Venous Thromboembolism Risk in Patients With Locoregional Urothelial Tract Tumors

Jorge D. Ramos^{1,2}, Jonathan T. Wingate³, Roman Gulati², Elizabeth R. Plimack⁴, Lauren C. Harshman⁵, Thomas Powles⁶, Simon J. Crabb⁷, Guenter Niegisch⁸, Joaquim Bellmunt⁹, Sylvain Ladoire^{10,11}, Ugo De Giorgi¹², Syed Hussain¹³, Ajjai S. Alva¹⁴, Jack Baniel¹⁵, Neeraj Agarwal¹⁶, Jonathan E. Rosenberg¹⁷, Ulka N. Vaishampayan¹⁸, Matthew D. Galsky¹⁹, Evan Y. Yu^{1,2}, and RISC Investigators

¹University of Washington, Seattle, WA ²Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA ³Madigan Army Medical Center, Tacoma, WA ⁴Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA ⁵Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA ⁶Barts and the London School of Medicine, London, England ⁷University of Southampton, Southampton, England ⁸Medical Faculty, Department of Urology, Heinrich-Heine-University, Düsseldorf, Germany ⁹Hospital del Mar, Barcelona, Spain ¹⁰Georges François Leclerc Center, Dijon, France ¹¹Université de Bourgogne, Dijon, France ¹²Istituto Scientifico Romagnolo per lo Studio e la Cura dei Tumori (IRST) IRCCS, Meldola, Italy ¹³University of Liverpool, Liverpool, England ¹⁴University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI ¹⁵Rabin Medical Center, Tel Aviv, Israel ¹⁶University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT ¹⁷Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center, New York, NY ¹⁸Karmanos Cancer Institute, Detroit, MI ¹⁹Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY

Abstract

There is limited data on venous thromboembolism (VTE) risk in patients with locoregional urothelial tract tumors. We performed a multicenter, retrospective study of 1732 patients assessing VTE rate, associative factors, and impact on survival in this population. Our study identified a high VTE rate (7.6%) and several factors associated with increased risk including non-urothelial histology, renal dysfunction, and cardiovascular disease.

Background—Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is common in cancer patients, but there is limited data on patients with urothelial tract tumors (UTT). We previously identified several associative factors for increased VTE rates in patients with metastatic UTT. In this study, we assessed the frequency, associative factors, and impact on survival of VTE in patients with locoregional UTT.

Methods—Patients with locoregional bladder, upper urinary tract, or urethral cancer were included in this multi-center study from 29 academic institutions. Patients with < cT2, > N1, or M1 disease at diagnosis were excluded. Patients with incomplete clinical staging or miscoded/

Address for correspondence: Evan Y. Yu, MD, Seattle Cancer Care Alliance, 825 Eastlake Ave, E – G4-800, Seattle, WA 98109-1024, evanyu@u.washington.edu.

Disclosure

The authors have stated that they have no conflicts of interest.

missing data were excluded. Cumulative, unadjusted VTE incidence was calculated from time of diagnosis of muscle-invasive disease, excluding VTEs diagnosed in the metastatic setting. χ^2 statistics tested differences in VTE rates across baseline and treatment-related factors. Significant covariates were incorporated into a multivariate, logistic regression model. Overall survival stratified by VTE was estimated using Kaplan-Meier methods and evaluated using the log-rank test.

Results—A total of 1732 patients were eligible. There were 132 (7.6%) VTEs. On multivariate analysis, non-urothelial histology ($P < .001$), clinical Nx stage ($P < .001$), cardiovascular disease ($P = .01$), and renal dysfunction ($P = .04$) were statistically significant baseline factors associated with VTE. Using surgery alone as reference, surgery with perioperative chemotherapy ($P = .04$) and radiation with concurrent chemotherapy ($P = .04$) also were significant.

Conclusions—The VTE incidence of 7.6% in locoregional disease is comparable with our previously reported rate in the metastatic setting (8.2%). Similar to our findings in metastatic UTT, non-urothelial histology, renal dysfunction, and CVD was associated with increased VTE risk.

Keywords

Bladder cancer; Localized; Metastatic; Non-urothelial; Thrombosis

Introduction

Patients with urothelial tract tumors (UTT) have an increased risk of venous thromboembolism (VTE). Although the Khorana score, a risk-stratification model for VTE, considers malignancies of the urothelial tract high risk for VTE, UTT only represented a minor subset of patients in their analysis.¹ Some risk factors for cancer-associated thrombosis that have been consistently shown to be associated with VTE are immobility, aggressive tumor biology, surgery, and systemic chemotherapy, particularly cisplatin-based regimens.^{2–7} More recently, our group identified multiple associative factors from a large, international, retrospective database of patients with UTT.⁸ However, this study focused exclusively on patients with metastatic disease, and the associative factors identified may not be applicable to the locoregional disease setting.

VTE rates in patients with locoregional UTT may be different compared with patients with metastatic disease.^{9,10} One might expect patients with metastatic disease to have higher VTE rates for multiple reasons. Generally, patients with metastatic disease have larger tumor volumes, which may lead to release of more thrombogenic cytokines, cause mechanical vascular compression, receipt of systemic chemotherapy, and declining performance status. Conversely, patients with muscle-invasive localized disease that are undergoing radical cystectomy also have the significant increased risk factor of VTE of undergoing a major pelvic surgery with limited mobility.¹¹

Extended (28-day) postoperative thromboprophylaxis in patients undergoing abdominal or pelvic cancer surgery has been shown to decrease VTE rates.¹² However, this information was not disseminated in a widespread fashion through clinical guidelines until more recently.^{13,14} Although clear benefit has been shown, the uptake of the practice of

prophylactic anticoagulation prior to radical cystectomy likely has had poor uptake.^{15,16} Therefore, we set out to describe the risk of VTE for patients with locoregional UTT, identify associative factors for patients in this setting, determine the risk of different systemic perioperative chemotherapy regimens, and determine association, if any, of VTE on overall survival.

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Patient Population

Data were collected and abstracted from the Retrospective International Study of Cancers of the Urothelium (RISC) database, a multi-center study of the management and outcomes of patients with UTT with at least muscle-invasive disease. As previously described, the RISC database is comprised of data that were gathered from 29 international centers and stored via a secure, password-protected platform.¹⁷ The institutional review boards at all participating institutions approved the study.

Patients diagnosed with cT2-T4, cN0-N1 (including Nx), andM0 (including Mx) cancer of the bladder, renal pelvis, ureter, and urethra were eligible for analysis. Urothelial and non-urothelial histologies (ie, adenocarcinoma, micropapillary, neuroendocrine, sarcomatoid, and squamous) were included. Patients were classified as having non-urothelial histology if they had purely or predominately variant histology. Patients with primarily urothelial carcinoma with a component of non-urothelial histology were categorized as urothelial histology. Patients without complete clinical staging at the time of diagnosis or miscoded/missing data were excluded from the study.

Patient-, tumor-, and treatment-related factors were assessed for their association with VTE incidence. Patient characteristics that were collected include age, race, gender, presence of renal dysfunction (investigator-designated), history of cardiovascular disease (CVD), CVD risk factors, congestive heart failure, and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. CVD encompassed coronary artery disease, peripheral vascular disease, and/or a cerebrovascular accident. Cardiovascular risk factors included diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and/or hyperlipidemia. Tumor characteristics assessed were primary tumor location, histologic subtype, clinical T-stage at diagnosis, and clinical N-stage at diagnosis. Primary treatment modality was categorized into 5 variables for analysis: (1) surgery alone; (2) surgery with perioperative chemotherapy; (3) radiation therapy alone; (4) radiation therapy with concurrent chemotherapy; and (5) no primary local treatment modality utilized. Surgical interventions included in the analysis were radical (both open and robotic) or partial cystectomy, nephrectomy, nephroureterectomy, ureterectomy, and urethrectomy. Lastly, in the patients that were treated with surgery in combination with perioperative chemotherapy, we assessed the association of VTE based on chemotherapy regimens. We specifically evaluated 3 chemotherapy regimens: (1) gemcitabine and cisplatin; (2) gemcitabine and carboplatin; and (3) MVAC (methotrexate, vinblastine, doxorubicin, and cisplatin) or CMV (cisplatin, methotrexate, and vinblastine).

Statistical Analysis

Cumulative, 3-month, and 6-month absolute VTE incidence rates were calculated from the date of diagnosis to the VTE date. Because we were interested in understanding VTE risk in the locoregional disease setting, VTEs that occurred after a patient developed metastatic disease were excluded. VTE rates based on demographic and baseline characteristics were compared using χ^2 tests. In assessing the association of VTE based on treatment modality, we recognized that treatment decisions may also be affected by baseline characteristics and extent of disease. Therefore, we evaluated whether there were differences in these clinical characteristics when stratified by treatment modality. In addition to age, covariates that were significant ($P \leq .05$) in the univariate analysis and/or significantly different across treatment modalities were included in a multivariate logistic regression analysis. Odds ratios (ORs) were calculated for each factor in the multivariate model. Kaplan-Meier estimation and the log-rank test was utilized to assess overall survival stratified by whether the patient experienced a VTE.

Results

Study Population and Patient Characteristics

The RISC database is comprised of 3025 patients, of which 1732 were eligible for analysis in this study (Figure 1). Of the 1732 patients, 1716 (99.1%) were diagnosed with muscle-invasive disease between January 1, 2000, and May 31, 2013. Only 16 (0.9%) patients were diagnosed between January 1, 1990, and December 31, 1999. Baseline characteristics of the study cohort are shown in Table 1. The mean age of the study cohort at the time of diagnosis was 67.4 years. The majority of patients had urothelial histology (90.0%), and the primary tumor was located in the bladder in 89.4% of cases. Most patients (70.6%) underwent surgical intervention as their primary treatment modality. Surgery in combination with perioperative chemotherapy represented the primary treatment modality in 37.0% of patients, and 33.6% were treated with surgery alone. The median overall survival of the study cohort was 3.0 years, with a median duration of follow-up of 1.7 years.

Cumulative Incidence of VTE and Association With Clinical Characteristics

VTE incidence over time is shown in Figure 2. Altogether, there were 132 VTE events for a cumulative VTE incidence of 7.6%, with the preponderance of events (77.3%) occurring within 6 months of the date of diagnosis of muscle-invasive disease. Unadjusted VTE incidence rates stratified by clinical characteristics are shown in Table 2. Baseline characteristics that were associated with VTE on univariate analysis were non-urothelial histology ($P < .001$), presence of CVD ($P = .004$), renal dysfunction ($P = .02$), and clinical Nx at diagnosis ($P < .001$). Furthermore, with surgery alone as the reference, surgery with perioperative chemotherapy ($P = .05$), radiation therapy alone ($P = .04$), and radiation therapy with concurrent chemotherapy ($P = .01$) were associated with an increased VTE incidence.

Multivariate Analysis of Association of Baseline Characteristics, Primary Treatment Modality, and Perioperative Chemotherapy Regimen With VTE

On multivariate analysis, non-urothelial histology (OR, 2.62; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.64–4.17; $P < .001$), clinical Nx at diagnosis (OR, 2.17; 95% CI, 1.47–3.20; $P < .001$), presence of CVD (OR, 1.74; 95% CI, 1.16–2.62; $P = .01$), and renal dysfunction (OR, 1.7; 95% CI, 1.02–2.98; $P = .04$) were still significantly associated with VTE (Table 3). In addition to the statistically significant covariates noted above, clinical T-stage and age were incorporated into the multivariate model when assessing the association between primary treatment modality and VTE. With surgery as the reference, surgery in combination with perioperative chemotherapy (OR, 1.65; 95% CI, 1.03–2.64; $P = .04$) and radiation therapy with concurrent chemotherapy was associated with an increased incidence of VTE (OR, 2.03; 95% CI, 1.02–4.03; $P = .04$). The highest absolute VTE rate based on perioperative chemotherapy regimen was seen in patients treated with gemcitabine and cisplatin at 8.2% (30/365) (Table 4). Patients treated with gemcitabine and carboplatin or MVAC/CMV had a VTE rate of 7.3% (6/182) and 5.6% (7/125), respectively. On multivariate analysis, when using gemcitabine and cisplatin as the reference, there was no statistical difference in VTE rates based on perioperative chemotherapy regimen.

Survival

There was no difference in overall survival in patients who had a VTE compared with patients who did not have a VTE ($P = .28$). The overall survival curves stratified by VTE are superimposed for the first year from the date of diagnosis, with separation of the curves after 1 year with more deaths in the group of patients who had a VTE (Figure 3). A landmark analysis at 2 years from the date of diagnosis demonstrates a trend towards worse overall survival in patients who had a VTE ($P = .09$).

Discussion

Based on a validated risk model for VTE, genitourinary malignancies (except for prostate cancer) are considered high-risk for VTE.¹ However, many clinical characteristics may modulate an individual cancer patient's risk for VTE. Multiple studies have demonstrated that patients with higher stage disease, such as those with metastatic disease, have increased VTE rates.^{9,10} Conversely, in the locoregional disease setting, surgical intervention is a well-established VTE risk factor.^{2,11} However, it is not clear which patient population is at the highest risk of VTE when all clinical factors are taken into consideration. Our group previously reported a VTE rate of 8.2% in patients with metastatic UTT.⁸ In the current analysis, we identified a VTE rate that was marginally lower at 7.6% in patients with locoregional UTT. Taken together, these data suggest that there may be a slightly greater VTE rate in patients with metastatic disease, though the difference is nominal, perhaps abrogated by the increased risk that surgery and associated immobility provide. Therefore, patients with UTT are at high risk of VTE regardless of whether they have locoregional or metastatic disease and should be counseled about their increased risk prior to initiating therapy.

In addition to surgery, treatment with cytotoxic chemotherapy can also increase VTE rates. The strongest evidence for this association is with cisplatin.³⁻⁷ Both perioperative and radio-sensitizing chemotherapy in patients with UTT predominately utilize cisplatin-containing regimens. Accordingly, in our analysis, patients who were treated with surgery in combination with perioperative chemotherapy (8.4%) or radiation in combination with chemotherapy (12.3%) had higher VTE rates than patients treated with surgery alone (5.5%). When we evaluated VTE rates of the various chemotherapy regimens in the perioperative setting, no statistically significant difference in VTE was identified. We recognize this may be a result of insufficient power as the number of events in this analysis was relatively low. Unexpectedly, with surgery alone as the reference, the odds of having a VTE were highest in patients treated with radiation alone (OR, 1.76; $P = .10$) or radiation in combination with chemotherapy (OR, 2.03; $P = .04$), even when controlling for age, clinical T-stage, clinical N-stage, renal dysfunction, histology, and CVD. There is very limited contemporaneous data on the association of radiation therapy with VTE in patients with cancer. One prospective, observational study of multiple malignancies demonstrated a 2.3-fold increased risk of VTE in patients treated with radiation therapy.¹⁸ Alternatively, the increased VTE rate seen in patients who were treated with radiation therapy may be a result of selection bias. Patients treated with radiation often have worse functional status than patients who undergo surgical intervention, which may have contributed to the increased VTE rate. Thus, this finding will require confirmation in future large, population-based studies.

In addition to treatments associated with increased VTE rates, several patient- and tumor-related characteristics were also associated with elevated risk of VTE. In the multivariate analysis of the current study, non-urothelial histology, renal dysfunction, and the presence of CVD were demonstrated to be associated with increased VTE rates, which is reassuringly similar to the findings in our prior analysis of patients with metastatic disease.⁸

Multiple studies have demonstrated that VTEs in patients with cancer are associated with worse overall survival.^{19,20} Although our study did not demonstrate a statistically significant difference in overall survival, there was a trend toward worse overall survival in patients who had a VTE within 2 years of diagnosis of muscle-invasive disease. One possible explanation is that VTEs may be acting as a surrogate for more aggressive disease. However, as demonstrated in the overall survival curve, the difference in survival between the 2 groups decreases beyond 2 years from the date of diagnosis. One would expect to continue to see more deaths in the VTE group even beyond 2 years if VTEs were solely a marker of aggressive tumor biology. Alternatively, patients may have died of complications of treatment of the VTE anticoagulation, the VTE itself, or a recurrent VTE. Indeed, patients with cancer have been shown to have higher rates of recurrent VTE and major bleeding than patients without cancer.²¹

There are several limitations to this study. First, this is a retrospective analysis that is limited by the inherent unmeasured confounders and biases of such analyses. Second, we do not have data on whether patients received postoperative thromboprophylaxis, although we suspect the numbers of patients who received anticoagulation were likely low. Another limitation is that patients with either upper tract or urethral UTT are often under-staged at

diagnosis, which may have had an impact on the results. Additionally, assessment of cancer-specific survival is limited in this analysis as the cause of death was not known in a substantial number of patients. Also, we did not have reliable data on a patient's Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group performance status; thus, it was not included in the analysis. Likewise, we did not have data on whether patients had a prior history of VTE, which is an established risk factor for future thrombotic events. Lastly, certain clinical factors were investigator-designated (eg, renal dysfunction, hypertension, diabetes mellitus) instead of utilizing a uniform definition.

The results from this study demonstrate that VTE in locoregional UTT is not arbitrary, and overall rates are not dramatically different than those from prior publications in patients with metastatic disease. This supports that this disease setting should also be considered high-risk for VTE and emphasizes the need for adherence to thromboprophylaxis guidelines. Specific attention should be paid to patients with non-urothelial histology, CVD, or renal dysfunction, as these patients had particularly high VTE rates. Furthermore, additional studies evaluating the association of radiation therapy and various chemotherapy regimens with VTE in UTT should be undertaken. Lastly, the underlying mechanisms driving VTE development in patients with cancer have not been well elucidated and should be a focus of future research.

Acknowledgments

J.D.R. is funded by a National Institutes of Health Training Grant (T32 CA009515).

References

1. Khorana AA, Kuderer NM, Culakova E, Lyman GH, Francis CW. Development and validation of a predictive model for chemotherapy-associated thrombosis. *Blood*. 2008; 111:4902–7. [PubMed: 18216292]
2. Timp JF, Braekkan SK, Versteeg HH, Cannegieter SC. Epidemiology of cancer-associated venous thrombosis. *Blood*. 2013; 122:1712–23. [PubMed: 23908465]
3. Hahn NM, Stadler WM, Zon RT, et al. Phase II trial of cisplatin, gemcitabine, and bevacizumab as first-line therapy for metastatic urothelial carcinoma: Hoosier Oncology Group GU 04-75. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011; 29:1525–30. [PubMed: 21422406]
4. Hussain M, Daignault S, Agarwal N, et al. A randomized phase 2 trial of gemcitabine/cisplatin with or without cetuximab in patients with advanced urothelial carcinoma. *Cancer*. 2014; 120:2684–93. [PubMed: 24802654]
5. Moore RA, Adel N, Riedel E, et al. High incidence of thromboembolic events in patients treated with cisplatin-based chemotherapy: a large retrospective analysis. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011; 29:3466–73. [PubMed: 21810688]
6. Seng S, Liu Z, Chiu SK, et al. Risk of venous thromboembolism in patients with cancer treated with cisplatin: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012; 30:4416–26. [PubMed: 23150697]
7. Starling N, Rao S, Cunningham D, et al. Thromboembolism in patients with advanced gastroesophageal cancer treated with anthracycline, platinum, and fluoropyrimidine combination chemotherapy: a report from the UK National Cancer Research Institute Upper Gastrointestinal Clinical Studies Group. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009; 27:3786–93. [PubMed: 19398575]
8. Ramos JD, Casey MF, Crabb SJ, et al. Venous thromboembolism in metastatic urothelial carcinoma or variant histologies: incidence, associative factors, and effect on survival. *Cancer Med*. 2017; 6:186–94. [PubMed: 28000388]

9. Blom JW, Doggen CJ, Osanto S, Rosendaal FR. Malignancies, prothrombotic mutations, and the risk of venous thrombosis. *JAMA*. 2005; 293:715–22. [PubMed: 15701913]
10. Chew HK, Wun T, Harvey D, Zhou H, White RH. Incidence of venous thromboembolism and its effect on survival among patients with common cancers. *Arch Intern Med*. 2006; 166:458–64. [PubMed: 16505267]
11. Tikkinen, KAO., Craigie, S., Agarwal, A., et al. [accessed August 1, 2017] Procedure-specific risks of thrombosis and bleeding in urological cancer surgery: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Urol*. [e-pub ahead of print] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2017.02.025>
12. Bergqvist D, Agnelli G, Cohen AT, et al. Duration of prophylaxis against venous thromboembolism with enoxaparin after surgery for cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2002; 346:975–80. [PubMed: 11919306]
13. Gould MK, Garcia DA, Wren SM, et al. Prevention of VTE in nonorthopedic surgical patients: antithrombotic therapy and prevention of thrombosis, 9th ed: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Chest*. 2012; 141:e227S–77S. [PubMed: 22315263]
14. Vogelzang NJ, Rusthoven JJ, Symanowski J, et al. Phase III study of pemetrexed in combination with cisplatin versus cisplatin alone in patients with malignant pleural mesothelioma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2003; 21:2636–44. [PubMed: 12860938]
15. James AC, Holt SK, Wright JL, Porter MP, Gore JL. Burden and timing of venothrombotic events in patients younger than 65 years undergoing radical cystectomy for bladder cancer. *Urol Oncol*. 2014; 32:815–9. [PubMed: 24837010]
16. Sterious S, Simhan J, Uzzo RG, et al. Familiarity and self-reported compliance with American Urological Association best practice recommendations for use of thromboembolic prophylaxis among American Urological Association members. *J Urol*. 2013; 190:992–8. [PubMed: 23538239]
17. Galsky MD, Pal SK, Chowdhury S, et al. Comparative effectiveness of gemcitabine plus cisplatin versus methotrexate, vinblastine, doxorubicin, plus cisplatin as neoadjuvant therapy for muscle-invasive bladder cancer. *Cancer*. 2015; 121:2586–93. [PubMed: 25872978]
18. Ay C, Vormittag R, Dunkler D, et al. D-dimer and prothrombin fragment 1 + 2 predict venous thromboembolism in patients with cancer: results from the Vienna Cancer and Thrombosis Study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2009; 27:4124–9. [PubMed: 19636003]
19. Gross CP, Galusha DH, Krumholz HM. The impact of venous thromboembolism on risk of death or hemorrhage in older cancer patients. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2007; 22:321–6. [PubMed: 17356962]
20. Sorensen HT, Mellemkjaer L, Olsen JH, Baron JA. Prognosis of cancers associated with venous thromboembolism. *N Engl J Med*. 2000; 343:1846–50. [PubMed: 11117976]
21. Prandoni P, Lensing AW, Piccioli A, et al. Recurrent venous thromboembolism and bleeding complications during anticoagulant treatment in patients with cancer and venous thrombosis. *Blood*. 2002; 100:3484–8. [PubMed: 12393647]

Clinical Practice Points

- VTE is a common complication in patients with locoregional UTT.
- Patients with non-urothelial histology, renal dysfunction, or CVD are at particularly high risk for VTE.
- The high rate of VTE in patients with UTT supports the development of primary thromboprophylaxis clinical trials.
- Ultimately, a better understanding of the underlying mechanisms driving VTE is critical for appropriate management of this patient population.

Figure 1.
Flow Chart of Patient Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Figure 2.
Cumulative Incidence of VTE of Study Cohort
Abbreviation: VTE = venous thromboembolism.

Figure 3.

Kaplan-Meier Plot of OS of Patients Who Had a VTE and Did Not Have a VTE. *P*-values Are a Result of the Log-Rank Test

Abbreviations: OS = overall survival; VTE = venous thromboembolism.

Table 1

Baseline Characteristics of Study Cohort

Characteristic	N (%)
Mean age, y $\pm$ SD	67.4 $\pm$ 10.8
Gender	
Male	1332 (76.9)
Female	396 (22.9)
Unknown	4 (0.2)
Race	
Caucasian	1591 (91.9)
Black	62 (3.6)
Asian	24 (1.4)
Hispanic	24 (1.4)
Other/unknown	31 (1.8)
Histology	
Urothelial	1559 (90.0)
Non-urothelial	166 (9.6)
Unknown	7 (0.4)
Primary tumor location	
Bladder	1549 (89.4)
Upper tract	138 (8.0)
Urethra	12 (0.7)
Unknown	33 (1.9)
Clinical T stage	
T2	1145 (66.1)
T3	403 (23.3)
T4	184 (10.6)
Clinical N stage	
N0	1084 (62.6)
N1	175 (10.1)
Nx	473 (27.3)
Primary treatment	
Surgery/chemotherapy	640 (37.0)
Surgery	582 (33.6)
Radiation/chemotherapy	114 (6.6)
Radiation	145 (8.4)
None/Unknown	251 (14.5)

Table 2

Clinical Characteristics and Association With VTE

Characteristic	VTE, N (%)	P Value
Histology		
Urothelial	104/1559 (6.7)	Ref
Non-urothelial	28/166 (16.9)	<.001
Primary tumor location		
Other/unknown	8/183 (4.4)	Ref
Bladder	124/1549 (8.0)	.08
Clinical T stage		
T2	90/1145 (7.9)	Ref
T3	27/403 (6.7)	.45
T4	15/184 (8.2)	.89
Clinical N stage		
N0	62/1084 (5.7)	Ref
N1	13/175 (7.4)	.38
Nx	57/473 (12.1)	<.001
Cardiovascular disease		
No	88/1332 (6.6)	Ref
Yes	44/400 (11.0)	.004
Renal dysfunction		
No	112/1569 (5.1)	Ref
Yes	20/163 (10.3)	.02
Primary treatment		
Surgery	32/582 (5.5)	Ref
Surgery/chemotherapy	54/640 (8.4)	.05
Radiation	15/145 (10.3)	.04
Radiation/chemotherapy	14/114 (12.3)	.01
None/unknown	17/251 (6.8)	.47

There was no statistical difference in VTE based on age, gender, or race.

Other baseline comorbidities assessed that were not statistically significant (defined as $P \geq .05$) on univariate analysis include chronic obstruction pulmonary disease, congestive heart failure, and presence of cardiovascular risk factors (ie, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, or hyperlipidemia).

Abbreviations: Ref = reference value; VTE = venous thromboembolism.

Table 3

Multivariate Analysis of Association of VTE and Baseline Characteristics and Primary Treatment Modality

Characteristic	OR	95% CI	P Value
Histology			
Urothelial	1.0	Ref	Ref
Non-urothelial	2.62	1.64–4.17	<.001
Clinical N stage			
N0	1.0	Ref	Ref
N1	1.31	0.69–2.47	.41
Nx	2.17	1.47–3.20	<.001
Cardiovascular disease			
No	1.0	Ref	Ref
Yes	1.74	1.16–2.62	.01
Renal dysfunction			
No	1.0	Ref	Ref
Yes	1.74	1.02–2.98	.04
Primary treatment			
Surgery	1.0	Ref	Ref
Surgery/chemotherapy	1.65	1.03–2.64	.04
Radiation	1.76	0.91–3.40	.10
Radiation/chemotherapy	2.03	1.02–4.03	.04

Four baseline clinical characteristics were significantly different across treatment modalities and thus controlled for in the multivariate analysis. The 4 characteristics were presence of cardiovascular disease, presence of renal dysfunction, clinical T-stage at diagnosis, and clinical N-stage at diagnosis.

Histology and age were controlled for in this analysis but were not statistically different across the treatment groups.

There was no statistical difference in VTE based on age.

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; OR = odds ratio; Ref = reference value; VTE = venous thromboembolism.

Multivariate Analysis of Association of VTE Based on Chemotherapy in Patients With Clinical Locoregional Disease

Table 4

Chemotherapy Regimen	VTE/Total, N	VTE Rate (%)	OR	95% CI	P Value
Gemcitabine and cisplatin	30/365	8.2	1.0	Ref	Ref
Gemcitabine and carboplatin	6/82	7.3	0.55	0.21–1.47	.23
MVAC/CMV	7/125	5.6	0.78	0.33–1.88	.58

Logistic regression model includes age, presence of cardiovascular disease, presence of renal dysfunction, histology, clinical T-stage at diagnosis, and clinical N-stage at diagnosis.
Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; CMV = cisplatin, methotrexate, and vinblastine; MVAC = methotrexate, doxorubicin, and cisplatin; OR = odds ratio; Ref = reference value; VTE = venous thromboembolism.