RESEARCH

BMC Gastroenterology



A postsurgical prognostic nomogram for patients with lymph node positive rectosigmoid junction adenocarcinoma



Wu Yanlong¹, Wu Yunxiao² and Wang Yibing^{3*}

Abstract

Objective The definition of rectosigmoid junction (RSJ) is still in debate. The treatment and prognosis of patients with rectosigmoid junction cancer (RSJC) and positive lymph nodes (PLN-RSJCs) are mostly based on the American Joint Committee on Cancer (AJCC) staging system. Our study aims to assist clinicians in creating a more intuitive and accurate nomogram model for PLN-RSJCs for the prediction of patient overall survival (OS) after surgery.

Methods Based on the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database, we extracted 3384 patients with PLN-RSJCs and randomly divided them into development (n = 2344) and validation (n = 1004) cohorts at a ratio of 7:3. Using univariate and multivariate COX regression analysis, we identified independent risk factors associated with OS in PLN-RSJCs in the development cohort, which were further used to establish a nomogram model. To verify the accuracy of the model, the concordance index (C-index), receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves, calibration curves, and an internal validation cohort have been employed. Decision curve analysis (DCA) was used to assess the clinical applicability and benefits of the generated model. Survival curves of the low- and high-risk groups were calculated using the Kaplan–Meier method together with the log-rank test.

Results Age, marital, chemotherapy, AJCC stage, T and N stage of TNM system, tumor size, and regional lymph nodes were selected as independent risk factors and included in the nomogram model. The C-index of this nomogram in the development (0.751;0.737–0.765) and validation cohorts (0.750;0.764–0.736) were more significant than that of the AJCC 7th staging system (0.681; 0.665–0.697). The ROC curve with the calculated area under the curve (AUC) in the development cohort was 0.845,0.808 and 0.800 for 1-year, 3-year and 5-year OS, AUC in the validation cohort was 0.815,0.833 and 0.814 for 1-year, 3-year and 5-year, respectively. The calibration plots of both cohorts for 1-year, 3-year and 5-year OS all demonstrated good agreement between actual clinical observations and predicted outcomes. In the development cohort, the DCA showed that the nomogram prediction model is more advantageous for clinical application than the AJCC 7th staging system. Kaplan–Meier curves in the low and high groups showed significant difference in patient OS.

*Correspondence: Wang Yibing house911cuddy@126.com ¹Department of Medical Records, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Nanchang, China ²Department of Neurosurgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Nanchang, China

³Department of Emergency, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University, Nanchang, China



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicate of therwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Conclusions We established an accurate nomogram model for PLN-RSJCs, intended to support clinicians in the treatment and follow-up of patients.

Keywords Nomogram, Postsurgical prognostic, Rectosigmoid junction adenocarcinoma

Introduction

According to the 2022 Cancer Statistics Report, about 609,360 people died from cancer in the United States. Colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of death, after lung cancer [1]. Roughly, 140 people die of colorectal cancer every day in the United States. [1]. The rectosigmoid junction (RSJ) is the connection between the sigmoid colon and the upper rectum [2, 3]. However, its exact definition is still debatable [4]. Anatomically, the RSJ is the tissue at the end of the sigmoid colon [5], yet some experts still prefer to attribute RSJ to the rectum, as it shares blood vessels and other support with the upper rectum [6]. In general, RSJ is usually attributed to the upper rectum, according to the AJCC staging system [7]. Due to the controversial location of RSJ and the relative rarity RSJ adenocarcinoma (RSJC), relevant clinical data is scarce, making its treatment difficult and patient prognosis hard to predict. The purpose of our study is to generate a reliable RSJC risk prediction model, that supports the prediction of the prognosis of RSJC patients with positive lymph nodes (PLN-RSJCs) after surgery.

The nomogram model is a digital simulation tool widely used in clinical research and its results can be recognized by the public [8–10]. By scoring each single predictor, total scores can be obtained in different stages of the disease, enabling the prognosis prediction in a more intuitive manner [11]. A model for the perioperative treatment of locally advanced rectosigmoid colon has been previously established by Chao Zhang and colleagues [12]. This study showed that the current perioperative neoadjuvant therapy for rectal cancer is different from that of RSJC, and proved that lymph node positivity is an important factor in the selection of treatment for patients with locally advanced RSJC [12].

The Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database, established by the National Cancer Institute (NCI), collects data on cancer diagnosis, treatment, and survival in the U.S. population. On average, around 400,000 cancer cases are collected each year, providing researchers with a large amount of retrospective data. The SEER medical database has been use in clinical research aiming at improving the outcome of colorectal cancer patients [13].

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to establish a prognostic model for PLN-RSJCs after surgery.

Methods

Patient selection and data processing

Data from PLN-RSJCs patients were selected from the SEER database using the SEER*Stat software version 8.4.0 (www.seer.cancer.gov/seerstat). Patients were selected based on the third edition of the International Classification of Diseases for Oncology (ICD-O-3). Inclusion criteria comprised: surgery performed, including sigmoidectomy, prerectotomy or proctosigmoidectomy; histologic type: adenocarcinoma M8140/3(morphological coding for adenocarcinoma diagnosis); and positive regional nodes \geq 1. Exclusion criteria were as follows: race unknown, marital status unknown; radiation unknown; summary stage unknown; tumor size unknown; Tx; Nx; M1 and Mx. According to the above criteria, we included 3348 eligible PLN-RSJCs patients in our retrospective study. The data were then randomly split into development (n=2344) and validation (n=1004) cohort at a ratio of 7:3 (Fig. 1).

Variables defined

The variables in the selected cohort included: age, sex, race, marital, AJCC stage (7th), T stage, N stage, summary stage, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, tumor size, examined and positive regional nodes. To facilitate the analysis, several continuous variables (age, tumor size, examined regional nodes, and positive regional nodes positive) were transformed into categorical variables using the X-Tile software (Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA), which calculates the best cutoff of the continuous variables: age (<45, 45-64, 65-84, and \geq 85), tumor size (\leq 3.7 cm, 3.8–5.6 cm, \geq 5.7 cm), examined regional nodes $(1-12, 13-16, \ge 17)$, positive regional nodes $(1-3, 4-8, \ge 9)$. Sex was divided into female and male, and race included White, Black, Asian or pacific islander, and American Indian or Alaska native. We defined marital as single, married, divorced (or separated), widowed and unmarried or domestic partner.

Statistical analysis

For the analysis of continuous and categorical variables in both development and validation cohort, the T and Chi-square tests were used. Univariate COX regression was used to extract the potential significant predictors in the development cohort. Predictors with p value lower than 0.05 were included in the multivariate COX



Fig.1 Data screening flow chart

proportional risk regression model. The independent prognostic factors with p lower 0.05 in the multivariate COX model were incorporated into the nomogram model, to establish a visual prediction model to evaluate the 1-year, 3-year and 5-year survival rates of patients. Hazard ratios and 95% confidence intervals are presented for all results.

To assess the performance of the model, we used concordance index (C-index) and receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves with the calculated area under the curve (AUC). Furthermore, calibration plots were used to evaluate the consistency of predicted and actual survival time at 1-year, 3-year and 5-year points in time. The clinical applicability and benefits of the prediction model were estimated using decision curve analyses (DCA). Finally, the development cohort was divided in two risk groups, based on the respective total points. The Kaplan–Meier method, combined with the log-rank test, was applied to analyze the differences in the OS between the low- and high-risk groups. Statistical analysis was performed with the SPSS 22.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY) and R version 4.2.0 software.

Results

Characterization of eligible patients

The PLN-RSJCs patients (n = 3348) from the SEER database were randomly divided at a ratio of 7:3 into development (n = 2344) and validation (n = 1004) cohort. A summary of the demographic and clinicopathological characteristics of the study population is presented in Table 1. No significant differences were observed in any of the considered parameters between the two cohorts.

Prognostic factors in development cohort

Univariate and multivariate analyses were applied to extract independent prognostic factors from the

Table 1 Demographics and clinical characteristics of eligible patients

Characteristics	Total cohort N(%)	Development cohort N (%)	Validation cohort N (%)	P-value
Number of patients	3348	2344(70%)	1004(30%)	
Age				0.732
<45	330(9.9%)	236(10.1%)	94(9.3%)	
45–64	1613(48.1%)	1128(48.1%)	485(48.5%)	
65–84	1234(36.9)	866(36.9)	368(36.7%)	
≥85	171(5.1%)	114(5.9%)	57(5.7%)	
Sex				0.396
Female	1480(44.2%)	1025(43.7%)	455(45.3%)	
Male	1868(55.8%)	1319(56.3%)	549(54.7%)	
Race				0.343
White	2623(78.3%)	1852(79.0%)	771(76.8%)	
Black	292(8.7%)	202(8.6%)	90(9.0%)	
Asian or Pacific Islander	412(12.3%)	274(11.8%)	138(13.7%)	
American Indian/Alaska Native	21(0.7%)	16(0.7%)	5(0.5%)	
Marital				0.513
Single	651(19.5%)	471(20.1%)	180(17.9%)	
Married	1923(57.4%)	1330(56.7%)	593(59.1%)	
Divorced or Separated	355(10.6%)	255(10.9%)	100(10%)	
Widowed	404(12.1%)	278(11.9%)	126(12.5%)	
Unmarried or Domestic Partner	15(0.4%)	10(0.4%)	5(0.5%)	
Radiation				0.559
No	2586(77.2%)	1817(77.5%)	769(76.6%)	
Yes	762(22.8%)	527(22.5%)	235(23.4%)	
Chemotherapy				0.204
No	968(28.9%)	693(2936%)	275(27.4%)	
Yes	2380(71.1)	1651(70.4%)	729(72.6%)	
Summary_stage				0.595
Regional	2551(76.2%)	1780(75.9%)	771(76.8%)	
Distant	797(23.8%)	564(24.1%)	233(23.2%)	
AJCC_Stage				0.086
IIIA	330(9.9%)	228(9.7%)	102(10.2)	
IIIB	1653(49.3%)	1168(49.8%)	485(48.3%)	
IIIC	625(18.7%)	417(17.8%)	208(20.7%)	
IVA	489(14.6%)	340(14.5%)	149(14.8%)	
IVB	251(7.5%)	191(8.2%)	60(6.0%)	
T			/	0.918
11	66(2.0%)	4/(2.0%)	19(1.9%)	
12	351(10.5%)	244(10.4%)	10/(10./%)	
13	2210(66.0%)	1555(66.3%)	655(65.2%)	
14a	497(14.8%)	347(14.8%)	150(15.0%)	
14b	224(6./%)	151(6.5%)	/3(/.2%)	0.706
N NIT-	001/07 50/)		264(26.20/)	0.726
N1b	921(27.5%) 086(20.5%)	05/(28.U%)	204(20.3%)	
	900(29.3%) E(0.104)	093(29.7%)	291(29.0%)	
	D(U.1%)	3(U.1%)	∠(U.Z%)	
NDh	720(21.7%)	470(21.370)	220(22./ %)	
	/ IU(21.2%)	491(20.9%)	219(21.070)	

Characteristics	Total cohort N(%)	Development cohort N (%)	Validation cohort N (%)	P-value
Tumor_size				0.924
≤3.7 cm	849(25.4%)	590(25.2%)	259(25.8%)	
3.8–5.6 cm	1579(47.1%)	1107(47.2%)	472(47.0%)	
≥ 5.7 cm	920(27.5%)	647(27.6%)	273(27.2%)	
Regional_nodes_examined				0.640
1–12	686(20.5%)	489(21.9%)	197(19.6%)	
13–16	842(25.1%)	592(25.3%)	250(24.9%)	
≥17	1820(56.4%)	1263(53.8%)	557(55.5%)	
Regional_nodes_positive				0.345
1–3	1913(57.1%)	1358(57.9%)	555(55.3%)	
4–8	976(29.2%)	668(28.5%)	308(30.7%)	
≤9	459(13.7%)	318(13.6%)	141(14.0%)	

development cohort. The results revealed that age, marital, chemotherapy, AJCC stage, T stage, N stage, tumor size, number of examined regional nodes were independent prognostic factors for PLN-RSJCs patients (Table 2).

Nomogram construction

Based on the previous results of multivariate analysis in the development cohort, we integrated these independent prognostic factors to establish a nomogram model for OS prediction in PLN-RSJCs (Fig. 2). Each variable in the nomogram was assigned a corresponding score from 0 to 100, based on the contribution to the nomogram model (Table 3). Therefore, for each patient we obtained a total number of points by adding the scores in each subgroup. By this method, we were able to predict the possibility of 1-year, 3 year, and 5-year OS. Higher scores were negatively associated with patient prognosis.

Validation of the nomogram

In the development cohort, the calculated C-index of the generated nomogram for patient OS was 0.751 (0.737–0.765), which was more significant than that of the 7th AJCC stage 0.681 (0.665–0.697). Additionally, the performances of the nomogram were assessed by ROC curves, with AUC values of 0.845, 0.808 and 0.800 for 1-year, 3-year and 5-year OS, respectively (Fig. 3 A). Moreover, calibration plots for 1-year, 3-year and 5-year OS in the development cohort, confirmed the correlation between actual observations and predicted outcomes (Fig. 4 A-C). Decision curve analysis further showed that this nomogram prediction model performs better in terms of clinical prediction than of the 7th AJCC staging system (Fig. 5). In addition, an internal verification of the nomogram was performed in the validation cohort to evaluate its applicability. In this cohort, the calculated C-index was 0.750 (0.764–0.736), with AUC values of 0.815, 0.833 and 0.814 for 1-year, 3-year and 5-year OS, respectively (Fig. 3 B). As previously observed for the development cohort, the calibration curve confirmed the positive correlation between nomogram prediction and actual patient outcome (Fig. 4 D-F).

Performance of the nomogram in patient of low risk group and high risk group

The development cohort was stratified in two subgroups, according to the obtained score: low risk group: score < 94 points; high risk group: score \geq 94 points. Kaplan–Meier survival curves showed a significant difference in OS between the two groups (P < 0.05; Fig. 6).

Discussion

In ICD-O-3, the location codes for sigmoid colon, rectosigmoid junction and rectal cancers are, respectively, C18, C19 and C20, suggesting distinct anatomical tissues, and thus, different associated pathologies [14]. However, most clinical systems, such as the AJCC system, classify diseases of the rectosigmoid junction as rectal disease. A conclusive definition of RSJ is yet to be reached by the scientific and clinical community. However, it has been shown that RSJC is more prone to present lymphatic metastasis than cancer in the sigmoid and the rectum [15], and that the first is more likely to originate distant metastases than the latter [16]. Despite being from the same pathological subtype, rectosigmoid

Page 6 of 11

Characteristics Univariate analysis P-value Multivariate analysis P-value HR (95%CI) HR (95%CI) Age <45 Ref Ref 45-64 0.978 (0.792-1.210) 0.844 1.124(0.906-1.394) 0.287 65-84 1.541(1.247-1.903) < 0.001* 1.767(1.416-2.205) < 0.001* >=85 2.975(2.256-3.925) < 0.001* 2.998(2.193-4.099) < 0.001* Sex Female Ref Male 1.007(0.898-1.129) 0.906 Race Ref Ref White < 0.001* 1.188(0.980-1.440) 0.079 Black 1.392(1.153-1.681) Asian or Pacific Islander 0.978(0.814-1.174) 0.810 1.008(0.837-1.212) 0.937 American Indian/Alaska Native 0.510(0.210-1.240) 0.552(0.229-1.330) 0.185 0.138 Marital Ref Ref Single Married 0.712(0.615-0.824) < 0.001* 0.741(0.637-0.862) < 0.001* Divorced or Separated 1.111(0.908-1.357) 0.309 1.138(0.925-1.398) 0.220 Widowed 1.370(1.137-1.652) < 0.001* 0.854(0.694-1.051) 0.136 Unmarried or Domestic Partner 1.099(0.454-2.664) 0.834 1.592(0.652-3.883) 0.307 Radiation No Ref Ref 0.721 Yes 0.739(0.641-0.851) < 0.001* 1.028(0.882-1.199) Chemotherapy Ref Ref No < 0.001* 0.468(0.408-0.537) < 0.001* Yes 0.498(0.443-0.560) Summary_stage Ref Regional Ref Distant 3.356(2.979-3.781) < 0.001* 1.122(0.673-1.871) 0.689 AJCC_Stage IIIA Ref Ref IIIB < 0.001* 1.007(0.596-1.703) 0.979 2.116(1.582-2.831) IIIC 3.112(2.289-4.229) < 0.001* 1.080(0.606-1.912) 0.793 IVA 6.139(4.529-8.320) < 0.001* 2.816(1.322-5.996) 0.007* IVB 10.779(7.854-14.792) < 0.001* 4.024(1.888-8.576) < 0.001* т Ref Ref Τ1 1.012(0.532-1.925) 0.971 0.971(0.507-1.861) 0.929 T2 T3 2.440(1.346-4.424) 0.003* 1.830(0.871-3.847) 0.111 T4a 4.553(2.487-8.334) < 0.001* 2.832(1.333-6.017) 0.007* 5.213(2.806-9.683) < 0.001* 2.393(1.100-5.205) 0.028* T4b Ν Ref Ref N1a N1b 1.272(1.086-1.492) 0.003* 1.229(1.046-1.443) 0.012* N1c 2.212(0.709-6.903) 0.171 4.400(1.329-14.564) 0.015* N2a < 0.001* 2.021(0.579-7.050) 0.270 1.368(1.153-1.624) N2b 2.140(1.820-2.516) < 0.001* 2.563(0.733-8.964) 0.141

Table 2 Univariate and multivariate regression analyses for OS

Table 2 (continued)

Characteristics

	HR (95%CI)		HR (95%CI)	
Tumor_size				
≤3.7 cm	Ref		Ref	
3.8–5.6 cm	1.268(1.094–1.470)	0.002*	1.008(0.864–1.175)	0.919
≥ 5.7 cm	1.711(1.461-2.003)	< 0.001*	1.194(1.007-1.416)	0.040*
Regional_nodes_examined				
1–12	Ref		Ref	
13–16	0.703(0.599–0.825)	< 0.001*	0.742(0.630-0.874)	< 0.001*
≥17	0.652(0.568–0.748)	< 0.001*	0.590(0.509–0.685)	< 0.001*
Regional_nodes_positive				
1–3	Ref		Ref	
4–8	2.061(1.131-1.469)	< 0.001*	0.620(0.180-2.140)	0.450
≥9	2.061(1.765-2.407)	< 0.001*	0.844(0.243–2.930)	0.789

* Statistical significance



junction and rectal tumors are associated with different patient OS [15, 17], thus requiring distinct treatment modalities [18–20].

A nomogram risk prediction model for colorectal cancer patients has been developed, however lacking data on its pathological type and on the prognosis of

Table 3 Nomogram scoring system

Age Marital <45 0 Single 21 45-64 7 Married 0 $5-84$ 38 Divorced or Separated 28 285 75 Widowed 10 285 75 Widowed 10 Chemotherapy ACC Stage 49 No 49 IIIA 0 Yes 0 IIIB 1 No 49 IIIA 0 Yes 0 IIB 1 T1 3 Nta 100 T2 0 Ntb 49 T4a 71 N2a 15 T4b 63 N2b 43 T4a 71 N2a 15 T4b 63 N2b 43 Storm 0 1-12 34 38/cm5.5cm 0 217 0 0.9 145 0.9 66 0.8<	Variables	points	Variables	points
<450Single2145-647Mariad065-8438Wored or Separated2828575Widowed1028575Widowed10ChemotherapyKCS Sage1No49IIIA0Yes0IIIC7Yes0IIIC7T3Na071110740Na10743Na107410Na107410Na107410Na107410Na107410Na10741110107412Na107413131475141314761313-1614831313-161475141214901413-161414151414151414141613141417141414181414141914141419141414101414141415141415141414161414141714 <t< td=""><td>Age</td><td></td><td>Marital</td><td></td></t<>	Age		Marital	
45-647Married or Separated06-8436Divorced or Separated28328575Widowed or Domestic Partner49Hornorestic Partner49Hornorestic Partner49No49IIIANo49IIIA1Yes0IIIA7No49IIIA1Yes0IIIA7TNaNa10T3Na10T3Na10TA0Na10Ta6Na10Ta6Na10Ta6Na10Ta0Na10Ta6Na10Ta0Na10Ta10Na10Sa cm01210Sa cm01210Sa cm121210Q14010Q15010Q16010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10010Q10	<45	0	Single	21
65-8438Divorced or Separated98≥S575Widoved10≥S6Widoved10Umarried or Domestic Partner80No49IIIA0Yes0IIB10Yes0IIB10TIIC7010TNa10010T3Na10T3Na10TA3Na10TA3Na10Ta3Na10Ta3Na10Ta3Na10Ta3Na10Ta3Na10Ta3Na10Ta10Na10Ta12Na10Ta131210Sa/m5cm013-1614Sa/m5cm121710Sa/m5cm130.9100,9140.9100,7260.4110,62010.5110,73300.1120,4200.412120,4200.412120,51414141214151414121516130.4120,6131414141414141414	45-64	7	Married	0
≥8575Widowed96Chemotherapy7676No49118Yes0118Yes0118T110TNoTNoTNoT100100100100100100100100100101100101100102100103100104100105100105100106100107100108100109100100100100100100100100100100<	65–84	38	Divorced or Separated	28
ChemeterHumanied or Domestic PatternACC StageNo9III0No9III0IIIIIIIII10IIIIIIIII70IIIIIIIII10IIIIIIIII10TIIIIII10TIIIIII10TIIIIIII10TA3Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10TA10Na10S7m013-1610S5m1217010S5m15161008195081008195081009200220042002200510102004200220051010100510101005101010051010100510101005101010051010100510<	≥85	75	Widowed	10
ChemotherapyAGC StageNo99IIA Constant91Yes99IIA Constant91YesIIA Constant9191IIIIA Constant9191TIIA Constant9191T3Na91Ta3Na91Ta63Na91Tab63Na91SJ Cm01-1291SJ Cm01-1291SJ Cm121491SJ Cm121491SJ Cm021791SJ Cm121291SJ Cm121491SJ Cm121491SJ Cm121491SJ Cm121491SJ Cm121491SJ Cm121491SJ Cm131491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm131491SJ Cm131491SJ Cm131491SJ Cm131491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm141491SJ Cm141491 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>Unmarried or Domestic Partner</td><td>49</td></t<>			Unmarried or Domestic Partner	49
No 49 IIIA 0 Yes 0 IIIB 1 Yes 0 IIB 1 IIIC 7 7 IVA 77 70 VB 100 7 T N 100 T N 100 T2 0 NIb 100 T2 0 NIb 14 T3 42 NIc 89 T4a 71 N2a 15 Tumor size Regional nodes examined 15 \$37 cm 0 1-12 34 38 cm-56 cm 0 13-16 14 \$57 cm 12 245 14 0.9 145 0.9 16 0.8 195 0.8 116 0.7 250 06 171 0.6 37 0.5 191 0.4 289 0.2 210 210	Chemotherapy		AJCC Stage	
Yes0IIB1IIC7IIC7IIC7IVA70T8T8T20N1aT342T4a71T4b63T4b63S2,Con0S3,Con01212S3,Con0131-12S3,Con01412S3,Con12S1,Con12S4,Con01412S1,Con12S1,Con12S1,Con12S1,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con12S2,Con13S2,Con14S314S3,Con13S3,Con13S3,Con13S414S414S414S3,Con14S3,Con14S3,Con13S414S414S414S414S514S414S513S414S414S514S414S513S514S414S	No	49	IIIA	0
IICIIC9IVIA70IVIV10IT3N1a0T20N1b14T32N1c9T4730N2a15T4b63N2b143T4b63N2b14333 cm01-12343433 cm01-12143435 cm021701425 cm122170140.91450.8161170.62500.60.71470.62500.617170.52100.519140.4300.221210.5300.421210.6300.322210.7300.322210.8300.221210.1300.221210.2300.122210.3300.322210.4780.331310.5313232310.6323232310.7433432320.8303233310.9323233310.1353434340.23434 <td>Yes</td> <td>0</td> <td>IIIB</td> <td>1</td>	Yes	0	IIIB	1
NANANATNNTNNT20NNT342NNT4a7N2aNT4a7NaNTumor sizeRegional odes examinedN\$37 cm01-12N\$38 cm-5.6 cm013-16N\$57 cm013-16N\$57 cm12217N0151414\$57 cm12217N0151414\$69081161026071470.52010.5140.63070.61910.4290.41200.33070.32100.4200.42100.52740.32100.6370.32100.7280.42100.83070.32100.92100.32100.12100.32100.22100.32100.33070.32100.42100.42100.52100.32100.61300.31010.71401201200.81401201200.91401201200.1140120120 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>IIIC</td><td>7</td></t<>			IIIC	7
Image: Note of the section of the			IVA	77
TNI3Nia0T20Nib14T340Nib89T4a71Na15T4b63Na31Bejonal nodes examinedSign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2">Sign colspan="2"\$37 cn01-1234\$37 cn01-1234\$25 cn122170\$25 cn1232160.81950.81160.72600.71470.80.90.61470.42000.51410.5370.32280.40.50.12100.30.70.12100.4300.12100.5780.41910.6130.12100.7280.41200.8100.12100.9280.11200.1200.12100.51340.31910.61920.31920.71930.12100.71940.11910.71940.11910.71940.11910.71940.11910.71940.11910.71941941910.7194 <td></td> <td></td> <td>IVB</td> <td>100</td>			IVB	100
TI3Nia0T20Nib14T342Nic89T4a71N2a15T4b63N2b15Tumor sizeRejonal nodes examined34\$37 cm01-1234\$57 cm122170\$57 cm1221701Ver Survival96166160.81950.96160.81950.96160.72600.71910.62500.61910.42890.42180.43070.32180.53700.12180.42890.42190.53600.12180.53600.12180.63600.12180.73630.42180.8780.32190.71930.12100.71940.32100.71930.12100.71940.32100.71950.31910.71930.12100.81941921910.91930.11910.91930.11910.91930.11910.91930.11910.91930.11910.91930.1 </td <td>т</td> <td></td> <td>Ν</td> <td></td>	т		Ν	
T20Nb14T342N1c89T4a71N2a51T4b71N2a53Tumor sizeBegonancesexamined43≤37 cm01-123438 cm-5.6 cm03-1614≥5.7 cm12≥1701-Year Survival3434660.81950.966670.72500.61711410.62500.61711410.63000.51911420.42500.61711410.52710.51911420.42890.42102110.33070.22122120.12500.12122120.13200.22132140.42800.42102140.5320.22142140.7360.12142140.9280.41242140.9280.4322140.9330.3314314	T1	3	N1a	0
T342Nt89T4a71Na15T4b63Nab30Bejonal nodes examinedTuror sizeRegional nodes examined34\$3 cm01-1234\$3 cm013-1634\$25 cm122731TVer survivalSear Societt340.91450.9160.72260.71470.62500.61710.52710.51910.43070.32100.5370.22100.43070.32100.23270.22470.1300.12100.2370.32100.4360.12100.7360.41720.8780.31900.71930.31900.71941931910.71930.31910.71941921910.71930.31910.71930.31910.71941921910.71930.31910.71941921910.71931931910.71941911910.71931931910.71941931910.7194194 </td <td>T2</td> <td>0</td> <td>N1b</td> <td>14</td>	T2	0	N1b	14
T4a71N2a15T4b63N2b43Turrer sizeRegional odes examined34§ 3.7 cm01-12343.8 cm-5.6 cm03-1634b.5.7 cm122170T-Fer Survival93-16340.91450.9660.81950.81160.72260.71470.625.7 cm200660.81950.81010.72010.51010.62010.61010.72010.52010.62010.42020.72012020.40.33070.32030.42030.12030.52122220.6230.1210.7280.30.30.8780.3210.9280.3210.721240.832330.5154	T3	42	N1c	89
T4b63N2b93 F urrer sizeRejonal nodes examined≤3.7 cm01-123438 cm-5.6 cm03-1614≥5.7 cm122170 F ver survival 9494950.91450.9660.81950.81160.72260.61710.62500.61910.52710.51910.42890.42010.33070.12110.43200.12120.7280.12130.8780.31920.98.30.31900.71900.31900.71900.31900.71900.11900.71900.11900.61310.11900.5154154100	T4a	71	N2a	15
FunctionRegional nodes examined≤37 cm01-123438 cm-5.6 cm013-1614≥5.7 cm1221701-Fur Survival34 cm Survival640.91450.9640.7260.71470.62500.61710.52710.51910.42890.42100.33070.32280.23200.12120.3360.12120.42890.42100.5370.32160.4360.12180.5780.41200.61330.11200.5154154144	T4b	63	N2b	43
≤37 cm01-23438 cm-56 cm013-1614≥57 cm12≥1701-Year Survival3-Year Survival660.91450.9660.81950.81160.72260.71470.62500.61710.52710.51910.42890.42100.33070.32280.23270.12470.1255-Year survival2470.9280.41720.9280.41720.9280.11720.9280.31900.71090.31200.61330.12100.5154154154	Tumor size		Regional nodes examined	
A D 13–16 14 ≥5.7 cm 12 ≥17 0 I-Year Survival Jear Survival 0 0.9 145 0.9 66 0.8 195 0.8 116 0.7 260 0.7 147 0.6 250 0.7 147 0.5 271 0.5 191 0.4 289 0.4 210 0.3 307 0.3 244 0.2 327 0.2 247 0.1 350 11 211 5-Year survival 27 24 24 0.9 28 0.4 210 0.1 350 11 211 0.9 28 0.4 210 0.8 0.4 200 210 0.7 109 0.2 210 0.6 133 0.1 213 0.5 154 14 14	≤3.7 cm	0	1–12	34
▶5.7 cm 12 ▶17 ▶17 ▶17 1.9 145 0.9 66 0.8 195 0.8 116 0.7 226 0.7 147 0.6 50 0.7 147 0.5 271 0.5 191 0.4 289 0.4 210 0.3 307 0.3 247 0.1 350 0.1 211 0.4 289 0.4 210 0.1 350 0.1 211 0.4 289 0.1 211 0.1 350 0.1 211 0.1 350 0.1 111 0.9 8 0.4 120 0.7 109 0.3 101 0.7 103 0.1 120 0.6 133 0.1 231 0.5 154 140 141	3.8 cm-5.6 cm	0	13–16	14
I-Year Survival JYear Survival Jest Jest Sear Survival 66 66 0.9 145 0.9 116 116 116 116 0.8 195 0.8 116 116 116 116 0.7 226 0.7 147 147 147 147 0.6 250 0.6 0.7 117 147 0.5 271 0.5 191 191 0.4 289 0.4 210 210 0.3 307 0.3 228 247 0.1 350 0.1 210 210 0.2 327 0.2 247 210 0.1 350 0.1 210 210 0.9 28 0.4 120 211 0.9 28 0.1 120 211 0.9 28 0.4 120 110 0.9 28 0.4 210 110 0.7 109 0.2 210 110	≥ 5.7 cm	12	≥17	0
0.91450.9660.81950.81160.72260.71470.62500.61710.52710.51910.42890.42100.33070.32280.23270.22470.13500.1210S-Year survival90.9280.41720.9280.12100.9280.11720.9280.41720.9190.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154154154	1-Year Survival		3-Year Survival	
0.81950.81160.72260.71470.62500.61710.52710.51910.42890.42100.33070.32280.23270.22470.13500.1271S-Year survival5-Year survival1720.9280.41720.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154154154	0.9	145	0.9	66
0.72260.71470.62500.61710.52710.51910.42890.42100.33070.32810.23270.22470.13500.1271S-Year survival5-Year survival1720.9280.41900.71090.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154154154	0.8	195	0.8	116
0.62500.61710.52710.51910.42890.42100.33070.32810.23270.22470.13500.1271S-Year survival5-Year survival1720.9280.41720.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154154154	0.7	226	0.7	147
0.52710.51910.42890.42100.33070.32280.23270.22470.13500.1271 5-Year survival 5-Year survival1720.9280.41720.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154154154	0.6	250	0.6	171
0.42890.42100.33070.32280.23270.22470.13500.1271 5-Year survival 0.9280.41720.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154154154	0.5	271	0.5	191
0.3 307 0.3 228 0.2 327 0.2 247 0.1 350 0.1 271 5-Year survival 0.9 28 0.4 172 0.8 78 0.3 190 0.7 109 0.2 210 0.6 133 0.1 233 0.5 154 154	0.4	289	0.4	210
0.23270.22470.13500.12715-Year survival5-Year survival1720.9280.41720.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.515414	0.3	307	0.3	228
0.13500.1271 5-Year survival5-Year survival 1720.9280.41720.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.51541414	0.2	327	0.2	247
5-Year survival 5-Year survival 0.9 28 0.4 172 0.8 78 0.3 190 0.7 109 0.2 210 0.6 133 0.1 233 0.5 154 154 154	0.1	350	0.1	271
0.9280.41720.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154154172	5-Year survival		5-Year survival	
0.8780.31900.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154	0.9	28	0.4	172
0.71090.22100.61330.12330.5154	0.8	78	0.3	190
0.6 133 0.1 233 0.5 154	0.7	109	0.2	210
0.5 154	0.6	133	0.1	233
	0.5	154		

lymph node positive patients [21–23]. Moreover, these reports have not distinguished RSJ from coloretal cancer [24, 25]. A study by B. Morcos et al. showed that the number of positive lymph nodes during surgery directly affects the choice of neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy after colorectal cancer surgery [26]. Our study established a risk assessment of the presence of positive lymph nodes (PLN) in patients with RSJ adenocarcinoma after surgery. Age, marital, AJCC stage, tumor size, and regional lymph nodes exam were selected as independent risk predictors of PLN-RSJCs. Using these parameters, we validated the nomogram accuracy by C-index, AUC in the ROC, and calibration curves. To evaluate the clinical utility and potential benefits of the model, the decision curve analysis was applied to current study [27]. Overall, our results showed that our newly generated model performs better in the



Fig. 3 ROC curves of the nomogram for 1-year, 3-year and 5-year OS in development cohort (A) and validation cohort (B)



Fig. 4 Calibration plots of development cohort for 1-year(A), 3-year(B) and 5-year(C) OS; calibration plots of validation cohort for 1-year(D),3-year(E) and 5-year (F) OS

prediction of patient outcome than the currently used AJCC staging system.

Still, we acknowledge the limitations of the present study. First, given that the SEER database collects information from the American population, which are mostly Caucasian, the findings may be biased, even though we did not include race as a predictor in our model. Additionally, available data is incomplete namely for initial records. For example, immunohistochemistry results have only been recorded since 2010.



Fig. 5 Decision curve analysis of nomogram and AJCC 7^{th} staging system for the survival prediction of PLN-RSJCs in development cohort(**A**) and validation cohort (**B**). (None: None of the patients have a bad outcome; All: Bad outcomes occur in all patients



Fig. 6 Kaplan–Meier overall survival curves of PLN-RSJCs with different risks stratified by the nomogram

Moreover, detailed therapeutic strategies for patients include chemotherapy plan and dose were not reported in the database. Radiation therapy also includes only radiotherapy sites and some techniques, such as seed implantation and external irradiation. Furthermore, we did not include any data on RSJC-associated tumor markers, such as CEA, Ca199, and Ca242. Finally, our study is limited by two important factors: the lack of analysis of cancer-specific survival (CSS), and the lack of external multi-center validation using patient cohorts in the clinical context. Therefore, additional research is advised to support our preliminary findings.

Acknowledgements

No applicable.

Special statement

All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations.

Authors' contributions

Wu Yanlong and Wang Yibing designed the research study. Wu Yanlong and Wu Yunxiao took responsibility for statistical analyses. Wu Yanlong wrote the manuscript. Wang Yibing evaluated and revised the manuscript. The author(s) read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

This work was supported by the following funds: Jiang xi Youth Science Fundation (20161BAB215250); Youth Fundation of Second Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University (2016YNQN12029); Jiangxi Provincial Health Fund for Traditional Chinese Medicine (2019A027); Jiangxi Health and Family Planning Commission Fundation (202130387).

Availability of data and materials

If anyone wants to request the data from this study, please contact the author named Wu Yan long(wuyanlong578@126.com).

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All methods were carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines and regulations. Ethical approval for study was obtained from second Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University Medical Research Ethics Committee. Informed consent was obtained from all the participants.

We declare that none of the work contained in this manuscript is published in any language or currently under consideration at any other journal, and there are no conflicts of interest to declare. All authors have contributed to read and approved this submitted manuscript in its current form.

Consent for publication

No applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Received: 28 August 2022 Accepted: 9 May 2023 Published online: 18 May 2023

References

- 1. Siegel RL, et al. Cancer statistics, 2022. CA Cancer J Clin. 2022;72(1):7–33.
- D'Souza N, et al. The rectosigmoid problem. Surg Oncol. 2018;27(3):521–5.
- Luna-Abanto J. The rectosigmoid junction: are limits important? Rev Esp Enferm Dig. 2019;111(5):410.
- Massalou D, et al. Is it possible to give a single definition of the rectosigmoid junction? Surg Radiol Anat. 2018;40(4):431–8.
- Shafik A. Rectosigmoid junction anatomical, histological, and radiological studies with special reference to a sphincteric function.pdf. Int J Colorectal Dis. 1999;14:237–44.
- Mukai M, et al. Stage II/III cancer of the rectosigmoid junction: an independent tumor type? Oncol Rep. 2011;26(3):737–41.
- Weiser MR. AJCC 8th Edition: Colorectal Cancer. Ann Surg Oncol. 2018;25(6):1454–5.
- Park SY. Nomogram: An analogue tool to deliver digital knowledge. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2018;155(4):1793.
- 9. Yu C, Zhang Y. Development and validation of prognostic nomogram for young patients with gastric cancer. Ann Transl Med. 2019;7(22):641.

- 10. Wu J, et al. A nomogram for predicting overall survival in patients with low-grade endometrial stromal sarcoma: A population-based analysis. Cancer Commun (Lond). 2020;40(7):301–12.
- 11. Iasonos A, et al. How to build and interpret a nomogram for cancer prognosis. J Clin Oncol. 2008;26(8):1364–70.
- 12. Zhang C, Zhao S, Wang X. A Postsurgical Prognostic Nomogram for Locally Advanced Rectosigmoid Cancer to Assist in Patient Selection for Adjuvant Chemotherapy. Front Oncol. 2021;11:772482.
- Daly MC, Paquette IM. Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) and SEER-Medicare Databases: Use in Clinical Research for Improving Colorectal Cancer Outcomes. Clin Colon Rectal Surg. 2019;32(1):61–8.
- Alves CMM, de Oliveira Prado PC, Bastos RR. Net survival for colorectal cancer in Cuiaba and Varzea Grande (state of Mato Grosso) Brazil. Ecancermedicalscience. 2021;15:1196.
- Falch C, et al. Oncological outcome of carcinomas in the rectosigmoid junction compared to the upper rectum or sigmoid colon - A retrospective cohort study. Eur J Surg Oncol. 2019;45(11):2037–44.
- 16. Majek O, et al. Survival from colorectal cancer in Germany in the early 21st century. Br J Cancer. 2012;106(11):1875–80.
- 17. Cai W, et al. Rectal NETs and rectosigmoid junction NETs may need to be treated differently. Cancer Med. 2020;9(3):971–9.
- Vogel JD, et al. The American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Colon Cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2022;65(2):148–77.
- You YN, et al. The American Society of Colon and Rectal Surgeons Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Management of Rectal Cancer. Dis Colon Rectum. 2020;63(9):1191–222.
- 20. Watanabe T, et al. Japanese Society for Cancer of the Colon and Rectum (JSCCR) guidelines 2016 for the treatment of colorectal cancer. Int J Clin Oncol. 2018;23(1):1–34.
- Yu C, Zhang Y. Establishment of prognostic nomogram for elderly colorectal cancer patients: a SEER database analysis. BMC Gastroenterol. 2020;20(1):347.
- Huang YQ, et al. Development and Validation of a Radiomics Nomogram for Preoperative Prediction of Lymph Node Metastasis in Colorectal Cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2016;34(18):2157–64.
- 23. Lv J, et al. A nomogram model for predicting prognosis of obstructive colorectal cancer. World J Surg Oncol. 2021;19(1):337.
- Kaser SA, et al. Adenocarcinomas of the upper third of the rectum and the rectosigmoid junction seem to have similar prognosis as colon cancers even without radiotherapy, SAKK 40/87. Langenbecks Arch Surg. 2015;400(6):675–82.
- Yamamoto S. Prospective evaluation of laparoscopic surgery for rectosigmoidal and rectal carcinoma.pdf. Laparosc Surg Rectal Carcinoma. 2002;45:1648–54.
- 26. Morcos B, et al. Lymph node yield in rectal cancer surgery: Effect of preoperative chemoradiotherapy. Eur J Surg Oncol (EJSO). 2010;36(4):345–9.
- 27. Zhang Z, et al. Decision curve analysis: a technical note. Ann Transl Med. 2018;6(15):308.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

