

















































































| Backgr | ound: "Aj | opi | ropr | iatel | y-s | elec | ted | pa | tien | ts" |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Optimal 7 | MT outcomes | 8: | | | | | | | | |
| » Patier | nt factors | | | | | | | | | |
| • Δ <i>ι</i> | ne comorhiditie | c | | | | | | | | |
| | ge, comorbiante | | +: | | | | | | | |
| • Ur | idenying bladde | er tur | iction | | | | | | | |
| T | r factors | | | | | | | | | |
| » Tumo | 1 1001013 | | | | | | | | | |
| ≫ Tumo • Ta | stage (T2 vs T3 | /4) | | | | | | | | |
| > Tumo • T : | stage (T2 vs T3 | /4) | S (cor | oinomo | in ci | +) | | | | |
| > Tumo • T : • Pr | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent c | /4) of CI | S (caro | cinoma | in si | tu) | | | | |
| > Tumo • T • Pr • Hy | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent o /dronephrosis | /4) of CI | S (caro | cinoma | in si | tu) | | | | |
| >> Tumo • T : • Pr • Hy • E> | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent o /dronephrosis (tent of TURBT | /4) of CI | S (caro | cinoma | in si | tu) | | | | |
| >> Tumo • T • Pr • Hy • E> Covariates | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent of /dronephrosis (tent of TURBT Comparison | /4) of CI | S (card | cinoma | in si | tu) Disease-sp surviv: | ecific al | dise | Bladder-in | ntact c survival |
| >> Tumo • T • Pr • Hy • E> | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent of /dronephrosis (tent of TURBT | /4) of CI | S (card Overall sur p value | cinoma rvival 95% CI | in si | tu) Disease-sp surviv: p value | ecific al 95% CI | dise HR | Bladder-ii ease-specifi p value | ntact c survival 95% CI |
| >> Tumo • T • Pr • Hy • E> Covariates | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent of /dronephrosis /tent of TURBT Comparison | /4) of CI HR 1.03 | S (card Overall sur p value <0.001 | cinoma rvival 95% CI 1.01-1.04 | in si | tu) Disease-sp surviv. p value | ecific al 95% CI | dise HR | Bladder-ii ease-specifi p value | ntact c survival 95% Cl |
| >> Tumo • T • Pr • Hy • E> Covariates Age at diagnosis Clinical T stage | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent of /dronephrosis (tent of TURBT Comparison | /4) of CI HR 1.03 0.57 | S (card Overall sur p value <0.001 <0.001 | rvival 95% CI 1.01-1.04 0.44-0.75 | In si | Disease-sp surviv: p value | ecific al 95% CI 0,36-0.73 | dise HR – | Bladder-ii ease-specifi p value | ntact c survival 95% CI |
| N IUMC O T O Pr Pr Pr Pr E> Covariates Age at diagnosis Clinical T stage Response to chemoradiation beforemberadiation | stage (T2 vs T3 esence/extent of /dronephrosis (tent of TURBT Comparison | /4) of CI HR 1.03 0.57 0.61 | S (card Overall sur p value <0.001 | vival 95% CI 1.01-1.04 0.44-0.75 0.46-0.81 | in si HR - 0.51 0.49 | tu) Disease-sp surviv: p value | ecific al 95% CI - 0.36-0.73 0.34-0.71 | dise HR - 0.16 | Bladder-ii ease-specifi p value - - - - - 0.001 | ntact c survival 95% Cl |
| N I Umo Umo I Umo I Umo Pr Pr Pr B T Covariates Age at diagnosis Clinical T stage Response to chemoradiation Hydronephrosis Tumore-associated CIS | stage (T2 vs T3 essence/extent of /dronephrosis (tent of TURBT Comparison | /4) of Cl HR 1.03 0.57 0.61 1.56 | S (card Overall sur p value <0.001 <0.001 0.002 0.002 | vival 95% Cl 1.01-1.04 0.44-0.75 0.46-0.81 1.06-2.15 1.17-2.08 | In si HR - 0.51 0.49 - 150 | tu) Disease-sp surviv. p value - - - - - - - - - - - - - | ecific 95% CI | dise HR 0.16 1.89 | Bladder-ii ease-specifi p value <0.001 <0.001 | ntact c survival 95% Cl 0.12-0.21 1.33-2.63 |











| Î | SCHOOL OF MEDICINE |
|---|--|
| | What to do when the RCT fails us? |
| • | We must turn to alternative, lower levels of evidence (often retrospective) Claims-based studies Leverage large numbers to detect even modest differences Exposure misclassification E.g. incorrectly identifying the technique/dose of radiotherapy; or cycles/type/timing of chemotherapy Outcome misclassification E.g. incorrectly assuming that billing codes accurately capture clinical toxicities Patient-level studies Granular data that can be missing from claims based studies E.g. baseline comorbidities and details of treatment E.g. toxicity measured directly by physicians or patients Fewer subjects |
| 0 | » Lack external validity or generalizability E.g. TMT at MGH Meta-analysis » Increase sample size » But only as good as the studies used ("garbage in equals garbage out"). Heterogeneity. Unable to adequately control for known much less unknown confounders » Were those who pursued TMT appropriate RC candidates? Or RC cisplatin candidates? These methods have been attempted to compare RC and TMT |



| | II UN SCHOO | L OF MEDICINE | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| Repre | esentative rec | ent studies comparing the eff | icacy (in overall survival) | of trimodality | therapy | versus r | adical cystectomy. | |
| Stud | у | Study type | Data source | Years | Samp | ole size | OS HRa (95%CI) | |
| | | | | | TMT | RC | | |
| Seise | en 20171 | Claims-based | NCDB | 2004-2011 | 1,257 | 11,586 | 1.37 (1.16-1.59) | |
| Cahr | n 2017 ² | Claims-based | NCDB | 2004-2013 | 1,489 | 22,680 | 1.58 (1.47-1.69) | |
| Willi | iams 2018 ³ | Claims-based | SEER-Medicare | 2002-2011 | 752 | 2,448 | 1.49 (1.31-1.69) | |
| Kulk | arni 20174 | Patient-level, retrospective | Institutional | 2008-2013 | 56 | 56 | 0.85 (0.43-1.66) | |
| Kim | 20175 | Patient-level, retrospective | Institutional | 2007-2014 | 29 | 50 | 0.89 (0.39-2.03) | |
| Vasl | nistha 2017¢ | Meta-analysis | Heterogeneous studies | 1976-2015♭ | 4,050 | 8,330 | 0.96 (0.72-1.29) | |
| *Comp *Comp •Study 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. | Survemance paring TMT (i y publication Seisen T, Su invasive Urc Cahn DB, Ha cystectomy doi:10.1002 Williams SB Therapy for Kulkarni GS in the Settin doi:10.1200 Kim YJ, Byu cancer: a pr Vashistha V, Bladder Can doi:10.1016 | n M, Lipsitz SR, et al. Compar- creference) to RC years n M, Lipsitz SR, et al. Compar- othelial Carcinoma of the Blad undorf EA, Ghiraldi EM, et al. C or bladter-preservation thera (/cncr.30900 i, Shan Y, Jazzar U, et al. Comp Older Adults With Muscle-Im , Hermanns T, Wei Y, et al. Pro g of a Multidisciplinary Bladd U/CO.2016.69.2327 n SJ, Ahn H, et al. Comparison opensity score matching anal (Wang H, Mazzone A, et al. Ra hcer: A Systematic Review and (/j.ijrobp.2016.11.056 | tive Effectiveness of Trin der. Eur Urol. 2017;72(4) contemporary use trends apy for muscle-invasive b aring Survival Outcomes a vasive Bladder Cancer. JA, opensity Score Analysis of er Cancer Clinic. J Clin On of outcomes between trir sysis. Oncotarget. 2017;8(- dical Cystectomy Compa l Meta-Analysis of over 12 | nodal Therapy). doi:10.1016/ and survival o ladder cancer. and Costs Asso <i>MA Surg.</i> 2018 f Radical Cyste <i>col.</i> 2017;35(2 nodal therapy 40):68996-690 red to Combine 2,000 patients. | Versus I (j.eururo utcomes <i>Cancer</i> . vciated W ;77555: ctomy V 0):JCO20 and radi 004. doi: cd Moda: <i>Int J Rac</i> | Radical Cy .2017.03. in patien 2017;123 Vith Radid 1-9. doi:1 ersus Bla 0166923? ical cysted 10.18632 lity Treat <i>diat Oncol</i> | ystectomy for Local 038 ts undergoing radi (22):4337-4345. :cal Cystectomy and 0.1001/jamasurg.2 dder-Sparing Trimo 27. ctomy in muscle-inr /oncotarget.16576 unent for Muscle-In 2.2016;97(5):1002- | ized Muscle- cal Trimodal 018.1680 odal Therapy vasive bladder vasive -1020. |
| | | | | | | | Royce 2019 | |



| UNC School of medicine |
|--|
| Organ preservation |
| Organ preservation is a hallmark of modern cancer care, ideally established through randomized controlled trials |
| Breast cancer: mastectomy -> breast conservation therapy Larynx cancer: laryngectomy -> larynx preservation Sarcomas: amputation -> limb-sparing |
| General principles Multidisciplinary and interdependency Maximal cytoreduction: Surgery Microscopic/regional/distant disease: Systemic therapy, radiation Goals: maintain function/preserve quality of life without compromising disease control |









| blo 2 Markov Cohort B | laca Caca Analycic | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| trategy | EV (LYS) | Incremental Value ^a | EV (QALYs) | Incremental Value ^a |
| MT, all patients | 8.89 | | 7.83 | |
| RC, all patients | 8.89 | 0.00 | 7.24 | 0.59 |
| RC, favorable cohort | 9.34 | -0.45 | 7.76 | 0.07 |
| MT, favorable cohort | 10.52 | - | 9.37 | - |
| RC, all patients | 8.89 | 1.63 | 7.24 | 2.13 |
| RC, favorable cohort | 9.34 | 1.18 | 7.76 | 1.61 |
| construction of the second sec | And the state of t | | | |









































