Original Article

Impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival in bladder cancer patients

Takashige Abe^{1,*}, Shuhei Yamada¹, Hiroshi Kikuchi^{1,2}, Ataru Sazawa³, Hidenori Katano⁴, Hidetaka Suzuki⁵, Ichiro Takeuchi⁶, Keita Minami⁷, Ken Morita⁸, Kunihiko Tsuchiya⁹, Norikata Takada¹⁰, Shintaro Maru¹¹, Soshu Sato¹², Takanori Yamashita¹³, Tango Mochizuki¹⁴, Tomoshige Akino¹⁵, Yoshihiro Sasaki¹⁶, Yuichiro Shinno¹⁷, Norihiro Murahashi^{18,19}, Takafumi Kawazu²⁰, Jun Furumido^{1,2}, Haruka Miyata¹, Ryuji Matsumoto¹, Takahiro Osawa¹, Sachiyo Murai¹ and Nobuo Shinohara¹

¹Department of Urology, Hokkaido University Graduate School of Medicine, Sapporo, Japan, ²Department of Urology, Teine-Keijinkai Hospital, Sapporo, Japan, ³Department of Urology, Obihiro Kousei Hospital, Obihiro, Japan,
 ⁴Department of Urology, Iwamizawa Municipal General Hospital, Iwamizawa, Japan, ⁵Department of Urology, Hakodate Central Hospital, Hakodate, Japan, ⁶Department of Urology, Tomakomai City Hospital, Tomakomai, Japan,
 ⁷Department of Urology, Sapporo City General Hospital, Sapporo, Japan, ⁸Department of Urology, Kushiro City General Hospital, Kushiro, Japan, ⁹Department of Urology, KKR Sapporo Medical Center, Sapporo, Japan,
 ¹⁰Department of Urology, Hokkaido Cancer Center, Sapporo, Japan, ¹¹Department of Urology, Jinyukai Hospital, Sapporo, Japan, ¹²Department of Urology, Ebetsu City Hospital, Ebetsu, Japan, ¹³Department of Urology, Nayoro City General Hospital, Nayoro, Japan, ¹⁴Department of Urology, Abashiri Kousei Hospital, Abashiri, Japan, ¹⁵Department of Urology, KKR Tonan Hospital, Sapporo, Japan, ¹⁶Department of Urology, Kushiro Rosai Hospital, Kushiro, Japan, ¹⁷Department of Urology, Otaru General Hospital, Otaru, Japan, ¹⁸Department of Urology, Asahikawa Kousei Hospital, Asahikawa, Japan, ¹⁹Department of Urology, JCHO Sapporo Hokushin Hospital, Sapporo, Japan and ²⁰Department of Urology, Hokkaido Urology Memorial Hospital, Sapporo, Japan

*For reprints and all correspondence: Takashige Abe, Department of Urology, Hokkaido University Graduate School of Medicine, North-15, West-7, North Ward, Sapporo 060-8638, Japan. E-mail: takataka@rf6.so-net.ne.jp

Received 2 May 2023; Editorial Decision 22 June 2023; Accepted 29 June 2023

Abstract

Objective: To determine the impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival outcomes in patients with bladder cancer undergoing radical cystectomy.

Methods: This retrospective multi-institutional study included 766 bladder cancer patients who underwent radical cystectomy between 2011 and 2017. Patient characteristics, perioperative outcomes, all complications within 90 days after surgery and survival outcomes were collected. Each complication was graded based on the Clavien-Dindo system, and grouped using a standardized grouping method. The Comprehensive Complication Index, which incorporates all complications into a single formula weighted by their severity, was utilized. Overall survival and recurrence-free survival (local, distant or urothelial recurrences) were stratified by Comprehensive Complication Index (high: \geq 26.2; low: <26.2). A multivariate model was utilized to identify independent prognostic factors.

Results: The incidence of any and major complications (\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III) was 70 and 24%, respectively. In terms of Comprehensive Complication Index, 34% (261/766) of the patients

© The Author(s) 2023. Published by Oxford University Press. All rights reserved. For permissions, please e-mail: journals.permission@oup.com. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact journals.permissions@oup.com had \geq 26.2. Patients with Comprehensive Complication Index \geq 26.2 had shorter overall survival (4-year, 59.5 vs. 69.8%, respectively, log-rank test, P = 0.0037) and recurrence free survival (51.9 vs. 60.1%, respectively, P = 0.0234), than those with Comprehensive Complication Index < 26.2. The Cox multivariate model identified the age, performance status, pT-stage, pN-stage and higher CCI (overall survival: HR = 1.35, P = 0.0174, recurrence-free survival: HR = 1.26, P = 0.0443) as independent predictors of both overall survival and recurrence-free survival.

Conclusions: Postoperative complications assessed by Comprehensive Complication Index had adverse effects on long-term survival outcomes. Physicians should be aware that major postoperative complications can adversely affect long-term disease control.

Key words: postoperative complication, radical cystectomy, bladder cancer, survival

Introduction

Radical cystectomy (RC) in conjunction with regional lymph node dissection (LND) and urinary diversion is the mainstay of treatment for muscle-invasive or treatment-refractory non-muscle-invasive bladder cancers (BCs). However, it is well known that RC is correlated with significant perioperative morbidity (approximately 50-70%) (1-3). Recently, our group collected data on 90-day postoperative complications in patients treated by RC at Hokkaido University Hospital and our affiliated hospitals between 2011 and 2017 (recent cohort, n = 838), and compared the perioperative outcomes with those of our previous cohort (n = 919, 1997-2010). We observed that RC has remained correlated with significant postoperative morbidity [overall complications: 69% (580/838) in the recent cohort vs. 68% (629/919) in the previous cohort, and major complications (Clavien-Dindo, CD, grade ≥ III): 25% (211/838) in the recent cohort vs. 22% (201/919) in the previous cohort, respectively] over the past two decades (4).

Recent studies involving colorectal, gastric and esophagogastric cancer, or hepatocellular carcinoma resection have shown an adverse impact of postoperative morbidities on long-term survival outcomes (5–8), which remains unknown after RC. In the present study, we aimed to clarify the impact of postoperative complications on the long-term survival impact after RC.

Materials and methods

The Institutional Review Board approved this study (No. 017-0038). We reviewed the medical records of 838 patients with muscle invasive or treatment-refractory non-muscle-invasive BC who underwent RC at Hokkaido University Hospital and 19 affiliated institutions between 2011 and 2017. As mentioned before, in terms of the current landscape of postoperative complications after RC, we previously published a paper (4). In the present study, we updated the survival information. Excluding patients with distant metastasis (n = 29) at the time of RC, who died within 90 days after surgery (n = 38), in order to highlight the long-term survival effect, with the final pathology of lymphoma (n = 1), with advanced prostate cancer (n = 1), no follow-up data (n = 2) and treated for disease palliation (n = 1), 766 patients were included in the current survival analysis.

During the study period (2011–2017), the type of urinary diversion (i.e. ileal conduit, ileal neobladder or cutaneous ureterostomy) was performed based on the patients' and surgeons' decisions, and the region of LND was determined by each surgeon. Laparoscopic RC was performed mainly without robotic assistance, and urinary diversion was performed extracorporeally via a small incision (extracorporeal urinary diversion) in all patients. Perioperative systemic chemotherapy was also administered based on the patients' and surgeons' decisions.

Patient characteristics, perioperative outcomes and all complications within 90 days of surgery were reviewed. Tumor staging was performed according to the Union for International Cancer Control TNM classification 7th edition, and the tumor grade was assessed according to the 2004 WHO classification. Postoperative complications were also assessed. Each complication was graded according to the CD system (9) by co-authors at each hospital, and grouped according to a standardized grouping method, consisting of the 11 complication categories reported by Shabsigh et al. (1). If there was any contradiction between CD grading and the management for each complication, two authors (YS and TA) asked co-authors to review the medical charts, and corrected the misgrading. Furthermore, in order to examine the cumulative postoperative morbidity, the Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI), which incorporates all complications into a single formula weighted by their severity, was calculated for each patient by one author (YS), who was blinded to the final survival outcomes (10). CCI ranged from 0 (no complications) to 100 (death). According to previous studies, we utilized CCI of 26.2 as the cut-off point (equivalent to one grade IIIa complication by the CD system) (11,12).

In terms of postoperative follow-up, in general, computed tomography was performed every 6 months for the first two years. Subsequently, follow-up examinations were performed every 6–12 months. The primary outcome of the current study was the impact of any or major complications on long-term survival after RC. Regarding the definition of a major complication for the subsequent analyses, both the highest CD grade of \geq III in each patient and CCI \geq 26.2 were utilized. The secondary outcome was the survival effect of each complication category. Any urine leak event was also evaluated separately, which may be associated with tumor dissemination if cancer cells remained within the urinary tract. Overall survival (OS) was defined as the interval between the date of surgery and that of death. Recurrence-free survival (RFS) was calculated from the date of surgery to disease recurrence or death from any cause. Local, distant and urothelial recurrences were included in the study.

Statistical analysis

OS and RFS were estimated using the Kaplan–Meier method, and the log-rank test was used to compare survivals between the groups. Univariate and multivariate Cox models were utilized to determine independent survival predictors in the current cohort. The significant

Table 1. Patients' characteristics

Characteristics	<i>n</i> = 766
Sex	
Male	567 (74%)
Female	199 (26%)
Age at radical cystectomy (years), median (range)	72 (34–93)
Body mass index (BMI) (kg/m ²), median (range)	22.7 $(13.5-34.5)$, $n = 761$
Average annual cystectomy volume	
High (≥ 10 per year)	257 (34%), 3 hospitals
Moderate ($5 \le - < 10$ per year)	371 (48%), 8 hospitals
Low (<5 per year)	138(18%), 9 hospitals
Performance status	
0	661 (86%)
1	82 (11%)
2	14 (2.0%)
3	2 (0.3%)
Unknown	7 (0.9%)
No. neoadjuvant chemotherapy	95 (12%)
No. adjuvant chemotherapy	79 (10%)
No. form of urinary diversion	
Illeal conduit	516 (67%)
Neobladder	55 (7%)
Ureterocutaneostomy	182 (24%)
Nephrostomy	3 (0.4%)
Not performed	10 (1.3%)
Type of neobladder	× ,
Hautmann	46 (84%)
Studer	6 (11%)
Unknown	3 (5%)
Pathological T-stage	
pT0	92 (12%)
pTa-is	110 (14%)
pT1	107 (14%)
pT2	148 (19%)
pT3	239 (31%)
pT4	70 (9%)
Pathological N-stage	
pN+	133 (17%)
pN0	603 (79%)
pNx	30 (4%)
Histology	
Pure urothelial carcinoma	687 (90%)
Others	79 (10%)
Grade	(10,0)
high	551 (72%)
low	98 (13%)
unknown	117 (15%)
Operative time (minutes), median (range)	390(75-820), $n = 764$
Estimated blood loss (mL), median (range)	1000 (0-9230) n = 760
Surgical approach	
Open	568 (74%)
Laparoscopic	198 (26%)
Laparoscopic	1.0 (20,0)

predictors in the univariate model were included in the multivariate model. The variables analyzed were sex, age (continuous), body mass index, average annual cystectomy volume (high: ≥ 10 per/year vs. moderate: $5 \leq <10$ per/year vs. low: <5 per/year), performance status (PS, 0 vs. 1 vs. 2 vs. 3), neoadjuvant chemotherapy (yes vs. no), adjuvant chemotherapy (yes vs. no), pathological T-stage (pT0-1 vs. pT2 vs. pT3-4), pathological N-stage (pN0 vs. pN+ vs. pNx), histology (pure urothelial carcinoma vs. urothelial carcinoma with variant histology), tumor grade (low vs. high), operative time (continuous), estimated blood loss (continuous), surgical approach (open vs. laparoscopic) and complications (none vs. minor/major, none/minor vs. major or CCI < 26.2 vs. CCI ≥ 26.2). All calculations were performed using JMP[®] Pro, version 16.0.0 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). Significance was set at p < 0.05.

(a) Highest Clavien-Dindo grade of complication







Results

Table 1 shows a summary of the patient characteristics. The median patient age was 72 years (range, 34–93). Neoadjuvant chemotherapy was administered to 12% (95/766) of patients. In terms of urinary diversion, two-thirds of the patients (67%, 516/766) received an ileal conduit. Seventeen % (133/766) of patients had node metastasis on pathology.

Complications

Table 2 summarizes the postoperative complications. The most common complications were infectious (39%, 300/766), followed by gastrointestinal (26%, 201/766), wound-related (18%, 136/766) and genitourinary (10%, 73/766) complications. Urine leakage was observed in 31 patients. Figure 1 shows the distribution of the highest CD grade complication per patient (a), and CCI (b). The incidences of any and major (\geq CD grade III) complications were 70 (535/766) and 24% (187/766), respectively. In terms of CCI, 34% (261/766) of the patients had CCI \geq 26.2.

Survival analyses

The median follow-up duration for the entire cohort was 53 months. Four-year OS and RFS rates were 66.4 and 57.4%, respectively.

969

		Clavien-Dindo grade				
Category	No. of all patients (%)	≤II	≥III	Events	No. of patients	
Gastrointestinal	201 (26%)	115	86	Ileus	174	
				Bowel anastomosis leak/fistula	15	
				Gastrointestinal ulcer/bleeding	9	
				Enterocolitis	14	
				Gastrointestinal perforation	3	
Infection	300 (39%)	259	41	UTI	218	
				FUO	27	
				Sepsis	14	
				Other site infection	69	
Wound	136 (18%)	102	34	SSI	79	
				Wound dehiscence	65	
Genitourinary	73 (10%)	29	44	Hydronephrosis	30	
				Urine leak	31	
				Renal failure	13	
				Ileal conduit injury/necrosis	3	
				Others	2	
Cardiac	6 (0.8%)	5	1	Arryhythmia	5	
				Hypotension	1	
Pulmonary	16 (2%)	12	4	Pneumonia	14	
·				Respiratory distress	1	
				Asthma attack	1	
Bleeding	8 (1%)	5	3	Postoperative bleeding	3	
0				Uretero-arterial fistula	3	
				Hematoma (wound)	1	
				Urinary tract bleeding	1	
Thromboembolic	7 (0.9%)	6	1	Vascular thrombosis	6	
	X ,			Pulmonary embolism	2	
Neurological	24 (3%)	22	2	Cerebrovascular event	2	
	()			Peripheral neuropathy	2	
				Delirium/Agitation/Dementia	17	
				Vertigo	2	
				Insomnia	1	
Miscellaneous	52 (7%)	39	13	Lymphocele	7	
	· · · ·			Dermatitis	2	
				Liver dysfunction	17	
				Electrolyte abnormality	5	
				Compartment syndrome	3	
				Drug eruption	2	
				Loss of appetite	2	
				Other rare complication	15	
Surgical	12 (2%)	2	10	Rectal injury	8	
0	· · ·			Incisional hernia	2	
				Intestinal injury	1	
				Obturator nerve injury	1	
				UTI = urinary tract infection		
				FUO = fever of unknown origin		
				SSI – surgical site infection		

Table 2. Summary of postoperative complications

The effects of complications on OS and RFS are shown in Fig. 2. There was no significant difference in OS or RFS between patients with and without any complications (Fig. 2a and c). Major complications (\geq CD grade III) were also not significantly correlated with poorer OS or RFS (Fig. 2b and d). In contrast, considering CCI, patients with CCI \geq 26.2 had shorter OS (4-year, 59.5 vs. 69.8%, respectively, log-rank test, *P* = 0.0037, Fig. 3a) and RFS

(51.9 vs. 60.1%, respectively, P=0.0234, Fig. 3b), than those with CCI <26.2.

Table 3 demonstrates the univariate and multivariate analyses of OS. Older age, higher PS, adjuvant chemotherapy, pT3-4, pN+, high grade and CCI \geq 26.2 were significant adverse prognostic factors in univariate analyses. On multivariate analyses, age, PS, pT3-4, pN+ and CCI \geq 26.2 remained independent predictors of OS. Table 4



Figure 2. Kaplan–Meier estimates for overall and recurrence-free survival according to (a), (c) any complication, and (b), (d) major complications (≥CD grade III). There was no significant difference in overall survival (OS) or recurrence-free survival (RFS) between patients with and without any complications (a, c). Major complications were also not significantly correlated with poorer OS or RFS (b, d).

presents the univariate and multivariate analyses data for RFS. Older age, higher PS, adjuvant chemotherapy, higher pathological T-stage, pN+ and CCI ≥ 26.2 were significant adverse prognostic factors in univariate analyses. In multivariate analyses, age, PS, pT3-4, pN+ and CCI ≥ 26.2 remained independent predictors of RFS.

Supplementary Tables 1 (OS) and 2 (RFS) summarize univariate analyses in terms of the survival impact of each category of complication according to the CD grading [(a) any grading, and (b) \geq CD grade III]. After adjusting for other independent survival predictors including age, PS, pathological T-stage, and pathological N-stage, thromboembolic and neurological complications remained significant predictors of OS, both in any and major categorizations (Table 5). Regarding RFS, any thromboembolic or neurological complication, or major infectious complications remained significant predictors of RFS (Table 5). Urine leak was not associated with poorer OS (4-year survival estimates, without urine leak: 66.3% vs. with urine leak: 67.6%, P = 0.89) or RFS (without urine leak: 57.3% vs. with urine leak: 59.1%, P = 0.76).

Discussion

This study investigated the prognostic impact of postoperative complications on long-term survival outcomes after RC for BC. When considering the most severe event in each patient, neither any nor CD grade \geq III was associated with OS or RFS. Rather, when considering all events together with their respective severity with the use of CCI, which Slankamenac and colleagues created in order to assess cumulative postoperative morbidity (10), CCI was

independently associated with both OS and RFS. Patients with CCI ≥ 26.2 had shorter OS (4-year, 59.5 vs. 69.8%, respectively, log-rank test, P = 0.0037) and RFS (51.9 vs. 60.1%, respectively, P = 0.0234), than those with CCI < 26.2. For the first time, we identified that postoperative complications assessed using CCI could impair long-term survival outcomes after RC. To date, the negative impact of postoperative periods has been reported in several cancers, such as colorectal, gastric and oesophagogastric cancer, or hepatocellular carcinoma (5–8). Taken together with these previous observations, postoperative complications could compromise long-term disease control after major cancer surgery.

To date, the CD Classification, a grading system based on the necessary treatment for proper management, has been widely utilized to report postoperative complications. CD Classification only accounts for the most severe complications in each patient, for example, patients with a single Grade 2 complication and those with multiple Grade 2 complications are categorized into the same category, 'minor complication.' However, infections requiring antibiotic treatment for a long time, or readmission for ileus, especially when multiple low-grade complications occur simultaneously in one patient, could significantly delay a patient's full recovery to daily life. This is because, during the healing process, physicians may be reluctant to perform adjuvant chemotherapy, which could influence long-term disease control, as described below. In the present study, when using CCI to identify cumulative postoperative morbidity, the proportion of patients with major complications (CCI ≥ 26.2) increased to 34% (261/776) as compared with 24% (187/766)





(b) Recurrence-free survival, divided by CCI



Figure 3. Kaplan–Meier estimates for (a) OS and (b) RFS according to CCI. Patients with CCI \geq 26.2 had shorter OS (4 years, 59.5 vs. 69.8%, respectively, log-rank test, P = 0.0037) and RFS (51.9 vs. 60.1%, respectively, P = 0.0234), than those with CCI < 26.2.

when considering only the highest-grade complications (\geq CD grade III). Other researchers have also observed higher cumulative postoperative morbidity after RC than the CD Classification (13,14). Consistent with the present study, the prognostic impact of CCI has been reported for other malignancies (11,12,15). For example, Yamashita et al. observed that CCI \geq 26.2 was independently associated with cancer-specific survival after resection of colorectal liver metastases (11).

Although the mechanism has not yet been fully clarified, one hypothesis is that the growth of residual cancer cells is fueled by inflammatory cytokines and growth factors that are stimulated by surgical stress (16-18). Another hypothesis is that an attenuated host immunological response during postoperative illness may promote tumorigenesis (19). In addition, the prolonged postoperative

period required to recover from major complications could preclude adjuvant chemotherapy, which may result in a poorer long-term survival outcome. For example, Jin et al. observed that, in the US Gastric Cancer Collaborative (n = 824), patients with postoperative complications were less likely to undergo adjuvant chemotherapy (odds ratio = 0.5, P < 0.001), and such patients had a significantly increased hazard of death (HR-2.3, P < 0.001) (20). The delay in adjuvant chemotherapy (oral fluoropyrimidine derivative monotherapy) was also associated with shorter recurrence-free survival in gastric cancer patients (21). In the present cohort, after excluding patients without information on adjuvant chemotherapy (n = 7), among the pTanypN+ or pT3-4pNany patients (n = 335) who were considered to be candidates for adjuvant chemotherapy, those with CCI ≥ 26.2 were less likely to receive adjuvant chemotherapy

Table 3. Univariate and multivariate analyses of prognostic factors for overall survival (OS)

Variables	OS Univariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI)	p-value	OS Multivariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI)	p-value
Sex				
Male	1			
Female	0.78(0.59-1.04)	0.089		
Age, year				
Continuous	1.05(1.03 - 1.06)	< 0.0001	1.03(1.02 - 1.05)	< 0.0001
Body mass index (BMI) (kg/m^2) , median (range)	0.97(0.93-1.00)	0.062	1.00 (1.02 1.00)	
Average annual cystectomy volume		01002		
High (>10 per year)	1			
Moderate $(5 < - < 10 \text{ per vear})$	0.92(0.71-1.19)	0.52		
Low (<5 per year)	0.95(0.67-1.34)	0.76		
Performance Status		017 0		
0	1		1	
1	1 70 (1 22 - 2 38)	0.002	1 29 (0 91–1 82)	0.16
2	4 03 (2 13–7 62)	< 0.000	3 36 (1 74–6 51)	0.0003
3	3 31 (0.82 - 13.33)	0.093	1.53(0.36-6.51)	0.57
Unknown	8 16 (3 56-18 69)	~0.0001	5 22 (2 19–12 44)	0.0002
Neoadiuvant chemotherany	0.10 (3.50 10.05)	<0.0001	5.22 (2.1) 12.11)	0.0002
No.	1			
Vec	1 15(0.81 - 1.62)	0 44		
Adjuvant chemotherany	1.15 (0.81–1.62)	0.11		
No	1		1	
Vac	1 1 72 (1 24 2 38)	0.001	1 0.88 (0.60, 1.29)	0.52
Unknown	1.72(1.27-2.38) 1.77(0.44, 7.13)	0.001	0.88(0.00-1.2))	0.82
Pathological T stage	1.// (0.44-7.13)	0.42	0.85 (0.21-3.52)	0.82
nT0 1	1		1	
p10-1	1 12 (0.97, 2.08)	0.069	1	0.29
p12	1.42(0.97-2.08)	0.069	1.19(0.80-1.77)	0.39
p15-4	4.03 (3.04–3.34)	<0.0001	2.96 (2.14-4.08)	<0.0001
nN0	1		1	
pino nNL	1 2 09 (2 28 4 02)	-0.0001	1	-0.0001
pin+	5.09(2.28-4.02)	< 0.0001	2.08(1.34-2.81)	< 0.0001
pixx Histology	1.16 (0.61–2.18)	0.66	0.84 (0.42-1.87)	0.62
Drug wasth slist sensing and	1			
A change of the second se	1	0.17		
Others	1.29 (0.90–1.88)	0.17		
Grade	1		1	
LOW	1	0.026	1 = 0.08 (0.65, 1.47)	0.02
High	1.34(1.06-2.26)	0.026	0.98(0.65-1.47)	0.93
	0.96(0.39-1.37)	0.87	0.89 (0.34–1.48)	0.66
Operative time (minutes), median (range)	0.99(0.99-1.00)	0.18		
Estimated blood loss (mL), median (range)	1.00 (0.99–1.00)	0.19		
Surgical approach	1			
Open	1			
Laparoscopic	1.15 (0.88–1.49)	0.3		
Complications				
None	1	0.01		
Minor/major	1.18 (0.91–1.53)	0.21		
None/minor	1	0.00 .		
Major	1.26 (0.97–1.64)	0.085		
CCI 26.2 low	1	0.05	1	
hıgh	1.42 (1.12–1.80)	0.004	1.35 (1.05–1.72)	0.017

than patients with CCI < 26.2 (25 vs. 15%, respectively, χ^2 test, P = 0.0235, Supplementary Fig. 1a), which might result in poorer survival in patients with CCI \ge 26.2. Furthermore, in patients who received NAC (n = 95), there was no significant difference in OS or RFS between patients with CCI \ge 26.2 and those with CCI < 26.2

(4-year OS: 57.7 vs. 60.5%, log-rank test, P = 0.91, and 4-year RFS: 55.4 vs. 49.2%, log-rank test, P = 0.52, Supplementary Fig. 1b and c). Based on these observations, we believe that NAC could be a promising treatment option because it is not influenced by postoperative complications.

Table 4. Univariate and multivariate analyses of prognostic factors for recurrence-free survival (RFS)

Variables	RFS Univariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI)	p-value	RFS Multivariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI)	p-value
 Sex				
Male	1			
Female	0.92 (0.72 - 1.17)	0.47		
	0.92 (0.72-1.17)	0.47		
Continuous	1.03 (1.02 - 1.04)	~0.0001	1.02(1.00-1.03)	0.023
Body mass index (BMI) $(k\alpha/m^2)$ median (range)	0.98(0.95-1.01)	0.17	1.02 (1.00-1.03)	0.025
Average appual systestomy volume	0.98 (0.95-1.01)	0.17		
High (>10 per year)	1			
Moderate $(5 \le 10 \text{ per year})$	1 0.95 (0.75 1.20)	0.67		
Noderate $(5 \le - < 10 \text{ per year})$	1.17(0.88, 1.57)	0.07		
Derformance statue	1.17 (0.88–1.37)	0.2)		
	1		1	
1	1	0.017	1 12 (0.92, 1.55)	0.46
1	1.46(1.07-1.98)	0.017	1.15(0.82 - 1.33)	0.46
2	2.73(1.49-4.99)	0.001	2.11(1.14-3.91)	0.018
	4.11 (1.02–16.57)	0.047	1.97 (0.46-8.43)	0.36
Unknown	4.84 (2.14–10.93)	0.0001	3.00 (1.24–7.27)	0.015
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy	4			
No		0.24		
Yes	1.17 (0.86–1.59)	0.31		
Adjuvant chemotherapy	4			
No		0.0004		0.04
Yes	1.94 (1.45–2.59)	<0.0001	0.96 (0.68–1.33)	0.81
Unknown	1.56 (0.50–4.88)	0.44	0.75 (0.23–2.39)	0.62
Pathological T-stage				
p10-1	1		1	
pT2	1.51 (1.09–2.11)	0.015	1.34 (0.96–1.88)	0.088
pT3-4	4.11 (3.20–5.27)	<0.0001	3.17 (2.42–4.16)	<0.0001
Pathological N-stage				
pN0	1		1	
pN+	3.04 (2.41–3.85)	<0.0001	1.97 (1.50–2.59)	< 0.0001
pNx	1.30 (0.76–2.22)	0.34	1.02 (0.56–1.87)	0.95
Histology				
Pure urothelial carcinoma	1			
Others	1.31 (0.94–1.81)	0.11		
Grade				
Low	1			
High	1.30 (0.94–1.78)	0.11		
Unknown	0.87 (0.57–1.32)	0.51		
Operative time (minutes), median (range)	0.99 (0.99–1.00)	0.53		
Estimated blood loss (mL), median (range)	1.00 (0.99–1.00)	0.15		
Surgical approach				
Open	1			
Laparoscopic	1.11 (0.88–1.40)	0.39		
Complications				
None	1			
Minor/major	1.14 (0.90–1.43)	0.27		
None/minor	1			
Major	1.20 (0.95-1.52)	0.13		
CCI 26.2 low	1		1	
high	1.28 (1.03-1.58)	0.025	1.26 (1.01–1.57)	0.044

Among postoperative complications, infectious complications were the most frequently reported as adverse prognostic factors in patients with hepatocellular, gastric, lung or colorectal cancers (8,22–24). As shown in Table 5, a major infectious complication (\geq CD grade III) remained an independent adverse factor for RFS, but this

was marginal (P = 0.0681) for OS. Although thromboembolic and neurological complications remained significant for OS and RFS, we could not draw a definitive conclusion because of the low number of events. A larger study is warranted to gain further insight into the survival impacts of each complication category.

<table-container>Cardia, any NoIII<</table-container>	Categories	OS Hazard ratio after adjusting (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value	Categories	RFS Hazard ratio after adjusting (95% CI)	<i>p</i> -value
No 1 No 1 Yes 170 (0) 57-3.87, 0 0.21 Yes for thrombonholic, any thrombonholic,	Cardiac, any			Cardiac, any		
Yes1.70 (0.75-3.87)0.21Yes1.56 (0.69-3.54)0.29Normboendic, any1No1Homboendic, any1Ne3.38 (1.50-7.64)0.003Yes2.64 (1.17-5.95)0.019Naurological, anyNaurological, anyNaurological, any10.019No1.71 (0.99-2.95)0.056Yes1.63 (1.01-2.64)0.018Infection, major1No1.56 (1.03-2.37)0.035Cardiac, major1.56 (1.03-2.37)0.035Cardiac, major1.56 (1.03-2.37)0.035Cardiac, major2.10 (0.28-15.59)0.74Tromboenboohic, major1.76 (1.03-2.37)0.035Yes2.10 (0.28-15.59)0.74Tromboenboohic, major1.76 (1.03-2.37)0.039No2.10 (0.28-15.59)0.0003Sargial, major6.83 (0.93-50.37)0.039Normohoenboohic, major1No1No1Yes5.60 (1.38-22.76)0.016Yes1.92 (0.90-4.12)0.93Surgical, major1No1No1Yes1.81 (0.80-4.12)0.16Yes1.92 (0.90-4.12)0.93Surgical, major1.81 (0.80-4.12)0.16Yes1.92 (0.90-4.12)0.916No1Yes1.061 (0.767-1.468)0.716No1Yes1.061 (0.767-1.468)0.716No1Yes1.021 (0.78-1.457)0.013No1Yes1.061 (0.767-1.468)0.716No1 <td>No</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>No</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	No	1		No	1	
Result Thromboenholic, any Thromboenholic, any No 1 No 3.38 (1.50-7.64) 0.003 Yes 2.64 (1.17-5.95) 0.019 Neurological, any 1 No Neurological, any 1 Neurological, any 1.63 (1.01-2.64) 0.018 Infection, major No No 1 Neurological, any 1.63 (1.01-2.64) 0.018 Cardiac, major No 1 Cardiac, major 1.03 (0.97-2.40) 0.068 Yes 1.64 (1.03-2.37) 0.037 Thromboenholic, major 1.71 (0.29-1.5.59) 0.47 Yes 2.47 (0.34-18.22) 0.37 Thromboenholic, major 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 50.62 (6.17-415.2) 0.0003 Yes 6.81 (0.93-0.37) 0.059 Norrological, major No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 50.62 (6.17-415.2) 0.016 Yes 1.92 (0.90-4.12) 0.93 Storgical, major 1 Yes No 1 Yes<	Yes	1.70 (0.75-3.87)	0.21	Yes	1.56 (0.69-3.54)	0.29
No 1 No 1 Yes 3.8 (1.50–7.64) 0.003 Yes 2.64 (1.17–5.95) 0.019 Naurological, any No 1 No 1 Yes 1.71 (0.99–2.95) 0.056 Yes 1.33 (1.01–2.64) 0.018 Infection, major 1 No 1 1.53 (0.97–2.40) 0.668 Yes 1.36 (1.03–2.37) 0.037 Cardiac, major No 1 Yes 2.47 (0.34–18.22) 0.37 Thromboembolic, major No 6.83 (0.93–50.37) 0.059 Yes 5.60 (1.38–22.76) 0.016 Yes 1.92 (0.90–4.12) 0.093 Yes 5.60 (1.38–22.76) 0.16 Yes 1.92 (0.90–4.12) 0.093 Surgical, major 1 Yes 1.92 (0.90–4.12) 0.093 Yes 1.81 (0.80–4.12) 0.16 Yes 1.92 (0.90–4.12) 0.093 Surgical, major 1 Yes Yes 1.92 (0.90–4.12) 0.093 Surgical, major 1 <t< td=""><td>Thromboembolic, any</td><td>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,</td><td></td><td>Thromboembolic, any</td><td>, , ,</td><td></td></t<>	Thromboembolic, any	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Thromboembolic, any	, , ,	
Yes 3.8 (1.50-7.64) 0.003 Yes 2.4 (1.17-5.95) 0.019 Neurological any 1 No No 1 No 1.7 (1.0)-92-2.95) 0.056 Yes 1.53 (1.01-2.64) 0.018 Infection, major No 1.63 (1.01-2.64) 0.018 Yes 1.63 (1.01-2.64) 0.018 Cardac, major No 1 1.000 1.000 1.000 0.055 Cardac, major No 1 Yes 1.63 (1.01-2.64) 0.003 Yes 2.10 (0.28-15.59) 0.47 Yes 6.31 (0.93-0.07) 0.059 Neurological, major No 1 Yes 5.60 (1.34-22.7) 0.003 Yes 6.31 (0.93-0.07) 0.059 Surgical, major No 1 Yes 5.60 (1.34-22.7) 0.016 Yes 1.20 (0.90-4.12) 0.013 Yes 1.20 (0.90-4.12) 0.093 Yes 1.20 (0.90-4.12) 0.903 Surgical, major I Yes 1.20 (0.90-5.1517) No 1.01 (1.0.77-1.468)	No	1		No	1	
Nacurological, any Neurological, any	Yes	3.38 (1.50-7.64)	0.003	Yes	2.64 (1.17-5.95)	0.019
No. I. No. I. Yes 1.7 (199–2.9) 0.056 Yes 1.53 (1.01–2.64) 0.018 Infection, major No. 1 No. 1 Yes 1.53 (0.97–2.40) 0.068 Yes 1.56 (1.03–2.37) 0.035 Cardiac, major No. 1 No. 1 No. 1 Yes 2.10 (0.28–15.5) 0.47 Yes 2.47 (0.34–18.22) 0.37 Thromboenholic, major No. 1 No. 1 No. 1 Yes 50.62 (6.17–415.2) 0.0003 Yes 6.33 (0.93–50.37) 0.059 Surgical, major No 1 No. 1 No. 1 Yes 5.60 (1.34–22.76) 0.016 Yes 1.22 (0.90–4.12) 0.093 Surgical, major No 1 No. 1 P-value Categories Rs No. 1 P-value Categories No. No. 1 P-value	Neurological, any	× ,		Neurological, any		
Yes1.71 (0.99-2.95)0.056Yes1.63 (1.01-2.64)0.018Infection, major1No1NoNoNoYes1.56 (1.03-2.37)0.058Yes1.56 (1.03-2.37)0.058Cardiac, majorNo1NoNoNoNoNo1NoNo1NoNoNoYes2.10 (0.23-15.59)0.47Yes2.47 (0.34-18.22)0.37Thromboenholic, majorNo1NoNoNoNe1No1NoNoYes5.06 (1.39-22.76)0.016Yes1.20 (0.90-4.12)0.093Nurological, majorNo1NoNoNoNo1NoNoNoNoNoYes5.60 (1.38-22.76)0.016Yes1.20 (0.90-4.12)0.093Nuraledical, major1.81 (0.80-4.12)0.16Yes1.20 (0.90-4.12)0.093Surgial, major1No1NoNoNoCategoriesRFS Univariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI)No1NoNoNo1NoNo1NoNoNoNoYes1.089 (0.983-1.547)0.1013YesNo1NoNoNoYes1.089 (0.983-1.547)0.4208YesNo1NoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNoNo <t< td=""><td>No</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>No</td><td>1</td><td></td></t<>	No	1		No	1	
Infection, major Infection, major Infection, major Interval (1000) Interv	Yes	1.71 (0.99-2.95)	0.056	Yes	1.63 (1.01-2.64)	0.018
No. No. No. I No. I Yes 1.55 (1.03–2.37) 0.068 Yes 1.56 (1.03–2.37) 0.035 Cardias, major No I No I No I No 2.10 (0.28–15.59) 0.47 Yes 2.47 (0.34–18.22) 0.37 Thromboenbolic, major I No I I I No 50.62 (6.17–415.2) 0.003 Yes 6.83 (0.93–0.37) 0.059 Surgical, major No I I No I I Yes 5.60 (1.38–22.76) 0.016 Yes 1.92 (0.90–4.12) 0.93 Surgical, major I No I	Infection, major	(, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Infection, major	(,	
Yes 1.53 (0.97-2.40) 0.068 Yes 1.56 (1.03-2.37) 0.035 Cardiac, major 1 No 1 No 1 No 1 No 1 No 1 Thromboenbolic, major 2.10 (0.28-15.59) 0.47 Yes 2.47 (0.34-18.2.2) 0.37 No 1 No 1 0.059 Simple And Simple An	No	1		No	1	
Cardiac, major Low (not loss) Cardiac, major Low (not loss) Cardiac, major Low (not loss) Low (no	Yes	1.53(0.97-2.40)	0.068	Yes	1.56(1.03-2.37)	0.035
No No 1 Hermitation 1 Yer 2.10 (0.28-15.59) 0.47 Yer 2.47 (0.34-18.22) 0.37 Thromboembolic, major No 1 No 1 No 1 No 1 0.37 Number 201 No 1 0.39 Surgical, major No 1 0.0016 Yes 1.92 (0.30-4.12.) 0.093 Surgical, major 1 No 1 0.093 1.92 (0.30-4.12.) 0.093 Yes 1.81 (0.80-4.12.) 0.16 Yes 1.92 (0.30-4.12.) 0.093 Categories RFS Univariate analysis p-value Hazard ratio (95% CI) P-value Restrintentinal, any I No 1 No 1 Yes 1.209 (0.963-1.517) 0.1013 Yes 1.616 (0.767-1.468) 0.7166 Infection, major Infection, major No 1 Yes 1.020 (0.784-1.327) 0.814 Yes 0.947 (0.582-1.541) 0.826	Cardiac, major	100 (00) (200)	0.000	Cardiac, major	1100 (1100 2107)	0.000
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	No	1		No	1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Yes	2 10 (0.28 - 15.59)	0.47	Yes	247(0.34-18.22)	0.37
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Thromboembolic major	2.10 (0.28-13.37)	0.47	Thromboembolic major	2.47 (0.34-10.22)	0.37
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	No.	1		No.	1	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	No V	1 = 50 (2) ((17, 415, 2))	0.0002	NO V	1	0.050
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Tes	30.62 (6.1/-413.2)	0.0005	Tes Constant and the second se	6.83 (0.93-30.37)	0.039
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Neurological, major	1		Surgical, major	1	
Yes 5.60 (1.38–22.76) 0.016 Yes 1.52 (0.30–4.12) 0.093 Surgical, major 1 <td< td=""><td>No</td><td>1</td><td>0.017</td><td>No</td><td>1</td><td>0.000</td></td<>	No	1	0.017	No	1	0.000
Surgical major No 1 Yes 1.81 (0.80-4.12) 0.16 Resonance of the second of the se	Yes	5.60 (1.38-22.76)	0.016	Yes	1.92 (0.90-4.12)	0.093
No 1 Ist (0.80-4.12) 0.16 Series RFS Univariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value Categories RFS Univariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value Gastrointestinal, any Image: Categories RFS Univariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value Gastrointestinal, any Image: Categories RFS Univariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.209 (0.963-1.517) 0.1013 Yes 1.061 (0.767-1.468) 0.7196 Infection, any Infection, major Infection, major 1 0.0063 0.0063 Yes 1.089 (0.885-1.341) 0.4208 Yes 0.947 (0.582-1.541) 0.8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major Genitourinary, major 0.947 (0.582-1.541) 0.8266 Yes 1.084 (0.765-1.536) 0.6505 Yes 1.339 (0.892-2.010) 0.1588 Cardiac, any No 1 Yes 7.380 (1.029-52.91) 0.0467 Yes 2.329 (1.039-5.21) 0.4011 <td>Surgical, major</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Surgical, major					
Yes 1.81 $(0.80-4.12)$ 0.16 RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value Categories RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value Gastrointestinal, any Categories RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value No 1 Categories RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value No 1 Categories RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value No 1 Categories RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value RFS Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value No 1 No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.089 (0.963–1.517) 0.1013 Yes 1.051 (0.77–1.468) 0.7196 Infection, any Infection, major No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.020 (0.784–1.327) 0.8814 Yes 0.947 (0.582–1.541) 0.8266 Genitourinary, anjor No 1 No 1	No	1				
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Yes	1.81 (0.80-4.12)	0.16			
No P-value Categories No P-value Gastrointestinal, any $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ No 1 $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ No 1 No 1 $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ No 1 No 1 $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ No 1 No 1 $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ No 1 No 1 $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ No 1 No 1 $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ Yes 1.089 (0.885-1.341) 0.4208 Yes $1.207 (1.167-2.556)$ 0.0063 Genitourinary, any Wound, major No 1 $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III)$ $(\geq C$		DEC			DEC	
Categories Orwariate analysis Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value Hazard ratio (95% CI) p-value Hazard ratio (95% CI) Gastrointestinal, any [2:Clavien-Dindo grade III] No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.209 (0.963-1.517) 0.1013 Yes 1.061 (0.767-1.468) 0.7196 Infection, any Infection, major No 1 . . No 1 No 1 . . . Yes 1.089 (0.885-1.341) 0.4208 Yes 1.727 (1.167-2.556) 0.0063 Wound, any No 1 . No 1 . No 1 No 1 No 1 . No 1 No 1 . No 1 	Catalania		6 1	Cotoronica		6 1
Initiate ratio (95 % Cl) Initiate ratio (95 % Cl) Gastrointestinal, major (≥Clavien-Dindo grade III)	Categories	Univariate analysis	<i>p</i> -value	Categories	Univariate analysis	<i>p</i> -value
Gastrointestinal, any Gastrointestinal, major (\geq Clavien-Dindo grade III) No No 1 No 1 Yes 1.209 (0.963–1.517) 0.1013 Yes 1.061 (0.767–1.468) 0.7196 Infection, any Infection, major Infection, major 0.0016 0.7196 No 1 No 1 0.7196 Yes 1.089 (0.885–1.341) 0.4208 Yes 1.727 (1.167–2.556) 0.0063 Wound, any Wound, major No 1 0.0063 0.947 (0.582–1.541) 0.8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major Genitourinary, major 0.947 (0.582–1.541) 0.8266 No 1 No 1 1 1 1 0.8266 Gastrointestinal, major Cardiac, major No 1 </td <td></td> <td>Hazard Fatio (93 % CI)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Hazard ratio (93 % CI)</td> <td></td>		Hazard Fatio (93 % CI)			Hazard ratio (93 % CI)	
No [≥Clavien-Dindo grade III] No No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.209 (0.963-1.517) 0.1013 Yes on 1.061 (0.767-1.468) 0.7196 Infection, any Infection, major 1 1 1 Yes 1.089 (0.885-1.341) 0.4208 Yes on 1.272 (1.167-2.556) 0.0063 Wound, any Wound, major 1 0.947 (0.582-1.541) 0.8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major 0.947 (0.582-1.541) 0.8266 No 1 No 1 1 Yes 1.020 (0.784-1.327) 0.8814 Yes on 1.339 (0.892-2.010) 0.1588 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major 1 1 1 Yes 1.084 (0.765-1.536) 0.6505 Yes on 1.339 (0.892-2.010) 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major 1 1 1 1 Yes 3.299 (1.039-5.21) 0.0401 Yes on 1.339 (0.292-5.91) 0.0467 Pulmonary, any No	Gastrointestinal, any			Gastrointestinal, major		
No 1 No 1 Yes 1.209 (0.963-1.517) 0.1013 Yes 1.061 (0.767-1.468) 0.7196 Infection, any Infection, major No 1 0.7196 No 1 No 1 0.61 (0.767-1.468) 0.7196 No 1 No 1 1.061 (0.767-1.468) 0.7196 Yes 1.089 (0.885-1.341) 0.4208 Yes 1.277 (1.167-2.556) 0.0063 Wound, any Wound, major No 1 .277 (1.167-2.556) 0.0063 Genitourinary, any Wound, major No 1 .277 (1.167-2.551) 0.8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major .041 (0.55-1.536) No 1 .8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major .277 (1.628-2.010) 0.1588	,			(>Clavien-Dindo grade III)		
No1No1O0OOO<	No	1		No	1	
Ites	Vec	1209(0.963-1.517)	0 1013	Ver	1 061 (0.767 - 1.468)	0 7196
Interfacion and of the second secon	Infaction any	1.209 (0.903–1.317)	0.1015	Infaction major	1.001 (0.707–1.408)	0.7170
No1No1No1Yes1.089 (0.885-1.341)0.4208Yes1.727 (1.167-2.556)0.0063Wound, anyWound, majorNo1No1No1No1No1Yes0.000 (0.784-1.327)0.8814Yes0.947 (0.582-1.541)0.8266Genitourinary, anyGenitourinary, majorINo1Yes1.084 (0.765-1.536)0.6505Yes1.339 (0.892-2.010)0.1588Cardiac, anyCardiac, majorINo1Yes2.329 (1.039-5.221)0.0401Yes7.880 (1.029-52.91)0.0467Pulmonary, anyPulmonary, majorNo19.9992Bleeding, anyNo19.99929.9992No1No19.9992Yes1.312 (0.628-2.805)0.4581Yes0.8069.762 (1.358-70.19)0.9991Thromboembolic, anyNo119.999119.9991No1No19.999119.9991Yes2.348 (1.047-5.265)0.0384Yes9.762 (1.358-70.19)0.0236No1No119.9991Yes2.028 (1.291-3.184)0.0021Yes3.108 (0.774-12.49)0.11Miscellaneous, anyNo111Yes3.138 (0.907-1.915)0.1473Yes0.856 (0.354-2.069)0.7295Surgical, anyNo111 <td>N-</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>NI-</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	N-	1		NI-	1	
Tes 1.089 (0.885-1.341) 0.4208 Tes 1.72 (1.187-2.356) 0.00053 Wound, any Wound, major Wound, major Wound, major No 1 No 1 No 0.947 (0.582-1.541) 0.8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major 0.6105 Yes 0.339 (0.892-2.010) 0.1588 Cardiac, any No 1 No 1 1 Yes 1.084 (0.765-1.536) 0.6505 Yes 1.339 (0.892-2.010) 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major 1 No 1 <	NO X	1	0.4200	INO	1	0.00/2
Wound, any NoINoINo1No0.947 (0.582-1.541)0.8266Genitourinary, anyGenitourinary, majorGenitourinary, majorNo1No1Yes1.084 (0.765-1.536)0.6505Yes1.339 (0.892-2.010)0.1588Cardiac, anyGardiac, majorCardiac, major0.0407Yes2.329 (1.039-5.221)0.0401Yes7.380 (1.029-52.91)0.0407Pulmonary, anyPulmonary, major0.04670.99920.9992Bleeding, anyNo110.9992No1Yes0.99920.99920.9992Bleeding, anyBleeding, major0.99920.9992No1Yes0.99911Yes1.311 (0.422-3.031)0.806Yes0.9911Thromboembolic, anyThromboembolic, major0.9991No1No10.0236Yes2.348 (1.047-5.265)0.0384Yes9.762 (1.358-70.19)0.0236Neurological, anyNo1No1Yes2.028 (1.291-3.184)0.0021Yes3.108 (0.774-12.49)0.11Miscellaneous, anyNo1No1Yes1.318 (0.907-1.915)0.1473Yes0.856 (0.354-2.069)0.7295Surgical, anyNo1Yes0.856 (0.354-2.069)0.7295Yes1.318 (0.077-1.943)0.2008Yes0.376 (1.124-5.021)0.0236	ies	1.089 (0.885–1.341)	0.4208		1./2/ (1.16/-2.556)	0.0063
No 1 No 1 Yes $1.020 (0.784-1.327)$ 0.8814 Yes $0.947 (0.582-1.541)$ 0.8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major Genitourinary, major 0.505 Yes $1.339 (0.892-2.010)$ 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major Cardiac, major 0.8266 0.8266 No 1 No 1 0.8816 Yes $0.339 (0.892-2.010)$ 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major No 1 0.8667 0.8266 0.8992 Pulmonary, any No 1 No 1 0.9992 0.9992 Bleeding, any No 1 0.9992 0.9992 Bleeding, any No 1 0.9992 Thromboembolic, any $1.131 (0.422-3.031)$ 0.806 Yes 0.9992 Thromboembolic, any 1 No 1 0.9992 No 1 0.9991 0.9992 Stardiang $0.3248 (1.047-5.265)$ 0.0384 Yes $0.9762 (1.358-70.19)$ 0.0236 <t< td=""><td>Wound, any</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>Wound, major</td><td>1</td><td></td></t<>	Wound, any	1		Wound, major	1	
Yes $0.20 (0.784-1.32/)$ 0.8814 Yes $0.94/ (0.582-1.541)$ 0.8266 Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major Genitourinary, major 0.8266 No 1 No 1 Yes $0.084 (0.765-1.536)$ 0.6505 Yes $1.339 (0.892-2.010)$ 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major 0.3266 Yes $1.339 (0.892-2.010)$ 0.1588 No 1 Cardiac, major $0.339 (0.892-2.010)$ 0.1588 Ves $0.3291 (0.39-5.221)$ 0.0401 Yes $7.380 (1.029-52.91)$ 0.0467 Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, major 0.991 0.9991 0.9992 0.9992 Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, major 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 Bleeding, any No 1 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 Bleeding, any I No 1 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 No 1 No 1 0.9992 0.9992 0.9992 <td>No</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>No</td> <td>1</td> <td></td>	No	1		No	1	
Genitourinary, any Genitourinary, major No 1 No 1 No 1.084 (0.765–1.536) 0.6505 Yes 1.339 (0.892–2.010) 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major Cardiac, major 1 No 1 Sage (0.892–2.010) 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major 1 No 1 Sage (0.129–52.91) 0.0407 Yes 2.329 (1.039–5.221) 0.0401 Yes 7.80 (0.129–52.91) 0.0467 Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, major 1	Yes	1.020 (0.784–1.327)	0.8814	Yes	0.947 (0.582–1.541)	0.8266
No 1 No 1 Yes $1.084 (0.765-1.536)$ 0.6505 Yes $1.339 (0.892-2.010)$ 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major Cardiac, major 0.401 Yes $1.339 (0.892-2.010)$ 0.1588 No 1 No 1 0.9921 0.0467 Yes $2.329 (1.039-5.221)$ 0.0401 Yes $7.380 (1.029-5.291)$ 0.0467 Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, major Pulmonary, major 0.9921 No 1 0.9921 0.9921 Steeding, any No 1 0.9992 Bleeding, major 0.9992 0.9992 Bleeding, any No 1 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any No 1 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any No 1 0.9991 Yes $2.348 (1.047-5.265)$ 0.0384 Yes $9.762 (1.358-70.19)$ 0.0236 Neurological, any Neurological, major No 1 0.9911 0.9911 No 1 No 1 0.7295 <t< td=""><td>Genitourinary, any</td><td></td><td></td><td>Genitourinary, major</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Genitourinary, any			Genitourinary, major		
Yes $1.084 (0.765 - 1.536)$ 0.6505 Yes $1.339 (0.892 - 2.010)$ 0.1588 Cardiac, any Cardiac, major Cardiac, major 0.0407 No 1 Yes $7.380 (1.029 - 52.91)$ 0.0467 Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, major 0.0467 0.0467 No 1 No 1 0.0467 Yes $1.327 (0.628 - 2.805)$ 0.4581 Yes 0.0992 Bleeding, any Bleeding, major 0.9992 No 1 No 1 0.9992 Start $0.3027 (0.628 - 2.805)$ 0.4581 Yes 0.9992 Bleeding, any Bleeding, major 0.9992 0.9992 No 1 No 1 0.9992 Thromboembolic, any 1 0.0021 No 1 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any 1 0.021 No 1 0.0236 No 1 0.021 Yes $0.108 (0.774 - 12.49)$ 0.111 Yes $0.208 (1.291 - 3.184)$ 0.0021 Yes<	No	1		No	1	
Cardiac, any Cardiac, major No 1 No 1 Yes 3.29 (1.039–5.221) 0.0401 Yes 7.380 (1.029–52.91) 0.0467 Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, major 9 9 0.0467 No 1 No 1 0.9992 Blecding, any No 1 0.9992 No 1.327 (0.628–2.805) 0.4581 Yes 0.9992 Blecding, any No 1 0.9992 No 1 0.9991 0.9992 Blecding, any No 1 0.9991 No 1 0.9991 0.9991 Yes 1.313 (0.422–3.031) 0.806 Yes 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any Thromboembolic, major 0.9991 0.9991 No 1 No 1 0.0236 Neurological, any No 1 0.0236 No 1 No 1 1 Yes 0.2028 (1.291–3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.111 Miscellaneous, an	Yes	1.084 (0.765–1.536)	0.6505	Yes	1.339 (0.892–2.010)	0.1588
No 1 No 1 Yes $2.329 (1.039-5.221)$ 0.0401 Yes $7.380 (1.029-52.91)$ 0.0467 Pulmonary, any Pulmoary, major Pulmoary, major 0.0467 No 1 No 1 0.9992 No 1 No 0 0.9992 Bleeding, any Bleeding, major 0.9992 No 1 0.9992 Bleeding, any No 1 0.9992 Yes $1.317 (0.422-3.031)$ 0.806 Yes 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any 1 No 1 0.9991 Yes $1.311 (0.422-3.031)$ 0.806 Yes 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any 1 No 1 0.9991 Yes $2.348 (1.047-5.265)$ 0.0384 Yes $9.762 (1.358-70.19)$ 0.0236 Neurological, any No 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Cardiac, any			Cardiac, major		
Yes $2.329 (1.039-5.221)$ 0.0401 Yes $7.380 (1.029-52.91)$ 0.0467 Pulmonary, any $ulmonary, major$ $ulmonary, major$ $ulmonary, major$ No 1 No 1 0.9992 Bleeding, any $Bleeding, major$ 0.9992 No 1 Yes 0.9992 Bleeding, any $Bleeding, major$ 0.9992 No 1 No 1 0.9992 Start $1.317 (0.628-2.805)$ 0.4581 Yes 0.0021 Yes 0.0021 No 1 No 1 No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes $2.348 (1.047-5.265)$ 0.0384 Yes $9.762 (1.358-70.19)$ 0.0236 Neurological, any No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes $2.028 (1.291-3.184)$ 0.0021 Yes $3.108 (0.774-12.49)$ 0.11 Miscellaneous, any No 1 No 1 No 1 No No No No	No	1		No	1	
Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, any Pulmonary, any No 1 No 1 Yes 1.327 (0.628–2.805) 0.4581 Yes 0.9992 Bleeding, any Bleeding, anjor 0.9992 No 1 1 0.9992 Bleeding, any Bleeding, anjor 0.9992 No 1 0.806 Bleeding, anjor 0.9992 No 1 1 0.9992 0.9992 Stard	Yes	2.329 (1.039-5.221)	0.0401	Yes	7.380 (1.029-52.91)	0.0467
No1No1Yes $1.327 (0.628-2.805)$ 0.4581 Yes 0.992 Bleeding, anyBleeding, major 0.9992 No1No 1 Yes $1.311 (0.422-3.031)$ 0.806 Yes 0.9991 Thromboembolic, anyThromboembolic, major 0.9991 No1No 0.9991 Thromboembolic, anyThromboembolic, major 0.9991 No1No 0.9991 Yes $2.348 (1.047-5.265)$ 0.0384 Yes $9.762 (1.358-70.19)$ 0.0236 Neurological, anyNo1 1 1 Yes $2.028 (1.291-3.184)$ 0.0021 Yes $3.108 (0.774-12.49)$ 0.11 Miscellaneous, anyNo1 1 1 No1No1 1 Yes $3.118 (0.907-1.915)$ 0.1473 Yes $0.856 (0.354-2.069)$ 0.7295 Surgical, anySurgical, majorNo1 1 No1No1 1 1 Yes $1.630 (0.771-3.443)$ 0.2008 Yes $2.376 (1.124-5.021)$ 0.0235	Pulmonary, any			Pulmonary, major		
Yes $1.327 (0.628-2.805)$ 0.4581 Yes 0.992 Bleding, any I I I I I No1 1 No 1 I Yes $1.31 (0.422-3.031)$ 0.806 Yes 0.9921 Thromboembolic, any I I I I No1 I No 1Yes $2.348 (1.047-5.265)$ 0.0384 Yes $9.762 (1.358-70.19)$ 0.0236 Neurological, any I No 1 I No1 I No 1 I Yes $0.028 (1.291-3.184)$ 0.0021 Yes $3.108 (0.774-12.49)$ 0.11 Miscellaneous, any I No 1 I I No1 I No I I I Yes $1.318 (0.907-1.915)$ 0.1473 Yes $0.856 (0.354-2.069)$ 0.7295 Surgical, any I No 1 I I No1 I I I I I Yes $1.318 (0.907-1.915)$ 0.1473 Yes $0.856 (0.354-2.069)$ 0.7295 Surgical, any I I I I I I No1 I I I I I Yes $1.630 (0.771-3.443)$ 0.208 Yes $2.376 (1.124-5.021)$ 0.0235	No	1		No	1	
Bleeding, any Bleeding, major No 1 Yes 1.131 (0.422–3.031) 0.806 Yes 1.131 (0.422–3.031) 0.806 Thromboembolic, any Thromboembolic, major 0.9991 No 1 No 1 Yes 2.348 (1.047–5.265) 0.0384 Yes 9.762 (1.358–70.19) 0.0236 Neurological, any No 1	Yes	1.327 (0.628-2.805)	0.4581	Yes		0.9992
No 1 No 1 Yes 1.131 (0.422–3.031) 0.806 Yes 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any Thromboembolic, major 0.9991 No 1 No 1 Yes 2.348 (1.047–5.265) 0.0384 Yes 9.762 (1.358–70.19) 0.0236 Neurological, any No 1 1 0.0236 Neurological, any Neurological, major 1 0.0236 Yes 2.028 (1.291–3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any No 1	Bleeding, any	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		Bleeding, major		
Yes 1.131 (0.422–3.031) 0.806 Yes 0.9991 Thromboembolic, any Thromboembolic, major 0.9991 No 1 No 1 Yes 2.348 (1.047–5.265) 0.0384 Yes 9.762 (1.358–70.19) 0.0236 Neurological, any Neurological, major 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Yes 2.028 (1.291–3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any No 1 1 1 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 1 1 1 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907–1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354–2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 1 1 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	No	1		No	1	
Ites Ites Ites Ites Ites Thromboembolic, any Thromboembolic, major Thromboembolic, major No 1 No 1 Yes 2.348 (1.047–5.265) 0.0384 Yes 9.762 (1.358–70.19) 0.0236 Neurological, any Neurological, major Neurological, major 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Yes 2.028 (1.291–3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any No 1 1 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907–1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354–2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	Yes	1 131 (0 422 - 3 031)	0.806	Yes	-	0 9991
No 1 No 1 Yes 2.348 (1.047–5.265) 0.0384 Yes 9.762 (1.358–70.19) 0.0236 Neurological, any Neurological, major Neurological, major 0.0236 No 1 No 1 Yes 2.028 (1.291–3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any No 1 1 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 1 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 1 1 Miscellaneous, any No 1 1 1 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907–1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354–2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 1 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	Thromboembolic any	1.101 (0.122 0.001)	0.000	Thromboembolic major		0.7771
No 1 No 1 Yes 2.348 (1.047–5.265) 0.0384 Yes 9.762 (1.358–70.19) 0.0236 Neurological, any Neurological, major Neurological, major 1 Yes 2.028 (1.291–3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any Miscellaneous, major No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907–1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354–2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 1 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	No.	1		No.	1	
Tes T	Vas	$\frac{1}{2}$ 2.48 (1.047 5.265)	0.0384	Vec	9762(13587019)	0.0236
No 1 No 1 Yes 2.028 (1.291–3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774–12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any Miscellaneous, major No 1 No 1 Yes 0.11 Miscellaneous, any No 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907–1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354–2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	Nerrale sizel and	2.548 (1.047-5.265)	0.0384	Neurological maior	9.762 (1.558-70.17)	0.0230
No 1 No 1 Yes 2.028 (1.291-3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.774-12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any Miscellaneous, major No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907-1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354-2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 1 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771-3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124-5.021) 0.0235	Neurological, any	1		Neurological, major	1	
Yes 2.028 (1.291-3.184) 0.0021 Yes 3.108 (0.7/4-12.49) 0.11 Miscellaneous, any Miscellaneous, major No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907-1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354-2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 No 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771-3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124-5.021) 0.0235	NO		0.0021	INO	1	0.11
Miscellaneous, any Miscellaneous, major No 1 No 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907–1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354–2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 1 No 1 No 1 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	ies	2.028 (1.291-3.184)	0.0021	res	3.108 (0.//4-12.49)	0.11
No 1 No 1 Yes 1.318 (0.907-1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354-2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 No 1 No 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771-3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124-5.021) 0.0235	Miscellaneous, any			Miscellaneous, major		
Yes 1.318 (0.907-1.915) 0.1473 Yes 0.856 (0.354-2.069) 0.7295 Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 No 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771-3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124-5.021) 0.0235	No	1		No	1	
Surgical, any Surgical, major No 1 No 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	Yes	1.318 (0.907-1.915)	0.1473	Yes	0.856 (0.354-2.069)	0.7295
No 1 No 1 Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	Surgical, any			Surgical, major		
Yes 1.630 (0.771–3.443) 0.2008 Yes 2.376 (1.124–5.021) 0.0235	No	1		No	1	
	Yes	1.630 (0.771-3.443)	0.2008	Yes	2.376 (1.124-5.021)	0.0235

Table 5. Summary of hazard ratio of each complication category, after adjusting for age, PS, and pathological T-stage and N-stage

In colorectal cancer, it was reported that long-term disease control was impaired by anastomotic leakage (25,26). It has been proposed that anastomotic leakage can lead to extraluminal dissemination of the remaining cancer cells. Based on this hypothesis, we compared survival curves between patients with and without urinary leakage. As described above, we did not observe significant differences in survival between patients with and without urine leak (4-year OS: without urine leak 66.3% vs. with urine leak 67.6%, P = 0.887 and 4-year RFS: without urine leak 57.3% vs. with urine leak 59.1%, P = 0.76).

Our study had several limitations. First, because of its retrospective design, some complications and comorbid conditions may not have been recorded. Second, variability among the participating hospitals regarding surgical techniques and postoperative management was another limitation. External validation is necessary to confirm the generalizability of the present findings. Nevertheless, this study is the first to demonstrate that postoperative morbidity can impair long-term disease control after RC, just as with other major cancer surgery. Physicians should be aware that major postoperative complications can impair long-term disease control.

Conclusions

Postoperative complications assessed by CCI independently had an adverse impact on long-term survival outcomes after RC. It is vital to mitigate postoperative complications, not only for early convalescence, but also for improving long-term disease control.

Acknowledgements

We thank Junji Ishizaki, Shuhei Ishikawa, Yuichiro Oishi, Chihiro Kamijyo, Keiji Sugishita, Tsuyoshi Furuno, Noboru Yamashita, Yuki Sugito, Tatsuya Hoshi, Oujiro Toukairin, Ataka Hanai, Kanta Hori, Kiyoto Nagamori, Madoka Higuchi, Mikio Konnno, Masaya Miyazaki, Ryo Kato, Ryo Kurosawa, Shogo Aizawa, Shigeru Harada, Shun Tsubouchi, Takuya Moriguchi, Takuto Morita, Tatsu Tanabe, Yurie Hirata, Yuki Muranishi, Takenori Ono and Gaku Tamaki for data collection.

Funding

The study was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Conflict of interest statement

The authors declare that they have NO affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with any financial interest in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

Ethics statement

This study received Institutional Review Board Approval (No. 017-0038).

Author Contributions

T.A., S.Y. and H.K. designed the research. T.A., S.Y., H.K., A.S., H.K., H.S., I.T., K.M., K.M., K.T., N.T., S.M., S.S., T.Y., T.M., T.A., Y.S., Y.S., N.M., T.K., J.F., H.M., R.M. and S.M. collected the data. T.A. and S.Y. analyzed the data or performed statistical analysis. T.O. and N.S. supervised the project. T.A. wrote the paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

References

- Shabsigh A, Korets R, Vora KC, et al. Defining early morbidity of radical cystectomy for patients with bladder cancer using a standardized reporting methodology. *Eur Urol* 2009;55:164–76.
- 2. Takada N, Abe T, Shinohara N, et al. Peri-operative morbidity and mortality related to radical cystectomy: a multi-institutional retrospective study in Japan. *BJU Int* 2012;110:E756–64.
- Novara G, De Marco V, Aragona M, et al. Complications and mortality after radical cystectomy for bladder transitional cell cancer. J Urol 2009;182:914–21.
- Yamada S, Abe T, Sazawa A, et al. Comparative study of postoperative complications after radical cystectomy during the past two decades in Japan: radical cystectomy remains associated with significant postoperative morbidities. Urol Oncol 2022;40:11.e17–25.
- Saunders JH, Yanni F, Dorrington MS, et al. Impact of postoperative complications on disease recurrence and long-term survival following oesophagogastric cancer resection. Br J Surg 2020;107:103–12.
- Artinyan A, Orcutt ST, Anaya DA, Richardson P, Chen GJ, Berger DH. Infectious postoperative complications decrease long-term survival in patients undergoing curative surgery for colorectal cancer: a study of 12,075 patients. *Ann Surg* 2015;261:497–505.
- Mirnezami A, Mirnezami R, Chandrakumaran K, Sasapu K, Sagar P, Finan P. Increased local recurrence and reduced survival from colorectal cancer following anastomotic leak: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Surg* 2011;253:890–9.
- Yang T, Liu K, Liu CF, et al. Impact of postoperative infective complications on long-term survival after liver resection for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Br J Surg* 2019;106:1228–36.
- Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. *Ann Surg* 2004;240:205–13.
- Slankamenac K, Graf R, Barkun J, Puhan MA, Clavien PA. The comprehensive complication index: a novel continuous scale to measure surgical morbidity. *Ann Surg* 2013;258:1–7.
- Yamashita S, Sheth RA, Niekamp AS, et al. Comprehensive Complication Index predicts cancer-specific survival after resection of colorectal metastases independent of RAS mutational status. *Ann Surg* 2017;266:1045–54.
- Tu RH, Lin JX, Li P, et al. Comprehensive Complication Index predicts cancer-specific survival of patients with postoperative complications after curative resection of gastric cancer. *Gastroenterol Res Pract* 2018;2018:4396018.
- Haas M, Huber T, Pickl C, et al. The comprehensive complication index is associated with a significant increase in complication severity between 30 and 90 days after radical cystectomy for bladder cancer. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2021;47:1163–71.
- Vetterlein MW, Klemm J, Gild P, et al. Improving estimates of perioperative morbidity after radical cystectomy using the European Association of Urology quality criteria for standardized reporting and introducing the Comprehensive Complication Index. *Eur Urol* 2020;77:55–65.
- Ortiz-Lopez D, Marchena-Gomez J, Nogues-Ramia E, et al. Utility of a new prognostic score based on the Comprehensive Complication Index (CCI(R)) in patients operated on for colorectal cancer (S-CRC-PC score). *Surg Oncol* 2022;42:101780.
- Bohle B, Pera M, Pascual M, et al. Postoperative intra-abdominal infection increases angiogenesis and tumor recurrence after surgical excision of colon cancer in mice. *Surgery* 2010;147:120–6.
- Abramovitch R, Marikovsky M, Meir G, Neeman M. Stimulation of tumour growth by wound-derived growth factors. Br J Cancer 1999; 79:1392–8.
- Balkwill F, Mantovani A. Inflammation and cancer: back to Virchow? Lancet 2001;357:539–45.
- Goldfarb Y, Sorski L, Benish M, Levi B, Melamed R, Ben-Eliyahu S. Improving postoperative immune status and resistance to cancer metastasis: a combined perioperative approach of immunostimulation and prevention of excessive surgical stress responses. *Ann Surg* 2011;253: 798–810.

- Jin LX, Sanford DE, Squires MH III, et al. Interaction of postoperative morbidity and receipt of adjuvant therapy on long-term survival after resection for gastric adenocarcinoma: results from the U.S. Gastric Cancer Collaborative. Ann Surg Oncol 2016;23:2398–408.
- Nakanishi K, Kanda M, Ito S, et al. Delay in initiation of postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy with S-1 monotherapy and prognosis for gastric cancer patients: analysis of a multi-institutional dataset. *Gastric Cancer* 2019;22:1215–25.
- Andalib A, Ramana-Kumar AV, Bartlett G, Franco EL, Ferri LE. Influence of postoperative infectious complications on long-term survival of lung cancer patients: a population-based cohort study. J Thorac Oncol 2013;8:554–61.
- Han WH, Oh YJ, Eom BW, Yoon HM, Kim YW, Ryu KW. Prognostic impact of infectious complications after curative gastric cancer surgery. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2020;46:1233–8.
- 24. Farid SG, Aldouri A, Morris-Stiff G, et al. Correlation between postoperative infective complications and long-term outcomes after hepatic resection for colorectal liver metastasis. *Ann Surg* 2010;251:91–100.
- Bell SW, Walker KG, Rickard MJ, et al. Anastomotic leakage after curative anterior resection results in a higher prevalence of local recurrence. Br J Surg 2003;90:1261–6.
- Law WL, Choi HK, Lee YM, Ho JW, Seto CL. Anastomotic leakage is associated with poor long-term outcome in patients after curative colorectal resection for malignancy. J Gastrointest Surg 2007;11:8–15.