

EUR Research Information Portal

Treatment Patterns and Differences in Survival of Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients Between Academic and Non-Academic Hospitals in the Netherlands

Published in:
Clinical Lung Cancer

Publication status and date:
Published: 01/01/2017

DOI (link to publisher):
[10.1016/j.clcc.2015.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clcc.2015.11.011)

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Document License/Available under:
Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

Citation for the published version (APA):
van der Linden, N., Bongers, ML., Coupe, VMH., Smit, EF., Groen, HJM., Welling, A., Schramel, F., & Groot, C. (2017). Treatment Patterns and Differences in Survival of Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients Between Academic and Non-Academic Hospitals in the Netherlands. *Clinical Lung Cancer*, 18(5), E341-E347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clcc.2015.11.011>
[Link to publication on the EUR Research Information Portal](#)

Terms and Conditions of Use

Except as permitted by the applicable copyright law, you may not reproduce or make this material available to any third party without the prior written permission from the copyright holder(s). Copyright law allows the following uses of this material without prior permission:

- you may download, save and print a copy of this material for your personal use only;
- you may share the EUR portal link to this material.

In case the material is published with an open access license (e.g. a Creative Commons (CC) license), other uses may be allowed. Please check the terms and conditions of the specific license.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this material infringes your copyright and/or any other intellectual property rights, you may request its removal by contacting us at the following email address: openaccess.library@eur.nl. Please provide us with all the relevant information, including the reasons why you believe any of your rights have been infringed. In case of a legitimate complaint, we will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website.



Treatment Patterns and Differences in Survival of Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer Patients Between Academic and Non-Academic Hospitals in the Netherlands

Naomi van der Linden,¹ Mathilda L. Bongers,² Veerle M.H. Coupé,² Egbert F. Smit,^{3,4} Harry J.M. Groen,⁵ Alle Welling,⁶ Franz M.N.H. Schramel,⁷ Carin A. Uyl-de Groot⁸

Abstract

Non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) survival is compared between patients treated in all academic (n = 1289) versus all non-academic (n = 12,698) Dutch hospitals, using Kaplan-Meier estimates and a Cox proportional hazards model. For 1009 patients, treatment patterns are described. Diagnosis in an academic hospital is associated with decreased mortality. Possibilities for improvement of NSCLC care are suggested.

Background: The aims of this study are to analyze differences in survival between academic and non-academic hospitals and to provide insight into treatment patterns for non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). Results show the state of NSCLC survival and care in the Netherlands. **Methods:** The Netherlands Cancer Registry provided data on NSCLC survival for all Dutch hospitals. We used the Kaplan-Meier estimate to calculate median survival time by hospital type and a Cox proportional hazards model to estimate the relative risk of mortality (expressed as hazard ratios) for patients diagnosed in academic versus non-academic hospitals, with adjustment for age, gender, and tumor histology, and stratifying for disease stage. Data on treatment patterns in Dutch hospitals was obtained from 4 hospitals (2 academic, 2 non-academic). A random sample of patients diagnosed with NSCLC from January 2009 until January 2011 was identified through hospital databases. Data was obtained on patient characteristics, tumor characteristics, and treatments. **Results:** The Cox proportional hazards model shows a significantly decreased hazard ratio of mortality for patients diagnosed in academic hospitals, as opposed to patients diagnosed in non-academic hospitals. This is specifically true for primary radiotherapy patients and patients who receive systemic treatment for non-metastasized NSCLC. **Conclusion:** Patients diagnosed in academic hospitals have better median overall survival than patients diagnosed in non-academic hospitals, especially for patients treated with radiotherapy, systemic treatment, or combinations. This difference may be caused by residual confounding since the estimates were not adjusted for performance status. A wide variety of surgical, radiotherapeutic, and systemic treatments is prescribed.

Clinical Lung Cancer, Vol. 18, No. 5, e341-7 © 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Academic medical centers, Cancer registry, General hospitals, Mortality, Therapy

N.v.d.L. and M.L.B. contributed equally to this work as first authors.

¹Centre for Health Economics Research and Evaluation, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia

²Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

³Pulmonology, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁴Department of Thoracic Oncology, Netherlands Cancer Institute, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

⁵Department of Pulmonary Diseases, University of Groningen and University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

⁶Department of Pulmonology, Medical Center Alkmaar, Alkmaar, the Netherlands

⁷Department of Pulmonology, St. Antonius Hospital, Nieuwegein, the Netherlands

⁸Institute for Medical Technology Assessment, Erasmus University, Rotterdam, the Netherlands

Submitted: Aug 4, 2015; Revised: Nov 22, 2015; Accepted: Nov 23, 2015; Epub: Nov 30, 2015

Address for correspondence: Naomi van der Linden, PhD, Centre for Health Economics Research and Evaluation, University of Technology Sydney, Level 2, Building 5 Block D, 1-59 Quay St, Haymarket NSW 2000, Australia
E-mail contact: naomi.vanderlinden@chere.uts.edu.au

Introduction

Incidence as well as mortality from lung cancer is relatively high in the Netherlands. In 2012, lung cancer incidence was 66.1 males and 44.5 females per 100,000 person years (European Standardised Rates). Lung cancer mortality was 59.6 males and 35.6 females per 100,000 person years.¹ Since 1989, the incidence of smoking-related lung tumors decreased in men and increased in women (all subgroups).²

More than 85% of lung cancers are from the non-small cell type.³ Patients in early stage of disease (stage I-II) that are eligible for surgery have a relatively good prognosis. Even so, the estimated 5-year survival for early stage patients is only between 45% and 50%. Unfortunately, only 20% of the patients are eligible for a tumor resection. For patients that are ineligible for resection, stereotactic radiotherapy is the best alternative for surgery, that is, if no locoregional metastases are present and the tumor is located centrally.⁴

Alternatively, concurrent chemoradiotherapy is the standard treatment option for inoperable non-metastatic patients. There is evidence from a meta-analysis that radiotherapy with concurrent chemotherapy reduces locally recurrent disease and mortality compared with sequential chemoradiotherapy.⁵ In the absence of distant metastases, these patients have a 5-year survival of 5% to 30%. Patients in advanced stage of disease (stage IV) are treated with combinations of chemotherapeutic agents or targeted therapy. The 5-year survival is 1%.⁶

Over time, the application of therapy that is currently considered as standard has improved in the Netherlands.⁷ However, within the Netherlands, differences exist between hospitals with respect to prescribed therapies and survival of patients with non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC). For patients diagnosed with stage I and II NSCLC in 2001 to 2006, the probability of tumor resection increased with the surgical experience (lung resection volume) of the hospital as well as the available expertise.⁸ Therefore, various conditions have been agreed upon in order to concentrate lung resections in specialized centers.⁹

For stage III NSCLC, the probability of receiving combination treatment in the Netherlands was highly dependent on the hospital as well, but no correlation was demonstrated with defined structural hospital characteristics such as teaching status or the availability of radiotherapy facilities.⁸ The same was true for the probability of receiving chemotherapy for stage IV NSCLC.¹⁰ Unfortunately, it was not reported whether and how treatment variability between hospitals affected overall survival.

Apart from the minimum surgical volumes, broader standards exist for Dutch hospitals treating patients with lung carcinoma. They include requirements regarding (multidisciplinary) staff composition and available facilities.¹¹ Furthermore, a Dutch evidence-based guideline for the diagnosis and treatment of NSCLC exists and (modular) revisions are performed regularly to ensure actuality.⁴

Despite efforts to standardize NSCLC treatments across the Netherlands, differences may exist in diagnostic and treatment patterns between hospitals and may result in differences in survival. The aims of this study are to analyze differences in survival between academic and non-academic hospitals and to provide the reader with

more information regarding NSCLC treatment patterns in the Netherlands. Current results will show the state of NSCLC survival and care in the Netherlands.

Materials and Methods

Patients and Data

NSCLC survival is analyzed based on population-based data from patients treated in any of the 84 Dutch hospitals. NSCLC treatment patterns are described based on a selection of patients from 4 Dutch hospitals. Both study populations are described below.

Population-based NCR (Netherlands Cancer Registry) data was used to analyze survival differences between academic and non-academic hospitals. The NCR provided data on all patients diagnosed with NSCLC between January 2009 until January 2011, as identified through the automated pathological archive (PALGA) and The National Registry of Hospital Discharge Diagnoses. Clinical information was manually abstracted from medical records and coded by trained NCR data managers, using a national manual and case report form. Data was obtained on patient characteristics, tumor characteristics, primary treatment, and overall survival. Hospital type (academic vs. non-academic) represents the type of hospital of diagnosis as registered in the NCR.

Detailed data on treatment patterns in Dutch hospitals was not available from the NCR and was therefore obtained from a convenience sample of 4 not randomly selected hospitals, based on previous research bonds. Two of the 4 hospitals were academic and 2 were non-academic, large teaching hospitals. A random sample of unselected patients diagnosed with NSCLC between January 31, 2009, and January 31, 2011, was identified through the four hospital databases. This sample included patients who were referred to 1 of the 4 selected hospitals from elsewhere, but did not receive treatment before. The random selection was performed by listing all NSCLC patients in Microsoft Excel, randomizing their order and including them from the top. Clinical data was manually abstracted from medical records and coded by trained data assistants, using a web-based case report form. Data was obtained on patient characteristics, tumor characteristics, and treatments. Data from the NCR was used to validate tumor histology and disease stage collected from the 4 hospital databases.

Selected tumor histologies included ICD-O (International Classification of Diseases for Oncology) codes 8010 to 8035, 8046 to 8230, 8244 to 8246 and 8250 to 8576 (all NSCLC). Presence of distant metastasis was recorded following the NSCLC stage classification system in use at diagnosis of the tumor, being either the sixth (2009) or the seventh (2010, 2011) TNM edition. However, TNM stage can change during the diagnostic period, can differ between clinicians, and cannot always reliably be obtained from patient charts. This was a limitation of both the data we collected and the NCR data, which we used to validate our stage information. We therefore decided not to separate stages I-III in order to minimize potential misclassification.

As our study design is not subject to the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act, the Medical Research Ethics Committee of VU University Medical Center exempted the study from ethical appraisal. Informed consent was not required for chart review.

Statistical Analyses

All analyses were performed in IBM SPSS Statistics 21. We compared overall survival for patients diagnosed in academic hospitals and patients diagnosed in non-academic hospitals, for the following groups: (1) patients with non-metastatic NSCLC; (2) patients with metastatic NSCLC; (3) patients treated with primary surgery for non-metastatic NSCLC; (4) patients treated with primary surgery for metastatic NSCLC; (5) patients treated with primary radiotherapy for non-metastatic NSCLC; (6) patients treated with primary radiotherapy for metastatic NSCLC; (7) patients treated with primary systemic treatment for non-metastatic NSCLC; (8) patients treated with primary systemic treatment for metastatic NSCLC; and (9) NSCLC patients who did not receive anti-tumor treatment.

We used Kaplan-Meier methods to estimate overall survival rates by hospital type and Cox proportional hazards models to estimate the relative risk of mortality (expressed as hazard ratios [HRs]) and their 95% confidence intervals per hospital type, with all non-academic hospitals as the reference group, with and without adjustment for age, gender, and tumor histology and stratifying for disease stage at diagnosis (M0 or M+).

We used descriptive analyses to report treatment patterns. Treatments were allocated to the categories “aimed at non-metastasized disease” or “aimed at metastasized disease” dependent on disease stage (M0 or M+) at treatment start. Treatments were classified to be either surgery, radiotherapy, systemic treatment (including chemotherapy and targeted therapies), or combinations of the above. Chemoradiation was defined as definitive radiotherapy combined with concurrent or sequential systemic treatment.

Results

Baseline Characteristics

Survival was analyzed for the complete Dutch population included in the NCR. This population included 13,992 patients fulfilling the selection criteria, 1289 (9%) of whom were diagnosed in academic hospitals. Treatments were analyzed for a sample of patients from 4 selected hospitals. This sample included 1067 patients. Fifty-eight patients (5.4%) were excluded because they came for a second opinion only. Only limited information was available about these patients, since they were treated in other hospitals than the 4 study hospitals. The distribution of the remaining 1009 patients over the study hospitals was 556 patients in academic versus 453 patients in non-academic hospitals.

Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of both study populations. Within the total Dutch population, 9% of patients were diagnosed in academic hospitals as opposed to non-academic hospitals. In these academic hospitals, there were less elderly patients (over 75 years of age; n = 239 [19%] vs. n = 3275 [26%] in non-academic hospitals), less squamous cell carcinomas (n = 327 [25%] vs. n = 3734 [29%]), and less large cell carcinomas (n = 125 [10%] vs. n = 1757 [14%]), as opposed to adenocarcinomas (n = 649 [51%] vs. n = 5572 [44%]). In the academic hospitals, relatively many patients (n = 644 [50%]) were diagnosed with stage < IV NSCLC, though not as many as in the 4 selected hospitals (n = 616 [61%]).

Distributions of age, gender, and tumor histology in the 4 selected hospitals are similar to these distributions in the total Dutch population. The total Dutch population also includes the patients from the 4 selected hospitals. In the 4 selected hospitals, a relatively

Table 1 Baseline Characteristics

	Total Dutch Population 2009-2011 N (%)	Dutch Population, Patients Diagnosed in Academic Hospitals, 2009-2011 N (%)	Dutch Population, Patients Diagnosed in Non-Academic Hospitals, 2009-2011 N (%)	Population in 4 Selected Hospitals (2 Academic, 2 Non-Academic), 2009-2011 N (%)
Total patients	13,992 (100) ^a	1289 (100)	12,698 (100)	1009 (100)
Age (years)				
<60	3566 (26)	391 (30)	3175 (25)	272 (27)
60-74	6910 (49)	659 (51)	6248 (49)	501 (50)
≥75	3516 (25)	239 (19)	3275 (26)	236 (23)
Gender				
Male	8841 (63)	780 (61)	8059 (64)	660 (65) ^b
Histology				
Adenocarcinoma	6222 (45)	649 (51)	5572 (44)	490 (49)
Squamous cell carcinoma	4062 (29)	327 (25)	3734 (29)	256 (25)
Large cell carcinoma	1884 (14)	125 (10)	1757 (14)	101 (10)
Other histology	407 (3)	48 (4)	358 (3)	33 (3)
Unknown	1417 (10)	140 (11)	1277 (10)	129 (13)
Clinical stage				
Stage <IV	6552 (47)	644 (50)	5904 (47)	616 (61)
Stage IV	6887 (49)	588 (46)	6298 (50)	363 (36)
Unknown	553 (4)	57 (4)	496 (4)	30 (3)

^aFor 5 patients, hospital type was not registered.

^bFor one patient, gender was not registered.

Treatment Patterns in Dutch Lung Cancer Care

high proportion of tumors were classified as clinical stage < IV (n = 616 [61%] vs. n = 6552 [47%]), mainly due to referrals from other hospitals for specialized treatments. Note that the patients from the 4 selected hospitals could be diagnosed elsewhere, as long as they did not receive treatment there. In addition to the 363 patients diagnosed with stage IV NSCLC at baseline in the 4 study hospitals, 113 patients initially had other stage disease that metastasized during our study period.

Unfortunately, World Health Organization (WHO) performance status and forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1) were often not reported in the medical charts (WHO performance status 80.8% and FEV1 76% not reported; Table 1)

Total Dutch Population and Survival

Table 2 shows the median overall survival of NSCLC patients per hospital and treatment type, not adjusted for case mix. Patients with non-metastasized disease treated in academic hospitals had superior overall survival as compared with patients with non-metastasized disease treated in non-academic hospitals. Survival for patients with metastasized disease was similar in both hospital types.

For non-metastasized as well as metastasized disease, no significant differences were found in overall survival of operated patients between the different hospital types. Patients treated with radiotherapy and/or systemic treatment for non-metastasized disease survived significantly longer when diagnosed in an academic hospital as opposed to a non-academic hospital. For patients treated with palliative radiotherapy for metastasized disease, and for patients who did not receive any antitumor treatment, median overall survival was similar between academic and non-academic hospitals (Table 2).

Cox proportional hazard models show a significantly decreased HR of mortality for patients diagnosed in academic hospitals, as opposed to patients diagnosed in non-academic hospitals. This is

specifically true for primary radiotherapy patients and patients who receive systemic treatment for non-metastasized NSCLC. For primary surgery patients and patients who receive systemic treatment for metastasized NSCLC, no significant differences in mortality existed between hospital types. For patients receiving radiotherapy for metastasized disease, the improved survival in academic hospitals was non-significant when corrected for age, gender, and tumor histology (Table 3).

Treatment Patterns in 4 Selected Hospitals

Surgery Patients. Out of 616 patients with non-metastasized disease, 268 patients (43.5%) were operated in the study hospitals. Including reoperations, a total of 292 surgeries for non-metastasized disease were performed during the 2-year study period. The majority of surgeries were lobectomies (66.1%; n = 193), followed by wedge resections (10.3%; n = 30) and pneumonectomies (7.2%; n = 21). For 148 operated patients (55.2%), surgery was the only antitumor treatment received in the study hospital.

Adjuvant radiotherapy is common in case of R1 or R2 (tumor-positive) resections. In the study hospitals, 7.5% of operated patients (n = 20) received adjuvant radiotherapy within 2 months of attempted surgery. Adjuvant systemic therapy is recommended for stage II-IIIa patients with a good performance score. Unfortunately, it was not known for which proportion of patients adjuvant chemotherapy was indicated in the study hospitals, but it was prescribed within 2 months of the surgery to 48 patients (17.9%). Chemoradiation preceded surgery in 6.0% of cases (n = 16).

Including patients who developed metastasis during the course of their disease (n = 113), 41 patients with metastasized disease were operated (8.6%), receiving a total of 45 operations. Most of these surgeries (n = 24) were non-locoregional (53.3%), mostly targeting the brain (n = 9). A total of 46.7% of surgeries (n = 21) were

Table 2 Median Overall Survival Per Hospital Type Per Treatment, Unadjusted

	Total Dutch Population, ^a 2009-2011	Dutch Population, Patients Diagnosed in Academic Hospitals, 2009-2011	Dutch Population, Patients Diagnosed in Non-Academic Hospitals, 2009-2011
	Median Overall Survival in Years (95% Confidence Interval), N		
Total			
Non-metastasized	1.93 (1.84-2.03), 6552	2.66 (2.14-3.18), 644	1.83 (1.73-1.93), 5904
Metastasized	0.39 (0.38-0.41), 6887	0.41 (0.35-0.48), 588	0.39 (0.38-0.41), 6298
Primary surgery			
Non-metastasized	3.07 (3.02-3.12), ^b 2808	3.16 (3.02-3.30), ^b 321	3.05 (3.00-3.10), ^b 2485
Metastasized	1.55 (0.99-2.12), 157	1.48 (0.12-2.85), 29	1.55 (0.92-2.18), 128
Primary radiotherapy			
Non-metastasized	1.67 (1.59-1.78), 2753	2.11 (1.72-2.50), 278	1.64 (1.55-1.72), 2474
Metastasized	0.43 (0.41-0.46), 2680	0.45 (0.36-0.54), 308	0.43 (0.40-0.46), 2372
Primary systemic treatment			
Non-metastasized	1.71 (1.61-1.81), 2843	2.22 (1.95-2.49), 261	1.66 (1.57-1.76), 2582
Metastasized	0.70 (0.67-0.72), 3518	0.81 (0.74-0.89), 306	0.69 (0.66-0.71), 3211
No antitumor treatment	0.15 (0.14-0.16), 3073	0.10 (0.07-0.14), 211	0.15 (0.14-0.16), 2861

^aIncluding the hospitals for which type was unknown/not registered.

^bThese numbers represent mean instead of median overall survival, since > 50% of patients were still alive at end of follow-up.

Table 3 Crude and Adjusted Hazard Ratios of Mortality for Patients Diagnosed in Academic Hospitals Versus Patients Diagnosed in Non-Academic Hospitals by Treatment Type

	Dutch Population, Diagnosed in Academic Hospitals, 2009-2011			
	Crude HR ^a		Adjusted ^b HR ^a	
	95% CI	Sig	95% CI	Sig
Total				
Non-metastasized	0.755 (0.674-0.845)	0.000	0.775 (0.685-0.876)	0.000
Metastasized	0.876 (0.802-0.956)	0.003	0.892 (0.812-0.980)	0.018
Primary surgery				
Non-metastasized	0.875 (0.711-1.078)	0.210	0.907 (0.733-1.121)	0.364
Metastasized	0.997 (0.591-1.682)	0.992	0.979 (0.564-1.698)	0.940
Primary radiotherapy				
Non-metastasized	0.789 (0.673-0.926)	0.004	0.767 (0.640-0.920)	0.004
Metastasized	0.883 (0.780-0.998)	0.047	0.890 (0.778-1.018)	0.089
Primary systemic treatment				
Non-metastasized	0.808 (0.686-0.952)	0.011	0.787 (0.656-0.942)	0.009
Metastasized	0.887 (0.785-1.003)	0.057	0.894 (0.784-1.019)	0.092
No antitumor treatment	1.046 (0.907-1.206)	0.537	0.980 (0.840-1.144)	0.800

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; HR = hazard ratio; Sig = significance.

^aReference category: Dutch population, patients diagnosed in non-academic hospitals, 2009-2011.

^bModels directly adjusted for age, gender, and tumor histology.

locoregional, most often lobectomy (n = 8) or wedge resection (n = 7).

Radiotherapy Patients. In addition to the 268 patients operated for non-metastasized disease, 142 patients received stereotactic radiotherapy (SBRT). In total, 353 out of 616 patients with non-metastasized disease (57.3%) received any type of radiotherapy, including combined modality treatments. Twenty-five patients received locoregional radiotherapy that was classified as being of palliative intent (n = 25; 7.1%).

Including patients who developed metastasis during the course of their disease (n = 113), 273 patients with metastasized disease were treated with (any) radiotherapy (57.4%, including combined modality treatments), 198 of whom received at least one fraction on a distant metastasis (72.5%).

Patients Treated With Systemic Therapy. A total of 242 patients with non-metastasized NSCLC (39.3%) received systemic treatment in the study hospital (including combined modality treatments). The most commonly prescribed drug regimen for non-metastasized disease was gemcitabine + cisplatin (n = 70; 28.9%). Other common regimens include pemetrexed + cisplatin (n = 59; 24.4%), vinorelbine + cisplatin (n = 24; 9.9%), and etoposide + cisplatin (n = 22; 9.1%).

One hundred thirty-seven patients were registered to receive chemoradiation, defined as systemic treatment with concurrent or sequential definitive, locoregional radiotherapy.

Including patients who developed metastasis during the course of their disease (n = 113), 234 patients with metastasized NSCLC (49.2%) received systemic treatment in the study hospital (including combined modality treatments). For 50.8% of the patients with metastasized disease, no systemic treatment

was prescribed in the study hospital. The most commonly prescribed drug regimen was pemetrexed with platinum (n = 105; 44.9%). Other common regimens include erlotinib (n = 44; 18.8%), gemcitabine + cisplatin (n = 23; 9.8%), docetaxel + carboplatin (n = 22; 9.4%), and docetaxel (n = 19; 8.1%). For patients who did not receive antitumor treatment, reasons are provided below.

Patients Who Did Not Receive Primary Antitumor Treatment (Selected 4 Hospitals). In the selected hospitals, 114 patients (11.3%) did not receive any antitumor treatment. Fourteen out of 114 patients were registered to have received previous treatment in another hospital (n = 5) or to be referred for treatment to another hospital during the study period (n = 9). Fifty-six (56.0%) of the remaining patients without antitumor treatment received supportive care only. An additional 18 patients did not receive antitumor treatment following their own specific wishes (18.0%). Fifteen patients died before treatment was started (15.0%); 4 patients had limited/no treatment options due to comorbidities (4.0%); in 4 cases, a wait and see policy was followed (4.0%); and for 1 patient, treatment for another type of cancer had priority over the symptom-free lung cancer (1.0%). For 2 patients, the reason for not receiving antitumor treatment was not registered.

Discussion

Patients with NSCLC in academic hospitals have better median overall survival than patients with NSCLC in non-academic hospitals. These differences mainly reflect differences in overall survival for patients treated with radiotherapy, systemic treatment, or combinations. No significant differences in overall survival between hospital types were found for the subgroup of patients treated with surgery.

Treatment Patterns in Dutch Lung Cancer Care

The generally improved survival of patients from academic hospitals might be explained by unmeasured confounders. In Cox proportional hazards analyses, HRs were adjusted for age, gender, and tumor histology and stratified for disease stage at diagnosis. However, we did not have the necessary information to correct for other relevant prognostic factors, such as WHO performance status and FEV1. Although performance status is one of the most important prognostic factors, unfortunately it was not recorded for the majority of our study population. Possibly the WHO performance status for patients diagnosed in academic hospitals was relatively good.

Another reason for improved survival in academic hospitals may be a different use of treatments, such as the proportion of patients receiving chemotherapy for metastasized disease. From the current study, it is unknown to what extent this may explain differences in survival. Another explanation may be the higher level of experience available in (generally large) academic centers as well as their pioneer role in adopting innovations. New or improved treatment regimens are usually not uniformly implemented in all hospitals from the start. This can be a matter of (un)awareness or (lack of) available information on the new treatment and outcomes.

If survival differences exist due to differences in experience or expertise, possibilities for improvement exist. Data collection, sharing, self-reflection, and communication between doctors are crucial feedback and improvement tools.¹² Also, further centralization of NSCLC treatments may improve treatment outcomes and reduce variability between hospitals. While literature about differences in treatments and/or survival between hospital types is mostly about surgery, recent innovation in cancer care has been mainly about combining treatment modalities.¹⁰ Therefore, patients may benefit from additional critical assessment of the minimum skills and experience in hospitals prescribing and applying these treatments for NSCLC.¹¹

Obviously, “treatment in an academic hospital” does not automatically mean good quality of care, or the other way around. Academic or non-academic hospital type is probably not the main predictor of treatment or survival differences. Other important factors might be hospital and treatment volume, infrastructure, dedication of multidisciplinary teams, and adoption of innovative treatments.¹⁰

Next to survival of the Dutch NSCLC population, this article describes treatment patterns for patients treated and/or followed for NSCLC in four selected hospitals. Our study as well as other studies¹³ show a multitude of treatments to be prescribed to these patients. Choice of treatment is very much patient- and tumor-dependent. This heterogeneity poses a challenge for economic evaluations, among others in selecting appropriate comparator treatment groups.

It would be interesting to study whether differences in treatment patterns between academic and non-academic hospitals may explain differences in survival. Unfortunately, this was not possible with our data since we did not include a representative sample of academic and non-academic hospitals. The 4 participating hospitals were a convenience sample based on previous research bonds. They are all teaching hospitals, are relatively large, and they employ some of the key opinion leaders in the Dutch field of lung oncology. Therefore, treatment patterns and survival in the 2 non-academic hospitals are probably not representative for non-academic hospitals in the rest of the Netherlands. Furthermore, the survival differences in our sample

do not reflect the survival differences we see between academic and non-academic hospitals on a national level.

A challenge in this study was the registration of disease stages. The TNM staging system was changed to the seventh edition halfway through the study period, so for each patient we used the TNM edition in use at the time the clinician recorded the disease stage in the patient chart. However, the TNM stage can change during the diagnostic period, can differ between clinicians, and cannot always reliably be obtained from patient charts. This was a limitation of both the data we collected and the NCR data, which we used to validate our stage information. We therefore decided not to separate stages I-III, in order to minimize potential misclassification.

In the treatment pattern part of this study, selection bias may have occurred since patients referred to the study hospitals from other hospitals were included. Treatment patterns were presented as such, so they include patients who were referred for specialized treatment. This reduces the generalizability of treatment patterns to other, non-specialized hospitals.

Furthermore, in the treatment pattern part of this study, the follow-up time of this study was relatively short. Since patients were included in the study as they were diagnosed within a 2-year time frame, we collected relatively more data on the early phases of disease. Patients with a relatively good prognosis become censored cases as they survived end of the study follow-up. Therefore, information about later treatment lines for these patients was lacking.

Since the data was collected retrospectively and was subtracted from medical charts, the resulting data was dependent on the patient information obtained by the hospital and on the registration in medical charts. Moreover, some patients were treated in multiple hospitals. Permission to collect and use patient chart data could only be obtained for the 4 study hospitals. Therefore, patients were “lost” and considered “censored” from the moment they were referred to a different hospital than the study hospitals. It would be more insightful to follow patients during their entire disease course, even when multiple hospitals are visited for diagnosis and treatment.

The demand for real-world evidence has increased recently, as policy makers recognize its value in providing information on treatment patterns, treatment effectiveness, and cost-effectiveness. This type of data is important to evaluate the large number of new, mainly targeted, therapies that are expected to be launched in the coming years. This study provides a broad overview of current NSCLC care in the Netherlands.

Conclusions

A wide variety of treatments was prescribed for NSCLC patients. Differences in survival between hospital types suggest possibilities for improvement in NSCLC care in the Netherlands. However, due to limitations of the data from the current study, confirmation by other studies is advised.

Clinical Practice Points

- Treatment of non-small cell lung cancer patients differs between hospitals and may result in differences in survival. In the Netherlands, differences in treatment between hospitals have been shown for surgery for stage I and II disease, combination treatment for stage III, and chemotherapy for stage IV disease.

Standards and guidelines, including minimum treatment volumes, aim to minimize these differences.

- This study shows a significantly decreased hazard ratio of mortality for patients diagnosed in academic hospitals, as opposed to patients diagnosed in non-academic hospitals. Furthermore, detailed treatment patterns are prescribed for a selection of hospitals (2 academic, 2 non-academic). The study provides an overview of current NSCLC care in the Netherlands. It raises questions about the cause of the differences in survival between hospital types and suggests possibilities for improvement in NSCLC care.

Acknowledgments

Funding for this study was provided by GlaxoSmithKline BV. GlaxoSmithKline was not involved with the data collection, data analysis, or reporting.

Disclosure

The authors have stated that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Ferlay J, Steliarova-Foucher E, Lortet-Tieulent J, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality patterns in Europe: Estimates for 40 countries in 2012. *Eur J Cancer* 2013; 49:1374-403.
2. De Jong WK, Schaapveld M, Blaauwgeers JLG, Groen HJM. Pulmonary tumours in the Netherlands: focus on temporal trends in histology and stage and on rare tumours. *Thorax* 2008; 63:1096-102.
3. Netherlands Cancer Registry. Kerncijfers. Available at: <http://cijfersoverkanker.nl/>. Updated 2015. Accessed: May 18, 2015.
4. IKNL/Landelijke Werkgroep Longtumoren. Niet kleincellig longcarcinoom, landelijke richtlijn, versie: 2.1. 2011.
5. Auperin A, Le Pechoux C, Rolland E, et al. Meta-analysis of concomitant versus sequential radiochemotherapy in locally advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2010; 28:2181-90.
6. American Cancer Society. Non-small cell lung cancer survival rates by stage. Available at: <http://www.cancer.org/cancer/lungcancer-non-smallcell/detailedguide/non-small-cell-lung-cancer-survival-rates>. Updated 2015. Accessed: June 21, 2015.
7. Van der Drift MA, Karim-Kos HE, Siesling S, et al. Progress in standard of care therapy and modest survival benefits in the treatment of non-small cell lung cancer patients in the Netherlands in the last 20 years. *J Thorac Oncol* 2012; 7: 291-8.
8. Wouters MW, Siesling S, Jansen-Landheer ML, et al. Variation in treatment and outcome in patients with non-small cell lung cancer by region, hospital type and volume in the Netherlands. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2010; 36(Suppl 1): S83-92.
9. Nederlandse Vereniging voor Heelkunde. Normering chirurgische behandelingen 3.0. Available at: [http://download.minimumkwaliteitsnormen.nl/Normen%20van%20de%20Nederlandse%20Vereniging%20voor%20Heelkunde%20\(NVvH-3.0.pdf\)](http://download.minimumkwaliteitsnormen.nl/Normen%20van%20de%20Nederlandse%20Vereniging%20voor%20Heelkunde%20(NVvH-3.0.pdf)). Updated 2012. Accessed: April 30, 2014.
10. Kankerbestrijding KWF. *Kwaliteit van kankerzorg in Nederland*. Oisterwijk: VandenBoogaard Print- & Mediamanagement; 2010. Available at: <http://www.kwf.nl/SiteCollectionDocuments/rapport-Kwaliteit-van-kankerzorg-in-Nederland.pdf>. Accessed: January 1, 2015.
11. SONCOS. Multidisciplinaire normering oncologische zorg in Nederland. 2015.
12. Uyl-de Groot CA, de Vries EG, Verweij J, Sullivan R. Dispelling the myths around cancer care delivery: it's not all about costs. *J Cancer Policy* 2014; 2:22-9.
13. Davis KL, Goyal RK, Able SL, Brown J, Li L, Kaye JA. Real-world treatment patterns and costs in a US Medicare population with metastatic squamous non-small cell lung cancer. *Lung Cancer* 2015; 87:176-85.