

Supplemental online content for:

Role of Locoregional Treatment in Vulvar Cancer With Pelvic Lymph Node Metastases: Time to Reconsider FIGO Staging?

Ashwin Shinde, MD; Richard Li, MD; Arya Amini, MD; Yi-Jen Chen, MD, PhD; Mihaela Cristea, MD; Wenge Wang, MD, PhD; Mark Wakabayashi, MD; Ernest Han, MD, PhD; Catheryn Yashar, MD; Kevin Albuquerque, MD; Sushil Beriwal, MD; and Scott Glaser, MD

J Natl Compr Canc Netw 2019;17(8):922–930

eTable 1: Multivariate Analysis of Use of RT in Patients Who Underwent Surgery

eTable 2: Multivariable Cox Proportional Hazards Model for Overall Survival in Patients Who Underwent Surgery

eTable 3: Multivariable Cox Proportional Hazard Models for Overall Survival in Patients Who Did Not Undergo Surgery

eTable 1. Multivariate Analysis of Use of RT in Patients Who Underwent Surgery (N=810)

	No RT (n=238)	RT (n=572)	Odds Ratio	95% CI	P Value
Sociodemographic factors					
Year of diagnosis					
2009–2012	148 (62.2)	316 (55.2)		Ref	
2013–2015	90 (37.8)	256 (44.8)	1.52	1.06–2.17	.022 ^a
Distance from treatment facility					
≤10 miles	86 (36.1)	271 (47.4)		Ref	
>10 miles	152 (63.9)	299 (52.3)	0.65	0.45–0.93	.019 ^a
Facility type					
Community/Comprehensive community	104 (43.5)	273 (49.7)		Ref	
Academic/Research	106 (45.2)	198 (36.7)	0.66	0.45–0.96	.032 ^a
Integrated health network	27 (11.3)	75 (13.6)	0.96	0.55–1.68	.84
Unknown	1 (0.4)	26 (4.5)	9.90	1.21–80.8	.032
Pathologic factors					
Positive regional lymph nodes					
Not examined	17 (7.1)	50 (8.7)		Ref	
0	7 (2.9)	9 (1.6)	0.50	0.13–1.93	.32
1	110 (46.2)	213 (37.2)	1.53	0.75–3.10	.24
2–3	56 (23.5)	186 (32.5)	2.27	1.09–4.75	.029 ^a
≥4	37 (15.5)	90 (15.7)	1.15	0.52–2.55	.73
Unknown	11 (4.6)	24 (4.2)	1.01	0.35–2.91	.98
Treatment factors					
Chemotherapy					
No	209 (87.8)	228 (39.9)		Ref	
Yes	29 (12.2)	344 (60.1)	12.93	8.20–20.4	<.001 ^a

Abbreviation: RT, radiation therapy.

^aStatistically significant.

eTable 2. Multivariable Cox Proportional Hazards Model for Overall Survival in Patients Who Underwent Surgery

	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P Value
Sociodemographic factors		
Age	1.04 (1.03–1.05)	<.001 ^a
Charlson/Deyo comorbidity score		
0	Ref	
1	1.41 (1.10–1.81)	.007 ^a
≥2	1.82 (1.26–2.62)	.001 ^a
Facility type		
Community/Comprehensive community	Ref	
Academic/Research	0.79 (0.62–1.00)	.050
Integrated health network	0.78 (0.54–1.12)	.18
Pathologic factors		
Tumor size		
0–4.0 cm	Ref	
≥4.1 cm	1.60 (1.27–2.02)	<.001 ^a
Unknown	0.88 (0.57–1.34)	.54
Positive regional lymph nodes		
Not examined	Ref	
0	0.24 (0.05–1.26)	.092 ^a
1	0.94 (0.37–2.36)	.891
2–3	1.64 (0.66–4.11)	.29
≥4	2.84 (1.11–7.27)	.030 ^a
Unknown	1.43 (0.77–2.67)	.26
Treatment factors		
Radiation therapy		
No	Ref	
Yes	0.78 (0.61–0.99)	.048 ^a

^aStatistically significant.

eTable 3. Multivariable Cox Proportional Hazard Models for Overall Survival in Patients Who Did Not Undergo Surgery

	Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	P Value
Sociodemographic factors		
Age	1.03 (1.01–1.04)	<.001 ^a
Insurance status		
Government	Ref	
Private	0.52 (0.36–0.76)	.001 ^a
Uninsured	0.48 (0.24–0.97)	.041 ^a
Unknown	0.30 (0.07–1.21)	.089
Median income (residential area)		
<\$38,000	Ref	
\$38,000–\$47,999	0.60 (0.41–0.90)	.013 ^a
\$48,000–\$62,999	0.74 (0.50–1.08)	.12
≥\$63,000	0.70 (0.48–1.01)	.057
Unknown	1.65 (0.64–4.28)	.30
Pathologic factors		
Tumor size		
0–4.0 cm	Ref	
≥4.1 cm	1.50 (1.04–2.15)	.029 ^a
Unknown	1.37 (0.94–2.00)	.099
Treatment factors		
Radiation therapy		
No	Ref	
Yes	0.66 (0.47–0.94)	.019 ^a

^aStatistically significant.