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Abstract

Survival prediction for cancer patients can increase the prognostic accuracy and might ultimately lead to better informed decision making. To this end, many studies apply machine learning to cancer data of the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program. The first part of this report contains a literature review to obtain a systematic overview of these studies. We identify 34 publications and extract information about experimental setups and efforts to ensure reproducibility. The review shows that only one of the identified studies mentions reproducibility and no study contains straightforward reproducible results. This motivates the second part of this work. We demonstrate the feasibility of reproducible cohort selection and survival prediction with SEER cancer data. Experiments are performed for 1- and 5-year survival of breast and lung cancer with cases diagnosed between 2004 and 2009. We compare minimal data preprocessing with 1-n encoding of categorical inputs and apply logistic regression and multilayer perceptron (MLP) models. Encoding with 1-n vectors proves beneficial throughout all experiments. For lung cancer, MLP models show a slightly superior performance. Moreover, importance of input attributes is analyzed with logistic regression weights and ablation analysis for MLPs.

1. Introduction

Cancer is the second leading cause of death in the United States. Most common types are breast and lung cancer with 268,670 and 234,030 expected new cases in 2018 (Siegel et al. (2018)). Applying machine learning for survival prediction, i.e. predicting whether a patient will survive a given period of time after diagnosis, can increase the prognostic accuracy and might ultimately lead to better informed decision making. The Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program of the National Cancer Institute collects cancer incidence and survival information covering over 30% of the population in the U.S. (Howlader et al. (2017)). Due to its broad coverage and comprehensive data collection, SEER data serves as basis for many survival prediction experiments with machine learning.
Reproducibility is a key requirement to obtain comparable results allowing a critical evaluation of new approaches in machine learning. In many disciplines, such as computer vision it is ensured through publicly available datasets and open code. Fully reproducible biomedical research is scarce (Collins and Tabak (2014)). A recent study examining reproducibility of mortality prediction in critical care based on the publicly accessible and well documented MIMIC-III dataset reports several problems in reproducing study cohorts based on textual descriptions. The authors suggest public dissemination of source code along with public datasets for an iterative improvement in the field (Johnson et al. (2017)).

Reproducibility for survival prediction experiments with SEER data can be separated into reproducible cohort selection and reproducible results. During cohort selection an experiment specific subset of all original cases is extracted. For instance, to perform survival prediction cases with benign tumors and certain unknown or missing attributes are commonly excluded. However, in contrast to datasets in most machine learning disciplines this experiment specific selections cannot be published due to privacy restrictions. Hence, cohort selections must be reproducible so that experiments can be conducted on the same data. Reproducible results require same cohorts but also allow to verify the experimental outcomes. For instance, by publishing the source code of the experiments.

Clinical Relevance Machine learning might improve prognostic models. However, survival prediction is a sensitive domain, so technology-based approaches should be reproducible for transparency and to establish trust. The first part of this report contains a literature review to identify efforts to ensure reproducibility in past studies. In the second part, we demonstrate fully reproducible survival prediction experiments with SEER data.

Technical Significance We do not present a new method for survival prediction, instead we use a simple setup with techniques from recent studies and focus on reproducibility. First, we will introduce our cohort selection, data extraction, and feature choice. We consider 1- and 5-year survival for breast and lung cancer based on cases diagnosed between 2004 and 2009. We compare minimal data preprocessing with 1-n encoding. Second, survival prediction is performed with logistic regression and multilayer perceptron (MLP) models. Lastly, we analyze the input attribute importance with logistic regression weights and ablation analysis for MLPs. By providing SEER*Stat session files and source code along with instructions, we ensure both reproducible cohort selection and reproducible results.

2. Literature Review

There are many studies applying machine learning for survival prediction with SEER cancer data. To obtain a systematic overview over existing publications and to assess their reproducibility, we perform a literature review. We extract information of the experimental setups and try to identify efforts to ensure reproducible experiments.

2.1. Study Selection

Figure 3 in the Appendix shows a flow diagram of inclusion and exclusion criteria for the literature review. Search was performed with PubMed and Google Scholar. Different queries are used, since the PubMed query yields more than 3,500 results in Google Scholar exceeding the scope of this review. Using a more specific query for Google Scholar lead
to 719 results that we cleaned from patents and citations \((N = 47)\). Furthermore, titles without association with SEER, machine learning, or an application to survival prediction were excluded \((N = 538)\). In general, uncertain candidates were kept for later and more in-depth analysis. We merged the resulting 134 candidate publications with the eleven results from PubMed and removed duplicates \((N = 5)\) resulting in a total of 140 publications for content review. During this review, we further excluded studies inaccessible through our university access, bachelor/master/dissertation theses, and work with duplicate content or different spelling of the title or authors \((N = 44)\). We screened the remaining 96 studies for clear indications of applying machine learning for survival prediction with SEER data and excluded studies based on abstract \((N = 35)\) and full text review \((N = 27)\) leaving us with 34 studies. In the last step, we also removed studies with ambiguous descriptions of the target variable and experiments that combined the SEER dataset with other data.

### 2.2. Information Extraction

We extracted information about the general experimental setups and try to identify efforts made for reproducibility in the 34 identified studies. To ensure correct data, two individuals performed information extraction separately. In case they extracted different information, the publication was consulted together to reach an agreement.

Information of the experimental setup includes cancer type, time range of SEER data, survival period, applied machine learning models, number of cases and attributes used as input, and the best reported result (see columns of Table 1). A dash indicates missing, a question mark uncertain information. We assigned models into common categories to simplify the notation. Abbreviations of those categories are given in the Appendix. Models that do not fit into a category or custom modifications are marked with an asterisk. Bracketing and plus symbols indicate model combinations. A single result is reported for each publication and cancer type. For this, we prefer the best model and 5-year and 1-year survival periods, because they are most common. The model and survival period for a reported result are indicated by mentioning them first in their respective columns. For instance, the result reported for Dimitoglou et al. (2012) \((\text{ACC}=0.944)\) is for 5-year survival and a decision tree model. Number of attributes refers to the number of original SEER attributes that were used. We report results as Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUC), F1 score (F1), and accuracy (ACC) in this order. Two experiments carry out regression for which we report root mean squared error (RMSE).

To identify efforts made for reproducibility in the selected studies, we used text comprehension gained during the extraction of experimental setups. In addition to that, we searched for the terms code and program to find hints for published code and the terms repro and repeat to find statements about reproducibility. We scanned figures, tables, footnotes, and appendices for hints of reproducible experiments. The last column in Table 1 indicates whether a study published the source code of their experiments.

### 2.3. Experiments

Table 1 summarizes the information extracted from the 34 identified studies. Six of these papers were published in 2017 illustrating the topic’s relevance. Most of the studies \((N = 23)\) are concerned with breast cancer, which is the most common type of cancer in the
Table 1: Experimental setups from 34 studies identified in the literature review. A single result is reported for each publication and cancer type. Survival period and model for reported results are indicated by mentioning them at the first position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Cancer</th>
<th>Time range</th>
<th>Surv. years</th>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Attr.</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afshar et al. (2015)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1999-2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SVM, BN, DT</td>
<td>22,763</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>ACC=0.967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Allak et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1990-1997</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>50,895</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACC=0.693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke et al. (1997)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1977-1982</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>6,787</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>AUC=0.730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delen et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1973-2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DT, MLP, LogR</td>
<td>202,932</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ACC=0.936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dooling et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1973-2012</td>
<td>0.5/0.5/1</td>
<td>RF, MLP</td>
<td>329,949</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>AUC=0.844 X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edeli and Pandya (2012)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1990-1997</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(RF, MLP, LogR, DT, SVM) + BOO, BAG</td>
<td>15,194</td>
<td>20 ?</td>
<td>ACC=0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jahanbazi and Nadimi (2016)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1973-2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DT</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ACC=0.871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan et al. (2017)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1973-2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SSL Co-train*, SVM, SSL*, MLP</td>
<td>162,500</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>AUC=0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1973-2012</td>
<td>5/0.5/1</td>
<td>RF, MLP</td>
<td>329,949</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>AUC=0.844 X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1973-2003</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SSL Co-train*, SVM, SSL*, MLP</td>
<td>162,500</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>AUC=0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shukla et al. (2018)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1973-2012</td>
<td>5/3/7</td>
<td>Clustering + MLP</td>
<td>85,189</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>ACC=0.692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silva et al. (2014)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>2004-2007</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>((SMOTE, DSO*) + PSO*) + CFS* + DT, BN, LR</td>
<td>23,512</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>AUC=0.939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stojadinovic et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>1987-2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DT, MLP</td>
<td>40,600</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>ACC=0.871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrawal et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>1998-2001</td>
<td>5/0.5/0.75/1/2</td>
<td>(DT, BOO, RF, MLP, SVM)</td>
<td>57,254</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>AUC=0.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimitoglou et al. (2012)</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>1988-2003</td>
<td>5/7/10</td>
<td>DT, NB</td>
<td>174,491</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>ACC=0.944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dooling et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>1973-2012</td>
<td>5/0.5/1</td>
<td>MLP, RF</td>
<td>177,089</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>AUC=0.875 X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch et al. (2017a)</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>6 (regression)</td>
<td>(GBM, LinR, RF, DT, SVM)</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>RMSE=15.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch et al. (2017b)</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>6 (regression)</td>
<td>(SOM, HC, MBC, k-means, NNMF, PCA) + LinR</td>
<td>10,442</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>RMSE=15.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delen (2009)</td>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>1988-2001</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SVM, MLP, DT, LogR</td>
<td>&gt;120,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>ACC=0.929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
U.S. One paper analyzes more than one cancer type (Dooling et al. (2016)). Stated start and end years vary between 1969 and 2013. Later start dates are chosen to include only recent data or to make use of attributes introduced at a later stage. The end date is usually determined by the SEER data available at experiment time with an additional offset to include all necessary follow-ups. A survival period of five years is used in many experiments (N = 25), followed by one (N = 8) and ten years (N = 7). There are two experiments which perform regression to predict survival months (Lynch et al. (2017a), Lynch et al. (2017b)). Plenty of different models are applied, sometimes in combination with sampling techniques or methods for input size reduction. Common models are decision trees (DT, N = 24) and multilayer perceptrons (MLP, N = 20), followed by logistic regression (LogR, N = 12) and support vector machines (SVM, N = 10). Cohort selection and, hence, the resulting number of cases varies a lot between experiments. Some studies simply use all cases available, others exclude cases based on empty attributes or specific filter criteria. Data preprocessing includes normalization methods, data imputation for missing values, and semantic mappings of attributes. In some experiments, especially where case numbers are round, cases were excluded to account for a target label imbalance or due to performance reasons. Input attributes used for prediction also differ a lot. Many experiments justify their selection with clinical relevance or a separate data analysis. AUC is given as performance measure in 18 studies. Whenever AUC is not given, F1 is also missing, so we report ACC.

2.4. Reproducibility

We identified several efforts to ensure reproducibility. Nearly all studies provide information about their experimental setups and textual descriptions of cohort selection (see Table 1). Several studies provide an overview of input attributes used for prediction. Some papers include overviews of the selected model parameters, names of SEER input files, or pseudocode for critical parts of their programs such as target label generation. Experiments with decision trees often include textual description of generated decision rules.

Only a single study (Dooling et al. (2016)) explicitly mentions reproducibility and provides Github repositories\(^1\) containing source code for experiments and a web application based on the prediction algorithm. However, both repositories provide no meaningful instructions. Our attempts to understand the provided code failed due to missing explanatory comments and several complex data mappings. Executing the program and reproducing results was impossible due to undocumented external dependencies.

We cannot conclude with absolute certainty that none of the identified studies contains reproducible cohorts or results. To verify this statement, a manual review of every experiment would be necessary, which laid outside the scope of our review. However, we observed that 33 out of 34 studies only come with textual descriptions of their experiments that already proved insufficient to reproduce cohorts (Johnson et al. (2017)) and contain no clear hints for reproducibility. Only a single paper mentions reproducibility and provides source code. However, this approach also proved insufficient due to missing instructions and bad code quality. Hence, we can conclude that none of the identified studies is straightforward reproducible. Straightforward in the sense that a publication contains clear and simple instructions to reproduce it. Moreover, the literature review revealed that no study conducted

---

\(^1\) https://github.com/doolingdavid/{PAPERDATA, colon-cancer-nn-errors}
by different researchers or institutions is based on the same input data. This supports our
assumption that it is difficult to reproduce cohorts of existing experiments. This motivates
the following work introducing fully reproducible cohort selection and reproducible results
for survival prediction with SEER data.

3. Cohort

SEER collects cancer incidence data from population-based cancer registries covering over
30% of the population in the U.S. The data contains detailed information on patient de-

gographics, primary tumor site, tumor morphology, stage at diagnosis, and first course of
treatment. In addition to that, SEER registries follow up with patients for vital status
to provide survival information (Howlader et al. (2017)). SEER releases data submissions
annually, containing new incidences and updated information for existing cases. Our study
is based on the November 2016 submission with data from 1974 to 2014 (SEER (2017)).

3.1. Cohort Selection

Cohort selection for our experiments is performed with SEER*Stat, a dedicated software
for the analysis of SEER data. It allows authorized users to investigate the collected cancer
cases and to produce statistics based on them. In addition to that, it offers (1) the specifica-
tion of a SEER database, (2) predefined exclusion criteria, (3) a custom query builder with
a sophisticated selection mechanism allowing to combine several attribute conditions, and
(4) an export functionality for selected cases. Most importantly, the complete SEER*Stat
configuration can be stored into a session file and re-used by others to fully reproduce the se-
lected cohort. It is possible to publish session files since they include no patient information
but only the necessary selection parameters.

We perform predictions for 1- and 5-year survival of breast and lung cancer, which are the
most common tasks in past experiments. Only cases diagnosed since 2004 are considered,
because at that time many new attributes were included and to use only recent data. We
chose 2009 as end date to ensure a 5-year follow-up period for all incidences. Selecting a
cohort for survival prediction with SEER data is an ambiguous task. There is no consent
about inclusion and exclusion criteria in existing studies. We use a SEER*Stat exercise
session provided by the SEER program\(^2\) as basis of our selection. The exercise description
claims to "represent the standard selections most commonly used for a survival analysis",
which was confirmed by the SEER staff. It includes cases with malignant tumors and known
age and excludes entries with unknown or missing cause of death, deaths only confirmed by
autopsy or death certificate, and cases that are marked as alive with no survival time. It
also excludes cases based on an expected survival table for U.S. citizens. We adjust these
predefined cohort selection only regarding cancer type and year of diagnosis. The resulting
SEER*Stat queries are given in Figure 1. The cohorts consist of 275,167 cases for breast
and 229,011 cases for lung cancer. SEER*Stat session files for our cohort selections are
contained in this paper’s repository\(^3\). We refer to these files for further details regarding
the cohort. By loading them into SEER*Stat, the selection can be reproduced.

\(^2\) https://seer.cancer.gov/seerstat/tutorials/survival
\(^3\) https://github.com/stefanhgm/MLHC2018-reproducible-survival-seer/tree/master/cohort
Reproducible Survival Prediction with SEER Cancer Data

SEER*Stat Survival Exercise 3: Cause-Specific Survival

Adjust selection to breast/lung cancer and diagnosis from 2004 to 2009.

SEER*Stat Case Selection

\{Race, Sex, Year Dx, Registry, County, Year of diagnosis\} = '2004', '2005', '2006', '2007', '2008', '2009' AND
\{Site and Morphology, Site recode ICD-O-3/WHO 2008\} = 'Breast'

275,167 cases

Merged SEER ASCII text data files for breast/lung cancer cases.

1973-2014.seer9/BREAST.TXT
yr1992-2014.sj_la_rg_ak/BREAST.TXT
yr2000-2014.ca_ky../BREAST.TXT
yr2005.lo.2nd_half/BREAST.TXT
1,548,199 cases

1973-2014.seer9/RESPIR.TXT
yr1992-2014.sj_la_rg_ak/RESPIR.TXT
yr2000-2014.ca_ky../RESPIR.TXT
yr2005.lo.2nd_half/RESPIR.TXT
1,256,246 cases

Export unique Patient ID and Record Number to filter same cases from ASCII files.

(275,167; 133) cases and attributes

Remove irrelevant, combined, post-diagnosis, and treatment attributes.

1-N-ENC: Encode categorical attributes and empty/special values of continuous.

Default (275,167; 108) 1-N-ENC (275,167; 1,479)

Create target label indicating cancer survival for 12/60 months (Algorithm 1).

Default 12: (270,107; 107) 60: (248,751; 107)
1-N-ENC 12: (270,107; 1,478) 60: (248,751; 1,478)

Remove inputs with constant values.

Default 12: (270,107; 57) 60: (248,751; 57)
1-N-ENC 12: (270,107; 1,423) 60: (248,751; 1,419)

Default 12: (215,630; 48) 60: (205,554; 48)
1-N-ENC 12: (215,630; 1,315) 60: (205,554; 1,315)

Figure 1: Flow chart for cohort selection, data extraction, and feature choice. The last boxes indicate the final number of cases and features for our experiments with breast and lung cancer, different input representations (Default and 1-N-ENC) and two survival periods (12 and 60 months).
3.2. Data Extraction

It is possible to export cases from SEER*Stat for further analysis. For our experiments, however, we use the SEER ASCII files since they contain numerical encodings of all attributes. The ASCII data for the 2016 submission (SEER (2017)) are available from SEER on request. Merging all incidences for breast and lung cancer results in 1,548,199 and 1,256,246 cases (see Figure 1). We export unique identifiers (patient ID and case number) from SEER*Stat and use them in our software to filter the ASCII data for our cohort. This yields the same cases in the ASCII format consisting of 133 attributes for each case.\(^4\) Irrelevant fields such as patient ID and compound fields that combine several information are removed in our software. Moreover, in consultation with SEER staff we removed treatment information commonly excluded from survival analyses and attributes added after the initial diagnosis leaking future information. This decreased the number of attributes to 108.

3.3. Feature Choices and Target Label Generation

We perform experiments with two different input representations. The first representation treats all inputs as continuous that are normalized with respect to mean and variance. Hence, the number of resulting inputs remains 108 (see Default in Figure 1). However, many SEER attributes encode categorical (e.g. sex) or non-interval values (e.g. stage). Moreover, some attributes contain codes for special or unknown values. For instance, a tumor size in the interval 1 to 988 encodes size in millimeters whereas 999 indicates unknown and 991 less than 1 cm. In addition to that, a custom value of -1 was introduced to represent missing data. Treating this variable as continuous can prove insufficient. This motivates an alternative input representation where we divide attributes into categorical and continuous. Categorical attributes are encoded as 1-n vectors where each entry in the vector represents a value of the original attribute. For continuous attributes, values are mean and variance normalized as for the first representation except for values representing an unknown or special code. In this case, the value is set to zero and an additional 1-n vector for special codes is used instead. Figure 2 illustrates both input representations without mean and variance normalization. Three rows represent three exemplary cases with attributes size (continuous) and stage (categorical). The values 999 for size represent unknown and -1 for stage missing. Model a) uses the first representation with attributes as single inputs. Model b) and c) use the second input representation. Size is used as single input except for the special code 999 which is 1-n encoded. Stage, a categorical variable, is completely encoded as 1-n vector. The 1-n encoding for the second input representation increases the inputs to 1,479 and 1,378 (see 1-N ENC in Figure 1).

We create a target label indicating whether a person died within one or five years due to cancer or survived for this period of time. Algorithm 1 contains the according pseudocode. For each case, the target label Survived cancer for n months is set to zero if Survival months is less than 12 or 60 and SEER cause of death classification is equals to one indicating that a person died of their cancer.\(^5\) If a person survived at least 12 or 60 months Survived cancer for n months is set to one. Remaining cases are removed. These are either right-censored or died within 12 or 60 months but due to another cause. For 60-months more cases are removed.

\(^4\) https://seer.cancer.gov/manuals/read.seer.research.nov2016.sas

Algorithm 1 Create binary target label indicating survival of cancer for $n$ months.

**Input:** Dataset $data$ and number of survival months $n$

**Output:** Dataset $data$ with new binary column $Survived cancer for n months$

Create new attribute column $Survived cancer for n months$

```
foreach case $c \in data$ do
    if $Survival months < n$ and SEER cause of death classification $= 1$ then
        set column $Survived cancer for n months$ to 0 (died within $n$ months of cancer)
    else if $Survival months \geq n$ then
        set column $Survived cancer for n months$ to 1 (survived $n$ months)
    else
        remove case from $data$ (died within $n$ months of other cause or right-censored)
    end
end

return $data$
```

affected and removed. We exclude them from the experiments since our modeling approach cannot handle them. To generate the target label two attributes are merged into $Survived cancer for n months$ decrementing the number of attributes by one (see Figure 1).

In a last step, constant attributes useless for discrimination are removed resulting in the final case and attribute counts given in Figure 1. Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 in the Appendix summarize the resulting SEER attributes for 1- and 5-year breast and lung cancer survival predictions. They contain 57 and 48 inputs resulting from data preprocessing without 1-n encoding. Attribute names correspond to the ASCII documentation file. A minimum value of -1 indicates empty values, which are only present for three attributes. The column empty shows the exact number of empty values that are of significant size for Insurance Recode (2007+) and Recode ICD-O-2 to 10. These two attributes are either collected since 2007 or contain only empty and unknown values. A maximum value consisting only of nines, usually a special value for unknown, appears for many attributes. Attributes with the highest number of different values are State-county recode, FIPS code for state and county, CS Tumor size, tumor size in millimeters, and Histologic Type ICD-0-3, histologic coding of tumors. The last row contains information about the binary target label.

4. Methods

We perform survival prediction with logistic regression and MLP models. They are the second and third most common models used in past studies (see Section 2.3). Logistic regression serves as a simple model to provide a baseline for prediction results. MLPs are applied frequently in machine learning since the rising popularity of artificial neural networks and have been successfully applied to complex tasks. In particular, we want to investigate whether MLPs prove beneficial for many input attributes and whether they can deal with sparse inputs resulting from 1-n encoding. MLP models for the first and second input representations are illustrated as models a) and b) in Figure 2. In addition to that, we use a slightly modified MLP with the second input representation that performs an embedding of 1-n encoded attributes in its first hidden layer (MLPEmb). This approach is inspired from word representations in natural language processing (Mikolov et al. (2013)).
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The underlying intention is to learn a representation of each input attribute in the first layer before combining them into a fully connected layer (see model c) in Figure 2).

The data resulting from cohort selection and data preprocessing is randomly split up into training, validation, and testing sets with the ratios 80%, 10%, and 10%. Evaluation is performed with Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (AUC) and F1 score (F1). We choose the best model based on the maximum sum of AUC and F1. We report accuracy (ACC) only for comparison with past studies. Hyperparameters are tuned on the validation set. A single run for each model and optimal parameter configuration is performed on the test set, which is the final score we are reporting.

For logistic regression, regularization parameter \( C \) is tuned with \( 1 \cdot 10^x \) for \( x \) in \(-2, -1, ..., 10\). For MLP models, the number of hidden layers (1, 2, 3, 4), nodes per hidden layer (20, 50, 100, 200), dropout (0.0, 0.1, ..., 0.5), and training epochs (20, 50, 100) are tuned. MLPEmb has an additional hyperparameter, the number of nodes used for attribute embedding in the first hidden layer (a single one for model c) in Figure 2). This value is tuned with (3, 5, 10). As a result, there are 13, 288, and 864 parameter configurations for the logistic regression, MLP, and MLPEmb models. Tuning is performed on the HPC cluster of the University of Münster.

In addition to the survival prediction performance, we analyze the input importance of SEER attributes for the best performing logistic regression, MLP, and MLPEmb models.

For logistic regression absolute values of the inputs weights are used. In case of 1-n-encoding, absolute weights for all inputs belonging to a specific attribute are summed. For MLP and MLPEmb ablation analysis is performed. For this, all inputs of a SEER attribute are set to zero and the absolute difference of the output serves as importance measurement.

Figure 2: Illustration of MLP models used for experiments. Inputs for b) and c) are 1-n encoded (1-N ENC) and c) contains an embedding in the first layer (MLPEmb).
Table 2: Survival prediction performance for breast cancer using a dummy classifier (BASE RATE), logistic regression (LOG REG), and MLP models (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1-year survival</th>
<th></th>
<th>5-year survival</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE RATE</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9849</td>
<td>0.9703</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOG REG</td>
<td>0.9381</td>
<td>0.9869</td>
<td>0.9744</td>
<td>0.8808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOG REG + 1-N ENC</td>
<td><strong>0.9440</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9873</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.9752</strong></td>
<td>0.9023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.9384</td>
<td>0.9871</td>
<td>0.9748</td>
<td>0.9002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP + 1-N ENC</td>
<td>0.9393</td>
<td>0.9872</td>
<td>0.9749</td>
<td>0.9039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPEmb + 1-N ENC</td>
<td>0.9397</td>
<td>0.9872</td>
<td>0.9749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Survival prediction performance for lung cancer using a dummy classifier (BASE RATE), logistic regression (LOG REG), and MLP models (see Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1-year survival</th>
<th></th>
<th>5-year survival</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASE RATE</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5609</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOG REG</td>
<td>0.8209</td>
<td>0.6942</td>
<td>0.7552</td>
<td>0.8932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOG REG + 1-N ENC</td>
<td>0.8419</td>
<td>0.7162</td>
<td>0.7696</td>
<td><strong>0.9100</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>0.8347</td>
<td>0.7207</td>
<td>0.7639</td>
<td>0.9026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP + 1-N ENC</td>
<td>0.8446</td>
<td>0.7265</td>
<td>0.7681</td>
<td>0.9076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLPEmb + 1-N ENC</td>
<td><strong>0.8476</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7351</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7736</strong></td>
<td>0.9078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results

SEER*Stat session files and the code to reproduce our experiments along with an example are contained in a public Github repository. Experimental results for 1- and 5-year survival prediction are contained in Table 2 for breast and Table 3 for lung cancer. Base rates of a dummy classifier predicting the most frequent label are given for comparison.

For breast cancer, the prior probability for surviving is already high as indicated by the base rates for F1 and ACC. Applying logistic regression or MLPs can only slightly improve these values in case of 1-year survival. Improvements are larger for 5-year survival. With regard to the optimization criteria AUC and F1, logistic regression with 1-n encoding almost always gives the best performance. Only AUC for 5-year survival is higher with the MLPEmb model. However, it is worth mentioning that prediction results for logistic regression with 1-n encoding and MLP models only show marginal differences making it difficult to determine a clearly superior approach. Input representation with 1-n encoding always improves AUC and F1 values. Best performing MLP models for breast cancer experiments contain only one or two hidden layers with 20 to 100 nodes per layer.

In case of lung cancer, base rates are lower and model differences are larger. The base rate for F1 is zero since the negative label prevails. The MLPEmb model yields the best performance regarding AUC and F1. Only exception is the AUC value for 5-year survival, which is higher for logistic regression with 1-n encoding. The MLP with 1-n encoding outperforms logistic regression on the same scores as the MLPEmb model, only by a smaller margin. This suggests that embedding 1-n encoded attributes in MLPEmb is advantageous. Top F1 scores are much lower compared to lung cancer. Additional experiments on a local machine show a low recall of 0.6936 and 0.6495 for 1- and 5-year survival with MLPEmb. Just as for breast cancer, using 1-n encoding always gives an improved performance. However, best MLP models for lung cancer experiments are larger with two to four hidden layers and up to 200 nodes per layer. This suggests that lung cancer data contains more complex relationships useful for survival prediction.

Figures 4, 5, 6, and 7 in the Appendix illustrate the relative attribute importance for 1- and 5-year breast and lung cancer survival prediction. The diagrams are limited to the top ten attributes according to their summed importance across all models. For both cancer types State-county recode receives a very high importance for logistic regression with 1-n encoding (note the y-axis break). One possible explanation might be that State-county recode contains the highest number of different values leading to many logistic regression weights responsible for the 1-n encoded attribute. In addition to that, AJCC codes, staging, and breast cancer specific attributes are most important for breast cancer survival prediction. For lung cancer, the most important attributes include information about the tumor extension, histology, staging, and metastases. Moreover, attribute importance for 1- and 5-year predictions are very similar sharing eight and nine attributes out of the top ten for breast and lung cancer.

6. Discussion

A literature review for survival prediction with SEER cancer data was performed and we identified 34 relevant studies. Six of them were published in 2017. These publications aim to increase prognostic accuracy with methods from machine learning. Application of machine learning is justified with the success in other disciplines and the objective to incorporate more information and more complex relationships than common statistical approaches. However, only one out of 34 studies mentions reproducibility and publishes source code. Due to missing explanations and bad code quality, this approach also proved insufficient. Hence, we conclude that none of the identified studies is straightforward reproducible.

Moreover, there are no studies from different researchers based on the same cohort. Efforts to compare experimental outcomes exist. For instance, Al-Bahrani et al. (2017) refers to Stojadinovic et al. (2013) and Wang et al. (2012) try to compare results with the much-cited work of Delen et al. (2005). However, since predictions are not based on the same input data, comparability of those studies is limited. In our experiments, we have experienced that slight changes of the study cohort can lead to significant changes of the results. The current situation prevents transparent benchmarking and reliable statements about machine learning approaches for survival prediction with SEER data. Instead of performing experiments with different cohorts, data preprocessing methods, and machine learning models, future research should instead put a greater emphasize on reproducibility.
In addition to that, we reckon that existing studies present their results too positively. Only few publications report target prior probabilities or base rates of prediction scores. This results in misleading impressions of prediction performances. For instance, our results for 1-year breast cancer survival seem very accurate, but the improvements over base rates are only marginal. Results in the reviewed experiments are often described as good or usable and some studies demand a clinical application. From our point of view, these assessments are wrong in many cases. Overly optimistic reports might raise unrealistic expectations leading to a loss of confidence into the field of machine learning in health care.

Our experiments show that 1- and 5-year survival prediction for breast cancer with logistic regression and MLP models only yield small improvements over base rates. The situation is different for lung cancer. MLP models slightly outperform logistic regression and base rates. However, top F1 scores are still relatively low. We think these results do not suggest the application in a clinical use-case and several obstacles concerning integration, usability, and interpretability must be overcome to realize a clinical decision support system based on SEER data. We consider our experiments as proof-of-concept that (1) demonstrates the feasibility of reproducible survival prediction by providing SEER*Stat session files and open code and (2) gives a baseline for survival prediction performances of modern machine learning methods.

This work has limitations. We tried to identify reproducibility efforts in the reviewed studies solely based on hints in the text, figures, tables, footnotes, and appendices. Some publication might not contain such indications but still allow reproduction of cohorts and results. To identify these studies, a manual review of every experiment would be necessary. Second, our cohort selection is based on a common survival analysis selection provided by SEER, which we consider suitable for survival prediction. However, there might be reasons to choose another cohort, for instance to remove cases with missing attributes. Moreover, we excluded cases from the original cohort that died within one or five years due to other reasons than cancer, since no target label could be assigned to them. This could bias the experimental outcomes. Third, we excluded irrelevant and combined attributes and in consultation with SEER staff also attributes that could leak prognosis information. Relevant attributes might have been excluded or leaking attributes overseen in this attribute selection process. Fourth, we performed survival prediction only with logistic regression and MLP models and two simple input representations. Our methods did not account for the class imbalance occurring in the experimental data. We are aware that this imbalance results in high performance metrics. However, by providing base rates of a dummy classifier and prior probabilities of our target label, we aim to set these values into perspective. This paper does not focus on the methods for survival prediction but the reproducibility of experiments with approaches of recent studies. Moreover, more extensive parameter tuning was performed for MLPs, which might be the reason for their superior performance. Lastly, attribute importance based on logistic regression weights and ablation analysis can only give hints of attribute importance and should not be confused with full model interpretability.

Our work opens up possibilities for future work. First of all, we hope that future research builds upon our results and some of the existing methods for survival prediction will be evaluated on our cohort. Even if another cohort is used, reproducible analysis of SEER data is feasible and therefore should be standard practice. Future work can consider incorporation of censored data that we removed for our experiments. Dooling et al. (2016)
tackle this problem by predicting a survival function that uses survival months as additional input variable; Alaa and van der Schaar (2017) by using a competing risk model with a designated event for censoring. Moreover, SEER data might be used in combination with other data sources such as the SEER-Medicare Linked Database. Another possibility would be a combination with clinical data elements that proved superior to SEER data alone for predicting short-term mortality (Elfiky et al. (2017)). Future work could investigate whether SEER data can actually lead to a clinical outcome. To this end, clinical decision support systems utilizing SEER data should be compared with established methods for assessing survival of cancer patients.

7. Conclusion

We identified 34 studies that apply machine learning for survival prediction with SEER cancer data in a literature review. We extracted information of their experimental setups and scanned them for efforts to ensure reproducibility. This review showed that past experiments were performed with many different setups but contain no straightforward reproducible cohorts and results. Moreover, there are no studies from different institutions that are based on the exact same input data preventing transparent benchmarking. We show that reproducible analysis with SEER data is feasible and present fully reproducible survival prediction experiments for breast and lung cancer with logistic regression and MLPs. We encourage future studies to build upon our results and follow an open data approach to foster reproducible research.
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Appendix A. - Study Flow Diagram

Figure 3: Inclusion and exclusion criteria for literature review to identify studies applying machine learning for survival prediction with SEER cancer data.
Appendix B. - Model Categories for Literature Review

1-NN - 1-nearest neighbor
ANFIS - Adaptive neuro fuzzy inference system
BAG - Bagging
BN - Bayesian (belief) network
BOO - Boosting
CFS - Correlation-based feature selection
Co-train - Co-training
DSO - Density-based synthetic oversampling
DT - Decision tree (including variants)
EV - (Ensemble) voting
GBM - Gradient boosting machine
HC - Hierarchical clustering
InfoGain - Information gain
k-means - k-means clustering
k-NN - k-nearest neighbor
MBC - Model-based clustering
MLP - Multilayer perceptron
NB - Naives Bayes
NNMF - Non-negative matrix factorization
LinR - Linear regression
LogR - Logistic regression
PCA - Principal component analysis
PSO - Particle swarm optimization
RF - Random forest
SMOTE - Synthetic minority oversampling technique
SSL - Semi-supervised learning
SOM - Self-ordering maps
ST - Stacking
SVM - Support vector machine
# Appendix C. - Input Attributes Overview

## Table 4: Input attributes for breast cancer 1-year survival prediction (270,107 cases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Empty</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at diagnosis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>60.07</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age recode &lt;1 year olds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Tumor size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>96.84</td>
<td>258.39</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - number of lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - positive lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>32.68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1945.98</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of diagnosis</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2006.56</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th M (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th N (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th Stage (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th T (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA site recode/WHO 2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36.19</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Code ICD-O-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Histology recode</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Extension</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>153.04</td>
<td>179.35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Lymph Nodes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>153.29</td>
<td>255.75</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Mets at DX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>256.29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>94.06</td>
<td>270.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>372.2</td>
<td>478.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>371.99</td>
<td>478.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>64.66</td>
<td>290.21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Current</td>
<td>20510</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>20514.53</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Original</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>10455.66</td>
<td>1307.25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC Stage Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER Status Recode Breast Cancer (1990+)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-2</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9580</td>
<td>8483.67</td>
<td>98.94</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-3</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9580</td>
<td>8486.61</td>
<td>94.57</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC Stage Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.42</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived JDIC T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCC site rec extended ICD-O-3/ WHO 2008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>104.75</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCC site recode ICD-O-3/WHO 2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>118.68</td>
<td>48.29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHS link</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Recode (2007+)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>130628</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status at diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month of diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHIA Derived Hist Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin Recode NHIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Status Recode Breast Cancer (1990+)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race recode Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode ICD-O-2 to 10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>57.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>270098</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode ICD-O-2 to 9</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>1738.41</td>
<td>116.37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER historic stage A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER registry</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1532.56</td>
<td>13.45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-county recode</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>53073</td>
<td>17874.25</td>
<td>14081.77</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of reporting source</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survived cancer for 12 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: Input attributes for breast cancer 5-year survival prediction (248,751 cases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Empty Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at diagnosis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59.35</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age recode &lt; 1 year olds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Tumor size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>96.49</td>
<td>257.97</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - number of lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>16.92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - positive lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1946.68</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of diagnosis</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2006.53</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th M (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th N (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th Stage (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>23.82</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted AJCC 6th T (1988+)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>29.39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA site recode/WHO 2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36.19</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Code ICD-O-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Histology recode</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Extension</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>152.45</td>
<td>178.48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Lymph Nodes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>153.29</td>
<td>254.51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Mets at DX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>18.27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>82.56</td>
<td>253.86</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>92.82</td>
<td>268.17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>33.74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>374.43</td>
<td>478.82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>374.22</td>
<td>478.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>209.07</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Current</td>
<td>20510</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>20514.42</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Original</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>10445.79</td>
<td>1276.85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC Stage Group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>30.28</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER Status Recode Breast Cancer (1990+)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-2</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9580</td>
<td>8483.79</td>
<td>98.71</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-3</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9580</td>
<td>8486.66</td>
<td>94.45</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic SS 2000 Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCC site rec extended ICD-O-3/ WHO 2008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>104.72</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCC site recode ICD-O-3/WHO 2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>118.65</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS link</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Recode (2007+)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status at diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month of diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHIA Derived Hist Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin Recode NHIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Status Recode Breast Cancer (1990+)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race recode A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race recode Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode ICD-O-2 to 9</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER historic stage A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER registry</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1532.49</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-county recode</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>53073</td>
<td>17840.35</td>
<td>14106.57</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of reporting source</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survived cancer for 60 months         | 0       | 1       | 0.87   | 0.33  | 2      | target
Table 6: Input attributes for lung cancer 1-year survival prediction (215,630 cases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Empty</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at diagnosis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68.24</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age recode &lt;1 year olds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.23</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Tumor size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>327.69</td>
<td>437.19</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - number of lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - positive lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>76.83</td>
<td>40.09</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1937.75</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of diagnosis</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2006.5</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA site recode/WHO 2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Code ICD-O-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Extension</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>518.96</td>
<td>313.5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Lymph Nodes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>276.64</td>
<td>331.83</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Mets at DX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.62</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>964.6</td>
<td>154.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Current</td>
<td>20510</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>20512.62</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Original</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>10551.98</td>
<td>1619.7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC Stage Group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>58.43</td>
<td>24.34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First malignant primary indicator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-2</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9581</td>
<td>8090.01</td>
<td>103.02</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-3</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9581</td>
<td>8096.95</td>
<td>100.61</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic SSG 2000 Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCC site rec extended ICD-O-3/ WHO 2008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>100.73</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCC site recode ICD-O-3/WHO 2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>116.31</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHS link</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Recode (2007+)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>107475</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status at diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month of diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHIA Derived Hsp Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin Recode NHIA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary by International Rules</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race recode A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race recode Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode ICD-O-2 to 10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>77.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215617</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode ICD-O-2 to 9</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>1625.12</td>
<td>67.67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER historic stage A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER registry</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1533.49</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-county recode</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>53073</td>
<td>18313.01</td>
<td>13210.1</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of reporting source</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survived cancer for 12 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Input attributes for lung cancer 5-year survival prediction (205,554 cases).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Empty</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at diagnosis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>68.11</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age recode &lt;1 year olds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Tumor size</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>354.17</td>
<td>499.59</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - number of lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>28.98</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD 10 - positive lymph nodes examined</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>77.57</td>
<td>39.56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1937.87</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of diagnosis</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2006.5</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA site recode/WHO 2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36.15</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Code ICD-O-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Histology recode</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Extension</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>526.12</td>
<td>312.05</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Lymph Nodes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>282.23</td>
<td>332.69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Mets at DX</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>26.28</td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Site-Specific Factor 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>965.08</td>
<td>152.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Current</td>
<td>20510</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>20512.61</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS Version Input Original</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>20550</td>
<td>16549.43</td>
<td>1613.83</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC M</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>27.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25.42</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC Stage Group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59.21</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived AJCC T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>40.35</td>
<td>29.02</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS1977</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived SS2000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First malignant primary indicator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-2</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9581</td>
<td>8089.43</td>
<td>102.64</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Histologic Type ICD-O-3</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td>9581</td>
<td>8096.4</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic SSG 2000 Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC site rec extended ICD-O-3/ WHO 2008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>100.73</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC site recode ICD-O-3/WHO 2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>116.31</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHS link</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Recode (2007+)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102909</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laterality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status at diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month of diagnosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHLA Derived Hisp Origin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin Recode NHLA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary by International Rules</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race recode A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race recode Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode ICD-O-2 to 10</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>79.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>205541</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recode ICD-O-2 to 9</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9999</td>
<td>1625.17</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER historic stage A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEER registry</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1533.48</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-county recode</td>
<td>2900</td>
<td>53073</td>
<td>18293.32</td>
<td>13211.73</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of reporting source</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>categorical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survived cancer for 60 months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D. - Attribute Importance

Figure 4: Relative attribute importance for 1-year survival prediction of breast cancer.

Figure 5: Relative attribute importance for 5-year survival prediction of breast cancer.
Figure 6: Relative attribute importance for 1-year survival prediction of lung cancer.

Figure 7: Relative attribute importance for 5-year survival prediction of lung cancer.
Appendix E. - Github Readme File

MLHC 2018 - Reproducible Survival Prediction with SEER Cancer Data
(https://github.com/stefanhgm/MLHC2018-reproducible-survival-seer)

This repository contains the code that was used for experiments reported in *Reproducible Survival Prediction with SEER Cancer Data* submitted to the Machine Learning for Healthcare 2018 conference.

Repository overview:

- **/bin/cluster**: Slurm submission scripts for all parameter tuning experiments on the HPC cluster.
- **/cohort**: SEER*Stat session files to reproduce cohort selections.
- **/example**: Randomly generated SEER example to test the software without sensitive data.
- **/example/CASES.csv**: Example case export. To reproduce experiments, this should be generated for each cohort by loading the provided session files into SEER*Stat, executing the case listing, and exporting it via Matrix→Export→Results as Text File... with "CSV Defaults".
- **/example/INCIDENCES.txt**: Example SEER incidences. To reproduce experiments, this should contain all incidences provided by SEER 1973-2014 data (November 2016 submission) in ASCII format (e.g. by merging them into a single file). The according ASCII data files are available from SEER on request.
- **/lib**: Python classes and functions used for the experiments.
- **main.py**: Main routine to perform the experiments.
- **requirements.txt**: Python dependencies (can be installed with pip, e.g. in a virtual environment).

To execute main.py and reproduce our experiments Python3 (we used version 3.5.2) is necessary and all dependencies in requirements.txt must be satisfied. The easiest way would be to setup an according virtual environment and to install requirements with pip (https://docs.python.org/3/tutorial/venv.html).

The option -h gives an overview of all command line arguments. Note that this code provides some additional functionality such as SVM models and survival regression that were not used for the paper’s experiments.

```bash
$ python main.py -h
```

An experiment with the randomly generated examples and an MLP model can be performed as shown below. This will produce a folder in the current directory containing results and a plot for the AUC score.

```bash
$ python main.py --incidences example/INCIDENCES.txt --specifications example/read.seer.research.nov2016.sas --cases example/CASES.csv --task survival60 --oneHotEncoding --model MLP --mlpLayers 2 --mlpWidth 20 --mlpEpochs 1 --mlpDropout 0.1 --importance --plotData --plotResults

[...]
```

Raw data: (10000; 133) cases and attributes
Filtered SEER*Stat cases from ASCII: (5000; 133) cases and attributes
Remove irrelevant, combined, post-diagnosis, and treatment attributes: (5000; 960) cases and attributes
Create target label indicating cancer survival for survival60: (2831; 959) cases and attributes
Remove inputs with constant values: (2831; 925) cases and attributes

Data: (2831, 925) -> x:(2831, 924), y:(2831,)
Train: x:(2264, 924), y:(2264,)
Valid: x:(283, 924), y:(283,)
Test: x:(284, 924), y:(284,)

Train on 2264 samples, validate on 283 samples
Epoch 1/1
- 1s - loss: 0.4241 - acc: 0.8913 - val_loss: 0.2623 - val_acc: 0.9293
Validation results: auc = 0.48878326996197724, f1 = 0.963369963699635, acc = 0.9293286219081273