

# Multi-domain quantitative recovery following Radical Cystectomy for patients within the iROC (Robot Assisted Radical Cystectomy with intracorporeal urinary diversion versus Open Radical Cystectomy) Randomised Controlled Trial: The first 30 patients

CATTO, James W.F., KHETRAPAL, Pramit, AMBLER, Gareth, SARPONG, Rachel, POTYKA, Ingrid, KHAN, Shamim, TAN, Melanie, FEBER, Andrew, BOURKE, Liam <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6548-4603>, NOON, Aidan P., DIXON, Simon, GOODWIN, Louise, WILLIAMS, Norman R., ROWE, Edward, KOUPARIS, Anthony, MCGRATH, John, BREW-GRAVES, Chris and KELLY, John D.

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

http://shura.shu.ac.uk/21932/

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

# **Published version**

CATTO, James W.F., KHETRAPAL, Pramit, AMBLER, Gareth, SARPONG, Rachel, POTYKA, Ingrid, KHAN, Shamim, TAN, Melanie, FEBER, Andrew, BOURKE, Liam, NOON, Aidan P., DIXON, Simon, GOODWIN, Louise, WILLIAMS, Norman R., ROWE, Edward, KOUPARIS, Anthony, MCGRATH, John, BREW-GRAVES, Chris and KELLY, John D. (2018). Multi-domain quantitative recovery following Radical Cystectomy for patients within the iROC (Robot Assisted Radical Cystectomy with intracorporeal urinary diversion versus Open Radical Cystectomy) Randomised Controlled Trial: The first 30 patients. European Urology, 74, 531-534.

# Copyright and re-use policy

See http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html

Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive http://shura.shu.ac.uk

Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive http://shura.shu.ac.uk

1	Multi-domain quantitative recovery following Radical Cystectomy for patients within the		
2	iROC (Robot Assisted Radical Cystectomy with intracorporeal urinary diversion versus		
3	Open Radical Cystectomy) Randomised Controlled Trial: The first 30 patients		
4	James W.F. Catto <sup>1,2*</sup> , Pramit Khetrapal <sup>2*</sup> , Gareth Ambler <sup>4</sup> , Rachael Sarpong <sup>3</sup> , Ingrid Potyka		
5	<sup>3</sup> , Shamim Khan <sup>5</sup> , Melanie Tan <sup>3</sup> , Andrew Feber <sup>2</sup> , Liam Bourke <sup>6</sup> , Aidan P. Noon <sup>1</sup> , Simon		
6	Dixon <sup>6</sup> , Louise Goodwin <sup>1</sup> , Norman R. Williams <sup>3</sup> , Edward Rowe <sup>8</sup> , Anthony Kouparis <sup>8</sup> , John		
7	McGrath <sup>9</sup> , Chris Brew-Graves <sup>3</sup> and John D. Kelly <sup>2</sup>		
8			
9	* Joint first authors		
10	1. Academic Urology Unit, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S10 2RX, UK		
11	2. Division of Surgery & Interventional Science, University College London, London		
12	3 Surgical & Interventional Trials Unit (SITU) Division of Surgery & Interventional		
12	Science University College London London NW1 2ED LIK		
13	A Department of Statistical Science, University College London, WC1E CDT		
14	4. Department of Statistical Science, University College London, WCIE 681.		
15	5. Department of Urology, Guys and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, SE1		
16	9RT.		
17	<ol><li>Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK</li></ol>		
18	7. Health Economics and Decision Science, NIHR Research Design Service Yorkshire and		
19	the Humber, University of Sheffield, S1 4DA, UK		
20	8. Department of Urology, North Bristol NHS Trust		
21	9. Department of Urology, Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Trust		
22			
23			
$\frac{23}{24}$	Correspondence to:		
27 25	Lamos Catto, Acadomic Uralogy Unit. The Medical School, University of Shoffield		
25	James Callo, Academic Urology Unit, The Wedical School, University of Sheffield,		
20	Beech Hill Koad, Shettleid, S1U ZKX, United Kingdom		
21	Iel: +44 (0)114 226 1229		
28	Fax: +44 (0)114 271 2268		
29	Email: <u>j.catto@sheffield.ac.uk</u>		
30			
31	Keywords: Bladder cancer, Cystectomy, Robotic surgery, Radical Cystectomy, RARC, Activity		
32	trackers, Complications, Recovery, Enhanced Recovery		
33	Abstract: 194 word		
34	Word count: 994 words		
35			
36	Conflicts of Interest		
37	The authors declare no conflicts of interest with this work. This work is funded by a grant		
38	from The Urological Foundation and The Champniss Foundation. The iROC RCT is sponsored		

39 by University College London. Robotic consumables are supplied at no cost by Intuitive

Surgical within the iROC trial. This company had no role in the design, implementation orinterpretation of the data.

42

#### 43 **Take Home Message**

We analysed recovery after radical cystectomy using multiple domains reflecting mobilisation (steps per day), exercise capacity (chair to stand), disability, HRQOL and health economics. We found most patients recovered most of their physical capacity by 12 weeks of surgery.

48

#### 49 **Tweet**

50 Activity trackers help measure recovery after major surgery

- 51
- 52

#### 53 Letter

54 Many patients develop complications after Radical cystectomy (RC) [1]. Reductions in 55 morbidity have occurred through centralization, technical improvements [2] and perhaps 56 through Robot-assisted RC (RARC). Whilst RARC is gaining popularity, there are concerns 57 about oncological safety [3], extra-corporeal reconstruction [4] and RCTs find little 58 difference [5]. We are conducting a prospective RCT comparing open RC and RARC with 59 mandated intra-corporeal reconstruction (iROC [6]). Within this trial we quantify recovery using multiple domains: personal activity trackers, the 30 second Chair Stand Test (CST30), 60 61 and qualitative questionnaires of disability (WHODAS 2.0), HRQOL (EORTC QLQ-C30 and 62 QLQ-BLM30 [6]) and health economics (EQ-5D-5L).

63

64 Given that little is known of these tools in this setting, we included an internal analysis when 65 the first 30 patients reached the primary outcome (90 days after RC). This was reached 209 days after the first recruitment and included 28/30 who underwent their allocated RC 66 (supplementary figures, supplementary table 1). The average time to discharge was 11.0 67 68 days (st dev. ± 5.7), and following discharge 20/28 (71%) patients visited their GP or A&E, 69 and 5/28 (18%) were readmitted to hospital. Within 90 days of surgery, the average 70 duration out of healthcare was 76.6 ± 6.7 days. Post-operative complications were seen in 71 15/28 patients, including; Clavien-Dindo Grade 1 in 5/28, Grade 2 in 7/28 and grade 3a/3b in 72 3/28 (11%, supplementary tables). Baseline compliance varied from 22/28 (79%) for activity 73 trackers, 24/28 (86%) for CST30, 27/28 (96%) for WHODAS 2.0, 27/28 (96%) for QLQ-C30, to 74 28/28 (100%) for EQ-5D-5L. The observed values (figure 1) matched the general population 75 (e.g. average WHODAS 2.0 score (15%) was within 78% of general population, CTS30 76 (average 13) was similar to that for >65 year old males and >60 year old females [7]) or were 77 slightly lower (age matched Canadian men and women walked 7,869 and 6,970/steps per 78 day, respectively [8]). Compliance with activity trackers and CTS30 improved during 79 recruitment as the trial staff became experienced with collection during the perioperative 80 period.

81

82 Each measure deteriorated after surgery (figure 2). At day 5 (POD5) the average number of 83 daily steps was 1840 ± 1348 (32±22% baseline) and CTS30 was 8.3±5.3 (62.0±38% baseline). Activities levels improved such that by week 5 walking reached 74±32% of the baseline 84 85 (4294±2370 steps/day) and CTS30 reached 96±35% baseline (12±4.3/30 seconds). By week 86 12 many patients had returned to their baseline level of activity (average steps/day 87 6375±3246, 99±47% baseline and CTS30 13±5, 108±33%). Patient reported qualitative 88 disability scores contrasted activity levels. At week 5, WHODAS 2.0 disability reached 89 26±22% (which was 2.9±3.3 fold higher than at baseline), before returning to pre-operative 90 levels in most patients by week 12 (0.9±1.1 fold baseline). Changes in EQ-5D-5L scores rating 91 'health today'(Q6) and QLQ-C30 (Q29: overall health and Q30: QOL in past week) 92 questionnaires mirrored activity levels with lower scores in week 5 (EQ-5D-5L 84±17%, QLQ-93 C30(Q29) 80±22% and QLQ-C30(Q30) 78±23% of baseline) that recovered to baseline by 94 week 12 (93±17%, 98±16% and 93±16%, respectively). Patients seeking medical review after 95 discharge (GP, A&E or hospital admission) averaged fewer daily steps at week 5 (medical 96 review: 4069±2526 vs. no review: 4743±2132) and week 12 (5535±1786 vs. 6724±3703), and 97 had lower absolute CTS30 numbers at the same times (week 5: 11.2±4.3 vs. 13.0±4.4 and 98 week 12: 13.2±5.5 vs. 13.5±3.1), although the low sample size precluded meaningful 99 statistical comparison. We hypothesised that multiple domains are needed to robustly 100 measure recovery after RC and that accurate measurement will allow a meaningful 101 comparison between open RC and RARC. Correlation of baseline data revealed no significant 102 associations between measures of activity, qualitative disability or QOL data (Pearson 103 correlation all p>0.08). Average daily steps was not correlated to CTS30 (r=-0.08, p=0.7 in 20

- 104 patients) and was closest to the QLQ-C30 domain reflecting QOL (r=0.41, p=0.08). In this
- 105 small sample size, one could hypothesise that daily steps reflect actual activity whilst CTS30
- 106 is a measure of lower limb strength and exercise capacity (which may not be used).
- 107
- 108 In conclusion, we report multi-domain measurements of recovery after RC. Our measures
- 109 appear well tolerated by patients, are applicable to routine practice, are likely to be useful
- 110 within our RCT and in the RC pathway.

### 111 Figure legends

- 112 Figure 1. Distribution of multi-domain measurements at recruitment (baseline).
- 113 Figure 2. Multi-domain measurements of RC recovery over the first 26 weeks after RC.
- 114 Supplementary figure 1. Recruitment within iROC. a). Consort diagram of iROC feasibility
- 115 phase recruitment and b). histogram of length of stay and primary outcome measure (days
- 116 alive out of hospital/healthcare).
- 117 Supplementary figure 2. Recruitment within iROC.
- 118 Supplementary Table 1. Patients and tumours within the iROC feasibility phase.
- 119 Supplementary table 2. Complications seen after surgery.
- 120
- 121
- 122

# 123 References

- 124 [1] Leow JJ, Cole AP, Seisen T, Bellmunt J, Mossanen M, Menon M, et al. Variations in the
- 125 Costs of Radical Cystectomy for Bladder Cancer in the USA. Eur Urol. 2018;In Press.
- [2] Pang KH, Groves R, Venugopal S, Noon AP, Catto JWF. Prospective Implementation of
  Enhanced Recovery After Surgery Protocols to Radical Cystectomy. Eur Urol. 2018;73:363 71.
- 129 [3] Ng CK, Kauffman EC, Lee MM, Otto BJ, Portnoff A, Ehrlich JR, et al. A comparison of 130 postoperative complications in open versus robotic cystectomy. Eur Urol. 2010;57:274-81.
- [4] Desai MM, Gill IS. "The devil is in the details": randomized trial of robotic versus openradical cystectomy. Eur Urol. 2015;67:1053-5.
- 133 [5] Tan WS, Khetrapal P, Tan WP, Rodney S, Chau M, Kelly JD. Robotic Assisted Radical
- 134 Cystectomy with Extracorporeal Urinary Diversion Does Not Show a Benefit over Open
- 135 Radical Cystectomy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled
- 136 Trials. PLoS One. 2016;11:e0166221.
- [6] Catto JWF, Khetrapal P, Ambler G, Sarpong R, Khan S, Tan M, et al. Robot Assisted
- 138 Radical Cystectomy with intracorporeal urinary diversion versus Open Radical Cystectomy
- (iROC): protocol for a randomised controlled trial with internal pilot phase. BMJ Open. 2018;In revision
- 141 [7] Jones CJ, Rikli RE, Beam WC. A 30-s chair-stand test as a measure of lower body strength 142 in community-residing older adults. Res Q Exerc Sport. 1999;70:113-9.
- 143 [8] Colley RC, Garriguet D, Janssen I, Craig CL, Clarke J, Tremblay MS. Physical activity of
- 144 Canadian adults: accelerometer results from the 2007 to 2009 Canadian Health Measures
- 145 Survey. Health Rep. 2011;22:7-14.
- 146

147

148 Supplementary table 1. Patient features within the iROC feasibility phase.

	n	%
Sex		
Male	23	76.7%
Female	7	23.3%
Age		
Average ± st. dev.	67.9	± 11.7
>75	10	33.3%
ASA		
1	5	16.7%
2	12	40.0%
3	4	13.3%
Missing	9	30.0%
Reconstruction		
lleal conduit	22	73.3%
Neobladder	5	16.7%
Missing	1	3.3%
BMI		
Average ± st. dev.	27.01	± 3.4

155 Supplementary table 2. Complications seen after surgery.

Patient	Grade of complication	Detail
2	Grade II	Systemic sepsis, ileus, blocked catheter
3	Grade II	Infection of unknown origin
6	Grade I	Wound - Hernia
7	Grade I	Gastrointestinal - ileus and emesis
8	Grade IIIb	Surgical - Incisional hernia. Small bowel obstruction
10	Grade II	Wound - Wound infection
11	Grade II	Genitourinary - Urosepsis and renal failure
13	Grade I	Gastrointestinal - Diarrhoea
19	Grade II	Cardiac - Arrhythmia
20	Grade I	Scrotal swelling. Anaemia not requiring transfusion
21	Grade IIIb	Obstructed common Bile Duct. Urinary infection.
26	Grade I	Gastrointestinal - Constipation
27	Grade IIIb	Cardiac - Myocardial infarction
31	Grade II	lleus. TPN line.
34	Grade II	Oral Thrush