

1 The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on health related
2 quality of life in head and neck cancer survivors: an
3 observational cohort study

4

5 B.I. Lissenberg-Witte^{1,2}, F. Jansen^{3,4,5}, R.J. Baatenburg de Jong⁶, F. Lamers^{4,7}, C.R. Leemans^{3,5}, S.F.
6 Oosting⁸, R.P. Takes⁹, I.M. Verdonck-de Leeuw^{3,4,5,10}

7

8 ¹Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit, Epidemiology and Data Science, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

9 ²Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Methodology, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

10 ³Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit, Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery, Amsterdam, the
11 Netherlands

12 ⁴Amsterdam Public Health Research Institute, Mental Health, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

13 ⁵Cancer Center Amsterdam, Treatment and Quality of Life, Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

14 ⁶Department of Otorhinolaryngology, Erasmus MC, University Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands

15 ⁷Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department of Psychiatry, Amsterdam, The
16 Netherlands

17 ⁸University of Groningen, Department of Medical Oncology, University Medical Center Groningen, Hanzeplein 1,
18 9700 RB Groningen, The Netherlands

19 ⁹Department of Otorhinolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen,
20 The Netherlands

21 ¹⁰Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Department Clinical, Neuro and Developmental Psychology, Van der
22 Boechorststraat 7-9, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

23

24

25

26 Corresponding author: Birgit I. Lissenberg-Witte (b.lissenberg@amsterdamumc.nl)

27

28

29 **Abstract**

30 **Background:** Physical, psychological, and social aspects of health-related quality of life (HRQOL)
31 among head and neck cancer (HNC) survivors may be more affected during the COVID-19 pandemic
32 than before the pandemic. However, the impact is not yet understood well.

33 **Methods:** Prospectively collected data from the NETHERlands QUality of life and Biomedical Cohort
34 study in HNC were used. All patients were diagnosed and treated before the COVID-19 pandemic.
35 Patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) collected 24 and 36 months after treatment (M24 and
36 M36) were compared between survivors who completed both assessments before the COVID-19
37 pandemic and those who completed M24 before but M36 during the pandemic. Personal, clinical,
38 physical, psychological, social, and lifestyle characteristics of the survivors assessed at baseline or
39 M24 were investigated as potential effect modifiers.

40 **Results:** In total, 318 HNC survivors were included, of which 199 completed both M24 and M36
41 before the COVID-19 pandemic and 119 completed M24 before but M36 during the pandemic.
42 Changes in HRQOL between 24 and 36 months follow-up did not differ between the two groups for
43 any of the PROMs. However, in some subgroups of HNC survivors the COVID-19 pandemic negatively
44 affected the course of HRQOL for several PROMs while it positively affected the course of HRQOL for
45 other PROMs.

46 **Conclusions:** The COVID-19 pandemic did not affect HRQOL in HNC survivors in general, but some
47 subgroups were affected in a positive and others in a negative way.

48 **Funding:** This work was supported by the Dutch Cancer Society [grant number VU 2013-5930] and
49 the Dutch Cancer Society, Alpe Young Investigator Grant [grant number 12820].

50 Introduction

51 Head and neck cancer (HNC) and its treatment negatively affect the physical, psychological, and
52 social aspects of health-related quality of life (HRQOL) not only before and during treatment but
53 also in long-term survivors [1-6]. It may be that HRQOL of HNC survivors is even more affected in
54 the setting of the COVID-19 pandemic which had an enormous health care, societal and economic
55 impact, but this is not yet understood very well. Previous studies among cancer patients reported a
56 negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on HRQOL related to physical [7, 8], psychological [7, 9-
57 12], and social functioning [7, 10, 12]. Other studies found no effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on
58 HRQOL [13, 14] or showed an improvement in physical, role, and social functioning [12] and less
59 loneliness [10]. Several studies investigated possible effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on HRQOL
60 among HNC patients specifically [15-19]. Gallo et al. reported a negative effect on physical, role
61 and emotional functioning and no effect on cognitive and social functioning, global quality of life,
62 or cancer related symptoms [15]. Hamilton et al. found a negative impact on cancer related
63 symptoms [16]. Kirtane et al. conducted a qualitative study and found a negative impact of the
64 COVID-19 pandemic on psychological distress and social isolation [17]. In contrast, Rodrigues-
65 Oliveira et al. found no differences on symptoms of anxiety and depression between HNC patients
66 during radiotherapy before or after the COVID-19 pandemic [18]. Büntzel et al. reported a negative
67 effect on physical and psychological function, and isolation, and a positive effect on relations with
68 family and nature [19].

69 An explanation for these different and sometimes contradictory findings on the impact of the
70 COVID-19 pandemic among cancer patients might be that most investigators used cross-sectional
71 study designs, and compared the results to reference values or historical cohorts [9-11, 13-19]. Only
72 few studies investigated HRQOL longitudinally, in which part of the measurements were carried out
73 before the COVID-19 pandemic and others during the pandemic [8, 12] or in which cancer patients
74 were prospectively followed during the COVID-19 pandemic [7]. Another explanation for the various
75 previous findings might be that the COVID-19 pandemic affected some patients more than others.
76 Factors that might moderate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic are age, sex, educational level,
77 marital status, household composition, type and stage of cancer, treatment intent, physical health,
78 job security, and pre-existing psychological problems [7, 9, 14]. Thus far, studies longitudinally
79 investigating the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic on HRQOL among HNC survivors are lacking.
80 The aim of this study is to prospectively investigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on HRQOL
81 among HNC survivors. The following two research questions are addressed: 1) Did the COVID-19
82 pandemic change the course of HRQOL over time (disease and tumor specific HRQOL, physical
83 activity, symptoms of distress, anxiety, and depression, fear of cancer recurrence, and loneliness),
84 2) Can subgroups of HNC patients (in terms of personal, clinical, psychological, physical, social,
85 lifestyle, and disease-related factors) be identified in which the course of HRQOL is positively or
86 negatively affected as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic.

87

88 **Methods**

89 *Study design and patients*

90 Data and samples were used from the NETHERlands QUality of life and Blomedical Cohort study in
91 HNC (NET-QUBIC), a prospective cohort study among 739 HNC patients. Patients were recruited
92 between March 2014 and June 2018. Patients were included before start of treatment (baseline)
93 and data was collected at baseline (T0) and 3, 6, 12, 24, and 36 months (M3, M6, M12, M24 and M36)
94 after end of treatment. Data was derived from an electronic case report form (eCRF) designed for
95 NET-QUBIC, patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) and fieldwork assessments. Newly
96 diagnosed HNC patients were included in NET-QUBIC if they were i) 18 years or older, ii) treated
97 with curative intent for cancer of the oral cavity, oropharynx, hypopharynx, larynx, or unknown
98 primary, and iii) able to write, read, and speak Dutch. Patients were excluded if they i) were unable
99 to understand the questions or test instructions, ii) had severe psychiatric comorbidities (i.e.
100 schizophrenia, Korsakoff's syndrome, dementia), or iii) were unable to understand informed
101 consent. In the current study, HNC survivors were included if they completed at least one PROM at
102 M36. Furthermore, only the T0, M24 and M36 PROMs were used. PROMs completed before March 14th
103 2020 were considered 'before COVID-19' while PROMs completed on or after March 14th 2020 were
104 considered 'during COVID-19'. Consent procedures were approved by the Medical Ethical Committee
105 of Amsterdam UMC location VUmc (METc VUmc 2013.301 (A2018.307)-NL45051.029.13)) and all
106 participating hospitals and followed the Dutch Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act. All
107 included survivors signed informed consent.

108 Details of the key components of NET-QUBIC were published previously: the study population
109 (including retention, attrition and potential selection bias), eCRF, the outcome assessment
110 protocol, biobanking protocol, data management (collection and storage), and data and sample
111 dissemination procedures [20, 21]. The STROBE guidelines were adhered when reporting the results
112 of this study [22]. As this was a not pre-planned post-hoc analysis of the original NET-QUBIC, no
113 formal sample size calculation for the current study has been performed.

114

115 *Outcome measures*

116 Disease specific and tumor specific HRQOL were measured with the European Organisation for
117 Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) Quality of Life Questionnaire (QLQ)-C30 and EORTC-
118 QLQ-HN35, respectively. The EORTC QLQ-C30 is a 30-item questionnaire and consists of one global
119 quality of life scale (QL), five functional scales (physical, role, emotional, cognitive and social
120 functioning), three symptom scales (fatigue, nausea and vomiting, and pain) and six single item
121 symptoms (dyspnoea, insomnia, appetite loss, constipation, diarrhoea and financial difficulties). A
122 sum score (SumSC) is based on the five functional scales, the three symptom scales and five of the
123 six single items (financial toxicity is not included) [23-25]. The EORTC-QLQ-HN35 consists of seven
124 HNC specific symptoms (pain, swallowing, senses, speech, social eating, social contact, and
125 sexuality) and ten single item symptoms (problems with teeth, dry mouth, sticky saliva, cough,

126 opening the mouth wide, weight loss, weight gain, use of nutritional supplements, feeding tubes,
127 and painkillers) [26]. QLQ-C30 and QLQ-HN35 Items were scored on a 4-point Likert scale and scores
128 for each of the subscales range from 0 to 100, where higher scores on QL, SumSC and the functional
129 scales indicate better HRQOL and functioning while higher scores on the symptom scales indicate
130 more symptoms.

131 Physical activity was measured with the Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly (PASE). The PASE is a
132 13-item questionnaire measuring duration and frequency of leisure time, household and work-
133 related physical activities [27, 28]. Subscale scores for each of the domains were calculated as well
134 as a total score. Higher scores on the subscales and total score indicate more physical activity. The
135 total activity score was also categorized as very poor, poor, fair, good, very good and excellent.

136 Distress and symptoms of anxiety and depression were measured using the Hospital Anxiety and
137 Depression Scale (HADS). The HADS is a 14-item questionnaire measuring emotional distress and
138 includes a total scale (HADS-T) and an anxiety (HADS-A) and depression (HADS-D) subscale [29].
139 Items were scored on a 4-point Likert scale and scores for each of the subscales range from 0 to 21,
140 where higher scores indicate higher extent of distress, depression or anxiety symptoms.

141 Fear of cancer recurrence was measured with the Cancer Worry Scale (CWS). The CWS is an 8-item
142 questionnaire measuring concerns about developing cancer or developing cancer again and the
143 effect of these concerns on daily life [30]. Items were scored on a 4-point Likert scale, and a total
144 scale score is calculated by summing all items, resulting in a total scale score ranging from 8 to 32.
145 A higher score indicates higher extent of fear of cancer recurrence.

146 Loneliness was measured with the De Jong Gierveld Loneliness Scale (De Jong Gierveld). The De
147 Jong Gierveld is an 11-item questionnaire measuring emotional and social loneliness [31, 32]. Items
148 were scored on a 3-point Likert scale. Scores for emotional loneliness range from 0 to 6 and scores
149 for social loneliness range from 0 to 5, where higher scores indicate higher loneliness. A total
150 loneliness score was calculated by summing the scores of the two scales. The total loneliness score
151 was also categorized as not lonely (score 0 to 2), moderate (score 3 to 8), severe (score 9 or 10) and
152 very severe (score 11) [33].

153

154 *Influencing factors*

155 Data on personal, clinical, physical, psychological, social, and lifestyle characteristics were
156 collected from eCRF data, PROMs and fieldwork assessments.

157 Personal factors (assessed at baseline) included age, sex, educational level (low, middle or high),
158 living status (alone or cohabiting), marital status (married or not married), and personality.

159 Personality was assessed by the extraversion subscale of the 60-item NEO Five Factor Inventory
160 (NEO-FFI) questionnaire [34]. Items are scored on a 5-point Likert scale. The extraversion subscale
161 consists of 12 item and ranges from 12 to 60, where a higher score indicates a higher level of
162 extraversion.

163 Clinical factors included tumor location (oral cavity, oropharynx, hypopharynx, larynx or unknown
164 primary), tumor stage (I/II or III/IV), treatment modality (single or multimodality treatment), World
165 Health Organization (WHO) performance status (0, able to carry out all normal activity without
166 restriction or ≥ 1 , restricted in normal activities), comorbidity and cancer progression at 24 months
167 follow-up. Comorbidity was assessed by the 27-item Adult Comorbidity Evaluation-27 (ACE-27)
168 Index, which categorizes comorbidity as none, mild, moderate and severe [35]. Cancer progression
169 status between end of treatment and M24 was categorized as residual disease, recurrence and/or
170 second primary tumor at M24 or none of those at M24.

171 Physical impairments in instrumental activities in daily life was assessed by the Instrumental
172 Activities of Daily Living (IADL) questionnaire [36].

173 Psychological characteristics included the presence of a major depressive disorder in the past year
174 at M24, and presence of a lifetime major depressive disorder at M24. Presence of a major
175 depressive disorder in the past year was assessed with the Composite International Diagnostic
176 Interview (CIDI), which is based on DSM-IV criteria [37]. The CIDI was assessed yearly during the
177 fieldwork assessment, i.e. at T0, M12 and 24. At T0, presence of a lifetime major depressive
178 disorder was also assessed. A lifetime major depressive disorder was scored as present in case it was
179 already present at baseline or when a major depressive disorder in the past year was diagnosed
180 during the CIDI at M12 and/or M24.

181 Having paid work (yes or no) was assessed by the iMTA productivity cost questionnaire at baseline
182 and at M24.

183 Lifestyle-related factors included excessive alcohol consumption (categorized as no or yes (at least
184 14 (women) or 21 (men) glasses of alcohol per week)), smoking behavior (categorized as current
185 smoker or never smoker and former smoker), and body mass index (BMI) at 24 months.

186

187 *Statistical analyses*

188 Data is described by number and frequency in case of categorical variables and by mean and
189 standard deviation (SD) in case of continuous variables. Differences in baseline characteristics
190 between survivors who completed M36 before COVID-19 and survivors who completed M36 during
191 COVID-19 as well as between survivors included in the current study and the other NET-QUBIC
192 participants were analyzed by the chi-square test or the independent sample t-test, depending on
193 the distribution of the variable. Difference in change from M24 to M436 of continuous PROMs
194 between the groups were analyzed by linear mixed effects models, with fixed effect for group,
195 follow-up measurement (M24 or M36) and their two-way interaction and a random intercept for
196 subject. Differences in change of dichotomous or categorical PROMs were analyzed by generalized
197 estimating equations (GEE), with a logit-link function (dichotomous PROMs) or cumulative logit-link
198 function (categorical PROMs). Reported effect sizes, with corresponding 95% confidence intervals
199 (CI) for the change between M24 and M36 include the difference between groups in change between

200 M24 and M36 based on the estimated marginal means for continuous PROMs and odds ratios (OR) for
201 dichotomous and categorical outcomes.

202 The modifying effect of potential influencing factors for the change between M24 and M36 was also
203 analyzed using linear mixed effects model, including fixed effects for group, measurement and the
204 potential effect modifier, all two-way interactions and the three-way interaction as well as a
205 random intercept for subject. In case of multiple effect modifiers for one PROM, analyses were
206 repeated after stratification for the factor with the lowest p-value (below 0.05) for the three-way
207 interaction. Continuous effect modifiers were stratified by median split. Stratification was only
208 done in case each stratum and each group (completely before COVID or partly during COVID)
209 contained at least 20 survivors. All analyses were performed in SPSS version 28 (IBM Corp., Armonk,
210 NY, USA). The two-sided significance level was set at 0.01, to account for the large number of
211 PROMs analyzed.

212 Results

213 *Study population*

214 Of the 739 participants included in NET-QUBIC, 487 were known to be alive and included in NET-
215 QUBIC at M24 of which 345 survivors completed at least one PROM questionnaire at the M36
216 assessment, 199 before the COVID-19 pandemic and 146 during the pandemic. Twenty-seven of
217 these 146 survivors also filled in the questionnaires at M24 during the pandemic, and were excluded
218 from analyses resulting in 119 survivors in the group with the M36 assessment during the pandemic
219 (Figure 1). Baseline characteristics, stratified by group, are displayed in Table 1. There were no
220 significant difference in characteristics between the groups. HNC survivors included in the current
221 study (n=318) had lower comorbidity and less often a lifetime major depressive disorder at M24
222 compared to HNC survivors who were not included (n=142) in the current study (Supplementary
223 Table 1).

224 *The course of HRQOL in relation to the COVID-19 pandemic*

225 There were no statistically significant differences in the change of PROMs between 24 and 36
226 months follow-up between survivors who completed all PROMs before COVID-19 and those who
227 completed the M36 assessment during COVID-19 (Table 2 and Supplemental Tables 2 and 3).

228 For 31 of the 46 PROMs, one or more factors were identified that showed a different effect of the
229 COVID-19 pandemic on the change of HRQOL between M24 and M36 ($p < 0.05$; Supplemental Table 4).
230 After stratification, the most important factors (with a p-value in at least one of the subgroups
231 < 0.01) were: gender, living status at baseline, treatment modality, comorbidity, cancer progression
232 status at M24, presence of a lifetime major depressive disorder at M24, and BMI at M24 (Figure 2;
233 Supplemental Table 5). Females deteriorated in PASE total score during COVID-19 while they
234 improved before COVID-19 (categorical) (OR: 0.25, 95% CI: [0.093; 0.68], $p = 0.007$). Survivors living
235 alone at baseline improved on EORTC-HN35 painkiller use during COVID-19 while they deteriorated
236 before COVID-19 (OR: 3.5, 95% CI [1.5; 8.1], $p = 0.003$). HNC survivors treated by multimodality
237 treatment who completed M36 during COVID-19 showed a deterioration on the EORTC-C30 loss of
238 appetite scale whereas survivors who completed M36 before COVID-19 improved (effect size: -8.5,
239 95% CI [-13.7; -3.4], $p = 0.001$). Survivors with residual disease, recurrence and/or second primary
240 tumor at M24 who completed M36 during COVID-19 improved on the EORTC-C30 financial problems
241 scale while survivors before COVID-19 deteriorated (effect size: 14.9, 95% CI: [5.4; 24.5], $p = 0.003$).
242 Survivors with moderate and severe comorbidity deteriorated on the EORTC-HN35 swallowing scale
243 during COVID-19 while survivors before COVID-19 improved (effect size: -10.2, 95% CI [-16.5; -3.9],
244 $p = 0.002$). Survivors with a lifetime major depressive disorder present at M24 deteriorated in fear of
245 recurrence during COVID-19 while they improved before COVID-19 (effect size: -3.0, 95% CI: [-5.1; -
246 0.84], $p = 0.007$). Finally, survivors with a BMI at M24 above the median improved on emotional
247 loneliness during COVID-19 while they deteriorated before COVID-19 (effect size: -0.72, 95% CI: -
248 1.2; -0.28], $p = 0.002$).

249

250 Discussion

251 Over all, the COVID-19 pandemic did not influence the change in HRQOL between 24 and 36 months
252 after treatment in HNC survivors. However, in some subgroups of HNC survivors the COVID-19
253 pandemic had a negative effect on some PROMs while in other groups there was a positive effect.
254 The COVID-19 pandemic had a negative effect on females (worsening of physical activity), survivors
255 treated with multimodality treatment (worsening of appetite loss), survivors with comorbidity
256 (worsening of swallowing problems), survivors with a history of a major depressive disorder
257 (worsening of fear of recurrence), and survivors with a high BMI (worsening of emotional loneliness).
258 The COVID-19 pandemic had a positive effect on survivors living alone (decrease of painkiller use)
259 and on survivors with disease progression (decrease of financial problems). Previous studies also
260 reported that sex and pre-existing psychological problems moderate the impact of the COVID-19
261 pandemic [7, 9, 14]. Furthermore, these studies suggested that also age, educational level, marital
262 status, household composition, type and stage of cancer, treatment intent, and physical health
263 might moderate the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic but this was not confirmed by the current
264 study [7, 9, 14].

265 An explanation for the negative and positive effects of the COVID-19 pandemic among subgroups of
266 HNC survivors might be an altered and unequal access to follow-up or supportive care during the
267 COVID-19 pandemic [7, 8, 17, 38, 39]. Among colorectal cancer survivors in follow-up care during
268 the COVID-19 pandemic, role, emotional and social functioning, fatigue, sleep disturbance, and
269 anxiety was worse in those survivors who had hospital visits canceled, postponed, or changed into
270 digital care, compared with survivors without changes in their cancer care planning [13]. In
271 contrast, a systematic review on studies investigating the effect of a reduction in follow-up
272 frequency during the COVID-19 pandemic among breast cancer patients, showed no adverse effect
273 on HRQOL (nor on survival) but improved cost-effectiveness of follow-up care. Four RCTs that
274 investigated follow-up on-demand versus scheduled follow-up visits found no statistically significant
275 differences in HRQOL [40]. What we learned from the COVID-19 pandemic is that supportive care
276 services were capable to make significant changes in the provision of their care in a short period of
277 time, and that eHealth was often used as integrated part of supportive care. However, it is known
278 that some cancer survivors benefit more from eHealth than others [41]. HNC survivors may also have
279 used peer support but a survey among health care professionals in the UK demonstrated that
280 different types of peer support are available but that referral to peer support is complex and divers
281 [42].

282 The key strength of this study is the prospective longitudinal research design. A limitation is that all
283 HNC survivors were included and finished their primary treatment for HNC before the COVID-19
284 pandemic, and the results cannot be generalized to those who were diagnosed and treated during
285 the COVID-19 pandemic. Also, for some variables, data were only available at baseline while their
286 situation may have changed two years later (e.g. marital status). Moreover, we investigated many
287 PROMs, and although we accounted for this by setting the significance level to 0.01, some of our
288 results could have been significant by chance. Finally, we do not know whether participating HNC

289 survivors were diagnosed with COVID-19. Cancer patients in general have higher odds to develop
290 severe COVID-19 and to die of the consequences [43].

291 In conclusion, the course of HRQOL between 24 and 36 months after treatment in HNC survivors in
292 general was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the COVID-19 pandemic did change
293 the course of some HRQOL domains or symptoms over time in some subgroups of HNC survivors. The
294 development of personalized supportive care programs including regular care, eHealth, and peer
295 support, tailored to the needs of the individual survivor may help to overcome disparities among
296 HNC survivors.

297

298 Funding

299 This work was supported by the Dutch Cancer Society [grant number VU 2013-5930] and the Dutch
300 Cancer Society, Alpe Young Investigator Grant [grant number 12820]. The funding body had no role
301 in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data nor in writing the
302 manuscript.

303

304 Competing interests

305 BLW: none

306 FJ: received funding from the Dutch Cancer Society, Alpe Young Investigator Grant [grant number
307 12820]. All payments were made to the institution.

308 RJBdJ: none

309 FL: received funding from the Dutch Cancer Society [grant numbers VU2017-8288 and 11839]. All
310 payments were made to the institution.

311 CRL: none

312 SFO: received funding from Celidex Therapeutics, payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations,
313 speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events from Merck and participated in the Data
314 Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board of GenMab and Bristol Myers Squibb. All payments were
315 made to the institution.

316 RPT: none

317 IMVdL: received funding from the Dutch Cancer Society (grant number VU 2013-5930). All payments
318 were made to the institution.

319

320 Data availability

321 The dataset generated and analyzed (including a deidentified version of it) during the current
322 study is not publicly available as the collection and integration of large amounts of personal,
323 biological, genetic and diagnostic information precludes open access to the NET-QUBIC research
324 data. Data are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. On the NET-QUBIC
325 website (www.kubusproject.nl) is described how NET-QUBIC data are made available for the
326 research community. In short, a research proposal has to be submitted to the NET-QUBIC steering
327 committee. The researcher has to be a member of the NET-QUBIC consortium, or a consortium
328 member has to collaborate in the project. The NET-QUBIC steering committee will judge the
329 proposal. The SPSS syntax of the analyses in this study are publically available on GitHub:
330 <https://github.com/b-lissenberg/COVID-and-cancer>.

331

332 References

- 333 1. Goyal, N., et al., *Head and neck cancer survivorship consensus statement from the American*
334 *Head and Neck Society*. *Laryngoscope Investig Otolaryngol*, 2022. 7(1): p. 70-92.
- 335 2. Nguyen, N.A. and J. Ringash, *Head and Neck Cancer Survivorship Care: A Review of the Current*
336 *Guidelines and Remaining Unmet Needs*. *Curr Treat Options Oncol*, 2018. 19(8): p. 44.
- 337 3. Ringash, J., et al., *Head and Neck Cancer Survivorship: Learning the Needs, Meeting the*
338 *Needs*. *Semin Radiat Oncol*, 2018. 28(1): p. 64-74.
- 339 4. Hammerlid, E., et al., *Prospective, longitudinal quality-of-life study of patients with head and*
340 *neck cancer: a feasibility study including the EORTC QLQ-C30*. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*,
341 1997. 116(6): p. 666-73.
- 342 5. Hammerlid, E., et al., *Health-related quality of life three years after diagnosis of head and*
343 *neck cancer – a longitudinal study*. *Head & Neck*, 2001. 23(2): p. 113-25.
- 344 6. Bjordal, K., et al., *A Prospective Study of Quality of Life in Head and Neck Cancer Patients.*
345 *Part II: longitudinal data*. *Laryngoscope* 2001. 111(8): p. 1440-52.
- 346 7. de Jaeghere, E.A., et al., *Mental Health and Quality of Life among Patients with Cancer during*
347 *the SARS-CoV-2 Pandemic: Results from the Longitudinal ONCOVID Survey Study*. *Cancers*
348 (Basel), 2022. 14(4).
- 349 8. Tabaczynski, A., et al., *Changes in physical activity and associations with quality of life among*
350 *a global sample of cancer survivors during the COVID-19 pandemic*. *J Cancer Surviv*, 2022.
- 351 9. Momenimovahed, Z., et al., *Psychological Distress Among Cancer Patients During COVID-19*
352 *Pandemic in the World: A Systematic Review*. *Front Psychol*, 2021. 12: p. 682154.
- 353 10. van de Poll-Franse, L.V., et al., *Perceived care and well-being of patients with cancer and*
354 *matched norm participants in the COVID-19 crisis: results of a survey of participants in the*
355 *Dutch PROFILES registry*. *JAMA Oncol*, 2021. 7(2).
- 356 11. Park, J., S. Kim, and J. Heo, *Aspects of Psychiatric Comorbidities in Breast Cancer Patients in*
357 *Tertiary Hospitals Due to COVID-19 Outbreak in South Korea: A Single Center Longitudinal*
358 *Cohort Study*. *Medicina (Kaunas)*, 2022. 58(5).
- 359 12. Bargon, C.A., et al., *Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Patient-Reported Outcomes of*
360 *Breast Cancer Patients and Survivors*. *JNCI Cancer Spectr*, 2021. 5(1): p. pkaa104.
- 361 13. Koinig, K.A., et al., *The cancer patient's perspective of COVID-19-induced distress-A cross-*
362 *sectional study and a longitudinal comparison of HRQOL assessed before and during the*
363 *pandemic*. *Cancer Med*, 2021. 10(12): p. 3928-3937.
- 364 14. Petrillo, L.A., et al., *Health-Related Quality of Life and Depression Symptoms in a Cross*
365 *Section of Patients with Advanced Lung Cancer before and during the COVID-19 Pandemic*. *J*
366 *Palliat Med*, 2022.
- 367 15. Gallo, O., et al., *The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the quality of life of head and neck*
368 *cancer survivors*. *Support Care Cancer*, 2021. 29(11): p. 6297-304.
- 369 16. Hamilton, S.N., et al., *Patient-reported outcomes and complications during head and neck*
370 *cancer radiotherapy before versus during the COVID-19 pandemic*. *Support Care Cancer*, 2022.
371 30(3): p. 2745-53.
- 372 17. Kirtane, K., et al., *"I have cancer during COVID; that's a special category": a qualitative study*
373 *of head and neck cancer patient and provider experiences during the COVID-19 pandemic*.
374 *Support Care Cancer*, 2022. 30(5): p. 4337-44.
- 375 18. Rodrigues-Oliveira, L., et al., *COVID-19 impact on anxiety and depression in head and neck*
376 *cancer patients: A cross-sectional study*. *Oral Dis*, 2021.
- 377 19. Büntzel, J., et al., *Oncology Services for Patients with Head Neck Cancer during Corona-Times*
378 *- Patients' Perspective*. *Laryngorhinootologie*, 2021. 100(2): p. 104-10.
- 379 20. Verdonck-de Leeuw, I.M., et al., *Advancing interdisciplinary research in head and neck cancer*
380 *through a multicenter longitudinal prospective cohort study: the NETHERlands Quality of life*
381 *and Biomedical Cohort (NET-QUBIC) data warehouse and biobank*. *BMC Cancer*, 2019. 19(1): p.
382 765.
- 383 21. Jansen, F., et al., *Study retention and attrition in a longitudinal cohort study including*
384 *patient-reported outcomes, fieldwork and biobank samples: results of the Netherlands quality*
385 *of life and Biomedical cohort study (NET-QUBIC) among 739 head and neck cancer patients and*
386 *262 informal caregivers*. *BMC Med Res Methodol*, 2022. 22(1): p. 27.
- 387 22. von Elm, E., et al., *Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology*
388 *(STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies*. *BMJ*, 2007. 335(7624): p.
389 806-8.

- 390 23. Aaronson, N.K., et al., *The European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-*
391 *C30: A Quality-of-Life Instrument for Use in International Clinical Trials in Oncology*. JNCI:
392 Journal of the National Cancer Institute, 1993. 85(5): p. 365-76.
- 393 24. Fayers, P. and A. Bottomley, *Quality of life research within the EORTC – the EORTC QLQ-C30*.
394 *European Journal of Cancer*, 2002. 38(4): p. 125-33.
- 395 25. Giesinger, J.M., et al., *Replication and validation of higher order models demonstrated that a*
396 *summary score for the EORTC QLQ-C30 is robust*. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 2016. 69: p. 79-88.
- 397 26. Bjordal, K., et al., *Development of a European Organization for Research and Treatment of*
398 *Cancer (EORTC) questionnaire module to be used in quality of life assessments in head and*
399 *neck cancer patients*. *EORTC Quality of Life Study Group. Acta Oncol*, 1994. 33(8): p. 879-85.
- 400 27. Schuit, A.J., et al., *Validity of the Physical Activity Scale for the Elderly (PASE): according to*
401 *energy expenditure assessed by the doubly labeled water method*. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 1997.
402 50(5): p. 541-46.
- 403 28. Washburn, R.A., et al., *The physical activity scale for the elderly (PASE): evidence for validity*.
404 *J Clin Epidemiol*, 1999. 52(7): p. 643-51.
- 405 29. Spinhoven, P., et al., *A validation study of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) in*
406 *different groups of Dutch subjects*. *Psychol Med*, 1997. 27(2): p. 363-70.
- 407 30. Custers, J.A., et al., *The Cancer Worry Scale: detecting fear of recurrence in breast cancer*
408 *survivors*. *Cancer Nurs*, 2014. 37(1): p. E44-50.
- 409 31. de Jong-Gierveld, J., *Developing and testing a model of loneliness*. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 1987.
410 53(1): p. 119-28.
- 411 32. de Jong-Gierveld, J. and F. Kamphuis, *The development of a Rasch-type loneliness scale*. *Appl*
412 *Physiol Maes*, 1985. 9(3): p. 289-99.
- 413 33. de Jong-Gierveld, J. and T.G. van Tilburg. *Manual of the Loneliness Scale*. 2022 24-02-2022
414 [cited 2022 06-09-2022].
- 415 34. Hoekstra, H.A., J. Ormel, and F. de Fruyt, *EO-PI-R en NEO-FFI: Big Five*
416 *Persoonlijkheidsvragenlijsten: Handleiding*. 1996, Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
- 417 35. Paleri, V. and R.G. Wight, *Applicability of the adult comorbidity evaluation-27 and the*
418 *Charlson indexes to assess comorbidity by notes extraction in a cohort of United Kingdom*
419 *patients with head and neck cancer: A retrospective study*. *J Laryngol Otol*, 2002. 116(3): p.
420 200-5.
- 421 36. Lawton, M.P., *Scales to measure competence in everyday activities*. *Psychopharmacol Bull*,
422 1988. 24(4): p. 609-14.
- 423 37. Wittchen, H.-U., *Reliability and validity studies of the WHO-Composite International*
424 *Diagnostic Interview (CIDI): A critical review*. *J Psychiatr Res*, 1994. 28(1).
- 425 38. Kanatas, A., et al., *Follow-up arrangements in head and neck cancer clinics during the COVID-*
426 *19 pandemic: results from two tertiary UK head and neck cancer centres*. *Ann R Coll Surg Engl*.
427 [Online ahead of print].
- 428 39. Dermody, S.M. and A.G. Shuman, *Psychosocial Implications of COVID-19 on Head and Neck*
429 *Cancer*. *Curr Oncol*, 2022. 29(2): p. 1062-8.
- 430 40. Surujballi, J., et al., *The COVID-19 pandemic: An opportunity to rethink and harmonise the*
431 *frequency of follow-up visits for patients with early stage breast cancer*. *Cancer Treat Rev*,
432 2021. 97: p. 102188.
- 433 41. Kazazian, K., D. Ng, and C.J. Swallow, *Impact of the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic on*
434 *delivery of and models for supportive and palliative care for oncology patients*. *Curr Opin*
435 *Support Palliat Care*, 2022. 16(3): p. 130-137.
- 436 42. Hatton, R.A., et al., *A survey to ascertain peer support models available in Head and Neck*
437 *cancer across the United Kingdom*. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg*, 2022. 60(4): p. 488-492.
- 438 43. Tian, Y., et al., *Cancer associates with risk and severe events of COVID-19: A systematic*
439 *review and meta-analysis*. *Int J Cancer*, 2021. 148(2): p. 363-374.
- 440

441 **Tables and Figures**

442 Table 1. Patients characteristics at baseline unless specified otherwise. Data is described as number
 443 and percentage or as mean (standard deviation).

	M36 assessment				p-value
	before COVID-19 (N=199)		during COVID-19 (N=119)		
Age (years)	63.5 (9.6)		63.6 (9.9)		0.89
Gender					0.091
Men	140	70.4%	94	79.0%	
Women	59	29.6%	25	21.0%	
Education level					0.33
Low	82	43.4%	41	35.3%	
Middle	50	26.5%	32	27.6%	
High	57	30.2%	43	37.1%	
Missing	10		3		
Living arrangement					0.044
Living together	157	83.1%	86	73.5%	
Living alone	32	16.9%	31	26.5%	
Missing	10		2		
Marital status					0.33
Not married	62	32.8%	45	38.5%	
Married	127	67.2%	72	61.5%	
Missing	10		2		
NEO-FFI extraversion ^a	41.2 (6.1)		40.3 (6.5)		0.23
Tumor location					0.69
Oral cavity	50	25.1%	30	25.2%	
Oropharynx	72	36.2%	43	36.1%	
Hypopharynx	14	7.0%	4	3.4%	
Larynx	57	28.6%	37	31.1%	
Unknown primary	6	3.0%	5	4.2%	
Tumor stage					0.19
Stage 0(Cis)/I*	52	26.1%	32	26.9%	
Stage II	35	17.6%	24	20.2%	
Stage III	38	19.1%	12	10.1%	
Stage IV	74	37.2%	51	42.9%	
Treatment modality (dichotomized)					0.56
Single modality	114	57.3%	64	53.8%	
Multimodality	85	42.7%	55	46.2%	
WHO performance status					0.59
0	152	76.4%	94	79.0%	
>0	47	23.6%	25	21.0%	
Comorbidity					0.55
None	68	34.7%	48	40.7%	
Mild	76	38.8%	46	39.0%	
Moderate	36	18.4%	18	15.3%	
Severe	16	8.2%	6	5.1%	
Missing	3		1		
Cancer progression status at M24					0.98
Disease free	165	82.9%	98	83.1%	
Residual, recurrence and/or SP	34	17.1%	20	16.9%	
Residual	5	2.5%	3	2.5%	
Recurrence	18	9.0%	12	10.2%	
Second primary	12	6.0%	7	5.9%	
Missing			1		
Type tumor recurrence					
Local recurrence (< 2 cm and <3 year)	6	33.3%	3	25.0%	
Regional recurrence	3	16.7%	3	25.0%	

Distant metastasis	3	16.7%	1	8.3%	
Delayed lymph node metastasis	6	33.3%	5	41.7%	
Treatment intent (in case of residual, recurrence and/or SP) at M24					
Curative intent	30	15.1%	19	16.1%	
Palliative intent	4	2.0%	1	0.8%	
IADL at M24 ^b	7.3 (1.0)		7.2 (1.0)		0.33
Major depressive disorder past year at M24					0.54
No	172	95.6%	109	97.3%	
Yes	8	4.4%	3	2.7%	
Missing	19		7		
Lifetime major depressive disorder at M24					0.24
No	124	82.1%	69	75.8%	
Yes	27	17.9%	22	24.2%	
Missing	48		28		
Paid work at M24					0.94
No	134	70.5%	83	70.9%	
Yes	56	29.5%	34	29.1%	
Missing	9		2		
Excessive alcohol consumption at M24					0.38
No	163	88.1%	95	84.1%	
Yes	22	11.9%	18	15.9%	
Missing	14		6		
Smoking behavior at M24					0.79
Not a current smoker	162	87.1%	97	88.2%	
Current smoker	24	12.9%	13	11.8%	
Missing	13		9		
BMI (kg/m ²) at M24 ^b	25.8 (4.2)		26.2 (4.1)		0.42

*One patient had a cTNM stage of 0, however, pTNM was stage 2.

^amissing for n=8 before COVID and n=7 during COVID

^bmissing for n=19 before COVID and n=7 during COVID


SP=second primary; NEO-FFI= NEO Five Factor Inventory; IADL= deze Instrumental Activities of Daily Living; BMI=body mass index

445 Table 2. Estimated effect sizes (estimated differences for continuous PROMs or odds ratios for
 446 dichotomous and categorical PROMs) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals and p-values of
 447 the two-way interactions time by group, to assess differences between groups in change of PROMs
 448 between 24 and 36 months follow-up.

PROM	p-value	ES	95% CI
EORTC - C30 domain			
Global quality of life [0-100]	0.44	1.4	[-2.2; 4.9]
Physical functioning [0-100]	0.15	1.5	[-0.58; 3.6]
Role functioning [0-100]	0.22	2.7	[-1.6; 7.0]
Emotional functioning [0-100]	0.19	2.2	[-1.1; 5.5]
Cognitive functioning [0-100]	0.52	-1.1	[-4.4; 2.2]
Social functioning [0-100]	0.17	2.8	[-1.2; 6.9]
Fatigue [0-100]	0.21	2.4	[-1.4; 6.2]
Nausea Vomiting [0-100]	0.29	-0.97	[-2.8; 0.84]
Pain [0-100]	0.29	-2.0	[-5.6; 1.7]
Dyspnoe [0-100]	0.80	0.52	[-3.6; 4.6]
Insomnia [0-100]	0.44	2.0	[-3.2; 7.2]
Loss of appetite [0-100]	0.018	-4.4	[-8.1; -0.75]
Constipation [0-100]	0.76	-0.53	[-3.9; 2.9]
Diarrhoea [0-100]	0.65	-0.75	[-4.0; 2.5]
Financial problems [0-100]	0.15	2.5	[-0.93; 5.9]
EORTC summary score [0-100]	0.14	1.2	[-0.41; 2.8]
EORTC - HN35 domain			
Pain [0-100]	0.65	-0.73	[-3.8; 2.4]
Swallowing [0-100]	0.24	-1.5	[-4.1; 1.0]
Senses problems [0-100]	0.62	-0.91	[-4.5; 2.6]
Trouble with social contact [0-100]	0.71	-0.42	[-2.6; 1.8]
Trouble with social eating [0-100]	0.70	-0.50	[-3.1; 2.1]
Speech problems [0-100]	0.26	1.7	[-1.3; 4.6]
Less sexuality [0-100]	0.96	-0.19	[-7.0; 6.6]
Teeth [0-100]	0.40	2.2	[-3.0; 7.5]
Opening mouth [0-100]	0.23	2.3	[-1.5; 6.0]
Dry mouth [0-100]	0.20	-3.1	[-7.8; 1.7]
Sticky saliva [0-100]	0.47	1.9	[-3.4; 7.3]
Coughing [0-100]	0.45	2.1	[-3.4; 7.7]
Felt ill [0-100]	0.82	0.57	[-4.2; 5.4]
Painkillers (dichotomous)	0.89	1.04	[0.62; 1.8]
Nutritional supplements (dichotomous)	0.93	1.03	[0.51; 2.1]
Feeding tube (dichotomous)	n.e.		
Weight loss (dichotomous)	0.26	0.44	[0.11; 1.8]
Weight gain (dichotomous)	0.28	1.5	[0.72; 3.1]
PASE			
Leisure activity	0.064	9.3	[-0.54; 19.1]
Household activity	0.39	7.2	[-9.1; 23.4]
Work activity	0.45	3.8	[-6.3; 14.0]
Total activity	0.10	20.2	[-3.9; 44.2]
Total activity (categorical)	0.24	0.78	[0.52; 1.2]
HADS			
Depression [0-21]	0.61	-0.16	[-0.75; 0.44]
Anxiety [0-21]	0.53	0.16	[-0.34; 0.65]
Total score [0-42]	0.79	0.12	[-0.78; 1.0]
CWS			
Fear of recurrence [8-32]	0.46	-0.26	[-0.95; 0.43]
De Jong Gierveld			
Emotional loneliness score [0-6]	0.52	-0.11	[-0.44; 0.22]
Social loneliness score [0-5]	0.27	0.19	[-0.15; 0.53]
Total loneliness score [0-11]	0.69	0.10	[-0.41; 0.62]

	<u>Total loneliness score (categorical)</u>	0.49	1.2	[0.75; 1.8]
449	n.e.=not estimable due to low number of events			
450				

451 Figure 1. Flow diagram of NET-QUBIC patients included in the current study.




452

453

454

HNC=head and neck cancer; M24=24 months follow-up assessment; M36=36 months follow-up assessment; PROM=patient reported outcome measure; T0=baseline assessment

455 Figure 2. Estimated effect sizes (estimated differences for continuous PROMs or odds ratios for
 456 dichotomous and categorical PROMs) with corresponding 95% confidence intervals and p-values for
 457 the differences between groups in change of PROMs between 24 and 36 months follow-up, overall
 458 and stratified by influencing factor. A) continuous PROMs. B) dichotomous and categorical PROMs.



459

460

461

462 Supplementary Tables

463 Supplemental Table 1. Patients characteristics at baseline unless specified otherwise for included
 464 survivors compared to excluded survivors. Data is described as number and percentage or as mean
 465 (standard deviation).

	included current study (N=318)		excluded current study (N=142)		p-value
Age (years)	63.5 (9.7)		63.3 (10.0)		0.77
Gender					0.94
Men	234	73.6%	105	73.9%	
Women	84	26.4%	37	26.1%	
Education level					0.77
Low	123	40.3%	58	43.0%	
Middle	82	26.9%	32	23.7%	
High	100	32.8%	45	33.3%	
Missing	13		7		
Living arrangement					0.70
Living together	243	79.4%	105	77.8%	
Living alone	63	20.6%	30	22.2%	
Missing	12		7		
Marital status					0.75
not married	107	35.0%	49	36.6%	
married	199	65.0%	85	63.4%	
Missing	12		8		
NEO-FFI extraversion ^a	40.9 (6.3)		39.9 (6.1)		0.17
Tumor location					0.53
Oral cavity	80	25.2%	40	28.2%	
Oropharynx	115	36.2%	48	33.8%	
Hypopharynx	18	5.7%	4	2.8%	
Larynx	94	29.6%	47	33.1%	
Unknown primary	11	3.5%	3	2.1%	
Tumor stage					0.56
Stage 0(Cis)/I ⁺	84	26.4%	38	26.8%	
Stage II	59	18.6%	33	23.2%	
Stage III	50	15.7%	17	12.0%	
Stage IV	125	39.3%	54	38.0%	
Treatment modality (dichotomized)					0.44
Single modality	178	56.0%	85	59.9%	
Multimodality	140	44.0%	57	40.1%	
WHO performance status					0.20
0	246	77.4%	102	71.8%	
>0	72	22.6%	40	28.2%	
Comorbidity					0.010
None	116	36.9%	30	23.1%	
Mild	122	38.9%	52	40.0%	
Moderate	54	17.2%	31	23.8%	
Severe	22	7.0%	17	13.1%	
Missing	4		12		
IADL at M24 ^b	7.2 (1.0)		7.1 (1.2)		0.25
Major depressive disorder past year at M24					0.013
No	245	95.3%	98	89.9%	
Yes	12	4.7%	11	10.1%	
Missing	61		33		
Lifetime major depressive disorder at M24					0.005
No	225	87.5%	66	65.3%	
Yes	32	12.5%	35	34.7%	
Missing	61		41		

Paid work at M24					0.039
No	192	65.1%	82	75.9%	
Yes	103	34.9%	26	24.1%	
Missing	23		34		
Excessive alcohol consumption at M24					0.37
No	228	78.9%	51	82.3%	
Yes	61	21.1%	11	17.7%	
Missing	29		80		
Smoking behavior at M24					0.19
Not a current smoker	239	82.7%	52	81.3%	
Current smoker	50	17.3%	12	18.8%	
Missing	29		78		
BMI (kg/m ²) at M24 ^b	26.2 (4.3)		25.1 (4.3)		0.074

*One patient had a cTNM stage of 0, however, pTNM was stage 2.

^amissing for n=32 excluded and n=15 included

^bmissing for n=34 excluded and n=26 included

NEO-FFI=NEO Five Factor Inventory; IADL=deze Instrumental Activities of Daily Living; BMI=body mass index

466

467

468 Supplemental Table 2. Descriptive statistics (total sample size (N), mean and standard deviation (SD)) per measurement for continuous PROMs per group.

PROM	M36 before COVID (N=199)						M36 during COVID (N=119)					
	M24			M36			M24			M36		
	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD	N	mean	SD
EORTC - C30 domain												
Global quality of life [0-100]	189	79.7	17.0	192	81.1	15.8	118	79.7	17.0	108	79.2	18.8
Physical functioning [0-100]	189	87.7	14.4	193	87.7	16.3	118	89.3	14.8	110	87.8	17.6
Role functioning [0-100]	189	86.7	21.3	193	87.7	22.2	118	88.6	20.1	110	87.0	22.4
Emotional functioning [0-100]	189	89.0	16.7	193	89.6	15.9	118	90.8	14.3	108	89.1	15.6
Cognitive functioning [0-100]	189	89.7	15.5	193	88.9	16.0	118	87.6	16.0	108	87.8	15.9
Social functioning [0-100]	189	91.5	15.9	193	91.5	16.1	118	93.5	13.1	108	90.6	19.2
Fatigue [0-100]	189	20.1	20.6	192	21.5	22.6	118	21.7	21.3	110	21.4	22.0
Nausea Vomiting [0-100]	189	1.5	5.6	193	1.6	7.0	118	0.8	5.3	110	1.8	6.1
Pain [0-100]	189	13.1	19.1	193	11.6	18.5	118	12.0	20.2	110	12.9	20.9
Dyspnoe [0-100]	189	12.2	22.5	193	14.2	23.7	118	12.1	21.6	110	13.9	24.9
Insomnia [0-100]	189	16.0	24.7	192	17.0	25.7	118	20.1	26.6	110	19.4	28.0
Loss of appetite [0-100]	189	7.6	17.1	193	5.7	15.5	118	4.8	15.9	110	7.3	20.9
Constipation [0-100]	189	6.5	15.7	193	6.7	16.5	117	6.3	14.5	110	6.7	14.8
Diarrhoea [0-100]	189	6.0	15.0	191	4.2	13.9	117	4.3	12.0	110	3.3	10.0
Financial problems [0-100]	187	5.2	15.6	193	6.4	15.9	118	5.9	18.3	108	4.9	16.3
EORTC summary score [0-100]	189	89.4	9.9	190	89.7	10.3	117	89.9	10.0	108	88.8	12.1
EORTC - HN35 domain												
Pain [0-100]	188	12.0	15.8	193	10.2	14.1	117	10.6	15.2	108	9.4	16.3
Swallowing [0-100]	189	9.7	14.6	193	9.3	13.6	118	7.8	14.1	108	9.1	16.4
Senses problems [0-100]	189	12.6	19.9	193	13.2	21.3	118	11.7	19.6	108	13.0	23.7
Trouble with social contact [0-100]	189	2.2	7.0	193	3.4	10.4	117	3.0	8.0	108	4.4	9.9
Trouble with social eating [0-100]	189	8.2	15.7	193	8.9	17.6	118	5.6	12.2	108	7.2	17.7
Speech problems [0-100]	189	9.9	14.7	193	10.4	15.5	118	9.7	14.6	108	8.5	15.5
Less sexuality [0-100]	176	23.7	32.1	177	27.6	34.5	108	23.8	31.5	102	28.4	32.5
Teeth [0-100]	189	10.8	21.9	193	11.7	22.6	117	8.5	18.1	107	7.5	17.3
Opening mouth [0-100]	189	8.5	21.7	193	10.0	21.6	118	9.6	22.7	108	8.6	17.9
Dry mouth [0-100]	188	35.5	32.8	193	33.2	30.3	118	28.5	28.7	108	29.3	26.9
Sticky saliva [0-100]	188	24.8	28.0	188	24.8	28.0	118	21.2	30.7	108	20.7	27.2
Coughing [0-100]	189	19.6	24.0	193	19.2	24.4	118	18.9	24.5	108	16.4	22.1
Felt ill [0-100]	189	7.4	17.6	193	6.6	15.7	118	5.4	13.8	108	4.0	11.8
PASE												
Leisure activity	187	40.7	40.2	188	42.3	36.7	115	49.5	54.6	110	42.3	43.1

Household activity	187	71.6	59.7	188	79.6	79.5	115	69.9	64.6	110	70.4	62.3
Work activity	186	18.3	39.8	184	20.7	43.0	112	14.2	32.7	108	11.9	35.5
Total activity	187	130.5	93.5	188	142.1	104.6	115	133.2	106.4	110	124.4	96.1
HADS												
Depression [0-21]	187	2.5	2.9	188	2.5	3.2	118	2.6	3.2	110	2.9	3.3
Anxiety [0-21]	188	3.0	3.1	189	3.0	3.2	118	3.0	3.1	108	2.8	2.9
Total score [0-42]	186	5.5	5.4	187	5.5	5.7	118	5.6	5.9	108	5.6	5.4
CWS												
Fear of recurrence [8-32]	184	11.8	4.0	187	11.6	3.5	114	11.5	3.4	108	11.4	4.2
De Jong Gierveld												
Emotional loneliness score [0-6]	180	1.0	1.6	185	1.1	1.8	112	1.1	1.8	109	1.3	1.9
Social loneliness score [0-5]	184	1.4	1.7	185	1.6	1.8	113	1.5	1.8	107	1.5	1.7
Total loneliness score [0-11]	184	2.4	3.0	186	2.7	3.1	114	2.6	3.2	109	2.7	3.1

469

470

471 Supplemental Table 3. Descriptive statistics (frequency (n) and percentage) per assessment for dichotomous and categorical PROMs per group.

			M36 before COVID (N=199)				M36 during COVID (N=119)			
			M24		M36		M24		M36	
			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
EORTC - HN35 domain										
Painkillers	no		135	71.8%	140	72.9%	84	71.8%	81	73.6%
	yes		53	28.2%	52	27.1%	33	28.2%	29	26.4%
Nutritional supplements	no		170	90.4%	173	89.6%	106	91.4%	100	90.9%
	yes		18	9.6%	20	10.4%	10	8.6%	10	9.1%
Feeding tube	no		188	99.5%	191	99.0%	116	100.0%	109	99.1%
	yes		1	0.5%	2	1.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.9%
Weight loss	no		178	94.7%	179	92.7%	113	96.6%	99	90.0%
	yes		10	5.3%	14	7.3%	4	3.4%	11	10.0%
Weight gain	no		148	79.6%	157	82.2%	94	81.7%	95	88.8%
	yes		38	20.4%	34	17.8%	21	18.3%	12	11.2%
PASE										
Total activity group	very poor		26	13.9%	33	17.6%	25	21.7%	30	27.3%
	poor		59	31.6%	43	22.9%	27	23.5%	24	21.8%
	fair		41	21.9%	39	20.7%	25	21.7%	17	15.5%
	good		24	12.8%	34	18.1%	16	13.9%	17	15.5%
	very good		18	9.6%	15	8.0%	8	7.0%	12	10.9%
	excelent		19	10.2%	24	12.8%	14	12.2%	10	9.1%
De Jong Gierveld										
Total loneliness category	not lonely [0-2]		117	63.6%	117	62.9%	74	64.9%	65	59.6%
	moderate [3-8]		55	29.9%	52	28.0%	33	28.9%	35	32.1%
	severe [9-10]		10	5.4%	15	8.1%	2	1.8%	8	7.3%
	very severe[11]		2	1.1%	2	1.1%	5	4.4%	1	0.9%

472

473

474 Supplemental Table 4. P-values for the three-way interaction between time, group and each potential influencing factor, to identify potential modifiers of
 475 the effect on the change of PROMs between 24 months and 36 months follow-up. Factors as assessed at baseline unless specified otherwise

PROM	Age	Gender	Educational level	Living arrangement	Marital status (T0)	NEO-FFI extraversion
EORTC - C30 domain						
Global quality of life [0-100]	y0.44	0.34	0.71	0.49	0.34	0.62
Physical functioning [0-100]	0.52	0.015	0.59	0.30	0.05	0.24
Role functioning [0-100]	0.45	0.24	0.88	0.88	0.44	0.11
Emotional functioning [0-100]	0.74	0.13	0.44	0.52	0.85	0.27
Cognitive functioning [0-100]	0.61	0.69	0.73	0.94	0.96	0.38
Social functioning [0-100]	0.023	0.22	0.29	0.54	0.70	0.99
Fatigue [0-100]	0.35	0.84	0.45	0.99	0.94	0.091
Nausea Vomiting [0-100]	0.94	0.63	0.22	0.73	0.82	0.75
Pain [0-100]	0.70	0.45	0.74	0.69	0.35	0.96
Dyspnoe [0-100]	0.58	0.34	0.92	0.69	0.29	0.46
Insomnia [0-100]	0.63	0.43	0.85	0.77	0.89	0.71
Loss of appetite [0-100]	0.082	0.60	0.25	0.12	0.92	0.53
Constipation [0-100]	0.16	0.27	0.59	0.028	0.11	0.31
Diarrhoea [0-100]	0.11	0.58	0.37	0.84	0.39	0.88
Financial problems [0-100]	0.38	0.79	0.23	0.60	0.41	0.31
EORTC summary score [0-100]	0.59	0.089	0.72	0.72	0.63	0.16
EORTC - HN35 domain						
Pain [0-100]	0.75	0.59	0.53	0.18	0.78	0.80
Swallowing [0-100]	0.83	0.97	0.83	0.55	0.42	0.098
Senses problems [0-100]	0.58	0.11	0.91	0.093	0.05	0.73
Trouble with social contact [0-100]	0.67	0.29	0.11	0.020	0.037	0.25
Trouble with social eating [0-100]	0.91	0.77	0.94	0.51	0.14	0.21
Speech problems [0-100]	0.81	0.13	0.59	0.38	0.79	0.70
Less sexuality [0-100]	0.48	0.036	0.13	0.39	0.18	0.92
Teeth [0-100]	0.51	0.17	0.51	0.97	0.61	0.87
Opening mouth [0-100]	0.77	0.98	0.59	0.45	0.64	0.74
Dry mouth [0-100]	0.58	0.54	0.65	0.75	0.72	0.20
Sticky saliva [0-100]	0.84	0.90	0.29	0.97	0.45	0.57
Coughing [0-100]	0.051	0.77	0.61	0.005	0.040	0.23
Felt ill [0-100]	0.22	0.45	0.92	0.83	0.61	0.07
Painkillers	0.53	0.62	0.67	0.004	0.015	0.92
Nutritional supplements	0.45	0.15	0.30	0.37	0.63	0.44

Feeding tube	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
Weight loss	0.67	n.e.	<0.001	n.e.	0.77	1.00
Weight gain	0.17	0.91	0.34	0.33	0.82	0.19
PASE						
Leisure activity	0.48	0.13	0.54	0.37	0.19	0.24
Household activity	0.87	0.08	0.21	0.56	0.36	0.16
Work activity	0.60	0.43	0.39	0.68	0.37	0.80
Total activity	0.85	0.033	0.20	0.36	0.14	0.70
Total activity (categorical)	0.15	0.018	0.34	0.55	0.11	0.99
HADS						
Depression [0-21]	0.022	0.094	0.58	0.35	0.15	0.80
Anxiety [0-21]	0.10	0.021	0.30	0.42	0.19	0.27
Total score [0-42]	0.023	0.070	0.43	0.34	0.12	0.43
CWS						
Fear of recurrence [8-32]	0.09	0.67	0.045	0.96	0.88	0.85
De Jong Gierveld						
Emotional loneliness score [0-6]	0.82	0.92	0.33	0.72	0.49	0.61
Social loneliness score [0-5]	0.26	0.61	0.57	0.56	0.09	0.78
Total loneliness score [0-11]	0.24	0.88	0.25	0.96	0.67	0.70
Total loneliness score (categorical)	0.18	0.82	0.16	0.96	0.36	0.89

n.e.=not estimable due to low number of events

476

477

478 Supplemental Table 4 (continued).

PROM	Tumor location	Tumor stage	Treatment modality	Comorbidity	WHO performance status	Cancer progression status (M24)
EORTC - C30 domain						
Global quality of life [0-100]	0.15	0.43	0.84	0.84	0.73	0.41
Physical functioning [0-100]	0.31	0.96	0.88	0.19	0.56	0.78
Role functioning [0-100]	0.54	0.015	0.51	0.09	0.36	0.20
Emotional functioning [0-100]	0.66	0.21	0.14	0.73	0.57	0.028
Cognitive functioning [0-100]	0.051	0.87	0.31	0.030	0.87	0.35
Social functioning [0-100]	0.27	0.82	0.62	0.095	0.73	0.22
Fatigue [0-100]	0.69	0.42	0.26	0.58	0.56	0.24
Nausea Vomiting [0-100]	0.23	0.99	0.89	0.39	0.18	0.43
Pain [0-100]	0.89	0.94	0.88	0.14	0.59	0.78
Dyspnoea [0-100]	0.76	0.57	0.73	0.22	0.80	0.09
Insomnia [0-100]	0.61	0.28	0.96	0.70	0.94	0.15
Loss of appetite [0-100]	0.048	0.60	0.046	0.003	0.75	0.63
Constipation [0-100]	0.86	0.07	0.26	0.19	0.79	0.22
Diarrhoea [0-100]	0.098	0.09	0.077	0.74	0.26	1.00
Financial problems [0-100]	0.69	0.40	0.60	0.21	0.004	0.001
EORTC summary score [0-100]	0.21	0.13	0.38	0.18	0.90	0.95
EORTC - HN35 domain						
Pain [0-100]	0.017	0.32	0.78	0.23	0.87	0.015
Swallowing [0-100]	0.69	0.96	0.90	<0.001	0.020	0.010
Senses problems [0-100]	0.92	0.07	0.13	0.066	0.089	0.034
Trouble with social contact [0-100]	0.22	0.74	0.29	0.33	0.52	0.29
Trouble with social eating [0-100]	0.94	0.74	0.62	0.039	0.89	0.14
Speech problems [0-100]	0.15	0.42	0.20	0.95	0.92	0.93
Less sexuality [0-100]	0.88	0.63	0.47	0.026	0.48	0.31
Teeth [0-100]	0.53	1.00	0.85	0.083	0.22	0.18
Opening mouth [0-100]	0.091	0.30	0.90	0.76	0.38	0.74
Dry mouth [0-100]	0.007	0.78	0.69	0.37	0.52	0.25
Sticky saliva [0-100]	0.48	0.56	0.75	0.35	0.82	0.035
Coughing [0-100]	0.12	0.17	0.34	0.085	0.64	0.56
Felt ill [0-100]	0.42	0.30	0.58	0.15	0.13	0.63
Painkillers	0.14	0.40	0.17	0.13	0.14	0.32

Nutritional supplements	n.e.	0.42	0.31	<0.001	0.55	0.66
Feeding tube	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
Weight loss	0.77	<0.001	0.23	<0.001	0.69	0.60
Weight gain	1.00	0.78	0.73	0.57	0.21	0.35
PASE						
Leisure activity	0.63	0.007	0.36	0.98	0.46	0.82
Household activity	0.07	0.97	0.49	0.94	0.06	0.44
Work activity	1.00	0.83	0.44	0.61	0.58	0.50
Total activity	0.22	0.33	0.88	0.94	0.19	0.85
Total activity (categorical)	0.003	0.48	0.81	0.27	0.07	0.90
HADS						
Depression [0-21]	0.77	0.76	0.022	0.35	0.74	0.64
Anxiety [0-21]	0.53	0.55	0.51	0.46	0.99	0.42
Total score [0-42]	0.64	0.99	0.035	0.55	0.77	0.39
CWS						
Fear of recurrence [8-32]	0.65	0.051	0.30	0.51	0.14	0.64
De Jong Gierveld						
Emotional loneliness score [0-6]	0.48	0.24	0.023	0.54	0.83	0.045
Social loneliness score [0-5]	0.36	0.25	0.65	0.79	0.22	0.63
Total loneliness score [0-11]	0.43	0.08	0.09	0.50	0.44	0.10
Total loneliness score (categorical)	0.30	0.64	0.65	0.39	0.92	0.20

n.e.=not estimable due to low number of events

480 Supplemental Table 4 (continued).

PROM	IADL (M24)	Major depressive disorder past year (M24)	Lifetime major depressive disorder (M24)	Paid work (M24)	Excessive alcohol consumption (M24)	Smoking behavior (M24)	BMI (M24)
EORTC - C30 domain							
Global quality of life [0-100]	0.93	0.57	0.30	0.49	0.61	0.21	0.66
Physical functioning [0-100]	0.56	0.29	0.20	0.24	0.66	0.71	0.37
Role functioning [0-100]	1.00	0.014	0.24	0.42	0.47	0.015	0.30
Emotional functioning [0-100]	0.069	0.61	0.63	0.80	0.72	0.090	0.56
Cognitive functioning [0-100]	0.84	0.28	0.40	0.46	0.71	0.11	0.12
Social functioning [0-100]	0.88	0.10	0.55	0.19	0.69	0.47	0.92
Fatigue [0-100]	0.053	0.73	0.91	0.09	0.35	0.41	0.20
Nausea Vomiting [0-100]	0.95	0.40	0.37	0.15	0.26	0.13	0.74
Pain [0-100]	0.66	0.92	0.81	0.74	0.51	0.91	0.44
Dyspnoea [0-100]	0.24	0.95	0.84	0.79	0.60	0.15	0.20
Insomnia [0-100]	0.065	0.82	0.80	0.66	0.20	0.46	0.36
Loss of appetite [0-100]	0.68	0.99	0.30	0.35	0.34	0.79	0.19
Constipation [0-100]	0.88	0.35	0.32	0.71	0.28	0.62	0.26
Diarrhoea [0-100]	0.078	0.89	0.10	0.020	0.69	0.16	0.53
Financial problems [0-100]	0.008	0.64	0.84	0.21	0.64	0.69	0.23
EORTC summary score [0-100]	0.97	0.96	0.11	0.60	0.44	0.99	0.81
EORTC - HN35 domain							
Pain [0-100]	0.90	0.16	0.81	0.57	0.73	0.68	0.020
Swallowing [0-100]	0.32	0.63	0.11	0.72	0.74	0.60	0.58
Senses problems [0-100]	0.37	0.78	0.78	0.47	0.13	0.89	0.30
Trouble with social contact [0-100]	0.99	0.001	0.027	0.056	1.00	0.003	0.25
Trouble with social eating [0-100]	0.39	0.20	0.42	0.41	0.23	0.30	0.18
Speech problems [0-100]	0.90	0.78	0.90	0.64	0.43	0.86	0.39
Less sexuality [0-100]	0.36	0.19	0.023	0.76	0.30	0.83	0.16
Teeth [0-100]	0.63	0.84	0.84	0.34	0.97	0.52	0.19
Opening mouth [0-100]	0.65	0.29	0.011	0.36	0.49	0.99	0.072
Dry mouth [0-100]	0.058	0.51	0.25	0.51	0.92	0.78	0.72
Sticky saliva [0-100]	0.53	0.34	0.50	0.39	0.59	0.046	0.096
Coughing [0-100]	0.074	0.54	0.11	0.14	0.64	0.016	0.16
Felt ill [0-100]	0.66	0.09	0.38	0.42	0.31	0.37	0.64

Painkillers	0.14	0.28	0.79	0.92	0.28	0.14	0.099
Nutritional supplements	0.20	n.e.	n.e.	0.61	0.53	0.64	0.10
Feeding tube	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.	n.e.
Weight loss	0.77	n.e.	<0.001	1.00	n.e.	n.e.	0.32
Weight gain	0.38	0.47	0.32	0.16	0.35	0.044	0.40
PASE							
Leisure activity	0.50	0.96	0.034	0.64	0.18	0.43	0.81
Household activity	0.12	0.34	0.65	0.30	0.33	0.81	0.60
Work activity	0.34	0.53	1.00	0.22	0.86	0.38	0.058
Total activity	0.30	0.70	0.20	0.19	0.25	0.85	0.22
Total activity (categorical)	0.27	1.00	0.18	0.31	0.50	0.50	0.24
HADS							
Depression [0-21]	0.53	0.39	0.35	0.33	0.21	0.68	0.33
Anxiety [0-21]	0.65	0.39	0.16	0.24	0.40	0.16	0.20
Total score [0-42]	0.87	0.27	0.18	0.14	0.83	0.35	0.18
CWS							
Fear of recurrence [8-32]	0.22	0.07	0.007	0.73	0.57	0.93	0.061
De Jong Gierveld							
Emotional loneliness score [0-6]	0.29	0.07	0.004	0.63	0.43	0.59	0.003
Social loneliness score [0-5]	0.95	0.60	0.85	0.44	0.50	0.96	0.32
Total loneliness score [0-11]	0.46	0.58	0.09	0.38	0.33	0.65	0.010
Total loneliness score (categorical)	0.29	1.00	0.90	0.27	0.53	0.96	0.21

n.e.=not estimable due to low number of events

481

482

483

484 Supplemental Table 5A. Stratified estimated marginal means for continuous PROMs per assessment and per group, with corresponding estimated changes
 485 between 24 (M24) and 36 (M36) months follow-up.

PROM	(sub)group	M36 before COVID			M36 during COVID		
		M24	M36	change	M24	M36	change
EORTC - C30 domain							
Loss of appetite [0-100]	all	7.8	5.6	-2.1	4.8	7.1	2.3
	single modality	6.5	5.6	-0.8	7.9	8.2	0.2
	multimodality	9.5	5.6	-3.9	1.2	5.8	4.6
Financial problems [0-100]	all	5.2	6.3	1.1	5.9	4.6	-1.3
	disease free at M24	3.8	3.6	-0.2	5.7	5.4	-0.3
	residual/recurrence/SP at M24	2.8	11.0	8.3	16.7	10.0	-6.7
EORTC - HN35 domain							
Swallowing [0-100]	all	9.8	9.4	-0.4	7.8	8.9	1.1
	no comorbidity	6.3	8.0	1.7	7.8	7.6	-0.2
	mild comorbidity	10.2	10.8	0.5	7.8	8.1	0.3
	moderate/severe comorbidity	14.7	9.7	-5.0	8.3	13.5	5.2
CWS							
Fear of recurrence [8-32]	all	11.8	11.6	-0.2	11.4	11.5	0.0
	no lifetime depressive disorder at M24	11.1	11.0	-0.1	10.7	10.8	0.0
	lifetime depressive disorder at M24	16.5	14.5	-2.0	13.6	14.5	0.9
De Jong Gierveld							
Emotional loneliness score [0-6]	all	1.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	1.3	0.2
	BMI < median	1.1	1.3	0.2	0.9	0.8	-0.1
	BMI > median	0.9	0.7	-0.2	1.1	1.7	0.5

486

487

488 Supplemental Table 5B. Stratified observed percentage for dichotomous and categorical PROMs per assessment and per group.

PROM		(sub)group	before		during		
			M24	M36	M24	M36	
EORTC - HN35 domain							
Painkillers (% yes)		all	26.3%	25.3%	28.7%	26.9%	
		living together at T0	24.8%	20.9%	28.2%	29.6%	
		living alone at T0	33.3%	48.3%	30.0%	18.5%	
PASE							
total score (categorical)		very poor	all	13.9%	17.6%	21.7%	27.3%
		poor		31.6%	22.9%	23.5%	21.8%
		fair		21.9%	20.7%	21.7%	15.5%
		good		12.8%	18.1%	13.9%	15.5%
		very good		9.6%	8.0%	7.0%	10.9%
		excelent		10.2%	12.8%	12.2%	9.1%
		very poor	male	14.7%	19.4%	24.2%	24.1%
		poor		30.2%	23.3%	22.0%	21.8%
		fair		19.4%	18.6%	18.7%	13.8%
		good		14.7%	17.1%	15.4%	17.2%
		very good		10.1%	9.3%	7.7%	12.6%
		excelent		10.9%	12.4%	12.1%	10.3%
		very poor	female	12.1%	13.6%	12.5%	39.1%
		poor		34.5%	22.0%	29.2%	21.7%
		fair		27.6%	25.4%	33.3%	21.7%
		good		8.6%	20.3%	8.3%	8.7%
		very good		8.6%	5.1%	4.2%	4.3%
		excelent		8.6%	13.6%	12.5%	4.3%

489

490