

The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on quality of life, physical and psychosocial wellbeing in breast cancer patients and survivors – a prospective, multicenter cohort study

Authors

Claudia A Bargon CA^{1,2}, MD; Marilot CT Batenburg⁵, MD; Lilianne E van Stam¹; BSc, Dieuwke R Mink van der Molen¹, BSc; Iris E van Dam⁴, MD; Femke van der Leij⁴, MD, PhD; Inge O Baas⁵, MD, PhD; Miranda F Ernst⁶, MD; Wiesje Maarse³, MD, PhD; Nieke Vermulst⁷, MD; Ernst JP Schoenmaeckers⁸, MD, PhD; Thijs van Dalen⁹, MD, PhD; Rhodé M Bijlsma⁵, MD, PhD; Danny A Young-Afat¹⁰, MD, PhD; Annemiek Doeksen², PhD; Helena M Verkooijen^{1,11}, MD, PhD; UMBRELLA study group

Affiliations

¹ Division of Imaging and Oncology, University Medical Center (UMC) Utrecht, Heidelberglaan 100, 3584 CX, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

² Department of Surgery, St. Antonius Hospital, Soestwetering 1, 3543 AZ Utrecht, The Netherlands.

³ Department of Plastic, Reconstructive and Hand surgery, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

⁴ Department of Radiation Oncology, University Medical Center Utrecht, Cancer Center, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

⁵ Department of Medical Oncology, University Medical Center Utrecht, Cancer Center, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

⁶ Department of Surgery, Alexander Monro Clinics, Bilthoven, the Netherlands.

⁷ Department of Surgery, Rivierenland Hospital, Tiel, The Netherlands.

⁸ Department of Surgery, Meander Medisch Centrum, Amersfoort, The Netherlands

⁹ Department of Surgery, Diaconessenhuis Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands.

¹⁰ Department of Plastic, Reconstructive and Hand surgery, Amsterdam University Medical Center, location VUmc, The Netherlands.

¹¹ Utrecht University (UU), Heidelberglaan 100, 3584 CX, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Role of the funding source

The authors received no financial support for the research (including study design; data collection, analysis, interpretation of data; and writing of the report), authorship, and/ or (the decision to submit the article for) publication.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Janet van Dasselaar for her support with the clinical data management, and Rosalie van den Boogaard for support with IRB approval. We are greatly indebted to the Medical Ethics Committee of the UMC Utrecht for expedited ethical review of the protocol.

Corresponding Author for Publication

Prof Dr HM Verkooijen

Imaging Division, University Medical Center (UMC) Utrecht

Heidelberglaan 100, 3584 CX, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Email: H.M.Verkooijen@umcutrecht.nl

Telephone: 0031 88 755 95 75

Corresponding Author during Submission

Drs C.A. Bargon

Department of Surgery, St. Antonius Hospital

Soestwetering 1, 3543 AZ Utrecht, The Netherlands

Email: c.bargon@antoniuziekenhuis.nl

Telephone: 0031 6 53 95 27 56

Running Head

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON BREAST CANCER PATIENTS AND SURVIVORS

Word Count

3263 words (excluding abstract, acknowledgments, tables, figure legends, and references).

Number of figures and tables

1 figure and 4 tables.

Disclosure of relationships and activities

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Originality of the Work

This manuscript, including related data, figures and tables, is solely the work of the authors stated, has not been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere.

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 **Purpose:** The COVID-19 pandemic and the resulting social distancing and lockdown
3 measures are having a substantial impact on daily life and medical management of
4 people with breast cancer. We evaluated to what extent these changes have affected
5 quality of life and physical, and psychosocial wellbeing of people (being) treated for
6 breast cancer.

7 **Methods:** This study was conducted within the prospective Utrecht cohort for
8 Multiple BREast cancer intervention studies and Long-term evaluation (UMBRELLA).
9 Shortly after the implementation of COVID-19 measures, extra questionnaires were
10 sent to 1595 cohort participants, including standard UMBRELLA quality of life
11 (EORTC) questionnaires. Patient-reported outcomes (PROs) were compared to the
12 most recent PROs collected within UMBRELLA before COVID-19. The impact of
13 COVID-19 on PROs was evaluated using mixed models analysis.

14 **Results:** In total, 1051 patients (66%) completed the questionnaires. One third (n =
15 327, 31%) reported a higher threshold to contact their general practitioner due to
16 COVID-19. A significant deterioration in emotional functioning was observed (82.6 to
17 77.9, $p < 0.001$) and 505 (48%, 95% CI 45-51) patients reported moderate to severe
18 loneliness. Small significant improvements were observed in QoL, physical-, social-
19 and role functioning scores. In the subgroup of 51 patients under active treatment,
20 there was a strong deterioration in social functioning (69.8 to 5.0, $p = 0.03$).

21 **Conclusion:** Due to COVID-19, patients (being) treated for breast cancer are less
22 likely to contact physicians, and experience a deterioration in emotional functioning.
23 Patients undergoing active treatment report a strong drop in social functioning. One
24 in two patients reports (severe) loneliness. Online applications facilitating peer

25 contact and e-mental health interventions could support mental health and social
26 interaction times of total lockdown or social distancing.

27

28 **Word count:** 275.

29

30 **Keywords:** Breast Cancer; COVID-19; Corona virus; Quality of Life; Psychosocial
31 Wellbeing; Longitudinal; UMBRELLA; pandemic; Patient-reported outcomes.

32

33 **ABBREVIATIONS**

34	BMI	Body Mass Index
35	CF	Cognitive functioning (EORTC-QLQ30 subdomain)
36	CI	95% Confidence Interval
37	COVID-19	COronaVirus Disease 2019
38	DCIS	Ductal carcinoma in situ
39	EF	Emotional functioning (EORTC-QLQ30 subdomain)
40	EORTC	European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer
41	HADS	Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale
42	IQR	Interquartile range
43	MD	Mean Difference
44	METC	Medical Ethics Research Committee (Dutch: Medisch Ethische
45		Toetsingscommissie)
46	n	number
47	NKR	Netherlands Cancer Registry
48	PF	Physical functioning (EORTC-QLQ30 subdomain)
49	PRO(s)	Patient reported outcome(s)
50	QoL	Quality of Life
51	RF	Role functioning (EORTC-QLQ30 subdomain)
52	SD	Standard deviation

53	SF	Social functioning (EORTC-QLQ30 subdomain)
54	SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
55	STROBE	STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in
56		Epidemiology
57	UMBRELLA	Utrecht cohort for Multiple BREast cancer intervention studies
58		and Long-term evaluation
59	UMCU	University Medical Center Utrecht
60	WHO	World Health Organization
61		

62 INTRODUCTION

63 With the outbreak of the novel and rapidly spreading coronavirus disease 2019
64 (COVID-19), many extraordinary emergency measures have been taken in order to
65 prevent and control spread of the virus.^{1,2} National restrictions varied from total
66 lockdown to targeted quarantine and social distancing.³⁻⁵ Despite drastic efforts, the
67 World Health Organization (WHO) declared the COVID-19 outbreak officially a
68 pandemic on March 11, 2020.⁶

69 As the COVID-19 pandemic has put health care systems under unprecedented
70 stress, urgent re-arrangements of non COVID-19 related health care has been of vital
71 importance.^{5,7,8} A shift of tasks and responsibilities of health care personnel was
72 needed in order to keep up with the increasing pressure on the health care
73 workforce.^{9,10} To prioritize hospital capacity in both workforce, (intensive care) beds
74 and medical recourses for critically ill COVID-19 patients, elective care was
75 suspended as much as possible while only emergency care and semi-urgent
76 oncological procedures were continued.^{5,11} For breast cancer, surgical procedures
77 were postponed when possible, various types of treatment (chemo- and
78 radiotherapy) were adapted, and follow-up appointments cancelled, postponed or
79 transformed into (video)calls.^{8,12} Also, paramedical (after)care such as medical
80 rehabilitation and psychological support was scaled down to a minimum.¹¹

81 Delays and changes in breast cancer diagnosis, treatment and follow-up protocols
82 due to COVID-19 may induce concerns about recurrence or survival.¹² This, in
83 combination with concerns about the new viral threat in general, could impair
84 patients' mental and emotional wellbeing.¹³ Moreover, social support is crucial for
85 supporting quality of life and mental health in people (being) treated for breast

86 cancer.^{14,15} Measures of social distancing or lockdown may interfere with networks of
87 support, and have a negative impact on mental health and emotional functioning.

88 The purpose of this study was to measure the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on
89 quality of life, physical and psychosocial functioning of women (being) treated for
90 breast cancer.

91

92 **MATERIALS & METHODS**

93 **Study design and participants**

94 The present study was conducted within the ongoing prospective multicenter Utrecht
95 cohort for Multiple BREast cancer intervention studies and Long-term evalUAtion
96 (UMBRELLA).^{16,17} Since 2013, the UMBRELLA cohort included patients \geq 18 years
97 old, who were referred from six hospitals in the Utrecht region to the Department of
98 Radiation Oncology of the University Medical Center Utrecht (UMCU), the
99 Netherlands. Inclusion criteria were histologically proven invasive breast cancer or
100 ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS), and the ability to understand the Dutch language
101 (written and spoken). Prior to the first appointment with the radiation oncologist,
102 breast cancer patients were invited to participate in the UMBRELLA cohort.
103 Participants provided informed consent for the longitudinal collection of clinical data
104 and patient-reported outcomes (PROs) through paper or online questionnaires at
105 regular intervals during and after treatment.¹⁶ Clinical data, including patient, tumor
106 and treatment characteristics, was provided by the Netherlands Cancer Registry
107 (NKR). PROs were collected before the start of radiation therapy (baseline), after
108 three and six months, and each six months up to ten years thereafter through self-
109 reported questionnaires.¹⁶ The UMBRELLA study adheres to the Dutch law on
110 Medical Research Involving Human Subjects (WMO) and the Declaration of Helsinki
111 (version 2013). The study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of the
112 UMCU (NL52651.041.15, METC 15/165) and is registered on clinicaltrials.gov
113 (NCT02839863). This study is reported in accordance with the STrengthening the
114 Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement.¹⁸

115

116 **Data collection**

117 Shortly after introduction of the COVID-19 measures in the Netherlands (March 12,
118 2020), an additional COVID-19 specific online survey was sent out on the 7th of April,
119 2020, and one reminder was sent on the 15th of April, 2020. The survey included
120 three PRO-questionnaires (the EORTC QLQ-C30/BR23, HADS and the De Jong
121 Gierveld Loneliness Scale) and a COVID-19-specific questions. The survey was
122 conducted among active UMBRELLA cohort participants who were enrolled between
123 October 2013 and April 2020 with a known email address.

124 The cancer specific Quality of Life core questionnaire (QLQ-C30) of the European
125 Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC) was used to assess
126 global health-related quality of life (QoL), physical functioning, role functioning,
127 cognitive functioning, emotional functioning, social functioning, dyspnea, insomnia,
128 and financial difficulties.¹⁹ Patients' future perspective was evaluated with the breast
129 cancer specific module (QLQ-BR23). Each subscale of the EORTC questionnaires
130 includes one to five items, all measured by a 4-point Likert scale.¹⁹ Global QoL is
131 scored on a 7-point Likert scale.²⁰ For each subscale a summary score was
132 calculated according to the EORTC manual.²⁰ After linear transformation to a 0 to
133 100 scale, a higher score represents a better outcome on each domain for functional
134 scales (i.e. QoL, physical-, role-, cognitive-, social-, and emotional functioning), and a
135 lower score represents better outcome for symptom scales (i.e. dyspnea, insomnia,
136 and financial difficulties).²⁰

137 The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) was used to assess symptoms
138 of anxiety and depression.²¹ The HADS is a 14-item scale and each item has four
139 answer options. Each question scores 0 to 3 points. Patients with scores of 8 or
140 higher are at risk of having anxiety or depressive disorders.²²

141 Overall, emotional, and social loneliness was assessed using the 6-item De Jong
142 Gierveld Loneliness Scale.²³ Each item has three scoring options: "yes", "more or
143 less", or "no". Loneliness scores were calculated using the matching scoring
144 algorithm.²⁴ Patients with scores between two and four on the 6-item scale were
145 considered moderately lonely, and patients with a score above four were considered
146 severely lonely were.²⁴ Scores above two on each of the 3-item subscales for
147 emotional and social loneliness indicate emotional and/ or social loneliness. ²⁴

148 Additional questions were developed to assess presence of (symptoms resembling)
149 COVID-19 and the impact of COVID-19 on health care consumption and
150 expectations.

151 PROs during COVID-19 were compared to the most recent pre-COVID-19
152 questionnaires as obtained within UMBRELLA. We excluded patients from
153 comparative analyses when their most recent questionnaire was completed more
154 than two years before the day that the first COVID-19 patient was diagnosed in the
155 Netherlands (February 27, 2020).

156 Clinical data was obtained from the electronic patient records and from the
157 UMBRELLA dataset as retrieved from the NKR, and included age at cohort
158 enrolment, Body Mass Index (BMI, calculated with last known mean height and
159 weight), smoking (current, previous, no smoker), self-reported highest educational
160 level (no education, primary school, pre-vocational secondary education, senior
161 general or pre-university secondary education, secondary vocational education,
162 higher professional education, or university degree), surgical treatment, most
163 invasive axillary treatment, (neo)-adjuvant radiation therapy and systemic treatment,
164 currently receiving active treatment, pathological T and N stage (American Joint
165 Committee on Cancer [AJCC] 7th edition).

166

167 **Treatment protocols**

168 All UMBRELLA participants underwent mastectomy or breast conserving surgery
169 combined with axillary staging and/or radiotherapy. Before the COVID-19 pandemic,
170 all patients were treated in adherence to the Dutch guidelines for breast cancer
171 treatment, as appropriate.²⁵

172 After the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, modifications to breast cancer treatment
173 protocols were advised by the Dutch Society for Surgical Oncology (NVCO; March
174 27, 2020), and the Dutch Society for Medical Oncology (NVMO; March 22, 2020). In
175 general, this advice included deferring of surgery in low risk patients, and de-
176 escalation of (neo)adjuvant chemotherapy. Details are presented in Appendix 1.
177 Breast cancer physicians from each of the six referring hospitals (where participants
178 received all breast cancer treatment, except radiotherapy) confirmed to adhere to the
179 new national advice, with the exception of one hospital, which was exclusively
180 reserved for non-COVID-19 care and could therefore continue with standard surgical
181 care without any alterations, while adhering to the new advice regarding medical
182 oncological care and breast reconstructive surgery.

183

184 **Statistical analysis**

185 Frequencies, proportions, and means with standard deviations (SD) or medians with
186 interquartile ranges (IQR) as appropriate, were used to describe patient and clinical
187 characteristics, COVID-19 related questions, and PROs.

188 To measure the impact of COVID-19 on PROs, most recent reported scores from the
189 EORTC-QLQ30/BR23 and the HADS before the start of the COVID-19 pandemic
190 were compared to the PROs during COVID-19. Crude mean EORTC scores were
191 compared with the paired samples t-test and crude median HADS scores with the
192 Wilcoxon signed rank test.

193 To estimate whether the impact of COVID-19 on clinically relevant PROs varied with
194 time since (active) treatment, participants were categorized into four groups, i.e.
195 active treatment, non-active treatment and enrolled in UMBRELLA < 24 months
196 before the survey, non-active treatment and enrolled 24-60 months before the
197 survey, and non-active treatment and enrolled > 60 months before the survey. A
198 linear mixed effect model for repeated measurements was used to measure the
199 impact of COVID-19 on PROs, and included a patient-specific random intercept, a
200 linear time effect, and an interaction between time since diagnosis and period (pre-
201 /post-COVID-19). To correct for potential confounders, age (linear) was included as
202 fixed variable in the model in the non-actively treated group. In the actively treated
203 group further adjustment was performed for chemotherapy, type of radiotherapy, and
204 type of surgery. Changes in PROs due to COVID-19 were reported as mean
205 differences (MD) with 95% confidence intervals (CI).

206 All reported p-values were two-sided and p-values < 0.05 were considered
207 statistically significant. Statistical analyses were performed with the use of IBM
208 Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software, version 25 (IBM Corp,
209 Armonk, NY).

210 **RESULTS**

211 Between October 2013 and April 2020, 3239 patients were enrolled in the
212 UMBRELLA cohort (Fig. 1). Of all study participants, 1595 met the inclusion criteria
213 for the present study and were sent the extra COVID-19 survey, of whom 1051
214 patients (66%) responded. Mean age was 56 years (SD 9.8) and median time since
215 diagnosis was 24 months (IQR 6-42, Table 1). Most patients (56%) were treated for a
216 stage 1 tumor and received breast conserving surgery (77%). Fifty-one participants
217 (4.9%) were receiving active treatment (chemo- and/or radiotherapy) for their breast
218 cancer during the COVID-19 pandemic (Table 2).

219

220 *Physical and psychosocial wellbeing during COVID-19*

221 Of all responders, one patient (0.1%) had confirmed COVID-19 infection and 100
222 patients (9.5%) indicated to have been possibly infected as they experienced
223 symptoms of fever, but they had not been tested for the virus. Twenty-seven percent
224 (n = 286) of all responders felt that the COVID-19 measures affected their current
225 treatment or (after)care, and 24% (n = 250) felt that these measures were likely to
226 affect their (after)care in the future (Table 2).

227 Almost one third (n = 327, 31%) reported a higher threshold to contact their general
228 practitioner due to the COVID-19 outbreak, and 162 patients (15%) indicated to be
229 less likely to contact the physician treating their breast cancer. Family and friends
230 were contacted less easily by 87 responders (8%). Most responders (n = 983, 95%)
231 were not or a little bit worried about their financial situation as a result of COVID-19
232 (Table 2).

233 During the COVID-19 pandemic, 409 of all responders (39%) reported moderate
234 feelings of loneliness, and 96 (9.3%) felt severely lonely (Table 3). Of these, 202
235 patients (40%) felt socially lonely, and 396 patients (78.4%) felt emotionally lonely.

236

237 *Comparison of PROs before and during COVID-19*

238 For 1022 responders (97%) pre and post COVID-19 EORTC scores, and for 942
239 (90%) pre and post COVID-19 HADS scores could be compared. Overall, mean
240 scores for the EORTC subdomains QoL, physical functioning, role functioning,
241 significantly improved during COVID-19. Mean scores for the EORTC subdomain
242 emotional functioning worsened significantly. Also, median HADS total score and
243 depression score deteriorated significantly during COVID-19 (Table 3).

244 In the subgroup of actively treated patients, there was a strong significant drop in
245 social functioning of 15.9 points during COVID-19 after adjustment for age,
246 chemotherapy, type of radiotherapy and type of surgery in mixed model analysis
247 (Table 4).

248 Among the non-actively treated patients, age adjusted analyses showed that
249 emotional functioning worsened significantly in all groups, whereas physical
250 functioning improved significantly in all groups (Table 4). QoL, role functioning, and
251 social functioning improved significantly in non-actively treated patients who were
252 enrolled in UMBRELLA < 24 months (Table 4).

253

254 **DISCUSSION**

255 The COVID-19 pandemic has a substantial impact on individuals (being) treated for
256 breast cancer. One in three patients reported to be less likely to contact their general
257 practitioner, and 15% indicated to be less likely to contact their breast cancer
258 physician due to barriers induced by COVID-19 restrictions. In patients actively
259 receiving treatment, social functioning decreased dramatically, and in patients who
260 were no longer receiving active treatment, deterioration of emotional functioning was
261 observed. At the same time, COVID-19 seemed to have a positive effect on QoL,
262 physical functioning, role functioning and social functioning in non-actively treated
263 patients. Loneliness was reported by almost 50% of all participants.

264 The high proportion of participants indicating to experience a higher barrier to contact
265 their health care providers is in line with the upsetting findings of the Dutch
266 nationwide cancer registry (NKR), who reported a nationwide decrease up to 40% in
267 cancer diagnoses during COVID-19.²⁶ Jones and colleagues²⁷ from the United
268 Kingdom also expressed their concerns about patients potentially feeling a higher
269 barrier to consult a general practitioner for non-specific symptoms and for moral
270 arguments.¹² Moreover, an average drop of 37% of referrals by general practitioners
271 to all medical specialties was observed in the Netherlands during the outbreak.²⁸ This
272 highlights the importance of creating public awareness about the risk a potential
273 delay in seeking medical help could cause, aiming to lower the barriers for patients to
274 contact a physician when they experience symptoms.²⁶

275 Among patients who were receiving active breast cancer treatment during the
276 COVID-19 pandemic, a major decrease in social functioning was observed (Table 4).
277 One explanation for this decrease could be that these patients were more careful
278 regarding social interaction. Recent publications underlining the risk of COVID-19

279 related adverse events in cancer patients might have amplified their concerns about
280 contracting the virus.^{8,12,29-31}

281 All non-actively treated patients (i.e., including all lengths of follow-up since
282 diagnosis) showed a significant reduction in the emotional functioning domain. The 4-
283 item emotional functioning domain assesses anxiety, depression and general distress
284 through questions about feeling tense, worrying, depressive, and irritable feelings.³²
285 The reduction in this domain is very likely attributable to COVID-19, since we know
286 from pre-COVID-19 work in UMBRELLA that emotional functioning of people treated
287 for breast cancer continues to increase over time (as shown in their supplementary
288 data).³³ Also, the median score for depression worsened significantly during COVID-
289 19. Concerns about the new viral threat might have enhanced overall uncertainty in
290 individuals. Different types of coping mechanisms could play a role here; lower
291 tolerance of uncertainty is related to higher appraisal of a health threat and higher
292 levels emotion-focused coping strategies.¹³ A previous study showed that, during the
293 2009 H1N1 viral outbreak, emotion-focused coping was related with increased levels
294 of depression.¹³

295 Interestingly, despite the deterioration in emotional functioning in all non-actively
296 treated patients, there was a significant increase in global QoL, role functioning,
297 social functioning, and physical functioning. This may partly be explained by the fact
298 that these scores tend to increase over time since diagnosis and, also in the absence
299 of COVID-19, we would expect an increase in these domains.³³ Another explanation
300 could be found in an effect of a Dutch media campaign that encourages (non-risk)
301 exercise to enhance both public physical and mental wellbeing in these exceptional
302 times.³⁴ The remarkable, perhaps counter-intuitive, increase in QoL could be
303 explained by the fact that a shared crisis may put patients' perceived QoL in relation

304 to their disease in a different perspective, and may even accelerate
305 reconceptualization of their QoL.³⁵ The significant increase in social and role
306 functioning suggests that patients reported an increased ability to fulfil responsibilities
307 associated with occupational, and/ or family roles. Governmental measures
308 encouraging work from home and prohibiting social events (i.e., less social
309 obligations) in times of social distancing or lockdown may also play a role.

310 The current study showed that 48% of all responders felt lonely, the majority
311 reporting to feel emotionally lonely. Experiencing health problems can induce
312 loneliness and vice versa.³⁶ Therefore, (breast) cancer patients might be particularly
313 vulnerable for feelings of loneliness. Social isolation measures to fight the COVID-19
314 pandemic might enhance these feelings. Unfortunately, loneliness is not a parameter
315 that was captured routinely in the UMBRELLA cohort, so it was impossible to
316 measure the impact of COVID-19 on loneliness. However, the reported proportion of
317 48% loneliness is substantially higher than the reported 34% in the general Dutch
318 population in 2019 (pre COVID-19), as measured by the same Loneliness scale in a
319 survey conducted by Statistics Netherlands (CBS, n = 7.398).³⁷ Also, our proportion
320 of patients feeling lonely was substantially higher than the 30-35% cancer patients
321 reporting to feel lonely in a study that was conducted before COVID-19.³⁸ Moreover,
322 the percentage of patients feeling severely lonely was strikingly high in this study
323 when compared to other studies; almost 10% compared to 0-2% in other studies
324 performed among cancer patients.³⁶ Thus, even though we cannot rule out other
325 contributing factors, the higher proportion of patients feeling lonely in this study is
326 likely due to the COVID-19 measures.

327 With the high survival rates of breast cancer patients, mental health has become an
328 integral focus of supportive treatment. However, a barrier to e-mental health still

329 exists.^{10,39} Especially in times when face-to-face contact is not an option, and when
330 the global need for psychological and/ or peer support is rising due to the viral threat,
331 efforts are needed to rapidly implement e-mental health programs and digital
332 psychological interventions. Only by adapting to the new circumstances will we be
333 able to treat both ongoing and emerging mental health care conditions due to
334 COVID-19, and prevent long-term problems.^{10,40} The results of this study underline
335 the magnitude of the impact of a major health crisis on the psychosocial wellbeing of
336 breast cancer patients. Considering that a second wave of COVID-19 or another
337 future outbreak with similar impact is probable,^{12,41} one would hope that the current
338 COVID-19 pandemic may serve as a turning point in the adoption and acceptance of
339 successful e-mental health applications.³⁹

340 A limitation of this study is the fact that only 51 patients (4.9%) in our cohort received
341 active treatment during COVID-19, causing relatively wide 95% confidence intervals
342 in this group. As a consequence, the results of this study are predominantly
343 influenced by the large group of breast cancer survivors, while the impact of COVID-
344 19 might be more severe for newly diagnosed patients who, for example,
345 experienced adjusted treatment protocols such as deferred surgery. Second, even
346 though baseline characteristics of responders and non-responders were comparable,
347 an under- or overestimation of the results due to selective (non-)response could not
348 be ruled out as the reasons for 34% non-response were unclear. Third, this study
349 measured the impact of COVID-19 approximately six weeks after the start of COVID-
350 19. Therefore, it is unclear whether the results of this study represent a short-term, or
351 a longer-lasting effect. However, previous literature on the 2009 H1N1 viral threat
352 showed that the psychological effects can persist up to 30 months after the
353 outbreak.¹³ Last, in this study, we could not compare the impact of COVID-19 on

354 patients (being) treated for breast cancer to the impact on a healthy reference
355 population. An important strength of this study is that the UMBRELLA cohort provided
356 a unique opportunity to longitudinally compare validated PRO scores during COVID-
357 19 with the scores before COVID-19 in an identical population, in a representative
358 population of patients with breast cancer.²⁰

359

360 **CONCLUSION**

361 COVID-19 is having a substantial impact on individuals (being) treated for breast
362 cancer. Emotional functioning deteriorated in patients treated for breast cancer
363 following the COVID-19 pandemic, one in two responders reported (severe)
364 loneliness, and one in three reported to be less likely to contact their health care
365 providers. In actively treated patients, social functioning decreased dramatically.
366 COVID-19 seemed to have a small but significant positive effect on QoL, physical
367 functioning, social functioning, and role functioning in previously treated breast
368 cancer patients.

369

370 **Compliance with ethical standards**

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

372

373 *Ethical approval:* This study was in accordance with the ethical standards of the
374 institutional and/ or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki
375 declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

376

377 *Informed consent:* Informed consent from all individual participants was obtained
378 within the UMBRELLA cohort.

379

380 **Author contributions**

381 The corresponding author (HM Verkooijen) confirms that she had full access to all the
382 data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

383 Each author has contributed significantly to, and is willing to take public responsibility
384 for, the following aspects of the study:

385 - *Design:* C.A. Bargon, M.C.T. Batenburg, L.E. van Stam, D.R. Mink van der
386 Molen, W. Maarse, N. Vermulst, I.E. van Dam, F. van der Leij, E.J.P.

387 Schoenmaeckers, M.F. Ernst, I.O. Baas, T. van Dalen, R. Bijlsma, D.A.

388 Young-Afat, A. Doeksen, H.M. Verkooijen.

389 - *Data Acquisition:* C.A. Bargon, M.C.T. Batenburg, L.E. van Stam, D.R. Mink
390 van der Molen, A. Doeksen, H.M. Verkooijen.

- 391 - *Analyses:* C.A. Bargon, M.C.T. Batenburg, L.E. van Stam, D.R. Mink van der
392 Molen, D.A. Young-Afat, H.M. Verkooijen.
- 393 - *Interpretation* C.A. Bargon, M.C.T. Batenburg, D.R. Mink van der Molen, D.A.
394 Young-Afat, H.M. Verkooijen.
- 395 - *Drafting:* C.A. Bargon, L.E. van Stam,
- 396 - *Critical Revision:* C.A. Bargon, M.C.T. Batenburg, L.E. van Stam, D.R. Mink
397 van der Molen, W. Maarse, N. Vermulst, I.E. van Dam, F. van der Leij, E.J.P.
398 Schoenmaeckers, M.F. Ernst, I.O. Baas, T. van Dalen, R. Bijlsma, D.A.
399 Young-Afat, A. Doeksen, H.M. Verkooijen.

400

401 *Role of medical writer or editor:* The authors did not receive any writing assistance.

402

403 REFERENCES

- 404 1. Wang H, Zhang L. Risk of COVID-19 for patients with cancer. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020
405 Apr;21(4):e181. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30149-2.
- 406 2. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult
407 inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet.* 2020 Mar 28;
408 395(10229):1054–1062. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3.
- 409 3. Haffajee RL, Mello MM. Thinking Globally, Acting Locally - The U.S. Response to
410 Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 Apr 2. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2006740.
- 411 4. Studdert DM, Hall MA. Disease Control, Civil Liberties, and Mass Testing - Calibrating
412 Restrictions during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 Apr 9. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2007637.
- 413 5. Abu Hilal M, Besselink MG, Lemmers DHL, Taylor MA, Triboldi A. Early look at the
414 future of healthcare during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Br J Surg.* 2020 May 8. DOI: 10.1002/bjs.11666.
- 415 6. World Health Organization (WHO). WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the
416 media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. Retrieved from:
417 [https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020)
418 [on-covid-19---11-march-2020](https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020). Published 2020. Updated March 11, 2020. Accessed April 10, 2020.
- 419 7. Emanuel EJ, Persad G, Upshur R, et al. Fair Allocation of Scarce Medical Resources
420 in the Time of Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 Mar 23. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMs2005114.
- 421 8. Marandino L, Necchi A, Aglietta M, et al. COVID-19 Emergency and the Need to
422 Speed Up the Adoption of Electronic Patient-Reported Outcomes in Cancer Clinical Practice. *JCO*
423 *Oncology Practice.* 0:OP.20.00237
- 424 9. Fraher EP, Pittman P, Frogner BK, et al. Ensuring and Sustaining a Pandemic
425 Workforce. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 Apr 8. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMp2006376.
- 426 10. Liu R, Sundaresan T, Reed ME, et al. Telehealth in Oncology During the COVID-19
427 Outbreak: Bringing the House Call Back Virtually. *JCO Oncology Practice.* 0:OP.20.00199
- 428 11. The Lancet Oncology. COVID-19: global consequences for oncology. *Lancet Oncol.*
429 2020 Apr;21(4):467. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30175-3.
- 430 12. The Lancet Oncology. Safeguarding cancer care in a post-COVID-19 world. *Lancet*
431 *Oncol.* 2020 May;21(5):603. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30243-6.

- 432 13. Taha S, Matheson K, Cronin T, Anisman H. Intolerance of uncertainty, appraisals,
433 coping, and anxiety: the case of the 2009 H1N1 pandemic. *Br J Health Psychol*. 2014 Sep;**19**(3):592–
434 605. DOI: 10.1111/bjhp.12058.
- 435 14. Sowa M, Głowacka-Mrotek I, Monastyrska E, et al. Assessment of quality of life in
436 women five years after breast cancer surgery, members of Breast Cancer Self-Help Groups - non-
437 randomized, cross-sectional study. *Contemp Oncol (Pozn)*. 2018;**22**(1):20–26. DOI:
438 10.5114/wo.2018.74389.
- 439 15. Legg MA-O, Hyde MK, Occhipinti S, Youl PH, Dunn J, Chambers SK. A prospective
440 and population-based inquiry on the use and acceptability of peer support for women newly diagnosed
441 with breast cancer. *Support Care Cancer*. 2019 Feb;**27**(2):677-685. DOI: 10.1007/s00520-018-4358-z.
- 442 16. Young-Afat DA, van Gils CH, van den Bongard H, Verkooijen HM. The Utrecht cohort
443 for Multiple BREast cancer intervention studies and Long-term evaLuAtion (UMBRELLA): objectives,
444 design, and baseline results. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2017 Jul;**164**(2):445–450. DOI:
445 10.1007/s10549-017-4242-4.
- 446 17. Gal R, Monninkhof EM, van Gils CH, et al. The Trials within Cohorts design faced
447 methodological advantages and disadvantages in the exercise oncology setting. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
448 2019 Sep;**113**:137–146. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.05.017.
- 449 18. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of
450 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational
451 studies. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2008 Apr;**61**(4):344-9. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.008.
- 452 19. Aaronson NK, Ahmedzai S, Bergman B, Bullinger M, et al. The European
453 Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer QLQ-C30: a quality-of-life instrument for use in
454 international clinical trials in oncology. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 1993 Mar 3;**85**(5):365–76.
- 455 20. Fayers P, Aaronson NK, Bjordal K, Groenvold M, Curran D, Bottomley A. EORTC
456 QLQ-C30 Scoring Manual. 3rd ed. Brussels: European Organisation for Research and Treatment of
457 Cancer, 2001.
- 458 21. Spinhoven P, Ormel J, Sloekers PP, Kempen GI, Speckens AE, Van Hemert AM. A
459 validation study of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) in different groups of Dutch
460 subjects. *Psychol Med*. 1997 Mar; **27**(2):363–70.

- 461 22. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The hospital anxiety and depression scale. *Acta Psychiatr*
462 *Scand.* 1983 Jun;**67**(6):361–70.
- 463 23. de Jong Gierveld J, van Tilburg T. [A shortened scale for overall, emotional and social
464 loneliness]. *Tijdschr Gerontol Geriatr.* 2008 Feb;**39**(1):4–15.
- 465 24. de Jong Gierveld, J, van Tilburg TG. Manual of the loneliness scale. VU University
466 Amsterdam, Department of Social Research Methodology. Updated from the printed version: 12-11-
467 2019. Retrieved from: https://home.fsw.vu.nl/tg.van.tilburg/manual_loneliness_scale_1999.html.
468 Published 2019. Accessed May 2, 2020.
- 469 25. Nationaal Borstkankeroverleg Nederland (NABON). [Landelijke richtlijn
470 Mammacarcinoom]. Retrieved from: [https://heelkunde.nl/sites/heelkunde.nl/files/richtlijnen-](https://heelkunde.nl/sites/heelkunde.nl/files/richtlijnen-definitief/Mammacarcinoom2012.pdf)
471 [definitief/Mammacarcinoom2012.pdf](https://heelkunde.nl/sites/heelkunde.nl/files/richtlijnen-definitief/Mammacarcinoom2012.pdf). Published 2012. Accessed April 20, 2020.
- 472 26. Dinmohamed AG, Visser O, Verhoeven RHA, et al. Fewer cancer diagnoses during
473 the COVID-19 epidemic in the Netherlands. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020 Apr 30. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-
474 2045(20)30265-5.
- 475 27. Jones D, Neal RD, Duffy SRG, Scott SE, Whitaker KL, Brain K. Impact of the COVID-
476 19 pandemic on the symptomatic diagnosis of cancer: the view from primary care. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020
477 Apr 30. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-2045(20)30242-4.
- 478 28. ZorgDomein. [ZorgDomein heeft actuele cijfers over zorgbehandelingen die zich
479 opstapelen door corona crisis]. Retrieved from: [https://zorgdomein.com/nieuws/actuele-cijfers-](https://zorgdomein.com/nieuws/actuele-cijfers-uitgestelde-zorg-coronavirus/)
480 [uitgestelde-zorg-coronavirus/](https://zorgdomein.com/nieuws/actuele-cijfers-uitgestelde-zorg-coronavirus/). Published 2020. Accessed May 13th, 2020.
- 481 29. Liang W, Guan W, Chen R, et al. Cancer patients in SARS-CoV-2 infection: a
482 nationwide analysis in China. *Lancet Oncol.* 2020 Mar;**21**(3):335–337. DOI: 10.1016/S1470-
483 2045(20)30096-6.
- 484 30. Sahu KK, Jindal V, Siddiqui AD. Managing COVID-19 in Patients With Cancer: A
485 Double Blow for Oncologists. *JCO Oncology Practice.* **16**:223-225, 2020
- 486 31. Jazieh A-R, Alenazi TH, Alhejazi A, et al. Outcome of Oncology Patients Infected With
487 Coronavirus. *JCO Global Oncology.* 471-475, 2020.
- 488 32. Gamper EM, Groenvold M, Petersen MA, et al. The EORTC emotional functioning
489 computerized adaptive test: phases I-III of a cross-cultural item bank development. *Psychooncology.*
490 2014 Apr;**23**(4):397–403. DOI: 10.1002/pon.3427.

- 491 33. Gregorowitsch ML, van den Bongard HJGD, Young-Afat DA, et al. Severe depression
492 more common in patients with ductal carcinoma in situ than early-stage invasive breast cancer
493 patients. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2018 Jan;**167**(1):205–213. DOI: 10.1007/s10549-017-4495-y.
- 494 34. NOC*NCF. [EXERCISE ADVICE in times of Corona] (Dutch: SPORT- EN
495 BEWEEGADVIEZEN in tijden van corona). Retrieved from: [https://nocnsf.nl/media/2521/sport-en-](https://nocnsf.nl/media/2521/sport-en-beweegtips-in-tijden-van-het-coronavirus.pdf)
496 [beweegtips-in-tijden-van-het-coronavirus.pdf](https://nocnsf.nl/media/2521/sport-en-beweegtips-in-tijden-van-het-coronavirus.pdf). Published 2020. Accessed May 13th, 2020.
- 497 35. Sprangers MA, Schwartz CE. Integrating response shift into health-related quality of
498 life research: a theoretical model. *Soc Sci Med*. 1999 Jun;**48**(11):1507–15.
- 499 36. Deckx L, van den Akker M, Buntinx F. Risk factors for loneliness in patients with
500 cancer: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Oncol Nurs*. 2014 Oct;**18**(5):466–77.
501 DOI: 10.1016/j.ejon.2014.05.002.
- 502 37. Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Nearly 1 in 10 Dutch people frequently lonely in 2019.
503 Retrieved from: [https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/news/2020/13/nearly-1-in-10-dutch-people-frequently-lonely-](https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/news/2020/13/nearly-1-in-10-dutch-people-frequently-lonely-in-2019)
504 [in-2019](https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/news/2020/13/nearly-1-in-10-dutch-people-frequently-lonely-in-2019). Published 2020. Updated March 27th, 2020. Accessed May 13th, 2020.
- 505 38. Deckx L, van den Akker M, van Driel M, et al. Loneliness in patients with cancer: the
506 first year after cancer diagnosis. *Psychooncology*. 2015 Nov;**24**(11):1521–8. DOI: 10.1002/pon.3818.
- 507 39. Wind TR, Rijkeboer M, Andersson G, Riper H. The COVID-19 pandemic: The 'black
508 swan' for mental health care and a turning point for e-health. *Internet Interv*. 2020 Apr 20;**100317**. DOI:
509 10.1016/j.invent.2020.100317.
- 510 40. Torales J, O'Higgins M, Castaldelli-Maia JM, Ventriglio A. The outbreak of COVID-19
511 coronavirus and its impact on global mental health. *Int J Soc Psychiatry*. 2020 Mar;
512 **31**:20764020915212. DOI: 10.1177/0020764020915212.
- 513 41. Leung K, Wu JT, Liu D, Leung GM. First-wave COVID-19 transmissibility and severity
514 in China outside Hubei after control measures, and second-wave scenario planning: a modelling
515 impact assessment. *Lancet*. 2020 Apr 25;**395**(10233):1382–1393. DOI: 10.1016/S0140-
516 6736(20)30746-7.
- 517 42. Dutch Society of Surgical Oncology (NVCO). [Handvat voor chirurgische ingrepen
518 tijdens Corona-crisis]. Retrieved from: [https://heelkunde.nl/nieuws/handvat-voor-chirurgische-](https://heelkunde.nl/nieuws/handvat-voor-chirurgische-ingrepen-tijdens-corona-crisis)
519 [ingrepen-tijdens-corona-crisis](https://heelkunde.nl/nieuws/handvat-voor-chirurgische-ingrepen-tijdens-corona-crisis). Published 2020. Accessed May 13th, 2020.
- 520

521 **APPENDIX 1**

522 The following (summarized) advice regarding surgical breast cancer treatment was
523 published by the Dutch Society for Surgical Oncology (NVCO) and the Dutch Society
524 for Gastrointestinal Surgery (NKGIC) on March 27, 2020.⁴²

525

526 **General advice:**

527 1. Based on foreign experiences with COVID-19 patients, sometimes
528 asymptomatic patients appeared to suffer from severe pneumonia.
529 Therefore, one could consider to perform a CT-scan of the thorax shortly
530 before the scheduled surgery in all patients who need intraoperative
531 intubation.

532

533 **Breast cancer specific advice:**

534 1. Triple negative patients with locally advanced breast cancer who show little
535 response to neo-adjuvant chemotherapy (NAC) should be operated with
536 priority.
537 2. Surgery should be postponed on the short-term for patients with Her2Neu
538 positive patients with a good response to NAC and who still receive
539 monotherapy with trastuzumab, as well as surgery for hormone receptor
540 positive (HR+) patients without progression under NAC who can already
541 start with hormone therapy (HT).

542 3. Surgery for patients with only ductal carcinoma in situ (DCIS) and for HR+
543 patients who can start with HT in the waiting time to their surgery should be
544 postponed for the long-term.

545 4. It should be considered to perform surgery on patients with positive lymph
546 node(s) (N+) and/ or smaller tumors in order to enable postponement of
547 chemotherapy.

548

549 **TABLES**

550

551 **Table 1.** Baseline characteristics of responders and non-responders of the COVID-19 specific online

552 survey that was sent to active UMBRELLA breast cancer cohort participants who were enrolled

553 between October 2013 and April 2020.

554

	Responders (n = 1051, 66%)		Non-responders (n = 544, 34%)	
Patient characteristics	n	%	n	%
Age [mean (SD)]	56	(9.8)	55	(10.4)
Gender [n, %]				
<i>Female</i>	1045	(99.4)	542	(99.6)
<i>Male</i>	6	(0.6)	2	(0.4)
Body Mass Index (Kg/m ²) ¹ [mean (SD)]	26.2	(4.7)	26.2	(5.0)
<i>Missing [n, %]</i>	16	(1.5)	54	(9.9)
Smoking [n, %]				
<i>Smoker</i>	48	(4.6)	38	(7.0)
<i>Previous smoker</i>	531	(50.5)	242	(44.5)
<i>Non-smoker</i>	461	(43.9)	217	(39.9)
<i>Unknown</i>	11	(1.0)	47	(8.6)
Highest educational level [n, %]				
<i>No education</i>	6	(0.6)	2	(0.4)
<i>Primary school</i>	9	(0.9)	7	(1.3)
<i>Pre-vocational secondary education</i>	134	(12.7)	64	(11.8)
<i>Senior general or pre-university secondary education</i>	82	(7.8)	40	(7.4)
<i>Secondary vocational education</i>	228	(21.7)	139	(25.6)
<i>Higher professional education</i>	374	(35.6)	153	(28.1)
<i>University degree</i>	207	(19.7)	92	(16.9)
<i>Unknown</i>	11	(1.0)	47	(8.6)
Time since diagnosis (months) [median (IQR)]	24	(6 - 42)	24	(6 - 42)
<i>Unknown (n, %)</i>	9	(0.9)	43	(7.9)
Tumor characteristics	n	%	n	%
Pathological T stadium				
<i>0</i>	66	(6.3)	44	(8.1)
<i>In situ (IS)</i>	92	(8.8)	56	(10.3)
<i>I</i>	585	(55.7)	301	(55.3)
<i>II</i>	211	(20.1)	100	(18.4)
<i>III</i>	22	(2.1)	16	(2.9)
<i>IV</i>	1	(0.1)	3	(0.6)
<i>X</i>	23	(2.2)	7	(1.3)
<i>Unknown</i>	51	(4.9)	17	(3.1)
Pathological N stadium				
<i>X</i>	66	(6.3)	23	(4.2)
<i>0</i>	606	(57.7)	329	(60.5)
<i>I</i>	268	(25.5)	145	(26.7)
<i>II</i>	25	(2.4)	10	(1.8)
<i>III</i>	7	(0.7)	2	(0.4)
<i>Unknown</i>	79	(7.5)	35	(6.4)
Treatment characteristics	n	%	n	%
Type of breast surgery				
<i>Breast conserving therapy</i>	813	(77.4)	440	(80.9)

<i>Mastectomy</i>	94	(8.9)	50	(9.2)
<i>Mastectomy with direct breast reconstruction</i>	93	(8.8)	43	(7.9)
<i>No breast surgery</i>	2	(0.2)	1	(0.2)
<i>Unknown</i>	49	(4.7)	10	(1.8)
Most invasive axillary treatment				
<i>Sentinel node procedure</i>	784	(74.6)	420	(77.2)
<i>Axillary lymph node dissection</i>	82	(7.8)	40	(7.3)
<i>Unknown or not performed</i>	185	(17.6)	84	(15.5)
Systemic therapy ²				
<i>No systemic therapy</i>	206	(19.6)	169	(31.1)
<i>Chemotherapy</i>	119	(11.3)	73	(13.4)
<i>Endocrine therapy</i>	282	(26.8)	182	(33.5)
<i>Immunotherapy</i>	73	(6.9)	19	(3.5)
<i>Combination of above</i>	49	(4.7)	63	(11.6)
<i>Other</i>	4	(0.4)	4	(0.7)
<i>Unknown</i>	318	(30.3)	34	(6.2)
Radiation therapy				
<i>Local</i>	678	(64.5)	361	(66.4)
<i>Locoregional³</i>	244	(23.2)	141	(25.9)
<i>Other or type unknown</i>	42	(4.0)	6	(1.1)
<i>No radiation therapy</i>	17	(1.6)	8	(1.5)
<i>Unknown</i>	70	(6.7)	28	(5.1)

555

556 As a result of rounding, percentages may not add up a 100%.

557 Abbreviations: IQR; Interquartile Range, n; number, SD; Standard Deviation.

558 ¹ Calculated as weight/height².

559 ² Pre- and/ or postoperative therapy.

560 ³ Including supraclavicular and/ or axillary lymph nodes.

561

562 **Table 2.** COVID-19 specific questions (n = 1051).

563

	Number of patients	Percentage
	n	(%)
Are you currently receiving active breast cancer treatment?¹		
Yes	51	(4.9)
No	1000	(95.1)
Are / were you infected by the COVID-19?		
Yes, confirmed by nasopharyngeal swab	1	(0.1)
Possibly, I have or had fever	100	(9.5)
No, I was tested negative	9	(0.9)
No, I had/ have no symptoms and I was not tested	941	(89.5)
Do the current COVID-19 measure affect your current treatment or (after)care?		
Yes	286	(27.2)
No	765	(72.8)
Do you expect that the current COVID-19 measures will affect your treatment or (after)care in the future?		
Yes	250	(23.8)
No	801	(76.2)
Did the threshold to contact your <u>general practitioner</u> change, because of the COVID-19 situation?		
Yes, I contact my general practitioner more easily	19	(1.8)
Yes, I contact my general practitioner less easily	327	(31.1)
No	705	(67.1)
Did the threshold to contact the <u>physicians treating your breast cancer</u> change, because of the COVID-19 situation?		
Yes, I contact my breast cancer physician(s) more easily	8	(0.8)
Yes, I contact my breast cancer physician(s) less easily	162	(15.4)
No	881	(83.8)
Did the threshold to discuss your breast cancer diagnosis or breast cancer (treatment) related symptoms with <u>family and friends</u> change, because of the COVID-19 situation?		
Yes, I contact my friends and family more easily	14	(1.3)
Yes, I contact my friends and family less easily	87	(8.3)
No	950	(90.4)
Are you worried about your financial situation as a result of COVID-19?		
Not at all	663	(63.1)
A little bit	320	(30.4)
Quite a bit	53	(5.0)
Very much	15	(1.4)

564

565 As a result of rounding, percentages may not add up a 100%.

566

¹ Active treatment includes chemotherapy and/ or radiation therapy.

567 **Table 3.** Comparison of crude patient-reported outcomes of all patients who completed the same questionnaire during and 2 years before COVID-19 (n =1022
 568 for EORTC, and n = 942 for HADS). Loneliness score was only measured during COVID-19 (n = 1051).

	Before¹ COVID-19		During COVID-19		MD	95% CI	p-value
	mean	SD	mean	SD			
EORTC-QLQ30 and BR23²							
<i>Quality of Life (QoL)</i>	76.3	(18.2)	78.9	(16.6)	-2.6	-3.6 - -1.6	< 0.001
<i>Future perspectives (FP)</i>	70.8	(24.9)	69.7	(20.0)	1.1	-0.2 - 2.4	0.086
Functioning scales							
<i>Physical functioning (PF)</i>	87.0	(15.1)	88.6	(14.0)	-1.5 ⁺	-2.2 - -0.9	< 0.001
<i>Role functioning (RF)</i>	78.3	(26.3)	81.8	(23.6)	-3.5	-5.1 - -1.9	< 0.001
<i>Emotional functioning (EF)</i>	82.6	(18.7)	77.9	(17.3)	4.6	3.6 - 5.6	< 0.001
<i>Social functioning (SF)</i>	86.8	(20.8)	88.5	(20.2)	-1.6 ⁺	-2.9 - -0.4	0.010
<i>Cognitive functioning (CF)</i>	80.8	(20.9)	82.2	(18.3)	-1.4	-2.4 - -0.4	0.004
Symptom scales							
<i>Dyspnea (D)</i>	12.0	(21.6)	10.5	(18.6)	1.5	0.3 - 2.7	0.014
<i>Insomnia (I)</i>	27.3	(28.3)	27.1	(26.5)	0.2	-1.5 - 1.8	0.845
<i>Financial difficulties (FD)</i>	6.2	(16.6)	5.9	(16.0)	0.3	-0.6 - 1.2	0.568
HADS³	median	IQR	median	IQR		Z	p-value
<i>Total</i>	7	(4-11)	8	(5-12)		-6.87	< 0.001
<i>Anxiety</i>	4	(3-7)	4	(3-6)	..	-0.58	0.560
<i>Depression</i>	2	(1-5)	3	(2-6)	..	-11.60	< 0.001
Loneliness Scale⁴			n	%			
<i>Not lonely</i>	546	(52.0)
<i>Moderately lonely</i>	409	(38.9)
<i>Severely lonely</i>	96	(9.1)

569
 570 Abbreviations CI; Confidence Interval, EORTC; European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer, HADS; Hospital Anxiety and Depression
 571 Score, IQR; Interquartile Range, MD; Mean Difference, SD; Standard deviation.

572 ¹ Last valid score measured within the last two years before start COVID-19 pandemic.

573 ² EORTC-QLQ30 scores range from 0 to 100. Higher scores represent better outcomes for QoL, FP and functioning scales, and lower scores on symptom
 574 scales indicate better outcomes.

575 ³ A HADS total score > 7 indicates a possible anxiety disorder or depression and a score > 11 indicates a probable depression or anxiety disorder.

576 ⁴ Higher scores indicate more severe feelings of loneliness.

577 ⁺ MD differs from difference mean scores due to rounding.

578

579 **Table 4.** Mixed model analyses in complete cases. The effect of COVID-19 on different EORTC¹ subdomains of quality of life per follow-up period.

580

	No active treatment									Active treatment		
	<24 months follow-up			24-60 months follow-up			> 60 months follow-up			n = 47		
	n = 441			n = 430			n = 104					
	Between group difference			Between group difference			Between group difference			Between group difference		
Group	Mean ²	MD	95% CI	Mean ²	MD	95% CI	Mean ²	MD	95% CI	Mean ²	MD	95% CI
Quality of Life												
Pre-COVID-19	73.3	Ref.	71.6-75.0	79.2	Ref.	77.6-80.8	79.6	Ref.	76.2-82.9	65.5	Ref.	56.2-74.8
During COVID-19	78.6	-5.3*	77.1-80.1	79.8	-0.6	78.3-81.4	80.0	-0.4	76.7-83.2	67.5	-2.0	60.0-75.0
Physical Functioning												
Pre-COVID-19	86.9	Ref.	85.5-88.3	88.0	Ref.	86.7-89.3	85.0	Ref.	81.6-88.4	75.2	Ref.	65.5-84.9
During COVID-19	89.4	-2.5*	88.2-90.6	88.8	-0.8*	87.6-90.0	88.0	-3.0*	84.6-91.4	75.2	<0.01	66.5-83.9
Role Functioning												
Pre-COVID-19	73.4	Ref.	70.8-75.9	83.4	Ref.	81.3-85.5	84.1	Ref.	79.5-88.8	56.3	Ref.	38.7-74.0
During COVID-19	81.3	-7.9*	79.2-83.4	84.3	-0.9	82.2-86.3	83.7	0.5 ⁺	79.0-88.4	55.6	0.8 ⁺	40.3-70.8
Emotional Functioning												
Pre-COVID-19	80.2	Ref.	78.3-82.0	84.6	Ref.	83.0-86.1	86.4	Ref.	82.8-90.0	75.8	Ref.	64.7-86.9
During COVID-19	77.0	3.1**	75.4-78.7	78.1	6.4**	76.6-79.7	82.2	4.2*	79.1-85.3	72.2	3.5 ⁺	63.8-80.7
Social Functioning												
Pre-COVID-19	83.6	Ref.	81.5-85.7	90.4	Ref.	88.8-92.0	90.1	Ref.	86.2-94.0	69.8	Ref.	55.6-84.1
During COVID-19	87.1	-3.5*	85.3-89.0	91.9	-1.6 ⁺	90.4-93.5	92.0	-1.9	88.2-95.8	54.0	15.9**	40.6-67.4
Insomnia												
Pre-COVID-19	28.8	Ref.	26.1-31.5	26.6	Ref.	24.0-29.2	21.2	Ref.	15.9-26.4	39.7	Ref.	25.0-54.3
During COVID-19	28.0	0.8	25.5-30.5	26.6	<0.01	24.1-29.0	23.4	-2.2	19.0-27.8	33.3	6.3 ⁺	21.9-44.8

581

582 Abbreviations CI; Confidence Interval, MD; Mean Difference, i.e. difference in mean scores between pre-COVID and during COVID19. Ref.; reference group.

583 ¹ EORTC QLQ C30 scores range from 0-100. For quality of life, and functioning scales a higher score indicates a better outcome. For insomnia a lower score

584 indicates a better outcome.

585 ² Mean scores were adjusted for age (linear). In addition, active treatment scores were adjusted for chemotherapy, type of radiotherapy and type of surger

586 * Significant difference with a p-value < 0.05.

587 + MD differs from difference mean scores due to rounding.




Figure 1. Flowchart of inclusion of study participants from UMBRELLA-cohort. Participants who did not fill out the COVID-19 questionnaire completely (n=23) were considered non-responders.