BMJ Open Willingness of patients with sarcoma to participate in cancer surveillance research: a cross-sectional patient survey

Patricia Schneider , ¹ Victoria Giglio , ¹ Dana Ghanem, ¹ David Wilson, ¹ Robert Turcotte,² Marc Isler,³ Sophie Mottard,³ Benjamin Miller,⁴ James Hayden,⁵ Yee-Cheen Doung,⁵ Kenneth Gundle ,⁵ R Lor Randall,⁶ Kevin Jones,⁷ Roberto Vélez,⁸ Michelle Ghert^{1,9}

To cite: Schneider P. Giglio V. Ghanem D. et al. Willingness of patients with sarcoma to participate in cancer surveillance research: a cross-sectional patient survey. BMJ Open 2021;11:e042742. doi:10.1136/ bmjopen-2020-042742

Prepublication history and supplemental material for this paper is available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (http://dx.doi. org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042742).

Received 13 July 2020 Revised 20 January 2021 Accepted 08 February 2021

Check for updates

@ Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2021. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

Correspondence to

Dr Michelle Ghert: ghertm@mcmaster.ca

ABSTRACT

Objectives To determine the proportion of patients with extremity sarcoma who would be willing to participate in a clinical trial in which they would be randomised to one of four different postoperative sarcoma surveillance regimens. Additionally, we assessed patients' perspectives on the burden of cancer care, factors that influence comfort with randomisation and the importance of cancer research.

Design Prospective, cross-sectional patient survey. Setting Outpatient sarcoma clinics in Canada, the USA and Spain between May 2017 and April 2020. Survey data were entered into a study-specific database.

Participants Patients with extremity sarcoma who had completed definitive treatment from seven clinics across Canada, the USA and Spain.

Main outcome measures The proportion of patients with extremity sarcoma who would be willing to participate in a randomised controlled trial (RCT) that evaluates varying postoperative cancer surveillance regimens.

Results One hundred thirty complete surveys were obtained. Respondents reported a wide range of burdens related to clinical care and surveillance. The majority of patients (85.5%) responded that they would agree to participate in a cancer surveillance RCT if eligible. The most common reason to participate was that they wanted to help future patients. Those that would decline to participate most commonly reported that participating in research would be too much of a burden for them at a time when they are already feeling overwhelmed. However, most patients agreed that cancer research will help doctors better understand and treat cancer.

Conclusions These results demonstrate that most participants would be willing to participate in an RCT that evaluates varying postoperative cancer surveillance regimens. Participants' motivation for trial participation included altruistic reasons to help future patients and deterrents to trial participation included the overwhelming burden of a cancer diagnosis. These results will help inform the development of patient-centred RCT protocols in sarcoma surveillance research.

Level of evidence V.

INTRODUCTION

Sarcomas are a rare and heterogenous group of cancers with distinct biology that represent

Strengths and limitations of this study

- ► The primary objective of this study was to investigate the proportion of patients with extremity sarcoma who would be willing to participate in a clinical trial in which they would be randomised to one of four different postoperative cancer surveillance
- The results of this study have been used to directly inform the definitive phase of the Surveillance AFter Extremity Tumor SurgerY (SAFETY) trial.
- ► Patient engagement in the preliminary trial development is expected to improve the trial's relevance, increase transparency and, ultimately, accelerate the adoption of findings into practice.
- Patients who agreed to participate in the survey study may be more likely to participate in research in general, thus possibly introducing selection bias.
- This may have resulted in an overestimation of the acceptance rate of the SAFETY study and interest in clinical research; however, our response rate of 92% may have somewhat mitigated these concerns.

<1% of all malignancies. 1-6 Following treatment for a sarcoma, patients remain at risk for the development of local and systemic disease recurrence, which necessitates careful postoperative surveillance. Almost 50% of all patients with sarcoma will develop a local or distant recurrence; however, the risk of recurrence is greatest in the first few years, with 68% occurring by 2 years and 90% by 5 years. 7-9 Metastasis to the lung is the most frequent single location of disease recurrence in patients with sarcoma, occurring in approximately one-half of all patients. 9-12 Earlier detection of less advanced and resectable disease relapse may prolong patient survival; however, once advanced metastases are detected, the median length of survival is 12–15 months. 9

As such, routine follow-up following the completion of sarcoma treatment is standard



by copyright

practice, and generally entails regular visits to sarcoma outpatient clinics in the first 5-10 years after surgery. These visits typically include a clinical history, a physical examination and imaging of the lungs. Regular, intensive surveillance is more likely to identify recurrent disease earlier than would less intensive surveillance. This may provide reassurance to patients and clinicians as if the interval screening is negative, the patient is considered at that time to be disease-free.

However, the adverse effects of intensive surveillance practices on patients are also noteworthy. Intensive surveillance can threaten the financial security of patients, due in part to the direct costs, including travel, accommodation, personal care and homemaking, and indirect costs, including lost wages for patients and their caregivers, incurred as a result of follow-up appointments. 1 result, patients' health and quality of life can be dramatically impacted should they decide to forego further treatment or alter their lifestyles in order to alleviate financial difficulties. 13-15 Furthermore, intensive surveillance investigations can also induce anxiety, and earlier knowledge of disease recurrence may adversely impact patients' psychosocial well-being for those whose mortality risk cannot be significantly reduced by further medical interventions. 16 In fact, the first recommendation put forward by *Choosing* Wisely Canada for oncology is not to 'order tests to detect recurrent cancer in asymptomatic patients if there is not a realistic expectation that early detection of recurrence can improve survival or quality of life'. 17

A randomised controlled trial (RCT) would be the ideal approach to determine the optimal postoperative surveillance strategy that balances potential gains in survival, costs and quality of life. Given the rarity of sarcoma, possible patient anxiety related to both lessintensive and more-intensive sarcoma surveillance and the fact that clinical trial recruitment is often slower than anticipated, such an RCT will require extensive international collaboration and patient willingness to be randomly allocated to varying surveillance regimens. Patients' perceptions of surveillance and of participation in a surveillance RCT are required in order to develop a study protocol that is patient-centred, compelling and feasible, and is capable of answering this high priority clinical question in a reasonable timeframe. 18 19 In this study, we conducted a patient survey to investigate the proportion of patients with extremity sarcoma that would be willing to participate in a clinical trial in which they would be randomised to one of four different postoperative sarcoma surveillance regimens. We also assessed the burden of cancer care on patients, the factors that influence patient comfort with being randomised to different surveillance protocols and we explored patients' views on the importance of cancer research.

METHODS

We conducted a cross-sectional multicentre survey between May 2017 and April 2020 at seven sarcoma

outpatient clinics in Canada (three sites), the USA (three sites) and Spain (one site).

Participants

Clinical sites

The clinical sites within our international orthopaedic oncology research network were carefully screened for the following criteria: (1) sufficiently high sarcoma volume defined as ≥20 participants per year; (2) adequate research personnel and infrastructure to manage the study and (3) an interest in participating in the Surveillance AFter Extremity Tumor surgerY (SAFETY) trial. The clinical sites that met the eligibility criteria were invited to participate in this cross-sectional study.

In order to be eligible for participation, patients must have: (1) been at least 18 years of age; (2) been able to read, understand and write in English, French or Spanish; (3) have recently completed treatment of an extremity sarcoma and (4) provided consent to participate.

Questionnaire objectives

Given that patients' willingness to participate in cancer surveillance research is the ultimate determinant of overall study feasibility, the primary objective of this questionnaire was to determine whether patients with extremity sarcoma would be willing to participate in the SAFETY trial.²⁰ The SAFETY trial, initiated in early 2020, is a 2×2 factorial design RCT in which patients with sarcoma are randomised to one of four different surveillance regiments. The primary objective of the SAFETY trial is to determine the effect of surveillance intensity on long-term survival in the soft-tissue sarcoma population. The current cross-sectional survey served as background work for the trial's development.

The secondary objectives of this cross-sectional patient survey included: (1) assessment of the burden of cancer care on patients; (2) assessment of factors that influence patient comfort with being randomised to different surveillance protocols and (3) the exploration of patients' views on the importance of cancer research.

Questionnaire development ltem generation

We developed a unique patient questionnaire for the purpose of this study. The development of this questionnaire was informed by a review of the current literature on patient surveillance and in consultation with experts in orthopaedic oncology, research methodology and patient recruitment. We utilised a 'sampling-to-redundancy' approach in which we solicited feedback from new orthopaedic oncologists and research methodologists until no new items for the questionnaire emerged.

Pretesting and validity assessments

The questionnaire was reviewed by nine additional experts, who were either orthopaedic oncologists or health research methodologists. These experts

Schneider P, et al. BMJ Open 2021;11:e042742. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042742 surveillance research is the ultimate determinant of overall study feasibility, the primary objective of this



evaluated whether the questionnaire as a whole appeared to adequately address the question of whether patients with extremity sarcoma would participate in cancer surveillance research (face validity) and whether the individual questions adequately addressed the objectives of the current study (content validity). These nine experts also assessed the questionnaire's comprehensiveness and flow, as well as identified any redundant, irrelevant or poorly worded questions.

Survey description

The final survey comprised 58 questions using Likert scales, multiple choice and brief open-ended questions. The following sections were included: (a) demographics, including medical history and income; (b) cancer history, including the number of treatment visits thus far required; (c) perceptions of cancer research; (d) financial burden of cancer care; (e) logistical burden of cancer care and (f) the SAFETY trial, including perceptions of cancer surveillance, the trial design and willingness to participate in such a trial and reasons for accepting or declining to participate. The survey is provided in online supplemental appendix 1.

All questions were straightforward and used clear and layman terminology to enhance the validity of the results. The survey length was kept to a minimum in an effort to maximise the response rate and to limit barriers that could have affected its proper completion.

Sample size

Convenience sampling of consecutive patients was used at the seven participating sites. One hundred thirty patients completed the patient survey, which represents a robust sample in the study of rare diseases.²¹

Survey administration and data collection

Initially, we approached all patients with extremity sarcoma in person that had consented for sarcoma surgery. However, after consulting with the SAFETY trial's Steering Committee members on the study's protocol in May 2018, we determined that patients would be approached, consented and randomised into the SAFETY trial after definitive treatment for their extremity sarcoma, as it was deemed a less stressful time for patients to make an informed decision, as well as a time point closer to the initiation of surveillance. After this decision was made, we began approaching all recent postoperative patients with extremity sarcoma for participation in this survey study, either at a postoperative clinical appointment or via telephone. After obtaining informed consent, the site study coordinator provided each participant with a paper copy of the questionnaire to complete in a private location. Participants were allowed to leave a question blank if they found it uncomfortable to answer. On completion, the participant returned the questionnaire to the site study coordinator who verified that all questions had been answered. Completed questionnaires were then entered

into a study-specific database using the REDCap electronic data capture software system.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive analyses, including frequency counts and percentages, were calculated for all collected data. Continuous data were presented as means and SD.

Role of the funding source

The funding source had no role in the design or conduct of the study; the collection, management, analysis or interpretation of the data or the preparation, review or approval of the manuscript. None of the authors has been paid to write this article. The study team had full access to all of the study data and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data.

Patient and public involvement

Although this study evaluates the patients' perspectives on participating in clinical trials and cancer research, patients were not involved in the design, conduct or reporting or dissemination of this research. However, the results of this study will help inform the development of patient-centred clinical trial protocols in sarcoma surveillance research.

RESULTS

Characteristics of respondents

A total of 142 patients were approached to complete the survey and 130 agreed (response rate 92%). To the best of our knowledge, no patients were missed during the recruitment period. Participant demographic and cancer history data are shown in Table 1. The mean participant a age was 56.4 years (SD 16.9 years) and 60.8% of participants were male. The majority of patient respondents were white (82.3%) and country of residence was reported as Canada in 40.8%, the USA in 52.3% and Spain in 6.9% of respondents. Most respondents were married or in a common law relationship (70.5%). There was a broad range of educational levels reported with a high school diploma as the most common response (31.3%), and a wide range of household incomes were reported. The most common anatomic location for the sarcoma was the lower extremity (66.7%), and participants reported receiving multidisciplinary treatment including chemotherapy (21.9%) and radiotherapy (68.4%). Travel times to the clinic ranged evenly across the spectrum from to medical appointments by personal vehicle (75%) by themselves (46.9%) or with a spouse (41.4%) five per cent of patient respondents reported not having previously been involved in a clinical research study.

Burden of cancer care

Respondent details for burden of cancer care are shown in table 2. The majority of participants reported at least some form of financial burden related to their cancer care and surveillance. These included transportation

N=130

Characteristic	N=130
Age (years), mean (SD)	56.4 (16.9)
Gender, n (%)	
Male	79 (60.8)
Female	51 (39.2)
Ethnicity, n (%)	
White/Caucasian	107 (82.3)
Black	3 (2.3)
Native	1 (0.8)
Asian	4 (3.1)
Hispanic	9 (6.9)
Other (specify)	5 (3.8)
Country, n (%)	
Canada	53 (40.8)
USA	68 (52.3)
Spain	9 (6.9)
Marital status, n (%)	
Single	20 (15.5)
Separated	0 (0)
Divorced	11 (8.5)
Common law	8 (6.2)
Married	83 (64.3)
Widowed	7 (5.4)
Highest level of education, n (%)	
Did not complete high school	11 (8.6)
High school diploma	40 (31.3)
College/Trade diploma	31 (24.2)
Undergraduate degree	18 (14.1)
Masters degree	11 (8.6)
Doctorate degree	3 (2.3)
Professional degree	7 (5.5)
Annual household income, n (%)*	
<\$20 000	12 (9.8)
\$20 000-\$39 999	25 (20.3)
\$40 000-\$59 999	21 (17.1)
\$60 000-\$79 999	13 (10.6)
\$80 000-\$99 999	15 (12.2)
\$100 000 +	37 (30.1)
Cancer type, n (%)	
Chondrosarcoma	5 (3.9)
Ewing's sarcoma	1 (0.8)
Fibrosarcoma	8 (6.3)
Fibrous histiocytoma	2 (1.6)
Leiomyosarcoma	4 (3.1)
Liposarcoma	16 (12.6)
Osteosarcoma	8 (6.3)
Rhabdomyosarcoma	4 (3.1)
Synovial sarcoma	11 (8.7)

Other Location of tumour, n (%)	49 (38.6)
Location of tumour, n (%)	
Upper extremity	29 (22.5)
Lower extremity	95 (73.6)
Other	5 (3.9)
Pelvis	2 (1.6)
Trunk	3 (2.3)
Cancer treatment modalities, n (%)	
Chemotherapy	25 (21.9)
Radiation therapy	78 (68.4)
Physiotherapy	4 (3.5)
Other	46 (40.4)
Travel time to sarcoma clinic, n (%)	, ,
<30 min	24 (18.6)
30–59 min	38 (29.5)
60–89 min	19 (14.7)
90–119 min	23 (17.8)
120min +	25 (19.4)
Primary mode of transportation to sarcoma of Public transit	
	8 (6.5)
Personal vehicle	93 (75.0)
Taxi	3 (2.4)
Bicycle	0 (0)
Foot	1 (0.8)
Hospital transportation	2 (1.6)
Relative's/Friend's vehicle	13 (10.5)
Other (specify)	4 (3.2)
Primary caregiver, n (%)	
Self	60 (46.9)
Spouse/Partner	53 (41.4)
Parent	8 (6.3)
Sibling	1 (0.8)
Child	5 (3.9)
Grandchild	0 (0)
Friend	1 (0.8)
Other (specify)	0 (0)
Previous participation in research study, n (%)	
No	98 (75.4)
Yes	32 (24.6)
1	22 (71.0)
2	8 (25.8)
3	1 (3.2)
>3	0 (0)

Table 1

Characteristic

Continued

to \$C and placed in the respective group at the time of manuscript preparation. Reported household income values include both \$C and US\$ as currency was not collected from participants when responding to this question.

Table 2	Burden of cancer care	е
Burden		n=130
Financial L	burdens	
Transporta	ation and travel expenses	, n (%)
No		16 (12.3)
Yes		114 (87.7)
Accommo	odation and meal expense	es, n (%)
No		30 (23.4)
Yes		98 (76.6)
Family and	d living expenses, n (%)	
No		27 (21.1)
Yes		101 (78.9)
Caregiving	g expenses, n (%)	
No		56 (43.8)
Yes		72 (56.3)
Personal I	oss of wages, n (%)	
Not app	olicable	40 (31.0)
No		40 (31.0)
Yes		49 (38.0)
Caregiver	loss of wages, n (%)	
Not app	olicable	38 (29.9)
No		62 (48.8)
Yes		27 (21.3)
Logistical	burdens	
Coordinat	ion of frequent medical a	opointments, n (%)
No		69 (53.5)
Yes		60 (46.5)
Completic	on and submission of pap	erwork, n (%)
Not app	olicable	20 (15.4)
No		76 (58.5)
Yes		34 (26.2)
Submissio	on of medical bills, n (%)	
Not app	olicable	28 (21.5)
No		61 (46.9)
Yes		41 (31.5)
Arrangem	ent of time off work, n (%)
Not app		53 (40.8)
No		36 (27.7)
Yes		41 (31.5)
Arrangem	ent of childcare, n (%)	
Not app		88 (67.7)
No		27 (20.8)
Yes		15 (11.5)

and travel expenses (87.7%), accommodation and meal expenses (76.6%), family and living expenses (78.9%), caregiving expenses (56.3%) and personal loss of wages (38%). Logistical burdens are also very significant for some participants. These included coordination of medical visits (46.5%), arrangement of time off work (31.5%) and arrangement of childcare when applicable.

Table 3 Reasons for trial participation			
Reason	N=130 N (%)		
I believe that the study offers the best treatment available.	65 (61.9)		
I want to contribute to scientific research.	83 (79.0)		
I believe that the quality of care I receive would be better as part of this study.	42 (40.0)		
I trust the doctor treating me.	79 (75.2)		
I believe the benefits of participating would outweigh any negative side effects.	53 (50.5)		
I believe the results from the study could benefit other patients in the future.	82 (78.1)		
I believe that I would be monitored more closely as part of this study.	42 (40.0)		
I think my cancer will get worse unless I participate in this study.	1 (1.0)		
I had a positive experience in a previous research study.	6 (5.7)		
Other (specify).	0 (0)		

The SAFETY trial: reasons to participate and views on cancer research

Protected by copyright, including for uses related A summary of patients' perceptions on cancer research and the SAFETY trial specifically are outlined in tables 3 and 4. The most common reasons for agreeing to participate in cancer research represented trust in the healthcare team and altruism: 'I want to contribute to scientific research' (79%), 'I trust the doctor treating me' (75%), "I believe the results from the study could benefit other patients in the future" (78.1%) and 'I believe that the study offers the best treatment available' (61.9%). With respect to overall views and perceptions of cancer research, approximately two-thirds of participants (68.7%) feel that they have a good understanding of clinical research. Notably, only about half (53.5%) are generally comfortable with the process of randomisation, in which their treatment or surveillance arm could be determined by chance. However, an overwhelming majority of participants (128/130, 98.5%) strongly agree or agree that cancer research will help doctors better understand and treat cancer. In addition, 93.9% of respondents strongly agree or agree that the primary reason cancer research is done is to improve the treatment of future patients with cancer. Interestingly, over half of respondents (68/130, 52.3%) strongly agree or agree that they would not **3** benefit directly from participating from cancer research.

A total of 106 of 124 respondents that answered the question 'Would you participate in the SAFETY trial if eligible?' reported that they would agree to participate (85.5%). Those that believed they would not agree to participate reported that they would decline for the following reasons: (1) 'I do not believe that I can currently cope with the additional requirements of a research study' (eight, respondents, 44.4%), (2) "I have concerns about possibly being followed

http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 10, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de

Table 4 Views on cancer research	
View	N=130 N (%)
I am interested in participating in clinical research my cancer.	related to
Strongly agree	63 (49.2)
Agree	51 (39.8)
Neither agree nor disagree	11 (8.6)
Disagree	2 (1.6)
Strongly disagree	1 (0.8)
I have a good understanding of clinical research.	
Strongly agree	31 (24.2)
Agree	57 (44.5)
Neither agree nor disagree	31 (24.2)
Disagree	3 (2.3)
Strongly disagree	6 (4.7)
Some clinical research determines by chance who treatment a patient receives (randomisation). I am comfortable with being randomly assigned (randomeceive a treatment.	1
Strongly agree	24 (18.6)
Agree	45 (34.9)
Neither agree nor disagree	35 (27.1)
Disagree	15 (11.6)
Strongly disagree	10 (7.8)
Cancer research will help doctors better understatreat cancer.	and and
Strongly agree	102 (78.5)
Agree	26 (20.0)
Neither agree nor disagree	2 (1.5)
Disagree	0 (0)
Strongly disagree	0 (0)
The primary reason cancer research is done is to the treatment of future patients with cancer.	improve
Strongly agree	86 (66.2)
Agree	36 (27.7)
Neither agree nor disagree	3 (2.3)
Disagree	3 (2.3)
Strongly disagree	2 (1.5)
I will not directly benefit from participating in canoresearch.	cer
Strongly agree	26 (20.0)
Agree	42 (32.3)
Neither agree nor disagree	31 (23.8)
Disagree	28 (21.5)
Strongly disagree	3 (2.3)
Patients who participate in research studies shou the results when the study is compete.	ld be told
Strongly agree	46 (35.4)
	Continued

Table 4 Continued	
View	N=130 N (%)
Agree	62 (47.7)
Neither agree nor disagree	20 (15.4)
Disagree	1 (0.8)
Strongly disagree	1 (0.8)
I would agree to participate in the SAFETY trial i (n=124).	f eligible
Yes	106 (85.5)
No	18 (14.5)
SAFETY, Surveillance AFter Extremity Tumor SurgerY.	·

less intensively in this study" (four respondents, 22.2%), (3) "I have concerns about additional radiation exposures from CT scans" (four respondents, 22.2%) and (4) "I believe that the quality of care I receive would be inferior to what I would receive if I did not participate" (three respondents, 16.7%). Other less common reasons to decline the study included "I do not believe that the study offers the best treatment available", "My family is not keen for me to participate" and travel and religious reasons. One respondent reported a negative experience with a previous trial.

DISCUSSION **Summary of findings**

This study explored the perceptions of international patients with extremity sarcoma on cancer surveillance. We found that patients endure significant financial and logistical burdens associated with sarcoma care and follow-up. In general, patients are very interested in participating in clinical research, and specifically in cancer surveillance research. The reasons for participating in research include the desire to help future patients and the perception that their care would be improved in the context of a clinical trial. However, some participants expressed a lingering concern with leaving their care and/or surveillance to chance (randomisation) and several indicated that they believe that they would not participate in research due to feeling overwhelmed with their cancer diagnosis and treatment. Overall, the results of this study will help inform the SAFETY trial and guide approaches to eligible patients when obtaining consent.

Strengths and limitations

This study has several strengths. First, we used a rigorous process for the development of the patient questionnaire and extensive piloting of the survey. This stepwise process created a questionnaire that was acceptable for patients and sufficiently clear and comprehensive to provide a robust dataset. Second, we surveyed patients across Canada, the USA and Spain. Although this required translation of English documents into French and Spanish, it provided a more global picture of patients' perceptions. The SAFETY trial is an international endeavour, and therefore international

participation in the background survey was critical. Finally, this survey study represents an important step in engaging patients in randomised controlled trial development and inception, thus improving the patient-centred nature of cancer research.

Our study also had some limitations to consider. First, there may have been selection bias in that those who agreed to participate in the survey study are also more likely to participate in research in general. This would overestimate the acceptance rate of the SAFETY study and interest in clinical research. However, our response rate was 92%, somewhat mitigating these concerns. Second, the survey was not a validated survey; however, it allowed us to determine the proportion of participants who would theoretically consent to participating specifically in the SAFETY trial, as well as investigate patients' views on the burden of cancer care and on cancer research in greater detail than would have been possible with standardised questionnaires. Third, the demographics of the respondents were not diverse with respect to race (82.3% white) and continent of residence (93.1% from North America). The incidence data collected in the Surveillance, Epidemiology and End Results database of the National Cancer Institute demonstrate similar rates of sarcomas between white and black populations. 22-25 This is also inconsistent with the overall North American demographic data, as black individuals comprise approximately 13% of the North American population. 26 27 These demographic discrepancies somewhat limit the external validity of the findings with respect to Europe and other international sites. And while it is not uncommon for non-white racial/ ethnic groups to be under-represented in cancer clinical trials, the race demographics of this survey have highlighted an important gap to address in our recruitment strategy for the SAFETY trial.^{28–30} Fourth, while the survey addressed indirect costs of sarcoma surveillance (such as the cost of travel or missed work to attend a clinic visit), it did not address the direct costs of surveillance (such as the cost to patients of different thoracic imaging techniques or additional imaging and clinic visits). However, postoperative sarcoma surveillance is considered standard of care despite being highly varied among orthopaedic oncologists with respect to thoracic imaging and frequency. 31-33 Therefore, direct costs should not apply to most patients as a wide spectrum of surveillance care regimens are within the range of standard practice and should be covered by the patients' federal, provincial/state or private health insurance.³⁴ Nevertheless, these cost data would likely prove valuable when considering trial participation of patients without private health insurance in countries without socialised healthcare such as the USA. Finally, the survey did not evaluate the optimal timing and method to approach patients to participate in the SAFETY trial.

Relevance to previous research

The exploration of patients' perceptions of sarcoma surveillance in the context of a randomised surveillance trial has not, to our knowledge, previously been reported. However, as far back as 1979, researchers interviewed patients with sarcoma to determine reasons for acceptance of randomisation in treatment-related clinical trials.³⁵ The authors of this study concluded that patient acceptance of participation in treatment-related clinical trials was associated with treatment factors such as burden of care and drug toxicities. Within the field of orthopaedic surgery, Creel et al⁶⁶ surveyed patients with meniscal tears and determined willingness to participate in a trial in which they would be randomised to operative versus non-operative treatment. The authors found that lack of strong treatment preferences and male gender were significantly associated with willingness to participate in such a trial. Only 46% of patients reported that they would be definitely willing or probably willing to participate.

A large survey study of 1227 Swiss patients in which four different clinical trial vignettes were described found that all studies were not equally acceptable to patients. A higher willingness to participate was found when a new drug was considered safe, no extra logistical burden of care was required, results were openly available to the public and the project was approved by a research ethics committee. In contrast, use of placebo controls, and random allocation to study arms were associated with a lower likelihood of participation.³⁷ Similarly, Halpern et al found that in patients with hypertension, for uses related to text and inconvenience, fear of known side effects and the possibility of receiving placebo were the most common concerns for patients in clinical trials.³⁸ Similar to the orthopaedic trial outlined above, only 47% of patients would be willing to participate in a placebo-controlled trial.

Implications

In this study, we found that a high percentage of patients with sarcoma would be willing to participate in surveillance research. In comparison to other published patient survey studies of treatment-related RCTs, the willingness to participate identified in this study is significantly greater. This has positive implications for sarcoma surveillance research in general, and specifically for the SAFETY trial. However, survey responses do not necessarily align with actual participation. Moreover, the sense of being overwhelmed with the diagnosis of sarcoma and the need for intensive treatment can deter patients from accepting an additional dimension to their care in the form of a trial. Nevertheless, the patient engagement strategy used in this study is likely to increase enrolment in the SAFETY trial and help guide study implementation. Technology

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this patient survey demonstrate that the general survey demonstrate the general survey demonstrate

majority of participants would be willing to participate in an RCT that evaluates different postoperative sarcoma surveillance regimens. Participants' motivations for trial participation included trust in the healthcare system and altruistic reasons to help future patients. Those that would decline the study for the most part would do so because of the overwhelming burden of a cancer diagnosis. These results will help inform the development of patient-centred clinical trial protocols in cancer surveillance research and specifically the implementation of the SAFETY trial.

Author affiliations

- ¹Department of Surgery, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
- ²Division of Orthopaedic Surgery, McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Québec, Canada
- ³Department of Orthopaedic Oncology, University of Montreal, Hopital Maisonneuve-Rosemont, Montreal, Québec, Canada
- ⁴Department of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, USA
- ⁵Department of Orthopaedics & Rehabilitation, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Oregon, USA
- ⁶Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of California, Davis, California, USA
 ⁷Department of Orthopaedics, Huntsman Cancer Institute, University of Utah School of Medicine. Salt Lake City. Utah. USA
- ⁸Orthopaedic Surgery Department, Hospital Universitario Vall d'Hebron, Barcelona, Spain
- ⁹Juravinski Cancer Centre, Hamilton Health Sciences, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

Twitter Patricia Schneider @PJTrouble88, Victoria Giglio @VictoriaGiglio7, Kenneth Gundle @GundleMD and Michelle Ghert @michelle_ghert

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank all research staff involved in this study: Steven Salomon, MSc (McGill University Health Centre), Hugo Saint-Yves, MSc (Hôpital Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Janie Barry, MSc (Hôpital Maisonneuve-Rosemont), Tammy Smith, BA, MS (University of Iowa), Rebecca Wetzel, BS (Oregon Health & Sciences University), Jacqueline Hart, AS (University of Utah), Alba Lopez-Fernandez, PhD (Hospital Universitario Vall d'Hebron) and any other research staff from participating sites.

Contributors PS and MG designed this study and are the principal authors of this manuscript. VG and DG contributed significantly to data collection and data analysis. DW, RT, MI, SM, BM, JH, Y-CD, KG, RLR, KJ and RV contributed to the conception of the study and acquisition of data. All authors reviewed and approved the manuscript.

Funding The institution of the authors has received, during the study period, funding from the McMaster Surgical Associates (MSA) Innovation Grant.

Competing interests None declared.

Patient consent for publication Not required.

Ethics approval Each author certifies that his or her institution approved or waived approval (McGill University Health Centre Research Ethics Board) for the human protocol for this investigation and that all investigations were conducted according to the ethical principles of research. The Methods Centre received approval from the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (HiREB) (Protocol No. 2954). Approval from each of the local ethics committees was obtained in writing prior to the local commencement of the study.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

Data availability statement The datasets generated during this study are not publicly available, but are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

Supplemental material This content has been supplied by the author(s). It has not been vetted by BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) and may not have been peer-reviewed. Any opinions or recommendations discussed are solely those of the author(s) and are not endorsed by BMJ. BMJ disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on the content. Where the content includes any translated material, BMJ does not warrant the accuracy and reliability of the translations (including but not limited to local regulations, clinical guidelines, terminology, drug names and drug dosages), and is not responsible for any error and/or omissions arising from translation and adaptation or otherwise.

Open access This is an open access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited, appropriate credit is given, any changes made indicated, and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/.

ORCID iDs

Patricia Schneider http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1425-0687 Victoria Giglio http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4399-9710 Kenneth Gundle http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0451-0561

REFERENCES

- 1 Ottaviani G, Jaffe N. The epidemiology of osteosarcoma. Cancer Treat Res 2009:152:3–13.
- 2 Brennan MF, Casper ES, Harrison LB, et al. The role of multimodality therapy in soft-tissue sarcoma. Ann Surg 1991;214:328–38. discussion 336-338.
- 3 Brennan MF. Management of extremity soft-tissue sarcoma. Am J Surg 1989;158:71–8.
- 4 Rosen G, Murphy ML, Huvos AG, et al. Chemotherapy, en bloc resection, and prosthetic bone replacement in the treatment of osteogenic sarcoma. Cancer 1976;37:1–11.
- 5 Eilber FR, Eckhardt J, Morton DL. Advances in the treatment of sarcomas of the extremity. current status of limb salvage. *Cancer* 1984;54:2695–701.
- 6 Europe PMC. The changing role of amputation for soft tissue sarcoma of the extremity in adults. - Abstract - Europe PMC, 2020. Available: https://europepmc.org/article/med/1440165
- 7 Whooley BP, Mooney MM, Gibbs JF, et al. Effective follow-up strategies in soft tissue sarcoma. Semin Surg Oncol 1999;17:83–7.
- 8 Whooley BP, Gibbs JF, Mooney MM, et al. Primary extremity sarcoma: what is the appropriate follow-up? Ann Surg Oncol 2000;7:9–14.
- 9 Kane JM. Surveillance strategies for patients following surgical resection of soft tissue sarcomas. Curr Opin Oncol 2004;16:328–32.
- 10 Gadd MA, Casper ES, Woodruff JM, et al. Development and treatment of pulmonary metastases in adult patients with extremity soft tissue sarcoma. Ann Surg 1993;218:705–12.
- 11 Huth JF, Eilber FR. Patterns of metastatic spread following resection of extremity soft-tissue sarcomas and strategies for treatment. Semin Surg Oncol 1988;4:20–6.
- 12 Songür N, Dinç M, Ozdilekcan C, et al. Analysis of lung metastases in patients with primary extremity sarcoma. Sarcoma 2003;7:63–7.
- 13 Longo CJ, Deber R, Fitch M, et al. An examination of cancer patients' monthly 'out-of-pocket' costs in Ontario, Canada. Eur J Cancer Care 2007;16:500–7.
- 14 Hopkins RB, Goeree R, Longo CJ. Estimating the National wage loss from cancer in Canada. Curr Oncol 2010;17:40–9.
- 15 Nipp RD, Zullig LL, Samsa G, et al. Identifying cancer patients who alter care or lifestyle due to treatment-related financial distress. Psychooncology 2016;25:719–25.
- 16 Thompson CA, Charlson ME, Schenkein E, et al. Surveillance CT scans are a source of anxiety and fear of recurrence in long-term lymphoma survivors. Ann Oncol 2010;21:2262–6.
- Mitera G, Earle C, Latosinsky S, et al. Choosing wisely Canada cancer list: ten low-value or harmful practices that should be avoided in cancer care. J Oncol Pract 2015;11:e296–303.
- 18 Fogel DB. Factors associated with clinical trials that fail and opportunities for improving the likelihood of success: a review. Contemp Clin Trials Commun 2018;11:156–64.
- 19 Schneider PJ, Evaniew N, McKay P, et al. Moving forward through consensus: a modified Delphi approach to determine the top research priorities in orthopaedic oncology. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2017;475:3044–55.
- 20 SAFETY Investigators. The surveillance after extremity tumor surgery (safety) trial: protocol for a pilot study to determine the feasibility of a multi-centre randomised controlled trial. BMJ Open 2019;9:e029054.
- 21 Stoller JK. The challenge of rare diseases. Chest 2018;153:1309-14.
- 22 Burningham Z, Hashibe M, Spector L, et al. The epidemiology of sarcoma. Clin Sarcoma Res 2012;2:14.
- 23 Zahm SH, Fraumeni J. The epidemiology of soft tissue sarcoma. Wb Saunders Co 1997;24:504–14.
- 24 Hsieh M-C, Wu X-C, Andrews PA, et al. Racial and ethnic disparities in the incidence and trends of soft tissue sarcoma among adolescents and young adults in the United States, 1995-2008. J Adolesc Young Adult Oncol 2013;2:89–94.
- 25 National Cancer Institute. Soft tissue including heart cancer recent trends in SEER age-adjusted incidence rates, 2000-2017, 2021. Available: https://seer.cancer.gov/explorer/application.html?site= 51&data_type=1&graph_type=2&compareBy=race&chk_race_3=3&chk_race_8=8&sex=1&age_range=1&stage=101&hdn_rate_type=1&advopt_precision=1&advopt_display=2
- 26 Government of Canada SC. Diversity of the black population in Canada: an overview, 2019. Available: https://www150.statcan.gc. ca/n1/pub/89-657-x/89-657-x2019002-eng.htm
- 27 US Census Bureau. The black population: 2010. the United States census bureau, 2021. Available: https://www.census.gov/library/ publications/2011/dec/c2010br-06.html
- 28 Murthy VH, Krumholz HM, Gross CP. Participation in cancer clinical trials: race-, sex-, and age-based disparities. *JAMA* 2004;291:2720–6.

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

- 29 Baquet CR, Commiskey P, Daniel Mullins C, et al. Recruitment and participation in clinical trials: socio-demographic, rural/urban, and health care access predictors. Cancer Detect Prev 2006;30:24–33.
- 30 Stewart JH, Bertoni AG, Staten JL, et al. Participation in surgical oncology clinical trials: gender-, race/ethnicity-, and age-based disparities. Ann Surg Oncol 2007;14:3328–34.
- 31 Gerrand CH, Billingham LJ, Woll PJ, et al. Follow up after primary treatment of soft tissue sarcoma: a survey of current practice in the United Kingdom. Sarcoma 2007;2007:1–6.
- 32 Greenberg DD, Crawford B. Surveillance strategies for sarcoma: results of a survey of members of the musculoskeletal tumor Society. Sarcoma 2016;2016:1–5.
- 33 Ries Z, Gibbs CP, Scarborough MT, et al. Pulmonary surveillance strategies following sarcoma excision vary among orthopedic oncologists: a survey of the musculoskeletal tumor Society. Iowa Orthop J 2016;36:109.

- 34 Cipriano CA, Jang E, Tyler W. Sarcoma surveillance: a review of current evidence and guidelines. J Am Acad Orthop Surg 2020;28:145–56.
- 35 Barofky I, Sugarbaker PH. Determinants of patient Nonparticipation in randomized clinical trials for the treatment of sarcomas. Am J Clin Oncol 1979;2:237–46.
- 36 Creel AH, Losina E, Mandl LA, et al. An assessment of willingness to participate in a randomized trial of arthroscopic knee surgery in patients with osteoarthritis. Contemp Clin Trials 2005;26:169–78.
- 37 Agoritsas T, Deom M, Perneger TV. Study design attributes influenced patients' willingness to participate in clinical research: a randomized vignette-based study. J Clin Epidemiol 2011;64:107–15.
- 38 Halpern SD, Karlawish JHT, Casarett D, et al. Hypertensive patients' willingness to participate in placebo-controlled trials: implications for recruitment efficiency. Am Heart J 2003;146:985–92.
- 39 Domecq JP, Prutsky G, Elraiyah T, et al. Patient engagement in research: a systematic review. BMC Health Serv Res 2014;14:89.

Participant Initials	Participant ID		Complet	tion Date	
				2 0	
		DD	MM	YYYY	

Surveillance AFter Extremity Tumor SurgerY (SAFETY) Protocol Study PATIENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for agreeing to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will help orthopaedic oncology researchers better understand whether sarcoma patients are willing to participate in research evaluating different post-operative follow-up schedules. This questionnaire should take you approximately 15 minutes to complete. A participant ID number will be assigned to track completion of the questionnaires. A master list linking the ID number will be maintained during the data collection phase. Once all questionnaires from each round have been received, the list will be destroyed and your responses will be anonymized.

Some of the questions may be uncomfortable for you to answer. However, we ask that you try your best in answering all of the questions. Your participation is important to us and those whom may benefit from this research.

Part A: DEMOGRAPHICS

This section asks a few basic questions to let us know a little bit more about you.

1. V	Vhat is your age?years	;					
2. V	Vhat is your gender?						
	Male				Female		
	Other (specify):						
3. V	Vhat is your race/ethni	city?					
	Caucasian				Native/Aboriginal		
	African/Caribbean				East Asian		
	Hispanic/Latino				South Asian		
	Middle Eastern				Other (specify):		
	Mixed (specify):			_			
4 V	Mhara da yayı liya?						
4. V	Vhere do you live? Canada				Spain		
	Netherlands				USA		
					USA		
Ш	Other (specify):			•			
5. V	Vhat is your first langu	age?					
	Arabic		French		Korean		Spanish
	Cantonese		German		Mandarin		Urdu
	Dutch		Hindi		Portuguese		Vietnamese
	English		Italian		Russian		Other (specify):
_	Č	_		_		_	, , ,

Version 1.0 Page **1** of **12** 16 March 2017

	Participant Initi	ials		Participant ID —				
6. V	Vhat is your ma	arital sta [Sepa		☐ Divorced	Co	☐ mmon Law Ma	rried	☐ Widowed
 7. What is your highest level of education? Did Not Complete High School College/Trade Diploma Masters Degree Professional Degree 						High School Diplor Undergraduate Deg Doctorate Degree Other (specify):	gree	
8. A	Yes → If yes No → If no,	, what is	your c	•				
]		Retired Student		ice/Disability		Homemaker Unemployed Other (specify):		
	Please select A				g dise	ases?		Peripheral Vascular
	None Addiction			Diabetes (Type I) Diabetes (Type II)		Disease Kidney Transplant		Disease Psychoses
	AIDS/HIV Anemia			Heart Disease Hepatitis		Liver Failure Neurological		Pulmonary Circulation Disorder Renal Failure
	Cardiac Arrhy Chronic Pulm			Hypertension		Disorders Obesity		Rheumatoid Arthritis Systemic Lupus
	Disease Depression	Onary		Hyperthyroidism Hypothyroidism		Osteoporosis		Erythematosus Other (specify):
10. D	o you smoke?		mer oker	☐ Current Smoker				
11. Do	o you routinely	use rec						
12. H		nol do yo Drinks /W		nk on a weekly basis?				
				live in Canada or the US o in the Netherlands or S				

	Particip	ant Ini	ials Participant ID		
Р	LEASE	E CC	OMPLETE THIS PAGE IF Y	OU/	LIVE IN CANADA OR THE USA .
13. W	/hat is yo Less th \$20,000 \$40,000	an \$2) to \$	39,999		\$60,000 to \$79,999 \$80,000 to \$99,999 \$100,000+
(A) F	or Cana nealth ins	dian suranc		/ med	ical insurance coverage outside of your provincial
	100	<i>y</i> oc	Employer-Provided Insurance		Military/Veteran
			Personally-Purchased Insurance		Other (specify):
(B) F	or Amer	ican	patients, do you have medical insura	ince (coverage?
	Yes →	If yes	s, please indicate what type of additional	medi	cal insurance coverage:
			Employer-Provided Insurance		Medicaid
			Personally-Purchased Insurance		Military/Veteran
			Medicare		Other (specify):

Please proceed to Part B on Page 5.

	Participant Initials Participant ID		
PL	LEASE COMPLETE THIS PAGE IF SP	YOU PAIN.	LIVE IN THE NETHERLANDS OR
13. W	What is your yearly household income before taxe	s?	
	Less than €14,500		€43,500 to €57,999
	€14,500 to €28,999		€58,000 to €71,999
	€29,000 to €43,499		€72,000+
14. D	o you have any <i>additional</i> medical insurance cov No	erage (outside of your state health insurance plan?
	Yes → If yes, please indicate what type of addition	ıal medi	cal insurance coverage:
	☐ Employer-Provided Insurance		Military/Veteran
	Personally-Purchased Insurance		Other (specify):

Please proceed to Part B on Page 5.

	Participant Ini	tials	Participant ID				
This s						ve been diagnosed with more than e in clinic for today.	one
15. W	hat type of ca	ncer do you have?	•				
	Chondrosar	•			Ewing's sar	coma	
	Fibrosarcon	na			Fibrous his	tiocytoma	
	Giant cell tu	mor of bone			Leiomyosar	rcoma	
	Liposarcom	а			Non-osteog	enic sarcoma of bone	
	Osteosarco	ma			Rhabdomy	osarcoma	
	Synovial sa	rcoma			Other (spec	ify):	
	Not Sure						
16 W	here is vour c	ancer located?					
TO: VV	Arm	ancer located:			Leg		
	Not Sure				•	ify):	
_				_	` .	,,	
17. W	hen were you	diagnosed with ca	Incer?		YYYY		
18. Ho	ow long have	you been a cancer	patient at the cer	nter w	here you are f	or your current treatment?	
						•	
	ess Than 2 Weeks	2 - 4 Weeks	1 - 6 Months	(Over Months		
19. Ho	ow has your c	ancer been treated	l so far?				
	lease select A	LL that apply.		_			
Ц	Chemothera	• •			Radiation th	• •	
Ш	Physiothera	ру		Ш	Other (spec	ify):	
20. H	ow many time	s have you seen y	our orthopaedic o	ncolo	gist (cancer sı	urgeon)?	
F	irst Visit	Once Before	2 - 3 Times	Ov	er 3 Times		
21 H	ow long does	it <i>typically</i> take you	ı get from home tr	n the l	nosnital for a d	cancer appointment?	
	ess Than Minutes	30 - 59 Minutes	1 - 1.5 Hours		1.5 - 2 Hours	Over 2 Hours	

	Participant Initials		Participant ID			
22. Ho	ow do you <i>typically</i>	γ travel to the h	nospital for a cancer	арр	oointment?	
	Public Transit				Personal Vehicle	le
	Taxi				Bicycle	
	Foot		L	_	Hospital Transp	
Ш	Relative/Friend's	s Vehicle	L	╛	Other (specify):	:
	ho is your primary primary caregiver is		assumes the most res	spoi	nsibility in caring fo	r your health and wellbeing.
	Myself				Spouse/Partner	•
	Parent				Sibling	
	Child				Grandchild	
	Friend				Other (specify):	!
This so	n question, please ra	s about your pr ate your level ag	revious participation in greement with each sta	aten	nent.	inion on cancer research. For each
24. l a	am interested in pa	rticipating in c	linical research relat	ed t	to my cancer.	
Stro	ngly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Disagree	Strongly Disagree
25. Ha	ave you previously No	participated in	n any other research	stu	udies?	
	Yes → If yes, how	v many other re	search studies have yo	ou p	previously participat	ted in?
	1		2		3	Over 3
	ow many different eatment?	research stu	udies have been dis	scu	ssed with you o	over the course of your cancer
	0	1	2		3	Over 3
27. l h	nave a good unders	standing of cli	nical research.		П	П
Stra	ngly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree	г	Disagree	Strongly
3110	nigiy Agree	Agree	Nor Disagree		Disagree	Disagree
co	omfortable with bein	ng randomly a	es by chance what to ssigned (randomized Neither Agree	d) to	o receive a treatm	receives (randomization). I amnent. Strongly
SIF0	ngly Agree	Agree	Nor Disagree	L	Disagree	Disagree

	Participa	nt Initials	Participant II			
29. Ca	ancer rese	earch will help doct	tors better understa	nd and treat cance	er.	
Stro	ngly Agr	ee Agree	Neither Agre Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
30. Th	ne primary	reason cancer re	search is done is to	improve the treatn	nent of <i>future</i> cance	r patients.
Stro	ngly Agr	ee Agree	Neither Agre Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
31. l w	vill not dir	ectly benefit from p	participating in cance	er research.		
			L. Noithar Agra		Ctropaly	
Stro	ngly Agr	ee Agree	Neither Agre		Strongly Disagree	
32. Pa	atients wh	o participate in res	earch studies shoul	d be told the resul	ts when the study is	complete.
Stro	ngly Agr	ee Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
This se	ection asks					reatment and whether
So	ome exam ensportatio	ples of transportation			care paid by you/yo from gas, tolls, parki	ur family? ing, taxis, and public
	No					
	Yes →	f <i>yes</i> , please indicat	e how much of a finar	ncial burden these co	osts are to you:	
		Unmanageable Burden	Significant Burden	Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden
	me exam _l				r care paid by you/y hotel stays and meals	
	No					
	Yes →	t <i>yes</i> , please indicat	e how much of a finar	ncial burden these co	osts are to you:	
		Llamonossabla	Cianificant	Computed of -		
		Unmanageable Burden	Significant Burden	Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden

	Participa	nt Initials	Participant —	ID		
Sc		ples of family and l		our cancer paid by your cancer paid by your cancer to		hold, childcare, and
	Yes →	If <i>yes</i> , please indicate	how much of a fina	ancial burden these cos	sts are to you:	
		Unmanageable Burden	Significant Burden	Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden
Sc	ome exam	ples of caregiving e	xpenses include d	ncer care paid by yo costs from hiring a po I personal support work	erson to prepare me	eals or drive you to
	Yes →	If <i>yes</i> , please indicate	how much of a fina	ancial burden these cos	sts are to you:	
		Unmanageable Burden	Significant Burden	Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden
37. Ha	Not App No	xperienced a loss o slicable → I was no		due to your cancer of my cancer diagnosis.	care?	
	Vac 👈	If yes please indicate	how much of a fina	ancial burden this loss	of income is to you:	
	Yes →	If <i>yes</i> , please indicate	how much of a fina	ancial burden this loss	of income is to you:	
	Yes →	If <i>yes</i> , please indicate Unmanageable Burden	how much of a fina Significant Burden	ancial burden this loss Somewhat of a Burden	of income is to you: Slight Burden	☐ No Burden
38. Ha	as your pr	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver exp	Significant Burden perienced a loss of	☐ Somewhat of a	Slight Burden cancer care?	☐ No Burden
38. Ha	as your pr Not App No	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver exp	Significant Burden perienced a loss of ary caregiver was n	Somewhat of a Burden f wages due to your	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis.	
38. Ha	as your pr Not App No	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver exp	Significant Burden perienced a loss of ary caregiver was n	Somewhat of a Burden f wages due to your ot employed prior to m	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis.	
38. Ha	as your pr Not App No	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver exp	Significant Burden perienced a loss of ary caregiver was n	Somewhat of a Burden f wages due to your ot employed prior to m	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis.	
Part E This s whether	as your pr Not App No Yes → E: LOGIS ection ask er they are	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver expelicable → My prima If yes, please indicate Unmanageable Burden TICAL BURDEN Of sequestions about soil	Significant Burden Derienced a loss of ary caregiver was not how much of a final Significant Burden F CANCER CARIES of the tasks you	Somewhat of a Burden If wages due to your ot employed prior to mancial burden this loss of the Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis. of income is to your process Slight Burden	rimary caregiver: No Burden cancer treatment and
Part E This s wheth people	as your pr Not App No Yes E: LOGIS ection ask er they are e that is dif	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver expelicable → My prima If yes, please indicate Unmanageable Burden TICAL BURDEN Of see a logistical burden to ficult to manage.	Significant Burden Derienced a loss of ary caregiver was not be much of a final Significant Burden F CANCER CARIEM of the tasks you you. A logistical burden	Somewhat of a Burden If wages due to your ot employed prior to mancial burden this loss of the Somewhat of a Burden If wages due to your ot employed prior to mancial burden this loss of the source	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis. of income is to your process Slight Burden e as a result of your convolves the coordination	rimary caregiver: No Burden ancer treatment and on of many details or
Part E This s wheth people	AS your price Not App No Yes E: LOGIS ection ask er they are et that is diff ind that co	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver expelicable My prima If yes, please indicate Unmanageable Burden TICAL BURDEN Of se a logistical burden to ficult to manage. Coordinating frequent	Significant Burden Derienced a loss of ary caregiver was not a final Significant Burden F CANCER CARIEM of the tasks you you. A logistical but a medical appointment of the property of the care appointment of the care appo	Somewhat of a Burden If wages due to your of employed prior to mancial burden this loss of a Burden Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis. of income is to your properties Slight Burden e as a result of your convolves the coordinations care is a logistical be	rimary caregiver: No Burden cancer treatment and on of many details or burden.
Part E This s wheth people	AS your price Not App No Yes E: LOGIS ection ask er they are et that is diff ind that co	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver expelicable My prima If yes, please indicate Unmanageable Burden TICAL BURDEN Of squestions about soft a logistical burden to fficult to manage. coordinating frequent If yes, please indicate	Significant Burden Derienced a loss of ary caregiver was not a final Significant Burden F CANCER CARIEM of the tasks you you. A logistical but a medical appointment of a log	Somewhat of a Burden If wages due to your of employed prior to mancial burden this loss of the solution of a Burden Somewhat of a Burden Europe may have to manage furden is any task that in the ments for my cancer is stical burden coordinate.	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis. of income is to your properties Slight Burden e as a result of your convolves the coordinations care is a logistical be	rimary caregiver: No Burden cancer treatment and on of many details or burden.
Part E This s wheth people	AS your price Not App No Yes E: LOGIS ection ask er they are et that is diff ind that co	Unmanageable Burden rimary caregiver expelicable My prima If yes, please indicate Unmanageable Burden TICAL BURDEN Of se a logistical burden to ficult to manage. Coordinating frequent	Significant Burden Derienced a loss of ary caregiver was not a final Significant Burden F CANCER CARIEM of the tasks you you. A logistical but a medical appointment of the property of the care appointment of the care appo	Somewhat of a Burden If wages due to your of employed prior to mancial burden this loss of a Burden Somewhat of a Burden Eu may have to manage ourden is any task that in ments for my cancer	Slight Burden cancer care? y cancer diagnosis. of income is to your properties Slight Burden e as a result of your convolves the coordinations care is a logistical be	rimary caregiver: No Burden cancer treatment and on of many details or burden.

Particip	ant Initials	Participant II			
	completing and subm plicable → I do not h	•	-	•	
Yes →	If <i>yes</i> , please indicate	how much of a logis	tical burden complet	ing additional paperwo	ork is to you:
	Unmanageable Burden	Significant Burden	Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden
Not Ap	processing medical bi	ave any additional r	nedical bills related to	o my cancer care.	
Yes →	If <i>yes</i> , please indicate	how much of a logis	tical burden process	ing additional medical	bills is to you:
	∟ Unmanageable Burden	∟ Significant Burden	∟ Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden
☐ Not Ap	arranging for time off v plicable → I am not on If yes, please indicate	currently employed.		·	-
	Unmanageable Burden	Significant Burden	Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden
	arranging childcare to plicable → I do not h	-	-		
☐ Yes →	If yes, please indicate	how much of a logis	tical burden arrangin	g childcare is to you:	
	Unmanageable Burden	Significant Burden	Somewhat of a Burden	Slight Burden	No Burden
Please review ti	AFETY TRIAL he Patient Information S nion, please rate your le	Sheet for the SAFET evel of agreement w	Y Trial before answe ith each statement.	ring the following ques	stions. For questions
44. The post-o	perative follow-up sc	hedule described l	pelow is standard o	are for my type of ca	ancer.
where you had j three years. At	o years after your surge your surgery or in your five years after surgery Otherwise, you will only	lungs. After that, you , your doctor will see	ur doctor will see you you once a year. Yo	ı for the same reasons	every six months for
Strongly Ag	ree Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
Version 1.0		Pa	ge 9 of 12		16 March 2017

Version 1.0

Participant Initia	als	Participant ID			
45. The post-operative type of cancer.	ve follow-up sch	nedule described abo	ve has been scie	entifically proven to be	the best for my
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
46. Compared with t		llow-up schedule, no	ne of the other	study follow-up sched	ules carry any
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
47. I have concerns a	about being folk	owed by my orthopae	dic oncologist le	ss frequently.	
		∟ Neither Agree	Ш	∟ Strongly	
Strongly Agree	Agree	Nor Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	
48. I have concerns a	about my expos	sure to radiation from	additional CT sc	ans or x-rays.	
		Notite on A man			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
49. I have concerns t	hat CT scans w	vill miss any cancer n	odules that were	n't detected on a chest	x-ray.
		Naith an Amna			
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
50. Compared with t		llow-up schedule, fe	wer follow-up ap	ppointments would eas	e the financial
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
51. Compared with t burden of my can		llow-up schedule, fev	wer follow-up ap	pointments would eas	e the logistical
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
52. Would you discus	ss this research	study with anyone b	efore deciding to	/ not to participate in the	nis study?
<u>_</u>	please specify w	ho:			
	Spouse/Partner		Parent		
	Sibling		Child		
	Friend		Grandchild		
	Family Physicia	n	Other (spec	ify):	

Page 10 of 12

16 March 2017

	Participant Init	tials	Participant ID			
53. W	ould you sear	ch for any additio	nal information be	efore d	eciding to /	not to participate in this study?
	Yes → If yes	s, please specify wl	here:			
		Internet			Literature	(books/journals)
		Hospital Resource			Patient Su	ipport Group(s)
		Other Organizati	on (specify):		Other (spe	ecify):
54. W	ould you parti	cipate in the SAF	ETY trial?			
	Yes	No				
55. M	y decision to /	not to participate	in this research s	study w	as easy.	
			☐ Neither Agree			 Strongly
Stro	ngly Agree	Agree	Nor Disagree		Disagree	Disagree
		56A if you <i>woul</i> e SAFETY Trial.	d participate in th	ie SAF	ETY trial.	Please answer 56B if you would not
			oate in this researd	ch stud	y?	
			offers the best		benefit otl	ve the results from the study could her patients in the future.
	B. I want to c	ontribute to scien	tific research.			eve that I would be monitored more part of this study.
		at the quality of capart of this study.	are I receive would		H. My fam	ily is keen for me to participate.
	D. I trust the	doctor treating me	e.			my cancer will get worse unless I e in this study.
		at the benefits of gh any negative s				a positive experience in a previous
					K. Other (specify):
		ı choose not to pa ALL that apply.	articipate in this re	search	study?	
	treatment ava	ilable.	dy offers the best	Ш		concerns about the additional radiation from CT scans.
	B. I do not research.	want to contril	bute to scientific		G. My fam	ily is not keen for me to participate.
			are I receive would eceive if I did not		with my in	ve that this study would cause issues issues issues coverage.
	D. I do not tru	ıst the doctor trea	iting me.			believe that I can currently cope with onal requirements of a research study.
		cerns about possi ely in this study.	bly being followed			a negative experience in a previous
					K. Other (specify):

Par <u>ticipant Ini</u> tials	Participant ID — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —
57. Which of the reasons abov SAFETY trial?	was the most important reason for you deciding to / not to participate in the
58. Additional Comments:	

Thank you for completing this questionnaire!