# Original Article Risk factors for radiation pneumonitis after radiotherapy in lung cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Dong-Shan Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Chang-Xi Zhou<sup>2\*</sup>, Zhi-Gang Song<sup>3</sup>, Gui-Zhi Zhang<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Office for Public Health Management, Beijing 102206, P. R. China; <sup>2</sup>Departments of Respiration, Chinese PLA General Hospital, Beijing 100853, P. R. China; <sup>3</sup>Departments of Pathology, Chinese PLA General Hospital, Beijing 100853, P. R. China. \*Equal contributors and co-first authors.

Received March 31, 2015; Accepted December 8, 2015; Epub February 15, 2016; Published February 29, 2016

**Abstract:** Objective: To study the risk factors for radiation pneumonitis after radiotherapy in lung cancer patients in order to find prognostic parameters and provide reference standard for the best treatment plans. Methods: The database of Pubmed, Embase, Cochrane Library and CNKI were searched from the date of their establishment to Feb. 2015, and other sources as supplied were also retrieved. Meta-analysis on literatures predicting radiation pneumonitis after radiotherapy was conducted by using RevMan 5.2 software. Results: A total of 75 articles were primarily included in systematic review. The exposure factors included demographics (sex, age, chronic lung diseases, pulmonary function, diabetes, tumor site) and treatment factors (operation before radiotherapy, combined radio chemotherapy, using radiotherapy sensitization agent-Amifostine). Meta-analysis results showed that the OR and 95% CI of each were: 0.97 [0.82, 1.15], 0.90 [0.63, 1.28], 2.18 [1.59, 3.00], 0.27 [0.11, 0.65], 2.46 [1.33, 4.58], 0.71 [0.57, 0.90], 0.92 [0.67, 1.25], 1.41 [1.17, 1.71] and 2.38 [1.79, 3.16]. Conclusion: The risk factors for radiation pneumonitis are chronic lung diseases, pulmonary function, diabetes, tumor located in left lower lung, combined radio chemotherapy and using Amifostine. The study results indicate that upper lung cancer patients with strong pulmonary functions and without complications such as diabetes or chronic pulmonary disease have less chance getting radiation pneumonitis after radiotherapy undertaken the simple radiotherapy added with Amifostine.

Keywords: Lung cancer, radiation pneumonitis, radiation lung injury, risk factors, meta-analysis

#### Introduction

Lung cancer is a kind of malignant tumor with the highest mortality rate in the world and about two-thirds lung cancer patients need to take radiotherapy. With rapidly development of radiotherapy technology, its side-effects, radiation lung injuries are becoming an increasingly severity problems in the world. According to the statistics from abroad, the occurrence rate of acute radiation lung injuries is about 5-36 percent [1, 2]. Meanwhile, radiation lung injuries often lead to respiratory failure, which is the major cause of death for radiation lung injuries. Radiation lung injuries include radiation pneumonitis (RP) in early-stage and radiation pulmonary fibrosis (RPF) in the late-stage. Unfortunately, there has been no satisfactory and effective measure in clinical practice up till now and the patients' treatment effects and quality of life are threatened after the radiation lung injuries occur. So it's essential to make sure the impact factors to predict the radiation lung injuries after radiotherapy. The data were searched from the date of their establishment to Feb. 2013, aimed to find out the risk factors for radiation pneumonitis after radiotherapy in lung cancer patients. This will provide evidence to guide clinical treatments better and reduce the occurrence of radiation pneumonitis.

#### Methods

#### Literature search

We undertook computerized literature searches of MEDLINE, PubMed, Cochrane Library, and EMBASE databases, from their inception to Feb. 2013. Search terms were "lung cancer", "radiation pneumonitis" and "radiation lung injury". These terms were used in different combinations with each other. In addition, we reviewed the reference lists of the original articles and reviews on the topic to identify other possible eligible trials.

#### Study selection

The inclusion criteria for this meta-analysis were as follows: 1) The study objects were patients who were diagnosed with primary lung cancer by cytology or pathology tests and thereby took the lung radiation therapy for the first time; 2) The numbers, percentage or mean  $\pm$  SD of the possible impact factors to RP were recorded in full texts; 3) When multiple publications from a single institution/author appeared to include duplication of patients, only the study with the largest patient group was included.

The exclusion criteria were as follows: 1) The meeting abstracts could not get its full text; 2) Patients had radiotherapy on other parts of the breast at the same time or had taken thoracic radiation therapy within one year; 3) The outcome of the study was radiation pulmonary fibrosis (RPF); 4) literatures with low grade according to Newcastle score standard; 5) literatures that were duplicate publication.

#### Data extraction

All the work of literature search was independently reviewed by two authors to identify relevant trials that met the inclusion criteria and checked by an independent reviewer. Disparities were resolved by discussion.

Study quality was assessed using a 3-item questionnaire designed to collect data on random assignment, blinding, and withdrawals/ dropouts. All questions were bipolar (yes, 1; or no response, 0). The minimum number of points possible was 0 and the maximum was 5, with a higher number reflecting a greater study quality. Data on trial size, patient characteristics were extracted, using Newcastle score standard to evaluate the quality of outcomes [4]. Study quality was independently assessed by 2 reviewers.

#### Data analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using Review Manager Software (RevMan 5.2; Cochrane Collaboration. Oxford, United Kingdom). Continuous descriptive data were reported as the mean Continuo deviation (Mean  $\pm$  SD) and dichotomous data were recorded as the case number (n).

The Mantel-Haenszel Q-statistic was used to assess heterogeneity among the studies and the I<sup>2</sup> statistic was computed to examine the proportion of total variation in the study estimate due to heterogeneity. We considered P > 0.10 or P≤0.10, I<sup>2</sup>≤50% to indicate no significant heterogeneity between the trials and select fixed effect models to analysis. Besides, we considered P≤0.10, I<sup>2</sup> > 50% to indicate significant heterogeneity and use random effect models. The integration results regarded P≤0.05 as the standard of its statistical significance.

Extensive effort was made to remove all duplicated data and to include all studies published to date. Publication bias in outcomes was assessed and treated using standard methodology. Funnel plots were used to visually inspect the relationship between sample size and treatment effects for each of the impact factors. Means, standard deviation, and corresponding 95% (Cls) were computed for continuous demographic factors. Event rates and corresponding standard errors and confidence intervals were computed for the other demographic factors describing proportions of the sample with varying comorbidities.

#### Results

#### Search results

A total of 2293 relevant articles were identified in a combined search of MEDLINE, PubMed, Cochrane Library and EMBASE databases, from their inception to Feb 2015, and by a manual approach (search of studies cited in previous reviews and of reference lists from the identified articles). Then 1715 articles were excluded because they were not relevant to the purpose of this meta-analysis through screening Title/Abstract. 150 articles were excluded because there were no full articles or they were repeated articles. Besides, 353 articles were excluded through screening full text for duplication, no relevant results and other reasons. In the end, 75 articles [5-79] were primarily included in systematic review, as shown in Table 1.

Study type

Age (years), Sex

68.3 (51-89), M37/F11

52 (33-70), M25/F6

Ν

48

31

547

GTV centroid information.

Clinical trial

Retrospective study

Retrospective study

Predicted factors for radiation pneumonitis

#### T stage, primary GTV, total-lung volume, MLD, V20, V13, lung Veff, and Kong FM et al. [5] USA, 2006 40-84, M82/F27 Clinical study 109 NTCP Barriger RB et al. [6] USA. 2009 243 MLD > 18 Gy, treatment with CD. Retrospective review Shi A et al. [7] China, 2010 M73/F21 Retrospective study 94 NTCP value and V10. Line Claude et al. [8] France, 2004 27-77. M84/F12 Retrospective study 96 MLD, V20, V30, age. Raymond H. Mak et al. [9] USA. 2012 67 (37-85), M/F 136 MTHFR genotype (1298AA vs. AC/CC; rs1801131). Retrospective study 97 SARA RAMELLA et al. [10] Italy, 2009 66 (49-82), M86/F11 Retrospective study V20ipsi and V30ipsi. 63 (19-84), M72/F21 Retrospective study Jun Dang et al. [11] China, 2010 93 Chemotherapy and DVH parameters. LI ZHANG et al. [12] China, 2009 60 (26-83), M207/F46 Retrospective study 253 Genetic polymorphisms of ATM. USA, 2000 66 (37-64), M120/F93 213 ACE inhibitors. Ling Wei Wang et al. [13] Retrospective study Masaharu Fujino et al. [14] Japan, 2006 72 (56-86), 76 (49-87); M/F Case-control study 12/31 Pre-treatment pulmonary function test (%VC, FEV1.0%), and dose volume (8/4, 22/9) statistics (V20, total dose, BED, dose per fraction, peripheral dose). Bhupesh Parashar et al. [15] USA. 2011 68 (40-91), M37/F49 86 Retrospective study Chemotherapy. Jedidiah M. Monson et al. [16] USA, 1998 61 (32-86), M47/F36 83 Retrospective study Low performance status, comorbid lung disase, smoking history, low pulmonary function tests, and the absence of a surgical resection. USA. 2008 Shiva K. Das et al. [17] 62 (43-83), 64 (27-87); Case-control study 34/185 Chemotherapy, EUD for exponent=1.2 to 3; EUD for a=0.5 to 1.2, lung volume receiving 20-30 Gy; female sex; and squamous cell histology. M/F (8/4, 22/9) Falk Roeder et al. [18] Germany, 2010 63 (42-80), 62 (37-90); M/F Case-control study 33/209 V30 and V40. (26/7, 145/64)H. Takahashi et al. [19] Japan, 2001 65.7; 64.5; M/F (8/4, 11/2) Case-control study 12/13 Surfactant proteins A and D. Takashi Uno et al. [20] Japan, 2006 68 (52-80), M16/F5 Retrospective study 21 A somewhat lower V dose value or MLD. MICHAEL FAY et al. [21] Australia, 2004 M73/F21 Retrospective study 156 V30 and MLD. Tae Hyun Kim et al. [22] Korea, 2005 60 (35-79), M66/F10 Retrospective study 76 MLD. MASASHI KOTO et al. [23] Japan, 2007 72 (47-85), M59/F21 Retrospective study 80 Dosimetric factors. Songhao et al. [24] China, 2009 63.5 (41-76), 64.5 (43-78); 52/104 Diabetes. Case-control study M/F (41/11, 81/23) Xiao Chun et al. [25] China, 2010 55.66 (40-71), 59.32 (49-69); Case-control study 46/42 M/F (36/6, 39/7) Tiziana Rancati et al. [26] Italy, 2003 66 (33-82), M75/F9 Retrospective study 84 Mitomycin or COPD. Wang Yingjie et al. [27] China, 2005 64 (20-87), M87/F25 112 Retrospective study THEODORE J. ROBNETT et al. [28] USA, 2000 63 (30-85), M82/F61 Retrospective study 144 Pretreatment performance status, gender, and FEV1. China. 2012 Xiao-Jing Zhang et al. [29] M1091/F4256 Retrospective study 5347 Chronic lung disease, diabetes mellitus, low pre-RT pulmonary function, smoking, tumor located in middle or lower lobe, RT combined with chemotherapy, absence of pre-RT lung tumor surgery, without amifostine combined RT (or RCT), end-RT/preRT TGF-b1 ratio C1 and some dosevolume parameters. Michelle A. T. Hildebrandt et al. [30] USA, 2010 63.60 (9.98), M91/F82 Retrospective study 173 Genetic variations among inflammation pathway genes. ELLEN X. HUANG et al. [31] 209 Heart irradiation. USA, 2011 65 (31-94), M105/F104 Retrospective study

#### Table 1. Characteristics of included studies

Country, year

USA, 2004

China, 2006

USA, 2012

Author (Ref. #)

Alena NJ, et al. [32]

WANG Wei-Hual et al. [33]

YEVGENIY VINOGRADSKIY et al. [34]

ANDREW J. HOPE et al. [35]	USA, 2006	65.2 (31-94), M108/F111	Retrospective study	219	Inferior tumor position.
SANG-WOOK LEE et al. [36]	Korea, 2003	60 (37-76), M10/F136	Clinical trial	161	Hyperfractionated three-dimensional CRT and concurrent chemotherapy.
Ming Yin et al. [37]	USA, 2011	63 (35-88), M125/F103	Retrospective study	228	HR genetic polymorphisms, particularly RAD51 2135G.C.
George Rodrigues et al. [38]	Canada, 2004		Retrospective study		Dose-volume histogram parameters.
Dongryul Oh et al. [39]	Korea, 2009	71 (32-88), M57/F12	Retrospective study	69	Dosimetric parameters (V20 and MLD).
Hiroki Kobayashi et al. [40]	Japan, 2010	67 (44-75), M33/F4	Retrospective study	37	V5 and V13.
AKIRA INOUE et al. [41]	Japan, 2001	63.9 (36-86), M154/F37	Retrospective study	191	Low Pa02 (<80 torr) before radiotherapy.
mototsugu Yamano et al. [42]	Japan, 2007	64.9 (35-89), M112/F23	Retrospective study	135	Grades.
YOSHIHIKO SEGAWA et al. [43]	Japan, 1997	70 (41-90), M70/F19	Retrospective study	89	Administration of a huge dally dose.
M. Yamada et al. [44]	Japan, 1998	66.6 (43-86), M50/F10	Retrospective study	60	Irradiated site (included lower lung $\textcircled{\sc eq}$ and concurrent CRT used with weekly CPT-11.
Luigi De Petris et al. [45]	Sweden, 2005	63 (44-77), M18/F14	Retrospective study	32	GTV, chemoradiotherapy.
Takeyuki Makimoto et al. ([46]	Japan, 1999	70.2 (57-85), 69.0 (44-86); M/F (16/1, 83/11)	Retrospective study	17/94	Pre-existing interstitial changes detected by chest radiography or com- puted tomography and radiotherapy to the contralateral mediastinum (> 40 Gy).
Yosuke Matsuno et al. [47]	Japan, 2006	73 (45-83), 74 (52-86); M/F (18/1, 19/1)	Retrospective study	19/20	KL-6.
Y. Ishii et al. [48]	Japan, 1999	64.9 (48-73), 66.1 (45-79), M/F (12/0, 17/1)	Retrospective study	12/18/13	Soluble intercellular adhesion molecule-1.
Jing Wang et al. [49]	China, 2009	65 (42-74), M20/F3	Retrospective study	23	Levels of serum TGF-B1.
DANIEL T. CHANG et al. [50]	USA, 2006	66 (34.9-84.9), M42/F26	Retrospective study	68	V20 or MLD.
JINGFANG MAO et al. [51]	USA, 2007	64 (40-87), M47/F44	Retrospective study	91	Pre-RT chemotherapy.
Z. Kocak et al. [52]	USA, 2005	62 (27-84), 65 (37-87), M/F (26/23, 59/69)	Retrospective study	49/128	PORT.
Steven E. Schild et al. [53]	USA, 2003	64 (36-79), M155/F89	Retrospective study	244	Combined-modality therapy.
S. J. Clenton et al. [54]	UK, 2005	64 (36-79), M106/F54	Retrospective study	160	V <sub>20Gy</sub> value.
Alena Novakova-Jiresova et al. [55]	The netherlands, 2004	62 (45-76), 65 (44-76), M/F (34/1, 10/1)	Retrospective study	35/11	Plasma TGF-b.
Wang Jing et al. [56]	China, 2009	65 (42-81), M91/F24	Retrospective study	115	V5.
Watanabe H et al. [57]	Japan, 1995	63.5 (32-71), M32/F25	Retrospective study	57	Male sex, chronic obstructive lung disease and chemotherapy.
Xie Songxi et al. [58]	China, 2006	62 (38-79), M19/F6	Retrospective study	25	V20.
Zhang Bin, et al. [59]	China, 2010	59 (32-74), M35/F12	Clinical trial	47	Three dimensional conformal radiotherapy, chemotherapy, radiation- induced pulmonary.
E. M. Wilson [60]	UK, 2003	(30-78)	Clinical trial	70	Three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy.
Zhong jun, et al. [61]	China, 2007	(33-79)	Clinical trial	53	TGF-β1.
Yu xian, et al. [62]	China, 2011	(32-83), M52/F10	Clinical trial	62	Radiation pneumonitis was affected by multiple factors. Patients with COPD or abnormal lung function should be treated with optimal plan, and V30<25%.
Cai Yong, et al. [63]	China, 2006	(32-83), M216/F84	Clinical trial	300	Chemotherapy and radiation treatment cycle, the synchronization use ammonia phosphorus set and the radiation dose, M L D radiation factors including lung v10s V 20 and cytokines A CE, have certain correlation with the occurrence of RP.
ELLEN D. YORKE, et al. [64]	USA, 2005	70 (39-84), M49/F29	Clinical trial	78	Correlations between severe pneumonitis and whole lung V13 and with other dose-volume factors of total lung and lower lung are confirmed.

R. BRYAN BARRIGER, et al. [65]	India, 2010	-	Clinical trial	243	Predictive factors for RP were MLD > 18 Gy and treatment with CD.
Ji-Yoon Kim, et al. [66]	Korea, 2009	63 (42-78), M25/F9	Clinical trial	34	Changes of TGF- $\beta$ 1 could be correlated with RP and the incorporation of the biological parameters into the dosimetric data could be useful for predicting symptomatic RP.
Zhang Yong, et al. [67]	China, 2009	63 (39-82), M27/F13	Clinical trial	40	Standardized uptake value (SUV) and the SUV ratio of the irradiated lung tissue to that of the non-irradiated lung tissue (L/B) for FDG PE7r-CT are positively correlated with radiation pneumonitis, and clinicians may use it to predict the occurrence of radiation pneumonitis.
Lujun Zhao, et al. [68]	China, 2007	56 (40-81), M35/F4	Clinical trial	39	Plasma ACE as a predictive factor for radiation pneumonitis deserves further study.
Elizabeth S. Evans, et al. [69]	USA, 2006	65 (33-88), M55/F45	Clinical trial	100	TGF- $\beta 1$ is generally not predictive for RP except for the group of patients with a high V30.
Feng Ming Kong, et al. [70]	China, 2001	(70-100)	Clinical trial	194	Loss of the M6P/IGF2R gene may predispose patients to the develop- ment of radiation-induced lung injury .
MITCHELL S. ANSCHER, et al. [71]	USA, 1998	M43/F30	Clinical trial	73	Plasma TGF-β1 levels appear to be a useful means to identify patients at low risk for the development of pneumonitis from thoracic RT.
XIAO-LONG FU et al. [72]	USA, 2001	M60/F43	Clinical trial	103	Combining both physical and biologic risk factors may allow for better identification of patients at risk for the development of symptomatic radiation-induced lung injury.
Ezra E. W. Cohen, et al. [73]	USA, 2001	-	Clinical trial	848	Advances in radiation therapy are triggering a revolution in dose intensity and scheduling that will one day offer superlative local control.
Dosia Antonadou [74]	USA, 2002	M131/F15	Clinical trial	146	Amifostine reduces the incidence of acute and late radiation-induced toxicities.
R. Komaki et al. [75]	USA, 2002	M26/F27	Clinical trial	53	Amifostine significantly reduced acute severe esophagitis and pneumo- nitis.
DOSIA ANTONADOU, et al. [76]	Greece, 2001	(39-78), M131/F15	Clinical trial	146	Amifostine reduces the incidence of pneumonitis, lung fibrosis, and esophagitis in radiotherapy patients with lung cancer without compromis- ing antitumor efficacy.
RITSUKO KOMAKI et al. [77]	USA, 2003	63.5 (37-80), M33/F29	Clinical trial	62	Conclusion: Amifostine reduced the severity and incidence of acute esophageal, pulmonary, and hematologic toxicity resulting from concur- rent cisplatin-based chemotherapy and RT. Amifostine had no apparent effect on survival in these patients with unresectable non-small-cell lung cancer.
YASUHIRO NAKAYAMA, et al. [78]	Japan, 1996	(39-78), M22/F6	Clinical trial	28	Irradiation can induce accumulation of activated T-cells (HLADR and ICAM-I-positive T-cells) in the lung.
Z. VUJASKOVIC, et al. [79]	USA, 2000	62 (44-76)	Clinical trial	27	Elevated TGF-b levels during radio-therapy may not only indicate patients with a higher risk of developing pulmonary toxicity but also patients with a higher risk of treatment failure.



Among the 75 included articles, Fu XL's research [73] had two sets of data.6 articles [63, 83-87], which were all randomized controlled trials, focused on the relationship between occurrence of RP and the use of Amifostine, while the other 68 articles were all case-control studies. The exposed factors included 6 demographics (gender, age, chronic lung diseases, pulmonary function, diabetes and tumor site) and 3 treatment factors (operation before radiotherapy, combined radio-chemotherapy treatment, the use of Amifostine). The process of study selection was listed in **Figure 1**.

#### Associations with demographics

Gender: 18 articles [4, 6, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 25-27, 30, 35, 38, 43, 54, 56, 59, 60] including 2178 cases indicated there was no association between gender and the occurrence of RP based on fixed effect model (P=0.73, OR: 0.97, 95% Cl: 0.82-1.15), correlated with the result (P=0.45,OR: 1.12, 95% Cl: 0.84-1.49) based on random effect model ,which indicated that the result was credible due to its low sensitivity and high stability (**Figure 2A**).

Age: 4 articles [15, 20, 27, 60] including 297 cases analyzed by taking 60 years old as a separatrix (**Figure 2B**). We used random effect model according to  $P \le 0.10$ ,  $l^2 > 50\%$ , and the

results were P=0.30, OR: 1.75, 95% CI: 0.61-5.03, correlated with the result (P= 0.20, OR: 1.48, 95% CI: 0.81-2.71) based on fixed effect model, which indicated that the result was credible.

Another 4 articles [6, 15, 43, 49] including 511 cases analyzed by taking 70 years old as a separatrix (Figure 2C). We used fixed effect model and the results were P=0.24. OR: 1.33, 95% CI: 0.83-2.15, correlated with the result (P=0.27, OR: 1.38, 95% CI: 0.77-2.46) based on random effect model, which indicated that the result was credible. Through meta-analysis of these two data, it was believed that there was no association between age and

RP. Although the former data had large heterogeneity, we could not take subgroup analysis because the article number was small.

*Chronic pulmonary diseases*: 13 articles [7, 15, 16, 18, 22, 26, 27, 46, 47, 50, 56, 57, 60] including 1409 cases indicated that patients with chronic pulmonary diseases were more liable to have RP based on the result of fixed effect model (P<0.00001, OR: 2.18, 95% CI: 1.59-3.00), correlated with the result (P<0.0001, OR: 2.35, 95% CI: 1.57-3.51) based on random effect model, which indicated that the result was credible (**Figure 2D**).

Pulmonary function before radiotherapy: 3 articles [7, 16, 22] including 237 cases focused on the relationship between forced expiratory volumes in 1 s (FEV1 $\geq$ 2L vs. <2 L) and RP. The data indicated that patients whose FEV1<2 L were more likely to have RP based on the result of fixed effect model (P=0.004, OR: 0.27, 95% CI: 0.11-0.65), correlated with the result (P=0.004, OR: 0.27, 95% CI: 0.11-0.66) based on random effect model, which indicated that the result was credible (**Figure 2E**). But the funnel plot was not completely displayed, considering there were publication bias (**Figure 2F**).

*Diabetes*: 3 articles [7, 27, 56] including 365 cases indicated that patients with diabetes





D	Stude of Sectors	have chronic lu	ung diseas	e noo	chronic	lung dise	ase	18/-1-1-4	Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
-	Daniel T Chang 2006	Events	10	(a) 35	Event	<u>s</u> 6	33	10.5%	0.75 ID 21 2	2 7 41	M-H, FIXed, 95% CI
	Falk Reoder 2010	11		73	2	2	169	22.3%	1.19 [0.54, 2	2.59]	<b>e</b>
	Hiroshi Watanabe 1995	9		19	1	1	37	7.8%	2.13 [0.68, 6	6.68]	
	Jedidiah M.Monson 1998	11		32		6 7	51 51	6.0% 5.7%	3.93 [1.28, 12	2.06]	
	Raymond H.Mak 2011	19	1	92		4	59	10.9%	1.51 [0.49, 4	4.63]	
	Shi 2010	4		11		7	83	2.1%	6.20 [1.45, 26	6.50]	
	Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Takawuki Makimaha 1000	1		17	1	1	59	9.2%	0.27 [0.03, 2	2.28]	
	Tiziana Rancati 2003	7		29		5 7	55	7.3%	2.18 [0.68, 6	0.34] 6.98]	
	Wang 2005	3		19		5	93	2.8%	3.30 [0.72, 15	5.20]	
	Wang 2009	9		16	2	4	99	5.8%	4.02 [1.35, 11	1.94]	
	YOSUKE 2006	9		14	1	U	25	5.1%	2.70 (0.70, 10	U.46J	
	Total (95% CI)		5	41			868	100.0%	2.18 [1.59, 3	3.00]	▲
	Total events	113 df = 12 /P = 0.16	S) 18 - 2006		12	3				⊢	
	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.8	3 (P < 0.00001)	5),1 = 50%							Ö	0.01 0.1 1 10 100
											have chronic long disease no chronic long disease
		have chronic lu	ng disease	no cl	hronic l	ung diseas	se		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
-	Study or Subgroup	Events	Tot	al	Events	T	otal   22	Z 0%	1-H, Random, 9	2 7 41	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
	Falk Reoder 2010	11	1	3	22		169	13.2%	1.19 [0.54,	2.59]	_ <b>-</b> _
	Hiroshi Watanabe 1995	9	1	9	11		37	8.4%	2.13 [0.68]	6.68]	
	Jedidiah M.Monson 1998	11	3	32 97	6		51 51	8.6%	3.93 [1.28, 1	12.06]	
	Raymond H.Mak 2011	19	19	92	4		59	8.7%	1.51 [0.49,	4.63]	
	Shi 2010	4	1	1	7		83	5.9%	6.20 [1.45, 2	26.50]	
	Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Takevuki Makimoho 1999	1	1	7	11		59 54	3.1% 6.0%	0.27 [0.03,	, 2.28] 20.541	
	Tiziana Rancati 2003	7		29	7		55	8.2%	2.18 [0.68,	, 6.98]	
	Wang 2005	3	1	9	5		93	5.5%	3.30 [0.72, 1	15.20]	
	Wang 2009 Yosuke 2006	9	1	6	24		99 25	9.0%	4.02 [1.35, 1 2.70 [0.70, 1	11.94] 10.461	
	100410 2000	Ŭ		-	10		20	0.0 %	2.10 [0.10] 1	10.40]	
	Total (95% CI)	112	54	1	100		868	100.0%	2.35 [1.57,	3.51]	-
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.16; C	hi <sup>2</sup> = 17.07. df =	12 (P = 0.1	5); I² = 30	123 )%					1	
	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.1	7 (P < 0.0001)									0.01 0.1 1 10 100 have chronic lung disease no chronic lung disease
_											
Е	of 1 - 0 - 1	FEV13	≥2	FEV1<	2			Odds Ra	tio		Odds Ratio
-	Study or Subgroup	Events	10tal E	vents	lotal	21 00	<u>-M-b</u>	<u>1, Fixed,</u>	95% CI		M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
	Sedician W.Wonson 199	10 1	71	10	22	31.8%		J.20 [U.U J.21 [0.0	2, 1.59j 6, 0, 701		
	Tae Hvun Kim 2005	4	40	4	23	43.4%		0.21 [0.0 1 44 [0 1	0,0.79] 0,2.001		
	rae nyan ram 2005	4	40	4	20	24.1 %	`		0, 2.00)		
	Total (95% CI)		128		109	100.0%	0	.27 [0.1	1, 0.65]		◆
	Total events	10		26							
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.	63, df = 2 (P =	: 0.73); l²:	= 0%						1	
	Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.90 (P = 0.	004)						0.01		FEV1≥2 FEV1<2
	Study or Subaroup	FEV1 ≥	2 F	EV1<2	2 Total I	Moight		Jdds Ra			Odds Ratio
	Jedidiah M Monson 199	8 1	17	16	66	18.1%	<u>ivi-ri,</u>	0.20.00	n 2 1 591		
	Shi 2010	5	71	6	23	46.9%		0.20 [0.	02, 1.33) 06, 0.791		<b>_</b> _
	Tae Hyun Kim 2005	4	40	4	20	35.0%		0.44 [0.	10, 2.00]		
								-			
	Total (95% CI)		128		109	100.0%		0.27 [0.	11, 0.66]		
	Total events	10		26							
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.1	00; Chi* = 0.63	3, df = 2 (F	P = 0.73	3); 1* = (	J%			0.0	01	0.1 1 10 100
	rest for overall effect. Z =	= 2.86 (P = 0.0	104)								FEV1≥2 FEV1<2
F	054-105%										
	<sup>0</sup> T <sup>SE(log[OR])</sup>	<b>A</b>									
		- ZN									
		1	N								
		1 1	N								
(	1.5-		$\sim N_{\odot}$								
	/	· .	\								
		0	0	Λ							
			0	N.							
	. /			$\sim \lambda$							
	'T /	0			Ν.						
					N						
	1				1						
						$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$					
1	1.5					N					
	1					$\sim N$					
						Ň					
							N		0.0		
	2	11		1			10		100	n	
	V.V.	e					10		100	~	



		r	ight		left		(	Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio		
	Study or Subgroup	Even	nts To	tal Ever	nts Tot	al Weigh	nt M-H,	Random, 95% CI		M-H, Rand	om, 95% (		
	Falk Reoder 2010		19 1	37	14 10	05 12.29	X6	1.05 [0.50, 2.20]					
	R.Bryan Barruger 2012		9 1	33	14 11	18 8.79	Xo	0.54 [0.22, 1.30]					
	S.J.Clenton 2005 Shive K Dec 2009		14	81 27	10 1	13 8.0	X0 V.	1.32 [0.55, 3.18]			_		
	Takashi Lino 2006		20 1	13	2	92 12.23	70 V.	0.25 [0.02, 2.19]	_		<u> </u>		
	Theodore J Robnett 2000		10	98	2	46 2.89	×6 ·	2 50 IO 52 11 91					
	Yevgenly V. 2011		73 3	25	38 23	22 35.49	X6 .	1.40 [0.91, 2.17]			-		
	Zhang 2010		28 1	54	16 9	95 14.79	X6	1.10 [0.56, 2.16]			-		
	Zhong 2007		12	31	5	22 4.49	X6	2.15 [0.63, 7.36]		-		-	
	Total (95% CI)		10	99	78	81 100.0	%	1.17 [0.90, 1.52]			•		
	Total events	1	86	1	15								
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00	; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	7.15, 0	lf = 8 (P =	: 0.52); I	l <sup>2</sup> = 0%			0.01	0.1	1	10	100
	Test for overall effect: $Z = 1$	.20 (P =	= 0.23)							right	left		
ï		conto	r	eid			Ode	le Patio		Odde P	atio		
J	Study or Subgroup	vente	Total	Evente	Total	Weight	мне	ived 95% Cl		M.H. Eived	95% CI		
-	Shive K Dec 2009	22	122	12	99	56.0%	1.2	2 10 57 2 621		m-n, rixeu	- 95% CI		
	Mana 2000	22	02	12	22	20.9%	2.0	4 [0.62 6 66]		-	· · · ·		
	Zhang 2009	19	24	4	13	20.0%	0.0	4 [0.03, 0.30] 6 [0.27, 3.47]					
	Zhang 2010	10	54	,	15	22.5%	0.3	0 [0.27, 3.47]					
	Total (95% CI)		260		121	100.0%	1.33	8 [0.76, 2.35]		-			
	Total events	69	200	23		100.070		[011 0, 2100]					
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0.8	= 10 0f	2 (P =	0.67).12	= 0%			⊢	12.110			-	
	Test for overall effect: Z =	: 1.00 (	P = 0.3	2)	- 0 /0			0.	.01	0.1 1		10	100
		1.00 (	0.0	-/						center s	side		
		center	r	side			Odd	ls Ratio		Odds F	Ratio		
	Study or Subgroup Ev	vents	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H. Ra	ndom. 95% Cl		M-H. Rando	m. 95% C	I I	
1	Shiva K.Das 2008	22	133	12	86	56.2%	1.	22 [0.57, 2.62]			-		
	Wang 2009	29	93	4	22	23.9%	2.	04 [0.63, 6.56]		+			
	Zhang 2010	18	34	7	13	19.9%	0.	96 [0.27, 3.47]					
	Total (95% CI)		260		121	100.0%	1.3	32 [0.74, 2.33]		4			
	Total events	69		23									
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	0. Chiz	- 0.90	df = 2/6	-0.67	N· 12 - 0.06		H				_	
	ricterogeneny. ruu = 0.0	0,011	- 0.00,	ui – 2 (i	0.07	1.1 - 0.30		'n	1 0 1	0.1 1		10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	0.95 (P	P = 0.34	ui = 2 (i  )	0.07	),1 = 0 %		Ó	0.01	0.1 1 center	side	10	100
	Test for overall effect: Z =	0.95 (P	P = 0.34	(ui – 2 (i i)	- 0.07	),1 = 0 %		Ö	0.01	0.1 1 center	side	10	100
K	Test for overall effect: Z = ha	0.95 (P	2 = 0.34	jur – 2 (r l) gery no	post lun	g surgery	Weight	Odds Ratio	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds	side Ratio	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = ha <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Cai 2011	0.95 (P ve post I <u>Events</u> 21	= 0.34 P = 0.34 Jung surg	gery no <u>Total</u> 63	post lun Events	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237	Weight 21.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.38 (0.76, 2.51)	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds <u>M-H, Fixe</u>	side Ratio ed, 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = ha <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998	0.95 (P ve post I <u>Events</u> 21	2 = 0.34 lung surg s 1 5	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44	post lun Events 63 12	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39	Weight 21.0% 13.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed, 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21	2 = 0.34 lung surg	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47	post lun <u>Events</u> 63 12 17	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 431	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39]	0.01	0.1 1 center <u>M-H, Fixe</u>	side Ratio ed, 95% Cl	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = har Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 5 23	2 = 0.34 lung surg s 1 5 3 1 4	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46	post lun Events 63 12 17 39 10	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35]	.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed, 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = ha Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 6 23 1 4	2 = 0.34 lung surg s 1 5 3 1 4 4	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46 9	post lun <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28	g surgery Total 237 39 43 121 51 53	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96]	.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed, 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = ha <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 5 23 1 4 4	= 0.00, P = 0.34 lung surg s 1 5 3 1 4 4 1	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46 9 20	post lun <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11	g surgery Total 237 39 43 121 51 53 56	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 0.42 [0.02, 1.20]	.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed, 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = ha Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2000 Wang 2005	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 5 23 1 4 4 4	P = 0.34 lung surg s 1 5 3 1 4 4 4 1 3 3	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77	post lun <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2	g surgery Total 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 191 35	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.7, 7.28]	.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed, 95% Cl	10	100
К_	Test for overall effect: Z = har Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2000 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak 2005	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 5 23	= 0.00, P = 0.34 lung surg s 1 5 3 1 4 4 4 5 3 3 5 3 1 5 3 3 5 3 5 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	(u) <b>Jery</b> no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33	post lun <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41	g surgery Total 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 191 35 45 145	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.56 [0.41, 2.22]	.01	0.1 1 center M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = har Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2000 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Zhong 2007	0.95 (F vve post I <u>Events</u> 21 6 23 1 4 4 4 4 1 3 8 9 9	P = 0.34 s s s s s s s s	(i) <b>Jery</b> no <b>Total</b> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36	post lun <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 145	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.35 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00]	.01	0.1 1 center M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	1'0 	100
K	Test for overall effect: Z = har Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2000 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Zhong 2007 Total (95% CI)	0.95 (P ve post I <u>Events</u> 23 1 2 23 2 3 2 3 2 3 2 4 4 4 4 4 4 5 2 3 5 1 5 5 1 5	2 0.00 P = 0.34 lung surg 5 3 1 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	(ur = 2 (ur) (ur = 2 (ur) (ur) (ur = 2 (ur)	post lun, Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 2	g surgery Total 237 39 43 121 53 56 191 35 56 191 35 145 17 988	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25]	.01	0.1 1 center M-H, Fixe	side	1'0 	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = har Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2000 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Zhong 2007 Total (95% CI) Total events	0.95 (P ve post I <u>Events</u> 23 1 4 4 4 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 23 1 5 23 23 1 5 23 23 23 1 5 23 23 23 23 23 23 24 23 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24	2 0.00, P = 0.34 lung surg s 1 5 3 1 4 4 4 5 2	(ur = 2 (i )) 63 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412	post lun; Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 248	g surgery Total 237 39 43 121 53 56 6 191 35 145 17 988	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.3% 9.6% 9.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9% 100.0%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25]		0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side		100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z = ha <u>Study or Subgroup</u> Cal 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2000 Wang 2000 Wang 2000 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Zhong 2007 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 18.52, df	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 5 23 1 4 4 4 5 23 15 15 92 = 10 (P =	2 0.05, P = 0.34	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46%	post lun, <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 248	g surgery Total 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 191 191 195 145 17 988	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.3% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9%	Odds Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 1.29] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10 	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z =         ha         Study or Subgroup         Cal 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>p</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (df=	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 5 23 1 4 4 4 4 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 23 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	2 0.05);   <sup>2</sup>	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46%	post lun, Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 248	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 1911 35 145 17 988	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9%	Odds Ratio <u>MH, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.55 [0.32, 4.20] 1.38 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
K_	Test for overall effect: Z =         ha         Study or Subgroup         Cal 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>p</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (free to overall effec	0.95 (F ve post I Events 21 5 23 1 4 4 4 1 5 5 5 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 1	2 0.05);   <sup>2</sup>	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no total	post lung 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 248	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 1911 355 145 17 988 Surgery	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9%	Odds Ratio <u>MH, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 (0.76, 2.51] 0.29 (0.09, 0.91] 1.47 (0.63, 3.39] 0.15 (0.02, 1.18] 0.39 (0.11, 1.35) 0.71 (0.17, 2.96] 0.22 (10.03, 1.79] 1.15 (0.32, 4.20] 1.39 (0.27, 7.28] 0.35 (0.41, 2.22] 5.36 (1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z =         har         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneily: Chi <sup>a</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (f         Study or Subgroup	0.95 (F ve post I Events 21 5 23 1 4 4 4 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 23 21 5 23 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	2 0.05);  * 2 0.05);  * 1 5 3 1 4 4 1 3 5 3 2 0.05);  *	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46%	post lun, Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 248 248 00st lung Events	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u>	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9% <b>100.0%</b> Weight	Odds Ratio <u>MH, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 (0.76, 2.51] 0.29 (0.09, 0.91) 1.47 (0.63, 3.39) 0.15 (0.02, 1.18) 0.39 (0.11, 1.35) 0.71 (0.17, 2.96) 0.22 (1.03, 1.79) 1.15 (0.32, 4.20) 1.39 (0.27, 7.28) 0.95 (0.41, 2.22) 5.36 (1.06, 27.00) 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio MH, Random, 95% CI	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10 	100
к	Test for overall effect: Z =         har         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhorag 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity. Chi <sup>a</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (f         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 7 92 5 7 92 5 7 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92 92	= 0.80, = = 0.34 trung sur; s 1 5 5 3 1 4 4 4 4 4 1 3 3 5 5 2 2 0.05);  ² - - - - - - - - - - - - -	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% 63	post lum <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 241 2 248 post lumg <u>Events</u> 63	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 1.9% <b>100.0%</b> Weight 1 16.6%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% (C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
к	Test for overall effect: Z = har Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2000 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 23 23 1 4 4 4 4 4 4 1 5 23 15 15 15 15 10 (P = P = 0.59) re post Iu <u>Events</u> 21 5 22 23 23 23 24 23 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	= 0.80, = 0.34 tung sur; s 1 5 5 3 1 4 4 4 1 3 5 2 0.05);   <sup>2</sup>	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no p <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 47 5 63 44 47 47 5 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	post lun <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 241 2 248 post lung <u>Events</u> 63 12 248 post lung 10 28 11 23 248 post lung 11 23 248 post lung 12 248 post lung 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 39	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 1.9% 1.9% 100.0% Weight 1 16.6% 9.9%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H. Random, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.62, 2.52]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
к	Test for overall effect: Z =         har         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Samella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Zane 2005         Wang 2005         Zkocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 1 5 23 15 15 15 10 (P = 0.59) re post Iu <u>Events</u> 21 5 23 1 5	= 0.80, = 0.34 tung sur; s 1 5 5 3 1 4 4 4 1 3 3 5 2 2 0.05);   <sup>2</sup>	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no p <u>Fotal</u> 63 44 47 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	post lung <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 248 post lung <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 3 2 41 3 2 41 41 2 41 41 2 41 3 12 17 3 41 2 41 3 12 17 3 41 3 12 17 3 41 3 12 17 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 <u>surgery</u> <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 3.0% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 16.6% 9.9% 13.4%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 1.21]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI no post lu s Ratio lom. 95% CI	10	100
к	Test for overall effect: Z = har Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak 2007 S.Kocak 2007 S.Ko	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 5 23 4 4 4 4 4 1 5 23 1 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9 2 9	= 0.80, = 0.34 iung sur; s 5 5 3 1 4 4 4 1 3 5 2 0.05;   <sup>2</sup> - - - - - - - - - - - - -	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no p <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 45 46 47 46 47 46 46 47 46 46 47 46 46 47 46 46 46 47 46 46 47 46 46 47 46 46 47 46 46 46 47 46 47 46 46 47 47 46 46 47 46 47 47 46 46 47 47 46 47 46 46 47 47 46 47 47 46 47 47 46 47 47 46 47 47 46 47 47 46 47 47 47 46 47 47 47 47 46 46 47 47 47 47 47 46 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47	post lun, <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 12 17 39 10	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56 56	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 9.6% 10.8% 9.6% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 4.5% 9.1%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.135] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.35 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
к_ -	Test for overall effect: Z = ha Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2005 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Chong 2007 Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>P</sup> = 18.52, df= Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (0 hav Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 23 23 1 1 2 23 1 2 23 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 2 2 2	= 0.80, = 0.34 iung sur; 5 5 3 1 4 4 4 1 3 5 5 2 2 0.05);   <sup>2</sup>	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no p <u>Fotal</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 45 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 45 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 45 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 41 41 45 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	post lung Events 63 122 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 248 00st lung Events 63 12 17 39 10 28	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 433 121 533 566 191 355 145 177 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 433 121 51 53 56 56 191 355 145 17 988 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 13.2% 1.9% 100.0% Weight 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 4.5% 9.1% 7.7%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96]	0.01	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixs	side	10	100
κ	Test for overall effect: Z = ha Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Wang 2005 Wang 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Z.Kocak 2005 Cai 2017 Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 18.52, df= Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (0 hav Study or Subgroup Cai 2011 Jedidiah M.Monson 1998 Line Claude 2004 Raymond H.Mak 2011 Sara Ramella 2010 T.Piotrowski 2005 Tae Hyun Kim 2005 Wang 2005	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 23 23 14 4 4 4 15 23 15 23 15 22 15 22 15 22 21 21 21 22 23 15 22 23 15 23 21 21 22 23 24 24 24 25 25 25 25 21 25 25 25 25 25 21 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	= 0.05;   <sup>2</sup> = 0.34 iung sur; 5 5 2 2 0.05;   <sup>2</sup> ing surg 	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no j <u>fotal</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 27 77 33 36 412 = 46% 9 20 22 27 77 33 36 412 23 44 47 45 46 9 20 20 27 77 33 36 412 415 415 415 415 415 415 415 415	post lung Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 248	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 433 121 53 566 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 56 145 17 988 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 13.2% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 1 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 4.5% 9.1% 7.7% 4.3%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.66] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.46 [0.22, 0.23]	0.01 0.01 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixs	side	10	100
к_ -	Test for overall effect: Z =         hat         Study or Subgroup         Cal 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>P</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (f         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 5 5 5 23 21 10 (P = P = 0.59) 21 5 5 23 21 4 4 4 4 1 3 5 23 23 1 4 4 4 4 1 3 5 23 23 23 23 23 23 24 23 24 25 23 24 25 25 25 25 21 25 25 25 25 21 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	= 0.05,    = 0.34 tung surg s 1 5 3 1 4 4 4 1 3 5 5 2 0.055;    = 1 1 4 4 4 1 3 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	(i) jery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no ( <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 15 46 9 20 27 77 37 36 41 41 41 41 41 46 9 20 22 77 36 41 41 41 41 41 46 9 20 22 77 36 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	post lung Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 11 248 post lung Events 63 12 248 post lung Events 63 12 248 post lung Events 63 12 248 post lung Events 63 12 248 post lung Events 63 12 248 post lung Events 63 12 28 11 28 28 11 28 11 28 12 17 28 11 28 11 28 11 28 12 17 28 11 28 12 17 28 11 28 28 11 28 11 28 28 11 28 28 11 28 28 11 28 28 11 28 28 11 28 28 11 28 28 11 28 28 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 1	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 237 398 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 131 53 56 191 135 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 5	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 13.2% 1.9% 100.0% Weight 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 4.5% 9.1% 7.7% 4.3% 8.7% 6.3%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Fixed, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.55 [0.32, 4.20] 1.38 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27,00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% CI</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.86] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.77, 7.28] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.39 [0.77, 7.28] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.39 [0.77, 7.28] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.39 [0.77, 7.28] 0.22 [0.03, 7.77] 1.39 [0.77, 7.28] 0.22 [0.03, 7.77] 0.22 [0.03, 7.77] 0.22 [0.03, 7.77] 0.22 [0.03, 7.77] 0.22 [0.03, 7.77] 0.22 [0.03, 7.77] 0.23 [0.77, 7.78] 0.24 [0.77, 7.88] 0.75 [0.77, 7.78] 0.77 [0.77, 7.88] 0.77 [0.77, 7.88] 0.78 [0.77, 7.88] 0.77 [0.77, 7.88] 0.77 [0.77, 7.88] 0.77 [0.77, 7.88]	0.01 0.01 0.01 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z =         hat         Study or Subgroup         Cal 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>p</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (0)         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Zkozak 2005	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 5 22 23 15 15 23 10 (P = P = 0.59) 21 5 223 21 5 223 1 4 4 4 4 4 3 6 9 9 2 15 2 10 (P	= 0.80, = = 0.34 tung surg s 	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no p <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 53 44 47 15 46 9 20 21 77 33 36 412 53 44 47 15 46 9 20 21 77 33 36 412 53 47 47 47 46 9 20 21 77 33 36 412 53 47 47 47 47 47 46 9 20 77 33 36 412 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47	post lung <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 12 248 post lung Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 2 41 41 2 41 2 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 1911 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 191 53 56 191 53 56 191 121 53 56 191 125 125 145 145 145 145 145 145 145 14	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 4.5% 9.1% 7.7% 8.7% 6.3% 8.7% 13.2%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H., Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.35 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22]	0.01 	0.1 1 center Odds M.H. Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z =         hat         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>P</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (0)         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Zkocak 2005         Zhong 2007	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 5 23 10 (P = P = 0.59) 21 5 233 1 4 4 4 4 4 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 233 1 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 20 1 5 23 20 1 5 23 20 1 5 20 20 1 5 20 20 20 1 5 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	= 0.80, = 0.34 tung surg s 5 5 5 1 4 4 4 4 5 5 2 2 0.05);  ² 	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 63 412 = 46% ery no j 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 53 44 47 15 46 9 20 21 77 33 36 41 47 15 46 9 20 21 77 33 36 41 41 41 41 41 45 46 9 20 21 77 33 36 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	post lum <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 248 bost lung Events 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 2 41 2 4 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 2 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 191 35 145 191 51 51 53 56 191 35 145 121 53 56 191 35 145 17 988 51 145 17 988 51 145 17 988 51 145 17 988 51 145 17 988 51 145 17 198 51 145 17 198 51 145 17 198 191 11 15 145 17 145 17 145 17 198 198 191 191 191 191 191 197 198 198 191 191 191 191 195 198 198 198 197 198 198 198 198 198 198 198 198	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 9.1% 7.7% 6.3% 8.7% 6.3% 13.2% 6.5%	Odds Ratio <u>M.H., Fixed, 95% (C1</u> 1.38 (0.76, 2.51] 0.29 (0.09, 0.91] 1.47 (0.63, 3.39) 0.15 (0.02, 1.18) 0.39 (0.11, 1.35) 0.71 (0.17, 2.96] 0.22 (1.03, 1.79) 1.15 (0.32, 4.20] 1.39 (0.27, 7.28] 0.95 (0.41, 2.22] 5.36 (1.06, 27.00] 0.92 (0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M.H. Random, 95% (C1</u> 1.38 (0.76, 2.51) 0.29 (0.09, 0.91) 1.47 (0.63, 3.39) 0.15 (0.02, 1.18) 0.39 (0.11, 1.35) 0.71 (0.17, 2.96) 0.22 (0.03, 1.79) 1.15 (0.32, 4.20) 1.39 (0.27, 7.28) 0.95 (0.41, 2.22) 5.36 (1.06, 27.00)	0.01 0.01 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ed. 95% CI	10	100
ĸ	Test for overall effect: Z =         hat         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>P</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (I)         Data (95% CI)         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)	0.95 (F ve post I 21 5 23 1 4 4 4 4 4 5 23 15 23 21 5 23 21 5 23 21 5 23 1 1 4 4 4 4 1 5 23 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 23 1 5 5 23 1 5 5 23 1 5 5 5 5 5 7 1 5 5 7 1 5 5 7 1 5 7 1 5 7 1 5 7 1 5 7 1 5 7 1 7 7 1 7 7 7 7	= 0.80, = = 0.34 tung sur; s 1 5 5 5 3 1 4 4 4 4 1 3 3 5 5 2 2 0.005);   <sup>2</sup>	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 ery no j 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 47 47 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 47 47 33 36 47 47 47 33 36 47 47 47 47 47 33 36 47 47 47 47 33 36 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47	post lum           Events           63           12           17           39           10           28           11           23           248           cost lung           Events           63           12           13           2           41           2           63           12           13           10           28           11           23           2           41           2           41           2           41           2           41           2           41           2           41           2	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 53 56 191 53 56 191 53 56 191 53 56 191 53 56 191 35 145 17 988 56 191 121 57 57 58 56 191 135 145 17 988 56 191 121 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 9.1% 7.7% 4.3% 8.7% 6.5% 13.2% 13.2% 13.2% 13.4% 14.6% 13.4% 15.6% 13.4% 14.6% 15.6% 13.4% 15.6% 13.4% 15.6% 15	Odds Ratio <u>MH, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.135] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>MH, Random, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.03, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.98 [0.53, 1.41]	0.01 0.01 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ad. 95% CI	10	100
к	Test for overall effect: Z =         hat         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total events         Heterogeneity. Chi <sup>P</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (f         Baymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)         Total (95% CI)	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 4 5 92 = 10 (P = P = 0.59) 7 21 5 23 1 1 4 4 4 4 4 1 5 23 15 23 15 23 1 1 5 23 1 1 5 23 1 5 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 23 15 23 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	= 0.80, = = 0.34 iung sur; 5 5 3 1 4 4 4 4 1 3 3 5 5 2 2 0.005);   <sup>2</sup>	gery no Total 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no ( fotal 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 44 47 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 42 47 45 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 47 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 41 41 41 45 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	post lung <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 248 post lung Events 63 12 248 post lung 10 28 11 2 248 11 2 248 248 248 248 248 248 248	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 55 145 17 988 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 51 51 51 51 55 145 17 988 51 51 51 55 145 17 988 51 51 51 51 55 145 17 988 51 51 51 55 145 17 988 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51 51	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 1 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 4.5% 9.1% 7.7% 8.7% 6.3% 13.2% 6.5% 10.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.21 [0.02, 1.29] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.33, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.86 [0.53, 1.41]	0.01 0.01 1 0.01 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side	10	100
к	Test for overall effect: Z =         hat         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Tae Hyun Kim 2005         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2000         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total events         Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 18.52, df=         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.53 (I         Naw         Study or Subgroup         Cai 2011         Jedidiah M.Monson 1998         Line Claude 2004         Raymond H.Mak 2011         Sara Ramella 2010         T.Piotrowski 2005         Wang 2005         Z.Kocak 2005         Zhong 2007         Total (95% CI)         Total events         Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.28; Chi <sup>2</sup>	0.95 (F ve post I <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 4 5 23 15 92 21 10 (P = P = 0.59) ve post Iu <u>Events</u> 21 4 4 4 1 5 23 15 23 15 21 4 4 4 15 23 15 21 23 15 23 15 23 15 23 15 21 23 24 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25 25	df = 10 (d)	gery no <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no ( <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no ( <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no ( <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 = 46% ery no ( <u>Total</u> 63 44 47 15 46 9 20 22 77 33 36 412 20 22 77 33 36 412 20 22 77 33 36 412 20 20 22 77 33 36 412 20 20 21 77 33 36 412 20 20 21 77 33 36 412 20 20 21 77 33 36 412 20 20 20 21 77 33 36 412 20 20 20 21 77 33 36 412 20 20 20 20 20 21 77 33 36 412 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2	post lung <u>Events</u> 63 12 17 39 10 28 11 23 241 2 248 00 50 10 28 11 2 248 00 10 28 11 2 248 11 2 248 12 17 248 12 248 12 248 12 248 248 248 248 248 248 248 24	g surgery <u>Total</u> 237 399 43 121 51 53 56 191 355 145 17 988 surgery <u>Total</u> 237 39 43 121 51 55 145 191 355 198 888 898 898 898 898 898 898	Weight 21.0% 13.4% 10.8% 9.6% 10.3% 5.4% 6.6% 4.9% 13.2% 100.0% Weight 1 16.6% 9.9% 13.4% 4.5% 9.1% 7.7% 6.3% 13.2% 6.5% 100.0%	Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Fixed, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.21 [0.02, 7, 28] 0.22 [0.03, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.92 [0.67, 1.25] Odds Ratio <u>M-H, Random, 95% C1</u> 1.38 [0.76, 2.51] 0.29 [0.09, 0.91] 1.47 [0.63, 3.39] 0.15 [0.02, 1.18] 0.39 [0.11, 1.35] 0.71 [0.17, 2.96] 0.22 [0.33, 1.79] 1.15 [0.32, 4.20] 1.39 [0.27, 7.28] 0.95 [0.41, 2.22] 5.36 [1.06, 27.00] 0.86 [0.53, 1.41]		0.1 1 center Odds M-H, Fixe	side Ratio ad. 95% CI	10	100

L		with chem	otherapy	without chemo	therapy		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio
-	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Tota	Weigh	nt M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	Akira Inoue 2001	14	123	11	68	6.69	% 0.67 [0.28, 1.56]		
	Alena N.J. 2004	8	30	3	18	5 1.59	% 1.58 [0.35, 7.02]		
	Andrew J Hope 2006	35	141	17	78	8.79	% 1.18 [0.61, 2.29]		
	Bhupesh Parashar 2011	42	67	3	19	0.99	% 8.96 [2.37, 33.84]		
	Dang 2010	23	30	23	57	3.4	2.62 [1.10, 6.19]		
	Daniel L.Chang 2006	8	53	3	15	2.11	x 0.22 (0.02, 2.46)		
	Uirochi Watanaha 1005	10	4	22	44	0.60	x 7 04 10 02 50 601		
	Hiloshi Watanabe 1995	13	126	16	73	0.01	x 1 10 (0.55, 59.06)		<b>_</b> _
	Jedidiah M Monson 1998	6	34	11	40	3 3 9	% 0.74 (0.24 2.24)		
	Jinyongan 2004	37	69	7	21	2.69	2 31 10 83 6 43		
	Li 2007	1	6	17	72	1.29	% 0.65 (0.07, 5.93)		
	Line Claude 2004	26	58	14	32	5.39	% 1.04 [0.44, 2.49]		
	Mao 2007	17	42	11	49	3.29	2.35 [0.94, 5.84]		
	Michelle A.T. 2010	37	138	6	35	5 3.79	% 1.77 [0.68, 4.61]		
	Motosugu Yamano 2007	8	65	12	70	5.49	% 0.68 [0.26, 1.78]		
	Raymond H.Mak 2011	39	130	1	6	6 0.79	% 2.14 [0.24, 18.95]		
	Shiva K.Das 2008	30	158	4	61	2.59	3.34 [1.12, 9.92]		
	T.Piotrowski 2005	21	39	11	23	3.49	% 1.27 [0.45, 3.57]		
	Tae Hyun Kim 2005	11	57	1	19	0.69	% 4.30 [0.52, 35.80]		
	Takashi Uno 2006	3	12	0	ş	0.29	% 7.00 [0.32, 154.87]		
	Takeyuki Makimobo 1999	12	60	5	51	2.39	% 2.30 [0.75, 7.04]		
	Tiziana Rancati 2003	9	49	5	35	5 2.59	% 1.35 [0.41, 4.44]		
	Wang 2000	16	123	10	90	5.39	% 1.20 [0.52, 2.78]		
	Wang 2005	3	48	5	64	2.19	% 0.79 [0.18, 3.47]		
	Wang 2009	18	73	15	42	7.69	% 0.59 [0.26, 1.35]		
	Yin 2011	175	201	20	22	2.59	% 0.67 [0.15, 3.05]		
	Yoshihiko 1997	29	48	23	41	5.29	% 1.19 [0.51, 2.78]		
	Yosuke 2006	12	23	7	18	5 2.19	% 1.40 [0.39, 5.06]		
	Yu 2011	9	50	2	12	2 1.49	% 1.10 [0.20, 5.89]		
	Zhang 2010	40	203	4	50	2.79	% 2.82 [0.96, 8.30]		
	Total (05% CI)		2222		1250	100.0	4 44 14 47 4 741		<b>A</b>
	Total (95% CI)	744	2322	200	1250	100.0	% 1.41[1.17, 1.71]		•
	I otal events	/41	0.463-12-0	290				L	
	Test for everall effect: 7 = 31.66	$a_1 = 30 (P = 0.00)$	$(0.16), \Gamma = 2$	0%				0.01	0.1 1 10 100
	Test for overall effect. $Z = 3.0$	64 (P = 0.000	33)						with chemotherapy without chemotherapy
		with chemo	therapy	without chemoth	erapy		Odds Ratio		Odds Batio
	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		M-H, Random, 95% CI
	Akira Inoue 2001	14	123	11	68	4.9%	0.67 [0.28, 1.56]		
	Alena N.J. 2004	8	30	3	16	2.0%	1.58 [0.35, 7.02]		
	Andrew J Hope 2006	35	141	17	78	6.9%	1.18 [0.61, 2.29]		
	Bhupesh Parashar 2011	42	26	22	19	2.5%	8.96 [2.37, 33.84]		
	Daniel T.Chang 2006	23	53	3	15	2.1%	0.71 [0.16, 3.10]		
	Dirk De Ruysscher 2011	1	4	22	44	0.9%	0.33 [0.03, 3.46]	-	
	Hiroshi Watanabe 1995	19	46	1	11	1.0%	7.04 [0.83, 59.68]		
	Huang 2011	32	136	16	73	6.6%	1.10 [0.55, 2.17]		
	Jedidiah M.Monson 1998	6	34	11	49	3.3%	0.74 [0.24, 2.24]		
	Li 2007	37	69	17	72	1.0%	2.31 [0.83, 6.43]		
	Line Claude 2004	26	58	14	32	4.8%	1.04 [0.44, 2.49]		
	Mao 2007	17	42	11	49	4.5%	2.35 [0.94, 5.84]		
	Michelle A.T. 2010	37	138	6	35	4.2%	1.77 [0.68, 4.61]		
	Motosugu Yamano 2007	8	65	12	70	4.1%	0.68 [0.26, 1.78]		
	Raymond H.Mak 2011 Shiva K Dae 2009	39	130	1	61	1.0%	2.14 [0.24, 18.95]		
	T.Piotrowski 2005	21	39	11	23	3.7%	1.27 [0.45, 3.57]		<b>.</b>
	Tae Hyun Kim 2005	11	57	1	19	1.1%	4.30 [0.52, 35.80]		
	Takashi Uno 2006	3	12	0	9	0.5%	7.00 [0.32, 154.87]		
	Takeyuki Makimobo 1999	12	60	5	51	3.3%	2.30 [0.75, 7.04]		
	Tiziana Rancati 2003	9	49	5	35	2.9%	1.35 [0.41, 4.44]		
	Wang 2005	3	48	5	64	2.0%	0.79 (0.18, 3.47)		
	Wang 2009	18	73	15	42	5.2%	0.59 [0.26, 1.35]		
	Yin 2011	175	201	20	22	2.0%	0.67 [0.15, 3.05]		
	Yoshihiko 1997	29	48	23	41	5.0%	1.19 [0.51, 2.78]		
	Yosuke 2006	12	23	7	16	2.6%	1.40 [0.39, 5.06]		
	7hang 2010	40	203	4	50	3.5%	2 82 (0 96 8 30)		
	Linung 2010		200			0.070	2.02 (0.00, 0.00)		
	Total (95% CI)		2322		1250	100.0%	1.38 [1.10, 1.72]		◆
	Total events	741		290					
	Heterogeneity: Tau* = 0.08; C	P = 0.005	ai = 30 (P =	0.16); 1* = 20%				0.01	0.1 1 10 100
	rescior overall effect. Z = 2.7	o (F = 0.005)							with chemotherapy without chemotherapy
М		RT/RCT alo	ne RT/F	CT plus amifos	tine		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
IVI	Study or Subaroup	Events	Total	Events	Total V	Veight	M-H, Fixed. 95% CI		M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
_	Cai 2011	69	204	15	96	38.3%	2.16 [1.31.3.58]		
	Dosia Antonadou 2003	18	27	10	33	16.9%	2.20 [1.23, 3.94]		<b></b>
	Dosia Antonadou 2001	24	36	6	32	11.9%	3.56 [1.67, 7.58]		<del></del>
	Dosia Antonadou 2002	15	65	7	32	17.6%	1.05 [0.48, 2.33]		_ <b>+</b> _
	Dosia Antonadou 2003	18	32	7	36	12.4%	2.89 [1.39, 6.01]		
	R.Komaki 2002	6	26	1	27	1.8%	6.23 [0.80, 48.27]		+
	Rilsuko Komaki 2004	5	31	0	26	1.0%	9.28 [0.54, 160.35]		
		1510	0673450	1000					
	Total (95% CI)		421		282 1	00.0%	2.38 [1.79, 3.16]		•
	Total events	155		46			-		
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7.35	, df = 6 (P =	0.29); I <sup>2</sup> = 1	8%			1	0.01	
	Test for overall effect: Z = 5	5.98 (P < 0.0	0001)					0.01	RT/RCT alone RT/RCT plus amifostine

	RT/RCT alone		RT/RCT plus amifos	tine		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Cai 2011	69	204	15	96	27.8%	2.16 [1.31, 3.58]	
Dosia Antonadou 2003	18	27	10	33	22.8%	2.20 [1.23, 3.94]	
Dosia Antonadou 2001	24	36	6	32	15.3%	3.56 [1.67, 7.58]	
Dosia Antonadou 2002	15	65	7	32	14.2%	1.05 [0.48, 2.33]	
Dosia Antonadou 2003	18	32	7	36	16.1%	2.89 [1.39, 6.01]	
R.Komaki 2002	6	26	1	27	2.5%	6.23 [0.80, 48.27]	
Rilsuko Komaki 2004	5	31	0	26	1.3%	9.28 [0.54, 160.35]	<b>_</b>
Total (95% CI)		421		282	100.0%	2.32 [1.67, 3.23]	•
Total events	155		46				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.04	4; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7.	35, df =	6 (P = 0.29); I <sup>2</sup> = 18%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	5.01 (P < 0	.00001)	1				RT/RCT alone RT/RCT plus amifostine

Figure 2. A. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with Age  $\leq$ 60 ys or > 60 ys. B. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with Age  $\leq$ 70 ys or > 70 ys. C. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with Age  $\leq$ 70 ys or > 70 ys. C. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with Age  $\leq$ 70 ys or > 70 ys. C. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with Age  $\leq$ 70 ys or > 70 ys. C. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with pulmonary function before radiotherapy. E. Funnel plot of RP associated with pulmonary function before radiotherapy. F. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with central type vs. peripheral type lung cancer. H. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with left lung vs. right lung cancer. I. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with operations before radiotherapy. K. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with operations before radiotherapy. K. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with operations before radiotherapy. K. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with operations before radiotherapy. K. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with operations before radiotherapy. K. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with operations before radiotherapy. K. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with radio-chemotherapy treatment. L. Effects estimate and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with sequential chemotherapy. M. Effects estimates and 95% CI of RP odds ratio (OR) associated with operation before.

were more liable to have RP based on the result of fixed effect model (P=0.004, OR: 0.27, 95% Cl: 1.33-4.58), correlated with the result (P=0.005, OR: 2.46, 95% Cl: 1.32-4.60) based on random effect model, which indicated that the result was credible (**Figure 2G**).

Tumor location: 13 articles [6, 17, 18, 20, 28, 34, 38, 42, 46, 49, 50, 62, 63] including 2211 cases (Figure 2F), 9 articles [6, 17, 18, 20, 28, 34, 54, 59, 61] including 1880 cases (Figure 2H) and 3 articles [17, 56, 59] including 381 cases (Figure 2I) successively focused on upper lung vs. middle or lower lung, left lung vs. right lung and central type vs. peripheral type lung cancer. The OR and 95% CI of each data were 0.71 [0.57, 0.90], 1.18 [0.91, 1.52], 1.33 [0.76, 2.35] based on the fixed effect model and P-values each were 0.005, 0.21, 0.32, which indicated that the patients with left lower lung cancer were more likely to have RP. Adjusted into random effect model, the OR and 95% CI of each data were 0.74 [0.56, 0.99], 1.17 [0.90, 1.52], 1.32 [0.74, 2.33] and P-values each were 0.04, 0.23, 0.34, correlated with the result based on fixed effect model, which indicated that the result was credible.

#### Association with treatment factors

Operations before radiotherapy: 11 articles [8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 22, 27, 38, 52, 61, 63] including 412 cases indicated that there was no associa-

tion between operation before radiotherapy and the occurrence of RP based on fixed effect model (P=0.59, OR: 0.92, 95% CI: 0.67-1.25), correlated with the result (P=0.56, OR: 0.86, 95% CI: 0.53-1.41) based on random effect model, which indicated that the result was credible (**Figure 2J**).

Combined radio-chemotherapy treatment: 31 articles including 3572 cases [8, 9, 11-13, 15-17, 20, 22, 26, 27, 29-31, 32, 35, 37, 38, 41-43, 46, 47, 50, 51, 56, 57, 60, 62] (Figure 2K), 18 articles including 1760 cases [9, 12, 15, 17, 27-29, 31, 35, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 55, 56, 60, 63] (Figure 2L) successively focused on radio-chemotherapy treatment vs. radiotherapy treatment alone and sequential chemotherapy vs. concurrent chemotherapy. The OR and 95% CI of the two series were 1.41 [1.17, 1.71]. 0.97 [0.76, 1.25] based on fixed effect model and P-values were 0.0003 and 0.83, which indicated that patients with combined radiochemotherapy treatment were more likely to have RP, Adjusted into random effect model, the OR and 95% CI of the two series were 1.38 [1.10, 1.72], 1.02 [0.71, 1.47], and P-values were 0.005 and 0.90, correlated with the result based on fixed effect model, which indicated that the result was credible.

*The use of radiotherapy sensitization agent-Amifostine*: 7 articles [63, 73-77] including 703 cases indicated that the use of Amifostine was associated with the occurrence of RP based on fixed effect model (P<0.00001, OR: 2.38, 95% Cl: 1.79-3.16), correlated with the result based on random effect model (P<0.00001, OR: 2.32, 95% Cl: 1.67-3.23), which indicated that the result was credible (**Figure 2M**).

### Discussion

Radiation pneumonitis is a restrictive factor to limit the dosage of chest radiation dose, which is also one of the essential risk factors to affect the prognosis of lung cancer patients after radiotherapy [11]. RP often occurs 2-3 months after radiation. If patients at the acute stage were not treated on time, the grade of RP would increase. Conversely, if patients received proper treatment, the RP in some of them would be degraded and some still gradually led to the stage of lung fibrosis. As three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT) is widely applied, researchers are paying more attention to the relationship between lung dose-volume histogram parameters and RP.

Recent researches suggested that, in clinical factors, gender, age, pulmonary function, tumor sites and treatment factors were related to the occurrence of radiation pneumonitis after radiotherapy. Dang J's research [11] showed that gender had independent effects on the occurrence of RP and the risk of RP morbidity in female was evidently lower than that in male, while more researchers [5, 28] supported that female patients had more opportunities to get this disease. Robnett et al. had analyzed 144 cases of patients with lung cancer, and found that the RP morbidity was higher in female than in male (15% vs. 4%, P=0.01). Their explanation was that the lung volume of female was relatively smaller, and it would be more likely for RP to occur in the same dosage of chest radiation dose. In addition, RP may be a kind of hypersensitivity, similar to autoimmune disease, which was more often in female. The interpretation of this discrepancy is difficult, the possible contributing factors, such as sample size for each gender, difference of living environment, personal smoking history, and genetic background could not be completely ruled out.

Meanwhile, it is widely believed that lung cancer patients who combined with chronic pulmonary diseases [7, 16, 26] and undertook com-

bined radio-chemotherapy treatments [10, 11, 26, 72] had more chances to get RP. However, the influence of cigarette smoking on the development of RP had shown conflicting results in prior studies, with some showing an increase in risk, others no relationship, and still others a protective effect [80-84]. The systematic review of Vogelius I.S. et al. [80] showed that old age, middle or lower lung cancer, combined with complications were risk factors for occurrence of radiation pneumonitis after radiotherapy, and it is interesting to note that in their study current smoking status (defined as active smoking during treatment with or without continued smoking after treatment) was found to be protective against the development of RP because smoking is known to be associated with elevated basal circulating TGF beta levels [85-87]. Also, smoking was known to favor a TH2 immunologic response to noxious stimuli. It is tempting to speculate that the up-regulation of TH2 responses in the lungs of active smokers may be preventing or ameliorating increases in TGF-B during treatment and thereby protecting against the development of subsequent toxicity, but this relationship cannot be proven in this study as we do not have TGF beta levels available for review.

#### Conclusions

The results of this paper are all convinced by heterogeneity analysis and sensitivity test. We also evaluate the bias effects on final results through sensitivity analysis. Based on the results of our study, we raise a conclusion that the risk factors of radiation pneumonitis are chronic lung diseases, pulmonary function, diabetes, tumor located in left lower lung, combined radio-chemotherapy and using radiotherapy sensitization agent-Amifostine. That is to say, upper lung cancer patients with strong pulmonary function and without complications such as diabetes or chronic pulmonary diseases have less chance getting radiation pneumonitis after the simple radiotherapy added with radiotherapy sensitization agent-Amifostine.

#### Disclosure of conflict of interest

#### None.

Address correspondence to: Dr. Gui-Zhi Zhang, Department of Respiration, Chinese PLA General Hospital, Beijing 100853, P. R. China. Tel: +86018601048015; Fax: +8618601048015; E-mail: helili\_hl@126.com

#### References

- [1] Medhora M, Gao F, Fish BL, Jacobs ER, Moulder JE, Szabo A. Dose-modifying factor for captopril for mitigation of radiation injury to normal lung. J Radiat Res 2012; 53: 633-640.
- [2] Wang D, Sun J, Zhu J, Li X, Zhen Y, Sui S. Functional dosimetric metrics for predicting radiation-induced lung injury in non-small cell lung cancer patients treated with chemoradiotherapy. Radiat Oncol 2012; 7: 69.
- [3] Stang A. Critical evaluation of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale for the assessment of the quality of nonrandomized studies in meta-analyses. Eur J Epidemiol 2010; 25: 603-605.
- [4] Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 Statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. J Pharmacol Pharmacother 2010; 1: 100-107.
- [5] Kong FM, Hayman JA, Griffith KA, Kalemkerian GP, Arenberg D, Lyons S, Turrisi A, Lichter A, Fraass B, Eisbruch A, Lawrence TS, Ten Haken RK. Final toxicity results of a radiation-dose escalation study in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC): predictors for radiation pneumonitis and fibrosis. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2006; 65: 1075-1086.
- [6] Barriger RB, Forquer JA, Brabham JG, Andolino DL, Shapiro RH, Henderson MA, Johnstone PA, Fakiris AJ. A dose-volume analysis of radiation pneumonitis in non-small cell lung cancer patients treated with stereotactic body radiation therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2012; 1: 457-462.
- [7] Shi A, Zhu G, Wu H, Yu R, Li F, Xu B. Analysis of clinical and dosimetric factors associated with severe acute radiation pneumonitis in patients with locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer treated with concurrent chemotherapy and intensity-modulated radiotherapy. Radiat Oncol 2010; 5: 35.
- [8] Claude L, Pérol D, Ginestet C, Falchero L, Arpin D, Vincent M, Martel I, Hominal S, Cordier JF, Carrie C. A prospective study on radiation pneumonitis following conformal radiation therapy in non-small-cell lung cancer: clinical and dosimetric factors analysis. Radiother Oncol 2004; 71: 175-181.
- [9] Mak RH, Alexander BM, Asomaning K, Heist RS, Liu CY, Su L, Zhai R, Ancukiewicz M, Napolitano B, Niemierko A, Willers H, Choi NC, Christiani DC. A single-nucleotide polymorphism in the MTHFR (methylene tetrahydrofolate reductase) gene is associated with risk of radiation pneumonitis in lung cancer patients treated with thoracic radiation therapy. Cancer 2012; 118: 3654-3665.

- [10] Ramella S, Trodella L, Mineo TC, Pompeo E, Stimato G, Gaudino D, Valentini V, Cellini F, Ciresa M, Fiore M, Piermattei A, Russo P, Cesario A, D'Angelillo RM. Adding ipsilateral V20 and V30 to conventional dosimetric constraints predicts radiation pneumonitis in stage IIIA-B NSCLC treated with combined-modality therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2010; 76: 110-115.
- [11] Dang J, Li G, Lu X, Yao L, Zhang S, Yu Z. Analysis of related factors associated with radiation pneumonitis in patients with locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer treated with threedimensional conformal radiotherapy. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 2010; 136: 1169-1178.
- [12] Zhang L, Yang M, Bi N, Fang M, Sun T, Ji W, Tan W, Zhao L, Yu D, Lin D, Wang L. ATM polymorphisms are associated with risk of radiationinduced pneumonitis. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2010; 77: 1360-1368.
- [13] Wang LW, Fu XL, Clough R, Sibley G, Fan M, Bentel GC, Marks LB, Anscher MS. Can angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors protect against symptomatic radiation pneumonitis. Radiat Res 2000; 153: 405-410.
- [14] Fujino M, Shirato H, Onishi H, Kawamura H, Takayama K, Koto M, Onimaru R, Nagata Y, Hiraoka M. Characteristics of patients who developed radiation pneumonitis requiring steroid therapy after stereotactic irradiation for lung tumors. Cancer J 2006; 12: 41-46.
- [15] Parashar B, Edwards A, Mehta R, Pasmantier M, Wernicke AG, Sabbas A, Kerestez RS, Nori D, Chao KS. Chemotherapy significantly increases the risk of radiation pneumonitis in radiation therapy of advanced lung cancer. Am J Clin Oncol 2011; 34: 160-164.
- [16] Monson JM, Stark P, Reilly JJ, Sugarbaker DJ, Strauss GM, Swanson SJ, Decamp MM, Mentzer SJ, Baldini EH. Clinical radiation pneumonitis and radiographic changes after thoracic radiation therapy for lung carcinoma. Cancer 1998; 82: 842-850.
- [17] Das SK, Chen S, Deasy JO, Zhou S, Yin FF, Marks LB. Combining multiple models to generate consensus: application to radiation-induced pneumonitis prediction. Med Phys 2008; 35: 5098-5109.
- [18] Roeder F, Friedrich J, Timke C, Kappes J, Huber P, Krempien R, Debus J, Bischof M. Correlation of patient-related factors and dose-volume histogram parameters with the onset of radiation pneumonitis in patients with small cell lung cancer. Strahlenther Onkol 2010; 186: 149-156.
- [19] Takahashi H, Imai Y, Fujishima T, Shiratori M, Murakami S, Chiba H, Kon H, Kuroki Y, Abe S. Diagnostic significance of surfactant proteins A and D in sera from patients with radiation pneumonitis. Eur Respir J 2001; 17: 481-487.

- [20] Uno T, Isobe K, Kawakami H, Ueno N, Kawata T, Yamamoto S, Sekine Y, Iyoda A, Iizasa T, Fujisawa T, Shigematsu N, Ito H. Dose-volume factors predicting radiation pneumonitis in patients receiving salvage radiotherapy for postlobectomy locoregional recurrent nonsmall-cell lung cancer. Int J Clin Oncol 2006; 11: 55-59.
- [21] Fay M, Tan A, Fisher R, Mac Manus M, Wirth A, Ball D. Dose-volume histogram analysis as predictor of radiation pneumonitis in primary lung cancer patients treated with radiotherapy. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2005; 61: 1355-1363.
- [22] Kim TH, Cho KH, Pyo HR, Lee JS, Zo JI, Lee DH, Lee JM, Kim HY, Hwangbo B, Park SY, Kim JY, Shin KH, Kim DY. Dose-volumetric parameters for predicting severe radiation pneumonitis after three-dimensional conformal radiation therapy for lung cancer. Radiology 2005; 235: 208-215.
- [23] Koto M, Tsujii H, Yamamoto N, Nishimura H, Yamada S, Miyamoto T. Dosimetric factors used for thoracic X-ray radiotherapy are not predictive of the occurrence of radiation pneumonitis after carbon-ion radiotherapy. Tohoku J Exp Med 2007; 213: 149-156.
- [24] Song H, Yu JM. Effect of diabetes mellitus on the development of radiation pneumonitis in patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Zhonghua Zhong Liu Za Zhi 2009; 31: 45-47.
- [25] Xiao C, Ding HJ, Feng LC, Qu BL, Dou YQ. Efficacy of Liangxue Jiedu Huoxue Decoction in prevention of radiation pneumonitis: a randomized controlled trial. Zhong Xi Yi Jie He Xue Bao 2010; 8: 624-628.
- [26] Rancati T, Ceresoli GL, Gagliardi G. Factors predicting radiation pneumonitis in lung cancer patients: A retrospective study. Radiother Oncol 2003; 67: 275-283.
- [27] Wang Y, Wang L, Feng Q, Chen D, Zhang H, Xiao Z, Zhou Z, Ou G, Zhao L, Zhang Z, Zhang K, Yin W. Factors predicting radiation toxicity in the treatment of three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy for lung cancer. Zhongguo Fei Ai Za Zhi 2005; 8: 454-458.
- [28] Robnett TJ, Machtay M, Vines EF, McKenna MG, Algazy KM, McKenna WG. Factors predicting severe radiation pneumonitis in patients receiving definitive chemoradiation for lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2000; 48: 89-94.
- [29] An JY, Kwon SJ, Lee YS. Factors predicting the development of radiation pneumonitis in the patients receiving radiation therapy for lung cancer. Tuberc Respir Dis 2004; 56: 40-50.
- [30] Hildebrandt MA, Komaki R, Liao Z, Gu J, Chang JY, Ye Y, Lu C, Stewart DJ, Minna JD, Roth JA, Lippman SM, Cox JD, Hong WK, Spitz MR, Wu X. Genetic variants in inflammation-related genes are associated with radiation-induced

toxicity following treatment for non-small cell lung cancer. PLoS One 2010; 5: e12402.

- [31] Huang EX, Hope AJ, Lindsay PE, Trovo M, El Naqa I, Deasy JO, Bradley JD. Heart irradiation as a risk factor for radiation pneumonitis. Acta Oncol 2011; 50: 51-60.
- [32] De Ruysscher D, Wanders R, van Haren E, Hochstenbag M, Geraedts W, Pitz C, Simons J, Boersma L, Verschueren T, Minken A, Bentzen SM, Lambin P. HI-CHART: a phase I/II study on the feasibility of high-dose continuous hyperfractionated accelerated radiotherapy in patients with inoperable non-small-cell lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2008; 71: 132-138.
- [33] Wang WH, Bao Y, Chen M, Zhang L, Li KX, Xu GC, Deng XW, Lu TX, Cui NJ. Initial outcome of induction chemotherapy with weekly paclitaxel followed by three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy and concurrent weekly paclitaxel for stage III non-small cell lung cancer. Ai Zheng 2006; 25: 1279-1283.
- [34] Vinogradskiy Y, Tucker SL, Liao Z, Martel MK. Investigation of the relationship between Gross tumor volume location and pneumonitis rates using a large clinical database of nonsmall-cell lung cancer patients. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2011; 82: 1650-1658.
- [35] Hope AJ, Lindsay PE, El Naqa I, Alaly JR, Vicic M, Bradley JD, Deasy JO. Modeling radiation pneumonitis risk with clinical, dosimetric, and spatial parameters. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2006; 65: 112-124.
- [36] Lee SW, Choi EK, Lee JS, Lee SD, Suh C, Kim SW, Kim WS, Ahn SD, Yi BY, Kim JH, Noh YJ, Kim SS, Koh Y, Kim DS, Kim WD. Phase II study of three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy and concurrent mitomycin-C, vinblastine, and cisplatin chemotherapy for Stage III locally advanced, unresectable, non-small-cell lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2003; 56: 996-1004.
- [37] Yin M, Liao Z, Huang YJ, Liu Z, Yuan X, Gomez D, Wang LE, Wei Q. Polymorphisms of homologous recombination genes and clinical outcomes of non-small cell lung cancer patients treated with definitive radiotherapy. PLoS One 2011; 6: e20055.
- [38] Piotrowski T, Matecka-Nowak M, Milecki P. Prediction of radiation pneumonitis: dose-volume histogram analysis in 62 patients with nonsmall cell lung cancer after three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy. Neoplasma 2005; 52: 56-62.
- [39] Oh D, Ahn YC, Park HC, Lim do H, Han Y. Prediction of radiation pneumonitis following highdose thoracic radiation therapy by 3 Gy/fraction for non-small cell lung cancer: analysis of clinical and dosimetric factors. Jpn J Clin Oncol 2009; 39: 151-157.

- [40] Kobayashi H, Uno T, Isobe K, Ueno N, Watanabe M, Harada R, Takiguchi Y, Tatsumi K, Ito H. Radiation pneumonitis following twice-daily radiotherapy with concurrent carboplatin and paclitaxel in patients with stage III non-smallcell lung cancer. Jpn J Clin Oncol 2010; 40: 464-469.
- [41] Inoue A, Kunitoh H, Sekine I, Sumi M, Tokuuye K, Saijo N. Radiation pneumonitis in lung cancer patients: a retrospective study of risk factors and the long-term prognosis. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2001; 49: 649-655.
- [42] Yamano M, Ogino H, Shibamoto Y, Horii N. Relationship between radiation pneumonitis and prognosis in patients with primary lung cancer treated by radiotherapy. Kurume Med J 2007; 54: 57-63.
- [43] Segawa Y, Takigawa N, Kataoka M, Takata I, Fujimoto N, Ueoka H. Risk factors for development of radiation pneumonitis following radiation therapy with or without chemotherapy for lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 1997; 39: 91-98.
- [44] Yamada M, Kudoh S, Hirata K, Nakajima T, Yoshikawa J. Risk factors of pneumonitis following chemoradiotherapy for lung cancer. Eur J Cancer 1998; 34: 71-75.
- [45] De Petris L, Lax I, Sirzén F, Friesland S. Role of gross tumor volume on outcome and of dose parameters on toxicity of patients undergoing chemoradiotherapy for locally advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer. Med Oncol 2005; 22: 375-381.
- [46] Makimoto T, Tsuchiya S, Hayakawa K, Saitoh R, Mori M. Risk factors for severe radiation pneumonitis in lung cancer. Jpn J Clin Oncol 1999; 29: 192-197.
- [47] Matsuno Y, Satoh H, Ishikawa H, Kodama T, Ohtsuka M, Sekizawa K. Simultaneous measurements of KL-6 and SP-D in patients undergoing thoracic radiotherapy. Med Oncol 2006; 23: 75-82.
- [48] Ishii Y, Kitamura S. Soluble intercellular adhesion molecule-1 as an early detection marker for radiation pneumonitis. Eur Respir J 1999; 13: 733-738.
- [49] Wang J, Qiao XY, Lu FH, Zhou ZG, Song YZ, Huo JJ, Liu X. TGF-beta1 in serum and induced sputum for predicting radiation pneumonitis in patients with non-small cell lung cancer after radiotherapy. Chin J Cancer 2010; 29: 325-329.
- [50] Chang DT, Olivier KR, Morris CG, Liu C, Dempsey JF, Benda RK, Palta JR. The impact of heterogeneity correction on dosimetric parameters that predict for radiation pneumonitis. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2006; 65: 125-131.
- [51] Mao J, Kocak Z, Zhou S, Garst J, Evans ES, Zhang J, Larrier NA, Hollis DR, Folz RJ, Marks

LB. The impact of induction chemotherapy and the associated tumor response on subsequent radiation-related changes in lung function and tumor response. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2007; 67: 1360-1369.

- [52] Kocak Z, Yu X, Zhou SM, D'Amico TA, Hollis D, Kahn D, Tisch A, Shafman TD, Marks LB. The impact of pre-radiotherapy surgery on radiation-induced lung injury. Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol) 2005; 17: 210-216.
- [53] Schild SE, Stella PJ, Geyer SM, Bonner JA, Mc-Ginnis WL, Mailliard JA, Brindle J, Jatoi A, Jett JR; North Central Cancer Treatment Group. The outcome of combined-modality therapy for stage III non-small-cell lung cancer in the elderly. J Clin Oncol 2003; 21: 3201-3206.
- [54] Clenton SJ, Fisher PM, Conway J, Kirkbride P, Hatton MQ. The use of lung dose-volume histograms in predicting post-radiation pneumonitis after non-conventionally fractionated radiotherapy for thoracic carcinoma. Clin Oncol (R Coll Radiol) 2005; 17: 599-603.
- [55] Novakova-Jiresova A, Van Gameren MM, Coppes RP, Kampinga HH, Groen HJ. Transforming growth factor-beta plasma dynamics and post-irradiation lung injury in lung cancer patients. Radiother Oncol 2004; 71: 183-189.
- [56] Wang J, Qiao XY, Cao YK. Analysis of correlated factors of Radiation Pneumonitis after Threedimens Conformal Radiotherapy for Non-small Cell Lung Cancer. Chinese Journal of Clinical Oncology 2009; 36: 1086-1089.
- [57] Watanabe H, Suga A, Tsuchihashi Y, Hori A, Kawakami K, Masaki H, Akiyama M, Ohishi K, Takahashi A, Nagatake T. Clinical study of radiation pneumonitis over 10 years. Nihon Kyobu Shikkan Gakkai Zasshi 1995; 33: 384-388.
- [58] Xie SX, Li WX, Lin YR. Segmentation of threedimensional conformal radiation therapy in non-small cell lung cancer treatment application. China Oncology 2006; 16: 1034-1037.
- [59] Zhang B, Qiao TK. Predictors of Pulmonary Lesion Induced by Three Dimensional Conformal Radiotherapy Combined with Chemotherapy of NP for III Stage Non-small Cell Lung Cancer. Cancer Research on Prevention and Treatment 2010; 37: 578-581.
- [60] Li Y, Zhu SC, Chi ZF. Three dimensional conformal radiotherapy in patients with lung cancer related factors analysis of radiation pneumonia. Cancer Research on Prevention and Treatment 2007; 34: 586-589.
- [61] Zhong J, Liu J, Chen WX. Relationship between the Plasma Transforming Growth Factor-β1 Levels and Radiation-Induced Lung Injury. The Practical Journal of Cancer 2007; 22: 468-471.
- [62] Yu X, Yang ZZ, Wang G. Correlative factor analysis of radiation pneumonitis in 62 locally ad-

vanced NSCLC cases treated with 3DCRT. Journal of Modern Oncology 2011; 19: 1120-1122.

- [63] Cai Y, Zhou DA. Related factors analysis for Non-small cell lung cancer with radioactive pneumonia. Chinese Journal of Nosocomiology 2011; 21: 3357-3359.
- [64] Yorke ED, Jackson A, Rosenzweig KE, Braban L, Leibel SA, Ling CC. Correlation of dosimetric factors and radiation pneumonitis for nonsmall-cell lung cancer patients in a recently completed dose escalation study. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2005; 63: 672-682.
- [65] Barriger RB, Fakiris AJ, Hanna N, Yu M, Mantravadi P, McGarry RC. Dose-volume analysis of radiation pneumonitis in non-small-cell lung cancer patients treated with concurrent cisplatinum and etoposide with or without consolidation docetaxel. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2010; 78: 1381-1386.
- [66] Kim JY, Kim YS, Kim YK, Park HJ, Kim SJ, Kang JH, Wang YP, Jang HS, Lee SN, Yoon SC. The TGF-beta1 dynamics during radiation therapy and its correlation to symptomatic radiation pneumonitis in lung cancer patients. Radiat Oncol 2009; 4: 59.
- [67] Zhang Y, Yu YH, Yu JM, He W, Fu Z, Guo SF, Liu XJ, Cong CS. Application of standardized uptake value for FDG PET-CT in predicting radiation pneumonitis. Zhonghua Zhong Liu Za Zhi 2009; 31: 622-625.
- [68] Zhao L, Wang L, Ji W, Wang X, Zhu X, Feng Q, Yang W, Yin W. Association between plasma angiotensin-converting enzyme level and radiation pneumonitis. Cytokine 2007; 37: 71-75.
- [69] Evans ES, Kocak Z, Zhou SM, Kahn DA, Huang H, Hollis DR, Light KL, Anscher MS, Marks LB. Does transforming growth factor-beta1 predict for radiation-induced pneumonitis in patients treated for lung cancer? Cytokine 2006; 35: 186-192.
- [70] Kong FM, Anscher MS, Sporn TA, Washington MK, Clough R, Barcellos-Hoff MH, Jirtle RL. Loss of heterozygosity at the mannose 6-phosphate insulin-like growth factor 2 receptor (M6P/IGF2R) locus predisposes patients to radiation-induced lung injury. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2001; 49: 35-41.
- [71] Anscher MS, Kong FM, Andrews K, Clough R, Marks LB, Bentel G, Jirtle RL. Plasma transforming growth factor beta1 as a predictor of radiation pneumonitis. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 1998; 41: 1029-1035.
- [72] Fu XL, Huang H, Bentel G, Clough R, Jirtle RL, Kong FM, Marks LB, Anscher MS. Predicting the risk of symptomatic radiation-induced lung injury using both the physical and biologic parameters V(30) and transforming growth factor beta. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2001; 50: 899-908.

- [73] Antonadou D, Petridis A, Synodinou M, Throuvalas N, Bolanos N, Veslemes M, Sagriotis A. Amifostine reduces radiochemotherapy-induced toxicities in patients with locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Semin Oncol 2003; 30 Suppl 18: 2-9.
- [74] Antonadou D. Radiotherapy or chemotherapy followed by radiotherapy with or without amifostine in locally advanced lung cancer. Semin Radiat Oncol 2002; 12 Suppl 1: 50-58.
- [75] Komaki R, Lee JS, Kaplan B, Allen P, Kelly JF, Liao Z, Stevens CW, Fossella FV, Zinner R, Papadimitrakopoulou V, Khuri F, Glisson B, Pisters K, Kurie J, Herbst R, Milas L, Ro J, Thames HD, Hong WK, Cox JD. Randomized phase III study of chemoradiation with or without amifostine for patients with favorable performance status inoperable stage II-III non-small cell lung cancer: Preliminary results. Semin Radiat Oncol 2002; 12 Suppl 1: 46-49.
- [76] Antonadou D, Coliarakis N, Synordinou M, Athanassiou H, Kouveli A, Verigos C, Georgakopoulos G, Panoussaki K, Karageorgis P, Throuvalas N; Clinical Radiation Oncololgy Hellenic Group. Randomized phase III trial of radiation treatment +/- amifostine in patients with advanced-stage lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2001; 51: 915-922.
- [77] Komaki R, Lee JS, Milas L, Lee HK, Fossella FV, Herbst RS, Allen PK, Liao Z, Stevens CW, Lu C, Zinner RG, Papadimitrakopoulou VA, Kies MS, Blumenschein GR Jr, Pisters KM, Glisson BS, Kurie J, Kaplan B, Garza VP, Mooring D, Tucker SL, Cox JD. Effects of amifostine on acute toxicity from concurrent chemotherapy and radiotherapy for inoperable non-small cell lung cancer: Report of a randomized comparative trial. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 2004; 58: 1369-1377.
- [78] Nakayama Y, Makino S, Fukuda Y, Min KY, Shimizu A, Ohsawa N. Activation of lavage lymphocytes in lung injuries caused by radiotherapy for lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 1996; 34: 459-467.
- [79] Vujaskovic Z, Groen HJ. TGF-beta, radiation-induced pulmonary injury and lung cancer. Int J Radiat Biol 2000; 76: 511-516.
- [80] Vogelius IS, Bentzen S. Clinical factors associated with risk of radiation pneumonitis: A litterature based meta-analysis. Radiotherapy and Oncology 2010; 96: S125-S126.
- [81] Johansson S, Bjermer L, Franzen L, Henriksson R. Effects of ongoing smoking on the development of radiation-induced pneumonitis in breast cancer and oesophagus cancer patients. Radiother Oncol 1998; 49: 41-47.
- [82] Jin H, Tucker SL, Liu HH, Wei X, Yom SS, Wang S, Komaki R, Chen Y, Martel MK, Mohan R, Cox JD, Liao Z. Dose-volume thresholds and smok-

ing status for the risk of treatment-related pneumonitis in inoperable non-small cell lung cancer treated with definitive radiotherapy. Radiother Oncol 2009; 91: 427-432.

- [83] Nieder C, Bremnes RM. Effects of smoking cessation on hypoxia and its potential impact on radiation treatment effects in lung cancer patients. Strahlenther Onkol 2008; 184: 605-609.
- [84] Shurin MR, Shurin GV, Chatta GS. Aging and the dendritic cell cystem: Implications for cancer. Crit Rev Oncol Hematol 2007; 64: 90-105.
- [85] Halwani R, Al-Muhsen S, Al-Jahdali H. Role of transforming growth factor-beta in airway remodeling in asthma. Am J Respir Cell Mol Biol 2011; 44: 127-133.

- [86] Makinde T, Murphy RF, Agrawal DK. The regulatory role of TGF-beta in airway remodeling in asthma. Immunol Cell Biol 2007; 85: 348-356.
- [87] Adcock IM, Caramori G, Barnes PJ. Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and lung cancer: New molecular insights. Respiration 2011; 81: 265-284.