Patient-Reported Symptom Assessments and Early Chemotherapy Discontinuation in Routine Gastrointestinal Cancer Care

Chengbo Zeng, PhD[1,2], Mariem Ahmed, BS[1], Yu-Jen Chen, MPH[3], Shumenghui Zhai, PhD[4], Gaberille B. Rocque, MD[5], Sandra C. Olisakwe, MPH[5], Patricia C. Dykes, PhD[2,6], Thomas J. Roberts, MD[2,7], Nneka N. Ufere, MD[2,8], Elizabeth S. Davis, MPH[1,3], Li Zhou, MD, PhD[2,6], Maria O. Edelen, PhD[1,2,9], Andrea L. Pusic, MD[1,2,10], Kelly M. Kenzik, PhD[1,2]*, Kelsey S. Lau-Min, MD[11]*, Jason B. Liu, MD[1,12]*

Author affiliations:

1. Patient Reported Outcomes, Value and Experience (PROVE) Center, Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
2. Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA
3. Center for Surgery and Public Health, Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
4. School of Nursing, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA, USA
5. Divisions of Hematology & Oncology and Gerontology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA
6. Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
7. Center for Head and Neck Cancers, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
8. Liver Center, Gastrointestinal Division, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

9. RAND Corporation, Boston, MA, USA
10. Division of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
11. Division of Hematology/Oncology, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
12. Department of Surgical Oncology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA

*: These authors contributed equally to this work.

Running Title: Symptom Assessments and Early Chemotherapy Discontinuation

Figures: 3; **Tables:** 3

Abstract: 273/275

Main Text: 2,841/3,000

Corresponding author:

Chengbo Zeng, Ph.D.

Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital

Address: 1620 Tremont Street, Boston, MA 02120

Email: czeng8@bwh.harvard.edu

Abstract (273/275)

Background: Early chemotherapy (CTh) discontinuation in gastrointestinal (GI) cancer patients can compromise treatment effectiveness and worsen outcomes. Clinical trials show that monitoring and addressing patient-reported symptoms may reduce early discontinuation and improve outcomes. However, evidence from routine care settings where patients are treated in standard clinical practice, especially on the dose-response relationship between number of completed assessments and risk of discontinuation, remains limited.

Methods: This retrospective cohort study included adult patients with GI cancers who received CTh at Mass General Brigham between 01/2019 and 01/2024. The Patient-Reported Outcome version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events assessed 12 CTh-related symptoms at CTh initiation and at days 30, 60, and 90. All patients completed baseline assessment. The primary outcome was early discontinuation due to toxicity within 90 days of initiation. Using the Fine-Gray model to account for competing risks of death and progression, we examined the association between early discontinuation and number of completed assessments over time. We also tested whether this association differed across prognostic groups. To address time-varying bias from disease severity, treatment, and prior completion, we applied inverse probability weighting.

Results: Among 1,178 patients, the most common cancers were colorectal (35%) and pancreatic (31%), and 45% had stage IV disease. Overall, 784 (67%) completed symptom assessments at CTh initiation and during follow-up. After adjusting for demographic and clinical covariates and time-varying bias, completing post-initiation

assessments was associated with a lower cumulative risk of early discontinuation (SHR: 0.70 [95% CI: 0.44–1.12]). Results were generally consistent across prognostic groups. **Conclusion:** More frequent completion of patient-reported symptom assessment post CTh initiation was associated with a lower risk of early discontinuation in practice.

Keywords: Gastrointestinal cancers, chemotherapy, early discontinuation, symptom monitoring

Introduction (2,841/3,000)

Chemotherapy (CTh) remains central to the treatment for locally advanced and metastatic gastrointestinal (GI) cancers, yet adverse effects from CTh and symptoms related to the underlying malignancy can lead to premature treatment discontinuation and compromise patient quality of life and survival. In clinical trials, patient-reported symptom assessments can help identify adverse events, guide timely management, reduce early CTh discontinuation, and ultimately improve quality of life and survival.[1-5] Whether these benefits hold in routine clinical practice, however, remains underexplored. Specifically, evidence is needed to determine whether a dose-response relationship exists — that is, whether greater completion of symptom assessments is associated with a lower risk of early CTh discontinuation.

Implementing patient-reported symptom assessments in clinical practice is often more challenging than in clinical trials.[6,7] In routine care settings, patients are treated within standard clinical practice. Unlike remote symptom monitoring conducted as an intervention outside of clinical sites, routine collection of patient-reported symptoms usually involves diverse patient populations and is typically integrated into regular clinical visits. Patients may complete symptom assessments synchronously or asynchronously with their visits, allowing the reported information to be used for symptom management and treatment plan adjustment, with the overall goal to improve care quality. However, large-scale implementation across diverse patient populations and within the healthcare systems is complex, and patient-reported assessments are susceptible to nonresponse, which is difficult to track in routine clinical care, leading to insufficient data to guide symptom management, prevent early discontinuation, and

preserve outcomes.[8,9] We hypothesized that higher completion of symptom assessments would be associated with a reduced risk of early CTh discontinuation, as more complete data would enable clinicians and patients to manage symptoms proactively.

Using routinely collected patient-reported symptom data from patients with GI cancers receiving CTh, we examined the association between symptom assessment completion and early CTh discontinuation. Specifically, we aimed to address two key research questions: (1) Is higher completion of symptom assessments associated with a lower risk of early CTh discontinuation? And (2) Does this association vary across prognostic groups, including age, degree of comorbidity, cancer stage, and site?

Methods

Study design, setting, and data source

This retrospective observational cohort study used routinely collected patient-reported symptom data and electronic health records (EHR) from the Mass General Brigham (MGB) health system. MGB is a large, integrated health system comprised of two academic medical centers, eight community hospitals, and 30 oncology practices. MGB has implemented the routine collection of patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) for clinical care, including in medical oncology practices, wholly within its EHR. Details have been previously reported.[6,10]

At MGB GI cancer clinics, the symptom assessment program launched in 2019 is part of the standardized PROMs initiative, which collects the Patient-Reported Outcome (PRO) version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (PRO-CTCAE®) from all clinic visits. Patients with scheduled appointments are asked to complete the

symptom assessment one week before their visit through the EHR patient portal. Those who do not complete the symptom assessment in advance are offered tablets to do so during their clinic visit. The symptom assessments are available in seven languages (i.e., English, Spanish, Portuguese, Haitian Creole, Traditional Chinese, Russian, Arabic). Reported scores are available immediately to clinicians in the EHR.

Study population

We included adults between 01/2019 and 01/2024 who met the following criteria: (1) had a diagnosis of all-stage colorectal, esophageal, hepatobiliary, pancreatic, or gastric cancers based on ICD-10 codes (**Supplemental Table S1**), (2) initiated any cytotoxic chemotherapy (CTh) regimens with or without concurrent immunotherapy or targeted therapy to GI cancers, as determined by regimens and their department specialties in the EHR, and (3) completed a patient-reported symptom assessment within 15 days of CTh initiation (i.e., the start of a CTh treatment), with possible additional completions at days 30, 60, and 90 post-initiation. Because a patient could have multiple lines of CTh treatment plan during the study period, and their clinical visits to GI clinics could occur at any time throughout treatment, not all these visits could fall into the four pre-specified time points and their corresponding time windows (i.e., –15 to 14 [CTh initiation], 15 to 44 [day 30], 45 to 74 [day 60], and 75 to 104 [day 90] days). Therefore, only the treatment line and its associated time windows that were linked to the greatest number of clinical visits were included, resulting in one CTh treatment line per patient in the final analysis.

For patients who completed multiple assessments around the four pre-specified time windows, we only selected the one closest to each time point, resulting in a total of

1 to 4 completions per patient. Each completion yielded symptom data, so a patient had symptom data at CTh initiation and might also have data post initiation. **Supplemental Section A** provides a detailed description of the processing of routinely collected EHR and patient-reported symptom assessments.

Patient-reported Symptoms

Details of the PRO-CTCAE surveys used here have been previously described.[11,12] Patients were asked to report on the 12 most common CTh-related symptoms: constipation, decreased appetite, diarrhea, dyspnea, fatigue, fever, insomnia, nausea, paresthesia, pain, rash, and vomiting.[13-18] For each symptom, patients are asked to report on its presence, frequency, severity, and/or interference. Assessment response for each symptom is assigned a composite score ranging from 0 to 3, where 0 represents no symptoms and 3 represents severe symptoms.[11,12]

Because we were interested in the relationship between number of patient-reported symptom assessment completion and the risk of early CTh discontinuation, the exposure of interest was the total number (ranging from 1 to 4) of assessments completed across the four pre-specified time points.

Early discontinuation of Chemotherapy

We defined early CTh discontinuation as any deviations from the CTh treatment plan (e.g., dose reduction, regimen switches, and treatment stop) within 90 days of initiation.[19,20] Reasons for discontinuation were obtained through independent manual chart review by three members (CZ, MA, and JL) of the research team and categorized into three groups: (1) toxicity, (2) disease progression, or (3) death. Treatments completed within 90 days were not considered discontinuation. Our primary analytic

focus was on CTh discontinuation due to toxicity, as toxicity can be managed through timely and appropriate care from clinicians receiving the patient-reported symptom scores.

Demographic and clinical characteristics

Demographic characteristics included age, sex, race/ethnicity, level of education, employment status, and insurance type. Clinical characteristics included National Cancer Institute Charlson comorbidity index (CCI: 0 or ≥1), primary cancer site, time since diagnosis, and cancer stage (i.e., I, II, & III vs. IV). Additional clinical details included the concurrent use of immunotherapy, radiation therapy, and targeted therapy during CTh (all coded as Yes/No), common CTh drugs (i.e., 5- fluorouracil, oxaliplatin, irinotecan, paclitaxel, and gemcitabine), and treatment goals (i.e., adjuvant/neoadjuvant, control, curative, maintenance/support, palliative).

Statistical analysis

In the study cohort, we first summarized the number of completed symptom assessments across the four time points. We then compared baseline symptom burden across groups with different numbers of completed assessments using analysis of variance (ANOVA). Because the likelihood of completing an assessment may change over time due to factors such as disease severity, CTh-related adverse events, or prior completion behavior, this creates potential time-varying bias. To address this, we applied inverse probability (IP) weighting to the ANOVA and subsequent regression analyses.[21-23] Details of the IP weight construction are provided in **Section B of the Supplemental Materials**.

We calculated the frequency and percentage of each reason for early discontinuation (i.e., toxicity, death, and disease progression). To address our first research question ("Is higher completion of symptom assessments associated with a lower risk of early CTh discontinuation?"), we used the Fine-Gray model to account for death and disease progression as competing risks. We further explored whether this association was consistent across age groups (< or ≥ 65 years), degree of comorbidity (CCI < or ≥ 1), cancer stage (i.e., I, II, & III vs. IV), and site (pancreatic cancer vs others), as these are the important factors associated with prognosis.[24-26] This analysis helped address our second research question: does this association vary across prognostic groups? We reported sub distribution hazard ratios (SHR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI). We also compared these results with a standard Fine-Gray model with baseline covariates only. In these analyses, we adjusted for age, sex, race, level of education, cancer sites, cancer stage, concurrent target therapy, concurrent immunotherapy, concurrent radiation therapy, use of 5-fluorouracil, use of oxaliplatin, use of gemcitabine, comorbidity, and symptom score at CTh initiation, all of which were associated with the completion of symptom assessment **(Table S2)** and/or the risk of early discontinuation **(Table S3)** according to our bivariate analyses and existing literature.[27]

Lastly, we conducted secondary analyses to examine the association between discontinuation and symptom burden cross-sectionally using data at CTh initiation. We also examined their longitudinal association using data across the four time points. Symptom burden was defined as the sum score of the 12 symptoms assessed. We employed multiple imputation with 50 replicates to handle missing symptom data. All

statistical analyses were conducted using SAS version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Inc.), with a statistical significance level set at the two-sided $p<0.05$.

Ethics Review

This study was approved by the Dana-Farber/Harvard Cancer Center (DF/HCC) Institutional Review Board (IRB protocol number: 25-048).

Results

Overview

Of the 1,178 eligible participants (**Figure 1**), more than half were older adults (52.4%), male (58.6%), White (86.1%), non-Hispanic (90.8%), and unemployed (56.9%) (**Table 1**). The most common cancers were colorectal (34.6%) and pancreatic (30.8%), and about 45% had stage IV cancers. The most frequently administered CTh drugs were 5-fluorouracil (65.5%), oxaliplatin (55.1%), and irinotecan (33.8%). About 45% of the patients received CTh with palliative intent.

Distribution of symptom assessment completion and symptom burden

All patients completed assessments at CTh initiation, of whom 76.4% completed additional assessments at days 30, 60, or 90. In total, 16.2% completed three, and 26.2% completed all four. **Table 2** shows the distribution of symptom monitoring completions across the four time points and their combinations.

Figure 2 displays mean symptom burden stratified by the number of symptom assessment completion at each time point. Among patients with only one symptom assessment completion (n=394), all contributed to the symptom score at CTh initiation, with a mean score of 8.4. For patients with additional assessments, the mean scores at CTh initiation were 8.1 for those with a total of two assessments (n=284), 7.4 for three

(n=191), and 6.4 for four (n=309), respectively. There was significant difference among these mean symptom scores (p<0.001).

Among patients with two symptom assessments, those with data at day 30 post CTh initiation had a mean score of 9.3; the mean was 8.4 for those with three assessments and 7.3 for those with four. We found significant differences in these scores (p<0.001). The mean scores among patients with data at days 60 and 90 are presented in **Figure 2.**

Early discontinuation and number of symptom assessment completion

A total of 124 (10.5%, 124/1,178) patients discontinued CTh within 90 days. Among these, 19 (15.3%) discontinued due to toxicity, 47 (37.9%) due to death, and 58 (46.8%) due to disease progression (**Figure 3**). After accounting for the competing risks of death and disease progression and time-varying bias, the weighted model revealed that completing additional symptom assessments post CTh initiation was associated with a lower risk of early discontinuation (SHR = 0.70; 95% CI: 0.44–1.12; **Table 3**), although this association was not significant. Subsequent analyses across age groups, degree of comorbidity, cancer stage, and site revealed similar findings.

The unweighted model without adjusting for time-varying bias found significant relationship between number of symptom assessment completion and early discontinuation. Subsequent analyses across age group, degree of comorbidity, cancer stage, and site found consistent trends, but we only found statistical significance in older adults and patients without pancreatic cancer.

Secondary analyses of early discontinuation and symptom burden

Our secondary analyses found that whether using symptom burden at CTh initiation or its change during the first 90 days of CTh, higher symptom burden was associated with an increased risk of discontinuation due to toxicity, although the association was only marginally significant **(Table S4)**.

Discussion

In these data, we observed a trend suggesting more frequent patient-reported symptom assessment completion during CTh was associated with a lower cumulative risk of early discontinuation due to toxicity; however, this relationship was not statistically significant. Notably, over 60% of the patients had assessments at both CTh initiation and post-initiation.

High-certainty evidence from clinical trials supports the use of patient-reported symptom assessment to reduce adverse patient outcomes;[4,5] however, the generalizability of these findings to routine clinical practice remains unclear.[28,29] Our study intended to bridge this knowledge gap by examining the relationship between the number of patient-reported symptom assessment completion and the risk of early discontinuation due to toxicity. Unexpectedly, after adjusting for the time-varying bias and competing events, this association was not statistically significant, but we detected a directional trend toward reduced discontinuation with more assessments being completed. As an observational study, our findings serve to generate hypotheses for future study. Our findings may be partially explained by the low incidence (10.5%) of early discontinuation due to toxicity within 90 days of CTh initiation. Another possibility is that patient-reported symptom data may not be used in real time by clinicians for treatment planning. Unlike in controlled clinical trial settings, the use of patient-reported

symptom data in clinical care is often influenced by clinicians' workload and by how both clinicians and patients perceive the utility of these activities and data. A large mixed-methods study found that over 20% of clinicians did not review patient-reported data with their patients, and 44% regarded the data as unhelpful or held a neutral attitude toward its usefulness.[30] This underscores the pervasive research-to-practice phenomenon that exists across clinical research, not only in the realm of patient-reported symptom monitoring.

Although not statistically significant, our findings have important implications for implementing patient-reported symptom assessment in routine cancer care. We found patients who completed symptom assessment at CTh initiation were found to have a lower risk of discontinuation if they also complete symptom assessment during follow-up. Conducting symptom monitoring in routine care during CTh can be challenging, as higher toxicity and lower patient engagement are often associated with lower response rates.[6,27] While it is difficult to ensure completion of symptom assessment throughout the entire treatment course, our findings suggest that collecting patient-reported symptoms at CTh initiation and at least one follow-up time point may be a practical and effective strategy. This approach provides clinicians and patients with symptom data both before and after CTh initiation, allowing for the tracking of progress and the detection for clinically meaningful changes. It may support better management of CTh-related side effects and potentially reduce early discontinuation within the first 90 days.

Strengths

Our study leveraged a real-world patient cohort from routine GI cancer clinics within an integrated health system that has a standardized, well-established PROMs

program. We focused on the number of symptom assessment completion and examined its dose-response relationship with the risk of early discontinuation among patients who were asked to report symptoms during their CTh. Our analytic approach was carefully designed to minimize time-varying bias inherent in observational EHR data. For example, recognizing that patients' ability and willingness to complete symptom assessment change over time, we applied inverse probability weighting to adjust for time-varying bias introduced by disease severity, treatment, and prior completion. We also employed the Fine-Gray model to account for competing risks, such as discontinuation due to death and disease progression. These methodological strategies enhance the internal validity of our findings and support the generation of high-quality, real-world evidence with strong clinical relevance and implications for routine cancer care.

Limitations

Our findings should be interpreted in the context of several limitations. First, despite the study's rigorous design and analytic approach, it was observational in nature and cannot establish a causal direction between symptom assessment and early CTh discontinuation. However, existing clinical trial evidence has shown that assessing and addressing patient-reported symptoms results in improved clinical outcomes. Thus, we aimed to provide complementary evidence from routine care to examine how clinical trial learnings support symptom assessment and management in practice. Second, the relatively low incidence of 90-day discontinuation due to toxicity limited our ability to detect significance in statistical inference. Future studies with a larger sample size and longer timeframe are needed to validate these results. Third, while IP weighting helps

reduce bias across patients with varying number of symptom assessment completion at different time points, it relies on the assumption that all relevant confounding variables were included in generating the weights. Due to limitations in data availability, our analysis may have omitted other important confounders. Finally, this study was conducted within a single healthcare system in the Boston metropolitan area. Therefore, caution is needed when generalizing these findings to other health systems or regions of the country.

Conclusions

Our findings suggest a trend toward more frequent completion of patient-reported symptom assessments being associated with a lower risk of early CTh discontinuation. Integrating patient-reported symptom assessment into routine care and using these data to guide medical decision-making represent a critical next step towards improving treatment safety and supporting the delivery of high-quality care during CTh.

Statement and Declarations

Acknowledgments: The authors thank the clinicians and program staff for their support on the successful implementation of patient-reported outcome measure collection at the gastrointestinal cancer clinics. The abstract related to this work has been published in the JCO Oncology Practice. Chengbo Zeng et al. Patient-reported symptom assessments and premature chemotherapy discontinuation in patients with gastrointestinal cancers. JCO Oncol Pract 21, 383-383(2025). DOI:10.1200/OP.2025.21.10_suppl.383

Competing interests: No other conflicts of interest were reported.

Consent for publication: This is a secondary data analysis based on de-identified electronic medical records. Therefore, no patient consent is needed.

Data availability statement: Individual patient data will not be shared.

Ethical approval statement and consent to participate: This study was approved by the Dana-Farber/Harvard Cancer Center (DF/HCC) Institutional Review Board (IRB protocol number: 25-048). This study involves secondary data analysis and does not require patient consent.

Funding: No funding resource related to this study.

Reference

1. Basch E, Deal AM, Kris MG, et al. Symptom Monitoring With Patient-Reported Outcomes During Routine Cancer Treatment: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. Feb 20 2016;34(6):557-65. doi:10.1200/JCO.2015.63.0830
2. Basch E, Schrag D, Henson S, et al. Effect of Electronic Symptom Monitoring on Patient-Reported Outcomes Among Patients With Metastatic Cancer: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. Jun 28 2022;327(24):2413-2422. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.9265
3. Mir O, Ferrua M, Fourcade A, et al. Digital remote monitoring plus usual care versus usual care in patients treated with oral anticancer agents: the randomized phase 3 CAPRI trial. *Nat Med*. Jun 2022;28(6):1224-1231. doi:10.1038/s41591-022-01788-1
4. Lizan L, Perez-Carbonell L, Comellas M. Additional Value of Patient-Reported Symptom Monitoring in Cancer Care: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *Cancers (Basel)*. Sep 15 2021;13(18)doi:10.3390/cancers13184615
5. Xia Y, Guan X, Zhu W, Wang Y, Shi Z, He P. Effectiveness of symptom monitoring on electronic patient-reported outcomes (ePROs) among patients with lung cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *NPJ Digit Med*. Jul 3 2025;8(1):399. doi:10.1038/s41746-025-01812-x
6. Zeng C, Martin NE, Pusic AL, Edelen MO, Liu JB. Enhancing representativeness of patient-reported outcomes in routine radiation oncology care: a quality improvement protocol to address non-response. *BMJ Open*. Dec 12 2024;14(12):e097127. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2024-097127

7. Stover AM, Haverman L, van Oers HA, Greenhalgh J, Potter CM, Group IPPiCPISW. Using an implementation science approach to implement and evaluate patient-reported outcome measures (PROM) initiatives in routine care settings. *Qual Life Res*. Nov 2021;30(11):3015-3033. doi:10.1007/s11136-020-02564-9

8. Basch E, Rocque G, Mody G, Mullangi S, Patt D. Tenets for Implementing Electronic Patient-Reported Outcomes for Remote Symptom Monitoring During Cancer Treatment. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform*. Feb 2023;7:e2200187. doi:10.1200/CCI.22.00187

9. Mody GN, Bennett AV, Stover AM, et al. Implementation of Symptom Monitoring With Electronic Patient-Reported Outcomes: Perspectives and Recommendations From Community Oncology Practices (Alliance AFT-39). *JCO Oncol Pract*. Apr 11 2025:OP2400627. doi:10.1200/OP-24-00627

10. Liu JB, Kaplan RS, Bates DW, Edelen MO, Sisodia RC, Pusic AL. Mass General Brigham's Patient-Reported Outcomes Measurement System: A Decade of Learnings. *NEJM Catalyst*. 2024;5(7)doi:10.1056/cat.23.0397

11. Hinds PS, Pinheiro LC, McFatrich M, et al. Recommended scoring approach for the pediatric patient-reported outcomes version of the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. Jun 2022;69(6):e29452. doi:10.1002/pbc.29452

12. Smith AW, Mitchell SA, C KDA, et al. News from the NIH: Person-centered outcomes measurement: NIH-supported measurement systems to evaluate self-

assessed health, functional performance, and symptomatic toxicity. *Transl Behav Med*. Sep 2016;6(3):470-4. doi:10.1007/s13142-015-0345-9

13. Reeve BB, Mitchell SA, Dueck AC, et al. Recommended patient-reported core set of symptoms to measure in adult cancer treatment trials. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Jul 2014;106(7)doi:10.1093/jnci/dju129

14. Ward Sullivan C, Leutwyler H, Dunn LB, Miaskowski C. A review of the literature on symptom clusters in studies that included oncology patients receiving primary or adjuvant chemotherapy. *J Clin Nurs*. Feb 2018;27(3-4):516-545. doi:10.1111/jocn.14057

15. Harris CS, Kober KM, Conley YP, Dhruva AA, Hammer MJ, Miaskowski CA. Symptom clusters in patients receiving chemotherapy: A systematic review. *BMJ Support Palliat Care*. Mar 2022;12(1):10-21. doi:10.1136/bmjspcare-2021-003325

16. Andre T, Boni C, Mounedji-Boudiaf L, et al. Oxaliplatin, fluorouracil, and leucovorin as adjuvant treatment for colon cancer. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 3 2004;350(23):2343-51. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa032709

17. Moore MJ, Goldstein D, Hamm J, et al. Erlotinib plus gemcitabine compared with gemcitabine alone in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer: a phase III trial of the National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group. *J Clin Oncol*. May 20 2007;25(15):1960-6. doi:10.1200/JCO.2006.07.9525

18. Wang-Gillam A, Li CP, Bodoky G, et al. Nanoliposomal irinotecan with fluorouracil and folinic acid in metastatic pancreatic cancer after previous gemcitabine-based

therapy (NAPOLI-1): a global, randomised, open-label, phase 3 trial. *Lancet*. Feb 6 2016;387(10018):545-557. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00986-1

19. Blumenthal GM, Gong Y, Kehl K, et al. Analysis of time-to-treatment discontinuation of targeted therapy, immunotherapy, and chemotherapy in clinical trials of patients with non-small-cell lung cancer. *Ann Oncol*. May 1 2019;30(5):830-838. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdz060

20. Boyne DJ, Brenner DR, Sajobi TT, et al. Development of a Model for Predicting Early Discontinuation of Adjuvant Chemotherapy in Stage III Colon Cancer. *JCO Clin Cancer Inform*. Oct 2020;4:972-984. doi:10.1200/CCI.20.00065

21. McCaffrey DF, Burgette LF, Griffin BA, Martin C, Ridgeway G. Toolkit for Weighting and Analysis of Nonequivalent Groups A Tutorial for the TWANG SAS Macros. *RAND Corporation*. 2014;doi:https://doi.org/10.7249/TL136

22. McCaffrey DF, Griffin BA, Almirall D, Slaughter ME, Ramchand R, Burgette LF. A tutorial on propensity score estimation for multiple treatments using generalized boosted models. *Stat Med*. Aug 30 2013;32(19):3388-414. doi:10.1002/sim.5753

23. McCaffrey DF, Ridgeway G, Morral AR. Propensity score estimation with boosted regression for evaluating causal effects in observational studies. *Psychol Methods*. Dec 2004;9(4):403-25. doi:10.1037/1082-989X.9.4.403

24. Mantziari S, St Amour P, Abboretti F, et al. A Comprehensive Review of Prognostic Factors in Patients with Gastric Adenocarcinoma. *Cancers (Basel)*. Mar 6 2023;15(5)doi:10.3390/cancers15051628

25. Sogaard M, Thomsen RW, Bossen KS, Sorensen HT, Norgaard M. The impact of comorbidity on cancer survival: a review. *Clin Epidemiol*. Nov 1 2013;5(Suppl 1):3-29. doi:10.2147/CLEP.S47150

26. Gospodarowicz M, O'Sullivan B. Prognostic factors in cancer. *Semin Surg Oncol*. 2003;21(1):13-8. doi:10.1002/ssu.10016

27. Palmer MJ, Mercieca-Bebber R, King M, Calvert M, Richardson H, Brundage M. A systematic review and development of a classification framework for factors associated with missing patient-reported outcome data. *Clin Trials*. Feb 2018;15(1):95-106. doi:10.1177/1740774517741113

28. Sherman RE, Anderson SA, Dal Pan GJ, et al. Real-World Evidence - What Is It and What Can It Tell Us? *N Engl J Med*. Dec 8 2016;375(23):2293-2297. doi:10.1056/NEJMsb1609216

29. Wilson BE, Booth CM. Real-world data: bridging the gap between clinical trials and practice. *EClinicalMedicine*. Dec 2024;78:102915. doi:10.1016/j.eclinm.2024.102915

30. Mou D, Horn DM, Heng M, et al. Primary care physician's (PCP) perceived value of patient-reported outcomes (PROs) in clinical practice: a mixed methods study. *BMJ Qual Saf*. Mar 2022;31(3):221-229. doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2020-012206

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients with gastrointestinal cancers receiving chemotherapy, 2019-2024 (N=1,178)

Characteristics	**n (%)**
≥ 65 years old	617 (52.4)
Male	690 (58.6)
White	1014 (86.1)
Non-Hispanic	1070 (90.8)
High school or less education	313 (26.6)
Unemployed, disabled, retired	670 (56.9)
Medicare/Medicaid insurance	461 (39.1)
Months since diagnosis	2.0 (0.8 – 9.3)
Cancer site	
Colorectal	408 (34.6)
Esophagus	196 (16.6)
Liver and bile duct	135 (11.5)
Pancreatic	363 (30.8)
Gastric	76 (6.5)
Cancer stage	
I, II, & III	653 (55.4)
IV	525 (44.6)
Treatment type	
Concurrent immunotherapy	357 (30.3)
Concurrent radiation	162 (13.8)

Concurrent target therapy	257 (21.8)
Regimen	
5-Fluorouracil	771 (65.5)
Oxaliplatin	649 (55.1)
Irinotecan	398 (33.8)
Paclitaxel	221 (18.8)
Gemcitabine	209 (17.7)
Treatment goal	
Adjuvant/Neoadjuvant	350 (29.7)
Control	132 (11.2)
Curative	154 (13.1)
Maintenance/supportive	6 (0.5)
Palliative	536 (45.5)
Charleson comorbidity index ≥ 1	130 (11.0)

Table 2. Distribution of symptom monitoring completion in the study cohort across the four time points (N= 1,178)

1st completion	2nd completion	3rd completion	4th completion	N	%
CTh initiation				394	23.6
CTh initiation	Day 30			211	12.6
CTh initiation	Day 30	Day 60		116	6.9
CTh initiation	Day 30	Day 60	Day 90	309	18.5
CTh initiation	Day 30	Day 90		45	2.7
CTh initiation	Day 60			48	2.9
CTh initiation	Day 60	Day 90		30	1.8
CTh initiation	Day 90			25	1.5
Total				**1,178**	**100**
One completion (Only CTh initiation)				394	23.6
Two completions (CTh initiation and one follow-up time point)				284	24.0
Three completions (CTh initiation and two follow-up time points)				191	16.2
Four completions (CTh initiation and three follow-up time points)				309	26.2

Notes: CTh: chemotherapy

Table 3. Fine-Gray model of 90-day discontinuation due to toxicity predicted by the number of symptom assessment completion in patients with gastrointestinal cancers receiving chemotherapy, 2019-2024

	Subdistribution hazard ratio (95%CI)	
	Unweighted	Weighted
Overall sample		
Number of completion	**0.49 (0.25 – 0.95)**	0.70 (0.44 – 1.12)
Age groups		
≤ 64 years	0.72 (0.42 – 1.24)	0.99 (0.64 – 1.52)
> 64 years	**0.27 (0.07 – 0.99)**	0.31 (0.08 – 1.17)
Comorbidity		
CCI = 0	0.62 (0.37 – 1.06)	0.80 (0.50 – 1.27)
CCI ≥ 1*	-	-
Cancer stage		
I, II, & III	0.63 (0.34 – 1.17)	0.85 (0.49 – 1.47)
IV	0.33 (0.10 – 1.10)	0.58 (0.31 – 1.06)
Cancer site		
Pancreatic cancer	0.50 (0.17 – 1.43)	0.79 (0.41 – 1.55)
Other cancers	**0.48 (0.24 – 0.97)**	0.65 (0.36 – 1.15)

Notes: We controlled age, sex, race, level of education, cancer site, cancer stage, concurrent immunotherapy, concurrent radiation therapy, use of 5-fluorouracil, use of oxaliplatin, use of gemcitabine, comorbidity, symptom score at treatment initiation. CCI: Charlson comorbidity index. *: Model was not converged due to small sample size.



Figure 1. Inclusion and exclusion flowchart for patients with gastrointestinal cancers completing symptom assessment within the Mass General Brigham Health System, 2019-2024

Notes: *: any colorectal, esophagus, liver and bile duct, pancreatic, and stomach cancers. †: patients might also submit PRO-CTCAE at days 30, 60, and 90 post initiation.



Figure 2. Symptom score by number of symptom assessments in patients with gastrointestinal cancers undergoing chemotherapy the Mass General Brigham Health System, 2019-2024

Notes: All patients with symptom assessments at chemotherapy (CTh) initiation were included. Patients with only one PRO-CTCAE contributed only to the symptom score at CTh initiation. Patients with at least two PRO-CTCAEs contributed to the symptom score at CTh initiation and at other time points (i.e., days 30, 60, and 90 post-initiation), depending on when they completed their symptom assessments.



Figure 3. Reasons and distributions of 90-day discontinuation in patients with gastrointestinal cancers receiving chemotherapy, 2019-2024 (N=124)

Supplemental Materials

Patient-Reported Symptom Assessments and Early Chemotherapy Discontinuation in Routine Gastrointestinal Cancer Care

Chengbo Zeng, PhD[1,2], Mariem Ahmed, BS[1], Yu-Jen Chen, MPH[3], Shumenghui Zhai, PhD[4], Gaberille B. Rocque, MD[5], Sandra C. Olisakwe, MPH[5], Patricia C. Dykes, PhD[2,6], Thomas J. Roberts, MD[2,7], Nneka N. Ufere, MD[2,8], Elizabeth S. Davis, MPH[1,3], Li Zhou, MD, PhD[2,6], Maria O. Edelen, PhD[1,2,9], Andrea L. Pusic, MD[1,2,10], Kelly M. Kenzik, PhD[1,2], Kelsey S. Lau-Min, MD[11], Jason B. Liu, MD[1,12]

Author affiliations:

1. Patient Reported Outcomes, Value and Experience (PROVE) Center, Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
2. Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA
3. Center for Surgery and Public Health, Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
4. School of Nursing, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, WA, USA
5. Divisions of Hematology & Oncology and Gerontology, Department of Medicine, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA
6. Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
7. Center for Head and Neck Cancers, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
8. Liver Center, Gastrointestinal Division, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
9. RAND Corporation, Boston, MA, USA
10. Division of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Surgery, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
11. Division of Hematology/Oncology, Department of Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, MA, USA
12. Department of Surgical Oncology, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA

Section A. Processing of routinely collected electronic health records and patient-reported symptom assessments

Challenges of processing routinely collected data

Processing routinely collected electronic health records (EHR) and patient-reported symptom assessments is challenging. Patients usually have multiple clinical visits during the study period, and the intervals between visits vary across individuals. Even patients with scheduled appointments are asked to complete a symptom assessment one week before their clinical visits through the standardized patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) program at Mass General Brigham (MGB); however, not all patients complete these assessments. By anchoring the clinical visits to the key time points of chemotherapy (CTh) and organizing it into a structured format, we enabled rigorous analyses to address our research questions.

Study population

Since the MGB gastrointestinal (GI) cancer clinics began implementing patient-reported symptom assessments through the MGB PROMs program in January 2019, our data extraction began at that time. Between January 2019 and January 2024, we identified adult patients with confirmed diagnoses of all-stage colorectal, esophageal, hepatobiliary, pancreatic, or gastric cancers based on primary diagnoses and corresponding ICD-10 codes **(Supplemental Table S1)**. We then identified a subset of patients who initiated any cytotoxic CTh regimens with or without concurrent immunotherapy or targeted therapy to GI cancers, as determined by regimens and their department specialties in the EHR. Patients who underwent immunotherapy or targeted therapy only were excluded. All included patients had at least one line of CTh treatment plan, while some had multiple lines depending on treatment adjustments.

Mapping clinical visits and their associated symptom assessments to key chemotherapy time points

Our primary focus was patient-reported symptom assessments, and the main outcome was early CTh discontinuation within 90 days of initiation. Although patients might have various clinical visits (e.g., 0, 1, 2, or more) to the GI clinics throughout their CTh treatment, not all these visits could be anchored to the initiation of a CTh treatment plan. Mapping these clinical visits to key CTh time points allowed us to maximize the use of their associated symptom assessments and responses in the analysis. Therefore, we pre-specified four time points: CTh initiation and days 30, 60, and 90 post-initiation. Eligible CTh treatment plans were required to have clinical visits occurring within 15 days of any of these four time points, resulting in four time windows: –15 to 14 (CTh initiation), 15 to 44 (day 30), 45 to 74 (day 60), and 75 to 104 (day 90) days. Only the treatment line and its associated time windows that were linked to the greatest number of clinical visits were included, resulting in one CTh treatment line per patient in the final analysis. For patients with multiple symptom assessments within the same window, we selected the one closest to the time point, resulting in one to four total assessments per patient. Finally, to ensure baseline completeness, we included only patients who completed a symptom assessment within 15 days of CTh initiation, with possible additional completions at days 30, 60, and 90 post-initiation.

Section B. Construction of inverse probability weight

The probability of completion is calculated at each time point. At chemotherapy initiation, the probability of completion (p_0) is 1. For any subsequent time point *i*, the overall probability of completion (P_i) is the cumulative product of the conditional probabilities of completion from time 0 through time *i*, i.e. $p_0, \ldots, p_i$. The formula for calculating P_i is shown in Formula 1:

$$P_i = P_{i-1} \cdot p_i = \left(\prod_{t=0}^{i-1} p_t \right) \cdot p_i \qquad (Formula\ 1)$$

For each time point, the weight (W_i) is calculated as the inverse of the probability of completion (P_i) (Formula 2). The final weight was retained for each individual and adjusted in the analysis.

$$W_i = \frac{1}{P_i} \qquad (Formula\ 2)$$

The probability of completion at each time point post chemotherapy initiation was modeled using age, sex, race, level of education, cancer site, cancer stage, concurrent immunotherapy, concurrent radiation therapy, use of 5-fluorouracil, use of oxaliplatin, use of gemcitabine, comorbidity, symptom score at CTh initiation, and prior completion.

Table S1. Cancer types and ICD-10 codes

Cancer Types	ICD-10 codes
Colorectal	C18.X, C19, C20
Esophagus	C15.X
Liver and bile duct	C22.X, C23
Pancreatic	C25.X
Gastric	C16.X

Table S2. Bivariate analysis of number of assessment completion (1 vs. ≥2) and demographic and clinical characteristics

Characteristics	p-value
Age group	0.866
Sex	**0.056**
Race	0.265
Ethnicity	0.320
Education	0.360
Employment	0.506
Insurance type	0.259
Duration of diagnosis	0.355
Cancer site	**0.069**
Cancer stage	0.196
Concurrent immunotherapy	0.629
Concurrent radiation	**0.052**
Concurrent target therapy	0.886
5-Fluorouracil	**<0.001**
Oxaliplatin	**0.009**
Irinotecan	0.504
Paclitaxel	0.111
Gemcitabine	0.251
Charleson comorbidity index	0.488
Symptom score at chemotherapy initiation	**<0.001**

Notes: Variables in bold were included in the construction of inverse probability weight.

Table S3. Bivariate analysis of discontinuation within the first 90 days of chemotherapy and demographic and clinical characteristics

Characteristics	p-value
Age group	**0.056**
Sex	0.943
Race	0.730
Ethnicity	0.522
Education	0.137
Employment	0.440
Insurance type	0.806
Duration of diagnosis	0.884
Cancer site	**0.027**
Cancer stage	**<0.001**
Concurrent immunotherapy	**0.003**
Concurrent radiation	0.988
Concurrent target therapy	0.364
5-Fluorouracil	0.407
Oxaliplatin	0.163
Irinotecan	0.410
Paclitaxel	0.858
Gemcitabine	**0.047**
Charleson comorbidity index	**0.005**
Symptom score at chemotherapy initiation	**<0.001**

Notes: Variables in bold were included in the construction of inverse probability weight.

Table S4. Fine-Gray model of 90-day discontinuation due to toxicity predicted by the symptom score in patients with gastrointestinal cancers receiving chemotherapy, 2019-2024[†]

	SHR (95%CI)
Model 1	
Symptom score at CTh initiation	1.03 (0.95 – 1.11)
Model 2[†]	
Change in symptom score from CTh initiation to day 90	1.07 (0.97 – 1.17)

Notes: †: Multiple imputation was used to handle missing data. SHR: Subdistribution hazard ratio**.** For these analyses, we controlled age, race, education, cancer site, concurrent target therapy, concurrent immunotherapy, concurrent radiation therapy, use of 5-FU, use of oxaliplatin, duration after diagnosis, comorbidity, and cancer stage.