TITLE PAGE

Lung cancer survivors and employment: a systematic review

Flora Vayr¹, Frédéric Savall^{2,3}, Laurence Bigay-Game⁴, Jean-Marc Soulat^{1,2}, Christos Chouaid⁵,
Fabrice Herin^{1,2}

¹ Occupational Diseases Department, Toulouse-Purpan, University Hospital Toulouse, F-31000,
France

² INSERM UMR 1027, Université de Toulouse III, Toulouse, F-31000, France

³ Laboratory of Molecular Anthropology AMIS, UMR 5288 CNRS

⁴ Pneumology Department, Toulouse-Purpan, University Hospital Toulouse, F-31000, France

⁵ Pneumology Department, Centre Hospitalier Intercommunal Creteil, Ile de France, France

* Corresponding author: Fabrice Herin, (MD, PhD)

Address: Occupational Diseases Department, University Hospital, Toulouse, Bâtiment Turiaf, Place
du Dr Baylac, 31059 Toulouse Cedex 9

Phone: +33 5 61 77 21 17; Fax: +33 5 61 77 75 61

e-mail: herin.f@chu-toulouse.fr

Abstract

Background The aim of this systematic review is to identify, in a comprehensive manner, the impact of lung cancer on the employment status of survivors.

Methods The *Preferred Reported Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses* (PRISMA) statement was used as a formal guideline. The systematic review includes scientific papers published between January 2000 and October 2018. The search strategy queried the database MEDLINE. Inclusion criteria comprised: (1) inclusion of patients diagnosed with lung cancer (LC); (2) assessment of employment status or employment outcomes or work adjustments or return to work; (3) inclusion of scientific papers published in peer-reviewed journals; (4) inclusion of articles written either in English or in French. Literature reviews were not included.

Results A total of 642 scientific papers were retrieved. Twenty-three articles were included in the systematic review: 5 longitudinal studies and 18 cross-sectional studies. LC survivors are 2-3 times more likely to be unemployed as compared with control groups. Previous studies highlight a median duration of sickness absence increased for LC survivors compared to control groups. The strongest decline in earnings was observed among LC survivors as compared to other cancer types.

Conclusions LC is associated with a significant impact on employment of patients. The promising results of recent therapeutic strategies could lead to a better social and professional prognosis. A reduction of indirect costs is to be expected.

Keywords

Lung cancer; lung neoplasms; employment; survivorship; immunotherapy; return to work

1. Introduction

For years, lung cancer (LC) has been considered as a severe disease characterised by poor prognosis and short-term survival. Nowadays, promising results of new therapies are broadening the therapeutic perspectives for LC patients. Early detection and more effective treatments have provided a notable improvement of long-term survival rates (1,2). Immunotherapy, with highly selective humanized monoclonal antibodies, have shown satisfying results in terms of efficiency and low toxicity (3,4). Despite the severity of the disease, more individuals are now able to resume their normal activities after diagnosis and treatment. As their mental and physical functioning is improving, patients can consider a social and professional rehabilitation. Return to work (RTW) is defined as recovery of the ability to perform work tasks after sick leave. This process is challenging for patients, who may face sequelae of the disease, side effects of their past and current treatments and potentially a psychological trauma after cancer. However, the professional rehabilitation of cancer survivors represents a crucial threshold and should be medically supported (5). RTW is associated with health-related quality of life of patients (6). Resuming work helps to regain a sense of normalcy, self-satisfaction and confidence. Moreover, RTW represents a priority for economic reasons, both at the individual and societal scale. LC can be associated with an increased social vulnerability and impoverishment. On a larger scale, LC and its treatments raise challenges in terms of economic sustainability. A clear understanding of the impact of new therapies is crucial in order to determine their cost-efficiency. Thus, the promising efficiency of immunotherapies could allow RTW of LC survivors and reduce indirect costs of the disease and its treatments. This remains to be demonstrated but represents an enthusiastic pathway for the economic sustainability of immunotherapeutic molecules. As LC long-term survivorship represents a recent topic, few studies have addressed the question of employment status and return to work of LC survivors. The aim of this systematic review is to precise the risk of unemployment among LC patients, to examine the economic consequences of unemployment on LC patients and society and to identify a potential impact of the therapeutic evolution on the RTW prognosis of patients.

2. Methods

2.1. Protocol

The “Preferred Reported Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses” (PRISMA) statement was used as a formal guideline (7). Details are provided in Additional file 1 (S1_Appendix. PRISMA Checklist).

2.2. Eligibility criteria

Studies were included if they met the following criteria: (1) inclusion of patients diagnosed with LC; (2) assessment of employment status or employment outcomes or work adjustments or RTW; (3) inclusion of scientific papers published in peer-reviewed journals; (4) inclusion of articles written either in English or in French. Literature reviews were not included.

2.3. Search strategy

A literature search was conducted using the electronic database MEDLINE. Studies published from January 2000 to October 2018 were retrieved. The following search terms were included: *lung neoplasms, return to work, employment, survivorship*. When available, Medical Subject Headings terms were used. In addition, the reference lists of selected articles were further reviewed to identify additional relevant papers. An overview of search terms is provided in Additional file 2 (S2_Appendix. Extensive overview of search terms).

2.4. Study selection

Titles and abstracts were reviewed to identify relevant articles by two independent reviewers. A second selection performed by two reviewers independently established the relevance of the full-text

articles according to the predefined inclusion and non-inclusion criteria. When the initial reviewers disagreed on a study, a third reviewer was responsible for the final decision.

2.5. Data extraction

Data extracted comprised: identification of the article (authors, year of publication, journal) and the methodology used. The data gathered was used to address the following aspects: employment status of LC survivors, work adjustments performed to facilitate RTW of LC survivors, economic difficulties related to the impact of LC on employment.

2.6. Methodological quality assessment

The methodological quality of articles included was assessed with the Methodological Index for Non-randomized Studies (MINORS) (8). Each study was scored on 12 components: clearly stated aim, inclusion of consecutive patients and response rate, prospective collection of data, endpoints appropriate to the aim of the study, unbiased assessment of study end points, follow-up period appropriate to the aim of the study, loss to follow-up, prospective calculation of the study size. In the case of comparative study, the four following items were added: an adequate control group, contemporary groups, baseline equivalence of groups, adequate statistical analysis. Scientific articles received 0 to 2 points for each of these 12 items. The global ideal score was 16 for non-comparative studies and 24 for comparative studies.

3. Results

3.1. Description of included studies

A total of 642 papers were retrieved from the electronic database, including 17 duplicates. Titles and abstracts were analysed and 78 papers were considered relevant for the topic. After assessment of inclusion and non-inclusion criteria, 23 articles were included in the systematic review. Five were longitudinal studies and 18 were cross-sectional studies. The reasons for exclusion are reported in the flow chart (Figure 1. Flow chart). Details concerning their quality assessment are given in Table 1 (Table 1. Methodological quality assessment based on MINORS). Six included articles were from the United States of America (USA) (9–14), 3 of each were from the Netherlands (15–17), 2 of each were from Japan (18,19), 2 of each were from Finland (20,21), 2 of each were from Korea (22,23), 2 of each were from Norway (24,25), and one of each was from Ireland (26), Denmark (27), Swiss (28), Spain (29). Finally, two articles analysed data from different European countries (30,31). Main results are reported in Table 2 (Table 2. Main results).

3.2. Employment status

Working age LC survivors are characterized by high rates of unemployment. Syse et al (Norway, 2008) described the employment probability by cancer form and stage. LC survivors were less likely to be employed than the reference group (no cancer). This difference was found in both genders (Odds Ratio (OR)_{men} = 0.37; 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.31–0.45 versus OR_{women} = 0.58; 95% CI: 0.48–0.71) (25). Likewise, LC survivors were less likely to be employed than cancer-free patients (Relative risk (RR) = 0.63; 95% CI: 0.56–0.71) in a cohort of 934 LC patients. LC patients were more likely to be retired in 1997 in comparison to referents matched for sex and age (RR = 1.53; 95% CI: 1.39–1.69). However, they did not have the highest risk of retirement in 1997 compared to other cancer types. This was explained by authors by the low life expectancy of patients, who often did not live long enough to retire (Finland, 2005) (20).

Moreover, LC patients seem to face earlier job loss according to two longitudinal studies. Earle et al (USA, 2010) reported that LC is associated with a higher risk of departing the workforce than the

control group (colon cancer) (OR = 2.83; 95% CI: 1.54–5.19). The type of cancer was found to be associated with the time until job loss of patients. Thus, having a LC was associated with an earlier job loss than the reference group (stomach cancer) (HR = 1.31; 95% CI: 1.12–1.53) (11). LC was a predictor of early job loss (Hazard ratio (HR) =1.31 [1.12-1.53]) in a longitudinal study (Korea, 2008) (23).

The impact of LC on employment persists years after the diagnosis. Two to three years after diagnosis, 279 patients with LC were less likely to be employed as compared with a reference group in a Finland study (RR = 0.45; 95% CI: 0.34–0.59) (Finland, 2004) (21). Kim et al (Korea, 2014) compared the employment status of 829 LC survivors at the time of diagnosis and at a median of 4.11 years after diagnosis with the general population. In total, 260 (31.4%) patients were unemployed at the time of diagnosis. After diagnosis and treatment, LC survivors were more likely to be unemployed (61.2%) than the general population (adjusted OR = 2.31; 95% CI: 1.66–3.22) and than survivors at the time of diagnosis (adjusted OR = 24.30; 95% CI: 11.40–51.79) (22). Compared with control group, 30 women and 28 men with LC were less often employed 5 years after diagnosis (OR_{female} = 0.39; 95% CI: 0.19–0.81; *p*-value = 0.011; OR_{male} = 0.39; 95% CI: 0.18–0.83; *p*-value = 0.014). After adjustments with socio-demographic and work-related variables, the odd ratio remained significant for women (aOR = 0.32; 95% CI: 0.15–0.70; *p*-value = 0.004) (Norway, 2013) (24).

Predictive factors of the employment rate of LC survivors have been explored in a cross-sectional study. In a univariate analysis, factors associated with unemployment were older age, lower educational level, low household income and the number of comorbidities. Concerning the quality of life scales, poor social functioning (assessed by 2 items in a questionnaire: the interaction with the family and social activities), fatigue, dyspnea and insomnia were associated with unemployment. In a multivariate analysis, the factors significantly associated with unemployment after LC treatment were: age more than 50 years (aOR = 5.21; 95% CI: 2.10–12.93), monthly household income less than \$3000 (aOR = 2.54; 95% CI: 1.67–3.85), 2 or more comorbidities (aOR = 1.78; 95% CI: 1.10–2.89), and poor social functioning (aOR = 8.02; 95% CI: 1.74–37.05). 322 (56.6%) patients had returned to work after diagnosis among the 569 patients who were employed at the time of diagnosis. Fatigue (78.6%) was the most frequent symptom reported by LC survivors who were working, along with

lower wages (9.2%), reduced ability to perform work tasks (9.2%) and meaningless work (1.7%). Physical limitations (39%), fatigue (31.8%) and fear of worsening health (24.7%) were the most frequently reported items for LC survivors who were unemployed, retired or homemakers (Korea, 2014) (22).

3.3. Sick leave

Two longitudinal studies focus on the duration of sick leaves related to LC. LC was a significant predictor of delayed re-employment (HR=0.79 [0.55-1.16]) in a cohort of 420 patients (Korea, 2008) (23). Endo et al (Japan, 2016) explored return to work after sick leave due to cancer in a 365-day cohort including 162 LC patients. Lung cancer was characterized by a lower cumulative full RTW rate than other cancers. Within 365 days after initial days of sickness absence, the median time to partial/full RTW was 96.5 days. Twenty-two patients died, 7 resigned, 11 were disabled. One hundred twenty-two patients returned to work: 31 had a full-time job and 91 performed a partial RTW. In a univariate analysis, LC survivors had a longer time to full RTW than patients with the reference group (gastric cancer) (HR = 0.33; 95% CI: 0.24–0.45), p -value < 0.01). This difference remained significant in the multivariate analysis (HR = 0.29; 95% CI: 0.21–0.39; p -value < 0.01) (19).

Cross-sectional studies confirm these results. According to Molina (Spain, 2008), having LC was associated with continuing sick leave (p -value < 0.001). LC was strongly associated with a low prognosis of RTW in a cohort of 35 patients (85% of LC patients did not return to work) (29). Among 448 LC patients (Netherlands, 2011), the median duration of sickness absence was 490 days (404-576). Two hundred and four patients (45%) returned to full time job 2 years after diagnosis, 65 patients (15%) received a disability pension, 88 patients resigned (20%) and 91 died (20%). Sick days percentages were higher as compared with the reference group for LC patients. Fifty-nine percent of them were absent from work for more than 12 months. LC employees had the worst RTW prognosis as compared to patients with non-malignant chronic disorders (17).

Among 73 LC patients, 19 were employed and had returned to work at a median of 2.8 years after diagnosis: 36% were currently employed and 15% had returned to work (Denmark, 2012) (27).

The duration of sick leave appears to be increased for LC patients both pre- and post-diagnosis. In a cohort of 2738 patients including 393 LC patients, Sjövall et al (Swiss, 2012) described that LC patients had the highest increase in sick days (sick leave and disability pension) both pre- and post-diagnosis compared to cancer-free patients. LC patients had 12 times the amount of sick days compared to their matched control patients. Likewise, disability pension was more common among LC patients. A pick in sick leave was reported 5 months post diagnosis. One year after diagnosis, 63% of LC patients were still on sick leave. The authors highlight that for this cancer type, sick leave increased already during the pre-diagnostic phase. LC survivors had the highest number of sick days. Their decrease in sick leave after diagnosis was slower than in the control group (28).

The duration of sick leave is increased and return to work is delayed for LC patients. This pattern also applies for partial RTW. In a cohort of 456 LC patients, the time to partial RTW was longer for LC survivors as compared with the reference group (skin cancer) (median days: 377, HR = 1.88; 95% CI: 1.51–2.25). The time to full RTW was also longer as compared with the reference group (median days: 484, HR = 1.61; 95% CI: 1.31–1.92) (Netherlands, 2011) (15). The time to partial RTW after LC in 2008 was longer than in 2002 (HR = 0.56; 95% CI: 0.37–0.85) (Netherlands, 2011) (16).

3.4. Work adjustments

In a cohort of 615 patients including 117 LC patients (USA, 2016), LC survivors were more likely to report changes in their employment or career decisions, including extended paid time off, unpaid time off, changing to a flexible schedule, changing from full time to part time, changing to a less demanding job ($p < 0.001$). Compared to other cancers, LC survivors experienced more interference between the disease and their physical or mental tasks at work. They reported an increased change of productivity ($p < 0.001$) (9). Likewise, in another American cohort of cancer survivors (USA, 2005), respiratory cancer was associated with having work-related disability in both male and female patients ($aOR_{male} = 0.603$; 95% CI: 0.146–2.488 versus $aOR_{female} = 1.468$; 95% CI: 0.468–4.607) (12).

3.5. Economic consequences for LC survivors

LC survivors are confronted with a loss of wages after the diagnosis and treatment. The impact of cancer on employment and earnings at the individual level has been explored in a few countries. The strongest decline in earnings was observed for leukemia, brain, bone and lung patients in a cross-sectional study which included 34,000 cancer survivors. The modeled income for reference categories was \$40,400 for men and \$35,500 for women. Men with LC earned annually -49,3% than the reference group (cancer-free patients) (p -value < 0.05). Women earned -33,5% than the reference group (p -value < 0.05) (Norway, 2008) (25).

Studies reveal that economic difficulties have an impact on career choices and the decision to keep working despite the disease. Nekhlyudov et al (USA, 2016) reported cancer survivor's experiences with finances and employment. Among 615 cancer survivors who had been employed during or since their cancer, 26% reported that keeping their insurance was a factor for them to remain at their job. In the study, LC survivors were more likely than other cancer survivors to be concerned by these economic worries ($p = 0.009$) (9).

3.6. Social impact of the work loss

The economic impact of LC is explored in two cross sectional studies at a societal scale. The cost of work loss on treatment days was estimated for lung cancer (including tracheal and bronchial cancers) in 2011 at 314.10 million USD by Yamauchi et al (Japan, 2017). The authors also estimated results of the work loss on non-treatment days using the product of "employment rate coefficient" and "productivity coefficient". In the case that the product of "employment rate coefficient x productivity coefficient" is 0.5, the work loss for lung cancer (including tracheal and bronchial cancers) averages 495.32 million USD. When LC survivors are not able to work (coefficients are 0), the work loss was estimated at 990.63 million USD (18).

Likewise, the projected productivity losses for cancer-related mortality was assessed between 2011 and 2030 (Ireland, 2016). Lung cancer was the costliest of all cancers. The authors projected 48.922 deaths from LC. The value of lost paid production averaged 2.4 billion euros, which was almost twice as costly as the other cancers. The value of lost household production was 12,493 million euros. The

value of lost paid production per death was 49,116 euros and the value of lost household production was 255,369 euros per death (26).

3.7. Impact of drug therapy

Few authors explored the impact of therapeutic choices on economic variables. Stanisic et al (Europe, 2010) examined the potential economic benefits related to RTW of LC patients when being treated with bevacizumab and platinum-based chemotherapy. The economic impact of the therapeutic program was analysed considering productivity losses due to LC. Mean costs savings related to productivity losses were estimated at €21,667 at year 1 and €39,001 at year 1.5 per salaried progression-free patient returning to work in the French setting. In Germany, mean costs savings represented respectively €21,171 and €38,107 per patient. In Italy, mean costs resulted in €17,578 at year 1 and €31,640. For Spain, mean costs savings were estimated at €12,401 at year 1 and €22,322 per patient still working (30).

The potential savings associated with a reduced productivity loss in patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer were estimated in the European setting (2012). The bevacizumab treatment group had increased gains in productivity and reductions of societal expenses (€5,216; €6,739; €3,455 and €4,046 per patient in France, Germany, Italy and Spain, respectively) as compared with the chemotherapy group (€1,774; €2,278; €1,178 and €1,377; respectively). These gains were related to the duration of progression-free survival, which allowed patients to return to work. Reduced losses in labor costs were the main source of societal savings (31).

4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of evidence

LC survivors are 2-3 times more likely to be unemployed as compared with control groups (patients with no cancer or cancer with less impact on employment) (11,20–22,24,25). Our findings highlight a median duration of sickness absence increased for LC survivors compared to control groups. This increase in sick days (sick leave and disability pension) occurs both pre- and post-diagnosis (17,19,28,29). The time to partial or full RTW is increased in LC (16,19,28,29) with a median duration varying between 96.5 days and 2.8 years according to studies. RTW of LC survivors is characterized by the need for work adjustments including changes of schedules and reducing workloads (9). Economic consequences related to LC diagnosis and treatments can alter patient's quality of life. The strongest decline in earnings was observed among LC survivors as compared to other cancers (25). Finally, the social impact of the patients' work loss was assessed by Yamauchi et al and Pearce et al (18,26). Cost of work loss was measured by projecting productivity losses or using the product of "employment rate coefficient and productivity coefficient". These studies highlight indirect costs associated with LC and its therapies. Stanisic et al and Lister et al explored the potential economic benefits related to RTW of LC patients according to therapeutic strategies (30,31).

The median age of LC survivors at diagnosis averages 70 years old and LC is characterized by a 5-year survival of 13% (32–34). Therefore, LC is often considered as a disease of the elderly and the employment situation of patients is not explored. However, 30.3% of patients are aged between 20 and 64 years old according to the American National Cancer Institute. This working age population is concerned by working difficulties and economic insecurity, justifying further scientific exploration to address this question. Working age LC survivors are characterized by higher rates of unemployment as compared to other cancer patients. Demographic and socio-economic characteristics of working age LC patients could partially explain this difference. Previous findings suggest that young patients (working age population) belong to a specific population with an over-representation of females (35–45) and a more advanced stage of disease at diagnosis compared to older patients (36,37,40,41,43–

47). Likewise, low educational level has been identified as a predictive factor of respiratory cancers in different studies (37, 38, 39). In a French cohort, 146 young LC patients (median age 38 years) had a lower educational level than the general population (45).

4.2. Limitations

In the oncology field, studies tend to focus on the short-term efficiency and low toxicity of drugs. RTW is considered a long-term challenge and is often excluded from medical objectives. Studies focused on the impact of LC on employment remains scarce. Moreover, most studies are designed with cohorts of patients diagnosed with different types of cancer. Specific data on LC is limited.

A comparison of quantitative variables would have been interesting but the data provided by the review was not considered to be sufficient. The narrow breadth of information available concerning the economic benefits related to RTW of LC patients according to therapeutic strategies prevents to draw conclusions in the present study. However, this promising perspective highlights the need to explore this topic with future clinical settings.

Our conclusions are limited by the heterogeneity of studies included: study designs (longitudinal and cross-sectional studies), time-lapses, countries with different national health insurance systems, populations, endpoints. Future research is required to understand the consequences of LC on employment, particularly when considering the different therapeutic strategies offered to patients.

4.3. Perspectives

To our knowledge, it is the first study to gather, in a comprehensive manner, employment data on LC patients. Studies have explored the proportion of cancer survivors who RTW and the work-related difficulties they face. Being employed is correlated with a better quality of life regarding physical functioning (48). Conversely, change of employment status (dismissal, layoff or retirement) impairs all functioning scales and worsens fatigue, appetite loss, constipation, and economic difficulties on the

EORTC QLQ-C30. Losing a job has a significant negative impact on an individual's well-being (48). In the clinical setting, supporting and encouraging RTW of patients should therefore be a priority. As it facilitates physical recovery, maintains mental well-being and reduces economic difficulties, RTW may contribute to patients' recovery.

On a societal perspective, RTW of LC patients represents a priority as the costs associated with work loss and reduction of productivity have a significant impact. For healthcare systems, cancer management implies direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are represented by chemotherapy and immunotherapy drugs, hospitalizations, transportation, imaging and laboratory tests. Indirect cost are related to the lost days of productivity due to the disease for both patients and family caregivers (22,49). Published data on indirect cost of LC management are scarce. Different variables have been considered to perform estimates such as lost days of productivity, short term disability and early death (50). LC represents one of the costliest cancer (26). Thus, reducing its indirect costs by facilitating RTW of patients is a promising pathway to maintain the economic sustainability of LC therapies.

The introduction of recent molecularly targeted agents and immunotherapies in the treatment of cancer has considerably renewed the prognosis of LC survivors. Agents targeting PD-1 are associated with favorable results in terms of progression-free and overall survival compared with platinum-based chemotherapy in LC patients (3,4). PD-L1 inhibitors are associated with the improvement of patients' quality of life (51). With these new treatments, LC survivors are likely to RTW after recovery. Future research is needed in this field. Assessing the benefit of immunotherapies in LC should not only consider clinical and paraclinical variables. The long-term benefits in terms of quality of life and professional rehabilitation of patients should be included in the analyses. New drug therapies may increase the patients' chance of resuming their former activities (including working); therefore, potentially reduce the economic burden they place on healthcare systems.

5. Conclusions

The risk of unemployment among LC survivors remains high. With an often delayed RTW compared to other cancers, LC patients are likely to experience economic and social complications. However, the introduction of novel molecularly targeted agents and immunotherapy drugs in the treatment of LC survivors is changing the prognosis of patients in terms of overall survival and quality of life. These promising results may be associated with a better RTW prognosis of patients. Future research should focus on the social and professional rehabilitation of patients who benefit from these therapeutic programs. A reduction of indirect costs due to loss of productivity, caregivers' implication and loss of work is to be expected and should be documented. As being part of a patient's recovery, the social and occupational reintegration of LC patients should be systematically assessed and supported.

COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICAL STANDARDS

Research involving human participants and/or animals

Ethics approval and consent to participate All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional committee, national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. This article does not contain any studies with humans or animals performed by any of the authors.

Informed consent No individual participants were included in the study.

Availability of data and material

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article.

Conflict of Interest None declared

SUPPLEMENTARY FILES

S1_Appendix: PRISMA Checklist

S2_Appendix. Extensive overview of search terms

Figure 1. Flow chart

Table 1. Methodological quality assessment based on MINORS

Table 2. Main results

References

1. Sugimura H, Yang P. Long-term survivorship in lung cancer: a review. *Chest*. 2006 Apr;129(4):1088–97.
2. Yun YH, Kim YA, Min YH, Chang YJ, Lee J, Kim MS, et al. Health-related quality of life in disease-free survivors of surgically treated lung cancer compared with the general population. *Ann Surg*. 2012 May;255(5):1000–7.
3. Zhao Q, Xie R, Lin S, You X, Weng X. Anti-PD-1/PD-L1 Antibody Therapy for Pretreated Advanced or Metastatic Nonsmall Cell Lung Carcinomas and the Correlation between PD-L1 Expression and Treatment Effectiveness: An Update Meta-Analysis of Randomized Clinical Trials. *BioMed Res Int*. 2018;2018:3820956.
4. Wang C, Yu X, Wang W. A meta-analysis of efficacy and safety of antibodies targeting PD-1/PD-L1 in treatment of advanced nonsmall cell lung cancer. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2016 Dec;95(52):e5539.
5. Rasmussen DM, Elverdam B. The meaning of work and working life after cancer: an interview study. *Psychooncology*. 2008 Dec;17(12):1232–8.
6. Stone DS, Ganz PA, Pavlish C, Robbins WA. Young adult cancer survivors and work: a systematic review. *J Cancer Surviv Res Pract*. 2017 Dec;11(6):765–81.
7. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA Statement. *Open Med*. 2009 Jul 21;3(3):e123–30.
8. Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D, Kwiatkowski F, Panis Y, Chipponi J. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (minors): development and validation of a new instrument. *ANZ J Surg*. 2003 Sep;73(9):712–6.
9. Nekhlyudov L, Walker R, Ziebell R, Rabin B, Nutt S, Chubak J. Cancer survivors' experiences with insurance, finances, and employment: results from a multisite study. *J Cancer Surviv Res Pract*. 2016 Dec;10(6):1104–11.
10. Tevaarwerk AJ, Lee J-W, Terhaar A, Sesto ME, Smith ML, Cleeland CS, et al. Working after a metastatic cancer diagnosis: Factors affecting employment in the metastatic setting from ECOG-ACRIN's Symptom Outcomes and Practice Patterns study. *Cancer*. 2016 Feb 1;122(3):438–46.

- 467 11. Earle CC, Chretien Y, Morris C, Ayanian JZ, Keating NL, Polgreen LA, et al. Employment
468 among survivors of lung cancer and colorectal cancer. *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol*.
469 2010 Apr 1;28(10):1700–5.
- 470 12. Short PF, Vasey JJ, Tunceli K. Employment pathways in a large cohort of adult cancer survivors.
471 *Cancer*. 2005 Mar 15;103(6):1292–301.
- 472 13. Bednarek HL, Bradley CJ. Work and retirement after cancer diagnosis. *Res Nurs Health*. 2005
473 Apr;28(2):126–35.
- 474 14. Bradley CJ, Bednarek HL. Employment patterns of long-term cancer survivors. *Psychooncology*.
475 2002 Jun;11(3):188–98.
- 476 15. Roelen C a. M, Koopmans PC, Schellart AJM, van der Beek AJ. Resuming work after cancer: a
477 prospective study of occupational register data. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2011 Sep;21(3):431–40.
- 478 16. Roelen C a. M, Koopmans PC, Groothoff JW, van der Klink JJJ, Bültmann U. Return to work
479 after cancer diagnosed in 2002, 2005 and 2008. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2011 Sep;21(3):335–41.
- 480 17. Roelen CA, Koopmans PC, Groothoff JW, van der Klink JJ, Bültmann U. Sickness absence and
481 full return to work after cancer: 2-year follow-up of register data for different cancer sites.
482 *Psychooncology*. 2011 Sep;20(9):1001–6.
- 483 18. Yamauchi H, Nakagawa C, Fukuda T. Social impacts of the work loss in cancer survivors. *Breast*
484 *Cancer Tokyo Jpn*. 2017 Sep;24(5):694–701.
- 485 19. Endo M, Haruyama Y, Takahashi M, Nishiura C, Kojimahara N, Yamaguchi N. Returning to
486 work after sick leave due to cancer: a 365-day cohort study of Japanese cancer survivors. *J Cancer*
487 *Surviv Res Pract*. 2016 Apr;10(2):320–9.
- 488 20. Taskila-Abrandt T, Pukkala E, Martikainen R, Karjalainen A, Hietanen P. Employment status of
489 Finnish cancer patients in 1997. *Psychooncology*. 2005 Mar;14(3):221–6.
- 490 21. Taskila-Brandt T, Martikainen R, Virtanen SV, Pukkala E, Hietanen P, Lindbohm M-L. The
491 impact of education and occupation on the employment status of cancer survivors. *Eur J Cancer*
492 *Oxf Engl 1990*. 2004 Nov;40(16):2488–93.
- 493 22. Kim YA, Yun YH, Chang YJ, Lee J, Kim MS, Lee H-S, et al. Employment status and work-
494 related difficulties in lung cancer survivors compared with the general population. *Ann Surg*. 2014
495 Mar;259(3):569–75.

496 23. Park J-H, Park E-C, Park J-H, Kim S-G, Lee S-Y. Job loss and re-employment of cancer patients
497 in Korean employees: a nationwide retrospective cohort study. *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin*
498 *Oncol.* 2008 Mar 10;26(8):1302–9.

499 24. Torp S, Nielsen RA, Fosså SD, Gudbergsson SB, Dahl AA. Change in employment status of 5-
500 year cancer survivors. *Eur J Public Health.* 2013 Feb;23(1):116–22.

501 25. Syse A, Tretli S, Kravdal Ø. Cancer's impact on employment and earnings--a population-based
502 study from Norway. *J Cancer Surviv Res Pract.* 2008 Sep;2(3):149–58.

503 26. Pearce A, Bradley C, Hanly P, O'Neill C, Thomas AA, Molcho M, et al. Projecting productivity
504 losses for cancer-related mortality 2011 - 2030. *BMC Cancer.* 2016 18;16(1):804.

505 27. Ross L, Petersen MA, Johnsen AT, Lundstroem LH, Carlsen K, Groenvold M. Factors associated
506 with Danish cancer patients' return to work. A report from the population-based study 'The
507 Cancer Patient's World'. *Cancer Epidemiol.* 2012 Apr;36(2):222–9.

508 28. Sjövall K, Attner B, Englund M, Lithman T, Noreen D, Gunnars B, et al. Sickness absence among
509 cancer patients in the pre-diagnostic and the post-diagnostic phases of five common forms of
510 cancer. *Support Care Cancer Off J Multinatl Assoc Support Care Cancer.* 2012 Apr;20(4):741–7.

511 29. Molina R, Feliu J, Villalba A, San José B, Jiménez AM, Espinosa E, et al. Employment in a
512 cohort of cancer patients in Spain. A predictive model of working outcomes. *Clin Transl Oncol*
513 *Off Publ Fed Span Oncol Soc Natl Cancer Inst Mex.* 2008 Dec;10(12):826–30.

514 30. Stanisic S, Bischoff HG, Heigener DF, Vergnenègre A, de Castro Carpeño J, Chouaid C, et al.
515 Societal cost savings through bevacizumab-based treatment in non-small cell lung cancer
516 (NSCLC). *Lung Cancer Amst Neth.* 2010 Aug;69 Suppl 1:S24-30.

517 31. Lister J, Stanisic S, Kaier K, Hagist C, Gulyaev D, Walzer S. Societal savings in patients with
518 advanced non-squamous non-small-cell lung cancer receiving bevacizumab-based versus non-
519 bevacizumab-based treatments in France, Germany, Italy, and Spain. *Clin Outcomes Res CEOR.*
520 2012;4:299–305.

521 32. Lung and Bronchus Cancer - Cancer Stat Facts [Internet]. [cited 2019 Mar 5]. Available from:
522 <https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/lungb.html>

523 33. Survival patterns in lung and pleural cancer in Europe 1999-2007: Results from the EURO CARE-
524 5 study. - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2019 Mar 5]. Available from:
525 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Francisci+S%2C+Minicozzi+P%2C+Pierannunzio>

+D%2C+Ardanaz+E%2C+Eberle+A%2C+Grimsrud+TK%2C+Knijn+A%2C+Pastorino+U%2C+
Salmeron+D%2C+Trama+A%2C+Sant+M%3B+EUROCARE-
5+Working+Group%3A+Survival+patterns+in+lung+and+pleural+cancer+in+Europe+1999%
E2
%80%932007%3A+results+from+the+EUROCARE-5+study.

34. Fry WA, Phillips JL, Menck HR. Ten-year survey of lung cancer treatment and survival in
hospitals in the United States: a national cancer data base report. *Cancer*. 1999 Nov 1;86(9):1867–
76.

35. Hsu C-L, Chen K-Y, Shih J-Y, Ho C-C, Yang C-H, Yu C-J, et al. Advanced non-small cell lung
cancer in patients aged 45 years or younger: outcomes and prognostic factors. *BMC Cancer*. 2012
Jun 13;12:241.

36. Kim L, Kim KH, Yoon YH, Ryu JS, Choi SJ, Park IS, et al. Clinicopathologic and molecular
characteristics of lung adenocarcinoma arising in young patients. *J Korean Med Sci*. 2012
Sep;27(9):1027–36.

37. Lung cancer in patients younger than 40 years of age. - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2019
Mar 5]. Available from:
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Maruyama+R%2C+Yoshino+I%2C+Yohena+T%2C+Uehara+T%2C+Kanematsu+T%2C+Kitajima+M%2C+Teruya+T%2C+Ichinose+Y%3A+Lung+cancer+in+patients+younger+than+40+years+of+age>

38. Radzikowska E, Roszkowski K, Głaz P. Lung cancer in patients under 50 years old. *Lung Cancer Amst Neth*. 2001 Sep;33(2–3):203–11.

39. Lung cancer in patients under age 40. - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2019 Mar 5]. Available
from:
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Skarin+AT%2C+Herbst+RS%2C+Leong+TL%2C+Bailey+A%2C+Sugarbaker+D%3A+Lung+cancer+in+patients+under+age+40>

40. Distinctive characteristics of non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in the young: a surveillance,
epidemiology, and end results (SEER) analysis. - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2019 Mar 5].
Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19934774>

41. Trends and Characteristics of Young Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients in the United States
[Internet]. [cited 2019 Mar 5]. Available from:
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4443720/>

- 556 42. Blanco M, García-Fontán E, Rivo JE, Repáaz JR, Obeso GA, Cañizares MA. Bronchogenic
557 carcinoma in patients under 50 years old. Clin Transl Oncol Off Publ Fed Span Oncol Soc Natl
558 Cancer Inst Mex. 2009 May;11(5):322–5.
- 559 43. Dell’Amore A, Monteverde M, Martucci N, Davoli F, Caroli G, Pipitone E, et al. Surgery for non-
560 small cell lung cancer in younger patients: what are the differences? Heart Lung Circ. 2015
561 Jan;24(1):62–8.
- 562 44. Ramalingam S, Pawlish K, Gadgeel S, Demers R, Kalemkerian GP. Lung cancer in young
563 patients: analysis of a Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database. J Clin Oncol Off J
564 Am Soc Clin Oncol. 1998 Feb;16(2):651–7.
- 565 45. Bigay-Gamé L, Bota S, Greillier L, Monnet I, Madroszyk A, Corre R, et al. Characteristics of
566 Lung Cancer in Patients Younger than 40 Years: A Prospective Multicenter Analysis in France.
567 Oncology. 2018;95(6):337–43.
- 568 46. Lung cancer in patients under age 40. - PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2019 Mar 5]. Available
569 from:
570 [https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Skarin+AT%2C+Herbst+RS%2C+Leong+TL%2C](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Skarin+AT%2C+Herbst+RS%2C+Leong+TL%2C+Bailey+A%2C+Sugarbaker+D%3A+Lung+cancer+in+patients+under+age+40)
571 [+Bailey+A%2C+Sugarbaker+D%3A+Lung+cancer+in+patients+under+age+40](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Skarin+AT%2C+Herbst+RS%2C+Leong+TL%2C+Bailey+A%2C+Sugarbaker+D%3A+Lung+cancer+in+patients+under+age+40)
- 572 47. Clinical Features and Gene Mutations of Lung Cancer Patients 30 Years of Age or Younger. -
573 PubMed - NCBI [Internet]. [cited 2019 Mar 5]. Available from:
574 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26332764>
- 575 48. Kobayashi K, Morita S, Shimonagayoshi M, Kobayashi M, Fujiki Y, Uchida Y, et al. Effects of
576 socioeconomic factors and cancer survivors’ worries on their quality of life (QOL) in Japan.
577 Psychooncology. 2008 Jun;17(6):606–11.
- 578 49. Chaker L, Falla A, van der Lee SJ, Muka T, Imo D, Jaspers L, et al. The global impact of non-
579 communicable diseases on macro-economic productivity: a systematic review. Eur J Epidemiol.
580 2015 May;30(5):357–95.
- 581 50. Zarogoulidou V, Panagopoulou E, Papakosta D, Petridis D, Porpodis K, Zarogoulidis K, et al.
582 Estimating the direct and indirect costs of lung cancer: a prospective analysis in a Greek
583 University Pulmonary Department. J Thorac Dis. 2015 Feb;7(Suppl 1):S12-19.
- 584 51. Abdel-Rahman O, Oweira H, Giryas A. Health-related quality of life in cancer patients treated
585 with PD-(L)1 inhibitors: a systematic review. Expert Rev Anticancer Ther. 2018 Sep 26;1–9.

PRISMA 2009 Flow Diagram

Figure 1. Flow chart

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit www.prisma-statement.org.

Table 1: Methodological quality assessment based on MINORS

Source	Aim ^b	Rate ^c	Data ^d	Measure ^e	Bias ^f	Time ^g	Loss ^h	Size ⁱ	Control ^j	Contemp ^k	Factor ^l	Analysis ^m	Total ⁿ
Yamauchi et al (18)	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	10/16
Endo et al (19)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	18/24
Nekhlyudov et al (9)	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	1	2	20/24
Pearce et al (26)	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	14/24
Tevaarwerk et al (10)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	20/24
Kim et al (22)	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	2	2	21/24
Torp et al (24)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	22/24
Ross et al (27)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	20/24
Lister J et al (31)	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	10/16
Sjövall et al (28)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	20/24
Roelen C (16)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	2	19/24
Roelen C (15)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	1	2	19/24
Roelen et al (17)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	18/24
Stanisic et al (30)	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	10/16
Earle et al (11)	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	0	2	19/24
Park et al (23)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	0	2	18/24
Syse et al (25)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	16/24
Molina et al (29)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	14/16
Short et al (12)	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	2	2	2	2	21/24
Bednarek et al (13)	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	11/16

Taskila-Abrandt et al (20)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	20/24
Taskila-Abrandt et al (21)	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	20/24
Bradley et al (14)	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	NA	NA	NA	NA	16/16

NA: not applicable

^a Assessed with the adapted Methodological Index for Non-Randomized Studies (MINORS)

^b Clearly stated aim (0,1,2 points)

^c Inclusion of consecutive patients and response rate (0,1,2)

^d Prospective collection of data (0,1,2)

^e Endpoints appropriate to the aim of the study (0,1,2)

^f Unbiased assessment of study end points (0 or 2)

^g Follow-up period appropriate to the aim of the study (0,1,2)

^h Loss to follow-up less than 5% (0,1,2)

ⁱ Prospective calculation of the study size (0 or 2)

^j An adequate control group (in the case of comparative study) (0,1,2)

^k Contemporary groups (in the case of comparative study) (0 or 2)

^l Baseline equivalence of groups (in the case of comparative study) (0,1,2)

^m Adequate statistical analysis (in the case of comparative study) (0 or 2)

ⁿ Total: minimum equals 0; maximum equals 24 points

0: not reported; 1: reported but inadequate; 2 reported and adequate

Table 2: Main results

Source	Date	Country	Study design	Population	Control group	Main results related to lung cancer
Employment status						
Torp et al (24)	2013	Norway	Longitudinal study	3,278 cancer survivors, 58 LC patients	N = 6,368 No cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher rate of unemployment 5 years after diagnosis on univariate analysis (OR female = 0.39; 95% CI: 0.19–0.81; p-value = 0.011; OR male = 0.39; 95% CI: 0.18–0.83; p-value = 0.014), and multivariate analysis for women (aOR = 0.32; 95% CI: 0.15–0.70; p-value = 0.004)
Earle et al (11)	2010	United States	Longitudinal study	2,422 cancer survivors, 812 LC patients,	N = 1,610 Colon cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher risk of departing the workforce (OR = 2.83; 95% CI: 1.54–5.19). Earlier job loss (HR = 1.31; 95% CI: 1.12–1.53)
Short et al (12)	2005	United States	Longitudinal study	1,433 cancer survivors, 51 respiratory cancer patients	N = 94 Colon cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased risk of quitting working (aOR = 1.21; 95% CI: 0.473–3.139) on univariate analysis After adjustments, these results were not significant
Kim et al (22)	2014	Korea	Cross sectional	829 LC survivors,	N = 1,000 Volunteers from the general population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unemployment at diagnosis: 260 (31.4%) After median of 4.11 years, higher rate of unemployment compared to the general population (adjusted OR = 2.31; 95% CI: 1.66–3.22) and to survivors at the time of diagnosis (adjusted OR = 24.30; 95% CI: 11.40–51.79)
Syse et al (25)	2008	Norway	Cross sectional	34,000 cancer survivors, 1,068 LC patients,	N = 1,082,191 No cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher risk of unemployment (OR men = 0.37; 95% CI: 0.31–0.45 versus OR women = 0.58; 95% CI: 0.48–0.71)
Taskila-Abrandt et al (20)	2005	Finland	Cross sectional	46,312 cancer survivors, 934 LC patients	N = 46,312 No cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher risk of unemployment (RR = 0.63; 95% CI: 0.56–0.71)
Taskila-Abrandt et al (21)	2004	Finland	Cross sectional	12,542 cancer survivors, 279 LC patients	N = 12,542 No cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher rate of unemployment 2-3 years after diagnosis (RR = 0.45; 95% CI: 0.34–0.59)
Tevaarwerk et al (10)	2016	United States	Cross sectional	680 cancer survivors, 134 LC patients	N = 282 Breast cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among the employment group, 16 LC patients were stably working and 58 were no longer working. This difference was not significant in a univariate analysis (OR = 1.0; 95% CI: 0.5–2.0)
Park et al (23)	2008	Korea	Longitudinal study	5,396 cancer survivors, 420 LC patients	N = 1,312 Stomach cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant predictor of early job loss (HR=1.31 [1.12-1.53])
Bednarek et al (13)	2005	United States	Cross sectional	253 cancer survivors, 53 LC patients	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 21 of 53 LC patients retired 1-7 years after diagnosis, 16 retired prior to diagnosis and 16 were employed 5-7 years after diagnosis

Bradley et al (14)	2002	United States	Cross sectional	253 cancer survivors, 58 LC patients	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Among 36 male LC patients, 38.9% were currently employed 5-7 years post-diagnosis Among 22 female LC survivors, 22.7% were currently employed at the time of study: 4 in full-time and 1 in part-time
Sick leave and return to work						
Endo et al (19)	2016	Japan	Longitudinal study	1,278 cancer survivors, 162 LC patients	N = 282 Gastric cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median time to RTW: 96.5 days 122 patients returned to work: 31 had a full-time job and 91 performed a partial RTW In a univariate analysis, longer time to full RTW (HR = 0.33; 95% CI: 0.24–0.45). This difference remained significant in the multivariate analysis (HR = 0.29; 95% CI: 0.21–0.39)
Park et al (23)	2008	Korea	Longitudinal study	5,396 cancer survivors, 420 LC patients	N = 1,312 Stomach cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant predictor of delayed re-employment (HR=0.79 [0.55-1.16])
Sjövall et al (28)	2012	Swiss	Cross sectional	2,738 cancer survivors, 393 LC patients	N = 12,246 No cancer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highest increase in sick days both pre- and post-diagnosis (12 times the amount of sick days compared to their matched control patients) A pick in sick leave 5 months post diagnosis One year after diagnosis, 63% of LC patients were still on sick leave
Molina et al (29)	2008	Spain	Cross sectional	347 cancer survivors, 35 LC patients	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having LC was associated with continuing sick leave (p-value < 0.001). LC was strongly associated with a low prognosis of RTW (85% of LC patients did not return to work)
Roelen et al (17)	2011	Netherlands	Cross sectional	5,074 cancer survivors, 448 LC patients	N = 271,834 Non malignant chronic disorders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Median duration of sickness absence: 490 days (404-576). 204 patients (45%) returned to full time job 2 years after diagnosis, 65 patients (15%) received a disability pension, 88 patients resigned (20%) and 91 died (20%). Higher sick days percentages. 59% of them were absent form work for more than 12 months.
Ross et al (27)	2012	Denmark	Cross sectional	1,490 cancer survivors, 73 LC patients	N = 1,417 Other cancers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Less likely to have returned to work after diagnosis (aOR = 0.10; 95% CI: 0.02–0.53). Less likely to be currently employed (aOR = 0.09; 95% CI: 0.03–0.27)
Roelen C (16)	2011	Netherlands	Cross sectional	In 2002: 1,209 cancer survivors, 132 LC patients In 2005: 1,522 cancer survivors,	In 2002: N = 841 In 2005: N = 995 In 2008: N = 977	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Time to partial RTW after LC in 2008 was longer than in 2002 (HR = 0.56; 95% CI: 0.37–0.85). Time to full RTW was longer after LC diagnosed in 2008 as compared to 2002 (HR = 0.46; 95% CI: 0.29–0.72). In 2002, among 44 female and 88 male patients, 65% of LC survivors

Yamauchi et al (18)	2017	Japan	Cross sectional	NA Patient Survey, Basic survey on Wage structure, Labour force survey	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of work loss on treatment days in 2011: 314.10 million USD Work loss: 495.32 million USD in the case that the product of “employment rate coefficient x productivity coefficient” is 0.5 Work loss: 990.63 million USD in the case that the product of “employment rate coefficient x productivity coefficient” is 0 (LC survivors not able to work)
Pearce et al (26)	2016	Ireland	Cross sectional	233,000 projected deaths from all invasive cancers in Ireland between 2011 and 2030 48,922 projected deaths from LC	N = 184,078 Other cancers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value of lost paid production: 2.4 billion euros Value of lost household production: 12,493 million euros Value of lost paid production per death: 49,116 euros Value of lost household production: 255,369 euros per death LC was the costliest cancer
Impact of drug therapy						
Stanisic et al (30)	2010	Europe	Cross sectional	France N = 1,481 Germany N = 1,492 Italy N = 820 Spain N = 745	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients treated with bevacizumab-based combination therapy France: mean costs savings related to productivity losses were €21,667 at year 1 and €39,001 at year 1.5 per salaried progression-free patient returning to work Germany: mean costs savings represented respectively €21,171 and €38,107 per patient Italy, mean costs results in €17,578 at year 1 and €31,640 Spain, mean costs savings were estimated at €12,401 at year 1 and €22,322 per patient still working
Lister J et al (31)	2012	Europe	Cross sectional	NA Health economic model developed with a Markov model	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bevacizumab treatment group had increased gains in productivity and reductions of societal expenses (€5216, €6739, €3455 and €4046 per patient in France, Germany, Italy and Spain, respectively) as compared with the chemotherapy group (€1774, €2278, €1178 and €1377, respectively).

aOR: adjusted odds ration; CI: confidence interval; HR: hazard ratio; LC: lung cancer; NA: not applicable; OR: odds ratio; RR: relative risk; RTW: return to work