

Cancerworld

Real-world evidence in oncology has benefits (and risks)

Cristina Ferrario / 13 January 2020

The Oncologist®

Commentary

Real-World Evidence in Oncology: Opportunities and Limitations

MASSIMO DI MAIO,^a FRANCESCO PERRONE,^b PIERFRANCO CONTE^c

^aDepartment of Oncology, University of Turin; Ordine Mauriziano Hospital, Torino, Italy; ^bClinical Trial Unit, National Cancer Institute, IRCCS Fondazione Pascale, Napoli, Italy; ^cDepartment of Surgery, Oncology and Gastroenterology, University of Padova and Oncologia Medica 2, Istituto Oncologico Veneto, I.R.C.C.S., Padova, Italy

Disclosures of potential conflicts of interest may be found at the end of this article.

Key Words. Real-world evidence • Clinical trials • Cancer treatments

Traditionally, randomized controlled clinical trials (RCTs) have been considered the highest level of evidence to define the efficacy of treatments, before their adoption in clinical practice. However, in oncology, like in other fields of medicine, the analysis of real-world evidence (RWE) to answer clinical and policy-relevant questions that cannot be directly or completely answered using data from RCTs has rapidly gained increased interest in recent years [1–3]. It is clear that data obtained from health records, cancer registries, and other RWE sources can produce valuable insights into treatments and their outcomes in routine, daily oncology practice. However, caution must be paid to the intrinsic limitations of such data, to avoid a misleading and potentially harmful use of them.

and treat in daily clinical practice [4, 5]. This is due to stringent eligibility criteria, such as good performance status and absence of clinically relevant concomitant diseases. For instance, the analysis of the Investigational New Drugs applications submitted in 2015 to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, for oncology and hematology products, showed that 60% of the trials required Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status 0 or 1 (practically excluding all significantly symptomatic and unfit patients), 77% excluded known active or symptomatic metastases to central nervous system (sometimes allowing the inclusion of patients with treated or stable brain metastases), 84% excluded patients with known or active human immunodeficiency virus infection, and 74% excluded

Despite some weaknesses, real-world data can have a pivotal role in oncology, helping researchers and physicians to better understand the efficacy of anti-cancer treatments and how to manage the side effects.

This is the position expressed in a [commentary](#) published in *The Oncologist* by three Italian experts: Massimo Di Maio from University of Turin, Francesco Perrone from the National Cancer Institute in Naples and Pierfranco Conte from University of Padua.

According to the authors, the analysis of real-world evidence (such as health records and cancer registries) is gaining increasing attention as a useful way to answer questions that randomised controlled trials (RCTs) cannot fully address. “However, caution must be paid to the intrinsic limitations of such data, to avoid a misleading and potentially harmful use” authors warned.

Several applications for real-world evidence have been proposed in recent years like their use to describe the efficacy of a treatment in a “real” population, more similar to the population clinicians see in their daily practice, and not shaped by the very stringent inclusion criteria often established for RCTs. Moreover, real-world evidence can help better understand if a result can be generalized to different sub-populations, or give clues on the optimal treatment sequence, while the majority of RCTs do not address this issue.

And there’s even more than this: real-world evidence is useful to describe the reliability of complex procedures in the clinical practice, to show the effectiveness of interventions in settings where RCT can be extremely challenging, as is the case of rare molecular subgroups, and can be used to establish the safety profile of a drug, especially when it comes to long-term adverse events. “Real-world studies can also give useful information about the compliance or adherence to treatment” Di Maio and colleagues added.

Getting a glimpse of the other side of the coin, it is clear that some characteristics of real-world evidence can limit their use. “The absence of a randomized group does not allow to estimate the efficacy compared with other treatments, and quality of data could be lower compared with clinical trials” said the authors, by way of example.