Gynecologic Oncology 137 (2015) 280–284

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Gynecologic Oncology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ygyno

Improving quality and decreasing cost in gynecologic oncology care. Society of gynecologic oncology recommendations for clinical practice

B.J. Rimel [a,*], William M. Burke [b], Robert V. Higgins [c], Paula S. Lee [d], Christopher V. Lutman [e], Lynn Parker [f]

[a] Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, 8700 Beverly Blvd, Los Angeles, CA 90048, USA
[b] Columbia University Medical Center, 630 W 168th St., New York, NY, USA
[c] Carolinas Medical Center, 1000 Blythe Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28203, USA
[d] Duke University Medical Center, 2301 Erwin Rd, Durham, NC 27705, USA
[e] Miami Valley Hospital, 1 Wyoming St., Dayton, OH 45409, USA
[f] University of Louisville, 2301 S 3rd St., Louisville, KY 40292, USA

HIGHLIGHTS

- There are areas where costs may be reduced in gynecologic oncology practice.
- Cost reduction does not mean quality reduction in the delivery of gynecologic oncology care.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 22 November 2014
Accepted 21 February 2015
Available online 28 February 2015

Keyword:
Cost containment

ABSTRACT

Objective. To identify potential cost savings in gynecologic oncology care without sacrificing quality.

Methods. Members of the Clinical Practice Committee of the Society of Gynecologic Oncology were asked to review current practice patterns in gynecologic oncology and assess the potential for cost savings founded on evidence-based medicine and current guidelines.

Results. Five clinical practices were identified including the following: vaginal cytology for endometrial cancer survivors; colposcopy for low grade cytologic abnormalities for cervical cancer survivors; routine imaging studies for gynecologic cancer survivors; screening for ovarian cancer with serum biomarkers and ultrasound; and improving palliative care for gynecologic cancer patients. Review of the published literature and guidelines were performed to make evidence-based recommendations for cost effective quality gynecologic oncology care.

Recommendations.

- Do not perform Pap tests of the vaginal cuff in patients with a history of endometrial cancer.
- Do not perform colposcopy for low grade Pap tests in women with a history of cervical cancer.
- Avoid routine imaging for cancer surveillance in asymptomatic women with gynecologic cancer, specifically ovarian, endometrial, cervical, vulvar and vaginal cancer.
- Do not screen women at low risk for ovarian cancer with ultrasound or CA-125 or other biomarkers.
- Do not delay basic level palliative care for women with advanced or relapsed gynecologic cancer, do refer to a palliative care specialist when needed, and avoid unnecessary treatments at life's end.

Introduction

The increasing cost of US healthcare over the last 10 years compared to other countries has led to nationwide discussions concerning costs of care. In response to the rising cost of cancer care, the American Society of Clinical Oncology released a list of 5 opportunities to improve value in cancer care. As a leader in cancer care for women, the Society of Gynecologic Oncology (SGO) sought to identify comparable ways to improve the value of gynecologic cancer care without sacrificing quality of care.

A committee of SGO members was established to investigate evidence-based recommendations for cost-containment in gynecologic

* Corresponding author at: Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, 8700 Beverly Blvd, Suite 290W, Los Angeles, CA 90048, USA. Tel.: +1 310 423 5800 (office); fax: +1 310 967 1142.
E-mail address: bobbie.rimel@cshs.org (B.J. Rimel).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ygyno.2015.02.021
0090-8258/

oncology. The following describes the five areas identified for cost-containment specific to gynecologic oncology. The literature and current treatment guidelines were reviewed to develop evidence-based recommendations for maximizing value in gynecologic cancer care.

Pap testing in endometrial and cervical cancer survivors

Liquid-based cytology (Pap testing) of the vaginal cuff to detect recurrence of endometrial cancer is not an effective strategy. Data from large retrospective studies has demonstrated a low rate of asymptomatic recurrence from 0 to 6.8% [1–3] Cost effectiveness analysis of vaginal cuff cytology for the detection of endometrial cancer recurrence revealed this modality to be costly and poorly effective [4,5]. A recent study of 433 patients with a history of endometrial cancer, who contributed 2378 Pap tests over a 4 year period revealed that no recurrent endometrial cancers were detected based on these tests [5]. Additionally, no recurrences were detected by Pap testing in a recent review of only Type II endometrial cancers [6].

Pap testing in cervical cancer survivors has also been studied extensively, with rates of detection of asymptomatic central recurrence being very low (0–18%) [7]. One recent study demonstrated that liquid-based vaginal cytology assessment in patients treated for cervical cancer results in frequent abnormal tests (34%), but that only those with at least a high grade squamous intraepithelial lesion require colposcopy [8]; a comparable cost-effectiveness analysis showed that only colposcopy after high grade Pap testing is associated with increased recurrence detection [9]. Given these findings, we suggest that Pap testing of the vaginal cuff be withheld as a surveillance strategy for patients with endometrial cancer and that low grade Pap tests (ASCUS HPV + and LGSIL) not be followed by colposcopy for patients with cervical cancer. Finally, performance of vaginal cytology cannot be viewed as a replacement for a careful pelvic exam, which after patient-reported symptoms is still the best way to detect recurrences of endometrial and cervical cancers.

Recommendations

- Do not perform Pap tests of the vaginal cuff in patients with a history of endometrial cancer.
- Do not perform colposcopy for low grade Pap tests in women with a history of cervical cancer.

Routine use of CT and PET imaging for cancer surveillance for gynecologic malignancies

Endometrial cancer is often diagnosed as early stage disease where survival rates are excellent. The majority of recurrences tend to occur within the first two years following treatment. Most patients with recurrence present with symptoms and sometimes these symptoms lead to evaluation prior to a planned surveillance visit. Sartori et al. reported that 52% of patients presented with symptoms alone [10]. Berchuck et al. reported that up to 84% of patients with recurrent disease presented with symptoms and signs [11]. CT scans have only been reported to detect 5–21% of asymptomatic recurrences [12]. Gadducci et al. evaluated an intensive follow up schedule in patients with clinical stage I endometrial cancer. Overall survival was not impacted by patient factors such as stage, grade, myometrial invasion, histologic type, or lymph node status. There was similar survival in both the symptomatic or asymptomatic recurrences [13]. Improved survival has not been demonstrated by radiologic surveillance in patients with endometrial cancer. No prospective studies have been done looking at PET scan in surveillance for endometrial cancer. Since the chance of recurrence of early stage endometrial cancer is low and survival after salvage therapy for patients with distant recurrence is also low, we do not recommend routine use of imaging for asymptomatic patients with a history of endometrial cancer.

Patients with ovarian cancer have a high risk of disease recurrence. Studies evaluating the role of CT scans in detecting recurrent disease have had mixed results in the ability to detect disease, but have not shown improvement in overall survival. Because ovarian cancer recurrence can be small volume disease that can be missed on CT scan, use of PET scans has been advocated by some to achieve higher sensitivity [14]. However, Sironi et al. still reported a negative predictive value of only 57% which indicates that PET scans also have difficulty detecting small volume disease [15]. Importantly, the use of PET scan for surveillance of asymptomatic patients has not been well evaluated. Most studies evaluated its use in patients who were having symptoms or elevating CA-125. In this setting, PET was more efficient in detecting recurrences than CA125 or standard CT scans [16,17]. In light of Rustin's data reporting that treatment of recurrent ovarian cancer based on rising CA125 values versus waiting until symptoms did not improve overall survival, it is unclear that diagnosing recurrence earlier with CT or PET scan would improve overall survival [18]. Therefore, we do not recommend the use of CT or PET scan for ovarian cancer surveillance, and instead would use them as tools to evaluate patients in the setting of symptoms or worrisome physical exam findings [19].

Cervical cancer recurrence presents most commonly with symptoms. However, typically only patients with local recurrence are curable. CT scan has low yield in detection of asymptomatic recurrence. PET/CT has shown promise in detecting locoregional recurrence and predicting those patients who may have poorer prognosis after primary Multiple studies have reported the prognostic significance of post treatment PET scan 3 months after completion of treatment [15,20]. For instance, Schwarz et al., reported that 3 year progression free survival rates were 78% in patients with complete metabolic response, 33% in patients with partial metabolic response, and 0% in patients with progressive disease [20]. Siva et al. reported 95% 3 year survival in patients with complete metabolic response on PET 3–12 months after completion of treatment and discussed with such a low recurrence rate that a more conservative surveillance program could potentially be utilized for this group of patients [21]. Brooks et al. reported in a small, single institution study from a prospective database that patients diagnosed with asymptomatic recurrences by PET (9 patients) had a 59% 3 year survival compared to 19% 3 year survival in patients with symptomatic recurrences by PET (21 patients) [22]. One concern is that lead time bias may allow patients to have known recurrence longer, but may not truly have improved overall survival. These data support the use of one post-treatment PET scan to gain prognostic information, but that is a different issue than routine cancer surveillance. Further, prospective and multi-institutional studies need to be done to further evaluate the role of surveillance PET in cervical cancer. The cost of PET remains high. In the United Kingdom, a cost benefit analysis was performed with PET added to the typical cancer surveillance. This yielded a cost-effectiveness ratio of >1 million pounds per quality-adjusted life-year (QALY) and the additional cost per case of recurrence was 600,000 lb. Therefore PET scan is not currently recommended in the United Kingdom for surveillance [23].

Based on available evidence, a post-treatment PET scan obtained about three months after completion of cervical cancer treatment may provide prognostic information and in turn assist in further treatment planning. There is only preliminary data for use of PET in cervical cancer surveillance, and with well documented significant cost, we do not recommend CT or PET imaging for routine cervical cancer surveillance at this time [3,24].

CT scans are also not without their risk. Wen et al. study in JAMA evaluating radiation related cancer risk from annual CT scans of the chest, abdomen, and pelvis for 10 years to be 1.3% in women and as high as 7.9% in young women 20 years old getting PET/CT every 6 months for 10 years. Risk and benefits of any intervention must be