

Ten Things Physicians and Patients Should Question

1 Don't order tests to detect recurrent cancer in asymptomatic patients if there is not a realistic expectation that early detection of recurrence can improve survival or quality of life.

In some specific situations, the early detection of cancer recurrence (local and/or distant) may increase the likelihood of successful subsequent curative treatment. However, in many circumstances, earlier knowledge of recurrence does not improve outcome. As such, it is important to balance the information that can come from advanced testing with what is best for the individual patient. Specifically, the need for patient reassurance should be balanced against the anxiety and uncertainty provoked by extensive follow-up testing when there is not a realistic expectation that the early identification of recurrence may improve survival or quality of life.

2 Don't perform routine cancer screening, or surveillance for a new primary cancer, in the majority of patients with metastatic disease.

Screening for cancer can be lifesaving in otherwise healthy at-risk patients. While screening tests lead to a mortality benefit which emerges years after the test is performed, they expose patients to immediate potential harms. In general, patients with metastatic cancer have competing mortality risks that would outweigh the mortality benefits of screening as demonstrated in healthy patients. In fact, patients with metastatic disease may be more likely to experience harm since patients with limited life expectancy are more likely to be frail and more susceptible to complications of testing and treatments. Therefore, the balance of potential benefits and harms does not favor recommending screening for a new asymptomatic primary malignancy in most patients with metastatic disease. Screening may be considered in a very small subgroup of patients where metastatic disease is relatively indolent, or its treatment is expected to result in prolonged survival.

3 Avoid chemotherapy and instead focus on symptom relief and palliative care in patients with advanced cancer unlikely to benefit from chemotherapy (e.g., performance status 3 or 4).

Studies show that, in general, cancer directed treatments are likely to be ineffective for patients with solid organ tumours who are markedly debilitated by their cancer (i.e., performance status 3 or 4). Exceptions may include patients with functional limitations due to other conditions resulting in a low performance status, or selected patients with specific disease types (e.g., germ cell cancer) or characteristics (e.g., mutations) that suggest a high likelihood of response to therapy. It has also been shown that appropriate symptom control and palliative care can significantly improve quality of life.

4 Don't perform routine colonoscopic surveillance every year in patients following their colon cancer surgery; instead, frequency should be based on the findings of the prior colonoscopy and corresponding guidelines.

Studies have shown clearly that, in the absence of heredity syndromes, the progression from polyp to cancer (adenoma carcinoma sequence) occurs over many years. Thus, the timing of a follow-up surveillance colonoscopy should be determined based on the results of a previous high-quality colonoscopy. Typical colonoscopic surveillance following colon cancer surgery consists of a colonoscopy at one year; thereafter it should not typically exceed every 3 years following detection of an advanced polyp, or every 5 years following a normal exam or one showing small polyps. In Canada, there is both evidence of overuse of surveillance colonoscopy following colon cancer resection and, in areas, a limited availability of endoscopy resources.

5 Don't delay or avoid palliative care for a patient with metastatic cancer because they are pursuing disease-directed treatment.

Numerous studies—including randomized trials—show that palliative care improves pain and symptom control, improves family satisfaction with care, and reduces costs. Palliative care does not accelerate death, and may prolong life in selected populations. The benefits of disease-directed treatment (e.g., chemotherapy or radiation) can be enhanced by early consideration of palliative care.

6 Don't recommend more than a single fraction of palliative radiation for an uncomplicated painful bone metastasis.

Randomized trials have established that single-fraction radiation to a previously unirradiated, uncomplicated peripheral bone or vertebral metastasis provides comparable pain relief and morbidity compared to multiple-fraction regimens, while optimizing patient and caregiver convenience. Although it results in a higher incidence of retreatment at a later date (20% vs. 8 % for multi-fraction regimens), the decreased patient burden usually outweighs any considerations of long-term effectiveness for those with a limited life expectancy.

7 Don't initiate management in patients with low-risk prostate cancer (T1/T2, PSA < 10 ng/ml, and Gleason score < 7) without first discussing active surveillance.

Patients with localized prostate cancer have a number of reasonable management options. These include surgery, radiation, as well as conservative monitoring without therapy in appropriate patients. Shared decision-making between the patient and the physician can lead to better alignment of patient goals with treatment and more efficient care delivery. The use of patient-directed written decision aids concerning prostate cancer can give patients confidence about their choices, and improve compliance with therapy. Discussion regarding active surveillance should include both the elements and timing of such surveillance, and emphasize the need for compliance.

8 Don't initiate whole breast radiotherapy in 25 fractions as a part of breast conservation therapy in women age ≥50 with early stage invasive breast cancer without considering shorter treatment schedules.

Whole breast radiotherapy is beneficial for most women with invasive breast cancer treated with breast conservation therapy. Many studies have utilized "conventionally fractionated" schedules that deliver therapy over 5 to 6 weeks, often followed by 1 to 2 weeks of boost therapy. However, more recent evidence (including a major study from Canada) has demonstrated equivalent tumour control and cosmetic outcome in specific patient populations with shorter courses of therapy (approximately 3 to 4 weeks). Patients and their physicians should review these options to determine the most appropriate course of therapy.

9 Don't deliver care (e.g., follow-up) in a high-cost setting (e.g., inpatient, cancer center) that could be delivered just as effectively in a lower-cost setting (e.g., primary care).

Several studies (including randomized clinical trials) have demonstrated that surveillance following definitive cancer therapy can be performed equally well, and in a more patient-centered fashion, within a primary care setting. With the substantial increase in cancer survivors, the traditional practice of providing routine follow-up care through specialist cancer centres is placing rising demands and competing with other care delivery functions of such centres. Primary care providers are both willing to provide follow-up cancer care and have repeatedly assumed such responsibility. Despite this, the transition to primary care in Canada has been both variable and incomplete.

10 Don't routinely use extensive locoregional therapy in most cancer situations where there is metastatic disease and minimal symptoms attributable to the primary tumour (e.g., colorectal cancer).

In the past, extensive local regional therapies (e.g., surgery) were often provided in patients with metastatic disease, regardless of the symptomatology of the primary tumour. However, recent evidence has suggested that in many cases these therapies do not improve outcome and, at times, delay the more important treatment of metastatic disease (e.g., chemotherapy). In general, patients with metastatic disease from solid organ malignancies and a relatively asymptomatic primary tumour should be considered for systemic therapy as a priority; the delay in systemic therapy and potential additional morbidity arising from extensive locoregional therapies should be avoided in these patients.

How the list was created

To help create the cancer specific list for *Choosing Wisely Canada*, a Tri-Society Task Force was convened by the Canadian Partnership Against Cancer in late 2013. The Task Force included representatives from the Canadian Association of Radiation Oncology (CARO), Canadian Association of Medical Oncologists (CAMO) and Canadian Society of Surgical Oncology (CSSO). Through a multipronged consensus process of the Task Force, along with broader society member engagement, an initial list of 66 practices was generated. In addition, a framework for subsequent selection of low value/harmful practices was established and included the following elements: (1) the size of population to which practice is relevant; (2) the frequency of use of the practice in Canada; (3) the cost of the practice; (4) the evidence/degree of harm of practice; and (5) the potential for change in use of the practice. Based on this framework, and after an iterative adjudication and voting process, this list was first reduced to a long list of 41 practices, then to a short list of 19 practices, and subsequently to a final list of 10 low value, unnecessary, or harmful practices. Many practices were considered, including cancer-related practices previously identified in the U.S. *Choosing Wisely*® campaign. Recommendation 3 was adapted with permission from the Five Things Physicians and Patients Should Question. © 2014 American Society of Clinical Oncology. All rights reserved. Recommendations 5 and 6 were adapted with permission from the Five Things Physicians and Patients Should Question. © 2013 American Academy of Hospice and Palliative Medicine. Recommendations 7 and 8 were adapted with permission from the Five Things Physicians and Patients Should Question. © 2013 American Society for Radiation Oncology.

Sources

- 1** BC Cancer Agency. Cancer Management Guidelines. Gastrointestinal, Colon [Internet]. 2014 Feb 1 [cited 2014 Sep 23]. Available from: <http://www.bccancer.bc.ca/HPI/CancerManagementGuidelines/Gastrointestinal/05.Colon/5.7+Follow+Up+and+Surveillance+of+Colon+Cancer+Patients+Treated+with+Curative+Intent.htm>

Earle C, Annis R, Sussman J, et al. Follow-up care, surveillance protocol, and secondary prevention measures for survivors of colorectal cancer [Internet]. 2012 Feb 3 [cited 2014 Sep 23]. Available from: <https://cancercare.on.ca/common/pages/UserFile.aspx?fileId=124839>.

Fahy BN. Follow-up after curative resection of colorectal cancer. *Ann. Surg. Oncol.* Mar 2014;21(3):738-746.

Grunfeld E, Mant D, Yudkin P, et al. Routine follow up of breast cancer in primary care: randomised trial. *BMJ.* Sep 14 1996;313(7058):665-669.

Khatcheressian J, Swaine C. Breast cancer follow-up in the adjuvant setting. *Curr. Oncol. Rep.* Jan 2008;10(1):38-46.

Meyerhardt JA, Mangu PB, Flynn PJ, et al. Follow-up care, surveillance protocol, and secondary prevention measures for survivors of colorectal cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline endorsement. *J. Clin. Oncol.* Dec 10 2013;31(35):4465-4470.

National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN clinical practice guidelines in oncology: colon cancer [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2014 Sep 23]. Available from: <http://www.nccn.org>.
- 2** Fisher DA, Judd L, Sanford NS. Inappropriate colorectal cancer screening: findings and implications. *Am. J. Gastroenterol.* Nov 2005;100(11):2526-2530.
- Lee SJ, Boscardin WJ, Stijacic-Cenzer I, Conell-Price J, O'Brien S, Walter LC. Time lag to benefit after screening for breast and colorectal cancer: meta-analysis of survival data from the United States, Sweden, United Kingdom, and Denmark. *BMJ.* 2013;346:e8441.
- Moyer VA. Screening for prostate cancer: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *Ann. Intern. Med.* Jul 17 2012;157(2):120-134.
- Schroder FH, Hugosson J, Roobol MJ, et al. Prostate-cancer mortality at 11 years of follow-up. *N. Engl. J. Med.* Mar 15 2012;366(11):981-990.
- Whitlock EP, Lin JS, Liles E, Beil TL, Fu R. Screening for colorectal cancer: a targeted, updated systematic review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. *Ann. Intern. Med.* Nov 4 2008;149(9):638-658.
- 3** Azzoli CG, Temin S, Aliff T, et al. 2011 Focused Update of 2009 American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline Update on Chemotherapy for Stage IV Non-Small-Cell Lung Cancer. *J. Clin. Oncol.* Oct 1 2011;29(28):3825-3831.
- Carlson RW, Allred DC, Anderson BO, et al. Breast cancer. Clinical practice guidelines in oncology. *J. Natl. Compr. Canc. Netw.* Feb 2009;7(2):122-192.
- Engstrom PF, Benson AB, 3rd, Chen YJ, et al. Colon cancer clinical practice guidelines in oncology. *J. Natl. Compr. Canc. Netw.* Jul 2005;3(4):468-491.
- Ettinger DS, Akerley W, Bepler G, et al. Non-small cell lung cancer. *J. Natl. Compr. Canc. Netw.* Jul 2010;8(7):740-801.
- Peppercorn JM, Smith TJ, Helft PR, et al. American society of clinical oncology statement: toward individualized care for patients with advanced cancer. *J. Clin. Oncol.* Feb 20 2011;29(6):755-760.
- Smith TJ, Hillner BE. Bending the cost curve in cancer care. *N. Engl. J. Med.* May 26 2011;364(21):2060-2065.
- Temel JS, Greer JA, Muzikansky A, et al. Early palliative care for patients with metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med.* Aug 19 2010;363(8):733-742.
- 4** BC Cancer Agency. Cancer Management Guidelines, Gastrointestinal, Colon [Internet]. 2014 Feb 1 [cited 2014 Sep 23]. Available from: <http://www.bccancer.bc.ca/HPI/CancerManagementGuidelines/Gastrointestinal/05.Colon/5.7+Follow+Up+and+Surveillance+of+Colon+Cancer+Patients+Treated+with+Curative+Intent.htm>
- Hill MJ, Morson BC, Bussey HJ. Aetiology of adenoma--carcinoma sequence in large bowel. *Lancet.* Feb 4 1978;1(8058):245-247.
- Leddin D, Enns R, Hilsden R, et al. Colorectal cancer surveillance after index colonoscopy: guidance from the Canadian Association of Gastroenterology. *Can. J. Gastroenterol.* Apr 2013;27(4):224-228.
- Levin B, Lieberman DA, McFarland B, et al. Screening and surveillance for the early detection of colorectal cancer and adenomatous polyps, 2008: a joint guideline from the American Cancer Society, the US Multi-Society Task Force on Colorectal Cancer, and the American College of Radiology. *Gastroenterology.* May 2008;134(5):1570-1595.
- Urquhart R, Folkes A, Porter G, et al. Population-based longitudinal study of follow-up care for patients with colorectal cancer in Nova Scotia. *J. Oncol. Pract.* Jul 2012;8(4):246-252.
- van Kooten H, de Jonge V, Schreuders E, et al. Awareness of postpolypectomy surveillance guidelines: a nationwide survey of colonoscopists in Canada. *Can. J. Gastroenterol.* Feb 2012;26(2):79-84.
- 5** Delgado-Guay MO, Parsons HA, Li Z, Palmer LJ, Bruera E. Symptom distress, interventions, and outcomes of intensive care unit cancer patients referred to a palliative care consult team. *Cancer.* Jan 15 2009;115(2):437-445.
- Elsayem A, Smith ML, Parmley L, et al. Impact of a palliative care service on in-hospital mortality in a comprehensive cancer center. *J. Palliat. Med.* Aug 2006;9(4):894-902.
- Elsayem A, Swint K, Fisch MJ, et al. Palliative care inpatient service in a comprehensive cancer center: clinical and financial outcomes. *J. Clin. Oncol.* May 15 2004;22(10):2008-2014.
- Gelfman LP, Meier DE, Morrison RS. Does palliative care improve quality? A survey of bereaved family members. *J. Pain Symptom Manage.* Jul 2008;36(1):22-28.
- Higginson IJ, Finlay IG, Goodwin DM, et al. Is there evidence that palliative care teams alter end-of-life experiences of patients and their caregivers? *J. Pain Symptom Manage.* Feb 2003;25(2):150-168.
- Jordhoy MS, Fayers P, Saltnes T, Ahlner-Elmqvist M, Jannert M, Kaasa S. A palliative-care intervention and death at home: a cluster randomised trial. *Lancet.* Sep 9 2000;356(9233):888-893.
- London MR, McSkimming S, Drew N, Quinn C, Carney B. Evaluation of a Comprehensive, Adaptable, Life-Affirming, Longitudinal (CALL) palliative care project. *J. Palliat. Med.* Dec 2005;8(6):1214-1225.
- Temel JS, Greer JA, Muzikansky A, et al. Early palliative care for patients with metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med.* Aug 19 2010;363(8):733-742.
- Zimmermann C, Swami N, Krzyzanowska M, et al. Early palliative care for patients with advanced cancer: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* May 17 2014;383(9930):1721-1730.
- 6** Fairchild A, Barnes E, Ghosh S, et al. International patterns of practice in palliative radiotherapy for painful bone metastases: evidence-based practice? *Int. J. Radiat. Oncol. Biol. Phys.* Dec 1 2009;75(5):1501-1510.
- Lutz S, Berk L, Chang E, et al. Palliative radiotherapy for bone metastases: an ASTRO evidence-based guideline. *Int. J. Radiat. Oncol. Biol. Phys.* Mar 15 2011;79(4):965-976.
- Popovic M, den Hartogh M, Zhang L, et al. Review of international patterns of practice for the treatment of painful bone metastases with palliative radiotherapy from 1993 to 2013. *Radiother. Oncol.* Apr 2014;111(1):11-17.
- Zimmermann C, Swami N, Krzyzanowska M, et al. Early palliative care for patients with advanced cancer: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* May 17 2014;383(9930):1721-1730.

- 7** Bill-Axelsson A, Holmberg L, Ruutu M, et al. Radical prostatectomy versus watchful waiting in early prostate cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med.* May 5 2011;364(18):1708-1717.
- Dahabreh IJ, Chung M, Balk EM, et al. Active surveillance in men with localized prostate cancer: a systematic review. *Ann. Intern. Med.* Apr 17 2012;156(8):582-590.
- Klotz L. Active surveillance for prostate cancer: overview and update. *Curr. Treat. Options Oncol.* Mar 2013;14(1):97-108.
- Klotz L, Zhang L, Lam A, Nam R, Mamedov A, Loblaw A. Clinical results of long-term follow-up of a large, active surveillance cohort with localized prostate cancer. *J. Clin. Oncol.* Jan 1 2010;28(1):126-131.
- Stacey D, Bennett CL, Barry MJ, et al. Decision aids for people facing health treatment or screening decisions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2011(10):Cd001431.
- Thompson I, Thrasher JB, Aus G, et al. Guideline for the management of clinically localized prostate cancer: 2007 update. *J. Urol.* Jun 2007;177(6):2106-2131.
- Wilt TJ, Brawer MK, Jones KM, et al. Radical prostatectomy versus observation for localized prostate cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med.* Jul 19 2012;367(3):203-213.
- 8** Clarke M, Collins R, Darby S, et al. Effects of radiotherapy and of differences in the extent of surgery for early breast cancer on local recurrence and 15-year survival: an overview of the randomised trials. *Lancet.* Dec 17 2005;366(9503):2087-2106.
- Darby S, McGale P, Correa C, et al. Effect of radiotherapy after breast-conserving surgery on 10-year recurrence and 15-year breast cancer death: meta-analysis of individual patient data for 10,801 women in 17 randomised trials. *Lancet.* Nov 12 2011;378(9804):1707-1716.
- Smith BD, Bentzen SM, Correa CR, et al. Fractionation for whole breast irradiation: an American Society for Radiation Oncology (ASTRO) evidence-based guideline. *Int. J. Radiat. Oncol. Biol. Phys.* Sep 1 2011;81(1):59-68.
- Whelan TJ, Pignol JP, Levine MN, et al. Long-term results of hypofractionated radiation therapy for breast cancer. *N. Engl. J. Med.* Feb 11 2010;362(6):513-520.
- 9** Del Giudice ME, Verma S, Piliotis E, Harvey BJ, Grunfeld E. Primary Care physician willingness to provide follow-up care for adult cancer survivors. *J. Clin. Oncol.* 2007; 25(18S):337s.
- Ristovski-Slijepcevic S. Environmental scan of cancer survivorship in Canada: Conceptualization, practice & research. Vancouver (BC): BC Cancer Agency; 2008.
- Erikson C, Salsberg E, Forte G, Bruinooge S, Goldstein M. Future supply and demand for oncologists : challenges to assuring access to oncology services. *J. Oncol. Pract.* Mar 2007;3(2):79-86.
- Grunfeld E. Looking beyond survival: how are we looking at survivorship? *J. Clin. Oncol.* Nov 10 2006;24(32):5166-5169.
- Grunfeld E, Levine MN, Julian JA, et al. Randomized trial of long-term follow-up for early-stage breast cancer: a comparison of family physician versus specialist care. *J. Clin. Oncol.* Feb 20 2006;24(6):848-855.
- Grunfeld E, Mant D, Yudkin P, et al. Routine follow up of breast cancer in primary care: randomised trial. *BMJ.* Sep 14 1996;313(7058):665-669.
- Murchie P, Nicolson MC, Hannaford PC, Raja EA, Lee AJ, Campbell NC. Patient satisfaction with GP-led melanoma follow-up: a randomised controlled trial. *Br. J. Cancer.* May 11 2010;102(10):1447-1455.
- Wattchow DA, Weller DP, Esterman A, et al. General practice vs surgical-based follow-up for patients with colon cancer: randomised controlled trial. *Br. J. Cancer.* Apr 24 2006;94(8):1116-1121.
- 10** Kleespies A, Füessler KE, Seeliger H, Eichhorn ME, Müller MH, Rentsch M, et al. Determinants of morbidity and survival after elective non-curative resection of stage IV colon and rectal cancer. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 2009;24(9):1097-109.
- National Comprehensive Cancer Network. NCCN Guidelines for Colon Cancer Version 3 [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2014 April]. Available from: http://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/rectal.pdf.
- Badwe, R. Surgical removal of primary tumor and axillary lymph nodes in women with metastatic breast cancer at first presentation: A randomized controlled trial. San Antonio Breast Conference; 2013.

About Choosing Wisely Canada

Choosing Wisely Canada is a campaign to help physicians and patients engage in conversations about unnecessary tests, treatments and procedures, and to help physicians and patients make smart and effective choices to ensure high-quality care. For more information on *Choosing Wisely Canada* or to see other lists of Five Things Physicians and Patients Should Question, visit www.choosingwiselycanada.org. Join the conversation on Twitter @ChooseWiselyCA.

About The Canadian Partnership Against Cancer

The Canadian Partnership Against Cancer (CPAC) is a proud partner of the *Choosing Wisely Canada* campaign. CPAC is an independent organization funded by the federal government to accelerate action on cancer control for all Canadians. CPAC works with cancer experts, charitable organizations, governments, cancer agencies, national health organizations, patients, survivors and others to implement Canada's cancer control strategy.

About Canadian Association of Radiation Oncology

The Canadian Association of Radiation Oncology (CARO) is a proud partner of the *Choosing Wisely Canada* campaign. CARO is a national professional association representing the official voice of radiation oncology in Canada in relation to the public interest and professional interest in the provision of radiation oncology consultative and treatment services. The association's regionally representative board structure and national membership facilitate the execution of its mission.

About The Canadian Society of Surgical Oncology

The Canadian Society of Surgical Oncology (CSSO) is a proud partner of the *Choosing Wisely Canada* campaign. The CSSO is a national association of surgical oncologists that promotes the optimum treatment of the patient with cancer through a multi-disciplinary treatment approach. The association fosters the development of education in cancer for both graduate, undergraduate and continuing medical education and encourages the development of research in oncologic surgery. The CSSO believes in facilitating communication between surgeons whose primary interest lies in the field of oncology and encourages the formation of surgical oncology training programs among Canadian Universities.

About The Canadian Association of Medical Oncologists

The Canadian Association of Medical Oncologists (CAMO) is a proud partner of the *Choosing Wisely Canada* campaign. CAMO, a national specialty society of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada, will contribute to cancer control, through research, education, and clinical practice in prevention, screening, diagnosis, treatment, supportive care, palliative care and rehabilitation. CAMO is committed to achieving and maintaining, among its members, excellence in clinical and scholarly activity, within a culture of compassion and respect for human dignity.