Survival Analysis of Age-related Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma: A Population Study Based on SEER

Peipei Wang

The First School of Clinical Medical, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou 310053, Z.J.

Kaibo Guo

The First School of Clinical Medical, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou 310053, Z.J.

Anlai Zhang

The First School of Clinical Medical, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou 310053, Z.J.

Wendi Li

The First School of Clinical Medical, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou 310053, Z.J.

Shuning Ding

The First School of Clinical Medical, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou 310053, Z.J.

Leitao Sun

Department of Medical Oncology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University (Zhejiang Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine), Hangzhou 310006, Z.J.

Shanming Ruan (✉ ruanshanming@zcmu.edu.cn)

Department of Medical Oncology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University (Zhejiang Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine), Hangzhou 310006, Z.J.

Research Article

Keywords: Oral Squamous Cell Carcinoma, Age, SEER database, Survival analysis

Posted Date: September 3rd, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-858316/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Abstract

This research aimed to investigate the prognostic factors of oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC), especially the role of age. A total of 33619 cases of OSCC were received from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database during 2005–2015. Kaplan-Meier curves of 5-year overall survival rates and 5-year cancer specific survival rates were performed, and univariate and multivariate Cox regression analysis as well as competing risk model were used to help understand the relationship between various factors and mortality of OSCC. Compared to 18–39 years old group, the older age was an important predictor of worse prognosis. The multivariate analysis of overall survival (OS) were 50–59 years old (HR, 1.32; 95% CI, 1.17–1.48; $p \leq .001$), 60–69 years old (HR, 1.66; 95% CI, 1.42–1.87; $p \leq .001$) and 70 + years old (HR, 3.21; 95% CI, 2.86–3.62; $p \leq .001$) respectively, while the specific value of competing risk model were 60–69 years old (HR, 1.21; 95% CI, 1.07–1.38; $p = .002$) and 70 + years old (HR, 1.85; 95% CI, 1.63–2.10; $p \leq .001$). In addition, female gender, unmarried, Blacks, tumor in floor of mouth, size and higher TNM classification were also other predictors that signify significant clinically deterioration of OS / CSS. Our research revealed that age was an important factor in explaining the difference of survival in the whole process of OSCC. It's suggested that we should pay attention to the influence of age on diagnosis, treatment and prognosis in the clinical process.

Introduction

Oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) is the most common histological type of oral cancer, with high morbidity and mortality, accounting for about 90% of oral cancer¹. Important causes of oral squamous cell carcinoma include smoking, drinking and betel nut chewing^{2,3}. It is worth mentioning that in recent years, human papillomavirus has also been found to be one of the important causes of OSCC^{4,5}, which has attracted widespread attention. In the early stages, OSCC are commonly asymptomatic, it is often at advanced-stage at the time of diagnosis. Early detection of precancerous lesions in OSCC can greatly improve the survival rate of patients⁶. In addition, the low survival rate of OSCC is also related to the fact that older patients have more complication, which make them more likely to be infected with other diseases and prematurely die. Also, there are more adverse drug reactions due to aging organ functions than younger patients. Hence it has been suggested that different treatment strategies should be given to the young and the old⁷. In this paper, we made a survival analysis based on information of patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma in different ages.

The acquisition of a large number of patients' real data has been one of the main problems faced by researchers in the research process. We used The Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) national cancer database, a cancer registry maintained by the American College of surgeons and the American Cancer Society. It records the incidence rate, mortality and morbidity of millions of malignant tumors in some states and counties in the United States. The tumor information in the database was unified and standardized by SEER*stat software, and is regularly updated and released. Researchers all over the world can easily get data through application, which provides a good data source for clinical researchers. In addition, SEER database has a large sample size cover about 34.6% of the U.S. population and strong statistical efficiency, which promoted the high clinical reference value of researches based on SEER database.

Results

Patient recruitment and characteristics

A total of 33619 cases in the SEER database were included in this study. The baseline characteristics of patients with OSCC were presented in Table 1. There were 5 groups stratified by age at diagnosis (18–39 years, 40–49 years, 50–59 years, 60–69 years, 70 + years). The incidence of OSCC was highest among 50–59 years old (10903, 13.24%), whereas the youngest group (18–39 years) had the least sample size. And the proportion of male is much higher than that of women, especially in the group younger than 70 years old. The most common site of cancer in the 18–39 years group was the tongue, which was different from other groups. The median follow-up time of the whole cases and each group were 34 months, interquartile range 15-73 months (total); 52 months, interquartile range 19-96 months (18–39 years), 50 months, interquartile range 20-93 months (40–49 years), 40 months, interquartile range 17-79 months (50–59 years), 34 months, interquartile range 15-68 months (60–69 years), 22 months, interquartile range 9-51 months (70 + years), respectively.

Table 1
Clinicopathological characters of patients with oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma by age at diagnosis

Age at diagnosis, n (%)						
Characteristics	Total	18–39	40–49	50–59	60–69	70+
Total	33619	1120(3.33)	4408(13.11)	10903(32.43)	9380(27.90)	7808(23.22)
Sex						
Female	9113(27.11)	431(38.48)	998(22.64)	2228(20.43)	2178(23.22)	3278(41.98)
Male	24506(72.89)	689(61.52)	3410(77.36)	8675(79.57)	7202(76.78)	4530(58.02)
Marital status						
Married	19106(56.83)	560(50.00)	2553(57.92)	6316(57.93)	5590(59.59)	4087(52.34)
Unmarried	14513(43.17)	560(50.00)	1855(42.08)	4587(42.07)	3790(40.41)	3721(47.66)
Race						
American Indian/Alaska Native	185(0.55)	3(0.27)	32(0.73)	70(0.64)	51(0.54)	29(0.37)
Asian or Pacific Islander	1796(5.34)	132(11.79)	256(5.81)	430(3.94)	463(4.94)	515(6.60)
Black	2748(8.17)	76(6.79)	459(10.41)	1040(9.54)	755(8.05)	418(5.35)
White	28890(85.93)	909(81.16)	3661(16.95)	9363(85.88)	8111(86.47)	6846(87.68)
Year of diagnosis						
2004–2010	16818(50.03)	637(56.88)	2548(57.80)	5476(50.22)	4279(45.62)	3860(49.44)
2011–2015	16801(49.97)	483(43.13)	1860(42.20)	5427(49.78)	5101(54.38)	3948(50.56)
Location						
Tongue	15300(45.51)	776(69.29)	1902(43.15)	4775(43.80)	4460(47.55)	3387(43.38)
Floor of mouth	2433(7.24)	25(2.23)	290(6.58)	843(7.73)	729(7.77)	546(6.99)
Other mouth	15886(47.25)	319(28.48)	2216(50.27)	5285(51.53)	4191(55.32)	3875(49.63)
Size						
≤1	2442(7.26)	128(11.43)	352(7.99)	726(6.66)	658(7.01)	578(7.40)
≤2	6139(18.26)	271(24.20)	931(21.12)	1941(17.80)	1666(17.76)	1330(17.03)
≤3	7045(20.96)	215(19.20)	877(19.90)	2303(21.12)	1932(20.60)	1718(22.00)
≤4	6228(18.53)	172(15.36)	766(17.38)	2009(18.43)	1812(19.32)	1469(18.81)
≤5	4048(12.04)	114(10.18)	501(11.37)	1305(11.97)	1140(12.15)	988(12.65)
≥ 5	3718(11.06)	125(11.16)	424(9.62)	1166(10.69)	1057(11.27)	946(12.12)
Unknown	3999(11.90)	95(8.48)	557(12.64)	1453(13.33)	1115(11.89)	779(9.98)

Age at diagnosis, n (%)						
Treatment modalities						
Surgery	8100(24.09)	382(34.11)	923(20.94)	2020(18.53)	2087(22.25)	2688(34.43)
Radiation	1968(5.85)	17(1.52)	144(3.27)	484(4.44)	524(5.59)	799(10.23)
Chemotherapy + XRT	9304(27.67)	138(12.32)	1241(28.15)	3497(32.07)	3008(32.07)	1420(18.19)
Surgery + XRT	5154(15.33)	183(16.34)	645(14.63)	1582(14.51)	1394(14.86)	1350(17.29)
Others	937(2.79)	21(1.88)	132(2.99)	328(3.01)	276(2.94)	180(2.31)
Triple therapy	6619(19.69)	359(32.05)	1208(27.40)	2625(24.08)	1684(17.95)	743(9.52)
No/Unknown	1537(4.57)	20(1.79)	115(2.61)	367(3.37)	407(4.34)	628(8.04)
Grade						
Well differentiated	4423(13.16)	188(16.79)	491(11.14)	1111(10.19)	1151(12.27)	1482(18.98)
Moderately differentiated	16467(48.98)	593(52.95)	2256(51.18)	5339(48.97)	4429(47.22)	3850(49.31)
Poorly differentiated	12445(37.02)	329(29.38)	1618(36.71)	4353(39.92)	3720(39.66)	2425(31.06)
Undifferentiated	284(0.84)	10(0.89)	43(0.98)	100(0.92)	80(0.85)	51(0.65)
T classification						
T1	9795(29.14)	431(38.48)	1421(32.24)	3108(28.51)	2659(28.35)	2176(27.87)
T2	10431(31.03)	334(29.82)	1342(30.44)	3430(31.46)	2951(31.46)	2374(30.40)
T3	4377(13.02)	129(11.52)	512(11.62)	1371(12.57)	1262(13.45)	1103(14.13)
T4	6294(18.72)	155(13.84)	754(17.11)	2001(18.35)	1776(18.93)	1608(20.59)
Unknown	2722(8.10)	71(6.34)	379(8.60)	993(9.11)	732(7.80)	547(7.01)
N classification						
N0	12381(36.83)	518(46.25)	1360(30.85)	3250(29.81)	3208(34.20)	4045(51.81)
N1	6022(17.91)	179(15.98)	784(17.79)	1999(18.33)	1744(18.59)	1316(16.85)
N2	13683(40.70)	383(34.20)	2056(46.64)	5096(46.74)	3983(42.46)	2165(27.73)
N3	1135(3.38)	28(2.50)	166(3.77)	466(4.27)	340(3.62)	135(1.73)
Unknown	398(1.18)	12(1.07)	42(0.95)	92(0.84)	105(1.12)	147(1.88)
M classification						
M0	32461(96.56)	1100(98.21)	4283(97.16)	10540(96.67)	9027(96.24)	7511(96.20)
M1	988(2.94)	13(1.16)	100(2.27)	310(2.84)	313(3.34)	252(3.23)

Age at diagnosis, n (%)						
Unknown	170(0.51)	7(0.63)	25(0.57)	53(0.49)	40(0.43)	45(0.58)
Stage						
1	5339(15.88)	283(25.27)	657(14.90)	1440(13.21)	1377(14.68)	1582(20.26)
2	3548(10.55)	136(12.14)	384(8.71)	937(8.59)	924(9.85)	1167(14.95)
3	5612(16.69)	193(17.23)	708(16.06)	1754(16.09)	1597(17.03)	1360(17.42)
4	17993(53.52)	475(42.41)	2543(57.69)	6449(59.15)	5156(54.97)	3370(43.16)
Unknown	1127(3.35)	33(2.95)	116(2.63)	323(2.96)	326(3.48)	329(4.21)
Status						
Alive	19464(57.90)	824(73.57)	3033(68.81)	7129(65.39)	5553(59.20)	2925(37.46)
Dead (attributable to cancer)	10623(31.60)	275(24.55)	1129(25.61)	3019(27.69)	2920(31.13)	3280(42.01)
Dead of other cause	3532(10.51)	21(1.88)	246(5.58)	755(6.92)	907(9.67)	1603(20.53)
Follow-up time	34(15, 73)	52(19, 96)	50(20, 93)	40(17, 79)	34(15, 68)	22(9, 51)

Survival analyses of OSCC According to Age at Diagnosis

Figure 2A presents the 5-year OS for OSCC decreased with age analyzed by Kaplan-Meier. With the extension of the follow-up time, the differences between the groups were larger. The Oral Squamous Cell cancer-specific survival among 18–39 years, 40–49 years, 50–59 years, 60–69 years, 70 + years group also gave a similar result (Fig. 2B), revealed that age had a major influence on survival time.

Kaplan-Meier survival curves as well as cumulative incidence function divided by age at each stage are produced (Fig. 3 and Fig. 4). The 5-year OS of stage I to II were similar to that of the general population, but for stage III and IV, only those aged over 60 had significant difference in survival rate, while the three groups of 18–39 years, 40–49 years and 50–59 years were similar, which indicated that age was an important factor in explaining the difference of survival, but not the only factor (Fig. 3). As for the result of CSS in different stages, the elderly group, especially 70 + years and 60–69 years patients still have a significant difference connection with cancer-specific death (Fig. 4).

When we conducted univariate and multivariate analysis targeting overall survival (OS) and cancer-specific survival (CSS), as expected, age, sex, marital status, race, tumor location and size, treatment, pathological grade and TNM staging were covariates in the adjusted model, which showed statistical significance ($P < 0.05$) (Table 2, Table 3). Older age (≥ 50 years old) was an important predictor of worse prognosis at all stages compared with patients aged 18–39. The specific value were 50–59 years old (HR, 1.32; 95% CI, 1.17–1.48; $p \leq .001$), 60–69 years old (HR, 1.66; 95% CI, 1.42–1.87; $p \leq .001$) and 70 + years old (HR, 3.21; 95% CI, 2.86–3.62; $p \leq .001$). While the competing risk model were 60–69 years old (HR, 1.21; 95% CI, 1.07–1.38; $p = .002$) and 70 + years old (HR, 1.85; 95% CI, 1.63–2.10; $p \leq .001$). In addition, Table 2 and Table 3 also revealed other predictors that signify significant clinically deterioration of OS / CSS in univariate and multivariate regression analysis included female gender, unmarried, Blacks, tumor in floor of mouth, size and higher TNM classification.

Table 2
Univariate and multivariable cox regression analysis of OS in oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma

	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
Clinicopathological variables	HR (95%CI)	<i>P</i>	HR (95%CI)	<i>P</i>
Age at diagnosis				
18–39	Reference		Reference	
40–49	1.19 (1.05–1.35)	.007	1.15 (1.01–1.30)	.034
50–59	1.43 (1.27–1.61)	< .001	1.32 (1.17–1.48)	< .001
60–69	1.83 (1.62–2.06)	< .001	1.66 (1.42–1.87)	< .001
70+	3.46 (3.07–3.89)	< .001	3.21 (2.86–3.62)	< .001
Sex				
Female	Reference		Reference	
Male	0.83 (0.80–0.86)	< .001	0.94 (0.90–0.97)	< .001
Marital status				
Married	Reference		Reference	
Unmarried	1.84 (1.78–1.90)	< .001	1.48 (1.43–1.54)	< .001
Race				
White	Reference		Reference	
Black	1.82 (1.73–1.92)	< .001	1.34 (1.27–1.41)	< .001
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.96 (0.89–1.04)	.340	1.02 (0.95–1.11)	.566
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.08 (0.86–1.36)	.482	1.04 (0.83–1.31)	.743
Location				
Floor of mouth	Reference		Reference	
Other mouth	0.62 (0.58–0.66)	< .001	0.60 (0.56–0.63)	< .001
Tongue	0.65 (0.62–0.69)	< .001	0.71 (0.67–0.76)	< .001
Size				
≤1	Reference		Reference	
≤2	1.38 (1.25–1.53)	< .001	1.35 (1.22–1.49)	< .001
≤3	1.96 (1.79–2.16)	< .001	1.63 (1.45–1.82)	< .001
≤4	2.49 (2.26–2.73)	< .001	1.91 (1.69–2.16)	< .001
≤5	3.36 (3.05–3.70)	< .001	2.29 (2.02–2.60)	< .001
≥ 5	5.48 (4.98–6.03)	< .001	3.11 (2.74–3.54)	< .001

	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
Unknown	3.17 (2.88–3.50)	< .001	2.40 (2.09–2.75)	< .001
Treatment				
No/Unknown	Reference		Reference	
Surgery	0.18 (0.18–0.19)	< .001	0.30 (0.28–0.32)	< .001
Radiation	0.44 (0.41–0.48)	< .001	0.48 (0.44–0.52)	< .001
Chemotherapy + XRT	0.23 (0.22–0.25)	< .001	0.26 (0.24–0.27)	< .001
Surgery + XRT	0.21 (0.19–0.22)	< .001	0.28 (0.26–0.30)	< .001
Triple therapy	0.18 (0.17–0.19)	< .001	0.25 (0.23–0.27)	< .001
Others	0.63 (0.58–0.70)	< .001	0.54 (0.49–0.60)	< .001
Grade				
Well differentiated	Reference		Reference	
Moderately differentiated	1.15 (1.09–1.21)	< .001	1.07 (1.02–1.13)	.009
Poorly differentiated	0.93 (0.88–0.98)	.006	0.86 (0.81–0.91)	< .001
Undifferentiated	0.83 (0.68–1.02)	.079	0.78 (0.63–0.95)	.015
T classification				
T1	Reference		Reference	
T2	1.61 (1.53–1.69)	< .001	1.13 (1.04–1.22)	.004
T3	2.67 (2.52–2.82)	< .001	1.24 (1.13–1.37)	< .001
T4	3.84 (3.66–4.04)	< .001	1.89 (1.73–2.06)	< .001
Unknown	1.85 (1.72–1.98)	< .001	0.82 (0.73–0.92)	< .001
N classification				
N0	Reference		Reference	
N1	1.25 (1.19–1.31)	< .001	1.36 (1.29–1.43)	< .001
N2	1.25 (1.20–1.30)	< .001	1.38 (1.32–1.45)	< .001
N3	1.71 (1.58–1.86)	< .001	1.75 (1.60–1.92)	< .001
Unknown	2.64 (2.33–3.00)	< .001	1.44 (1.26–1.65)	< .001
M classification				
M0	Reference		Reference	
M1	4.00 (3.72–4.29)	< .001	2.54 (2.36–2.74)	< .001
Unknown	2.50 (2.11–2.97)	< .001	1.38 (1.16–1.65)	< .001

Table 3
Univariate and multivariable competing risk model regression analysis of CSS in oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma

	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
Clinicopathological variables	SHR (95%CI)	<i>P</i>	SHR (95%CI)	<i>P</i>
Age at diagnosis				
18–39	Reference		Reference	
40–49	1.04 (0.91–1.18)	.590	0.98 (0.86–1.12)	.800
50–59	1.17 (1.04–1.32)	.011	1.06 (0.94–1.20)	.360
60–69	1.37 (1.21–1.55)	< .001	1.21 (1.07–1.38)	.002
70+	2.05 (1.82–2.32)	< .001	1.85 (1.63–2.10)	< .001
Sex				
Female	Reference		Reference	
Male	0.84 (0.81–0.88)	< .001	0.85 (0.81–0.89)	< .001
Marital status				
Married	Reference		Reference	
Unmarried	1.71 (1.65–1.78)	< .001	1.33 (1.27–1.38)	< .001
Race				
White	Reference		Reference	
Black	1.86 (1.76–1.97)	< .001	1.29 (1.20–1.38)	< .001
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.08 (0.99–1.18)	.072	1.18 (1.08–1.29)	< .001
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.11 (0.86–1.42)	.430	1.06 (0.82–1.36)	.650
Location				
Floor of mouth	Reference		Reference	
Other mouth	0.64 (0.60–0.69)	< .001	0.60 (0.55–0.64)	< .001
Tongue	0.72 (0.68–0.77)	< .001	0.76 (0.71–0.82)	< .001
Size				
≤1	Reference		Reference	
≤2	1.65 (1.45–1.88)	< .001	1.51 (1.33–1.72)	< .001
≤3	2.49 (2.20–2.82)	< .001	1.83 (1.57–2.12)	< .001
≤4	3.21 (2.84–3.64)	< .001	2.11 (1.80–2.47)	< .001
≤5	4.56 (4.02–5.17)	< .001	2.59 (2.20–3.05)	< .001
≥ 5	7.37 (6.51–8.34)	< .001	3.39 (2.87–4.00)	< .001

	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
Unknown	4.46 (3.94–5.06)	< .001	2.73 (2.29–3.25)	< .001
Treatment				
No/Unknown	Reference		Reference	
Surgery	0.163 (0.15–0.18)	< .001	0.33 (0.29–0.37)	< .001
Radiation	0.441 (0.40–0.49)	< .001	0.53 (0.47–0.59)	< .001
Chemotherapy + XRT	0.28 (0.26–0.30)	< .001	0.33 (0.30–0.36)	< .001
Surgery + XRT	0.23 (0.21–0.25)	< .001	0.35 (0.32–0.39)	< .001
Triple therapy	0.23 (0.21–0.25)	< .001	0.34 (0.31–0.38)	< .001
Others	0.74 (0.66–0.83)	< .001	0.65 (0.57–0.75)	< .001
Grade				
Well differentiated	Reference		Reference	
Moderately differentiated	1.28 (1.21–1.36)	< .001	1.08 (1.01–1.16)	.023
Poorly differentiated	1.05 (0.99–1.12)	.130	0.86 (0.80–0.93)	< .001
Undifferentiated	0.87 (0.69–1.11)	.260	0.69 (0.54–0.88)	.003
T classification				
T1	Reference		Reference	
T2	1.80 (1.70–1.92)	< .001	1.17 (1.06–1.30)	.002
T3	3.09 (2.89–3.30)	< .001	1.29 (1.15–1.45)	< .001
T4	4.48 (4.23–4.75)	< .001	1.94 (1.74–2.16)	< .001
Unknown	2.18 (2.01–2.36)	< .001	0.85 (0.73–0.98)	.025
N classification				
N0	Reference		Reference	
N1	1.52 (1.43–1.60)	< .001	1.48 (1.39–1.58)	< .001
N2	1.63 (1.55–1.70)	< .001	1.56 (1.47–1.65)	< .001
N3	2.34 (2.14–2.57)	< .001	2.06 (1.84–2.31)	< .001
Unknown	2.87 (2.46–3.35)	< .001	1.50 (1.26–1.79)	< .001
M classification				
M0	Reference		Reference	
M1	4.39 (4.05–4.76)	< .001	2.62 (2.36–2.90)	< .001
Unknown	2.60 (2.11–3.22)	< .001	1.47 (1.12–1.93)	.006

Discussion

Age has always been an important factor in the occurrence, development and prognosis of various tumor. Squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck (HNSCC) is generally considered to be more frequent in the elderly, associated with tobacco and alcohol, and mainly occurs in men⁸. However, more and more young patients with HNSCC have been reported all over the world⁹. For the past few years, the incidence of OSCC has been on the rise, especially among young patients¹⁰. The purpose of this SEER database analysis was to assess the clinical characteristics and risk factors of OSCC in different age groups. At the same time, understanding of other factors (gender, tumor size, histological grade, treatment, etc.) that affect the premature death of patients will help to formulate the corresponding treatment plan in advance and improve the survival rate. To our knowledge, this study is the first to observe the possible differences stratified by age in studies with a large sample size.

As we expected, whether it is OS or CSS, the research shows that the survival time of patients decreases orderly and stepwise with the increase of age group. This result is consistent with other large cohort studies that have been published. A study carried out in Brazil shown that age has a strong impact on mortality from oral and oropharyngeal cancer. The risk increases from 40 years old for men to 55 years old for women and the effect of the overall period was observed¹¹. Laith et al. reported that their study indicated improved OS and disease-specific survival in young patients with oral tongue squamous cell carcinoma (OTSCC)¹². But another interesting finding of the regression analysis is that compared with the higher age group, people aged < 30 showed a higher probability of transition, which is not statistically significant¹³. Younger age at diagnosis even was found to be a risk factor for the development of pleural metastasis¹⁴. In general, the effect of age on the prognosis of OSCC is still controversial. Although a number of studies have made different results, they are unable to explain the etiology and pathological mechanism in detail. From our analysis of the results, young patients (18–39) had a higher rate of surgery (34.11%) and triple therapy (32.05%), indicating that they tend to accept more aggressive treatments.

It has reported that five-year survival rates for patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma vary greatly by stage, from about 90% in the early stage to about 30% in the late stage¹⁵. Surgery is the main treatment for early (stage I-II) oral squamous cell carcinoma. Advanced (Stage III-IV) disease indicates difficulty in obtaining a clear incision margin, which means a higher recurrence rate. Under the circumstance, adjuvant therapy is appropriate¹⁶. Our research found that age has different effects on prognosis at different stages. In the early stage, the patient's survival period decreased with increasing age. As the stage progresses, the impact of different age groups on the prognosis is less obvious, which is mainly reflected in the poor prognosis of the elderly. Therefore, clinical staging at diagnosis is important and can be used as a predictor of recurrence and death in patients with OSCC.

Based on the results of previous studies, the most common major sites involved in OSCC vary by geographic location. The buccal mucosa is more common in Asian populations, including South Asia, Sri Lanka, etc., where 40% of oral cancers are found in the buccal mucosa due to the common practice of men and women chewing betel nut/tobacco. In contrast, the tongue is the most common site of oral cancer in European and American populations, accounting for 40–50% of oral cancers^{17,18}. The main source of cases in our study is mostly white Americans and our results for the location of OSCC are also within this range. It is worth noting that the proportion of tongue cancer patients is the highest in the 18-39-year-old group (69.29%). This is consistent with a previous study based on a global database analysis¹⁹. However, the incidence factors of young people are still unclear, and may be related to changes in the etiology of oral cancer, such as human papilloma virus (HPV) infection. In addition, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) analyzed data from the 2011–2015 National Youth Tobacco Survey (NYTS) and determined that the use of e-cigarettes and hooks by middle

school students has increased significantly, and the trend is much larger than that of adults²⁰. But it is still necessary to further investigate the influence of young people's eating habits, lifestyle and other factors on their incidence and tumor location.

As a retrospective study we acknowledge there are certain limitations to the study. As for SEER database, a large population retrospective database, inevitably, it has some drawbacks. It does not provide the data of detailed immunohistochemical analysis, for example. It also lacks related chemotherapy or radiotherapy regimens. However, the strengths of our study include a large nationally representative sample, meticulous grouping of age, as well as a wealth of other relevant factors.

Conclusion

Our study revealed that age was an independent predictor of both OS and CSS in the oral squamous cell carcinoma patients, and more aggressive treatments (surgery, triple therapy) tend to be used in young patients, which can provide certain reference value for the current clinical diagnosis and treatment.

Methods

Data source

We collected the clinicopathological data of all 33619 adult patients (≥ 18 years old) with primary oral squamous cell carcinoma from the year of 2004 to 2015 from the SEER database. The histological type codes for squamous cell carcinoma are 8070, 8071, 8072, 8073, 8074, 8075, and 8076, according to the third edition of the *International Classification of Diseases for Oncology* (ICD-O-3). Specific information includes age, gender, race, tumor location, grade, marital status, surgery, radiation, chemotherapy, T-level, N-stage and M-stage.

Data processing

The detailed steps are explained in the Fig. 1. "Age", as the main predictor, was clustered into five groups: 18–39, 40–49, 50–59, 60–69, 70+. The SEER "stage" was used for tumor staging according to the seventh edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) manual. In this study, the primary and secondary endpoints were overall survival and cancer-specific survival, which were analyzed based on the time of diagnosis, "status" and "cause-specific death classification". And we used the ICD-O-3 code to classify the site of oral tumors: Floor of mouth (C04.0-4.1, C04.8-4.9), tongue (C01.9-2.4, C02.8-2.9), other (C03.0-3.1, C03.9, C05.0-5.2, C05.8-6.2, C06.8-6.9, C07.9-8.1, C08.9-9.1, C09.8-9.9). Moreover, the treatment methods were divided into the following groups: surgery, radiation, chemotherapy + XRT, surgery + XRT, others, triple therapy, no/unknown. Other variables available for statistical analysis were also standardized in the light of the definition of the SEER database.

Statistical analysis

All analyses were conducted in R-studio (version 4.0.2, <https://www.r-project.org/>). We used the Kaplan-Meier method and log-rank test to obtain the Kaplan-Meier curves of 5-year overall survival rates and 5-year cancer specific survival rates for each age, as well as Kaplan-Meier curves by age for each stage. To understand the relationship between other acquired factors and mortality of OSCC, univariate and multivariate Cox regression analysis were performed. The variables with $P < 0.05$ in univariate analysis were further analyzed by multivariate analysis.

Ethics approval

1. SEER database, a cancer registry maintained by the American College of surgeons and the American Cancer Society, is the authoritative cancer statistical database in the United States, which has its own ethical approval; 2. Because it is a public anonymous database, our hospital ethics has no related approval.

Declarations

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by Program for the Cultivation of Youth talents in China Association of Chinese Medicine (QNRC2-C08); Zhejiang Provincial Program for the Cultivation of the Young and Middle-Aged Academic Leaders in Colleges and Universities (2017-248); Zhejiang Provincial Project for the Key Discipline of Traditional Chinese Medicine (2017-XK-A09).

Author information

These authors contributed equally: Peipei Wang & Kaibo Guo.

These authors jointly supervised this work: Leitao Sun & Shanming Ruan.

Affiliations

The First School of Clinical Medical, Zhejiang Chinese Medical University, Hangzhou 310053, Z.J. China

Peipei Wang, Kaibo Guo, Anlai Zhang, Wendi Li & Shuning Ding.

Department of Medical Oncology, The First Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang Chinese Medical University (Zhejiang Provincial Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine), Hangzhou 310006, Z.J. China

Leitao Sun & Shanming Ruan

Contributions

Peipei Wang and Kaibo Guo: contributed to the conception and design of the work, drafted and critically revised the manuscript, made the equal contribution to this paper; Anlai Zhang and Wendi Li: contributed to the acquisition, analysis of data and drafted the work; Shuning Ding and Leitao Sun: contributed to the interpretation of data and critically revised the manuscript; Shanming Ruan: contributed to the conception of the work, the analysis of data and critically revised the manuscript; All authors approved final publication of the manuscript and agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Ethics declarations

Competing interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

1. Dewan, A. K. *et al.* Squamous cell carcinoma of the superior gingivobuccal sulcus: an 11-year institutional experience of 203 cases. *Jpn J Clin Oncol*, **44**, 807–811 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jjco/hyu088> (2014).
2. Oji, C. & Chukwuneke, F. Poor oral Hygiene may be the Sole Cause of Oral Cancer. *J Maxillofac Oral Surg*, **11**, 379–383 (2012).
3. Tsai, S., Wong, T., Ou, C., Fang, S. & Chang, J. S. The interplay between alcohol consumption, oral hygiene, ALDH2 and ADH1B in the risk of head and neck cancer. *International Journal of Cancer*, **135**, 2424–2436 (2015).
4. Rooper, L. M. *et al.* HPV-positive Squamous Cell Carcinoma of the Larynx, Oral Cavity, and Hypopharynx: Clinicopathologic Characterization With Recognition of a Novel Warty Variant. *The American Journal of Surgical Pathology* **44** (2020).
5. Johnson, D. E. *et al.* Head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*, **6**, 92 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-020-00224-3> (2020).
6. Silverman, S., Kerr, A. R. & Epstein, J. B. Oral and pharyngeal cancer control and early detection. *J Cancer Educ*, **25**, 279–281 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13187-010-0045-6> (2010).
7. Yamada, S. I. *et al.* Treatment strategies for and outcomes of older patients with oral squamous cell carcinoma. *Oral Surg Oral Med Oral Pathol Oral Radiol*, **129**, 322–329 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oooo.2019.10.009> (2020).
8. Hashibe, M. *et al.* Interaction between tobacco and alcohol use and the risk of head and neck cancer: pooled analysis in the International Head and Neck Cancer Epidemiology Consortium. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*, **18**, 541–550 (2009).
9. Majchrzak, E. *et al.* Oral cavity and oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma in young adults: a review of the literature. *Radiol Oncol*, **48**, 1–10 (2014).
10. Hussein, A. A. *et al.* Global incidence of oral and oropharynx cancer in patients younger than 45 years versus older patients: A systematic review. *Eur J Cancer*, **82**, 115–127 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2017.05.026> (2017).
11. Perea, L. M. E., Antunes, J. L. F. & Peres, M. A. Oral and oropharyngeal cancer mortality in Brazil, 1983–2017: Age-period-cohort analysis. *Oral Dis*, <https://doi.org/10.1111/odi.13732> (2020).
12. Mukdad, L. *et al.* Oral tongue squamous cell carcinoma survival as stratified by age and sex: A surveillance, epidemiology, and end results analysis. *Laryngoscope*, **129**, 2076–2081 <https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.27720> (2019).
13. Siriwardena, B. S. M. S. *et al.* Predictive model of oral cancer metastasis for different cancer sites and age groups. *J Investig Clin Dent*, **7**, 127–131 <https://doi.org/10.1111/jicd.12145> (2016).
14. Shao, Y. Y. & Hong, R. L. Pleural metastases as a unique entity with dismal outcome of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Oral Oncol*, **46**, 694–697 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oraloncology.2010.06.014> (2010).
15. Omar, E. Current concepts and future of noninvasive procedures for diagnosing oral squamous cell carcinoma—a systematic review. *Head Face Med*, **11**, 6 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13005-015-0063-z> (2015).
16. Fridman, E. *et al.* The role of adjuvant treatment in early-stage oral cavity squamous cell carcinoma: An international collaborative study., **124**, 2948–2955 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.31531> (2018).
17. Shibahara, T. [Oral cancer -diagnosis and therapy-]. *Clin Calcium*, **27**, 1427–1433 (2017).
18. Siriwardena, B. S. M. S., Tilakaratne, A., Amaratunga, E. A. P. D. & Tilakaratne, W. M. Demographic, aetiological and survival differences of oral squamous cell carcinoma in the young and the old in Sri Lanka. *Oral Oncol*, **42**, 831–836 (2006).

19. Ghantous, Y., Abu Elnaaj, I. & INCIDENCE AND RISK FACTORS OF ORAL CANCER]. *Harefuah*, **156**, 645–649 (2017).
20. Singh, T. *et al.* Tobacco Use Among Middle and High School Students–United States, 2011–2015. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, **65**, 361–367 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6514a1> (2016).

Figures

Figure 1

The flow chart of OSCC patient data processing

Figure 2

Kaplan-Meier survival curves and cumulative incidence function for 5-year OS/CSS

Figure 3

Kaplan-Meier survival curves grouped by age at each stage

Figure 4

Cumulative incidence function grouped by age at each stage