## Early Patient-Reported Outcomes Are a Promising Predictive Factor of Cancer Progress and Outcome in Older Patients: The EPROFECY Study. <br>   5. CHU pointe-à-Potre, Guadeloupe, France

## Background

The benefits of Electronic Patient Remote Outcomes (e-PRO) for telemonitoring are well established, allowing early detection of illnesses and continuous monitoring of patients. We have previously shown high levels of compliance of use of telemonitoring in daily care (1).
Contrary to commonly-held beliefs, older patients (OPs, aged 70 or more) in oncology are compliant with the use of a telemonitoring digital platform. Such a tool allows the medical team to gain detailed knowledge of the tolerance profile of patients, and help monitor and maintain their quality of life, which is a particularly important goal for older patients. The
EPROFECY study assesses the predictive power of the patient health status in the first month of treatment, evaluated with the digital telemonitoring platform Cureety, on survival.
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## Patients \& Methods

This prospective study was conducted at the Military Hospital Bégin on OPs. Patients were allowed to respond to a symptomatology questionnaire based on CTCAE v.5.0, personalized to their pathology and treatment. A
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For A/B (good health status), the patient received therapeutic advice to help manage each of the reported adverse events. For C/D (poor health status), the patient was invited to call the hospital.
To assess the early tolerance of patience to their treatments, we
determined the health status in the 1 sa month after initiation which was classified as "Good health" (GH, majority of A/B reports) or "Poor health" (PH, majority of C/D reports). The primary endpoint was to assess if the first-month tolerance is a predictive factor of progression freesurvival (PFS). The secondary endpoint was to assess if the first-month tolerance is a predictive factor of overall survival (OS).

## Results

| - 61 patients were enrolled be <br> - The median age was 78.0 ye <br> - $81 \%$ presented a metastatic <br> - The most represented cance <br> - The median follow-up was 8. <br> - 2299 questionnaires were co <br> - $79 \%$ of the patients $(48 / 61)$ w <br> - $21 \%$ of the patients (13/61) w <br> - PFS at 6 months was $64.6 \%$ in <br> - OS at 6 months was $100 \%$ in | 2020 and 6/30/2021. $70.0 \text { - 99.0). }$ <br> ate cancer (67.2\%). <br> the patients. <br> " $G H$ " the first month. <br> ed " PH " the first month. <br> $4 \%$ in $\mathrm{PH}(\mathrm{p}=0.0339)$ <br> $95.5 \%$ in $\mathrm{PH}(\mathrm{p}=0.77)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Variables | Patient count and \% |
| Number of patients n , (\%) | 61 (100\%) |
| Gender N, (\%) <br> Female <br> Male | $\begin{aligned} & 14(14 \%) \\ & 47(47 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age (median, range) | 78.0 (70.0-99.0) |
| Comorbidities n, (\%) <br> Cardio-vascular <br> Pulmonary <br> Renal <br> Other | $\begin{gathered} 41(60.3 \%) \\ 7(10.3 \%) \\ 3(4.4 \%) \\ 17(25.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Primitive type of cancer <br> Prostate <br> Lung <br> Breast <br> Others gynaeco-urinary cancers | $\begin{gathered} 41(67.2 \%) \\ 9(14.8 \%) \\ 6(9.8 \%) \\ 5(8.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Stage <br> Localized disease <br> Advanced disease | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \text { (18.3\%) } \\ & 49 \text { (81.7\%) } \end{aligned}$ |
| Type of treatment $\mathbf{n}$, (\%) <br> Chemotherapy <br> Hormonotherapy <br> Immunotherapy <br> Combined treatment | $\begin{aligned} & 18(29.5 \%) \\ & 34(55.7 \%) \\ & 5(8.2 \%) \\ & 4(6.6 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| Clinical trial <br> No <br> Yes | $\begin{aligned} & 39 \text { (66.1\%) } \\ & 20(33.9 \%) \end{aligned}$ |

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the patients.


Figure 2. Distribution of health classifications. The 61 patients completed 2299
 Class ifications (green or orllow),
and $23^{\prime}$ "poor Health" and $23^{3}$ "Poor Health"
classifications (orange or red).


Figure 3. Patient monitoring timelines for the timelines for the
$G H$ and $P H$ groups. Each line represent the
monitoring for one patient and allows to visualize the,
duration of the monitoring, the report free eunency and
health classifications.
$\square 55 \%$ Correct -34\% Compromised $\square 10 \%$ To Monitor - $1 \%$ Critical

Figure 4. PFS (A) and OS (B) for the GH and PH groups.


## Conclusions and Perspectives

- First study assessing the use of PRO-based tolerance as a predictive factor of treatment response in OPs. Significant $80 \%$ reduction in the risk of progression in OPs that exhibited a good first-month tolerance
e-PRO follow-up might be an effective early predictor of response and help with the treatment plan.

