## PROSTATE CANCER OPERATE OR WAIT? NOMOGRAM DECIDES

A new tool is available to help individualize the choice between immediate prostatectomy and active surveillance for older men with low-risk prostate cancer.

Firas Abdollah and colleagues used propensity-score matching to generate nearly 12,000 patient-pairs of SEER data. This cohort—comprising men aged at least 65 years with localized prostate cancer—was randomly split into development and validation sets.

A competing-risks model was applied to the development cohort, in order to account for the effect of deaths unrelated to prostate cancer. Men who had undergone prostatectomy were much less likely to die from disease than those who were managed with active surveillance (hazard ratio at 10 years 0.48). Interestingly, surgery was also associated with reduced other-cause mortality (hazard ratio 0.57).

These data support the primary finding of the only contemporary randomized trial of watchful waiting versus surgery. However, the trialists in that case concluded that the protective effect of prostatectomy was restricted to patients aged less than 65 years.

It is one thing to counsel newlydiagnosed men using average risks. The ideal of accurately predicting an individual patient's likelihood of survival if managed using different strategies is closer to being realized.

Abdollah et al. used their population-based analysis to construct the first nomogram for prediction of disease-specific death and other-cause mortality relative to treatment choice for the 65-years-plus age group. In addition to radical prostatectomy versus observation, inputs for the nomogram are age, race, comorbidity index, tumor stage and Gleason score. Discrimination for prediction of 10-year mortality is about 70%.

Suzanne J. Farley

**Original article** Abdollah, F. et al. Cancer-specific and other-cause mortality after radical prostatectomy versus observation in patients with prostate cancer: competing-risks analysis of a large North American population-based cohort. *Eur. Urol.* doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2011.06.039