



Academic or non-academic: should we really pick one?

Nora Mayer¹, Fabrizio Minervini²[^]

¹Division of Thoracic Surgery, University Hospital of Berne, Inselspital, Berne, Switzerland; ²Division of Thoracic Surgery, Cantonal Hospital of Lucerne, Lucerne, Switzerland

Correspondence to: Fabrizio Minervini, MD. Division of Thoracic Surgery, Cantonal Hospital of Lucerne, Spitalstrasse 16, 6000 Lucerne, Switzerland. Email: fabriziominervini@hotmail.com.

Comment on: Zbytniewski M, Gryszko GM, Cackowski MM, *et al.* The effectiveness of surgical treatment of lung cancer in Polish academic and nonacademic centers. *Transl Lung Cancer Res* 2023;12:1717-27.

Keywords: Lung cancer surgery; academic vs. non-academic centre; surgical volume; outcomes

Submitted Nov 05, 2023. Accepted for publication Nov 15, 2023. Published online Nov 24, 2023.

doi: 10.21037/tlcr-23-723

View this article at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tlcr-23-723>

Improving oncologic outcomes as well as the efficacy of lung cancer surgery in early-stage non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) has ever since been a priority in thoracic surgery. Multiple factors, e.g., video-assisted thoracic surgery (VATS) have already been identified to reduce morbidity and mortality (1). The impact of hospital volume on patient outcomes is an ongoing controversial debate (2), nevertheless there is increasing evidence of high-volume centres showing better patient outcomes (3-5). Moreover, in large retrospective European and US-American investigations, better overall survival and surgical outcomes in academic versus non-academic hospitals were shown (6,7). In-hospital mortality has moreover been reported to be reduced in patients undergoing lung cancer resections in teaching hospitals regardless of the surgical volume (8). Not to forget, surgeon specialty (general versus thoracic or cardiothoracic surgery) and surgeon volume are important determinants of outcome in lung cancer resections (9,10). Zbytniewski *et al.* retrospectively illuminated the current situation of this context in Poland in their publication on “The effectiveness of surgical treatment of lung cancer in Polish academic and nonacademic centers” (11).

In this retrospective analysis of 31,777 Polish patients, Zbytniewski *et al.* compared academic versus non-academic centres with regards to postoperative outcomes. Despite a more accurate staging, overall, 5-year survival

was not affected. Length of stay (LOS) and postoperative complications, however, were improved in academic centres. Median hospital volume in academic centres was reported as 97.5 and 54.5 cases/year in non-academic institutions.

Matching the current consensus in literature, Zbytniewski *et al.* have shown that academic centres show better perioperative patient outcomes in early-stage NSCLC resection. This superiority of academic hospitals is certainly partially accountable to the more experienced way of dealing with complications (12), as well as the fact that academic centres provide highly specialized multidisciplinary treatment facilities and infrastructure (e.g., intensive care units).

As a matter of fact, seen in the study results, academic centres in Poland simultaneously have a higher caseload than non-academic centres. Considering those two variables in the quote, we were questioning the fact, which one of them can be attributed to be the causative force for the outcome-difference between academic and non-academic facilities? Can we really reliably divide the influence of academic affiliation and numerical volume to receive valid answers? As previously discussed by Bach *et al.*, the underlying etiologies contributing to improved NSCLC survival at academic facilities were considered to be related to higher surgical caseload (13), which however could not be scientifically proven (14). Lim *et al.* just recently argued

[^] ORCID: 0000-0003-3595-7307.

against the volume-outcome correlation in academic centres when presenting the preliminary results of the MARS 2 clinical phase III trial at the 2023 World Conference on Lung Cancer. All the centres included in MARS 2 were national centres of surgical expertise for mesothelioma, independent of the hospital volume (15).

Let us take a closer look at the statement of improved morbidity and mortality following NSCLC resection in academic hospitals in related published articles (7) from a different perspective and be slightly provocative: Is the type of healthcare facility an independent determinant of surgical outcome following early-stage NSCLC resection? As published evidence supporting this thesis is predominant, our clearly defined task has to be surgical centralization. In 2020, Ely *et al.* published their data on centralization of thoracic surgery units in the US, successfully increasing both hospital and surgeon volume (16). Spinning that wheel further, higher surgical volume has shown better patient outcomes (17). However, hospital volume and definition of high versus low volume centres are very heterogenous, depending on geographical region, population density and catchment area (9). Baum *et al.* for example described numbers of >140 anatomical resections/year as high volume as compared to less than 27 cases/year in low volume centres in Germany (12). Zbytniewski *et al.* moreover mentioned the results of Lüchtenborg *et al.*, who showed that in centres with ≥ 150 resections/year, survival significantly improved as compared to low volume centres with <70 resections/year (4). Therefore, a comparison of the published studies can only be made with extreme caution avoiding to compare apples with oranges.

Putting the fact, that both surgeon and hospital volume correlate with better outcomes, together, we claim that it does indeed make sense for thoracic trainees to spend part of their thoracic training in a high-volume and/or academic centre to profit from apparent availabilities of more VATS cases, more complex cases in comorbid patients in highly specialized surroundings including better perioperative medical care and facilities. This centralization of education should go hand in hand with the centralization of the surgical services.

To compensate for a small caseload in low volume centres, simulation training might be considered to close the gap to high-volume centres as well as keeping specialist surgeons' volume as high as possible to keep patient outcomes optimized (18).

The quest to improve patient outcomes is a constant topic, like the current study of Zbytniewski *et al.* shows.

Whether it can be achieved by increasing the surgeon or hospital volume or the centralization of surgical services remains a matter of debate. Considering the available literature, we strongly vote for the centralization of thoracic surgery services to improve outcomes following lung resections for early-stage NSCLC.

Acknowledgments

Funding: None.

Footnote

Provenance and Peer Review: This article was commissioned by the editorial office, *Translational Lung Cancer Research*. The article did not undergo external peer review.

Conflicts of Interest: Both authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <https://tldr.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tlcr-23-723/coif>). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Ethical Statement: The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Open Access Statement: This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license). See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

References

1. Scott WJ, Allen MS, Darling G, et al. Video-assisted thoracic surgery versus open lobectomy for lung cancer: a secondary analysis of data from the American College of Surgeons Oncology Group Z0030 randomized clinical trial. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2010;139:976-81; discussion 981-3.
2. Otake H, Yasunaga H, Horiguchi H, et al. Impact of hospital volume on chest tube duration, length of stay, and mortality after lobectomy. *Ann Thorac Surg*

- 2011;92:1069-74.
3. Møller H, Riaz SP, Holmberg L, et al. High lung cancer surgical procedure volume is associated with shorter length of stay and lower risks of re-admission and death: National cohort analysis in England. *Eur J Cancer* 2016;64:32-43.
 4. Lüchtenborg M, Riaz SP, Coupland VH, et al. High procedure volume is strongly associated with improved survival after lung cancer surgery. *J Clin Oncol* 2013;31:3141-6.
 5. Park HS, Detterbeck FC, Boffa DJ, et al. Impact of hospital volume of thoracoscopic lobectomy on primary lung cancer outcomes. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2012;93:372-9.
 6. van der Linden N, Bongers ML, Coupé VMH, et al. Treatment Patterns and Differences in Survival of Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients Between Academic and Non-Academic Hospitals in the Netherlands. *Clin Lung Cancer* 2017;18:e341-7.
 7. Merritt RE, Abdel-Rasoul M, Fitzgerald M, et al. The Academic Facility Type Is Associated With Improved Overall Survival for Early-Stage Lung Cancer. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2021;111:261-8.
 8. Meguid RA, Brooke BS, Chang DC, et al. Are surgical outcomes for lung cancer resections improved at teaching hospitals? *Ann Thorac Surg* 2008;85:1015-24; discussion 1024-5.
 9. von Meyenfeldt EM, Gooiker GA, van Gijn W, et al. The relationship between volume or surgeon specialty and outcome in the surgical treatment of lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Thorac Oncol* 2012;7:1170-8.
 10. Lien YC, Huang MT, Lin HC. Association between surgeon and hospital volume and in-hospital fatalities after lung cancer resections: the experience of an Asian country. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2007;83:1837-43.
 11. Zbytniewski M, Gryszko GM, Cackowski MM, et al. The effectiveness of surgical treatment of lung cancer in Polish academic and nonacademic centers. *Transl Lung Cancer Res* 2023;12:1717-27.
 12. Baum P, Diers J, Haag J, et al. Nationwide effect of high procedure volume in lung cancer surgery on in-house mortality in Germany. *Lung Cancer* 2020;149:78-83.
 13. Bach PB, Cramer LD, Schrag D, et al. The influence of hospital volume on survival after resection for lung cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:181-8.
 14. Kozower BD, Stukenborg GJ. The relationship between hospital lung cancer resection volume and patient mortality risk. *Ann Surg* 2011;254:1032-7.
 15. Lim E, Darlison L, Edwards J, et al. Mesothelioma and Radical Surgery 2 (MARS 2): protocol for a multicentre randomised trial comparing (extended) pleurectomy decortication versus no (extended) pleurectomy decortication for patients with malignant pleural mesothelioma. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e038892.
 16. Ely S, Jiang SF, Patel AR, et al. Regionalization of Lung Cancer Surgery Improves Outcomes in an Integrated Health Care System. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2020;110:276-83.
 17. Schillemans V, Vrijens F, De Gendt C, et al. Association between surgical volume and post-operative mortality and survival after surgical resection in lung cancer in Belgium: A population-based study. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2019;45:2443-50.
 18. Grossi S, Cattoni M, Rotolo N, et al. Video-assisted thoracoscopic surgery simulation and training: a comprehensive literature review. *BMC Med Educ* 2023;23:535.

Cite this article as: Mayer N, Minervini F. Academic or non-academic: should we really pick one? *Transl Lung Cancer Res* 2023;12(11):2148-2150. doi: 10.21037/tlcr-23-723