

# MUSIC: Patterns of Care in the Radiographic Staging of Men with Newly Diagnosed Low Risk Prostate Cancer

Ishai Ross, Paul Womble, Jun Ye, Susan Linsell, James E. Montie,\*  
David C. Millert† and Michael L. Cher‡,§

From the Departments of Urology, Wayne State University (IR, MLC), Detroit and University of Michigan (PW, JY, SL, JEM, DCM), Ann Arbor, Michigan, for the Michigan Urological Surgery Improvement Collaborative

**Purpose:** MUSIC is a statewide consortium of 44 urology practices that aims to improve the quality of prostate cancer care in Michigan. As an initial priority, we examined patterns of care in the radiographic staging of men with newly diagnosed prostate cancer. We determined whether collaborative-wide data review and performance feedback would decrease the imaging rate in men with low risk prostate cancer.

**Materials and Methods:** Practices submitted standardized data, including the use and results of staging computerized tomography and bone scan, to a web based clinical registry of all men with newly diagnosed prostate cancer. We identified all patients with low risk prostate cancer and compared imaging use patterns before and after practice level performance feedback and guideline review, which were provided at collaborative-wide meetings.

**Results:** In MUSIC 813 patients were newly diagnosed with low risk prostate cancer during the 19-month study period. Of 410 patients diagnosed in the prefeedback period (phase I) 15 (3.7%) and 21 (5.2%) underwent bone scan and computerized tomography, respectively. Of 403 patients diagnosed after feedback (phase II) radiographic staging was done in 5 men (1.3%) with bone scan and in 13 (3.2%) with computerized tomography ( $p = 0.03$  and  $0.17$ , respectively).

**Conclusions:** The overall rate of radiographic staging in men with newly diagnosed low risk prostate cancer was appropriately low. The imaging rate decreased even further after collaborative education and performance feedback. MUSIC appears to be a successful tool for quality improvement, affecting practice patterns and increasing efficiency of care.

**Key Words:** prostatic neoplasms, diagnostic imaging, physician's practice patterns, quality improvement, feedback

## Abbreviations and Acronyms

BCBSM = Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan

CT = computerized tomography

MUSIC = Michigan Urological Surgery Improvement Collaborative

Accepted for publication October 27, 2014.

Study received institutional review board approval at each site.

Supported by a National Cancer Institute grant and the Urology Care Foundation Rising Star in Urology Research Award (DCM), and BSBSM.

\* Financial interest and/or other relationship with BSBSM.

† Financial interest and/or other relationship with BSBSM and ArborMetrix.

‡ Correspondence: Department of Urology, Wayne State University, University Health Center, Suite 7-C, 4201 St. Antoine, Detroit, Michigan 48201 (telephone: 313-577-5222; FAX: 313-577-5217; e-mail: [mcher@med.wayne.edu](mailto:mcher@med.wayne.edu)).

§ Financial interest and/or other relationship with Bayer, Astellas, Janssen Biotech and Dendreon.

THE cost of all prostate cancer care in the United States was estimated at almost \$12 billion in 2010 and by 2020 it is projected to grow to more than \$16 billion.<sup>1</sup> Appropriate ordering of imaging could have an important role in curtailing this spending growth. For men with prostate cancer most guidelines agree

that those with low risk tumors do not need radiographic staging with CT or bone scan to screen for metastatic disease before definitive local therapy due to the extremely low chance of a positive study.<sup>2-5</sup> This holds true whether the D'Amico,<sup>6</sup> the UCSF-CAPRA (University of California-San Francisco Cancer of

the Prostate Risk Assessment)<sup>7</sup> or another classification system is used. There is also the risk that false-positive diagnoses and red herrings could lead to unnecessary further testing, procedures and patient morbidity. Radiation exposure is another concern due to the risk of secondary cancer.

Given these concerns, the first recommendation from the AUA (American Urological Association) in the Choosing Wisely® campaign is the avoidance of bone scans in patients with low risk prostate cancer.<sup>8</sup> Omitting imaging in patients at low risk is also an endorsed quality measure of the Medicare PQRS (Physician Quality Reporting System) program.<sup>9</sup>

Despite these recommendations many patients are low risk are still imaged at diagnosis.<sup>10–14</sup> As such, we have made improving the use of radiographic staging in men with newly diagnosed low risk prostate cancer an initial priority of MUSIC. To this end we compared baseline rates of imaging among MUSIC practices and determined whether the performance feedback and guideline review provided at our collaborative-wide meetings altered imaging rates in men with low risk tumors.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### MUSIC

MUSIC is a physician led, quality improvement collaborative that aims to assess and improve the quality and efficiency of urological care in Michigan. MUSIC comprises a consortium of urology practices located throughout the state. Program activities are administered by the MUSIC Coordinating Center at University of Michigan. The initial focus of MUSIC has been on men with prostate cancer and men undergoing prostate biopsy. To join MUSIC a urology practice must enter a minimum of 50 prostate biopsy or prostate cancer cases per year, be affiliated with a physician organization recognized by BCBSM and participate in the BCBSM Physician Group Incentive Program.

Practices joined MUSIC in several waves starting with the first 12 practices in March 2012 (wave 1), followed by 7 more in October 2012 (wave 2). All current analyses relate to data from wave 1 and wave 2 practices. MUSIC currently includes 42 practices and more than 200 urologists.

### Data

**Collection infrastructure.** Institutional review board approval was obtained at each site. Most applications were deemed nonregulated and some were exempt due to the quality improvement nature of the study. Each practice site has a physician clinical champion and a data abstractor. De-identified patient data, including detailed clinical and demographic information such as patient age, race, serum PSA at diagnosis, clinical T stage, biopsy Gleason score, total number of biopsy cores and number of positive cores, are submitted electronically to the MUSIC clinical registry. Quality control visits are

performed at each site to ensure accurate and complete data collection. Triannual consortium-wide meetings are held at a central location to compare practice performance, discuss quality initiatives and implement changes in clinical behavior. Although detailed data are collected on individual patients, practice level data are presented at MUSIC meetings in a comparative and de-identified manner.

**Imaging.** Data abstractors at each practice entered into the registry whether bone scan or CT was performed and the imaging results. For study purposes scans ordered by nonurologists were not counted as having been ordered by the urologist or the urology practice. Although radiological reports were available, the treating urologist and/or clinical champion was responsible for the final interpretation of scan results. During the on-site data audits a random sample of imaging results was validated at the MUSIC coordinating center.

### Imaging Intervention

A multistep intervention was performed at our collaborative-wide meetings starting with a review of baseline practice level data and the various imaging guidelines, such as the NCCN (National Comprehensive Cancer Network) and AUA Best Practice Statements, for patients with newly diagnosed prostate cancer. After presenting practice level baseline use and guidelines at a second meeting the clinical champion at each practice reviewed the performance data and the relevant guideline recommendations at the practice site with colleagues. Although data were presented in de-identified fashion at the meetings, the clinical champion at each site had access to practice level data at the practice as well as to individualized physician level data on physicians in the practice. The date of local review by each practice was documented and defined as the transition point for the pre-intervention (phase 1) and postintervention (phase 2) analyses presented.

### Statistical Analysis

Based on the D'Amico risk classification system<sup>6</sup> we identified patients at low risk in wave 1 and wave 2 practices. Demographic characteristics and rates of imaging in phase 1 and phase 2 were tabulated. The chi-square test was used to analyze differences in imaging use between practices and from before to after the multistep intervention. Statistical testing was 2-sided and performed at the 5% significance level using software.

## RESULTS

Of 2,869 patients with newly diagnosed prostate cancer 813 (28.3%) were at low risk by the D'Amico criteria.<sup>6</sup> Approximately equal numbers of patients in each risk group were diagnosed during phases 1 and 2. Demographic and clinical characteristics were similar in the 2 groups (supplementary table, <http://jurology.com/1>). There was a significant difference in practice size ( $p < 0.0001$ ) with more patients from practices with more than 10 urologists in phase 2.

Across the entire collaborative the rate of ordering bone scan decreased significantly after data review and performance feedback from 3.7% to 1.3% ( $p = 0.03$ ). There was a similar trend toward less frequent ordering of CT from 5.2% to 3.2% ( $p =$

[F1]

0.17, see figure). The total number of studies decreased from 14 to 5 and 21 to 13 from phase 1 to 2 for bone scan and CT, respectively. No ordered imaging studies were positive for metastatic disease.


At the practice level at most sites no radiographic staging was ordered for patients with low risk tumors in phase 1 or 2 (see table). Due to the overall low number of studies a statistically significant change in practice patterns was observed at only 1 site. After the intervention the CT rate in patients at low risk decreased from 38.1% to 0% at that site ( $p < 0.05$ ).

[T1]

**DISCUSSION**

We evaluated the effect of audit and performance feedback on practice patterns in MUSIC. We specifically looked at the use of bone scan and CT for radiographic staging of newly diagnosed, low risk prostate cancer. In the 19 practices included in analysis imaging rates at baseline were generally low but they decreased even further after collaborative education and feedback.

Unnecessary imaging continues despite several guidelines, best practice statements<sup>2-5</sup> and incentives that recommend against radiographic staging in patients with low risk prostate cancer.<sup>10-14</sup> After evaluating SEER (Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results)-Medicare data Prasad et al found widespread overuse of imaging with an estimated cost that exceeded \$3.6 million dollars in 2 years.<sup>15</sup> Collaborative groups such as ours have successfully altered practice patterns. The USQC (Urological Surgery Quality Collaborative) reported



Collaborative-wide changes in bone scan and CT use in patients with low risk prostate cancer.

Patients who underwent bone scan and CT in each practice before and after quality improvement intervention

Practice No.*	No. Bone Scan (%)			No. CT (%)		
	Phase I	Phase II	p Value	Phase I	Phase II	p Value
3	0	0	Not applicable	0	1 (3.7)	0.16
4	6 (6.7)	1 (8.3)	0.84	10 (10.8)	4 (26.7)	0.09
5	0	0	Not applicable	0	0	0.09
7	2 (8.7)	0	0.5	2 (8.7)	0	0.5
8	5 (26.3)	0	0.11	8 (38.1)	0	0.04
9	0	0	Not applicable	1 (3.3)	0	0.62
10	0	3 (1.6)	Not applicable	0	6 (3.2)	Not applicable
11	1 (3.6)	0	0.57	0	0	Not applicable
16	0	0	Not applicable	0	1 (10.0)	0.21
17	1 (5.6)	1 (3.9)	0.79	0	1 (3.9)	0.41

\* No patient in practice 1, 2, 6, 12 to 15, 18 or 19 ( $p$  not applicable).

that significantly fewer bone scans and CTs were ordered in the postintervention phase of a separate project, including a significant decrease in these studies in patients with low and intermediate risk cancer.<sup>16</sup> While the same strategy was used, MUSIC is a much broader statewide effort that includes a diverse range of practices, in contrast to the 3 large practices in the previous pilot study.

Using a slightly different approach Makarov et al from Sweden recently noted that clinically and statistically significant decreases in prostate cancer imaging were possible by disseminating use data to urologists along with the latest imaging guidelines.<sup>17</sup> Clearly changing physician practice patterns can be a challenge. However, our data show that significant improvement can occur quickly through collaborative audit and performance feedback.

A limitation of our study is the lack of a control group to which feedback was not provided. However, this was partly addressed by measuring imaging rates before and after feedback. Secular trends and other factors that were not controlled for, such as implementation of the Physician Quality Reporting System (PQRS) to promote avoidance of bone scans in patients at low risk and the Choosing Wisely® campaign, may also have affected the radiographic staging rate. In addition, changes in practice patterns may be related to observation in and of itself. Lastly, as with all registries, data accuracy depends to some extent on the diligence of individual practices and data managers. However, MUSIC standard operating procedures include quality control activities (eg site visits) to ameliorate this concern. One of the challenges that we face in the long term is to maintain this low level of imaging in the collaborative.

These limitations notwithstanding, our study supports a growing body of evidence that collaborative performance feedback is a powerful tool that can affect physician behavior and improve efficiency

of care in a short period. Moving forward, there is also the potential for more appropriate radiographic staging for other prostate cancer risk categories with further improvement in the quality and efficiency of prostate cancer care.

## CONCLUSIONS

Patterns of care in the use of radiographic staging for newly diagnosed patients with low risk prostate cancer in MUSIC were appropriately low at baseline and decreased even further after

collaborative education and performance feedback. Opportunities exist to further improve appropriate imaging use in patients with prostate cancer. MUSIC appears to be a successful tool for quality improvement, affecting practice patterns and increasing efficiency.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. David Share, Tom Leyden and Amy Jarabek, Value Partnerships, BSBSM assisted with the study.

## REFERENCES

- Mariotto AB, Yabroff KR, Shao Y et al: Projections of the cost of cancer care in the United States: 2010-2020. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2011; **103**: 117–128.
- Mohler JL, Armstrong AJ, Bahnson RR et al: Prostate cancer, Version 3.2012: featured updates to the NCCN guidelines. *J Natl Compr Canc Netw* 2012; **10**: 1081.
- Greene KL, Albertsen PC, Babaian RJ et al: Prostate specific antigen best practice statement: 2009 update. *J Urol* 2009; **182**: 2232.
- Eberhardt SC, Carter S, Casalino DD et al: ACR Appropriateness Criteria prostate cancer—pretreatment detection, staging, and surveillance. *J Am Coll Radiol* 2013; **10**: 83.
- Heidenreich A, Bastian PJ, Bellmunt J et al: EAU guidelines on prostate cancer. Part II: treatment of advanced, relapsing, and castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Eur Urol* 2014; **65**: 467.
- D'Amico AV, Whittington R, Malkowicz SB et al: Biochemical outcome after radical prostatectomy, external beam radiation therapy, or interstitial radiation therapy for clinically localized prostate cancer. *JAMA* 1998; **280**: 969.
- Cooperberg MR, Pasta DJ, Elkin EP et al: The University of California, San Francisco Cancer of the Prostate Risk Assessment score: a straightforward and reliable preoperative predictor of disease recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *J Urol* 2005; **173**: 1938.
- Choosing Wisely: Imaging Tests for Early Prostate Cancer. Available at <http://www.choosingwisely.org/doctor-patient-lists/imaging-tests-for-early-prostate-cancer/>. Accessed August 7, 2014.
- PQRS PRO™: Measure #102: Prostate Cancer: Avoidance of Overuse of Bone Scan for Staging Low Risk Prostate Cancer Patients. Available at [https://pqrspro.com/Prostate\\_Cancer\\_Avoidance\\_of\\_Overuse\\_of\\_Bone\\_Scan\\_for\\_Staging\\_Low\\_Risk\\_Prostate\\_Cancer\\_Patients](https://pqrspro.com/Prostate_Cancer_Avoidance_of_Overuse_of_Bone_Scan_for_Staging_Low_Risk_Prostate_Cancer_Patients). Accessed August 7, 2014.
- Plawker MW, Fleisher JM, Vapnek EM et al: Current trends in prostate cancer diagnosis and staging among United States urologists. *J Urol* 1997; **158**: 1853.
- Kindrick AV, Grossfeld GD, Stier DM et al: Use of imaging tests for staging newly diagnosed prostate cancer: trends from the CaPSURE database. *J Urol* 1998; **160**: 2102.
- Cooperberg MR, Lubeck DP, Grossfeld GD et al: Contemporary trends in imaging test utilization for prostate cancer staging: data from the cancer of the prostate strategic urologic research endeavor. *J Urol* 2002; **168**: 491.
- Choi WW, Williams SB, Gu X et al: Overuse of imaging for staging low risk prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2011; **185**: 1645.
- Lavery HJ, Brajtbord JS, Levinson AW et al: Unnecessary imaging for the staging of low-risk prostate cancer is common. *Urology* 2011; **77**: 274.
- Prasad SM, Gu X, Lipsitz SR et al: Inappropriate utilization of radiographic imaging in men with newly diagnosed prostate cancer in the United States. *Cancer* 2012; **118**: 1260.
- Miller DC, Murtagh DS, Suh RS et al: Regional collaboration to improve radiographic staging practices among men with early stage prostate cancer. *J Urol* 2011; **186**: 844.
- Makarov DV, Loeb S, Ulmert D et al: Prostate cancer imaging trends after a nationwide effort to discourage inappropriate prostate cancer imaging. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2013; **105**: 1306.