Core Outcome Research Measures in Anal Cancer

DOI:

[10.1111/codi.13776](https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.13776)

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

[Link to publication record in Manchester Research Explorer](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Fish, R., Sebag-Montefiore, D., Sanders, C., Williamson, P., & Renehan, A. (2017). Core Outcome Research Measures in Anal Cancer. *Colorectal Disease*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/codi.13776>

Published in:

Colorectal Disease

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on Manchester Research Explorer is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Proof version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Explorer are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Takedown policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please refer to the University of Manchester's Takedown Procedures [<http://man.ac.uk/04Y6Bo>] or contact uml.scholarlycommunications@manchester.ac.uk providing relevant details, so we can investigate your claim.

Article type : Correspondence

330-2017

Correspondence

Core Outcome Research Measures in Anal Cancer

Ms Rebecca Fish¹ Professor David Sebag-Montefiore,² Dr Caroline Sanders,³ Professor
Paula Williamson,⁴ Professor Andrew Renehan^{1,5}

1. Clinical Research Fellow, Division of Cancer Sciences, School of Medical Sciences
Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of Manchester, Vaughan House,
Portsmouth Street, Manchester, M13 9GB.
rebecca.fish-2@manchester.ac.uk
2. Professor of Clinical Oncology, Radiotherapy Research Group, Leeds Institute of
Cancer & Pathology, University of Leeds, St James's University Hospital, Leeds, UK
D.SebagMontefiore@leeds.ac.uk
3. Senior Lecturer in Medical Sociology, Centre for Primary Care, University of
Manchester, Williamson Building, 6th Floor, Suite 3, Manchester, M13 9PL.
Caroline.sanders@manchester.ac.uk
4. Professor of Medical Statistics, Department of Biostatistics, Block F Waterhouse
Building, University of Liverpool, 1-5 Brownlow Street, Liverpool, L69 3GL.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not
been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may
lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as
doi: 10.1111/codi.13776

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

P.R.Williamson@liverpool.ac.uk

5. Professor in Cancer Studies and Surgery, Honorary Consultant Peritoneal and Colorectal Cancer Surgeon Peritoneal and Colorectal Oncology Centre, Christie NHS Foundation Trust, 550 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 4BX.

andrew.renehan@ics.manchester.ac.uk

Correspondence to:

Dr Rebecca Fish

Clinical Research Fellow,

Division of Cancer Sciences, School of Medical Sciences

Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health,

University of Manchester,

Vaughan House, Portsmouth Street,

Manchester, M13 9GB.

E-mail: rebecca.fish-2@manchester.ac.uk

Dear Sir,

We would like to draw attention of the readership to the problems associated with outcome heterogeneity in clinical trials, with particular reference to anal cancer. Outcome heterogeneity, and the related issue of reporting outcome bias, is a barrier to evidence synthesis [1] [2], particularly in rare diseases where few randomised trials are published. A recent review [3] of trials of chemoradiation for anal squamous cell carcinoma (ASCC) highlights the heterogeneity observed in reporting outcomes and calls for the development of a core set of outcomes.

A core outcome set (COS) is a standardised set of outcomes that should be measured and reported in all trials in a particular health area, the benefits of which are increasingly recognised by research funding bodies, regulators and journal editors, via the work of the COMET Initiative (Core Outcome Measures in Effectiveness Trials). The European Medicines Agency recommends COS use in asthma trials [4], and the UK National Institute for Health Research recommends inclusion of established COS in health technology assessment proposals.

A retrospective review of the outcomes used in phase III randomised ASCC trials [3] is a first step towards developing a COS, but on its own fails to represent the priorities of all stakeholders, especially patients. The included trials were all designed over a decade ago and capture only sparse late effects and quality of life data. The focus in such retrospective reviews is often on *how* outcomes should be defined and measured. However, it is vital additionally to consider *what* should be measured, considering the priorities of all stakeholders. Having a clearly defined and reproducible outcome measure has limited value if the outcome in question is not important to patients.

COMET recommends that COS development utilises rigorous consensus methods involving relevant stakeholders. The CORMAC (Core Outcome Research Measures in Anal Cancer) project [5] has been set up to develop a COS for ASCC using the COMET methodological framework [6]. A primary information gathering phase will be followed by a consensus phase, with patients and health care professionals involved at each stage. An up-to-date systematic review will identify all outcomes used in all trials, observational and qualitative studies published up to January 2016 [5]. This outcomes list will be supplemented by outcomes identified as important to patients through a series of semi-structured patient

interviews. The complete outcome list will populate an international Delphi process involving patients, health care professionals and trialists. The final COS will be agreed at a consensus meeting in September 2017.

References

1. Davey J, Turner RM, Clarke MJ, Higgins JP. Characteristics of meta-analyses and their component studies in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews: a cross-sectional, descriptive analysis. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2011; **11**: 160.
2. Smith V, Clarke M, Williamson P, Gargon E. Survey of new 2007 and 2011 Cochrane reviews found 37% of prespecified outcomes not reported. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2015; **68**: 237-45.
3. Glynne-Jones R, Adams R, Lopes A, Meadows H. Clinical endpoints in trials of chemoradiation for patients with anal cancer. *The Lancet Oncology*; **18**: e218-e27.
4. Agency EM, Use CfMPfH (2016) Guideline on the clinical investigation of medicinal products for the treatment of asthma CHMP/EWP/2922/01 Rev.1. European Medicines Agency.
5. Fish R, Williamson PR, Sanders C, Ryan N, Van der Veer S, Renehan AG (2016) CORMAC: Core Outcome Research Measures in Anal Cancer. Protocol for a systematic review of outcomes measured and reported in studies of anal squamous cell carcinoma treated with primary chemoradiotherapy. PROSPERO, PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews.
6. Williamson PR, Altman DG, Blazeby JM, Clarke M, Devane D, Gargon E, et al. Developing core outcome sets for clinical trials: issues to consider. *Trials* 2012; **13**: 1–8.