RESEARCH



A dynamic nomogram predicting symptomatic pneumonia in patients with lung cancer receiving thoracic radiation



Yawen Zha¹, Jingjing Zhang¹, Xinyu Yan², Chen Yang², Lei Wen³ and Minying Li^{1*}

Abstract

Purpose The most common and potentially fatal side effect of thoracic radiation therapy is radiation pneumonitis (RP). Due to the lack of effective treatments, predicting radiation pneumonitis is crucial. This study aimed to develop a dynamic nomogram to accurately predict symptomatic pneumonitis ($RP \ge 2$) following thoracic radiotherapy for lung cancer patients.

Methods Data from patients with pathologically diagnosed lung cancer at the Zhongshan People's Hospital Department of Radiotherapy for Thoracic Cancer between January 2017 and June 2022 were retrospectively analyzed. Risk factors for radiation pneumonitis were identified through multivariate logistic regression analysis and utilized to construct a dynamic nomogram. The predictive performance of the nomogram was validated using a bootstrapped concordance index and calibration plots.

Results Age, smoking index, chemotherapy, and whole lung V5/MLD were identified as significant factors contributing to the accurate prediction of symptomatic pneumonitis. A dynamic nomogram for symptomatic pneumonitis was developed using these risk factors. The area under the curve was 0.89(95% confidence interval 0.83–0.95). The nomogram demonstrated a concordance index of 0.89(95% confidence interval 0.82–0.95) and was well calibrated. Furthermore, the threshold values for high- risk and low- risk were determined to be 154 using the receiver operating curve.

Conclusions The developed dynamic nomogram offers an accurate and convenient tool for clinical application in predicting the risk of symptomatic pneumonitis in patients with lung cancer undergoing thoracic radiation.

Keywords Dynamic nomogram, Lung cancer, Symptomatic pneumonia

*Correspondence: Minying Li 13928197276@163.com ¹Departments of Thoracic Cancer Radiotherapy, Zhongshan People's Hospital, Zhanshan, China ²Xinxiang Medical University, Xinxiang, China ³Departments of Medical Oncology, Sun Yat-sen University Cancer Center, Guangzhou, China



© The Author(s) 2024. **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 indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise 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.

Introduction

According to the latest global cancer statistics, lung cancer is the second most diagnosed cancer and the leading cause of cancer death, with an estimated 2.2 million new cancer cases and 1.8 million deaths [1]. Radiotherapy has been demonstrated to improve lung cancer survival rates and is widely used for treating various stages of lung cancer [2]. However, radiation pneumonitis (RP), as the most common and potentially fatal toxic side effect, there is no specific treatment for radiation pneumonia, which is mainly treated with corticosteroids, and failure of treatment can lead to death, which can offset the survival benefits of radiotherapy and impact survivors' quality of life.^{3–5} Due to the lack of effective treatments for radiation pneumonitis, establishing an accurate RP prediction model is crucial [6].

Previous studies have shown that clinical factors such as older age, T stage, female, non-smokers, ECOG performance [3, 4], tumor location in the mid-lower lung, chemotherapy, targeted therapies, immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICIs), postoperative radiotherapy (PORT), total lung volume, smaller spared lung volume, and poor pulmonary function are closely related to RP incidence [3, 7–13]. Additionally, whole lung V5, V10, V20, mean lung dose (MLD), and normal tissue complication probability (NTCP) have been reported to be strongly associated with RP occurrence [14-16]. Theoretically, combining multiple risk factors can establish an accurate prediction model. Some researchers have successively developed prediction models combining clinical factors with dosimetric factors based on risk factors, with the highest AUC being 0.853 [17–21]. In recent years, radiomic analysis techniques have been widely used in studying treatment-related adverse reactions, and lung texture characteristics can be obtained using radiomic features, which can be utilized to describe potential RP risk [22, 23]. When combined with radiomic factors, the prediction performance was greatly improved, and the highest AUC could reach 0.94 [24-29]. However, radiomic features are difficult and complex to apply in clinical practice, particularly in primary hospitals.

The initial aim of this study was to validate the predictive performance of a symptomatic pneumonitis model based on lung dosimetry factors combined with clinical characteristics. Additionally, the optimal lung dose threshold was determined using this prediction model. More importantly, a dynamic nomogram was developed, which is a conveniently applicable prediction model integrating clinical and dosimetry characteristics to accurately predict the risk of developing symptomatic pneumonitis. Furthermore, the predictive power of this model is higher than previous models combining dosimetry factors with clinical characteristics.

Materials and methods

A retrospective study was conducted on lung cancer patients who received radiation therapy at the Zhongshan People's Hospital Department of Radiotherapy for Thoracic Cancer between January 2017 and June 2022. Inclusion criteria were: (1) patients with pathologically diagnosed stage I to stage III lung cancer (2), patients who received chest radiation therapy, and (3) no cause of death other than radiation pneumonitis within six months after radiotherapy. Exclusion criteria included: (1) patients who did not complete the entire radiotherapy course due to reasons other than radiation pneumonitis (2), incomplete follow-up data, and (3) radiotherapy interruption for more than one week. One hundred sixty patients were selected for this study based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Radiation pneumonitis was diagnosed and graded according to clinical symptoms, physical examination, and imaging evidence, following the commonadversereactioneventevaluationcriteri a(CTCAE,5.0). Available: http://ctep.cancer.gov/protocolDevelopment/electronic_applications/ctc.htm.) The endpoint of this study was symptomatic pneumonitis, defined as RP grade two or higher occurring within six months of receiving radiation therapy.

Level 1: No symptoms, only clinical or imaging changes, and no treatment is required;

Level 2: Mild symptoms, limited work-related daily activities, need drug treatment;

Level 3: Severe symptoms, personal daily activities are limited, requiring oxygen inhalation;

Level 4: Life-threatening respiratory symptoms that require urgent treatment;

Level 5: Causing the death of the patient.

Enrolled patients were divided into symptomatic pneumonitis and asymptomatic pneumonitis groups, and independent prognostic factors were determined using univariate and multivariate Cox regression analyses. Based on the identified variables, the nomogram was developed and validated to predict symptomatic pneumonitis in patients with lung cancer receiving thoracic radiation. The discrimination, calibration, and clinical utility of the nomogram were evaluated using the concordance index (C-index), receiver operating characteristic(ROC) curve and the area under the curve (AUC), calibration curve, and decision curve analysis (DCA). Furthermore, a web-based survival calculator was developed based on the nomogram. Finally, each patient's risk score was calculated to determine the optimal high and low-risk cut-off values.

Statistical analysis

Univariate logistic regression analysis was used to identify potential risk factors for symptomatic pneumonitis. The chi-square test and t-test were employed to compare the baseline characteristics between the two groups. All statistical analyses were computed using the statistical software (SPSS 25.0). Factors with a *P*-value \leq 0.10 in univariate analysis were included in further multivariate logistic regression analysis. Independent risk factors (OR>1and P<0.05 in multivariate logistic regression) were ultimately used to build the predictive model. A nomogram was then constructed based on the independent risk factors of the multivariate logistic regression model using the "rms" and "DynNom" packages in the R project software (version 6.5). The regression model calculated a score for each variable, and the predicted probability of symptomatic pneumonitis could be derived by summing the scores of the individual variables. The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve with the value of the area under the curve (AUC) was further utilized to appraise the prediction efficiency of the model and calculate the optimal cut-off values of parameters. Calibration assessed the extent to which the predicted probabilities were consistent with the actual outcomes. Additionally, decision curve analysis (DCA) was used to evaluate the clinical utility of nomograms based on net returns to different probability thresholds. The receiver operating curve was employed to further determine the optimal cut-off values for high and low risk, as well as the cut-off values for Vx(percentage of whole lungs volume receiving x Gy) and MLD.

Result

Patient characteristics and incidence of symptomatic pneumonia (Grade \geq 2)

The detailed characteristics of the enrolled population are presented in Tables 1 and 2. A total of 28 patients developed symptomatic pneumonitis, with the median interval from receiving the first radiation treatment to the appearance of symptomatic pneumonitis being 52 days (range, 14–134 days). The occurrence time of radiation pneumonitis is depicted in Fig. 1.

Univariate and multivariate analyses

The results of the univariate analysis are reported in Tables 1 and 2. Potential factors predicting RP \geq 2 were identified as follows: age, smoking index, chemotherapy, PTV, lung V5, V10, V20, V30, V40, MLD of the total lung, and ipsilateral lung (all $P \leq 0.10$). Multivariate analysis indicated that age, smoking index, chemotherapy, lung V5 and MLD of the whole lung were independent predictors of symptomatic pneumonitis (all P < 0.05 and OR>1). These factors were ultimately used to build our nomogram.

Construction and validation of nomogram

Based on the identified independent risk factors, we developed a nomogram to predict symptomatic

pneumonitis in patients with lung cancer receiving thoracic radiation (Fig. 2). The C-index of our nomogram was 0.89 (95% CI: 0.82-0.95), supporting its excellent predictive capacity. Moreover, the ROC curve showed that the AUC value reached 0.89 (95% CI: 0.83-0.95), indicating an excellent distinguishing ability of this model. The comparison of ROC curves between the nomogram and each prognostic factor revealed that the comprehensive model had higher discrimination than any single variable (Fig. 3). Additionally, the calibration curve demonstrated favorable consistency between the predicted symptomatic pneumonitis and the actual observed results, confirming that our nomogram was well calibrated (Fig. 4). DCA displayed the agreeable potential clinical impact of our prediction model (Fig. 5). Furthermore, a risk classification system for symptomatic pneumonitis was generated by recursive partitioning analysis according to the calculated total score of each patient using the nomogram.

Risk classification system

A novel risk classification system for symptomatic pneumonitis is shown in Fig. 6. The optimal cut-off values were determined as 154. All patients were classified into two risk groups: the low-risk group (score 0-154) and the high-risk group (score > 154). The incidence of symptomatic pneumonitis in the low and high-risk groups was 17.85% (5/28) and 82.14% (23/28), respectively. Further analyses demonstrated that our risk classification system effectively differentiated the incidence risk of RP \geq 2 risk levels, facilitating decision-making in clinical practice.

Development of a dynamic web-based calculator

Based on the established nomogram, we developed a dynamic web-based survival calculator to simplify the application of this nomogram (available at https:// rp-2023.shinyapps.io/rp2023/) (Fig. 7). Our web-based calculator for the incidence of symptomatic pneumonitis allows for better identification of patients at high risk for symptomatic pneumonitis and enables timely treatment. By inputting patients' clinical and dosimetry features, it is convenient to predict the probability of symptomatic pneumonitis.

Discussion

Radiation pneumonitis (RP) is the most common side effect following radiotherapy for lung cancer. Currently, there is no effective treatment for RP. Symptomatic pneumonitis can impact a patient's prognosis and reduce their quality of life. It is well-recognized that radiation dose parameters are the most important influencing factors for RP. The lung V20 is a classic and frequently described dosimetry parameter, and limiting lung V20 can significantly reduce the incidence of RP [30]. However, even

patients (rs1-10) preumonia/n=20 (rs1-30) formatic (rs1-30) of (95%C) P QC (95%C) P Conder 133 25 108 1523(2517 0.301 0.344 Male 133 25 108 1523(2517 0.301 0.344 Fermale 27 5 7 0 0111(0060 0.303 0.007 Age - 1102(025.32-291) 0.588 - 1 0.007 Solo 77 5 7 0.107 0.1017 0.0017 Solo 71 23 0.40 - 0.017 0.017 Solo 9 84 - 0.017 0.017 0.017 Solo 9 84 0.017 0.017 0.017 0.017 Solo 9 84 0.017 0.017 0.017 0.017 Solo 9 9 84 0.017 0.017 0.017 Solo 9 9 <t< th=""><th></th><th></th><th>symptomatic</th><th>asymp-</th><th colspan="2">univariate analysis</th><th colspan="2">multivariate analysis</th></t<>			symptomatic	asymp-	univariate analysis		multivariate analysis	
ImpartmentImpartmentImpartmentImpartmentImpartmentImpartmentGender33326820(517-6638)0.34Female27332010008-05080.0016243(1635-25.03)0.007Age75501100085-05080.0016243(1635-25.03)0.007-00755008201-0075001101-0079001111-10010120011 <th></th> <th>patients</th> <th>pneumonia(<i>n</i>=28)</th> <th>tomatic</th> <th>OR (95%CI)</th> <th>, Р</th> <th>OR (95%CI)</th> <th>P</th>		patients	pneumonia(<i>n</i> =28)	tomatic	OR (95%CI)	, Р	OR (95%CI)	P
Gendar 1.852(0.517-6.53) 0.344 Male 133 25 108 Age 0.181(0.065-0.50) 0.001 6,243(1.558-25.50) 0.007 400 77 5 72 50 1.027(0.353-2.50) 0.908 5COC 1.032(0.353-2.50) 0.908 1.032(0.353-2.50) 0.908 52 29 5 24 1.032(0.353-2.50) 0.908 52 29 5 24 1.032(0.353-2.50) 0.908 52 29 5 24 1.032(0.357-3.320) 0.499 5400 93 9 4 0.017 0.498 7000 67 19 48 1.5000.57.3.320) 0.409 7100 131 7 24 1.000 1.000 1.000 1000 129 21 1.08 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.000 1.0000 1		(<i>n</i> =160)		pneumonia (<i>n</i> =132)				
Male1320Female320.00Permele370.00App7712±00777±017712±02771220013130200233290.003±1012300±2013130±20944±20944±20944±20944±20944±20944±200994±200994±200994±200994±200994±200994±2001371±2001491±2001491±2001491±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001411±2001511±20014	Gender				1.852(0.517-6.638)	0.344		
Female2732424Age	Male	133	25	108				
AppUU0.181 (0.005-0.50)0.016.243 (1.683-7.5.0)0.007\$<00	Female	27	3	24				
side735775860832360CCGC1022(0.35.3-2.96)0.96821231082229524Snoking index9240.03440067988006719880067198800671988001292110891292110810mor location7410mor location7410mor location1292110mor location3310mor location1292110mor location47810mor location13310mor location14310mor location14310mor location14310mor location14310mor location13310mor location1410mor location14 <td< td=""><td>Age</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>0.181(0.065-0.505)</td><td>0.001</td><td>6.243(1.658–25.503)</td><td>0.007</td></td<>	Age				0.181(0.065-0.505)	0.001	6.243(1.658–25.503)	0.007
>>033333360ECOG13123108>>113623108>>2935108>>39394103>4400671984>400711910Seginatory comobidity101000/573-39290.009Y13744No13714No131010No131010Upper left habe38830Upper left habe38830Upper left habe131010Upper left habe141010Upper left habe131010Upper left habe141010Upper left habe141010Upper left habe121010Upper left habe121010Upper left habe121010Upper left habe121010Upper left	≤60	77	5	72				
ECOG1.312.31.0221.0220.968\$12.950.40.034.498(1.306-15.489)0.017<400	>60	83	23	60				
s11323108>2295200.017Smoking index0.27110.114-0.4510.034.498(1.306-15.4890.017<400	ECOG				1.022(0.353-2.961)	0.968		
<table-container>>22452424454445444544454445444544454445454647464647464746474647<td>≤1</td><td>131</td><td>23</td><td>108</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></table-container>	≤1	131	23	108				
Simologi ndexU0271 (0.114-0.643)0.0034.498 (1.306-15.489)0.017c400671948UUUURespiratory comorbidity748UU<	>2	29	5	24				
e400939848424006719482400671948Resplatary comothidity1500(0.573-3.9290.409VES31724NO19108108Upper left lobe33330Lower left lobe38830Upper light tobe (including middle42933Lower left lobe42933Lower left lobe520.488Lower left lobe520.488Squarous cell carcinoma608Sage (AUCS th)71Sage (AUCS th)103Jage cell carcinoma5210Sage (AUCS th)111122I103Notation of gene7YES1214NO316NO1824No12214No16No3No1210No3YES1214No3No1425No34No144No3No144No19No194No19No194No194No194No194No194No194No194No194No194<	Smoking index				0.271(0.114-0.645)	0.003	4.498(1.306–15.489)	0.017
> 400671948Respiratory conorbidity1100(0.573-329)0.409YES19211081NO129211082241Upper left lobe38301Lower left lobe388301Lower left lobe388301Lower left lobe388301Lower left lobe478391Lower left lobe69331Lower left lobe69361Lower left lobe69371Squalmost cell carcinoma69371Squalmost cell carcinoma69371Squalmost cell carcinoma10111Stage cell carcinoma13111Stage cell carcinoma13111Stage cell carcinoma13111I131111No1322111No14221611No14221611No14210111No14421011Premetrexed + cisplatin/carboplatin111No14421011No14421011 <t< td=""><td><400</td><td>93</td><td>9</td><td>84</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	<400	93	9	84				
Respiratory convolbidityIIISO0(0.573-3.92)0.409YES31724NO12921108	≥400	67	19	48				
YES31724Note that the set of the se	Respiratory comorbidity				1.500(0.573-3.929)	0.409		
NO 129 21 108 Tumor location / 0.264 Upper left lobe 33 3 30 Lower left lobe 38 8 30 Lower left lobe 47 8 39 Lower left lobe 42 9 31 Lower left lobe 16 9 37 Stage (ALC 8th) 11 12 14 If 132 21 111 V 0 0 0 0 Stage (ALC 8th) 16 1 1 NO 142 26 <td< td=""><td>YES</td><td>31</td><td>7</td><td>24</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	YES	31	7	24				
No No / 0.264 Upper light lobe 33 3 30	NO	129	, 21	108				
Number of the boot	Tumor location	125	21	100	/	0 264		
Dip in Nature Display Display Display Lower (right lobe) 47 8 39 Lower (right lobe) (including middle) 47 8 39 Lower (right lobe) (including middle) 47 8 39 Lower (right lobe) (including middle) 42 9 33 Pathological types / 0.488		33	3	30	/	0.204		
Land Landou Jo Jo Jo Upper right lobe 47 8 39 Lower right lobe (including middle 42 9 33 Jach 1 1 1 Adenocarcinoma 60 8 52 1 Adenocarcinoma 60 8 52 1 Signal cell carcinoma 60 9 37 1 Single cell carcinoma 52 1 1 1 Stage (ALCC 8th) 7 1 1 1 Ill 132 1 1 1 1 No 0 0 0 558(0,121–256) 0,455 VES 14 14 1 <t< td=""><td>Lower left lobe</td><td>38</td><td>8</td><td>30</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Lower left lobe	38	8	30				
Dependence N D DS Lover right lobe (including middle 4 9 33 lobe) / 0.488 Pathological types / 0.488 Adenocaricoma 60 8 52 squamous cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 52 10 42 Stage (AJCC 8th) / / 0.215 l 18 4 111 V 0 0 0 Mutation of gene . 0.558(0.121–2.576) 0.455 VES 182 26 116 . NO 182 26 16 . NO 122 14 108 . NO 122 14 108 . Stape (AJC atholatin 2 35 .	Lipper right lobe	17	8	30				
Lower Ingle tode (including include "I "I I Pathological types / 0.488 Adenocacrinoma 60 8 52 Samal cell carcinoma 60 9 7 Small cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 2 1 1 Stage (VACC 8th) / 0.215 large cell carcinoma 1 1 . VACC 8th) / 14 . VIII 10 3 7 . VIIII 132 21 111 . VIX 132 21 111 . VIX 132 21 111 . VIX 142 26 116 . NO 142 26 116 . NO 38 14 24 . Paclitaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2	Lower right lobe (including middle	47	0	22				
Pathological types 0.488 Adenocarcinoma 60 8 52 -	lobe)	42	9	22	,	0.400		
Adenocarcinoma 60 8 52 squamous cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 52 10 42 stage (AJCC 8th) / 0.215	Pathological types	<i>c</i> 0		50	/	0.488		
squanous cell carcinoma 46 9 37 Small cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 2 10 1 Stage (AJCC 8th) / 0.215 I 10 3 7 II 18 4 14 IV 0 0 0 Mutation of gene 52 16 1 V 0 0 0 0.455 Motation of gene 12 16 1 Chemotherapy 12 14 08 1 NO 38 14 08 1 1 NO 38 14 08 1 1 Paditaxel - cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 1 1 Paditaxel - cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 1 1 Inmunotherapy 1 1 1 1 1 Yes 16 3 13 1 1 <td>Adenocarcinoma</td> <td>60</td> <td>8</td> <td>52</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Adenocarcinoma	60	8	52				
Small cell carcinoma 52 10 42 large cell carcinoma 2 1 1 2 1 Stage (AJCC 8th) / 0.215 0 I 10 3 7 . . II 18 4 14 III 132 21 111 .	squamous cell carcinoma	46	9	37				
large call carcinoma 2 1 1 Stage (AJCC 8th) / 0.215 I 10 3 7 I 18 4 14 III 132 21 111 IV 0 0 0 Mutation of gene - 0.558(0.121–257) 0.455 VES 18 2 16 - Chemotherapy 2 16 - - Chemotherapy 26 16 - - VES 122 14 08 - - NO 38 14 24 - - - VES 122 14 108 - - - - - NO 38 14 24 -<	Small cell carcinoma	52	10	42				
Stage (AUCC 8th) 10 30 7 0.215 I 10 34 7 1 II 18 4 14 1 IV 0 0 0 0 Mutation of gene 111 1 1 1 IV 0 0 0 0 0 Mutation of gene 18 2 0.558(0.121–2.576) 0.455 VES 18 2 16 1 1 Chemotherapy 18 2 16 1 1 NO 18 2 16 1 1 1002 Chemotherapy 122 14 108 1 1002 1 1 1002 NO 38 14 24 1	large cell carcinoma	2	1	1				
I 10 3 7 II 18 4 14 III 122 21 111 V 0 0 0 Mutation of gene 0 0 0 YES 18 2 16 NO 142 26 16 Chemotherapy 12 26 16 YES 12 14 08 NO 122 14 08 NO 123 14 08 NO 124 14 108 Penditaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 11 Penditaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 10 12 Immunotherapy 1 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 109 140 NO	Stage (AJCC 8th)				/	0.215		
II 18 4 14 III 132 21 111 IV 0 0 0 Mutation of gene 0.558(0.121-2.576) 0.455 YES 18 2 16 NO 142 26 116 Chemotherapy 122 14 08 NO 38 14 24 Chemotherapy regimen 2 14 08 NO 38 14 24 Chemotherapy regimen 2 31 - Paclitaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 - Immunotherapy 10 35 - - Ves 16 3 13 - - NO 144 25 119 - - - Ves 16 3 13 - - - - NO 144 25 119 - - - - - - - - - - - - -		10	3	7				
III 132 21 111 IV 0 0 0 Mutation of gene 0 0.558(0.121–2.576) 0.455 YES 18 2 16 NO 142 26 16 Chemotherapy 0.222(0.094–0.527) 0.001 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 YES 122 14 108 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 NO 38 14 24 6.698 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 YES 122 14 108 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 YES 123 14 24 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 Yes 123 14 24 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 PacItaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 31 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 Immunotherapy 1 2 31 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 Yes 16 3 13 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 Yes 16 3 13 7.1098(0.291–4.142) 0.890	II	18	4	14				
IV 0 0 0 Mutation of gene	III	132	21	111				
Mutation of gene 0.558(0.121–2.576) 0.455 YES 18 2 16 NO 142 26 116 Chemotherapy 122 140 0.222(0.094–0.527) 0.001 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 YES 122 14 08 0.222(0.094–0.527) 0.001 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 YES 122 14 08 0.222(0.094–0.527) 0.001 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 YES 122 14 08 0.222(0.094–0.527) 0.001 7.188(2.055–25.141) 0.002 YES 123 14 24 0.698 0.698 0.698 Pendtrexel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 31 0.698 0.698 0.698 Pendtrexed + cisplatin/carboplatin 10 42 1.098(0.291–4.142) 0.890 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 0.990 1.149(0.393–3.362) 0.800 Yes 164 25 119 1.149(0.393–3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 1.149(0.393–3.362) 0.800 <td>IV</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	IV	0	0	0				
YES 18 2 16 NO 142 26 116 Chemotherapy	Mutation of gene				0.558(0.121-2.576)	0.455		
NO 142 26 116 Chemotherapy	YES	18	2	16				
Chemotherapy 0.222(0.094-0.527) 0.001 7.188(2.055-25.141) 0.002 YES 122 14 108 108 108 108 108 108 109 100	NO	142	26	116				
YES 122 14 108 NO 38 14 24 Chemotherapy regimen / 0.698 Paclitaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 31 Pemetrexed + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 Etoposide + cisplatin/carboplatin 10 42 Immunotherapy 10 42 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 199 Yes 16 3 3 NO 144 25 199 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 199 Yes 16 3 3 NO 144 25 199 Yes 1.149(0.393–3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111	Chemotherapy				0.222(0.094–0.527)	0.001	7.188(2.055–25.141)	0.002
NO 38 14 24 Chemotherapy regimen / 0.698 Paclitaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 31 Pemetrexed + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 Etoposide + cisplatin/carboplatin 10 42 Immunotherapy 10 42 Yes 16 3 NO 144 25 Yes 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 NO 144 25 Yes 16 3 NO 144 25 Yes 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 NO 144 25 Yes 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 11 1.149(0.393-3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 Yes 1.149(0.393-3.362) 0.800 NO 134 23 111 Yes Yes 1.149(0.391-3.362) 0.800	YES	122	14	108				
Chemotherapy regimen / 0.698 Paclitaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 31 Pemetrexed + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 Etoposide + cisplatin/carboplatin 10 42 Immunotherapy 1 0.698 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 164 3 119 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 164 3 13 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 144 25 119 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 164 25 119 1098(0.291-4.142) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 1149(0.393-3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 1149(0.393-3.62) 0.744	NO	38	14	24				
Paclitaxel + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 31 Pemetrexed + cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 Etoposide + cisplatin/carboplatin 10 42 Immunotherapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Yes 16 3 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 14 25 119 Yes 144 25 119	Chemotherapy regimen				/	0.698		
Pemetrexed+cisplatin/carboplatin 2 35 Etoposide+cisplatin/carboplatin 10 42 Immunotherapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Targeted therapy 16 3 13 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Pestoperative Radiotherapy 16 3 13 Yes 16 3 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 144 25 119 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 1149(0.393-3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111 Pulmonary ventilation function / 0.744	Paclitaxel+cisplatin/carboplatin		2	31				
Etoposide + cisplatin/carboplatin 10 42 Immunotherapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Targeted therapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 144 25 119 NO 144 25 13 NO 144 25 119 Pes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 144 25 119 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 1149(0.393-3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111 Pulmonary ventilation function 1 1 1	Pemetrexed + cisplatin/carboplatin		2	35				
Immunotherapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119	Etoposide + cisplatin/carboplatin		10	42				
Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Targeted therapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 144 25 119 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111 Pulmonary ventilation function 1 1 1	Immunotherapy				1.098(0.291-4.142)	0.890		
NO 144 25 119 Targeted therapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 1.149(0.393-3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111 Pulmonary ventilation function / 0.744	Yes	16	3	13				
Targeted therapy 1.098(0.291-4.142) 0.890 Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 1.149(0.393-3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111 Pulmonary ventilation function / 0.744	NO	144	25	119				
Yes 16 3 13 NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 1.149(0.393–3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111	Targeted therapy				1.098(0.291-4.142)	0.890		
NO 144 25 119 Postoperative Radiotherapy 1.149(0.393–3.362) 0.800 Yes 26 5 21 NO 134 23 111 Pulmonary ventilation function / 0.744	Yes	16	3	13				
Postoperative Radiotherapy1.149(0.393-3.362)0.800Yes26521NO13423111Pulmonary ventilation function///////////////////////////////	NO	144	25	119				
Yes26521NO13423111Pulmonary ventilation function////0744	Postoperative Badiotherapy				1 149(0 393-3 362)	0.800		
NO 134 23 111 Pulmonary ventilation function / 0.744	Yes	26	5	21		0.000		
Pulmonary ventilation function / 0.744	NO	134	23	111				
	Pulmonary ventilation function	131			/	0 744		

Table 1 Clinical characteristics of patients

Table 1 (continued)

Characteristic	All patients (<i>n</i> =160)	symptomatic pneumonia(<i>n</i> =28)	asymp- tomatic pneumonia (n=132)	univariate analysis		multivariate analysis	
				OR (95%CI)	Ρ	OR (95%CI)	Р
Normal	42	9	33				
Mild abnormality	30	4	26				
Moderate abnormal	15	3	12				
Severe abnormality	13	3	10				
Extremely severe abnormality	3	0	3				
Radiotherapy mode				5.697(0.736-44.078)	0.177		
VMRT	136	27	109				
SBRT	24	2	22				
Dose fraction				/	0.247		
60 Gy/28-30 F	114	21	93				
45 Gy/30F	24	5	19				
50 Gy/25F	7	1	6				
40-60 Gy/8-10 F	7	1	6				
45-54 Gy/18F	2	0	2				
48-50 Gy/4-6 F	6	0	6				

Table 2 Dosimetry characteristics of patients

Characteristic	Symptomatic pneumonia(X±S)	Asymptomatic pneu-	Univariate analysis		Multivariate analysis	
		monia (X±S)	OR (95%CI)	Р	OR (95%CI)	Р
BED(Gy)	68.55±11.87	71.89±12.57	1.02(0.988-1.061)	0.198		
GTV (cm ³)	56.28 ± 59.29	54.30 ± 74.03	1.000(0.995-1.006)	0.892		
GTVnd(cm ³)	14.75±18.42	12.69±29.68	0.998(0.985-1.011)	0.726		
PTV (cm ³)	353.82±196.46	292.40 ± 173.68	0.998(0.996-1.000)	0.101	1.000(0.996-1.004)	0.881
Left lung volume(cm ³)	1423.66±343.58	1429.56±436.85	1.000(0.999-1.001)	0.946		
Right lung volume(cm ³)	1754.07 ± 468.70	1700.36±491.30	1.000(0.999-1.001)	0.595		
Total Lung Volume(cm ³)	3177.23±729.26	3114.24±866.33	1.000(0.999-1.000)	0.719		
V5 of total lungs(%)	64.98 ± 14.32	50.53±18.42	0.945(0.916–0.975)	< 0.001	1.083(1.012-1.159)	0.022
V10 of total lungs(%)	45.52 ± 12.04	38.34±16.59	0.970(0.943–0.998)	0.035	0.855(0.747–0.978)	0.023
V20 of total lungs(%)	23.18 ± 8.67	18.00 ± 8.88	0.936(0.892–0.983)	0.008		
V30 of total lungs(%)	13.10±6.31	9.59 ± 5.05	0.889(0.820-0.963)	0.004	1.17(0.634–2.159)	0.251
V40 of total lungs(%)	7.65 ± 4.34	5.62 ± 3.32	0.861(0.767–0.966)	0.011	0.752(0.423-1.336)	0.331
V50 of total lungs(%)	3.75 ± 3.41	2.98 ± 2.94	0.928(0.822-1.048)	0.231		
V60 of total lungs(%)	1.49 ± 1.15	1.02 ± 1.54	0.831(0.651-1.061)	0.137		
MLD of total lungs	1383.15 ± 324.92	1002.98 ± 505.05	0.998(0.997–0.999)	0.001	1.005(1.000-1.010)	0.005
MLD of ipsilateral lung	1793.29±652.52	1464.68±652.52	0.999(0.998-1.000)	0.011	1.00(0.999-1.002)	0.733
Max of total lungs	6195.95±1117.16	5805.172±1686.10	1.000(0.999-1.000)	0.256		
Min of total lungs(%)	53.13±80.19	41.57±107.76	0.999(0.996-1.002)	0.601		

when the whole lung V20 dose parameter is strictly restricted before radiotherapy, RP is still unavoidable. This suggests that multiple factors, in addition to dose parameter factors, contribute to RP.

Identifying high-risk patients for symptomatic pneumonitis before radiotherapy is crucial to prevent its occurrence. Patients with $RP \ge 2$ represent a highly heterogeneous group; our study combined multiple clinical and dosimetry indicators to establish a predictive model. The results demonstrated that a combination of three dosimetry and three clinical factors could predict $RP \ge 2$. More importantly, we developed a dynamic nomogram and risk classification system with good predictive performance, which is easy for physicians to understand and implement in practice.

Previous studies have estimated the incidence of symptomatic pneumonitis to be 15–40% among patients undergoing thoracic radiotherapy [14]. Our study's incidence (17.5%) is consistent with these findings. However, the incidence of fatal pneumonitis in our study was 5% (8/160), significantly higher than the 2% reported in previous studies [8]. In our study, 13 patients had Grade 3 symptomatic pneumonitis, accounting for 46.43% (13/28) of all symptomatic pneumonitis cases. The high mortality



Fig. 1 The occurrence time of radiation pneumonitis





Fig. 3 Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves

rate in our study may be related to the increased number of patients diagnosed with \geq Grade 3 pneumonitis, which is more likely to develop into fatal pneumonitis.

Older age has been shown to be a predictor of symptomatic pneumonitis [7, 31]. Previous studies have found that older patients (age \geq 70) are more likely to develop symptomatic pneumonitis [31]. Similar results were confirmed in a prospective study with 7752 patients who received stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) for stage IA to IB non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) [10]. This is primarily due to the fact that older patients have more comorbidities that are a risk factor for RP than younger patients [7]. Although age≥60 years was an independent risk factor in our study, a threshold value has not been determined due to additional risk factors such as smoking status and pulmonary function [3]. While age is an uncontrollable factor, it has minimal impact on the symptomatic pneumonitis score in the nomogram.

The relationship between smoking and radiationinduced lung injury remains controversial [32]. Tobacco smoking is the leading risk factor for developing lung cancer. In contrast, smoking has been found to have a protective effect on the risk of RP. Smokers are less likely to develop radiation pneumonitis, as it is thought that smoking-damaged lungs may be less sensitive to radiation damage [33, 7, 34]. However, smoking is a significantly poor prognostic factor for overall survival [35]. The smoking index, calculated as cigarettes smoked per day \times years smoked, was an independent risk factor for symptomatic pneumonitis when the index was ≥ 400 in our study. The relationship between the smoking index and symptomatic pneumonitis has received insufficient attention in lung cancer patients; our results provide solid evidence, but the nomogram showed that the smoking index had the lowest impact among the six risk factors for symptomatic pneumonitis.

Conflicting results exist regarding the effects of concurrent, concomitant, or neoadjuvant chemotherapy on radiation toxicity. A dosimetric analysis of 25 patients with NSCLC revealed that approximately 30% of patients experienced at least a 20% reduction in tumor volume following induction chemotherapy, translating into a



Fig. 4 Calibration curves for the constructed nomogram

slight yet statistically significant reduction (5%) in the predicted risk of RP [36]. However, a retrospective analysis of 223 patients by Wang et al. [37] did not find a significant association in the risk of Grade 3 RP between patients with and without induction chemotherapy. In contrast, another retrospective study of 84 lung cancer patients receiving three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT) showed that the risk of symptomatic pneumonitis was three-fold higher in the chemotherapy group than in the non-chemotherapy group (31.2%) [38]. Our findings showed that patients who did not receive chemotherapy were more likely to develop symptomatic pneumonia than those who did. We consider the reasons that lead our results to differ from those of previous studies as follows: Some patients in the symptomatic pneumonia group were more prone to symptomatic pneumonia due to older age and poor ECOG score, so we did not give chemotherapy to these patients. In addition, some patients with large lung tumors refuse chemotherapy due to their own wishes, resulting in a larger radiation treatment area, which in turn exposes more normal lung tissue to radiation. Therefore, we believe that the appropriate course of chemotherapy helps to shrink the tumor, and does not increase the occurrence of symptomatic pneumonia.

It should be noted that following the introduction of volumetric modulated arc therapy (VMAT) and SBRT into clinical practice, greater attention has been paid to the potential adverse effects of low-dose lung dosevolume histogram (DVH) parameters on RP \geq 2. Several studies [12, 29, 39-42] have reported a close relationship between whole lung V5, V10, and RP in lung cancer. Sheng L et al. [40] found that the dose threshold for V5 in patients with non-small cell lung cancer treated with induction chemotherapy was 44%. Another study discovered that ipsilateral lung V5 \geq 55.65% might be associated with a higher risk of RP [21]. A previous clinical study reported that acute radiation pneumonitis was reduced from 29.2 to 5.7% in lung cancer patients receiving concurrent chemoradiotherapy when $V10 \le 50$ [41]. Moreover, Boonyawan et al. [43] identified a correlation between V10>30% and grade \geq 2 RP in patients who had undergone surgery followed by PORT. Our study found that lung V5 was independent risk factors. We conducted a univariate receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis on lung V5, with the best cut-off value being 61.10% (AUC=0.726, 95% CI: 0.626-0.827, sensitivity=0.679, specificity=0.720). The whole lung V5>61.1% in the symptomatic pneumonitis group was 67.86% (19/28) compared to 28.03% in the asymptomatic pneumonitis



Fig. 5 Decision curve analysis for the constructed nomogram evaluating the risk of symptomatic pneumonia



Fig. 6 Histogram of nomogram scores for all patients. The red columns represent patients with symptomatic pneumonia., the blue columns represent patients with non-symptomatic pneumonia, and the dotted line indicates the threshold values separating the two risk groups

group (37/132). These data differences were statistically significant(P<0.05). Our whole lung V5 was mostly above the dose-optimal threshold, which may be associated with higher severity and mortality of symptomatic pneumonitis than previously reported. In conclusion, further research is needed to confirm that our findings are not

accidental and to define the optimal cut-offs of whole lung V5 for more accurate prediction of symptomatic pneumonitis.

Mean lung dose (MLD) can be employed to predict the risk of symptomatic pneumonitis in lung cancer patients undergoing radical radiotherapy [44, 45]. A finding

Dynamic Nomogram



Fig. 7 A dynamic web-based survival calculator for predicting the occurrence of symptomatic pneumonia

concur with these studies, indicating that the incidence of RP≥Grade 2 increased in cases where the MLD was ≥14.3 Gy [18]. A prior study [21] found that patients with a mean ipsilateral lung dose≥11.86 Gy might be at a higher risk of RP≥Grade 2. Another study suggested that MLD of 10 Gy was significantly correlated with an increased risk of RP, while an MLD<12 Gy was significantly correlated with a low risk of RP≥Grade 2 [17]. Lee et al. [46] used perfusion single-photon-emission computed tomography and fluorodeoxyglucose positron-emission tomography imaging to demonstrate that MLD (also functional MLD) was a significant predictor of grade≥2 pneumonitis, with a cutoff value of 13.6 Gy (functional MLD: 13.2 Gy). Baker R et al. [42] found that patients receiving stereotactic body radiation therapy (SBRT) with MLD less than 600 Gy had a lower risk of $RP \ge Grade 2$, and the same results were obtained in another study [45]. For patients receiving postoperative radiotherapy, it is recommended to control the whole lung MLD below 10.8 Gy [12]. A machine learning study based on 203 stage II-III lung cancer patients receiving chemoradiotherapy found that whole lung MLD was strongly associated with symptomatic pneumonitis, with a cutoff value of 13.4 Gy [39]. In our study, the best cutoff value of whole lung MLD was 948.15 Gy (AUC=0.726, 95% CI: 0.622–0.799, sensitivity=1.00, specificity=0.424), indicating that the incidence of symptomatic pneumonitis was definite in cases where the whole lung MLD was >948.15 Gy. Although the cutoff values for MLD differ across research institutions, our findings were within the range previously reported.

As is well-known, multifactorial combined prediction models are beneficial in enhancing RP prediction performance. Although several prediction models have been preliminarily established in prior studies, their implementation in the clinic has been limited due to their unsatisfactory ability to identify RP or the practical challenges they pose. In our study, however, a number of essential variables, including age, smoking index, whole lung V5 and whole lung MLD, were integrated into a nomogram to accurately personalize the risk assessment of RP \geq 2 for each patient. The c-index of the nomogram in this study was 0.89, indicating that it outperformed previously reported models combining clinical dosimetric factors in predicting $RP \ge 2$. The transformation into a dynamic nomogram makes it more convenient for clinicians to apply. More importantly, a new risk classification system was established that effectively stratified lung cancer patients into distinct RP risk groups. Our study demonstrates that the model exhibits excellent discrimination in predicting the occurrence of $RP \ge 2$. As any physician can easily measure the included variables, the practicability of the model is enhanced. Despite the many advantages of our study, some limitations should be acknowledged. First, Due to the small sample size, we did not set up a validation group. Although there is no external validation, our concordance index and calibration plots confirmed the good predictive performance of our model. This study is a preliminary study, we will continue to collect more patients and expand the sample size to verify the accuracy of our nomogram. Second, as this study is retrospective and from a single institution, there may be a selection bias. In addition, our previous clinical data are incomplete, lacking crucial information such as inflammatory factors and specific chemotherapy courses, which may help improve the accuracy of symptomatic pneumonitis prediction. Lastly, only symptomatic pneumonitis was used as an endpoint, while local tumor control and overall survival were not considered. Reducing

the risk of symptomatic pneumonitis may concurrently increase the risk of local tumor control failure and alter patient survival time. In the future, multi-objective models will be developed to assist physicians in determining the best course of treatment. This study only employed symptomatic pneumonitis as an endpoint and did not consider other treatment outcomes, such as local tumor control and overall survival rate. Reducing the risk of RP \geq 2 may simultaneously increase the risk of tumor local control failure and decrease survival time; thus, our prospective study is ongoing.

Conclusion

We developed a dynamic nomogram and risk classification system by incorporating age, smoking index, chemotherapy, whole lung V5 and whole lung MLD. Our results demonstrated that the model performs well in helping physicians recognize high-risk RP \geq 2 lung cancer cases and guide individualized treatment and clinical decision-making.

Abbreviations

3D-CRT	Three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy
AUC	Area under the curve
BED	Biological effective dose
C-index	Concordance index
CTCAE, 5.0	The common adverse reaction event evaluation criteria
DCA	Decision curve analysis
DVH	Dose-volume histogram
DVH	Dose-volume histogram
GTV-nd	Gross lymph node volume
GTV	Gross tumor volume
ICIs	Immune checkpoint inhibitors
IMRT	Intensity-modulated radiotherapy
MLD	Mean lung dose
NSCLC	Non-small-cell lung cancer
NTCP	Normal tissue complication probability
PORT	Postoperative radiotherapy
PTV	Planning target volume
ROC	Receiver operating characteristic
$RP \ge 2$	Symptomatic pneumonitis
RP	Radiation pneumonitis
SBRT	Stereotactic body radiation therapy
VMAT	Volumetric modulated arc therapy
Vx	percentage of whole lungs volume receiving x Gy

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Author contributions

Yawen Zha wrote the paper, Jingjing Zhang and Lei Wen designed this study. Xinyu Yan and Chen Yang performed the data collection. Minying Li revised the manuscript. The author(s) read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding

Zhongshan Social Welfare Science and Technology Research Project (2019B1101).

Data availability

All data acquisition from the medical record management system of Zhongshan People's Hospital. The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Zhongshan People's Hospital in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. Approval for a waiver of informed consent for the study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board of Zhongshan People's Hospital. All methods were performed in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Received: 4 July 2023 / Accepted: 7 February 2024 Published online: 26 February 2024

References

- Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A, Bray F. Global cancer statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2021;71(3):209–49. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21660
- Vinod SK, Hau E. Radiotherapy treatment for lung cancer: current status and future directions. Respirology. 2020;25(S2):61–71. https://doi.org/10.1111/ resp.13870
- Giuranno L, lent J, De Ruysscher D, Vooijs MA. Radiation-induced lung injury (RILI). Front Oncol. 2019;9:877. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2019.00877
- Yue J, Shi Q, Xu T, Jeter M, Chen T-Y, Komaki R, Gomez DR, Pan T, Cleeland CS, Liao Z, Wang XS. Patient-reported lung symptoms as an early signal of impending radiation pneumonitis in patients with non-small cell lung cancer treated with chemoradiation: an observational study. Qual Life Res. 2018;27(6):1563–70. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-018-1834-3
- Xiao L, Yang G, Chen J, Yang Y, Meng X, Wang X, Wu Q, Huo Z, Yu Q, Yu J, Kong F-M, Spring); Yuan S. Comparison of predictive powers of functional and anatomic dosimetric parameters for radiation-induced lung toxicity in locally advanced non-small cell lung cancer. Radiother Oncol. 2018;129(2):242–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2018.09.005
- Yang W-C, Hsu F-M, Yang P-C. Precision radiotherapy for non-small cell lung cancer. J Biomed Sci. 2020;27(1):82. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12929-020-00676-5
- Vogelius IR, Bentzen SMA, Literature-Based. Meta-analysis of clinical risk factors for development of radiation induced pneumonitis. Acta Oncol. 2012;51(8):975–83. https://doi.org/10.3109/0284186X.2012.718093
- Palma DA, Senan S, Tsujino K, Barriger RB, Rengan R, Moreno M, Bradley JD, Kim TH, Ramella S, Marks LB, De Petris L, Stitt L, Rodrigues G. Predicting radiation pneumonitis after chemoradiation therapy for lung cancer: an international individual patient data meta-analysis. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2013;85(2):444–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2012.04.043
- Briere TM, Krafft S, Liao Z, Martel MK. Lung size and the risk of radiation pneumonitis. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2016;94(2):377–84. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ijrobp.2015.10.002
- Zhao J, Yorke ED, Li L, Kavanagh BD, Li XA, Das S, Miften M, Rimner A, Campbell J, Xue J, Jackson A, Grimm J, Milano MT; (Spring) Kong F-M. Simple factors associated with radiation-induced lung toxicity after stereotactic body radiation therapy of the thorax, editors. A Pooled analysis of 88 studies. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2016;95(5):1357–1366. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2016.03.024
- 11. Jang JY, Kim SS, Song SY, Kim YJ, Kim S, Choi EK. Radiation pneumonitis in patients with non-small-cell lung cancer receiving chemoradiotherapy and an immune checkpoint inhibitor: a retrospective study. Radiat Oncol. 2021;16(1):231. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13014-021-01930-2
- Tang X, Li Y, Tian X, Zhou X, Wang Y, Huang M, Ren L, Zhou L, Xue J, Ding Z, Zhu J, Xu Y, Peng F, Wang J, Lu Y, Gong Y. Predicting severe acute radiation pneumonitis in patients with non-small cell lung cancer receiving postoperative radiotherapy: development and internal validation of a nomogram based on the clinical and dose–volume histogram parameters. Radiother Oncol. 2019;132:197–203. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2018.10.016
- Lu X, Wang J, Zhang T, Zhou Z, Deng L, Wang X, Wang W, Liu W, Tang W, Wang Z, Wang J, Jiang W, Bi N, Wang L. Comprehensive pneumonitis profile of thoracic radiotherapy followed by immune checkpoint inhibitor and

risk factors for radiation recall pneumonitis in lung cancer. Front Immunol. 2022;13:918787. https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2022.918787

- Rodrigues G, Lock M, D'Souza D, Yu E, Van Dyk J. Prediction of radiation pneumonitis by dose–volume histogram parameters in lung cancer—a systematic review. Radiother Oncol. 2004;71(2):127–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. radonc.2004.02.015
- Kong F-M, 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 nonsmall-cell lung cancer (NSCLC): predictors for radiation pneumonitis and fibrosis. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2006;65(4):1075–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ijrobp.2006.01.051
- Bledsoe TJ, Nath SK, Decker RH. Radiation pneumonitis. Clin Chest Med. 2017;38(2):201–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccm.2016.12.004
- Wang L, Liang S, Li C, Sun X, Pang L, Meng X, Yu JA. Novel nomogram and risk classification system predicting radiation pneumonitis in patients with esophageal cancer receiving radiation therapy. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2019;105(5):1074–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2019.08.024
- Zhou Y, Yan T, Zhou X, Cao P, Luo C, Zhou L, Xu Y, Liu Y, Xue J, Wang J, Wang Y, Lu Y, Liang B, Gong Y. Acute severe radiation pneumonitis among non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients with moderate pulmonary dysfunction receiving definitive concurrent chemoradiotherapy: impact of pre-treatment pulmonary function parameters. Strahlenther Onkol. 2020;196(6):505–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00066-019-01552-4
- Yafeng L, Jing W, Jiawei Z, Yingru X, Xin Z, Danting L, Jun X, Chang T, Min M, Xuansheng D, Dong H. Construction and verification of a radiation pneumonia prediction model based on multiple parameters. Cancer Control. 2021;28:107327482110266. https://doi.org/10.1177/10732748211026671
- McFarlane MR, Hochstedler KA, Laucis AM, Sun Y, Chowdhury A, Matuszak MM, Hayman J, Bergsma D, Boike T, Kestin L, Movsas B, Grills I, Dominello M, Dess RT, Schonewolf C, Spratt DE, Pierce L, Paximadis P, Jolly S, Schipper M. Predictors of pneumonitis after conventionally fractionated radiotherapy for locally advanced lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2021;111(5):1176–85. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2021.07.1691
- Tang W, Li X, Yu H, Yin X, Zou B, Zhang T, Chen J, Sun X, Liu N, Yu J, Xie PA. Novel nomogram containing acute radiation esophagitis predicting radiation pneumonitis in thoracic cancer receiving radiotherapy. BMC Cancer. 2021;21(1):585. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-021-08264-y
- Krafft SP, Rao A, Stingo F, Briere TM, Court LE, Liao Z, Martel MK. The utility of quantitative CT radiomics features for improved prediction of radiation pneumonitis. Med Phys. 2018;45(11):5317–24. https://doi.org/10.1002/mp.13150
- Bourbonne V, Da-ano R, Jaouen V, Lucia F, Dissaux G, Bert J, Pradier O, Visvikis D, Hatt M, Schick U. Radiomics analysis of 3D dose distributions to predict toxicity of radiotherapy for lung cancer. Radiother Oncol. 2021;155:144–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.radonc.2020.10.040
- Liang B, Tian Y, Chen X, Yan H, Yan L, Zhang T, Zhou Z, Wang L, Dai J. Prediction of radiation pneumonitis with dose distribution: a convolutional neural network (CNN) based model. Front Oncol. 2020;9:1500. https://doi.org/10.3389/fonc.2019.01500
- Adachi T, Nakamura M, Shintani T, Mitsuyoshi T, Kakino R, Ogata T, Ono T, Tanabe H, Kokubo M, Sakamoto T, Matsuo Y, Mizowaki T. Multi-institutional dose-segmented dosiomic analysis for predicting radiation pneumonitis after lung stereotactic body radiation therapy. Med Phys. 2021;48(4):1781–91. https://doi.org/10.1002/mp.14769
- 26. Yang S, Huang S, Ye X, Xiong K, Zeng B, Shi Y. Risk analysis of Grade ≥ 2 radiation pneumonitis based on radiotherapy timeline in stage III/IV nonsmall cell lung cancer treated with volumetric modulated arc therapy: a retrospective study. BMC Pulm Med. 2022;22(1):402. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12890-022-02211-8
- 27. Jiang W, Song Y, Sun Z, Qiu J, Shi L. Dosimetric factors and radiomics features within different regions of interest in planning CT images for improving the prediction of radiation pneumonitis. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2021;110(4):1161–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2021.01.049
- Zhang Z, Wang Z, Yan M, Yu J, Dekker A, Zhao L, Wee L. Radiomics and dosiomics signature from whole lung predicts radiation pneumonitis: a model development study with prospective external validation and decision-curve analysis. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2023;115(3):746–58. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2022.08.047
- 29. Katsuta Y, Kadoya N, Kajikawa T, Mouri S, Kimura T, Takeda K, Yamamoto T, Imano N, Tanaka S, Ito K, Kanai T, Nakajima Y, Jingu K. Radiation pneumonitis

prediction model with integrating multiple dose-function features on 4DCT ventilation images. Phys Med. 2023;105:102505. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ejmp.2022.11.009

- Marks LB, Yorke ED, Jackson A, Ten Haken RK, Constine LS, Eisbruch A, Bentzen SM, Nam J, Deasy JO. Use of normal tissue complication probability models in the clinic. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2010;76(3):10–S19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ijrobp.2009.07.1754
- Dang J, Li G, Zang S, Zhang S, Yao L. Risk and predictors for early radiation pneumonitis in patients with stage III non-small cell lung cancer treated with concurrent or sequential chemoradiotherapy. Radiat Oncol. 2014;9(1):172. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-717X-9-172
- Kong F-M (Spring), Wang S. Nondosimetric risk factors for radiation-induced lung toxicity. editors. Semin Radiat Oncol. 2015;25(2):100–109. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.semradonc.2014.12.003
- Hernando ML, Marks LB, Bentel GC, Zhou S-M, Hollis D, Das SK, Fan M, Munley MT, Shafman TD, Anscher MS, Lind PA. Radiation-induced pulmonary toxicity: a dose-volume histogram analysis in 201 patients with lung cancer. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2001;51(3):650–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/ S0360-3016(01)01685-6
- Rojewski AM, Tanner NT, Dai L, Ravenel JG, Gebregziabher M, Silvestri GA, Toll BA. Tobacco dependence predicts higher lung cancer and mortality rates and lower rates of smoking cessation in the national lung screening trial. Chest. 2018;154(1):110–8. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2018.04.016
- Shiono S, Katahira M, Abiko M, Sato T. Smoking is a perioperative risk factor and prognostic factor for lung cancer surgery. Gen Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2015;63(2):93–8. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11748-014-0461-3
- Amin NP, Miften M, Thornton D, Ryan N, Kavanagh B, Gaspar LE. Effect of induction chemotherapy on estimated risk of radiation pneumonitis in bulky non–small cell lung cancer. Med Dosim. 2013;38(3):320–6. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.meddos.2013.03.003
- 37. Wang S, Liao Z, Wei X, Liu HH, Tucker SL, Hu C, Mohan R, Cox JD, Komaki R. Analysis of clinical and dosimetric factors associated with treatment-related pneumonitis (TRP) in patients with non–small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) treated with concurrent chemotherapy and three-dimensional conformal radiotherapy (3D-CRT). Int J Radiat Oncol. 2006;66(5):1399–407. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2006.07.1337
- Rancati T. Factors predicting radiation pneumonitis in lung cancer patients: a retrospective study. Radiother Oncol. 2003;67(3):275–83. https://doi. org/10.1016/S0167-8140(03)00119-1
- Luna JM, Chao H-H, Diffenderfer ES, Valdes G, Chinniah C, Ma G, Cengel KA, Solberg TD, Berman AT, Simone CB. Predicting radiation pneumonitis in locally advanced stage II–III non-small cell lung cancer using machine learning. Radiother Oncol. 2019;133:106–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. radonc.2019.01.003
- 40. Sheng L, Cui X, Cheng L, Chen Y, Du X. Risk factors of Grade ≥ 2 radiation pneumonitis after gemcitabine induction chemotherapy for patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Radiat Oncol. 2019;14(1):229. https://doi. org/10.1186/s13014-019-1440-8
- Han S, Gu F, Lin G, Sun X, Wang Y, Wang Z, Lin Q, Weng D, Xu Y, Mao W. Analysis of clinical and dosimetric factors influencing radiation-induced lung injury in patients with lung cancer. J Cancer. 2015;6(11):1172–8. https://doi. org/10.7150/jca.12314
- Baker R, Han G, Sarangkasiri S, DeMarco M, Turke C, Stevens CW, Dilling TJ. Clinical and dosimetric predictors of radiation pneumonitis in a large series of patients treated with stereotactic body radiation therapy to the lung. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2013;85(1):190–5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2012.03.041
- 43. Boonyawan K, Gomez DR, Komaki R, Xu Y, Nantavithya C, Allen PK, Mohan R, Liao Z. Clinical and dosimetric factors predicting Grade ≥ 2 radiation pneumonitis after postoperative radiotherapy for patients with non-small cell lung carcinoma. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2018;101(4):919–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ijrobp.2018.04.012
- 44. Robnett TJ, Mckenna MG, Mckenna WG. Factors predicting severe radiation pneumonitis in patients receiving definitive chemoradiation for lung cancer. 2000;48(1).
- Ryckman JM, Baine M, Carmicheal J, Osayande F, Sleightholm R, Samson K, Zheng D, Zhen W, Lin C, Zhang C. Correlation of dosimetric factors with the development of symptomatic radiation pneumonitis in stereotactic body radiotherapy. Radiat Oncol. 2020;15(1):33. https://doi.org/10.1186/ s13014-020-1479-6

 Lee HJ, Zeng J, Vesselle HJ, Patel SA, Rengan R, Bowen SR. Correlation of functional lung heterogeneity and dosimetry to radiation pneumonitis using perfusion SPECT/CT and FDG PET/CT imaging. Int J Radiat Oncol. 2018;102(4):1255–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2018.05.051

Publisher's Note

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