

5. Sylvester RJ, van der Meijden APM, Lamm DL. Intravesical Bacillus Calmette-Guérin reduces the risk of progression in patients with superficial bladder cancer: a meta-analysis of the published results of randomized clinical trials. *J Urol*. 2002;168:1964–1970. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5347\(05\)64273-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5347(05)64273-5).
6. Yoshimura K, Utsunomiya N, Ichioka K, Matsui Y, Terai A, Arai Y. Impact of superficial bladder cancer and transurethral resection on general health-related quality of life: an SF-36 survey. *Urology*. 2005;65:290–294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2004.09.050>.
7. Gilbert SM, Dunn RL, Hollenbeck BK, et al. Development and validation of the Bladder Cancer Index: a comprehensive, disease specific measure of health related quality of life in patients with localized bladder cancer. *J Urol*. 2010;183:1764–1769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2010.01.013>.
8. Hedgepeth RC, Gilbert SM, He C, Lee CT, Wood DP. Body image and bladder cancer specific quality of life in patients with ileal conduit and neobladder urinary diversions. *Urology*. 2010;76:671–675. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2010.01.087>.
9. PORTER MP, PENSON DF. Health-related quality of life after radical cystectomy and urinary diversion for bladder cancer: a systematic review and critical analysis of the literature. *J Urol*. 2005;173:1318–1322. <https://doi.org/10.1097/j1.0000149080.82697.65>.
10. Reeve BB, Potosky AL, Smith AW, et al. Impact of cancer on health-related quality of life of older Americans. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2009. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djp123>.
11. Kent EE, Ambs A, Mitchell SA, Clauser SB, Smith AW, Hays RD. Health-related quality of life in older adult survivors of selected cancers: data from the SEER-MHOS linkage. *Cancer* 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.29119>.
12. Fung C, Pandya C, Guancial E, et al. Impact of bladder cancer on health related quality of life in 1,476 older Americans: a cross-sectional study. *J Urol*. 2014;192:690–695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2014.03.098>.
13. Jones Iii N, Jones SL, Miller NA. Health and quality of life outcomes the medicare health outcomes survey program: overview, context, and near-term prospects. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2004;2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-2-33>.
14. Ambs A, Warren J, Bellizzi K, Topor M, Haffer SC, Clauser SB. Overview of the SEER-medicare health outcomes survey linked dataset. *Health Care Financ Rev*. 2008;28:5–21.
15. Health Services Advisory Group. Medicare Health Outcomes Survey. <http://www.hosonline.org/en/program-overview/>. Accessed February 10, 2017.
16. Medicare health outcomes survey performance measurement data user's guide cohort 15 performance measurement data user's guide; 2012. http://hosonline.org/globalassets/hos-online/dugs/mao-pm/hos_dug_c15pmd.pdf. Accessed 24 September 2017.
17. Babjuk M, Böhle A, Burger M, et al. EAU guidelines on non-muscle-invasive urothelial carcinoma of the bladder: update 2016. 2017. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2016.05.041.
18. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. L. Erlbaum Associates; 1988.
19. Hays RD, Farivar SS, Liu H. Approaches and recommendations for estimating minimally important differences for health-related quality of life measures. *COPD J Chronic Obstr Pulm Dis*. 2005;2:63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1081/COPD-200050663>.
20. Winters BR, Wright JL, Holt SK, Dash A, Gore JL, Schade GR. Health related quality of life following radical cystectomy: comparative analysis from the medicare health outcomes study. *J Urol* 2017;. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2017.08.111>.
21. Schmidt S, Francés A, Lorente Garin JA, et al. Quality of life in patients with non-muscle-invasive bladder cancer: one-year results of a multicentre prospective cohort study. *Urol Oncol Semin Orig Investig*. 2015;33:19.e7–19.e15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urolonc.2014.09.012>.
22. Reeve BB, Stover AM, Jensen RE, et al. Impact of diagnosis and treatment of clinically localized prostate cancer on health-related quality of life for older Americans: A population-based study. *Cancer* 2012. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.27578>.
23. Smith AB, Jaeger B, Pinheiro LC, et al. Impact of bladder cancer on health-related quality of life. *BJU Int*. 2018;121:549–557. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14047>.
24. Yang LS, Shan BL, Shan LL, et al. A systematic review and meta-analysis of quality of life outcomes after radical cystectomy for bladder cancer. *Surg Oncol*. 2016;25:281–297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.suronc.2016.05.027>.
25. Chang SS, Boorjian SA, Chou R, et al. Diagnosis and treatment of non-muscle invasive bladder cancer: AUA/SUO guideline. *J Urol*. 2016;196:1021–1029. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2016.06.049>.
26. Shang PF, Kwong J, Wang ZP, et al. Intravesical Bacillus Calmette-Guérin versus epirubicin for Ta and T1 bladder cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011(5) CD006885. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD006885.pub2>.
27. Porena M, Del Zingaro M, Lazzeri M, et al. Bacillus Calmette-Guérin versus gemcitabine for intravesical therapy in high-risk superficial bladder cancer: a randomised prospective study. *Urol Int*. 2010;84:23–27. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000273461>.
28. Edmondson AJ, Birtwistle JC, Catto JWF, Twiddy M. The patients' experience of a bladder cancer diagnosis: a systematic review of the qualitative evidence. *J Cancer Surviv*. 2017;11:453–461. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11764-017-0603-6>.
29. Agarwal A, Eryuzlu LN, Cartwright R, et al. What is the most bothersome lower urinary tract symptom? Individual- and population-level perspectives for both men and women. *Eur Urol*. 2014;65:1211–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2014.01.019>.

EDITORIAL COMMENT



In the study “Nonmuscle Invasive Bladder Cancer Influences Physical Health Related Quality of Life and Urinary Incontinence, Wayne G. Brisbane and colleagues examine patient-reported quality of life (QOL) and urinary incontinence outcomes associated with the diagnosis and management of non-muscle invasive bladder cancer. The study is based on SEER cancer registry data linked to patient-reported outcomes (PROs) data collected as part of the Medical Health Outcomes Survey (SEER-MHOS), which allowed the authors to not only evaluate patient-reported outcomes in a representative sample of bladder cancer patients managed with endoscopic and intravesical treatments, but also benchmark those outcomes to surveys taken from noncancer controls who participated in MHOS as part of their Medicare Advantage plan. Though changes in patient-reported QOL and urinary function were apparent in both groups, declines in PRO scores were more pronounced among NMIBC patients than in noncancer controls. For example, SF-36 physical component summary (PCS) scores decreased by 3.0 points among bladder cancer patients from before diagnosis to after treatment (assessments were performed at 2 year intervals according to MHOS assessment frames) but only 1.5 in the control group ($P = .01$). Similarly, problems with urinary incontinence were more commonly reported by patients than controls; 15.2% of NMIBC patient respondents endorsed new urinary incontinence compared to 11.2% of controls ($P = .09$), and 20.0% of patients reported increased severity of incontinence compared to 11.4% of controls ($P < .01$). Notably, significant deficits in physical health and QOL were driven primarily by low scores in high-risk NMIBC cases (high-grade Ta disease, CIS, and T1 disease), implicating a close association between frequent interventions, such as repeated cystoscopy, biopsy, resection and intravesical therapies, and poorer patient-reported

outcomes. Although these results may not be surprising and likely confirm the observations of practicing urologists who often manage bladder cancer, they provide empirical evidence that quantifies the burdens associated with the diagnosis and treatment of NMIBC. Moreover, these data have several palpable implications in my opinion. First, they represent a step forward and knowledge gained; they pencil in previously undescribed details about patient-reported symptoms and QOL outcomes within the outlines of a relatively understudied area. Second, they underscore the importance of PROs and QOL assessments among bladder cancer patients managed with endoscopic and intravesical therapies, which is particularly relevant given the exploding number of clinical trials evaluating emerging NMIBC therapies that are currently underway.¹ Patient-report outcome and QOL measures should be compulsory components in these trials. Finally, they foreshadow a not-distant future in which PROs will enter routine clinical care. The salutary effects of using PRO measures to inform and guide clinical care have come into focus in recent years, and increasingly health systems are steering toward them.²

Scott M. Gilbert, Department of Genitourinary Oncology, Department of Health Outcomes and Behavior, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center & Research Institute, Tampa, FL

References

1. Nykopp TK, Batista da Costa J, Mannas M, Black PC. Current clinical trials in non-muscle invasive bladder cancer. *Curr Urol Rep*. 2018;19:101.
2. Rotenstein LS, Huckman RS, Wagle NW. Making patients and doctors happier – the potential of patient-reported outcomes. *N Engl J Med*. 2017;377:1309–1312.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2018.11.040>
UROLOGY 125: 152–153, 2019. © 2018 Elsevier Inc.

AUTHOR REPLY

We would like to thank Scott M. Gilbert for [his] thoughtful examination of this manuscript. As outlined, a major finding of

this work is that patients with high-risk nonmuscle invasive bladder cancer (NMIBC) as defined by the European Urological Association and American Urological Association [ref] had significantly worse patient reported outcomes compared to those with nonhigh-risk disease. The survey tools utilized for the Medicare Health Outcomes Survey (MHOS) are not cancer specific instruments, yet still demonstrated statistically and clinically significant decreases in physical and mental health-related quality of life.¹ As noted by Dr. Gilbert, there are multiple factors at work including treatment side effects and oncologic burden. Further work will be needed to delineate if there are adjustments in clinical practice that can decrease the treatment and disease related burden experienced by patients. While MHOS is able to demonstrate general trends, specific causes remain obscure and want of clarification. Investigation of such topics is a priority among funding organizations such as the Patient-Centered Outcomes research Institute (PCORI) and will require further exploration amidst the changing landscape of treatment options for high-risk NMIBC. We agree that patient reported outcomes will become a compulsory component of research and will increasingly be interwoven into clinical care. To make meaningful contributions survey questions will need to balance inclusivity with specific disease process-oriented questions. Next steps will likely include engaging patients and their advocates with disease specific questions to prioritize research and clinical objectives.²

Wayne G. Brisbane, George R. Schade, University of Washington, Department of Urology, Seattle, WA

References

1. Hays RD, Farivar SS, Liu H. Approaches and recommendations for estimating minimally important differences for health-related quality of life measures. *COPD J Chronic Obstr Pulm Dis*. 2005;2:63–67. <https://doi.org/10.1081/COPD-200050663>.
2. Smith AB, Chisolm S, Deal A, et al. Patient-centered prioritization of bladder cancer research. *Cancer*. 2018;124:3136–3144. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cncr.31530>.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.urology.2018.11.041>
UROLOGY 125: 153, 2019. © 2018 Elsevier Inc.

