



Usefulness of Palliative Prognostic Index for Patient With Advanced Cancer in Home Care Setting

著者	Hamano J, Maeno T, Kizawa Y, Shima Y, Maeno T
journal or publication title	American journal of hospice & palliative medicine
volume	30
number	3
page range	264-267
year	2013-05
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/00122544

doi: 10.1177/1049909112448923

American Journal of
Hospice and Palliative Medicine

**Usefulness of Palliative prognostic Index for advanced
cancer patient in home care setting**

Journal:	<i>American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Medicine</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Medical Manuscripts
Keyword:	Advanced Cancer patient, home care setting, Prognostic prediction, Palliative Prognostic Index, Retrospective study, Palliative care, Home visiting service

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

review

1
2
3
4
5
6 Usefulness of the Palliative Prognostic Index for advanced cancer patients in the home
7
8 care setting
9

10 11 12 13 Introduction

14
15 Prognostic prediction is necessary for advanced cancer patients, especially those in
16
17 the home care setting, in order to determine treatment goals, the content and location of
18
19 provided care, and indications for hospital referral.¹⁾ An appropriate prognostic
20
21 prediction tool is therefore essential not only for patients and their families, but also for
22
23 the healthcare professionals who support their decision making.²⁾ Previous studies have
24
25 examined several prognostic prediction tools for cancer patients, for example the
26
27 Palliative Prognostic Index (PPI),³⁾ Palliative Performance Scale,³⁾ Cancer Prognostic
28
29 Scale,³⁾ Palliative Prognostic Scale,⁴⁾ Japan Palliative Oncology Study-Prognostic Index
30
31 (J-POS-PI),⁵⁾ and Prognosis in Palliative Care Study model,⁶⁾ and each was properly
32
33 validated. These tools are intended for use in assessing inpatient and ambulatory
34
35 patients, and the appropriateness of their application to advanced cancer patients in the
36
37 home care setting is uncertain. Only Stone et al. prospectively studied the usefulness of
38
39 the PPI in 194 cancer patients in a variety of settings: 73.7% of patients were
40
41 hospitalized, 25.8% were in the home care setting, and 0.5% were in hospice.⁸⁾
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 The PPI was defined based on performance status assessment using the Palliative
50
51 Performance Scale (PPS), oral intake, and the presence or absence of dyspnea, edema,
52
53 and delirium (Table 1). The PPI does not require blood tests or radiological evaluation,
54
55 and would therefore be very useful for cancer patients in the home care setting as
56
57 compared to other validated prognostic prediction tools. Each PPI component is
58
59 assigned an individual score, and these are added to derive the overall score. The final
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 PPI score classifies patients into 1 of 3 groups: those with survival predicted to be
7
8 shorter than 3 weeks ($PPI \geq 6$), shorter than 6 weeks ($PPI \geq 4$), or more than 6 weeks
9
10 ($PPI < 4$).

11
12 The PPI was developed and successfully validated for cancer patients in palliative care
13
14 units by Morita et al. in Japan,⁷⁾ but the usefulness of the PPI for advanced cancer
15
16 patients in the home care setting has not been established. The aims of this study were
17
18 thus to clarify the sensitivity and specificity of the PPI for this particular population.
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Methods

26
27 Our study population included all advanced cancer patients who received home
28
29 visiting services regularly from Yamato Clinic between April 2007 and June 2009, and
30
31 who died at home or in the hospital. Yamato Clinic provides ambulatory care and home
32
33 visiting services for community residents, with 3 doctors specialized in family medicine
34
35 and palliative care. We assessed the components of the PPI during the first home visit,
36
37 as is our usual practice. In June 2010, one researcher (JH) then used medical records
38
39 from patients' first home visits to determine actual survival time as well as each
40
41 component of the PPI: PPS score, oral intake, and the presence or absence of dyspnea,
42
43 edema, and delirium. The PPI score was calculated for each patient, along with overall
44
45 sensitivity and specificity. Survival predictions were defined as mentioned above: less
46
47 than three weeks for $PPI \geq 6$, and less than 6 weeks for $PPI \geq 4$.
48
49
50
51
52

53 This study was conducted in conformity with the Declaration of Helsinki and was
54
55 carried out with special regard for the protection of individual data.
56
57
58
59

60 Results

1
2
3
4
5
6 Sixty-five patients (41 males) were included in this study. Table 2 shows patient
7 background information in detail. The mean patient age was 73.5, with 25 patients
8 (38.4%) in their 70s and 14 patients (21.5%) in their 80s. The primary cancer site was
9 the stomach/esophagus in 12 patients (18.4%), the lung in 11 patients (16.9%), and the
10 colon/rectum/anus in 11 patients (16.9%). The mean survival time after the first home
11 visit was 55 days. Survival time was shorter than 3 weeks in 22 patients (33.8%) and
12 shorter than 6 weeks in 35 patients (53.8%) (Table 2).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 Twenty-one patients (32.3%) had PPI scores ≥ 6 , while 29 (44.6%) had PPI scores ≥ 4
23 (Table 3). The distribution of performance status and clinical symptoms is indicated in
24 Table 4. Twelve patients with PPI scores ≥ 6 survived for less than 3 weeks, while 22
25 patients with PPI scores ≥ 4 survived for less than 6 weeks (Tables 5, 6). Three-week
26 survival was predicted with a sensitivity of 55% (95% CI, 33–75), a specificity of 79%
27 (95% CI, 66–91), a positive predictive value of 57%, and a negative predictive value of
28 77%. Six-week survival was predicted with a sensitivity of 63% (95% CI, 46–78), a
29 specificity of 77% (95% CI, 61–91), a positive predictive value of 77%, and a negative
30 predictive value of 64% (Table 7).

31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 Discussion

47
48
49 The most important finding of this study was that the sensitivity of the PPI for advanced
50 cancer patients in the home care setting was lower than for advanced cancer patients in
51 palliative care units as previously reported.⁷⁾ To the best of our knowledge, this study is
52 the first to clarify the usefulness of the PPI for advanced cancer patients in the home
53 care setting. It demonstrated the sensitivity and specificity of the PPI as a prognostic
54 prediction tool for 3- and 6-week survival. Our findings suggest limitations of the PPI in
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 this population and setting.
7

8 One possible reason for the discrepancy in PPI sensitivity between advanced cancer
9 patients in palliative care units and those in the home care setting is the differential
10 prevalence of delirium, which is the most heavily weighted score in the PPI scoring
11 system. In our study, the prevalence of delirium in the home care setting was 9.2%,
12 whereas Morita et al.⁷⁾ reported a prevalence of 23% in the hospice setting. This
13 discrepancy suggests 2 possibilities: 1) The prevalence of delirium in the hospice setting
14 may in fact be higher than that in the home care setting,^{9,10)} or 2) we might have
15 underestimated the prevalence of delirium because we diagnosed it only by
16 retrospective chart review.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 In addition to the results above, we found the specificity of PPI for advanced cancer
30 patients in the home care setting to be nearly 80% in our study for both 3- and 6-week
31 survival. These results suggest that the PPI might not be useful as a screening tool for
32 poor prognosis in the home care setting because of its low sensitivity, but might be
33 useful with PPI scores <4, predicting survival longer than 6 weeks, and with PPI scores
34 <6, predicting survival longer than 3 weeks.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 This study has several limitations. First, it was carried out in one institution and the
44 study population was small, restricting the generalizability of our results. Second, one
45 researcher (JH) was aware of each patient's prognosis before performing the medical
46 chart review, making it impossible to confirm the absence of bias during data collection.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 However, because the PPI score is defined based on objective indicators, this limitation
54 most likely had only a relatively small effect on the study outcome. Third, since this
55 study was carried out retrospectively, we cannot be certain that patients' symptoms and
56 signs were recorded correctly at the first home visit.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 In conclusion, this study showed that the PPI had a lower sensitivity for advanced
7
8 cancer patients in the home care setting than for those in palliative care units. Further
9
10 research is needed to develop more accurate prognostic prediction tools for use in the
11
12 home care setting.
13

14
15 **Declaration of Conflicting Interests:** The author(s) declared no conflicts of interest
16
17 with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.
18

19
20 **Funding:** The author(s) received no financial support for the research and/or authorship
21
22 of this article.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Palliative Prognostic Index

		score
Palliative Performance Scale	10%–20%	4
	30%–50%	2.5
	60%	0
Oral intake	Severely reduced	2.5
	Moderately reduced	1
	Normal	0
Edema	Present	1
	Absent	0
Dyspnea at rest	Present	3.5
	Absent	0
Delirium	Present	4
	Absent	0

Overall PPI score was calculated by adding each component score

Table 2. Patient background information (n = 65)

		n	(%)
Gender	Male	41	(63.0)
	Female	24	(37.0)
Mean age (years) †		73.5	(35–96)
Mean survival duration (days) †		55.0	(1–344)
Age distribution	35–49	2	(3.1)
	50–59	7	(10.8)
	60–69	11	(16.9)
	70–79	25	(38.4)
	80–89	14	(21.5)
	90-	6	(9.2)
Primary cancer site	Stomach/Esophagus	12	(18.4)
	Lung	11	(16.9)
	Colon/rectum/anus	11	(16.9)
	Pancreas	7	(10.8)
	Prostate	4	(6.2)
	Kidney/bladder	4	(6.2)
	Liver	3	(4.6)
	Breast	3	(4.6)
	Biliary system	3	(4.6)
Unknown	3	(4.6)	
	Others	4	(6.2)
Survival duration	0 ≤ week < 1	11	(16.9)
	1 ≤ week < 2	8	(12.3)
	2 ≤ week < 3	3	(4.6)
	3 ≤ week < 4	7	(10.8)
	4 ≤ week < 5	2	(3.0)
	5 ≤ week < 6	4	(6.2)
	6 ≤ week < 7	7	10.8
	7 ≤ week < 8	0	(0.0)
	8 ≤ week < 9	3	(4.6)
	9 ≤ week	20	(30.7)

† Mean (range)

Table 3. Distribution of PPI scores (n = 65)

score	n	(%)
0	3	(4.6)
$1 \leq \text{PPI} \leq 2$	4	(6.2)
$\text{PPI} = 2.5$	6	(9.2)
$3.5 \leq \text{PPI} < 4$	23	(35.4)
$4 \leq \text{PPI} < 6$	8	(12.3)
$6 \leq \text{PPI} \leq 8$	13	(20.0)
$8.5 \leq \text{PPI} \leq 10$	3	(4.6)
$10.5 \leq \text{PPI} \leq 12$	5	(7.7)
$\text{PPI} \geq 12.5$	0	(0.0)

For Peer Review

Table 4. Patient performance status and symptoms (n = 65)

		n	(%)
Palliative Performance Scale	10%–20%	6	(9.2)
	30%–50%	51	(78.5)
	60%	8	(12.3)
Oral intake	Severely reduced	11	(16.9)
	Moderately reduced	36	(60)
	Normal	15	(23.1)
Edema	Present	22	(33.8)
	Absent	43	(66.2)
Dyspnea at rest	Present	14	(21.5)
	Absent	51	(78.5)
Delirium	Present	6	(9.2)
	Absent	59	(90.8)

Table 5. PPI score and 3-week survival

	<3-week survival	≥3-week survival	Total
PPI≥6	12□	9	21
PPI<6	10	34	44
Total	22	43	65

□ Number of patients surviving <3 weeks with PPI scores >6

For Peer Review

Table 6. PPI score and 6-week survival

	<6-week survival	≥6-week survival	Total
PPI≥4	22□	7	29
PPI<4	13	23	36
Total	35	30	65

□ Number of patients surviving <6 weeks with PPI scores >4

For Peer Review

Table 7. Accuracy of the PPI for advanced cancer patients in the home care setting

	<3 weeks (%)	<6 weeks (%)
Sensitivity	54.5	62.8
Specificity	79.0	76.6
Positive Predictive Value	57.1	75.8
Negative Predictive Value	77.2	63.8

For Peer Review

References

- 1) Glare, P. A., & Sinclair, C. T. Palliative medicine review: prognostication. *Journal of palliative medicine*. 2008;11(1), 84-103.
- 2) Steinhauser, K. E., Christakis, N. A., Clipp, E. C, et al. Preparing for the end of life: preferences of patients, families, physicians, and other care providers. *Journal of pain and symptom management*. 2001;22(3), 727-37.
- 3) Lau, F., Cloutier-Fisher, D., Kuziemy, C., Black, F., Downing, M., Borycki, E., & Ho, F. A systematic review of prognostic tools for estimating survival time in palliative care. *Journal of palliative care*. 2007;23(2), 93-112.
- 4) Glare, P. A., Eychmueller, S., & McMahon, P. Diagnostic accuracy of the palliative prognostic score in hospitalized patients with advanced cancer. *Journal of clinical oncology*. 2004;22(23), 4823-8.
- 5) Hyodo I, Morita T, Adachi I, et al. Development of a predicting tool for survival of terminally ill cancer patients. *Japanese journal of clinical oncology*. 2010;40(5):442-8.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 6) Gwilliam B, Keeley V, Todd C, et al. Development of Prognosis in Palliative care
8
9
10 Study (PiPS) predictor models to improve prognostication in advanced cancer:
11
12 prospective cohort study. *BMJ (Clinical research ed.)*. 2011;343:d4920.
13
14
15
16 7) Morita T, Tsunoda J, Inoue S, Chihara S. The Palliative Prognostic Index: a scoring
17
18 system for survival prediction of terminally ill cancer patients. *Support Care Cancer*.
19
20 1999;7(3):128-133.
21
22
23
24
25 8) Stone, C. A., E. Tiernan, et al. Prospective validation of the palliative prognostic
26
27 index in patients with cancer. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2008;35(6): 617-22
28
29
30
31 9) Morita T, Akechi T, Ikenaga M, et al. Terminal delirium: recommendations from
32
33 bereaved families' experiences. *Journal of pain and symptom management*.
34
35 2007;34(6):579-89.
36
37
38
39
40 10) Boorsma M, Joling KJ, Frijters DHM, et al. The prevalence, incidence and risk
41
42 factors for delirium in Dutch nursing homes and residential care homes.
43
44
45
46
47 *International journal of geriatric psychiatry*. 2011.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60