Abstract. Background/Aim: We investigated the clinical impact of the lymph node ratio (LNR) on overall survival (OS) and recurrence-free survival (RFS) in esophageal cancer patients who underwent curative surgery. Patients and Methods: One hundred twenty patients who underwent curative surgery for esophageal cancer between 2005 and 2017 were included in this study. The LNR was defined as the ratio of the number of metastatic lymph nodes (LNs) to the total number of harvested LNs. Results: A lymph node ratio of 10% was regarded as the optimal critical point for classification based on the overall survival rate. The 3-year and 5-year OS rates were 65.5% and 57.0%, respectively, in the LNR<10% group, and 11.8% and 0% in the LNR≥10% group; the difference was statistically significant (p<0.001). The 3-year and 5-year RFS rates were 52.6% and 44.6%, respectively, in the LNR<10% group, and 0% and 0% in the LNR>10% group; the difference was also statistically significant (p<0.001). When comparing the sites of first relapse, the incidence of distant lymph node metastasis in the LNR>10% group was significantly higher than that in the LNR<10% group. Conclusion: The LNR was a risk factor for both OS and RFS in patients who underwent curative surgery for esophageal cancer.
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overall survival (OS) and recurrence-free survival (RFS) in esophageal cancer patients who received curative treatment.

**Patients and Methods**

**Patients.** The medical records of consecutive patients who were diagnosed with primary esophageal adenocarcinoma or squamous cell carcinoma and who underwent complete resection at Yokohama City University from January 2005 to December 2017 were included on this study.

**Surgical procedure.** Our standard procedure consisted of open subtotal esophagectomy via right thoracotomy. A greater curvature tube was used for reconstruction. The patients who had a tumor in the middle to lower thoracic esophagus received two-field lymph node dissection, while the patients who had a tumor in the upper thoracic esophagus received three-field lymph node dissection.

**Lymph node harvesting methods and pathological diagnosis.** The LNs were harvested from the specimen immediately after surgery. First, the surgeons removed the palpable LNs. Second, the surgeons stretched the fat tissues, which included the LNs to detect visible LNs. Then, the harvested LNs were fixed with 10% buffered formalin for 48 hours. After standard histological processing, two-step sections were cut from each block and stained with eosin and hematoxylin (H&E). Experienced pathologists examined all slides.

**Evaluations and statistical analyses.** The lymph node ratio (LNR) was defined as the ratio of the number of metastatic lymph nodes to the total number of lymph nodes examined. Fisher’s exact test or the \( \chi^2 \) test were used to assess associations between LNR and each parameter. The Kaplan-Meier method and log-rank test were used to calculate and compare overall survival (OS) and recurrence-free survival (RFS). The univariate and multivariate survival analyses were performed using a Cox proportional hazards model. \( p \)-Values of <0.05 were considered to indicate statistical significance. The SPSS software program (v11.0 J Win, SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA) was used for all of the statistical analyses. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Yokohama City University.

**Results**

**Patients.** One hundred twenty patients (male, \( n=104 \); female, \( n=16 \)) were evaluated in the present study. The median age was 68 years (range=40-82 years). The median follow-up period was 72.5 months (range=13.9-125.2 months). The median operation time was 570 minutes (range=236-911 min). The median blood loss was 541 ml (range=70-3000 ml). Seventy-four patients received two-field lymph node dissection and 36 patients received three-field lymph node dissection.

---

**Table I. Comparison of survival rates stratified by patient characteristics.**

| Characteristics                  | No. of patients (%) | 1-year survival rate (%) | 3-year survival rate (%) | 5-year survival rate (%) | \( p \)-Value |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|
| Age (years)                      |                     |                          |                          |                          |              |
| <68                              | 56 (46.7)           | 75.7                     | 47.7                     | 36.3                     | 0.067        |
| ≥68                              | 64 (53.3)           | 85.4                     | 64.6                     | 57.9                     |              |
| Gender                           |                     |                          |                          |                          | 0.153        |
| Male                             | 104 (86.7)          | 80.1                     | 53.8                     | 45.9                     |              |
| Female                           | 16 (13.3)           | 86.7                     | 79.4                     | 66.2                     |              |
| Site of tumor                    |                     |                          |                          |                          | 0.530        |
| Upper                            | 35 (29.2)           | 80.3                     | 54.8                     | 44.2                     |              |
| Middle or Lower                  | 85 (71.8)           | 82.4                     | 62.8                     | 47.1                     |              |
| Metastatic lymph node ratio      |                     |                          |                          |                          | <0.001       |
| 0%                               | 61 (50.8)           | 84.8                     | 68.2                     | 61.7                     |              |
| 0% to <5%                        | 27 (22.5)           | 88.6                     | 60.2                     | 49.3                     |              |
| 5% to <10%                       | 14 (11.7)           | 76.9                     | 61.5                     | 52.8                     |              |
| ≥10%                             | 18 (15.0)           | 58.8                     | 11.8                     | 0.0                      |              |
| UICC T status                    |                     |                          |                          |                          | 0.007        |
| T1                               | 44 (36.7)           | 93.1                     | 73.3                     | 69.8                     |              |
| T2 to T3                         | 76 (63.3)           | 73.7                     | 47.6                     | 36.9                     |              |
| Lymph vascular invasion          |                     |                          |                          |                          | 0.025        |
| Negative                         | 38 (31.7)           | 89.0                     | 74.6                     | 68.4                     |              |
| Positive                         | 82 (68.3)           | 77.1                     | 49.1                     | 40.4                     |              |
| Lymph node dissection            |                     |                          |                          |                          | 0.651        |
| Two-field                        | 74 (61.7)           | 80.4                     | 57.8                     | 44.3                     |              |
| Three-field                      | 46 (38.3)           | 81.7                     | 56.4                     | 56.4                     |              |
| Neoadjuvant therapy              |                     |                          |                          |                          | 0.652        |
| Yes                              | 51 (42.5)           | 87.3                     | 58.8                     | 51.5                     |              |
| No                               | 69 (57.5)           | 76.8                     | 55.6                     | 46.4                     |              |

UICC: Union for International Cancer Control.
dissection. The median number of harvested lymph nodes was 37 (range=7-118).

Survival analysis. OS was stratified by each clinical factor, compared by the log-rank test (Table I). There were significant differences in the lymph node ratio, lymphovascular invasion, and UICC T factor. An LNR of 10% was regarded as the optimal cutoff value for classification according to the OS rate.

The univariate and multivariate analysis of factors associated with OS in shown in Table II. LNR was identified as a significant prognostic factor in both the univariate and multivariate analyses. The 3-year and 5-year OS rates were 65.5% and 57.0%, respectively, in the LNR<10% group, and 11.8% and 0% in the LNR≥10% group (p<0.001). Figure 1 shows the OS curves of the LNR<10% and LNR≥10% groups. Table IV shows the sites of first relapse in the LNR<10% and LNR≥10% groups. When the sites of first relapse were compared, the incidence of distant lymph node metastasis was significantly higher in the LNR≥10% group than in the LNR<10% group.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to evaluate the clinical impact of the LNR, which was defined as the ratio of the number of metastatic LNs relative to the total number of harvested LNs, in patients who underwent curative resection for esophageal cancer. The major finding of the present study was that the LNR was a significant prognostic factor in patients who underwent curative resection for esophageal cancer. Thus, the LNR might be a useful tool for assessing the lymph node metastasis status in esophageal cancer.

The present study demonstrated that the LNR was a significant risk factor for esophageal cancer patients after esophagectomy. Limited studies have shown the similar results. Mariette et al. have evaluated the prognostic impact of the ratio of metastatic lymph nodes to harvested lymph nodes in 536 esophageal cancer patients who received curative en bloc esophagectomy (16). They set the cutoff

| Factors                          | No | Univariate analysis | Multivariate analysis |
|----------------------------------|----|---------------------|-----------------------|
|                                 |    | OR      | 95%CI            | p-Value | OR | 95%CI | p-Value |
| Age (years)                      |    | 0.044   | 0.023            |         |
| <68                              | 56 | 1.000   |                  |         |
| ≥68                              | 64 | 1.772   | 1.016-3.094      | 1.000   | 1.874 | 1.091-3.219 | 0.091 |
| Gender                           |    |         |                  | 0.220   |
| Female                           | 16 | 1.000   |                  |         |
| Male                             | 104| 1.932   | 0.675-5.531      |         |
| Metastatic lymph node ratio      |    | <0.001  |                  | <0.001  |
| <10%                             | 102| 1.000   |                  | 1.000   |
| ≥10%                             | 18 | 3.766   | 1.934-7.335      | 4.301   | 2.293-8.068 | 0.077 |
| Site of tumor                    |    |         |                  | 0.811   |
| Middle or Lower                  | 85 | 1.000   |                  |         |
| Upper                            | 35 | 1.083   | 0.561-2.092      |         |
| UICC T status                    |    |         |                  | 0.394   |
| T1                               | 44 | 1.000   |                  |         |
| T2 or T3                         | 76 | 1.383   | 0.656-2.917      |         |
| Lymphovascular invasion          |    | 0.213   |                  | 0.077   |
| Negative                         | 38 | 1.000   |                  | 1.000   |
| Positive                         | 82 | 1.610   | 0.761-3.405      | 1.841   | 0.935-3.626 |       |
| Lymph node dissection            |    | 0.811   |                  |         |
| Two-field                        | 74 | 1.000   |                  |         |
| Three-field                      | 46 | 1.083   | 0.561-2.092      |         |
| Neoadjuvant therapy              |    | 0.568   |                  |         |
| Yes                              | 51 | 1.000   |                  |         |
| No                               | 69 | 1.189   | 0.657-2.151      |         |

UICC: Union for International Cancer Control.
Figure 1. A comparison of the overall survival between the LNR <10% group and the LNR >10% group.

Table III. Uni and multivariate Cox proportional hazards analysis of clinicopathological factors for recurrence-free survival.

| Factors                        | No   | Univariate analysis | Multivariate analysis |
|-------------------------------|------|---------------------|-----------------------|
|                               |      | OR                  | 95% CI                | p-Value   | OR                  | 95% CI                | p-Value |
| Age (years)                   |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| <68                           | 56   | 1.000               | 0.849-2.422           | 0.178     |                     |                       |         |
| ≥68                           | 64   | 1.434               | 1.000                 | 0.171     | 1.856               | 0.765-4.503           | <0.001  |
| Gender                        |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| Female                        | 16   | 1.000               | 1.000                 | 0.177     |                     |                       |         |
| Male                          | 104  | 1.856               | 0.765-4.503           | 1.856     | 1.000               | 0.765-4.503           | 0.002   |
| Metastatic lymph node ratio   |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| <10%                          | 102  | 1.000               | 1.000                 | <0.001    | 1.000               | 1.000                 | <0.001  |
| ≥10%                          | 18   | 3.096               | 1.671-5.738           | 3.096     | 3.085               | 1.679-5.669           | 3.085   |
| Site of tumor                 |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| Upper                         | 85   | 1.000               | 1.000                 | 0.993     |                     |                       |         |
| Middle or Lower               | 35   | 1.003               | 0.543-1.852           | 1.000     |                     |                       |         |
| UICC T status                 |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| T1                            | 44   | 1.000               | 1.000                 | 0.035     | 1.000               | 1.000                 | 0.002   |
| T2 or T3                      | 76   | 2.134               | 1.056-4.314           | 2.000     | 2.699               | 1.423-5.123           | 2.699   |
| Lymph vascular invasion       |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| Negative                      | 38   | 1.000               | 1.000                 | 0.104     |                     |                       |         |
| Positive                      | 82   | 1.761               | 0.890-3.487           | 1.761     |                     |                       |         |
| Lymph node dissection         |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| Two-field                     | 74   | 1.000               | 1.000                 | 0.983     |                     |                       |         |
| Three-field                   | 46   | 1.006               | 0.573-1.765           | 1.000     |                     |                       |         |
| Neoadjuvant therapy           |      |                     |                       |           |                     |                       |         |
| Yes                           | 51   | 1.000               | 0.704-2.123           | 1.000     |                     |                       |         |
| No                            | 69   | 1.223               | 0.704-2.123           | 1.223     |                     |                       |         |

UICC: Union for International Cancer Control.
value of the ratio of metastatic lymph nodes to harvested lymph nodes (LNM) as 0.2. When comparing the 5-year survival rates between the LNM≥0.2 and LNM<0.2 groups, there was a significant difference (p<0.001). The 5-year survival rate was 22% in the LNM≥0.2 group, and 53% in the LNM<0.2 group. Univariate and multivariate analyses demonstrated that LNM≥0.2 was a prognostic factor (Odds ratio=1.9, 95% confidence interval=1.2-3.0). In addition, Chen et al. have evaluated a modified staging system utilizing the lymph node ratio (LNR) in 2011 patients with esophageal squamous cell cancer (17). They defined the LNR as the ratio of metastatic lymph nodes to the total number of harvested lymph nodes and set the cut-off value of the LNR as 10%. Patients were classified into four LNR categories: Nr0 (LNR=0), Nr1 (LNR: 0-10%), Nr2 (LNR: 10-20%), and Nr3 (LNR: >20%). They found that the median OS and 5-year survival rate was 155 months and 61.1%, in Nr0, 39 months and 41.1% in Nr1, 28 months and 33.0% in Nr2, and

![Figure 2. A comparison of the recurrence-free survival between the LNR <10% group and the LNR >10% group.](image)

| Recurrence site | All cases | <10% (n=102) | ≥10% (n=18) | p-Value |
|-----------------|-----------|--------------|-------------|---------|
|                 | Number    | %            | Number      | %       | Number   | %       |         |
| Lymph node      |           |              |             |         |          |         |         |
| Regional        | 22        | 18.3         | 16          | 15.7    | 6        | 33.3    | 0.074   |
| Distant         | 7         | 5.8          | 4           | 3.9     | 3        | 16.7    | 0.033   |
| Local site      | 11        | 9.2          | 10          | 9.8     | 1        | 5.6     | 0.565   |
| Distinct site   |           |              |             |         |          |         |         |
| Lung            | 13        | 10.8         | 10          | 9.8     | 3        | 16.7    | 0.388   |
| Liver           | 12        | 10.0         | 6           | 5.9     | 6        | 33.3    | 0.001   |
| Bone            | 5         | 4.2          | 5           | 4.9     | 0        | 0.0     | 0.337   |
| Others          | 9         | 7.5          | 7           | 6.9     | 2        | 11.1    | 0.528   |
19 months and 22.9% in Nr3, respectively. There were statistically significant differences according to the LNR categories (p=0.001). Considering the results of the present and the previous studies, the LNR might have a clinical impact in esophageal cancer patients after surgery.

In the present study, we set the cut-off value of the LNR as 10% according to the overall survival rate. There were some differences in the cut-off value in the present study and previous studies. For example, a further important limitation of all of the available data regarding LNR, including the current study, is the lack of consensus regarding the most appropriate cut-off point for the evaluation of the LNR. Previous studies have reported LNR cut-offs ranging from 0.1 to 0.3 (18-20). For example, Mariette et al. set the cut-off value as 0.2 in 536 patients who received esophagectomy and Bhamidipati et al. used the same cut-off value (0.2) in 347 consecutive patients who received esophagectomy for esophageal cancer (16, 18). In our study, we used a cut-off value of 0.1 according to 3-year and 5-year survival rates. There are some differences between the previous studies and the present study. First, the sample size was different. Second, the perioperative adjuvant treatment was different. The previous reports only analyzed the patients who were treated with surgery alone, while the present study analyzed only patients who were treated with surgery and perioperative adjuvant treatment. The outcomes of patients with esophageal cancer have gradually improved with effective adjuvant treatment. Theoretically, effective adjuvant treatment could improve patient survival by inhibiting micro metastasis. Actually, a previous study has demonstrated that perioperative adjuvant treatment was associated with a reduced lymph node ratio in other gastrointestinal cancer (21, 22). Third, the median numbers of harvested lymph nodes differed between the previous studies and the present study. The LNR was affected by both the number of harvested lymph nodes and the number of metastatic lymph nodes. In the present study, the median number of harvested lymph nodes was 37 and the cut-off value of the LNR was 10%. In contrast, Mariette et al. have reported mean number of harvested lymph nodes 19.6 and set the cut-off value of LNR at 20% (16). Moreover, Bhamidipati et al. have reported median number of harvested lymph nodes 13-15 and set the cut-off value of the LNR at 20% (17). The median number of metastatic lymph nodes in the present study was similar to that in previous studies. These differences might have affected the cut-off value of the LNR.

Special attention is required when interpreting the current results because the present study has several potential limitations. First, the present study was a retrospective analysis that was performed in a single institution. We cannot deny the possibility that our findings were observed by chance. Second, there was a selection bias in the patients in this series. Surgeons often avoid performing esophagectomy in some patients because the procedure is associated with high rates of morbidity and mortality (40-60% and 1-5 respectively). Third, there was a time bias in the present study. The surgical procedure, perioperative care, and adjuvant treatment changed during the study period. Considering these limitations, the results must be confirmed in another cohort or in a prospective multicenter-study.

In conclusion, the OS and RFS of the esophageal cancer patients who underwent curative surgery differed significantly based on the LNR. It is necessary to develop strategies that effectively utilize the lymph node metastasis status.
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