Partial Cystectomy Could Be a Better Option of Bladder Preservation in T1 High-Grade Bladder Cancer Patients: A Propensity Score Matching Study

Xiangpeng Zhan

First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University

Bin Fu (✉ uofbin@163.com)

First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6686-7561>

Research

Keywords: Partial cystectomy, T1 high-grade, TURBT, radical cystectomy, SEER, prognosis

Posted Date: November 8th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1046708/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Purpose: Partial cystectomy was investigated as a method of bladder preservation with better disease outcomes than transurethral bladder tumor resection in T1 high-grade bladder cancer patients.

Method and materials: The national Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results database (SEER) (2004-2015) was used to obtain patients diagnosed with T1 high-grade bladder cancer, and finally, 25263 patients were enrolled in our study. The Kaplan-Meier method with the log-rank test was performed to analyze the outcome of overall survival (OS) and cancer-specific survival (CSS) between patients undergoing PC, TURBT, or RC. Moreover, the propensity score matching (PSM) and multivariable Cox proportional hazard model were also utilized in the study.

Results: Ultimately, 24635 patients were undergoing TURBT, while 190 and 438 patients were respectively assigned to PC and RC groups. Compared with patients with TURBT, a tendency of a higher proportion of higher older and male patients was observed in the PC group. When matching with RC patients, patients in the PC group were common older and had bigger tumor sizes and single tumor. (All $P < 0.05$). After 1:1 PSM, 190 patients with TURBT and 160 patients receiving RC were selected. In survival analysis, the patients in the PC group had a higher survival probability of both OS and CSS before and after PSM compared with those in the TURBT group. Meanwhile, no significant differences were observed between the RC and PC groups in OS and CSS analysis. Moreover, multivariable cox regression showed that PC was a protective factor for overall mortality (OM) and cancer-specific mortality (CSM) compared with TURBT in T1 high-grade patients. (All $P < 0.05$)

Conclusion: Patients undergoing partial cystectomy were shown to have a better outcome compared to those with transurethral bladder tumor resection in T1 high-grade bladder cancer patients. Partial cystectomy was a worthwhile alternative for T1 high-grade bladder cancer.

1 Introduction

Urothelial bladder cancer (UBC) is the 9th most common cancer globally and the most common cancer in the urinary system(1, 2). 75% of patients diagnosed with UBC are non-muscle-invasive bladder cancer (NMIBC), and 20% of NMIBC patients are T1 high-grade (T1HG)(3, 4).

T1 high-grade tumours are invasive and have a high probability of disease recurrence and progression to muscle invasion compared with other NMIBC tumours(5). Now, there are still challenges to the treatment of T1 high-grade tumours, and the main difficulties are choosing between bladder preservation like transurethral resection of the bladder (TURB) with maintenance bacillus Calmette-Guerin (BCG) and aggressive treatment such as radical cystectomy(2, 6). Bladder preservation approach was considered the ideal treatment and used widely but had a high risk of disease progression and recurrence, and radical cystectomy was confirmed as the best chance at cure while it might be overtreatment for some patients with T1HG tumour(2) (5-7). Urologists are committed to finding an ideal bladder preservation

method with better oncology outcomes in view of the negative effects of radical cystectomy on patients' quality of life.

Over the past decade, partial cystectomy as an approach of bladder preservation was explored as a viable alternative to radical cystectomy for some specifically selected MIBC patients, and partial cystectomy offered acceptable outcomes and adequate local control(8, 9). Partial cystectomy as an alternative to TURBT and RC might gain a balance between disease prognosis and patient's quality of life for T1HG bladder cancer patients. However, partial cystectomy was not utilized frequently, ranging from 7 to 10% of all cystectomies based on the studies of the National Cancer Database(10). To our knowledge, no studies focused on PC's effect in T1HG bladder cancer patients due to insufficient cases. To better understand treatment effect of PC compared with TURBT and RC in T1HG patients, we searched the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) database (2004-2015). We enrolled 25264 patients with T1HG tumours who had received surgery of PC, TURBT, or RC. Ultimately, the purpose of this study is to present a relatively good level of evidence for urologists and patients to choose the most suitable and ideal treatment for T1HG bladder cancer patients.

2 Materials And Methods

2.1 Patient database and study population

All patient data were obtained from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER), which represented the demographic composition and cancer incidence of the United States population. The conditions for inclusion were as follows: (1) Year of diagnosis: 2004-2015; (2) T stage: T1 high-grade (CS site-Specific Factors 1 code 20); (3) Histology behavior: Transitional cell carcinoma (TCC) and papillary transitional cell carcinoma (PTCC); (4) Surgical approach using surgery codes: transurethral bladder tumor resection (C10, C12, C14, C15, C16, C20, C21, C22, C23, C24, C25, C26, C27), partial cystectomy (C30) and radical cystectomy (C50, C60, C61, C62, C63, C64). The following exclusion criteria were also applied: (1) N1, N2, N3, NX (485); (2) M1, MX (270); (3) Grade unknown (1263); (4) tumour size unknown (7453); (5) Marital status unknown (417).

2.2 Definition of variables

In our study, patients with T1 high-grade bladder cancer were divided into three groups according to the "RX Summ-Surg Prim Site (1998+)" column in the SEER database, which contained TURBT, PC, and RC. Demographic characteristics of patients included age of diagnosis, sex, race, and marital status. Cancer characteristics incorporated tumor location, tumor grade, histology of the tumor, tumor size, and number of tumors. Treatment of patients contained surgical approaches, radiation recode, and chemotherapy recode. The race was divided into three categories: white, black, and other styles (American/Indian/Alaska/Native/Asian/Pacific Islander). Marital status was classified into three types: married, SDW (separated, divorced, widowed), and single. Tumor grade was separated into three groups, including grade I or grade II, III, and IV, to facilitate analysis. Tumor size and the number of tumors were converted to categorical variables as continuous variables. Other variables included: (1) Radiation recode

(no/unknown, yes) ;(2) Histology: Transitional cell carcinoma (TCC) and papillary transitional cell carcinoma (PTCC); (3) chemotherapy recode (no/unknown, yes). (4) Tumor site (Trigone, Dome, Lateral, Anterior, Posterior, Bladder neck, Ureteric orifice, Other sites including overlapping lesion of bladder and bladder, NOS).

2.3 Endpoints

The overall mortality (OM) and cancer-specific mortality (CSM) were the primary endpoints in our study. Overall mortality matched with any cause of death, and cancer-specific mortality referred to only those who died of bladder cancer. Any patients still were coded as alive if they died after the study cutoff date. The unit of survival time was recorded as a month.

2.4 Statistical analyses

Propensity score matching (PSM) was performed by SPSS version 22.0 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY). Baseline characteristics of patients receiving PC were assessed to confirmed whether significant differences were comparing with patients in other groups. *Two-sample t-tests* were used for continuous variables while *Chi-square test* for categorical variables to verify heterogeneity between groups. The $P < .050$ was recognized as significant, and all P -values of results were two-tailed. The mean $\pm$ SD, medians, and interquartile ranges were all presented for continuous variables while frequencies and their proportions for categorical variables. Survival curves of overall survival (OS) and cancer-specific survival (CSS) were constructed by R studio using the Kaplan-Meier method with the log-rank test. Meanwhile, subgroup analysis of OS and CSS was performed in T1HG patients stratified by age (<70 years and >70 years), sex (male and female), histology (Transitional cell carcinoma and papillary transitional cell carcinoma), tumor size (<3cm and >3cm), number of tumors (single and multiple) and grade (Grade I and Grade II), which could go further study the outcomes of T1HG patients. In addition, univariate and multivariate cox regression analysis was also applied to analyze the prognosis of PC. All results of cox regression analysis were presented with hazards ratios (HR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). The multivariate cox regression model adjusted confounding factors which contained age, sex, race, marital status, grade, histology, tumor size, number of tumors, tumor sites, radiotherapy, and chemotherapy. To balance baseline characteristics of the research population, Propensity score matching (PSM) was performed by SPSS. For PSM, patients receiving TURBT, or PC were matched 1:1 with a caliper set at 0.001 on the based sample size, but a caliper of 0.02 was applied for patients receiving PC or RC.

3 Results

3.1 Demographics and Clinical Characteristics of the Study Population

Finally, 25263 patients were enrolled in our study. There were 24635 patients receiving TURBT, while 190 and 438 patients were respectively assigned to PC and RC groups. The median follow-up time was 43 months. Table 1 and Table 2 revealed the baseline characteristics of the study population before and

after PSM. As Table 1 showed, patients in TURBT groups were older than those in the PC group (72.9 ± 10.371 vs 71.5 ± 9.830 $P=0.014$). Meanwhile, a higher percentage of male was showed in PC patients comparing with TURBT patients. Similarly, the PC group had a higher rate of dome, anterior and posterior tumors. However, there were still statistical differences between TURBT and PC groups on histology, tumor size, tumor site, and number of tumors (all $P<0.05$). When matching with RC patients, patients in the PC group were older (71.5 ± 9.830 vs 67.9 ± 9.625 , $P<0.001$). Moreover, bigger tumor size and single tumor were more common in the PC group (all $P<0.05$). After PSM, significant differences existed in tumor size and tumor site between PC and RC patients.

Table 1
Clinicopathological features between TURBT and PB before and after propensity score matching.

	No PSM			PSM		
Variables	TURBT (n=24635)	PC (n=190)	P-value	TURBT (n=190)	PC (n=190)	P-value
Age (year)						
Mean±SD	72.9±10.371	71.5±9.830	0.014*	72.7±11.448	71.5±9.830	0.260
Median (25th–75th percentile)	72(67.5-82)	72(67.5-77.5)	0.016*	77.5 (62-82)	72(67.5-77.5)	0.068
Sex			0.041*			0.769
Female	5115(20.8%)	28(14.7%)		26(13.7%)	28(14.7%)	
Male	19520(79.2%)	162(85.3%)		164(86.3%)	162(85.3%)	
Race			0.572			0.072
White	21859(88.7%)	171(90.0%)		162(85.3%)	171(90.0%)	
Black	1448(5.9%)	12(6.3%)		10(5.3%)	12(6.3%)	
Other style	1328(5.4%)	7(3.7%)		18(9.5%)	7(3.7%)	
Marital status			0.055			0.859
Married	15420(62.6%)	132(69.5%)		135(71.1%)	132(69.5%)	
SDW	6285(25.5%)	34(17.9%)		30(15.8%)	34(17.9%)	
Single	2930(11.9%)	24(12.6%)		25(13.2%)	24(12.6%)	
Grade			0.544			0.090
Grade I or Grade II	517(2.1%)	6(3.2%)		2(1.1%)	6(3.2%)	
Grade III	4926(20.0%)	40(21.1%)		55(28.9%)	40(21.1%)	
Grade IV	19192(77.9%)	144(75.8%)		133(70.0%)	144(75.8%)	
Histology			0.119			0.047*
TCC	7527(30.6%)	68(35.8%)		87(45.8%)	68(35.8%)	
PTCC	17108(69.4%)	122(64.2%)		103(54.2%)	122(64.2%)	
Radiotherapy			0.535			0.2

	No PSM			PSM		
no/unknown	24081(97.8%)	187(98.4%)		183(96.3%)	187(98.4%)	
yes	554(2.2%)	3(1.6%)		7(3.7%)	3(1.6%)	
Chemotherapy			0.127			0.618
no/unknown	18389(74.6%)	151(79.5%)		147(77.4%)	151(79.5%)	
yes	6246(25.4%)	39(20.5%)		43(22.6%)	39(20.5%)	
Tumor size			0.267			<0.001*
≤3cm	10919(44.3%)	78(41.1%)		129(67.9%)	78(41.1%)	
3-6cm	9833(39.9%)	74(38.9%)		54(28.4%)	74(38.9%)	
>6cm	3883(15.8%)	38(20.0%)		7(3.7%)	38(20.0%)	
Tumor site			<0.001*			<0.001*
Trigone	1266(5.1%)	1(0.5%)		19(10.0%)	1(0.5%)	
Dome	1235(5.0%)	29(15.3%)		11(5.8%)	29(15.3%)	
Lateral	4941(20.1%)	30(15.8%)		35(18.4%)	30(15.8%)	
Anterior	704(2.9%)	10(5.3%)		8(4.2%)	10(5.3%)	
Posterior	2453(10.0%)	22(11.6%)		23(12.1%)	22(11.6%)	
Bladder neck	784(3.2%)	2(1.1%)		7(3.7%)	2(1.1%)	
Ureteric orifice	584(2.4%)	4(2.1%)		4(2.1%)	4(2.1%)	
Other sites	12668(51.4%)	92(48.4%)		83(43.7%)	92(48.4%)	
Number of tumors			0.880			<0.001*
single	14655(59.5%)	112(58.9%)		74(38.9%)	112(58.9%)	
multiple	9980(40.5%)	78(41.1%)		116(61.1%)	78(41.1%)	
Survival time(month)						
mean	47.498	55.121	<0.001*	51.763	55.121	0.015*
median (25th–75th percentile)	55(37-77)	55.5(37-77)	<0.001*	48(23-81.25)	55.5(37-77)	0.236

No PSM	PSM
<p>PC: Partial cystectomy; TURBT: Transurethral Bladder Tumor Resection; Other race: American/Indian/Alaska/Native/Asian/Pacific Islande; SDW: separated, divorced or widowed; Other sites: Overlapping lesion of bladder, Bladder, NOS; TCC: Transitional cell carcinoma, PTCC: papillary Transitional cell carcinoma.</p> <p>PSM, propensity score matching</p> <p>*Statistically significant.</p>	

Table 2
Clinicopathological features between RC and PB before and after propensity score matching.

	No PSM			PSM		
Variables	RC (n=438)	PC (n=190)	P-value	RC (n=160)	PC (n=190)	P-value
Age (year)						
Mean±SD	67.9±9.625	71.5±9.830	<0.001*	69.9±9.408	71.5±9.830	0.121
Median (25th–75th percentile)	67.5(62-72)	72(66-77.5)	<0.001*	72(62-77.5)	72(66-77.5)	0.063
Sex			0.968	0.817		
Female	64(14.6%)	28(14.7%)		25(15.6%)	28(14.7%)	
Male	374(85.4%)	162(85.3%)		135(84.4%)	162(85.3%)	
Race			0.496	0.318		
White	387(88.4%)	171(90.0%)		144(90.0%)	171(90.0%)	
Black	25(5.7%)	12(6.3%)		6(3.8%)	12(6.3%)	
Other style	26(5.9%)	7(3.7%)		10(6.3%)	7(3.7%)	
Marital status			0.826	0.393		
Married	301(68.7%)	132(69.5%)		117(73.1%)	132(69.5%)	
SDW	74(16.9%)	34(17.9%)		30(18.8%)	34(17.9%)	
Single	63(14.4%)	24(12.6%)		13(8.1%)	24(12.6%)	
Grade			0.703	0.215		
Grade I or Grade II	9(2.1%)	6(3.2%)		1(0.6%)	6(3.2%)	
Grade III	95(21.7%)	40(21.1%)		38(23.8%)	40(21.1%)	
Grade IV	334(76.3%)	144(75.8%)		121(75.6%)	144(75.8%)	
Histology			0.13	0.602		
TCC	185(42.2%)	68(35.8%)		53(33.1%)	68(35.8%)	
PTCC	253(57.8%)	122(64.2%)		107(66.9%)	122(64.2%)	
Radiotherapy			0.653	0.403		
no/unknown	433(98.9%)	187(98.4%)		159(99.4%)	187(98.4%)	

	No PSM		PSM			
yes	5(1.1%)	3(1.6%)		1(0.6%)	3(1.6%)	
Chemotherapy			0.842			0.868
no/unknown	345(78.8%)	151(79.5%)		126(78.8)	151(79.5%)	
yes	93(21.2%)	39(20.5%)		34(21.3%)	39(20.5%)	
Tumor size			<0.001*			0.042*
≤3cm	323(73.7%)	78(41.1%)		87(54.4%)	78(41.1%)	
3-6cm	86(19.6%)	74(38.9%)		46(28.7%)	74(38.9%)	
>6cm	29(6.6%)	38(20.0%)		27(16.9%)	38(20.0%)	
Tumor site			<0.001*			0.041*
Trigone	14(3.2%)	1(0.5%)		8(5.0%)	1(0.5%)	
Dome	17(3.9%)	29(15%)		15(9.4%)	29(15.3%)	
Lateral	49(11.2%)	30(15.8%)		34(21.3%)	30(15.8%)	
Anterior	11(2.5%)	10(5.3%)		7(4.4%)	10(5.3%)	
Posterior	29(6.6%)	22(11.6%)		12(7.5%)	22(11.6%)	
Bladder neck	11(2.5%)	2(1.1%)		4(2.5%)	2(1.1%)	
Ureteric orifice	6(1.4%)	4(2.1%)		1(0.6%)	4(2.1%)	
Other sites	301(68.7%)	92(48.4%)		79(49.4%)	92(48.4%)	
Number of tumor			<0.001*			0.457
single	183(41.8%)	112(58.9%)		88(55.0%)	112(58.9%)	
multiple	255(58.2%)	78(41.1%)		72(45.0%)	78(41.1%)	
Survival time(month)						
mean	60.021	55.121	0.40	59.106	55.121	0.196
median (25th–75th percentile)	62(39-86)	55.5(37-77)	0.038*	60.5(39-82.75)	55.5(37-77)	0.157

No PSM	PSM
PC: Partial cystectomy; RC: Radical cystectomy; Other race: American/Indian/Alaska/Native/Asian/Pacific Islande; SDW: separated, divorced or widowed; Other sites: Overlapping lesion of bladder, Bladder, NOS; TCC: Transitional cell carcinoma, PTCC: papillary Transitional cell carcinoma.	
PSM, propensity score matching	
*Statistically significant.	

3.2 Survival analyses and subgroup analysis

As survival curves showed, patients receiving PC had a better prognosis of OS and CSS compared with those with TURBT before and after PSM (Figure1 ABCD, all P<0.05). In addition, no significant differences in OS and CSS were observed in terms of surgery of PC and RC before and after PSM (Figure2 ABCD; all P>0.05). When stratified by age, we found that patients over 70 years could obtain survival benefit of OS and CSS from PC while this effect was not observed in patients younger than 70 years. (Figure3 BF, P<0.001; Figure 3 AE, P>0.05) Moreover, subgroup stratified by gender to validate the different survival outcomes between PC and TURBT revealed that better survival probability of OS and CSS was obtained in the male patients (Figure 3 DH). At the same time, similar conditions did not appear in female patients who might account for a small sample size (Figure 3 CG). We also conducted subgroup analysis stratified by tumor size and number of tumors, and we obtained the results that patients with tumor size bigger than 3cm or multiple tumour could gain a better prognosis from PC matching with TURBT in term of OS and CSS. (Figure 4 ADEH) Patients in the PC group all showed longer CSS and OS than those in the TURBT group when stratified by grade and history, while the statistical difference was failed to show in terms of OS in PTCC patients. (Figure 5)

3.3 Multivariable analysis of PC for CSM and ACM before and after PSM

Table 3 demonstrated multivariable Cox proportional hazard models. After adjustments for confounding factors like age, sex, race, marital status, grade, histology, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, tumor size, tumor site, and the number of tumors, the adjusted model all presented that PC was a protective factor for all-cause mortality (OM) (PC vs. TURBT; HR=0.717, 95% CI = 0.565-0.908, P=0.006), while this result failed to gain in term of cancer-specific mortality (CSM) (PC vs TURBT; HR=0.756, 95% CI = 0.547-1.044, P=0.09) before PSM. However, after 1:1 PSM, statistical differences on ACM (PC vs TURBT; HR=0.667, 95% CI =0.467-0.952, P=0.026) and CSM (PC vs TURBT; HR=0.589, 95% CI =0.370-0.939, P=0.026) were both witnessed.

Table 3
Univariate and multivariable Cox proportional hazard model for PC

Outcomes	PC HR (95% CI), (TURBT ref.)	P-value
Overall mortality		
Non-adjusted	0.650(0.513-0.824)	P<0.001*
Adjusted	0.717(0.565-0.908)	P=0.006*
PSM non-adjusted	0.562(0.417-0.758)	P<0.001*
PSM adjusted	0.667(0.467-0.952)	P=0.026*
Cancer-specific mortality		
Non-adjusted	0.664(0.481-0.917)	0.013*
Adjusted	0.756(0.547-1.044)	P=0.09
PSM non-adjusted	0.474(0.319-0.705)	P<0.001*
PSM adjusted	0.589(0.370-0.939)	P=0.026*
<p>Non-adjusted: Univariate cox regression analysis for PC</p> <p>All model adjusted for: Age, sex, race, marital status, grade, histology, radiotherapy, chemotherapy, tumor size, tumor site, number of tumors.</p> <p>PC: Partial cystectomy; PSM: propensity score matching</p> <p>*Statistically significant.</p>		

4 Discussion

The aim of our study was to investigate an approach in T1HG patients, which could be a better choice than TURBT to preserve bladder and retained not bad disease prognosis compared with RC. In this study, we confirmed the results that the T1HG patients could gain survival benefit of OS and CSS from PC when matched with TURBT, and most subgroup analysis confirmed the result. Meanwhile, statistical differences were failed to observe between PC and RC on CSS and OS analysis. Moreover, compared to TURBT, multivariate cox regression analysis revealed that PC was a protective factor of OM and CSM in T1HG patients.

Formerly, partial cystectomy has experienced a resurgence. A growing body of literature has argued that PC might be a viable alternative to RC for select muscle-invasive bladder cancer (MIBC) patients(8, 9, 11). Considering potential complications of RC like severe blood loss, infections, paralytic ileus, and issues with wound healing and negative effect on long-term life, urologist and patients transferred their focus on PC, which could preserve a complete bladder and function of voiding, avoids urinary diversion, and

maintain sexual function(11). In addition, *Umberto Capitanio*' study based on the SEER database got similar results, which showed PC did not enervate the prognosis of OS and CSS in selected patients(12). Subsequent retrospective study has also issued a similar conclusion that no differences were seen between PC and RC in metastasis-free or cancer-specific survival(8, 13, 14). However, some critics of partial cystectomy proclaimed that PC was an incomplete cancer operation following a significant risk of recurrence for MIBC patients and delaying the best treatment time(11, 15). T1HG tumour was aggressive cancer but in the early stages comparing to MIBC tumours. Therefore, partial cystectomy might be worth trying as a method of bladder preservation to replace RC.

As far as we know, there were few studies focusing on the impact of TURBT and PC. However, there was research revealed that 50% of patients diagnosed with T1 bladder cancer in the first TURBT displayed residual tumors when a second TURBT was applied, while 10–25% of those patients were confirmed as muscle-invasive bladder cancer(15-18). TURBT showed a lousy power of cancer control and accurate pathology report based on the results of these data. Meanwhile, PC removed local tumors, which deleted full-thickness bladder containing lesions, while the alarm of intraoperative bladder perforation still existed in surgery of TURBT. Furthermore, more pathological data obtaining like muscle infiltration and lymph node metastasis was the superiority of PC(9, 11, 13). Simultaneously, BCG shortage was also a challenge for traditional treatment like TURBT following BCG(19). In summary, PC was a bladder preservation strategy with significant quantity advantages superior to TURBT, and it was an option worth considering for T1HG patients.

In this study, compared with TURBT patients, patients receiving PC tended to be young (71.5 ± 9.830 vs 72.9 ± 10.371 , $P=0.014$) and had a higher proportion of male (85.3% vs 79.2%, $P=0.041$). When matched with the RC group, the PC group appeared more older (71.5 ± 9.830 vs 67.9 ± 9.625 , $P<0.001$) and were more likely to have a single tumor (58.9% vs 41.8%, $P<0.001$). This result confirmed with criteria of adopting PC developed by *MD Anderson*(9, 13). However, a higher proportion of bigger tumours size was observed in the PC group, which might be the cause of insufficient sample size.

Survival analysis in propensity score-matched subgroups was performed to precisely compare the efficacy between PC and TURBT. In the subgroup of age>70, male, tumour size<3cm, multiple, grade I and II, histology of transitional cell carcinoma and papillary transitional cell carcinoma, T1HG patients with PC all showed better survival outcomes of OS and CSS than those with TURBT. Nevertheless, it failed to gain significant differences in OS and CSS analysis in the subgroup of age<70, female, tumour size>3cm, and single. More similar studies were needed to confirm these results.

Up to our knowledge, it is the first study to propose the idea of performing PC as a method of bladder preservation in T1HG patients. Utilization of propensity matching score method to perform potential confounding factors and reduce selective bias was also the advantage of this study. Detailed subgroup analysis also made the results more convincing. However, there were still some limitations in our study. Firstly, unavoidable selection bias still existed in this retrospective study even PSM was applied. Then, the number of patients receiving PC is still not enough to go further study, and it might be the reason for

insignificant differences in subgroup analysis and multivariate cox regression analysis. In addition, the SEER database lacked some important disease outcomes such as tumour recurrence and progression, and they are also essential evaluation indexes for surgery. Ultimately, statistical differences in demographics and clinical characteristics of the study population remained after PSM. The patients of RC and PC group failed to match 1:1 in performing PSM owing to insufficient patients with RC (160 for RC vs 190 for PC after PSM). Consequently, A prospective study with larger sample size and a more rigorous design is needed to verify these results.

Finally, some problems of PC were needed to attach importance to. For some special patients with carcinoma in situ (CIS), tricky tumor location including ureteral orifice and bladder neck and multiple tumors, we need to carefully consider the effect of partial cystectomy for these patients(9, 11, 13). Frequent follow-up or RC might be needed to take for them.

5 Conclusions

Partial cystectomy was showed to have better outcome of overall survival and cancer specific survival when compared with transurethral bladder tumor resection in T1 high-grade patients. In addition, no difference in overall survival and cancer-specific survival was observed between patients undergoing partial cystectomy and those undergoing radical cystectomy. Partial cystectomy could be the more worthwhile choice for bladder preservation in T1 high-grade bladder cancer patients.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The data from SEER is publicly available and de-identified. This study was approved by the institutional. This study was approved by the institutional of the First Affiliated Hospital of Nanchang University.

Consent for publication

All author confirmed that no conflict of interest exists in the submission of this manuscript, and manuscript is approved by all authors for publication.

Competing interests

There is no conflict of interest in this study.

Funding

This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of P.R. China (Grant Nos. 81560419, 81960512, and 81760457) and Jiangxi Provincial "Double Thousand Plan" Fund Project (Grant No. jxsq2019201027).

Authors' contributions

Not applicable.

Acknowledgements

All authors agree to publish this study.

Availability of data and material

The data in this article comes from the SEER database This data can be found here:

<https://seer.cancer.gov/data/>

Reference

1. Song YP, McWilliam A, Hoskin PJ, Choudhury A. Organ preservation in bladder cancer: an opportunity for truly personalized treatment. *Nat Rev Urol*. 2019;16(9):511-22.
2. Klaassen Z, Kamat AM, Kassouf W, Gontero P, Villavicencio H, Bellmunt J, et al. Treatment Strategy for Newly Diagnosed T1 High-grade Bladder Urothelial Carcinoma: New Insights and Updated Recommendations. *Eur Urol*. 2018;74(5):597-608.
3. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2018;68(6):394-424.
4. Kirkali Z, Chan T, Manoharan M, Algaba F, Busch C, Cheng L, et al. Bladder cancer: epidemiology, staging and grading, and diagnosis. *Urology*. 2005;66(6 Suppl 1):4-34.
5. Lopez-Beltran A, Cheng L. Stage T1 bladder cancer: diagnostic criteria and pitfalls. *Pathology*. 2021;53(1):67-85.
6. De Berardinis E, Busetto GM, Antonini G, Giovannone R, Gentile V. T1G3 high-risk NMIBC (non-muscle invasive bladder cancer): conservative treatment versus immediate cystectomy. *Int Urol Nephrol*. 2011;43(4):1047-57.
7. Babjuk M, Burger M, Compérat EM, Gontero P, Mostafid AH, Palou J, et al. European Association of Urology Guidelines on Non-muscle-invasive Bladder Cancer (TaT1 and Carcinoma In Situ) - 2019 Update. *Eur Urol*. 2019;76(5):639-57.

8. Holzbeierlein JM, Lopez-Corona E, Bochner BH, Herr HW, Donat SM, Russo P, et al. Partial cystectomy: a contemporary review of the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center experience and recommendations for patient selection. *J Urol*. 2004;172(3):878-81.
9. Kassouf W, Swanson D, Kamat AM, Leibovici D, Siefker-Radtke A, Munsell MF, et al. Partial Cystectomy for Muscle Invasive Urothelial Carcinoma of the Bladder: A Contemporary Review of the M. D. Anderson Cancer Center Experience. *Journal of Urology*. 2006;175(6):2058-62.
10. Kibel AS. Treatment of Muscle Invasive Bladder Cancer: Evidence From the National Cancer Database, 2003 to 2007. *Yearbook of Urology*. 2011;2011:218-20.
11. Knoedler J, Frank I. Organ-sparing surgery in urology: partial cystectomy. *Curr Opin Urol*. 2015;25(2):111-5.
12. Capitanio U, Isbarn H, Shariat SF, Jeldres C, Zini L, Saad F, et al. Partial cystectomy does not undermine cancer control in appropriately selected patients with urothelial carcinoma of the bladder: a population-based matched analysis. *Urology*. 2009;74(4):858-64.
13. Peak TC, Hemal A. Partial cystectomy for muscle-invasive bladder cancer: a review of the literature. *Transl Androl Urol*. 2020;9(6):2938-45.
14. Knoedler JJ, Boorjian SA, Kim SP, Weight CJ, Thapa P, Tarrell RF, et al. Does partial cystectomy compromise oncologic outcomes for patients with bladder cancer compared to radical cystectomy? A matched case-control analysis. *J Urol*. 2012;188(4):1115-9.
15. Klän R, Loy V, Huland H. Residual tumor discovered in routine second transurethral resection in patients with stage T1 transitional cell carcinoma of the bladder. *J Urol*. 1991;146(2):316-8.
16. Kitamura H, Kakehi Y. Treatment and management of high-grade T1 bladder cancer: what should we do after second TUR? *Jpn J Clin Oncol*. 2015;45(4):315-22.
17. Brauers A, Buettner R, Jakse G. Second resection and prognosis of primary high risk superficial bladder cancer: is cystectomy often too early? *J Urol*. 2001;165(3):808-10.
18. Schips L, Augustin H, Zigeuner RE, Gallé G, Habermann H, Trummer H, et al. Is repeated transurethral resection justified in patients with newly diagnosed superficial bladder cancer? *Urology*. 2002;59(2):220-3.
19. Veeratterapillay R, Heer R, Johnson MI, Persad R, Bach C. High-Risk Non-Muscle-Invasive Bladder Cancer-Therapy Options During Intravesical BCG Shortage. *Curr Urol Rep*. 2016;17(9):68.

Figures

Figure 1

Survival curve with the Kaplan-Meier method between TURBT and PB patients: A) before PSM for OS; B) before PSM for CSS C) after PSM for OS D) after PSM for CSS

Figure 2

Survival curve with the Kaplan-Meier method between RC and PB patients: A) before PSM for OS; B) before PSM for CSS C) after PSM for OS D) after PSM for CSS

Figure 3

Survival curve with the Kaplan-Meier method between TURBT and PB patients after PSM subgroup analysis by age and gender: A, B, C, D for OS; E, F, G, H for CSS

Figure 4

Survival curve with the Kaplan-Meier method between TURBT and PB patients after PSM subgroup analysis by size and number of tumour: A, B, C, D for OS; E, F, G, H for CSS

Figure 5

Survival curve with the Kaplan-Meier method between TURBT and PB patients after PSM subgroup analysis by Grade and Histology: A, B, C, D for OS ; E, F, G, H for CSS