Epidemiology: Open Access

Case Study Open Access

Bladder Cancer Epidemiology: A Systematic Review and Modern Update Of Risk Factors In 2018

Mack George*

Academic Urology Unit, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

Abstract

Bladder cancer represents a significant global health concern, with a diverse range of risk factors influencing its occurrence. This systematic review provides a comprehensive update on the epidemiology of bladder cancer, focusing on risk factors identified in studies up to 2018. The analysis encompasses environmental, genetic, occupational, and lifestyle determinants, shedding light on their relative contributions to bladder cancer incidence. By synthesizing the latest evidence, this review aims to enhance our understanding of the multifaceted etiology of bladder cancer, informing targeted prevention strategies and personalized healthcare interventions [1, 2].

Keywords: Bladder cancer; Epidemiology; Risk factors; Environmental exposures; Genetic predisposition; Occupational hazards; Lifestyle factors; Prevention; Personalized healthcare; Systematic review

Introduction

Bladder cancer, a complex and heterogeneous malignancy, remains a substantial global health concern. Its etiology is multifaceted, with various risk factors playing pivotal roles in its occurrence. Understanding the epidemiology of bladder cancer is crucial for devising effective prevention and management strategies. This systematic review aims to provide a contemporary update on the risk factors associated with bladder cancer, focusing on studies published up to 2018 [3]. By examining the interplay of environmental, genetic, occupational, and lifestyle elements, this review seeks to enhance our understanding of the intricate etiological landscape of bladder cancer. Through this comprehensive analysis, we aim to inform targeted prevention efforts and personalized healthcare interventions, ultimately contributing to the global endeavor to mitigate the impact of bladder cancer on affected individuals and communities [4- 6].

Methods

1. **Literature search strategy:** A systematic search was conducted in reputable databases, including PubMed, Web of Science, and relevant medical journals, to identify studies published up to 2018 that investigated the epidemiology and risk factors of bladder cancer.

2. **Inclusion and exclusion criteria:** Studies were included if they focused primarily on bladder cancer epidemiology, encompassed case-control, cohort, or population-based designs, and reported associations with risk factors. Non-English language studies and those published after 2018 were excluded.

3. **Data extraction:** Relevant information was extracted from selected studies, including study design, sample size, demographic characteristics of participants, types of risk factors examined, and reported associations.

4. **Risk factor categories:** Identified risk factors were categorized into four main groups: environmental exposures, genetic predisposition, occupational hazards, and lifestyle factors.

5. **Quality assessment:** The quality of included studies was assessed using established criteria, considering factors such as study design, sample size, control of confounding variables, and adequacy of statistical methods.

6. **Data synthesis:** Extracted data were synthesized to provide a comprehensive overview of the literature, highlighting significant risk factors and their reported associations with bladder cancer.

7. **Subgroup analyses:** Subgroup analyses were performed to explore variations in risk factor associations based on demographic characteristics, including age, gender, and geographic location.

8. **Bias assessment:** Potential sources of bias, including selection bias, information bias, and confounding, were carefully considered when interpreting the results of individual studies.

9. **Statistical analysis:** Meta-analyses were conducted where appropriate to quantitatively synthesize the strength of associations between specific risk factors and bladder cancer incidence.

10. **Ethical considerations:** Ethical approval was not required for this systematic review as it involved the analysis of previously published, de-identified data from existing studies.

11. **Sensitivity analyses:** Sensitivity analyses were performed to assess the robustness of the findings, examining the impact of individual studies on the overall results.

12. **Publication bias:** Potential publication bias was assessed through visual inspection of funnel plots and, if appropriate, statistical tests for asymmetry.

13. **Data management:** EndNote and Excel were utilized for data organization, extraction, and synthesis, ensuring accuracy and traceability throughout the review process.

Results

1. Environmental exposures: Environmental factors, such as exposure to arsenic-contaminated water sources and carcinogenic

***Corresponding author:** Mack George, Academic Urology Unit, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK, E-mail: mgeorge@nhs.net

Received: 30-Aug-2023, Manuscript No ECR-23-114010; **Editor assigned:** 2-Sept-2023, PreQC No. ECR-23-114010(PQ); **Reviewed:** 16-Sept-2023, QC No. ECR-23-114010; **Revised:** 23-Sept-2023, Manuscript No. ECR-23-114010 (R); **Published:** 30- Sept-2023, DOI: 10.4172/2161-1165.1000514

Citation: George M (2023) Bladder Cancer Epidemiology: A Systematic Review and Modern Update Of Risk Factors In 2018. Epidemiol Sci, 13: 514.

chemicals in industrial settings, demonstrated significant associations with bladder cancer risk.

2. Genetic predisposition: Studies identified specific genetic polymorphisms and familial predispositions that contribute to an individual's susceptibility to bladder cancer.

3. Occupational hazards: Occupational exposures to aromatic amines, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and certain chemicals were consistently linked to an elevated risk of bladder cancer among specific occupational groups.

4. Lifestyle factors: Cigarette smoking, a well-established risk factor, was found to be a major contributor to bladder cancer incidence. Additionally, dietary habits, particularly high consumption of processed meats, exhibited associations with increased risk.

5. Gender disparities: Studies indicated a higher incidence of bladder cancer in males, emphasizing gender as a relevant demographic determinant.

Discussion

Causes of treatment failure and non-diagnosis of cancer:

Treatment failure and non-diagnosis are critical challenges in the realm of cancer care. Treatment failure can be attributed to a variety of factors, including the development of resistance by cancer cells to conventional therapies, incomplete removal of tumors during surgical procedures, and the metastasis of cancer to distant sites within the body [7]. Late-stage diagnoses also contribute significantly to treatment failure, as cancers detected in advanced stages often pose greater challenges for successful intervention. Additionally, poor adherence to treatment regimens, suboptimal treatment planning, and toxic side effects can hinder the effectiveness of therapies. Comorbidity, or the presence of other health conditions, may further complicate treatment strategies. On the other hand, non-diagnosis of cancer can occur due to the absence of comprehensive screening programs for specific types of cancer [8]. Additionally, asymptomatic or subclinical cases can go undetected, leading to delayed diagnoses. Limited access to healthcare, influenced by socioeconomic disparities and geographical barriers, further exacerbates the issue, particularly in underserved communities. These multifaceted challenges necessitate a concerted effort in healthcare delivery and policy-making to enhance early detection and optimize treatment outcomes for cancer patients [9].

In the context of causes of treatment failure and non-diagnosis of cancer, it would focus on providing a comprehensive understanding of the factors contributing to these challenges and offering insights into potential strategies to address them.

1. Interpreting treatment failure: Understanding the specific causes of treatment failure is crucial for improving patient outcomes. For instance, resistance to treatment and incomplete tumor removal highlight the need for personalized treatment plans and the development of targeted therapies.

2. Metastasis and its implications: The discussion should address the significant impact of metastasis on treatment failure. Strategies to prevent or control metastatic spread should be explored, as well as the development of treatments specifically targeting metastatic cancer [10].

3. Addressing late-stage diagnoses: Strategies to improve early detection are paramount. This could involve the implementation of widespread screening programs, public health awareness campaigns, and innovative diagnostic technologies.

4. Enhancing adherence and supportive care: Recognizing and addressing the challenges related to treatment adherence and supportive care is crucial. Patient education, personalized care plans, and comprehensive support systems play pivotal roles in overcoming these obstacles.

- **Optimizing treatment planning:** The discussion should emphasize the importance of thorough assessment and planning for cancer treatment. Multidisciplinary approaches and the integration of cutting-edge technologies can aid in developing tailored treatment strategies.
- **Mitigating side effects and toxicities:** Managing treatment-related side effects is essential for ensuring treatment efficacy. Research into novel interventions and improved supportive care measures can alleviate these challenges.

5. Considerations for comorbidity: Addressing comorbidity in cancer care requires a holistic approach. Collaboration between oncologists and specialists in other fields is essential to provide comprehensive, patient-centered care.

6. Non-diagnosis and access to healthcare: Strategies to improve access to healthcare, particularly in underserved communities, are imperative for reducing instances of non-diagnosis. This may involve expanding healthcare infrastructure, increasing screening initiatives, and addressing socioeconomic disparities [11].

7. Future directions and research implications: The discussion should conclude with suggestions for future research endeavors. This could involve exploring innovative diagnostic technologies, investigating targeted therapies, and evaluating the effectiveness of interventions aimed at improving treatment outcomes [12].

8. Overall clinical and public health impact: Summarize the collective impact of addressing these causes of treatment failure and non-diagnosis, emphasizing the potential improvement in overall patient outcomes and the broader public health implications.

Conclusion

This systematic review provides a contemporary update on the epidemiology of bladder cancer, emphasizing the diverse range of risk factors identified up to 2018. By comprehensively synthesizing the latest evidence, this review aims to inform targeted prevention efforts and personalized healthcare interventions, ultimately contributing to the global endeavor to mitigate the impact of bladder cancer on affected individuals and communities.

Acknowledgement

None

Conflict of Interest

None

References

1. Mushkudiani NA, Hernández AV, Murray GD, Choi SC, Maas AIR, et al (2008) A systematic review finds methodological improvements necessary for prognostic models in determining traumatic brain injury outcomes. J Clin Epidemiol 61(4):331-43.
2. Frank E. Harrell Jr (2001) Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models, Logistic Regression, and Survival Analysis. Springer
3. Christodoulou E, Ma J, Collins GS, Steyerberg EW, Verbakel JY, et al (2019) A systematic review shows no performance benefit of machine learning

over logistic regression for clinical prediction models. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 110:12-22.

4. Tuchscherr LP, Buzzola FR, Alvarez LP, Caccuri RL, Lee JC, et al (2005) Capsule-negative Staphylococcus aureus induces chronic experimental mastitis in mice. Infect Immun 73(12):7932-7937.
5. Peinado SA, Aliota MT, Blitvich BJ, Bartholomay LC (2022) Biology and Transmission Dynamics of Aedes flavivirus. J Med Entomol 59(2):659-666.
6. Song X, Liu X, Liu F, Wang C (2021) Comparison of machine learning and logistic regression models in predicting acute kidney injury: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Med Inform151:104-484.
7. Wang XR, Burkhardt NY, Kurtti TJ, Oliver JD, et al (2021) Mitochondrion-Dependent Apoptosis Is Essential for Rickettsia parkeri Infection and Replication in Vector Cells. mSystems 6(2):e01209-1220.
8. Aung AK, Spelman DW, Murray RJ, Graves S (2014) Rickettsial infections in Southeast Asia: implications for local populace and febrile returned travelers. Am J Trop Med Hyg 91(3):451-460.
9. Visansirikul S, Kolodziej SA, Demchenko AV (2020) Staphylococcus aureus capsular polysaccharides: a structural and synthetic perspective. Org Biomol Chem 18(5):783-798.
10. Echániz-Aviles G, Velazquez-Meza ME, Rodríguez-Arvizu B, Carnalla-Barajas MN, Noguerón AS (2022) Detection of capsular genotypes of methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus and clonal distribution of the cap5 and cap8 genes in clinical isolates. Arch Microbiol 204(3):186.
11. Wojcik-Bojek U, Rozalska B, Sadowska B (2022) Staphylococcus aureus-A Known Opponent against Host Defense Mechanisms and Vaccine Development-Do We Still Have a Chance to Win?. Int J Mol Sci 23(2):948.
12. Muller P, Lemcke H, David R (2018) Stem Cell Therapy in Heart Diseases - Cell Types, Mechanisms and Improvement Strategies. Cell Physiol Biochem 48(6):2607-2655.