

**QUANTIFYING THE RISK OF NON-HODGKIN LYMPHOMA FROM SYMPTOMS IN SYMPTOMATIC
PRIMARY CARE PATIENTS: A LARGE CASE-CONTROL STUDY USING ELECTRONIC RECORDS.**

Elizabeth A Shephard, PhD, CPsychol, Research Fellow¹

Richard D Neal, PhD FRCGP, Professor of Primary Care Medicine ²

Peter W Rose, MD FRCGP, Senior Clinical Researcher³

Fiona M Walter, MD, FRCGP, GP & Clinician Scientist⁴

William T Hamilton, MD, FRCP, FRCGP, Professor of Primary Care Diagnostics¹

¹ University of Exeter Medical School

College House

St Luke's Campus

Magdalen Road

Exeter

EX1 2LU

²North Wales Centre for Primary Care Research

Bangor University

Gwenfro Unit 5

Wrexham Technology Park

Wrexham

LL13 7YP

³Department of Primary Care Health Sciences

University of Oxford

New Radcliffe House

2nd Floor

Radcliffe Observatory Quarter

Woodstock Road

Oxford

OX2 6GG

⁴Department of Public Health & Primary Care

University of Cambridge

Strangeways Research Laboratory

Cambridge

CB1 8SR

Correspondence to Dr Shephard

Email: E.A.Shephard@exeter.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Background: Non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL) is the sixth commonest cancer in the UK; approximately thirty-five people are diagnosed and thirteen die from the disease daily.

Aim: To identify the primary care clinical features of NHL and quantify their risk in symptomatic patients.

Design and setting: Matched case-control study using Clinical Practice Research Datalink patient records.

Methods: Putative clinical features of NHL were identified in the year before diagnosis. Results were analysed using conditional logistic regression and positive predictive values (PPVs).

Results: 4,362 patients aged ≥ 40 years, diagnosed with NHL between 2000 and 2009, and 19,468 age, sex and general practice-matched controls were studied. Twenty features were independently associated with NHL. The five highest risk symptoms were: lymphadenopathy, odds ratio 263 (95% confidence interval 133,519), head and neck mass not described as lymphadenopathy 49 (32,74), other mass 12 (10,16), weight loss 3.2 (2.3,4.4), and abdominal pain 2.5 (2.1,2.9). Lymphadenopathy *per se* has a positive predictive value (PPV) of 13% for NHL in patients over 60 years. Weight loss in conjunction with repeated back pain or raised gamma globulin had PPVs over 2%.

Conclusions: Unexplained lymphadenopathy in patients over 60 produces a very high risk of NHL in primary care. These patients warrant urgent investigation, potentially sooner than 6 weeks post initial presentation – where the GP is particularly concerned.

Keywords: Non-Hodgkin lymphoma; Primary Health Care; diagnosis

HOW THIS FITS IN

What is already known on this subject?

- The number of avoidable deaths in the UK from NHL has risen. A third of NHL patients visit their GP three or more times before being referred to a specialist.
- Lymphadenopathy is a known feature of NHL and a primary indicator for referral in the NICE guidance for haematological cancer. A comprehensive investigation of primary care features has never been studied.

What this study adds

- Patients over the age of sixty with lymphadenopathy have a 13% risk of having NHL. When the findings of this study are added to those of HL, the PPVs for lymphadenopathy and head and neck mass rise to 18.6% and 4.6% respectively. Any mass symptoms in combination with illness symptoms such as weight loss or abdominal pain elicit an elevated risk of having NHL.
- The findings should aid doctors' clinical decision making in selecting relevant patients for referral and further investigation, thereby reducing diagnostic delay.

INTRODUCTION

Lymphoma is lymphocyte cancer, with two main types: non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL; approximately 90% of lymphomas) and Hodgkin lymphoma (around 10%). NHL has over sixty sub-types.(1) It is the sixth most common UK cancer, (2) with approximately 12,800 new cases, and 4,600 deaths annually.(2) The only way to diagnose NHL is by biopsy. It has a male: female ratio of 12:10, and is more common with increasing age: over 70% of UK cases occur in those aged 60 and over.(3) Five-year UK survival across all subtypes is 61% for males and 66% for females; follicular lymphoma has the highest at 87% and mantle cell lymphoma the lowest at 27%.(1)

Despite recent improvements, the UK still lags behind Europe for NHL survival; between 1995 and 1999 there were an estimated 632 'avoidable' NHL deaths (meaning if relative survival matched the best in Europe).(4, 5) Patient delay in presentation to medical care and diagnostic or treatment delays are possible causes.(6-9) Mean diagnostic delay is estimated as 103 days:(9) greater delays are found in younger patients.(10) Currently, over 30% of NHL patients visit general practitioner(GP) three or more times before referral.(11) Government initiatives have focused on improving cancer survival through publishing referral guidance for GPs and reducing waiting times for specialist treatment.(12) Current UK guidelines make recommendations for haematological cancer as a whole. For unexplained lymphadenopathy or fatigue, a full blood count, blood film, and inflammatory markers is recommended. Specialist referral is recommended for patients with persistent lymphadenopathy of over 6 weeks, lymph nodes over 2cm, increasing in size or widespread, or with accompanying weight loss, splenomegaly or night sweats.(12) Four general symptoms, intermittent fever, weight loss, pruritus, and night sweats – sometimes called B symptoms – are also associated with lymphomas, typically at a later stage. (13)

Diagnosing NHL currently relies on symptomatic presentation to a health professional, usually a GP, though the main features of NHL in primary care have not been reported. One primary care case-

control study investigated a period of 15 years before a diagnosis of lymphoma, finding increased consultations over the whole period. (14) Within the secondary care literature, lymphadenopathy is the main reported feature of NHL.(6, 15, 16) Abdominal pain, fatigue, stomach/bowel problems, infection, back pain and pain on drinking alcohol have also been reported.(6, 17)

This study aimed to identify and quantify the clinical features of NHL in primary care, to guide GPs when to consider referral for investigation, and to inform health policy regarding referral and investigation pathways.

METHODS

This was a matched case-control study using electronic UK primary care patient records from the Clinical Practice Research Datalink (CPRD). The methods follow that of our previous papers.(18-20)

This large computerised database contains anonymised patient data from over 680 general practices, covering 8.8% of the UK population. Patient registration data and primary care clinical events are recorded. CPRD have stringent quality standards for data entry.

Cases and controls

Cases in the CPRD with NHL were collated using a list of 106 NHL codes (available from authors). They were aged ≥ 40 years (thus capturing almost 95% of adult NHLs(2)) and diagnosed with NHL between January 2000 and December 2009. Up to five age, sex and practice controls were matched to each case. The first NHL code was taken as the date of diagnosis. The index date for controls matched their case's diagnosis date. Exclusion criteria were: cases with Hodgkin lymphoma, mycosis fungoides or Sézary syndrome and their matched controls; any case or control with less than one year of records before the index date; cases without controls; controls with NHL; and controls who had not sought medical care after registration.

Selection of putative clinical variables

Potential clinical features of NHL (abnormal investigation results, signs and symptoms) reported in existing literature and from online patient support groups were used. This allowed for known and new symptoms to be studied. PubMed, EBSCO and Google were used with the search terms 'non-Hodgkin lymphoma symptoms', 'non-Hodgkin lymphoma reported to GP', and 'early signs/indications/symptoms of non-Hodgkin lymphoma'.

The CPRD contains over 100,000 medical codes, several of which can pertain to one feature.

Accordingly, a symptom library of codes was compiled for each feature. Occurrences were identified in the year before the index date. Only those features present in $\geq 2\%$ of cases were retained. The

possibility of recording bias was tested on a condition thought to have no association with NHL – varicose veins. Abnormal investigation results were defined as the patient having a test value falling outside their local laboratory's normal range. Patients with a normal laboratory result were grouped with those who had not been tested.

Composite variables

Some investigations were grouped together. The raised inflammatory markers variable was a composite of any of: abnormal erythrocyte sedimentation rate, plasma viscosity, or C-reactive protein. Similarly, abnormal liver function investigations reflected a raised value of any of the hepatic enzymes reported by each laboratory. Low full blood count was also any of: low haemoglobin, low white cell count or thrombocytopaenia. Three categories of masses were compiled. First was masses in the head or neck called 'head and neck mass', (this variable incorporated cervical lymphadenopathy); second, those called 'lymphadenopathy', incorporating generalised lymphadenopathy and lymphadenopathy with no site mentioned; with the final category being mass elsewhere in the body, called 'mass'. There was some overlap between these three categories (described in results). No reliable information could be extracted relating to the size of masses, or their specific sites when multiple. To estimate the duration of masses indirectly (direct measurement was impossible, as duration is poorly recorded) we identified the first and last report of any of the three mass variables in the year before diagnosis, and separately report on masses which have an apparent duration at least of 42 days, this being the duration of lymphadenopathy recommended for investigation in current NICE guidance.(12)

Analysis and statistical methods

The main analysis was conditional logistic regression. Firstly, univariable analysis was performed with retention of variables for later stages using a p-value threshold of ≤ 0.1 . These features were then grouped into small clinically coherent groups (such as malaise, fatigue and nausea) for

multivariable analyses, with retention requiring a p-value ≤ 0.05 . A final multivariable model used the surviving variables from the group stages, using a p-value threshold of 0.01. Excluded variables were checked against the final model. Clinically plausible interaction terms were added to the final model and retained if their p-value was also ≤ 0.01 .

Risk estimates in the form of positive predictive values (PPVs) were calculated using Bayes' theorem (prior odds x likelihood ratio = posterior odds). Prior odds were calculated from the age-specific national incidence of NHL for 2008, expressed as odds. PPVs were estimated for consulting patients only: thus, the posterior odds were divided by 0.906 as 2,018 (10%) of 21,486 eligible controls were non-consulters (see Figure 1). No sub-analyses by histological subtype were performed. This was a *pre hoc* decision, as we wished to identify features of any NHL, as opposed to for specific subtypes. In any case, many of the NHL codes did not specify the precise subtype.

Power calculation

The CPRD provided estimates of 5,000 cases and 22,500 controls; as this number was effectively fixed, we performed power calculations instead of sample size calculations. This number provided >99% power (5% two-sided alpha) to detect a difference in a rare variable from 2% of cases to 1% of controls. For a commoner variable, the study had >86% power to detect a change in prevalence of 20% in cases to 18% in controls. Data analysis was conducted using Stata software, version 13.1.(21)

RESULTS

The CPRD provided 28,502 patients (4,799 cases; 23,703 controls). Application of the exclusion criteria (Figure 1) led to a final number of 23,830 (4,362 cases; 19,468 controls).

Figure 1 here

Patient demographic and consultation information is given in Table 1. Cases consulted significantly more frequently than controls in the year before diagnosis ($p < 0.001$; ranksum test).

Table 1 here

Clinical features

Forty-three symptoms and twenty-two abnormal investigation results were considered initially. Twenty remained significant in the final model. Their frequencies, univariable likelihood ratios and multivariable odds ratios are shown in Table 2. Of the B symptoms reported with lymphoma, fever, sweating and weight loss, only weight loss was frequent enough to proceed to multivariable analysis. There were 53 (1.2%) of cases with excessive sweating and 51 (0.3%) controls; for fever the respective figures were 53 (1.2%) and 83 (0.4%). Raised cholesterol was excluded from the final model as it was apparently protective, with an OR of 0.7 (0.6,0.8). The proportion of patients with varicose veins did not differ between cases and controls ($p = 0.68$). Some overlap between the mass variables occurred when multiple recordings were made, with the second occurrence sometimes using a different mass label for what was presumably the same feature. In total, 229 (5.2%) cases and 10 (0.05%) controls had multiple consultations with one of the mass variables at least 42 days apart, a univariable odds ratio of 103 (55,194); $p < 0.001$. No interaction terms, including with gender,

were found. Of the 4,362 cases, 3,438 (79%) had at least one of the final model features from Table 2.

Table 2 here

Positive predictive values

PPVs for the final model features are shown in a Risk Assessment Tool (RAT; see figures 2 and 3) and calculated for the 60+age group. By choosing ages 60 and above we are targeting patients near to the average age of NHL diagnosis - this accounted for 78.5% of our overall cases.

Figure 2 shows the PPVs for single and combined symptoms, for patients aged ≥ 60 .

Lymphadenopathy as a single symptom had a PPV of 13%. All three mass variables produced risk estimates of between 0.6% and over 10% when combined with other symptoms. The PPV for those aged >60 with two mass codes at least 42 days apart was 6.4% (3.1,13) in the >60 s, and for the 40-59 age group, it was 1.8% (0.6,5.7).

Figure 3 shows the PPVs for symptoms combined with blood tests, again in patients aged ≥ 60 . For patients aged 40-59, the PPVs for lymphadenopathy, head and neck mass and mass were 3.7% (1.4,10), 3.7% (0.9,14) and 0.1% (0.1,0.2) respectively.

Figure 2 here

Figure 3 here

DISCUSSION

Summary

This is the first study to identify and quantify the clinical features of NHL in primary care. Thirteen symptoms and seven abnormal investigations were associated with NHL. Lymphadenopathy had high PPVs; masses elsewhere in the body also had high PPVs but lower than lymphadenopathy. This remained the case, even when combined with abnormal blood test results or symptoms. Weight loss was the only other symptom to have a moderately high PPV, though this was only when additional features were present, such as recurrent back pain or with abnormalities in blood tests. These findings come from the UK, but are likely to be generalizable to other healthcare systems with the patient first seeing a generalist.

Strengths and limitations

This is a large study of over 4,000 primary care NHL patients and is the first to study symptoms recorded before diagnosis. The CPRD is the largest longitudinal primary care database and is recognised for its data quality. Therefore, the results are likely to be representative of UK patients and thus be generalizable. The study's large sample size allowed for sub-analyses by age, whilst still providing enough power to identify rare but relevant symptoms of NHL. Our comprehensive strategy for identifying putative features of NHL, including using online support forums to search for patient-reported symptoms, makes it unlikely that relevant features were omitted. Lastly, the study's primary care setting is important. The clinical problem of whom to select for cancer investigation resides in primary care, so requires primary care research.

The use of primary care records has some limitations. Information is not well recorded for the duration or severity of a complaint, or for cancer staging. We were also reliant on accurate data recording. Individual GPs have personal recording styles, though the framework of CPRD codes provides some uniformity. This was particularly important for the mass variables we chose. There

was some overlap between these terms, though most of this overlap was with lymphadenopathy – the highest risk of the three masses - as one of the variables. GPs can record information in a hidden ‘free text’ section, which can affect the strength of associations if it preferentially occurs in either cases or controls.(22) In theory, cases had a greater opportunity to report symptoms due to their higher attendances: however our test using varicose veins, did not suggest this was occurring. Another aspect is that of matching. Once cases and controls are matched, the matching variable cannot be studied directly. However, using stratified analyses (by age, primarily) and seeking internal interaction terms (used for gender here) we can to a large extent sidestep this apparent limitation. Finally, as in our previous studies, we overcame the problem of estimating PPVs from a case-control study design by calculating the prior odds of NHL from registry data.(18, 23)

Comparison with existing literature

Consistent with previous research, cases consult their GP significantly more than controls in the year before the cancer diagnosis. (24) Our main finding was the strong association between lymphadenopathy and NHL; similarly, head and neck masses also were strongly associated. This was no surprise, as these are the main feature in the secondary care literature.(6, 25, 26) Other masses (some of which may have been lymphadenopathy, as discussed in Methods) were also associated with NHL, but with a much lower risk. Cervical lymphadenopathy in primary care has been investigated in three old studies.(27-29) In the first, no malignancies were found from a group of 80 primary care patients with lymphadenopathy, 44% of whom had isolated cervical node enlargement.(29) A second study of 249 patients also found no malignancies, and no final diagnosis was established for most.(27) A third study examined referrals for lymph node biopsy. 29 malignancies were found in 82 referred patients, with a prior probability for lymphadenopathy presenting to primary care of 1.1% calculated from these results.(28) All three studies emphasized the ability of GPs to identify lymphadenopathy of malignant origin.

Weight loss was the non-mass feature with the highest risk estimates in this study. We also found that abdominal pain, fatigue, indigestion, infection, anaemia and back pain, each of which has been reported in secondary care, were also features in primary care, albeit low risk ones.(6, 17, 30)

Implications for practice

The clearest message from this study is the importance of lymphadenopathy and head and neck masses. There is some overlap between these, with many of the head and neck masses probably being of lymphatic tissue. The risks of NHL with these are generally over 5%, and warrant serious consideration of lymphoma. The abnormal blood tests and other symptoms helped to refine the risk a little, generally increasing the overall risk when they accompanied head and neck masses, though making little practical change to the overall likely management. Conversely, many patients with NHL had normal inflammatory markers, so this test cannot be used to exclude the disease. We were unable to examine persistence of the mass directly, as duration of symptoms is poorly recorded.(31) However, our proxy for duration, two mass codes at least six weeks apart, had a relatively high PPV of 6.4% (3.1,13) in the over 60s; a figure high enough to justify investigation. The word 'unexplained' is used in referral guidance.(12) Although this word does not feature in the CPRD medcodes for mass or lymphadenopathy, it is likely that many of the masses were unexplained, as GPs prefer to document diagnoses where possible. When should GPs refer unexplained lymphadenopathy or neck mass? The reports that GPs appear able to distinguish malignant from benign lymphadenopathy are helpful.(27-29) When the results of this study are added to those for Hodgkin's lymphoma in the companion paper (ref please subeditor), the PPVs rise to 18.6% for either lymphoma for lymphadenopathy, 4.6% for head and neck mass, and 1.1% for mass elsewhere. Therefore the default decision should be referral of patients over 60 with these features, unless there is a clear reason not to.

We found that most B symptoms were too infrequent to be analysed, other than weight loss, which had a modest association with NHL, Thus B symptoms are of limited value in diagnosis, though they

do have prognostic implications, should a lymphoma be diagnosed.(32) Weight loss is a difficult symptom in cancer diagnosis. It is rare in isolation, and can be caused by several malignancies, though often has a benign cause. When of malignant origin, there is often a pointer towards which malignancy is likely, simplifying referral decisions. NHL is probably fairly low in the list, so it is unlikely that patients with weight loss should be considered for NHL as a first choice.

Conclusion

Lymphadenopathy and head and neck masses in adults are the strongest predictors of NHL and HL and warrant urgent investigation, particularly if they have been present for six weeks or more. No blood test or other symptoms change that statement. This largely accords with current guidance, though it could be argued that the need to wait six weeks – to allow resolution or an alternative diagnosis to emerge – is unnecessarily long. Implementation of our recommendations can be by education, dissemination of the risk assessment tool, by incorporation into practice software – or a combination of these.

Funding: This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) under its Programme Grants for Applied Research Programme (Grant Reference Number RP-PG-0608-10045). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health. FMW is part-funded by a NIHR Clinician Scientist award. RDN is part funded by Public Health Wales and Betsi Cadwaladr University Health Board.

Ethical approval: Independent Scientific Advisory Committee – protocol 09-110

Competing interests: WH is clinical lead on the ongoing revision of the NICE guidance on investigation of suspected cancer. His contribution to this article is in a personal capacity, and is not to be interpreted as representing the view of the Guideline Development Group, or of NICE itself. PR reports personal fees from GP Update Ltd, outside the submitted work. Other than this, no competing interests.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to acknowledge the contribution to the research presented in this paper made by the Discovery Programme Steering Committee comprising: Roger Jones (chair); Jonathan Banks; Alison Clutterbuck; Jon Emery; Joanne Hartland; Sandra Hollinghurst; Maire Justice; Jenny Knowles; Helen Morris; Tim Peters; Greg Rubin.

REFERENCES

1. Cancer Research U. Different types of non Hodgkin lymphoma 2014 [30.07.14]. Available from: <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-help/type/non-hodgkins-lymphoma/about/types/the-most-common-types-of-non-hodgkins-lymphoma>.
2. Cancer Research U. Non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL): Key Facts 2014 [30.07.14]. Available from: <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-info/cancerstats/keyfacts/non-hodgkin-lymphoma/>.
3. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Non-Hodgkin's lymphoma: draft scope. London: 2013.
4. Cancer Research UK. Non-Hodgkin lymphoma survival statistics. 2014.b [31.07.14]. Available from: <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/cancer-info/cancerstats/types/nhl/survival/nonhodgkin-lymphoma-survival-statistics>.
5. Abdel-Rahman M, Stockton D, Rachet B, Hakulinen T, Coleman MP. What if cancer survival in Britain were the same as in Europe: how many deaths are avoidable? Br J Cancer. 2009;101(S2):S115-S24.
6. Howell DA, Smith AG, Jack A, Patmore R, Macleod U, Mironska E, et al. Time-to-diagnosis and symptoms of myeloma, lymphomas and leukaemias: a report from the Haematological Malignancy Research Network. BMC Hematol. 2013;13(1):9.
7. Howell DA, Smith AG, Roman E. Referral pathways and diagnosis: UK government actions fail to recognize complexity of lymphoma. European journal of cancer care. 2007;16(6):529-32.
8. Vedsted P, Olesen F. Are the serious problems in cancer survival partly rooted in gatekeeper principles? BJGP. 2011;61:512-3.
9. Allgar V, Neal R. Delays in the diagnosis of six cancers: analysis of data from the National Survey of NHS Patients: Cancer. British Journal of Cancer. 2005;92:1959-70.
10. Neal R, Allgar V. Socio-demographic factors and delays in the diagnosis of six cancers: analysis of data from the 'National Survey of NHS Patients: Cancer'. British Journal of Cancer. 2005;92:1971-5.
11. Lyratzopoulos G, Neal RD, Barbieri JM, Rubin GP, Abel GA. Variation in number of general practitioner consultations before hospital referral for cancer: findings from the 2010 National Cancer Patient Experience Survey in England. The Lancet Oncology. 2012(0).
12. NICE. Referral Guidelines for Suspected Cancer. London: NICE; 2005 June 2005.
13. Cancer Research U. Treatment for high grade non Hodgkin lymphoma 2014 [cited 2014 28.10.14]. Available from: <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/type/non-hodgkins-lymphoma/treatment/types/treatment-for-high-grade-non-hodgkins-lymphoma>.
14. Crouch S, Simpson J, Ansell P, Kane E, Howell D, Smith A, et al. Illness patterns prior to diagnosis of lymphoma: analysis of UK medical records. Cancer Epidemiol. 2011;35(2):145-50.
15. Howell DA, Smith AG, Roman E. Help-seeking behaviour in patients with lymphoma. European journal of cancer care. 2008;17(4):394-403.
16. Dommett RM, Redaniel MT, Stevens MC, Hamilton W, Martin RM. Features of cancer in teenagers and young adults in primary care: a population-based nested case-control study. British journal of cancer. 2013;108(11):2329-33.
17. Deyo RA, Diehl AK. Cancer as a cause of back pain: frequency, clinical presentation, and diagnostic strategies. Journal of general internal medicine. 1988;3(3):230-8.
18. Shephard E, Neal R, Rose P, Walter F, Hamilton WT. Clinical features of kidney cancer in primary care: a case-control study using primary care records. Br J Gen Pract. 2013;63(609):e250-5.
19. Stapley S, Peters TJ, Neal RD, Rose PW, Walter FM, Hamilton W. The risk of oesophago-gastric cancer in symptomatic patients in primary care: a large case-control study using electronic records. Br J Cancer. 2013;108(1):25-31.
20. Walker S, Hyde C, Hamilton W. Risk of uterine cancer in symptomatic women in primary care: case-control study using electronic records. Br J Gen Pract. 2013;63(614):643-8.
21. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 13.1. College Station, TX: Stata Corporation

2013.

22. Price SJ, Shephard EA, Stapley SA, Barraclough K, Hamilton WT. Non-visible versus visible haematuria and bladder cancer risk: a study of electronic records in primary care. . British Journal of General Practice. 2014;64:464-5.

23. Stapley S, Peters TJ, Neal RD, Rose PW, Walter FM, Hamilton W. The risk of pancreatic cancer in symptomatic patients in primary care: a large case-control study using electronic records. Br J Cancer. 2012;106(12):1940-4.

24. Hamilton W, Lancashire R, Sharp D, Peters TJ, Cheng K, Marshall T. The risk of colorectal cancer with symptoms at different ages and between the sexes: a case-control study. BMC medicine. 2009;7:17.

25. Friese C, Abel G, Magazu L, Neville B, Richardson L, Earle C. Diagnostic delay and complications for older adults with multiple myeloma. Leukemia and Lymphoma. 2009;50(3):392-400.

26. Chau I, Kelleher MT, Cunningham D, Norman AR, Wotherspoon A, Trott P, et al. Rapid access multidisciplinary lymph node diagnostic clinic: analysis of 550 patients. British journal of cancer. 2003;88(3):354-61.

27. Williamson HA, Jr. Lymphadenopathy in a family practice: a descriptive study of 249 cases. Journal of Family Practice. 1985;20:449-52.

28. Fijten GH, Blijham GH. Unexplained lymphadenopathy in family practice. An evaluation of the probability of malignant causes and the effectiveness of physicians' workup. Journal of Family Practice. 1988;27:373-6.

29. Allhiser JN, McKnight TA, Shank JC. Lymphadenopathy in a family practice. Journal of Family Practice. 1981;12:27-32.

30. Tørring ML, Frydenberg M, Hamilton W, Hansen RP, Lautrup MD, Vedsted P. Diagnostic interval and mortality in colorectal cancer: U-shaped association demonstrated for three different datasets. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2012;65(6):669-78.

31. Hamilton W, Round A, Sharp D, Peters T. The quality of record-keeping in primary care: a comparison of computerised, paper and hybrid systems. British Journal General Practice. 2003;53:929-33.

32. Zucca E, Conconi A, Mughal TI, Sarris AH, Seymour JF, Vitolo U, et al. Patterns of Outcome and Prognostic Factors in Primary Large-Cell Lymphoma of the Testis in a Survey by the International Extranodal Lymphoma Study Group. Journal of Clinical Oncology. 2003;21(1):20-7.

Table 1. Patient demographics and consultation rates in the year before diagnosis

	Cases			Controls		
	Male (n=2300)	Female (n=2062)	Total (n=4362)	Male (n=9932)	Female (n=9536)	Total (n=19468)
Median (IQR) age in years at diagnosis	69 (60-77)	71 (62-79)	70 (61-78)	70 (61-77)	71 (62-79)	71 (61-78)
Median (IQR) number of consultations	15 (9-23)	16 (10-25)	16 (10-24)	7 (3-14)	8 (4-15)	8 (4-14)

Table 2. Features of NHL in patients aged ≥ 40 years.

Feature	Cases, <i>n</i> (%) <i>n</i>=4362	Controls, <i>n</i> (%) <i>n</i>=19468	Likelihood ratio (95% CI)	Odds ratio in multivariable analysis (95% CI)
<i>Symptoms</i>				
Infection (UTI/URTI/Skin/Chest)	902 (21)	2897 (15)	1.4 (1.3-1.5)	1.3 (1.1 to 1.4)
Lymphadenopathy	632 (14)	13 (0.1)	217 (125-375)	263 (133 to 519)
Abdominal pain	610 (14)	833 (4)	3.3 (3.0-3.6)	2.5 (2.1 to 2.9)
Mass	473 (11)	199 (1)	11 (9.0-12)	12 (10 to 16)
Shortness of breath	413 (9)	976 (5)	1.9 (1.7-2.1)	1.5 (1.3 to 1.8)
Head and neck mass	355 (8)	36 (0.2)	44 (31-62)	49 (32 to 74)
Fatigue	300 (7)	547 (3)	2.5 (2.1-2.8)	1.4 (1.2 to 1.7)
Constipation	261 (6)	526 (3)	2.2 (1.9-2.6)	1.4 (1.2 to 1.8)
Vomiting and nausea	247 (6)	391 (2)	2.8 (2.4-3.3)	1.4 (1.1 to 1.7)
Indigestion	203 (5)	491 (3)	1.9 (1.6-2.2)	1.5 (1.2 to 1.9)
Weight loss	164 (4)	115 (1)	6.4 (5.0-8.1)	3.2 (2.3 to 4.4)
Back pain – 2 nd occurrence	163 (4)	308 (2)	2.4 (2.0-2.9)	1.7 (1.3 to 2.3)
Malaise	159 (4)	240 (1)	3.0 (2.4-3.6)	1.7 (1.2 to 2.3)
<i>Investigations</i>				
Low full blood count	1369 (32)	1645 (8)	3.7 (3.5-4.0)	3.3 (2.9 to 3.7)
Raised inflammatory markers	1184 (27)	1202 (6)	4.4 (4.1-4.7)	2.5 (2.2 to 2.9)
Raised liver function tests	863 (20)	1878 (10)	2.1 (1.9-2.2)	1.3 (1.1 to 1.5)
Leucocytosis	521 (12)	478 (2)	4.9 (4.3-5.5)	3.0 (2.5 to 3.6)
Microcytosis	227 (5)	246 (1)	4.1 (3.5-4.9)	1.5 (1.1 to 1.9)
Macrocytosis	207 (5)	405 (2)	2.3 (1.9-2.7)	1.4 (1.1 to 1.8)
Raised gamma globulin	174 (4)	228 (1)	3.4 (2.8-4.1)	1.8 (1.3 to 2.4)

Figure 1. Non-Hodgkin lymphoma exclusion data




Figure 2. Positive predictive values for **non-Hodgkin's lymphoma symptoms** in patients *sixty years of age and over*, for single and paired features.

Infection	Shortness of breath	Indigestion	Constipation	Back Pain – 2 nd occurrence	Fatigue	Vomiting & nausea	Abdominal pain	Malaise	Weight loss	Mass	Head and neck mass	Lymphadenopathy	
0.1 0.08, 0.10	0.1 0.10, 0.13	0.1 0.10, 0.14	0.1 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.15, 0.20	0.2 0.15, 0.21	0.2 0.18, 0.22	0.2 0.16, 0.24	0.4 0.3, 0.5	0.8 0.7, 1.0	2.3 1.6, 3.2	13 7.1-22	Risk as a single symptom
	0.1 0.1, 0.2	0.1 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.1, 0.2	0.1 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.15, 0.24	0.2 0.1, 0.2	0.4 0.2, 0.6	0.7 0.5, 1.1	2.8	>10	Infection
		0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.4	0.2 0.2, 0.4	0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.4	0.4 0.2, 0.8	0.6 0.3, 1.2	>5	11	Shortness of breath
			0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.4	0.1 0.1, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.4	0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.5 0.2, 1.0	0.3 0.1, 0.7	1.1	0.9	>10	Indigestion
				0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.4 0.2, 0.6	0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.6 0.3, 1.1	0.4 0.2, 0.9	1.0	1.5	6	Constipation
					0.4 0.2, 0.9	0.3 0.2, 0.5	0.5 0.3, 0.8	0.8	2.3	1.0	>10	>10	Back pain – 2 nd occurrence
						0.4 0.2, 0.6	0.3 0.2, 0.5	0.5 0.3, 0.8	0.9	1.8	4.9	>10	Fatigue
							0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.3 0.2, 0.6	0.6 0.3, 1.3	1.3	4.0	>10	Vomiting & nausea
								0.4 0.2, 0.6	0.6 0.4, 1.1	1.1 0.6, 1.8	2.6	13	Abdominal pain
									0.9	1.3	>10	>10	Malaise
										2.2		>10	Weight loss
											3.6	>10	Mass
												11	Head and neck mass

Notes: The PPV is shown on the first line of each cell with the 95% confidence limits shown underneath. PPVs were not calculated if fewer than 5 cases had the feature. Where fewer than 10 cases or controls had the combined features, CIs were omitted. Where no control had the combination of paired symptoms a label of >5 or >10 was given; while strictly undefined, these PPVs are likely very high. The yellow shaded cells indicate a PPV of 1.0-1.9%; orange cells 2.0-4.9% and red cells of 5% and over. The cells showing the same feature vertically and horizontally represent a second attendance with the same investigation.

Figure 3. Positive predictive values for **non-Hodgkin's lymphoma blood tests with symptoms** in patients *sixty* years of age and over: risk estimate for single investigations and paired with symptoms.

Raised liver function tests	Macrocytosis	Raised gamma globulin	Low full blood count	Raised inflammatory markers	Microcytosis	Leucocytosis	
0.1 0.12, 0.14	0.2 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.2, 0.3	0.2 0.22, 0.25	0.3 0.25, 0.30	0.3 0.2, 0.3	0.3 0.26, 0.34	Risk of lymphoma as a single feature
>10	>10	>10	>10	15	>10	15	Lymphadenopathy
5.0	>10	>10	6	7	>10	6	Head and neck mass
1.1 0.7, 1.9	1.1	1.0	1.5 0.9, 2.4	2.3 1.3, 4.2	0.9	2.1	Mass
1.5 0.8, 2.8	0.2	3.5	0.9 0.6, 1.3	0.8 0.6, 1.3	1.4	1.0 0.5, 2.0	Weight loss
0.4 0.3, 0.6	0.1	0.8	0.4 0.3, 0.6	0.5 0.3, 0.7	0.6	0.5 0.3, 0.9	Malaise
0.4 0.3, 0.5	0.3 0.2, 0.6	0.7 0.3, 1.4	0.5 0.4, 0.7	0.5 0.4, 0.7	0.8 0.4, 1.4	0.5 0.3, 0.7	Abdominal pain
0.4 0.2, 0.5	0.2 0.1, 0.5	0.5	0.3 0.3, 0.4	0.5 0.3, 0.6	0.3 0.1, 0.6	0.5 0.3, 0.8	Vomiting and nausea
0.4 0.3, 0.5	0.4 0.2, 0.8	0.6 0.3, 1.3	0.4 0.3, 0.5	0.4 0.4, 0.6	0.7 0.4, 1.3	0.6 0.4, 0.9	Fatigue
0.3 0.2, 0.5	1.0	0.3	0.4 0.3, 0.6	0.4 0.3, 0.6	0.9	0.3 0.2, 0.6	Back pain – 2nd occurrence
0.2 0.2, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.3 0.1, 0.6	0.3 0.2, 0.3	0.4 0.3, 0.5	0.3 0.1, 0.6	0.3 0.2, 0.5	Constipation
0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.5	0.2 0.1, 0.5	0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.7	0.4 0.2, 0.8	Indigestion
0.2 0.2, 0.3	0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.3 0.2, 0.5	0.3 0.2, 0.3	0.3 0.2, 0.3	0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.3 0.2, 0.5	Shortness of breath
0.2 0.1, 0.2	0.2 0.1, 0.3	0.3 0.2, 0.4	0.3 0.2, 0.3	0.3 0.2, 0.3	0.4 0.2, 0.5	0.3 0.2, 0.4	Infection