EVALUATION OF DIFFERENTIATED THYROID CANCER PATIENTS ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT SCORING SYSTEMS: A SINGLE CENTER EXPERIENCE
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Introduction

➢ True risk evaluation is important in the management of thyroid cancer. We aimed to evaluate patients with differentiated thyroid cancer (DTC) according to the different staging systems.

Methods

Data of patients diagnosed with DTC between 2007 and 2014 at our institution were analysed retrospectively. TNM, MACIS, EORTC, AMES, De Groot, ETA, LATS, and ATA staging systems were applied to patients according to their original description. In ATA risk classification system, we classified patients into four categories considering inappropriate postoperative thyroglobulin levels.

Results

➢ There were 983 patients (218 male and 765 female) with a mean age of 49.4±12.5 and a mean follow-up of 42.6±24.3 months. Distribution of patients according to the staging systems were as follows; TNM: 81.1%, 4.7%, 12.7%, 1%, 0.3%, 0.2% of patients in stage I, II, III, IVA, IVB, IVC respectively; MACIS: 91%, 5.9%, 2.2%, 0.8% of patients in group 1-4 respectively; EORTC: 39.4%, 36.7%, 19.8%, 4%, 0.1% of patients in group 1-5 respectively; AMES: 82.2% of patients in low risk and 17.8% in high-risk group; De Groot: 81.6%, 4.7%, 13.3%, 0.4% of patients in stages 1-4 respectively; ETA: 35.5%, 25.9%, 12.4%, 26.1% of patients in very low, low, high and undetermined risk groups respectively; LATS: 35.5%, 26.7%, 17.7%, 20.1% of patients in very low, low, high and undetermined risk groups respectively. According to ATA, distribution of patients in low, intermediate, high and undetermined risk groups were respectively 26.4%, 8.7%, 40.8% and 23.6% in category 1, 39.7%, 12.9%, 23.8% and 23.6% in category 2, 46.7%, 15.2%, 14.5% and 23.6% in category 3, and 3.9%, 19.2%, 3.3% and 23.6% in category 4.

Conclusion

➢ Variable scoring systems with variable risk assessments were suggested for DTC in the literature. A standardized categorization is required to overcome confusion and help clinicians during management of these patients.