EDITORIAL

Journal of Stem Cell Research and Regenerative Medicine

FORCED EXPIRATORY VOLUME FACTORS OF STAGE III NON-SMALL CELL LUNG CANCER PATIENTS

Rabindra Nath Das
University of Burdwan, India

Objectives:

Forced expiratory volume in 1 (FEV1) second is known as the amount of air volume that can forcibly be blown out in one second, after full inspiration. Average FEV1 values between 80% and 120% are considered as normal. The determinants of FEV1 are aimed to identify in the report for stage III non-small cell lung cancer (SIIINSCLC) patients.

Background: Previous examination articles have announced that the normal FEV1 values in solid people rely upon tallness, age, weight file, sex and ethnicity. Little investigations have been performed with respect to the FEV1 determinants for SIIINSCLC patients.

Materials & Methods: Published records on 239 SIIINSCLC patients with 23 study characters (variables/factors) are considered in the present study. The study variable FEV1 is positive and heterogeneous. Statistical analysis procedure to be specific, joint summed up straight Log-typical models is utilized for breaking down the reaction FEV1.

Keywords

Chemotherapy, Forced expiratory volume, Heteroscedastic, Log-ordinary model, Lung malignant growth

Constrained Expiratory Volume in 1 (FEV1) second is the measure of air volume that can persuasively be smothered from the lungs in the primary second of a constrained exhalation. FEV1 is profoundly related with the Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) which is a dynamic ailment that makes it hard to breath. For COPD patients, the air from their lungs is to be breathed out in littler sums and at a lower rate in contrast with a solid individual without COPD. For the most part, specialists use FEV1 as one of the measures to decide the lung capacity of a person. Therefore, the determinants of FEV1 are very important to the medical practitioners. Many exploration articles have revealed that the normal FEV1 values in sound people rely upon stature, age, weight record, sex and ethnicity [1-5].

The new report makes an endeavor to distinguish the FEV1 determinants for SIIINSCLC patients. e FEV1 as one of the measures to decide the lung capacity of a person. Lung cancer starts if the lung cells become abnormal, and they grow out of control. Tumor is formed with the growing of more cancer cells, and the tumors spread through the different organs of the body. Generally, there are two types of lung cancers, namely, Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer (NSCLC), and Small Cell Lung Cancer (SCLC) [6-10]. The FEV1 of SIIINSCLC patients is sure and non-steady difference reaction. It has a place with exponential family appropriation. Along these lines, it ought to be displayed utilizing joint Log-typical and gamma models. Joint Log-ordinary model gives better attack of FEV1 for SIIINSCLC patients. Best of our insight, there is little investigation of FEV1 for SIIINSCLC patients. In this way, we have inspired to recognize the FEV1 determinants for SIIINSCLC patients.

Materials

The considered informational collection is acquired from Oberije et al. [11]. It contains 239 SIIINSCLC patients, with 23 property characters/factors. The informational collection can be acquired from the connection: http://www.redjournal.org/article/S0360-3016(15)00254-0/fulltext.The covariates/factors along with their levels, means, standard deviations, proportions are displayed in Table 1. Data collection method, subject population are clearly described in Oberije et al.; Das and Mukherjee [11,12].

Factors name	Operationalization	Mean (standard deviation)/Proportion
Sex	Sex (Male=1; Female=2)	1%=73.1; 2%=26.9
Age	Age at study	65.56 (9.40)
WHO-PS	World health association execution status or measure (WHO-PS) levels are 1, 2, 3	1%=42.43; 2%=45.80; 3%=11.77
BMI	bmipatient pre RT: Body mass record of patient at pre radiation therapy	25.09 (4.14)
FEV1	Forced expiratory volume in 1 second. level of anticipated pre RT	77.20 (21.10)
Smok2	Never/ex smoker=1; Current smoker=2	1%=64.28; 2%=35.72
T_ct_loc	CT-examine: Locations of tumor, 19 areas are: correct lower lobe (1); right middle lobe (2); right hilus (3); right upper lobe (4); left lower lobe (5); left upper lobe (6); lefthilus (7); mediastinum (8); not applicable (9); lingula (10); upper lobe, unknown (11); lower lobe, vague (12); lung, trachea (13); lung, windpipe left (14); lung, trachea, right (15); LUL+LLL (16); right bronchus (17); left bronchus (18); numerous projections (19)	4.22

(1.13) Attribute character, however rewarded as discrete variable

HistologyHistology: (Adenocarcinoma=1; Squamous Cell Carcinoma=2, Large cell carcinoma=3, other=4) 1%=32.35; 2%=15.96; 3%=39.07; 4%=12.62

PLNS Probably this is PLNS variable that implies number of positive lymph hub stations 3.13 (1.21)

Countpet_mediast6g None 2.77 (1.03)

T-stage T-stage (combined 6th or 7th edition): (T0-1=1; T2=2; T3=3; T4 or Tx=4) 1%=13.02; 2%=36.13; 3%=9.66; 4%=41.19

N-stage N-stage (combined 6th or 7th edition): (N0=1; N1=2; N2=3; N3 or Nx=4) 1%=17.22; 2%=2.10; 3%=49.15; 4%=31.53

S-stage Clinical by and large stage: Levels: (IIIA=1; IIIB=2) 1%=31.93; 2%=68.07

Timing Chemotherapy: Level: (No chemo=1; Sequential=2, Concurrent=3) 1%=32.35; 2%; 15.96 3%=39.07

Group Group: (no chemo=1; sequential selected=2; standard sequential=3; standard concomitant=4) 1%=10.50; 2%=6.72; 3%=47.90; 4%=34.88

Yearrt Start of study 2006 (2.32)

Proportional portion (Eqd) Equivalent radiation portion (adjusted for part size) at 2 (Gray (Gy) is the SI unit of assimilated portion. One dim is equivalent to an assimilated portion of 1 Joule/kilogram (100 rads) 59.69 (7.22)

Treatment time (Ott) Overall treatment time 30.10 (8.50)

Gtv1 Gross tumor volume 89.24 (97.83)

Tumorload_total None 123.45 (105.52)

Model	Covariate	Estimate	Standard error	T-vale	P-value
Mean Model	Constant	4.0770	0.14018	29.085	<0.0001
	T-stage 2	0.0947	0.06960	1.360	0.1752
	T-stage 3	0.0850	0.08347	1.018	0.3097
	T-stage 4	-0.0045	0.06965	-0.065	0.9482
	BMI	-0.0072	0.00382	-1.891	0.0599
	T_ct_loc	0.0091	0.00770	1.187	0.2365
	Group 2	0.0847	0.08372	1.012	0.3126
	Group 3	0.2314	0.05491	4.215	<0.0001
	Group 4	0.3070	0.05668	5.417	<0.0001
	Smok 2	0.0589	0.03116	1.889	0.0601
	Histology 2	0.0751	0.04665	1.610	0.1088
	Histology 3	0.0021	0.03584	0.060	0.9522
	Histology 4	-0.0111	0.05231	-0.212	0.8323
	N-stage 2	0.0194	0.07621	0.255	0.7989
	N-stage 3	0.0694	0.04735	1.466	0.1440
	N-stage 4	0.1238	0.05008	2.472	0.0142
Dispersion Model	Constant	-0.7525	1.2521	-0.601	0.5484
	Age	0.0185	0.0121	1.527	0.1282
	Smok 2	-0.2247	0.2157	-1.042	0.2985
	PLNS	-0.2069	0.0652	-3.175	0.0017
	T-stage 2	-0.7569	0.3146	-2.406	0.0172
	T-stage 3	-0.3968	0.4422	-0.897	0.3706
	T-stage 4	-0.7465	0.3286	-2.272	0.0240
	Equivalent dose	-0.0187	0.0140	-1.338	0.1822
	Gtv1	-0.0053	0.0015	-3.616	0.0003
	Survmonth	-0.1204	0.0598	-2.015	0.0451

Survmonth Survival time in months 26.77 (23.36)

Survyear Survival time in years 2.23 (1.95)

Deadstat Dead/alive: (alive=1; dead=2) 1%=84.45; 2%=15.55

Table 1. Factors/variables (operationalization) in the FEV1 analysis and descriptive statistics.

Statistical methods and FEV1 data analysis

The FEV1 response is continuous, positive and heteroscedastic. The probability distribution of FEV1 belongs to exponential family distribution. It should be analyzed by joint Log-normal or gamma model analyses

which are given in Firth; Das and Lee; Lee et al.; Das [13-16]. One can easily find the detailed analysis techniques of joint Log-normal and gamma models in Lee et al.; Das [15-17]. These are not reproduced herein.

The response FEV1 is considered as the dependent variable, and the remaining others are considered as the explanatory factors/ variables. The reaction FEV1 has been fitted utilizing both the joint Log-ordinary and gamma models. It is discovered that the joint Log-typical model fit gives better results, than gamma fit. The results of joint Log-ordinary model examination are shown in Table 2.On the basis of lowest Akaike information criterion (AIC=2063, for the fitted Log-normal model in Table 2) value in each class, the last fitted models have been chosen. AIC selects a model that minimizes the predicted additive errors and squared error loss [18]. Some in part critical/inconsequential components/factors are remembered for both the mean and change of the fitted Log-typical models (Table 2) for better fitting [18]. The included in part huge components/factors in the fitted Log-ordinary models (Table 2) are called confounder in the study of disease transmission. Diagnostic checkup of the final selected fitted Log-normal models in Table 2 is displayed in Figure 1.

Table 2. Joint Log-normal fitted model results of FEV1 for SIIINSCLC patients.

Figure 1. For the Log-normal fitted models of FEV1 for SIIINSCLC patients (Table 2), the (a) absolute residuals plot with respect to fitted values, and the (b) normal probability plot of the mean model.

Figure 1a shows the Log-normal fitted absolute residual values plot in respect of fitted values (Table 2), which is a flat diagram with the running means, indicating that variance is constant. Figure 1b displays the normal probability plot for the Log-normal fitted mean model (Table 2), which does not reveal any kind of model lack of fit due to missing vales, or variables, or outliers.

Interpretations of FEV1 data analysis

The summarized outputs of the FEV1 analysis are displayed in Table 2. The mean model of FEV1 (Table 2) interprets the following:

1. The mean FEV1 (MFEV1) is inversely partially related with the Body Mass Index (BMI) (P=0.0599).It implies that MFEV1 of SIIINSCLC patients is higher who have lower BMI.

2. The MFEV1is emphatically mostly related with T-stage at level (T2=2) (P=0.1752), inferring that MFEV1 is higher of SIIINSCLC patients at level (T2=2), than different levels.

3. The MFEV1 is legitimately mostly connected with smoking status (Smok2) (P=0.0601), showing that MFEV1 is higher of current SIIINSCLC patients, than the never/ex-smokers.

4. In the informational collection there are 19 areas of tumor. Area of tumor (P=0.2365) is incompletely emphatically related with the MFEV1.

5. The MFEV1 is straightforwardly related with chemotherapy bunch at level (standard sequential=3) (P<0.0001) and at level (standard concurrent=4) (P<0.0001), showing that MFEV1 is higher at levels standard sequential=3 and standard concurrent=4, than the no-chemo=1 gathering and consecutive selected=2 gathering of SIIINSCLC patients.

6. The MFEV1 is directly correlated with histology at level (squamous cell carcinoma=2) (P=0.1088), implying that MFEV1 is higher at level squamous cell carcinoma=2, than the other levels of SIIINSCLC patients.

7. The MFEV1 is directly associated with the N-stage at level (N2=3) (P=0.1440) and (N3 or Nx=4) (P=0.0142), indicating that MFEV1 is higher at levels (N2=3) and (N3 or Nx=4), than the other levels of SIIINSCLC patients.

Dispersion model of FEV1 (Table 2) of SIIINSCLC patients interprets the following:

1. The FEV1 variance (FEV1V) is positively partially associated with the age (P=0.1282), indicating that FEV1V is higher at older ages, and vice versa.

2. The FEV1V is inversely partially related with smoking status (Smok2) (P=0.2985), indicating that FEV1V is higher for non-smoker/ex-smokers of SIIINSCLC patients, than the current smokers.

3. The FEV1V is inversely significantly related with PLNS (i.e., number of positive lymph node stations) (P=0.0017), indicating that FEV1V increases as PLNS increases.

4. The FEV1V is reciprocally related with T-stage at level (T2=2) (P=0.0172) and (T4 or Tx=4) (P=0..0240), indicating that FEV1V is higher at levels (T2=2) and (T4 or Tx=4).

5. The FEV1V is reciprocally partially related with equivalent dose (Equd) (P=0.1822), indicating that FEV1V decreases as the equivalent dose increases.

6. The FEV1V is reciprocally related with gross tumor volume (Gtvl) (P=0.0003), indicating that FEV1V decreases as the Gtvl increases.

7. The FEV1V is reciprocally related with survival time in month (Survmonth) (P=0.0451), indicating that FEV1V is decreases as the Survmonth increases.

Results: The mean FEV1 (MFEV1) is higher for SIIINSCLC patients who are current smoker (P=0.0601), or who have lower body mass index (BMI) (P=0.0599). Location of tumor is positively partially related (P=0.2365) with the MFEV1. The MFEV1 is higher for SIIINSCLC patients with histology level at squamous cell carcinoma (P=0.1088), or T-stage at level (T2=2) (P=0.1752), or N-stage at level (N2=3) (P=0.1440) and (N4 or Nx=4) (P=0.0142) than the other levels. The MFEV1 is higher for SIIINSCLC patients with chemotherapy at levels (standard sequential=3) (P=0.1282), or never/ex-smoker patients (P=0.2985). The FEV1V increases as the number of positive lymph node stations increases (P=0.0017). The FEV1V is inversely related with T-stage at level (T2=2) (P=0.0172) and at level (T4 or Tx=4) (P=0.0240). The FEV1V decreases at the higher equivalent dose (P=0.1822), or at larger gross tumor volume (P=0.0003), or at higher survival times (P=0.0451).

Conclusion: The FEV1 determinants for both the mean and variance have been identified for SIIINSCLC patients. These results may help the lung cancer specialists. The current findings of FEV1 (related to SIIINSCLC patients) are new addition to the lung cancer literature.

In the current report, the determinants of FEV1 of SIIINSCLC patients have been determined (Table 2). In the interpretation section, effects of the determinants have been

focused. Many determinants of FEV1 have been derived in Table 2, which are almost new in lung-cancer literature. The present report shows that age, BMI, equivalent dose, tumor volume, survival time in month, location of tumors, smoking status, chemo-group, T-stage, N-stage, histology, number of positive lymph node stations (Table 2) are the important determinants of FEV1 of SIIINSCLC patients, which are little focused in earlier research reports. Care should be taken on equivalent dose applying. Lung cancer patients and medical lung cancer specialists will be benefited from the present research.

References

1. Jain NB, Brown R, Tun CG, et al. Determinants of Forced Expiratory Volume in 1 Second (FEV1), Forced Vital Capacity (FVC), and FEV1/FVC in Chronic Spinal Cord Injury. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2006;87(10):1327-33.
2. Linn WS, Spungen AM, Gong H, et al. Forced vital capacity in two large outpatient populations with chronic spinal cord injury. Spinal Cord. 2001;39:263-8.
3. Linn WS, Spungen AM, Gong H, et al. Smoking and obstructive lung dysfunction in persons with chronic spinal cord injury. J Spinal Cord Med. 2003;26:28-35.
4. Spungen AM, Grimm DR, Schilero G, et al. Relationship of respiratory symptoms with smoking status and pulmonary function in chronic spinal cord injury. J Spinal Cord Med. 2002;25:23-7.
5. Crapo RO, Morris AH, Clayton PD, et al. Lung volumes in healthy nonsmoking adults. Bull Eur Physiopathol Respir. 1982;18:419-25.
6. Siegel R, Ma J, Zou Z, et al. Cancer statistics. CA Cancer J Clin. 2014;64:9-29.
7. Berghmans T, Paesmans M, Sculier JP. Prognostic factors in stage III non-small cell lung cancer: A review of conventional, metabolic and new biological variables. Ther Adv Med Oncol. 2011;3:127-38.
8. Fowler JF. Biological factors influencing optimum fractionation in radiation therapy. Acta Oncol. 2001;40:712-7.
9. Solan MJ, Werner-Wasik M. Prognostic factors in non-small cell lung cancer. Semin Surg Oncol. 2003;21:64-73.
10. Burnham KP, Anderson DR. Model selection and multimodal inference. NY, USA: Springer Science & Business Media. 2002.
11. Oberije C, Ruysscher DD, Houben R, et al. A validated prediction model for overall survival from stage III non-small cell lung cancer: Toward survival prediction for individual patients. Int J Radiation Oncol Biol Phys. 2015;92(4):935-44.
12. Das RN, Mukherjee S. Mean-variance overall survival time fitted models from stage III non-small cell lung cancer. Epidemiology (Sunnyvale). 2017;7(1):296.
13. Firth D. Multiplicative errors: log-normal or gamma? J R Statist Soc B. 1988;50(2):266-8.
14. Das RN, Lee Y. Log-normal versus gamma models for analyzing data from quality improvement experiments. Quality Engineering. 2009;21(1):79-87.
15. Lee Y, Melder JA, Pawitan Y. Generalized linear models with random effects (Unified Analysis via H-likelihood). London: Chapman & Hall. 2006.
16. Das RN. Discrepancy in fitting between log-normal and gamma models: An illustration. Model Assisted Statistics and Applications. 2012;7(1):23-32.
17. Das RN. Robust response surfaces, regression, and positive data analyses. Chapman & Hall, London. 2014.
18. Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J. The elements of statistical learning. Springer-Verlag, NY, USA. 2001.