RESEARCH ARTICLE

Low Income and Rural County of Residence Increase Mortality from Bone and Joint Sarcomas

Min Rex Cheung

Abstract

<u>Background</u>: This is a part of a larger effort to characterize the effects on socio-economic factors (SEFs) on cancer outcome. Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Result (SEER) bone and joint sarcoma (BJS) data were used to identify potential disparities in cause specific survival (CSS). <u>Materials and Methods</u>: This study analyzed SEFs in conjunction with biologic and treatment factors. Absolute BJS specific risks were calculated and the areas under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve were computed for predictors. Actuarial survival analysis was performed with Kaplan-Meier method. Kolmogorov-Smirnov's 2-sample test was used to for comparing two survival curves. Cox proportional hazard model was used for multivariate analysis. <u>Results:</u> There were 13501 patients diagnosed BJS from 1973 to 2009. The mean follow up time (SD) was 75.6 (90.1) months. Staging was the highest predictive factor of outcome (ROC area of 0.68). SEER stage, histology, primary site and sex were highly significant pre-treatment predictors of CSS. Under multivariate analysis, patients living in low income neighborhoods and rural areas had a 2% and 5% disadvantage in cause specific survival respectively. <u>Conclusions:</u> This study has found 2-5% decrement of CSS of BJS due to SEFs. These data may be used to generate testable hypothesis for future clinical trials to eliminate BJS outcome disparities.

Keywords: Bone and joint sarcoma - radiotherapy - SEER registry - socio-economic factors - cause specific survival

Asian Pac J Cancer Prev, 14 (9), 5043-5047

Introduction

This study is a part of a comprehensive effort to survey Surveillance Epidemiology and End Result (SEER) (Cheung, 2012) for socio-economic factors (SEFs) impacting on the cause specific survival (CSS) of bone and joint sarcomas (BJS). SEER cancer registry data have been used to study the biologic and racial prognostic factors for the large number of sub-types of bone and joint sarcoma (Giuffrida et al., 2009; Nathan and Healey, 2012). To improve the power of this analysis, the SEER designation of BJS was used as opposed to using the sub-types. The nature of the socio-economic barriers to good CSS for BJS as a whole has not been well characterized. In addition to constructing the best predictors of cause specific survival, this study also aimed to identify barriers to good treatment outcome that may be discernable only from a national database. To this end, this study investigated the impact of rural urban residence status, county level family income and county level percent college graduate on CSS of BJS.

Materials and Methods

SEER registers public use data. These data can be used for analysis with no internal review board approval needed. SEER registry has massive amount of data available for analysis, however, manipulating the data could be challenging. SEER Clinical Outcome Prediction Expert (SCOPE) (Cheung, 2012) was used to mine SEER data and construct accurate and efficient prediction models (Cheung, 2012). The data were obtained from SEER 18 database. SEER*Stat (http:// seer.cancer.gov/seerstat/) was used for listing the cases. The filter used was: Site and Morphology. Site rec B with Kaposi and mesothelioma='Bones and Joints'. All of the statistics and programming of this study were performed in Matlab (www.mathworks.com). The variable 'SEER cause-specific death' was used as the CSS outcome variable. The areas under the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve were computed. Similar strata were fused to make more efficient models if the ROC performance did not degrade (Cheung et al., 2001a; 2001b). Kaplan-Meier method was used for time to event data analysis. Kolmogorov-Smirnov's 2-sample test and Cox proportional hazard model were used respectively univariate and multivariate analyses. Probability p<0.05 was considered significant.

Results

There were 13501 patients included in this study (Table 1). The follow up duration (SD) was 75.6 (90.1) months. 56% of the patients were male. The mean (SD) age was 40.1 (24.2) years. The absolute overall risk of death from

275 South Bryn Mawr Ave, Bryn Mawr, PA *For correspondence: cheung.r100@gmail.com

Min Rex Cheung

Table 1.	The Ris	sk Models	Include t	he Socio-T)emographic.	Tumor and	Treatment	Factors 1	for 1	BIS
I HOIC II	THE INC	IN INIOUCID	Include of		/cmogi apmeg	Tamor and	11 cutilitut	I actor b	LUL 1	DJU.

Sindy population Age of diagnosis 1391 MemsDD Age of diagnosis MemsDD > 20 years of 20 years	Initial univariate risk models			Model	ROC Area	S.D.	-	
Age of diagnosis Means D 20 years old 925 0.29 0.50 0.01 20 years old 925 0.71 0.50 0.01 State Entable 5960 0.44 0.53 0.00 Site Extremities 6676 0.49 0.52 0.01 SteR Others 6625 0.51 0.01 100.0 4762 0.35 0.68 0.01 SteR bistorie stage A Localizadel* 100.0 4762 0.35 0.61 0.00 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.01 0.00 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01	Study population	13501					-	
- 20 years old 3976 0.29 0.20 0.01 -20 years old 9925 0.71	Age of diagnosis	Mean±SD						
>20 years old 925 0.71 Sex Female 550 0.44 0.53 0.00 Site Extremities 676 0.49 0.52 0.01 Site Diters 6825 0.51 623 0.00 SEER historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4762 0.35 0.66 0.01 Stepsel-all Bistam:=III+*** 6.3 1762 0.55 0.61 0.00 0.		< 20 years	3976	0.29	0.50	0.01		
Follow up (nonths) MeanzSD Sax Funda Sax F		≥20 years old	9525	0.71				
Sax Female 5960 0.44 0.53 0.00 Site Extremities 6761 0.56 0.00 Site Extremities 6625 0.51 0.52 0.00 SEER historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4762 0.35 0.68 0.01 SEER historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4762 0.35 0.67 0.00 Bitabology 9180-9239: oscous and chondromatous geogliams Others 63.3 1860 166.25 0.01 30.0 12.6 Grade Unknown Others 63.3 166.3 166.4 0.01 0.00 10.0 12.6 10.0	Follow up (months)	Mean±SD						
Male 7541 0.55 Site Extermities 675 0.49 0.52 0.00 SEEE historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4762 0.33 0.68 0.01 SEEE historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4762 0.33 0.67 0.01 30.0 SEEE historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4763 12.6 1613 1763 0.67 0.01 30.0 0.67 0.01 30.0 12.6 11.6	Sex	Female	5960	0.44	0.53	0.00		
Site Extremities 6676 0.49 0.52 0.00 SEER historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4762 0.33 0.68 0.01 SEER historic stage A Localized-1* 100.0 4762 0.33 0.67 0.01 30.0 Statar-III+*** Statar-III+*** 63 163 163 0.67 0.01 30.0 Grade Unknown Others 63 17.63 163 0.61 0.00 30.0 Grade Unknown Countifs in metropolitan areas ge1 militon pop 56.3 17.64 17.95 0.61 0.00 31.3 0.00 30.0 33.3 Rural-Urban Continuum Counties in metropolitan areas ge1 militon pop 57.0 17.66 0.11 0.51 0.00 33.3 Code 2003 Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 to 1 million entor area 91 0.67 31.3 0.00 33.3 Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 not adjacent to a metro area 91 0.67 31.3 0.00 33.3 Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 not adjacent to a metro area 91 0.67<		Male	7541	0.56				
Others Others 6825 0.51 SEEE historic stage A Localized-1** 100.0 4762 0.33 0.68 0.01 Bistant-III*** Distant-III*** 0.53 1061 1501 161 1501 0.67 0.01 30.0 12.8 Histology 9189-9249: osseous and chondromatous-geoleans 56.3 1266 12.66	Site	Extremities	6676	0.49	0.52	0.00		
SEEE historic stage A Localized=1* 100.0 4762 0.53 0.68 0.01 Regional=11** 56.2 56.25 56.25 56.3 57.5 56.3 56.3 57.5		Others	6825	0.51				
Regional-III** 4905 2051 19613 0.67 0.01 30.0 Histology 9180-9249: osseous and chondromatous recognams Others 53 2501 11.56 0.67 0.01 30.0 30.0 Grade Unknown Moderately differentiated: Grade II 56.3 1746.8 12.66 0.61 0.00 30.0 30.0 Rural-Urban Continuum Moderately differentiated: Grade II 50.3 1746.8 12.66 0.51 0.00 30.0	SEER historic stage A	Localized=I* 100.0	4762	0.35	0.68	0.01		
Distant=III*** Unstaged=IV 9180-9249: osseous and chondromatous neoglasms Others Others Grade Unknown Moderately differentiated; Grade II Well differentiated; Grade II 9000 90		Regional=II**	4895	36.25				
Unstaged=IV Histology 9180-9249: osseus and chondromatous geoglasms Others		Distant=III*** 6.3	22 80.1	1 2013	0.67	0.01		12.8
Histology 9180-9249: essecus and chondromatous <u>250</u> ans <u>550</u> Others 014 Grade <u>1</u> Well differentiated; Grade II Well differentiated; Grade II Well differentiated; Grade II Well differentiated; Grade II Well differentiated; Grade II Solo Undifferentiated; Grade IV Well differentiated; Grade IV Solo Undifferentiated; Grade IV Well differentiated; Grade IV Solo Undifferentiated; Grade IV Solo Undifferentiated; Grade IV Solo Undifferentiated; Grade IV Undifferentiated; Grade IV Counties in metropolitan areas <u>250</u> 2000 to 1 millior.prepr Urban pop of ge 20,000 at adjacent to a metro area Compruent IL 250 outban pop, not adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) County Family Income 250000 County Family Income 25000 County Family Income 25000 Coun		Unstaged=IV	1561	11.56				
Others 121 3121 37933 12.0 121 37933 Grade Unknown Moderately differentiated: Grade II 56.3 146.8 11.269 11.2	Histology	9180-9249: osseous and chondromatous peoplasms	\$380	62.07	255	0.01	30.0	
Grade Unknown 475.9 0.61 0.00 51.1 Wed reatly differentiated; Grade II 50.0 11.69 12.69 31.3 30.0 <t< td=""><td></td><td>Others 75.0</td><td>5121</td><td>37.93</td><td>25.0</td><td></td><td>50.0</td><td></td></t<>		Others 75.0	5121	37.93	25.0		50.0	
Moderately differentiated; Grade II56.3149.811.6931.330.030.0Rural-Urban Continuum Code 2003Counties in metropolitan areas of 250.000 to 1 million pop Counties in metropolitan areas of 250.000 to 1 million pop Counties in metropolitan areas of 250.000 to 1 million pop Counties in metropolitan areas of 250.000 to 1 million pop Counties in metropolitan areas of 250.000 to 1 million pop turban pop of 25.000 tadjacent to a metropolitan Counties in metropolitan areas of 12.50 thousand pop Urban pop of 25.000 urban pop, not adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Urban pop of 25.000 urban pop, not adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State)38.00.0431.330.033.1County Family Income ex5000025500 urban pop, not adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State)11.690.500.0130.033.1County Ve college graduate ex50000255%0.500.010.520.000.520.00County % college graduate surgery25%0.500.012520.500.01Addiation for to surgery Radiation port to surgery30.015.20.000.520.00Reason no cancer-directed surgery metromed16.075.30.280.600.01Reason no cancer-directed surgery metromed17.3312.980.600.01Reason no cancer-directed surgery metromed17.3312.980.600.01Reason no cancer-directed surgery metromed17.3312.980.600.01Reason no cancer-d	Grade	Unknown	6426	47.59	0.61	0.00		
Well differentiated; Grade II 50.0 339 1692 31.3 0.0 Rural-Urban Continuum Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 to 1 million pop 2870 21.26 0.51 0.00 0.51 0.00 33.3 Code 2003 Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 to 1 million pop 28.1 31.3 0.00 0.51 0.00 0.51 0.00 33.3 Code 2003 Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan areas 12.80 31.3 0.00 33.1 30.0 33.1 Counties in metropolitan areas of 12.500 not adjacent to a metropolitan areas 12.81 31.7 12.26 31.3 30.0 30.0 33.1 Urban pop of 2.500 to 19.999, not adjacent to a metro area 91 0.67 12.27 12.26 31.3 30.0 30.0 33.1 County Family Income ≈550000 12.9099, adjacent to a metro area 91 0.67 12.25 0.28 16 12.25 160 12.25 160 12.25 160 12.25 0.50 0.01 2.27 160 12.25 160 12.25 160 12.25 160 160		Moderately differentiated; Grade II 56.3	1746.8	12.69				51.1
Poorly differentiated; Grade II 50.0 1309 163.6 31.3 Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 to 1 million pop Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 to 1 million pop Urban pop of ge 20,000 adjacent to a metropolitan area Unknown/missing/no match Urban pop of 2,250 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro portan Comp rural II 2,500 urban pop, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop of 2,500 urban pop (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) of 2,500 urban pop (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500 urban pop) (2,500		Well differentiated; Grade I	1578	11.69				
Rard-Urban Continuum Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 to 1 million pop Urban pop of ge 20,000 adjacent to a metropolitan areas Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan areas Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan areas Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan areas Counties in metropolitan areas of 12.500 to 19.999, not adjacent to a metro area Commersion function and adjacent to a metro area Comp trail 12.500 to 19.999, not adjacent to metro area Comp trail 12.500 to 19.999, not adjacent to a metro area Comp trail 12.500 to 19.999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2.500 to 19.999, adjacent to a metro area Comp trail 12.500 to 19.999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2.500 to 19.999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop de 2.500 to 19.999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop de 2.500 to 19.999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop de 2.500 to 19.999, adjacent to a metro area Urbanown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) State 10.67 State 31.3 30.0 33.1 County Family Income ≥550000 <550000		Poorly differentiated; Grade III 50.0	1399	10.364	31.3		20.0	
Rural-Urban Continuum Code 2003 Counties in metropolitan areas ge 1 million pop Urban pop of ge 20,000 adjacent to a met 25 ; 0 0 to 1 million reat Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a met 25 ; 0 0 tran area Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan reat Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan reat Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan reat Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban www.missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) 91 0.67 300 31.3 30.0 33.1 County Family Income < \$50000		Undifferentiated; anaplastic; Grade IV	2384	17.66			30.0	
Code 2003 Countes in metropolitan areas of 25,000 to 1 millior term Unknown/missing/no match Urban pop of ge 20,000 adjacent to a metropolitan area Counties in metropolitan areas of 12.50 thousand pop Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Comp rural It 2.500 urban pop, not adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) S50000 County Family Income s500000 County & college graduate 225% Count reat metropolitan area Radiation and/or cancer-directed surgery Black Radiation treatment given No radiation and/or cancer-directed surgery Radiation before and after surgery Radiation before and after surgery Radiation before and after surgery Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed Reason no cancer-directed but not performed, unknown reason Sequence unknown, ib both were given Reason no cancer-directed but not performed, unknown reason Sequence unknown, ib performed, unknown reason Sequence unknown, ib performed, patient fer furgery Reason no cancer-directed but not performed, unknown reason Sequence unknown, but both were given No treformed, unknown reason Sequence unknown, ib performed Not recommended but not performed, unknown reason Sequence unknown, but both were given Not performed, patient if epi for to cancer direct after surgery Not recommended but not performed, patient refused Not performed, patient if epi for to the commended surgery Not performed, patient if epi for to the commended surgery Not performed, patient if epi for to the commended surgery Not performed, patient if epi for to the commended surgery Not performed, patient if epi for to recommended surgery Not performed contraindicated due to other commended surgery Not performed contraindi	Rural-Urban Continuum	Counties in metropolitan areas ge 1 million pop	8120	60.14	0.51	0.00		
Urban pop of ge 20,000 adjacent to a mcgrgchtan area Urban opp of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan 33.3 Counties in metropolitan areas of it 250 thousand pop Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urbanown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) 91 0.67 31.3 30.0 30.0 30.0 County Family Income ≥550000 41 ge 36 ge 58 62 92 92 82 County We college graduat ≥25% 41 ge 3.60 0.50 0.01 99 93 1225 ge 0.49 0.50 0.00 99 92 86 0.50 0.01 90 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 93	Code 2003	Counties in metropolitan areas of 250,000 to 1 million pop	- 2870	21.26				
Unknown/missing/no match Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan Counties in metropolitan areas of lt 250 thousand pop Urban pop not adjacent on ametro area Comp rural lt 2,500 urban pop, not adjacent on metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent on ametro area Comp rural lt 2,500 urban pop, not adjacent on ametro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent on ametro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 urban pop, adjacent pom		Urban pop of ge 20,000 adjacent to a me 25 politan area	379	2.81				
Counties in metropolitan areas of 11 250 thousand por Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,990, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,990, adjacent to 2,990,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,00		Unknown/missing/no match	38.0	0.04	21.2		20.0	33 1
Countres in metropolitia areas of If 250 thousand pop Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) County Family Income \$50000 County & college graduate 25% Race White/others Black Radiation and/or cancer-directed surgery Radiation and/or cancer-directed surgery Radiation prior to surgery Radiation prior to surgery Radiation prior to surgery Radiation prior to surgery Reason no cancer-directed surgery Reason no cancer-directed Surgery Performed Surgery Performed Surgery Performed Surgery Performed Surgery Recommended but not performed, unknown reason Surgery Recommended but not performed, unknown reason Surgery SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause Set Count of the cause Set Count or dead of other cause Set Count or dead of the		Urban pop of ge 20,000 not adjacent to a metropolitan area -	217	23.7	51.5		30.0	5513
Comprual lt 2.500 rbma pop, not adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2.500 rb 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Urban pop of 2.500 rb 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) Soundy Family Income \$50000 County % college graduat 225% Race White/others Black 0 Radiation after surgery Radiation after surgery Radiation perfor and after surgery Radiation perfor and after surgery Radiation before and after surgery Radiation before and after surgery Reason no cancer-directed Surgery Recommended but not performed, nuknown reason Surgery Recommended but not performed, nuknown reason Surgery Recommended but not performed, patient refused Not recommended to ther conditions Not performed, patient refused Not recommended to ther conditions Not performed, patient refused Not recommended patient refused Not performed, patient refused N		Counties in metropolitan areas of It 250 thousand pop	985	7.30				
County Family Income S50000 10.999, adjacent to metro area Comp rural It 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) 112 0.49 91 0.51 County Family Income S50000 1844 0.49 0.59 0.61		Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, not adjacent to a metro area	307	2.27				
Comp rula 10 po of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area Comp rula 11 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State) County Family Income \$50000 County % college graduat \$25% County % college graduat \$260 \$260 County % college graduat \$260 County % college graduat \$260 County % college graduat \$270 \$260 County % college graduat \$270		Comp rural it 2,500 urban pop, not adjacent to metro area	91 41 4	0.67	_		e	≥
County Family Income \geq \$50000 unban pop, adjacent to a metro area in the income and the income and the income income income income income income and the income income income income and the income income income income and the income in		Urban pop of 2,500 to 19,999, adjacent to a metro area	41E	3.04	sio		lon	rap
County Family Income \$\$50000 to \$\$5000 to \$		Comp rural It 2,500 urban pop, adjacent to a metro area		0.25	nis		Z	hei
County Family income \$50000 10 11 51412 0.00 0.51 0.00 50 (\$50000 10 5365 0.45 0.51 0.00 0.01 (\$25% 0.52% 0.45 0.45 0.50 0.01 (\$25% 0.52% 0.45 0.50 0.00 12256 0.47 0.50 0.00 Black 0.52 0.00 1242 0.06 1242 0.00 1242 0.05 0.00 1242 0.05 0.00 1242 0.05 0.00 1242 0.05 0.00 1242 0.05 0.00 1242 0.05 0.00 1242 0.06 12	Country Francisco Income	Unknown/missing/no match (Alaska - Entire State)		0.8	Ger	0.00		Jot
County % college graduate 25% County % college graduate 25% < 25% Race White/others 25% Black 725% Radiation ad/or cancer-directed surgery 11607 Radiation ad/or cancer-directed surgery 11607 Radiation after surgery 2122 Radiation prior to surgery 35 Radiation before and after surgery 30 Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed 9813 Recommended but not performed, unknown reason 1222 Recommended, unknown if performed 93 Not recommended unt opt performed 93 Not recommended unt ont performed, patient refused 97 Not recommended contraindicated due to other conditions 76 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause Part 4	County Family Income	≥\$50000 ₽ ₽	814 5	0.000	17.0	0.00		Jen
County % concege graduate22.5%12150.500.01RaceWhite/others06280.490.500.00Black0101010101Radiation and/or cancer-directed surgery01010101Radiation after surgery0101010101Radiation before and after surgery0101010101Radiation before and after surgery0101010101Radiation before and after surgery0101010101Reason no cancer-directedSurgery performed000010101surgeryRecommended but not performed, unknown reason1222000101surgeryRecommended but not performed030.690.600.01Not recommended175312.980.69010101Not recommended but not performed, patient refused070.720.720.72Not recommended but not performed, patient refused070.720.720.72Not recommended but not performed, patient refused070.720.720.72SEER cause specific Survival Alive or deal of other cause798059.100.020.02SEER cause specific Survival Alive or deal of other cause798059.100.020.02SEER cause specific Survival Alive or deal of other cause798059.100.020.02SEER cause specific Survival Alive or deal of	County & collage graduate	<\$30000 not	7212	0.460	0.50	0.01		с С
Race White/others black 0.50 0.00 Black 0.50 0.00 Radiation after surgery 0.52 0.00 Radiation prior to surgery 0.52 0.00 Radiation prior to surgery 0.52 0.00 Radiation before and after surgery 0.52 0.00 Radiation before and after surgery 0.55 0.26 Intraoperative radiation 8 0.06 Sequence unknown, but both were given 20 0.15 Intraoperative rad with other rad before/after surgery 3 0.02 Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed 9813 72.68 0.60 0.01 surgery Recommended but not performed, unknown reason 1222 9.05 Recommended but not performed 93 0.69 Not recommended but not performed 93 0.69 Not recommended but not performed 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10	County % conege graduate	22.5%	421 3	00 1	0.50	0.01		
Race Winterbalance Black	Pace	Vhite/others	122500	0.49	0.50	0.00		
Radiation treatment given No radiation and/or cancer-directed surgery in 11697 86.6.3 0.52 0.00 Radiation after surgery in 1527 11.27 Radiation prior to surgery 2142 1.60 Radiation before and after surgery 35 0.26 Intraoperative radiation 8 0.06 Sequence unknown, but both were given 20 0.15 Intraoperative rad with other rad before/after surgery 3 0.02 Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed 9813 72.68 0.60 0.01 Recommended but not performed, unknown reason 1222 9.05 Recommended but not performed 93 0.69 Not recommended to the performed 93 0.69 Not recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10	Race	Plask 0	1223 12420	0.77 0.070	0.50	0.00		
Readiation it cannot it cannot can be cancer outcold surgery in the second strugery in the second strugery in the second strugery is the second strugery in the second strugery is the second strugery in the second strugery is the	Radiation treatment given	No radiation and/or cancer directed surgery	116010	86.63	0.52	0.00		
Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed unknown if performed unknown reason 1222 9.05 Recommended but not performed 1753 12.98 Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10 Dead	Radiation treatment given	Rediction after surgery	152	11.27	0.52	0.00		
Realiation prior to surgery Radiation before and after surgery Intraoperative radiation Sequence unknown, but both were given Intraoperative rad with other rad before/after surgery Reason no cancer-directed surgery Recommended but not performed, unknown reason surgery Recommended, unknown if performed Not recommended Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case Recommended but not performed, patient refused Recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause Part Alive or		Radiation prior to surgery	21	1.60				
Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed with other rad before/after surgery 3 0.02 Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed 9813 72.68 0.60 0.01 surgery Recommended but not performed, unknown reason 1222 9.05 Recommended, unknown if performed 93 0.69 Not recommended 1753 12.98 Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10 Dead		Radiation before and after surgery	35	0.26				
Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed unknown is performed, unknown reason 1222 9.05 Recommended but not performed 93 0.69 Not recommended 1753 12.98 Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02		Intraoperative radiation	8	0.06				
Intraoperative rad with other rad before/after surgery 3 0.02 Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed 9813 72.68 0.60 0.01 surgery Recommended but not performed, unknown reason 1222 9.05 93 0.69 Not recommended 1753 12.98 12.98 12.98 12.98 Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 12.98 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10		Sequence unknown but both were given	20	0.15				
Reason no cancer-directed Surgery performed with not performed, unknown reason 1222 9.05 Recommended but not performed 93 0.69 Not recommended 1753 12.98 Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10 Dead		Intraoperative rad with other rad before/after surgery	3	0.02				
Recommended but not performed, unknown reason Recommended but not performed, unknown reason Recommended unknown if performed Not recommended Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case Recommended but not performed, patient refused Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause Particular 1222 9.05 1222 9.05 12.98 12.98 12.98 12.98 0.69 0.72 0.72 0.72 0.002 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10 12.08 12.98	Reason no cancer-directed	Surgery performed	9813	72.68	0.60	0.01		
Recommended, unknown if performed 93 0.69 Not recommended 1753 12.98 Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10	surgery	Recommended but not performed, unknown reason	1222	9.05	0100	0101		
Not recommended 1753 12.98 Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10	87	Recommended, unknown if performed	93	0.69				
Unknown; death certificate or autopsy only case 444 3.29 Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10 Dead 1211 2110		Not recommended	1753	12.98				
Recommended but not performed, patient refused 97 0.72 Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10		Unknown: death certificate or autopsy only case	444	3.29				
Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions 76 0.56 Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery 3 0.02 SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10		Recommended but not performed, patient refused	97	0.72				
Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery30.02SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause798059.10Dead421131.10		Not recommended, contraindicated due to other conditions	76	0.56				
SEER cause specific Survival Alive or dead of other cause 7980 59.10		Not performed, patient died prior to recommended surgery	3	0.02				
	SEER cause specific Surviva	al Alive or dead of other cause	7980	59.10				
Deau 4211 51.19	1	Dead	4211	31.19				
N/A not first tumor 1310 9.70		N/A not first tumor	1310	9.70				

Model: *I,II,III,IV; **Optimized; and ***I,(II,III),IV



Figure 1. Kaplan-Meier Product Limit Estimate of BJS Cause Specific Survival. The '+' marker indicates when censoring occurred

bone and joint sarcoma was 31.2% (Table 2). Figure 1 shows the actuarial survival probability of BJS patients from SEER database. About 29.4% of the BJS patents younger than 20 years old were diagnosed with bone and joint sarcoma. The absolute risk of cause specific death was 29.4% for patients younger than 20 years old and similarly for older patients (Table 2). Extremities BJS account for about 55% of all cases (Table 3). Extremity BJS carries a 28.9% risk of cause specific death compared with 33.4% for the others (Table 2). Grade was predictive of BJS survival. The risk of cause specific death was 10.3% for grade II, 16.6% for grade II, 34.3% for grade III and 37.2% for grade IV. Being un-graded has the same

risk of cause specific death as patients with a grade IV disease. SEER stage was predictive of absolute risk of cause specific death. There was a 17.1% risk of death

 Table 2. Cause Specific Mortality (%) Associated with

 Different Models

Variables: risk models	No. at	expected risk of death	
		115K	TISK OF death
Age of diagnosis	<20	3976	0.32
_	≥20	9525	0.31
Sex	Female	5960	0.28
	Male	7541	0.33
Primary site			
C40.2-Long bones of	f lower limb and		
associated joints/C40).0-Long bones: up	per	
limb, scapula, and as	sociated joints	6676	0.29
Others		6825	0.33
Histology			
9180-9249: osseous	and chondromatou	s neoplas	sms
		8380	0.28
Others		5121	0.36
Grade Well differentiated; C	Grade I	1578	0.10
Moderately different	iated; Grade II	1714	0.17
Poorly differentiated	; Grade III	1399	0.34
Undifferentiated; and	aplastic; Grade IV	2384	0.37
Unknown		6426	0.37
Rural-Urban Continuum			
Counties in metropol	litan areas ge 1		
million pop/Code 20	03/Counties in		
metropolitan areas of	f 250,000 to 1		
million pop/Urban p	op of ge 20,000		
adjacent to a metrop	olitan area versus	11975	0.31
Others		1526	0.36
County Family Income	≥\$50000	8141	0.30
	<\$50000	5360	0.32
County % college graduate	≥25	7213	0.31
	<25	6288	0.31
Race	White/others	12259	0.31
	Black	1242	0.31
Radiation treatment given			
Preoperative Radioth	nerapy	216	0.42
Postoperative Radiot	herapy	1522	0.37
Others		11763	0.30
Reason no cancer-directed s	surgery		
Surgery performed		9813	0.25
Others		3688	0.47
SEER Staging	Localized	4762	0.17
	Regional	4895	0.30
	Un-staged/others	1561	0.38
	Distant	2283	0.58

for localized disease. This risk increased to more than 30% when there was lymph node metastasis. When the staging was not complete, it was associated with 58.4% risk of death (Table 2) that is higher than the 38.2% risk of death of patients with metastatic disease. Living in a cosmopolitan area was associated with 30.6% risk of BJS specific death compared with 35.5% risk living in a rural area (Table 2). Race, county education attainment and family income were not predictive of treatment outcome. Pre-operative radiotherapy was given to 4.3% of patients and was associated with 30% risk of BJS death. Preoperative radiotherapy was given to 1.6% of patients and 11.3% of patients had post-operative radiotherapy (Table 1). Surgery was associated with 25.3% risk of BJS death while 56.7% risk of death was associated with no surgery performed.

For the SEER stage model, the staging of BJS was defined as localized, regional, distant or incompletely staged/others. The stage status was highly predictive of BJS specific survival (ROC area or 0.68). This 4-tiered staging model was optimized to a 3-tiered model consisted of localized versus regional or distant versus un-staged/ others with a ROC area of 0.67 (Table 1). Based on absolute risk of death from BJS, rural residents had a 5% additional risk of BJS specific death. This translated into marginally elevated ROC areas (Table 1). Other pre-treatment factors grade, site and histology had respectively 0.61, 0.55 and 0.52 ROC areas. Radiotherapy had a ROC

Fable 3. The Distributior	of Sites that BJS Occurred
----------------------------------	----------------------------

Factor	Coun	t Percent
Primary Site - labeled	13501	
C40.2-Long bones of lower limb and associated joints	5167	38.26840468
C41.0-Bones of skull and face and associated joints	1163	8.613538735
C40.0-Long bones: upper limb, scapula, and associated jo	oints	
	1509	11.17612206
C41.2-Vertebral column	942	6.976744186
C41.3-Rib, sternum, clavicle and associated joints	1007	7.458154348
C41.4-Pelvic bones, sacrum, coccyx and associated joints	2140	15.84950378
C41.1-Mandible	615	4.554880758
C41.9-Bone, NOS	434	3.214338617
C40.1-Short bones of upper limb and associated joints	160	1.185009628
C40.3-Short bones of lower limb and associated joints	304	2.251518294
C40.9-Bone of limb, NOS	39	0.288846097
C41.8-Overlap bones, joints, and art. cartilage	15	0.111094653
C40.8-Overlap of bones, joints, and art. cartilage of limbs	6	0.044437861

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov 2-sample test			Cox proportional hazard model			
		1	р	k	beta	s.e.	р	
SEER stage	0=local/regional 1=metastatic/unstaged	1	4.15E-53	0.8641	1.0073	0.0318	0	
Sex	0=female 1=male	1	4.13E-23	0.5596	0.1352	0.0315	0	
Primary site	0=long bones (Table 2) 1=others	1	9.79E-20	0.5157	0.2612	0.034	0.0001	
Histology	0=bone/cartilage 1=others	1	4.70E-18	0.4898	-0.1355	0.0523	0	
Grade	0=grade 1-2 1=grade 3-4, ungraded	1	9.84E-54	0.8737	1.1049	0.0523	0	
Rural Urban residence	0=urban 1=rural	0	0.1081	0.1446	0.1584	0.0492	0.0013	
County level family income	0=more than \$50k/year 1=less or equal to \$50k/yr	0	0.8287	0.0695	0.1173	0.0335	0.0005	

*For Kolmogorov-Smirnov's test, l=1 if the two survival curves were statistically different as measure by k. Beta and s.e. were respectively Cox proportional hazard coefficients and the standard errors. Probability p<0.05 was considered significant

Min Rex Cheung



Figure 2. The Survival Curves Plotted. A) SEER stage; B) Sex; C) Primary site; D) Histology; E) Grade; F) Rural urban residence status; and G) County level family income. In each case, the two curves were compared with a 2-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov's test. The results were reported in Table 4



Figure 3. Cox Proportional Model Plotted with the Fitted Parameters in Table 4

area of 0.52 while surgery had a ROC area of 0.60. For lymph node positive patients, the use of radiotherapy was 17.2%.

Figure 2 shows the results of comparing the CSS separated by A) SEER stage; B) sex; C) primary site; D) histology; E) grade; F) rural urban residence status; and G) county level family income. SEER stage, sex, primary site, histology and grade were highly significant univariate predictors of CSS (Table 4). The rural urban residence status and county level family income were not significant under univariate analyses. Under multivariate analysis, these two SEFs became statistically independent CSS predictors. Figure 3 shows the Cox proportional model closely resembling the Kaplan-Meier survival estimate.

Discussion

This study investigated the impact of SEFs on CSS (Figure 1 and Table 1-3) of BJS using SEER data. Recently, an important 10-15 years long-term study demonstrated that moving patients from low income neighborhoods to higher ones improved their obesity and diabetes (Ludwig et al., 2011; 2012). In this study examined three SEFs: *i*) whether the patients lived in a rural as opposed to urban counties; *ii*) whether the patients lived in a county with a family income equal or lower than \$50000 per year as opposed to a higher one; and *iii*) whether the patients lived in a low college education attainment county were examined. These SEFs were examined in conjunction with other pretreatment factors to detect if they were independent predictors of CSS of BJS.

In order to be consistent over decades, SEER historical stage abstracts the staging into simple but important stages

for cancer progression: localized, regional and distant. SEER stage was highly predictive of patient outcome (Table 1). The model has a ROC area of 0.68. Thus complete staging is important in this disease since it will aid patient selection and council. After binary fusion by SCOPE, the 4-tiered stage model was reduced to a 3-tiered model based on ROC area calculations (Table 1). Being un-staged was associated with a risk of cause specific death similar to those with regional disease (Table 2).

Regional BJS is an aggressive disease, there was a 30% risk of cause specific (Table 2). These are patients most likely to benefit from radiotherapy (Horton et al., 2011; Schreiber et al., 2012). Thus radiation oncologist should be more attentive in recommending RT for these patients. For the pediatric populations, proton use is expected to improve the outcome of these patients by primarily decreasing the rate of secondary cancers (Miralbell et al., 2002; Cohen et al., 2005; DeLaney, 2007; Kuhlthau et al., 2012).

This study found the pretreatment factors (Figure 2A-2E) SEER stage, sex, primary site, histology, and grade were highly statistically significant predictors of CSS. While rural urban residence status (Figure 2F) and county level family income (Figure 2G) impacted on the CSS, but they were not significant on statistical tests (Table 4). This was probability due to the highly significant biologic factors (Table 4). Under multivariate analysis using Cox proportional hazard method (Table 4 and Figure 3), when the biologic factors were accounted for, these two SEFs become significant predictors. This study has found 2-5% decrement of CSS of BJS due to rural and low income county residence. These data may be used to generate testable hypothesis for future clinical trials to eliminate BJS outcome disparities. Further studies investigating the socio-economic disparities of subtypes of BJS is under way.

References

- Cheung R (2012). Poor treatment outcome of neuroblastoma and other peripheral nerve cell tumors may be related to under usage of radiotherapy and socio-economic disparity: a us SEER data analysis. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev*, **13**, 4587-91.
- Cheung R, Altschuler MD, D'Amico AV, et al (2001a). ROCoptimization may improve risk stratification of prostate cancer patients. *Urology*, 57, 286-90.

- Cheung R, Altschuler MD, D'Amico AV, et al (2001b). Using the receiver operator characteristic curve to select pretreatment and pathologic predictors for early and late post-prostatectomy PSA failure. *Urology*, **58**, 400-5.
- Cohen RJ, Curtis RE, Inskip PD, Fraumeni JF Jr (2005). The risk of developing second cancers among survivors of childhood soft tissue sarcoma. *Cancer*, **103**, 2391-6.
- DeLaney TF (2007). Clinical proton radiation therapy research at the Francis H. Burr Proton therapy center. *Technol Cancer Res Treat*, **6**, 61-6.
- Giuffrida AY, Burgueno JE, Koniaris LG, et al (2009). Chondrosarcoma in the United States (1973-2003): an analysis of 2890 cases from the SEER database. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*, **91**, 1063-72.
- Horton JK, Gleason JF Jr, Klepin HD, et al (2011). Age-related disparities in the use of radiotherapy for treatment of localized soft tissue sarcoma. *Cancer*, **117**, 4033-40.
- Kuhlthau KA, Pulsifer MB, Yeap BY, et al (2012). Prospective study of health-related quality of life for children with brain tumors treated with proton radiotherapy. *J Clin Oncol*, **30**, 2079-86.
- Ludwig J, Duncan GJ, Gennetian LA, et al (2012). Neighborhood effects on the long-term well-being of low-income adults. *Science*, **337**, 1505-10.
- Ludwig J, Sanbonmatsu L, Gennetian L, et al (2011). Neighborhoods, obesity, and diabetes--a randomized social experiment. *N Engl J Med*, **365**, 1509-19.
- Miralbell R, Lomax A, Cella L, Schneider U (2002). Potential reduction of the incidence of radiation-induced second cancers by using proton beams in the treatment of pediatric tumors. *Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys*, **54**, 824-9.
- Nathan SS, Healey JH (2012). Demographic determinants of survival in osteosarcoma. Ann Acad Med Singapore, 41, 390-9.
- Schreiber D, Rineer J, Katsoulakis E, et al (2012). Impact of postoperative radiation on survival for high-grade soft tissue sarcoma of the extremities after limb sparing radical resection. *Am J Clin Oncol*, **35**, 13-7.