

Societal costs of localized renal cancer surgery

Peter Chang, MD,^{*1,2} Peter Renehan, MBA,^{*2} Kimberly N. Taylor, RN,¹

Lauren E. Dewey, BS,¹ Kyle C. McAnally, BS,¹ Sara Hyde, BS,¹

Catrina M. Crociani, MPH,¹ Arie Carneiro, MD,^{3,4} Lisa T. Beaulé, MD,⁵

Andrew A. Wagner, MD^{1,2}

¹Division of Urology, Department of Surgery, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts, USA

²Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA / ³Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, São Paulo, Brazil

⁴ABC Medical School, São Paulo, Brazil / ⁵Maine Medical Center, South Portland, Main, USA

CHANG P, RENEHAN P, TAYLOR KN, DEWEY LE, MCANALLY KC, HYDE S, CROCIANI CM, CARNEIRO A, BEAULE LT, WAGNER AA. Societal costs of localized renal cancer surgery. *Can J Urol* 2018; 25(4):9401-9406.

Introduction: Hospital-related costs of renal cancer surgery have been described, but the societal costs of surgery-related lost productivity are poorly understood. We estimated the societal cost of renal cancer surgery by assessing surgery-related time off work (TOW) taken by patients and their caretakers.

Materials and methods: A total of 413 subjects who underwent partial or radical nephrectomy enrolled in an IRB-approved prospective study received an occupational survey assessing employment status, work physicality, income, surgery-related TOW, and caretaker assistance. We excluded subjects with incomplete occupational information or metastatic disease. We estimated potential wages lost using individual income and TOW, and used logistic regression to evaluate for factors predictive of TOW > 30 days.

Results: Of the 219 subjects who responded, 138 were employed at time of surgery. Ninety-seven subjects returned to work, met the inclusion criteria, and were analyzed. Mean age was 54 and 56% of subjects had sedentary jobs. TOW ranged from 7 to 92 days; mean and median TOW was 35 and 33 days, respectively and 58% of subjects took > 30 days off. Mean potential wages lost for TOW was \$10,152. Eighty-three percent of subjects had at least one caretaker take TOW (mean/median caretaker TOW: 11/7 days, respectively) to assist in recovery. Subjects with sedentary jobs were less likely to take > 30 days off (OR 0.30; 95% CI 0.09-0.99).

Conclusions: Most renal cancer surgery patients take over 1 month off work. Recognizing the associated societal costs may allow better adjustment of patient expectations, and more comprehensive cost-effectiveness analyses in renal cancer care.

Key Words: kidney neoplasms, cost of illness, return to work

Introduction

There are approximately 62,000 new cases and 14,000 deaths from kidney cancer each year.¹ Mortality is declining in part due to curative surgical management,

but also due to the increased incidental detection of small, potentially indolent renal masses with cross-sectional imaging.² With increased acceptance of non-operative management for incidentally discovered small renal masses³ and advances in minimally invasive renal cancer surgery, increased emphasis is being placed on the costs of renal cancer treatment.

Most cost analyses for renal cancer surgery focus on direct, hospital-related costs,^{4,5} which may vary considerably between institutions. Another common approach is to use reimbursement data as a single proxy for cost, which may paint an incomplete picture of the multiple billable events accounting for hospital costs.

Still less attention has been paid to the societal costs of these surgeries, which may be both economically and clinically significant. Under most health economic models, the costs of surgical procedures are assumed up front, while the value (patient satisfaction, function in society) may be accrued over time and thus difficult to measure. However, time off work (TOW) is a societal

Accepted for publication July 2018

*shared lead authorship

Acknowledgement

Dr. Chang is supported by a Urology Care Foundation Research Scholar Award and the Martin and Diane Trust Career Development Chair in Surgery. Work presented at the 2015 American Urological Association Annual Meeting in New Orleans, LA

Address correspondence to Dr. Peter Chang, Division of Urology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, 330 Brookline Avenue, Rabb 440, Boston, MA 02215 USA

cost that reflects lost productivity for patients and their caretakers, and is a measurable societal cost that may ultimately prove more generalizable than direct costs, which tend to vary across institutions.⁶

TOW also has clear clinical importance, as it may influence patient satisfaction, treatment preference, and timing of treatment. A clearer understanding of surgery-related TOW after radical and partial nephrectomy could help set realistic expectations for postoperative recovery, potentially leading to improved overall patient satisfaction.

To our knowledge this study represents the first description of the societal costs of renal cancer surgery. Using an occupational questionnaire, we examined postoperative TOW in patients and their caretakers, and used this representation of lost productivity to estimate surgery-related societal cost.

Materials and methods

Cohort

We administered a societal cost questionnaire to 413 subjects who had undergone radical nephrectomy (RN) or partial nephrectomy (PN) for localized renal cancer from 2008 to 2016 at two academic medical centers. These subjects had already consented to enrolling and participating in an IRB-approved kidney surgery study involving prospective collection of patient-reported quality of life at pre-treatment baseline, and 2, 4, 8, 12, and 52 weeks after surgery, as well as yearly follow up. Subjects were instructed by their surgeon to avoid heavy lifting for 4 weeks postoperatively.

We maintained and updated all data in our secure database provided by Research Electronic Data Capture web application (REDCap).⁷ We sent subjects the occupational survey 8 weeks after surgery, either through the REDCap system or by traditional mail, per patient preference. Those subjects already enrolled on the quality of life study at the onset of this societal cost study were sent the societal cost survey at their next scheduled follow up interval. Non-response prompted

re-sending of the survey at 4 week intervals, for up to three total requests.

Outcomes

To all subjects, we administered a societal cost questionnaire that assessed employment at the time of surgery, work physicality (sedentary/moderate/heavy lifting), TOW in days, level of caretaker assistance (number of caretakers; total number of days they took off work), and income by tax bracket.⁸ We excluded subjects from the analysis if they underwent cytoreductive nephrectomy, had inadequate societal cost questionnaire data, or were not employed at the time of surgery.

We considered the societal cost of lost productivity proportional to the time costs of surgery convalescence. Furthermore, we estimated the potential wages lost for each subject by multiplying their annual income (the median value of their reported tax bracket) by their TOW in days, and dividing by 365.

We also evaluated the degree of caretaker assistance required by each subject, asking subjects to report the number of caretakers that took time off to help in the subjects' recovery, and the amount of time taken off by caretakers. We then sought to identify predictors of TOW > 30 days, using multivariable logistic regression to evaluate for factors significantly associated with this outcome. SAS version 9.3 was used for all statistical analyses.

Results

Of the 413 subjects sent the societal cost questionnaire, 194 did not complete the survey despite multiple requests and 219 subjects responded to the survey. There were 138 employed at the time of surgery, 97 subjects met the inclusion/exclusion criteria, and were included in the analysis, Figure 1. Six subjects did not return to work after surgery, all of whom were over 65 at the time of surgery, and none of whom had a surgical complication. There were no significant differences in




Figure 1. Analytic cohort.

TABLE 1. Subject clinical and surgical characteristics

Variable	Radical nephrectomy (n = 25)	Partial nephrectomy (n = 72)	Total (n = 97)
Age (SD)	54 (10)	54 (11)	54 (10)
Minimally invasive surgery (%)	23 (92)	66 (92)	89 (92)
Estimated blood loss in cc (SD)	114 (141)	236 (183)	204 (181)
Hospital stay (median IQR)	2 (1)	2 (2)	2 (1)
Postoperative complications – any Clavien Grade (%)	6 (24)	9 (13)	15 (17)

age, surgical approach, or complication rate between survey responders and non-responders.

Subject clinical and surgical characteristics are presented in Table 1. The mean subject age was 54 years. We used a minimally invasive surgical approach in 92% of subjects, and almost all subjects were discharged on postoperative one or two. The majority (56%) of subjects had sedentary jobs, while 12% routinely performed heavy lifting at work, Table 2. Most subjects (54%) were of middle class income, as

described by an annual income of \$48,601-\$125,450, corresponding to the 41st-60th percentile of average annual income for U.S. citizens in 2010.

The majority of subjects (57%) took more than 4 weeks off work (mean TOW for all subjects = 36 days; Table 2). Under the assumption that the societal cost of lost productivity is proportional to potential lost income, the mean societal cost of surgery-related time off work was \$10,152 (SD = \$8153). Eighty-three percent of subjects reported that at least one caretaker

TABLE 2. Subject occupational characteristics

Variable	Radical nephrectomy (n = 25)	Partial nephrectomy (n = 72)	Total (n = 97)
Job physicality (col %)			
Sedentary	19 (76)	35 (49)	54 (56)
Moderate activity	4 (16)	27 (37)	31 (32)
Heavy lifting	2 (8)	10 (14)	12 (12)
Income by tax bracket			
\$0 to \$12,750 (%)	0 (0)	3 (4)	3 (3)
\$12,751-\$48,600 (%)	7 (28)	10 (14)	17 (18)
\$48,601-\$125,450 (%)	12 (48)	39 (54)	51 (54)
\$125,451-\$203,150 (%)	2 (8)	14 (19)	16 (16)
\$203,151-\$398,350 (%)	3 (12)	5 (7)	8 (8)
\$398,351-\$425,000 (%)	1 (4)	1 (1)	2 (2)
Time off work (in days)		see Figure 2	
Mean (SD)	34 (17)	37 (17)	36 (16)
Median (IQR)	29 (16-42)	32 (21-43)	31 (28-42)
Potential wages lost due to TOW after surgery, in USD* (SD)	\$8990 (5935)	\$10556 (8794)	\$10152 (8153)
Caretaker assistance			
Required the assistance of one or more persons (%)	21 (84)	60 (83)	81 (83)
Mean days off for all assistants per subject (SD)	14 (14)	10 (10)	11 (12)

*(median value of subject's reported tax bracket * TOW in days)/365




Figure 2. Time off work, in weeks, after localized renal cancer surgery.

took time off to help with postoperative convalescence. Average caretaker time off was 12 days, Table 2.

On multivariable analysis, subjects with sedentary jobs were significantly less likely to take more than 30 days off work (OR 0.30, 95% CI 0.09-0.99). Age, type of surgery (radical or partial nephrectomy, surgical approach (minimally invasive or open), income bracket, postoperative complications, and caretaker assistance were not associated with TOW > 4 weeks on multivariable analysis, Table 3.

Discussion

Measuring and understanding the costs of healthcare procedures and processes is now commonplace; however, the perspective and methods by which such analyses are performed vary significantly. Most cost analyses for kidney cancer surgery have focused on estimating direct, hospital-related costs. For example, several investigators have evaluated both variable and fixed costs of surgery for minimally invasive kidney surgery and found hospital costs to range from \$7,000-\$15,000 for laparoscopic radical nephrectomy and robotic partial nephrectomy.^{4,9,10}

These approaches have their limitations, however. Charges vary significantly by institution and region, and therefore may not be generalizable. Reimbursement data stems from the payor perspective, also varies by region, and thus may not be reflective of the patient experience. Moreover, the hospital costs do not take into account costs incurred in the post-hospitalization

TABLE 3. Predictors > 30 days off work

Variable	Odds ratio (OR)	95% CI
Sedentary job	*0.30	0.09-0.99
Age	0.67	0.21-2.2
Postoperative complications	1.3	0.28-6.2
Income bracket	0.33	0.09-1.2
Surgical approach (minimally invasive; open)	1.1	0.29-3.9
Caretaker assistance	0.71	0.22-2.3

period, which could be as significant as the costs of the hospitalization. This and other inherent challenges in measuring cost were the impetus for guideline publications by the Panel of Cost Effectiveness in Medicine¹¹ and the World Health Organization.¹² Both documents acknowledge the importance and challenges of measuring costs from the societal perspective.

Until now, post-hospitalization costs after kidney surgery were unknown. Other fields have used TOW as a proxy for health outcomes, including rehabilitation medicine, pain management, oncology, and orthopedics.¹³⁻¹⁶ In these studies TOW is often modeled dynamically (Markov),^{16,17} in step-wise fashion (Kaplan-Meier),¹⁸ or using logistic regression, and the emphasis is often on patients suffering from chronic, debilitating conditions such as severe burns or back pain.^{13,14,18} By assessing the impact of TOW we measure an outcome that is not only an important contributor to societal cost, but is also critical information for patients and their families. The period between discharge and the first postoperative visit (often as many as 90 days after surgery) is traditionally a “black box,” during which convalescence occurs and employed patients return to work (or do not). To our knowledge, this is the first study to investigate this period from the societal cost perspective in kidney surgery patients.

Reports describing TOW for other abdominal surgical procedures are sparse and importantly, costs have not been incorporated into these analyses. A prospective study of 100 patients undergoing laparoscopic cholecystectomy reported a median TOW of 7 days,²⁰ while a randomized trial comparing single incision laparoscopic cholecystectomy to mini-laparoscopic cholecystectomy showed a mean TOW of 5.3 and 5.9 days, respectively.²¹

In contrast, the median TOW in subjects undergoing kidney surgery in our study was 31 days. This is shorter, but on the same scale as the median

TOW of 46 days described after laparoscopic donor nephrectomy reported in a matched pair comparison between laparoscopic donor nephrectomy and laparoscopic single site (LESS) donor.²² Interestingly, the investigators found LESS patients returned to work after only 18 days. These findings allow practitioners to appropriately adjust patient and family expectations before kidney surgery by using another surgery as a frame of reference. Extrapolating from the data above, it would conceivably help patients to know that recovery after minimally invasive renal cancer surgery is significantly more delayed than that after laparoscopic cholecystectomy.

Our study found average estimated societal costs incurred from renal cancer surgery-related TOW to be about \$10,000. Moreover, about half of our patients required a caretaker at home whom also took 1 week off work. Even in those patients who have paid TOW and do not directly incur these costs, the societal costs are proportional to lost productivity from this TOW, and may at least equal the average hospital-based costs that have been demonstrated after kidney surgery.^{4,9,10} Thus our results carry important implications and suggest that the societal costs incurred in the immediate post-hospitalization period may be as impactful as those incurred in the hospital.

We evaluated factors influencing the TOW and found the only significant predictor of taking more than 30 days off work was the physicality of patient employment. Patients with sedentary jobs were significantly less likely to take TOW > 30 days than those who described their jobs as requiring moderate physical activity or heavy lifting. Although to our knowledge, no other studies describe this finding, at least one study has investigated the influence of physical activity on TOW. Onerup et al reported that preoperative level physical activity was directly correlated with TOW less than 3 weeks following elective cholecystectomy, although they did not assess the level of activity required at work.^{20,21}

It is possible that TOW is also influenced by non-clinical factors such as limitations to heavy lifting imposed by the surgeon, surgeon suggestion (rather than requirement) of how much TOW to take, availability of short term disability insurance, whether TOW was paid/unpaid, or amount of TOW allowed/encouraged by the workplace policies.²⁴ The reasons for TOW were not captured in our occupational questionnaire, and are important areas for future investigation in a larger cohort.

Our study has several limitations. A larger sample size would have increased our power to detect significant predictors of TOW > 30 days. Most of our

subjects underwent minimally invasive surgery, which limited our ability to evaluate the influence of surgical approach on TOW. However, given the short term advantages in pain and convalescence associated with the MIS approach, it is likely that the societal costs of TOW associated with the open approach would be at least that of the MIS approach. In our societal cost estimation, we assumed that lost societal productivity from the TOW is proportional to income, which may not be the case; however, this is a common assumption made in such analyses, and on the individual patient basis, is certainly valid if TOW is unpaid. We chose to use individual subjects' income for our calculations of societal costs rather than income by median age group or ZIP code, which may limit the generalizability of our results. However, only through this approach could we assess the potential influence of individual income on TOW. Despite its limitations, our study uses a novel approach to look beyond payor-oriented traditional cost analyses and to examine not only the societal cost of renal cancer surgery, but also its practical burden on their employment and their caretakers.

Conclusion

Even with the growing utilization of minimally invasive surgical approaches, most patients, especially those with non-sedentary jobs, take more than 4 weeks off work following renal cancer surgery, and many require the assistance of caretakers and loved ones during convalescence. In our cohort, this lost productivity was associated with a substantial average societal cost of at least \$10,000. These findings may help better estimate overall societal costs after kidney surgery, help practitioners to refine patient expectations and improve overall patient satisfaction. □

References

1. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2018. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2018;68(1):7-30.
2. Hollingsworth JM, Miller DC, Daignault S, Hollenbeck BK. Rising incidence of small renal masses: a need to reassess treatment effect. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006;98(18):1331-1334.
3. Pierorazio PM, Johnson MH, Ball MW et al. Five-year analysis of a multi-institutional prospective clinical trial of delayed intervention and surveillance for small renal masses: The DISSRM registry. *Eur Urol* 2015;68(3):408-415.

4. Alemozaffar M, Chang SL, Kacker R, Sun M, DeWolf WC, Wagner AA. Comparing costs of robotic, laparoscopic, and open partial nephrectomy. *J Endourol* 2013;27(5):560-565.
5. Wang Y, Chen YW, Leow JJ, Levy AC, Chang SL, Gelpi FH. Cost-effectiveness of management options for small renal mass: a systematic review. *Am J Clin Oncol* 2016;39(5):484-490.
6. Hodgson TA, Meiners MR. Cost-of-illness methodology: a guide to current practices and procedures. *Milbank Mem Fund Q Health Soc* 1982;60(3):429-462.
7. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data capture (REDCap)—A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009;42(2):377-381.
8. Congressional Budget Office. The Distribution of Household Income and Federal Taxes, 2010. December 4, 2013. Available from <http://www.cbo.gov/publication/44604>.
9. Mir SA, Cadeddu JA, Sleeper JP, Lotan Y. Cost comparison of robotic, laparoscopic, and open partial nephrectomy. *J Endourol* 2011;25(3):447-453.
10. Yang DY, Monn MF, Bahler CD, Sundaram CP. Does robotic assistance confer an economic benefit during laparoscopic radical nephrectomy? *J Urol* 2014;192(3):671-676.
11. Russell LB, Gold MR, Siegel JE, Daniels N, Weinstein MC. The role of cost-effectiveness analysis in health and medicine. Panel on cost-effectiveness in health and medicine. *JAMA* 1996; 276(14):1172-1177.
12. Evans DB, Lim SS, Adam T, Edejer TT; WHO Choosing Interventions that are Cost Effective (CHOICE) Millennium Development Goals Team. Evaluation of current strategies and future priorities for improving health in developing countries. *BMJ* 2005;331(7530):1457-1461.
13. Dyster-Aas J, Kildal M, Willebrand M. Return to work and health-related quality of life after burn injury. *J Rehabil Med* 2007; 39(1):49-55.
14. Fisher TF. Perception differences between groups of employees identifying the factors that influence a return to work after a work-related musculoskeletal injury. *Work* 2003;21(3): 211-220.
15. Şahin F, Akca H, Akkaya N, Zincir ÖD, Işık A. Cost analysis and related factors in patients with traumatic hand injury. *J Hand Surg Eur* 2013;38(6):673-679.
16. Han KT, Park EC, Kim SJ et al. Factors affecting the quality of life of Korean cancer survivors who return to the workplace. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* 2014;15(20):8783-8788.
17. Kulkarni GS, Alibhai SM, Finelli A et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of immediate radical cystectomy versus intravesical bacillus calmette-guerin therapy for high-risk, high-grade (T1G3) bladder cancer. *Cancer* 2009;115(23):5450-5459.
18. Ament JD, Yang Z, Nunley P, Stone MB, Kim KD. Cost-effectiveness of cervical total disc replacement vs fusion for the treatment of 2-level symptomatic degenerative disc disease. *JAMA Surg* 2014;149(12):1231-1239.
19. Parker SL, Mendenhall SK, Shau DN et al. Minimally invasive versus open transforaminal lumbar interbody fusion for degenerative spondylolisthesis: comparative effectiveness and cost-utility analysis. *World Neurosurg* 2014;82(1-2):230-238.
20. Bringman S, Anderberg B, Heikkinen T, Nyberg B, Peterson E, Hansen K, Ramel S. Outpatient laparoscopic cholecystectomy. A prospective study with 100 consecutive patients. *Ambul Surg* 2001;9(2):83-86.
21. Lee PC, Lo C, Lai PS, Chang JJ, Huang SJ, Lin MT. Randomized clinical trial of single-incision laparoscopic cholecystectomy versus minilaparoscopic cholecystectomy. *Br J Surg* 2010; 97(7):1007-1012.
22. Canes D, Berger A, Aron M, Brandina R, Goldfarb DA, Shoskes D. Laparo-endoscopic single site (LESS) versus standard laparoscopic left donor nephrectomy: matched-pair comparison. *Eur Urol* 2010;57(1):95-101.
23. Onerup A, Angeras U, Bock D et al. The preoperative level of physical activity is associated to the postoperative recovery after elective cholecystectomy – A cohort study. *Int J Surg* 2015;19:35-41.
24. Barkun JS, Keyser EJ, Wexler MJ et al. Short-term outcomes in open vs. laparoscopic herniorrhaphy: confounding impact of worker's compensation on convalescence. *J Gastrointest Surg* 1999; 3(6):575-582.