Quality of life - finding VALUE in research

Roger Wilson CBE

Sarcoma Patients Euronet



Evolution of the cancer clinical trial over three decades: problems of design, analysis, reporting and interpretation

Plenary Speakers Evolution of problems of

Ian Tannock

Princess Margar

Princess Margaret Hospital, Toronto, Canada lan Tannock

The randomised co. in clinical oncology. colorectal (CRC), ar journals.

- 2. Increasing size of RC benefits might be obtain
- 3. There was increasir
- 4. Effect size remains
- 5. Publication bias is
- 6. Approval of drug free survival, ofte
- 7. Authors have b in trials sponsore conclusions bas
- 8.Comparison the often false
- 9. A minority

- 1. RCTs in oncology have become larger and are more likely to be sponsored by industry. A minority of RCTs evaluate quality-of-life (QL) even for patients with incurable cancer and the quality of QL assessment has been poor
 - 10. There is under reporting of harm in RCTs, important side effects are often identified after drug approval.

10. There is

11. Cost-effectiveness is almost never addressed, and the after drug approval

increased >100 fold





the reality that we risk fooling even ourselves?

Nature





Value =

Variations in **A**ctual Life and **U**sual Experience

Fewer tools, easier to use

Compare outcomes between studies in same disease

Aggregate data

Longitudinal studies in standard care

Identify trends and pathways using 'big data'

Feedback data to patients – treatment benefits

Make it impossible to 'hide' side effects

Regulators could manage interim approvals











quality and outcomes of person-centred care policy research unit









Value =

Variations in **A**ctual Life and **U**sual Experience

