborate and extend the findings reported by Shah and Boucai (16) who evaluated the effect of age at diagnosis on response to therapy and mortality in high-risk DTC.

Our study has several limitations and strengths. This was a retrospective study. Specific selection criteria were used to obtain a multicenter series of surviving DTC patients in whom complete follow-up data were available. Only adult patients treated with thyroidectomy and RAI were included. Importantly, these patients were treated and followed up at four different institutions, and the study results may be applicable only to patients having such treatment.

In conclusion, the age cutoff adopted in the eighth edition of thyroid TNM staging system for DTC patients at risk of death (i.e., 55 years) is also alone able to identify patients at higher risk of structural relapse. Applying this age cutoff to the ATA risk stratification system significantly improves the selection of cases at highest risk of relapse.

Authors' Contributions

P.T., L.G., and A.P.: conceptualization. A.B., G.S., A.D.P., V.S., A.C., and G.F.: extraction and curation of data. P.T. and L.C.: analysis of data. P.T. and A.P.: original draft and writing. All authors have reviewed the article and agreed to their individual contributions before submission.

Author Disclosure Statement

No competing financial interests exist.

Funding Information

No funding was received.

References

 Haugen BR, Alexander EK, Bible KC, Doherty GM, Mandel SJ, Nikiforov YE, Pacini F, Randolph GW, Sawka AM, Schlumberger M, Schuff KG, Sherman SI, Sosa JA, Steward DL, Tuttle RM, Wartofsky L 2016 2015 American Thyroid Association Management Guidelines for adult patients with thyroid nodules and differentiated thyroid cancer: the American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force on thyroid nodules and differentiated thyroid cancer. Thyroid **26:**1–133.

- Bychkov A AJCC/TNM staging. PathologyOutlines.com website. PathologyOutlines.com, Inc. Available at https:// www.pathologyoutlines.com/topic/thyroidstaging.html (accessed November 26, 2019).
- 3. Nixon IJ, Wang LY, Migliacci JC, Eskander A, Campbell MJ, Aniss A, Morris L, Vaisman F, Corbo R, Momesso D, Vaisman M, Carvalho A, Learoyd D, Leslie WD, Nason RW, Kuk D, Wreesmann V, Morris L, Palmer FL, Ganly I, Patel SG, Singh B, Tuttle RM, Shaha AR, Gönen M, Pathak KA, Shen WT, Sywak M, Kowalski L, Freeman J, Perrier N, Shah JP 2016 An international multi-institutional validation of age 55 years as a cutoff for risk stratification in the AJCC/UICC staging system for well-differentiated thyroid cancer. Thyroid 26:373–380.
- 4. Jonklaas J, Nogueras-Gonzalez G, Munsell M, Litofsky D, Ain KB, Bigos ST, Brierley JD, Cooper DS, Haugen BR, Ladenson PW, Magner J, Robbins J, Ross DS, Skarulis MC, Steward DL, Maxon HR, Sherman SI; National Thyroid Cancer Treatment Cooperative Study Group 2012 The impact of age and gender on papillary thyroid cancer survival. J Clin Endocrinol Metab **97:**E878–E887.
- Nam SH, Bae MR, Roh JL, Gong G, Cho KJ, Choi SH, Nam SY, Kim SY 2018 A comparison of the 7th and 8th editions of the AJCC staging system in terms of predicting recurrence and survival in patients with papillary thyroid carcinoma. Oral Oncol 87:158–164.
- Kim M, Kim WG, Oh HS, Park S, Kwon H, Song DE, Kim TY, Shong YK, Kim WB, Sung TY, Jeon MJ 2017 Comparison of the seventh and eighth editions of the American Joint Committee on cancer/union for international cancer control tumor-node-metastasis staging system for differentiated thyroid cancer. Thyroid 27:1149–1155.
- Lamartina L, Grani G, Arvat E, Nervo A, Zatelli MC, Rossi R, Puxeddu E, Morelli S, Torlontano M, Massa M, Bellantone R, Pontecorvi A, Montesano T, Pagano L, Daniele L, Fugazzola L, Ceresini G, Bruno R, Rossetto R, Tumino S, Centanni M, Meringolo D, Castagna MG, Salvatore D, Nicolucci A, Lucisano G, Filetti S, Durante C 2018 8th edition of the AJCC/TNM staging system of thyroid cancer: what to expect (ITCO#2). Endocr Relat Cancer 25:L7–L11.
- Tam S, Boonsripitayanon M, Amit M, Fellman BM, Li Y, Busaidy NL, Cabanillas ME, Dadu R, Sherman S, Waguespack SG, Williams MD, Goepfert RP, Gross ND, Perrier ND, Sturgis EM, Zafereo ME 2018 Survival in differentiated thyroid cancer: comparing the AJCC cancer staging seventh and eighth editions. Thyroid 28:1301–1310.
- Kim TH, Kim YN, Kim HI, Park SY, Choe JH, Kim JH, Kim JS, Oh YL, Hahn SY, Shin JH, Kim K, Jeong JG, Kim SW, Chung JH 2017 Prognostic value of the eighth edition AJCC TNM classification for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Oral Oncol 71:81–86.
- Kim M, Kim YN, Kim WG, Park S, Kwon H, Jeon MJ, Ahn HS, Jung SH, Kim SW, Kim WB, Chung JH, Shong YK, Kim TH, Kim TY 2017 Optimal cut-off age in the TNM Staging system of differentiated thyroid cancer: is 55 years better than 45 years? Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 86: 438–443.

AGE IN DIFFERENTIATED THYROID CARCINOMA

- Francis GL, Waguespack SG, Bauer AJ, Angelos P, Benvenga S, Cerutti JM, Dinauer CA, Hamilton J, Hay ID, Luster M, Parisi MT, Rachmiel M, Thompson GB, Yamashita S; American Thyroid Association Guidelines Task Force 2015 Management guidelines for children with thyroid nodules and differentiated thyroid cancer. Thyroid 25:716–759.
- Piccardo A, Trimboli P, Foppiani L, Treglia G, Ferrarazzo G, Massollo M, Bottoni G, Giovanella L 2019 PET/CT in thyroid nodule and differentiated thyroid cancer patients. The evidence-based state of the art. Rev Endocr Metab Disord 20:47–64.
- Crescenzi A, Trimboli P, Modica DC, Taffon C, Guidobaldi L, Taccogna S, RainerA, Trombetta M, Papini E, Zelano G 2016 Preoperative assessment of TERT promoter mutation on thyroid core needle biopsies supports diagnosis of malignancy and addresses surgical strategy. Horm Metab Res 48:157–162.
- 14. Tuttle RM, Ahuja S, Avram AM, Bernet VJ, Bourguet P, Daniels GH, Dillehay G, Draganescu C, Flux G, Führer D, Giovanella L, Greenspan B, Luster M, Muylle K, Smit JWA, Van Nostrand D, Verburg FA, Hegedüs L 2019 Controversies, Consensus, and Collaboration in the Use of 1311 Therapy in Differentiated Thyroid Cancer: a Joint

Statement from the American Thyroid Association, the European Association of Nuclear Medicine, the Society of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging, and the European Thyroid Association. Thyroid **29**:461–470.

- 15. Kulkarni K, Van Nostrand D, Atkins F, Aiken M, Burman K, Wartofsky L 2006 The relative frequency in which empiric dosages of radioiodine would potentially overtreat or undertreat patients who have metastatic well-differentiated thyroid cancer. Thyroid 16:1019–1023.
- Shah S, Boucai L 2018 Effect of age on response to therapy and mortality in patients with thyroid cancer at high risk of recurrence. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 103:689–697.

Address correspondence to: Pierpaolo Trimboli, MD Clinic for Nuclear Medicine and Competence Centre for Thyroid Disease Imaging Institute of Southern Switzerland Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale Bellinzona 6500 Switzerland

E-mail: pierpaolo.trimboli@eoc.ch