

Quality of Life of NHL Survivors in England

Findings from the 2011 pilot Department of Health Patient Reported Outcomes Measure (PROMs) Survey

Jo Partington, Survivorship Lead; DH 27th September 2012



Background

- Growing prevalence of cancer 3.2% per annum; 3.4 million by 2030
- Unmet needs
- Late morbidity recognised little population based data for adults
- Growing literature on late effects
- Very few cancer PROMs for survivors
- Addressing these issues should benefit the health and social care economy in the future
- Aim to be able to compare quality of health of those living with, and beyond, cancer with other long term conditions



Objective of Cancer PROMS programme

- To embed routine collection of PROMs within core business of cancer services
- By using PROMs to
- Describe the quality of survival
- Identify the consequences of survival/treatment and impact on function
- Enable the provision of appropriate health & social care services
- Compare outcomes by service provider organisations



Patients in 2011 pilot PROMs

- From 4 cancer groups (breast, colorectal, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and prostate)
- 4 time points (1, 2, 3 and 5 years post diagnosis)
- Patients were identified from 3 cancer registries ECRIC,WMCIU and TCR
- Around 300 patients with each cancer, and at each time point were surveyed (total 4992)
- Around 200 patients in each cancer/time group responded, with 3300 respondents in total (response rate 68%, plus high completion rates)





Survey content

- Demographics and treatment details (self report)
- Disease status (remission, relapse, uncertain)
- Long term conditions
- Generic quality of life (EQ5D)
- Physical activity
- Social Difficulties Inventory
- Experience of care
- Psychological issues
- Work status
- Tumour specific questions (Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy)

Average – c.70 questions (breast 66;prostate 70;NHL 71;colorectal 72)







Demographics of all respondents (n=3300)

- Median age 69 years (range 36-102)
- Males 52%; Females 46%; Missing 2%
- White 90.4%; Non-white 6.3%; Missing 3.3%
- Socioeconomic status
 - Least deprived 25% (n=826)
 - Most deprived 12% (n=399)
- Almost equal numbers by time since diagnosis
- Presence of long term conditions:
 - Yes = 55%; No = 38%; Not reported = 7%
- Remission status (self-report):
 - Remission 67%; Disease present 17%; Uncertain 17%





Demographics of NHL respondents n=778

• Age

<55y 20% 55-64y 22% 65-74y 31% 75-84y 22% 85+y 5%

- Males 54%; Female 45%; Missing 1%
- White 88%; Non-white 8%; Missing 4%
- Socioeconomic status
 - Least deprived 26% (n=202)
 - Most deprived 12% (n=91)
- Almost equal numbers by time since diagnosis 25%, 24%, 27%, 24%
- Long term conditions:
 - Yes = 56%; No = 37%; Not reported =7 % (don't know 4%; missing 3%)
- Remission status (self-report):
 - Remission 68%; Disease present 10%; Uncertain 12%





Quality of life (EQ5D) for all respondents: Individual domains

	No problems	Slight problems	Moderate problems	Severe/extre me problems
Mobility	60%	16%	14%	8%
Self care	81%	8%	6%	2%
Usual activities	57%	19%	14%	8%
Pain	51%	28%	13%	6%
Anxiety/depression	61%	24%	10%	3%

(Figures rounded. Missing around 2% on each item)





NHL Quality of life (EQ5D): Individual domains

	No problems	Slight problems	Moderate problems	Severe/ extreme problems
Mobility	60% <u>55%</u>	16%	14%	8%
Self care	81%	8% <u>8%</u>	6%	2%
Usual activities	57%	19%	14%	8%
Pain	51%	28%	13% <u>15%</u>	6%
Anxiety/depression	61%	24%	10%	3%
	(Figu	res rounded.	Missing around 2%	on each item)

Merged cohort data in normal font <u>NHL</u> data in <u>Bold</u>





Quality of life: EQ5D summary score

	"High"	"Medium"	"Low"	Missing
Total (n=3300)	32	53	10	5
Breast (208)	24	60	9	7
Colorectal (255)	31	54	11	3
NHL (247)	32	51	13	4
Prostate (347)	40	45	9	6
Patients in remission (n=222	7)			
No LTC (848)	51	44	2	2
1 LTC (691)	36	55	6	3
2+ LTCs (688)	19	61	17	3
Patients not in remission (n=	:822)			
No LTC (233)	34	56	6	4
1 LTC (277)	23	63	9	5
2+ LTCs (312)	12	53	30	5





Factors associated with poor quality of life (EQ5D) – all respondents

- Number of concurrent long term conditions (OR No LTC = 1; 1 LTC = 1.8; 2+ LTCs = 7.3)
- Disease status (OR remission = 1; Recurrence = 4.7; Not sure = 2.5)
- Deprivation (OR Quintile 1 = 1; Quintiles 2-4 = N/S; Quintiles 5 = 3.0)
- Time since diagnosis (NOT significant)
- Age

(65-74 year olds have best QOL)

- Physical activity (The more, the better QOL)
- Ethnicity (NOT significant)





Fear of recurrence and dying – all respondents

Time since diagnosis	Fear of recurrence (%)	Fear of dying (%)
1 year	51.5	30.2
2 years	48.3	27.9
3 years	46.7	26.6
5 years	42.5	22.2
Total	47.3	26.8





No activity

27.4%

31.5%

27.4%

33.5%

Physical activity – all respondents

 Overall: 21.4% of respondents reported taking 30 minutes of physical activity at least five days a week (in line with Government recommended level), but 29.8% reported doing no physical activity



 Higher physical activity levels were associated with better QOL, but...





NHL and QoL

- Physical activity
 - Significant positive association between increasing physical activity and QoL
 - Each additional day of physical activity reduced the odds of poorer QoL by 9% (OR 0.91, 95% CI 0.84,0.98)
- LTCs
 - Presence of 1 or "2 or more" LTCs significantly associated with poorer QoL





Quality of life – Comparisons with other studies

	Median age	"High"	"Medium"	"Low"
Cancer pilot PROMS				
- All patients	69 years	32%	53%	11%
- In remission & no LTC	63 years	53%	44%	2%
Health Survey England	48 years	54%	39%	7%
	<u>></u> 45 years	45%	46%	9%
GP Patient Survey				
- All patients	48 years	51%	42%	8%
- No LTC	39 years	74%	25%	1%





Discussion (1)

- Measuring quality of life in cancer survivors in the community, on a population-basis who are 1-5 years post diagnosis, is feasible and acceptable to patients. "Proof of Principle" established
- Although this was a pilot study, it is the largest European survey of cancer survivors involving multiple cancer types, at defined time points, post diagnosis.
- On the summary EQ5D measure
 - Around one third are scored as having 'high' QOL
 - Around one half are scored as having 'medium' QOL
 - Around 10% are scored as having 'low' QOL





Discussion (2)

- QOL changed surprisingly little over time since diagnosis (though fear of recurrence/dying decreased)
- QOL is closely associated with disease status and presence of other long term conditions (LTC)
- Amongst those who were in remission with no LTC
 - Over half had 'high' QOL
 - 44% had 'medium' QOL
 - Only 2% had 'low' QOL
- Comparisons with normative data from other surveys using EQ5D are difficult because of age differences





Next Steps

- Follow up, longitudinal survey of the 2011 respondents just closing. 85% response rate overall; for NHL 79% at 1yr –> 89% at 5 years
- 4 x pilot pelvic cancer PROMs being developed bladder, cervix, ovary and uterus will be rolled out in early 2013
- 1 x national colo-rectal PROM will be rolled out in early 2013
- Presentation being made to central PROMs steering group 28/09/12 including recommendation of 3rd data collection point for the 2011 cohort, including NHL, in July 2013





Thank You for Listening

Any Questions?

Please direct them to "Adam.Glaser@leedsth.nhs.uk"

