Image directed redesign of bladder cancer treatment pathways: the BladderPath RCT

Nicholas James,^{1*} Sarah Pirrie,² Wenyu Liu,² James Catto,³ Kieran Jefferson,⁴ Prashant Patel,⁵ Ana Hughes,² Ann Pope,² Veronica Nanton,⁶ Harriet P Mintz,^{2,7} Allen Knight,⁸ Jean Gallagher⁸ and Richard T Bryan⁹

¹Institute of Cancer Research, London, UK

- ²Cancer Research Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Cancer and Genomic Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- ³Department of Urology, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK
- ⁴Department of Urology, University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust, Coventry, UK
- ⁵Institute of Cancer and Genomic Sciences, University of Birmingham, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK
- ⁶Medical School, University of Warwick, Warwick, UK
- ⁷Medical School, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- ⁸Patient and Public Involvement Representatives, Gallagher, Bradford Knight, Basingstoke, UK
- ⁹Bladder Cancer Research Centre, Institute of Cancer and Genomic Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

*Corresponding author nick.james@icr.ac.uk

Published August 2024 DOI: 10.3310/DEHT5407

Plain language summary

Image directed redesign of bladder cancer treatment pathways: the BladderPath RCT

Health Technology Assessment 2024; Vol. 28: No. 42 DOI: 10.3310/DEHT5407

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain language summary

The BladderPath trial explored how to accelerate diagnosis and avoid unnecessary surgery for patients with bladder cancer which had grown into the muscle wall of the bladder, referred to as muscle-invasive bladder cancer.

Following initial outpatient diagnosis, bladder cancer patients currently undergo inpatient or day-case surgical tumour removal using a telescope (transurethral resection of bladder tumour). This surgery is fundamental to the treatment of early bladder cancer (non-muscle-invasive). However, for muscle-invasive disease, the main role of transurethral resection of bladder tumour is to confirm that the tumour has grown into the bladder muscle, and this is often inaccurate; the actual correct treatment for muscle-invasive bladder cancer patients should include chemotherapy, radiotherapy and/or bladder removal. For these patients, having transurethral resection of bladder tumour may delay this correct treatment and impact survival. Additionally, for patients determined to need palliative care due to advanced disease, the transurethral resection of bladder tumour may represent over-treatment.

A magnetic resonance imaging scan with contrast agent (called multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging) gives a clearer picture of the bladder than normal scans, allowing distinction between invasive and non-invasive tumours. The BladderPath trial investigated adding multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging for patients with suspected muscle-invasive bladder cancer and the effect on treatment times. Subsequent therapy could include transurethral resection of bladder tumour if clinically determined as necessary by the treating team.

Trial participants were randomly allocated either to the standard pathway (Pathway 1: all underwent transurethral resection of bladder tumour) or to a new pathway (Pathway 2). In Pathway 2, urologists conducting the initial outpatient diagnostic bladder inspections used a scale to assess whether tumours appeared to be either probably non-muscle-invasive or possibly muscle-invasive. Participants whose tumours appeared possibly muscle-invasive had initial multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging as their next investigation instead of transurethral resection of bladder tumour. We then compared the duration of time from initial diagnosis to receiving the correct treatment for participants in each pathway.

Of the 143 participants, 75 (52.1%) were diagnosed as possibly muscle invasive. In Pathway 1, the duration for half of the participants in the group to have received their correct treatment for muscle-invasive bladder cancer was 98 days, which reduced to 53 days in Pathway 2. Furthermore, the duration for half of all the participants in the two groups to have received their correct treatment was 37 days for Pathway 1 and 31 days for Pathway 2.

In summary, use of initial multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging in suspected muscle-invasive bladder cancer participants substantially reduced the time to correct treatment (surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy or instigation of palliative care) and avoided unnecessary surgery. There was no negative impact on participants with non-invasive disease. Adopting multiparametric magnetic resonance imaging into the pathway ahead of transurethral resection of bladder tumour for patients with suspected muscle-invasive bladder cancer is recommended.

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.6

A list of Journals Library editors can be found on the NIHR Journals Library website

Launched in 1997, *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) has an impact factor of 3.6 and is ranked 32nd (out of 105 titles) in the 'Health Care Sciences & Services' category of the Clarivate 2022 Journal Citation Reports (Science Edition). It is also indexed by MEDLINE, CINAHL (EBSCO Information Services, Ipswich, MA, USA), EMBASE (Elsevier, Amsterdam, the Netherlands), NCBI Bookshelf, DOAJ, Europe PMC, the Cochrane Library (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, USA), INAHTA, the British Nursing Index (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA), Ulrichsweb[™] (ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) and the Science Citation Index Expanded[™] (Clarivate[™], Philadelphia, PA, USA).

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta.

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Manuscripts are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

This article

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as award number 14/08/60. The contractual start date was in April 2016. The draft manuscript began editorial review in February 2023 and was accepted for publication in September 2023. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' manuscript and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this article.

This article presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, these of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

This article was published based on current knowledge at the time and date of publication. NIHR is committed to being inclusive and will continually monitor best practice and guidance in relation to terminology and language to ensure that we remain relevant to our stakeholders.

Copyright © 2024 James *et al.* This work was produced by James *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This is an Open Access publication distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY 4.0 licence, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, reproduction and adaptation in any medium and for any purpose provided that it is properly attributed. See: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. For attribution the title, original author(s), the publication source – NIHR Journals Library, and the DOI of the publication must be cited.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Newgen Digitalworks Pvt Ltd, Chennai, India (www.newgen.co).