Supplementary material 7

Risk stratification models

Main study characteristics

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa	Outcomes, length of follow-up
BTOG-0129 F	RP∆ risk strat	ification model							tiveness.	
Ang 2010, US Developme nt NB patient characteristi cs reported for n=323 with known HPV status	RTOG- 0129 RPA model Carcinoma of the oral cavity, oropharynx , hypophary nx, or larynx	Patients recruited July 2002 - May 2005 as part of randomised controlled trial; retrospective analysis; n=433; n=266 (61%) in analysis	HPV+: median 53.5 (range 31-78); HPV-: 57 (387-82). 84% male.	TNM vr NR III: 14% IV: 86%	TNM vr NR T2: 31% T3: 39% T4: 30% N0: 7.4% N1: 14.2%, N1: 14.2%, N2a:11. 5% N2b: 33.1% N2c: 24.1% N3: 9.6%	HPV+: 64% HPV-: 36% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV DNA detection (in situ hybridization)	HPV+: Median n of pack years 12.2 (range 0- 152); HPV-: 36.5 (0-96). Never smoker (23%), former (51%), current (17%) and <u>unknown (9%).</u> No details on <u>alcohol.</u> Zubrod score 0-1: 71.9%, 2- 3: 24.2%, unknown 3.8%.	Fractionati on radiothera py and cisplatin: 51% Accelerate d- fractionatio n radiothera py and cisplatin: 49%	US trial population (RTOG-129 study). Eligibility criteria: presence of untreated, pathological ly confirmed, stage III or IV squamous- cell carcinoma of the oral cavity, oropharynx, hypopharyn x, or larynx without distant	OS: defined as time from randomisation to death. PFS: defined as time from date of randomisation to death or first documented relapse categorised as local-regional recurrence or distant metastases. Median follow up 4.8 y (range, 0.3 to 6.5y)

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	TNM	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
									metastases (M0); Zubrod's performanc e status score of 0 or 1 (asymptom atic or symptomati c but ambulatory, respectively); age of 18 years or older; and adequate bone marrow, hepatic, and renal function.	
Granata 2012, Italy <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC (no further details)	Consecutive patients treated at one Italian institution 2003 - 2009; retrospective analysis; n=140; n= 120 (86%) in analysis	Median (range) 61.0 (37- 88) 80% male	TNM vr NR I: 0.8% II: 5.8% III: 8.3% IVa:75.8 % IVb: 9.2%	TNM vr NR T1: 14.2% T2: 30.8% T3: 12.5% T4: 41.7%	p16+: 54.6% p16-:45.4% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis)	Median (range) packs/year: 30 (0-120). No smoking: 20.8%, smoking: 79.2% No details on alcohol.	Induction CT +CRT: 32.5% CRT: 53.3% RT only: 14.2%	Single Italian institution (consecutiv e patients). Not explicitly stated whether patients treated with	OS: defined as time from the date of starting therapy to the date of death due to any cause, censoring at the date of last available follow-up assessment for living patients. Median follow-up of 23 months (interquartile range: 13–39 months)

BMJ Open

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
					Tis: 0.8% N0: 12.5% N1: 10% N2a: 2.5% N2b: 40.8% N2c: 25% N3: 9.2%		ECOG status- 0: 73.3%, 1: 23.3%, 2: 3.4%		curative intent.	
Rietbergen 2013, The Netherlands <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC HPV+: tonsil 58.9%, base of tongue 31.3%, soft palate 5.5%, oropharynx nos 4.3%; HPV-: tonsil 38.4%,	All patients with an OPSCC diagnosed at two Dutch University hospitals Jan 2000 - Dec 2006; retrospective analysis; n=906; n=721 in analysis (those treated with curative intent and	HPV+: mean age at diagnosi s 60.53 (median 58.14), HPV-: mean 60.94 (median 59.67). 67% male <i>NB</i> based on n=809	TNM vr NR I-VI	TNM vr NR HPV+: T1-2: 54% T3-4: 46% Tx: 0 N0: 14.7% N1-3: 85.3% Nx: 0 HPV-: T1-2: 39.1%	HPV+: 19.4% HPV-: 76.8% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV DNA detection (PCR) <i>NB based on</i> <i>n=809</i>	HPV+: 0-10 pack years 40.5%, 11-24 PY 16.0%, >24 PY 42.9%, unknown 0.6%. HPV-: 0-10 PY 6.3%, 11-24 PY 9.3%, >24 PY 83.1%, unknown 1.2%. HPV+: 0-100 unit yrs 68.7%, 111-149 UY 9.2%, >149 UY 21.5%, unknown 0.6%. HPV-: 0-100	HPV+: Curative 93.3%, palliative 6.7%, Surg +/- RT 27.7% RT 18.4%, CRT 27.6%, RT+LND+ RT (brachythe rapy) 26.3%; HPV- curative	Unselected Dutch cohort of patients with OPSCC treated with curative intent.	OS: defined as the time from the date of incidence (defined as the date on which the squamous cell carcinoma was histologically confirmed) to death (any cause). PFS: defined as the time period from date of incidence to death or the first documented relapse, which was categorized as local- regional recurrence or distant metastases. Median follow-up of patients who received treatment and remained alive was 4.33 years (range 0.1–12.1)

BMJ O	pen
-------	-----

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	TNM	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
	tongue 24.9%, soft palate 17.8%, oropharynx nos 18.9%.	parameter data).			60.9% Tx: 4.0% N0: 39.3% N1-3: 60.4% Nx: 0.3%		UY 25.9%, 111-149 UY 7.7%, >149 UY 64.2%, unknown 2.2% HPV+: ACE-27 score 0: 56.4%, 1:24.5%, 3:17.2%, unknown 0.6%. HPV-: 0:32.4%, 1:30.3%, 2:28.8%, 3:8.4%, unknown: 0.2%	palliative 15.5%, surg +/-RT 30.7%, RT 31%, CRT 28.8%, RT +LND+RT (brachythe rapy): 9.5%		
Rietbergen 2015, The Netherlands <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC (no further details)	Patients curatively treated 2000–2011 at Maastricht University Medical Center, The Netherlands; retrospective analysis; n=235	Mean 60.24, median 58.96 73.6% male	TNM vr NR I-II: 20.4% III- IV: 79.6%	TNM vr NR T1-2: 51.5% T3-4: 48.5% Tx=0 N0- N2a: 48.1% N2b- N3: 51.9% Nx:0	HPV+: 30.2% HPV-: 69.8% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV DNA detection (PCR)	0-10 PY: 18.7%, >10 PY: 81.3%) unknown: 0 Details collected but not reported. ACE score 0-1: 71.9%, 2-3: 24.2%, unknown 3.8%.	Surgery +/- RT: 30.2% RT: 46% CRT: 19.1% Other: 4.7%	Single Dutch institution. Patients treated with curative intent.	OS: defined as time from date of incidence (defined as the date on which the squamous cell carcinoma was histologically confirmed) to death (any cause). PFS: defined as time period from date of incidence to death or the first documented relapse that was categorised as local– regional recurrence or distant metastases. Mean/median follow-up time not stated. Up to 5 years.

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	TNM	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
Wang 2016, Taiwan <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC stage III-IV (57.5% tonsil, 23.9% tongue base, 10.6% pharyngeal wall, 8.0% soft palate)	Patients with non- metastatic stage III–IV OPSCC who had completed definite therapy June 2006 -Jan 2013 at one hospital; retrospective analysis; n=130; n=113 (87%) in analysis.	Range 28-86, 52.2% >50 years 90.3% male	TNM 7 th ed III: 10.6% IVa: 64.6% IVb: 24.8%	TNM 7 th ed T1-T3: 44.2% T4:55.8 % N0- N2a: 23.0%, N2b- N3: 77.0%	P16+: 24.8% P16-: 75.2% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis)	72.6% smokers No details on alcohol. No details on co-morbidity.	Cisplatin- based CCRT: 75.2%, induction chemother apy and CCRT: 18.6%, cetuximab bio- radiothera py: 4.4%, radiothera py alone: 1.8%.	Single Taiwanese hospital. Patients who had cancer and achieved complete remission for more than three years without CT or RT were eligible for the current study. Patients were excluded if they had been previously treated for OPSCC at other institutions or had a positive history of malignancie s for which they had	OS: not defined. DSS: not defined. At least 24 months or until death. Median follow-up time 27.6 months (range: 5.2–98.0 months).

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
									been treated with CT or RT.	
Fakhry 2017, US Developme nt cohort (for Fakhry model), used for external validation of RTOG-0129 model	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC (no further details)	Patients from RTOG 0129 and 0522 clinical trials (2002-2005 and 2005- 2009), not consecutive, n=493	Mean age NR; 27.6% ≤50 yrs, 72.4% >50 yrs 87.4% male	All Stage III-IV as per the original RTOG studies.	TNM 7 th and 8 th eds T2-3: 72.0% T4: 28.0% N0-2b (TNM7) or N0-N1 (TNM8): 66.5% N2c-3 (TNM7) or N2- N3 (TNM8): 33.5%	P16 +: 73.6% P16-: 26.4% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis)	≤10 PYs: 47.3%, >10 PYs: 52.7% Not reported Zubrod/ECOG/ WHO PS: PS0: 69.0%; PS1: 31.0%	All patients curative RT+CT.	Patients from two US trials (NRG Oncology RTOG 0129 and 0522). Eligible patients had untreated, pathological ly confirmed, AJCC 5th edition (RTOG 0129) or 6th edition (RTOG 0522) stage III to IV7 head and neck squamous cell carcinoma, Zubrod performanc	OS: defined as time from date of randomisation to death from any cause. PFS: defined as from date of randomization to local, regional, or distant progression or death from any cause. Median: 5.7 years (95% Cl, 5.2 to 6.0 years)

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort	Outcomes, length of follow-up
									representa tiveness.	
									e status of 0 to 1, age ≥ 18 years, and adequate bone marrow, hepatic, and renal function.	
Deschuyme r 2018, Belgium <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC (no further details)	All non- metastatic OPSCC patients treated with primary RT in a single institution Jan 2004 -July 2017; retrospective analysis; n=333; n=258 (77%) in analysis.	HPV+ mean (IQR) 63.6 (54.9- 70.1); HPV- 59.7 (54.0- 65.8). 79.2% male.	TNM 7 th ed HPV+: I: 0.% II:10.0% III: 11.0% IVa: 68.0% IVb: 11.0% HPV-: I: 0.63% II:11.88% III:16.25 % IVa: 57.5% IVb: 13.75%	TNM 7 th ed HPV+: T1: 12.0% T2: 41.0% T3: 19.0% T4a: 23.0% T4b: 5.0% N0: 17.0% N1: 10.0% N2a: 5.0% N2b: 42.0%,	HPV+: 38.5% HPV-: 61.5% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis)	HPV+: mean PY 22.6 (21.65), never smoker 27.0%, ≤10 PY 14.0%, >10 PY 57.0%, unknown 3.0%. HPV-: mean PY 38.8 (22.12), never smoker 1.88%, ≤10 PY 5.0%, >10 PY 91.87%, unknown 1.25%. No details on alcohol. HPV+: ACE27 0 : 31.0%, 1: 37.0%, 2: 24.0%, 3:8.0%.	All primary radiothera py. HPV+ no systematic treatment 31.0%, cisplatin 66.0%, EGFR inhibitor 3.0%. HPV- no systematic treatment 28.75%, cisplatin 60.63%, EGFR inhibitor 17.0%.	Single Belgian institution. Included only patients treated with curative primary RT, excluding stage IV (8th Ed) and excluding patients treated with primary surgery.	OS: calculated from the date of histological diagnosis to the date of death from any cause. LRC: calculated from the date of histological diagnosis to the date of locoregional relapse (tumour at the primary site or regional nodes). DMC: calculated from the date of histological diagnosis to the date of distant metastases. Median follow-up 63.7 months (IQR 30.0; 99.9).

BMJ	Open
-----	------

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
					N2c:20. 0% N3: 6.0%. HPV-: T1: 0% T2: 33.13% T3: 22.5% T4a: 26.25% T4b:11. 88% N0: 23.13% N1: 17.5% N2a:		HPV-: ACE27 0: 16.25%, 1:40.0%, 2:23.75%, 3:20.0%.			
					2.5% N2b: 26.88% N2c: 28.13% N3: 1.88%					

BMJ (Open
-------	------

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	TNM	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
Rios- Velaquez 2014, The Netherlands <i>External</i> <i>validation</i> <i>Cohort 1</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC (Tonsillar fossa (36.9%), base of tongue (29.8%), oropharynx overlap (25.6%), soft palate 7.7%))	Consecutivel y treated patients (Maastro Clinic) Jan 2000-Oct 2011; retrospective analysis; n=168	Median 59 (range 43-83) 74.4% male	TNM vr NR I–IVb (no further details)	TNM vr NR T1: 14.9% T2: 27.4% T3: 22.6% T4: 35.1% N0: 34.5% N1: 17.3% N2: 44.1% N3: 3.6% Nx: 0.6%	P16+: 34.5% P16-: 64.3% P16 unknown: 1.25% HPV_DNA+:30 .4% HPV_DNA-: 69.6% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV- 16 DNA detection (PCR)	Median 30PY (range 0-100) Median 134 units/years (range 0-660) ACE 27 None: 33.3% Mild: 41.1% Moderate: 19% Severe: 6.5%	RT only: 67.9% CRT: 32.1%	Single Dutch institution. Patients treated with curative intent.	OS: defined as the time from starting radiotherapy to death from any cause. PFS: defined as the time from starting radiotherapy to time of first documented recurrence at any site (locoregional or metastasis) or death from any cause. Median 26 months (range 2.5– 127.2) overall. Median 37.5 months (range 6.4– 127.2) for patients alive at last follow-up.
Rios- Velaquez 2014, The Netherlands <i>External</i> <i>validation</i> <i>Cohort 2</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC (Tonsillar fossa (38.1%), base of tongue (29.1%), oropharynx	Consecutivel y treated patients (VU University Medical Center) Jan 2000-Dec 2006; retrospective analysis; n=189	Median 60 (range <u>43– 93)</u> 64.6% male	TNM vr NR I–IVb (no further details)	TNM vr NR T1: 13.8% T2: 28% T3: 33.3% T4: 24.9% N0:	P16+: 16.9% P16- : 82% P16 unknown: 1.1% HPV DNA+: 18% HPV DNA-: 82% Tumour p16 protein	Median 32 PY (range 0-100) Median 170 units/years (range 0-350) ACE 27 None: 35.4% Mild: 29.1%	RT only: 60.8% CRT: 39.2%	Single Dutch institution. Patients treated with curative intent.	OS: defined as the time from starting radiotherapy to death from any cause. PFS: defined as the time from starting radiotherapy to time of first documented recurrence at any site (locoregional or metastasis) or death from any cause.

BMJ	Open
-----	------

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	TNM	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
	overlap (20.1%), soft palate 12.7%))				43.9% N1: 12.2% N2: 41.8% N3: 2.1% Nx: 0%	expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV- 16 DNA detection (PCR)	Moderate: 29.6% Severe: 5.8%			Not reported.
Rietbergen 2	013 risk strat	ification model								
Rietbergen	Rietbergen	All patients	HPV+:	TNM vr	TNM vr	HPV+: 19.4%	HPV+: 0-10	HPV+:	Unselected	OS: defined as the time from the
2013, The	2013	with an	mean	NR	NR	HPV-: 76.8%	pack years	Curative	Dutch	date of incidence (defined as the
Nethenanus	model	diagnosed at	diagnosi	I-IV	HPV+·	NB based on	40.5%, 11-24 PY 16.0% >24	palliative	patients	carcinoma was histologically
Developme	OPSCC	two Dutch	s 60.53		T1-2:	n=809	PY 42.9%,	6.7%,	with	confirmed) to death (any cause).
nt	HPV+:	University	(median		54%		unknown 0.6%.	Surg +/-	OPSCC	
	tonsil	hospitals Jan	58.14), HDV-:		T3-4: 46%	Tumour p16	HPV-: 0-10 PY	RT 27.7%,	treated with	PFS: defined as the time period
	base of	2006:	mean		40% Tx:0	expression	PY 9.3%. >24	CRT	intent.	or the first documented relapse.
	tongue	retrospective	60.94		N0:	(immunohistoc	PY 83.1%,	27.6%,		which was categorized as local-
	31.3%, soft	analysis;	(median		14.7%	hemical	unknown 1.2%.	RT+LND+		regional recurrence or distant
	5.5%	n=906, n=721 in	<u>67%</u>		85.3%	Tumour HPV	HPV+: 0-100	(brachvthe		Median follow-up of patients
	oropharynx	analysis	male		Nx: 0	DNA detection	111-149 UY	rapy)		who received treatment and
	nos 4.3%;	(those				(PCR)	9.2%, >149 UY	26.3%;		remained alive was 4.33 years
	tonsil	treated with curative			HPV-:		21.5%,			(range 0.1–12.1)

BMJ O	pen
-------	-----

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
	38.4%, base of tongue 24.9%, soft palate 17.8%, oropharynx nos 18.9%.	intent and with model parameter data).	NB based on n=809		T1-2: 39.1% T3-4: 60.9% Tx: 4.0% N0: 39.3% N1-3: 60.4% Nx: 0.3%		unknown 0.6%. HPV-: 0-100 UY 25.9%, 111-149 UY 7.7%, >149 UY 64.2%, unknown 2.2% HPV+: ACE-27 score 0: 56.4%, 1:24.5%, 3:17.2%, unknown 0.6%. HPV-: 0:32.4%, 1:30.3%, 2:28.8%, 3:8.4%, unknown: 0.2%	HPV- curative 84.4%, palliative 15.5%, surg +/-RT 30.7%, RT 31%, CRT 28.8%, RT +LND+RT (brachythe rapy): 9.5%		
Rietbergen 2015, The Netherlands <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>	Rietbergen 2013 model OPSCC (no further details)	Patients curatively treated 2000–2011 at Maastricht University Medical Center; retrospective analysis; n=235	Mean 60.24, median 58.96 73.6% male	TNM vr NR I-II: 20.4% III- IV: 79.6%	TNM vr NR T1-2: 51.5% T3-4: 48.5% Tx=0 N0- N2a: 48.1%	HPV+: 30.2% HPV-: 69.8% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV DNA detection (PCR)	0-10 PY: 18.7%, >10 PY: 81.3%) unknown: 0 Details collected but not reported. ACE score 0-1: 71.9%, 2-3: 24.2%, unknown 3.8%.	Surgery + RT: 30.2%; RT: 46%; CRT: 19.1%; other: 4.7%	Single Dutch institution. Patients treated with curative intent.	OS: defined as time from date of incidence (defined as the date on which the squamous cell carcinoma was histologically confirmed) to death (any cause). PFS: defined as time period from date of incidence to death or the first documented relapse that was categorised as local– regional recurrence or distant metastases.

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
					N2b- N3: 51.9% Nx:0					Mean/median follow-up time not stated. Up to 5 years.
Deschuyme r 2018, Belgium <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>	RTOG- 0129 RPA model OPSCC (no further details)	All non- metastatic OPSCC patients treated with primary RT in a single institution Jan 2004 -July 2017; retrospective analysis; n=333; n=258 (77%) in analysis.	HPV+ mean (IQR) 63.6 (54.9- 70.1); HPV- 59.7 (54.0- 65.8). 79.2% male.	TNM 7 th ed HPV+: I: 0.% II:10.0% III: 11.0% IVa: 68.0% IVb: 11.0% HPV-: I: 0.63% II:11.88% III:16.25 % IVa: 57.5% IVb: 13.75%	TNM 7 th ed HPV+: T1: 12.0% T2: 41.0% T3: 19.0% T4a: 23.0% T4b: 5.0% N0: 17.0% N1: 10.0% N2a: 5.0% N2b: 42.0%, N2c:20. 0% N3: 6.0%.	HPV+: 38.5% HPV-: 61.5% Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis)	HPV+: mean PY 22.6 (21.65), never smoker 27.0%, ≤10 PY 14.0%, >10 PY 57.0%, unknown 3.0%. HPV-: mean PY 38.8 (22.12), never smoker 1.88%, ≤10 PY 5.0%, >10 PY 91.87%, unknown 1.25%. No details on alcohol. HPV+: ACE27 0 : 31.0%, 1: 37.0%, 2: 24.0%, 3:8.0%. HPV-: ACE27 0 : 16.25%, 1:40.0%, 2:23.75%, 3:20.0%.	All primary RT. HPV+ no systematic treatment 31.0%, cisplatin 66.0%, EGFR inhibitor 3.0%. HPV- no systematic treatment 28.75%, cisplatin 60.63%, EGFR inhibitor 17.0%.	Single Belgian institution. Included only patients treated with curative primary RT, excluding stage IV (8th Ed) and excluding patients treated with primary surgery.	OS: calculated from the date of histological diagnosis to the date of death from any cause. LRC: calculated from the date of histological diagnosis to the date of locoregional relapse (tumour at the primary site or regional nodes). DMC: calculated from the date of histological diagnosis to the date of distant metastases. Median follow-up 63.7 months (IQR 30.0; 99.9).

BMJ	Open

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
					HPV-: T1: 0% T2 [.]					
					33.13% T3:					
					22.5% T4a: 26.25%					
					T4b:11. 88%					
					N0: 23.13% N1:					
					17.5% N2a:					
					2.5% N2b: 26.88%					
					N2c: 28.13%					
					N3: 1.88%					
Huang 2015	RPA and AHF	Rrisk stratificat	ion models							
Huang 2015,	Huang 2015 RPA	Consecutive patients	Median 57.8	TNM 7 th ed	TNM 7 th ed	100% HPV + (p16 +/-	Median 40 PYs	All radiothera	Unselected patient	OS: defined as the duration between "random assignment"
Canada	model and AHR	treated 2000- 2010 at one	79%	l: 1.4%	T1:	staining)	Not reported	ру CRT: 50%	population with HPV-	and death.
Developme nt	model	institution; retrospective analysis; n=573	male	II: 4.4% III: 13.8% IV: 80.5%	20.4% T2: 34.6%	Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc	Not reported		related OPC from a single Canadian	Median 5·1 years

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
Koona	OPSSC (HPV+ only)	NB based on 1,108 patients, 573HPV+, 237 HPV- and 298 (27%) with unknown status	Madian		T3: 26.9 % T4: 18.2% N0: 12% N1: 10.5% N2a: 7.9% N2b: 36.3% N2c: 24.1% N3: 9.3%	hemical analysis)		Dediates	institution treating almost all patients in its region. Patients with nonmetasta tic (M0) OPC treated with definitive RT or CRT.	
Keane 2016, US <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>		Patients from SEER database, diagnosed 2004-2008; retrospective analysis; n=8427	Median 58 (21– 96) 82.8% male.	INM 6 ⁴¹ ed I: 5.9% II: 8.9% III: 22.6% IVA: 57.5% IVB: 5.2%	TNM 6 ^m ed T1: 25.3% T2: 39.2% T3: 12.5% T4: 23.0% N0: 21.9% N1: 24.8% N2a: 10.6%	HPV+ (no further information on method of HPV status determination). Method not reported.	Not reported Not reported	Radiothera py No: 14.4% Yes: 85.6% Radical surgery No: 72.1 Yes: 27.7% Unknown: 0.02%. No informatio n on CT.	Patients with non- metastatic cancer from US SEER database. No information on CT, smoking, alcohol or co- morbidities. Unclear if cohort different to DEV one.	OS: defined as time from date of diagnosis to date of death. HNC-specific mortality: defined as time from date of diagnosis to date of head and neck cancer related death. Median follow-up 50 months

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
					N2b: 24.7% N2c: 12.9% N3: 5.2% All M0				Not possible to determine whether patients received definitive- intent surgery.	
O'Sullivan 2016, Canada <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>		Consecutive patients treated 2000- 2011 at six institutions; retrospective analysis; n=1246 NB based on patients with known HPV+ status	Median 56 (IQR 51–62) 86% male	TNM 7 th ed I: 1% II: 3% III: 13% IVA: 76% IVB: 7%	TNM 7 th ed T1: 30% T2: 39% T3: 19% T4a: 11% T4b: 1% N0: 7% N1: 12% N2a: 12% N2a: 12% N2a: 12% N2b: 41% N2c: 22%	100% HPV + (p16 +/- staining) Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV DNA detection (in situ hybridization)	Median PYs 6 (IQR 0-25) Not reported Not reported	Surgery: 2% RT: 98% CT yes: 75% CT no: 25%	Patients with non- metastatic oropharyng eal cancer from six institutions, one from Denmark, one from the Netherland s and four from the US. Patients with newly diagnosed non- metastatic (M0)	Risk of death: defined as risk of death from any cause from the date of diagnosis. Median 4.6 years (IQR 3.1–5.5)

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	TNM	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
					N3: 6% All M0				oropharyng eal cancer undergoing either primary surgery or primary radiotherap y with or without chemothera py. No explicit statement on treatment with curative intent.	
O'Sullivan 20	16 AHR and	RPA risk stratif	ication mo	del (updated	d from Hua	ing 2015)				
O'Sullivan 2016, Canada	O'Sullivan 2016 AHR model	Consecutive patients treated 2000-	Median 57 (IQR 51–65)	TNM 7 th ed	TNM 7 th ed	100% HPV + (p16 +/- staining)	Median PYs 15 (IQR 0-30)	Surgery: 1% RT: 99%	Patients with non- metastatic	Risk of death: defined as risk of death from any cause from the date of diagnosis.
Developme nt	OPSSC (HPV+ only)	2011 at one institution; retrospective analysis, n=661 NB based on patients with known HPV+ status	80% male	I: 1% II: 4% III: 13% IVA: 68% IVB: 13%	T1: 20% T2: 35% T3: 26% T4a: 13%	Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV DNA detection	Not reported	CT yes: 49% CT no: 51%	oropharyng eal cancer from one Canadian institution. Patients with newly diagnosed non-	Median 5.5 years (IQR 3.2–6.6)

BMJ Open

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
O'Sullivon		Concocutivo	Modian		T4b: 5% N0: 12% N1: 10% N2a: 8% N2b: 36% N2b: 36% N2c: 25% N3: 8% All M0	(in situ hybridisation).	Median BYa 6	Surgery	metastatic (M0) oropharyng eal cancer undergoing either primary surgery or primary RT with or without CT.	Piels of dooth: defined on risk of
2016, Canada <i>External</i> <i>validation</i>		patients treated 2000- 2011 at six institutions; retrospective analysis; n=1246 NB based on patients with known HPV+ status	86% male	ed I: 1% I: 3% III: 13% IVA: 76% IVB: 7%	ed T1: 30% T2: 39% T3: 19% T4a: 11% T4b: 1% N0: 7% N1: 12% N2a: 12%	(p16 +/- staining) Tumour p16 protein expression (immunohistoc hemical analysis); Tumour HPV DNA detection (in situ hybridisation).	Not reported Not reported	2% RT: 98% CT yes: 75% CT no: 25%	with non- metastatic oropharyng eal cancer from six institutions, one from Denmark, one from the Netherland s and four from the US. Patients with newly diagnosed non-	Median 4.6 years (IQR 3.1–5.5)

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	TNM N2b: 41% N2c: 22% N3: 6% All M0	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness. metastatic (M0) oropharyng eal cancer undergoing either primary surgery or primary RT with or without CT.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
Alabi 2022 Ri	sk stratificat	ion model								
Alabi 2022 Developme nt	ProgTOOL OPSCC (Tonsil 55.1%), base of tongue (37.2%), oropharynx (6.9%), vallecular 0.8%))	Patients from SEER database 2010-2015; retrospective analysis; n=3164 Patients with known clinical and pathological characteristic s.	Median 61 (SD 10.4, range 20-85; mean 61.4) 79.8% male	Not reported	TNM 7 th ed T1: 27.6% T2: 40.4% T3: 18.3% T4: 13.6% N0: 44.8% N1: 45% N2: 0%	HPV+: 63.9% HPV-: 36.1% No further information on method of HPV status determination.	Not reported Not reported Not reported	Surgery: 18.3% Surgery + RT: 40.1% Surgery + CRT: 18.3% CRT: 13.1% No treatment: 12.1%	Included all cases with OPSCC with known clinical and pathologic characterist ics.	OS: defined as the time period from the beginning (or end) of treatment until the patients die of any cause. Median 49, mean 49.4, SD 27.2, range 0 to 107 months.

Study (D or EV)	Model and cancer location	Source of data (n, and n included in analysis)	Age (mean y (SD)), sex	Cancer stage	ТММ	HPV status and measurement method	Smoking, alcohol, co- morbidities	Treatment	Inclusion criteria/ comments on cohort representa tiveness.	Outcomes, length of follow-up
Alabi 2023	ProgTOOL	Caso of	Median	Not	N3: 10.2% M0: 97.5% M1:2.5 %	HDV/1+ 74 2%	Not reported	Surgery:	Included	OS: not defined
External validation	OPSCC (Tonsil 58.9%), base of tongue (28.2%), oropharynx (12.9%).	OPSCC from electronic patient records at Helsinki University Hospital; retrospective analysis; n=163 Patients with known clinical and pathological characteristic s.	62 (SD 9.1, range 37-85, mean 61.4) 75.5% male	reported	rtim 74 ed T1: 32.5% T2: 32.5% T3: 10.4% T4: 24.5% N0: 15.3% N1: 9.8% N2: 73.6% N3: 1.2% M0: 98.8% M1:1.2 %	No further information on method of HPV status determination.	Not reported	- 4.9% Surgery + - RT: 14.1% Surgery + CRT: 21.5% CRT: 51.5% No treatment: 8.0%	cases with OPSCC with known clinical and pathologic characterist ics.	Median 50, mean 45.8, SD 19.9, range 0 to 88 months.

Model characteristics and performance

Ang 2010, US	RTOG-0129 RPA model	Model discrimination (c-index): NR
Development		Model calibration: NR
	<u>HPV status:</u> positive vs negative	Other model performance measures: patients classified as having low, intermediate or high risk of 3-yr
Granata 0010, Italy	Number of pack-years of tobacco	US using RPA.
Granala 2012, Italy	$\frac{\text{SHOKING}}{Nodel/turnour stage: NO to NO vo$	Model discrimination (<i>c-index</i>): 2yr OS: c-index (adjusted for optimism) 0.70 (no Ci stated)
External validation	N2b to N2 for HDV positivo	whole calibration. Observed event rate for OS in external validation set was slightly higher than the
		Observed event rate for OS in the DEV conort for all three predicted risk groups.
Diath anns a 0010. Tha	OB_{1} tumour stage (T2 or T2 ve T4)	Other model performance measures: NR
Rietbergen 2013, The	OR. Iumour stage (12 or 13 vs 14),	Model discrimination (c-index): US: c-index 0.58 (95% CI 0.56-0.61)
Netherlands	for HPV-negative lumours	Model calibration: NR
External validation	Elevenhaut averagente el an have ta	Other model performance measures: NR
Rietbergen 2015, The	Flowchart presented on now to	Model discrimination (c-index): 5 yr OS: c-index 0.65 (95% CI 0.59, 0.70); 5 yr PFS: c-index 0.61 (95%
Netherlands		GI 0.54, 0.68)
External validation	risk.	Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: NR
Wang 2016, Taiwan		Model discrimination (c-index): OS: c-index 0.67 (CI NR); DSS: c-index 0.68 (CI NR)
External validation		Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: NR
Fakhry 2017, US		<i>Model discrimination (c-index)</i> : OS: c-index 0.71 (95% CI 0.66, 0.76)
External validation		Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: NR
Deschuymer 2018,		Model discrimination (c-index): OS: c-index 0.57 (95% CI 0.52, 0.62); OS HPV+ group only: c-index
Belgium		0.62 (95% CI 0.51, 0.73); c-index not reported for LRC or DMD
External validation		Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: NR
Rios-Velazquez 2014		Model discrimination (c-index): OS c-index 0.76 (95% CI 0.65, 0.80); PFS: c-index 0.74 (95% CI 0.70,
External validation		0.82)
(Maastro cohort)		Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: NR
Rios-Velazquez 2014		Model discrimination (c-index): OS: c-index 0.72 (95% CI 0.64, 0.78); PFS: c-index 0.64 (95% CI 0.59,
External validation		0.72)
(VUMC cohort)		Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: NR
Rietbergen 2013, the	Rietbergen 2013 model	Model discrimination (c-index): OS: c-index 0.68 (95% CI 0.65-0.71)
Netherlands	HPV status: positive vs negative	Model calibration: NR

Development	Comorbidity: ACE 0 vs ACE 1-2 vs	Other model performance measures: NR
Rietbergen 2015	ACE 3 (HPV-); ACE 0-1 vs ACE 2-	Model discrimination (c-index): 5 yr OS: c-index 0.69 (95% CI 0.63, 0.75); 5 yr PFS: c-index 0.66 (95%
	3 (HPV+)	CI 0.59-0.74)
External validation	<u>Nodal stage (in HPV-):</u> N0-N2a vs	Model calibration: NR
	N2b-N3	Other model performance measures: NR
Deschuymer 2018,	Tumour stage (in HPV+ with ACE	Model discrimination (c-index): OS: c-index 0.58 (0.53, 0.64); OS: c-index HPV+ group only: 0.62 (0.52,
Belgium	<u>0)</u> : T1-2 vs T3-4	0.73); LRC, DMC: NR
		Model calibration: NR
External validation	Flowchart presented on how to	Other model performance measures: NR
	assign low, intermediate and high	
Livers 0015 Canada	TISK.	Madal diagrimination (a index) ND
Huang 2015, Canada	Huang 2015 RPA model	Model alschmination (C-index): NR
Development	Recursive partitioning analysis	Other model performance measures: Based on an overall score derived from the hazard consistency
Development	model	score the bazard discrimination score, explained variance score, bazard difference score and sample
	BPA-I: T1-3N0-2b	size balance score the RPA risk prediction model performed best followed by the AHB model and
	BPA-II: T1-3N2c	then the AJCC/UJCC 7 th edition.
	RPA-III: T4 or N3	(NB Further model developed based on RPA stage, age and smoking developed in Huang 2015 but
		not validated)
Keane 2016, US		Model discrimination (c-index): OS c-index 0.60 (95% CI 0.59, 0.61); HNC-specific mortality: c-index
		0.62 (95% CI 0.61, 0.63); AJCC staging system: OS: c-index 0.54 (95% CI 0.53, 0.55); HNC-specific
External validation		mortality: c-index 0.55 (95% CI 0.54, 0.57)
		Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: NR
Huana 2015, Canada	Huang 2015 AHP model	Model discrimination (a index): NP
Hually 2015, Callaua	Huang 2015 ATTA model	Model calibration: NR
Development	Adjusted hazard ratio derived	Other model performance measures: Based on an overall score derived from the hazard consistency
2010000000	model	score, the hazard discrimination score, explained variance score, hazard difference score and sample
	AHR-I: T1N0-N2b or T2N0-N2a	size balance score, the RPA risk prediction model performed best, followed by the AHR model and
	AHR-II: T1N2c, T2N2b-N2c, or	then the AJCC/UICC 7th edition.
	T3N0-N2b	(NB Further model based on RPA stage, age and smoking developed in Huang 2015 but not validated)
O'Sullivan 2016,	AHR-III: T1-2N3, T3N2c, or T4N0-	Model discrimination (c-index): NR
Canada	N2a	Model calibration: NR
	AHR-IVA: T3N3 or T4N2b-N3	Other model performance measures: Based on an overall score derived from the hazard consistency
External validation (in	AHR-IVB: M1	score, the hazard discrimination score, explained variance score, hazard difference score and sample
both training cohort		size balance score, the AHR risk classification performed best, followed by the RPA model and then
and validation cohort)		the AJCC/UICC 7th edition.

O'Sullivan 2016,	O'Sullivan 2016 AHR model	Model discrimination (c-index): NR
Canada		Model calibration: NR
	Adjusted hazard ratio derived	Other model performance measures: Based on an overall score derived from the hazard consistency
Development	model	score, the hazard discrimination score, explained variance score, hazard difference score and sample
	AHR-New I: T1-T2N0-N2b	size balance score, the AHR (NEW) risk classification performed best (and as well as the AHR
	AHR-New II: T1–T2N2c or T3N0–	Original), followed by the RPA model and then the AJCC/UICC 7th edition.
O'Sullivan 2016,	N2c	Model discrimination (c-index): NR
Canada	AHR-New III: T4 or N3	Model calibration: NR
		Other model performance measures: Based on an overall score derived from the hazard consistency
External validation	O'Sullivan 2016 RPA model	score, the hazard discrimination score, explained variance score, hazard difference score and sample
	RPA stage I: T1-T3N0-N2b	size balance score, the AHR (NEW) risk classification performed best, followed by AHR Original, the
	RPA stage II: T1-T3N2c	RPA model and then the AJCC/UICC 7th edition.
	RPA stage III: T4 or N3	
	-	
Alabi 2022	ProgTOOL	Model discrimination (c-index): NR
		Model calibration: NR
Development	Age	Other model performance measures: PPV: 0.97, NPV: 0.76, sensitivity: 0.89, specificity: 0.92, F1
	Sex: 0=male, 1=female	score: 0.93, Accuracy: 89.9%, balanced accuracy: 86.3%, weighted accuracy: 92.5%, Matthews'
	Ethnicity: 0=white, 1=black,	correlation coefficient: 0.77, weighted AUC: 0.929
Alahi 2022	2=other	Model discrimination (c-index): NR
Alabi 2023	Marital status: 1=married, 0=single	Model calibration: Slope not fitted so difficult to interpret. Accuracy of prediction appears to vary
	Tumour grade: I-IV	depending on lower/higher predicted probabilities.
	HPV status: 0=negative, 1=positive	Other model performance measures: PPV: 0.93, NPV: 0.89, sensitivity: 0.76, specificity: 0.97, F1
External validation	Site: 1=base of tongue,	score: 0.84, Accuracy: 90.2%, balanced accuracy: 86.5%, Matthews' correlation coefficient: 0.78,
External validation	2=oropharynx, 3=tonsils	weighted AUC: 0.94, Brier score 0.06, Net Benefit value of model approximately 0.7 at 10% - 50%
	4=n=vallecular	probability threshold.
	T-stage (AJCC 7th ed): 1-4	
	N=stage (AJCC 7 th ed): 1-3	
	M-stage (AJCC 7 th ed): 0-1	
	Surgery: 0=no, 1=yes	
	Surgery +radiotherapy: 0=no,	
	1=yes	
	Chemotherapy: 0=no, 1=yes	
	Disease free survival (months): 0-	
	500	
	http://oncotelligence.com/	

Risk of bias summary



Figure: PROBAST summary Chart shows percentage of study cohorts meeting/not meeting criteria: Y=yes; PY=probably yes; NI=no or insufficient information; PN=probably no; N=no. AS=all study cohorts; MD=model development cohorts; EV=external validation cohorts. Numbers of cohorts contributing to the different criteria varies (e.g. as not all evaluations reporting both OS and PFS; the criterion 'participants with missing data handled appropriately' is only applicable where there was missing data). Every evaluation counted for the analysis domain; some cohorts were used for evaluating more than one model. The criterion 'all enrolled participants included in analysis' was answered with 'no' if participants were excluded on the basis of missing variable data.