BMJ Open

Prognostic prediction models for oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC): a protocol for systematic review, critical appraisal and meta-analysis

Journal:	*BMJ Open*
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-073375
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Mar-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Lu, Zhen; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Zhou, Xinyi; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Fu, Leiwen; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Li, Yuwei; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Tian, Tian; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Liu, Qi; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Zou, Huachun; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen)
Keywords:	Systematic Review, ONCOLOGY, Prognosis, Head & neck tumours < ONCOLOGY, Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

Prognostic prediction models for oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC): a protocol for systematic review, critical appraisal and meta-analysis

Zhen Lu[1], Xinyi Zhou[1], Leiwen Fu[1], Yuwei Li[1], Tian Tian[1], Qi Liu[1], Huachun Zou[1,*]

[1] *School of Public Health (Shenzhen), Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518107, China*

[*] *Correspondence: zouhuachun@mail.sysu.edu.cn*

Abstract

Background: Oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC) is increasingly prevalent and has significantly heterogeneous risks of survival for diagnosed individuals due to the inter-related risk factors. Precise prediction of the risk of survival for an individual patient with OPSCC presents a useful adjunct to therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC. This study will systematically review published prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC, describe their characteristics, compare performance, and assess risk of bias and real-world clinical utility.

Methods: Studies will be identified by searching MEDLINE and Embase databases. Selection of eligible studies, data extraction, and critical appraisal will be conducted independently by two reviewers. Included studies will be systematically summarized using appropriate tools designed for prognostic prediction modelling studies. Performance measures of these models will be pooled and analyzed with meta-analyses if feasible.

Discussion: This work will lay a foundation for future research programs to develop, validate, and assess prognostic prediction models for OPSCC. The final model will estimate the absolute risk of survival for patients with OPSCC and can be implemented into real-world clinical practice as an evidence-based prognostic prediction model for OPSCC. This work will support risk-differentiated clinical decision making at various health service levels, ultimately, facilitate more personalized management of OPSCC and positively enhance the quality of life of patients.

Systematic review registration: PROSPERO registration number CRD42023400272.

Keywords: Oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC); Prognostic prediction model; Survival; Systematic review; Head and neck carcinoma

Introduction

Oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC) is one of the head and neck carcinomas, which originates in tissues of the oropharynx (the part of the throat at the back of the mouth, including the soft palate, the base of the tongue, and the tonsils)[1-3]. OPSCC represents an increasingly prominent public health concern internationally. Albeit OPSCC only represents 0.9% of all cancers, its incidence has been rapidly growing worldwide in recent years, with an estimated 182666 new cases in 2020[4-6]. An increased incidence of OPSCC among men under 45 years of age has been reported recently[6-9]. Moreover, the death rate of OPSCC is rising by 2% worldwide per year, compared with other head and neck carcinomas[10], with an estimated 86742 new deaths in 2020[4]. Of note, OPSCC has a special feature of epidemiologic trends in different settings worldwide. Over the past few decades, OPSCC diagnosis increased especially in developed countries, including the United States, and Canada[6, 11-13], while South-central Asia had the highest proportion of new OPSCC cases (35.1% of global incident cases)[14]. Across China, there has also been an obvious increase in OPSCC in the recent decade, especially for incidence and mortality of males and in rural areas, whereas the rates of females remained stable[15].

Compared with other common type of head and neck carcinomas, OPSCC is likely to be advanced (i.e., with neck metastases) at the time point of diagnosis and its primary treatment is more likely to be aggressive (such as radiation therapy and/or chemoradiation), which may have devastating effects on the survival of these patients[16-19]. OPSCC is a heterogeneous condition with inter-related factors

significantly modifying the absolute risk of survival at an individual level.

Human papillomavirus (HPV) is considered to be the most significant risk factor for OPSCC[20-22]. HPV is a major carcinogen, which meets the epidemiological criteria for OPSCC causality[23, 24]. Up to 70 % of newly diagnosed OPSCCs are HPV positive[25]. In addition, the current identified risk factors include heavy smoking and alcohol consumption[26]. However, it is worth noting that HPV-positive OPSCC patients are usually confronted with decades of significantly improved quality of life, compared to the HPV-negative OPSCC group of patients[19]. HPV-positive OPSCC is associated with a 58% reduction in the risk of death compared to its counterpart[27].

In contemporary real-world clinical practice, interventions (treatment and/or management) are implemented after diagnosis of OPSCC, without individualized risk assessment of the absolute risk of survival. Consequently, in case of immediate start of treatment after diagnosis of OPSCC, this mode of intervention fails to identify of the proportion of patients at high risk (with a lower probability to obtain a good response) who should have received new or more aggressive therapy regimens. Meanwhile, patients at low risk will not be spared from harm of unnecessary aggressive cancer treatment and significant financial burden of cancer management. Therefore, limitations of the one-size-fits-all mode of intervention and lack of risk-differentiated decision making are evident. In this regard, it is imperative to develop a precise and applicable prognostic prediction model for calculating the absolute risk of survival for patients with OPSCC, based on considering any relevant risk factors related to survival and individual demographical characteristics. Accurate prediction of risk of survival

would then guide risk-differentiated clinical decision making at health services level, ultimately, facilitate more personalized management of OPSCC and positively enhance the quality of life of patients.

This systematic review will identify, screen, and assess all published prognostic prediction modelling studies for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC. We aim to answer the question: what prognostic prediction models have been developed and validated for application in patients with OPSCC to predict risk of survival and inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC. The detailed objectives of this systematic review are: 1. To systematically identify existing prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC; 2. To qualitatively describe characteristics of identified models; 3. To quantitatively compare their performance across different clinical settings and population from different regions in the world with meta-analysis where appropriate; 4. To rigorously assess the conduct and real-world clinical utility of these prognostic prediction modelling studies.

Methods

This systematic review protocol was registered on the PROSPERO international registry of systematic reviews on February 27, 2023 (CRD42023400272). This protocol for the systematic review is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) guideline[28], Cochrane Prognosis Methods Group Protocol Template[29], ransparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (TRIPOD)

statement[30], PROBAST tool (prediction model risk of bias assessment)[31], and the corresponding CHARMS checklist (checklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies)[32].

A systematic review of prognostic prediction modelling studies for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC will be conducted to identify eligible studies published before March 2023. The review will be guided by the recommendations of The PROGnosis RESearch Strategy (PROGRESS) Partnership, which is an international, interdisciplinary collaboration that has published a framework to improve the standards of prognosis research to improve its translational impact. The framing of the review question is presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Framing of this systematic review with key items identified by the CHARMS checklist[32]

Items	Comments
1. Prognostic versus diagnostic prediction model	Prognostic prediction model (Aimed to predict future survival outcomes of people diagnosed with OPSCC)
2. Intended scope of the review	Prognostic prediction models to inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC
3. Type of prediction modelling studies	All study types including prognostic prediction modelling studies (with or without external validation) and external model validation studies (with or without model updating)
4. Target population to whom the prediction model applies	Patients diagnosed with OPSCC according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review
5. Outcome to be predicted	Future survival outcomes after diagnosis of OPSCC, including overall survival (and/or disease-related mortality), progression-free survival, and disease-free survival
6. Time span of prediction	Survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC
7. Intended moment of using the model	At any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC

Notes: OPSCC, oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma.

Eligibility criteria

Table 2 shows the review question in population, index, comparator, outcome, timing,

setting, and study type (PICOTS) format[33]. Selection of studies will be based on the eligibility criteria framed with the PICOTS system, which is a modification of the established PICO system and designed for the specific requirements of systematic reviews of prediction models with additional consideration for timing and clinical setting[31].

Table 2 Eligibility criteria for the systematic review framed with the PICOTS system[33]

Items	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population	Patients diagnosed with OPSCC according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review	
Index	Development or external validation of a prognostic prediction model for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC (e.g., prognostic prediction models for patients with OPSCC to predict survival outcomes)	Diagnostic prediction models (e.g., diagnostic prediction models for diagnosis of OPSCC)
Comparator	No predefined comparator	
Outcomes (primary)	Overall survival (and/or disease-related mortality, if possible)	
Outcomes (secondary)	Progression-free survival, and disease-free survival	
Timing	Survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC	
Setting	Prognostic prediction models that are designed to be used by healthcare professionals in the clinical setting to inform their therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC, at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC	
Study type	Any study design including primary research (e.g., randomized controlled trial, cohort study, case-control study) or secondary research (e.g., systematic review) that reports on one or more statistical models, tools or scores with at least two predictors proposed to predict an individual's risk of a future survival outcome (prognostic prediction modelling studies). Prognostic prediction modelling studies can be either model development, model validation or a combination	Editorial comments or letters

Notes: OPSCC, oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma.

Population

Studies reporting on prognostic prediction models proposed for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC will be included into the systematic review. OPSCC could have been diagnosed according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review.

Intervention

Prognostic prediction modelling studies (with or without external validation) and external model validation studies (with or without model updating) will be considered for inclusion into the systematic review, if they were intended to inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC.

Outcome

The included outcome endpoints related to OPSCC, defined as the outcomes of interest in the eligibility criteria, are aligned with those agreed by consensus of systematic reviews for treatment of OPSCC and draw on published search strategies for similar review questions for prognostic models of cancers[16, 17, 27, 34-38].

The primary outcome endpoint is overall survival (OS). We choose this endpoint because it has the greatest clinical relevance and is most important for patients diagnosed with OPSCC. Furthermore, OS is an objective endpoint not susceptible to bias of the outcome assessor. In addition, disease-related mortality will be considered if possible. The secondary outcome endpoints include progression-free survival (PFS) and disease-free survival (DFS). We choose these endpoints as patients with similar survival may nevertheless have different lengths of time without disease progression or symptoms, depending on both initial treatment after diagnosis and disease characteristics.

Outcome endpoints will be assessed in hierarchical fashion in the following order: OS

(and/or disease-related mortality), PFS, and DFS. The timing and effect measures for each outcome endpoint will be as defined according to each eligible study included in the review. In addition, we will not require studies to have a minimum follow-up duration for inclusion in this systematic review.

Timing

Each eligible study included in the review should report on prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC.

Setting

Prognostic prediction models that are designed to be used by healthcare professionals in the clinical setting, at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC, will be considered for inclusion in the review.

Type of studies and limits

Any study design including primary research (e.g., randomized controlled trial, cohort study, case-control study) or secondary research (e.g., systematic review) that reports on one or more statistical models, tools or scores with at least two predictors proposed to predict an individual's risk of a future survival outcome (prognostic prediction modelling studies) will be considered for inclusion in the review. Prognostic prediction modelling studies can be either model development, model validation or a combination. Specifically, editorial comments or letters will be excluded from the review. Eligible

studies included in the review will be limited to those conducted in humans by applying The Cochrane Group's filter for Humans not Animals filter[39].

Search methods for identification of studies

Databases

The following electronic databases will be systematically searched to identify eligible studies from their inception: 1) Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process, In-Data-Review & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Daily on Ovid and Ovid MEDLINE(R) (from 1946 to present); 2) Embase Classic+Embase on Ovid (from 1947 to present).

Search strategy

A highly sensitive search strategy, based on the eligibility criteria for the systematic review and combining subject indexing terms (i.e., MeSH) and free-text search terms, will be designed for MEDLINE Ovid. The search strategy, specifically, subject indexing terms will be translated appropriately for Embase.

The draft search strategy will combine concepts related to prognostic prediction modelling studies, OPSCC, and survival outcomes. The updated version of a validated filter for prediction modelling studies[40] will be used. For OPSCC and survival outcomes related to OPSCC, a search strategy aligned with those agreed by consensus of peer-reviewed systematic reviews of treatments for OPSCC and drew on published search strategies for similar review questions for prognostic models of cancers will be

used[16, 17, 27, 34-38]. The draft search strategy is provided in Supplementary Table 1. The final search strategy will be iteratively refined.

The reference lists of included model development studies and relevant systematic reviews for further studies will be hand searched for additional potentially relevant citations. The included studies will be checked for error or fraud. We will not place any restrictions on language, publication year or publication status when searching the electronic databases. Any non-English studies identified will be translated and assessed for eligibility.

Data collection and analysis

Selection process

Two independent reviewers will screen and assess the abstracts of each study identified by the final search strategy. Duplicate records will be excluded using a systematic, rigorous and reproducible method utilizing a sequential combination of fields including author, year, title, journal and pages[41]. Thereafter, if the information suggests that the study meets the eligibility criteria for the review (Table 2) or there is any doubt against eligibility, full texts of the studies will be independently accessed for further assessment. Any conflict will be resolved through discussion with a senior advisor (HZ), where required.

Data extraction

Two independent reviewers will extract data from eligible studies included in the

review, using a standardized electronic form developed with reference to the checklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies (CHARMS)[32].

For each eligible study, we plan to seek information on objective, source of data, participants, survival outcome(s) to be predicted, candidate predictors, sample size, missing data, model development, model performance (discrimination, calibration, clinical utility, and measures of case-mix variation), results including final multivariable models and interpretation of presented models, and model validation[32]. Moreover, information on diagnostic criteria for OPSCC and treatment type after diagnosis will also be extracted. Missing data will be obtained from the study authors wherever possible, in addition, if insufficient information is obtained the study will be excluded from the review. Any disagreement will be resolved through consultation with a senior advisor (HZ), when necessary.

Data management

Covidence systematic review software will be used to manage screened records throughout the review (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia. Available at: http://www.covidence.org). Eligible studies included in the review will be imported into Endnote reference manager software (Version 20.4.1, Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, USA. Available at: https://endnote.com/).

Critical appraisal

The methodological quality (risk of bias) and relevance (applicability) to the review question (Table 1 and 2) of eligible studies included in the review will be systematically assessed using the prediction model risk of bias assessment tool (PROBAST)[31]. This tool is structured around four key domains (participants, predictors, outcome, and analysis), of which each will be rated as high, low, or unclear risk of bias.

Two independent reviewers will assess the risk of bias and applicability of each eligible study included in the review. Each study will be given a rating of high, low, or unclear risk for each of the four domains. Any disagreement will be resolved through discussion and consultation with a senior advisor (HZ) to reach a consensus, where required.

Qualitative data synthesis of prognostic prediction models

All extracted data on prognostic prediction models from included studies will be tabulated to facilitate comparison of survival outcomes to be predicted, predictors included in the final model and performance measures[32]. Measures of uncertainty will be reported when published or approximated using published methods[33].

Quantitative analysis and comparison of the predictive performance of prognostic prediction models

Our quantitative analysis will depend on the data available, the final number of eligible prognostic prediction models included in the review, and the type of prognostic prediction modelling studies (i.e., development or validation).

We will attempt a meta-analysis by type of prognostic prediction modelling studies, if

included studies are sufficiently homogenous. Clinical homogeneity will be regarded as satisfied, if the review identifies: 1) multiple validation studies for a common prognostic prediction model are identified or, 2) multiple development studies where the target population to whom the model applies, and survival outcomes to be predicted are considered similar or the same.

Meta-analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

Where data permits, meta-analysis will be conducted with reference to the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group guidelines[42]. Where meta-analysis is feasible, performance measures such as discrimination (e.g., area under the receiver operating characteristic curve) and calibration (e.g., calibration slope) will be pooled and analyzed using a random-effects model[39]. The restricted maximum likelihood and Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman methods will be used to estimate the between-study heterogeneity and 95% confidence intervals for the average performance[33]. Statistical or clinical homogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 test, where an I^2 value $>$ 50% indicates moderate to high heterogeneity, as specified in published literatures[39, 43]. Potential sources of heterogeneity will be investigated by undertaking a meta-regression analysis.

Subgroup analysis

Where there are enough eligible studies included in the review, we planned to conduct subgroup analyses. Subgroup analyses will be undertaken according to the type of

prognostic prediction modelling studies (i.e., development or validation), target population to whom the model applies, diagnostic criteria for OPSCC, whether population was treated (yes/no), treatment type after diagnosis, the follow-up duration, survival outcomes to be predicted, and study quality (risk of bias).

Sensitivity analysis

If meta-analysis would be performed, we would undertake sensitivity analyses to explore the influence on effect size for exclusion of studies at lower and higher risk of bias[33].

Summary of findings

Reporting and presentation of findings will be guided by the PRISMA statement (preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses)[28], and relevant recommendations from the TRIPOD statement (transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis)[30]. The GRADE approach (grading of recommendations, assessment, development and evaluation) will be utilized to determine confidence in estimates[44, 45].

Discussion

This systematic review will identify, screen, and assess all published prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC. All eligible models included in the review will be systematically summarized and compared for their

performance across different clinical settings and population from different regions in the world with meta-analysis if feasible.

A prognostic prediction model for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC is designed to be used by healthcare professionals in the clinical setting to inform their therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC, at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC. Compared with other common types of head and neck carcinomas, OPSCC is likely to be advanced (i.e., with neck metastases) at the time point of diagnosis and its primary treatment is more likely to be aggressive (such as radiation therapy and/or chemoradiation), which may have devastating effects on the survival of these patients[16-19]. Survival outcomes affecting the quality of life of these patients are of utmost importance. Hence, accurate prediction of risk of survival would guide risk-differentiated clinical decision making at health services level, ultimately, facilitate more personalized management of OPSCC and positively enhance the quality of life of patients. Consequently, in case of immediate start of treatment after diagnosis of OPSCC, identification of patients with a lower probability to obtain a good response will aid in making decisions regarding management, for instance, deciding new or more aggressive therapy regimens would be delivered to this proportion of patients at high risk. In contrast, in case of a watch-and-wait strategy, differences in estimated prognostic survival risks can affect patient management regarding surveillance and treatment.

Prognosis-related research in OPSCC has been seeking to predict risk of survival after diagnosis based on routinely collected data, with a view to directing treatment and/or

management efforts in real-world clinical practice. This systematic review will make an important contribution to the understanding of risk of survival for patients diagnosed with OPSCC. Moreover, each eligible prognostic prediction models included will be compared head-to-head for their performance and clinical utility in the review. From this perspective, the review will comprehensively promote the consideration of risk-differentiated clinical management of OPSCC in real-world practice. Furthermore, in case that insufficient applicable models are identified, or screened models have poor performance, and/or high risk of bias, we will provide explicit rationale and detailed guidance for development, validation, and/or updating for prognostic prediction models for OPSCC. In contrast, in case that high-performance models are identified, they will be valuable to helping clinicians and patients with OPSCC understand and consider estimated risk of survival in shared decision making, objectively and systematically.

As such, this systematic review forms the foundations of future research programs to develop, validate, and assess a prognostic prediction model for OPSCC across the four themes of the PROGRESS prognosis research framework[46]. We noted that researchers have been focusing efforts on developing new prognostic prediction models to date, however, disproportionate efforts have been put into improving and ultimately implementing existing models into real-world clinical practice, which have caused a huge waste of research resources. Therefore, we strongly recommend that, in the future, researchers could optimally utilize information from our review. If appropriate, seeking to validate and update existing prognostic prediction models would be better choice[47].

In conclusion, this systematic review will comprehensively consider contemporary best

practice and evidence of prognostic prediction modelling studies for OPSCC. This work will support risk-differentiated clinical decision making at health services level, ultimately, facilitate more personalized management of OPSCC and positively enhance the quality of life of patients.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China Excellent Young Scientists Fund [82022064] and Merck Investigator Studies Program [100073]. The funding parties did not have any role in the design of the study or in the explanation of the data. ZL and HZ conceived the study and designed the protocol. ZL, XZ, LF, YL, TT, and QL contributed to the manuscript with all authors critically revising the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declared no conflict of interest.

References

1. Shibahara, T., *[Oral cancer -diagnosis and therapy-.].* Clin Calcium, 2017. **27**(10): p. 1427-1433.
2. Gooi, Z., J.Y. Chan, and C. Fakhry, *The epidemiology of the human papillomavirus related to oropharyngeal head and neck cancer.* Laryngoscope, 2016. **126**(4): p. 894-900.
3. *Definition of Oropharyngeal Cancer—NCI Dictionary of Cancer Terms—National Cancer Institute*. Available from: https://www.cancer.gov/publications/dictionaries/cancer-terms/def/oropharyngeal-cancer.
4. Sung, H., et al., *Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries.* CA Cancer J Clin, 2021. **71**(3): p. 209-249.
5. De Felice, F., et al., *Advances in the Management of HPV-Related Oropharyngeal Cancer.* J Oncol, 2019. **2019**: p. 9173729.
6. Chaturvedi, A.K., et al., *Worldwide trends in incidence rates for oral cavity and oropharyngeal cancers.* J Clin Oncol, 2013. **31**(36): p. 4550-9.
7. Abram, M.H., et al., *Epidemiology of oral squamous cell carcinoma.* SADJ, 2012. **67**(10): p. 550-3.
8. Majchrzak, E., et al., *Oral cavity and oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma in young adults: a review of the literature.* Radiol Oncol, 2014. **48**(1): p. 1-10.
9. Auluck, A., et al., *Population-based incidence trends of oropharyngeal and oral cavity cancers by sex among the poorest and underprivileged populations.* BMC Cancer, 2014. **14**(1): p. 316.
10. Lee, S.C., et al., *Fluid Biomarkers in HPV and Non-HPV Related Oropharyngeal Carcinomas: From Diagnosis and Monitoring to Prognostication-A Systematic Review.* Int J Mol Sci, 2022. **23**(22).
11. Simard, E.P., L.A. Torre, and A. Jemal, *International trends in head and neck cancer incidence rates: differences by country, sex and anatomic site.* Oral Oncol, 2014. **50**(5): p. 387-403.
12. Chi, A.C., T.A. Day, and B.W. Neville, *Oral cavity and oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma--an update.* CA Cancer J Clin, 2015. **65**(5): p. 401-21.
13. Lambert, R., et al., *Epidemiology of cancer from the oral cavity and oropharynx.* Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol, 2011. **23**(8): p. 633-41.
14. Shield, K.D., et al., *The global incidence of lip, oral cavity, and pharyngeal cancers by subsite in 2012.* CA Cancer J Clin, 2017. **67**(1): p. 51-64.
15. Liu, J., et al., *Incidence, mortality, and temporal patterns of oropharyngeal cancer in China: a population-based study.* Cancer Commun (Lond), 2018. **38**(1): p. 75.
16. Parmar, A., et al., *Interventions for the treatment of oral cavity and oropharyngeal cancer: chemotherapy.* Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2021(12).
17. Howard, J., et al., *De‐intensified adjuvant (chemo)radiotherapy versus standard adjuvant chemoradiotherapy post transoral minimally invasive surgery for resectable HPV‐positive oropharyngeal carcinoma.* Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2018(12).
18. Hoxbroe Michaelsen, S., et al., *Quality of life in survivors of oropharyngeal cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 1366 patients.* Eur J Cancer, 2017. **78**: p. 91-102.
19. Larsen, C.G., et al., *Novel nomograms for survival and progression in HPV+ and HPV- oropharyngeal cancer: a population-based study of 1,542 consecutive patients.* Oncotarget, 2016. **7**(44): p. 71761-71772.
20. Mehanna, H., et al., *Prevalence of human papillomavirus in oropharyngeal and*

nonoropharyngeal head and neck cancer--systematic review and meta-analysis of trends by time and region. Head Neck, 2013. **35**(5): p. 747-55.

21. Lundberg, M., et al., *Increased incidence of oropharyngeal cancer and p16 expression.* Acta Otolaryngol, 2011. **131**(9): p. 1008-11.
22. D'Souza, G., et al., *Case-control study of human papillomavirus and oropharyngeal cancer.* N Engl J Med, 2007. **356**(19): p. 1944-56.
23. Gillison, M.L., et al., *Epidemiology of Human Papillomavirus-Positive Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma.* J Clin Oncol, 2015. **33**(29): p. 3235-42.
24. Sudhoff, H.H., et al., *Evidence for a causal association for HPV in head and neck cancers.* Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol, 2011. **268**(11): p. 1541-7.
25. Ndiaye, C., et al., *HPV DNA, E6/E7 mRNA, and p16INK4a detection in head and neck cancers: a systematic review and meta-analysis.* The Lancet Oncology, 2014. **15**(12): p. 1319-1331.
26. Carpen, T., et al., *Presenting symptoms and clinical findings in HPV-positive and HPV-negative oropharyngeal cancer patients.* Acta Otolaryngol, 2018. **138**(5): p. 513-518.
27. Ang, K.K., et al., *Human Papillomavirus and Survival of Patients with Oropharyngeal Cancer.* New England Journal of Medicine, 2010. **363**(1): p. 24-35.
28. Moher, D., et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement.* Syst Rev, 2015. **4**(1): p. 1.
29. Cochrane Prognosis Methods Group. *Cochrane prognosis methods group protocol template: the Cochrane collaboration*. 3 February 2023]; Available from: https://methods.cochrane.org/prognosis/sites/methods.cochrane.org.prognosis/files/public/uploads/protocol_template_prognosis_reviews.doc.
30. Collins, G.S., et al., *Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (TRIPOD): the TRIPOD statement.* Journal of British Surgery, 2015. **102**(3): p. 148-158.
31. Moons, K.G.M., et al., *PROBAST: A Tool to Assess Risk of Bias and Applicability of Prediction Model Studies: Explanation and Elaboration.* Ann Intern Med, 2019. **170**(1): p. W1-W33.
32. Moons, K.G., et al., *Critical appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies: the CHARMS checklist.* PLoS Med, 2014. **11**(10): p. e1001744.
33. Debray, T.P., et al., *A guide to systematic review and meta-analysis of prediction model performance.* BMJ, 2017. **356**: p. i6460.
34. Perry, A., et al., *Therapeutic exercises for affecting post‐treatment swallowing in people treated for advanced‐stage head and neck cancers.* Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2016(8).
35. Chan, K.K.W., et al., *Interventions for the treatment of oral and oropharyngeal cancers: targeted therapy and immunotherapy.* Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2015(12).
36. McAleenan, A., et al., *Prognostic value of test(s) for O6‐methylguanine‐DNA methyltransferase (MGMT) promoter methylation for predicting overall survival in people with glioblastoma treated with temozolomide.* Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2021(3).
37. Kreuzberger, N., et al., *Prognostic models for newly‐diagnosed chronic lymphocytic leukaemia in adults: a systematic review and meta‐analysis.* Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 2020(7).
38. Aldin, A., et al., *Interim PET‐results for prognosis in adults with Hodgkin lymphoma: a systematic review and meta‐analysis of prognostic factor studies.* Cochrane Database of

Systematic Reviews, 2020(1).

39. The Cochrane Collaboration. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. 3 February 2023]; Available from: https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current.

40. Geersing, G.J., et al., *Search filters for finding prognostic and diagnostic prediction studies in Medline to enhance systematic reviews.* PLoS One, 2012. **7**(2): p. e32844.

41. Bramer, W.M., et al., *De-duplication of database search results for systematic reviews in EndNote.* J Med Libr Assoc, 2016. **104**(3): p. 240-3.

42. Stroup, D.F., et al., *Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group.* JAMA, 2000. **283**(15): p. 2008-12.

43. Higgins, J.P., et al., *Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses.* BMJ, 2003. **327**(7414): p. 557-60.

44. Iorio, A., et al., *Use of GRADE for assessment of evidence about prognosis: rating confidence in estimates of event rates in broad categories of patients.* bmj, 2015. **350**.

45. GRADE Handbook. *Handbook for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach: the GRADE working group*. 3 February 2023]; Available from: https://gdt.gradepro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html.

46. Hemingway, H., et al., *Prognosis research strategy (PROGRESS) 1: a framework for researching clinical outcomes.* BMJ, 2013. **346**: p. e5595.

47. Debray, T.P., et al., *Meta-analysis and aggregation of multiple published prediction models.* Stat Med, 2014. **33**(14): p. 2341-62.

Supplementary Table 1 The draft search strategy for MEDLINE

Concept	Step	Search strategy
Study type = prognostic prediction modelling studies		
Study type = prognostic prediction modelling studies (Ingui filter for prediction models[1])	1	Validat$.mp. or Predict$.ti.
	2	(Predict$ and (Outcome$ or Risk$ or Model$)).mp.
	3	((History or Variable$ or Criteria or Scor$ or Characteristic$ or Finding$ or Factor$) and (Predict$ or Model$ or Decision$ or Identif$ or Prognos$)).mp.
	4	Decision$.mp. and ((Model$ or Clinical$).mp. or Cox Models/)
	5	(Prognostic and (History or Variable$ or Criteria or Scor$ or Characteristic$ or Finding$ or Factor$ or Model$)).mp.
	6	or/1-5
Study type = prognostic prediction modelling studies (Addition to Ingui filter proposed by Geersing to improve specificity[2])	7	"ROC Curve"/ or Discrimination.mp. or Discriminate.mp. or c-statistic.mp. or "c statistic".mp. or "Area under the curve".mp. or AUC.mp. or Calibration.mp. or Indices.mp. or Algorithm.mp. or Multivariable.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
Combination of study type concepts	8	6 and 7
Population = people with oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma		
	9	exp Oropharyngeal Neoplasms/
	10	"Head and Neck Neoplasms"/
	11	exp Otorhinolaryngologic Neoplasms/
	12	exp Neoplasms/
	13	(cancer$ or tumour$ or tumor$ or neoplas$ or malignan$ or carcinoma$ or SCC$).ti,ab.
	14	12 and 13
	15	exp Oropharynx/
	16	(oropharyn$ or mesopharyn$ or tonsil$ or "head and neck" or "head neck" or "head-neck" or "head-and-neck" or tongue$).ti,ab.
	17	15 and 16
	18	14 and 17
	19	(HNSCC or SCCHN or "OP-SCC" or OPSCC or OPC or SCCOP).mp.
	20	9 or 10 or 11 or 18 or 19
Outcome = survival		
	21	exp Mortality/
	22	exp Survival/
	23	exp Survival Analysis/

	24	"survival rate"/
	25	(surviv* or mortal* or death*).ti,ab.
	26	or/21-24
	27	25 and 26
Combinations of concepts		
	28	8 and 20 and 27
Human filter		
	29	exp animals/ not humans/
Final		
	30	28 not 29

References

1. Ingui, B.J. and M.A. Rogers, *Searching for clinical prediction rules in MEDLINE.* J Am Med Inform Assoc, 2001. **8**(4): p. 391-7.
2. Geersing, G.J., et al., *Search filters for finding prognostic and diagnostic prediction studies in Medline to enhance systematic reviews.* PLoS One, 2012. **7**(2): p. e32844.

Framing of this systematic review with key items identified by the CHARMS checklist[1], which is the checklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies

Items	Comments
1. Prognostic versus diagnostic prediction model	Prognostic prediction model (Aimed to predict future survival outcomes of people diagnosed with OPSCC)
2. Intended scope of the review	Prognostic prediction models to inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC
3. Type of prediction modelling studies	All study types including prognostic prediction modelling studies (with or without external validation) and external model validation studies (with or without model updating)
4. Target population to whom the prediction model applies	Patients diagnosed with OPSCC according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review
5. Outcome to be predicted	Future survival outcomes after diagnosis of OPSCC, including overall survival (and/or disease-related mortality), progression-free survival, and disease-free survival
6. Time span of prediction	Survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC
7. Intended moment of using the model	At any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC

Notes: OPSCC, oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma.

References

1. Moons, K.G., et al., *Critical appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies: the CHARMS checklist.* PLoS Med, 2014. **11**(10): p. e1001744.

BMJ Open

Prognostic prediction models for oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC): a protocol for systematic review, critical appraisal and meta-analysis

Journal:	*BMJ Open*
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2023-073375.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	04-Jul-2023
Complete List of Authors:	Lu, Zhen; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Zhou, Xinyi; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Fu, Leiwen; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Li, Yuwei; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Tian, Tian; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Liu, Qi; Sun Yat-Sen University, School of Public Health (Shenzhen) Zou, Huachun; Fudan University, School of Public Health; Southwest Medical University, School of Public Health
Primary Subject Heading:	Oncology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Oncology, Public health, Qualitative research, Epidemiology
Keywords:	Systematic Review, ONCOLOGY, Prognosis, Head & neck tumours < ONCOLOGY, Protocols & guidelines < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

Prognostic prediction models for oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC): a protocol for systematic review, critical appraisal and meta-analysis

Zhen Lu[1], Xinyi Zhou[1], Leiwen Fu[1], Yuwei Li[1], Tian Tian[1], Qi Liu[1], Huachun Zou[2,3,4,*]

[1] School of Public Health (Shenzhen), Sun Yat-sen University, Shenzhen 518107, China

[2] School of Public Health, Fudan University, Shanghai, China

[3] School of Public Health, Southwest Medical University, Luzhou, China

[4] Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

[*] ***Correspondence to***: zouhuachun@mail.sysu.edu.cn

Abstract

Introduction: Oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC) is increasingly prevalent and has significantly heterogeneous risks of survival for diagnosed individuals due to the inter-related risk factors. Precise prediction of the risk of survival for an individual patient with OPSCC presents a useful adjunct to therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC. The aim of this systematic review, critical appraisal and meta-analysis is to assess prognostic prediction models for OPSCC and lay a foundation for future research programs to develop and validate prognostic prediction models for OPSCC.

Methods and analysis: This protocol will follow the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocol (PRISMA-P) statement. Based on predefined criteria, electronic databases including MEDLINE, Embase, Web of Science, the Cochrane Library and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) will be searched for relevant studies without language restrictions from inception of databases to present. This study will systematically review published prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC, describe their characteristics, compare performance, and assess risk of bias and real-world clinical utility. Selection of eligible studies, data extraction, and critical appraisal will be conducted independently by two reviewers. A Third reviewer will resolve any disagreements. Included studies will be systematically summarized using appropriate tools designed for prognostic prediction modelling studies. Risk of bias and quality of studies will be assessed using the Prediction Model Risk of Bias Assessment Tool and the Transparent

Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis. Performance measures of these models will be pooled and analyzed with meta-analyses if feasible.

Ethics and dissemination: This review will be conducted completely based on published data, so approval from an ethics committee or written consent is not required. The results will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed publication.

PROSPERO registration number: CRD42023400272.

Keywords: Oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC); Prognostic prediction model; Survival; Systematic review; Head and neck carcinoma

Strengths and limitations of this study

- This study will provide the comprehensive evidence on existing prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC.
- The results will help us to analyze and assess the quality, risk of bias and clinical utility of existing prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC.
- The results of this review will provide insight that will assist in developing and validating prognostic prediction models for OPSCC in future studies.
- A highly sensitive search strategy and robust quality assessment criteria (Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis) will be used to appraise existing prognostic prediction modelling studies for OPSCC.
- The main limitation of this study could be the potential heterogeneity among studies included in the analysis.

Introduction

Oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma (OPSCC) is one of the head and neck carcinomas, which originates in tissues of the oropharynx (the part of the throat at the back of the mouth, including the soft palate, the base of the tongue, and the tonsils) [1-3]. OPSCC represents an increasingly prominent public health concern internationally. Albeit OPSCC only represents 0.9% of all cancers, its incidence has been rapidly growing worldwide in recent years, with an estimated 182666 new cases in 2020 [4-6]. An increased incidence of OPSCC among men under 45 years of age has been reported recently [6-9]. Moreover, the death rate of OPSCC is rising by 2% worldwide per year, compared with other head and neck carcinomas [10], with an estimated 86742 new deaths in 2020 [4]. Of note, OPSCC has a special feature of epidemiologic trends in different settings worldwide. Over the past few decades, OPSCC diagnosis increased especially in developed countries, including the United States, and Canada [6 11-13], while South-central Asia had the highest proportion of new OPSCC cases (35.1% of global incident cases) [14]. Across China, there has also been an obvious increase in OPSCC in the recent decade, especially for incidence and mortality of males and in rural areas, whereas the rates of females remained stable [15]. Compared with other common type of head and neck carcinomas, OPSCC is likely to be advanced (i.e., with neck metastases) at the time point of diagnosis and its primary treatment is more likely to be aggressive (such as radiation therapy and/or chemoradiation), which may have devastating effects on the survival of these patients [16-19]. OPSCC is a heterogeneous condition with inter-related factors significantly

modifying the absolute risk of survival at an individual level.

Human papillomavirus (HPV) is considered to be the most significant risk factor for OPSCC [20-22]. HPV is a major carcinogen, which meets the epidemiological criteria for OPSCC causality [23 24]. Up to 70 % of newly diagnosed OPSCCs are HPV positive [25]. In addition, the current identified risk factors include heavy smoking and alcohol consumption [26]. However, it is worth noting that HPV-positive OPSCC patients are usually confronted with decades of significantly improved quality of life, compared to the HPV-negative OPSCC group of patients [19]. HPV-positive OPSCC is associated with a 58% reduction in the risk of death compared to its counterpart [27]. In contemporary real-world clinical practice, interventions (treatment and/or management) are implemented after diagnosis of OPSCC, without individualized risk assessment of the absolute risk of survival. Consequently, in case of immediate start of treatment after diagnosis of OPSCC, this mode of intervention fails to identify of the proportion of patients at high risk (with a lower probability to obtain a good response) who should have received new or more aggressive therapy regimens. Meanwhile, patients at low risk will not be spared from harm of unnecessary aggressive cancer treatment and significant financial burden of cancer management. Therefore, limitations of the one-size-fits-all mode of intervention and lack of risk-differentiated decision making are evident. In this regard, it is imperative to develop a precise and applicable prognostic prediction model for calculating the absolute risk of survival for patients with OPSCC, based on considering any relevant risk factors related to survival and individual demographical characteristics. Accurate prediction of risk of survival

would then guide risk-differentiated clinical decision making at health services level, ultimately, facilitate more personalized management of OPSCC and positively enhance the quality of life of patients.

This systematic review will identify, screen, and assess all published prognostic prediction modelling studies for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC. We aim to answer the question: what prognostic prediction models have been developed and validated for application in patients with OPSCC to predict risk of survival and inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC. The detailed objectives of this systematic review are: 1. To systematically identify existing prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC; 2. To qualitatively describe characteristics of identified models; 3. To quantitatively compare their performance across different clinical settings and population from different regions in the world with meta-analysis where appropriate; 4. To rigorously assess the conduct and real-world clinical utility of these prognostic prediction modelling studies.

Methods

This systematic review protocol was registered on the PROSPERO international registry of systematic reviews on February 27, 2023 (CRD42023400272). This protocol for the systematic review is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols (PRISMA-P) guideline [28], Cochrane Prognosis Methods Group Protocol Template [29], transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis (TRIPOD)

statement [30], PROBAST tool (prediction model risk of bias assessment) [31], and the corresponding CHARMS checklist (checklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies) [32] (see Supplementary Table S1 and S2).

A systematic review of prognostic prediction modelling studies for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC will be conducted to identify eligible studies published before March 2023. The review will be guided by the recommendations of The PROGnosis RESearch Strategy (PROGRESS) Partnership, which is an international, interdisciplinary collaboration that has published a framework to improve the standards of prognosis research to improve its translational impact. The framing of the review question is presented in Table 1. Formal activities for this study are scheduled to commence in September 2023 and should conclude by June 2026. Data analysis and dissemination of results will be completed in this period.

Table 1 Framing of this systematic review with key items identified by the CHARMS checklist [32]

Items	Comments
1. Prognostic versus diagnostic prediction model	Prognostic prediction model (Aimed to predict future survival outcomes of people diagnosed with OPSCC)
2. Intended scope of the review	Prognostic prediction models to inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC
3. Type of prediction modelling studies	All study types including prognostic prediction modelling studies (with or without external validation) and external model validation studies (with or without model updating)
4. Target population to whom the prediction model applies	Patients diagnosed with OPSCC according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review
5. Outcome to be predicted	Future survival outcomes after diagnosis of OPSCC, including overall survival (and/or disease-related mortality), progression-free survival, and disease-free survival
6. Time span of prediction	Survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC
7. Intended moment of using the model	At any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC

Notes: OPSCC, oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma.

Patient and Public Involvement

This review will be conducted completely based on published data, so approval from an ethics committee or patient consent is not required. The results will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed publication.

Ethics and dissemination

This review will be conducted completely based on published data, so approval from an ethics committee or written consent is not required. The results will be disseminated through a peer-reviewed publication.

Eligibility criteria

Table 2 shows the review question in population, index, comparator, outcome, timing, setting, and study type (PICOTS) format [33]. Selection of studies will be based on the eligibility criteria framed with the PICOTS system, which is a modification of the established PICO system and designed for the specific requirements of systematic reviews of prediction models with additional consideration for timing and clinical setting [31].

Table 2 Eligibility criteria for the systematic review framed with the PICOTS system [33]

Items	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria
Population	Patients diagnosed with OPSCC according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review	
Index	Development or external validation of a prognostic prediction model for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC (e.g., prognostic prediction models for	Diagnostic prediction models (e.g., diagnostic prediction models for diagnosis of

	patients with OPSCC to predict survival outcomes)	OPSCC)
Comparator	No predefined comparator	
Outcomes (primary)	Overall survival (and/or disease-related mortality, if possible)	
Outcomes (secondary)	Progression-free survival, and disease-free survival	
Timing	Survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC	
Setting	Prognostic prediction models that are designed to be used by healthcare professionals in the clinical setting to inform their therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC, at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC	
Study type	Any study design including primary research (e.g., randomized controlled trial, cohort study, case-control study) or secondary research (e.g., systematic review) that reports on one or more statistical models, tools or scores with at least two predictors proposed to predict an individual's risk of a future survival outcome (prognostic prediction modelling studies). Prognostic prediction modelling studies can be either model development, model validation or a combination	Editorial comments or letters

Notes: OPSCC, oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma.

Population

Studies reporting on prognostic prediction models proposed for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC will be included into the systematic review. OPSCC could have been diagnosed according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review. In addition, this study will include both HPV-positive and HPV-negative OPSCC.

Intervention

Prognostic prediction modelling studies (with or without external validation) and external model validation studies (with or without model updating) will be considered for inclusion into the systematic review, if they were intended to inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC.

Outcome

The included outcome endpoints related to OPSCC, defined as the outcomes of interest

in the eligibility criteria, are aligned with those agreed by consensus of systematic reviews for treatment of OPSCC and draw on published search strategies for similar review questions for prognostic models of cancers [16 17 27 34-38].

The primary outcome endpoint is overall survival (OS). We choose this endpoint because it has the greatest clinical relevance and is most important for patients diagnosed with OPSCC. Furthermore, OS is an objective endpoint not susceptible to bias of the outcome assessor. In addition, disease-related mortality will be considered if possible. The secondary outcome endpoints include progression-free survival (PFS) and disease-free survival (DFS). We choose these endpoints as patients with similar survival may nevertheless have different lengths of time without disease progression or symptoms, depending on both initial treatment after diagnosis and disease characteristics.

Outcome endpoints will be assessed in hierarchical fashion in the following order: OS (and/or disease-related mortality), PFS, and DFS. The timing and effect measures for each outcome endpoint will be as defined according to each eligible study included in the review. In addition, we will not require studies to have a minimum follow-up duration for inclusion in this systematic review.

Timing

Each eligible study included in the review should report on prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC.

Setting

Prognostic prediction models that are designed to be used by healthcare professionals in the clinical setting, at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC, will be considered for inclusion in the review.

Type of studies and limits

Any study design including primary research (e.g., randomized controlled trial, cohort study, case-control study) or secondary research (e.g., systematic review) that reports on one or more statistical models, tools or scores with at least two predictors proposed to predict an individual's risk of a future survival outcome (prognostic prediction modelling studies) will be considered for inclusion in the review. Prognostic prediction modelling studies can be either model development, model validation or a combination. Specifically, editorial comments or letters will be excluded from the review. Eligible studies included in the review will be limited to those conducted in humans by applying The Cochrane Group's filter for Humans not Animals filter [39].

Search methods for identification of studies

Databases

The following electronic databases will be systematically searched to identify eligible studies from their inception to present: 1) Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process, In-Data-Review & Other Non-Indexed Citations and Daily on Ovid and Ovid MEDLINE(R); 2) Embase Classic+Embase on Ovid; 3) Web of Science; 4) the

Cochrane Library; and 5) China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI).

Search strategy

A highly sensitive search strategy, based on the eligibility criteria for the systematic review and combining subject indexing terms (i.e., MeSH) and free-text search terms, will be designed for MEDLINE Ovid. We aimed to avoid missing any valuable relevant predictive modelling studies for OPSCC. The search strategy, specifically, subject indexing terms will be translated appropriately for the other databases.

The draft search strategy will combine concepts related to prognostic prediction modelling studies, OPSCC, and survival outcomes. The updated version of a validated filter for prediction modelling studies [40] will be used. For OPSCC and survival outcomes related to OPSCC, a search strategy aligned with those agreed by consensus of peer-reviewed systematic reviews of treatments for OPSCC and drew on published search strategies for similar review questions for prognostic models of cancers will be used [16 17 27 34-38]. The draft search strategy is provided in Supplementary Table S3. The final search strategy will be iteratively refined.

The reference lists of included model development studies and relevant systematic reviews for further studies will be hand searched for additional potentially relevant citations. The included studies will be checked for error or fraud. We will not place any restrictions on language, publication year or publication status when searching the electronic databases. Any non-English studies identified will be translated and assessed for eligibility.

Data collection and analysis

Selection process

Two independent reviewers will screen and assess the abstracts of each study identified by the final search strategy. Duplicate records will be excluded using a systematic, rigorous and reproducible method utilizing a sequential combination of fields including author, year, title, journal and pages [41]. Thereafter, if the information suggests that the study meets the eligibility criteria for the review (Table 2) or there is any doubt against eligibility, full texts of the studies will be independently accessed for further assessment. Any conflict will be resolved through discussion with a senior advisor (HZ), where required.

Data extraction

Two independent reviewers will extract data from eligible studies included in the review, using a standardized electronic form developed with reference to the checklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic Reviews of prediction Modelling Studies (CHARMS) [32].

For each eligible study, we plan to seek information on objective, source of data, participants, survival outcome(s) to be predicted, candidate predictors, sample size, missing data, model development, model performance (discrimination, calibration, clinical utility, and measures of case-mix variation), results including final multivariable models and interpretation of presented models, and model validation [32].

Moreover, information on diagnostic criteria for OPSCC and treatment type after diagnosis will also be extracted. Missing data will be obtained from the study authors wherever possible, in addition, if insufficient information is obtained the study will be excluded from the review. Any disagreement will be resolved through consultation with a senior advisor (HZ), when necessary.

Data management

Covidence systematic review software will be used to manage screened records throughout the review (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia. Available at: http://www.covidence.org). Eligible studies included in the review will be imported into Endnote reference manager software (Version 20.4.1, Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, USA. Available at: https://endnote.com/).

Critical appraisal

The methodological quality (risk of bias) and relevance (applicability) to the review question (Table 1 and 2) of eligible studies included in the review will be systematically assessed using the prediction model risk of bias assessment tool (PROBAST) [31]. This tool is structured around four key domains (participants, predictors, outcome, and analysis), of which each will be rated as high, low, or unclear risk of bias.

Two independent reviewers will assess the risk of bias and applicability of each eligible study included in the review. Each study will be given a rating of high, low, or unclear risk for each of the four domains. Any disagreement will be resolved through discussion

and consultation with a senior advisor (HZ) to reach a consensus, where required.

Qualitative data synthesis of prognostic prediction models

All extracted data on prognostic prediction models from included studies will be tabulated to facilitate comparison of survival outcomes to be predicted, predictors included in the final model and performance measures [32]. Measures of uncertainty will be reported when published or approximated using published methods [33]. The characteristics of models will be tabulated to show classification measures such as sensitivity, specificity, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) [32], where reported. Relevant analyses and visualizing will be performed using R software version 4.2.1 (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria, available at: https://www.R-project.org).

Quantitative analysis and comparison of the predictive performance of prognostic prediction models

Our quantitative analysis will depend on the data available, the final number of eligible prognostic prediction models included in the review, and the type of prognostic prediction modelling studies (i.e., development or validation).

We will attempt a meta-analysis by type of prognostic prediction modelling studies, if included studies are sufficiently homogenous. Clinical homogeneity will be regarded as satisfied, if the review identifies: 1) multiple validation studies for a common prognostic prediction model are identified or, 2) multiple development studies where

the target population to whom the model applies, and survival outcomes to be predicted are considered similar or the same.

Meta-analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

Where data permits, meta-analysis will be conducted with reference to the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group guidelines [42]. Where meta-analysis is feasible, performance measures such as discrimination (e.g., area under the receiver operating characteristic curve) and calibration (e.g., calibration slope) will be pooled and analyzed using a random-effects model [39], which provide estimates of the average performance of predictive models across the selected modelling studies. The restricted maximum likelihood and Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman methods will be used to estimate the between-study heterogeneity and 95% confidence intervals for the average performance [33].

Statistical or clinical homogeneity will be assessed using the I^2 test, where an I^2 value $>$ 50% indicates moderate to high heterogeneity, as specified in published literatures [39 43]. The I^2 test is a statistical measure used in systematic reviews and meta-analyses to assess heterogeneity among studies included in the analysis. It quantifies the proportion of total variation in effect estimates that is due to heterogeneity rather than chance. It is expressed as a percentage and ranges from 0% to 100%. A higher value of I^2 suggests a greater degree of heterogeneity. Potential sources of heterogeneity will be investigated by undertaking a meta-regression analysis. The analysis will be carried out using R software version 4.2.1 (R Core Team, Vienna, Austria, available at:

https://www.R-project.org).

Subgroup analysis

Where there are enough eligible studies included in the review, we planned to conduct subgroup analyses. Subgroup analyses will be undertaken according to the type of prognostic prediction modelling studies (i.e., development or validation), target population to whom the model applies, diagnostic criteria for OPSCC, whether population was treated (yes/no), treatment type after diagnosis, the follow-up duration, survival outcomes to be predicted, and study quality (risk of bias).

Sensitivity analysis

If meta-analysis would be performed, we would undertake sensitivity analyses to explore the influence on effect size for exclusion of studies at lower and higher risk of bias[33].

Summary of findings

Reporting and presentation of findings will be guided by the PRISMA statement (preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses) [28], and relevant recommendations from the TRIPOD statement (transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model for individual prognosis or diagnosis) [30]. The GRADE approach (grading of recommendations, assessment, development and evaluation) will be utilized to determine confidence in estimates [44 45].

Discussion

This systematic review will identify, screen, and assess all published prognostic prediction models for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC. All eligible models included in the review will be systematically summarized and compared for their performance across different clinical settings and population from different regions in the world with meta-analysis if feasible.

A prognostic prediction model for survival outcomes in patients with OPSCC is designed to be used by healthcare professionals in the clinical setting to inform their therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC, at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC. Compared with other common types of head and neck carcinomas, OPSCC is likely to be advanced (i.e., with neck metastases) at the time point of diagnosis and its primary treatment is more likely to be aggressive (such as radiation therapy and/or chemoradiation), which may have devastating effects on the survival of these patients [16-19]. Survival outcomes affecting the quality of life of these patients are of utmost importance. Hence, accurate prediction of risk of survival would guide risk-differentiated clinical decision making at health services level, ultimately, facilitate more personalized management of OPSCC and positively enhance the quality of life of patients. Consequently, in case of immediate start of treatment after diagnosis of OPSCC, identification of patients with a lower probability to obtain a good response will aid in making decisions regarding management, for instance, deciding new or more aggressive therapy regimens would be delivered to this proportion of

patients at high risk. In contrast, in case of a watch-and-wait strategy, differences in estimated prognostic survival risks can affect patient management regarding surveillance and treatment.

Prognosis-related research in OPSCC has been seeking to predict risk of survival after diagnosis based on routinely collected data, with a view to directing treatment and/or management efforts in real-world clinical practice. This systematic review will make an important contribution to the understanding of risk of survival for patients diagnosed with OPSCC. Moreover, each eligible prognostic prediction models included will be compared head-to-head for their performance and clinical utility in the review. From this perspective, the review will comprehensively promote the consideration of risk-differentiated clinical management of OPSCC in real-world practice. Furthermore, in case that insufficient applicable models are identified, or screened models have poor performance, and/or high risk of bias, we will provide explicit rationale and detailed guidance for development, validation, and/or updating for prognostic prediction models for OPSCC. In contrast, in case that high-performance models are identified, they will be valuable to helping clinicians and patients with OPSCC understand and consider estimated risk of survival in shared decision making, objectively and systematically.

As such, this systematic review forms the foundations of future research programs to develop, validate, and assess a prognostic prediction model for OPSCC across the four themes of the PROGRESS prognosis research framework [46]. We noted that researchers have been focusing efforts on developing new prognostic prediction models to date, however, disproportionate efforts have been put into improving and ultimately

implementing existing models into real-world clinical practice, which have caused a huge waste of research resources. Therefore, we strongly recommend that, in the future, researchers could optimally utilize information from our review. If appropriate, seeking to validate and update existing prognostic prediction models would be better choice [47].

In conclusion, this systematic review will comprehensively consider contemporary best practice and evidence of prognostic prediction modelling studies for OPSCC. This work will support risk-differentiated clinical decision making at health services level, ultimately, facilitate more personalized management of OPSCC and positively enhance the quality of life of patients.

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China Excellent Young Scientists Fund [82022064] and Merck Investigator Studies Program [100073]. The funding parties did not have any role in the design of the study or in the explanation of the data.

Contributors

ZL and HZ conceived the study and designed the protocol. ZL, XZ, LF, YL, TT, and QL contributed to the manuscript with all authors critically revising the manuscript. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding

This study was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China Excellent Young Scientists Fund [82022064] and Merck Investigator Studies Program [100073].

Competing interest

None declared.

Data availability statement

No data are available. The study is a protocol for a systematic review. Thus, no data are available.

ORCID ID

Zhen Lu, https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3481-6310

References

1. Shibahara T. [Oral cancer -diagnosis and therapy-.]. *Clin Calcium* 2017;27(10):1427-33.
2. Gooi Z, Chan JY, Fakhry C. The epidemiology of the human papillomavirus related to oropharyngeal head and neck cancer. *Laryngoscope* 2016;126(4):894-900. doi: 10.1002/lary.25767 [published Online First: 20160204]
3. Definition of Oropharyngeal Cancer—NCI Dictionary of Cancer Terms—National Cancer Institute [5 December 2022]. Available from: https://www.cancer.gov/publications/dictionaries/cancer-terms/def/oropharyngeal-cancer.
4. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. 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. doi: 10.3322/caac.21660 [published Online First: 20210204]
5. De Felice F, Tombolini V, Valentini V, et al. Advances in the Management of HPV-Related Oropharyngeal Cancer. *J Oncol* 2019;2019:9173729. doi: 10.1155/2019/9173729 [published Online First: 20190414]
6. Chaturvedi AK, Anderson WF, Lortet-Tieulent J, et al. Worldwide trends in incidence rates for oral cavity and oropharyngeal cancers. *J Clin Oncol* 2013;31(36):4550-9. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2013.50.3870 [published Online First: 20131118]
7. Abram MH, van Heerden WF, Rheeder P, et al. Epidemiology of oral squamous cell carcinoma. *SADJ* 2012;67(10):550-3.
8. Majchrzak E, Szybiak B, Wegner A, et al. Oral cavity and oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma in young adults: a review of the literature. *Radiol Oncol* 2014;48(1):1-10. doi: 10.2478/raon-2013-0057 [published Online First: 20140122]
9. Auluck A, Walker BB, Hislop G, et al. Population-based incidence trends of oropharyngeal and oral cavity cancers by sex among the poorest and underprivileged populations. *BMC Cancer* 2014;14(1):316. doi: 10.1186/1471-2407-14-316
10. Lee SC, Leung KKC, Chung ACY, et al. Fluid Biomarkers in HPV and Non-HPV Related Oropharyngeal Carcinomas: From Diagnosis and Monitoring to Prognostication-A Systematic Review. *Int J Mol Sci* 2022;23(22) doi: 10.3390/ijms232214336 [published Online First: 20221118]
11. Simard EP, Torre LA, Jemal A. International trends in head and neck cancer incidence rates: differences by country, sex and anatomic site. *Oral Oncol* 2014;50(5):387-403. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2014.01.016 [published Online First: 20140213]
12. Chi AC, Day TA, Neville BW. Oral cavity and oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma--an update. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2015;65(5):401-21. doi: 10.3322/caac.21293 [published Online First: 20150727]
13. Lambert R, Sauvaget C, de Camargo Cancela M, et al. Epidemiology of cancer from the oral cavity and oropharynx. *Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2011;23(8):633-41. doi: 10.1097/MEG.0b013e3283484795
14. Shield KD, Ferlay J, Jemal A, et al. The global incidence of lip, oral cavity, and pharyngeal cancers by subsite in 2012. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2017;67(1):51-64. doi: 10.3322/caac.21384 [published Online First: 20161019]
15. Liu J, Yang XL, Zhang SW, et al. Incidence, mortality, and temporal patterns of oropharyngeal cancer in China: a population-based study. *Cancer Commun (Lond)* 2018;38(1):75. doi: 10.1186/s40880-018-0345-5 [published Online First: 20181229]
16. Parmar A, Macluskey M, Mc Goldrick N, et al. Interventions for the treatment of oral cavity and

oropharyngeal cancer: chemotherapy. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2021(12) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD006386.pub4

17. Howard J, Dwivedi RC, Masterson L, et al. De‐intensified adjuvant (chemo)radiotherapy versus standard adjuvant chemoradiotherapy post transoral minimally invasive surgery for resectable HPV‐positive oropharyngeal carcinoma. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018(12) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012939.pub2
18. Hoxbroe Michaelsen S, Gronhoj C, Hoxbroe Michaelsen J, et al. Quality of life in survivors of oropharyngeal cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 1366 patients. *Eur J Cancer* 2017;78:91-102. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2017.03.006 [published Online First: 20170418]
19. Larsen CG, Jensen DH, Carlander AF, et al. Novel nomograms for survival and progression in HPV+ and HPV- oropharyngeal cancer: a population-based study of 1,542 consecutive patients. *Oncotarget* 2016;7(44):71761-72. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.12335
20. Mehanna H, Beech T, Nicholson T, et al. Prevalence of human papillomavirus in oropharyngeal and nonoropharyngeal head and neck cancer--systematic review and meta-analysis of trends by time and region. *Head Neck* 2013;35(5):747-55. doi: 10.1002/hed.22015 [published Online First: 20120120]
21. Lundberg M, Leivo I, Saarilahti K, et al. Increased incidence of oropharyngeal cancer and p16 expression. *Acta Otolaryngol* 2011;131(9):1008-11. doi: 10.3109/00016489.2011.575796 [published Online First: 20110504]
22. D'Souza G, Kreimer AR, Viscidi R, et al. Case-control study of human papillomavirus and oropharyngeal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356(19):1944-56. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa065497
23. Gillison ML, Chaturvedi AK, Anderson WF, et al. Epidemiology of Human Papillomavirus-Positive Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 2015;33(29):3235-42. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2015.61.6995 [published Online First: 20150908]
24. Sudhoff HH, Schwarze HP, Winder D, et al. Evidence for a causal association for HPV in head and neck cancers. *Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol* 2011;268(11):1541-7. doi: 10.1007/s00405-011-1714-8 [published Online First: 20110727]
25. Ndiaye C, Mena M, Alemany L, et al. HPV DNA, E6/E7 mRNA, and p16INK4a detection in head and neck cancers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Oncology* 2014;15(12):1319-31.
26. Carpen T, Sjoblom A, Lundberg M, et al. Presenting symptoms and clinical findings in HPV-positive and HPV-negative oropharyngeal cancer patients. *Acta Otolaryngol* 2018;138(5):513-18. doi: 10.1080/00016489.2017.1405279 [published Online First: 20171121]
27. Ang KK, Harris J, Wheeler R, et al. Human Papillomavirus and Survival of Patients with Oropharyngeal Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2010;363(1):24-35. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0912217
28. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015;349:g7647. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g7647
29. Cochrane Prognosis Methods Group. Cochrane prognosis methods group protocol template: the Cochrane collaboration [Available from: https://methods.cochrane.org/prognosis/sites/methods.cochrane.org.prognosis/files/public/uploads/protocol_template_prognosis_reviews.doc accessed 3 February 2023.
30. Collins GS, Reitsma JB, Altman DG, et al. Transparent reporting of a multivariable prediction model

for individual prognosis or diagnosis (TRIPOD): the TRIPOD statement. *Journal of British Surgery* 2015;102(3):148-58.

31. Moons KGM, Wolff RF, Riley RD, et al. PROBAST: A Tool to Assess Risk of Bias and Applicability of Prediction Model Studies: Explanation and Elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2019;170(1):W1-W33. doi: 10.7326/M18-1377
32. Moons KG, de Groot JA, Bouwmeester W, et al. Critical appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies: the CHARMS checklist. *PLoS Med* 2014;11(10):e1001744. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001744 [published Online First: 20141014]
33. Debray TP, Damen JA, Snell KI, et al. A guide to systematic review and meta-analysis of prediction model performance. *BMJ* 2017;356:i6460. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i6460 [published Online First: 20170105]
34. Perry A, Lee SH, Cotton S, et al. Therapeutic exercises for affecting post‐treatment swallowing in people treated for advanced‐stage head and neck cancers. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2016(8) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD011112.pub2
35. Chan KKW, Glenny AM, Weldon JC, et al. Interventions for the treatment of oral and oropharyngeal cancers: targeted therapy and immunotherapy. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015(12) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD010341.pub2
36. McAleenan A, Kelly C, Spiga F, et al. Prognostic value of test(s) for O6‐methylguanine‐DNA methyltransferase (MGMT) promoter methylation for predicting overall survival in people with glioblastoma treated with temozolomide. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2021(3) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD013316.pub2
37. Kreuzberger N, Damen J, Trivella M, et al. Prognostic models for newly‐diagnosed chronic lymphocytic leukaemia in adults: a systematic review and meta‐analysis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2020(7) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012022.pub2
38. Aldin A, Umlauff L, Estcourt LJ, et al. Interim PET‐results for prognosis in adults with Hodgkin lymphoma: a systematic review and meta‐analysis of prognostic factor studies. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2020(1) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD012643.pub3
39. The Cochrane Collaboration. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions [Available from: https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current accessed 3 February 2023.
40. Geersing GJ, Bouwmeester W, Zuithoff P, et al. Search filters for finding prognostic and diagnostic prediction studies in Medline to enhance systematic reviews. *PLoS One* 2012;7(2):e32844. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0032844 [published Online First: 20120229]
41. Bramer WM, Giustini D, de Jonge GB, et al. De-duplication of database search results for systematic reviews in EndNote. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2016;104(3):240-3. doi: 10.3163/1536-5050.104.3.014
42. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000;283(15):2008-12. doi: 10.1001/jama.283.15.2008
43. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003;327(7414):557-60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557
44. Iorio A, Spencer FA, Falavigna M, et al. Use of GRADE for assessment of evidence about prognosis: rating confidence in estimates of event rates in broad categories of patients. *bmj* 2015;350
45. GRADE Handbook. Handbook for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach: the GRADE working group [Available from:

https://gdt.gradepro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html accessed 3 February 2023.

46. Hemingway H, Croft P, Perel P, et al. Prognosis research strategy (PROGRESS) 1: a framework for researching clinical outcomes. *BMJ* 2013;346:e5595. doi: 10.1136/bmj.e5595 [published Online First: 20130205]

47. Debray TP, Koffijberg H, Nieboer D, et al. Meta-analysis and aggregation of multiple published prediction models. *Stat Med* 2014;33(14):2341-62. doi: 10.1002/sim.6080 [published Online First: 20140114]

Table of Contents

Supplementary Table S1. PRISMA-P[1] (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Page Number
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	1
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	20
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	N/A
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	20
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	20
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	20
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	4-6
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	6
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6-11
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	6-11
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	11-12, Supplementary Table S3
Study records:			

Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	12-17
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	12-17
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	12-17
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	6-17
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	6-11
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	6-11
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	12-17
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)	12-17
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	12-17
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	12-17
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	12-17
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	6-17

* It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.

Supplementary Table S2. The CHARMS checklist[2]

Items	Comments
1. Prognostic versus diagnostic prediction model	Prognostic prediction model (Aimed to predict future survival outcomes of people diagnosed with OPSCC)
2. Intended scope of the review	Prognostic prediction models to inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC
3. Type of prediction modelling studies	All study types including prognostic prediction modelling studies (with or without external validation) and external model validation studies (with or without model updating)
4. Target population to whom the prediction model applies	Patients diagnosed with OPSCC according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review
5. Outcome to be predicted	Future survival outcomes after diagnosis of OPSCC, including overall survival (and/or disease-related mortality), progression-free survival, and disease-free survival
6. Time span of prediction	Survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC
7. Intended moment of using the model	At any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC

Framing of this systematic review with key items identified by the CHARMS checklist, which is the checklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies.
Notes: OPSCC, oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma.

Supplementary Table S3. The draft search strategy for MEDLINE

Concept	Step	Search strategy
Study type = prognostic prediction modelling studies		
Study type = prognostic prediction modelling studies (Ingui filter for prediction models[3])	1	Validat$.mp. or Predict$.ti.
	2	(Predict$ and (Outcome$ or Risk$ or Model$)).mp.
	3	((History or Variable$ or Criteria or Scor$ or Characteristic$ or Finding$ or Factor$) and (Predict$ or Model$ or Decision$ or Identif$ or Prognos$)).mp.
	4	Decision$.mp. and ((Model$ or Clinical$).mp. or Cox Models/)
	5	(Prognostic and (History or Variable$ or Criteria or Scor$ or Characteristic$ or Finding$ or Factor$ or Model$)).mp.
	6	or/1-5
Study type = prognostic prediction modelling studies (Addition to Ingui filter proposed by Geersing to improve specificity[4])	7	"ROC Curve"/ or Discrimination.mp. or Discriminate.mp. or c-statistic.mp. or "c statistic".mp. or "Area under the curve".mp. or AUC.mp. or Calibration.mp. or Indices.mp. or Algorithm.mp. or Multivariable.mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms]
Combination of study type concepts	8	6 and 7
Population = people with oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma		
	9	exp Oropharyngeal Neoplasms/
	10	"Head and Neck Neoplasms"/
	11	exp Otorhinolaryngologic Neoplasms/
	12	exp Neoplasms/
	13	(cancer$ or tumour$ or tumor$ or neoplas$ or malignan$ or carcinoma$ or SCC$).ti,ab.
	14	12 and 13
	15	exp Oropharynx/
	16	(oropharyn$ or mesopharyn$ or tonsil$ or "head and neck" or "head neck" or "head-neck" or "head-and-neck" or tongue$).ti,ab.
	17	15 and 16
	18	14 and 17
	19	(HNSCC or SCCHN or "OP-SCC" or OPSCC or OPC or SCCOP).mp.
	20	9 or 10 or 11 or 18 or 19
Outcome = survival		
	21	exp Mortality/
	22	exp Survival/

	23	exp Survival Analysis/
	24	"survival rate"/
	25	(surviv* or mortal* or death*).ti,ab.
	26	or/21-24
	27	25 and 26
Combinations of concepts		
	28	8 and 20 and 27
Human filter		
	29	exp animals/ not humans/
Final		
	30	28 not 29

Reference

1. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015;349:g7647. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g7647
2. Moons KG, de Groot JA, Bouwmeester W, et al. Critical appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies: the CHARMS checklist. *PLoS Med* 2014;11(10):e1001744. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001744 [published Online First: 20141014]
3. Ingui BJ, Rogers MA. Searching for clinical prediction rules in MEDLINE. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2001;8(4):391-7. doi: 10.1136/jamia.2001.0080391
4. Geersing GJ, Bouwmeester W, Zuithoff P, et al. Search filters for finding prognostic and diagnostic prediction studies in Medline to enhance systematic reviews. *PLoS One* 2012;7(2):e32844. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0032844 [published Online First: 20120229]

Table of Contents

Supplementary Table S1. PRISMA-P[1] (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Page Number
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	N/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	1
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	20
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	N/A
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	20
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	20
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	20
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	4-6
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	6
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6-11
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	6-11
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	11-12, Supplementary Table S3
Study records:			

Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	12-17
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	12-17
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	12-17
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	6-17
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	6-11
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	6-11
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	12-17
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)	12-17
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	12-17
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	12-17
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	12-17
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	6-17

* It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.

Supplementary Table S2. The CHARMS checklist[2]

Items	Comments
1. Prognostic versus diagnostic prediction model	Prognostic prediction model (Aimed to predict future survival outcomes of people diagnosed with OPSCC)
2. Intended scope of the review	Prognostic prediction models to inform clinicians' therapeutic decision making regarding the management of OPSCC
3. Type of prediction modelling studies	All study types including prognostic prediction modelling studies (with or without external validation) and external model validation studies (with or without model updating)
4. Target population to whom the prediction model applies	Patients diagnosed with OPSCC according to criteria in each eligible study included in the review
5. Outcome to be predicted	Future survival outcomes after diagnosis of OPSCC, including overall survival (and/or disease-related mortality), progression-free survival, and disease-free survival
6. Time span of prediction	Survival outcomes occurring at any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC
7. Intended moment of using the model	At any time point after diagnosis of OPSCC

Framing of this systematic review with key items identified by the CHARMS checklist, which is the checklist for critical Appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies.
Notes: OPSCC, oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma.

Reference

1. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* 2015;349:g7647. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g7647
2. Moons KG, de Groot JA, Bouwmeester W, et al. Critical appraisal and data extraction for systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies: the CHARMS checklist. *PLoS Med* 2014;11(10):e1001744. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001744 [published Online First: 20141014]