

Reply: **Circulating Neutrophils in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma**

Stephen L Chan^{1,2}, Richard McNally³, Helen L Reeves^{4,5}

¹ State Key Laboratory in Oncology of South China, Department of Clinical Oncology, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

² Institute of Digestive Disease, Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong.

³ Institute of Health & Society, Newcastle University, Sir James Spence Institute, Royal Victoria Infirmary, Queen Victoria Road, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE1 4LP.

⁴The Hepatopancreatobiliary Unit, Freeman Hospital, Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Freeman Road, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE7 7DN.

⁵ Northern Institute for Cancer Research, The Medical School, Framlington Place, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH

We thank Yuying and Xianchun for their interest in our paper entitled ‘Neutrophils: driving progression and poor prognosis in patients with hepatocellular carcinoma?’. We would like to respond to their comments.

The authors point out that there were significant differences between the two cohorts that we have studied and suggest that our analytical approach was not consistent with ‘statistical rules’ and that these may have resulted in ‘incorrect conclusions’. The authors go on to suggest that unmatched conditions should have been eliminated in our combined cohort analyses and reference two methods, namely Propensity Score Matching or Decision Tree and Random Forest.

We have considered these suggestions carefully and on these statistical matters we have to respectfully disagree. We entirely accept that there were differences between our UK and Hong Kong cohorts. Having demonstrated the key associations with neutrophils in our own large UK cohort with hepatocellular carcinoma, we deliberately chose a validation cohort where other factors that could impact peripheral blood counts – such as race, etiology, age, testing laboratory – were different. While the combination analyses enhanced statistical significance, all of the reported associations were present in each independent cohort despite the differences between them, which we see as a major strength of our study rather than a limitation. In the larger combined group, in which ‘cohort’ was included as a variable, a key added value was that it provided sufficient numbers of cases to perform sub-analyses where numbers were small in individual cohorts. For example, the presence of cirrhosis may have been a confounder as it can also affect cell number. By combining UK and Hong Kong cohorts, we were able to study associations in just over 400 patients and confirm that the reported cancer associations persisted.

We could reiterate in more depth additional details of our study, but feel it is sufficient in addition to our explanation above, to state that we believe that our approaches to the statistical analyses were biologically relevant and robust. Furthermore, suggesting some sort of matching would have improved the integrity of our study is simply not true. As described in the papers referenced by Yuying and Xianchun, matching methods are typically used when comparing a treatment arm of a clinical trial with a non-treatment arm – with the need to ensure that reported outcomes are independent of differences – such as race, age, sex, severity of underlying disease – that may impact outcome. It is not appropriate to try and apply this kind of matching to an observational study of a large heterogenous population in which many variables may influence outcome and the opportunity to assess their independent contributions is

related to the size of the cohort – and diminished by elimination of cases. In our combined analysis of factors influencing survival, the UK versus Hong Kong cohort was included as a variable in the multivariate analyses and it was not significantly different – with a hazard ratio of 0.93 (0.82-1.05) – which indicates that cohort differences have little relevance, whilst other factors have demonstrated importance. At a more practical level, any kind of matching has to be done in an inclusive and comprehensive fashion addressing all potential confounders – not just one or two. Matching on race or etiology alone would diminish our combined cohort to less than 100 patients, without even considering sex, age, cirrhosis, treatment etc. In short, it would be an inappropriate and pointless exercise.

The overall concern of Yuying and Xianchun stems from an assumption that we propose neutrophils alone are central to disease progression and outcome for patients with HCC. Actually, this is not our belief. Roles for lymphocytes in determining disease progression in the immunosuppressed tumour microenvironment (TME) are undoubtedly of paramount importance and roles for platelets are also increasingly realized. It is the role of neutrophils that has received far less attention and our study – in which circulating neutrophils were the only immune cell type independently associated with poorer prognosis in two very different cohorts of patients – provides a compelling argument for turning our attention to them. We proposed that studying neutrophils and their interactions with other cells, as well as how levels in the circulation reflect the TME, would be very worthwhile. We agree – as suggested by Yuying and Xianchun - that studying relationships between cell counts in a longitudinal fashion may aid our understanding of their roles in disease progression and responses to treatment. Not having done this as yet does not, however, invalidate the findings reported in our study of data generated from cell counts at the time of diagnosis. In short, we firmly stand by our conclusions and discussion points.