



**HAL**  
open science

## Long-term patient reported outcomes and hematologic toxicity among patients who received Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factors during chemotherapy for early breast cancer

Pietro Lapidari, Arnauld Gbenou, Julie Havas, Elise Martin, Barbara Pistilli, Anne-Laure Martin, Sibille Everhard, Charles Coutant, Paul Cottu, Anne Lesur, et al.

### ► To cite this version:

Pietro Lapidari, Arnauld Gbenou, Julie Havas, Elise Martin, Barbara Pistilli, et al.. Long-term patient reported outcomes and hematologic toxicity among patients who received Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factors during chemotherapy for early breast cancer. *The Breast*, 2021, 57, pp.43-48. 10.1016/j.breast.2021.02.014 . hal-04769597

**HAL Id: hal-04769597**

**<https://hal.science/hal-04769597v1>**

Submitted on 13 Nov 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

**Title: Long-term patient reported outcomes and hematologic toxicity among patients who received Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factors during chemotherapy for early breast cancer**

**Authors:** Pietro Lapidari<sup>1,2</sup>, Arnauld Gbenou<sup>1</sup>, Julie Havas<sup>1</sup>, Elise Martin<sup>1</sup>, Barbara Pistilli<sup>1</sup>, Anne-Laure Martin<sup>3</sup>, Sibille Everhard<sup>3</sup>, Charles Coutant<sup>4</sup>, Paul Cottu<sup>5</sup>, Anne Lesur<sup>6</sup>, Florence Lerebours<sup>7</sup>, Olivier Tredan<sup>8</sup>, Laurence Vanlemmens<sup>9</sup>, Christelle Jouannaud<sup>10</sup>, Christelle Levy<sup>11</sup>, Olivier Rigal<sup>12</sup>, Marion Fournier<sup>13</sup>, Fabrice Andre<sup>1</sup>, Ines Vaz-Luis<sup>1</sup>, Antonio Di Meglio<sup>1,\*</sup>

**Affiliations:**

- (1) Gustave Roussy, Villejuif, FR;
- (2) Univesità degli Studi di Pavia, Pavia, IT
- (3) Unicancer, Paris
- (4) Centre Georges-François Leclerc, Dijon
- (5) Institut Curie, Paris
- (6) Centre Alexis Vautrin, VANDOEUVRE LES NANCY
- (7) Institut CURIE\_Hôpital René Huguenin, SAINT CLOUD
- (8) Centre Léon Berard, LYON
- (9) Centre Oscar Lambret, Lille
- (10) Institut Jean Godinot, Reims
- (11) Centre François Baclesse, CAEN
- (12) Centre Henri Becquerel, Rouen
- (13) Institut Bergonié, Bordeaux

**\*Corresponding author:**

**Name:** Antonio Di Meglio, MD

**Address:** Institut Gustave Roussy, 39 rue Camille Desmoulins, 94800, Villejuif, France

**Telephone and fax numbers:** +33 (0)142114827

**E-mail:** Antonio.DI-MEGLIO@gustaveroussy.fr

**Running title:** Long-term effects of Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factors in early breast cancer patients

**Word count:** Abstract 100/100; Manuscript 1185.

2 Tables, 2 Figures, 1 Supplementary Table.

**Keywords:** breast cancer, survivorship, Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factors, health-related quality-of-life, patient-reported outcomes

**Ethical approval:** The CANTO study was approved by the national regulatory authorities of France (ID-RCB: 2011-A01095-36) and by the ethics committee CPP IDF VII (11-039). Informed consent for study participation was obtained at patient enrollment.

**Data availability:** CANTO data is available upon request to a dedicated study Executive Committee (<http://www.unicancer.fr/rd-unicancer/letude-canto>).

**Funding:** This research was supported by a Career Catalyst Research grant from Susan G. Komen (CCR17483507) to Ines Vaz-Luis, funding from Odyssea to Ines Vaz-Luis and from Foundation Gustave Roussy to Ines Vaz-Luis. The CANTO study is supported by the French Government under the “Investment for the Future” program managed by the National Research Agency (ANR), grant n° ANR-10-COHO-0004.

**Previous presentations:** This manuscript contains original material. Portions of this work were presented in the Mini Oral session of the ESMO Virtual Congress on September 18, 2020 (<https://oncologypro.esmo.org/meeting-resources/esmo-virtual-congress-2020/long-term-patient-reported-outcomes-pro-and-hematologic-toxicity-among-patients-pts-who-received-granulocyte-colony-stimulating-factors-g-csf>; *Annals of Oncology* (2020) 31 (suppl\_4): S988-S1017. 10.1016/annonc/annonc291). This study was also recognized with an ESMO Merit Award to Dr. Lapidari.

**Conflict of interest statement:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## **ABSTRACT**

We assessed long-term associations of Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factors (G-CSF) use with patient-reported outcomes (PROs) and hematologic toxicity among chemotherapy-treated, early-stage breast cancer patients in CANTO (NCT01993498).

Among 2920 patients longitudinally followed-up until year-4 after diagnosis, 49% used G-CSF. In multivariable-adjusted mixed-models, EORTC QLQ-C30 pain and summary score were not substantially different between groups (overall adjusted mean difference, use vs no-use [95%CI]: +1.27 [-0.33 to +2.87] and -1.01 [-1.98 to -0.04], respectively). PROs were slightly worse at year-4 among patients receiving G-CSF, although differences were of trivial clinical significance. No major differences were observed in leucocyte or platelet count over time.

## INTRODUCTION

Adjuvant chemotherapy reduces recurrence risk and improves survival in women with early breast cancer (EBC). Patients with unfavorable prognostic clinical, pathological, and molecular features, including stage 2 or 3 BC, Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2 overexpressing BC, triple-negative BC or estrogen-receptor positive BC with unfavorable genomic signatures, typically derive bigger absolute benefit from such strategy.[1,2] Nevertheless, chemotherapy can induce relevant hematologic toxicities, namely leukopenia, neutropenia and febrile neutropenia (FN), which are important limiting factors in cycles spacing, potentially leading to serious morbidity and complications [3–5]. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factors (G-CSF) are able to reduce the incidence of FN, with the relative risk of FN being almost halved among patients receiving G-CSF during standard chemotherapy [6–9]. This allows pre-defined chemotherapy schedules and avoiding delays, particularly in dose-dense regimens [10,11]. G-CSF are generally well tolerated, although some short-term toxicities were reported, most frequently medullary bone pain (25-36%) [12,13]. Other adverse reactions include leukocytosis, transient thrombocytopenia and transient reversible alterations in chemistries [12–21]. Very few data exist about long-term toxicities and impact on patient-reported quality of life (QOL) [22]. We aimed to assess associations between G-CSF utilization and long-term variation in patient reported outcomes (PROs) and hematologic values, using CANTO data (CANcer TOxicities cohort; NCT01993498). CANTO is a prospective, multicenter study that enrolled patients with stage I-II-III BC across 26 centers in France. The study collects extensive longitudinal clinical, sociodemographic, tumor, treatment, and PROs data, with the specific purpose of characterizing long-term toxicities of BC and its treatments. Patients are assessed at diagnosis and at several time-points during follow-up after primary treatment completion, which includes surgery, chemo- and/or radiation-therapy, whatever came last. Endocrine and anti-HER2 treatment could be ongoing in the follow-up phases. All participants provided informed consent and the study was approved by the national regulatory and ethics committee (ID-RCB:2011-A01095-36,11-039). Study procedures were previously described. [23]

## METHODS

We used data of 6,619 women with EBC from CANTO, with available follow-up until year-4 post-diagnosis (**Figure 1**). Per protocol, CANTO patients are censored at BC recurrence. Our primary outcome was pain, assessed using the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) QOL questionnaire (QLQ)-C30 v3.0. [24] Exploratory outcomes were QLQ C30-Summary score [25–27], all other QLQ-C30 domains, leukocyte and platelet counts. PROs were longitudinally collected at diagnosis (baseline), year-1, year-2- and year-4 post-diagnosis. Hematological values were obtained from blood samples at diagnosis, at year-1 and year-4 post-diagnosis. G-CSF use (yes vs no) was our independent variable.

We used longitudinal mixed models to assess associations between G-CSF use and continuous outcomes. Covariates included time, G-CSF use-by-time interaction and cohort characteristics (categorized per **Table 1**). We obtained model-based, multivariable-adjusted mean values within groups, mean between-group differences (G-CSF use vs no) and respective 95% Confidence Intervals (CI) at each time point for each outcome. Adjustment factors were chosen based on differences in univariate tests between groups ( $p < 0.05$ ) and variables of *a priori* clinical interest.

Statistical analysis was performed using R studio (R version 3.6.2) and SAS statistical software Version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc.) Statistical significance was defined with a 2-sided  $p$ -value  $< 0.05$ .

## RESULTS

**Cohort description.** We included 2,920 women treated with chemotherapy that had available information on G-CSF use and primary outcome assessments (**Figure 1**). Mean age was 52.7 years (Standard Deviation [SD] 11.0). Most women (86.3%) received anthracycline-taxane containing regimens (FAC/FEC+docetaxel=85.1%). 1,422 patients (48.7%) received G-CSF (long-acting [pegfilgrastim]=47.5%, short-acting [filgrastim or lenograstim]=28.3%, combinations of the two=9.4%, others=13%). Mean duration of G-CSF treatment with was 12.3 weeks (SD 13.8).

Patients receiving G-CSF were older, more frequently had higher stage BC, underwent axillary dissection and received AI vs. those not receiving G-CSF (**Table 1**).

**PROs and hematological values by G-CSF use.** Patients receiving G-CSF seemed to have worse baseline PROs, including lower Summary Score (**Figure 2** and **Table 2**).

Over time, pain score was not statistically different between groups, with an adjusted overall mean difference (adjMD) (vs no G-CSF use) of +1.27 (95% CI -0.33 to +2.87). The trajectory of C30-Summary Score behaved similarly, with an adjMD (vs no G-CSF use) of -1.01 (95% CI -1.98 to -0.04). **Figure 2** displays mean values by group (**2A,B**) and mean differences vs no G-CSF in pain and C30 Summary Score at each time point (**2C,D**). For both outcomes, we observed slightly worse scores at year-4 post-diagnosis among patients receiving G-CSF (**Figure 2C,D**). Consistently, other evaluated PROs were substantially similar between groups (**Table 2, Supplementary Table 1**).

No major differences were observed in leucocyte or platelet count (overall adjMD vs no-G-CSF use [95% CI]: -281 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> [-394 to -168] and -255 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> [-4452 to +3942], respectively [**Figure 2E,G** and **2F,H**, respectively]) (**Table 2** and **Supplementary Table 1** show between-group differences and mean scores by group at each time point).

## DISCUSSION

In this CANTO sub-study, we observed similar patterns in QOL and hematological values between patients receiving G-CSF or not during (neo)adjuvant chemotherapy for EBC. All explored outcomes followed almost superimposable long-term trajectories.

Among patients receiving G-CSF, several short-term side effects were previously described and some biological mechanisms were proposed. G-CSF are thought to trigger medullary bone pain through bone marrow expansion, activation of pro-inflammatory circuits and sensitization of peripheral nerve fibers to pain stimuli [28–30]. In addition, after a prolonged G-CSF-stimulated granulopoiesis, the number of erythropoietic progenitors may decline, favoring the onset of anemia and thrombocytopenia [12,17,18,21]. Building on this, we hypothesized that some inflammatory



and hematopoietic alterations may persist in patients receiving G-CSF, resulting in worse pain, worse PROs and hematologic toxicity over time. Although minor differences were present at later time-points in our analysis, suggesting a slightly worse status among patients treated with G-CSF (e.g., pain score +2.75 points at year-4), differences of such small magnitude may have only trivial clinical significance, as reported by Cocks K. [31]. In addition, the overall trend of similar trajectories between groups does not indicate substantial detrimental effects of G-CSF on long-term QOL and hematological profile. Strengths of our study include its large sample, longitudinal design and availability of socio-demographic, clinical and treatment data, allowing to adjust our analyses. Nevertheless, we acknowledge some residual selection bias, as there were baseline and treatment differences between the groups and potential unmeasurable confounders beyond adjustment factors. For example, patients receiving G-CSF scored slightly worse at diagnosis, denoting a poorer initial clinical condition, and received more frequently adjuvant treatments that may lead to increased patient-reported pain (e.g., AI). Statistical adjustment may not be able to fully address such differences.

In conclusion, G-CSF seemed overall well-tolerated in our cohort, with no major clinical impact on PROs and hematologic toxicity on the long run. Although we did not report safety concerns or specific warning signals about long-term impact of G-CSF use in this study, appropriate G-CSF administration during chemotherapy for EBC is warranted. A number of reports documented G-CSF overuse in clinical practice, with 10%-62% of patients receiving G-CSF as prophylaxis during regimens at low-risk for neutropenic events or as therapy for existing FN [32–35]. G-CSF support should be provided as recommended by dedicated guidelines [6] and in the setting of emerging algorithms, suggesting feasibility and safety of its omission while respecting pre-specified safety rules [36].

## References

- [1] Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG). Effects of chemotherapy and hormonal therapy for early breast cancer on recurrence and 15-year survival: an overview of the randomised trials. *Lancet* 2005;365:1687–717. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)66544-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)66544-0).
- [2] Burstein HJ, Curigliano G, Loibl S, Dubsy P, Gnant M, Poortmans P, et al. Estimating the benefits of therapy for early-stage breast cancer: the St. Gallen International Consensus Guidelines for the primary therapy of early breast cancer 2019. *Ann Oncol Off J Eur Soc Med Oncol* 2019;30:1541–57. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdz235>.
- [3] Del Mastro L, De Placido S, Bruzzi P, De Laurentiis M, Boni C, Cavazzini G, et al. Fluorouracil and dose-dense chemotherapy in adjuvant treatment of patients with early-stage breast cancer: an open-label, 2 × 2 factorial, randomised phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2015;385:1863–72. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)62048-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)62048-1).
- [4] Klastersky J, de Naurois J, Rolston K, Rapoport B, Maschmeyer G, Apro M, et al. Management of febrile neutropaenia: ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Ann Oncol* 2016;27:v111–8. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdw325>.
- [5] Weycker D, Li X, Edelsberg J, Barron R, Kartashov A, Xu H, et al. Risk and Consequences of Chemotherapy-Induced Febrile Neutropenia in Patients With Metastatic Solid Tumors. *J Oncol Pract* 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1200/jop.2014.001492>.
- [6] Apro MS, Bohlius J, Cameron DA, Lago LD, Donnelly JP, Kearney N, et al. 2010 update of EORTC guidelines for the use of granulocyte-colony stimulating factor to reduce the incidence of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia in adult patients with lymphoproliferative disorders and solid tumours. *Eur J Cancer* 2011;47:8–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejca.2010.10.013>.
- [7] Kelly S, Wheatley D. Prevention of febrile neutropenia: use of granulocyte colony-stimulating factors. *Br J Cancer* 2009;101 Suppl:S6-10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6605269>.
- [8] Cooper KL, Madan J, Whyte S, Stevenson MD, Akehurst RL. Granulocyte colony-stimulating factors for febrile neutropenia prophylaxis following chemotherapy: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Cancer* 2011;11:404. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-11-404>.
- [9] Kuderer NM, Dale DC, Crawford J, Lyman GH. Impact of Primary Prophylaxis With Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factor on Febrile Neutropenia and Mortality in Adult Cancer Patients Receiving Chemotherapy: A Systematic Review. *J Clin Oncol* 2007;25:3158–67. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2006.08.8823>.
- [10] Citron ML, Berry DA, Cirincione C, Hudis C, Winer EP, Gradishar WJ, et al. Randomized trial of dose-dense versus conventionally scheduled and sequential versus concurrent combination chemotherapy as postoperative adjuvant treatment of node-positive primary breast cancer: first report of Intergroup Trial C9741/Cancer and Leukemia. *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol* 2003;21:1431–9. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2003.09.081>.
- [11] Bonilla L, Ben-Aharon I, Vidal L, Gafter-Gvili A, Leibovici L, Stemmer SM. Dose-Dense Chemotherapy in Nonmetastatic Breast Cancer: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *JNCI J Natl Cancer Inst* 2010;102:1845–54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jnci/djq409>.
- [12] Holmes FA, O'Shaughnessy JA, Vukelja S, Jones SE, Shogan J, Savin M, et al. Blinded, Randomized, Multicenter Study to Evaluate Single Administration Pegfilgrastim Once per Cycle Versus Daily Filgrastim as an Adjunct to Chemotherapy in Patients With High-Risk Stage II or Stage III/IV Breast Cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20:727–31. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2002.20.3.727>.
- [13] Holmes FA, Jones SE, O'Shaughnessy J, Vukelja S, George T, Savin M, et al. Comparable efficacy and safety profiles of once-per-cycle pegfilgrastim and daily injection filgrastim in chemotherapy-induced neutropenia: a multicenter dose-finding study in women with breast cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2002;13:903–9. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdf130>.

- [14] Aapro M, Crawford J, Kamioner D. Prophylaxis of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia with granulocyte colony-stimulating factors: where are we now? *Support Care Cancer* 2010;18:529–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-010-0816-y>.
- [15] Yang B-B, Savin MA, Green M. Prevention of Chemotherapy-Induced Neutropenia with Pegfilgrastim: Pharmacokinetics and Patient Outcomes. *Chemotherapy* 2012;58:387–98. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000345626>.
- [16] Dunn CJ, Goa KL. Lenograstim. *Drugs* 2000;59:681–717. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00003495-200059030-00017>.
- [17] D’Souza A, Jaiyesimi I, Trainor L, Venuturumili P. Granulocyte Colony–Stimulating Factor Administration: Adverse Events. *Transfus Med Rev* 2008;22:280–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmr.2008.05.005>.
- [18] Green MD, Koelbl H, Baselga J, Galid A, Guillem V, Gascon P, et al. A randomized double-blind multicenter phase III study of fixed-dose single-administration pegfilgrastim versus daily filgrastim in patients receiving myelosuppressive chemotherapy. *Ann Oncol* 2003;14:29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdg019>.
- [19] Jakubowski A, Gabrilove J. Granulocyte Colony Stimulating Factor (G-CSF): Biology and Clinical Status. *Cancer Biother Radiopharm* 1996;11:5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cbr.1996.11.5>.
- [20] Raposo CG, Marín ÁP, Barón MG. Colony-stimulating factors: clinical evidence for treatment and prophylaxis of chemotherapy-induced febrile neutropenia. *Clin Transl Oncol* 2006;8:729–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12094-006-0119-4>.
- [21] Frampton JE, Yarker YE, Goa KL. Lenograstim. *Drugs* 1995;49:767–93. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00003495-199549050-00009>.
- [22] Lapidari P, Vaz-Luis I, Di Meglio A. Side effects of using granulocyte-colony stimulating factors as prophylaxis of febrile neutropenia in cancer patients: A systematic review. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2021;157:103193. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.critrevonc.2020.103193>.
- [23] Vaz-Luis I, Cottu P, Mesleard C, Martin AL, Dumas A, Dauchy S, et al. UNICANCER: French prospective cohort study of treatment-related chronic toxicity in women with localised breast cancer (CANTO). *ESMO Open* 2019;4:e000562. <https://doi.org/10.1136/esmoopen-2019-000562>.
- [24] Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, Bullinger M, Cull A, Duez NJ, et al. The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: a quality-of-life instrument for use in international clinical trials in oncology. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1993;85:365–76.
- [25] O H, BH de R, J K, S O, F M, NK A, et al. The EORTC QLQ-C30 Summary Score as Prognostic Factor for Survival of Patients With Cancer in the “Real-World”: Results From the Population-Based PROFILES Registry. *Oncologist* 2020;25. <https://doi.org/10.1634/THEONCOLOGIST.2019-0348>.
- [26] Giesinger JM, Kieffer JM, Fayers PM, Groenvold M, Petersen MA, Scott NW, et al. Replication and validation of higher order models demonstrated that a summary score for the EORTC QLQ-C30 is robust. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;69:79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.08.007>.
- [27] Phillips R, Gandhi M, Cheung YB, Findlay MP, Win KM, Hai HH, et al. Summary scores captured changes in subjects’ QoL as measured by the multiple scales of the EORTC QLQ-C30. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2015;68:895–902. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.02.011>.
- [28] Lambertini M, Del Mastro L, Bellodi A, Pronzato P. The five “Ws” for bone pain due to the administration of granulocyte-colony stimulating factors (G-CSFs). *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2014;89:112–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.critrevonc.2013.08.006>.
- [29] Lindemann A, Riedel D, Oster W, Ziegler-Heitbrock HW, Mertelsmann R, Herrmann F. Granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor induces cytokine secretion by human polymorphonuclear leukocytes. *J Clin Invest* 1989;83:1308–12. <https://doi.org/10.1172/JCI114016>.
- [30] Wirthmueller U, De Weck AL, Dahinden CA. Platelet-activating factor production in human neutrophils by sequential stimulation with granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor and the chemotactic factors C5A or formyl-methionyl-leucyl-phenylalanine. *J Immunol* 1989;142:3213–8.


- [31] K C, MT K, G V, M MS-J, PM F, JM B. Evidence-based Guidelines for Determination of Sample Size and Interpretation of the European Organisation for the Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire Core 30. *J Clin Oncol* 2011;29. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.2010.28.0107>.
- [32] JD W, AI N, CV A, SN L, ET W, YS L, et al. Deviations from guideline-based therapy for febrile neutropenia in cancer patients and their effect on outcomes. *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173. <https://doi.org/10.1001/JAMAINTERNMED.2013.2921>.
- [33] AG F, EJ B, KA S, MJ B, JI I, CA M, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the use of antimicrobial agents in neutropenic patients with cancer: 2010 Update by the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis* 2011;52. <https://doi.org/10.1093/CID/CIQ147>.
- [34] AL P, JL M, B K, EA C, SB M, N H, et al. Use of colony-stimulating factors with chemotherapy: opportunities for cost savings and improved outcomes. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2011;103. <https://doi.org/10.1093/JNCI/DJR152>.
- [35] Waters GE, Corrigan P, Gatesman M, Smith TJ. Comparison of Pegfilgrastim Prescribing Practice to National Guidelines at a University Hospital Outpatient Oncology Clinic. *J Oncol Pract* 2013;9:203. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JOP.2012.000662>.
- [36] Vaz-Luis I, Barroso-Sousa R, Di Meglio A, Hu J, Rees R, Sinclair N, et al. Avoiding Peg-Filgrastim Prophylaxis During the Paclitaxel Portion of the Dose-Dense Doxorubicin-Cyclophosphamide and Paclitaxel Regimen: A Prospective Study. *J Clin Oncol* 2020;JCO.19.02484. <https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.19.02484>.

## FIGURE LEGENDS


**Figure 1.** CONSORT diagram of patient population. G-CSF= Granulocyte-Colony Stimulating Factors; PRO= patient-reported outcomes

**Figure 2.** Mean model-based pain and summary score values (EORTC QLQ-C30) over time (**2A, B**) and between-group differences (**2C, D**) in pain and summary score (G-CSF use vs no). Mean model-based leukocyte and platelet count values over time (**2E, F**) and between-group differences (**2G, H**) in leukocyte and platelet count (G-CSF use vs no). C30 summary score is calculated using the mean scores for 13 of the 15 QLQ-C30 domains (the Global Health and the Financial Impact scales are not included) and has appeared to have stronger prognostic value for overall survival than single QLQ-C30 domains. For functional scales, higher scores and a positive difference indicate a better condition. Vice versa, for symptom scales higher scores and a positive difference are indicative of a worse symptomatology. 95% Confidence Interval around the mean difference not crossing 0 indicate a statistically significant difference.

**Figure 1**




**Figure 2**



**2A**


**EORTC QLQ-C30 Pain**



**2C**


Adjusted overall mean difference: +1.27 (95% CI -0.33 to +2.87)

**EORTC QLQ-C30 Summary Score**



**2B**

**Between groups differences (vs. No-G-CSF)**




**2D**

Adjusted overall mean difference: -1.01 (95% CI -1.98 to -0.04)


**Figure 2**

**Leukocyte count**




**2E**

**Platelet count**



**2F**


**Between groups differences (vs. no-G-CSF)**



**2G**

Adjusted overall mean difference:  
-281 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (95% CI -394 to -168)

**Between groups differences (vs. no-G-CSF)**



**2H**

Adjusted overall mean difference:  
-255 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (95% CI -4452 to +3942)



TABLES

Table 1. Cohort characteristics overall and by use of G-CSF				
	Whole cohort	By use of G-CSF		
N (%)		Yes	No	p*
<b>Total</b>	2920 (%)	1422 (48.7%)	1498 (51.3%)	
<b>Age at diagnosis, years</b>				
Mean (SD)	52.7 (11.0)	53.4 (11.3)	52.1 (10.7)	<0.001
Missing	-	-	-	
<b>Marital Status</b>				
In a relationship	2086 (74.6)	1044 (76.0)	1042 (73.2)	0.097
Not in a relationship	712 (25.4)	330 (24.0)	382 (26.8)	
Missing	122	48	74	
<b>Highest education level</b>				
Primary or lower	370 (13.1)	191 (13.8)	179 (12.4)	0.122
High school	1298 (45.9)	651 (47.1)	647 (44.8)	
College graduate or higher	1159 (41.0)	541 (39.1)	618 (42.8)	
Missing	93	39	54	
<b>Menopausal status</b>				
Premenopausal	1380 (48.1)	619 (44.6)	761 (51.5)	<0.001
Postmenopausal	1487 (51.9)	770 (55.4)	717 (48.5)	
Missing	53	33	20	
<b>Charlson Comorbidity Index</b>				
0	2179 (81.0)	1033 (80.4)	1146 (81.6)	0.443
1+	510 (19.0)	252 (19.6)	258 (18.4)	
Missing	231	137	94	
<b>Smoking behavior</b>				
Active smoker	537 (18.6)	233 (16.6)	304 (20.6)	0.006
Former/Never smoker	2344 (81.4)	1173 (83.4)	1172 (79.4)	
Missing	39	16	23	
<b>Tumor stage</b>				
I	792 (27.2)	373 (26.3)	419 (28.0)	0.032
II	1607 (55.1)	768 (54.1)	839 (56.0)	
III	518 (17.7)	279 (19.6)	239 (16.0)	
Missing	3	2	1	
<b>Breast surgery</b>				
Partial surgery	1834 (62.8)	874 (61.5)	960 (64.1)	0.154
Mastectomy	1086 (37.2)	548 (38.5)	538 (35.9)	
Missing	-	-	-	

<b>Axillary surgery</b>				
Sentinel lymph node	1181 (40.4)	548 (38.5)	633 (42.3)	0.045
Axillary dissection	1739 (59.6)	874 (61.5)	865 (57.7)	
Missing	-	-	-	
<b>Chemotherapy</b>				
Adjuvant	2272 (77.8)	1115 (78.4)	1157 (77.2)	0.472
Neoadjuvant	648 (22.2)	307 (21.6)	341 (22.8)	
Missing	-	-	-	
<b>Type of chemotherapy</b>				
Anthracyclines	118 (4.0)	63 (4.4)	55 (3.7)	0.340
Taxanes	283 (9.7)	129 (9.1)	154 (10.3)	
Anthracyclines and Taxanes	2519 (86.3)	1230 (86.5)	1289 (86.0)	
Missing	-	-	-	
<b>Adjuvant radiation therapy</b>				
No	194 (6.7)	91 (6.4)	103 (6.9)	0.662
Yes	2723 (93.3)	1329 (93.6)	1394 (93.1)	
Missing	3	2	1	
<b>Endocrine therapy</b>				
Tamoxifen	856 (29.4)	394 (27.8)	462 (30.9)	0.019
Aromatase Inhibitor	1348 (46.3)	694 (49.0)	654 (43.8)	
No	707 (24.3)	329 (23.2)	378 (25.3)	
Missing	9	5	4	
<b>Anti-HER2 therapy</b>				
No	2279 (78.1)	1134 (79.8)	1145 (76.4)	0.031
Yes	640 (21.9)	287 (20.2)	353 (23.6)	
Missing	1	1	-	
*The distribution of variables by G-CSF use was described with Wilcoxon test for continuous variables and with chi-square tests for categorical variables. G-CSF= Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factors; SD= Standard Deviation; HER= Human Epidermal growth factor Receptor				

<b>Table 2. Mean between-group differences (G-CSF use vs no) in patient-reported outcomes and hematological values.</b>								
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Diagnosis (baseline)</b>		<b>Year-1</b>		<b>Year-2</b>		<b>Year-4</b>	
	<b>Mean difference vs no G-CSF</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>Mean difference vs no G-CSF</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>Mean difference vs no G-CSF</b>	<b>95% CI</b>	<b>Mean difference vs no G-CSF</b>	<b>95% CI</b>
<b>EORTC QLQ-C30 Functional Scales</b>								
Global Health	-1.72	-3.24 to -0.21	-1.35	-2.83 to +0.14	-0.29	-1.81 to +1.23	-0.73	-2.54 to +1.08
Physical Function	-0.58	-1.62 to +0.45	-0.78	-2.03 to +0.46	-0.43	-1.72 to +0.86	-0.95	-2.38 to +0.48
Emotional Function	-0.68	-2.60 to +1.24	-0.37	-2.34 to +1.60	+0.76	-1.28 to +2.80	-0.28	-2.64 to +2.08
Social Function	-0.67	-2.20 to +0.85	-1.30	-3.35 to +0.75	+1.29	-0.60 to +3.18	-0.67	-2.86 to +1.53
Cognitive Function	-1.31	-3.03 to +0.40	+0.12	-1.87 to +2.11	+0.41	-1.65 to +2.47	-1.29	-3.60 to +1.02
Role Function	-1.99	-3.78 to -0.20	-1.87	-3.91 to +0.17	-0.60	-2.59 to +1.40	-2.24	-4.47 to +0.002
<b>EORTC QLQ-C30 Symptom Scales</b>								
Fatigue	+1.14	-0.76 to +3.03	+1.56	-0.49 to +3.61	+0.44	-1.60 to +2.48	+0.41	-1.94 to +2.76
Insomnia	+2.08	-0.58 to +4.74	+2.20	-0.61 to +4.99	-0.20	-3.08 to +2.68	-0.47	-3.79 to +2.84
Nausea/Vomit	+0.08	-0.86 to +1.01	+0.30	-0.84 to +1.44	-0.91	-1.99 to +0.17	-0.13	-1.46 to +1.21
Dyspnea	+1.38	-0.29 to +3.05	+1.07	-1.07 to +3.20	+1.23	-0.91 to +3.38	+2.78	+0.31 to +5.26
Appetite Loss	+1.18	-0.84 to +3.19	+0.46	-1.24 to +2.16	-1.16	-2.71 to +0.40	+1.57	-0.41 to +3.55
Constipation	+1.75	+0.02 to +3.48	+2.74	+0.63 to +4.86	+3.98	+1.68 to +6.27	+1.93	-0.67 to +4.53
Diarrhea	+0.27	-1.20 to +1.74	-0.11	-1.83 to +1.61	-2.00	-3.63 to -0.37	+0.76	-1.33 to +2.84
Financial difficulties	-0.04	-1.59 to +1.50	+0.13	-2.04 to +2.31	+0.22	-1.67 to +2.11	+1.50	-0.38 to +3.39
<b>Hematological values</b>								
Leucocyte count (count/mm <sup>3</sup> )	-387	-540 to -233	-267	-425 to -110	N.A.	N.A.	-190	-336 to -45
Platelet count (count/mm <sup>3</sup> )	-629	-5630 to +4371	+133	-4364 to +4630	N.A.	N.A.	-269	-5333 to +4794

Estimates were obtained from a mixed model including G-CSF use, time, G-CSF use\*time interaction, and covariates: age, marital status, education level, Charlson score, smoke behavior, stage of disease, breast surgery, axillary surgery, type of chemo- and endocrine therapy, anti-HER2 therapy (categorized as in Table 1). All reported values are model-based, multivariable-adjusted average scores. For functional scales, a positive difference indicates a better condition. Vice versa, for symptom scales a positive difference is indicative of a worse symptomatology. 95% Confidence Interval around the mean difference not crossing 0 are bolded and indicate a statistically significant difference.

G-CSF= Granulocyte Colony-Stimulating Factors; CI= Confidence Interval; EORTC QLQ-C30= European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer Quality of Life Questionnaire-C30; N.A.= not assessed.