

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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

**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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup>

**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.