



# BMJ Open Cohort profile: Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden (BladderBaSe) 2.0

Christel Häggström ,<sup>1,2</sup> Oskar Hagberg,<sup>3</sup> Truls Gårdmark,<sup>4</sup> Firas Aljabery,<sup>5</sup> Viveka Ströck,<sup>6,7</sup> Abolfazl Hosseini,<sup>8</sup> Amir Sherif,<sup>9</sup> Per-Uno Malmstrom,<sup>1</sup> Karin Söderkvist,<sup>10</sup> Anders Ullén,<sup>11,12</sup> Tomas Jerlström,<sup>13</sup> Staffan Jahnson,<sup>5</sup> Fredrik Liedberg,<sup>3,14</sup> Lars Holmberg <sup>1,15</sup>

**To cite:** Häggström C, Hagberg O, Gårdmark T, *et al.* Cohort profile: Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden (BladderBaSe) 2.0. *BMJ Open* 2022;**12**:e064898. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2022-064898

► Prepublication history and additional supplemental material for this paper are available online. To view these files, please visit the journal online (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-064898>).

Received 17 May 2022

Accepted 01 December 2022

## ABSTRACT

**Purpose** We constructed Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden (BladderBaSe) 2.0 to expand studies in BladderBaSe on incidence, treatment outcomes, side effects, survival and health economic aspects of men and women with cancer in the urinary bladder, upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC) (renal pelvis and ureter) and urethral carcinoma.

**Participants** BladderBaSe 2.0 includes 53 298 patients with cancer in the urinary bladder, diagnosed from 1 January 1997 to 31 December 2019, and 961 patients with UTUC in the renal pelvis and 792 in the ureter, and 146 patients with urethral urothelial carcinoma, diagnosed from 1 January 2015 to 31 December 2019, and in total 275 816 participants in reference groups, free of cancer in the urinary tract, matched 1:5 on sex, age and county.

**Findings to date** To date, 18 published studies based on data from the BladderBaSe have investigated calendar time trends in survival; impact of gender, socioeconomic factors, tumour aggressiveness and hospital volume for radical cystectomy on prognosis; survival after radical cystectomy compared with radical radiotherapy; risk factors for complications and side effects after radical cystectomy such as thromboembolism, strictures of ureteroenterostomies and incisional hernia.

**Future plans** The BladderBaSe initiators are currently investigating gender-dependent detection delays due to urinary tract infections; survival after non-muscle invasive bladder cancer with respect to the number of transurethral resections; short-term outcomes comparing open and robot-assisted radical cystectomy; studies on risk for intravesical recurrence after different diagnostic measures in UTUC, and suicide risk after bladder cancer diagnosis. The BladderBaSe project group is open for collaborations with national and international colleagues.

## INTRODUCTION

We have previously linked data from The Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer (SNRUBC) to several national health-care and demographic registers to construct the Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden (BladderBaSe).<sup>1</sup> The linkage created a comprehensive and population-based cohort of patients with bladder cancer with detailed data on background and tumour characteristics, treatment, socioeconomic factors,

## STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- ⇒ The Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden (BladderBaSe 2.0) includes data from 55 197 patients with cancers in the urinary tract, using national registers with high coverage collected during more than 20 years.
- ⇒ The BladderBaSe 2.0 includes information on tumour characteristics and treatments, extensive follow-up through registers, and data on important confounding factors such as socioeconomic variables and comorbidity.
- ⇒ The BladderBaSe 2.0 includes data of 275 816 randomly selected matched reference participants to the cancer cases.
- ⇒ Results from specific validation studies are included as attachments.
- ⇒ Limitations are lack of lifestyle data such as smoking and alcohol use, and molecular information of the cancer cases.

comorbidity and causes of death enabling studies of incidence trends, effects of treatment, overall and disease-specific survival.

For further studies of the epidemiology, care, management and outcomes for patients with cancer in the urinary tract, we constructed the BladderBaSe 2.0. This novel research database expands the previous version to also include: (1) longer follow-up, with data additional from patients diagnosed through 2019 and updated data in the SNRUBC (described below in further detail); (2) patients with urothelial carcinoma of the upper urinary tract (UTUC) (renal pelvis and ureter) and urethra; (3) data from the Prescribed Drug Register; (4) reference populations free of cancer in the urinary tract, randomly selected from the background population and individually matched on age, sex and county, at the date of diagnosis of the patients. The matched participants can be used as a prospective comparison cohort or as controls in case-control designs.



© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2022. Re-use permitted under CC BY-NC. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

For numbered affiliations see end of article.

### Correspondence to

Dr Christel Häggström; [christel.haggstrom@umu.se](mailto:christel.haggstrom@umu.se)

## COHORT DESCRIPTION

### The Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer (SNRUBC)

The BladderBaSe 2.0 like the previous version builds on SNRUBC<sup>1</sup> with its current updates. SNRUBC is a clinical database created for clinical audit and research. Data in the SNRUBC are updated with half-year intervals and presented in an interactive online report.<sup>2</sup> All new diagnoses of a tumour in the urinary tract for individuals 18 years or older are requested to be reported into the SNRUBC. The specific coding criteria for inclusion are shown in online supplemental table 1. The records in SNRUBC are validated and checked for completeness by comparison with the Swedish Cancer Register, to which reporting is mandated by law (see below). The total capture ratio as compared with the Swedish Cancer Registry was 2017–2019 between 97% and 99%. For the same years, the capture ratios stratified by cancer sites were >98%, for cancer in the urinary bladder and UTUC, and around 90% for urethral carcinoma.<sup>2</sup>

Patient records in the SNRUBC are standardised into different registration forms. For bladder cancer, five different forms are used and for UTUC and urethral carcinoma, three different forms are used, with separate variables adapted for each cancer site. An overview of the different forms and their included variables is shown in [table 1](#). For bladder cancer, the forms for tumour information at diagnosis and primary treatment have been used since the initiation of the SNRUBC, 1 January 1997. Participants with non-muscle invasive bladder cancer (NMIBC) (stage Ta, Tis or T1) without metastases diagnosed 2004 and onwards are followed up at 5 years after diagnosis for relapse, progression, and death. From 1 January 2011, detailed data in conjunction with radical cystectomy are registered including surgical parameters, complications and reoperations up to 90 days postoperatively.

Updates in SNRUBC included in BladderBaSe 2.0 are data on UTUC and urethral carcinomas since 1 January 2015, including forms for tumour information at diagnosis and primary treatment. From 1 January 2017, oncological treatments are reported with details on neoadjuvant, adjuvant, induction or palliative systemic treatment for all patients with any urinary tract cancer. Sequential reporting of oncological systemic treatments for locally advanced and/or metastatic disease can also be reported in the SNRUBC.

Flow chart and number of participants included in each registration form are shown in [figure 1](#) for bladder cancer, and in online supplemental figure 1 for patients with (A) UTUC in the renal pelvis and ureter, and (B) urethral carcinoma. The variables and different options included in the forms for diagnosis of bladder cancer, primary treatment, radical cystectomy and 5-year follow-up for NMIBC and their capture ratios are shown in [tables 2–5](#). Detailed data of complications and reoperations registered in the radical cystectomy form is listed

in online supplemental table 2. Variables and options for diagnosis and primary treatment for UTUC in the renal pelvis and ureter, and for urethral carcinoma are shown in online supplemental tables 3–5. Capture ratios for the four different parts of the oncological treatment form for all cancer sites included are shown in online supplemental table 6. Detailed data on neoadjuvant, induction, adjuvant and palliative systemic oncological treatment is listed in online supplemental table 7.

### The BladderBaSe 2.0

In 2020, data on participants in the SNRUBC with date of diagnosis from 1 January 1997 to 31 December 2019, were linked to a number of healthcare and demographic registries at the National Board of Health and Welfare and the Statistics Sweden by use of the personal identification number (PIN)<sup>3</sup> (see [figure 2](#)). A matched reference group with individuals free from cancer in the urinary tract at the time of diagnosis of the index case were randomly selected from the background population at Statistics Sweden. Five reference participants were selected without replacement for each index cancer patient at date of diagnosis, matched for sex, year of birth and county, separately for each cancer site in the urinary tract. The referent participants were allowed to later develop cancer in the urinary tract; hence one individual could first be a referent in the database and later a patient, with corresponding new referents allocated.

Selected data from the Swedish Household Census and the Register of Total Population and Population Changes, and the Longitudinal Integration Database for Health Insurance and Labour Market Studies (LISA) were also linked to the data in SNRUBC and the reference population. Data for all individuals (participants in the SNRUBC and the reference population) was linked at the National Board of Health and Welfare to the Cancer Register, The Patient Register, The Cause of Death Register and The Prescribed Drug Register. Participants in the BladderBaSe 2.0 have been assigned an internal identification number, for which the key between the PIN and internal id number is kept exclusively by Statistics Sweden. An overview of variables retrieved from each register is shown in [table 6](#). More details of each register and selected variables are described below. The BladderBase 2.0 is structured as four different study databases, one for each cancer site included.

### The Prescribed Drug Register

The Swedish Prescribed Drug Register started in July 2005, and includes all prescribed drugs dispensed at pharmacies.<sup>4</sup> Each row in the register corresponds to one dispensation at a pharmacy with dose and Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical code. Data on drugs for hormonal treatment, antibiotics, osteoporosis treatment, psychiatric drugs, tuberculosis and cancer treatment, and data on all medications to calculate the Drug Comorbidity Index<sup>5</sup> were retrieved from this register. The Drug Comorbidity

**Table 1** Standardised forms with data collection in the SNRUBC for BladderBaSe 2.0

Cancer types	Registration forms with data collection in SNRUBC (registration years)	Data recorded
Urinary bladder cancer	(1) Characteristics of the primary tumour at diagnosis (1997–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Patient information: Age, sex, smoking status (from 2019), care chain alternative. Dates of: diagnosis, referral, received referral, first visit to specialist and date of TUR/px Tumour information: Cancer site diagnosis, basis of diagnosis suspicion, ICD code, TNM stage, grade, tumour diameter, no of tumours, histology and morphological codes Alternatives for referral reason, basis of diagnosis suspicion, morphological confirmation
	(2) Primary treatment (1997–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Primary investigation options: discussed on multidisciplinary tumour board, single dose chemotherapy, reresection, grade, T stage Date and hospital details of given treatment: Intravesical instillations, systemic oncological treatment (neoadjuvant, adjuvant, palliative), partial cystectomy, radical cystectomy or curative radiotherapy.
	(3) Follow-up at 5 years after diagnosis for non-muscle invasive bladder cancer (2009–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Status of recurrence and progression.
	(4) Preoperative, perioperative and postoperative events in conjunction with radical cystectomy (2011–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Preoperative data: TNM stage, weight, height, body mass index, American Society of Anesthesiologists score, Charlson Comorbidity Index, previous pelvic surgery, radiation, or neoadjuvant chemotherapy Perioperative data: Type of surgery, type of lymphadenectomy, type of urinary diversion, blood loss, duration of surgery, accidental organ injury during surgery Postoperative data: Complications, reoperations and readmissions within 90 days, length of hospital stay, pT stage, no of excised lymph-nodes and number of excised and metastatic lymphnodes
	(5) Oncological treatment (2017–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Treatment details of: Treatment intention for systemic therapy (neoadjuvant, adjuvant, induction, palliative), Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) Performance status score, distribution of metastases (date and locations), systemic antitumoural treatment regimen, number of cycles, treatment response, rechallenge, side effects, line of palliative treatment and reason for ending treatment.
Upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC) in the renal pelvis	(1) Characteristics of the primary tumour at diagnosis (2015–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Patient information: age, sex, smoking status (from 2019), standardised care pathway referral Dates of: diagnosis, referral, received referral and first visit to specialist Tumour information: Cancer site diagnosis, basis of diagnosis suspicion, International Classification of Diseases (ICD) code, TNM stage, grade, histology and morphological codes Side (right/left) Previous urothelial carcinoma elsewhere in the urinary tract
	(2) Primary treatment (2015–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Primary investigation options: Discussed on multidisciplinary tumour board, single dose chemotherapy, grade, TNM stage Date of treatment decision Date and hospital details of given treatment: Nephroureterectomy, bladder cuff included in the specimen, nephrectomy, local resection, endoluminal resection/coagulation, endoluminal instillation of BCG/chemotherapy and curative treatment.
	(3) Oncological treatment (2017–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Treatment details of: Treatment intention for systemic therapy (neoadjuvant, adjuvant, induction, palliative), ECOG Performance status score, distribution of metastases (date and locations), systemic antitumoural treatment regimen, number of cycles, treatment response, rechallenge, side effects, line of palliative treatment and reason for ending treatment.

Continued

**Table 1** Continued

Cancer types	Registration forms with data collection in SNRUBC (registration years)	Data recorded
UTUC in the ureter	(1) Characteristics of the primary tumour at diagnosis (2015–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Patient information: Age, sex, smoking status (from 2019), standardised care pathway referral Dates of: diagnosis, referral, received referral and first visit to specialist Tumour information: Cancer site diagnosis, basis of diagnosis suspicion, ICD code, TNM stage, grade, histology and morphological codes Side (right/left) Previous urothelial carcinoma elsewhere in the urinary tract
	(2) Primary treatment (2015–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Primary investigation options: Discussed on multidisciplinary tumour board, local resection, grade, TNM stage, tumour discovered at cystectomy Date of treatment decision Date and hospital details of given treatment: Nephroureterectomy, bladder cuff included in the specimen, nephrectomy, systemic chemotherapy (neoadjuvant/induction/adjuvant or palliative intent), local resection, endoluminal resection/coagulation, endoluminal instillation of BCG/chemotherapy and curative treatment.
	(3) Oncological treatment (2017–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Treatment details of: Treatment intention for systemic therapy (neoadjuvant, adjuvant, induction, palliative), ECOG Performance status score, distribution of metastases (date and locations), systemic antitumoural treatment regimen, no of cycles, treatment response, rechallenge, side effects, line of palliative treatment and reason for ending treatment.
Urethral carcinoma	(1) Characteristics of the primary tumour at diagnosis (2015–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Patient information: Age, sex, smoking status (from 2019), standardised care pathway referral Dates of: diagnosis, referral, received referral and first visit to specialist Tumour information: Cancer site diagnosis, basis of diagnosis suspicion, ICD code, TNM stage, grade, histology and morphological codes Previous urothelial carcinoma elsewhere in the urinary tract
	(2) Primary treatment (2015–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Primary investigation options: Discussed on multidisciplinary tumour board, local resection, grade, TNM stage, tumour discovered at cystectomy Date of treatment decision Date and hospital details of given treatment: Cystoprostatourethrectomy/cysturethrectomy, systemic chemotherapy (neoadjuvant/induction/adjuvant or palliative intent), urethrectomy/local resection, endoluminal resection/coagulation, endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy and curative treatment.
	(3) Oncological treatment (2017–2019)	Reporter information: Hospital and department Treatment details of: Treatment intention for systemic therapy (neoadjuvant, adjuvant, induction, palliative), ECOG Performance status score, distribution of metastases (date and locations), systemic antitumoural treatment regimen, no of cycles, treatment response, rechallenge, side effects, line of palliative treatment and reason for ending treatment.

BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden; SNRUBC, Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer; TUR, transurethral resection.


Index is built of data of prescribed drugs within 1-year period before diagnosis/index date for cases/referents.

### The Patient Register

The Swedish Patient Register includes information regarding inpatient and outpatient care from 1987. The Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI) was calculated with data from the Patient Register to estimate the concomitant disease burden of the both the cases and the reference population in BladderBaSe 2.0.<sup>6</sup> The CCI was calculated based on recorded diagnoses withing 10 years prior to diagnosis/

index date for cases/referents. A validation study of the Patient Register reported high validity for most diagnoses, with a positive predictive value about 85%–95%.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, data were retrieved both prior to and after the date of bladder cancer diagnosis from the Patient Register on risk factors for bladder cancer, risk factors of treatment side effects and/or modifiers of treatment response and natural history of the disease. Examples of such data are urinary tract infections, diabetes mellitus, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and abdominal or pelvic surgery.





**Figure 1** Flow chart and number of participants with bladder cancer included in the different forms of SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0. BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden; SNRUBC, Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer.

### The Cancer Register

In Sweden, all new histologically, cytologically or clinically diagnosed tumours are by law reported to the Regional Cancer Centres, and these regional registries report once a year to the national Swedish Cancer Registry.<sup>8</sup> The Swedish Cancer Register was initiated 1958 and has due to mandatory reporting high coverage.<sup>9</sup> We retrieved data on all other cancer diagnoses and their dates from this register, irrespective of date of bladder cancer diagnosis for all participants in the BladderBaSe 2.0.

### The Cause of Death Register

From the Cause of Death Register, we retrieved data on underlying and contributing causes of death and dates of death. The Cause of Death Register was initiated on 1953, and proportion of missing death certificates in 2014 was 1%.<sup>10</sup>

### Swedish Household Census and the Register of Total Population and Population Changes

We retrieved data from the Register of Total Population and Population Changes and the Swedish Household Census on marital status, continent of birth, dates of immigration and emigration.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, we retrieved data from the Swedish Household Census from year 1990 on socioeconomic status based on the Swedish Socio-Economic Index and profession.

### Longitudinal Integration Database for Health Insurance and Labour Market Studies (LISA)

The LISA database holds annual registers from 1990 of data based on the labour market, educational and social sectors.<sup>12</sup> The LISA database provides information at an individual level, and at a group level such as families, companies and places of employment. From the LISA database we retrieved information about socioeconomic variables such as educational level, annual family and individual income.

Socioeconomic background factors and comorbidity of participants diagnosed with bladder cancer and their reference group are shown in table 7, and similar data for patients with UTUC and urethral carcinoma and their

corresponding reference groups in online supplemental tables 8–10.

### Patient and public involvement

Patients' advocates or public representatives were not involved in the design or conduct of studies in BladderBaSe 2.0. The SNRUBC is, like other Swedish National Quality Registers, obliged to inform all patients prior to registration with an option to opt-out. The SNRUBC steering committee have patient representatives from two organisations and the results from research based on the SNRUBC, including the BladderBaSe 2.0, are transferred back to patient advocates and support groups through the quality assurance system at the Regional Cancer Centres.

## FINDINGS TO DATE

### Published studies

To date, there are 18 published studies based on the BladderBaSe. A number of clinically relevant inferences have emerged: Age-related differences in prognosis in bladder cancer points to age-dependent differences in management and in tumour biology. Findings about risk of recurrence after stage TaG1 bladder cancer and papillary urothelial neoplasm of low malignant potential (PUNLMP) challenge the recently adapted notion that management strategies can be merged into one low-risk group of NMIBC. Treatment for bladder cancer, after or in conjunction with another primary cancer, should not be neglected and carries the same probability of success as treatment in patients with bladder cancer only. Survival after radical cystectomy in Sweden is similar during holiday and non-holiday periods, contradicting indications about season related survival differences in bladder and renal cancer in other studies. A study of possible factors explaining why a lower socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with lower survival in bladder cancer indicate that comorbidity and treatment delay contribute, but optimisation of all aspects of care across SES strata is necessary. A clinical challenge is an increasing proportion of node-positive patients with significant comorbidity, where one additional publication on the natural history of those patients unable to receive curatively intended therapy reported that they frequently are hospitalised during their final year of life and primarily die of bladder cancer. Our data makes a strong case for a randomised study defining the role of second look resection in stage T1 bladder cancer. The cumulative incidence of midline incisional hernia after cystectomy continues to rise over many years and avoiding postoperative wound dehiscence is a critical preventive measure. Ureteroenteric strictures after cystectomy requiring intervention is a larger clinical problem than previously anticipated and continue to be relevant many years after the primary operation. Findings of the association between caseload and outcome after radical cystectomy support centralisation for surgical treatment of bladder cancer. More details of all these studies are shown in table 8.

**Table 2** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardised form for diagnostic variables for bladder cancer of the SNRUBC in the BladderBaSe 2.0

Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: capture ratio
Date of diagnosis	Date	1997–2019: 100%
Reporting date	Date	1997–2019: 100%
County at diagnosis	Stockholm county: 17.7%	1997–2019: 100%
	Västra Götaland county: 16.7%	
	Skåne county: 15.7%	
	Östergötland county: 4.7%	
	Jönköping county: 3.7%	
	Halland county: 3.4%	
	Kalmar county: 3.3%	
	Värmland county: 3.1%	
	Södermanland county: 3.1%	
	Gävleborg county: 3.0%	
Other counties: 25.7%		
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	1997–2019: 99–100%
Healthcare region	Stockholm/Gotland: 18.5%	1997–2019: 100%
	Uppsala/Örebro: 20.9%	
	South-East: 11.6%	
	South: 21.1%	
	West: 18.7%	
	North: 9.2%	
T stage	Ta: 49.5%	1997–2019: 96–99%
	Tis: 2.8%	
	T1: 23.0%	
	T2: 17.8%	
	T3: 4.2%	
	T4: 2.8%	
N stage	N0: 39.5%	1997–2019: 97–100%
	N+: 3.5%	
	NX: 57.1%	
M stage	M0: 45.5%	1997–2019: 92–100%
	M1: 3.3%	
	MX: 51.2%	
Grade (three classes, GX is set to missing)	G1/LMP: 26.1%	1997–2019: 95–98%
	G2: 32.1%	
	G3-G4/anaplastic: 41.7%	
Date of referral	Date	2008–2019: 94–99%
Reason for referral	Registered referral: 77.7%	2000–2019: 56–100%
	Self-referral by patient: 7.7%	
	Other: 14.6%	
Date of referral registered	Date	2000–2002: 54–67%; 2003–2019: 86–99%
Date of first visit to urologist	Date	2008–2019: 97–100%

Continued

**Table 2** Continued

Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: capture ratio
Morphology code (SNOMED)	813021: 19.7%	2008–2019: 82–100%
	813022: 18.0%	
	813033: 17.0%	
	812033: 14.5%	
	813023: 5.8%	
	813032: 5.4%	
	812032: 4.9%	
	81203: 3.6%	
	81202: 2.8%	
	812031: 2.3%	
	Other: 6.2%	
Date of TUR/px	Date	2008–2019: 98–100%
Date of TUR/px*	Date	1997–2019: 85–100%
Maximal tumour diameter	0–10 mm: 23.6%	2012: 43%; 2013–2019: 58–73%
	11–30 mm: 43.4%	
	>30mm: 33.0%	
Carcinoma in situ	No: 78.5%	2012–2019: 28–59%
	Yes: 21.5%	

\*Enriched with data from the Patient Register for those patients with missing date in the SNRUBC. BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden; SNRUBC, Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer; TUR, transurethral resection.

Some of these findings have changed practice for urothelial carcinoma care in Sweden and been incorporated in the Swedish National Guidelines on Urothelial carcinoma.<sup>13</sup> For example, the regionalisation of the cystectomy care in Sweden during recent years is supported by the identification of an improved overall survival in hospitals in the highest period-specific mean annual hospital cystectomy volume tertile (above 25 cystectomies annually).<sup>14</sup> The risk of venous thromboembolism after treatment for muscle-invasive bladder cancer, particularly after chemotherapy is increased also beyond 30 days, challenging the current recommendation of prolonged low molecular weight heparin for 4 weeks after radical cystectomy.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, during follow-up of patients with primary bladder cancer and PUNLMP, follow-up cystoscopies beyond 3 years are not recommended any longer in the Swedish national guidelines on urothelial carcinoma based on a lower risk of recurrence compared with TaG1-tumours.<sup>16</sup>

### Ongoing investigations

The initiators of BladderBaSe are currently investigating survival of NMIBC, gender-dependent detection delays related to urinary tract infections, outcomes after robot-assisted and open radical cystectomy, studies of outcomes after different diagnostic modalities in UTUC, and psychological effects from a bladder cancer diagnosis, such as suicide. Furthermore, planned projects

involve studies of; associations between hormonal pharmacological interventions and incidence and prognosis in bladder cancer; of risk factors for complications after radical cystectomy among women; of treatment patterns and outcomes for patients with UTUC and urethral carcinomas; of health economy studies in patients with advanced bladder cancer; of long-term consequences of urinary diversion on metabolism and bone health; of the association between different approaches to lymph node dissection and prognosis; and of associations between the metabolic syndrome and risk of and prognosis in bladder cancer.

### STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

#### Strengths

To our knowledge, the BladderBaSe 2.0 forms the largest clinical database for cancers in the urinary tract, with data from 55 197 patients and 275 816 randomly selected reference participants. The cancer cases are recruited from an entire nation in a register with very high coverage, collected during more than 20 years. The main strengths of the BladderBaSe 2.0 are detailed information on tumour characteristics and treatments, extensive follow-up through registers for all individuals, data on important confounding factors such as socioeconomic variables and comorbidity, and access to a large

**Table 3** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardised form for primary treatment variables for bladder cancer of the SNRUBC in the BladderBaSe 2.0

Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: capture ratio
Reporting date	Date	1997–2019: 88–100%
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	1997–2019: 100%
Discussed at multidisciplinary conference	No: 64.0%	2008–2019: 99–100%
	Yes: 36.0%	
Single dose chemotherapy	No: 92.8%	2008–2019: 99–100%
	Yes: 7.2%	
Reresection	No: 77.1%	2008–2019: 98–100%
	Yes: 22.9%	
Additional treatment*	No: 63.2%	1997–2019: 99–100%
	Yes: 36.8%	
Intravesical treatment†	No: 47.2%	1997–2019: 100%
	Yes: 52.8%	
Date of commencing intravesical instillations	Date	2004–2019: 79–100%
Type of intravesical treatment	BCG: 77.3%	2008–2019: 99–100%
	Chemotherapy, multiple instillations: 22.7%	
Systemic chemotherapy‡	No: 88.0%	1997–2019: 100%
	Yes: 12.0%	
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy	No: 33.3%	1997–2003: 29–66%; 2004–2019: 77–100%
	Yes: 66.7%	
Date of commencing neoadjuvant chemotherapy	Date	2008–2016: 80–99%
Adjuvant chemotherapy	No: 75.1%	1997–2003: 29–66%; 2004–2019: 77–99%
	Yes: 24.9%	
Date of commencing adjuvant chemotherapy	Date	2008–2015: 96–100%; 2016: 67%
Radical cystectomy‡	No: 68.2%	1997–2019: 100%
	Yes: 31.8%	
Date of radical cystectomy	Date	2003–2016: 70–100%
First date of radical cystectomy‡	Date	1997–2019: 72–100%
Urinary diversion§	Ileal conduit: 78.4%	1997–2016: 83–100%
	Neobladder: 14.5%	
	Continent cutaneous diversion: 7.1%	
Urinary diversion‡	Ileal conduit: 80.3%	1997–2018: 92–100%; 2019: 62%
	Neobladder: 13.5%	
	Continent cutaneous diversion: 6.1%	
Type of lymphadenectomy	Iliac bifurcation: 63.7%	2008–2016: 82–99%
	Aortic bifurcation: 11.7%	
	Obturator fossa: 10.5%	
	None: 14.1%	
Curative external beam radiation†	No: 94.3%	1997–2019: 100%
	Yes: 5.7%	
Date of commencing curative external beam radiation	Date	2003–2019: 79–99%

\*Key variable for further primary treatment data.

†Only available options for patients with additional treatment chosen.

‡Enriched with data from the Patient Register for those patients with missing date in the SNRUBC.

§Data available in the primary treatment form until 2016 to avoid double registration, as these data also are collected in the radical cystectomy form.

BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden; SNRUBC, Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer.



**Table 4** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardised form for preoperative perioperative and postoperative variables radical cystectomy variables for bladder cancer of the SNRUBC in the BladderBaSe 2.0

Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: capture ratio
Date of radical cystectomy	Date	2011–2020: 100%
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2011–2020: 100%
Reporting date	Date	1997–2019: 100%
Weight (kg)	Mean: 79.8 kg, median: 79	2011–2020: 98–100%
Height (cm)	Mean: 174 cm, median: 175	2011–2020: 98–100%
Body mass index	Mean: 26.2, median: 25.7	2011–2020: 98–100%
American Society of Anesthesiologists score	Mean: 2.23, median: 2	2011–2020: 98–100%
Previous pelvic surgery or radiation	No: 79.6% Yes: 20.4%	2011–2020: 95–100%
Clinical T stage	Ta: 3.2% Tis: 4.7% T1: 19.2% T2: 54.4% T3: 13.2% T4: 5.3%	2011–2020: 98–99%
Clinical N stage	N0/NX: 90.6% N+: 9.4%	2011–2020: 98–100%
Clinical M stage	M0: 96.7% M1: 1.8% MX: 1.5%	2011–2020: 98–100%
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy	No: 66.7% Yes: 33.3%	2011–2020: 99–100%
Code for hospital performed radical cystectomy	Hospital codes	2011–2020: 95–100%
Type of surgery	Open: 69.9% Robot: 30.1%	2011–2020: 100%
Type of lymphadenectomy	None: 11.2% Iliac bifurcation: 60.4% Obturator fossa: 6.5% Aorta bifurcation: 20.2% Only enlarged: 1.7%	2011–2020: 99–100%
Primary urethrectomy	No: 78.9% Yes: 21.1%	2011–2020: 98–100%
Type of urinary diversion	Illeal conduit (Bricker): 88.0% Cutaneous continent diversion: 0.9% Neobladder: 9.5% Other: 1.6%	2011–2020: 100%
Perioperative bloodloss (mL)	Mean: 767, median: 500	2011–2020: 95–100%
No of blood transfusions	Mean: 3.11, median: 0	2014–2020: 88–99%
Duration of surgery (min)	Mean: 341, median: 326	2011–2020: 95–100%
Accidental organ injury	No: 95.8% Yes: 4.2%	2011–2020: 94–100%
Complications at 90 days	No: 48.5% Yes: 51.5%	2011–2020: 77–100%
Reoperation within 90 days	No: 88.7% Yes: 11.3%	2011–2020: 77–99%
Length of stay (no of days)	Mean: 14.5, median: 12	2011–2020: 78–100%

Continued

**Table 4** Continued

Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: capture ratio
Unscheduled readmission within 90 days	No: 71.8% Yes: 28.2%	2011–2020: 70–98%
pT stage	Ta: 4.7% Tis: 13.1% T1: 10.7% T2: 22.8% T3: 34.0% T4: 14.8%	2011–2020: 65–81%
No of excised lymph nodes	Mean: 17.6, median: 15	2011–2020: 78–99%
No of excised metastatic lymph nodes	Mean:0.85, median:0	1997–2019: 75–100%
Death within 90 days	No: 93.8% Yes: 6.2%	2011–2020: 78–99%
Cause of death	Bladder cancer: 53.6% Other: 35.3% Unknown: 11.2%	2011–2020: 95–100%

BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden; SNRUBC, Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer.

reference population which can be used as a prospective comparison cohort or as controls in case–control designs. Information about prescribed drugs and hospitalisations can be used to address questions relating to intended treatment outcomes as well as side effects, and to study health economy. Another strength is the recent validation studies described below.

#### Validation of data for T1 patients in the SNRUBC as compared with medical charts

Specially trained nurses with extensive experience of registration in the SNRUBC and other national urological registries did a second registration using original data in the medical charts for all patients registered in the SNRUBC 2008 and 2009 with clinically stage T1 (cT1) tumours (N=1044).<sup>17</sup> Variables validated were dates of referral to a urologic consultation and transurethral resection of the tumour. In addition, tumour

characteristics such as tumour grade according to WHO 1999 system and clinical TNM category (TNM 2009) were reregistered as was the primary treatment. The validation registration was also completed with information about T category of the second-look resection. Results from this validation are shown in online supplemental file 2.


#### Validation of short-term outcomes of radical cystectomy in the SNRUBC

Data in the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC (variables listed in table 4) was validated using the linked data from the BladderBaSe 2.0. Data on unscheduled readmissions, reoperations, dates and causes of death within 90 days from radical cystectomy was compared with the Patient Register and the Cause of Death Register among patients undergoing radical cystectomy from 2011

**Table 5** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardised form for 5 years follow-up for non-muscle invasive bladder cancer (NMIBC) of the SNRUBC in the BladderBaSe 2.0

Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years*: capture ratio
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2004–2014: 70–89%
Reporting date	Date	2004–2014: 90–99%
Recurrence	No: 53.7% Yes: 46.3%	2004–2014: 81–92%
Date of recurrence*	Date	2004–2014: 100%
Progression	No: 91.7% Yes: 8.3%	2004–2014: 57–84%
Date of progression*	Date	2004–2014: 94–100%

\*Year of diagnosis of the bladder cancer cases.  
BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden; SNRUBC, Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer.



**Figure 2** Flow chart of register linkages to construct the BladderBaSe 2.0. LISA, Labour Market Studies; SNRUBC, Swedish National Register for Urinary Bladder Cancer.

to 2019. Results of this validation are shown in online supplemental file 3.

**Validation of postoperative complications of radical cystectomy in the SNRUBC as compared with medical charts**

Data on postoperative complications, readmission rates, and death in with 90 days from radical cystectomy was validated by a comparison between data in the SNRUBC and medical charts in two healthcare regions in Sweden in 2011 to 2016.<sup>18</sup> The study included 429 randomly selected patients from a larger cohort of 949 patients and showed under-reporting in the SNRUBC of low-grade complications (Clavien-Dindo I–II), and readmissions, but less under-reporting of high-grade complications (Clavien-Dindo III–V).

**Limitations**

BladderBaSe 2.0 lacks information on tobacco and alcohol exposure. We have proxy information in the linked registers for these exposures consisting of data

regarding diagnoses or medications for tobacco-related and alcohol-related diseases. However, these proxies will not adjust for all confounding by smoking and alcohol use. Additionally, we only have limited patient reported outcome measures. However, distribution of the validated Swedish version of the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy Scale Vanderbilt Cystectomy Index prior to radical cystectomy and 12 months postoperatively has been initiated on a national basis.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, as noted above, for some sites of the urinary tract we miss information for approx. 10% of the patients. However, we have to date no information to tell us that these are extreme outliers that would threaten the external validity for studies of patients with cancers at these sites. Another limitation is lack of molecular information for the cancer cases.

A limitation within the SNRUBC is that the tumour stage at progression for patients with NMIBC progressing to muscle-invasive disease is registered only from 2004 and onwards. However, the clinical tumour stage can also be ascertained from the radical cystectomy form for patients undergoing secondary cystectomy at progression. In addition, short follow-up time for recently introduced novel oncological systemic immunotherapies for advanced disease reduce the possibility to do studies with survival outcomes in these patients.

**COLLABORATION**

The steering group of the SNRUBC and the project group working with the BladderBaSe 2.0 are open for collaborations with national and international colleagues. For more information please access the SNRUBC website,<sup>2</sup> or contact the corresponding author. De-identified data can be available to researchers after application to the BladderBaSe Steering Committee. Researchers have to provide a methodologically sound proposal for a project that conforms with the Swedish Ethical Review Authority

National registries	Retrieved data
The Cancer Register	Data on all cancer diagnoses including site and date.
The Patient Register	Inpatient and outpatient data on diagnoses, medical procedures and surgeries that may be related to risk, treatment effects and survival of cancer in the urinary areas, including diagnoses to calculate Charlson Comorbidity Index.
The Prescribed Drug Register	Data of drugs for hormonal treatment, antibiotics, osteoporosis treatment, psychiatric drugs, tuberculosis and cancer treatment, and data of all medications to calculate the Drug Comorbidity Index <sup>1</sup> .
The Cause of Death Register	Date of death, and underlying and contributing causes of death
Swedish Household Census	Data from 1990 of socioeconomic status and profession
Longitudinal Integration Database for Health Insurance and Labour Market Studies	Annual data with socioeconomic factors such as marital status, education level and annual income
Register of Total Population and Population Changes	Randomly selection of reference group matched on sex, birth year, and region. Data on immigration and emigration.
BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden.	

**Table 7** Baseline data of bladder cancer cases and their reference population in the BladderBaSe 2.0

	Cases (n total=53 298)		Reference group (n total=266 324)	
	N	%	N	%
Gender*				
Men	39 751	75	198 608	75
Women	13 547	25	67 716	25
Diagnosis/index year*				
1996–2004	15 730	30	78 602	30
2005–2012	17 930	34	89 595	34
2013–2019	19 638	37	98 127	37
Age at diagnosis/index date*				
64 and below	11 469	22	57 412	22
65–69	7579	14	37 770	14
70–74	9568	18	47 874	18
75–79	9806	18	48 932	18
80–84	8158	15	40 856	15
85 and above	6718	13	33 480	13
Marital status				
Unmarried/single	5626	11	30 771	12
Married/registered partners	30 485	57	154 221	58
Divorced/widowed	17 129	32	81 113	30
Missing	58	0	219	0
Education level				
Mandatory school	22 785	43	110 393	41
High school	19 517	37	94 886	36
University	9585	18	53 780	20
Missing	1411	3	7265	3
Birth country				
Sweden	46 575	87	235 248	88
Other nordic country	2345	4	11 946	4
Europe without nordic countries	3121	6	12 501	5
World outside Europe	1254	2	6610	2
Missing	3	0	19	0
Charlson Comorbidity Index†				
No comorbidity (0)	28 166	53	167 935	63
Mild comorbidity (1)	8895	17	37 713	14
Intermediate comorbidity (2)	9078	17	34 910	13
Severe comorbidity (>2)	7159	13	25 766	10
Drug Comorbidity Index‡				
Below 1.5	18 823	35	112 791	42
1.5 up to 3	8708	16	33 203	12
3 and above	6929	13	26 198	10
Missing	18 838	35	94 132	35

\*Matching variables for reference group selection.

†Calculated based on diagnoses recorded in the patient register within 10 years prior to diagnosis/index date.

‡Calculated based data on prescribed drugs according to Gedeberg *et al*<sup>5</sup> for patients with diagnosis/index date after 1 July 2006. BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden.

**Table 8** Publications based on the BladderBaSe version 1.0

Title	Journal, year	Conclusion
Improved long-term outcome of patients with non-muscle invasive, low and medium risk bladder cancer between 1997 and 2014; A Swedish Population-based Study.	Scand J Urology, 2022	Half of the patients had a recurrence. Rates were high in the first 2 years after diagnosis and very rare after 5 years of follow-up. Rates decreased in the last time period studied. Mortality was mostly due to non-bladder cancer related disease. Grade was the most important prognosticator for long-term outcome.
Risk of bladder cancer death in patients younger than 50 with non-muscle-invasive and muscle-invasive bladder cancer	Scand J Urology, 2021	Patients diagnosed with non-muscle-invasive bladder cancer when aged <50 are at decreased risk of bladder cancer-specific death when compared with their older (50-70) counterparts
Bladder cancer recurrence in papillary urothelial neoplasm of low malignant potential (PUNLMP) compared with G1 WHO 1999: a population-based study	Scand J Urology, 2021	The difference in risk of recurrence between primary stage TaG1 and PUNLMP stands in contrast to the recently adapted notion that treatment and follow-up strategies can be merged into one low-risk group of NMIBC.
Cumulative incidence of ureteroenteric strictures after radical cystectomy in a population-based Swedish cohort.	Scand J Urology, 2021	Ureteroenteric strictures requiring intervention may be more common than previously reported, affecting nearly one fifth of patients who have undergone RC for UBC. The annual incidence was highest in the first 2 years after surgery but the cumulative incidence increased continuously during 17 years of follow-up.
Survival after radical cystectomy during holiday periods	Scand J Urology, 2021	Same survival after radical cystectomy during holiday periods.
Cumulative incidence of midline incisional hernia and its surgical treatment after radical cystectomy and urinary diversion for bladder cancer: A nationwide population-based study	PloS One, 2021	The cumulative incidence of midline incisional hernia (MIH) was 8% 3 years postoperatively, and increase over time. Avoiding postoperative wound dehiscence after midline closure is important to decrease the risk of MIH.
A Population-based Study on the Effect of a Routine Second-look Resection on Survival in Primary Stage T1 Bladder Cancer.	Scand J Urology, 2021	We found similar survival outcomes in patients with and patients without second-look Resection (SLR), but our study is likely affected by selection mechanisms. A randomised study defining the role of SLR in stage T1 BCa would be highly relevant to guide current praxis.
Thromboembolism in Muscle-Invasive Bladder Cancer. A Population-based Nationwide Study	Bladder Cancer, 2021	Cumulative incidence thromboembolism increased 2 years after diagnosis, and was commonly observed after 30 days from diagnosis and from first treatment date.
Treatment and prognosis of bladder cancer patients with other primary cancers. A nationwide population-based study in the BladderBaSe	BJU International, 2020	Other concomitant or previous primary cancers is common in bladder cancer patients, but carries just as high chance of treatment success as in patients with only bladder cancer.
A mediation analysis to explain socio-economic differences in bladder cancer survival	Cancer Medicine, 2020	Mediation analysis suggests that the association between socio-economic status (SES) and BC survival can be explained by several factors.
Radical cystectomy compared with intravesical BCG immunotherapy for high-risk NMIBC—is there a long-term survival difference? A Swedish nationwide analysis	Scand J Urology, 2019	Improved cancer-specific survival after BCG compared with radical cystectomy in high-risk non-muscle invasive disease is probably related to selection mechanisms in the investigated population.
Sex Differences in Urothelial Bladder Cancer Survival	Clinical Genitourinary Cancer, 2020	Excess bladder cancer mortality in females with muscle-invasive bladder cancer.
Period-specific mean annual hospital volume of radical cystectomy is associated with outcome and perioperative quality of care: a nationwide population-based study	BJU International, 2019	With period-specific mean annual hospital volume (PSMAV) as a continuous variable, OS was improved for every increase of 10 RCs annually (HR 0.95, 95% CI 0.90 to 0.99). Moreover, higher PSMVA was associated with increased use of extended lymphadenectomy, continent reconstruction and use of neoadjuvant chemotherapy.
Management and outcome of muscle-invasive bladder cancer with clinical lymph node metastases. A nationwide population-based study in the BladderBaSe	Scand J Urology, 2019	Decreased use of treatment with curative intent in patients with lymph node metastases, but among those receiving such treatment the combination of chemotherapy and cystectomy has increased during later years.
Neoadjuvant chemotherapy for muscle invasive bladder cancer: a nationwide investigation on survival	Scand J Urology, 2019	Similar survival with or without neoadjuvant chemotherapy.
Management and outcome of TaG3 tumours of the urinary bladder in the nationwide, population-based bladder cancer database Sweden (BladderBaSe)	Scand J Urology, 2019	An underuse of adjuvant instillations in stage TaG3-disease was associated with decreased cancer-specific survival.
Survival after radiotherapy vs radical cystectomy for primary muscle-invasive bladder cancer: A Swedish nationwide population-based cohort study	Cancer Medicine, 2019	When taking into account unmeasured confounding by instrumental variable analysis, no differences in survival was found between the treatments for a selected group of patients.
A Nationwide, Population Based Analysis of Patients with Organ Confined, Muscle Invasive Bladder Cancer Not Receiving Curative Intent Therapy in Sweden from 1997 to 2014	Journal of Urology, 2019	Patients not treated with curative intent are frequently hospitalised during their final year of life and primarily die of bladder cancer.

BladderBaSe, Bladder Cancer Data Base Sweden; NMIBC, non-muscle invasive bladder cancer.



permit for the project. Researchers will have to sign a data access agreement. Data to achieve the aims in the approved proposal will be made available at a secure remote server.

#### Author affiliations

- <sup>1</sup>Department of Surgical Sciences, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden  
<sup>2</sup>Northern Registry Centre, Department of Public Health and Clinical Medicine, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden  
<sup>3</sup>Department of Translational Medicine, Lund University, Lund, Sweden  
<sup>4</sup>Department of Clinical Sciences, Karolinska Institute, Danderyd Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden  
<sup>5</sup>Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine, Division of Urology, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden  
<sup>6</sup>Department of Urology, Sahlgrenska University Hospital, Gothenburg, Sweden  
<sup>7</sup>Department of Urology, Institute of Clinical Sciences, Sahlgrenska Academy, University of Gothenburg, Göteborg, Sweden  
<sup>8</sup>Department of Urology, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden  
<sup>9</sup>Department of Surgical and Perioperative Sciences, Urology and Andrology, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden  
<sup>10</sup>Department of Radiation Sciences, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden  
<sup>11</sup>Department of Oncology-Pathology, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden  
<sup>12</sup>Department of Pelvic Cancer, Genitourinary Oncology and Urology unit, Karolinska University Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden  
<sup>13</sup>School of Medical Sciences, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden  
<sup>14</sup>Department of Urology, Skåne University Hospital, Malmö, Sweden  
<sup>15</sup>Translational Oncology & Urology Research (TOUR), School of Cancer and Pharmaceutical Sciences, King's College London, London, UK

**Acknowledgements** This project was made possible with help of the data collected in the SNRUBC, and we would like to thank the steering committee, and all involved that support the SNRUBC. We thank Hans Garmo for calculations of the Drug Comorbidity Index 5. We also thank Pia Mårtensson-Löthgren, Anton Svensson, and Therese Lithner for organising the data deliveries from their different authorities.

**Contributors** CH, LH, FL and OH initiated the study and drafted the manuscript. TG, FA, VS, AH, AS, P-UM, KS, AU, TJ, SJ, FL and LH contributed with data and CH and OH analysed data. All authors revised the manuscript and approved the final version to be published. LH is the guarantor of the study.

**Funding** This work was supported by the Swedish Cancer Society, grant number CAN 2019/62 and CAN 2020/0709.

**Competing interests** None declared.

**Patient and public involvement** Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research.

**Patient consent for publication** Not applicable.

**Ethics approval** This study was approved by The Research Ethics Board at Uppsala University, Sweden. (Dnr 2015-277, 2019-03574, 2020-05123, and 2022-01747-02)

**Provenance and peer review** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

**Data availability statement** Data are available on reasonable request. Reports from the SNRUBC are available online (only in Swedish). Researchers can apply for data by submitting a proposal to the BladderBaSe 2.0 steering committee and data files for studies can be uploaded to remote servers for secure analysis. For more information contact the corresponding author.

**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


Christel Häggström <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6808-4405>  
 Lars Holmberg <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4417-7396>

#### REFERENCES


- Häggström C, Liedberg F, Hagberg O, *et al*. Cohort profile: the Swedish national register of urinary bladder cancer (SNRUBC) and the bladder cancer data base Sweden (BladderBaSe). *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e016606.
- Nationellt kvalitetsregister för urinblåsecancer. Regional cancer centres in collaboration. Available: <https://statistik.incanet.se/Urinblasecancer/> [Accessed May 2022].
- Ludvigsson JF, Otterblad-Olausson P, Pettersson BU, *et al*. The Swedish personal identity number: possibilities and pitfalls in healthcare and medical research. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2009;24:659–67.
- Swedish Prescribed Drug Register. The National board of health and welfare. Available: <https://www.socialstyrelsen.se/statistik-och-data/register/lakemedelsregistret/> [Accessed May 2022].
- Gedeborg R, Sund M, Lambe M, *et al*. An aggregated comorbidity measure based on history of filled drug prescriptions: development and evaluation in two separate cohorts. *Epidemiology* 2021;32:607–15.
- Ludvigsson JF, Appelros P, Asklung J, *et al*. Adaptation of the Charlson comorbidity index for register-based research in Sweden. *Clin Epidemiol* 2021;13:21–41.
- Ludvigsson JF, Andersson E, Ekbohm A, *et al*. External review and validation of the Swedish national inpatient register. *BMC Public Health* 2011;11:450.
- The Swedish Cancer Register. The National board of health and welfare. Available: <https://www.socialstyrelsen.se/statistik-och-data/register/cancerregistret/> [Accessed May 2022].
- Barlow L, Westergren K, Holmberg L, *et al*. The completeness of the Swedish cancer register: a sample survey for year 1998. *Acta Oncol* 2009;48:27–33.
- Brooke HL, Talbäck M, Hörnblad J, *et al*. The Swedish cause of death register. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2017;32:765–73.
- Ludvigsson JF, Almqvist C, Bonamy A-KE, *et al*. Registers of the Swedish total population and their use in medical research. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2016;31:125–36.
- Ludvigsson JF, Svedberg P, Olén O, *et al*. The longitudinal integrated database for health insurance and labour market studies (LISA) and its use in medical research. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2019;34:423–37.
- Swedish National Guidelines on Urothelial carcinoma. Regional cancer centres in collaboration. Available: <https://kunskapsbanken.cancercentrum.se/diagnoser/urinblase-och-urinvagscancer> [Accessed May 2022].
- Liedberg F, Hagberg O, Aljabery F, *et al*. Period-specific mean annual hospital volume of radical cystectomy is associated with outcome and perioperative quality of care: a nationwide population-based study. *BJU Int* 2019;124:449–56.
- Schomburg J, Krishna S, Soubra A, *et al*. Extended outpatient chemoprophylaxis reduces venous thromboembolism after radical cystectomy. *Urol Oncol* 2018;36:77.e9–77.e13.
- Liedberg F, Kjellström S, Lind A-K, *et al*. Swedish national guidelines on urothelial carcinoma: 2021 update on non-muscle invasive bladder cancer and upper tract urothelial carcinoma. *Scand J Urol* 2022;1–10.
- Patschan O, Holmäng S, Hosseini A, *et al*. Second-look resection for primary stage T1 bladder cancer: a population-based study. *Scand J Urol* 2017;51:301–7.
- Böös M, Jerlström T, Beckman E, *et al*. Who should record surgical complications? Results from a third-party assessment of complications after radical cystectomy. *Scand J Urol* 2019;53:339–43.
- Stenzelius K, Lind A-K, Wanegård J, *et al*. Patient-reported outcome after radical cystectomy: translation and psychometric validation of the Swedish version of the functional assessment of cancer therapy scale Vanderbilt cystectomy index. *Scand J Urol* 2016;50:374–9.

**SUPPLEMENT 1**

a)



b)



**Figure 1.** Flowchart and number of participants of a) UTUC and b) urethral carcinoma included in the different forms of SNRUBC.

**Table 1.** Coding and morphology for cancer types included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

Cancer types	ICD-0-3 codes	Morphology	SNOMED codes
Urinary bladder cancer	C67.0-C67.6, C67.8, C67.9	Urothelial carcinoma Adenocarcinoma Squamous cell carcinoma Mucinous adenocarcinoma Adenosquamous carcinoma Neuroendocrine carcinoma Unspecified	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023, 81403, 80703, 81313, 81223, 80823, 80313, 80203, 80003, 84803, 85603, 80413, 80133, 82403
Upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC) in the renal pelvis	C65.9	Urothelial carcinoma	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023
Upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC) in the ureter	C66.9	Urothelial carcinoma	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023
Urethral carcinoma	C68.0	Urothelial carcinoma	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023

**Table 2.** Registered data on complications and re-operations recorded within 90 days after radical cystectomy in the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0.

<b>Gastrointestinal complications (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Postoperative intestinal obstruction
Anastomotic insufficiency
Intestinal fistula
<b>Cardiovascular complications (recorded with date and Clavien score)</b>
Deep vein thrombosis
Pulmonary embolism
Acute myocardial infarction
Cerebrovascular insult
Arterial thrombosis/emboli
<b>Infectious complications (recorded with date and Clavien score)</b>
Sepsis
Pneumonia
Pyelonephritis
Lymphocele
Other specific infectious complications
<b>Abdominal wall/parastomal complications (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Wound infection
Subcutaneous wound dehiscence
Abdominal wall hernia
Other abdominal wall complications
Stoma necrosis
<b>Urinary tract complications (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Ureteroenteric stenosis
Other urinary tract complications
Ureteroenteric anastomosis insufficiency
Enterourethral stricture neobladder
<b>Bleeding (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Re-do surgery due to bleeding
<b>Other complications (recorded with Clavien score)</b>

**Table 3.** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardized form for a) diagnosis and b) primary treatment of UTUC in the renal pelvis in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

a) Variables from the diagnosis form of UTUC in the renal pelvis		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Date of diagnosis	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Side	Right: 48.8%	2015-2019: 100%
	Left: 51.5%	
	Missing: 0.1%	
County at diagnosis	Stockholm county: 19.8%	2015-2019: 100%
	Västra Götaland county: 17.8%	
	Skåne county: 14.4%	
	Östergötland county: 4.7%	
	Halland county: 4.4%	
	Örebro county: 3.6%	
	Jönköping county: 3.5%	
	Uppsala county: 3.2%	
	Västernorrland county: 3.1%	
Södermanland county: 3.0%		
Other: 22.4%		
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 99-100%
Healthcare Region	Stockholm/Gotland: 20.6%	2015-2019: 100%
	Uppsala/Örebro: 19.3%	
	South-East: 10.5%	
	South: 19.4%	
	West: 20.6%	
North: 9.5%		
Grade in three classes, GX set to missing	G1/LMP: 15.0%	2015-2019: 86-95%
	G2: 34.3%	
	G3-G4/anaplastic: 50.7%	
Date of referral	Date	2015-2019: 97-99%
Reason for referral	Referral registered: 67.4%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	Self-referral by patient: 20.2%	
	Other: 12.4%	
Date of referral registered	Date	2015-2019: 75-83%
Date of first visit to urologist	Date	2015-2019: 98-100%
Smoking status	Never smoker: 34.4%	2019: 81%
	Previous smoker: 39.3%	
	Current smoker: 26.4%	
Date of basis for diagnosis (below)	Date	2015-2019: 99-100%
Basis for diagnosis (several alternatives)	Computed tomography/MRI	Not applicable
	Retrograde or antegrade pyelography	
	Ureteropyeloscopy	
	Voided urinary cytology	
	Cytology obtained from renal pelvis or ureteric barbotage	
	Selective urinary cytology obtained from ureteric catheter	
	Biopsy obtained during ureteropyeloscopy	
Morphological diagnosis (SNOMED)	813033: 21.4%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	813022: 17.4%	
	812033: 17.1%	
	813021: 10.4%	
	813032: 8.9%	
	81203: 8.4%	



	813023: 6.2%	
	812032: 5.0%	
	81202: 2.2%	
	812031: 1.0%	
	Other: 2.1%	
Earlier/concomitant diagnosis (several alternatives)	No	Not applicable
	Urinary bladder cancer	
	UTUC in the ureter	
	UTUC in the renal pelvis, other side	
T stage (TNM-2017)	Urethral carcinoma	2015-2019: 96-100%
	Ta: 36.6%	
	Tis: 1.9%	
	T1: 12.0%	
	T2: 7.9%	
	T3: 26.9%	
N stage	T4: 7.3%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	TX: 7.5%	
	N0: 66.2%	
	N1: 6.7%	
	N2: 8.9%	
M stage	N3: 0.3%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	NX: 18.0%	
	M0: 89.1%	
	M1: 10.9%	

<b>b) Variables from the primary treatment form of UTUC in the renal pelvis</b>		
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Options (proportions)</b>	<b>Recorded years: Capture ratio</b>
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 95-99%
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 99-100%
Discussed at multidisciplinary conference	No: 38.6%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	Yes: 61.4%	
Additional treatment	No: 14.6%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	Yes: 85.4%	
Given treatment (several alternatives)	Nephroureterectomy (yes/no)	Not applicable
	Date of nephroureterectomy	
	Bladder cuff excised (yes/no)	
	Nephrectomy (yes/no)	
	Date of nephrectomy	
	Type of nephrectomy (open, robot, laparoscopy)	
	Local resection (yes/no)	
	Date of local resection	
	Type of local resection (open, robot, laparoscopy)	
	Endoluminal resection (yes/no)	
	Date of endoluminal resection	
	Endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy (yes/no)	
	Date of local endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy	
	Type of administration of endoluminal instillation (Nephrostomy/ Double-J/ Ureteric catheter)	
Treatment with curative intent	No: 13.5%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	Yes: 86.5%	

**Table 4.** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardized form for a) diagnosis and b) primary treatment of UTUC in the ureter in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

a) Variables from the diagnosis form of UTUC in the ureter		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Side	Right: 48.9%	2015-2019: 100%
	Left: 50.7%	
	Missing: 0.4%	
Date of diagnosis	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Report date	Date	2015-2019: 100%
County at diagnosis	Stockholm county: 24.1%	2015-2019: 100%
	Skåne county: 17.8%	
	Västra Götaland county: 15.2%	
	Östergötland county: 4.5%	
	Jönköping county: 4.5%	
	Halland county: 3.7%	
	Västerbotten county: 3.7%	
	Kalmar county: 2.9%	
	Uppsala county: 2.6%	
	Kronoberg county: 2.6%	
Other: 18.3%		
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 100%
Healthcare Region	Stockholm/Gotland: 24.9%	2015-2019: 100%
	Uppsala/Örebro: 13.0%	
	South-East: 12.2%	
	South: 24.0%	
	West: 17.3%	
	North: 8.6%	
Grade in three classes, GX set to missing	G1/LMP: 22.4%	2015-2019: 90-96%
	G2: 31.1%	
	G3-G4/anaplastic: 46.5%	
Date of referral	Date	2015-2019: 92-99%
Reason for referral	Referral registered: 50.6%	2015-2019: 97-100%
	Self-referral by patient: 40.5%	
	Other: 8.9%	
Date of referral registered	Date	2015-2019: 53-67%
Date of first visit to urologist	Date	2015-2019: 97-99%
Smoking status	Never smoker: 27.5%	2019: 74%
	Previous smoker: 43.6%	
	Current smoker: 28.9%	
Date for basis for diagnosis (below)	Date	2015-2019: 98-100%
Basis for diagnosis (several alternatives)	Computed tomography/MRI	Not applicable
	Retrograde or antegrade pyelography	
	Ureteropyeloscopy	
	Voided urinary cytology	
	Cytology obtained from renal pelvis or ureteric barbotage	
	Selective urinary cytology obtained from ureteric catheter	
	Biopsy obtained during ureteropyeloscopy	
Morphological diagnosis (SNOMED)	813022: 18.3%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	813021: 16.9%	
	81202: 15.4%	
	813033: 12.6%	
	812033: 11.4%	
	813023: 7.9%	

	813032: 5.8%	
	812032: 4.6%	
	81203: 4.1%	
	81301: 1.6%	
	Other: 1.5%	
Earlier/concomitant diagnosis (several alternatives)	No	Not applicable
	Urinary bladder cancer	
	UTUC in the ureter, other side	
	UTUC in the renal pelvis	
	Urethral carcinoma	
T stage (TNM-2017)	Ta: 45.9%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	Tis: 14.4%	
	T1: 14.8%	
	T2: 9.0%	
	T3: 8.4%	
	T4: 1.4%	
	TX: 6.0%	
N stage	N0: 72.3%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	N1: 2.8%	
	N2: 3.2%	
	N3: 0.2%	
	NX: 21.4%	
M stage	M0: 95.8%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	M1: 4.2%	

<b>b) Variables from the primary treatment form of UTUC in the ureter</b>		
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Options (proportions)</b>	<b>Recorded years: Capture ratio</b>
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 95-100%
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 99-100%
Discussed at multidisciplinary conference	No: 35.4%	2015-2019: 84-93%
	Yes: 64.6%	
Additional treatment	No: 17.5%	2015-2019: 84-99%
	Yes: 82.5%	
Detected by cystectomy	No: 86.4%	2015-2016: 7-38%; 2017-2019: 98-100%
	Yes: 13.6%	
Given treatment (several alternatives)	Nephroureterectomy (yes/no)	Not applicable
	Date of Nephroureterectomy	
	Bladder cuff (yes/no)	
	Local resection (yes/no)	
	Date of local resection	
	Type of local resection (open/robot/laparoscopy)	
	Endoluminal resection (yes/no)	
	Date of endoluminal resection	
	Endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy (yes/no)	
	Date of local endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy	
	Type of local endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy (nephrostomy/double-J/ureterary catheter)	
Treatment with curative intent	No: 12.9%	2015-2019: 97-100%
	Yes: 87.1%	



**Table 5.** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardized form for a) diagnosis and b) primary treatment of urethral carcinoma in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

a) Variables from the diagnosis form of urethral carcinoma		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Date of diagnosis	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 100%
County at diagnosis	Skåne county: 37.0%	2015-2019: 100%
	Stockholm county: 13.7%	
	Västra Götaland county: 12.3%	
	Norrbottnens county: 6.2%	
	Jämtlands county: 4.8%	
	Östergötland county: 4.1%	
	Jönköping county: 4.1%	
	Gävleborg county: 2.7%	
	Uppsala county: 2.1%	
Kronoberg county: 2.1%		
Other: 11.0%		
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 100%
Hospital region	Stockholm/Gotland: 13.7%	2015-2019: 100%
	Uppsala/Örebro: 8.9%	
	South-East: 10.3%	
	South: 41.1%	
	West: 12.3%	
Grade in three classes (GX set to missing)	G1/LMP: 15.6%	2015-2019: 86-94%
	G2: 15.6%	
	G3-G4/anaplastic: 68.9%	
Date of referral	Date	2015-2019: 66-100%
Reason for referral	Referral registered: 42.5%	2015-2019: 100%
	Self-referral by patient: 47.9%	
	Other: 9.6%	
Date of referral registered	Date	2015-2019: 36-66%
Date of first visit to urologist	Date	2015-2019: 96-100%
Smoking status	Never smoker: 26.3%	2019: 60%
	Previous smoker: 47.4%	
	Current smoker: 26.3%	
Date of basis for diagnosis (below)	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Basis for diagnosis (several alternatives)	Computed tomography/MRI	Not applicable
	Urethrocystoscopy	
	Voided urinary cytology	
	Cytology urethral barbotage	
	Urethral biopsy	
Morphological diagnosis (SNOMED)	81202: 29.0%	2015-2019: 93-100%
	812033: 17.9%	
	813022: 13.1%	
	813033: 11.7%	
	813021: 8.3%	
	813023: 8.3%	
	81203: 3.4%	
	81301: 2.8%	
	81302: 2.1%	
	812032: 1.4%	
	Other: 2.1%	
	No	Not applicable
	Urinary bladder cancer	

Earlier/concomitant diagnosis (several alternatives)	UTUC in the ureter	
	UTUC in the renal pelvis	
T stage (TNM-2017)	Ta: 36.1%	2015-2019: 96-100%
	Tis: 28.5%	
	T1: 15.3%	
	T2: 10.4%	
	T3: 2.8%	
	T4: 2.8%	
N stage	TX: 4.2%	2015-2019: 100%
	N0: 56.8%	
	N1: 1.4%	
	N2: 4.8%	
M stage	NX: 37.0%	2015-2019: 100%
	M0: 93.2%	
	M1: 6.8%	

b) Variables from the primary treatment form of urethral carcinoma		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 86-100%
Reporting hospital code	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 100%
Discussed at multidisciplinary conference	No: 33.8%	2015-2019: 91-100%
	Yes: 66.2%	
Additional treatment	No: 33.8%	2015-2019: 91-100%
	Yes: 66.2%	
Detected at cystectomy or in the cystectomy specimen	No: 94.3%	2015-2016: 19-61%; 2017-2019: 97-100%
	Yes: 5.7%	
Given treatment (several alternatives)	Cystectomy (yes/no)	NA
	Date of cystectomy	
	Type of cystectomy (open/robot)	
	Local resection (yes/no)	
	Date of local resection	
	Endoluminal resection (yes/no)	
Treatment with curative intent	No: 15.7	2015-2019: 97-100%
	Yes: 84.3%	

**Table 6.** Capture ratios of the different options in the standardized form for oncological treatment for bladder cancer, upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC), or urethral carcinoma in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0. As comparison, we have used patients with diagnosis date in 2017 and later and systemic chemotherapy as primary treatment, separately for each cancer form.

Diagnosis	Diagnosis year	Neoadjuvant	Induction	Adjuvant	Palliative	Any
Bladder cancer	2017	62 (33,9 %)	10 (5,5 %)	2 (1,1 %)	34 (18,6 %)	95 (51,9 %)
	2018	72 (40,0 %)	22 (12,2 %)	4 (2,2 %)	38 (21,1 %)	126 (70,0 %)
	2019	58 (30,1 %)	14 (7,3 %)	0 (0,0 %)	42 (21,8 %)	108 (56,0 %)
	Total	192 (34,5 %)	46 (8,3 %)	6 (1,1 %)	114 (20,5 %)	329 (59,2 %)
UTUC in the renal pelvis	2017	0 (0,0 %)	2 (12,5 %)	1 (6,2 %)	5 (31,2 %)	8 (50,0 %)
	2018	0 (0,0 %)	2 (8,0 %)	1 (4,0 %)	8 (32,0 %)	11 (44,0 %)
	2019	0 (0,0 %)	1 (3,7 %)	1 (3,7 %)	5 (18,5 %)	7 (25,9 %)
	Total	0 (0,0 %)	5 (7,4 %)	3 (4,4 %)	18 (26,5 %)	26 (38,2 %)
UTUC in the ureter	2017	0 (0,0 %)	1 (11,1 %)	1 (11,1 %)	1 (11,1 %)	3 (33,3 %)
	2018	0 (0,0 %)	2 (14,3 %)	3 (21,4 %)	2 (14,3 %)	7 (50,0 %)
	2019	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	1 (9,1 %)	2 (18,2 %)	3 (27,3 %)
	Total	0 (0,0 %)	3 (8,8 %)	5 (14,7 %)	5 (14,7 %)	13 (38,2 %)
Urethral carcinoma	2017	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)
	2018	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)
	2019	1 (25,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	1 (25,0 %)	2 (50,0 %)
	Total	1 (10,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	1 (10,0 %)	2 (20,0 %)
Total	2017	62 (29,1 %)	13 (6,1 %)	4 (1,9 %)	40 (18,8 %)	106 (49,8 %)
	2018	72 (32,7 %)	26 (11,8 %)	8 (3,6 %)	48 (21,8 %)	144 (65,5 %)
	2019	59 (25,1 %)	15 (6,4 %)	2 (0,9 %)	50 (21,3 %)	120 (51,1 %)
	Total	193 (28,9 %)	54 (8,1 %)	14 (2,1 %)	138 (20,7 %)	370 (55,4 %)

**Table 7.** Registered data in the oncology form in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0.

<b>General information</b>
Date of cancer diagnosis to be treated with oncology treatment
Cancer site: bladder cancer, UTUC in the renal pelvis [right/left], UTUC in the ureter [right/left], urethral carcinoma
Type of treatment: neoadjuvant, induction, adjuvant, palliative
ECOG at start of treatment: 0,1,2,3,4
Included in clinical study: yes, no
<b>Neoadjuvant treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, other
Number of courses: 1,2,3,4
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased
<b>Induction treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Metastases: lymph nodes, liver, bone, brain, other
T stage T4b: Yes, no
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, other
Number of courses:1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8,9,10,>10
Best treatment effect: complete response, partial response, stable disease, progressive disease, not applicable
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased
<b>Adjuvant treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, other
Number of courses:1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,>10
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased
<b>Palliative treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Date of confirmed metastatic disease
Metastatic sites: lymph nodes, liver, bone, lung, brain, other
Locally advanced disease T4b: yes, no
Hemoglobin level at start of treatment
Treatment line: 1,2,3,4,5,6
Re-challenge: yes, no
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, Gemcitabine, Gemcitabine-Carboplatin, Gemcitabine-Paklitaxel, Vinflunine, Pembrolizumab, Nivolumab, Atezolizumab, other
Number of courses:1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8,9,10,>10
Best treatment effect: complete response, partial response, stable disease, progressive disease, unknown
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased

ddMVAC=dose dense MVAC with GCSF

**Table 8:** Baseline data of UTUC in renal pelvis and their reference population in the BladderBaSe 2.0. For case individuals with cancer at both sides, only data from the first UTUC in renal pelvis diagnosis is included in the table.

		Cases (n total= 961)		Reference group (n total=4802)	
		N	%	N	%
Gender*	Men	601	63	3002	63
	Women	360	37	1800	37
Age at diagnosis/index date*	64 and below	156	16	782	16
	65-69	133	14	674	14
	70-74	228	24	1131	24
	75-79	231	24	1146	24
	80-84	151	16	750	16
	85 and above	62	6	319	7
Marital status	Unmarried/single	114	12	655	14
	Married/registered partners	529	55	2693	56
	Divorced/widowed	317	33	1454	30
	Missing	1	0		
Education level	Mandatory school	316	33	1547	32
	High school	410	43	1944	40
	University	220	23	1244	26
	Missing	15	2	67	1
Birth country	Sweden	820	85	4127	86
	Other nordic country	44	5	236	5
	Europe without nordic countries	61	6	281	6
	World outside Europe	36	4	158	3
	Missing				
Charlson Comorbidity Index**	No comorbidity (0)	419	44	3010	63
	Mild comorbidity (1)	101	11	643	13
	Intermediate comorbidity (2)	241	25	698	15
	Severe comorbidity (>2)	200	21	451	9
Drug Comorbidity Index***	Below 1.5	524	55	3275	68
	1.5 up to 3	252	26	868	18
	3 and above	185	19	659	14

Matching variables for reference group selection

\*\*Calculated based on diagnoses recorded in the patient register within 10 years prior to diagnosis/index date

\*\*\*Calculated based data on prescribed drugs according to Gedeberg et al[1] for patients with diagnosis/index date after 1 July 2006.

**Table 9.** Baseline data of UTUC in ureter and their reference population in the BladderBaSe 2.0. For case individuals with cancer at both sides, only data from the first UTUC in ureter diagnosis is included in the table.

		Cases (n total= 792)		Reference group (n total=3960)	
		N	%	N	%
Gender*	Men	514	65	2570	65
	Women	278	35	1390	35
Age at diagnosis/index date*	64 and below	95	12	472	12
	65-69	131	17	672	17
	70-74	183	23	890	22
	75-79	189	24	957	24
	80-84	128	16	636	16
	85 and above	66	8	333	8
Marital status	Unmarried/single	84	11	456	12
	Married/registered partners	430	54	2263	57
	Divorced/widowed	277	35	1238	31
	Missing	1	0	3	0
Education level	Mandatory school	288	36	1276	32
	High school	318	40	1554	39
	University	176	22	1085	27
	Missing	10	1	45	1
Birth country	Sweden	665	84	3401	86
	Other nordic country	35	4	172	4
	Europe without nordic countries	63	8	240	6
	World outside Europe	29	4	147	4
	Missing				
Charlson Comorbidity Index**	No comorbidity (0)	192	24	2441	62
	Mild comorbidity (1)	73	9	530	13
	Intermediate comorbidity (2)	275	35	570	14
	Severe comorbidity (>2)	252	32	419	11
Drug Comorbidity Index***	Below 1.5	366	46	2620	66
	1.5 up to 3	237	30	807	20
	3 and above	189	24	533	13

\*Matching variables for reference group selection

\*\*Calculated based on diagnoses recorded in the patient register within 10 years prior to diagnosis/index date

\*\*\*Calculated based data on prescribed drugs according to Gedeberg et al[1] for patients with diagnosis/index date after 1 July 2006.



**Table 10.** Baseline data of urethral carcinoma and their reference population in the BladderBaSe 2.0

		Cases (n total= 146)		Reference group (n total=730)	
		N	%	N	%
Gender*	Men	121	83	605	83
	Women	25	17	125	17
Age at diagnosis/index date*	64 and below	18	12	90	12
	65-69	23	16	110	15
	70-74	32	22	166	23
	75-79	37	25	187	26
	80-84	18	12	87	12
	85 and above	18	12	90	12
Marital status	Unmarried/single	12	8	89	12
	Married/registered partners	87	60	414	57
	Divorced/widowed	47	32	227	31
	Missing				
Education level	Mandatory school	46	32	235	32
	High school	61	42	300	41
	University	36	25	184	25
	Missing	3	2	11	2
Birth country	Sweden	128	88	634	87
	Other nordic country	3	2	31	4
	Europe without nordic countries	13	9	44	6
	World outside Europe	2	1	21	3
	Missing				
Charlson Comorbidity Index**	No comorbidity (0)	20	14	427	58
	Mild comorbidity (1)	7	5	107	15
	Intermediate comorbidity (2)	57	39	110	15
	Severe comorbidity (>2)	62	42	86	12
Drug Comorbidity Index***	Below 1.5	68	47	451	62
	1.5 up to 3	38	26	169	23
	3 and above	40	27	110	15

\*Matching variables for reference group selection

\*\*Calculated based on diagnoses recorded in the patient register within 10 years prior to diagnosis/index date

\*\*\*Calculated based data on prescribed drugs according to Gedeborg et al[1] for patients with diagnosis/index date after 1 July 2006.

## References

1. Gedeberg, R., et al., *An aggregated comorbidity measure based on history of filled drug prescriptions - development and evaluation in two separate cohorts*. *Epidemiology*, 2021.

## **SUPPLEMENT 2**

# Validation of variables in SNRUBC in stage T1 tumors diagnosed 2008-2009

**Background:** To correctly interpret data from the diagnosis form in the Swedish National Registry of Urinary Bladder Cancer (SNRUBC) when reporting data and in scientific research, we aimed to validate the data for selected variables related to diagnosis for all clinically stage T1 (cT1) tumours during the years 2008 and 2009.


**Method:** All patients registered as cT1 in the SNRUBC in the were included in the study (n=1044) [1]. Two specially trained nurses with broad experience of registration in the SNRUBC and other national population-based urological registries were employed to perform a second professional registration of the entire study population by doing a second review of all available patient charts. Care was taken to avoid that one nurse performed both the primary registration and the second registration of the same patient. All registered variables were thus registered once more without knowledge of the results from of the primary registration. Variables reregistered were date of referral to a urologic consultation and a transurethral resection (TUR) of the tumour. Tumour characteristics such as tumour grade according to WHO 1999 classification and clinical TNM category (TNM 2010) and primary treatment were also reregistered. The validation registration was also completed with information about T category of the second-look resection.

**Results:** The time from referral to TUR were similar in the primary registered and validated registrations as illustrated in **Figure 1**. There was similarly a high concordance between primary registration and validated registration with respect to cT stage (**Figure 2**), where 92% of the patients were registered as cT1 based on the information from patient charts. Of the patients with other than cT1 at validation, 4% had a lower clinical T stage, 2% had a higher stage, 1% were TX, and 3 % had missing data making validation impossible. We found concordance between registered data of grade as compared to the clinical journals for 82% of the G1 tumours, 89% for G2, and 92% for G3 (**Table 1**).


Concordance between primary registration and validation of clinical nodal (cN) stage and clinical metastasis (cM) stage were lower (**Table 2 and 3**). Of patients registered in SNRUBC with N0/NX, 96% had the same information whereas among the few patients with N+ (n=10) only 30% had the same information during validation with information from available patient charts. Similar pattern was found for cM, with very high concordance, 96%, among patients with M0/MX, but only 27% among the few patients registered as M1 in the SNRUBC (n=15).

**Conclusion:** In the SNRUBC primary registration of cT1 urinary bladder cancer, the concordance with clinical journals were high, However, improved registration of cN and cM are necessary. Continuous validation projects and programmes to detect and correct weaknesses in the registration process is important.

**Figure 1.** Density estimation of time from referral to transurethral resection (TUR) of the bladder tumour. Comparison of data in the diagnosis registration form in the SNRUBC and patient charts (validation data). Higher the curve means higher number of patients with that value.



**Figure 2.** Concordance of clinical T stage of all patients registered as clinically stage T1 in the validation study. Data from patient charts were used as validation data.



**Table 1.** Concordance between grade registered in the diagnosis form in the SNRUBC for all clinical stage T1 patients diagnosed 2008-2009 as compared to data obtained during validation.

SNRUBC register	Patient charts					
		G1	G2	G3	GX	Missing
G1		31 (81.6%)	3 (7.9%)	3 (7.9%)		1 (2.6%)
G2		2 (0.5%)	379 (89.0%)	31 (7.3%)	2 (0.5%)	12 (2.8%)
G3			21 (3.7%)	519 (91.7%)	7 (1.2%)	19 (3.4%)
GX				2 (66.7%)		1 (33.3%)
Missing			2 (18.2%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)	6 (54.5%)

**Table 2.** Concordance between clinical node (cN) stage registered in the diagnosis form in the SNRUBC for all clinical stage T1 patients 2008-2009 as compared to data obtained during validation.

SNRUBC register	Patient charts			
		NO/NX	N+	Missing
NO/NX		989 (95.7%)	12 (1.2%)	32 (3.1%)
N+		7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	
Missing		1 (100%)		

**Table 3.** Concordance between clinical metastasis (cM) stage registered in the diagnosis form in the SNRUBC for all clinical stage T1 patients 2008-2009 as compared to data obtained during validation

SNRUBC register	Patient charts			
		M0/MX	M1	Missing
M0/MX		986 (95.9%)	9 (1.0%)	33 (3.2%)
M1		10 (66.7%)	4 (26.7%)	1 (6.7%)
Missing		1 (100%)		

## References

1. Patschan, O., et al., *Second-look resection for primary stage T1 bladder cancer: a population-based study.* Scand J Urol, 2017. **51**(4): p. 301-307.

### **SUPPLEMENT 3**

## **Validation of deaths and unscheduled readmissions within 90 days of radical cystectomy in the SNRUBC**

**Background:** To correctly interpret data from the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC when reporting and performing research, we aimed to validate the data on deaths and unscheduled readmissions within in 90 days of radical cystectomy.

**Method:** Concordance between data on death within 90 days of radical cystectomy registered in the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC and date of death within the Register of total population and population changes (RTB) was investigated.

Data on unscheduled readmissions within 90 days of radical cystectomy registered in the radical cystectomy form in SNRUBC was compared with data from the in-patient register for all patients subjected to urinary diversion with an ileal conduit. The reason for not including patients with continent reconstructions was difficulties to separate scheduled readmissions when commencing catheterization of continent pouches and spontaneous voiding in patients with orthotopic neobladders from unscheduled readmissions. Variables for both these analyses were selected from BladderBaSe 2.0, with data from 2011 to 2019.

**Results:** Data on death within 90 days were compared for all patients (n=3603, of them 78 with missing data), and data on unscheduled readmissions for 3164 patients subjected to ileal conduit reconstruction (of them 108 missing).

Of the 3307 patients alive 90 days after radical cystectomy according to the cystectomy form, 3302 were registered alive in the RTB (Table 1). 218 patients were registered as dead, however, only 130 (60%) of them had died according to the RTB. Among those registered as dead within the radical cystectomy form, but not in the RTB, 20 died between 90 and 120 days postoperatively and additional 20 patients between 120 to 150 days (results not shown). This indicates that misclassifications to some extent might be due to erroneous registration of date of radical cystectomy in the SNRUBC.

Out of 3164 patients included in the analysis, 803 patients were re-admitted to hospital according to the radical cystectomy form for unscheduled readmission within 90 days (Table 2). Of these, 91% were captured in the in-patient register. 2253 patients were registered as no unscheduled readmissions, however 25% of them had hospitalization data in the in-patient register. This analysis was also performed in selected categories of calendar years with similar results (Table 3).

**Conclusion:** Scientific studies or reports using data on unscheduled readmissions within 90 days of radical cystectomy within the SNRUBC should be interpreted with caution. Further validation studies of other variables in the radical cystectomy form are recommended.



**Table 1.** Data for 3603 patients on death within 90 days from radical cystectomy in the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC as compared to date of death registered in the Register of total population and population changes.

	Register of Total Population and Population Changes		
SNRUBC register		Alive	Dead
	Alive	3302 (100%)	5 (0%)
	Dead	88 (40%)	130 (60%)
	Missing	77 (99%)	1 (1%)

**Table 2.** Data for 3164 patients subjected to ileal conduit reconstruction on unscheduled readmissions within 90 days in the cystectomy registration form in the SNRUBC as compared to the same information from comparison to the in-patient register.


	In-patient register		
SNRUBC register		No unscheduled readmissions	Unscheduled readmission
	No unscheduled readmissions	1699 (75%)	554 (25%)
	Unscheduled readmission	73 (9%)	730 (91%)
	Missing	63 (58%)	45 (42%)

**Table 3.** Data of unscheduled readmissions within 90 days in the cystectomy registration form in the SNRUBC as compared to the same information from comparison to the in-patient register, separated by categories of year of radical cystectomy.


	In-patient register			
	Year of radical cystectomy		No unscheduled readmissions	Unscheduled readmission
SNRUBC register	2011-2013	No unscheduled readmissions	489 (73%)	180 (27%)
		Unscheduled readmission	20 (10%)	184 (90%)
		Missing	12 (55%)	10 (45%)
	2014-2016	No unscheduled readmissions	623 (76%)	197 (24%)
		Unscheduled readmission	18 (6%)	276 (94%)
		Missing	25 (71%)	10 (29%)
	2017-2019	No unscheduled readmissions	587 (77%)	177 (23%)
		Unscheduled readmission	35 (11%)	270 (89%)
		Missing	26 (51%)	25 (49%)

**SUPPLEMENT 1**

a)



b)



**Figure 1.** Flowchart and number of participants of a) UTUC and b) urethral carcinoma included in the different forms of SNRUBC.

**Table 1.** Coding and morphology for cancer types included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

<b>Cancer types</b>	<b>ICD-0-3 codes</b>	<b>Morphology</b>	<b>SNOMED codes</b>
Urinary bladder cancer	C67.0-C67.6, C67.8, C67.9	Urothelial carcinoma Adenocarcinoma Squamous cell carcinoma Mucinous adenocarcinoma Adenosquamous carcinoma Neuroendocrine carcinoma Unspecified	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023, 81403, 80703, 81313, 81223, 80823, 80313, 80203, 80003, 84803, 85603, 80413, 80133, 82403
Upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC) in the renal pelvis	C65.9	Urothelial carcinoma	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023
Upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC) in the ureter	C66.9	Urothelial carcinoma	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023
Urethral carcinoma	C68.0	Urothelial carcinoma	81202, 81301, 81203, 812031, 812032, 812033, 81302, 813021, 813022, 813023

**Table 2.** Registered data on complications and re-operations recorded within 90 days after radical cystectomy in the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0.

<b>Gastrointestinal complications (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Postoperative intestinal obstruction
Anastomotic insufficiency
Intestinal fistula
<b>Cardiovascular complications (recorded with date and Clavien score)</b>
Deep vein thrombosis
Pulmonary embolism
Acute myocardial infarction
Cerebrovascular insult
Arterial thrombosis/emboli
<b>Infectious complications (recorded with date and Clavien score)</b>
Sepsis
Pneumonia
Pyelonephritis
Lymphocele
Other specific infectious complications
<b>Abdominal wall/parastomal complications (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Wound infection
Subcutaneous wound dehiscence
Abdominal wall hernia
Other abdominal wall complications
Stoma necrosis
<b>Urinary tract complications (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Ureteroenteric stenosis
Other urinary tract complications
Ureteroenteric anastomosis insufficiency
Enterourethral stricture neobladder
<b>Bleeding (recorded with date, re-operation, and Clavien score)</b>
Re-do surgery due to bleeding
<b>Other complications (recorded with Clavien score)</b>

**Table 3.** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardized form for a) diagnosis and b) primary treatment of UTUC in the renal pelvis in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

a) Variables from the diagnosis form of UTUC in the renal pelvis		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Date of diagnosis	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Side	Right: 48.8%	2015-2019: 100%
	Left: 51.5%	
	Missing: 0.1%	
County at diagnosis	Stockholm county: 19.8%	2015-2019: 100%
	Västra Götaland county: 17.8%	
	Skåne county: 14.4%	
	Östergötland county: 4.7%	
	Halland county: 4.4%	
	Örebro county: 3.6%	
	Jönköping county: 3.5%	
	Uppsala county: 3.2%	
	Västernorrland county: 3.1%	
Södermanland county: 3.0%		
Other: 22.4%		
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 99-100%
Healthcare Region	Stockholm/Gotland: 20.6%	2015-2019: 100%
	Uppsala/Örebro: 19.3%	
	South-East: 10.5%	
	South: 19.4%	
	West: 20.6%	
North: 9.5%		
Grade in three classes, GX set to missing	G1/LMP: 15.0%	2015-2019: 86-95%
	G2: 34.3%	
	G3-G4/anaplastic: 50.7%	
Date of referral	Date	2015-2019: 97-99%
Reason for referral	Referral registered: 67.4%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	Self-referral by patient: 20.2%	
	Other: 12.4%	
Date of referral registered	Date	2015-2019: 75-83%
Date of first visit to urologist	Date	2015-2019: 98-100%
Smoking status	Never smoker: 34.4%	2019: 81%
	Previous smoker: 39.3%	
	Current smoker: 26.4%	
Date of basis for diagnosis (below)	Date	2015-2019: 99-100%
Basis for diagnosis (several alternatives)	Computed tomography/MRI	Not applicable
	Retrograde or antegrade pyelography	
	Ureteropyeloscopy	
	Voided urinary cytology	
	Cytology obtained from renal pelvis or ureteric barbotage	
	Selective urinary cytology obtained from ureteric catheter	
	Biopsy obtained during ureteropyeloscopy	
Morphological diagnosis (SNOMED)	813033: 21.4%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	813022: 17.4%	
	812033: 17.1%	
	813021: 10.4%	
	813032: 8.9%	
	81203: 8.4%	

	813023: 6.2%	
	812032: 5.0%	
	81202: 2.2%	
	812031: 1.0%	
	Other: 2.1%	
Earlier/concomitant diagnosis (several alternatives)	No	Not applicable
	Urinary bladder cancer	
	UTUC in the ureter	
	UTUC in the renal pelvis, other side	
T stage (TNM-2017)	Urethral carcinoma	2015-2019: 96-100%
	Ta: 36.6%	
	Tis: 1.9%	
	T1: 12.0%	
	T2: 7.9%	
	T3: 26.9%	
N stage	T4: 7.3%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	TX: 7.5%	
	N0: 66.2%	
	N1: 6.7%	
	N2: 8.9%	
M stage	N3: 0.3%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	NX: 18.0%	
	M0: 89.1%	
	M1: 10.9%	



<b>b) Variables from the primary treatment form of UTUC in the renal pelvis</b>		
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Options (proportions)</b>	<b>Recorded years: Capture ratio</b>
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 95-99%
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 99-100%
Discussed at multidisciplinary conference	No: 38.6%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	Yes: 61.4%	
Additional treatment	No: 14.6%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	Yes: 85.4%	
Given treatment (several alternatives)	Nephroureterectomy (yes/no)	Not applicable
	Date of nephroureterectomy	
	Bladder cuff excised (yes/no)	
	Nephrectomy (yes/no)	
	Date of nephrectomy	
	Type of nephrectomy (open, robot, laparoscopy)	
	Local resection (yes/no)	
	Date of local resection	
	Type of local resection (open, robot, laparoscopy)	
	Endoluminal resection (yes/no)	
	Date of endoluminal resection	
	Endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy (yes/no)	
	Date of local endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy	
	Type of administration of endoluminal instillation (Nephrostomy/ Double-J/ Ureteric catheter)	
Treatment with curative intent	No: 13.5%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	Yes: 86.5%	

**Table 4.** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardized form for a) diagnosis and b) primary treatment of UTUC in the ureter in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

a) Variables from the diagnosis form of UTUC in the ureter		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Side	Right: 48.9%	2015-2019: 100%
	Left: 50.7%	
	Missing: 0.4%	
Date of diagnosis	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Report date	Date	2015-2019: 100%
County at diagnosis	Stockholm county: 24.1%	2015-2019: 100%
	Skåne county: 17.8%	
	Västra Götaland county: 15.2%	
	Östergötland county: 4.5%	
	Jönköping county: 4.5%	
	Halland county: 3.7%	
	Västerbotten county: 3.7%	
	Kalmar county: 2.9%	
	Uppsala county: 2.6%	
	Kronoberg county: 2.6%	
Other: 18.3%		
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 100%
Healthcare Region	Stockholm/Gotland: 24.9%	2015-2019: 100%
	Uppsala/Örebro: 13.0%	
	South-East: 12.2%	
	South: 24.0%	
	West: 17.3%	
North: 8.6%		
Grade in three classes, GX set to missing	G1/LMP: 22.4%	2015-2019: 90-96%
	G2: 31.1%	
	G3-G4/anaplastic: 46.5%	
Date of referral	Date	2015-2019: 92-99%
Reason for referral	Referral registered: 50.6%	2015-2019: 97-100%
	Self-referral by patient: 40.5%	
	Other: 8.9%	
Date of referral registered	Date	2015-2019: 53-67%
Date of first visit to urologist	Date	2015-2019: 97-99%
Smoking status	Never smoker: 27.5%	2019: 74%
	Previous smoker: 43.6%	
	Current smoker: 28.9%	
Date for basis for diagnosis (below)	Date	2015-2019: 98-100%
Basis for diagnosis (several alternatives)	Computed tomography/MRI	Not applicable
	Retrograde or antegrade pyelography	
	Ureteropyeloscopy	
	Voided urinary cytology	
	Cytology obtained from renal pelvis or ureteric barbotage	
	Selective urinary cytology obtained from ureteric catheter	
	Biopsy obtained during ureteropyeloscopy	
Morphological diagnosis (SNOMED)	813022: 18.3%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	813021: 16.9%	
	81202: 15.4%	
	813033: 12.6%	
	812033: 11.4%	
	813023: 7.9%	

	813032: 5.8%	
	812032: 4.6%	
	81203: 4.1%	
	81301: 1.6%	
	Other: 1.5%	
Earlier/concomitant diagnosis (several alternatives)	No	Not applicable
	Urinary bladder cancer	
	UTUC in the ureter, other side	
	UTUC in the renal pelvis	
	Urethral carcinoma	
T stage (TNM-2017)	Ta: 45.9%	2015-2019: 98-100%
	Tis: 14.4%	
	T1: 14.8%	
	T2: 9.0%	
	T3: 8.4%	
	T4: 1.4%	
	TX: 6.0%	
N stage	N0: 72.3%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	N1: 2.8%	
	N2: 3.2%	
	N3: 0.2%	
	NX: 21.4%	
M stage	M0: 95.8%	2015-2019: 99-100%
	M1: 4.2%	

<b>b) Variables from the primary treatment form of UTUC in the ureter</b>		
<b>Variable</b>	<b>Options (proportions)</b>	<b>Recorded years: Capture ratio</b>
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 95-100%
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 99-100%
Discussed at multidisciplinary conference	No: 35.4%	2015-2019: 84-93%
	Yes: 64.6%	
Additional treatment	No: 17.5%	2015-2019: 84-99%
	Yes: 82.5%	
Detected by cystectomy	No: 86.4%	2015-2016: 7-38%; 2017-2019: 98-100%
	Yes: 13.6%	
Given treatment (several alternatives)	Nephroureterectomy (yes/no)	Not applicable
	Date of Nephroureterectomy	
	Bladder cuff (yes/no)	
	Local resection (yes/no)	
	Date of local resection	
	Type of local resection (open/robot/laparoscopy)	
	Endoluminal resection (yes/no)	
	Date of endoluminal resection	
	Endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy (yes/no)	
	Date of local endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy	
	Type of local endoluminal instillation BCG/chemotherapy (nephrostomy/double-J/ureterary catheter)	
Treatment with curative intent	No: 12.9%	2015-2019: 97-100%
	Yes: 87.1%	

**Table 5.** Variables, their options and proportions, and variable capture ratios in the standardized form for a) diagnosis and b) primary treatment of urethral carcinoma in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0

a) Variables from the diagnosis form of urethral carcinoma		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Date of diagnosis	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 100%
County at diagnosis	Skåne county: 37.0%	2015-2019: 100%
	Stockholm county: 13.7%	
	Västra Götaland county: 12.3%	
	Norrbottnens county: 6.2%	
	Jämtlands county: 4.8%	
	Östergötland county: 4.1%	
	Jönköping county: 4.1%	
	Gävleborg county: 2.7%	
	Uppsala county: 2.1%	
Kronoberg county: 2.1%		
Other: 11.0%		
Code for reporting hospital	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 100%
Hospital region	Stockholm/Gotland: 13.7%	2015-2019: 100%
	Uppsala/Örebro: 8.9%	
	South-East: 10.3%	
	South: 41.1%	
	West: 12.3%	
Grade in three classes (GX set to missing)	G1/LMP: 15.6%	2015-2019: 86-94%
	G2: 15.6%	
	G3-G4/anaplastic: 68.9%	
Date of referral	Date	2015-2019: 66-100%
Reason for referral	Referral registered: 42.5%	2015-2019: 100%
	Self-referral by patient: 47.9%	
	Other: 9.6%	
Date of referral registered	Date	2015-2019: 36-66%
Date of first visit to urologist	Date	2015-2019: 96-100%
Smoking status	Never smoker: 26.3%	2019: 60%
	Previous smoker: 47.4%	
	Current smoker: 26.3%	
Date of basis for diagnosis (below)	Date	2015-2019: 100%
Basis for diagnosis (several alternatives)	Computed tomography/MRI	Not applicable
	Urethrocystoscopy	
	Voided urinary cytology	
	Cytology urethral barbotage	
	Urethral biopsy	
Morphological diagnosis (SNOMED)	81202: 29.0%	2015-2019: 93-100%
	812033: 17.9%	
	813022: 13.1%	
	813033: 11.7%	
	813021: 8.3%	
	813023: 8.3%	
	81203: 3.4%	
	81301: 2.8%	
	81302: 2.1%	
	812032: 1.4%	
	Other: 2.1%	
	No	Not applicable
	Urinary bladder cancer	

Earlier/concomitant diagnosis (several alternatives)	UTUC in the ureter	
	UTUC in the renal pelvis	
T stage (TNM-2017)	Ta: 36.1%	2015-2019: 96-100%
	Tis: 28.5%	
	T1: 15.3%	
	T2: 10.4%	
	T3: 2.8%	
	T4: 2.8%	
N stage	TX: 4.2%	2015-2019: 100%
	N0: 56.8%	
	N1: 1.4%	
	N2: 4.8%	
M stage	NX: 37.0%	2015-2019: 100%
	M0: 93.2%	
	M1: 6.8%	



b) Variables from the primary treatment form of urethral carcinoma		
Variable	Options (proportions)	Recorded years: Capture ratio
Reporting date	Date	2015-2019: 86-100%
Reporting hospital code	Hospital codes	2015-2019: 100%
Discussed at multidisciplinary conference	No: 33.8%	2015-2019: 91-100%
	Yes: 66.2%	
Additional treatment	No: 33.8%	2015-2019: 91-100%
	Yes: 66.2%	
Detected at cystectomy or in the cystectomy specimen	No: 94.3%	2015-2016: 19-61%; 2017-2019: 97-100%
	Yes: 5.7%	
Given treatment (several alternatives)	Cystectomy (yes/no)	NA
	Date of cystectomy	
	Type of cystectomy (open/robot)	
	Local resection (yes/no)	
	Date of local resection	
	Endoluminal resection (yes/no)	
	Date of endoluminal resection	
Treatment with curative intent	No: 15.7	2015-2019: 97-100%
	Yes: 84.3%	

**Table 6.** Capture ratios of the different options in the standardized form for oncological treatment for bladder cancer, upper tract urothelial carcinoma (UTUC), or urethral carcinoma in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0. As comparison, we have used patients with diagnosis date in 2017 and later and systemic chemotherapy as primary treatment, separately for each cancer form.

Diagnosis	Diagnosis year	Neoadjuvant	Induction	Adjuvant	Palliative	Any
Bladder cancer	2017	62 (33,9 %)	10 (5,5 %)	2 (1,1 %)	34 (18,6 %)	95 (51,9 %)
	2018	72 (40,0 %)	22 (12,2 %)	4 (2,2 %)	38 (21,1 %)	126 (70,0 %)
	2019	58 (30,1 %)	14 (7,3 %)	0 (0,0 %)	42 (21,8 %)	108 (56,0 %)
	Total	192 (34,5 %)	46 (8,3 %)	6 (1,1 %)	114 (20,5 %)	329 (59,2 %)
UTUC in the renal pelvis	2017	0 (0,0 %)	2 (12,5 %)	1 (6,2 %)	5 (31,2 %)	8 (50,0 %)
	2018	0 (0,0 %)	2 (8,0 %)	1 (4,0 %)	8 (32,0 %)	11 (44,0 %)
	2019	0 (0,0 %)	1 (3,7 %)	1 (3,7 %)	5 (18,5 %)	7 (25,9 %)
	Total	0 (0,0 %)	5 (7,4 %)	3 (4,4 %)	18 (26,5 %)	26 (38,2 %)
UTUC in the ureter	2017	0 (0,0 %)	1 (11,1 %)	1 (11,1 %)	1 (11,1 %)	3 (33,3 %)
	2018	0 (0,0 %)	2 (14,3 %)	3 (21,4 %)	2 (14,3 %)	7 (50,0 %)
	2019	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	1 (9,1 %)	2 (18,2 %)	3 (27,3 %)
	Total	0 (0,0 %)	3 (8,8 %)	5 (14,7 %)	5 (14,7 %)	13 (38,2 %)
Urethral carcinoma	2017	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)
	2018	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)
	2019	1 (25,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	1 (25,0 %)	2 (50,0 %)
	Total	1 (10,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	0 (0,0 %)	1 (10,0 %)	2 (20,0 %)
Total	2017	62 (29,1 %)	13 (6,1 %)	4 (1,9 %)	40 (18,8 %)	106 (49,8 %)
	2018	72 (32,7 %)	26 (11,8 %)	8 (3,6 %)	48 (21,8 %)	144 (65,5 %)
	2019	59 (25,1 %)	15 (6,4 %)	2 (0,9 %)	50 (21,3 %)	120 (51,1 %)
	Total	193 (28,9 %)	54 (8,1 %)	14 (2,1 %)	138 (20,7 %)	370 (55,4 %)

**Table 7.** Registered data in the oncology form in the SNRUBC and included in the BladderBaSe 2.0.

<b>General information</b>
Date of cancer diagnosis to be treated with oncology treatment
Cancer site: bladder cancer, UTUC in the renal pelvis [right/left], UTUC in the ureter [right/left], urethral carcinoma
Type of treatment: neoadjuvant, induction, adjuvant, palliative
ECOG at start of treatment: 0,1,2,3,4
Included in clinical study: yes, no
<b>Neoadjuvant treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, other
Number of courses: 1,2,3,4
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased
<b>Induction treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Metastases: lymph nodes, liver, bone, brain, other
T stage T4b: Yes, no
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, other
Number of courses:1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8,9,10,>10
Best treatment effect: complete response, partial response, stable disease, progressive disease, not applicable
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased
<b>Adjuvant treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, other
Number of courses:1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,>10
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased
<b>Palliative treatment (start date, end date)</b>
Date of confirmed metastatic disease
Metastatic sites: lymph nodes, liver, bone, lung, brain, other
Locally advanced disease T4b: yes, no
Hemoglobin level at start of treatment
Treatment line: 1,2,3,4,5,6
Re-challenge: yes, no
Type of treatment: ddMVAC, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 3 week courses, Cisplatin-Gemcitabine 4 week courses, Gemcitabine, Gemcitabine-Carboplatin, Gemcitabine-Paclitaxel, Vinflunine, Pembrolizumab, Nivolumab, Atezolizumab, other
Number of courses:1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8,9,10,>10
Best treatment effect: complete response, partial response, stable disease, progressive disease, unknown
Reason for terminating treatment: progression, side-effects, planned end, patients wish, patient deceased

ddMVAC=dose dense MVAC with GCSF

**Table 8:** Baseline data of UTUC in renal pelvis and their reference population in the BladderBaSe 2.0. For case individuals with cancer at both sides, only data from the first UTUC in renal pelvis diagnosis is included in the table.

		Cases (n total= 961)		Reference group (n total=4802)	
		N	%	N	%
Gender*	Men	601	63	3002	63
	Women	360	37	1800	37
Age at diagnosis/index date*	64 and below	156	16	782	16
	65-69	133	14	674	14
	70-74	228	24	1131	24
	75-79	231	24	1146	24
	80-84	151	16	750	16
	85 and above	62	6	319	7
Marital status	Unmarried/single	114	12	655	14
	Married/registered partners	529	55	2693	56
	Divorced/widowed	317	33	1454	30
	Missing	1	0		
Education level	Mandatory school	316	33	1547	32
	High school	410	43	1944	40
	University	220	23	1244	26
	Missing	15	2	67	1
Birth country	Sweden	820	85	4127	86
	Other nordic country	44	5	236	5
	Europe without nordic countries	61	6	281	6
	World outside Europe	36	4	158	3
	Missing				
Charlson Comorbidity Index**	No comorbidity (0)	419	44	3010	63
	Mild comorbidity (1)	101	11	643	13
	Intermediate comorbidity (2)	241	25	698	15
	Severe comorbidity (>2)	200	21	451	9
Drug Comorbidity Index***	Below 1.5	524	55	3275	68
	1.5 up to 3	252	26	868	18
	3 and above	185	19	659	14

Matching variables for reference group selection

\*\*Calculated based on diagnoses recorded in the patient register within 10 years prior to diagnosis/index date

\*\*\*Calculated based data on prescribed drugs according to Gedeberg et al[1] for patients with diagnosis/index date after 1 July 2006.

**Table 9.** Baseline data of UTUC in ureter and their reference population in the BladderBaSe 2.0. For case individuals with cancer at both sides, only data from the first UTUC in ureter diagnosis is included in the table.

		Cases (n total= 792)		Reference group (n total=3960)	
		N	%	N	%
Gender*	Men	514	65	2570	65
	Women	278	35	1390	35
Age at diagnosis/index date*	64 and below	95	12	472	12
	65-69	131	17	672	17
	70-74	183	23	890	22
	75-79	189	24	957	24
	80-84	128	16	636	16
	85 and above	66	8	333	8
Marital status	Unmarried/single	84	11	456	12
	Married/registered partners	430	54	2263	57
	Divorced/widowed	277	35	1238	31
	Missing	1	0	3	0
Education level	Mandatory school	288	36	1276	32
	High school	318	40	1554	39
	University	176	22	1085	27
	Missing	10	1	45	1
Birth country	Sweden	665	84	3401	86
	Other nordic country	35	4	172	4
	Europe without nordic countries	63	8	240	6
	World outside Europe	29	4	147	4
	Missing				
Charlson Comorbidity Index**	No comorbidity (0)	192	24	2441	62
	Mild comorbidity (1)	73	9	530	13
	Intermediate comorbidity (2)	275	35	570	14
	Severe comorbidity (>2)	252	32	419	11
Drug Comorbidity Index***	Below 1.5	366	46	2620	66
	1.5 up to 3	237	30	807	20
	3 and above	189	24	533	13

\*Matching variables for reference group selection

\*\*Calculated based on diagnoses recorded in the patient register within 10 years prior to diagnosis/index date

\*\*\*Calculated based data on prescribed drugs according to Gedeberg et al[1] for patients with diagnosis/index date after 1 July 2006.

**Table 10.** Baseline data of urethral carcinoma and their reference population in the BladderBaSe 2.0

		Cases (n total= 146)		Reference group (n total=730)	
		N	%	N	%
Gender*	Men	121	83	605	83
	Women	25	17	125	17
Age at diagnosis/index date*	64 and below	18	12	90	12
	65-69	23	16	110	15
	70-74	32	22	166	23
	75-79	37	25	187	26
	80-84	18	12	87	12
	85 and above	18	12	90	12
Marital status	Unmarried/single	12	8	89	12
	Married/registered partners	87	60	414	57
	Divorced/widowed	47	32	227	31
	Missing				
Education level	Mandatory school	46	32	235	32
	High school	61	42	300	41
	University	36	25	184	25
	Missing	3	2	11	2
Birth country	Sweden	128	88	634	87
	Other nordic country	3	2	31	4
	Europe without nordic countries	13	9	44	6
	World outside Europe	2	1	21	3
	Missing				
Charlson Comorbidity Index**	No comorbidity (0)	20	14	427	58
	Mild comorbidity (1)	7	5	107	15
	Intermediate comorbidity (2)	57	39	110	15
	Severe comorbidity (>2)	62	42	86	12
Drug Comorbidity Index***	Below 1.5	68	47	451	62
	1.5 up to 3	38	26	169	23
	3 and above	40	27	110	15

\*Matching variables for reference group selection

\*\*Calculated based on diagnoses recorded in the patient register within 10 years prior to diagnosis/index date

\*\*\*Calculated based data on prescribed drugs according to Gedeborg et al[1] for patients with diagnosis/index date after 1 July 2006.

## References

1. Gedeberg, R., et al., *An aggregated comorbidity measure based on history of filled drug prescriptions - development and evaluation in two separate cohorts*. *Epidemiology*, 2021.

## **SUPPLEMENT 2**

# Validation of variables in SNRUBC in stage T1 tumors diagnosed 2008-2009

**Background:** To correctly interpret data from the diagnosis form in the Swedish National Registry of Urinary Bladder Cancer (SNRUBC) when reporting data and in scientific research, we aimed to validate the data for selected variables related to diagnosis for all clinically stage T1 (cT1) tumours during the years 2008 and 2009.

**Method:** All patients registered as cT1 in the SNRUBC in the were included in the study (n=1044) [1]. Two specially trained nurses with broad experience of registration in the SNRUBC and other national population-based urological registries were employed to perform a second professional registration of the entire study population by doing a second review of all available patient charts. Care was taken to avoid that one nurse performed both the primary registration and the second registration of the same patient. All registered variables were thus registered once more without knowledge of the results from of the primary registration. Variables reregistered were date of referral to a urologic consultation and a transurethral resection (TUR) of the tumour. Tumour characteristics such as tumour grade according to WHO 1999 classification and clinical TNM category (TNM 2010) and primary treatment were also reregistered. The validation registration was also completed with information about T category of the second-look resection.


**Results:** The time from referral to TUR were similar in the primary registered and validated registrations as illustrated in **Figure 1**. There was similarly a high concordance between primary registration and validated registration with respect to cT stage (**Figure 2**), where 92% of the patients were registered as cT1 based on the information from patient charts. Of the patients with other than cT1 at validation, 4% had a lower clinical T stage, 2% had a higher stage, 1% were TX, and 3 % had missing data making validation impossible. We found concordance between registered data of grade as compared to the clinical journals for 82% of the G1 tumours, 89% for G2, and 92% for G3 (**Table 1**).

Concordance between primary registration and validation of clinical nodal (cN) stage and clinical metastasis (cM) stage were lower (**Table 2 and 3**). Of patients registered in SNRUBC with N0/NX, 96% had the same information whereas among the few patients with N+ (n=10) only 30% had the same information during validation with information from available patient charts. Similar pattern was found for cM, with very high concordance, 96%, among patients with M0/MX, but only 27% among the few patients registered as M1 in the SNRUBC (n=15).


**Conclusion:** In the SNRUBC primary registration of cT1 urinary bladder cancer, the concordance with clinical journals were high, However, improved registration of cN and cM are necessary. Continuous validation projects and programmes to detect and correct weaknesses in the registration process is important.



**Figure 1.** Density estimation of time from referral to transurethral resection (TUR) of the bladder tumour. Comparison of data in the diagnosis registration form in the SNRUBC and patient charts (validation data). Higher the curve means higher number of patients with that value.



**Figure 2.** Concordance of clinical T stage of all patients registered as clinically stage T1 in the validation study. Data from patient charts were used as validation data.



**Table 1.** Concordance between grade registered in the diagnosis form in the SNRUBC for all clinical stage T1 patients diagnosed 2008-2009 as compared to data obtained during validation.

SNRUBC register	Patient charts					
		G1	G2	G3	GX	Missing
G1		31 (81.6%)	3 (7.9%)	3 (7.9%)		1 (2.6%)
G2		2 (0.5%)	379 (89.0%)	31 (7.3%)	2 (0.5%)	12 (2.8%)
G3			21 (3.7%)	519 (91.7%)	7 (1.2%)	19 (3.4%)
GX				2 (66.7%)		1 (33.3%)
Missing			2 (18.2%)	2 (18.2%)	1 (9.1%)	6 (54.5%)

**Table 2.** Concordance between clinical node (cN) stage registered in the diagnosis form in the SNRUBC for all clinical stage T1 patients 2008-2009 as compared to data obtained during validation.

SNRUBC register	Patient charts			
		NO/NX	N+	Missing
NO/NX		989 (95.7%)	12 (1.2%)	32 (3.1%)
N+		7 (70.0%)	3 (30.0%)	
Missing		1 (100%)		

**Table 3.** Concordance between clinical metastasis (cM) stage registered in the diagnosis form in the SNRUBC for all clinical stage T1 patients 2008-2009 as compared to data obtained during validation

SNRUBC register	Patient charts			
		M0/MX	M1	Missing
M0/MX		986 (95.9%)	9 (1.0%)	33 (3.2%)
M1		10 (66.7%)	4 (26.7%)	1 (6.7%)
Missing		1 (100%)		

## References

1. Patschan, O., et al., *Second-look resection for primary stage T1 bladder cancer: a population-based study*. Scand J Urol, 2017. **51**(4): p. 301-307.

### **SUPPLEMENT 3**

## **Validation of deaths and unscheduled readmissions within 90 days of radical cystectomy in the SNRUBC**

**Background:** To correctly interpret data from the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC when reporting and performing research, we aimed to validate the data on deaths and unscheduled readmissions within in 90 days of radical cystectomy.

**Method:** Concordance between data on death within 90 days of radical cystectomy registered in the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC and date of death within the Register of total population and population changes (RTB) was investigated.

Data on unscheduled readmissions within 90 days of radical cystectomy registered in the radical cystectomy form in SNRUBC was compared with data from the in-patient register for all patients subjected to urinary diversion with an ileal conduit. The reason for not including patients with continent reconstructions was difficulties to separate scheduled readmissions when commencing catheterization of continent pouches and spontaneous voiding in patients with orthotopic neobladders from unscheduled readmissions. Variables for both these analyses were selected from BladderBaSe 2.0, with data from 2011 to 2019.

**Results:** Data on death within 90 days were compared for all patients (n=3603, of them 78 with missing data), and data on unscheduled readmissions for 3164 patients subjected to ileal conduit reconstruction (of them 108 missing).

Of the 3307 patients alive 90 days after radical cystectomy according to the cystectomy form, 3302 were registered alive in the RTB (Table 1). 218 patients were registered as dead, however, only 130 (60%) of them had died according to the RTB. Among those registered as dead within the radical cystectomy form, but not in the RTB, 20 died between 90 and 120 days postoperatively and additional 20 patients between 120 to 150 days (results not shown). This indicates that misclassifications to some extent might be due to erroneous registration of date of radical cystectomy in the SNRUBC.

Out of 3164 patients included in the analysis, 803 patients were re-admitted to hospital according to the radical cystectomy form for unscheduled readmission within 90 days (Table 2). Of these, 91% were captured in the in-patient register. 2253 patients were registered as no unscheduled readmissions, however 25% of them had hospitalization data in the in-patient register. This analysis was also performed in selected categories of calendar years with similar results (Table 3).

**Conclusion:** Scientific studies or reports using data on unscheduled readmissions within 90 days of radical cystectomy within the SNRUBC should be interpreted with caution. Further validation studies of other variables in the radical cystectomy form are recommended.

**Table 1.** Data for 3603 patients on death within 90 days from radical cystectomy in the radical cystectomy form in the SNRUBC as compared to date of death registered in the Register of total population and population changes.

	Register of Total Population and Population Changes		
		Alive	Dead
SNRUBC register	Alive	3302 (100%)	5 (0%)
	Dead	88 (40%)	130 (60%)
	Missing	77 (99%)	1 (1%)

**Table 2.** Data for 3164 patients subjected to ileal conduit reconstruction on unscheduled readmissions within 90 days in the cystectomy registration form in the SNRUBC as compared to the same information from comparison to the in-patient register.

	In-patient register		
		No unscheduled readmissions	Unscheduled readmission
SNRUBC register	No unscheduled readmissions	1699 (75%)	554 (25%)
	Unscheduled readmission	73 (9%)	730 (91%)
	Missing	63 (58%)	45 (42%)

**Table 3.** Data of unscheduled readmissions within 90 days in the cystectomy registration form in the SNRUBC as compared to the same information from comparison to the in-patient register, separated by categories of year of radical cystectomy.

	Year of radical cystectomy	In-patient register		
			No unscheduled readmissions	Unscheduled readmission
SNRUBC register	2011-2013	No unscheduled readmissions	489 (73%)	180 (27%)
		Unscheduled readmission	20 (10%)	184 (90%)
		Missing	12 (55%)	10 (45%)
	2014-2016	No unscheduled readmissions	623 (76%)	197 (24%)
		Unscheduled readmission	18 (6%)	276 (94%)
		Missing	25 (71%)	10 (29%)
	2017-2019	No unscheduled readmissions	587 (77%)	177 (23%)
		Unscheduled readmission	35 (11%)	270 (89%)
		Missing	26 (51%)	25 (49%)